AN
EXPLICATION
OF THE
GOSPEL-THEISM
AND THE
DIVINITY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Containing the true Account of the

Syſtem of the Univerſe,

AND OF THE

CHRISTIAN TRINITY.

Propos'd to the Conſideration of all Learned and Holy Men.

By Richard Brocklesby, a Chriſtian Trinitarian.

When I have raiſed up thy Sons, O Zion, againſt thy Sons, O Greece. Zech. ix. 13.

LONDON,
Printed for the Author, by *J. Heptinſtall*; and Sold by *Samuel* and *John Sprint*
at the *Bell* in *Little Britain*. M DCC VI.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

3Om

The PREFACE.

A Book of many and great Singularities, the Fruit of much Time and Thought, of anxious Contemplation and great Labour, I publiſh to the World; and for ſuch a Publication need not to make an Apology: As we need to make, when we will be communicative to the Publick, but communicate nothing out of our own ſtore, ſay nothing but what hath been as well ſaid before, and publiſh new Books that have nothing new in them, nothing that encreaſeth the Stock of Learning, no Improvement of Knowledge. But this deſigneth an *Advancement of Learning*, and of the beſt Learning, which is the Chriſtian (in order whereto it maketh ſome Improvement of thoſe Arts of common Learning, *Logick* and *Rhetorick*) it pretendeth to *an Explication of the Chriſtian or Goſpel-Theiſm* (which compriſeth an Explication of the old Pagan-Theiſm, Natural Religion, and much of the old Judaical-Theiſm) and ſuch an Explication which is an Improvement of this infinitely valuable and Divine Learning. It explaineth the matters of the Chriſtian-Theiſm (the main of them) by ſetling their true Notion and Idea, proving their Truth and Reality, aſſoiling the Difficulties that incumber them; and becauſe throughout the whole it obſerveth, explicateth, and vindicateth a Divine and Saint of God-kind of Excellency that is in them (which is their Specifick Nature and their peculiar Glory and Excellency) thence it is Intituled *both an Explication of the Goſpel-Theiſm and of the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion.* The due Explication of both theſe conſiſteth in giving a good account of two comprehenſive Theories, that compriſe a vaſt number of Theories (neceſſary to the right underſtanding the Chriſtian Religion) the one is *The true Syſtem of the Univerſe of Rationals*, the other is *The Chriſtian Trinity.* The Chriſtian Trinity is here (as it ought to be) of the Chriſtian, not the Scholaſtic kind of Explication; whence I denominate my ſelf *A Chriſtian Trinitarian*, in contradiſtinction to *A Scholaſtic Trinitarian.*

In the Age wherein we live, great Induſtry hath been us'd (not without conſiderable Succeſs) to improve the Humane Arts and Sciences, *Natural Philoſophy, Mathematicks, Medicine, Anatomy, the Mechanic Arts*, and *the Man-killing Art of War:* but the like Induſtry hath not been us'd in cultivating and improving Theology, which in our Times is as imperfect in its notices of things, as much inwrapp'd in Obſcurities, as in former Ages, and continueth clogg'd with the ſame Difficulties, ſome of which are ſo great, that it is much, that the Chriſtian Religion ſhould keep a Standing in the World. This Conſideration prevail'd with me, to dedicate my Time and Studies to the Improvement of the Learning of the Chriſtian Theology, which is as capable of Improvement as the Human Arts and Sciences, needeth it at a greater rate than they, and is far more worthy to employ our Induſtry, the Theories of it being of infinite importance, and the truly noble Theories (that employ the Contemplation of Angels) the Summity of Learning and Science. (*a*) Γυμνάσιον μὲν φαμὲν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην σοφίαν, τέλος δὲ τὴν θείαν, *We ſay, that the Human Wiſdom is a lower exerciſe of the Soul of Man, but the Divine is the end.* The greater excellency and importance that theſe Divine Theories are of, the more pious care and ſedulous application is requiſite, that we commit no Miſtakes in them: For a Miſtake meerly in Natural Philoſophy can be no great matter (it is not a burning the Capitol, as *Epictetus* ſpeaketh;) but a Miſtake in Theology may be deadly in its ſelf and its conſequences. (*b*) Ὅσῳ μεῖζον τὸ ὑποκείμενον, καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος χαλεπώτερος, *The greater the Subject is, the greater is the Danger*; whence a moſt pious care and moſt ſedulous contemplation is requiſite in the Theory of the Godhead and the Perſons thereof. Which is alſo requiſite in theſe Theories, becauſe all the Helps and Aſſiſtances that we have, are ſcarce ſufficient to enable us to maſter the mighty Difficulties that ſome of them involve. In ſome Inſtances the Revelation is not full and clear; the Holy Scriptures (the only ſure Guide in theſe Theories) afford but imperfect notices, their ſenſe is ambiguous, it is not an eaſie matter to fix and determine it, and to inveſtigate their genuin Interpretation. In making Interpretations of Scripture, and explicating theſe great Theories, *Eccleſiaſtical Tradition* is very needful; but in caſes where it is needful, it is of no value. It was not of any value, to determine a trifling Diſpute between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches touching the time of obſerving *Eaſter*; nor another the like Diſpute about

(a) *Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p.* 284.

(b) *Gr. Naz. Or.* 26.

re-baptizing thoſe that were baptized by Hereticks; nor that greater Diſpute between the *Catholicks* and the *Arians:* both Parties in theſe Diſputes pretended to Apoſtolical Tradition, and their Pretenſions were alike frivolous and vain. Nothing is more fallacious than pretended (unwritten) Tradition: nor is there any ſafe relying upon the great *Councils* of the Church (their Authority, Wiſdom and Reaſons) of which none can certainly ſay, what are legitimate Councils and to be allowed, and what not. *They have erred and may err* (and therefore muſt be tried by the Rule which they ought to obſerve) they have decreed things groſly erroneous and ſinful, and have contradicted one another in their Decrees, as being of ſeveral Parties (*Arian* and *Catholic*, *Neſtorian* and *Eutychian*, *Iconoclaſts* and the contrary:) Ignorance and Temerity, Faction and Intereſt, have manifeſtly borne ſway in them, and things have been determin'd in them meerly by the majority of Men's Voices agreeably to their Prejudices. The Writings of *the Fathers* are of great uſe, but not in expounding difficult places of Scripture, nor in theſe great Theories touching the Godhead, wherein they (in conſort with the Councils) are great Maſters at creating Difficulties, but cure none. Their Notices of the Trinity are in great part unholy Trifles and Futilities; here they are unlike themſelves, and their Diſcourſes (otherwiſe laudable) are as remote from the Sanctity of their Religion and good ſence, as the things that they contemplate are remote from ordinary apprehenſion.

But the Difficulty that is in theſe Theories, is like that which is in acquiring Virtue, ſuch as ſhould awaken and excite Induſtry, not ſtifle and ſufflaminate it. The great Difficulty is in the beginning. *Sapere aude, incipe.* From ſmall Beginnings Men raiſe themſelves to great Eſtates (and like *Simonides*, that gained his little Wealth hardly, his great Riches eaſily:) So he that hath gained a true Principle, hath got a Thread by the end that will lead him out of a Labyrinth. *Lignum parvum incendit lignum magnum*, as the Jews ſay. In the main of theſe Theories (as in acquiring Virtue) the Difficulty is not inſuperable; Clearneſs and Certainty in them (notwithſtanding their Difficulty) by ſedulous ſeeking may be found. *(c) Nil tam difficile eſt, quin quærendo inveſtigari poſſiet.* Nor is a ſedulous Enquiry into theſe Divine Theories diſſonant from Piety, but it is really a Duty of Piety. For Chriſtianity is not like *Muhammediſm*, (*d*) that is afraid to be ſearch'd into. Old Errors paſs undiſcover'd, becauſe Men are afraid to look into them, being affrighted with that Maxim, *Scrutator majeſtatis opprimetur à gloria.* But they are worſe ſcar'd than they can be hurt by a pious ſearch into Divine Myſteries. Godlineſs requireth a ſedulous Enquiry into the great Myſtery of Godlineſs. *If thou crieſt after knowledge, and lifteſt up thy voice for underſtanding: if thou ſeekeſt her as ſilver, and ſearcheſt for her as for hid treaſures: then ſhalt thou underſtand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God.* But ſuch an Inquiſitiveneſs into Divine Myſteries there may be, which is not of the pious, and therefore not of the laudable, but of a criminal kind. And it is too poſſible, that there may be a Theology (touching the Godhead and the Perſons thereof) that declaimeth againſt, yet practiſeth an Inquiſitiveneſs into Divine Myſteries that is not of the pious kind. A Theology that preſcribeth Rules, Μὴ περιεργάζεσθαι τὰ σιωπώμενα, μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖν τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, yet it ſelf maketh curious Theories, of which the Scripture hath ſaid nothing; with great Curioſity and Philoſophic Subtilty it ſpeculateth the (Scholaſtic) divine Eſſence, and by its Theories which are of kind and quality no better than School-philoſophy, it profaneth the Divine Myſteries, depraveth and dark'neth them by its Explications. At the rate that the old *Ariſtotelian* Philoſophy ſalveth the Phænomena of Nature, it explicateth the Divine Myſteries. And as ſome great Phænomena of Nature are now with great induſtry ſalv'd, but not without introducing a better ſort of Philoſophy than the *Ariſtotelian:* ſo the great myſterious Theories of the Chriſtian Theology may be competently well explained, but not without introducing a better kind of Theology than the *Scholaſtic*, which was the Theology both of the *Arians* and the *Catholicks*, and is the Theology which from ancient times prevaileth in the Church.

(c) *Terent.*

(d) *Meritò ſuſpecta merx eſt, quæ ea lege obtruditur, nè inſpici poſſit.* Grot.

The Origin of this ſort of Theology is from the Schools of the Philoſophic Pagans, whoſe Theology therefore, and its ſuppoſed Traduction from the *Hebrews*, we were oblig'd to take into conſideration in our *Firſt Book*, as alſo the Pagans Syſtem of the Univerſe of Rationals (their City of Gods and Men) and their Inſtitutions of Virtue, ſo to illuſtrate that Divine Excellency, which is peculiar to the Religion of Chriſtians. Of theſe matters we have given a large Account, becauſe this *Firſt Book* is deſign'd to be *an Inſtitution of the knowledge of the Pagan-Theology*, which ſort of Inſtitution is very much wanting in the Commonwealth of Learning. For none can have cauſe to repent of employing his Time and Studies in converſing with this Learning of ancient Times. Young Students in Theology ought to be furniſh'd with an Inſtitution of it, that they may be converſant in the Pagan-Theology with caſe and pleaſure, and to their great emolument. The Learned alſo are not without need of it; for the Pagan-Theology is generally miſunderſtood; and ſo it was in the elder times, when it was a Fountain of Evils to the Church both in Doctrine and Worſhip. Without underſtanding the Pagan-Theiſm the Scriptures cannot be underſtood, nor any of our Diſcourſes touching the Trinity of the Chriſtian Religion. A principal Vice in the Chriſtian Church, both in ancient and latter times, is a criminal philoſophic-paganizing the matters of the Chriſtian Theology. Which Vice ought to be cur'd, that Chriſtians may duely Chriſtianize in their Theology (which would be a great ſtep to a right underſtanding the myſterious Theories of it) and this beſt Method we take for the Cure of it. We ſhew the true nature of the philoſophic Pagan Theology, and that as ſuch it conſiſteth of τὰ ἀλλότρια, *things heterogeneous* and alien from the Sanctity of our Religion: but withall we ſhew, that the Theology of the Pagans (both popular and philoſophic) is not without its noble parts, that ſeveral Branches of it are a great Confirmation of the Truth of the Theories of the Chriſtian Religion, and an Antidote againſt the Atheiſm and Deiſm of the Times wherein we live. But chiefly our account of the Affairs of Paganiſm (both in our firſt and ſecond Book) and our large Confutation of *Van Dale*'s Book of Oracles, hath reſpect to the Deiſts of theſe Times, who pretend to believe the Exiſtence of a God, but will by no means believe that there is a *Devil*, the belief of whoſe Exiſtence is alike fundamental to Chriſtianity as the belief of the Exiſtence of God, and whoſe Exiſtence is ſo manifeſt in the Affairs of Paganiſm, that it is uſually matter of obſervation to Travellers in Heathen Countries. (e) *It is impoſſible* (ſaith a late Traveller) *to force an* (Eaſtern) *Indian to curſe the Devil. And if he is preſs'd to do it, he will anſwer, He is not to curſe one that hath done him no harm.*

(c) Dr. Gemelli's *Voyage round the World*, Par. 5. L. 2. c. 1.

In our *Second Book* we conſider the Agreement and Difference between the Chriſtians and the Pagans touching the Monarchy of the Univerſe, and the principal Matters in diſpute between them; which are certain Debates, that concern the Syſtem of the Univerſe, namely, whether the Pagans mundane Syſtem, or our Catholic Church, is the true City and Kingdom of God? And whether the true God was an Intrinſic of their Theopolity? The Reſolution of which Queſtions ſheweth, how far the Pagans were from being his Worſhippers, and how far they were ignorant of him; that our Heathen ſtate is deadly, and the Pagano-mundane Empire is the Kingdom of Darkneſs. The proof whereof from the Pagan Theology is an Atteſtation of the Heathen World to the Truth of one half of the Chriſtian Religion; and it ſheweth the neceſſity of introducing into a ſinful World a Saviour-King, his Kingdom and ſaving Religion.

For the right underſtanding and illuſtrating the Theology of the Godhead, we have introduc'd into Theology a ſort of Learning, which we have called *Nobility-Learning*, that hath been of great uſe in the Inveſtigation and Deſcription of that Idea of God (an Idea of immenſly difficult Inveſtigation and Deſcription) which our *Third Book* repreſenteth. With this Idea of God many Theories are connex'd touching his Religion and God-ſervice, his original Law and Kingdom, his Creation and the final Cauſe thereof. And with theſe Theories we have combin'd the Theory of *a Præ-exiſtence of Souls*, which ſome will greatly diſguſt. But we have done it, not out of Vanity, but meer Neceſſity, not knowing how to give an Account of an univerſal Lapſe of human Souls from any other Hypotheſis; nor do we know any other Hypotheſis *de origine animæ*, that tolerably ſuiteth with the Nobleneſs of our Religion. They that ſuppoſe themſelves furniſh'd with a better Hypotheſis, might do well to communicate it: but they muſt not think, to give an Account of the now original Evils of Souls meerly from the Hiſtory of *Adam* in his terreſtrial Paradiſe, as we have plainly prov'd in our Account of the criminal and penal Evil, which is involv'd in the Lapſe of Mankind. Every Man that will converſe with his own Soul, may be competently well ſatisfied, that he came into this World both an Heaven-born Soul and a lapſed Soul (that needeth a Renovation into the divine Image); which is an Hypotheſis ſo far from being diſſonant from the general ſenſe of Chriſtians, that they implicitly aſſert it in almoſt all their Books of Piety; ſo that it may be counted a branch of their Theology.

Our *Fourth Book* repreſenteth an Idea of the *Holy Spirit*; from which Idea, conjoined with the Idea of God, it is manifeſt, that by long and ſedulous Contemplation a great Improvement is made in the Theology of the Godhead. And it may be hop'd,

64

that in proceſs of time contemplative Divines will make a greater Improvement, and go to greater heights in this divine Learning, than thoſe to which we have proceeded. With this Idea of the Holy Ghoſt, *An Idea of the Nature of the Holy Scriptures* is connex'd, which demonſtrateth, that they are Aliens from Scholaſticiſm, and conſequently our Theology of the Godhead and the Perſons thereof ought to be of another kind and Character than Scholaſtic. This Character of the Scriptures, is ſuch a Preſcription againſt the Articles of the Scholaſtic Theology, as the ancient Writers alledge againſt Hereticks; for the Scriptures are not of Scholaſtic Interpretation. It is a Teſt or Touchſtone, whereby to diſcern, what *Dogmata* in Theology are genuin, and what are ſpurious; for thoſe which ſuppoſe the Holy Scriptures not to be of an holy-popular but a Scholaſtic kind of ſenſe, are of the illegitimate kind. Holy People may try Doctrines (as the Palate trieth Meats) by the holy Life which is in them.

Our *Fifth Book* beginneth with ſuch an Idea of *the Law of Nature*, as promiſeth an univerſal Satisfaction. For it giveth not a lame and mutilate, but a duely plenary Account thereof (in the various Conſiderations of it) clearly explicateth and defineth the *principia juſti & decori*, proceedeth upon the true Grounds of Law and Morality, and ſheweth, that thoſe Grounds are as plain and certain as thoſe of the Mathematicks. From the Law of Nature, as it is the Law-Religion of the Law-Religioniſts, we deduce the natural and legal condition of Mankind, whence the Deiſts of our Times, that adhere to Natural Religion againſt the Chriſtian, may diſcern the ſtate that they are in; for if they are not Atheiſts, but a ſort of Religioniſts, they are the Law-Religioniſts, whoſe Religion is ruinous to their Soul-intereſts; and if that will not ſufficiently ruin them, the Religion of their Saviour will do it, from whom they are Apoſtates. His ſaving Religion we have deduc'd from the Beginning of the World, and conſidering it under the various Names and Notions of it, we have given an Account of its Nature and Excellency, which more eſpecially appeareth in the Nobleneſs of the Faith of his genuin Religioniſts, and the Tranſcendence of their Virtue and Piety.

Our *Sixth Book* repreſenteth an Idea of our bleſſed Saviour (connex'd with an Idea of the Chriſtian Trinity) about whoſe Perſon there have been, and are, more Diſputes and unchriſtian Conteſts in the Chriſtian Church, than about all other Articles of Religion put together. It may juſtly ſeem ſtrange and be ſurprizing, that in all theſe innumerable Conteſts which have been in former or latter Ages, all the contending Parties ſhould miſtake his true Idea: yet there is nothing more evident and certain than that they have miſtaken it. For ſeeing God is certainly The imperial Eſtate of the Kingdom of God, what can this definitive Name *The Son of God* ſignifie, but *The imperial Son of this high and holy imperial Eſtate* (The imperial Saint of God-kind of Son) The Perſon of the Meſſiah? And what can this definitive Name *Meſſiah the Prince*, *A Prince and a Saviour*, *The Prince of Life*, ſignifie, but that our Saviour is *The Prince the Son*, and is the ſame unto God, as the Prince the Son in an Empire (or Kingdom) is to the King the Father? His true Idea may be underſtood from that Meſſage which the *Inga* or King of *Peru* ſent by his Army to the People of *Chile*, (f) *that they came not to ſpoil them of their Lands or Goods, but only to oblige them to own the Sun for their God, and the Inga for his Son and their Lord.* The *Inga* ſuppos'd the Sun to be God, himſelf the *imperial Son of the Sun*, and therefore *The Lord the Son and Lord of all.* In ſuch ſence our Saviour is the Son of God, and this is his true Idea. But altho' this Idea is ſelf-evident, yet being diſſonant from the ſence of all Parties, it will probably (in reſpect of ſome Branches of it) give Offence to all Parties. For the diſagreeing Parties ſuppoſe, that there is no Medium between God and Creature, and accordingly they are divided in their Opinion, one Party creaturizing the Son of God, the other ſuppoſing him to be God, ſo as to be *The eternal almighty God.* Both which Idea's are ſinful Extravagancies, widely diſſonant from his true Idea who is God, but it is only as *The imperial Son of God.* And this the diſagreeing Parties ought to have conſidered, that it is one thing to be God *definitively and abſolutely*, and another thing to be God as the imperial or Creature-tranſcendent Son of God, and only as ſuch; which is the true Idea of our Saviour. By this Hypotheſis his true Divinity, Deity or Creature-tranſcendence of Perſon is ſecur'd, and the Chriſtian Trinity and Religion is conſtituted: but becauſe this imperial Son of God is neceſſarily *An imperial Saint of God-kind of Son, and the Perſon of the Meſſiah* (who is eſſentially *Deus-homo*) this therefore is one branch of our Hypotheſis, That there is no *Abſtract Logos or incomplex Son* of Eternal Generation. Which branch of our Hypotheſis will probably give offence to the generality of Divines and Chriſtians.

(f) Ovalle's *Relation of the Kingdom of* Chile, B. 3. c. 2.

Some will object, that the denying an Abſtract Son or incomplex Logos of Eternal Generation, is very prejudicial to the Honour of our bleſſed Saviour: which is a matter of ſo great regard, that it muſt be acknowledg'd, that it were far better that ſuch an one as I had never been born, than that I ſhould in the leaſt degree diminiſh his Honour or eclipſe his Glory. But this Objection is wholly groundleſs; for altho' our Hypotheſis diſcardeth the Scholaſtick's extravagant and irreligious deifyings of their own Idea's, yet it ſtrenuouſly aſſerteth and proveth the Deity or Creature-tranſcendence of our Saviour's Perſon (both in his primary and his officiary Capacity, both native and factive) and thereby entitleth him to the divine Honours in conſort with God the Father. In which divine Honours an Abſtract Son or Logos of Eternal Generation ought to have no ſhare. For ſuch a Son or Logos is not the Perſon of our bleſſed Saviour, nor of any concern to us or our Religion, but is only a Scholaſtic Idea, whoſe Deity cannot be ſuppos'd without doing heinous Diſhonour unto God, and bringing ruinous Prejudices and Miſchiefs upon the Chriſtian Trinity and Religion. And ſuch an honouring a ſuppoſed Son of God, our Saviour will not count a doing him Honour.

It may be objected, that our Hypotheſis, which denieth an Abſtract Son or Logos of Eternal Generation, is contrary and repugnant to (*Judicium Eccleſiæ Catholicæ*) the Judgment of the Catholic Church, to which we owe great reſpect. And we do indeed owe ſuch reſpect thereto, that we ought not to diſſent from it, but upon ſuch Grounds and Reaſons that will juſtifie our Diſſent, make it neceſſary, and are of force, to outweigh the reſpect that we owe to any meer human Authority whatſoever. Such Reaſons our Hypotheſis proceedeth upon, Reaſons ſo many and ſo mighty, that they cannot deceive us, unleſs mathematical Evidence and Certitude can deceive us. And as divine Authority cannot be alledg'd, ſo no humane Authority may be alledg'd againſt the Certitude of Demonſtration.

Some will probably object the Crime of Hereſie againſt our Hypotheſis, that in denying an incomplex Son or Logos of Eternal Generation, it denieth much of the Catholic Faith. But nothing of the Catholic Faith is denied by this branch of our Hypotheſis ſave only the Scholaſtic Theology (commonly called the Catholic Faith) which being falſe and illegitimate (as we have plainly demonſtrated) a Doctrine cannot be therefore Hereſie or Infidelity, becauſe it is repugnant to this human Scholaſtic Faith. Which is not of kind and quality the Chriſtian and Divine Faith, but heterogeneous and exotic; nor do the Matters of it (being Scholaſtic) appertain to the ſaving Faith of Chriſt's Believers; nor are they eſſential to his being *The Chriſt*, the belief whereof is the Summary of the Chriſtian Faith. But becauſe the Chriſtian Trinity is eſſential to his being *The Chriſt*, the Anti-Trinitarians are concern'd, to vindicate themſelves from the Crime of Hereſie, wherewith they are charg'd by the Church. And becauſe God the Father's Scriptural *Monothe-iſm* is an Article alike fundamental as our Saviour's being *The Chriſt*, therefore the Church is concern'd, to vindicate herſelf from the Charge of Hereſie, which the Anti-Trinitarians recriminate upon her and her Scholaſtic (Catholic) Faith. Which, whether it be liable to the Charge of Hereſie or not, is certainly ſo very criminal, that the Church is oblig'd, not to impoſe it, but diſown it.

With great Aſſurance we may diſown the Scholaſtic Explications of the Trinity: but we may not be ſo dogmatical and decretory touching all our own Explications thereof, till they have paſs'd the Cenſure of the learned World. Great things are not begun and perfected at one time. There may be ſomething of Obſcurity, Difficulty, Falſity, in our Explications, which I am not aware of. Which therefore I propoſe to the Conſideration of all learned and holy Men (with all due deference to their Perſons and Judgment) to be examin'd and cenſur'd (according to their deſert) as being prepar'd thankfully to receive their Inſtructions, Admonitions, Reproofs, and to rectify any thing that they ſhew to be amiſs. And ſeeing I have no worldly or ſelfiſh Intereſt, but deſign only to ſerve the Intereſt of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, I may not doubt, but that they will concur in my Deſign, aſſiſt my Explications of divine Myſteries, and be my Fellow-helpers to the Kingdom of God. And of the Sons of Profaneneſs it may reaſonably be hop'd, that henceforth they will forbear ſcoffing at the Trinity *as a Myſtery*, ſeeing from a due Explication thereof it appeareth, to be the moſt venerable religious Myſtery that the Mind of Man can contemplate, and ſuch a Myſtery which could never enter into the heart of Man to invent or excogitate: Which therefore argueth the Chriſtian Religion to be of divine Original, no Effect of humane Artifice or Impoſture, (or, to ſpeak in the Courtly Language of theſe

Times, of *any Prieſtcraft*;) Our Explication alſo of this divine Myſtery, appeareth to be true and legitimate from the Coherence and Conſiſtence of the whole of it; for Lies do not well hang together.

But ſome things may be really conſiſtent and coherent, that yet do not ſeem well to hang together: Of which there is an inſtance in this Book, which diſcourſeth of ſeveral Matters of Natural Philoſophy that occur in the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe, yet it affirmeth of this Moſaic Hiſtory, *p.* 461. that there is no Natural Philoſophy in it. But of this Affirmation the meaning is not, that there is no matter of Natural Philoſophy in the Moſaic Hiſtory; but, that *Moſes* doth not treat of ſuch Matters as a Natural Philoſopher, but as a Prophet of God. Of this the Reader ought to be advertiſ'd, and of another thing alſo that occurreth in this Book; which is, a Repetition of ſome Citations (ſometimes out of Choice, and ſometimes from a Failure of Memory): But theſe Repetitions are ſo ſmall and ſo few, that a Reader muſt be very much wanting in Candor and Good-nature, if he inſiſteth upon them as any conſiderable fault. Touching theſe Citations, all poſſible Care hath been taken, that they be true and legitimate. And becauſe in Citations the Senſe of Authors is uſually miſrepreſented, therefore (ſo often as it can be done without inconvenience) the cited Author's own Words are here ſet before the Reader's eyes; which is not a little to his Advantage: For ſo by reading one Book (in ſome degree) he readeth a great number, and becometh acquainted with Books of ancient Learning, which ought to be reviv'd in our time.

But all human exotick Learning is here made uſe of only to ſerve the Chriſtian Learning, which cannot be promoted otherwiſe than in Conſort with the Chriſtian Life. Whence, in great part, this Book conſiſteth of Chriſtianity *in re practicâ*, as being deſign'd to promote not meer Notional Learning, but (that which is far better than the beſt of ſuch Learning) Virtue and Piety, and ſuch Virtue and Piety which is ſaving to the Souls of Men, which conſtituteth regenerate and ſanctify'd Chriſtians (the only Heirs of Salvation) and is not to be found in unregenerate Humanity. Such a Piety (not an empty Surface thereof) ought to ſound from all our Pulpits, and a Chriſtian Church muſt not be alien from it in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, or Life.

ERRATA that (for ſeveral Reaſons) could not well be corrected by a Pen.

PAge 23. Column 2. Line 21. read ען אזל. p. 29. c. 2. l. 27. r. *Subvection.* p. 79. c. 1. l. 40. r. θεωρητικοί. p. 72. c. 1. l. 67. r. συνθήματα. p. 142. c. 1. l. 38. r. *the Platoniſt.* p. 155. c. 2. l. 2. r. ἀῤῥενόθηλυς. p. 217. c. 1. l. 12. r. *Excommunication.* p. 300. c. 1. l. 32. r. συνήθειας. p. 388. c. 1. l. 1. r. ישמו הוא. p. 394. c. 2. l. 40 r. προσάσουσιν. p. 578. c. 2. l. 40. r. ἐκπομπῇ. p. 626. c. 1. l. 36. r. *Improbabilities.* p. 776. c. 1. l. 55. r. *Aſſimilation.* p. 852. c. 1. l. 9. r. *A Third ſort of Arguments.* p. 861. c. 1. l. 5. r. *Intellectualiſts.* Some Engliſh words ſlightly miſ-ſpell'd ſeem not to need a Correction: as, p. 7. *incompatible.* p. 107. *contumelius.* p. 360. *Phiſiology.* p. 414. *unregenrate.* p. 434. *alloted.* p. 636. *ſingnifieth and exhilerate.* p. 640. *opperative.* p. 690. *parriſide.* p. 723. *Agreebly.* p. 755. *Intelligennt.* p. 762. *Teſtamens.* p. 794. *Eleaſinian.* p. 814. *Ungdodlineſs.* A Repetition there is of *a*, *the*, and *new*, p. 17, 683, 828.

In the Margin, p. 102. at (r) r. *Solem mundi.* p. 122. at (l) r. καθήκει. p. 169. at (b) r. ἥλικον. p. 579. at (n) r. *magnificus.* p. 652. at (a) r. *Virtutes.* p. 656. at (s) r. *totus.* p. 682. at (l) r. κωμὰς. ibid. at (t) r. εἰς ἡμᾶς. p. 752. at (f) r. *dicenti.* p. 723. at (o) r. Ἀχέροντος. ibid. at (r) r. ἃ διδάγει. p. 774. at (r) r. *ſempiternas.* p. 833. at (e) r. *cogitare.* p. 851. at (w) r. *formam.* p. 864. at (y) r. ἀρετὴν.

THE

THE
Goſpel Theiſm Explained,
AND THE
DIVINITY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

BOOK I.

An Idea of the Pagan Syſtem of the Univerſe.

The INTRODUCTION.

Of the firſt Theory in Theology. Of the Pagans One Intellectual Head of the Univerſe, and of their One Univerſe. Of the various Conſiderations thereof.

THE principal and moſt eminent Branch both of the Chriſtian and Pagan Theology (wherein the goodneſs of the one and the badneſs of the other chiefly appeareth) is their diſſonant Doctrine, περὶ τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ παντὸς, *touching the Conſtitution of the Univerſe*, which ought to be the firſt Theory in Theology, and is ſo in the Pagan Theology. For the ſeveral Sects of Philoſophic Pagans agree in the uſual diſtribution of Philoſophy *(a)* into *Theoretic* and *Practic* (Philoſophy as to the matter of Theory and the matter of Practice, commonly ſo call'd;) and in the Theoretic part of Philoſophy (Phyſiology, Metaphyſicks, or the Philoſophic Pagans Theology) ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις, *the nature of the Univerſe and the things thereof* is contemplated in the firſt place, the practic part of Philoſophy being built upon certain Maxims, δόγματα, or decretory Sentences touching the Conſtitution of the Univerſe. This their Philoſophy in both the conſtitutive parts of it is an Heathen kind of Philoſophy, which is no ſmall diſparagement; but their Method of philoſophizing was Rational and Judicious, and ought to be a pattern to Chriſtian Theologers. They look'd upon the Theory of the Conſtitution of the Univerſe as the firſt Fundamental Theory. *(b) What is thine Art or Profeſſion? To be good* (ſaith the Philoſophic Emperour.) *And how can this be well effected but by certain Theorems, ſome concerning the Nature of the Univerſe, and ſome concerning the proper Conſtitution of Man.* (c) Plato *conſidering, that the knowledge both of Divine and Humane Things belongeth to Philoſophy, allotted one part of it for contemplating and treating of the Nature of the Univerſe* (which is call'd, ἡ περὶ τῶν ὅλων φιλοσοφία, *the Philoſophy touching the whole*;) *a ſecond part for treating of Humane Things; and the third part of Philoſophy is the Logical.* It is ſaid, that this method of philoſophizing was the *Indians*, that a certain *Indian* at *Athens* ask'd *Socrates*, τί ποιῶν φιλοσοφοίη; *what he was doing philoſophizing? Socrates* anſwering, that he was inquiring, περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου, *touching the matters of Humane Life*; the *Indian* derided him, and told him, that *none can have the knowledge of Humane Things, that doth not know*, τὰ θεῖα, *the things of the Gods, or the Divine.* Philoſophers muſt contemplate in the ſame method that Phyſicians practiſe. (d) *As Phyſicians deſigning to cure parts of the Body, firſt take care of the ſtate of the whole: So the nature of the whole muſt be firſt known, that we may ſpeculate humane things; for Man is a part of the whole. Good is two-fold; Ours and the good of the Univerſe: the latter is the principal and beyond the other, which is in order unto it.* The Theory of the Conſtitution of the whole ought to be the firſt Theory, *(e) becauſe* (ſaith a *Pythagorean*) *the knowledge of the divine and moſt excellent things is the beginning, and cauſe, and rule of Man's Felicity.* This Method of philoſophiſing a Chriſtian Apologiſt learn'd from the Schools of the Philoſophic Pagans. *(f) All things are ſo connex'd and link'd together, that Humane things are not to be known without a diligent ſearching into the things Divine, nor can a Citizen of a particular City underſtand his*

(*a*) Gaſſend. *t.* 1. *l. proœm. c.* 1. & 9.

(b) Τίς σου ἡ τέχνη; ἀγαθὸν εἶναι. τοῦτο δὲ πῶς καλῶς γίνεται ἢ ἐκ θεωρημάτων, τῶν μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ ὅλου φύσεως, τῶν δὲ περὶ τῆς ἰδίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευῆς. M. Ant. *l.* xi. *s.* 5.

(c) Πλάτων μέντοι κατανοήσας, ὡς εἴη μιᾶς ἡ τῶν θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιστήμη, πρῶτος διεῖλε, καὶ ἔφη τὴν μέν τινα περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως εἶναι πραγματείαν· τὴν δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τρίτην δὲ περὶ τοὺς λόγους. Ariſtocl. *ap* Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* xi. *c.* 3.

(d) *Ibid.*

(e) Ἀρχὰ καὶ αἰτία καὶ κανὼν ἐντὶ τᾶς ἀνθρωπίνας εὐδαιμοσύνας ἁ τῶν θείων καὶ τιμιωτάτων ἐπίγνωσις. Theag. *ap.* Stob. *S.* 1.

(f) *Omnia ita cohærentia, connexa, concatenata ſunt, ut niſi divinitatis rationem diligenter excuſſeris, neſcias humanitatis; nec poſſis pulchre gerere rem civilem, niſi cognoveris hanc communem omnium mundi civitatem.* Min. Fel. *p.* 125.

duty and behave himſelf aright, unleſs he underſtandeth the City of the Univerſe, and conſidereth himſelf as a Citizen thereof.

The Philoſophic Pagans (that were Theiſts) did ſo far contemplate the Univerſe aright, they acknowledg'd one intellectual Head of it preſiding over it; for by *Jupiter* the Pagan Theologers underſtand (g) *that moſt ancient and princely Mind, which all things follow and obey, the common Father of Gods and Men, the Maker and King of all.* And as they acknowledge this one intellectual Head of the Univerſe, ſo they ſuppoſe, that there is but one Univerſe, not ſuch an Univerſe as the *Epicureans* imagin'd, who talk'd of infinite incoherent Worlds in infinite Space; which may be call'd, an Univerſe of Worlds; but is not ſo an Univerſe, as to be one total mundane Syſtem (or Syſtematical Frame,) but only the Aggregate of incoherent Severals, A-Syſtematical multitudes of particular Syſtems and Comprehenſions; whereas this was the Senſe of the Pagan Theiſts touching the Univerſe; that it was ſo an Univerſe, as to be one total mundane Syſtem, the one total mundane Syſtem, beſides which there is no other World, according to that commonly receiv'd Maxim of theirs, (h) ὅτι εἷς κόσμος, καὶ ἓν τὸ πᾶν, *that there is but one World and one Univerſe.* But this one World or Univerſe may be one Syſtem made up of ſeveral ſubordinate Syſtems involving and comprehending one another in greater and greater Orbs and Comprehenſions, and ſo may conſiſt of multitudes of particular mundane Syſtems, every one of which may not improperly be call'd a World, according to that of *Proclus*, (i) *One Polity is a comprehenſion of many Polities, and one World of many Worlds.* Such an one World is that plurality of Worlds which *Plutarch* diſputeth for, which is not diſſonant from the Senſe of the Stoicks whom he oppoſeth, and would ſeem to differ from them, yet without diſagreement. They argu'd thus for the Unity or Singularity of the World: *There is but one Jove, one Fate, one Providence,* which could not be πλειόνων ὄντων κόσμων, *if there were more Worlds than one. Plutarch* refuſeth this Conſequence of theirs, and thus argueth againſt it. (k) *What neceſſity is there, that there muſt be more* Joves *than one, if there be more Worlds? for why may not the God of the whole be ruler in chief in every one of theſe Worlds, having Mind and Reaſon, as he that is ſtiled by us,* κύριος ἁπάντων καὶ πατήρ, *Lord and Father of all? or what hindreth but that a multitude of Worlds may be all ſubject to the Fate and Providence of one* Jove, *himſelf inſpecting and directing every one, and imparting Principles and Spermatick Reaſons to them: For in our Region of humane things one Body is often conſtituted of ſeveral Bodies, as an Aſſembly, an Army, a Chorus. And is it not poſſible, that in the Univerſe ten, or fifty, or an hundred Worlds ſhould all be govern'd by one Reaſon, and be order'd in reference to one Principle?* Such a plurality of Worlds is not at all diſſonant from the forementioned Maxim of the Pagan Theiſts, *that there is but one Univerſe or one World,* (as there is one intellectual Head preſiding over it;) which one Univerſe is capable of four ſeveral Notions or Conſiderations. For it muſt be conſider'd both *Politically* and *Phyſiologically*: And as it is conſider'd *Politically*, it may be conſider'd both as it is *the Pagans Univerſe of Rationals*, and as it is *their Univerſe of Gods*, which is not abſolutely the ſame with their Univerſe of Rationals.

The Univerſe was *politically* conſider'd by the Pagan Theologers; for they ſuppos'd it, to be *a mundane Political Syſtem, City, Monarchy* or *Polity* Imperial, having the forementioned intellectual Head preſiding in it, and over it, as an *Imperial Potentate.* But they conſider'd it alſo *Phyſically* or *Phyſiologically*, ſuppoſing it to be *an Animate Syſtem* or *Fabrick, a Mundane Animal*; and the forementioned intellectual Head was conſider'd as *the Mundane Syſtems, Animative Genius* (Mind or Soul,) yet ſo as to be alſo the Imperial Head of the Mundane Monarchy. So the *Zeus* or *Jupiter* of their Theology (which is God in the Pagan Notion and Expreſſion) is ſaid to be (l) βασιλεὺς θεῶν, *the King of the Gods,* and θεὸς θεῶν, *God of the Gods,* (as he is ſtil'd in *Plato*;) and ſo *Plutarch* (who ſometimes diſtinguiſheth the true *Jupiter* (m) from the *Jupiter Homericus*, yet) ſaith of *Homer*, τὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων ἄρχοντα θεὸν, ὕπατον κρειόντων προσεῖπε, *he ſtiled that God, who is the Prince of Princes, the higheſt of Rulers.* And *Ariſtotle* (who allotteth τὸν ἀνωτάτω τόπον, *the higheſt place,* the Heavens, to the Divinity) thus argueth for the Monarchy of the Univerſe;

> Τὰ δὲ ὄντα οὐ βούλεται κακῶς πολιτεύεσθαι,
> Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος.

The Syſtem of Beings is not willing to be ill govern'd; according to Homer, *the Government of many is not good; therefore there is one Prince or Monarch of all.* The *Zeus* or *Jupiter* of the Pagan Theology was alſo of *the ſecond* conception; for *apud Theologos Jupiter eſt Mundi Anima* (ſaith *Macrobius*) Jupiter, *with the Theologers, is the Soul of the World,* ſuppos'd to be a Vital Principle diffus'd and diſpread through all, as well as an Imperial Power over all. So *Porphyry* declareth the Senſe of the Greek Theologers. (n) *By* Zeus *the* Greeks *underſtand the Mind of the World, which framed all things in himſelf, and containeth the World.* The *Nous* of *Anaxagoras* (who was himſelf call'd *Nous* for his *Dogma*) is of affinity with this Notion; for his Maxim was, (o) *that Mind being imperial and unmingled with any thing, ordereth all things, pervading and paſſing through all things. Nous* or Mind might be firſt introduc'd by *Anaxagoras* into the Phyſiology of the Greek Philoſophers of the *Ionick* Succeſſion, although * Mind was a Principle in the *Greeks* Religion long before *Anaxagoras*'s time. *Anaxagoras* was a Naturaliſt, not a Religioniſt, ſuch as the Phyſiologizing Pagan Theologers were, (and therefore his *Solitary Mind*, notwithſtanding its Affinity with, is different from *their Mind of the World*:) but he choſe to phyſiologize, not after the method of his Predeceſſors, that were Materialiſts, and acknowledg'd no other Subſtance beſides Body; but agreeably to that great Principle of popular Pagan Theology, a Principle that all wiſe men agree in (as *Plato* ſaith in his *Philebus*,) that νοῦς ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, *Mind is the King of Heaven and Earth.*

(g) Κάλει τὸν μὲν Δία νοῦν πρεσβύτατον καὶ ἀρχικώτατον, ᾧ πάντα ἕπεται καὶ πειθαρχεῖ. M. Tyr. *Diſſ.* 29. Εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἐκλαμβάνουσι τὸν Δία, ἢ εἰς νοῦν πρεσβύτατον καὶ ἀρχαιότατον, κἀντεῦθεν καὶ σοφώτατον. Nyceph. *in* Syneſ. *p.* 356. Ὁ κοινὸς ἀνθρώπων τε καὶ θεῶν πατήρ. Muſon. *ap.* Grot. *in* Luc. 2. 49. Τῶν πάντων δημιουργὸς καὶ βασιλεύς. Ariſtid. *orat. in minerv.*

(h) Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ. l.* 1. *c.* 2. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 14. *c.* 23.

(i) Τὴν μίαν πολιτείαν πολλῶν πολιτειῶν εἴποι ἄν τις ἀριθμόν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν ἕνα κόσμον πολλῶν κόσμων συνεκτικόν. *In* Tim. *p.* 39.

(k) *De Def. orac. p.* 425.

(l) Eugub. *de per.* Phil. *l.* 3. *c.* 13. & *l.* 5. *c.* 6.

(m) *De Def. orac. p.* 426.

(n) Τὸν Δία τὸν νοῦν κόσμου ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, ὃς τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδημιούργησεν, ἔχων τὸν κόσμον. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 9.

(o) Αὐτοκράτορα γὰρ ὄντα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐδενὶ μεμιγμένον πάντα φησὶν αὐτὸν κοσμεῖν τὰ πράγματα, διὰ πάντων ἰόντα. Plato *in* Cratylo.

* *V.* Marſham. *Can. Chron. p.* 261. *Ed.* Lipſ.

CHAP. I.

1. The Pagan Theologers ſuppoſe the Univerſe of Rationals, to be one Mundane City, Political Syſtem or Commonwealth, which is their prime fundamental miſtake. 2. Learned Chriſtians alike erroneous with the Pagans, 3. Of the ſeveral Orders of Rationals of which the Pagans Mundane City conſiſteth. 4. Of the Demonial Order and its neceſſary Exiſtence in the Univerſe according to the Pagans. 5. Of the Jewiſh *Eſſens. 6. Of the Traduction of the Philoſophic Pagan Theology from the Hebrews. 7. A Review of it.*

I. THE Goſpel Theiſm repreſenteth the Univerſe of Rationals as in *a divided State*, compriſing not only a great diverſity, but a contrariety of Kingdoms and Societies, of Laws and Government, of Eſtates and Conditions, of Lives and Religions, of Heads of Empire and Parties of Men and People; but the Pagan Mundane Theiſm (which doth not acknowledge any ſuch Society or City as the Church of God) repreſenteth the Univerſe of Rationals as of one piece, *as one Mundane City, Polity Imperial, or Commonwealth*, of which all Rationals are Members and Citizens. For as the Pagan Theologers agree, that there is but one World or Univerſe, ſo they agree, that this one World or Univerſe is (p) μία πόλις, *one City*, (q) *the common City of Gods and Men, that are to live together with Juſtice and Virtue, in Concord and Happineſs. So they explain the Conſtitution of the Univerſe.* (r) *As God* (or *Jupiter*) *is to the World, ſo is a King to a City; and as a City is to the World, ſo is a King to God.* (s) *The reaſon of the whole is like reaſon ordinating a City,* (t) μίαν ἐκ πάντων πολιτείαν συνυφαίνων, *compoſing one Polity of all.* In which Polity there are ſeveral διακοσμήσεις, *ordinate Conſtitutions of Gods, the laſt whereof are the Gods that fill this ſenſible World, ſharing it amongſt them, and having their ſeveral Diſtricts, Lots or Prefectures in it, and perpetual Receptacles, by this method they compoſe the one and beſt Polity of the World.* The *Pythagoric* Verſes thus explain τὴν σύνταξιν τοῦ ὅλου, *the Conſtitution of the Univerſe.* (u) *The ſeveral kinds of rational Eſſences are plac'd in ſeveral ranks* (the immortal Gods are the imperant party, and mortal Men the ſubject party, and the immortal Gods are of ſeveral ranks,) *by which method they are diſcriminated and united; they are diſcriminated by their ſeveral Ranks, but come together,* εἰς μίαν κοινωνίαν, *into one Society. Mundus omnis ſocietate cœli & terræ conſtat, & eorum naturis quæ utrinſque ſunt; the Society of Heaven and Earth, and of thoſe Natures which are in both, maketh the World,* ſaith *Apuleius.* So the Univerſe is defin'd by the Pagan Theologers, (w) *The Syſtem of Heaven and Earth, the Syſtem of Gods and Men. The World is a Syſtem conſtituted of Gods and Men; as if you ſhould ſay, It is a City conſiſting of the party imperant and the party ſubject.* (x) *A City ſignifieth the Place and alſo the Inhabitants, the Society of the Citizens. The World is a City in both Senſes; a City conſiſting of the Gods and Men, the Gods being the party regent, and Men the ſubject. Theſe are of a Society, becauſe they communicate in Reaſon, which is by nature Law to all.* So *Cicero* argueth; (y) that the Gods and Men having Reaſon in common have Right Reaſon in common, which is Law, and therefore Men are conſociate with the Gods in this reſpect; they are of one common Law, and conſequently of one *Jus* (comprehenſion of Right and Due) and theſe things being common to them, they muſt be accounted Citizens of the ſame City (Society,) *unde univerſus hic mundus una civitas communis deorum atque hominum exiſtimanda, whence this Univerſe is to be thought one City of Gods and Men in common.* So the Philoſophic Emperor argueth; (z) that Reaſon is common to all, that Reaſon which preſcribeth what is to be done, and what not; and if that, then Law; and if Law, then are we Fellow-Citizens; and if ſo, then are we partners in ſome one Commonwealth; and if ſo, then the World is as it were a City; *for what other Commonwealth is it, that all Men can be ſaid to be Members of?* Often and with great admiration he inſiſteth upon this Idea of his paganically conſtituted Univerſe (to which the ſtate of the Univerſe according to the Iſraelitical and Chriſtian Theiſm is diametrically oppoſite,) ſometimes ſtyling it (a) μεγάλη πόλις, *this great City*, ſometimes πόλις φίλη Διός, *this lovely City of Jove*, ſometimes *his City and Country as a Man* (*my City and Country as* Antoninus *is* Rome, *as a Man the whole World*,) and ſometimes affirming, that Men are Citizens, πόλεως τῆς ἀνωτάτης, *of the ſupernal City, of which other Cities are as Houſes or Families.* (b) *Why ſhould not Man be called of City and Country* κόσμιος *Mundane? Why not the Son of God?*

So the Pagan Theologers diſtinguiſh two Republicks; the one particular, wherein a Man is born, (c) *alteram magnam & verè publicam, quâ Dii atque homines continentur; in quâ non ad hunc angulum reſpicimus, aut ad illum, ſed terminos Civitatis noſtræ cum ſole metimur; the other great and truly publick, comprehenſive of the Gods and Men, wherein we look not towards this or that Corner, but our City is commenſurate with the Circuit of the Sun:* Which univerſal mundane Syſtem they call not only *the City of God, but the Kingdom of God.* (d) *In regno nati ſumus, Deo parere libertas eſt. We are born in a Kingdom, it is our liberty to obey God.* Much of diſcourſe there is amongſt them touching the Harmony of the Univerſe; and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that in this their mundane kind of Monarchy or Political Syſtem of Rationals (which is ſuited to their Demonolatry, and which neceſſarily laps'd them into Demonolatry) there is *Harmony*, *Unity* and *Indiſtinction* of things more than enough. For God and the Creature are not duly diſtinguiſh'd, but criminally confounded by deifying Creatures and introducing multitudes of inferiour Gods. The Kingdoms of good and bad Demons (or Angels) are not diſtinguiſh'd, but jumbled together and confounded (or rather in Paganiſm there is no acquaintance with the Polity of the holy Angels.) The *Church* and the *World*

(p) Epict. *Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 24.

(q) Plut. *adv.* Stoic. *p.* 1063.

(r) Diotog. *de regno.*

(s) Plotin. *En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 39.

(t) Procl. *Plat. Theol. l.* 5. *c.* 24. 21. & *l.* 6. *c.* 15.

(u) Hierocl. *in aur. Car. p.* 238.

(z) *l.* 4. *s.* 4.

(a) *l.* 12. *s.* 36. *l.* 4. *s.* 23. *l.* 6. *s.* 44. *l.* 3. *s.* 11.

(b) Epict. *Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 9.

(c) Sen. *de otio ſap. c.* 31.

(d) Sen. *de vit. beat. c.* 15.

(w) Σύστημα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, τὸ ἐκ Θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων σύστημα. Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ. l.* 1. *c.* 25. Ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐκ Θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων· ὡς εἴ τις λέγοι, πόλις ἐστὶν ἐξ ἀρχόντων καὶ ἀρχομένων. Gat. *in Ant. p.* 352.

(x) Λέγεσθαι δὲ κόσμον καὶ τὸ οἰκητήριον Θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων. ὃν γὰρ τρόπον πόλις λέγεται διχῶς, τότε οἰκητήριον, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἐνοικούντων σὺν τοῖς πολίταις σύστημα· οὕτως καὶ ὁ κόσμος οἱονεὶ πόλις ἐστὶν, ἐκ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων συνεστῶσα, τῶν μὲν θεῶν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐχόντων, τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ὑποτεταγμένων, κοινωνίαν δ᾽ ὑπάρχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, διὰ τὸ λόγου μετέχειν ὅς ἐστι φύσει νόμος. Ar. Did. *ap.* Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 15. *c.* 15.

(y) *De Leg. l.* 1. & 3. & *Paradox.* 2.

World are not diſtinguiſh'd, but confounded; or rather the Church is ſhut out of being, there being no place for any ſuch thing as the Church of God in the Pagan Syſtem. *Heaven, Earth* and *Hell* are not duly diſtinguiſh'd, but criminally confounded into one Monarchic Political Society, and they are ſtated *as friendly conſpiring together.* So the *Stoicks* ſay, (e) πάντα δὲ φίλων μεστὰ, *all is full of Friends, of Gods firſt, next of Men by nature ally'd to one another.* (f) *All things are link'd and knit together, and the Knot is ſacred; they are co-ordinately conſtituted and conſtitute the ſame World:* πάντα φιλὰ ἀλλήλοις, *all things are mutually amical,* (whence they thought themſelves ſecure from ſuffering any Diſaſters after Death.) And becauſe they ſuppos'd themſelves, to be by Nature and the Conſtitution of the Univerſe the Citizens of the Kingdom of God already, they could not be prevail'd with, (when the Goſpel was publiſh'd) to enter into the real Kingdom of God; nor could any one enter into it (according to their Maxims) without being guilty of the crime of *Schiſm*; for he muſt be (g) *as an Hand or Foot cut off and diſſever'd from the Body, deſtroy the unity of the Mundane Body, ceaſe to be a part of the whole, and become an Apoſtem of the World.* And becauſe their whole (or Univerſe) was an Univerſe of Heathen Gods and Heathen Men, if (as parts of the whole and Citizens of their great City) they look'd upon themſelves as oblig'd to take care of and preſerve the whole (as their Maxims taught them) they muſt neceſſarily think themſelves oblig'd to oppoſe and deſtroy the real Kingdom of God, which was oppoſite and deſtructive to their whole. Their Theory of the whole was their fundamental Theory, (*h*) the ground of their Morality and Practical Virtue, the Rules whereof are ſuch as naturally flow from theſe Pagan Principles. (*i*) *This All is one* (all things are combin'd into one amical Syſtem) *every one is a part of this whole* (this Heathen Univerſe of things) *which is govern'd by the Will of Nature. All Rationals* (the Pagan *Jove*, Pagan Demons, and Pagan Men) *are one Alliance and Kindred.* And Heathen Mankind (*k*) *are God's Societiſts and Citizens, and the Univerſe is their City and Country.* They ſuppos'd themſelves (as Fellow-Citizens with the Gods) to be no leſs than Celeſtial Citizens; which ſome of their Friends have alledg'd as a ground of that mighty power, which they pretended to, the right and power of making Gods. (*l*) *Jus ſuffragiorum in Cœlis ipſis ſe habere putabant Gentiles (uti qui mundi concives eſſent,) neque Deos ipſos eorum conſortium rejecturos, quos illi unâ voce heic Apotheoſi dignos judicaverant. The Gentiles and the Gods being Fellow-Citizens of one World, they thought they had the right of ſuffrage in Heaven it ſelf; and that the Gods would not refuſe the Conſortſhip of thoſe, whom they with one voice pronounced worthy of an Apotheſis.* This Vanity of theirs was not unhandſomly rebuk'd by *Ageſilaus*; when the *Thracians* honour'd him with Temples and Divine Honours, and ſent an Embaſſy, to ſignifie ſo much to him; he ask'd their Embaſſadors, if their Country had power to make Gods of Men? and they anſwering, it had; Go to then (ſaid he) firſt make your ſelves Gods, and then I will believe that you can make me a God.

II. The Heathen Hypotheſis touching the undivided ſtate of the Univerſe is of much larger extent than reputed Heathen Authors; it appeareth in the Writings of *Philo*, who by the moſt is reputed a *Jew*, by ſome a *Chriſtian*; but if he muſt be denominated from the main of his Sentiments, he ought to be call'd *a Philoſophic Pagan*, and accordingly he is call'd by *Clemens, the Pythagorean Philo.* Agreeably to the Senſe of the Pagans he calleth God (*m*) *the Prince or Ruler of this great City.* (*n*) Several times he calleth the *World this great City*, and he repreſenteth it as *one great City* in the *ſame Notion* and upon the ſame Grounds with the Pagans. (*o*) *This World is a great City, having one Polity and one Law, the reaſon of Nature commandeth what is to be done, and forbideth what is not to be done.* In commending the Law of *Moſes* he ſpeaketh the Language of a Philoſophic Pagan. *Moſes's Law beginneth with the Creation of the World,* (p) *the World harmonizing with the Law and the Law with the World. A Man of the Law being ſtraitway a Coſmopolite or Citizen of the World, ordering his Actions according to the directive Will of Nature governing this Univerſe of things.* God's Religioniſts indeed are in a large ſenſe Citizens of this lower World, they have a Duty to diſcharge as ſuch, and muſt not fail of a dutiful and virtuous correſpondence with Nature and common Providence; but the proper Deſign and Effect of the *Moſaic* Law was not to inſtate Men mundane Citizens at large, nor was it the proper Law of that eſtate of Life, nor was it the Law of (Mundane) Nature governing all things as ſuch; but it was the Law of that Imperial Majeſty, who governeth all things as Lawgiver of the Law of his Church. Nor do the truly Religious direct their Actions meerly to the *directive Will of Nature governing this Univerſe of things* (which is to be *Infidels*) but to the Law of their Eſtate in holy Society, which is paramount to that of meer Mundane Citizens. But becauſe a Mundane Citizenſhip and a great Mundane City carry a ſhew of Amplitude and Magnificence; *Euſebius* followeth *Philo* and the Philoſophic Pagans, and thinketh, that he honoureth God by ſtiling him (*q*) *The King as of a great City the World. He ruleth the World* (ſaith *Euſeb.*) ὡς ἂν μεγάλης πόλεως, *as a great City, being both Lord, King and God.* A learned Commentator on *M. Antoninus* calleth his reſembling the World to a City, (*r*) *iconem pulcherrimam*, (a moſt lively reſemblance) applaudeth his Author for uſing it frequently. And *Lipſius* is tranſported at the thoughts of *a Mundane City conſiſting of the Gods and Men* (having Reaſon in common as a common Law) and with the Philoſophic Pagans Diſcourſes about it. (*s*) *Theſe are excellent things, and expreſs both the Dignity of the World and ours, as alſo our Duty and Office. It is a reſemblance which the* Stoicks *are much pleas'd with, and often uſe, as* Seneca *to* Marcia; *you are entring a City common to the Gods and Men.* Cicero: *This whole World is to be look'd upon as one City of Gods and*

(e) Epict. *Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 24.

(f) M. Ant. *l.* 7. *s.* 9. & *l.* 6. *s.* 38.

(g) *Ibid. l.* 8. *s.* 34. & *l.* 2. *s.* 16.

(h) Caſaubon. *in Perſ. p.* 290, 291.

(i) *Omnia hæc unum eſſe.* Ὅτι μέρος εἰμὶ τοῦ ὅλου ὑπὸ φύσεως διοικουμένου· ὅτι συγγενὲς πᾶν τὸ λογικόν.

(k) Sen. *Ep.* 94. Epict. *Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 24.

(l) *De Religion. Gentil. p.* 108.

(m) Τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς μεγάλης πόλεως. *De* Decal. *p.* 513. *ed. Gr. Paris.*

(n) Τὴν μεγαλόπολιν. περὶ κόσμοπ. *p.* 3. περὶ μοναρχ. *l.* 1. *p.* 558.

(o) Ἡ μὲν γὰρ μεγαλόπολις ὅδε ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ, καὶ μιᾷ χρῆται πολιτείᾳ, καὶ νόμῳ ἑνί. λόγος δὲ ἐστι φύσεως, προστακτικὸς μὲν ὧν πρακτέον, ἀπαγορευτικὸς δὲ ὧν οὐ ποιητέον. Περὶ Ἰωσήφ. p. 360.

(p) Ὡς καὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῷ νόμῳ, καὶ τοῦ νόμου τῷ κόσμῳ συνᾴδοντος, καὶ νομίμου ἀνδρὸς εὐθὺς ὄντος κοσμοπολίτου, πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τῆς φύσεως τὰς πράξεις ἀπευθύνοντος, καθ᾽ ἣν καὶ ὁ κόσμος διοικεῖται. Περὶ κοσμοπ. *p.* 1.

(q) Ὥσπερ μιᾶς τινος μεγαλοπόλεως τοῦ κόσμου βασιλέα. *Pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 8, 9.

(r) Gat. *in* Ant. *p.* 75.

(s) *Phyſ.* Stoic. *l.* 2. *Diſſ.* 7. *Sunt Pulchra, & dignitatem mundi exprimunt & noſtram. Itemque officium & munus. Imago eſt, quæ valde placita Stoicis, & paſſim uſurpant,* &c.

and Men in common. Elſewhere: The World is as a common Houſe of the Gods and Men, or a City of both. I ſay again, theſe things are excellent, and ſublime; and who is not erected, as alſo poſſeſs'd with Reverence and Fear, when God and the Genii as about him, and above him, Inſpectors and Rectors are in his thoughts? And on the other ſide, who contemneth not Avarice, and diveſteth himſelf of ſordid Cares, when he incompaſſeth himſelf with the World as his City and Country? Seneca. *We have not incloſ'd our ſelves within the Walls of one City, but with generous greatneſs of Mind have enlarg'd our ſelves to the whole World's Commerce, to give the more room for the Exerciſe of Virtue: Of all Virtue indeed, eſpecially Charity and care of Mankind. We are all the Citizens of one City.* Some have their Eyes ſo dazled with the falſe Luſtre of Philoſophic Pagan Virtue, Bravery, and generous Sentiment, that they cannot diſcern the difference between an Holy Divine Republick and a Paganical Mundane Syſtem. Others, not looking beyond the ſhews and appearances of Truth, heedleſly entertain falſe Notions of the State of the Univerſe, and ſpeak the Language of the Pagan Theiſts irreconcileable both with the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Religion. Which is the beſt Apology that can be made for this Paſſage of *Minucius Felix*, (t) *Deo una domus eſt mundus hic totus, to God this whole World is one Houſe*; and for that other beforemention'd, that in order to Duty and Virtue every one muſt know, *hanc communem omnium mundi civitatem*, (this common City of all which is the World,) and for that *(u)* of *Tertullian*, unleſs his words may be underſtood in a large ſenſe) *Unam omnium Rempublicam mundum agnoſcimus, We acknowledge one Republick of all, the World.* There are many Paſſages in ſome late Learned Writers (Divines and others) that need this Apology; ſuch as theſe following. *(w) The whole World is but one Commonwealth, whereof God is the Monarch.* The End of all our Actions, the Univerſal Good is call'd, *(x) The Good of the whole Univerſe, as it were one Corporation or Society. (y) All Rational Beings or Agents are and muſt be conſider'd together as naturally and neceſſarily conſtituting one Intellectual Syſtem or Society. —— Men are the finite parts of the Rational Syſtem, whereof God is the infinite yet ſympathizing Head. —— God and Mankind are the conſtituent parts of this Syſtem, (z) the Aggregate Body of Mankind ſubordinate to God as the Head of Rational Beings in this Natural Syſtem or Commonweal eſtabliſhed by Natural Law. (a) God having made the Heavens and the Earth, and divers other Creatures, not at all ſenſible of their common Happineſs, would alſo make ſome Beings, which might know him, and might make up one Body conſiſting of Rational Members. All Men are Members of this Body, ſo that it is neceſſary to their Happineſs, that all particular Men, as Members of this Body, conform their particular Wills to the Univerſal Will of God, that governeth the whole Body as the Head or Soul thereof.* This Language (without conſidering the divided ſtate of the Univerſe) a learned Writer of *the Laws of Nature* uſually ſpeaketh. *(b) The moſt ample Society of all Rationals, the City of God. The Syſtem of all Rationals, or the whole Natural City of God. The whole aggregate of Rational Beings, or the whole City, the Head whereof is God. The Syſtem of all Rationals, the Kingdom of God. God the Head and Father of Rationals, and other Rationals as his Sons. All Men, although they are not under the ſame Humane Imperial Power, yet are in the moſt ample City of God. In the City of God, or in the Univerſe, they are Subjects, that in an Humane City are Supream. This Law of Nature, care of the publick Good, is the Natural Law uniting all Rational Beings; the Summary of the Laws of Rational Nature, or of the City of God, which is the Aggregate of Mankind ſubordinate to God the Rector, his City conſtituted by the nature of it. The whole Syſtem of Rationals, that City the Head of which is God, the Members all his Subjects.* So ſome build their Scheme of Politicks upon (*c*) *the Divine Monarchy of the World* (as they ſpeak) meaning thereby, *(d) that the World is a Kingdom whereof God is the King*, (*e*) and that Humane Commonwealths are *by God's inſtitution parts of this Univerſal Kingdom.* They that diſcourſe of Politicks, muſt be underſtood, to ſpeak in the uſual Senſe of Politicks; theſe Chriſtian Theiſts therefore in their Schemes of Politicks (of ſuch Law and Morality which is Politicks, and of Theo-Politicks) agree with the Pagan Theiſts in making the Univerſe of Rationals a City, Kingdom, Monarchy, or Imperial Polity in the uſual Senſe of Politicks conſiſting of the party imperant and the party ſubject, the Supream together with the Subordinate Rationals. They agree with them in making the Univerſe of Rationals one Mundane City, Commonwealth, and Polity Imperial: They agree with them in making Common Reaſon (which directeth to Common Good) to be the Common Law, which uniteth the Univerſe of Rationals into a City or Polity Imperial: And they agree with them in making degenerate Mankind, to be by nature in the ſtate of Society with God, the Citizens of the City of God, and the Subject-party of his Kingdom in the uſual Senſe of Politicks. In great degree therefore their Conſtitution of the Univerſe of Rationals is the Paganical, but with theſe differences; the Pagan Theiſts deify inferiour and ſubordinate Rationals, which theſe Chriſtian Theiſts do not; and they are much more curious than theſe Chriſtian Theiſts in diſtinguiſhing ſeveral Ranks and Orders in their Mundane City of Rationals.

III. Sometimes the Pagan Theologers make a diſtribution of *three*, and ſometimes of *four* Orders, ἐν λογικῷ διακόσμῳ, *in their ordinate Conſtitution of Rationals.* For *(f)* St. *Auſtin* from *Apuleius* and the *Platonic* Theologers thus repreſenteth the Polity of the Univerſe; *Dii excelſiſſimum locum tenent, homines infimum, Demones medium. The Univerſe hath an higher, a middle, a lower part. The Gods have the higheſt place, Men the loweſt, the Demons are in the midſt. Their dignity of place is different, as they are of different excellency of Nature. To the Immortal Gods* Plato *allotted Heaven, as was fit for their Majeſty; and theſe Celeſtial Gods are partly viſible* (ſuch as the Sun, Moon and Stars) *and partly inviſible, which are diſcern'd by the Sagacity of our Mind, and from the ſeveral utilities of Life, which they are ſuppos'd to produce or take care of. In the Air between the Ether and the Earth there are certain* divinæ mediæ poteſtates, *Mediate Gods, or Divine Powers, which are ſaid to be ſubſervient Miniſters to the Gods, but the Preſidents and Superintendents of*

(t) *p.* 318.

(u) Apol. *c.* 38.

(w) *Mr.* Charnock. *Diſc. of the Ex. and Attr. of God. p.* 396.

(x) *Eſſay in Morality. p.* 18.

(y) *Mr.* Tyrrell *Diſquiſ. of the Law of Nature.* Pref.

(z) *Idem ch.* 1. *p.* 28.

(a) *Monſ.* Paſchal *cited in the abovesaid* Pref.

(b) Dr. Cumberl. *de Leg. Nat.* c. 7. p. 350. *Ampliſſima omnium Rationalium ſocietas, Dei Civitas.* p. 296. *Syſtema omnium rationalium ſeu tota civitas Dei naturalis.* p. 300. *Totum aggregatum entium rationalium, ſeu integra civitas cujus caput eſt Deus.* c. 4. p. 180. *Syſtema omnium rationalium Regnum Dei.* c. 1. p. 22. *Rationalium caput ac patrem, alioſque rationales tanquam ejus filios.* c. 5. p. 303. *Homines omnes, etiamſi ſub eodem imperio humano non ſint, ſunt tamen in ampliſſima civitate Dei.* c. 9. p. 388. *In Civitate Dei ſeu Univerſo, ſubditi ſunt, qui in civitate humana ſunt ſummi.* c. 2. p. 88. *Lex naturalis uniens omnia entia rationalia.* p. 235. *Leges naturæ rationalis, ſeu civitatis Dei.* c. 1. p. 28. *Aggregatum humani generis Deo Rectori ſubordinatum illius civitatem naturâ ſuâ conſtitutam.* *In pro legem: totum Syſtema Rationalium, civitas illa cujus caput eſt Deus, membra omnes Deo ſubditi.*

(c) *Mr.* Baxter, *Holy Commonwealth; c.* 3. *Th.* 26.

(d) *Ibid. Th.* 24.

(e) *Ibid. ch.* 5. *initio.*

(f) *De C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 14. Apuleius *de* Deo Socrat. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 4. *c.* 5.

Θεῶν μὲν ὑπηρέται, ἀνθρώπων δ' ἐπιστάται. *M* Tyr. D*iſſ.* 26.

Men, of whom they are ſollicitous Curators and Guardians. The Gods Supra-demonial and Demonial are the Curators of Men, and Men are the Servers and Worſhippers of the Gods. Thus the three kinds or orders are ſtated as in Political Society, *and link'd together in one Chorus and Harmony, the Father and Opificer-God ruling over all,* (g) as *Hierocles* repreſenteth them. But ſometimes, as in his Comment upon the Golden Pythagoric Verſes, he calleth the whole middle Order *the illuſtrious Heroes*, taking the name Heroes in a large ſence, ſo as to comprehend the whole middle Order, which is uſually diſtinguiſh'd into *Demons* and *Heroes*, and Demons are diſtinguiſh'd into Demons *native* and *factive* or adventitious. When the middle Order is diſtinguiſh'd into *Demons* and *Heroes*, there is a quadripartite diviſion and gradual Subordination of rational Beings ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ τοῦ παντὸς, *in the Polity of the Univerſe*, (h) as *Plutarch* ſpeaketh. Who alſo applaudeth a diſtribution of Rationals, which he ſaith is *Heſiod's*, though no ſuch thing appeareth in *Heſiod*. (i) *Heſiod* (ſaith he) *was the firſt that clearly and diſtinctly made a diſtribution of Rationals into four kinds: Gods, Demons good and many, Heroes and Men.* (k) *In the Air together with the Demons the Heroes cohabit, by which name they call the Souls of the Dead, that are ſignaliz'd by ſome Merit.* Which Heroes are called Demons (factive) by many of the Pagan Theologers, (*l*) who diſtinguiſh an higher and more auguſt kind of Demons, that were never link'd to an human body, and a ſecond kind of Demons, *Dii Manes* the Souls of the Dead (for the unclothed Soul is ſaid to be a Demon) *Soul-Demons* that were *Demon-Gods*; for the making of which ſort of Gods the *Romans* had certain *Sacra* or Conſecrations, whereby the Souls of Men may be turned into Gods. The Men of the Golden-age in *Heſiod* when they departed this Life, became by the appointment of *Jupiter* Demons, ſuch a divine or demonial ſort of Powers as he deſcribeth, ἁγνοί, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, *Pure and Good, Patrons and Protectors of mortal Men, Overſeers of their Actions, Givers of Riches.* And this officiary Dignity of theſe tutelar Demons, he calleth γέρας βασιλήϊον, *a Royalty given them.*

But although theſe diſtributions of the Univerſe of Rationals into three or four Orders are currant amongſt the Pagan Theologers, it muſt not be thought that they confine themſelves thereto; for ſometimes they deſcend to greater exactneſs in making diſtributions of the Gods and Demons, and thereby enlarging their Orders of Rationals. In a large Sence all their *Men-ſuperiorities*, or Rationals κρείττονες ἀνθρώπων, *of ſupra-human kind, nature and condition*, that were Objects of their religious worſhip, are called *Gods*; as in *Ovid*, *Deus & melior natura* are the ſame; and *Cicero* argueth, (*m*) *eſt aliquid homine melius; eſt igitur profectò Deus.* But in their enumerations of the Orders of their mundane Republick the name *Gods* is taken in a ſtricter Notion; for they are contradiſtinguiſh'd to the Demons and Heroes, and ſo they are contradiſtinguſh'd in the Golden Pythagoric Verſes, (*n*) where *Hierocles* hath miſtaken the meaning of καταχθόνιοι δαίμονες (*the Terreſtrial Demons*,) which doth not ſignifie Human Souls, but is the ſame with δαίμονες ἐπιχθόνιοι, *Demons the Preſidents of earthly things*; which Preſidentiary and tutelar Demons, together with *the illuſtrious Heroes*, are (in eſſence and in honour) *Dii medioxumi*, midling Gods in the Gentile Theology. But although the name *Gods* in theſe Golden Verſes, and in other uſual enumerations of the Orders of their Imperial Polity is taken in a reſtrict Notion, yet they uſe it in ſo general and comprehenſive a Notion, that it ſignifieth the All or Collective of the Secondary Gods (ſtrictly ſo call'd) together with their Head, King and Father (the Supream Deity,) *the God of Gods*, or *higheſt God*, as *Hierocles* ſpeaketh. But in ſome of their enumerations of the Orders of their Imperial Polity the Supream Deity (who is of it as the Principal Head and Regent Party thereof) is *an Order* by himſelf, diſtinct from all the inferior Gods; and in theſe enumerations there are four Orders of Rationals beſides Men. For ſo the Greek Theologers in *Euſebius* (*o*) diſtinguiſhing the *Demons* and *Heroes* and the *Supream God* from the Secondary Gods, make a diſtribution of Rationals into four kinds beſides Mankind. *In the firſt place, they Segregate the Supream God, whom, they ſay, they know to be over all, and firſt of all, and God of all, the Father and King. In the next place they ſet a Second kind of Gods, the third place they allot to Demons, and the fourth to Heroes.* This is the diſtribution of Rationals, that *M. Tyrius* maketh in his Account of the one Political Mundane Syſtem, in which, beſides the *Supream* God, there are three Orders of Subordinate Gods, that are concern'd in the Government of the World, whom this Writer calleth θεοὺς θεοῦ παῖδας καὶ φίλους, *Gods the Sons and Friends of God. Conceive* (ſaith he) *that the great King remaining unmov'd giveth Law to the Subjects, the Law of their Safety and Well-being, the Conſorts of his Empire being many both viſible and inviſible Gods; ſome of which that are neareſt to him and immediately attend him,* (*p*) *are ſuch Kings that are next of Kin to the King, of the ſame Family and Table; others are their ſubſervient Miniſters; and thoſe of a third Rank are inferior to them. You ſee the Series and Order of Empire deſcending from God to the Earth.*

Sometimes theſe Theologers deſcend to more than ordinary exactneſs in their diſtribution of the *Demonial* (or middle) Order, the whole of which is call'd *Angels, Demons, Heroes*, (*q*) yet oftentimes (ſaith *Hierocles*) we diſtribute the middle kind into three. *That of the middle Order which is next to the Celeſtials we call Angels; that which is next to the Terreſtrials we call Heroes; that which is equidiſtant from both extreams, we call Demons, as* Plato *doth many times.* (*r*) The name of *Angels* was not in uſe amongſt the Pagans in *Plato*'s time, nor a great while after: But amongſt the later Pagan Theologers that liv'd ſince the times of Chriſtianity, there is frequent mention of *Angels* and *Archangels*: And a Divine of our own is of Opinion, that *Hierocles* by the Order of *the immortal Gods underſtandeth the ſame with thoſe called in the Scripture Archangels*; (*ſ*) *for I find* (ſaith he) *that he giveth the name Angels to an Order next below them.* According to this mode of Theologizing, *Hierocles*'s Demons muſt be thought the Holy *Angels*, and his immortal Gods the Holy *Archangels* of the Scripture-Theology. But ſuch learned Men ought to conſider, that the confounding theſe two Theologies, the *Scriptural* and *Paganical*

(g) De Fato p. 40.

(h) Qu. Platon. p. 1001.

(i) De Def. orac. p. 415.

(k) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 23.

(l) Plutarch. *de plac. phil. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *de Def. orac. p.* 421. Apuleius *de Deo Socr. M. Tyr. diſſ.* 27. *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 115. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *Viv. in Aug. de C. D. l.* 9. *c.* 11.

Quod homini præcellit Heros aut Dæmonium aut Deus id fuerit, neceſſum eſt, Selden. de D. Syr. proleg. c. 3.

(m) *De N. D. l.* 2.

(n) Windet. *de vit. funct. p.* 117. *ed.* 3. *vid. Viv. in Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 21. *Laert. p.* 581. *ed. colon. an.* 1615.

(o) *Pr. Ev. l.* 4. *c.* 5. Εἰς γένη τέτταρα πάντα τὸν λόγον [ἔχοντα] διαιροῦντες πρώτιστα πάντων τὸν πρῶτον ἀφορίσαντες θεὸν εἰδέναι φασὶ τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι. πρῶτόν τε ὄντα καὶ πάντων θεόν. πατέρα τε καὶ βασιλέα. μεθ' ὃν γένος τὸ θεῶν ὑπάρχειν δεύτερον, ἑπόμενον δὲ τὸ δαιμόνων, τὸ δὲ ἡρώων τέταρτον.

(p) Βασιλεῖς συγγενεστάτους, ὁμοτραπέζους αὐτοὺς καὶ συνεστίους. τοὺς δὲ τούτων ὑπηρέτας· τοὺς δὲ ἔτι τούτων καταδεεστέρους, διαδοχὴν ὁρᾷς καὶ τάξιν ἀρχῆς καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ μέχρι γῆς. *Diſſ.* 1.

(q) Hierocl. *in aur. Car. p.* 41, 42. *procl. in Tim. p.* 290.

(r) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 247.

(ſ) *The deſign of Chriſtianity. ſ.* 3. *Ch.* 14. *p.* 154.

ganical is really an injury to both Theologies: That the order of *immortal Gods* in the Pythagoric Verſes certainly compriſeth the Supream God (elſe there would be no Precept in thoſe Verſes for worſhipping the Supream God): That the Order of *immortal Gods* in *Hierocles* differ at the rate of Gods from the *Angelical* or *Demonial*, and are diſtinguiſh'd (*t*) into ſeveral Ranks and Gradualities according to the gradual Subordination of the Celeſtial Orbs or Spheres (which are things incompatible to the Holy Archangels of our Theology:) That the Pagan Theologers, who treat of theſe Matters, ſubject the Order of *Angels* and *Archangels* to that of the Gods (the immortal Gods) according to that of *Porphyry*. (*u*) *The Prieſts are analogous to the Archangels in Heaven, that look to the Gods whoſe Angels they are.* In *Porphyry* and *Jamblichus*, who were great Magicians, of great familiarity with Spirits, and who talk of certain Notes or Characters, whereby they could diſtinguiſh the φάσματα or apparitions of the ſeveral ſorts of Gods, the four Orders of Rationals (Gods, Demons, Heroes, Human Souls) are diſtributed into theſe nine Claſſes. *The inviſible Gods. The viſible Gods. The Archangels. The Angels. The Demons. The ſuperior or coſmical Archontes. The inferior or material Archontes. Heroes. Souls.* In which Enumeration of nine Orders the Gods * are reckon'd diſtinct from Angels and Archangels, (*w*) as the Annotator upon *Jamblichus* obſerveth. The ſuperior *Archontes* are (*x*) κοσμοκράτορες, *Prefects of this ſublunary World*, that preſide over the Mundane Elements and Mundane things. The inferior *Archontes* preſide over the Terrene Matter and Terrene Material Things only. The *Souls* mention'd in this diſtribution are *unclothed* Souls, which are diſtinguiſh'd from the Heroes by their inferiority.

IV. The ſeveral Orders of Rationals which conſtitute the Pagan Mundane Monarchy or City Imperial (the Heroes only excepted) appertain to the original Conſtitution of the Univerſe. The middle Order of Demons doth not emerge upon any lapſe of Angels, ſuch as the Scripture-Theology ſuppoſeth, but is ſuppos'd by the Pagan Theologers, to be originally requiſite and neceſſary in the Polity of the Univerſe for many Reaſons. (1.) *That all the Regions of the Univerſe may be full and repleniſhed with agreeable Animals and Rationals.* For theſe Theologers conceive, that the ſeveral Orbs and Regions of the Univerſe are inhabited by agreeable Animals according to the Original and Natural order of Things; (*y*) that Heaven (which is called by *Plato* Fire) hath the Stars for its Inhabitants; the *Ether* (which is another ſort of igneous Nature or Element next under the Moon) is inhabited by Etherial Demons; that the *Air* (the next ſucceeding Region) is inhabited by Aerial Demons, and that the Element of *Water* is inhabited by an Aqueous kind of Demon, which *Plato* calleth ἡμίθεον (ſemideous) according to the Original and Natural Order of the Univerſe. Of the Aerial Demons *Plato* ſaith; *Although they are near us, they are inviſible to us; they are of admirable Prudence, and of ſuch a kind as excelleth in Wit and Memory; they know all our Mind, and have a marvellous Kindneſs for any one of us that is Honeſt and Good, but hate one that is mighty bad.* Theſe things are diſcours'd in his *Epinomis* with great ſerioūſneſs and zeal for his Religion, forbidding all innovation in theſe Matters, *becauſe it would be an alteration of eſtabliſh'd Religion, and becauſe Mortal Nature cannot poſſibly know any thing certain concerning them.* Yet thus much theſe Theologers pretend to know. (*z.*) That there are Demons in the *Ether*, *Fire*, *Air* and *Water*; that no part of the World is devoid ζώου κρείττονος θνητῆς φύσεως, *of an Animate Nature more than Humane*; that (according to their uſual Maxim) *All things are full of Gods*, and that there are Myriads of theſe *Genii* abroad in the World, which are ἀθάνατοι Ζηνὸς πρόπολοι, *immortal Natures that have a Family Relation to* Jove, *and are his Houſhold-Servants*; which is a groſly Paganical Mode of Theologizing, that repreſenteth their Polity as of kind and quality *the Demonial*, wherein the Aerial Demons have the ſtate and right of Citizens. But in this Paganical Mode of Theologizing, there is much of ſound Reaſon and Philoſophy (which is eaſily diſtinguiſhable from the impure Phantaſtry and Paganiſm that is in it;) for the Reaſon of Mankind contemplating the Univerſe cannot fail to pronounce it incredible, that this Mole-hill of the Earth (*a*) called by *Pliny*, *Mundi punctus*, ſhould be all the World; or that the Air and vaſt Etherial Regions ſhould be nothing better than a great Waſt or Solitude unfurniſh'd with Inhabitants, ſeeing the Earth, Sea and Rivers are all repleniſh'd with agreeable Animals. (2.) *That there may be due Order amongſt Rationals* (*b*) *there muſt be* τὰ πρῶτα, τὰ μέσα, τὰ ἔσχατα, *the prime, the middle, and the laſt; ſo Nature gradually deſcendeth* (without any wide leap) *from the moſt excellent to the leaſt excellent by the middle Order.* An appearance there is of great Order in the Pagans Mundane Polity (for in the ſame Proportion that Heroes tranſcend Men, the Gods tranſcend the Demons,) and in their Method of Religious Worſhip; (*c*) for they aſcend in the ſame orderly Gradation by which the Rational Beings of the Univerſe deſcend; *aſcending gradually and orderly from the Gods that are near us to the more remote, proportionating their Honour* κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, *according to their Dignity, and referring* ἐπὶ τὸν δημιουργικὸν αὐτῶν θεὸν τὸ σέβας, *their Honour to God the Opificer of them.* They put a difference between *Sovereign* and *Subordinate* Worſhip, and alſo diſtinguiſh'd ſeveral degrees of *Subordinate* Worſhip, and not only venerated one Supream Deity, but referr'd the honour of their Subordinate Deities to the Supream. So infinitely falſe is this Aſſertion of a late Writer, (*d*) *That amongſt the Idolatrous Nations there is but an obſcure, ſcarce any Notice of a Supream Deity, nor are any Sacrifices made to him.* So great a Conſonance there is between ancient Paganiſm and the Chriſtiano-Paganiſm, which aſſerteth that (*e*) *Ultima reducuntur in Deum per media: Ideo mediantibus ſanctorum ſuffragiis Dei beneficia in nos diffunduntur. We have the Benefits of God by the Saints Mediation, agreeably to the Order of reducing the laſt things to God by the middle.* (*f*) *It is lawful to worſhip Angels and Saints with Dulia, or inferior Honour proportion'd to their Excellency.* (3.) *The Gods* (ſaith *Apuleius*) *are not contaminated*

(t) Hierocl. *in aur. Car. p.* 10. *Tria ſunt genera Deorum; Dæmones, Intelligentiæ ſiderum, Dii Cœlicolæ cum ſummo Deo extra Cœli ſoliſque vias habitantes.* Eugubin. de per. phil. l. 5. c. 2.

(u) Τοὺς μὲν ἱερέας ἀναλογεῖν τοῖς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀρχαγγέλοις τετραμμένοις πρὸς θεούς, ὧν εἰσὶν ἄγγελοι. *ap. procl. in Tim. p.* 47.

* *Quemadmodum Artifex non omnia quæ in animali ſunt, efficit oculos, ita neque ratio fecit omnia Deos: verùm alia quidem eſſe Deos ſtatuit, alia vero Dæmones ſequenti natura, poſt hæc autem Homines. Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 11.

(w) *p.* 206. & *v. p.* 205.

(x) Jamblic. *de myſt. p.* 41, 49, 84. *Liv. Galant. Chriſt. Theol. cum plat. comp. l.* 6. *p.* 179, 182.

(y) Eugubin. *de per phil. l.* 8. *c.* 21, 27. *Ficin. in plotin. p.* 289. *Nè regio foret ulla ſuis animalibus orba, Aſtra tenent Cœleſte ſolum formæque deorum Ovid.*

(z) Alcin. *Doctr. plat. c.* 15. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 26. *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 18. &c.

(a) *l.* 2. *c.* 68.

(b) Hier. *in aur. car. p.* 17. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 27. *Saluſt. de D. & mund. c.* 13.

(c) *Ficin. Arg. in Dial.* 7. *de Leg.* Hierocl. *in aur. car. p.* 10. *Marcil. com. p.* 347.

(d) *Huet. Dem. Ev. pr.* 9. *c.* 107. *ſ.* 3.

(e) *Aquin. ap. Chemnit. exam. Conc. Trid. par.* 3. *p.* 579.

(f) H. T. *Abridg. of Chriſt. Doctr. p.* 76. *in expoſ. of* 1. *Command.*

taminated with any handling of us, nor doth it beſeem the Majeſty of the Celeſtials, to manage the care of Humane Neceſſities; the Demonial Order therefore is neceſſary, *for all matters of Service and Miniſtery to the Gods and of good to Men.* (g) τὸ μὲν θεῖον ἐστιν ἡγεμονικὸν, διακονικὸν δὲ τὸ δαιμόνιον, *The Order of the Gods is Imperial in the Polity of the Univerſe, the Demonial Order is Miniſterial, whence they are called* ὀπαδοὶ θεῶν, *the Followers and Servitors of the Gods*; and they are diſtributed, (ſaith *Proclus*) *according to the ſeveral Properties of the inmundane Gods, whoſe Followers they are.* The Pagan Theologers would not believe, (h) *but that if there are Demons,* δηλονότι ϗ οὗτοι τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν, *undoubtedly they are Gods Demons* (his Servitors) *and that we ought to give Credit, and to do Sacrifice to them according to the Laws, and pray that they may be propitious.* (4.) The Demonial Order according to theſe Theologers is neceſſary for managing the Affairs of their Demonial Religion and Vertue, and for the felicity of their Souls. For not only the Chriſtian, but the Pagan Theologers themſelves derive their Religion from the Inſtitution and Diſcipline of Demons, to whom (i) they attribute the Management of the preſidency of their Oracles (which govern'd all their Religious and Civil Concerns;) the Affairs of *Prophecy* and *Divination* (that by Dreams, inſpiration of Prophets, entrals of Beaſts, Birds, Meteors, and the like Signs and Tokens of future Events) are alſo of their Management, and the Miracles done by the *Magi* are aſcribed to their agency. *All theſe things are done by the appointment and Authority of the Gods, but by the Agency and Miniſtry of the Demons.* So *Plato* ſaith in his *Sympoſium.* (k) *By this Order all Vaticination cometh to Men, and the Sacerdotal Art about Sacrifices, Religious Rites and Inchantments, and all Divination and Goety.* (l) *Quorum adminiculis præcipuis Pythagoras enituiſſe dicitur, & Socrates Numáque Pompilius, & ſuperior Scipio, Hermeſque ter maximus, & Tyaneus Apollonius, atque Plotinus, auſus quædam ſuper hac re diſſerere myſtica. By whoſe aid* (and inſpiration) Pythagoras, Socrates, Numa, *and the Elder* Scipio, *gain'd their Vertue and Fame*; *as alſo* Hermes Triſmegiſt, Apollonius Tyaneus *and* Plotinus, *who hath diſcours'd certain abſtruſe things touching the Conjunction of theſe Genii with the Souls of Men.* To this Demonial aid and inſpiration, the Thurgical Theologers aſcribe their ſublime ſort of Vertue and the Reduction of their Souls, according to that of *Hierocles.* (m) *They raiſe us from a Terrene to a Divine Life.* (n) *But none can return to that of himſelf which is moſt Divine, unleſs he hath a Demonial Guide, who is to make a genuine Purgation of every Lover of the Gods, the firſt-fruit whereof is a Ceſſation of our connate Evils from Generation.* Hence that Prayer in the Pythagoric Verſes.

Ζεῦ πάτερ ἢ πολλῶν τε κακῶν λύσειας ἅπαντας·
Ἢ πᾶσιν δείξαις οἵῳ τῷ δαίμονι χρῶνται.

Jupiter *Father, either do thou thy ſelf looſe all Men from theſe Multifarious Evils: or ſhew them all what Demon is to be made uſe of for that purpoſe.* A Paſtoral Office and eximious Paſtoral Vertues are attributed to this Order by *Plato*, who ſtileth them νομεῖς θεῖοι, *Divine Paſtors*, and (in his *Politicus*, and in his *fourth of Laws* alſo) he reporteth a Tradition, that in the Saturnian Golden-age, Mankind did not live under the Government of Men, *but of a Diviner and better kind, the Demons.* (5.) The Demonial or middle Order is neceſſary for matter of Entercourſe and Society between the Gods and Men, and to be Mediators between them. Θεὸς ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μίγνυται, *That which is a God is not approach'd by Men, but all Commerce and Intercourſe between the Gods and Men is by the Mediation of Demons*, ſaith *Plato* in his *Sympoſium.* Who therefore ſtileth this Order, (o) *The Interpreter and Carrier from Men to the Gods, and again from the Gods to Men*; *of the Supplications and Prayers of the one, and of the Injunctions and Rewards of Devotion from the other.* As the Pagan Theologers have aſſign'd the Mediatory-Office to the Demonial Order, ſo their way of diſtinguiſhing this Order from the Supra-demonial Order of the Gods is, to repreſent them as in reſpect of *their Place of Abode, their Temper of Mind and Conſtitution of Body*, intermediate between the Gods and Men. They are of a middle Rank between the Gods and Men in reſpect of *their place of Abode*, (Heaven is the Region of the Gods, the Earth of Men, the Demons inhabit the ſublime Aerial place;) they have *the Paſſions of the Mind* in common with Men (Anger, Pity, and ſuch more) immortality of Body in common with the Gods; but their Conſtitution of Body is *Aerial*, whereas the Gods have Etherial, and Men Terreſtrial Bodies, as *Apuleius* diſcourſeth. The generality of the Pagan Theologers do not hold the *mortality* of Demons, nor the change of Demons into Gods (by any Purgation of the Reliques of their old Nature,) and ſeveral of them deny, (p) that Humane Souls are chang'd into Demons or Angels, or can be rais'd to the Angelical Orders. But theſe are Branches of *Plutarch*'s Demonology; who ſuppoſeth, (q) that the change from a Demon into a God, is from a *mutable, paſſible, mortal* Nature, into a Nature *immutable, impaſſible, and immortal.* For in his Life of *Romulus*, he diſcourſeth; *That vertuous Souls are of ſuch a Divine Nature and Condition, that they paſs from Men into Heroes, from Heroes into Demons, and thence if they are as in Religious Purgations perfectly purged and conſecrate, and be diſcharg'd of all that's ſubject to Death and other Paſſions, they are tranſlated into Gods, having attain'd the moſt excellent and bleſſed Conſummation, not by the Decree of any City, but really and according to right Reaſon.* (6.) The Demonial Order (in ſubſerviency to the Gods) is ſuppoſed to manage *Nature, Providence*, and the Affairs of Men in their ſeveral Eſtates of Life, and all manner of *Prefectures, Curatorſhips*, and *Superintendencies* over ſublunary things. For the Univerſe of Pagan Deities (their Theopolity) is an Univerſe of preſidentiary Gods and Demons called by *Plato* (r) ἄρχοντες ἐπιμεληταὶ ἐπιστάται, *Rectors, Curators, Prefects*, which have their ſeveral *Prefectures*, and govern the Matters thereof; the Earth and the whole Univerſe being diſtributed into various Cures and Prefectures, as the *Ægyptians* diſtributed their Country into ſeveral *Nomi* or Prefectures, and *Sais* was *Minerva*'s Lot or Prefecture, who was alſo the Preſident Tutelar Deity of *Attica.* So the Nations are ſaid to be diſtributed by the common Father, ἐθνάρχαις ϗ πολιούχοις θεοῖς, *to ſe-*

veral

(g) Jambl. *de myſt.* p 36. Apulei: *de Deo Socr. procl. de An. & Dæm.* p. 197.

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 393.

(i) Plutarch. *de Def. or. p.* 417. Apul. *ſupr.*

(k) Διὰ τούτων καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πᾶσα χωρεῖ, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη, τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας ϗ τὰς τελετὰς ϗ τὰς ἐπωδὰς καὶ τὴν μαντείαν πᾶσαν καὶ γοητείαν.

(l) Am. Marcellin: *l.* 21.

(m) Αἴροντες ἡμᾶς ϗ κουφίζοντες πρὸς τὴν θείαν πολιτείαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν γῇ διατριβῆς. *in aur. car. p.* 41.

(n) Jamblic. προτρεπ. p. 10, 11. v. *de myſt. p.* 131. & S. Aug. *de C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 9.

(o) Ἑρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον θεοῖς τὰ παρ᾽ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις ϗ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν.

(p) Gale in Jambl. *p.* 205, 211.

(q) *De Def. orac. p.* 416.

(r) Eugub. *de per phil. l.* 8. *p.* 417, 428, 454. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 242. S. Cyr. *c. Jul. l.* 4. *p.* 115, 143. *Gale in* Jambl. *p.* 279, 286, 291.

veral Nation and City tutelar Gods (which have their Demons under them,) whereof every one adminiſtreth his own Allotment in his own way. So Humane Souls in their Original ſtate in the ſupernal Regions (ſ) are ſaid to be diſſeminated amongſt and about their Social Stars, having Gods for their Leaders, and Demons for their Curators. So the Government of the World was modell'd into an harmonious Syſtem, the ſeveral Gods being of ſeveral Faculties and Offices, (all are not good at all things,) and the Prefecture of a God (*t*) containing the Prefectures of ſeveral Demons, under whoſe Care and Providence Mankind and all Sublunary Things next and immediately are. The vaſt variety of things in Nature and Providence is ſuppos'd to be adminiſtred by a vaſt variety of Gods, which this Theology furniſheth for the various needs of Men and their ſeveral conditions of Life (for Health, Corn, Wine, Eloquence, War, Victory, Honour; for Shepherds, Women in Travail, Way-faring Men, and ſuch more,) and in ſubſerviency to the Gods, it ſuppoſeth a δαιμονίαν ἐπιςασίαν, *Demonial Preſidency* in ſo vaſt a variety, that no thing (not the leaſt of things) is without ſome *Genius* to preſide over it. *All things are full of Gods and Demons*, which have their ſeveral (κλῆροι, λήξεις) Lots and Prefectures under their care. (u) *Nothing is without a Divine preſident. No part of univerſal Nature is to* Homer *without a God, none is deſtitute of a Prefect or Ruler; but all things and places are full of Divine Names, of Divine Reaſons, and of Divine Art. For if the whole World be an happy God, not any of its Parts is without a God and a Providence; and if they partake of God and Providence, they have a Divine Nature to preſide over them, (which adminiſtreth the Matters of Providence:) God hath ſet preſident Powers over all Men, to diſtribute to them according to their Worth, unto the leaſt thing that is done.* Such Maxims of the Pagan Theology introduc'd a numerous, or rather innumerable Fry of Divine Preſidents, πολιῦχοι, ἑςιῦχοι, ἀγοραῖοι, ἐνόδιοι, γαμήλιοι, ἐπικάρπιοι, and ſuch more. Some of them preſide over Plants and their parts, others preſide over Animals, ſome preſide over Infants, others are the Preſidents of Womens Affairs, and others of the Doors of their Houſes. The Virtues and Vices, Appetites and Paſſions, Youth and Old Age, Speech and Silence, Labour and Reſt, and ſuch more have their Divine Preſidents; the Sea, Rivers and Fountains and the Woods have theirs in great abundance; the Hills and Valleys, High-Ways, Fields, their Dung and the ſweeping of their Houſes are not without their Prefects. (7.) The Demonial Order was thought neceſſary for conjoining the extremes, and becauſe without it *Harmony*, *Unity* and *Continuity* would be wanting in the Univerſe of Rationals. For (*w*) *it is in Nature as in the moſt perfect Harmony, in an Harmony of Sounds that which is of a middle nature maketh the Conſonancy of the Extreams; and in all apt Compoſures ſomething of a middle nature is requiſite.* (*x*) *Betwixt the immortal Gods and the mortal there muſt be a middle kind, more excellent than Man, leſs excellent than God,* (that which is God,) *that by its Mediation, univerſal rational Nature may cohere, and one part of it may not be disjoin'd from another. He that taketh away the Air that is betwixt the Earth and the Moon,* (*y*) *will diſſolve the Unity and Communion of the Univerſe, a vacuity being made in the midſt: The like is done by them that take away the Demon-kind. Which intervening between the Gods and Men, by the cognation which they have with both,* (*z*) *they are a common Bond or Ligament, whereby Humane weakneſs is connex'd to the Divine Pulchritude.* The Univerſe of Rationals therefore is repreſented by the Pagan Theologers as undivided and of one piece; and ſo *Jamblichus* repreſenteth his four Orders of Rationals, (the Gods, Demons, Heroes, and Human Souls) as compacted together into one harmonious Syſtem. (*a*) *The intermediate kinds* (the Demons and Heroes) *are a common Bond of the Gods and Souls, making an indiſſoluble connexion between them and one continuation of things from firſt to laſt, and an undivided Communion of all, cauſing a juſt and ſymmetral Temperament of the whole, and thence ariſeth a Proceſſion of the Superior to the Inferior, and a reduction of the Inferior to the Superior an equal order and meaſure of Communication deſcending from the Superior, and of reception in the Inferior, and All become amical and accommodate to All, receiving the Cauſes of All from the Gods above.* The Univerſe of Rationals being thus compacted together into one amical and harmonious Syſtem, there is (*b*) *una Monarchia in toto Mundo, ut ſit totus Mundus quædam Reſpublica, cives ejus omne hominum genus; One Monarchy in the whole World, the whole World is one Republick, and all Mankind Citizens of it*, as a Chriſtian Platoniſt deſcribeth the State of the whole. And he deſcribeth it agreeably to the Sentiment of his Maſter. (*c*) *Wiſe Men ſay* (ſaith Plato) *that Heaven and Earth, the Gods and Men, have Society and Friendſhip and well compos'd Order*; which is a fundamental Miſtake of the Pagan Theology (that maketh it Pagan,) and therefore is no Traduction from the *Hebrews*.

V. But *Voſſius* ſaith (*d*) *There is ſuch Agreement between the Platoniſts and Chriſtians in the matter of Demonology, that it is hugely probable to me, that either they themſelves, or thoſe from whom* Plato *learned this Doctrine, partly received it from ancient Tradition deriv'd from the Sons of* Noah; *and partly when it was obliterated as to the main of it, receiv'd it from the* Hebrews *or* Egyptians, *or ſome others that deriv'd it from the Jewiſh Nation. Grotius* is of Opinion, that *Pythagoras* took from the Hebrews the Names of thoſe Orders of Rationals that Conſtitute

---

(ſ) *Procl. de An. & Dæm. p.* 201, 217.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 207. Plutarch. *de Fato p.* 573. *de An. Tranquill. p.* 472.

(u) Μηδὲν ἄναρχον. Ecphant. de regno. ὐδὲν μέρος Ὁμήρῳ ἄθεον, ὐδὲ δυνάςυ ἄπορον, ὐδὲ ἀρχῆς ἔρημον, ἀλλὰ πάντα μεςὰ θείων ὀνομάτων, καὶ θείων λόγων, καὶ θείας τέχνης. M. Tyr. diſſ. 16. Εἰ γὰρ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος θεὸς εὐδαίμων ἐςὶ, ὐδὲν ἐςὶ τῶν συμπληρύντων αὐτὸν μορίων, ἄθεον καὶ ἀπρονόητον· Εἰ δὲ ϗ θεῦ πάντα μετέχει ϗ προνοίας, θείαν ἔλαχε φύσιν. Procl. in Tim. *p.* 287. Πᾶσι τε ἐπέςησεν ὁ θεὸς δυνάμεις τῆς κατ' ἀξίαν ἀποκληρωπκαὶ μέχρι τῆς μικροτάτης ποιήσεως. Simplic. in Epict. *p.* 216.

(w) M. Tyr. *diſſ.* 27.

(x) Ἀνάγκη γένος τι εἶναι τιμιώτερον μὲν ἀνθρώπυ καταδεέστερον δὲ θεῦ, τῇ δὲ ἑαυτῦ μεσότητι τὰ πρὸς ἄλληλα συνάπτον, ὥςε τὸ πᾶν λογικῆς τῆς ὐσίας αὐτὸ ἑαυτῷ συνδεδέσθαι καλῶς. Hierocl. in aur. car. *p.* 14.

(y) Τὴν ἑνότητα διαλύσει καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῦ παντός. Plut. *de Def. orac. p.* 416. *Liv. Galant. p.* 392.

(z) Δεσμὸς συνέδησε τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀσθένειαν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον κάλλος. M. Tyr. diſſ. 26.

(a) Ταῦτα δὴ ὖν τὰ γένη μέσα συμπληρῦντα τὸν κοινὸν σύνδεσμον θεῶν τε ϗ ψυχῶν, ϗ ἀδιάλυτον αὐτῶν τὴν συμπλοκὴν ἀπεργάζεται, μίαν τε συνέχειαν ἄνωθεν μέχρι τῦ τέλυς συνδεῖ, ϗ ποιεῖ τῶν ὅλων τὴν κοινωνίαν εἶναι ἀδιαίρετον, κρᾶσιν τε ἀρίςην ϗ σύμμιξιν τοῖς ὅλοις ἔχειν σύμμετρον, πρόοδόν τε ἀπὸ τῶν βελτιόνων ἐπὶ τὰ ἐλάττονα, ϗ ἀναγωγὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑποδεεςέρων ἐπὶ τὰ πρότερα, ἀναβιβάζει πως ἐξ ἴσυ τάξιν τε ϗ μέτρα τῆς κατιύσης μεταδόσεως ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμεινόνων, ϗ τῆς ἐγγινομένης ὑποδοχῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀτελεςέροις ἐντίθησι, ϗ ποιεῖ πάντα πᾶσι προσήγορα ϗ συναρμόζοντα, ἄνωθεν τὰς τύτων ὅλων αἰτίας ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν παραδεχόμενα. *De Myſt. p.* 8, 9.

(b) Eugub. *de per. Phil. l.* 4. *c.* 17. *l.* 8. *c.* 22.

(c) Φασὶ δὲ οἱ σοφοὶ ϗ ὐρανὸν ϗ γῆν, ϗ θεὺς ϗ ἀνθρώπυς κοινωνίαν συνέχειν, ϗ τὴν φιλίαν ϗ κοσμιότητα.

(d) *De Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *In quo oſtendimus, ſic ſatis convenire Platonicis cum Chriſtianis, &c.*

his Mundane City, and that from the Hebrews he deriv'd many other things of his Inſtitution. (e) *Thoſe Spirits which are interpos'd between God (the Opificer of things) and Men, the Hebrews call ſometimes Elohim, or Gods, ſometimes Angels. Thence thoſe Names were taken by* Pythagoras, *who took many things from the Hebrews, as* Numenius *and other Pythagoreans profeſs'd; and whoſe Inſtitutes are ſaid by* Joſephus, *to be the ſame with the Inſtitutes of the* Eſſens. *But thoſe names be uſed with ſome difference. For by the name of Gods, he called thoſe ſublimer Minds that approach nearer to the Nature of God, which he held immutable: but thoſe Spirits that are next below them, he call'd Angels, as being thoſe that annunciate and declare unto us the Rules of well and happy living, as* Hierocles *ſpeaketh; from whom we alſo learn, that thoſe Angels ſo call'd in common, were again diſtinguiſh'd into three Claſſes; into Angels ſtrictly ſo call'd, into good Demons and Heroes. All theſe things were deriv'd from* Pythagoras's *School into the* Platonic. If *Pythagoras* took the Names of the ſeveral Orders of his mundane City from the *Hebrews*, he took the name without the thing; for in the *Hebrew* Theology there is no ſuch diſtinction of *Gods* and *Angels* as the Pythagoric Philoſophy ſuppoſeth: nor is it a deſcendent from the *Hebraical*, but from the *Zoroaſtrian* Theology, as Mr. *Mede* ſaith (in his Apoſtacy of the later times) *Demons in the Gentiles Theology were Deaſtri, or an inferior ſort of deify'd Powers, as a middle between the Sovereign* (Suprademonial) *Gods and mortal Men. So ſaith* Plato, πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστι θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ, *A Demon is intermediate between God and Man. So ſay all the* Platoniſts, *and well-nigh all other Sects of Philoſophers; I am ſure moſt do; for it is a very ancient Doctrine, inſomuch that* Plut. *de Def. Orac. fetcheth the diſtinction between* θεοί, i. e. *Sovereign Gods and Demons as far as the antiquity of* Zoroaſter. As *Pythagoras* had not the chief Orders of his mundane City from the *Hebrews*, ſo neither had he their Names from thence; For *Pythagoras* and *Plato* had no acquaintance with the name of *Angels*, which demonſtrateth their unacquaintedneſs with the *Hebrew* Theology, the Deſign and Buſineſs whereof is the due Unpaganizing of a People. If therefore theſe Pagan Virtuoſo's (*Pythagoras* and *Plato*) were converſant in it, they might have imbib'd *Antipaganiſm* (which is Gods Religion,) to diſcard the plurality of Gods, the Demonolatry of the Pythagoric Verſes, (f) the deifying the Heavens and heavenly Bodies (which is a principal Branch of the *Pythagoric* and *Platonic* Theiſm;) but (as if we ſhould deduce the origine of Images from the Iconoclaſts) they are not ſuppos'd to have imbib'd from it any thing of Antipaganiſm, but only the Pagan Theiſm, which was never there. If *Pythagoras* had introduc'd into the World a new ſort of Theiſm diſtinct from, and oppoſite to the Pagan Theiſm, there had been ſome colour for this Pretenſion, that he was converſant with the Scriptures, or the *Hebrew* Theology, and took his Theiſm with the Terms of it from thence: But the *Pythagoric* or Pagan Theiſm (which are the ſame, ſave only that *Pythagoras* intermix'd with the Popular-pagan Theiſm Philoſophy and Theurgy) is Senior by much to *Pythagoras*, to the Scriptures, and to the *Hebrew* Theology; his Theoſophy knoweth no better Polity than the Pagan-mundane, its Polity of Gods is no other than the Theopolity of the Pagan Religion and Laws, its Deities are of kind and quality the Paganical (ſuch as *Apollo, Minerva, Diana,*) the Order of immortal Gods in *Hierocles* are no better than thoſe Myſtic-Metaphyſical Phantomes, the Intelligences of the Celeſtial Orbs, nor are his good Demons any thing better than evil Angels (as Chriſtianity repreſenteth them, (g) and all Chriſtians renounce them as ſuch;) therefore the Pythagoric Theology is no traduction from the Hebraical. But thus not a few of the learned World Diſcourſe, as if the Pagan Theiſm could not have been in the World, unleſs it had been ſtollen (as the Fathers ſpeak) from the *Hebrews*. And ſome ſay, (h) *The Heathens in their ſtealth were very imprudent, glean'd only that which was not worth the carrying away.*

What regard is to be had to the Teſtimony of *Numenius* and other Pythagoreans, or to the Inſtitutes of the *Eſſens* (which are cited by *Grotius*, to prove the traduction of Pythagoriſm from the *Hebrew* Theology,) will appear from this account of the Jews Affairs. (i) In the Times of *Hyrcanus* and *Ariſtobulus* (as appeareth from a Decree that was then made,) the Jews applied themſelves to the Study of the Greek Philoſophy, and ſeveral of them became ſuch proficients in it and admirers of it, that both *Joſephus* and *Philo*, inſtead of the holy Popular and holy Scriptural notices of God, have ſubſtituted the Philoſophic Pagan. The Dogmes of the Greek Philoſophy were imbib'd by Jews, who conform'd their *Midraſh*, or Allegorical Expoſition of their Law to the Philoſophy of *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, diſtorting it by their Myſtical Expoſitions, as is viſible in *Philo*, from whom that abſurd allegorical Mode of Expounding the Scriptures, which prevail'd in the Chriſtian Church, had its riſe, as *Photius* obſerveth. (k) The Helleniſtical Jews imitated the Philoſophic Pagans, and *Origen* and other Chriſtian Theologers imitated the Helleniſtical Jews. This humour of Philoſophic-paganizing gain'd the Jews (uſually contemn'd and hated amongſt the Heathen) a good Reputation for Wiſdom amongſt the Philoſophic Pagans. *Longinus* (a Philoſopher as well as a Philologer) and his Scholar *Porphyrius* make an honourable mention of *Moſes*, ſtyling him the Legiſlator; in *Porphyry* he is ſtyled *the Prophet*, who alſo mentioneth with reſpect *the ſacred Books and Oracles of the Prophets. Numenius* before him had mention'd *Moſes* with great reſpect and ſeveral Honourary Epithets; it was uſual with this Philoſopher to inſert into his Books places of Scripture, and following the Track of the Helleniſtical Jews) to make Allegorical or Tropological Interpretations of them, (l) as *Origen* ſaith; who alſo informeth us, that *Ariſtobulus* a Jew by Nation and a Peripatetick Philoſopher, had allegoriz'd the Scripture (in the time of *Ptolomæus Philometor*) long before *Philo*. But his Character ſheweth, and the deſign of his Books (in which he proveth that the Peripatetic Philoſophy depended upon the Law of *Moſes* and the other *Prophets*, (m) ſaith *Clemens*) that this Philoſopher

---

(c) *Hebræi Spiritus iſtos qui inter Deum rerum opificem hominesque ſunt interpoſiti, modo* אלוהים θεοὺς, modo מלאכים ἀγγέλους *vocant. Atque inde eas appellationes ſumpſit Pythagoras, quem multa hauſiſſe ab Hebræis Numenius aliique Pythagorici profitebantur. Cujuſque adeo inſtituta eadem eſſe cum Eſſenorum inſtitutis Joſephus prodidit. Sed & eas voces uſurpavit adhibito diſcrimine. Nam* θεοὺς *vocabat mentes ſublimiores & ad divinam naturam propius accedentes, quas ſtatuebat* ἀτρέπτους· ἀγγέλους *autem eos ſpiritus, qui proximum primis illis locum eſſent ſortiti,* ὡς ἐκφαίνοντας καὶ διαγγέλλοντας ἡμῖν τοὺς πρὸς εὐζωίαν κανόνας, *ut loquitur Hierocles; qui itidem nos docet, illos communiter dictos* ἀγγέλους *iterum diſtinctos in claſſes tres; in* ἀγγέλους *proprie ac peculiariter ita dictos, in* δαίμονας ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ ἥρωας. *Quæ omnia ex Pythagoræ Schola in Platonicam ſunt derivata.* Not. *in* Matth. 1. 20.

(f) Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 37. Eugub. *de per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 1.

(g) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 378.

(h) *Dr.* Ham. *Ser. on* Act. 17. 30.

(i) *Cun. de Rep. Hebr. l.* 3. *c.* 4. Fuller. *Miſc. in Append. & l.* 3. *c.* 7. *l.* 2. *c.* 3.

(k) *V. Mr.* Dodw. *Diſc. of* Sanchoniathon. *p.* 66, &c.

(l) *C. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 13. *l.* 4. *p.* 198. Spencer. *not. p.* 55.

(m) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 434. *ed. Lugdun. Batav.*

Philoſopher did not Myſticize the Scriptures to a Senſe ſo conformable to Pythagoriſm and Platoniſm, as *Philo* did afterwards, of whom the Greeks uſually ſaid; Ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει, ἢ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει, ***Either Philo Platonizeth, or Plato Philonizeth.*** The Holy Scriptures being thus Philoniz'd, and the Moſaic Theology Philoſophic-paganiz'd, it is no whit ſtrange, that the Philoſophic Pagans ſhould have it in great eſteem, that *Numenius* ſhould look upon *Platoniſm* as a deſcendent from it, and fancy ſuch a Conſonance between them as that ſaying of his importeth; τί γάρ ἐςι Πλάτων ἢ μωσῆς ἀττικίζων; ***What is*** Plato ***but*** Moſes *ſpeaking Greek?* For as ***Eugubinus*** ſpeaketh, (*n*) *He had ſeen ſuch a thing in* Philo; he conſider'd the Hebrew Theology, not as it is in it ſelf, but as that Platonic Allegoriſt had repreſented it.

But beſides the allegorical Interpretations of Scripture, there was another thing that gain'd the Jews a great Reputation amongſt the Pagans, which was the Inſtitution of their *Eſſens*, who, (*o*) as *Joſephus* ſaith, *were a ſort of Men not unlike the Pythagoreans of the Greeks.* (*p*) They are highly commended by *Philo* and *Joſephus*, whoſe honourable Character of them is tranſcrib'd by *Porphyry*. *Pliny* and *Solinus* admir'd their *Inſtitution*, and not only private Men, but great Kings (as *Philo* ſaith) have admir'd and honour'd them, and celebrated their Philoſophic Life. With reſpect to theſe Monaſticks and Aſceticks *Numenius* reckoneth the Jews amongſt *the Nations famous for Wiſdom that ſymbolize with* Plato. Thoſe Nations are *the Brachmans*, *Jews*, *Magi* and *Egyptians*. And with reſpect to theſe we may allow that account of the Jews in *Laertius*, ἔτοι δέ εἰσιν ἀπόγονοι τῶν ἐν Ἰνδοῖς φιλοσόφων, *Theſe are a Progeny of the Indian Gymnoſophiſts.* If the Inſtitution of theſe Judaical Pythagoricks was antecedent to *Pythagoras*'s Inſtitution, then it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe this latter a derivative from the former; the above mention'd *Ariſtobulus* (*q*) had reaſon to ſay, that *Pythagoras tranſlated many of our things into the Philoſophy of his Sect*; and *Joſephus* might ſay with great reaſon, that *he was not only knowing in the matters of our Diſcipline*, ἀλλὰ ϗ ζηλωτὴς αὐτῶν ἐκ πλείστου, *but alſo an Emulator of them for the moſt part.* But if the Inſtitution of theſe Judaical Pythagoricks (*r*) be of much later Original than *Pythagoras*'s time, it will ſignifie nothing to *Grotius*'s purpoſe (to prove the Traduction of Pythagoriſm from the Hebrew Theology,) and the reports of Judaical Zealots for the Glory of their Nation without ground or reaſon will ſignifie as little. Now that the Inſtitution of the *Eſſens* is of much later Original than *Pythagoras*'s time, is the concurrent Opinion (*ſ*) of ſuch learn'd Men, that are competent Judges in theſe Matters (and of *Grotius* himſelf on 1 *Maccab.* 2. 42.) who with great reaſon ſuppoſe the Sect of the *Eſſens*, as alſo that other Sect of the *Phariſees*, to have riſen from the חסידים *Aſſideans* (mention'd 1 *Maccab.* 2. 42. and 7, 13. 2 *Maccab.* 14. 6.) thoſe eximious ſupererogating Saintiſts among the Jews. But the Sanctity and Religion of theſe Judaical Pythagoricks was not purely Judaical; they were in part *Pythagoric Magi*, and therefore a Traduction from the Pagan *Pythagoreans*. For beſides their enormous Superſtitiouſneſs beyond the ſize of any other Sect of Judaical Religioniſts, beſides their Schiſm which divided them from the Jews and their Religion, (they thought their own Ceremonies more holy than thoſe of the Temple, and therefore did not Sacrifice there, but by themſelves,) they are noted (*t*) *for honouring the names of Angels*, a branch of the Pythagoric Demonolatry. (*u*) They were addicted to Divination (the foretelling things to come) to which the Pythagoreans were moſt extravagantly addicted; and *Joſephus* ſaith, (and ***Porphyry*** from him) *they ſeldom miſs'd the Mark in their predictions.* (*w*) The ſame Author mentioneth ſeveral of their Prophets. *Menahem* the *Eſſen* foretold the Kingdom to *Herod*. *Judas* the *Eſſen* predicted Death to *Antigonus*. *Simon* the *Eſſen* foretold to *Archelaus* the term of his Domination. Whence it is manifeſt, that there is a mixture of Pythagoric Demonolatry and Theurgy in their *Inſtitution*. Which Character of their Inſtitution may determine a matter of debate amongſt learned Men, (*x*) *whether the* Eſſens *were* Solicolæ, *Worſhippers of the Sun or not?* (y) *They ſpeak not any thing profane* (ſaith *Joſephus*) *before the riſing of the Sun, but certain Patrial Prayers unto him, as praying to be Orient.* In going to the ground they us'd great caution; for digging an Hole in the Earth (a Foot-ditch) with an Inſtrument, into which they evacuated, (and into which afterwards they threw back the Earth which they had digg'd up) covering all with their Garment during the time of Evacuation, ὡς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζοιεν τοῦ θεοῦ, *leſt they ſhould be injurious to the Light or Rayes of God.* Some are of Opinion, that the *Eſſens* were Worſhippers of the Sun, becauſe they ſuppoſe that *Joſephus* in theſe places affirmeth it; and they believe it the rather, (z) becauſe the *Sampſæi* in *Epiphanius* (that ſprung from the *Eſſens*) were Worſhippers of the Sun, and had their name שַׁמְשָׁאִין from שֶׁמֶשׁ *the Sun*, which they Worſhipped. Others think it incredible that *Joſephus* ſhould call the Sun God after the Pagan mode (although it will hereafter appear, that he affecteth the Pagans Dialect) or that the *Eſſens* being Jews ſhould be Sun-worſhippers. But they that conſider at what a rate the *Platoniſts* and *Pythagoreans* worſhipp'd the Sun (the *Platoniſts* and ſuch like Philoſophers worſhip the Sun only amongſt the Celeſtials, (*a*) ſaith *Ficinus*) and that the *Eſſens* were in part Pythagoric Magi (ſuch as *Clemens* deſcribeth, (*b*) the Magi abſtain'd from Wine, things animate and venereous, and worſhipp'd Angels) will be prone to think them Sun-worſhippers, whether *Joſephus* affirmeth it or not. Probably upon this account (for the reaſons uſually given ſatisfy not) no mention is made of their Sect in the Writings of the *New Teſtament*, becauſe they were look'd upon by the Holy Writers, not as a Sect of Judaical Religioniſts, but as Foreigners to the Jewiſh Church and Religion. If they were look'd upon as a Sect of the *Jews* Religion, with what truth could the Apoſtle call the Sect of the Phariſees *the ſtraiteſt Sect of our Religion*, the *Eſſens* being by much the moſt ſevere and rigid of all others? Or if they were look'd upon by the Holy Writers as a Sect of the *Jews* Religion, they might conſider them as a Branch of the Sect of the *Phariſees*, and compriſe them under that Name. For ſo the *Jewiſh* Writers ſometimes (*c*) do not diſtinguiſh the Names of *Phariſees* and *Aſſideans*, but call all the *Aſſideans Phariſees* (the Names may well be confounded, becauſe both of them denote *Saintiſts*, and becauſe the Piety of the *Aſſideans* was plainly *Phariſaiſm*)

and

(n) *De per. phil. l.* 1. *c.* 30.

(o) *Antiq. Jud. l.* 15. *c.* 13.

(p) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 8. *c.* 11, 12. *Selden. de J. nat. & Gent. l.* 5. *c.* 3. *Laert. in proœm. & Caſaubon in Notis.*

(q) *Seld. ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(r) *V.* Luc. Holſten. *obſ. ad vit. Pythag. p.* 72.

(ſ) Scaliger, Caſaubon, Druſius, Cunæus, Fuller, L'Empereur, Hottinger, *&c.*

(t) *Druſ. de* 3. *Sect p.* 236. Scaliger *Elench. c.* 27. *Selden de D. Syr. p.* 31. *Grot. in Col.* 2. 18.

(u) Euſeb. *ubi ſupr. Druſ. de* 3. *Sect. l.* 4. *p.* 245.

(w) Scultet. *exercit. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 30.

(x) Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *Petit. Var. Lect. c.* 21. *L'Emper. in Bertram. de Rep. Jud. c.* 19. Iſ. Voſſ. *de Sibyl. or. p.* 28.

(y) Πρὶν γὰρ ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον, οὐδὲν φθέγγονται τῶν βεβήλων, πατρίους δέ τινας εἰς αὐτὸν εὐχὰς, ὥσπερ ἱκετεύοντες ἀνατεῖλαι.

(z) Hotting. Theſaur. *phil. p.* 38.

(a) *Com. in Plotin. p.* 423.

(b) Strom. *l.* 3. *p. m.* 325.

(c) Druſ. *de Haſid. Qu. Hebraic. l.* 1. *p.* 47. *de* 3. *Sect. l.* 1. *c. ult.*

and compriſe the *Eſſens* under that Name, which are thought by many, (that have obſerv'd a great agreement between them and the Phariſees in their Dogmata) to have had their origin from the Phariſees. If this Conjecture will approve it ſelf (which ſome Learned Men (*d*) are inclin'd to embrace) the Phariſees muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into two ſorts; the one *the Popular*, which are famouſly known; the other *the Philoſophical* (that is, the Unpopular) who pythagoriz'd in their Inſtitutes; which proveth a Traduction of their Sect from *the Greek Pythagoreans* (whoſe Philoſophy the *Jews* ſtudied and imbib'd) not any Traduction of *Pythagoriſm* from the Hebrew Theology, as *Grotius* ſuppoſeth. But becauſe this Opinion of that excellent Perſon is no ſingularity of his, the Jews and Chriſtians both of ancient and modern times (*e*) have entertain'd an Opinion touching the Traduction of the Philoſophy and Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans from the ancient People of God, the Jewiſh Church and Scriptures, we will conſider further theſe following Reaſons againſt it.

VI. *Firſt*, It is the Subject of innumerable fabulous Conceits and Narrations apparently ſuch. (*f*) Such as that Conceit touching *Adam*, *that he was a great Philoſopher from his Birth* (or as the *Jews* ſpeak, חכם גדל) *ignorant of nothing pertaining to the Myſtery of Nature.* Such is that Report (from *Eupolemus* and *Alexand. Polyhiſtor*,) *that* Abraham *converſing with the* Egyptian *Prieſts at* Heliopolis, *taught them Aſtrology and the other matters of Science* (he is ſaid by *Eupolemus*, *to have found out Aſtrology and the Chaldaic Art*) ſaying, *that the* Babylonians *and himſelf were the Inventors*, *but that* Enoch *was the firſt Inventor of Aſtrology, who learned all things from the Angels of God.* Of the ſame Character are thoſe other Reports (from *Nic. Damaſcenus*, *Artapanus* and others,) *that* Abraham *taught the* Egyptians *Arithmetick and Aſtrology, which they were altogether ignorant of before his coming.* (He is ſaid to have inſtituted the *Phœnicians* alſo in the ſame Arts;) *that he inſtituted the King of* Egypt *in Aſtrology and ſpent twenty Years there*; And that of *Philo*; *that* Abraham *by the motion of the Stars and Heavenly Bodies found out the knowledge of the true God*: And that of *Joſephus* (rightly call'd by *Lud. Cappell. homo* χαυνὸς,) who pretendeth to have ſeen one of *Seth*'s Pillars, whereon the matters of Sidereal Science were ingraven. (*g*) *Artapanus* hath reported, that *Joſeph* was the firſt that taught the *Egyptians* Geometry, that they aſcribe to *Moſes* the Invention of Ships, Arms, Machins, and of Philoſophy; and *Clemens* addeth, that the *Greeks* learn'd from him the Stratagems of War. *Eupolemus* (who is follow'd by *Theodoret* and *Iſidore*) ſaith of *Moſes*, that he was the firſt Wiſe Man, and that he taught the *Hebrews* the knowledge of *Letters*; which is alike true with that of *Artapanus*, *that* Moſes *was* Orpheus's *Maſter*. The Senſe of *Clemens*, *Euſebius*, and others, is thus repreſented by a Learned Man; (*h*) *that the beginnings of Learning in all kinds was among the* Jews, *whilſt the whole Heathen World beſides was barbarouſly ignorant*; *that* Moſes *appointed Maſters among the Tribes*, γραμμάτων εἰσαγωγεῖς, *which initiated the Youth of* Iſrael *in all kind of Secular Learning.* Yet we read in (*i*) *Euſebius* and *Clemens*, that the *Chaldeans* were the Inventors of Aſtrology, the *Egyptians* of Geometry and Medicine, and (to ſay nothing of other Arts) that Philoſophy had its origin from the Contemplative Power of the Soul, was given by Divine Providence, was given to the *Greeks* by the Son of God by the means of Inferiour Angels, and that part of it might be from Evil Angels. Philoſophy therefore and other Pagan Literature (as theſe Authors acknowledge) was derived from ſeveral Originals, and is not to be ſuppos'd intirely a Traduction from the *Hebrews*. But ſuch a Suppoſition is for the Tooth of the *Hebrew* Doctors, who are never wanting in fabulous Conceits and Narrations. (*k*) One of them (*R. Meir*) was ſurpris'd, to find ſo many Truths (mix'd with Falſhoods) in the Writings of the *Greek* Philoſophers, מי נתן הכהן בבית חקברות *who hath given us a Prieſt among the Graves*, in a ſordid place? But his wonderment was ſilenc'd, when he found it written in a Book, that the Grecanic Sophiſts learn'd thoſe ſcatter'd Fragments of Wiſdom which appear in their Writings, from the Wiſe Men of *Iſrael* in their *Babylonian* Captivity. The ſumm of their Pretenſion is, “ That all Arts and Sciences (Poetry amongſt the reſt) were firſt amongſt them and originally theirs; that they came into the *Gentiles* Hands, when they were conquer'd by them, and forc'd to live amongſt them, and under their Domination, or when their Books were tranſlated; that the Ancient Philoſophers receiv'd their Wiſdom from *Shem*, *Heber*, *Abraham*, and other Fathers, eſpecially from *Solomon*, to whom all Nations reſorted to hear his Wiſdom; that the Foundations and Principles of all Sciences and Philoſophic Diſciplines were traduc'd from them to the *Chaldeans*, thence to the *Perſians*, whence the *Greeks* had them; that all the Wiſdom of the *Gentiles* is פסולת מחכמת בני ישרל *the Dregs and Droſs of the Wiſdom of* Iſrael, or ſome Gleanings which their Wiſe Men have left them: (*J. Mart. Clemens*, *Tertullian*, *Euſebius*, *Tatianus*, *Theophilus*, and other Ancients, (*l*) are ſaid to be of this Mind, that the knowledge of many things which the *Greeks* had, was *nothing elſe but the Dregs of the Science of* Iſrael) and that all true things which the *Iſhmaelites* and *Edomeans*, (that is, the Chriſtians) have, are from the Sons of *Iſrael*. *Socrates* (of whom they ſay, that he was the firſt, that found out by Philoſophy, that there is *Ens aliquod abſtractum*) had his Philoſophy from *Aſaph* and *Achitophel*, *Plato* had his from the Prophets, himſelf writeth, that he ſpake with a Prophet of *Iſrael*, and thought him at firſt a Man of ſmall Learning, but having more throughly conſider'd his words, he much admir'd him, and endeavour'd to underſtand his Mind. (A late *Rabbi* inferreth from hence (*m*) the Eternity of their Law, becauſe it is ſo perfect in all matters of Wiſdom, and he ſaith, his Intention is, to write a Book call'd *Plato Moſaicus*;) *Ariſtotle* alſo wrote in a certain Epiſtle, that he had ſpoken with *Simeon the Juſt* about Natural things, but was aſtoniſhed at his Wiſdom when he heard him ſpeak of Divine things; this Philoſopher, when *Alexander* had taken *Jeruſalem*, found the Books of *Solomon*, and publiſh'd them under his own Name with the addition of his own Errors; but at length he was made a Convert by *Simeon the Juſt* (a Proſelyte of Juſtice) at the end of his Days he chang'd his Mind, embrac'd the Law and Doctrine of the *Hebrews*, (they ſay alſo in their *Talmud* (*n*) that *Cæſar Antoninus* took care to be circumciſed and died a *Jew*) and

(d) Fuller, *Miſc. l.* 2. *c.* 3.

(e) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 325.

(f) Coſri *p.* 52. *ed.* Buxt. Euſeb. *pr Ev. l.* 9. *c.* 16, 17. Voſſ. *de Sect.* Phil. *p.* 3. *Viv. in Aug. de c. D. l.* 18. *c.* 2. *Sir* W. Rawleigh *Hiſt. l.* 1. *p.* 1. *ch.* 11. *S.* 2. *Wits* Ægypt. *l.* 3. *c.* 12. Marſham *Can. Chron. p.* 72. *Ed.* Lipſ.

(g) Voſſ. *ſupr. p.* 11. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 9. *c.* 27. *Viv. in Aug. de C. D. l.* 18. *c.* 39. Clem. Strom *l.* 1. *p. m.* 254. Huet. *Dem. Ev. p.* 88. 111. *ed.* 2.

(h) *Dr.* Ham. 1. *Ser. on Act.* 17. 30.

(i) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 10. *c.* 6. Clem. Strom. *l.* 6. *p. m.* 497. *l.* 7. *p.* 505. *l.* 1. *p.* 227. & *l.* 5. *p.* 405. *Vid.* Gr. Naz. *orat.* 3. *c.* Julian.

(k) Coſri *p.* 29.--32. & *p.* 131, 420. *ed.* Buxt.

(l) Windet. *de vit. funct. p.* 4.

(m) Menaſ. Ben Iſr. *Qu. in Lev. p.* 191. *in Gen. p.* 15.

(n) Buxt. *Syn Jud. c.* 2. *p.* 105.

"at his death taught his Diſciples the Immortality of the Soul and Future Rewards and Puniſhments. If now we miſtruſt the Judgment or Sincerity of theſe Rabbinical Hiſtorians, and will not take their Reports upon their bare word (which few Men will do;) if we ask what ſingular Eminency in all Arts and Sciences their Nation hath to ſhew? or what ancient Books, Monuments, and Syſtems of Philoſophy are they poſſeſs'd of? (o) They ſay, *that their Nation hath loſt many egregious Sciences and Books.* Either they have loſt them, or they never had them; for the beſt of their Philoſophic Writers know no better Philoſophy than the Peripatetic; their Book *Jezirah* (a Cabaliſtical Book of difficult Explication) which pretendeth to be a Relique of the ancient Judaical Philoſophy, and which beareth the Name of the Patriarch *Abraham*, (p) is plainly ſuppoſititious, and in the beſt accounts that are given of its Sublimities, there is ſuch an heap of Rabbinical Phantaſtry, of abſurd Nugacities, of Peripatetic Philoſophy, Magick, and Aſtrology, that no wiſe man can doubt of the Wiſdom of *Buxtorf*'s Cenſure of Cabaliſm. (q) *This Cabaliſtic Doctrine is an Abyſs unſearchable, a Labyrinth inextricable, neither ſhewing Ingreſs nor Egreſs, of no uſe or advantage: So that one being ask'd, what he thought of* Cabala? *anſwer'd not ineptly, The ſame that he thought of* Fabula.

The Cabala which this Author hath charg'd with Fabuloſity, is, (r) the Cabaliſts *Philoſophical Cabala*, as it muſt be call'd, to diſtinguiſh it from the other ſorts of *Judaical Cabala's*. For the *Talmudiſts* have their *Cabala* as well as the *Cabaliſts*, their Oral Law (Syſtem of Traditions) which they ſuppoſe a Tradition from *Mount Sinai*, is a *Cabala* according to that Talmudic Maxim (s) דברי קבלה כדברי תורה *The words of the Cabala are as the words of the Law.* Beſides this Talmudic Cabala the Cabaliſts (t) have a *Magical*, *Grammatical*, and *Philoſophical* (or *Theological*) kind of *Cabala*. The Magical (or Practical) is a Cabaliſtical kind of Art Magick (familiarity with Angels, curing Diſeaſes, quenching Fires, expelling Devils, and the like) which maketh *Charms*, *Amulets*, *Exorciſms* by cabaliſtical abuſes of the Scripture and Sacred Names. Thus *R. Moſes Ben Nachman* is ſaid to have drawn a great Ship into the Sea (which the Workmen could not do) at *Barcelona*, in the ſight of the King; and alſo to have brought a little Ship to Land by virtue of the Tetragrammaton written in a Schedule. This ſort of Magick appeareth to be of conſiderable Antiquity among the *Jews*; (u) for *Joſephus* maketh an high Elogy of *Solomon*'s Wiſdom for finding out and compoſing forms of Exorciſm and Enchantment (Conjuration) whereby Diſeaſes are cur'd, and Demons expell'd, ſo that they never return again. *And this Method of cure* (as he ſaith) *is ſtill in force* amongſt the *Jews*; for himſelf ſaw one *Eleazar* a *Jew* in the preſence of *Veſpaſian*, his Sons and great Officers, cure Demoniacks by holding a Ring to their Noſe, under the Seal whereof was hid the Root of a certain Plant preſcrib'd by *Solomon*, at the ſcent whereof the Demon diſlodg'd preſently, whom the Exorciſt (reciting certain Charms ſaid to be made by *Solomon*) charg'd never to return. And to ſhew them, that he was really gone, he commanded the Demon as he went out, to overturn a Cup of Water, which he had cauſed to be ſet in the Room before them. The Cabaliſts *ſecond* ſort of Cabala may be fitly call'd *a Grammatical* kind of *Cabala*, being imploy'd about Grammatical Trifles, the Words, Letters, Points and Accents of their Law, (their Shapes, Abbreviatures, Combinations, Permutations, Numeral Powers) wherein they ſuppoſe, that certain Myſteries are couch'd, and their Modes or Artifices of finding them out are ſtil'd *Gematria*, *Notaricon*, *Temurah*. Their Pretenſion is, (w) that their Law hath a Body and a Soul, and a Soul of that Soul. The *Miſhnah* (or Oral Law of the *Talmudiſts*) is the Soul; but the Soul of that Soul is in the *Cabaliſts Cabala*. They that buſie themſelves in the *Miſhnah* are compar'd to *Apothecaries* that compound Medicines, whoſe Virtues they know not, but only follow the Preſcript of the Phyſician; but the Cabaliſts are the Doctors, that underſtand the Cauſes and Reaſons of what is preſcrib'd to the Sick. This Cabaliſtic Art (which is an Inſtitution of finding out Arcane and Myſtical Senſes of the Law by the Modes and Artifices before-mention'd) is ſuppos'd, to be a Cabala from *Moſes*, who receiv'd it from the Mouth of God; but is certainly an Invention of the later Rabbins, altogether unknown to the ancient Jews or Chriſtians. The laſt ſort of *Cabala* (the Philoſophical or Theological) is an Inſtitution of Myſtical and Arcane Philoſophy or Theology. (x) *A recondite Learning myſtically and enigmatically propounded, touching things Divine, Angelical, Theological, Celeſtial, and Metaphyſical, concerning Angels and Spirits, involv'd in ſtrange Symbols and arcane ways of teaching.* The principal matter of this Cabala is אילן הקבלה *a Cabaliſtic Tree*, conſiſting of ten *Sephiroth* (Numerations, Emanations or Genealogies) diſpos'd in form of a Tree, (y) one of which is *Chochmah* or *Chochmoth* (Sapience) which anſwereth to the νοῦς (Intellect) in the *Pythagoric* and *Platonic* Triad; which Cabaliſtic Term is doubtleſs the ſame with the *Valentinians Achamoth* (one of their thirty *Æons*, to which they attributed the making of the World;) whence it appeareth, that this Philoſophical Cabala is of conſiderable Antiquity, no late Invention of the Modern Rabbins, as the Grammatical Cabaliſm manifeſtly is. (z) But becauſe the Sublime Philoſophic Cabaliſts (in compariſon of whom the Miſnical Doctors are dull Theologers) uſe the Grammatical Cabaliſtic Artifices, and an Anagogic Expoſition of Scripture, to ſerve their purpoſe of ſublime Contemplation, hence theſe two ſorts of Cabala (the Grammatical and Philoſophical) are uſually confounded. From this laſt ſort of Cabala (the Philoſophical or Theoretic) the *Pythagoric* and *Platonic* Theology is ſuppos'd by ſome to be deriv'd: (a) Others ſuppoſe the contrary; that the Judaical Cabaliſts traduc'd their *Sephiroth* from the School of the *Platoniſts* (whence alſo the *Valentinians* and *Gnoſticks* had their *Æons* and their Combinations of them) as *Grotius* himſelf (b) hath diſcours'd; who hath alſo obſerv'd the like fabulous Genealogies in the Theology of the *Perſian Magi*. And that this was indeed the true ſtate of the Caſe, will appear when we come to conſider the Cabaliſtical Doctors notices of God.

Secondly, This Traduction from the *Hebrews* is believ'd without any good *Hiſtorical Atteſtati-*

(o) Coſri *p.*319,420. Fuller *Miſc.in Append.* Maimon. *Mor. Nev. par.* 2. *c.* 11.

(p) Buxt. *de Abbrev. p.*167,296. Simon. *Hiſt. Crit. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(q) *Cabaliſtica hæc doctrina abyſſus eſt imperſcrutabilis, labyrinthus inextricabilis, nec introitum oſtendens, nec exitum; fructus ejus nullus: Adeò ut non inepte quidam interrogatus quid de Cabala ſentiret? reſponderet, Idem quod de Fabula.*

(r) Coſri *p.* 318. & *p.* 200.

(s) Buxt. *Lex.Talm. col.* 1954.

(t) *Proleg. in Bibl.Polyglott. p.* 53. Hotting. *Theſ. Phil. p.* 447.

(u) *Antiqu. Jud. l.* 8. *c.* 2.

(w) Menaſſ. ben Iſr. *Qu. in* Exod. *p.* 168, &c. Rittangel. *Not. in lib.* Jezirah. *p.* 27, &c.

(x) *Scientia eſt arcana, myſticè & ænigmaticè quodammodò propoſita, de rebus divinis, angelicis, theologicis, cæleſtibus & metaphyſicis, de angelis & ſpiritibus, miris ſymbolis & arcanis docendi modis involuta.* Buxt. *Lex. Talm. ubi ſupr. de Abbreviat. p.* 84, &c.

(y) Windet. *de vit. funct. p* 37. Hotting. *Theſaur. Phil. p.* 444.

(z) Reuchlin. *de Art. Cab. l.* 1. *fol.* 15.

(a) *Hebræi Platonicis imbuti opinionibus,* &c. *Pareus in* Heb. 2. 5.

(b) *Not. in* 1 Tim. 1. 4.

on. For the Sayings of the Jews and Chriſtians concerning it muſt be conſider'd as their Judgment or Opinion only: They pretend not to atteſt ſuch a matter of fact, nor can they ſay any thing of it upon their own knowledge; nor have they produc'd any creditable Heathen Author to atteſt it, or any creditable Pagan Hiſtory that reporteth it; the Reports of it produc'd (c) by a deſervedly great Name are not good Hiſtorical Atteſtations, but muſt be numbred with the fabulous Conceits and Narrations. For unleſs by the *Jews* we underſtand the *Pythagoric Eſſens*, thoſe Reports cannot be true, which parallel the *Jews* (who are a Theocracy, a Religious State and Government) with the *Brachmans*, which repreſent them as a Sect of Oriental Philoſophers, of a Philoſophic Inſtitution (whereas they were of an Unphiloſophic, that is, a Popular Religious Inſtitution) and their Wiſdom Natural Philoſophy; which ſuppoſe, that the Name *Judæus* ſignifyeth a Philoſopher, and that the *Jews* were renowned for their Philoſophic Wiſdom (which is ſaid to have drawn thoſe *Grecanic* Merchants, the Philoſophers, to trade with them) and that *Ariſtotle* had Commerce with them and diſcours'd of them. As *Clearchus* (a Diſciple of *Ariſtotle*) is ſuppos'd to ſay, *that he ſaw a* Jew, *who was converſant with* Ariſtotle; *that* Ariſtotle *ſpake in his hearing of this Man's wonderful Philoſophy, and ſaid of him,* (d) *He communicated ſomewhat more than he receiv'd from* Ariſtotle *and his Fellow-Philoſophers; that in this Diſcourſe* Ariſtotle *ſpake of* Jeruſalem *and of the* Jews, *of whom he gave this account,* (e) *Theſe are the Progeny of the* Indian *Philoſophers. The Philoſophers amongſt the* Indians *(as 'tis ſaid) are named* Callani, *but amongſt the* Syrians Jews, *ſo denominated from the place.* (f) *Clearchus* the ſuppos'd Author of theſe fabulous Reports is plainly Suppoſititious (as are alſo *Ariſtobulus*, *Hecatæus*, *Ariſteus*, and ſuch more), but the Report may be fabulous, although the Author be genuine, not ſuppoſititious; and ſuch is that Account of the *Jews* (unleſs it be underſtood of the *Eſſens*) which *Clemens* and *Euſebius* cite from an Ancient Hiſtorian *Megaſthenes.* (g) *All that the Ancients have ſaid of Nature* (Natural Philoſophy) *is ſaid by them that philoſophize out of* Greece: *Amongſt the* Indians *by the* Brachmans, *and in* Syria *by thoſe that are call'd* Jews. Of no better a Character is the Story from *Hermippus* touching *Pythagoras*; for we are told, that this Author reporteth, *that* Pythagoras *ſaid, The Soul of one of his Friends (Calliphon the Crotonian who was dead) accompany'd him Day and Night, charging him, not to paſs by a place where an Aſs ſtumbleth or falleth upon his Knees, and to abſtain from Waters that cauſe Thirſt, and from all Contumelious Language.* It is viſible, that this Story of a preaching Soul hath the Face of a Tale, and it is not probable, that *Pythagoras* ever related ſuch a Legend: Nor are thoſe Inſtitutes which the Soul is ſaid to give in charge, (though Learned Men ſuppoſe, (h) that the firſt of them had its riſe from *Baalam*'s Aſs) either *Hebraic* or *Pythagoric.* Yet the Hiſtorian *Hermippus* addeth, as *Joſephus* ſaith, (i) *Theſe things* Pythagoras *did and ſaid, imitating the Diſciplines of both the* Jews *and* Thracians, *which he transferr'd to himſelf: For that Man ſaith very true* (as *Joſephus* inferreth) *that he tranſlated many of the* Judaical *Inſtitutes into his Philoſophy.* If *Hermippus* may be ſuppos'd to have written theſe Fabuloſities, I ſhould ſuſpect (the *Indians* being a much more agreeable Mate for the *Thracians* than the *Jews*) that he wrote Ἰνδῶν, *Indians*, not Ἰουδαίων, *Jews*. Howſoever that be, *Joſephus*'s Inference is much larger than the Premiſes: But *Origen* hath enlarg'd it at the rate of a Rabbi. (k) *Hermippus* (ſaith he) *is ſaid to report in his firſt Book of Legiſlators,* Πυθαγόραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν, *that* Pythagoras *traduc'd his Philoſophy* (all his Philoſophy, ſaith Mr. *Selden*) *from the* Jews *to the* Greeks. *Origen* is paid home in his own Coin by his Adverſary *Celſus*, who pretendeth, (l) that the Chriſtians traduc'd many of their Doctrines (which he inſtanceth in) *from* Plato, *from the Pagan Theology and the Fables thereof* (the Chriſtians miſunderſtanding or changing them) and that Chriſt himſelf took his Saying touching the difficulty of a Rich Man's Salvation from *Plato.* (m) So *Amelius* the *Platoniſt* (as *Druſius* ſaith) having read the beginning of the Goſpel of St. *John*, complain'd of him, that he had traduc'd into his Book his Maſter's Myſteries. As if the Pagan Theologers deſign'd to imitate the Chriſtian in extravagant Conceits touching the traduction of Matters of Learning and Theology! Of the extravagant Conceits of elder times there have been Learned Aſſertors in theſe later Ages, that have made conſiderable Improvements of them; for (to inſtance only in *Pythagoras*) *Voſſius* ſuppoſeth (n) that *Pythagoras* convers'd with thoſe that profeſs'd the Diſcipline of the Prophets *Elias* and *Eliſha* on Mount *Carmel*; others, (as *Wendelin*) are of Opinion, that he convers'd with the Prophet *Daniel*, and learned from him the Tetragrammaton; others ſuppoſe, that *Zaratus Pythagoras*'s Maſter was the Prophet *Ezekiel*, and that *Mochus* the *Sidonian* Phyſiologer in *Jamblichus* (with whoſe Succeſſors *Pythagoras* convers'd) is *Moſes*. Theſe Learn'd Aſſertors of the old Extravagancies are the more culpable for their Credulity, becauſe ſome of them have ſo plainly convicted the Authors of them of groſs Fabuloſity, and becauſe their fabulous Reports ſo plainly confute one another, and ſometimes the Learned Aſſertors of them plainly confute themſelves: For *Serranus* ſaith, that *Plato* made no mention of the *Jews*, though he deriv'd his Wiſdom from them, becauſe their Name was odious amongſt all Nations; which is a ſelf-contradiction. For becauſe their Name was odious amongſt all Nations (as aſſuredly (o) it was) therefore *Plato* did not derive his Wiſdom from them. *Joſephus* reporteth touching the *Seventh Day*, *that there is not any City of the* Greeks *or* Barbarians, *or any one Nation, where the cuſtom* (or rite of obſerving) *of the Seventh Day, on which we reſt, hath not come.* In which words he confidently affirmeth theſe two things: (p) That in all Cities and Nations of the World there was an Obſervation of the Seventh Day (though they obſerv'd it not as the *Jews*) which was the *Jews Sabbath*: And that this their Obſervation of the Seventh Day had relation to the *Jews Sabbath*, and was a Propagation or Traduction from that Original; as both his words, and the ſcope and buſineſs of his whole Diſcourſe importeth. But there is more

(c) Selden. *de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(d) Παρεδίδου τι μᾶλλον ὧν εἶχε.

(e) Οὗτοι εἰσιν ἀπόγονοι τῶν ἐν Ἰνδοῖς φιλοσόφων· καλοῦνται δὲ, ὥς φασιν, οἱ φιλόσοφοι παρὰ μὲν Ἰνδοῖς Κάλλανοι, παρὰ δὲ Σύροις Ἰουδαῖοι, τοὔνομα λαβόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου.

(f) Simon. *Hiſt. Crit. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *l.* 3. *c.* 23.

(g) Ἅπαντα μέν τοι τὰ περὶ φύσεως εἰρημένα παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, λέγεται καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἔξω τῆς Ἑλλάδος φιλοσοφοῦσι· τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Βραχμάνων, τὰ δὲ ἐν Συρίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν καλουμένων Ἰουδαίων.

(h) Huet. *Dem. Ev. p.* 78. *ed.* 2.

(i) Ταῦτα δὲ ἔπραττε καὶ ἔλεγε, καὶ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Θρακῶν δόξας μιμούμενος, καὶ μεταφέρων εἰς ἑαυτόν. λέγει γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος πολλὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων εἰς τὴν αὑτοῦ μετενεγκεῖν φιλοσοφίαν.

(k) c. Celſ. *l.* 1. *p.* 13.

(l) *Ibid. l.* 6. *p.* 286. *l.* 7. *p.* 370.

(m) Druſ. *Not. in* Joh. 1. 1.

(n) Voſ. *de Sect. Phil. c.* 6. *ſ.* 5. Huet. *Dem. Ev. p.* 79. 397, 414. *ed.* 2. Selden. *ubi ſupr.*

(o) Spencer. *de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 1. *c.* 2. *ſ.* 2. & 5.

(p) Selden. *ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 23.

more than enough diſcours'd by Mr. *Selden*, to (q) *Ibid. c.* 16. convict this Report of groſs Fabuloſity. (*q*) *Ariſtobulus* (who is follow'd by *Clemens* and *Euſebius*) ſaith of the Seventh Day; *that* Homer *and* Heſiod *having tranſlated this out of our Books, plainly ſay, that it is holy.* As if *Homer*'s and *Heſiod*'s holy Seventh Day was the ſame with the *Judaical* holy Seventh Day, which is altogether as remote from it as the Rod in the (r) Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 17. Temple of *Iſis* from the Rod of *Moſes*, (*r*) or the Croſs in the Temple of *Serapis* from the Croſs of Chriſt. A Diſcourſe of this Author (*Ariſtobulus*) is recited in *Euſebius*, *Pr. Ev. l.* 13. *c.* 12. In the entrance thereof he pretendeth, *that* Plato *follow'd the Inſtitutes of our Law, and it is manifeſt, that he ſearch'd into all the ſeveral Matters thereof; that* Pythagoras *ſelected and tranſlated many of our things into the Philoſophy of his Sect* (the like he affirmeth of *Socrates*;) *and to countenance this Fiction he reporteth, that there was a Tranſlation of the Scriptures into Greek before* Demetrius Phalereus *and the Empire of* Alexander. The Body of this Diſcourſe is a recital of (pretendedly) Orphic Verſes, which (s) Huet. *Dem. Ev. p.* 187, 82, 85, 239. *ed.* 2. (*s*) a very learned Writer explodeth as Suppoſititious, the Figments of ſome Ancient Chriſtians and certain parcels of Scripture patch'd together: Yet this ſame Learned Writer ſuppoſeth, that the Entrance of this Author's Diſcourſe is *genuine*, that both the Pretenſions thereof are true, *viz.* that the *Greek* Philoſophers were converſant with the *Jews*, and ſearch'd the Scriptures, whence they deriv'd their Doctrine; and that there was a Tranſlation of the Scriptures (in part) into Greek before the Verſion of the *Septuagint*. But againſt this pretended Tranſlation of the Scriptures ſome other Learned Writers that ſuppoſe the Philoſophic Pagans, to have deriv'd the Matters of (t) *Prolegom. in Bibl. Polyglot.* 9. *s.* 6. their Wiſdom from the *Hebrews* (*t*) by way of Commerce and Tradition only (not from an acquaintance with the Scriptures) diſpute in this manner. *There was no known Verſion of the Scriptures into Greek before* Demetrius Phalereus; *for he telleth King* Ptolomæus, *that none of the Greek Writers, Poets, or Hiſtorians dar'd to meddle with the Sacred Volumes, that they were far from making any mention of them, that* Theopompus *and* (u) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 8. *c.* 3, 5. Theodectes (*u*) *were puniſh'd by a Divine Hand for preſuming to meddle with them, and that the former of theſe having labour'd under a certain trouble of Mind for thirty Days, and pray'd to know the Cauſe, receiv'd this Anſwer in a Dream; It was becauſe he would ſearch too curiouſly into Divine Myſteries, and divulge them to common Men. Beſides, it is not reaſonable to think, that* Ariſtotle *would make uſe of an Hebrew Man, to interpret the Scriptures to him, as* Clearchus *reporteth* (but no Man of common Wit and Sagacity can believe) *if they had been tranſlated into Greek.* It is manifeſt, that theſe *Judaical* Fabuloſities do not co- Lactant. here, *(ea enim mendaciorum natura, ut cohærere non poſſint)* that *Judaical* Writers fabulouſly report the Affairs of the Philoſophic Pagans, as the Pagans report Fabuloſities, when they write of the Affairs of the *Jews*. But we will ſuppoſe, that there is nothing of Fabuloſity in *Porphyry*'s account of *Pythagoras*'s reſort to the *Jews*; he reporteth from *Diogenes*, that *Pythagoras* went to the *Egyptians*, *Arabians*, *Chaldeans* and the *Hebrews*; but this *Porphyry* did not write, till the *Jews* were become famous for Philoſophy (their Philoſophic Paganizing had gain'd them a repute amongſt the Philoſophic Pagans) and then he had a mind, to do an Honour, not only to *Pythagoras*, but to the *Jews*, to whom alſo he might be willing to do an Honour out of ſpight to Chriſtianity (as either *Porphyry*, or the Devil, or both, were willing to do, (*w*) if thoſe Oracles that *Euſebius* hath cited from *Porphyry*, which rank the (w) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 9. *c.* 10. *Hebrews* amongſt the Nations eminent for Wiſdom and Religion, be not the Forgeries of ſome *Jews* or Chriſtians:) but allowing him (as we ought) the repute of a competent Witneſs touching the Affairs of *Pythagoras*; according to his Narration, Pythagoras *became exact in the skill of Divination by Dreams amongſt the* Hebrews. His Aſſociates (it ſhould ſeem) amongſt the *Hebrews* were certain *Jews* of his own Foot-mark, by whoſe Converſe (agreeably to the deſign of his Perigrination) he improv'd himſelf in that Branch of *Theurgy* (perhaps alſo in ſome * others, * *Vid.* Gale *Not. in* Jambl. *p.* 248, 249, 293. and he might learn amongſt them certain efficacious Names of great regard in *Theurgy*;) but the *Pythagoric* Philoſophy or Theology is not according to *Porphyry* a Deſcendent from the *Hebrews*. *Porphyry* and the Ancient Philoſophers ſuppos'd, that *Egypt* and the Oriental *Magi* were the Fountain of Philoſophy, not the *Hebrews*. The Roſicrucian *Philoſophia Theologizata* ſeemeth as credible as φιλοσοφία θεοπαράδοτος, *a Philoſophy of Arcane Divine Tradition.*

Thirdly, The Philoſophic-pagan kind of things are of no ſuch affinity with things Hebraical, that we may rationally ſuppoſe them Traductions from the Hebrews. The learned and holy Writers of the Primitive Church that ſuppoſe it, were far from conſidering the true Nature of the Hebrew Theology and Inſtitution; which overſight of theirs was the Origin (in ſeveral of them that were Philoſophical Men) of their extravagant Suppoſitions touching the Divine Original and Deſcent of the Wiſdom of the Philoſophic Pagans, of their groſs Miſrepreſentations of the Moſaic Theology, of their enormous Philoſophic paganizing the matters of the Chriſtian Theology (confounding things of Kind and Quality Pagan, with things of Kind and Quality Chriſtian,) of their great eſteem for ſuppoſititious Writings that were Philoſophic paganizing, of their extravagant Elogies of the Greek Philoſophy, their various Self-contradictions in diſcourſing of the Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans, and their inept Allegations to prove its Traduction from the Hebrews; which are too many Vices to be remark'd (if it could be avoided) in the Writings of learned and holy Men, *that intentionally Diſpute for the Honour and Intereſt of Chriſtianity.* (*x*) For that they (x) Baron. *ad ann.* 362. *n.* 256. might advance the Credit of it, reflect an Honour upon the Scriptures, and beat down the pride and boaſtings of the Heathen, therefore they Diſpute that their Philoſophers (and Poets alſo) traduc'd the Matters of their Wiſdom from the Hebrews. Not that the Greek Philoſophers traduc'd all their Wiſdom from thence; (y) Selden. *ſupr.* (*y*) but (as *Clemens* inculcateth) *that they were generally Thieves, having taken their Principal Dogmata from* Moſes *and the Prophets without a thankful acknowledgement of them*, (which is really an Argument that they had no acquaintance with them. The ſame Author ſaith of *Plato*, (*z*) *I* (z) Προτρεπτ. *p.m.* 34. *ed. Lugd. Bat.* *know thy Maſters, though thou haſt a mind to conceal them. Thou learneſt Geometry from the Egyptians, Aſtronomy from the* Babylonians, *ſalutary Inchantments from the* Thracians, *and the* Aſſyrians *taught thee many things: But Laws ſo many as are true, and thy Opinion concerning God, theſe the* Hebrews *afforded thee.* So *Euſebius* (who conceiveth, that *Plato*'s Philoſophy is *for the moſt part a Tranſlation as it were of the Scriptures into Greek*) diſcourſeth; (*a*) *That the Greeks had their Arts* (Geometry, Muſick, Aſtronomy, Medicine, and many more) *from the* Barbarians, *as alſo their Doctrine of many Gods, their Myſteries and ſacred Rites, and their fabulous Theology : But* (as if thoſe Barbaric-pagan Nations could not afford them their Metaphyſicks as well as their other Learning) *all that belongeth to the Religion of one Supream Deity, and ſuch things which concern thoſe great Enquiries that are for the bettering the Mind or the advantage of the Soul, are deriv'd from the Hebrews only.* The ground of this Conceit is the great Affinity and Agreement, which the Philoſophic-pagan Theology is ſuppos'd to have with the Hebraical, which theſe Theologers of the Church pretend to demonſtrate by voluminous Collections out of the Writings of *Plato* eſpecially: But theſe voluminous Allegations are plainly inept for their purpoſe, the moſt of them plainly refute their Hypotheſis; the agreement of the Philoſophic-pagans with the Hebrews in any matter of Theology is nothing ſo great as the diſagreement; there is not any branch of their Theology that is a genuine Traduction from the Hebrews; the Similitude that is between certain Sayings of the Philoſophic Pagans and the Sayings of Holy Scripture (as between *Plato*'s *τὸ ὄν, That which is*, and Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, *I am he that is*) is but in Words, not in Senſe; for the Philoſophic Pagans ſpeak of Philoſophic-pagan kind of things, whereas the Sayings of Holy Scripture are touching Holy-popular kind of things, (ſuch are the matters of the Hebrew Theology) which are of Nature and Character diametrically oppoſite to one another. From which account of their Difference it appeareth, that there is much of foul dealing in the Parallelіſms that are made between the Hebrew Theology and the Philoſophic Pagan, which is too viſible in ſome ancient Writers of the Church; for as *Eraſmus* complaineth, *that ſince Men could not bring the World to Chriſtianity, they have brought Chriſtianity to the World :* So to accommodate an Agreement between theſe two oppoſite Theologies, thoſe learned Writers have brought the Hebrew Theology to the Philoſophic Pagan. In imitation of *Philo* and the Philoſophic Pagans (who myſticiz'd and allegoriz'd their fabulous Theology) the beſt learn'd of them took up an humour of allegorizing away the true Senſe of the Scriptures. Inſtead of genuine and legitimate Notices of the Matters of the Chriſtian Theology, they have ſubſtituted *Platoniſm, Philoniſm, Scholaſticiſm*, which is much elder than our Schoolmen. To conform our Wiſdom to the Philoſophic Pagan, (*b*) S. *Cyril* maketh the Moſaic Philoſophy (as they call it) *Bipartite*, diſtinguiſhing it into *Theoretic* and *Practic*, (*c*) *for what wiſe or worthy Diſcipline is there* (ſaith he) *that is not in* Moſes's *Diſcourſes ? Euſebius* will have it *Tripartite*, and diſtributeth the Diſcipline of the Hebrews (*d*) into *Ethical, Logical, Phyſiological*. (*e*) *Origen* will have the diſtribution Quadripartite, which he ſuppoſeth *Solomon* to have compris'd in his Books; the Ethical in his *Proverbs*, the *Phyſical* in *Eccleſiaſtes*, the *Theological* in the *Canticles*, commixing the *Logical* with the other; and this diſtribution of Diſciplines he ſuppoſeth the Grecanic Wiſemen to have learn'd from *Solomon*, but to have arrogated the Invention to themſelves. The humour of Philoſophic-paganizing matters of Theology was the riſe of *Origen*'s extravagant Conceits (which are commonly known and as ſeverely cenſur'd) in ſubſtituting the things of the Philoſophic-pagan Theology inſtead of the holy things of the Chriſtian Theology, or in turning the latter into the former (which one Error (*f*) is the Summ of *Origen*'s Errors) he trod in the ſteps of his learned Inſtitutor *Clemens* (who is thought by S. *Hierom* the moſt learned of all the Ancients;) and although they differ in the Members of their diſtribution, yet they agree in making (*g*) a quadripartite diſtribution of the Moſaic Philoſophy, and their diſtribution is alike abſurd. For as it is an abſurdity in *Origen*, to make the Book of *Eccleſiaſtes* a Book of Phyſicks (or natural Philoſophy) ſo it is alike abſurd in *Clemens*, to make the *Moſaic Sacrifices* a matter of Phyſiology; to make one part of the Moſaic Philoſophy *Hiſtorical* (which cannot be Philoſophy) and another part of it *Metaphyſical*, which is not Scriptural Philoſophy. Of the Greeks Philoſophy, he ſaith, (*h*) *They were made juſt by it in part* (and in part only; for he ſaith, (*i*) *they that were juſt according to Philoſophy, had need of Faith in our Lord and the abandoning of Idolatry, and therefore had the Goſpel preach'd to them in Hades*;) (*k*) *Philoſophy was given to the Greeks as their proper Teſtament*, (*l*) *and as the Law to the Jews until the coming of our Saviour*, (*m*) *is an Erudition preparative to the perfection, that is by Chriſt*, (*n*) *and as the Law the Hebrews, ſo Philoſophy pedagogiz'd the Greeks unto Chriſt*; (*o*) *As God would have the Jews ſaved, and therefore gave them Prophets, ſo the moſt excellent of the Greeks theſe he raiſed as their Prophets. The ſame God afforded both Teſtaments the Old and New, and was the donor of Philoſophy to the Greeks, whereby the Almighty is glorified by the Greeks. The Jews and the Greeks Teſtament are both Old: But the one only God is known by the Greeks Ethnically, by the Jews Judaically, by us newly and ſpiritually*, as this Author diſcourſeth from a certain Book, *The Preachment of S.* Peter, to which he added a (pretended) ſaying of S *Paul*, that directeth us, (*p*) to conſult the *Grecanic Books, the Sibyll and Hyſtaſpes*. Agreeably to theſe Elogies of the Greek Philoſophy he confoundeth the true God with the Platoniſts Myſtic-Metaphyſical firſt Nature, (*q*) repreſenteth him as *unknowable, innominable, undeclarable*, as they do their *Monad* or *T'Agathon*, who is not to be worſhipp'd by Speech, but in Silence; and ſo *Clemens* ſaith of God, (*r*) *who is not to be declar'd by Word or Speech, but to be ador'd and Worſhipp'd* (*being ſtruck with an holy admiration*) *with veneration and ſilence.* (*s*) He ſuppoſeth, that the Region of God is *χώρα ἰδεῶν, the Land of the Platonic Ideas*, (*t*) that he who is converſant with the Forms or Ideas (which is a Philoſophic-pagan kind of heavenly mindedneſs) is *already become as an Angel, or a God amongſt Men, and ſhall be with Chriſt being a Theoretic*; (*u*) *that* Plato's *City is ſeated in Heaven*, (*w*) *that* the Abſtract Philoſophic Life deſcrib'd by *Plato* in his *Theætetus* is the Chriſtian Life; that the comprehenſion of the Ideas (*x*) which is the Platonic *Nous* is (*y*) the Logos of God; that the Logos of the Father of all is (*z*) the ſame with Reaſon, of which all Men participate; and that Philoſophy hath its Origin from this Platonic

Son

(a) *Pr. ev. l.* 13. *proœm.*

J. Mart. *paræn. p.* 19, 20. *S.* Aug. *de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 11.

(b) C. Jul. *l* 1. *p.* 14.

(c) Ποῖον γὰρ μάθημα σοφόντε καὶ ἀξιόληπτον τοῖς Μωσαϊκοῖς οὐκ ἔνεστι λόγοις;

(d) *Pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 3, 4, &c.

(e) *Hom.* 1. *in Cant. Huet. Dem. Ev. p.* 357. *ed.* 2.

(f) *Petav. T.* 1. *proleg. c.* 3. *S.* 6.

(g) Clem. *Strom. l.* 1. *p. m.* 259.

(h) *Strom. l.* 1. *p.* 234.

(i) *l.* 6. *p.* 459.

(k) *p.* 467.

(l) *p.* 497.

(m) *p.* 499.

(n) *l.* 1. *p.* 207.

(o) *l.* 6. *p.* 458.

(p) *V.* Spencer. *not. in Orig. p.* 70.

(q) *Strom. l.* 5. *p.* 422, 424, 428.

(r) Ὀυκ ἔτι φωνῇ παραδιδόμενον, σεβάσματι δὲ καὶ σιγῇ μετ᾽ ἐκπλήξεως ἁγίας σεβαστὸν καὶ σεπτόν. Strom. *l.* 7. *p.* 503.

(s) *p.* 425.

(t) *l.* 4. *p.* 391.

(u) *p.* 396.

(w) *l.* 5. *p.* 434.

(x) *l.* 4. *p.* 391.

(y) *l.* 5. *p.* 403.

(z) *l.* 1. *p.* 214. *l.* 5. *p.* 300. προλεγ. *p.* 46.

Son of God (*a*) *diſtributing to all* Greeks *and* Barbarians, *according to their aptitude and capacity of receiving* τοῖς μὲν ἐντολάς, τοῖς δὲ φιλοσοφίαν παραχών, *having given Laws to the one, Philoſophy to the other.* Thus the great Articles of the Chriſtian Theology are Philoſophic-paganiz'd by this learned Rhapſodiſt, who as he was impos'd upon by the Philoſophic-paganizing Gnoſticks (ſo called from their pretended arcane ſublime Knowledge) and their ſuppoſititious Writings, ſo the deſign of his *Stromata* is to deſcribe and form, not a genuine holy Man of the Chriſtian Inſtitution, but a *Gnoſtick*, that is (not a Theologus (*b*) as *Petavius* miſtaketh, but) *a Philoſophic Perfectioniſt Chriſtiano-platonic-ſtoical*, whoſe γνῶσις or *Sapience* is the perfection of Philoſophizing. I will not ſay, that this Idea is Heretical, as the Gnoſticks were, but (*c*) it aboundeth with extravagant Conceits. (For this Idea is conform'd to the Platoniſts and Stoicks deſcription of their *Sapiens*, or Philoſophic Perfectioniſt, *Clemens*'s Gnoſtick is a Platonic *Theoriſt* and Stoical *Apathiſt*, his Habit or State of Apathy maketh him equal to the Angels and a a God in Fleſh; he is a Co-heir of the Lords and Gods (as this Author (*d*) ſpeaketh.) Other Chriſtians are ſuppoſed to be meer Servants, or but faithful Servants, the Gnoſtick is a Friend and Son of God; his Principle of Well-doing is not to gain Reward, or to avoid Puniſhment, γνῶσις, and to be in perpetual Contemplation, is his *ſummum bonum*; he would not only have Science as an Adjunct, but his aim is, to *be* it; he needeth not the cuſtody of Angels, nor needeth to Pray as others do, *&c*). Which extravagant Conceits being for the moſt part Philoſophic-pagan, they demonſtrate at what a rate the matters of the Chriſtian Religion have been (culpably) Philoſophic-paganiz'd by the learned Writers of the Church Primitive. The Philoſophic Pagans being of great renown, this humour of (criminal) Philoſophic-paganizing that ſo early invaded the Church, was thought a noble thing, and ſeem'd to make for the Honour and Intereſts of Chriſtianity: but becauſe it is oppoſite to the Nature and Deſign of the Chriſtian Religion, therefore the Fathers are forc'd to ſay and unſay the ſame things; they fall into many Self-contradictions in their account of the Pagan Theology, as might be prov'd by many Inſtances, but theſe following Inſtances may ſuffice. *Clemens* who hath diſcours'd ſo copiouſly for the Traduction of Grecanic Literature from the Hebrews, for the Grecanic notices of God, and who pretendeth to find the great things of the Chriſtian Theology in the Greek Philoſophy, and affirmeth, that the Hebrew or Moſaic Philoſophy is without Controverſie (*e*) *the moſt ancient of any Wiſdom or Philoſophy*, yet ſaith of Philoſophy, (*f*) *It treateth not of the Son of God, for it was not acquainted with God's Religion,* [(*g*) *ſecular learning is a ſtrange Woman,*] *the Hereſies that are in the Barbaric Philoſophy ſpeak of one God, but invent another God.* (*h*) *The Greek Philoſophers although they name God, know not God*; Homer *ſpeaketh of the Father of Gods and Men,* (*i*) μὴ εἰδὼς τίς ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ πῶς ὁ πατὴρ, *not knowing who is the Father and how a Father.* The Philoſophy which the Apoſtle calleth Secular or Mundane, is ſometimes interpreted (*k*) of the Gentile Philoſophy in general, (*l*) ſometimes of the Atheiſtic Epicurean Philoſophy only. Of *Moſes*, *Clemens* reporteth, (*m*) *that he was taught the Arithmetic, Geometric, Rhythmic, Harmonic, Iatric* and *Muſic* Learning by eminent Perſons amongſt the Egyptians; that he learned their Letters, and the Science of things Celeſtial from the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians*; that they taught him *the Philoſophy by Symbols or Hieroglyphicks*; *and that the Greeks in Egypt taught him (as being a regial Child) another Encyclopædy, as* Philo *ſaith in the Life of* Moſes. But if he learn'd an Encyclopædy under Grecanic Maſters, how could he be the firſt wiſe Man, or his Philoſophy be the moſt ancient? How could the Grecanic Sages be but Children in reſpect of his Age, and derive their Learning from him? With the like inconſiſtence the Alexandrian *Cyril* writeth, (*n*) that the Greeks (their Wiſemen) were acquainted with the Dogmata of *Moſes*, and with the Holy Trinity of *Moſes* and the Prophets: Yet he not only denieth, (*o*) that Chriſtianiſm hath any thing in common with Greciſm; but he affirmeth alſo touching the Greeks, (*p*) *they Mythologize many thouſands of Gods,* τὸν ἕνα δὲ φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς εἰσάπαν ἠγνοηκότες, *but are totally ignorant of the one God really and truly ſuch.* *Theodoret* writeth, (*q*) *that* Anaxagoras *and* Pythagoras (as alſo *Plato*) *were converſant in Egypt with the Egyptian and Hebraic Wiſemen, from whom they gain'd the knowledge of the true God.* But if they gain'd it from the Hebrews, they could not gain it from the Egyptians (for theſe were ſuch oppoſite kind of Religioniſts, that they could not agree to inſtitute the Greeks in the knowledge of one and the ſame kind of Deity;) and if theſe Philoſophers had the knowledge of the true God, that cannot be true, which this Author writeth of *Homer* and *Heſiod*, (*r*) παντάπασι τὸν τοῦ παντὸς ἠγνόησαν ποιητὴν *they were altogether ignorant of the Maker of the World.* Yet ſome affirm, (*s*) *That* Homer *had read over all the Books of* Moſes, *as by places ſtollen thence almoſt word for word may appear; of which* Juſtin *Martyr remembreth many.* (*t*) Others have obſerv'd, that *Heſiod* and *Homer* (in their Coſmogonia) follow *a Moſaic Cabala*, which *Plato* and *Ariſtotle* underſtood not, which implieth, that the Philoſophers were the greater ſtrangers to matters Hebraical. It is much, that learned Men ſhould entertain a Suppoſition, that the Poets and Philoſophers deriv'd their Doctrine from the Hebrews, and yet deſtroy the ground and reaſon of it. For *J. Mart.* tells the Greeks, (*u*) *That nothing true in matters of Religion is to be learn'd from their Maſters.* *Theophilus* ſaith, (*w*) *That their Diſcourſe is vain and fooliſh, a multitude of Nugacities, not a particle of Truth is found in them; (for if they ſeem to ſay any thing that is true, it is as Honey or Wine mix'd with Poyſon;)* and the *Alexandr. Cyril* (*x*) ſaith of *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, *They were ſcarce able to ſteal a becoming Opinion likely to truth.* If the Doctrine and Diſcourſes of the Heathen Writers are of ſo bad a Character, why are they thought a Traduction from the Hebrews? how is it, that the Wiſdom and Learning of the Hebrews is not to be found in them?

Fourthly, Many of the ſuppos'd Traductions from the Hebrews are independent and undeſign'd Coincidences and Correſpondences (in whole or in part) *many of them are Traductions from another Original; and ſome of them are traduc'd not from the Hebrews, but by the Hebrews from the Pagans.* (*y*) *There is ſuch a Coincidence between the Exordium of* Solomon's *Divine Satyr (Vanity of Vanities, all is Vanity) and the beginning of* Perſius's *firſt Satyr (ô curas hominum! ô quantum eſt in rebus inane!) that if the Romans had been acquainted with the*

(a) *l.* 7. *p.* 504.

(b) *T.* 1. *proleg. c.* 4.

(c) *Strom. l.* 4, 6, 7.

(d) *Strom. l.* 6. *p.* 483.

(e) *Strom. l.* 1. *p.* 234.

(f) *l.* 6 *p.* 486.

(g) *l.* 1. *p.* 207.

(h) *l.* 6. *p.* 495.

(i) *p.* 499.

(k) *l.* 1. *p.* 229.

(l) *l.* 6. *p.* 465, 467. *l.* 1. *p.* 216.

(m) *l.* 1. *p.* 252.

(n) C. Jul. *l.* 1. *p.* 14, 32. & *l.* 9. *p.* 294.

(o) *l.* 1. *p.* 7.

(p) *l.* 7. *p.* 232.

(q) Θεραπ. *ſer.* 1. & 2 *p.* 6, 24, 25, 27.

(r) *ibid. p.* 25.

(s) *Sir* W. Rawleigh *Hiſt. l.* 1. *par* 1. *c.* 6. *S.* 7.

(t) *Dr.* Cudw. *Intell. ſyſt. p.* 352.

(u) *Paræn. p.* 8.

(w) *Ad Autol. l.* 2. *p.* 91.

(x) *c. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 7.

(y) *Caſaub. com. ad Perſ. ſat. p.* 36.

the Holy Books, as they were with the Grecanic Poets, who would have doubted of Perſius's *borrowing his Exordium from* Solomon? *But this marvellous* ξυνέμπτωσις (Coincidence) *is fortuitous*, ſaith *Caſaubon*. There is in great part (z) a Correſpondence between the Apologue of *Er* in *Plato*, and our Saviour's Parable touching *Dives* and *Lazarus*, which can be no Traduction, but a fortuitous Parallelìſm only; and there is alike undeſign'd Coincidence between the religious Forms of ſpeaking uſual in ancient Pagan Writers, and the religious Phraſeology of holy Men in Scripture, (God put it into my Heart, God deliver'd him into my Hand) as the Apologiſt for *Herodotus* (*a*) hath obſerv'd. (*b*) So there are ſome Laws of ancient Legiſlators (mention'd by *Ariſtotle* in his Politicks touching Eſtates and Inheritances, that are like the Moſaic Laws, but there is no appearance, that they were traduc'd from the Hebrews. Of this Nature (as ordinary Reaſon will pronounce) are thoſe Parallelìſms that are made (*c*) between the holy Writers of the Bible and the Prince of Grecanic Poets (*Homer*,) their Phraſes and forms of Speech, Hiſtorical Narrations and Moral Sentences; as alſo the Conformity which the Sentences of many other Greek Writers (*d*) are obſerv'd to have with the Scriptures, which are *Teſtimonia animæ naturaliter Chriſtianæ* (thoſe Sentences ſhew, that there are Notices and Principles of Religion in Humane Nature) no Hebraical Traductions. So there are many little correſpondences between the Hebrew Theology and the Diſcourſes of *Plato* touching the Origin of the Univerſe, the goodneſs of the Opificer, the Exiſtence of a Deity, particular Providence, the Juſtice of Providence, the Veracity of the Gods, the Duty of Belief, the Virtue of Fidelity, the Obſervance of Parents, the Neceſſity of good Education, and adherence to our Duty, and the diſtribution of his Citizens into Twelve Tribes; (*e*) and ſome few of *Plato*'s Laws (who yet inſtituteth a Common-wealth as if he was inſtituting a Bawdy-houſe) are conſentaneous to the Moſaical: But all theſe little Correſpondences are plainly undeſign'd and independent upon the Hebrews, as is alſo that wild Imagination (diſcours'd of in *Plato*'s *Politicus*) touching the inverted Revolution of the World from Weſt to Eaſt, (whereby the order of Nature is inverted, and old age runneth back into Childhood) which yet is alledg'd by *Euſebius* as one of the principal of the Dogma's which he deriv'd from the Moſaic Writings. There is nothing in *Plato* better than Pagan Theology, the Wit and Judgment of a learned Heathen may Philoſophize touching theſe matters to as good purpoſe, as *Plato* hath done without learning Hebrew or reading *Moſes and the Prophets.* A Conceit that had its riſe from that extravagant eſteem of *Plato* and his Theology (for want of underſtanding it aright) which hath ſometime poſſeſs'd the learned World. His extravagant Admirers ſuppoſe, (*f*) that he was more than a Man, that he ſpake by the afflation of the Holy Ghoſt, that he read the Divine Oracles (and traduc'd his Doctrine from them) wherewith he had no acquaintance. One thing that is thought, to argue his acquaintance with the Scriptures, or at leaſt with ſome Tradition of the Hebrew Theology, is the Platonic *Logos* and *Triad* of Archical Hypoſtaſes (call'd by *Proclus* with reſpect to the *Chaldaic* Oracles, Θεοπαράδοτος Θεολογία, *a Theology deliver'd by the Gods*,) which is thought originally a *Moſaic Cabala*, a Triad conſonant to the Scriptures and the Holy Trinity of our Theology. But it will be found (in the ſequel of this Diſcourſe,) that there is little of real Conſonance (and that fortuitous) in this parallelìſm; that no ſuch thing as a Trinity is to be learned from the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament (for God, ſaith *Theodoret*, (*g*) did not openly reveal the Dogma of the Trinity in thoſe times;) that it is not a Cabala of the Old Teſtament, any further than the Meſſiah is a *Cabala* (which Meſſiah is *Chriſt as deliver'd by the Prophets* (*h*) whom no Infidels do receive;) that the Platonic Triad is a meer Philoſophic-Pagan Myſtery, of Nature and Character oppoſite to the matters of the Hebrew Theology; and as Learning is thought (*i*) to have had its riſe amongſt the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians* (Philoſophy and the moſt ancient Learning of Aſtronomy) from whom alſo the Greeks had their Learning: So *Grotius* ſuppoſeth, (*k*) that *Plato* learn'd his Triad from the Chaldeans; doubtleſs, it is a deſcendent, not from the Hebrew Theiſm, but from Oriental *Zabiiſm*, from the ancient Magi, from whom the Egyptian Prieſts and the Greek Philoſophers deriv'd it, as *Pletho* affirmeth. And the ſame account muſt be given of the Platonic Philoſophers Doctrine touching Αὐγοειδὲς σῶμα, ψυχῆς λεπτὸν ὄχημα, ὄχημα αἰθέριον, *the luciform Body, ſubtle Vehicle, etherial Vehicle of the Soul*; that this was an eminent Branch of the ancient Philoſophic Theurgical Theology, which hath a meaſurable agreement with Chriſtianity (complicated with far greater diſagreement:) but in debating the buſineſs of a Cabala, we are not conſidering its Agreement with Chriſtianity, but with the Theology of the ancient Hebrews, who had (comparatively) very ſlender Notices of Eternal Life, or of an heavenly Glory and Immortality, and therefore cannot probably be thought, to have Philoſophiz'd touching *the ſubtle Luciform Body, the Etherial Vehicle of the Soul.* This may be called an ancient Philoſophic *Cabala*, but is no proof of *a Divine Tradition or Cabala amongſt the Hebrews firſt, and from them communicated to the Egyptians and other Nations. Grotius* ſaith (*l*) *that many things came from the Chaldeans and Greeks to the later Hebrews*; and diſcourſing of the viſibility of the *Lucid Vehicle of the Soul*, he ſaith, *it may well be doubted, whether this was not one of them.* From the ſame Original with this Philoſophic *Cabala Numa* deriv'd his *Pythagoric Wiſdom, his never dying Fire, his Averſation from Images*, which (together with innumerable other Rites in Paganiſm) are fortuitous undeſign'd Coincidences with the Moſaic Inſtitutes. For there is no reaſon to think that *Numa* had any Commerce with the Hebrews, but great reaſon to think that in *Egypt* he became acquainted with the Theology of the ancient Magi, which being (without doubt) the Origin of *Pythagoras*'s Philoſophy or Theology, his Sentences and Inſtitutes, even thoſe which have ſome correſpondence with the Moſaical, may with greater probability be deriv'd from them than from the Hebrews. Such as (*m*) *to abſtain from that which dyeth of it ſelf*, (an Inſtitute not peculiar to the Hebrews, (*n*) amongſt the Pagans it was thought a Pollution, to Eat of that which dieth of it ſelf) *Not to ingrave the form of a God upon a Ring, not to hurt or deſtroy an innocuous fruit-bearing Tree.* He preſcrib'd the gaining of purity (*o*) *by Expi-*

ations.

(z) Spencer. *not. in Orig. c. Celſ. p.* 36.

(a) H. Stephan. *Apol. pro Herodot. p.* 4.

(b) *Cunæus de Rep. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(c) Duport. *Metaphr. Pſal. præfat.*

(d) Grot. *Dict. Poet. in proleg. Huet. dem. ev. p.* 338, 346, 349, *ed.* 2.

(e) Spencer. *not. in Orig. c. Celſ. p.* 76.

(f) Spencer. *ibid. p* 28. *Tiraquel. de nobil. c.* 20. *n.* 137. *Huet. dem. ev. p.* 80. *ed.* 2.

(g) Θεραπ. *Ser.* 2. *p.* 30.

(h) Clem. *Str. l.* 6. *p.* 486.

(i) Jambl. *vit. Pyth. c.* 29. *Sennert T.* 1. *p.* 60. *Bullialdus. proleg. ad Aſtr. phil. Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 2. *S.* 9.

(k) *Ibid. l.* 4. *S.* 12.

(l) *Not. in* Matth. 28. 9.

(m) *Idem de V. R. C. l.* 1. *S.* 16. *in Annot.*

(n) *Idem in Lev.* 17. 15.

(o) Spencer. *de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *S* 3. *Grot. Not. in Matt* 8. 22.

ations, Ablutions, Aſperſions, by being pure from the Pollution of dead Bodies, and Women in Child-birth, and abſtaining from theſe following Meats; that which dieth of it ſelf, Mulli, Melanuri, Eggs, Oviparous Animals and Beans, and other things which they injoin, that perform the ſacred Rites and Myſteries in the Temples. Theſe Rites of Purity are plainly the Inſtitutes of Theurgical Sanctity, that muſt be deriv'd from Oriental *Zabiiſm*; for ſeveral of them cannot be deriv'd from the Hebrews: Nor is it reaſonable with *J. Mart.* to derive the Pagans Cuſtom of putting off their Shooes in their Temples from thoſe words of the Lord to *Moſes* (out of the burning Buſh) *put off thy Shooes from off thy Feet*, which were (p) *an Admonition only of the Divine Preſence, thereby commanding the Rite then accuſtomed in places hallowed.* Such an imaginary Traduction from the Hebrews is that of *Philo*, (q) who will have the Philoſopher *Zeno*, to have deriv'd his Notion of Liberty and Servitude from the Jews Law: Whereas not *Zeno* from the Hebrews, but the Hebrews (ſuch as *Philo*) deriv'd from *Zeno* the Notion of Liberty and Servitude. From the various Opinions of the Jews touching our Saviour's Perſon (ſome ſaying that he *was* John *the Baptiſt*, *ſome* Elias, *and others* Jeremias, *or one of the Prophets*, Matth. 16. 14.) it appeareth that they ſuppos'd a certain *Metempſychoſis* or Tranſmigration of the Soul (for they ſuppos'd, that the Soul of ſome one of their eminent holy Men deceas'd animated our Saviour's Body;) the Phariſees held a Tranſmigration of virtuous Souls out of one Body into another; the Cabaliſts amongſt the Jews agreeable to the Platoniſts aſſert גלגול הנפשות *the rotation of Souls*, therefore ſome of the learn'd conceive, (r) that the Hebrews anciently held ſuch an Opinion touching the Soul, and that the Pythagoric or Platonic παλιγγενεσία (the being born again into a new Body) is a Traduction from the Hebrews. But *Euſebius* who could find an Hebrew Original for almoſt every trifling conceit in Platoniſm, could find none for the Platonic Rotation of Souls; he affirmeth, (s) that the Dogma is not Hebraical, but that *Plato* traduc'd it from the Egyptians. Therefore (according to this Author) the Hebrews have traduc'd it from the Philoſophic Pagans. But this Author is not always alike happy in diſcerning matters Hebraical from things of Kind and Quality Philoſophic Pagan; as appeareth from that ignorant Conceit of his, (wherein yet he hath ſeveral Followers both of Ancient and Modern times) touching the *Therapeutæ* deſcrib'd by *Philo* (in his Book of Contemplative Life) who in ſeveral parts of the World, but chiefly in *Egypt*, liv'd the Life of *Philoſophical Aſceticks*, (not ſolitarily, but) in Religious Societies. Theſe *Therapeutæ Euſebius* peremptorily affirmeth, to have been Chriſtians converted by S. *Mark*, that embrac'd an Aſcetick Philoſophic Life. The abſurdity of this Conceit is demonſtrated by *Scaliger*, *Valeſius*, and a judicious Divine of our own (t), we will only obſerve, that their Wiſdom was the *Theoretic part* of Philoſophy (which, as *Philo* ſaith, is the moſt Divine of all other,) the Knowledge and Contemplation of Nature, and the Allegory of the Moſaic Law; that they Pythagoriz'd in their Diet, their ſilent Feaſt, and their veneration for numbers; that their deſcription ſpeaketh them *Philoniſts*, a Philoſophic Paganizing Sect (whether they may be called a Sect of Contemplative Eſſens, it is needleſs to diſpute.) one Reaſon of their Name is becauſe (u) *from Nature and the Holy Laws they have learn'd to Worſhip the Being, or Him that truly is, who is alſo better than Goodneſs, more ſimple than Unity, more Archigenial than the Monad.* In which deſcription of the Deity *Philo* is a Diſciple of the Philoſophic Pagans, and ſuch are alſo the Hebrew Doctors, who uſually derive their Dogmata from them. (w) They have deriv'd their Purgatory, or *Gehenna Superior*, where Souls are tormented and purg'd for Twelve Months, from *Plato's Phædo* (thoſe that ſeem to be guilty of great yet ſanable Offences, it is neceſſary that they fall into *Tartarus*; but the Surge there caſteth them out, after they have ſtay'd a Year, ſaith *Plato*,) whence *Origen* alſo had his Purgatory, which he introduc'd into the Church. What *Plato* ſubjoineth in his *Phædo* is almoſt word for word tranſcrib'd by the Talmudiſts. (x) Thoſe that are to be judged in the other World, the Jews rank and diſtribute in the ſame manner with *Plato*, who diſtributeth them into *thoſe that have liv'd well (holily and juſtly) thoſe that have not ſo liv'd, and thoſe of a middle Order*; which ſeverals have a like allotment from *Plato* and from the Hebrew Doctors. (y) Of the *Eſſens* Opinion touching a future State, *Joſephus* giveth an account tranſcribing the very words of *Homer*. (z) *Their Opinion is the ſame with the Greeks, they allot an Elyſium of perpetual ſerenity and good temperature of Weather, and of gentle refreſhing breathings of Air, to good and vertuous Souls.*

(p) *Mr.* Mede *on Eccl.* 5. 4. *S.* 3.

(q) *Quod omn. prob. liber. p.* 598. *ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(r) *Grot. not. in* Matth. 14. 2.

(s) *Pr. Ev. l.* 13. *c.* 16.

(t) D. Cave *Life of S.* Mark.

(u) Ἐκ φύσεως ᾗ τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἐπαιδεύθησαν θεραπεύειν τὸ ὂν, ὃ ᾗ ἀγαθοῦ κρεῖττόν ἐστι, καὶ ἑνὸς εἰλικρινέστερον, καὶ μονάδος ἀρχεγονώτερον.

(w) Windet. *de vit. funct. p.* 199. *ed.* 3.

(x) *Ibid. p.* 124.

(y) *Ibid. p.* 177. Marſham *Can. Chron. p.* 287. *ed. Lipſ.*

(z) Ταῖς μὲν ἀγαθαῖς (ψυχαῖς) ὁμοδοξοῦντες παισὶν Ἑλλήνων ἀποφαίνονται τὴν ὑπὲρ ὠκεανὸν δίαιταν ἀποκεῖσθαι, καὶ χῶρον οὔτε ὄμβροις, οὔτε νιφετοῖς, οὔτε καύμασι βαρυνόμενον, ἀλλ' ὃν ἐξ ὠκεανοῦ πρᾶυς ἀεὶ ζέφυρος ἐπιπνέων ἀναψύχει.

VII. This Diſcourſe againſt pretended Traductions from the Hebrews muſt be underſtood with ſome Diſtinctions, Reſtrictions and Limitations. For it is not my intention to ſay that there are no Traductions from the Hebrews amongſt the Pagans: But that the Pagans genuine or undoubted Traductions from the Hebrews are not many. That the Philoſophic Pagan Theology and the Philoſophic Pagan kind of things are no Traduction from the Hebrews; that *Pythagoras* and *Plato* (who are ſuppos'd to be חכמי חקבלה *Wiſe-men of the Cabala*, as the Jews ſpeak) had no better Notices of matters Hebraical than other Foreigners to the Hebrews Inſtitution; and that *Joſephus's* Elogies of the Law (which have obtain'd credit both amongſt the Ancient and Modern Writers of the Church) are intermix'd with very vain and romantick Conceits; namely, *That the Inſtitutes of the Law ingendered in all Men a deſire of Emulation, that the Greek Philoſophers ſeem'd to obſerve their Country-inſtitutes, but in the matters of Practice and in Philoſophizing follow'd* Moſes, *ſymbolizing with him in their Sentiments touching God, teaching perfection* (or frugality) *of Life and mutual Communion; that in the vulgar ſort there was no ſmall, deſire of imitating afar off the Judaical Rites, nor is there any City or Nation, Greek or Barbarian, to which the Cuſtom of the Seventh Day (whereon the Jews reſt) hath not come; Faſts alſo and Lights, and many Obſervations touching Meats prohibited to us. They endeavour alſo* (ſaith he) *to imitate our mutual Concord, equal diſtribution of things, induſtry in Arts, and the tolerance or conſtancy to which we are driven for the Laws.*

Joſeph. c. *Apion. l.* 2.

Laws. As God pervadeth the whole World, ſo the Law hath gone through all Men. This Author hath not told us by what means the *Moſaic* Law arriv'd at the notice of the Greek Philoſophers and of all Mankind; he hath not ſo much as mention'd *Ariſtobulus's* Verſion of the Scriptures into Greek before *Demetrius Phalereus* and the Empire of *Alexander*; which is an Argument, that he had no intelligence of any ſuch Author, or of his Greek Verſion. And the Greek Writers of thoſe elder times had as little; for whereas if there had been any ſuch Verſion, the Greeks could not have fail'd, to have been well acquainted with the *Jews* and their Affairs, they were ſo obſcurely known to *Herodotus*, that he calleth them, (a) *the* Syrians *in* Paleſtine. The *Jews* themſelves had no notice of any ſuch Verſion, as appeareth from their Calendar at the eighth Day of the Month *Tebeth*. (b) *A Faſt. The Law was written in Greek in the Days of* Ptolomee *the King: Darkneſs for three Days throughout the World.* But if we ſhould ſuppoſe a Verſion of the Scriptures into Greek before the *Alexandrian*, it would ſignifie little to the propagating the *Moſaic* Inſtitutes throughout the World; nor was the *Jews* Religion ſo well thought of in the Pagan World, as to ingender in them *a deſire of Imitation* (many Matters of the Law of the *Jews* paſs'd through the World, but not as Matters of their Law;) nor do the Greek Philoſophers *follow* Moſes *ſymbolizing with him in their Sentiments touching God*; nor is it poſſible, that the Greeks Philoſophy ſhould be *a Traduction from the* Hebrews *Law and Religion.* There is (doubtleſs) amongſt the Pagans a Traduction of ſome Hebrew Names and Phraſeologies (as *Jao*, *Cabiri*, and *Bacchus*'s being born out of *Jupiter*'s Thigh) the Hebrew Names *Sabaoth*, *Adonai* and ſuch more, were found to be of great efficacy in Theurgy; (c) *for Men acknowledge* (ſaith *Clemens*) *that thoſe Prayers were more powerful which are ſpoken in a Barbaric Language.* Beſides theſe undoubted Traductions from the Hebrews *Villalpandus* ſuppoſeth a Traduction of Architecture, (d) and others (with good reaſon) ſuppoſe, that ſome of the *Attick* Laws are traduc'd from the *Moſaic*. In the *Phenician* (*Sanchoniathon*'s) account of the Origin of the World and the *Egyptians* account of it in *Diodorus*, and in ſeveral other Heathen Authors, there are various notices of things pertaining to the *Coſmopœia* (or Creation of this lower World) that are of great affinity with the *Moſaical: Chaos, Tartarus, Erebus*; ſo the *Pythagoreans* (e) *Euryſus*, *Euryphamus*, *Archytas*, have diſcourſed, that *the Opificer himſelf was the Exemplar, conformably to which he made Man*, conſonantly to the *Moſaic* Theology; but with no greater Conſonance thereto than is viſible in that of the Poet, *Finxit in effigiem moderantum cuncta Deorum.* In their notices touching *Noah*'s Sons there is an appearance of Traduction from the *Hebrews* (but who can ſay, whether theſe Notices of the Pagans were the Remains of Ancient Tradition, or Traductions from the *Hebrews* by the *Phenicians*?) there is alſo an appearance, that ſome few of the Religious Rites and Inſtitutes of the *Hebrews* were propagated amongſt the Pagans; that the *Bætulia* or rude unpoliſh'd Stones which in ancient times were Symbols of the Gods, and were conſecrated by pouring Oyl upon them, had their Name from *Jacob*'s fact at *Bethel*, *Gen.* 28. 18. As the Rite of Sacrifice was deriv'd from the Religion of *Adam*'s Family: So the Rite of Circumciſion which was in uſe (f) amongſt the *Egyptians*, *Ethiopians*, *Colchi*, and other Heathen Nations (the *Americans* alſo (g) are ſaid to have us'd it) but with great difference from the Cuſtom of the *Hebrews*, might be a derivative from the Religion of *Abraham*'s Family; and on the other Hand, an humourſome Rite of the Nations might be inſtituted by God into a Rite of Religion to *Abraham* and his Family. There is great likelihood, that the Proverb (h) τὰ καννάκȣ κλαύσω, *I will lament with the Lamentation of* Cannachus, had its Origin from *Enoch* or *Hannoch* and his Prophecy of the Deluge; there is a greater likelihood of Traduction from the Hebrews in the Heathens Mythology, for ſeveral of their Fables are plainly matters of Biblical Hiſtory diſguiz'd, which argueth either a Traduction from the *Hebrews*, or at leaſt certain Remains of Scripture-Hiſtory amongſt them. *Sanchoniathon*'s Story, that *Saturn*, whom the *Phenicians* call Ἰλ or Ἰσραὴλ (*who after his Death was conſecrated into a Star of the ſame Name) when he reigned in thoſe parts, and had an only Son call'd* Jeoud *of a Nymph called* Anobret, *being in great danger, did ſacrifice that Son of his, being cloathed with Royal Habit*, is thought to be a Traduction from the Hiſtory of *Abraham*'s ſacrificing his Son *Iſaac*: So *Plato* in his *Sympoſium* bringeth in *Ariſtophanes* diſcourſing a wild Conceit, which looketh like a *Jewiſh* Tradition; *That there was anciently three ſorts of Mankind, Male, Female, and Androgynon compounded of both*, (their Backs growing together) *which Androgynon* Jupiter *afterwards divided into two, whence there is an innate love in Mankind to their ancient Nature, a propenſion to make one again of two.* (i) This Conceit is ſuppos'd to have had its origin from the words of *Moſes*, *Male and Female created he them*; and becauſe *Philo* and the Rabbins have the ſame Conceit touching *Adam* and *Eve* (to countenance which the Rabbins cite *Pſal.* 139. 5. *Ante & retrò formaſti me*) ſome have ſtiled it a *Jewiſh* Cabala; but becauſe there is no probability, that *Plato* look'd upon it as a *Cabala*, but rather as a *Fabula* (for he bringeth in *Ariſtophanes* telling this ridiculous Story to make him ridiculous,) it ſeemeth more reaſonable, to ſuppoſe it one of the Rabbin's Traductions from *Plato*, rather than a Traduction from the *Hebrews*. But if this ſort of Traductions be acknowledg'd (as they ought to be) this will by no means infer a Traduction of the Philoſophy or Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans from the *Hebrews*. To ſuppoſe, that the Foreigners to the *Hebrews* Religious Inſtitution traduc'd from them fortuitouſly certain Hear-ſays and Reports, which (being intermix'd with fabulous Vanities) are no genuine Traductions, is no unreaſonable Suppoſition. But to ſuppoſe, *That Foreigners and Adverſaries to the* Hebrews *Religious Inſtitution were the Wiſe Men of a Cabala of* Hebrew *Recondite Learning and Theology; that they ſtudiouſly and deſignedly traduc'd the principal Dogmata of the* Hebrews; *that a genuine Traduction of ſome of their principal Dogmata is to be found in Paganiſm; that Philoſophers traduc'd the Matters of a Philoſophic Inſtitution* (properly ſuch) *from the Inſtitution of the* Hebrews *which was Unphiloſophic, Unpopular Dogmata from Popular; Metaphyſicks and Arcane Philoſophy from Political Laws; Arcane Philoſophy whereby Life and Immortality was brought to light, before it was brought to light, Pagan Philoſophy from the Laws of true Religion:* Theſe and ſuch more Conceits are no Learned nor Pious Opinions. Is it probable, that the

Greek

(a) *l.* 2. *c.* 104.

(b) Scalig. *Can. Iſag. p.* 42.

(c) Clem. *Strom. l.* 1. *p. m.* 248.

(d) Grot. *de V. R. C. l.* 1. *S.* 16. *cum Annot.* Selden. *ſupr.*

(e) *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 2, 4. Jambl. περὶ βίȣ. *p.* 15.

Bochart. Chanaan. *l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(f) Spencer. *in* Orig. *p.* 16. Huet. *Dem. Ev. p.* 226. *ed.* 2.

(g) *Ibid. p.* 149.

(h) D. Ham. *Not. on* Jude 14.

(i) *Dr.* Jackſon. *Etern. Tr. of the Script. p.* 56.

Greek Philoſophers were acquainted with the Hebrew Theology, who underſtood not the prime Article of it, *The Unity of the Godhead*; nor the prime Cabala, (*k*) as *Reuchlin* calleth it, *The coming of the Meſſiah for the Salvation of Mankind*; nor the *Theopolity of the Hebrews*, or of the Church of God? for they knew no other Theopolity but their Demonial Theopolity, which conſiſteth of ſeveral Orders and Diſtributions of Gods and Demons.

(k) De Art. *Cabaliſt. fol.* 9.

CHAP. II.

1. *Of the Pagans Diſtributions of the Demonial Order.* 2. *Of their Diſtribution of it into Good and Evil, and of their Ditheiſm.* 3. *Of a late Hypotheſis touching the two* Moſaic *Expiation-Goats and Birds, with a Confutation of it.* 4. *Of the primary End of the* Moſaic *Rites.* 5. *Of the different Sentiments of the Pagan Theologers touching Evil Demons, and the different Senſes wherein they are ſo denominated.* 6. *Of the firſt Senſe, and of their Corporeity.* 7. *Of the ſecond Senſe, and of the Primitive Writers Philoſophic Paganizing.* 8. *Of the third Senſe, and of the* Jews *Sentiments touching Evil Demons.* 9. *Of the fourth Senſe, and of the Chriſtian Demonology.*

I. THE Diſtributions which the Philoſophers make of the Middle or Demonial Order, have for the moſt part little that is remarkable, ſave only an Enormous Philoſophic Phantaſtry of theſe Theologers of the Kingdom of Darkneſs. (*l*) Some of them do not confine the Demonial Order to the Sublunary Regions, but diſtribute it into *Celeſtial*, *Etherial* (which often ſignifieth the ſame with Aerial) *Aerial*, and thoſe lower Ranks which they call περιγείους & ἐνύλους, *terrene and material.* There are according to *Proclus* theſe ſeveral Ranks of Beings one below another; *Henades* or *Unities*, *Noes* (Minds or Intellects) *Souls*, *Natures*; and below all theſe, *Body* or *Matter.* The Demons are accordingly diſtributed into five Ranks anſwerable to theſe ſeveral Ranks of Beings, and the higheſt kind of them (ſaith he) often carry the appearance of Gods, and are ſtiled θεῖοι or ἑνοειδεῖς, *Divine or Heniform*, the other νοεροὶ, *Intellectual* (which are ſometimes ſtil'd θεῖοι, *Divine*, alſo) ψυχικοὶ, *Pſychical*, and ſo downwards. *Socrates*'s proper Demon was of the number of *Divine* Demons, and *Plotinus*'s alſo; for there was an *Egyptian* Prieſt and Magician at *Rome*, that undertook to ſhew *Plotinus*'s proper Demon, and perform'd the Invocation in the only pure place that he could find, the *Iſeum* (Temple of *Iſis*) and inſtead of a Demon a God ſtepp'd forth or a Divine Demon. Sometimes theſe Theologers content themſelves to ſay, that one Order of them are νοερώτεροι, *more Intellectual*, another λογικώτεροι, *more Rational*; a third are ἀλογώτεροι, ἐνυλότεροι, *more Irrational, Brutal and Material*; for according to the Theurgiſts, *there are* ἄλογοι δαίμονες, *an irrational ſort of them*, which ſome ſay, are wholly devoid of Intellect; others that they have ſome, but the laſt and leaſt Footſtep of it. (*m*) They are ridiculouſly diſtributed by *Proclus* into Maſculine and Feminine. And the *Stoicks* demonologize at the ſame rate, *Singulis enim & Genium & Junonem dederunt*, *our Anceſtors* (ſaith *Seneca*) *were Stoicks, for they allotted to every one a Genius and a Juno.* A like Phantaſtick is that Aſtrological and Planetary Diſtribution of Demons into *Saturnian*, *Jovial*, *Mercurial*, and ſuch more. In the ſame manner Humane Souls are differenc'd; (*n*) for αἱ ψυχαὶ σπειρόμεναι περὶ τὰ σύννομα ἄστρα, *Souls diſſeminated about their ſocial Stars contract from thoſe their Leaders a propriety of Life, ſo that each Soul is not only a Soul, but ſuch a Soul, Martial, Jovial or Lunar.* As the Orb or Sphere which Souls originally belong to, is more or leſs Sublime, ſo they are more or leſs Noble; *and this is a Nobility* (ſaith *Proclus*) *wherein one may truly glory, not in any Nobility according to terrene Progenitors and Cities.* But without ſoaring ſo high in Aſtrological Phantaſtry, the Pagan Theologers make ſeveral Diſtributions of the Demonial Order from the diverſity of their *Tempers*, *Faculties*, *Offices*, *Reſidences and Preſidences.* Οἱ μὲν ἰατροὶ νοσημάτων· οἱ δὲ τῶν ἀπόρων σύμβουλοι· *Some of theſe officious Demons cure Diſeaſes, ſome give Counſel in difficult Caſes, ſome diſcover things hidden, ſome help Artificers, and ſome accompany on the way.* (Into the ſimilitude of ſuch officious Demons the Theologers of the Church about the fourth Century transform'd the deceaſed Saints and Martyrs.) Some are *Marine*, ſome are *Terreſtrial*, ſome are *Rural*, and others reſide in Cities. The diverſity of their Temper is viſible in their Sacra; for ſome of theſe Gods delight in *Diurnal*, others in *Nocturnal*, ſome in *open* and ſome in *ſecret*, ſome in more *cheerful*, and ſome in more *ſad* Sacrifices and Rites, and there is great variety in their Pomp, the ſilence of their Myſteries, the Offices of their Prieſts (and the like) as *Apuleius* diſcourſeth.

(l) Ficin. *Arg. in* 10. *de Rep. com. in* Plotin. *p.* 93, 288, 290. *procl. de An. & Dæm.* Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 258, 310. *& alibi paſſim. Liv. Galant. compar. l.* 15. *p.* 396.

(m) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 11, 15. Sen. *Ep.* 110. Pamel. *in* Tertul. *de An. c.* 39. *n* 448.

(n) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 290, 34. *de An. & Dæm. p.* 217. Syneſ. *de pr v. p.* 89. Ficin. *Arg. in Apolog. M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 26.

II. The only conſiderable Diſtribution of this Order (of great concern in Religion) is into *Good* and *Evil*, which is an uſual Diſtribution amongſt the Pagans. For their Vulgar Theology ſaith, (*o*) *Some of the Gods are Good and others are bad* (called *Vejoves* and *mala numina*) *and of a more hurtful nature. The former are worſhipped that they may help, the other that they may not hurt.* This Partition of Gods concerneth the Demonial Order, (*p*) *which although it be univerſally bad* (as *Euſebius* ſaith) *yet they diſtribute it in two ſorts*; εἴς τε τὸ βλαπτικὸν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ὠφελοῦν, *the one helpful, the other hurtful, calling the one Good, the other Bad.* (*q*) *The generality of the Pagans* (ſaith S. *Hierom*) *are wont to worſhip ſome Demons, that they may not hurt, and they ſue to others, to afford them benefits; whence ſome of their Sacrifices were white, others of the ſad colour.* Theſe two Parties of the Demonial Order are ſometimes differenc'd by the Theurgical Names of *Light* and *Darkneſs*; (*r*) *for all that are of the better Nature are called Light, and in this comprehenſion God hath the chief Power; but that which is Evil (which hath no friendly Commerce with that*

(o) *Eſſe quoſdam ex Diis bonos, alios autem malos, & ad nocendi libidinem promptiores: illiſque ut proſint, his verò ne noceant, ſacrorum ſolennia miniſtrari.* Arnob. *adv. Gent. l.* 7. *p.* 228. Lipſ. *Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 19.

(p) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 5. *c.* 3.

(q) *Solent plerique Gentilium Dæmones alios colere, ne noceant, & alios exorare, ut præſtent beneficia: unde & illud Virgilianum eſt, Nigram hyemi pecudem, Zephyris felicibus albam.* Com. in Jerem. 10.

(r) Euſeb. *ſupr. l.* 4. *c.* 5.

which is Good, and hath the chief Power throughout the nature of things contrary to Good) ruleth over the worſe, τοῦτο δὲ μοχθηρῶν δαιμόνων γένος, *which is the kind of improbous Demons.* This Diſtribution of things deſcendeth from the ancient *Perſian* and *Chaldean Magi*, and is as ancient as their Philoſophic Theurgical Theology; a ſort of Theology of very great conſonance with the Chriſtian Theology complicated with extream Diſſonance. *(s)* For ſuch is the Hypotheſis of *a good God and an evil, independent on each other, or that there are two Principles and Archical Cauſes of things, the one lucid* (like unto Light) *the other tenebricoſe; and that there are two oppoſite parties of things in the World, whereof the one appertaineth to the party and preſidency of the Imperial Principle of Light called* Oromaſdes, *the other to the Imperial Principle of Darkneſs called* Arimanius. To the one of theſe Imperial Powers (that of Light) *Zoroaſter* taught them, to offer ſuch Sacrifices as were εὐκταῖα ϗ χαριστήρια, *for the obtaining of Good and Euchariſtical:* to the other, ἀποτρόπαια ϗ σκυθρωπά, *ſuch as were ſad and for the averting of Evil.* And in ſacrificing (as *Plutarch* relateth their Theurgy) they invok'd *Hades* and *Darkneſs*, making uſe of a certain Herb *Omomi*, wherewith they mix'd the Blood of a Wolf, and which afterward they carry'd out and caſt into a dark place, where the Sun-beams came not. This Magical *Ditheiſm* of the *Perſians* (or their *Althanawiah*, that there are two Imperial Principles of things, Light and Darkneſs,) had partly its origin from the Phænomenon of *Evil*, which is intermix'd with good in every thing, and cannot be ſalv'd without a Principle of Evil, as *Plutarch* diſputeth. *(t) For if nothing can be without a Cauſe, and that which is Good cannot be the cauſe of Evil, there muſt be in Nature a proper Principle of Evil and a production thereof, as well as of Good. And thus the moſt and wiſeſt think.* *(u) But ſome make account* (ſaith he) *that there are two Gods, contrary Artificers as it were, the one the maker of all Good, the other the maker of all Evil; but others call only the better Principle a God, the other a Demon, as* Zoroaſter *the* Perſian *Philoſopher.* In this account of the *Perſian* Ditheiſm *Plutarch* is a better Moraliſt than Theurgiſt; for there is great reaſon to think, that the ancient Magi introduc'd their Imperial Principle of Evil, not only upon account of the common Phænomenon of Evil intermix'd with Good in the World, but upon account of certain Arcane Phænomena obſervable in their Theurgical Operations.

For the Evil Principle or Demon was look'd upon by the *Magi*, not only as a Principle of Evils in the World, but as a Principle inimical to their Theurgical Sanctity and Beatitude; therefore they wore *(w) a white ſhining Garment againſt Hades or Darkneſs* (the ſame with *Arimanius*;) and *Theopompus* reporteth, that according to the *Magi*, *the two oppoſite Gods* ſhall conflict and fight with one another for ſome thouſands of Years, τέλος δὲ ἀπολείπεσθαι τὸν ᾅδην, *but in the iſſue Hades will ceaſe or be deſtroy'd, and that then Mankind ſhall be happy, neither needing Food nor cauſing Shadow.* Which happy ſtate of Mankind will emerge upon the deſtruction of *Hades* in the *Chaldeans* Notion, this God being *(x) the Prince or Chieftain of the Circumterraneous Prefecture*, upon whoſe Deſtruction the Souls of Men will have a *Reduction* to the Supernal Regions, *a Liberation from Geniture*, from Evils, and from being under Fate. But as the *Magi* look'd upon *Hades* as inimical to their Beatitude, ſo they look'd upon this God as inimical to their Theurgical Sanctity. For they could not be ignorant of that νεῖκος or *Contrariety of Operation*, *(y)* which is ſaid to be in Theurgy: nor of thoſe *Antithei* or *Anti-Gods*, which the Theurgiſts uſually met with in their Operation, and which they grievouſly complain of as diſturbing or fruſtrating them. Sometimes they were fruſtrated by a Diviner Power intervening, (z) too hard for their Demons and Inchantments (as in *Baalam*'s caſe:) But that which the Theurgiſts complain of, is not a Diſturbance or Fruſtration in their Theurgy from the Interpoſition of any Superiour Powers, but from an inferiour ſort of Demons, which (as they ſay) are inimical to their Theurgical Sanctity, and which obtruded themſelves inſtead of thoſe Gods which they were calling for, making ſhew that they were thoſe Gods. *(a) We find* (ſaith *Proclus*) *that in Expiations and Religious Rites every where ſome of the worſer ſort put on the garb and ſhew of the better and more perfect, thereby to entice imperfect and unskilful Souls to themſelves, and to divert them from the Superiour Gods.* *(b) Before the God himſelf cometh, certain Terrene Demons occur, and ſights which trouble and diſtract thoſe that are expiated, drawing them downward from the incontaminate Goods to the Matter.* The *Chalday* Oracles charge the Theurgical Saintiſt, to take heed of them, and to fortifie himſelf by the Forces and Virtues of the Theurgic Conſecrations. *(c) You muſt beware of beholding them till you be expiated as to the Body and purg'd by the Sacra. They are always ſeducing Souls from the Sacred Myſteries.* Theſe impure Demons that peſter'd the Theurgical Saintiſts (they are ſaid *(d)* παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς θεουργοῖς, *to moleſt and trouble the Theurgiſts*) were certainly known to the ancient *Magi*, as appeareth from what *Min. Felix* *(e)* reporteth of one of the famous Magi, *Hoſtanes* (for though *Minucius Felix*'s account of his Doctrine is not wholly true and genuine, yet this Branch of his account is plainly a Branch of the Philoſophic Theurgical Theology) *Dæmonas prodidit terrenos, vagos, humanitatis oſores; He declar'd, that there are Terrene Demons, wanderers, haters of Mankind.* The *Magi* being acquainted with this Phænomenon, and meeting with *(f)* δαίμονες πονηροὶ ἀντὶ θεῶν, *improbous Demons inſtead of the Gods they were calling for*, (which improbous Demons are called *Anti-Gods* from the Theology of *Zoroaſter*, as ſome ſay) they could not but ſuppoſe an Imperial Head or Principle, to whoſe Party and Preſidency thoſe troubleſom Demons belong'd. For thus *Porphyry* believing the Exiſtence of evil Demons ſuppoſeth, *(g)* that they have an Imperial Head preſiding over them, which he calleth *Sarapis*, the ſame with *Pluto*, which (as alſo *Hades*, *Orcus*, *Diſpater*, the Infernal *Jupiter*) is one of the Names of the Perſian *Arimanius*. Thus in the Egyptian Theology there is a *Typhon* (whence that proverbial Speech in *Plato*'s *Phædrus* τυφῶνος πολυπλοκώτερον θηρίον, *a more multifarious Beaſt than* Typhon,) who

(s) Plutar. *de Iſ. & Oſir.* p. 369. Eugub. *de Per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 34.

(t) *De Iſ. & Oſir.* p. 369.

(u) Νομίζουσι γὰρ οἱ μὲν θεοὺς εἶναι δύο, καθάπερ ἀντιτέχνους· τὸν μὲν ἀγαθῶν, τὸν δὲ φαύλων δημιουργόν· οἱ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀμείνονα θεὸν, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον δαίμονα καλοῦσιν· ὥσπερ Ζωροάστρης ὁ μάγος.

(w) Plutarch. *Qu. Rom.* p. 270. *de Iſ. & Oſir.* p. 370.

(x) Τῆς ὑλαίας ϗ περιγείου λήξεως ἀρχηγός. *Niceph. in Syne.* p. 385.

(y) *V.* Gale *in* Jambl. p. 256, 253, 252, 232.

(z) Orig. *c. Celſ. l.* 1. p. 46.

(a) *Compertum habemus in expiationibus atque ſacris ubique ex deterioribus aliquid induere perfectioris imaginem, per quam animas nondum perfectas alliciat ad ſeipſum, à ſuperioribuſque divertat.* De An. & Dæm. p. 185.

(b) Καὶ ὄψεις ἐκταράττουσαι τοὺς τελουμένους, ϗ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀχράντων ἀγαθῶν εἰς τὴν ὕλην προσκαλούμεναι. Gale *ſupr.*

(c) Οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κείνους σε βλέπειν, πρὶν σῶμα τελεσθῇς, τὰς ψυχὰς θέλγοντες ἀεὶ τελετῶν ἀπάγουσι. Ibid. p. 210, 211, 254.

(d) Porphyr. *de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 47.

(e) p. 270.

(f) Gale *ſupr.* p. 253.

(g) *De Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 42. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 4. *c.* 22, 23.

who is the head of the Typhonian Demons; and (*h*) the Egyptian Fablers ſay (which ſheweth what kindneſs they had for the Hebrews,) that *Typhon* begat two Sons *Hieroſolymus* and *Judæus.* Thus *Pherecydes Syrus* (*i*) Theologizing in the fabulous way, and talking of two oppoſite Armies and their various Conflicts with one another (upon this condition, that the party which ſhould be caſt into *Ogenus*, ſhould be reputed vanquiſh'd; and the other party that drave them out and vanquiſh'd them, ſhould be Poſſeſſors of Heaven) maketh *Saturn* the Head and Chieftain of the one Party, and *Ophioneus* of the other, Ὀφιωνεὺς Θεὸς, *the God Ophioneus*, who is ſometimes called Ὀφίων, *Ophion*, and is ſaid to be Superior to all the Giants. Agreeably to this Mode of Theologizing the ancient Magi introduc'd *Arimanius* an evil God, as ſuppoſing that there is a Prince or Chieftain of their evil Demons.

III. From theſe two contrary Principles and Oppoſite-kind of Gods (*k*) a Divine of our own (who hath abandon'd the common Opinion touching the Traduction of the Rites of Paganiſm from Judaiſm, and is of Opinion, that not a few of the Moſaic Rites are traduc'd from the Pagans) hath given an account of the two Expiation-Goats in the Feaſt of Expiation, whereof the one was killed, the other ſet at Liberty, *Lev.* 16. 5, 10. He ſuppoſeth, "That the Judaical Rites of Expiation had their Origin from Pagan Rites (but ſomewhat transform'd and amended,) which were the cauſe of their Inſtitution, that the two Expiation-Goats have reſpect to the Pagans two Principles, or two kind of Gods; for the Lot of one was *for the Lord*, the other was diſmiſs'd or ſent away unto *Azazel*, that is, the Devil (for he ſaith, that *Bochartus* proveth from the Etymology of the word, that it cannot ſignifie a Goat) into the Wilderneſs the Manſion of the Devil, and was there left alive in honour of the God to whom he was devoted, as the Heathens had their ſacred Animals, which they diſmiſs'd to range freely in honour of thoſe Deities to whom they were conſecrated. This Inſtitution of two Expiation-Goats hath reſpect alſo to thoſe two kinds of Oblations before mention'd (the one touching the obtaining of Good, the other the averting of Evil) which *Zoroaſter* taught the Perſians, and which agreeably to their two kind of Gods were in uſe among the Pagans. For one of theſe Expiation-Goats (that of Mactation) is ſuppos'd to be Propitiatory, for the taking away the Guilt of Sin; *Cathartic*, and for the obtaining of good: The other Expiation-Goat (that of Diſmiſſion) was ἀποπομπαῖος for the averting of Evil and taking away the puniſhment of Sin. Theſe two Expiation-Goats God would have offered and conſecrated to him at once, at the Door of the Tabernacle, in oppoſition to the Pagans *Ditheiſm*, (to reprove and aboliſh it,) that the Jews by theſe Rites might acknowledge him alone the Author of all Goods and the averter of all Evils, not *Azazel*, whom the Jews propitiated for the averting of Evils, looking upon him as the principle or cauſe of them. A like account is given of the purgation of a leprous Perſon or Houſe, *Lev.* 14. by two Birds, the one killed, the other ſet at liberty into the open Air. This Rite of purgation is ſuppos'd to have been inſtituted in Oppoſition to a ſuppos'd Heathen Cuſtom of killing of ſome Birds in honour of the inferior Gods, and ſetting others at liberty in honour of the ſupernal Gods. And that by theſe ſymbolic Actions the Leprous Perſon might make Profeſſion, that he worſhipped one God Lord of Heaven and Earth, and that he ow'd his Purgation to his Grace, not to any inferior or ſupernal Heathen Deity." This account of theſe Judaical Rites of Expiation, like its Author, in ſome reſpect deſerveth a great Character; but it hath not a few infirm Parts in it, that prejudice its Entertainment. For there is no appearance that the Jews propitiated the Devil as the principle of their Evils (that he might not hurt, and for the averting of Evils:) Nor is there any probability that the name *Azazel* ſignifieth the Devil. For whereas it is argu'd from *Bochartus*, that *Azazel* cannot be the name of a Goat, becauſe its Etymology cannot be עזאזל, the one being of the Maſculine, the other of the Feminine Gender; this Argument is of no validity; for if we ſuppoſe the name *Azazel*, to be deriv'd from עז *a Goat*, and אֹזֶל the Subſtantive (as we read of הָאֶבֶן הָאֹזֶל, *Lapis Itionis vel Abitionis*, 1 *Sam.* 20. 19.) the name will ſignifie the *Scape-Goat*, and this Etymology will be unexceptionable in point of Grammar. If the name *Azazel* is not the name of a Goat, whence is it, that throughout the Bible it is never us'd ſave only in the Law touching the two Expiation-Goats? In that Law it is uſed (*l*) as a known Name and of familiar uſe: But as a name of the Devil it was not of familiar uſe; therefore it is the name of a Goat, of ſuch a Goat which is an Inhabitant of the Wilderneſs (after the ſending away the firſt Scape-Goat;) whence in the Language of the Law, *Lev.* 16. 21, 22, 26. to ſend away or let go the Goat into the Wilderneſs, (*m*) and unto *Azazel*, or *to be the Scape-Goat*, is the ſame thing. But that the Wilderneſs ſhould be conſider'd as the Devil's Manſion, that to ſend away or diſmiſs one unto the Wilderneſs, the Wilderneſs of *Judea* (which was the Manſion of *John* the holy Baptiſt, and to ſend away to the Devil are the ſame thing, of this there is no appearance in the Law, nor in the whole Bible (though Deſart Places are often ſaid to be the Haunts of unclean Spirits;) nor is the Wilderneſs conſider'd in this Law of Expiation in any other Notion than as *a Land not inhabited*, as is plain from the Text, *Lev.* 16. 22. upon which account the *Hermits or Anachorites* preferr'd it (as more remote from the Devil's Neighbourhood) before the populous Cities, and God himſelf upon the ſame account made choice of it for the publication of his Law. (*n*) *The Law was given in places uncultivated or not inhabited* (ſaith *Grotius*,) *that ſo the people being remote from the contagion of Cities, and purg'd by Hardſhips, and taught by Miracles to depend on God, not on created things, might be prepar'd for that Republick which God deſign'd.*

The ſending away a live-Goat to the Devil is an Inſtitution, of which it is not imaginable, that there could be any cauſe in the Moſaic Oeconomy; it is a Rite that hath no Parallel, there is nothing like it in any Religion; it neceſſarily bordereth upon Demonolatry and tendeth to promote it (though in ſome reſpects it might be oppoſite thereto;) had ſuch a Rite been inſtituted, the Jews would certainly have underſtood it as an Inſtitution of Demonolatry. For thus (*o*) the Jewiſh Doctors (and *Origen* amongſt

(h) Plutarch. *de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 363.

(i) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 303. Spencer. *Not. Gale. in* Jambl. *p.* 258.

(k) D. Spencer. *de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 8.

(l) D. Spencer. *ſupr. p.* 498. *ed.* 2.

(m) *Ibid. p.* 4[illegible]1. *The Devils have thoſe places allotted to them*, ἔνθα ἐρημία ἐςὶ γνώσεως Θεȣ̃. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 399.

(n) Grot. *explicat. Decal. non procul ab initio.*

(o) *D.* Spencer *ſupr. p.* 457, 459. Buxtorf. *Synag.* Jud. *c.* 21. *ſub fin.*

amongſt the Chriſtians) who by the name of *Azazel* underſtand the Devil; ſuppoſe, that the Law injoineth Demonolatry, according to that trite ſaying of theirs, *Date munus ipſi Samael in die Expiationis, make a preſent to Samael* (the Devil) *himſelf on the day of Expiation.* This is the Conſequence of ſuppoſing *Azazel* to be the Devil; the Goat will be thought devote and ſeparate to the Devil in ſuch ſort as the ſacred Animals were devote to the Heathen Deities, as this learned Author himſelf ſometimes ſeemeth to ſay. For thus he diſcourſeth (p) *The Goat that fell to* Azazel *by Lot, was ſent forth into the Wilderneſs, perhaps becauſe it was the Cuſtom of ancient times, that every Animal devoted or deſtinated to any Numen ſhould be ſent away to the Seat and Territories of that Numen. Veteres nullum animal ſacrum in finibus ſuis eſſe patiebantur, ſed abigebant ad fines Deorum quibus eſſet ſacrum. The Ancients* (ſaith *Macrobius*) *ſuffer'd no conſecrate Animal to remain in their Territories but drove it away to the Territories of the Gods to whom it was ſacred. To this Cuſtom* (*at leaſt to Reaſon*) *it was agreeable, that the Goat deſtinated by lot to God and his Altar ſhould be brought to his Territories, as it were the Altar and Sanctuary: But the Goat devoted and ſeparated to the Devil ſhould be driven away without the Borders of* Iſrael, *to the Devils Territories as it were the Deſart Places.* Here the Goat is ſaid to be ſent away into the Wilderneſs, becauſe he was *devote* and *ſeparate* to the Devil: He is alſo ſuppos'd (q) to be left alive there in *Honour of the God to whom he is devoted*; which if it be underſtood of the Devil, it is downright Demonolatry; if it be underſtood of God, then the Goat was left alive, and diſmiſs'd to range freely in the Devils Territories in Honour of God (which is contrary to *Macrobius*,) and the God of *Iſrael* is ſuppos'd to be honour'd after the Mode of the Pagan Deities, *by conſecrate Animals diſmiſs'd to range abroad.* We will ſuppoſe for the preſent (in compliance with this learn'd Author,) that this is a true account of the Diſmiſſion of the live-Goat; which implieth, that he was diſmiſs'd or ſent away to be kept alive, not deſtroy'd: But this ſame learned Author diſcourſeth, that this live-Goat was ſent away to the Devil, (not as an Honorary Preſent, but) as (r) a thing Devote and an Anathema; (s) that he was ſent away devoted to the publick Nemeſis, and they heap'd upon him all their Execrations; (t) that he was diſmiſs'd with an Imprecation, that all the Evil impendent upon the People might light upon his Head; (u) that he was ſent away to the Devil, to denote that Sinners are his Portion; all which unavoidably inferreth, that he was ſent away to the Devil in order to his Deſtruction. Which account of his Diſmiſſion is inconſiſtent with the former, and contrary to the intention of the Law: For doubtleſs the Law (w) deſigneth not the deſtruction of the Scape-Goat, but the contrary; and the Jews that talk of (x) devoting him, throwing him down a Rock, and other methods of deſtroying him, that pluck'd him, prick'd him, ſpit on him, and loaded him with contumelies, have extreamly miſtaken the nature of this Moſaic Inſtitution. But although we have been willing to ſuppoſe that the Scape-Goat was diſmiſs'd to range abroad freely in Honour of God, yet no ſuch Rite ought to be ſuppos'd in the Jews Religion. For if the God of *Iſrael* had inſtituted ſuch a Right of honouring him, it muſt have been expreſs'd in his Law, the Jews muſt have been taught, that a live Animal was diſmiſs'd as a mode of religious honouring their God: *So if God would have both the Expiation-Goats preſented to him at once, that by this Rite the Jews might acknowledge him alone, to be the Author of all Goods and the averter of all Evils*; the Jews muſt have been taught that this was the meaning, deſign and intention of that Religious Rite; for unleſs they had ſuch an intention in the uſe of that Rite, no ſuch act of Piety could be done. Wherefore there is no appearance that the Inſtitution of the two Expiation-Goats hath any reſpect to the Pagans *Ditheiſm*, or to their two ſorts of Oblations (εὐκταῖα ϗ χαριστήρια, *for the obtaining of Good and Euchariſtical*, ἀποτρόπαια ϗ σκυθρωπὰ, *ſuch as were ſad and for the averting of Evil*,) nor are the diſtinctions which this learned Author hath framed, to difference the piacular uſe of the two Expiation-Goats, allowable or tolerable diſtinctions. For if we ſay with him, (y) that one of the Expiation-Goats was ἱλαστικὸν, *Propitiatory*, the other, ἀποτρόπαιον, *depulſory of Evils*; that the one was καθάρσιον, *Cathartic*, the other ἀποπομπαῖον, *for the uſe of averting Evils*; that the one was to take away the guilt of Sin, the other the puniſhment of Sin, what do we but make diſtinctions without difference? The account which he hath given of *the Purgation of a Leprous Perſon*, is of the ſame extraordinary Character, but liable to the ſame exceptions with his account of the two Expiation-Goats. Moreover, (z) it ſuppoſeth, but doth not prove an Heathen Cuſtom of killing ſome Birds in Honour to the inferior Gods, and diſmiſſing others in Honour of the ſupernal Gods; and that the God of *Iſrael* was to be honour'd by the diſmiſſion of the live Bird (after the Mode of the Pagan Deities,) which was ting'd with the Blood of the Bird that was killed, that it might be diſtinguiſh'd from any other Bird, which was diſmiſs'd in Honour of an Heathen God.

IV. Agreeably to the grand Pretenſion of his excellently learned Volume (that the primary end of the Hebrew-Rite was, to be Medicinal to the *Iſraelites* Idolatry and Proneneſs to Heatheniſm) the Origin of theſe Rites of Expiation is thus repreſented by this Author. (a) *The Superſtitition of the Gentiles having produc'd Luſtrations and Expiations publick and private without meaſure, and burthened the Life of Man and Religious Worſhip with multifarious Rites and Kinds of Expiation; God traduc'd ſome Expiatory Rites into his Law, partly that he might exerciſe the ritual Genius of the Jewiſh Nation, and that Judaiſm might not be thought to afford leſs Security than Gentiliſm from the Conſcience of Sin, or the fear of ſome impending Evil; partly alſo that he might confine the luxuriant Rites of Expiation within ſome certain bounds, and might reſtore the Minds of Men labouring under the Burden of thoſe Rites to a juſt Liberty.* Something of Truth there is in this Account of the Origin of theſe Rites; for it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that *God would not have Judaiſm thought inferiour to Gentiliſm in Expiations:* But the primary end of the Hebrew Rites is of ſeveral Notions, and muſt be contemplated in ſome other Notions than this learned Author hath pitch'd upon, or elſe the true Notices of things will be diſtorted and miſrepreſented, the Wiſdom and Sanctity that is in the Hebrew-ritualities will be overlook'd, the Wiſdom, Sanctity and Deſign of the Moſaic Oeconomy will be diſparag'd to ſerve an Hypotheſis. For it is certain, and plainly demonſtrable,

(p) p. 462.

(q) Ibid. p. 464.

(r) Ibid. p. 458, 479.

(s) p. 484.

(t) p. 478, 481.

(u) p. 460.

(w) Dr. Outram de Sacrific. l. 1. c. 8. p. 84.

(x) Spencer. ſupr. p. 481, 471, 475.

(y) Ibid. p. 478, 480, 493, 500.

(z) Ibid. p. 488. 489, 492.

(a) l. 3. p. 472. ed. 2.

ble, that the primary end of the Moſaic Law and Hebrew-ritualities was, *That God and his People might live together in holy Society*, according to that of the Book *Coſri*, (*b*) *We are bound to obſerve the Law, becauſe of his bringing us out of* Egypt, והתחברות כבודו אלינו *and becauſe of the Society of his Glory which adjoin'd it ſelf unto us; whence we are called a Peculium amongſt Men.* And as to be in Judaiſm, (*c*) is to be בקדושה *in Sanctity:* So the Hebrew-Rites muſt be contemplated as the Matters of Judaical Sanctity or God-Society, the matters of the holy popular Commonwealth ſymbolically ſo. Wherefore the Origin of the Rites of Expiation is deducible from that Maxim in Theology. (*d*) *We ought being pure and cleans'd from Sin ſo to appear before God.* For thus the Law expreſſeth the Deſign and Uſe of the two Expiation-Goats (and other Rites) on the day of Expiation, *Lev.* 16. 30. *That you may be clean from all your Sins before the Lord.* The two Expiation-Goats (which cannot be traduc'd from the Pagans, there being no ſuch Rite of Expiation amongſt them) concur to this Effect as two diſtinct ſort of Sin-bearers, *The one by way of Portation*, the other *by way of Deportation.* The Goat of Mactation was a Sin-bearer by way of Portation, as an Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifice: But the Scape-Goat was a Bearer of Sins by way of ſolemn Deportation and carrying them away. As after the Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifices there followeth in the Law a donation of Forgiveneſs of Sins, *Numb.* 15. 28. *Lev.* 4. 20. and *ch.* 5. 13, 18. (*e*) *Expiation and Remiſſion of Sin are uſually conjoined:* So on the day of Expiation, after the Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifices (the Goat and the Bullock) there ſucceedeth a Deportation or carrying away of Sins, (into a Land not inhabited) by the Scape-Goat, which was a ſort of formal Diſcharge from them, that they might be *clean from all their Sins before the Lord*, and that they might never more come into his Sight. Agreeably to this Notion of the Scape-Goat and his Expiation, it is obſerv'd, (*f*) that this Goat was properly no Sacrifice, nor did he Expiate Sin, as the Expiatory Sacrifices did: But he muſt be brought as an Oblation unto God, becauſe he muſt be his Sin-bearer; and becauſe he muſt be of his appointment, therefore it muſt be determin'd by Lot, which of the Goats ſhall be the Scape-Goat. *The other Law of Judaical God-Society* touching the Purgation of a Leprous Perſon by two Birds, *Lev.* 14. is of a like explication. (*g*) *For the two Birds*, ſaith *Origen*, (he calleth them Hens) *ſeem to me, to have a certain Similitude with the two Goats, of which one is offer'd to the Lord, the other is ſent away into the Wilderneſs: So here of the two Birds one is ſacrific'd* (but not properly) *the other is diſmiſs'd into the Field.* The diſmiſſion of the living Bird into the open Field is nothing like the ſending away the live Goat to the Devil; which is an Argument, that no ſuch thing was intended in the Law of the two Expiation-Goats: Nor was the Leprous Perſon taught, that the meaning of that Rite *the diſmiſſing the living Bird*, was to make Profeſſion, that he worſhipp'd one God Lord of Heaven and Earth; and therefore he could have no ſuch meaning in the uſe of it. But as in the legal Purifications the Blood of the Sacrifices was not only ſhed, but ſprinkled; not only ſprinkled by way of Sacrifical *Oblation*, but by way of Sacrifical *Ablution* alſo: So in the Ceremonial Purgation of a Leprous Perſon (or Houſe) the Blood of the Bird of Mactation muſt not only be ſhed, but ſprinkled alſo upon the Leprous Party by *Cedar-wood*, *Scarlet*, *Hyſſop*, *and a living Bird.* After which Expiation, that which is analogous to Remiſſion of Sins, or the Donation of Forgiveneſs ſucceedeth, namely, *The letting looſe the living Bird into the open Field.* For this Symbolical Rite was a formal Diſcharge or ritual Abſolution of the Leprous Party from his סגירות *recluſive or ſecluſive Leproſy*, a ſolemn Diſmiſſion or Liberation of the Priſoner from his penal Confinement, a reſtauration to his native Liberty and Denizonſhip (as *Abarbanel* and *Chaskuni* (*b*) underſtand it;) and therefore it was a perfecting this Purgation. The Rite of diſmiſſing a Bird might be materially traduc'd from the Heathen, who diſmiſſed Birds in Honour of their Gods: But God inſtituted it to another purpoſe. And thus a fair Account may be given of the Rites of Expiation by two Birds and Goats, without ſuppoſing them to relate to the Pagans *Ditheiſm*, of which the Law taketh no notice.

V. We have ſeen, that the Doctrine of evil Demons is at leaſt as ancient as *Zoroaſter*, who us'd the name *Demon*, to ſignifie in an evil ſenſe; *Plutarch* alſo and *Porphyry* vouch the old Theologers for their notices of evil Demons (to ſay nothing of the ancient Stories of *Giants* and *Titans* (*i*) which *Plutarch* interpreteth of evil Demons:) The Doctrine therefore of evil Demons amongſt the Pagans is of great Antiquity. But touching the univerſality of this Doctrine *Origen* expreſſeth himſelf with ſome Caution and Reſtriction. (*k*) *It is not we only that ſay there are evil Demons, but almoſt all that hold the Exiſtence of Demons.* In the Heatheniſm which at this day over-ſpreadeth a great part of the Earth (as it is reported to us) there are many notices of *evil Spirits*, of an *evil Numen*, *of a punitive hurtful Potentate in the inviſible World*, which are worſhipp'd, as other noxious things are, *that they may not hurt.* But it is not our deſign to give an account of the Heathen Theology of later times: Of ancient times *Origen* reporteth, that a certain *Pythagorean* writing concerning things allegorical in *Homer*, ſaith, that the words of *Chryſes* to *Apollo*, and *Apollo*'s Peſtilence ſent by him upon the Grecians ſhew, (*l*) *that* Homer *knew there are evil Demons, that are gratified with Nidours and Sacrifices, and reward their Worſhippers with the Miſchief and Deſtruction of others, if they pray for it.* (*m*) In S. *Auſtin*'s time the name *Demon* was a name of Horror amongſt the Pagans, which that Father imputeth to *the Light of Chriſtianity, that had ſhone upon the World*: But from a Paſſage in *Tertullian*, it ſeemeth more probable, that the name was of an evil Senſe amongſt the Popular Pagans before the times of Chriſtianity: (*n*) *A Follower of* Chryſippus *mocketh at evil Demons: But that they exiſt and are had in Abomination, thy Execrations ſhew. Amongſt the illiterate Vulgar*

(b) p. 19. *ed.* Buxt.

(c) Selden. *de J. Nat. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

(d) Ὅτι χρὴ καθαροὺς ϗ ἐκνενιμμένους τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, παρίστασθαι τῷ Θεῷ. S. Cyr. *de Ador. in Sp. & Ver. l.* 15. *vid.* Buxt. *Syn. Jud. c.* 21. *ſub fin.*

(e) *Paſſim conjunguntur iſta, Expiatio & Remiſſio.* Grot. *de ſatisf. Chriſt. c* 10. *p. m.* 185. *D.* Spencer. *ſupr. p.* 483.

(f) *D.* Outram. *de Sacrif. p.* 83.

(g) *Ap.* Bochart. *de An. Sacr. par.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 16.

(h) *Ap. Sim. de Muis var. Sacr.* Ainſworth *in Lev.* 14. 7.

(i) *De Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 360.

(k) Φαύλους δὲ δαίμονας οὐ μόνον λέγομεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ ϗ σχεδὸν πάντες ὅσοι δαίμονας τιθέασιν εἶναι. *C. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 377.

(l) Ὅτι ἠπίστατο ὅμηρος πονηρούς τινας δαίμονας χαίροντας ταῖς κνίσσαις ϗ ταῖς θυσίαις. *C. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 335.

(m) *De C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 14. *& l.* 9. *c.* 19.

(n) *Aliqui Chryſippi adſentator inludit ea; at eſſe, & abominationem ſuſtinere, execrationes tuæ reſpondent. Etiam vulgus indoctum in uſum maledicti frequentat. de Teſt. an. c.* 3. *Apolog. c.* 22.

the uſe of them is frequent in Execrations. Chryſippus who is here repreſented by *Tertullian* as a Maſter-derider of evil Demons, is by *Plutarch* (o) reckon'd amongſt thoſe Philoſophers, which he ſuppoſeth, to have acknowledg'd their Exiſtence, *Pythagoras* (the Pythagoreans thought Typhon a δαιμονικὴ δύναμις, *Demonical Power*) *Empedocles*, *Xenocrates*, *Plato* alſo, and *Democritus*, εὐχόμενος εὐλόγχων εἰδώλων τυγχάνειν, who becauſe he made it his Prayer or wiſh, *that he might meet with good or happy Apparitions*, (which he ſuppos'd to be Native and Mortal,) it is plain, that he acknowledg'd there were others δυστράπελα καὶ μοχθηρὰ, *ill natured and improbous*. This and ſome other Sayings of that Atheiſtic Philoſopher demonſtrate (p) that notwithſtanding his Atheiſm he acknowledg'd a ſort of evil Demons: But the School of the Stoicks notwithſtanding their Theiſm and Demonology alſo, their loud pretenſions to Virtue, and fierce declamations againſt Vice, is no friend to the Hypotheſis of improbous Demons. There is ſcarce any mention of them in any of their Writings; and although ſome of that Sect (q) ſeem to acknowledge *Erynnes* or *Furies* for the puniſhment of Delinquents, yet the principal Leaders of it, *Epictetus* and *Seneca*, acknowledge no ſuch Beings, but explode and deride the puniſhments of another Life. (r) *There is no Hell, no Acheron, no Cocytus, no Pyriphlegethon: But all things are full of Gods and Demons.* It is not certain, whether *Ariſtotle* acknowledg'd any Demons or not: Nor is it certain, that *Plato* (the grand Demonologiſt) held the Exiſtence of evil Demons. He is repreſented by *Plutarch* (s) as an Aſſerter of his Ditheiſtick Hypotheſis, and conſequently of a ψυχὴ ἄνους ϗ κακοποιὸς, *an irrational and maleficent Soul, a furious and irrational mover of the matter unmade and coexiſting with God and the matter.* And it muſt be acknowledg'd, that there are ſome Paſſages in *Plato*, which ſound like ſuch an Hypotheſis; as this noted one in his *Tenth of Laws*; *that the Soul of the Heavens or World is twofold, beneficent and the contrary*; and there is a like paſſage in his *Epinomis*. But becauſe theſe Paſſages in *Plato* are ſomewhat obſcure, and may be interpreted of the ſame Soul conſider'd *with and without Intellect* (as *Ficinus* underſtandeth them,) therefore to infer from them, that he was an Aſſerter of *Plutarch*'s Principle of Evils, would be great Raſhneſs and Folly. And it would be far greater Raſhneſs and Folly to infer that he ſuppoſed ſuch a Principle of Evils, as the Scripture-Theology calleth *the Devil*; yet to this Senſe ſeveral learned Writers of the Primitive Church have interpreted ſeveral Paſſages in *Plato*. For thus *Clemens*: (t) Plato *in his Tenth of Laws ſaith, The Devil ſo much ſpoken of in the Barbaric Philoſophy, the Prince of Demons, is a maleficent Soul. Moreover in that Tenth of Laws* (ſaith *Clemens*) *Plato plainly expreſſeth that of the Apoſtle*, We Wreſtle not againſt Fleſh and Blood, but againſt Principalities, againſt Powers, againſt ſuch Spirituals as are in the Heavens, writing thus; (u) *Heaven* (or the World) *being full of Goods, and alſo of the Contraries, ſuch a State of things is an immortal War, and needeth a wonderful Guard or Cuſtody.* In this War againſt the Evils that are in the World, the Pagan Demons are according to *Plato*, the Guard and Aſſiſtants to Mankind. (w) *The Gods and Demons* (ſaith he) *are our Coadjutors, we are the Poſſeſſion of the Gods and Demons*, (which they ſollicitouſly look after.) The War therefore in *Plato* is a Demon-Confederacy, not the Chriſtian kind of Warfare againſt the Demonial Powers, (for the ruin of Demonolatry) as *Clemens* pretendeth. But thus ſeveral of the learned Writers of the Primitive Church pretending to find the matters of Sanctity and Divinity of Religion in profane Authors (*Plato* eſpecially,) and confounding two oppoſite kind of Theologies, the Pagan and Chriſtian, have made very foul work with both Theologies. Beſides the above cited Paſſages from *Plato* (which are alſo produc'd by *Euſebius* (x) as inſtances of Concord and Conſent between the Hebraic and Platonic Theology) *Clemens* and *Theodoret* (y) have produc'd another from *Plato*'s *Phædrus*, which they are willing to underſtand in the Senſe of our Theology. (z) *There are alſo other Evils, but ſome Demon hath mix'd with the moſt a preſent Pleaſure: as in a flattering direful Beaſt and grievous hurt Nature hath mix'd a Pleaſure.* But from this Paſſage of the Philoſopher (wherein Nature doth not ſignifie any thing that is Evil, nor is the name Demon to be underſtood in an evil Senſe,) it doth not appear, that he acknowledg'd any evil Demons. On the contrary, *Eugubinus* affirmeth (deſtructively to his own Hypotheſis of a *Perennis Philoſophia, that the* Philoſophic Pagan and the Chriſtian Theology are the ſame) that *Plato* (a) *maketh no diſtribution of Demons into good and bad, but all are good with him.* Moreover, according to him All Demons are to be worſhipp'd; therefore in his Opinion they are all morally Good; for if they were not good, they ought not to be worſhipp'd, nor could they be Gods according to the Tenour of *Plato*'s Doctrine, of which S. *Auſtin* hath taken notice, (b) and from thence argueth againſt the Worſhip of evil Gods. Wherefore a judicious Writer rightly ſaith of *Plato*; *when he ſpeaketh of Demons who afflict Men, he is to be interpreted rather of good Spirits executing Juſtice, than of evil Spirits or Angels venting their Malice.* But although *Plato* in the whole comprehenſion of Demons could find none improbous and evil, yet his Followers abound with expreſs Notices and acknowledgments of evil Demons; and amongſt the reſt *Celſus* the foul Philoſopher, who was certainly a very Orthodox Platoniſt (the Diſpute between *Origen* and *Celſus*, is between a Chriſtian and a Pagan Platoniſt;) but he is repreſented by *Origen* as an *Epicurean*, who alſo ſaith of him, (c) *that he acknowledg'd no evil Demons.* Whereas there are in *Origen*'s own Book ſeveral plain acknowledgments that *Celſus* hath made of evil Demons. For in his allegorical interpretation of certain Verſes in *Homer* (d) he diſcourſeth of God's puniſhing the *terrene material Demons* ὅσοι ὑβρισταὶ, *ſo many of them as are contumelious.* He mentioneth alſo (from *Pherecydes Syrus*) the Tartarian Portion or Region, which is ſaid to be kept by the Daughters of *Boreas*, the *Harpies* and *Thyella*, (e) *if any of the Gods be contumelious,*

(o) *De Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 360. *& de Def. or. p.* 419.

(p) *Niceph. in Syneſ. p.* 378. *Voſſ. de Sect. phil. c.* 4. *p.* 22. *Viger. in* Eu*ſeb. p.* 18.

(q) *Phornut. de nat. Deor. p.* 16.

(r) Οὐδεὶς Ἅδης, οὐδ' Ἀχέρων, οὐδὲ Κωκυτὸς, οὐδὲ Πυριφλεγέθων· ἀλλὰ πάντα θεῶν μεστὰ ϗ δαιμόνων. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 13.

(s) *De Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 370.

(t) Τὸν θρυλλούμενον διάβολον, τὸν τῶν δαιμόνων ἄρχοντα, κακόεργον εἶναι ψυχήν. *Clem. ſtr. l.* 5. *p. m.* 432, 433, Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 13. *p.* 670. *Liv. Gallant. comp. l.* 15. *p.* 400.

(u) Τὸν οὐρανὸν πολλῶν μεστὸν ἀγαθῶν, εἶναι δὲ ϗ τῶν ἐναντίων· μάχη δὴ φαμὲν ἀθάνατός ἐσθ' ἡ τοιαύτη, ϗ φυλακῆς θαυμαστῆς δεομένη.

(w) Ξύμμαχοι δὲ ἡμῖν θεοί τε ἅμα καὶ δαίμονες, ἡμεῖς δ' αὖ κτήματα θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων.

(x) *Pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 26. *p.* 549.

(y) Θεραπ. *Ser.* 3.

(z) Ἔστι μὲν δὴ ϗ ἄλλα κακά· ἀλλά τις δαίμων ἔμιξε τοῖς πλείστοις ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα ἡδονήν.

(a) *Dæmonas ſolum bonos tradidit. Platoni nunquam mali. De per. Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 33, 20, 23.

(b) *De C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 13.

(c) *l.* 8. *p.* 403.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 6. *p.* 303, 304.

(e) Ἔνθα Ζεὺς ἐκβάλλει θεῶν ὅταν τις ἐξυβρίσῃ.

ous thither he is caſt by Jupiter. And he addeth, that in *Minerva*'s *Peplum* (Pall or Embroider'd Veſt) the Victory of that chaſt Goddeſs without a Mother over the Giants was repreſented. It is poſſible, that *Origen* might remember this Diſcourſe of *Celſus*, when he ſaith of him, *that he acknowledged no Evil Demons:* for in ſo ſaying *Origen* might mean, that although *Celſus* in ſome ſort acknowledged Evil Demons, yet (becauſe that impure Pagan explodeth the *Satanas* of our Theology) he did not acknowledge the Evil Demons which the Chriſtian Theology ſuppoſeth. And whether any of the Pagan Theologers did ſo, and how far they did ſo, may be underſtood from this following compendious account of their Doctrine of Evil Demons.

VI. *Firſt*, Becauſe of the *lowneſs* or *infimouſneſs* (rather) of their Nature and Condition ſome ſorts of theſe *Genii* are call'd *Bad* by the Pagan Theologers; as in Greek Authors the abject and ignoble ſort of Men are uſually call'd κακοὶ and φαῦλοι, *the bad ſort*, becauſe what is abject and ignoble, is in reſpect of rank not well. In this Notion the *Chalday* Oracles and the *Platoniſts* uſually ſpeak of bad Demons; *(f)* for it is the inferiour, meaner and viler ſort of theſe *Genii* (the Terrene and Material) which they call bad; the ſuperiour or higher ſorts of them, *the Etherial*, *Igneous*, and *Aereal* (which are alſo called by other Names) theſe are all good. *Socrates*, ſaith *Proclus*, *(g) was to* Alcibiades *as a good Demon; the reſt of his Lovers as Material and Terrene Demons.* Theſe roll and tumble themſelves in Terrene Matter (and are involv'd in it) and have Bodies or Vehicles of ſo groſs a Material Conſiſtence, that as ſeveral Demonologiſts report, *(h)* they may be beaten and feel pain, and cut with a Sword or Knife, and in Conjuration they are ſaid to wear ſuch Weapons, to fright the Demons from leaping on them to their hurt. The *Chalday Oracles* call them θῆρες χθονὸς, *the ferine Beaſts of the Earth*, and ſay of them, that they poſſeſs the feculent Bodies of Men and make them their Habitation. Σὸν ἀγγεῖον θῆρες χθονὸς οἰκήσουσιν, *the ferine Beaſts of the Earth will inhabit thy Veſſel*, as the Apoſtle *(i)* agreeably to Heathen Authors calleth the Body, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 4. They are deſcrib'd by *Syneſius* a Biſhop of the Chriſtian Church, but no Chriſtian Theologer (for his Theology is the *Chalday* Theurgical Theology, Ἕλλην ϗ οὗτος τῇ δόξῃ ὤν, *(k) being in his Sentiment a Greek*) as the natural Iſſue and Progeny of the Terreſtrial Hyle, which is, *(l) the Sink of Nature that produceth the Rabble of Demons*; the Chieftain of whom he Theurgically calls *(m)* κύνα τὸν χθόνιον, δαίμονα γαίας, *the Terreſtrial Dog*, *the Demon of the Earth*, and ſometimes *(n)* Δαίμων ὕλας, *the Demon of the Matter.* *Arnobius* therefore thus repreſenteth the Senſe of the Theurgical Theologers, *(o) that there are certain Anti-Gods, which are Spirits conſiſting of craſs Matter, that feign themſelves to be Gods*; and *Origen* ſpeaking his own Senſe (which is agreeable to the Theurgiſts) ſtileth them *(p) Craſſitudes from the Earth.* Their craſs materialneſs rendreth them inept for the Theurgiſts purpoſe; for according to the *Chalday* Oracles and thoſe that follow them, *(q) they are remote from Intellectual Contemplation, full of tenebricoſe Matter, rude and illiterate, and unable to give true Intelligence in matters of Divination.* To which Demonology of the *Chalday* Oracles we will annex *Porphyry*'s Deſcription of his Evil Demons, which he repreſenteth *(r)* as circumterraneous in reſpect of their Aboad and Converſe, delighting in what is Mortal and Material, taking pleaſure (and epicurizing as it were) in the Steams and Nidours of Sacrifices, δι' ὧν αὐτῶν τὸ πνευματικὸν πιαίνεται, *by which their Spirital Body is fatted; for this liveth and is nouriſhed by Vapours and Suffumigations.* Theſe notices of the Evil Genii repreſent them as of inferiour Rank and Condition; but in *Plutarch* certain evil Genii are repreſented as of great Rank and Power; whence it appeareth, that a Learned Man hath committed a miſtake in ſaying, *(s) that the old Philoſophers did not conceive any evil Angels to be in the Air.* *(t)* For *Xenocrates* was of Opinion, that ſeveral Rites of the Pagan Religion (ſuch as unlucky Days, and the Holy Days wherein certain Modes of beating and lamenting, faſtings, bad words and obſcene ſpeeches were us'd) were not agreeable to the Worſhip of the Gods or of good Demons, *(u) but that there are in the Air certain great and potent Natures, ſad, and ſurly, and ill-natur'd, that take pleaſure in ſuch things, and enjoying them proceed to nothing worſe.* *Plutarch* himſelf *(w)* is of the ſame Opinion with *Xenocrates*, that the forementioned Rites of their Religion with ſeveral others, *Antic*, *Barbarous* and *Bloody*, are not the worſhip of any of the Gods, but of Evil Demons that are ἰσχυροὶ ϗ βίαιοι, *valid and violent.* Moreover, the Calamitous Tranſactions which the vulgar Theology reporteth of the Gods, are according to *Plutarch*, *(x)* the Calamities, μεγάλων δαιμόνων, *of certain great Demons.* Which Suppoſition of great and potent evil Demons is a great approach to the Demonology of the Holy Scriptures; but it ſpeaketh the Author of it a better Moraliſt than Theurgiſt, as is before obſerv'd.

From the Theurgical Theologers notices of the bad ſort of Demons, it appeareth, that they did not ſuppoſe the Demons to be *naked Minds*, or *abſtract Forms* and *ſeparate Intelligences*, as the Schools of Chriſtendom and ſeveral of the Hebrew Doctors conceive of Angels; but they ſuppos'd them to have Bodies, and ſome of them Bodies of ſo craſs a Conſiſtence, that they might be cut and wounded with a Sword. From which Conceit of the Magicians of ancient Times *(y)* a Learned Divine hath given an account of a Magical Rite mention'd by the Prophet, *Ezek.* 33. 26. *ye ſtand upon your Swords:* For they had their Swords in readineſs drawn and glittering, to keep the Ghoſts and Demons in awe, which they had rais'd up by Conjuration. As rude and unſkilful as this Conceit of the ancient Magicians may ſeem, it cannot be thought more rude and unphiloſophical than that Conceit of ſeveral of the Hebrew Doctors, *(z) that the Aereal Demons eat and drink, generate and die as Men:* Nor than that Conceit of ſeveral of the Fathers, *(a) J. Mart. Athenagoras, Clemens Al. Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Methodius, Euſebius, Ambroſius*, that the fall of Angels was their falling in love with Women, and having unclean Commerce with them; whence the Giants were begotten, as ſome of them ſay; others (as *J. Mart.* and *Lactantius*) affirm, that Demons were generated. Theſe ancient Theogers of the Church, (as alſo *Philo* and *Joſephus*, who entertain the ſame Conceit) ſuppoſe the Angels material or corporeal at an extravagant

---

(f) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 258, 253.

(g) *De An. & Dæm. p.* 188.

(h) Niceph. *in* Syneſ. *p.* 394, 399, 411, 412. J. Bapt. Criſp. *de Ethn. Phil. Quin.* 1. *p.* 444. Arn. *adv. Gent. l.* 1. *p.* 12, 13. Pſell. *de Dæm. c. ult.*

(i) M. Anton. *l.* 3. *S.* 3.

(k) Nicep. *in* Syneſ. *p.* 358.

(l) Ἵνα δαιμόνων ὅμιλον φύσις ἰζάνουσα τίκτει. Hymn 2.

(m) *Hymn.* 4.

(n) *Hymn.* 3.

(o) *Antitheos eſſe quoſdam materiis ex craſſioribus ſpiritus, qui Deos ſe fingunt.* L. 4. p. 134.

(p) Αἱ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς παχύτητες. *c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 132.

(q) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 238. Niceph. *ſupr. p.* 399.

(r) *De Abſt. l.* 2. *p.* 86, 83.

(s) Windet. *de vit. funct. p.* 261. *ed.* 3.

(t) Plutar. *de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 361.

(u) Ἀλλ' εἶναι φύσεις ἐν τῷ περιέχοντι μεγάλας μὲν ϗ ἰσχυρὰς, δυστρόπους δὲ ϗ σκυθρωπὰς, &c.

(w) *De Def. Orac. p.* 417.

(x) *De Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 360.

(y) D. Spencer. *de Leg. Hebr. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *p.* 299. *ed.* 2.

(z) Munſter. *Not. in Lev.* 17. 7.

(a) Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 1. *c.* 2. *& l.* 3. *c.* 2. *Viv. in Aug. de C. D. l.* 15. *c.* 23. Eugub. *de per. Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 32. Spencer. *ſupr. p.* 407. *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 20

rate; and not a few others of the ancient Writers without the intermixture of ſuch an Extravagance, ſuppoſe, that the Angels have Bodies (which is an Opinion, that ſome think next door to Hereſie, and that it wanteth nothing but the plain and clear Definition of the Church to make it ſuch;) for this is the Opinion of *Origen*, *Baſil*, *Macarius*, the *Alexandrian Cyril*, *Cæſarius*, *Joannes Theſſalonicenſis* (whoſe Dialogue was read in the ſecond *Nicene* Synod) *Auguſtin*, *Rupertus*, *Claudianus*, *Mamertus*, *Fulgentius*, *Caſſian*, *Anaſtaſius Sinaita*, and ſome others. (*b*) Touching the Heathen Demons the ancient Theologers of the Church generally (*J. Mart. Tatianus*, *Athenagoras*, *Clemens*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Jul. Firmicus*, *Lactantius*, *Minuc. Felix*, *Cyprian*, *Euſebius*, *Baſil*, *Hierom*, *Chryſoſtom*) are of Opinion, that they have their Compoſition and Conſiſtence of Matter (σύμπηξιν ἐξ ὕλης,) that their Bodies are Aerial, but craſs and feculent, that they are in ſome ſort nouriſh'd by the Blood, and Nidors, and Fumes of the Sacrifices, and that they take delight to dabble in them: And this thoſe ancient Theologers account a grand Diſparagement to the Material and Bloody Sacrifices; *They are things whereby the evil Demons are principally gratify'd.* Agreeably to thoſe ancient Theologers the ancient *Zabii* demonologiz'd, (*c*) as is viſible in their Rites, the Rites of Magical Demonolatry. For they ſuppoſed (as *Maimonides* diſcourſeth) that Blood was food to the Demons; therefore they kill'd Animals in honour of them, and poured the Blood upon the Ground, or into a Ditch, as an allective to the Demons to come, themſelves banquetting about the Blood upon the Sacrifice, that ſo they might gain the Friendſhip and Society of the Demons, and the faculty of Divination. In oppoſition to which Magical Rites of the ancient *Zabii* the Children of *Iſrael* are forbidden to eat על הדם which probably ſignifieth *upon*, or *over*, or *by* the Blood, *Lev.* 19. 26. They are commanded to bring the Animals which they kill'd, *unto the Door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation*, and their Blood was to be *ſprinkled upon the Altar*, that the Children of *Iſrael* might *no more offer their Sacrifices* לשעירם *Dæmonibus* τραγομόρφοις, *to the Goat-like Demons*, *Lev.* 17. 3–7. whence it is manifeſt, that theſe Demons call'd in Scripture שעירם *the Ragged* or *Hairy*, becauſe they uſually appear'd in the ſhape of Hairy Goats (whence one ſort of the Heathen Gods were *Ægipanes* or *Capripedes Panes*, *Fawns*, *Goat-footed Satyrs* and *Sileni*, as the elder ſort of Satyrs were called) are ſuch as the Theurgical Theologers above-mention'd account the bad ſort of Demons. Agreeably whereunto the Stone μνιζουρὶν (which the *Chalday* Oracles preſcribe to be ſacrificed, to drive away the bad ſort of Demons) is thought to have its Name from (*d*) *Menos Sebirim*, which ſignifieth its virtue of driving away *the Ragged or Hairy*; and *Procopius* (*e*) calleth the *Sebirim*, ἔνυλον ϗ ἐσκοτισμένον δαίμονα, *a material and tenebricoſe ſort of Demon.* But although the *Sebirim* to which the *Iſraelites* ſacrificed, were of that ſort of Demons which the Theurgical Theologers accounted *bad Demons*; yet the *Egyptianizing Iſraelites* accounted them good Demons, as is evident from the mighty Veneration and Affection, which the *Egyptians* had for Goats. (*f*) They religiouſly abſtain'd from killing them, and certain of their Women thought it Religion, to proſtitute their Bodies to the Sacred Goats. They put the Name *Mendes* (a Goat) upon the God *Pan*, and the *Mendeſians* (a People of *Egypt*) thought it a matter of Honour to bear the Name of *Mendes*: They erected Statues in the Temples in Honour of them, τὸν τράγον ἀπεθέωσαν, *they deify'd the Goat*, and were ſo madly addicted to the Goat-Religion, *that the Prieſts who ſucceeded their Fathers in the Prieſthood, were firſt of all to be initiated unto this God*; and *Maimonides* ſaith of this and ſome other Animals, *They were of higheſt eſteem amongſt Idolaters.* The *Iſraelites* therefore that ſacrificed in the Wilderneſs to the *Sebirim*, did not account them evil Demons: In ſacrificing to thoſe Demons they did not deſign to propitiate the Devil under the Name of *Azazel*, as the principle and cauſe of their Evils: had they ſuppos'd *Azazel* the Prince and Chieftain of them, they could not have ſuppos'd him to be the Devil.

VII. *Secondly*, The evil *Genii* are ſo denominated by ſome of the later *Platoniſts*, (who probably improv'd their Notices touching evil Demons from the Chriſtian Theology) *becauſe of the Vitioſity of their Nature and Practice.* Which ſort of Evil Demons are of a threefold Origination; ſome are *the Souls of evil Men*, *others are good Demons degenerate*, and others are *by Nature* (the Natural Conſtitution of the Univerſe) *evil Demons.* For although the Suppoſition of Evil Demons by the Natural Conſtitution of the Univerſe doth plainly infer the *Perſian Ditheiſm*, (becauſe ſuch Evil Demons cannot iſſue from a good Principle) yet it is not imaginable, that the Terrene Material Demons of the Theurgical Theologers have any other Original but Nature, whence they are call'd by *Jamblichus*, (*g*) οἱ φύσει πονηροὶ δαίμονες, *Evil Demons that are ſuch by Nature.* The Souls of Men are Demons factive; (*h*) *if good, they are Lares*; *if evil, Lemures or Larvæ.* Evil Demons are alſo ſuppos'd (as Evil Men) to make themſelves Evil. (*i*) *For the Gods are neceſſarily good* (ſay the *Platoniſts*) *and cannot loſe their Virtue*; *but the Demonial Tribe is diſtinguiſh'd from the Gods*, φαυλότητος ὂν ϗ μοχθηρίας δεκτικὸν, *being capable of Badneſs and Improbity and of a change to the worſe.* (*k*) *There are differences of Virtue and Vice amongſt Demons, as amongſt Men.* So according to *Porphyry* (the beſt of the Pagan Demonologiſts) the Demons which adminiſter the Sublunary parts of the World degenerate into Diſorder and Vitioſity, and this is the origin of Evil Demons. (*l*) *Of thoſe Souls (the progeny of the Univerſal Soul) that adminiſter the ſublunary parts of the World, ſo many as rule their Spirital Body, which is their Vehicle, according to reaſon, theſe are good Demons*; *but thoſe Souls that do not rule over, but are for the moſt part under the Rule and Maſtery of their Vehicle, and are agitated very much, and carry'd according to the Irritation and Impetuoſity of the iraſcible and concupiſcible of their Vehicle, theſe Souls are Demons indeed, but maleficent ones.* The principal Vitioſities of this ſort of Demons are (*m*) *their faſtuous Pride*, remark'd by *Proclus*, *Julian* and *Porphyry*, by whom they are denominated πλήρεις τύφου, *full of Faſtuoſity.* (*n*) *The practice of Deceit, Lying and Impoſture* ſubſervient to their Pride. For they are ſaid to be ἀπατηλῆς φύσεως, *of a fallacious or deceitful nature*, τὸ ψεῦδος τούτοις οἰκεῖον, *the practice of Lying is proper unto theſe*, *the Terrene Demons are* ψευδεῖς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, *naturally Lying*, ſaith *Pſellus* according to the Mind of the *Chalday* Oracles. (*o*) The Black or hurtful *Magick* (commonly call'd Goety) is attributed to their Agency; and they are call'd by *Plutarch* in the Life of *Dio*, τὰ φαῦλα δαιμόνια ϗ βάσκανα, *evil and*

(b) Petav. *ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *Dr.* Cud. *Intell. Syſt.* *p.* 811, &c. Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(c) Spenc. *ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 11. Ficin. *com. in Plotin. p.* 289.

(d) Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(e) *Ap.* Bochart. *de Anim. p.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 53.

(f) Spenc. *ſupr. l.* 3. *p.* 474, 475, 477. Outram *de ſacrific. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 100. Marſham. *Can. Chron. p.* 65. *ed.* Lipſ.

(g) *De Myſt. p.* 111.

(h) S. Aug. *de C. D. l.* 9. *c.* 11.

(i) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 13. *c.* 15.

(k) Plutar. *de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 360.

(l) *De Abſt. l.* 2. *p.* 81.

(m) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 275. *S.* Cyr. *C.* Jul. *p.* 224. & *p.* 125. Porphyr. *de Abſtin. l.* 2. *p.* 86.

(n) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 53. Porph. *ubi ſupr. orac. mag. p.* 108.

(o) Porph. *ibid. p.* 85. *S.* Aug. *de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 19.

and envious Demons (envying Man's Happineſs being one of their eminent Vitioſities) whence *Syneſius* ſaith, (p) *the Calamities of the Nations are a Banquet for Evil Demons.* In the Life of *Galba* the ſame Author (*Plutarch*) relateth the Speech of a Military Officer to his Soldiers (then about to revolt from the Emperour) wherein he reproacheth their Mutability, that chang'd ſo oft in ſo ſhort a time, not upon any rational Conſideration, ἀλλὰ δαίμονος τινὸς ἐλαύνοντος, *but by the impulſe of ſome Demon, that hurry'd them from one Treaſon to another.* The evil influence of certain Demons upon the minds of Men was a common notice amongſt the Pagans, and (probably) the vulgar Pagans thought thoſe Demons, from whom ſuch extraordinary impulſes to bad were ſuppos'd to come, *morally evil* agreeably to the ſenſe of the Platoniſts, who attribute to their evil Genii an evil influence upon the minds and manners of men, (q) the Tragedies of Melancholy (*ſome being agitated by evil Demons*, ſaith *Julian*, *haunt Wilderneſſes inſtead of Cities*) the hindring men from virtue, the inflaming mens minds ἔρωτι ϗ πόθοις πλούτων, *with the love and deſire of riches and potentacies and pleaſures, as alſo vain-glories, whence ſeditions and wars ariſe*; *for all intemperance and deſire of riches and glory is from their influence.* *Jamblichus* reporteth, (r) that *Epimenides* (the Diſciple of *Pythagoras* and therefore a Theurgiſt) *having invok'd the* Erynnes ϗ τοὺς τιμωροὺς θεοὺς, *and the punitive Gods, made his Inſidiators that were about to kill him, to kill themſelves.* (s) *Himerius* complaineth, that one of theſe malificent Genii ſtrangled his Son *Rufinus*. They are ſuppos'd therefore, to have (t) a miſchievous influence upon the external affairs of mankind. *They variouſly infeſt mankind* (ſaith *Porphyry*) *and are the Authors of circumterraneous calamities, ſuch as peſtilences, earthquakes, droughts, ſterilities*; and this Philoſopher will by no means allow, that the beneficent Gods are the cauſes of theſe Calamities (ὅτι τὸ ἀγαθὸν οὐ βλάπτει ποτε, *becauſe what is good never doth hurt*; *for it is not the property of heat to cauſe cold, but of the contrary*, as *Plato* ſaith:) But ſome of his Platonic School ſay, *that the Gods make uſe of the material Demons, to produce ſuch calamities.* Theſe evil Demons they generally call (u) ἀκαθάρτους, *impure and unclean*, which aſſociate with and infeſt the impure; for theſe *by congeniality attract theſe evil ſpirits to themſelves, and are by them impell'd* πρὸς κακίαν πᾶσαν, *to all manner of wickedneſs.* Purity therefore is a neceſſary amulet againſt their incurſions and moleſtations, and is neceſſary to qualify for the Converſe of the Incontaminate Spirits. For in Vulgar Paganiſm (w) *oftentimes ſomething appeareth*, ὃ ταράττει τὸ ἱεροσκόπον, *that troubleth the Prieſt or Soothſayer (who maketh Divination from the Entrals of Beaſts) becauſe ſome that are there are impure. Wherefore the Prieſts and Soothſayers charge both themſelves and others, to abſtain from Sepulchres, from unholy Men, Menſtruous Impurities and Venereal Congreſſes, from ſeeing ſuch ſights that are foul and lugubrous, and hearing ſuch things that excite Paſſion.* Such a Self-inconſiſtence there is in the Pagan Deities, (x) *they require, that their Worſhippers ſhould be juſt, yet themſelves if required thereto, refuſe not to do unjuſt things. They will not hear one that invoketh them, becauſe impure by things Venereous, yet themſelves make no demur* (as in Love-effaſcinations) *to inſtigate* εἰς παράνομα ἀφροδίσια, *to unlawful Venery.* But theſe foul Inſtigations are ſuppos'd to be the doings of the Evil Demons (which are acknowledged to be Maleficent Genii, yet Cities and the Popular Societies of Men (y) are ſuppos'd to be under a neceſſity of averting their Diſpleaſure and courting their Favour) and in them we muſt remark another principal Vitioſity, (z) which is (agreeably to Terrene Material Demons) the hindring the aſcent of Souls and drawing them down to the Matter. Τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπὶ τὴν φύσιν καθέλκουσι, *They draw down the Soul into inferiour Nature, and ſuch as are haſting to the intelligible Fire they detain in this low place.* (a) So the War between the *Athenians* and *Atlanticks* in *Plato* is ſaid to ſignifie the conflict between the Souls that are aſcending upwards, and the Demons deducing them into Generation; that the loweſt and material kind of them conflict with Souls in their aſcent and deſcent; and as *Plato*'s *Atlantis* was ſituate in the Weſt, ſo the Weſt (ſaith *Proclus*) according to the *Egyptians*, τόπος ἐστὶ δαιμόνων κακωτικῶν, *is the place of the noxious Demons.* The *Material Genii* (contradiſtinct to the ἄϋλοι, *Immaterial*) therefore concern themſelves to withdraw Souls from the *Teletæ* or Sacred Rites and Myſteries, becauſe the Teleſtick Buſineſs is deſign'd (b) πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναγωγὴν, *in order to the reduction or ſubvecſion of the Soul*; whereas the Material Genii make it their Buſineſs, to hinder the aſcent of Souls, and to immerſe them into Hyle or the Terreſtrial Matter.

Hyle is extreamly infamous amongſt this ſort of Theologers (whoſe Life and Happineſs is that of Abſtract, Myſtic-metaphyſical or Theurgical Intellectualiſts and Immaterialiſts) and it is from their Demonology, (c) that *Syneſius* borroweth his Δαίμων ὕλας, *Demon of the Matter.* From the ſame Fountain *Minucius Felix* deriveth his Deſcription of Demons; (d) *à cœlo deorſum gravant, & à Deo vero ad materiam avocant, Their motion is an heavy ſinking from Heaven downwards, and they withdraw from the true God to the Matter.* *Athenagoras* diſcourſeth, (e) that when the Angels were created, the things of the Creation were committed to their care, and the Prince of the Apoſtate Angels was originally ὁ τῆς ὕλης ϗ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ εἰδῶν ἄρχων, *the Ruler and Preſident of the Matter, and of the Forms that are in it.* He ſuppoſeth, that this Rule and Preſidency is ſtill continued; for he calleth him ſeveral times τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ὕλης, *the ruler of the Matter*, and τὸ περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἔχον πνεῦμα, *the Circum-material Spirit that oppoſeth God's Goodneſs.* *Lipſius* is of Opinion, (f) that in this account of the Prince of Apoſtate Angels, he hath reſpect to the Ditheiſts malificent Soul of the Matter: whether ſo or otherwiſe, it is an inſtance of that irreligious Humour, which very early invaded the Church, *the Philoſophic paganizing the Matters of the Chriſtian Theology. What then ſhall we ſay, that the Devil is?* ſaith *Methodius*, (g) πνεῦμα περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἔχον, *a Spirit converſant about the matter*, as *Athenagoras* ſaid. Theſe Notices are deſcendents from the *Chaldeans* Magick, whence *Manes* (the Father of the *Manichees*) is ſaid, to have learn'd (h) Διάβολον *eſſe* ἄρχοντα τῆς ὕλης, *that the Devil is the preſidentiary ruler of the matter.* So the counterfeit *Dionyſius* ſtileth the Rabble of Demons πρόσυλον, *adhering to the matter*; and *Tatianus J. Martyr*'s Scholar (ſpeaking not the Chriſtian, but the Philoſophic-pagan Language) giveth us this rule touching the Evil Demons; (i) *He that would overcome them*, τὴν ὕλην παραιτησάσθω, *let him repudiate the matter.* Agreeably to *Athenagoras*'s account of the Prince of Apoſtate Angels (k) *Gr. Nyſſen* and *J. Damaſcen.* ſuppoſe, that when the

---

(p) Συμφοραὶ γὰρ ἐθνῶν εὐωχία φαύλων δαιμόνων. *De provid. p.* 97.

(q) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 228. *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *Diſſ.* 19. Porphyr. *ſupr.* & Ep. *ad Aneb.*

(r) *De Vit.* Pythag. *p.* 188.

(s) Phot. *cod.* 243.

(t) Porph. *ſupr.* Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 5. *c.* 8. Eugubin. *de per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 35. Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 35.

(u) Porph. *ſupr. p.* 86, 89, 90. Jambl. *de myſt. p.* 103. Niceph. *in* Syneſ. *p.* 363.

(w) Porph. *ſupr. p.* 87, 91.

(x) Jambl. *de myſt. p.* 108, 114.

(y) Porph. *ſupr. p.* 86.

(z) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 210, 211.

(a) Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 24. Ficin. *com. in* Tim. *c.* 4.

(b) *Orac. mag. p.* 26. *ed. op. Sop.*

(c) *Hymn.* 3.

(d) *p.* 248.

(e) Apol. *p.* 27, 28.

(f) *Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 20.

(g) *Ap. Petav. T.* 2. *Præfat. c.* 3. *S.* 3.

(h) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 208.

(i) *p.* 155.

(k) Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 8, 9. *c.* 3. *S.* 5. *Vid.* Eugub. *de per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 38.

World was created, the ſeveral parts of it were committed to ſeveral Orders of Angels; that he who is now the Devil, was the Prefect of the Terrene Order, having the Preſidency over the Earth, and the Adminiſtration of terrene things; and that his Sin was, *He envied and could not brook the Dignity beſtow'd upon Man.* Which Conceit of theirs, *that Envy was the Devil's Sin*, is entertain'd by ſeveral other Theologers of the Primitive Church.

Inſignis pars Intelligentiarum quæ diſpoſitioni materiali mundi præeſt, malorum & inferiorum dæmonum nomine vocata eſt. Poſtell. de orig. Etrur. *p.* 181.

VIII. *Thirdly*, As in the Vulgar Theology the Pagans diſtributed their Gods into Good and Evil, (*l*) one ſort of them were call'd *Mala Numina*, (which according to *Labeo* muſt be appeas'd and ſweeten'd by ſad and cruentous Sacrifices) becauſe unfriendly to them: So there are (according to the Pagan Theologers) *Demons of a punitive nature and practice*, which as ſuch without any reſpect to their Vitioſity are denominated *Evil.* So according to ſome Expoſitors, *the Evil Angels* ſpoken of, *Pſal.* 78. 49. were not morally evil, but are denominated *evil*, as being Angels of Puniſhment. Of this nature are (*m*) the δαίμονες παλαμναῖοι χθονιοί τε, *direful, punitive and terreſtrial Demons*, which together with *Nemeſis* the Supream God hath made Overſeers of Humane Affairs. Of this Number are the Greeks *Alaſtores*, (*n*) *the Furies, revenging Diræ* (the *Telchines* alſo ſeem to be of this number) *and thoſe ſtrange horrible Deities* which *Atteius* call'd upon and nam'd, when he curs'd *Craſſus*, as *Plutarch* relateth in his Life. *The Terreſtrial Dogs* alſo in the *Chalday* Oracles are denominated *Ferine Beaſts*, (*o*) *to ſignify their ferity and cruelty, and that they are punitive tormentors of Souls. The Greeks ſuppoſe* (as *Pſellus* repreſenteth their Demonology) *that but a ſmall part of the Demons are bad, and that theſe are bad, not by choice or lapſe, but originally for the torture of delinquent Souls.* When theſe appear (in Theurgy) *they ſhew the ſeveral Puniſhments which they inflict*, (*p*) as a principal Theurgiſt affirmeth; who alſo calleth them, (*q*) *certain ferine Beaſts, noxious, truculent and ſanguivorous.* If ſuch *Sanguivorous Beaſts* do really exiſt in the Kingdom of Darkneſs, if they were not ludicrous appearances (as ſeveral of the Phænomena in Theurgy manifeſtly are) wherewith the impoſtorous Demons abus'd the Theurgiſts, the ancient *Zabii* were not out in their Suppoſition, *that Blood is the Food of Demons.* Some of theſe (*r*) οἱ τιμωροὶ ἢ καθάρτικοι δαίμονες, *Punitive or Cathartic Demons* go about to puniſh proud and great Injuſtices in this World; and the Buſineſs of puniſhing theſe Theologers of the *Platonic* School appropriate to their Demonial Order, (*s*) accounting it incongruous and incompetible to the Gods, ἐριννυῶδες ϗ δαιμονικὸν, *proper and agreeable only to Erynnes and Demons*, as *Plutarch* ſuppoſeth it. Yet thus far he ſuppoſeth it competible to the Gods; *They make uſe of the Demons as their Executioners.* For inquiring the reaſon, why the *Romans* cloathed their *Lares* or Domeſtic Gods with Dogs-skins, he maketh this Conjecture. (*t*) *As Chryſippus ſuppoſeth, that certain evil Genii go about, which the Gods make uſe of to do the work of Executioners upon impious and unjuſt Men: So the Lares may be thought certain direful and punitive Genii.* In this Author's Deſcription of the Puniſhments of another Life, (*u*) certain Lakes are ſaid to be there, καί τινας ἐφεστῶτας δαίμονας, *and certain Demons ſtand by, which plunge Souls in, and draw them out:* As in the Apologue of *Er* in *Plato* there are ἄνδρες ἄγριοι ϗ διάπυροι ἰδεῖν, *Men ferine and of igneous Aſpect*, the tormentors of Souls. This ſort of Evil Demons is acknowledged by *Plato*; and one of his School (who acknowledgeth no Demons morally evil, yet) affirmeth, (*w*) *that there are Demons which puniſh Souls, that the Sins of Men make the Gods their Enemies, (not that the Gods are angry, but) they ſeparate them from the Gods, and joyn them* δαίμοσι κολαστικοῖς, *to the punitive Demons; that the Souls of the Flagitious after their departure from the Body are tormented by them, and that there are for ſeparate Souls,* θεοὶ καθάρσιοι, ϗ δαίμονες ἁμαρτημάτων καθαίρουσι, *expiatory Gods, and the Demons purge from Sins.* Doubtleſs, it was this ſort of Demons that are *punitively* bad, which the Pagans ſuppoſed the Maleficent Magicians to hold Correſpondence with, and which they call'd (*x*) *Impios Deos, Erynnyes, Hecate, Proſerpina.*

(l) Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *l.* 8. *c.*18. Windet. *de Vit. funct. p.* 116. Eugub. *ſupr. l.* 10. *c.* 23. & *l.* 8. *c.* 28, 31.

(m) Tim. Locr. *de An. Mundi in fine.*

(n) Αἱ ποιναὶ μερόπων ἀγκτεισαι, *The Vindictive Furies do the work of Executioners unto Men.*

(o) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 212. Pſell. *de Dæm.* of Ficin. *tranſlation*, *p.* 357.

(p) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 48.

(q) Θηρία τινὰ βλαβερὰ ϗ αἱμοβόρα ϗ ἄγρια.

(r) Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 35. Plut. *de Def. or. p.* 417.

(s) Eugubin. *ſupr. l.* 8. *c.* 35. *l.* 10. *c.* 26.

(t) Καθάπερ οἱ περὶ Χρύσιππον οἴονται φιλόσοφοι φαῦλα δαιμόνια περινοστεῖν, οἷς οἱ θεοὶ δημίοις χρῶνται κολασταῖς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνοσίους ϗ ἀδίκους ἀνθρώπους· οὕτως οἱ Λάρητες ἐριννυώδεις τινές εἰσι ϗ ποίνιμοι δαίμονες.

(u) *De his qui ſero pun. p.* 567.

(w) Salluſt. *de D. & mund. c.* 12, 14, 19. *How the Demons purge, v.* Syneſ. *Ep.* 44.

(x) Tacit. *An. l.* 16. *p.* 301. Lucian. *in* Menippo, *p.* 63.

The *Jews* are ſaid by a very learned Writer (*y*) to acknowledge only *Dæmones tortores non peccatores, Demons the Tormentors, not Demons the Sinners.* "For they ſay nothing (ſaith he) *of* "*the lapſe of Evil Spirits*, but they teach, "that they are ſuch as they were created by "God in and together with Hell. In this manner they conſtitute three Claſſes of Angels: "In the firſt and higheſt they place שכלים "הנבדלים *ſeparate Intelligences*, that is, *the Angels ſo called*, becauſe they appear not in a "Corporeal Form, nor can they be comprehended by Bodily Senſes, but only by Prophetic Viſion; and theſe incompaſs the Throne "of the Divine Majeſty, ſuch as *Michael, Gabriel, Raphael.* The Second Claſſis are the "מלאכי השרת *Angels of Miniſtry*, created by "God for the miniſtry and welfare of Men. "The third Claſſis are the מלאכי חבלה or "מלאכי מות *Angels of Deſtruction, Miſchief and* "*Death*, that poſſeſs the Sublunary and Infernal Manſions; and theſe are deſtinated for "inflicting Death and all manner of Calamities "upon Mankind for their Sins. Yet the *Jews* "cannot deny, that beſides this ſort of Angels "there are Spirits, that are formally and morally evil; but theſe they place not in any "of the three Claſſes, nor do they ſuppoſe them "to be created by God, nor that they fell from "God by any lapſe; but they ſuppoſe them generated by an impure and carnal commixtion "with Mankind, whence they fable many things "touching *Lilith Adam*'s firſt Wife, that afterwards degenerated into an evil Spirit. This laſt Clauſe of this learned Man's Account of the *Jews* Demonology agreeth with a Tradition of theirs reported by *Maimonides*, (*z*) *that for the ſpace of* 130 *Years intire in which* Adam *was rejected, he begot meer Demons.* That other Branch of this account of the *Jews* Demonology touching מלאכי חבלה *Angels of Puniſhment or Torment*, is doubtleſs agreeable to the Senſe of the Hebrew Writers. (*a*) For they ſuppoſe, that ſome of their prefect Angels are good and others are bad; the Name which they give to the good Angels is מלאכי שרת *Angels of Miniſtry*, bad Angels they call מלאכי חבלה *Angels of Puniſhment or Torment*; and the Head of this ſort of Angels is *Samael*, מלאך המות *the Angel of Death* (as the (*b*) *Jews* call him) who is ſuppos'd to kill Mankind and other Animals.

(y) Hulſ. *Theol. Jud. P.* 1. *l.* 1. *p.* 71, 72.

(z) Buxt. *Lex. Talm. col.* 237. Hotting. *Hiſt. or. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *p.* 16. *ed.* 1.

(a) *L'Emper. in* Jachiad. *in* Dan. *p.* 146.

(b) Lightfoot *Hor. in* 1 Cor. 10. 10.

But this punitive ſort of Angels is conſider'd by the Jews, not as *Tormentors* only, but as *Tempters* alſo of Mankind. For they diſcourſe, that Mankind Sin (*c*) by the ſeduction of the Serpent, (*d*) that *Samael* rode upon the Serpent for bigneſs like a Camel, when he tempted *Eve* (which is one of their portentous Conceits,) that *Satan* hath his name (*e*) from שָׂטָה, *for he it is, that cauſeth Man to decline from the way of Truth. Aſmodeus* (whom the Jews ſuppoſe the King or Head of Demons) is in all probability deriv'd (*f*) from the Perſic ازمود (*Azmoud*) *tentavit, ad malum ſolicitavit*, he tempted or ſolicited to *Evil*, and therefore ſignifieth *the Tempter*. So (*g*) שֵׁדִים mention'd by *Moſes, Deut*. 32. 17. which the Jews ſuppoſe to be evil Spirits that come out of the Waters, are ſaid to have their name from *devaſtating* or *deſtroying, becauſe they devaſtate a good Mind with bad Opinions and Affections*. In ſome ſenſe therefore the Jews acknowledge not only *Demons the Tormentors*, but Demons *the Sinners*; for they acknowledge Demons the Tempters. And although *Trypho* the Jew plainly denieth the lapſe of Angels, and for this Reaſon objecteth Blaſphemy againſt *J. Mart*. (*h*) ἀγγέλους γὰρ πονηρευσαμένους καὶ ἀποστάντας τοῦ θεοῦ λέγεις, *thou affirmeſt, that Angels have ſinned and apoſtatiz'd from God*; yet there are ſeveral Paſſages cited from the Hebrew Theologers, that are plain acknowledgments of the lapſe of Angels, and ſome others that ſound that way. Of this Nature (*i*) are certain ſayings of *R. Eleaſar*; *The evil Angels were driven out of Heaven* בשבט אש אל *by an igneous Sceptre*, Samael *and his Armies God caſt them out of Heaven*, Aza *and* Azael *were two Angels that accus'd their Lord, and God caſt them headlong out of the holy place*. The Cabaliſtical Book *Zohar* treating of lapſed Angels ſaith; *God threw them down headlong bound and enchained; theſe were* Aza *and* Azael. And in another ancient Book (of the death of *Moſes*) it is ſaid of them, *deſcending from Heaven they corrupted their way*. So in *Jonathan*'s Targum *Samchazai* and *Uziel* (the ſame with *Aza* and *Azael*) are ſaid *to have fallen from Heaven*, and are ſuppos'd to have begotten Giants. In ſome degree therefore the lapſe of Angels is notic'd and acknowledg'd in the Hebrews Theology, as may be farther underſtood from this Rabbinical Name of the Prince and Head of them (*k*) מָרוֹד which ſignifieth *an Apoſtate*, and therefore is an acknowledgment of the lapſe of Angels. Which is alſo implied in ſeveral other Rabbinical Names of the Head of them; as (*l*) שׂראל גהינם, *the Prince of Hell*, ראש כל השטנין, *the Head of all the Satanæ*, as theſe evil Angels are call'd by the Talmudiſts. שרו של רומי *the Prince of Rome*, as *R. Bechai* calleth *Samael*, agreeably to the Senſe of the Apocalypſe; for *Samael is nothing elſe but Satan himſelf*, as *Maimonides* ſaith (of whom as alſo of *A. Ezra* a learned Writer reporteth, (*m*) that he is of Opinion, that there are no Demons.) To ſignifie, that he is Aerial and *the Prince of the Air*, one of the Targums ſaith of *Samael*, that *he flyeth as a Bird*, and he is ſaid *to have cauſed Death to all the World*, agreeably to his Rabbinical Name, *the Angel of Death*. To theſe Rabbinical Names I will ſubjoin (with deſign to illuſtrate it) the name of *Beelzebub*, or rather *Beelzebul*, which is now no Rabbinical name, but was in our Saviour's time of ordinary and familiar uſe amongſt the Jews, to ſignifie *The Prince of Devils*. Touching the Reaſon of this Name, the beſt learned profeſs themſelves ignorant (*n*) and are unſatisfied with the uſual accounts; I will therefore propoſe this Conjecture. As the Jews in and before our Saviour's time Philoſophic Paganiz'd in ſeveral of their Notices: So *Beelzebul*, ſeemeth to be the ſame with ἄρχων τῆς ὕλης, or Δαίμων ὕλας, *the preſidentiary Ruler of the matter*, (which Notion of the Devil *Athenagoras* probably deriv'd from the Jews;) for זבול *Zebul* is the ſame with κόπρος, which in the Orphic Verſes ſignifieth the matter.

Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε Θεῶν, εἰλυμένε κόπρῳ.
Jupiter moſt Illuſtrious, the greateſt of the Gods,
Involv'd in Dung or the Matter.

IX. Fourthly, As amongſt the Rabbins, ſo amongſt the Pagan Theologers a lapſe of Demons from Heaven is in ſome degree acknowledg'd; for ſome of them diſcourſe of a ſort of *evil Genii paſſively and penally ſuch*, which are called by *Plutarch* (*o*) Οἱ θεήλατοι καὶ οὐρανοπετεῖς ἐκεῖνοι τοῦ Ἐμπεδοκλέους δαίμονες, *Thoſe God-agitated and Heaven-fallen Demons of Empedocles*. The penal Condition which *Empedocles* allotteth to his criminal Genii, is a reſtleſs Condition, *to be toſs'd* (as the rejectaneous Outcaſts of univerſal Nature) from one Region of the Univerſe to another, till being expiated and purg'd by theſe Puniſhments they regain their former natural Place and Station.

Αἰθέριον μὲν γάρ σφε μένος πόντον δὲ διώκει.
Πόντος δ᾽ ἐς χθονὸς οὖδας ἀπέπτυσε, γαῖα δ᾽ ἐσαῦθις
Ἠελίου ἀκάμαντος: ὁ δ᾽ αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις.
Ἄλλος δ᾽ ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται, στυγέουσι δὲ πάντες.

From the Etherial Region down
Into the Sea in rage they're thrown.
The raging Sea rejects this rout
Unto the Land, and ſpews them out.
The Land unto the Sun them hurles,
The Sun into the Ether's whirles.
*Thus they are toſs'd (the Outlaws * Fate)*
By Univerſal Nature's Hate.

Theſe Heaven-fallen Demons of *Empedocles purſu'd by the Vengeance of the Gods* (although they are an approach to the Chriſtian Demonology, yet) cannot reaſonably be thought a *Traduction* from the Hebrews: Nor is there any thing of that Nature throughout this whole Syſtem of Pagan Demonology, unleſs the *Ophioneus* of *Pherecydes Syrus* may be thought the *Satanas* of our Theology turn'd into a Fable. So *Origen* affirmeth (*p*) that *Pherecydes Ophioneus* had its riſe from the Serpent in *Moſes*: But *Philo* out of *Sanchoniathon* ſaith (*q*) *From the Phenicians Pherecydes took occaſion to Theologize touching the God called by him Ophioneus, and touching the Ophionidæ. He ſuppoſeth, that the Phenicians* Theologizing much about Serpents (of great veneration amongſt the Pagans) *Pherecydes* took occaſion from thence, to entitle a certain God of his *Ophioneus* or *Ophion*, as from the ſuppoſed Wiſdom of Serpents the moſt ancient of the Diviners (*r*) had the name *Ophion*. Probably therefore no Traduction from the Hebrews is to be found in this Syſtem of Pagan Demonology, which yet in theſe following (and many other) reſpects greatly befriendeth the Demonology of the Chriſtian Religion. (1.) *The Heaven-fallen Demons of Empedocles* befriend the common Hypotheſis

(c) Hulſ. *ſupr. p.* 169.

(d) *Maimon. mor. nev. P.* 2. *c.* 30.

(e) *Ibid. P.* 3. *c.* 22.

(f) Grav. *Annot. in Perſ. Evangel. verſ. not. in* Matth. 4. 1.

(g) P. Fagius *Annot. ad Deut.* 32. 17.

(h) *Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 305.

(i) *Windet. de vit. funct. S.* 13. Spencer. *de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 8. *p.* 457. *ed.* 2. Buxt. *Lex. Talm. col.* 1593. 2444. Hoornbeck. *c. Jud. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *p.* 309.

(k) *Schindler. Lex. col.* 1036. Spencer. *ſupr. p.* 455.

(l) *Windet. ſupr. p.* 116. Buxtorf. *ſupr. col.* 1495.

(m) *Dion. Voſſ. in Maim. de Idol. c.* 11. *ſub fin.*

(n) Selden. *de D. Syr. Synt.* 2. *c.* 6.

(o) *De vit. ære al. p.* 830. *de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 361.

* *The* Saxons *call an Outlaw a Friendleſs Man, none may ſhelter or receive him. V.* Cowel's Interpreter, *Friendleſs Man.*

(p) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 304.

(q) Παρὰ φοινίκων δὲ καὶ Φερεκύδης λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς, ἐθεολόγησε περὶ τοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ λεγομένου Ὀφιωνέως θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν Ὀφιονιδῶν. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 10.

(r) Bochart. *de Anim. P.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 3. *col.* 22.

potheſis of *the lapſe of Angels from Heaven*; which muſt be called the Chriſtian Hypotheſis, although ſome Eccleſiaſtic Writers (*s*) oppoſe it, and ſome thus diſpute againſt it. (*t*) *The Devil and his Angels were originally the prefect-tutelar Angels of the Air and Earth, but were never in Heaven, nor enjoyed the beatific Viſion there. For Heaven is a reward; therefore the Angels in their firſt Eſtate were not the Poſſeſſors of it: But were created (as Mankind was) in ſuch a condition, that they might acquire it by their Piety and Obedience, the faileur whereof was the loſs of it. But from Heaven they could not fall; becauſe Heaven is not the Portion of thoſe that can fall into Sin, but of thoſe only that are firm and rooted in piety: Nor could they Sin in the place and ſtate of Perfection. Had they been Poſſeſſors of Heaven, the beatific Viſion muſt neceſſarily have repleniſhed them with Wiſdom and Beatitude; it would have drawn their deſires towards it immutably, they could not have deſired any thing elſe.* But theſe are ſlender appearances of Reaſon, that ſuppoſe a conſequence, for which there is no appearance of Reaſon; *that becauſe Heaven is to us a Reward, and a State of unchangeable Felicity by the Goſpel-ſettlement of things, therefore it was ſuch to the Angels in the original Conſtitution of the Kingdom of God; and becauſe* (*u*) *ſome holy Men attain to an immutable eſtate of Grace antecedently to their heavenly Reward, therefore none were ever Inhabitants of Heaven, ſave only thoſe that were arriv'd at that confirmed State, and were* ἄπτωτοι εἰς κακίαν, *undeclinably good.* The Angels height of Perfection and Felicity (in their Celeſtial Condition) was ſo far from ſecuring them from a Fall, that it might occaſion it; (*w*) as *Origen* ſuppoſeth, *that Satan being a Crown of Pulchritude in the Paradiſe of God periſhed by a fulneſs of Goods*: Or as we commonly ſuppoſe, that he fell by *Elation* (priding himſelf againſt God,) φιλαυτία, *Self-admiration and Self-love*, and by affecting *a Domination* not ſubject (or not duly ſubject) unto God, agreeably to the Heads of Empire which he ſetteth up in the World, that uſually affect an unſubject and unbounded Liberty. And that himſelf in Conſort with his Fellow-rebels ſhould be like-minded, and therefore ſhould chuſe to make a total Revolt from God and their Duty, was not incompetible to their Celeſtial Condition, nor is it at all incredible, the like prodigiouſly frantick Enormities being no rarities amongſt intelligent Agents. For in our own Nation a young Gentleman (not naturally craz'd in his Underſtanding) choſe to leave his Father's Houſe and a fair Eſtate, to Ramble about with the Gypſies. Wherefore the uſual Theology is unexceptionable, which is clearly enough expreſs'd in holy Scripture. For according to the Scriptures the holy Angels are originally the Inhabitants of Heaven, *Matth.* 22. 30. *Luc.* 20. 36. *Heb.* 12. 22. and the lapſed Angels were originally of the number of the holy Angels, 2 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Jud.* 6. (2.) The Pagan Demonology thus far befriendeth the Chriſtian Hypotheſis of *an Imperial Polity and Kingdom of evil Angels.* It ſheweth, that this is the true and reaſonable Hypotheſis, for the Pagan Demonologiſts ſuppoſe, that the evil Demons have an Imperial Head over them; therefore in conſiſtence with themſelves, they ought to have ſuppoſed, that there is a diſtinct Imperial Polity and Kingdom of Evil Demons, as Chriſtianity aſſerteth. But they have ſo paganically qualified their Doctrine of evil Demons, as to make it no contradiction to their Doctrine *of the Unity* of the Mundane City and Monarchy (for their evil Demons are of their Theopolity, of their City of God, and are Gods alſo;) and there is a monſtrous abſurdity and impiety in their account of the Polity of the Univerſe, as alſo in the Hypotheſis of certain Deiſts, *That the Catholick Church is of the ſame extent with the World of Rationals*; for according to this Hypotheſis *the evil Demons are Church-Members.* This with Deiſts will be counted a ſmall matter; but if they have any veneration for God, they will not count it a ſmall matter to deify evil Demons and to pay them religious Worſhip: Yet this Demonolatry was the Religion of Pagan Cities and Popular Societies, as ſome of the Pagan Demonologiſts plainly acknowledge (*x*) thereby giving a great Atteſtation to the truth of the Chriſtian Religion (which chargeth upon Paganiſm an horrendous Demonolatry, *the Sacrificing unto and having Fellowſhip with Devils*,) and to the peculiar excellency of the Chriſtian Learning, which alone *to the purpoſe* diſcovereth Satan and maketh him known. For both Jews and Pagans (notwithſtanding their ſlender Notices of evil Angels) are far from knowing him as they ought, and ſo far as is needful to the purpoſe of Piety and Sanctity, as *Tertullian* (ſpeaking of *Socrates*'s Demon) ſaith,

(*y*) *As yet there were none of the Documents of the Chriſtian Power, which alone traduceth that moſt pernicious Power, that is never good, the Artificer of old Error, and the turner away from all Truth. The Chriſtian alone knoweth Satan.* Yet both in Ancient and Modern Paganiſm (obſcure) notices of evil Demons are ſo far diffus'd, that we may juſtly ſay, as the ſame Author (*Tertullian*) doth. *Dæmonium ubique, & maledictio Dæmonii ubique. The Devil was notic'd every where and had in execration every where.* (3.) The Pagan Demonology greatly befriendeth the Chriſtian by aſſerting and aſcertaining (in Conſort with it) the Exiſtence of evil Demons. For it appeareth from Heathen Authors to have been from the moſt ancient times the general Senſe of the Heathen World of Mankind, that there are evil Demons and evil Gods. They were aſſured of their Exiſtence from their Operations and Effects (of which many will be hereafter enumerated;) and from this Hypotheſis *Plutarch* giveth an account of the Apparitions to *Brutus* and *Dio* (the Truth whereof (*z*) a late pretending Demonologiſt hath endeavour'd to ſlur and diſparage.) *If Brutus and Dio* (ſaith he) *Philoſophical Men, of great ſtrength of Mind, and not apt to fancy horrible Appearances, were put into ſuch commotion by Apparitions, that they ſolicitouſly related them to their Friends; perhaps we may be forc'd to embrace that (ſeemingly) moſt abſurd Opinion of the Ancients, that there are evil and envious Demons, that envying good Men and withſtanding their Actions, raiſe fears and troubles to them, to ſhake and overthrow their Virtue, leſt if they ſhould perſiſt ſtedfaſt and uncorrupted in good, they ſhould after their deceaſe enjoy a better Condition than theirs.* *Plato* who in his *Tenth of Laws* would have thoſe ſeverely puniſh'd, that by *Sacrifices, Prayers, and Inchantments*, endeavour to deſtroy private Men, whole Houſes and Cities, had great reaſon to believe the Exiſtence of evil Demons. And the Laws of Pagan Commonwealths (as that of the XII Tables) condemning

(*s*) Rupert. *ap. Petav. T.* 3. *p.* 93, 902.

(*t*) Eugubin. *de per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 38.

(*u*) *The Collect. of* Dr. Jackſon's *Works B.* 10. *c.* 37.

(*w*) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 306.

(*x*) Porphyr. *de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 43. 58. Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 270. Plutarch. *de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 360, 361. *de Def. or. p.* 417.

(*y*) *Nondum Chriſtianæ poteſtatis documenta proceſſerant, quæ vim illam pernicioſiſſimam nec nunquam bonam, antiqui erroris artificem omnis veritatis avocatricem, ſola traducit. Solus Chriſtianus novit Satanam. De An. c.* 1. *de Teſt. An. c.* 3.

(*z*) *P. Gaſſend. Eth. l.* 3. *p.* 856.

ning and puniſhing ſuch maleficent Magick acknowledge their Exiſtence, the Theurgical Theologers report, that they ſaw them (in Theurgy,) and theſe were very learn'd Philoſophers, who cannot be ſuppoſed, to have been impos'd upon by meer Fancy and Imagination. And who can doubt, but that thoſe learned Pagan Demonologiſts are in the right, who ſuppoſe the antic and barbarous Rites of their Religion, to be the Worſhip of potent evil Demons? For the Pagan Religion is a (no leſs than Mathematical) demonſtration of the Exiſtence of evil Demons, becauſe it cannot be ſuppoſed, that any Power but a Diabolical, did ſubdue and ſubject the World of Mankind (for many Ages) to ſuch an Inſtitution as Paganiſm is. Nor can unprejudic'd Reaſon refuſe this ſound Philoſophical Reaſoning of the Pagan Demonologiſts, whereby they prove the Exiſtence of Aerial Demons. (a) *Would Nature, that hath repleniſh'd all other Regions with Inhabitants, ſuffer the ſpacious Element of the Air, to be a Waſt and Deſart devoid of Inhabitants?* The Hebrew Doctors therefore and the Chriſtian Theologers alſo, agree with the Pagan Demonologiſts, that the Univerſe is full, and that the Air is repleniſh'd with Animals and Rationals. *R. Joſeph* ſaith, (b) *From the Earth to the Firmament there is no place empty, but all is full with Multitudes,* (or Spectres) *of which ſome are Pure, of Beneficence and Mercy. But beneath are many Creatures Impure, Hurtful and Accuſers. And all of them have their abode and flee in the Air; ſo that no place from the Earth to the Firmament is empty, but all is Multitudes, ſome inſtigating to Peace, others to War; ſome to Good, Others to Evil; ſome to Life, others to Death.* (c) Two other Hebrew Authors (one a Commentator on *Pirke Aboth*, the other מנחה חדשה *munus novum*) ſay, *All the ſpace between the Earth and Firmament is full of Troops and Prefects.* The Senſe of the Chriſtian Theologers may be underſtood from that of S. *Hierom*; (d) *Hæc omnium Doctorum opinio eſt, This is the Opinion of all the Doctors, that the Air between Heaven and Earth, which is looked upon as a vacuity, is full of contrary Powers.* But the Air is not properly the Manſion and Habitation of contrary Powers; for all the Aerial Demons are notic'd in Scripture to be evil Demons, whence the evil Demons are called by S. *Auſtin*, (e) *Aerea Animalia, Aerial Animals*, and the Chieftain of them is called by the Apoſtle, *The Prince of the Power of the Air* (that Imperial Power;) the Rulers of his Empire are called *Spiritual Wickedneſs*, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, *in the* (Aerial) *Heavenlies above*; to ſignifie, that they are *Men-ſuperiorities, the Supernal Aerial Potentates.* But this Branch of Scripture-demonology muſt be underſtood with Limitation; for the Aerial Demons are ſometimes under Penal Confinement to the ſqualid and horrid Subterraneous Regions, as that Petition of theirs implieth. *Luc.* 8. 31. *They beſought him, that he would not command them, to go into the Deep, or Abyſs.* An excellent Divine for want of interpoſing this Limitation, hath diſcours'd upon this Argument inconſiſtently with himſelf: (f) Sometimes affirming, *That the evil Spirits are exiled from Heaven no farther than the Air*; and ſometimes diſcourſing, *That the old Giants wail under the Waters with their Fellow-inhabitants, the reſt of the damned.*

(a) *Hoc ſolum quartum elementum aeris, quod tanto ſpatio interpoſitum eſt, caſſum ab omnibus deſertumque à cultoribus ſuis natura pateretur? Apulei. de Deo Socrat.*

(b) *Ap. Reuchlin. de Arte Cab. l.* 3. *fol.* 77. *Windet. de vit. funct. S.* 13.

(c) Druſ. *in Eph.* 2. 2. *&* 6. 12.

(d) *Com. in Epheſ.* 6.

(e) *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 3. *c.* 1.

(f) *Mr.* Mede *on* 2 Pet. 2. 4. *and on* Prov. 21. 16.

CHAP. III.

1. *Of the Guardian-Angel.* 2. Plato *had it not from the* Hebrews, *more probably from the* Egyptians. 3. *The true Origin of it was the Pagans Polity and Government of the Univerſe.* 4. *Of their Demonolatry* 5. *Of the Senſe of the Jews touching the Polity and Government of the Univerſe.* 6. *Of the Senſe of the Fathers.* 7. *The Scripture's Notices of the Holy Angels do not imply their Subordinate Mundane Magiſtracy, nor the Guardian-Angel. The firſt Notice doth not.* 8. *Nor the ſecond Notice.* 9. *Arguments againſt their Subordinate Mundane Magiſtracy and the Guardian-Angel.* 10. *Of the* Gnoſticks, Angelitæ, *and their Demonolatry.*

I. THE Pagan Theologers agree, that the beneficent ſort of Demons are *Guardian-Genii*, which are certain Tutelar or Patron Lord-preſidents of Men (though Servitors to the Gods) of particular Perſons and Societies of things and places (Regions, Provinces, Houſes, Cities, Towns, Colledges,) according to that of *Servius*, (g) *Genium dicebant antiqui naturalem Deum uniuſcujuſque loci, vel rei aut hominis. The Genius according to the Senſe of the Ancients is the natural God of every place, or thing or perſon.* Hence we read of δαίμονες κατέχοντες τοῦτον τὸν τόπον, *Local-guardian Genii*, and that ancient Inſcription ſpeaketh the Senſe of the Ancients, *Jovi Op. Max. & Genio loci, To Jupiter the beſt and greateſt and to the Genius of the place.* The Genius of the Roman People (diſtinct from the tutelar God of the City, whoſe Name was kept ſecret) called by *Ammianus* the publick Genius, is uſual in ancient Coins; and the *Lares* were look'd upon as the proper Guardian Genii of their Houſes, whence they were ſtiled *Præſtites*, (as being προεστῶτες) and cloathed with Dogs Skins. Among the Perſonal Guardian Genii that of the Prince was thought far more auguſt than other Mens, (h) whence aroſe a Cuſtom amongſt the Romans of ſwearing by *Cæſar*'s *Genius*, which if any did forſwear by in a ſuit, his puniſhment was *Fuſtigatio* (ῥοπαλισμὸς) *Baſtinadoing*, whereas if the Perjury was committed againſt the Name of God, no Puniſhment follow'd by their Cuſtoms (they ſuppoſing that God would ſufficiently avenge the abuſe of his Deity,) whence *Tertullian* thus upbraideth them (i) *with you Men ſooner forſwear by all the Gods than by the Genius of Cæſar.* (k) The Platoniſts ſuppoſe, that every Nation hath a tutelar Deity, to preſide over it with an Angel or Demon under him; and of theſe Demons they ſay, *ſome Preſide over larger Regions, ſome over narrower Territories and Cities, and ſome have the Government of particular Men; namely, Thoſe which deſcending Souls, according to*

(g) *Elmenh. in Arnob. p.* 23. *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 28, 153. *Lipſ. phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 19. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 8. *c.* 18.

(h) Selden, *Titles Par.* 1. *c.* 4. *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 6.

(i) *Citius apud vos per omnes Deos quam per unum Genium Cæſaris pejeratur.*

(k) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 4. *p.* 143. *Ficin. Arg. in Apolog. Socr.*

the Life which they make choice of, acquire to themſelves which are thenceforth the Guides and Inſpectors and Judges of their Life.

But the Pagan Theologers are not agreed touching the Prefectſhip of the maleficent Genii; (*l*) for ſome of them affirm, that theſe have no ἡγεμονικὴν λῆξιν, or *Prefecture, with every one at the time of his Nativity a proper Genius* (called by *Pindar* δαίμων γενέθλιος,) *aſſociateth, to be the Maſter and Guide of his Life*, ſaith *Menander*; *a good Genius; for it is not to be ſuppoſed, that there is a bad Genius hurtful to good Life.* But this ſolitary Genius is rejected by ſome (*m*) that prefer *Empedocles*'s Conceit before it, which is the ſame with that of the Poet, *Quiſque ſuos patimur manes, every one at his Birth hath two Fates or Genii; one inclining to Good, the other to Evil; one Friendly, the other Adverſe.* To this Adverſe ſort of Genii, the Magi (probably) directed certain Prayers (mention'd by *Arnobius*) on behalf of Souls departed. (*n*) *For they pretended by ſome Commendatory Prayers, to mitigate and ſweeten certain adverſe Powers, that they ſhould not hinder the Souls departed from returning to their Native Country.* Agreeably to the Pagan Theologers (*o*) the Jews ſay (but *Maimonides* interpreteth their Saying to a Moral Senſe, touching the good and evil figment in Man,) *that every Man hath two Angels, one on the Right-hand, the other on the Left.* And this Opinion which attributeth a good and bad Angel to every Man, is entertain'd by the Pontifician Divines. *Muhammed* hath alſo receiv'd it into his Religion (for he ſuppoſeth, that every one hath a good and bad Angel, that they ſit upon Men's Shoulders with Table-Books in their Hands, the one writing down all the good that a Man doth, the other all the evil) and ſome few of the Theologers of the Primitive Church, *Origen*, *Gr. Nyſſen*, with ſome others, were of this Opinion (*Origen*, moreover ſuppoſeth, that the ſeveral Vices in Man have their ſeveral Preſident Demons, that there is a Spirit of *Pride*, of *Fornication*, of *Paſſion*, *Covetouſneſs* and ſuch more:) But although this Conceit hath ſome great names to Countenance it, I do not ſuppoſe it worth the while to examine it, we will therefore content our ſelves to examine the Pagan Theologers Dogma, περὶ τοῦ εἰληχότος ἡμᾶς δαίμονος, *touching that one ſingular Demon whoſe allotment we are.*

II. Of the Eximious Powers, good Offices and Benefits and the Religious Worſhip of this Guardian Numen *Apuleius* hath diſcours'd; of whoſe diſcourſe one of the Pontifician party ſaith (*p*) *It ought not to be over-look'd, ſeeing nothing can be more conſentaneous to thoſe things which we are taught according to ſacred Religion.* Of the diſcourſe of *Ammianus* touching this Dogma another of them ſaith, (*q*) *Some few things excepted the Chriſtian Religion is conſentaneous thereto.* (*r*) *Who doubts* (ſaith one of our own,) *but the good Genius of the Heathen, and the Chriſtians Angel Guardian, are one and the ſame thing?* If theſe things are ſo, if there is in the Chriſtian Religion a Guardian-Angel ſo fully agreeable to the Pagan Dogma, there is great reaſon to think it originally a Traduction from the Hebrews, as ſome in ancient times have ſuppos'd it. *Iſidore* the Son and Diſciple of *Baſilides* (as *Clemens* reporteth) deduc'd it from this Origin; his words are, (*s*) Ariſtotle *ſaith that all Men have Demons, which become their Aſſociates, when they put on the Body; which Opinion he took from the Prophets, and inſerted it into his Books, not confeſſing whence he had it.* *Clemens* himſelf affirmeth, that the Opinion is of Hebrew original, and he findeth (or maketh) a Paralleliſm betwixt Chriſt's *little ones* with their Guardian-Angels, and the Pagan Infants with their Guardian-Demons, for thus he diſcourſeth of *Plato.* (*t*) *Pointing at the Angels of the little ones and of the leaſt, ſuch as ſee God, as alſo ſhewing the Providence and Overſight which reacheth unto us by Preſident-Angels, he doubted not to write thus. When all the Souls had choſen their ſort of Life, as their Lot was to make their Choice, they come in order to* Lacheſis; *ſhe according to every ones choice ſendeth a Demon with him, to be the Guardian of his Life, and to execute or fulfil the things which he had choſen.* This diſcourſe of *Plato* cited by *Clemens* is touching the ſeveral *Lives* and *Demons* which Souls make choice of, and the Fates which confirm their choice. The ſeveral Lives which Souls that (in ſome one of their various Circuits and Revolutions) are to enter into the Body, have liberty to chuſe, are (*u*) ſeveral *primary Lives* and ſeveral *ſecundary Lives.* They may chuſe the Life of a *Swan*, a *Lion*, a *Nightingale*, or an *Human* Life, and that either of a Man or a Woman; theſe are the primary Lives. If they chuſe an *Humane* Life, they may chuſe that of a *Soldier*, or a *Magiſtrate*, or a *private Man*; theſe are the *ſecondary Lives.* So in the Apologue of *Er* in *Plato Orpheus*'s Soul being to come again into a Body, choſe rather the Life of a *Swan* than to be born of a Woman and to live an Human Life, out of hatred to Woman-kind, becauſe he was torn in pieces by Women. (*w*) A Swan alſo choſe an Human Life. *Agamemnon*'s Soul out of diſlike to Mankind becauſe of his Toil and Grievances, choſe the Life of an Eagle. *Ulyſſes* (who was to chuſe in the laſt place) remembring his former Labours, and now no more Ambitious, ſought a great while for the Life of a private Man free from Buſineſs, and at length having found it (neglected by others) made choice of it, profeſſing, that if his Lot had been to have choſen in the firſt place, he would have choſen no other Life. The Souls having thus made choice of their proper Life, they come in order to *Lacheſis* (ſaith *Plato*) who ſendeth with every one the Demon that he hath choſen. This Guardian Prefect or Captain-Demon firſt carrieth the Soul to *Clotho* (confirming under her Hand or Revolution, the Lot and Portion which the Soul made choice of,) next to *Atropos*, from thence he leadeth her under Ἀνάγκης θρόνος, *Neceſſity's Throne*, and thence to the Field of *Lethe* and the River *Amelita*, which whoſo drinketh of, forgetteth all things. This Platonic deſcription of the return of Souls from the other Life (of which the Platoniſts (*x*) make different interpretations) is in the whole of it ſo Poetical and Phantaſtic, ſo Alien both from ſound Philoſophy and true Religion, that *Iſidore* and *Clemens* muſt be thought extreamly blind and undiſcerning in theſe Matters,

---

(l) Jambl. *de myſt.* p. 170. Plutarch. *de ſto. repugn.* p. 1051.

(m) Plutarch. *de An. tranq.* p. 474. *Gale in* Jambl. p. 317. *Herald. in Arnob* p. 73.

(n) *Quid illi ſibi volunt ſecretarum artium ritus, quibus affamini neſcio quas poteſtates, ut ſint vobis placidæ, neque ad ſedes remeantibus patriis obſtacula impeditionis opponant.*

(o) Maimon. *mor. Nev. P.* 3. *c.* 22. *Grot. Not. in* Matth. 18. 10. *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 2 *c.* 6.

(p) *Cùm nihil eſſe poſſit iis, quæ juxta ſacram Religionem docemur, magis conſentaneum.* Gaſſend. *Eth. l.* 3. *p.* 852.

(q) *Quibus, paucis quibuſdam demptis concordat Chriſtiana Religio.* Baron. *ad Ann.* 361. *n.* 17.

(r) Dingley *the Deput. of Angels. p.* 45.

(s) Spencer. *Not. in Orig.* p. 91.

(t) Τῶν μικρῶν δὲ κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν καὶ ἐλαχίστων τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοὺς ὁρῶντας τὸν θεόν. πρὸς δὲ, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς δι' ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐφεστώτων ἥκουσαν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐμφαίνων, οὐκ ὀκνεῖ γράφειν. Ἐπειδὴ πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς τοὺς βίους ᾑρῆσθαι, ὥσπερ ἔλαχον, ἐν τάξει προσιέναι πρὸς τὴν Λάχεσιν· ἐκείνην δὲ ἑκάστῳ ὃν εἵλετο δαίμονα, τοῦτον φύλακα συμπέμπειν τοῦ βίου, καὶ ἀποπληρωτὴν τῶν αἱρεθέντων. Strom. *l.* 5. *p. m.* 432.

(u) *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 201, &c.

(w) J. *Bapt. Criſp. Quin. prim. p.* 433.

(x) *Stob. ſupr. Procl. Theol. plat. l.* 6. *c.* 23.

ters, that ſuppos'd it (in whole or in part) a Traduction from the *Hebrews*. *Porphyry* much more probably affirmeth, (y) that *Plato* deriv'd his Notices touching the diverſity of *Lives* and of *Genii* from the *Egyptians*, but he thought it requiſite to recede from ſome of their Notions. For according to the *Egyptians* the Lives which Souls live in Bodies are neceſſarily conformable to the *Zodiac*, the *Horoſcope*, the *Poſition* and *Diſpoſition* of the Stars at the Nativity; whereas *Plato* alloweth Souls a liberty of choice. Beſides, according to the *Egyptians*, the proper Demon is given by the οἰκοδεσπότης, *Lord of the geniture* (a Conceit that *Porphyry* favoureth) is adjoyn'd to every one at theHour of Nativity, (z) and they look'd only at the *Horoſcope* without enquiring any further; which mode of Aſtrologizing is ſomewhat alien from the Mind of *Plato*, but is agreeable to that piece of *Platoniſm* (ſo call'd by *Ficinus*) *That every one hath a certain Demon, the Keeper and Guardian of his Life, appointed by his Star.* The uſual way was (a) to derive the proper Demon from the *Decani*, *the Stars*, Animals of the *Zodiac* and other parts of the Heavens (according to the *Egyptians*, the proper Demon deſcendeth by ſome ſign of the *Zodiac*, and partaketh of the Quality thereof) and the Poets that ſpeak the Language of the Mathematical and Aſtrological Fataliſts, Aſtrologize after the *Egyptian* mode.

> —— —— —— *Geminos Horoſcope varo*
> *Producis Genio* — —— Perſ. Sat. 6.
> *The Horoſcope produceth Twins of great diverſity of Genius.*

In *Platoniſm* there are (b) ſeveral other Magical and Aſtrological-Magical Conceits touching the Guardian Genius, which have their origin from ſomewhat elſe than the Scripture-Theology.

III. The immediate Origin of the Pagans Dogma touching the Guardian-Genius is *their Polity and Government of the Univerſe*, of which the Guardian-Genius is an eminent Branch. For their Theology diſtinguiſheth the Mundane Magiſtracy (or Rectorſhip of the World) into *Sovereign and Subordinate*; and the Subordinate Mundane Magiſtracy it attributeth to *the Heavenly Bodies* (the Stars) *and unto tutelar Spirits* (Gods and Demons) *who are ſuppos'd to be the Lord-preſidents and Rulers over ſeveral Prefectures, Precincts, Places, Things and Perſons.* The Univerſality of Pagan Religioniſts agree in the acknowledgment of theſe two fundamental Points, (c) *one Providence adminiſtring theſe things, and* (many) *ſubordinate Powers ſet over all.* Of the Demiurgus *Julian* ſaith, (d) *We have better Opinions concerning him* (than the *Jews*) *who ſuppoſe him to be the common Lord of all; but that there are other Governours of Nations and Countries under him, which are as* ὕπαρχοι, *the Subrectors* (Under-rulers) *of the King*. Theſe are diſtinguiſh'd by their various *Faculties* and *Offices*, and by their various Prefectures and Preſidences over the Parts of the Univerſe; ſo that all things in Nature and Providence are adminiſter'd by certain Preſidentiary Deities of various *Faculties and Offices*. (e) *In the Father* (ſaith he) *all things are perfect, and All is one; but the particular Deities excell in ſeveral Faculties and Powers:* Mars *adminiſtreth the matters of War,* Minerva *thoſe of War with Prudence*, Mercury *the things that are matter of Wit rather than of Boldneſs. The Muſes with* Æſculapius *and* Apollo *and eloquent* Mercury *indoctrinate our Souls*, Mars *and* Bellona *are aſſociate helpers in War; what appertaineth to Mechanic Arts* Vulcan *aſſigneth and diſtributeth.* (f) *They that ſay, there is but one God,* ἁμαρτάνοντι, *are deceiv'd*, ſaith *Onatus* the *Pythagorean. It ſeemeth to me, that there is not one onely God, but one the greateſt and ſupream governing the Univerſe,* οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πολλοὶ διαφέροντες κατὰ δύναμιν, *but there are many others that are of different Powers.* They are alſo of different Prefectures and Preſidences over the Parts of the Univerſe, whence they are call'd by *Plato* in his *Politicus*, (g) *the Gods that are the Prefects of the ſeveral Regions the Collegues of the greateſt God.* (h) In a Diſcourſe of *Proclus* touching the Lots or Prefectures of the Gods and Demons there are various Diſtributions of the Univerſe into Prefectures. One is a Diſtribution into three (which *M. Tyrius* calleth (i) a Juſt and Philoſophical Diſtribution) the Prefectures of that Triumvirate of Gods, amongſt whom *Homer* ſhareth the Government of the Univerſe. *The Sea is* Neptune's *Lot, the dark infernal Region* Pluto's, *but Heaven is* Jupiter's. The Univerſe is alſo diſtributed into five parts, *agreeably to ſeveral ſorts of Preſidentiary Deities, Celeſtial, Igneous, Aerial, Aqueous, Terreſtrial; all which keep in Conſiſtence their ſeveral Prefectures*, and govern the Affairs of them. (k) *From the beginning* (ſaith *Celſus*) *a Diſtribution was made of the ſeveral parts of the Earth to ſeveral* (ἐπόπταις) *Overſeers, and being divided into ſeveral Prefectures they are in this manner govern'd. And* (l) *becauſe the Demonial kind every where accompanieth the Gods as their followers, there are Demons that adminiſter the matters of this Region of Generation: Some have preſidency and rule over whole Elements, ſome are tutelar of Climes, ſome are Rulers of Nations, and ſome of Cities; ſome are Inſpectors of whole kinds, and others of ſingulars.* (m) *The Aereal Demons have the ſeveral parts of the World for their divided Provinces, which they keep in eternal unchangeable Conſiſtence.* Such a Demonial or Angelical Superintendency and Government Mankind are ſuppos'd to be next and immediately under; and *Celſus* ſheweth from the *Egyptians*, (n) *that even the leaſt things have their Preſidents, every part of the World, and of the Body of Man hath ſome Genius to preſide over it.* So *Plato* diſcourſing, that the Providence of the Gods taketh care of the leaſt things, ſaith of all the parts of the Univerſe, (o) *every one of theſe have their Prefects ſet over them.* So *Symmachus* ſaith of Cities, (p) *the Divine Mind diſtributeth to all Cities various Tutelar or Guardian Preſidents.* To theſe Tutelar Spirits the *Literati* or thoſe of the Sect of *Confucio* in *China* (q) erect their Temples (acknowledging one Supream God, but how far, Relations do not agree) and to theſe Patron or Tutelar Spirits the Ancient Pagans pay'd their Religious Homage, as in this Inſcription, (r)

> *Mercurio & Minervæ Dis Tutelaribus.*
> *To the Tutelar Deities* Mercury *and* Minerva.

The Pagans Polity of the Univerſe therefore conſiſteth of a Supream Deity and of Tutelar

---

(y) *Ap.* Stob. *ſupr.*

(z) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 312. Ficin. *de Vit. l.* 3. *c.* 23. *Com. in Plotin. p.* 132.

(a) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 165. Gale *Not. p.* 313.

(b) Gale *ibid.* Procl. *de An. & Dæm. p.* 201, 217, 218. Hierocl. *in aur. Car. p.* 41. *de Fato, p.* 24, 26, 20. Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 170. Apulei. *de Deo* Socrat.

(c) Μιᾶς προνοίας ταῦτα ἐπιτροπευούσης, καὶ δυνάμεων ὑπουργῶν ἐπὶ πάντας τεταγμένων. Plutarch. *de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 377.

(d) S. Cyr. *C.* Jul. *l.* 4. *p.* 148.

(e) *Ibid. p.* 115. *& l.* 7. *p.* 235.

(f) Stob. *Ecl. phyſ. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(g) Οἱ κατὰ τόπους συνάρχοντες τῷ μεγίστῳ δαίμονι θεοί.

(h) *In Tim. p.* 42.

(i) *Diſſ.* 16.

(k) Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 5. p. 257.

(l) Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 43, 287.

(m) Οἱ κατὰ μέρη διῃρημένοι δαίμονες, οἱ φυλάττοντες τὰ μέρη τοῦ παντός. Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 148.

(n) Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 8. *p.* 416.

(o) Τούτοις δὲ εἰσὶν Ἄρχοντες προστεταγμένοι ἑκάστοις. *Ap.* Euſeb. *pr. Ev. p.* 633.

(p) *Varios cuſtodes urbibus cunctis mens divina diſtribuit.* l. 10. Ep. 54.

(q) *Semedo Hiſt. P.* 1. *c.* 18.

(r) Elm. *in* Arnob. *p.* 119.

Spirits or Patron-Ghoſts of ſubordinate Rank, (ſome of higher, ſome of lower Rank) and of Mankind their Clients and Suppliants. So *Lactantius* expreſſeth the Senſe of the Pagans touching the Gods; (s) *They ſay, that their Gods ſo preſide over the ſeveral things and parts of the World, as that yet there is one Eximious Rector.* And the Supream Deity is ſo the Head and Rector of this Political Mundane Syſtem, as that there are (t) *many Gods, the Sons of God, Co-reigners and Co-governours with God.* Such are the *Stars*, which *Philo* (ſpeaking the Senſe of the *Platoniſts*) calleth (u) *certain Rulers of the Univerſe, Sub-rectors of the Father of it.* Agreeably to theſe Notices of the Polity of the Univerſe, the Heathen Idolaters in an ancient Author thus plead for their Religion. (w) *We likewiſe acknowledge one God, who is Lord over all, but yet the other are Gods too; as there is but one* Cæſar *who hath many Officers under him, as Prefects, Conſuls, Tribunes, and other Magiſtrates: after the ſame manner we ſuppoſe, when there is but one Supream God, he hath many other Inferiour Gods as ſo many Officers under him, who are all ſubject to him, but yet over us.*

IV. From this Account of the Polity and Government of the Univerſe it appeareth, that the Religion of the *Gentiles* is of this Character: *It is a Piety, Devotion and Religion of Patron-Ghoſts* (or Tutelar Spirits) *and of their Clients; this is their way and inſtitution of Religion.* Their Theopolity conſiſteth of Tutelar Spirits or Patron-Ghoſts, to whom they attribute (not the Supremacy, yet) ſuch Excellence, Power, Officiary Dignity, Faculties, Offices and ſuperiour relation to Men, that are ſufficient to make thoſe, that are the Religioniſts of their Theopolity, *the Religioniſts of ſuch a way of Piety, Devotion and Religion; which is fitly called Demonolatry.* For the Name *Demon* in the Pagan Theology is ſometimes of the *largeſt* Acceptation, ſometimes of the *ſtricteſt* Acceptation, and ſometimes of a *middle* Acceptation. In the *largeſt* Acceptation it is ſynonymous with the word Θεός, (x) as *Plutarch* obſerveth, that *Homer* calleth the Gods *Demons*; and the Pagans ſay of S. *Paul*, *Act.* 17.18. *He ſeemeth to be a ſetter forth* ξένων δαιμονίων, *of ſtrange Gods.* So τὸ δαιμόνιον (the Demonium) ſometimes ſignifieth the *Divinity* or the party of the Gods in contradiſtinction to Mankind. In the *ſtricteſt* Acceptation the Name *Demon* ſignifieth, *that inferiour Rank of inviſible Powers the middle Order* (or middling Gods) *diſtinguiſh'd from the Gods*, of which Acceptation of the word we have had many Inſtances in this Diſcourſe. In the Theology of the *Stoicks* the Name *Demon* is of a middle Acceptation; for they compriſe the whole Order of *ſubordinate inviſible Gods*, (y) under the Name of *Demons* and *Genii*, all which inferiour Gods they ſuppoſe to be generate and corruptible, and that in the World's Conflagration they will be deſtroy'd and extinguiſh'd. So by the Name *Rationals* they intend to ſignify *God, the Demons and Men*, (z) ſaith *Caſaubon.* So the Philoſopher *Thales thought God the Mind of the World*, (a) *that the Univerſe was animated and alſo full of Demons.* Where the Name Demons includeth the *ſubordinate inviſible Gods.* Agreeably to that other Saying of *Thales* cited by *Ariſtotle* (b) *all things are full of Gods.* So the ſubordinate inviſible Gods that follow *Jupiter* agitating his winged Chariot, have the Name of δαίμονες, *Demons*, (c) in *Macrobius*; and in *Plato* (who diſtinguiſheth the Order of *the ſubordinate inviſible Gods* from that of *Demons*, and will have Love not a God but a Demon) there is an appearance of this Notion of the Name, for in his *Politicus* and his *fourth of Laws* he ſaith of *Saturn*, *He did not ſet Humane Kings and Rulers over our Cities*, (d) *but ſuch as were of a diviner and better kind, the Demons.* If this Saying of *Plato* (e) muſt be underſtood according to the tenour of the *Platonic* Theology (which ſuppoſeth, not Demons alone, but Gods attended with Demons, to preſide over the greater Communities of Mankind) we muſt ſuppoſe, that the word *Demons* includeth the Order of *the ſubordinate inviſible Gods.* But whether this be *Plato*'s Senſe or not, it is manifeſt, that the Name Demons is of a middle Acceptation (f) in *Celſus* the *Platoniſt*; that in his Acceptation the Supream God is not included in the Name; but the Name includeth the Supra-demonial Order on this ſide the Supream God and the Order of Demons ſtrictly ſo call'd; to which we muſt add the *Heroes* (whom the *Stoicks* uſually diſtinguiſh from *Demons*, but are) commonly call'd Demons by the Pagan Theologers. Now, if the Name Demons hath an indifferent Senſe in Heathen Authors (as is commonly known) if in a *middle* Acceptation it ſignifieth the Comprehenſion of *inviſible Powers* or *tutelar Spirits* (for all things act and move (g) *ſub tutelaribus divis, under the tutelar Deities*) diſtinct from and on this ſide the Supream God, than the Worſhip of any inviſible Powers that are of the ſubordinate Rank, or a Piety, Devotion and Religion of Tutelar Spirits and their Clients, may juſtly and unexceptionably be called *Demonolatry* or *Demon-worſhip.* Therefore the Name of Demonolatry admitteth of a narrower and larger Acceptation, for it may be confined to the worſhip of the Order of *Demons* ſtrictly ſo called in the *Platonic* Theology; and it may be extended, to ſignifie the Pagans Worſhip of any inviſible Powers (real or imaginary) that are of the Subordinate Rank; which they conſider'd as their Patron Superiorities.

V. The *Jews* ſymbolize with the Pagan Theologers in their impure Phantaſtry touching the Polity and Government of the Univerſe. For they ſuppoſe, (h) that their Nation alſo hath a Guardian Angel, but with this difference; The Divine Providence is their Curator, and their Angel-Guardian doth nothing without leave: But the reſt of the World they ſubject to Angels and the Celeſtial Orbs; they ſuppoſe, that all other Nations are neglected by God, and are govern'd by Stars and Angels, to whom God hath committed the care of them; and theſe Preſident Angels are their Gods, and operate upon them as Gods; whence in the *Talmud* the *Iſraelites* are often oppos'd to עובדי כוכבים ומזלות *the Servitors of the Stars and Planets.* Touching the Angelical Adminiſtration of Things, the Number and Offices of Angels (which they call *Animalia Sanctitatis, the Animals of Sanctity*) they have prodigious Conceits. (i) To the parts and things of Nature they have aſſign'd Preſident Angels; as *Nekid* is the Preſident Tutelar Angel of Bread and Food; *Aſariel* is the Preſident Angel of the Waters, (that they overflow not their Bounds and cover the

---

(s) *Ita vos præſſe ſingulis rebus ac partibus dicunt, ut tamen unus ſit Rector eximius.* Lib. 1. c. 3.

(t) Πολλοὶ θεοί, παῖδες Θεοῦ, συνάρχοντες Θεῷ. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 1.

(u) Ἄρχοντας τινὰς ὑπάρχους τῷ πάντων πατέρος. *Ap.* Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 30.

(w) Clem. *Recogn. l.* 5. *n.* 19.

(x) *Ap.* Eugub. *de per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 20.

(y) Lipſ. *Phyſ. l.* 1. *Diſſ.* 18, 19. Plutarch. *adv.* Stoic. *p.* 1075.

(z) *Com. in Perſ. p.* 291. Gat. *in* Ant. *p.* 95.

(a) Τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἔμψυχον ἅμα καὶ δαιμόνων πλῆρες. Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 2.

(b) Πάντα θεῶν πλήρη. *De Animal. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(c) Saturn. *l.* 1. *c.* 23.

(d) Ἀλλὰ γένους θειοτέρου καὶ ἀμείνονος δαίμονας.

(e) Eugub. *ſupr. c.* 23.

(f) *V.* Orig. *c.* Celſ. *l.* 8. *p.* 385, 393, 400.

(g) Arnob. *adv. Gent. l.* 3. *p.* 114. *l.* 4. *p.* 133.

(h) Jacchi. ad. *in* Dan. *p.* 207, 208. *cum Annot.*

(i) Vorſt. *in* Maimon. *de fund. Leg. p.* 16, 17. Reuchlin. *de Art. Cab. fol.* 17. Buxt. *Lex. Talm. de his Angel. nominibus.*

Earth;) *Gabriel* is the Preſident of *Fire*, who is alſo to take care of Fruits, that they be brought to maturity; another is the Preſident of *Hail*, another of *Winds*, or as one of their Doctors ſaith, *four Angels were created, which preſide over the four Winds Day and Night*. They have alſo aſſign'd (*k*) ſeven Preſident Angels to the ſeven Days of the Week, and twelve Preſident Angels to the twelve Months in the Year, and four Preſident Angels (with their Auxiliaries) to the four Quarters of the Year. *The* Jewiſh *Aſtrologians ſavouring of Gentiliſm* (as Mr. *Mede* (*l*) diſcourſeth) *make the ſeven Archangels the Prefects of the ſeven Planets, which they ſeem to have learned in part from the Greek Philoſophy.* (*m*) *Having imbib'd* Platonic *Opinions, they ſuppos'd Angels the Governours of the World. A. Ezra* ſaith, (*n*) *that it appear'd by Experiments, that every Nation and every City (except the People of* Iſrael) *hath its particular Planet to which it is ſubject. Alſo with alluſion to the Government of the Nations by Angels in Stars and Conſtellations, and not by immediate Providence, the* Jews *in their Liturgy give to God the Name of the King of Kings; that is, the King of thoſe Angelical Powers, who rule over the Potentates of the Earth.* (*o*) They are of Opinion, that the number of Nations and Languages upon Earth is 70, that the 70 Nations have 70 tutelar prefect Angels, and that the diviſion of Languages was made by thoſe 70 Angels, as *Jonathan* ſaith in his Paraphraſe, *Gen.* 11. 7, 8. This Opinion of theirs is viſible in the *Septuagint's* Tranſlation of *Deut.* 32. 8. *When the moſt High divided the Nations, when he ſeparated the Sons of* Adam, *he ſet the Bounds of the People* [κατ᾽ ἀριθμὸν Ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ] *according to the Number* [not of the Children of *Iſrael*, as the Hebrew hath it, but according to the Number] *of the Angels of God*, which are 70, (as they ſay) and whom they call the *Sanedrim above*. This Opinion (*p*) *Siracides* may ſeem to favour, *Eccluſ.* 17. 17. *In the diviſion of the Nations of the whole Earth he ſet a Ruler over every People, but* Iſrael *is the Lord's Portion.* But the wiſeſt Expoſitors (*q*) do not ſuppoſe, that the Son of *Sirach* ſpeaketh of an *Angel-Ruler*, but of a *Man-Ruler* ſet over every People, whereas the Government of the *Jews* was a *Theocracy*. And becauſe there is nothing in the Scripture-Theology that favoureth this Conceit of the *Septuagint* touching 70 Prefect Angels, it is reaſonable to think, (*r*) that *the Number of the Angels of God* was ſubſtituted in that Tranſlation inſtead of *the Number of the Children of* Iſrael, out of deſign to gratifie the *Egyptians*, and in compliance with a Conceit of theirs reported by *Horus Apollo*, (that of ancient times the Regions of the Earth inhabited were 72:) And conſequently the *Jews* Opinion touching 70 Nations with their 70 Prefect Angels is originally a Paganical Conceit. And it is the more groſly Paganical, becauſe it implyeth, that the Tutelar Deities of the Pagans were *Holy Angels*; and probably they were thought ſuch by that famous pair of Philoſophic Paganizing *Jews*, *Joſephus* and *Philo*. (*s*) for *Joſephus* in his account of the *Moſaic* Laws reckoneth this for one (*Romanis haud dubie blandiens*, ſaith *Grotius*) βλασφημείτω δὲ μηδεὶς θεοὺς οὓς πόλεις ἄλλαι νομίζουσι θεούς, *Let none blaſpheme the Gods, which other Cities account Gods.* And *Philo* ſaith, that *Moſes* forbiddeth the reviling the Gods, οὓς ἕτεροι νομίζουσι θεοὺς εἶναι, *that others ſuppoſe to be Gods*, which groſs Miſrepreſentation of the Senſe of *Moſes* ſpeaketh too great a kindneſs for the *Gentiles* Demonolatry, that had its riſe from the ſuppoſed (Subordinate) *Magiſtracy*, *Rectorſhip*, *Guardianſhip* and *Curatorſhip* of their Genii in the Polity and Government of this World. For ſo (*t*) *Celſus* compareth them to the *Satrapæ*, *Preſidents*, *Commanders* and *Procurators* of the *Perſian* or *Roman* Emperour; ſtileth them *the Aerial and Terreſtrial Satrapæ*; and thence inferreth, that they have power to hurt, if contumeliouſly treated, and that we ought to pray to them, that they may be favourable to us. On this account the Pagan Religioniſts religiouſly worſhipp'd their ſeveral *proper Guardian Demons*, that they might be favourable and beneficent Patrons to them; (*u*) for *according to the propriety of their Nature* (ſaith *Proclus*) *they are every one of them beneficent Patrons to their Clients in order to a bleſſed Life.*

VI. The Ancient Theologers of the Chriſtian Church, our Modern Schoolmen, and ſome Philoſophic Writers unhappily ſymbolize with the Pagan Theologers in their extravagant Conceits touching the Polity and Government of the Univerſe; they transform the holy Angels into Pagan Gods and Demons, and ſet up a Pagan-like Mundane Polity. (*w*) *For the Generation, Adminiſtration and Safeguard of things, God himſelf in this Mundane Republick hath ſet Prefect Angels* (ſaith *Bodinus*) *over all things Celeſtial, Elementary, Animals, Plants, Minerals, Cities, Provinces, Families, and every particular Man.* Which Paganical Conceit of Prefect Tutelar Angels over their ſeveral Prefectures, Provinces and Guardianſhips by way of a Subordinate Mundane Rectorſhip and Magiſtracy, manifeſtly transformeth the Univerſe into a Pagan-like Republick, and the holy Angels into Pagan Gods and Demons. But thus our Modern Schoolmen ſuppoſe an Angelical Prefecture and Superintendency, not only over us Men and our Affairs, but over the ſeveral Species of Things, over Animals, Fruits, Winds (and ſuch more) over all the parts and things of Sublunary Nature (which they diſpence;) for theſe Maxims they have receiv'd from S. *Auſtin* and *Gregor. M.* (*x*) *every viſible thing in this World* (the Species of things) *hath an Angelical Preſident. Nothing in this viſible World can be diſpos'd of*, (or adminiſtred) *but by an inviſible Creature.* So far *Origen* and *Celſus* agree; for the one of them inſiſting, that we have our Bread and Fruit, Wine, Water and Air from ſome of the Demons, to whom the care of them is committed by way of Diſtribution; the other granteth, that we have none of theſe goods of Life, (*y*) χωρὶς προστασίας ἀοράτων, *without the preſidency of ſome inviſible Powers*; but *Celſus* diſputeth, that Mankind hath all theſe Goods, χαριζομένων δαιμόνων, *as good turns of the Demons*, that adminiſter Nature, and to whom the diſpenſing them is committed: *Origen* on the contrary aſſerteth, that the care of theſe things is not committed to thoſe Demonial Superintendents, but θείοις ἀγγέλοις, *to Divine Angels*, which he oppoſeth to the Demons of the Pagan Theology. So we have ſeen before, that *Gr. Nyſſen*

(k) Seld. *de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 4. *c.* 7.

(l) *On* Zech. 4. 10.

(m) *Hebræi Platonicis imbuti opinionibus Angelos mundi gubernatores eſſe putabant.* Pareus *in* Heb. 2. 5.

(n) Dr. Teniſon *of Idol.* p. 106.

(o) *Ibid. p.* 105. Bochart. *phaleg. l.* 1. *c.* 15.

(p) Dr. Gell *Ser. on* Deut. 32. 8, 9. *p.* 10.

(q) Grot. Druſ. *aliique.*

(r) Gale *Not. in* Jambl. *p.* 279.

(s) Selden. *ubi ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 13. Grot. *de J. B. ac P. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

(t) Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 8. *p.* 400, 393.

(u) *Secundum eorum ſubſtantiam ſinguli clientibus ſuis ad beatam vitam patrocinantur.* Procl. de An. & Dæm. p. 210.

(w) *In hac republica mundana Deus ipſe ad rerum generationem, procurationem ac tutelam, Angelos locis omnibus cœleſtibus, elementaribus, animantibus, ſtirpibus, foſſilibus, civitatibus, provinciis, familiis, ſingulis hominibus, principes ac moderatores collocavit.* Bodin. *Natur. Theatr. ſub fin.*

(x) *Unamquamque rem viſibilem in hoc mundo habere angelicam poteſtatem ſibi præpoſitam. In hoc mundo viſibili nihil niſi per creaturam inviſibilem diſponi poteſt.* Aquin. 1. *par. Qu.* 110. *Art.* 1. *Viv. in* S. Aug. *de C. D. l.* 12. *c.* 24. Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 7. *c.* 7.

(y) Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 8. *p.* 398, *&c.*

and *Jo. Damaſcen.* ſuppoſe, that *when the World was created, the ſeveral Parts of it were committed to ſeveral Orders of Angels* (which ſpeaketh their Pagan-like ſubordinate Magiſtracy in the Polity of the Univerſe, and that the Univerſe was divided into various Angelical Cures and Prefectures, as the Pagan Theologers ſuppoſe;) *and that he who is now the Devil was the Prefect of the Terrene Order, having together with his Angels the Preſidency over the Earth, and the Adminiſtration of Terrene Things. Gr. Nyſſen* calleth him *a certain Power conſtituted to keep in conſiſtence and to govern the Circumterraneous Place.* So *Lactantius* (who was certainly of the ſame Opinion with *Gr. Nyſſen*) ſtileth the Devil, (z) *That Dominator of the Earth, to whom God from the beginning had given the power of the Earth.* So *J. Mart.* repreſenteth the Polity of the World in its original Conſtitution by God; (a) *He deliver'd the governing Providence of Men and of the things that are under Heaven unto Angels, which he ſet over theſe things.* (b) *Athenagoras* and (c) *Methodius* diſcourſe, *that God created Angels,* ἐπὶ προνοίᾳ, *for a governing Providence of the things which he had made; that his Providence is general, the governing Providence of the whole Univerſe of things,* τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους, οἱ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ταχθέντες ἄγγελοι, *but particular Providence, or the Providence over particular things, this the Angels which are ſet over them exerciſe* (therefore Satan and his Angels were originally κοσμοκράτορες, *the Rulers of this World,* as theſe Authors ſuppoſe;) *the Ruler and Preſident of the Matter and of the Forms that are in it became wicked in his Adminiſtration, and other Angels fell by falling in love with Women.* With reſpect to which Opinion (that the Devils in their original ſtate were *uti minores Dii & Mundo regendo præfecti, as minor Gods and Prefects for governing the World,* as *Eugubinus* (d) expreſſeth this Opinion) *Anaſtaſius Sinaita* from a certain Doctor ſaith, (e) *That when this viſible World was made, the Devil thought, that God deſign'd to conſtitute him* βασιλέα καὶ κύριον τῆς ὁρατῆς κτίσεως, *King and Lord of the viſible Creation.*

But this Original Rule and Domination of Satan over this lower World is too extravagant a Conceit, to be univerſally entertain'd by the Ancient Fathers: It hath not gain'd ſuch a general reception as the *Septuagint*'s Conceit, *Deut.* 32. 8. *When the moſt High divided the Nations, when he ſeparated the Sons of* Adam *he ſet the Bounds of the People according to the Number of the Angels of God.* Taking this groundleſs Conceit for their ground, the Fathers affirm, (f) that as particular Perſons, ſo the ſeveral Nations have their Angel-Patron or Curator (their ἄρχων, Prince or Ruler;) but the Tutelar Angels of Nations are Archangels, as ſome ſuppoſe; and ſome ſay, that the Hebrew Nation had the Son of God for their Prefect. Cities alſo as well as Nations are certain Angelical Prefectures, as *Clemens* expreſſeth the Senſe of the Ancients; *There is a Diſtribution of the Prefectures of Angels by Nations and Cities.* S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, (g) *God hath ſet Angels according to the Climes of the World, one adminiſtring each one, as* Moſes *ſaith, one of every Nation, and he hath ſet them, to keep within due Bounds the inanimate Creation, the Sun, and Moon, and Sea, and Earth, and the things that are in them, that they may ſerve the uſe of Man.* This ſuppoſed Prefecture of Angels over Cities, Nations, and the Parts of the World muſt be call'd *their Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtracy,* as ſeveral of the Ancient Theologers repreſent it; (h) for S. *Hierom* ſaith, *Provinces for them to govern were committed to the Angels, as to Judges by the Emperour. God from the beginning* (ſaith *Ruffinus*) *when he had made the World, conſtituted certain Powers of the Heavenly Virtues the Prefects of it, to govern Mankind and diſpenſe their Affairs. Euſebius* ſaith, *That Mankind upon Earth might not be like the Irrational Animals without any Rulers and Governours ſet over them, therefore the God of all conſtituted the Divine Angels their Prefects and Curators, as certain Herdſmen and Paſtors.* This mode of Theologizing is viſibly an Imitation of *Plato*; in imitation of *Philo* the ſame Author ſuppoſeth, *that God conſtituted his only begotten and firſt begotten Logos, the Prefect of all theſe Prefect Angels and of the whole Univerſe, and that the Nation of the* Hebrews *was aſſign'd to him for his peculiar Lot or Prefecture*; which is alſo the Senſe of *Origen*, of whom we muſt add, (i) that (as the *Jews*) he ſuppoſeth, that ſeveral Angels were the Authors of ſeveral Languages to their ſeveral Provinces. *Theodoret* is of Opinion, that the *Dominions, Principalities and Powers* (ſo call'd in Scripture) are this ſort of Prefect Angels, to which the Nations are ſubjected; and a Book that beareth his Name, ſaith of *Plato*, (k) *He called thoſe Beings Gods and Demons which we call Angels.* If the holy Angels of our Theology are the ſame with the Gods and Demons of the *Platonic* Theology, there is great reaſon, that the Pagans ſhould argue againſt the Chriſtians in this manner; (l) *You affirm, that there are certain inviſible Powers, which you call Angels and Archangels, Principalities and Powers, Dominions and Thrones, and certain others alſo called in Hebrew Cherubim and Seraphim; why then are you angry at us, who after Him that always is, and is unchangeable, ſuppoſe and venerate certain Gods, that are ſecondary and very much inferiour to him?* To this ſtrenuous Argumentation of the Pagans *Theodoret* maketh anſwer; *That we do not call them Gods* (as if we did not call them Elohim;) *we do not diſtribute the Divine Worſhip unto God who is truly ſuch, and unto theſe* (but the contrary appeareth from (m) this Author's account of the Honours done to the Martyrs in his time;) *we ſay, that they are more honourable than Men, but our Fellow-Servants*; (ſo the Gods and Demons are ſaid by *Plato*, (n) to be the Miniſters of the Supream God;) *we do not divide the Incorporeal Nature into Maſculine and Feminine*; as if the Saint-Worſhippers of the Chriſtian Church had not their *He and She Saints.* It is much for the Credit of the Pagans Religion, that their Gods and Demons ſhould be thought the ſame with the Holy Angels of our Theology; therefore they plead for themſelves, (o) *We do not worſhip evil Demons. Angels which you call ſo, thoſe we alſo worſhip, the Virtues of the great God, and the Miniſteries of the great God.*

The confounding therefore the Holy Angels with *Plato*'s *Gods and Demons* is a groſs ſymbolizing with the Senſe of the Pagans in contradiction to the Chriſtian Religion. And it ſheweth, at what a rate the Humour of Philoſophic Paganizing the matters of Theology invaded the Chriſtian Church in ancient times; the Fa-

(z) *Dominator ille terræ, cui ab initio terræ dederat poteſtatem Deus.* l. 2 c. 15.

(a) Τὴν μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν ἀγγέλοις, οὓς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔταξε, παρέδωκεν. *Apol.* 1. *p.* 44. & *v. Ep. ad Diognet. p.* 498.

(b) Apol. *p.* 27.

(c) *Ap.* Phot. *cod.* 22.

(d) De per. *Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 38.

(e) Petav. *T.*3. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.*10.

(f) Petav. *ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(g) Ἔστησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλους κατὰ τὰ κλίματα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕνα ἕκαστον ἐπιτροπεύειν, ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς λέγει, ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἔθνους· ἔστησε δὲ, ἵνα τὴν ἄψυχον κτίσιν χαλινώσωσιν, ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην, καὶ θάλασσαν καὶ γῆν, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὑπηρετεῖν τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπολαύσει. *Ap.* Phot. *cod.* 277.

(h) Petav. *ubi ſupr.*

(i) Spencer. *Not.in* Orig.*p.*19, 20, 89.

(k) Θεραπ. *Ser.* 4. *p.* 61.

(l) *Ibid.* Ser. 3. *p.* 52.

(m) *Ibid.* *Ser.* 8.

(n) *Ibid.* *Ser.* 4. *p.* 62.

(o) *Non colimus mala dæmonia: Angelos quos dicitis, ipſos & nos colimus, virtutes Dei magni & miniſteria Dei magni.* S. *Aug. in* Pſal. 96.

thers as by a general conſent) aſcribing to the holy Angels a Pagan-like mundane Magiſtracy, and making them of the ſame condition with the Platoniſts *in-mundane Gods*, (*p*) *that fill this ſenſible World*, κατὰ μέρη διειλόμενοι τὸ πᾶν, *ſharing it amongſt them and having their Diſtricts or Prefectures in it.* So *Tertullian* ſuppoſeth, (*q*) *That an Angelical Power adminiſtreth the Conception and Formation of Man in the Womb*, agreeably to the Pagans, (*r*) who ſuppos'd the Genius of every Man, to be his Generation-Curator, which rude Paganical Conceit (neither agreeable to Philoſophy, nor ſound Theology) is of the ſame Authority with the other Sayings of the Fathers touching every Mans Guardian-Angel, and the Pagan-like mundane Magiſtracy of the holy Angels, nor can we reaſonably ſuppoſe, that an Opinion of theirs touching *the mundane Magiſtracy of the holy Angels* grounded upon a Miſtake in the Septuagints Tranſlation is of any greater Authority than that other Opinion of theirs *touching the Fall of Angels by falling in Love with Women*, which was grounded upon a miſtaken Tranſlation and Interpretation of that place in Scripture, *Gen.* 6. 2. *The Sons of God ſaw the Daughters of Men.*

VII. The Sayings of the Fathers touching the Guardianſhip and mundane Magiſtracy of Angels being of no Authority, the only Authority that we can ſafely rely upon, and which alone can afford us certain notices of the Holy Angels, is that of the Holy Scriptures, which deſcribe ſome of the Holy Angels as a ſort of *Supernal Potentates and Providential Superintendents*, but not *as ſublunary Prefects of various Faculties and Offices reſiding upon and appropriate to their ſeveral Cures and Prefectures.* The Jews ſay (*s*) *That God doth not any thing, without having before conſulted about it* בפמליא של מעלה *with the Family above: Wherever it is ſaid in Scripture, Et Dominus* (*And the Lord,*) *there we are to underſtand himſelf* ובית דינו *and his Houſe of Judgment or Sanhedrin above.* In favour of theſe Maxims they alledge, *Dan.* 4. 17. *This matter* (the Judgment upon *Nebuchadnezzar*) *is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand* (or ordinance) *by the word of the holy ones.* The holy Angels have the name of *the Watchers*, as Expoſitors ſuppoſe, from their vigilant Nature, which is igneous and ethereous, not obnoxious to drowſineſs and ſleep (they are not clogg'd with dull Fleſh, as we Mortals are;) as an ancient Writer of the Church defining an Angel ſtileth him a reaſonable Creature, but ἄϋπνον, *one that liveth without ſleep.* They are alſo the holy kind of *Watchers* (Watchers as to matters of Piety and Sanctity,) to which *Clemens* ſeemeth to have reſpect, when he injoineth us, (*t*) *oft to riſe out of our Bed in the Night-time, to praiſe God, aſſimilating our ſelves to the Angels*, (who attend to the matters of Piety without ſleep) οὓς ἐγρηγόρους καλοῦμεν, *whom we call the Watchers.* But in a Prophecy touching future Events (doubtleſs) the name of *Watchers* is principally deſign'd to ſignifie that the Angelical Powers are the *Providential kind of Watchers*, that watch over and ſuperintend Human Affairs, and are *certain Eyes of inſpection and ſuperintendence over them* (as will appear preſently,) which is an Office and Miniſtry that they perform to Gods governing Providence. Touching theſe *Providential ſuperintendents* the Angel (which reveal'd to *Nebuchadnezzar* his Dream) ſaith; *This matter is by the decree of the Watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy Ones*, which is a mode of expreſſing God's decree. But the Phraſeology of the Angel hath ſeduc'd Expoſitors (both Jewiſh and Chriſtian) into multitudes of vain Imaginations; *That the Buſineſs of* Nebuchadnezzar's *Judgment was determin'd by the Sentence and Decree of the holy Angels after ſome deliberation about it; that God is here repreſented as acting by the Counſel of the Senate; that the Angels are adjoyn'd to God as his Counſellors, and are ſaid to Decree together with God, and that they ſubſcribe to his Judgment; that they Decree by God's Preſcript, and that the Decree of God is called theirs, becauſe they approve what God judgeth and decreeth; that the Preſident-angels of the* Babylonian *Monarchy decreed the matter at the Petition of the tutelar Angels of the ſeveral Provinces, who complain'd of* Nebuchadnezzar's *Tyranny; that the greater Angels made this Decree at the Requeſt of the inferior Angels.* Others to avoid theſe Abſurdities, ſuppoſe, That *the Decree of the Watchers ſignifieth not a Decree which they made, but which was made to them*; and others ſuppoſe; *That the Watchers here are the three Perſons of the Trinity.* But there is no neceſſity of excogitating ſuch Subterfuges; the Text will be clearly enough intelligible, if we conſider, that when the Angel ſaith, *This matter is by the Decree of the Watchers, and the demand by the Word of the holy Ones*, his intention is to ſay, *This matter is by more than Human appointment, it is by nothing leſs than the Decree of the moſt High.* For thus the Prophet (in his Interpretation of the Dream) interpreteth the Angels ſaying, *v.* 24. *This is the Decree of the moſt High, which is come upon my Lord the King.* Therefore the Angels Saying is a mode of expreſſing *the Decree of the moſt High.* If we ſay in the ſingular number, *This matter is by the Decree of a Watcher, and by the Word of an Holy One* (as it is in the 13. Verſe of this Chapter, where *a Watcher and an holy One cometh down from Heaven, and crieth, hew down the Tree,*) in ſo ſaying we affirm, *That this matter is by much more than Human appointment* (for it is by the Decree of a Watcher.) *It is by nothing leſs than Gods Decree and Word*; for *the Decree of a Watcher and Word of an Holy One* is not his own Decree and Word, but God's whoſe Agent he is. Such is the Senſe of the Angel ſpeaking in the Plural Number; therefore in this illuſtrious Scripture there is no foundation for that Judaical Notion of God's conſulting with his *Sanhedrin above*: But here is a clear expreſs Teſtimony for the *Providential Superintendence* of the Holy Angels. So the *elect Angels* are conſider'd by the Apoſtle as the Spectators of our Actions, and as one ſupernal providential ſuperintendence (or ſuperintending Party) with God and Chriſt. 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jeſus and the elect Angels.* And agreeably to the name of *Vigils* in *Daniel* we read (in the Divine *Apocalyptic* Viſions) *of ſeven Lamps of fire burning before the Throne of God, which are the ſeven Spirits of God; of ſeven Angels which are and ſtand before the Throne; of the ſeven Horns and ſeven Eyes of the Lamb, which are the ſeven Spirits of God ſent forth into all the Earth.* So in the Prophet *Zechariah* as Interpreters (*u*) have obſerv'd and diſcours'd) ſeven Angels are repreſented by the Candleſtick of *ſeven Lamps*, which burn'd continually in the Temple; and thoſe ſeven Angels (becauſe appointed to exerciſe both in Heaven and in this World an Inſpection and Superintendence over us and our Affairs) are ſtiled *the ſeven Eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro*

Apoc. 1. 4. 4. 5. 5. 6. 8. 2.

(p) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 6. *c.* 15.

(q) *De Anim. c.* 37.

(r) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 119.

(s) *Maimon. mor. Nev. P.* 2. *c.* 6. *v. Hotting. de Creat. p.* 253, 254.

(t) *Pædag. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

(u) *Mr.* Mede *on* Zech. 4. 10.

fro through the whole Earth. The Scripture therefore deſcribeth the Court of Heaven conformably to the *Perſian* Court, where there were *ſeven Princes, who ſaw the Kings face and ſate firſt in the Kingdom,* (to be Officers of the Preſence, ſuch as ſee the King's face, denoteth the principal Perſons at Court, *Jer.* 52. 25.) who are ſometimes ſtiled *the King's ſeven Councellors.* And becauſe theſe ſeven Angels in the Court of Heaven are plainly Analogical to the ſeven Princes in the *Perſian* Court, becauſe we read of *Angelical chief Princes,* Dan. 10. 13. Therefore ſome of the holy Angels are conſider'd by the Prophets as (w) αἱ ἄνω δυνάμεις, *a ſort of ſupernal Potentates* agreeably to the ſtile of the New Teſtament.

For in the New Teſtament ſome of the holy Angels are uſually intituled *Authorities, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers,* 1 Pet. 3. 22. Eph 1. 21. Col. 1. 16. S. *Paul* therefore ſuppoſeth, that there are *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities* and *Powers* in the Univerſe; contemplating theſe Sublimities and Chriſt as their Head he affirmeth of them, *Col.* 1. 16. that *whether they be Thrones,* or *Dominions,* or *Principalities* and *Powers, all things were created by him.* Where it is manifeſt, that the Apoſtle maketh ſome diſtinction between *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers:* But the difference which he maketh between them is no greater, than this; he conſidereth them *as the ſeveral* (general *Names and Notions of the moſt eminent* (created) *Sublimities or Potentates in the Univerſe.* For his intention is to ſay, *That all things were created by Chriſt, Viſible and Inviſible,* without exception of any the moſt eminent (created) Sublimities, whether they be *Thrones* (of ſuch Celſitude and Eminence,) or *Dominions* (of ſuch height of Dignity,) or *Principalities* or *Powers* (of ſuch Eminence and Sublimity,) all which are *Potentates of the higheſt Rank conſider'd under thoſe ſeveral Names and Notions.* Thrones are the higheſt Rank of Potentates according to the beſt Expoſitors, and as will appear to any that underſtand the Word (therefore all thoſe imaginary Orders of Angels which ſeveral ancient Writers ſuppoſe to be above *Thrones,* are Figments and *Chimæra's*;) the word κυριότητες, *Dominions* ſignifieth thoſe that are in the higheſt Honours, *Jude* 8. (x) in the ſame ſignification the word occurreth, *Eph.* 1. 21. and the Sublimity of that Honorary Name may be further underſtood from that Divine Attribute, 1 *Tim.* 6. 15. *Rex Regum & Dominus Dominorum vel Dominantium*; where the Apoſtle manifeſtly conſidereth *Dominions* as the higheſt Rank of created Potentates. Thoſe other great Names of *Principalities* and *Powers* in the ſtile of S. *Paul* uſually and undeniably ſignifie the higheſt Rank of (created) Potentates. *Tit.* 3. 1. *Rom.* 8. 38. *Eph.* 1. 21. *Col.* 2. 10. *Eph.* 3. 10. So the higheſt Rank of Potentates in Satan's Kingdom are called by the Name of *Principalities and Powers.* Eph. 6. 12. Col. 2. 15. From which account of the uſe of the words in S *Paul*'s Epiſtles we may ſafely infer, that he meaneth by *Thrones* the moſt eminent (created) Sublimities conſider'd under that Name and Notion; *Dominions* are the moſt eminent (created) Sublimities conſider'd under that Name and Notion, and the ſame account muſt be given of *Principalities* and *Powers.* Wherefore it is a great miſtake (y) in ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church (as alſo in Modern Interpreters,) to ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtle maketh a diſtribution of the holy Angels into four Subordinate Ranks, Orders and Claſſes, which are ſignified by four Names; that the firſt and higheſt Rank or Claſſis is that of *Thrones*; the next *Dominions,* the third *Principalities,* the laſt and loweſt *Powers.* Such an Interpretation quite recedeth from St. *Paul*'s uſe of the words, is not at all agreeable to the Apoſtles ſtile, his raiſed Devotional way of expreſſing Chriſt's Tranſcendency in other places (as *Eph.* 1. 21. he ſetteth him *far above all Principality and Power, and Might and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but alſo in that which is to come,*) which are not to be underſtood as diſtributions of Human or Angelical Authorities into ſeveral higher and lower Degrees and Claſſes: But the Apoſtle ſpeaketh by way of *Expolition* ἐπιμονὴ and *Amplification.* Nor hath he any occaſion, to deſcend to a diſtinction of Humane or Angelical Authorities into ſeveral Ranks and Degrees; a general conſideration of (*Thrones, Dominions, Principalities* and *Powers,*) whatever is high and eminent in Polity is ſufficient for his purpoſe, which is to ſet forth Chriſt's Tranſcendency. Had the Apoſtle made a diſtribution of Human or Angelical Authority into ſeveral ſubordinate Ranks and Degrees, he muſt have noted thoſe Subordinate Ranks and Degrees by proper diſtinctive Names: But will any Maſters of Language, any that underſtand Policy and Government, any that underſtand Nobility-learning or Titles of Honor, allow, that *Dominions, Principalities and Powers* are the proper diſtinctive Names of ſeveral ſubordinate Ranks of Authority? Do *Thrones* and *Dominions, Principalities* and *Powers* look like a diſtribution, the parts whereof muſt not be Coincident? Whereas *Thrones* are *Dominions, Principalities and Powers, Dominions, Principalities and Powers* are *Thrones.* (z) *How thoſe four Names wherein the Apoſtle ſeemeth to have compriſed the whole celeſtial Society, are differenc'd from one another, let them ſay that can, if they can prove what they ſay; I confeſs my ſelf ignorant of thoſe things,* ſaith S. *Auſtin.* He miſtaketh in ſuppoſing, that the whole Celeſtial Society is compris'd under theſe Honorary Names; the Conſequence whereof is a Suppoſition, that theſe Honorary Names denote certain ſubordinate Ranks and Claſſes of Angels, which is another Miſtake: But I do not therefore deny a Subordination of Dignity and Order amongſt them. We read of the heavenly Hoſts moving under their Leaders (as *Apoc.* 12. 7. *Michael and his Angels,*) and we have ſeen, that the Scriptures mention ſeven Archangels, according to the Senſe of the Jews and that of *Clemens,* (a) *There are ſeven of the greateſt Power, the Primogenit Princes of Angels.* Theſe are *ſupernal Potentates* in the Polity of Angels, but there is no appearance, that they are Magiſtrates of our Mundane Polity.

VIII. *In the holy Scriptures the holy Angels are repreſented as the occaſional Miſſionary Miniſters of God's governing Providence, and the Works thereof are repreſented as done by their Miniſtery* according to that of *Theodoret*; the Works of the holy Angels (b) *is lauding the Creator, and alſo their ſubſervient Miniſteries to the Divine Will, being ſent by the God of all.* This their Miniſtry is viſible

---

Eſther 1. 14.
Ezra 7. 14.

(w) S. Chryſoſt. *in Col.* 1.

(x) *Vid.* Grot. *Not. in Jude* 8.

(y) *V.* Gale. *Not. in* Jambl. *p.* 206, 207. Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c* 1.

(z) *Quid inter ſe diſtant quatuor illa vocabula, quibus univerſam ipſam cæleſtem ſocietatem videtur Apoſtolus eſſe complexus, dicant qui poſſunt, ſi tamen poſſunt probare quod dicunt; ego me iſta ignorare fateor.*

(a) Ἑπτὰ μέν εἰσιν οἱ τὴν μεγίστην δύναμιν ἔχοντες, πρωτόγονοι ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες. Srom. *l.* 6. *p. m.* 493.

(b) Θεραπ. *Ser.* 3. *p.* 52.

ble in their Name (for thoſe immortal glorious Spirits have their Name, becauſe they are Meſſengers,) and there are innumerable Teſtimonies and Inſtances in Scripture, which ſhew that they are imployed in God's appearances, in making Revelations and bringing Meſſages to Mankind, in guiding, ſuccouring and defending the Juſt, in oppoſing the Enemies of the Church and the Malice of evil Spirits, in diſpenſing Benefits and executing Judgments upon the World, and at the end of the World they are the reapers. (*c*)*It is acknowledg'd by all Divines, that the Works of Divine Providence and Gubernation are done by the adminiſtration of Angels.* But this their Miniſtry is far remote from a Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtracy of the holy Angels, nor doth it infer an Angel-Guardian in the Senſe of the Ancients, nor have theſe Conceits of the Ancients any foundation in holy Scripture, as will appear from a diſtinct view of all the places alledg'd on behalf of them.

(c) Joſ. Med.Com. Apocalyp. ad. c. 8. *v.* 6. *per miniſtros more potentiſſimi regis omnia facit*. Bonavent.

The Septuagints Tranſlation of *Deut.* 32. 8. which hath given credit to the Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtracy of holy Angels, is really a diſcredit to that Paganical Conceit; for whereas in the Hebrew the Senſe is clear and eaſily intelligible (that the moſt High in ſharing the Earth amongſt the Nations, allotted ſo much Ground to the *Canaanites*, as might ſuffice for a commodious Habitation to the Children of *Iſrael*, who were to ſucceed in their room) no tolerable Senſe can be made of the Septuagints Tranſlation. (*d*) For what do they mean, when they ſay, *that the moſt High ſet the Bounds of the People according to the number of the Angels of God?* Are there no more Angels than People, Regions or Provinces? Or is it only certain principal People whom they mean, that certain principal Angels are their Curators? Or do they ſuppoſe, that ſeveral Troops of Angels preſide over ſeveral People, and that there is a Partition of Angels into Troops according to the number of the People? This ſort of Theology is viſibly a piece of Phantaſtry; and ſuch is alſo that unaccountable Conceit, (*e*) which ſome of the ancient Writers have entertain'd, *that the Preſident-Angels of Nations were deſign'd to induce them to the Knowledge and Worſhip of the true God as much as in them lay.* Agreeably whereunto (*f*) the proper Guardian-Angels of particular Perſons are ſtiled by the Fathers, *παιδαγωγοί, παιδονόμοι, τῶν ἀνθρώπων διδάσκαλοι, Paſtores, Paſtors, Pædagogues, Inſtitutors of Children, Preceptors of Men.* (*Origen* ſuppoſeth, that theſe Guardian Angels are accountable for their Charge, that they are puniſhed, if thoſe that are committed to their Care miſcarry, fall into Sin and Ruin:) So the Judaical Cabaliſts have a Conceit (*g*) that the Patriarchs of the eldeſt times had Angels for their Preceptors. *Adam* had *Raziel*, *Sem Jethiel*, *Abraham Zedechiel*, *Iſaac Raphael*, (to others they allot the like Preceptors,) and that every one of theſe Angels deliver'd by word of Mouth a Cabala to his Scholar. To recite ſuch extravagant Conceits as theſe touching the Paſtorſhip and Mundane Magiſtracy of holy Angels, is ſufficient to refute them; they palpably betray the Phantaſtry of their Authors.

(d) *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 9.

(e) *Ibid. S.* 4, 5, 7.

(f) *Ibid. c.* 6.

(g) Simon. *Hiſt. Crit. l.* 1. *c.* 7. Reuchlin *de Art. Cab. fol.* 10.

Nor is the Opinion of the Guardian Angel (a Branch of the mundane Magiſtracy of Angels) of a better Character; there is no Footſtep of it, to be found in the Bible, not in that known place *Act.* 12. 15. where the Chriſtians at *Jeruſalem* ſay of *Peter* knocking at the Gate, *It is his Angel.* (*h*) Some good Expoſitors render the words *not his Angel*, but his *Meſſenger* (becauſe they cannot ſuppoſe the Faithful ſo ignorant, as to think that an Angel would not come in without knocking, or having the Doors open'd,) or one that came from him and made uſe of his Name. Others conceive, that it is S. *Peter's* Angel-Guardian (in the uſual Senſe) which the Chriſtians at *Jeruſalem* mean by his Angel; and this Interpretation hath ſomething to recommend it; for the Jews (as is before obſerv'd) in the latter times of their Commonwealth Philoſophic Paganiz'd in their Notices of things. If we ſuppoſe, that this was the Senſe of the Jews and Jewiſh Converts in the Apoſtle's time (which yet doth not appear,) they that Argue in this manner; The Opinion of the Guardian Angel in the uſual Notion is therefore the Senſe of Scripture, becauſe it was the Opinion of the Jews and the Jewiſh Converts, and the holy Pen-men have recorded it without the addition of any diſlike, are bound by their own Rule, to ſuppoſe the Præ-exiſtence of Human Souls to be the Senſe of Scripture, for this was the Opinion of the Jews and of Jewiſh Converts, and the holy Pen-men have recorded it without any diſlike, *Joh.* 9. 2. But whatever truth there may be in the Theory of *Præ-exiſtence*, it is manifeſt from the Story of S. *Peter's* deliverance out of Priſon by an Angel ſent to him, and which departed from him, *Act.* 12. 10, 11. that the Angel-Guardian in the uſual Notion is a meer Imagination. For what need was there, that an Angel ſhould be ſent to deliver St. *Peter* out of Priſon, or St. *Paul* from Shipwrack, or to ſtrengthen our Lord in his Agony, if an Angel-Guardian was their inſeparable Attendant? If the ſaying of the Chriſtians touching *Peter*, *It is his Angel*, be underſtood (not of ſome Miſſionary of his, but) of an Angel, yet there is no neceſſity of ſuppoſing the Angel-Guardian, becauſe their ſaying admitteth a commodious Senſe without it. For they thinking it incredible, that *Peter* ſhould be at the Gate (which the Damſel *Rhoda* confidently affirm'd,) ſuppos'd, that it was *an Angelical appearance in his ſtead and likeneſs* (that perſonated him,) which the Damſel miſtook for St. *Peter*; and this ſuppos'd Angelical appearance they ſtiled his Angel (as a judicious Commentator (*i*) expoundeth the place:) But that this ſuppos'd Angelical appearance was thought St. *Peter's* Angel-Guardian, or that Guardian-Angels were thought to appear in the likeneſs of the Perſon that was their Charge, of this there is no indication in the Text. Nor is there any Indication in our Saviour's Text, that his words, *Matth.* 18. 10. are meant of the Angel-Guardian. *Take heed, that ye deſpiſe not one of theſe little ones; for I ſay unto you, that in Heaven their Angels do always behold the face of my Father, which is in Heaven.* Our Saviour ſheweth, that the Sin and danger of deſpiſing his littles ones is not little; becauſe although they be little in the Eye of the World, yet really they are of great Quality, of ſuch precioſity, *that their Angels* (the Spirits that Miniſter unto them) *always behold the face of his Father in Heaven*, which ſpeaketh the height of Dignity. This Name *their Angels* doth not ſignifie here *their Guardian-Angels* in the uſual Notion (which the Church hath learned from the Pagans, but the Scripture hath no acquaintance with it) but it certainly ſignifieth in the Scrip-

(h) *Dr.* Hammond Iſidor. Clar.

(i) *Dr* Lightfoot.

ture-notion their λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, *the Spirits that Miniſter to them* (which is the Apoſtles Notion of Angels, *Heb.* 1. 13.) this place alſo ſpeaketh not of the inferiour Angels, but of *the Angels of Preſence*, ſuch as the Jews *Metatron* (whom they call שר הפנים *the Prince of Faces*, becauſe he ſtandeth before the Face of God ;) which Angels of Preſence are analogous to the *Proceres Regni*, who alone are priviledg'd to ſee the Kings face : But it cannot be thought that every one of the univerſality of pious Perſons hath one of theſe eminent Angels for his Attendant in the nature and quality of a Pagan-like Angel-Guardian ; therefore our Saviour ſpeaketh not of ſuch Guardian-Angels.

From the Patriarch *Jacob*'s Wiſh or Prayer, *Gen.* 48. 16. *The Angel which redeemed me from all Evil, bleſs the Lads.* S. *Baſil* proveth, that an Angel is preſent with every one of the Faithful, as a Pædagogue and Paſtor ordering and directing his Life. And to the ſame purpoſe, to prove the Guardian-Angel that of the Preacher is alledg'd, *Eccl.* 5. 6. *Neither ſay thou before the Angel, that it was an error: Wherefore ſhould God be angry at thy voice, and deſtroy the work of thine hands?* The Preſence of the holy Angels and their Inſpection of our Ways and Actions is indeed a great Conſideration in order to an holy Life. (It ſhould awe us into all manner of Piety in our Behaviour, and reſtrain us from doing any thing ſinful or unſeemly :) But I do not acknowledge, that the Angel which the Preacher ſpeaketh of, is either the Angel-Guardian, or any meer Angel or Creature, but *the Angel of his Name and Preſence*, whoſe Name is the Name of more than created Power and Authority. The difference between *the Angel of the Name of God* and a meer Angel is viſible in the *Iſraelites* Caſe, who before their Idolatry of the Calf had an Angel to conduct them, of whom God ſaith, *Exod.* 23. 21 *My Name is in him.* But after that Idolatry of theirs God threatneth, *Exod.* 33.2,3. *That he will ſend an Angel before them, but himſelf will not go up in the midſt of them.* As the Angel of *the Name of God*, ſo *the Angel of his Preſence* tranſcendeth a meer Angel ; for *Moſes* would not be ſatisfied with the Guardianſhip of a meer Angel, but petitioneth for the continuance of Gods Preſence, *Exod.* 33. 15. *The Angel of his Preſence*, Iſa. 63. 9. which is manifeſtly the ſame with *the Angel of Gods Name.* Such an Angel (becauſe God's Name is in him) is of more than Creature-power and Authority ; and therefore great Charge is given to the Iſraelites, to revere and obey him. *Exod.* 23. 21. In the preſence and appearance of ſuch an Angel God exhibiteth his preſence and an appearance of himſelf (for ſo holy People of Old ſometimes look'd upon the appearances of Angels as Gods appearances,) and a declaration of his Mind by the Angels Voice ; the Angel beareth the Name, ſuſtaineth the Perſon of God, carrieth it, ſpeaketh and is ſpoken to as God (as appeareth from many inſtances in the Old Teſtament.) becauſe in his preſence and appearance, the preſence and appearance of God is exhibited. And becauſe this Angel is not a meer Angel, but he is (or there is in him) a complication of God and the Angel, his Idea is this Total, *God as exhibiting himſelf by an Angel* ; therefore the Name of God is in him. For the ſame Reaſon God may be fitly ſtiled *the Angel* ; becauſe God as exhibiting his preſence and an appearance of himſelf by an Angel (that Total) is this Angel, and this Angel that Total. For this Reaſon this Name *the Angel* may fitly be one of the Names of God, and may ſignifie God (not ſimply, but) as exhibiting himſelf by an Angel. And if this mode of ſpeaking is congruous and unexceptionable, it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that ſome Inſtances of it may be found in ſome places of Scripture ; and ſuch are thoſe places which we have now under Conſideration. For the Angel mention'd by the Patriarch *Jacob*, Gen. 48. 16. and by the Preacher, *Eccl.* 5. 6. is (plainly enough) *the Angel of Gods Name, Preſence and Appearance* (the viſible Glory or Schekinah) uſual in ancient times. And becauſe this Angel is not the meer Angel, but God as exhibiting his preſence and an appearance of himſelf by an Angel (that Total is this Angel and this Angel is that Total) therefore this Name *the Angel* in theſe places ſignifieth God in the Senſe but now mention'd. And as that ſaying in *Daniel*, *This matter is by the Decree of the Watchers*, is a mode of expreſſing God's Decree : So (becauſe God uſually in the times of the Old Teſtament exhibited himſelf by an Angel) the Preacher uſeth this Phraſeology *before the Angel* inſtead of that other *before God*, as a mode of expreſſing Gods Inſpection. That this is the Preacher's Senſe appeareth from the Contexture of his words ; *Neither ſay thou before the Angel, that it was an error ; wherefore ſhould God be angry at thy voice?* The 70. alſo (*k*) render that which is in the Hebrew *before the Angel*, πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, *before the face or in the ſight of God* ; and *Gregory* in his Metaphraſe of the Book of *Eccleſiaſtes* thus rendreth the place. *We ought by all means to eſchew the flowing of any bad words from us*, ὡς ἀκουσαμένου θεοῦ, *becauſe God heareth.* Agreeably hereunto, when *Jehovah* or the *Lord* is ſaid to do any thing, the Arabic Verſion ſubſtituteth inſtead of it that other Phraſeology, and ſaith, *the Angel of the Lord did ſuch a thing.*

Some *Prophetic* parts of Holy Writ are alledg'd in favour of the Pagan-like mundane Magiſtracy of the holy Angels. In the Prophet *Zech.* 6. 1. there is a Quadripartition of the Angelical Hoſt (concern'd in the Affairs of the World) into four Chariots (as in ancient times their Hoſts conſiſted of Chariots,) as the Jews ſay in all their *Medraſhoth*, (*l*) *Quatuor ſunt exercitus vel caſtra Angelorum, There are four Hoſts or Squadrons of Angels.* This Quaternio of Angelical Warriours are ſaid *to come out from between two Mountains, to go forth from ſtanding before the Lord of the whole Earth, into the four quarters of the World, to execute God's Judgments*, *v.* 1. 5. Yet S. *Hierom* againſt all Reaſon ſuppoſeth, (*m*) *that they are four Angelical Powers, to which the principal Kingdoms are committed according to that of* Deut. 32. 8. *When the moſt High divided the Nations*, &c. Touching theſe four Chariots the Prophet maketh enquiry, *What are theſe my Lord?* The Angel anſwereth, *Theſe are the four* רוחות *Winds of Heaven*, (*n*) like that of the *Apocalypſe* ch. 7. 1. where there is mention of four Angels at the four Corners of the Earth, holding the four Winds of the Earth, that they ſhould not blow on the Earth nor on the Sea. The Name of Winds given to the Angels denoteth their Subtilty and Agility according to the Pſalmiſts deſcription of them, *Pſal.* 104. 4. *Who maketh his Angels* (Meſſengers) רוחות *Winds or Spirits : his Miniſters a flaming fire.* It denoteth alſo their activity in the Commotions and Mutations of the Affairs of Men, in raiſing new Empires and demoliſhing the old ; *for that the*

(k) Heinſ. *Ariſt. Sac.* c. 21. *v.* Knatchbul. *Not.* *in* 1 Cor. 11. 10.

(l) Maimon. *mor. nev. p.* 2. *c.* 10.

(m) *Com.* in Dan. 7.

(n) *Dr.* H. More *Expoſ. of* Dan. 7. 2.

great things in the viciſſitude of Kingdoms and Empires are done by the Angels is an Hypotheſis, that both Daniel *and the* Apocalypſe *plainly ſuppoſeth.*

This plain Hypotheſis will inable us to form a true Notion of the Prince of *Perſia* and *Grecia*, which are Parties in that conflict of the Angelical Powers ſpoken of in *Dan.* 10. 13, 20, 21. as *Michael* there (the Jews Prince) is an Angel: So doubtleſs the Prince of *Perſia* and *Grecia* are Angels alſo, not evil, but good Angels: For the Angel that ſpeaketh to *Daniel*, looketh upon them as an adverſe Party, but of the number of good Angels (*v.*21. *There is none that holdeth with me in theſe things, but* Michael *your Prince*,) and theſe Angels conflict with each other (*o*) as oppoſite Parties at Court, that have an Intereſt there. Here is therefore an appearance, that the Court of Heaven reſembleth the Court of *Rome*, where ſeveral Nations have their ſeveral *Cardinal-Protectors* as their Patron and Tutelar Angels; of this (in the Prophets Viſion) there is much more appearance than of a Pagan-like mundane Magiſtracy of holy Angels, (*p*) *that all Kingdoms and Nations have their Reſident, Preſident, or Prefect tutelar Angels.* Yet becauſe *Michael* is uſually thought the Preſidentiary Angel of the Jewiſh Nation, and becauſe the Prince of the Kingdom of *Perſia* is certainly an Angel, hence many learned Writers infer, *It is plain, that there are Preſidentiary Angels of all Kingdoms, Nations and Countries*, which are ſuppoſed to have a ſettled Prefecture over them. Whereas it is plainly incongruous to ſuppoſe, that the Nations of *Greece* uſually at War with one another, and not united into one Eſtate, are the Prefecture of one Angel; and that the holy Angels bandy againſt, and conflict with each other on behalf of their ſeveral Nations and Countries; which is as unlikely, as that they ſhould fight with each other, when thoſe Nations fight. It is incongruous alſo, to ſuppoſe, that two great Pagan Nations have two Angelical Princes (or Chieftain Angels) for their Prefects, unleſs all ſuch other Pagan Nations have the like; and to ſuppoſe holy Angels the Prefects of unholy Pagan Nations is incongruous; and it is much more incongruous to infer this from the Names of *Perſia* and *Grecia* in the Prophecy. For theſe Names in the Prophecy do not ſignifie two meer Countries or Nations, but two great Monarchies, ſuch Monarchies wherein the Fates of God's People were involv'd. The Prince of *Grecia* and *Perſia* (underſtood according to the Hypotheſis before mention'd) are the Angelical Agents of raiſing thoſe two Empires (as the Archangel *Michael* is by Divine appointment the Agent of the Jews deliverance out of Captivity and of raiſing or re-erecting their Government;) which Imperial Adminiſtration of theirs maketh them adverſe and punitive to the Jews, and accordingly they are ſomewhat inimically and punitively affected towards them; for the Prince of the Kingdom of *Perſia* withſtandeth the Jews deliverance out of Captivity (probably pleading the demerit of their Crimes,) and withſtandeth the Angel that ſpake to *Daniel* One and Twenty Days. To this account of theſe Angelical Princes it is requiſite to add; that as the ſeven Archangels or ſeven Eyes of the Lord *Zech.* 4. 10. are uſually imploy'd in the Affairs of the ſeveral Parts of the World (inſpecting, ſuperintending, adminiſtring them, *Zech.* 1. 10.) as occaſional Miſſionaries of Providence only, without being conſtituted the Preſidentiary Angels of any Parts of the World (in the uſual Notion) without preſiding over them in the nature and quality of ſuch a mundane Magiſtracy; and as the Angel *Gabriel* is uſually imploy'd in the Affairs of Prophecy and of the Prophets as *an occaſional Miſſionary of Providence only*, without being conſtituted the Preſidentiary Angel of Prophecy and of Prophets (like an Heathen *Præſes Eloquentiæ*, *Preſident of Eloquence*:) So we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that the Prince of *Perſia* and his Angels (which are thought to have the Name of מלכים Kings or Dukes, *Dan.* 10. 13.) were uſually imploy'd in the Affairs of *Perſia*, that *Michael* and his Angels were imploy'd in the Affairs of the Jews, without being conſtituted the Preſidents or Prefects over *Perſia* and the Jewiſh Nation; they were no more than * occaſional Miſſionaries of Providence (Gods Meſſengers and Miniſters that do nothing but by his Command) *Angels imploy'd in ſuch an Imperial or National Adminiſtration.* Having thus illuſtrated the Notion of the Angelical Princes in the Prophet *Daniel*, we will remark nothing more in the Prophetic part of Holy Writ touching the Miniſtery of Angels, ſave only this in the Book of the *Apocalypſe*, the Name *Angels* is ſometimes taken Metaphorically. For *Ch.* 1. 10. the Paſtors of the ſeven Churches repreſented by *ſeven Stars* (which denote illuſtrious Apoſtolic Governments) are ſtiled *ſeven Angels*, becauſe their Function maketh them reſemble מלאכי שרת *the Angels of Miniſtery*, and *Ch.* 9. 14. four Turkiſh Sultanies or Tetrarchies are ſtiled *four Angels* (which four Angels are thought by *Epiphanius* (*q*) the Preſident Angels of four Nations, the *Aſſyrians*, *Babylonians*, *Medes* and *Perſians*,) becauſe they were the Miſſionaries of Providence for executing God's Judgments.

(o) *V.* Grot. *Not. in v.*13, & 20.

(p) *Dr.* H. More *ſupr.* p. 144, 158.

* *In this Notion* Cyrenius *is called Governour of* Syria. Dr. Ham. *on* Luc. 2. 2.

(o) *Har.* 51. *ſub. fin.*

IX. The holy Angels belong not to the Polity of this World, nor are they Citizens of this mundane City; and therefore they are no mundane City Magiſtrates; which if they were, this World would be the City of God and his Republick. They are *occaſional Miſſionaries* (*Miniſtring Spirits ſent forth*, Heb. 1. 14.) no Pagan-like mundane Rectors and Prefects, nor Guardian Angels (in the Senſe of the Ancients) that are fix'd and ſettled, and reſide upon their ſeveral Cures and Prefectures. Their Dwelling and Abode is in this World; the Guardian-Angel in the Senſe of the Ancients is a Reſident-preſident Angel, a vigilant Aſſociate, an inſeparable Concomitant, always at hand and in attendance upon Men all their Days (whence a Biſhop of our Church pretendeth, (*r*) that he can ſee no Impiety in this Addreſs, *Sancte Angele cuſtos ora pro me, holy Guardian Angel pray for me*:) But the holy Angels are *the Angels of God in Heaven* (*Matth.* 22. 30. *Luc.* 15. 10.) they are the Courtiers and Citizens of Heaven; and ſuch are the Guardian-Angels which our Saviour ſpeaketh of; *that always* (ſave only when they are ſent abroad) *behold his Father's Face in Heaven*, and have their abode and dwelling there. the Jews are known to Entitle their Phyſiology *Bereſhith*, and their more recondite ſublime Theology touching God and Angels *Mercavah* from the Viſion, *Ezek.* 1. and 10. wherein the holy Angels (which are ſignified by the Hieroglyphic Forms and Figures of Cherubims) are repreſented as the Imperial Chariot of the God of *Iſrael*. This Notion of the Holy Angels importeth, that the God of *Iſrael* is their Imperator

(r) Montague *Invocat. of Saints* p. 97, 98.

tor, and that he rideth in *Imperial* Proweſs and Puiſſance through their *Miniſterial* Proweſs and Puiſſance; *he flyeth* (as a great Commander once ſaid to his Soldiers) *upon their Wings*. Agreeably to which Notion of the holy Angels (*s*) the God of *Iſrael* is uſually in Scripture deſcribed *as ſitting upon the Cherubims, dwelling between the Cherubims*, and the holy Angels are repreſented as his regial Seat or Throne; the poſture of the Cherubims in the Tabernacle and Temple was ſtanding, they were furniſh'd with Wings, and their Faces were towards the Mercy Seat; all which Notices of the holy Angels (and many more, repreſent thoſe glorious immortal Spirits as the Miniſters of the heavenly Sanctuary, and the conſtant attendants upon the Divine Majeſty; not as ſublunary mundane Magiſtrates, that have the Government of this World ſhar'd amongſt them, and conſtantly reſide and attend upon their Cures.

To live out of Society, Holy Society, is againſt Nature and againſt Grace; inconſiſtent both with Civil and Religious Duty and Happineſs; our State would be friendleſs, helpleſs, ſafeleſs, loveleſs, lifeleſs, if we did not live in the Love and Enjoyment of one another. There is no Honour, no Comfort, no Glory, no Joy, no Solace, no Refreſhment, no intercourſe nor delightful variety of Things, no Friendſhip, no doing nor receiving nor enjoying good out of Society. God hath therefore ordain'd in Nature, that Men ſhould live in Society, in Cluſters, Families, Cities and Common-wealths under their ſeveral Leaders and Governours, and even the Brute-animals are ſociable, and generally they live together in Flocks and Herds. As in Nature, ſo in Grace God hath ordain'd, that his People ſhould live in holy Society under the guidance of publick Officers; they muſt combine and aſſociate and hold Aſſemblies, and live as Fellow-members of that great Body Politick *the Church*. Agreeably whereunto the inviſible World is conſtituted; for the holy Angels are Sons of the Divine Family, and live in Society as other Families do. *Eph*. 3. 15. They are Members of the Church Triumphant, and live in Communion with it as Church-Members, *Heb*. 12. 22, 23. They are Members of that ſupernal City *the heavenly Jeruſalem* (having *Domicilium in Urbe*,) where they bear Offices and enjoy Honours, and live as Citizens in Society with their Fellow-Citizens. How elſe can they Conſtitute a Family, a City, a Church? They are an Hoſt, and an heavenly Hoſt; therefore they live in Angelical Society reſiding in Heaven; which is deſtructive to their Pagan-like mundane Magiſtracy, and the Hypotheſis of the Guardian Angel (in the Senſe of the Ancients;) for ſuch an Angel liveth out of Angelical Society. The Monks that are ſaid to live an Angelical Life, (*t*) are ſome of them Solivagant *Hermits* or *Anachorites*, that live alone; others are *Cœnobites*, that live in Society: and ſuch are the holy Angels, as the Bonds of Duty and the Intereſt of Felicity oblige them. They are *no Solitaries, nor ſcatter'd Regiment, nor Solivagant Animals*, as (in reſpect of Angelical Society) the Guardian-Angels of the Ancients are.

The Angels which miniſter to the Welfare of the Juſt, uſually go forth (like the Locuſts) by Troops and Bands. *Luc*. 2. 13. *Suddenly there was with the Angel a multitude of the heavenly Hoſt*. 1 Cor. 11. 10. *A Woman ought to have Power over her Head becauſe of the Angels*. Matth. 13. 41. *At the end of the World the Son of Man ſhall ſend forth his Angels*. Apoc. 12. 7. *Michael and his Angels fought*. Pſal. 91. 11. *He ſhall give his Angels charge over thee*. Pſal. 34. 7. *The Angel of the Lord encampeth about them that fear him*. In this laſt place, *The Angel* (as ſome Expoſitors obſerve) is not to be underſtood of one ſole individual Angel, but of that Species; or as the Hebrew uſually putteth one for a multitude, *Ship* for *Ships*, *Spear* for *Spears*, *Bird* for *Birds*, *Chariot* for *Chariots*, *Frog* for *Frogs*, *Tree* for *Trees*, *Quail* for *Quails*: So *the Angel of the Lord* (as the Phraſe of *encamping* ſheweth) muſt be plurally underſtood of a Party or Troop of Angels; or the Angel may be ſaid to ſignifie the Captain of that Angelical Troop, as the Angel ſignifieth, *Act*. 7. 38. agreeably to what is obſerv'd touching the Angelical appearances (*u*) *The Chieftain Angels are uſually accompany'd with Attendants*. So the Chieftain Angels which according to our Saviour are concern'd in the Welfare of his People, have their Attendants; for whereas according to *Plato* (*w*) every ones proper Demon is ἐις ᾅδȣ ἡγεμὼν, *the Companion and Captain of his departing Soul into Hades*; Chriſtianity allotteth a Convoy of Angels for the departing Soul of one pious Man (*Lazarus*,) whom S. *Chryſoſtom* calleth ἀγγέλȣς δορυφόρȣς, *Guard-Angels*, that (having the Office of *Mercury* amongſt the Poets) conduct Souls to Paradiſe. The Jews ſuppoſe, that pious Souls departed are conducted by *Michael* and his Officers (*Michael* according to them is הכהן העליון *the High Prieſt that offereth the Souls of the Juſt*,) and *R. Eleaſar* ſaith, (*x*) *When a Juſt Man is diſmiſs'd out of the World three Troops of the Angels of Miniſtery go forth to meet him. One ſaith to him, He entreth into Peace; another ſaith, Whoſo walketh in his Uprightneſs* (Iſa. 57. 2.) *a third ſaith, He ſhall enter into Peace, they ſhall reſt in their Beds*. If the holy Angels go forth in Bands and Troops for the Guardianſhip and Reception of the Saints departed into the other World, the Inference is but reaſonable, that doubtleſs they go forth in Bands and Troops, to miniſter to their Welfare in this Life; and (though they ſometimes upon occaſion go alone, yet) they live in Angelical Societies. Numbers of them Aſſociate with the Juſt (for like muſt neceſſarily Aſſociate with like;) they Aſſociate with us in our Aſſemblies, and are Inſpectors of our Behaviour there. 1 *Cor*. 11. 10. Prayer raiſeth us up to the Inhabitants of Heaven (therein we unite our Souls and Voices (*y*) with the Celeſtial Choire,) and it bringeth down the Inhabitants of Heaven unto us, they join with us in our holy Adorations and Praiſes. *Origen* is bold to ſay, (*z*) *When good People Pray, innumerable holy Powers of their own accord Pray with them*. When the Jews were the holy People, the holy Angels in ſome ſort reſided amongſt them, to which ſome refer (*a*) that of *Pſal*. 68. 10. חַיָּתְךָ יָשְׁבוּ בָהּ *thine Animals or Angels dwelt therein*, viz. (in thine Inheritance;) and that voice which was heard in the Temple immediately before its Deſtruction, μεταβαίνωμεν ἐντεῦθεν *let us go hence*, (which may be underſtood of the Angels of the Schekinah or Majeſtatick Preſence,) is reaſonably enough underſtood of the Jews Aſſociate Tutelar Angels. The Jews were then left naked and expos'd to all Calamities, that ſometimes enjoyed the Society and Guardianſhip of the Angelical Powers, according to that Cabaliſtic

Maxim

(s) Spencer. *de Leg. Hebr. l*. 3. *diſſ*. 5. *c*. 3, 5, 7.

(t) Theodoret. Θεραπ. *Ser*. 3. *p*. 53.

1 King. 19. 22. 2 Chron. 9. 21. 2 King. 11. 10. 2 Chron. 23. 9. Pſal. 8. 8. *and* 20. 7. *and* 68. 17. *and* 78. 45. *and* 105. 33. 40.

(u) Grot. *Explic*. Exod. 20. 1.

(w) Winde. *de vit. funct. p*. 116. 119, 120. *ed*. 2.

(x) L'Emper. *Annot. in Cod. Mid. c*. 3. *S*. 1. *p*. 99.

(y) *S*. Chryſoſt. *T*. 6. *p*. 754. Clem. *Str*. *l*. 7. *p. m*. 523, 536.

(z) Μυρίαι ὅσαι ἄκλητοι συνεύχονται δυνάμεις ἱεραί. *C. Celſ*. *l*. 8. *p*. 420.

(a) Joſ. Med. *Com. Apoc. ad c*. 4. 1. Spencer. *de Leg. Heb. l*. 3. *diſſ*. 5. *c*. 4. *p*. 242. *ed*. 2. Hammond *in loc*, Maxim or Aphoriſm of theirs; (*b*) *The Terreſtrial Militia is not to be humbled, unleſs the Celeſtial Militia be firſt humbled.*

The Company and Cuſtody of the Holy Angels is (according to the Scriptures) a principal Privilege of God's People, and a Privilege is an uncommon Right; this Principle therefore deſtroyeth the Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtracy of the Holy Angels, and refuteth much of that impure Phantaſtry (touching the Curatorſhip of Angels) which occurreth in ſeveral of the Ancient Writers of the Church, namely, (*c*) *that the Holy Angels are Generation-Curators, that the Angel-Guardian is common to all Mankind for the ſafety of Humane Life; that they have an Angel-Guardian aſſign'd them from the time of their Birth; and that great is the Dignity of Humane Souls, every one from his Birth having an Angel delegated for his Cuſtody.* This Philoſophic Pagan Conceit touching the Dignity of Man appeareth from *Origen* himſelf, to be perfectly Heatheniſh and Unchriſtian; for he hath ſhew'd, (*d*) that Mankind in the time of their Sins and Infidelity, born of Infidel Parents are under the Angels of Satan. S. *Baſil* diſcourſeth, *that the fetid Scent of Sin and Wickedneſs driveth away the Angel-Guardian of our Life,* (*e*) *as Smoak driveth away Bees, and an evil ſmell the Doves.* An Heathen Theologer and a *Platoniſt* (that believeth no Evil Demons) diſcourſeth, (*f*) *that although there are as many ſeveral ſorts of Demons, as there are different Tempers of Men, yet an improbous Soul hath none to inhabit it, no Curator to preſide over it.* But that we may not ſerve an Hypotheſis to the prejudice of the Truth, and by eſchewing one extream run into a worſe (*by fleeing the Smoak fall into the Fire,* (*g*) as the Greek Proverb hath it) we will acknowledge the Holy Angels general Guardianſhip of Mankind in general, and conſequently, that there is ſome truth in *Theodoret*'s Diſcourſe, (*h*) *That Mankind are committed to the cuſtody of Preſident Angels by the Creator, that their Adverſary inviſibly ſetting upon them may not by force and tyranny ſecurely deſtroy them.* The Evil Demons are under Laws and Government; God is the Founder and Providential Governour of this lower World. As he hath an Univerſal Dominion and Sovereignty, ſo he exerciſeth and maketh uſe of that right in a Superintendency and Superviſorſhip of all as the Sovereign Diſpoſer of the private and publick Affairs of Men. In which Providential Government and Adminiſtration of things the Holy Angels are employ'd (Chieftain-Angels in the Adminiſtration of ſuch Polities as are beforemention'd) which are defenſative to Mankind in general, to publick Perſons and the publick Societies of Men, which are not (unleſs ſometimes for their Puniſhment) wholly abandon'd to the Will of Satan and his Partiſans, according to that wild Opinion of ſome in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s time, (*i*) ὅτι δαίμονες τὰ ἀνθρώπινα διοικοῦσι, *that the Demons adminiſter Humane Affairs.*

If we ſuppoſe the Holy Angels to be Pagan-like *Mundane Rectors and Magiſtrates,* κοσμοκράτορες, *Lords and Rulers of the World* in their ſeveral Provinces, to whom Mankind are rightfully ſubjected; if the diſpoſal of our Affairs is committed to their Care and Government; if they adminiſter and diſpoſe of them as the ſettled Prefects and Lord-Preſidents of Provinces ſet over Mankind; if our Goods and Evils, the concerns of our Weal and Punitive Woe are in their Hands to diſpenſe: This is that which the Pagan Theology ſuppoſeth, (*k*) *a delegate vicarious Providence, whereby the World is govern'd;* Whereas the Providence which the Scripture Theology ſuppoſeth and treateth of (and which is the Foundation of true Piety) is God's *own unvicarious exerciſe of Providence* in his Divine Ordinations or Decrees and the executions of them, in the Conſervation and Gubernation of all things, guiding and managing the Affairs of the World, ſo that his wiſe Counſels are fulfilled, *ordering all things ſo as is the beſt,* and for the good of his Choſen. The Scripture Theology repreſenteth God as the Inſpector and Curator of all (to the meaneſt Sparrow) the univerſal Proviſor, Protector and Benefactor; the ſole Arbiter of our Fate, upon whoſe Pleaſure our well or ill being entirely dependeth. Pious Men ſubmit to Afflictions as God's Hand, give thanks for Mercies as his Gifts, in Wants and Dangers they truſt to his Aid, and in all their Ways and Enterprizes the Eye of their Obſervance and Regard is upon him alone (*Famulus ejus qui eum ſolum obſervo,* (*l*) *I am his Servant obſervant of him alone*) and their Service is to this their ſole Lord, *Prov.* 3. 6. *Pſal.* 16. 8. *Gen.* 15. 1. The Works of Providence are his *Ordination, Operation, Diſpenſation, Command, Hand and Counſel, of his Agency and Influence, his Tradition, ſending, directing, judging, rewarding, puniſhing, or ſparing and forgiving; to ſave and deſtroy, to diſpenſe Light and Darkneſs* (Proſperity and Adverſity) *to change the Scene of things, to be the Author of our Weal or Punitive Woe* (our Helper or our Hurter) *are his Royal Prerogatives,* the holy Angels are ſent to execute his Commands, and hearken to the Voice of his Word; *Iſa.* 26. 12. and 45. 7. and 5. 12. *Pſal.* 44. 4. and 75. 7. and 62. 11. and 119. 11. 1 *Sam.* 2. 7. 2 *Sam.* 16. 11. 1 *King.* 8. 24. *Exod.* 21. 13. *Gen.* 24. 7. and 18. 25. *Dan.* 2. 21. and 4. 35. *Amos* 5. 8. *Ezek.* 14. 19. *Jer.* 20. 23. and 32. 19. *Prov.* 19. 21. and 29. 26. and 16. 1. and 20. 24. *Act.* 4. 28. 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. *Jam.* 4. 12. *Job* 34. 29. *Pſal.* 103. 20. The Gubernation of Providence is God's own unvicarious exerciſe of Providence, (*m*) *ut omnis timor noſter & devotio atque obſervatio ad Deum convertatur, that all our Fear, Devotion and Obſervance may be turn'd towards God.*

If the Holy Angels are the Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtrates and Rectors, they are to Mankind *Patron Superiorities and governing Authoritative Powers* (accordingly *Euſebius* ſaith, (*n*) that Mankind might not be ἄναρχοι ϗ ἀνεπιστάτητοι, *without any Rulers and Governours over them like the irrational Animals, therefore God conſtituted the Divine Angels their Prefects:*) They muſt reſemble Kings and Civil Governours, as Kings are God's Vicegerents by which he governeth the World, but *excel them in Dignity,* (*o*) as the Catechiſm of the Council of *Trent* argueth; there muſt be Societies conſiſting of the Holy Angels as the Regent-party, and of Mankind as the Subject-party, and the Societies of the World muſt be ſuch Societies; Mankind muſt owe to theſe Angelical κοσμοκράτορες, (Rulers of the World) all ſuch Duties as Subjects owe to their Princes, but of an higher kind, and muſt in conjunction with them conſtitute Societies of an higher kind than Civil Societies; for theſe Angelical Prefects are more than Humane or Civil Authoritative Powers. But of ſuch Political Societies the Holy Scriptures know nothing (unleſs we ſuppoſe

---

(b) *Non humiliabitur militia terreſtris in terra, niſi prius humilietur militia cæleſtis in cælo.* Gaulmin. *in lib. de Vit. & Mort. Moſ. Not. l.* 1.

(c) Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 6, 7.

(d) Spencer. *Not. in* Orig. *p.* 82.

(e) Ὡς τὰς μελίσσας καπνὸς φυγαδεύει, ϗ τὰς περιςερὰς δυσωδία ἐξελαύνει. *In Pſal.* 33. *p.* 220.

(f) M. Tyr. *diſſ.* 26.

(g) Theodor. Θεραπ. *Ser.* 3. *p.* 46.

(h) *Ibid. p.* 54.

(i) *T.* 6. *p.* 680.

(k) S. Cyr. *c. Jul. l.* 4. *p.* 115, 143. Orig. *c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 247.

(l) Tertul. *Apol. c.* 30.

(m) S. Cyp. *de orat. dom. p. m.* 159.

(n) *Ap.* Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 3.

(o) *P.* 424, 425. *ed. an.* 1567.

them in the Kingdom of Darkneſs, which conſiſteth of Heathen Mankind and of the Rulers of the Darkneſs of this World) nor are theſe Political Societies conſiſtent with true Religion; for they manifeſtly imply and introduce *Idolatry* and *Demonolatry*. If Mankind make themſelves the Subjects and Servitors of certain Creatures of the Inviſible World, they practiſe Idolatry, aſcribing to thoſe Creatures the Divine Attributes and doing to them appropriate God-ſervice. If they make themſelves the Subject-ſervient Party to them in more than Civil Society, they make themſelves their Subjects and Servants in Society of Religion (God-ſervice) which is to make them Gods. And it would be agreeable to make them ſuch, if they were the Pagan-like Mundane Rectors. All Men would be prone to make their Prayers and Addreſſes to them, to ſeek their Favour, to depend upon them, to honour them with Religious Honour and Obſervance, and to ſay as the Heathen did, The Gods are made to be the Curators of Men, and Men to be the Subjects and Servitors, the Clients and Suppliants of theſe Gods. Mankind would be taken off from immediate Addreſſes to God, and would direct their Dependance and Addreſſes to the Subordinate Mundane Rectors, if theſe had their Concerns in their Hand and Diſpoſal.

X. Yet it muſt be acknowledg'd, that although a Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtracy of the Holy Angels was entertain'd by ſeveral of the Learned Theologers of the three firſt Ages of the Church, yet no ſuch thing as Church-Demonolatry appeareth in thoſe early Days, ſave only amongſt the *Simonian Gnoſticks* and the ancient *Angelici* or *Angelitæ* condemn'd by S. *Paul* (*Col.* 2. 18) which I ſuppoſe to have been a diſtinct ſort of *Gnoſticks* from the *Simonian*, who had their origin from *Simon Magus*. For although the ancient Writers of the Church affirm, (*p*) *that all thoſe who adulterate the Truth are the Scholars and Succeſſors of* Simon Magus, and therefore they have reported to us no other *Gnoſticks* but the *Simonian*, yet from the Scriptures it appeareth, that there is a neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing two oppoſite ſorts of *Gnoſticks*, which had their oppoſite ſorts of *Cabala's* or Recondite Theologies (the *Gnoſticks* univerſally pretended to a Recondite Theology, and had their Name from their Pretenſion to a Sublime Recondite Knowledge) the one *Judaical*, the other *Anti-Judaical*. The Recondite Theology of the *Simonian Gnoſticks* was deſignedly *Anti-Judaical*, oppoſite to the God and Law of the *Jews*, denying the onely Lord God, *Jude* 4. (*q*) *They ſubvert many by a pretence of Recondite Knowledge, withdrawing them from the Creator, as having ſomething higher and greater to ſhew than God, who made Heaven and Earth, and all things that are in them*, as *Irenæus* relateth their *Dogma*. There is great variety of Schemes amongſt theſe Heretical Theologers (each one ſetting up for a Doctor:) but they univerſally pretended to a Myſtical Theology, to an unknown Power or God-head, ſuperior to the Power or Powers that made and governeth the World, (to which they profeſs'd themſelves Adverſaries, and therefore Adverſaries to the Conſtitution and good Order of Nature and laudable Humanity) from the Dominion whereof they pretended to deliver Mankind, and that in order to that End the coming of a Saviour was neceſſary. The Doctrine of *Si[illegible] Magus* was of this ſtrain, (*r*) *that the World was made by Angels* (who had their origin from an *Ennœa* or Conceit of his) *which govern'd it amiſs, and that he was come for the Emendation of things; that thoſe Angels or Powers, by their Laws, had made a difference between Good and Evil, but that his Partiſans ſhould be free from their Dominion; that the Prophets had their Inſpirations from thoſe Angels (the Makers of the World) and ought not to be of any regard among his Believers.* So *Menander* his Succeſſor pretended, *that the World was made by Angels, that the firſt Power was unknown to all, that himſelf was the Saviour ſent by the inviſible Powers for the Salvation of Men, and taught a Knowledge, whereby the Angels that made the World might be overcome*; (*s*) *and that the End of his coming was to ſave ſome from Servitude under the Principalities and Powers.* Agreeably to *Menander Saturninus* pretended, (*t*) *to make known one unknown Father, who made Angels, Archangels, Principalities and Powers, ſeven of which Angels making a Defection from the unknown Father made the World; that the God of the* Jews *was one of theſe Angels, and that the Saviour came for the Deſtruction of him; that Matrimony and Generation were from Satan, and Propheſies partly from the Angels Opificers of the World, and partly from Satan.* *Baſilides*'s Supream Deity is ſtiled (*u*) *Abraxas* or *Abraſax*, from whom *Nun* was born, from *Nun Logos*, from *Logos Phroneſis*, from *Phroneſis Sophia* and *Dynamis*, from *Dynamis* and *Sophia the Principalities, Powers and Angels, that made the Heavens and preſide over them*, and are of ſeveral Ranks and Orders agreeably to the Celeſtial Orbs which they preſide over. The loweſt Rank of theſe Opificer-Angels he ſuppoſed the Creators of this lower World, which have the ſeveral parts of the Earth and the ſeveral Nations of Mankind for their Prefectures; the Chieftain of which loweſt Rank of Angels is (according to this Heretical Theology) *The God of the* Jews, *the God of the Law and the Prophets. whoſe Lot or Prefecture is the Seed of* Abraham. The other Prefect-Angels bandying againſt this Prefect-Angel of the *Jews*, and Factions ariſing amongſt them, *the innominate Father ſent his primogenit Nun, who is the Chriſt, for the liberation of his Believers from the power of thoſe that made the World*; but Chriſt crucify'd is not to be acknowledg'd; *for he that confeſſeth the crucify'd is of Servile Condition, and under the power of thoſe that made the Body*, to which this Theology promiſeth no Salvation, but to the Soul only. The other *Simonian* Gnoſtick Cabala's or Recondite Theologies, (the *Valentinian*, *Cerinthian*, *Carpocratian*, and ſuch more) are alike Anti-Judaical with theſe, that we have repreſented an account of, and therefore it is needleſs to take a view of them. We will only take notice of the Heretick *Marcion*'s *Antitheſes* (which he wrote) *the Contrarieties between the Old and New Teſtament.* His Pretenſions were, that there are two Gods, a Good and an Evil; that the World was created by the Evil God, who was alſo the Author of the old Law. Which portentous Conceit of his is in *Epiphanius* (*w*) imputed to *Simon Magus*; for he is ſaid to have taught, *That the Law and the Prophets were not from a good God, but a ſiniſter Virtue, and that Death is the portion of every one that believeth the* Old Teſtament.

If the profeſſion of the *Simonian Gnoſticks* was *Anti-Judaical*, it is not poſſible, that they ſhould Judaize in Doctrine and Practice any otherwiſe than by diſſembling their Profeſſion to ſerve a turn; (*x*) but there was a Party of ſeducing Teachers in the Apoſtles Days, who made *Judaiſm*

(p) Iren. *adv.* Hær. *l.* 1. *c.* 30.

(q) *Idem in Proœm.*

(r) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 20, 21.

(s) Epiph. *Hær.* 22.

(t) Iren. *l.* 1. *c.* 22. Epiphan. *Hær.* 23.

(u) Iren. *l.* 1. *c.* 23. Tertul. *de præſcr.* c. 46.

(w) *Hær.* 21.

(x) Euſeb. *H. E. l.* 4. *c.* 22.

daiſm their conſtant Profeſſion, to ſerve the Intereſts of Profit, Safety and Worldly Glory. They were *Jews* originally, and pretended to be Chriſt's Apoſtles, 2 *Cor.* 11. 13, 22, 23. They were therefore in ſome ſort the profeſs'd Teachers of Chriſtianity, but it was of ſuch Chriſtianity, which was *Chriſtiano-Judaiſm. Phil.* 3. 2.--5. They have the Character of *Dogs, Evil workers, the Conciſion, the Circumciſion-Religioniſts*, that made the *Moſaic* Rites and *Judaical* Prerogatives their *Confidence* and their *Glory*, and their way of Religionizing was *a truſting in the Fleſh* (what is of party and quality the Fleſh) the things of Carnality and Unregeneracy of Religion; *Tit.* 1. 10, 11. *There are many unruly and vain-talkers, and deceivers, eſpecially they of the Circumciſion.* They of the Circumciſion were certainly a Gang of *Judaical* Impoſtors, whom S. *Chryſoſtom* thus deſcribeth; (y) *There were ſome that the Apoſtle denoteth in all his Epiſtles, filthy and abominable* Jews, *addicted to filthy Lucre and Domination, who deſigning to ſeduce many of the Believers, preached both Chriſtianiſm and Judaiſm, perverting the Goſpel.* Not the *Simonian Gnoſticks*, but theſe *Judaical Impoſtors* ſeduc'd the *Galatians* to *Judaiſm*, as appeareth from their Name, *Gal.* 6. 13. οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι, (which place a Learned Expoſitor (z) hath plainly diſtorted) which muſt be underſtood to ſignifie *thoſe that are circumciſed, the Circumciſion-Religioniſts.* Not that they were Conſcientious *Circumciſion-Religioniſts*, or car'd for a Religious obſervance of the Law; but theſe Pſeudo-Apoſtolical Teachers made *Judaiſm* in part their Profeſſion, *leſt they ſhould ſuffer Perſecution*, v. 12. and they perſwaded the *Galatians* to be circumcis'd, that amongſt the *Jews* they might have this glory, *They had made the* Galatians *in ſome ſort Proſelytes to* Judaiſm, *v.* 13.

As the Seducers of the *Galatians* were no *Simonian Gnoſticks*; ſo the Seducers of the *Coloſſians* were doubtleſs of another Character, *Chriſtiano-Judaical Pythagoriſts and Cabaliſts.* That their Profeſſion was *Judaical*, appeareth from the Antitheſis which the Apoſtle maketh to the *Moſaic* and *Phariſaic* Rites and Inſtitutes, *Col.* 2. 11. *In Chriſt ye are circumcis'd with the Circumciſion made without Hands*, v. 14. *blotting out the Handwriting of Ordinances*, v. 16. *Let no Man judge you in Meat, or in Drink, or in reſpect of an Holy Day, or of the New Moon, or of the Sabbath-days*, v. 17. *which are a Shadow of things to come, but the Body is of Chriſt*, v. 20. *If ye be dead with Chriſt from the Rudiments of the World* (the Inſtitutes of Mundane kind of Religioniſts) *why as though living in the World* (that is, as if ye were not dead) *are ye ſubject to Ordinances?* If this Diſcourſe touching the *Judaical* Rites had been deſign'd againſt the *Simonian Gnoſticks* (whoſe Profeſſion was *Anti-Judaical*) it had been a grand Impertinence: Nor doth the Apoſtle in this Diſcourſe to the *Coloſſians* make uſe of any but ſoft terms of Language (of the *Simonian Gnoſticks*, the Apoſtles ſpeak in a ſeverer Dialect;) for whereas both the *Jews* and the *Pythagoreans* had their Inſtitutes of *touch not, taſt not, handle not, which are all to periſh with the uſing* (redound to no Fruit) touching theſe and ſuch more Inſtitutes wherewith the Seducers of the *Coloſſians* ſought to corrupt them, the Apoſtle expreſſeth his *Epicriſis* in no harder terms than theſe, *v.* 23. *which things have a ſhew of Wiſdom* (of Philoſophy and a Philoſophic Life) *in Will-worſhip* (voluntary Worſhip) *and Humility, and neglect of the Body* (Auſterity to it) *not in any honour* (regard to it) *to the ſatisfying of the Fleſh.* Agreeably to this account of the *Coloſſians* Seducers and their Dogmata, *Theodoret* ſaith, (a) *Thoſe who maintain'd an obſervance of the Law together with the Goſpel, taught alſo, that Angels were to be worſhipp'd, ſaying, that the Law was given by them.* So S. *Hierom ad Algaſiam* is of Opinion, that the Religioniſts of Angels which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, were *Jews*; and perhaps hence it was, (b) that *Celſus* counteth the *Jews worſhippers of Angels.* For theſe reaſons it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Seducers of the *Coloſſians* were *Chriſtiano-Judaical Pythagoriſts* (or Eſſens) that taught them a medly of Philoſophy and *Jewiſh* Rites, and that their *Cabala* was *Judaical.*

That they ſeduc'd the *Coloſſians* to a Medly of Philoſophy and Jewiſh Rites is manifeſt from *Col.* 2. 8. *Beware leſt any Man ſpoil you through Philoſophy and vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Chriſt.* The things that are after Chriſt, which conſtitute Chriſtian and Divine Kind of Religioniſts, are by the Apoſtle oppos'd to Humane Traditions and Mundane Rudiments, that are originally, of kind and quality ſuch. The *Moſaic* Rites abſtracted from Chriſt are of kind and quality ſuch; the *Phariſaic* Inſtitutes, the Doctrine and Inſtitutes of Secular Philoſophy are both *originally* and of *kind and quality* ſuch; although they pretend to be Θεοπαράδοτα, *Traditions originally Divine*, they have * nothing of that which is of God in them. But out of theſe riff-raff Materials theſe Seducers compos'd their Inſtitution, which being manifeſtly and certainly *Judaical*, the *Cabala* of this ſort of *Gnoſticks* (for that they had a *Cabala* and were *Gnoſticks* appeareth plainly from their pretenſions to *Philoſophy* and *Wiſdom* and from their *intruding into things not ſeen*) muſt neceſſarily be of the ſame Character. Their *Cabala* therefore was the ſame with *the Fables and endleſs Genealogies*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 4. which *Grotius* rightly interpreteth of the *Judaical Cabaliſts* Emanations.

כתר *Corona*
בינה ἔννοια *Intelligence* חכמות Ἀχαμὼθ *Sapience.*
פחד *vel* גבורה *Fear or Strength* נרולה *vel* חסד *Magnificence or Mercy.*
תפארת *Pulchritude.*
הוד *Majeſty* נצח *Victory.*
יסוד *the Foundation which is alſo* כל *all things.*
מלכות *Kingdom, which is alſo* שכינה *the preſence of God.*

Although theſe Emanations of the *Judaical Cabaliſts* and the *Cabala* of the *Simonian Gnoſticks* have ſome agreement in their Nature and alſo in their Original (for both are Derivatives from the School of the *Platoniſts* and *Pythagoreans*) yet the manner of holding them was extreamly diſſonant; for the *Judaical Cabaliſts* held to the Law and God of the *Jews*, which the *Simonian Gnoſticks* renounc'd, whence we infer, that the Seducers of the *Coloſſians* were not *Simonian Gnoſticks*, but a Generation of *Judaical Pythagoriſts* and *Cabaliſts*, that foul'd the pure Waters of Chriſtianity with their Heterogeneous Mixtures. So the above-mention'd Expoſitor thinketh it moſt probable, (c) *That the Inſtitute and Way of the ancient Angelici was the ſame with the Judaical Cabaliſts, who* (as he ſheweth from *Joſ. Albus*) *agree with the* Pythagoreans *and* Platoniſts, *and ſuppoſe, that by inferiour Angels Men ought to be recommended to the ſuperiour, and ſo by degrees to the higheſt, allotting to the Angels ſeveral Names, Offices, and Faculties of diſpenſing Benefits.* Many

Curioſities

(y) *In Ep. ad* Philip. λογ. 1.

(z) *Dr.* Ham. *Diſſert.* 4. c. 3. *S.* 18. *Diſſ. proœmial.*

(a) *In loc.*

(b) Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 1. *p.* 20.

* *Has non aliunde accipientes, ſed ex affectione hominum.* Iren. *l.* 2. c. 47.

(c) Grot. *Explicat. Decal. ad* Exod. 20. 3.

Curioſities theſe Cabaliſts have about Angels and pretenſions to acquaintance with them; for they pretend, (*d*) that every Angel hath his Root and Foundation in one of the Emanations; that all the Names of the Superiour Prefects depend upon the Emanations; that where the Scripture mentioneth any thing touching the Divine Eſſence, the Divine Name of ſome Angel deputed to this or that Office may be found expreſs'd in that place, and they have their Cabaliſtic Methods of finding it out. They have alſo an Aſtrological Method of finding out the Angels Name, that is to be the Preſident of any Buſineſs, (*e*) and if any one would make uſe of any Angel's Names in Prayer, he ought to learn them from ſome Cabaliſt, who hath receiv'd the knowledge of thoſe matters by Tradition from ſome other Cabaliſt, ſaith *Joſ. Albus.* Theſe their Conceits touching Angels may juſtly denominate their Cabaliſtic Diſcipline an Inſtitution of *Angelici* or *Angelitæ*; and therefore it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the old *Angelici* condemn'd by the Apoſtle were of their Footmark. In the Damnatory Sentence which the Apoſtle hath pronounc'd againſt thoſe *Angelici*, he hath condemn'd ſimply, abſolutely and univerſally all ſuch mode of Religionizing *as the worſhip of Angels*; which he would not, ought not to have done if any ſuch Mode had been allowable: Nor have the Pontificians any thing to ſay for themſelves, which the old *Angelici* might not have pleaded as well as they, whoſe way of Religion is a worſhipping Saints and Angels with all the Branches of Religious Worſhip in an inferiour degree, which we will call Church-Demonolatry.

CHAP. IV.

1. *Of a fundamental Hypotheſis of Church-Demonolatry, that the Saints departed are the Patron Superiorities of Mankind.* 2. *Of the ways of gaining their Patronage.* 3. *Of their Knowledge and Preſence.* 4. *Of their twofold Power, their Interceſſional and Authoritative Operative Power.* 5. *Of their Power in general.* 6. *Of the ground of their Interceſſional Power.* 7. *Of their Goodneſs and Beneficialneſs.* 8. *Of the Senſe of the Ancient Church-Demonolatriſts, and of Demonolatry in the fouleſt Senſe.* 9. *Of the Colledge of Supernal Powers and of the Mother of God.* 10. *Of her honorary Attributions and Paralleliſm to* Minerva. 11. *Of the Devotional Service to her and to the other Saints.*

I. AS innumerable Religious Inſtitutes of the degenerate Chriſtian Church were traduc'd from and ſubſtituted in the ſtead of the Pagans Religious Inſtitutes; and as the *ten-horned Beaſt* or Pagano-Chriſtian Empire is the Image and Subſtitute of the Draconic Beaſt according to the Divine Apocalyptic Viſion (*ch.* 13.) ſo the Pagano-Chriſtian Saint-worſhip is the Image and Subſtitute of the Pagans Demonolatry, and the deceas'd Saints and Martyrs uſually ſtiled (*f*) *Dii*, *Divi*, *Superi*, *Cœleſtes*, *Cœlites*, *Cœlites Tutelares*, are made the Surrogates, Subſtitutes and Succeſſors of the Pagan Gods and Demons in that Officiary Dignity of theirs, *The Subordinate Mundane Magiſtracy or Patron-Superiority over Mankind.* For the Pagano-Chriſtians have a particular Saint for every thing, as the Heathens had a God; their ſeveral Countries and Cities have Saints for their ſpecial Patrons and Protectors, as alſo the ſeveral Profeſſions, Occupations and Conditions of Men, and the ſeveral ſorts of Cattle. As the Pagan Gods are of ſeveral Faculties and Offices (whence *Varro* counteth the knowledge of the Gods requiſite, (*g*) *that we may direct our Petitions to them aright, and not ask Water from the God of Wine, or Wine from the Goddeſs of Water*:) ſo the Saints are appropriated to particular Offices, have their ſeveral Gifts and Faculties, and are famous for affording ſpecial aid and aſſiſtance in ſeveral Caſes. But theſe Specific Vertues of Patron-Saints were (like the Specific Virtues of many Medicines) unknown till later times; the Theologers of the Church that liv'd at the riſe of Church-Demonolatry were not ſo far learn'd; but they are not ſparing in ſetting forth the Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtracy of the deceas'd Saints and Martyrs (their Rulerſhip in the Affairs of Men) nor in making mighty Elogies thereof. (*h*) *As the Angels are Prefects* (ſaith S. *Ambroſe*) *ſo are they that have merited the Life of Angels*: (*i*) *For thoſe are the Martyrs of God, our Prelates, the Inſpectors of our Life and Actions.* (*k*) *The Martyrs are always with us* (ſaith *Maximus Taurinenſis*) *they ſtay* (or make their abode) *with us*; *while we live in the Body they guard us, and when we depart, they receive us.* At the riſe of Church-Demonolatry Paralleliſms were made between our Theology and the Demonology of *Plato* (which ſhew, that the Humour of extravagant Philoſophic Paganizing which early invaded the Church, was a principal Source of Church-Demonolatry;) for to ſhew, that *Plato* in his Diſcourſes is conſentaneous to the Hebrew Theology, and deriv'd his Philoſophy from it, *Euſebius* citeth this celebrated Paſſage. (*l*) Plato *would have the Souls of the Military Virtuoſo's accounted Demons after Death, and their Coffins and Sepulchres to be venerated and ador'd as the Sepulchres of Demons.* The *Alexandrian Cyril* proveth againſt *Julian* the unexceptionableneſs of honouring the Saints, becauſe *Plato would have Men that liv'd moſt excellently and dy'd generouſly, to be worſhipped as Demons or Salutary Genii.* (*m*) *Which Example of Gentile Superſtition* (ſaith a Pontifician Dogmatiſt) *did not at all deter, either the Chriſtians from giving to the Martyrs ſome like worſhip on this ſide the ſupream worſhip peculiar unto God*; *or* Cyril *from approving it by his Sentence and Authority.* *Theodoret* (a Tranſcriber of *Euſebius*) ſuppoſeth, (*n*) *That the Souls of the Saints departed take care of humane things, and that the Martyrs obtain this Honour or Reward agreeably to* Heſiod *and* Plato. They are ſtiled by this Author, (*o*) *Tutelar Preſidents of Cities and Guardians, Captains of Men, and Propugnators, and Auxiliators, and Averters of Evils,*

(d) *Rittangel. not. in lib.* Jezirah. *p.* 14, 16.

(e) Menaſſ. Ben Iſr. *Qu. in* Gen. *p.* 86, 87.

(f) Dallæus *de rel. cult. Object. l.* 3. *c.* 30. Chamier. Panſtrat. *T.* 2. *l.* 19. *c.* 1.

(g) S. Aug. *de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 22.

(h) *Sicut Angeli præſunt, ita & hi qui vitam meruerint Angelorum.*

(i) *Iſti enim ſunt* Dei *Martyres, noſtri præſules, ſpeculatores vitæ actuumque noſtrorum.* Ap. *Bellarm.* de ſanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 18. *Petav.* T. 4. Par. 2. l. 14. c. 10. S. 7.

(k) *Semper nobiſcum ſunt, nobiſcum morantur*; *hoc eſt, & in corpore nos viventes cuſtodiunt, & de corpore recedentes excipiunt.* Ibid.

(l) *Pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 9. & *l.* 12. *c.* 3.

(m) Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. *p.* 147. & *T.* 4. *p.* 2. *l.* 14. *c.* 14.

(n) Θεραπ. *Ser.* 8.

(o) Πολιοῦχοι καὶ φύλακες, πρόμοι ἀνθρώπων καὶ πρόμαχοι καὶ ἐπίκουροι, καὶ τῶν κακῶν ἀποτρόπαιοι, τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐπιφερομένας ἀποδιοπομπούμενοι βλάβας.

vils, that drive away the Miſchiefs, which come from evil Demons. (p) *Cities and Villages* (ſaith he) *divide the Bodies of the Saints amongſt them. They ſtile them Saviours both of their Souls and Bodies, and Phyſicians, and venerate them as the Tutelar-preſidents of Cities and Guardians.* So they are ſtiled by others (q) *our Propugnators and Defenſors,* (r) δορυφόροι καὶ ὑπερασπισταί, *Guardmen and Protectors,* (s) *Patroni mundi quos precantes ambiant, the Patrons of the World whom they that pray may make ſuit unto.* So the Pontifician Theologers diſpute, (t) *that the Faithful in this Life are rul'd and govern'd, not by Angels only, but alſo by the Spirits of bleſſed Men; that they are* (præpoſiti Eccleſiæ) *the Prefects of the Church,* (præſunt nobis & rerum noſtrarum curam gerunt) *they Preſide over us, and take care of our Affairs, that the Saints reigning with Chriſt take care of and adminiſter Terrene things; that Authority is given them, to reſtrain and puniſh the impious, and to deliver the pious out of their hands; that they are ſet over the Goods of their Lord, and are Adminiſtrators of them; what Kings can do by their Power* (profligate Enemies) *the Rich by their Wealth* (relieve the Indigent,) *Phyſicians by their Art* (Cure the Sick,) *that the glorified Saints can do, no leſs than the Holy Angels.* A late Romiſh Catechiſt thus repreſenteth the Senſe of his Church. (u) Q. *How prove you, that the Saints have any Power to do us good?* A. *Out of* Apoc. ch. 2. 26, 27. *Where Chriſt hath promis'd them Power over us. To him* (ſaid he) *that ſhall overcome and keep my words to the end, to him will I give Power over the Nations, and he ſhall rule them in that Rod of Iron.* Agreeably to this mode of expounding the *Apocalypſe*, when the Saints are ſaid, to ſit with Chriſt in his Throne, *Apoc.* 3. 21. the meaning is ſaid to be, (w) *that they Preſide together with him over the whole World, and Rule and Govern the Church.* Such a Conceit is that of *Plato*; (x) *The Soul of Man rais'd to Perfection and reduc'd to God, is converſant on high, and adminiſtreth the whole World.*

So great a reſemblance have the Pagano-Chriſtians Saints and Martyrs to the Pagans Tutelar Gods and Demons, that the Manichean *Fauſtus* look'd upon the degenerate Chriſtians of his time (y) as a Sect of the Gentiles (differing in nothing but that they held different Aſſemblies,) *that had turn'd the Idol-Gods into Martyrs. Maximus Madaurenſis* alſo ſuppoſeth, that the Chriſtians ſubſtituted the Martyrs inſtead of the Pagan-Gods. And *Eunapius* inveigheth againſt the Chriſtians for impoſing upon Mankind, (z) *the Worſhip of Slaves* (the Martyrs) *inſtead of the intelligible Gods.* This was thought by *Manicheans* and by Pagans one of the fouleſt Reproaches that could be caſt upon the Chriſtian Church, which ſeveral of her Theologers are ſo far from diſowning, that they openly confeſs the Fact and glory in it. For ſo (a) ſome of the Pontifician Theologers are not aſham'd to Diſcourſe; that the Martyrs ſucceeded in the room of the Pagan Gods, and the Worſhip of the Martyrs was ſubſtituted inſtead of the Worſhip of the Gods according to *Theodoret*. (b) *For our Lord* (ſaith he) *hath ſubſtituted* (or introduc'd into the Temples) *his dead Men inſtead of your Gods; thoſe he hath rendred evanid, but their Honour or Reward he hath given to the Martyrs.* Agreeably to which Conceit the Pontifician Writers often call, the Saints and Martyrs *Deities, Tutelar Deities.* (c) *Divus Lazarus eſt numen tutelare Heduorum; S. Lazarus is the Tutelar Deity of the Hedui, the Patron, Protector and Conſervator of our City.* (d) S. Quintin *is mine and my Church's or Pariſh's Patron and Tutelar Deity.* So the Pontificians make Inſcriptions in this form; (e) *Petrus, Helena, Maſtidia, Tutelaria Trecenſium numina.* In the Hiſtories of *Paulus Jovius*, I remember to have read *Deos Tutelares* (f) ſaith *Chamier*. The Maſter of Controverſies ſometimes pretendeth, (g) that he never approv'd of the uſual application of the Names *Divus* and *Diva* to the Saints, becauſe amongſt the Heathens thoſe Names ſignifie Gods; yet himſelf (more than once) calleth them (h) *Dii per participationem, Deities by Participation.* So *P. Bembus* ſaith in his Venetian Hiſtory as *Acontius* affirmeth, (i) that *S. Francis* was *in Deorum numerum relatus, put into the number of the Gods.* The Papal Canonization of Saints anſwereth to the Apotheoſis of the Pagan Deities, they are alike *Tutelar Spirits, Prefects and Deities*, and Mankind are alike (k) their *Clientes, Alumni, Famuli, Cultores, Servi, Supplices, The Clients, Nurſlings, Servitors, Worſhippers, Servants, Suppliants*, of theſe Patron-Ghoſts; as *S. Ambroſe* repreſenteth the Relation between Kings on Earth and the Saints in Heaven, (l) *Illi fiunt Supplices, hi Patroni, Thoſe are made the Suppliants, Theſe the Patrons.* The Conformity is ſo great between the Pagans and the Pagano-Chriſtians in the Worſhip of one Supreme Deity and many ſubordinate Tutelar Spirits, that *Trigautius* conceiveth Hope of the ancient *Chineſe*, (m) *that not a few of them found Salvation in the Law of Nature.*

II. The fundamental Hypotheſis of Church-Demonolatry, *that the Saints departed are the Pagan-like Patron-ſuperiorities of Mankind*, involveth a Suppoſition, that Mankind for the gaining and keeping their Patronage, muſt become their devotional Clients and Suppliants. *We Pray to the Saints, to take us into their Patronage,* (n) ſaith the Tridentine Catechiſm. They are ſuppos'd (o) *to help their ſedulous Worſhippers; with God's Domeſticks you have ſo much Interceſſion, as you beſtow Veneration.* But at the riſe of Church-Demonolatry, they did not content themſelves with Prayers and Addreſſes, which may be made to the Martyrs in all places, and whereby their Patronage may every where be obtain'd: but to entitle themſelves, their Churches, Cities and Countries to their ſpecial Patronage, their Method was *the having, keeping, enſhrining, honouring their Reliques;* (with immenſe Veneration,) which are called by the Pontifician Theologers (p) *Sacra Pignora Patronorum noſtrorum, the ſacred Pledges of our Patrons.* (q) For this Reaſon the City of *Rome* was ſuppos'd to be entituled to the Special Patronage of S. *Peter*, becauſe his Body was entomb'd there; for the ſame Reaſon the City *Millain* was ſuppos'd, to have the Special Guardianſhip of S. *Ambroſe*'s Martyrs (or Giants rather; for he repreſenteth them as Giants, and the Giants and the Martyrs as Coætaneous;) and for the ſame Reaſon the ſeveral Cities, Nations and Provinces were ſuppos'd to have their ſeveral Patron-Saints aſſign'd them by Divine Providence, to be their Tutelar Prefects; as *Nola* (*Paulinus*'s City) had the Patronſhip of S. *Felix* having his ſacred Aſhes.

(p) Σωτῆρας καὶ ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων καὶ ἰατροὺς ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ ὡς πολιούχους τιμῶσι καὶ φύλακας. *Ap. Petav. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *l.* 14. *c.* 11. *S.* 16.

(q) Ambroſ. *l.* 10. *Ep.* 85.

(r) *Gr. Nyſſen. in* 40. *Mart. or.* 2.

(s) *Prudent. de Mart. Calagur.*

(t) Bellarm. *de Sanct. Beat. l.* 1. *c.* 18, 20. *v. Le Blanc. Theſ. p.* 364, 366.

(u) H. T. *Abridg. of Chriſt. Doctr. p.* 38.

(w) Bellarm. *ſupr.*

(x) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 217. *ed.* Lond.

(y) S. Aug. c. Fauſt. *l.* 20. & *Ep.* 43.

(z) *In vit. Ædes.*

(a) *Petav. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *l.* 15. *c.* 13. *p.* 584.

(b) Τοὺς γὰρ οἰκείους νεκροὺς ὁ Δεσπότης ἀντεισῆξε τοῖς ὑμετέροις θεοῖς, καὶ τοὺς μὲν φρούδους ἀπέφηνε, τούτοις δὲ τὰ ἐκείνων ἀπένειμε γέρα.

(c) Caſſanæus *Catal. glor. mund. P.* 3. *fol.* 92.

(d) *Ibid. P.* 12. *fol.* 302.

(e) *Le Blanc. Theſ. p.* 379.

(f) *Panſtrat. T.* 2. *l.* 19. *c.* 1. *p.* 771.

(g) Amam. *Antib. Bibl. l.* 2. *p.* 323.

(h) *De cult. ſanct. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

(i) *Stratagem. p.* 345. *ed. an.* 1664.

(k) *Petav. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *l.* 14. *c.* 9.

(l) *Ibid. c.* 10. *S.* 6.

(m) *Sinic. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *p.* 104.

(n) *P.* 561.

(o) *Petav. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *l.* 14. *c.* 11. *S.* 17.

(p) Bellarm. *de reliqu. Sanct. c.* 2.

(q) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 11. *S.* 18. 13. & *c.* 10. *S.* 13. *S.* Ambroſ. *l.* 10. *Ep.* 85.

Inclyta cine ſacro, Cœleſti firma Patrono.

Which Conceit had its Origin from the Pagans Theology, who deify’d their dead Men, (r) *placed in their Temples the Coffins of the Dead, ſuppoſing that Soul-Demons ought to be worſhipped, as having by Divine Providence receiv’d Power for the Service of Men, to be converſant about the Earth, and that ſome Souls are naturally tied by the Body.* They ſuppoſe the Preſences and Powers of Demons at their Coffins and Sepulchres, and that there is a natural Tye between the Souls departed and their Reliques, and therefore they built Temples to them there, where their Bodies and Aſhes were entomb’d; whence the Chriſtian Apologiſts (not imagining, that the Chriſtians would have done the ſame thing) often upbraid them, that their Temples were nothing better than the Sepulchres of dead Men. But this Branch of Heatheniſm the degenerate Chriſtians not only tranſcrib’d, but improv’d, counting the Martyrs Bodies (s) *as Walls, Towers, Rampires, Rocks and Fortreſſes to their Cities, which not only repell’d viſible Enemies, but defeated alſo the Ambuſcado’s of inviſible Fiends; and if God be angry becauſe of our Sins, ſetting before us theſe Bodies* (ſay they,) *we may ſoon reconcile him to the City.* They ſuppos’d, *That the Bones of the Martyrs are of great Efficacy and Power,* (t) *that both their Bodies and their Sepulchres are repleniſh’d with Spiritual Grace, and that by touching them with Faith they might attract from them very great Virtue (in Sanctis divinitus inſita Membris;) that there is a vivificative Virtue in their Bodies as in* Eliſha’s, (u) *and ſuch a ſanative Virtue as in the Handkerchiefs and Aprons brought from* Paul’s *Body, which they communicate to the Garments that touch them; that if any one toucheth the Martyrs Bones, he becometh partaker of ſome Sanctification or Benediction from the Grace reſiding in them, and that the Martyrs Bodies alone can do as much as their holy Souls.* They pretend, that they do not worſhip Images *for any Divinity or Power inherent in them, or repoſing any Truſt in them,* thereby to excuſe themſelves from the Charge of Idolatry: But their worſhip of Reliques is not thus excuſable, therein thoſe Salvo’s can have no place. For the Reliques of the Martyrs have been from the elder Times ador’d, not only becauſe of their near Relation to them, nor only to gain their Special Favour and Patronage, but becauſe they were ſuppos’d to be of *Superlative Sanctity,* and that a Supernatural *ſanctifying,* and *beneficial Miracle-working Virtue and Power* (w) reſided in the Reliques and Sepulchres of the Martyrs. The touching, kiſſing or embracing them was thought to increaſe Sanctity and Charity. No Churches might be built without Reliques, which were thought to Sanctifie them and ſuch as reſorted thither for Devotion; none were thought to touch their Bones or Coffin without ſome ſignal Benediction; or if it was thought (as at *Rome*) intolerable and ſacrilegious, to look upon or touch the Body of a Martyr otherwiſe than by ſome Napkin, Handkerchief or Veil (called *Sanctuarium* or *Brandeum,*) this was ſuppos’d to imbibe from it a Divine and Wonder-working Virtue. If the Garments of the Sick, or Deceas’d were laid upon the Sacred Altars, where the Reliques of the Martyrs were, they had the Virtue of healing the Sick, and raiſing the Dead; the Duſt alſo and Mouldineſs about the Martyrs Sepulchres, and the Oil of the Lamps that were lighted about their Sepulchres, were endowed with ſuch miraculous Virtue, that they raiſed the Dead to Life. Innumerable Miracles of all ſorts (curing Diſeaſes, raiſing the Dead, ſilencing and expelling Devils, feeding the Hungry, clothing the Naked, and ſuch more) are ſaid to have been wrought at the Martyrs Sepulchres on behalf of ſuch as made their Supplication there. Hither Mankind reſorted in vaſt concourſe to pay their Devotions to the Martyrs *for the Relief of their own Neceſſitics and the ſetting forth their Glory*; here they preſented their Oblations of Silver and Gold to obtain their Requeſts, and here they hung up their *Donaria* to the Martyrs in thankfulneſs for their Benefits; the Sepulchre of a Martyr was ſtiled *a publick Phyſic-ſhop, a relief of the afflicted, the ſhelter of the Calamitous, the Table of the Hungry, a common Propitiatory of the whole Earth.* A new Scene of Miracles was requiſite for the founding and introducing the new Religion of Church-Demonolatry; (x) for ſo the Heathens were ſeduc’d to worſhip their *Heroes* by Miracles wrought at the Monuments of the Dead. And becauſe the ſacred Reliques were found to be of Celeſtial Virtue and Divine Wonder-working Power, the main of the Piety and Devotion of ſome Ages (eſpecially the Fifth and Sixth Centuries) was a raking up Reliques, collecting them from remote Countries, diſtributing them to ſeveral Provinces, diſperſing them far and near, richly adorning theſe Celeſtial Gemms and Precioſities (with Silk, Silver, Gold,) tranſlating them to more honourable Places with magnificent Pomp, Pſalmody and all expreſſions of Joy, vowing and making Pilgrimages to viſit the Repoſitories of them, making their Prayers * at or before them; carrying them about in Golden Chariots; lighting Lamps and ſetting up Tapers before them; not only building Churches where the Martyrs Bodies lay (for conſerving their Memory,) but building the moſt magnificent Churches in honour of their Reliques and for the conſerving them; placing them under the Altars, which were called by their Names; preſerving them as their grand Defenſatives, and carrying about them Handkerchiefs (or other things) which had touch’d the Reliques, as Amulets and Antidotes againſt all Evils; kiſſing them and touching their Eyes (or other Parts of their Body) with them; anointing with Oil their Septs and Sepulchres; (y) *the Prieſts doing Service to the ſacred Aſhes by duly frequent Pſalmody* (which is Idolatry to the pitch of Madneſs) and both Prieſt and People paying their holy Worſhip to things inanimate, the Martyrs Altars, Bodies, Sepulchres. Agreeably to the Church-Demonolatriſts of elder Times the Pontificians have an Idolatrous Opinion of an Idolatrous Paſſion of Veneration for, and various Modes of venerating the holy Reliques. They profeſs (z) *to give the worſhip of Dulia and Adoration to the Saints and their Reliques.* And although their Doctors Diſpute, (a) whether the Reliques may be ſeparately worſhipped, or only in mental Conjunction with the Saints whoſe Reliques they are (ſo worſhipping the Saints in them,) yet it is paſt diſpute, that as the Church practiſeth, and her Theologers teach, *the fragments of the Croſs, the Thorns, Spear, Sponge and Nails of the Croſs, the Blood which Chriſt is ſaid to have left behind him upon Earth, and is ſolemnly worſhipped at* Rome *upon* Eaſter-day (with ſuch more Reliques) are conſecrated and ſanctified

(r) Clem *Strom. l* 6. *p.m.* 455. *v.* Baron. *ad an.* 55. *n.* 15.

(s) *V. Mr.* Mede *Apoſt. of the lat. times P.* 1. *ſub. fin. Petav. ſupr. c.* 11. *S.* 10.

(t) *Ibid. S.* 8, & 13.

(u) *Ibid. S.* 2, & 3.

(w) *Ibid. c.* 11, 12, 13. Baron. *ad an.* 55. *n.* 12, 13, 14. *ad an.* 461. *n.* 5. *ad an.* 560. *n.* 7, 8. *ad an.* 594. *n.* 21, 22. & *ad an.* 552. *n.* 22. Cochlæus *de Reliqu. c.* Calvin. *c.* 7. *v.* Maimbourg. *Hiſt. of the League. p.* 338.

(x) Selden *de D Syr. proleg. c.* 3.

* *To add Efficacy to their Prayers.*

(y) *Concil. Epaunenſ. ap. Petav. ſupr. c.* 12. *S.* 14.

(z) Cochlæus *de Reliqu. c.* 5. *S.* 9.

(a) *Vaſqu. in* 3. *Par. Th. Diſp.* 113.

ctified at ſuch a rate, that they muſt be worſhipped with *Latria* the ſupreme Adoration. (*b*) They ſpeak to, and pray as formally and addreſs their Petitions to the *Veronica*, as if they were ſpeaking to Chriſt himſelf. They ſwear by their Reliques in the moſt ſolemn Oaths, thoſe which the Pope exacteth from the Emperor. They pretend to Worſhip them, that they may derive from them (*c*) *gratiam aliquam & ſalutem, ſome ſalutary Grace*; they rub upon them their Roſaries (or other Trinkets,) to imbibe a Divine Virtue from them; almoſt every Papiſt poor or rich, young or old, hath his *Reliquiary* (ſome Relique ſet in Gold, Silver, or Silk,) which he weareth as a mighty Amulet and Defenſative; they ſay, (*d*) that *Conſtantine* incloſ'd in his Statue at *Conſtantinople* a Particle of the true Croſs, ſuppoſing that the City would be kept in ſafety by it, ſo making Reliques the *Teleſms* of Chriſtendom; they carry them in pompous Proceſſion (the People expreſſing the greateſt Devotion imaginable towards them,) expect Rain and fair Weather from them, ſuppoſe them the moſt preſent Remedies againſt Calamities, and agreeably to that idolatrous Truſt which they repoſe in them, they pretend to work all ſorts of Miracles by them, (*e*) to ſtill Tempeſts, ſave from Shipwrack, cure Diſeaſes, profligate Devils. In every *Portatile* Altar ſome Relique muſt be incloſ'd; they place them upon the Altars (there the Reliques are now inthron'd) fall down and adore them; and when the Reliques are by way of Proceſſion (with ſeveral antic Rites) brought from ſome other place into a new Church, to Conſecrate it, the Biſhop and Clergy Sing (*f*) *Riſe up ye Saints of God from your Habitations, ſanctifie the place, bleſs the People, and keep us ſinful Men in Peace.* The Rites of Adoration which the Papacy accounteth due to the Places and Reliques of the Saints, (*g*) *Proceſſions, Genuflections, bowing the Body, Thurifications, Deoſculations, burnings of Lights and Pilgrimages*, far tranſcend the Romans Adoration of their *Ancilia* (which they ſuppoſ'd Pledges of Empire,) the Roman Soldiers Adoration of their Military Enſigns, and the Jews Adoration of that ſacred Relique *the Brazen Serpent*. And if it was Pagan Idolatry to Worſhip the deceas'd Heathen Virtuoſo's, their Sepulchres and Reliques as the Guardians of Mankind, according to *Plato*, ſhall it not be thought Pagano-Chriſtian Idolatry, to Worſhip the deceas'd Chriſtian Virtuoſo's, their Sepulchres and Reliques under the ſame Notion? But in the Worſhip of Reliques degenerate Chriſtendom hath quite outdone ancient Paganiſm; which is one of the greateſt Victories that the Kingdom of Darkneſs hath gain'd upon Chriſtianity, to have lapſed the Chriſtian Church into the Worſhip of dead Men's Bodies, and rotten Bones, and Hair and Nails, and old Shooes and Clouts.

Although the *venerating* the Saints Reliques is an uſeful Method for gaining their Patronage; yet their ſpecial Patronage (as the Pontificians ſuppoſe) may be gain'd without Reliques. For in the Papacy (*h*) many Churches are dedicated to the *Bl. Virgin* and to *Angels* (who have left no dead Bodies behind them) in ſuch places where they have appear'd, or done ſome miraculous thing. (*i*) There is a Feſtival in the Church of *Rome* call'd *the Apparition of* S. Michael, *which is in Memory of his miraculous Apparition on Mount* Garganus, *where by his own appointment* (as they ſay) *a Temple was dedicated to him in Pope* Gelaſius's *time*. He is ſaid alſo (*k*) *to have appear'd in* France *at a place called* Tumba, *charging the Biſhop of the place to build a Church there, and promiſing to inhabit it and to keep the Realm in ſafety.* Of Churches or Chappels thus dedicated to the Bl. Virgin and the Holy Angels they are ſuppoſ'd to be the Patrons; their Images ſet up in theſe Churches are look'd upon as their *Symbolical Preſence, whereby they are repreſented and where they are preſentiated.* Their Churches or Chappels and Images (*l*) are thought the ſacred Seats of their Preſence, beneficent Virtue and Power; where they are eſpecially preſent, to receive Honour and Worſhip, Addreſſes and Oblations, to hear Prayers, grant Petitions, relieve the needs of Men by their Salutary aid, work Prodigies and miraculous Cures (as appeareth from the great Fame of *the Lady of* Loretto, *Diva Virgo Hallenſis* (*m*) S. James *of* Compoſtella and ſuch more;) and to theſe Symbolical Preſences of the Bl. Virgin and other Saints, the doating Devotioniſts of Chriſtendom reſort and make Pilgrimages now, as in the elder times of Church-Demonolatry (before Images were introduc'd) they reſorted to the Sepulchres of the Martyrs, that were then look'd upon as the places of their Reſidence and Special Preſence. Without Reliques the Saints as well as the Holy Angels may be conſtituted Patrons of Churches; (*n*) *For if a Church be built to any Saint in the place where he dwelt, or did any great thing, or if his Image be ſet up in it, or if be only dedicated to him, he becometh the Patron thereof.* But of the Churches thus erected and Dedicated the Saints departed are more than the meer *Tutelar Patrons*, they are ſuppoſ'd to be the *Proprietors* of them (as alſo of thoſe Oblations and *Donaria* that are conſecrated to them;) for the Dedication of them to the Saints and the Vows that are made to them import nothing elſe. (*o*) As when *Laurentius Almeida* before he engag'd in Battel, *Ædem Mariæ Virgini victrici vovit, vowed a Church to* Mary *the victorious Virgin*, his Dedication and Vow importeth, that the Bl. Virgin was intitled to it, as the proper Owner thereof. So the ſeveral Monaſteries and their Appurtenances are ſtiled (*p*) *the Inheritances and conſecrated Goods of the Divi Cœlites*, or Canoniz'd Saints, that were the Founders of the ſeveral Monaſtick Orders. Whence it is manifeſt, that the Patron-Saints in the Papacy are ſuppoſ'd to be ſubordinate *rerum Domini* Lords of Places and Eſtates in this lower World at the ſame rate with thoſe Pagan *Genii*, which were worſhipped as ſubordinate Lords of the place, according to that Inſcription before cited.

JOVI OP. MAX. ET GENIO LOCI.

As Churches, ſo Cities and Nations, the ſeveral Profeſſions and Occupations of Men are ſuppoſ'd to be entitled to the Special Patronage of particular Saints (whom they have in ſingular Veneration and to whom they peculiarly recommend themſelves) without Reliques. The Saints of *particular Cure* in the Papacy are conſtituted ſuch by the choice of their Clients and Suppliants. So the Maſters of Spiritual Inſtitution direct their devout People, (*q*) to chuſe and ſelect one or more out of the number of Saints as their Patrons, through their hands to offer daily all their Works to God, to commend themſelves to their Protection Morning and Evening and at other times, eſpecially in Difficulties and Tentations, and to uſe them as

Witneſſes

(b) *V.* Curcell. *Inſtitut. l.* 7. *c.* 19. *S.* 14.

(c) Baron. *ad ad.* 55. *n.* 9.

(d) Bellarm. *de Reliqu. l.* 2. *c.* 27. *Arg.* 4.

(e) *V.* Dallæum. *de rel. cult. object. l.* 1. *c.* 10.

(f) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 9.

(g) Spelman. *Concil. T.* 2. *p.* 653, 666.

(h) Bellarm. *de cult. ſanct. c.* 4.

(i) H. T. *Abridgm. of Chriſt. Doctr. p.* 215. *v.* Baron. *ad an.* 493. *n.* 43, 44.

(k) Caſſan. *Catal. Glor. mund. P.* 2. *fol.* 84.

(l) Saul *and* Sam. *at Endor. p.* 337, 338, 362, &c.

(m) *In majori veneratione eſt corpus ejus quam alicujus Apoſtoli.* Caſſan. *ſupr. p.* 3. *fol.* 89.

(n) Bellarm. *ſupr.*

(o) Maffeius *Indic. l.* 3. *p.* 117.

(p) Alphonſ. *de* Vargas *de Stratagem Jeſuit. p.* 88, 93, 114.

(q) *Horſt. parad. Anim. Sect.* 2. *p.* 100.

Witneſſes and Directors of their Actions. Agreeably to which groundleſs enormous Phantaſtry (which ſuppoſeth that Mankind have the priviledge of allotting to Saints and Angels their ſeveral Provinces and Patronſhips without asking their Conſent and without Divine appointment) in the elder times of Church-Demonolatry (*r*) ſome Saints were particularly honour'd in this or that Province, not in others; every Biſhop by Cuſtom might have injoin'd his Flock, to do Homage unto Saints of his own Erection: But *Alexander the Third*, and *Innocent the Third* diſguſted this Licence, and made a Decree, that none after their times ſhould be enroll'd in the Catalogue of Saints or publickly worſhipp'd (leaving Men at Liberty to chuſe their private Patron-Saints) without the Approbation of their Succeſſors.

III. They that ſuppoſe thoſe *reigning Superi* the Saints departed, to be the * Pagan-like *Patron-Superiorities* to Mankind, ſuppoſe them qualified with a ſufficiency of *Wiſdom* and *Knowledge*, of *Preſence*, *Power* and *Goodneſs* for ſo great an officiary Dignity. Every Patron-Saint knoweth all his Suppliants, knoweth them all at once, knoweth all their Circumſtances, heareth all their Petitions, (heareth them all at once,) that in the numberleſs Places, Churches, Regions vaſt and vaſtly diſtant (at the Earth's Diameter's diſtance from one another) and in innumerable Exigences by Sea and Land, are addreſs'd to him at the ſame time, heareth all their tacit mental Prayers, and therefore knoweth all their Hearts (at once,) their Virtues and their Vices, and what they are worthy of; knoweth all that is ſaid, thought or done by Mankind for his Honour, taketh ſpecial Care of his Suppliants, provideth for them and affordeth them ſalutary Aid and Relief (by his Intereſt at Court or otherwiſe) in all parts of the World according to their various needs. Such a vaſt unlimited *Science*, *Preſence*, *Providence* the Hypotheſis of Patron-Saints capacitated for *Invocation and for an univerſal unlimited Patronage*, neceſſarily implieth. And this the Pontifician Theologers diſpute for, when they maintain, (*s*) *That the Saints have ſuch a knowledge of us and our Affairs, as capacitateth them for Invocation unconfin'd as to time and place.* But of this they have no Aſſurance, and therefore their Demonolatry cannot be wiſe or reaſonable (for ought they know they Pray to them that cannot hear;) nor are they able to ſalve the Phænomenon, to give an account how their Patron-ſuperiorities become capacitated for unlimited Patronage and Invocation. For this pretenſion, *That the Saints underſtand not their Suppliants Prayers without Divine Revelation, or the Looking-glaſs of the Divine Eſſence, wherein all things are repreſented* (which is a mode of Revelation) is inconſiſtent with the *Saints Symbolical Preſences*, and with this other Principle, (*t*) *That the Prefect-Tutelar Saints* vigilantly inſpect the Places which they preſide over. It is Inconſiſtent with their Suppoſition, that the Saints *attend to their Prayers* (*u*) *are propitious to them in hearing and helping them*, and with their deſire *to find Favour in their Patrons Eyes.* (*w*) For *becauſe S.* Martin *attendeth to the Prayers of the Faithful, giving all ſalutary things, therefore his Suppliants ſeek* (invenire gratiam coram expetito Patrono) *to find Grace or Favour before their deſir'd Patron.* It's manifeſtly Inconſiſtent with their pathetic ſtrains and forms of Addreſs in all their Prayers to the Saints; ſuch as (*x*) *Turn thy merciful Eyes towards us, look upon us, with* Commiſeration *look upon us, hear the Prayers of thy Suppliant-ſervants that implore thine aid; Hear,* O *Lady, be preſent with thy Suppliants and Propitious, apply the Ears of thy Piety to our Prayers, benignly admit them within the* (ſacrarium exauditionis) *ſacred place of hearing, accept what we offer.* O *thou moſt benign Hearer! favourably accept and hear this Supplication, and deſpiſe not our Prayers, Te rogamus, audi nos.* In their Miſſal they make their Prayers to S. *Sebaſtian* in this Form. (*y*) *Regard thy Family, which prayeth with bended Knees. Hear thy praying Servants,* O *Martyr* Sebaſtian. They never Pray unto God, to ſhew or expoſe their Prayers to the Saints; therefore they ſuppoſe either that ſuch a Revelation is no Favour, or that the Saints have no need of it. They manifeſtly recede from the Senſe of the ancient Theologers at the riſe of Church-Demonolatry (to whoſe Hypotheſis the Stile of their Prayers is accommodated;) for thoſe Theologers ſuppos'd, (*z*) that the Saints and Martyrs (like the holy Angels of the Pagan Demons) perform'd the Office of *Legation*, and carry'd the Prayers of their Suppliants to the Divine Majeſty: But they do not (S. *Gregory* only excepted) Theologize after the Pontifician mode touching the Saints ſeeing all things in a Divine Looking-glaſs, or that God performeth the Office of Legation to the Saints, revealeth to them the Prayers of their Suppliants, and telleth them all their Errands, that they may tell them to him again; ſuch antic Rounds and Turns are Inconſiſtent with the Saints interceſſional imploy, and can be nothing better than irreligious and ridiculous Foolery. Thoſe ancient Theologers ſuppos'd, (*a*) that the Saints and Martyrs of themſelves without Divine Revelation heard the Prayers of their Suppliants. (*b*) S. *Hierom* and *Maximus Taurinenſis* ſay, that the Saints *are every where.* (*c*) S. *Baſil* ſaith, that *they ſee every where.* (*d*) *P. Leo M.* ſaith, that *S. Peter extendeth the Care of his Piety every where to the People of God.* Theſe ancient Theologers attributed to all the Saints *Ubiquity* or *Omnipreſence*, *Omniſcience*, *Univerſal* Providence, whereby they ſuppos'd them capacitated for hearing and helping all their Suppliants. And if the Church-Demonolatry was once Idolatry, as it manifeſtly was in thoſe elder times, when thoſe Divine Attributes were aſcrib'd to the Saints, which the Pontifician Theologers will not allow them, they might do well, to inform the World, when it ceas'd to be ſo. *The Patron-Saints in the elder times were Superiorities in Rule and Government, that had much of Deity* (God-propriety) *aſcrib'd to them; therefore they were the Pagano-Chriſtians Deities.*

Of the Pontifician Hypotheſis (that the Saints underſtand their Suppliants Prayers by Divine Revelation) there are two remarkable Branches: The one is, *that a God-intelligence reſideth in the Patron-Saints*; the other is, *that it reſideth in them in ſuch meaſure and manner, as to capacitate them for Invocation and in order to that end.* The firſt Branch is a plain acknowledgment, that the Buſineſs of Invocation is proper to ſuch a Nature, which tranſcendeth meer created intelligent Nature (which ſpoileth the Parallel between their *ora pro nobis*, and the asking an holy Man on Earth to pray for us,) for with-

---

(r) Bellarm. *de ſanct. Beat. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *Dr.* Jackſon *Origin. of Unbelief. ch.* 39.

* *Suum cuique propugnaculo ab cœleſtibus patronis indiderant nomen.* Maffeius *Indic. p.* 558.

(s) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 14. *c.* 17. Bellarm. *de ſanct. Beat. c.* 20.

(t) *Fel. Fab. Hiſt. Suev. l.* 2. *c.* 17.

(u) *Luſitani ſanctum* Jacobum *appellant. Audiit Apoſtolus voces, ac ſuis de more propitius hoſti metum incuſſit.* Maffeius Indic. *p.* 328.

(w) Baron. *ad an.* 560. *n.* 8.

(x) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 9. *S.* 13. *c.* 10. *S.* 13, 14. *Chemnic. Exam. Conc. Trident. P.* 3. *p.* 581, 583, *&c.*

(y) Dallæus *de rel. cult. object. p.* 401.

(z) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 10. *S.* 4, 9, *&c.*

(a) *Chemnic. ſupr. p.* 642, 647.

(b) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 10. *S.* 15. & *c.* 17. *S.* 6.

(c) *T.* 1. *p.* 741.

(d) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 11. *S.* 18.

out Divine Revelation whereby they are rais'd beyond the Pitch and Limits of meer created intelligent Natures, whereby there reſideth in them an Intelligence of a Superiour Rank (or a God-intelligence) they are not (according to theſe Theologers) capacitated for Invocation. This appeareth in their Argumentation for *tacit mental Prayers to Saints.* (e) *Although they have not by Nature the power of beholding our ſecret Thoughts, yet God's Omnipotent Goodneſs may beſtow it upon them. What is more proper to God, than to foreknow and foretel Futurities? yet this Intelligence is communicated to the Prophets. And who will dare to deny, that God can tell the Saints our ſecret Thoughts?* Such inept Argumentations may not ineptly be reproved by *Celſus* a Pagan Demonolatriſt arguing againſt the Chriſtians. (f) *Having nothing to anſwer, they betake themſelves* εἰς ἀτοπωτάτην ἀναχώρησιν, *to the abſurdeſt Refuge, the Divine Omnipotency: but certainly God can do no filthy things; nor if any Man deſireth any flagitious thing, can that be done by God.* (g) *For God is not the Leader or Conducter of Inordinate Deſire and Diſorder, but of the right and juſt ſtate of things in Nature.* This generous Philoſophy out of the Mouth of a Varlet reflecteth upon, not Chriſtianity (as its impure Author deſign'd) but the Religion of the Church of *Rome*, which putteth God upon a continual working the moſt prodigious Miracles, and upon the continual making new Revelations, and thoſe ſuch as are manifeſt diſorder, oppoſite to the right and juſt ſtate of things. It allotteth alſo unto God the Place and Office of an Intelligencer, to ſerve the *Romaniſts* in their Demonolatry (all which are things filthy and flagitious;) and which is ſtill worſe, *there is a ſecond Branch of their Hypotheſis*, that the God-intelligence reſideth in them, ſo as to capacitate them for Invocation, which implyeth, *that the Intelligence of the Secrets of all their Suppliants Hearts reſideth in them conſtantly and unfailingly; that an unlimited Intelligence reſideth in them permanently and uninterruptedly* for the purpoſe of capacitating them for Invocation; and therefore they are raiſed to *God-graduality*, the Rank and Condition of Deities. If God appointeth Prophets, it is neceſſary, that he furniſh them with *a Prophet-conſtitutive Intelligence*, they muſt have Revelations; but theſe are *tranſient* by way of *extraordinary Viſitation*, for a certain time and of ſome few things only. This doth not capacitate a Prophet for Invocation; to capacitate him for Invocation, an unlimited God-Intelligence muſt reſide in him *permanently and uninterruptedly*, which elevateth him to the Rank and Condition of a Deity. So if God appointeth Patron-Saints of unlimited Patronage and Invocation, and that Mankind ſhall be their Suppliants, it is neceſſary, that he be unto them *a ſtanding, continual, perpetual, all-informing Intelligencer*; they muſt be rais'd to ſuch a Perfection and vaſtneſs of Intelligence, that if the Saints have it by vertue of an Intelligent Faculty or Power imparted to them, *the God-intelligent Nature is imparted*; if they have it by way of Revelation only, *the God-graduality* of Intelligence is imparted (and they are made God-Intelligences;) nothing leſs will ſuffice to qualify the Saints for their Patronſhip and Worſhip, and conſequently they are made Deities.

IV. The *Power* that hath been attributed to the Celeſtial Patron-Saints ever ſince the riſe of Church-Demonolatry, is both *an Interceſſional* and an *Authoritative-operative Power*, ſuch as that of the Holy Angels, whom none ſuppoſe, to be meer *Interceſſors* for Mankind. The Church of *Rome* is ſo far from ſuppoſing them ſuch, that ſhe calleth them (h) *Magiſtrates* (the Pagan-like Mundane Magiſtrates) and will have Honours done them, ſuch as Subjects owe to their Princes (but at an higher rate) ſuch as Clients owe to (i) their *Lord-Patrons*, agreeably to her Maxim, *Angelus nobis datus eſt Patronus, an Angel is given us to be our Patron.* She hath appointed a Feaſt of *the Angels Guardian*, and an Office or Devotional Service call'd *Officium Angeli cuſtodis* (the Office of the Angel-Guardian) is a Branch of her Religion, which in great part (notwithſtanding the expreſs Prohibitions of Scripture) is the worſhip of *Tutelar Spirits* and *Patron Ghoſts* after the manner of the Heathen. In this Office ſhe teacheth her Devotioniſts to pray to the Angel-Guardian of the Country *for Soundneſs of Mind and for External Peace*; and to all their Guardian Angels, *to defend them in Battel.* To their particular Angel-Guardian (as his daily Service) they pray (k) *for Illumination, Cuſtody and Government*, (l) and they are taught to repoſe a Religious Truſt in him.

Angele Dei, qui cuſtos es mei, me tibi commiſſum
pietate ſuperna
Hodie illumina, cuſtodi, rege & guberna.

From which devotional Addreſſes to the Guardian-Angels (and ſuch more) a Judgment may be made of that uſual pretenſion of the Pontificians, that there is nothing more in their *Invocation of Saints* than an *Ora pro nobis, a deſiring them to pray to God for us, which may as well be done to the Saints deceas'd as to the Saints alive:* And doubtleſs they are not miſtaken in their Suppoſition of a parity in the Caſe. If we inveſt any Saint alive with the ſame Officiary Dignity, wherewith they inveſt a Saint departed; if we aſcribe to him no leſs *Divinity* or *Deity* than they aſcribe to a Canoniz'd Saint; if the World of Mankind be the Clients and Suppliants of ſuch a Saint alive, at the ſame rate, that they are now the Clients and Suppliants of ſuch a Saint departed, the Invocation of him will be of the ſame criminal Character with the *Romiſh* Invocation of Saints (the *Roman* Emperours were idolatrouſly worſhipp'd alive as well as dead,) and the *Ora pro nobis* of the Clients and Suppliants of ſuch a Patron-Saint alive will be of the ſame Vitioſity with that which is in uſe amongſt the Church-Demonolatriſts. But the *Ora pro nobis* uſual amongſt Chriſtians is of another kind; it is not a Prayer of Clients and Suppliants to their *Lord-Patrons* (*ſanctis debetur honor duliæ tanquam Dominis*, (m) ſaith *Vaſquez*;) nor is it any part of their Devotional Service, nor do they chant it out in Churches in the midſt of their ſolemn God-ſervice (with the ſame ſigns of Obſervance and Devotion wherewith they worſhip God,) nor do we attribute any thing of Deity to the Perſon whoſe Prayers we deſire, or idolize his Patronage (having ſuch a regard and eſteem for it as we ought to have for God's only;) ſo frivolous a Triviality is this Plea for the *Romaniſts* Invocation of Saints, allowing the truth of their Pretenſion, that there is nothing more in it than an *Ora pro nobis.* But the falſity of this Pretenſion is viſible in the Prayers that are made to Guardian-Angels for mighty Benefits. For when they (n) pray to *Michael*

(e) Petav. *ſupr. c.* 17. *ſub. fin.*

(f) Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 5. *p.* 240, & *v. p.* 246, 247.

(g) Ὀυ γὰρ τῆς πλημμελοῦς ὀρέξεως, οὐδὲ τῆς πεπλανημένης ἀκοσμίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας φύσεως θεός ἐστιν ἀρχηγέτης.

(h) *Catechiſm. ex decr. Concil. Trid. p.* 424, 425.

(i) Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 3. *Caniſ. Catechiſm. p.* 169.

(k) Caniſ. *ſupr. p.* 171.

(l) Curcel. *Inſtit. p.* 513. *Vid.* Caſſan. *Catal. glor. mund. P.* 2. *fol.* 50.

(m) *In* 3. *Th. Diſp.* 108. *Qu.* 25. *Art.* 3. *c.* 4.

(n) *Breviar.* Rom. *in Feſt. Apparit. S.* Michael. *Archang.*

the Archangel, *to come to the help of the People of God* (as the Church prayeth;) to *Gabriel* (o) *to proſtrate their Enemies*, to *Raphael*, *to bring a Medicine to the Sick*; when in their Manuals they pray to all good Angels, (p) *to exerciſe their Offices of Charity towards themſelves, their City, and Country, Parents, Friends and Benefactors, directing all their Thoughts, Words and Deeds to the Salvation of their Souls*; when they pray to their Angel-Guardian, (q) *that he would continually protect and guard them from all the Incurſions of the Devil, drive from them the Power of Satan, and when they decline from the Path of Virtue to Vice, endeavour to bring them back by the Path of Juſtice to their Saviour; and when they die, not to ſuffer their Souls to be terrify'd by malignant Spirits, or carry'd into the Pit of Deſperation:* Nothing of this uſual Angel-worſhip is praying to the Angels for Interceſſion. They manifeſtly pray to them as unto great *Authoritative Operative Powers* for the benefits of their Miniſtration, which they are ſuppos'd *operatively* (in the Execution of their Prefectſhip and Patronſhip) to have power to beſtow upon them; *not for the procuring but the diſpenſing Bleſſings.* The meaning of theſe their Prayers may be underſtood from a Dogmatiſt of their own thus diſcourſing touching the Invocation of Angels. (r) *The help which they afford the Faithful of their own accord, why may we not lawfully deſire it of them? and if we may deſire it of them, why may we not ask it of them? which is done by Imploration and Invocation.* There might be ſome colour for their Pretenſion, that they pray to the reigning Saints for nothing more than *Interceſſion*, if they ſuppos'd them furniſh'd with no other Power, whereby they may benefit their Suppliants ſave only an *Interceſſional Power.* But they that make this Reſtriction and Limitation of the Senſe of their Prayers, (s) *diſpute for* (the Pagan-like) *Mundane Magiſtracy of the Saints, ſuppoſe them great Authoritative-Operative Powers, and that a wonder-working Power reſideth in their very Bodies and Reliques.* The Bl. Virgin (t) is ſaid (by the Jeſuit *Coſterus*) to avert Evils and beſtow Goods *by her Prayers, Merits, Authority and Power.* There are Stories innumerable in this Church of the Bl. Virgin's and other Patron-Saints appearing on behalf of their Clients, and for their defence and deliverance in times of danger; and Revelations not a few touching thoſe, whoſe Souls the Bl. Virgin hath deliver'd from Devils, and brought them to Heaven by her Authoritative-Operative Power. So at the riſe of Church-Demonolatry the Saints departed were ſuppos'd, to be the *Tutelar Prefects of Cities and Guardians, to preſide over the World, to take care of and adminiſter terrene things.* The Souls of the Martyrs were ſuppos'd (u) to be preſent at their Memorials or *Martyria*, the places where their Bodies were laid (which were the Churches, to which the Chriſtians did commonly reſort) and elſewhere in the World; to hear the Prayers of their Suppliants, and as Legates to carry them to the Divine Majeſty; and not only to obtain for their Suitors a grant of their Petitions, and to impetrate for them (as Advocates) all ſorts of Benefits and Salutary Helps, but theſe Benefits and Salutary Helps were ſuppos'd to come (w) from their ἐπιφάνεια. *beneficent Preſence and Virtue.* Many Stories we have of their *preſence* and the *apparition* of their Perſons, (x) ſometimes to give order about the diſpoſal of their Reliques, (y) ſometimes to ſignify where their Bodies lay, (z) ſometimes to aſſure Men, that they had pray'd for the pardon of their Sins, and that their Sins were forgiven; (a) ſometimes to diſpenſe Mercies and Benefits, the cure of Diſeaſes, the protection of Cities. The Miracles that are ſaid to have been wrought at the Tombs of the Martyrs, were attributed to their *Preſence* (ἐπιφάνεια) and their *Power* (the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem* prayed to one of the Martyrs in this form, (b) *ut innoteſcat gentibus potentia tua*;) they deſire to be intermix'd with Humane Affairs, and are delighted with the Converſation of Men, (c) as *Procopius* affirmeth; they preſide over us, govern us, are Witneſſes of our Actions, our Aſſociates in travel; we have the Company and Cuſtody of thoſe Tutelar Spirits, as *Theodoret* and not a few of the Theologers of thoſe elder times have diſcours'd. Much of their Senſe may be underſtood from S. *Baſil*'s Panegyrical Oration upon the Martyr *Mamas*. *Be mindful of the Martyr as many of you as have enjoy'd him by Dreams; as many of you as coming to this place have had him an helper to your praying; as many as to whom being called by Name, he ſhew'd himſelf preſent by his Works; as many Travellers as he hath brought back again* (they that return in ſafety, give thanks to the Martyrs, ſaith *Theodoret*;) *as many as he hath rais'd from Sickneſs; as many as he hath reſtor'd their Children unto being now dead; as many as by his means have receiv'd a longer term of Life.* (d) *Having obtain'd miraculous* (or wonder-working) *Grace the Saints are as Channels of it from the moſt Supernal and Divine Fountain, and beſtow it upon thoſe that petition for it,* ſaith another S. *Baſil.* (e) *How wonderful is the Power of God's Mother* (ſaith the ſame Author) *and how far doth it tranſcend ſo many Saints, whom we venerate? for if Chriſt gave his Servants ſuch Grace, as not only to cure the Sick by the touch, but alſo to do the ſame by their Shadows, what Virtue ought we to ſuppoſe in the Mother? muſt it not be much greater than that of the Subjects? as is manifeſt to all. And what wonder is it, if the Saints alive wrought Miracles, ſeeing when they are dead their Power is not dead and buried, but although Stones cover their Bodies, they are able to ſave the calamitous, if they worthily approach them? If to theſe he hath given the Grace of working ſuch wonders, how great* τερφεῖα. *hath he given to his Mother, and with what Gifts hath he made her reſplendent?* According to theſe Ancient Theologers the Patron-Saints are not only *Interceſſional Powers*, but *Wonder-working, Authoritative, Operative Powers:* And as the Bl. Virgin is by the preſent Church ſuppos'd to be *the Diſpenſatreſs of Grace*, ſo ſome ſay, (f) *The Saints are the Members of Chriſt, by whom many times he beſtoweth his Gifts upon us, as a pious Man giveth a Penny to an Indigent Perſon by his Hand, and Counſel by his Tongue, and relieveth the neceſſity of the Indigent by the other Members of his Body: ſo Chriſt by his Members, that is the Saints, giveth Grace.*

The Patron-Saints anſwer to the Heathen (Subordinate) Deities and Demons, and are ſuppos'd (as well as they) to be the Tutelar Preſidents of Places, Things and Perſons; nor are they leſs than the Angelical Powers; therefore they diſpenſe Favours and Bleſſings to their Suppliants * in a way of *Authoritative Operative Power*, as well as procure them by their *Interceſſional.* Their Religioniſts chuſe them for their Tutelar Guardians in the ſame Notion with the Guardian-Angels (uſing them as Wit-

nesses

(o) *Ap.* Chemnic. *p.* 599.

(p) *Manual of Prayers and Lit. printed at* Antwerp *An.* 1656. *p.* 141.

(q) *Key of Paradiſe*, *p.* 356.

(r) Petav. *T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 9. *S.* 4.

(s) Bellar. *de Sanct. Beat. & de Reliqu.*

(t) Le Blanc. *Theſ. p.* 367.

(u) Chemnic. *ſupr. p.* 642.

(w) Petav. *ſupr. c.* 11. *S.* 4. *Baron. ad an.* 561. *n.* 15.

(x) Baron. *ad an.* 262. *n.* 68. & *ad an.* 598. *n.* 26.

(y) Petav. *ſupr. c.* 13. *S.* 2.

(z) Baron. *ad an.* 560. *n.* 3.

(a) *Id. ad an.* 461. *n.* 6. *S.* Aug. *de cur. pro mort. c.* 16.

(b) Baron. *ad an.* 566. *n.* 28.

(c) *Idem ad an.* 552. *n.* 22.

(d) Baſil. *Seleuc. de mirac. S.* Thecl. *p.* 281.

(e) *Idem orat.* 39. *p.* 218.

(f) Conrad. Klingii *loc. com. l.* 4. *c.* 45.

* *Saluti fuit ſuppliciter invocatum B. Virginis auxilium, ejus præſenti ope, deſperatis jam rebus, nullo nautarum miniſterio ſuam in ſedem carina rediit, ita fluctus exhauſti. Votiva dein caſus effigies Goæ in ejuſdem Dei matris templo ſuſpenſa.* Maffeius *Indic. p.* 708.

neſſes and Directors of their Actions, recommending themſelves to their Guidance and Protection, truſting in their Cuſtody and Aid, ſuppoſing that they are preſent with them in their Difficulties, Dangers, and in the Hour of Death;) As *great Authoritative Powers* they have their *Symbolical Preſences*, where they are thought to relieve the Needs of Men by their Salutary Aid, and to work Miracles, and a certain Sovereign Authority is attributed to the Bl. Virgin *the Queen of Heaven*. Now, if the Church, her Theologers, and the Populace of her Communion do ſuppoſe, that the Patron-Saints are not only *Interceſſional*, but great *Authoritative-operative Powers*, what ſhould hinder them from making their Prayers to them (for Bleſſings Temporal or Spiritual) in that Notion and Capacity? from praying to their Guardian Saints as they pray to their Guardian Angels? And ought not their Prayers to be interpreted agreeably to their Hypotheſis, eſpecially when the Terms are incapable of any other Conſtruction? For as *Authoritative-operative Powers* they are ſuppoſed to be Patrons and Patroneſſes to their Clients, and as ſuch they act in the Affairs of the World, and of the Church, and in the Affairs of their Suppliants; and if it is reaſonable, to ſay an *Ora pro nobis* to the Saints in Heaven, becauſe we do ſo to our Brethren on Earth: It is as juſtifiable, to crave an Alms, Help and Deliverance from the Saints in Heaven by way of Operative Power, becauſe we crave ſuch Benefits and Favours from our Brethren on Earth. Agreeably to which Hypotheſis, in the elder times of Church-Demonolatry Prayers were made to the Patron Saints, not only as to *Interceſſional*, but as to great *Authoritative-operative Powers*, as *Gregor. M.* in his Epiſtle to *Leontia* the Empreſs thus addreſſeth to S. *Peter*; (g) *May he be the Guardian of your Empire, a Protector to you on Earth, and an Interceſſor for you in Heaven.* He ſuppoſeth, that his Preſents to Princes (h) *were accompany'd with S.* Peter's *Benediction*, (i) *that S.* Peter *was able to beſtow great things in this Life, and Eternal Benefits with God Almighty.* He wiſheth, that this mighty Patron of his, (k) *may happily conduct his Viſitants to his Temple*; and writing to the Queen of *France*, he maketh this addreſs to him, (l) *May he grant your Excellency to rejoyce in your Off-ſpring here, and after the term of many Years, may he make you to be found perfectly free from all Evils before the Face of the Eternal Judge.* The Stile of theſe *Gregorian* Devotions demonſtrateth, that in the elder times of Church-Demonolatry the Saints were pray'd to, both as *Interceſſional Powers* and as *Tutelar Spirits of great Authoritative-operative Power*. Such were thoſe Spirits, to which *Syneſius* pray'd, and which he look'd upon as *ſubordinate Gods*. (m) *I made my Supplication to the Servitor Deities, ſo many as preſide over the* Thracian *and oppoſite* Chalcedonian *Soil; thy Sacred Miniſters, O King, whom thou haſt crown'd with Angelical Glories. Thoſe Bleſſed Spirits help'd my Prayers and aſſiſted my many Labours.* *Gr. Naz.* (in whoſe Days the Invocation of Saints was far from its height) thus addreſſeth to S. *Cyprian*, (n) *Look down upon us propitiouſly from above, and direct our Word and Life, and feed or co-feed this Sacred Flock, driving away the grievous Wolves, vouchſafing us a more perfect and brighter ſhine of the Holy Trinity.* (o) *Do thou behold us from above* (ſaith he to S. *Baſil*) *and that Thorn of the Fleſh given by God for our Diſcipline, either put a ſtop to by thy Interceſſions, or perſwade the bearing it with Fortitude; and direct our whole Life to what is moſt advantageous. But if we depart this Life, receive us from hence into thy Tabernacles.* S. *Athanaſius* he thus beſpeaketh; (p) *Look on us propitiouſly from above, O Sacred Head, and guide this People; if Times be peaceable, keep me here and govern the Flock with me; but in caſe of War or Trouble, reduce or aſſume me, and place me with thy ſelf.* So the *Seleucian Baſil* prayeth to the Holy Virgin; (q) *Propitiouſly behold us from above, rule us now to lead our lives in peace, and bringing us before the Throne of Judgment without Shame, make us partakers of the Station on the Right-hand.* The preſent Church prayeth to the Bl. Virgin, (r) *Do thou protect us from the Enemy, and receive us at the Hour of Death; Let* Mary *and her Son bleſs us.* (s) *Vouchſafe me to praiſe thee, holy Virgin, give me Strength againſt thine Enemies*; which is plainly an Addreſs to the Bl. Virgin as to a great Authority in the firſt part of it, and as to *a Diſpenſatreſs of Grace* in the ſecond. Nor is this following Prayer of (t) the maſter of Controverſies otherwiſe intelligible: *Oh bleſſed Mary, how intirely did you love your Son Jeſus! Oh cauſe me to love him, to ſerve him, and that nothing in the World may ever ſeparate me from his Holy Grace!* (u) When they *devote themſelves to follow and ſerve her diligently, and ſo to behave themſelves in all their Thoughts, Words and Actions, as never to do any thing diſpleaſing in her or her Son's Eyes*, they ſuppoſe her an Authoritative Inſpector of their Actions (without Divine Revelation;) and when in their dying Hour they cry, *Jeſu Maria, deſiring to die in their bleſſed Arms*, they conſider her as an Authoritative Receiver of their Souls: And when they pray to her, (w) *O bleſſed Virgin, be graciouſly pleas'd to pour forth that Grace of which thou art full*, (x) *make haſt and come to my help in my Straits and Neceſſities; come thou high Lady* Mary, *do thou viſit us, enlighten our diſeaſed Minds by the holy Gifts of Life, by viſiting the People remove the danger of Puniſhment; benignly ſtretch forth thine Hand and direct our Life; in my laſt Day irradiate me with thy ſplendid Face*; they pray for ſomewhat elſe than Interceſſion. In the ſame Stile in former Ages they uſually pray'd to the other Patron-Saints, nor have they alter'd their Stile of Prayer in this preſent Age (for the Sham of new Popery is of no regard;) They pray to thoſe Tutelar Spirits as unto *great Authorities* and *Tutelar Operative Powers*, (y) *to take them into their faithful Cuſtody and Patronage, and the Boſom of their Mercy; to keep them under their Protection from all Evils; to guide them and govern their Sences by their Regency; to be with them in Tribulations and Temptations; to viſit them in Weakneſs, and in the end of their Life to come to their help againſt all Enemies; to be preſent with them and receive them at the Hour of Death, and to carry their Souls to Eternal Joys.* The *Aid* and *Interceſſion* are uſually conjoyn'd in their Devotions as things diſtinct (ſo the Council of *Trent* reckoneth them;) as when they pray to the holy Mother of God, (z) *at the Hour of Death I beſeech thee depart not from me, that by thy Prayers and Protection I may be ſafe.* The extravagant Authority which for ſeveral Ages hath been attributed to S. *Peter* in the Weſtern Church involveth a Suppoſition, that

(g) *Ipſe ſit veſtri cuſtos imperii, ſit vobis protector in terra, ſit pro vobis interceſſor in cœlo.* Ep. l. 11. c. 44.

(h) *Ibid. l.* 9. *c.* 60.

(i) *l.* 8. *c.* 31.

(k) *l.* 7. *c.* 77.

(l) *Hic excellentiam veſtram in ſobole gaudere concedat, & poſt multorum annorum curricula, à malis omnibus abſolutam ante conſpectum æterni faciat Judicis inveniri.* L. 5. c. 105.

(m) Ἱκέτευσα θεὺς Δρηστῆρας ὅσοι γόνιμον Θρήκης κατέχουσι πέδον, &c. *Hymn.* 3. *n.* 460.

(n) *Orat.* 18. *in fin.*

(o) *Or.* 20. *in fin.*

(p) *Or.* 21. *in fin.*

(q) *Orat.* 39. *in fin.*

(r) *Offic. parv. B.* Mar.

(s) *Offic. B.* Mar. *in Sabbat.*

(t) Bellarm. *Catech. p.* 75.

(u) *Key of Paradiſe*, p. 476, 477.

(w) Horſt. *Parad. An. Sect.* 7. *p.* 446.

(x) Chemnic. *ſupr. Par.* 3. *p.* 586, 589, &c.

(y) Chemnic. *Ibid.*

(z) *Manual of Pray. and Lit. printed at* Antwerp. 1658. *p.* 140.

that he ſtill retaineth his Apoſtolic Authority and Principality upon Earth; and upon the founding his Church at *Weſtminſter* (*a*) he is ſaid to have appeared to a Fiſherman, telling him; *That he had dedicated the Church in his own Name, and prevented the Epiſcopal Benediction by the Authority of his own Sanctification; that he would often viſit the place and afford his Preſence to the Prayers of the Faithful, and open the Gate of Heaven to ſuch as liv'd ſoberly, piouſly and juſtly in this World.* Agreeably to this conceit of ſenſleſs Superſtition (*b*) the Church prayeth to St. *Peter* and to the Apoſtles in common, *to looſe us from our Sins, to heal us of our Spiritual Diſeaſes, to open Heaven to us,* by their *Command, Precept* and *Authoritative-Power,* expreſſing the Notion of their Apoſtolic Authority (as plainly as words can ſpeak it,) which ſhe ſuppoſeth them ſtill to retain and exerciſe.

V. In Church-Demonolatry the reigning Saints are addreſs'd to *as Supernal Powers, that can be ſuch powerful Patrons to their Suppliants as none but God can be to his.* (*c*) *The Mountains* from whence their help cometh, (*d*) the *Walls, Bulwarks, Fortreſſes, Towers, Protectors, Guardians* and *Defenders* of their Cities and Countries; (*e*) *the conjoin'd Towers that ſecure their Country from the Incurſion of Enemies;* (*f*) *the Pillars, Rocks and Towers of the Church* (becauſe they Protect and Support it,) *their Saviours and Phyſicians* (as we have ſeen from *Theodoret,*) *ſuch Supernal Powers which can fulfil the Petitions and Deſires of their Suppliants, and actually anſwer their Prayers,* as *Prudentius* ſaith, (*g*) in his Hymn touching S. *Laurence.* Their Honorary Names denote the tranſcendent greatneſs of their Power (and who would Pray to them that cannot Save, or invoke their aid that cannot Help?) which tranſcendency of Power is in the Bl. Virgin Singular and Supereminent; whence ſhe is intituled (*h*) *the Mountain of Mountains, the ſwift invincible Defence; the Hope, Safeguard and Sanctuary of Chriſtians,* as the Greeks ſtile her in their *Preces Horariæ,* and in this manner invoke her Aid. (*i*) *O thou Virgin Mother of God, thou impregnable Wall, thou Fortreſs of Salvation!* A mighty Confidence may reaſonably be repos'd in their Protection, that can be ſuch an impregnable Safeguard to their Clients; and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that if they can be ſuch *Patrons, Proviſors, Protectors, Phyſicians, Guardians, Saviours, Rocks* and *Bulwarks* to their Suppliants, to all their Suppliants throughout the World; If they can anſwer all their Prayers, perform all their Requeſts, furniſh all their Wants, and do all manner of good Turns for them; if they can work Miracles, and Effect for their Suppliants whatever they pleaſe (as the Maſter of the Sentences ſaith, (*k*) *If they will, God willeth,*) they are potent Patrons at an immenſe rate of Power, nothing leſs than *Omnipotent,* which if we ſuppoſe, there can be no incongruity in the ſtile of the Church-Demonolatriſts Prayers, we may Pray to them for all ſorts of Bleſſings with great Reaſon and Congruity, as the Church ſuppoſeth in her Exhortation from S. *Bernard.* (*l*) *Let us embrace the footſteps of* Mary, *and let us caſt our ſelves at her bleſſed Feet with moſt Devout Supplication, let us hold her and not let her go, till ſhe Bleſs us, for ſhe is able.* The Church-Demonolatriſts therefore ſuppoſe, that in praying to Saints they pray to ſuch Supernal Powers, which are able to furniſh them with the Bleſſings which they Pray for; whence they court their Favour in the moſt pathetic Strains; they make their Prayers and lift up their Cries to them, as unto thoſe that have Power to do the Deed for them, and effect the thing deſir'd; they Pray to them for all ſorts of Bleſſings, and they Pray in the Phraſe of the Church-Demonolatriſts of the elder times, (*m*) *Redona quod rogamus, give us back what we ask.* They ſuppoſe therefore, that the Saints can be in ſome Senſe *the Donors of all ſorts of Bleſſings to them;* as appeareth alſo from the Expoſition which they make of the Church's Senſe in her Prayers. (*n*) *It is lawful to ſay,* S. Peter *have Mercy on me, ſave me, open to me the Gate of Heaven, give me health of Body, give me Patience, give me Fortitude, provided we underſtand it thus; Salva me & miſerere mei orando pro me; Da mihi hoc & illud tuis precibus & meritis: Save me and have Mercy on me by praying for me; give me this and that by thy Prayers and Merits.* This mode of expounding the Church's Senſe ſuppoſeth, that they are Donors of the Bleſſings pray'd for, not by *proper formal Donation,* but by their meritorious Mediation effective of the proper formal Donation. It aſcribeth to the Saints the Power of doing the Effect, but without *the Authoritative-operative Power;* ſo that a Suppliant prayeth to his Patron-Saint, to give him Chaſtity, Patience, or other Celeſtial Gifts, not ſuppoſing, that he can give it to him as having the *Authoritative-operative Power of proper formal Donation,* but ſuppoſing that he can *do the Deed or Effect for him* (the thing which he deſireth) *make him Chaſt and Patient,* by his meritorious *Interceſſional Power,* which is ſo ſurely and ſo potently Effective of the proper formal Donation, that in juſt computation it is as much as *a proper formal Donation of the Bleſſing deſir'd,* and therefore is uſually ſo expreſs'd (as if it was the proper formal Donation) in the Church-Demonolatriſts Prayers. (*o*) *Dona Confer Cæleſtia, give Celeſtial Gifts, mites fac & caſtos, make us Meek and Chaſt.* This mode of expounding the Church's Prayers is not allowable in many Inſtances (as when they beg (*p*) *the Bl. Virgins Preſence, and pray to the Sweet Lady, to come and take away their Evils;* they cannot be ſuppos'd to deſire, that *ſhe would be preſent and come to take away their Evils by her Merits and her Prayers;* (for ſo to take away their Evils, is a work to be done in Heaven, not by coming and being preſent here on Earth;) but allowing this Expoſition of the Church's Prayers, to be true and genuine (in ſeveral Inſtances;) it manifeſtly containeth an acknowledgment of this Principle, *that the Saints can be Donors of all manner of Bleſſings to their Suppliants* (for they that can be Donors of all manner of Bleſſings to their Suppliants by *their Merits and Prayers,* can be Donors of all manner of Bleſſings to them;) *they can be Donors of all manner of Bleſſings to their Suppliants either by an Authoritative-operative Power of proper formal Donation, or by a Power* (their meritorious Interceſſional Power) *which as to all the purpoſes of a Suppliant is equivalent thereto;* for it is the having the benefit, not the mode of its Donation, which is the Suppliants concern. As to the Suppliants concern, this Principle aſcribeth to the Patron-Saints no leſs Power, than if they were ſuppos'd *the great Lords of Affairs;* for they can effect what they pleaſe (whence the Jeſuits in *Germany* pleaded, (*q*) that S. *Benedict* had

(a) Baron. *ad annu* 610. *n.* 11.

(b) *Breviar. Rom. in Feſt. Cathedr.* S. Petr. *& in Commun. Apoſtol.*

(c) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 9. *S.* 13, 14.

(d) *V. Mr.* Mede *Apoſt. of the lat. times p.* 1. *ſub fin*

(e) *S.* Baſil. *Hom.* 20 *p.*533.

(f) *S.* Chryſoſt. *T.* 5. *p.* 536.

(g) *Quæ ſit poteſtas credita, & muneris quantum datum, probant Quiritum gaudia quibus rogatus annuis.*

(h) *Petav. ſupr.*

(i) *Mr.* Mede *ſupr.*

(k) *l.* 4. *diſt.* 45.

(l) *Offic.* B. Mar. *in* Sabbat.

(m) *Brev. Rom. ſec. Die infr. Octav. Nativ. B.* Mar.

(n) Bellarm. *de ſanct. Beat. l.* 1. *c.* 17.

(o) *Offic. parv. B.* Mar.

(p) *Ibid.*

(q) Alphonſ. *de* Vargas *Stratagem Jeſuit. p.* 57.

had loſt all Right to thoſe Monaſteries of his, that were taken from him by the Hereticks, and were ſince regained from them, becauſe he ſuffer'd them to be taken from him; whereas he might have obtained of God what he would by his Prayers;) it aſcribeth to them the incommunicable Glories and Excellencies of God (making them equivalent to God, praying to them in ſuch form of words which as to the form of words is a making them Gods;) it maketh them of no leſs uſe to their Suppliants than God is to his (furniſhing them with what they want, Life, Health, Pardon, Grace, Glory;) And it entitleth the Patron-Saints to all manner of Religious Worſhip and Service. For upon this account, becauſe the Saints can furniſh their Suppliants with all things which they want, or can be Donors of all manner of Bleſſings to them (by their Merits and Prayers or otherwiſe) Mankind (not without Reaſon) become their Clients and Suppliants, ſeeking them with Faith and Hope, placing their Affiance in them, and exerciſing their dependence upon them with Love and Gratitude, having recourſe to them in all their Wants and Dangers, making Vows to them in their Diſtreſs, recommending themſelves to their Protection, devoting themſelves to their Service, reſigning up their All to them, making their Prayers to them for the furniſhing their Wants, the Donation of all Goods and deliverance from all ſorts of Evils, giving thanks to them as to the Authors of their Bleſſings communicating to them Gods Prerogatives (making them their *Rocks*, *Mountains*, *Fortreſſes*, *Saviours*,) and ſerving them with the other Branches of Religious Worſhip. The Pontificians therefore condemn themſelves by their Apology for their Saint-Invocation (*excuſando exprobramus, we condemn our ſelves by our Excuſes:*) Nor have they better ſerv'd their cauſe by the diſtinctions which they have fram'd, deceiving themſelves by Equivocation of words. (r) *That we ought not to Pray to the Saints abſolutely and ultimately, as we Pray to God, as if what we ask was to be impetrated of them and fulfilled by them.* (s) *Prayer may be directed to one two ways: One way to have impletion by him, another way to be impetrated by him.* But if what we ask is not to be impetrated of the Saints, why do they pray them to give it (to give it by their Merits and Prayers?) If effectual Impetration is that which they mean by Donation, then their Prayer is directed to the Saints, to have *Impletion* by them; and if they pray to the Saints *to do the Deed for them* (by their Mediatory Power) what is this but *Impletion?* Doubtleſs, their meaning is, they impetrate all manner of Bleſſings at the Saints Hands, as well as at God's Hands, but not upon the ſame account, nor in the ſame way. They impetrate them at God's Hands upon the account of his *Authoritative-operative Power of proper formal Donation, and in the way of diſpenſing them:* But they impetrate them at the Saints Hands (whom they call (t) the Senators of the Celeſtial Court) only *upon account of their Intereſt at Court and in the way of procuring them.* As if a Criminal ſhould kneel down to a potent Favourite at Court, and pray to the Courtier to give him his Pardon, Life and Safety, not meaning *by a proper formal Donation, but by his Intereſt at Court.* But if any ſhould pray to a Courtier in ſuch a ſtile, the ſtile of his Prayers would be thought much more than a begging his Interceſſion, it would be thought a making that Courtier King: So the Stile of the Church-Demonolatriſts Prayers muſt be thought much more than an *ora pro nobis*; it is a making the Saints Gods and cannot be excus'd from Blaſphemy and Idolatry.

VI. The Prayers of Patron-Saints are ſaid to have their Power and Prevalency upon the account of their *great Merits* (which therefore are a Branch of their Power,) whereby they are ſuppos'd to be qualified both to be *Mediators of Interceſſion themſelves*, and alſo to have *their Merits and Interceſſion* made uſe of in our Prayers. For (u) *Sinners being deficient in Merit* are taught to *have recourſe to the Interceſſion and Merits of the Saints; they flee to the Saints to be ſaved by their Prayers and Merits;* and the Saints are ſaid *to offer their Prayers and Merits for the obtaining our Salvation, ſo that God is mercifully reconcil'd to us becauſe of their Prayers and Merits* (w) *and giveth us many Benefits by their Merit and Favour.* The Church repoſeth ſuch Affiance in their Merits, that ſhe prayeth for all her Bleſſings Secular and Spiritual through their *Merits and Interceſſion*, and the Prayers of this Form every where occur in her publick Service. (x) *By the Prayers and Merits of B.* Mary *always a Virgin and all the Saints let the Lord bring us to the Kingdom of Heaven.* Sometimes ſhe prayeth, to have them her *Interceſſors* and *Defenſors* (as touching S. *Ambroſe*; (y) *Grant us to have him our Interceſſor in Heaven*;) which ſheweth, that ſhe looketh upon them as Interceſſors by Divine Conſtitution and appointment. Sometimes ſhe expreſſeth the mighty Truſt which ſhe repoſeth in their Interceſſion; as, *Let thy Church rejoice, O God, which truſteth in the Suffrages of B.* Agapetus *the Martyr.* Sometimes ſhe maketh acknowledgment, that the Benefits which ſhe hath obtained (as help out of Tribulation) are from the Merits of the Saints whom ſhe commemorateth; and oftentimes ſhe prayeth, that her Oblations (even the Sacrifice of the Maſs) may be accepted *by the Prayers and Merits of the Saints.* Agreeably to her Senſe one of her Divines ſaith; (z) *Becauſe we are apt to be afraid of God, and therefore of the Divine Majeſty of the Son, he would have us to have a Mother, whoſe Love is wont to be more tender, to be our Advocate, to reconcile us to her Son, and by whom our Prayers and Sacrifices might be offer'd, that by this Ladder we might go unto God without trembling fear, by the Mother to the Son, and by the Son to the Father.* So the Greek Church prayeth agreeably to the Senſe of the Latin Church, (a) *Thou, O God, art holy, holy, holy; for the ſake of the Mother of God have Mercy upon us.* (b) *The Hebrews us'd to pray, that God would be beneficent to the People for the Fathers ſake,* Abraham, Iſaac, Jacob *and* David: *But now a new way of praying is taught, through Chriſt.* Joh. 14. 13. Such is the new and Chriſtian way of praying: But the Church-Demonolatriſts have excogitated another new way of praying, *for the ſake of the Mother of God*, whom they account their paramount *Advocatreſs* (the Advocatreſs of Sinners, and in Conſort with her they have introduc'd into Religion ſwarms of Courtier-Mediators and Advocates beſides the Royal Mediator Chriſt Jeſus. Which Hypotheſis of theirs communicateth to the Patron-Saints not a few of the incommunicable Prerogatives of our Royal Mediator. For the Name of *Patron*, *Mediator*,

(r) *Fran. à Sanct. Clara probl.* 37.

(s) *Aquin.* 22. *Qu.* 83. *Art.* 4.

(t) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 14. *c.* 9. *S.* 14.

(u) *Chemnic. ſupr.* p. 578, *&c.*

(w) *Catechiſm. ex Decr. Concil. Triden.* p. 426.

(x) *Precibus & meritis B.* Mariæ *ſemper Virginis & omnium ſanctorum, perducat nos Dominus ad regna cælorum.* Offic. B. *Mar.* in Sabbato.

(y) Dallæus *de rel. cult. object.* p 402, 403, *&c.*

(z) Biel in *Feſt. Aſſumpt. Ser.* 2. *&* in *Feſt. Nativ. Ser.* 2.

(a) *Mr.* Smith's *Account.* p. 232

(b) Grot. *Not.* in Joh. 14. 13.

Advocate and *Interceſſor*, denoteth an *Officiary Dignity*; and if the Bl. Virgin and the other Saints are *Patrons* and Mediators by Divine Conſtitution and Appointment, they muſt neceſſarily be ſuch in the Nature and Notion of an *Officiary Dignity*, which is the incommunicable Prerogative of the Son of God. And as none but Chriſt can have the Officiary Dignity of Mediator and Advocate, ſo to *reſide at Court* in the Quality and Condition of ſuch an Officiary Dignity is another incommunicable property of our Royal Mediator; for it belongeth not to any *He* or *She-Saint*, to appear in the Preſence of God for us as our Patron and Advocate, and by his Patronage to recommend us to God. Chriſt is alſo robb'd of his ſole Mediatorſhip, and his Mediatorſhip is diſparag'd as inſufficient by introducing a Fry of Potent Mediators, which are as much *Saviours of Interceſſion* (tho' not of Redemption) as Chriſt himſelf is. For as they have their Clients and Suppliants in common with Chriſt, ſo there is nothing which Chriſt as a *Saviour of Interceſſion* doth or can do for his Clients, but the Patron-Saints do and can do the ſame for theirs; and therefore they make them no leſs than *Magnificent Interceſſional Saviours.* They make them their Saviours at ſuch a rate, as is an heinous violation of our Saviour's Honour; and the enormous *Affiance* and *Hope* which theſe blind Superſtitioniſts repoſe in the Patronage, Court-intereſt, Merits and Interceſſion of their imaginary Patrons (to which they have recourſe in all Wants and Dangers Secular and Spiritual; to which they aſcribe the Benefits that they receive, and on which they place their Dependence; promiſing themſelves (*c*) that the Saints will obtain for thoſe that recommend themſelves to their Patronage Remiſſion of Sins and Salvation) can be nothing leſs than the Crime of Idolatry. A like Criminal and Oppoſite to the very Frame of our Religion is their extravagant Conceit, *that every Patron-Saint is Merit, Righteouſneſs, Acceptation with God to his Client.* (*d*) *That the Bl. Virgins Virtue and Grace compenſateth our Faults and Vices,* (*e*) *her Integrity excuſeth with her Son the fault of our Corruption, her acceptable Humility impetrateth Pardon for our Vanity, her copious Charity covereth the multitude of our Sins, and her glorious Fecundity conferreth upon us a Fecundity of Merits.* The Church (as the ſtile of her Prayers demonſtrateth) hath recourſe to her Patron-Saints for *Merit, Righteouſneſs, Acceptation with God*; which implieth, that Chriſt is not ſufficient to furniſh her; and if theſe may be had in the Saints, they are raiſed to a Chriſt-like Excellency and Tranſcendency. As if they were Mediatory Heads of their People, the various Honours which are done them and their Reliques, are ſaid to be deſign'd for this end, (*f*) *that their Clients may Conſociate with their Merits*, and ſhare in them, which was one of the Conceits of the elder times; for S. *Auſtin* reporteth, (*g*) that in his Days at the Feſtival Commemoration of the Martyrs many brought their Meats to be ſanctified by the Martyrs Merits. Beſides the Phantaſtry and Sillineſs which is viſible in theſe Conceits, and their injurioufneſs to the Souls of Men (which are deluded with falſe Reliances,) they are intolerably injurious to our Saviour; for if the Merits and Interceſſion of the Patron-Saints are made the Ground and Reaſon of the acceptance of our Perſons and Services with God, of the audience of our Prayers and of his Donation of Benefits, are they not ſubſtituted in Chriſts ſtead? Which is plainly demonſtrable from one ſort of thoſe Prayers, which the Church maketh for Bleſſings, *through the Merits and Interceſſion of the Saints.* The Prayers of this kind are ſome of them made to God the Father, at the end of which the Church ſubjoineth (*per Dominum*) *through our Lord.* As in the Canon of the Maſs; *communicating and reverencing the Memory of all thy Saints, by whoſe Merits and Prayers grant that in all things we may be guarded by thy Protection and Help through Chriſt our Lord.* Another ſort of theſe Prayers are made, not through, but to Chriſt our Lord; and ſo the Church prayeth, (*h*) *That by the aid of S.* Peter's *Interceſſion we may be freed from the Bond of our Sins, and that by the Merits of S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *we may obtain the Glory of Eternity.* The Prayers of the firſt ſort Aſſociate Courtier-Mediators with the Royal Mediator, and rob him of his ſole Mediatorſhip; the Prayers of the ſecond ſort put him out of the place of Mediator; his place in this Religion of Church-Demonolatry is the place of God the Father (whoſe Propriety it is, not to be acceſſible but by a meritorious and interceſſional Mediator,) and the Courtier-Mediators are introduc'd into and ſubſtituted in his place, according to that Maxim of S. *Bernard*; *opus eſt Mediatore ad Mediatorem, there needeth a Mediator to the Mediator.* In *Simeon Metaphraſtes* there are ſeveral Prayers of the Martyrs (forg'd by thoſe abominable Lyars, the Eccleſiaſtic Legendaries,) wherein they Pray to Chriſt, *that whoſoever ſhould Pray unto him in their Names, or ask Salvation and Mercy through them, or Worſhip the Tabernacle of their Body*, might obtain whatever they ask; and Chriſt is ſaid to have come down and ſpoken to thoſe new Mediators, the Martyrs, and to have aſſur'd them, that what they deſir'd ſhould be done. So in an ancient Saxon Manuſcript S. *George* at his Martyrdom is ſaid to have pray'd to the Lord, (*i*) *that whoſoever ſhall in any Danger either by Sea or elſewhere, uſe my Name, thou wilt be merciful to him. Then came a Voice from Heaven ſaying, come thou bleſſed, and whoſoever ſhall in any Danger or Place call on my Name through thee, him will I hear.* To authorize this ſort of Praying (through the Merits of the Saints) the Church-Demonolatriſts argue; that *Moſes* prayeth * alledging the Merits of Saints deceas'd; *Remember Abraham, Iſaac* and *Iſrael thy Servants.* God promiſeth to Protect *Jeruſalem for his Servant* David's *Sake, and ſheweth Mercy unto Thouſands of them that Love him.* But theſe places of Scripture which they alledge, are impertinent to their Caſe, for they concern only Temporal Bleſſings, in reſpect of which Concernments God (uſually) conſidereth Men, and proceedeth with them, not meerly in their *Perſonal*, but in their *Politic* and *Relative* Capacity (their Family or National Capacity;) the Seed of the Righteous are bleſs'd for their ſake, a ſort of Righteouſneſs accrueth to them from their Parents; and the Poſterity of Evil-doers fare the worſe for their ſake, a ſort of Criminality accrueth to them from their Parents. But there is no ſuch Relation between the Saints Religioniſts and their fictitious Patrons: nor doth God conſider and proceed with Men in ſuch *Politic Relative* Capacity in reſpect of their Spiritual and Eternal Intereſts.

VII. The

(c) *Manual of Pray. and Lit. printed at* Antwerp An. 1658. *p.* 352.

(d) Biel *in Feſt.Nativ. Ser.* 1.

(e) Laurent. Surii Homil. in Feſt. Annunciat. Ser. 3.

(f) Caſſandr. *conſult. de ven. Reliqu.*

(g) *De C. D. l.* 8. *c. ult.*

(h) *Brev. Rom. in Feſt. & in Octav.S.S. Apoſt.* Petr. *&* Paul.

(i) Selden. *Titles of Hon. P.* 2. *p.* 673. *ed.* 3.

* Bellarm. *de ſanct. Beat. l.* 1. *c.* 19. *Fr. à ſanct. clar. probl.* 37.

VII. The *Goodneſs* or *Beneficialneſs* for which the Patron-Saints are celebrated in Church-Demonolatry, is *the operative Goodneſs of their Nature, the immenſity of their good Works, the beneficialneſs of their Patronage, and unbounded Beneficence to their Suppliants.* They are ſaid (*k*) *to have a Commiſeration for Sinners, to incline to our Prayers with a favourable Piety, and to receive us into their Bowels, ſo often as we knock at their Door with a worthy Intention.* (*l*) *It is lawful to Pray to the Saints, to have Mercy or Commiſeration upon us, for they are moſt merciful; therefore we may Pray them, that being mov'd with the Miſery of our Condition, they help us by their Favour with God and Deprecation.* So frail and weariſom Mortality mindful of its own infirm Condition (as *Pliny* ſpeaketh) is taught in its Neceſſities (*m*) *to flee to the Grace, the help and aid of the Saints*; and more eſpecially to flee for refuge to the Bl. Virgin (*n*) *under thy Patronage we flee, holy Mother of God: Deſpiſe not our Prayers in our Neceſſities, but always deliver us from all Dangers, O glorious and bleſſed Virgin.* This Patronage of the Saints is אליל *nothing*, as an Idol is; for by the Inſtitution of God-Society (or Saint-Society) we are to live in Society with the Saints as Fellow-Citizens and Fellow-Servants, with God and our Redeemer as our *ſole beneficent Patron-ſuperiority.* The Church-Demonolatry therefore hath erected an Idol by ſetting up the Patronage of the Saints: A Patronage that muſt be gain'd by Offices of Piety towards them, as the Divine Patronage muſt be gain'd by Piety towards God; a Patronage that ingageth Men to diligence in the Service of the Saints, as pious People are diligent in the Service of God; a Patronage which is ſuppos'd to be *All-beneficial*, nor can God's own Clients expect more from his Patronage, than the Saints Religioniſts expect and promiſe themſelves from theirs, and therefore muſt be thought not leſs deſerving Affiance, Love and Gratitude, nor leſs deſirable than that of God and Chriſt, as being no leſs beneficial. For the Church (communicating a principal Divine attribute to a Creature) intituleth the Bl. Virgin with Reſpect to her Patronage (*o*) *omnia omnibus, All unto All.* If a Saint is a beneficent Patroneſs to all her Suppliants throughout the World and relieveth all their needs (whether by her Mediatory Power or otherwiſe, ſhe is of immenſe *Goodneſs and Beneficialneſs,*) as the *Ave-Mary* Religioniſts uſually ſay of their Patroneſs, (*p*) *The Earth is full of her Mercy.* The ſame immenſity of good Works a Greek Marianolatriſt aſcribeth to the Saints in general, (*q*) *Although their Reliques are circumſcrib'd in their Sepulchres, yet their Salutary Virtue is not circumſcrib'd under Heaven.* Such ſuperlative Beneficence is viſible in thoſe Miracles, which are ſaid, to have been wrought at the Monuments of the Martyrs in the elder times (which firſt begat a Perſwaſion in the Minds of Men, that the Matyrs were willing and able to help them; for the Devotioniſts of thoſe times that in vaſt concourſe frequented the Tombs of the Martyrs, (*r*) *prayed for and obtain'd Safety for themſelves and their Cattel; the Sepulchres of the Martyrs were a Refuge for the calamitous, an Haven of Tranquility in the troubles and tempeſts of Life, where penuries were relieved, Diſeaſes were healed, minacious Rulers were placated,* and the Devils (neither ſcar'd nor hurt) *were made to roar.* The Petitions of the Pagano-Chriſtians of thoſe elder times were of the ſame Nature with the popular Pagans Religion (whoſe principal Deſign in their God-ſervice was worldly Proſperity and to be deliver'd from worldly Calamities,) as they are deſcrib'd by S. *Baſil* and *Theodoret* to this Senſe: (*s*) *They that are in Health and Proſperity betake themſelves to the Martyrs for the Conſervation of it; they that conflict with a Diſeaſe or any Affliction flee to them for Deliverance. The Religious Woman prayeth to the Forty Martyrs for her Children, her Husbands return from a Journey, his Health in Sickneſs. They that are barren and ſuch as have no Children, pray to have them; and they that have them pray to have them kept ſafe and ſound. And they that have a Journey to go, pray the Marytrs to be their Companions and Guides,* who are ſaid to have been ſo officious to their Clients in thoſe days, (*t*) *that none of them made his Prayer in vain.* Such a Fame ſpread abroad touching the Beneficence and Salutary aids of the Saints and Martyrs, could not fail to attract Suppliants innumerable, and effectually lapſe the Church into Demonolatry. But as the Pagans over-officious Demons were not always alike officious, their Suppliants were ſometimes forc'd (*u*) to treat them minaciouſly, (that if they deny'd their Requeſts, *they would rend the Heavens, divulge the Secrets of* Iſis, *or that in* Abydos, *ſtop* Baris, *diſperſe the Members of* Oſiris *to* Typhon: So thoſe impure Demons that play'd their Pranks, and wrought counterfeit Miracles under the Name of Chriſtian Martyrs, were ſometimes threatned into compliance by their Clients and Suppliants. As when the Church of *S. Metrias* was robb'd by a potent Courtier and his Accomplices, the Biſhop of the Church thus beſpeaketh the Patron-Saint. (*w*) *No Candle ſhall be lighted here* (at the Sepulchre,) *nor ſhall there be any ſinging of Pſalms, moſt glorious Saint, unleſs thou firſt avenge thy Servants of their Enemies, and reſtore to thy Holy Church the things that are violently taken away.* Such minacious forms of ſupplicating the Patron-Saints (*x*) are not unuſual in the Church of *Rome*: But uſually in the elder times the Church-Demonolatriſts met with ſuch officious Spirits that eaſily gratify'd their Deſires touching ſecular Intereſts though never ſo fooliſh and unreaſonable (a Sign that they were no good Spirits;) which becauſe they ſuppos'd the Spirits of the Martyrs, and that all the great things that were done for their Suppliants, (*y*) *were the Benefits of the Martyrs, done by their Powers,* they preſum'd that ſuch Beneficent Supernal Powers were not unable to Patronize their Suppliants as to their Spiritual and Eternal Intereſts. And therefore they promis'd themſelves from their Patronage (*z*) *Remiſſion of Sins, Reconciliation with God, Safety from the capital Sentence, Victory over Temptation, Succour in Tribulation; to be commended to God, to have audience of Prayer, Defence and Protection at the Day of Judgment, and to be Partakers of the Martyrs beatitude.*

Agreeably to which Conceits of the elder times the preſent Church's Books of Devotion are fill'd with Prayers to Saints for all ſorts of Benefits Publick and Private, Secular and Spritual, (*To grant their Suppliants deliverance from Diſeaſes, Dangers, ſudden Death, from impure Thoughts, Scandal, Mortal Sin, from the Frands of the Devil and all Evils ghoſtly and bodily;*

(k) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 11. *S.* 18.

(l) *Catechiſm. ex decret. Concil. Trid. p.* 561.

(m) *Ad Sanctorum gratiam, opem auxiliumque confugere.* Catechiſm. Ibid. p. 427.

(n) *Sub tuum præſidium confugimus ſancta Dei Genetrix, noſtras Deprecationes ne deſpicias in neceſſitatibus, ſed à periculis cunctis libera nos ſemper, Virgo glorioſa & Benedicta.* Offic. parv. B. *Mar.*

(o) V. Caſſian. *Catal. Glor. mund. P.* 3. *fol.* 78.

(p) Bellarm. *controv. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 15. *de orat.*

(q) *Proclus orat.* 5.

(r) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 10. *S.* 9. *c.* 11. *S.* 14. *c.* 13. *S.* 3.

(s) *Ibid. c.* 10. *S.* 4, 16.

(t) *Ibid. c.* 11. *S.* 14, *c.* 13. *S.* 3.

(u) Jambl. *de Myſt.* p. 147.

(w) Baron. *ad an.* 579. *n.* 15, 16.

(x) Dallæus *de rel. cult object p.* 95. 522.

(y) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 10. *S.* 16. & *c.* 11. *S.* 11.

(z) *Ibid.* & *c.* 11. *S.* 18.

dily; to give them Pardon of Sin and all Virtues and increaſe of Grace; to give them the Everlaſting Kingdom, and to increaſe the Church's Glory;) God and the Saints are pray'd to in the ſame form of words, in the ſame form of words that the Heathens pray'd to their Deities (although ſome (*a*) have the confidence to deny it;) for it muſt be ſaid, that ever ſince the riſe of Church-Demonolatry the Patron-Saints have been look'd upon as δωτῆρες ἑάων, *the Donors of Goods* (of miraculous Relief and Salutary Benefits to their Suppliants) as well as the Heathen Deities, and have been pray'd to accordingly. The innumerable Miracles which are ſaid to have been wrought for the relief of the Suppliants of Saints and Martyrs, are uſually called their *Works, Gifts, Benefits. Illinc pia dona dat patronus, from the ſupernal Region the Patron giveth pious gifts*, ſaith *Prudentius* in his Hymn touching S. *Cyprian*. S. *Martin* is ſaid (*b*) *petita donaſſe, to have given what his Suppliant ask'd.* The Saints are ſaid (*c*) to anſwer their Suppliants Prayers, to be with them in Tribulation, (*d*) to be propitious to them when their Prayers prevail, and they acknowledge the Saints *the Donors of their Bleſſings*, for they pay their *Thankſgivings* and *Thank-offerings* to thoſe pretended Patrons. All this is acknowledg'd by the Church-Demonolatriſts, but their Pretenſion is, that they ſuppoſe the Saints to be only a meritorious and interceſſional ſort of Donors. Which Pretenſion is not true, and if it was true, it is not to the purpoſe; for ſuch a ſort of Donors may be as Beneficent Patrons to their Suppliants; Mankind may be as obſervant of them, as dependant upon them, as thankful to them, and as great Religioniſts towards them, as if they had a Subordinate Authoritative-Operative Power of *formal Donation of Benefits*. The beneficent Patronage of the Saints which the Church-Demonolatriſts have erected, is their great Idol, and all their foul Demonolatry (which is Idolatry) is the legitimate and neceſſary conſequence of it. Thereby alſo their method of Religion is agreeable to the method of the Ancient Religion, as *Ficinus* calleth it; (*e*) which was, *to proceed orderly and gradually downwards and upwards*; downwards from the Supream Deity by the Gods and Demons; and upwards, by the Demons and the Gods to the Supream Deity. So in the Religion of Church-Demonolatry, (*f*) *The Law of God is, to bring the loweſt by the middle to the Supream; but as to the Gifts of Grace the Saints are medioxumous between God and us Viators; the Divine Benefits therefore deſcend to us by the Mediating Angels and Holy Souls.*

VIII. Becauſe the preſent Church and her Theologers are not the Inventors and Founders of Church-Demonolatry, the beſt Method of underſtanding the true Nature of it and of the Miracles that authoris'd it (which many Learned Men ſuppoſe to be true Divine Miracles) is, to conſult the Senſe of the Church-Demonolatriſts of the elder times, of which the beſt Account that I know, is *the Seleucian Baſil's* Narrative of the Miracles of S. *Thecla*, an exact Parallel for the *Romaniſts Queen of Heaven and Mother of Mercy*. (*g*) “For to the Temple of this Patron-Saint (*a publick Phyſick-ſhop and the common Propitiatory of the whole Earth*) both Citizens and Strangers reſorted in vaſt numbers, partly for Prayer, doing Honour, and making their Oblations and Conſecrations to her; and partly to be help'd againſt their Ailments and heal'd of their Diſeaſes (as now the Pilgrims reſort to *Loretto* to be cur'd of all Diſeaſes:) Nor did any complain of Fruſtration, but return'd bleſſing and praiſing, the Miracles and Cures exceeded their Hopes. One Woman that was hurt by a Fall, being carry'd to her Temple, (*h*) beſought the Martyr with Tears and Lamentations, many and ſufficient to ſweeten the Virgin, and was cur'd within leſs than three Days. Scrape the filthy ſtuff (ſaid the Martyr) that is about my Apartment, and lay it to the part affected, and it will preſently remove the Pain. To a Noble Woman that was almoſt conſtantly with the Martyr, and continually urgent with her, ſhe gave a miraculous Refreſhment, dipping her Finger in a Baſon of Water and beſprinkling her. Another that had an Huſband extravagantly addicted to the love of other Women, betook her ſelf to the Martyr crying and curſing the Women; the Martyr was not averſe from her Supplication, but gave her this benefit, on a ſudden ſhe chang'd the Manners of her Huſband. The Nurſe of a Child that by overmuch crying was likely to loſe one of his Eyes, aſcendeth the Temple, and there continueth with Lamentations, Supplications and Tears, offereth the Child to the Martyr, ſheweth her the Hurt, prayeth her not to over-look the Child, whoſe Viſage was ſo deform'd; the Martyr ſaid nothing to the Nurſe, but a Bird (by the Martyr's command) leap'd upon the Child, and inſtead of picking out his Eye let out the ſuperfluous Humour. A Noble Woman (*Calliſte*) that had her Face very much deform'd by certain Artifices of Poyſon, which an Harlot of her Huſband made uſe of, fleeth to the Martyr, relateth her own Miſfortune, and the Harlot's Maleficence, prayeth for a Cure, that ſhe might recover her Beauty again and her Huſband's Affection. Theſe things the Martyr heareth, and was much mov'd at the Calamity (for the Woman ſent forth Rivers of Tears with her Words; plenty of Tears pour'd out from the bottom of the Soul being the beſt Condiment of Prayer) and preſently ſignifieth and preſcribeth a Remedy. Take (ſaid the Martyr) the Sweepings or Scrapings that are ſold before the Door of this Temple, and having wetted them with Wine, waſh thy Viſage with them, and thou ſhalt preſently waſh away the Deformity thereof. At a ſumptuous Wedding of the Daughter of one *Paula* an Arch-Thief, *Eurybatus*, ſtole a Girdle of great Precioſity, and hid it under Ground, which damp'd all their Mirth and chang'd it into Mourning. The Martyr ſeeing and obſerving all things, the Thief, Mourners, and the Wedding diſgrac'd, went to *Paula* and made a diſcovery of the Thief and of the place where his Prey was hid, whereby ſhe put an end to their Mourning and reſtor'd their Mirth. One ſtole a Croſs that was conſecrated to her, and hid it, which was an occaſion of Laughter to the Martyr, that the Thieves ſhould not hold their Hands from her, as if they could eſcape her τὸ πανδερκὲς ϗ θεῖον ὄμμα, *omni-vident and Divine Eye*. This Theft ſhe reveal'd to one of her Servitors and Attendants, and reſtor'd the Holy Croſs to its place. The Citizens of *Seleucia* being one Sum-

“ mer

(a) *Ibid. c.* 16. *S.* 13.

(b) Baron. *ad an.* 825. *n.* 25.

(c) Petav. *ſupr. c.* 10. *S.* 17.

(d) Baron. *ad an.* 560. *n.* 9.

(e) *Argum. in Dial.* 7. *de Leg.*

(f) *Lex Deitatis eſt, infima per media ad ſuprema adducere: quantum verò ad dona gratiæ, Beati ſunt medii inter Deum & viatores. Divina igitur beneficia ad nos deſcendunt mediantibus Angelis & animabus ſanctis.* Alex. Halenſ. P. 3. Tit. 3.

(g) De *vit. S.* Thecl. p. 276, 277.

(h) *Mirac.* 2. 3, 4, 8, 28, 5, 6, 21.

mer univerſally troubled with a Diſtemper of the Eyes, wherein methods of Phyſick had no place, the Martyr in the Night-time bade one of them, that they ſhould make uſe of the Water of her Temple, which being impregnated by the Martyr's Virtue, was found a Sovereign Remedy. They were afraid, that the Water ſhould have fail'd them, but there was no failure in the Martyr's Grace and Beneficence: She receiv'd them and ſent them back heal'd; (i) her Grace and Beneficence is an ever-flowing Fountain of Miracles and Curations. In another Summer exceſſively hot the Cattle dy'd of an unknown Diſeaſe; but the Martyr was not wanting in Benignity or Power, had compaſſion on them and provided a Remedy; a new Fountain of Water flowing out of a Cave (a delectable place, where the Martyr is thought to reſide for the moſt part, and a place commodious for Prayer, to obtain what one deſireth by Prayer from the Martyr) oppoſite to her Temple, where there is a Church or Chapel of hers. (k) Agreeably to the *Mother of Mercy* this Patron-Saint is ſaid to take care of calamitous and injur'd Perſons; and (as an inſtance of her Care) ſhe appear'd in a Dream to one *Pappus*, that cheated his Partner's Children, and denounc'd (from Chriſt) the Sentence of Death upon him. And as that infinitely ambitious Ghoſt, the *Romaniſt*'s Queen, concerneth her ſelf in the Affairs of her Service and Worſhip, for her Honour reſenteth Affronts and Injuries at the higheſt rate, and is pleas'd extreamly with her own Vain-glorious Praiſes: “So this Patron-Ghoſt injoyned the People of the City *Silenus*, to build a Temple to her which ſhould be a defenſative againſt their Enemies: Such Power (which is ſo great (l) that all are healed by it) the Martyr demonſtrateth; by a little Temple ſhe turneth away furious Armies. S. *Paul* is ſaid to remove from *Rome* to *Tarſus* once a Year, * to be there, when his Feſtival is celebrated; thereby ſhewing his Honourers, that he is pleas'd with their Feſtival, and accepteth the Sacred Honours that are done him: S. *Thecla* in like manner once a Year removeth from *Seleucia*, to viſit her Temple at *Daliſandus* (a place for Air and Water, Herbs and Trees ſuperlatively pleaſant, and therefore the Martyr loveth it extreamly and taketh delight in it) at the time when her publick Feſtival is celebrated there ſumptuouſly and with great concourſe. They that watch the Night before her Feſtival, ſee her yearly at that time driving a Fiery Chariot in the Air in her remove to *Daliſandus*. Where having finiſh'd the Feſtival, and given her uſual Gifts to thoſe that come thither, ſhe returneth to *Seleucia*: Not as having left this her Temple; for the Eye of the Saints is not reſtrain'd or hinder'd from pervading all things always, what Regions, Nations and Cities they pleaſe, and when they pleaſe. So great is her regard for the Honour of her Temple, that when ſome attempted to bury a Corps in one of the Porches of it, the Martyr came upon them, chiding, reprehending their Boldneſs, and commanding them to be gone; and when they attempted it again a ſecond time, ſhe came upon them again with ſuch an angry look (the Martyr is terrible, not only when ſhe exerteth her Power, but if occaſion be, in her Looks) as made them ſhake and tremble in every Joynt, and had well nigh ſtruck them dead. Her concern is no leſs for the reputation of her Power; for when *Dexianus* (the Prefect of thoſe that look'd to her Temple) had carry'd the Silver and Golden Ornaments of her Temple into the City (*Seleucia*) to ſecure them from ſome Neighbouring Robbers, at Night the Temple was fill'd with Noiſe, Tumult and Clamour, the Virgin running up and down and crying, that *Dexianus* her Attendant had treated her as an Enemy, deſpoiled her of her Ornaments, and thought her weak and ungenerous, not able to protect her Temple and aid her Servitors. How highly this Magiſterial Goddeſs reſenteth Affronts and Injuries, (m) is viſible in her treatment of two drunken Men (which ſhould be a warning to others, to abſtain from things unworthy of the Martyr's Eyes) that in her Garden under her Eyes, had got one of her Virgins with deſign to defile her; but falling aſleep before the fact, the Martyr came upon them, with this ſevere Reprimand; Why is it, O ye moſt Improbous, that ye have taken my Dove out of mine Houſe, and would corrupt her? I will take care, that ye ſuffer condign Puniſhment for ſo audacious a crime; which accordingly came to paſs. (n) For the Martyr knoweth how to be beneficial to thoſe that do well, and how to puniſh the Impious. The Revengeful Humour of this Ghoſt is viſible in the Inſtance of *Marianus* Biſhop of *Tarſus*, who out of ſpight to the Biſhop of *Seleucia* forbad the *Cilicians* to reſort to the Martyrs Feſtival (ſo to rob her of her Praiſes;) “whereupon one *Caſtor* ſaw a Virgin with a fierce Countenance running all about the City, frequently clapping her Hands, crying out of *Marianus*, and the Injury done her, and threatning to puniſh him; which was ſpeedily done; for he ſurviv'd his Temerity not above five or ſix Days. Her Careſſes of Kindneſs are as extravagant as her Punitive Severity; (o) for ſhe is a lover of Oratory and Poeſy, and continually delighteth in thoſe that more oratorially ſet forth her Praiſes. “When this Author was writing her Miracles, and grew weary of his Labour, he telleth us; The Martyr (that us'd to appear to him at other times) ſeem'd to ſit by me in in my ſight, where I was wont to be at my Book, and to take the Quaternion out of my Hand, in which I tranſcrib'd theſe things out of my Table-Book, yea, and ſhe ſeem'd to read it, and to rejoyce and to ſmile, and to ſhew unto me by her Aſpect, that ſhe was pleas'd with the things that were written, and that I ought to finiſh this Labour. The Martyr (ſaith he) is ſuch a lover of Learning, and taketh ſuch delight in theſe Oratorial Praiſes, that I will tell ſomewhat of thoſe things that were done to my ſelf, and for my ſelf, which the Martyr that did it, knoweth to have been done, and that I do not lye. When her Anniverſary Feſtival was to be celebrated, and I had made a ſmall Oration to the praiſe of it (that I might gain ſome Favour from the Martyr; for thoſe that honour her but a little, ſhe knoweth to reward with the greateſt things;) the Day before it was to be pronounc'd, a grievous Pain in the Ear befell me, ſo that I deſpair'd of pronouncing my Oration, and I began to be aſham'd, becauſe the moſt would think, that I had flinch'd from my Work. But at Night the Martyr ſtood by me, and ſhaking mine Ear took all the Pain away, and gave me ſuch

(i) De vit. S. Thecl. p. 276. Mirac. S. Thecl. p. 312.

(k) Mirac. 20, 11, 10, 15, 17.

(l) Mirac. 26.

* *The Heathen Gods were thought to viſit their Cities at their Solemn Feſtivals.* V. *Marſham* Can. Chron. p. 54. ed. Lipſ.

(m) Mirac. 19, 13, 14.

(n) Mirac. 12.

(o) Mirac. 24, 27, 16.

“ Force and ſuch a Grace, that I ſpoke to the greateſt Admiration. *Alypius* the Grammarian betook himſelf to the Martyr, to be cur'd of a dangerous Diſeaſe; becauſe of her love to Secular Learning, ſhe made haſt, to do his Buſineſs for him. At Night ſhe appear'd to him (in her Temple) ask'd him what his Malady was, and what he deſir'd? He anſwer'd her in the words of *Achilles* in *Homer* to his Mother *Thetis* (thereby ſhewing his Art and gaining the Martyr's Favour by ſo apt a Verſe.)

Οἶσθα, τίη τοι ταῦτ᾽ εἰδυίῃ πάντ᾽ ἀγορεύω.

Thou knoweſt, why ſhould I tell it thee, that knoweſt all?

“ The Martyr ſmiling at it, and being delighted partly with the Man and partly with the Verſe, and admiring that he had anſwer'd ſo aptly, reach'd to him a fine Stone, which had the Power of profligating his Diſeaſe, becauſe, as I ſuppoſe, the Martyr's Hand had touch'd it.

This portentous Narrative I have compendiouſly but faithfully tranſlated, not with deſign to debate the Matters of Fact (which are agreeable to the lewd Conceits and loud Lyes of other Eccleſiaſtic Writers touching the Glories and Miracles of the Martyrs;) but to repreſent the true Nature of Church-Demonolatry from the riſe of it; how lamentable a ſtate the Chriſtian Church hath been in ever ſince thoſe times; and how intolerable the Communion of the Church of *Rome* is, that retaineth and improveth the Inſtitutes (Idolatrous and Demonolatrous) of thoſe elder times. The Church Demonolatry of thoſe times will appear to any that are not Sots and Superſtitioniſts, *the Image and Subſtitute of the Pagan Demonolatry*; It was plainly *a Religion*, or an Inſtitution of Religious Service to the Saints and Martyrs; they were worſhipp'd, not only as *Interceſſional*, but as great *Authoritative-operative Powers*; innumerable Miracles are ſaid to have been wrought by S. *Thecla*'s wonder-working Goodneſs and Power (as the other S. *Baſil* ſaith of S. *Julitta*; (p) *That when her Reliques were brought to a certain place, that wanted Water, preſently a Fountain of ſweet Water flow'd out of the Earth; ſo that that Saint might ſeem as a Mother, or Common Nurſe, to nouriſh that whole Region with her Milk*;) the indigent World made her their Refuge in all the Exigencies of Humane Life, had recourſe to her Temple for doing her Honour and making their Oblations; the Prayers which they made to her were *abſolute Prayer*, ſhe anſwer'd the Prayers of her Suppliants, was the Donor of their Benefits, and ſeverely puniſh'd Offences againſt her Ladiſhip. (q) Her Suppliants communicated to her the Divine Attributes at a great rate, in ſuch reſpect ſhe was made nothing leſs than a Subordinate Pagan Deity, and agreeably to the Pagan Deities ſhe had her Churches or Chappels dedicated to her, her Temple wherein ſhe reſided, the Furniture of it was her Goods, the Officers of it her Officers, the Virgins were her Virgins, and the Croſs her Croſs. She had her Feſtival Solemnity for her Honour and Service, and was delighted with her own vain-glorious Praiſes, was a lover of the Pagan Learning, of the fine things and Vanities of the World, and was in all reſpects conformable to the Genius and Humour, the Follies and Vitioſities of the Pagan Deities. And like an imperious impoſtorous Demon (that contemneth Mankind, and delighteth to put ſhams and abuſes upon them) ſhe would have the very filth and naſtineſs of her Houſe reputed Sacred Stuff, and made uſe of as of ſovereign wonder-working Virtue. Whence it is manifeſt, that if her Story is not meer legend and fable, if there is any thing of conſiderable truth in it, the Church-Demonolatry in the elder times was Demonolatry in the foul Senſe, by her Saint-worſhip the Church relaps'd in great degree under the Rulers of the Darkneſs of this World, and worſhipp'd impure Demons under the Names of Patron-Saints and Martyrs. Something of this nature is acknowledg'd by the Pontifician Theologers; for they ſay, (r) *without Canonization* (which is not infallible) *the People may eaſily miſtake, and worſhip damn'd Ghoſts inſtead of Saints.* (s) *It is not certain and of Faith, that all whom they venerate are real Saints.* It is probable, that in enrolling a vaſt number of Saints (forty or fifty thouſand) ſome may have paſt the Muſter, that belong to another Cenſus, and the Lives of many of them demonſtrate, that they were Perſons of another Character: For even Card. *Beſſarion* living at *Rome* found, (t) *that many were ſainted by the Church, whoſe Lives and Actions were not approvable.* Themſelves tell us, (u) that at a place not far from *Evora* in *Portugal* call'd *the Cave of Martyrs*, a Biſhop and Martyr famous for miraculous Cures was worſhipped by the Name of *Viarius*, whom a Learned Man of their Church diſcover'd (by an Inſcription) to have been nothing better than a Pagan Overſeer of the Highways (*viarum curandarum*;) that Pope *Alexander* the Third (w) rebuked ſome in his time for worſhipping one as an holy Martyr, who had been kill'd in a drunken fray; that *Sulpitius* reporteth of a certain People, that they worſhipp'd a certain dead Man for a Martyr, and that at the Prayer of S. *Martin* (who ſuſpected their Religion, becauſe he had no certain account of any ſuch Saint from his Anceſtors) the Soul of this pretended Martyr appear'd to him, and confeſs'd, that it was the Soul of a certain Robber, who had ſuffered capital Puniſhment for his Crimes. If the Souls of improbous dead Men ſubſtitute themſelves in the place of Saints and Martyrs, is it not reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that improbous Demons play the ſame pranks? The Miracles and Oracles in Paganiſm were the Operations of impure Spirits, that counterfeited the Souls of the Dead, and were call'd by their Names; and as *Tertullian* ſaith of that Evil Power which the Pagans ador'd, (x) *lurking under the Names and Images of the Dead, by certain Signs, Miracles and Oracles it gaineth a belief of its Divinity:* So the Church Demonolatry was introduc'd by *Viſions, Revelations, Apparitions, Miracles*, wrought by impure Spirits, that counterfeited deceas'd Saints and Martyrs, and were call'd by their Names. For *Viſions, Revelations, Apparitions* and *Miracles* which contradict God's Religion eſtabliſh'd upon uncontrollable Miracles, are certainly the Artifices of Improbous Demons (Lying Wonders, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 9.) as *Caſſander* complaineth. (y) *By the Craft and Illuſion of the Devil abuſing the Superſtition of Men in Dreams and Viſions new Reliques were reveal'd, and by his Operation ſeeming Miracles were wrought.* The Viſions and Revelations which *Egwin* of *Worceſter* (about the Year 712.) pretended to have receiv'd, whereby he was enjoyn'd, to ſet up in his Dioceſs (of *Worceſter*) the Image of the Bl. Virgin for the People to worſhip, were either forged Lyes or the Illuſions of Devils. And ſuch are thoſe Ghoſts or Spirits that appear and work

(p) *Orat. in S.* Julit.

(q) De *Mirac. S.* Thecl. *p.* 281.

(r) Bellar. *de ſanct. Beat. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(s) *Vaſqu. in* 3. *Th. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 97. *c.* 3.

(t) Bodin. *Meth. Hiſt. c.* 4.

(u) Reſſen. *Ep. ad* Barthol. Kebed *p.* 168.

(w) Bellar. *ſupr.*

(x) *Apologet. c.* 22.

(y) *Conſult. de vener. Reliqu.*

work Miracles in the Names of the Martyrs, that inhabit their Temples and animate their Images, furniſhing them with all ſorts of vital Motions (Sweating, Speaking, removing themſelves from place to place;) theſe are both *the Thieves* and *the Receivers* of the Church-Demonolatriſts Worſhip. For both in the Greek and Latin Church they worſhip the inviſible Prefects or Preſidents of Wells and Fountains, of Kingdoms, Provinces and Cities; which inviſible Prefects were anciently the Pagan Demons; and if the Church-Demonolatriſts have not diſpoſſeſs'd thoſe Demons, and ſhar'd their Provinces amongſt their Canoniz'd Saints (which aſſuredly they have not been able to do) thoſe Pagan Demons* ſtill continue in poſſeſſion, and conſequently they are the Receivers of the Church-Demonolatriſts Worſhip, which is directed to thoſe inviſible Prefects. When our Anceſtors worſhipp'd, (z) *the Prefect or Preſident of War*, ſeeing Chriſtianity knoweth no Preſident of War, that Pagan Demon the old Heathen *Mars* muſt neceſſarily be thought the Receiver of their Worſhip. Nor muſt this heavy charge upon the Church-Demonolatriſts be thought over-heavy, ſeeing the holy Oracles have laid this Burden upon them. *Apoc.* 9. 20. *And the reſt of the Men which were not killed by theſe Plagues* (that is, the Weſtern part of the *Roman* Empire, that was only afflicted, not kill'd by the *Turks* or *Euphratean* Horſemen) *yet repented not of the Works of their Hands, that they ſhould not worſhip Devils, and Idols of Gold and Silver.* Τὰ δαιμόνια is rightly render'd by our Tranſlation *Devils*, although in the Writings of the Pagans it ſignifieth in a good or indifferent ſenſe *the middle inviſible Powers*; and thus ſome of the Learned ſuppoſe it to ſignifie in this place; but this is not the Scriptural Notion of the word: And in this Apocalyptic Deſcription of Idol-worſhip it is moſt agreeable to underſtand it in the ſame Senſe as the Apoſtle uſeth it in his Deſcription of the *Gentiles* Idolatry, where it certainly ſignifieth *Devils*, 1 Cor. 10. 20. *The things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to Devils.*

IX. The Pagan Theologers look upon the Powers above (*a*) as one Colledge or θεῖον σύστημα, *Divine Syſtem:* So the Pontifician Theologers conſider God and the reigning Saints as one Syſtem of Supernal Powers (ſo far are they from obſerving a due diſtance between God and Creatures) as appeareth from the Paganical Language of their Learned Writers. For to a Syſtem of Supernal Powers they aſcribe their Aid and the Succeſs of their Affairs, (*b*) *Chriſt and thoſe above favouring (Chriſto ſuperiſque faventibus) by the manifeſt aid of God and thoſe above, (evidenti plane Dei ſuperumque auxilio:)* To this Supernal Syſtem they make their Prayers and pay their Thankſgivings, (*c*) *may God and all the Supernals take notice of ſuch a Wickedneſs, (Deus ac ſuperi omnes tale flagitium advertant) having made his Prayers to God, and ſuppliantly implor'd the aid of all the Celeſtials (ſuis ad Deum precibus & Cæleſtium univerſorum opè ſuppliciter implorata) having given thanks to Chriſt the Lord and thoſe above, (Chriſto Domino ſuperiſque gratulatus,) firſt of all they give praiſe and thanks to God and thoſe above, and chiefly to their Patron S.* James *(primum omnium Deo ſuperiſque ac patrono præſertim Divo Jacobo laudes grateſque agunt:)* This Supernal Syſtem is the Object of their Piety and Religion, (*d*) *a Man of excellent Piety and Religion towards God and thoſe above (vir excellenti in Deum ſuperoſque pietate ac religione:)* Their Piety is (*e*) *in Deum & ſuperos omnes ac beatam præcipue Dei matrem obſervantia, a religious regard towards God and all the Supernal Powers, chiefly the Bl. Mother of God*; and accordingly they make their Prayers, (*f*) *earneſtly imploring help of God and the Celeſtials, eſpecially of the Virgin Mother of God, that the moſt gracious Queen of Heaven would not neglect the Concerns of Chriſtians commended to her by Chriſt her Son.* In this Supernal Syſtem the Bl. Virgin is of Supereminent Condition, and of diſtinct Conſideration from meer Saints. The ſwelling Titles and Attributes which the Pontificians have heap'd upon her, and the extravagant Honours that are done her in their Religion, amount to nothing leſs than Divinity, are nothing leſs than Immenſity; yet the *Habeſſines* are ſaid (*g*) *to bear ſuch an affectionate Reverence to the moſt holy Virgin, that they think whatever the Church of* Rome *hath invented to her Honour, all too little. When they were in a Rage againſt thoſe of the* Roman *Religion, and purſu'd them in their Fury with Sticks and Stones, they cry'd out kill, kill; whoever is not an Enemy of* Mary, *let him take up a Stone to ſtone her Enemies to Death.* Some of thoſe ſwelling Titles and Attributes which the *Marianolatriſts* have invented, and to which they endeavour to make new Additions (the Names of prodigious Phantaſtry) are Attributes of *Greatneſs*, and others are properly Attributes of *Goodneſs*; in both ſorts of Attributes their μεγαλυσμοὶ, or *Doxologies*, tranſcend all Dimenſions, and are too numerous to be recounted; but the ſummary comprehenſion of them all is that famous honorary Attribute of θεοτόκος, or θεομήτωρ, *the Mother of God.* So the Church ſpake in the Days of *Neſtorius* (who quarrell'd with this Attribute upon erroneous grounds) Μαριὰμ θεοτόκος, Mary *the Mother of God.* And it muſt be acknowledg'd, that this Attribute, if underſtood with due Diſtinction, Limitation and Abatement of Senſe (not without it) may admit of a true and good Senſe; which yet doth not hinder, but that in the natural ſignification of it, and as it is underſtood in *Marianolatry*, it is an Attribute extreamly ſinful and erroneous, blaſphemous and idolatrous. For,

(1.) This Honourary Title in the natural ſignification of it and as it is underſtood in *Marianolatry*, denoteth the Bl. Virgin to be the Mother of God *definitively* and *abſolutely* ſo, of the Perſon of *Almighty God*. But although our Bl. Saviour is truly God, yet he is not God *definitively* and *abſolutely* (to be underſtood without Limitation) nor *the Perſon of God*; for in the Chriſtian Trinity there is but one, *that is the Perſon of God, and the Father alone is He*, as will be copiouſly diſcours'd hereafter. Agreeably whereto a grand *Marianolatriſt* giveth this account of the Name which the Angel gave our Saviour. (*h*) *He ſhall be called, not God (although truly God) but the Son of God, to make a Diſcrimination of our Saviour conceiv'd in the Womb from the Father and the Holy Spirit.* The Son is the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, and this is the ordinary and uſual Language of Religion. Therefore ſpeaking according to the ordinary and uſual Language of Religion, it is abſurd and irreligious to ſay, that any one is *the Father of God*; and it cannot be leſs abſurd and irreligious to ſay, *that any one is the Mother of God.* To make this Title *the Mother of God*, the ordinary and uſual Language of our Religion, is to make the ordinary and uſual Language of our Religion contradictory to it ſelf. And (which is a far greater incongruity) there is a real groſs Contradiction to Religion in the Marianolatriſts Senſe of this their Title *the Mother of God*; for in their Senſe of it and in the Natural ſignification of it, it denoteth *the Mother of the Perſon of Almighty God*, which none is but God the Father. That this is their Senſe of it, appeareth from their creating Doctors (i) *ad laudem & gloriam omnipotentis Dei, & glorioſiſſimæ ejus Matris Mariæ Virginis, to the Praiſe and Glory of Almighty God and of his moſt glorious Mother the Virgin* Mary.

---

* *Recte obſervavit Servius topicos Deos ad alias regiones nunquam tranſire.* Cambd. Britan. *p.* 563.

(z) Heylin *of S.* George, *p.* 246.

(a) Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 28.

(b) Maffeius Indic. p. 168, 482.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 157, 429, 431, 567.

(d) *Ibid.* p. 427.

(e) *Ibid.* p. 6.

(f) *Ibid.* p. 128.

(g) Ludolph. *Hiſt.* of Ethiop. *l.* 3. *c.* 5. *p. m.* 279.

(h) *Vocabitur non Deus (quamvis verè Deus) ſed Filius Dei, ut notetur diſcretio concepti ſalvatoris à patre & ſpiritu ſancto.* Biel. in Feſt. Annunciat. Ser. 1. in Luc. 1. 35.

(2.) This Honorary Title in the Natural ſignification of it and in the Senſe of the Marianolatriſts denoteth the Bl. Virgin, to be *of God-productive Virtue*, as other Mothers are of *Man-productive Virtue*: Every Man hath much of his Humanity (his being Man) from his Mother, who is of Man-procreative and propagative Quality and Virtue; and ſo the Mother of our Bl. Saviour was only of Man-productive Quality and Virtue; for our Saviour had nothing of his Divinity (his being God) from her. But as *the Father of our Lord, the Father of Glory, the* Father *of Lights*, ſpeaketh one that is of Virtue productive of our Lord, of Glory, and of the luminous kind of things: So this Name *the Mother of God* ſignifieth one that is of Virtue productive of God, and ſo the Marianolatriſts underſtand it when they ſay (k) *An infinite goodneſs in the Fruit ſheweth in ſome ſort an infinite goodneſs in the Tree.* (l) *The Virgin the Mother of God is the Stem* (or Rod,) *her Son is the Flower thereof.* (m) *O the Tree of Life indeed, which was alone worthy to bear the ſalutiferous Fruit!* The Mother of God is ſuppos'd, to be productive of God her Son, as a Tree is of its Fruit, as a Branch is of its Flower; and the infinite goodneſs of the Fruit is ſaid to demonſtrate a ſort of infinite goodneſs in the Tree; therefore the Mother of God is ſuppos'd, to be of God-productive Virtue. Which alſo appeareth from theſe other ſayings of the Marianolatriſts. (n) *As a Star is productive of a Ray, ſo is the Virgin of her Son.* (o) *She was the Light of the Morning, which produc'd out of her ſelf that Sun.* (p) The *Marianitæ* or Marian Religioniſts of the elder times (as the Arabic Writers *Elmacinus* and *Patricides* report) ſuppos'd, that *Chriſt* and *Mary* were two Gods beſides God; and *Abunazar* ſaith of the *Melkites, They believe three Gods*, Mary, Iſa *and* God. So the beſt learned in the Church of *Rome*, and ſome of greateſt Authority (the Pope himſelf) have intituled the Bl. Virgin *Goddeſs, our Goddeſs, our Lady Goddeſs.* They ſeem to ſuppoſe the Mother of God of the ſame Species with God, as other Mothers are with Man, and that God's being generated of her was ſuch a Propagation of the Species as is in Univocal Generation.

(3.) This Honorary Title in the Natural ſignification of it and in the Senſe of the Marianolatriſts denoteth the Bl. Virgin, to be the Mother of God incarnate (in the Plenary Senſe,) *ſo as to be the Mother of his Incarnation.* His Incarnation is ſaid to have been deferr'd ſo long, (q) *becauſe it was requiſite to ſtay till there was a Woman of ſo great Sanctity, as to equalize ſo great a Dignity, whoſe Grace and infinite opulency of Virtues* (r) *drew down God to her, and induc'd him to take her Fleſh; the Spikenard of her Graces ſent forth its Odour, and attracted him from the Boſom of the Father into the Virginal Womb.* So the Church renowneth her (s) *as worthy of the Lord's reſpect, that the King ſhould deſire her Beauty, and be drawn down by her moſt ſweet Odour from his eternal lying in the Boſom of the Father*; and generally they hold, (t) *that by her Sanctity and Virtue ſhe merited ex congruo the infinite Dignity of being the Mother of God.* Her Name alſo (the Mother of God) importeth, that ſhe was qualify'd for ſo great a Dignity; and to qualifie her for it, ſhe is ſaid to have receiv'd (u) *the whole treaſure of Sanctification, infinite Grace, Grace it ſelf, to others by parts, but to* Mary *in intire fulneſs, to water plenteouſly the whole Creature.* So the Church ſaith; (w) *who will affirm her devoid of Grace, whom the Angel in his Salutation calleth full of Grace? Nor is this All, but he ſaith alſo, that the Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon her* (ſuperventurum,) *to what purpoſe, but that he may ſuper-fill her? To what purpoſe, but that the Holy Spirit being now advenient, ſhe may be full to her ſelf, the ſame being ſupervenient* (nobis quoque Superplena & ſuper effluens fiat) *ſhe may be ſuper-full and running over unto us.* The Church therefore and her Theologers ſuppoſe her *the overflowing Diſpenſatreſs of Gifts and Graces*; (x) *for of her fulneſs we all receive Grace for Grace. By influential Virtue* (Virtute influxiva as *Gerſon* ſpeaketh) *ſhe deriveth upon all her Lovers the copious Rivulets of Grace.* (y) *The Aqueduct of Grace* is part of her ſtile (as alſo the *Neck* and the *Moon*,) *and God hath made her his Repoſitory, and would have us to have nothing but what paſſeth through her Hands*, as not a few of the *Marian* Theologers diſcourſe.

(4.) This Honorary Title in the Natural ſignification of it and as it is underſtood by the *Marianolatriſts*, denoteth the Bl. Virgin, to be *the Mother of God-Redeemer* (in the plenary Senſe,) ſo as to be *the Mother of Redemption and of the mighty Benefits thereof.* Accordingly ſhe is intituled (z) *The Reparatrix of our Parents, the Vivificatrix of their Poſterity, the Mother of Redemption, the Mother of Life, the beginning of Spiritual Regeneration by Chriſt her Son, the Key of* David *that open'd the Gate of Paradiſe; the Medicine of our Vices, the Morning-ſtar of Grace and Salvation, the Reſtauration of Mankind, the holy Leaven prepared by God whence the whole Maſs of Mankind is leavened, the Reparatrix of the loſt World by her Merits (for Men have gain'd Redemption, Salvation and all manner of Goods by her Merits,) that hath recover'd loſt Salvation, loos'd the Bonds of Death from off Mankind, deliver'd* Eve *from ſhame,* Adam *from the Commination, deſpoil'd the Devil of his Principality, caſt him out of his Tyranny, and thrown him down; the Mother of Regeneration that made us paſs from Sin into Grace, as* Eve *made us paſs from Grace into Sin.* So the Church ſaith (a) *Thou reſtoreſt what* Eve *took away*; ſhe giveth thanks to the Bl. Virgin and celebrateth her Praiſes for *ſuccouring the loſt World by her ſingular Aſſent, ſaving the World by her Suffrage, and finding out the way of recovering Life by her Commerce; for diſſolving the Miſchiefs of our firſt Mother, aboliſhing the old Hand-writing of Diabolical Sedition, and opening the Kingdom of Heaven*, agreeably to her Verſion of *Gen.* 3. 15. *She ſhall bruiſe thy Head.*

The

(i) Selden *Titles of Hon. p.* 333. *ed.* 3.

(k) *Infinita Bonitas in Fructu oſtendit quodammodo infinitam in arbore Bonitatem.* Albert. ap. Biel in Feſt. viſit. Ser. 2.

(l) *Virgo Dei genetrix Virga eſt, Flos filius ejus.* Baſil. Seleuc. orat. 39. p. 215.

(m) *O verè lignum vitæ, quod ſolum fuit dignum portare fructum Salutis!* Laurent. Surii Hom. in Feſt. Annunciat. Ser. 3.

(n) *Sicut Sydus radium profert Virgo Filium.* Breviar. Sariſbur. in Feſt. purificat.

(o) *Fuit Aurora, quæ de ſe ſolem illum produxit.* Biel in Feſt. Concept. Ser. 4.

(p) Hotting. *Hiſt. or. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *ed.* 1.

(q) *Petav. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *l.* 14. *c.* 8. *S.* 2.

(r) Biel in Feſt. Concept. Ser. 3. & in Feſt. Aſſumpt. Ser. 4.

(s) *In octav. Aſſumpt.*

(t) *Petav. ſupr.*

(u) *Ibid. S.* 6, 7, &c.

(w) *In octav. Aſſumpt.*

(x) Biel in Feſt. Nativ. Ser. 2. & in Feſt. Aſſumpt. Ser. 1.

(y) *Ibid. & vid. Le Blanc. Theſ. p.* 369. *Anſw. to the Jeſ. Chall. p.* 431, &c.

(z) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 9. Biel *in Feſt. Concept. Ser.* 1. & 3. *in Feſt. viſit. Ser.* 1. *Caniſ. Catech. p.* 168. *Laur. Surii Hom. in Feſt. Aſſumpt. Ser. ult. Breviar. Rom. in Feſt. Nativ.*

(a) *Ibid. & Brev. Sariſbur. in Servit. B. Mar.*

The Marianolatriſts have made her a She-Redeemer and She-Saviour to us, (*b*) *our Mediatreſs and Reconciliatreſs in the buſineſs of our Redemption*, (*c*) *the Propitiatreſs of Sinners, the Conquereſs of Hell, and the World is ſaid to be* (new) *founded upon a Woman.* They ſay (*d*) *that Salvation is given us as the Reward of her Womb*; (*e*) *all our Salvation and Redemption was accompliſh'd by her, for our Redeemer was conceiv'd, born and educated by her*, (*f*) *ſhe deplor'd the miſerable Condition of Mankind, and pray'd importunately for our Redemption*, (*g*) *her Mercy obtain'd the Reparation of the whole World*, (*h*) *ſhe conſtrain'd our Redeemer to come down from Heaven to the Earth, and therefore doubtleſs ſhe can do all things for Men and raiſe them unto Heaven.* When ſhe was made the Mother of God, ſhe was rais'd (*i*) *to be a Mother to the whole Creation* (*the Lady of the World of Creatures, the Empreſs of Angels and Reparatreſs of Men,*) *a publick Perſon, the Mother of Redemption, that whom Chriſt was the Father of by Redemption, ſhe by co-operating thereto might be their Mother.* (*k*) *And becauſe ſhe procureth the Salvation of Believers with great Solicitude, and Chriſt's Brethren muſt have the ſame Parents with himſelf, and becauſe Believers are Regenerate by her Grace, ſhe is intituled the Mother of Believers and of the Regenerate, the Mother of the Church.* (*l*) *The Mother of Redemption was to pour out her Soul under the Croſs; her Soul penally dy'd with Chriſt dying, by the Merit of which Compatiency ſhe co-operated to the Redemption of many.* Much of this Nature the Marian Theologers ſay of the Bl. Virgin (ſome ſay things of an higher Nature, (*m*) *that ſhe offer'd up Chriſt to God the Father, and truly and properly gave the price of our Redemption*, having the Parental Power of her Son:) But if we enquire into the ground of theſe extravagant Attributions, they have nothing to ſay ſave only (*n*) a vulgar Maxim which muſt be underſtood with Limitation) *Cauſa Cauſæ eſt etiam Cauſa Cauſati*, and this place of *Irenæus*. (*o*) Mary *was perſwaded to be obedient to God, that ſhe might be the Virgin* Eve's *Advocate* (*Eve* was helped out by her;) *that Mankind might be loos'd by a Virgin, as it was bound over to Death by a Virgin, for what the Virgin* Eve *bound by incredulity, the Virgin* Mary *looſed by Faith; the Virgin yielding Obedience was made the cauſe of Salvation both to her ſelf and all Mankind.* To ſatisfie this Allegation from *Irenæus* (which is the Marianolatriſts ſtrength,) we will acknowledge, that in a plain and obvious Senſe the Bl. Virgin may be rightly denominated *the Mother of Salvation*, *Mother of Redemption* both to her ſelf and to Mankind. We may ſpeak the Language of the *Ave-Mary* Religioniſts in an extremely diſſonant Senſe and Notion. The Mother of our Saviour and Redeemer is by being ſuch, the Mother of Salvation and Redemption both to her ſelf and to Mankind: As *Nero*'s *Mother* by being ſuch, was the Mother of Deſtruction both to her ſelf and to Mankind; and *Hippocrates*'s *Mother* by being ſuch, was the Mother of Health (*Mater Salutis*) both to her ſelf and to Mankind. *Nero*'s Mother was productive of Deſtruction both to her ſelf and to Mankind, and therefore is rightly denominated *the Cauſe of it*; for the word *Cauſe* (an ambiguous word, which is ſometimes taken in a large Senſe; as ſome have defin'd it, *Cauſa eſt ad quod aliquid ſequitur*) ſignifieth *Productive*: So the Bl. Virgin is *the cauſe of Salvation* in a Senſe coincident with that other Title *the Mother of Salvation*. And as *Nero*'s Mother was the cauſe (or productive) of Deſtruction both to her ſelf and to Mankind by her *Maternal Production*, whereby ſhe became Productive (or the Cauſe) of the *Event*, not of *the Effect* (for it was not her doing, nor ought it to be attributed to her,) in the ſame Senſe the Bl. Virgin is denominated *the Cauſe of Salvation* both to her ſelf and to Mankind by *Irenæus*. And as it is no contradiction to ſay that *Nero*'s Mother was the cauſe of Deſtruction both to her ſelf and to Mankind, without being the cauſe of Deſtruction either to her ſelf or to Mankind; *She was ſo Productive of it, as not to be at all Effective of it; eventually not effectively Productive of it*: So the Bl. Virgin was in ſuch Senſe *the cauſe of Salvation*, as not to be at all the cauſe of Salvation to her ſelf or to Mankind; *ſhe unloos'd* (by her Faith and Obedience) *what was bound by incredulity*, without her unlooſing it, without her being at all the Unlooſer of it. Her dutiful obediential Faith qualify'd her to be *Productive* of the Unlooſer of it; ſhe was imploy'd by God, to be naturally Parental to him that redeem'd us from the Curſe: But this was not her doing, nor did ſhe contribute any thing towards it, that may juſtly denominate her at all effective of it. Thus the words of *Irenæus* (and other Fathers that Symbolize with him) are clearly expounded to a Senſe hugely diſſonant from the *Marianolatriſts*.

(5.) This Honorary Title in the natural ſignification of it and in the Senſe of the Marianolatriſts denoteth the Bl. Virgin, to be no leſs than *the Queen-Mother in Divinis, and the Feminine Sovereignty of the Church and of the World.* For as the true Idea of God and the Son of God is an holy Imperial Honour and Dignity: So the Marianolatriſts underſtand by *the Mother of God an holy Imperial Honour and Dignity conjunct with the Deity.* They ſuppoſe her as *a Queen-Mother of the King, an Empreſs-Mother of the Emperor*, or as if we ſhould ſuppoſe ſuch an Eccleſiaſtic Imperial Honour as *the Queen-Mother of Chriſt's Vicar conjunct with the Papacy*, that ſo the Roman Catholic Church might be furniſh'd with a viſible Soveraign Lady as well as a viſible Soveraign Lord. So her Title *the Mother of God* is ſaid to import (*o*) *an infinite Majeſty, that ſhe is the Queen of Heaven, the Lady and Dominatreſs of all Creatures, the ſupreme Lady and ſole Dominatreſs of Heaven and Earth, that ſhe outſhineth all the Martyrs as the Sun doth the Stars and as the Mother the Subjects. The Throne of the moſt bleſſed Virgin was prepar'd before the Conſtitution of the World, and ſhe is ſeated on the Right-hand of the Majeſty. As God is the Father and God of all by creating all things by his Power: So the Bl. Mother of God, becauſe ſhe hath repair'd and re-eſtabliſhed all things by her Merits, is the Mother and Lady of all things.* The Church in her Devotions repreſenteth her as a Divine Imperial Lady; (*p*) *O glorious Lady high above the Stars, in thy Pulchritude go on proſperouſly and Reign* (ſpecie tua & Pulchritudine tua, intende, proſperè procede & Regna;) her uſual devotional Salutation is *Salve Regina* (Hail O Queen.) agreeably whereto the Litanies that are uſually Sung in the Holy Houſe at *Loretto* chant the Praiſes of the Bl. Virgin. (*q*) *Queen of Angels, Queen of Patri-*

(b) *Petav. ſupr. c. 9. S. 2, 3.*
(c) Biel *in Feſt. Aſſump. Ser.* 2, 3.
(d) *Petav. ſupr. S.* 5.
(e) Biel *in Feſt. viſit. Ser.* 3.
(f) *Idem in Feſt. Nat. Ser.* 4
(g) Bernard. *in Aſſump. B. Mar. Ser.* 4.
(h) Biel *in Feſt. viſit. Ser.* 3.
(i) *Ibid. Ser.* 1.
(k) *Idem in Feſt. viſit. Ser.* 2, 3, 4. *in Feſt. Aſſump. Ser.* 1. *Laur. Surii Hom. in Feſt. Purif. Ser.* 4
(l) Biel *in Feſt. viſ. Ser.* 1. *in Feſt. Aſſump. Ser.* 2.
(m) Salazar. *in Prov.* 8. 19.
(n) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 8. & 9.
(o) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 8. 9 Baſil. *Seleuc. orat.* 39. p. 218.
(p) *Offic. parv. B.* Mar.
(q) *Caniſ. Catech. p.* 153.

(o) Maria *ſuaſa eſt obedire Deo, uti Virginis Evæ fieret Advocata; ut quemadmodum adſtrictum eſt morti genus humanum per Virginem, ſolvatur per Virginem. Quod enim alligavit Virgo Heva per incredulitatem, hoc Virgo Maria ſolvit per fidem; Virgo obaudiens & ſibi & univerſo generi humano cauſa facta eſt Salutis.* Iren. *l.* 5. *c.* 19.

archs, *Queen of Prophets*, *Queen of Apoſtles*, *Queen of Martyrs*, *Queen of Confeſſors*, *Queen of Virgins*, *Queen of all Saints*. Innumerable Attributes of Imperial Dignity, Majeſty, Pomp and Power the Marianolatriſts have inſtated upon the humble Virgin; ſuch as *God's dear Daughter* (which ſpeaketh her a Spiritual Princeſs, as God's dear Son is a Spiritual Prince, *the Spouſe of God*, *his Lady*, *Queen*, *Empreſs*, and therefore the Lady, Queen and Empreſs of his Kingdom and Empire (ſuch fanatic and idolatrous Imaginations this Honorary Title *the Mother of God* is apt to excite in the Minds of Men,) *the Empreſs of Heaven and Earth, to whom God delivered the Empire of the World and of all things therein contain'd, and all Power in Heaven and Earth*; *the excellent Monarcheſs and Governeſs of the whole World, the Aſſociate of Divine Majeſty and Power, the ſole Dominatreſs and Princeſs of all Creatures, that beareth Rule in Heaven, the World and Hell, whom all Creatures ſerve (Saints, Angels and Archangels are her Courtiers, Officers and Servants,) whom God hath highly exalted, and given her the Name of* Mary (Domina,) *which is above all Names, that at this Name every Knee ſhould bow*; *the glorious Queen, whoſe brightneſs enlightneth the whole Celeſtial World, as the Sun enlightneth the Day and the World, the refulgent Morning Star*, which is the Star of Empire. Such Elogies her Devoto's pour out ὅλῳ θυλάκῳ, *by whole Sack-fulls*, (of which the learned have made ample Collections;) and ſome of them raiſe Debates touching the right placing her in Heaven. (*r*) *For ſeeing the Angels are in the Eleventh Heaven, and the Virgin* Mary *is exalted above the Choires of Angels, it ſeemeth agreeable to place her in the Twelfth Heaven which belongeth to the Trinity. For ſhe is called* Deipara, *and we Celebrate the Holy Virgin as truly and properly the Parent and Mother of God; and ſuppoſe, that he is true God that is born of her, ſo that the true Mother of God generated the true God incarnate of her. If therefore ſhe be the Genetrix and Mother of God, ſhe ought to be plac'd at the Right-hand of the Son, as the Mother is to be plac'd, and not under the Son. It ſeemeth therefore agreeable, that the Virgin* Mary *be plac'd in the Twelfth Heaven where God is.* Some ſay (*s*) ſhe is rais'd to ſuch Sublimity, whither Human Nature may not come, that of her ſelf ſhe maketh a diſtinct Hierarchy, the next to the Trinity; ſhe is uſually intituled *totius Trinitatis complementum*, *the accompliſhment of the whole Trinity*; and not a few of them ſuppoſe *a Communication of the Deity to her and her Identity with God*. She muſt be Creature-tranſcendent, if *J. Damaſcen* ſaith well; (*t*) *It is fitting, that this Mother of God ſhould enjoy that which belongeth to her Son, and therefore the Glory of being ador'd by all Men.*

(6.) By ſtiling her *the Mother of God* the Bl. Virgin is made to be of *all ſuch Excellency*, as this her Title in any Natural ſignification and Senſe of the Marianolatriſts doth imply. In ſuch Senſe her Honour-Title doth imply (*u*) *a certain infinite Dignity*, an Excellency parallel to her Son; and accordingly her Devoto's have rais'd her to a Chriſt-like Excellency and Tranſcendency by their Hypotheſis of her fulneſs of Grace and Merit, her Mother-hood of Redemption, Regeneration and of the Church, her Imperial Dignity and Rank in the Heavenly Regions, and by their Romantic Conceits and Devotional Celebrations of her immaculate Conception, miraculous Aſſumption, and Exaltation above all the Hierarchies of Angels, of whoſe joyful Congratulations and Celebrations of her Honour at her arrival (*w*) the *Marian* Theologers have given a particular account. Intoxicated with blind Conceits, an idolatrous Eſtimation and Love-paſſion for the Holy Lady, they make no ſcruple, to communicate to her the proper Honorary Attributions of the Lord Meſſiah, ſuch as (*x*) *Abraham rejoiced to ſee my Day, I was ſet up from Everlaſting, in whom dwelt all the fulneſs of the God-head bodily, the very Ark of God, the Ark of the Propitiatory, the Mercy-ſeat, the Tabernacle, the Rod out of the Stem of* Jeſſe, *the erected Aſylum, the Gate of Heaven, that opened Paradiſe, and deliver'd the Souls of Men from Hell*, (*y*) *the noble Star of* Jacob. (*z*) *None can ſufficiently praiſe her, though all his Members were turn'd into Tongues; they that ſay of her all excellent and illuſtrious things, yet praiſe her below her Dignity*, though they ſtile her *the Paradiſe of God, the Wood of Life, the Temple of the Living God, the Hall of the Eternal King, the Temple of the Trinity*, (the Mother of the whole Trinity) *the Throne of God, the Orient Light of* Nazareth, *the Glory of* Jeruſalem, *the joy of* Iſrael, *the Glory and Joy of Angels, the Glory of the World, the Nobility of the Chriſtian People, the Light of the Church, Light of Lights*, (*a*) *Thou art moſt worthy of all Praiſe*; So the Church Doxologizeth. (*b*) *Hail the inexhauſted Ocean of Joy! Hail the ſole Levamen of Troubles! Hail the Medicine of all the Griefs of the Heart! Hail Mother, Heaven* (becauſe Chriſt is the Sun, therefore the Church ſtileth the Virgin Heaven) *Maid, Virgin, Throne, the Grace, Glory, Stabiliment of our Church! The Abyſs of Grace, the inextinguiſhable Lamp, the Sceptre of the Orthodox Faith, the indiſſoluble Temple*, ſo the Church renowneth her; and her Sepulchre ſhe ſtileth *a Divine Temple*, which ſpeaketh her nothing leſs than a Goddeſs. Agreeably whereto *Pſalters* and *Bibles* alſo (*Biblia Mariæ*) are compos'd for her Honour, and what is of Pulchritude and Precioſity throughout the Bible or in the World (*c*) *the Sun, Moon, Stars, Earth, the rutilant Morning, the Cedar of* Lebanon, *the Cypreſs, Palm, Olive, the Aromatic Spices, Cinnamon, Myrrhe and Balm, the Waters of Paradiſe, the Ark of* Noah, *the Rainbow of Heaven, the Ladder of* Jacob, *the Buſh of* Moſes *and Table of the Law, the Rod of* Aaron *that budded, the Fleece of* Gideon, *the Honey-comb of* Samſon, Sion, Jeruſalem, *the Throne of Solomon, the Houſe of Wiſdom with Seven Pillars, the Mountain in* Daniel *whence the Stone is cut, the Gate in* Ezekiel *that muſt be always ſhut, the Garden ſhut up and the Fountain ſealed* (with ſuch more) her Religioniſts have made Typical and Repreſentative of her, and with ſuch Elogies in their Mouths they make their Court to her. All the Pulchritudes, Pomps and Delicacies of the Spouſe in the *Canticles* the Church (*d*) hath apply'd to *the Queen of the World, the Queen at the King's Right-hand in clothing of Gold, clad about with divers Colours*; and ſhe is uſually intituled *the Woman clothed with the Sun Crown'd with Twelve Stars, that hath the Moon under her Feet*. Which extravagant Elogies may ſeem to raiſe her to no higher pitch than a co-equality with the Church: But the Marianolatriſts have more Seraphic Notions of her Glories; for they affirm (*e*) *That the Moon under her Feet is the Church, which ſhe hath under her Defence and Protection, and lying at her Feet praying to be ſav'd by her, till ſhe did deduce her to eternal Peace; and that every faithful Soul and the univerſal Church her ſelf is the Handmaid of the Virgin.* (*f*) *None of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Doctors, may compare with her perſpicacity of Light and Knowledge* (be-

cauſe

(r) Caſſan. *Catal. Glor. Mund. par.* 12. *fol.* 285.

(s) Biel *in Feſt. Aſſump. Ser.* 3.

(t) 1. *De Nativ. & 2. de Aſſump.*

(u) *Aquin.* 1. *Qu.* 25. *Art.* 6. *ad* 4.

(w) Biel *in Feſt. Aſſump. Ser.* 4.

(x) *Idem de Feſt. Div. Virg.*

(y) Bernard. *ſuper Miſſus eſt Hom.* 2.

(z) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 9. *S.* 12. *Breviar. Sariſbur. in ſerv. B. M. Laur. Sur.* 1. *de Nativ.*

(a) *Offic. parv. B. M.*

(b) *Breviar. Rom. in Aſſump. & Nat. B. M.*

(c) Biel 2. *de Nativ. Laur. Sur.* 2. *de Aſſumpt.*

(d) *Breviar. Rom. in Aſſump. B. M. & in Feſt. Concept.*

(e) Biel 4. *de Concept. & de B. Virg. Ser. gener Bonavent. in Specul. c.* 1.

(f) Biel 4. *de Aſſumpt. Petav. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *in fin.*

cauſe ſhe penetrated the Abyſs of Divine Wiſdom, when the fulneſs of the Deity inhabited her;) *ſhe hath rais'd the Sublimity of her Merits unto the Throne of the Deity* (g) *the Monarchy of the World devolveth upon Chriſt as being her Son.* (h) *All the Inhabitants of Heaven and thoſe that are in Hell, we and thoſe that have gone before us, muſt look unto her as to the Center* (ſicut ad rerum cauſam, ſicut ad negotium ſeculorum) *as to the cauſe of things, as to the buſineſs of all Ages.*

(g) Ildelphonſ. *Ser. de Aſſumpt.*
(h) Bernard. *In Feſt. Pentecoſt. Ser.* 2.

(7.) This Honorary Title in the Natural ſignification of it and in the Senſe of (the leſs as well as the more extravagant) *Marianolatriſts* denoteth the Bl. Virgin, *to have ſuch a Superiority over God*, as other Mothers have righfully over their Sons. It cannot be imagin'd, that in a vaſt Body of Men all ſhould be Marianolatriſts at the ſame rate; bodily Diſeaſes affect one part more than another: So ſome are more and others are leſs extravagant Marianolatriſts. The more extravagant ſort of Marianolatriſts (from whom I have tranſcrib'd nothing,) ſtick not to ſay, (i) *That the Mother of God is Superior to her Son, that he ought to Honour and Obey her, that ſhe hath an Authority and Dominion over him, that he is ſubject to her and ſerveth her, and that ſhe hath plac'd her Throne above the Throne of God.* The other ſort of Marianolatriſts are more ſparing in their Expreſſions; yet theſe (the Church's genuine Children, Doctors, Saints, that deviate not from her Senſe, but ſpeak their Mothers Tongue that procreated them and taught them their Marianolatry) even theſe are bold to ſay of the Mother of God; (k) *That ſhe hath as it were an Authority and Natural Dominion as to the Lord of the whole World, and much more as to all that is ſubject to this Lord: So that in her Name all things bow in Heaven and in Earth and in Hell, and Miracles are ſhew'd. She cometh before the Golden Altar of Human Reconciliation, not intreating only, but commanding, a Miſtreſs, not a Servant. It is not poſſible, but ſhe muſt be heard in all her Requeſts, becauſe God is obedient to her as to his true and immaculate Mother.* And now it is not hard to determine, whether the Bl. Virgin (who was but an Human Mother of her Divine Lord) may have this Title of Honour (which is without diſtinction, reſtriction or abatement of Senſe) lawfully given to her *the Mother of God.* And it is eaſie to make a Judgment touching the Wiſdom and Piety of thoſe elder times of the Church, that introduc'd this Honour-Title.

(i) *Le Blanc. Theſ. p.* 368.
(k) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 8. *S.* 5. *&c.* 9. *S.* 13, 14.

(10.) The phantaſtry of the Marianolatriſts in their Elogies of the Bl. Virgin hath no exact Parallel in Paganiſm: But a conſiderable Paralleliſm there is between their Virgin-Goddeſs and the Pagans *Minerva*, which is diſcourſed by one of their own Writers. (l) *Cum primum illuxit & invaluit ſplendor Chriſtianæ Pietatis, Toloſani proceres tectorio inaurato ſpecioſum fanum, antea palladi dedicatum, Mariæ Virgini conſultiſſimè tranſcripſerunt: Tum quia pallas Virgo ex Jovis Parentis cerebro nata fingatur, tum quia conſilio & opibus abundè fortunet mortales, & Maria Virginitatem naturæ obſtupendam retinuit, & in Dei* Opt. *Max. mente ante ſolem & tempora verſabatur, & auream nobis Ætatem prorſus reduxit, ac partu mirifico miſeros ægroſque proſperavit.* Beſides that this Pagan Goddeſs is famous for Virginity, (and is intituled (m) *κόρη, a pure Virgin*) ſhe is the Daughter of *Jupiter*: As the Marianolatriſts have intituled their Virgin-Goddeſs *the beloved Daughter of the eternal Father.* And as they (uſually) ſuppoſe, that their She-God hath her Throne on the King's Right hand (n) *being made ſo much better than the Angels, as ſhe hath obtain'd a more excellent Name than they*, the Name of *Mother*: So *Minerva* (as *Ariſtides* diſcourſeth from *Pindar*,) *ſitting at the Right-hand of her Father there receiveth Commands from him to be deliver'd to the Gods. For ſhe is greater than the Angels, and commandeth them ſome one thing and ſome another, accordingly as ſhe had firſt received of her Father, ſhe performing the Office of an Interpreter and Introducer to the Gods, when it is requiſite. Minerva* in (o) *Proclus* and *Plato* hath the Honorary Epithet of *Δέσποινα, Lady, ἡ Δέσποινα ἡμῶν, our Lady*, which is the Marianolatriſts uſual Name for their Goddeſs. And as the Pagan *Pallas* is a Warrioureſs renown'd by her Military Proweſs in killing a Giant, and *Pauſanias* ſpeaketh of (p) *the Altar of the Martial* Minerva: So the Pagano-Chriſtians have ſtiled our Lady (q) *noſtra Bellatrix, our Warriowreſs, that bruiſed the Serpents Head by her Fortitude; that hath the Power of Hoſts and Military Virtues, and is conjoyned with the Lord of Hoſts; that is the Tower of* David, *whereon there hang a thouſand Bucklers of Defence, the confidence of thoſe that are valiant in Fight, terrible to her Enemies as an Army with Banners* (*ſhe went out furniſh'd with all the Armature of the Mighty againſt the Princes of Darkneſs,* (r) *ſhe alone hath ſlain all the Hereſies in the World*;) whence *Philip of Valois* having obtain'd a great Victory over the Rebels in *Flanders*, conſecrated his Horſe and Arms to that *Martial Pallas* the Virgin-Goddeſs of the Pontificians. But although they have an Idea of their Goddeſs, which is of great Affinity with a *Martial Pallas*, yet their uſual Idea and Elogies of her ſuperlative Goodneſs, and the uſual tenour of their Marian Devotions, ſpeak her rather *an indulgent Mother of Children*; for her ſuperlative Goodneſs is a Womaniſh Facility and Tenderneſs of Nature. (s) *The Name of* Mary *is moſt ſweet, in ſome ſort more tender than the Name of Jeſus, which is as it were a a proud Name, and too Potent. If any one is afraid of the Severity of the Deity or Virile Sex in Jeſus, let him have recourſe to* Mary, *in whom nothing of theſe is to be ſuſpected.* Mary *is a Womans Name carrying a ſhew of and commending Manſuetude.* (t) *Why is our Frailty afraid of coming to* Mary? *There is nothing Auſtere in her, nothing Terrible: She is altogether Sweet, offering to all Milk and Wooll* (ſoft Effeminate things,) *ſhe openeth the Boſom of her Mercy to all, that all may receive of her Fulneſs, the captive Redemption, the Sick curation, the ſorrowful Conſolation, the Sinner Pardon, the juſt Grace, an Angel joy, the whole Trinity Glory, the Perſon of the Son,* (which is a great Favour) *the ſubſtance of Human Fleſh, ſo that there is nothing hid from her heat.* Her Devotioniſts ſuppoſe her, not only the Mother of God, but (u) *a Mother unto us* (which ſpeaketh both her Maternal Authority and Diſpoſition *the common Mother and Nurſe of Cities and Provinces, yea of all Mankind, the Mother of Orphans, Mother of the Miſerable, the Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, the Hope and Comfort of the afflicted, the Chancelareſs in the Court of Heaven, the Throne of Grace, the Pacificatory of God towards Men, that reigneth not by Juſtice but by Mercy*; (w) they celebrate *the Longitude* and *Latitude*, the *Sublimity* and *Profundity* of her Mercy; and the Church in her Devotions celebrateth her (x) as *the Queen of Mercy and our Advocate and the only Hope of Sinners.*

(l) *Forcatul. l.* 1. *p.* 32. *vid.* Dr. Jackſon *Origin. of Unbelief. c.* 38. *p.* 355.
(m) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 5. *c.* 35.
(n) Biel 4. *de Aſſump.*
(o) *Procl. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 11. *p.* 372.
(p) *P.* 52. *Ara* Ἀθηνᾶς ἀρείας *Minervæ martiæ.*
(q) *Laur. Sur.* 1. *de Nativ.* Biel 4. *de Aſſump.* Le Blanc *Theſ. p.* 367.
(r) *Offic. parv. B. Mar.*
(s) Biel 4. *de Concept.*
(t) Bernard. *de B. Virg. Ser.* 2. *in Apocal.* 12. 1.
(u) Biel 4. *de Aſſumpt.* Petav. *ſupr. c.* 9. *S.* 1, 9. *Anſw. to the Jeſ. Challenge p.* 483, 484.
(w) Biel 3. *de Nativ.*
(x) *Petav. ſupr. S.* 11, 13.

The relief of Sinners is well provided for in this *Marian* Religion; for none is ſaid (y) to patronize Sinners at ſuch a rate as this their Indulgent Mother and Advocate, (z) *in whom the Sinner may find Pardon, the Juſt inceaſe of Grace, and the Angels Joy to Eternity. Theophilus* (who by an Hand-writing had given himſelf to the Devil, but had it given back again by the Bl. Virgin) is an Inſtance, that the greateſt of Sinners may find Pardon in her, who is paramount to our Saviour in Goodneſs and Tenderneſs, (for ſhe is not a Judge, (a) *ſhe doth not diſcuſs Mens Merits in time paſt, but is exorable to all, moſt gentle to all, and compaſſionateth the Neceſſities of all with a moſt ample affection*;) becauſe of her Feminine Paſſivity and Motherly Tenderneſs of Nature the Church hath made her the Mediatrix to the Mediator, (b) *to appear in the ſight of her Son* (the Judge) *for Sinners*; whom they repreſent (c) *as a tremendous Judge, terrible to us, and vibrating over us the Sword of his Anger, but to her ſweet and affording all Grace; and therefore they bow to her glorious Majeſty and bend their Neck before the Glory of her Celſitude, ſending up their Cries and Snſpirious Prayers to her to mitigate her Son's Anger towards us*, ſo to be a Savioureſs from the only Saviour. And as her Clients promiſe themſelves the Pardon of their Sins in her; ſo they promiſe themſelves Salvation, becauſe they are her Devoto's; (d) *for without doubt we ſhall have Salvation, if we truly worſhip her, through whom Salvation aroſe unto all.* Suppoſe, we are not qualify'd for Pardon and Salvation, yet (e) ſome rare holy Men have ſeen in Viſion, that certain whom Chriſt would have condemn'd, yet in regard they were her Servants, by her Interceſſion have been abſolv'd; whence it followeth, that the *Marian* Religion is an eaſier way to Salvation than the Chriſtian; her Goodneſs being of ſuch tranſcendency, that (f) *ſhe will not permit any to have an evil End, who ſtudieth reverently to make her Crown* (to repeat the Roſary of Prayers made for her worſhip;) *The old Serpent is under her Feet and cannot approach her, nor thoſe that invoke her.* The Elogies of her Goodneſs and Beneficence are a great part of her Style; ſuch as (g) *The Reconciliatreſs of Sinners, the Advocatreſs of the Poor,* (h) *the Refuge of Sinners, the Help of Chriſtians, the Comfortreſs of the Afflicted,* (i) *the Haven of ſuch as are in Tempeſts, the Delivereſs of the Impriſoned, the Redemption of the Captives, the Exultation of the Sick, the Peace, Solace and Health of the World,* (k) *the Expeller of our Darkneſs, the moſt potent ſubduer of our Adverſaries,* (becauſe the Lady) *the Ark of thoſe that are to be ſav'd, the Staff of the Weak, the Wall of the whole World, the moſt compatient Reliever of our Miſeries,* (l) *the Star of the Sea* (ſo they perverſly interpret the Name *Miriam*) *to defend us from Rocks and Pirates, pluck us out of the Waves, and the Shipwreck'd from the Jaws of Death, and to traduce us to the Port of Eternal Salvation*; (m) *for all that are ſav'd ſhe begetteth by Faith, nouriſheth by Charity, defendeth by continual Interceſſion.* Such a fam'd Beneficence (n) draweth ſuch a throng of Suppliants, that the Bl. Virgin complaineth in *Eraſmus*, *tantum non enecant, ſhe hath much adoe to live.*

XI. The Honourary Aſcriptions and Attributions of the Bl. Virgin which we have recounted, (which are no leſs than the eminent Attributes of God, his incommunicable Prerogatives and our Bl. Saviour's, his peculiar Works of Providence, Patronage and Redemption, and which would certainly put *Paul* and *Barnabas* into a ſecond Conſternation, if they were alive) are but certain Fragments of her Praiſes, and thoſe Praiſes are but a Branch of her Service, of ſo great a Bulk and ſo high a Strain is the Church-Marianolatry. Theſe Elogies ſpeak the Humour of the times of Marianolatry; they ſhew the height of the Diſeaſe, at what a rate Marianolatry hath prevail'd; they ſerve (amongſt other things) to demonſtrate, that the Principles and great Eſſentials of Marianolatry, the prevailing Senſe and Practice of the Church are of a tranſcendent ſtrain; and that the Current of Marianolatry hath run ſo high in the Church, that nothing can be more apparent, than that ſhe is deeply laps'd into *Idolatry* and *Demonolatry* upon the account of it. The reſt of the Marianolatriſts devotional Services are of the ſame elevated Strain with their Honourary *Aſcriptions* and *Attributions*; for this Queen Regent of the Church and of the World is worſhipp'd by her Religioniſts (o) *with the fulneſs of their Devotional Affection,* (p) *with the moſt profound Reverences,* (q) *with their whole Deſire and with all their Praiſes.* They joyn her with God in their Doxologies and Forms of Bleſſing, their Sermons are begun with an *Ave-Mary* for a Bleſſing upon their Work, and they uſually conclude their Books with *praiſe to God and the Bleſſed Virgin.* They devote themſelves to her Service, (r) reſign themſelves to her Will and Pleaſure, give up their Soul, Body, Eſtate, and their All to her at the moſt ſuperlative rate (nothing more can be done to God;) * *where one prayeth before the Crucifix, two before her Image; where one voweth to Chriſt, ten vow unto her; where one faſteth on* Friday, *many faſt the* Saturday *in devotion to her; and in all outward Actions the Honour which they do her, is for the moſt part double unto that which they do our Saviour.* Her numerous and ſtately *Churches* and *Altars*, the *Vows, Pilgrimages* and *Oblations* (rich and in great abundance) that are made to her, the many *Feſtivals* for her Honour and Service, the multitude of her *Ave's* (the very Bell that calleth them to their daily Prayers hath the name of the *Ave-Mary Bell,*) their making the *Ave-Mary* a Fundamental of Religion, a Principle in their Catechiſms; their *Devotional Salutations* of her, and their *Recommendations* of themſelves (Soul and Body now and evermore) to her Protection and Guidance; The *Sodalities* inſtituted to her Honour, the mighty Piety and Devotion uſually expreſs'd to her Image, her *Roſary*, proper *Maſſes, Litanies, Canonical Hours, great and ſmall Offices* (with other Branches of Marianolatry)

(y) *Ibid. S.* 13.

(z) Biel 4. *de concept.*

(a) Bern. *Ser.* 2. *de B. Virg. in* Apoc. 12. 1.

(b) Petav. *ſupr. S.* 11.

(c) Laur. Sur. 1. *de Nativ. & in Aſſumpt. Ser. ult.*

(d) Biel 1. *de Aſſumpt.*

(e) Europ. *Spec. p.* 9.

(f) *Anſw. to the Jeſ. challenge, p.* 488. Biel 4. *de Aſſumpt.*

(g) Biel. 3. *de Nativ.*

(h) *Caniſ. Catech. p.* 168.

(i) Bellar. *Controv. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 15. *de orat.*

(k) Biel 2. *de Aſſump.* 4. *de Nativ.*

(l) *Idem* 4. *de Concep.*

(m) *Ibid. Ser.* 1.

(n) The Attributes of her Goodneſs and Beneficence are abridg'd in this following Leſſon of a *Roman* Breviary. *Beatiſſima virgo Dei genetrix Maria à ſuis primordiis Domino conſecrata, propter beneficia ejus inaudita exhibita populo invocanti, omnes in neceſſitate conſtituti ad eam confugiunt, tanquam ad ſingulare remedium, ubi humanum ſubſidium non ſufficit requiſitum. Diſponit namque omnia inferiora ſua ſapientia, providentia & induſtria propulſata. Ipſa enim ex abundantia gratiæ ſibi data eſt cura curarum, cùm ſit viſitatrix, nutrix, genetrixque bonorum. Gaudet autem Deus & latatur per ſecula, quando regina Cœli cuncta debitè ſunt ſubjecta. Vbi enim eſt Gubernatrix provida cœlicæ & terrenæ poteſtatis? in Maria. Vbi mater miſericordiæ & Impetratrix veniæ? in Maria. Vbi Mediatrix ad Deum pro crimine? in Maria. Vbi Reparatrix ſperandæ gratiæ? in Maria. Vbi mater militantis Eccleſiæ? in Maria. Vbi Advocata ſeculi? in Maria. Ipſa ſiquidem eſt advocata mundi, patrona peculii, viſitatio periculi, ſpes ſalutis populi Chriſtiani. Ipſa miſerorum miſeratio, afflictorum relevatio, deſolatorum conſolatio, peccatorum viſitatio, diſcordantium redintegratio cum triumpho.* Breviar. Roman. ex ſacra potiſſimum ſcriptura & probatis ſanctorum hiſtoriis confectum. Antwerpiæ in ædibus Joannis Steelſii 1563. Fol. 362.

(o) *Totis medullis cordis, totis præcordiorum affectibus.* Biel 1. de Annunciat.

(p) *Profundiſſimis reverentiis.* Le Blanc. Theſ. p. 362.

(q) *Totis deſideriis, totiſque præconiis.* Breviar. Sarisbur. in ſervit. B. M.

(r) P. Damian. *Ep.* 14. *l.* 2.

* Europ. *Spec. p.* 6, 7.

latry) demonſtrate the immenſe Devotion of her Servitors towards her, that a principal part of the Pontifician Piety is the Marian Devotion (whence a mighty Devotion to the Bl. Virgin is the uſual Character of a mighty Pietiſt) that the Church of *Rome* maketh it her Deſign to promote Devotion towards the Holy Virgin, and that Marianolatry is ſubſtituted in the place of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs. (s) *In our Lady's Office, why do we end every Leſſon, ſaying, But thou, O Lord, have mercy on us?* ſaith a late Catechiſt. *A. To beg, that the Praiſes and Virtues of the Bl. Virgin which we have there read, may be deeply ſettled in our Hearts, and that God would pardon our former Negligence both in his and her Service.* S. *Gerard* Biſhop of *Canade* in *Hungary* is ſaid to have promoted her Service to ſuch a pitch of Extravagance, (t) that it became cuſtomary in that Country, when they heard the Name of our Lady pronounc'd, they fell on their Knees, and bowed their Heads to the Earth. In a Church which he built, he dedicated a Chappel to her Honour, and having there ſet up her Statue, he daily offer'd Incenſe to it, and ordain'd, that her Altar ſhould never be without fine Odours upon it, which ſhould continually ſmoke to her Honour. Nor is the Greek Church without Prodigies of Marianolatry; for ſuch are her *Marian* μεγαλυσμοὶ, or Doxologies, her Hymns call'd θεοτόκια (directed to the Mother of God,) her Oblation of the Particle at the Euchariſt in honour of our Lady (called παναγία, *All-holy*) and the *Kaloirs* celebration of a Mock-Sacrament for her Honour.

Notwithſtanding the Marianolatriſts Doctrine *de finibus regundis* (that God muſt be worſhipp'd with *Latria*, the higheſt degree of worſhip; the Bl. Virgin with *Hyperdulia*, an honourary Service next to God; and the other Saints with *Dulia*;) it is not probable, that themſelves underſtand how far they may go, and where they muſt ſtop in theſe ſeveral Stages of Religious Worſhip; or that in doing their Devotions they always obſerve their Bounds ſo punctually and critically, as never to make an *Hyperdulia* inſtead of doing *Dulia* only; nor ever aſcending to *Latria*, when they ought to ſtop at *Hyperdulia*. But whether they rightly obſerve their Stops or otherwiſe; this their diſtinction of Worſhip is Paganical; for the Pagans gave not Divine Honour to their *Heroes* in the fulleſt height of it. (*u*) They pretended not to give them the Honour of Sacrifice, although they lighted Tapers about their Statues and burned Incenſe unto them: So the Pagano-Chriſtians that do the ſame things to the Saints departed, yet pretend not to give them the Honour of Sacrifice. The Pagans made a diſtinction between the *Divine Worſhip* or *God-Service* ſtrictly ſo called (the worſhip of the Gods in a ſtrict acceptation) and their Religious *Heroic* Worſhip: So the Pagano-Chriſtians make a diſtinction between the Divine Worſhip or God-ſervice, ſtrictly ſo call'd (*Latria*) and their Religious Saint-worſhip; but the Worſhip which both Parties give to their *Heroes*, is the God-ſervice and Worſhip in a larger ſenſe; both becauſe it conſtituteth them a ſort of Religioniſts or Devotioniſts (in contradiſtinction to Atheiſts;) and becauſe the ſeveral Modes or particular Acts of it belong not to *the Man-honourary Service and Worſhip*, and therefore are the appropriate Modes of God's Service and Worſhip, and the proper Acts of it. For by *the Man-honourary Service and Worſhip* we are to underſtand, *That which is on this ſide the making a God, a Religion, or one a Religioniſt to another*; and in ſuch Senſe *Tertullian* ſaith moſt truly, (*w*) *what is ultra humani honoris modum, beyond the Modes and Meaſures of the Man-honourary Service and Worſhip*, is part of God's holy Worſhip, *as being the God-honourary Service and Worſhip*. Such is the Worſhip which the Pagano-Chriſtians (agreeably to the Pagans) pay to their Men-Superiorities, that are not God. Such are their *Devotional Attributions*, their aſcribing to the Saints ſuch *Patronage*, *Providence*, *Protection*, *Redemption*, *Salvation*, *Omniſcience*, *Omnipotence*, *Greatneſs*, *Beneficialneſs*, *Mediatorſhip*, *Imperial Dignity*, *Plenitude of Grace*, *Pulchritude and Pretioſity of Perſon*, as is proper to God and the Son of God. Such are their *Devotional Affections*, their idolizing the Saints and their Patronage in their *Eſtimation* and *Regard*, their idolatrous *love* for them (being more affected (*x*) *towards ſome certain Saint than towards our Lord*,) their ſeeking them with *Faith* and *Hope*, their Religious *Truſt* in them, *Dependence* upon them, (*y*) and making them *their only Refuge and Confidence*; as alſo their *Soul-ſubmiſſions*, *Subjections*, *Reſignations*, and *Dedications* of themſelves at a ſuperlative rate. Such are theſe their various modes of doing *Honour and Service* to the Saints; their Devotional *Salutations*, *Recommendations*, *Forms of Addreſs*, *Homages*, *Congratulations*; their ſerving them with *Prayers*, *Supplications*, *Litanies*, *Praiſes*, *Doxologies*, *Thankſgivings*, *making Vows to them and ſwearing by their Names*; their making *Confeſſion* of their Sins to them, diſmiſſing *departing* Souls in their Names, *contradicting and adjuring* Evil Spirits by their Virtue, making their ſolemn *Excommunications* and *Abſolutions* in the Name and by the Authority of S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* (together with God) *conſecrating Churches* and *Altars* in their Names, inſtituting *Sodalities* and *Feſtivals* for their Honour and Service, and making *Oblations* to them at their Shrines and Altars; *Offices* and *Forms* of Devotion, *Hours*, *the Myſteries* and *Contemplations* of the *Roſary*. Their building *Temples* and conſecrating *Altars* to the Saints as Patrons of them, and for their publick *Invocation* and *Worſhip*: Their offering *Sacrifice* to their Honour (and receiving the Sacrament to their Honour;) their erecting the *Symbolical Preſences* of the Saints, ſolemn *Invocation* of them in their Temples, paying them (in the geſture of their Mind and Body) the Religious *Adoration*, praying to them with all the ſolemn uſages of Devotion wherewith they pray unto God, bowing their Bodies and bending their Knees to them, as ſuppoſing themſelves in their *preſence*; ſinging Laudatory *Hymns* to them, offering and *burning Incenſe* to them, conſecrating their *Images* and *Reliques*, which they richly adorn, Temple, place upon their Altars, ſet up for Publick Worſhip, making their *Genuflexions* and *Proſtrations* to them (putting up their Prayers and Supplications with Hands and Eyes devoutly lifted up to their Images (making *Vows*, *Oblations* and *Pilgrimages* to them, offering and burning *Lamps* and *Tapers* to them, carrying them in *pompous Proceſſion*, placing their *Hope* and *Confidence* in them, expecting *Gifts* and *Graces* from them, and attributing all ſorts of *Miracles* to them. The Pagans worſhipp'd their *Divi* as *the Sons and Friends of God*, his near Relatives (as appeareth from *M. Tyrius* and others) not *principally*, but only *ſecondarily and relatively* (although they worſhipp'd them with *abſolute* Prayer:) So the Pagano-Chriſtians religiouſly worſhip their *Divi*, not *principally*, but *ſecondarily* and *relatively*, as the *Servants* and *Friends* of God, (z) as themſelves ſay.

(s) H. T. *Abridgment of Chriſt. Doctr. p.* 205.

(t) Aug. Wichman. *Sabbat. Mar. c.* 7.

(u) Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 12. *Ld.* Herb. *de Rel. Gentil. p.* 101, 106, 112. Selden. *de Synedr. l.* 3. *p.* 438.

(w) De *Idolatr. c.* 15.

(x) Alex. *de* Hales *ſumm. Par.* 4. *qu.* 26. *membr.* 3. *Art.* 5.

(y) Bellar. *Controv. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 15. *de orat.*

(z) Petav. *T.* 4. *P.* 2. *l.* 15. *c.* 5. *S.* 1.

CHAP. V.

1. *An Idea of the Nature of the Philoſophic-Pagans Theology.* Sect. 1. *Of the Philoſophic-Pagans Theology as Phyſical.* Sect. 2. *Of the Philoſophic-Pagans Theology as Metaphyſical.* 1. *Their Theology was their Metaphyſicks.* 2. *The things confronted and oppos'd in the Metaphyſical Platonic Theology.* 3. *A diſparagement of generate corruptible Nature.* Sect. 3. *Of the Philoſophic-Pagans Theology as Myſtic-Metaphyſical.* 1. *Of the ſeveral Platonic Modes of Theologizing.* 2. *An Inference from the firſt Mode.* 3 *An Inference from the ſecond Mode.* 4. *An Inference from the third Mode, and of the Pythagoric Tetractys.* 5. *Of the Philoſophic Pagans hidden Theology.* 6. *Of the Platonic Theamatiſts.* 7. *Of the ſeveral parts of the Platonic Theology.* Sect. 4. *Of the Philoſophic Pagans Theology as Arcane-Theurgical.* 1. *Of the Nature of Theurgy.* 2. *Of the Extent of it.* 3. *Of the* Perſian *Magick.* 4. *Of the Origin of the Theology of the* Perſian *Magi.* 5. *Of the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theology of their Inſtitution.* 6. *Of their Myſtic-Metaphyſical and Myſtic-Theurgical Sanctity.* 7. *Of the grand Theory fundamental to their Inſtitution and the principal matters involv'd therein.* 8. *Of the Tranſmigration of the Soul.* 9. *Of the Vehicles of the Soul.* 10. *Of the Purgation of the Vehicle.* 11. *Of the Purgation of the Soul and the Deſign of it.* 12. *Of the Philoſophic-Pagans method of the Soul's Liberation and Reduction.* 13. *Of the Sublimity that is in the Pagan Theology.* Sect. 5. *Of the Philoſophic-Pagans Theology as Aſtrological and Aſtrological-Magical.* 1. *The Philoſophic-Pagans Aſtrologize in their Theology.* 2. *Much of their Learning lay in Aſtrology.* 3. *Much of the Pagans Magick was complicated with Aſtrology.* 4. *Of certain Operations in Paganiſm that are Aſtrological-Magical.* 5. *Aſtrology complicated with Magick in the Teleſmatical Artifice.* 6. *Of the Ancient and Modern Zabii.*

I. WE have conſider'd the Pagan Syſtem of the Univerſe of Rationals, ſo far as it is a Polity of *Demons*, and ſhould now (going on directly) proceed, to conſider it, as it is a Polity of *the Gods* in the ſtrict Acceptation: But theſe Gods (which will be ſufficiently notic'd in conſidering the *Pagan Syſtem of the Univerſe of Gods*) were in great degree unknown to the Popular Pagans, and peculiarly belong to *the Philoſophic Pagans Theology*; they are therefore not clearly intelligible without underſtanding it; for which reaſon we will repreſent an Account of the Nature and Properties of it in the ſeveral Sections of this Chapter. A conſiderable notice of the Nature of it we have in that Diſtribution, which *Scævola* (the Learned Pontifex) hath made, of the Pagan Deities (*a*) *into the Poetical, Philoſophical and Political.* Which Diſtribution of Gods is the ſame in ſenſe with *Varro*'s Diſtribution of Theology into three kinds: (*b*) the *Mythical* or Fabulous, the *Phyſical* or Natural, the *Civil* or Political; for the ſecond kind of Theology in this Diſtribution is call'd by *Varro (Phyſicon quo philoſophi utuntur) the Philoſophical.* But from the Account which theſe Learned Pagans have given of this ſort of Theology, it appeareth, that they look'd upon it as in part only ſtrictly Philſophical and Unpopular; as S. *Auſtin* ſaith of *Varro*; *when he diſtinguiſh'd the Civil Theology from the Fabulous, and the Phyſical as of it ſelf a third kind of Theology, he would have it underſtood, to be compos'd of both temper'd together rather than ſeparate from both; for he ſaith, that in the Poetic Theology there is too little, and in the Philoſophic Theology too much for the People, which are ſo diſtant from one another, as that yet many things are taken from both into the Civil Theology.* He ſuppoſeth therefore, that the Philoſophic Theology was in part Popular (common to the People and the Philoſophers) and in part ſtrictly Philoſophical and Unpopular, as *containing many things not expedient for the People to know, above the Capacity of Vulgar Citizens, and containing many Queſtions about the Gods,* (*c*) *which are more tolerably diſcours'd within the Walls of the Schools than without in the Forum, that is, amongſt the People.* Of this Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans contradiſtinct to their *Fabulous* and *Civil Theology*, and in great degree *Scholaſtical and remote from the People*, there are five eminent Deſcriptive Notices; for it is of kind and quality *Phyſical* (Phyſical Theory) *Metaphyſical*, *Myſtic-Metaphyſical*, *Arcane-Theurgical*, *Aſtrological-Magical*. And theſe Notices of it imply, that the Philoſophic-Pagan Theiſm is in great part that which is of kind, quality and ſpecific Comprehenſion *Sorcery and Wizzardiſm.*

SECT. 1. *Of the Philoſophic-Pagan Theology, as it is Phyſical* (Phyſical Theory.)

THE Philoſophic-Pagans are diſſonant from the *Hebrews* (from whom they are thought to have deriv'd their Wiſdom) in the Diſtribution that they make of *Wiſdom* or *Philoſophy*. (*d*) For the *Hebrews* diſtribute it into *the Ethical, the Phyſical, the Theological*; but the Philoſophers (uſually) do not thus diſtinguiſh the *Phyſical* and *Theological*, for they compriſe the *Theological* under the *Phyſical*, and their *Theology* is a Branch of their *Mundane Phyſical Theory*, or Phyſiology of the Mundane Syſtem. The School of the *Stoicks* and that of *Plato* agree (*e*) in diſtributing Philoſophy into three parts or kinds; the *Logical*, *Ethical*, *Phyſical*; and the *Stoicks* ſay, (*f*) *in the Phyſical part the Doctrine of the Gods* (or Theology) *ought to have the laſt place.* So of *Plato*'s Tripartite Diſtribution of Philoſophy (Philoſophy Tripartite is ſaid (*g*) to come from *Plato*) one part is *the Mundane Phyſical*, ἡ περὶ τῶν ὅλων φιλοσοφία, or περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως, *touching Univerſal Mundane Nature*; and to this part of Philoſophy, ἡ τῶν θείων ἐπιστήμη, *the Science of the Gods and the things Divine appertaineth.* With theſe Pagan Sages φιλοσοφία φυσικὴ, *the Philoſophy of Nature*, or *Phyſiology* is the ſame with (*h*) *Ontology* or

---

(a) *S.*Aug. *de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 27.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 5. Plutarch. *de placit. phil. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(c) *Quæ facilius intra parietes in ſchola, quàm extra in foro ferre poſſunt aures.*

(d) Grot. *Not. in* Prov. 22. 2c. Huet. *Dem. Ev. p.* 357. *ed.* 2.

(e) Plutarch. *de* Stoic. *repugn. p.* 1035. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 2, 3.

(f) Τῶν δὲ φυσικῶν ἔσχατος εἶναι ὁ περὶ τῶν θεῶν λόγος.

(g) Cic. *Academ. Qu. l.* 1.

(h) Alcin. *de Doctr. Plat. c.* 3.

or γνῶσις τῶν ὄντων, *the knowledge of Beings* (which is the uſual definition of Contemplative Philoſophy) the ſame with (i) φιλόσοφος θεωρία τῶν ὄντων, *the Philoſophic Contemplation of the Univerſe of Beings*; their *Philoſophy of Nature* is of ſo large an Acceptation, that it compriſeth their Metaphyſicks, and is divided into (k) *the Theory of Senſibles and Incorporeals*. (l) Nature alſo is divided into two Principles of things; the one *efficient*, the other *paſſive* and *material*; (m) for *Plato* affirm'd two Principles of all things, θεὸν ϗ ὕλην, *God and the Matter*. The Writer *de placitis philoſophorum* (n) thus expreſſeth the Senſe of the Ancient Phyſiologers (whoſe Phyſiology was principally an Account of the Origin of the Univerſe;) *It is impoſſible that Matter alone ſhould be the Principle of all things, but we muſt ſuppoſe alſo an Active or Efficient Cauſe. As Silver alone is not ſufficient to make a Cup, unleſs there be an Artificer to work upon it. And the ſame is to be ſaid concerning Braſs, Wood, and other Matter.* Inquiring whence it is that Mankind have a Notion of God? He anſwereth, (o) *That the Pulchritude of the Phænomena of the Univerſe firſt ſuggeſted the Notion of God; for no Pulchritude is by chance, but the effect of Art and Skill.* For theſe reaſons (and ſuch more) theſe Ancients ſuppos'd two Principles of this Univerſe of things, both of them called *Nature* (Mundane Nature) τὸ πάσχον, *Mundane Corporeal Paſſive Nature*, *and* τὸ ποιοῦν, *Mundane Intelligent Active Nature* (a Principle of Mind and Counſel in the World, which they called *God*;) And becauſe the Univerſe conſiſteth of both theſe, *their Mundane Phyſiologicals neceſſarily compriſe their Theologicals*: Which *Porphyry* alſo intimateth in his Account of the Theology of the *Zoroaſtrian Magi*; that *Pythagoras* converſing with *Zabratus* (p) *learned of him the Doctrine of Univerſal Nature, and the knowledge of the Principles or Archical Cauſes in the Mundane Syſtem of Beings.* For theſe ancient Phyſiologers having (in their Theory of the Univerſe) inveſtigated a Principle of Mind and Counſel in the World, which they called God: In the next place they conſider'd the ſeveral *Species*, *Ranks* and *Orders* of *Natures* and of *Beings* that conſtitute the Univerſe, calling the *Primary* and *Archical God and Gods*; as the Phyſiologizing *Atheiſtic* Pagans called that which is *Primary* and *Archical* in the Univerſe of things (according to their Hypotheſis) by the Name of *God* and *Gods*. (q) *Anaximander* called infinite ſenceleſs Matter τὸ θεῖον, or God; certain Atheiſtic Theologers in *Ariſtotle* call'd the inanimate Elements *Gods*, θεοὶ δὲ ϗ ταῦτα, *theſe are alſo Gods*; and *Apollonius Tyanæus* (a Theiſt) calleth the firſt Matter (r) Θεὸν ἀΐδιον (Eternal God) attributing Deity and Eternity to the Matter or Chaos (as many of the Ancient Greeks did,) becauſe *Primary* and *Archical* in Nature. For this reaſon the Ancients called *the firſt or primary Subſtances the Gods*, (s) as *Ariſtotle* affirmeth: And the ſame Notion of the Name uſually occurreth in *Platoniſm*. (t) *All that ever dealt with Theology call ſuch as are the firſt or primary according to nature Gods, and ſay, that the Theological Science is converſant about theſe. Some* (ſaith *Proclus*) *appropriate Eſſence or Being to Bodily Subſtance, and ſuppoſe, that all kinds of Incorporeals are as to Eſſence or Being Secondary, that the Principles of Beings are Corporeous, and the Faculty in us which diſcerneth them. Others make all Bodies dependents upon Incorporeals, ſuppoſing, that the firſt and primary Subſiſtence is in Soul and Soul-faculties, and they proceed no further. Theſe, I ſuppoſe, call the moſt excellent Souls Gods, and Science aſcending thus far, and being the the knowledge of theſe, they call Theology. But they that ſuppoſe, that the multitude of Souls are produc'd by a ſenior Principle, and that Mind or Intellect is the prime leader of all; theſe ſay, that the chief end is the union of Soul with Mind, that the intellectual kind of Life excelleth all other; and they make Theology the ſame with the Doctrine of Intellectual Subſtance or Eſſence. Wherefore the Primary Principles of Beings* (the Primary and Archical Beings) *and the moſt ſelf-ſufficient all Men call Gods, and the Science of theſe Theology.* (u) Theology exhibiteth the Doctrine τῶν κυριωτάτων ϗ πρώτων οὐσιῶν, *of the moſt principal and primary Subſtances.* (w) *They that firſt impos'd the Name* (Gods) *called the Stars* Θεοί, (Gods) *from the ſwiftneſs of their motion, but afterwards raiſed it, to ſignifie the Incorporeal Intelligible Cauſes of things, and the one Principle and Cauſe of all.*

This account of Theology and of the Name Θεοί, *Gods* (a Name of various Notions in the Pagan Theology) is as a Key to the Platonic Theology, not ſo much to open the Senſe of it as to open the Origin of it. For *Plato* in his mode of Phyſiologizing (x) rejecteth with diſdain all Corporeals from being Primary and Archical; becauſe whatever is Corporeal, can neither produce, nor conſerve it ſelf, but its *Being*, *Agency* and *Patiency* is by Soul. He demonſtrateth, that Pſychical Eſſence (or Soul) is Senior to Bodies, which Pſychical Eſſence is dependent upon the *Intellectual*. Having found that Mind or Intellect is the Cauſe and Parent of Souls and Bodies, he proceedeth to another Principle *altogether exempt from Intellect, more incorporeal and ineffable, and tranſcendent to Eſſence*, whence he deriveth the ſubſiſtence of all Beings. For there muſt be ſuch a Principle tranſcendent to Eſſence and to Intellect, becauſe (y) *before multitude there muſt be one* (or henotety,) *whence multitude proceedeth, and which is the cauſe of Intellect.* The Platonic Reaſon having thus inveſtigated *the Principle of Principles in the Univerſe*, a Principle Senior to Mind ἐν ἀβάτοις ἀποκεκρυμμένην, *inacceſſibly bidden and recondite* (ſaith *Proclus*) *there are* τρεῖς ἀρχικαὶ ὑποστάσεις, *three Archical Hypoſtaſes* (Principles in the Univerſe) above Bodies in the Platonic Phyſiology. Such a mode of Theologizing is but a ſort of mundane Phyſiologizing, for which Reaſon their mundane Phyſiology is their Theology; as alſo becauſe the World in their Philoſophy is a World of Gods. (z) *The whole World is called* Jove (ſaith *Porphyry*,) *an Animal conſiſting of Animals and a God of Gods.* So the *Coſmogonia* or Generation of the World is in their Philoſophy a *Theogonia* or Generation of a World of Gods. Whence *Plato*'s *Timæus*, which all Men ſay, is a Book of *Nature*, and *Proclus* ſaith, (a) τὴν φυσιολογίαν ἔχει σκοπὸν, (the whole of it aimeth at Phyſiology,) is neceſſarily a Book of Pagan Theology. So *Pherecydes Syrus*, who was ſtiled ὁ θεολόγος, *the Theologer*, (b) is ſaid to be the firſt amongſt the Grecians, that wrote περὶ φύσεως ϗ θεῶν, *of Nature and of the Gods.*

SECT.

(i) Procl. plat. Theol. *l.* 1. *c.* 28. *p.* 69.

(k) Euſeb. *ſupr. c.* 1.

(l) Cic. *ſupr.*

(m) Laert. *in* Platon.

(n) *l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(o) *Ibid. c.* 6.

(p) Τόν τε περὶ φύσεως λόγον ἤκουσε, ϗ τίνες αἱ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχαί. *De Vit.* Pythag. *p.* 185.

(q) *Dr.* Cudw. *Intell. Syſt. p.* 195.

(r) Windet. *de vit. Funct. p.* p. 34. *ed.* 3.

(s) Eugub. *de Per. Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 1.

(t) Ἅπαντες οὖν, ὅσοι πώποτε θεολογίας εἰσὶν ἡμμένοι, τὰ πρῶτα κατὰ φύσιν θεοὺς ἐπονομάζοντες, περὶ ταῦτα τὴν θεολογικὴν ἐπιστήμην πραγματεύεσθαι φασί. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 1.

(u) Jambl. προτρεπτ. p. 12.

(w) *Simpl. in Epict.* p. 200.

(x) Procl. *ſupr. & l.* 3. *c.* 21. *p.* 158. Plotin. *En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 1. *En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 5.

(y) Δεῖται πρὸ πολλοῦ τὸ ἓν εἶναι, ἀφ' οὗ ϗ τὸ πολύ. Plotin. En. l. 3. c. 12.

(z) Ζεὺς οὖν ὁ πᾶς κόσμος, ζῶον ἐκ ζώων, καὶ θεὸς ἐκ θεῶν. Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. c. 1.

(a) *In* Tim. p. 1.

(b) Laert. *in* Pherecyd.

SECT. 2. *Of the Philoſophic Pagans Theology as Metaphyſical.*

I. IN the Schools of Chriſtendom there is a Two-fold Metaphyſical Theology: For the Science of *Metaphyſicks* is intituled a (Theologia Naturalis) *ſort of Theology which Natural Light furniſheth*; and beſides this *the Scholaſtic Theology* (commonly ſo called) is a Metaphyſical kind of Theology. Such is the *Muhammedans* Learning called *the Science Al Calam*, which literally ſignifieth *the Science of Speech*; but the Name is us'd to ſignifie, and is render'd by Lexicographers and other learned Men (c) *Metaphyſica*, *Theologia Philoſophica*, *Theologia Scholaſtica*, *Metaphyſic*, *Philoſophic and Scholaſtic Theology*. The Name *Al Calam* is moſt agreeable to *Logick*, but is us'd to ſignifie the Learning of *Metaphyſicks* (or rather a ſort of Learning that is a medley of Logic and Metaphyſic,) as the Metaphyſicks in *Plato* are called *Dialectica*. The Hebrews call this ſort of Learning חכמת דברים *The learning of Words*, and the diſputacious Pretenders to it are known by the Name of *Loquentes*; becauſe as ſome ſay, they are idlely talkative: (*d*) according to others, becauſe they diſpute *Dialectically*, *Metaphyſically* and *Scholaſtically*. And becauſe theſe Scholaſtic Metaphyſicks are a Theology, the word Θεόλογοι in a Latin Verſion of *Ariſtotle*'s Metaphyſicks with *Averroes*'s Commentary is render'd *Loquentes*. But with this brangling kind of Metaphyſical Theology the old Metaphyſical Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans hath ſmall Affinity; for (agreeably to the Science of Metaphyſicks) it is *the Speculation of their ſublime Incorporeals*. And becauſe the Stoicks know no ſuch Speculation of ſublime Incorporeals, their Theology is a low and flat mundane Phyſiology, that deſerveth not the Name of Metaphyſicks, nor have they the Name of *the Metaphyſical Theologers*: But the Name is appropriate to thoſe other Philoſophers, that in their Phyſiology of the mundane Syſtem aſcended to the Speculation of their *high Archical Intelligibles* and *Immaterials*; and to theſe *Abul-pharagius* alſo appropriateth the Name of *Theologi*, which denoteth a Divine ſort of Philoſophers. (*e*) He deſtributeth the Philoſophers into three Sorts: *The Secular*, *the Natural* and the *Theologers*. The *Secular* deny'd any Creator of the World, and affirm'd, that the World always was, as now it is. The *Natural* (or Naturaliſts) conſider'd the Actions and Paſſions that are in Nature, the Properties of Plants, Animals, and acknowledg'd the Power and Wiſdom of God, but they deny'd the Immortality of the Soul. *The Theologers are the later Greek Philoſophers, ſuch as* Socrates Plato's *Maſter, and* Plato Ariſtotle's *Maſter, but* Ariſtotle *is the Man* ſaith he,) *that reduc'd theſe Sciences into Order and Method. Ariſtotle*'s Theology is a Branch of his *Phyſiology of the mundane Syſtem*; for his Gods (called by him ἀρχαὶ, *Principles* in the Univerſe) are the *Intelligences* of the ſeveral Celeſtial Spheres, and his ſupreme Deity is τὸ πρῶτον κινοῦν ἀκίνητον, *the firſt immovable Mover*, or the mover of the *primum Mobile*. His Metaphyſicks or prime Philoſophy is ſtiled by him θεολογικὴ ἐπιστήμη, *the Theological Science*, and is thus diſtinguiſh'd from Phyſiology in a narrow Acceptation. (*f*) There are three Speculative Sciences (according to this Philoſopher;) *Phyſice* or Phyſiology, *the Mathematicks* and *Theology* or the *Metaphyſicks*. And as the Speculative Sciences in general are more Noble and Excellent than the other, ſo is Theology or Metaphyſicks the moſt honourable of all the Speculatives. This third and laſt is converſant περὶ χωριστὰ ϗ ἀκίνητα, *about the things both immovable* (which are always the ſame immovably) *and ſeparate from matter. If there were no other ſubſtance* (ſaith he) *beſides theſe Natural things, which are material and movable, then would Phyſiology be the firſt Science: But if there be any immovable Subſtance, the Philoſophy thereof muſt needs in order of Nature be before the other.* This prime Philoſophy of his ſublime Incorporeals is uſually called by *Ariſtotle Sapience* as well as *Theology*. And ſo the *Pythagoreans* place their Wiſdom in their Metaphyſical Sapience; for according to *Pythagoras* Wiſdom is (*g*) *The Science of Beings that are properly ſuch* (ὄντως ὄντα, Beings indeed) *not equivocally ſo called.* Thoſe of an higher ſort of Nature, the Incorporeal and Metaphyſical (*h*) *the immaterial and ſempiternal and ſole active, that is, the incorporeous, Pythagoras* called ὄντα Beings; other things are equivocally ſo called, and by Participation of theſe, (*i*) *the Corporeous and Material, which are the things of Generation and Corruption, and therefore ſuch as are not* (ſubſiſtent) *Beings. Philoſophy* (the prime Philoſophy) is τῶν καλλίστων θεωρία, *the Contemplation of the things moſt excellent*; It is converſant (*k*) *about the primary excellent things, the Divine, Immortal, and always the ſame.* In theſe tranſcendent Speculations the celebrated Philoſophy of the School of *Plato* mainly conſiſteth; the Wiſdom of thoſe ſublime Philoſophers * was their Metaphyſical Sapience, and this their Metaphyſical Sapience is the ancient *Scholaſtic-Theology*.

II. The Platonic Metaphyſical Theology confronteth and oppoſeth (τὸ ἀεὶ ὄν) *the Nature which always is to generate corruptible Nature. It is the proper Genius of Philoſophers* (ſaith *Plato* in his *Sixth de Rep.*) they always love that Diſcipline, which layeth open the Knowledge (*l*) *of Nature or Eſſence which ſempiternally is, and is not chang'd by Generation and Corruption.* This Diſcipline is *Plato*'s *Dialectica*, which he ſaith (in his Seventh *de Rep.*) is the ſupreme of all other, and the end of other Diſciplines; and he thinketh it requiſite, that Youth ſhould not be admitted to it till *Thirty* Years of Age, at which time they are to be try'd, if they can aſcend ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸ ὂν μετ' ἀληθείας, *to that which indeed is* (or Being it ſelf) *with Truth.* For this Platonic *Ontology* is an aſcent of the Mind, ἀπὸ τοῦ γιγνομένου ἐπὶ τὸ ὄν, *from what is generated to that which is.* Whence *Celſus* in *Origen* repreſenteth and highly recommendeth this Summary of the Platonic Theology, wherein are confronted and oppoſed (*m*) *Eſſence and Generation, intelligible and ſenſible. Truth is with Eſſence, Falſity with Generation. Of Truth there is Science, of the other but Opinion.* Let any Man read this Diſcourſe more at large in *Origen*, and then let him try, if he can believe *Origen*, that his Adverſary was an Epicurean; for he may be ſatisfied from this one Diſcourſe, that no Man admir'd *Plato* more than *Celſus*, or more rightly repreſented his Senſe; which was the ſame with that of *Parmenides*; who ſaid, that there are two Doctrines: The one of *Theological* and *Metaphyſical* things, called by him ἀλήθεια, *Truth*; the other of *Phyſical* and *Corporeal* things called by him δόξα, *Opinion.* So *Plato* in the beginning of his *Timæus*, to prove the Origin of (the ſenſible) World, diſtinguiſheth in this manner. (n) *We ought in the firſt place according to my Opinion, to make a diſtinction betwixt that which always is, and hath no Generation; and that which is generated, but never truly is. The former of which is comprehenſible by Intellection with Reaſon, being always the ſame and like it ſelf. The latter of them that which is generated and periſheth, but never truly is, is the object of Opinion only* (opinable only) *together with irrational Senſe. Now every thing that is generated, is neceſſarily generated by ſome Cauſe.* In this Diſcourſe *Plato* is ſuppos'd by a learned Author (o) *very carefully to diſtinguiſh betwixt God and the Creature, determining the bounds between them.* But this is not imaginable, ſeeing the ſenſible World is with *Plato a generated God.* Seeing the inviſible Subordinate Gods according to *Plato* are cauſed to exiſt but without *Geneſis*; ſeeing according to *Plato*'s way of arguing incorporeal Souls are not generated, nor are Creatures, but muſt exiſt from Eternity. The Pagan Theologers never confront and oppoſe God and the Creature (as ſuch,) nor doth *Plato* in this Diſcourſe: But the Antitheſis which he maketh, is between τὸ ἀεὶ ὄν (that which ſempiternally is) and *generate-corruptible Nature*; betweeen τοῦ ὄντος χώρα, *the Region of that which truly is*, (p) and τῆς γενέσεως χώρα, *the Region of Generation* which ſtandeth againſt it. Thus he repreſenteth his own Senſe. (q) *We have made the diviſion before into two kinds: One is the Paradigm or Exemplar, which is intelligible only and always the ſame; the other is the imitamen and reſemblance thereof, Generate and Viſible.* Afterwards diſcourſing of the Forms or Species of Fire, Water, Earth and Air, and of the difference between *Knowledge* and *Opinion*, he inferreth. *It muſt be acknowledg'd, that there is Species always the ſame, not ſubject to Generation or Corruption, neither receiving any thing into it ſelf from elſewhere, nor removing it ſelf to any thing elſe, inviſible and imperceptible by any bodily Senſe, and intelligible only. There is a ſecond thing of the ſame Name with the Species but equivocally ſo called, the Similitude of it, Senſible, Generate, always carried about, riſing and periſhing, comprehenſible by Opinion with Senſe.*

(c) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 195, 198. *Lex. Heptaglott. col.* 1735.

(d) *Coſri p.* 360. *ed. Buxtorf.*

(e) *Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 60.

(f) *Metaph. l.* 6. *c.* 1.

(g) Jambl. *de vit. Pythag. c.* 29. *Porphyr. de vit. Pythag. p.* 202.

(h) Τὰ ἄυλα ϗ ἀΐδια ϗ μονοδραστικά, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὰ ἀσώματα.

(i) Σωματικὰ ἤδη καὶ ὑλικά. γεννητά τε καὶ φθαρτά, ϗ ὄντως οὐδέποτε ὄντα.

(k) Περὶ τὰ καλά, πρῶτα ϗ θεῖα, ϗ ἀκήρατα καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ϗ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα. Jambl. ſupr. c. 12.

* *Alii Metaphyſicam, Platonici auguſtiore nomine Theologiam dixere.* L. Holſtein. de Vit. & Script. Porphyr. c. 9.

(l) Τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἀεὶ οὔσης καὶ μὴ πλανωμένης ὑπὸ γενέσεως ϗ φθορᾶς.

(m) Οὐσία ϗ γένεσις, νοητὸν, ὁρατόν· μετ' οὐσίας μὲν ἀλήθεια, μετὰ δὲ γενέσεως πλάνη. Περὶ ἀλήθειαν μὲν οὖν ἐπιστήμη, περὶ δὲ θάτερον δόξα. Or. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 362, 363.

The Platonic Metaphyſical Theology therefore confronteth and oppoſeth the *intelligible* and *ſenſible* World, the *intelligible* (Platonic) *Ideas* with our *Corporeals* and *Senſibles* (r) which cannot be the Objects of Science, becauſe being *ſingulars* and *unſtable* they are incapable of firmitude and ſtability of Science, nor can there be any definitions of them, nor are they the true things but their Images. For the true things are *the intelligible Ideal Natures of things*, which are Univerſal, Eternal and Immutable, (s) *incorporeal and intelligible, permanent and always the ſame, and the things themſelves moſt primarily ſo, the cauſes alſo that others are ſuch as they are according to their likeneſs to thoſe Ideas. Ariſtotle* explodeth as Nugacities theſe ſublime Incorporeals; *But the height and upſhot of* Plato's *Philoſophemes (as Atticus* ſaith) *is touching this intelligible and eternal Eſſence of the Ideas. He that reacheth hither is ſurely Happy: But he that falleth ſhort and can be no Contemplator here, is left altogether deſtitute of Felicity.* The popular ſort of Mankind therefore, becauſe they can be no Centemplators of theſe Sublimities, muſt be deſtitute of Happineſs; and for the ſame Reaſon they muſt be deſtitute of *Knowledge*, as *Plato* repreſenteth them in his Fifth *de Rep.* to this Senſe. “They have great curioſity about *ſenſible* things, to gain a ſort of Knowledge of them, being φιλοθεάμονες καὶ φιλήκοοι, *greedy of beholding and hearing fair and delectable ſights and ſounds, and they are very much delighted with them*, becauſe of their Pulchritude; but to the Nature of Pulchritude it ſelf their cogitation cannot reach: Whereas true Philoſophers are τῆς ἀληθείας φιλοθεάμονες, *ſtudious of beholding what is Truth.* The Philoſopher only is awake, the popular ſort that are delighted with the Pulchritude of fair ſights and ſounds, but think not of Pulchritude it ſelf, nor is it poſſible to conduct them to the knowledge of it, live in a Dream. For he dreameth, that taketh the Similitude of a thing, not for the Similitude, but the thing it ſelf. The Philoſophers contemplate αὐτὰ ἕκαστα, *every it ſelf* (ipſa quæque;) they behold αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν, *fair it ſelf*, and diſtinguiſh it from the things that participate of it, not thinking that it is they, or they are it. The popular ſort behold πολλὰ καλὰ, πολλὰ δίκαια, *many fair and many juſt things*, but αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν, αὐτὸ τὸ δίκαιον, *fair it ſelf, juſt it ſelf*, they ſee not, nor are they capable of being guided to the knowledge of it. Now theſe many *Fairs* many *Juſts* are in part ſuch, in part not ſuch, and therefore are in the middle between *Ens* and *non Ens.* Wherefore they are the object not of Knowledge, but of Opinion, which is in the middle between Ignorance and Knowledge; and conſequently the popular ſort are not Men of Knowledge but of Opinion. In this Diſcourſe of *Plato* we may contemplate the Origin of his Metaphyſical Deities; for his Metaphyſic is buſied about his *Intelligibles* (ſupra-ſenſibiles) and *Incorporeals*, that are agreeably to the great Buſineſs of his Dialogues (which is the purſuit of Abſtract Ideas) *certain Abſtract Platonic Metaphyſical Ideas or Species*; wherefore his Metaphyſical Deities (the ſublime Intelligibles and Incorporeals of his Theology) are certain *Abſtract Platonic Metaphyſical Ideas.* Such is his firſt and higheſt Deity (which the Platoniſts ſay, is above all Species and Ideas) *ipſum unum, one it ſelf*, or τὸ μόνως ἕν, *that is only one, nothing more than one*, (which is an Idea of greateſt ſimplicity poſſible) *ipſum bonum, good it ſelf*, or ἰδέα τ' ἀγαθοῦ, *the Idea of*

(n) Ἔστιν οὖν δὴ κατ' ἐμὴν δόξαν πρῶτον διαιρετέον τάδε· τί τὸ ὂν μὲν ἀεὶ, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον· καὶ τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν, ὂν δὲ οὐδέποτε. τὸ μὲν δὴ νοήσει μετὰ λόγου περιληπτὸν, ἀεὶ κατὰ ταὐτὰ ὄν. τὸ δ' αὖ δόξῃ μετ' αἰσθήσεως ἀλόγου δοξαστὸν, γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀπολλύμενον, ὄντως δὲ οὐδέποτε ὄν. Πᾶν δὲ αὖ τὸ γιγνόμενον ὑπ' αἰτίου τινὸς ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίγνεσθαι.

(o) Dr. Cudw. Intell. Syſt. p. 570.

(p) *Procl. in Tim. p. 69. The Separation of the Soul from the Body is* ἐκ γενέσεως φεύγειν εἰς οὐσίαν, *to flee from Generation to Eſſence.* Plotin. En. 2. l. 9. c. 6.

(q) Δύο εἴδη διειλόμεθα· ἓν μὲν ὡς παραδείγματος εἶδος ὑποτεθὲν νοητὸν, καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ ταὐτὰ ὄν· μίμημα δὲ παραδείγματος δεύτερον, γένεσιν ἔχον καὶ ὁρατόν.

(r) Jambl. de vit. Pythag. c. 29.

(s) Ἀσώματα καὶ νοητὰ, κατὰ ταὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα ἀεὶ, καὶ μάλιστα μὲν πρώτως αὐτὰ ὄντα, παραίτια δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦ εἶναι τοιαῦτα ἕκαστα οἷάπερ ἐστι, κατὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὰ ὁμοιότητα. Attic. ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 15. c. 13.

good. His ſecond Deity is (t) *the firſt Fair and Pulchritude it ſelf, in which are contained the things that are indeed and all the Eſſences of all Beings.* This Deity is κοσμὸς νοητὸς, *the intelligible World,* (or World of Intelligibles,) κόσμος ἰδανικὸς, (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) *the Ideal mundane Syſtem.*

Theſe two Worlds confronted in Platoniſm are alſo *two Animals, the comprehenſions of Animals, and two Gods the comprehenſions of Gods.* For the ſenſible World is a θεὸς γεννητὸς, *generated God* (as *Plato* calleth it ;) and it is (u) θεὸς ἐκ θεῶν, *a God that is a Comprehenſion of Gods.* The *intelligible World is* ſometimes of a larger and ſometimes of a narrower acceptation in Platoniſm. In the narrower acceptation as it ſignifieth *the Paradigm,* the Archetypal world, *it is a God the intelligible God,* (according to that of *Plato* in the concluſion of his *Timæus,* εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ θεοῦ αἰσθητὸς, *and this ſenſible World is the Image of the intelligible God* ;) and this intelligible God is *a comprehenſion of Gods,* according to that of *Plotinus* ; (w) *remove all bulk, place and all imagination of Matter, then pray the God to come, and he will come bringing his World with him,* μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ θεῶν, *with all the Gods that are in him.* This Deity alſo (as the ſenſible World is (x) Ζῶον ἐκ Ζώων, *an Animal, a comprehenſion of Animals*) is call'd by *Plato* in the beginning of his *Timæus,* Ζῶον ἀΐδιον, *a ſempiternal Animal,* and is ſaid to contain in it τὰ νοητὰ ζῶα πάντα, *all the intelligible Animals, as this ſenſible World doth us and other ſenſible Animals.* The ſenſible mundane Animal is an Image of the eternal mundane Animal, and the moveable time which belongeth to the one, is according to *Plato* an Image of the ſtanding Eternity of the other. And becauſe he attributeth to it a ſtanding Eternity, and calleth it τὸ ὂν μὲν ἀεὶ, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον, *That which always is and hath no Generation,* hence (y) *J. Mart. Euſebius,* and many other Theologers of the Church will have this Branch of Platoniſm deriv'd from and coincident with that Branch of holy Scriptural Theiſm, Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὢν, *I am he that is.* The vanity of which Paralleliſm will be ſufficiently confuted by obſerving only, that the ſublime Attribute ὁ ὢν, *he that is,* (as it is underſtood by theſe Theologers of the Church) belongeth to every one of the intelligible Ideas ; every one of theſe intelligible Animals (ſuch as *ipſe Homo, ipſe Equus, the Ideal Man or Horſe*) may ſpeak in the Language and Stile of a Deity, Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὢν, *I am he that is.*

III. But in this Branch of Platonic Ontology there is ſomething of ſolid truth, that is uſeful to the purpoſe of holy Living ; for it importeth an elegant diſparagement of Generate-corruptible Nature, as *Plutarch* diſcourſeth. (z) “We do not participate any thing of Being truly and indeed ſo. All Mortal Nature, it is between Generation and Corruption, φάσμα παρέχων καὶ δόκησιν ἀμυδρὰν ϗ ἀβέβαιον αὐτῆς, it exhibiteth only a ſlender appearance and matter of unſtable Opinion. If a Man fixeth his Mind upon it, thinking to take hold of it, it fareth with him as in graſping an handful of Water ; while he graſpeth it and compreſſeth it, it glideth away and is gone. Our Reaſon purſuing an evident clearneſs in contemplating any of theſe Paſſibles and Changeables, unſteddily wandereth to here it's riſing, there it's periſhing, not being able to take hold of any thing Permanent, nor that truly is. For no Man can go twice into the ſame River, according to *Heraclitus,* nor twice touch any mortal Subſtance in Conſiſtence ; but with a quickneſs and celerity of Change it diſſipateth and congregateth again : Or rather, not again, nor afterwards, but at the ſame time and at once it is conſtituted and periſheth, and hath an acceſs and receſs. Hence the Origin of it doth not terminate in Being ; for its Geneſis doth not ceaſe, nor ſtand at a ſtay, but is always changing, from the Seed to make an Embryo, then an Infant, then a Boy, next a Youth, then a young Man, then a Man, an elderly Man, an old Man, deſtroying the former Geneſes and Ages by the ſucceeding. But we ridiculouſly are afraid of one death, having dy'd ſo many, and yet dying. For not only, as *Heraclitus* ſaid, the death of Fire is the generation of Air, and the death of Air the generation of Water, but this may be more clearly exemplify'd in Men. For when the old Man is generated, the Man is dead ; the young Man died into the Man, the Boy into the young Man, the Infant into the Boy, Yeſterday's Man died into this Day's, and this Days Man dieth into to Morrow's. No one is permanent, nor is one, but the Matter whirling and being circum-agitated about one Phantaſm, one common expreſs Species or Similitude (that appearance which every Man is) and ſliding away, we become various and many. For how do we continue the ſame, ſeeing other things pleaſe us now than formerly, we love and hate, admire and diſparage Contrarieties, we uſe other Speeches, have other Paſſions, not retaining the ſame Aſpect, the ſame Form, nor the ſame Mind. For none can ſuffer Alterities without a Change, nor changing can he be the ſame. And if the ſame is not, neither is he ; but he is changing himſelf, and becoming ſtill another after another. It is the Fallacy of Senſe through Ignorance of what truly is, to ſuppoſe that which appeareth to be. Τί οὖν ὄντως ὂν ἐστι ; *What* then is that which truly is ? (a) *That which is Sempiternal, not Generate, not Corruptible, wherein time maketh no Change.*

But theſe ſublime Attributes being incompetible *to Soul,* it can neither be ſo high as *that which truly is,* nor yet is it ſo low as *Generate-corruptible Nature.* The Platoniſts therefore (*b*) count it of an intermediate Nature between both, ἀγέννητον ἄρα ϗ γέννητον, αἰώνιόν τε ϗ οὐκ αἰώνιον, *not Generate and Generate, Sempiternal and not Sempiternal.* So Geneſis is ſaid to be (*c*) incompetible to the Gods, although their Exiſtence be ἀπ' αἰτίας, *from a cauſe.* Uſually they call the matter (*d*) τὸ μὴ ὂν, which ſignifieth *Non-entity* ; οὔτε γιγνόμενον, *nor is it that which is generated or made,* ſaith *Proclus* ; yet this Platoniſt denieth the Self-exiſtence or improduction of the matter. Platonic Language muſt be underſtood with Caution ; and it is as eaſie, to make Lexicons (which *Joſ. Scaliger* ſaith, is the worſt of Labours) as to interpret the meaning of it.

SECT. 3. *Of the Philoſophic Pagan Theology as it is Myſtic-Metaphyſical.*

I. THE Platoniſts Metaphyſical Theology is not meer *Cyclical Metaphyſicks,* much of

(t) Τὸ πρώτως καλὸν ϗ αὐτόκαλον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ ὄντως ὄντα ϗ ἡ πᾶσα οὐσία τῶν ὄντων. Porphyr. ap. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 1. p. 32.

(u) Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ.* c. 1.

(w) *En.* 5. *l.* 8. *c.* 9.

(x) Stob. *ubi ſupr.*

(y) J. Mart. *Paræn. p.* 19, 20. Euſeb. *pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 9. *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 11. *Eugub. de per. phil. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *Huet. Dem. Ev. p.* 4. *c.* 2. *S.* 13. Theodoret. Θεραπ. *Ser.* 2.

(z) *De Ei ap. Delph. v. Viv. in Aug. de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 11. Διώκομεν τὸ φεῦγον ἀεὶ κινούμενον. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 339.

(a) Τὸ ἀΐδιον, ϗ ἀγέννητον, ϗ ἄφθαρτον ᾧ χρόνος οὐδεὶς μεταβολὴν ἐπάγει.

(b) *Liv. Galant. compar. l.* 12. *p.* 320. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 69, 72.

(c) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 28.

(d) *Ficin. Arg. in Tim. c.* 7. *& Arg. in* 5. *de Rep.*

of it is *Myſtic-Metaphyſical*; for (e) *according to the Diſcipline of the Pythagoreans it is their way, to be Sublime, Intellectual, Entheal, annexing all things to the Intelligibles as dependent upon them, to be Myſtical, Symbolical, Reductive* (or Subvective) *in all things they treat of.* At this rate they Phyſiologize, treating of the matters of Natural Philoſophy in their Theological mode, which is agreeable to the Genius of their Maſter, of whom they ſay, (f) *Plato teacheth us*, τὰ μυστικὰ περὶ τῶν θείων νοήματα, *Myſtical Notions touching Divine things.* In teaching theſe Myſtical Notions he doth not always obſerve the ſame Method of Diſcipline; for ſometimes he teacheth ἐνθεαστικῶς, *Entheaſtically* or *Enthuſiaſtically*, like a Myſtic-Metaphyſical Devotioniſt; as in his *Phædrus*; (g) *being in a tranſport from Divine Afflation, in ſuch a madneſs which is better than Human Intelligence*, he is ſaid to teach *Arcane Doctrines* touching ſeveral ſorts of Gods. Sometimes *Plato* teacheth διαλεκτικῶς ἢ ἐπιστημονικῶς, *dialectically or in the way of Science* (like a Myſtic-Metaphyſical Scholaſtick; as in his *Sophiſta* he treateth dialectically, (h) *touching Ens or Being, and the ſeparate Nature of the Monad from the comprehenſion of Beings.* Beſides theſe Modes of Theologizing (the Entheaſtical and Dialectical) *Plato* uſeth a veiled and Cryptic way of teaching (i) *Symbolically and Mythically or by Images.* As *Orpheus* repreſented his Myſteries and Arcane pieces of Wiſdom by Tales and Fables; and the *Pythagoreans* attributed ſeveral Numbers and Geometrical Figures to ſeveral Gods, which they made ſacred to them. Some diſtinguiſh the *Orphic* from the *Pythagoric* mode of teaching; others ſay, (k) the *Pythagoric* Mode is the ſame with the *Orphic*, and was deriv'd from it; for *Orpheus taught the eternal Nature of Number is the primary Principle of the whole Heaven and Earth and the intermediate Nature; and alſo the root of the things Divine and of the Gods and Demons.*

II. From the firſt of the *Platoniſts* θεολογίας τύποι, (Modes of Theologizing) we learn, that their ſublime Metaphyſicals are (in part at leaſt) ſo Myſtick and Arcane, *that they could not be known without Divine Revelation, Inſpiration, and Arcane Tradition; and that the Pagan Metaphyſical Myſticks pretend to Theologize by Inſpiration*; (l) as *Proclus* is ſaid to have written his Book of the Mother of the Gods by Divine Inſpiration, themſelves call their Philoſophy ἔνθεος φιλοσοφία, *Entheal or Inſpiration-Philoſophy*: And becauſe *Ariſtotle*'s Philoſophy is *Technical*, not *Entheal*, *Iſidore* the *Platoniſt* deſpis'd and rejected it; for he affirm'd, that a good Ingeny, Sagacity of Mind and Quickneſs of Phancy are not the principal cauſe of Knowledge, (m) *but that there is a Divine Correption and Occupation, which ſedately openeth and purgeth the Eyes of the Soul, irradiating her with intellectual Light for the beholding and diſcerning of Truth and Falſhood*; without which all other Endowments are of no avail; which is agreeable to the *Pythagoric* Rule, (n) *ſpeak not of the* Pythagoric *Divine things without Light*; and to what *Jamblichus* reporteth of *Pythagoras*, (o) *that after a divine manner be heal'd and purg'd the Soul, and exſuſcitated that which is Divine in her, and carry'd*, ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν τὸ θεῖον ὄμμα, *to that which is intelligible the Divine Eye*, which according to *Plato*, is of more importance to be preſerv'd than Millions of Fleſhly Eyes. There was great reaſon for this Sollicitude about the Divine Eye (which I ſuppoſe, (p) is that *third Eye*, which *Plato* ſeem'd to himſelf to have) becauſe by this only ἡ περὶ τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἀλήθεια, *the truth touching the univerſality of Beings is diſcern'd.* But beſides this ſedate kind of Inſpiration (intellectual Irradiation) which the *Platoniſts* pretend to, they Theologize alſo from a *Bacchical* ſort of Enthuſiaſm, *Extaſie* (Alienation of Mind) *Rapture*, *Divine Fury*, which is the ſame Principle, whence the Pagan Poets Theologiz'd (whom *Plato* in his *Io* accounteth Divine Enthuſiaſts and Interpreters of the Gods) as alſo the *Delphic Pythia*, the *Dodonean Prieſteſſes*, and *Sibylla*, as *Plato* diſcourſeth in his *Phædrus*. *Proclus* uſually ſaith of himſelf and his Fellow-Platoniſts, *that they were acted by Enthuſiaſms*; and he calleth his Maſter (q) τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς Βάκχον, *the true* Bacchus *or Bacchical Enthuſiaſt, who being ſuperlatively Entheal in* Platoniſm, *made the light of that wonder and aſtoniſhment, the* Platonic *Theory, to ſhine even unto us.* And that we may not ſuppoſe *Platonic* Enthuſiaſm, to be nothing more than ſome Emotion of an impaſſionated Mind, we are told, that ſuch as Theologize Entheaſtically, are (r) ὑπ' αὐτῶν κινούμενοι θεῶν, *moved and acted by the Gods themſelves.* If the *Platoniſts* did not believe themſelves or their Maſters inſpir'd Men, it is much that they ſhould believe their own Theology touching ſuch *Platonic* Sublimities, that are manifeſtly beyond the reach of all Humane Cognizance; ſuch as (s) *the ſuper-celeſtial place, where there is the true Eſſence, the Field of Truth, and the Meadow, the Kingdom of* Adraſtia, *and the Divine Chorus of the Virtues, and where Souls are fed with the Divine Ideas.* Their Syſtem of Theology ſtandeth upon the Credit of certain Pagan Enthuſiaſts of the elder times, from whom (as themſelves ſay) they receiv'd it by way of Myſtery and Arcane Tradition. (t) *For all the Greek Theology is the Progeny of the Orphic Myſtagogy* (Arcane Diſcipline.) Pythagoras *being firſt taught by* Aglaophemus *the Orgia or Myſteries touching the Gods*, Plato *was the next, that receiv'd the perfect knowledge of theſe things both from the Pythagoric and Orphic Writings.* The Philoſophy of *Pythagoras* is ſaid to be (u) *originally a Tradition from the Gods*; and the Chalday Oracles (that are accounted by the Platoniſts genuine Divine Oracles) are called by *Proclus* (w) θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία, *the Myſtagogy or Arcane Diſcipline deliver'd by the Gods.* From theſe Oracles a Party of Theologers in the Church of *Rome* have deriv'd much of their *Myſtical Divinity*, that is hugely agreeable to the Genius of the Platoniſts, who were a Sect of Myſtic-Metaphyſical Devoto's and Inſpirado's.

III. From the ſecond Mode of Platonic Theologizing we learn, that there is a certain Paralleliſm between thoſe two Dialogues of *Plato* his *Sophiſta* and his *Parmenides.* For he muſt be ſuppos'd, to teach, not *Entheaſtically* or *Symbolically* in his *Parmenides*, but *Dialectically*, as he teacheth in his *Sophiſta.* Both theſe Dialogues muſt be ſuppos'd, to be Books of Platonic Scholaſticiſm; and as his *Sophiſta* is a Metaphy-

(c) *Ex Pythagoreorum inſtituto* Τὸ ὑψηλόνουν, τὸ νοερὸν, τὸ ἔνθεον, τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν πάντα ἐξάπτειν, τὸ μυστικῶς τὰ πράγματα καὶ συμβολικῶς ἐνδεικνύμενον, τὸ ἀνάγωγον, *ubique adhibent.* L. Holſten. de Vit. & Scr. Porphyr. c. 9.

(f) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(g) Νυμφόληπτος γενόμενος, καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης νοήσεως τὴν κρείττονα μανίαν ἀλλαξάμενος.

(h) Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος, καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ὄντων χωριστῆς ὑποστάσεως.

(i) Συμβολικῶς καὶ μυθικῶς ἢ δι' εἰκόνων.

(k) Jambl. *de vit. Pythag. c.*28. *p.* 135.

(l) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 54.

(m) *Phot. cod.* 242. *col.* 1034.

(n) Περὶ πυθαγορείων ἄνευ φωτὸς μὴ λάλει.

(o) *De Vit. Pythag. c.*16. *p.* 76.

(p) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 28.

V. Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 92.

(q) *Theol. Plat. l.* 4. *p.* 215.

(r) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(s) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 4.

(t) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 5. & *in Tim. p.* 289.

(u) Jambl. *de vit. Pythag. c.* 1.

(w) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 203.

Metaphyſical Altercation *de Ente*, ſo his *Parmenides* is a Metaphyſical Debate *de Uno*. As in his *Sophiſta* he treateth, (x) *touching Ens or Eſſence and the ſeparate nature of the Monad* (or Henotety) *from the Comprehenſion of Entia*: So in his *Parmenides* he demonſtrateth, (y) *The Proceſſes of Eſſence from the Monad, and the Eminence or Tranſcendence of the Henotety*. Agreeably to the Nature of the *Platonic* Scholaſticiſm this *Platonic* Dialogue is Myſtic beyond all parallel; both becauſe the Philoſopher (as *Atticus* in *Euſebius* ſaith of *Ariſtotle* comparing him to the Cuttle-fiſh) hideth himſelf in his own Ink: And becauſe the Subject-matter of it tranſcendeth the Faculty of Underſtanding and the Region of Intelligibility. The Subject-matter of this Enigmatical Dialogue is (together with the *Platonic* Idea's) *Ipſum Unum*, *One it ſelf*, which (as *Ipſum magnum*, *Magnitude it ſelf*,) is an Idea. Touching this *Unum one* (which is in no reſpect *multa* or more than one) the *Parmenides* pretendeth to demonſtrate ſuch a ſort of Attributes, as *Plutarch* imputeth to the Stoicks Univerſe; (z) that it is *Non Ens*, *can neither do nor ſuffer any thing, nor be in a place; neither remain in a poſture, nor be in motion, neither be light nor heavy, animate or inanimate*. For ſuppoſing *Ipſum Unum* to be, the *Parmenides* pretendeth to demonſtrate, *it is neither whole nor part, can neither ſtand nor move; is neither the ſame with, nor different from it ſelf; is neither like nor unlike to it ſelf nor any other; is no where, nor in any Time: And becauſe it is above Eſſence*, (a) *it is of no Name, nor is it the Object of Speech, or Science, or Senſe, or Opinion. There is no Congruity, no Proportion between the firſt Principle and Underſtanding; it tranſcendeth the kind of things intelligible*, as *Ficinus* ſaith, (b) *principium rerum non habens cum intellectu proportionem, ſupereminet Genus intelligibile*. Without the Vice and Crime of ſpeaking evil of things we underſtand not, one may ſafely pronounce, that *Plato*'s Myſtical *Parmenides* can be nothing better than a ſublime *Platonic* Crotchet, a Metaphyſical Griphus, or as *Plato* himſelf calleth the Diſpute there πραγματειώδης παιδιά, *a troubleſome Sport*.

IV. From the *third Mode* of *Platonic* Theologizing we learn, that the *Pythagoric* Theology is (c) κατ' ἀριθμὸν θεολογία, *a Number-kind of Theology*. The *Pythagoreans* made uſe of Numbers for *Devotion*, *Divination* and *Contemplation*. Their ſtudy was about Numbers and Lines, and of theſe for the moſt part (d) *they made Oblations to the Gods; calling one Number* Minerva, *another* Diana, *and another* Apollo; *as alſo one Number they called* Juſtice, *and another* Temperance; *ſo Geometrical Figures alſo. And by theſe Firſt-Fruits and Oblations they ſo pleas'd the Gods, that calling any of them by their Name, they had them and the benefit of uſing them for Divination and the finding of things.* (e) *Abaris* buſied himſelf about Sacrifices, thoſe of Cocks eſpecially, to make Preſages. *Pythagoras* would not take him off from his ſearch after what is true, but he counted a Cock ſacred to the Sun, and taught him a ſafer way of finding what is true than by Blood; for he did the Buſineſs by Arithmetical Learning. *He made by Numbers* καὶ θαυμασίαν πρόγνωσιν καὶ θεραπείαν τῶν θεῶν, *both a wonderful preſagiency and ſervice of the Gods.*

The other uſe of Numbers amongſt the *Pythagoreans* hath reſpect to *Contemplation*; for by the ſtudy of Numbers (and of the Mathematicks in general) their Minds were prepared for the Contemplation of (f) τὰ ὄντως ὄντα, *the things that truly are, the Incorporeal Forms and Primary Archical Cauſes*. And they made ſeveral Numbers *the Symbols of thoſe things, which were thought to be of like nature with thoſe Numbers*; ſuppoſing, that all things were like to certain Numbers according to that great Principle of theirs, —ἀριθμῷ δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν. This Number-kind of Philoſophy or Theology produc'd that celebrated Myſtic-Metaphyſical Maxim of *Parmenides*, *Xenophanes*, *Meliſſus*, and other Ancients, of which *Ariſtotle* ſaith, (g) *This ſeemeth to be an ancient Opinion, That an Unit is the Principle.* So the *Pythagoreans* ſay, *that a Monad is the Principle of all things* (which Monad or Unit theſe Pagan Sages count τὸν ὑπεράνω θεόν, *the higheſt God*;) and the *Platoniſts* are known to hold, that (h) *a Monad is the Root of all.* As their Number-kind of Theologizing produc'd their firſt Principle, ſo the reſt of their Triad iſſu'd from the ſame Fountain; for their Triad is τὸ πρῶτον ἕν, *the firſt Unite*, ἓν πολλά, *one-many*, ἓν καὶ πολλά, *one and many*. Their Theological Theorems and Raciocinations are thoſe of the Number-kind of Theology; ſuch as that of the *Pythagoreans* (i) *Numbers*, (the intelligible Ideas) *are the cauſes of Eſſence to other things*. *Porphyry* proveth, (k) that Mind is not the Principle of All, πολλὰ γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νοῦς, *for Mind or Intellect is many, now one muſt neceſſarily be before many*; which is a Number-kind of Theologizing; ſo *Plotinus* argueth, that *Intellect* and *Underſtanding* is incompetible to the firſt Principle, (l) πολλὰ ἄρα καὶ οὐχ ἓν τὸ νοεῖν, *Underſtanding is Multitude, not One; therefore where there is no Multitude, there is no Intellection.* And as the *Pythagoric* Theology, ſo the Phyſiology alſo of that Sect of Philoſophers was of the *Number-kind*; as appeareth from *Plato*'s Compoſition of the Soul of the World (for it is compos'd of Numbers;) from *Pythagoras*'s firſt Principles of things, a *Monad* and a *Dyad*, or an *Unit* and a *Binary*; and from his celebrated *Tetractys or Quaternary*.

For that the famous *Tetractys* was (amongſt other things) a *Phyſiological* Symbol, the moſt of the Learned Pagans that treat of theſe matters do agree; (m) *Plutarch*, *Porphyry*, *Proclus*. *Themiſtius* alſo ſaith, (n) that *the* Pythagoreans *made Numbers the Principles of all Senſibles*; and *Sextus Empiricus* ſaith, *The* Pythagoreans *ſuppos'd, that Univerſal Nature was adminiſtred according to Numbers.* And *Philo diſcourſeth Pythagorically, that the Quaternary is the firſt Number, which ſheweth the nature of a Solid, the foregoing Numbers being dedicated to Incorporeals. And that Heaven was made in perfect Number, for ſuch is the Tetrad.* Agreeably to theſe Notices of the *Pythagoric* Phyſiology the Number *Four* was thought by the *Pythagoreans*, τῶν φυσικῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων πηγή, *the Fountain of natural Effects*, and was call'd, (o) *The World, Body, Harmony, the exciter of Divine Rapture*, (denoting the enraviſhingly harmonious Conſtitution of the Univerſe) *the Key-bearer of Nature*. And becauſe it is the Root-number in Nature and Phyſiology, and denoted the four Elementary Natures (Fire, Water, Earth and Air) the Golden Verſes call it, (p) *The Fountain, containing the Roots*

(x) Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ὄντων χωριστῆς ὑποστάσεως.

(y) Τάς τε τοῦ ὄντος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς προόδους καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς ὑπεροχήν. Procl. *Plat. Theol.* *l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(z) *Adv.* Stoic. *p.* 1073, 1074.

(a) Οὐδ' ὄνομά ἐστιν αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ λόγος, οὐδέ τις ἐπιστήμη, οὐδὲ αἴσθησις, οὐδὲ δόξα.

(b) *Com. in* Plotin. *p.* 525.

(c) Jambl. *de vit.* Pythag. *c.* 28. *p.* 134.

(d) Porph. *de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 36.

(e) Jambl. *ſupr. p.* 94. 95. 136.

(f) Porph. *de vit.* Pythag. *p.* 202, 203. Voſſ. *de Philoſ. Sect. c.* 6.

(g) Ἔοικε παλαιὰ εἶναι, αὕτη ἡ δόξα, ὅτι, τὸ ἓν ἀρχή. Eugubin. *de per. Phil. l.* 3. *c.* 5, 6.

(h) Ἡ μονὰς ῥίζα τῶν ἁπάντων.

(i) Procl. *Theol. Plat. l.* 4. *c.* 29.

(k) Sentent. *p.* 223.

(l) *En.* 5. *l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(m) Plut. *de* Iſid. *p.* 382. Porp. *de vit.* Pythag. *p.* 189. Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 155.

(n) Meurſ. Den. Pythag. *p.* 47, 51, 60, 55, 58, 59.

(o) Κόσμος, σῶμα, Ἁρμονία, Βακχασμὸν ἀνεγείρων, κλειδοῦχος τῆς φύσεως.

(p) Παγὰν ἀενάου φύσεως ῥιζώματ' ἔχουσαν.

Roots of ever-flowing Nature. For theſe Roots of ever-flowing Nature in the Golden Verſes are (in all probability) the ſame with thoſe of *Empedocles* (q);

Τέσσαρα γὰρ πάντων ῥιζώματα πρῶτον ἄκουε.

Firſt learn that there are four Roots or Principles of all things, the four Elements.

(q) *V.* Selden. *de D. Syr.* p. 135. D. Teniſon *of Idolatry*, p. 405.

That this is a true Interpretation of the *Pythagoric Tetractys*, appeareth from *Heſychius* (who ſaith, that the Tetractys ſignifieth the four Elements, and from the *Pythagoric* Hymn (r) *Divine Number proceedeth from the Receſs of the Monad to the Divine Tetrad,* which ſignifieth *the four Elements*, as may be ſeen in *Proclus*. But although this Interpretation of the *Pythagoric Tetractys* is not refuſable (it is ſometimes the genuine meaning of the *Tetractys*;) yet I am far from thinking it a juſt and adequate account of ſo great and ſacred a *Pythagoric* Myſtery. The celebrated *Tetractys* was (I ſuppoſe) the comprehenſion of the four firſt Numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4. which Comprehenſion of Numbers is the All of Number (for all Number is no more than ten, as is commonly known;) wherefore the *Tetractys* of the *Pythagoreans* denoteth the whole Comprehenſion of their Number-kind of Philoſophy, *the All of their Recondite Wiſdom.* As this Account of the *Tetractys* repreſenteth it as a very venerable *Pythagoric* Myſtery: So it appeareth from *Jamblichus*, (s) that *Pythagoras* was celebrated amongſt his Diſciples as the Inventor and Teacher of the *Tetractys*; which cannot reaſonably be thought, to ſignifie any thing leſs than the whole of their myſtic kind of Philoſophy. And it appeareth from ſeveral Teſtimonies (t) that the *Pythagoreans* called the Univerſality of Number *Tetractys*; therefore the Tetractys (being the Comprehenſion of the Univerſality of Number) is the Comprehenſion of their Number-kind of Phyſiology and Theology. Now, ſeeing the whole Frame and Compoſition of the *Pythagoric* Philoſophy is of the Myſtic-number-kind; this will certainly infer, that the *Tetractys* is *Pythagoric-Number-kind of Myſtery*, as all the ancient Writers repreſent it. Therefore this Conceit of ſome Learned Men, that the *Pythagoric Tetractys* is the ſame with the Hebrew *Tetragrammaton* is without all colour of probability. Nor is there any Name, which the *Pythagoreans* have given their Tetractys, that hath any relation to the *Tetragrammaton:* Nor was the Hebrew *Tetragrammaton* any ſuch Recondite Myſtery in *Pythagoras*'s days, as the later *Jews* have made it; nor was *Pythagoras* any pretender to the God of the *Hebrews*, to his Theology or Religion. Moreover according to the uſual Paralleliſms that are made between the Pagan and Scriptural Theology, not the *Tetrad* of *Pythagoras*, but his *Monad* (which ſeemeth to be the Number call'd by the *Pythagoreans* (u) ἀριθμὸς ἀριθμῶν, *the Number of Numbers*) *is coincident with the* Hebrew *Tetragrammaton.*

(r) Προϊὼν ὁ θεῖος ἀριθμὸς, μονάδος ἐκ κευθμῶνος τετράδ᾽ ἐπὶ ζαθέην. Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 96. 155.

(s) De vit. Pythag. *p.* 138, 147.

(t) *Ap.* Meurſ. Den. Pythag. *p.* 55, 56.

(u) Hierocl. *in Car.p.*225.

V. If the *Tetractys* might be thought the ſame with the myſterious *Tetragrammaton* (which all Reaſon refuſeth) yet *Pythagoras* could not be ſaid, *to reveal it to the* Gentiles (as ſome ſuppoſe) but rather to conceal it from them. For (w) *the* Pythagoreans *involv'd the Matters of their Diſcipline in a Symbolic kind of Expreſſion, to conceal them from vulgar People.* *Pythagoras* together with his Recondite Learning, deriv'd from *Egypt* the unpopular Humour of keeping it Arcane and Recondite: (x) For the *Egyptians* did not reveal their Religious Myſteries promiſcuouſly to all, nor communicate them to the Profane, but only to the (qualify'd) Prieſts, and to ſuch as are to ſucceed in the Kingdom. When a King was choſen out of the Military Order, he was brought to the Prieſts, and by them inſtructed in that Arcane Philoſophy, which concealeth myſterious Truths under obſcure Fables and Allegories; therefore they plac'd *Sphinges* before their Temples, to ſignify (ſaith *Plutarch*) *that their* (fabulous) *Theology contained a certain Arcane and Enigmatical Wiſdom in it.* (y) This was the way of *Orpheus* and of thoſe that firſt wrote of the Gods, to repreſent the Matters of their Wiſdom under Fables and Allegories agreeably to the *Egyptians* vulgar Theology; and their Sphinges intimated the Enigmatical Nature of it. Beſides theſe *Sphinges* they had in their Temples *Harpocrates* and *Sigalions*, which plainly intimated *Silence*, and that as (in the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries) the Rites of their Religion ſhould not be communicated to the Prophane. They had alſo (z) their ἱερὰ γράμματα and ἱερατικοὺς χαρακτῆρας, *Sacred and Sacerdotal Characters*, unknown to the ordinary ſort of Men, and peculiar to their Prieſts, amongſt whom was kept ſecret the Learning of their Philoſophy and Theology, their ἄῤῥητος and ἀπόῤῥητος θεολογία, *Arcane and Myſterious Theology*, which was twofold; for in great part their *Arcane* Theology was only the Myſteries of their *Exoterical* Theology (Myſteries that were involv'd in it) and in part it was their *Philoſophic Acroamatical* Theology, which was *Myſtic-Metaphyſical.* For the firſt Principle and ſupream Deity of the Philoſophic *Egyptian* Pagans was called by them, (a) σκότος ἄγνωστον, σκότος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν νόησιν *unknown Darkneſs, Darkneſs beyond all ken* (they did not amiſs to keep ſuch Deities in the dark;) but this Supream Deity was no Deity of the *Egyptians* Exoterical Theology, or of the Popular *Egyptian* Pagans. On the contrary, the Goddeſs *Iſis* was a Deity of the Popular *Egyptiam* Pagans Religion, and of their Exoterical Theology; and the Arcane Interpretations which they made of this Goddeſs and of that Inſcription to her, *Tibi Una quæ es omnia (to thee who being one art all things,)* theſe were properly Myſteries of their Exoterical Theology. Agreeably to which Account of the *Egyptians Arcane* Theology the ἄῤῥητος θεολογία, *Arcane and Myſterious Theology* of the *Perſians*, *Syrians*, *Indians* (and other Philoſophic Pagan Nations) muſt be diſtinguiſh'd; as alſo the Arcane Theology of thoſe ancient Barbaric Sects, the *Magi*, *Brachmans*, and *Druids*, who beſides their Exoterical Theology and the Myſteries thereof had a *Myſtic-Metaphyſical* and *Theurgical Diſcipline and Inſtitution.* *Pythagoras* form'd an Inſtitution of the ſame nature, *an Inſtitution of Philoſophic and Theurgic Myſticks*, who beſides their ſilence for certain Years, were injoyn'd a perpetual ſilence, never to reveal the Matters of their Learning to Aliens that were not of their Society (call'd ἀμύητοι, ἀτέλεστοι, θυραῖοι, ἐξωτερικοὶ, βέβηλοι, *the not initiated, the exotericks, thoſe without, the profane,*) which one of the *Pythagoric* Women (*Timycha* the Wife of *Myllias*) ſo religiouſly obſerv'd, (b) that being tortur'd by *Dionyſius*, to force her to declare the reaſon of their Religious Abſtinence from *Beans*, ſhe, biting off her Tongue with her Teeth, and ſpitting it out upon the Tyrant, declar'd thereby her invincible adherence to ſilence. (c) The Gods were thought to be very angry with one that

(w) Meurſ. ſupr. p. 59.

(x) Clem. *Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 413. Plutarch. *de* Iſ. *p.* 354, 378.

(y) Procl. *Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(z) Boch. *Canaan. l.* 2. *c.* 17.

(a) Eugub. *de Per. Phil. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

(b) Jambl. *de vit.* Pythag. *p.* 169.

(c) *Ibid. p.* 226.

divulg'd a *Pythagoric* Secret (for he was drown'd in the Sea;) It is certain the *Pythagoreans* themſelves were ſo. For *Hipparchus* is known to have been baniſh'd their School, and a κενοτάφιον, or empty Coffin was ſet in his place (as a Perſon dead and loſt) becauſe he went about to proſtitute their *Arcana*. On this account, and becauſe they were rigid Separatiſts, excluding all Exortericks (except their Parents) from their Friendſhip and Converſation, the whole of the Inſtitution of the *Pythagoric* Saintiſts is ſaid to be ἰδιότροπος καὶ συμβολική: *their way of Life was private and peculiar to themſelves, alien from others; their mode of Doctrine alſo was uncouth, myſtic and ſymbolic.* (d) A mode of Doctrine that was deſign'd to keep off the unworthy and unlearned, nor were any qualify'd for the *Pythagoric* Inſtitution, but thoſe that were learned in Secular Sciences. (e) When *J. Mart.* betook himſelf to a famous *Pythagorean*, to be indoctrinated in Philoſophy, *Have you been converſant* (ſaid the *Pythagorean*) *in Muſic, Aſtronomy and Geometry? do you think to ſee any thing that conduceth to Beatitude, unleſs you have firſt learned theſe things, which withdraw the Soul from Senſibles, and render her adapt for the Intelligibles,* ὥστε αὐτὸ κατιδεῖν τὸ καλόν, καὶ αὐτὸ ὅ ἐστιν ἀγαθόν; *ſo as to behold Fair it ſelf* (or the firſt Fair) *and Good it ſelf*, or the firſt Good?

VI. The *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* were a Sect (both of Theurgical and) of *Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theamatiſts*, (f) as *Iſidore*'s ſublimate Soul is ſaid to aſcend upon any ſmall occaſion from theſe Inferiour Senſibles, ἐπὶ τὰ πρεσβύτατα τῶν θεαμάτων, *to the moſt noble and excellent ſights*; and *Proclus* wrote his *Platonic* Theology, (g) that he might leave to Poſterity a Monument τῶν μακαρίων θεαμάτων, *of thoſe bleſſed ſights*, which himſelf and his Aſſociates were the Beholders of. Such as the *firſt Fair*, (h) *where the greateſt and ultimate Conflict is propos'd to Souls, for the ſake of which no labour is to be ſpar'd, that we fail not of the beſt ſight, which whoſo attaineth, is happy,* ὄψιν μακαρίαν τεθεαμένος, *beholding the Beatific Viſion; but he is unhappy that faileth of it. For not he that faileth of beholding beauteous Colours and Bodies, nor he that faileth of Power, Principalities and a Kingdom, is unhappy; but he that is without the poſſeſſion of this, of this alone; for the gaining whereof, the Kingdoms and Principalities of the whole Earth, and Sea, and Heaven are to be thrown away.* To qualifie and prepare one, to be ſuch a Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theamatiſt, the Maſters of this Inſtitution require ſeveral reſemblances of Sanctity, with a mixture of groſs *Platonic* Phantaſtry. (i) *For he that is a beholder of this Pulchritude, muſt no more look at any bodily Pulchritudes; but knowing, that they are Images, and Footſteps, and Shadows, muſt flee to that whoſe Images they are: For if any one purſueth bodily Pulchritude thinking to take hold of it as true, it is as a fair Image in the Water, which when one would lay hold of, (as a Fable ſignifieth) he drowned himſelf in the River.* Φεύγωμεν δὴ φίλην εἰς πατρίδα, *let us flee to our pleaſing Country, not with our Feet, nor need we Horſes, or to provide Ships to carry us; but all theſe things you muſt diſmiſs, and not ſeeing, but ſhutting as it were the bodily ſight, exſuſcitate inſtead thereof another ſight, which all have, but few uſe.* (k) *What then doth this Internal Eye behold? upon the firſt Exſuſcitation of it, it is not able to look at things that are very bright. Wherefore the Soul muſt be inur'd, firſt to behold fair Studies, next fair Works; not the Works of Art, but of Men that are called Good; next inſpect the Soul of thoſe that do thoſe fair Works.* But becauſe it is not eaſie, to inſpect the fair Souls of others, the Theamatiſt is better adviſ'd, to make fair his own Soul. (l) *As the Statuary cutteth off, and ſhaveth, and ſmootheth, and poliſheth, till a fair Face appeareth in his Statue; ſo do thou pare off Superfluities, rectifie Obliquities, brighten what is Tenebricoſe, and give not over poliſhing thy Statue, till the deiform pulchritude of Virtue ſhine forth to thee:* εἰ γέγονας τοῦτο καὶ εἶδες αὐτὸ, *if being become this, thou behold thy ſelf, being now become ſight, take Confidence concerning thy ſelf, and being now aſcended hither, that thou needeſt no more any Guide to ſhew thee, fix thy ſight and behold; for this Eye alone beholdeth the great Pulchritude.* But if one goeth to the Spectacle λημῶν κακίαις καὶ οὐ κεκαθαρμένος, *having his Eyes ſordify'd with Vices and not purg'd, or be timid and unable to look upon what is very bright, he ſeeth nothing, though another ſhew him a preſent Object that may be ſeen. The Spectator muſt be made congenial and like to the Spectacle, before he aſſayeth to be a Theamatiſt. For the Eye hath never ſeen the Sun* ἡλιοειδὴς μὴ γεγενημένος, *without being Sun-like; nor can the Soul which is not become fair behold the Fair. Let every one become deiform and fair, that intendeth to behold God and the Fair. Aſcending, he will come firſt unto Intellect, and there he will ſee the fair Species, and he will ſay, that this Pulchritude is the Idea's. But above this is the Nature of the Good having the Fair projected before it.* In this method of conducting the Mind, to ſee the *Platonic* Deity *Plotinus* hath glanc'd at ſeveral Qualifications, requiſite to furniſh a *Platonic* Theamatiſt; *Mathematical Contemplation, Illumination, Purgation, Transformation,* χωρισμὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος, *ſeparation from the Body*; to which for the beholding the firſt Good the *Platonic Faith* muſt be added. (m) *What is it, that will unite us to T'Agathon and ſurceaſe our Action and Motion? And what is it that conjoyneth all the Divine kinds to the firſt and ineffable Henotety of Goodneſs? It is the Faith of the Gods.* (n) *For T'Agathon is not to be inquir'd after knowingly* (in a way of Knowledge and Underſtanding) *which is an imperfect way; but giving our ſelves up to the Divine Light, and ſhutting our Eyes, we muſt in this manner be ſeated in the unknowable and hidden Henad of Beings. For this kind of Faith is more ancient and excellent than the knowledge-kind of Operation, not only in us, but with the Gods themſelves alſo, and by this all the Gods are together united about one Center.* The *Platoniſts* therefore contemplate the firſt Nature, (o) μεμυκόσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, *with their Eyes ſhut*, tranſcending Intellection and all that is Intelligible (which is groſs *Platonic* Phantaſtry) and therefore ſhutting the Eyes of their Underſtanding as well as their Bodily Sight.

(n) Δεῖ γὰρ οὐ γνωστικῶς οὐδ' ἀτελῶς τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπιζητεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐπιδόντας ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θείῳ φωτί, καὶ μύσαντας, οὕτως ἐνιδρύεσθαι τῇ ἀγνώστῳ καὶ κρυφίῳ τῶν ὄντων ἑνάδι.

VII. Agreeably to the general nature of the *Platonic* Theology (which is ſtiled (p) ἡ περὶ τῶν θείων μυστικὴ ἀλήθεια, *the Myſtic Verity touching things Divine,*) the ſeveral parts of it are *Myſtic-Metaphyſical*; for almoſt every Branch of it is repreſented by *Proclus* as ἄῤῥητος, ἄφραστος, ἀπόῤῥητος, ἄγνωστος, *ineffable, indeclarable, arcane, unknowable.* This Humour pervadeth the Body of the *Platonic* Philoſophy; uſually the particular Theories of it are ſmutted with ſomething (more or leſs) of an impure *Myſtic-Metaphyſical* Phantaſtry. For inſtance; the Theory of the *Humane Soul* in

(d) Clem. *Strom. l.* 5. *p.m.* 419.

(e) *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 219. *v.* Plotin. *En.* 1. *l.* 3.

(f) Phot. *Cod.* 242.

(g) *Theol. Plat. p.* 2.

(h) Plotin. *En.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 7.

(i) *Ibid. c.* 8.

(k) *Ibid. c.* 9.

(l) *Ibid.*

(m) Procl. *Theol. Plat. l.* 1. c. 25.

(o) Procl. *Theol. Plat. l.* 2. c. 11. & *l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 2.

in Platoniſm is *Myſtic-Metaphyſical.* For the *Platoniſts* ſay, (*q*) that the Rational Soul is produc'd by Mind or Intellect, and is the Image thereof. They place Intellect above Reaſon, which belongeth to *Soul*, making two Intellects in a Man, *the one ſtable, the other diſcurſive.* In the *Platonic* νοῦς καθαρὸς, *pure Intellect*, which (according to *Plotinus*) is always in ſtable Act or Operation beholding the *Platonic* Intelligibles, are the *Ideal Forms* of things; and above this Intellect there is an *Henotety* or *Unity*, which the Oracles call νοῦ ἄνθος, *the Flower of the Mind*; for the Flower of the Mind is ἡ ἑνιαία τῆς ψυχῆς δύναμις, *the Heniadic Power of the Soul*, as *Pſellus* ſaith. So *Plotinus* argueth (*r*) from the Reaſonings of the Soul (as when ſhe inquireth, *whether this be juſt*, or *that be fair?*) that there is neceſſarily ſome *ſtanding* or *ſtable Juſt*; wherefore (*s*) *there muſt be Intellect in us, as alſo the Principle of Intellect, and the cauſe of it, and God, that is the Henotety.* As the Theory of the Humane Soul in *Platoniſm*, ſo the Theory of her Virtues is *Myſtic-Metaphyſical.* For the *Platoniſts* have excogitated four ſeveral kinds of Virtues. The *Political* or *Practic*, the *Cathartic* or *Purgative*, the *Soul-intellectual*, and the *Paradigmatical* or *Exemplar.* (*t*) *For Juſtice it ſelf, Temperance it ſelf is not properly Virtue, but is as the Exemplar; that which is from it in the Soul is Virtue.* Of all theſe ſeveral kinds of Virtue one only is *Moral* Virtue, which the *Platoniſts* account rather a Preparation for Virtue than Virtue, and ſay of it, (*u*) αἱ δὲ πολιτικαὶ τὸν θνητὸν ἄνθρωπον κατακοσμοῦσαι, *the Political Virtues are ornamental to the Mortal Man.* The reſt are pure Myſtic-Metaphyſical Virtue peculiar to the Inſtitution of οἱ θεωρητικοί, *the Theoretic Men*, or the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theamatiſts (they are call'd in *Macrobius*, (*w*) *Virtutes otioſorum, the Virtues of ſuch as ſequeſter themſelves from ſecular Buſineſs*) who alone pretend to Aſſimilation unto God, or to Deification, as they ſpeak. For the *Purgative* ſort of Virtue is only to prepare the Theoriſt who after Purgation is to be furniſh'd with the *Soul intellectual* ſort of Virtue (the Virtue of the Soul νοερῶς καὶ πρὸς τὸν νοῦν ἐνεργούσης, *operating intellectually, directing her Acts unto Intellect*, being turn'd to it, form'd and repleniſh'd by it,) which is deriv'd from the *Paradigmatical.* And as the Theory of the Human Soul and that of her Virtues in Platoniſm is Myſtic-Metaphyſical: So the Platonic Beatitude or the Felicity of the Soul is of the ſame Note. For ſometimes they diſcourſe, (*x*) *that Intellect is the height of Life*, the true and perfect Life, and that other lives are imperfect and but Images of life; that their Felicity conſiſteth ἐν νοερᾷ ζωῇ or ἐν τῷ ζῆν κατὰ νοῦν, *in intellectual Life, in living according to Intellect* (the Platoniſts intellectual form of Life,) *in the Felicitative intellectual Theory, in being ſegregate from ſenſibles*, and in a Life that is ἀφάνταστος καὶ ἀπαθής, *devoid of Phancy and Paſſion as much as may be* (the Soul in a Philoſophic way diveſteth her ſelf of the ſenſible Nature which ſhe hath aſſum'd, and of ſenſitive Propenſion, ſeparateth from the bodily Senſe, phantaſie and the irrational Nature and the Paſſions that are in it, as things Alien from her Nature and primitive intellectual State; enjoyeth the Theory of the intelligibles, and reduceth her ſelf to an Incorporealneſs of Life conformable to them, and becometh as much as may be a ſeparate purely intellectual Soul;) that the Rational Nature (*y*) obtaineth Beatitude of Life, when it is turn'd to Intellect and form'd by it, and liveth by its Life (which Intellect is always in conjunction with the Divine Intellect and form'd by it) becometh totally Intellect and an Intellectual World. Sometimes they diſcourſe, that the height of their Beatitude is *tranſcendent to Intellect*; (*z*) that the Soul having put off all that Multitude, which is in Imagination, Reaſon and Intellection, becometh only her own *Henotety* or *Unity* (changing her Intellectual form into that of the Unity) and being thus one like *the firſt Unity*, ſhe gaineth the ſight of the firſt Unity, and is united therewith (ὥσπερ κέντρῳ κέντρον συνάψας, *conjoyning as it were Center with Center*, the Center of the Soul with the Center of the Univerſe,) and being one with God is God, (*a*) ſaith *Plotinus.* (On this account the *Platoniſts* have furniſh'd Souls both with an *Intellect* and an *Unity*, that they might be capable of conjunction both with the firſt Intellect and the firſt Unity.) Διὸ καὶ δύσφραστον τὸ θέαμα, *wherefore the Spectacle or Sight here is hard to be declar'd, becauſe of the Union that is here*; (*b*) which *Union* (Rapture and Extaſie) is οἷον ἐπαφή, *a tactual kind of Union*; for the Attingency of the firſt Principle is not by way of Reaſon and Intellection (becauſe there is ποικίλον τι, *ſeveralty there*) but by expelling all multiplicity, diſcurſive, compounding and diſtinguiſhing Reaſon out of the Mind, (*c*) and Intellect muſt as it were diſmiſs it ſelf, μὴ πάντη νοῦν εἶναι, *wholly ceaſe to be Intellect, to behold the firſt Nature.* Theſe things are matter of copious Diſcourſe; but thus much may ſuffice to demonſtrate, that the Theories of the Platonic Philoſophy are Myſtic-Metaphyſical, the Theory of the *firſt Nature* in *Platoniſm* is eminently and beyond all parallel ſuch. It is a *Philoſophic-Pagan Myſtic-Metaphyſical Nature* to the height of being ſo, and therefore a ſuperlative *Myſtic-Metaphyſical Deity.* (*d*) *Touching the ſimple Unite above Intellect many things are diſcours'd in the way of Underſtanding, but it is better contemplated by a neſcience or not underſtanding than by underſtanding; becauſe it is* γνωστοῦ ὁμοίωσις, *an Aſſimilation to to the Object*, to be devoid of Reaſon and Underſtanding. When the Mind betaketh her ſelf to Knowledge, ſhe departeth from *Uniteneſs* and from the Principle.

(q) Ficin. *in* Plotin. *p.* 279, 497. 25, 27. Porphyr. *Sentent. p.* 221.

(r) *En.* 5. *l.* 1. *c.* 11.

(s) Δεῖ νοῦν ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι, εἶναι δὲ καὶ τὴν νοῦ ἀρχὴν, καὶ αἰτίαν, καὶ θεόν.

(t) Οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸ δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐνταῦθα ἀρετὴ, ἀλλ' οἷον παράδειγμα. Plotin. *En.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 6.

(u) Porph. *Sent. p.* 235, 237.

(w) *In Somn. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *V.* Salmaſ. *in Epict. p.* 16, 18.

(x) Plotin. *En.* 1. *l.* 4. Porphyr. *de Abſtin. l.* 1. *S.* 29, 30, 31. *l.* 2. *S.* 43. Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 205.

(y) Ficin. *in* Plotin. *p.* 10, 25, 354, 727.

(z) *Ibid. p.* 768.

(a) *En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 8, 9, 10.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 39.

(c) *Ibid. En.* 3. *l.* 8. *c.* 8. Ficin. *Com. p.* 515, 527.

(d) Περὶ τοῦ ἐπέκεινα νοῦ, κατὰ μὲν νόησιν πολλὰ λέγεται· θεωρεῖται δὲ ἀνοησίᾳ κρεῖττον νοήσεως. Porphyr. *Sent. p.* 229.

SECT. 4. *Of the Philoſophic Pagans Theology as it is the Arcane Theurgical.*

I. THeurgy is conſider'd by the Writers of *Magick* as a Species of Art Magick (or of the Magical Skill and Operation,) which is *more than Natural Operation, ſo as to be Diabolical Operation.* (*e*) The Hebrew Doctors will have *Aſtrology*, to be an ingredient of its definition, ſuppoſing it *to be built upon Aſtrology*, becauſe the Oriental Magicians were of Opinion, *that no Magical Operation can be done without reſpect had to the Stars*; for they ſuppos'd, *that every Plant hath his Star, and all Animals and Metals in like manner.* This (no doubt) was the ground of the Aſtrological Magick of the *Zabii* (and the Cabaliſts Magick (*f*) is of the ſame Character,) which although *Maimonides* explodeth and condemneth, yet himſelf and his Fellow Rabbins manitain the ground of it. For they ſuppoſe, that this inferiour World of Generables

(e) Maimon. *Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. *c.* 37.

(f) *Rittangel. in l.* Jezir. *p.* 14.

nerables and Corruptibles is govern'd by the Virtues and Influences of the Celeſtial Spheres, according to that Maxim of theirs, (g) *There is not any Herb here below, which hath not its* מזל *Planet or Star above in the Firmament, which ſtriketh it and ſaith unto it Grow.* But how Rabbinical and Romantick ſoever theſe Aſtrologizing Conceits of the Rabbins may ſeem, yet thus far they rightly repreſent the Notion of Magick; *they count it more than Natural Operation in the foul Senſe.* They have given it an accommodate Name, and this their Maxim concerning it is worth remarking. *In quocunque eſt aliquid de Medicina, in eo nihil eſt de via Amoræorum.* Whereby they mean; *that in things of Natural Operation there is nothing of Magick,* which they call *the way of the Amorites.* Therefore the recondite wonder-working Artifice by the Virtues and Powers of natural Agents only, commonly call'd *Natural Magick,* is not ſuch Magick as we ſpeak of; nor is any meer Human juggling Illuſion or Impoſture ſuch Magick; nor any thing that is not more than Natural Operation, not any thing on this ſide *the dealing with the evil Demons in the foul Senſe.* But although Magick ſignifieth in a black and criminal Senſe, yet the diſtribution of it (*h*) into *Theurgy* and *Goety* (or white and black Magick) may be an allowable diſtinction, if by *Theurgy* we underſtand *the good Angel-kind of Magick* ſo reputed, (*i*) either by private Magicians (who pretend by certain Solemnities and Ceremonies to draw down Divine Virtues,) or by the Pagan Theologers, whoſe Magick was of the black and criminal kind, yet they repute it *Theurgy.* (*k*) *The Prieſts* (ſaith *Proclus*) *by theſe things of Nature that are near convok'd the Demons into Preſence; from the Demons they proceeded to the Gods, aſcending to the proper underſtanding of them, partly by the inſtruction of the Demons, and partly through their own induſtry interpreting their agreeable Symbols; and laſtly, leaving behind them natural things and actions, and in great part the Demons, they came into Conſortſhip with the Gods.* Such is the Magic of the Pagan Theologers, which they account *Theurgy.* By which Name they call their Sanctimony or Religion-Magick, their God-Society-Magick, (*l*) ἡ τῶν ἱερῶν τέχνη, *the Art of their Sacra* (*m*) their ἱερατικὴ ἀπεργησία, *Prieſt-religious Operation, their Theoſophy Practic.* (*n*) Their Theurgy is thus defin'd by *Jamblichus* (that grand Theurgiſt, who for his eminence in Theurgy and Pagan Sanctity is call'd by *Simplicius* and others *Divus,*) ἡ τῶν θείων ἔργων τέχνη, *the Art of the Divine Operations* (which ſignifieth both ſuch Operations that are converſant about the Gods, and alſo ſuch as are the Work of the Gods,) and his account of it compriſeth *the Worſhip of the Gods,* the Prayers and Sacrifices of their Worſhippers with their Magical Efficacy, their Magical Trinkets of *Names, Characters, Herbs, Stones, Charms,* the variegated Garments of the Prieſts, and all the Symbols of the Gods, their arts of adapting matter for the reception of the Gods, their Oracles and various modes of Divination, of Expiations, Luſtration, Purgation and perfecting the Soul, their Myſtic Union with the Gods, their Magical threats and modes of compelling the Gods, their θεαγωγία, *Evocation of the Gods,* and *Theophania* (appearances of the Gods,) their Theurgical Virtue and way to felicity by hieratic Theurgy, their modes of driving away evil Demons, the uſe of ſacred Animals, the *Arcana* of *Iſis* and *Oſiris,* their Divine Illuminations and Inſpirations; and to ſpeak Summarily, their Diſcipline of *Theurgy* compriſeth (*o*) *the Sanctimonies of the Gods, the Communion between the Gods and Men. Mantice,* (the Diſcipline of Divination) in *Plato*'s Sympoſium ſeemeth to be of the ſame ſignification with *Theurgy.* For the thing that it preſideth over (ſaith he) is (*p*) *the Communion and Society between the Gods and Men. Mantice is the Maker of Friendſhip between the Gods and Men.*

II. It appeareth from the Notion of *Theurgy,* that it is not to be confin'd to any private Technical ſort of Magick; for the Pagans *Sacerdotal Inſtitution, their Religious Inſtitution in general, their ſeveral Inſtitutions of Myſtic-religious Society, and the Arcane Philoſophic Theology of the ancient Magi,* are Theurgy. Multitudes of private Men amongſt the Heathen (Philoſophers and others) had their Theurgic Arts; as *Theoſebius* (*q*) becauſe his Wife brought him no Child, he gave her a Ring of *Continence* (as before he had given her a Wedding Ring,) and ſhe liv'd with him in Continence ever after. Certain Magical Phyſicians of *Thrace,* the Followers of *Zamolxis,* were Phyſicians both of Soul and Body (as *Plato* in his *Charmides* diſcourſeth;) they pretended, that the Diſeaſes of the Body are not to be cur'd, unleſs the Diſeaſes of the Soul be cur'd; and that the Diſeaſes of the Soul are to be cur'd by certain Charms or Inchantments. (*r*) So the *Pythagoreans* are ſaid, to have uſually cur'd bodily Diſeaſes by Inchantments, *Pythagoras* the Diſeaſes both of Soul and Body. *Proclus,* that Divine Man, as *Marinus* calleth him, obſerv'd his private Faſting-days becauſe of Theurgical Apparitions. And many others of the Philoſophic Family, *Empedocles, Porphyrius, Jamblichus, Julianus* the Theurgiſt, *Appuleius, Apollonius Tyanæus, Maximus, Libanins, Amelius, Sopater, Ædeſius, Chryſanthius,* were plainly Men of Theurgic Artifices and Correſpondences. But beſides that multitudes of private Men amongſt the Heathen had their Theurgic Arts, and publick Perſons alſo practis'd a private kind of Theurgy (as *Numa* and *Julian* the Emperor;) the Prieſts of the Pagan Religion practis'd a publick Theurgy, and were οἱ θεουργοί, *the Theurgical Magicians.* Their Hieratic Books, Magical Prayers and calling of the Gods, the Laws and Rites of their *Sacra,* their Enthuſiaſms, modes of Sacrificing and Divination with the reſt of (*s*) their ἱερατικὴ μυσταγωγία, *Hieratic Arcane Diſcipline* and Sacerdotal Operation (before recited from *Jamblichus*) were the buſineſs of their Theurgy (*their Magical kind of Sanctimony and Religion*) intermixt with much of Human Cheat and Impoſture. The Pagans Religious Inſtitution in general deriveth it ſelf from *Magick,* according to that Principle of the *Pythagoreans,* (*t*) *thoſe things are to be done, which are pleaſing to God;* but the knowledge of them is to be gain'd διὰ τέχνης θείας, *by the Divine Art.* Hence *Magick* is called by *Appuleius* (*u*) *The learning that appointeth the Sacra of the Gods, and is skilful of their Worſhip.* So *Pliny* ſaith, *the Art Magick was in greateſt Dignity among the Ancients, becauſe it compriſeth the three eminent Arts: Phyſick, the Mathematical Arts and Religion.* And

---

(g) Maimon. *ſupr. par.* 2. *c.* 10. *Inſtructa eſt magia multum Aſtronomica facultate, plurimaque per ipſam peragit.* Pſellus *de Dæmon.*

(h) *Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 9. *Nonn. in Gr. Naz. n.* 67. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *Perer. de magia. c.* 9.

(i) *Corn. Agrip. de van. ſcient. c.* 46.

(k) *Procl. de magia v. Gale in Jambl. p.* 277, 286.

(l) *Procl. in polit. p.* 370.

(m) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 107, 138. Gale *not. p.* 222.

(n) *Ibid. p.* 18.

(o) Τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἁγιστείας, τὴν κοινωνίαν θεῶν ϗ ἀνθρώπων. Jambl. ſupr. p. 140.

(p) Ἡ περὶ θεοὺς τε καὶ ἀνθρώπους πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνία. ἐστὶν αὖ ἡ μαντικὴ φιλίας θεῶν ϗ ἀνθρώπων δημιουργός.

(q) Phot. *cod.* 242. *col.* 1074.

(r) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 126. *Tiraquell. de Nobil. p.* 321. *Appul. Apol. p.* 433, 474.

(s) Jambl. *de myſt. p.* 20.

(t) *Idem de vit. Pythag. p.* 129.

(u) *Cælitum Antiſtita, colendique eos ac venerandi gnara.* Beroald. in Appulei. de aur. Aſ. præfat. Gale in Jambl. p. 279.

S. *Auſtin* ſaith of the Jews, when they fell to the Worſhip of ſtrange Gods, (w) they were *Magicis Artibus ſeducti, ſeduced by Magic Arts.* As the Pagans Religious Inſtitution in general is Theurgy; ſo the ſeveral Myſtic-Religious Inſtitutions in Paganiſm (popular Myſtic-Religious Inſtitutions) *the Mithraic, Iſiac, Eleuſinian, Samo Thracian* (and ſuch more) were certain Inſtitutions of *Myſtic-Theurgical God-Society, Sanctimony and Beatitude.* According to that of *Jamblichus*; (x) *To make the Gods remote from the Earth, is an Opinion deſtructive of the ſacred Sanctimony and the Theurgical Communion which Men have with the Gods.* The *Myſtæ* or Intrinſicks of theſe Inſtitutions (after certain Rites of Initiation and Purgation) were conſider'd as *God-Society-Men* according to that of *Plato* in his *Phædo. A Soul that mindeth the Buſineſs of Philoſophizing* (the Meditation of Death) *is after this Life in ſuch a State,* (y) *as they that are initiated into the Religious Myſteries are ſaid to be in, the remainder of her time is a living with the Gods indeed.* Theſe God-Society-Men were not only admitted (z) to the ſight of thoſe occult myſterious things that might not be divulg'd (which were ſhew'd and explain'd by the *Hierophantæ,*) but there were alſo θεάματα τοῖς μύσταις, *Viſions and Apparitions to the Myſtæ,* Lightning, ſhining Fire, ſhakings of the Ground, and other ſtrange appearances in their Theurgy (as the Pagan Theologers report,) the ſigns of the Preſence of their Gods; and the ἐπόπται in theſe Inſtitutions were θεόπται, *Theurgical Theamatiſts,* that ſaw the appearances of their Deities. *The Gods being delighted with their Symbols,* ſaith *Proclus, readily come at call,* (a) *and exhibite intire and immote and ſimple Spectacles to the Myſtæ to behold.* Theſe Popular-myſtic Religious Inſtitutions in Paganiſm are of great Conſideration, to illuſtrate the Chriſtian Religion (as will hereafter appear:) But of all the Inſtitutions in Paganiſm there is none ſo conſiderable as *the Arcane Philoſophic Theology of the ancient Magi Perſian and Chaldean*; which was alſo the Theology of the Egyptian Prieſts, the Gymnoſophiſts, Druids, the Pythagoreans and Platoniſts. This is the Theology, which ſeveral learned Men ſuppoſe to be *a Divine Cabala*; and it muſt be ſuppos'd (as we have ſaid before) *a Theology of very great Conſonance with the Chriſtian Religion complicated with extreme Diſſonance.* Which extreme Diſſonance is viſible in the true Name of it; for as being *the Arcane Philoſophic Theology* of the Perſian Magi, it muſt be denominated *the Arcane Philoſophic Theurgical Theology.*

III. The account which the learned Author of *the true intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe* hath given of this Theology, and of the *Perſian Magick and Theurgy,* is agreeable to the Air and Humour of his learned Volum (which Philoſophic-paganizeth the matters of the Chriſtian Theology,) and to that unwarrantable Liberty which ſometimes he taketh to himſelf, to miſrepreſent the Senſe of the Pagan Theologers. For thus this learned Author diſcourſeth (b) *Zoroaſter's Polytheiſm is intimated by* Plato, *where his Magick is defin'd to have been nothing elſe but* θεῶν θεραπεία, *the Worſhip of the Gods. Whence by the way we may learn alſo, that the word* μαγεία, *or Magick, was firſt taken in a good Senſe, which is confirmed by* Porphyrius; παρά γε τοῖς Πέρσαις, οἱ περὶ τὸ θεῖον σοφοὶ, ϗ τȣ́τȣ θεραπεύοντες, Μάγοι μὲν προσαγορεύονται. *Amongſt the Perſians thoſe who were skilful in the knowledge of the Deity, and Religious Worſhippers of the ſame, were called Magi. And as Magick is commonly conceived to be founded in a certain vital Sympathy that is in the Univerſe, ſo did theſe ancient Perſian Magi and Chaldeans (as* Pſellus *tells us) ſuppoſe* συμπαθῆ εἶναι τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω, *that there was a Sympathy betwixt the Superiour and Inferiour Beings; but it ſeems, the only way at firſt by them approved, of attracting the Influence and Aſſiſtance of thoſe ſuperiour inviſible Powers, was by Piety, Devotion and Religious Rites: Nevertheleſs their Devotion was not carried out only to one Omnipotent God, but alſo to many Gods; neither is it to be queſtioned but this Divine Magick of* Zoroaſter *ſhortly after degenerated in many of his Followers into the Theurgical Magick, and at length into* γοητεία, *downright Sorcery and Witchcraft, the only thing which is now vulgarly called Magick.* If we ſuppoſe (as this learned Author obſerveth in the firſt place,) that the *Perſian Magick* is defin'd by *Plato* θεῶν θεραπεία, *the Worſhip of the Gods* and nothing elſe (though *Plato* doth not ſay all this) This will not infer, that there was no Theurgic Magick in the Religion of the ancient Magi, but the contrary. For *Plato*'s and the Pagan Theologers θεῶν θεραπεία, (Worſhip of the Gods) is the ſame with their θεȣργία, *Theurgy,* the Magick of their Sacra or Theoſophy-Practic. *Jamblichus* ſaith of *Pythagoras* (c) he conjoined τὴν θείαν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ θεραπείαν, *Divine Philoſophy and Worſhip,* that is, θεολογίαν ϗ θεȣργίαν, *Theology* and *Theurgy,* as himſelf ſpeaketh elſewhere. Agreeably hereunto the Diſcipline of the *Magi* is called by *Plato Magagiſtia* or *Magachagiſtia* (not *Machagiſtia* as *Ammianus* hath it,) which is the ſame with μαγικὴ ἁγιστεία, *the Magical Sanctimony,* as is obſerv'd by (d) *Huetius.* Moreover, θεῶν θεραπεία, *the Worſhip of the Gods,* or μαγεία, *Magick,* ſignifieth in *Plato,* not only the Sacra of the Pagans Religious Worſhip, but the Art or Skill alſo which inſtituted thoſe Sacra, and the Diſcipline which govern'd them, as (e) *Ammianus* (f) and *Appuleius* underſtand *Plato* and the Perſian Magick, which *Appuleius* calleth *piam & Divina ſcientem, pious and skilful of Divine things.* So *Plato* ſufficiently explaineth his own Senſe, when in his *Sympoſium* he ſaith of the Order of Demons, (g) *By this Order all vaticination cometh to Men, and the Sacerdotal Art about Sacrifices, the Religious Myſtic Rites and Inchantments, and all Divination and Goety.* *Plato* deriveth the Pagans Sacra from the Inſtitution of Demons; therefore the ancient Perſian Magick which inſtituted their Sacra, was Art Magick in the foul Senſe. And this will be paſt doubt unto any, that conſider the accounts which are given us of the *Zoroaſtrian Magi,* (h) of their *Mantice* or Divination (that was their Profeſſion, and a Diſcipline that was πατροπαράδοτος, *deliver'd from Father to Son,*) their πυραθεῖα, *Septs or incloſures for fire,* their Magical Rods for ſtirring it, and mode of Divination by Rods, the Charm which they ſang in their ſacred Miniſtration, their Magical Rites of ſacrificing to the Water (deſcrib'd by *Strabo,*) and to the principle of Light and of Darkneſs (mixing the Blood of a Wolf

---

(w) *De C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 34.

(x) Τῆς ἱερᾶς ἁγιστείας ϗ τῆς θεȣργικῆς κοινωνίας θεῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπȣς. De Myſt. p. 15.

(y) Ὥσπερ λέγεται κατὰ τῶν μεμυημένων, ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον μετὰ θεῶν διάγȣσα.

(z) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 215. *Gothofred. exercit. in* 1 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16.

(a) Καὶ ὁλόκληρα καὶ ἀτρεμῆ ϗ ἁπλᾶ θεάματα τοῖς μύσταις προξενȣ͂σι καθορᾶν. In Polit. p. 372.

(b) *Intellect. Syſt. p.* 285, 286.

(c) *De vit. Pythag. p.* 139.

(d) *Dem. Ev. prop.* 4. *c.* 5.

(e) *l.* 23.

(f) *Apol.* 1.

(g) Διὰ τȣ́τȣ καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πᾶσα χωρεῖ, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς τελετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπῳδὰς καὶ τὴν μαντείαν πᾶσαν καὶ γοητείαν.

(h) *V. Seld. de D. Syr. p.* 243, &c. *Montacut. Orig. Eccleſ. T.* 1. *p.* 174. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 238. *L. Holſten. de vit. & Scr. Porphyr. p.* 57.

with the Herb *Omomi*, as is before ſaid,) which mode of ſacrificing was taught them by *Zoroaſter*, as *Plutarch* ſaith; their boaſts that the Gods appear'd to them (as *Clitarchus* in *Laertius* relateth,) the nature of the *Mithraic* Inſtitution, and that of *Arnobius*; *Age nunc veniat quis ſuper igneam zonam Magus interiore ab orbe Zoroaſtres*, &c. Theſe things with other of like Nature are plain and certain Indications, that the ancient *Perſian* * *Magiſm* was ſuperlative Sorcery and Wizzardiſm.

* *The Name* Magus *ex duabus Perſiſis vocibus conflatum eſt, quæ nihil ad Religionem ſpectans ſignificant, ſed Hominem breves aures habentem notant, qualem primum Diſciplinæ hujus Authorem fuiſſe perhibent.* Th. Grav. Annot. in Perſic. Evang. Verſ. Not. ad Matth. 2. 1.

But as if there was nothing of Sorcery and Witchcraft in the ancient *Perſian Magiſm*, this learned Author proceedeth to obſerve, that the word *μαγεία*, *Magick*, was firſt taken in a good Senſe. If it was firſt taken in a good Senſe, it ſignified ſome good thing: But ſuch is not θεῶν θεραπεία, *the Worſhip of the Gods* amongſt Chriſtian Theologers. If his meaning be, that the word μαγεία (Magick) was firſt taken in the Heathen Theologers good Senſe, both his diſcurſive Reaſon and his Language needeth emendation. And indeed the Language of his learned Volume needeth great emendation. For it is not *a Divine Monarchy* which the Pagans aſſerted, nor was *Plato a Divine Theogoniſt*, nor *Pythagoras* and *Plato Divine Philoſophers*, as this learned Author loveth to ſpeak: But theſe things and Perſons (and ſuch more) are *Pagan-Divine*, as Alien from what is truly Divine, as Polytheiſm and Idolatry is from true Religion. If Polytheiſm in their good Senſe is the Sin of Idolatry, why ſhould not Magick in their good Senſe be the Sin of Witchcraft? This learned Author might have obſerv'd, that γοητεία, (Goety) is ſometimes taken in the Pagan Theologers good Senſe, as well as μαγεία, (Magick) particularly in *Plato*'s *Sympoſium* above cited, (*i*) and in *Plotinus*. Yet *Goety* taken in ſuch good Senſe is nothing better than Witchcraft: Nor is *Magick* taken in ſuch good Senſe any thing better than Sorcery. And this appeareth from this learned Author's deſcription of *Zoroaſter*'s Divine Magick, which he maketh a diſtinct Species of Magick from *Theurgy* and *Goety*. For the Pagans Art Magick (*k*) pretendeth for the ground of it, συμπαθῆ εἶναι τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω, *that there is a Sympathy between the things above and the things below*. And an ἕνωσις ϗ συμπάθεια τοῦ παντὸς, *Union and Sympathy betwixt the parts and things of the Univerſe*. That by Virtue of *Similitude*, *Cognation and Sympathy* the things below are attractive of the things above and of their Influences, and ſeveral Natures are attractive of ſeveral Natures (thus the *Philtra* operate, ſaith *Ficinus*; and if the Hearts of *Crows*, *Moles* or *Hawks* be ſwallowed, they attract the Souls of thoſe Animals, which inable for Divination, ſaith *Porphyry*.) It pretendeth to ſearch out the Nature, Powers and Qualities of the Elements and their Parts (ſaith *Pſellus*) of Animals and all Plants, of Seeds, Stones and Herbs, and all the things of Nature, and inveſtigateth the Agreement and Diſſonancy of things; *for the Similitude of things is cauſe ſufficient to link them together*, (*l*) as *Proclus* affirmeth. The Obſervation of this Similitude and Sympathy of things was the Origin of the Pagans Sacerdotal-Religious Rites. *But the Authors of the Inſtitution of the ancient Prieſthood* (ſaith *Proclus*) *diſcern'd, that things ſimple and uncompounded are of the Propriety of a God* (as ſome things, Herbs, Stones, Animals, are of Order and Propriety Solar, others Lunar, and the like; (*yet that ſingly they were inſufficient for their purpoſe, to call the God to them*, * *and to procure the Preſence of a Divine Power*; *wherefore they mix'd ſeveral things together, and by this commixture attracted influxes upon us. But ſometimes one Herb or Stone is ſufficient for the Divine Operation, to procure the ſudden appearance of a God, as alſo for the keeping of him.* (*m*) *The Theurgic Art often compoundeth together Stones, Herbs, Animals, ſacred and perfect and deiform Species, and of all theſe maketh a perfect and pure receptacle for the Gods.* (*n*) And the Sacrifice of ſuch matter exciteth the Gods to appear. A taſt of this unſavoury Theurgical Magick is enough to ſatisfie them that can taſt, that *Zoroaſter*'s Divine Magick did not degenerate into *the Theurgical Magick and Goety* (and that in ſome of his Followers only, as our learned Author pretendeth,) but was *Originally* and *Natively* ſuch.

(i) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 256.

(k) *Gale ibid. p.* 236, 260, 261. 191, 193, 266, 248, 250, 199. 234.

(l) *De Sacrific. & Magia.*

* *Vid S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 24.

(m) *Jambl. de myſt. p.* 138, 139.

(n) *Ibid. v. Syneſ. de Inſomn. p.* 134.

IV. The Theology of the Zoroaſtrian Magi ſeemeth to be a *Native* of their own, no derivative from *Egypt*, though ſome of the learned (that have a peculiar fondneſs of deriving every thing from *Egypt*) ſay. (*o*) *Whatever Conceits* Zoroaſter *the Magician and the Perſians had touching* Oromazes *the lucid God, and* Arimanius *the Tenebricoſe*; *the Chaldeans touching the Planets, their Beneficent and Maleficent Deities*; *the Philoſophers touching contrary Principles*; *all theſe had their Origin from the moſt ancient Theology of the Egyptians.* This account of the Origin of the Theology of the Zoroaſtrian Magi is againſt the uſual Senſe of the Learned, the reports of moſt of the ancient Writers, it pretendeth to nothing of Reaſon, is againſt very plain and evident Reaſon. For (although much of Antiquity as well as Futurity is ἄδηλον, *in the Dark*, yet) theſe two things ſeem very plain and evident: *That the ancient Magi were orignally Perſian or Chaldean*; *and that their Theology was of their own growth, no Foreign Ware.* Becauſe the Name *Magus* is originally *Perſic*, and was the *Perſians* Name for their Sages or Sacerdotal Philoſophers, (*p*) as all Authors agree; though there might be Pagan Sages before the *Perſian*, yet there could be no *Magi* before them. But although their Name ſpeaketh them *Perſian*, they are not the leſs *Chaldean* Magi. (The *Babylonians* (*q*) are called *Perſians*, and *Babylon a Perſian City*; (*r*) in *Nonnus*'s Collections the *Chaldeans* are ſaid to be a *Perſian* Nation;) for whoſe Theology and Religion *Jamblichus* perſonating an Egyptian Prieſt hath ſo great Reſpect, (*s*) that he preferreth it before the *Egyptian*, (*t*) and ſetteth *the Chaldean Wiſe-men* before the *Egyptian Prophets* as their Seniors. *Ariſtotle* is alſo cited (*u*) by *Laertius* for the Seniority of the *Magi* (that they were the Egyptians Seniors;) there is great reaſon to think the ancient Zabii (*w*) of Name and Original *Chaldean*; and becauſe the Zoroaſtrian Magi were the firſt (*x*) that inſtituted a Den for their Initiations and their Sacra, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe them the Authors of their Myſtical Philoſophy of *Light* and *Darkneſs*, and conſequently, that the Ditheiſtick Doctrine touching a *Lucid* and *Tenebricoſe* Deity was originally theirs; and accordingly, the dark Principle beareth the Name of ὁ πονηρὸς δαίμων Περσῶν, *the evil Demon of the Perſians*. The Arcane Philoſophic Theurgical Theology was thought in

ancient

(o) *Marſham Can. Chron. p.* 205. *ed. Lipſ.*

(p *Huet. Dem. ev. p.* 133. *ed.* 2.

(q) *Seld. de D. Syr. p.* 112.

(r) *In Naz. n.* 67.

(s) *De Myſt. p.* 149.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 2.

(u) *In proœm.*

(w) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *S.* 1. & 2.

(x) *Porphyr. de antro p.* 253, 254.

ancient times originally *Chaldaic*, as appeareth from the Name of the *Chalday* Oracles; and becauſe it is *Fire-Theology* (whereas had it been originally *Egyptian*, it muſt have been *Water-Theology*,) it is originally *Perſian-Chaldean*; the Egyptians (y) according to *Pletho* deriv'd it from *Zoroaſter*; and that the Theology of the Magi was look'd upon as the prime Original Theology, appeareth from *Porphyry*'s account of *Pythagoras*. (z) *The most ſay, that he learned the Mathematical Sciences from the Egyptians, Chaldeans and Phenicians. For the Egyptians of old time minded Geometry, the Phenicians Arithmetic, the Chaldeans Aſtronomy.* (a) *But the Sanctimonies of the Gods and the other Inſtitutes of Life he receiv'd (as 'tis ſaid) from the Magi.* Agreeably hereunto the Orientals are in Scripture celebrated for their Wiſdom, 1 *King.* 4. 30. And with great conſent ancient Writers (*b*) aſcribe the beginning of Magick (which denoteth ſome Magical kind of Religion) to *Zoroaſter*; which agreeth with the report of *Patricides* and *Elmacinus* touching the Religion of the *Zabii*, (*c*) *that* Zoroaſter *was the Founder of it.* The Arabic Writers are not agreed, whether he was the Founder or only the Reformer of the Religion of the Magi: But they that ſuppoſe him the Founder of the Religion of the *Zabii*, muſt neceſſarily look upon his Theology as the prime leading Theology of the Oriental Pagans (and conſequently of the *Occidental*, which was deriv'd from the other;) as *Abul-pharagius* ſaith of the *Egyptians* (*d*) *they received Wiſdom and Learning from the Chaldeans.* The aſcription of the beginning of Magick to *Zoroaſter*, and the reports of Fame ſpeak him of great Antiquity, (*e*) which is acknowledg'd by the moſt judicious in theſe Affairs: But touching his Antiquity it is not eaſie to make a better Judgment than *Pletho* hath done. *Plutarch among the reſt reporteth, that he liv'd five Thouſand years before the Trojan Wars; which if it ſeem incredible, yet he is certainly the moſt ancient of all fam'd Wiſe-men and Law-givers.* There is nothing objected (*f*) againſt his ſuppos'd Antiquity, which may not be objected againſt the Antiquity of the Egyptian *Thoth* or *Hermes* (for ſome have queſtion'd, whether ever there was ſuch a Perſon, becauſe of the diſſonant and uncertain Accounts that are given of him;) the *fabuloſity* of his Age and the *diſagreement* of ancient Writers about it ſpeaketh his great Antiquity, and ought not to be objected to the prejudice of the repute thereof. We will therefore ſuppoſe, (*g*) that *Pletho* hath given a true Account of the Origin of *the Arcane Philoſophic-Theurgical Theology. Plato's Philoſophy*, (ſaith he) *is not a private Philoſophy of his own Inveſtigation, but that which deſcended to him from* Zoroaſter *by the Pythagoreans.* Pythagoras *learn'd it from the Magi, that deſcended from* Zoroaſter, *being converſant with them in* Aſia. *Chiefly, the Dogmata of* Zoroaſter *were received by the Prieſts of* Egypt, *which got them a great Fame.* To repreſent an Idea of this Zoroaſtrian Theology, ſometimes we muſt have recourſe to the *Magic or Chalday Oracles*, not as ſuppoſing them ſo ancient as the ancient Magi, but becauſe they contain ſeveral undoubted remains of their Theology, and becauſe they ſpeak the Senſe of thoſe Philoſophic Pagans (the Platoniſts,) that acknowledge them for true and genuine, and with *Syneſius* (a Philoſophic-paganizing Biſhop of the Chriſtian Church) account them ἱερὰ λόγια, *Holy Oracles.*

V. This Arcane Philoſophic Zoroaſtrian Inſtitution is an Inſtitution of the *Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theology complicate with Theurgy.* For whereas the true God is the Creator of the World, who is notic'd to all Men by the Light of Nature, this Theology pretendeth (with the *Gnoſticks*) that there is an higher Deity than the Creator, ſuch a Myſtic-Metaphyſical Deity that Mankind know nothing of him: So the Oracles ſay, (*h*) *The Father or the firſt Deity perfected all things* (the intelligible Idea's) *and delivered them to the ſecond Mind, who is He, whom all Mankind call the firſt God. Plato* therefore upbraided all Mankind with Ignorance of the firſt God, (*i*) *O ye Men, the Opificer of the World whom you account the firſt God, is not the firſt, but there is one before him.* (*k*) *The Father or firſt God was not known to Mankind* (ſaith *Eugubinus*) *they knew no further than the Creator of the World.* Philo, Nu*menius* and *Plotinus* ſay, *That the Father was not known to Mankind, inſomuch that the* Hebrews (ſaith he) *knew not the Father. They know and celebrate the Creator of the World, this is he whom they worſhip in their Synagogues; but this is the Son of God. The Father dwelt* ἐν ἀβάτοις, or was inacceſſibly recondite; and alike recondite and unknowable are the Sublimities of his Myſtic-Metaphyſical Devotioniſts, which are no other than the Myſtic Theology famous in the Church of *Rome*, which is thus defin'd by one of that Communion. (*l*) *The Myſtic Theology is the moſt ſecret Collocution of the Mind with God, the Intuition of the Divine Darkneſs, and a climbing up to God by the more ſecret and admirable methods, whereby through Contemplation one is rais'd to Unity it ſelf* (the Henotety) *by approaching more unto God, having left things ſenſible and the intellectual.* So ſaith *Plotinus.* (*m*) *As the Matter muſt be devoid of Form, to be receptive of the Forms of all things: So the Mind muſt be devoid of all Species, to be illuminated and repleniſh'd with the firſt Nature, and therefore muſt be ſegregate from all Externals, and intirely turn'd to that which is within, and muſt become* ἀνοήσαντα τὰ πάντα, ἀγνοήσαντα δὲ καὶ αὐτόν, *unknowing of all things even of it ſelf, to be capable of this Viſion and Converſe.* (*n*) *As Senſe and Motion muſt be laid aſleep for the vigorous exerciſe of Imagination, and Imagination for the vigorous exerciſe of Underſtanding: So he that would reach what is above Intellectual and Intelligible Nature, muſt perfectly paſs beyond what is intelligible, and leave behind his own Underſtanding, and ſilence all Intellection, that being reduc'd into the Primity* (Unity) *of himſelf, he may enjoy the Primity of the Univerſe. All Motion, multiplicity and determinate Conception muſt be expell'd out of the Mind;* (*o*) πῶς δ' ἂν τοῦτο γένοιτο; ἄφελε πάντα, *how may this be accompliſh'd? obliterate all things.* Of *Plotinus Porphyry* reporteth (in his Life) *That God who hath neither Form nor Idea, but is ſeated above Intellect and all that is Intelligible, ſometimes appear'd to him*, agreeably to his End and Scope, *which was to be united and conjoyned with the God above all* (to be one and the ſame with God, as *Plotinus* ſpeaketh:) but there is no attaining the ſight and fruition of this Deity

by

(y) *Ap. Eugub. de Per. Phil. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(z) De vit. Pythag. p. 182.

(a) Περὶ δὲ τὰς τῶν θεῶν ἁγιστείας, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ περὶ τὸν βίον ἐπιτηδευμάτων παρὰ τῶν Μάγων φησὶ διακοῦσαί τε καὶ λαβεῖν.

(b) *Huet. ſupr. Montacut. orig. Eccl. T.* 1. *p.* 195.

(c) Selden. *de J. nat. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 53, 54. *Hiſt. or. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *ed.* 1.

(d) *Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 41.

(e) Selden. *ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 19. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 184.

(f) Marſham. *ſupr. p.* 144.

(g) *Ap. Eugub. de Per. Phil. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(h) Πάντα γὰρ ἐξετέλεσε πατὴρ καὶ νῷ παρέδωκε Δευτέρῳ, ὃν πρῶτον κλήζετ' ἅπαν γένος ἀνδρῶν.

(i) Euſeb. *pr. ev. l.* 11. *c.* 18. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 297.

(k) *Eugub. de Per. Phil. p.* 8, 68, 70, 75, 104.

(l) *Myſtica Theologia eſt ſecretiſſima mentis cum Deo loquutio, divinæ caliginis intuitio, & ad Deum per ſecretiora & admirabiliora ſcanſio, qua per contemplationem quis erigitur uſque ad ipſam unitatem, Deo magis appropinquando, relictis ſenſualibus & intellectualibus.* Syntax. Art. Mirabil. l. 6. c. 4.

(m) *En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 7.

(n) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 342, 527.

(o) *Plotin. En.* 5 *l.* 3. *c.* 17.

by the Underſtanding, but only (as the Oracles ſpeak) *by the flower of the Mind* (the Henotety or Heniadic Power of the Soul) which is that which the Myſticks of the Church of *Rome* call *The Fund of the Spirit.* (p) *Their Union with God in the Fund of the Spirit, their Deiformity, their abſtracted and ſupereſſential Life, their contemplative Life in the ſtate of Quieſcency* (wherein all the Actions of the Soul are ſuſpended) *their internal and external Solitude, Viſions, Raptures* (with other Matters of their Myſtical Divinity) are no other than ſo many Branches of this Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theology of the Oracles (that ſpeak of *abſtracting from the Body*, and of *the Soul's being inebriated by God*, which *Pſellus* expoundeth of Divine Illumination and Extaſies) and of the *Platoniſts* their Admirers and Followers.

But in this *Zoroaſtrian* Inſtitution the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theology is complicate with *Theurgy*, according to that of the Oracles.

——Ἱερῷ λόγῳ ἔργον ἑνώσας.

Conjoyning ſacred Word and Work.

The holy Work is the Teleſtick Buſineſs, ſaith *Pletho. The Oracle meaneth, that to the Sacred Doctrine the uſe of the Sacred Rites and Myſteries muſt be adjoyned* πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναγωγὴν, *for the Reduction* (or Subvection) *of the Soul. Pſellus* thus explaineth the Oracle; *The Vehicle of the Soul muſt be corroborated by the material Myſtic Rites. The Oracle ſuppoſeth the Soul to be purg'd by Stones, Herbs and Charms,* ϗ εὔλεγχον τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν, *and ſo to become agile and nimble for her aſcent.* In every Religion both its Inſtitutes and its δογματικὰ θεωρήματα, or Doctrines muſt be conſider'd: So in this Inſtitution the Religious Rites and Inſtitutes which are θεουργία (Theurgy) are conjoyn'd with (q) θεολογία, *Theology Doctrinal.*

VI. By this *Zoroaſtrian* Inſtitution therefore the Philoſophic Pagans were inſtituted *both Myſtic-Metaphyſical and Myſtic-Theurgical Saintiſts.* For it is an Inſtitution of Arcane *God-Society, Sanctity* and *Beatitude*, that by its Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theology inſtituted them, to be *Myſtic-Metaphyſical* Saintiſts: And by its Theurgy inſtituted them, to be *Myſtic-Theurgical* Saintiſts. So in *Hierocles* there is a two-fold Reduction of the Soul: The one is the *Myſtic-Metaphyſical*, (r) *the reductive Solution is the Metaphyſical Contemplation of the things that truly are*; the other is the *Myſtic-Theurgical*, (s) *the Hieratic method of Reduction.* Upon account of theſe two Salutary Methods the Family of the *Platoniſts* was divided into *Philoſophi & Hieratici*, (t) *thoſe of the Philoſophic and thoſe of the Hieratic way.* Thoſe that will have Union with the Gods and Beatitude acquir'd by Philoſophy alone as ſufficient, are *Philoſophi* ſtrictly ſo called (ſuch as *Plotinus* and *Porphyrius*;) which are contradiſtinguiſh'd to the *Hieratici* (ſuch as *Jamblichus, Syrianus* and *Proclus*) whoſe way is, to conduct Men to Union with the Gods and Beatitude by the Sacred Symbols, Rites and Myſteries in the Theurgical way. But as the two Methods of the Reduction of the Soul, ſo theſe two ways of attaining *Union with the Gods and Beatitude* are not ſo oppoſite, but that they are very well conſiſtent; and ſo are theſe two methods of purging the Soul, the one *the Myſtic-Metaphyſical*, the other *the Myſtic-Theurgical.* The former of theſe chiefly conſiſteth (u) in a Receſs from material Cogitations, a Repleniſhment from Intellect and that which truly is (w) in the Soul's collecting her ſelf from the Body into her ſelf, and in an Apathy as to the Body; by which Apathy (being purg'd from Sympathy with the Body) ſhe gaineth another Apathy, becometh devoid of the Bodily Paſſions, wholly an intellectual Soul. Such is *Plato*'s method of purging the Soul (when the Soul forſaketh the Body, and will not communicate with it, but live by her ſelf as much as is poſſible; this is call'd in his *Phædo* κάθαρσις, λύσις ϗ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς, *the Purgation, Solution and Separation of the Soul*) which is contradiſtinct to the Myſtic-Theurgical method *of Teleſtick Purgations by Rites and Symbols.* The *Teletæ* or Theurgic Conſecrations which (x) S. *Auſtin* diſcourſeth of from *Porphyry*, are ſaid to have *the virtue of purging the Soul and rendring her fit to ſee the Gods*, thoſe φάσματα θεῖα, *Divine Apparitions*, μακάρια θεάματα, *Beatific ſights*, (y) that are in Theurgy; the Gifts and Effects whereof are ſaid to be *Health of Body, Purity of Mind, Virtue of the Soul, and the Reduction of all things in us to their proper Principles, Divine Love, Incredible Joy, Truth, Power, excellent Performances, and the Gifts of the greateſt Goods.* (z) *It is generally acknowledg'd, that the Myſteries and the Teletæ reduce and raiſe Souls from the in-material and mortal kind of Life, and conjoyn them with the Gods.* Great Effects are aſcrib'd to the *Teletæ* (the *Teletæ* of the *Sun, Moon, Mithras*, and *Bacchus*) inſomuch that *Syneſius* ſaith of them, (a) *we may not disbelieve the Teletæ ſo well known.* They are ſo well known indeed, that they are rightly call'd by *Theodoret* (b) τῶν δαιμόνων τελεταί, *the myſterious Rites of the evil Demons and their worſhip.*

VII. The grand Theory fundamental to this Inſtitution of Theurgical Sanctity is *the Deſcent and Reaſcent of Souls.* For the Buſineſs of the Theology and Religion of the ancient Magi, as the *Arabic* Writers relate, was (c) *the magnifying Light and the eſchewing Darkneſs*; (*Plutarch* ſaith, *They wore a white and ſhining Garment againſt Hades and Darkneſs,*) *all their Diſputations were about two Fundamentals: The firſt is, a Declaration of the cauſe of the mixture of the Light and the Darkneſs; the ſecond is, a Declaration of the cauſe of the Liberation of the Light from the Darkneſs; and that mixture they call* (Initium) *the Entrance, that Liberation, the Return.* The Arabic word מברא which D. *Pocock* rendreth *Initium*, I have render'd *the Entrance* (according that of *Varro*, (d) when Soul and Body *in unum ineunt*, this is call'd *Initia*) with reſpect to the Soul's *entrance* into the Body. For this Theology of the *Magi* is Enigmatical and Symbolical, and is thus rightly explain'd. (e) *The* Magi *diſputed touching the deſcent of the Soul into the Body, which they call'd the mixture of the Light and the Darkneſs, but the Greeks* κάθοδον, *the Deſcent; and touching the Liberation of the Light from the Darkneſs, which the Greeks call* ἄνοδον, *the Re-aſcent.* (f) *So the* Perſians (ſaith *Porphyry*) *myſtically ſignifying the deſcent of Souls and their egreſs back again, they call the place into which Souls deſcend, a Den.* Zoroaſter *having firſt of all* (as *Eubulus* hath related) *conſecrated a native Den or Cave adorn'd with Flowers and water'd with Fountains in the Mountains near* Perſis, *to the honour of* Mithras *the Maker and Father of all things; this Cave or Den being to him an Image of the World which* Mithras *made.* The lively Lineaments of this *Zoroaſtrian*

(p) *V.* Caſaubon *of Enthuſiaſm* c.3. *p.*113, *&c.* Dr. Stillingfl. *Anſw. to* Creſſy's *Ep. Apol. p.*126, &c.

(q) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 174, &c.

(r) Ἀνάγωγος λύσις ἡ διαλεκτικὴ τῶν ὄντων ἐποπτεία.

(s) Ἡ ἱερατικὴ ἀναγωγή. *In Aur. Carm. p.* 305.

(t) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 213, 252.

(u) Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ. p.*143. Salmaſ. *in* Epict. *p.*16.

(w) Porph. *Sent. p.* 239, 240. Ficin. *in* Plot. *p.*10.

(x) *De C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 9.

(y) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 23, 47, 51, 53.

(z) Procl. *in Polit. p.* 369.

(a) Οὐ θέμις ἀπιστεῖν ἐγνωσμένων τῶν τελετῶν. *De Inſ. p.*140.

(b) Θερ. π. p. 7.

(c) Pocock. *Specim. p.* 146. & Plutarch. *Qu. Rom. p.* 270.

(d) *De L.L. p.* 17.

(e) Gale *Not. in* Jambl. *p.* 185.

(f) *De Antro. p.* 253, 254. *vid.* Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 101, 102. Plotin. *En.* 4. *l.*8. *c.*1.

Zoroaſtrian Inſtitution appear in the *Mithraic* Inſtitution, (which was in honour of *Mithras*, (*g*) and a Den or Cave was the μυστικὸς οἶκος, *Myſtic Houſe of the* Mithraicks, wherein they had their Initiation into their horrendous *ſacra*) which therefore doubtleſs is a Deſcendent from the ancient *Magi*. Such was alſo the *Pythagoric* Inſtitution, as we have ſeen from *Porphyry*, (*h*) from whom alſo it appeareth, that the ancient *Magi* were great *Aſceticks*, not eating nor killing Animals, and that the chief of the *Magi* continu'd this Abſtinence in after-times; that *Pythagoras* learned his Abſtinence from his Maſter *Zabratus*, and had his Den near *Samos* in imitation of the *Magi*. His Doctrine of the Soul's *Immortality* and of the *Tranſmigration* of Souls was deriv'd from the *Magi*, as alſo that other *of the periodical Revolution of all things, and that there is nothing new*; as *Theopompus* reporteth the Doctrine of the Magi; *that men ſhould live again and become immortal, and that all things having their Circuits and Revolutions there is a permanency and continuance of all things.* (*i*) Moſt Men accounted him a Follower of *Zoroaſter*, and he is thought to have learn'd from his Maſter *Zabratus* (*by whom he was purg'd from all the filth of his former life*) the *Teleſtic Purgations* and Hieratic Method *of the Reduction* of the Soul, which were one part of his Inſtitution, according to that of *Hierocles*, (*k*) *Philoſophy is conjoyn'd with the Art of Sacred Inſtitutes.* The deſign of this Compoſition of Philoſophy and Theurgy was, (*l*) *the Reduction* (or Subvection) *of the Soul to the true Goods, and to ſet her free from the troubles that are here, as out of a Den of in-material Life*; which is manifeſtly the ſame deſign with that of the ancient Magi, and of the *Egyptians* alſo in their Philoſophic Inſtitution of Theurgy. *For the Theurgiſts did not trouble the Divine Mind about little things,* (*m*) *but about the things that concern the Purgation, Solution, and Salvation of the Soul.* (*n*) *The Scope of the Religious Myſteries is, to reduce Souls to that final ſtate, which was original to them, and from which they made their deſcent.* It is thought (*o*) that *Homer* was inſtructed in the *Egyptians* Theurgical Theology, and underſtood this grand Theory, which ſuppoſeth, (*p*) *Souls to deſcend from on high, to ſerve in the Body for ſome time, and then to return again*; that his *Antrum Nympharum* repreſenteth and ſignifieth this inferiour Orb of Corruption into which Souls (which are the Nymphs) deſcend; and that by the two Gates thereof, the one *Northern* the other *Southern*, they deſcend and re-aſcend (*q*).

—— —— —— —— Janua duplex
Hæc Boream ſpectans homines admittit, at illa
Reſpiciens Auſtrum divinior, invia prorſus
Eſt homini, præbetque viam immortalibus unis.

The principal matters of this grand Theory as *Proclus* ſuppoſeth, (*r*) are compriz'd by him in ten *Demiurgic Laws* or Laws of Fate (in great part Laws of Fancy) which he collecteth from *Plato*'s *Timæus*. The Demiurgus having compos'd the Soul of the World of a certain mixture of *Number-Ingredients*, and particular Souls * out of the remains of it (according to *Plato*'s fanciful way of philoſophizing) *Theſe Souls in their immaterial or ethereal Vehicles are diſtributed and diſſeminated about their ſocial Stars. There is one Deſcent common to all Souls in every periodical Circumvolution of the Univerſe. The Soul which deſcendeth, in the firſt Generation, deſcendeth into a Religious Animal. The Soul which deſcendeth into Humane Nature, firſt deſcendeth into the Geniture of a Man. The Soul in the Body* (*s*) *is conjoyn'd with the material Lives, which have their Origin from the Soul. The Soul which maſtereth the material Life* (of Senſe and Paſſion) *is juſt and liveth juſtly; but if maſter'd thereby, is unjuſt. The juſt returneth to the ſocial Star. He that is unjuſt or criminal deſcendeth again in a ſecond Generation into a Woman's Nature,* (which implyeth, (*t*) that Women have their origin from the Putrefaction of Men, from their degenerate, timid, unjuſt, intemperate Souls.) *If that Criminality of his continueth during the ſecond Generation, he muſt be chang'd into ſuch a Brute as he reſembleth in Manners.* The laſt and principal of the Demiurgic Laws is; *There is no other way, to ſave the Soul, to put an end to her Troubles, and ceaſe the Circuit of wandring in Generation, but by a Life reductive of the Soul to her Priſtine Habit.* In which *Demiurgic Laws* and *Platonic Salvation* (wherein the Souls (*u*) called Ἄχραντοι ψυχαί, *impollute Souls*, have no concern; for theſe deſcend to declare the Gods, for the welfare of this lower Region, to purifie and perfect the things that are here, are unprejudic'd by their deſcent and are free from the Evils of Generation,) there is nothing of true and ſaving Religion, nothing of a *Divine Cabala*, nor any Traduction from *the Hebrew Theology*, nor do they ſufficiently illuſtrate the grand Theory *touching the deſcent and reaſcent of Souls*; for the due illuſtration whereof theſe four things (compris'd in it) are of good obſervation.

(1.) *The original ſublime condition of the Soul* agreeable to the tenour of the Pagan Theology in general, which deriveth Souls from Heaven and the Stars; (*w*) for *noſtros animos deduci e cœlo, reduci in cœlum, that our Souls come from Heaven and return thither*, was the uſual maxim. The *Stoicks* thus far agree with the *Platoniſts* and the *Chaldaic* Theology; they ſuppoſe, that the Humane Soul is of a luminous fiery nature, a Deſcendent from Heaven, the Gods and Stars, and thither ſome of them return it after ſeparation from the Body. Theſe ſublime Speculations touching the Origin of the Humane Soul (which otherwiſe would deſerve an applauſe) the Pagan Theologers have intermix'd with much of enormous Phantaſtry and Extravagance. For as the *Stoicks* derive the Soul or Animative Principle even of Brute-Animals from Heaven: So it appeareth from ſeveral paſſages in *Plato*, (*x*) that he ſuppos'd the Souls of Brutes, to be diſtributed and diſſeminated about their Social Stars as well as the Humane Souls; and according to this Philoſopher, the Swans ſing moſt, when they diſcern their approaching death, becauſe they preſage, that they ſhall ſpeedily go to that God (*Apollo*) whoſe Family they are of. The condition of the Humane Soul in her Original State (according to this Philoſopher,) is that of a Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theamatiſt, (*y*) *aſcending to the top of Heaven, and beholding in the ſupercœleſtial place* (which *Origen* thinketh, *Plato* traduc'd from the *Hebrews*) *the ſights of the happy Theamatiſts.* So in his *Phædrus* in a ſtrain of Poetic

(g) Beyer. *addit. ad* Selden. *p.* 272, &c.

(h) *De Abſt. l.* 4. *S.* 16. *de vit. Pythag. p.* 184. L. Holſten. *de vit. & Scr.* Porphyr. *p.* 73, 74, 80, 81.

(i) Seld. *de D. Syr. p.* 137, 150. Lil. Gyral. Pythag. *Symb. p.* 92.

(k) Συνάπτεται τῇ τῶν ἱερῶν τέχνῃ ἡ φιλοσοφία. *In aur. Carm. p.* 306.

(l) Ἀναγαγεῖν πρὸς τὰ ὄντως καλά· ἀπολῦσαι ἢ τῶν τῇδε πόνων, ὡς ἐκ τινὸς καταγείου σπηλαίου τῆς ἐνύλου ζωῆς. *Ibid. p.* 310.

(m) Ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν εἰς ψυχῆς κάθαρσιν καὶ ἀπόλυσιν καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀνηκόντων. Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 178.

(n) Σκοπὸς τῶν τελετῶν ἐστιν, εἰς τέλος ἀναγαγεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκεῖνο, ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὴν πρώτην ἐποιήσαντο κάθοδον ὡς ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς. Martin. *Lex. in voce Myſterium.*

(o) Marſham. *Can. Chron. p.* 270. *ed.* Lipſ.

(p) *Orac. Mag. p.* 25.

(q) *Odyſſ.* 13. *v.* 109.

(r) *In* Tim. *p.* 331.

* Plato *elſewhere ſuppoſeth Souls exiſtent from Eternity.*

(s) Ficin. *in* Plotin. *p.* 1-7.

(t) J. Bapt. *Criſp. Quin. prin. p.* 353, &c.

(u) Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 271.

(w) Macr. *in Somn. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 9. Lipſ. *Phyſ. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 8, 9, 14 Gaſſen. *T.* 2. *p.* 239.

(x) J. Bapt. Criſp. *p.* 123, 435.

(y) Πεφυκείας ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἁψῖδα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπερουρανίῳ τόπῳ θεωρεῖν τὰ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων θεατῶν θεάματα. Orig. *c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 159. & *l.* 6. *p.* 288.

Phancy (z) he repreſenteth *Jupiter agitating a winged Chariot conducting an Army of Gods aud Demons, and follow'd by Souls to the Felicitative Viſion of the Super-celeſtial place (where is the Field of what is Truth and the Meadow, and where they behold Juſtice it ſelf, Temperance and Science, the Intelligible Pulchritude and the Divine Idea's;)* which happy Viſion he calleth *a Banquet* (the Nutriment and Feſtivity of Souls,) an agreeable Repaſt for *Platonic* Theoriſts, and for ſuch is *Plato*'s Heaven and for none other.

(2.) *The Cauſe of the Soul's deſcent* (touching which (*a*) the *Platoniſts* have very various Sentiments) which according to *Plato* in his *Phædrus* is a failure of the *Platonic* Viſion and an Ineptitude thereto. *The Law of* Adraſtia *is this* (ſaith he;) *that every Soul which accompanying the God to the Banquet ſhall behold ſomething of the things that are true, remain unprejudic'd till the next Circuit of the Heavens, and if ſhe can always do this, that ſhe always remain unhurt. But when ſhe is impotent and cannot reach, but faileth of the Viſion, and having ſuſtained ſome miſhap, and being replete with Oblivion and Pravity is become heavy, and in this unwieldineſs her Wings fall off, and ſhe falleth to the Earth, then the Law is, that ſuch a Soul ſhall not go into any Brutal Nature in the firſt Generation; but a Soul that hath been the greateſt Theamatiſt, muſt be the Soul of a Philoſopher, or a lover of Beauty, or a Muſical and Amatorious Perſon. A ſecondary Soul muſt be the Soul of a legitimate King or of a Man of War:* And alike diſpoſal he maketh of other Souls in a way of ludicrous toying rather than of ſolid ſerious philoſophizing. But if the cauſe of the Soul's deſcent be (*b*) λήθη καὶ πτερορρύησις, *obliviouſneſs and her Wings falling off*, her deſcent was a miſchance: If her deſcent was (*c*) διὰ τὴν αὐτεξούσιον ῥοπὴν, *by her autexouſious Propenſion* and (*d*) αὐτοθελῶς, *ſelf-choſen*, it was her Crime; if Souls are (*e*) ἐπὶ δίκῃ καὶ κρίσει, *judicially ſent down hither*, and the Body be their *Priſon*, *Sepulchre*, and the *Bonds* of the Soul, her Deſcent was her Puniſhment. But as ſometimes this Philoſopher (*Plato*) conſidereth not the Body as a Priſon or Sepulchre, nor the World as a Den, but as a beautiful Fabrick: So he ſometimes waveth the conſideration of other cauſes of the deſcent of Souls, and repreſenteth it as (*f*) an effect of the Divine Goodneſs and Providence *for the Ornament and Perfection of the World of Animals, and becauſe thoſe kinds of Animals which are in the Intelligible World ought to be in the Senſible.* The deſcent of Souls is ſaid to be requiſite alſo (*g*) for the exerciſe of their lower Powers, and the diſplay of them in the matter, that they might have experience of Evil, take care of things Mortal, do ſervice for the generation of the things of Nature, and for variety ſake there muſt be aſcending and deſcending; for κάματός ἐστι τοῖς αὐτοῖς μοχθεῖν, *it is one ſort of Defatigation to be tir'd with the ſame things*, as *Heraclitus* ſaith. The deſcent of Souls therefore (*h*) ſubſerveth the wiſe and good Ends of Providence, whether it proceeds from Neceſſity or Liberty, Fate or Choice, or (as *Plotinus* ſuppoſeth) a Mixture and Complication of both theſe, from an impotency of converſing always with the Intelligibles, a defect and obliviouſneſs of the Soul; from an innate Inſtinct and Propenſion to the Body, or an affectionate Inclination to that particular Animal which every Man is; or whether they be drawn down ἴυγγι τινὶ φυσικῇ, *by ſome natural Inticement*, or a Pleaſure which they take in Generation; for (according to *Heraclitus*) theſe *Naiades* delight to dabble in Humidity. The *Pythagoreans* complain of the Soul's deſcent as hugely Criminal in it ſelf and Penal in its Conſequences. *For Man falleth from the happy Region*, (*i*) *by being a Fugitive and Wanderer from God* (the *Platonic* Divine Intellect) *complying with a mad kind of Strife or Contention*, that of the lower part of the Soul againſt the higher, whence *Heraclitus* ſaith, (*k*) πόλεμος πατὴρ πάντων, *War or Strife is the Father of all things*, becauſe it is the Origin of Generation. But the *Pythagoreans* and the old Theologers did not only ſuppoſe the deſcent of Souls, to be penal in its Conſequences, but formally and in it ſelf penal; for *Empedocles*'s Doctrine was, (*l*) *that there is a Law, that ſinning Souls ſhould deſcend hither.* And theſe have Bodies and all the Circumſtances of Life allotted to them agreeably to their Merits. (*m*) *Thoſe of the elder times ſay, that the Soul ſuffereth Puniſhment, and that we live in a ſtate of Chaſtiſement for ſome great Sins.* The Doctrine of the ancient Magi appeareth from the Account (*n*) which *Abu Ali Ebn Sennæ* giveth of the *Arabians* Doctrine; *ſubſcribing to the Judgment of the Magi they are of Opinion, that the Retention and Incarceration of the Soul in this Elementary World is her Penal and Calamitous State.* (*o*) This was the Doctrine *of the Ancient Theologers and Diviners* (as *Philolaus* the *Pythagorean* affirmeth) and therefore of the ancient Magi. If the old Theologers the Inſtitutors of the Sacred Ceremonies in divers Nations acknowledg'd no other Infernal Region ſave only the Body, as *Macrobius* affirmeth, (*p*) the original and principal deſign of the Pagans in their Inſtitution of Religion was *the liberation and reduction of the Soul.* Agreeably to thoſe old Theologers the *Chalday* Oracles repreſent the Circumterraneous Region and the Terreſtrial *Hyle* as the Infernal Region (*q*).

Μηδὲ κάτω νεύσῃς εἰς τὸν μελαναυγέα κόσμον
Ὧ βυθὸς αἰὲν ἄπιστος, ὑπέστρωται τε καὶ ἅδης.

Do not bend downwards to this every way tenebricoſe World, whoſe bottom is profoundity always unſtable (that is the matter) *and Hades.*

(3.) *The Evils conſequent upon the Souls deſcent*, which are a vaſt Tragedy of Human *Folly*, *Pravity*, *Ignobleneſs* and *Infelicity*, (*r*) ταραχῆς ἐνύλου καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ γενέσει πόνων, *of in-material Perturbation and the toils and troubles in Generation*, and in the World (call'd by *Plato* ἀνομοιότητος τόπος, *the place of diſſimilitude*) the Region of *Ate* (*s*) *where there are Sholes of all ſorts of Miſchiefs.* (*t*) *It is not natural to the Soul, to live with Bodies and in Generation: But on the contrary a ſeparate, immaterial, incorporeal Life is rather agreeable to Souls. When they live in Generation therefore they are like to Men, that dwell in a Peſtilent Region: But when they live out of Generation, as* Plato *ſaith, they are like thoſe that dwell in Meadows. As therefore it is not to be admir'd, if ſuch as inhabit Peſtilent places be moſt of them unhealthful, and but few conſerve their natural Health: So neither ought you to wonder, that Souls in Generation are moſt of them bad and obnoxious to Paſſions. The deſcent of the Soul into the Body hath ſeparated her from thoſe*

(z) Plotin. *En.* 5. *l.* 8. c. 10. *Souls conſiſt of the ſacred Forms and the Divine Symbols*, ſaith *Pſellus.* Orac. mag. p. 106.

(a) Plotin. *En.* 4. *l.* 8. c. 1. Gale *in* Jambl. *p.* 193. Celſ. *ap.* Orig. *l.* 8. *p.* 412.

(b) Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 339.

(c) *Ibid.* *p.* 338.

(d) Simpl. *in* Epict. *c.* 34.

(e) Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ.* *p.* 113, 114.

(f) Plotin. *ſupr.* J. B. *Criſp. p.* 134. Eugub. *de Per. Phil. l.* 9. *c.* 29.

(g) Liv. *Galant. Compar. p.* 328. Procl. *de An. & Dæm. p.* 193. Niceph. *Schol. in Syneſ. p.* 386. Plotin. *ſupr.*

(h) Plotin. *ibid. c.* 5. Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 324. Ficin. *in* Plotin. *p.* 17, 70. Wander. *de vit. funct. S.* 5. Porphyr. *de Antr. p.* 256, 261.

(i) Φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης, νείκει μαινομένῳ πίσυνος. Empedocl. *ap.* Hierocl. *in Aur. Carm. p.* 254.

(k) Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 54.

(l) Ἁμαρτανούσαις νόμον εἶναι ταῖς ψυχαῖς πεσεῖν ἐνταῦθα. Plotin. *ſupr. c.* 1. Orig. *c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 26.

(m) Jambl. προτρεπ. *p.* 53.

(n) Windet. *ſupr.*

(o) Clem. *Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 316.

(p) *Hoc animæ ſepulchrum, hoc Ditis concava, hoc Inferos vocaverunt.* In ſomn. Scip. l. 1. c. 10.

(q) Syneſ. *de* Inſomn. *p.* 140.

(r) Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 338.

(s) Ἔνθα φόνος τε κότος τε καὶ ἄλλων ἔθνεα κηρῶν. Hierocl. in aur. car. p. 254.

(t) Procl. *de An. & Dæm. p.* 250, 238.

Divine Minds, by whom ſhe was repleniſh'd with Intelligence, Power and Purity; but hath conjoyn'd her to Generation and Nature, and to material things, by which ſhe is imbu'd with Oblivion, Error and Ignorance. (u) *What is it that hath cauſed Souls to forget God (the Platonic Divine Intellect) and being originally Divine and wholly his, to be ignorant both of themſelves and of him? The beginning of Evil to them is Audaciouſneſs, Geneſis, their firſt Diverſity or Segregation, and becauſe they would be by themſelves and their own.* Having made a great departure, *they are become ignorant, that their Original is from thence, as Children that are preſently taken from their Parents, and educated for a long time a great way off, neither know themſelves nor their Parents; undervaluing and making themſelves mean* ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ γένους, *through their ignorance of the nobleneſs of their Pedigree, and honouring and admiring thoſe inferior things.* (w) *Their Propenſion to the Earth ſheweth, that their departure from God hath hurt their Intellectuals; for the moſt are bad, under the Power of the ſenſitive Propenſion,* φρενοβλαβεῖς, ἀνόητοι, *ſottiſh, delirous and ſuch as are fallen into madneſs* (devoid of the principal Operations of Mind and Intellect.) The deſcent of Souls importeth the loſs (x) of their νοερὰ εὐζωΐα, *intellectual happy Life* (the Platonic Contemplation) *perfect ignorance of that which truly is, obtenebration and infantility followeth upon their deſcent into Generation (which beſmeareth them with humidity)* and the Soul is ſaid to fall (y) εἰς βόρβορον σκοτεινόν, *into the tenebricoſe Dirt.* (z) *The Soul is inveloped in darkneſs by the Body, which he that ſhall call the River* Ameleta, *or the Water of* Lethe, *or Ignorance and Madneſs, or the Bonds of the Soul, or the Privation of Life, or any other Evil, doth not ſufficiently expreſs the incongruity of it.* So *Plato* in his *Phædo* enumerating the calamitous things, which imbodied Souls are incumbred with, complaineth of (*a*) *the loſs of Intellect and the inordinacy of Animal Paſſions* (*b*) *of Error and Madneſs, of Fears and wild kind Loves and other Human Evils*; and the material Conſiſtence (the Body) is call'd by this Philoſopher (*c*) πόντος ϗ θάλασσα ϗ κλύδων, *a tumultous Sea.* The Animal Nature is ſaid to be (*d*) *an Alien Animal, that accrueth to us from Generation, which ſome call a many headed Beaſt, (Plotinus* calleth it θηρίον ζωωθὲν, *a wild Beaſt enliven'd,) ſome the Mortal kind of life, others the Generation-kind of Nature, the Pythagoric Verſes call it connate Strife or Contention.* (*e*) Becauſe the Body is inimical to Philoſophic Theory (by the various impoſtures of Senſe and Diſturbances from thence, the various Paſſions of it, which fill the mind with all ſorts of Phantaſms and Nugacities, by the multifarious needs and concerns of it, which bring upon us μυρίας ἀσχολίας, *innumerable Buſineſſes,* as *Plato* ſaith,) the goodly things of Human Life are a meer *Sciagraphy* or Adumbration of the things that truly are, and becauſe the Soul is here in a State of Puniſhment, *the Conjunction of Soul and Body is like the device of the Tyrant* Mezentius, *a tying the living and dead together.* The Poet ſpeaketh the Philoſophers Senſe, when he ſaith, that (*f*) Obtenebration and Animal Paſſion accrueth to imbodied Souls.

Hinc metuunt, cupiuntque, dolent, gaudentque, nec auras
Suſpiciunt, clauſæ tenebris & carcere cæco.

(4.) *The Sanctity of the Philoſophic Pagans* viſible in this ſtrain of Philoſophy; for much of it conſiſteth in a Philoſophic Averſation *from Terreſtrial Matter and Body*, the Generation-kind of Nature, and an Affectation of *Incorporealneſs, Immaterialiſm and Intellectualiſm.* (g) *Philoſophy deſigneth the Purgation of the Soul from Corporeity; for if the Soul departeth pure, carrying along with her nothing of the Body (having in the time of Life disjoin'd her ſelf from Commerce with it) ſhe goeth to what is like her ſelf, Divine, Immortal and Wiſe: But if the Soul departeth polluted and not clean from the Body, ſhe carryeth with her what is heavy and terrene* (ſaith *Plato*,) *and is drawn again into this viſible place.* (*h*) *That the Soul may return to her own things*, ſhe muſt put off πᾶν τὸ ὑλικὸν καὶ θνητὸν, *whatever is Material and Mortal and diveſt her ſelf of all things of the mortal Nature which ſhe hath aſſum'd, together with her Propenſion towards theſe things, which was cauſal of her deſcent.* The Scope and Buſineſs of Philoſophy (the Myſtic-Metaphyſical and Myſtic-Theurgical is, (*i*) *to undertake the Celeſtial Journey, to be conjoin'd to the intellectual Gods, to be ſegregate from Material Nature, and to be carryed to an immaterial and pure Life. The Philoſophers concern is for the Mind, not to Symbolize or Sympathize with the Body; he is not taken with Precioſities of Apparel, nor followeth bodily Pleaſure, which as it were* προσηλοῖ αὐτὴν καὶ προσπερονᾷ, *naileth and affixeth her to the Body*, (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) *maketh her corporeous, of a bodily Genius and full of the bodily Nature.* (*k*) *He ſtudieth to be unlike the bad Men and Genii that take delight in what is Mortal and Material.* And his Cathartic Virtues (*l*) *intirely ſeparate and looſen the Soul from the truly plumbeous Weights of Generation, ſo that ſhe may fly from the things that here without let or impediment.* So the Buſineſs of *Syneſius*'s Piety, the Summ of his Prayers and the burden of his Song is, (*m*) *That he may flee from the miſchief of the Body, and being purged from the Matter* (which theſe Philoſophers (*n*) ſuppos'd the Origin of Evil) *and avoiding the voracious Barkings of the Matter, he may take a ſwift leap to the Manſions of the Father, whence the Soul iſſueth.* Agreeably to this their Averſation from Material (Innocent) Nature and Philoſophic Affectation of *Immaterialiſm*, the Platoniſts ſuppos'd, *that nothing ſenſible ought to be offer'd to the God over all,* (*o*) *for there is nothing Material, which is not impure and unclean to that which is Immaterial. Euſebius* alſo in his humour of Philoſophic-Paganizing and in compliance with theſe Metaphyſical Immaterialiſts, although he could not but know, that the Crown of our Religious Worſhip is the Holy Euchariſt, yet he pretendeth, that in our Chriſtian Worſhip (*p*) *we bring nothing that is Terrene and Dead, nor any thing of corruptible and material Subſtance.* The like extravagant Im-

---

(u) Ἀρχὴ μὲν αὐτοῖς τοῦ κακοῦ, ἡ τόλμα καὶ ἡ γένεσις, ϗ ἡ πρώτη ἑτερότης. Plotin. En. 5. l. 1. c. 1.

(w) *Hierocl. ſupr. p.* 261.

(x) *Ibid. p.* 253. *Porphyr. Sentent. n.* 32.

(y) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 8. c. 13.

(z) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 86. *vid. Gale not. p.* 242.

(a) *V. Plotin. En.* 4. *l.* 8. *c.* 2.

(b) Πλάνης καὶ ἀνοίας, καὶ φόβων ϗ ἀγρίων ἐρώτων.

(c) *Porph. de Antr. p.* 271.

(d) Τὸ παραπεφυκὸς ἡμῖν ἀλλότριον ζῶον, ὅπερ οἱ μὲν πολυκέφαλον θηρίον, οἱ δὲ θνητὸν ζωῆς εἶδος, ἄλλοι δὲ φύσιν γενεσιουργὸν καλοῦσιν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἔριν σύμφυλον ἐπωνόμασαν. Jambl. προτρ. p. 9. Plotin. En. 1. l. 1. c. 10.

(e) *Jambl.* προτρεπτ. c. 13. & 8. Plutarch. *conſol. ad Apollon. p.* 108.

(f) Virgil *Æneid.* 6.

(g) *Jambl.* προτρεπτ. c 13. *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 5. *Theodor. Marcil. com. in carm. Pythag. p.* 382, 383.

(h) *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 1. *S.* 30.

(i) Τῆς οὐρανίας πορείας ἀντέχεσθαι ϗ τοῖς νοεροῖς θεοῖς συνάπτεσθαι, τῆς τε ἐνύλου φύσεως χωρίζεσθαι, ϗ περιάγεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἄϋλον ϗ καθαρὰν ζωήν. Jambl. ſupr. p. 139, & c. 13.

(k) *Porphyr. de Abſt. l* 2. *S.* 43.

( ) *Marin. in vit. Procl.*

(m) Δός με φυγοῖσαν σώματος ἄταν, θεὸν ἅλμα βαλεῖν ἐπὶ σὰς αὐλάς. Hymn. 3 Ὡς ἐξ ὕλας φοιβαθεὶς. Hymn. 5. Μάκαρ ὅστις βορὸν ὕλας προφυγὼν ὕλαγμα. Hymn. 1.

(n) Windet. *de vit. funct.* S. 3.

(o) Οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἔνυλον, ὃ μὴ τῷ ἀΰλῳ εὐθύς ἐστιν ἀκάθαρτον. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 4. c. 10, 11.

(p) Οὐδὲν μὲν γεῶδες ϗ νεκρὸν, οὐδὲ τῆς φθαρτῆς ϗ ὑλικῆς οὐσίας. Ibid.

materialiſm is viſible in the Philoſophic Affectation of a Life (*q*) *devoid of Phancy and Paſſion*, (*r*) in pretending to the height of *Apathy, not to limit or meaſure the Paſſions, but to be wholly and intirely devoid of them.* (*s*) *The purged Soul collecteth her ſelf into her ſelf, and not ſympathizing with the Body or the Motions and Paſſions in the irrational Nature*, is pure from them and ſinneth not: But her aim is, οὐκ ἔξω ἁμαρτίας εἶναι, ἀλλὰ θεὸν εἶναι, *not only to be without Sin, but* (the Paſſions being extinguiſh'd) *to tranſcend a Demon, and to be a God. Porphyry* was ſo delirous an Immaterialiſt, that *Eunapius* ſaith of him, *He hated his being a Man. Plotinus* alſo (as *Porphyry* ſaith in his Life) *was as one aſhamed, that he was in the Body.* And the true Reſurrection in his Philoſophy is (*t*) *to riſe intirely from all Bodies, which are of an oppoſite Nature to the Soul; to riſe with the Body, is but to paſs* ἐξ ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλον ὕπνον, *from one Sleep to another.* The matter alſo in his Philoſophy (*u*) *is the firſt and chief Evil, bad it ſelf*; and the Platoniſts ſuppoſe (as the Poet *Virgil* before-cited repreſenteth their Hypotheſis,) that the Body as it is a terrene material Subſtance, *infecteth the Soul with vicious Motions and inordinate Paſſions*, and is the Origin of them. Which is a Branch of extravagant Immaterialiſm deſervedly reprov'd by S. *Auſtin.* (*w*) *There is a carnal Affectation of the Nature of the Soul, and a carnal Averſation from the Fleſh; as when the one is magnified as the chief good, and the Nature and Subſtance of the other is accus'd as Evil. Such a Sentiment is not from Divine Verity, but Human Philoſophic Vanity.*

Such Philoſophic Vanity uſually occurreth in the Theology (or Metaphyſicks) of the Hebrew Doctors, who ſuppoſe, (*x*) *that ſpeculative Science is Mans higheſt Perfection, and the only cauſe of perpetual and eternal Life.* (*y*) *The matter is as a Partition-wall and a Veil hindring the true apprehenſion of the abſtract Intelligence. And this is every where hinted in all the Books of the Prophets, that there is a Veil ſeparating between us and God. As when it is ſaid, he is hidden to us in a Cloud, in Obſcurity, in thick Darkneſs, a thick Cloud or the like; becauſe in reſpect of the Matter we are too imperfect to apprehend him.* (*z*) *Man may follow his Intellect and be as the Supernals: Or his Matter and be as a Beaſt or Animal.* And as our Rabbins ſay, אםימות יחיה ואם יחיה ימות *if he dyeth, he ſhall live; and if he liveth he ſhall die. That is, if he ſlayeth his Matter, his Intellect ſhall live: But if his Matter liveth, he killeth the Faculty of Intellect.* This Rabbinical mode of Theologizing is a Deſcendent from the Philoſophic Pagans, who are undoubtedly the Origin of it: Yet *Clemens* will have the Philoſophic-Pagan Immaterialiſm a Deſcendent from *Moſes.* (*a*) *Philoſophy is defin'd by* Socrates *the Meditation of Death; for he that without uſing his Eyes or any other Senſe applieth the pure Mind to the things, Philoſophizeth aright.* Pythagoras *alſo injoin'd his Diſciples, that abſtracting from things ſenſible, they ſhould Contemplate God with the naked Mind. Theſe things the chief of the Greek Philoſophers traduc'd from* Moſes. *For he commandeth, that having taken off the Skins of the Holocauſts, they ſhould divide them into parts; becauſe the cognitive or contemplative Soul if ſhe be denudate of the material Skin* (or covering of matter,) *if ſhe be without the bodily Nugacity and all Paſſions, and have put off all carnal Concupiſcences, muſt neceſſarily be conſecrated to Light.*

VIII. The grand Theory touching the Deſcent and Re-aſcent of Souls is complicated with ſome other Theories touching *the Tranſmigration of the Soul* (both that which is into and that which is in Generation) *her Circuit and Rotation.* Theſe Theories are diſcourſed in the Writings of *Plato*, but without any tolerable Self-conſiſtence (as *Euſebius* (*b*) and others have noted,) and with the intermixture of ſuch ridiculous Phantaſtry (as in making harmleſs Men paſs into Birds and deriving the Origin of creeping Animals from ſuch Men that do not Philoſophize, but follow the lower parts of the Soul,) that ſome have thought his Diſcourſes jocular not ſerious. But theſe Circuits and Rotations of the Soul are doubtleſs Theories of his Philoſophy, and they are agreeable to certain Philoſophic Maxims, (*c*) *That there is a periodical Revolution of all things, that the Souls of Men and Brutes are congenial, That all Souls are fitted with Bodies agreeable to their former Life*; and ſome of the Platoniſts argue; (*d*) *If there be not a return of Souls into Bodies, the number of Souls muſt be infinite, or God muſt always make new Souls.* Touching the firſt Tranſinigration-Circuit (which is into Generation) *Plato* and his Followers ſuppoſe a Deſcent and Re-aſcent of the Soul upwards and downwards in endleſs Rotations and Viciſſitudes. As *Plotinus* ſaith of the Soul, (*e*) that according to *Plato, when ſhe is aſcended, certain Circuits* (of the Heavens) *bring her thither again. Syneſius* fearing ſuch a diſaſtrous Circuit maketh it his Prayer, (*f*) *that his Soul elapſed from the Body may relapſe no more into the Evils of the Earth.* Not only from above, but from beneath alſo there is a Tranſinigration into Generation; (*g*) for the Subterraneous Souls are ſuppos'd (by the Platoniſts) to Re-aſcend and to live in Human Bodies; and *Proclus* calleth the Soul (*h*) *the multifarious Wanderer, deſcending to Tartarus and rais'd up to her former Altitude again.* But as ſome Souls that are incurably bad, never come out of *Tartarus* (as *Plato* (*i*) ſometimes diſcourſeth:) So the Pythagoric Verſes promiſe an happy Immortality to all purged Souls without a relapſe into Generation. (*k*) *If upon leaving the Body thou come to live in the free Ether, thou ſhalt be a God Immortal, Mortal no more.* So *Epicharmus* ſaith, (*l*) *A pious Mind ſuffereth no evil by Death. The Spirit remaineth in Heaven the Supernal Region.* So *Empedocles* promiſeth a perpetuity of felicity to the Juſt. (*m*) *They ſhall live in Conſortſhip with other Immortals, without Human Miſeries, Immortal and Impaſſible.* Theſe truly noble Sentiments as they are inconſiſtent with a Platonic Rotation of Souls upwards and downwards in endleſs Viciſſitudes, ſo they are not peculiar to the Philoſophic Pagans; for the Prieſts and Saintiſts

of

(q) *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 1. *S.* 30.

(r) *Marin. in vit. Procl.*

(s) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 5, 6.

(t) *En.* 3. *l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(u) *En.* 1. *l.* 8. *v. Ficin. in loc.*

(w) *Qui velut ſummum bonum laudat animæ naturam, & tanquam malum naturam carnis accuſat, profecto & animam carnaliter appetit, & carnem carnaliter fugit. Quoniam id vanitate ſentit humana, non veritate divina.* De C. D. l. 14. *c.* 3, 5.

(x) *Maimon. mor. nev. Par.* 2. *c.* 27.

(y) *Ibid. Par.* 3. *c.* 9. *V. Windet. de vit. funct. S.* 3.

(z) *Abarbinel. ap. Hotting. de creat. p.* 263.

(a) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 523.

(b) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 13. *c.* 16. *J. Bapt. Criſp. Quin.* 1. *Diſtr.* 3. *l.* 1.

(c) *L. Holſten. de vit. & Scr. Porphyr. p.* 81, 82. *Spencer. not. in Orig. p.* 27, 64. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 41.

(d) *Salluſt. de D. & mundo c.* 20.

(e) Περίοδοι αὐτὴν ἀνελθοῦσαν πάλιν φέρουσι τῇδε. En. 4. l. 8. c. 1.

(f) Νεῦσον δὲ πάτερ Σῶμα φυγοῖσαν, Μηκέτι δῦναι ἐς χθονὸς ἄταν. Hymn. 3.

(g) *J. B. Criſp. p.* 520, 522.

(h) Τὸ πολυπλανὲς, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ταρτάρου κάτιον καὶ αὖθις ἀναγειρόμενον. In Tim. p. 318. Inſtit. Theol. c. 205.

(i) *Marſh. Can. Chr. p.* 283. *ed. Lipſ.*

(k) Ἢν δ' ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς αἰθέρ' ἐλεύθερον ἔλθῃς Ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατος θεὸς, ἄμβροτος οὐκέτι θνητός.

(l) Εὐσεβὴς τὸν νοῦν πεφυκὼς οὐ πάθῃς γ' οὐδὲν κακὸν κατθανών. Ἄνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμένει κατ' οὐρανόν. Ap. Grot. Proleg. ad Dict. Poet.

(m) Ἀθανάτοις ἄλλοισιν ὁμέστιοι, ἔν τε τραπέζαις Εὔνιες ἀνδρείων ἀχέων, ἀπόκηροι, ἀτειρεῖς. Clem. Str. l. 5. p. m. 442.

of *Cybele* (and other popular Pagan Deities) promiſ'd themſelves a perpetuity of Felicity after this Life, (*n*) and that they ſhould live for ever with thoſe Deities, whoſe *Myſtæ* they were without relapſing into Generation. The *Egyptians* alſo at their Funerals ſpake the Praiſes of the dead Man, (*o*) *as of one that was to ſpend Eternity in Hades* (which comprehendeth both *Tartara* and *Elyſium*) *with the pious.* And this Principle of Theology is uſual in the Writings both of the Popular and Philoſophic Pagans (in *Plato* himſelf,) *That Rewards and Puniſhments are allotted to the Souls of Men upon their departure from their Body, in another World; that pure Souls go to a State of Celeſtial or Elyſian happineſs, and the impure ſuffer infernal puniſhments.* Which is a Principle manifeſtly inconſiſtent with the latter of the above-mentioned Rotations (that which is in Generation,) which *Herodotus* aſcribeth to the Egyptians. (*p*) *They held, that the Soul of Man is Immortal, and that the Body dying it entreth ſome other Animal that is always generated, and after it hath gone about through all the Terreſtrial and Marine Animals and the Birds, there is a remigration of it into ſome Human Body that is generated, and that this Circuit is finiſh'd in three Thouſand Years.* So in *Benjamin's Itinerarium*, p. 34. *The Dogziin* are ſaid to hold, *that a Soul which goeth out of the Body of a good Man, entreth the Body of a little Child, which is born at the time of that Soul's departure: But the Soul which goeth out of the Body of a bad Man, entreth the Body of a Dog or Beaſt.*

(n) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 252.

(o) *Marſham ſupr. p.* 274, 278, 284.

(p) *V. Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 324. &c. *Herbert. de Rel Gentil. p.* 203. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *l.* 3. *c.* 41. *de Philoſ. Sect. c.* 6. *Gaſſend. T.* 2. *p.* 261. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 30.

This Tranſmigration of Human Souls into the Bodies of Brutes (whether by a Tranſmigration *into* or *in* Generation) which was of old and is at this day an Opinion in the *Eaſtern* parts, was thought abſurd by *Timæus Locrus*, *Jamblichus* and *Porphyrius*; S. *Auſtin* alſo noteth, that *Porphyry* diſſenteth from his Maſter *Plato* touching the Rotation of the Soul upwards and downwards; for he is of Opinion, *that the purged Soul which returneth to the Father, deſcendeth no more into the Evils of this World.* Some of the Platonic Family (as *Proclus*) ſuppoſe, that the Human Soul tranſmigrateth into ſuch Brutes as ſhe reſembleth in manners, (*q*) but that thoſe Brutes have their own Soul and Life, wherein they ſuppoſe the Human Soul οἷον ἐποχουμένην, *ſeated as it were and carry'd and bound to it by Sympathy.* Others of the Platoniſts and Pythagoreans (as *Empedocles* and *Plotinus*) ſuppoſe a Tranſmigration of the Human Soul (*r*) not only into Brutes, but Plants alſo, and that the Human Soul becometh a Plantal Soul. *For they that keep themſelves Men, are again born Men* (ſaith *Plotinus*;) *They that live by Senſe only, Animals; if by Senſe with Paſſion, wild Animals: if with Concupiſcence and Pleaſure, ſalacious Animals; if immoderately Philomuſical (and not otherwiſe deprav'd,) Muſical Animals; if irrational Kings* (without any other pravity,) *Eagles; if ſuch as ſoar high without Wiſdom, Birds; if of civil Virtue, Men; if ſuch as live not by Sence ſo much as by a degeneracy of Sence, Plants.* From whence the Platonic Hypotheſis raiſes them (ἀπηλλαγμένας τῆς γενέσεως, *diſentangled from Generation*) to their original ſublime Condition. But becauſe it was thought the grand infelicity of the Soul, to be toſs'd about and wander in the Region of Generation, the Pythagoric Inſtitution injoineth *Abſtinence from Beans*, making the Bean a Symbol (*s*) *of direct continued Generation without any reflexion or return; becauſe of ſpermatic Plants the Bean in a manner only is perforated and hollow throughout, without any internodial obſtructions*, Knots or Joynts in the Stalk. Upon which account the Bean was alſo ſaid to reſemble the Gate of *Hades*, which is always open and never barr'd to Souls deſcending into Generation. Abſtinence from Beans (wherein there is no ſtop) therefore was deſign'd, to ſignifie to *Pythagoras*'s Scholars, that a ſtop muſt be put to the continued Progreſs of Generation, and that they ſhould endeavour a return to the ſupernal Regions, a liberation from the Body and Generation. But touching the time when they might expect a liberation from the Body and Generation, *Plato* in his *Phædrus* determineth, *that Souls do not regain their Wings in leſs ſpace than ten Thouſand Years, except the Souls of Philoſophers and Philoſophic Lovers of Beauty; for theſe regain theirs within the ſpace of three Thouſand Years, if* (in the Tranſmigration Circuit) *they thrice make choice of that Life.* Having regain'd their Wings (*t*) they re-aſcend πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ νοητὸν, *to the ſame ſublime Intelligible whence they made their deſcent*, which is an higher reaſcent than that other to their *Social Star.* To the Social Star they may re-aſcend in a leſs ſpace of time, the ſpace of a Thouſand Years: Or as S. *Auſtin* repreſenteth the Platoniſts Senſe (*u*) *the Souls of the wiſe after death are carried to the Stars, the Souls of the fooliſh to ſuch Bodies as are due to their Merits.* But what their determinate Opinion was touching this matter or whether they had any, is not ſafe to determine. One thing we may ſafely determine, (*w*) that the Jews and their Cabaliſts have deriv'd their Doctrine of *the Tranſmigration of Souls* (which ſome of them attribute to the Patriarch *Abraham*) from the Schools of the Pagans. And as in *Pindar* thoſe that for *three Tranſmigrations* are able to keep themſelves from Injuſtice and Zicioſity, *go the way of* Jove *to the City of* Saturn (enjoy the Golden Age of *Saturn* and the higheſt Felicity in *Elyſium*:) So the Cabaliſts think, that every Soul muſt be at leaſt conjoined with three Bodies, leaſt they ſhould have this excuſe for themſelves before the Supreme Judge, that they were joined to a Body, which was not ſo fit for Virtue. And *R. Simeon* in *Zoar* ſuppoſeth, that at the third Turn there is a ſtop put to Tranſmigration, it doth not proceed to the fourth, becauſe of the words of the Prophet *Amos* 1. 3.

(q) *L. Holſten. ubi ſupr.*

(r) *Nemeſ. de Nat. Hom cum Annot. Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 4. *c.* 3. *En.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 15.

(s) *Porph. de Antr. p.* 202.

(t) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 328.

(u) *De C. D. l.* 13. *c.* 19.

(w) *Windet. de vit. funct. S.* 5. & 11. *Witſii Ægyptiac. p.* 15.

IX. The grand Theory *of the deſcent and reaſcent of Souls* is complicated with another Theory touching the *Souls Vehicles*, of which there are no leſs than three in Platoniſm: (*x*) *The Connate, the Second and the Oſtreaceous. The Connate Vehicle maketh the Soul a Citizen of the World, the Second a Citizen of Generation, the Oſtreaceous, maketh her Terreſtrial.* Each of theſe Vehicles hath its proper life (whence ſome infer, that there muſt be three Animals in one Man:) But in the firſt Vehicle is there no number of Sences, and Sence is there without Paſſion. In the ſecond there is no number of Sences, but Sence is there with Paſſion. In the third there is Paſſion with a number of Sences. The ſecond of theſe Vehicles is ſuppos'd to accrue to the Soul in her gradual deſcent into this groſs Vehicle (the earthly Body) from the Elements commonly ſo called, and is ſaid to be *Mortal*; for the Soul diveſteth her ſelf of it in her re-aſcent. But of the firſt Vehicle of the Soul (τὸ συμφυὲς ὄχημα) ſome Pla-

(x) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 330, 311, 312. *J. Bapt. Criſp. p.* 175, 177. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 263.

toniſts ſay, *It is Connate to the Soul and Immortal, and ſhe never diveſteth her ſelf of it.* Others ſuppoſe, *that it accrueth to the deſcending Soul from the Spheres, that there is a refuſion of it back again, and that the Soul diveſteth her ſelf of all Vehicles in her re-aſcent.* This Vehicle of the Soul is of a noble Nature and of great uſe in Theurgical Operation; for the Platoniſts uſually ſtile it φωτεινὸν, αὐγοειδὲς, ἀστροειδὲς, *Lucid, Luminous, Aſtral,* and the Poet calleth it (y)

Æthereum Senſum atque aurai ſimplicis ignem.

Upon the Conjunction of Soul and Body this Vehicle is ſaid, to take up its Seat in the Brain, and it is called by *Syneſius* (z) τὸ φανταστικὸν πνεῦμα, *the Spirit of the Phantaſy* (that is the Phantaſy.) which he maketh the Faculty of Divination, pretending to introduce God into it, and to have the ſight of God in the Phantaſy, and that the buſineſs of Divination may be perform'd by it. *Jamblichus* alſo deſcribeth (*a*) a ſort of Divination by the Phantaſy, which he calleth φωτὸς ἀγωγὴν, *the Introduction of Light,* (*b*) *it illuſtrateth the Etherial and ſplendid Vehicle, which inveſts the Soul with Divine Light, whence Divine Phantaſms ariſe* (that take hold of our Imagination,) *which are moved by the Will of the Gods.* Great things (as 'tis pretended) may be done by the ſubtil Sence of the Vehicle, (*c*) *converſing with Demons and hearing the Harmony of the Spheres*; and in ſeeing a God or Spirit (which may be ſeen ſeveral ways; *by Intelligence, by the imaginary Vehicle of the Soul, and by the bodily Eyes*) the lucid Vehicle is of principal concern. For the appearances of the Gods (in Theurgy) are ſeen (*d*) τοῖς αὐγοειδέσι τῶν ψυχῶν περιβλήμασι, *by the luminous induments of Souls.* But becauſe the thickneſs and foulneſs of the Vehicle rendreth it inept for ſuch ſublime Operations, care muſt be taken, to *clarify* and *ſubtilize* it by an intellectual Life, and by the *Teletæ* or Theurgical Conſecrations, which (according to *Porphyry* in S. *Auſtin* before cited) were deſign'd to purge *the Spirital* (not the Intellectual) part of the Soul, to make it fit *for the reception of Spirits,* and to ſee the Gods. Of the Spirit of the Phantaſy *Syneſius* ſaith, (*e*) καθαιρόμενον διὰ τελετῶν ἔνθεον γίνεται, *being purged by the Teletæ it becometh Divine. By the goodneſs or intellectual Life of the Soul the Vehicle is ſubtiliz'd and rendered Etherial: But if the Soul degenerateth to badneſs* (*or propendeth to corporeal Affections and to the matter,*) *it becometh thick and terrene.* The Chalday Oracles injoin the Theurgick Saintiſt

Μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς, μηδὲ βαθύνῃς τὸ ἐπίπεδον.

Do not pollute the Spirit, nor make an addition of profundity to that which is a plane or ſuperficies. Which *Pſellus* thus interpreteth. *The Chaldeans put upon the Soul two Veſts. The one they called the Spirital, which is adjoyn'd to her from the ſenſible World: The other, the luminous, tenuious and intangible, which is nam'd the Plane or Superficies* (to ſignifie the great ſubtilty of it ſaith *Pletho.*) *Therefore it is ſaid, neither pollute the Spirital Veſt of the Soul by the impurity of the Paſſions, nor make her Superficies profound by certain material Additaments.*

X. The Purgation of the Vehicle is a principal Branch of that Purgation of the Soul, which is requiſite to her *Liberation and Reduction.* For the Philoſophers (*f*) *deduce the Soul being Divine into this World as into a place of puniſhment: But it is requiſite according to them, that imbodied Souls ſhould be purged.* And ſome ſay (*g*) the Souls exile from the Gods and her various Tranſmigrations are for her Purgation. Which is of ſo great Concern and Efficacy in her Liberation, (*h*) *that the Cathartic Virtue alone is to be called Salvific of Souls, which cutteth off, and conſumeth utterly the material Natures, and the Paſſions which accrue to us from Generation: But ſeparateth the Soul and carrieth her to Intellect, leaving the Veſts which ſhe hath put on to the Earth.* The neceſſity of purging the Soul in order to her Liberation and Reduction is viſible in the Rites and Inſtitutes of the popular Pagans; for their *Teletæ* or Initiations into Religious Myſteries were deſigned *for the Purgation of the Soul*; as appeareth from the Rites of *Bacchus,* the Nature of which was ſignify'd by the Symbol —— *Myſtica Vannus Iacchi.* (*i*) In the Myſteries of *Bacchus* there was a Corn-Sieve (in which Country-Men purge their Corn,) *becauſe his holy Rites are Purgative of the Soul, as Corn is purged by a Sieve* (ſaith *Servius*:) *Whence he hath the Name of Liber from Liberation.* The Cuſtom of *burning the Dead* is with great reaſon thought to have had its Origin from an Opinion, that, as the Orator ſaith, (*k*) *The Soul muſt firſt be purged with fire before it could re-aſcend to the Stars.* The Inſtitution of the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Philoſophy ſuppoſeth alſo a neceſſity of purging the Soul in order to her Liberation and Reduction. It deſigneth, *to turn the Mind upwards, to draw off the Soul from the Body* (the Sences, Paſſions and Concerns of the Body,) *and to collect her into her ſelf,* that the Soul may be pure from all Stain and Contagion of the Body. It pretendeth, that this Abſtraction from the Body is her *Purgation,* and that by this Method the Inſtitution of Philoſophy affordeth (*l*) *a Liberation from the Human Bonds, and a Solution of Generation, a carrying the Soul to that which truly is, and the knowledge of that which is truth indeed, and the Purgation of Souls.* But ſome of the Philoſophic Family repreſent theſe matters otherwiſe; for they look upon the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Contemplation, not as the *Purgation,* but as the *Perfection* of the Soul. So *Hierocles* (having defin'd Philoſophy to be (*m*) *the Purgation and Perfection of the Life of Man; the Purgation from the material irrationality and the mortal Body; the Perfection, the recovery of our proper happy Life, which reudceth to the Divine Similitude*) maketh a diſtribution of Philoſophy into three Parts; *Theoretic, Moral* and *Teleſtic.* And the *Purgation* is ſaid to be made *by Moral Virtue* (Ethical and Political) and by the Moral part of Philoſophy: But *the Perfection* conſiſteth in the *Theorctical Virtue* (which

is

(y) *Gale ſupr. p.* 229.

(z) *De Inſomn. p.* 137, 130.

(a) *De Myſt. p.* 27. *& v. p.* 73. *Gale not. p.* 240.

(b) Αὐτὴ δέ πως τὸ περικείμενον τῇ ψυχῇ αἰθερῶδες ϗ αὐγοειδὲς ὄχημα ἐπιλάμπει θείῳ φωτί.

(c) *J. Bapt. Criſp. p.* 176. *Gale ſupr. p.* 232. *Pſell. in Naz. or.* 42. *n.* 15.

(d) *Procl. in Polit. p.* 359.

(e) *Ubi ſupr. p.* 138, 139. *Niceph. Schol. p.* 391.

(f) *Clem. Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 315.

(g) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 4 2. *Gaſſ. T.* 2. *p.* 622.

(h) Μόνην ἄρα τὴν καθαρτικὴν ἀρετὴν σώτειραν προσρητέον τῶν ψυχῶν ἀποκόπτουσαν μὲν καὶ ἀφανίζουσαν ἄρδην τὰς ἐνύλους φύσεις καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως ἡμῖν προσφύτα πάθη, χωρίζουσαν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν, ϗ ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν περιάγουσαν, ϗ τοὺς χιτῶνας οὓς ἐνεδύσατο καταλείπουσαν εἰς γῆν. Procl. in Tim. p. 330.

(i) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

(k) *Animam quoties exonerata membris mortalibus levi ſe igne luſtraverit, petere ſedes inter aſtra.* Quintil. Decl. 10. *Holyday* on Juv. p. 17. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 249. Porphyr. de Abſt. l. 4. S. 18.

(l) Ἀπαλλαγὴν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων δεσμῶν, ϗ λύσιν τῆς γενέσεως, ϗ περιαγωγὴν ἐπὶ τὸ ὂν ϗ γνῶσιν τῆς ὄντως ἀληθείας, ϗ κάθαρσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς. Jambl. προτρεπτ. c. 13, 16.

(m) Ζωῆς ἀνθρωπίνης κάθαρσις ϗ τελειότης· κάθαρσις μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ὑλικῆς ἀλογίας ϗ τοῦ θνητοειδοῦς σώματος. Τελειότης δὲ τῆς οἰκείας εὐζωΐας ἀνάληψις, πρὸς τὴν θείαν ὁμοίωσιν ἐπανάγουσα. In aur. Car. p. 2. & 309.

is the *Platonic* Science and Contemplation) which aſſimilateth the Theoretical Man to God, and is the Divine Virtue, whereas the Moral is but the Humane Virtue; (*n*) πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον δεῖ γενέσθαι, καὶ τότε θεόν, *firſt become a Man* (one of the Ethical and Political Virtue, that hath brought into order his Irrationality) *then a God. Simplicius* thus diſtinguiſheth a Man of the *Cathartic* and *Theoretic* Virtue. (*o*) *The former fleeth from the Body and from the Bodily Paſſions, propendeth into himſelf. The latter* (the Theoretic Man) *tranſcending his own Rational Life tendeth wholly to the Divine Beings.* But the Perfection which this Philoſophy pretendeth to, is imperfect, without the addition of a third part of Philoſophy (falſly ſo called) *the Teleſtick Operation.* (*p*) *The Teleſtick Operation is the Purgation, which purgeth the lucid Vehicle from the material Feculencies and Pollutions and ſympathy with the Mortal Body; prepareth it for the Converſation of pure Spirits, corroborateth and invigorateth it, and rendreth it winged for the Celeſtial Journey.* In the Teleſtic Purgation abſtinence from certain Meats was requir'd, which were thought prejudicial to Purity and to the Solution of the Soul (ſuch as the *Pythagoric* Inſtitution forbiddeth, ἔν τε καθαρμοῖς, ἔν τε λύσει ψυχῆς, *in the Rites of Purgation and the Solution of the Soul)* Watchings alſo (*q*) Prayer, Luſtrations and other Theurgic Rites were injoyned; but Fire was thought of Principal Efficacy and Cathartic Virtue. *As by the Fire of the Gods* (in Theurgy) *that which is material is cut away,* ſaith *Proclus: So the Teleſtic Operation by Divine Fire conſumeth all the Spots from Generation, and all that Foreign and Irrational Nature, which the Vehicle of the Soul hath attracted.* The Teleſtic καθαρμοί, or Rites of Purgation (*r*) were ſo highly eſteemed by the chief Philoſophers, that they trotted up and down the World, to be initiated into all the Religious Myſteries of the Gods, ſuppoſing that the Mind by ſo many Purgations became more pure from the Contagion of things Mortal, and fit for the Contemplation of the things Divine; and ſome of them pretend, (*s*) that the Theurgical Operations purge, not the Vehicle only, but the upper Soul alſo; that the Method of Theurgy maketh a Man a God, and raiſeth him to the Divine Similitude (not only a God but a Theopator alſo, that maketh others Gods) and that the Soul by virtue thereof (*t*) may diſmiſs her Vehicle, when it depreſſeth her by its heavineſs, and aſcend on high purely immaterial.

XI. The Purgation of the Soul is deſign'd to reſtore her to her ancient intellectual Form, which is requiſite to her *Reduction* according to *Plato*'s (abovemention'd) tenth Demiurgic Law. (*u*) *The one only Salvation of the Soul, that ſetteth her free from the Circuit of Generation and multifarious wandring, and an endleſs Life, is to return to the intellectual Form of Soul, and to flee from all things that adhere to us from Generation.* Otherwiſe ſhe is unqualify'd for ſo ſublime a Condition as Philoſophy promiſeth. (*w*) *None may be admitted into the Kind or Order of the Gods, ſave only he that hath the Contemplative Truth* (the Theoretic Virtue) *and the Practic Virtue in his Soul, and Pureneſs in the Lucid Vehicle thereof* (which is here called Spirital;) *for ſo being become ſound and intire, he is reſtor'd to the form of his ancient Habit.* (*x*) The purgation which reſtoreth the Soul to her ancient intellectual Form is of the whole Man; which univerſal Purgation compriſeth that *Theoretic Virtue* oppos'd by *Hieorocles* to the Purgation of the Soul ſtrictly ſo called (which is by Moral Virtue) and which he calleth *the height of Philoſophy and the perfection of the Soul:* Which Notions of his are diſſonant from the general Senſe of the *Platoniſts*, who place *the height of Philoſophy and the perfection of the Soul* in union with the Father and in the Unity of the Soul. (*y*) Plato *and* Pythagoras *bid to flee Multitude, the Multitude external, which diſtracteth and deceiveth, and the Multitude within us, which diſtracteth and deceiveth much more. Firſt therefore flee the Multitude of Affections, Senſes, Imaginations and Opinions, in which Multitude there is Contrariety, and betake your ſelf to the Sciences, in which Multitude there is no contrariety. After the ſtudy of Science it is requiſite to lay aſide Compoſitions and Diviſions, and multiform Diſcourſes, and to aſcend to an intellectual Life, ſimple Intuitions and Perceptions; for Science is not the higheſt knowledge, but Intellect is above it. Aſcending to Intellect, we may contemplate the intelligible Eſſence: After which it is requiſite, that we excite the Height and Flower of the Soul, our Unity, to reach and have conjunction with the Divine Unity. This Unity and Operation by it is the Height of our Actions, by this we are made Divine.* Nothing ſhort of the height of Unity is the height of the Number-kind of Theology. (*z*) *Reduction muſt be made unto one without any addition; not moving at all, fearing to recede from it; not going in the leaſt to two.*

XII. To repreſent a ſummary account of the Philoſophic Pagan method of *Liberation* and *Reduction* of the Soul, (which is alſo called (*a*) *The ſolution of the Soul from the Body, from Evils and from under Fate, the looſing of her Bonds, and her liberation from Geniture, her getting out of the Den wherein ſhe is fetter'd and confin'd, her reſtitution into the Nature of the Univerſe, and the freeing her from living in a ſtrange place;*) the primary Rule of it is an ἀναδρομή, *the method of the Soul's deſcent inverted, a running back again.* By this Method the *Pythagoric* Virtue is ſaid to be (*b*) *an eſchewing the impious Strife* (the Principle leading to Geneſis, called by *Heraclitus* πόλεμος καὶ ἔρις, *War and Strife*, by *Empedocles* Strife and Contention) *the Salvation of the Soul, her Purgation from the mad Contention and the Revocation of her flight from God.* For as the lapſe of the Soul downwards was (*c*) νοῦ ἀποβολή, *the caſting away the Intellectual Operation* (the *Platonic Contemplation;*) *ſo the Theoretic Virtue and the Contemplative Life is in part a Reduction of the Soul now;* (*d*) *for it conciliateth her to the converſe of the Superiour Natures;* (*e*) *and when ſhe turneth*

to

(n) *Ibid. p.* 6.

(o) Φεύγειν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος βούλεται καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σωματικῶν παθῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν συννεύειν. Ἄνθρωπος θεωρητικὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν ζωὴν ὑπερέχων, ὅλως εἶναι βούλεται τῶν κρειττόνων. *Com. in* Epictet. *p.* 4.

(p) Τελεστικὴν δὲ ἐνέργειαν λέγω τὴν τοῦ αὐγοειδοῦς καθαρτικὴν δύναμιν. Hierocl. *ſupr. p.* 306, 309, 289, &c.

(q) Jambl. *de Myſt. p.* 128. Gale *Not. p.* 269. Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 331. Porphyr. *de Antr. p.* 260.

(r) L. Holſten. *de vit. & ſer.* Porphyr. *c.* 8.

(s) Gale *ſupr. p.* 199, 206, 264, 308.

(t) Niceph. *in* Syneſ. *p.* 383.

(u) Μία σωτηρία τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ κύκλου τῆς γενέσεως ἀπαλλάττουσα, καὶ τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης, καὶ τῆς ἀνηνύτου ζωῆς, ἡ πρὸς τὸ νοερὸν εἶδος τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναδρομή, καὶ ἡ φυγὴ πάντων τῶν ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως ἡμῖν προσπεφυκότων. Procl. *in* Tim. *p.* 330.

(w) Εἰς γένος θεῶν οὐ θέμις ἀφικνεῖσθαι ἄλλῳ, ἢ τῷ κτησαμένῳ ἀλήθειαν μὲν καὶ ἀρετὴν ἐν ψυχῇ, καθαρότητα δὲ ἐν τῷ πνευματικῷ αὐτῆς ὀχήματι· οὕτω γὰρ ὑγιής τις καὶ ὁλόκληρος γενόμενος εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἕξεως εἶδος ἀποκαθίσταται. Hierocl. *ſupr. p.* 310, 313.

(x) Hierocl. *ibid. p.* 294, 297, 305, 309.

(y) Procl. *de An. & Dæm. p.* 244, &c.

(z) Δεῖ τὴν ἀναγωγὴν ποιήσασθαι εἰς ἕν, καὶ μηδὲν αὐτῷ ἔτι προσθεῖναι· ἀλλὰ στῆναι παντελῶς, δεδιότα αὐτοῦ ἀποστῆσαι· μηδὲ τοὐλάχιστον, μηδὲ εἰς δύο προελθεῖν. Plotin. *En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 4.

(a) Λύσις ἀπὸ σώματος, ἀπαλλαγὴ τῶν καταδεσμῶν, ἀπαλλαγὴ γενέσεως, λύσις τῆς εἱμαρμένης, λύσις κακῶν, χωρισμὸς ἐκ τοῦ σπηλαίου, εἰς φύσιν ἀποκατάστασις, ἐλευθερία τῆς ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ τόπῳ διαγωγῆς. Simplic. *in* Epict. *p.* 85.

(b) Τῆς ἀθέου ἔριδος ἀποφυγή, καὶ σωτηρία ψυχῆς, καὶ ἀποκάθαρσις τοῦ μαινομένου νείκους, καὶ ἀνάκλησις τῆς θεόθεν φυγῆς. Hierocl. *in aur. car. p.* 256.

(c) *Ibid. p.* 258.

(d) *Ibid. p.* 218.

(e) Plotin. *En.* 4. *l.* 9. *c.* 4.

to Intelligence and to contemplate the things that are true, ſhe beginneth to be looſed from her Bonds and to aſcend. (f) *As the wandring flight from God and the* (πτερορρύησις) *falling off of thoſe Feathers of the Soul whereby we were raiſed to the things Supernal, brought us into the Region of things mortal, which are attended with Evils : ſo* (ἡ τῆς θνητῆς προσπαθείας ἀποβολή) *the caſting away the propenſe affection to things mortal, and the pullulation of Virtues as of certain Wings of the Soul will reduce us to the Region pure from Evils, unto a divine and happy Life.* So in *Empedocles's* Philoſophy, (g) *The Fugitive and Wanderer from God aſcendeth again and re-aſſumeth the ancient Habit by fleeing from terrene things and the unpleaſant place.*

Εἰ φεύξει τὰ περὶ γῆν, καὶ τὸ ἀτερπέα χῶρον.

Becauſe the Soul's propenſion to the Earth (which ſeparated her from the Divine Chorus) is to be cur'd by an averſation from things Terrene; and her wandring flight hither by fleeing from the things that are here, (h) τὴν θνητὴν φύσιν πρῶτον ἀποστραφῆναι δεῖ, *the thing that is to be done in the firſt place, is an Averſation from Mortal Nature, to be pure from the Body and to live ſeparate from it,* (i) not to be inveigled with kindneſs to the Body and *the Gifts of the Matter* (as *Syneſius* calleth things pleaſant to ſenſe;) for this ὑλικὴ προσπάθεια, *material propenſe Affection* is the grand impediment to the return of the Soul. Averſation from the Body is of ſuch importance to the reduction of the Soul, that the *Chalday* Oracles affirm, *thoſe Souls are moſt pure which leave the Body by a violent Death*, becauſe they abominate this Life, and hate a return to the Body, and go rejoycing to the Supernal Regions; (k) for which reaſon the ancient Greeks commended *dying in the Wars; they that die of a Diſeaſe are uſually effeminate, and deſirous of Life; their Soul goeth forth not pure, but carrieth along with it certain plumbeous deſires.* (l) *We ought to flee from hence, and ſeparate our ſelves from thoſe things, that are adjoyned to us in Generation, and not to be this compound thing, an animated Body, in which the nature of Body moſt prevaileth.*

As the flight of the Soul hither is to be cur'd by a flight from hence; (m) ſo καταγωγὸς ῥοπὴ ἀναγώγῳ δυνάμει, *the propenſion which ſinketh her downwards by her ſubvective Power*, which is called by *Syneſius* (n) Ἀναγώγιος τις ἀλκά, *a certain reductive force.* (o) *Although the Soul by inſinuating her ſelf into another Soul* (the θεοπτικὴ ψυχὴ, *God-ſeeing Soul* inſinuating it ſelf into the lower Soul, which is accompany'd with the Humane Shape) *is become fetter'd under Fate and Neceſſity, yet by her intellectual Operation, which is free and unſubject to the motion of the Univerſe* (or Aſtrological Fate) *ſhe may recede from the things generated, may reach that which is Intelligible and Divine, and have conjunction therewith, and union with the Gods, and tranſcend the Mundane Order, and partake of Eternal Life, and the Energy of the Supra-mundane Gods.* The Oracles pretend, that in all Souls there is a Principle of Reduction (p) certain latent συνθήματα, *Tokens or Impreſſions from the Father of Souls*, whereby they are often mov'd, to make a return. They have provided a Magical (q) *Fountain of Virtue* for Souls (*in the Cavities of* Hecate's *left ſide*) and certain Deities call'd ἀμείλικτοι *(not to be ſweetned)* as being rigid and inconvertible to the things that are here, and which are the cauſe that Souls are not allur'd *by ſweet inticing Affections.* They have alſo furniſh'd the Univerſe with *Gods* and *Demons*, whoſe ſpecial Faculty and Operation it is, to be Ἀνάγωγοι, *reductive* to the Soul. Souls are ſaid to be diſſeminated about the viſible Gods their ſocial Stars, (r) *that they may have thoſe Gods to be their Saviours from wandring about Generation, and may invoke them as their proper Preſidents.* So ſome that were initiated into the Myſteries of *Bacchus* and *Ceres* Daughter, pray'd to thoſe Deities, κύκλου τ' ἂν λῆξαι καὶ ἀναπνεῦσαι κακότητος, *that they might ceaſe the round and breath from trouble*; for that time wherein the Soul is out of the Body and Generation, they look'd upon (s) as the time of her repoſe and vacation from doing ſervice. But there are ſeveral higher ſorts of Deities, in whom (t) *the Theurgiſts place their hope of Salvation.*

XIII. Having thus repreſented an Idea of *the Arcane, Philoſophic, Theurgical Theology*, we will infer from it, that there are ſeveral ſorts of *Heatheniſm of Mind and Life, of Theology and Religion.* For the Popular Pagan Saintiſts of the Myſtic Religious Inſtitutions, the Pagan Saintiſts of a Philoſophic Inſtitution (ſuch as the *Stoicks*) and the Philoſophic-Pagan Saintiſts of the Arcane Theology, ſuch as the *Magi*, the *Egyptian Prieſts, Brachmans, Druids, Pythagoreans, Platoniſts*, are manifeſtly diſtinguiſh'd from the Heathen-generality characteriz'd by our Saviour, *Matth.* 6. 32. *After theſe things do the Gentiles ſeek.* Although *the common Heathen Inſtitution of Religion* and the generality of the Heathen themſelves in their Life and Religion had mainly reſpect to the Goods and Evils of this Animal Senſitive Life, yet it appeareth from this Idea, that certain Inſtitutions in Paganiſm and the Myſtæ of thoſe Inſtitutions, had mainly reſpect (not to the Goods and Evils of this Animal Senſitive Life, but) to the *Purgation, Sublimation and Perfection of the Soul, her ſeparation from the Body, Material Nature and Geneſis; her elevation to, acquaintance and union with the Supra-mundane Gods; her Heights of Sanctity, Virtue and Beatitude; her Liberation from the Evils of this Mortal Life and Reduction to her Original State.* What greater Sublimities is any Inſtitution capable of, than theſe Pagan Inſtitutions pretend to? whence a Judgment may be made of *that new* and (as it is called) *unanſwerable charge*, which an excellent Perſon of our own hath produc'd againſt Paganiſm, (u) *That Paganiſm reach'd no further than the Animal Life.* Another of the ſame Character (w) *from the Heathens Deities, Sacrifices, Feſtivals*, and certain Sayings of theirs inferreth, *That the Gentiles had their Belly for their God.* And this is ſuppos'd to have been the reaſon, *why God gave the* Iſraelites *a Law containing only Carnal Rites and promiſing only Carnal Temporal Goods, that thereby he might accommodate himſelf to the Genius of that Age and People. The Religion of old every where receiv'd, and to which the* Hebrews *in* Egypt *had been accuſtom'd, reſpected only Temporal Goods. nor did it extend hope or care beyond this Animal Life.* This Account of Univerſal Paganiſm in great degree bereaveth true Religion of that ſupport, which *Natural Light, the Conſent of Nations, and the Theology of the Gentiles* are ſuppos'd to afford it; which is an Indication, that it is a miſtake; and it will appear to be a great miſtake, not only by confronting to it *the ancient Theurgical Inſtitutions in Paganiſm and the ancient Pagan Theologers ſublime Principles*, but alſo by confronting to

(f) Hieroc. p. 257.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 254.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 257.

(i) Niceph. *in* Syneſ. p. 386, 389.

(k) Clem. *Str. l.* 4. p. m. 350.

(l) Φεύγειν ἐντεῦθεν δεῖ, καὶ χωρίζειν αὑτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν προσγεγενημένων, καὶ μὴ τὸ σύνθετον εἶναι σῶμα ἐμψυχούμενον, ἐν ᾧ κρατεῖ μᾶλλον ἡ σώματος φύσις. Plotin. *En.* 2. *l.* 2. *c.* 10.

(m) Hier. *ſupr.* p. 266.

(n) *Hymn* 1.

(o) Jambl. *de Myſt.* p. 162, 176. Stob. *Eclog. Phyſ.* p. 204.

(p) Gale *ſupr.* p. 310.

(q) Λαιῆς ἐν λαγόσιν Ἑκάτης ἀρετῆς πέλε πηγή.

(r) Procl. *in* Tim. p. 325, 330.

(s) Plotin. *En.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 12. Herald. *in* Arnob. p. 73.

(t) Procl. *Theol. Plat. l.* 4. *c.* 9.

(u) *Dr.* H. More *Myſt. of Godlin. B.* 3. *ch.* 6, 7.

(w) Spencer. *de. Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *p.* 13, 14. *ed.* 2.

to it thoſe ancient, currant, famous Notices in Paganiſm touching *the Soul's Immortality*, (x) *the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life*, touching *Hades*, *Elyſium*, *Beatorum Inſulæ*, *Orcus*, *Erebus*, *Tartarus*, *Mercurius* ψυχοπομπὸς (the Soul-carrier) *the Judges* and *Rivers* of Hell, and the reſt of the Infernal *Apparatus*, which are called by *Seneca* (a *Stoick*) *perſuaſio publica*, *the publick Belief*, becauſe they were the Notices of Vulgar Paganiſm, and without them *Natural Religion* (y) would be γέλως πλατὺς, *a great Ridicule*, as *Athenagoras* ſpeaketh. *All Men have a common Notion touching the Inferi, as of the Gods*, (z) ſaith S. *Empiricus*. It is an Article of Natural Religion, which is antecedent to any Inſtitution of *Paganiſm*, *Judaiſm*, *Chriſtianiſm*. And the Chriſtian Doctrine touching the Rewards and Puniſhments of a Future Life is ſo connatural to the Mind of Man (which hath the Conſcience of Good and Evil) ſo conſentaneous to his Reaſon and his Notices of a God and Providence, that it meeteth with this hearty approbation from that virulent Pagan (but no Epicurean) *Celſus*, (a) *Let not the Chriſtians nor any Man elſe ever depart from this Dogma*. So much of this Dogma was entertain'd by the *Eleuſinian* Saintiſts, that they gain'd by their Inſtitution (which was a Deſcendent from *Egypt*) as *Cicero* ſaith, (b) *not only the way of living joyouſly, but of dying with better hope*. In vulgar Paganiſm there was a Conceit (as appeareth from the Story of *Cleobis* and *Biton*) that Death was better than Life. (c) *Clemens* diſcourſeth againſt them for praiſing Death and diſpraiſing Generation. In the generality of the Pagan Religioniſts there was alway (ſo far as any Memoirs will inform us) a great Opinion of the Nobleneſs of the Mind and Soul of Man. They ſtile it *Divine*, *of kin to the Gods*, *a God*, *a part and particle of God*, *our Preſident Demon* and *venerable Ingeny*; they deduce it from Heaven and reduce it thither again. Their Religion ſwarmeth with *Dii Animales* (Soul-Deities) they worſhipp'd their *Heroes* and *Benefactors*, promoted them to *Demonſhip*, (d) *rais'd them to Celeſtial Condition*, *conſecrated them in the Stars*. All which implieth, that their Religion had this generous Sentiment in it, which *Cicero* accounteth one of its Principles; (e) *that Virtue* and *Piety* are things, *propter quæ datur homini aſcenſus in cœlum*, *which raiſe Men unto Heaven*. The *Egyptians* are (f) particularly fam'd for their Dogma *of the Soul's Immortality* and *the Rewards of the Pious in another Life*, (and probably they thought the Tranſmigration of Souls a kind of Purgatory:) But at what a rate they theologiz'd in their popular Theology *touching the Soul and a Future Life*, and how far they were from making *their Belly their God*, may beſt appear from a Funeral Rite of theirs recorded by *Porphyry*, and which deſerveth an eternal Memory. When they embalm'd one of their Nobles, they took out the Belly, put it into a Cheſt, which they held up to the Sun, one of the Embalmers making this Oration for the dead Man. (g) *O Lord the Sun, and all ye Gods that give Life to Men, receive me and tranſmit me into Conſortſhip with the Eternal Gods; for ſo long as I liv'd in the World, I piouſly worſhipp'd the Gods, whom my Parents ſhew'd me; thoſe that generated my Body I always honour'd; I neither kill'd any Man, nor defrauded any of what was committed to my truſt, nor have I done any thing elſe of an atrocious nature. If in my life-time I committed any offence in eating and drinking what was not lawful, the offence was not done by my ſelf, but by thoſe, pointing at or ſhewing the Cheſt wherein the Belly was. And having ſo ſaid, he threw it into the River.* The reſt of the Body was embalm'd as pure.

SECT. 5. *Of the Philoſophic Pagan Theology, as it is Aſtrological and Aſtrological-Magical.*

I. THE Philoſophic Pagans muſt be conſider'd as of one Religion with the Popular Pagans (whoſe Religion was *Coſmolatry*, *Uranolatry*, *Aſtrolatry*) and conſequently they *Aſtrologize in their Theology*, ſuppoſing the Divinity of the *Heavens*, *Spheres*, *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars* (both fix'd and erratick) their *Magiſtracy* and *Preſidency* in the Mundane Polity, and the Conſequence thereof *the Aſtrological Fate*. In *Cicero's* dream of *Scipio* (h) the higheſt Orb or Sphere is intituled *ſummus Deus*, *the higheſt God*, with reſpect to thoſe leſſer Spheres or Gods which it containeth. (i) *The Stars, both thoſe that are in the inferiour Spheres and thoſe that are in the higheſt Sphere*, διὰ τί οὐ θεοί; *for what reaſon can we deny them to be Gods?* ſaith *Plotinus*. So *Plato* in his *Epinomis*, having enumerated the Celeſtial Spheres, ſubjoineth (k) *with great aſſurance let theſe things be eſtabliſh'd by Law; for it is madneſs to think, that things Divine are not to be venerated, or that theſe are not things Divine. The Stars muſt be ſaid to be the viſible Gods, the greateſt and chiefly to be venerated, of piercing ſight and diſcernment every where, the principal Gods.* The Divinity of the Stars being a currant Notion in the *Platonic* Theology, it is much, (l) that *Voſſius* with ſome others ſhould be of Opinion, that when *Plato* calleth the *World*, *Sun* and *Stars*, God, or the *Ether*, *Air*, *Water*, *Earth*, he ſpeaketh not his own Senſe but the Senſe of others, and that for fear of the People he ſacrific'd to their Gods: Which aſſuredly is a groſs miſrepreſentation of *Plato's* Sentiments, who was a very ſerious and zealous Pagan Religioniſt, and whoſe great concern in all his Diſputes for Religion, is not for his Myſtic-Metaphyſical Deities, but for the Godſhip of the *Heavens* and the *Heavenly Bodies* (of which any Man may be ſatisfy'd from his * *Tenth of Laws* and his *Epinomis*; and thoſe that were injurious to their Godſhip (ſo heartily is he ingag'd in the Cauſe) he uſually chargeth with Madneſs, Impiety and Atheiſm. A like miſtake *Voſſius* committeth in his Account of *Philo*; (m) *That he ſuppos'd the Stars pure Minds and intelligent Animals agreeably to* Plato, *but did not ſuppoſe them Gods.* Whereas *Philo* in ſeveral places of his Works ſpeaketh of the Divinity or Godſhip of the Stars after the *Platonic* mode, and expreſly ſtileth them Deities, *ſubordinate and miniſterial Deities, not Sovereign and Imperial.*

(x) Grot. *de V. R. C. l.* 1. *S.* 22. Voſſ. *de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 10. Eugubin. *de Per. Phil. l.* 9. 10. Herbert *de Rel. Gent. p.* 203.

(y) *Athenag. de reſur. p.* 62.

(z) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 14.

(a) Τούτου δὲ τοῦ δόγματος μήθ᾽ οὗτοι μήτ᾽ ἄλλοι ἀνθρώπων μηδεὶς ποτὲ ἀποστῇ. Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 8. *p.* 409.

(b) *Non ſolum cum lætitia vivendi rationem, ſed etiam cum ſpe meliore moriendi.* De Leg. l. 1.

(c) *Strom. l.* 3. *p. m.* 315.

(d) *Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 78, 79.

(e) De Leg. 2.

(f) *Marſham. can. chr. p.* 269. *ed. Lipſ.*

(g) Ὦ δέσποτα ἥλιε, καὶ θεοὶ πάντες, οἱ τὴν ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δόντες προσδέξασθέ με, καὶ παράδοτε τοῖς ἀϊδίοις θεοῖς σύνοικον. ἐγὼ γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς, οὓς οἱ γονεῖς μοι παρέδειξαν, εὐσεβῶν διετέλουν, ὅσον χρόνον ἐν τῷ ἐκείνῳ αἰῶνι τὸν βίον εἶχον, τούς τε τὸ σῶμά μου γεννήσαντας ἐτίμων ἀεί· τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων οὔτε ἀπέκτεινα, οὔτε παρακαταθήκην ἀπεστέρησα, οὔτε ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἀνήκεστον διεπραξάμην· εἰ δέ τι ἄρα κατὰ τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ βίον ἥμαρτον, ἢ φαγὼν, ἢ πιὼν ὧν μὴ θεμιτὸν ἦν, οὐ δι᾽ ἐμαυτὸν ἥμαρτον, ἀλλὰ διὰ ταῦτα, δείξας τὴν κιβωτὸν, ἐν ᾗ ἡ γαστὴρ ἦν. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἀφίησι. *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 4. *S.* 10.

(h) *Macrob. l.* 1. *c.* 17.

(i) *Plotin. En.* 2 *l.* 9. *c.* 8.

(k) Θαῤῥοῦντας χρὴ ταῦτα εἰς νόμους θέσθαι· τὸ γὰρ μὴ τίμια τὰ θεῖα εἶναι, ἢ τάδε μὴ θεῖα, σαφῶς οὐκ ἐμφρόνων. θεοὺς δὴ τοὺς ὁρατοὺς, μεγίστους καὶ τιμιωτάτους καὶ ὀξύτατον ὁρῶντας πάντη, τοὺς πρώτους, τὴν τῶν ἄστρων φύσιν λεκτέον.

(l) *De Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 2, & 41.

* *V. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 13. *c.* 18.

(m) *Ubi ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 30.

He diſcourſeth againſt the Aſtrological *Chaldeans*, of whom he ſaith, (n) *they being great Students in Aſtronomy, and attributing all things to the motions of the Stars, by which Powers they ſuppos'd the things of the World to be adminiſtred, worſhipp'd the viſible Subſtance, having no Cogitation of the inviſible and intelligible.* Theſe worſhipp'd *the viſible Subſtance*, and therefore were a ſort of *Theiſts* and *Religioniſts*, but were Atheiſts as to an Inviſible Supream Deity; and of theſe *Philo* ſaith, (o) *Some have ſuppos'd the Sun and Moon and the other Stars* θεοὺς αὐτοκράτορας, *Self-imperial Gods, to whom they referr'd the Cauſes of all things that come to paſs; but* Moſes *ſuppoſeth the World to be generated, and alſo to be like a great City, that hath Rulers and Subjects; that the Rulers are all the Celeſtial Stars fix'd and erratic; the Subjects, the Sublunary and Circum-terreſtrial Natures in the Air; that the Rulers ſo called are not Autexouſious* (Self-ſovereign) *but the Sub-rulers of one Father of all, whoſe Prefectſhip they imitate juſtly and according to Law adminiſtring all things.* (p) *Therefore all the viſible Gods in Heaven muſt not be thought Self-imperial, having the Order of Sub-prefects; he that is inviſible and only perceptible by Mind,* θεὸς θεῶν ἐστι νοητῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν, *is the God of Gods both of the intelligible and of the viſible.* The Stars are called Gods by *Philo*, but he reproveth the immenſe error of thoſe, who ſuppoſe μόνους εἶναι τούτους θεοὺς, *that theſe are the only Gods*; and in this Senſe he ſpeaketh, when he calleth it *Error, to entertain thoſe above-ſaid things as Gods* (Self-imperial Deities.) In another place diſcourſing of two Worlds agreeably to *Plato* (the one the Intelligible World conſiſting of inviſible Idea's, the other of viſible Bodies) this Author ſaith, (q) *Some being ſtruck with admiration of the Nature of both theſe Worlds, have not only deify'd the whole of them, but alſo the moſt excellent parts in them, the Sun, Moon and the whole Heaven, which they without Scruple have called Gods. This Notion of theirs was underſtood by* Moſes, *and therefore he ſaith,* κύριε, κύριε, βασιλεῦ τῶν θεῶν, *Lord, O Lord, the King of Gods, to ſhew the precellency of the Ruler above the Subjects.* As *Philo* not only ſuppoſeth the Stars rational and intelligent (a Conceit that *Origen* (r) deriv'd from the School of *Plato*, and which the Rabbinical Doctors (s) have deriv'd from the School of *Ariſtotle*) but he entitleth them Gods after the *Platonic* mode: So *Joſephus* alſo ſaith of the *Judaical* Zealots, that their Inhumanity was ſuch (in hindring the burial of dead Bodies) *as if they had made an agreement, to deſtroy the Laws of Nature together with their Country-Laws,* (t) *and together with their Injuſtices towards Men, to pollute the Divinity, they left the Dead rotting under the Sun.* Where it ſeemeth very plain, that *Joſephus* attributeth Divinity to the Sun, (as in his Account of the *Eſſens* he calleth the Sun-beams the Rays of God;) which may proceed, not from a Pagan Principle of Aſtrolatry, but from an extravagant affectation of conformity of Speech to the Pagans, in whoſe Theology the Divinity of the Heavens and the Heavenly Bodies was the grand Fundamental. Whence their Aſtrology is neceſſarily complicate with their Theology, and the Pagan Aſtrologians uſually Theologize (as when they ſtile the Days of the Week, which have their Names from the Planets, (u) ἡμέραι τῶν θεῶν, *the Days of the Gods*;) and they conſider themſelves, not as bare Aſtrologians, but as Men of the moſt Sacred and Divine Science, Maſters in Religion and Theology; for ſo *Jul. Firmicus* calleth *Necepſus* and *Petoſyris,* (w) *divinos viros ac ſanctiſſimæ religionis antiſtites, Divine Men and Prefects of moſt holy Religion.* Their holy Religion (agreeably to *Philo*) ſuppoſeth the Stars *the Mundane-City Magiſtrates*: (x) And according to the *Phenician* Theology the Sun is *Beelſamen, the Lord or King of Heaven*, the Moon Βαάλτεια Βῆλθις, *the Queen of Heaven*; the *Egyptians* compar'd the Sun to a King, the Moon to a Queen, and the twelve Signs of the Zodiac (as they ſuppos'd) were θεοὶ βουλαῖοι, *Conciliary Gods*, and the five Planets were ῥαβδοφόροι, *Serjeants* to attend upon the Sun and Moon. So the Stoicks ſay, (y) The World is a City, and the Stars are Rulers or Magiſtrates. Theſe Mundane-City Magiſtrates are ſuppos'd to exerciſe (z) an Aſtrological kind of Rule and Gubernation in the World, as *Jul. Firmicus* ſaith of the *Decani*. (a) *The* Decani *are of great Divinity and Power, for by them all proſperous and adverſe Events are decreed.* So *Seneca* ſaith, (b) *The Fortunes of the People, the greateſt and the leaſt things depend upon the motion of the five Planets, and as the Stars are auſpicious or inauſpicious.* Not as if the Stars were Sovereign and Self-imperial, but they are Sub-rulers only, and (as the *Egyptians* Doctrine is repreſented (c) in *Stobæus*) are ὄργανον εἱμαρμένης, *the Inſtrument of Fate, which is a Law inevitable, according to which all things are order'd.*

In ſuch Senſe ſome of the Stoicks *Seneca, Manilius, Firmicus* (are great Aſſerters of *the Mathematical or Aſtrological Fate* without a due regard to the Liberty of Human Agency; as appeareth from that of *Manilius*, (d) *Criminals are to be hated the more, becauſe deſtin'd to their Sin and Puniſhment.* The Platoniſts are alſo Aſſertors of an Aſtrological Fate, but with great regard to Human Liberty of Agency. As *Plotinus* having repreſented *Plato*'s Doctrine, *that the lower Soul with the Paſſions thereof is given us by the Stars*, repreſenteth alſo and anſwereth this Conſequence of it: (e) *By this Doctrine we are not at Liberty from, but bound to the Stars, receiving our Soul from them, and it maketh us ſubject to Fate and Neceſſity that deſcend hither. Our Manners alſo or Temper is from them, and according thereto our Actions and Paſſions. But we are ſomething beſides all this,* κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν ἡμᾶς, *our true ſelves, to whom Nature hath given Rule and Domination over the Paſſions.* Several ancient Writers have charg'd the *Egyptians* with this Aſtrological Fataliſm, *they ſubjected all Human Liberty to the motion of the Stars.* To avoid which abſurdity, ſome of the School of *Plato*, pretending to follow the *Egyptians* Doctrine, (f) diſtinguiſh two Souls in Man: *The one from the circuition of the Celeſtial Worlds, which is obſequious to their Motions; the other from the firſt Intelligible, which is beyond the Orb of Geniture.* They are Solicitous for Human Liberty, yet ſome of the Maxims of their School touching Aſtrological Fate, eſpecially *their Periodical Revolution of all things by the*

(n) Περὶ Ἀβραάμ, p. 244. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(o) Περὶ μοναρχ. l. 1. initio.

(p) Πάντας οὖν τοὺς κατ᾽ οὐρανὸν οὓς αἴσθησις ἐπισκοπεῖ θεοὺς, οὐκ αὐτοκρατεῖς νομιστέον.

(q) Περὶ συγχύσ. διαλεκτ. p. 233. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(r) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 238.

(s) Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par. 2. c. 4, 5.

(t) Ἅμα τε τοῖς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἀδικήμασι συμμιᾶναι καὶ τὸ θεῖον, ὑφ᾽ ἡλίῳ τοὺς νεκροὺς μυδῶντας ἀπέλιπον. De Bell. Jud. l. 5. c. 2.

(u) Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l. 3. c. 19, 20.

(w) P. Crinit. de hon. Diſc. l. 15. c. 13.

(x) Selden. ſupr. c. 21. & D. de Syr. proleg. c. 2.

(y) Lipſ. Phyſ. l. 1. diſſ. 7.

(z) Maimon. ſupr. c. 5.

(a) *Sunt Decani magni numinis & poteſtatis, quòd omnia proſpera per ipſos, & omnia infortunia decernuntur.* Apud P. Crinit. ſupr.

(b) *Ex ſiderum quinque leviſſimis motibus fortunæ populorum dependent, & maxima ac minima proinde formantur, prout æquum iniquumve ſidus inceſſit.* Lipſ. ſupr. diſſ. 14.

(c) Ecl. Phyſ. p. 13.

(d) *Nocentes oderimus magis, in pœnam culpamque creatos.*

(e) Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι συνδέουσιν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἄστροις, παρ᾽ αὐτῶν ψυχὴν κομιζομένους, καὶ ὑποτάττουσι τῇ ἀνάγκῃ. En. 2. l. 2. c. 9.

(f) Jambl. de Myſt. p. 161, 162.

Stars, prejudice it at a great rate. (g) *For the Pythagoreans and Platoniſts ſay, that when the Stars according to certain ſtated Periods ſhall have the ſame Configuration, and reſpect to one another, which they had before, all things on Earth will be in the ſame State, which they were in before, when that Poſition of the Stars was in Being. It is neceſſary according to this Doctrine, that when the Stars after a long Period of Time come to have the ſame reſpect to one another, which they had in the time of* Socrates, Socrates *muſt be born again of the ſame Parents, and ſuffer the ſame things, being accus'd by* Anytus *and* Melitus *and condemned by the Areopagites.* Phalaris *muſt alſo act the Tyrant again, and his Brazen Bull muſt bellow with the Voices of the ſame inclos'd Men, that were condemn'd in the former Period. And* Alexander Phæreus *muſt Tyrannize with the ſame Tyranny upon the ſame Men whom he condemn'd before.* But as the Platoniſts notwithſtanding their Aſtrological Fataliſm were laudably Solicitous for Human Liberty : So *Joſephus* ſaith of the Phariſees, (h) *they attributed all things that are done to Fate* (Aſtrological and Planetary,) *yet not ſo as to Deprive Man of Liberty of Will.* In thoſe days and in ſucceeding Ages (*i*) the Jews have been great Aſtrologians (and as themſelves boaſt, have gain'd a great renown by it,) *following the Vanities of the Gentiles in Aſtrology*, (*k*) as *Epiphanius* ſaith of them; and accordingly their Maxim is הכל תלוי במזל *all things depend upon Fate*, or are ſubject to the Rule and Domination of the Stars. They Symbolize with the Pagan Aſtrologers (*l*) in allotting the ſeveral Climates to the Dominion of ſeveral Planets, which are ſuppos'd to preſide over them. The Heavens and their Stars are ſaid by *Jacchiades*, (*m*) *to make Conſtitutions touching the Affairs of the World*; and although *Iſrael* is not ſuppos'd to be under the Domination of the Stars and Planets, as other Nations are, yet they have מזל קשה בשמים *an afflictive Planet or Star in the Heavens, that decreeth upon them Depreſſion and Miſery : But when they fear God, he deſtroyeth thoſe Conſtitutions of the Heavens.* Therefore they ſay, *there is no Planet to* Iſrael. *They that adhere to the Precepts, are above the Planets.*

II. Agreeably to their Theology much of the *Learning* of the Philoſophic Pagans lay in Aſtrology (*Apoteleſmatica illa divinatrix, judiciary Aſtrology*,) as will appear, if we take a view of the Learning of the ancient Philoſophic-Pagan Nations, the *Egyptian* Literature, and that of the ancient *Perſian* and *Chaldean Magi*, whom I ſuppoſe (contrary to a late Egyptian Antiquary,) to be the *Egyptians* Seniors in the *Aſtrological* Learning and Theology. For ſeeing the Aſtrologers (*n*) are called *Chaldeans*, the Art it ſelf χαλδαϊκὴ *Chaldaic*, and the Aſtrological Fate is intituled *Babylonian* by ancient Writers, this ſheweth, that the *Chaldeans* were reputed the Inventors of Aſtrology, and were the moſt famous pretenders to it. (*o*) *They were moſt of all addicted to Aſtrology, and made Obſervations* (ſaith *Porphyry*) *before the Egyptians.* (*p*) Our Egyptian Antiquary acknowledgeth, *that the moſt ancient Celeſtial Obſervations which we read of, are thoſe which* Calliſthenes Ariſtotle's *Scholar tranſmitted from* Babylon *into* Greece; which Celeſtial Obſervations were not barely Aſtronomical, but *Aſtrological* alſo; for the *Chaldeans* are ſaid, (*q*) *to have made Obſervation for two Thouſand Years (before* Alexander *took* Babylon) *what Effects follow'd the riſing of every Star.* (*r*) The *Babylonians* in *Suidas* are ſaid to have firſt found out Aſtronomy by *Zoroaſter*; and if Arts flouriſh'd with Empire (as is moſt likely,) they will be found beforehand with the *Egyptians* in Arts; for according to the expreſs Teſtimony of Scripture (which is not to be confronted (*s*) by a few weak Surmiſes) *Nimrod*'s Empire was the firſt after the Flood. *He began to be a mighty one in the Earth. And the beginning of his Kingdom was* Babel, *and* Erech, *and* Accad, *and* Calneh, *in the Land of* Shinar. *Gen.* 10. 8, 10. Thoſe alluſions that are made to *Babylon* in the Book of the *Apocalypſe*, ſpeak both its Grandeur and Antiquity; for that City is conſider'd by the Spirit of Prophecy as (*the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth*) the Metropolis of ancient idolatrous Paganiſm. The *Chaldeans* are alſo particularly renown'd by the Prophet as an *ancient Nation*, *Jer.* 5. 15. which becauſe it is acknowledg'd by all ancient Writers (whether good Hiſtorians or Fabulous) our Engliſh Tranſlation of that difficult place, *Iſa.* 23. 13. (which is the Senſe (*t*) that our Egyptian Antiquary hath pitch'd upon) is not to be entertain'd. *Behold the Land of the Chaldeans; this people was not, till the Aſſyrian founded it for them that dwell in the Wilderneſs : They ſet up the Towers thereof, they rais'd up the Houſes thereof, he ſet it to ruin.* It cannot be true, that the Chaldeans were no Nation, nor *Babylon* a City, till the Aſſyrian *Nabonaſſar* founded it; nor hath this Senſe any coherence with the Context, nor is it pertinent to the Prophets Buſineſs, to Prophecy the ruin of *Babylon*, who is foretelling the Deſtruction of *Tyre*, and deſcribing her Condition without Succour or Refuge, *v.* 12. *Ariſe, paſs over to* Chittim, *there alſo ſhalt thou have no reſt* v. 13. הֵן אֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים זֶה הָעָם לֹא הָיָה אַשּׁוּר יְסָדָהּ לְצִיִּים *Behold the Land of the Chaldeans that People*; Aſſyria *is not* (being devour'd by the *Chaldeans*, and therefore *Tyre* might rationally expect no better Quarter from them:) *He hath founded it* (Tyre) *for Ships, they ſet up the Towers thereof, they rais'd up the Houſes thereof, he hath ſet it to ruin.* This ſeemeth to be the beſt Verſion of this otherwiſe unintelligible place; which if it ſaith nothing of the building of *Babylon*, or the founding the *Chaldean* Nation, there is nothing in Scripture, to countenance the Pre-antiquity of *Egypt* or that of the Poet

> *Quique Magos docuit Myſteria vana Necepſis*
> *The Magi* (the Chaldeans) *were taught their vain*
> *Myſteries* (Aſtrology) *by Necepſis.*

But it is certain, that *Egypt* was the chief School of Literature to the Greeks, and that the Learning of the *Egyptian* Prieſts and Prophets was of the ſame Character with the *Chaldean*; (*u*) for they were חכמי תולדות or Aſtrologers. *Calaſiris* the Egyptian in *Heliodorus* (*w*) giveth this account of them. *There is a twofold Wiſdom of the Egyptians : One vulgar, which is Necyomanty; another Divine, which is true Wiſdom.* (*x*) *Which we Prieſts and the Progeny of Prophets are converſant in from our Youth, which ſpeculateth the Celeſtials, aſſociateth with the Gods, participateth of the ſuperiour Natures, inveſtigateth the motion of the Stars, and gaineth us the knowledge of future Events. Clemens* ſaith (*y*) *the Egyptians were the firſt Inventors of Aſtrology, the like is ſaid of the Chal-*

deans

(g) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 245. *v. Plutarch. de Fato. p.* 539.

(h) *Druſ. de* 3. *Sect. l.* 2. *c.* 14, 21.

(i) *Ibid. & vid. Annot. in Nemeſ. de Nat. Hom. p.* 39. *L'Emper. not. in Abraban. com. in Iſa.* 30. *p.* 61.

(k) *Baron. Apparat. n.* 8.

(l) *Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 3. *c.* 20. *Menaſ. Ben. Iſr. in Deut. Qu.* 2. *p.* 222.

(m) *In Dan. c.* 10. *v.* 22.

(n) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 47. *Hotting. Hexaem. p.* 129.

(o) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 17. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 277.

(p) *D. Marſham. Can. Chron. p.* 504. *ed. Lipſ.*

(q) *Voſſ. ſupr.*

(r) *Marſham ſupr. p.* 477.

(s) *Ibid. p.* 417, 508, 509.

(t) *p.* 509.

(u) *Hotting. Hexaem. p.* 130.

(w) *l.* 3.

(x) Ἣν ἱερεῖς καὶ προφητικὸν γένος ἐκ νέων ἀσκοῦμεν, ἄνω πρὸς τὰ οὐράνια βλέπουσαν, θεῶν συνόμιλον, καὶ φύσεως κρειττόνων μέτοχον, ἀστέρων κίνησιν ἐρευνῶσαν, καὶ μελλόντων πρόγνωσιν κερδαίνουσαν.

(y) *Strom. l.* 1. *p. m.* 224.

deans. (z) *The Chaldeans and Egyptians* (ſaith an anonymous Author) *the followers of* Zoroaſter *and* Hyſtapes *recounted the days of the Week from the number of the Planets.*

(a) Other Authors (*Herodotus* and *Dio Caſſius*) report, *that the conſecrating the ſeven Days of the Week to the ſeven Planets was an invention of the Egyptians, which paſs'd among all Men. That they found out the Month and the Day of every one of the Gods* (the Planets) *and that on what Day every one was Born, and what Fortune he ſhould have, what Death he ſhould die, and what kind of Perſon he ſhould be, which things the Grecanic Poets made uſe of.* Theſe Aſtrological Crotchets were by Foreigners thought their nobleſt Inventions, and by themſelves *their divine and true Wiſdom*, inſomuch that they that condemn Aſtrology, (b) are by *Ptolomy* look'd upon as Atheiſts. The Egyptian Prieſt *Chæremon* accounted it the only *Divine Wiſdom*; for he is ſaid (c) to acknowledge no higher Cauſes of mundane things than the *Planets, Zodiac, Decani, Horoſcopes and the Stars which they call* τὺς κραταιὺς ϗ ἡγεμόνας, *the robuſt Princes. The Names of theſe were inſerted into their* Almanacks *together with the times of their Riſing and Setting, and the Prognoſticks of future Events from them.* The Wiſdom of an *Almanack* was *their Divine Wiſdom* (which therefore was a principal part of their Literature;) and it appeareth from the Memorials which yet remain of their ancient Learning, that in great part it conſiſted of Aſtrological Conceits. (d) *For in the Sepulchre of* Oſymandis *a Theban King there was a Golden Circle, one Cubit thick, in compaſs 365 Cubits, whereon the Days of the Year divided into ſo many Cubits were inſcrib'd, with the Notation of the natural Riſing and Setting of the Stars, and of their Significations according to the Egyptian Theologers.* The Egyptian *Hermes* is ſaid (e) to have taught, that *according to the ſeven Stars the Generation of Men conſiſteth*; and the Books of *Hermes* (f) *Hermetis* γενικὰ, *Hermaic* & *Diataxes* were Aſtrological Diſcourſes. *Abul-Pharagius* ſaith, (g) *It is reported of the firſt* Hermes, *that he preſcrib'd Men Religious Worſhip, Faſting, Prayer, and Alms, and that they ſhould obſerve Feſtival Days, when the Planets deſcended into their Houſes and aſcended, and alſo every new Moon, and as oft as the Sun entred any of the twelve Signs. Maimonides* ſaith, (h) *the Egyptians worſhipped the Conſtellation* Aries, *and therefore abominated the ſacrificing Sheep; ſhall we Sacrifice the abomination of the* Egyptians? *Exod.* 8. 26. They worſhipped Animals as Symbols or living Images of their Gods; of which their Symbolical Religion and Theology *Lucian de Aſtrologiâ* (i) hath given this Aſtrological account. *Some of the Conſtellations or Parts of the Heavens were us'd by ſome of the* Egyptians *in Divination, other Parts by others. The Worſhippers of the Celeſtial* Aries *worſhipped that Animal a Ram. Others in honour of the Celeſtial* Taurus *pay'd their Veneration to a Bull*, and the like account is given of the reſt. (k) The Conſtellation *Aries* is probably thought, to have the firſt place, amongſt the Signs of the *Zodiac*, and *Taurus* the ſecond, by the appointment of the *Egyptians*, who worſhipp'd *Cham* or *Hammon* in *Aries* and his Son *Miſraim* in *Taurus*. And as in great part their Religion and Divine Learning was Aſtrological; ſo (doubtleſs) they were Aſtrological kind of Phyſicians; for (l) *they compounded together and taught, not ſeparately and apart, but conjunctly and together as things coherent* τὰ ἀςρολογικὰ, τὰ ἰατρικὰ, ϗ τὰ τελεςικὰ, *the Aſtrologicks, Iatricks, Teleſticks.* The impure Phantaſtry of Aſtrology pervadeth alſo the Body of the Egyptians more recondite Philoſophy, their choiceſt Theories are ſmutted with it, and the Greek Philoſophy being a Deſcendent from *Egypt* is of the ſame Complexion. (m) Souls deſcend by the *Zodiac* and the twelve Signs thereof (and therefore partake of the qualities of thoſe Signs) according to the Egyptians, (n) *Homer*'s *Antrum Nympharum* (beforemention'd) hath two Gates, the *Northern* and *Southern*, which are ſaid to be the two Tropicks of *Cancer* and *Capricorn*: By the one Souls are ſuppos'd to deſcend into Bodies, by the other they re-aſcend. Which Aſtrological Conceit is ſo far entertained by *Origen*, (o) he ſuppoſeth ſome ſuch thing is intimated in the Viſion of *Jacob*'s Ladder, agreeably to *Philo*'s Interpretation, (p) that the Angels deſcending and aſcending (on the Ladder) are Souls deſcending and re-aſcending, ſome of which re-aſcending Souls flee quite away, and return no more, others deſirous of the things of Life return into Bodies again.

A like commixture of Aſtrological Conceit is viſible in the Philoſophy of the ancient *Perſian Magi*; for in the *Mithraic Sacra* (q) there was a κλίμαξ ὑψίπυλος, *Gradation or Aſcent of ſeven Gates one above another repreſentative of the Planets by which Souls deſcend.* Which Branch of the Perſian Theology is the more obſervable, becauſe the very ſame Aſtrological Conceit occurreth in the *Zoroaſtrian* or *Chalday* Oracles (and therefore doubtleſs they are thus far genuine, they contain much of the ancient *Perſic-Chaldean Arcane Theurgical Theology*;) for the Oracles ſpeak of the Deſcent of Souls by the ἑπτάπορος βαθμὶς, *or Gradation of ſeven Paſſages*, under which —— Ἀνάγκης θρόνος ἐςὶ, *there is the Region, where Neceſſity or Fate hath its Seat and Throne.* (r) *The Gradation of ſeven Paſſages ſo call'd by the Oracles* (ſaith *Pletho*) *is the Planetary Fate, under which there is an horrendous inflexible Neceſſity.* Agreeably to the Egyptian Prieſts and Prophets theſe oriental Sages the Perſian Magi are known to have been חכמי המולות *the Wiſe-men of the Stars.* As Aſtrology was commix'd with their Religion (the Perſians gave the Names of their Gods (s) to their Months and Days, believing that their Gods did preſide over them,) ſo *Divination* was their Profeſſion of Learning. (t) *The ſeveral Diſciplines of Divination paſs'd from Father to Son by way of Inheritance and of Cabala, every one of the Magi deriv'd them to Poſterity in the Line of his Family* (ſaith *Ammianus*,) of which Diſciplines Aſtrological Divination is the principal. So the Indian Sages *foretel things to come; by obſerving the Celeſtials and their ſignifications they make certain Prognoſticks*, (u) as *Clemens* ſuppoſeth. But the vanity of Aſtrology (which for many ages (t) prevail'd in the whole World) was in Proceſs of time diſcern'd and exploded, not only by thoſe popular Pagans that made Laws againſt Aſtrologers (as the Romans did,) but by (u) ſeveral of the Philoſophic Pagans; (w) *a Party of the Chaldean Philoſophers rejected Genethliacal Aſtrology.* Yet ſuch is the Affinity between the Aſtrological and Magical Genius, that the Platoniſts of the later times continu'd to Aſtrologize; and even thoſe of them that rejected and refuted the Predictions of the vulgar Aſtrologers (as *Plotinus* did,) yet themſelves Aſtrologiz'd at ſo extravagant a rate, that they retain'd the ground of them. (*x*) *Plotinus in his Book intituled, Whether the Stars be effective* (or only ſignificative,) *determineth, That nothing befalleth Men by their Virtue or Power: but thoſe things which the Decree of Providence allotteth unto every one are ſhewed and ſignified by the Tranſition, Station and Receſſion of the Planets, in ſuch a manner as the Birds in Augury, not knowing any thing themſelves, by their Poſture of flying or ſtanding, by their Feathers and Voice ſignifie futurities. In this mode of Philoſophizing one Planet will rightly be called Salutary, another terrible, ſeeing proſperous Events are ſignified by one, Misfortunes by another.* (*y*) *Origen* alſo determineth, that the Stars are not *effective*, but *ſignificative*, that the Heavens are a Book wherein God hath deſcrib'd Futurities, but its Letters and Characters (which *Plotinus* calleth the Grammar of the Heavens) cannot be read by Men, but by ſuch only that are more than meer Men. Agreeably to the Magical Aſtrologizing Genius of the Platoniſts *Syneſius* ſuppoſeth, (*z*) *that the World is a Book, wherein Events are written in various Letters, whence various Modes of Divination ariſe.* And becauſe they ſuppos'd, that the Motions and Configurations of the Heavens correſpond with Human Actions and Events, ſo that the one may be prognoſticated from the other, *Simplicius* ſaith touching Fate, (*a*) *The fatal Converſion of the Heavens correſpondeth with the Production of Souls into Generation, which cometh to paſs at that time, not neceſſitating them to Will this or that, but correſponding with their Appetites or Volitions.*

(z) Οἱ περὶ Ζωροάςρην ϗ Ὑςάσπην χαλδαῖοι ϗ Αἰγύπτιοι ἀπ' ἀριθμῦ τῶν πλανητῶν ἐν Ἑβδομάδι τὰς ἡμέρας ἀνέλαβον Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l. 3. c. 19.

(a) *Seld. ibid. Marſham ſupr. p.* 197.

(b) *Tetrab. l.* 2.

(c) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

(d) *Marſham ſupr. p.* 246, 247.

(e) *Ibid. p.* 476.

(f) *Gale in Jambl p.* 296, 305.

(g) *Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 6, 7.

(h) *Mor. Nev. par.* 3. *c.* 46.

(i) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 74.

(k) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 36.

(l) Selden. *ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 22.

(m) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 309, 310, 313.

(n) *Porph. de Antr. p.* 264. *Macrob. in Som. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

(o) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 289.

(p) Περὶ ὀνειρ. *p.* 598. *ed. Gr. Pari.*

(q) *Celſ. ap. Orig. l.* 6. *p.* 290.

(r) Ἑπτάπορον δὲ βαθμίδα φησὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν πλανήτων εἱμαρμένην.

(q) *J. Gol. Not. in Alferg. p.* 20.

(t) *Diſciplinas præſentiendi futura per ſuam quiſque progeniem poſteris ætatibus tradunt.* Ammian. l. 43.

(u) *Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 329.

(t) *Plin l.* 30. *c* 1.

(u) *Cic. de Divin. l.* 2. *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 1. *c.* 9.

(w) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 1. *c.* 15.

III. Agreeably to the Magical Aſtrologizing Genius of the Ancient Pagans Paganiſm aboundeth with *Aſtrological-Magical* Myſtery (of which (*b*) Aſtrology it ſelf is thought a Branch;) much of Paganiſm is Magick complicated with Aſtrology. (*c*) The Egyptians Conſtitution of the Heavens and their agreable *Demonolatry* is *Aſtrological-Magical. That the leaſt things have their Preſidents* (ſaith *Celſus*,) *we may learn from the Egyptians, who diſtribute the Body of Man into ſix and thirty parts* (anſwerable to the Decani,) *ſaying, that ſo many* δαίμονες ἢ θεοί τινες αἰθέριοι, *Demons or Ethereal Gods preſide over thoſe parts. And the Names of theſe Demons are, Chumen, Cnachumen, Cnat, Sicat, Biu, Erebiu, Romanor, Rejanoor, which being invok'd do all of them heal the Diſeaſes of their ſeveral parts.* Theſe *Origen* calleth *ſix and thirty Barbaric Demons, which only the Egyptian Magicians invoke.* And if this Conſtitution of the Heavens according to the Egyptians is Aſtrological-Magical, their diſtribution of the Heavens is of no better Character. (*d*) *They diſtribute the Heavens into two parts* (the two Hemiſpheres) *or four parts* (four Portions of the Zodiac,) *or into twelve parts* (the twelve Signs of the Zodiac,) *or into ſix and thirty parts* (each one of the twelve Houſes of the Planets is divided into three Portions, which they call *Decani*,) *and allot ſome to preſide, more or fewer, over thoſe Diviſions.* So *Triſmegiſt* in his *Aſclepius* allotteth to the Sun and the Planetary Spheres (*e*) their Preſident Demons or Princes (which he calleth ἐπάρχας,) and the Names of the twelve Gods are ſaid to have had their riſe amongſt the Egyptians. Theſe twelve Gods or Spirits, which are thought to be the Gods, (*f*) that in *Proclus* have the Name of θεῶν μοιρηγετῶν, (the Name ſignifieth, that they have a principal hand in diſpenſing the Fates of Men, Cities and all the things of Nature) according to the *Egyptians* and *Chaldeans* bear rule in the twelve Signs of the *Zodiac* each in his proper Sign; one Month is ſacred to each God (as in *Jul. Cæſar*'s Calendar, *Juno* governeth *January*, *Neptune February*, *Minerva March*,) and to theſe principal Gods the *Chaldeans* added thirty Auxiliary Gods in thirty Stars, ſo contriving an Univerſe of their own Character Aſtrological-Magical. So *Proclus* imagineth, (*g*) that Human Souls diſſeminated about their Social Stars are ſome of them *Jovial*, others Martial, others *Heliacal* (of various Planetary Families,) and are ſeverally annex'd to the ſeveral Powers of their God, ſo contriving a *Mundus magicus, an Univerſe of Aſtrological-Magical Conceit.* Such an Univerſe the Aſtrological-Magical Jews alſo (in Conformity to the Pagans) have contriv'd; (*h*) for they ſuppoſe twelve Angels to preſide over the twelve Signs of the *Zodiac* (as *Aſmodel* in *Taurus*, *Hanael* in *Capricorn*,) and ſeven Angels to preſide over the ſeven Planets. Which Planets ſome of the Pagans ſuppos'd to be govern'd by *Intelligences*, others look'd upon the Planets themſelves as a ſort of Demons: As *Euſtathius* obſerveth, (*i*) that the Sun was conſider'd, not only as a Luminary of the Heavens, but as a σωματικὸς δαίμων, *Spirit cloathed with ſuch a luminous Body*; and *Tatianus* ſaith, (*k*) *Chriſtians have learned one inerratick Lord* ἀντὶ πλανητῶν δαιμόνων *inſtead of the Pagans Planet-Demons.* The Stars and Planets in Paganiſm as a ſort of Demons (*l*) deliver Oracles, preſcribe their way of Worſhip, the matter and form of their Statutes, and viſit their Suppliants. By theſe Oracles the Pagans were taught the way of *Planetary Demonolatry*, to invoke the Planets upon their proper Days, that bare their Names and were ſacred to them, according to that Aſtrological-Magical rule of *Pythagoras* (*m*) Ἀφροδίτῃ τῇ θυσιάζειν τῇ ἕκτῃ, *Sacrifice to* Venus *on the ſixth Day.* So *Jarchas* the *Brachman* gave to *Apollonius Tyanæus* (*n*) *ſeven Rings called by the Name of the ſeven Planets*, which *Apollonius* ware one by one according to the Names of the Days. (*o*) So the *Perſians* and *Magi* had their particular Prayers and Devotions according to the ſeveral Days and Months; and not only ſo, but their very Meat and Drink, Clothing and Perfumes were different; and they had their Tables or Rubricks to inſtruct them. The Oracle in *Euſebius* ſaith; *Invoke* Mercury, *and according to the ſame rule the Sun on the Sun's Day; the Moon alſo when her Day cometh, and in like manner* Saturn *and* Venus.

> Κλήσεσιν ἀφθέγκτοις ἃς εὗρε Μάγων ὄχ' ἄριστος
> Τῆς ἑπταφθόγγου βασιλεὺς, ὃν πάντες ἴσασιν,
>
> *With Words Arcane found out by the beſt of the Magi*
> *King of the* Septiſonous, *known unto all Men.*

The Hearers of this Oracle thought, that *Hoſtanes* the Magician was the Perſon here deſcrib'd; ſuppoſing that the Title *King of the* Septiſonous denoteth an Aſtrological-Magical Prince or Chieftain. (*p*) And probably he is ſo intituled by the Oracle, to denote him the King of the *Magi* and the Chieftain of the *Septiſonous Magick*, the Planetary Cant, Charm or

(x) *Macrob. in Som. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

(y) *Philocal. p.* 75.

(z) *De Inſomn. p.* 134.

(a) Σύμφωνός ἐστιν ἡ εἱμαρμένη περιφορὰ τῇ προβολῇ τῶν ψυχῶν τῇ κατ' ἄυλην ἐρχομένῃ εἰς τὴν γένεσιν. In Epict. p. 23.

(b) *Montacut. or. Eccl. T.* 1. *p.* 199.

(c) *Celſ. ap. Orig. l.* 8. *p.* 416.

(d) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 159. *v. Gale Not. p.* 362.

(e) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *Diſſ.* 26. *Herodot. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

(f) *Gale ſupr. p.* 309, & 304. *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 23.

(g) *In Tim. p.* 290, 325, 330.

(h) *Zanch. de oper. Dei P.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 1. *vid. Macrob. Saturn. l.* 1. *c.* 23.

(i) *In Odyſſ. T. p.* 1871.

(k) *Or. c. Græc. p.* 148.

(l) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 5. *c.* 12, 13, 14.

(m) *Selden. de J. Nat & G. l.* 3. *c.* 20.

(n) *Ibid. c.* 19.

(o) *J. Gol. Not. in Alferg. p.* 20.

(p) *Sleden ſupr. c.* 19.

Modulation, which was *Septiſonous*; for the Oracle addeth, *that every God* (or Planet) *muſt be invok'd ſeven times on his day.* Whether *Hoſtanes* the Magician was a King in Civil Polity and Government, (as *Scaliger* ſuppoſeth,) we do not know: But the Philoſophic-Pagan *Julian* was in ſuch Senſe an Aſtrological-Magical Prince. For riſing at Midnight (q) *he ſecretly pray'd to* Mercury, *who is the ſwift and agile Senſe of the World; exciting and quickning the motion of our Minds, as the Theological Doctrines teach*, ſaith the Hiſtorian. The account which this Hiſtorian giveth of the Origin of Divination is the ſame with the Philoſophic-Pagans (for they impute it to the Spirit or *Aporrhæa* from *Phœbus*, *Hecate*, or ſuch others,) and is a Branch of their Aſtrological Magick. (r) *The Sun, the Mind of the World, inſpiring our Minds with a very vehement Ardour and Eſtuation, giveth them the Faculty of Divination.*

IV. *Syneſius* ſuppoſeth, (s) that there is ſuch a Conſent and Conſpiration among the things of the Univerſe (being all the parts of one Animal,) that the Pagan Methods of Divination (by the Stars, Birds, Entrals of Beaſts, and ſuch more) are true Methods; that all ſorts of things are ſignificative of future Events; that one part of the Univerſe is attractive of another, which is of Cognation and Sympathy therewith; that the Magicians *Iynges* are nothing but the Conſent and Sympathy of the parts of the Univerſe, and he is a Wiſe-man that underſtandeth the Cognation of the parts of the World. (t) *For a Stone or Herb that is here, being of Cognation with ſome in-mundane God, he is naturally drawn thereby and inchanted.* So the Pagan Theologers ſay, (u) that the things on Earth, Plants, Stones, Animals, are of the *Solar*, *Lunar*, or the like Family and Order; as amongſt Plants the *Heliotrope* and *Lotus*; amongſt Animals *Lions* and *Cocks*, are *Solar*, they participate of a Solar Numen. (Whence the Lion feareth the Cock becauſe of his greater Solar Virtue, and becauſe he is ſuperior in the Order of things Solar) Theſe things Terrene are cauſally in Heaven, and things Celeſtial are of Cognation and Sympathy with them. The conſideration whereof ſuggeſteth the way of worſhipping the ſuperior Virtues; for by compounding theſe things that are of Cognation and Sympathy with the things Celeſtial and uniting their Forces, we draw influxes upon us. (w) *The Prieſts of old conſidering a certain Cognation of the things of Nature, and the Sympathy of them with one another, of things manifeſt with things occult, and that all the things above were in things below, and the things below were in things above, invented their ſacred Diſcipline. For Terrene things are cauſally and in a Celeſtial manner in things Celeſtial: And things Celeſtial are in things Terrene in a Terrene manner.* Touching the method of attracting the influxes of the Celeſtials (x) *Ficinus* hath compos'd a Book of Aſtrological Magick (interpreting *Plotinus* as himſelf ſaith in his Apology,) which pretendeth to various Methods of attracting the Celeſtial Spirit and Virtue of any Star, as alſo of the Demons, and the vital Spirit and Virtue of the Soul of the World. One method of Attraction is by Aſtrological-Magical Figures. (y) *They uſe Figures that are of operative Virtue, and by the figuration of themſelves after a certain manner they ſecretly induce upon themſelves operative Virtues.* Words and Sounds are ſuppos'd to be efficacious: (z) *For Words, Singings, Sounds, form'd according to a certain preſcrib'd Correſpondence with the Planets, have from thence a ſidereal Virtue. The Planets anſwer thereunto will as naturally come to you from Heaven* (as *Plotinus* and *Jamblichus* ſay) *as a String of a Muſical Inſtrument ſhaketh, when another that is Uniſon to it is ſhaken, or as an Echo is made from the oppoſite Wall.* (a) *Charms, Verſes and certain Sounds and the Figuration of the Agent are attractive.* Aſtrological Prayer (ſuch Prayer as the Platoniſts made to the Sun and other Pagans to other Stars and Planets,) was alſo ſuppos'd to be of great Efficacy. *Memento verò orationem aptè & opportune compoſitam, & affectu ſenſuque plenam atque vehementem, ſimilem cantibus vim habere.* Prayer (ſaith *Ficinus*) *fitly and ſeaſonably made, vehement and full of Affection and Sence, hath the like force with thoſe other modes of Incantation.* Another principal Method of drawing Influxes was by *Images* and *Statues*, whence the Statues and ſenſible *Sacra* were ſuppos'd, to have a Celeſtial and wonderful Virtue reſiding in them. (b) *The Wiſe-men of old that made and erected Images and Statues of the Gods, that ſo they might have the Gods preſent with them, ſeem to have conſider'd the Nature of the Univerſe, and to have underſtood, that Soul is eaſily drawn. It may be got the moſt eaſily of any thing, if any ſuch thing be made, that is of Paſſive Affinity with it, and ſuſceptive of a Portion of it. Of Paſſive Affinity being ſome way reſembled and ally'd, as a Specular Body is of Efficacy to ſnatch away the Species.* Some pretend (c) to make Images of Medicinal Virtue both for Mind and Body, (the Images of *Saturn* or *Jupiter* for procuring long Life, of *Mercury* for Wit and Memory and againſt Fevers;) Magical and Idolatrous Paganiſm (d) hath its *Amulets*, *Seals*, *Phylacteries*, which relate to this ſort of Magick; and ſo doth that celebrated Artifice of the Magi (the followers of *Zoroaſter*, that made uſe of a Golden Ball or little Sphere *mark'd with the Characters of the Celeſtials* (the Hecatine Circle,) having a Sapphire Stone in the midſt, to call forth Spirit and Virtue from *Hecate* or an *Hecatic* Demon. The Aſtrological Magicians (e) had Images alſo devis'd for procuring Felicity or Calamity to a Perſon, Houſe or City. *Olympius* an Egyptian Magician and Aſtrologer by this ſort of Magical Contrivances attempted upon *Plotinus*: But his Attempts were retorted upon himſelf by the Celſitude of *Plotinus*'s Soul, or (which is too probable and lamentable) by his Superiority in the Magical Order.

(q) *Occultè Mercurio ſupplicabat, quem Mundi velociorem ſenſum eſſe, motum mentium ſuſcitantem Theologicæ prodidere Doctrinæ.* Ammian. Marcell. l. 16.

(r) *Sol, ut aiunt phyſici, Mens Mundi,* [in] *noſtras mentes ex ſeſe velut ſcintillas diffunditans, cùm eas incenderit vehementiùs, futuri conſcias reddit.* Gal. Not. in Jambl. p. 224, 236.

(s) *De Inſomn. p.* 134. *Ficin. Arg. in Apolog. Procl. Theol. Plat. l.* 6. *c.* 4.

(t) Καὶ θεῷ τινὶ τῶν εἴσω τοῦ κόσμου λίθος ἐνθένδε καὶ βοτάνη προσήκει, οἷς ὁμοιοπαθῶν εἴκει τῇ φύσει καὶ γοητεύεται.

(u) *Procl. de Magia.*

(w) *Sacerdotes antiqui, cùm conſiderarent in rebus naturalibus cognationem quandam compaſſionemque aliorum ad alia, & manifeſtorum ad vires occultas & omnia in omnibus invenirent, ſacram eorum ſcientiam condiderunt. Agnoverunt enim & in infimis ſuprema, & in ſupremis infima: In cœlo quidem terrena ſecundum cauſam, modoque cœleſti; in terra verò cœleſtia, ſed modo terreno.*

(x) *Ficin. de vita.*

(y) Καὶ τοῖς σχήμασι προσχρῶνται δυνάμεις ἔχουσι καὶ αὐτοὺς σχηματίζοντες ὡδὶ ἐπάγουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀψοφητὶ δυνάμεις. Plotin. En. 4. l. 4. c. 40. Ficin. de vit. l. 3. c. 17, 18, 26.

(z) *Ficin. de vit. l.* 3. *c.* 21. *com. in Plotin. En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 38, 39, 40, 43.

(a) Πέφυκε δὲ καὶ ἐπῳδαῖς, τῷ μέλει καὶ τῇ τοιᾷδε ἠχῇ καὶ τῷ σχήματι τοῦ δρῶντος· ἕλκει γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Plotin. En. 4. l. 4. c. 40, & 30.

(b) Καί μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ πάλαι σοφοί, ὅσοι ἐβουλήθησαν θεοὺς αὐτοῖς παρεῖναι, ἱερὰ καὶ ἀγάλματα ποιησάμενοι, εἰς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς φύσιν ἀπιδόντες, ἐν νῷ λαβεῖν ὡς πανταχοῦ μὲν εὐάγωγον ψυχῆς φύσις. Δέξασθαι γε μὲν ῥᾷστον ἂν εἴη ἁπάντων, εἴ τις προσπαθές τι τεκτήναιτο, ὑποδέξασθαι δυνάμενον μοῖράν τινα αὐτῆς. Προσπαθὲς δὲ τὸ ὁπωσοῦν μιμηθέν, ὥσπερ κάτοπτρον ἁρπάσαι εἶδός τι δυνάμενον. Plotin. En. 4. l. 3. c. 11.

(c) *Ficin. de vit. l.* 3. *c.* 11, 14.

(d) *Scalig. Ep. p.* 377, & *Cauſin. in Hor. Apoll. p.* 100. *Hoffman. Umbr. in Luc. p.* 171.

(e) *Ficin. ſupr.*

V. One of the principal Artifices of the Pagans Aſtrological Magick was the *Teleſms* or *Taliſmanical* Figures and Statues, which are called by *Scaliger priſcum Magorum & Chaldæorum Inventum, an old Invention of the Magi and the Chaldeans:* But *Apollonius Tyanæus* is celebrated as the Prince of the *Teleſmatical Artiſts*, conſecrating in his Travels for the benefit of ſeveral Cities and Countries, *Teleſms* againſt *Storks*, *Gnats*, *Snails*, *Inundations of Rivers*, *Winds and Storms*, and other noxious things. And according to the mode of making theſe στοιχεῖα, or *Teleſms* he took care (as *Scaliger* (*f*) citeth it from *Tzetzes*,) to have Images of Storks made, τὰς ἐπεμβάσεις τῶν ἀστέρων σκοπῶν, *obſerving the Ingreſſes of the Stars.* As in the building of Cities the Rules of Aſtrology were conſulted for a propitious Configuration of the Heavens: So the Teleſmatical Figures and Statues were made and erected under a certain Configuration of the Heavens and the influences thereof; and one of the principal Grounds of the Teleſmatical Artifice was that Aſtrological Maxim (*g*) *vultus hujus ſeculi ſunt ſubjecti vultibus cœleſtibus, the forms of inferiour things are anſwerable to the Celeſtial Configurations, and the Celeſtial Forms influence the Sublunary, the Celeſtial Scorpion and Serpent the Sublunary and Terreſtrial.* Therefore *Apollonius Tyanæus* was careful (in making his Teleſms,) to obſerve τὰς ἐπεμβάσεις τῶν ἀστέρων, *the Ingreſſes of the Planets into thoſe Celeſtial Forms or Configurations.* Some others alſo of the Philoſophic Pagans have pretended to the ſame Wonder-working Faculty (of making Teleſms,) and their Teleſms have been of great Fame. For the Trojan *Palladium* was not διοπετὲς, *a thing that fell from Heaven*, but a *Teleſm* made by a Philoſopher and Mathematician, (as *Joannes Antiochenus* affirmeth) ὡροσκοπίᾳ καλλίστῃ, *under a moſt Fortunate Horoſcope*, and incloſing the Genius or Fortune of the City by Virtue of the uſual Artifices of Aſtrological Magick. To this ſort of Magick we muſt refer the Images call'd by *Triſmegiſt* and other Philoſophic Pagans (*h*) *Statuæ animatæ, Senſu & Spiritu plenæ, futurorum præſciæ, animated Statues, full of Sence and Spirit, preſcious of things future*, ἀγάλματα θείας μετουσίας ἀνάπλεα, *Images full of Divine Communication* (as *Jamblichus* calleth them) ſaid to be οὐρανίας φύσεως, *of a Celeſtial Nature*, and which were uſeful both for the driving away of Evils (which was the uſe of the Teleſms) and alſo for oracular Reſponſes. Which variety of Virtues they were furniſh'd with, not only from the Poſition of the Stars and their beneficial Influxes, (*i*) but ἀπὸ τῶν προσηγγίσιων *Dæmoniorum, becauſe certain Demons at a certain Poſition of the Stars were incloſ'd in thoſe Statues, or being invok'd by Magical Prayer took up their Habitation there.* To this Aſtrological ſort of Magick (*k*) the Conſent of the learned referreth the ***Teraphim*** of the ancient oriental Pagans and the Egyptian *Serapes* (the ſame with Teraphim,) which are ſuppoſ'd to be *oracular ſpeaking Statues made under a certain Poſition of the Stars, **from whoſe influx they were thought to derive their Oracular ſpeaking Virtue.*** That they were Oracular (or Prophetic) and ſpeaking, is manifeſt from Scripture; for the King of ***Babylon*** conſulteth ***Teraphim***, Ezek. 21. 21. ***The Teraphim have ſpoken Vanity***, Zech. 10. 2. (So the Idol *Nebo* hath his Name from נביא, *a Prophet*, Iſa. 46. 1.) whence it ſeemeth the moſt Natural Etymology of *Teraphim*, to derive it from (*l*) Syriac תרף (*percontatus eſt*,) which denoteth *conſulting* or inquiring. The Syrian *Laban* may rationally be thought a Man addicted to Paganical Soothſaying and Divination (becauſe Mankind are madly addicted to Divination, *Teraphim* muſt neceſſarily be in great requeſt,) and his *Teraphim* or Gods (*Gen.* 31. 19, 30.) the ſame with the Oriental Pagans Oracular Statues, which the Name *Teraphim* denoteth in its firſt original Signification. But uſe enlargeth the Terms of Language beyond their firſt and original to a more general Signification (as *Clades* originally ſignify'd (*m*) the breaking of the κλάδοι, or Branches of Trees, but was afterwards extended to other things;) and accordingly in ſeveral places of Scripture the Name *Teraphim*, ſignifieth in general *a Statuary Oracle*, and being join'd with *Ephod* (a Sacerdotal Habiliment) it ſignifieth *a Sacerdotal Statuary Oracle.* Hoſ. 3. 4. *The Children of Iſrael ſhall abide many days without a King and without a Prince* (without Civil Polity, and the things that belong to the Polity of Religion are next enumerated) *and without a Sacrifice, and without an Image* (or Statue,) *and without an Ephod and Teraphim*, that is, a Sacerdotal Oracle. Such an Oracle was that which *Gideon* made, *Judg.* 8. 27. which is Synecdochically called an *Ephod.* Gideon *made an Ephod and put it in his City.* Judg. 17. 4, 5. *The Founder made a graven Image and a molten Image, and they were in the Houſe of* Micah. *And the Man* Micah *had an Houſe of Gods* (of Images or Statues of his Religious Worſhip) *and made an Ephod and Teraphim*; (that is) to the Images and Statues which were meerly for Religious Worſhip he ſuperadded a Sacerdotal Oracle of Vocal Divination. Touching the Religion of *Micah*, I am of Opinion, that the Scripture looketh upon him as an Idolatrous Religioniſt (although his Statues were dedicated to the true God;) for the Name *Elohim* or Gods in the Text (but now cited) plainly ſignifieth the Images or Statues of his Religious Worſhip, as appeareth from the Connexion of the two Verſes, and from the uſual Dialect of Scripture, in which the Name Gods denoteth the Images or Statues of Mens Religious Worſhip. *Gen.* 31. 30. and *ch.* 35. 4. *Exod.* 20. 3, 23. and *ch.* 32. 4, 31. *Joſh.* 24. 14. 2 *King.* 19. 18. 2 *Chron.* 13. 8, &c. The Scripture ſpeaketh of *Micah* in a Phraſe characteriſtical of an Idolatrous Religioniſt (the Man *Micah* had an Houſe of Gods) and the Man himſelf ſpeaketh in a Dialect peculiar to an Idolatrous Religioniſt, *Judg.* 18. 24. *Ye have taken away my Gods.* The Scripture alſo repreſenteth him as a grand Criminal, *Judg.* 17. 6. *In thoſe days there was no King in* Iſrael, *but every Man did that which was right in his own Eyes.* If the *Danites* conſulting this Religioniſts Levite, *Judg.* 18. 5. obtain'd an Anſwer from the true God, this will not infer, that *Micah* was no Idolatrous Religioniſt, ſeeing ſuch as *Balaam* the Magician have had Reſponſes from the true God. But there is nothing in Scripture which aſcertaineth us, that *Micah*'s Levite was ſo far in favour with God, or that his Oracular Anſwer was of Divine Original: Nor on the other hand, is there any appearance, that he degenerated to downright Heatheniſm, or that in the Fabrication of his *Teraphim* there were any Artifices of Aſtrological Magick, whence the

(f) *Ep.* 119.

(g) *Seld. de D. Syr. Synt.* 1. *c.* 2. *J. Gregor. Not.*] *& obſerv. c.* 7, 8. *Hotting. Hiſt. or. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *ed.* 1.

(h) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 249, 256.

(i) *Seld. ſupr. Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 378.

(k) *Seld. ſupr. Spencer de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 7. *c.* 3. *S.* 6. & 10. *Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. col.* 2661. *de Dieu in Gen.* 31. 19.

(l) *Lex. Heptaglot. col.* 3951.

(m) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 12.

the Pagans thought, that their *Teraphim* deriv'd their Oracular Virtue; and therefore they are call'd by the Book *Coſri* (n) אַנְשֵׁי הָרוּחָנִיּוּת *the Men of Spirituality, who ſuppos'd, that Spiritual Influence and Virtue might be drawn from the Heavenly Bodies into the Images which they made by the Methods of Aſtrological Magick.* But that there was nothing of Magical Correſpondence in *Micah*'s *Teraphim*, is more than we may affirm.

VI. The Religion of the *Zabii* (ſo much ſpoken of by Oriental Writers) is an Inſtance of unparallell'd *Aſtrological Magick.* Some Men of Learning (ſuppoſing them the ſame with the ancient Magi inſtituted by *Zoroaſter*) have ſtil'd them *Philoſophers:* But although Philoſophers may be of the Party and Profeſſion of the *Zabii*, and may be call'd by that Name, yet the Name is not deſign'd to denote any profeſſion of Learning or Philoſophy, but of Religion only. As in *Muhammed Ben Iſaac*'s Story the *Charanæi* ſay of themſelves, (o) *We are* Zabii, *which is a Name of Religion mention'd in the Alcoran.* To the Accounts which many Learned Writers have given of this Religion, I have nothing to add, but that there is a neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing two ſorts of *Zabii* (to ſave the Credit of the Oriental Writers) the *Ancient* and the *Modern*, the one *meer Pagan*, the other *Heretical Pagan.* Sometimes the *Zabii* are repreſented as *meer Pagan Religioniſts*; for *Abul-Pharagius* ſaith of *Conſtantine*, (p) *He embrac'd the Chriſtian Faith, having left the Religion of the* Zabii. Of the *Grecians* he ſaith; *moſt of them were* Zabii, *magnifying the Stars and worſhipping Idols.* Of the *Perſians*, *Chaldeans*, *Grecians*, *Egyptians*, *Turks*, *Indians*, *Sinenſes*, he ſaith, *They were all* Zabii, *worſhipping Idols made after the ſimilitude of the Heavenly Bodies.* *Zabiiſm* in the Notion of the *Arabic* Writers plainly ſignifieth in the ſame Latitude with *Ethniciſm*, *Aſtrolatry* and *Heathen Idolatry.* Agreeably whereunto ſome ſay, (q) *The Superſtition of the* Zabii *in the* Arabic *Writers ſeemeth to us, to be the ſame that the* Greek *Fathers call* Helleniſm. The *Zabii* (r) are the *Chaldeans*, (s) the Name is deriv'd from the Arabic Noun *Tſeba*, and importeth צביים *Orientals, by which Name the* Chaldeans *are underſtood.* By *Chaldeans* they mean the Ancient *Chaldeans* agreeably to that of *Abul-Pharagius*, (t) *we are aſſur'd by certain Tradition, that the Profeſſion of the* Zabii *is the ſame with that of the Ancient* Chaldeans. The Profeſſion of the Ancient *Chaldeans* may ſignifie the Profeſſion of *Aſtrology*, and in ſuch Senſe the Profeſſion of the *Chaldeans* is by *Origen* (u) oppos'd to the Profeſſion of the *Magi*, whoſe Buſineſs was matter of Religion principally. But the *Ancient Chaldeans* were alſo the eminent Pagan Religioniſts, the *Magi* were their Philoſophers * (as S. *Hierom* ſaith) and miniſtred their *Sacra*, according to that of the Poet *Claudian*,

——— rituque juvencos
Chaldæo ſtravere Magi ——

The Profeſſion of the *Zabii* being the ſame with the Profeſſion of the Ancient *Chaldean* Religioniſts and their *Magi*, *Abulfeda* may affirm with truth touching theſe *Zabii*, (w) *that their Religion is moſt ancient and had poſſeſs'd almoſt all the World*; and *Maimonides*, (x) *that the* Zabaiſts *were a Nation, quæ totum terrarum orbem impleverat, that had fill'd the whole Earth.* *Maimonides* alſo may affirm with truth, *that they prevail'd in the Days of* Abraham, *that our Father* Abraham *was educated in the Faith and Rites of the* Zabii, *and that the Precepts of the* Moſaic *Law contain a deſign'd Antitheſis to their Rites.* All this is true of the purely Pagan *Eaſterlings*; but nothing of this is true of the Modern and ſecond ſort of *Zabii*, which are commonly ſpoken of and deſcrib'd by the Oriental Writers, and which are plainly an *Heretical* and *Mongrel* ſort of Pagans (not meer Pagans) like the *Gnoſticks* of the Primitive Church. This appeareth from *Beidavi*'s Deſcription of them; for he calleth the *Zabii* (y) *a People betwixt Chriſtians and Maguſeans* (the Magi;) and their grand pretence is דינהם דין נוח *their Foundation is the Religion of* Noah. *Maimonides* repreſenteth them as great Adverſaries to *Noah*; howſoever that be, theſe can be no purely Pagan Religioniſts. *Keſſæus* reporteth, that their Party diſtinguiſh themſelves by this Profeſſion; *we follow the Religion of* Scheth, Edris *and* Noah. They boaſt, that *Seth* the Son *Adam* (of whom they ſay, that beſides *Enoſh* he had another Son call'd *Sabius*) was the Founder of their Religion, and *Enoch* (called by the *Muhammedan* Writers *Edris*) the Propagator thereof. They ſhew a Book (as *Abulfeda* relateth) the Book of their Sect, (z) intituled *The Book of* Seth, as containing his Doctrine and Inſtitutes, and treating of Honeſty of Life, the ſtudy of Virtue, and eſchewing of Vice. Theſe are plainly the practices of *Hereticks* (as *Hottinger* obſerveth) to father their Suppoſititious Books upon *Patriarchs* and *Prophets.* They are call'd (a) *Arabic Hereſiarchs*, and *Thebeth ben Corrah* and *Albategnius* (fam'd Aſtronomers) are noted to have ſymboliz'd with their Hereſie. Moreover, the Rites and Sacra of the *Zabii* (as they are recited by Learned Men) are ſeveral of them extreamly diſſonant from the Rites of meer Pagan Religioniſts and the Ancient *Chaldeans.* And if *Maimonides* and the Oriental Writers do not Legendize, the *Zabii* were *Pre-Adamites*, told prodigious Stories of *Adam* and *a Book of his touching a Tree in* India, *of Diſputations with* Abraham, *of* Seth's *departing from the Opinion of his Father touching the Worſhip of the Moon*, and had wild Conceits touching the Saints of the *Old Teſtament.* As for Philoſophy, *Maimonides* upbraideth them with the height of Ignorance in it, nor is there any appearance of Philoſophy amongſt the Modern *Zabii* ſave only ſome few Principles of the *Ariſtotelian*; whereas the Ancient *Chaldeans* (b) were conſiderable for their Learning in Philoſophy and Aſtronomy. *Abul-Pharagius* giveth this Account of their Wiſdom. (c) *There were of the* Chaldeans *wiſe men, that made ample progreſs in ſeveral ſorts of the Liberal Arts, Mathematical and Theological Sciences; but they chiefly excell'd in the Obſervation of the Stars, and the Inveſtigation of the Celeſtial Arcana, Skill of the Nature of the Stars and their Significations; in this ſort of Learning they excell'd to the height. They taught the Occidentals, how the Sacella* (Schemes of the Celeſtials) *ſhould be rightly order'd, to elicit the Virtues of the Stars, and manifeſt their Natures, and the Projection of their Rays upon them, their agreeable kind of Sacrifices being offer'd, and their peculiar kind of Rites. And from them came marvellous Contrivances, and famous Concluſions for the making Teleſms and other things of like nature.* The Heretical-Pagan *Zabii* retain'd the *Chaldeans Aſtrologicals* as they are here repreſented; but hugely degenerated from the Liberal Arts, Mathematicals and Theologicals alſo of the Ancient *Chaldeans*, agreeably to that Etymology of their

(n) P. 178. *ed. Buxtorf.*

(o) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *ed.* 1.

(p) *Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 2, 62, 69.

(q) *Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 53.

(r) *Scalig. Ep.* 62.

( ) *Huet. Dem. Ev. pr.* 4. *c.* 4.

(t) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 138.

(u) *C. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 45.

* *Com. in Dan.* 2.

(w) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 145.

(x) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. *c.* 29.

(y) *Hotting. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(z) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 138.

(a) *Hoffman. umbr. in Luc. p.* 95.

(b) *Voſſ. de Sect. Phil. c.* 1.

(c) *Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 47.

their Name from the Arabic Verb *Tſeba*, which ſignifieth *a new religionizing and a forſaking the old*; as if theſe Heretical Pagans were ſo denominated, becauſe in part the Religion of their Anceſtors (the Ancient *Chaldeans*) was relinquiſh'd, meer Paganiſm being chang'd into Heretical Paganiſm. Thus *Maimonides* and *Abul-Pharagius* ought to have repreſented the Religion of the more modern ſort of *Zabii*, as in part only and in ſome reſpects the ſame with the Ancient *Chaldeans* Religion.

There is another Etymology of the Name *Zabii* from the Hebrew word צבא (Hoſt) which is thought moſt agreeable to their Rites and Inſtitutes, becauſe they were the Worſhippers of *the Hoſt of Heaven*. They are diſtinguiſh'd by *Shareſtanius* into two Sects: (*d*) *The one the worſhippers of the Sacred Habitacles* (worſhipping the Bodies of the Planets as Habitations of the Spiritual Intelligences;) *the other, the worſhippers of Images and Statues. The former obſerve the Houſes of the Planets, their Riſings, Settings, Conjunctions, diſtributing Days, Nights and Hours to them, aſſigning to them Forms, Figures and Regions; and from theſe Obſervations they preſcribe the way of making Teleſms, Seals and Figures, Inchantments alſo, and Prayers, with ſuch more; all which are thought available to do wonderful Feats by virtue of the Stars. If upon the Day and Hour proper to any Planet, they put on his Seal and the Garments proper to that Planet, and ſay the Forms of Prayer that properly agree to him, they doubt not they ſhall be heard in whatever they ask (depending upon his Influence) and obtain what they pray for.* The other Sect *made their Images according to the proper Figure of every one of the ſeven Sacred Habitacles, of proper Planetary Metal, with due obſervation of Days, Hours, Degrees, Minutes and other things which the Aſtrologers count uſeful for eliciting benign Influxes, uſing alſo ſuch Seals, Garments, Odours, Prayers and Incantations, as were moſt pleaſing to the Star, whoſe Favour they deſign'd to gain.* *Maimonides* ſaith of the *Zabii* in general, (*e*) *They erected Images to the Stars, to the Sun Images of Gold, to the Moon Images of Silver, diſtributing the Metals and Climes amongſt the Stars, and ſaying, that ſuch a Star is the God of ſuch a Clime. They built little Temples, in which they plac'd their Images, affirming an Influx of the Virtues of the Stars into thoſe Images, ſo that thoſe Images were intelligent and loquent, inſpiring Men with the gift of Prophecy and teaching them things ſalutary.* The like Opinion they had of Trees; that by virtue of Charms and Dedications the Stars were preſent in them by an Ethereal Spirit or Spiritual Virtue to wonderful effects. An Aſtrological-Magical Rite of the *Zabii* is by *Maimonides* (*f*) thought the cauſe of that Precept of the Law *Deut.* 22. 5. *The Woman ſhall not wear that which pertaineth to a Man, neither ſhall a Man put on a Woman's Garment.* The Precept carrieth an *Antitheſis* to that Inſtitute of Zabiiſm; *A Man muſt put on Woman's Apparel when he ſtandeth before* Venus, *and a Woman muſt put on Military or Martial Habiliments, when ſhe ſtandeth before* Mars. But touching the *Moſaic* Inſtitutes that are deſign'd to confront the Rites of the *Zabii*, this is not a place to diſcourſe, we will conclude this Account of the *Zabii* and of the Philoſophic Pagans Aſtrological-Magick with theſe two Remarks. One is, *That* the Religion of the preſent *Banians*, *Bramanes* and *Perſees* in *India* (*g*) as it is of late repreſented, is hugely different from the Religion of the Ancient *Brachmans* and *Perſians*, as the Modern *Zabii* are hugely diſſonant from thoſe of ancient times. The other Remark is touching *Plotinus*, who by the generality of the Learned (following *Macrobius*) is thought, to be of Opinion, that the Stars are only ſignificative, not effective of Events. But his own words are expreſſive of a contrary Senſe. (*h*) *But what ſhall we attribute to the Stars and their Configurations, Effection or bare Signification? both Effection and Signification in many Caſes, in others Signification only.*

(d) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 139, *&c.*

(e) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. *c.* 29. *Of the Spirit of the Stars* Ficinus *may be ſeen*, de Vita l. 3. c. 20.

(f) *Ubi ſupr. Par.* 3. *c.* 37.

(g) *A Diſcov. of the Sect. of the* Banians, *&c. by Mr.* Lord.

(h) Ἀλλὰ τί ποιήσεις ἢ σημασίας; καὶ ποιήσεις καὶ σημασίας ἐν πολλοῖς· ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ σημασίας μόνον. *En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 34.

CHAP. VI.

1. *Of the Deities of the Exoterical Theology and the Supream Deity thereof as to the Mundane City locally underſtood.* 2. *A miſtake of* Voſſius. 3. *Of a twofold Conſideration of this Supream Deity.* 4. *Of a groſs miſtake of the Rabbins and ſome of the Fathers.* 5. *Of the ſeveral Aſtral Deities of ſeveral Parties of the Pagans.* 6. *Of the Deities of the* Samaritan *Colonies.* 7. *Of the various Acceptations of the Pagan Deities, with a general Application of them to the Oriental* Baal. 8. *A particular Application of them to the Oriental* Baal, *with an Account of* Heliogabalus's *God and ſome other Deities.* 9. *The Sun not abſolutely the Supream Deity of the Pagans, nor are the Proofs of it valid.* 10. *Of the Pagans deifying Heaven and Earth with the Mundane Elements.* 11. *Of the Deities of the Exoterical Theology that are Inhabitants of the Mundane City, the firſt ſort whereof are the Genial kind of Deities of the Supra-demonial Order.* 12. *Who the principal of theſe Genial kind of Deities were, and of the Herological Deities.* 13. *Of the Deiformities and the Mythical Deities.* 14. *Of the Animal Deities.*

I. THE Pagan Theology muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into the *Exoterical* and *Acroamatical* (as appeareth from our Idea of the Philoſophic Pagan Theology;) and conſequently the Deities of it muſt be diſtributed into thoſe of the *Exoterical* Theology, which were the Popular Pagans Deities; and thoſe of the *Acroamatical* and *Myſtic-Metaphyſical* Theology, which were peculiar to the Philoſophic Pagans; the Popular Pagans knew nothing of them. To give an account of the firſt ſort of theſe Deities (thoſe of the Exoterical Theology) we muſt conſider the World as *a City of Gods and Men*, (ſo the Pagan Theologers define it) the word *City* denoting both the place *inhabited* and the *Inhabitants*. For many of the Pagan Deities belong to the Mundane City *locally* underſtood (the World and the Parts thereof:) Others of them are the Inhabitants of the Mundane City, Inhabitants either *real* or *fictitious*. As to the

Deities belonging to *the Mundane City locally underſtood*, this Mundane City it ſelf is (doubtleſs) the firſt and eldeſt Deity in Paganiſm; for there is great reaſon to think, that the firſt original *Theiſm* of the Pagans was *the Deifying the viſible Heaven or World* (as the Supream Univerſal Deity or Chief God) *and the Lights of Heaven*. Their eldeſt Idolatry was *Uranolatry*, *Coſmolatry*, *Aſtrolatry*, as appeareth from the *Jove* of the eldeſt times. Of the *Perſians*, *Herodotus* reporteth, (i) *that they did not like the* Greeks *think the Gods* ἀνθρωποφυέας, *of Humane Birth and Original*; *but their way was*, *aſcending to the tops of the Mountains they ſacrific'd to* Jove, *calling the whole Circle of the Heaven* Jove. *Strabo* ſaith of them, (k) *They ſacrifice in an high place, thinking the Heaven* Jove. So *Plutarch* ſaith of the *Egyptians*, (l) *They take the firſt God and the Univerſe for the ſame thing*. And *Diodorus Siculus* affirmeth, that *Pan* and *Zeus* are but two ſeveral Names for one and the ſame Deity. Univerſal Mundane Nature the *Egyptians* deify'd under the Name of *Iſis* (which was their Supream Deity) as the Inſcription before her Temple at *Sais* ſheweth; *I am all that hath been, is, and ſhall be, and my Peplum or Veil no Mortal hath ever yet uncover'd*; and that other Inſcription on an Altar at *Capua* (*Tibi una. Quæ es omnia. Dea. Iſis.*) which maketh her *one and all things*. The *Egyptian Scrapis* (their greateſt and ſupream Deity) is *the World*; (m) *for Serapis being ask'd by* Nicocreon (King of the *Cypriots*) *what God he was? made anſwer, I am a God ſuch as I deſcribe my ſelf. The Starry Heaven is my Head, the Sea is my Belly, the Earth my Feet, mine Ears are in the Ether, and mine Eye is the bright Eye and Lamp of the Univerſe, the Sun.* The Orphic Theology (which is generally thought a Deſcendent from *Egypt*) makes (n) a like Deſcription of *Jove* or *Zeus*. So *Cicero* hath ſhew'd from *Ennius* and *Euripides* (who is call'd the Scenical Philoſopher) that *the Heaven or Circumambient Ether* is (o) the *European* Pagans *Jove*, the Supream Univerſal Numen. So in the Poet *Æſchylus* (of whom *Clemens* (p) ſaith, that he ſpeaketh concerning God σεμνῶς σφόδρα, *mighty venerably*) *Jupiter* is univerſal Mundane Nature. (q) Jupiter *is Ether and Earth, and Heaven, and all things. And if there be any thing above theſe* Jupiter *is it*. (r) *The Naturaliſts* (ſaith *Macrobius*) *called the Sun* Dionyſos, *the Mind of* Jove, *becauſe the Mind of the World. The World is called Heaven, which they call* Jove. *Whence* Aratus *being to ſpeak of Heaven, ſaith, Let us take our riſe from* Jove. So in an ancient Inſcription the viſible Heaven (s) is intituled *Eternal*, *the beſt and greateſt* Jupiter. So in *Plato*'s ſeventh of Laws the Pagans confound *the greateſt God* and *the whole World*. *As to the greateſt God and the whole World* (τὸν μέγιστον θεὸν ϗ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον) *Men ſhould not buſily ſearch after the knowledge thereof* (ſay they) *nor buſily enquire into the cauſes of things, it being not pious for them ſo to do*. Agreeably to which Senſe of the Ancient Pagans that Tradition of theirs reported by *Ariſtotle* is to be underſtood touching the Divinity or Godſhip of the Heavens. (t) *It hath been deliver'd to us from thoſe of very ancient times, both that the Stars are Gods, and that the Divinity containeth the whole of Nature.* This Notion was ſo familiar with the Pagans, that *Strabo* writing of *Moſes*, could not but ſuppoſe the God of his Religion, to be of this Nature and Notion; (u) *That which containeth us all, and the Earth, and the Sea, which we call Heaven, and the World, and the Nature of the whole* (Univerſal Mundane Nature.) So the Poet *Juvenal* deſcribeth the God of the *Jews*.

(w) *Nil præter Nubes & Cœli numen adorant.*
They worſhip no Deity but the Clouds and the Heaven.

So *Diodorus Sic.* reporteth *Moſes* to have been of Opinion, (x) *That the Heaven which ſurroundeth the Earth, is the only God and Lord of all.* Theſe Pagans did not imagine, that the *Jews* could worſhip any higher kind of Deity than their Supream *Jove*, *the Heaven*, which in the larger Senſe of the Word ſignifieth the whole Corporeal World. So the *Stoicks* uſually Theologize; (y) *that God is all that we ſee, and all that we do not ſee, the Stars are parts of* Jove, *all the Gods and Goddeſſes are one Jupiter. Vis illum Naturam vocare? non peccabis: vis illum vocare Mundum? non falleris.* God, Nature and the World are ſynonymous in their Theology; and the World with them is the Supream Deity, becauſe it is the *Supream Excellence*; (z) *for in Nature there is nothing greater or better than the World*, ſaith *Seneca*. *Pliny* (a Spurious *Stoick*) rightly expreſſeth their Dogma, or rather the firſt and principal Dogma of Pagan Theiſm. (a) *The World or the Heavenly Canopy muſt in reaſon be thought a Deity.* Such a Deity was the *European* Pagans *Jove*, and ſuch a Deity was the *Aſiatic Bel* or *Baal*; for that Name is interpreted οὐρανὸς, *the Heaven*, (b) *the comprehenſion of the Ether and the Stars*, and the Heaven was called *Bel* by the *Chaldeans*, as *Euſtathius* reporteth from the Ancients. And *Philo* ſaith of the *Chaldeans*, (c) *They ſuppos'd the viſible World or Heaven the Supream Deity.* The proclivity of Heathen Mankind to ſuch a Notion of the Supream Deity is viſible in a late Writer of the Affairs of *China*. (d) *A mighty Nation of the* Tartars, *though they are not by what appeareth, of any particular Religion, but indifferently receive all Religions, which they are acquainted with, and conform themſelves to all, not knowing or caring to know what it is they adore, and they have no knowledge of the Idols or Deities which the Ancients ador'd; nor doth it appear, that they receive or retain thoſe firſt Notions which the inſtinct of Nature without the aſſiſtance of any*

(i) L. 1. c. 131.

(k) L. 16.

(l) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 7. c. 2.

(m) Εἰμὶ θεὸς τοιόσδε μαθεῖν, οἷον κ' ἐγὼ εἴπω
οὐράνιος κόσμος κεφαλὴ, γαστὴρ δὲ θάλασσα,
Γαῖα ἢ μοι πόδες εἰσι. τὰ δ' οὔατ' ἐν αἴθερι κεῖται.
ὄμμα τε τηλαυγὲς, λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο.
Lipſ. Phyſ. l. 2. diſſ. 10.

(n) *En hujus caput eximium, vultuſque decoros*
Undique reſplendens cœlum, cui pendula circum
Aurea Cæſaries Aſtrorum lumina fundit.
Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 3. c. 9.

(o) *Hunc Ennius* nuncupat ita dicens,
Aſpice hoc ſublime candens, quem invocant omnes Jovem. Hunc etiam Augures noſtri cùm dicunt, Jove fulgente, tonante: dicunt enim, Cœlo fulgente tonante. Euripides autem, ut multa præclare, ſic hoc breviter.
Vides ſublime fuſum, immoderatum æthera
Qui tenero terram circumvectu amplectitur.
Hunc ſummum habeto Divum, hunc perhibeto Jovem.
De N. D. l. 2.

(p) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 440.

(q) Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθὴρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' οὐρανὸς
Ζεύς τοι τὰ πάντα, χ' ὅτι τῶνδ' ὑπέρτερον.

(r) Phyſici Διόνυσον Διὸς νοῦν, *ſolum mundi mentem eſſe dixerunt. Mundus autem vocatur cœlum, quod appellant Jovem. unde Aratus de cœlo dicturus ait*, ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα. Saturn. l. 1. c. 18.

(s) *Optimus Maximus, Cœlus æternus, Jupiter.* Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p. 30.

(t) Παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων ϗ παλαιῶν, ὅτι θεοί τέ εἰσιν οὗτοι, ϗ περιέχει τὸ θεῖον τὴν ὅλην φύσιν. *Metaph. l.* 14. *c.* 8.

(u) Τὸ περιέχον ἡμᾶς ἅπαντας ϗ γῆν ϗ θάλατταν, ὃ καλοῦμεν οὐρανὸν ϗ κόσμον, ϗ τὴν τῶν ὅλων φύσιν. *L.* 16. *Intell. Syſt. p.* 516.

(w) *Gat. Not. in Ant. l* 4. ſ. 23.

(x) Τὸν περιέχοντα τὴν γῆν οὐρανὸν μόνον εἶναι θεὸν ϗ τῶν ὅλων κύριον.

(y) *Gat. ſupr. Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 8. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 11.

(z) *Nihil enim novit natura vel majus vel pulchrius.* Vid. Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 6. c. 5.

(a) *Mundum & hoc quod nomine alio cœlum appellare libuit, cujus circumflexu teguntur cuncta, numen eſſe credi par eſt.*

(b) *Seld. de D. Syr. Synt.* 2. *c.* 1. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 15.

(c) Τὸν κόσμον αὐτὸν ὑπέλαβον εἶναι θεόν· περὶ Ἀβραάμ. *p.* 244. *Ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(d) *Palafox p.* 440. *Heaven ſignifieth* τὸν ἄνω τόπον, *the place above us.* Ariſtot.

any ſupernatural Light impreſſeth upon the very Breaſt of every Man ; yet they Worſhip the Heavens, and to theſe they pay their greateſt Adoration ; and this maketh the greateſt impreſſion upon the Minds of the People. Of the barbarous Nation of the *Gallans* bordering upon *Habiſſinia* we have this account. (e) *They have no Idols, and but very little Divine Worſhip. If you ask them concerning God or any ſupreme Numen, or who it is, that governeth the Earth with ſo much order and conſtancy? They anſwer, Heaven, which embraceth in their view all the reſt.* (f) A great Nation on the North of *Japan* are ſaid to have no other Religion ſave only *the Worſhip of Heaven* ; and the Supreme Deity or greateſt God of the *Chineſe* is ſaid to be *the Heaven*, which they ſuppoſe *increate, without beginning, unbodily and a Spirit.*

II. According to the Teſtimony of the Scriptures and of Heathen Authors, the conſent of all the Chriſtian and the beſt of the Hebrew Writers, the firſt and earlieſt Idolatry of the Heathen was the Worſhip *of the Lights of Heaven*, which inferreth the Antiquity of *Uranolatry*, and that the firſt Original Pagan Theiſm was the deifying *the* (Syſtema Coſmicum) *Mundane Syſtem.* (g) *Voſſius* indeed affirmeth (agreeably to their Opinion, who ſuppoſe the Sun, to have been the Pagans ſupreme Deity,) that their Worſhip of the Celeſtial Lights was antecedent to the Worſhip of the *Æther*, *Heaven or World* ; that *Uranolatry* and *Coſmolatry* ſucceeded *Aſtrolatry* ; which is a Suppoſition altogether groundleſs, and as unreaſonable, as if he ſhould ſuppoſe them the Worſhippers of Mountains and Rivers, before they were the Worſhippers of their great Goddeſs *the Earth* (h) *which Plato calleth the moſt ancient of the Gods.* (i) The ſame Philoſopher ſuppoſeth, that *Uranolatry* and *Aſtrolatry* was the eldeſt Religion of the Pagans, and that *Uranolatry* was contemporary with *Aſtrolatry* both amongſt the *Greeks* and *Barbarians.* The Greeks receiv'd *Aſtronomy* and the knowledge of thoſe Celeſtial Deities, the *Stars*, from the *Barbarians*, thoſe ancient Pagan Nations, which were the Inventors of Aſtronomy, and which in *Egypt* and *Syria* (as *Plato* diſcourſeth in his *Epinomis*) had great advantage for the knowledge of the Stars becauſe of the Serenity of their Country. The Theology therefore of thoſe ancient Pagan Nations may be underſtood from the Greek Theology of the elder times, which the Philoſopher in his *Cratylus* thus repreſenteth. *The firſt Inhabitants of Greece ſeem, as many of the Barbarians now, to have thought the Sun and the Moon and the Earth, καὶ ἄστρα καὶ οὐρανὸν, and the Stars and the Heaven, the only Gods. When they beheld theſe running round perpetually, they call'd them θεοὺς from θέω, which ſignifieth to run. Afterwards taking notice, that there were other Gods, they called them alſo by the ſame Name.* As the firſt Inhabitants of *Greece* deify'd not only the Sun, Moon and Stars, but the Heaven above them: So when *Diodorus* ſaith of the Men of ancient times, (k) *that beholding the World and univerſal mundane Nature, being ſtruck with admiration, they thought the prime eternal Gods were the Sun and Moon, calling the one* Oſiris, *the other* Iſis ; this is not ſo to be underſtood, as if they deify'd the Sun and Moon excluſively of the reſt of the World above them: But beholding τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὴν τῶν ὅλων φύσιν, *the World and univerſal Mundane Nature*, and being ſtruck with admiration, they deify'd it, and ſuch illuſtrious parts of it as the Sun and Moon. So when *Maimonides* ſaith of the *Zabii*, that their Tenent was, (l) *there is no other God but the Stars* ; This is not to be underſtood excluſively of *Heaven*, as if the *Zabii* did not ſuppoſe it the Supreme Deity ; for the ſame Author ſaith of them, (m) *All the Zabaiſts held the eternity of the World ; for the Heavens according to them are the Deity.* So *Philo* ſaith of the *Chaldeans*, (n) *They ſuppoſe the Stars to be Gods, and the Heaven and the World* (the firſt and greateſt God,) *to which they refer the Fates of Men, acknowledging no cauſe of things abſtract from ſenſibles.* If the firſt Heathen deify'd the Lights of Heaven (o) becauſe of their *Amplitude*, *Pulchritude*, *Utility*, and Reſidence in *Heaven* (which is called τὸ θεῖον, *the Divinity* by *Ariſtotle* in his Book *de Cælo l. 2. c. 3.*) they could not fail upon the ſame accounts to Deify the illuſtrious Canopy of Heaven, according to that of *Plato* in his *Epinomis* ſpeaking of the Author of all Goods. (p) *What God is it, that I Celebrate? The Heaven in any wiſe, whom it is moſt juſt that we, as all the other Demons and Gods, honour and pray to eximiouſly. This we all readily acknowledge the Author of all other Goods to us.* *Celſus* cannot but wonder at the Jews, (q) that worſhipping Heaven (as he ſuppos'd,) they ſhould ſlight the moſt auguſt and venerable and potent Parts of it, the Sun, Moon and Stars. It would have been as great an incongruity in the firſt Heathen, to have deify'd the Sun, Moon and Stars without acknowledging the Divinity of the Heavens and the Mundane Syſtem, which is much more auguſt and venerable than any luminous parts of Heaven. So ſtrange an incongruity ought not to be ſuppos'd in the Heatheniſm of the firſt times, becauſe no ſuch thing, but the contrary appeareth in the Pagans Theiſm of ſucceeding Ages ; the univerſality of Pagan Theiſts (otherwiſe of diſagreeing Sentiments) agreeing in the Godſhip of the viſible World or Heaven, which was their Catholic Doctrine. So ſenſible a Deity, of ſuch admirable *Greatneſs* and *Goodneſs*, *Sublimity*, and *Pulchritude*, (which is viſibly πολυόφθαλμος, *many-ey'd*, as the Name of the Egyptian God *Oſiris*, who is the ſame with *Serapis*, is ſaid to ſignifie,) *Order*, *Stability*, *Perennity*, and ſuppos'd *Incorruptibleneſs*, to which in ancient times (their Learning being that of Aſtrology) they attributed the *Gubernation* of all things, could not be overlook'd in the firſt Inſtitution of the Aſtrological Religion of the Pagans: Nor could their Religion well be without one Supreme all-comprehending Numen. (r) *Ipſum itaque Jovem veteres vocaverunt, the Heathen of ancient times therefore called the Heaven Jove.* (s) The old Arabians are ſaid by *Arrianus*, to have worſhipp'd only two Gods, *Uranus* and *Dionyſus. Uranus as containing in himſelf both the other Stars and the Sun, from whom the greateſt and moſt manifeſt utility cometh to Human Affairs.*

III. The viſible Heaven conſider'd under this Notion *as the Mundane Syſtem of all-comprehending Amplitude* was the Pagans Supreme Deity: But they often conſider it under another Notion, *as the ſupernal part of the World*, and

in

(e) *Ludolph. Hiſt. of Ethiop. B. 1. c. 16.*

(f) *Hoffman. umbr. in Luce p. 88. Purchas pilgr. Par. 1. B. 4. c. 19. S. 2. B. 5. c. 15. S. 7.*

(g) *De Idol. l. 2. c. 37. & l. 7. c. 2.*

(h) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 51.*

(i) *V. Eugubin. de Per. phil. l. 5. c. 3.*

(k) *Dion. Voſſ. in Maimon. de Idol. p. m. 5.*

(l) *Nullum eſſe Deum præter ſtellas*, Mor. Nev. Par. 3. c. 29.

(m) *Omnes Zabaiſtæ crediderunt Antiquitatem mundi, quia cœli juxta illos ſunt Deus.*

(n) Τοὺς ἀστέρας θεοὺς νομίζουσι, καὶ τὸν σύμπαντα οὐρανὸν τε καὶ κόσμον. Περὶ εὐγενείας, p. 622. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(o) *Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 35.*

(p) *Voſſ. Ibid. c. 37.*

(q) *Ap. Orig. l. 5. p. 234.*

(r) *Macrob. ſom. Scip. l. 1. c. 17.*

(s) *Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 26.*

in this Notion they muſt neceſſarily make it the Supreme of their Deities. For ſeeing the World (according to their Hypotheſis) is a World of Deities, it naturally and neceſſarily falleth to the ſhare of the Supernal part of the World, to be the Supreme of Deities. (t) *Univerſal Mundane Nature,* (ſaith *Varro*) *is divided into Heaven and Earth, which is the ancient Diviſion. The ſupernal Places and thoſe of the Gods, are called the Heavens: The places below and thoſe of Men, the Earth. Heaven is of a twofold acceptation: The higheſt part of it where the Stars are, is called Heaven; and that which Pacuvius pointeth at, the next Circumambient, which ſurroundeth and containeth the Earth. Heaven and Earth are the chief Gods. Theſe Gods are the ſame with* Serapis *and* Iſis *in* Egypt, Taautes *and* Aſtarte *amongſt the Phenicians,* Saturn *and* Ops *in Latium. For Heaven and Earth are (as the Samothracian Myſteries teach) Dei magni, the great Gods, which are call'd in Samothrace,* θεοὶ δυνατοὶ, *and in the Books of the Augurs, Divi potes, the potent Gods.* This pair of Deities the Ancients renown'd for their Beneficence (u) ſtiled them *Jupiter and Juno, the grand Parents of things: Heaven or Jupiter is ſtiled Father, and the Earth hath the name of Mother.* The one was ſuppos'd, to be of *Active Virtue* and *Maſculine Nature* (for Heat, Fire and Soul in Generation is from Heaven, where there are innumerable immortal Fires,) the other was thought of Feminine Paſſive Nature (as the *Scythians* in *Herodotus* (w) ſuppoſe the Earth to be the Wife of *Jove,*) whence the Athenians (x) made them their Nuptial Deities. The one they ſuppos'd of *ſubject* Nature, the other *dominant* and *ruling*, agreeably to the natural notice of their Minds (that the Heavens rule,) and as the Poet repreſenteth them. (y) *Behold me* Acmonides *King of the broad-breaſted Earth. Acmonides* (ſaith the Scholiaſt) is Heaven, the ſame with *Jove*. In ſtiling him *Acmonides* the Poet ſeemeth to have reſpect, both to his uſual Name *Chronides* (for *Acmon* in *Heſychius* is interpreted *Chronos,*) and alſo to the Name of the Sidereal Heaven, which is called Ἀκμὼν, (*Acmon*) from its ſteddy unwearied Motion. Which Sidereal Heaven (whether conſider'd as univerſal mundane Nature All-comprehending, or as the ſupernal part of the World) was accounted by the Pagans *Animate* and *Intelligent* mundane Nature, otherwiſe they would not have accounted it *Jove* their Imperial Majeſty of Heaven. For they deify'd *Heaven* and *Earth*, becauſe they ſuppos'd them *Animate* and *Intelligent*, as the Writer *de placitis Philoſophorum* diſcourſeth of the Men of ancient times. (z) *The Notion of God in their Minds had its riſe from the appearing Stars, ſeeing them the cauſes of very great Harmony, and beholding the ſtated orderly Succeſſion of Day and Night, Summer and Winter, Riſings and Settings, and the Animals and Fruits brought forth by the Earth. Wherefore Uranus ſeem'd to them to be the Father, becauſe the pouring out Water is as the emiſſion of Seed: But the Earth the Mother, becauſe ſhe receiveth the Seed and bringeth forth.* The Men of ancient times deify'd the Stars together with Uranus (Heaven:) So the Orientals (a) *worſhipped the Sun together with Heaven, Antiquity call'd the Sun the Eye of Jove*; whence it appeareth, that the firſt Original Pagan Theiſm was the deifying *Heaven* (the Mundane Syſtem,) the making this their Jove.

But *Varro* obſerveth from *Pacuvius*, that there is an Heaven on this ſide the Sidereal Heaven, that the ambient Air is ſtiled *Jupiter* (whoſe Temple was perforate (b) *ut videatur Divum, id eſt Cœlum, that the Air-heaven may be ſeen,*) which *Air-Jupiter* was look'd upon (c) as *Omnipreſent* and *Omniſcient*, had the Supreme Attributes communicated to him, is ſtil'd by the Poet *Virgil*, *Pater omnipotens*, and is ſo confounded with the great univerſal *Jove*, that *Theon* the Scholiaſt upon *Aratus* ſuppoſeth, that this Hemiſtich —— τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν, (*for we are his Off-ſpring*) may be underſtood of the Air, which is ſtiled by him Ζεὺς φυσικὸς, *the Phyſical Jupiter*. The mean and ſottiſh Conceits which the Greeks and Romans had of their *Jupiter-Father*, appear in the Verſes of *Ennius* touching this *Air-Jupiter*. (d) To this Senſe; *The Air as the Greeks call it, which hath various Tranſmutations, is* Jupiter, *the Helper of Men, Cities and Cattel, the Father-King of the Gods and Men.* The vulgar Notion of the Pagan *Jove* is of great Affinity with this *Air-Jupiter* (for by *Jove* they commonly underſtood the Power of the Air that thundereth and lightneth;) who hath alſo the Name of *Dieſpiter*, and was the Preſident of the Day; the ſuperiour part of the World being under the Preſidency of *Jove*, and the inferiour part under *Hades* or *Pluto*. So the Gods were diſtributed into *Dii Superi* and *Inferi*; which diſtribution of them probably had its Origin only from a diſtribution of the parts of the Univerſe; for (e) they that derive it from the *Perſian Ditheiſm*, have not alledg'd any ſufficient Reaſon for their Opinion.

IV. The Rabbins ſuppoſe, that Providence taketh no care of the Gentiles, but hath intirely committed the care of them (f) to the Stars, Planets, and the Angels which preſide over and govern them; and that the Goods and Evils which befal them, are not from God's governing Providence, (g) but from the determination of the Stars, or from the Aſtral Preſident Angels, that act by the Influence of the Stars. Such a ſuperiority in Rule and Government is manifeſtly ſomething of Deity (God-propriety,) the Stars according to this Rabbinical Hypotheſis are Deities to the Gentiles, who are abandon'd by God, to Serve and Worſhip them. As the Gentiles made them in Honour and Dignity Gods by their Religious Worſhip: So *Trypho* in *J. Mart.* ſaith of the Sun and Moon, (h) *which it is written, God hath granted to the Gentiles to Worſhip as Gods.* To this Senſe ſeveral ancient Writers of the Church have interpreted, *Deut.* 4. 19, 20. *And leſt thou lift up thine Eyes unto Heaven, and when thou*

(t) *Omnis natura in cœlum & terram diviſa eſt. Cœli dicuntur loca ſupera, & ea Deorum: Terræ, loca infera, & ea hominum. Cœlum dicitur duobus modis: Et pars ejus ſumma, ubi Stellæ; & id quod Pacuvius demonſtrat, cùm dicit, Hoc vide circum ſupraque quod complexu continet terram. Principes Dei, Cœlum & Terra.* Varro de L. L p. 13. 8, 17.

(u) *Duo hi Parentes magni dicuntur: Jupiter* (Cœlum) *Pater appellatur. Tellus terra mater.* Ibid. p. 17, 18, & de re ruſtic. p. 4.

(w) *l.* 4. *c.* 59.

(x) *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 58.

(y) Λεῦσσέ με τὸν γᾶς τε βαθυστέρνου ἄνακτ' Ἀκμονίδαν. Ibid. c. 37.

(z) Θεοῦ ἔννοιαν ἔσχον ἀπὸ τῶν φαινομένων ἀστέρων, ὁρῶντες τούτους μεγάλης συμφωνίας ὄντας αἰτίους, καὶ τεταγμένας ἡμέραν τε καὶ νύκτα, χειμῶνα καὶ θέρος, ἀνατολάς τε καὶ δυσμάς· καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῆς γῆς ζωογονούμενα καὶ καρπογονούμενα. Διὸ πατὴρ μὲν ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ οὐρανὸς ὑπάρχειν, μήτηρ δὲ ἡ γῆ. τούτων δὲ ὁ μὲν οὐρανὸς πατὴρ, διὰ τὸ τὰς ὑδάτων ἐγχύσεις σπερμάτων ἔχειν τάξιν. Ἡ δὲ γῆ μήτηρ, διὰ τὸ δέχεσθαι ταῦτα καὶ τίκτειν. L. 1. c. 6.

(a) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 11. & 37.

(b) *De L. L. l.* 4.

(c) *Grot. Dict. Poet. p.* 117.

(d) *Iſthic eſt is Jupiter, quem dico, quem Græci vocant aera: Qui ventus eſt & nubes, himber poſtea, atque ex himbre frigus; ventus poſt fit, aer denuo. Hæc propter Jupiter ſunt iſta, quæ dico tibi: Qui mortaleis atque urbeis belluaſque omneis juvat. Quòd hic omneis & ſub hoc. Eundemque appellans dicit Ennius, Divumque hominumque Pater Rex.* Varro ſupr. p. 18.

(e) *Marſham. can. chr. p.* 258. *ed. Lipſ. Windet. de vit. funct. S.* 3.

(f) *L'Emper. not. in Iacchiad. in Dan. p.* 116, 117, 209, 214.

(g) *Idem Not. in Abarb. in Iſa.* 30. *p.* 61, *&c. Hulſ. Theol. Jud. p.* 437.

(h) *p.* 274.

ſeeſt the Sun, and the Moon, and the Stars, even all the Hoſt of Heaven, ſhouldeſt be driven to Worſhip them, and Serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all Nations under the whole Heaven. But the Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the Iron Furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a People of inheritance, as ye are this day. *Clemens,* who at a great rate of Extravagance hath diſcours'd for the Greek Philoſophy, at the ſame rate hath diſcours'd for the Gentiles Religion of Aſtrolatry; *that they were in part Religious by it, and that the Worſhip of the Stars was the way which was given them, to raiſe themſelves unto God.* (*i*) *God, who hath preſcience, knew, that the Gentile would be a Non-Believer, nevertheleſs, that he might not want ſuch Perfection as was competible to him, God gave him Philoſophy, but before Faith. He gave alſo the Sun, Moon and Stars for Religious Worſhip, which God hath made for the Nations, ſaith the Law; that they might not be totally Atheous, and totally Periſh.* *Clemens* is follow'd by (*k*) *Origen* and *Euſebius*; who ſaith; *It was requiſite, for them* (the Gentiles,) *to make choice of the moſt excellent parts of Heaven, leſt ſeeking after God and buſying themſelves about things inviſible, they ſhould ſtumble upon the Aerial Demons.* Some ſuppoſe, that the Senſe of *Moſes* is; that God divided the Sun, Moon and Stars to the mundane Nations, ſo as to permit the Worſhip of them to the Gentiles, but that he ſtrictly forbiddeth it to his own peculiar People; and to this Senſe *Grotius* inclineth: but aſſuredly there is no foundation for any of theſe odd Conceits in the Moſaic Text, the ſeveral Clauſes whereof are ſo many diſſuaſives from Aſtrolatry. For that *Moſes* may alienate the Iſraelites Minds from it, he repreſenteth to them, of how diſſonant a Character the Stars are *from their God,* and of how diſſonant a Character themſelves are from *other People.* The Stars are not any religiouſly adorable Objects, but ought to be conſider'd as the Clouds and Rain, *Act.* 14. 17. as the Works of Gods general Beneficence (that is the true Notion of them) *which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all Nations under the whole Heaven.* This diſtribution of them in Creation and Providence is remote from the Inſtitution of Sanctity, and Iſraelitical Theiſm; and the Stars themſelves are ſo remote from the *Divinity,* that they are nothing better than things of common mundane Nature, and of the common mundane Nations, *Dona Dei ſine Deo, Gifts of God but without God,* Godleſs Bounties. They are great utilities to the World, and inſtances of God's Beneficence to all Nations, all Nations therefore are Objects of God's Beneficence: But not of ſuch Beneficence as his redeemed *Iſrael,* they are not Nations of his Election and Inſtitution of Sanctity, as the Nation of *Iſrael* is, (which therefore is under the mightieſt Obligations to be Gods Religioniſts, and not Star Worſhippers,) *which the Lord hath taken and brought forth out of the Iron-furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a People of inheritance.* Agreably to this diſſonant Character of Iſrael from other Nations the Book *Coſri* thus diſcourſeth. (*l*) *Moſes in the Introduction of his Speech unto* Pharaoh *ſaith, the God of the Hebrews hath ſent me unto thee. He did not ſay, the God of Heaven and Earth hath ſent me unto thee; nor did he ſay, my Creator, or thy Creator. The like Introduction God maketh in ſpeaking to the People of* Iſrael, Exod. 20. 2. *I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; not I am Creator of the World and your Creator.* The Jews Inſtitution therefore and their near Relation to God (for their Church was not a Society of meer Creator and rational Creatures, nor did they acknowledge and Worſhip God as meer Creator of all things, but as God-redeemer of a peculiar People) ſetteth them at a great remove from the Heathens Religion of Aſtrolatry, which was doubtleſs the principal and primitive Branch of their Idolatry, as *Maimonides* ſaith. (*m*) *In the days of* Enoſh *the Sons of Men grievouſly err'd, and the Wiſe-men of that Age became brutiſhly ſtupid (even* Enoſh *himſelf being of their number,) and their Error was this; that ſince God had created the Stars and Spheres to govern the World, and placing them on high had beſtow'd this honour upon them, that they ſhould be his Miniſters and ſubſervient Inſtruments, Men ought therefore to Praiſe them, Honour and Worſhip them.* There is a miſtake touching *Enoſh* and ſomething of Self-contradiction alſo viſible in this Doctor's account of the Origin of Idolatry (as will be noted hereafter:) But theſe intermixtures of Folly are no prejudice (*n*) to the wiſdom and reaſonableneſs of his Hypotheſis, that the firſt original Idolatry of the Heathen *was the Worſhip of the Stars,* which they commonly call the *Senſible* and *Viſible* Gods. So *Philo* diſcourſing of the Creation of Heaven, ſaith, (*o*) *It was to be the moſt ſacred Manſion-houſe both of the Inviſible and viſible Gods.* Where it is again obſervable, that *Philo* like an Orthodox Philoſophic Pagan (for ſuch he was more than a Jew) calleth the Stars Gods. The proclivity of Mankind to this ſort of Idolatry in the elder times is viſible, *Job* 31. 26, 27. *If I beheld the Sun when it ſhined, or the Moon walking in brightneſs, and my heart hath been ſecretly enticed, or my mouth hath kiſs'd my Hand.*

V. Several Parties of the Pagan Religioniſts had their ſeveral *Aſtral* and *Aſtrological* Deities, of which number (agreeably to the Antiquity of Aſtrolatry and Aſtrology) ſeveral of the Deities (*p*) that occur in the old Teſtament manifeſtly are. For the Star-worſhip of the ancient times was the ſame with that of the *Indians* and other barbarous Nations of theſe latter Ages, (*q*) that ſuppoſe twelve Stars (which they adore) to preſide over the twelve Months; that every Animal hath its like in Heaven, whence it is procreated and receiveth its growth; that the Stars are of ſeveral Faculties and Offices (whence they adore them, as need requireth;) one Star preſideth over Bears and Tygers, another is the Keeper of their Cattel; ſome of them are addicted to the Worſhip of *Lyra,* others adore the *Pleiades,* and others are the Devoto's of the Northern Polar Star. (*r*) The Arabic Writers report, that the *Arabians* and *Indians* differ'd from others in their Method of Aſtrological Obſervation and Divination (for in their Aſtrological Judgments they had greater regard to the fix'd Stars than to the Planets;) and that the Indian *Zabii* were different from the *Chaldean* and *Grecian Zabii* in this; theſe latter worſhipp'd the Planets in chief, the former the fix'd Stars. (*s*) Among the old Arabian Tribes there was ſome diverſity of Religion; for *Hamyar* worſhipp'd the Sun, *Cenanah* the Moon, *Miſah* the Star *Aldobran* (the Bull's Eye,) *Lachamus* and *Jedamus* worſhipp'd *Jupiter, Tai* the Star *Sohail* or *Canopus,*

(i) *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 482.

(k) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 236. *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *de Dem. ev. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(l) p. 18. *ed. Buxt.*

(m) *De Idololatr. c.* 1.

(n) *Dion. Voſſ. not. in Maim. de Idol. p. m.* 2, 4.

(o) Θεῶν ἀοράτων τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν ἔμελλεν οἶκος ἔσεσθαι ἱερώτατος. De Mund. Opif. p. 4. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(p) *Hotting. Hexaem. p.* 117.

(q) *Hoffman. umbr. in Luce p.* 93, 94.

(r) *Pocock. ſpec. p.* 163.

(s) *Ibid. p.* 5.

nopus, *Nai* the Star *Alſhaari-lobur*, or the Dog-Star, and in *Abul-Pharagius* (*t*) the *Zabii* are ſaid to have the Arctic Pole for their *Kebla*. Which is hugely Diſſonant from the ancient Magi, (*u*) who were taught by *Zoroaſter*, to make the Eaſt (the Quarter whence the Luminaries aroſe) their *Kebla* (the place or Region towards which Men turn themſelves when they pray, as the *Muhammedans* towards *Mecca*, is call'd the *Kebla*.) The Rabbins ſuppoſe, that the Pagan Religioniſts are differenc'd by a Diverſity of their Aſtral Deities, (*w*) *That all people have a Star and a Planet and a known Prince, which are inferionr to the Angels of God : As it is ſaid in* Daniel, *the Prince of the Kings of Perſia, and the Prince of the Kingdom of Grecia. Theſe they make their Gods by ſerving them.* So the *Syrians* are known to have had a particular Veneration for the Conſtellation *Piſces*, the *Egyptians* for *Sothis* or the Dog-Star (from whoſe riſing they reckon'd the beginning of their Year, and of their Month *Thoth*, and made their Prognoſticks for the enſuing Year; their *Nilus* alſo beginneth his increaſe at that time :) So the Idolatrous Iſraelites had a particular Veneration for the Planet *Saturn*, as the Prophet ſaith, *Amos* 5. 26.

וּנְשָׂאתֶם אֵת סִכּוּת מַלְכְּכֶם *But ye have born the Tabernacle* (Tent or Pavillion) *of your King*,
וְאֵת כִּיּוּן צַלְמֵיכֶם *and Chiun your Images* (their Images were ſo many Chiuns)
כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם *the Star of your God.*

There will not be any thing of difficulty in this Prophetic Text, nor in *S. Stephen*'s verſion of it (*Act.* 7. 43.) if theſe two things be conſider'd. Firſt, that *Chium* is the Planet *Saturn*, that *Remphan* or *Rephan* is an Egyptian Name for that Planet (therefore the ſame with *Chiun*,) and conſequently *Saturn* was the idolatrous Iſraelites King; agreeably whereunto an Arabic Writer affirmeth, (*x*) that *Satrun* is a Syriac word and ſignifieth King. Another thing to be conſider'd in this Prophetic Text and *S. Stephen*'s Verſion of it, is the Phraſe of *taking up and bearing the Star* of their God, which the idolatrous Iſraelites are ſaid to do, becauſe they took up and bare the Symbol thereof (moſt of the Images of the oriental Pagans (*y*) had relation to ſome Star or Planet;) for they that carry the Symbol of a Deity are uſually ſaid, to carry the Deity.

If the Iſraelites deify'd the Aſtral or Planetary *Saturn* (which was but one Notion of him,) it cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, that they neglected to Worſhip him in the other uſual Notions of the God *Saturn* (*the Star of your God* ſignifieth both the Star which you Deify, and alſo which relateth to, and beareth the Name of your God;) in ſuch latitude and variety of Notion this Deity was *their King* (*Malcham your King* is his Name, *Zeph.* 1. 5.) their *Baal*, *Moloch* or *Milcom*. For that theſe Names denote *Saturn* the Supreme Deity of the oriental Pagans, appeareth from the general conſent of the ancient Writers. (*z*) They all affirm that *Beel* is *Chronos*, that the orientals called *Chronos Belus* and *Baal* (the ſame with *Moloch*, *Jer.* 19. 5.) and that the *Phenicians* and their Colonies ſacrific'd their Children to *Saturn*. If *Saturn* was the Supreme Deity of the Popular oriental Pagans (of which we have great aſſurance,) it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe him the *Syrians Rimmon*, (*a*) who hath his Name from רום which denoteth his Highneſs. And doubtleſs the *Syrians* Worſhip of *Saturn* in other Notions was (like the idolatrous Iſraelites) complicated with the Worſhip of the Planetary *Saturn*, who is *altiſſimo orbe* (as *Tacitus* ſaith) and therefore fitly denominated *Rimmon*. Agreeably whereunto *Plotinus* and other Platoniſts ſay, (*b*) *that* Saturn *being ſublime and next to the Supreme Heaven, whence Souls deſcend into Bodies, be endoweth the deſcending Soul with the Virtue of underſtanding and contemplating ſublime things.* So *R. Iſaac Caro* ſaith; (*c*) *that according to the Opinion of all the Aſtrologers* Saturn *is* Iſrael*'s Star, that the Rational Soul, the Power of Cogitation and of knowing all Myſteries are in his Portion, as alſo the Houſe of the Sanctuary, the Hebrew-tongue and the Law of* Iſrael.

As the idolatrous Iſraelites were ſometimes the Religioniſts of a particular Planet : So they were the Religioniſts of the Septenary of the Planets, (*d*) as ſome interpret the Prophet *Iſa.* 65. 11. *Ye are they that prepare a Table* (Lagad) *for that Troup, and that furniſh the Drink-offering* (Lammeni) *unto that number.* Agreeably to the Aſtrologizing humour of the Chaldeans the Hebrew Doctors rightly underſtand that Speech of *Leah*, *Gen.* 30. 11. (Bagad) in an Aſtrological Senſe, (*e*) *good Luck cometh*, or an *happy Star* (ſome underſtand it (*f*) of the Aſtrologers Part of Fortune :) in like manner the Rabbins ſuppoſe, that this Text of the Prophet ought to be underſtood agreeably to the Genius of oriental Paganiſm, (*g*) that *Gad* and *Meni* are the Names of Aſtral and Aſtrological Deities. But *Meni* is of great Affinity with *Menes* a deify'd Pagan Hero, (*h*) of whom ſome underſtand it : Others underſtand it of an Arabian Idol *Manah*, (*i*) that was thought to have the Virtue of procuring the benign influx of the Stars for cauſing Rain, which the *Arabians* counted one of the greateſt Goods that could befal them, and which together with the Winds, Heat and Cold they attributed to the influence of the Stars, accounting this one of their principal Sciences, to have the Learning and Skill touching the Virtue of the Stars in cauſing Rain. Both theſe latter Interpretations are liable to this Exception; *Gad* and *Meni*, according to the uſual Mode of ſpeaking in Scripture, ſeem to be exegetical of each other; and therefore I chuſe rather, to interpret *that Troup* and *Number* of the Hoſt of Heaven or Septenary of the Planets.

VI. We do but grope in ſeveral Affairs of Antiquity, as appeareth from our ſlender Notices of ſeveral of the Deities of the Oriental Pagans. We have no notices of the Babylonian Idol *Merodach*, *Jer.* 50. 2. who yet ſeemeth very plainly, to have the Babylonian *Mor* (Dominus) in his Name. And if his Name was from מר and רְדָה (which denoteth *expulſion*,) it ſignifieth a *Deus Averruncus* of the Babylonians. The ſignification of the Name *Sheſhach*, (*Jer.* 25. 26. and 51. 41.) is now loſt. It is thought, to denote one of the Babylonian Deities : But I am prone to think, that *Sheſhach* was no Name of a Deity, that *Shach* and *Sheſhach* in ancient times denoted *Mirth* and *Joy*, *Drink* and *Revelling*, that the Babylonian revelling, *Saturnalia*, were thence denominated *Sacea*, and that the City Babylon is called *Sheſhach*, to denote it a joyous revelling City. As this conjecture is not improbable (for the Deſolation of *Babylon* is foretold under the Name of *Drinking*, *Jer.* 25. 26. and the City was taken by *Cyrus*

(t) *Hiſt. Dyn.* p. 184.

(u) *Pocock. ſpec.* p. 148.

(w) *Moſes G. ap. Druſ. in Deut.* 4. 19. *Hulſ. Theol. Jud.* p. 437.

(x) *Pocock. ſupr.* p. 390.

(y) *Grot. not. in Jer.* 10. 3. *Iſa* 24. 21.

(z) *V. Petit. var. Lect.* c. 1. *Selden de D. Syr. Synt.* 1. c. 6. *Synt.* 2. c. 1. *Voſſ. de Idol.* l. 2. c. 4, 5. *Theoph. ad Autol.* l. 3. p. 139.

(a) *Grot. not. in* 2 *King.* 5. 18.

(b) *Voſſ. de Idol.* l. 2. c. 34.

(c) *De Dieu not. in Act.* 7. 43.

(d) *Vatabl. in loc.*

(e) *Full. Miſc.* l. 5. c. 17.

(f) *Seld. de D. Syr. Synt.* 1. c. 1.

(g) *Pocock. Spec.* p. 92, 93.

(h) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr.* l. 3. *Diſſ.* 2. c. 2. S. 2.

(i) *Pocock. ſupr.* p. 92, & p. 163.

at the Revelling Feſtival time of the *Sacea* :) So ſome probabilities may be propos'd touching moſt of the Deities of the Colonies transplanted into *Samaria*. 2 *King*. 17. 29, 30, 31. *Every Nation made Gods of their own, and put them in the houſes of the high places, which the* Samaritans *had made, every Nation in the Cities where they dwelt. And the Men of* Babylon *made* Succoth Benoth, *and the Men of* Cuth *made* Nergal, *and the Men of* Hamath *made* Aſhima. *And the* Avites *made* Nibchaz *and* Tartak, *and the* Sepharvites *burnt their Children in fire to* Adrammelech *and* Anammelech *the Gods of* Sepharvaim. Of the two firſt of this Rabble of Deities Mr. *Selden* hath inveſtigated very good Notices. He ſuppoſeth, that *Succoth Benoth* ſignifieth *the Tabernacles of the Daughters*, which were the Temple of the Babylonians *Venus Militta* ; and that *Nergal* denoteth that unextinguiſhable fire, which the Perſians kept in their *Pyræths* (Septs or Incloſures thereof) and worſhipp'd. Of *Aſhima* we have no Memoirs worth conſidering : But of *Nibchaz* and *Tartak* the Rabbins ſay, that the former was a Dog, and the latter an Aſs ; whence ſome ſuppoſe, that *Nibchaz* was *Latrator Anubis*. If *Nibchaz* was *Latrator Anubis*, which the Etymology of the Name maketh very probable (for *Nibchaz* is from נבח which denoteth Barking,) it muſt be a Symbol of the God *Mercury* ; and if *Nibchaz* was a Symbol of the God *Mercury*, *Tartak* may be probably ſuppos'd, to have been a Symbol of the God *Mars* (to whom ſome Northern Warlike Nations (*k*) ſacrific'd an Aſs,) for *Monimus* and *Azizus*, (*l*) *Mercury* and *Mars*, were copulate or conjunct Deities in ſome parts of the Eaſt, as *Nibchaz* and *Tartak* undoubtedly were. In the Name of one of the *Sepharvites* Deities, *Adrammelech*, there is the Notion of Superiority ; (*m*) for *Addir* ſignifieth *Sublime*, and therefore *Adrammelech* is ſupernal King. In the Name of the other there is the Notion of Inferiority ; for probably it is deriv'd from *Melech* and צָנָה which ſignifieth *depreſſit* ; whence we may reaſonably ſuppoſe *Adrammelech* and *Anammelech* (to whom the *Sepharvites* burnt their Children) the one a ſupernal, the other an infernal *Saturn*, agreeable to the Stygian *Jupiter* of the Gentile Theology. And ſeeing both *Adrammelech* and *Anammelech* muſt be ſuppos'd the *Saturn* of the Orientals (as appeareth from their Names and their Rite of Worſhip,) and both of them cannot be one and the ſame *Saturn*, is it not neceſſary to ſuppoſe the one a ſupernal, the other an infernal *Saturn* ? There are other Deities of the oriental Pagans, which are fairly reducible to *Saturn* (as *Niſroch Sennacherib*'s God was *Saturn*, if the Story be true, (*n*) that his two Sons ſlew him with the Sword, becauſe he had vow'd to Sacrifice them :) But inſtead of purſuing that Argument, we will infer from our account of the *Sepharvites* Deities, that the *Saturn* of the Orientals cannot be the Sun only ; for there can be no ſuch thing as an infernal Sun. Or if any other Notion of this pair of Deities may be excogitated, yet their Names imply, that there was a twofold *Moloch* or *Saturn* in the oriental Pagans Theology, and conſequently their *Saturn* cannot be the Sun only.

VII. But before we can repreſent the true and adequate Notion of the oriental *Saturn* or *Moloch*, it is requiſite to diſtinguiſh the various Acceptations and Notions of *Saturn*, *Jupiter* and other Deities in the Gentile Theology. Sometimes they are taken κοσμικῶς, *Coſmically*, as when *Jupiter* is ſaid to be the whole World or the Soul of it, and *Saturn* is confounded with *Uranus*, as we have ſeen from *Varro*. Sometimes they are taken ἀστροειδῶς, *Aſtrally*, as when by *Jupiter* is meant the Sun, or the Planet ſo called : So the higheſt of the Planets is a *Saturn*. Sometimes they are taken φυσικῶς, *Phyſically* ; as when by *Saturn* is meant Time, and by *Jupiter* ſome Elementary Nature. So *Empedocles* calleth (*o*) the igneous Nature or Ether *Jupiter*, the Air *Juno*, the Earth *Pluto*, and the Water *Neſtis*. Sometimes the Names of the Pagan Deities ſignifie ἱστορικῶς, *Hiſtorically* or *Herologically*, in which Notion there are many *Joves* * and not a few *Saturns*. Sometimes the Pagan Deities are of ſuch a Notion, as reſembleth deify'd Hero's, yet are not deify'd Hero's, but of another kind, originally Gods or Demons, which belong to the Pneumatology of the inviſible World, and therefore their Names in this Notion may fitly be ſaid to ſignifie πνευματολογικῶς, *Pneumatologically*. Such a Pneumatological kind of *Jupiter* was the Chieftain of the *Dii Conſentes* ; for the Romans ſuppos'd him *a Deity always Celeſtial*, yet this Chieftain of Deities always Celeſtial ſo far reſembled a deify'd *Hero*, that they ſuppos'd, (*p*) he might be drawn down from Heaven by their Charms and Sacrifices, and therefore ſtiled him *Jupiter Elicius*. So the Poet *Virgil* repreſenteth, not an Herological kind of *Saturn* born in *Crete*, but a Pneumatological kind of Deity originally Celeſtial, (*q*) *that fled from* Jupiter's *Arms and lay hid in Latium*. Sometimes the Names of the Pagan Deities (*Saturn*, *Jupiter* and ſuch more) ſignifie ἀκροαματικῶς, *Acroamatically*, thoſe Deities, that are of Nature aud Notion *Acroamatical*. As *Plato* in his *Cratylus* endeavouring to make good Senſe of the Fable, that *Jupiter* is the Son of *Saturn* aud *Saturn* the Son of *Uranus*, interpreteth it in this manner. *To ſay, that* Jupiter *is the Son of* Chronos, *may ſeem contumelius, to one that heareth it.* Εὔλογον δὲ, μεγάλης τινὸς διανοίας ἔκγονον εἶναι τὸν Δία, *but it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that* Jupiter (the Soul of the World) *is the Off-ſpring of a certain great Mind or Intellect.* (*r*) *This great Mind or Intellect is the Son of* Uranus, *as it is ſaid ; for the ſupernal Aſpect or looking upwards is fitly called* Urania. *Plato* ſuppoſeth, that as the great Soul hath its Original from a great Mind, ſo that great Mind hath its Origin from a ſuperiour Principle, and that this is the meaning of the Fable. But of this ſort of *Acroamatical* or *Myſtic-metaphyſical* Deities it is not poſſible, that any ſhould be found in the Popular-Pagan Theology.

In the ſame Latitude and variety of Notion with the European, *Saturn* and *Jupiter*, the *Baal* or *Moloch* of the Oriental Pagans muſt be underſtood ; for according to the Senſe and Interpretation of the Ancient Writers the Oriental *Baal* or *Moloch* is both the European *Saturn* and *Jupiter*. As *Jupiter* and *Saturn* alſo (*s*) hath the Name of *Deorum Princeps*, *Chieftain of Deities* : (*t*) So *Moloch undoubtedly hath his Name as being the King and greateſt of the Gods.* The *Phenicians* and *Syrians* call *Saturn El*, and *Bel*, and *Bolathen*, (*u*) ſaith *Damaſcius*. So *Apollinaris*, (*w*) The

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 16. & *l.* 2. *c.* 13.

(l) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 5. & *c.* 32.

(m) *Ibid. c.* 37.

(n) *V. Grot. not. in* 2. *Reg.* 19. 37.

(o) *Plutarch. de placit. phil. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

* *Vives in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 18. *c.* 15.

(p) *Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p.* 155. *Plutarch. in Numa.*

(q) *Primus ab Æthereo venit Saturnus Olympo*
Arma Jovis fugiens, &c. Æn. l. 8.

(r) Ἔστι δὲ οὗτος οὐρανοῦ υἱός, ὡς λόγος· ἡ δ᾽ αὖ ἐς τὸ ἄνω ὄψις καλῶς ἔχει τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα καλεῖσθαι οὐρανία, ὁρῶσα τὰ ἄνω.

(s) *Elmenhorſt. in Min. Fæl. p.* 209.

(t) *Dion. Voſſ. in Maim. de Idol. c.* 6. *S.* 4.

(u) *Phot. cod.* 242.

(w) *The* Greeks *call* Baal, Bel, *which is ſaid to be the ſame with* Saturn. So *Procopius.* (x) Bel *is called by the* Greeks,Chronos, *to whom Mankind ſacrific'd their deareſt Pledges.* The *Saturn* whoſe rite of worſhip was the Humane Sacrifices, was thought by the Fathers generally, to be the *European Saturn*, as is plain from the reaſon (y) which they give of the Congruity of ſuch a Sacrifice; *Quia propriis filiis non pepercit, becauſe he ſpar'd not his own Children, but devour'd them.* So Learn'd Men generally agree, (z) that the old *Hetrurians* (from whom the *Romans* took a great part of their Sacra) were originally *Aſiaticks*, that the old *Hetruſcan* Language hath almoſt all its ſacred Names *à Syris, from the Orientals*, and therefore the *Hetrurian Saturn* was originally Oriental, and deriveth his Name from סתר, either as that word ſignifieth *to lie hid*, or as it ſignifieth, *to hide and protect*, which is the Office of a King or מלך, by which Name the Orientals call'd their *Saturn.* Of the Oriental *Saturn Servius* ſaith, (a) *It is manifeſt, the* Aſſyrians *worſhipp'd* Saturn, *which ſame is ſaid to be the* Sun *alſo*; that is, *Saturn* is both *Saturn* and the *Sun*) *and they worſhipp'd* Juno. *Amongſt the* Aſſyrians Bel *is ſaid to be by a certain reaſon of the Sacra both* Saturn *and the* Sun. Agreeably to the *European Saturn* the *Saturn* of the Orientals was in part, and in a certain Notion and Acceptation *the Sun*; their *Bel* was a Complication of *Saturn* (in other Acceptations) and of the Sun; (b) and of *Jupiter* alſo, as *Servius*'s Diſcourſe implieth; for he ſaith, *The* Aſſyrians *worſhipp'd* Saturn *and* Juno; therefore their *Bel* or *Saturn* was *Jupiter*. (c) So *Beroſus*, *Herodotus*, *Menander*, *Dius* and other ancient Writers agree, that *Belus* is by Interpretation *Zeus* or *Jupiter*; (d) the *Phenician*'s *Beelſamen* is by Interpretation *Jupiter Olympius*; and the Learned agree, that the *Cretians* had their *Jupiter* from the *Gazites* (who were *Philiſtines*) and from their *Marnas* (which ſignifieth *Lord of Men*) the ſame with *Baal*; which inferreth, that the *Aſiatic* Pagans had one *Jupiter* in common with the *European*; (e) *for that* Jupiter *reigneth in Heaven, is* (ſaith *Pauſanias*) *the common Language of all Men.*

It may ſeem perhaps an Incongruity in the Ancient Writers, to interpret *Baal* both *Saturn* and *Jupiter*, for the *European Saturn* and *Jupiter* are ſeveral Deities. But although in ſome Notions and Acceptations they are ſeveral Deities, yet in others they are the ſame Deity, as we have ſeen in *Varro*, who calleth Heaven *Saturn* and *Jupiter Pater.* (f) *Jupiter Latialis* was in his Feſtival at *Rome* honour'd with an ἀνθρωποθυσία, *Humane Sacrifice*, the right of Worſhip which belong'd to old *Saturn* of *Latium*, which is an Indication, that they were the ſame Deity. They are the ſame Deity, when they are but ſeveral Names of the Sun; or if we ſuppoſe them ſeveral Deities, it is agreeable to the Genius of the Pagan Theology, to complicate them in one *Baal* or *Moloch.*

VIII. But becauſe the *European Saturn* and *Jupiter*, as alſo the *Aſſyrian* and *Chaldean Belus*, the *Phenician Beelſamen*, the *Ammonites Moloch* and the *Perſian Mithras*, are ſometimes underſtood of the Sun, hence ſome of the Learned infer (a groundleſs Conceit which they have entertain'd) that the Sun was the Oriental Pagans Supream Deity. Which groundleſs Conceit *Macrobius* may ſeem to favour in his Reduction of *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Mercury* and other Pagan Deities to the Sun. But *Macrobius* hath not attempted, to reduce all the Pagan Deities to the Sun (but almoſt all the Sub-celeſtial Gods only,) nor hath he conſider'd the ſeveral Notions and Acceptations of the Pagan Deities. The *Stoicks* ſay, that one God (the Univerſal) *Jupiter* is *Mercury*, *Æolus*, *Bacchus*, and ſuch more; but do not hereby intend to deſtroy the particular Deities known by thoſe Names: So *Macrobius* hath ſhew'd, that *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Mercury*, and ſuch more, are one God, the Sun; but he hath not ſhew'd, nor was it his Opinion, that there is no other ſort of *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Mercury* or the like) in the Pagan Theology, ſave only the Sun. If by this Name *Jupiter* ἀστροειδῶς, (Aſtrally) the Sun is ſignify'd, by the ſame Name κοσμικῶς, the World (or the Mind thereof) is ſignify'd; and by the ſame Name φυσικῶς, an elementary Nature is ſignify'd; by the ſame Name πνευματολογικῶς, a great Genius is ſignify'd; by the ſame Name ἡρωικῶς, an Hero is ſignify'd; and by the ſame Name ἀκροαματικῶς, an Acroamatical Deity is ſignify'd. Agreeably to this medly of Polytheiſm in the *European* Pagan Theology the Oriental *Baal* or *Moloch* is *Coſmical*, *Pneumatological*, *Aſtral*, *Phyſical*, *Hiſtorical*, and alſo *Acroamatical.* For the firſt God in the *Chalday* Oracles that all Mankind are ignorant of, is an Acroamatical kind of *Baal.* A *Coſmical Baal* is viſible in the firſt of the Popular Pagan Deities *Uranus*, (g) a Deity that was worſhipp'd by Humane Sacrifices in *Africa*, *Libya*, and the Weſtern Iſlands. So *Manaſſeh*'s Graven Image, 2 *King*. 21. 7. is thought to have been (h) a Statue of the Hoſt of Heaven, and that the Idol *Baal* was ſuch a Statue, the Language of the Scriptures is an Indication; for they uſually conjoyn the worſhip of *Baal* and the Hoſt of Heaven, 2 *King*. 17. 16. *They worſhipp'd all the Hoſt of Heaven and ſerved* Baal. 2 King. 21. 3. and 23. 5. *They burnt Incenſe unto* Baal, *to the Sun, and to the Moon, and to the Planets, and to all the Hoſt of Heaven.* So a Learned Man of our own ſuppoſeth, (i) *that the whole Syſtem and Univerſality of the Celeſtial Bodies was the grand* Baal *of the* Gentiles, according to one reading of *Tobit* 1. 5. *The Houſe of my Father ſacrific'd*, τῇ Βαὰλ τῇ δυνάμει, *to* Baal *the Hoſt.* But by *Baal* and *Moloch* the Scriptures uſually mean *the Image or Idol* known by that Name. (k) The Idol *Moloch* (as ſome of the Rabbins deſcribe it) was *an hollow Image of Braſs having ſeven Rooms or Apartments according to the number of the Planets*; which Rabbinical Deſcription ſpeaketh it the Statue of a Coſmical Deity. The ſame Judgment muſt be made of the *Perſian Mithras*, in whoſe Sacra there was an aſcent of *ſeven Gates repreſentative of the ſeven Planets* (by which Souls deſcend) which Deſcription ſpeaketh him at once an Aſtrological-Magical and a *Coſmical* Deity. But the Oriental Pagans conſider'd this Coſmical Deity as the Material World complicate with the Regial Mind or Soul of it; for the Hiſtorian ſtileth the *Hetrurian Saturn* (originally Oriental) *The giver and perfecter of all Happineſs to Men*, (l) *a Deity that comprehendeth the whole Nature of the World.* There are many Notices in the *Perſians* Theology of a *Jupiter* diſtinct from the Sun, which *Jupiter* of theirs is the ſame with their *Belus*, (m) as he is repreſented by *Agathias* from ſeveral ancient Writers of the *Aſiatic* Affairs.

(w) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(x) *In Eſai. cap.* 46.

(y) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 291.

(z) *Grot. not. in Matth.* 12. 1. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 18. *l.* 2. *c.* 57. *l.* 7. *c.* 4. *Pocock. Spec. p.* 390.

(a) *Aſſyrios conſtat Saturnum (quem eundem & ſolem dicunt) Junonemque coluiſſe. Apud Aſſyrios Bel dicitur, quadam ſacrorum ratione & Saturnus & Sol.*

(b) *Seld. de D. Syr. Proleg. c.* 3.

(c) *Ibid. Synt.* 2. *c.* 1.

(d) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(e) Δία γὰρ ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλεύειν, οὗτος μὲν λόγος κοινὸς πάντων ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων.

(f) *V. Annot. in Min. Fœl. p.* 199. 297.

(g) *Betuleius in Lactant. p.* 51.

(h) *Selden. de D. Syr. Synt.* 2. *c.* 10.

(i) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *l.* 7. *c.* 2.

(l) Πᾶσαν δὲ περιειληφότα τὴν τοῦ κόσμου φύσιν. *Dion. Halicarn. Antiq. l.* 1. *p.* 24.

(m) *Seld. ſupr. ſynt.* 2. *c.* 1. *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 15.

In their Religious Pomp and Proceſſion (*n*) a Chariot was drawn ſacred to *Jupiter* (diſtinct from the Sun; which *Jupiter* (to whom this Chariot was ſacred) is moſt reaſonably to be ſuppos'd *a Pneumatological Jupiter* (or *Belus*) the ſame with *Jupiter* the Chieftain of the *Romans Dii Conſentes*. Such a *Jupiter* (or *Belus*) we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, to have been called by the *Perſians* Ζεὺς πατρῷος, *their Country-Jupiter* (a Deity diſtinct from and Superior to the Sun) as in *Cyrus*'s Prayer in *Xenophon*, (*o*) *Thou our Country-Jupiter, and thou Sun, and all ye other Gods, accept theſe Euchariſtical Sacrifices.* Of an *Aſtral Baal* or *Moloch* we have ſeen Inſtances in the *Sun*, in *Chiun*, *Rimmon* and the Planet *Jupiter*, call'd by the *Chaldeans* (*p*) *Moloch Baal*, and by the *Phariſees* (*q*) *Coceb Baal.* A *Phyſical Baal* or *Moloch* (agreeable to the *European* Pagans *Jupiter*, which was the Igneous Nature, is viſible in the God *Fire*, (*r*) a well-known Deity of the Oriental Pagans (from which the *Europeans* deriv'd their veſtal Fire;) Moloch *was an Idol in which they worſhipp'd the Fire*, (*s*) as *R. Levi* affirmeth. The *Hiſtorical* or *Herological Baal* of the Orientals is ſaid to be (*t*) the ſame with their *Mars*, whom ſome ſuppoſe to be *Nimrod* the Father of *Ninus*, others ſuppoſe him to be *Thurras* the Succeſſor of *Ninus*, moſt probably he was *Ham* the Son of *Noah*. But howſoever theſe things were, an Herological *Jupiter Belus* (*Aſſyrian* or *Phenician*) is remembred by the Poet *Virgil*.

(n) Curtius l. 3.

(o) Ζεῦ πατρῷε ϗ ἥλιε, ϗ πάντες θεοὶ δέχεσθε τάδε χαριστήρια. Inſtit. Cyr. l. 8. p. 184.

(p) Voſſ. ſupr. l. 2. c. 33.

(q) Seld. ſupr.

(r) Voſſ. ſupr. c. 64, 65.

(s) Druſ. not. in Lev. 18. 21.

(t) Voſſ. ſupr. l. 1. c. 16. & 25. Gale in Phornut. de nat. Deor. p. 56.

> *Implevitque mero pateram, quam Belus & omnes*
> *A Belo ſoliti* —— ——

Heliogabalus's Deity, *Sol Elagabalus*, is a *Belus Demiurgus*, if the Etymology of his Name be from *Elah Gabul* (*u*) which ſignifieth ὁ ἥλιος δημιουργός, or God the Creator. But probably his Name ſignifieth nothing more than *Eloah Geboul, the God of the Coaſt*, or *Deus Gabalæ* (a Syrian City) *the Syrian Deity*, under which Notion *Heliogabalus* would have his Deity introduc'd and conſider'd at *Rome*. The Symbol of this Deity was a *great Stone of the faſhion of a Cone*, one of the *Bætulia* famous in the Oriental Parts, many of which were ſeen by *Aſclepiades* on Mount *Libanus* near *Heliopolis* in *Syria*, *of which ſome were conſecrated to one, others to another, to* Saturn, Jupiter, *the* Sun *and others*, (*w*) as *Damaſcius* reporteth. From which Account of the Oriental *Bætulia* it is manifeſt, that there was in the Theology of the Popular Oriental Pagans a *Saturn* and a *Jupiter* diſtinct from and ſuperiour to the *Sun*; as **Lampridius** alſo ſaith of *Heliogabalus*'s Deity, *that ſome ſuppos'd him to be* Jove, *others the* Sun. So *Spartianus* maketh a doubt touching a certain Temple, (*x*) whether it was built *Jovi Syrio vel Soli, to the* Syrian Jove *or to the* Sun. Agreeably to which Notices of the Oriental Pagan Theology and to our Account of the *Sepharvites Adrammelech and Anammelech* a not improbable Interpretation may be made of that Marble Inſcription at *Palmyra* in *Syria* (*y*).

(u) Fuller Miſc. l. 1. c. 14.

(w) Phot. Cod. 242.

(x) In vit. Caracall. in fin.

(y) Seld. de D. Syr. ſynt. 2. c. 1. Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 5.

ΑΓΛΙΒΩΛΩ. ΚΑΙ. ΜΑΛΑΧ-
ΒΗΛΩ. ΠΑΤΡΩΟΙϹ. ΘΕΟΙϹ.

To Aglibolus (*or* Aglibelus) *and to* Malachbelus, *my Country Gods.*

Some underſtand by this pair of Deities *the Summer and Winter Sun:* Others diſcerning the improbability of that Interpretation, underſtand by *Malach-belus*, the Moon, and by *Agli-belus*, the Sun, as being עגול בעל *rotundus Dominus*, of round Figure, or Lord of the round World. The reaſon which induceth them, to underſtand by *Malach-belus* the Moon, is, becauſe in the Marble-Table there are two Men ingraven (which are ſuppos'd to repreſent *Aglibelus* and *Malach-belus*) the latter of which hath the Moon on his Shoulders. But this Interpretation which maketh the Moon a *Belus*, and not only a *Belus* but a *Malach-Belus* or King-Belus, is quite againſt the Analogy of the Oriental Pagan Theology. And from the reaſon which induceth them to make it, I infer, that the full Title of *Malach-belus* is *the ſublunary* Malachbelus, or the *Infernal Saturn*. And if *Malachbelus* be the *Infernal Saturn*, *Agli-belus* is manifeſtly applicable to the Supernal. Howſoever this Conjecture ſhall approve it ſelf, it is certain, the Oriental *Baal* ought to be underſtood in very great latitude and variety of Notion; and there is the ſame reaſon for the *Moabites* and *Madianites* Deities, *Chemoſh* and *Baal-peor*, the *Egyptians Oſiris* and *Jupiter-Ammon*, and the *Aſſyrian Adad*, which (as *Macrobius* affirmeth) ſignifieth *One*, and is ſuppos'd to be that אחד *One*, *Iſa.* 66. 17. behind whom (his Idol or Temple) the Idolatrous *Iſraelites* are ſaid to purifie themſelves. If *Adad* ſignifieth *One*, ἀςεροειδῶς, he is the Sun, ἀκεραματικῶς, the Platonic Monad (which was originally oriental) κοσμικῶς the Univerſe (ἓν ϗ πάντα, *One and All*) more eſpecially the ſupernal part of it; for as *Macrobius* affirmeth, (*z*) *The* Aſſyrians *ſubjoyn to* Adad *a Goddeſs called* Atergatis, *attributing the Power of all things to theſe two, underſtanding thereby the Sun and the Earth.* Theſe copulate Deities could not be the *Sun* and the *Earth only*, but (*a*) *Saturn* and *Rhea*, Heaven and Earth (as we have ſeen from *Varro*;) *Adad* therefore is *Uranus*. And if *Atergatis* (*b*) is the *Watery Nature*, *Adad* φυσικῶς, muſt be the Igneous Nature. *Adad* is an uſual Name of Oriental Kings (as *Ben-Adad*) and therefore is ἱςορικῶς, a deify'd King, or Ἄδωδος βασιλεὺς θεῶν, Adad *the King of the Gods*, as *Philo Byblius* calleth him; which King of the Gods muſt in reaſon be thought (conformably to the *European Jupiter*) *a Pneumatological Adad*, a great Genius as well as a great Hero.

(z) *Subjungunt eidem Deum nomine Adargatin* (*Atergatin*) *omnemque poteſtatem cunctarum rerum his duobus attribuunt, ſolem terramque intelligentes.* Saturn. l. 1. c. 23.

(a) Voſſ. ſupr. l. 2. c. 54.

(b) Ibid. c. 76.

From what hath been diſcours'd touching the various Notions and Acceptations of *Saturn*, *Jupiter* and the Oriental *Baal*; we may in ſome degree illuſtrate his copulate Deity *Aſhtaroth* or *Aſtarte*, *Judg.* 10. 6. and 12. 13. 1 *Sam.* 7. 4. and 12. 10. For as *Baal* is to be interpreted *Jupiter*; ſo (*Baal* and *Aſhtaroth* being copulate Deities) the genuine method of interpreting *Aſtarte* or *Aſhtaroth* is not in the firſt place, to interpret her the *Moon*, but *Juno*, which is comprehenſively and incluſively the Moon. (*c*) *It is commonly ſaid, that* Baal *in the oriental parts is the Name of* Jupiter, *but* Aſtarte *of* Juno. *Doubtleſs* Juno (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) *is call'd by the* Pæni Aſtarte; ſo the *Sidonian* and *Carthaginian* Goddeſs hath in the Poet the Name of *Juno*.

(c) *Solet dici Baal nomen eſſe apud Gentes illarum partium Jovis, Aſtarte autem Junonis.* S. Aug. ſup. Judic. Qu. 16.

> *Hic Templum Junoni ingens Sidonia Dido*
> *Condidit* —— ——

So in **Lucian** (who had inquir'd into theſe Matters) the *Syrian* Goddeſs to whom the City *Hierapolis* was ſacred, (*d*) is ſaid to be the *Aſſyrian Juno*.

(d) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 55.

Juno. *Aſtarte* therefore was the Oriental Pagans Queen of Deities, Βασίλεια Βῆλτις, and the Queen of Heaven (as our Tranſlation rendreth, *Jer.* 44. 17.) which ἀστεροειδῶς is the Moon. But φυσικῶς, *Aſtarte*, is the *Earth*, which is agreeable to the Theology of the *European* Pagans; for they called the Earth *Juno.* *Atergatis* alſo or *Dagon*, 1 *Sam.* 15. 2. was the Earth, which comprehendeth the Elements of Water; and therefore *Aſtarte* and *Atergatis* are of great Affinity (if not the ſame Deity) although their Symbols were diſſonant, the Symbol of *Aſtarte* being throughout a Woman, the Symbol of *Atergatis* being half a Woman and half a Fiſh; whence ſome (*e*) render, 1 *Sam.* 5. 5. *Only the form of a Fiſh was left.* Both theſe Deities are uſually interpreted *Venus*; and *Aſtarte* had in her Symbol an Ox's Horn, which ſheweth her to be *Venus Urania, a Goddeſs that was firſt worſhipp'd by the* Aſſyrians, *from whom the* Paphii *in* Cyprus *and the* Phenicians in *Aſcalon receiv'd her Sacra, and the* Cytherians *learn'd them of the* Phenicians, (*f*) as *Pauſanias* affirmeth. Which Account of the Origin of the worſhip of *Venus Urania* is an Inſtance of the Symphony between the Oriental and the European Pagans Theology, and ſheweth, that the latter is a deſcendent from the former.

IX. The Sun was of immenſe Veneration in the Heathen World (more eſpecially in the Eaſtern parts) and is of many Eminencies and Magnificences in the Pagan Theology; but hath no higher place in it than (*g*) that of Ἑβδομαγέτης (as the Ancients ſtil'd him) *The Chieftain or Leader of the Septenary of the Planets*, and King of the viſible Gods. So the Pagan Theologers (*h*) repreſent him, and ſo the Oriental Pagans conſider'd him as the Celeſtial *Baal*, *Moloch*, *Adon*, Lord and King, (*i*) *to whom all the Celeſtial Gods* (the Stars) *are obſequious as to their Lord and Potentate.* His Name ἥλιος is from the Hebrew *El* which is God's Name, and in the Writings of the Pagans he is ſtil'd God ſimply and without addition (as ὁ θεοῦ ἐνιαυτός, the *Egyptians* Civil or *Heliacal* Year was ſtil'd the Year of God) as being eminently ſuch. In their Inſcriptions his Stile is, *Domino Soli, to the Lord the Sun, Deo Soli, to God the Sun, Omnipotens Deus, Almighty God.* (*k*) *Attis* (the Sun) in an Inſcription is denominated ὕψιστος, *the moſt high.* Sometimes he is ſtil'd παντοκράτωρ, *omni-imperial*, the Attribute of Omniſcience is uſually given him, and the Oracle intitleth him *Iao* and the Supream Deity.

Φράζεο τὸν πάντων ὕπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν' Ἰάω.

But none of theſe μεγαλυσμοὶ, or Doxologies are ſo to be underſtood, as if his Deity was abſolutely Supream or Sovereign; for the Pagans uſually aſcribe the ſublimeſt ſort of Attributes to their Supra-demonial Gods. So when *Maimonides* ſaith of the *Zabii*, (*l*) *According to them the Stars are Gods, but the Sun the greateſt God*; This muſt be underſtood with reſpect to the Stars. And if ſome *Egyptians* in an Inſcription on an Obelisk ſtil'd the Sun (*m*) κτιστὴς τῆς οἰκουμένης, *Opificer of the World* (which Title ſignifieth, that he is eminently one of the Opificers of the World) it muſt not therefore be thought, that there was no other nor higher Sovereign Deity in the *Egyptians* Theology; for (to ſay nothing of their Acroamatical Theology) becauſe the Stars are igneous, (*n*) the *Egyptians* ſuppos'd, that *Sol* was the Son of *Vulcan.* That devotional Addreſs to the Sun in *Jul. Firmicus*, (*o*) *O Sol the beſt and greateſt, ſeated in the midſt of Heaven, the Mind of the World and Temperature, the Guide and Prince of all*; is to be underſtood in the Senſe of the *Stoicks*, who made the Sun the Supream Deity, but no otherwiſe than as the *Hegemonicon* or *Principale* of the great Mind or Soul of the World, *the* Jove *of their Theology*, and therefore not excluſively of ſuch a *Jove.* (*p*) *The* Perſians (ſaith *Trogus* in *Juſtin*) *ſuppoſe the Sun, unum Deum, alone God, to which God they conſecrate Horſes.* Some ancient Writers have the like Paſſages touching the Religion of the *Maſſagetæ* (miſunderſtood (*q*) of the *Perſians*) which if they deſign, to repreſent the Oriental Pagans as meer *Helio-Theiſts*, not *Polytheiſts*, are enormous miſtakes; but probably thoſe Authors mean nothing more, than that the *Perſians* and other Orientals were ſuperlative *Helio-Theiſts*, that ſuppos'd the Sun an Imperial Lord or Monarch of the viſible Mundane Syſtem, and therefore *alone Lord or God*; for a Monarch is alone Lord. So that Supream Title of the Sun in *Philo Byblius*'s Account of the *Phenician* Theology, μόνος οὐρανοῦ κύριος, is literally the very ſame with *Monarcha Cœli* (Monarch of Heaven) and nothing more; which Title was given to the Sun by the generality of the Pagan Theiſts, who were far from ſuppoſing him abſolutely the Supream Deity. But in *Philo Byblius* this Title ſignifieth, that the Sun was abſolutely the *Phenicians* Supream Deity; for he reporteth from *Sanchoniathon*, (*r*) *that the* Phenicians *had no immortal Gods ſave only the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and that their mortal Gods were deify'd Benefactors and Authors of Good to Men.* And having repreſented a (*Mythological*) Coſmogony abſurdly Atheiſtical (that the Univerſe of things and of Mankind had their origin from *Spirituous Air* and *Chaos*) and peopled *Phenicia* with Inhabitants (the firſt of Human Race;) he reporteth of thoſe *Phenicians*, (*s*) *They thought the Sun God, alone Lord of Heaven, calling him* Beelſamen, *which in the* Phenician *Tongue denoteth Lord of Heaven, but is the* Grecians Zeus. Theſe Paſſages are alledg'd by *Euſebius* and (*t*) S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, to no better purpoſe than injuriouſly to miſrepreſent the Pagan Theology; for it is a great folly and injuſtice, from a fabulous Coſmogony (ſuch as *Philo Byblius* deſcribeth from *Sanchoniathon*) to make a Judgment of the Pagan Theology.

The fabulous Coſmogony could not be the Primitive and Original Theology of the Pagans, but is (comparatively ſpeaking) a late thing, if (as is generally and probably ſuppos'd) it had its origin from certain broken Traditions of the *Moſaic Coſmopœia.* *Herodotus* counteth it a late thing; (*u*) *whence every one of the Gods was generated, or whether they all of them ever were, and what are their Forms, was not known till very lately. For I ſuppoſe, that* Heſiod *and* Homer *were not above four hundred Years my Seniors. And theſe were they that introduc'd the* Theogonia *amongſt the* Greeks. The Heathen World had certainly an Heathen Religion and Theology long before the Greek Poets and the Gods of their Theogony (or Coſmogony) were in being, and long before the time of *Moſes*, with whom the Greek Poets (*w*) are obſerv'd

to

(e) *Ouzel. in Min. Fel. p.* 274.

(f) *Voſſ. ſupr.*

(g) *Seld. de J. nat. & G. l.* 3. *c.* 21.

(h) *Plutarch. Qu. Plat. p.* 1006. *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 2. *s.* 36, 37.

(i) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 2. *diſſ.* 13.

(k) *Marſham. can. chr. p.* 136. *ed. Lipſ.*

(l) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. *c.* 29.

(m) *Fuller Miſc. l.* 1. *c.* 14. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 308.

(n) *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 64. *Marſham. ſupr. p.* 462.

(o) *Sol optime, maxime, qui mediam cæli poſſides partem, mens mundi atque temperies, dux omnium princepſque.* Lipſ. Phyſ. l. 2. diſſ. 13.

(p) *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

(q) *Ibid. Hiſt. Pelag. l.* 3. *Par.* 3. *Theſ.* 6.

(r) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 9, 10.

(s) Τὸν ἥλιον θεὸν ἐνόμιζον, μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον, Βεελσαμὴν καλοῦντες, ὅ ἐστι παρὰ Φοίνιξι κύριος οὐρανοῦ, Ζεὺς δὲ παρ' Ἕλλησι.

(t) *C. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 205.

(u) *Euterp. c.* 53.

(w) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 1. *S.* 16.

to ſymbolize (ſome more and ſome leſs) in their *Chaos*, *Erebus*, *Tartarus*.

The fabulous Coſmogony was but in ſome degree receiv'd into the Pagans Religion; much of it remain'd properly Poetical, and was no part of the Greeks *Civil Theology*, which was their publick authoriz'd Religion. For *Plato* (x) hath with great freedom condemn'd *Heſiod* for lying, lying unhandſomly touching the Gods in his fabulous *Theogonia* (which ſort of Fables (y) the *Romans* alſo rejected;) yet he ſuppoſeth Men oblig'd in obedience to the Laws, to believe what the Poets have taught touching the generation of thoſe *Genial* kind of Gods, *Oceanus*, *Tethys*, *Phorcys*, *Saturn*, *Rhea*, *Jupiter*, *Juno*, and ſuch more. It ſhould ſeem the fabulous Theogony had in ſome degree the Countenance of the Laws, which yet did not ſettle any determinate Belief touching that grand Article of Religion, *The Origin of the Univerſe*, much leſs did they ſettle a determinate Belief of it in the fabulous Theogoniſts way.

The fabulous Coſmogony hath not *a Demiurgic Zeus* in it, yet ſuch a *Zeus* was an acknowledg'd Principle in the generally receiv'd Pagan Theology. (z) In the Orphic Theology *Zeus* is Coſmical and Demiurgic — ἁπάντων Ἀρχιγένεθλος, *the beginning and Prince of all*; agreeably whereto the *Hierophantes* in the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries (a) repreſented the *Demiurgus*; whence it appeareth, that there was ſuch a Demiurgic Principle as νοῦς or Mind in the Greek Theology long before *Anaxagoras*'s time. *Aratus*'s *Zeus* is Coſmical and Demiurgic — τάγε σήματ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξεν, *he hath fixed the Signs in Heaven.* The Oracle diſſwaded the *Cnidians* (b) from making their City an Iſland for this reaſon; *Jupiter enim ſi voluiſſet, Inſulam feciſſet*; Jupiter *had made it an Iſland, if it had been his Will.* The Pagan Theologers uſually teach, (c) *The Gods are the makers of all things that were made*; (d) ὦ Ζεῦ ϗ Θεοὶ πατέρες ϗ ποιηταὶ γῆς ϗ θαλάττης, O Jupiter *and the Gods, the Fathers and Makers of the Earth and Sea.* Throughout Univerſal Pagan Religioniſm *Jupiter* is intituled *The Father of the Gods*; he is ſo intituled by *Homer* and *Heſiod*, who although in their fabulous way of *Coſmogony* and *Theogony* (deriving all things and the Gods themſelves from the *Ocean* and the *Chaos*) they make no mention of a *Demiurgic Zeus*; yet there are ſeveral Paſſages in them, whence it appeareth, that they acknowledg'd that Pagan Religious Principle; as for inſtance, *Heſiod* ſaith, (e) *The motion of Sun, the finiſhing of Winter Days is of* Jupiter's *appointment*; which implieth, that the Order of the World is of his Conſtitution, and is beſt underſtood of a *Coſmical Zeus.*

The fabulous Coſmogony inverteth the Order of Nature and the Tenour of the Pagan Theology; of which therefore a Judgment muſt not be made from the fabulous Coſmogony. For according to the tenour of the Pagan Theology *Heaven and Earth* are the grand univerſal Parents, the one is the Father (Heaven) the Earth is the Mother; but according to the fabulous Coſmogony *the Earth generateth the Starry Heaven (f)* and is both Father and Mother unto it. Of the ancient Poets that were fabulous *Theogoniſts Ariſtotle* obſerveth, (g) *They do not attribute Regnancy and Rule to thoſe things that are ſuppos'd, to have the Primacy* (in order to Exiſtence) *the Night*, *Uranus*, *Chaos or the Ocean*, *but to* Jupiter. Becauſe they attributed the Rule and Principality to *Jupiter*, and acknowledg'd the Pagan Theopolity, they were Pagan Theiſts, not Atheiſts; but becauſe they did not attribute the Primacy of Exiſtence to that which hath the Rule and Principality, but made the worſt firſt (whereas the beſt ought to be the firſt) they did μεταβάλλειν τοὺς ἄρχοντας, *change the chieftain things* (as the Philoſopher ſpeaketh) and invert both the order of Nature and of the Greek Theology. So a *Phenician* fabulous Theogoniſt hath inverted the order of Nature and of the *Phenician* Theology.

The fabulous Coſmogony was a Tradition of ſeveral Poets, that were Pagan Theiſts; but of it ſelf it is perfectly Atheiſtic (one Form of Atheiſm;) and it is abſurd, to make a Judgment of the Pagan Theiſm from a Form of groſs Atheiſm. For it atheizeth that *Love-Deity* (the only Deity which it admitteth) which ſeveral of the Pagan Theologers celebrate as an active Principle in the Coſmogony, that decided the Contentions of the Chaos The *Argonauticks* attributed to *Orpheus* repreſent this *Love* as a ſelf-exiſtent Deity, calling it (h) *Love, the moſt ancient of Gods, ſelf-perfect and mighty wiſe. Parmenides* celebrateth this Deity, but not as an unmade Deity; for he ſaith of it, (i) *He firſt made Love before all the other Gods.* If we inquire of the Pagan Theologers, what they mean by this celebrated *Love*, *Plutarch* interpreteth it (k) of that Love and Deſire which is requiſite in Generation. *Phornutus* interpreteth it, (l) *the impetus to Generation.* Some will have it the Divine Love (the Love that God is) ſuch Love as cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd to be found in Paganiſm. But becauſe *Simmias Rhodius* in his Hymn made in honour of it, deſcribeth this Love which is a Principle in the Coſmogony and more ancient than the other Gods) as of a nobler kind than the effeminate Love, it is reaſonable to interpret it *the pagan Theologers celeſtial Cupid*; agreeably to that ſaying of *Pherecydes Syrus* (which is meant of *Jupiter*'s transforming himſelf into the ſhape of a Celeſtial Cupid) * εἰς ἔρωτα μεταβεβλῆσθαι τὸν Δία μέλλοντα δημιουργεῖν, Jupiter *transform'd himſelf into Love, when he went about the Demiurgic Operation.* The reaſon why theſe Pagan Theologers introduc'd Love (their Celeſtial Cupid) into the Coſmogony, was, becauſe they ſuppos'd a Love-Conſtitution of the Univerſe, which is the cauſe of the Harmony of it, as *Gr. Naz.* ſaith, (m) *The artificer* Logos *hath combin'd the Univerſe by the Bonds of Love.* So the *Chalday* Oracles ſay (n).

The Cauſe of all hath ſown in all
the Seeds of flagrant Love,
The Bond of all, that nothing
might for ever diſcord move.

Of this Love-Conſtitution of the Univerſe a Love-Deity independent upon the Chaos was ſuppos'd to be the efficient cauſe, and this was Pagan Theiſm; but in the fabulous Coſmogony this Love-Deity is made an Atheiſtic Principle; for it deriveth the Generation of all things from the Chaos and from *Love*, ſo as to make this Love-Deity (as well as all things elſe) the Off-ſpring of the *Chaos*. Thus the Coſmogony is repreſented in *Ariſtophanes de Avibus*. *At firſt there was nothing but Night and Chaos, and Night laying an Egg, from thence was produc'd Love gliſtering with golden Wings* (the Celeſtial Cupid,) *which mingling with the Chaos generated Men and the Gods, that before had no Exiſtence.* In *Heſiod*'s Theogony the Love Deity ſeemeth to be repreſented as emerging out of the Chaos; for in this Order things ſucceed in it. (*o*) *Chaos was firſt, next the broad-breaſted Earth, and Love the moſt beauteous of the Gods.* In *Homer*'s Theogony there is no Love-Deity, he repreſented the Gods as having their Original (*p*) wholly and ſolely from the Ocean (the fluid matter) and from Mother *Tethys*. In *Sanchoniathon*'s fabulous Coſmogony there is a Love-Deity, but of no better Original than an Off-ſpring of the Chaos. For he ſuppoſeth, *that at firſt there was nothing but Spirit or Tenebricoſe Air and Chaos.* (*q*) *But when Spirit became in Love with its own Principles, and a mixture was made, that Conjunction was called Cupid, or Deſire, which is the Principle of the Creation of all things.*

(x) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(y) *Ibid. c.* 8.

(z) *Eugub. de Per. phil. l.* 7. *c.* 10.

(a) *Marſham. can. chr. p.* 261. *ed. Lipſ.*

(b) *Oenomaus ap. Euſeb. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 26.

(c) *Phornut. de nat. Deor p.* 3.

(d) *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 34.

(e) Εὖτ' ἂν ἑξήκοντα μετὰ τροπὰς ἠελίοιο Χειμέρι' ἐκτελέσῃ Ζεὺς ἤματα —— *Op. & Dies. l.* 2.

(f) Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἶσον ἑαυτῇ Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτοι.

(g) Βασιλεύειν ϗ ἄρχειν φασίν, οὐ τοὺς πρώτους, οἷον Νύκτα ϗ οὐρανὸν, ἢ χάος, ἢ ϗ Ὠκεανὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Δία. *Metaphyſ. l.* 14. *c.* 4.

(h) Πρεσβύτατόν τε ϗ αὐτοτελῆ πολύμητιν Ἔρωτα. *Eugubin. ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 10.

(i) Πρώτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσατο πάντων. *Ibid. c.* 12.

(k) Ἐρωτικ. p. 756.

(l) *De nat. Deor. p.* 39.

* *Eugubin. ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 10.

(m) Τοῖς τῆς εὐνοίας δεσμοῖς ὁ τεχνίτης λόγος τὸ πᾶν συνέδησε. *Or.* 1. *de pace, c.* 199.

(n) Πᾶσιν ἐνέσπειρεν δεσμὸν πυριβριθῆ ἔρωτος
Ὄφρα τὰ πάντα μένῃ, χρόνον εἰς ἀπέραντον ἐρῶντα.

A fabulous Coſmogony might be amongſt the *Phenicians* as well as amongſt the Greeks: But that this ſhould be the *Phenicians* Theology, as *Euſebius* will have it, is as incredible and impoſſible as that *Ariſtophanes*'s Coſmogony ſhould be the Greeks Theology. *Euſebius* could not be ignorant, (*r*) that *Orpheus*'s Theology was a deſcendent from *Egypt*, that the Orphic Theology acknowledgeth an incorporeal Deity, and a Deity of the Univerſe, (*s*) that the Egyptians ſuppos'd the Deity, to pervade all things, (*t*) the Sun and Moon to have had an eternal Generation (and conſequently, that they were generated Deities,) that the Egyptians (*u*) acknowledg'd an Intellectual Demiurgus or Maker of the World called *Cneph*, and that (*w*) the Prieſts of Egypt had an Arcane Theology; nothing of this was unknown to *Euſebius*. And yet he ſuppoſeth, (*x*) that their Coſmogony was Atheiſtic from an αὐτοματισμός, *Spontaneous Motion* of the Elements, (*y*) that the Egyptians acknowledg'd no incorporeal Deity, nor any incorporeal Subſtance (as if the Doctrine of incorporeal Subſtance was peculiar to true Religion;) that the Men of ancient times (*z*) worſhipp'd only the Lights of Heaven, knowing nothing of the God of the Univerſe, (*a*) that the *Phenicians* and *Egyptians* ſuppos'd the Sun, Moon and Stars the ſole Cauſes of Generation and Corruption, and that the latter knew no other Gods but thoſe and the Elements. Such Contradictions they muſt admit, that admit this Report, that the Sun was abſolutely the Supreme Deity of the Oriental Pagans.

X. At the riſe of Paganiſm *Heaven* and *Earth* ſeem to have been honour'd (*b*) as amongſt the Chineſe, as univerſal Parents; next to Heaven therefore and the Heavenly Bodies the Earth was the principal Deity; as *Plato* ſtileth it, *the firſt and moſt ancient of the Gods within the Heavens*. The Earth hath an Intellectual Soul, *and ſo is a God*, (*c*) ſaith a Platoniſt. Which reaſon of its Deity implieth, that thoſe Philoſophic Pagans (*d*) who accounted the four Elements Gods as well as the Sun and Moon, ſuppos'd them to be *Animate* and *Intelligent* as well as the Heavenly Bodies, nor did the Intelligent Pagans account any thing a God *abſolutely* and in the Plenary Senſe, ſave only what they ſuppos'd, to be *Animate* and *Intelligent*. The *Egyptians* ſaith *Salluſtius* the Philoſopher (*e*) think and call αὐτὰ τὰ σώματα, *even the bodily Subſtances Gods. The Earth* Iſis, *the moiſt Element* Oſiris, *the Heat* Typhon, *or the Water* Saturn, *the Fruits* Adonis, *Wine* Bacchus. *It is the part of Wiſe-men, to ſay, that theſe are dedicated to the Gods, (as Herbs, Stones and Animals are,) but to call them Gods, is the part of Mad-men.* To call them Gods in the Plenary Senſe, is the part of Mad-men: But they may be accounted Gods in a *partial limited Senſe*, ſo far only as to be the Objects of Religious Veneration, and for that Reaſon to have the Name of Gods; and in ſuch a partial limited Senſe Intelligent Pagans would have many things *inanimate* and *unintelligent* called Gods. But touching the *four Elements*, *Ficinus* ſaith; (*f*) *Plotinus & multi unicuique elementorum ſuam tribuunt Animam*, Plotinus *and many attribute a diſtinct Intelligent Soul to each one of the Elements*, calling the Soul of the Earth *Veſta* and *Ceres*. As the Earth was deify'd under the Names of *Veſta*, *Rhea*, *Cybele* (and ſuch more,) ſo thoſe other mundane Elements, *Water*, *Fire*, *Air*, their *Powers*, *Parts and Productions*, were perſonated and deify'd (either in the Plenary or Partial Senſe,) and had their *Temples*, *Altars*, *Sacrifices*. They were deify'd (as upon other accounts, ſo) with reſpect to their Preſident Deities; for much of the Senſe of the ancient Pagans is viſible in this account of the Religion of the *Chineſe*. (*g*) *They Sacrifice four times a Year, to Heaven, the Sun, Moon, and greater part of the Planets and Stars; to the Earth, Mountains, and the four parts of the World; to the Sea, Rivers, Lakes, and other things: But it ſeemeth, that in reality they Sacrifice to the Spirits of thoſe things.* So the ancient Pagans called the Sea and its Preſident Deities by the Names of *Neptune*, *Nereus*, *Tethys*, *Thetis* and *Amphitrite*. The *Parts* and *Powers* of the Sea were alſo deify'd (the *Romans* ſacrific'd to the *Waves* for the ſafety of their Navies, and *Tempeſtas* was one of their Deities,) and its *Productions* the *Rivers* and *Fountains*, which were ſuppos'd to flow from the Sea by Subterraneous Paſſages, as *Homer* philoſophizeth. (*h*).

Thence ſtores of Waters, Rivers, Rills,
Do flow, all Fountains and deep Wells.

The Worſhip of the *Fire* (which the European Pagans kept in their *Prytanea* and call'd by the Names of *Vulcan* and *Veſta*) was of (*i*) vaſt diſpread in the Pagan World: But the Oriental Pagans, the *Perſians* and *Chaldeans* were the ancient and eminent Fire-worſhippers. The City *Ur* of the Chaldees is ſuppos'd, to have its Name (*k*) from Fire-worſhip (אור ſignifieth Fire;) and the Perſian God *Amanus* (from חמה *Heat*) is probably ſuppos'd to be the Fire; and *Chammanecem* rendred your Images, *Lev.* 26. 30. ſeemeth to ſignifie your Fire-Temples or Fire-Hearths, places for the Cuſtody of the ſacred Fire. The *Perſians* and *Chaldeans* are ſaid, to have preſerv'd their ſacred Fire (*l*) four thouſand

---

(o) Ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, &c.
Ἠδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

(p) Ὠκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν, ϗ μητέρα τηθύν.

(q) Ὅτε δὲ ἠράσθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρασις, ἡ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη πόθος. αὕτη δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἁπάντων. Poſt Chaos fuere Tellus & Tartara: Item Amor. Voſſ. de Heſiodo. de Idol. l. 8. c. 3.

(r) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *l.* 3. *c.* 9.

(s) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

(t) *Ibid. c.* 3.

(u) *Ibid. c.* 11.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 1. *p.* 54.

(x) *Ibid. c.* 7.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 13.

(z) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 9.

(a) *Ibid. c.* 6, *&* 9.

(b) *Semedo Hiſt. par.* 1. *c.* 18.

(c) *Plotin. En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 22.

(d) *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 5. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 51.

(e) *De Diis. c.* 4.

(f) *Com. in Plotin. p.* 414.

(g) *Semedo ſupr. c.* 19.

(h) Ἐξ ὅπερ πάντες ποταμοὶ ϗ πᾶσα θάλασσα
Καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι, ϗ φρείατα μακρὰ νάουσιν.

(i) *Huet. Dem. ev. pr.* 4. *c.* 5.

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 9. *&* 64.

(l) *Hotting. Hexaem. p.* 132.

thouſand Years, until *Omer* the third Succeſſor of *Muhammed* extinguiſh'd it. At this day *Magus* and a Fire-worſhipper (*m*) are amongſt the *Arabians* and *Perſians* Synonymous, and Terms of Diſgrace; for ſuch the *Perſians* thus reproach in their taunting Proverb;) (*n*) *Although Kebber* (a Fire-religioniſt) *kindleth the Fire an hundred Years, yet if he falleth into it but once, he is burned.* The beſt account of the Origin of Fire-worſhip amongſt the *Magi* is that (*o*) of the Arabic Writers; *becauſe they had Light in great Veneration, therefore they worſhipp'd Fire.* They worſhipp'd the Fire with *proper* Worſhip, yet they worſhipp'd it alſo with a Symbolical Worſhip. (*p*) *For they kept the never-dying Fire in their Temples in honour of the Celeſtial viſible Gods* (the Stars) *as being moſt like them.* The liquid *Air* was perſonated and deify'd (Wiſd. 13. 2.) under the Names of *Minerva*, *Juno*, *Jupiter*, *Dijovis*, *Dieſpiter*; and the Meteors, the Winds, Thunder and Lightning, the Rainbow, *Caſtor* and *Pollux* were deify'd alſo. So the *Productions and ſeveral parts of the Earth*, Trees, and Groves, Stones, Metals and the Mountains were made Gods and Goddeſſes and the Symbols of the Pagan Deities, and the City of *Rome* was made a Goddeſs.

As mundane Nature was the Pagans Supreme Deity, ſo the things of mundane Nature without bound or meaſure were deify'd by them (either in the Plenary or Partial Senſe) agreeably to the Phantaſtry of their Minds. *Terminus* and Time (called an eaſie God in *Sophocles*,) the Night, the Hours, were deify'd; and (probably in an Atheiſtic Senſe) the *Chaos* is call'd a God by the Coſmogoniſts. There is nothing ſo vile in the comprehenſion of Nature, which the impure Phantaſtry of theſe mundane Theiſts hath not deify'd; (*q*) for the *Braſilians* deify'd a Fruit like a Gourd, the People of *Guinea* Rings of Straw and a Bundle of Feathers. But chiefly things of an extraordinary appearance and things of great utility were deify'd by the Pagans. As *Acoſta* ſaith of the *Peruans*; (*r*) *they worſhipp'd Rivers, Fountains, Rocks or great Stones, Hills and the tops of Mountains, which they called Apachita's, and all things in Nature which ſeem'd to have ſomething extraordinary in them. A Sand-hill was a principal Idol of theirs, which they venerated for a Miracle, becauſe it was ſandy in the midſt of ſtony Mountains. A great ill-favour'd Tree they look'd upon as having ſomething of Divinity in it, becauſe it tranſcended the reſt in magnitude.* Some things in Nature by their *Majeſty*, *Terribleneſs*, *Surprizingneſs*, *Solemneſs*, made a Religious or Devotional kind of impreſſion upon the Minds of the Heathen, (*s*) *whence they ador'd the heads of great Rivers, and Fountains of hot Waters; the ſudden eruption of a vaſt River out of the Caverns of the Earth hath its Altars erected to it; and ſome Pools have been made ſacred for their immenſe Profundity and Opacity.* (*t*) So Trees and Groves came to be of ſacred Eſteem and were deify'd (properly or ſymbolically, as the Reſidences and Repreſentatives of their Deities;) and other things were deify'd for their beneficial Nature and Utility to Mankind. (*u*) *The Egyptians worſhipp'd Fire and Water as the chief cauſes of our Welfare. Sanchoniathon* in *Euſebius* ſaith of the *Egyptians*; *theſe were the firſt that conſecrated the Plants of the Earth, and counted them Gods and worſhipp'd them.* The Egyptians (and others) ſo deify'd the Fruits of the Earth, as to make them the Gods that preſided over them (ſaying, that *Oſiris* was buried, when the Seed was buried in the Earth, and return'd to Life, when the Seed began to ſprout,) which ſenſleſs piece of Superſtition is reprov'd by *Plutarch* for this Reaſon; (*w*) *a God is not a thing inanimate Subject to the Hand of Man.* Nothing *imperſonal* and therefore nothing inanimate and unintelligent can be *a perſonal God or Goddeſs*, as common Senſe dictateth; and therefore it is marvellous, and ſheweth the prevalency of Phantaſtry againſt Reaſon, that the vulgar Pagans thought the Fruits of the Earth, to be thoſe perſonal Gods and Goddeſſes, that preſided over them, (*x*) as *Plutarch* repreſenteth them.

XI. The *viſible Heavens*, *heavenly Bodies*, and *mundane Elements* (which we have conſider'd) belong to the mundane City *locally* underſtood, as conſtitutive parts thereof; the next ſort of Pagan Deities are *Inhabitants of the Mundane City real or fictitious.* Which yet are not ſo ſtrictly Inhabitants of the mundane City, but that ſome of them muſt be conſider'd alſo as conſtitutive parts of the mundane City locally underſtood: In like manner as ſome parts of the mundane City locally underſtood (which we have repreſented,) muſt alſo be conſider'd as Inhabitants of the mundane City. The Star *Arcturus* is both a Conſtitutive part of the mundane City locally underſtood, and alſo an Inhabitant or Citizen thereof; for thus in *Plautus*'s *Rudens* he ſpeaketh of himſelf. (*y*) *I am one of his Celeſtial Citizens that is Rector of the Univerſe.* The Citizens and Inhabitants of this mundane City (ſuch as appertain to the Exoterical Theology) as they are recounted by (*z*) *Euſebius* and *Theodoret* (an immenſe Rabble) are theſe following Pagan Deities. 1. The *Genial* (or Pneumatological) kind of Deities, τὸ τῶν ἀοράτων πλῆθος, *the World of inviſible Spirits and Gods* contradiſtinct to the viſible. 2. The *Herological* Deities, ſuch as *Herodotus* calleth ἀνθρωποφυέας, *of Human Birth and Original.* 3. The *Deiformities*, ſo that ſort of Deities may be fitly call'd, which are nothing but *Affections*, *Qualities* and *Forms* of Subſtances perſonated and made Deiform, ſuch as *Virtue*, *Piety*, *Fidelity*, *propter quæ datur homini adſcenſus in Cœlum, for which Men are tranſlated to Heaven.* 4. The *Mythical.* 5. The *Animal.* 6. The *Symbolical* Deities.

The *Genial* Deities are diſtributed by the Philoſophic Pagans into the *Imperial* and *Miniſterial*, the Lords and the Servitors, the *Gods* and the *Demons* in the reſtrict Notion (before diſcours'd of;) which diſtribution of theirs inferreth, that the Platoniſts of the Chriſtian Church do not deal fairly (*a*) in making their order of Gods in the ſtrict Notion (the ſuprademonial Order) Parallel to the Angels of our Theology; for the Pagan Theology (*b*) acknowledgeth no Angels but only thoſe of the *Demonial Order*, and always repreſenteth the Gods as Supra-angelical. The Order of Government in the Pagan Theopolity is thus repreſented by *Julian* and his Divine *Jamblichus.* (*c*) *Several Nations have their ſeveral Prefect-Gods, which Prefect-Gods have Angels* (an higher rank of Demons) *Demons and a peculiar kind of Souls for their Servitors.* Agreeably to the Fundamentals of their Theology and Religion the Pagan Theologers uſually aſcribe

---

(m) *Pocock. ſpec.* p. 146.

(n) *Hoffman Umbr. in Luc.* p. 110.

(o) *Pocock. ſupr.*

(p) *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 5.

(q) *Beyer. Addit. ad Selden de D. Syr.* p. 121.

(r) *Nat. and Mor. Hiſt. of the Indies.* B. 5. c. 5.

(s) *Sen. Ep.* 1.

(t) *V.* Dr. *Hammond* n *Col.* 2. 3.

u) *Sbarock de* ff. c. 5. 8.

(w) Οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἄψυχον ἀνθρώποις ὁ θεὸς ὑποχείριον. De Iſ. & Oſir. p. 377.

(x) *Ibid.* p. 379.

(y) *Qui Gentes omnes mariaque & terras movet ejus ſum civis civitate cœlitum.*

(z) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 5. c. 3. *Theodor.* Θεραπ. *Ser.* 3.

(a) *Eugubin. de Per. phil. l.* 8. *Liv. Galant. compar. l.* 6. *Mat. Panſa de Oſcul.* p. 63. *Theodoret. ſupr. Ser.* 4.

(b) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 9 *c.* 23.

(c) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 4. p. 143. *Jambl. de Myſt.* p. 124, 140, 141.

the Divine Attributes, *Omniſcience*, *Omnipreſence*, *Omnipotence*, *univerſal Providence and Beneficence* (not to the Demonial, but) to their Supra-demonial Order of Deities, ſtiling them *the Makers*, *Archical Cauſes*, *Lords*, *Rulers*, *Curators of the Univerſe.* Theſe Fundamentals of their Theology are thus abridg'd by *Epictetus.* (d) *To have right Opinions concerning the Gods, their Exiſtence and their univerſal Providence, and that they adminiſter all things juſtly.* They are more fully diſcours'd by *Plato in his Tenth of Laws* to this Senſe; (e) *The being of the Gods, their univerſal Providence, and that they adminiſter all things according to Juſtice, and cannot be perverted from the Rule of Juſtice, to give indulgence to Criminals, by any Gifts or Services. The Gods neglect not the Care of the leaſt things, for they know, ſee, and hear all things; nothing eſcapeth their notice that can be known: They are able to do all that can be done; and they are of all manner of Virtue, without Sloth, Negligence, Timidity, there is nothing of this in any of the Gods.* They are not without their (f) κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι περὶ τὸ θεῖον, *common Notices touching the Divinity; that the Divinity is good and the Author of goods only, is unchangeable, and free from lying and deceiving.* Agreeably to which common Notices touching the Gods the Divine Attributes are transferr'd by the Platoniſts upon their Supra-demonial Deities, and thus they diſtinguiſh them from the Demonial Order, but ſo as alſo to diſtinguiſh them into ſeveral Orders.

(g) *It is a common Notion, that every one of the Gods is every where preſent, and heareth all things in all places.* (h) *Their Providence is not circumſcrib'd, nor themſelves confin'd in any part of the World.* Accordingly, the Dii ἄζωνοι, *Azonous* Gods in the Chaldaic Theology are of this Explication. (i) *They are certain Gods that have no certain determinate parts of the World for their Allotment, but are generally worſhipp'd by all; for it is manifeſt, that they are every where, their Power is in all the Zones.*

(k) *The Gods generate and adminiſter all things, and as the Archical cauſe imperially precede all things; they rule over all things by the Power of their Cauſality, and by their Empire* or Prepollency. (l) *The Parents, Guides, Rulers of all things in the World; having the Rectorſhip of all things, their Providential Care extendeth to all things, and their Preſence alſo* (πάντα περιέχοντες ϗ πάντα προνοοῦντες,) *for they contain all things, but are contained by nothing.* (m) *Remaining in themſelves the Gods go forth into all places, and although preſent to all depart not from their own* περιωπὴ, *ſublime Station of Providence: Nor is their Providence laborious and troubleſome,* (n) *for beholding themſelves only and by their own Eſſence they conduct all things* ἀψόφῳ κελεύθῳ, *in a ſilent way, and repleniſh them with Goods* ἀφθόνῳ βουλήσει, *with an uninvidious Good-will.* (o) *The viſible and inviſible Gods comprehend all things in their Gubernation, all the Heaven, the World, and the inviſible Powers in the Univerſe.*

(p) *The Gods are of omnimodous Unity and permanent Stability in one's ſelf, the cauſe of indiviſible Eſſences, immoveable, the cauſe of all Motion, tranſcending the Univerſe of things, having nothing in common with them, but being unmix'd and ſeparate, in Eſſence, Power and Operation; all ſuch things we muſt aſcribe to the Gods.* (q) Πάντα δύναται ἅμα ἐν τῷ νῦν μονοειδῶς, *they can do all things in an inſtant uniformly,* (r) *have unbounded Power indiviſible and uncircumſcrib'd,* (s) *wherefore the Poets rightly ſay,* πάντα δύνασθαι τοὺς θεοὺς, *the Gods can do all things.*

(t) *The Vaticination of what is future is not from thoſe things that have not Preſcience in themſelves, but from the Gods, which have in themſelves* τὰ πέρατα τῆς ὅλης εἰδήσεως τῶν ὄντων, *the extremities of the whole knowledge of Beings.* (u) *The Gods know all things at once, things univerſal and particular, eternals and things done in time, (and therefore in their Oracles they teach alike all thoſe things;) for the intellection of the Gods is eternal, nothing is at any time abſent from the Intellect of the Gods, but all things are preſent; no God Philoſophizeth or deſireth to be Wiſe* (ſaith *Plato*,) *but is ſo.*

(w) *Diſtinguiſh the Demons from the Gods in this manner. In the God of Gods Providence is altogether univerſal, extending to all and all things, and communicating accordingly. It is alſo in a manner univerſal in the Divine Mind and in the Soul of the World. In the following Gods, whether they be inviſible or viſible, Providence is alſo in a manner univerſal, but with a particular Condition. For either they communicate to all, but not all things, but certain Gifts only: Or if they communicate all ſorts of Gifts, it is but to ſome. But in the Demons Providence is both particular, and with a particular Condition. For they diſtribute only ſome certain Gifts, and but to ſome certain kinds of things and Regions.*

Whether thoſe Sublimities that are attributed to the (Supra-demonial) Gods in common, are not inconſiſtent with that great Superiority and Tranſcendency of ſome of them above others, which the Platoniſts ſuppoſe (for they ſuppoſe (x) their Super-celeſtial (y) and Supramundane Gods at a great rate tranſcendent to their other Supra-demonial Deities) is not worth the while to diſpute. We will only obſerve, that if the Gods (Supra-demonial) are at this Platonic rate unconfin'd in Power, Providence and other Perfections, it is not they that are Parallel to the Angels of our Theology, but only the Demons, (z) as *Tertullian*, S. *Auſtin* and *Philo* ſuppoſe. *Philo* (not making a due diſtinction between the Church and the World) muſt not be thought a Church of God-kind of Theologiſt, nor is he better than a Philoſophic Pagan Demonologiſt (as being wholly ignorant of any ſuch Polity as the Kingdom of Darkneſs, of the Fall of Angels, of their baniſhment from the Celeſtial and Penal confinement to the Aerial Regions:) But his parallеliſm between the *Pagan* and *Moſaic* Theology is much more Legitimate than that of our Chriſtian Platoniſts. For ſpeaking of the Souls that fly in the Air he ſaith, (a) *other Philoſophers call theſe Demons, but the holy Scripture is wont to call them Angels.*

XII. The principal Deities (ſupra-Demonial) of the Exoterical Theology are the *Dii Conſentes* (*Dii majorum Gentium*) contain'd in thoſe two Verſes of *Ennius*,

Juno, Veſta, Minerva, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars,
Mercuri', Jovis, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Apollo.

Theſe are call'd in the Law of the twelve Tables, (b) *The Gods that were always Celeſtial* (or Gods,) *a Colledge of Sempiternal Deities.* So *Plutarch* in the life of *Pelopidas* repreſenteth *Apollo* as one of the Sempiternal Deities. *For our Tradi-*

(d) Ὀρθὰς ὑπολήψεις περὶ θεῶν ἔχειν, ὡς ὄντων, ϗ διοικούντων τὰ ὅλα καλῶς ϗ δικαίως. Enchir. c. 38.

(e) Τὸ εἶναι τοὺς θεοὺς, τὸ προνοεῖν πάντων, τὸ κατὰ δίκην τὰ πάντα ἄγειν.

(f) Ὅτι ἀγαθὸν τὸ θεῖον, ϗ μόνων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιον, ἀμετάβλητον τὸ θεῖον, ἀληθευτικὸν τὸ θεῖον. Procl. in Polit. p. 358. Theol. Plat. l. 1. c. 12. 17.

(g) *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 5. *c.* 4. *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 6. *p.* 192.

(h) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 15, 16.

(i) *Seld. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 3. *c.* 20.

(k) *Jambl. ibid. p.* 11, 12. *de vit. Pythagor. p.* 138.

(l) *Procl. Th. Plat. l.* 1. *c.* 13. *& p.* 51.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 23.

(n) *Ibid. p.* 41.

(o) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 35.

(p) *Ibid. p.* 9, 10.

(q) *Ibid. p.* 11.

(r) *Porphyr. Ep. ad Aneb.*

(s) *Procl. Th. Plat. p.* 164.

(t) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 59.

(u) *Procl. ſupr. p* 54, 55, *& l.* 5. *c.* 17. *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 8. *c.* 3, 4.

(w) *Ficin. Com. in Plotin. p.* 49, 193.

(x) *Procl. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 16.

(y) *Syneſ. de provid. p.* 97.

(z) *Petav. T.* 3. *p.* 2.

(a) Ταύτας δαίμονας μὲν οἱ ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι, ὁ δὲ ἱερὸς λόγος ἀγγέλους εἴωθε καλεῖν. περὶ ὀνειρ. p. 398. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(b) *Divi Cœleſtes ſemper habiti.*

Tradition (ſaith he) *doth not rank this God amongſt thoſe that were born and ſo made Immortal, as* Hercules *and* Bacchus) *whom their Virtues rais'd above a mortal and paſſible Condition; but he is one of the eternal, if we may gather any certainty concerning theſe things from the Diſcourſes of the oldeſt and wiſeſt in theſe matters.* And thus *Apuleius* would have us conſider *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Juno*, *Venus* and the reſt of the *Dii Conſentes*, as certain eternal Minds, (c) ſaith *Voſſius.* (d) *Theſe Gods plac'd in the higheſt Ether* Plato *thinketh true, incorporeal,* (or incorporeal Nature's,) *Animal, without beginning or end, eternal in their own Nature remote from the Contagion of Body, happy to the height of Happineſs of Mind, good not by Participation of any external good, but of themſelves ſo; of promptitude, eaſie and free to all Functions belonging to them.*

A late Learned Author (e) hath undertaken, to make it evident, that *Apuleius* was not rightly underſtood by *Voſſius*, that his words muſt be underſtood in a Senſe properly Platonic, *touching the Ideal Deities in the intelligible Archetypal World*, his deſign being to accommodate thoſe civil Poetic Gods, *the twelve Conſentes*, to thoſe Gods of *Plato* the firſt Paradigms and Patterns of things. But of this Deſign there is no appearance in *Apuleius*; nor hath our learned Author produc'd any thing conſiderable, to determine his words to ſuch a Senſe. On the contrary, it is evident, that the *Dii Conſentes* are Deities of the Exoterical Theology, and therefore can be no Ideal Deities of the School of *Plato*; that the ſubject of *Apuleius*'s Diſcourſe is the Celeſtial Deities contradiſtinct to the Demonial Order; (f) that S. *Auſtin* underſtandeth *Apuleius*'s Diſcourſe touching (not the Ideal, but) *Genial* or Pneumatological kind of Deities; that twelve Deities of this kind are viſible in the beginning of *Plato*'s *Eighth of Laws*, (g) and are famouſly known in Platonic Authors; that *Apuleius*'s Deities are thoſe, *whoſe Powers are diſcern'd by the Minds of Men, by the many utilities which they are found to bring to the life of Man in thoſe things which every one of them taketh care of*; which are the ſame ſort of Deities with thoſe of *Balbus* in *Cicero*, (h) *utilitatum magnitudine conſtituti ſunt ii Dii, qui utilitates quaſque gignebant, thoſe Natures of Gods have been conſtituted, that produc'd the ſeveral utilities of life.* If the Platoniſts ſuppos'd a whole World of eternal Ideal Deities (which are Animals and Intelligent,) is it ſtrange, that the popular Pagans ſhould ſuppoſe *twelve Sempiternal Genial Deities*, or that *Apuleius* and other Platoniſts ſhould entertain this Branch of their Theology? (i) In *Salluſtius* the Platoniſt theſe twelve Deities are manifeſtly not *Ideal*, but *Genial* Deities; for having conſider'd the *firſt Cauſe* he proceedeth to the Subſequent Orders of the Gods, which he diſtinguiſheth into the *Super-mundane* and the *In-mundane*. *The In-mundane ſome of them make the World, ſome animate it, ſome adapt* (or harmonize) *the different parts of it, and ſome keep it ſo compos'd. Here then being four things, and each of them conſiſting of Firſt, Middle and Extreme, they that adminiſter theſe things muſt neceſſarily be twelve in number. They therefore that make the World, are* Jupiter, Neptune *and* Vulcan. *They who animate it, are* Juno, Ceres *and* Diana. *The Harmonizers of it are* Apollo, Venus *and* Mercury. *The Keepers of it are* Veſta, Pallas *and* Mars. If the popular Pagans ſuppos'd twelve of their Deities of theſe Denominations, to exiſt from Eternity, this will not infer, that they ſuppos'd them all *Self-exiſtent*, (for they that ſuppos'd the World, to exiſt from Eternity, did not therefore ſuppoſe it Self-exiſtent; nor did the Platoniſts ſuppoſe their eternal Ideal Deities Self-exiſtent;) nor could they ſuppoſe them all Self-exiſtent without contradicting their generally receiv'd Maxim, *that* Jupiter *is the Father of Gods and Men*, and thoſe ſupreme Attributes alſo (as peculiar to *Jupiter*,) which they appropriated to him in their uſual Inſcriptions. (k)

I. O. M.
CETERISQ.
DIS CONSENTIBUS.

To the Coſmical *Jupiter* (according to the Pagan Theologers) the Name *Zeus* moſt properly belongeth, (l) which denoteth him *the cauſe of Life to all that live.* In the *Pœnulus* of *Plautus* (m) Mankind are ſaid, *to have life and vitality from him* (per quem vivimus vitale ævum;) he was therefore celebrated by the popular Pagans as *the Father of Men*; (n) and they ſuppos'd the Gods, to iſſue from the Coſmical *Jupiter* (for *Jove* is the World, ſaith *Varro*) *as from a Father and Mother.* If therefore they had ſet at the head of their *Dii Conſentes* (or Colledge of Sempiternal Deities) this Coſmical *Jupiter*, we muſt be ſatisfied, that they did not make any of them Self-exiſtent but *Jupiter* only. And they have done the ſame thing in ſetting *a Genial Jupiter* at the head of their *Dii Conſentes*, as if they had ſet the Coſmical *Jupiter* there; becauſe *Jupiter* in the Coſmical and in the Genial (or *Jupiter* conſider'd as Coſmical and as Genial) are by them confounded. And the ſupreme Attributes of the Coſmical *Jupiter* theſe blundring Theiſts uſually communicate to *Jupiter* in other Notions, as to *a Genial* Jupiter, an *Herological* Jupiter, and alſo to *a Phyſiological* Jupiter. For *Diodorus* affirmeth, that (o) *the Egyptians call'd that ſpirituous matter which pervadeth all things,* Jove, *and look'd upon it as a certain Father of all things; and that the Greek Poets Symbolize with them, ſtiling* Jupiter *the Father of Gods and Men.*

The next ſort of Deities *the Herological*, returneth us back again to the conſideration of the *Dii Conſentes*; for *Jupiter*, *Juno*, *Vulcan*, *Veſta*, and others of the *Dii majorum Gentium* are repreſented by S. *Auſtin* (p) as *Herological* Deities; and the moſt of the *Dii Nobiles* (the *Conſentes* and *Selecti*) were in one Notion of them the deify'd Souls of Men. Beſides the *Genial Apollo* and *Jove* there is an Herological *Apollo* (according to that of *Pindar*, (q) 'Εν χρόνῳ δ' γένετ' 'Απολλών, Apollo *was ſometime born*) and a *Jupiter* born in *Crete*, whom the Poet (conſidering him in his Infancy) calleth (r) *parvum Tonantem, the little Thunderer.* So in a Coin in honour of *Titus* (s) ΖΕΥϹ ΚΡΗΤΑΓΕΝΗϹ, Jupiter *born in* Crete, furniſh'd with a Thunderbolt is plac'd amongſt the Stars. S. *Auſtin* argueth from the Enſigns of *Jupiter* (t) plac'd in the *Capitol*, that the *Capitoline Jupiter* was ſuppos'd to be of Humane Birth and Original, and conſequently the *Romans* (agreeably to other Pagans) made an Hero *the Supream Deity and the Supream Governour of the World.* To this ſort of Deities (the Herological) the great Men deify'd by the Pagans in their life-time, and their deify'd Cities (if by City we underſtand the Inhabitants) appertain. The Heavenly Bodies were alſo confounded with this ſort of Deities; for the Heathen ſuppoſing that their deceas'd Heroes were deify'd in the Heavenly Bodies, attributed their Names to them and worſhipped both together.

(c) De Idol. l. 2. c. 31.

(d) *Hos Deos in ſublimi Ætheris vertice locatos, Plato exiſtimat veros, incorporales,* (vel naturas incorporales) *animales, neque fine ullo, neque exordio, ſed prorſus ac retro Æviternos, corporis contagione ſuâ quidem naturâ remotos, ingenio ad ſummam beatitudinem porrecto, nullius extranei boni participatione, ſed ex ſeſe bonos, & ad omnia competentia ſibi, prompto nutu, facili, ſimplici, libero, abſoluto.*

(e) Intellect. Syſt. p. 496. &c.

(f) De C. D. l. 8. c. 14. l. 9. c. 7. &c.

(g) V. Gale in Salluſt. de Diis. c. 6. in Jambl. p. 269.

(h) De N. D. l. 2.

(i) De Diis. c. 5, 6.

(k) Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p. 125. Ouzel. in Min. Fel. p. 198.

(l) Phornut. de Nat. Deor. p. 4.

(m) Act. 5. Scen. 4.

(n) *Jupiter omnipotens Regum Rex ipſe, Deuſque, Progenitor, Genitrixque Deûm* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 7. c. 9, & 11.

(o) Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 3. c. 3.

(p) De C. D. l. 8. c. 5.

(q) Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 10. c. 12.

(r) Statius Thebaid. l. 5.

(s) Marſh. Can. Chr. p. 259. ed. Lipſ.

(t) *Quid de ipſo Jove ſenſerunt, qui ejus nutricem in capitolio poſuerunt? Quid illic facit ſcutum illud Jovis, quod appel-*

XIII. As many of the vaſt number of the Pagans *Herological* Deities were the Ghoſts of dead Men famous for Vice and Miſchief, Murders, Luſts and Rapes: So many of their *Deiformities* (which had Temples and Altars erected to them) were the moſt vicious and noxious things in Nature; ſuch as (u) *Contumely* and *Impudence*, *Luſt*, *the Fever*, *Orbona*, *evil Fortune* and *Death.* So *Impiety* and *Iniquity* (w) are ſaid to have had their Altars, *Pallor* and *Pavor*, Diſeaſes and Plagues were Pagan Deities. The popular Pagans conſecrated ſuch criminal and diſaſtrous things, that they might be deprecated: (x) but *Cicero* would have nothing deify'd ſave only what is virtuous, ſuch as *Mind*, *Piety*, *Virtue*, *Fidelity*, and the Names of things deſirable, (ſuch as Health, Honour, Victory) as *Symmachus* argueth, pleading for the reſtauration of the Altar of *Victory*, after it had been demoliſh'd, (y) *Nemo colendam neget, quam profitetur optandam, they that refuſe not Victory, but acknowledg her deſirable, ſhould not refuſe her Worſhip.* The deſirableneſs of ſuch things gain'd them a great veneration, (z) and about *Gades* on the Coaſt of *Spain* Altars were erected to *Old Age*, becauſe they had it in great veneration. Such Romantick Deities were ador'd in Paganiſm, not only by the ſottiſh Vulgar, but the Humour of deifying things *unſubſtantial* and *imperſonal* was the general humour of the Pagan World, of the Sage Philoſophers, of the Popular Pagan Theologers, of the great Captains, the wiſe Stateſmen, and the Learned Pagan Nations in their Civil Theology, as if common Reaſon had forſaken the World of Mankind. *Theſeus* before he fought with the *Amazons* ſacrific'd to *Fear. Lycurgus* now and then would ſacrifice an Hour to the little God *Riſus*, to whom he dedicated a Statue in his Houſe. *Marcellus* was hindred by the Prieſts from dedicating the Temple which he had vow'd to *Honour* and *Virtue*, becauſe they ſuppos'd, that one Temple might not lawfully be dedicated to two Deities. *Timoleon* after his Victories built a Chappel in his Houſe, in which he ſacrific'd to *good Fortune*, as a Deity that had much favour'd him, devoted the Houſe it ſelf to that ſacred Genius; and in *Rome* the Lady *Fortune* had more Temples than any other God or Goddeſs. Such Deities become Religioniſts in jeſt; agreeably to the Story of *Themiſtocles* requiring Money of the Iſland *Andros:* He told them, he had brought with him two Goddeſſes, *Perſuaſion* and *Force*; and they made anſwer, that they had alſo two great Goddeſſes, which prohibited them from giving him Money, *Poverty* and *Impoſſibility*. *Poverty* had Altars erected to it about *Gades* (as *Philoſtratus* (a) reporteth;) *Neceſſity* was a *Platonic* Deity (b) the Mother of the Fates. (c) Τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν ὑμνήκασιν ὡς θεὸν οἱ θεουργοί, *the Theurgiſts have celebrated Time it ſelf as a God.* The Philoſophic Pagans ſymboliz'd with the Popular, but with this difference; they perſonated and deify'd things Philoſophical; as *Anaxagoras* dedicated two Altars, *the one to Mind, the other to Truth.* The Philoſophy of the *Platoniſts* deifieth all the abſtract Notions of the Mind; *Ipſum Unum*, *Ipſum Ens*, *Ipſa Mens*, *Ipſa Vita*, (d) αὐτοεπιστήμη, *Science it ſelf*, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, *Juſtice it ſelf*, αὐτοσωφροσύνη, *Temperance it ſelf*, (which are θεότητες νοηταί, *Deities that are the Intelligibles*;) and their firſt Intellect is a World of abſtract Notions or Idea's, which are ſuppos'd to be Gods. Theſe *Pagan Deiformities* have their Parallels amongſt the Pagano-Chriſtians, and there is the ſame origin of both; for in our Forefathers Days (e) the Theological Virtues of *Faith*, *Hope* and *Charity* were worſhipp'd as Saints, and the ſame Phantaſtry ſet up the Picture of St. *Sunday*. In an ancient and fair *Romiſh* Manual I find, ſaith a Divine of our own, (f) *this to be part of a Letany; Holy Faith pray for me, Holy Hope pray for me, Holy Charity pray for me.* As the Pagano-Chriſtians conceiving of theſe *unſubſtantial* and *imperſonal* things as ſo many abſtract Forms, thought them to be ſo many Saints; ſo the Pagans forming the like Conception of *Truth*, *Faith*, *Hope*, *Juſtice*, *Clemency*, *Liberty*, *Fame*, *Memory*, *Victory*, as alſo of *Sleep*, *the Night*, *Echo*, and innumerable other accidental things, thought them to be ſo many Gods and Goddeſſes. *Balbus* in *Cicero* (g) aſſigneth another reaſon of their Deification, which hath only thus much of good Senſe in it; the Pagans deify'd ſuch unſubſtantial things, *in quibus vis ineſt major aliqua, in which there is ſome extraordinary force.* (h) So *Impudence* was accounted a Deity becauſe of its prevailing force, and according to *Cæcilius* in *Cicero* Love muſt be reputed a God, (i) *as having power to make Men mad, and to throw them into Diſeaſes.* Becauſe of their τὸ δραστικὸν, *operative force and power*, theſe unſubſtantial things were deify'd; and for the ſame reaſon it was thought requiſite, that a God ſhould preſide over them and rule them (and there was a Goddeſs (k) *Pecunia*, *Concordia*, *Victoria*, *Virtus*, *Felicitas*, which was ſuppos'd, to diſpence and beſtow Money, Concord, Victory, Virtue, Felicity) and the Pagans deify'd the things themſelves in complication with their ſynonymous preſident Deities, as when we call *Corn Ceres*, and *Wine Liber*. This is no unreaſonable account of the origin of their Religious Worſhip of the Deiformities; but it is altogether unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, (l) *that theſe were perſonated and deify'd as ſeveral Powers, Vertues, Effects and Manifeſtations of the Deity, and that the Pagans conſider'd them as ſuch*; for of this there is not any appearance in Paganiſm. The *Platoniſts* did not conſider thoſe various abſtract Forms which they deify'd, *as the ſeveral Powers and Manifeſtations of the Deity*; nor were the Gods *Labor & Triumphus* conſider'd by the Popular Pagans *as Virtues and Effects of the Deity*; nor was S. *Paul's Anaſtaſis*, *Act.* 17. conſider'd in ſuch a Notion, which his Pagan Auditors ſuppos'd a Goddeſs; nor is it probable, that the Heathen when they deify'd the *Echo*, or the *Morning*, or *Eros*, *Anteros*, *Concord* and *Diſcord*, had any more regard to the *Virtues*, *Powers*, and *Manifeſtations* of the Deity, than when they deify'd *Aius Locutius*, *the God call'd the Speaker or Caller*; nor doth *Syneſius* ſuppoſe *the Muſes* to be meer *Virtues* and *Effects* of the Deity, when he writeth of them in this manner; (m) *that an illiterate perſon falling aſleep, and converſing with the Muſes,*

---

lant Aegida? De C. D. *l.* 6. c. 7. de conſ. Evang. l. 1. c. 23.

(u) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 8. *c.* 6, 14.

(w) *Hoffm. umbr. in Luc. p.* 87.

(x) *De Leg.* 2.

(y) *L.* 10. *Ep.* 54.

(z) *Hoffman. ſupr. p.* 132.

(a) *Phot. Cod.* 241.

(b) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 6. *c.* 23.

(c) *Id. in Tim. p.* 252.

(d) *Id. Plat. Theol. l.* 4. *p.* 201.

(e) *Dr. Jackſon orig. of Unbelief, ch.* 17.

(f) *Dr Teniſon of Idol. p.* 207.

(g) *De N. D. l.* 2. *Seld. de D. Syr. Proleg. c.* 3.

(h) *Voſſ. ſupr. c.* 14.

(i) *Cui in manu ſit, quem eſſe dementem velit, Quem ſapere, quem ſanari, quem in morbum injici.*

(k) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 24.

(l) *Intell. Syſt. p.* 227, 521, 525.

(m) *De Inſomn. p.* 136.

Muſes, ſhould awake an expert Poet, as ſome in our time have done, this is not to be thought incredible. It muſt be acknowledg'd, that the intelligent Pagans ſometimes diſpute and reaſon againſt theſe unſubſtantial and imperſonal Deities, (n) and that *Cotta* ridiculeth theſe Deiformities (as no perſonal Gods and Goddeſſes;) but Reaſon is of little force againſt *eſtabliſh'd Religion, ancient venerable Superſtition, and the power of Phantaſtry*, which hath the faculty and a propenſity, to perſonate and deifie every thing. Beſides, the intelligent Pagans that ſometimes reaſon againſt their Deiformities, yet thought it reaſonable, that they ſhould be Objects of their Religious Veneration (as *Cicero* hath diſcours'd in his Book of Laws) and that it was Piety to make them ſuch. And how much better are *Faith* and *Truth*, *Honour* and *Virtue*, and more deſerving of Divine Honours than the Rabble of Pagan Perſonal Deities?

The next ſort of Deities, *the Mythical*, are the Matters of Mundane Phyſiology (Natural Philoſophy) fabulouſly turn'd into perſonal Gods and Goddeſſes. For the Pagan Theologers ſay of their fabulous Theology, (o) *It was Matters of Phyſiology involv'd in Fables.* They ſuppoſe, that there is a Mythical θεοποιΐα, *way of making Deities*, that the contrivers of the Fables deſign'd to ſignifie and repreſent *things Phyſical* by fictitious Deities, which therefore are of Allegorical and Phyſiological Interpretation. (p) *Saturn* they interpret *Time* (as in the Fable of *Saturn* devouring his own Children;) *Juno* the Air; the Generation of *Vulcan*, the change of Air into Fire; *Pluto*, who is ſaid to carry away with him *Proſerpina*, is the Sun going under the Earth about the Winter-Solſtice. So the naſty Stories of their Deities, (q) *Jupiter*'s Adulteries and *Pluto*'s Rapes, are interpreted to an Allegorical and Phyſiological Senſe; and this method of Interpretation the Pagans made uſe of in their Diſputes with the Chriſtians, to ſave the Credit of their Religion. So *Celſus* will have the Fable in *Homer* touching *Jupiter*'s binding *Juno*, (r) to ſignifie God's binding the Matter to its good-behaviour; *that being at firſt diſorderly, God bound it by certain Laws of Regularity and adorn'd it.* It is manifeſt, that this mode of interpreting the θεομυθία *Fables of the Gods* deifieth the things of Nature and ſeveral parts of the World, which are realities, not figments; but ſuch Gods and Goddeſſes as were made of them, and by which they were ſignify'd and repreſented in the fabulous Theology, were figments of the Phancy, not Realities; and theſe are the Deities that are called (s) by *Balbus* in *Cicero* (agreeably to the Senſe of the *Stoicks*) *fictitious*, *poetic* and *fabulous* Deities. (t) *See you not* (ſaith he) *how from the things of Nature fictitious Gods have been made?* The things of Phyſiology were cloath'd in humane form, and repreſented as (*Figuræ Deorum, non rerum naturæ*) *of the Shape and Figure of Gods, not as the natures of things*, and being ſo fictitiouſly perſonated and made ſuch Gods and Goddeſſes, the Phyloſopher calleth them fictitious Deities; rejecting therefore theſe fictitious Deities, he ſubſtituteth in their ſtead (u) *God paſſing through the nature of every thing, through the Earth* Ceres, *through the Seas* Neptune. This mythical ſort of Deities ſo call'd by *Balbus* and the *Stoicks*, are by them accounted *the various Powers, Virtues, Effects and Manifeſtations of the Deity pervading all things.*

XIV. *Animals* of all ſorts (Beaſts, Birds, Inſects, Fiſhes, Serpents, Goats, Oxen, Dogs, Cats, Apes, Hawks, Crocodiles, Ichneumons, (a kind of Water-Rats) and their Images alſo were religiouſly worſhipp'd by the *Egyptians* and ſome other Pagans. (w) *The* Egyptians (ſaith *Mela*) *worſhip the Images of many Animals, much more the Animals themſelves*, (x) which they repreſented by Golden Images. The Animals themſelves were ſacred to their ſeveral Deities (as the Eagle to *Jupiter*, the Lion to *Vulcan*;) not only ſacred to them, but Symbols of them (as the Ox of *Oſiris*, the Ram of *Jupiter Ammon*;) not only Symbols of them, but the *Egyptians* thought it reaſonable, to worſhip their ſacred Animals with proper worſhip, thereby making them at once Deities (as *Labeo* wrote a Book (y) *de Diis Animalibus, touching the Animal Deities*) and Symbols of Deities; which ſeemeth to have been the condition of many other Symbols in Paganiſm; (for a * Mountain was to the *Cappadocians their God, their Oath, and their Statue*; and Mount *Atlas* was both *Temple, and God, and Oath, and Statue to the* Libyans.) Upon various Accounts and Reaſons the *Egyptians* and other Pagans worſhipp'd Animals; for in *America* (z) the fiercer ſort of Animals were worſhipp'd becauſe of their hurtful power; (a) but the *Egyptians* gave Religious Veneration to their Animals upon the account of their Utility and Beneficence; (b) as the *Peruans* that liv'd near the Sea-ſide, anciently before the time of the *Incas* worſhipp'd the Whales, becauſe they afforded them Nutriment and fatned their Fields. Animals were alſo worſhipp'd by the *Egyptians*, becauſe they ſuppos'd, that there is ſomething in ſome of them which is of quality Divine; (c) for upon this account the Lion was worſhipp'd as a God, and Serpents alſo, as the King of *Calecut* in the Eaſtern *India* (d) is ſaid to have look'd upon Serpents *as Spirits of celeſtial deſcent*, and therefore gave them the worſhip of Deities. The Devils appearing in the form of *Goats* and ſome other Animals (e) are thought to have conciliated Veneration to thoſe Animals; others were had in Religious Veneration, becauſe of their relation to, and affinity with ſome of the *Gods*, *Stars*, *Planets*, or *Celeſtial Conſtellations*, (f) as an Aſtrologizing Village in *Egypt* ſuppoſing a Cognation between the Celeſtial *Venus* and a Cow, worſhipp'd the Celeſtial *Venus* in a Cow. A relative and ſymbolical worſhip was given to Animals, when they were conſider'd by the Philoſophic Religioniſts amongſt the *Egyptians* as reſemblances of the Divine Ideas; for *Celſus* affirmeth, (g) *The* Egyptians *worſhip was not the worſhip of periſhing Animals, as the Vulgar ſuppoſe, but of the Eternal Ideas.* *Porphyry* imputeth the *Egyptians* worſhip of Animals to their profound Wiſdom and Diſcernment of divine things; (h) they underſtood how congenial ſeveral Animals are to ſeveral Gods (as the Hawk to the Sun, being an Animal full of Blood and Spirits, and that they are of dearer regard to them than Men are; whence they worſhipp'd *a Scarabee*, ὡς εἰκόνα ἡλίου ἔμψυχον, *as the Sun's living Image or Statue.* (i) *In the Aſp, the Weaſel and the Scarabee, they diſcern'd* εἰκόνας τινὰς ἀμυδρὰς, *certain obſcure repreſentations of the Power of the*

(n) *Cic. de N. D. l.* 3.

(o) Λόγος ἦν φυσικὸς ἐγκεκαλυμμένος μύθοις. *Plutarch. ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. p.* 83.

(p) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 3. & 11.

(q) *V. Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 5. *p.* 179, 180, 186. *Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p.* 172. *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 208.

(r) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 304.

(s) *De N. D. l.* 2.

(t) *Videtiſne ut à phyſicis rebus tracta ratio ſit ad commentitios & fictos Deos?*

(u) *Deus pertinens per naturam cujuſque rei, per terras Ceres, per maria Neptunus.*

(w) *Mela de orbis ſitu, l.* 1. *c.* 9.

(x) *Effigies ſacri nitet aurea Cercopitheci.* Juv. Sat. 15.

(y) *Wower. in Min. Fæl. p.* 261.

* *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 38.

(z) *Hoffman. Umbr. in luc. p.* 119.

(a) *Ouzel. in Min. Fæl. p.* 278.

(b) *Hoffman. ſupr. p.* 118.

(c) *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 4. *S.* 9. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 1. *c. ult.*

(d) *Hoffman. ſupr. p.* 123.

(e) *Grot. expl. Decal. ad Exod.* 20. 3. *Bochart. de Anim. p.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 53.

(f) *Ouzel. ſupr.*

(g) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 121.

(h) *Ubi ſupr.*

(i) *Plut. de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 380.

Gods, and in the Crocodile who is without Tongue; for ſo Divine Reaſon ſilently with Juſtice adminiſtreth Humane Affairs, and in ſeeing not being ſeen he reſembleth the principal God; wherefore we ought to approve, not thoſe that worſhip theſe, but thoſe that through theſe worſhip the Divinity, as being the clearer Glaſſes and the natural. And it is not fit, that any thing inanimate and ſenſeleſs (as Images are) *ſhould be preferr'd before that which is animate and hath Senſe.* This Paganical Principle of beſtial Idolatry, *that the Divinity may be worſhipp'd through Animals* (that the *Egyptians* did well in giving Religious Adoration to Animals, with intention to terminate it upon God) is entertain'd and enlarg'd amongſt the Pontifician Theologers, who are not aſham'd to aſſert, (*k*) *that we may lawfully worſhip God in any Creature whatſoever.* So the *Banians* Religion bindeth them, (*l*) *to give worſhip to God upon ſight of any of his Creatures firſt preſented to the Eye after the riſing Sun; eſpecially they pay their Devotion to the Sun and Moon.* The *Banians* ſtill retain another Principle of the *Egyptians* worſhip of Animals, *the Tranſmigration of Souls*; for they worſhipp'd ſome of their Animals *as animated Statues of their deify'd Heroes.* The Ox *Apis* at *Memphis* (whom they ſuppos'd, to be (*m*) conceiv'd by Lunar Rays, and therefore a Treaſury of Celeſtial Virtue) was worſhipp'd (*n*) as the Image of *Oſiris*'s Soul; (*o*) and they ſuppos'd, that *Oſiris*'s Soul paſs'd by Tranſmigration into *Apis*. So *Apollonius Tyanæus* perſuaded the *Alexandrians*, (*p*) that a certain good-natur'd Lion was King *Amaſis*; whereupon the Prieſts convening ſacrific'd to *Amaſis*, adorn'd the Beaſt, ſent him into the interior parts of *Egypt* with Muſick, Hymns and Songs. Whence it appeareth, that Symbolical Worſhip mix'd with proper was given to the Sacred Animals, not only by the ſottiſh vulgar, (*q*) but by the intelligent Philoſophic Pagans, whoſe Philoſophy (Philoſophic Phantaſtry) was the Parent or Nurſe of the groſſeſt beſtial Idolatry.

To the Intelligent Philoſophic Pagans the Apoſtle hath reſpect, *Rom.* 1. 22, 23, 25. *Profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe they became fools; and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds and four-footed Beaſts, and creeping things. They changed the truth of God into a Lye.* The Gentiles chang'd the σέβασμα, *Religious Worſhip objectively underſtood*: The Truth of God and the Glory of the uncorruptible God is the σέβασμα; therefore as it is the σέβασμα, the Gentiles chang'd or turn'd it into a Lye, a vile Image or vile Animals, making theſe the σέβασμα they muſt neceſſarily change the σέβασμα into theſe; as they that make the Miſſal Sacrifice the Holy Euchariſt, neceſſarily change the Holy Euchariſt into the Miſſal Sacrifice. But this change of the Truth of God (that is, of the Truth of the Godhead, not of the true Notices of God) and of the Glory of the uncorruptible God may be alſo underſtood (*r*) in a ſenſe of permutation or exchange, as Money is ſaid to be chang'd into Commodities; ſo the Gentiles exchang'd the *Truth* and *Glory* of God for Images and Animals. But this Expoſition ſeemeth alien from the Apoſtles ſenſe (whoſe words import an hideous Transformation of the Godhead by the Gentile Idolatries) as alſo from the *Pſalmiſts*, *Pſal.* 106. 20. *They chang'd their Glory* (their God) *into the ſimilitude of an Ox that eateth Graſs*; Egyptianizing in their Idolatry. The Antiquity of this *Egyptian* Idolatry (that Idolatry was the Religion of *Egypt* in the Age of *Moſes*, (*s*) and that in his Days a principal Branch of their Idolatry was the worſhip of Animals) is viſible enough in the *Moſaic Pentateuch*, *Deut.* 4. 15, 16. And ſeeing all agree, that the *Egyptians* were immenſely Superſtitious, that much of their Superſtition was about Animals (particularly *lanata animalia*) and that they were extreamly nice and divided in their Superſtition about them (for they ſacrific'd Oxen, but not *Boves Fœminas*, and eat other parts of the ſacrific'd Ox, but not the Head;) hence I look upon it as a thing unqueſtionable, that the *Egyptians* averſation from foreign Shepherds, and from eating with the *Hebrews* (as afterwards with the *Greeks*) was from their Superſtition, ſome of their nice Superſtitions about Animals, and that all other Accounts of it are illegitimate. If the *Hebrews* ſacrific'd a Cow (*Exod.* 8. 26.) if they ate any Food which the *Egyptians* abhorr'd, (*Gen.* 43. 32.) if the Foreign Shepherds fed on Sheep or Sheeps-Milk, violated their Inſtitutes touching Sheeps-Wool, or any other of their Inſtitutes about the *lanata animalia*, they muſt neceſſarily be an Abomination to ſome of the *Egyptians*, *Gen.* 46. 24. Notwithſtanding the naſtineſs and ſenceleſneſs of their Idolatry the *Jews* ſometime egyptianiz'd ſo far, that they worſhipp'd Animal Forms, as the Prophet repreſenteth the Idolatry of their Ancients or Sanhedrin; *Ezek.* 8. 7,—11. *He brought me to the Door of the* Court, *and when I looked, behold, a hole in the Wall. Then ſaid he unto me, Son of Man, dig now in the Wall. And when I had digged in the Wall, behold a Door. And he ſaid unto me, go in, and behold the wicked Abominations that they do here. So I went in, and ſaw, and behold, every Form of creeping things, and abominable Beaſts, and all the Idols of the Houſe of* Iſrael *pourtrayed upon the Wall round about. And there ſtood before them ſeventy Men of the Ancients of the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and in the midſt of them ſtood* Jaazaniah *the Son of* Shaphan, *with every Man his Cenſer in his Hand, and a thick Cloud of Incenſe went up. Then ſaid he unto me, Son of Man, haſt thou ſeen what the Ancients of the Houſe of* Iſrael *do in the dark, every Man in the Chambers of his Imagery?*

(k) *Vaſqu. in* 3. *Th. Diſp.* 110. *qu.* 25.

(l) *Lord's Diſc. p.* 60.

(m) *Seld. de D. Syr. ſynt.* 1. *c.* 4.

(n) *Plut. de Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 362.

(o) *Diodor. Sic. l.* 1. *p.* 76.

(p) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 74.

(q) *Maſſeium Indic. p.* 55, 56.

(r) *De Dieu in l. c.*

(s) *Bochart. de Anim. p.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 53. *Seld. de D. Syr. ſynt.* 1. *c.* 4. *Herodot. Euterp. c.* 39, 41. *Pignor. Menſ. Iſ. p.* 22. *Beroald. in Apul. p.* 962.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

1. The general Notion of a Symbolical Deity. 2. The Deſign of the Symbols of the Gods. 3. The Nature of them. 4. How far they were Deify'd by the Pagans. 5. A due abatement of our Account. 6. Of Image-worſhip amongſt the Jews, *and of the Firſt and Second Commandment. 7. Of the* Iſraelites *worſhip of the Golden Calf, and the Idolatry of the Ten Tribes. 8. Of the Idolatry of the Pagano-Chriſtians Image-worſhip. 9. They have improv'd in Symbol Idolatry, yet in ſome reſpect fall ſhort of the Pagans. 10. Their Images, as the Pagans, are vicarious and ſubſtitute to the remote Exemplar. 11. Their Images are parallel to the Pagans in the ſuppos'd preſence of their* Divi *and other reſpects. 12. Their Rites of Image-worſhip are an Imitation of Paganiſm. 13. The weak defence of their Images and Image-worſhip.*

I. NExt to the Animal Deities a principal Crime of the *Gentiles* Religious Worſhip was their *Symbolical Deities* or their *Image* σεβάσματα under which Names we comprize thoſe Symbols of the Gods, which were things natural as well as things artificial; *Trees*, *Mountains*, *Pillars*, *Pyramids*, *rude Stones*, *pieces of Wood without any Imagery of Man or Beaſt*, *monſtrous Repreſentations*, *Images of Humane Shape or other regular Figure*, which were εἴδωλα, in a twofold ſenſe; both as being Repreſentations, and as being the Objects of Idolatry. But the Name of *Symbolical Deities* is applicable to the Deities themſelves, as well as to their Symbols; for a Symbolical Deity may ſignifie ſuch a perſonal Godhead, which is a Symbolical Deity, and it may ſignifie ſuch an Image which is a Symbolical Deity. (*t*) There are two ways of worſhipping the Gods, the one without, the other with *Symbols*, *Statues*, *Images*; which latter is the Symbolical way, and the Pagans way, and their Deities being worſhipp'd (agreeably and according to their Inſtitution) in this Symbolical way, are therefore fitly call'd *Symbolical Deities*; for ſuch they are by their Statue-Religion. And becauſe their Statue-Religion is a *Symbol-Idolatry*, and the Symbols of the Gods are in ſome ſort deify'd by it, theſe are alſo fitly denominated *Symbolical Deities*. But they may be call'd Symbolical Deities, only to ſignifie *the Gods ſymbolically underſtood* as (*u*) *every Image of* Juno *was call'd* Juno, the *Iſraelites* call'd their Symbol *Elohim*, *Exod.* 32. 23. and when the Pagan Writers ſpeak of their ſeveral Deities (*Jupiter Ammon*, *Berecyntbia Mater*, and ſuch more) it is thoſe Deities as Symbolically repreſented and perſonated, which they uſually mean; agreeably whereunto the Poet ſpeaketh.

(t) *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 38.

(u) S. *Aug. ſupr. Judic. Qu.* 16.

Propter quæ fas eſt genua incerare Deorum.

The *Gentile* Idolatry was for ſome time, and in ſome places of long time, without theſe Symbolical Dieties or Image-σεβάσματα. The moſt ancient ſeem to have been Ἀνδριάντες στηλῶν (as *Cedrenus* calleth them) *Statues of Pillars* or *rude unpoliſh'd Stones* anointed and conſecrated. And becauſe a Statue (*w*) *is a Structure*, *to which People reſort for Divine Service*, and conſequently it determineth the place of Religious Worſhip, therefore a Statue is neceſſarily *Beth-El* an Houſe of God; and conſequently *Jacob*'s fact, *Gen.* 28. 18. his erecting and anointing a Pillar, and the name *Bethel* which he gave the place, might be tranſcrib'd from the Pagans. In proceſs of time Images of Humane Shape were introduc'd; but the ancient Statues before *Dædalus* (in which neither the Hands were diſ-joyn'd from the Sides, nor the Feet from one another) could be but rude Symbols of the Gods.

(w) *Maimon. de Idol. c.* 6. *S.* 8.

II. The Pagans Symbols of the Gods were deſign'd and inſtituted, *to be vicarious and ſubſtitute Deities*, *ſo as* (viſibly and inviſibly) *to preſentiate the Deities, and to be ſo far proximate and preſent Deities.* (*x*) *Images were form'd by the* Gentiles, *that they might have before their Eyes that which they worſhipp'd.* (*y*) *Theſe were Inſtruments, whereby they might have their Gods with them, behold them before their Eyes, ſpeak immediately to them, and with them as preſent perſons, mingle as it were their Religious Colloquies*; (*z*) *for there is a great deſire in all Men, to worſhip the Divinity, not at a diſtance, but at hand, approaching and touching*; ſo *Phidias* in *Dio Chryſoſtom* pleadeth for the Statue of *Jupiter Olympius*. (*a*) For this reaſon, when *Oſiris* was worſhipp'd throughout *Egypt*, and his living Image was viſible only in the ſuperiour part of it, the Metropolis of *Memphis*; the Prieſts took occaſion to ſet on foot a Schiſm, and thoſe of *Heliopolis* would alſo have a ſacred Bull, that their Deity might be as viſible and preſent to them, as to the other *Egyptians*. So thoſe old *Idolomaniſts* the Idolatrous *Iſraelites*, *Exod.* 32. 1. deſir'd a Statue-Divinity, *a God to go before them*, and like jolly Religioniſts they danc'd about their Deity, although the Symbols of the Gods (*b*) were thought to be of good uſe, *to keep the People in awe, to reſtrain them from evil practices, and to make them Religious in their behaviour, as ſuppoſing themſelves in the preſence of their Gods.* (*c*) *Our Fathers* (ſaith *Julian*) *appointed them, to be Symbols of the Gods*, σύμβολα τῆς παρουσίας τῶν θεῶν, *Symbols of their preſence.* And becauſe they were the preſence of the Gods to them; the *Sicilians* in *Cicero* complain, (*d*) *They had now no Gods left them in their Cities, to flee to for help, becauſe* Verres *had taken away their moſt holy Images out of their Temples.* So the *Ambracienſes* in *Livy* complain. (*e*) *The Gods being pull'd out of their Seats, they had now none to adore, none to pray and make ſupplication unto.* They had loſt the preſence of their Deities having loſt their Images; for it was ſuppos'd, that the Symbols were both a *viſible* and a *virtual*, a *repreſentative* and a *perſonal-real* preſence of the Gods to them.

(x) *Gentiles ob hoc ſimulachra finxerunt, ut in ipſis erroribus oculis cernerent, quod colebant.* P. Chryſol. Ser. 147.

(y) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 6. *p.* 192.

(z) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 241.

(a) *V. Dr. Teniſon of Idol. p.* 26.

(b) *Herald. ſupr. p.* 256. *Arnob. p.* 208.

(c) *In Fragm. inter op. p.* 537.

(d) *Lactan. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

(e) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 9. *c.* 2.

The Statues as *viſibly repreſenting* their Deities were their *viſible* and *repreſentative* Preſence; and both a *Phyſical* and a *Legal* kind of Repreſentative. For as the external Form and Figure of the Image repreſenteth the Prototype, it is a *Phyſical* kind of Repreſentative. And becauſe it ſuſtaineth the Prototype's Perſon, beareth his Name, receiveth his Worſhip in his place and ſtead, and is the Prototype to the Religioniſt, not φύσει, *by Nature*, but θέσει, *by*

Inſtitution and *vacarious Subſtitution*, it is a *Legal* kind of Repreſentative. (*f*) *Simulachra hæc omnia Diis immortalibus vicaria Subſtitutione formatis. Theſe Images are all of them made to the Immortal Gods by vicarious Subſtitution.* So the Statue of *Jupiter* is a Vicarious and Subſtitute *Jupiter*.

(*g*) *Origen* ſuppoſeth a *Perſonal-real* Preſence of the Demons at their Statues, that they delight to dabble in the matter, and as Smell-feaſts deliciate themſelves in the Steams and Nidor's of the Sacrifices, and are as it were nail'd thereunto (*αἵμασι ϗ κνίσῃ προσηλωμένοι,*) upon which account, as alſo upon the account of Magical incantations, they adher'd to their Altars and Statues; where if they wrought any extraordinary Operations (gave Oracles, heal'd Diſeaſes, puniſh'd Tranſgreſſors) as the Pagans ſuppos'd, theſe could not fail to beget in their Minds an Opinion of the perſonal Preſence of their Deities there. They had alſo an Opinion, (*h*) that certain Powers dwelt in their Statues, which when their Statues were ruin'd, took their flight to Heaven, (*i*) that their Deities inhabited and animated their Statues; (*k*) and that their ſacred (Magical) dedication introduc'd them; (*l*) and their Theurgic Art pretended (by Deiform Spices and other Materials,) *to make a perfect and pure receptacle for the Gods.* This Opinion was common amongſt the Pagans, but could not be Catholic; for their Symbols of the elder times were manifeſtly incapable of inhabitation and animation by their Deities (the *Theſpians* (*m*) worſhipp'd a Bough for *Cinxia*, the *Icarians* an unhewn piece of Wood for *Diana*, the *Peſſinuntii* a Flint for the Mother of the Gods, the *Romans* a Spear for *Mars*, the *Samii* a Frame of Wood for *Juno*;) and the more intelligent Pagans thought of Statues as *Clinia* in *the Eleventh of* Plato's *Laws*. *Of the Gods* (ſaith he) *ſome are ſeen; to others which we ſee not, we erect Images and Statues. And although theſe be inanimate, yet whilſt we Worſhip them, we think the animate Deities have upon that account a very great favour for us.*

(*n*) They were generally ſuppos'd by their *Favour and Help* preſent in their Images (which is their *virtual* preſence;) whence the *Tyrians* bound the Image of *Apollo* faſt with Golden Chains, and the *Athenians* clipt the Wings of the Image of *Victory*, that they might not loſe the preſence of their Deities. Hence ſome carry'd about with them the Image of *Alexander M.* The Philoſopher *Aſclepiades* carry'd about with him a Silver Image of the Celeſtial Goddeſs. The *Egyptians* in travel carry'd with them the Image of ſome Deity, to which they made ſolemn Supplication on Feſtival-days, and to whoſe Guardianſhip they committed themſelves. The *Philiſtines* carry'd their Idols with them, when they went to Battel. 2 *Sam.* 5. 21. and the Silver-ſhrines for *Diana*, *Act.* 19. 24. were certain portatile Temples, wherein the Image of *Diana* was inclos'd, which the Religioniſts of that Goddeſs carry'd about with them as their Defenſative and for Religious Worſhip. So the Images of the Gods in the City of *Rome* are ſaid, (*o*) *to have conſerv'd to the City perpetual Happineſs.* (*p*) And *Ammianus* ſaith, that the City *Memphis was famous by the Preſence of the God Æſculapius.*

III. The Images of the Pagans therefore muſt not be conſider'd as chiefly a *medium* of Worſhip: But the Nature of them chiefly conſiſteth *in being certain proximate and preſent Deities.* Not that the intelligent Pagans accounted them Gods (perſonal Gods, or of the number of Gods,) or ſuppos'd them to be the Gods whoſe Names they bore; *for who but ſuch an one that is wholly a Fool, thinketh the Statues Gods?* (*q*) ſaith *Celſus*. Agreeably to whom other Pagans (*r*) Theologize. Some of them are ſo nice, that they diſlike the common Language, and would not have the Statues called by the Name of the Gods whom they repreſent, becauſe it ingendreth an Opinion in the Minds of Men, that the Statues are thoſe real perſonal Gods. *Philoſophers ſay, They that underſtand not words, abuſe the things,* (*s*) ſaith *Plutarch*. *As the Greeks that have not learn'd, nor are accuſtom'd, to call the brazen, painted and ſtony* (Symbols) *the Statues or Honours of the God, but the Gods, have proceeded to ſuch extravagant boldneſs, as to ſay, that* Lachares *ſtript* Minerva, Dionyſius *ſhav'd away* Apollo's *golden Locks,* Jupiter Capitolinus *about the Civil War was burnt and periſht.* The ſame Author preferreth the *Egyptians* Worſhip of Animals as Symbols of the Gods before the Worſhip of Statues, (*t*) *becauſe theſe are inanimate, devoid of Senſe, not ſo good as dead, for they never were alive.* (*u*) *The Ancients underſtood* (ſay the Pagans,) *that the Symbols have nothing of Divinity* (God-propriety,) *and that there is not any Sence at all in them.* The uſe which ſome pretended to make of them, was (*w*) by the Contemplation of the viſible Symbol to aſcend *ἐπὶ τὸ νοούμενον, to the inviſible intelligible Deity, which they repreſented.* (*x*) *Theſe are the Images, thoſe are the Gods, of which they are the Images.* But notwithſtanding that by theſe Sayings the Pagans ſeem to make their Images *no Gods*, yet if the *Aſclepian Dialogue* (one of the Triſmegiſtic Books) doth ſpeak the Senſe of the intelligent Pagans (as in all probability it doth,) they pretended (*y*) by making Images *efficere Deos, to make Gods.* Therefore to make their Sayings conſiſtent with themſelves, we muſt diſtinguiſh between *their Deities ſimply and without addition ſuch*, and their *Deities proximate or preſent*. If they had ſuppos'd their Images, to be their Deities ſimply and without addition ſuch, they muſt have deſtroy'd their being Images, and have made them Prototypes, not Images. But although they could not ſuppoſe a Deity, to be an Image, nor an Image to be no Image, but a Deity (the Prototype,) yet they look'd upon their Images *as the Deities proximate and preſent.* For the Statue in it ſelf is the Deity *as viſibly preſentiated*; and in reſpect of what it is *cauſally* and *concomitantly*, it is the Deities *inviſible Preſence*, (a Deity inviſibly preſentiated;) and alſo its *Topical Deity-ſhip* (thereby it became the Deity of that place and people, which poſſeſs'd its Image;) in theſe reſpects therefore it is *a proximate and preſent Deity.* They that ſuppoſed their Images the Habitations of the Deities, ſuppos'd them proximate and preſent Deities in reſpect of their Inhabitants; and the complicate of theſe two, the Image and the Inhabitant muſt be thought a proximate and preſent Deity. They that did not ſuppoſe their Statues animated, yet (linking together the perſonal or virtual Preſence of their Deities with

---

(f) *Arnob. ſupr. l.* 6. *p.* 195.

(g) *C. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 128. *l.* 7. *p.* 374. *l.* 8. *p.* 418.

(h) *Sozomen. Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 15.

(i) *Dr. Hamm. of Idolatry. S.* 34.

(k) *Arnob. ſupr. l.* 6. *p.* 203.

(l) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 139.

(m) *Arnob. ſupr. l.* 6. *p.* 196.

(n) *Dr. Ham. ſupr. Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 24. *Spencer. de Leg. Heb. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 1. *c.* 3. *S.* 1.

(o) Φυλάξαι τῇ πόλει τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἀίδιον. Zoſim. Hiſt. l. 5.

(p) *Præſentia numinis Æſculapii Clara. l.* 22.

(q) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 373.

(r) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 6. *p.* 203. *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *S. Aug. in Pſal.* 113. *Julian. in Fragm. inter op. p.* 537.

(s) *De Iſ. p.* 379.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 382.

(u) *Nihil habere numinis ſigna, neque ullum omnino ineſſe his ſenſum.* Arnob. ſupr. p. 208.

(w) *Orig. ſupr. l.* 7. *p.* 362.

(x) *Orig. ibid. l.* 6. *p.* 284. *Athenag. Legat. p.* 17.

(y) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 23, 24.

with their viſible Preſences) ſuppos'd them as good as animated; for a Statue that hath a δαίμων πάρεδρος, *aſſociate Demon*, is as good a Deity as an animated Statue. So a Deity eſpecially and *virtually* preſent in or at his Statue, to receive Honour and Worſhip, hear Prayers and relieve his Suppliant, is as good a Deity to all the purpoſes of Religious Worſhip as an animated Statue, and is alike *a proximate and preſent Deity.* The Statues of the Deities being alſo *Vicarious* and *Subſtitute* to them, (yet ſo as inviſibly as well as viſibly to preſentiate them,) and their Legal kind of Repreſentatives, to receive their Worſhip in their place and ſtead, were ſo far Deities preſent by Proxy, and the Pagans worſhipp'd their Deities as ſuch. (z)

The Etherial Gods by the Statues became proximate and preſent.
Jove *may be pray'd to without travelling ſo far as Heaven.*
His Statue being a vicarious ſubſtitute Jove.

IV. If *the Form of* Jove *was worſhipp'd for* Jove (as the Poet ſaith,) the Pagans Images were their σεβάσματα, *objects of Religious Worſhip*; and conſequently they made them Gods at leaſt in a partial limited Senſe, if not by attributing to them *ſubjective Perfection*, yet in a way of *objective Application.* (a) *The Image is adorn'd, conſecrated, worſhipp'd, and then it is made a God.* The *Firſt* of theſe *the ornamental pompouſneſs and gariſhneſs of the Images* (their ſplendor of Gold and Silver, their ſumptuous Veſtments, Crowns and Enſigns of Power, *Jer.* 10. 9. *Baruch* ch. 6.) was one allective to Idolatry; as goodly Proportion, comely Stature, and gorgeous Apparel adorn and ſet forth the Perſons of Men (they ſeem goodly Perſonages,) whereby Women are enamour'd upon them: So were Idolaters upon their Idols, whence the Prophet ſtileth them חֲמוּדֵיהֶם (their delectable or deſirable things, *Iſa.* 44. 9.) a word whence the Arabian Prophet hath his Name *Muhammed*, which ſignifieth precious or deſirable. The *Second* thing requiſite to deifie the Images, was their *Conſecration*, (b) which was done by the Prieſts, and was ſuppos'd, to bring the Gods into them: But whether this Conſecration was perform'd with a certain Form of Words or not, (c) this the learned (becauſe the old Pontifical Books are loſt) pretend not to know. Doubtleſs, the Conſecration of Images for publick Worſhip was a Branch of the Pagans Theurgy (as appeareth (f) from *Proclus*;) the Gods were introduc'd into them διά τινων συμβόλων, *by certain Symbols*, by which Name the Theurgiſts underſtand *Words, Characters, Charms, Plants, Animals, and the Sacerdotal Veſtments.* Their *Idol-worſhip* (which is the *Third* thing requiſite to make an Image a God) was *interiour* and *exteriour* (uſually commix'd and complicate,) the Rites whereof are diſtinguiſh'd by *Maimonides* (g) into thoſe that are appropriate to the ſeveral Idols (as the caſting of Stones at *Mercury* was his proper Worſhip,) and thoſe that are proper to the Worſhip of the true God, *Incurvation, Incenſe, Libation, Sacrifice, Invocation, Bleſſing, making Vows and Swearing by them.* An Image-σέβασμα, thus made is call'd a God in Scripture, and the making of it is the making a God. *Exod.* 20. 23. *Ye ſhall not make with me Gods of Silver, neither ſhall ye make unto you Gods of Gold.* Exod. 34. 17. *Thou ſhalt make thee no molten Gods.* Iſa. 44. 15, 17. *He maketh a God and worſhippeth it: He maketh a graven Image and falleth down thereto. —— the reſidue thereof he maketh a God, even his graven Image.* The making it his σέβασμα the object of his Religious Worſhip was the making it a God.

The Heathen made their Images Gods in reſpect of *ſubjective Perfection*, ſo far as to ſuppoſe them *their proximate and preſent Deities.* In thus deifying their Images vulgar Heathen tranſcended the more intelligent. For *Origen* ſaith of them; (h) *they would not endure, that any one ſhould ſay, that their ador'd Statues are not Gods.* (i) The ſacredneſs and ſublimity of their place, their ſolemn Worſhip, the attendance and multitude of their Suppliants, their ſhape and pourtraiture, ſo amus'd and affected ſome vulgar Heathen (as S. *Auſtin* ſaith;) that they durſt not account them ſenſleſs, but thought them living, or that a living Inhabitant was in them. Agreeably whereto ſome of them pray their Images, (k) *to be Keepers and Guardians of their Cattel.* It would be an extravagance, to impute to the generality of the Heathen all the Idolatrous Conceits of theſe vulgar Heathen: But thus much we may ſafely affirm, that the generality of the Heathen, who made their Images the Objects of their Religious Worſhip, ſo far deify'd them in reſpect of *ſubjective Perfection*, they ſuppos'd them their *proximate and preſent Deities.* Whence they had an high Opinion of them (of their Power and Efficacy) repos'd a mighty Truſt in them, and made great aſcriptions to them, as may be exemplify'd in the Jews ſymbolizing with the Heathen in their Idolatries. For as the Heathen *truſted in graven Images, boaſted themſelves of Idols, and aſcribed to them their Succeſſes and Proſperities*: So God by the Prophet declareth, that for this reaſon he had foretold a great deliverance of the Jews, before it came to paſs, that when it was come to paſs, they might not aſcribe it to their Images. *Iſa.* 48. 5. *I have from the beginning declar'd it to thee, before it was come to paſs, I ſhew'd it thee, leſt thou ſhouldſt ſay, mine Idol hath done them, and my graven Image and my molten Image hath commanded them.* The great Opinion which the Idolaters had of the Power and Efficacy of their Images (or Idols) occaſion'd theſe words of God by the Prophet. *Iſa.* 40. 18, 19, 20, 25. *To whom will ye liken God? Or to whom ſhall I be equal, ſaith the Holy one. The Workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldſmith ſpreadeth it over with Gold, and caſteth Silver Chains. He that is ſo impoveriſh'd, that he hath no Oblation, chooſeth a Tree that will not rot; he ſeeketh unto him a cunning Workman, to prepare a graven Image that ſhall not be moved.* Iſa. 46. 5, 6, 7. *To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal and compare me, that we may be like? They laviſh Gold out of the Bag, and weigh Silver in the Ballance, and hire a Goldſmith, and he maketh it a God. They bear him upon the Shoulder, they carry him and ſet him in his place, and he ſtandeth.* The Sin which God in theſe places of the Prophet inveigheth againſt, is not meerly the Sin of making Pictures of God (which yet is an high and heinous criminality:) But the Crime is of a more criminal Character; for the Idolaters in making their Images Objects of their Religious Worſhip and in their high Opinion of them made them *Beings like unto God and his Compeers*; and therefore God, to ſhew the infinite

Ii distance

(z) *Sic homines meruere Deos, quos arduus Æther occulit, & colitur pro Jove forma Jovis.* Ovid. de ponto. l. 2.

(a) *Simulachrum ornatur, conſecratur, oratur, tunc Deus eſt.* Min. Fœl. p. 220.

(b) *Quintil. Declam.* 323.

(c) *Guther de vet. jur. pontif. l.* 4. c. 20.

(f) *Theol. Plat. l.* 1. c. 29. *Gale in Jambl.* p. 285.

(g) De I-d. c. 2, 3, 4.

(h) *C. Celſ. l.* 7. p. 375.

(i) *S. Aug. Ep.* 49. *Qu.* 3. & *in Pſal.* 113.

(k) *Hoffman. umbr. in luce* p. 141.

Iſa. 42. 17. *Pſal.* 97. 7. *Judg.* 16. 23. *Dan.* 5. 4.

diſtance between himſelf and their Idols, expatiateth in the following Verſes in a large Declaration of his infinite Power. So *Calvin* interpreteth God's Expoſtulation, *quòd ipſum parem facerent Idolis, they made Idols his Compeers*, and they did ſo in making them Idols. From the diſparity between God and Idols, and becauſe they are totally heterogeneous (which Image-Religioniſm over-looketh) the Apoſtle inferreth the Folly and Impiety of the Athenian Idolatry. *Act.* 17. 28, 29. *Certain of your own Poets have ſaid, for we are alſo his Off-ſpring. Foraſmuch then as we are the Off-ſpring of God, we ought not to think, that the Godhead is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone graven by art and man's device.* The Crime which the Apoſtle reproveth in the Athenians is *their Image* σεβάσματα, *which were a making the Godhead like thoſe Images.* But we ought not to think the Godhead like thoſe (either by likeneſs of Compariſon or Repreſentation,) or that thoſe are like the Godhead (in Matter, Form, Nature, Nobleneſs or other Reſpect,) *ſeeing we know ſo much of God, that we are his reſembling Off-ſpring.* We that know ſo much of God by natural Notice, cannot but know, *that the Godhead is not like unto Mens artificial Images and mechanical Statues, to Gold, Silver or Stone graven by art and Mans Device*; therefore your making the Godhead ſuch by your Image σεβάσματα, is atrocious Impiety. Thus the Apoſtle argueth with the Athenians, agreeably to what a Pagan Theologer ſaith, (*l*) *ſpeaking univerſally, a Lover of God ought not to pay Honour to any things, that are below Human Nature.*

As the Apoſtle repreſenteth the Athenians Statues as no better than graven Gold, Silver, or Stone: So the Scripture uſually repreſenteth the Heathens σεβάσματα, (Objects of Religious Worſhip) as *ſenſleſs Idols, that can neither See, Speak, nor Hear*; vain Fray-bugs, that hold in their hands a Scepter, a Dagger, or an Ax, but can do no execution (*whereby they are known not to be Gods*, Baruch 6. 16.) Carpenters Chips (as one in *Hen.* 8. days called the Images, and was accus'd of Hereſie for his ſaying,) and Wooden Logs, part of ſuch Materials that are us'd for the Fire. *Iſa.* 44. 16, 17. *They have no knowledge, that ſet up the Wood of their graven Image, and pray unto a God that cannot ſave.* Iſa. 45. 20. *Saying to a Stock, thou art my Father; and to a Stone thou haſt brought me forth.* Jer. 2. 17. Wiſd. 14. 21. *Men aſcribed unto Stocks and Stones the incommunicable Name.* Iſa. 44. 10. *Who hath formed a God or molten a graven Image, that is profitable for nothing?* So in many other places of Scripture the ſenſleſs Statues are ſaid to be the Gods of the Heathens Religious Worſhip; agreeably whereto (*m*) the Chriſtian Apologiſts uſually reproach the Pagans with their *wooden, ſtony and metalline Gods; that leaving Heaven they framed to themſelves Terreſtrial Gods; that it is madneſs, to believe that a God, and to implore its aid, which themſelves have made; to ſuppoſe Images made by Men, to be Gods that work Miracles; and that they might be aſhamed, to hope for Defence and Guardianſhip from that which needed their Guardianſhip.* But although the Pagans, their Gods or their Idols are deſervedly thus reproach'd and expos'd by holy Men and in holy Scripture, yet it is certain, that they conſider'd their Idols or Images in one Notion, and the Scripture conſidereth them in another. For when the Scripture thus reproacheth them, it conſidereth their Images only as to what they are in themſelves: But the Pagans conſider'd them, as to the whole of what they are in their Magical Religion, and therefore *as their proximate and preſent Deities.* So *Arnobius* conſider'd them, when he was a Pagan. (*n*) *I worſhipp'd Images* (ſaith he) *that came out of the Furnaces, Gods that were fabricated on the Anvil and by the Hammer.* —— *I ſpake to and flatter'd a ſmooth anointed Stone, as if a Divine Preſence was in it.* So ſometimes the Scripture conſidereth the Heathens Idols as their proximate and preſent Deities; for ſo the Apoſtle conſidereth them, when he ſaith; 1 *Cor.* 10. 20. *The things which the Gentiles Sacrifice, they Sacrifice to Devils.*

V. This account that we have given of the Pagans Symbolical Deities, is not ſo to be underſtood, as if all their *Symbol-Idolatry* was of this high ſtrain, which we have repreſented; for ſome of it was without any Rites of Religious Worſhip. As the *Ancilia* and *Palladium* introduc'd by *Numa* (a great Adverſary of Image-Worſhip) as Pledges of Divine Favour and of Empire, were made Idols without the Rites of Idol-worſhip, by repoſing an Idolatrous truſt in them. And the Brazen Serpent amongſt the Jews being worſhipp'd by one only Rite of Religious Worſhip, became an Idol; *the Children of Iſrael burnt Incenſe unto it.* Some of the Pagans Symbols of their Gods were Idol-Symbols, that were not ſuppos'd to be *ſuch proximate and preſent* Deities as their Images; without ſuppoſing them ſuch it was Idolatry to Worſhip them as meer Symbols relative to their Deities, on which account they were uſually worſhipp'd. As *Theocritus* introduceth the *Plane* Tree thus ſpeaking; (*o*) *Worſhip me, for I am* Helena's *Tree.*

VI. If the God of *Iſrael* had been ſuch a Symbolical Diety, as the Pagan Deities were, (a Diety to be worſhipp'd by a Symbol, Image or Statue,) Image-worſhip amongſt the Iſraelites would not have chang'd the object of Worſhip; for in worſhipping their *Calves* they did not intentionally change the object of Worſhip any farther than to change its mode of *Subſiſtence*, by preſentiating that Deity, which otherwiſe was (as they ſuppos'd) of remote Subſiſtence: But becauſe the God of *Iſrael* was no ſuch Symbolical Deity, therefore their Image-worſhip really chang'd the object of Worſhip, and was the Worſhip of an heterogeneous Symbolical Trinket inſtead of the true natural Perſon of their Deity. The true natural Perſon of their Deity was the *object-no-object* of their Image-worſhip, *it was intended to him, but was really alien'd from him.* If Children ſhould make a Sign-poſt the Repreſentative of their abſent Father, and pay to it their Filial Homage in his place and ſtead, the true and natural Perſon of their Father would be the *object-no-object* of ſuch Filial Homage. Or if an Husband ſhould make a *Bed-poſt* the Repreſentative of his abſent Wife, and pay to it the Conjugal Duty in her place and ſtead, the true natural Perſon of his Wife would be the *object-no-object* of ſuch Conjugal Duty. To pay that Conjugal Duty which is proper to her true natural Perſon, to a Proxy of his own deviſing, is not to pay it to her, but to alienate

(l) Ὅλως γὰρ τὰ χείρονα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ȣ̓σίας ȣ̓ καθήκει τιμᾶν τῷ ἐρωτικῶς ἔχοντι τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃. Hierocl. in aur. car. p. 46.

Pſal. 135. 15. *and* 115. 4. *Iſa.* 41. 7, 21, &c. *Jer.* 10. 14. *Habak.* 2. 18, 19.

(m) *Dalleus de rel. cult. object. l.* 1. *c.* 19, 20, &c.

(n) *Adv. Gent. l.* 1. *p.* 22.

(o) —— Σέβȣμ' Ἑλένας φυτόν εἰμι.

nate it from her, and to give it to another thing. So the worſhipping an Image may be called *the worſhipping God by an Image*, becauſe it is intentionally ſo: But really it is an alienating his Worſhip from him, and a giving it to the Image. For God's Worſhip, like Conjugal Duty to a Wife, cannot be given him by Proxy; nor is a Statue any more fit to be a Proxy Deity, than a Bed-poſt to be a Proxy-Wife; and the Inſtitution of a Proxy-Deity and a Proxy-Wife are alike incongruous.

An Image amongſt the Iſraelites was by Inſtitution and Deſign a *vicarious* or *ſubſtitute* Deity; what the true and natural Perſon of the Deity was to the immediate Adorers of it, that this putative ſuppoſititious Perſon of the Deity was to the Image-adorers; and becauſe they did unto it what is proper to be done only to the true and natural Perſon of the Deity, therefore they made the former, not the latter their Deity. This matter will be more clearly intelligible by comparing the Deity with the Papacy. If at the Election of a new Pope, when he is ſolemnly ador'd at *Rome*, the Romaniſts at *Avignion* ſhould erect and adore *a golden Calf* for a vicarious ſubſtitute Pope; if they ſhould pay their ſolemn Adorations to it, adorn it with all the magnificent Titles of his *Holineſs*, beg Indulgences from it, conſult it as their Oracle, and do unto it what the Catholicks at *Rome* do to the true and natural Perſon of the Pope; if this putative ſuppoſititious Perſon of the *Pope* ſhould be to the Romaniſts at *Avignion* (as to their ſtating of it) what the true and natural Perſon of the Pope is to the Catholicks at *Rome*. This would be making *a Pope of Gold*, as the Iſraelites made *a God of Gold*. And as Gold is not fit to make ſuch a ſubſtitute Pope of, the whole Inſtitution of ſuch a putative ſuppoſititious Perſon of the Pope is a monſtrous abſurdity, and the Pope himſelf would be concern'd to demoliſh it as an *Idol-Pope* and an *Anti-Pope*, and would forbid his Catholicks to reſort to it as their Head: So Gold is infinitely inept, to make a Subſtitute God of, and the whole Inſtitution of a putative ſuppoſititious Perſon of the God of *Iſrael* (ſuch as the Golden Calf was) is a monſtrous Idolatry. Or ſuppoſe a Party of Subjects, that live at a diſtance from the Court, ſhould erect a ſubſtitute *King of Clouts*, and pay their Homage, offer their Preſents, make their Petitions and reſort for Protection to this putative ſuppoſititious Perſon of the King, making it their Head of Sovereignty; ſuch a King of Clouts would be *an Idol-King*, and a tolerable reſemblance of the Iſraelites *God of Gold*.

The Nature of Idolatry (as that ſignifieth the giving God's Worſhip unto Creatures) is viſible in this Image-worſhip of the Iſraelites; from whence it followeth, that all ſuch Image-worſhip altereth the object of Worſhip, and maketh a new object; that we ought not to imagine ſuch a ſtrict Notion of Idolatry, as ſome ſuppoſe, *which is not the giving the Worſhip of God to Creatures, but is the Worſhip of God by an Image*; which maketh ſuch Images, not the Object, but only the *medium* of Worſhip; that when God forbiddeth Image-worſhip in the ſecond Commandment, he only forbiddeth that *manner* of Worſhip, not that Object. Both the general current of holy Scripture and the Contexture of the Decalogue demonſtrate, that there is miſtake in theſe Notices of Image-worſhip. For if Image-worſhip is not a mode of violating the firſt Commandment, whence is it, that the firſt Commandment hath no diſtinct Sanction, but the Sanction of the ſecond belongeth to both Commandments? They have one Sanction in common, therefore one criminality is common to the violation of them both, namely, *the alienating from God his Worſhip and the giving it to a Creature*. If there was nothing of this in Image-Worſhip, how could it merit an horrendous penalty, how could it move God's jealouſie (as the Rival of an adulterous Wife doth an Husband,) and be ſtiled *hatred* or inimical Affection to God (in a Senſe of eminence) in common with the violation of *the firſt Commandment?* And do not Image-worſhippers violate the firſt Commandment in ſaying (expreſly or implicitly) to their molten Images, *Ye are our Gods?* Iſa: 42. 17. The *Firſt* Commandment forbiddeth the having any other σέϐασμα, *Object of Religious Worſhip*, ſave only the true God; the *Second* particularly forbiddeth any Image σέϐασμα, which is one eminent mode (becauſe of the proclivity of Mankind to dote on a viſible Object) of violating the firſt Commandment. This will further appear from a brief explication of it.

In an Image σέϐασμα, two things are of diſtinct conſideration; *the Image it ſelf, and the Religious Worſhip of it.* Accordingly, two things are diſtinctly prohibited in the Commandment: Both the making the Image, and the making it a σέϐασμα, by Religious Worſhip. The Commandment diſtinctly enumerateth the ſeveral Practices of Image-religioniſts, and injoineth God's Religioniſts to eſchew them; and therefore the Intention and Purport of it is to ſay, *That Gods People muſt be no Religioniſts in making them, bowing down to them and ſerving them.* They muſt be no *graven Image Religioniſts*, ſaith the Commandment expreſly; graven or molten Images are by much the moſt noble and eminent ſort of Images; therefore if God's Religioniſts muſt be no *graven Image* Religioniſts, they muſt be no Religioniſts of any ſort of Images. Expreſly they are forbidden, to be graven Image-Religioniſts; implicitly and by conſequence the Precept is general, and they are commanded not to be at all *Image-religioniſts, in making them, bowing down to them, or worſhipping them.* Which ſheweth the vanity (p) of that Judaical Conceit, *that the making extant or protuberant Images, but not the plain or depreſs, is prohibited by the Precept.* Whereas the terms of the Precept [making, bowing down to, ſerving a graven Image] are nothing more than a Periphraſis or Deſcription of an Image-religioniſt; and therefore the making Extant or Protuberant Images, if there be nothing in it of Image-religioniſm, is no leſs lawful, than the making plain or depreſs; as appeareth from many Inſtances, *the brazen Serpent, the Cherubims*, Solomon's *brazen Bulls, and golden Lions*, and ſuch more. But upon this groundleſs Conceit (that the making extant and protuberant Images is unlawful) the Jews have founded the Criticiſms of their vain Superſtition. (q) *It is forbidden, to make Images for Ornament only: It is not forbidden, to make an Image for Ornament, ſave only the figure of a Man* (others extend the prohibition to the Images of all Animals,) *and this muſt be underſtood of an Image that is Protuberant. A Ring whoſe Seal is the figure of a Man, if it be gibbous, is forbidden to be worn, but it is lawful to Seal with it* (for the impreſſion will be hollow:) *But if the*

Figure

(p) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 5. *c.* 7. *S.* 1. *vid. Petav. T.* 4. *par.* 2. *l.* 15. *c.* 14. *S.* 4.

(q) *Maimon. de Idol. c.* 3, 12, 13.

Figure be depreſs or hollow, it is lawful to wear it, but not to ſeal with it, for the Impreſſion will be gibbous. Such Criticiſms of vain Superſtitioniſts are altogether beſides the Intention of the Lawgiver, whoſe Deſign is, to alienate his People from all *Image-Religioniſm*, and from nothing but *Image-Religioniſm*, Deut. 4. 15, 16. *Take good heed unto your ſelves (for ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude on the day that the Lord ſpake unto you in* Horeb *out of the midſt of the Fire) leſt ye corrupt your ſelves, and make you a Graven Image, the ſimilitude of any Figure, the likeneſs of Male or Female.* Similitude (*Temunah*) both in this Text and in the Second Commandment is added to Graven Image by way of *Explication*, not of *Diſtinction*, (r) as ſome Learned Men rightly ſuppoſe; but this is no ſufficient ground for certain *Criticiſms* of theirs in matter of Religion; *viz. that the Second Commandmemt forbiddeth none but Graven Images, or none but Graven Images reſembling Animals* (theſe being the Images capable of Animation) *and that it forbiddeth the* Jews *the making or having ſuch Images.* For the Intention of the Lawgiver is (becoming a Lawgiver in matter of Religion, and agreeable to the deſign of the *Moſaic Inſtitution*, which was, to unpaganize the *Iſraelites*) neither more nor leſs, than to forbid his Religioniſts, to be *Image-Religioniſts.* They are forbid all *Image-Religioniſm*, as appeareth from the Reaſon of the Law, *ye ſaw no ſimilitude.* They are therefore commanded, to demoliſh all the Pagans Image-σεβάσματα without exception; *Numb.* 33. 52. *Ye ſhall drive out all the Inhabitants of the Land from before you, and deſtroy all their Pictures, and all their Molten Images.* As they are commanded to deſtroy all the Pagans Image-σεβάσματα, ſo they are forbid the *making* or *having* any of their own, whereby they would become guilty of the Crime of being Image-Religioniſts; *Lev.* 26. 1. *Ye ſhall make you no Idols, nor Graven Image, neither rear you up a ſtanding Image, neither ſhall ye ſet up any Image of Stone in your Land, to bow down unto it.* So the Second Commandment ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeneſs of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, or that is in the Water under the Earth: Thou ſhalt not bow down thy ſelf to them nor ſerve them.* The Commandment forbiddeth the making any Image-σέβασμα by fabricating it, and the making any Image-σέβασμα by worſhipping it; which Image-σεβάσματα are throughout the *Bible* called *Gods, Gods no Gods, Idols,* which are falſe Gods, *Exod.* 20. 23. and 34. 17. and 32. 31. *Judg.* 17. 5. and 18. 24. 2 *Chron.* 13. 9. *Pſal.* 115. 4. & 135. 15. 2 *King.* 19. 8. *Iſa.* 42. 17. and 44. 10, 15, 17. *Jer.* 16. 20. Therefore the purport of the Second Commandment being this, to forbid all Image-σεβάσματα, the purport of it is to forbid one eminent mode of violating the Firſt Commandment.

VII. There is now no difficulty in reconciling the ſeeming diſſonant Accounts, which the Scripture giveth of the *Iſraelites* worſhip of *the Golden Calf*, and *the Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel.* On the one hand, the Scripture is expreſs (as many have demonſtrated) that their Calves were Symbols of the God of *Iſrael*, and conſequently the *Iſraelites* in worſhipping them were *intentionally* the Worſhippers of the true God, *Exod.* 32. 5. *they kept a Feaſt to the Lord.* *Exod.* 32. 6. 1 *King.* 12. 32. they ſacrific'd the *Jewiſh* kind of Sacrifices (Burnt-offerings and Peace-offerings) and therefore offer'd them *intentionally* to the God of *Iſrael*, 2 *King.* 10. 23. in oppoſition to the Worſhippers of *Baal.* *Jeroboam*'s Religioniſts are call'd *the Servants of the Lord*, 2 *King.* 9. 25, 36. and *ch.* 10. 10, 16. 2 *Chron.* 22. 9. *Jehu* (one of theſe Religioniſts) with great Devotion owneth the true God and his Prophets, looketh upon himſelf as an Executioner of his Judgments, profeſſeth himſelf a Zealot for the Lord, ſheweth reſpect to the Son of *Jehoſhaphat*, becauſe he ſought the Lord with all his Heart, 2 *King.* 13. 4. *Jehoahaz* his Son *beſought the Lord, and the Lord hearkened unto him*, 2 King. 13. 14. *Joaſh* his Son with great piety lamenteth the death of *Eliſha*, ſtiling him *My Father, the Chariot of* Iſrael *and the Horſemen thereof*; 2 *Chron.* 28. 13. The Heads of the Children of *Ephraim* confeſs their Sins againſt the Lord and dread his Wrath, 1 *King.* 17. 26, 27. An *Iſraelitiſh* Prieſt taught the *Samaritan* Colonies the Worſhip of the God of the Land, which was the worſhip of the God of *Iſrael*: So great Evidence is there, that the Worſhippers of *Jeroboam*'s Calves were in ſome ſort the Worſhippers of the true God. Their Idolatry was not purely Pagan, but *Pagano-Iſraelitical*, diſtinguiſh'd by (s) *Jewiſh* Writers and in Scripture from meer Heathen Idolatry, *Act.* 7. 41, 42. The Calves of *Jeroboam* and that of *Aaron* were Repreſentatives of their God, *that brought them out of the Land of* Egypt, which could not be thought an *Egyptian* Deity, *Exod.* 32. 4. 1 *King.* 12. 28. Their deſign in erecting thoſe Symbols, was not to relinquiſh, but to preſentiate their Deity; *Exod.* 32. 1. 1 *King.* 12. 27, 28. And becauſe theſe Symbols are of no certain Name (ſuch as *Baal, Moloch, Chemoſh*) therefore ſome of the Pontifician Theologers (t) allow it probable, *that the* Jews *did worſhip the true God in the Idol.* The Religion of *Micah*, *Judg.* 17. is of the ſame Character; for his devout Mother dedicated the Silver *to the Lord*, of which his Graven and Molten Image was made. And his joyful Entertainment of a Levite for his Prieſt, and his bleſſing himſelf for his good fortune in lighting upon him *(now know I, that the Lord will do me good, ſeeing I have a* Levite *for my Prieſt)* plainly demonſtrateth him in ſome ſort a *Moſaic* Religioniſt. But as the Religion of *Micah* was Idolatry; ſo the *Iſraelites* worſhip of the *Aaronical* Calf is of the ſame criminal Character, *Act.* 7. 41. *They made a Calf in thoſe Days, and offered Sacrifice to the Idol.* Exod. 32. 31. *Oh this People have ſinned a great ſin, and have made them Gods of Gold.* The greatneſs of their Crime is viſible in the ſeverity of their Puniſhment (the Trangreſſors were ſlain, *v.* 22.) in *Moſes*'s tranſport of Paſſion (he caſt the two Tables of Teſtimony out of his Hands and brake them; he burnt the Calf in the Fire, ground it to Powder, and as if he could never ſufficiently be reveng'd upon the Idol, he caſt the Duſt of it into the Brook that ran out of *Horeb*, and made the People drink of that Water; to ſhew, in what infinite deteſtation Idols muſt be held, they muſt be utterly aboliſh'd and not the leaſt memorial of them left;) and by the height of God's diſpleaſure againſt their Sin, *Exod.* 32. 10. *Let me alone, that my Wrath may wax hot againſt them, and that I may conſume them.* As Idolatry hath the primacy amongſt Sins; ſo the Religion of *Jeroboam*'s Calves hath the primacy amongſt *Iſrael*'s Sins (which therefore was an Idolatrous Worſhip) as *Jeroboam*'s uſual Character implieth, *who made*

Iſrael

(r) *Grot. explic. Decal. ad Ex.* 20. 4. *Dr. Hammond of Idol. S.* 37.

(s) *Coſri* p. 288. *ed. Buxt.*

(t) *Bellarm. de Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 13.

Iſrael *to ſin*, 1 King. 14. 9. *Thou haſt done Evil above all that were before thee* (ſaith God to *Jeroboam*) *for thou haſt gone and made thee other Gods, even molten Images, to provoke me to anger, and haſt caſt me behind thy back*; 2 Chron. 13. 9. *Abijah* King of *Judah* upbraideth *Iſrael* with their Golden Calves which *Jeroboam* made them for Gods, 2 *Chron.* 11. 15. Jeroboam *ordained him Prieſts for the High places, and for the Devils, and for the Calves which he had made.* The word which our Tranſlation rendreth Devils, is *Leſebirim*, which ſeemeth to be a word extended beyond its original uſe to a general Signification, and ſhould be rendred, *not Devils*, but *falſe Gods.* The falſe Gods of the elder times being *Sehirim* (the ragged or hairy) the word was uſed in after-times, to ſignifie falſe Gods. As falſe Gods are ſtiled *Vanities*; ſo *Baaſha*, and *Elah*, and *Omri*, *Jeroboam*'s Succeſſors are ſaid *to provoke the Lord God of* Iſrael *to anger with their Vanities*; 1 King. 16. 13, 26. Vanities are Gods no Gods, 2 *Chron.* 13. 9. *Whoſoever cometh to conſecrate himſelf with a young Bullock and ſeven Rams, the ſame may be a Prieſt of them that are no Gods.* The Scripture inſiſteth upon it, that the *Iſraelites* Calves were no Gods, becauſe by way of *objective application* they made them Gods (making them Image-σεβάσματα;) and not only ſo, but in reſpect of *Subjective Perfection* thus far they accounted them Gods (or Elohim) *they ſuppos'd them to be their proximate or preſent Deity*, therefore the Prophet argueth againſt them in the ſame manner as the Scripture argueth againſt the Idols of the Heathen; *Hoſ.* 8. 6. *The Workman made it, therefore it is not God, but the Calf of* Samaria *ſhall be broken to pieces.*

VIII. Conformably (in great degree) to the guiſe of ancient Paganiſm the Pagano-Chriſtians have introduc'd into our Religion Image-σεβάσματα or *Idol-Symbols*; for that their Images are of the nature of Idol-Symbols, this is a ſhrewd Indication; *They are ſuch in the Eyes of all Mankind except their own.* For the *Heathen* count them ſuch Image-worſhippers as themſelves are; reform'd Chriſtendom chargeth them with Symbol-Idolatry; ſo do the *Muhammedans*; (u) and the *Jews* call a Church בית עבודה זרה *an Houſe of Idolatry* (or ſtrange worſhip) and בית דתרפת *an Houſe of turpitude*, becauſe of the Pontificians Idolatrous Image-worſhip. Agreeably to this *conſent of Nations* ſome Learned Men of their own Communion (*Lud. Vives*, *Polydore Virgil*, *Caſſander*, *Heſſelius*) have acknowledg'd and lamented the Heatheniſm of their Image-worſhip, (w) *and that they ſeem not to come ſhort of the higheſt Adoration, which the Pagans gave their Images, nor of their extream Vanity in forming and adorning them.* Some of the Learned of that Communion make a further acknowledgment, that in the *Old Teſtament*, and particularly in the Second Commandment, Statues and Images for Worſhip are univerſally prohibited, that their Image-worſhip is a violation of the Second Commandment, and that the Worſhip which they give their Images, (x) *is the ſame* (prohibited) *Worſhip, that the* Jews *gave the Brazen Serpent*; but they pretend, that this *Moſaic* Prohibition of Image-worſhip is poſitive and temporary, that now *they are paſt Infancy, and grown to be perfect Men, and therefore are not under the Pædagogy of the Law* (as *J. Damaſcen.* ſpeaketh) *againſt Image-worſhip.* But if the Commandment forbiddeth their Image-worſhip in terms expreſſive of the higheſt Criminality, which ſpeak the Criminals Idolaters (haters of God) and with a Commination of an horrendous Penalty, this is a fair Indication, that their Image-worſhip is not evil becauſe prohibited, but is prohibited, becauſe in it ſelf it is evil and in its own nature Idolatry; which will appear by reflecting upon what hath been diſcours'd touching *Symbol-idolatry*; that *when the worſhip proper to the true natural perſon of the God of* Iſrael *is given to the Symbol, although it be intended to him, it is really alien'd from him, and ſo given to the Symbol; and conſequently, it is a making the Symbol, not the Deity, our God.* Moreover, if that Honour and Worſhip which is proper to God, be truly and really given to any created thing in any manner, or upon any account whatſoever, ſuch Worſhip is in its own nature Idolatry; no Diſtinctions of Worſhip, no Intention of the Religioniſt can poſſibly make it otherwiſe. For which reaſon, although in the intentional worſhipping God by an Image, the worſhip be (intentionally) meerly σχετικὴ, *relative* and *tranſitive*, not *terminative*, yet it is certainly Idolatry; how much more if the Worſhip be mixt of *abſolute* and *relative*, with which ſort of Worſhip many of the Heathen worſhipp'd their Images? To make a Judgment therefore touching the Religious Worſhip of unreform'd Chriſtendom, whether it be Symbol-Idolatry or not, it muſt be conſider'd, what Worſhip ſhe allotteth to her Image-σεβάσματα.

(u) *Hoornbeck c. Jud. proleg. p.* 17.

(w) *Caſſand. Conſult. de Imagin.*

(x) *Vaſqu. in* 3. *Th. Diſp.* 104. *Qu.* 25.

According to the Definition of the *Second Nicene Council* it is and is not *Latria* the Sovereign Religious Worſhip: For if the Images be conſider'd in themſelves, as diſtinct from the Prototype, they ought not to be worſhipp'd with *Latria*, with true *Latria*, *Latria* in Spirit, as the Council ſpeaketh) but with an inferiour ſort of Worſhip, *as the Holy Goſpels and Sacred Utenſils*; but the Images muſt be alſo worſhipp'd in conjunction with the Prototype, as the Definition of the Council implieth; (y) *for the Honour of the Image paſſeth to the Prototype* (ſaith the Council) *and he that worſhippeth the Image, worſhippeth in it the repreſented Exemplar.* The Prototype cannot be worſhipp'd in the Image, unleſs the Prototype's proper worſhip be given it (ſuch Worſhip which is fit to be given to, and receiv'd by the Prototype;) therefore the Image of Chriſt muſt be worſhipp'd with nothing leſs than *Latria*; not that the Image muſt be ſo worſhipp'd for it ſelf, with *abſolute Latria* (as a God in reſpect of Subjective Perfection ſuch) but the Prototype conjoyn'd in Mental Conſideration with the Image muſt be worſhipp'd with abſolute *Latria*; with reſpect to the Image the *Latria is relative or reſpective*, and for the ſake of the Prototype, to whom the Religioniſt intentionally referreth it. If the Image be worſhipp'd as conſider'd in it ſelf and diſtinct from the Prototype with an inferiour ſort of Worſhip, ſuch Worſhip is ſuppos'd to be honourary to the Prototype, but is not the Worſhip of the Prototype (as when an Embaſſadour is honour'd with an Honour proper to his perſon for the King's ſake, this is honourary to the King, but is not the proper Regial Honour:) If the Prototype be worſhipp'd in worſhipping the Image (as the Council defineth) his proper worſhip muſt be given him *mediante Imagine, through the Image*; (which proper worſhip is *Latria*, if God be the Object, *Dulia* and *Hyperdulia* if the Bl. Virgin and the Saints be the Object) the Image muſt be worſhipp'd with the ſame act of Adoration and with the ſame Worſhip that is due to the Prototype. From which account of the

(y) *Act.* 7. *p.* 755.

the Senſe of this *Nicene* Council (agreeably whereunto the Church practiſeth, her Synods Decree, and the generality of her Theologers diſpute) it appeareth, that not a few of their Image-σιϐάσματα are Idol-Symbols: For if their Saint-worſhip be Idolatry (as is before demonſtrated) the worſhip of their Images with the ſame worſhip muſt be much more Idolatry. The *relative* Divine Worſhip of their other Image-σιϐάσματα, *the Croſs and Image of Chriſt*, can be nothing better than Symbol-Idolatry; for the Image of Chriſt muſt be worſhipp'd with *Latria*, Divine Honours muſt be done it σχετικῶς or relatively, which is the ſame Symbol-Idolatry with the ancient *Gnoſticks*, (z) who worſhipp'd the Image of Chriſt with Divine Honours, not *abſolutely* and *terminatively*, but *relatively*; for they worſhipp'd an Image as an Image, a Symbol as a Symbol, as the reſt of Mankind do. The Church forbiddeth no Worſhip to be given to her Images ſave only *abſolute Latria* and certain Hypotheſes which infer it (that *the Images are Gods*, and that there is *ſome Divinity or Virtue in them*, for which they ought to be venerated;) but there are ſome Modes of Image-worſhip maintain'd and practis'd in her Communion, on this ſide *abſolute Latria*, which ſome of her great Divines pronounce Idolatry; for they that pay their Worſhip to the Image as conſider'd in it ſelf and diſtinct from the Prototype, worſhipping it with an inferiour worſhip diſtinct from that which is due to the Prototype, theſe expreſs their Submiſſion and do ſervice to a meer inanimate irrational thing, and therefore (*a*) *Vaſquez* accounteth them Idolaters. On the other hand, they that ſuppoſe, that the Image and Exemplar ought to be worſhipp'd with the ſame Worſhip, and conſequently, that the Image of Chriſt ought to be worſhipp'd relatively with *Latria* (which is the Doctrine of the generality of the Pontifician Theologers) incur the guilt of Idolatry, (*b*) as the great Writer of Controverſies diſputeth: Which ſevere Charges of Idolatry upon the two oppoſite Modes of Image-worſhip muſt neceſſarily involve their Church in the guilt of Symbol-Idolatry.

But by diſowning abſolute *Latria* the Church diſtinguiſheth her Image-worſhip from Heathen Idolatry; (*c*) for *the Gentiles* (as her Theologers ſuppoſe) *intent upon their Images and Statues attributed God-excellence to them, having no thought of any Deity which they expreſs'd and ſignify'd; they worſhipp'd them ſimply and abſolutely, and their worſhip of Latria was not* σχετικὴ, *relative and tranſient* (paſſing through the Image to the Prototype) *but terminative and ſtopping in the Image.* As the Philoſophy of *Philo* the *Jew* is uſually no better than Heatheniſm, yet he diſtinguiſheth it from Heatheniſm by affixing to the Heathen certain abſurd unphiloſophical Conceits, that were in great meaſure ſtrangers in the Heathen World; at the ſame rate the Roman-Catholicks diſtinguiſh their Image-worſhip from Heathen Idolatry. For the Heathen thought not their Images *Deities no-Images*, they ſuppos'd them proximate and preſent Deities, yet ſo as to be vicarious and ſubſtitute to the Prototypes, and the worſhip which they gave them, was relative to the Prototypes: Many of them ſuppos'd, that their inviſible Deities animated their Images, and their Image-worſhip was relative to that real perſonal preſence of their Deities, which they worſhipp'd with *abſolute Latria*, according to this their Profeſſion, (*d*) *In theſe material Images we worſhip thoſe, whom the ſacred Dedication introduceth*; and therefore the whole of their Religious Worſhip was a Mixture and Complication of *abſolute* and *relative Latria*. But the new Doctors of Symbol-idolatry ſuppoſe no real perſonal preſence of a Deity in their Images, they have ſubſtituted inſtead of it *a phantaſtic and imaginary preſence* of their Saint or Deity, (which they worſhip in, with and by the Image) the Image repreſenting the Exemplar to their Minds they imagine it in the Image (as contain'd and inclos'd in it, and as it were animating the Image) and this imaginary preſence of their Saint or Deity (*e*) they call the *Life*, *Soul*, and *Dignity* of the Image, and the Image taken in Complication with it is ſtiled *Imago animata & in actu exercito* (which actually doth the Function of an Image and containeth the Prototype) and of ſuch Images conſider'd as containing the Exemplar they ſay, (*f*) *None hath made ſcruple to affirm, that true Latria or Latria in Spirit ought to be given them, if the Exemplar be God or Chriſt.* Agreeably to the Pagans therefore the whole of their Image-worſhip is a Mixture and Complication of *abſolute* and *relative Latria*. In ſuch an animated Image the Image in it ſelf conſider'd and the Exemplar (the Phantaſm of the Exemplar) concur, to conſtitute *one Total, one total Object of the Supream Honour and Worſhip*, which is ſuch a ſtrain of Idolatry (in worſhipping at once their Images and Imaginations with the Supream Worſhip) that nothing higher can be found in Paganiſm. The Image in a narrow acceptation is the partial term or object of the Supream Worſhip (relatively) and in a large conſideration (as it comprehendeth the Phantaſm of the Exemplar) it is the total Object of it, the Object of *abſolute Latria alſo*; and what is this but θεοποιεῖν τὰς εἰκόνας, *a deifying Images?* Nor is it to purpoſe to alledge, that the Object of this abſolute Latria is *Chriſt cloathed with his Image*, (*g*) *the Prototype ſhining in his Image*, which they worſhip *per ſe*, the material Image being ador'd *per accidens only* (as a Prince's Robe is ador'd when he is worſhipp'd;) for the Prototype ſhining in his Image is like the Image behind the Looking-glaſs (to which (*h*) they uſually compare it) a mear Creature of Man's Phantaſy, as the material Image is the Creature of Man's Hands; the *Image* and *Imagination* are alike, a fictitious, not a real Perſon of the Prototype, and the latter is εἰδώλου εἴδωλον, *but the Image of an Image.*

IX. Since the times of the *Nicene* Synod the Church hath improv'd in Symbol-idolatry; for ſhe pretendeth to make and worſhip certain Images of God and the holy Trinity, which the *Nicene* Synod abhorr'd. (*i*) *Theſe Pictures are in common uſe amongſt Catholicks, and have their common approbation.* (*k*) *Origen* accounteth it Madneſs, *to think the Works of impious Artizans and Mechanicks honourary to true Gods*; but degenerate Chriſtendom thinketh it no diſhonour to God and the holy Trinity, to ſubject them to the Pencils of impious Artizans. (*l*) A late Painter teacheth (as a Branch of his Art) *how the Trinity is uſually painted*, and treating of an Artifice in *Grammica* or the Art of Delineation, *after this manner* (ſaith he) *the Picture of God the Father is done by* Pordonone *in the top of the Roof of St.* Mary's *in* Campagna *of* Placentia. This unholy kind of picturing God (for there is an holy kind of depainting God in our Souls and Lives, which is God-imagery) is neceſſarily οὐχ ὅσιον, or *profane* and *irreligious*, (*m*) as the

Jews

(z) *Bellarm. de Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 24.

(a) *In* 3. *Th. Diſp.* 108. *Qu.* 25. *Art.* 3. *c.* 9.

(b) *Bellarm. ſupr.*

(c) *Petav. T.* 4. *Par.* 2. *l.* 15. *c.* 17. *S.* 5.

(d) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 6. *p.* 203.

(e) *Vaſq. ſupr. Diſp.* 108. *c.* 5. & 15.

(f) *Ibid. Diſp.* 109. *c.* 3.

(g) *Bellarm. ſupr. c.* 23.

(h) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 15. *c.* 15. *S.* 3.

(i) *Ibid. c.* 14. *S.* 6.

(k) *C. Cell. l.* 3. *p.* 158.

(l) *Lomatius l.* 7. *c.* 2. & *l.* 5. *c.* 13.

(m) *V. Grot. Explic. Decal. ad Exod.* 20. 4.

Jews ſtile it; the Pillar of Fire that conducted the *Iſraelites*, ſignifieth, ſaith *Clemens*, (n) τὸ ἀνεικόνιστον τοῦ Θεοῦ; *that the perſonal Glory and Majeſty of God is not ſo mean a thing*, * *as that Pictures and Sculptures may be made of it.* Theſe are not duly honourary Repreſentations of God, but extreamly diſhonourable and diſgraceful. They affix a viſible corporeal ſhape to the Godhead, and the finite littleneſs of a Creature; they aſſimilate the Godhead to a carv'd Log or a painted Stone (*Act.* 17. 29.) and make the Lineaments and Colours of a Painter *God's Image* (the Image of his Glory, 1 *Cor.* 11. 7.) which ſpeaketh τὸ ἐξαίρετον. *that which is eximious*; and therefore no Picture or Sculpture (thoſe vile Trumperies of Humane Artifice) can be the Image of God, nor will God own them for ſuch; and conſequently they that religiouſly worſhip them, commit the Sin of Idolatry. But if we ſhould ſuppoſe, that the Draughts of a Painter are the Images of God (that of an Old Man, or of a Pope in his Pontifical Habit) as Man is in reſpect of his Manhood, as Kings are in reſpect of their Sovereignty, and as Saints and Angels are in reſpect of their Sanctity; yet ſeeing theſe ſtately Realities are not σεβάσματα, *to be had in Religious Veneration*, whence is it, that Pictures are become Image-σεβάσματα; created Beings may be the Images of God in a large ſenſe; but there is one that is the Image of God, ſo as to be God. God muſt be conſider'd as *the ſuper-create Excellence* (the Excellency that he properly is, is beyond the Rank of created Beings) and there is one that is this ſuper-create Excellency, in whom it exiſteth as *in Imagine*, (in the Image of God;) and becauſe in this Senſe there is but one Image of God, there can be but one Image-σέβασμα, according to that of S. *Auſtin* (o). *No Image of God ought to be worſhipp'd, but the Image which is that which He is, nor that inſtead of Him but with Him.* (p) *We worſhip one Image, which is the Image of the Inviſible and Omnipotent God.* (q) Not a few of the Pagan Nations prohibited the worſhip of Images. (r) The Philoſophers diſcourſe, *that God is like to nothing viſible*, (s) the ſublimer ſort of them ſuppos'd the Supream Deity beyond Imagination and Intellect, *for which reaſon Antiquity form'd no Image of him.* The making and worſhipping the Images of God and the Holy Trinity therefore in ſome reſpects tranſcendeth Paganiſm.

(n) *Str. l.* 1. *p. m.* 255.

* *Vid. Baron. ad an.* 324. *n.* 110.

(o) *Nulla Imago ejus coli debet niſi illa quæ hoc eſt quod ipſe, nec ipſa pro illo, ſed cum illo.* Ep. 119. ad Januar. c. 11.

(p) *S. Hierom. l.* 4. *in Ezech. c.* 16.

(q) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 6. *c.* 10.

(r) *Antiphanes.*

(s) *Macrob. in Som. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

But in ſome reſpect the Symbol-idolatry of degenerate Chriſtendom falleth ſhort of the Pagan; for there are two ways of Image-worſhip, the one is ſuch Image-worſhip (or Idol-worſhip) which is *the plenary Divine Service*; the other is, *Image-worſhip*, which is but *an Ingredient of the Divine Service. Jeroboam*'s Calves were erected as a vicarious ſubſtitute God of *Iſrael* for plenary Divine Service and the whole of Religious Worſhip; they had their Temples, Altars, Feſtivals, Prieſts, Sacrifices, and the Buſineſs of his Religioniſts Religious Aſſemblies was the Religious Worſhip of thoſe putative ſuppoſititious Perſons of the Deity. Of like Nature and Notion (in this reſpect) were the Statues in the Pagans Idol-Temples, *Gal.* 4. 8. 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 9. But the Symbol-idolatry of degenerate Chriſtendom (like the *Jews* worſhip of the Brazen Serpent, or the Pagans worſhip of the *Pine-Tree* in *Cybele*'s *Sacra*) is only a Branch or Ingredient of their Religious Worſhip; they have not proceeded to Image-σεβάσματα or Idols of the plenary Divine Service, nor made the God-ſervice of an Image the entire Buſineſs of their ſtated Aſſemblies, nor have they erected any publick Statue of the (non-incarnate) Supream Deity, to poſſeſs the place of an Imperial Head in our Religion, agreeably to the Pagan *Moloch* or *Capitoline Jupiter*. But they that have proceeded thus far, to make and worſhip Images of God and the Holy Trinity, what ſhould hinder them from proceeding a ſtep further, to make certain Statues of God and the Holy Trinity, (t) ſeeing there is the ſame reaſon, (as themſelves ſay) of Pictures and of Statues? But although the Church pretendeth not to erect any publick Statues of the Divinity, and probably accounteth it a kind of Sanctity (like ſome Chriſtian People in *Salvian*) *minus eſſe vitioſum, not to preceed to the height of Wickedneſs*; yet to compenſate this defect, ſhe hath her *Relique-Images* (ſuch as the *Veronica* and that famous one ſent to *Agbarus*, which are Reliques as well as Images) and an Imperial Lady at *Loretto*, which may juſtly be thought a Parallel for the grandeſt Idols in Paganiſm. And in the (u) devotional Pomp of her Proceſſions, the immenſe Veneration which ſhe payeth to her Images in thoſe grand Solemnities, her Symbol-idolatry hath manifeſtly outgrown the Pagan ſize.

(t) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 15. *c.* 14. *S.* 6.

(u) *Saul and Sam. at Endor. c.* 16. *p.* 351. *Dr. Stillingfl. Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 663, &c.

X. But the Pagano-Chriſtians Images are parallel to the Pagan in being *vicarious* and *ſubſtitute* to the Exemplars. (w) *Sometimes* (ſay they) *we conſider them as ſtanding in the place and ſtead of the Exemplars.* (x) *The nature of things ſeemeth to teach us, that the Image is the Subſtitute of the unſeen Exemplar, and ſometimes it is ſurrogated in the place of it.* (y) *Images ſo repreſent the Exemplar, that they are ſubſtituted in the place of it.* (z) *I adore the inanimate Figure of Chriſt* (ſaith *Leontius*) *for when I hold this, by it I ſeem to my ſelf, to hold and adore Chriſt.* (a) *Images ſupply the place of the thing repreſented.* (b) *The Image is a vicarious Repreſentation of the Prototype, and is in ſome ſort in its place and ſtead.* (c) *The Image differeth from the Prototype in Nature only, not in Hypoſtaſis or Perſon.* (d) *When one that injureth the Statue of a King, is as ſeverely puniſh'd as if he had injur'd the King himſelf, it is not becauſe he injur'd the Statue as his Statue, but becauſe he took the Statue for the King himſelf.* According to this Hypotheſis the vile Images muſt have an *Unity* or *Identity* of perſon with God in Religious Worſhip; to which purpoſe a Saying of *Athanaſius* (which concerneth the Myſtery of the Trinity) was cited (e) in the Second *Nicene* Synod. *The Similitude of the King is in the Image without any variation or difference; ſo that if one that ſeeth the Image, deſireth to ſee the King, the Image may ſay to him, I and the King are one. I am in him and he is in me.* A Saying alſo of S. *Baſil* of the ſame nature was cited to the ſame purpoſe: *The Image of a King is call'd the King, and there are not two Kings* (the one the King the other his Image) *for the Empire is not divided, nor the Glory; but as the Imperial Power over us is one, ſo is our Glorification one, not multifarious.* The Image being vicarious and ſubſtitute to the Exemplar ſo as to be of Unity and Identity of perſon, the Image-Religioniſts do and ſpeak the ſame things to the Image, and behave themſelves towards it in the ſame manner as if it was the Exemplar viſibly preſent. (f) *We ſpeak to the Croſs, and pray to it* (ſaith *Aquinas*) *as if it was Chriſt crucify'd upon it. O Crux ave ſpes unica! Hail O Croſs our only Hope!* in

(w) *Bellarm. ſupr. c.* 23.

(x) *Vaſqu. ſupr. Diſp.* 108. *c.* 8.

(y) *Ibid. c.* 11.

(z) *Ibid. Diſp.* 110. *c.* 2.

(a) *Suarez. in* 3. *Th. qu.* 25. *Diſp.* 54. *art.* 3. *S.* 6.

(b) *Valentia. T.* 3. *Diſp.* 6. *Qu.* 11. *punct.* 6.

(c) *Petav. ſupr. S.* 6.

(d) *Bellarm. ſupr. c.* 24.

(e) *Petav. ſupr. S.* 8.

(f) *Aquin. Par.* 3. *Qu.* 25. *art.* 4.

this time of the Paſſion increaſe the Righteouſneſs of the Juſt, and give Pardon to the Guilty. (g) When the Image of our Saviour was carryed in ſolemn Proceſſion from the Chappel of S. *Laurence* in the *Lateran* to S. *Mary*'s, through thoſe Streets of *Rome* that were thought infeſted with evil Spirits, the manner was at the firſt opening the place, to ſalute the Image with this Prayer. *O Saviour of the World, ſave us all thy poor Servants, and grant us all, that by the Merits of the two* Johns, *the Baptiſt and the Evangeliſt, we may appear guiltleſs before thee.* The Pope and Cardinals made their approach to the Image bare-foot, kneeling or bowing ſeven times, then opening the Image and kiſſing the Feet of the Lord, all ſang *Te Deum, We Praiſe thee, O God, we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.* (h) *The Image is ſometimes taken for the Prototype himſelf, and thoſe things which ſhould be done about the Prototype himſelf, if he was preſent, are done about the Image, but with the Mind defix'd upon the Prototype. So Preachers addreſs their Speech to the Image of Chriſt crucify'd, and ſay to it, Thou haſt redeem'd us, thou haſt reconcil'd us to the Father; for theſe things are not ſaid to the Image, either as it is Wood, or as it is an Image, but as it is taken in the place and ſtead of the Prototype; that is, they are ſaid to Chriſt himſelf, to whom the Image is vicarious and ſubſtitute.* As *on* Good-Friday, *when Chriſt crucify'd is by little and little uncover'd and ſhew'd, and propos'd to be ador'd, all thoſe things are underſtood to be done to true Chriſt himſelf by the Image. In this caſe no Honour is given to the Image properly, but to the Exemplar only, yet the Image it ſelf may be ſaid to be honoured improperly.* If this Apology would excuſe the Image-Religioniſts, it would not only excuſe the Pagano-Chriſtian, but the Pagan, who did and ſpake the ſame things to the Image of *Jupiter*, (a vicarious and ſubſtitute *Jupiter*,) and behav'd themſelves towards it, as if the Exemplar was viſibly preſent. It would much more excuſe the Pagans (from worſhipping Idol-Symbols) than the Pagano-Chriſtians, whoſe Deity is no Symbolical Deity (as the Pagan Deities were;) they that ſet up any thing vicarious and ſubſtitute to him, and ſpeak and do unto it what is proper to his true natural Perſon, alienate from him his Divine Honours, give them to that deviſed Subſtitute, and make that their God, as the Iſraelites did *their Vicarious Subſtitute Golden Calf.* As if Subjects that live remote from Court, ſhould make any one Vicarious and Subſtitute to their King, ſo as to be of Unity and Identity of Perſon, and did ſpeak and do the ſame things to him, as if their King was viſibly preſent, this would be a raiſing the Subſtitute above the rank of a Subject, a making him their King: And in the ſame manner they may make a Bundle of Clouts their King, and ſo the Paganizing Iſraelites made a Calf their God, and the Pagano-Chriſtians make a Croſs or an Image their God and their Saviour. Not *plenarily*, not *properly*, yet ſo *plenarily* and ſo *properly*, as to make it an *Idol-Symbol*; and ſo far as to make their *Approaches, Salutations, Adorations, Addreſſes* to the Image with the ſame Religious Fear and Reverence, as if the Prototype was in Perſon preſent, and to Worſhip an Image at the ſame rate of Devotion (in their *bowings, proſtrations, reverential looks and touches*) with the ancient Pagans. There is a mixture of Impropriety in the Honours which they do to the Croſs, yet ſuch Propriety, that they ſuppoſe, *Latria is due to the Croſs*, as the Church determineth in her Pontifical; and ſhe conjoineth theſe Prayers and Praiſes (wherein there is ſtrict Propriety) in her Adorations of it. (i) *O Croſs! brighter than all the Stars, famous in the World, exceeding amiable to Men, more holy than all things, which alone haſt been thought worthy to bear the weight of the World. Sweet Wood! bearing the ſweet Nails, and ſweet Burdens, ſave the preſent Company gather'd together this Day to thy Praiſe.*

XI. The Pagano-Chriſtians Images are a Parallel for the ancient Pagan in *the ſuppoſed preſence of their Divi, their inherent Sanctity and Wonder-working Faculties, and various Uſes and Benefits.* For they reſort and make long Pilgrimages to the Images of the Bl. Virgin (erected in her ſacred Chappels) and of other Saints, for the Cure of their Diſeaſes and the Relief of their Neceſſities; to theſe they pay what they have vow'd, and make their Preſents and Oblations; at theſe they make their Prayers and expect miraculous help in their Diſtreſſes (as of old at the Sepulchres of the Martyrs,) and therefore they ſuppoſe them (at leaſt) the Symbolical Preſences of their *Divi*. They carry them into Battel with them, as the Pagans carry'd their Idol-Symbols (for which purpoſe (k) the Images of our Saviour and the Bl. Virgin are highly commended;) they wear Crucifixes and Images of the Bl. Virgin about their Necks (ſome of them (l) when they go to Battel) and *Agnus Dei*'s as their Guardians, Amulets and Defenſatives; (m) the Jeſuits and their Converts ſtile them *Arma Spiritualia, their Spiritual Arms,* and Weapons of Defence againſt the Enemy and imminent Dangers. As the Bodies of the Saints, ſo their Images, are thought Tutelar to their Adorers; for *Theodoret* in the Life of *Simeon Stylita* reporteth, that at *Rome* they erected in the Entrance of all their Shops the Image of that Saint, *ſuppoſing* (which ſurely is truſting in Images) *this a ſafe Cuſtody and Security* to them. That famous Image of our Saviour ſaid to be ſent to *Agbarus* King of *Edeſſa*, which the Emperor (not without much ado) gain'd from the Citizens of *Edeſſa* and tranſlated to *Conſtantinople*, (n) is ſtiled by the Citizens of *Edeſſa, the Guardian of their City and the ſafety of all* (as the Oration of *Conſtantinus Porphyrogenitus* repreſenteth their Senſe;) and to the City of *Conſtantinople* it is ſaid *to impart Sanctification and Strength.* (o) To ſave that City from imminent Danger, the Image of the holy Virgin was ſometime carried about over its Walls. (p) And *Iſaacius Angelus* on the ſame account tranſlated it from a certain Monaſtery unto the Walls of that City. (q) *Wamba* King of *Spain*, when after his Victories he erected new Buildings in the City of *Toledo*, upon the tops of the Towers (agreeably to that of the Prophet, *I have ſet Watchmen upon thy Walls, O Jeruſalem,* Iſa. 62.) He ſet up *the Statues of the Saints* with this Inſcription (which ſpeaketh the preſence of the Saints with their Images, and illuſtrateth Church-Demonolatry)

Vos Domini Sancti, quorum hic præſentia fulget,
Hanc Urbem & Plebem ſolito ſervate favore.
Lord Saints, whoſe preſence adorneth this place,
Keep City and People with wonted grace.

They ſuppoſe a Conjunction between the viſible and inviſible Preſence of their *Divi*; which implieth, that their holy venerable Images are animated,

(g) *C. Raſponi de Baſil. Lateran. l.* 4. *c.* 19.

(h) *Bellarm. ſupr. c.* 23.

(i) *Breviar. Roman. in Feſt. Invent. Sanct. Cruc.*

(k) *Baron. ad an.* 610. *n.* 2.

(l) *Krantz. Saxon. l.* 9. *c.* 10.

(m) *V. Dallæum. de rel. cult. object. l.* 1. *c.* 23, 24.

(n) *Baron. ad an* 944. *n.* 8. 12.

(o) *Idem ad an.* 717. *n.* 3.

(p) *Id. ad an.* 1187. *n.* 22.

(q) *Id. ad an.* 674. *n.* 5.

animated, or as good as animated, agreeably to the Pagan. In miraculous Faculties and Operations and ſalutary Effects (which are thought ſo Authentic, that the Nicene Pſeudo-Synod recounteth the Miracles wrought by Images, for eſtabliſhing their Worſhip) they plainly tranſcend the Pagan, and may vie with the Reliques of the elder times. They have the Faculty of moving the Head, Hand or Foot, of removing themſelves from place to place, and of flying in the Air; the Faculty of ſpeaking, ſinging, laughing, weeping, howling, ſmiling, frowning, bleeding, ſweating, ſweating out Medicinal Oil, foreſhewing future Events; of reſiſting the Fire, ſtopping and repreſſing Scale-fires, of helping Women to eaſie Labour, of profligating Demons (from the places where they are ſet up,) of curing Demoniacks, of guarding Mens Goods (a Faculty for which S. *Nicholas*'s Image deſerveth a remark,) of driving away the Peſtilence (which ſeveral Images are ſaid to have done, when carry'd in Proceſſion) of working all ſorts of Miracles; and not a few of their Images are of great fame, becauſe all ſorts of Diſeaſes are cur'd, and all ſorts of Diſaſters are remov'd by adoring them.

It would be a voluminous buſineſs, to give an Hiſtorical Account of all their miraculous Feats and Faculties; we will content our ſelves with a few inſtances from *Baronius*. (*r*) The Image of Chriſt crucify'd bow'd its Head to S. *Gualbertus*. (*s*) For the ſpace of ſeveral days a flood of Tears iſſued from its Eyes preſaging an imminent Calamity. (*t*) *Joannes Comnenus* by looking on the Image of the Bl. Virgin with Lamentation and rueful Geſtures was arm'd with Celeſtial Proweſs and profligated the *Scythians*. After his Victory in Gratitude to that mighty Conquereſs, her Image in a pompous Chariot was carried in Triumph, as *Trajan* triumph'd in his Statue. (*u*) The abovementioned Image tranſlated from *Edeſſa* to *Conſtantinople* wrought innumerable Miracles on the way (and hath the Name of the Miracle-working Image,) *the Blind receiv'd their ſight, the Lame walk'd, they that had been of long time Bed-rid danc'd; they that had wither'd Hands were made ſound, and all Diſeaſes and Infirmities were profligated.* (*w*) To the Roman Soldiery the Divine Effigies imparted a Divine Proweſs, and gave them Victory over the *Perſians*. (*x*) *Anatolius* going to make Supplication to the Image of the Bl. Virgin, the Image check'd him and drove him away. (*y*) Blood flow'd out from the Image of our Saviour, when it was wounded by a Jew, (*z*) as alſo from the Image of S. *Theodore*, when it was wounded by a Saracen. (*a*) An Image of our crucified Saviour miraculouſly ſpake, and decided a Conteſt between the married Clergy and the Monks. (*b*) An Image of the Mother of God carried in Proceſſion profligated the Plague at *Rome*. (*c*) A Picture of her upon a Board at *Saidaneida* near *Damaſcus* (ſo holy that none dare touch it) is become fleſhy, a moſt fragrant Oil floweth from it continually, which cureth Mankind of their Diſtempers. (*d*) Another Image of her that was hid in a Cypreſs Tree, diſcover'd it ſelf by its own refulgent Light (ſeeming to burn like a Torch,) and a mighty Miracle-working Virtue iſſu'd from its latent Efficacy. If the Wonder-working Virtue aſcrib'd to the holy Images, be adherent only and extrinſecal, they are as good as animated: But the Eccleſiaſtic Legendaries that report theſe Miracles, uſually aſcribe them to an inherent Virtue, (*e*) they ſuppoſe *a Virtue in the Divine Effigies of our Saviour*. Agreeably to which Hypotheſis the Roman Catholicks ſuppoſe themſelves and their Beads ſanctified by touching an holy Image, and they are careful to get thoſe little Images which they buy, touch'd by ſome Image of our Lady. (*f*) *The Greeks in the time of Sickneſs and Mournings for the dead retain, not only ſome Ceremonies by us accounted Superſtitious, but alſo ſavouring ſomewhat of ancient Gentiliſm. If the Head ach or be ill affected, the Prieſt bindeth it with the Veil of the Sacramental Chalice, and adminiſters to the Sick a draught of conſecrated Water, in which is Baſil, or Dittamon, or ſome other odoriferous Herb bleſſed with the touch of a Crucifix, or the touch of our Lady.* The Church of *Rome* conſecrateth Images, Agnus Dei's and Croſſes for the producing ſupernatural and ſalutary Effects, which are expected from them (to be ſalutary Remedies to Mankind againſt the Frauds of the Devil, Storms and Tempeſts, Peſtilence and Corruption of the Air, Fire and Falling Sickneſs, Sin and Adverſity; for the ſtrengthening Faith; proficiency in good Works, redemption of Souls; for Comfort, Protection and ſafe Defence againſt all the cruel Darts of the Enemy, and ſuch more,) and in conſecrating a *new Croſs* ſhe prayeth; *that the Benediction of that Wood on which our Saviour's holy Members were hanged may be in this Wood, that by the Holineſs of that* (which is not diminiſh'd how much ſoever is taken from it) *he would ſanctifie this*, which implieth a Conceit of inherent Sanctity and Virtue in the Wood of the Croſs. Notwithſtanding the Declaration of the Council of *Trent*, (which is utterly inconſiſtent with the Church's Practice, the Hiſtory of Miracle-working Images, and which cannot be meant of Relique-Images,) *that there is no Divinity or Virtue in them, for which they are to be worſhipped; nor is any thing to be ask'd of them, nor any truſt to be put in Images*; yet Pagano-Chriſtendom affordeth a Parallel for the moſt extravagant and ſottiſh Conceits in vulgar Paganiſm. (*g*) For *Polydore Virgil* complaineth of many that worſhipped Images, *not as ſignificative, but as ſentient and perceptive, and put more truſt in them than in Chriſt and the Saints, to which they were dedicated.* And *Æn. Sylvius* telleth of an Image of the Bl. Virgin, *which the People worſhipp'd with wondrous Devotion, as the Giver of Rain and Fair Weather upon occaſion.*

XII. The various Rites of Image-worſhip in degenerate Chriſtendom are an imitation of Paganiſm, and their Images are the Subſtitutes and Succeſſors of the Pagan. For ſo a ſuppoſititious Apoſtolic Canon (publiſh'd by *Turrianus*) ordaineth, (*h*) *that ſuch as are ſaved erre not about Idols, but that inſtead of them they Picture the Human Divine Effigies of the true God (our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt) and of his Servants in Oppoſition to Idols.* (*i*) So the Jeſuits of *China*, when they had perſuaded their Converts, to part with their Pagan-Idols, ſubſtituted inſtead of them their own Images, and ſet them up in their Oratories. The Pontifician Theologers acknowledge, (*k*) that they have tranſlated the Rites of Gentiliſm into their Religion. And the Book *Coſri* rightly ſaith, (*l*) of the Chriſtians (for the Worſhippers of Images would be thought the only Chriſtians, and their Adverſaries muſt be called χριστιανο-κατήγοροι, *the Accuſers of the Chriſtians*,) *they retain the Rites of*

(r) *Ad ann.* 051. *n.* 1.
(s) *Ad ann.* 888. *n.* 11.
(t) *Ad ann.* 1124. *n.* 7
(u) *Ad ann.* 944. *n.* 10.
w) *Ad nn* 599. 50.
x) *Ad ann.* 80. *n.* 3.
y) *Ad ann.* 60 *n.* 4.
z) *Ad ann.* 09. *n.* 10.
) *Ad ann.* 5. *n.* 12.
b) *An. ann.* 90. *n.* 13.
c) *Ad ann.* 70. *n.* 5.
d) *Ad nn.* 446. 16.
(c) *Ad ann.* 944. *n.* 11.
(f) *Rycaut State of the Greek Ch.* p. 292.
(g) *V. Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 9. c. 6.
(h) *Petav. T.* 4. *par.* 2. *l.* 15. c. 14. *S.*6.
(i) *V. Dallæum ſupr. l.* c. 12.
(k) *Baron. ad ann.* 58. *n.* 77.
(l) p. 284.

the old Paganical Worſhip. As the Pagans conſecrated their Images, and their Conſecrations were a Magical conjuring and inchanting: So the Pagano-Chriſtian Church conſecrateth *Images, Croſſes, Agnus Dei's, Churches, Candles, Oil, Salt, Water,* (and other material Elements,) and her Conſecrations muſt be ſtiled a Magical conjuring and inchanting, in the ſame Senſe that her Conſecration of Bells is called the *Baptizing* or *Chriſtening* of them. For as in this Conſecration there is a great reſemblance of Baptizing or Chriſtening: So in her other Conſecrations, which the Church accounteth *a Religious Conjuring or Inchanting*, there is at leaſt, a great reſemblance of Magical conjuring and inchanting, and in all probability (ſeeing the Church is in ſome degree laps'd into Demonolatry in the foul Senſe) there is more than meerly a great reſemblance, ſomething of true and proper Magical Operation. The Conſecrations of her Wonder-working Trinkets are all perform'd after the mode of Magical inchanting; and *the making Greek and Latin Characters in aſhes upon the ground croſs-wiſe, the blowing three times croſs-wiſe over Oil, antick turnings, croſſings, mutterings,* (and ſuch more Ceremonials,) what are they but the proper Rites of Magical conjuring? The conjuring the Devil out of Oil (or other material Element) involveth a principle of the old Magical Philoſophy, *that all material things carry* τὰς ἀπορροίας δαιμονίων ὑλικῶν, *the effluxes of the material Demons.* If their *inchanted* Materials have the Wonder-working Virtue that is aſcrib'd to them, it muſt be by Magical Operation; and the very pretence of raiſing them to prodigious and ſupernatural Effects (to drive away evil Spirits, to cure Diſeaſes, to be a Safeguard both to Soul and Body) without Divine Inſtitution, is a Magical Buſineſs. To Conjure Oil into an aptitude for the reception of the Holy Ghoſt, what is it but a branch of *Theurgy, that adapteth matter for the reception of the Gods?* To make *an holy exorciz'd Salt* for the health both of Soul and Body, and *an holy exorciz'd Oil to purifie both Fleſh and Spirit*, what is this but Symbolizing with the Pagan Theurgiſts, that pretended *by Stones, Herbs and Charms*, to make a Purgation for the Soul? A great Divine of our own faith, (m) *The uſe of holy Water as it ſeems was firſt borrowed from the Heathens, and in Proceſs of time perverted from a Civil to a Magical Ceremony.* Whence it appeareth, that the Pagano-Chriſtian Prieſthood have their Theurgical Conſecrations, and their θεουργικὴ τέχνη, *Theurgic Art*, as well as the Pagan; and if the Pagans mode of driving away Spectres by *Holy Water* and the jangling of Braſs-inſtruments is thought Magical, ſhall not the Pontificians mode of driving away evil Spirits by the ringing of *baptized Bells* be thought of the ſame Character? It is not reaſonable to imagine, that their *horrible Conjurings*, which involve much of Magical Rite, and are horrible Profanations of the Name of God and of the Inſtitutes of the Chriſtian Religion, are tranſacted without the Commerce of unclean Spirits: Nor is it reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that all their *Apparitions, Revelations, Miracles*, are meer Fiction or Juggle; ſome of the miraculous Feats aſcrib'd to Images have probably ſome reality, and muſt be look'd upon as real Effects of their Theurgy. Their Conſecrate Images are ſuppoſed to have real, viſible, ſupernatural Effects, yet theſe muſt be thought devoid of *inherent Virtue*, as the Tridentine Fathers teach: But their conſecrate *Oil, Candles, Aſhes*, which are not ſuppos'd to have any ſuch real, viſible, ſupernatural Effects, theſe muſt be thought replete with inherent Virtue; for into theſe the Church's Conſecration introduceth *the Holy Ghoſt, Grace, Strength, and Bleſſing.* (She prayeth for the infuſion of them.) Which ſheweth, how arbitrariouſly and inconſiſtently they Philoſophize touching their Theurgic Sacra.

But it is not only their Magical Conſecrations which deſerve the Name of *Theurgic Sacra*; Theurgy inſtituted the Pagans Religion and their various Rites of Image-worſhip, which the Pagano-Chriſtians tranſcribe and imitate. For (agreeably to the ancient guiſe of Paganiſm) they erect Altars and place their Images upon them for ſolemn publick Worſhip; they Crown them, Cloath them, Paint and Gild them ſumptuouſly, and conſecrated Lights and Tapers are burning before them, to make them illuſtrious. They make Oblations to them, and carry them in pompous Proceſſion: But in *Lent* cover them and draw a veil before them, as the Pagans at certain times cover'd and conceal'd their Idol-Symbols from the Eyes of the People. The conſecrated Images (conſecrated by *holy Water, holy Incenſe, Croſſings and Benedictions,*) claim from us the Worſhip of *Salutation, Incurvation, Genuflexion, Proſtration, Exoſculation* and *Incenſing*, which was a principal Branch of the Pagans Idol-ſervice; for (as *A. Ezra* noteth on the ſecond Commandment) their Idol-ſervice chiefly conſiſted in *Sacrifice* and *Incenſe.* Their Religioniſts * make their devotional *Salutations* to our Lady as repreſented and preſentiated by her Image, and with the ſame reverential Looks and Geſtures, as if her ſelf was viſibly preſent; and at the ſame rate they make their Prayers, Prayers of as high a ſtrain as any the Pagans ever made to their Idols. For to the abovementioned *Effigies* of our Saviour which was tranſlated to *Conſtantinople* (and there laid up for the Glory of the Faithful, the Guardianſhip of the Emperors, the Defence of the whole City, and of the State of Chriſtians) *Conſtantinus Porphyrogenitus* maketh this following Prayer. (n) *O Divine Similitude of the unchangeable Similitude of the Father! O Character of the Character of the Divine Subſtance! O venerable and all honourable Impreſs of the primary Pulchritude of Chriſt our God (for I talk with thee as with an animate thing) conſerve and keep always him that piouſly and moderately governeth us, and that ſplendidly celebrateth the Memory of thy coming hither. And when thy Benignity hath rais'd him to the Seat of his Fathers, conſerve his Stem, the Succeſſion of his Family, and the perpetuity of their Sceptres: Grant a pacific State to the Republick, that this Queen of Cities may continue impregnable, and that we being acceptable to thy Archetype Chriſt our God may be admitted into his Heavenly Kingdom.* To the *Portugueze* in their Expedition to the Eaſtern Indies the Sign of the Croſs is ſaid to have appear'd in Heaven, whereupon all of them fell down and worſhipp'd, *Albuquercius* (a Man of eximious Piety) lifted up his Hands to it, and with a loud Voice poured out this following Prayer. (o) *O Croſs, the argument of our Redemption, O thou Sign of Chriſtian Victory, O thou that art grac'd with the moſt precious Blood of the Lord Jeſu, O Divine Tree, by whoſe vital Fruit the Fruit of the deadly Plant is repair'd: In thee, in thee,*

(m) Dr. *Jackſon of the Orig. of Unbelief ch. 33. p. 312. in marg. v. Lanſell. Calumn. Caſaubon. diſpunct. c. 6.*

* *Ave Maria, Salve Regina.*

(n) Bar ad an. 544 n. 14.

(o) Maff us Indic. l. 5. p. 220.

thee, I ſay, all our hopes are repoſ'd; thee we profeſs, acknowledge, adore; and humbly beſeech thee, to be a Safeguard to us amongſt ſo many Dangers by Land and Sea. They that ſuppoſe a Croſs a Salvific Figure, and make their Prayers to it as to a Salvific Numen, ſhould not complain of Miſrepreſentation, becauſe they are accus'd of praying to Images: Nor do their Theologers diſallow praying to Images, if they be animated with the Phantaſm of the Prototype. (p) *Chriſtians are not to be reprov'd* (ſaith *Coſterus*,) *that with bended Knees, uncover'd Heads, join'd Hands, adore and pray to Chriſt in his Image, and implore his Mercy, Help and Aid.* So the Pagans in time of Danger betook themſelves to their Devotions, (q) *ut ante ſimulachra projecti victoriam à Diis expoſcerent, that being proſtrate before their Images, they might deſire Victory of the Gods.*

XIII. The Pontifician Divines have nothing to ſay in Defence of Images of God and the Holy Trinity properly ſuch, and but little in Defence of their Image-Worſhip. They pretend not, to depaint the proper likeneſs of God, but only of ſome of his *Appearances* (as that of the ancient of days in *Daniel*) and what is *analogically* or *metaphorically* expreſſive of what he is. Which is as much as to ſay, they make properly no Images or Pictures of him; they ſo depaint him, as properly not to depaint him at all. For ſuppoſe, we depaint an appearance of his in *a bright Cloud*, or *a Globe*, or *Pillar of Fire*, ſuch a Picture cannot juſtly be call'd the Picture of him, but of his *Appearance* (not of an Appearance of what he is in himſelf, but of an exhibited expreſſive Appearance:) Nor is it otherwiſe, if thoſe Apparitions of God be depainted, that are of an Human Form, or approach to an Human Form. For (as the Pontifician Theologers generally affirm) God's appearances in the Old Teſtament *were by Angels*; which implieth, that they were by Angels of a viſible Form; therefore thoſe Appearances ought to be depainted no otherwiſe than as God's Angelical Appearances, nor ought the viſible Form (that is in thoſe Apparitions) to be conſider'd otherwiſe than as the Angels viſible Form, which would tempt no Body but ſuch as the *old Angelici* to adore it. We will ſuppoſe, that the Holy Ghoſt caus'd the viſible appearance of *a Dove* at his deſcent upon our Saviour, as he caus'd the viſible Appearance of fiery cloven Tongues at his deſcent upon the Apoſtles, and as our Saviour caus'd the viſible appearance of *a Lamb* in a Viſion to S. *John*: They that depaint thoſe fiery cloven Tongues, or that viſible form of a Dove, do not make a Picture of a Divine Perſon, but of ſome of his Appearances only, that are *analogically* and *metaphorically* expreſſive of what he is. Speaking *figuratively* and *rhetorically* both a living Lamb and the Picture of it may be call'd the Picture of our Saviour; both a live Dove and the painted Image of it may be ſtil'd the Picture of the Holy Ghoſt: But in propriety of Speech the Picture of a Lamb is the Picture of that Animal and nothing elſe; and the Picture of a Dove (the Picture of that Animal) is no more the Picture of the Holy Ghoſt than that of fiery cloven Tongues. If any Perſon of the Godhead is Human-divine, and appeareth in a viſible Form as his viſible perſonal Form, it is lawful, to depaint him in ſuch a Form: But the lawfulneſs of depainting Apparitions in Scripture inferreth not the lawfulneſs of making an Image or Picture of God or the Holy Ghoſt (that which may be taken for ſuch,) all ſuch Images ſtand condemn'd by a Commandment, that is of eternal Reaſon and Obligation. Yet ſuch Images are known to be of common uſe in the Church of *Rome*, and her Theologers propounding the Queſtion, *Whether Images of God be prohibited?* anſwer negatively, pleading for their ground the Church's practice, (r) which propoſeth her Fanatic Images of the Trinity for Divine Worſhip; which is no leſs a crime than the lapſing the World into the old Egyptian Idolatry of worſhipping *Animal-forms*, for ſuch the Image of a Dove is. In defence of the lawfulneſs of *Image-worſhip*, they plead for themſelves, the Reverence that we do to the holy Goſpels, and the Command given to *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, to put off their Shooes upon holy Ground. To which Allegations the Anſwer is; that as the kindneſs which one hath for the Animals of his Friend, is not his Friendſhip, but is only a concomitant Effect of it, that is much below it: So the Reverence which we do to ſacred Officers and to the ſacred Books (in taking an Oath) is not our Religious Worſhip, but is only a concomitant Effect of it, that is much below it. We owe ſo much Reverence to ſacred things, that we ought to pull off our Gloves in handling them, ſo *Moſes* ought to pull off his Shooes upon holy Ground: But neither the pulling off the Glove nor the Shooe is a mode of doing the Religious Worſhip to things ſacred: Nor do the *Muhammedans* deſign to do the Religious Worſhip to their *Alcoran* (which they dare not touch with unwaſhen Hands,) as the Pagano-Chriſtians do to their Images.

It appeareth, that the Image-religioniſts of degenerate Chriſtendom have but ſlender Pleas for their Image-worſhip: But the Heatheniſm of their Creature-worſhip in the ſeveral Branches of it is palpable and notorious, and their groſs Superſtition and Idolatry is condemnable upon the ſame grounds with ancient Paganiſm. *Eutychius* giveth this account of the Origin of the Church *Cæſarea* at *Alexandria*. (s) *A Temple was built by* Cleopatra, *and a great Braſs Idol was worſhipped there by the Name of* Michael, *and on the twelfth day of the Month* Athyr *the Alexandrians and Egyptians celebrated a grand Feaſt unto this Idol, ſacrificing to him many Sacrifices. But ſo ſoon as* Alexander *was made Patriarch there, (making uſe of his Politicks, to get that Idol broken and thoſe Sacrifices aboliſh'd,) he told the People, that the Idol was good for nothing; but if they would celebrate that Feaſt to* Michael *the Archangel, and offer thoſe Sacrifices to him, he would intercede with God for them, and would be the cauſe of greater good to them than the Idol would ever be. Having gain'd their conſent he brake the Idol, and made a Croſs of it*, and nam'd the *Temple the Church of* Michael (*which is the Church* Cæſarea) *and the Feaſt and the Sacrifices became* Michael *the Angel's. As yet the Coptites in Mitzar* (Grand Cair or the Egyptian Babylon) *and in Alexandria celebrate a Feaſt on that day to* Michael *the Angel, and Sacrifice thereon very many Sacrifices.* The Pagano-Chriſtians Saint-worſhip and Angel-worſhip ſtandeth upon the ſame ground with the Pagan *Demonolatry* and *Aſtrolatry*, inſomuch that the Jeſuit *Tannerus* ſaith, (t) *If the Heavens or the Stars were endow'd with a rational or intelligent Soul, and were in Grace, they might be worſhipped by us by ſome ſacred or religious*

(p) V. Le-Blanc Theſ. p. 339.

(q) Cæſar. de bello civ. l. 2.

(r) Vaſq. in 3. Th. Diſp. 103. c. 3.

(s) Selden. de Synedr. l. 3 c. 15. §. 8.

(t) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 30.

gious Worſhip, ſuch as is agreeable unto Saints. In Relique Worſhip the Ancient Pagan is younger Brother to the Pagano-Chriſtian, his Superſtition is by much paramount to Ancient Paganiſm, and Modern Judaiſm alſo, which yet proceedeth a great way in idolizing the Reliques of Saints and Prophets; for *R. Benjamin* reporteth, (u) *That the River* Tigris *divideth the City* Shuſan *into two parts; that on one ſide the River, where the* Jews *dwell, all the Inhabitants were rich, and on the other ſide all were poor. Becauſe the Riches and Splendor of the former was ſuppoſ'd to proceed from hence, the Prophet* Daniel *lay buried amongſt them, therefore thoſe on the other ſide the River, who were poor, deſir'd that he might be buried in the midſt between them; but this the other Party would by no means yield to; at length the Buſineſs came to blows, and the Parties fought it out till they were weary, and then they made an Agreement upon this Condition; The Prophet* Daniel's *Coffin ſhould change place by turns, thoſe on the one ſide the River ſhould have it one Year, and thoſe on the other ſide ſhould have it another.*

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Of the Acroamatical Theology and the Deities thereof.* 2. *Of the Triplaſian Mithras.* 3. *Of the* Zoroaſtrian *and* Platonic *Triad.* 4. *Of the Inventor of T'Agathon or the Firſt Henad.* 5. *Of T'Agathon or the Firſt Henad as he is the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Firſt Nature.* 6. *Of the* Platonic *Henades.* 7. *Of the* Platonic *Noes.* 8. *Of the Ideas of the firſt* Platonic *Intellect, that they are not meer Notionalities.* 9. *Of the arbitrarious Partiality of Chriſtian* Platoniſts. 10. *Of the* Proclo-Platonic *diſtribution of Gods.* 11. *Of the Genial kind of Deities.* 12. *Of the Schoolmens Hierarchies of Angels.*

I. THE *Acroamatical* Theology by its *unpopular* Nature diſtinguiſheth it ſelf from the *Exoterical*; and ſo far as it is diſtinguiſh'd from the *Exoterical*, we are now to conſider the Deities thereof. The only *Acroamatical* Theology whoſe Deities we are concern'd to conſider, is that of Platoniſm; for although ſeveral Learned Nations of the Pagans had their *Acroamatical* as well as their *Exoterical* Theology, and other Sects and Schools of Philoſophers (ſuch as the Peripateticks and Stoicks) had their *Acroamatical* Theology as well as the *Platoniſts*; yet becauſe the *Acroamatical* Theology of thoſe other Sects and Schools of Philoſophers is nothing like a Syſtem of *Acroamatical* Theology, and becauſe the *Acroamatical* Theology of thoſe Learned Pagan Nations is coincident with *Platoniſm*, which is call'd by *Pletho* (w) *the Theology that is according to* Zoroaſter *and* Plato; therefore we will confine our Conſideration to the Deities of the *Platonic* Theology with ſome Intermixtures of the *Chaldaic*. To repreſent an Account of the Deities of this ſort of Theology (which becauſe of its Antiquity, ample diſpread and great Fame is in a ſenſe of Eminence the Acroamatical Theology) we will take our riſe from a *Platonic* Deſcription of *the Mundane City* or *Polity Imperial.* (x) *How is it juſtifiable, to criminate ſuch a City, which giveth to every one his deſert, wherein Virtue is rewarded with Honour, and Naughtineſs with convenient Shame? wherein not only the Statues of the Gods are, but the Gods themſelves inſpecting from on high, who will eaſily be diſcharg'd of any Crimination from Men, conducting all things orderly from the beginning to the end, and diſtributing to every one what is agreeable, and conſequent to what was antecedent according to the viciſſitude of Lives; to be ignorant of ſuch a Diſtribution, is to be rudely unskilful in Divine Matters; but it is requiſite, you ſhould endeavour your ſelf, to be as good as may be, not only believing, that you may be ſo good, but that there are other very good Men, and that the Demons are good alſo; much more the Gods, who being in this viſible ſenſible World are eying the intelligible; but moſt of all the Regent of the Univerſe, the moſt bleſſed Soul; and thence further to praiſe and celebrate the intelligible Gods* (the Ideal Deities:) *and yet above all the great King there, whoſe greatneſs is chiefly ſhew'd in a multitude of Gods.* The *Platoniſts* Notion of the Conſtitution of the Univerſe (as appeareth from this account of the Mundane Syſtem) is the ſame with the Popular Pagans; for they ſuppoſe it *a City of Gods and Men.* And their Inſtitution not only retaineth all the Deities of the Popular Pagans, but agreeably to their Polytheiſtic Genius and Principle (that it belongeth to the Magnificence of the firſt God, to have many Gods dependent upon him) they vaſtly inhance the Pagan Theiſm, and ſuperadd to the Deities of the *Exoterical* Theology theſe three things. A *Zoroaſtrial Triad* of Archical Hypoſtaſes, three Kings and three Gods of the Theopolity (each of which is called *Zeus* or *Jove*) of which Archical Hypoſtaſes but one belongeth to the *Exoterical* Theology. *A Syſtem of Myſtical Natures*, which the Exoterical Theology hath no acquaintance with. *Various Families and Diſtributions of Genial kind of Deities*, that are in part not *Exoterical* but *Acroamatical.*

II. The principal thing that recommendeth the Acroamatical Theology is the *Zoroaſtrian* (or *Platonic*) *Triad*, which many Learned Men have thought *a Divine Cabala* and the ſame with the Trinity of the Chriſtian Religion. For (although there is no certainty touching the Name of the ſecond Hypoſtaſis in the *Perſian* Theology) there is great reaſon to think, that there was a Triad of Archical Hypoſtaſes or Principles in the Ancient *Perſian* Theology. For the *Platoniſts* had their Triad by Arcane Tradition (from the Magi) and accordingly it is call'd by

---

(u) *Itinerar. p.* 86, 87.

(w) Θεολογία ἡ κτ̓ Ζωροάστρην καὶ Πλάτωνα. *Pletho apud Leo. Allat. demenſur. temp. c.* 11. *p.* 133.

(x) Πῶς ἂν ὀρθῶς ἔχει, μέμφεσθαι πόλιν διδοῦσαν ἑκάστῳ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἧ καὶ ἀρετὴ τετίμηται καὶ κακία τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀτιμίαν ἔχει; καὶ θεῶν οὐ μόνον ἀγάλματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄνωθεν ἐφορῶντες, οἳ ῥηϊδίως αἰτίας φησὶν ἀποφεύξονται πρὸς ἀνθρώπων, πάντα ἄγοντες τάξει ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος, μοῖραν ἑκάστῳ τὴν προσήκουσαν διδόντες κατ' ἀμοιβὰς βίων τοῖς προϋπηργμένοις ἀκόλουθον· ἣν ὁ ἀγνοῶν προπετέστερος ἀνθρώπων, περὶ πραγμάτων θείων ἀγροικιζόμενος· ἀλλὰ χρὴ ὡς ἄριστον μὲν αὐτὸν πειρᾶσθαι γίνεσθαι· μὴ μόνον δὲ αὐτὸν νομίζειν ἄριστον δύνασθαι γένεσθαι· οὔπω γὰρ οὔπω ἄριστος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἄλλους ἀρίστους. ἔτι καὶ δαίμονας ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι· πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον θεοὺς τούς τε ἐν τῷδε ὄντας, κἀκεῖ βλέποντας, πάντων δὲ μάλιστα τὸν ἡγεμόνα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ψυχὴν μακαριωτάτην. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἤδη καὶ τοὺς νοητοὺς ὑμνεῖν θεούς. ἐφ' ἅπασι δὲ ἤδη τὸν μέγαν τὸν ἐκεῖ βασιλέα, καὶ ἐν τῷ πλήθει μάλιστα τῶν θεῶν τὸ μέγα αὐτοῦ ἐνδεικνυμένους. *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 9. *contr. Gnoſticos.*

Proclus ἡ τῶν τριῶν θεῶν παράδοσις, *the Tradition of the three Gods*. *Porphyry* reporteth, (y) that the *Perſians* were of Opinion, δύο νόας πρὸ ψυχῆς εἶναι, *that there are two Minds before Soul*; and *Proclus* hath cited this Magick or Chaldaic Oracle.

> ———Μετὰ δὲ πατρικὰς Διανοίας
> ψυχὴ ἐγὼ ναίω. *After* (or next below)
> *the paternal Mind I* Pſyche *dwell*.

But although there is great reaſon to think, that there was in the Ancient *Perſian* and *Chaldean* Theology a Triad of Archical Hypoſtaſes, yet there is no reaſon to think, that this Triad was meant by the *Perſians Triplicate or Triplaſian Mithras*, which in all probability was nothing better than an *Aſtrological-Magical* Buſineſs, (z) ſuch as *Hecate triplex Dea* (a threefold or triplicate Deity) undoubtedly is. *Hecate* is no ſtranger in the *Zoroaſtrian* Theology, nor to the *Perſian Mithras*; the triplicate *Hecate* is conjoyn'd with *Mithras* in this Inſcription upon an Altar recorded by *Baronius* (a).

GRATIANO IV. ET MEROBAVDE CONSVLIBVS DEDICAVIT
ANTIQVA GENEROSE DOMO CVI REGIA VESTÆ
PONTIFICI FELIX SACRATO MILITAT IGNE
IDEM AVGVR TRIPLICIS CVLTOR VENERANDE DIANE
PERSIDIQ. MITHRE ANTISTES BABILONIE TEMPLI
TAVRIBOLIQ. SIMVL MAGNI DVX MISTICE SACRI.

As *Hecate* (call'd *Diana* in this Inſcription) is the Moon in conjunction with her * preſidentiary Spirit or God, the Moon not ſimply, but transform'd into the great *Witch* of the Univerſe and the *Witch-Goddeſs*; ſo the threefold *Mithras* agreeably to the *threefold Hecate* is moſt probably to be underſtood of that *Mithras* the Sun in conjunction with his preſidentiary Spirit, the Sun not ſimply, but transform'd into the great *Wizzard* of the World and *Wizzard-God*. And this is the more likely, becauſe the *Magi celebrated a ſolemn Feſtival in honour of the threefold Mithras*, (b) as the counterfeit *Dionyſius* reporteth. For it is not probable, that the Arcane Cabala of a Trinity quite remote from the publick Theology and conceal'd from the People ſhould be the matter and occaſion of a Solemn Religious Feſtival: Nor is this Philoſophic-Pagan Triad a Buſineſs of Popular Religion, but of Philoſophy only; which is an Argument, that the threefold *Mithras* honour'd with the celebration of a Solemn Feſtival is to be underſtood of the Sun. (c) *Kircher* is one of thoſe Theologers that at a great rate Philoſophic-paganize the matters of the Chriſtian Theology, yet he maketh a rational conjecture touching one of the Idols in *Japan* with *three Heads* (Images with three Heads and one Body are uſual amongſt the *Eaſtern* Idolaters) that it is to be underſtood of the Sun. And the words of *Volaterranus* touching the *Seres* are manifeſtly to be underſtood of the Sun. *As they riſe from Bed, ad orientem ſe ſolem convertunt, Trini Dei opem implorantes, they turn themſelves to the Sun, imploring the help of the Trine God.* From *Macrobius* (d) it appeareth, that the Sun was repreſented with three Heads in the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphicks. (e) And *Cerberus*'s three Heads ſignifie the three Regions of the Sun. (f) There are ſeveral other Ternaries alſo remarkable in the Sun.

The counterfeit *Dionyſius* and his Scholiaſts ſuppoſe, that the *Triplaſian* or *Threefold Mithras* is the Sun, and that he is ſo denominated from the Miracle wrought in the Days of *Hezekiah*, when the Day was increas'd, and almoſt triplicated: But this Conceit is a Foolery; whence ſome infer, that *by the Triplaſian Mithras* muſt be meant the *Perſian Trinity*, becauſe this Conceit is a Foolery. But they that make this Inference are guilty of ſomewhat worſe than a Foolery. (g) *For* Pletho (*in* conſort with others) *affirmeth, that the third Hypoſtaſis of the Perſian Trinity was that which they call'd* Arimanius, *he gathering as much from* Plutarch *himſelf. He obſerveth alſo, how great an Agreement there was between the* Zoroaſtrian *and the* Platonic Trinity, *they differing in a manner only in words*. It is much, that any Chriſtian Divines ſhould proceed to this pitch of Extravagance in their humour of Philoſophic Paganizing the Matters of Chriſtian Theology. But they ſuppoſing the *Zoroaſtrian* or *Platonic Triad* a divine *Cabala* coincident with the holy Trinity of the Scripture-Theology (as it muſt be if it was deriv'd from the *Hebrews*) infer from this Hypotheſis, *that the Holy Ghoſt and the* Perſian *Arimanius* (ὁ πονηρὸς δαίμων Περσῶν, *the evil Demon of the* Perſians) are one and the ſame Hypoſtaſis; confounding (h) *the delirous Imaginations of the Magi with the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, that is, Hell with Heaven.*

III. The matter will not be much amended by confounding and identifying the Chriſtian Trinity with this Philoſophic Pagan Trinity, as it is repreſented by the *Platoniſts* without any conſiderable difference in their Accounts of it. For in their Trinity the third Archical Hypoſtaſis is *the Soul of the World*, which implieth, that the World is the *third God*. The World being their third God (not primarily, but ſecondarily and by conſequence upon the account of its Soul) *Numenius* in *Proclus* (i) thus repreſenteth the *Platonic* Triad of Gods. *He calleth the firſt God the Father, the ſecond the Opificer, the Work* (or the World) *the third*. *Harpocration* in like manner, (k) *calleth the firſt God* Uranus *and* Chronus, *the ſecond* Jupiter *and* Zeus, *the third* Heaven *and the* World. So *Plotinus* ſaith; *The World, as is uſually ſaid, is the third God.*

According to *Parmenides* the Triad of Archical Hypoſtaſes is thus denominated and diſtinguiſh'd; (l) τὸ πρῶτον ἕν, *the firſt Hen*; ἓν πολλά, *one many*; ἓν καὶ πολλά, *one and many*. From the firſt Hen all Beings are ſuppos'd to derive *their Unity or Oneneſs*. (m) *Whatever is one, is one by participation of the firſt Unity, which is one it ſelf*, and is more large and general than *Ens* it ſelf, *Mind* it ſelf (the Hypoſtaſis which is no higher than ſo) *the Henad ſuperiour to and exempt from the whole comprehenſion of Beings*. This firſt *Hen* is of abſolute Simplicity, devoid of all Forms, Species, or Ideas; but the ſecond *Hen* is: *omniform*; (n) *therefore this one Nature is all Beings* (the Beings themſelves) *that which is Truth, and a certain great God, or rather not any one God, but every*

(y) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 297. *Intellect. Syſt. p.* 289.

(z) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 192, &c.

(a) *Ad ann.* 377. *n.* 1.

* *Signorum præſtites Dii Macrob. Saturn. l.* 1. *c.* 23.

(b) *Selden. de D. Syr. proleg. c.* 3.

(c) *Hoffman. umbr. in Luc. p.* 97, 98.

(d) *Saturn. l.* 1. *c.* 20.

(e) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 11.

(f) *V. Dictionar. Hiſtoric. Geographic. Poetic. p.* 112. *ed. Ann.* 1670.

(g) *Intell. Syſt. p.* 289, &c.

(h) *Magorum deliria cum dogmatis Chriſtianis, quod idem eſt ac ſi cœlo Tartara.* Pocock. Spec. p. 149.

(i) Πατέρα μὲν καλεῖ τὸν πρῶτον, ποιητὴν δὲ τὸν δεύτερον, ποίημα δὲ τὸν τρίτον. *In Tim. p.* 93.

(k) Ἀποκαλεῖ τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κρόνον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον Δία καὶ Ζῆνα, τὸν δὲ τρίτον οὐρανὸν καὶ κόσμον. *Ibid.* Ὁ κόσμος θεὸς, ὥσπερ σύνηθες λέγειν, τρίτος. *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 5. *c.* 6.

(l) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(m) Πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον ἓν μεθέξει τοῦ ἑνὸς γίνεται ἕν. ἑνὰς πρὸ τῶν ὄντων. *Procl. Inſtit. Theol. c.* 3. *Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 3. & *p.* 85, 86.

(n) Μία τοίνυν φύσις αὕτη τὰ ὄντα πάντα, ἡ ἀλήθεια, ἡ δὲ θεός τις μέγας· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ τις, ἀλλὰ πᾶς. *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 3.

very God, the Comprehenſion of all the Pagan Deities. The *third Hen* (the intellectual Soul) is alſo *omniform*, and is denominated *one and many*, to ſignifie, that it is further remov'd from Simplicity than the Second.

Uſually the *Platoniſts* call this Triad of Hypoſtaſes *three Kings* (as *Plato* and *Amelius* ſtile them) as well as *three Gods*; they ſuppoſing (o) *an intellectual Kingdom amongſt Beings* (the *Platonic* Univerſe of Beings maketh one Imperial Polity) and attributing βασιλείαν τῶν ὄντων, *the Kingdom of all Beings* to the firſt Hypoſtaſis, the Kingdom of Ideas (the Kingdom of that which is Truth) and *the Divine Conſtitution of Gods* to the Second, and *the Kingdom of the Univerſe that is made* to the third; which ſpeaketh that Hypoſtaſis hugely diſſonant from the Chriſtians Holy Ghoſt.

Numenius call'd theſe three Hypoſtaſes (p) πάππον, ἔγγονον, ἀπόγονον, *the Grandfather, the Son, and the Nephew*. *Plotinus* in like manner calleth the Second *the Father of the Third*, and the Firſt *the Grandfather of the Third*. Their relation and dependance he thus expreſſeth; (q) Plato *calleth T'Agathon the Father, and that which is above Intellect and above Eſſence. He often calleth Ens and the Intellect The Idea: His Notion is, that Intellect is from T'Agathon, and Pſyche from Intellect.* (r) *This Nature* (Intellect) *is a God, the ſecond God, that ſheweth himſelf before the beholding that other* (T'Agathon) *who ſitteth aloft, and is ſeated upon the ſecond Deity as his fair Seat or Baſis, that is dependent on him.* Their gradual ſubordination and dependance is moſt clearly thus expreſſed; (s) *The Eſſence or Nature of Soul is above all Bodies, and the Intellectual Nature is above all Souls, and One it ſelf is above all Intellectual Hypoſtaſes.*

The firſt Hypoſtaſis is καθ' οὐσίαν or eſſentially *T'Agathon:* (t) The ſecond is call'd ἀγαθοειδὴς *Boniform*, to ſignifie, that it hath *the ſimilitude and form of* (T'Agathon) *the ſuper-eſſential Good*, and participateth thereof; and the third is denominated νοειδὴς, *Menti-form*, and is ſaid to participate both of *Intellect* and *T'Agathon*. *T'Agathon* is of a twofold Conſideration and hath two Names; for it is conſider'd as the procreant cauſe of all Beings, whence they proceed as Multitude from Unity; and accordingly it is denominated *Ipſum unum, one it ſelf.* It is conſider'd alſo as the Object of Deſire, towards which all Beings naturally turn themſelves, and accordingly it is denominated *Ipſum Bonum, Good it ſelf.* (u) *For if all Beings have an Appetite after Good, it is manifeſt, that the firſt Good is before all Beings* (as alſo becauſe the firſt muſt be the beſt.) The ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis is likewiſe of a twofold Conſideration; for it may be conſider'd in general as Νοῦς or Intellect only, and in ſuch ſenſe it is *Exoterical* and known to all Mankind; but conſider'd as the Platonic-kind of Νοῦς or Intellect, it is *Arcane-Philoſophic*.

The third Archical Hypoſtaſis (the Intellectual Soul) is alſo of a twofold Conſideration; for the *Platoniſts* (particularly *Plotinus*) conſider it (w) as *Intellectual*, and as *Vital* or Vivificative to the World; and therefore it is denominated both ψυχὴ ὑπερκόσμιος, *the Super-mundane Soul, and* ψυχὴ ἐγκόσμιος, *the Inmundane Soul*, or the informing Soul of the World; which *Inmundane* and *Super-mundane Soul* ought not (according to the true method of Philoſophizing) to be repreſented as two *Specifically* or *Numerically* diſtinct Souls, (x) as a Learned Writer repreſenteth them, ſuppoſing this to be the Senſe of *Plotinus*; but as partial Conſiderations of one and the ſame Soul. For *Plotinus* maketh the Soul of the World *twofold* in no other Senſe than he maketh the Soul of the *Sun* and *Stars* twofold; nor otherwiſe than as ſome make a twofold *Humane Soul*, whoſe intellectual part is in ſome ſort ſeparate from the Body. Of which *ſeparate* or *intellectual* Soul of the World *Plotinus* ſaith, *If it be reckon'd with the World, the World is a God:* Τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν, δαίμων φησὶ μέγας· καὶ τὰ πάθη τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ δαιμόνια, *but the reſt* (of the Mundane Soul) *is called by* Plato *a great Demon, and the Paſſions that are in it are Demonial.* This great Demon (ſo called by *Plato*) is manifeſtly of affinity with the *Perſian Arimanius*; for (y) *Plutarch*'s Notion of the *Perſian Arimanius* is coincident with this partial inadequate Notion of the third Hypoſtaſis of the *Zoroaſtrian* or *Platonic* Triad.

The Platonic Triad is coincident with (z) the Orphic Triad of Archical Deities *Phanes, Uranus* and *Chronus*; which inferreth, that the Egyptians had ſuch a Triad in their *Acroamatical* Theology; for *Orpheus* deriv'd his Theology from *Egypt*. But in the account that is given us of the Egyptians Triad there is a difficulty touching their remarkable Deity *Kneph*, (a) who is thought to be the ſame with the Orphic *Chronus* (becauſe an Egg is attributed to both) and is repreſented by *Jamblichus* as an *Acroamatical* Deity. Whereas the famous Egyptian *Kneph* was certainly an *Exoterical* and Popular Pagan Deity, (b) being the Deity of the People of *Thebais*, their ſupreme Deity, the Deity of their Religion, worſhipp'd in a Statue of Human Form, of a Sky-colour'd Complexion, ſomewhat blackiſh, holding in his Hand a Girdle and a Scepter, and having upon his Head a kingly Plume (καὶ ὅτι βασιλεὺς, καὶ νοερῶς κινεῖται, *in token that he is a King and moveth intellectually*) thruſting *an Egg* out of his Mouth, which ſignifieth the World, of which he was ſuppos'd to be the Demiurgus. There is a neceſſity therefore of diſtinguiſhing in the Egyptian Theology an Acroamatical from the Exoterical *Kneph*, for ſeveral Deities were called by that Name. The Philoſophic Pagans alſo made ſeveral of their Deities *the Demiurgus*; and therefore it is not ſafe to affirm, that *Kneph* is the ſame with the Orphic *Chronus* (who ſeemeth to be an Acroamatical Deity,) becauſe an Egg is attributed to both. But ſuppoſing, that there was in the Egyptian Theology an Acroamatical as well as an Exoterical *Kneph*, and that Ptha (a Deity ſaid to be generated by Kneph) ſignified in their Acroamatical Theology a different Deity from what it ſignified in their Exoterical, admitting theſe reaſonable Suppoſitions, the Egyptian Triad may reaſonably be thought to have conſiſted of theſe three Archical Hypoſtaſes: *Kneph* (the intelligible World, as ſome have interpreted this Deity,) *Ptha, Vulcan* the immediate Artificer the mundane Soul,) τὸ ἓν ἀμερὲς, *the impartible Unite*, which the Egyptian *Hermes* is ſaid to have ſet before thoſe other Deities.

IV. But

(o) Τὴν νοερὰν βασιλείαν ἐν τοῖς οὖσι. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 2. c. 4. l. 3. c. 7.*

(p) *Procl. in Tim. p. 93.*

(q) Πατέρα φησὶ Τ'ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐπέκεινα νοῦ, καὶ ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας. Πολλαχοῦ δὲ τὸ ὂν καὶ τὸν νοῦν τὴν ἰδέαν λέγει· ὥστε Πλάτωνα εἰδέναι ἐκ μὲν Τ'ἀγαθοῦ τὸν νοῦν, τὴν ἰδέαν· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ τὴν ψυχήν. *Enn. 5. l. 1. c. 8.*

(r) Καὶ θεὸς αὕτη ἡ φύσις, καὶ θεὸς δεύτερος προφαίνων ἑαυτὸν πρὶν ὁρᾷν ἐκεῖνον· ὁ δὲ ὑπερκάθηται καὶ ὑπερίδρυται ἐπὶ καλῆς οὕτως οἷον κρηπῖδος, ἣ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐξήρτηται. *Ibid. l. 5. c. 3.*

(s) Πάντων σωμάτων ἐπέκεινά ἐστιν ἡ ψυχῆς οὐσία, καὶ πασῶν ψυχῶν ἐπέκεινα ἡ νοερὰ φύσις, καὶ πασῶν τῶν νοερῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐπέκεινα τὸ ἕν. *Procl. Inſt. Th. c. 20.*

(t) *Procl. Th. Plat. l. 1. c. 12. & l. 3. p. 95.*

(u) Εἰ γὰρ πάντα τὰ ὄντα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐφίεται, δῆλον ὅτι τὸ πρώτως ἀγαθὸν ἐπέκεινά ἐστι τῶν ὄντων. *Id. Inſt. Theol. c. 8.*

(w) *V. Plotin. En. 2. l. 3. c. 9. & 18. Ficin. Com. p. 288.*

(x) *Intellect. Syſt. p. 562, 576.*

(y) *Pſychogon. p. 1014.*

(z) *Procl. in Tim. p. 93.*

(a) *Jambl. de Myſt. p. 158. Gale not. p. 301.*

(b) *Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 2, 5. l. 9. c. 11. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 3. c. 11.*

IV. But the *Egyptian Hermes* ſeemeth not to have been the Inventor of *Hen* or *T'Agathon*, but rather the *Perſian Zoroaſter*: For the *Perſian Oromaſdes* (to whoſe Party and Preſidency the things and Powers of the Univerſe that are of luminous Quality do belong) the *Zoroaſtrian* Fable ſay; (c) *he made ſix Gods, of Benevolence, Truth, Equity, Wiſdom, Riches, and the Opificer of the Pleaſure that followeth honeſt things. After this he augmented himſelf thrice, and remov'd himſelf as far from the Sun, as the Sun is from the Earth, and furniſh'd the Heavens with Stars. One Star above the reſt, the Dog-Star, he conſtituted as a Curator of the reſt. He alſo made four and twenty other Gods and put them into an Egg.* How much ſoever of Non-ſenſe and Impiety there is in this *Zoroaſtrian* mode of Theologizing, it is manifeſt, that *Oromaſdes* (according to the Perſians) is a Deity ſuperiour to the Sun, and the ſame with that *Mithras*, of whom *Eubulus* ſaith, τὸν κόσμον ἐδημιούργησε, *he was the Demiurgus of the World.* A learned Man addeth; (d) *that* Oromaſdes *is God properly as the Fountain of Light, and the Original of all Good, and the ſame with* Plato's *T'Agathon or firſt Good.* But this Notion of *Oromaſdes* from *Pletho* is plainly a miſtake, that confoundeth diſtinct Principles or Deities in the Perſian Theology. For the ancient Magi before the times of *Zoroaſter* or *Zaraduſht* acknowledg'd two Principles of things, *Light* and *Darkneſs*, *Oromaſdes* and *Arimanius*. (e) *Zoroaſter* was a Reformer of their Theology (not the Founder) and is ſaid, to have made this change in their Profeſſion; *whereas the Magi before his time held, that Light and Darkneſs* (Oromaſdes *and* Arimanius) *were the firſt Principles of things, he taught, that God was Senior to both and the Maker of them.* The accounts which are given us of the Tenents of the Magi by *Plutarch* and *Theodorus* in *Photius*, agree with this account of the Arabic Writers touching *Zoroaſter*. For *Oromaſdes* in *Plutarch* is ſaid, to have had his Origin from the pureſt Light and *Arimanius* from Darkneſs, * as if neither of them was Self-originate. And in *Theodorus*'s account both *Ormiſdas* and *Satanas* (which is the Name that he giveth to the Perſian *Arimanius*) are ſaid to be begotten by *Zaruam*, (f) whoſe Name is thought to be derived from the Arabic *Zarahou*, which ſignifieth *omnium Satorem, the Sower or Father of all things.* Such Etymological Gueſſes are too lubricous to build any thing upon: But the Relation of the Arabic Writers touching *Zoroaſter* and his reform'd Theology is a fair account of the Origin of the Platonic *Hen* or *T'Agathon*. For if *Zoroaſter* introduc'd into the Theology of the *Magi* a Principle ſuperiour to *Oromaſdes* and *Arimanius* (the former of which is the Demiurgus,) what could that be but *T'Agathon* or the *Monad*? And this is the more probable, becauſe the Chalday Oracles upbraid all Mankind with Ignorance of the firſt God. There is alſo ſomething expreſſive of the *Monad* in *Zoroaſter*'s Aſſertion touching the firſt Principle or God, as the Arabic Writers report it, (g) *that he is one and ſolitary without any Aſſociate.* But that which *Plutarch* reporteth of *Zaratas Pythagoras*'s Maſter, is much more conſiderable, (h) *Zaratas Pythagoras*'s *Maſter called the Dyad the Mother of Number, and the Monad the Father.* Whence it is manifeſt, that the Pythagoric Number-kind of Theologizing, making a *Monad* the Principle or Father of all things, is originally *Perſian* or *Chaldean*, and therefore *Zoroaſtrian*.

Moreover, they that conſider *Zoroaſter*'s Character, cannot doubt of the *fiery Nature* of his Theology. For the *Perſians* did not only Worſhip two Gods, the one good, the other bad, (i) as S. *Auſtin* miſtaketh; they were the Worſhippers of many Gods, but of *Fire* in chief, invoking it firſt in every Sacrifice, as the *Romans* did *Janus*, (k) not daring to pollute ordinary Fire. The *Perſees* at this Day diſpers'd in *India* Worſhip Fire in chief, and ſuffer it not to be extinguiſh'd, believing its Nature moſt Divine, and like to God's Nature; and ſome ſay, they Worſhip Fire as a part of God. The *Magi* in general are remarkable for their *unextinguiſhable Fire* and their *Pyratheia*; *Magus* and a *Fire-worſhipper* are words of the ſame importance amongſt the *Perſians* and *Arabians*; Prayers, Sonnets and myſterious Rites in Honour of the *Fire* were the main of their Religion. *Zoroaſter* is peculiarly remarkable for his Name זרדוסת *Zarduſt*, which ſignifieth *a Friend of the Fire*; his Story is full of Fire, and he is thought by ſome the Diſciple of the Prophet *Elias* (upon no other account ſurely, but) becauſe he was a Man of Fire. (l) *Zoroaſter* being ſuch a Fire Theologer, it is more than probable, that he Theologiz'd (in his Myſtic-Philoſophic-Theurgical Theology) in ſome ſuch fiery way, as the Chalday Oracles repreſent, whoſe ſound is Fire, which by Fire ſignifie the Divine Nature (as *Pletho* ſaith,) which deſcribe the appearances of the Gods as certain Fire-appearances, and derive all things from one Fire, —— εἰσὶ πάντα πυρὸς ἑνὸς ἐκγεγαῶτα, *all things are the Off-ſpring of one Fire.* And being ſo great a Reformer of the Doctrine of the Magi, that common fame ſpeaketh him the Author of their Theology and Religion, it is reaſonable, to think him the Author and Introducer of that firſt and higheſt Principle of the Philoſophic Fire-Theology called τὸ ἓν *the Henotety.* We will conſider further, that the Philoſophic Pagans do not (as our Chriſtian Platoniſts) Parallel the God of *Iſrael* with their *Monad* or *T'Agathon*, but with that ſecondary inferiour God of theirs, *the Demiurgus*, as one of them (*Julian*) hath diſcours'd. (m) *If it is the next Opificer of the World, whom the Hebrews Worſhip* (ſaith he), *we have better Opinions of him than they.* Whence his Adverſary S. *Cyril* inferreth, (n) *Julian therefore degradeth the next Opificer of the World into the ſecondary Rank and Nature from the firſt God. For they ſet before him* T'Agathon, *which they ſay is immote and ſtirreth not; and having remov'd from him all care of us, they excogitate a ſecond God, whom they call next and attent to the things that are made.* The Philoſophic Pagans have rightly judg'd, that the God of *Iſrael* is of no Affinity with their T'Agathon (if he is as idle (o) as an Epicurean Deity, and hath as little Right or Title to Religious Service:) Nor is there any Principle in the Theology of the Hebrews, which reſembleth that Philoſophic-pagan Principle. Therefore a learned Preacher pointeth to its true Original, when he ſaith; (p) *The Philoſophers diſliking the vulgar Superſtition, went to School, ſaith* Clem. *to the Perſian Magi, and of* them learn'd a more *Scholaſtic Atheiſm*. The Alexandrian *Clemens* (contrary to his ſtrain of Diſcourſe elſewhere) ſometimes reputeth this Philoſophic-pagan Theiſm no better than Atheiſm. *The Philoſophers* (ſaith he) *confeſs that the Perſians, or Sarmatians, or the Magi were their Maſters,* (q) *of whom thy learned the Atheiſm of their venerable Principles, not knowing the Prince, the Maker of all, and the Maker of all their Principles, the Self-exiſtent God.* If the Magi were ignorant of the true God, if their Theiſm was but a ſort of Scholaſtic Atheiſm, the Zoroaſtrian Triad could not be an Hebrew *Cabala*, nor is the *unknown* and *unintelligible T'Agathon* any part of ſacred Doctrine, but the Notices of it are pure Human Invention, introduc'd by *Zoroaſter* or the Egyptian *Hermes* or by both; for according to *Athanaſius Kircherus* they were both the firſt Revealers of this and ſome other venerable Myſteries of like Nature. *Hæc ſunt vetuſtiſſima omnium ſacræ Theologiæ dogmata, à Zoroaſtre & Hermete mundo primævo propalata. Theſe the moſt ancient Theological Dogmes* (ſaith he) *were by Zoroaſter and Hermes made known to the primeval World.*

(c) Plutarch de Iſid. p. 369.

(d) Intell. Syſt. p. 287, &c.

(e) Pocock. Spec. p. 148.

* Vid. Gale not. in Phornut. de nat. Deor. p. 43.

(f) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1, c. 5.

(g) Pocock. ſupr.

(h) Καὶ Ζαράτας ὁ Πυθαγόρου διδάσκαλος, ταύτην μὲν (τὴν δυάδα) ἐκάλει τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ μητέρα· τὸ δὲ ἓν πατέρα. Meurſ. Den. Pythag. p. 13, 15.

(i) De C. D. l. 5, c. 21.

(k) Seld. de D. Syr. Synt. 2, c. 8. Gale in Phornut. p. 74. Hoffman. umbr. p. 109.

(l) Hotting. Hiſt. l. 2. c. 6. S. 16. ed. 1. Gale in Jambl. p. 222, 254, 209, 297.

(m) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 141.

(n) Καταβιβάζει μὲν οὖν ὡς ἐν δευτέρᾳ τάξει τε καὶ φύσει τοῦ πρώτου τὸν προσεχῆ τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργόν. Προαναχθέντες γὰρ αὐτοῦ τ' Ἀγαθὸν, ἀτρεμεῖν τε αὐτὸ φασὶ, καὶ τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν φροντίδος ὁλοτρόπως ἀποσοβήσαντες, δεύτερον ἐπινοοῦσι θεὸν, ὃν καὶ προσεχῆ καλοῦσι τοῖς κτίσμασιν.

(o) S. Cyr. ibid. p. 61, 68, 117. Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 11. c. 18.

(p) Dr. Ham. Ser. on Act. 17. 30. p. 184.

But of *Zoroaſter* it is further obſervable; that the Theology of the *Valentinians* and Gnoſticks (r) is generally reputed *Zoroaſtrian*, and that thoſe Heretical Theologers Symbolize with the Philoſophic Pagans *Monad* or *T'Agathon* (s) in their Cant touching *Proarche, proanennoetos & inenarrabilis & innominabilis, the Pro-principle, Præ-unintelligible, both undeclarable and innominable.* Such are their Sublimities touching *the Monotety* (as they call their Principle;) and the principal point of their Hereſie was; *they pretended to ſomething higher than the Opificer and Creator of all things.*

V. The old Philoſophic Pagans were ſuperlative Scholaſticks, and in their *Scholaſticiſm* or *Ontology* the *Monad* or *Henotety* is of the ſame Attributes (if they may be called Attributes) with the Gnoſticks *Monotety.* (t) *Antecedent to all Beings and to the Gods the producers of all Beings, there is one ſeparate and imparticipate cauſe ineffable and unſayable by all Speech, unknowable by all Knowledge and beyond Conception, producing all things into Light from it ſelf, exiſting in an ineffable manner before all things, converting all things towards it ſelf, being the beſt end of all. This therefore which is ſeparate from all, ſo as to ſurmount all which Heniadically cauſeth to ſubſiſt both all the Divine Henades and all the kinds of Beings and their Proceſſes,* Plato *calleth T'Agathon.* Reproaching the Devotions of the Chriſtian Church as of a mean and low Strein, the ſame Author (*Proclus*) thus celebrateth the Praiſes of the firſt God. (u) *Let us celebrate him, not ſaying, that he is the Founder of the Earth and Heaven, nor of Souls and the Generations of all Animals, of theſe things he is indeed the Founder, but in the laſt place. But before theſe things, that he brought to light all the intelligible kind of Gods, and all the intellectual, all the ſupermundane and all the in-mundane Gods, and that he is the God of all Gods, and the Henad of all Henades, and that he is above the firſt Impoſſibles, and more unſayable than all ſilence, more unknowable than all ſubſiſtence, Holy in the Holies, hidden and conceal'd within the intelligible Gods.* In this Proclo-Platonic Syſtem of Deities there are Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures of different Kinds and Degrees. Of the firſt and higheſt of them and the Fountain of the reſt (Hen or T'Agathon) we have this account from *Petavius*, who in great degree followeth *Plotinus* in his Platonic Conceits. (w) *Plotinus uſually removeth Being, Eſſence, Life, Mind* (Intellect) *and the like from the higheſt Principle* (the firſt God) *as incompetible thereto.*

His Reaſons are; (x) becauſe *Eſſence, Species, Form and Idea* is τὸ δέ τι, *a definite, diſtinct and determinate This or That,* ἐκεῖνο δὲ οὐ τι, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἑκάστου, *but the firſt Principle is not This or That thing, but before every thing.* And that the firſt Principle is not Eſſence, Form or Species, (nor can any of them be found there) he further argueth from its abſolute Oneneſs and Simplicity. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἰδέα ἕν, ἀλλ' ἀριθμὸς μᾶλλον, ϗ ἑκάστη, ϗ σύμπασα, *Idea is not ſimply one, but number rather* (more than one) *both every Idea and the whole comprehenſion; they are but one as the World is one.* Whereas the firſt Principle is ὅλως ἕν, *totally one* without all Multiplicity, Diverſity, or Duplicity. And therefore Eſſence is as remote from *the very one,* as Number is from Unity. Another Reaſon is; (y) *the firſt Principle is nothing of thoſe, whereof it is the Principle.* For which Reaſon *Life* is incompetible to the firſt Principle, (z) τὸ παρέχον ταύτην ἐπέκεινα ταύτης, *that which affordeth it, is perfectly beyond it.* And for the ſame Reaſon (as it is beyond all Beings, ſo) it is beyond *Ens* or Eſſence. Beſides, (a) *Ens hath as it were the Form of Ens,* ἄμορφον δὲ ἐκεῖνο, *but the firſt Principle is informous, and without all intelligible Form; therefore it is beyond Ens,* which is determin'd by its proper Form. Being the Nature procreant of All, and none of All, it is not this or that, nor of any quality or quantity, nor is it Mind or Soul, nor in motion or reſt, nor in place or time, is ſoliform by its ſelf, or rather without Form, before all Form or Species, and above it, and above reſt or motion; for theſe are the Properties of *Ens,* which make it many, but are altogether (the one or the other) incompetible to the firſt Nature. And upon this account All proceed from it, (b) *becauſe it is not determin'd by any Form,* μόνον γὰρ ἓν ἐκεῖνο, *for Henotety is the All that it is.* (c) *Nothing can be predicated of it, not Ens, not Eſſence, not Life, it is a meer tranſcendental to them all.* (d) *It is incapable of all Additionals; for every addition* (Reſtriction or Determination) *deſtroyeth the exact and ineffable Henotety thereof.* If you ſay *one Soul,* οὐ μὲν αὐτὸ

(q) Παρ' ὧν τὴν ἀθεότητα τῶν σεβασμίων αὐτοῖς μεμαθήκασιν ἀρχῶν, ἄρχοντα τὸν πάντων ποιητὴν καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν αὐτῶν δημιουργὸν ἀγνοοῦντες, τὸν ἄναρχον θεόν. Προτρεπτ. p. m. 32.

(r) *Ut Valentini Doctorem agnoſcere poſſis, & Gnoſticorum in Æonibus ſuis.* Montacut. Orig. Eccl. T. 1. p. 177. de Zoroaſtre.

(s) *Iren. adv. Hær. l. 1. c. 5. & in proœm. v. Gale in Jambl. p. 298. Pearſon. vindic. Epiſt. S. Ignat. par. 2. p. 66, &c.*

(t) Ἁπάντων δὴ τῶν ὄντων, ϗ αὐτῶν τῶν τὰ ὄντα παραγόντων θεῶν, μία ἐξῃρημένη ϗ ἀμέθεκτος αἰτία προϋφέστηκεν, ἄρρητος μὲν παντὶ λόγῳ ϗ ἄφραστος ἄγνωστος δὲ πάσῃ γνώσει ϗ ἄληπτος, πάντα μὲν ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἐκφαίνουσα, πάντων δὲ ἀρρήτως προϋπάρχουσα, καὶ πάντα μὲν πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἐπιστρέφουσα τέλος δὲ οὖσα πάντων τὸ ἄριστον. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν ὄντως ἐκβεβηκυῖαν χωριστῶς ἀπὸ πασῶν, καὶ πάσας μὲν ἑνάδας τῶν θείων, πάντα δὲ τὰ γένη τῶν ὄντων καὶ τὰς προόδους ἑνιαίως ὑφιστᾶσαν, τ' ἀγαθὸν ἀποκαλεῖ. Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 3. c. 7.

(u) Ὑμνήσω μὲν αὐτὸν οὐχ ὅτι γῆν ϗ οὐρανὸν ὑπέστησεν λέγοντες, οὐδ' ἂν ὅτι ψυχὰς ϗ ζώων ἁπάντων γενέσεις· ϗ ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐσχάτοις πρὸ δὲ τούτων, ὡς πᾶν μὲν τὸ νοητὸν τῶν θεῶν γένος, πᾶν δὲ τὸ νοερὸν ἐξέφηνε, πάντας δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸν κόσμον, ϗ τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θεοὺς ἅπαντας, ϗ ὡς θεός ἐστι θεῶν ἁπάντων, ϗ ὡς ἑνὰς ἑνάδων, ϗ ὡς τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐπέκεινα τῶν πρώτων, ϗ ὡς πάσης σιγῆς ἀρρητότερον, ϗ ὡς πάσης ὑπάρξεως ἀγνωστότερον, ἅγιος ἐν ἁγίοις, τοῖς νοητοῖς ἐναποκεκρυμμένος θεοῖς. Ibid. l. 2. c. 11.

(w) *Plotinus paſſim nomina iſta* ὄν, οὐσίαν, ζωὴν, νοῦν, *Ens, Eſſentiam, Vitam, Mentem, & ſimilia, removet ab eo qui ſummus eſt.* Dogm. Theol. T. 1. l. 1. c. 6. S. 10.

(x) *En. 6. l. 9. c. 2, 3. En. 5. l. 5. c. 6.*

(y) *En. 3. l. 8. c. 9.*

(z) *En. 3. l. 9. c. 3. En. 5. l. 5. c. 6.*

(a) *En. 6. l. 9. c. 3.*

(b) *En. 5. l. 1. c. 7.*

(c) *En. 3. l. 8. c. 9.*

(d) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 3. c. 20. Plotin. En. 6. l. 9. c. 1.*

τὸ ἕν, ψυχὴ γὰρ μία· καὶ δύο ταῦτα ψυχὴ καὶ ἕν. *This is not one it ſelf, for it is one Soul; and theſe are two, Soul and One.* Thus the Maſters of Platoniſm Diſpute for the *abſtractedneſs* and *indeterminateneſs* of their Principle, for the meer *Henotety* and *immenſe Simplicity* thereof, and that *One* is of greater latitude and extent than *Ens* or Being.

And for the like Reaſons they affirm, that (although it is ſometimes called *Mind* in a large Senſe,) it quite tranſcendeth *Mind*, *Intellect*, *Intellection*, and that all theſe fall to the ſhare of *a ſecond* Nature, which is (*e*) the πρῶτον γινώσκον, *the firſt knowing Nature*; for the firſt Nature is above it and needeth it not, as the Soul needeth not Hands and Feet, to keep it from being lame. Nor is the Multiplicity that is in Intellect and Intellection conſiſtent with the Simplicity of the firſt Nature. (*f*) *For Intellect and Intelligible are connex'd, and therefore at leaſt there muſt be two, wherefore what is above Duplicity and exempt therefrom, muſt be above Mind and Intellect. And if one and the ſame be both underſtanding and the thing underſtood, there will be Duplicity, not pure Simplicity and Henotety.* (*g*) *Whatever underſtandeth it ſelf,* ὃ δ' ἐξελίττει ἑαυτὸ, καὶ πολλὰ ἂν εἴη, *expandeth and diſplayeth it ſelf, and will be more than one. In all Intellection there is* unum & aliud, *identity and alterity, and multitude* πολλῶν εἰς αὐτὸ συνελθόντων, *ſeverals coming together. And in an Object that is Intelligible there muſt be* ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο, *a diſtinctneſs of one from another: Elſe what can be ſaid, or diſtinctly underſtood about it?* εἰ γὰρ ἑνὶ καὶ ἀμερεῖ προσϐάλλοι, ἠλογήθη, *for if the Application be to what is abſolutely indiſtinct, there is no room for Speech or Reaſon. Wherefore in all underſtanding there muſt be ſeverals, and in every thing that is underſtood there muſt be* (ποικίλον) *Diverſity, or elſe there will be no Intellection, but touch only inexplicable and unintelligible.* Theſe Maſters (who aſſuredly never deriv'd this kind of Theology from the Hebrews) further Diſpute, (*h*) *that 'tis not Intelligence which underſtandeth, but that which hath Intelligence; whence again there emergeth Duplicity in that which is Intelligent. Intellection is Motion,* κίνησις πρὸς ἀγαθὸν, *Motion to good*, (in Life alſo there is Motion *ad aliud*, viz. to Good,) *which is incompetible to the firſt Immoveable, which muſt be without all Action. Underſtanding is not the firſt, either in Being or being honourable, nor is all Underſtanding ſuch, but the Underſtanding of good; Good therefore is before and tranſcendent to Intellection.* And it argueth a defect ἐν τῷ νοεῖν ἔχειν τὸ εὖ, οὐκ ἐν τῇ ὑποϛάσει, *to have well being in Underſtanding, not in Subſiſtence.* For theſe and the like Reaſons they judge it no abſurdity, to ſay, that the firſt Principle knoweth not, nor underſtandeth it ſelf, nor any thing elſe, is unſayable and unintelligible, nor can this exquiſite Henotety (underſtanding it ſelf) ſay or affirm any thing of it ſelf, not ſo much as (*i*) ἐγὼ εἰμὶ, *I am*, (for this is compounding) or εἰμὶ τόδε, *I am this or that*: Nor can it operate upon it ſelf; for being abſolutely one, there is nothing for it to act upon. The Platonic reaſon in its inquiries after the *firſt Nature* having thus demonſtrated, that *Eſſence*, *Intellect*, *Mind* and *Life* can be no higher than a *ſecond Nature*, pitcheth upon an Idea more ſimple than All theſe, and before All, *ipſum unum*, *One it ſelf* (the moſt ſimple Idea poſſible, which is not multitude but before it and the beginning of it) and better than All theſe and beyond All, *ipſum bonum*, *Good it ſelf* (than which there can be no higher Good, which all things need, and tend to, but it to none, not needing any Good) *for the firſt Nature*; which Myſtic-Metaphyſical Nature is (*k*) the Platonic Divinity of Nature. Whence the *Unity* of the Soul (*l*) is call'd *God* by *Plotinus*, and the *Henades* are *Myſtic-Metaphyſical Divinities of Nature*, the rank of Gods, that have no Intellection but what is Super-intellectual.

VI. The *Henades* may be underſtood from the ſeveral ranks of Beings in the *Proclo-Platonic* Theology. (*m*) Above Body or Matter there is the rank of (Plaſtic) *Natures*, above the rank of Natures there is the rank of *Souls*, above the rank of *Souls* there is the rank of *Noes*, and above the rank of *Noes* there is the rank of *Henades*, *Unities*, *or* θεοὶ ἑνιαῖοι, *Heniadic Gods*. Sometimes a rank of *Lives* is inſerted. (*n*) *Soul is firſt ſeated above Bodies; Intellect is above Soul; Life is before Intellect* (for many things partake of Life, that do not partake of Intellect, and therefore Life is more general,) *but the firſt Ens is above Life; for many Beings are deſtitute of Life.*

In all theſe ſeveral Ranks there is one that is *Firſt*, *Univerſal* and *Imparticipate* (a Monad,) and the Proceſs is by Similitude (like produceth like,) every *Monad* produceth a number agreeable to it ſelf. (*o*) *The imparticipate Intellect is before all that partake of Intellect, and the imparticipate Life before all that partake of Life, and the imparticipate Ens before thoſe that partake of Ens.* So in the rank of Natures there is one imparticipate univerſal Nature (the head of that Rank) before many particular Natures. In the rank of Souls there is one univerſal Soul before many particular Souls. And in the rank of *Henades* there is a firſt imparticipate Henad (the firſt Hen or T'Agathon) before many Secondary, particular and participate Henades. The firſt *Henad* or *T'Agathon* therefore muſt be look'd upon as ſurrounded with *Henades* (called alſo *Agathotetes* or Goodneſſes,) ſo that (*p*) there is one God and many Gods, one Principle and many Principles: But with this difference, the Secondary *Henades* (or Unities) are *particular*, the firſt is ſimply *Hen* and *T'Agathon* or *Oneneſs* and *Goodneſs*: Every one of the reſt is a certain *Henad* and *Agathotety* of a certain Propriety of Goodneſs (perfective, contentive, cuſtoditive, or the like) or as *Simplicius* repreſenteth the difference, (*q*) *The firſt is not this or that Principle, as every one of the reſt is; one the Principle of Pulchritude, another of Truth, another of Symmetry, or of ſomething elſe, but ſimply the Principle, the Principle of Principles.* From which conceit and contrivance in the Acroamatical Theology, it appeareth, that the Philoſophic Pagans in their Polytheiſm imitated the popular Pagans (who phanſied ſo many diſtinct inviſible Cauſes, as there are diſtinct viſible Effects, one the Goddeſs of Water, another the God of Wine;) for the great variety of things are thus reduc'd to their proper Principles. *All fair things in Bodies and Souls are reduc'd to one Fountain of Pulchritude,*

(e) *En.* 5. . 3. *c.* 12.

(f) *En.* 3. . 8. *c.* 8. *En.* 6. *l.* 9. . 2. & *l.* 7. *c* 39.

(g) *En.* 5. . 3. *c.* 10, 13.

(h) *En.* 5. . 6. *c.* 5, . *En.* 6. *l.* 7. *c.* 38. *En.* 3. *l.* 9. *c.* 3.

(i) *En.* 5. 3 *c.* 10, 3. *En.* 6. 7. *c.* 38.

(k) *Simpl. in Epict. p.* 9. *Procl. in Tim p.* 110.

(l) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 759.

(m) *Inſtit. Theol. c.* 21. *Th. Plat. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(n) Ψυχὴ μὲν ἐϛι τὸ πρώτως ὑπεριδρυμένον σωμάτων· νοῦς δὲ ἐπέκεινα ψυχῆς· ζωὴ δὲ νοῦ πρεσϐυτέρα τὸ δὲ ὂν ἐφ' ἅπασιν ἵδρυται, τὸ πρώτως ὄν. Idem Th. Plat. l. 3. c. 1.

(o) Πάντων τῶν νοῦ μετεχόντων ἡγεῖται ὁ ἀμέθεκτος νοῦς, καὶ τῶν τῆς ζωῆς ἡ Ζωὴ, καὶ τῶν τοῦ ὄντος τὸ ὄν. Id. Inſt. Theol. c. 101.

(p) *Simpl. in Epict. p.* 9, 10. *vid. Grot. in Epheſ.* 3. 15.

(q) Ἐϛὶν ἐκεῖνο οὐ τὶς ἀρχὴ, ὥσπερ ἑκάϛη τῶν ἄλλων, ἡ μὲν καλοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀληθείας, ἡ δὲ συμμετρίας, ἡ ἄλλου τινὸς, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς ἀρχὴ, ἀρχὴ ἀρχῶν.

ſo all Symmetral things and things that are true. As theſe ſecondary *Henades* are *particular*, ſo they are called *Participate* (whereas the firſt is ſeparate and exempt, and therefore denominated the *Imparticipate*,) being not wholly ſeparate from Beings, but *participated* by thoſe of an inferior Rank, and thoſe that Participate them thereby become Divine and Gods. (r) *Every Divine Body is Divine by reaſon of a deify'd Soul, every Divine Soul is ſuch by reaſon of a Divine Intellect or Mind, every Divine Mind or Intellect becometh ſuch by Participation of a Divine Henad.* But the *Henades themſelves* are not Gods by another Nature Participate, they are primarily and of their Nature Gods, (s) and the Divinity is ſaid to ſubſiſt primarily in the *Henades*, whoſe Myſtic-Metaphyſical Nature (the ſupereſſential Unity and Goodneſs is that which they are) is Divinity of Nature. (t) *Every God* (Henad) *is ſuper-eſſential, ſuper-vital, ſuper-intellectual.* Being αὐτοενάδες, αὐτοαγαθότητες, *every one of them an Unity it ſelf, a Goodneſs it ſelf*, their knowledge is not an intellectual kind of knowledge, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἰδιότητα τὴν θείαν ὑπὲρ νοῦν ἱδρυμένη, *but of Propriety Divine, which is ſuper-intellectual*, wherefore an univerſal Providence belongeth to theſe *Henades*, as the Etymology of the word ſheweth; ἡ δὲ πρόνοια ἐνέργειά ἐστι πρὸ νοῦ, *Providence is an operation before Intellect.*

In the Writings of *Plato* there is not any mention of theſe ſecondary *ſuper-ſubſtantial Henades and ſuper-eſſential Goodneſſes*: But *Plotinus* ſaith; (u) *There are three ranks according to* Plato, *all about the firſt King. For he ſaith, there are the firſt*, (or as *Euſebius* readeth *Plotinus*, (w) *the firſt about the firſt*,) *the ſecond about the ſecond, the third about the third.* It is probable, that *Plotinus* ſuppos'd, that there are *ſecondary Henades about the firſt*; and thus *Proclus* (x) and many other Platoniſts underſtand the Philoſophy of *Plato*; that it demonſtrateth three *Archical Cauſes* or *Monads* above Body; *Soul, Intellect* and *Unity*, every one of which produce their proper number; whence ariſe ſeveral Sets of Gods, οἱ μὲν οὐσιώδεις καὶ ζωτικοί, *ſome Eſſential and Vivific*, οἱ δὲ νοεροί, *ſome Intellectual*, οἱ δὲ ἑνιαῖοι, *others Heniadical.* But whether the later Platoniſts have made a right Judgment of their Maſter's Senſe, or otherwiſe, *theſe Henades* are an Inſtance of the boundleſs Phantaſtry and Polytheiſm of the Philoſophic Pagans, and of their deifying their own Imaginations; which is not much for their Credit, nor can it reaſonably invite any, to Philoſophic-paganize the great things of the Chriſtian Theology, which hath been the Practice of Chriſtian Divines and learn'd Men from the eldeſt times of Chriſtianity.

VII. As from the *firſt Hen* multitudes of ſecondary *Henades* ſo from the *firſt Intellect* multitudes of ſecondary *Noes* or θεοὶ νοεροί, *intellectual Gods* (as they are uſually called) are ſuppos'd to iſſue; which muſt be conſider'd both as exiſtent in the Univerſe and as (in ſome ſort) exiſtent in Man. Theſe (as alſo the firſt Intellect whence they iſſue,) are *pure mental Intellects*, a rank of Beings that are *an higher rank of Intellects than Soul-intellectual Natures* (which are called *mentes animales, Soul-Minds*,) they are *abſtract Intellects, ſubſtantial Intellects, eſſential Intelligences.* So *Ariſtotle* ſuppoſeth, that beſides and above Soul there are in the ſeveral Orbs or Spheres certain *abſtract Intellects* or *Separate Intelligences*; (y) and the *Intellectus agens* of that Philoſopher is thought to be an abſtract Intellect. The Platoniſts from their Principles of mundane Phyſiology demonſtrate the Eſſence, Order and Exiſtence of their *Noes* in this manner. (z) *The Eſſence of Soul is above that of Bodies, and the intellectual Nature is above all Souls, and the Unity is above all intellectual Hypoſtaſes. For Body is moveable by another, but not of Nature ſelf-moveable* (ἑτεροκίνητον, *not* αὐτοκίνητον,) *therefore Soul which is eſſentially ſelf-moveable, is above Bodies. On the other hand, Soul which is ſelf-mov'd, is of ſecond or inferior rank to that nature which is immote. That which moveth, it ſelf being immote, muſt be before it. Mind or Intellect moveth, it ſelf being immote, and its operation is always the ſame. And as Body by Soul is ſelf-moving: So Soul by Intellect participateth of always underſtanding. Intellect therefore is before Souls. But the Unity is before Intellect, for although Intellect is immoveable, yet it is not very one. For it underſtandeth it ſelf, and operateth about it ſelf. And all things that are in any ſort Beings, participate of one, but all things do not participate of Intellect.* Upon theſe grounds the Platoniſts have introduc'd their rank of (abſtract) *Intellects*, which are below the *Unity* and a *reſemblance* thereof; but above intellectual Soul, which is a reſemblance of them. (a) *For thoſe things that are congenit to the more excellent Natures but inferiour to them, theſe Philoſophers call their* εἴδωλα, *Images or Reſemblances: As Intellect congenit to God* (the Unity,) *the rational Soul to Intellect.* Agreeably to which gradual deſcent of Natures (Unity producing Intellect and Intellect producing Soul) Man is conſtituted. For in the Soul of Man there is *the Unity*, which is the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Divinity of Nature (and when the Soul becometh her own *Unity* only, ſhe becometh God, (b) according to *Plotinus*;) there is alſo the *Intellect*, which is above Soul-Intellect. (c) *For as above the lower Soul which is as it were corporeal, there is the Soul it ſelf ſimply and without addition: So above the Soul-intelligence there is the Intellect it ſelf ſimply and without addition.* This in-ſouled Intellect is properly no *abſtract Intellect*, nor *intellectual Hypoſtaſis* (unleſs there may be two Perſons in one Man:) But the intellectual Nature which the Platoniſts attribute to this in-ſouled Intellect (that is above Soul-intellect) is the ſame with thoſe other Platonick *Noes*, which are *intellectual Hypoſtaſes*, and which are ſaid, (d) *to differ ſpecifically from intellectual Souls.* They repreſent it as much above *Soul-intellect* as Senſe is below it. (e) *Sence is our Meſſenger, Intellect is a King to us.*

(r) Πᾶν μὲν σῶμα θεῖον διὰ ψυχῆς ἐστι θεῖον, τῆς ἐκθεουμένης. Πᾶσα δὲ ψυχὴ θεία διὰ τὸν θεῖον νοῦν. Πᾶς δὲ νοῦς κατὰ μέθεξιν τῆς θείας ἑνάδος. Procl. Inſt. Theol. c. 129.

(s) Procl. Inſt. Theol. c. 129. 139. Th. Plat. l. 1. c. 27.

(t) Πᾶς θεὸς ὑπερούσιός ἐστι, καὶ ὑπέρζωος, καὶ ὑπέρνους. Procl. Inſt. c. 115, 120, 121, 127, 128, 119.

(u) Τὰ Πλάτωνος τριττά· τὰ πάντα περὶ τὸν βασιλέα. φησὶ γὰρ, πρῶτα, καὶ δεύτερον περὶ τὰ δεύτερα. Καὶ περὶ τὰ τρίτα τρίτον. En. 5. l. 1. c. 8. En. 1. l. 8. c. 2.

(w) Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 11. c. 17.

(x) V. Gale in Jambl. p. 300. Procl. Th. Plat. l. 1. c. 3, 4. l. 2. p. 103.

(y) Gaſſend. T. 2. l. 3. c. 1.

(z) Πάντων σωμάτων ἐπέκεινά ἐστιν ἡ ψυχῆς οὐσία, καὶ πασῶν ψυχῶν ἐπέκεινα ἡ νοερὰ φύσις, καὶ πασῶν τῶν νοερῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐπέκεινα τὸ ἕν. Πᾶν γὰρ σῶμα κινητόν ἐστιν ὑφ' ἑτέρου, κινεῖν δὲ ἑαυτὸ οὐ πέφυκεν. Ἐπέκεινα ἄρα σωμάτων ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ ὡς αὐτοκίνητος κατ' οὐσίαν. Πάλιν δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ κινουμένη ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς δευτέραν ἔχει τάξιν τῆς ἀκινήτου φύσεως. Δεῖ πρὸ αὐτῆς εἶναι τὸ ἀκινήτως κινοῦν. Νοῦς δὲ κινεῖ ἀκίνητος ὤν, καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐνεργῶν. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ διὰ νοῦν μετέχει τοῦ ἀεὶ νοεῖν, ὥσπερ σῶμα διὰ ψυχῆς τὸ ἑαυτὸ κινεῖν. Πρὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ἄρα ὁ Νοῦς. Ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ νοῦ τὸ ἕν. Νοῦς γὰρ κἂν ἀκίνητος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἕν. Νοεῖ γὰρ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ἐνεργεῖ περὶ ἑαυτόν. Καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἑνὸς πάντα μετέχει τὰ ὁπωσοῦν ὄντα· Νοῦ δὲ οὐ πάντα. Procl. Inſt. Theol. c. 20. Th. Plat. l. 1. c. 12.

(a) Pſellu in orac. mag. p. 53.

(b) Fici in Plotin. p. 759.

(c) Idem ibid. p. 10 p. 365.

(d) Liv. Galant. Compar. 185, 19

(e) Αἴσθησις δὲ ἡμῖν ἄγγελος, βασιλεὺς δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνος. Plotin. En. 5. l. 3. c.

This Hypotheſis of a Platonic Intellect in the Soul implieth, that there are ſeveral ſorts of Intellection in a Man. (*f*) *We do not alike underſtand in all reſpects, but agreeably to ſeveral Natures: In Intellect intellectually, in Soul rationally.* (*g*) *The Species of things alſo* (which are from Intellect impreſs'd upon our Reaſon, or reſult from thence in our Reaſon) *are in us two ways: In Intellect they are all together, in Soul as explicate and ſeparate.* Becauſe the Species of things are originally in the Platonic Intellect (where they are altogether, yet ſo as to be diſtinct) the true Sciences (*h*) *the Sciences of the Intelligibles* are ſaid to come from Intellect into the rational Soul (which is an eaſie way of acquiring them;) and becauſe it affordeth the Principles of all Sciences, and there can be no reaſoning without thoſe Stable Ideas (of Juſt, Good, and ſuch more) which are ſuppos'd to be there, therefore Intellect is thus diſtinguiſhed; (*i*) *there is the reaſoning Intellect, and that which affordeth reaſoning.* All reaſoning, rational inquiry, diſcurrency and deduction is Soul-intellection, the rational Power is the moveable Intelligence: But in Intellect (this Platonic Intellect) and the Intellection thereof all is ſtable, ſtanding and quieſcent. (*k*) *The Intellect is more inward, whoſe Being and Converſe is with it ſelf perpetually and which is Act; and which is not intent upon the reaching any thing, as if it had it not, or acquiring or diſcurrent about things that are not at hand, (for theſe are properly Soul-qualities,) but is ſtable in it ſelf, being it ſelf all things together.* This account of a Platonic *Nous* or Intellect in Man repreſenteth it (*l*) as an Intellect, as an omniform Intelligible alſo, and as an *Orb of Intelligence*, νοῦν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ οὐκ ἔξω, *Intelligent in it ſelf, not looking out to externals*; which is a principal point of difference between *Soul-intellection and Intellect-intellection.* (*m*) *To intellectual Soul it belongeth, to conſider Externals, and to be a buſied thing: But to Intellect it belongeth, to ſpeculate it ſelf, and what is in it ſelf*; for Intellect having the Intelligibles, being the Intelligibles, its Intellection of the Intelligibles is ſelf-Intellection.

As the Platoniſts diſtinguiſh the rational Soul in Man from Intellect; ſo they diſtinguiſh the intellectual Soul of the Univerſe from the Firſt or Univerſal *Intellect*: which firſt Intellect (the ſecond Nature in Platoniſm) is ſaid to be (*n*) *Underſtanding in perpetual act, that of its own nature and eſſence hath the intellection of the Intelligibles.* Such is the common nature of the Platonic *Noes*; they are *actual underſtandings and actual intelligence*, and their οὐσία or eſſence is their ἐνέργεια *operation of intellection.* Their eſſence and operation being one and the ſame, the intelligence which they are, is neceſſarily *the immovable intelligence*; and the Eſſence being eternal, their Operation muſt be in Eternity, not in Time. Whereas time (paſt and to come) is incident to Soul, nothing is paſt or to come in Intellect, but *Is* onely is there. Soul underſtandeth ſucceſſively one thing after another, (*o*) τὰ μὲν παρεὶς, τοῖς δὲ ἐπιβάλλων, *diſmiſſing ſome, attent upon others; now ſome one thing, anon ſome other; now Socrates, anon an Horſe.* But Πᾶς νοῦς πάντα ἅμα νοεῖ, *every Intellect* (both the Firſt and the Secondary in ſome ſort) *underſtandeth all things together and at once.* And as theſe wiſe intelligent Natures (or rather αὐτοσοφίαι, *eſſential wiſdoms*, as they are called) are beyond *Time*, *Flux* and *Succeſſion* of intellection: ſo they are above *motion, action* or *practice* (being no ſelf-moveable Beings, nor of a moveable nature actively or paſſively, but abſolutely immoveable) having their perfection ἐν νοήσεσιν, *in notions or intellections*; (*p*) for the intelligence or wiſdom which they are, is purely ſpeculative. So *Plotinus* ſaith of the Firſt Intellect, (*q*) *It hath no practice, nor any work or eſſence, but to be Intellect onely*; οὐ γὰρ δὴ πρακτικὸς ἐςι, *for it is not practick, nor is there in pure Intellect any deſire of any thing abſent; wherefore it looketh not to externals but is ſelf-reflexive, and turneth its aſpect upon it ſelf*, ἐν τῷ θεωρεῖν τὸ ζῆν ἔχων, *having its life and beatitude in contemplation.* (*r*) *Becauſe it is Intellect actually intelligent, and underſtandeth of it ſelf the things which it underſtandeth*, αὐτός ἐςιν ἃ νοεῖ, νοεῖ οὐ ζητῶν, ἀλλ' ἔχων, *It is the things which it underſtandeth, it underſtandeth, not inquiring, but poſſeſſing.* The Intelligibles are its Eſſence, (*s*) they are not things without, (for ſuch kind of Intellection is indigent, fallacious and fortuitous, and would infer, that νοῦς or intelligent Intellect may be ἀνόητος, *unintelligent*:) Nor doth it underſtand by Impreſſes and Images from Objects, which would ſpoil the certainty of Intellection. (*t*) *For ſo we ſee touching matters of Senſe* (ſenſible Qualities) *which ſeem to be matters of greateſt aſſurance. It is doubted, whether they have their ſeeming Subſiſtence in their Subjects, or in our Paſſions.* (*u*) *The Intellect and Intelligible muſt be the ſame, or Truth will not be there: For if it contemplates the true things, not having them, but only certain Images of them, the Truth is not there.* (*w*) *And ſeeing Intellect muſt be the Maker of the World, its Intelligibles muſt be before the World; not any Figures or Impreſſes from others, but Archetypal and Firſt, and the Eſſence of Intellect*, ὁ νοῦς ἄρα τὰ ὄντα ὄντως, *therefore Intellect is the things that truly are.* The ſeveral intelligible Species which are in Intellect (unchangeable and unperiſhing, which are the true things) are there, not only as Intelligibles, but as *live-intelligent Intelligibles*; each of them is *that vital intellectual Act, the Intellection of that Intelligible*, (this live-Act or intellectual Operation is τοῦ ὄντος ἐνέργεια, *the Act of the Intelligible*) which Act of *Intellection* is the Eſſence of *Intellect actually intelligent.* ἓν ἄρα πάντα ἔςαι νοῦς, νόησις, τὸ ὄν, καὶ τὸ νοητὸν, *wherefore all theſe are one*, (though in ſome ſort diſtinct; for Identity and Alterity is in all Intellection) *Intellect, Intellection, Intelligible Species*, and *Ens* or *Eſſence*: Such an Intellect being the Seat of the Intelligibles, and the Intellection of thoſe Intelligibles, is *truly knowing, always knowing*, without *Obliviouſneſs* or *Inquiſitiveneſs*, *having and beholding all things in it ſelf.* The Ideas of it are commonly call'd θεοὶ νοητοὶ, *the Intelligible Gods.*

VIII. This

(f) Οὐχ ὁμοίως μὲν νοοῦμεν ἐν πᾶσιν, ἀλλ' οἰκείως τῇ ἑκάςου οὐσίᾳ· ἐν νῷ μὲν νοερῶς· ἐν ψυχῇ δὲ λογικῶς. Porphyr. ſent. p. 221.

(g) Ἔχομεν καὶ τὰ εἴδη διχῶς· ἐν μὲν ψυχῇ οἷον ἀνειλιγμένα καὶ οἷον κεχωρισμένα· ἐν δὲ νῷ ὁμοῦ τὰ πάντα. Plotin. En. 1. l. 1. c. 8. Ficin. in En. 5. l. 3. c. 6.

(h) *Plotin. En. 5. l. 9. c. 7. Ficin. Com. p. 19.*

(i) Νοῦς δὲ ὁ μὲν λογιζόμενος, ὁ δὲ λογίζεσθαι παρέχων. Plotin. En. 5. l. 1. c. 10, 3, 4. & l. 9. c. 7.

(k) Ὁ νοῦς ἔνδον συνὼν αὑτῷ ἀεὶ καὶ ἐνέργεια ὑπάρχων, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιβάλλων ὡς οὐκ ἔχων, ἢ ἐπικτώμενος, ἢ διεξοδεύων οὐ προκεχειρισμένα (ψυχῆς γὰρ ταῦτα πάθη) ἀλλ' ἕςηκεν ἐν αὑτῷ ὁμοῦ πάντα ὤν. Plotin. ſupr.

(l) *Idem En. 6. l. 2. c. 8. En. 1. l. 8. c. 2.*

(m) *Ibid. En. 5. l. 3. c. 3.*

(n) Ἐνεργείᾳ καὶ ἀεὶ νοῦς, ὃς κατ' οὐσίαν ἔχει τὸ νοεῖν. Idem En. 5. l. 9. c. 5. Procl. Theol. Plat. p. 35.

(o) *Procl. Inſtit. Th. c. 170. Plotin. En. 5. l. 1. c. 4. Porphyr. Sent. p. 228, 229, 280.*

(p) *Procl. ſupr. c. 134.*

(q) *En. 5. l. 3. c. 6. En. 6. l. 7. c. 15.*

(r) *En. 5. l. 9. c. 5. & l. 1. c. 4.*

(s) *En. 5. l. 3. c. 13.*

(t) Ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς αἰσθήσεως, ἃ δὴ δοκεῖ πίςιν ἔχειν ἐναργεςάτην, ἀπιςεῖται μήποτε οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς πάθεσιν ἔχῃ τὴν δοκοῦσαν ὑπόςασιν. *En. 5. l. 5. c. 1, 2.*

(u) Δεῖ τὸν νοῦν ταὐτὸν τῷ νοητῷ· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴ ταὐτὸν, οὐκ ἀλήθεια ἔςαι. *En. 5. l. 3. c. 5. & l. 5. c. 1.*

(w) *En. 5. l. 9. c. 5. 8. & l. 6. c. 2. Ficin. com. p. 601, 602, 561, 342.*

VIII. This Deſcription of the *firſt Platonic Intellect* (touching the Secondary *Noes* we ſhall not concern our ſelves) plainly ſheweth, that its *Eternal Ideas* or *Intelligible Species* are not meer νοήματα, *Conceptions* or *Notionalities*; but as the *Stoicks* thought Virtues and Vices Animals, ſo thoſe Ideal Natures or Species that are in the firſt Intellect, were thought by the *Platoniſts* not meer Notionalities, but *Realities* and *Subſtantialities*; the *Realities* and *Subſtantialities*, (x) not exiſting apart by themſelves out of any Mind (as *Ariſtotle* miſrepreſenteth the Doctrine of *Plato*) but exiſting in Intellect as the Eſſence thereof. For in this Philoſophy, not the *Singulars* and *Senſibles*, but the *Species* and *Ideal Natures* of things are look'd upon as τὰ ὄντα ὄντως, *the true Eſſences*, of which *Singulars* and *Senſibles* are but the *Imitamens* and *Images*, according to that known *Platonic* Maxim, τὰ αἰσθητὰ τῶν νοητῶν μιμήματα, *Senſibles are but the Ectypal reſemblances of the Intelligibles*. The firſt Intellect is the Seat of *Entia* or *Eſſences*, and the *Archetypal* World; which is not a World of Notions only, but of the great and only Realities. (y) *The World of that which is Truth, of which this beautiful World is the Shadow and Image*; for the intelligible World is οὐσία, *Eſſence* (as we have ſeen before from *Plato*) contradiſtinct to γένεσις, *Generation*. (z) *Plato* (ſaith *Tertullian*) ſuppoſeth *certain inviſible Subſtances, Incorporeal, Supermundial, Divine and Eternal, which he calleth Ideas, that is, the exemplar Forms and Cauſes of things ſenſible; and that thoſe are that which is Truth, theſe the Images of them.* *Philo* ſaith; (a) *The Creator firſt made in the intelligible World an Incorporeal Heaven and an Inviſible Earth, and the Idea of Air and Vacuum: Next, he made the Incorporeal Eſſence of Water and of Spirit* (the Spirit of God;) *and laſtly, of Light in like manner incorporeal, the intelligible Exemplar of the Sun and of all the Stars, the Fountain of the ſenſible Stars, whence the Sun and Moon, and the other Planets and fix'd Stars draw ſuch Light or Splendor, as is fit for them to have.—— The Incorporeal World being perfected, ſeated in the Divine Logos, the Senſible was fram'd according to this Exemplar.* The *Platonic* Hypotheſis touching an *Intelligible Archetypal World*, (b) *Philo*, *Juſt. M. Clemens*, *Euſebius*, look upon as true and genuine Theology, and pretend to find it, where it never was, in the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*. The Hebrew *Cabaliſts* alſo (a ſort of *Platoniſts*) have entertain'd the Hypotheſis of *an Intelligible Archetypal World*, which they do not ſuppoſe a World of meer Notionalities, (c) *but of the Firſt, Primitive and Archetypal Beings*, agreeably to this Maxim of theirs; *That every thing below hath ſome root above*; and this remarkable Saying of one of their Doctors. *That which is ſealed and receiveth the Sigillation here below, is like to the ſhape and form of thoſe things above, which did ſeal and ſtamp the Signature.* Conformably hereunto the Intelligible World (or the Divine Logos) is call'd by *Philo* (d) ἀρχέτυπος σφραγὶς, *the Archetypal Seal*; and the ſeveral Ideal or Archetypal Natures are call'd τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων σφραγῖδες, *the Seals of ſenſible Effects*, Forms and Species being their Expreſs and Image, as that upon the Wax is the Seals. *By their Energy what is without order becometh ordinate, what is without figure Figurate, and undetermin'd determinate; what hath no quality becometh qualify'd, and form accrueth to the informous, whence they are rightly call'd Ideas.* As the Forms that are in Matter are ſuppos'd to be deriv'd (not immediately, but by the Intervention of the Mundane Soul) from the Forms of the Univerſal Intellect, which is ἡ τῶν ὅλων σφραγὶς, *the Seal of the Univerſality of things:* So the Forms of Arts and Virtues that are in Man, (e) are ſuppos'd to be certain impreſſes from the general Nature or Archetypal Idea, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ πολλὰ ἀμύθητα ἐκεῖνα διεπλάσθη, *whereby thoſe many Muſicals, Grammaticals, Temperates or Juſts were form'd.* This Author (*Philo*) uſually ſtileth them *Powers, Incorporeal Powers*, τὰς δορυφορούσας δυνάμεις, *the Powers that are as a Guard unto God*, and αἱ ποιοῦσαι δυνάμεις, *the Powers or Virtues that form and figurate things.* So *Plotinus* (f) calleth them *Powers*, and the known Maxim of the *Pythagoreans* ſpeaketh them ſuch, *That Numbers* (that is, (g) the Ideas) *are the cauſes of the Eſſence of other things.* Their Names and Operations import, that they are real Eſſences, the real Eſſences of things as well as the Notionalities of the firſt Intellect (not only the Notionalities of all things are in the Archetypal World, but the true Realities and Subſtantialities) as the *Platoniſts* generally define them. (h) *An Idea in reſpect of God is his Intellection or Conception; in reſpect of us the firſt Intelligible; in reſpect of Matter the Meaſure; in reſpect of the ſenſible World, the Exemplar; in its own nature Eſſence or Subſtance.* The Ideas in this Deſcription are ſaid to be our *Intelligibles*, becauſe being ſtable, Univerſal and Eternal, they are the Objects of Knowledge (as Knowledge differeth from Opinion) of them there is Science and Definition. They are ſaid to be *the Meaſure* in reſpect of Matter, becauſe material things have their juſt Meaſure and Circumſcription from them; for the Opificer is ſaid, (i) ταῖς ἰδέαις οἰακίζων, *to govern the Matter and keep it in conſiſtence by the Idea's.* And every material thing is ſaid, to be to its Idea, (k) *as the Image and Picture to the live-Subſiſtence.* *Atticus* and *Didymus* in *Euſebius* define an Idea; (l) *an Eternal Eſſence, the Cauſe and Origin, that every thing is ſuch, as it ſelf is.* So *Timæus Locrus* calleth an Idea (which he ſaith, is *ingenit, immote, permanent, and the intelligible Paradigm of things generated, which are in change and viciſſitude*) * τὰν νοητὰν οὐσίαν, *the intelligible Eſſence.* Agreeably whereunto *Plotinus* ſaith; The firſt Intellect is (m) *Ens or Eſſence, that is, the comprehenſion of all Entia or Eſſences; Animal it ſelf, the univerſal abſolute Animal, comprehending in it ſelf all Animals; not as one Intellect, but the comprehenſion of all Intellects: Whatever you pitch upon of the things that are there, is Eſſence, live-Eſſence and Intellectual.* The abſtract Forms or Species that are there, (n) are compar'd to a Sphere of *live-Faces* or Countenances; for each of them is a certain *Eſſence, Life, Intellect; and every Idea of thoſe things that are here without Life, is a certain Life and Intelligence.* (o) *For it is Intellect that underſtandeth an Horſe, the Intellection of it is Intellect, that Intelligible is this Intellect and Intellection; therefore it is ſuch an Intellect, ſuch a Life, and cannot be devoid of Intellect and Life.* (All things live here.) Hence the *Platonic* Ideas are call'd by *Euſtratius*,

---

(x) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l. 2. diſſ. 3. Plutarch. de placit. Phil. l. 1. c. 10. J. Mart. Paræn. p. 8.*

(y) Κοσμὸς ἀληθινὸς, οὗ καὶ ὁ καλὸς οὗτος κόσμος σκιὰ καὶ εἰκών. *Plotin. En. 5. l. 5. c. 2. En. 3. l. 2. c. 1. & l. 9. c. 10.*

(z) *Tertul. de Anim. c. 8.*

(a) *De Mund. opific. p. 3, 4. ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(b) *J. Mart. Paræn. p. 28, 29. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 11. c. 24, 25. & l. 13. p. 671.*

(c) *Dr. Cudworth. Union of Chriſt and the Church. p. 3, 4, 6.*

(d) *Petav. T. 1. l. 4. c. 9. S. 5, 12. vid. Gale in Jambl. p. 299.*

(e) *Philo opuſc. p. 42, 45. v. p. 24, 25, 37, 114.*

(f) *En. 5. l. 9. c. 6. En. 6. l. 2. c. 21.*

(g) *Procl. Plat. Th. l. 4. c. 29.*

(h) Ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἰδέα, ὡς μὲν πρὸς θεὸν νόησις αὐτοῦ· ὡς δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς νοητὸν πρῶτον· ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὴν ὕλην, μέτρον· ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον παράδειγμα· ὡς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐξεταζομένη, οὐσία. *Alcin. de Doctr. Plat. c. 9. vid. Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. l. 1. c. 15.*

(i) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 11. c. 18.*

(k) *Ficin. in Plotin. p. 564.*

(l) Ἀΐδιον οὐσίαν, αἰτίαν καὶ ἀρχὴν τοῦ ἕκαστον εἶναι τοιοῦτον, οἷα ἐστὶν αὐτή. *Pr. Ev. l. 11. c. 23.*

* *De An. Mund. p. 2, 4.*

(m) Τὸ ξύμπαν ὄν, αὐτοζῶον, τὸ παντελὲς ζῶον ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ζῶα περιέχον· οὐχ ὡς νοῦς εἷς, ἀλλὰ πᾶς ἐκεῖ μὲν ὢν ὁμοῦ πάντων ὄντων, ὅτι ἂν λάβῃς αὐτῶν, οὐσία καὶ νοερὰ, καὶ ζωῆς ἕκαστον μετέχον. *En. 6. l. 6. c. 15. & c. 7. & l. 7. c. 8. En. 5. l. 9. c. 10.*

(n) *En. 6. l. 7. c. 9, 15.*

(o) *Ibid. c. 9, & 13.*

Euſtratius, (p) *ſuch things as properly are and ſubſiſt, that are actuous and intelligent, as well as intelligible.* Becauſe the firſt Intellect (q) *containeth all things in the way of its own Nature, which is Eſſence live and intellectual; therefore the Intelligibles of this Orb of Intelligence are not Figments* (Images of things) *but real Exiſtents, living and intellectual.* So the *Chalday* Oracles repreſent them.

Νοούμεναι Ἴυγγες πατρόθεν νοέουσι καὶ αὐταί.

The Oracle (ſaith *Pletho*) *calleth the intelligible Species Iynges, which being conceiv'd from the Father, themſelves alſo conceive or underſtand.* (r) *Every one of them is an Intellect and an Ens or Eſſence, and the whole is every Intellect and every Ens,* the Aggregate of Eſſences, Animals, Intellects.

The *Platonic* Family (s) *Plato, Plotinus, Syrianus* (and the reſt) are ſo far from ſuppoſing their Archetypal Ideas meer *νοήματα, Notionalities,* that they expreſly deny it, and diſpute againſt it. In the beginning of the *Parmenides, Plato* (diſcourſing of certain Species or Ideas, *Similitude, Magnitude, Pulchritude, Juſtice,* by participation whereof things become *Like, Great, Fair, Juſt*) introduceth *Socrates* philoſophizing very ſoberly touching theſe Ideas. *Perhaps* (ſaith he) *every one of theſe Species is but a νόημα, Notion of the Mind, which hath no exiſtence ſave only in the Soul.* But *Parmenides* rejecteth, and thus refuteth *Socrates's* Suppoſal; *ſuch a Notion of the Soul cannot be the Notion of nothing, but of ſomething exiſtent.* Thus all Mankind (becauſe whatever we conceive of, we conceive of it as exiſtent) are prone to think their own Phantaſms, or the Ideas of their Minds, Realities in Nature (Objective Realities) as is plain from the Phænomenon of ſenſible Qualities. And ſo it fareth with thoſe, whom *Plato* (at the end of his fifth *de Rep.*) calleth *φιλοσόφους, the Men of Philoſophic Knowledge or Science,* that love and admire the Matters thereof, which he oppoſeth to the Men of (popular) *Opinion* (whom he calleth *φιλοδόξους*) that love and admire the Matters thereof, which are *πολλὰ καλὰ, the many Fairs, that are partly fair and partly foul; πολλὰ δίκαια, the many Juſts, that are in part juſt and in part unjuſt, as alſo the many Greats and Littles, Lights and Heavies,* are partly ſuch and partly the contrary. Theſe are properly the Matters of *that dubious ſort of Knowledge and Power* (below Intellect) which the old Philoſophers call *Opinion,* and theſe the Men of (popular) Opinion admire, not acknowledging (t) *Fair it ſelf, and a certain Idea of Pulchritude always the ſame,* nor any ſuch abſtract Forms, which the Philoſophic ſort love and admire, and which are properly the Objects of Knowledge or Science, becauſe they are *τὸ ὄν, That which is indeed,* and *οὐσία, Eſſence.* (u) *That the knowledge of the firſt Intellect may be true Knowledge or Science, it muſt have οὐκ εἰκόνα τοῦ πράγματος, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα, not the Image or Notion of the thing, but the thing it ſelf;* being *χώρα ἰδεῶν, the Region of Ideas,* it muſt be *τοῦ ὄντος χώρα, the Region of that which truly is.* (w) *In the firſt place touching the Species we ought not to think, as if an intelligent Mind had underſtood them, and that by this Intellection they had their Subſiſtence; for Juſtice did not therefore exiſt, becauſe he underſtood what Juſtice is; nor had motion its ſubſiſtence, becauſe he underſtood what Motion is; for Intellect is in order poſteriour to Ens or Eſſence; therefore Intellect operating and underſtanding doth not generate Entia or Eſſences.* (x) It is not rightly ſaid, that *νοήσεις τὰ εἴδη, the intelligible Species are Intellections, if the meaning be, that Intellect became ſuch or ſuch an Intelligible after the underſtanding it; for the Intelligible muſt be before this Intellection, ſeated in Intellect.*

If you ſay, that *this Intellection is the ſame with the Intelligible,* ſuch an Aſſertion may ſeem to be countenanc'd by this *Platonic* Maxim; (y) *In things which exiſt independently upon Matter, the thing and the Science of it are the ſame.* But againſt this *Plotinus* maketh theſe following Objections. (z) *Firſt, it is abſurd, to make Juſtice nothing but a Definition of it.* In the next place, (a) *It is impoſſible, to take the definition of a thing not ſubſiſtent.* As for that *Platonic* Maxim, the meaning is not, *that the Science is the thing;* but on the contrary, *that the thing it ſelf exiſting without Matter is both the Intelligible and the Intellection:* Whence it is manifeſt, that the *Platoniſts* Eternal Ideas are real Ideal and Archetypal Natures, not Ideal and Archetypal Notions only (ſo the Ideal Juſtice is *οἷον ἄγαλμα νοερόν, as an intellectual Statue,* ſaith *Plotinus*;) and that their firſt Intellect muſt neceſſarily be an heap of *Entia* or *Eſſences, Animals, Intellects* and *Gods.* Thoſe *Egyptians* undoubtedly that were Worſhippers of the Divine Ideas directed their worſhip, not to meer Notionalities, but to *Subſtances, Animals* and *Gods.* So the *Platoniſts* ſtile them, (b) *All the pulchritude of the Ideas, all the intelligible Gods.* Becauſe the Ideas are Gods, hence they infer, (c) *that there is no Idea of Evil; for if there was, it would be a God. Æſculapius* is one of theſe *intelligible Gods,* who coming out of Heaven upon Earth, appear'd in Humane Shape about *Epidaurus,* according (d) to *Julian's* Notion of him (he ſuppoſeth him the Eternal Idea of the Art of Medicine generated in the Intelligible World) who alſo ſtileth the Sun, Moon and Stars *the viſible Gods, Images of the Inviſible.* The Exoterical Theology deifieth *the ſenſible World,* making it a God, a Comprehenſion of Gods; and the Acroamatical Theology (with great Congruity) deifieth *an Intelligible Archetypal World,* making it a God, a Comprehenſion of Gods, a *Pantheon.*

IX. It is not without cauſe, that we have made a large Deſcription of the *Platoniſts* firſt Intellect, and a ſomewhat large Deſcription of their *Hen* or *T'Agathon* (yet with deſign to make a larger Deſcription of it hereafter;) for theſe Archical Hypoſtaſes, in the Chriſtian Church, in the elder times of Chriſtianity and in ſucceſſive Ages have been thought very venerable Myſteries; and the Platoniſts Triad (of Henotety, Intellect and Soul) hath been, and is at this Day, accounted *a Divine Cabala and a Traduction from the Hebrews.* Whereas from its Deſcription it appeareth, to be nothing better than a gradual Subordination of Natures in their Phyſiology of the Mundane Syſtem, altogether alien from the knowledge of God and true Religion, in the main of it and the eſſential Branches of it conſiſting of ſuch Abſurdities (mix'd with ſome good Notices) as its Deſcription repreſenteth. And as their Triad hath been

(p) Τὰ κυρίως ὄντα, καὶ ὑφεστηκότα, δραστικά τε καὶ νοερά. *Petav. ſupr.*

(q) *Ficin. in Plotin. p. 612.*

(r) Ἕκαστον δὲ νοῦς καὶ ὂν ἐστι, καὶ τὸ σύμπαν πᾶς νοῦς καὶ πᾶν ὄν. *Plotin. En. 5. l. 1. c. 4. En. 6. l. 7. c. 9, 17. En. 5. l. 9. c. 8.*

(s) *Gaſſend. T. 2. p. 459.*

(t) Τὸ αὐτοκαλὸν, καὶ ἰδέαν τινὰ τοῦ κάλλους ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσαν.

(u) *Plotin. En. 6. l. 6. c. 6.*

(w) *Ibid.*

(x) *En. 5. l. 9. c. 7, 8. En. 6. l. 6. c. 6.*

(y) Ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ἄνευ ὕλης, τὸ αὐτόν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπιστήμη τῷ πράγματι.

(z) Πρῶτον μὲν ἄτοπον, μηδὲν εἶναι δικαιοσύνην ἢ τὸν οἷον ὁρισμὸν αὐτῆς.

(a) Μὴ ὑφεστῶτος πράγματος λόγον λαβεῖν ἀδύνατον.

(b) Πᾶν μὲν τὸ τῶν ἰδεῶν κάλλος, πάντας δὲ θεοὺς νοητούς. *Plotin. En. 5. l. 1 c. 7.*

(c) *Procl. in Polit. p. 357.*

(d) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 6. p. 200. & l. 2. p. 65.*

thought a Divine Cabala, ſo it hath been introduc'd into our Theology as the ſame with the Chriſtian Trinity, the ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis of it (the firſt Intellect) being the ſame with the Logos of *Philo* and the *Platoniſts*, hath been, and is ſuppos'd, to be the ſame with the Chriſtian Logos, and S. *John* in the Proem of his Goſpel is interpreted to mean this Logos of *Philo* and the *Platoniſts*, which is their *firſt Intellect*.

They that make theſe Pretenſions, make them with ſome abatement; for they ſay, that *the genuine Cabala of the Trinity is in ſeveral reſpects deprav'd and adulterated by the* Platoniſts (where then ſhall we find this genuine Cabala?) and as if they deſign'd, to requite the *Platoniſts*, and to pay them in their own Coin, *they quite deprave and adulterate the* Platoniſts *Trinity*, alter it in the main Branches of it, and ſpoil the Eſſential Conſtitution of it. For they will have the third Hypoſtaſis of the *Platoniſts* (e) not to be the Mundane Soul, but ſuch a Supra-mundane Soul, as *Platoniſm* hath no acquaintance with. *(f)* They diſallow the *Platoniſts* Notion of their firſt Hypoſtaſis, which they will have to be *Intellect* and *Wiſdom*; and if ſo, there can be no ſuch thing as the *Platoniſts* firſt Hypoſtaſis; for if it is *Intellect* and *Wiſdom*, it is not τὸ ἓν, τὸ μόνως ἓν, μὴ πλέον ἑνός, *one ſo as to be nothing more than one*; it is *Duplicity*, *Diverſity*, *Multitude*, *Compoſition*, *Ens*, *Eſſence*, *Life*, *Animal*, and therefore is not the firſt, but the ſecond Hypoſtaſis in *Platoniſm*; of which ſecond Hypoſtaſis they ſay, *(g) that the* Platoniſts (as if they knew not their own Minds, or did ſay one thing and mean another) *very well underſtood, that all their Ideas were really nothing elſe but Noemata or Conceptions of that one perfect Intellect their ſecond Hypoſtaſis.* For the proof whereof *Amelius* the *Ita-Pniſt* is very unhappily alledg'd, thus gloſſing upon the Evangeliſt's Text, *Joh.* 1. 3, 4. ἐν ᾧ τὸ γενόμενον ζῶν καὶ ζωὴν εἶ, καὶ ὂν πεφυκέναι, *in whom whatſoever was made, was Living, and Life, and true Being*, that is, *Reality* and *Subſtantiality*.

Some Chriſtian *Platoniſts* diſcard *the Secondary Henades* in *Platoniſm*, but pretend not to diſcard *the Firſt Henad* (Hen or T'Agathon;) which is an incongruous Partiality; for it is one and the ſame *Myſtic-Metaphyſical Divinity of Nature*, that conſtituteth the *Firſt Henad* and *the Secondary Henades*; and ſeeing *the firſt Henad* is no *Ens* or *Eſſence*, it can have no exiſtence, no more than *the Secondary Henades*. The ſame Chriſtian *Platoniſts* diſcard the *Secondary Noes* as *Platonic* Figments and Chimæra's, yet retain *the Firſt or Univerſal Intellect*; whereas they ought to make the ſame Judgment touching the whole Rank of *Platonic Noes*. For the firſt Intellect is of as bad a Character as the *Secondary Noes*, and of no better a Character than *the Platonic Ideas*, becauſe it is nothing elſe but *(h)* ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν, *the Idea of the Ideas*, or the World of abſtract Ideas. They are It, and It is they. And becauſe the *Platoniſts* αὐτοὸν, (Ens or Eſſence it ſelf) is no ſingular individual Eſſence, nor the Comprehenſion of ſingular individual Eſſences; their αὐτοζῶον (Animal it ſelf) is no ſingular individual Animal, nor the comprehenſion of ſingular individual Animals; their αὐτονοῦς (Intellect it ſelf) is no ſingular individual Intellect, nor the comprehenſion of ſingular individual intellectual Eſſences; it is certain, that this Intellect or Logos of theirs (which is made uſe of, to expound our Evangeliſt) can have no exiſtence. Nor can a meer abſtract *Nous* or Intellect be a legitimate intellectual Hypoſtaſis, as being without *Imagination*, *Reaſon*, *Will* and *Affection*, without true *Vitality*, and *all liberty of Agency*; and therefore the firſt Intellect and the reſt of the *Platonic Noes* are incapable of any thing *moral* or *morally Divine*. As wiſe as theſe *Noes* are ſaid to be (they are ſaid to be eſſentially and perfectly wiſe) they effect nothing like wiſe and intelligent Agents, but fatally and naturally; for every Platonic *Nous (i) effecteth whatever is effected by it, by this agency, its Intelligence, which is the ſame with its Eſſence.* The firſt Intellect created, (or rather form'd) the viſible World, as Plaſtic Principles, or Seminal Forms operate: *(k) For as if there be the ſeminal form of any Animal, and Matter prepar'd to receive it, the Animal muſt neceſſarily be generated; in like manner, intellectual and all-powerful Nature exiſting, and nothing hindring, nothing interpoſing between it and the recipient, the one neceſſarily formeth, the other is neceſſarily formed.* The various Ideas are in Intellect, as the various ſeminal Powers are in Soul.

X. The *Platoniſts Henades* and *Noes* are of the number of their *Super-mundane Deities*, which yet are not ſo Super-mundane, but that (according to our Diſtribution of Pagan Deities) they may be look'd upon as Inhabitants of the Mundane City either *real* or *fictitious*. And that they are fictitious Phantomes, the Humour of the *Platoniſts* is a great Indication; for their way is, *to deifie the abſtract Notions of their own Minds, to make them Powers*, *Animals*, *Intelligences* and *Gods*. This Humour of theirs will appear in a Set of Deities (Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures) which we muſt now enumerate, but which are ſo extreamly abſurd and extravagant, that I would gladly paſs them by in ſilence, if I was not oblig'd to take notice of them, for the aſſiſtance of ſuch Students as have a mind to converſe with the old Philoſophers, and to travel through all the Obſcurities of the Platonic Theology, and becauſe our Account of the Pagan Deities (of the Acroamatical Theology) will not be tolerably perfect without them. This Set of Deities muſt be denominated *Proclo-Platonic*, as being introduc'd by *Proclus* into the *Platonic* Theology, with deſign to model it into ſuch a Conformity with the *Chaldaic*, as *Plato* never deſign'd. (*l*) The *Chaldeans* (ſaith *Pſellus*) *ſuppoſe, that there is one Principle of all things, which they declare to be one and good. (m) Next they worſhip a certain paternal Bythus or Profundity, compos'd of three Triads, each Triad having Father, Power and Mind.* Agreeably hereunto in the *Proclo-Platonic* Theology (*n*) there are *three Triads* next after the *firſt Hen* or *T'Agathon*; every Triad having τὸ πέρας *Finity* (the Father) τὸ ἄπειρον, *Infinity* (the Power) τὸν νοῦν, *the Mind*, or τὸ μικτὸν, *that which is mixed of Finity and Infinity* (for this Theology ſuppoſeth, that thoſe *Henades Finity and Infinity* proceed from *T'Agathon*, and that all Beings are a mixture of *Finity* and *Infinity*, as *Plato* ſaith in his *Philebus.*) Theſe Triads are conſtituted of theſe ſubordinate Ranks: The *firſt Ens* or *Eſſence*, the *firſt Life* and the *firſt Intellect*. For in the firſt Triad τὸ μικτὸν, *that which is mixed of Finity and Infinity* is αὐτὸ ὂν or αὐτουσία, *Ens or Eſſence it ſelf.* In the ſecond Triad τὸ μικτὸν, *that which is mix'd of Finity and Infinity* is ἡ νοητὴ ζωὴ, *the intelligible Life*, *the firſt Life*, or ὁ αἰὼν, *ipſum Ævum*, *Eternity it ſelf.* In the third Triad τὸ μικτὸν, *that which is mix'd of Finity and Infinity* is ὁ νοητὸς νοῦς, *the intelligible Intellect*, *the firſt Intellect* (the Name of Intellect is appropriate to it, although the other are in ſome ſort νόες *Minds* or *Intellects*) which is alſo *Plato*'s αὐτοζῶον, *Animal it ſelf*, as *Proclus* will have it; (o) *who alſo ſuppoſeth theſe ſupernal Gods, to be the paramount Ideas, and as it were the Univerſals of all things.* This διάκοσμος, or order of Gods is denominated by *Proclus* θεοὶ νοητοὶ, *the intelligible Gods.* The next order of Gods (which are the proceſs of theſe) the *Proclo-Platonic* Theology calleth θεοὺς νοητοὺς ϗ νοερούς, *the intelligible and intellectual Gods*, *as underſtanding the Gods that are before them*, *being underſtood by thoſe that are after them.* This order of Gods is alſo the Comprehenſion of *three Triads*, every Triad conſiſting of thoſe three μονάδες ὑπερούσιοι, *Superessential Unities*, *Eſſence*, *Life*, *Intellect* (but with ſome difference not worth the inſiſting on) which in this order are a Triplication of thoſe in the former. Theſe imaginary Triads are of various Faculties and Operations, as their Names ſignifie; (p) *Three collective Unites*, *three contentive* (one of theſe is ſaid to contain one World, another the infinity of the Matter, and therefore they are called συνοχεῖς, *the Conteiners* in the Chaldaic Theology) *Three Teleſiurgic.* But that which chiefly ennobleth them, is their great concern in the *Theurgical Reduction* of the Soul.

(e) *Intell. Syſt.* p. 562.

(f) *Ibid.* p. 586.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 563.

(h) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil.* l. 8. c. 12.

(i) Ποιεῖ δὲ ποιεῖ τῷ εἶναι, καὶ τῷ νοεῖν· τὸ γὰρ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ νοεῖν, ἓν ἄμφω. *Procl. Inſt. Theol.* c. 173.

(k) Ὡς γὰρ ὄντος λόγου ζώου τινὸς, οὔσης δὲ καὶ ὕλης τὸν τοῦ λόγου τὸν σπερματικὸν δεξαμένης, ἀνάγκη ζῶον γενέσθαι· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ φύσεως νοερᾶς καὶ παντελοῦς δυνάμεως οὔσης, καὶ οὐδενὸς διείργοντος, μηδενὸς ὄντος μεταξὺ τούτου καὶ τοῦ δέξασθαι δυναμένου, ἀνάγκη τὸ μὲν κοσμηθῆναι, τὸ δὲ κοσμῆσαι. *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 9. *c.* 9, 6. *En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 1, 2, 3. *Ficin. Com.* p. 559.

(l) *Orac. Mag.* p. 113.

(m) Εἶτα πατρικόν τινα βυθὸν σέβονται, ἐκ τριῶν τριάδων συγκείμενον. ἑκάστη δὲ τριὰς ἔχει πατέρα, δύναμιν καὶ νοῦν.

(n) *Plat. Theol.* l. 3. 4, 5.

(o) *Creditque Deos hos ſupernos eſſe Ideas illas ſummas, & quaſi univerſalia rerum cunctarum.* Eugub. de Per. Phil. l. 8. c. 11.

(p) Τρεῖς μὲν αἱ συναγωγοὶ μονάδες, τρεῖς δὲ αἱ συνεκτικαί, τρεῖς δὲ αἱ τελεσιουργοί.

To theſe Orders of Deities which are plainly Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures (and wherein there are ſeveral *Ideal Natures*, ſuch as the *firſt Number*, *Identity and Diverſity* it ſelf) we muſt annex a third Order of Deities in the *Proclo-Platonic* diſtribution of Gods, which proceed from the former Orders, and are intituled θεοὶ νοεροὶ, *the intellectual Gods*; but without determining (becauſe it is a diſputable Point not worth the diſputing) whether they be *Myſtic-Metaphyſical* Natures or of the *Genial* ſort of Deities. Theſe Gods that are νοεροὶ μόνον, *intellectual only*, are an *intellectual Hebdomad*, and there is in this Order a Triad call'd οἱ τρεῖς νοεροὶ πατέρες, *the three intellectual Fathers* (whereof one is a Mother) *the great Saturn*, *Queen Rhea* (call'd alſo *Ceres*) and *the great Jupiter*, who is ſaid to partake of Mind from his Father and of Soul from *Queen Rhea*, and is (according to *Proclus*) the ſame with *Plato's Demiurgus* or Opificer of all things. To this Triad of Intellectual Fathers this Theology (which transformeth the Popular-Pagan into Philoſophic-Pagan Deities, and accommodateth to them the matters of the fabulous Theology) adjoyneth another Triad, the Trinity of *Curetes*, which are alſo call'd οἱ ἄχραντοι or ἀμείλικτοι θεοὶ (the Deities impollute or not to be ſweetned) and a *Diacritic* or diſcretive Monad. In this Order of Gods *the intellectual Fathers* are the ſame with the πηγαῖοι πατέρες, *Fontal Fathers* or κοσμαγωγοί, *Leaders of the World* in the Chaldaic Theology, which the Oracle calleth νοεροὺς ἀνοχῆας, *intellectual Suſtainers.*

Jambl. de Myſt. p. 71.

Πᾶς ἔχει κόσμος νοεροὺς ἀνοχῆας ἀκαμπεῖς.

Theſe intellectual Suſtainers (which *Eugubinus* (q) fondly miſtaketh for Angelical Powers) are ſo intituled, becauſe they ſuſtain the whole World. They are ſtiled *inflexible*, to denote their firmitude; and they have the Name of *Leaders of the World*, becauſe they are *Powers*, *that actuate and guide the World by their providential Motions.* (r) *Hecate* is the midſt or center of theſe three Powers, having on the right-ſide the Font of Souls, and on the left-ſide *the Font of Virtues.* So the *Proclo-Platonic Rhea* is remarkable for two of her *Secondary Powers or Monads*; the one is *Plato's Crater* (wherein the Elements of Souls are temper'd) *the Font of Souls*; the other is *the Font of Virtues.* (s) *The* Chaldeans *alſo worſhip a Fontal Triad of* (Chaldaic or Platonic) *Faith*, *Truth and Love*; which Ternary of Virtues are in the Proclo-Platonic Theology (t) ſtil'd the three Anagogic Cauſes, becauſe they are reductive to Souls.

(q) *De Per. Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 9.

(r) *Orac. Magic. p.* 78.

(s) *Ibid. p.* 114.

(t) *Plat. Theol. l.* 4. *c.* 9. *p.* 193, 194.

XI. The various *Families* and diſtributions of *Genial* Deities that occur in *Proclus*'s Platonic Theology (with whom ſeveral others of the Platonic School Symbolize) are properly Deities of the Exoterical Theology: As the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures (or Phantomes) are peculiarly the Deities of the Acroamatical Theology; for the Exoterical Theology acknowledgeth no Myſtic-Metapyſical Natures. But becauſe the Platoniſts Syſtem of Deities from the higheſt to the loweſt, their ſeveral διάκοσμοι, *ordinate Conſtitutions of Gods* (u) are as ſo many Links of one Chain, of indiſſoluble coherence and cloſe Contexture; and becauſe their Philoſophizing about the Genial Deities hath rendred them in ſome reſpect *Acroamatical*, therefore we will conſider their Account of them as one Branch of the Acroamatical Theology. The *Genial* ſort of Deities in this Theology are of a three-fold Diſtribution: One Order of them is *Hegemonical* or *Archical* (αἱ ἀρχαὶ, *the Principles*,) which are ſuper-mundane Deities of the higher rank. The next Order of them is the Dii ἀπόλυτοι, *free and exempt ſort of Deities*, which are *ſuper-mundane* and *ſuper-celeſtial* Deities of the lower rank. A *third* Order of them is that of *In-mundane Gods*, the *Celeſtial* and *Geneſiurgic.*

(u) *Procl. ſupr. l.* 6. *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 34.

The firſt Order of them (the Hegemonical or Archical) proceed from the *intellectual Fathers*, and are ſaid, to be ἀφομοιωτικοὶ θεοί, Deities that aſſimilate Beings, the lower to the higher, from which ſimilitude great and numerous Effects enſue. In this Order there are four Triads of Deities (the Platoniſts have the Faculty of making Deities at their Fingers ends) πατρικὴ, *the paternal Triad* conſiſting of the three *Saturnidæ*, or Sons of *Saturn* in *Plato*'s *Gorgias*, *Jupiter* (a ſecondary *Jupiter*) *Neptune*, *Pluto*, that Triumvirate of Gods amongſt whom *Homer* ſhareth the Government of the World: Ζωογόνος or κορικὴ, the *Zoogonic* or *Virgin-Triad* conſiſting of *Diana*, *Proſerpina*, *Minerva*: Ἐπιστρεπτικὴ, *the Converſive Triad*, which cauſeth the Converſion of things to their Principle (calleth alſo the Apollinary or Solar Triad:) Φρουρητικὴ, *the cuſtoditive Triad* (the Triad cuſtoditive of the other;) for the Pagan Deities (as *Xerxes* appointed a Guard, to defend the Plane-Tree, which he had choſen for his God) muſt have a Guard to keep them. The firſt of theſe Triads *the Paternal* (called alſo the Demiurgic Triad or Trinity of Opificers) is concern'd in ſome Diſputes in the Proclo-Platonic Theology. (w) For in ſeveral Diſputations

(w) *Plat. Th. l.* 5. *c.* 14, 28. *l.* 6. *c.* 7. *in Tim. p* 93.

putations *Proclus* concerneth himſelf, to demonſtrate, that before a Triad of Demiurgical Hypoſtaſes there muſt be a *Demiurgic Monad*, becauſe *none of the Divine Orders beginneth from multitude, but the Order of many proceedeth from Unity*. In which Diſputations, as ſome obſerve, (x) his deſign is, to introduce a *Monad* before *Plato's T' Agathon*; and to ſhew, who is the Demiurgus by demonſtrating, that he is *one exempt Demiurgic Monad* before the Order of many and before a Triad. Accordingly, this Author's *Demiurgus* is the great *Jupiter* (one of the intellectual Fathers) who precedeth the *Paternal Triad* (or Trinity of Opificers) in the higher rank of ſuper-mundane Gods.

Between this rank of Deities which is wholly *ſupermundane*, and that other rank which is *inmundane*, the Dii ἀπόλυτοι, *free and abſolute ſort of Deities* intervene, communicating in the Properties of both, and as a common Bond combining them together. The twelve Deities in *Plato's Phœdrus*, which are Captains of *the inmundane Gods* and of Demons, and the Leaders of particular Souls to the *ſublime intelligible*, namely, *Jupiter agitating a wing'd Chariot* (a third *Jupiter*,) *Juno*, *Veſta*, *Mars*, *Mercury* and ſuch more (which are diſtinguiſh'd into four Triads according to the mode of the Proclo-Platonic Theology) are ſaid to be Deities or Princes of this Rank and Quality. The *inmundane* Gods (which this Theology ſtileth our Princes and Saviours) are diſtributed according to the ſeveral diſtributions of the ſenſible World, from which they are inſeparate, *and wherein they have their Receptacles and Preſectures making the moſt excellent mundane Polity*. Theſe are the Captains of the Demons (which bringeth us back again to Demonology;) for *every in-mundane God is Commander over ſome Demonial Order*, as *Proclus* ſaith. With reſpect to the matter (which they comprehend in themſelves and adorn) the Chaldaic Theology ſtileth theſe Deities ὑλαίους, *the material Deities*. They have alſo the Name of *Zonæi* (whereas thoſe of an higher rank are ἄζωνοι, *the Azonous*) in that Theolgy. If we ſhould recount the reſt of the Chaldaic Deities (which I willingly overlook, as alſo ſome of the Platonic) *the Recital would ſeem to conjure the Reader into ſome Magical Maze or Circle*, (y) as a judicious Writer ſpeaketh touching the intelligible *Iynx*, *Synocheis*, *Empyrial*, *Etherial*, *Material*, *Teletarchæ* and the rabble of Names that follow them.

As bad as the Deities of the Theurgical Theology are, *Syneſius* thought them worth remembring in his Hymn to God, (z) whom he invoketh by the Name of Αὐτουργὲ θεῶν, *the Opificer of the* (Chaldaic) *Gods. The intellectual Gods* (ſaith he) *celebrate thee, O King, and the Leaders of the World. The Gods that are about the World, the Gods that are in the World, the Zonæi and the Azonous.*

Σὲ μὲν οἱ νοεροὶ
Μέλπουσιν ἄναξ
Σὲ δὲ κοσμαγοὶ
οἱ περὶ κόσμον,
οἱ κατὰ κόσμον,
οἱ ζωναῖοι,
οἱ τ' ἄζωνοι.

Thus to celebrate the Praiſes of God, is not the Sanctification of his Name, but a deadly Profanation of it; for it is a making him the Head and Societiſt of Fictitious, Profane and Magical-kind of Deities. But ſo in the ſecond Hymn of *Syneſius* there are the *Platonic Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures*, with the ſubordinate ranks of Philoſophic-Pagan Deities, which ſhew him to have been (a) *A Philoſophic-pagan*, when he was a Biſhop. *Thoſe that tranſcend the World* (ſaith he) *the individuous Diviſion of the intellectual and intelligible Gods, bleſt ſilence covereth. From one Fountain and Root the vaſt ſtore of Goods emergeth, the Superſubſtantial Progeny of Gods fervid with prolific Motions, and the admirable ſplendors of the bleſſed that are in-ſubſtantial Gods. Thence the in-mundane Chorus of immortal Kings and the army of Angels that knoweth not old age.*

Τὰ πρόσω μάκαρα σιγὰ
Νοερῶν τε καὶ νοητῶν
Ἄτομον τομὰν καλύπτει.
Μία παγὰ, μία ῥίζα

Ἀγαθῶν ἀνέσχεν ὄλβον,
Ὑπερούσιόν τε βλάσταν
Γονίμοις ζέοισαν ὁρμαῖς
Τὰ τ' ἐνουσίων προλάμπει

Μακάρων αἴγλα φέγγη.
Ὅθεν ἐγκόσμιος ἤδη
Χόρος ἀφθίτων ἀνάκτων
Στρατὸς ἀγγέλων ἀγήρως.

To which numerous Progeny this Hymn ſubjoyneth the rout of *Material Demons*, as the Theurgical Theology ſtileth them. A learned Man of our Nation and Biſhop of our Church obſerveth, that *Syneſius* ſpeaketh the Dialect of that Heretical Theologer *Valentinus*: But taketh it for granted, that *Syneſius* (a Catholick Father) is not chargeable with *Valentinianiſm*. (b) *In his moſt ſweet Hymns* (ſaith he) we have *Pater* Ἄρρητος, *the unſayable Father, Nous and Logos, who is ſtiled the firſt Off-ſpring from the firſt Root, and the Root of all that have a Being after him. He placeth the ſupreme Beatitude in the Viſion of the Bythus or Profundity, pronuncing him bleſſed, that after Death becoming intellectual* Βυθὸν εἶδεν θεολαμπῆ, *ſeeth the Bythus refulgent with the Light of the Gods, which he ſometimes calleth* αἴγλαν Ἀγάλματι Βυθῶ Ἀμαρυσσομέναν, *the Splendor ſhining in the immote Bythus. God the Father he calleth* προπάτορα, αἰωνοτόκον, θῆλυ καὶ ἄρρεν, *Before-Father, the Parent of Æon, Male and Female, is not all this the Language of the Valentinians?*

It is much, that any one who obſerveth ſuch a *verbal* Affinity between *Syneſius* and the *Valentinians* Theology ſhould not diſcern the *real* Affinity; for *Syneſius's* Theology is the very ſame with the *Chaldaic-Theurgical*, whence the Theology of the *Valentinians* and *Gnoſticks* is manifeſtly deſcended. From hence they had (c) their προπάτορα, *Before-Father*, βυθὸν, *Bythus or unfathomable depth*, σιγὴν, *Silence*, νοῦν, *Nun or Intellect*, ἀλήθειαν, *Verity*, αἰῶνα, *Æon*, their Theological terms, προβολὴ, *Prolation or Emiſſion*, πλήρωμα, *Fulneſs*, ἐλπὶς, *Hope*, καρπὸς, *Fruit*, καρπιστὴς, *Fructuary*, are of the ſame Original; whence alſo *Epiphanes* (who gave new Names to the Gnoſtic Figments) had his *Monoteta*, *Henoteta*, *Monada* and *Hen*; *the Philoſophers were the Patriarchs of the* (Philoſophic-paganizing) *Hereticks*. *Valentinus* is call'd by *Tertullian* a follower of *Plato*, the *Valentinians* call'd their firſt *Tetrad* the Pythagorick *Tetractys*, the Gnoſticks worſhipp'd the Images of *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, and there is ſomething of Platoniſm in this their Dogma; *that the viſible World was made by Angels*; for (d) the Platoniſts *ſuper-mundane* and *in-mundane* Gods are Creators. *Baſilides* alſo injoin'd ſilence to them, to whom he revealed his Myſteries (probably) both in imitation of the Pythagorean *Silence*, and out of reſpect to Mother *Sige*, as *Tertullian* ſaith. Moreover, in this *Heretical Pagan Theology* the firſt *Æon* or God is ſtiled ἄγνωστος, ἀκατονόμαστος, ἄρρητος, *Ignote*, *Innominable*, *undeclarable*, *unſayable*, (the ſame with their *Bythus*,) which is a palpable Indication of its deſcent from the old *Myſtic-Metaphyſical* Theology, and that this was the Ground-work, whereupon they rais'd their Model. That ſomewhat of the *Valentinians Æons* (or Gods) and their *Syzygiæ* (Combinations) may be underſtood, I will repreſent a Fragment of their Genealogy from the beginning of *Irenæus*.

Bythus

(x) *Petav. de Trin. l.* c. 1. S. 3, 4. *Intell. Syſt. p.* 626.

(y) *Purchas Pilgrim par.* 1. *B.* 4. *c.* 6.

(z) *Hymn.* 3.

(a) *See Luc. Holſten. Diſſert. de Syneſio at the end of the Ecleſ. Hiſt. publiſh'd by Valeſius.*

(b) *Pearſon vindic. ep. S. Ignat. par.* 2. *p.* 5.

(c) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 201, 211, 213, 298, 301, 302. *Tenſon of Idol. p.* 149, 150, 153. *Spencer in Orig. p.* 88.

(d) *Salluſt. de Diis, c.* 6.

Bythus —— *Sige*	*Bythus* is call'd the *Firſt-Father*, *Before-Father*; *Sige* is call'd alſo *Ennœa*, *Conceit*, *Charis*, *Grace*.
Nous —— *Aletheia*	*Nous* (called alſo the Unigenit) is a Father for the Production of other Subſequent Æons.
Logos —— *Vita.*	*Logos* not being generated by *Bythus* is wholly ignorant of *the firſt* Father, and is therefore called *the blind Æon.*

XII. As the Names of the *Valentinians Æons* ſpeak them of Original and Deſcent Philoſophic-Pagan: So the Cabaliſtical Jews diſtribution of Angels into a *Ternary* of Kinds and Claſſes (e) *ſeparate Intelligences*, *Angels of Miniſtry* and *ſublunary Spirits*, is an imitation of the Philoſophic Pagans diſtribution of their Deities (for it is a great Miſtake, (f) to ſuppoſe the Philoſophic Pagans diſtribution of their Deities a deſcendent from the Jews;) and the ſame humour of criminal Philoſophic-paganizing in matters of Theology hath contriv'd the Schoolmens *Orders* and *Hierarchies* of Angels. For they blindly following their blind Guide the Counterfeit *Dionyſius*, have form'd three *Hierarchies* of Angels, each conſiſting of *a Triad of Orders*, conformably (but with ſome diſcrepancy) to the *Proclo-Platonic* Scheme of Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures, θεοὶ νοητοὶ, *the intelligible Gods*, νοητοὶ καὶ νοεροὶ, *the intelligible* and *intellectual*, νοεροὶ μονὸν, *the intellectual only.* There is ſuch Conformity between theſe two Models, that *Suidas*, (g) *Eugubinus*, (and others) blindly ſuppoſe, that *Proclus* ſtole his Scheme from their great Theologer, the Titular *Dionyſius* the Areopagite. His Model (conſiſting of a *ſuperior*, *middle* and *inferior*) is thus delineated.

1. Hierarchy { Seraphim, Cherubim, Throni }
2. Hierarchy { Dominationes, Virtutes, Poteſtates }
3. Hierarchy { Principatus, Archangeli, Angeli. }

The *Marian* Theologers ſuppoſe, (h) that the Mother of God conſtituteth a *fourth* Hierarchy, and that her Seat is in the twelfth Heaven. But this combination of a Woman with the Divine Majeſty may paſs for a *Valentinian Syzigia*: And a like inept is this following Combination of a *Seraphim* with S. *Francis*, and of *Prelates* with the Order of *Dominations*. (i) *We Minorites hold it for certain, that the bleſſed God ſent one of the Order of Seraphim to our Seraphic Father, when out of his Benignity he would impreſs in his Fleſh the five Wounds. Hence we ſing, Cui Seraph apparuit*, (to whom one of the Order of Seraphim appear'd;) *hence alſo the bleſſed Father* Francis *is ſaid to be full of Seraphic ardour, and to burn continually in his Life-time (having the Seraphim for his Maſters,) and to have inſtituted thoſe of his Fraternity in true love both by Words and Examples.* (k) *The Dominations are ſo call'd, becauſe they have Domination over the reſt, and are ſubject to none. Their Office is to inſtruct the Prelates, how they ought to behave themſelves in the Spiritual Warfare, witneſs S.* Gregory; *and how they are bound to exerciſe Domination diſcreetly over their Inferiours or Subjects.* There is nothing more inept in the *Valentinians* Scheme than theſe Friar-like *Combinations*: But the latter doubtleſs (the Combination of Prelates and Dominations) is no Fictitious *Syzigia*, but too viſible a reality, that hath caus'd more numerous and dolorous Wounds in the Church and Servants of Chriſt, than the *Seraphim* is ſaid to have made in S. *Francis.*

Theſe Hierarchical Orders are called διάκοσμοι, by the counterfeit *Dionyſius*, who ſpeaketh the Language of the *Proclo-Platonic* Theology. (l) The Philoſophers Intelligences are the Angels of the Schools, the Hierarchical Orders conſiſt of abſtract *Noes*, that underſtand without Phantaſms, whoſe Intellection is that of ſimple Intuition, without Ratiocination or ſucceſſive Diſcourſe; *ſo far the Noes of the Schools Symbolize with the Platonic.* In theſe Orders (which are ſubordinate, aud gradually deſcending agreeably to the *Proclo-Platonic*) the ſuper-celeſtial Eſſences that are near to God, are ſtiled νοηταὶ δυνάμεις, *the intelligible Powers*; thoſe that are remote, are intituled νοεραὶ, *the intellectual*, by the pretended *Dionyſius.* The Schools alſo diſpute (conformably to the Doctrine of *Proclus* touching his Myſtic-Metaphyſical Natures,) that as the Angels are ſuperior in Nature, ſo the Species whereby they underſtand, are more univerſal. The Superiors exerciſe towards their Inferiors the Hierarchical Function, thoſe three Hierarchical Acts, κάθαρσις, *Purgation*, φωτισμὸς, *Illumination*, τελείωσις, *Perfection*; which account of their Operations conformeth them to the Pagan Deities in Theurgy; and accordingly the Theurgical Theology of *Proclus* (m) touching *the perfective initiation of aſcending Souls to the intelligible ſublime view* (conſiſting of three degrees τελετὴ, the firſt Initiation, μύησις, the ſecond, ἐποπτεία, the third) is tranſcrib'd by the Titular *Dionyſius.* The Orders of the firſt Hierarchy ſeem to be rais'd to the rank and condition of the *Proclo-Platonic* θεοὶ νοητοὶ, *intelligible Gods*; for at what a rate do they tranſcend Angels and Arch-Angels?

With theſe Speculations (and ſuch more) touching *three Celeſtial Hierarchies and nine Orders* the Schools have entertain'd themſelves; not conſidering, that they were impos'd upon by a Philoſophic-paganizing Trick of the Titular *Dionyſius*, and that there is no Foundation either in Theological Reaſon or good Authority for the belief of their Exiſtence. (n) Some credulouſly ſuppoſe, that the knowledge of them was communicated to the pretended Areopagite by S. *Paul* his Maſter or Initiator, as he calleth him. (o) Others pretend to no great aſſurance touching theſe abſtruſe matters, wiſely conſidering, that there no is mention made of theſe nine Orders by the more ancient Writers of the Church, *that liv'd in the five firſt Centuries, when the Writings of* Dionyſius *were not extant.* If the Church at that time and in the ſubſequent Ages had not paganiz'd, this Author with his *Hierarchies* and *nine Orders* could never have gain'd an univerſal Reception (as they did, but with ſome difference in placing ſome of the Orders) both in the Greek and Latin Church. They could not have fail'd, to explode the Impoſtor, if for no other Crime, yet for this one of the firſt Magnitude, *His Nefarious* * *Philoſophic-paganizing the matters of the Chriſtian Theology.*

(e) *Hoornbeck c. Jud. l.* 4. *c.* 1.

(f) *Ibid. p.* 308. *vid. Jac. Cappell. not. in Heb.* 1. 14.

(g) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 11. & *Liv. Galant. Compar. l.* 7. *p.* 195.

(h) *Biel* 3. *de Aſſumpt.*

(i) *Liv. Galant. ſupr. l.* 5. *p.* 166.

(k) *Dominationes dictæ ſunt, eo quia cæteris dominantur, & nulli ſubjecti extant. Horum officium eſt, inſtruere prælatos, quomodo in pugna ſpirituali ſeſe gerere debeant, teſte* Greg. *S. & quomodo ipſi diſcretè inferioribus ſuis, ſive ſubditis dominari teneantur.* Liv. Galant. ibid. p. 150.

(l) *Liv. Galant. ſupr. p.* 154. *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 1. *c.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 3. & *Aquin.* 1. *Qu.* 58. 3, 4. *qu.* 55 3. *qu.* 108, 5, 6.

(m) *Plat. Theol. p.* 220. *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 8. *c.* 13.

(n) *Vaſqu. in Th. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 216. *c.* 1.

(o) *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 1. *S.* 12. & *c.* 2.

* *Quàm abſurda docuit Origenes, quàm ſtulta & vana voluit aſtruere Euſebius, cùm in aliis libris, tum in Præparationibus Evangelicis, quando quædam ex Gentilibus conatur in noſtram religionem transferre?* Herman. Hameſman. de Tradition. Apoſtol. p. 11.

CHAP. IX.

1. Of the Phyſiological conſideration of the Pagans Syſtem of the Univerſe and of their Notion of a Supreme Deity. 2. Of the Supreme Deity of their Religion and Laws. 3. Of the Supreme Deity of their Religion and Laws according to the Platoniſts. 4. Of the Supreme Deity of their Religion and Laws according to the general Senſe of the Pagan Theiſts. 5. Of the Jews and Chriſtians Agreement with the Pagans touching this Idea of God. 6. Of the Heatheniſm of this their Idea. 7. Of the Agreement and Difference of the Pagan Theiſts touching their Archical Hypoſtaſes. 8. Of the Unity of the Univerſe as one animate mundane Syſtem and mundane Animal. 9. Of the Unity of it as one Deity and one Houſe and Temple. 10. As All is one according to the Pagan Theiſts, ſo One is All. 11. Of a moſt extravagant Senſe wherein One is ſaid to be All. 12. How One is the multitude and variety of Pagan Deities, and of the Stoicks Polyonymy. 13. The Reaſons of their Polyonymy and the falſe Senſe of it. 14. Their Coſmical Jove *both politically and animatively Imperial. 15. This Coſmical Regent is Order, Law, Providence, Fate and Fortune to the World.*

I. THE Pagans Syſtem of the Univerſe which muſt be *Politically* conſider'd (and which we have conſider'd both as their Univerſe of Rationals and of Gods) is alſo of *Phyſiological* conſideration, and this conſideration of it is (doubtleſs) of equal importance with the other; as will appear from one of their ſupreme Deities, which (although it was not abſolutely their ſupreme Deity, yet) is juſtly called *the ſupreme Deity of their Religion and Laws.* For it muſt be ſaid, that the Pagan Theiſts held *a ſupreme Deity*, whereby they meant *their ſupreme Deity*, *the ſupreme of their Deities*, which ſignified in various Notions, and conſequently various ſupreme Deities, of which one that was not the higheſt Deity in Paganiſm, was yet the ſupreme Deity of their Religion and Laws.

The common Profeſſion of the Pagan Theiſts importeth *a Supreme Deity*, ſuch a Supreme Deity as this Profeſſion of Atheiſm diſclaimeth. (p) *There is no Government of the Gods, nor any univerſal Providence of the Chieftain or the Supreme of the Gods.* In oppoſition to this Profeſſion of Groſs Atheiſm the Popular-pagan Theiſm is the acknowledgment of *a ſupreme Deity* and an *univerſal Providence.* Which ſheweth the Injuſtice and Partiality of *Euſebius* in treating of the matters of the Gentile Theology; for he maketh the Platonic (or Philoſophic-Pagan) Theiſm, to be nothing worſe than the Iſraelitical Theiſm; but the Popular-Pagan Theiſm nothing better than Atheiſm. Whereas the *Popular-pagan* and the *Philoſophic-pagan* Theiſts are of one and the ſame Religion, and equally agree with the Iſraelitical Theiſts in the acknowledgment of a Supreme Deity. But the *Agreement* and *Difference* between the Pagan and Iſraelitical Theiſm inferreth, that this Name (or theſe complex Terms) *a Supreme Deity* is of that ambiguity, which ſome Logicians call *Æquivocatio Erroris* (the Equivocation of Error,) as alſo thoſe other equivalent Names expreſſive of a Supreme Deity in the Pagan Writers. (q) *The God of the Univerſe, the God above all, the Ruler of all things, the Ruler and Prince of all, the Prince and chief Leader of the Univerſe, the Supreme Governor and Lord of the Univerſe, that chief or principal God, the firſt and greateſt God, he that generated this whole Univerſe, the Parent of the World, the great Father of Nature, the Parent of Gods and Men, the Hegemonic and ruling Principle of the World, the beſt and greateſt, the Governour of the World.* Theſe Honorary Names (and ſuch more) are expreſſive of a Deity that is Supreme, to which ſort of Deity the Pagan Theologers (agreeably to the Iſraelitical Theiſts) often aſcribe the Attributes of *Ingenit*, *Eternal*, *Beate*, and ſuch other, as the Name of the *Beſt* and *Greateſt* manifeſtly implieth. (r) *Both Parties grant, that there is one Parent of the Univerſe, Immortal and Ingenit alone.* Wherefore if this Name the Supreme Deity be underſtood in a general and indeterminate Notion without *Specific* or *individual* determination, it is matter of agreement between theſe two ſorts of Theiſts: But if it ſignifyeth, not without, but with *Specific* or *Individual* determination, it is not matter of Agreement, but of difference between the Pagan and Iſraelitical Theiſts, and in ſome ſort amongſt the Pagan Theiſts themſelves, they underſtanding *the Supreme Deity* in various Notions (and ſo far making various Supreme Deities) κοσμικῶς, *Coſmically*, φυσικῶς, *Phyſically*, ἱστορικῶς, *Herologically*, πνευματολογικῶς, *Pneumatologically or Genially*, ἀκροαματικῶς, *Acroamatically*. But as the Name of *Princeps Philoſophorum* (the Prince of Philoſophers) in the Schools of the *Ariſtotelians* muſt be underſtood of *their Prince of Philoſophers* (reputatively ſuch,) the *Platoniſts* and *Epicureans* have another Prince of Philoſophers: ſo this Name *the Supreme Deity* amongſt the Pagan Theiſts, and the ſeveral ſorts of Pagan Theiſts muſt be underſtood of their Supreme Deity (reputatively ſuch,) ſeveral ſorts of Pagan Theiſts having ſeveral Supreme Deities. So that the Epithet which they gave to the Jews Supreme Deity properly belongeth to their own.

——— ——Dedita Sacris
Incerti Judæa Dei——— ——— Lucan.
Judæa the Devotioniſt of an uncertain God.

II. *The Supreme Deity* amongſt the Pagan Theiſts is of this Specific determination, it ſignifieth a Paganical kind of Supreme Deity; for with them the Name doth not ſignifie meerly *a Deity Supreme*, but *the Supreme* (or Chieftain) *of their Pagan Deities.* As in *Silius Italicus* (s) *Jove* is invok'd by the Name of *Summe Deorum the Supreme of the Deities.* And the uſual Form of Invocation amongſt the Pagan Religioniſts is, ὦ Ζεῦ ϗ Θεοί, *O Jove and the Gods,*

(p) — *jam neque Dii regunt, Neque profectò Deûm ſummus Rex omnia curat.* V. Annot. in Min. Fæl. p. 41.

(q) Ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὅλων, ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός, *dominator rerum*, ἡγεμὼν ϗ ἄρχων ἁπάντων, ὁ ἡγεμὼν τοῦ παντὸς ϗ Ἀρχηγέτης, *ſummus Rector & Dominus*, *Princeps ille Deus*, ὁ πρῶτος ϗ μέγιστος θεός, ὁ τόδε τὸ πᾶν γεννήσας, *mundi parens*, *parens hominum deorumque*, τὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἡγεμονικόν, *opt. max.* κοσμοκράτωρ, παντοκράτωρ.

(r) *Omnes concedimus unum eſſe rerum Patrem, immortalem, atque ingenitum ſolum.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 2. p. 67.

(s) l. 4.

Gods, underſtanding by *Jove* (*t*) τὸν θεὸν θεῶν, or as ſome Inſcriptions ſtyle him *Numen Deorum*, *the God of the Gods*. Their Prayers are made Διΐ τε βασιλεῖ ϗ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς, *to* Jupiter *the King and to the other Gods.* His uſual ſtyle in *Homer*, *Virgil*, *Ennius*, *Plautus* and other Poets, is *the Father and King of the Gods*; (*u*) *for him they will have to be the King of the other Gods and Goddeſſes.* By the Gods they underſtand (*w*) τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν ϗ τοὺς ἄλλους, *the Supream Deity and the other Deities*; and for this reaſon they ſpeak of *God* and the *Gods* promiſcuouſly, becauſe they conſider them as *one Syſtem* and *one Chorus.* (*x*) *The reſt of the Gods* (ſaith *Onatus* the *Pythagorean*) *are to the Firſt God, the Intelligible* (or Super-ſenſible) *God, as thoſe of the Chorus to the Coryphæus, or as the Souldiers to their General.* They conſider'd their Deities collectively, celebrated a Feſtival of them all in common (call'd θεοξενία or θεοξυνία) and conſecrated Altars θεοῖς πᾶσιν ἐν κοινῷ, *DIS Deabuſque omnibus, to all the Gods and Goddeſſes.* They are his Aſſociates, Collegues and near Allies, and He is the Head of the Family of Pagan Deities. It is the Title of a Chapter in *Eugubinus*, (*y*) *that* Ariſtotle *affirmeth with* Homer, *that the Supream God is the Father of the Gods and of Men* (Heathen Gods and Heathen Men) *ejuſdemque generis cum illis, of the ſame Kind, Kindred and Family with them*; as the Anceſtor and the Younger (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) *he that begetteth and he that is begotten.* The ſubordinate Deities are ally'd to the Supream as Sons to the Father, that conſtitute with him one Family, for they are (*z*) παῖδες θεοῦ, *Sons of God, co-reigners with God*; (*a*) or *Daughters* of *Allah taal* (ὀλοτάλ) *the Supream Deity*, as the *Arabians* in their Heatheniſm call'd their *Alilahat* (Ἀλιλάτ) *Inferiour Deities.* The *Dii Conſentes* are ſo nearly ally'd to the Supream Deity, that the Civil Theology ſuppoſeth them his *Counſellors* and *Aſſeſſors* (their conſent being ask'd to every Decree in Heaven;) the Noble and Greater Gods are (*b*) βασιλέως συγγενέστατοι, *of Royal Dignity, next of kin to him, feaſting as it were at the ſame Table with the Supream God*, (*c*) as the Philoſophers and the Poets agree.

Homer therefore and *Ariſtotle*, the Poets and the Philoſophers, (the Popular and the Philoſophic Pagans) agree in the acknowledgment of a Supream Deity, and of one and the ſame Supream Deity, yet not without diſtinction and limitation of Senſe. For they do not agree in the acknowledgment of an *Acroamatical* Supream Deity, of whom there are no Notices amongſt the Popular Pagans. But they agree in the acknowledgment of a Supream Deity in general, and of a Paganical kind of Supream Deity, as *the Supream Deity* is in the Pagan Theology *a Term of Polytheiſm*, which relateth to the Subordinate Deities, as ὁ πρῶτος θεὸς (the firſt God) relateth to the Secondary. They agree therefore in the acknowledgment of a Supream Deity in the Senſe of their Religion and Laws, but not in the Senſe of their Schools of Philoſophy. When the Philoſophers ſpeak of the Supream Deity Scholaſtically (in the peculiar Senſe of their Schools) they mean one Supream Deity; and when they ſpeak of the Supream Deity (popularly) in the Senſe of their Religion and Laws, they mean another.

III. The Pagans Theiſm being their *Polytheiſm*, and *the Supream Deity* being a Term of their Polytheiſm, it is manifeſtly inconſiſtent with the acknowledgment of the true God, to whoſe Supremacy and Sovereignty it belongeth, to ſubſiſt in the Quality and Condition of God alone. Their Supream Deity manifeſtly claſheth alſo with the ſolitary Supream Deity of *Anaxagoras*, whoſe Hypotheſis ſo far befriendeth Atheiſm, it ſubverted the main of their Theiſm by ſubverting their Polytheiſm. The Atheiſm charg'd upon *Anaxagoras* (for which the *Athenians* baniſh'd him, fin'd him five Talents, and had put him to death, if his Scholar *Pericles* had not interpos'd) may beſt be underſtood from *Plato's tenth Book of Laws*; where deſigning to eſtabliſh the Belief of *Deity* and *Providence* as the Foundation of Laws, he aſſerteth in the firſt place, *The Godſhip of the Earth, the Sun, the Moon, the Stars*; falleth foul upon *Anaxagoras* and the young Men that ſlighted theſe things ὡς γῆν τε ϗ λίθους αὐτὰ ὄντα, *as being but Earth and Stones without any Deity or Divinity*; and he is ſo earneſt in purſuit of the Argument, that *Ficinus* ſaith of him, *Vix ab ira continere ſe poteſt, He is almoſt out of patience.* From this Bigotic Diſpute of *Plato* (who was a very ſerious and zealous Pagan Religioniſt) on behalf of the Pagan Theiſm againſt ſuppoſed Atheiſm, it appeareth, that *Anaxagoras's* Philoſophy was charg'd with Atheiſm and Impiety, becauſe it ſhut out of Being *the Mundane Soul, deſtroy'd the Godſhip of the World and the parts thereof* (making them inanimate and unintelligent) calling the *Moon an Earth*, and *the Sun* μύδρον διάπυρον, *a Maſs of Fire*; ἥλιον ϗ σελήνην ϗ τὰ ἄλλα ἄστρα εἴπερ ψυχὴ περιάγει πάντα, ἆρ' οὐ ϗ ἓν ἕκαστον; *The Sun, Moon and Stars if they are all mov'd by Soul, are they not ſingly animated?* This is the Summ of *Plato's* Theiſm, the oppoſite to the Atheiſm which he diſputeth againſt. The grand Fundamental of it which the main of his Diſpute is employ'd about, is *the Exiſtence of the Mundane Soul* (which inferreth the Deity of the illuſtrious parts of the World; and for this reaſon he aſcendeth to no higher Deity in his Book of Laws *than the Univerſal Mundane Soul*, becauſe the Theiſm which he deſigneth to aſſert, is the oppoſite to the Atheiſm which he intendeth to deſtroy. In his *twelfth Book of Laws* the Philoſophy of *Anaxagoras* is ſaid to be injurious to Religion, and to have cauſed much Atheiſm, becauſe injurious to Soul. (*d*) *Some who affirm, that Mind order'd all things in the Heavens, themſelves erring about the nature of Soul and not making it elder than Body, have overturn'd all again: Theſe things cauſed much Atheiſm.* For there are two things that *Plato* accounteth eſſential to Religion. (*e*) *One is, that Soul is the moſt ancient and divineſt of all things, whoſe motion being generated, hath produc'd the ever-flowing Subſtance. The other is concerning the orderly motion of the Stars and the reſt, which Intellect guideth, ordering all things.* (*f*) *No Man can be firmly religious, that doth not believe theſe two things; that Soul is the moſt ancient of all things generated, and immortal, and ruleth all Bodies. The other is; that Mind or Underſtanding is in the Stars.* The belief of Soul, both the Soul of the World, and the parti-

cular

(t) Hierocl. in aur Car. p. 10.

(u) *Ipſum enim deorum omnium dearumque regem eſſe volunt.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 4. c. 9.

(w) Porphyr. de Abſt. l. 3. S. 5.

(x) Jambl. de Myſt. p. 84. Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. c. 3.

(y) De Per. Phil. l. 4. c. 13.

(z) M. Tyr. diſſ. 1.

(a) Pocock. Spec. p. 107, 108.

(b) M. Tyr. ſupr.

(c) Idem Diſſ. 29.

(d) Λέγοντες ὡς νοῦς εἴη ὁ διακεκοσμηκὼς πάνθ' ὅσα κατ' οὐρανόν, αὐτοὶ δὲ πάλιν ἁμαρτάνοντες ψυχῆς φύσεως, ὅτι πρεσβύτερον εἴη σωμάτων, ἅπανθ' ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος ἀνέτρεψαν πάλιν. —— Ταῦτ' ἦν τὰ τότε ἐξειργασμένα πολλὰς ἀθεότητας.

(e) Ἓν μὲν ὃ περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐλέγομεν, ὡς πρεσβύτατόν τε ϗ θειότατόν ἐστι πάντων ὧν κίνησις γένεσιν παραλαβοῦσα ἀέναον οὐσίαν ἐπόρισεν. ἓν δὲ τὸ περὶ τὴν φοράν, ὡς ἔχει τάξεως ἄστρων τε ϗ ὅσων ἄλλων ἐγκρατὴς νοῦς ἐστι, τὸ πᾶν διακεκοσμημένος.

(f) Οὐκ ἔστι ποτὲ γενέσθαι βεβαίως θεοσεβῆ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐδένα, ὃς ἂν μὴ τὰ λεγόμενα ταῦτα νῦν δύο λάβῃ· ψυχήν τε ὡς ἔστι πρεσβύτατον ἁπάντων ὅσα γονῆς μετείληφεν, ἀθάνατόν τε, ἄρχει τε δὴ σωμάτων πάντων. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοισι δή, τὸ νῦν εἰρημένον πολλάκις, τόν τε εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις νοῦν τῶν ὄντων.

cular Souls of the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, is of grand concern in Religion, becauſe they have their Godſhip from it. *Anaxagoras* therefore introducing a ſolitary ſeparate Mind and diſcarding the Deifying Soul of the World, Athe-iz'd the World (with the illuſtrious parts of it) which was no leſs than a ſubverſion of the main of the Pagan Theiſm.

We have ſhew'd one Reaſon, why *Plato* in his Book of Laws aſcendeth to no higher Deity than *the Mundane Soul*; this was the Deity (not any higher Deity) whoſe Exiſtence he was to prove againſt the ſuppos'd Atheiſm of *Anaxagoras*. *Ficinus* furniſheth us with another Reaſon; *Why doth* Plato (ſaith he) *in this Book of Laws manifeſtly aſſert the Celeſtial Gods only?* (g) *becauſe the Contemplation of the higher Deities is very alien from the Matter of Laws*; which is an Intimation, that thoſe higher Deities in *Platoniſm*, *the firſt Archical Hypoſtaſis*, and *the Second* alſo as it is a *Platonic* kind of *Intellect*, are properly Gods of Philoſophical Speculation only, no Deities of Religion and Laws; which *Card. Beſſarion* intimateth alſo, anſwering *Trapezuntius* (who chargeth *Plato*, that he did not worſhip God) in this manner; (h) *that in his Books of Laws which were made for the People, he doth not expreſly preſcribe any worſhip to God under the Name of One, or Firſt, or Ineffable.* Such a Deity not at all accommodate to the People can be no Deity of Religion and Law; for theſe are *Exoterical* and *Popular* things. Nor could the *Platoniſts* ſuppoſe their firſt Principle a Deity of Religion and Laws; for they look upon it as quite above all external Adoration, as *Porphyry* diſcourſeth. (i) *Let us ſacrifice, but as becometh us, to the God over all, that is, as a wiſe man ſaid, by offering up no ſenſible thing to him; for every material thing is impure or unclean unto that which is immaterial; therefore the beſt Sacrifice to God is, to offer up our Lives to him (for even our Words are not agreeable to him) which is the moſt proper Hymn to him, and the moſt beneficial to our ſelves.* This Acroamatical kind of Deity was *Numa*'s Deity, (k) *to whom he would allow no Image to be erected in the Temples, becauſe unſuitable to his Nature; nor would he allow (for the ſame reaſon) any material Sacrifices to be offer'd to him, but ſuperſenſible only*; (l) *theſe being only acceptable to him.* So *Apollonius Tyanæus* will not allow (m) *that any Sacrifice be offer'd to the greateſt God that is over all, or that any thing ſenſible be conſecrated to this Supream Deity; for there is nothing that the Earth or Air affordeth, Plant or Animal, which is not a Pollution unto him.* Agreeably to the Senſe of theſe Theurgical Sophiſts the firſt Deity is repreſented by *Eugubinus* as a Deity altogether *unpopular*, ſuch as cannot be a Deity of Religion and Laws, and therefore *Plato* hath not propos'd him as an Object of Worſhip. (n) Plato *did not ſo clearly propoſe the greateſt God as an Object of Worſhip, becauſe he could not be worſhipp'd; what He is, and how to be worſhipp'd, cannot be deſcrib'd or declar'd. In three places he calleth him Undeclarable, in the* Timæus *difficult for Thought, undeclarable by Speech or Word. According to* Philo *alſo He is unconceivable, unintelligible, unthinkable, undeclarable; being thus unſpeakable and inexplicable, and ſuch as the old Theologers call'd innominable, ſome inviſible, others to be worſhipp'd in ſilence, others un-inveſtigable, therefore* Plato *hath ſaid nothing of him in his Book of Laws, nor ſet down any thing concerning his Worſhip, becauſe he could not, this Deity being unknowable both as to Name and Nature.* If *Plato*'s Supream Deity is of no *Religion*, if all *Underſtanding*, *Conception*, *Name*, *Word*, *Speech*, be utterly incompetible and unapplicable to this Firſt Principle; if He be perfectly tranſcendental to all *Cognoſcibility*, *Intelligibility*, *Speakability*; if there can be no *Doctrine*, no *Learning*, no *Diſcipline* or *Inſtitution* touching ſuch a Deity, and conſequently no *Religion*, *Lactantius* had great reaſon to ſay; (o) Plato *hath ſpoken many things of one God, by whom he ſaith the World was conſtituted; but nothing of Religion; for he only dream'd of, but knew not God.*

But although *Plato* hath preſcrib'd no Worſhip for his Supream Deity, yet his Followers (the Myſtic-Metaphyſical and Theurgical Theologers) allot him a ſort of Worſhip (p) *δι' ἑνώσεως καὶ σιγῆς, by Henotety and Silence.* (q) *Porphyry* that forbiddeth all External Speech, (which he alloweth in the Praiſes of the Intelligible Gods, becauſe they are Intelligible) and *Internal* alſo, if inquinated by any Paſſion, preſcribeth *pure Silence* (pure from that materiality which is in Speech) and *pure Cogitations*, *Conjunction with him and Aſſimilation to him, the Apathy of the Soul, and Theory of this God, which is the Sacrificing our Life to him. The* Pythagoreans *and* Egyptian *Wiſe Men forbad Men to ſpeak, when they paſs'd by the Doors or Gates, worſhipping by that ſilence God that hath the* (entrance or) *beginning of all things.* Prayer may be made to the greateſt God; for (r) *all pray except the Firſt*, ſaith *Theodorus Aſinæus*; but the Prayer muſt be *purely mental* according to *Apollonius*: and *Pſellus* intituleth this Deity, (s) *a Deity rather to be honour'd by Silence, than celebrated by any Words that ſpeak an Admiration of him*; *τὸ ἓν τετιμήσθω σιγῇ, the Henotety muſt be honour'd in pure Silence*, (t) ſaith *Damaſcius*. And *Clemens* in his Humour of (Criminal) Philoſophic-Paganizing ſaith of the Father and Cauſe of the Univerſe, (u) *He is unſayable, and moſt properly to be worſhipp'd and venerated with Silence together with an holy Aſtoniſhment.* Agreeably to the Firſt, a Second Deity or Archical Hypoſtaſis, (w) *διὰ σιγῆς μόνης θεραπεύεται, is worſhipp'd only by Silence.* But ſuch Acroamatical kind of Deities and their Worſhip being alien from Matter of Law, and altogether unſuitable to the generality of Mankind and the Societies of Men, *Plato* thought it a ſolecism, to mention them in his Book of Laws. As in his Epiſtle to *Dionyſius*; (x) *He taketh care, that the matters of his Acroamatical Theology, his Acroamatical Deities do not fall into the Hands of unskilful Men; for ſcarce*

any

(g) *Quoniam ſuperiorum contemplatio eſt à legum materia admodum aliena.* Arg. in 10. de Leg.

(h) *L.* 3. *c.* 5.

(i) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.*2. *p.* 60.

(k) *Ibid. l.* 6. *p.* 193.

(l) Θυσίαις δὲ χαίρειν αὐτὸ ταῖς νοηταῖς, οὐχὶ ταῖς ἐνύλοις ἰσχυρίζετο.

(m) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 4. *c.* 13.

(n) *Illum autem maximum ineffabilemque Deum idcircò non tam clarè adorandum propoſuiſſe, quòd non poſſet adorari, & deſcribi qualis eſſet, & quomodo colendus: confeſſus eſt enim eum tribus locis inenarrabilem, in Timæo cogitatu difficilem, dictu ineffabilem: Philo etiam cogitari & intelligi non poſſe, nedum proferri. Quoniam igitur hunc ineffabilem, inexplicabilem, quenque ſuperiores omnes Theologi, alii innominabilem, alii inviſibilem, alii ſilentio colendum, alii* ἀζήτητον *non inveſtigabilem dixerant, non eſt de eo in legibus locutus, cujus de cultu quicquam ſtatuere, quia nec nomen noſſet, nec naturam ejus haberet exploratum, non poſſet.* De Per. Phil. l. 5. c. 3.

(o) *Plato quidem multa de uno Deo locutus eſt, à quo ait, conſtitutum eſſe mundum; ſed nihil de religione. Somniaverat enim Deum, non cognoverat.* l. 5. c. 15.

(p) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *l.* 4. *c.* 6.

(q) *De Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 34. *de Antro. p.* 265. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 4. *c.* 13, 14.

(r) Πάντα εὔχεται πλὴν τοῦ πρώτου. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 281.

(s) Σιγῇ μᾶλλον τιμώμενον ἢ θαυμασίαις φωναῖς σημαινόμενον. *Orac. Mag. p.* 110.

(t) *Eugubin. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

(u) Οὐκέτι φωνῇ παραδιδόμενον, σεβάσματι δὲ καὶ σιγῇ μετ' ἐκπλήξεως ἁγίας σεβαστὸν καὶ σεπτὸν κυριώτατα. *Strom. l.* 7. *p. m.* 503.

(w) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 301, 274.

(x) *Cave, inquit, ne quando excidant hæc in homines imperitos. Si quidem, ut ego cenſeo, nihil propè eſt, quod magis irrideatur apud plebem. habes igitur à Platone cauſam veram, cur*

any thing, as I ſuppoſe, would be matter of more deriſion amongſt the common People. From Plato *therefore you have the true cauſe, why we may not ſpeak of the Firſt Deity amongſt the Vulgar, why it is not lawful to publiſh to the Vulgar the Parent of the Univerſe: For not underſtanding the things that are ſaid of him, they deride them, being things remote from Popular Cuſtom, and groſs Ears; therefore treating of Laws which ought to be publiſh'd to the People, he ſpake nothing of that great un-inveſtigable Deity, propoſing only the worſhip of Heaven to the People, to whom he muſt ſpeak only of that which they thought certain Religion.*

IV. The *Platoniſts* therefore, although they had higher Deities in their School, do yet agree, *That the Supream Deity of their Religion and Laws is the Mundane Soul, or the Syſtema Coſmicum* (Mundane Syſtem before diſcours'd of) *as animated by a Regial Mind and Soul, which is deifying to it.* The Popular-Pagans in their Religion acknowledg'd no higher Deity than an Univerſal Mind, *animative of the Mundane Syſtem and Sovereign thereof*; for upon this account *Plato* in his Book of Laws, in proving the Exiſtence of a Deity, aſcendeth no higher than *the Heavens and the Mundane Soul*, becauſe he look'd upon *the Heavens* or *the Mundane Soul* as the higheſt Deity of their Religion and Laws. So the Deſcription which he maketh of the Mundane Soul in his *Cratylus*, ſheweth, that he look'd upon it as the Grecanic *Zeus* or *Jupiter*, which was undoubtedly the higheſt Deity of their Religion and Laws. (y) Some call the ſame God Ζῆνα (*Zena*,) others Δία (*Dia*,) dividing his Name (ſaith he) Δία-Ζῆνα (which is in Senſe δι' ὃν ζῆν, *He from whom all things have their Life*) into two parts, which if join'd together, ſhew the Nature of this God. (z) *For there is nothing which is more the cauſe of Life to us and all other things than this Prince and King of all; therefore the Greeks have given him a very ſuitable Name.* In his *Philebus* alſo, having own'd the Opinion of the Ancients, who held, that the World was not fortuitouſly and temerariouſly mov'd, but govern'd by Mind and wonderful Wiſdom, he ſubjoyneth; (a) *Wiſdom and Underſtanding cannot be diſjoyn'd from Soul; therefore you muſt conclude, that in the Nature of* Jove *there is a Regial Soul, and a Regial Mind or Underſtanding. Speuſippus* agreeably to *Plato* is ſaid by *Cicero* (b) to have held *Vim quandam quâ omnia regantur, eámque Animalem, a certain Force or Power, whereby all things are govern'd, and that Animal.* Such was *Pythagoras*'s Notion of the Deity, as the Writers of the Church in conſort with *Cicero* and others report it. (c) *There is one God, who is not, as ſome ſuppoſe, without the Fabrick of the World, but in it, whole in the whole Circle, the Overſeer of all Generation, the Contemperation of all things, the Father of all, Mind and Animation to the whole Circle, the Motion of all.* (d) Pythagoras *alſo acknowledgeth one God, an Incorporeal Mind, diffus'd through the whole Nature of things, the Origin of Vital Sence to all Animals.* The Writers of the Church take it for granted, that this *Pythagoric* Deſcription of the Deity is to be underſtood of the Supream Deity; but doubtleſs the Deity thus deſcrib'd is but the third Hypoſtaſis of the *Pythagoric* Triad, which was the Supream Deity of the Pagan Theiſts Religion and Laws. So God is defin'd by *Onatus* the *Pythagorean*; (e) *God is Mind and Soul and the Hegemonic of the whole World.* The *Zeus* or *Jove* of the *Orphic* Theology is *the Mundane Soul* and the *Mundane Syſtem.*

> (f) Πάντα γὰρ ἐν μεγάλῳ Ζηνὸς τάδε σώματι κεῖται:
> *All theſe things lie in the great Body of* Jove.

(g) *A Spirit that pervadeth the whole World* (τῶ παντὸς κόσμω τὸ διῆκον πνεῦμα) was one of the *Egyptians* Notices of God. (h) *The Force which pervadeth all things, and which is both Fate and Mind*, is the Grecanic *Zeus*, which noticeth to us, that *Aratus*'s *Zeus* is the Regial Mundane Soul, (i) *the Life of the World, the common Life of the Mundane Body*, the Supream Diety of the Poetic and Civil Theology.

> ——Μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαὶ
> πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραὶ, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
> καὶ λιμένες· πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
> *All is full of* Jupiter (He is διήκουσα διὰ πάντων δύναμις, the Power that pervadeth All) *He is every where needful and uſeful to us All.*

The Supream Deity of the *Peruans* was of this Notion, as appeareth from his Name *Pachacamac*, which ſignifieth *the Soul or Life of the World.* And as *Aratus* ſtileth *Jupiter* μέγα θαῦμα, *the great Wonder*, ſo the *Peruans* are ſaid, (k) to have intituled their Deity *Uſapu admirabile, or Wonderful.* In the School of the *Stoicks* the Supream Deity is uſually intituled, (l) *The Mind and Underſtanding of the whole, the common or univerſal mundane Nature, and the common Reaſon of Nature, the Hegemonic and Ruling Principle of the World, and* (as *Zeno* defin'd God) *A Spirit pervading the whole World.* And in the Senſe of the Stoicks *the Indians* ſuppos'd (as *Megaſthenes* (m) in *Strabo* reporteth) *that the God who is the Maker and Governour of the World,* δι' ὅλω διαπεφοίτηκεν, *pervadeth the whole of it.* The Learned *Romans* Stoicize in their Notices of the *Capitoline Jove*, ſtiling him, (n) *The Mind and Spirit, the Guardian and Governour of the Univerſe, the Artificer and Lord of this Mundane Fabrick, to whom every Name, Fate, Providence, Nature, the World,* is agreeable. So true is that of *Macrobius*; (o) Jupiter *amongſt the Theologers is the Soul of the World.* The Soul moveth and governeth the Body, which it preſideth over, ſaith *Cicero*, (p) *as that Chieftain God governeth the World.* The Pagans in S. *Auſtin* ſay, (q) *We worſhip* Jove *of whom* Virgil *ſaith, All things are full of* Jove; *that is, the*

---

oporteat de primo ſilere apud vulgus, cur efferre nefas in vulgus parentem Univerſi. Irrident enim non intelligentes, veluti à populari conſuetudine, craſſiſque auribus remota, quæ de eo dicuntur. Eóque cùm de legibus loqueretur, quas populo publicare oporteret, de magno illo & inſcrutabili Deo nihil eſt locutus, propoſito tantùm cœli cultu, ut cui de certa religione loquendum eſſet. Eugubin. ſupr. l. 5. c. 3.

(y) *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 9.

(z) Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσιν, ὅστις ἐστὶν αἴτιος μᾶλλον τῶ ζῆν, ἢ ὁ ἄρχων τε καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν πάντων.

(a) Σοφία μὲν καὶ νοῦς ἄνευ ψυχῆς οὐκ ἄν ποτε γενοίσθην. οὐκοῦν ἐν μὲν τῇ τῶ Διὸς ἐρεῖς φύσει, βασιλικὴν μὲν ψυχὴν, βασιλικὸν δὲ νοῦν ἐγγίνεσθαι.

(b) De N. D. l. 1.

(c) Ὁ μὲν θεὸς εἷς· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐχ ὥς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τᾶς διακοσμήσιος, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ, ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ, ἐπίσκοπος πάσας γενέσιος, κρᾶσις τῶν ὅλων. πάντων πατὴρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ, πάντων κίνασις. *J. Mart. de Monarch. Clem. in protrept. S. Cyr. c. Jul. Lactant. de ira Dei c.* 11. *Eugubin. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 164, 165. *Min. Fœl. p.* 151.

(d) *Pythagoras quoque unum Deum confitetur, dicens incorporalem eſſe mentem, quæ per omnem rerum naturam diffuſa & intenta, vitalem ſenſum cunctis animalibus tribuat.*

(e) Αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ νοῦς καὶ ψυχὴ, καὶ τὸ ἁγεμονικὸν τῶ συμπάντως κόσμω. Stob. *Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 4.

(f) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 9.

(g) *Hor. Apol. Hieroglyph. l.* 1. *n.* 61.

(h) Ἀνάγκη καὶ νοῦς ἐστὶν, ἡ διήκουσα διὰ πάντων δύναμις. *Plutarch. Pſychog. p.* 1026.

(i) *Ficin. de vita in Apolog.*

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(l) Ὁ τῶ ὅλω νοῦς καὶ διάνοια, ἡ κοινὴ φύσις, καὶ ὁ κοινὸς τῆς φύσεως λόγος, τὸ τῶ κόσμω ἡγεμονικὸν, πνεῦμα διῆκον δι' ὅλω τῶ κόσμω.

(m) *L.* 15.

(n) *Sen. Qu. Nat. l.* 2. *c.* 45.

(o) *Jupiter apud Theologos eſt Mundi Anima.* In Som. Scip. l. 1. c. 17.

(p) *Ut hunc mundum princeps ille Deus.* Ibid. l. 2. c. 12.

(q) *Nos Jovem colimus, de quo ait Maro; Jovis omnia plena: id eſt omnia vivificantem ſpiritum.* De Conſenſ. Evangel. l. 1. c. 23.

univerſal Spirit of the Mundane Syſtem vital and vivificative to the whole. From *Varro* the ſame Father repreſenteth the Supream Deity as *the Mundane Syſtem's Animative Genius.* (r) *When* Varro *elſewhere calleth the Rational Soul of every one a Genius, and affirmeth ſuch a Mind or Soul of the whole World to be God, He plainly implieth, that God is the univerſal Genius of the World, and that this is he whom they call* Jove. (s) *Thoſe only ſeem to* Varro, *to have underſtood what God is, who thought him a Soul governing the World by Motion and Reaſon.* Such a Soul of the World is call'd by the *Stoicks* πῦρ τεχνικὸν ὁδῷ βαδίζον εἰς γένεσιν, *the artificial Fire orderly proceeding to the Generation of the things of the World.* And of ſuch a Mundane Fiery Nature *Plutarch* (in the Life of *Camillus*) ſeemeth to interpret *Numa's Fire-worſhip.* For ſpeaking of the Veſtal Virgins flight from *Rome* becauſe of the *Gauls*; *Some write* (ſaith he) *that they preſerv'd nothing but the ever-living Fire, which* Numa *had ordain'd, to be worſhipp'd as the Principle of all things; for Fire is the moſt active thing in Nature, and all Generation is Motion, or at leaſt with Motion; all other parts of Matter without warmth are ſluggiſh and dead, and crave the Influence of Heat as their Soul, which when it cometh upon them, they preſently fall to doing or ſuffering ſomething. Wherefore* Numa, *a Man very curious in ſuch things, and for his Wiſdom thought to converſe with the Muſes, did conſecrate Fire, and ordain'd it to be kept ever burning, in reſemblance of that Eternal Power which preſerveth and acteth all things.* But it is not probable, that *Numa's* ſacred Fire related to a *Stoical Fiery Deity*, as *Plutarch* (who had little inſight into Theurgical Theology) ſeemeth to ſuppoſe; but his Inſtitution of Fire-worſhip was (doubtleſs) of the ſame nature with that of the ancient *Magi*, from whom by the way of *Egypt* he deriv'd both his Acroamatical Deity and his Fire-worſhip as alſo his averſation from Images.

V. Theſe Notices of a Coſmical Zeus (or a Mundane-Syſtem Jove) of the Exoterical kind, although they are Popular-Pagan (for it is not the Popular, but the Philoſophic Pagans and their Theology that have gain'd the great Reputation in the Chriſtian Church, amongſt the Rabbins alſo and the Muhammedan Sophiſts) yet have met with ſuch Approbation, that ſeveral both Jews and Chriſtians ſymbolize with them at a great rate. The Hebrew Doctors diſcourſe, (t) that the venerable Name, the Tetragrammaton, is form'd from thoſe four Letters *Aleph*, *He*, *Vau*, *Jod*, that theſe four Letters are as the Soul and Spirit of the reſt, without which they cannot be mov'd or pronounc'd; which denoteth the Nature of God, *that He is the Soul of all things, and as* R. Moſes *ſaith, The Life of the World.* (u) R. Jehuda Levi *ſaith*; *As the firſt Cauſe is the Soul and Spirit of the World (which is alſo confirm'd by the Sacred Book* Zoar, *where the Bleſſed God is ſaid to be the Spirit and Soul of the Univerſe;) ſo in Man (who is ſtiled a little World) Intellect in Act is his Soul and Life.* The Book *Coſri* (w) ſpeaketh favourably of thoſe Philoſophers, that (agreeably to theſe Popular Pagan Notices of a Deity) *have compar'd the World to a great Man, and Man to a little World; that repreſent God as the Spirit, Soul, Intellect and Life of the World, as he is called* חי העולם (a Name ſomewhat near the Life of the World) *Dan.* 12. 7. *Philo* proceedeth ſo far, as to call God the Soul of the World. (x) *They that know not the Eſſence of their own Soul* (ſaith he) *how ſhould they exactly know the Soul of the Univerſe?* *Origen* thus philoſophizeth touching the State of the World. (y) *As our Body being one is made up of many Members, and is contained by one Soul: So I think, that the whole World is to be look'd upon as one huge Animal, which is contain'd as it were by one Soul, the Virtue and Reaſon of God. And this I ſuppoſe, the Scripture intimateth by that which the Prophet ſaith, Do not I fill Heaven and Earth? ſaith the Lord. And by that which S.* Paul *ſaith, when he preach'd to the* Athenians, *for in him we live, and move, and have our Being. For how is it, that we live, and move, and have our Being in God, but becauſe in his Virtue and Power he doth conſtringe and contain the whole World?* *Origen* doth not call God the Soul of the World, but *as it were the Soul of the World:* yet if the World is an huge Animal, as he ſuppoſeth, God muſt be ſuppos'd to be the Soul of it.

Lactantius is of Opinion, that the *Stoicks* Supream Deity or *the Mind of Jove* is the ſame with the Logos or Son of God in the Chriſtian Theology; (z) *for it is the Spirit of God* (ſo this Author calleth the Son) *which* Zeno *hath called the Mind of* Jove. *Tertullian* hath alſo diſcours'd in favour of this Notion. (a) *We have ſaid, that God made the World by a Word, and Reaſon, and Virtue; your Wiſe Men are alſo of Opinion, that Logos, that is, Reaſon or Speech, is the Artificer of the Univerſe. According to* Zeno's *determination, this is the Maker, that form'd all things in regularity, and is called by the Name of Fate, God, the Mind of* Jove, *and the Neceſſity of all things. Theſe things* Cleanthes *attributeth to a Spirit, which he ſaith is the Permeator of the Univerſe; and we alſo uſe the Name Spirit, to ſignifie the proper Subſtance of that Speech, and Reaſon, and Virtue, by which we ſay God made all things.* *Eugubinus* followeth *Lactantius*, and confoundeth the Chriſtians Meſſiah with the Pagan *Jove*, ſo perverting the Holy Scriptures, confounding the Holy and Profane, Old and New, Humane and Divine, Mundane Nature and Goſpel-Grace; God and the World, Chriſt and Belial, the Kingdom of Darkneſs and of Light, unchriſtianizing the matters of Chriſtianity and paganizing the Believers of it. (b) *He that manifeſted himſelf viſibly to all in the laſt Ages, was the very ſame, whom all Men ſometime venerated obſcurely, calling him Jove, Creator, Omni-regent; known to all Philoſophers, Religions, Ages.*

Some ſuppoſe, that (not the Son, but) the Holy Ghoſt is *the mundane Soul*, which was the Pagans *Jove* and ſupreme Deity. This ſeemeth to be the Senſe of *Paulinus*, who ſpeaketh like one of the Stoicks, that call univerſal mundane Nature *Deum mundo permiſtum*, *God permix'd with the World*, (c) *Who ſeeth not, that corporeal World to be govern'd by an incorporeal Virtue, and that by having the Mind of that Divine Spirit whereby it was made, infus'd and permix'd with the great Body of the Univerſe, the whole bulk hath agitation and vivification?* All thoſe Writers of the Church (both the later and more ancient) that account the Platonic Triad the ſame with the Chriſtian Trinity, if they are conſiſtent with themſelves, do ſuppoſe the Holy Ghoſt, to be the ſame with the Platoniſts *mundane Soul*, which is the Pagan *Jove*. *Theodoret* ſaith, (d) *He whom we call the Father*, Plato *calleth* T'Agathon; *he whom we call the Son and the Logos, he calleth the Intellect; and the Force which animateth and enliveneth all things, he calleth* Soul, *which the holy Scriptures call the Holy Ghoſt. Theſe things were ſtollen from the Philoſophy and Theology of the Hebrews*. *Theodoret* is a Tranſcriber of *Euſebius* and ſpeaketh his Senſe (*e*) touching the Identity of the Platonic Triad with the Chriſtian, and of the Platonic *Pſyche* (mundane Soul) with the Holy Ghoſt of our Religion. So a late Writer of *the Court* of the Gentiles (citing alſo *Lud. Vives* for his Opinion) pretendeth to prove, (*f*) *that* Plato's *Soul of the World is the Spirit of God, or God* (which is a confounding the true God with the Pagan *Jove*) and calleth the Spirit of God *the Increate mundane Spirit*. The *Alexandrian Cyril* doth not ſuppoſe, that the Platoniſts Triad is abſolutely the ſame with the Chriſtian, or that their mundane Soul is abſolutely the ſame with our Holy Ghoſt: But (*g*) *inſtead of the holy Spirit* (ſaith he) *they introduce a third, Pſyche, by whoſe implanting Life in them every Animal is animated, and they have attributed to it the Powers and Operations of the holy Spirit, which moveth all things that are moved, and containeth the Univerſe, and from which all things animate have their Animation and Vivification*. This Father might as well have ſaid, that the holy Spirit is the mundane Soul, as to make it ſuch by his deſcription of it; for if the holy Spirit is of his Deſcription and Idea, it ought to be denominated the mundane Soul. There are other paſſages in ſome Ancient and Modern Writers that (more or leſs) Identify the holy Spirit and the mundane Soul, which will be remark'd hereafter.

(r) *Cum alio loco dicit, Genium eſſe unius cujuſque animam rationalem, talem autem Mundi Animam Deum eſſe, ad hoc idem utique revocat, ut tanquam univerſalis Genius ipſe Mundi Animus eſſe credatur. Hic eſt igitur quem appellant Jovem.* De C. D. l. 7. c. 13.

(s) *Ibid. l.* 4. c. 31.

(t) *Menaſſ. ben Iſr. in Exod. Qu.* 3.

(u) *Idem Qu. in Gen. p.* 27.

(w) *P.*274. *ed. Buxt.*

(x) Οἱ τὴν ἰδίας ψυχῆς τὴν οὐσίαν οὐκ ἴσασι, πῶς ἂν περὶ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ψυχῆς ἀκριβώσαιεν. *Allegor.* p. 39. *ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(y) Περὶ Ἀρχ. *l.* 2. c. 1.

(z) *Eſt enim ſpiritus Dei, quem ille* (Zeno) *animum Jovis nominavit.* L. 4. c. 9.

(a) *Jam ediximus* Deum *univerſitatem hanc mundi verbo & ratione & virtute molitum. Apud veſtros quoque ſapientes* λόγον, *id eſt ſermonem atque rationem conſtat artificem videri univerſitatis. Hunc enim Zeno determinat factitatorem, qui cuncta in diſpoſitione formaverit, eundem & Fatum vocari, & Deum, & Animum Jovis & neceſſitatem omnium rerum. Hæc Cleanthes in ſpiritum congerit, quem permeatorem univerſitatis affirmat: & nos etiam ſermoni atque rationi, itemque virtuti, per quæ omnia molitum Deum ediximus, propriam ſubſtantiam ſpiritum inſcribimus.* Apologet. c. 21.

(q) *Qui ſe noviſſimis ſeculis viſibiliter omnibus declaravit, erat ille ipſe, quem olim obſcurè cuncti venerabantur, Jovem, Creatorem, regentemque omnia poteſtatem vocantes: Philoſophis, religionibus, ſeculis omnibus notum.* De Per. Phil. l. 1. p. 9.

The mundane Soul is uſually call'd by the Stoicks *Nature*, *common or univerſal Nature*, and the Name is ſo well thought of by the Alexandrian *Clemens*, that he ſaith of the Stoicks; (*h*) *They hold, that the final good is to live agreeably to Nature, the Name God being elegantly chang'd into that of Nature. The Stoicks ſay, the end of Philoſophy is to live according to Nature*; Plato *to be aſſimilated to God*; Zeno *had his Dogma from* Plato. By Nature is meant *Intelligent Nature*, touching which *Lactantius* (who yet denieth, that the World is an Animal, and that God is the Soul of it) argueth; (*i*) *Nature which you ſay, is the Origine of all things, if it have not Counſel, can effect nothing. But if it can generate and effect, it hath Counſel, and therefore muſt neceſſarily be God. Nor can that force be called by any other Name, wherein there is Providence to Excogitate, and Skill and Power to effect. Better therefore* Seneca *the moſt acute of the Stoicks, who ſaw, that Nature is nothing but God.* This Argument may be us'd either in a Chriſtian or a Pagan Senſe. In a Chriſtian Senſe the intent of it is not to ſet up *an univerſal mundane Intelligent Nature as God* (which is a falſe and ſpurious kind of Deity:) But the intent of it is to ſay, that *intelligent and provident Nature, the Origin of things*, is *God-propriety*, it is ſomewhat of that which God is *peculiarly* and *appropriately*, and that they which aſſert ſuch a *Nature* muſt neceſſarily aſſert a Deity. But in the Pagan Senſe, the intent of it is to affirm, that *univerſal mundane intelligent Nature* is the Idea of God, that *this Ideal Being or Perſon an intelligent Mind or Soul of the World* is the Deity. And the Argument us'd in this Senſe in Conſort with *Seneca*, ſetteth up his *Coſmical Jove* for God; which is a Principle ſo far from ſaving Men from Paganiſm, that it muſt neceſſarily lapſe them into it. It is one thing, to ſay, that *mundane-animative-intelligent Nature* is God as being ſomewhat, that he *comprehenſively* and *incluſively* is; and another thing, to ſay, that *mundane-animative-intelligent Nature* form'd by the Pagans into a *Jove* is as ſuch God: The former Aſſertion is legitimate Theiſm, the latter is Heatheniſm. From which the Argument of *Lactantius* is not wholly excuſable, nor is this other of *Minucius Fœlix*, unleſs it be underſtood with due limitation of Senſe. (*k*) *They that will have* Jove *the Chieftain* (or Supreme) *Deity, are deceiv'd in the Name, but touching one Soveraign Power they agree. The Poets ſpeak of one Father of Gods and Men, and that every Man is of ſuch a Mind as the Father of all every day induceth into him. The Mantuan Maro doth he not ſpeak more plainly, nearly and truly? When he ſaith, that a vital Spirit within nouriſheth, and an infus'd Mind agitateth Heaven and Earth, and the other parts of the World, whence Mankind and other Animals have their Origin? In another place he nameth that Mind and Spirit God. For he ſaith, that God paſſeth through the Heavens, the Earth and the Sea: Thence Men and Cattel, and Showers and Fire. What elſe do we ſay, that God is, but a Mind and Reaſon and Spirit?* Unleſs *Name* ſignifieth *Perſon* (as it may and uſually doth) this Diſcourſe repreſenteth the difference between *the God of Iſrael* and *the Pagan Jove* as meerly *verbal*, not *real*.

(c) *Quis non videt mundum* *um corporeum vi incorporea* *bernari, totamque molem, in-* *ſa atque permiſta magno uni-* *rſitatis corpori divini ſpiritus* *ente qua facta eſt, agitari ad* *itam?* Ep. 38.

(d) Ὃν ἡμεῖς πατέρα κα- ῦμεν, τἀγαθὸν ὀνομάζοντα. ῦν δὲ, ὃν ἡμεῖς υἱὸν καὶ λό- ον προσαγορεύομεν. τὴν δὲ ὶ πάντα ψύχουσαν ϗ ζωοποι- σαν δύναμιν, ψυχὴν καλοῦντα, πνεῦμα ἅγιον οἱ θεῖοι προ- αγορεύουσι λόγοι: ϗ ταῦτα δὲ ὰ τῆς τῶν Ἑβραίων φιλοσο- ίας ϗ θεολογίας σεσύληται. θεραπ. Ser. 2. p. 33.

(e) Pr. ev. . 11. c. 0.

(f) B. 3. . 9. p. 24, 335.

(g) Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ρίτον εἰσκομίζουσι, ψυχὴν, ὑφ' ς καὶ ἅπαν ψυχοῦται ζῶον, ιείσης αὐτοῖς τὴν ζωὴν, καὶ ὰς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος δυνά- μεις τε ϗ ἐνεργείας προσνενε- μήκασιν αὐτῇ. —— Κινεῖ γὰρ ὰ κινούμενα, ϗ συνέχει τὸ πᾶν αὶ ψυχοῖ ϗ ζωοποιεῖ. C. Jul. l. 8. p. 275, 276.

(h) Τὸ ἀκολούθως τῇ φύσει ζῆν τέλος εἶναι ἐδογμάτισαν, τὸν θεὸν εἰς φύσιν μετονομάσαντες εὐπρεπῶς. Strom. l. 2. p. m. 295. & l. 5. p. m. 433, 435.

(i) *Natura à qua dicitis orta eſſe omnia, ſi conſilium non habet, efficere nihil poteſt. Si autem generandi & faciendi potens eſt, habet ergo conſilium; & propterea Deus ſit neceſſe eſt. Nec alio nomine appellari poteſt ea vis, in qua ineſt & Providentia excogitandi, & ſolertia poteſtaſque faciendi. Melius igitur Seneca omnium Stoicorum acutiſſimus, qui vidit nil aliud eſſe naturam quam Deum.* L. 2. c. 9.

(k) *Qui Jovem principem volunt, falluntur in nomine, ſed de unâ poteſtate conſentiunt. Audio poetas quoque unum patrem divûm atque hominum prædicantes; & talem eſſe mortalium mentem, qualem parens omnium in diem induxerit. Quid Mantuanus Maro? Nonne apertius, proximius, verius? Principio, ait, cœlum & terras, & cætera mundi membra Spiritus intus alit, & infuſa mens agitat: Inde hominum pecudumque genus, & quidquid aliud animalium Idem alio loco, mentem iſtam & Spiritum Deum nominat. Hæc enim ejus verba ſunt: Deum namque ire per omnes, terraſque tractuſque Maris, cœlumque profundum: Unde homines & pecudes, unde imber & ignes. Quid aliud & à nobis Deus, quàm Mens & Ratio & Spiritus prædicatur?* P. 145, 146.

VI. The *Coſmical Zeus* of the Popular Pagans (univerſal mundane animative Nature, or the regial Mind and Soul of the World) may juſtly be thought the beſt ſort of *Zeus* or *Jove* in the Pagan Theology: But the Heatheniſm of this Idea will (in ſome degree) appear from the Original of it. For to this Notion of the Supreme Deity the Heathens were carry'd, partly by *the firſt original Theiſm of their Inſtitution*, and partly by their Method of proving *the Exiſtence of a Deity againſt Atheiſm*. The firſt Original Theiſm of their Inſtitution, or their eldeſt Idolatry (as is before diſcours'd) was the deifying the *viſible Heaven or World* as the ſupreme univerſal Deity or chief God. As amongſt the *Chineſe*, (l) *ſome ſuppoſe, that the Sun, Moon and Stars, and chiefly Heaven it ſelf (whence the Earth deriveth all her Goods) muſt be worſhipp'd with all poſſible Devotion.* Heaven which the elder times worſhipp'd as the Supreme God, was ſuppos'd Intelligent and animate, as *Philo* ſaith (not of the Magi, but) of the Popular-Pagan Chaldeans; (m) *they thought this viſible Univerſe was either it ſelf the only Deity, or that the Soul of the Univerſe which it containeth, was ſuch.* To ſubvert this Chaldaic Dogma, he introduceth *Abraham* perſuading the Chaldeans to deſiſt from their Aſtronomical Sublimities, from inquiries into the courſe of the Sun, Moon and Stars, as things above their reach, and to buſie themſelves in conſidering their own Nature, for by contemplating themſelves God and his Works may be underſtood. (n) *For bethink your ſelves, as there is a Mind in us which hath the Rule and Principality, ſo the Univerſe is conſtituted.* By which Paganical Method of teaching the knowledge of God *Philo* hath not deſtroy'd, but eſtabliſh'd the *Chaldeans Dogma*; for if God is to the World what our animative Mind and Soul is to our Human Body, the animated Univerſe is neceſſarily the Supreme Deity.

Which Idea of the Supreme Deity was a conſequent of the Pagans method of proving *the Exiſtence of a Deity* againſt Atheiſm; which hath much of ſound Reaſon and Philoſophy in it, but it involveth alſo *the Godſhip of the World*, which is of the ſame Importance in the Pagan Theiſm with the Exiſtence of a Deity. *Plato's* Theiſm which he aſſerteth againſt Atheiſm, is (as we have ſeen) the World's Animation. So *Cicero* diſputeth. (o) *There is aſſuredly a Celeſtial Force or Power Divine. An animative Principle of Life and Sence which is in our Bodies and our meanneſs, is not wanting in the greatneſs of univerſal Nature* and the illuſtrious Motion thereof. *Unleſs perchance they think there is no ſuch thing, becauſe it is not viſible, nor ſenſible: As if our own Mind whereby we are Wiſe and Provident, whereby we do and ſay theſe very things, was viſible, or diſcernible by Senſe.* The Philoſophic Emperor and others argue. (p) *Can there be Order in thee, and none in the World? It is abſurd, to ſay, that the Heaven or viſible World is inanimate,* (without Mind or Soul,) *ſeeing we that have but a part of the Body of the Univerſe, have a Soul. For how could a part have Soul, if the Univerſe was devoid of it?* *Socrates*'s diſcourſe (with *Ariſtodemus*) againſt Atheiſm is thus repreſented by *Cicero*. *The Humour and Heat and Earth and Breath which is in our Body, if any one asketh, whence we have them? It is manifeſt, that we took one of them from the Earth, another of them from the Water, the other from the Fire and Air. But that which ſurmounteth all theſe, Reaſon, Mind, Counſel, Cogitation, Prudence, where found we it? Whence took we it?* Unde hanc Homo arripuit? *Whence hath Man ſnatch'd to himſelf ſuch a thing as this?* So the Father of the Stoicks (*Zeno*) diſcourſeth againſt Atheiſm. (q) *What is devoid of Soul and Reaſon cannot generate an Animal and a Rational. But the World generateth Animals and Rationals: Therefore the World is an Animal and Rational. That which is Rational, is better than that which is not Rational: But nothing is better than the World. Therefore the World is Rational. In like manner, we may infer, that the World is Wiſe, that the World is Bleſſed, that the World is Eternal.* So *Balbus* in *Cicero* diſcourſeth for the Theiſm of the Pagans (the Theiſts or Religioniſts of the mundane Syſtem) againſt Atheiſm.) (r) *From that Ardor or vital Heat which is in the World,* (the mundane Soul of the Stoicks) *all Motion ariſeth: Which becauſe it is ſelf-moving, is neceſſarily a Mind. whence it followeth, that the World is an Animal. Hence alſo we may infer, that it is intelligent, becauſe the World is certainly better than any particular Nature, which is but part of the World. The World becauſe it comprehendeth all things, nor is there any thing which is not in it, is every way Perfect: Nothing can be wanting to what is* (abſolutely) *the beſt: There is nothing better than Mind and Reaſon: Theſe therefore cannot be wanting to the World. Wherefore it is Wiſe and God.* At this rate theſe mundane Theiſts deify the World in their Diſputes againſt Atheiſm, which deſign to prove the Exiſtence of *the animative Mind of the World*, the acknowledgment whereof conſtituteth a (Pagan) Theiſt, and is that which diſtinguiſheth him from an Atheiſt. (s) *All others affirm* ἔμψυχον τὸν κόσμον καὶ προνοίᾳ διοικούμενον, *that the World is animated and adminiſtred by Providence: But* Democritus *and* Epicurus *and ſo many as introduce* Atoms *and* Vacuum (as the Principles of all things) *do neither acknowledge the World to be Animant, nor to be govern'd by Providence, but by an irrational Nature.*

(l) *Alii Solem & Lunam ac Stellas Cœlumque præcipuè ipſum, unde cuncta in terras bona promanent, omni ſtudio colendum exiſtimant.* Maffeius Indic. l. 6. p. 258.

(m) Οὗτοι τὸν φαινόμενον τοῦτον κόσμον ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν ὑπετόπησαν εἶναι μόνον, ἢ θεὸν ὄντα αὐτὸν, ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ θεὸν περιέχοντα τὴν τῶν ὅλων ψυχήν. Περὶ Ἀποικίας. P. 284. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(n) Λογιεῖσθε γὰρ, ὡς ἐν ἡμῖν ἔνεστι νοῦς, καὶ τῷ παντὶ ἐστι. Ibid. p. 285.

(o) *Eſt, eſt profectò illa vis* (vis Cœleſtis numenque Divinum:) *Neque in his corporibus atque in hac imbecillitate noſtra ineſt quiddam quod vigeat & ſentiat, & non eſt in hoc tanto naturæ tam præclaro motu. Niſi fortè idcirco eſſe non putant, quia non apparet, nec cernitur: Perinde quaſi noſtram ipſam mentem qua ſapimus, qua providimus, qua hæc ipſa agimus, ac dicimus, videre aut planè qualis, aut ubi ſit ſentire poſſimus.* Orat. pro T. Ann. Milone.

(p) Ἐν σοὶ μέν τις κόσμος ὑφίστασθαι δύναται, ἐν δὲ τῷ παντὶ ἀκοσμία; M. Ant. l. 4. S. 27. Ἄτοπον τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄψυχον λέγειν, ἡμῶν οἱ μέρος σώματος ἔχομεν τοῦ παντὸς, ψυχὴν ἐχόντων. Πῶς γὰρ ἂν τὸ μέρος ἔχειν, ἀψύχου τοῦ παντὸς ὄντος; Plotin. En. 4. l. 3. c. 7.

(q) *Nihil quod animi, quodque rationis eſt expers, id generare ex ſe poteſt animantem compotemque rationis. Mundus autem generat Animanteis, compoteſque rationis. Animans eſt igitur Mundus compoſque rationis. Quod ratione utitur, id melius eſt, quàm id quod ratione non utitur. Nihil autem mundo melius. Ratione igitur mundus utitur. Similiter effici poteſt, ſapientem eſſe mundum: Similiter Beatum: Similiter Æternum.*

(r) *Quoniam ex mundi ardore motus omnis oritur, is autem ardor non alieno impulſu, ſed ſua ſponte movetur: Animus ſit neceſſe eſt. Ex quo efficitur, animantem eſſe mundum. Atque ex hoc quoque intelligi poterit, in eo eſſe intelligentiam, quod certè eſt mundus melior quàm ulla Natura. Mundus quoniam omnia complexus eſt, nec eſt quidquam quod non inſit in eo, perfectus undique eſt. Quid igitur poteſt ei deeſſe, quod eſt optimum? Nihil autem eſt mente & ratione melius. Ergo hæc mundo deeſſe non poſſunt. Sapiens igitur eſt: Et propterea Deus.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(s) *Plutarch. de placit. Phil. l. 2. c. 3.*

In their Diſputes againſt Atheiſm the Pagan Theiſts deſign to eſtabliſh their own Theiſm, which is their Religion of *Coſmolatry*, *Uranolatry*, *Aſtrolatry*. For their Regial Mind and Soul of the Univerſe (for whoſe Exiſtence they diſpute) is *univerſal mundane animative Nature*, *animative of the World*, (as the Soul of Man is of his Body) *complicate with the World*, *deifying to the World*. In the Stoicks account of the mundane Syſtem (t) there are various complications of *Jupiter and the World*; and they are ſo complicated, that each communicateth to the other his Name and his Properties. For the Deity is called *the World*. *Vis Deum Mundum vocare? non falleris. If you call the Deity the World* (ſaith *Seneca*,) *you are not Miſtaken in ſo doing*. And as the Deity is called *the World* (both the whole and the parts of it) is called God, according to that of *Manilius*.

> *Quà pateat Mundum Divino Numine verti,*
> *Atque ipſum eſſe Deum.* ———
> *The World is govern'd by the Deity, and is it ſelf the Deity.*

There is alſo a Communication of Properties between God and the World. For the Stoicks God is round and of Globoſe Form (whence their Deity was derided as being *ſine capite & præputio*, *without Human Form*,) and this is from the World. The *Stoicks* World is *wiſe and abſolutely the beſt*, and this is from God.

VII. The Stoicks Theology in this account of it is of a mean and ſorry appearance; and there is an appearance of very great Diſſonance between their Pedantry and the ſublimer ſort of Platonic Theology; which yet doth not hinder, but that in ſeveral reſpects there is a great Symphony between theſe two Theologies. For as the Platoniſts Triad is nothing better than a Ternary of their Univerſal Phyſiological Principles of the Univerſe: So the Stoicks Deity is nothing better than a Principle of their mundane Phyſiology, which divideth univerſal mundane Nature into two Parts: (u) εἰς τὸ ὑλικὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ αἰτιῶδες, *that which is paſſive and material, and that which is active and formal*, (the one is God, the other is the Matter,) which are two Principles of the Univerſe of things, that by their neceſſary Connexion and Union conſtitute the whole animate Syſtem, as Man is conſtituted of Soul and Body. The Deity they call (w) *Nature*, *common Nature*, *the Catholic Soul*, *the Mind of the Univerſe*, *containing in it and under it all ſeminary Reaſons or Spermatic Principles*, *a Spirit immixed with all the parts of the World*, *God permix'd with the World*; which are none of the ſublimeſt Attributes and Appellatives. But in this their Deity of the meaner ſort of Appellatives, there is (x) *T'Agathon*, *Nous*, *Pſyche* (the Names of the Platonic Triad;) and how far their Moral *T'Agathon* tranſcendeth the Platoniſts Myſtic-Metaphyſical *T'Agathon*, appeareth from the devout *Cleanthes*'s deſcription of *what Good is*.

> Τ'ἀγαθὸν ἐρωτᾶς μ' οἷον ἔς', ἄκουε δή.
> Τεταγμένον, δίκαιον, ὅσιον, εὐσεβές·
> Κρατοῦν ἑαυτοῦ, χρήσιμον, καλὸν, δέον·
> Αὐστηρὸν, αὐθέκαστον, ἀεὶ συμφέρον·
> Ἄφοβον, ἄλυπον, λυσιτελὲς, ἀνώδυνον·
> Ὠφέλιμον, εὐάρεστον, ὁμολογούμενον.
> Εὐκλεὲς, ἄτυφον, ἐπιμελὲς, πρᾶον, σφοδρόν·
> Χρονιζόμενον, ἄμεμπτον, ἀεὶ διαμένον.

> *I tell the Nature of the Good,*
> *That may be clearly underſtood.*
> *Ordinate, not Vicious,*
> *Beneficent, Juſt and Pious,*
> *Self-imperant, Due, Beauteous,*
> *Auſtere and ſtrict, Innoxious,*
> *Fearleſs, Griefleſs, Honourable,*
> *Profitable, Pleaſant, Stable,*
> *Devoid of* Faſtus, *Provident,*
> *Diſpaſſionate, yet Vehement,*
> *Unſtain'd by Defect or Crime,*
> *Not limited by any time.*

One great and real difference there is between the *Stoicks*, *Platoniſts* and other Pagan Theologers touching the Supreme Deity, which we ought to remark; for ſome of them were *Monadiſts*, others *Dyadiſts*, others *Triadiſts*, and ſome were reputed *Atheiſts*. The Stoicks that diſtinguiſh'd not any *Archical Hypoſtaſes*, were *Monadiſts*, *Pſychical Monadiſts*, as holding one univerſal deifying Soul of the World, and no higher Deity. *Anaxagoras* that was reputed a kind of Atheiſt by the Pagan Religioniſts, and vehemently declaim'd againſt by *Socrates* and *Plato* (amongſt others,) muſt be called a *Monadiſt*, *a Mental but no Pſychical Monadiſt*, his Hypotheſis of a ſolitary ſeparate *Nous* being deſtructive of the *Stoicks* and *Platoniſts* deifying Soul of the World (the Coſmical *Zeus* of the Pagan Religion) and Atheizing the World and the illuſtrious parts of it. He muſt be called a *Monadiſt*, becauſe of what *Plotinus* ſaith of him. (y) *Anaxagoras aſſerting a pure and unmix'd Mind, maketh the firſt Principle ſimple and a ſeparate Unity. Xenocrates* was a *Dyadiſt* in a twofold Senſe: (z) For he ſuppos'd two Archical Hypoſtaſes or Principles, one of which hath the Name of a *Dyad*; *that both a Monad and a Dyad were Gods, the one Maſculine, having the order of a Father, which he calleth Zen and Mind, and which is alſo to him the firſt God: The other Feminine as it were the Mother of the Gods, which is alſo to him the Soul of the Univerſe*: The former of theſe Deities (Monad or Zen) *Xenocrates* ſuppoſeth ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλεύουσαν, *reigning in Heaven*, the ſecond of them (the Dyad or mundane Soul) τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν λήξεως ἡγουμένην, *having its rule and prefecture under Heaven*. Whence it appeareth, that this Hypotheſis of a Dyadiſt is nothing more than the Section or Partition of the Popular Pagans *Coſmical Zeus* into two Archical Hypoſtaſes (Mind and Soul;) and therefore the difference between the *Stoicks* and *Dyadiſts* Theiſm ſeemeth not very conſiderable.

Nor is the Platoniſts diſtinction of Archical Hypoſtaſes (which yet is a great and real difference between the Stoical and Platonical Theiſm) of any value or conſideration in Matter of Religion: Nor are they the better Religioniſts upon account of it. The *Stoicks* are thought groſly criminal in making God no higher than the Soul of the World: But this groſs criminality is no ſingularity of theirs, the Platoniſts are alike criminal and do the ſame thing; for they degrade the Supreme Deity of their Religion into the Rank and Condition of *the Soul of the World, the deifying Soul*

(t) *Jacob. Thomaz. Diſſert.* p. 178.

(u) *Voſſ. de Idol.* l. 7. c. 5. & *Gat. in Ant.* p. 145. *Lipſ. Phyſ.* l. 1. *Diſſ.* 4, 5.

(w) Φύσιν, φύσιν κοινὴν, τὴν ψυχὴν καθολικὴν, τὸν τοῦ ὅλου νοῦν, τὸν ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ λόγον, λόγον σπερματικὸν τοῦ κόσμου, *ſpiritum omnibus partibus immiſtum, Deum mundo permiſtum.*

(x) *Clem. Str.* l. 5. p. m. 439. προτρεπτ. p. m. 35. *Euſeb. pr. Ev.* l. 13. c. 13.

(y) Ἀναξαγόρας δὲ νοῦν καθαρὸν καὶ ἀμιγῆ λέγων, ἁπλοῦν καὶ αὐτὸς τίθεται τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ χωριστὸν τὸ ἕν. En. 5. l. 1. c. 9.

(z) *Stob. Eccl. Phyſ.* p. 5.

of the World, Plato's *Pyſche* conſtituting the World a Deity as well as the Stoicks. (a) *This World is a God by the Soul of it: So the Sun is a God becauſe animated, and the other Stars.* So *Plato* in his *Tenth of Laws* proveth the Godſhip of the Heavens, and the heavenly Bodies becauſe they are animated. (b) *Becauſe a Soul or Souls virtuous with all ſort of Virtue, are demonſtrated to be the Cauſes of all theſe, we will affirm, that they are Gods.* Now, if the World be deify'd, deify'd at ſuch a rate; if ſuch a Foundation be laid for *Coſmolatry*, *Uranolatry*, *Aſtrolatry*; it is all one as to the buſineſs of true Religion and the Service of God, whether we ſay, that God is the *informing* Soul of the World, or only *the aſſiſting* Soul of the World; whether the World be deify'd by an *in-mundane* or a *ſuper-mundane* Soul. As ſome of the learned Diſpute, (c) that the *Pſyche* which *Plato* contendeth for in his *Tenth Book of Laws*, is not ψυχὴ ἐγκόσμιος, *an in-mundane Soul* (the immediate Soul of the mundane Animal,) but purely ὑπερκόσμιος, *a ſuper-mundane Soul*, and that this is the third Hypoſtaſis of the Platonic Triad. But there is great Reaſon to think the contrary, and that ſuch a meer *ſuper-mundane* Soul is altogether alien from the Platonic Inſtitution; that the Coſmical *Zeus* of the Popular Pagans (the ſame with the Stoicks) is the third Hypoſtaſis of the Platonic Triad (there are but three Archical Hypoſtaſes in Platoniſm, and the Introduction of a fourth is a grand incongruity,) and that one and the ſame Soul is both ὑπερκόσμιος, *ſuper-mundane* and ἐγκόσμιος, *in-mundane*, whence the Platoniſts (although they ſpeak of a ſuper-mundane Soul, yet) uſually call the World *the third God*, which is *Plotinus*'s Language. The ſame Author intituleth Human Souls (d) *the Siſters of the Soul of the World and of the ſame Species with it* (which ſpeaketh it *in-mundane*,) as alſo the Souls of the heavenly Bodies. (e) *As if you ſhould ſuppoſe an animated City comprehenſive of other animated Cities, the Soul of that animated comprehenſive City would be more perfect and powerful: Yet nothing hindreth, but the Souls of the other Cities may be of the ſame Nature.* Certainly, a Soul of this deſcription is *an in-mundane* Soul; and if the Fathers underſtood Platoniſm aright, the third Hypoſtaſis of the Platonic Triad is *an in-mundane* Soul. (f) *The Platoniſts affirm, that the* (viſible) *Gods have moſt happy Souls, yet fetter'd in eternal Bodies, the celeſtial in fiery Bodies, but the Soul of* Jove *himſelf* (*whom they will have to be the World*) *inclos'd in all the Elements of this corporeal bulk, which reacheth from Earth to Heaven. For this Soul is ſuppos'd by* Plato, *to be diffus'd and extended by muſical Numbers from the Center of the Earth to the ſummity of Heaven, ſo that this World is an huge Animal, moſt happy and eternal, whoſe Soul hath the perfect felicity of Wiſdom, and never deſerteth its Body, and whoſe Body liveth for ever by its inclos'd Soul, and retardeth it not in its operations. Moreover*, It is evident beyond all Diſpute, that the mundane Soul which *Plato* diſputeth for in his *Tenth of Laws*, is a deifying Soul of the World; whence it unavoidably followeth, that it is an *in-mundane* Soul. Nor is there any thing in Platoniſm of a contrary appearance, which the Platoniſts themſelves (g) have not anſwered, or which is not before conſider'd. For agreeably to *Plotinus*'s Senſe (which is before conſider'd) the other Platoniſts that intitle their mundane Soul ὑπερκόσμιος, *ſuper-mundane*, ſuppoſe it alſo ἐγκόσμιος, *in-mundane*, as *Jamblichus*'s Text ought to be read. (h) *By the eternal ſuper-mundane and in-mundane Soul God maketh the Worlds.*

VIII. The animative Genius of the mundane Syſtem (as *Varro* calleth *Jove*) inferreth *the Unity of the Univerſe*, that all things are one, *one animate mundane Syſtem.* (i) *The chief Philoſophers have declar'd, that All is one.* So *Linus* in *Stobæus.* (k)

Omnia ſunt unum, ſunt omnis ſingula partes.
All things are parts of the Univerſe, and that
All is one.

The unity of the Univerſe (which ſo far as it claſheth with the divided ſtate of it according to Chriſtianity, is a grand irreligious miſtake) is a grand Maxim in the Stoicks Theology. (l) This whole (ſaith *Seneca*) *in which we are contain'd, is both one thing and God. This All, the comprehenſion of Divine and Human things, is one thing: We are the Members of one great Body.* The Univerſe is ſuppoſ'd to be one Body becauſe of its informing Soul, which connecteth and holdeth together the parts of it. (m) *For if there was not one animative Force pervading through All, the Univerſe could not be wiſely and well govern'd.* So *Sextus Empiricus* repreſenteth the Senſe of *Pythagoras*, *Empedocles*, and all the *Italic* Philoſophers. (n) *We Men have not only a Conjunction amongſt our ſelves with one another and with the Gods above us, but alſo with the Brute-animals below us: Becauſe there is one Spirit which as a Soul pervadeth the whole World, and uniteth together all the parts of it.* The Pagan Theologers thought it a grand abſurdity, to ſuppoſe the Univerſe a meer mechanical Structure. (o) *For the Structure of the World ought not to be like an inanimate Houſe great and multifarious, of Wood, Stone and other Materials regularly numbred: But it ought to be vigilant every where and vital with great Diverſity.* The vital Conſtitution of the Univerſe is the Origin of *Natural Magic*, wch is a vital Sympathy and Antipathy between ſeveral things in the World, according to that of *Plotinus*, (p) *the true Magick is the Friendſhip and Inimicalneſs that is in the Univerſe.* But under the pretext of Natural Magick the Pagan Theologers introduc'd all the Artifices of their *Technical* and *Theurgical* Magick. Reſolving the operations of Art Magick (in the foul Senſe) into an (q) ἕνωσις καὶ ἡ συμπάθεια τοῦ παντὸς, *Union, Alliance and Sympathy of the whole mundane Compages*, ſuch as is amongſt the parts of an Human Body, or the Strings of a muſical Inſtrument; (r) *for there is* (ſaith *Syneſius*) *a Sympathy and Conſent amongſt the parts of the Univerſe, as being parts of one whole.* Into this they reſolve the Efficacy of (s) *Charms* and *Faſcinations*, of *Philtres* alſo (ſome of which are Magical in the foul Senſe,) the Efficacy of their *Myſtic Ceremonies*, *Symbols*, *Sacrifices* (which are ſuppos'd Cognate and Congenial to ſeveral Deities,) the Efficacy *of Prayer to the Sun and Stars*, which putteth them into Motion, and attracteth influxes from them, in the ſame manner, as when the lower part of a Chord that is ſtretch'd, is put into Motion, the upper part is put into Motion alſo. For this reaſon *Pythagoras* forbiddeth the ſacrificing *a Cock*, becauſe ally'd to the Sun and Moon; which is ſaid to be an Indication (*t*) *of the Unity, mutual Connexion, Sympathy, and Conſent that is between the parts of the World.* But although there are many unqueſtionable Inſtances of a marvellous Sympathy (*u*) that is in Nature (ſuch as that of a young Woman, who was grievouſly tortur'd in her Joints, when her Father at a great diſtance was broke upon the Wheel) yet theſe Sympathies being altogether heterogeneous do not at all countenance the Sympathies of the Pagan Theologers Theurgical Magick.

(a) Διὰ ταύτην ὁ κόσμος ὅδε θεός ἐςι δὲ καὶ ἥλιος θεὸς, ὅτι ἔμψυχος, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἄςρα, Plotin. En. 5. l. c. 1, 2.

(b) Ἐπειδὴ ψυχὴ μὲν ἢ ψυχαὶ πάντων τούτων αἰτίαι ἐφάνησαν, ἀγαθαὶ δὲ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν, θεοὺς αὐτὰς εἶναι φήσομεν.

(c) Intell. Syſt. p. 562, 576, 594.

(d) Ibid. p. 593.

(e) Οἷον εἰ πόλις ἔμψυχος ἦν περιεκτικὴ ἐμψύχων ἄλλων, τελειωτέρα μὲν πόλεως καὶ δυνατωτέρα, οὐδὲν μὲν ἐκώλυε τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως εἶναι καὶ τὰς ἄλλας. Plotin. En. 4. l. 8. c. 3.

(f) *Deos dicentes habere beatiſſimas animas & tamen Æternis corporibus illigatas, Cœleſtes quidem igneis, Jovis autem ipſius animam, quem mundum iſtum volunt, omnibus omnino corporeis Elementis, quibus hæc tota moles, à terra in cœlum ſurgit, incluſam. Hanc enim animam Plato ab intimo terræ medio quod Geometræ centrum vocant, per omnes partes ejus uſque ad Cœli ſumma & extrema diffundi, & extendi per numeros muſicos opinatur, ut ſit iſte mundus Animal maximum, beatiſſimum, ſempiternum, cujus Anima & perfectam ſapientiæ felicitatem teneret, & corpus proprium non relinqueret, cujuſque corpus & in Æternum ex illa viveret, & eam quamvis non ſimplex, ſed tot corporibus tantiſque compactum hebetare atque tardare non poſſet.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 17. vid. S. Cyr. C. Jul. l. 4. p. 147. Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 11. c. 20. Theodor. Θεραπ. Ser. 2.

(g) Alcin. de Doctr. Plat. c. 14.

(h) Διὰ τῆς ἀϊδίου τῆς ὑπερκοσμίου καὶ ἐγκοσμίου ψυχῆς δημιουργεῖ τοὺς κόσμους. De Myſt. p. 98. Gale not. p. 249.

(i) Ἓν τὸ πᾶν *ſapientum Principes prodiderunt.* Macrob. Saturn. l. 1. c. 17.

(k) Πάντα δ' ἕν ἐςιν, ἕκαςτ' ἑνὸς μέρος. Grot. Excerpt. p. 150.

(l) *Totum hoc quo continemur, & unum eſt, & Deus eſt. Totum hoc quo divina & humana concluſa ſunt, unum eſt: Membra ſumus corporis magni.* Lipſ. Phyſ. l. 1. Diſſ. 8.

(m) *Attic. ap. Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 15. c. 12.

(n) Μὴ μόνον ἡμῖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι κοινωνίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἄλογα τῶν ζώων· ἓν γὰρ ὑπάρχει πνεῦμα τὸ διὰ παντὸς κόσμου διῆκον Ψυχῆς τρόπον, τὸ καὶ ἑνοῦν ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὰ ἐκεῖνα. Adv. Matth. p. 331.

(o) Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὥσπερ ἄψυχον οἰκίαν μεγάλην ἄλλως καὶ πολλὴν ἐκ τινων εὐαριθμήτων κατ' εἶδος, οἷον λίθων καὶ ξύλων· εἰ δὲ βούλει καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν εἰς κόσμον, ἔδει αὐτὸ γεγονέναι· ἀλλ' εἶναι αὐτὸ ἐγρηγορὸς πανταχῇ καὶ ζῶν ἄλλο, ἄλλως. Plotin. En. 4. l. 4. c. 16.

Their one animated mundane Syſtem is neceſſarily *one mundane Animal*; upon which account they attribute a Magical Conſtitution to the Univerſe. For they ſuppoſe, (*w*) *that this Univerſe is one, and one Animal, ſo that nothing is ſo remote, as not to be near, becauſe of the Sympathy and* συγκίνησις, *or Conſent of Motion, which is between the parts of one Animal.* As an Animal the Univerſe is conſtituted of Soul and Body; as a Rational intelligent Animal it is conſtituted of Mind, Soul and Body, ὅλον δὶ ὅλου ψυχῆς καὶ νοῦ πλήρες, *throughout full of Soul and Mind*, (*x*) as *Julian* expreſſeth this Paganic Dogma. An Animal Fabrick muſt have diſtinction of Parts: So the Stoicks ſay, *that God is the Mind of the Univerſe, the Body of it is his Body, and the Sun, Moon and Stars* are the Eyes of this great mundane Animal. The mundane Animal was thought *Hermaphroditick* (becauſe a generative Animal) both Sexes are attributed to it in *Jarchas the Brachman*'s Anſwer to *Apollonius*. (*y*) *The World is an Animal; for it generateth all things, being of both Natures, Male and Female, and doing the part both of Father and Mother for Generation.* The World conſiſting of active and paſſive Nature, and becauſe the Virtue of *generating* and *conceiving* (the Maſculine and Feminine Virtue) are conjunct in univerſal Nature, is not ineptly intituled ἀῤῥενόθηλος, *Male and Female*: (*z*) *So* Orpheus *and* Triſmegiſt *alſo call Nature and the mundane* Jove *Male and Female.* And in imitation of theſe mundane Theiſts *Syneſius* hath aſſum'd the boldneſs, to ſalute his Supreme Deity in this manner.

Σὺ δὲ ἄῤῥην, σὺ δὲ θῆλυς.
Thou art both Male and Female. Hymn. 2.

The Popular Pagans call their Deities (*a*) ſometimes by Maſculine and ſometimes by Feminine Names (in the Septuagint alſo *Baal* is ſometimes of the Maſculine and ſometimes of the Feminine Gender,) not pretending to know their Sexes; or judging it a matter indifferent, which of the Sexes they aſcrib'd to their Deities; or perhaps ſuppoſing them *Hermaphroditick*: But touching the true God Piety alloweth no ſuch arbitrarious uſe of Names. The true God is neither a Maſculine nor a Feminine Imperial Dignity, but muſt be called by ſuch Names of Imperial Dignity (God, Lord, King,) which denote an Imperial Dignity of the nobler kind of Idea. To ſuppoſe the Godhead *a Goddeſs, Lady or Queen*, is not a genuine legitimate Idea, thoſe Names of Imperial Dignity being complicate with ſomewhat of blemiſh and imperfection, are a ſpice of Blaſphemy and Reproach; for (as *Buxtorf* ſaith,) *it is not agreeable to the Divine Majeſty, that his Name be of Feminine termination.*

IX. The one animate mundane Syſtem is alſo *one Deity*, (*b*) *ſome ſay the firſt God, others the ſecond, and ſome call it the third God.* In the Stoicks Theology the World is *the ſupreme God*: But *Philo* (having a greater regard to the Platonic Philoſophy than to the Religion which he profeſs'd) often diſputeth, (*c*) *that the World is not the firſt God.* The Platoniſts uſually call it *the third God*: But *Origen* ſaith, that they call it *the ſecond God.* Which is very agreeable to what *Plato* ſaith in his *Timæus* (according to *Cicero*'s Verſion of it) *Deus ille æternus hunc perfectè beatum Deum procreavit, that God who belongeth to unchangeable Eternity procreated this perfectly happy God.* The viſible, ſenſible, fabricated World (which belongeth not to unchangeable Eternity) being thus confronted to an inviſible, intelligible, parental Deity conſider'd in general only, and in a ſuſpence Notion (without deſcending to the conſideration of diſtinct Archical Hypoſtaſes) in this Antitheſis and mode of conſidering things, it falleth to the World's ſhare, to be called *the ſecond God.* So the Suppoſititious *Triſmegiſtic* Books often call the viſible World *the ſecond God*, ſometimes tranſcribing *Plato*'s Language. (*d*) *The Lord of Eternity is the firſt God, the ſecond is the World.* The World is call'd by *Plato* in the cloſe of his *Timæus* μονογενὴς, *Unigenit*; and *Theodoret* (*e*) citeth a Verſe of *Parmenides*, which ſo calleth the World.

Μοῦνον, μουνογενές τε καὶ ἀτρεμὲς, ἠδ' ἀγένητον.
Sole, Unigenit, and Immote, and Ungenerate.

If the Attribute ἀγένητον be underſtood, to ſignifie, that the World is *ſelf-originate*, as *Theodoret* underſtandeth it, there will be an enormous contradiction in *Parmenides*'s Poetry; for the World cannot be *Unigenit* if it be Self-originate and abſolutely *ungenerate*. By *Ungenerate* therefore *Parmenides* muſt mean *that which is not ſubject*

(p) Ἡ ἀληθινὴ μαγεία, ἡ ἐν τῷ παντὶ φιλία καὶ τὸ νεῖκος αὖ. En. 4. l. 4. c. 40.

(q) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 80.

(r) *De Inſomn. p.* 134.

(s) *Plotin. ſupr. Jambl. de myſt. p.* 124. *Gale not. p.* 271.

(t) Τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ἑνώσεως, καὶ ἀλληλουχίας, συμπαθείας τε καὶ συμπνοίας. Jambl. προτρεπτ. p. 146.

(u) *Etmuller. T.* 2. *p.* 977.

(w) Πᾶν τοῦτο τὸ ἕν, καὶ ὡς ζῶον ἕν· ζώου τε ὄντος καὶ εἰς ἓν τελοῦντος, οὐδὲν οὕτω πόῤῥω τόπῳ ὡς μὴ ἐγγὺς εἶναι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ζώου πρὸς τὸ συμπαθεῖν φύσει. Plotin. En. 4. l. 4. c. 32.

(x) *Orat. in Ant. p.* 164. *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 2. *Diſſ.* 10. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 37.

(y) Ζῶον τὸν κόσμον, ζωογονεῖν γὰρ τὰ πάντα· ἀμφοῖν, ἄρσενός τε θηλείας φύσεως· αὐτὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ ξυγγινόμενον, τὰ μητρός τε καὶ πατρὸς εἰς τὴν ζωογονίαν πράττειν.

(z) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 419. *Jupiter & mas eſt, & neſcia Fœmina Matis.*

(a) *Seld. de D. Syr. Synt.* 2. *c.* 2.

(b) *Orig. C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 235.

(c) Περὶ Ἀβραάμ. p. 245. Περὶ Ἀποικίας. p. 285. *ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(d) *Æternitatis Dominus Deus primus eſt, ſecundus eſt mundus.* Aſclep. c. 6.

(e) Θεραπ. Ser. 2.

ject to Generation and Corruption; and in ſuch Senſe the World is ſuppos'd to be both *Ungenerate* and *Unigenit*, which Attribute ſpeaketh it *an only Son of God*. So *Celſus* the *Platoniſt* (f) and the Triſmegiſtic Books have intituled the animated World *the Son of God*. And conſequently there is in *Platoniſm a twofold Son of God*; the one is *the Metaphyſical Intellect of the Mundane Syſtem*, the other is *the Intelligent Mundane Animal*, the only begotten *ſenſible Son of God*. *Philo* throughly imbib'd theſe *Platonic* Notions; for of the High Prieſt's Robes (which repreſented the World) he giveth this Account. (g) *They were inſtituted in the firſt place, that the High Prieſt might have about him a manifeſt Repreſentation of the Univerſe, by the continual beholding whereof he might live a Life worthy the Nature of the whole. In the next place, that in his Sacred Miniſtrations the whole World might co-officiate with him; for being conſecrated Prieſt to the World's Father, it was hugely convenient*, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐπάγεσθαι πρὸς θεραπείαν τοῦ γεγεννηκότος, *that the Son ſhould be made a Party in the Worſhip of the Father*, (h) ἵνα συνιερουργῇ καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἀνθρώπῳ, *to conjoyn the World with Man in the Sacred Miniſtration.* Sometimes he diſtinguiſheth two Sons of God, *the Seniour and the Juniour*, (i) the *Intelligible* and the *Senſible*, ſtiling the viſible World νεώτερον υἱὸν θεοῦ, *the younger Son of God*, (k) τὸν μόνον καὶ ἀγαπητὸν αἰσθητὸν υἱόν, *the ſole and belov'd ſenſible Son.* And ſometimes this extravagant Allegoriſt preſcribeth to the World a Life of Devotional Duty to its Father. (l) Βίος γὰρ ἐμπρεπὴς κόσμῳ, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ποιητῇ συνεχῶς καὶ ἀδιαστάτως εὐχαριστεῖν; *ſuch a Life becometh the World, to give thanks continually to its Father and Maker.* The World's Religious Life (being no Figurative Expreſſion) ſpeaketh it *Animated* and *Intelligent*; and therefore *Philo* muſt be ſuppos'd to acknowledge not only the two firſt Archical Hypoſtaſes, but the third *Platonic* Archical Hypoſtaſis (m) τὴν τοῦ παντὸς ψυχήν, *the Soul of the World*; nor is it a reaſonable thing in him, to refuſe the Godſhip of the World, acknowledging its Sonſhip to God in the *Platonic* Notion.

The one Mundane Syſtem is alſo intituled *one Temple, Houſe or Habitation and Deiform Statue*; all which Appellatives denote ſuch an Unity and undivided State of the Univerſe, which is diſſonant from Chriſtianity. (n) *The Habitation of the Immortal Gods* is one of the uſual Names of the World. One Philoſopher calleth it, *The Temple of the Father*; another calleth it *A moſt holy and God-becoming Temple*; another ſtileth it *The Fire-refulgent Houſe of* Jove. By *Cicero* it is intituled *the Celeſtial and Divine Houſe*; and by the *Egyptians, the Kingly Houſe of the Deity. Is God ſhut up within the Walls of Temples?* ſaid *Heraclitus.* (o) *The whole World variouſly adorn'd with Animals, and Plants, and Stars is his Temple.* So the *Stoicks* ſay, (p) *The whole World is the Temple of the Gods, and the only Temple becoming their Amplitude and Magnificence:* Whence the *Perſians* and their Magi condemn'd all artificial Temples, and *Xerxes* (by the perſwaſion of the Magi) burnt the Temples of the *Greeks*, themſelves doing their Religious Worſhip to the Gods under the open Heaven, to whom they ſuppos'd, that all things ſhould be open, *and that this whole World is their Temple and Habitation. Zeno* in like manner (the Father of the *Stoicks*) is ſaid, to have diſallow'd the building of Temples; and *Plato* (as *Clemens* (q) will have it) privately prohibited the having Statues of the Gods, as knowing, *that the World is the Temple of God.* The World is call'd by him, (r) *The Houſe of the Gods*; and in his *Timæus*, *The made Image of the Gods that belong to Eternity* (a Deiform Statue) whereby he meaneth, what *Plotinus* ſaith, *that the viſible World is a conſpicuous and illuſtrious Statue of the Intelligible Gods. Philo* diſtinguiſheth two Temples of God: (s) One is the Rational Soul; and the Prieſt of this Temple is the true Man: The other is *the World*; and the High-Prieſt in this Temple is the Divine Primogenit Logos. *This ſenſible World* (ſaith he) *is nothing elſe but the Houſe of God, a comely and ready-furniſh'd ſenſible Houſe of God. And we ought to ſuppoſe this whole World* τὸ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεοῦ, *the Supream Temple of God and that which is truly ſuch, which hath Heaven (the moſt holy part of the ſubſtance of things) for its holy place, the Stars are its Anathemata or Ornaments, and the Prieſts of it, the Sub-miniſters of his Powers, are the Angels and the ſeparate Souls.* Agreeably to *Philo* and the Philoſophic Pagans the Apocryphal Book of *Baruch* (*ch.* 3. 24.) looketh upon the viſible Univerſe as *the Houſe of God*; but no ſuch Language ever occurreth in the Holy Bible; from which ſilence of the Holy Scriptures, the Chriſtian Apologiſts ſhould have learn'd ſo much Warineſs and Diſcretion, as not to ſpeak the Senſe and Language of the Philoſophic-Pagans, which they ordinarily do. (t) *A Chriſtian, even an unlearned one*, (ſaith *Origen*) *is perſwaded, that every place of the World is a part of the whole, and that the whole World is the Temple of God. What Temple* (ſaith S. *Cyprian*) *can God have, whoſe Temple is the whole World? He needeth not a Temple, whoſe Houſe is the World; a Divine Temple*, ſaith *Lactantius. This World* (ſaith he) *is one Houſe of God.* So *Minutius Fœlix* ſaith, *This whole World is to God one Houſe.* But theſe Chriſtian Writers ought to have conſider'd, that there are *Apartments* and *Incloſures* in the Univerſe; that this lower World is not *an holy place*, but (u) *ſedes ac domicilium in quo omne quotidie perpetratur nefas, the Seat and Manſion-houſe of all manner of Wickedneſs, which is daily perpetrated in it*; that although God is preſent every where, yet his eſpecial preſence, *his Houſe and Temple* is not every where, nor is it any where, but where *his dwelling Houſe is, the place of his Reſidence and his Holy Habitation, where he is a Domeſtick*; for this is the Notion of a Temple. But God neither animateth nor inhabiteth the whole World ſave only in a large improper Senſe.

X. As the Pagan Theologers ſuppoſe, that *All is One*, ſo they alſo ſuppoſe that *One is All*, and that in many varieties of Senſe. The *firſt* Senſe that I will take notice of, is imply'd in an excellent Paſſage of *Plotinus*, which befriendeth Piety at a great rate. (w) *If any one ſaith, that a Virtuous Soul is oblivious in this ſort, he will ſpeak truly; for ſhe* *fleeth*

(f) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 308.

(g) Περὶ Μοναρχ. 2. *p.* 505.

(h) Περὶ ὀνειρ. *p.* 406.

(i) *Quod Deus ſit immutab. p.* 201.

(k) Περὶ μέθης, *p.* 166.

(l) *Quis rer. divin. Hær. p.* 345. *ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(m) *V. Philon. opuſc. p.* 70.

(n) *Deorum immortalium domicilium.* Τὸν ναὸν τοῦ πατρός. *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 46. Ἱερὸν ἁγιώτατον καὶ θεοπρεπέστατον. *Plutarch. de Tranquill. an. p.* 477. Τὸν τοῦ Διὸς πυριλαμπῆ οἶκον. *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 3. *Cæleſtis & divina domus.* Cic. de N.D. l. 2. Βασίλειος οἶκος. *Hor. Apoll. Hierogl. l.* 1. *n.* 58.

(o) *Ep. ad Hermod. p.* 51.

(p) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 2. *diſſ.* 7. *v. Macrob. in ſom. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 14. *Eugub. de Per. Phil. p.* 253. *Cic. de N. D. l.* 2.

(q) *Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 426.

(r) Θεῶν οἶκος. *Macrob. Saturn. l.* 1. *c.* 23. Τῶν ἀϊδίων θεῶν γεγονὸς ἄγαλμα. *Eugub. de Per. Phil. l.* 3. *c.* 11. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 6. *c.* 3. *p.* 347. Ἄγαλμα ἐναργὲς καὶ καλὸν τῶν νοητῶν θεῶν. *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 8.

(s) Περὶ ὀνειρ. *p.* 406, 403. Περὶ φυτουργ. *p.* 150. Περὶ μοναρχ. 2. *p.* 562. *ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(t) Χριστιανὸς δὲ, καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης, πάντα μὲν τόπον τοῦ κόσμου πέπεισται εἶναι μέρος τοῦ ὅλου, ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντος τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 362. *Quod vero Templum habere poſſit Deus, cujus Templum totus eſt Mundus?* S. Cypr. *Quod Idol.* Dii non ſint, n. 63. *Non indiget Templo, cujus domicilium mundus eſt.* Lactant. Epit. *c.* 2. *Divinum Templum.* De Ira D. c. 14. *Hic mundus una Dei Domus eſt.* Idem Inſtit. l. 4. c. 29. *Deo una Domus eſt, mundus hic totus.* Min. Fœl. p. 318.

(u) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 2. *p.* 7

(w) Ὥστε ὁ ἐπιλήσμονα ἂν τ λέγων τὴν ἀγαθήν, ὀρθῶς ἂ λέγοι τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ· ἐπεὶ κ φεύγει ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ τ

fleeth from the many, and collecteth the many into one, diſmiſſing what is interminate and endleſs; for thus ſhe liveth, not with the many, but diſburdened and with her ſelf alone; for while ſhe is here below, when ſhe would be there above, ſhe diſmiſſeth all other things. But it is in the Senſe of their Number-kind of Theology, that the Pagan Theologers uſually ſay, *One is All.* (x) *The Hen that is before the many, being the cauſe of the many, precontaineth the many in himſelf Unitively, being All before All.* In this Senſe the old Metaphyſical Theologers (*Parmenides, Xenophanes, Meliſſus*) uſe this Maxim, ἓν τὸ πᾶν, *One, the Univerſe or All*; for their meaning is, that the *Platonic Monad* is virtually and originally *All things. A ſimple Unite is the vaſt Univerſe of things*; which grand Maxim of the Number-Theology hath the ſound of an high-flown unintelligible Paradox; accordingly the Orator (y) cenſureth *Meliſſus* as abſurdly Paradoxical; *for whereas there is an infinite multitude of things, he went about to demonſtrate, that One is All.* The Paradoxical *Stoicks* pretend to no ſuch Myſtic-Metaphyſical Paradoxes (that a ſimple Unite is virtually and originally all things;) but in their Theology (or Phyſiology) *One is All*; for the Mundane Syſtem *Jove* is the Univerſe of things δημιουργικῶς, *demiurgically*, and alſo συνοχικῶς, *ſelf-containingly.* (z) *He alone is all things, containing his own work, not only without but within.* In a like Senſe the ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis in *Platoniſm* (the Mundane Syſtem's Archetypal Intellect) is *One and All things*; for he is that Animal which containeth all other Animals in it as its parts (as *Plato* ſpeaketh;) the intelligible All things is coexiſtent with him and inexiſtent in him; and he is the ſenſible All things *Demiurgically*, and (in ſome ſort) *ſelf-containingly.* (a) *Having the fulneſs of Ideas in himſelf, he containeth all things in himſelf.*

Πάντα γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ ἐν κόσμῳ τῷγε νοητῷ.
For all things are together in this Intelligible World.

The firſt Archical Hypoſtaſis in *Platoniſm* (τὸ ἓν, the Henotety) is alſo cauſal of the *Unity* of All, as well as of the *Exiſtence* of All; and in this Senſe it is ἓν τὸ πᾶν, *cauſally the one Univerſe*, or the cauſe why the Univerſe is one; for this Archical Hypoſtaſis is πάντων κέντρον, *the Centre of the World or Univerſe*, according to that known ſaying of *Plato* in his Epiſtle to *Dionyſius*, (b) *About the King of all things All things are.* So the *Platoniſts* ſay of the *firſt Hen*, (c) *It is the Centre of all Beings and about it all Beings, and all the Gods have their Eſſences, and Faculties, and Operations*; ſo that the whole Univerſe or the Mundane Syſtem is (as *Heraclitus* ſpeaketh) ἐκ πάντων ἓν, καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντα, *One conſiſting of All, and All from One.* (d) *There is a proceſs of all from one, a recourſe and reduction of all unto one, and the Empire of one over all, which maketh a Communion between the Gods in this World and thoſe pre-exiſting in the intelligible.* The Fontral and Central one is the cauſe of the Unity and undivided ſtate of the Univerſe.

In the *Stoicks* Phyſiology the one Mundane-Syſtem *Jove* is *All things*, not only *Demiurgically* and *Self-containingly*, but *He is all things* and *All things are Him as his Parts and Members.* Particular Souls are μόρια Θεοῦ καὶ ἀποσπάσματα, *parts of God and Avulſions from Him*; viſible corporeal things are the Parts and Members of his Body. (e) *If God is the Mind of the World, and the World his Body, ſo that the whole is one Animal conſiſting of Mind and Body; and that Deity be a deep Cavity of Nature* (ſinus quidam naturæ) *containing all things in it ſelf, ſo that from his Soul which is vivificative to the whole bulk the Souls of all things that have Life are taken according to every one's Lot; there remaineth nothing, which is not a part of God.* There is yet a further meaning of God's being *all things* in the *Stoicks* Phyſiology; for all things (as they ſuppoſe) conſiſt of the Deity. (f) *Univerſa ex materia & ex Deo conſtant*; *All things conſiſt of God and the Matter*, which are ſuppos'd to make up one compleat Subſtance. If all things conſiſt of God and the Matter, *God is all things* as in part their conſtitutive Subſtance, and conſequently *All is God.* Moreover, as a Man is ſometimes *diviſively* defin'd (the parts of which he is conſtituted are diviſively conſider'd) as when he is ſaid to be the Intelligent Soul of an Animal Body (and therefore he may be defin'd comprehenſively, *the Compound of both theſe:*) So when the *Stoicks* define *Jove the Intelligent Mind and Soul of the World*, this diviſive Definition inferreth, that he is in the whole comprehenſion of himſelf *both that Intelligent Soul and the Mundane Body*, or the Compound of both theſe *the animated World*, which is manifeſtly *Unum & Omnia, One and All things.* Their Deity is ſo intimate, complicate, united and connex'd with all things (*Totus ſuis partibus inditus*, ſaith *Seneca*) as to conſtitute with them *one Mundane Intelligent Animal*; therefore the whole Animated World and all the things thereof are *Jove*, and *Jove* is the Animated World and the things thereof.

Jupiter eſt quodcunque vides. ——

Agreeably to the *Stoicks* (for the main) the Orphic Verſes Theologize, and the old *Egyptian* Theology ſymbolizeth with them in their cant of *God's being all things*; for ſuch the *Egyptians* counted their *Iſis, one and all things*, as appeareth from an Inſcription upon an Altar at *Capua* (before-mention'd) and from this other before her Temple at *Sais*; Ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονός, καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον; *I am all that hath been, is, and ſhall be.* Which Inſcriptions plainly demonſtrate, that *Iſis* is no *Acroamatical* Deity, but a Deity of the Exoterical Theology (for the Popular-Pagan Religioniſts were concern'd in theſe Inſcriptions) that *Iſis* in theſe Inſcriptions is taken κοσμικῶς, *Coſmically*, and can be no other Deity but *Univerſal, Animative, Mundane Nature*, the very ſame Deity with the *Stoicks Mundane Syſtem Jove.* Agreeably to which Account *Iſis* is intituled by *Apuleius*, (g) *rerum Natura parens, the parental Nature of things* (which is both Mother and Nurſe to all the things of Nature, and therefore they made her *Multi-mammia*, all over full of Breaſts, to ſignifie her feeding all things) *the origin of the Fruits of the Earth, the perpetual Savioureſs of Mankind, that hath a Motherly Affection for the Miſerable, the Mother of* the

---

πολλὰ εἰς ἓν συνάγει, τὸ ἄπειρον ἀφιεῖσ. οὔπω γὰρ καὶ οὐ μετὰ πολλῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐλαφρὰ καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῆς. ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὅταν ἐκεῖ ἐθέλῃ εἶναι, ἔτι οὖσα ἐνταῦθα, ἀφίησι πάντα ὅσα ἄλλα. *Enn.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 32.

(x) Τὸ πρὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἓν αἴτιον τῶν πολλῶν ὑπάρχον, προείληφεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ πολλὰ κατὰ μίαν ἕνωσιν, πάντα ὂν πρὸ πάντων. *Simplic. in Epict.* p. 210.

(y) *Iſocrat. Helen. Laud. initio.*

(z) *Solus eſt omnia, opus ſuum & extra & intra tenet.* Sen. Nat. Qu. Procem.

(a) Τῶν δὲ ἰδεῶν πλήρης ὤν, διὰ τούτων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ ὅλα περιείληφε. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 95.

(b) Περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ᾽ ἐστίν.

(c) Πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν ὄντων κέντρον, καὶ περὶ αὐτὸ πάντα τὰ ὄντα, καὶ πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τάς τε οὐσίας καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας ἔχουσι. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *p.* 27.

(d) Ἥτε ἀφ᾽ ἑνὸς πρόοδος, καὶ εἰς ἓν τῶν ὅλων ἀναγωγή, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς πάντη ἐπικράτεια συνάγει τὴν κοινωνίαν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θεῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τῷ νοητῷ προϋπάρχοντας. *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 159. & 33.

(e) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 12.

(f) *Sen. Ep.* 65.

(g) *V. Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 7. *c.* 2.

the Gods, Mother of the Stars, Parent of Times, Lady of the whole World, Chief of the Gods, Queen of the Seas, Lady of all the Elements. Athenagoras giveth a like account of the Goddeſs *Iſis*; (*h*) *They ſay, that* Iſis *is the Nature of the World, from which all ſpring, and by which all exiſt.* In the ſame Author *Minerva* or *Neith* (which at *Sais* in *Egypt* (*i*) was one of *Iſis*'s Names) is ſaid to be ἡ φρόνησις διὰ πάντων διήκουσα, *Wiſdom or Providence paſſing through all things*; which is a Deſcription of *Intelligent Animative Mundane Nature*, which was the Supream Deity of the Pagans Religion and Laws, and was worſhipp'd as ſuch throughout the whole Pagan World; as *Apuleius* ſaith of *Iſis*, * *That being but one, the whole World venerated her in a multiform manner with various Rites and under manifold Names. Iſis* therefore was the Supream Univerſal Numen, of which the World of Popular Pagans were the Religioniſts, which was no other than *the Mundane Syſtem, the Nature of the whole* (as *Strabo* ſpeaketh,) *Univerſal Animative Mundane Nature*, which in its whole Comprehenſion is *all things collectively*, the whole animated World; and therefore *God is all things, and there is not any thing, which is not God*, as the *Egyptians* Theologiz'd; which ſpeaketh the Unity of the Univerſe at a prodigiouſly extravagant rate.

XI. To ſuch a pitch of Extravagance the Popular Pagans proceeded in their Religion; but ſome of the Philoſophic Pagan Theiſts (ſo accounted) are ſaid, to proceed to an higher pitch of Madneſs and Impiety in ſenſing their Dogma of *One being All, or of God's being All things.* For the Pagan Myſticks in the Eaſtern parts ſuppoſe, (*k*) that there is one firſt Principle of all things, perfectly wiſe, but mindleſs and unintelligent of the Affairs of the World, living in perfect Eaſe and Happineſs; that by long Meditation they get acquaintance with, and arrive at the degree of the Firſt Principle, which is the ſtate of perfect *Quietiſts*; and they diſcard the plain and obvious truths of Religion (touching Mens ſubſiſtence in a future ſtate) for this grand *Arcanum* of theirs, that all Subſtances are nothing elſe but an Extenſion or Expanſion of God's own Subſtance (all Subſtances are the Divine Subſtance expanded,) Creation is nothing elſe but an Extraction or Extenſion which God maketh of his own Subſtance, and the deſtruction or diſſolution of things is nothing elſe but a reſuming or taking up again of this Divine Subſtance and their relapſe into the Firſt Principle. (*l*) Such Myſticks are thoſe, that ſay, their Souls are created out of God's Subſtance, that when they die, they ſhall be what they were before, as a Cup of Water refunded into the Fountain whence it was taken; and that after the Day of Judgment all Men good and bad will be but one and the ſame Eſſence of God, which will remain without action to all Eternity. (*m*) Such Myſticks there are amongſt the Judaical Cabaliſts, which deny the Creation of any Subſtance, and ſuppoſe all things to conſiſt of the Divine Eſſence as of their material conſtitutive cauſe. Many places there are in the Book *Emek Hammelek*, which plainly import, *That all things are made of God as of their material Cauſe, that there is but one Subſtance in the World, and that all Subſtance is neceſſarily exiſtent.* Chriſtendom hath produc'd a Generation of Philoſophic Enthuſiaſts, that philoſophize at the ſame rate of extravagance; for about the end of the twelfth Century (*n*) *Dinantius* publiſh'd his Dogma, *Deum eſſe materiam primam* (that God is the firſt Matter) *which all things are made up of.* And the Cant of his Maſter *Amalricus* was, *Omnia ſunt Deus, Deus eſt Omnia*; *All is God, God is All; the Creator and the Creature are the ſame. God is therefore ſaid to be the End of all, becauſe all things ſhall return into Him, that they may immutably reſt in God, and remain one unchangeable Individuum. And as* Abraham *is not of one Nature,* Iſaac *of another, but both are of one and the ſame; ſo all things are one, and all things are God*; for he affirm'd, that God is the Eſſence of all Creatures. So *Joannes Scotus Erigena* (who imbib'd his Myſticks from the Books of the Counterfeit *Dionyſius*) had taught before him, *that all things are God, and God is all things. Servetus* is charg'd with this delirous Conceit, (*o*) *That all Creatures conſiſt of the proper Subſtance of God, and that he doubted not to affirm touching any thing that was ſhew'd him (as a Stool) that it is the Subſtance of God.* Fanaticks ſtill hold on the ſame Cant; *When we conſider Univerſal Nature and the Properties thereof, then we contemplate the Father. God is all things, and whatever is made, is made of or out of God. The whole Univerſe is God, the Earth and Water not excepted,* (*p*) ſaith a known Familiſtical Myſtick. It is not to be ſuppos'd, that theſe delirous Fanaticks deſign downright Atheiſm; for their Hypotheſis is Atheiſm inverted: the Atheiſts ſuppoſe, that Univerſal Matter is the only Deity; on the contrary theſe Enthuſiaſts ſuppoſe, that God or the Divine Eſſence is the Univerſal Matter, and conſequently is *All things as their material conſtitutive Cauſe.*

Some of the Familiſtical Tribe declining this way of the Cabaliſtical Myſticks, have made Chriſt *the Univerſe of things*, not as their material conſtitutive Cauſe, but in the way of *Orpheus* and the old *Egyptian* Theologers; who though they did not abſolutely confound or identifie *Zeus* or *Iſis* with the Univerſal Matter, yet they ſo far confounded them, that the Mundane Syſtem *Jove* is in his whole comprehenſion *All things* (the whole Animative Mundane Syſtem) and all things are parts of *Jove. The Word made Fleſh* (ſaith a certain Preacher) *is the whole Tree of Being uncreated and created, the Root, the Body with all the Branches, putting forth themſelves into one little Top-branch, now withering, that through its Death they may renew all to a freſh and flouriſhing Spring.* A Divine of our own hath exhibited a Scheme of this Familiſtical Sophiſt's and his Fellows Theology. (*q*) *They ſay, that God is the Fountain of Being by emanation, as the Sun is of Light; and that his Eternal Wiſdom is Jeſus Chriſt in the firſt Inſtant or Nature; that the firſt Creature which emaneth from him, is a perfect univerſal Mind, the Platform of all the reſt of the Creation, and that this is Jeſus Chriſt in his ſecond Nature and Notion, which* Arius *knew, but did ill to deny his Divine Nature; that this Univerſal Spirit or Mind maketh all the World beſides, and is in them all: and ſo the whole Creation elſe was Chriſt's firſt ſhadowy Image or Body; that the Angels are the nobleſt parts of this, and that the Deity firſt, and Chriſt's Super-angelical Nature next, is one in them all, and they one with him, as the Beams with the Sun, and as the lower part of the Sun-beams with the parts next the Sun: That the*

Soul

(h) Ἣν φύσιν αἰῶνος ἐξ ἧς πάντες ἔφυσαν, καὶ δι᾽ ἧς πάντες εἰσὶ, λέγοντες. *Legat. p.24.*

(i) *Plutar. de Iſ. p.* 345.

* *Cujus numen unicum multiformi ſpecie, ritu vario, nomine multijugo, totus veneratur orbis.*

(k) *Poſſevin. Biblioth. l.* 10. *c.* 2, 3, 5. *Bernier's Memoir. T.* 3. *p.* 178. *Semedo's Hiſt. p.*90.

(l) *Jac. Thomazii Diſſert. p.* 19, 20.

(m) *Dr. H. More confut. Cabal. Aetopædo. Meliſ. T.* 1. *p.* 927.

(n) *Jac. Thomaz. ſupr. p.* 199, &c.

(o) *Verba Serveti ſunt: ex propria Dei ſubſtantia eſſe omnes creaturas. Item, ſe non dubitare, & ſcamnum hoc & quicquid oſtenditur, Dei ſubſtantiam eſſe.* Melancthon. Exam. Theol. de Deo, p. m. 55.

(p) *V. Dr. H. More ſupr. p.* 538.

(q) *Mr. Baxter Cathol. Theol. Par.* 3. *p.* 311, 312.

Soul of Man is the next part of Chriſt's ſhadowy Image, into which he deſcended, and ſo into all Bodies; and as into a ſpecial, into that Body born of the Virgin Mary, *and in that and in other Bodies he dieth, and deſcendeth to his lowеſt ſtate; and then (as the Sun) doth riſe again and bring all back to the ſtate of pure Spirituality in his Super-angelical Nature, whence all ſprang.* Here are ſeveral intermixtures of *Platoniſm* in this Idea; *for a perfect Mind the Platform and Opificer of the Creation*, is a Platonic Principle; and the Phraſeology of *a ſhadowy Image or Body* is Platonic alſo; but according to the *Platoniſts*, this ſenſible World is not *the ſhadowy Image and Body of the perfect Mind* (which hath no Body;) but it is rather to be call'd *the ſhadowy Image and Body of their Mundane Pſyche*; for they ſtyle it, (*r*) τὸ ἴνδαλμα καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς ψυχῆς, *the Image of Soul*, from which they ſuppoſe it to iſſue, and to be form'd by a continual emanation; for they ſay, (*s*) *This World is an Image, that is always in fieri or in aſſimilation.* If the World is *Chriſt's Body*; if He is *the Univerſe of Beings*; if Men, Animals and other parts of the Univerſe are his Parts or Members, He is neceſſarily the ſame Hypoſtaſis with the Platoniſts Mundane *Pſyche*, and conſequently with *Orpheus*'s and the *Stoicks* Mundane Syſtem *Jove*, the *Egyptians Iſis*, and the Popular Pagans *Coſmical Zeus.* Wherefore in this miſhapen Scheme of Theology there is a confuſed Jumble of two *Platonic* Archical Hypoſtaſes; a ground is laid for *Coſmolatry*, *Uranolatry*, *Aſtrolatry*, (and all manner of Creature-worſhip;) and Heatheniſm is ſubſtituted inſtead of Chriſtianity. (*t*) *The Spirit of Nature is ſuppos'd, to be the plaſtick part of this Soul of Chriſt extended through the whole World, which Soul is ſuppos'd to be hypoſtatically united with God, and ſo God will be hypoſtatically united with the World, God and the whole Univerſe will be one Hypoſtaſis.* The God, Chriſt, and Chriſtianiſm of ſuch wild Religioniſts, is of the Character, which *Euſebius* giveth of the *Egyptian* Theology, (*u*) *Such is the* Egyptians *miſhapen Atheiſm rather than Theiſm.*

XII. The one Mundane Syſtem *Jove* is in ſome ſort *the multitude and variety of the Pagans Gods and Goddeſſes*; and there is a certain Polytheiſm of theirs, which is nothing more than *the Polyonymy of this one Supreme God.* For it is not unuſual with the Pagan Theologers, to reduce the multitude and variety of their Deities to one *Jupiter* in various Senſes and upon various Accounts. Sometimes they conſider the *Coſmical Zeus* as *originally* and *comprehenſively* the All of their Deities, as *Valerius Soranus* repreſenteth them (*w*).

Jupiter omnipotens, Regum Rex ipſe Deûmque,
Progenitor Genitrixque Deûm, Deus unus & omnis.
Omnipotent Jupiter, *the King of Kings and Gods,*
The Progenitor and Genitrix of the Gods, one God and all Gods.

Jupiter *is all the Gods*; not as if there was no Polity of Gods; but as the Founder (the Father and Mother) of the Polity, and as a Deity *comprehenſive* of all the Deities; for *Jupiter* is the ſame with *Pan* (Univerſal Mundane Nature) whom in the *Certamina* at *Athens* (*x*) they look'd upon as a *Pantheon*, the Comprehenſion of all the Gods. So the Author of the *Orphic* Verſes (*y*) *having ſuppos'd the World a great Animal, and having call'd this Mundane Animal* Jupiter, (*z*) he placeth Heaven, the Earth, the Sea, and the whole of the Univerſe in *Jupiter*'s Womb.

Πάντες τ' ἀθάνατοι μάκαρες θεοί, ἠδὲ θέαιναι.
And all the bleſſed immortal Gods and Goddeſſes.

The Rabble of Deities contained in him are neceſſarily his Parts and Members, both as He is *Politically Imperial*, and as He is *Animatively Vital*; in a *Political* and in a *Phyſiological* Senſe; they are the Members of his *Body Politick* and of his *living Animal-Body*; as *Seneca* ſaith of Mankind, *& ſocii ejus ſumus & membra, we are his Aſſociates* (the Members of his Body Politick) *and the Members of his Animal-Body.* Both theſe Notions are glanc'd at by the Poet introducing *Jupiter* thus ſpeaking to the other Gods.

Cœlicolæ mea membra Dei, quos noſtra poteſtas
Officiis diviſa facit. ——
Ye Gods my Members, to whom my Imperial Power
allotteth diverſity of Offices.

The Gods to whom *Jupiter* allotteth diverſity of Offices, are not meer *Names* or *Virtues*, but ſo many *ſubſtantial Beings*, *diſtinct perſonal Deities*; yet theſe being contained in him, are in ſome ſort reducible to him; but there is another ſort of Deities, which the *Stoicks* ſuppoſe to be nothing more than ſo many ſeveral *Names*, *Notions* and *particular Conſiderations* of the one Supreme *Jupiter*, or only ſo many ſeveral *Powers*, *Virtues*, *Functions* and *Agencies* of his fictitiouſly perſonated and deify'd; and the reduction of theſe to the *one ſupreme God* is (according to their Hypotheſis) nothing more than his *Polyonymy*; which Polyonymy of the one Supreme God is a principal Theorem (*a*) of the Philoſophic-Pagan Theology, and at firſt ſight may ſeem a great Theory; but really it is a pompous futility, that maketh a great ſhew, but hath nothing valuable in it, ſave only that it importeth the Pagans honourary acknowledgment of one Supreme Deity, and explicateth an eminent Mode of their Idolatry.

For the Stoicks Polyonymy of the one Mundane Syſtem *Jove* ſignifieth nothing, but that the ſupreme Deity is capable of a great diverſity of *Names*, both according to his *univerſal Nature* (ſuch as *Zeus*, *Pan*, *Genius*, *Iſis*, *Minerva*,) and according to particular conſiderations of Him, as pervading the ſeveral parts of the world, and diſplaying his various *powers* and *agencies* in it. (*b*) Pervading, acting, and ruling in the *Air*, He may be call'd *Juno*; in the Earth, *Pluto*; in the inferiour parts of it *Proſerpina*; in the Sea, *Neptune*; in the lower part of it *Salacia*; in the Vineyards, *Liber*; in the *Smith*'s Forges, *Vulcan*; and in the domeſtic Hearths, *Veſta.* As he beſtoweth Corn, he may be called *Ceres*; Wine, *Bacchus*; Health, *Æſculapius*; as he governeth the Wars, *Mars*; and the Winds, *Æolus.* (*c*) *The Names that denote a certain Force and Effect of things Celeſtial are any of them properly applicable to Him. His Appellatives may be as many as his Gifts or Functions.*: which Polyonymy of the one ſupreme God inferreth, that the Pagans Polytheiſm was in part not *real*, but *apparent* only. Their Theologers ſuppos'd (as *Alexander* the Peripatetick in his Book of Providence (*d*) expreſſeth his ſenſe,) *that all things are full of the Deity, who pervadeth all Beings.* (e) Παντοίαις δυνάμεσι τὰ πάντα πληρῶν, *filling all things with his various powers.* Which various powers

of

(c) *Quæcunque voles illi nomina propriè aptabis, vim aliquam effectumque cæleſtium rerum continentia. Tot appellationes ejus poſſunt eſſe, quot munera.* Sen. de Benef. l. 4. c. 7.

(r) *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 3. *c.* 18.

(s) Οὗτος ὁ κόσμος εἰκὼν ἀεὶ εἰκονιζόμενος. *Plotin. ibid.*

(t) *V. D. H. M. ubi ſupr. p.* 438.

(u) Τοιαύτη ἡ Ἀιγυπτίων ἀ-[illegible]ήμων ἀθεότης μᾶλλον ἢ θεολογία. *Pr. Ev. l.* 2. *c.* 1.

(w) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 9.

(x) *V. Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(y) *Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 9.

(z) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 95.

(a) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 7.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 11.

(d) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 3. *p.* 82.

(e) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 13.

(f) *Ad* 4. *Thebaid.*

of the Coſmical *Zeus* the *Magi* (as *Luctatius* upon *Statius* (*f*) ſaith, abuſively ſet forth as ſo many diſtinct perſonal Deities, (g) *and endeavour'd to call the Deity by the ennoblement of very many Deities.* Such Deities are plainly *fictitious*, and conſequently the Philoſophical Theology is in ſome degree fabulous; for as the *Mythical* Theology perſonateth and deifieth the parts and powers of mundane corporeal nature: ſo the Philoſophical Theology perſonateth and deifieth the ſeveral Powers, Virtues and Agencies of the one ſupreme God. In this mythical way the Pagans pretended to worſhip (*h*) τὸν ἀμέριστον καὶ τὸν μεμερισμένον νοῦν, *the undivided and divided Mind or Soul*, by which plea they defend their Worſhip of the ſeveral parts of the corporeal World. For their Polyonymy of the one ſupreme God was not deſign'd to deprive the parts of the World of all their Godſhip; but to give a plauſible account and reaſon of their Worſhip. (*i*) *The Virtues of the one ſupreme God* (ſaith *Maximus Madaurenſis*) *diffus'd throughout the whole World we invoke under very different Names, becauſe we know not what his proper Name is. Whence it cometh to paſs, that whilſt we proſecute with our Supplications his as it were divided members ſeverally, we muſt neceſſarily be judg'd to worſhip the whole Deity.* (*k*) *Many* (Pagans) *the moſt ancient eſpecially, agree in this*, *that* Deus *was* Anima Mundi, *the World was animated by God, as our Bodies are by our Souls. Whence they concluded, as ſome later Romaniſts do, that all or moſt viſible Bodies might be religiouſly worſhipp'd or ador'd with reference to God's reſidence in them.* The intentional worſhipping God in the Creatures is an eminent mode of Pagan Idolatry.

(g) *Et quaſi plurimorum Numinum nobilitate Deum appellare conati ſunt.*

(h) *Jul. Firm. de err. prof. rel. p.* 19.

(i) *Ep.* 43. *inter Ep. S. Aug.*

(k) *Dr. Jackſon Orig. of Unbelief. ch.* 19.

XIII. The Supreme Deity in the Stoicks Theology is ſuperlatively *Polyonymous* upon a twofold account: both becauſe of a phancy which they had, to apply to him the proper names of other Deities; and becauſe they diſcarded the Deities, which they called *Mythical* and *Commentitious*. Agreeably to their humour of changing the Names of things they applied to the ſupreme Deity the Names of other Deities, allegorically interpreting and ſenſing their proper Names. (*l*) *We Stoicks make account*, *that he is* Liber Pater, Hercules *and* Mercury. Liber Pater, *becauſe He is Parental to all, and the Inventor of the force of Seeds.* Hercules, *becauſe of his invincible force.* Mercury, *becauſe with him is Reaſon, Number, Order and Science.* (*m*) In ſuch things as theſe they pleas'd themſelves, applying (as the Platoniſts did alſo) the vulgar Mythicals to their Myſticals. In this ſenſe the *Orphic* Verſe may be underſtood (which may be alſo underſtood to ſignify, that *Jupiter* is all the Deities *originally* and *comprehenſively*.)

(l) *Sen. de Ben. l.* 4. *c.* 8.

(m) *Lipſ. in loc. Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 6. *c.* 19. *En.* 5. *l.* 8. *c.* 4, & 13.

Εἷς Ζεύς, εἷς Ἀΐδης, εἷς ἥλιος, εἷς Διόνυσος.
Jupiter, Pluto, the Sun and Bacchus are one.

Another Origin of the Stoicks Superlative *Polyonymy* was their diſcarding the Deities call'd by themſelves *the Mythical* and *Commentitious* (which are things Phyſical repreſented by fictitious Deities;) for having diſcarded theſe fictitious Deities, they ſubſtituted in their ſtead the various *Powers*, *Virtues*, *Effects* and *Agencies* of the *Coſmical Zeus.* (*n*) *Calling him* Minerva, *becauſe his Hegemonicon is extended in the Ether*; Juno *as pervading the Air*; Vulcan, Neptune, Ceres, *as pervading and acting in the Artificer's Fire, in the Sea and the Earth.* So *Balbus* in *Cicero* (before cited) having rejected the Deities, which he calleth the *Mythical*, ſubſtituteth in their room *God paſſing through the Nature of every thing.* Agreeably to which Stoical Notion it is moſt reaſonable, to underſtand the ſaying of *Antiſthenes* the Cynick in his Book called *Phyſicus*, (*o*) *Populareis Deos multos, naturalem unum eſſe dicens*, that is, *one natural God ought to be ſubſtituted in the ſtead of thoſe many popular Deities, which the Stoicks and their Brethren the Cynicks rejected as the Mythical and Commentitious.*

(n) *Laert. in Zenone.*

(o) *Cic. de N. D. l.* 1.

Some unwiſe Theologers ſuppoſe, (*p*) that the Ancients were no Polytheiſts, that the Egyptians Inſtitutes (which they account a Pædagogy to the ſublime Myſteries of the Chriſtian Theology) were alien from Polytheiſm: *But they called one God by various Names, to ſignifie his various Effects in the World.* Such a Polyonymy of one God (excluſive of all Polytheiſm) is much what as likely to be found in Paganiſm, as that *a Serpent* ſhould be an *Hieroglyphic* of the Chriſtian Theology's Son of God. The Stoicks Polyonymy is ſo far from deſtroying the Pagans Polytheiſm, that it maketh no conſiderable abatement in the multitude of their Deities. For they deify'd the parts of the Corporeal World as living Members of the mundane Animal, Reſidences of the Powers and Virtues of the Supreme God, Sections of the mundane Soul, (*q*) *Chryſippus affirmeth, that the World is God, and the univerſal Diffuſion of its Soul.* Although they ſeem to reduce all the Deities properly belonging to *the mundane City locally underſtood* to the Polyonymy of one Supreme God, yet both *Varro* and *Balbus* plainly affirm, (*r*) that the Stars are animated with intelligent Souls (they might as well ſay the ſame of the Earth,) and conſequently they are ſo many diſtinct perſonal Deities. But ſuppoſe, they abate the number of Deities properly belonging to the mundane City *locally* underſtood, yet they extravagantly inhance that other Fry of Deities *the Inhabitants of the mundane City*, which they multiply without end or meaſure; whence *Plutarch* repreſenteth the Stoical Polyonymiſts as the moſt extravagant Polytheiſts in all the pack, (*s*) *that filled the Heaven, Earth, Air and Sea with Gods.* Wherefore their reduction of Deities to the Polyonymy of one Supreme God, ſignifieth nothing to the prejudice or diminution of their Polity of Gods. When they call *Jove* by the proper Names of ſeveral other Deities, they muſt not be thought to deny the Exiſtence of thoſe Synonymous *Genial* Deities of the vulgar Theology (*Liber Pater*, *Mercury* and ſuch more;) for in their ὑπονοίαις, *Allegorizings*, *Interpretations*, *Accommodations*, and the various honorary Appellatives which they beſtow upon *Jove*, they do not ſpeak *privatively* with reſpect to their Genial Deities, but *accumulatively*; not with intention to deſtroy them, but to ſuperadd to them the Polyonymy of their Supreme God. And if this is the true account of the *Stoicks* Polyonymy (as certainly it is,) there is no reaſon imaginable, why they ſhould condemn the vulgar Polytheiſm, (*t*) as a learned Writer ſuppoſeth, they would have done, if fear of diſturbing the Commonwealth, and creating a *Socrates-like* danger to themſelves, had not reſtrain'd them. For the Senſe of the Stoicks and

(p) *Kircher. Oedip. Ægyp. T.* 2. *par.* 2. *Synt.* 3.

(q) *Chryſippus ait, mundum Deum eſſe, & ejus Animi fuſionem univerſam.* Cic. de N. D. l. 1.

(r) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 6. *Cic. de N. D. l.* 2.

(s) *Adv. Stoic. de Com. Not. p.* 1075. Ἐν πά- τοις θε *M. Ant. l.* 9. *S.* 35.

(t) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 7. *c.* 7.

and of all the genuine Pagan Theologers muſt be thus repreſented, *The conſtitution of the Univerſe being politically conſider'd, and* Jupiter *as* (politically *Imperial, they conceiv'd* (as they uſually ſay) πάντα θεῶν πλήρη, *all full of Gods and Demons: But withall the Conſtitution of the Univerſe being Phyſiologically conſider'd, and* Jupiter *as vital or animative of the whole, they conceiv'd* Jovis omnia plena, *all full of* Jove, his various Virtues, Powers and Effects. Theſe things perfectly conſorting together, and carrying an abſolute conſiſtency in their Eyes, the *Stoicks* and *Cynicks* might condemn the want of Philoſophy in the vulgar (in ſuppoſing the parts of the World ſo many ſeveral animate perſonal Deities,) but could not condemn their Religion. They are miſtaken, when their Polyonymy is repreſented as Anti-polytheiſm: As ſome other Philoſophers are miſtaken, when they are repreſented as Stoical Polyonymiſts. For when *M. Tyrius* ſaith (u) *that according to* Homer *all is full of Divine Names* (which is manifeſtly meant of the Preſidentiary Gods and Demons,) it is marvellous, that his ſaying ſhould be interpreted (w) of the Stoicks Polyonymy. And when he ſaith, (x) *that* Neptune *is a Spirit which paſſing through the Earth and Sea cauſeth their State and Harmony*, (being a Platoniſt) he muſt be interpreted to ſpeak (not according to the Stoicks Polyonymy, but) according to the Senſe of thoſe Platoniſts, who ſuppos'd the Elements to have particular intelligent Souls of their own; *which Spirits of the Elements* (y) Julian *worſhipp'd* as ſuppoſing them endow'd with the Faculty of Divination.

XIV. The mundane Syſtem *Jove* muſt be conſider'd both as *animatively* (or Phyſiologically) and as *Politically* Imperial to the World. For being the mundane Soul he is *animatively* Regent and Imperial, as the Soul of Man is. (z) *That is a God* (or Divine) *which is Vigent, Sentient, Reminiſcent, Provident, which ruleth and governeth and moveth that Body, whoſe Prefect it is, as the Chieftain God doth this World.* (a) *As we have a Soul, that is an animative Regent: So the Gubernation of the World is by a Soul, that containeth and keepeth it in Conſiſtence, which is called* Zeus. Who as an animative Regent is ſuppos'd, regularly to agitate the mundane Matter, to form all things Celeſtial and Terreſtrial, to figurate his own Animal-body, and to generate all ſorts of Animals, as the Poet Philoſophizeth. (*b*)

From firſt, Earth, Seas and
Heavens all ſpangled Robe
The Golden Stars and Phœbe's
Silver Globe,
A Spirit fed, and to the Maſs
conjoin'd,
Inſpiring the vaſt Body with a
Mind.
Hence Men and Beaſts, and
Birds derive their ſtrain,
And Monſters floating in the
Marble Main.
Mr. *Ogleby*'s Tranſlat. p. 259.

By Phyſical motion and as animatively Regent the Coſmical *Zeus* ſteereth the World, (c) *as a Pilot doth a Ship, or as a Charioteer doth a Chariot,* (d) *circumvolving the Heavens; keeping the Earth in conſiſtence, ruling the Sea* (ſo *Apuleius* ſaith of the Goddeſs *Iſis, tu rotas Orbem, luminas Solem, regis Mundum, thou whirleſt about the World, lighteneſt the Sun, ruleſt the World*) and variouſly influencing the Minds of Men, according to that of *Homer.* (*e*)

Men hold not conſtant in one
Mind, ſuch is their Senſe,
As daily is inſtill'd by Jove's
bid influence.

Becauſe the Coſmical *Zeus* is animatively the Regent of the World, he ought to have his *Hegemonicon* (or Regent part) ſeated in ſome ſuperiour part of the World (agreeably to the Soul of Man, whoſe Hegemonicon or rational Faculty is ſeated in the Head) either in the *Ether*, as *Antipater*; or in *Heaven*, as *Chryſippus*; or in the Sun, as *Cleanthes* ſuppos'd, (*f*) which latter (doubtleſs) was the Senſe of the *Pythagoreans* in thoſe illuſtrious Epithets which they gave the Sun, ſtiling him.

Ζηνὸς πύργον, Διὸς φυλακὴν, Διὸς θρόνον,
The Tower, Cuſtody or Hold, and Throne of Jove.

But the Coſmical *Jove* is alſo *Politically* the Regent of the World (the Univerſe being ſuppos'd one imperial Polity, one common City of Gods and of Men;) for ſuch a governing Power the Pagan Theologers diſpute with great Reaſon and ſtrength of Argument. (*g*) *Without* (Political) *Government neither any Houſe, nor City, nor Nation, nor Mankind in general can ſubſiſt, nor the whole Nature of things, nor the World it ſelf.* (*h*) *Seeing a City or an Houſe cannot continue for the leaſt time without a Governour and Curator, how is it poſſible, that ſo great and illuſtrious a Structure as the World ſhould be ſo orderly adminiſtred fortuitouſly and by chance?* (*i*) *The Knowledge and Contemplation of things Celeſtial, the beholding how great Moderation and Order there is among the Gods, begetteth modeſty; and the beholding the Works and Facts of the Gods ingendreth a greatneſs of Mind, and Juſtice alſo, when you underſtand the Supreme Rector and Lord, what his Will and Counſel is* (in the Conſtitution, Gubernation and Adminiſtration of this Univerſe of things,) *Reaſon ſuited to his Nature being call'd by Philoſophers the true and ſupreme Law.* As politically imperial the ſupreme Rector appointeth to the ſubordinate Deities their Lots and Prefectures, and their Function and Imploy is to execute his Appointments. (*k*) *For the Sun was made for ſome Work or Function and the other Gods.*

XV. The Coſmical Rector is *Order, Law, Fate, Fortune, Providence,* (a governing ſuperviſorſhip of things) *juſt and good Government* to the World. (l) *Either this Univerſe is a meer Hotch-potch and caſual Implication of things, which may be disjoin'd and diſſipated: Or there is in it Union, Order and a Providence.* But it could not be κόσμος, a regular and comely piece without *Order*; and this Order and *the Law* that is viſible in the Univerſe infer *a Providence*, (m) *whereby the World and all the parts of it were at firſt conſtituted, and is at all times adminiſtred.* (n) *The equable Motion and Circumvolution of Heaven, the Sun, Moon and all the Stars, their diſtinction, variety, pulchritude, order, the ſight of theſe things ſufficiently ſheweth, that they are not by chance,* (o) but *eternæ Legis Imperio, by an eternal Law or Preſcript, a Law of the World*, which the Stoicks call *Fate*.

(u) *Diſſ.* 16. *confer. Diſſ.* 26, & 29.

(w) *Intellect. Syſt.* p. 494, 492.

(x) *Diſſ.* 30.

(y) *Am. Marcellin.* l. 21.

(z) *Eſt Deus qui viget, qui ſentit, qui meminit, qui providet, qui tam regit & moderatur & movet id corpus cui præpoſitus eſt, quam hunc mundum ille Princeps Deus.* Cic. in ſom. Scip. l. 2. c. 12.

(a) Ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ ψυχῆς διοικούμεθα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ κόσμος ψυχὴν ἔχει τὴν συνέχουσαν αὐτὸν ϗ αὕτη καλεῖται Ζεύς. Phornut. de Nat. Deor. p. 4.

(b) *Principio Cælum, ac Terras camposque liquentes,*
Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque aſtra
Spiritus intus alit; totamque infuſa per artus
Mens agitat molem, & magno ſe corpore miſcet.
Inde Hominum, pecudumque genus, vitæque volantum.
Et quæ marmoreo fert monſtra ſub æquore Pontus.
Virgil Æneid. 6.

(c) *Lib. de Mundo c.* 6.

(d) *Cic. de N. D. l.* 3.

(e) Τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
Οἷον ἐπ᾽ ἦμαρ ἄγησι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

(f) *Laert. in Zenon.*

(g) *Sine Imperio nec Domus ulla, nec Civitas, nec Gens, nec Hominum univerſum Genus ſtare, nec rerum Natura omnis, nec ipſe Mundus poteſt.* Cic. de Leg. 3.

(h) Πῶς οἷόντε, πόλιν μὲν ἢ οἶκον μὴ δύνασθαι διαμένειν, μηδ᾽ ὀλιγιστὸν χρόνον, δίχα τοῦ διοικοῦντος ϗ ἐπιμελουμένου· τὸ δ᾽ οὕτω μέγα καὶ καλὸν κατασκεύασμα εἰκῆ καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν εὐτάκτως οἰκονομεῖσθαι; Epict. Diſſ. l. 2. c. 14.

(i) *Modeſtiam quandam cognitio rerum cæleſtium affert iis, qui videant, quanta ſit etiam apud Deos moderatio, quantus ordo; & magnitudinem animi Deorum opera & facta cernentibus: Juſtitiam etiam, cùm cognitum habeas quod ſit ſummi Rectoris & Domini Numen, quod conſilium, quæ voluntas, cujus ad naturam apta ratio vera illa & ſumma Lex à Philoſophis dicitur.* Cic. de Fin. 4.

(k) Καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐρεῖ πρός τι ἔργον γέγονε, ϗ οἱ λοιποὶ θεοί. M. Ant. l. 8. S. 19.

> *Sed nihil in tota magis eſt mirabile mole,*
> *Quàm ratio, & certis quod Legibus omnia Parent.*
> *The Courſe and Frame of this vaſt bulk diſplay*
> *A Reaſon and fix'd Laws which all obey.*

In the other Branches of their Doctrine of Fate there is (p) τὸ σφοδρὸν τῆς ἀνάγκης, *an exceſs of Fatality.* For as the governing Mind or Reaſon which conſtituted and adminiſtreth the corporeal World is Law to it: So all things that befal Mankind, are of his Præ-ordination and appointment, as the *Stoicks* ſuppoſe; and therefore they derive all things (q) *from a Law of Fate. All things proceed by a fix'd ſempiternal Law, fatality leadeth us, by a long ſeries and concatenation of cauſes all things neceſſarily emerge, your joyous and mournful occurrences were appointed long ago.* A Wiſe Man will underſtand, *that whatever happens is a Law of* (univerſal) *Nature.* (r) *It was ordinated to him and he to it.* (s) *Whatever happens to thee, it is that which from Eternity* (or the beginning of things) *was fore-deſtinated unto thee; thy ſubſiſtence and ſuch an accident are by an implex'd Series of Natural Cauſes from Eternity fatally connex'd or ſpun together.* Fatality by this Hypotheſis is ſcrew'd up to an high pitch of Extravagance, eſpecially as this their Dogma, *that all things come to paſs fatally*, is underſtood by the ancient Doctors of the *Stoa*; (t) for they ſubvert (ſo far appeareth) all Contingency and Human Liberty of Agency, and conſequently all *Humanity* and *Divinity*. (u) In the Conſtitution of the World thoſe ancient Doctors ſuppoſe *Jupiter* hamper'd by *material Neceſſity* (that becauſe of the inobſequiouſneſs of the matter, ſome Men are unavoidably made of an evil Diſpoſition, and good Men are obnoxious to external Evils,) and not being able to do what he would, he is willing to do what he can. In his adminiſtration of the World and Soveraign diſpoſal of things (w) he can alter nothing of his own fatal Ordinations; *Scripſit Fata ſed ſequitur, having once written the Fates he always obeyeth them* (ſome ſuppoſe, (x) that the *three Fates* wrote his Decrees;) and conſequently the Supreme Deity in reſpect of his Adminiſtration of things is nothing but *intelligent Fate* in himſelf and to the World (as Plaſtick Natures are nothing elſe but blind unintelligent Fate in themſelves and to the World,) and unchangeable or inexorable Fate is the Supreme Deity. (y)

> Μόνη γὰρ ἐν θεοῖσιν οὐ δεσπόζεται.
> *For Fate alone amongſt the Gods is unſubject.*

But although their rigid Genius hath introduc'd much of extravagant Fatality, yet ſome of the ancient Stoicks (z) attempted to mollifie the rigour of Fate to accommodate it to Human Liberty; ſome report of *Chryſippus*, (a) that he ſuppos'd Human Liberty exempt from Fate; (b) and ſome of them (of later times) more than ſufficiently aſſert *the Human Power and Liberty of Agency.* They refuſe not the Name of *Fortune*; for they adviſe Men to commit all their Externals (c) τῷ δαιμονίῳ, τῇ τύχῃ, *to the Divinity, to Fortune*, underſtanding thereby the Providential diſpoſal of things. Notwithſtanding their rigid Genius they are no Friends to that rigid Dogma of *abſolute Reprobation*; (d) *for God* (as they ſuppoſe) *hath made all Men to felicity and good Eſtate of Mind, and hath given them what is requiſite thereunto.* (e) *If the Gods have conſulted concerning me, and thoſe things that ought to happen to me, they have well conſulted; for a God devoid of Counſel is ſcarce conceivable: But to do me a miſchief, what ſhould impell them? For what emolument would accrue from thence, either to them, or to the publick, which they chiefly take care of?* Inexorable Fate (according to their generally receiv'd Maxims) is their Soveraign Deity, yet ſome of them are prone to think, (f) that there is a πρόνοια ἱλάσιμος, *placable and flexible Providence*, and others of them tell us, that they had better Notices of the ſupreme *Jupiter*. (g) *They call* Jupiter *placid, being ſuch to them that change from injuſtice; for he is not irreconcileable to them. Whence there are Altars of* Jupiter *placid to Suppliants.* They allow not God or Man, to be properly angry with Criminals, yet ſuppoſe, that the Coſmical Rector is juſt and good Government to the World. (h) *That he hath made the parts for the uſe of the whole,* (i) *and ordereth all things as is moſt conducive to the good of the whole.* (k) *Good Men are his Witneſſes, that he exiſteth, and governeth the Univerſe of things well, and neglecteth not Human Affairs, and that nothing Evil happens to a good Man either alive or dead.* He diſpoſeth of all to a good uſe, as is moſt needful for the good of the World. (l) *For he, the Governour of the Univerſe, will not fail to put thee to a good uſe.* (m) *Neither willingly nor unwillingly doth he commit any Error.* His Rule therefore is without miſrule. (n) *His Government is Paternal, as a Father taking care of all, that his Citizens may be happy like himſelf.* (o) *Making a diſtribution of things as is fit and juſt* (whence they ſtile him νόμος, from νέμω, *to diſtribute*;) the better Men (p) have the better part, and the good (q) are not afflicted without great Reaſon and for wiſe and good Ends.

CHAP.

(l) Ἤτοι κυκεὼν καὶ ἀντεμπλοκὴ καὶ σκεδασμός· ἢ ἕνωσις καὶ τάξις καὶ πρόνοια. M. Ant. l. 6. S. 10. & l. 4. S. 27.

(m) *Providentia Deorum mundum & omnes mundi partes & initio conſtitutas eſſe, & omni tempore adminiſtrari.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(n) *Ibid.*

(o) *Sen. de provid. c.* 1. *Nat. Qu. l.* 2. *c.* 29.

Manil. l. 1. *Aſtron.*

(p) *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(q) *Laert. in Zenon. Sen. de provid. c.* 5. *de vit. beat. c.* 15.

(r) *M. Ant. l.* 12 *S.* 1.

(s) Ὅ τι ἄν σοι συμβαίνῃ, τοῦτό σοι ἐξ αἰῶνος προκατεσκευάζετο· καὶ ἡ ἐπιπλοκὴ τῶν αἰτίων συνέκλωθε, τήν τε σὴν ὑπόστασιν ἐξ ἀϊδίου καὶ τὴν τούτου σύμβασιν. Ibid. l. 10. S. 5.

(t) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 49.

(u) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *Diſſ.* 14.

(w) *Ibid. Diſſ.* 12.

(x) *Capella l.* 1.

(y) *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 9.

(z) *Lipſ. ſupr. diſſ.* 14.

(a) *Cicero de Fato.*

(b) *Steare Anim. medel. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

(c) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 4. *c.* 4.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 2

(c) Ει μὲν ἐβουλεύσαντο περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἐμοὶ συμβῆναι ὀφειλόντων οἱ Θεοί, καλῶς ἐβουλεύσαντο· ἄβουλον γὰρ Θεὸν οὐδ' ἐπινοῆσαι ῥᾴδιον· κακοποιῆσαι δέ με διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν ἔμελλον ὁρμᾷν; τί γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἢ τῷ κοινῷ οὗ μάλιστα προνοοῦνται, ἐκ τούτου περιεγένετο; M. Ant. l. 6. S. 44.

(f) *M. Ant. l.* 12. *S.* 14.

(g) Προσαγορεύουσι δὲ καὶ μειλίχιον τὸν Δία, εὐμείλικτον ὄντα τοῖς ἐξ ἀδικίας μεταβαλλομένοις, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀδιαλλάκτως ἔχει πρὸς αὐτούς. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἱκεσίου Διός εἰσι βωμοί. Phornut. de Nat. Deor. p. 1

(h) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 4.

(i) *M. Ant. l.* 5. *S.*

(k) *Epict. diſſ. l. c.* 26.

(l) Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ πάντως σοι καλῶς χρήσεται, ὁ τὰ ὅλα διοικῶν. M. Ant. l. 6. S. 42.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 12. *S.* 12.

(n) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 328, 330,

(o) *M. Ant. l.* 4. *S. l.* 7. *S. l.* 10. *S.* 25.

(p) *Epict. Diſſ. l. c.* 17.

(q) *Sen. de provid. c.* 3.

CHAP. X.

1. *Of the Stoicks Inſtitution of Virtue as they were a Sect of Philoſophic-Pagan Saintiſts. Their Rules of Piety.* 2. *Their Rules of Duty to themſelves, and of Humanity.* 3. *Their Inſtitution in great degree Unpopular and Irreligious, as appeareth in their ſubverting Religion.* 4. *In their Philoſophy of Death.* 5. *In their Philoſophy of Pain and Sickneſs, and their Indifference.* 6. *Their Inſtitution of Virtue is an Inſtitution of an unpopular kind of Nobility and Beatitude.* 7. *Of placing their All in their Hegemonicon.* 8. *Of their Apathy.* 9. *Of the Faſtuouſneſs of their Virtue towards* Jupiter. 10. *Of the reſt of their faſtuous Grandiloquence, and their Faſtuouſneſs towards others.* 11. *Of their affecting Tranſcendentals.* 12. *Their Paſſive Obedience examin'd.* 13. *The Stoicks more than meer Moraliſts.* 14. *Of their marvellous abſurd Conceits.* 15. *Of their foul and groſs Immoralities.* 16. *The Concluſion.*

I. THE exiſtence of the Coſmical Rector (to whom it belongeth, to be imperial over all, and conſequently all ought to be ſubject unto him) is obligatory to Mankind, to ſubject themſelves to his Regency. Upon which ground the Moral Philoſophy of the *Stoicks* runneth deſcant; *for it is the Learning, Diſcipline and Inſtitution of the Virtue of a Sect of Philoſophic-Pagan Saintiſts*, in part excellently well, in part abſurdly unpopular and irreligious, which they rais'd (in great degree) as a Superſtructure upon this Foundation, *the Law of Man's Subjection to the Coſmical Regent.* The State and Life which they propoſe to themſelves, is that of (r) *Jupiter's Subjects, Friends, Miniſters, Soldiers, Citizens, Sons*, to be and to be intituled (as *Diogenes, Heraclitus*, and the reſt of the Philoſophic-Pagan Saintiſts were) θεῖοι, *nothing leſs than Divine.* The Law of their Subjection they conſider as an Obligation both to *Active* and *Paſſive Obedience.* (s) *How great a power hath Man? a power not to do any thing but what God approveth, and to imbrace all that God diſtributeth to him. We ought to make an Oath unto God, as the Soldiers do to* Cæſar, (t) *never to be diſobedient, nor to accuſe, nor blame any thing that he ſendeth*; (u) diſcarding all Externals, the Body, Riches, Fame, Empire, they made it their Buſineſs, to be Philoſophic Pagan Saintiſts, or (which is the ſame thing) to be and to do what theſe Philoſophic Pagan Saintiſts counted *agreeable to Nature* (to our proper Nature, which is Rational, Social, Humane; to the Will of the governing Nature of the Univerſe; to the governing Right-reaſon of *Jove*, which is a common Law; to the ordination and purport of Nature, which appointeth Man for his proper Work and Function;) for being Philoſophers they were ἐξηγηταὶ τῆς φύσεως. *the Interpreters of Nature.* They thought themſelves unconcern'd in the Applauſe or Contumelies, the Approbation or Reprehenſions of Men, as having no power to do them good or hurt; (w) *But I have whom I ought to be ſubject to, whom to obey, God and the Subordinate Deities.* As good and dutiful Subjects they profeſs themſelves (x) *Friends to God in the firſt place* (as Socrates was;) *chiefly to regard his Eye over them, whom they ought to pleaſe; to concern themſelves about this only, how to fulfil their own Province orderly and obediently to God, to underſtand and mind his Commands and Interdicts, and to be converſant in his Affairs; in all their Actions to have reſpect to him; to deſire, to ſeem fair to him, and to be pure with themſelves and with God; in all Circumſtances to inquire what God would have them to do, and to divine (if it be poſſible) what his Will is; to imitate him in Faithfulneſs, Beneficence, Liberty, Magnanimity; continually to praiſe and celebrate and give thanks to the Divinity; to give thanks for all things, eſpecially for their virtuous living, without their former Vices and Crimes; for the Suſtenance of Life, but eſpecially for the Faculty of underſtanding and uſing things; to ſubmit their Minds to the Governour of all things as good Citizens to the Law of the City; not only to obey, but to approve and praiſe his adminiſtration of things; to will the things that happen in the World, the Eſtate or Uſage that is allotted them, becauſe God willeth them; to will nothing but what God willeth; to be devoted to his Commands;* ἐσθίειν ἀρεστῶς θεοῖς, *ſo to eat as to pleaſe the Gods; to confide in the Governour of all; to live in mindfulneſs of him; to worſhip the Gods, and to invocate them in all Affairs; for Man is made* πρὸς θεοσέβειαν, *to worſhip the Gods.* (y) To the acknowledgment of their Exiſtence *two things are requiſite; the one a faculty of diſcerning the Phænomena of Providence, the other a grateful temper of Mind.* Are not the Academicks εὐχάριστοι καὶ αἰδήμονες, *grateful and modeſt Men, that daily eating Bread, yet dare to tell us, that we do not know, whether there be a* Ceres, Proſerpina *or* Pluto? *To them that ask, where haſt thou ſeen the Gods, or whence is thine aſſurance of their Exiſtence whom thou worſhippeſt? From thoſe things that are Indications of the Power of the Gods I am aſſur'd of their Exiſtence, and therefore worſhip them.*

(r) Epict. Diſſ. p. 337, 344, 91, 107, 122, 135. Enchir. c. 21.
(s) M. Ant. l. 12. S. 11.
(t) Μὴ ἀπειθήσειν μηδέποτε, μηδ' ἐγκαλέσειν, μηδὲ μέμψασθαί τι τῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνου διδομένων. Epict. Diſſ. p. 124.
(u) Ibid. l. 4. c. 4.
(w) Ἐγὼ δ' ἔχω τινὶ ὑποτετάχθαι, τινὶ πείθεσθαι, τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς μετ' ἐκεῖνον. Ibid. c. 12.
(x) Epict. Diſſ. p. 217, 337.
p. 165, 341.
p. 342, 231.
p. 225, p. 385, 333.
p. 207.
p. 127, 350.
p. 401, 382, &c.
p. 247, 127.
p. 118.
p. 349, 350, l. 2. c. 16. l. 3. c. 26.
p. 221, 218, 122.
Marc. Ant. l. 6. S. 10, 7, 23. l. 5. S. 33.
(y) Epict. Diſſ. p. 96, 237. M. Ant. l. 12. S. 28.

II. From the great Law of Subjection to the Coſmical Rector the Stoical Pietiſts deduce, (z) τὸ πρὸς τὸν Δία καθῆκον, *the comprehenſion of their Duty to God*; and thence alſo the great Theorems which properly concern their own Beatitude, have the Name of Laws. (a) Τί δ' ὁ νόμος ὁ θεῖος; τὰ ἴδια τηρεῖν, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων μὴ ἀντιποιεῖσθαι, *what doth the Divine Law command? to keep the things that are our own, and not to challenge to our ſelves the things of others; but if granted to us, to uſe them; if not granted to us, not to deſire them: when taken away, to reſtore them cheerfully, and to be thankful for the time we have had the uſe of them.* (b) *Haſt thou not a Commandment from* Jupiter? *hath he not given thee thine own things* (thoſe which are in the power of thine own Will) *exempt from Prohibition and Impediment, the other things which are not thine own liable to Prohibition and Impediment? What Commandment therefore, what preſcript haſt thou*

(z) Epict. Diſſ. p. 141. ed. Cantab.
(a) Ibid. p. 215.
(b) Ὁ Ζεύς σοι οὐκ ἐντέταλται; οὐ δέδωκέ σοι τὰ μὲν σὰ ἀκώλυτα καὶ ἀπαραπόδιστα, τὰ δὲ μὴ σὰ κωλυτὰ καὶ παραπόδιστα; τίνα οὖν ἐντολὴν ἔχων ἐκεῖθεν ἐλήλυθας; ποῖον διάταγμα; τὰ σὰ τήρει ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων μὴ ἐφίεσο. Epict. Diſſ. p. 145.

thou brought from him? The things that are thine own keep by all means, deſire not the things that belong to others. Faithfulneſs is thine own, who can take away ſuch things as theſe, who ſhall hinder thee from uſing them beſides thy ſelf? In this manner thou may'ſt hinder thy ſelf; when thou mindeſt the things that are not thine own, thou haſt loſt the things that are thine own. (c) *Man muſt do what his Reaſon and Mind injoyneth, which is an Avulſion from* Jupiter, *and which* Jupiter *(a ſevere exactor of Virtues) hath given him to be his Leader and Prefect.*

From the ſame Principle (the Law of Subjection to the Coſmical Rector) the Stoicks infer their various Rules of duty to Mankind. For (*d*) *Man is not* ἀπόλυτος, *abſolute and unbound, but a part of a certain whole,* (*e*) *a Member of the one univerſal Syſtem of Rationals, a Citizen of the World, and therefore is an intellectual ſocial Animal* (deſign'd, inclin'd, adapted and neceſſitated to live in Society,) the Coſmical Rector's Subject, not in a ſingle, but a ſocial Capacity, in conjunction with his Fellow-rationals, (*f*) *that are of the ſame nature and kind, of one Tribe or Alliance, his Kinſmen, Fellows, Aſſociates, Neighbours, Brothers, (not as deriving their origin from the ſame Blood or Seed, but from the ſame Parental Mind, of which their Minds are ſo many Decerptions or Avulſions) Fellow-members of one Body, that are born to be Fellow-workers, (as the Feet, the Hands, the Eye-lids, the Rows of the Upper and Under-Teeth) and by nature Friends.* (*g*) *Let this be laid down in the firſt place; I am a part of the whole which is govern'd by Nature. In the next place, I am nearly ally'd to thoſe other parts that are of the ſame kind.* (*h*) *The Mind of the Univerſe is ſocietive; wherefore the principal thing intended in the Conſtitution of Man is the ſocietive deſign, which is the end and good, and ought to be the ſcope of Man; and whatever practice of his hath not reference (immediately or remotely)* ἐπὶ τὸ κοινωνικὸν τέλος, *to the Societive Deſign, deſtroyeth the Uniformity of Life and is ſeditious, as a Factioniſt among the People divideth his own party from the common conſent:* Wherefore a virtuous Man is (*i*) κοινωνικὸς, *Societive*, the Rule of his Agency is κοινωνικῶς πρᾶξαι, *to practiſe ſocietively, not to be hurry'd away by ſuch Motions, which are unſocietive, to paſs from one ſocietive practice to another with mindfulneſs of God,* (*k*) *to treat Men ſocietively according to the natural Law of Fellowſhip, kindly and juſtly.* (*l*) *What do I care for more than this, that my preſent action be the proper action of one that is rational, one that is ſocietive, and that is govern'd by the ſame Law of right reaſon with God?*

To Man that is rational and ſocietive, and that ought to live the ſocietive life, it is proper and agreeable, (*m*) *to do nothing but what the reaſon of his Regial and Nomothetic part ſuggeſteth for the good of Men. He ought to love them truly and from the Heart, to take care of the welfare of all Men, to worſhip and praiſe the Gods and to do good to Men* (for if Man is born κοινωνικὸς, *ſocietive*, he is neceſſarily born εὐεργετικὸς, to be beneficent to Men) *to bear with them, forbearing to injure them, to do them good unweariedly (perſiſting in an uninterrupted ſeries of good actions) accounting Beneficence to others his own Emolument, and* (becauſe they are Members of the ſame Body) *a doing good to himſelf. The joy of a Man is to do what properly belongeth to a Man;* ἴδιον δὲ ἀνθρώπου εὔνοια πρὸς τὸ ὁμόφυλον, *and it properly belongeth to a Man, to be kindly affected to thoſe of the ſame Tribe or Kindred. It is proper and agreeable to a Man, to love thoſe that offend againſt him, (for by nature they are his Friends and Kinſmen;) to bear good-will to them that hate and diſparage him; not to be angry with the ſtupid and ungrateful, but to take care of them; to be amical and benevolous to every Man; Men are made* ἀλλήλων ἕνεκεν, *for one another; teach them better or bear with them. A Branch cut off from Continuity with its Neighbour-branch is neceſſarily cut off from the whole Tree; a Man divideth himſelf from his Neighbour, hating him and having an averſation from him, yet knoweth not, that at the ſame time he divideth himſelf from the whole Body or Corporation.* (*n*) As a Citizen of the World and a part of the whole Man is oblig'd μηδὲν ἔχειν ἰδίᾳ συμφέρον, *to have no private ſelf-intereſt or emolument, to conſult about nothing as* ἀπόλυτος, *looſe and unbound; but as the Hand or Foot if they had Reaſon and Underſtanding of the natural order, ſhould have no Motions, nor deſire any thing, but with reſpect to the whole; to direct his whole endeavour to the common good, and to abſtain from the contrary* (not prejudicing the Community for ſuppos'd ſelf-intereſt) κυριώτερον γὰρ τὸ ὅλον τοῦ μέρους καὶ ἡ πόλις τοῦ πολίτου, *for the whole is of greater regard than a part, and a City than a Citizen.* The Duties of *Juſtice* are eminently compris'd in this Law of *the Societive Life*: And becauſe the Founder of the Univerſe is the Founder of it in the Frame and Conſtitution of Nature (as alſo of the various Offices of Relations, *Father*, *Son*, *Brother*, and ſuch more,) therefore the Violation of it is a grand Impiety; (*o*) ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀσεβεῖ· *He that is unjuſt to any is impious, for the Nature of the Univerſe having made all Rational Animals one for another, that they ſhould benefit one another according to every one's worth, but in no wiſe hurt one another: He that tranſgreſſeth this her Will,* ἀσεβεῖ δηλονότι εἰς τὴν πρεσβυτάτην τῶν θεῶν, *is manifeſtly guilty of Impiety towards the moſt ancient and venerable of the Gods.*

III. The Law of Nature and the Original Law thereof is egregiouſly illuſtrated by this Account of the Stoicks Inſtitution of Virtue (which yet is far from being abſolutely the ſame with the Law of Nature;) and in this better part of it there is much of *Natural Religion*, which the worſer part of it in great degree ſubverteth and deſtroyeth. For one great Article of the Popular Pagans *Natural Religion* was *the Immortality of Humane Souls, that after this Life they exiſt in an happy or calamitous ſtate, and that Mankind ought to be govern'd by hope of Reward and fear of Puniſhment*, which *Plato* calleth *the two adamantine Pillars of a Common-wealth*. The Epicureans found, that Religion ſtood firm, becauſe theſe two Pillars could not be demoliſh'd; *Lucretius* complaineth, that Mankind were apt to be ſcar'd with *the threats of Prophets and the fears of Puniſhment after Death*; and therefore would be Religious, becauſe they were unable.

——— Minis obſiſtere vatum
Æternas quoniam pœnas in morte timendum.

(c) M. Ant. l. 5. S. 27. Sen. de provid. c. 1.

(d) Epict. Diſſ. p. 181.

(e) M. Ant. l. 2. S. 13. l. 3. S. 11, 7.

(f) Ibid. & l. 2. S. 1. l. 9. S. 8, 9. Epict. diſſ. p. 122.

(g) Πρῶτον κείσθω, ὅτι μέρος εἰμὶ τοῦ ὅλου ὑπὸ φύσεως διοικουμένου, ἔπειτα, ὅτι ἔχω πως οἰκείως πρὸς τὰ ὁμογενῆ μέρη. *M. Ant. l.* 10. *S.* 6.

(h) Ὁ τοῦ ὅλου νοῦς κοινωνικός, τὸ μὲν οὖν προηγούμενον ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευῇ τὸ κοινωνικόν ἐστι. *Ibid. l.* 5. *S.* 30. & *l.* 7. *S.* 55. & *l.* 5. *S.* 16. *l.* 11. *S.* 21. *l.* 9. *S.* 23.

(i) Ibid. l. 5. S. 6. l. 9. S. 31. l. 2. S. 2. l. 6. S. 7.

(k) Τοῖς ἀνθρώποις χρῆσθαι κοινωνικῶς, κατὰ τὸν τῆς κοινωνίας φυσικὸν νόμον, εὐμενῶς καὶ δικαίως. *Ibid. l.* 6. *S.* 23. *l.* 3. *S.* 11.

(l) Τί πλέον ἐπιζητῶ, εἰ τὸ παρὸν ἔργον ζώου νοεροῦ καὶ κοινωνικοῦ καὶ ἰσονόμου θεῷ. *Ibid. l.* 8. *S.* 2.

(m) Ibid. l. 4. S. 12. l. 6. S. 39. l. 7. S. 13. l. 3. S. 4. l. [illegible]. S. 33. l. 5. S. 42. l. 7. S. 74. l. 12. S. 29. l. 7. S. 13. l. 8. S. 25. l. 7. S. 22. l. 9. S. 27. l. 8. S. 8. l. 11. S. 13. l. 8. S. 50. l. 11. S. 8.

(n) Epict. Diſſ. l. 2. c. 10. M. Ant. l. 10. S. 6.

(o) M. Ant. l. 9. S. 1.

But theſe grand Articles of Natural Religion the School of the Stoicks diſcardeth as Plebeian Notices; deſigning to rid themſelves of the *Paſſions*, to reſcue themſelves intirely from all Bondage and Servility of Mind, and to enjoy perfect Liberty and Tranquility; deſigning to inſtitute a *Philoſopher* (who muſt be an unpopular kind of Virtuoſo call'd *Sapiens*, and his Inſtitution or Diſcipline *Sapientia*) they undermine the Fundamentals of the Inſtitution of Religion, they conſpire with the Epicureans in raſing and demoliſhing the principal Pillars of it, and make their own Law (the Law of Man's Subjection to the Coſmical Rector) not Law, but an extravagant Hypotheſis. They ſuppoſe, that an Imperial Head preſideth over an Univerſe of Rationals, which muſt be govern'd by Law, but without the Sanction of Rewards and Puniſhments; (p) that the Virtuous muſt hope for no other Reward, the Vicious need to fear no other Puniſhment, but their being ſuch; that the *Inferi* and Infernal *Apparatus* are a poetic Fable, the Puniſhments after Death are like *Accho* and *Alphito, whereby Women affright Children from doing unhappy Turns; and nothing muſt be thought our good or evil ſave only the things that are in the power of our own Wills, leſt we curſe the Gods, when they ſeem to neglect or croſs us.* Upon which terms there can be no Sanction of Rewards and Puniſhments, no virtuous hopes or Fears of them, no dutiful Submiſſion to Divine Chaſtiſements and Puniſhments, no pious Addreſſes for preventing or removing them, and for procuring the external Bleſſings of this or a better Life. Accordingly, a Stoick liveth (*q*) μηδὲν περιμένων, μηδὲ φεύγων, *without expecting or fleeing from any thing, without concerning himſelf about Futurities.* His Infidelity tranſcendeth the Popular-Pagan; *for at beſt he doubteth of a future ſtate, and ſuſpecteth, that there is none.* (r) He ſuppoſeth, *that the Agent ſuffereth no Evil, when his Operation ceaſeth in due time and ſeaſon. In a Daunce or Stage-play, if any part be cut off, the whole is imperfect; but it is not thus with the Soul; in what part or time ſoever ſhe is ſeized, ſhe compleateth what is already done, and maketh it full and unwanting to her ſelf*, ſo that ſhe can ſay, ἐγὼ ἀπέχω τὰ ἐμὰ, *I want not any thing of what belongeth to me.* (s) *It is of no concern, for how long you ſhall practiſe virtuouſly; three Hours are ſufficient. Prorogation of Life conduceth nothing to Felicity; a bleſſed Life that is ſhort, is no leſs deſirable than that which is long; both are alike; Beatitude is not increas'd by length, nor diminiſh'd by ſhortneſs of time; Time is of no moment to Beatitude. Nihil intereſt inter diem & ſeculum; morâ non fit beatior vita ſed longior: There is no difference between a Day and an Age; Life by ſtay is made longer, but not happier.* An Inſtitution which at this rate affronteth the common reaſon of Mankind, corrupteth their natural Notices, ſlaketh their innate Deſires and noble Aſpires after Immortality, diſputeth againſt the Deſirableneſs of Life and Immortality (to which an Inſtitution of Virtue ought to conduct Men) is doubtleſs (in great meaſure) no Inſtitution of (t) ſerious Virtue, but of unpopular and irreligious Humour.

(p) *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 335, 280, 293. *Sen. ad Marc.* c. 19. *Plutarch. de Stoic. repugn.* p. 1040. *Epict. Ench.* c. 38.

(q) *M. Ant.* l. 3. S. 12. l. 12. S. 1, 3, 5.

(r) *Ibid.* l. 12. S. 23. l. 10. S. 1. l. 11. S. 1.

(s) *M. Ant.* l. 6. S. 23. *Sen. de Benef.* l. 5. c. 17. *Plut. adv. Stoic.* p. 1061, 1062. *Gat. in Ant.* p. 108, 111.

(t) *Lact.* l. 3. c. 27.

The Stoicks are alſo extremely Irreligious in bereaving the Coſmical Rector of governing Diſtributive Juſtice, of duly Premiant Goodneſs, and Punitive Anger (or Severity;) in attributing to him an extravagant indulgent Goodneſs, deſtructive to the true uſe of Sacrifices, methods of Atonement, Penitential Sorrow and the pious fear of a Deity; for although they ſometimes acknowledge, (*u*) that the Coſmical Rector inflicteth *caſtigatory Puniſhments* (in this Life) yet they do not ſuppoſe, that he inflicteth any (properly) Penal Evils. (*w*) *There are ſome Beings, that cannot hurt, and which have no force but what is ſalutary and beneficent, as the immortal Gods that neither will, nor can endamage; for their Nature is mild and placid, as far remote from doing, as from receiving an Injury; wherefore no Man of a ſound Mind feareth the Gods; for it is madneſs to fear what is ſalutary.* (*x*) *The Gods like the beſt Parents that ſmile upon their Infants, when they reproach or curſe them, ceaſe not to heap benefits upon thoſe, that doubt of the Author of them; in an equal tenour they diſtribute their Goods through various Nations and People, having only this one power, to benefit or profit.* Agreeably to theſe Maxims the ſame Author ſaith, (*y*) *Abſoluta libertas, nec homines timere, nec Deum; the ſtate of abſolute liberty is neither to fear Men, nor God.* So according to *Zeno* one thing requiſite in an happy Man is, (z) *nec Deos extimeſcere, not to fear the Gods.* The Platoniſts agree with the Stoicks in attributing an irreligious kind of Goodneſs to the Deity (for *Plato* in his *ſecond de Rep.* reproveth *Homer* for his δοιοὶ πίθοι, *duo dolia*, making *Jupiter* the diſpenſer both of Goods and Evils; whereas *Plato* thinketh it a thing unſufferable, to ſay, that God is the cauſe of Evil unto any; he ſuppoſeth, that if any be puniſh'd by him, it is to help and benefit them;) yet they ſuppoſe Caſtigatory Puniſhments in a future Life, and make uſe of their Dogma for promoting Virtue and reſtraining Men from Vice. But *Chryſippus* affirmeth, (*a*) ὐτ' ὀρθῶς ἀποτρέπειν τῷ ἀπὸ θεῶν φόβῳ τῆς ἀδικίας τὸν Κέφαλον, *that* Cephalus *in* Plato *doth not rightly deter Men from Injuſtice by the fear of the Gods.* The Gods themſelves (all the Subordinate Deities) are ſuppos'd by the Stoicks, to be *mortal* and *corruptible*, and they are all to be ſwallow'd up by the Mundane Syſtem *Jove* in the univerſal Conflagration: (*b*) Nor is their Coſmical *Jove* (being nothing better than a corporeal fiery nature) abſolutely *indiſſoluble, indiſcerpible and incorruptible.*

(u) *Sen. Ep.* 95.

(w) *Quædam ſunt quæ nocere non poſſunt, nullamque vim niſi beneficam & ſalutarem habent; ut Dii immortales, qui nec volunt obeſſe, nec poſſint, natura enim illis mitis & placida eſt, tam longe remota ab aliena injuria, quàm à ſua. itaque Deos nemo ſanus timet, furor eſt enim metuere ſalutaria.* Sen. de Benef. l. 4. c. 19.

(x) *More optimorum parentum, qui maledictis ſuorum Infantium arrident, non ceſſant Dii beneficia congerere de beneficiorum auctore dubitantibus: ſed æquali tenore bona ſua per gentes populoſque diſtribuunt, unam potentiam ſortiti, prodeſſe.* Idem. ibid. l. 7. c. 31.

(y) *Ep.* 75.

(z) *Cic. Tuſc. Qu.* l. 3.

(a) *Plut. de Stoic. repugn.* p. 1040.

(b) *Orig. c. Celſ.* l. 1. p. 17. l. 3. p. 156. l. 4. p. 169, 208.

IV. They phyſiologize away the Fear of Death, explode the laudable uſage of burying the Dead (*c*) *officioſâ pietate* (with officious Piety) and of *mourning for the Dead*; all which is abſurdly unpopular and irreligious. Nor could the World be govern'd, if all Men entertain'd a perſwaſion, that Death (and conſequently the Execution of Criminals) is no penal Evil, no deadly Evil, no Evil at all, as the Stoicks ſuppoſe. (*d*) *To die is the Work of Nature, he that feareth any Work of nature is a very Child; but Death is not only a Work of Nature, but alſo conducive to her.* (*e*) *All ways of dying are alike* (there is no difference between Natural Death and Death aggravated by horrible Modes and Circumſtances of dying,) *dying is like playing at Ball, where the Contention is not about the Ball, as if it was good or evil, but only about the caſting it and catching it well.* (*f*) *Socrates* called theſe things μορμολύκεια, *frightful Mormo's, jeſted with his Adverſaries at his Trial, and play'd at Ball well.*

(c) *S. Aug. de C. D.* l. 1. c. 13.

(d) *M. Ant.* l. 2. S. 12.

(e) *Epict. Diſſ.* l. 2. c. 5, 6. & l. 4. c. 7.

(f) *Ibid.* p. 170, 180.

(g) *Canius Iulus* (highly commended by *Seneca* for his contempt of Death) was playing at Cheſs, when the Centurion call'd him forth to die (after he had been reſerv'd for Execution ten Days) leaving his Game he counted his Cheſs-men, ſaying to his Companion, *Vide nè poſt mortem meam mentiaris te viciſſe, Do not lie after my Death, and ſay, that you have beaten me.* (h) μὴ τραγῴδει τὸ πρᾶγμα, *Do not tragically exaggerate the Buſineſs, but repreſent the thing as it is. Death is the Reſolution of the material Concretion into thoſe Elements which it conſiſteth of. God calleth thee to nothing dreadful, but to things amical and congenial, whence thou hadſt thine origin. The Fire which is in thee returneth to Fire, the Earth to Earth, the Air to Air, the Water to Water*; (i) οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ λύσις τῶν στοιχείων, *it is nothing elſe but a Diſſolution of the Elements: It is but being what we were before. Contemn Death, which is either your Extinction or Tranſlation; for neither of theſe hath any Evil in it: If it tranſlateth you to another Life, no place is devoid of Gods: If it depriveth you of all Senſation, there is an end of Pains and Bodily Miniſteries. Death is not any thing, and therefore is not Evil.* Which *Cicero* alſo proveth from an Epicurean piece of Sophiſtry; (k) *whilſt we are, Death is not; and when Death exiſteth, we are no more.*

(g) *Sen. de Tranquil. c.* 14.
(h) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 293, 402.
(i) *M. Ant. l.* 2. *S.* 17. *l.* 4. *S.* 5. *l.* 3. *S.* 3. *Sen. Ep.* 54. *de provid. c.* 6. *ad Marc. c.* 19.
(k) *Tuſc. Qu. l.* 1.

Nil igitur mors eſt, ad nos neque pertinet hilum.

Plato alſo and *Socrates* affirm, (l) *That Death is good and better than living with the Body, not to ſome only, but ſimply unto all.* (m) *He feareth not Death, that loveth to be alone, ſeparate from the Body.* But ſome of the Pagans conſider'd Death under other Notions. (n) *Some ſuppoſe, that by a privation of Goods only, others, that by Eternal Puniſhments under the Earth and horrendous penalties Death is Evil.*

(l) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 58.
(m) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 6.
(n) Τόν τε θάνατον οἱ μὲν ἀγαθῶν στερήσει μόνον, οἱ δὲ καὶ τιμωρείαις αἰωνίοις ὑπὸ γῆν, καὶ κολασμοῖς φρικώδεσι, κακὸν εἶναι νομίζουσιν. *Plutarch. de virt. mor. p.* 450.

It is not hard for a Stoick to be a Man of Fortitude, to contemn Death and Dangers, and to trample on the whole Kingdom of Fortune; for why ſhould he fear any Evils of Life or the End of Death, that feareth no Diſaſters after Death, and may die when he pleaſeth? (o) If the Wiſe Man be in tragical Circumſtances, and weary of Life, his Philoſophy alloweth and injoyneth εὔλογον ἐξαγωγήν, *an Eduction agreeable to Reaſon* (ſelf-murder) ἡ θύρα ἤνοικται, *the Gate is open*, he may go forth out of Life, if he pleaſeth, and imitate the Children's οὐκέτι παίζω, *I will play no longer.* (p) *None hath reaſon to complain of Life, for none is forc'd to live againſt his Will; if he liveth miſerably, it is his own fault; doth it pleaſe you? live: doth it not pleaſe you? you may return whence you came.* This Philoſophy was put in practice by ſeveral of the Philoſophic Pagans (*Metrocles*, *Zeno*, *Menippus* and *Cato*,) the School of *Plato* (q) was ſomewhat infected with this impure Dogma; but the Popular Pagans that follow'd the Sentiments of Nature, (r) were of better Principles.

(o) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 145, 170. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 83, 213, 314.
(p) *Sen. Ep.* 70.
(q) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 83, 84.
(r) *Lipſ. Manuduct. l.* 3. *c.* 22.

V. The Philoſophy of Pain and Sickneſs (and other Evils of Humane Life) is in the School of the Stoicks of the ſame Character with their Notices of Death, not Wiſdom, but *unpopular*, *irreligious* and *paradoxical Humour*; for their magnificent pretenſions are, (s) *That pain and torture of Body is not evil*, (as *Poſſidonius* the Stoick carried on his Diſcourſe, when *Pompey* viſited him tormented with the Gout, thus ſlighting his Torture; *Nil agis dolor, quamvis ſis moleſtus, nunquam te confitebor malum*:) or if it be Evil, it is ἀλλότριον κακὸν, *another's Evil, not ours*, the Body being no part of us, but our Organ only; (t) *dolorem in pede manere, divinus Socrates aſſerebat.* Socrates *affirm'd, that Pain remaineth in the Foot*, it doth not affect the Mind with Evil. *They can live in great hilarity of Mind, although the Wild Beaſts pull in ſunder their bodily Members*; οἱ πεπαιδευμένοι, *the Men of Learning* (as they ſuppoſe) *are furniſh'd with Fortitude againſt things painful and dolorous, which ſuffereth them not to paſs within the Porch of the Soul; but conſidering them as a propos'd exerciſe, beareth them without Dolour and Affliction.* (u) Πόνος, ἡδονὴ, ἅπτεταί σου; ὄψεται ἡ αἴσθησις· *Doth ſenſitive Pain or Pleaſure touch thee? let Sence look to it:* ὄψεται τὸ πάσχον, *let the Body and Bodily Members make it their care, if they can, that they ſuffer not; and when they ſuffer, let them complain, if they can, and judge that Pain is Evil: The Soul may keep her proper Tranquility and Serenity, and not ſuppoſe it Evil; for all Judgment, Proſecution, or Averſation is within, and no Evil* (unleſs let in by Opinion) *aſcendeth thither. Not Fire, nor Iron, nor a Tyrant, nor contumelious Language, can touch the Mind, when ſhe is become like a Sphere* (by involving her ſelf in her ſelf) *teres tota atque rotunda.* But if they can abſtract the Mind from all Sympathy with the Body, and keep her from Diſeaſement by the Pains of it, whence is it, that they cannot keep her from Diſturbance by the Humours of the Body? (for they acknowledge themſelves (w) as liable as other Mortals, to Fevers, Phrenzies and Delirations) whence is it, that upon account of the extremity of Pain, they think it decent, to take away their own lives? and why do they talk of Pain *intolerable*, and uſually make uſe of the Epicurean *Paregorick*, (x) *if Pain be intolerable, it is not long* (for it quickly riddeth us of all Pain:) *If it be long, it is not intolerable?* (y) When *Dionyſius Heracleotas* (called ὁ μεταθέμενος, *the Changeling or Retractator*, becauſe in his declining Age from a Stoick he turn'd Epicurean) fell under great Pain, he relinquiſh'd his Opinion, *that Pain is indifferent.* He found, that the Stoicks Philoſophy did little more for the cure of Humane Evils, than to make Men (as *Critolaus Phaſelites* (z) call'd the Stoicks) ὀνοματομάχους, *wranglers about Names and Terms*; as if changing the Names chang'd the Nature of things: So the Friar on a Faſting-day bade his Capon be Carp, and then very canonically ate it up.

(s) *Cic. Tuſc.* 2. *Stearne Animi Med. l.* 4. *c.* 7.
(t) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 77.
(u) *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 41. *l.* 7. *S.* 13, 14, 16. 18. *S.* 28. *l.* 4. *S.* 39. *l.* 12. *S.* 1.
(w) *M. Ant. l.* 3. *S.* 1.
(x) *Ibid. l.* 7. *S.* 33. 64.
(y) *Laert. in vit. Erill.*
(z) *Clem. Str. l.* 2. *p. m.* 273.

The external Goods of Human Life are not much valuable (ὀβολοῦ γὰρ εἰσὶ, ταλάντου δ' οὐκ εἰσίν, (a) *for they are worth an Half-penny only, they are not of the worth and weight of a Talent*;) nor is much of them deſirable, (nothing more than is Salutary, and the deſire whereof is Salutary:) But the Stoical *indifference* is an extravagant unpopular Humour, (b) making no difference between *optimè valere* and *peſſimè ægrotare*; for they will not have externals call'd *Human Goods*, but *things indifferent*, or at the moſt (c) *ſumenda non expetenda, to be taken if they fall, not things to be deſired*, only προηγμένα, *things to be preferr'd before their contraries.* (d) Externals concern us not, are neither our Goods nor Ills, and conſequently we ought not to ſeek or ſhun them: But however they ſhall happen, make a right uſe of them; *for although the things be indifferent, the uſe of them is not indifferent: As Children when they play with Shells, their ſollicitude is not about the Shells, but to play with*

(a) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 335.
(b) *Cic.* *Fin.* 2.
(c) *Lipſ. Manud.* 2. *Diſſ.* 23.
(d) *Epict. diſſ. p.* 179, 400.

with them dextrouſly. (*e*) Upon which terms there may be *Well-doing*, but no ſuch thing as *doing Good* to others in the uſe of Externals; yet the Stoicks pretend to *Beneficence*, and write Books *De Beneficiis*: Although they are like a Phyſician whoſe care and concern is not the Life and Welfare of his Patient, but only that his own demeanour and management be *ſecundum Artem.* (*f*) They inſtitute Mankind to an *indifference* as to Life and Death, Health and Sickneſs (and yet exhort them to be thankful for their Life and the helps of Life, the Fruits of the Earth) *bodily Pain or Pleaſure, Honour or Ignominy, Plenty or Penury*, as to *Wife, Children, Country, Fame, Poſſeſſions, Friends and their own Bodies.* (*g*) *If a Tyrant threatneth me with Bonds, I ſay, he threatneth the Hands and the Feet: If to cut off my Head, I ſay, he threatneth the Neck: If to Impriſon me, the Corpuſculum.* Σοὶ οὖν οὐδὲν ἀπειλεῖ; *doth he therefore threaten nothing to thee? If I look upon theſe things as nothing to me, he threatneth nothing to me: But if I fear any of them, he threatneth me.* (*h*) Diogenes *would not have purſu'd you, had you ſeiz'd and taken away his Poſſeſſions, or a Member of his Body: In like manner, he would have abandon'd his Kinsfolk, Friends and Country.* (*i*) Ὁ υἱὸς ἀπέθανε; τί ἐγένετο; ὁ υἱὸς ἀπέθανεν. Ἄλλο οὐδὲν; οὐδέν. *Is thy Son dead? what hath happened? Thy Son is dead. Is that All? That is All. That Ill hath happened, is thine own Additional.* (*k*) *If thine Hearing be incommodated, what is that to thee?* (*l*) *No ill News can come to thee from* Rome, *for what Evil can befal thee there, where thou art not?* Baniſhment is no Evil; (*m*) *It is but to be elſewhere.* (But if Servitude is no Evil, what meaneth that Soveraign Antidote againſt it (*n*) τὸ εὐκόλως ἀποθνήσκειν, to die readily?) *Do'ſt thou want Bread?* (*o*) *The Door is open, thou mayſt go out of a ſmoaky Houſe.* (*p*) *But is not Life a good? No.* (*q*) *May we not deſire Health? No, by no means, nor any thing elſe of the Aliena, from which the Appetite muſt be far remov'd; or elſe thou ſubmitteſt thy Neck to ſervitude, to the Things firſt, and next to the Men that have the diſpoſal of them.* (*r*) *Health is not good, nor Sickneſs evil, the good is,* τὸ καλῶς ὑγιαίνειν, *to be healthful as you ought: In like manner, be Sick as you ought, and Sickneſs becometh good and profitable.* The ὀρθὴ χρῆσις τῶν φαντασιῶν, *right uſe of the Externals* (or appearances) *which preſent themſelves* (which the Stoicks account the Summary of Virtue) *is a* Mercury's *Rod which turneth every thing that it toucheth into golden.* (*s*) *Sickneſs, Death, Penury, Contumely, capital Sentence, touch them with the Rod of* Mercury, *and they all become profitable. Why then ſhould we ſeek our Goods and Evils in Externals, ſeeing it is in our own Power, to make all Externals good?* This is the moſt plauſible Pretenſion for a Stoical indifference as to all Externals: But to rectifie this miſtake in the Philoſophy of Good and Evil, it ought to be conſider'd, that Goods are of a twofold Notion. For ſome things are good as conſtitutive of our true Perfection and felicitative Life: Others are good as mediately conducive thereto. In the firſt Notion the Goods commonly ſo reputed (Life, Health, Honour, Plenty and ſuch more) cannot be Evils; and the Evils commonly ſo reputed (Death, Sickneſs, Infamy, Penury and ſuch more) cannot be Goods. In the ſecond Notion the Evils commonly ſo reputed may be Goods, and the Goods commonly ſo reputed may be Evils, and uſually are, not helps, but hindrances to our true perfection and felicitative Life in a future State.

VI. The Stoicks Moral Philoſophy is an Inſtitution to an *unpopular* kind of Nobility and Beatitude (of being Noble, Brave, Rich, Proſperous, Fortunate, free from Servitude, Subjection, Miſery and Misfortune altogether unpopularly) quite out of the road both of Civil and Religious Society. For they ſuppoſe, (*t*) that nothing but our Intelligent free-agent Nature (which they call προαίρεσις, is our ſelf, nothing but τὰ προαιρετικὰ, or τὰ ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν, *the things which properly belong to our Intelligent free-agent Nature, and fall within the Power of our Wills, do concern us, or are our Goods and Evils.* Ἔξω τῆς προαιρέσεως οὐδὲν ἐστιν οὔτε ἀγαθὸν, οὔτε κακὸν, *out of the Intelligent free-agent Nature* (its good Moralities or Vicioſities) there is nothing Good or Evil. (*u*) Mankind are wretchedly miſtaken in things of greateſt concernment, *ſeeking their Goods in Externals, which they muſt ſeek in themſelves, if ever they find them.* (*w*) *Diſcarding therefore the many things, they place their one thing and their All in cultivating their Intelligent free-agent Nature, in its being vertuous, and ſuch as the proper Nature of Man requireth.* By which method of Diſcipline and Inſtitution they attain (*x*) *a ſtate of proſperity and felicity without impediment or danger of misfortune*; for they have learned (and they account it their only Learning) *never to fail of their Appetitions, never to fall into their Averſations.* As to their Goods and Evils, Proſecutions and Averſations, they are liable to no prohibition, hindrance, conſtraint, fruſtration: But are in a State of *perfect Liberty* (becauſe not liable to prohibition, impediment, conſtraint, fruſtration in their Appetitions or Averſations,) which they account the greateſt of Goods. (*y*) *From the time that* Antiſthenes *ſet me at Liberty* (ſaid *Diogenes*) *I have not been in any Servitude, nor was he liable to be brought into any. Antiſthenes* ſet him at Liberty by ſhewing him what were his own things, and what were not his own; teaching him to diſcard the Body, its Parts and Powers, Poſſeſſions, Fame, Honours, Magiſtracies, Wife, Children, Friends, Relations, and all Externals, as not his own things, but *Aliena*, and things that were not his Concern, which alone is our Manumiſſion and true Liberty. (*z*) So *Crates* having given his Eſtate to the publick Bank, τότε ἔδοξεν ἐλευθερῶσθαι, *he then thought himſelf, to be made a Freeman.* Agreeably to their Free Eſtate whereby theſe Philoſophic Gallants are *ennobled, unſubjected, unſerviliz'd, royaliz'd* (for a Kingdom being an unſubject Eſtate (*a*) they that as to their Goods and Liberties are obnoxious to no ſuperior Power, are neceſſarily in a Kingdom-eſtate,) their temper of Mind is unabject, unſubject, unſervile, ſublime and generous. (*b*) *They that place their Good and Emolument in thoſe things only, that are liable to no prohibition, the things of that comprehenſion which is properly ours, will be free, proſperous, happy, unhurt magnanimous, and pious.* Having diſmiſs'd the deſire and fear of Externals, none can hurt them, they inhabit an impregnable City, none can have acceſs to their Riches, they have no Enemy, they complain of none, criminate no Body. (*c*) *Hearken to me* (ſaith the Stoick,) *and you ſhall never live in Envy, nor be in Anger, Grief, or Fear, never be prohibited or hindred, nor ever Flatter any. To me no Evil can happen, to me there is no Thief* (he that ſtole *Epictetus*'s Lamp,

(*d*) was

(e) *Plutarch. adv. Stoic. p.* 1072.

(f) *M. Ant. l.* 2. *S.* 11. *l.* 9. *S.* 1. *Epict. diſſ. p.* 361, 386, 400, 403.

(g) *Ibid. p.* 158.

(h) *Ibid. p* 370, 371, 337.

(i) *Ibid. p.* 281.

(k) *Ibid. p.* 385.

(l) *Ibid. p.* 332.

(m) *Ibid. p.* 384

(n) *Ib. p.* 352.

(o) *Ib. p.* 418.

(p) *Ib. p.* 368.

(q) *Ib. p.* 359, 141.

(r) *Ib. p.* 302, & 415.

(s) Φέρε νόσον, φέρε θάνατον, φέρε ἀπορίαν, φέρε λοιδορίαν, δίκην περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων, πάντα ταῦτα τῷ ῥαβδίῳ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ὠφέλιμα ἔσται.

(t) *Ib. p.* 265, 287, 360, 393.

(u) *Ib. p.* 313, 344.

(w) *Ibid. p.* 84, 283, 336.

(x) *Ib. p.* 172, 313, 206, 221, 358, & 337, 355, 365, 367, 374.

(y) *Ib. p.* 337, 365, 370, 371, 380, 336, 367.

(z) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 59.

(a) *Laert. in Zenon. Epict. ſupr. p.* 336, 338, 189.

(b) *Ib. p.* 401, 409, 391, *Ench. c.* 3.

(c) *Diſſ. p.* 392, 84, 292.

(d) was no Thief to him,) *nor any Earthquake: But all things are full of peace and undiſturbance* (quid eſt beata vita? Securitas & perpetua tranquilitas, Sen. Ep. 92.) *every Way, every City, every Convention*, (e) *becauſe I ſeek Good and Evil*, ἔσω ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς, *within only in mine own things* (in judging aright of things, in having my Appetitions and Averſations right, and in the right uſe of Externals) *not giving the Name of Good or Evil; of Utility or Damage or any thing of that Nature to the Aliena.* (*f*) For if you place your Good or Evil in Externals, you will neceſſarily be baſe, ſordid, ſervile, liable to prohibition, impediment, conſtraint, grief, envy, fruſtration of deſire, and misfortune, ſubject to the Power of others, and a Servant to them, who have thoſe things at their diſpoſal which you admire or fear, querulous, ireful, timid, accuſing all and never quiet. For all which Evils there is no remedy, but wholly to turn away your deſire from things External, and to turn your Averſation ἐπὶ μόνα τὰ προαιρετικὰ, *to thoſe things only, which properly belong to your free Will and Agency.* (*g*) Μία ὁδὸς ἐπὶ εὔροιαν, *there is but one way to a proſperous State*, to diſmiſs the things External, *leaving them to* Jupiter *and the other Gods.* Such are the ὀρθὰ δόγματα, *right Principles* (Scholaſtick Dogmata,) which theſe Philoſophers inculcate in their Schools, and live in the Meditation and Exerciſe of them, but relinquiſh or diſſemble, when they betake themſelves to the management of publick Affairs. (*h*) For theſe they manage, as if they accounted Externals (Health, Riches and Glory) Goods; and how can they be throughly concern'd, to avert publick Calamities, if they ſuppoſe them no Evils, or not their Concern?

VII. They have adapted their Inſtitution, not to Human Souls. But to *abſtract Noes* or ſeparate Intelligences; and it muſt be denominated *an Inſtitution of extravagant unpopular Mentaliſts and Intellectualiſts, of their Liberty aad Regality, Security, Tranquility and Proſperity.* For the great Principle of their Inſtitution and their Form of living is (*i*) *the placing their All in the comprehenſion of their own Hegemonicon, diſcarding all things elſe as not belonging to them.* (*k*) Corpuſculum nihil ad me: Partes illius nihil ad me: Mors nihil ad me. *The Body is nothing to me: The Parts of it are nothing to me: Death is nothing to me.* (*l*) *The Buſineſs of a Philoſopher is not to conſerve Externals, but to form and conſerve his own Hegemonicon*, which is the Repoſitory of all his Goods, and *where his All is always in ſafety.* (*m*) *This is the State and Character of a Philoſopher, he looketh for all his Utility and Damage from himſelf.* He deſireth no accommodations, feareth no incommodations from any. (*n*) *If another can hurt me, then I do nothing: If I expect, that another help me, then I am nothing.* He is his own Safety and City of Refuge; (*o*) *for the Hegemonicon is inexpugnable, when collected into it ſelf, it is Self-content, the Mind devoid of Paſſions is an Acropolis, a ſtronger place (whereunto to make his Refuge, and ſo to become impregnable) and better fortified than this, hath no Man.* (*p*) *If he is impriſon'd, he ſuffereth no prohibition; if thrown down a Precipice, he ſuffereth no conſtraint; if tortur'd, he is not tormented; if burn'd, he is not hurt; if he falleth in wreſtling, yet he cannot be vanquiſh'd; if incompaſs'd by a Wall, yet he cannot be beſieg'd; and if he be ſold by Enemies, yet he cannot be captivated; he hath Riches and a Kingdom, and is fortunate and proſperous, unindigent and ſelf-ſufficient without a Penny in his Purſe*, as *Plutarch* expreſſeth the Stoicks Rhodomontades. So *Varro* jeſteth upon their Romantic Virtue; (*q*) *he that hath Virtue, needeth not a Cloak in the Rain. He that is Indigent, let him become a Cynick* (the Cynicks boaſted, that they had found out the moſt compendious way to felicity) *and hunger no more*, ſaith the Epigrammatiſt. (*r*) *Fecit ſibi pacem nihil timendo, fecit ſibi divitias nihil concupiſcendo. The wiſe Man hath created Peace to himſelf by fearing nothing, and Riches by not deſiring any thing.* (*s*) *Although without City, Houſe or Harbour* (ἄοικος, ἄπολις, ἀνέστιος) *yet he wanteth nothing.* (*t*) *He can be happy by himſelf in a State of Solitude* (without the innumerable and ineſtimable Benefits of Society) as being *Self-felicitative and Self-ſufficient.* (*u*) And becauſe *he liveth in the perfection of Virtue and Felicity*, as *Plotinus* ſaith (who with a mixture of Platoniſm entertaineth theſe Dogmata of the *Stoicks* together with their αὐτοχειρία, *Self-murder*,) neither *publick* nor *private* Calamities are at all infelicitative to the wiſe Man. Not publick Calamities; for (*w*) *the overturning and ruin of his City will he count it any great thing? If he ſuppoſeth it a grand Evil or any evil at all, he will be ridiculous, and no more virtuous, accounting Wood and Stone and the death of Mortals ſome great matter.* (*x*) *Wars, Seditions, the death of multitudes of Men, the over-turning and burning of Cities are no great things: As the death of multitudes of Cattel, the over-turning and burning of Birds-neſts are no great matters.* Not private Calamities that befal himſelf or his Relatives. For without any Title to a future Happineſs (*y*) *the wiſe Man is Happy in the midſt of Torments.* (*z*) *His Beatitude receiveth no addition from Health, Eaſe and Pleaſures, nor any diminution from their Oppoſites.*

(*a*) *Shew me a Man* (a genuin Stoick) *proſperous and happy in Sickneſs, Danger, Death, Baniſhment, Diſgrace.* Such Bravado's deſerve this Reprimand. *Quid tu tibi in acerbis caſibus conſtitutus Beati nomen imponis? Thou that art in a calamitous State, what haſt thou to do to call thy ſelf Bleſſed?* Jul. Firm. de Err. Prof. Rel. p. 40.

VIII. The Stoicks pretenſions to *Apathy* (to be devoid of the Animal Affections and Paſſions) ſpeak them of Character *extravagant and unpopular Mentaliſts.* For all the External Goods and Evils of this and another World (which are the object of Human Paſſions) muſt be diſcarded, to reduce themſelves to an *Apathy.* And whereas there is a duplicity of Nature in Man, an upper and alſo a lower Soul wherein the Paſſions are ſeated (for the compleating of which the Stoicks require the concurrence of Opinion and Judgment, (*b*) ſeating them in part in the *Hegemonicon*, and denying that Brute-animals have any true Affections or Paſſions,) inſtead of theſe Paſſions of the lower Soul they ſubſtitute certain mental operations, (*c*) *Will inſtead of the paſſion of Deſire, mental Joy inſtead of the paſſion of Joy, Caution inſtead of the paſſion of Fear; but inſtead of Grief or Sorrow they ſubſtitute nothing, becauſe they deny any ſuch thing in a wiſe Man.* (*d* *If* Ulyſſes *in truth lamented for his Wife, was he not unhappy? But what good Man is unfortunate or unhappy? If therefore he cried and lamented*

(d) *Ib. p.* 132, 160.

(e) *Ib. p.* 178, 336.

(f) *Ib. p.* 386, 401, 267.

(g) *Ib. p.* 387, 221.

(h) *Plutarch. de Stoic. repugn. p.* 1034.

(i) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 360, 361, 393.

(k) *Ib. p.* 310.

(l) *Ib. p.* 287. 418.

(m) Φιλοσόφου στάσις καὶ χαρακτήρ, πᾶσαν ὠφέλειαν καὶ βλάβην ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ προσδοκᾷ. Epict. Ench. c. 71.

(n) *Idem Diſſ. p.* 409.

(o) *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 48.

(p) *Plutarch.* ὅτι παραδοξότερα, &c. p. 1057, &c.

(q) *Gat. in Ant. p.* 40, 155, 182.

(r) *Sen. Ep.* 87.

(s) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 422.

(t) *Lipſ. manud. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 10.

(u) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 4.

(w) *Ibid. c.* 7. *Lactant. l.* 6. *c.* 15.

(x) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 156, 157.

(y) *Lipſ. ſupr. Diſſ.* 6. *Lactant. l.* 3. *c.* 27.

(z) *Plotin. ſupr. c.* 14.

(a) Δείξατέ μοι τινὰ νοσοῦντα καὶ εὐτυχοῦντα, κινδυνεύοντα καὶ εὐτυχοῦντα, ἀποθνήσκοντα καὶ εὐτυχοῦντα, πεφυγαδευμένον καὶ εὐτυχοῦντα, ἀδοξοῦντα καὶ εὐτυχοῦντα. Epict. Diſſ p. 232.

(b) *Lipſ. manud. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 7. *Gat. in Anton. p.* 211, 329, 382.

(c) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 14. *c.* 8.

(d) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 331, 312.

lamented, he was not a good Man. Agamemnon *was unhappy, for he lamented, that the Greeks were in danger, and were likely to be kill'd by the Trojans. But muſt they not die, although the Trojans do not kill them?* (e) Sorrow for parting with, or for the death of Friends are in this Inſtitution very bad things (a Branch of Apathy which (f) even *Epicurus* and *Seneca* inveigh againſt;) this Philoſophy is a contrivance, to live in perfect indolence. (g) It alloweth not Sorrow for our Sins and Vices. (h) *Felicity is inconſiſtent with the deſire of things abſent; he that is happy muſt have all that he deſireth, like unto a full Man,* ȣ δίψος δεῖ προσεῖναι αὐτῷ, ȣ λιμός, *without either Hunger or Thirſt.* Thus the Doctors of the *Stoa* make a *Lycurgus*'s Reformation of Humane Nature, inſtead of wiſe and regular Paſſions they deſign the Eradication of them (of Sorrow, Anger, Hope or Fear of any thing,) the wiſe Man muſt be like the Witches (*i*) that cannot cry (as it is ſaid,) like thoſe that deſcend into *Trophonius*'s Den, who become ἀγέλαστοι, and cannot laugh, and (to uſe *Epictetus*'s Phraſe (*k*) of a proud Man) as rigid *as if he had ſwallow'd an Obelisk.* But if this be Philoſophy, the old Man had great reaſon, to tell his Son, (*l*) *Hear me my Son! you muſt Philoſophize, but you muſt have Brains too: Theſe are egregious fooleries.* And ſuch are the Stoicks Paradoxical Maxims, although not of ſo bad a meaning, as they ſeem to be at firſt ſight. (*m*) *Sapientem gratiâ nunquam moveri; nunquam cujuſquam delicto ignoſcere. Neminem miſericordem eſſe, niſi ſtultum & levem. Viri non eſſe exorari atque placari. The wiſe Man is never mov'd by Grace or Favour; never pardoneth the Crimes of any. None commiſerate* (or are merciful) *but the vain and fooliſh. It is not the property of a Man to be exorable and placable.* (*n*) *Miſericordia* or Commiſeration (which is the Name both of a Natural Paſſion and a Divine Grace) is in Stoiciſm a forbidden thing, becauſe of the Grief and Sorrow which it involveth.

But (doubtleſs) it would be better for Mankind, to be left to the Sentiments of Nature, than to be inſtituted to ſuch an harden-fac'd Virtue, that is neither poſſible (for themſelves acknowledg'd (*o*) that the Inchoations of Paſſion which the Schools call *Propaſſiones* are unavoidable) nor *tolerable*, being abſolutely deſtructive both of good Nature (the kindly inſtincts that are in Nature) and *the Life of Grace*, which conſiſteth in the exerciſe of divine and gracious Affections and Paſſions. (*p*) *The leſs their dolours are, the greater are their tumours: The greateſt Saints are the greateſt weepers in prayer.* (*q*) *The affections* (if rightly directed) *are the chariot of life. Fear and Deſire are divine virtues, if their objects be things divine.* (*r*) Τὸ συγχαίρειν ϗ συναλγεῖν, *to ſympathize with others in their Joys and Sorrows, is inſeparable from true Benevolence.* But the Stoicks admit no ſympathick Sorrow ſave only (*s*) κατ' οἰκονομίαν, *by way of adminiſtration* or Politick management of things. (*t*) *If you ſee a Man lamenting his Misfortunes, you may in words accommodate your ſelf to him, and if you be ſo diſpos'd, co-lament with him: But take care, that you do not internally co-lament. Nemeſius* a Biſhop of the Chriſtian Church (commixing Stoiciſm and Platoniſm) determineth, (*u*) *All Sorrow is Evil in its own Nature: For although the Man of Moral Virtue will ſometimes be ſorrowful, when good Men, or his Children are deſtroyed, or when his Country is vaſtated, yet this is not primarily or of purpoſe, but by accidental miſ-hap; and in theſe Circumſtances the Theoretic Man is altogether in Apathy, having alienated himſelf from the things that are here, and conjoyn'd himſelf with God: And the Man of Moral Virtue is but moderately affected with them.* (*w*) *Epictetus* was uſually read by the vulgar Pagans (*Plato* only by the learn'd,) who much admir'd him, becauſe they were ſenſibly benefited by reading him; and ſo may Chriſtians without criminally Philoſophic-paganizing, or making Divine Chriſtianity and Heathen Philoſophy of one piece. But the Monk *Evagrius* (*x*) wrote a Book on behalf of the Stoical *Apathy* endeavouring to introduce it into the Church. And (agreeably to the Humour of Criminal Philoſophic-paganizing which of old invaded the Church) a late Author hath attempted (*y*) to revive the Stoicks *Indolence*, and pretendeth to their abſurd Paradoxical *Apathy* at a great rate. *Dolorem, Metum & Spem profligavimus, à quibus mente liberatâ, Audacia, Deſperatio atque Ira evaneſcunt. We have profligated Sorrow, Fear and Hope* (and *Miſericordia* alſo,) *from which the Mind being freed, Audacity, Deſperation and Anger neceſſarily vaniſh.* There is ſomething of *Ariſtippus* and the *Cyrenaicks* in this Author's *Dogmata* (for he placeth our *ſummum bonum* in Pleaſure, which the Stoicks did not;) and therefore they may well walk in Company with the ſaying of a Modern Atheiſt and boon Companion. (z) *All things are good that make us Merry, and the merrier any Man is, the more of the Divine Nature and Perfection he hath.*

IX. Amongſt the Pagans the Sect of the Stoicks was charg'd with *Arrogance* (it was objected to *Rubellius Plautus, quòd aſſumſiſſet Stoicorum arrogantiam,* (as *Tacitus* ſaith,) and not without great reaſon; for their extravagant *Liberty, Security, Tranquillity, ſelf-ſufficiency* (*ſibi ſufficiunt ad beatam vitam*) *Nobility, Beatitude, Apathy* (and other Branches of their Inſtitution) ſpeak them of Character *Philoſophic Bravo*'s; and (which is a prodigy of Arrogance) their wiſe Man is not any thing leſs than one of *Jupiter*'s *Peers, that liveth as well as the Gods live.* (*a*) *The wiſe Man full of Joy, Pleaſant, placid and unſhaken by any thing,* cum Diis ex pari vivit. *And as it is agreeable to* Jove (ſaith *Chryſippus,*) *to elate himſelf upon account of his life, to think great, and (if I may ſo ſpeak)* ὑψαυχεῖν καὶ κομᾶν ϗ μεγαληγορεῖν, *to lift up his Head to glory and magnifie himſelf, living worthy of a magnifying Elation: So theſe things agree to all good Men, that in nothing come behind* Jove. (*b*) *As to the Body thou art a ſmall part of the Univerſe: But in reſpect of the Mind or Reaſon, not worſe, nor leſs than the Gods; for the greatneſs of the Mind is not to be judg'd of by Longitude or Altitude, but*

(e) *Ib. p.* 215, 329.

(f) *Plut. non poſſe, &c. p.* 1101. *Sen. Ep.* 39.

(g) *Plut. de Tranqu. An. p.* 468.

(h) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 331.

(i) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 47.

(k) *Diſſ. p.* 139. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 13.

(l) Ἄκȣσόν μȣ τέκνον· δεῖ μὲν ϗ φιλοσοφεῖν, δεῖ δὲ ϗ ἐγκέφαλον ἔχειν· ταῦτα μωρά ἐστι. Epict. Diſſ. p. 142.

(m) *Ibid. p.* 28, 69.

(n) *Sen. de Clem. c.* 5. *Lactant. l.* 3. *c.* 23. *l.* 6. *c.* 10. *&* 17.

(o) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 9. *c.* 4. *Gat. Supr. p.* 421. *Stearne An. Med. p.* 206.

(p) *Hoc ipſo in eis ſunt ma-*
ores tumores, quo minores do-
lores. Quanto quiſque eſt San-
ior & deſiderii Sancti plenior,
anto eſt ejus in orando fletus
berior. S. Aug. de C. D. l.
4. c 9. l. 20. c. 17.

(q) *Lactant. l.* 6. *c.* 17.

(r) *Plut. Supr. p.* 451.

(s) *M. Ant. l.* 11. *S.* 18.

(t) Μέχρι μὲν τοι λόγȣ μὴ
ȣνει συμπεριφέρεσθαι (τῷ κλαί-
ντι) κἂν ȣ̎τω τύχῃ, συνεπι-
νάξαι. πρόσεχε μέντοι, μὴ
ἔσωθεν συνεπιστενάξῃς. Epict.
nch. c. 22. M. Ant. l. 5. S.
6. & l 7. S. 43.

(u) Πᾶσα δὲ λύπη κακὴ τῇ ἑαυτῆς φύσει· εἰ γὰρ ϗ ὁ σπȣδαῖος λυπηθήσεταί ποτε χρηστῶν ἀνδρῶν διαφθειρομένων, ἢ τέκνων ἢ πόλεως πορθȣμένης, ἀλλ' ȣ προηγȣμένως· ȣ δὲ κατὰ πρόθεσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περίστασιν. ϗ ἐν τȣ́τοις, ὁ μὲν θεωρητικὸς ἀπαθὴς ἐστι παντάπασιν, ἀλλοτριώσας ἑαυτὸν τῶν τῇδε ϗ συνάψας θεῷ· ὁ δὲ σπȣδαῖος μετριοπαθὴς ἐν αὐταῖς. De Nat. Hom. c. 19.

(w) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 275.

(x) *Baron. ad ann.* 388. *n.* 104.

(y) *Stearne Med. An. l.* 3. *c.* 18. *de obſtinat. c.* 11, 12.

(z) *Spinoſa.*

(a) *Lipſ. Manuduct. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 14. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 109, 295. *Plut. de Stoic. repugn. p.* 1038.

(b) Οὐκ οἶσθα, ἡλίκον μέρος πρὸς τὰ ὅλα· τȣ̃το δὲ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα· ὡς κατά γε τὸν λόγον, ȣ̓δὲ χείρων τῶν θεῶν, ȣ̓δὲ μικρότερος. Λόγȣ γὰρ μέγεθος ȣ̓ μήκει, ȣ̓δ' ὕψει κρίνεται, ἀλλὰ δόγμασιν. Epict. Diſſ. p. 121.

by decretory Sentiments. In this Philoſophy one of the Fundamental Maxims is, *Sapientes omnes pares eſſe, all the Wiſe and Good are Equals*, being all of them happy to the height of Beatitude. For Virtue the true Beatific Good is equal in them all (it is not capable of increaſe or diminution; and as for Externals, which are of no conſideration, they make no diſparity: Time alſo maketh no diſparity; for an honeſt Life of an hundred Years and of one Day is equally honeſt. From whence it followeth, Τὸν Δία ϗ τὸν Δίωνα σοφοὺς ὄντας, *that* Jupiter *and* Dio *being both Wiſe*, are Equals; for notwithſtanding ſome minute differences there is no conſiderable diſparity between them. *In Virtue* (which is the ſole Beatific Good) *Jupiter doth not tranſcend* Dio. *In Felicity God doth not tranſcend the wiſe Man, although he ſurmounteth him in age*, which maketh no diſparity. But is not *Jupiter* the more Potent and the more Opulent? (c) *Sextius was wont to equalize* Jupiter *and the good Man.* Jupiter *indeed hath more, and can do more for Mankind: But between two that are good the richer is not the better. Do you inquire of the difference between a wiſe Man and the Gods? The Gods will exiſt a longer time. But it is a great Artifice*, clauſiſſe totum in exiguo, *to incloſe the whole in a little room.* For the wiſe Man will have the whole in his Age, which God hath in a long Succeſſion of Ages. In this and ſome other reſpects the wiſe Man tranſcendeth *Jupiter*, and he admireth himſelf above him. (d) *There is ſomething wherein the wiſe Man may have the Precedence of God: He is one of the Wiſe by the benefit of Nature, not by his own Efficiency, as the wiſe Man is.* (e) *The wiſe Man ſeeth and contemneth all things, which others Poſſeſs, with as equal a Mind as* Jupiter: *And upon this account more admireth himſelf;* Jupiter *cannot make uſe of them, the wiſe Man will not.* Theſe Bravado's (with ſuch more) are peculiar to the School of the Stoicks, and have no Parallel. For who but they make ſuch Compariſons? Rival it with *Jupiter*? Diſpute Precedence with him and with the other Gods? there is nothing of this Nature in any other Sect of Pagan Theologers, much leſs amongſt the Chriſtian Theologers; for thoſe Aſcriptions of *Divinity to Divine Men* which are of Kind and Quality Religious, (*f*) a late Apologiſt for Stoiciſm ought to have diſtinguiſh'd from *the Stoicks rampant Luciferian kind of Aſcriptions*, and not to have confounded things extremely Diſſonant and Repugnant. They are alſo things extremely Diſſonant and Repugnant, which this learned Apologiſt hath confounded in ſome other impure Philoſophic-paganizing Conceits. (*g*) *That the Holy Scriptures ought to be interpreted out of the Writings of the Heathen Philoſophers.* (*h*) *The meaning of Scripture-terms muſt be learn'd from their Schools.* (*i*) *When the Divine Word is capable of ſeveral Senſes, that ſhould be thought the genuin, which its Philoſophic Auditors were moſt likely to underſtand, and is moſt conformable to their Principles.* (*k*) *That the Stoicks* ſacer Spiritus, bona Mens, *ſacred Spirit, good Mind, are the very ſame with the Holy Ghoſt of the Chriſtian Religion.* At this rate of confounding things that meer declamatory Stoick *Seneca* (*l*) will be a good Chriſtian, (*m*) the Holy Ghoſt a Pagan Demon, (*n*) the Stoicks Sapience will be Divine Grace, (*o*) their Paradoxes Divine Oracles, (*p*) Salvation the deſign of their Philoſophy, (*q*) their parity with *Jove* coincident with the Chriſtian Theology, (*r*) and theſe Philoſophic-Pagan Saintiſts *inſpired Men*, as they ſuppos'd themſelves. For (*s*) they had in themſelves οἱονεὶ θεόν, *God as it were*, and therefore were *Divine.* (*t*) *God counſell'd them and put them upon their teaching Trade, as alſo* Socrates *and* Diogenes. (*u*) *A Cynick is* Jove's *Miniſter and Witneſs, a Meſſenger ſent from him, to rectifie Mens Errors about their Goods and Evils; a partaker of his Empire, and is furniſh'd by him with a Scepter and a Diadem.* But notwithſtanding theſe their magnificent Pretenſions, it is manifeſt that they were ἀπειρόκαλοι, *atheouſly unskilful in the Science of Good and Evil*, that they miſtook Vice for Virtue, and that their Virtue (full of Arrogance) is Self-magnifying and Self-deifying in an improbous Senſe. (*w*) *Origen* therefore (who well underſtood their Idiom) ridiculeth and explodeth this their delirous Gloriation, *that the God over all is not happier than the wiſe Man.*

X. There is the ſame Reaſon for the reſt of their Paradoxical Grandiloquence. (*x*) *The wiſe Man is always alike, and of the ſame countenance (as* Socrates *was) in all circumſtances, always joyous, deſiring no greater things than he hath at Home.* (*y*) *If by magnanimity alone (which is but a Branch of Virtue) he is above all things, then Virtue contemning all things that ſeem to be dolorous, is alone ſufficient to Beatitude.* (*z*) *The wiſe Man doth not opine* (aſſent to any incertitude,) *is ignorant of nothing, never deceiv'd, never unſucceſsful, never repenteth of any undertaking, wondereth at nothing, nothing befalleth him contrary to Opinion. The good Man is perfect, ſinneth in nothing, is impeccable, ſuffereth no injury, is not mad although maniacal, is inebriated yet not drunk.* (*a*) *All things are the Stoical wiſe Man's, he is the only King and Free-man, he alone is rich, beauteous, noble* (as alſo *the only Citizen, Magiſtrate, Judge, Orator, Poet, Prieſt, Prophet,*) all which romantick and ſwaggering Prerogatives of the wiſe Man are nothing better than unpopular humour and bravado. The popular Pagans religiouſly acknowledge (*b*) *their good Endowments the Gifts of God:* But the Stoicks ſay of their Sapience (*c*) *every one that hath it, oweth it to himſelf.* When theſe mundane Sages are in their ruff, they make a puff at praying and imploring the Divine Aid for the acquiſition of Virtue. (*d*) *Quid votis opus eſt? fac te ipſe felicem. What need is there of Prayers? Beatifie thy ſelf.* In a better Humour they aſſert the concurrence of Divine Aſſiſtance with Human Endeavours, they exhort us to pray for *Virtue, a good Mind*, and the *Divine Aid: But ſo that the Effect is properly to be aſcrib'd to our own Power, becauſe it is a thing which properly belongeth to our own Power.* For this Philoſophy contradiſtinguiſheth τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, τὰ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, *the things that properly belong to our own Power, the things that do not properly belong to our own Power.* The Works of Providence are not the things that properly belong to our own Power, they are properly to be aſcrib'd to the Gods: But the Stoicks Virtue and its conſequent Felicity are

---

Plotin. En. 1. l. 4 c. 15.

Τοῦ μὲν Διὸς οὐδὲν χείρους φασὶν εἶναι. Ariſtid ap. Phot. cod. 249. col. 1312. Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. p. 178.

(c) *Solebat Sextius dicere, Jovem plus non poſſe quàm bonum Virum. Plura Jupiter habet, quæ præſtet hominibus, ſed inter duos Bonos, non eſt melior qui locupletior.* Sen. Ep. 73.

(d) *Eſt aliquid quo ſapiens antecedat Deum: Ille naturæ beneficio, non ſuo ſapiens eſt.* Sen. Ep. 53.

(e) *Sapiens tam æquo animo omnia apud alios videt contemnitque, quàm Jupiter: Et hoc ſe magis ſuſpicit, quòd Jupiter uti illis non poteſt, ſapiens non vult.* Sen. Ep. 74.

(f) *H. Dodwell. proleg. Apolog. præfix. J. Stearnii Libel. de obſtinat. S.* 63.

(g) *Ib. S.* 27.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 83, 96.

(i) *Ibid.* p. 101.

(k) *Ibid.* p. 215, 228, 237, 266.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 118.

(m) *Ib.* p. 133, 266.

(n) *Ib.* p. 218.

(o) *Ibid.* p. 228.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 210.

(q) *Ibid.* p. 264.

(r) *Ib.* p. 14 228.

(s) *Laert. in Zeno.*

(t) *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 307.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 310, 315, 319, 321, 350, 410.

(w) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. p. 309.

(x) *Simplic. in Epict.* p. 232. *Lipſ. ſup. Diſſ.* 5. *Gat. in Ant.* p. 13.

(y) *Laert. in Zeno. Cic. Tuſc.* 5.

(z) *Lipſ. ſupr. Diſſ.* 3. & *Gat. in Ant.* p. 112, 17

(a) *Lipſ. ibid. Diſſ.* 11, &c.

(b) Εἰ μάλα καρτερός ἐσ θεός που σοὶ τόγ' ἔδωκεν. Homer.

(c) *Illam ſibi quiſque debet.* Sen. Ep. 90.

(d) *Gat. in Ant.* p. 6

are things that properly belong to our own Power, and are properly to be aſcrib'd thereunto, according to that of *Cotta* in *Cicero*. (*e*) *All Mankind aſcribe the Commodity and Proſperity of Life to the Gods: But none ever aſcrib'd* (the Philoſophic) *Virtue to the Deity.* So the Poet (ſpeaking the Philoſophers Senſe) aſcribeth Life and Riches to *Jove*, but not a virtuous Mind; for that is an Effect which properly belongeth to his own Power. (*f*) *Let him give Life and Riches, I will get to my ſelf a good Mind.* But as Riches are the Gift of Providence, yet not excluſively to Human Endeavours: So the Virtue of the Mind belongeth to our own Power, yet not excluſively to Divine Aſſiſtance; (*g*) *for who hath told thee* (ſaith *M. Antoninus*,) *that the Gods do not help us even in thoſe things that they have put in our own Power?* Whence an appearing inconſiſtency in another Poet (who alſo ſpeaketh the Philoſophers Senſe) is eaſily reconcileable.

Orandum eſt ut ſit mens ſana in corpore ſano.
Monſtro quod tibi ipſi poſſis dare. —— Juvenal.

Becauſe the Gods help us in thoſe things that properly belong to our own Power, therefore the Poet ſaith, *pray for a virtuous Mind.* Yet becauſe the Virtues of the Mind are things that properly belong to our own Power, and muſt be aſcrib'd thereto, therefore the Poet ſaith, *I tell thee of that which thou mayeſt beſtow upon thy ſelf.* (*h*) For the help of the Gods is not requiſite in any great degree, nor otherwiſe than as a leſs principal and adjuvant Cauſe: Nor is Man ſuppos'd, to be impotent and inſufficient for Virtue and Beatitude in any great degree. (*i*) *Patranda eſt potiùs quàm impetranda, it is rather a thing to be patrated by Man than impetrated of the Gods.* If this be the genuin Senſe of the Stoicks, (which their learned Apologiſt (*k*) hath not explicated, but imbroil'd,) their Virtue and Beatitude is of themſelves properly as the Authors and Donours of it, and is properly to be aſcrib'd to themſelves; their ability, ſafety, and their ſufficiency for Virtue and Beatitude, is in themſelves; their Truſt, Hope and Confidence is properly and principally in themſelves (the inexpugnable Caſtle of their own *Hegemonicon* and their adamantine Dogmata;) and the Spirit that breaths in a genuin Stoick is a criminal gigantic Self-ſufficiency, Self confidence, Self-dependence, Self-aſſuming Gloriation. (*l*) *Ille verò glorietur audacter, & Diis agat gratias.* He thanketh the Gods, but with audacious Self-gloriations. (*m*) His Joy is an Elation of the Mind *ſuis bonis viribuſque fidentis, truſting in its own Goods and Abilities.* He talketh big and high and challengeth Danger to a Combat, (*n*) *vires ſuas novit, ſcit ſe eſſe oneri ferendo, he knoweth his own ſtrength, and that no burden is too many for him.* His Liberty is not obnoxious to *Jupiter*'s Power, (*o*) τὴν προαίρεσιν ὐδ' ὁ Ζεὺς νικῆσαι δύναται, *the agency of his free-will or his Philoſophic purpoſe even* Jupiter *cannot vanquiſh.* The Stoicks are (*p*) *alti Spiritus Viri, the Men of an high Spirit, and* (*q*) *the difference between them and the other Sects of Philoſophers is as great as between Men and Women.* Agreeably to their faſtuous Sublimities *Syneſius* Philoſophic paganizeth. (*r*) *Trouble the Gods no more, being able to ſave your ſelf out of your own Stores, if you will.*

Their faſtuous Temper appeareth not only in their Demeanour towards *Jupiter* and the Gods, but in their Carriage to their Civil Governours. For they ſuppos'd, (*s*) that no Man had Dominion over them being *Jupiter*'s *Sons and Subjects*, manumis'd and ſet at Liberty by him from all Servitude, Force and Conſtraint. And having diſcarded all regard to things Premiant and Penal, whereby Societies are governed, they diſcarded therewith their due Subjection and Reverence to the Civil Power. A crime not ſo bad (perhaps) as baſe, ſervile, ſoothing and treacherous Adulation; but extremely incongruous to Philoſophers, that are Citizens of the Univerſe. Yet theſe taught the Cynick his faſtuous Language. (*t*) *How do I treat thoſe as Slaves, whom you fear and admire? Who is there, that when he ſeeth me, doth not ſuppoſe, that he ſeeth his Lord and King? What is* Cæſar *to a* Cynick, *or the Proconſul or any other, ſave only* Jupiter *that ſent him down and whom he ſerveth?* They are alike faſtuous in their contempt of the Chriſtians, imputing the Fortitude of the Martyrs in their Sufferings, (*u*) ſometimes to *meer Cuſtom*, (*w*) ſometimes to *meer obſtinacy.* Their Crime was, they were *Popular Religioniſts*, not Philoſophers, (*x*) they did not φυσιολόγως ὁρᾶν τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ, *Phyſiologically ſpeculate the things of Humane Life.* But it is too little, to ſay, that theſe ſurly Sophiſts contemn'd Chriſtianity, ſome of them were nefarious Perſecutors of the Chriſtians (for *Creſcens* the Synick is a known Perſecutor, (*y*) nor is it poſſible to acquit *M. Antoninus* of that heinous crime,) which being a repugnance to the kindly Inſtincts that are in Nature, the Bonds and Alliances that are in Nature, the Deſign and Inſtitution of Nature, the grand Law of Nature (univerſal Benevolence and Beneficence,) the good that ſhould be in Nature, and the natural uſe of things, ſpeaketh thoſe Philoſophers that are guilty of it *bad Interpreters of Nature.*

XI. Inſtead of ſober Moralities their Philoſophic Pride affecteth *Tranſcendentals* that are Extravagances; for ſuch is their Superlative Strictneſs, (*z*) *not to move a Finger unleſs Reaſon dictateth:*

(Ni tibi conceſſit Ratio, digitum exſere peccas.)

Their ſeverity of Temper (*a*) *never ſpeaking any thing for pleaſure, nor admitting any thing of that nature ſpoken by others*; which is Sowreneſs and ſupercilious Gravity. (*b*) Their Preſcript of *Silence for the moſt part and ſpeaking ſeldom* is an Exceſs; as alſo their conformity to the Phariſees (to whom *Joſephus* compareth them) in a ſupercilious Contempt of the Vulgar Pagans; and their Averſation from Vulgar Converſation upon the Separatiſts Hypotheſis; *He that is converſant with a polluted Companion muſt neceſſarily be polluted.* The *Patience* which they preſcribe the *Cynick* (a Divine Man) is nothing better than (*c*) *ſuperbiæ ſtupor, an haughty ſullen Inſenſibleneſs*; for his *Tolerance* muſt be ſuch, (*d*) *that he ſeemeth to the Vulgar devoid of Senſe and a Stone.* Their *Conſtancy* to their Principles was a Vice (for *Cicero* obſerveth that when Reaſon and Arguments fail'd them, they ſupply'd that defect by Conſtancy and Courage;) and their unvariable *conſtancy of Temper*

(e) *Omnes mortales ſic habent; omnem commoditatem proſperitatemque vita à Diis ſe habere: Virtutem autem nemo unquam acceptam Deo retulit. Judicium hoc omnium mortalium eſt, fortunam à Deo petendam, à ſeipſo ſumendam ſapientiam.*

(f) *Hæc ſatis eſt orare Jovem, qui donat & aufert.*
Det vitam, det opes: Æquum mi animum ipſe parabo. Horat.

(g) *M. Ant. l. 9. S. 40.*

(h) *V. M. Ant. l. 2. S. 11. & l. 6. S. 32.*

(i) *S. Aug. Ep. 52.*

(k) *Epict. Diſſ. p. 372. 392.*

(l) *Sen. Ep. 92.*

(m) *Lipſ. Manud. l. 3. Diſſ. 5.*

(n) *Sen. Ep. 64. & 71.*

(o) *Epict. Diſſ. l. 1. c. 1.*

(p) *Sen. Ep. 90.*

(q) *Id. de Conſtant. Sap. c. 1.*

(r) Μηκέτ' οὖν ἐνόχλει τοῖς θεοῖς, οἴκοθεν ἣν ἐθέλῃς δυνάμενος σώζεσθαι. De provid. p. 101.

(s) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 135, 158, 381, 402.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 314. *vid. Heraclitus's behaviour. ibid. p.* 175.

(u) *Ibid. p.* 400.

(w) *M. Ant. l. 11. S. 3.*

(x) *Ibid. l. 9. S. 31.*

(y) *V. Baron. ad an.* 164. *n.* 6. & 10.

(z) *Lipſ. Manud. l. 3. diſſ.* 15.

(a) *Laert. in Zenon.*

(b) *Epict. Ench. c.* 41, 45.

(c) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 19. *c.* 4. *Tertull. de Patient. c.* 2.

(d) Ὡς αὐτὸν ἀναίσθητον δοκεῖν τοῖς πολλοῖς, ϗ λίθον. *Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c.* 12.

per or *Self-conſiſtency* could be no Virtue, but an Inconſiſtency with the true Virtue, which exerciſeth various Affections and Paſſions upon various occaſions, *Anger*, *Mildneſs*, *Boldneſs*, *Fearfulneſs*, *Joy*, *Sorrow*. But the Stoical Wiſe Man is criminally μονοπρόσωπος, (*e*) *he never changeth Countenance*, (*none ever ſaw* Socrates *more joyous or more ſad*,) agreeably to the Conceit of *Ariſto Chius*, (*f*) that the final good is τὸ ἀδιαφόρως ἔχοντα ζῆν, *neutram in partem moveri*, *to live in an abſolute indifferency of Mind* (*which is a thing intermediate between Virtue and Vice*) *without any variation or motion either way* (like the dead Sea) *carrying one's ſelf with the ſame equable tenour in all things*. (*g*) *The Wiſe Man muſt be always alike*, *in acute Pains*, *in the loſs of Children*, *in long Diſeaſes*. The Extravagance of their tranſcendental *Fortitude* appeareth in *Celſus*'s Objection againſt our Saviour. (*h*) Anaxarchus *put into a Mortar and moſt cruelly beaten*, *contemn'd the puniſhment at a great rate*, *ſaying*, *Beat*, *beat the Sack of* Anaxarchus, *for him thou doſt not beat*, *which was indeed the voice of ſome Divine Spirit*. Epictetus *not at all intimidated*, *but ſmiling at his Maſter*, *when he wrench'd and tortur'd his Leg*, *told him*, *you will break it*; *and having broken it*, *did I not tell you*, *ſaid he*, *that you will break it?* τί τοιοῦτον ὁ ὑμέτερος θεὸς κολαζόμενος ἐφθέγξατο; *what like this did your God utter in his Pains?* The Divine Paſſive Virtue of the Captain of our Salvation was not agreeable to their Idea of *Fortitude* (which was an high Tumour and greatneſs of Mind, of the ſame kind with the Military Gallantry, diſdaining all Hardſhips and adverſe occurrences of Fortune, and all ſeeming abjection and weakneſs of Mind) the Philoſophic Ruffians and mighty Men of Valour diſdain it at the ſame rate with the ſwaggering *Vaninus*; *Illi in extremis præ timore imbellis ſudor*, *ego imperterritus morior*: *He at his laſt had a cowardly Sweat*, *I die without fear or affrightment*. (*i*) With the like Military Gallantry and Stoutneſs ſeveral of the Ancient Philoſophers died; and of later times *Simonides* a young Philoſopher of great Auſterity condemn'd to the Fire by the Emperour *Valens*, as being conſcious of a Magical Complotment againſt him; (*k*) *Fleeing Life as a rabid Miſtreſs*, *deriding the ſudden downfals of ponderous Maſſes*, *he burn'd with immovable Firmitude*; *imitating a famous Philoſopher* Peregrinus, *who having determin'd to leave the World*, *at the time of the Olympicks*, *under the Eyes of all* Greece, *aſcending a Fire-pile which himſelf made*, *was conſum'd by Flames*. Of ſuch Military kind of Bravery and Celſitude of Mind are the Philoſophic-Pagan Σιδηρόφρενες, *Iron-minded Men*; their Fortitude and Magnanimity (which rais'd them above Fortune, (*l*) provok'd and contemn'd all her adverſe Power) is of the ſame ſtrain with *Democritus*'s, who ſcorn'd the great Goddeſs *Fortune*, ſent an Halter to her (thereby bidding her hang her ſelf) and in contempt of her held out the middle Finger.

> ——— *Cum Fortunæ ipſe minaci*
> *Mandaret Laqueum*, *mediumque oſtenderet unguem*.
> Juven. Sat. 10.

As the Stoicks *Patience*, their *Conſtancy* and *Fortitude*, ſo their *Paſſive Obedience and conformity of Will to the Divine Will* (which is a grand Fundamental of their Inſtitution, and wherein their Philoſophy moſt of all expatiateth and triumpheth) is a tranſcendental Extravagance. (*m*) For they accommodate their Will to all Events and reſolve it into the Will of Governing Providence, that by this method they may live in a ſtate of *perfect Liberty* (Tranquillity, Proſperity, Felicity and Generoſity of Mind) not obnoxious to any Prohibition, Impediment, Force, Subjection to the power of others, failure of Appetition, nor to fall into any Averſation. (*n*) *How ſhall I become of free eſtate? for he is a Freeman*, *to whom all things happen according to his Mind*, *and none can be his hindrance*; *naturally I would have all things to happen*, *as I pleaſe*; *but to be learned*, *is to learn to will all things to be as they are*. *Will nothing but what God willeth*, *and none can hinder thee*, *none can force thee*, *no more than* Jupiter. *I was never hindred in my Volitions*, *nor neceſſitated to my Nolitions*, *becauſe I have rendred my Appetition accommodate to God*. *Is it his Will*, *that I ſhould be in a Fever? it is my Will*. *Is it his Will*, *that I ſhould obtain any thing? it is my Will*. *Is it not his Will? it is not mine*. *Who can now hinder me*, *or force me againſt mine own Mind? Seek not*, *that Events ſhould be as thou willeſt*; *but will them to be as they are*, *and thou canſt not fail to be proſperous*.

XII. In this eminent Branch of Stoical Philoſophy there is an appearance of great Virtue and an exact conformity to the Religion of God's People; but if we examine it, it will be found extremely alien and diſſonant from their true Piety. For (1.) The entire Submiſſion and Reſignation to the Coſmical Rector which Piety injoyneth, muſt be underſtood of ſuch a Submiſſion and Reſignation, which is *due*, and is of kind and quality *Virtuous* and *Pious*; but Stoiciſm over-ſtretcheth the String, and runneth into profane Exceſs and Extravagance: For it is not pious, to pray with the dying Stoick, (*o*) *place me in what Region thou pleaſeſt*. (*p*) Ἆρόν με καὶ βάλλε ὅπου θέλεις, *Take me and throw me*, *where thou wilt*, *I am indifferent*.

(2.) It is not a due conformity to the Divine Will, to have regard to no Calamities, but the common Calamities of Humane Life, to overlook the grand Events of Death and the intolerable Calamities of a future ſtate. (*q*) *Nothing can happen to thee or any Man*, *which is not an Humane Calamity*; *for ſurely the common Nature of all would not bring upon thee that which is intolerable*.

(3.) It is not a due conformity of Will to the Divine Will, to entertain all afflictive Providences with a *Stoical Indifference*, as being Externals, which are ſubjected to the Divine Gubernation and Diſpoſal, none of our Goods or Ills, which are only in the Mind. (*r*) *What good happeneth to a Ball*, *when it is thrown upwards?*

(c) *Stearne de obſtin. p.* 341. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 13.

(i) *Laert. in Zenon.*

(g) Ἀεὶ χρὴ τὸν σοφὸν εἶναι ὅμοιον, ἐν ἀλγηδόσιν ὀξείαις, ἐν ἀποβολῇ τέκνων, ἐν μακραῖς νόσοις. *M. Ant. l.* 1. *S.* 8. *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 148.

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 367.

(i) *Clem. Str. l.* 4. *p. m.* 362. *Tertul. Apol. c.* 49.

(k) *Vitam ut Dominam fugitans rabidam*, *ridens ſubitas momentorum ruinas*, *immobilis conflagravit*; *Peregrinum illum imitatus protea cognomine Philoſophum clarum*: *qui cum mundo digredi ſtatuiſſet*, *Olympiæ quinquennali certamine ſub Græciæ conſpectu totius*, *aſcenſo rogo quem ipſe conſtruxit*, *flammis abſumptus eſt*. Am. Marcellin. l. 29.

(l) *Cic. Tuſc.* 5. *Sen. Ep.* 88. *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 222.

(m) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 119, 387.

(n) Πῶς ἂν γενοίμην ἐλεύθερος; ἐλεύθερος γάρ ἐστιν, ᾧ γίνεται πάντα κατὰ προαίρεσιν, καὶ ὃν οὐδεὶς δύναται κωλῦσαι. ἐγὼ θέλω πᾶν τὸ δοκοῦν μοι ἀποβαίνειν· ἀλλὰ τὸ παιδεύεσθαι, τοῦτ' ἐστι μανθάνειν ἕκαστα οὕτω θέλειν ὡς γίνεται. *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 118, 119. Μηδὲν ἄλλο θέλε, ἢ ἃ ὁ θεὸς θέλει, καὶ τίς σε κωλύσει; τίς ἀναγκάσει; οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν Δία. *Ibid. p.* 221. Ἐγὼ δὲ πώποτ' οὐ θέλων ἐκωλύθην, οὔτ' ἠναγκάσθην μὴ θέλων· καὶ πῶς τοῦτο δυνατόν; προσκατατέταχα μου τὴν ὁρμὴν τῷ θεῷ. θέλει μ' ἐκεῖνος πυρέσσειν; κἀγὼ θέλω. θέλει με τυχεῖν τινός; κἀγὼ βούλομαι· οὐ θέλει; οὐ βούλομαι· τίς ἔτι με κωλῦσαι δύναται παρὰ τὸ ἐμοὶ φαινόμενον ἢ ἀναγκάσαι; *Ibid. p.* 361, 362. Μὴ ζήτει τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι ὡς θέλεις· ἀλλὰ θέλε τὰ γινόμενα ὡς γίνεται, καὶ εὐροήσεις. *Vid. Gat. in Ant. p.* 160.

(o) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 116.

(p) *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 45.

(q) Ἀνθρώπῳ οὐδενὶ συμβαίνειν τι δύναται, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρωπικὸν σύμπτωμα· οὐ γὰρ ἀφόρητόν σοι ἔφερεν ἡ κοινὴ φύσις. *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 46.

(r) Τί οὖν ἀγαθὸν τῷ σφαιρίῳ ἀναφερομένῳ; ἢ κακὸν κα-

upwards? or evil, when it falleth downwards?

(4.) A Stoick's conformity of Will to the Divine Will is not a due conformity, becauſe it implieth *Apathy* and *Indolence.* His Inſtitution obligeth him, notwithſtanding all his own Sins and Sufferings, the Sins and Miſeries of Mankind, and the Sufferings of God's People, to be (s) ἄλυπος, ἄφοβος, ἀπαθής, ἀτάραχος, (t) δι᾽ οὐδένα δυστυχεῖν, *devoid of Sorrow, Fear, Paſſion, Perturbation, not to make himſelf unhappy* (or dolorous) *upon any one's account.*

(5.) The Stoical Wiſe Man is always *in Joy*; accordingly, a late Chriſtian Stoick hath taught us, (u) *to rejoyce in all the tragical Calamities of Mankind, that thereby our Wills may be conform'd to the all-diſpoſing and adminiſtring Divine Will.* And withal he ſuppoſeth, (w) that our Saviour hath forbidden *Jejunium luctuoſum*, *ſuch Faſts which are mournful Exerciſes of Piety* (as all true Faſts are) *approving only a joyous, or at leaſt an indolent Faſt*; which goeth a great way towards bidding the *Italians*, keep *Carnival* all the Lent-time. (x) *We will add the almoſt laſt words of* M. Antoninus *to his Friends bewailing him near his Death. Why do you lament for me, and do not rather think of the Peſtilence and the common Death? Which words he ſpake deridingly of Humane Affairs, as* Capitolinus *ſaith*; *whereas he ought rather to have ſpoken them deploringly, which alſo* Joſ. Scaliger *hath obſerv'd.*

(6.) It muſt not be thought a due conformity to the Divine Will, to diſcard the humbling methods of Piety for the cure and removal of the diſaſtrous Events of Providence (Faſting, afflicting the Soul, Deprecation, Interceſſion) and to ſubſtitute in their ſtead that magnanimous voice (y) συνορμῶ, συνορέγομαι, ἁπλῶς συνθέλω, *with him (God) I affect and purſue, with him I deſire, my Volitions are ſimply and abſolutely co-incident with the ſupreme Volitions.* They that are oblig'd, to make uſe of thoſe humbling methods of Piety (although they accept the Puniſhment of their Iniquities, yet) how are they oblig'd at the ſame time without Exception or Limitation (z) θέλειν, (a) φιλεῖν, (b) ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσπάζεσθαι τὰ συμβαίνοντα, *to will, love, be well pleas'd with, and from the whole Soul to embrace the things that happen?*

(7.) Nor is it agreeable to the Divine Will (c) to diſcard the Methods of Religion for propitiating the Divine Diſpleaſure and obtaining the Divine Favour in diſaſtrous Circumſtances (which not only God's People, but the Popular Pagans (d) made uſe of, to appeaſe the Divine Anger, when Calamities came upon them) as ſuppoſing or preſuming (e) that *the Divine Nature cannot be angry,* (f) *and that the Events of Providence are Fatalities*; both which are ſettled Maxims in the School of the Stoicks. Their Philoſophy had been much more agreeable to Piety, had they entertain'd that other Hypotheſis, which they ſometimes harp upon, but have not made it a ſettled Maxim, nor form'd their Philoſophy agreeably thereto. (g) *If there be a placable and exorable Providence, make thy ſelf worthy of help from the Divinity.*

(8.) They that will all things to be as they are, muſt neceſſarily will the ſtate of things in the World, to be as bad as it is; which is repugnant to all true Virtue, to the uſe of Prayer, (h) and to the Stoicks deſires and endeavours for the emendation of Mankind. Yet this they muſt mean by their conformity of Will to the Divine Will. (i) *Seeing a Man is therefore happy, becauſe he hath whatſoever he willeth; that he may never fail of it, it is requiſite, that he will things to be as they are, and not to be as they are not: Every one is calamitous, whoſe Will is not conformable to the things, or to whoſe Will the things are not conform'd. But becauſe things are, or are not, according to the determination of the Divine Will as their cauſe; to will that things be as they are, and that things be not, as they are not, is to will what God willeth, and to nill what God willeth not; but to will what God willeth not, is madneſs, and is never fulfill'd; and to will what God willeth, never faileth of Completion and Fruition. I Will ſomething, and it is not done; and that which is done, is againſt my Will; what can be more unhappy?*

(9.) Their *Paſſive Obedience* is nothing more than a Tolerance of the *Patienda*, ſeparate from thoſe grand duties of Piety (the humbling our ſelves under the Divine Hand, ſearching and trying our ways, practice of Repentance, rectifying our Nature, refining our Temper, improving in Devotion) which are the *Agenda* in a ſtate of Affliction. (k) *What will you do with a Diſeaſe, when it cometh? I will demonſtrate its Nature, and demonſtrate in it mine own Excellency, Stability, Proſperity, I will not flatter the Phyſician, nor deſire to die*; and this is all the uſe, which the beſt of Stoicks could make of a Diſeaſe.

(10.) Their Tolerance is not the genuine kind of Tolerance, but is of kind and quality ſpurious and illegitimate; for there is in it, (l) *the inſolent boldneſs of an affected liberty,* (which rivals with *Jupiter*) *and the immodeſt boaſting of a ſhew'd-forth and half-naked Breaſt* (which Expreſſion relateth to the Philoſopher's naked Shoulder) as S. *Cyprian* remarketh. To which we may add; that the Virtue and Glory of it is no better than the Fortitude and Stoutneſs of Philoſophic Bravo's. (m) *Look at the Powers which thou art furniſh'd with, and having view'd them ſay,* φέρε νῦν ὦ Ζεῦ, ἣν θέλεις περίστασιν, *bring upon me now,* O Jupiter, *what hardſhip thou wilt, I am ſufficiently furniſh'd by what thou haſt given me, to make whatever happeneth ornamental to me.* (n) *At length erect thy Neck as come out of Servitude, fearing nothing that can happen: Dare to lift up thine Eyes to God, and ſay, Uſe me hereafter to whatſoever thou pleaſeſt, I am of the ſame mind with thee, I am equal to any thing.* (o) *Endure Death, endure Labours, endure Impriſonment, endure Diſgrace, endure Condemnation. I will wiſh in*

ταφερομένῳ; *M. Ant. l.* 8. *s.* 20. *vid. l.* 9. *S.* 1.

(s) *Epict. Diſſ.* p 222, 395.

(t) *Ibid.* p. 337. *M. Ant. l.* 4. *S.* 49.

(u) Stearne de obſtinat. 163, 164.

(w) *Ibid.* 186.

(x) *Adjicere lubet Marci ipſum verba ferè noviſſima ad amicos moribundum deflentes; Quid me fletis & non magis de peſtilentia & communi morte cogitatis? Quod res humanas ridendo protuliſſe eum dicit Capitolinus; cùm deplorando potius dicere debuerit; quod & Joſ. Scaliger obſervavit.* Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 324. ed. ann. 1652.

(y) *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 402.

(z) *M. Ant. l.* 12. *S.* 3.

(a) *Ibid. l.* *S.* 16.

(b) *Ib. l.* 3. 4. *vid. l.* *S.* 6.

(c) *Sen. Ep.* 95.

(d) *Tiraquel. de Nobil.* p. 326.

(e) *Lipſ. de Conſtant. l. c.* 6. *Lactant de irà D.*

(f) *M. Ant. l.* 10. *S.* 5.

(g) Εἰ δὲ πρόνοια ἐπιδεχομένη τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἄξιον αὐτὸν ποίησον τῆς ἐκ τοῦ θείου βοηθείας. *M. Ant. l.* 12. *S.* 14.

(h) *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 389.

(i) *Cùm homo beatus ſit, quia habet quicquid vult, ut voti ſui ſemper fiat compos, velle ut res ſint ut ſunt; & ut non ſint, ut non ſunt, oportet: calamitoſus eſt omnis, ſive cujus voluntas rebus non eſt conformis, ſive cujus voluntati res non ſunt conformes. Quoniam verò res ſunt, vel non ſunt, pro arbitrio voluntatis divinæ tanquam cauſæ; velle ut res ſint, ut ſunt; & ut non ſint, ut non ſunt; eſt velle quod Deus vult, & nolle quod Deus non vult: velle autem quod Deus non vult, dementiæ eſt, & nunquam completur; & velle quod Deus vult, fruitione nunquam non completur.* Stearne An. Medel. l. 1. c. 19. *Volo aliquid, & non fit: & non volente fit. Quo quid infelicius?* Epict. Diſſ. p. 220.

(k) Τὴν νόσον τί ποιήσεις; δείξω αὐτῆς τὴν φύσιν, διαπρέψω ἐν αὐτῇ, εὐσταθήσω, εὐροήσω, τὸν ἰατρὸν οὐ κολακεύσω, οὐκ εὔξομαι ἀποθανεῖν. *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 304. *v. M. Ant. l.* 7. *S.* 58.

(l) *Inſolens affectatæ libertatis audacia, & exerti ac ſeminudi pectoris inverecunda jactantia.* S. Cypr. de Bono patient.

(m) *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 100.

(n) Ἀνάτεινόν ποτε τὸν τράχηλον ὡς ἀπηλλαγμένος δουλείας. Μηδὲν φοβούμενος τῶν συμβῆναι δυναμένων· τόλμησον ἀναβλέψαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι χρῶ μοι λοιπὸν εἰς ὃ ἂν θέλῃς, ὁμογνωμῶ σοι, ἴσος εἰμί. *Ibid.* p. 217, 222.

(o) Φέρε θάνατον, φέρε πόνους, φέρε δεσμωτήριον, φέρε ἀδοξίαν, φέρε καταδίκην. *Ibid.* p. 172. *Ut me in illis fortiter, animoſè, honeſtè geram, optabo.* Sen. Ep. 67.

all theſe to carry my ſelf without failure of Fortitude, Stoutneſs, Laudableneſs.

(11.) Their αὐτοχειρία, *to run the Pit and ſlink out of Harm's-way by taking away their Lives in bad Circumſtances*, is a grand inconſiſtence with the Heroic Atchievements of their Paſſive Virtue, and demonſtrateth, that it was of kind and quality ſpurious and illegitimate.

(12.) A ſtate of Sufferings for Righteouſneſs ſake (which as ſuch cannot be Afflictions for Sin) is of ſuch Ennoblement and Perfection, of ſuch vaſt advantages, and both preſent and future-premiant Beatitude, that it ſeemeth not reaſonable, to affix the Cenſure of Imprudence upon the Chriſtian Martyrs, that throng'd the Tribunal of their Perſecutors. But what ſhould invite a Stoick, who looketh for nothing but his Labour for his Travel, to relinquiſh the *Indifference* of his Inſtitution, and to become a Zealot for Blows? yet not content with the obſervance of their own Rules, *to follow things and to follow Providence*, they have a faſtuous Humour and extravagant Fondneſs, (to over-run their Diſcretion, and) to run before them. (*p*) *Man, you ſhould go rejoycing into Priſon, making haſt, over-going thoſe that carry you thither.* (*q*) *I remember to have heard this ſtout Saying of the moſt ſtout* Demetrius; *for this one thing, ye immortal Gods, I may complain of you, that you have not before made known your Will to me; for I had before come to thoſe things, to which I am now come by your providential call. Would you have my Children? they are at your diſpoſal; or ſome part of my Body? take it. It is no great thing, that I promiſe, I ſhall ſoon leave the whole. Is it your Will, to have my Spirit? in me there ſhall be no delay, but that you may receive what you have given. Whatever you ask, you ſhall have it from a willing Man. What therefore is the matter? I had rather offer, than meerly deliver. What need was there to take away, what you might have taken as an Oblation?*

(13.) Their conformity of Will to the Divine Will in Paſſive Obedience, as it is exemplify'd in the Lives of their greateſt Saintiſts, is but acting an unpopular Humour; as is apparent from the Life of *Diogenes* (and there is the ſame reaſon for *Socrates*, *Heraclitus* and others;) yet this their κυρία δόξα, or principal Rule is miſtaken by the Myſtical Theologers of the Church of *Rome* for a Rule of Seraphic Virtue. And hence *Thaulerus* hath form'd his Tale of a Chriſtian Beggar, (*r*) who pretended, *that he was never unhappy or unfortunate, nor ever had an unproſperous Morning. Becauſe* (ſaid he) *whatever God willeth, that I will.* But theſe Myſtical Theologers ought to have underſtood, that our conformity to the Divine Will ought to be a due conformity, and that there may be ſuch a conformity to the *Divine Will of Events*, as claſheth with the Divine Will of *Duty and Precept*.

(14.) The Stoicks Inſtitution to Paſſive Virtue is for the moſt part founded upon bad (Stoical) Principles. (*s*) *Doſt thou call that a miſchance to a Man, which is no miſchance to the* (proper) *Nature of Man?* (*t*) *Let that part which judgeth of things be at reſt*, (and not ſuppoſe any Externals good or evil) *although the Body which is next the thing, be cut or burn'd, ſuffer Corruption or Putrefaction.* (*u*) *That which maketh not the Man worſe* (which doth not involve him in any Crime, nor deteriorate his Mind) *doth not make his Life the worſe, nor can it hurt him*; as many more beſides the Stoicks ſuppoſe. (*w*) *All things that befall Men are allotted them by that Whole or Univerſe, whereof they are a part; and that is good for every one, which the nature of the whole bringeth upon every one.* (*x*) *For two reaſons thou muſt be well pleas'd with every thing that happeneth to thee: the one is; becauſe for thee it was brought to paſs, and was to thee co-ordinate, and to thee had relation, and was from the beginning and the moſt ancient cauſes woven together with thee* (thy deſtiny brought it it upon thee, and it was ordain'd for thee, and thou to it;) *the other is; becauſe it is requiſite to the Proſperity, Conſummation, and indeed the Permanency of the Adminiſtrator of the whole.* (*y*) *Whatever ſhall come to paſs, the World loveth to have it ſo: I ſay therefore to the World, I concur with thee in Affection*, and love to have it ſo: Which muſt not be thought a virtuous ſaying; (for what Virtue is there in deifying the World? in concurring in Affection with this Region of Sin and Mortality and Miſery, the Laws of whoſe Adminiſtration are manifeſtly penal and calamitous?) but it ſpeaketh a Philoſophic-Pagan Gallantry and greatneſs of Soul, agreeably to *Seneca*'s and the reſt of the Stoicks Grandiloquence, which it may fitly interpret. (*z*) *Nihil patior invitus, nec ſervio Deo, ſed aſſentio.* (*a*) *Naturæ conſentiamus: optimum eſt pati, quod emendare non poſſis: & Deum quo auctore cuncta proveniunt, ſine murmuratione comitari. Malus Miles eſt, qui imperatorem gemens ſequitur, quare impigri atque alacres excipiamus imperia; id poſſumus, magnum ſumere animum. Hic eſt magnus animus, qui ſe Deo tradidit, at contra ille puſillus ac degener, qui obluctatur, & de ordine mundi male exiſtimat, & emendare mavult Deos quam ſe.*

Inſtead of a bare Tranſlation of theſe Latin Sayings of *Seneca* we will give an Account of the true ſenſe and meaning of them in this following Metaphraſe. " A Stoick having dei-
" fy'd Mundane Animative Nature, which is
" ſuppos'd, to be cauſal of the Order and E-
" vents of the World, is not meerly ſubject
" thereto by *Paſſive Obedience* (although he ad-
" viſeth others to bear what they cannot amend:)
" but his Paſſive Virtue is of an higher ſtrain,
" he is of the ſame Mind and Affection with
" Mundane Governing Nature and with the
" World; therefore he ſuffereth no diſaſters un-
" willingly, nor followeth this Orderer of the
" World's Events with complaint, nor with re-
" gret and ſorrow (if at any time he alloweth
" Sorrow, it is againſt his Principle; for he is
" an ill Soldier, that followeth his General la-
" menting;) but with *Indifference*, *Apathy*, *In-*
" *dolence*,

(p) Ἄνθρωπε εἰς φυλακὴν σε δεῖ χαίροντα ἀπιέναι, σπεύδοντα, φθάνοντα τοὺς ἀπάγοντας. *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 339.

(q) *Hanc animoſam Demetrii fortiſſimi viri vocem audiſſe me memini: Hoc unum, Dii immortales; de vobis queri poſſum, quod non ante mihi voluntatem veſtram notam feciſtis; prior enim ad iſta veniſſem, ad quæ nunc vocatus adſum. vultis liberos ſumere? illos vobis ſuſtuli. vultis aliquam partem corporis? ſumite. Non magnam rem promitto, citò totum relinquam. vultis ſpiritum? quidni? nullam moram faciam, quo minus recipiatis, quod dediſtis. à volente feretis quicquid petieritis. Quid ergo eſt? maluiſſem offerre, quàm tradere. quid opus fuit auferre? accipere potuiſtis.* Sen. de provid. c. 5. v. Epict. Diſſ. l. 2. c. 6. & 10.

(r) *Stearne An. Medel. l.* 3. *c.* 18. *de obſtinat. p.* 346.

(s) *M. Ant. l.* 4. *S.* 49.

(t) Κἂν τὸ ἐγγυτάτω αὐτοῦ τὸ σωμάτιον, τέμνηται, καίηται, διαπυΐσκηται, σήπηται, ὅμως τὸ ὑπολαμβάνον περὶ τούτων μόριον, ἡσυχαζέτω. *Ibid.*

(u) Ὃ χεῖρω αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἄνθρωπον οὐ ποιεῖ, τοῦτο οὐδὲ τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ χείρω ποιεῖ, οὐδὲ βλάπτει. *Ibid. l.* 4. *S* 8. *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *vid. Gat. Not. p.* 48.

(w) Συμφέρει ἑκάστῳ ὃ φέρει ἑκάστῳ ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις. *Ibid. l.* 10. *S.* 20. *l.* 2. *S.* 3. *l.* 3. *l.* 4 *l.* 7. *S.* 66.

(x) Κατὰ δύο λόγους στέργειν χρὴ τὸ συμβαῖνόν σοι· καὶ ἕνα μὲν, ὅτι σοι ἐγίνετο, καὶ σοὶ συνετάττετο, καὶ πρὸς σέ πως εἶχεν, ἄνωθεν ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτάτων αἰτίων συγκλωθόμενον· καθ' ἕτερον δὲ, ὅτι τῷ τὸ ὅλον διοικοῦντι τῆς εὐοδίας, καὶ τῆς συντελείας, καὶ νὴ Δία τῆς συμμονῆς αὐτῆς αἴτιόν ἐστι. *Ibid. l.* 5. *S.* 8.

(y) Ἐρᾷ δὲ ὁ κόσμος ποιῆσαι ὃ ἂν μέλλῃ γίνεσθαι· λέγω οὖν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι σοὶ συνερῶ. *Ibid. l.* 10. *S.* 21.

(z) *Sen. de provid. c.* 5.

(a) *Idem Ep.* 107.

dolence; yea with *promptitude, alacrity, magnanimity.* He is not ſollicitous for the cure and removal of calamitous Events, nor for propitiating the Divine Diſpleaſure, and conciliating the Divine Favour, nor doth he ardently deſire a better State of this World, nor that himſelf be in a better State, nor is he ſollicitous for the preſent bettering his Eſtate towards God, nor for the great *Agenda* in a State of Affliction; for no ſtate is to him afflictive. But he is ſollicitous for a greatneſs of Mind, which he aſſumeth to himſelf, reproaching the Atheiſtically impatient ſort of Men with abjectneſs and degeneracy of Mind, who think ill of the Order of the World, and ſtrive againſt it, and inſtead of amending themſelves would have the Gods amend: Nor hath he any better conceit of the truly Religious; for they are ſaid to be poor in Spirit, they ſuppoſe Afflictions the Diſcipline of Sinners, that they ought to be humbled under them, to comport with the Economy of Providence, and to anſwer the pious Deſigns of them; that Death is Puniſhment, that God can be Angry, that the World is under the Divine Diſpleaſure; and they live in fear of otherkins Puniſhments than meerly Caſtigatory and Medicinal. Thoſe only he accounteth the Men of great Minds, that have made a Stoical Tradition of themſelves to mundane Regent Nature, and given up all that belongeth not to their own Power to its Gubernation, thereby becoming Free-men and Philoſophic Bravo's; ſuch as this Author deſcribeth elſewhere. (*b*) *Ferte fortiter: hoc eſt quo Deum antecedatis. Ille extra patientiam malorum eſt, vos ſupra patientiam. Bear Diſaſters ſtoutly: In this you may precede God. He is without the Patience of Evils, you are above it.* From this account of the (forecited) Sayings of a declamatory Stoick it appeareth, that they are in great part *Paganical, Stoical, Tranſcendental Extravagances*; and therefore I muſt complain of an Irreligious Extravagance in the Elogy, which a late learned Biſhop hath given of them in his Diſcourſes of *Paſſive Obedience.* (*c*) *Where is there any thing among thoſe that profeſs Chriſtianity better and more becomingly ſaid to this purpoſe? Or how can the Wit of Man frame any Senſe or Words, that do more fully expreſs this Self-reſignation and Submiſſion to the Providence of God than is done in thoſe* **excellent** *Speeches of an Heathen Philoſopher?*

XIII. It is a vulgar Error, to ſuppoſe the ſublime Heathen Philoſophers (commonly called the Moral Philoſophers,) to be Teachers of nothing higher than *common Morality and Natural Religion*; whereas the Men of this low level are the popular Pagans (and ſuch Philoſophers as tranſcend not their Inſtitution,) amongſt whom much of this is to be found, and nothing higher than this. (*d*) ***Many glory of their Works, and many*** (popular) ***Pagans will therefore not become Chriſtians, becauſe they ſuppoſe their good Life ſufficient. To live well, ſaith the Pagan, is the thing that is needful. What will Chriſt command me? To live well? I do that already. Why then is Chriſt neceſſary for me? I commit no Homicide, nor Theft, nor Rapine, nor deſire other Mens Goods, nor am I contaminated by any Adultery. Let any thing reprehenſible be found in my life, and he that reprehendeth it, let him make me a Chriſtian.*** To this Morality Nature inſtituted the Popular Pagans. (*e*) *For the Diſcipline of Ethicks is Nature's Inſtitution, common to all Mankind.* But although the Stoicks in forming their Moral Philoſophy (which they call βίȣ τέχνη, ἐπιστήμη τȣ̃ βίȣ, *the Art of life, the Science how to live*) pretend to follow Nature as their School-Miſtreſs, and although they call their Philoſophy *Moral* (as indeed it is their Morality,) yet their Moralities are extremely Diſſonant from, and tranſcendent to Nature's Inſtitution of Morality; for they are the Moralities of *Philoſophic-Pagan Saintiſts, of unpopular Humoriſts, of abſtract Mentaliſts, Enthuſiaſts and Divine kind of Men*, as they account themſelves. (*f*) *Shew me a Man* (ſaith the Stoick) *that deſireth, to be made a God of a man, and in this mortal Body to have Conſortſhip with* Jove. The Religion therefore and Piety which is properly Stoical, is not *Natural Religion* (of Nature's Inſtitution and of Natural Obligation:) But a ſupernatural Religion, the fruit of Art and human Contrivance, to ſerve the deſign of living in *Self-ſufficiency, Independency, Liberty, Apathy, Proſperity, and undiſturb'd Tranquillity.* (*g*) As *Crates* with his Scrip and Cloak παίζων ϗ γελῶν ὥσπερ ἐν ἑορτῇ τὸν βίον διετέλεσε, *paſſed over his Life ſportfully and ludicrouſly as in a Feſtival.* (*h*) *God hath no need of a querulous Spectator. But of thoſe that Feaſt and Dance together with him, that may rather applaud, and like thoſe that are in a tranſport celebrate and praiſe the Feſtival Solemnity. It is not ungrateful to him, to ſee the miſerable and timid diſmiſs'd from the Feſtival Solemnity; for when they were at it, they did not behave themſelves as at a Feſtivity.* It is not hard to determine, which were the better ſort of Religioniſts: Whether the Popular Pagans that complain'd, when they were hurt (provided they abſtain'd from curſing their Deities,) were touch'd with their Afflictions, and look'd upon mournful Spectacles with the Eyes of Mourners: Or the Ruffian-like gigantick Philoſophers, (*i*) who took a pride in being Soldiers of Fortune, and truſting in their own ſtrength and their invincible Dogmata, derided all her frowns; that would live at the rate of Pagan Deities (who are above Paſſion) in Human Fleſh, and were ſo far from ſuppoſing with Holy Men, (*k*) ὅτι θρήνων ὁ παρὼν καιρὸς, *this is a time of lamenting*, that they turn it into a Play and a Feſtival. Agreably to their Hypotheſis (*l*) *that the perfection of felicity is attainable in this Life*, they contriv'd a method of arriving at ſo tranſcendent a Condition; which was by placing all their good ἐν τοῖς προαιρετικοῖς, *in their own things only, that are at the diſpoſal of their own Wills*, contemning (*m*) all the ἀπροαίρετα, *that belong not to their free-agent Nature.* Being thus inſti-

---

(b) *Sen. de Provid. c.* 6.

(c) *Biſhop Wilkins of Natural Relig.* 1. *Par. ch.* 17. *Quid eſt præcipuum? Poſſe læto animo adverſa tolerare; quicquid acciderit ſic ferre, quaſi tibi volueris accidere. Debuiſſes enim velle, ſi ſciſſes omnia ex decreto Dei fieri.* Sen. Qu. Nat. l. 3. Præfat.

(d) *Multi gloriantur de operibus, & invenis multos Paganos propterea nolle fieri Chriſtianos, quia quaſi ſufficiunt ſibi de bona vita ſua. Bene vivere opus eſt, ait. Quid mihi præcepturus eſt Chriſtus? ut bene vivam? Jam bene vivo. Quid mihi neceſſarius eſt Chriſtus? Nullum homicidium, nullum furtum, nullam rapinam facio, res alienas non concupiſco, nullo adulterio contaminor. Nam inveniatur in vita mea aliquid quod reprehendatur, & qui reprehenderit, faciat Chriſtianum.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 31.

(e) Τὰ γὰρ ἠθικὰ μαθήματα πάντας ἀνθρώπȣς ἡ φύσις ἐπαίδευσε. Theodor. Θεραπ. Ser. 2.

(f) Θεὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπȣ ἐπιθυμȣ̃ντα γενέσθαι, ϗ ἐν τῷ σωματίῳ τȣ́τῳ τῷ νεκρῷ, περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δία κοινωνίας βȣλευόμενον, δείξατε. Epict. Diſſ. p. 231.

(g) *Plut. de An. Tranquil.* p. 466.

(h) Οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν [ὁ Θεὸς] θεατȣ̃ μεμψιμοίρȣ. Τῶν συνεορταζόντων δεῖται, τῶν συγχορευόντων ἵν' ἐπικροτῶσι μᾶλλον, ἐπιθειάζωσιν, ὑμνῶσι δὲ τὴν πανήγυριν. Τȣ̀ς ταλαιπώρȣς δὲ ϗ δειλȣ̀ς, ȣ̓κ ἀηδῶς ὄψεται ἀπολελυμένȣς τῆς πανηγύρεως· ȣ̓δὲ γὰρ παρόντες ὡς ἐν ἑορτῇ διῆγον. Epict. Diſſ. p. 364.

(i) *Sen. Ep.* 67. *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 372.

(k) *S. Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom.* 64.

(l) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 19. *c.* 4. & *Ep.* 52.

(m) *Ep. Diſſ. p.* 401, 330

inſtituted, to live in *Safety*, *Liberty*, *Independency upon others*, *not liable to be conſtrain'd*, *hurt*, *or hindred by any*, *never failing of proſperous Succeſs*, *never being unfortunate*, *nor conflicting with any adverſity*, they could bear. (n) *whatever happen'd without humiliation or brokenneſs of Mind*. They aſſumed to themſelves a greatneſs of Mind (as ſuppoſing that nothing could hurt them, and that they were beyond the power of Evil,) and were able to make this Reſignation to Providence from their whole Soul. *(o)*

Ἄγε δέ μ' ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ σύ γ' ἡ πεπρωμένη,
Ὅποι ποθ' ὑμῖν εἰμι διατεταγμένος.
Carry me, O Jupiter, *and thou O Fate*,
Whitherſoever I am deſtin'd by you.

Such is the Stoicks *magnanimous paſſive Obedience*, neither *Natural*, nor *Chriſtian Religion*, yet ſuch as hath a Conſonance with both: But ſuch a Conſonance that is complicated with extreme Diſſonance, the Diſſonance is greater than the Agreement. And if we agree not with the Stoicks touching *Paſſive Obedience* (which is the top-Flower and Quinteſſence of their Philoſophy,) nor think it ſafe to rely upon the Maxims of the Philoſophic Pagans (both becauſe they are Pagans, and becauſe they are Philoſophic, of an unpopular humour) we are not likely to entertain a late Conceit, *that all the Agenda in Chriſtianity* (the two Sacraments excepted) *are nothing but what was taught before by the Moral Philoſophers.* For although of all things in our Religion and Theopolity there are Conſonances, Affinities and Reſemblances in their Religion and Inſtitutions of Learning and Virtue (as all Terreſtrial Animals are ſaid to have their Reſemblances in the Sea:) yet the beſt of them muſt be thought bad Teachers of Duty and Virtue, all of them being Aliens from true Piety, and ſome of them extremely deficient in Philoſophizing.

XIV. For in the Stoicks *Natural* and *Moral* Philoſophy there are ſuch marvellous abſurd Imaginations, as plainly ſhew them extremely deficient in the Faculty of Reaſoning and Philoſophizing. *(p)* The Sun, Moon and Stars are nouriſh'd by Vapours from the Earth, Sea and Rivers (as they ſuppoſe;) and when theſe Vapours fail, there will be a Conflagration of the vaſt Univerſe, a Reſolution of the Gods (*Jupiter* only excepted) and of Man into their firſt Elements (God and the Matter;) after which Conflagration there will be a Reſtauration of the ſame World and the ſame Men, and ſo in endleſs Circuitions. *(q)* The Night, Day, Evening, Morning, our Arts, Memories Phantaſies, Aſſents, Affections, (Anger, Sorrow, Fear, Audacity,) *Sapience* alſo and *Bonum* are all Bodies (in this Philoſophy,) as alſo our Virtues (Prudence, Fortitude, Juſtice) and all our Vices are Bodies; *and not only Bodies*, *but Animals*; which is ſuch an Imagination, as could ſcarce enter into any one's Head, that is not a Philoſopher or a Rabbi. (*r*) *Virtus nihil aliud eſt*, *quàm Animus quodammodo ſe habens*, *ergo Animal eſt. Virtue is nothing elſe but the Mind modify'd*, *therefore it is an Animal.* Agreeably to the Mind of the Univerſe (who in this Philoſophy is a ſubtle fiery Body,) the Mind of Man is a Body, (*s*) *a part of God and a God too.* (*t*) And this deify'd Mind of Man (not the Holy Ghoſt of the Chriſtian Religion) is that which they mean by *Sacer Spiritus an Holy or Divine Spirit in Man.* (u) *Ratio nihil aliud eſt*, *quàm in corpus humanum pars Divini Spiritus merſa. Reaſon in Man is nothing elſe but a part of the Divine Spirit* (the mundane Soul) *immers'd in an Human Body.* At the ſame rate the *Pythagoreans* and Platoniſts (*w*) deify the Humane Nature (they forbid Men to pollute by corporeal Paſſions, τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἔνοικον αὐτοῖς, *their Domeſtick God)* as alſo *Syneſius* and *Philo* according to their uſual mode of criminal Philoſophic-Paganizing. (*x*) *Syneſius* calleth the Head νεὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, *the Temple of God*, *Philo* calleth the Mind *an Avulſion of the divine and bleſſed Soul.* So thoſe old Philoſophic-paganizing Hereticks (*y*) the *Manichees* and ſome Branches of the Gnoſticks, are ſaid, to have held the Soul *a part of God*, *of the Divine Subſtance.* In the elder times of the Church *Prudentius* (*z*) is thought a Philoſophic Pagan in this Language of his, *Deus*, *ignee fons Animarum*, *God the igneous Font of Souls*; and of later times *Andreas Cæſalpinus* maintain'd, (*a*) *that the Souls of Angels*, *Men and Animals are Particles of God.* But this Paganical Conceit is peculiarly Platonic; the Stoicks ſay, *that the Minds of Men*, *not the Souls of Animals*, *are parts of the Deity*, which is the more tolerable Hypotheſis: yet becauſe it ſuppoſeth a Diſcerption and Dilaceration of the Deity, and that the parts of God may be miſerable, (*b*) *Cicero* (ſometimes) rejecteth it as an abſurd Imagination.

A like intermixture of abſurd Imaginations pervadeth their *Moral* Philoſophy; for ſuch are their Dogmata, *that all Sins are equal*; *that all who are not of the Wiſe of the firſt Form* (that are in the State of Perfection) *are equally fooliſh*, *bad*, *vicious*, *morbid*, *miſerable*, *inſani*, as they love to ſpeak. And this is the Beatitude which they propoſe to themſelves. (*c*) *O my Soul*, *when wilt thou be full and unindigent*, *and deſiring nothing*, *either animate or inanimate*, *for pleaſant enjoyment*; *nor time for long enjoyment*, *nor place*, *nor region*, *nor good temperature of Air*, *nor agreeable Society of Men: But be ſatisfy'd with thy preſent Conſtitution*, *delighted with all preſent things*, *and perſuaded that all is preſent*, *and that thou art well as to all things? Make this thy care and deſire*, *to be ſatisfy'd with thy ſelf*, *and the Goods that ariſe from thy Self. What felicity can be nearer to God?* This terrene Region is viſibly (*d*) κακώσεως τόπος, *the Region of Sin and Sufferings:* But in Stoiciſm (which is a ſullen and ſurly contempt of Human Calamities) the State of the World is a πανήγυρις, *Feſtival Solemnity*; (*e*) Death is the Nature of Man, not Puniſhment; and the ſerious Calamities of Mankind (as *Plotinus* (*f*) Stoically Philoſophizeth,) *Deaths*, *Rapines*, *the ſlaughtering Men and ſacking Cities*, *are to be contemplated as the ſcenical ſhiftings on the Theaters*; *the Tears of Mourners as ſhews of Lamentation*, *and* (*the Affairs of Life being a Play*) *as Childrens crying.* They are not troubled for their own Vices, (*g*) *for who hindreth them from rectifying their own Principles?* Nor are they troubled at the Impieties of others, or angry and offended at their Sins and Injuries; (*b*) *If any one hath ſinn'd the hurt is only his own.*

(n) Πᾶν τὸ συμβαῖνον, μὴ ταπεινούμενοι, μηδὲ συγκλώμενοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Epict. Diſſ. p. 100.

(o) *Ibid.* p. 367.

(p) *V. Jac. Thomaz. Diſſertationes.*

(q) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 2. *Diſſ.* 4, 5.

(r) *Sen. Ep.* 113.

(s) *Lipſ. ſupr. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 8. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 43, 99, 207, 211, 432.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 69.

(u) Sen. Ep. 66.

(w) Gat. ſupr. p. 201.

(x) Ibid. p. 211, 432.

(y) Gaſſend. T. 2. p. 239. J. Bapt. Criſp. p. 67.

(z) Jac. Thomaz. Diſſ. p. 253.

(a) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 40.

(b) De N. D. l. 1.

(c) Ἔσῃ ποτὲ ἄρ' ὦ ψυχὴ ... πλήρης καὶ ἀνενδεὴς, καὶ οὐδενὸς ἐπιποθοῦσα, οὐδὲ ἐπιθυμοῦσα οὐδενὸς, οὔτε ἐμψύχου, οὔτε ἀψύχου πρὸς ἡδονῶν ἀπολαύσεις; οὐδὲ χρόνου, ἐν ᾧ ἐπὶ μακρότερον ἀπολαύσεις; οὐδὲ τόπου, ἢ χώρας, ἢ ἀέρων εὐκαιρίας, οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπων εὐαρμοστίας; ἀλλὰ ἀρκεσθήσῃ τῇ παρούσῃ καταστάσει, καὶ ἡσθήσῃ τοῖς παροῦσι πᾶσι, καὶ συμπείσεις σεαυτὴν, ὅτι πάντα σοι πάρεστι, πάντα σοι εὖ ἔχει. M. Ant. l. 10. S. 1. *Hoc cura, hoc opta, ut contentus ſis temetipſo, & ex te naſcentibus bonis. Quæ poteſt eſſe felicitas Deo propior?* Sen. Ep. 20.

(d) *Orig. C. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 366.

(e) *Sen. Excerpt.*

(f) *En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 15.

(g) *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 47. *l.* 2. *S.* 11.

(h) Εἰ μὲν ἥμαρτεν, ἐκεῖ τὸ κακόν. M. Ant. l. 9. S. 38.

Ἡ κακία οὐδὲν βλάπτει τὸν κόσμον. Ibid. l. 8. S. 35. Διέταξε δὲ [ὁ Διατάσσων] θέρος εἶναι ϗ χειμῶνα, ϗ φορὰν ϗ ἀφορίαν, ϗ ἀρετὴν ϗ κακίαν, ϗ πάσας τὰς τοιαύτας ἐναντιότητας ὑπὲρ συμφωνίας τῶν ὅλων. Epict. Diſſ. p. 119. Stearne de obſtin. p. 155. Gat. in Ant. p. 54, 348.

οων. *Wickedneſs doth not at all hurt the World.* Jupiter *hath ſo diſpos'd things, that there ſhould be Summer and Winter, Fertility and Sterility, Virtue and Wickedneſs, and all ſuch Contrarieties for the good and ſymphony of the Univerſe.* Nothing can be more extravagant than this Stoical Dogma; (*i*) that the worſt of Men do but act according to their Opinion, and are to be rectify'd, not deſtroyed. With this extravagance ſeveral of their Maxims ſymbolize, and are extravagant without due limitation. (*k*) *The Maxim is true of all that offend, it is againſt their Will. All Men miſs of the Truth againſt their Will.* Upon this Maxim (the unwillingneſs that all Men have to err) a *Polonian* Gentleman, Scholar to *Socinus*, founded his Dogma (which *Socinus* was not able to cure him of) *that there is no ſuch thing as Sin in the World.* Which delirous Conceit may fitly walk in company with theſe abſurd Singularities of the Stoicks. (*l*) *Nothing is hurtful to a part* (but good,) *which is for the good of the whole. What is not hurtful to the City, hurteth not a Citizen. Bad Men are neither affected with Benefits, nor have they any Benefactors, nor are they guilty of neglecting their Benefactors.*

(i) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(k) Ἀληθές ἐστι τὸ, πάντας ἄκοντας ἁμαρτάνειν. Epict. Diſſ. p. 375, 129. Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἄκουσα στέρεται τῆς ἀληθείας. M. Ant. l. 7. S. 63. Reynolds of the Paſſions. ch. 8.

(l) Οὐδὲν βλαβερὸν τῷ μέρει ὃ τῷ ὅλῳ συμφέρει. Ὃ τῇ πόλει οὐκ ἔστι βλαβερὸν, οὐδὲ τὸν πολίτην βλάπτει. M. Ant. l. 10 S. 6 & l. 5. S. 22. Οὐδὲ εὖ πάσχουσιν οἱ φαῦλοι, οὐδὲ εὐεργέτας ἔχουσιν, οὐδὲ εὐεργετῶν ἀμελοῦσιν. Plutarch. c. Stoic. p. 1058.

XV. The great imperfection of the Stoicks Inſtitution (which is alſo applicable to other Philoſophic-pagan Inſtitutions) appeareth from the groſs Immoralities wherein they liv'd; for they were not well diſciplin'd againſt the foul Vices of *Drunkenneſs, Uncleanneſs and irreligious Swearing.* (*m*) *Seneca* pleadeth for Drunkenneſs, (*n*) and *Zeno* practis'd it. Being ask'd at a Banquet why ſo Merry? (his Nature being ſevere,) he made anſwer; that *Lupines* though bitter, yet being well wetted become ſweet. In favour of Drunkenneſs he pronounc'd *that a lapſe of the Feet is not ſo bad as a lapſe of the Tongue. Zeno* liv'd in it, and *Chryſippus* dy'd by it; (*o*) for the drinking Trade brought the Vertigo upon him, which ended his days. The great *Hercules* (*p*) celebrated for a great Drinker (his Cup is alſo celebrated) is a Divine Man in the Stile of *Epictetus*'s Diſſertations; and *Cato* a Stoical wiſe Man of the firſt Form is of the ſame Character: But no Body muſt call his Drunkenneſs a Crime; for *it is eaſier* (ſaith *Seneca*,) *to make it no Crime* than *Cato* a *Criminal.* But as a Stoick is extravagant in his Suppoſition, (*q*) that he remaineth ſafe and unhurt ϗ οἰνωμένος ϗ ἐν μελαγχολίᾳ, *in Drink and in Melancholy*; that his Body may be in Drink as to all its Senſes and Powers, yet his Mind remain unprejudic'd (which is the meaning of that Maxim, *the Wiſe Man is liable to be inebriated, but not drunk:*) So it is a wild kind of Virtue, that is conſiſtent with ſo great a Vice, which is indeed all Vices in one; for Drunkenneſs is (as St. *Baſil* calleth it) κακίας μήτηρ, ἀρετῆς ἐναντίωσις, *the Mother of all Wickedneſs, a Repugnance to all true Virtue.* But theſe impure Pagans ſuppos'd, (*r*) *that there is a right and prudent uſe of Drunkenneſs, which contributeth to Virtue, and that it ought not to be extirpated from a well-govern'd City.* (*s*) Plato *forbiddeth Children to drink any Wine before they be Eighteen Years of Age, and to be drunk before they come to Forty. But to ſuch as have once attain'd the Age of Forty, he is content to pardon them, if they chance to delight themſelves with it, and alloweth them ſomewhat largely, to blend the influence of* Dionyſos *in their Banquets, that good God who beſtoweth chearfulneſs upon Men, and youth unto aged Men, who allayeth and aſſwageth the Paſſions of the Mind (even as Iron is made flexible by the fire,) and in his profitable Laws, drinking Meetings or quaffing Companies as neceſſary and commendable (always provided there be a chief Leader amongſt them, to contain and order them,) Drunkenneſs being a good and certain trial of every Man's Nature, and therewithal proper to give aged Men the courage to make merry in Dancing and in Muſick, things allowable and profitable, and ſuch as they dare not undertake being ſober and ſettled.* But in his *Sixth of Laws Plato* doth not allow drinking to Drunkenneſs ſave only in the Solemnities of that God who is the giver of Wine, being of the ſame Mind with the popular Pagans, who call'd their Feaſts after Vintage and Harveſt Θοῖναι q. Θεοῖναι, becauſe they ſuppos'd, that in Duty and to the Honour of the Gods they ought to be drunk. The Philoſophic Pagans were of no better a Religion than the Popular, and therefore (Symbolizing with them) were of ~~the~~ drinking kind of Men. Such was (*t*) *Anacharſis*, and the Prince of Philoſophic Pagan Saintiſts *Socrates* himſelf. (*u*) *He was not forward to drink at Banquets* (ſaith *Plato*,) *but when he was compell'd, he maſter'd all; and which is moſt to be wondred at, no Man ever ſaw* Socrates *drunk.*

(m) De Tranquill. An. c. ult.

(n) Lipſ. in loc.

(o) Laert in Chryſip.

(p) Macrob. Sat. l. 5. c. 21. Epict. Diſſ. p. 330.

(q) Ib. p. 222, 266.

(r) Procl. in Polit. p. 369.

( ) *Montaign Eſſays l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(*w*) *They ſay in this too* Socrates *the Wiſe*
And great in Vertue's Combats bare the Prize.

The reports of his garrulity and idle loquacity in his Cups (*x*) are not credible: But his Friends report, that he ſpent whole Nights in drinking. And a certain Author ſaith; (*y*) *the Greeks praiſe him exceedingly, that having ſpent a whole long Night drinking for Victory with* Ariſtophanes, *he was able at Day-break, to delineate and demonſtrate, a ſubtil Geometrical Problem, thereby ſhewing that the Wine had no noxious effect upon him.*

(t) *Plutarch. ſept. ſap. Conviv. p.* 156.

(u) *Lipſ. Manud. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 18.

(w) *Montaigne ſupra*

(x) *Theodoret.* Θεραπ. *Ser.* 12.

(y) *Galateus de moribus p.* 123.

Socrates acted the humour of *a great Lover* (an amorous Lover) mightily enamour'd upon Beauty, which was accounted a noble and Gentile quality in his time, when it was a Gentile Faſhion (and therefore forbidden to Slaves,) for Men to be the paſſionate amorous Lovers of Boys, and to have Boys their amorous Lovers. For although the Athenian Laws did forbid Boys, to *proſtitute* themſelves, or to be *proſtituted* by thoſe that had the Government of them, yet theſe maſculine Amours were creditable and in faſhion. But how far *Socrates* proceeded in them is uncertain, probably he went no further than by acting the humour of a great Lover (of beauty and of beauteous Boys,) to give occaſion to that proverbial Speech *Socratici Cinædi.* But it is certain, that amongſt the popular Pagans theſe maſculine Amours were (in leſſer or greater degree) unchaſt and impure; and the Philoſophic Pagans were uſually not more chaſt than the popular. Such Love of Boys as was at *Thebes, Elis* and in *Crete* is condemn'd (z) by *Plutarch*, who alloweth that which was at *Lacedæmon* and *Athens.* But how allowable the *Athenian Love of Boys* was, may

(z) *De Educ. Liber. p.* 11, 12.

be underſtood from a great Vindicator of the maſculine Amours of *Socrates*. (*a*) *Finding this Love-paſſion prevalent in other parts of* Greece *and chiefly at* Athens, *and that all was full of injurious Lovers and deceived Youths*, *Socrates* bethought himſelf of remedying the miſchiefs of this Love-paſſion, and would act the humour of a great amorous Lover of Youths. (*b*) *Go to* Socrates, *and ſee him lying with* Alcibiades *and eluding his* (tempting) *beauty. And bethink thy ſelf, what a Victory he underſtood himſelf to have obtain'd? What Olympicks? How little diſtant was he from* Hercules*? So that one may juſtly ſalute him, hail O wonderful!* If it was a wonderful thing, a mighty Victory, an Olympick, and an effect of Herculean ſtrength, for *Socrates* to reſtrain himſelf in lying with *Alcibiades*, it could be no ordinary thing, for Lovers to reſtrain themſelves in their accompanying with thoſe beauteous Youths (or Paramours,) for whom they had a violent burning Love-paſſion. They proceeded uſually to impure dalliance (at leaſt,) as may be argu'd from the inſtance of *Euripides*, (*c*) who being invited to a Banquet by King *Archelaus* became drunk, and in that mood kiſs'd the Poet *Agatho* (who ſate next him) then being Forty Years old. Whereupon the King ask'd him, if his Paramour was yet delectable? To which *Euripides* anſwer'd, that not only the Spring, but the *Autumn* of the Fair is delectable. But uſually in theſe maſculine Amours they proceeded alſo to the fouleſt impure mixtures For amongſt the *Cretians* (*d*) if they obtain'd the Boy whom they lov'd, they carry'd him into ſome Mountain or into their Fields and there banquetted for Sixty Days, and then ſent him Home. Which banquetting cannot rationally be ſuppos'd, to be deſign'd for any thing but the enjoyments of Luſt, (*e*) as the Apologiſt for *Socrates* calleth this Love-paſſion amongſt the Athenians; and accordingly the Athenian *Hierophanta* (*f*) thought himſelf unable to reſtrain τὰς ἀῤῥενικὰς ὀρέξεις, *his maſculine kind of Luſts.* The Origin of theſe maſculine Amours (as it is reported) was from Luſt. (*g*) *For they ſay, that* Laius *was firſt enamour'd on generous Youths, and took by rape* Chryſippus *the Son of* Pelops. *And from this amongſt the Thebans it ſeem'd one of the fine things, to be Lovers of beauteous Youths.* Some ſay, that *Orpheus* taught the *Thracians* the abuſe of Boys. Whether ſo or otherwiſe; it is manifeſt, (*h*) that *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Xenophon*, *Cebes*, *Cicero*, approv'd the maſculine Amours; and a fragment of *Bardeſanes* in *Euſebius* (*i*) mentioneth this as a ſingularity amongſt the Greeks; οἱ σοφοὶ ἐρωμένους ἔχοντες, οὐ ψέγονται, *the Philoſophers have their maſculine Paramours without diſgrace or reprehenſion.* It was they that wrote *Amatorious Dialogues* and Diſcourſes, which the Celeſtial *Venus* never inſpir'd. (*k*) *Socrates* and *Cato* communicated their Wives to their Friends. (*l*) *All manner of Inceſt, Adultery, and maſculine mixtures ſome of the ancient famous Philoſophers accounted things indifferent.* Some of the Stoicks befriend Chaſtity at an extraordinary rate, (*m*) commending chaſt Eyes, forbidding obſcene Speech, adviſing Men to be pure as much as may be from τὰ ἀφροδίσια, *the things venereous before Marriage* (yet agreeing with the popular Pagans, amongſt whom the Harlotry of ſimple Fornication was accounted no Crime, and which (*n*) almoſt all the great Philoſophers are known to have liv'd in:) But the generality of that Sect are prodigiouſly Paradoxical in their unchaſtities. (*o*) Teaching the Father to commit Inceſt with the Daughter, the Son with the Mother, and the Brother with the Siſter; (*p*) Men and Women to wear the ſame Garments, (*q*) that no Speeches are obſcene, and that every thing ſhould be called by its own Name, themſelves not ſcrupling the moſt immodeſt Actions. *Cicero* (*de Off.* 1.) would have the whole Sect of the *Cynicks* caſt out, as inimical to Modeſty and Shamefac'dneſs; for they had openly to do with their Wives (pretending, that Nature did not teach theſe things to be obſcene, but cuſtom,) and publickly perpetrated (as *Diogenes* is known to have done) their filthy χειρουργήματα. (*r*) *Zeno* was a Lover of Boys, made uſe of both Sexes, and ſware by *a Caper*, a laſcivious Vegetable, as *Socrates* ſware by a Dog, a laſcivious Animal. But it is not reaſonable to believe all that is ſaid (*s*) of his mulieroſity, (*t*) or of his maſculine Amours although his Enthuſiaſtic Temper was libidinous. *Socrates* hath had the happineſs of an Eloquent Apologiſt: But *Plato* is charged with unchaſtity by ſome of his greateſt Admirers and Followers. For *Philo* ſaith of his *Convivium*, (*u*) *the ſubject-matter of it is not the love of Men and Women, but the love of Men towards Boys*; and he doth not ſuppoſe, that *Plato* was a meer Platonic Lover, but by the Love of Boys he underſtandeth the foul maſculine mixtures. When it was objected to *Apuleius*, that his Love-verſes were not ſuitable to a Platonic Philoſopher, (*w*) he juſtifieth himſelf by *Plato*'s Practice and Example, *who hath no Verſes extant but Love-Verſes* upon the Boy *Aſter*, *Alexis*, *Phædrus* and *Dion*. If yet his unchaſtity may be thought dubious and uncertain, yet this is certain; (*x*) *Ficinus* changeth and omitteth part of the amatorious things in *Plato*'s *Charmides*, as offenſive to chaſt Ears. In his *Fifth de Rep.* (*y*) he will have young Souldiers that behave themſelves valiantly, gratify'd with the enjoyment of their Amours *whether Maſculine or Feminine.* Following *Lycurgus*'s Inſtitution *he will have Women expos'd naked to the Eyes of Men:* Tranſcending *Lycurgus*'s Inſtitution and the popular Pagans Impieties, *he aboliſheth Marriage and inſtituteth the Community of Women.* So the Founders of Stoiciſm *Zeno* and *Chryſippus* (*z*) *will have a Community of Wives amongſt the wiſe Men, that every one may have to do with the Woman which he firſt meeteth.* Ταῦτα νομοθετεῖ ἡ στοὰ, ſuch are the unpopular and irreligious Inſtitutes of the Stoical Philoſophy; which are partly to be attributed to the Spirit of Uncleanneſs predominant in the Philoſophic Pagans (inſomuch that *Lais* once laugh'd, to ſee more of the Philoſophers with her than of any other ſort of Men;) and partly to their croſs-grain'd unpopular Humour, expreſs'd by *Diogenes*, (*a*) who entering into the Theatre oppoſite to the People that were coming out, was ask'd why he did ſo? τοῦτο, ἔφη, παντὶ τῷ βίῳ ἐπιτηδεύω ποιεῖν, *This, ſaid he, I ſtudy to do through my whole Life.* But although the Philoſophers had a great Affectation, to difference themſelves from the popular Pagans, (*b*) yet theſe they tranſcend in the abſurdity of their Inſtitutes, the popular Pagan

Doctors

(a) Εὑρὼν τὸ πάθος ἐνακμάζον τῇ τε ἄλλῃ ἑλλάδι ϗ πολὺ μάλιστα ταῖς ἀθήναις, ϗ μεστὰ πάντα ἀδίκων ἐραστῶν ϗ μειρακίων ἐξηπατημένων, οἰκτείρας τοῦ πάθους. &c. M. Tyr. Diſſ. 9.

(b) Ἄπελθε πρὸς Σωκράτη, ϗ ἴδε αὐτὸν συγκατακείμενον Ἀλκιβιάδῃ, ϗ διαπαίζοντα αὐτοῦ τὴν ὥραν. Ἐνθυμήθητι οἵαν νίκην ποτὲ ἔγνω ἐκεῖνος νενικηκότα ἑαυτόν; οἷα ὀλύμπια, πόσος ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους ἐγένετο; ἵνα τις νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς δικαίως ἀσπάζηται αὐτόν, χαῖρε παράδοξε. Epict. Diſſ. p. 225, 226.

(c) *Ælian. var. Hiſt. l.* 13. *c.* 4.

(d) *Heraclides de politiis p.* 436.

(e) *M. Tyr. ſupr.*

(f) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 365.

(g) *Ælian. ſupr. c.* 5.

(h) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(i) *Pr. ev. l.* 6. *c.* 10.

(k) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 39.

(l) *Marſham. Can. Chron. p.* 172. *ed. Lipſ.*

(m) *M. Ant. l.* 3. *S.* 2. *Epict. Ench. c.* 47, 55.

(n) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 2. *S* 13. *cum Annot.*

(o) *Sext. Empir. Pyr. Hyp. l.* 3. *c.* 24, 25.

(p) *Laert. in Zeno.*

(q) *Cic. ad Pætum l.* 9. *Ep.* 22.

(r) *Laert. in Zeno.*

(s) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 185.

(t) *Theodoret. Serm.* 12.

(u) *De vit. contempl. p.* 615, 616. *ed. Gr. Par.*

(w) *Apol. p.* 455. *ed. Beroald.*

(x) *Argum. in Charm.*

(y) *J. Bapt. Criſp. Quin. prim. p.* 372, *&c.*

(z) *Laert. in Zeno.*

(a) *Idem in Diogen.*

(b) *S. Chryſoſt. in Act. Apoſt. 4. Hom. p.* 634

Doctors may at leaſt vie with them for ſound and laudable Morality, and one of the Poets thought he had reaſon to prefer *Homer* before them.

> *Qui quid ſit pulchrum, quid turpe, quid utile, quid non,*
> *Plenius & melius Chryſippo & Crantore dicit.*
> Horat.

The common and cuſtomary kind of *Swearing* whether by the Deity or by Creatures (all that Profane irreligious Swearing) Chriſtianity forbiddeth: But no Moral Philoſopher ever prohibited ſuch Swearing by the Creatures. *Socrates* ordinarily practis'd it (doubtleſs out of Reverence to the Gods) ſometimes Swearing by Animals, a Dog, a Gooſe, a Goat, and ſometimes by Plants, an *Oak* or a *Plane* Tree. (*c*) *Philo* (an Aſſociate of the Philoſophic Pagans) declaimeth againſt Swearing at a great rate, yet directeth to that mode of Swearing by the Creatures, which Chriſtianity forbiddeth. Nor is this the only defect in their Diſcipline touching Oaths; for being Separatiſts from the popular Pagans (whom they contemned at a great rate,) and no great Friends to their Civil Government, they were ſhy of the ſolemn judicial Oaths (which are of all other the moſt allowable and needful,) but made no ſcruple of idle criminal Swearing. *Clinias* the Pythagorean in a ſuit depending before the Judge, by taking a true and juſt Oath, might have freed himſelf from a Fine of three Talents: But he choſe rather, to pay the Mulct, than to take the Oath; ſo great a reſpect had theſe *Pythagoreans* for their own Philoſophic Inſtitution, and ſo little for Civil Government. For none can be ignorant, that they were not ſo ſhy of *Swearing by the Maſter of their Inſtitution*, as Religioniſts Swear by their God; (*d*) and *Hierocles* (who hath given many wiſe Cautions touching the uſe of Oaths connex'd with the Honour of the Gods) juſtifieth their Practice. Touching a ſolemn judicial Oath *Epictetus* ſaith, (*e*) *refuſe it altogether, if it be poſſible: If not, as much as may be*; yet himſelf ordinarily ſweareth in his Diſſertations, and ſometimes at an horrible rate. (*f*) ὀμνύω ὑμῖν πάντας θεὺς, *I Swear to you by all the Gods*. There is a Vein of Paganical Swearing that pervadeth the Writings of the Philoſophic Pagans, and of the Stoicks amongſt the reſt, which muſt be reckoned amongſt the blemiſhes of their Inſtitution. But although their Inſtitution hath its foul blemiſhes, yet it muſt be acknowledg'd, that their Writings (ſuch as remain) are of great uſe, and ought to be of great value in the Church of God; that the true Lovers of Virtue and Piety may with great Profit be converſant in their Philoſophy (without an undue confounding things and making it of one piece with the Chriſtian Religion;) and that *Epictetus* deſerveth the honourary Epithet, which *Simplicius* hath given him, ὁ θαυμάσιος, *the wonderful Epictetus*.

XVI. We have repreſented an Idea of the Pythagoric, Platonic and Stoical Inſtitutions, but have (almoſt wholly) overlook'd the *Ariſtotelian*; partly, becauſe it is well known, and chiefly becauſe the conſideration of it is not requiſite *for curing the Vice of criminal Philoſophic-paganizing*. Unleſs it falleth into the Hands of ſuch a Preacher, as *Melancthon* ſaith, he heard, who took his Text for his Sermon out of *Ariſtotle's Ethicks*, it is not capable of being abuſed to the Prejudice of *the Sanctity and Divinity of the Inſtitutes* of the Chriſtian Religion. *Philo* ſaith, (*g*) *Ariſtotle was not piouſly and holily learned.*

(c) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pelag. l.* 5. *Par.* 2. *Antitheſ.* 1. *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 34.

(d) *In aur. car. p.* 33, 34.

(e) *Ench. c.* 44.

(f) *p.* 301.

(g) Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ μήποτ᾽ εὐσεβῶς καὶ ὁσίως ἐπιστάμενος. Περὶ Ἀφθαρ. κόσμ. p. 645. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

BOOK

BOOK II.

An Idea of the Pagans Imperial Polity according to the Scriptures.

CHAP. I.

1. The firſt Agreement between the Scriptural and Pagan Theology touching the Deſignation, Conſtitution and Adminiſtration of the World by a governing Providence. 2. Their Agreement, that Providence is Parental of the Animal-Family. 3. Their Agreement, that Providence is of Parental Goodneſs to the Animal-Family. 4. Their Agreement touching Governing Providence, that the Univerſe of things is His, and of the ſeveral Notions wherein they are ſo. 5. The firſt Illuſtration of this Attribute. 6. A ſecond Illuſtration of it. 7. A third Illuſtration of it. 8. A fourth Illuſtration of it. 9. A fifth Illuſtration of it. 10. A ſixth Illuſtration of it. 11. Of a Theological ſtate of Nature. 12. Of the ſtate of Mankind in it.

I. THE *Pagans* (Religious) *Imperial Polity according to the Scriptures* implieth, that the Scriptural and Pagan Theology (being the Theologies of two oppoſite Kingdoms) are like the Pythagoric Letter Y, which for a good part of it is one only Line, but at length divideth it ſelf into two oppoſite parts. So they that compare theſe two Theologies, are like a Man, that for a good ſpace travelleth in one great Road, but at length he cometh to a place, *parteis ubi ſe via findit in ambas.* The Scriptural and the Pagan Theology at length part with great diſagreement; but for a good ſpace there is great Conſonance and Agreement between them. For in *the firſt* place; Theſe two Theologies agree *touching the Deſignation and Conſtitution of this World, as alſo the Inſpection and Adminiſtration of things in it by a Governing Providence.*

By *Providence* I mean *an Eternal Being as provident touching the World*, or preſiding intelligent Mind (which is governing in a large ſenſe, becauſe preſiding) the oppoſite to the Theoretic Atheiſm of *blind Nature, Chance* or αὐτοματισμοῖς, *that things of themſelves are as they are.* In this latitude of Senſe governing Providence is conſiderable in a threefold Notion. (1.) As *deſigning the World* and deſtinating its emergent Events. So the Stoicks ſay, (*h*) *Cogitavit nos ante Natura quàm fecit, Nature thought of us, before ſhe made us.* And becauſe they ſuppos'd, that emergent Events were deſign'd Fatalities, their Providence was call'd by their Adverſaries, (*i*) *Fatidica Anus, their fatidical Old Woman.* (2.) As *conſtituting* the World, forming the Matter and ſettling the Laws of Mundane Nature. So *Plotinus* ſaith, (*k*) ἐτάχθη τὸ πᾶν προνοίᾳ στρατηγικῇ, *the World was conſtituted by an Army-leading Providence*, which juſt Events follow. (3.) As *inſpecting the conſtituted World and adminiſtring* Affairs in it. So the Pagan Theologers are Aſſerters, (*l*) ἑνὸς λόγου τοῦ ταῦτα κοσμοῦντος, καὶ μιᾶς προνοίας ἐπιτροπευούσης, *of one Reaſon making an Ornamental Conſtitution of this Univerſe of things, and of one Providence adminiſtring them.* Agreeably to theſe Paganical Notices of *governing Providence* the Scripture-Theology repreſenteth God as *the Eternal Arbiter and Diſpoſer of things, provident concerning us before the World was*; ſtileth the Acts of his Sovereign All-diſpoſing Will touching what he will do himſelf, and what ſhall be done by or unto others, *his Thoughts, Pleaſure, Mind, Decrees, Counſel, Will, Purpoſe, Fore-determinations*; and deriveth the Creation of the World from his ſovereign good pleaſure, *who worketh all things after the Counſel of his own Will*, Apoc. 4. 11. And as the Platoniſts divide the Univerſe (*m*) εἰς οὐρανὸν καὶ γένεσιν, *into Heaven and this Region of Generation*, the Popular Pagans diſtribute it into Heaven and Earth (the one the ſupernal illuſtrious part, the other the infimous and ignoble) *which is the ancient Diviſion*, ſaith *Varro:* So the Holy Scriptures (to denote, that God is the Founder of the whole Univerſe) uſually celebrate Him as *the Creator of Heaven and Earth and of all things therein contained.* The Scripture-Theology and the Pagan agree, (*n*) that they are Impudent and Senſeleſs, that have a Face to gainſay, but no Wit to diſcern Deity and Providence; and that the Stoical Maxim underſtood of ſuch Fools is no Paradox, *omnes ſtulti inſaniunt, all Fools are mad.* For the ordinary Phænomena of our World, of *Motion, Plants, Animals, the Origination of Mankind, of the Sea, Moon, Earth, the Situation of the Earth, the viciſſitudes of Nights and Days, and the Seaſons of the Year,* (*o*) καθάπερ παρθένοι τινὲς χορεύουσαι ἐν κύκλῳ, *like certain Maidens dancing in a round*, proclaim the ſuperintendency of Providence in its Conſtitution. And as the Pagan Theologers demonſtrate a governing Providence (*p*) from the conſent of Mankind, (*q*) the Phænomena of Humane Nature, (*r*) the artificial Contrivance and wiſe Adaptation of things to one another in this lower Region, and becauſe they are manifeſtly deſign'd for *End, Uſe or Utility (one of theſe Productions is enough to impreſs upon a modeſt and grateful Man a ſenſe of Providence,* ſaith *Epictetus:)* So the holy Writers devotionally contemplate the Furniture of this Earthly Stage, and the adorable Attributes of God reſplendent in its *Beauty, Uſefulneſs, Curioſity of Artifice, Plenitude and vaſt Variety. O Lord, how manifold are thy Works! in Wiſdom haſt thou made them all; the Earth is full of thy Riches;* Pſal. 104. 24. The ſame Providence that founded this lower World, continueth in Government (for what can diſplace it?) inſpecting all things, ordering, guiding, adminiſtring Affairs, and ſo ordering them as is moſt Wiſe and Juſt, and ſo as is the beſt, all things conſider'd, and ſo as to fulfil his own Counſels, and ſo as is moſt for the good of his People (yet ſo that the ſettled Laws of Nature are not ordinarily violated, much alſo is left to the Will of Satan and the Will of Man,) and ſo as to be ordinarily a Con-

ſervator,

(h) *Sen. de Benef.* 6. 23.

(i) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 11.

(k) *En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(l) *Pluta. de Iſid. p.* 377.

(m) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 24.

(n) *Epict. Diſſ. p.* 125.

(o) *S. Chryſoſt.* Ἀνδριαντ. θ.

(p) *Sen. Ep.* 117.

(q) *Cic. de N. D. l.* 2.

(r) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 6. & 16. *Xenophon.* 4. *Apomn. p.* 466.

Prov. 15. 3. 29. 6. *Exod.* 21. 13. *Dan.* 2. 21. *Pſal* 66. 7. 67. 4. *Deut.* 32. 4. *Iſa.* 46. 10. *Rom.* 8. 28. *Nehem.* 9. 6. *Job* 14. 5, 38, 41.

ſervator, *Curator* and *Guardian*, *Proviſor*, *Protector*, and immenſe *Benefactor* to the World. *The Lord is good to all, and his tender Mercies are over all his Works*, Pſal. 145. 9.

II. The Scripture-Theology and the Pagan agree, *That Providence is Parental of and to the Animal Family, this World of living Creatures, eſpecially Mankind.* The production of them into Life was *a Parental Act*, and conſtituteth a Father, (s) διαφέρει γὰρ πατὴρ τε ποιητοῦ καὶ γεννήσεως ποίησις· ἐμψύχου γένεσις ἡ γέννησίς ἐστι. *Generation is the production of that which is Animate: For a Father differeth from an Opificer, and making from generating.* Generation may be taken in as large a Senſe as Production, (accordingly we read of *the Generations of the Heavens and of the Earth*, Gen. 2. 4.) and in ſuch latitude of ſenſe God may be ſtil'd (as he is intituled in *J. Mart.*) πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων, *the Father of all.* But the Interpreters of *Ariſtotle* obſerve, (t) that there can be no mutual love but amongſt *Perceptive Vitaliſts*, nor a proper Parental Relation, and therefore no proper Parental Generation on this ſide the Generation of an Animal. Such a Vital Production is a (plenary or partial) proper Parental Generation, and therefore judicious Naturaliſts treating of Animals (u) have ſtiled the Supreme Creator *their Progenitor.* So the Pagan Theologers in their uſual definition of God repreſent Animals as ally'd to the Deity, and a Progeny thereof; for they define God, *Animus per omnes mundi partes commeans atque diffuſus, ex quo omnia quæ naſcuntur Animalia, vitam capiunt: A Mind pervading and diffus'd through all parts of the World, from whom all Animals that are born, have their Life.* The Poet repreſents them as the progeny of the Deity at a great rate (w).

His quidam ſignis atque hæc exempla ſecuti,
Eſſe apibus partem divinæ mentis & hauſtus
Ætherios dixere. Deum namque ire per omneis
Terraſque tractuſque maris, cœlumque profundum.
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum
Quemque ſibi tenueis naſcentem arceſſere vitas.

From theſe Examples ſome there are maintain,
That Bees deſcend from a Celeſtial Strain,
And Heavenly Race. They ſay, The Deity
Is mix'd through Earth, the Sea and lofty Sky.
Hence Men and Beaſts, both wild and tame derive,
And whatſoe'er by breathing Air ſurvive.

To this Branch of the Pagan Theology the Apoſtle hath reſpect in his celebrated Diſcourſe to the *Athenians*, wherein he affirmeth theſe *four* things.

Firſt, He affirmeth, that Mankind are *the Off-ſpring of God* upon a Reaſon common to them with the whole Animal World, (yet ſo that Mankind in this tranſcend other Animals, they are peculiarly the reſembling Off-ſpring of God) *becauſe we are a vital production of the Deity*, who is the Author of Life to all the Animal-Family: *Act.* 17. 25. *He giveth to all Life, and Breath, and all things*; v. 28. *we are his Off-ſpring.* So *Arnobius* repreſenteth the Apoſtle's Senſe. (x) *Our locomotive Faculty, our Breath and our Life, doth it not come from him to us? and is it not his doing, that we have that force which Life is, and are mov'd with Animal Agitation?* The Production of the firſt *Adam* (call'd the Son of God) is expreſs'd in terms, which ſignifie nothing more than *Zoogony*, Gen. 2. 7. 1 Cor. 15. 45. *God breathed into his Noſtrils the Breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul* (that is, he became Animate, for whatever is Animate, is a living Soul,) which implieth, that *Zoogony*, *the putting our Soul in Life* (Pſal. 66. 9.) is a ſort of Parental Generation. The term מְרַחֶפֶת alſo *Gen.* 1. 2. if it ſignifieth *ſpreading the Wings for Incubation*, implieth, that the production of the Animal World is anſwerable to the Parental Generation of Birds, who firſt produce the Egg, and then hatch the *Fœtus*; for Providence having produc'd the Mundane Matter, (y) *cheriſh'd and imbu'd with prolific Virtue the Nature of the Waters, after the manner of a Bird hatching Eggs, and imparting a vital virtue to what ſhe ſitteth over.*

A *Second* thing the Apoſtle affirmeth; *That we* (and the reſt of Animals) *have our Subſiſtence within the Amplitude and Embraces of Parental Providence.* Act. 17. 27, 28. *He is not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being:* Where it is not the Apoſtle's Intention to ſay, that we have our Subſiſtence within the amplitude of the Divine Eſſence, as his Words are commonly miſtaken (ſo Hell it ſelf hath its Subſiſtence;) but that we live, and move, and have our being within the Amplitude and in the Boſom of *Parental Providence*, whoſe Progeny and Off-ſpring we are (thoſe words demonſtrate, that the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of Parental Providence,) and which is daily a loving helpful Benefactor to us. Agreeably to the Apoſtle's Senſe *Minucius Fœlix* may be underſtood; (z) *Non ſolum in oculis ejus, ſed & in ſinu vivimus, We do not only live in his Eyes, but alſo in his Boſom*, where we are tenderly nouriſh'd and ſuſtain'd.

A *third* thing the Apoſtle affirmeth; *that the Poets* (the Popular-Pagan Doctors) *have taught very true Doctrine* (not touching their God, but) *concerning God, and that common mundane parental Providence which he is.* It is true Natural Theology, to ſay of *Zeus*, *Deus or God* (which are Synonyma's, and therefore *Virgil* in the Verſes above cited rendreth *Aratus*'s *Zeus*, *Deus*) with a Grecanic Poet, τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν, *for we are his Off-ſpring.* And

Χαῖρε πάτερ μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειαρ.
Hail, O Father, the great wonder, the great utility to Mankind!

The Popular Pagans were ſo far right in their Theology, they acknowledg'd a God, and by that Name they meant, *One that is inviſible, that pervadeth the World and is a Mundane Parental Providence*, which implieth ſeveral Divine Attributes before-mention'd. Theſe being truly Divine Attributes, and this in great meaſure a right Idea, *Aratus*'s Doctrine is both in Terms (for in ſaying, that we are *Zeus*'s Off-ſpring, the Poet doth ſay, that we are the Off-ſpring τοῦ Θεοῦ, *of God*, thoſe terms being ſynonymous) and alſo in great degree of Senſe and Notion the very ſame with S. *Paul*'s; but this will not infer, that the Popular Pagans *Coſmical Zeus* and the true God muſt be confounded and identify'd. For theſe truly Divine Attributes and this conſiderably right (yet criminally defective) Idea may not be attributed to that Being, which really is them, but to ſuch an Ideal Being, which is not of kind and quality the true God, which was the caſe of the Heathen Religioniſts, as will be hereafter diſcours'd.

(s) *Plut. Qu. Platon.* p. 1001.

(t) *Conimbric. in l.* 1. *Ariſt. de Gen. & Cor. c.* 4. *Qu.* 10.

(u) *Harv. de Gen. Anim. Exercit.* 49.

(w) *Virg. Georg. l.* 4.

Ogilby's Tranſlat. p. 116.

(x) *Non quod incedimus, quod ſpiramus & vivimus, ab eo ad nos venit, vique ipſa vivendi efficit nos eſſe, & animali agitatione motari?* Adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 16.

(y) Συνέθαλπε καὶ ἐζωογόνει τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν, κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωαζούσης ὄρνιθος, καὶ ζωτικήν τινα δύναμιν ἐνιείσης τοῖς ὑποθαλπομένοις. S. *Baſil. in Hexaem. Hom.* 2.

(z) P. 319.

A *fourth* thing the Apoſtle implicitly affirmeth (in his Diſcourſe with the *Athenians*;) *that the true God is the true Zeus*, as that Name ſignifieth, (a) αἰτία τοῖς ζῶσι τοῦ ζῆν, *the cauſe of Life to thoſe Beings that live*; and that the honourary Attributes of the Coſmical Zeus belong to that Mundane Parental Providence, which he is. Such as *Juvans Pater*, *Helping Father*, φίλος πατὴρ, *Friend-Father*, *the beginning of all things*, *Progenitor*, *King*, *Saviour*, *giver of Rain*, *calmer of Weather* (Serenator,) *Opulent*, *Fecund*, *Liberal*, *Benign*, *Placable*, *Provident*, and thoſe in *Aratus* and in *Cleanthes*'s Hymn.

——— ——— (b) Ὁ δ᾽ ἤπιος ἀνθρώποισι
Δεξιὰ σημαίνει, λαοὺς δ᾽ ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει
Μιμνήσκων βιότοιο· λέγει δ᾽ ὅτε βῶλος ἀρίστη
Βουσί τε καὶ μακέλῃσι. λέγει δ᾽ ὅτε δεξιαὶ ὧραι
Καὶ φυτὰ γυρῶσαι, καὶ σπέρματα πάντα βαλέσθαι.
(c) Ἀλλὰ Ζεῦ πάνδωρε, κελαινεφὲς, ἀρχικέραυνε,
Ζεὺς φύσεως Ἀρχηγὲ, νόμου μετὰ πάντα κυβερνῶν
Χαῖρε. Σὲ γὰρ πᾶσι θέμις θνητοῖσι προσαυδᾶν,
Ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν.——— ———

So kind to Men, to ſhew them what is good
For Human Life, to mind them of their Food,
To rouze them to their Work, to teach them Skill,
With Plough-ſhare and with Ox the Ground to till,
To ſhew them by the Stars, when they ſhould Plow,
When Seaſon is to plant, and when to ſow.
Hail, Jove! *vaſt Nature's Prince, All-donor,*
Condenſer of black Clouds, the Thunderer,
Ruling * *by Law the Machine of the World,*
Which elſe into a Chaos would be hurl'd,
Of right we thee addreſs, though Mortal Men,
For we thine Off-ſpring are, and near of kin.

To this Mundane Parental Providence which pervadeth the World, and repleniſheth it with the Animal-vital Goods, the Attributes of the Goddeſs *Iſis* (in *Apuleius*) manifeſtly belong; namely, *The Parent of things*, *the origin of the Fruits of the Earth*, *the perpetual Savioureſs of Mankind*, *that hath a Motherly Affection for the Miſerable*, *the Mother of the Stars*, *Parent of Times*, *Lady of the whole World*, *Lady of all the Elements*, *Queen of the Seas*, *by whoſe beck the Rivers flow*, *the Seeds ſprout out*, *the Plants grow*, *the Illuminatreſs of the Sun*, *the Mitigatreſs of the Tempeſts of Fortune*, *and Multimammia*, *full of Breaſts*, which Name ſignifieth, that *ſhe is the bounteous Nouriſher of all living Creatures*.

III. For Providence which is Parental or Generative of Animals, is alſo Parental to the Animal-Family in goodneſs of Diſpoſition and acts of Beneficence. The Frame and Structure of their Bodies, their different Sexes, their places of abode, and the admirable Inſtincts and Sagacities wherewith they are endow'd, demonſtrate a Parental Care and Solicitude in Providence for their welfare. And in the viſible World things are contriv'd and fram'd as they are (there is a viciſſitude of Night and Day, and of the Seaſons of the Year, and the Earth is invelop'd with fluid Air) upon this account and for this general reaſon, *becauſe it was requiſite for the well-being of the Animal-Family, that they ſhould be ſo.* And ſo *Socrates* in *Xenophon* pronounceth; (d) *That the whole Univerſe is the Artifice of an Opificer, that is wiſe and a lover of Animals.* Next to the *making* Providence in the Creation took care for *maintaining* the Animal-Family, and became (e) *their Nurſing-Father* (τροφεὺς) ſo liberally providing all Accommodations for the Life of Man and of all Animals, (f) *that Providence may ſeem Epicurean*, and this lower World (a vaſt Store-houſe of all manner of Goods delightful to the Senſes) may ſeem deſign'd to be the Senſualiſts Paradiſe. The ſame Parental Providence which founded it, continueth an immenſe overflowing Goodneſs to it (as to Animal Senſitive Nature and the Goods thereof,) covering with its Wings, incircling in its Arms, cheriſhing in its Boſom this World of living Creatures, diſpenſing Benefits to them with a liberal hand according to their ſeveral Capacities, *The Animal-Family ſwimmeth in an Ocean of Parental Bounty.* Pſal. 36. 5, 6, 7. *Thy Mercy, O Lord, is in the Heavens, and thy Faithfulneſs reacheth unto the Clouds. Thy Righteouſneſs* (Beneficence) *is like the great Mountains, thy Judgments* (God's providential Doings or Adminiſtrations are call'd his Judgments, becauſe they are what he judgeth fit to do) *are a great Deep: O Lord, thou preſerveſt Man and Beaſt. How excellent is thy loving-kindneſs, O God; therefore the Children of Men put their truſt under the ſhadow of thy Wings*, as Chickens under the covert of the Mother's Wings; *Act.* 14. 16, 17. *Who in times paſt ſuffer'd all Nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheleſs he left not himſelf without witneſs, in that he did good and gave us Rain from Heaven, and fruitful Seaſons, filling our Hearts with Food and Gladneſs.* Pſal. 65. 9, 10, 11. *Thou viſiteſt the Earth and watereſt it: thou greatly enricheſt it with the River of God, which is full of Water. Thou prepareſt them Corn, when thou haſt ſo provided for it. Thou watereſt the Ridges thereof abundantly, thou ſettleſt the Furrows thereof; thou makeſt it ſoft with Showers, thou bleſſeſt the ſpringing thereof. Thou crowneſt the Year with thy Goodneſs, and thy Paths* (the Clouds) *drop Fatneſs.* Luk. 12. 24. *Conſider the Ravens, for they neither ſow nor reap, which neither have Store-houſe nor Barn; and God feedeth them.* Pſal. 104. 21. *The young Lions roar after their Prey, and ſeek their Meat from God.* Pſal. 136. 25. *Who giveth Food to all Fleſh, for his Mercy endureth for ever.* Matth. 10. 29. *Are not two Sparrows ſold for a Farthing? and one of them ſhall not fall to the Ground without your Father*; that is, without the regard of Parental Providence. Parental Providence maketh proviſion for, and a diſtribution of Food and Suſtenance to, all the Animals of the Earth and Air, and therefore is like a great Houſekeeper diſtributing Food to his Charge and Family. *Pſal.* 145. 15, 16. and 104. 27,—30. *Theſe wait all upon thee, that thou mayeſt give them their Meat in due ſeaſon. That thou giveſt them they gather; thou openeſt thine Hand, they are fill'd with good. Thou hideſt thy Face, they are troubled: thou takeſt away their Breath, they die, and return to their Duſt. Thou ſendeſt forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou reneweſt the Face of the Earth.* The *Pſalmiſt* repreſenteth the Animal World as ſometimes in a ſtate of Deſertion; for in a time of Famine or Peſtilential Putrefaction of the Earth and Air, and in an hard Winter (which may happen in the courſe of Nature, and according to thoſe Laws that are ſettled in it) Parental Providence withdraweth; but by that *vivificative virtue* which is in Mundane Nature, or which is diſpens'd in the courſe of Providence (which the Pſalmiſt calleth God's Spirit) the World of Animals reviveth again; and not they only, but univerſal Nature re-flouriſheth, and by the influence of Parental Providence *the Graſs and Lilies of the Field* are cloathed with pompous Array; *Matth.* 6. 28, 29. To this vivificative virtue which is in Nature (in the ſeminal Principles of things) or is diſpens'd by Providence Mankind owe their original: *Pſal.* 113. 9. *He maketh the barren Woman to keep Houſe, and to be a joyful Mother of Children.* A Providence of ſuch a Character, which the Scripture-Theology every where celebrateth as vaſtly kind and charitable, good and bounteous to the World of Living Creatures, caring and providing for them, tending, nurſing and guarding them, muſt be look'd upon as a Parental Providence to the Animal-Family, and more eſpecially to Mankind, agreeably to what the Pagan Religioniſts in *Plutarch* ſay; (g) *Not* Typhons *or* Titans, *but the Father of Gods and Men reigneth.* Providence indeed might ſeem unkind to Man in producing ferine and rapacious Animals, if Man was not (h) *more pernicious to Man than all Ferine Animals.* Nor ought Mankind, to think it a blemiſh in Providence, that certain Animals are *wild*, ſeeing themſelves are of their Foot-mark and Fraternity.

(a) *Phornut. de Nat. Deor.* p. 4.

(b) *Arat. Phænom.* p. 1.

(c) *Cleanth. ap. Stephan. Poeſ. Philoſ.* p. 49.

* Νόμος μὲν πάντα κρατύνει. *All things in nature are done by a certain Law.* Hippocrates de Genitura, Initio.

(d) Ὅλον τὸ πᾶν σοφοῦ τινος καὶ φιλοζώου δημιουργοῦ τὸ τέχνημα.

(e) *Euſeb. pr. Ev.* l. 4. c. 21.

(f) *Cic. de N. D.* l. 2.

(g) *In vit. Pelopid.*

(h) *Sen. Ep.* 167.

IV. Touching Governing Providence the Scripture-Theology and the Pagan agree, *that the Univerſe of things is His in various Senſes.* For they are *His Aſcriptively*, in an honourary Senſe; and they are *His in a twofold Common-Law Senſe*

as being His (property) *ſimply and without addition,*
and, as being His with this addition, as being his Servants.

(1.) They are *Aſcriptively His in an honourary Senſe*, becauſe they are matter of Aſcription to his Honour, of right they are devotionally to be aſcrib'd to him, as the original Author, (whoſe doing and handywork they are) and the free Donor of all: which is a principal mode of doing *Honour* to God, an eminent Branch of *Juſtice* and *Gratitude* in Man, and a due mode of *humbling* and *abaſing* our ſelves, the oppoſite to *Arrogance* and *Self-aſſuming*. In this devotional ſtrain the Pſalmiſt uſually celebrateth the Deity. *Pſal.* 74. 16, 17. *The Day is thine, the Night alſo is thine, thou haſt prepared the Light and the Sun, thou haſt ſet all the Borders of the Earth, thou haſt made Summer and Winter.* Pſal. 89. 11, 12. *The Heavens are thine, the Earth alſo is thine; as for the World and the fulneſs thereof thou haſt founded them, the North and the South thou haſt created them.* Tabor *and* Hermon *ſhall rejoyce in thy Name; that is, they ſhall rejoyce in thee as their beneficent Founder.* 1 Chron. 29. 11, 12, 14. *Thine, O Lord, is the Victory —— both Riches and Honour come of thee —— in thine Hand it is to make great, and to give ſtrength unto all —— for all things come of thee, and of thine Hand have we given thee.* So the Hebrew hath it; but our Tranſlation rightly rendreth it, *of thine own have we given thee*; for what is of his Hand, is *originally and aſcriptively his.* In this Notion the words of God may be underſtood, *Job* 41. 11. where he ſetteth forth his *Primacy, Independency*, and *Supremacy* of Condition, that this whole comprehenſion of things is of his *Ordination* and *Appointment*, of his *Sufficiency* and *fulneſs of Goods*, of his *original Bounty* (for none are before-hand with him,) of his *abſolutely diſoblig'd* but *infinitely obliging Beneficence*, and therefore this All is *originally* and *aſcriptively* His: *Who hath prevented me that I ſhould repay him? Whatſoever is under the whole Heaven is mine.* In this Notion the Father ſaith, (k) *Dei eſt omne quod poſſumus, inde vivimus, inde pollemus:* (l) *In nullo gloriandum, quando noſtrum nihil ſit: Our Life and Strength and all that we can do is of God; nothing is to be gloried in, ſeeing nothing is ours*; not our Body, or Mind, natural Endowments or acquir'd Accompliſhments, or any Accommodations of Life: They are *aſcriptively* and *imputatively* His, that made them and that gave them (immediately or mediately) who is the total Author of all the Goods of Man; 1 Cor. 4. 7. *What haſt thou that thou didſt not receive? now if thou didſt receive it, why doſt thou glory, as if thou hadſt not receiv'd it?* The vice of *Self-glorriation* maketh an enormous *Self-aſcription* both of Good and of Honour upon the account of it (as if theſe things were originally and aſcriptively ours,) which is nothing better than *Self-deifying*, and therefore *Athe-iſm* and *Antithe-iſm*; as is viſible in thoſe great Inſtances of Atheiſtical Self-aſcription, (m) which the Scripture remarketh in Secular Bravo's and Haughty Mundane Monarchs, of whom *Luther* ſaith, (n) *I am of Opinion, that Monarchies would far longer continue, if the Monarchs omitted this one Pronoun I.* All Irreligious *Self-aſcriptions* are of kin to the Atheiſtic Rants and rude Impieties of an *Engliſh* Phyſician, who reproach'd and beat his Patient for thanking God that he was well; *when it was I that cur'd you* (ſaid he) *do you thank God for it?* So a rude Countryman, who having a rich Crop of Corn upon his Ground, when his Neighbour exhorted him to thank God for it, anſwer'd, *nay rather thank my Dung-Cart.* (*o*) But (in their way devoutly) the Pagans aſcribe their Soul, Body, Life, Sences, the Fruits of the Earth and the Goods of Life, their Virtue and Victory over Inteſtine Foes, to the Divine Beneficence; as alſo their Victories over External Enemies, conſecrating the beſt of the Spoil (ἀκρόλεια) to the God that was ſuppos'd to give them the Victory. They look'd upon the Gods as (δωτῆρες ἐάων) the Donors of their Goods, (*p*) the Supreme Deity as the Donor of all, (*q*) and their Sacrifices, as alſo their Libations at Meals, were honourary Aſcriptions to their Deities, and grateful acknowledgments of their Beneficence. Although much of Bravado was intermix'd with the Philoſophers Piety, yet in this manner one of them (ready to leave the World) ſpeaketh to the Supreme Deity. (*r*) *I give thee thanks for thy Gifts; the time that I have had the uſe of thy things is ſufficient for me; for all things were thine, thou gaveſt them to me.*

(k) S. Cypr. p. 2.

(l) Idem Teſtim. 3.

(m) *Iſa.* 10,13. 37, 25. *Ezek.* 28,6.25,3. *Dan.*4.30. *Hab.*1.16.

(n) *In Pſal.* 127.

(o) *M. Ant. l.*12. *S.*26. *Epict. Diſſ. p.*127, 247. 388.

(p) *M. Ant. l.*10. *S.*14.

(q) *Porph. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 14.

(r) Χάειν ἔχω ὧν ἔδωκας. ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ἐχρησάμην τοῖς σοῖς ἀρκεῖ μοι. σὰ γὰρ ἦν πάντα. σύ μοι αὐτὰ δέδωκας. Epict. Diſſ. p. 416.

(2.) This all is His in another Notion, in an uſual *Common-Law Senſe*, as *being his* (property) *ſimply and without addition*, which denominateth Him *the Owner and Superiour Proprietor of all.* The Owner of things or perſons is *the rightful Poſſeſſour and Diſpoſer of them in his own right.* For in Common-Law we are look'd upon as the owners of Money, Land or Goods, *if theſe things are matter of proper right to us, and This be in our own right*, not in another's, as it is with thoſe things that are mutuatitious and alienable without our conſent. What is committed to our cuſtody (*depoſitum*) we rightly poſſeſs; what is lent us (*mutuum*) we rightly poſſeſs and uſe; but not in our own right. He that maketh a Steward, maketh an *Officer*, not an *Owner*. If Land be demis'd to us, during the term (performing the Condition) we have right to the Poſſeſſion, Uſe and Fruits, the *Uſufructuary* is Owner of the Fruits, but is not the *Landlord*. In a *Mortgage* the property of the Land is transferr'd upon Condition only, is capable of a Defeiſance, and may be made void without our conſent, *the right of Property* is not in us, which is defin'd by *jus alienandi the right of alienating* (s) according to *Ariſtotle*; and his definition may ſerve well enough for Human right of Property: But no ſuch right of Property is competible to God; who yet hath right to *claim, poſſeſs, enjoy and diſpoſe of things and Perſons in his own right*, and therefore is *a proper Owner*. Such an Owner of Land (in reſpect of Men) was *Ananias*, Act. 5. 4. *Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was ſold, was it not in thine own power?* He that poſſeſſeth and diſpoſeth of things in his own Right, is no *Truſtee* or *Accomptant*, and therefore (if he is a meer Owner, Lord or Proprietor) may diſpoſe of them at Diſcretion and Pleaſure, according to the Law-maxim (*Quilibet eſt Arbiter & moderator rei ſuæ*,) and as our Saviour argueth *Matth.* 20. 15. *Is it not lawful for me, to do what I will with mine own?* Such Owners of Human Goods the Gods are, as the Pagan Theologers ſuppoſe; for they teach us, when any of them is taken away, (t) not to ſay, ὅτι ἀπώλεσα αὐτὸ, *I have loſt it*; ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀπέδωκα, *but I have reſtor'd it to the Owners.* Uſually they oppoſe τὸ ἴδιον, *proprium* to that which is *mutuatitious and alienable* without our Conſent; as in that of *Terence*. (u)

Ego vitam Deorum propterea ſempiternam eſſe
arbitror,
Quòd voluptates eorum propriæ ſunt.
I ſuppoſe the Life of the Gods, is therefore ſempiternal, becauſe their Pleaſures
Are their own, not mutuatitious and alienable.

But of Human external Goods they ſay, (w) *Nihil eſſe in vita proprium mortali datum. Man hath nothing in this Life, but what is mutuatitious and alienable. Quicquid eſt cui Dominus inſcriberis, apud te eſt, tuum non eſt. Whatſoever thou art called Lord of, is only in thy Poſſeſſion, it is not thine.* They ſuppoſe the goodly ſpecious things of Human Life, are not *Gift* properly (at leaſt not plenarily) but Lone; and agreeably to the Scripture-Theology they ſtile us *Procuratours*, that have the charge of, and adminiſter the Buſineſs and Goods of others. So *Euripides* repreſenteth the Gods as the Proprietors of Human Goods.

Οὔτοι τὰ χρήματ' ἴδια κέκτηνται βροτοί.
Τὰ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα.

The things are not their own, of which Mankind
take care.
They have them but in Truſt, the Gods the
Owners are.

So the Holy Scripture repreſenteth God as the *Owner* or ſuperiour Proprietor of the whole comprehenſion of things, and the Univerſe (but in different Notion) as his Eſtate of Goods, (x) *who is Lord and Poſſeſſor of Heaven and Earth.* Deut. 10. 14. *Behold the Heaven and the Heaven of Heavens is the Lords thy God, the Earth alſo with all that therein is.* The Sun is his, the Rain is his, the Silver and the Gold are his. *Matth.* 5. 45. *Hagg.* 2. 8. All places are of his *Dominion*, which reacheth from the higheſt Star to the loweſt Clod of Earth. *Pſal.* 103. 22. So the Jews (y) call the World *his World.* Pſal. 50. 10, 12. *Every Beaſt of the Foreſt is mine, and the Cattel upon a thouſand Hills—— —— the World is mine and the fulneſs thereof.* Pſal. 24. 1. Exod. 9. 29. and ch. 19. 5. *The Earth is the Lords and the fulneſs thereof, the World and they that dwell therein.* Upon this Aphoriſm the Apoſtle groundeth his Diſcourſe to the *Corinthians* touching *eating things offer'd to Idols*, and he maketh uſe of it to contrary purpoſes (as the ſame Key both openeth and ſhutteth,) both to grant them Licenſe, and to abridge their Liberty. He maketh uſe of it, to grant them Licenſe, arguing in this manner. *God's Religioniſts acknowledge no ſuch Propriety as Idols Goods or Idols Meat; for the Earth is the Lord's and the fulneſs thereof.* Whatſoever therefore is expos'd to Sale (or ſet upon the Table) although offer'd to an Idol, you may without ſcruple eat. 1 *Cor.* 10. 25, 26. *Whatſoever is ſold in the Shambles that eat, asking no queſtion for Conſcience ſake; for the Earth is the Lord's and the fulneſs thereof.* He maketh uſe of this Aphoriſm, to abridge their Liberty, arguing in this manner; *you may not partake of any thing as Idols Goods, or eat any thing as Idols Meat*, (as ſuch or under that Notion in the apprehenſion of others,) *it is againſt Religion, ſo to acknowledge any thing, to be Idols Goods or Meat; for the Earth is the Lord's and the fulneſs thereof.* 1 *Cor.* 10. 28. *If any Man ſay unto you, this is offer'd in Sacrifice to Idols, eat not, for his ſake that ſhew'd it, and for Conſcience ſake; for the Earth is the Lord's and the fulneſs thereof.* God's Religioniſts that acknowledge no Idol-Gods, to be Proprietors of Goods, do not deny, that there is Idolatry or Idol-ſervice: But of the Goods that are imploy'd in it God is the Proprietor; and therefore in the Prophet he aſſerteth his right of Property, and threatneth to ſnatch them out of their Hands, who furniſh'd their Idol-ſervice out of his Goods, as an unchaſt Wife maintaineth a Rival out of her Husbands Eſtate. *I will return and take away my Corn in the time thereof, and my Wine in the Seaſon thereof, and will recover my Wooll and my Flax given to cover her nakedneſs.* Hoſ. 2. 10. So the Pſalmiſt celebrateth his right of property to the Earth and Sea. *Pſal.* 95. 5, 7.

(3.) An Owner or ſuperiour Proprietor of Things and Perſons in Common Law-Senſe, becauſe he is rightful Poſſeſſor and Diſpoſer of them in his own right, hath therefore right to Poſſeſs them and to diſpoſe of them for his own uſe, ſervice and behoof; it is his right to have them, to ſerve him, and to diſpoſe of them, for his Service; and therefore if they be *his ſimply and without addition, they are his alſo* (in a ſecond Law-Notion included in the former) *with this addition as his Servants.* He hath *Dominium directum & utile, both the things themſelves and the uſe of them belongeth to him*; and though he may imploy them to another's uſe, yet that ſheweth the uſe of them belongeth to him, that they are of ſervient condition to him; and therefore an Owner is fitly intituled *Dominus* or *Lord.* Such an *Owner* is governing Providence; *all things are his in Common Law Senſe*; which is to ſay, that *all are his as his Servants*, they are Servants to him as to their ſuperior Proprietor (whoſe Propriety is as full and abſolute as can be) according to that of the Pſalmiſt *all are thy Servants.* Pſal. 11 91. So when the Apoſtle ſaith of God, *whoſe I am* (his I am) his meaning is, *I am his as his Servant*; Act. 27. 23. for thus his words run, *whoſe I am, and whom I ſerve.* No Beings can be *his* or *his own* in common Law-ſenſe, otherwiſe than *as being his Servants*; for to be *his* or *his own* in the uſual Law-ſenſe, and to be Servants to him as to their Owner or ſuperior Proprietor, is but the very ſame thing in different Expreſſions. As he is their Owner in uſual Law-ſenſe, *he is their*

(s) Grot. *de J. B. ac P. l.* 2. c. 6. S. 1.

(t) Epict. *Ench. c.* 15.

(u) *Martin. Lex. in voce proprius.*

(w) *Grot. Not. in Luc.* 16. 9, 12. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 216, 433, 365. *M. Ant l.* 12. *S.* 3. *Stearne M. An. p.* 149.

(x) *Gen.* 14. 22. *Matth.* 11. 25. *Act.* 17. 24.

(y) *Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. p.* 5.

their Dominus; therefore as they are *his* or *his own* (in the ſame uſual Senſe) they are his *ſervi* (*Dominus eſt ſervi Dominus*;) and becauſe they are Servants to him as to their Owner or ſuperior Proprietor, hence it is, that Piety is both the Buſineſs of being God's Servants, and the Buſineſs of giving unto God that which is his own, *the rights and dues of his Godhead.* All rational Beings (Men and Angels) are of right and by obligation his Servants, becauſe he is *their Lord, Owner or ſuperior Proprietor.* They owe to him the Duties of Servants in general; *to look upon themſelves as rightfully his Poſſeſſion* (as *Plato* in his *Phædo* calleth Mankind ἓν τῶν κτημάτων τοῖς θεοῖς, *one of the Gods Poſſeſſions,*) *and as under his Command,* Matth. 8. 9. *faithfully to obey his preceptive Will and dutifully to ſubmit to his providential Diſpoſals.* Rom. 6. 16. Pſal. 39. 9. *To conſider themſelves as for his uſe and ſervice* (the Servant is for the Maſter's Uſe. 2 *Tim.* 2. 21.) *And therefore faithfully to do him Service, and to be faithful to his Intereſt, quitting all things that are inconſiſtent with the due adherence thereto.* Matth. 25. 21. and 6. 24. *Not behaving themſelves as their own Men* (ſui juris) *or at their own diſpoſal as to their Perſons, Actions, Condition, or as at Liberty, to do their own Will, to follow their own Pleaſures, to mind their own Affairs, to ſeek their own Intereſt, and to imploy their Time, Eſtates, Faculties, Abilities for Self-gratification and Advantage; for ſuch Behaviour is a making themſelves* ἀδέσποτοι, *without a Lord, whoſe they are, whoſe Rights they ought to acknowledge, whoſe Superiority they ought to revere* (1 Tim. 6. 1. Mal. 1. 6.) *to whoſe Will they ought to conform themſelves, and to be for the pleaſing of him* (Tit. 2. 9.) *attending his Buſineſs, propoſing to themſelves the Matters of his intereſt and behoof, whoſe Truſtees they are in this World, and for whoſe Goods they muſt be Accomptants.* (z) *Scitè Hebræi; da illi de ſuo, quia tu & omnia tua illius ſunt.* Rational Beings do not only owe unto God the duties of Servants in general becauſe he is their Owner and ſuperior Proprietor: But they are under a further obligation; *to be Servants to him as to their abſolute Owner and Proprietor.* Which implieth *a ſerving him with nothing leſs than their All, devoting and reſigning all to him, uſing and employing their All for him* (themſelves and all that is theirs,) *without alienating any thing* (which is a defrauding him; for it is his Right, fully and entirely to have the Poſſeſſion, Diſpoſal and Uſe of us, without any exception, limitation or reſerves,) *ſerving him at any rate, not declining his Service whatever they do, loſe or ſuffer, doing whatever is matter of Service unto him, living a Life of doing him Service, and making it their Buneſs, their one thing and their All, to be his Servants.* But notwithſtanding ſuch *abſolute* and *intire* devotedneſs to God which is due from rational Beings, they have, and may ſeek ſuch Intereſts and Advantages of their own, which are conſiſtent with, or ſubordinate to, God's Intereſt; for theſe are propos'd as the grand motives to Piety. *Pro.* 3. 1, 2. *Pſal.* 34. 12. *Joh.* 12. 26. *Rom.* 2. 7, 10. *Rev.* 22. 14. *Heb.* 11. 26.

V. We have competently explain'd this Divine attribute, *Lord or Owner and Proprietor of All.* But becauſe it is generally miſunderſtood, and there are ſeveral ambiguities and difficulties in it, we will ſubjoin ſome further Illuſtrations of it. And our *firſt Illuſtration* of this Divine Attribute is from God's relation to thoſe Rationals that belong to his Church and Kingdom (which is the holy kind of Univerſe) *who are his or his own* in the ſtate of Society with him, and whom he peculiarly owneth for his, to whom he is related, not as a meer Lord or Owner, but as a Liege-Lord to his *Liege-ſervants, Subjects and People.* In this ſtate of Society with God we are *his* or *his own,* not only in the Common Law-Notion, but in a Special Notion importing *Alliance* and *Friendſhip*; (*a*) as *Gr. Naz.* (to ſignifie, that her Perſon was eſpecially ally'd to him, and that ſhe had a ſpecial Intereſt in his Affections) calleth *Gr. Nyſſen's* Wife *My Theoſebia.* In this Notion the Pſalmiſt ſaith; *I am thine* (as one of thy faithful Liege-people) *ſave me.* Pſal. 119. 99. *I ſware unto thee, and entred into covenant with thee, and thou becameſt mine.* Ezek. 16. 9. *I am my Beloved's and my Beloved is mine.* Cant. 2. 16. This Friendſhip-propriety is mutual and reciprocal, God's Liege-people have a Propriety in his Perſon (and conſequently in that plenitude of Goods which he bringeth with him,) and God hath not only a Propriety in his People, but ſetteth his Mark of Property upon them, as Merchants ſet their Property upon their Goods (to which the Apoſtle alludeth, *Eph.* 1. 13. *Ye were ſealed with that holy Spirit of Promiſe,*) or as of old the Goods belonging to the Exchequer had a Mark ſet upon them, which they called *the Title.* To old *Iſrael* Circumciſion was the Mark of Divine Property, agreeably to what God ſaith, *Lev.* 20. 26. *I have ſevered you from other People, that ye ſhould be mine.* Upon this ground the holy People are animated to a generous Truſt in God, and to fear no Diſaſters (O *Iſrael* fear not;) for they that belong to ſuperior Owners or Proprietors in the Senſe of Alliance and Friendſhip, ought to be matter of their proper Care and Cuſtody, as Wives are of their Husbands, Children of their Parents (who have a proper Right in the Perſon of their Husbands and Parents, and a ſpecial Intereſt in their Affections.) 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. *If any Man provide not for his own, he hath deny'd the Faith.* So God promiſeth thoſe pious Jews, that were his Partiſans and firm Adherents in evil Times, *they ſhall be mine* (Mal 3. 17.) They ſhall be in the Condition of thoſe that are mine, who are matter of my proper Care and Cuſtody. Wherefore it is a great Reaſon, that Chriſt maketh uſe of, to recommend his Diſciples to his Father's Paternal Care and Cuſtody, *Joh.* 17. 10. *All mine are thine.* Chriſtians belong to the Father of the Divine Family in a Senſe of Alliance, Friendſhip and Society; and in the ſame Senſe (καθ' οἰκείωσιν,) he is their Owner and ſuperior Proprietor; and in the ſame Senſe *Chriſts Sheep* (thoſe that are the People of the Divine Sentiment but preparitorily and initially) do *inchoatively* belong to the good Shepherd, as being deſign'd and prepar'd to be his Familiſts and Societiſts; whence he calleth them *his* and *his own.* Joh. 10. 12, 14. *Whoſe own the Sheep are. I know my Sheep and am known of mine.* This Popular Senſe of Propriety importing *Alliance,* is uſually in Scripture complicated with *the Common Law-Senſe of Propriety*: But it is not unuſual to ſeparate this twofold Senſe. For in a Senſe of meer Alliance and Cognation, without any thing of *Common Law-Senſe*, the World's Allies and Partiſans are called *its own.* Joh. 15. 19. *If ye were of the World, the World would love his own.* And the Apoſtle proceding upon a meer *Common Law-Senſe* formeth an Argument for

(z) Druſ. Job 35.

ttb. 37. mb. 14. or. 8. m. 14. 8. il. 1. and 2. Luke 42. 14. Matth. 46. im. 4.

(a) Ep. 95.

for all Holineſs of Body and Spirit. 1 *Cor.* 6. 19, 20. *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price. Therefore glorifie God in your Body and in your Spirit, which are Gods.* Of Right and by Obligation God is to have the Poſſeſſion of you, and your whole Man, Soul and Body, is to be imploy'd for his Uſe and Service, (according to the Chriſtian Inſtitution of Sanctity,) which is inconſiſtent with being your own *ſo as not to be his.* This Due accrueth to him upon the account of your *Liberation by a price*: As in Human Affairs *Emptum cedit in jus Emptoris, a thing that is bought is his that bought it.*

VI. *A ſecond Illuſtration* of this Divine Attribute is from God's Relation to the whole Univerſe of Rationals, *both thoſe within and without.* To this Univerſe God is related not as *a meer Lord or Owner in Common Law-Senſe, but as their rightful Liege-Lord. He is their Lord or Owner in Common Law-Senſe: But as their rightful Liege-Lord, and as other rightful Liege-Lords are Lords or Owners in Common Law-Senſe.* For ſo ſoon as the Univerſe of Rationals was founded, they were bound to all the Duties of Society with God. *To take him for their God and make him their God*, by a Soveraign Eſteem and Veneration, and Fear and Love, and Gratitude and Praiſe, a faithful Homage and Obedience, Honour and Subjection to the Father of Spirits, as his Liege-people and Subjects, and dutiful Beneficiaries; and he was to them *the Holy Name*, that muſt be hallow'd and ſanctified by them. Therefore in reſpect of Right and Obligation to Duty he was immediately upon their Creation, *their God, their Father, their Maſter, their Sovereign and their Liege-Lord.* And as immediately upon their Creation they were bound to the Duties of God's Religioniſts and Societiſts; ſo they were neceſſarily in the State of *God-Societiſts*; for to be out of that Divine Condition, is the moſt criminal and penal Condition, which therefore is incompetible to unfallen Rationals. From whence it followeth, that God is not, nor ever was, related to any Rationals *as a meer Lord or Owner in Common Law-Senſe, but as a Liege-Lord* (a God-Society Liege-Lord;) and that this Univerſe muſt be conſidered as *by Original State, Obligation and Deſign God's Religioniſts and Societies.* To thoſe Rationals that are within God is related as their rightful Liege-Lord; therefore thoſe extraneous Rationals that are out of the State of Society with God, muſt be conſider'd *as his Religioniſts* (or God-Societiſts) *now in the State of Rebels againſt, and Exiles from their rightful Sovereign and Natural Liege-Lord.* They are fallen from God, and therefore are fallen from the State of Society with God. They are fallen into the State of Sin and Miſery, and therefore are fallen from the State of Holineſs and Happineſs, which is the State of Society with God, and which was their *Primitive Original State.* Of which Original (holy and happy) Condition there are conſpicuous Marks ſtill remaining in degenerate Human Nature. For (as it is generally obſerv'd,) not reaſon, ſo much as a capacity of and propenſeneſs to Religion, is the conſtitutive form and ſpecific difference of Mankind as contradiſtinguiſh'd to Brute Animals. ——— *Separat hoc nos à grege Brutorum.* The Philoſopher ſaith of Rationals. (b) *They only are adapted to converſe with God, being conjoyn'd to him by reaſon.* Which is an Indication, that they were originally made for Religion, *the State and Life of Society with God*; which being fallen from, God is now no more their Proprietor or Owner in the Senſe of Alliance and Friendſhip, till they be recover'd by the Methods of Redemption. But as by Redemption God becometh not their meer Lord or Owner, but their Liege-Lord: So the ſame Relation reſulteth from Original Creation, God is their *Society-Lord*, their *God-Society-Lord*, who is the Rector of a Polity.

VII. Hence ariſeth *a third Illuſtration* of this Divine Attribute; for God as *a Liege-Lord*, and no otherwiſe than is competible to *a Liege-Lord, is abſolute Lord or Owner of Rationals* (ſpeaking in a Common Law-Senſe) their *Dominus abſolutus*: And they are no otherwiſe *abſolutely his* in Common Law-Senſe, than as his *Liege-Servants and People.* That he is plenarily, abſolutely, unlimitedly our Lord and Owner in Common Law-Senſe, is the Senſe of all that are truly pious; they expreſly acknowledge it *in their abſolute devotedneſs to his Service, and in their abſolute ſubjectneſs to his Divine Will.* For their abſolute devotedneſs to his Service ſuppoſeth, that he hath plenary Right *to all that they are, have and can do* (Soul, Body, Time, Talents, Abilities, Intereſts,) that nothing leſs than their All muſt be dedicated to him, and imploy'd for his uſe; that no Love or Service muſt be thought too much or too dear for him; and that legally and of right *whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; living therefore or dying we are the Lords.* That is, we are for his Service in all Conditions. *Rom.* 14. 8. As the truly pious are abſolutely devoted to his Uſe and Service, ſo they are abſolutely and without Exception *ſubjected to his Divine Will.* Whereby I do not mean, that they abſolutely and unlimitedly Subject all matters of Event to his meer Will and Pleaſure (which is a Stoical extravagance,) or that God hath an abſolute unlimited Right, to diſpoſe of his Rational Creatures as to all matters of Event (which is falſe Theology:) But the truly pious ſimply, abſolutely and unlimitedly ſubject themſelves *to his Will of Duty, (to follow the Lord fully*, Numb. 14. 24.) and as a Branch of this Subjection they dutifully ſubmit themſelves to his Will of Events (to do the Will of God in dutiful ſuffering his Will;) they content themſelves with his Allowance, ſubmit to his Uſage and Correction, leave it to God, to chuſe their Condition for them, prefer his Choices before their own Wiſhes, and dutifully acquieſce in his Soveraign all-diſpoſing Will. *It is the Lord, let him do what ſeemeth him good.* God is therefore related to his Liege-People as their abſolute Lord or Owner, they acknowledge it both verbally and really, and by acknowlegding it they enter into the State of Society with God: But this Relation is not the Relation of *an abſolute meer Lord or Owner* (which would be abſolute Servitude to his People,) but is a Branch of his Relation of Alliance, Friendſhip and God-Society. For being related as a Liege-Lord to his Liege-People (as Princes and Patrons are to their Lieges,) this Relation of Friendſhip and God-Society compriſeth both *the Duty-part and the Benefit-part of Religion.* His being our abſolute Lord or Owner is *the Duty-part* of Religion to us, obliging us to an abſolute Subjection to his Divine Will, and an abſolute devotedneſs to his Service, agreeably to the Lieges of mundane Princes and Patrons

(b) Ὅτι κοινωνεῖν μόνον ταῦτα πέφυκε θεῷ τῆς συναναστροφῆς κατὰ τὸν λόγον. Epict. Diſſ. l. 1. c. 9.

trons, (*c*) *who become their Men* (as the *Engliſh* Phraſe is in doing Homage) *and are devoted to live and die with them.* But by the Duty-part of Religion we do not loſe or relinquiſh, but gain and enjoy a right to the Benefit-part of Religion: By reſigning and relinquiſhing abſolutely (in the Senſe of Religion) *our Party-things*, we are entituled *to God's Party-things* (we gain and enjoy a Propriety in his Perſon, and that infinite good which he is in himſelf and to his People,) and as the Apoſtle ſaith in another Caſe, *by having nothing we Poſſeſs all things.* This is certainly the State of things in the Univerſe, as it is now conſtituted, and this was the original State of Things. God was never related to his Religioniſts and Societiſts as an abſolute meer Lord or Owner, but as their Liege-Lord, the rightful Liege-Lord of all Rationals, who as ſuch is their abſolute Lord or Owner.

VIII. *A fourth Illuſtration* of this Divine Attribute is from ſeveral Modes of God's being *in Poſſeſſion* or *out of Poſſeſſion* of Rationals. For as a governing Providence he is in Poſſeſſion of the Univerſe of Rationals: But as *a God-Society-Lord*, he is out of Poſſeſſion of the extraneous Rationals (not having *jus in re*, whatever *jus ad rem* he may have;) *for the Lords Portion is his People*, Jacob *is the Lot of his Inheritance.* *Jacob* or *Iſrael*, *God's People*, *his Portion*, *Inheritance*, or *Poſſeſſion*, are ſynonymous Expreſſions in Scripture, and ſignifie *Peculium Dei*, *the Church of God*, *the Syſtem of God's-Societiſts*, who is alſo intituled *the Portion of* Jacob, *the excellency of* Jacob, *the holy One of* Iſrael. For God was peculiarly their God, and in the ſtile of the Old Teſtament, *they be thy People and thine Inheritance. Save thy People and bleſs thine Inheritance. Remember me, O Lord, with the favour that thou beareſt unto thy People. That I may ſee the good of thy choſen, that I may rejoice in the gladneſs of thy Nation, that I may glory with thine Inheritance.* The Name of *a Portion* and *Inheritance* (a People of Inheritance, a Flock of Heritage, *Deut.* 4. 20. *Mic.* 7. 14) importeth, that the Univerſe of Rationals is in a divided State; *for thou didſt ſeparate them from among all the People of the Earth, to be thine Inheritance.* 1 King. 8. 53. And becauſe in parting and ſharing Inheritances *Lines* and *Rods* were made uſe of, to meaſure them, and they were uſually divided by *Lot*, hence *Iſrael* (that was God's *Partage* or *Portion*) is ſometimes called *his Lot of Inheritance*, ſometimes *the Rod of his Inheritance. Remember thy Congregation, which thou haſt purchaſed of old; the Rod of thine Inheritance, which thou haſt redeemed.* By which Redemption they became λαὸς τῆς περιποιήσεως, *a People of God's purchaſe and acquiſition to himſelf*, and therefore of *Choiceneſs*, *Precioſity* and *Peculiarity.* *Iſrael* was peculiarly God's *Poſſeſſion* in reſpect of his *Civil kind* of Sovereignty over that People, (*d*) which God took upon him and exerciſ'd for ſome time (at leaſt till they choſe a King,) and in this Notion the Son of *Sirach* may be underſtood to ſay; *In the diviſion of the Nations of the whole Earth he ſet over every People a Ruler: But Iſrael is the Lord's Portion.* Eccluſ. 17. 17. But *Iſrael* was alſo God's Portion or peculiar Poſſeſſion in reſpect of his holy Sovereignty over that People (being the God of *Iſrael*;) for they were in the State of Society with God and God with them, as God and People. *I will take you to me for a People, and I will be to you a God.* Exod. 6. 7. (*e*) Accordingly upon receiving his holy Government and Inſtitution of Religion they became *his* in the Senſe of Alliance (*Take us for thine Inheritance*, Exod. 34. 9. is rendred by the Septuagint *we ſhall be thine*) his Religioniſts, Familiſts, Societiſts and Republick; and God became their *Proprietary* and *Poſſeſſor* as a God-Society Lord of a God-Society People. *Jer.* 7. 23. *This thing I commanded your Fathers, ſaying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye ſhall be my People.* Deut. 26. 17, 18. *Thou haſt avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk in his ways. And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar People.* By their confederating with God they were diſcriminated from unholy Mankind, introduced into the State of Sanctity, appropriated to and ſet apart for God, to be unto him a People, for God to Poſſeſs, Enjoy and have the Uſe of; and God ſet apart himſelf, to be unto them *a God*, a God-like Governor, Protector and Benefactor. Whence the Pſalmiſt (in an high ſtrain) uſually celebrateth their felicitative Eſtate. *Bleſſed is the Nation, whoſe God is the Lord, and the People whom he hath choſen for his own Inheritance.* Agreeably to the ſtate of old *Iſrael* the Chriſtian Church is called in Scripture and by the Fathers *Vinea Domini*, *the Lord's Vineyard*; *Area Dominica*, *the Lord's Floor*; *Ager Dei*, *God's Field*; *Grex Dei*, *God's Flock*; *Ovile Dei*, *God's Sheep-fold*; *Civitas Dei*, *God's City*; *Regnum Dei*, *God's Kingdom.* All which Appellatives import, both that God is *the God-Society-Lord*, and that as ſuch he hath *no other Poſſeſſion* amongſt Rationals but his Church only. So S. *Hilary* (abating his miſtake touching Angelical Prefects) well repreſenteth the Senſe of the Promiſe made to Chriſt, *Pſal.* 2. 8. that all Nations ſhould become his *Inheritance* and *Poſſeſſion.* (*f*) *This is his Inheritance; that all Nations baptiz'd and taught be regenerate into Life: Not now (according to* Moſes's *Divine Song) conſign'd to the Domination of Angels, nor divided according to the number of them: But taken into the Divine Family, and made God's Domeſticks, and from the unjuſt wrongful Power of the Dominations tranſlated into an eternal Divine Kingdom. For it doth not now hold, that* Iſrael *only is the Lord's Portion, and* Jacob *the rod of his Inheritance: But all Nations before divided according to the number of Angels, this whole of Nations is now one and the People of one God.* But before they become the People of God (or make approaches to ſo Divine a Condition) they are (*g*) *tanquam Sylvæ cubile Diaboli, as Woods the Lodging of Satan*, and this is the change that is made in their Condition. † *The Church had its riſe from Chriſt, but is found amongſt the Gentiles, which are of the Fields of the Wood: Of Horrid they are become nitid, of Steril fruitful, of Food for the fire a Region of vital Food, of wild Beaſts Lodgings the reſting place of God, his Houſe, Temple and Poſſeſſion.* As by coming into the Church the Gentiles became God's Poſſeſſion: So if any be juſtly caſt out of the Church, they ceaſe to be God's *Poſſeſſion*, being

Deut. 32. 9.

1 *King.* 8. 51. *Pſal.* 28. 9. and 106. 4 78. 6 71 5, 1 106. 4 *Deut.* 4. 20. 9. 26, 29. *Exod.* 34. 9. *Iſa.* 19. 25. 47. 6. 63. 17. 1 *Sam.* 10. 1. 26. 19. 2 *Sam.* 14. 16. 21. 3. 20. 19. 2 *King.* 21. 14. *Jer.* 12. 7, 8, 9. *Joel* 2. 17. 3. 2. *Mic.* 7. 14, 18. *Zech.* 2. 12. *Jer.* 10. 16. and 51. 19. *Pſal.* 74. 2.

Pſal. 33. 12. and 144. 15. &c.

(c) *Selden. Titles p.* 274, 355, &c. ed 3.

(d) *V. Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. Diſſ. de Theocrat. Jud.*

(e) *V. Coſri p.* 261. *ed. Buxt.*

(f) *Hæc eſt hæreditas ejus — ut omnes gentes baptizatæ atque doctæ regenerentur in vitam: Non jam ſecundum illam divinam Moyſi cantionem angelorum dominatui dedicatæ, neque ſecundum eorundem numerum diviſæ: Sed in dominicam familiam ſuſceptæ, & in domeſticos Dei deputatæ & ex injuſto atque perverſo jure dominatuum in regnum æternum divinumque tranſlatæ. Neque enim adhuc tantum portio Domini Iſrael, neque funiculus hæreditatis ejus Jacob: Sed gentes omnes ſecundum numerum angelorum antè diviſæ, nunc jam unus atque unius omnis hæc univerſitas gentium Dei populus eſt.* In Pſal. 2. Enarr.

(g) *Idem in Pſal.* 131.

† *Eccleſia cœpit à Chriſto, ſed in gentibus reperitur, quæ ſunt ex Sylvæ campis: Ex horrentibus nitidæ, ex ſterilibus fructuoſæ, ex ignis pabulo vitalis cibi regio, ex ferarum cubilibus Dei requies, Domus, Templum atque Poſſeſſio.* Ibid.

being *excommunicati à Deo* (excommunicated from God, as the Writers of the Church ſpeak) becauſe they are caſt out of the ſtate of Society with God into the Herd of Mundane and Godleſs People, that are not his Inheritance. *Iſa.* 63. 18, 19. *The People of thy Holineſs have poſſeſs'd it but a little while: Our Adverſaries have trodden down thy Sanctuary. We are thine, thou never beareſt rule over them, they are not called by thy Name.* Extraneous Rationals therefore are out of God's poſſeſſion; but not in the Rabbins Notion, who ſuppoſe, that their Affairs are not govern'd by Providence; for as a governing Providence God *inheriteth all Nations*; Pſal. 82. 8. The Lord of the Church is alſo the Lord of the whole Earth: *Pſal.* 92. 5. *Mic.* 4. 13. ארון העולם *Lord of the World*, רבון העולמים *Lord of the Worlds* (the upper and lower) as the Rabbins ſtile Him: And becauſe he is Lord in reſpect of *Might* as well as *Right*, He can never be put out of poſſeſſion; wherefore the *Perſians* Name of God خدا חדא (which is the moſt proper Name of God in their Language) is adapted to what God is; (*h*) for that Name properly ſignifieth *a Poſſeſſour*, and therefore fitly denoteth him that is eminently ſo, *the poſſeſſour of Heaven and Earth.* O *Lord God of Iſrael* (ſaith *Hezekiah*) *which dwelleth between the Cherubins, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth, thou haſt made Heaven and Earth*; 2 King. 19. 15. And now it is eaſie, to anſwer S. *Hierom*'s Interrogatory: (*i*) *God is every where, and whole every where, from whom who can be ſeparated, ſeeing all things are in him? and himſelf ſaith by the Prophet, I am a God nigh at hand, and not afar off: and the Pſalmiſt witneſſeth, If I aſcend into Heaven thou art there: If I deſcend into Hell, thou art there.*

IX. A *Fifth* Illuſtration of this Divine Attribute is from *the unſettled condition of the Goods of this World, and the arbitrarious diſpoſal that Providence maketh of them*; in which reſpect the World is of oppoſite condition to the Kingdom of God. For of the Goods of his own Kingdom God made a Settlement in the firſt Conſtitution of things, and in the new Creation or Conſtitution of things he hath made a new Settlement of the State and Inheritance of Bleſſedneſs. Having made ſuch a Settlement of things (of Rights and Dues) *as a Kingdom of God*; the Goods whereof are ſettled to perpetuity, God doth not retain to himſelf a full and abſolute power, to give and take them away at diſcretion and pleaſure, they are not liable to an arbitrary diſpoſal, nor are they that enjoy them *meer Tenants at Will*, they have ſuch a Propriety in them, that they cannot be taken away without a forfeiture. But the State of this World is no ſuch Settlement of things (of Rights and Dues:) Mankind hold not their Inheritances by any Law-ſettlement made by governing Providence (abſtracting from certain Promiſes made in Scripture, which are but particular Caſes;) nor are the Goods of this World ſettled irrevocably or to perpetuity, or any longer (abſtracting from thoſe Scripture-promiſes) than *durante bene placito*. For although God hath made a grant of the Earth to *Adam* (and if any might pretend, to be Univerſal Monarch or Proprietor of the whole Earth, and to diſpoſe of it from the Arctick to the Antarctick Pole, as Pope *Alexander* the Sixth is ſaid to have done, it was *Adam* the Father of Mankind.) A like Grant was made to *Noah* and his Sons; and the Pſalmiſt repreſenteth God as keeping the Heavens in his own Hand (as his own Demeſnes,) *but the Earth he hath given to the Children of Men*: Although *the moſt High divided to the Nations their Inheritance, and hath aſſign'd them the Bounds of their Habitation*, and hath made Mankind of dominant condition in this lower Region (and therefore it is a grand Extravagance to ſuppoſe, that Worldly Dominion is founded in Grace, that none but gracious Perſons have right to the Earth) yet God hath not made them a Leaſe of their Eſtates or of their Lives: He may conſerve or change their Condition, preſerve or deſtroy their Lives, and the Earth it ſelf (which yet he hath promis'd not to deſtroy by Water) *as he pleaſeth, and as ſeemeth good in his Eyes.* In his own right (as a Lord or Owner) he hath right to diſpoſe of and govern the Affairs of this World of his Creatures *pro arbitrio, to give and take away, to make poor and to make rich, to kill and to make alive, as the God of the Spirits of all Fleſh, in whoſe Hand our Breath is, and whoſe are all our ways. In his Hand is the Soul of every living thing, and the Breath of all Mankind.* And he doth but make uſe of his own Right and Liberty, (of which he hath made no reſtriction by a Kingdom of God-kind of Settlement) *in giving the Kingdom to whomſoever he will.* The great Lords and Owners of Eſtates (things mutuatitious and alienable) are but Tenants at Will to governing Providence, which (notwithſtanding any Grants or Donations made of the Earth) ſtill retaineth a plenary right, to diſpoſe of them at pleaſure. (*k*) *Why have you receiv'd theſe things? to make uſe of them. How long? ſo long as he that lendeth them pleaſeth. If ye have not been faithful in that which is another Man's, who ſhall give you that which is your own?* ſaith our Saviour. He confronteth and oppoſeth a twofold ſtate, and two oppoſite ſorts of Goods. In this World we are poſſeſſors of Goods only as Servants to another (Servants not Owners) the Goods are his, he hath right to call us to account for them, and to take them out of our Hands; but in the Heavenly World we are Owners of a Felicitative Eſtate, (*l*) the Heavenly kind of Goods are given *Nobis & propter Nos, chiefly for our own good* (not like thoſe of which we are only Stewards and Depoſitaries,) none may call us to account for our Miniſtration there, nor take away our Celeſtial Inheritance.

X. A *Sixth* Illuſtration of this Divine Attribute is from the *Muhammedan* Explication of it, which attributeth unto God as abſolute Lord *an abſolute Infinity of Right or Power over all the Creatures* (at leaſt it is unbounded by any Rights of the Creatures) which involveth in it a *threefold* Imagination. *Firſt, an imaginary Power of abſolute Reprobation. Secondly, an Imaginary Theological ſtate of Nature. Thirdly, an abſolute Slavery of all Creatures in their Original Condition.* For there is a party of the *Muhammedan* Theologers, who maintain, (*m*) "That God is reg-
"nant in that Univerſe which he hath created,
"ſo as to do what he will, and determine what
"he pleaſeth. If he ſhould introduce all the
"Creatures together into Paradiſe, there would
"be no Iniquity in this; or if he ſhould caſt
"them

(h) *Hotting. Diſſert. Faſcic.* p. 299.

(i) *Deus ubique eſt, & totus ubique eſt, à quo quis poteſt ſeparari, cùm in eo ſint omnia? & ipſe per prophetam loquatur. Ego Deus appropinquans, & non de longe: & pſalmiſta teſtatur: Si aſcendero in cælum, tu illic es; ſi deſcendero in Infernum ades.* In Epheſ. 2. 13.

Gen. 1. 28.

Gen. 9. 2. *Pſal.* 115. 16.

Deut 32. 8. *Act.* 17. 26. *Pſal.* 8. 6.

Vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus uſu.

Job 1. 21. 1 *Sam.* 2. 6, 7. *Numb.* 16. 22. *Dan.* 5. 23. *Job* 12. 10. *Dan.* 4. 25.

(k) Ἐπὶ τί εἴληφας ταῦτα; χρησάμενος. μέχρι τίνος; μέχρις ἂν ὁ χρήσας θέλῃ. *Epict. Diſſ.* p. 364.

Luk. 16. 12.

(l) *Biſhop Sanderſon Ser. on* 1 *Cor.* 12. 7.

(m) *Pocock. Spec.* p. 252, 253.

“ them into the Fire, this would be no Injuſtice. Injuſtice is, when one taketh upon him, to adminiſter things, where he hath not right, or putteth them in a place which is not theirs; but ſeeing he is abſolute Lord of things, Iniquity cannot be charg'd upon him, nor Injuſtice be attributed to him. God is juſt in his Works, becauſe he is in his own Poſſeſſion and Kingdom, and there doth whatever he will, and determineth what he pleaſeth. Juſtice is, when a thing is plac'd in its own place; and that is, when one is converſant in his own Kingdom according to his own Will: On the contrary, Iniquity is, when one is converſant in the Dominion or Poſſeſſion of another, which cannot be aſcrib'd to God, who is Lord of all. (*n*) One may ſuſpect a Man of acting unjuſtly, by invading the Rights of others; but no Injuſtice can be imagin'd in God, *ſeeing there is nothing that belongeth to any but himſelf.* An abſolute Lord of this irregular kind is not deſirable or tolerable in Civil Affairs; (*o*) and therefore *Auguſtus* by publick Edict prohibited the Attribute of *Lord*, nor would he ſuffer his Children or Nephews, to give him that Title. *Domini Appellationem ut maledictum & opprobrium ſemper exhorruit. He always abhorr'd* (ſaith *Suetonius*) *the Appellative of Lord as a bad Name and a Reproach.* So *Tiberius* and ſome others of the *Roman* Emperours would not endure the Title of *Dominus*, becauſe they look'd upon it as the Relative to *Servus* (a Bond-ſlave;) in which Notion it implieth, that the Subject and his Subſtance are in the Property of the Emperour. But although a Lord of the unnatural and irregular kind is not thought tolerable in Civil Government, yet ſuch a kind of Lord is introduc'd into Religion, not only by *Mahummedan* but Chriſtian Theologers, who in ſeveral degrees of Extravagance attributed unto God *an abſolute Dominion and Sovereignty* (which are terms extremely equivocal, yet are made uſe of without due diſtinction of Senſe) of a moſt irregular and unnatural kind. (*p*) *The Writer of Predeſtination and Grace is of Opinion, that God by the abſolute right of his Dominion might adjudge Men to Eternal Death, although they had not ſinned. Which alſo may be read in the Homilies of* Macarius. (*q*) *It is matter of diſpute amongſt Divines touching God, whoſe Power over his Creatures is ſupreme and infinite, whether he can by abſolute right damn eternally any innocent Perſon; touching which Point the ancient Fathers are of different Opinions; yet in this all agree, that if it be done, it is by extraordinary and abſolute Power, not by the common and uſual Law which he hath preſcrib'd to himſelf in governing Men, and of which he hath given us ſome ſignification in his word.* (*r*) *If God, ſo ſoon as he made Man, had ſunk him into the deep abyſs of Hell without any regard of his good or evil Actions, only that he might ſhew his Summity of Sovereignty over his Creatures, Man ought not unwillingly to acquieſce in that Severity, becauſe the Creature is the Creators by abſolute and indefinite right.* Such an abſolute right would be to no purpoſe, nor would it be a Right, if it might not be made uſe of; wherefore the abſolute *Reprobationers* ſuppoſe, that the Creator maketh uſe of *his abſolute indefinite Right*, and they found their Doctrine upon this Baſis: (*s*) *The great God bleſſed for ever hath abſolute right of Dominion over his Creatures, to diſpoſe and determine of them as ſeemeth him good.* They ſuppoſe, that the Creator (*t*) as abſolute Lord *hath right of predeſtinating and creating to Perdition whom he pleaſeth* (the Sublapſarian Hypotheſis implieth it, and the Supralapſarians diſpute for it,) that God maketh them Veſſels of Wrath, *pro ſuo jure & mera voluntate, in virtue of his own Right and by his meer Will; that the end of Reprobation is, that thereby God may ſhew his Power of doing what he will with his own, his Right and Authority over all; for Sin is not the impulſive cauſe of Reprobation, but the Will of God only.* Agreeably whereto they underſtand S. *Paul*'s Text; *For this ſame purpoſe have I raiſed thee up, that I might ſhew my Power in thee. Hath not the Potter power over the Clay, of the ſame Lump, to make one Veſſel to honour, and another unto diſhonour?*

Many that diſlike this extravagant Aſſertion, that God hath right, to damn faultleſs and guiltleſs Creatures, that count it the higheſt wrong and injuſtice, yet retain the ground of it and the fundamental miſtake upon which it is built; which is, *That the Creatures have no Rights.* (*u*) *If the Creatures ſhould have a right to any thing, of which God cannot deprive them, they would have ſomething of their own, to which God hath no right. But ſeeing every Creature is entirely God's, and can have nothing which is not his Gift, and can do nothing which is not his Debt; it cannot have a right where God hath none, becauſe He cannot but have an entire right in his own Works. And therefore if in any thing God's Supreme Sovereignty ſeems confin'd, 'tis not bounded by any right or priviledge in the Creature, but only regulated by his own Perfections.* (*w*) *We are abſolutely at the will and diſpoſal of God, as Slaves and Vaſſals are at the will of their Lord.* (*x*) *Ancient Servitude to which the Scriptures relate, put the Servants wholly in the poſſeſſion of their Maſter, ſo that their Perſons were as properly his, as the reſt of his Goods: And we be ſo in reſpect of Chriſt.* A Divine of our Nation that ſeems to have conſider'd this Attribute, (Lord or Owner of all) at a more than ordinary rate, yet explaineth it exactly after the *Muhammedan* mode. (*y*) *God is* jure creationis & conſervationis, *the moſt abſolute Owner or Proprietor of Man and the whole Creation; therefore it belongs to God, to be the abſolute Diſpoſer of all things; to do with them what he pleaſeth, and to uſe them to the pleaſure of his Will. Therefore alſo* (in hoc inſtanti, *antecedently to any further Relation or Covenant*) *it is not poſſible for God, to do wrong to his Creature, howſoever he ſhall uſe it; becauſe it is abſolutely his own, and he oweth it nothing: And where there is* no Debitum, *there is no* Jus, *and can be no* Injuria. *God having made himſelf Rector of the World, hath, as it were, obliged himſelf, that is, declar'd his Will, to deal equally with all Men, and judge them according to their Works; and ſo hath created a* Debitum & Jus *to Man, which inferreth a certain Juſtice on God's part. But conſidering him only in this firſt Relation, meerly* ut Dominus abſo-

---

(n) *Ibid.* p. 288, 289.

(o) Selden Titles par. 1. ch. 4.

(p) *Scriptor libri de prædeſtinatione & gratia cenſet Deum pro abſoluto dominii ſui jure etiam homines potuiſſe adjudicare morti æternæ, etſi non peccaſſent. Quod etiam in homiliis Macarii Ægyptii legere eſt.* Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 2. par. 1. Theſ. 3.

(q) *De Deo, cujus eſt in res à ſe conditas ſuprema & infinita poteſtas, inter Theologos quæritur, an abſoluto jure innocentem quempiam poſſit æternæ damnationi ſubjicere: de quo variant ſanè antiquorum patrum ſententiæ: illud tamen inter omnes convenit, extraordinaria & abſoluta, ſi id fiat, poteſtate fieri: non communi & uſitata lege, quam in gubernandis hominibus ſibi ipſe præfixit, & cujus nobis in verbo ſuo ſignificationem aliquam dedit.* Petav. T. 1. l. 10. c. 7. S. 2.

(r) *Si Deus ſtatim poſtquam hominem condidit, eum in profundum inferorum abyſſum demerſiſſet, nulla habita ratione actionum ipſius ſeu bonarum ſeu malarum, tantum ut ſummum ſuum in creaturas imperium oſtenderet, debuiſſe hominem in ea ſeveritate non invitum acquieſcere, quia creatura creatoris eſt, ex abſoluto Jure atque indefinito.* Amyrald. ap. Curcell. de Jur. Dei in creat. c. 1.

(s) *Cole Pract. Diſc. of God's Sover. p. 2.*

(t) *V. Curcell. ſupr. c. 10.*

(u) *Sa. Parker Bi- of Oxf of God's Domin. p.* 149.

(w) Dr. *Sherlock of Providence p.* 140.

(x) *Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed, Art.* 2. *p.* 312. *ed.* 1.

(y) *Mr. Baxter Reaſons of the Chriſt. Relig. par.* 1. *ch.* 6.

lutus, *or Proprietor, it is not poſſible for any thing that he can do, to be an Injury. A meer corporeal pain (including no Contradiction or Error, as Conſcience's Accuſation of the Innocent doth,) could be no wrong; there being leſs appearance of reaſon, to call it wrong, than for my burning my Wood, or plucking a Roſe, to be a wrong; for it is not the Pain of the one that can make it an Injury, any more than the Deſtruction of the other. —— Every one may do with his own what he liſt, except the Propriety be but limited and dependent on another, or but* ſecundum quid; *who ſhould interpoſe, and any way hinder God from the free diſpoſal of his own? Not any Copartner, for there is none: Nor the Creature it ſelf, becauſe it is abſolutely His.* (z) *It is altogether impoſſible for God, the moſt abſolute Lord of all, in this firſt Inſtant, before he maketh Promiſes or other Manifeſtations of his Will, to do wrong to any Creature; for where the Dominion is abſolute, there the Creature can have no right; and where there is no right there can be no wrong. It would be no more Injury to a Man than to a Brute, to be depriv'd of Life or of Pleaſure, or to be tortur'd with Pains, if God was only Lord of Men, and ſtood not related to them in any other Relation than unto Brutes. But now, ſeeing He that is Lord is alſo Rector and Benefactor, and as Rector He hath publickly declar'd, that he will govern and judge his Subjects by his Laws (not by his abſolute Right, but by his ordinate Will, as it is commonly call'd,) none ought to fear, that God will deal with him according to the Power of his abſolute Dominion, without regard to Right and Juſtice; becauſe he hath now ſignified to the World, that he will act otherwiſe.* (a) *As a Governour and a Father he hath ſecur'd the Faithful of Eternal Life; otherwiſe as their Owner he could not have wrong'd them, if he had made the moſt innocent as miſerable, as he is capable to be.*

(z) *Method. Theolog. par.* 1. *cap.* 12. *p.* 248.

(a) *Chriſtian Directory T.* 1. *p.* 84.

XI. In this mode of Theologizing (wherein Rationals are ſuppos'd to be related to God as their meer Lord or Owner) we have an Idea of *a Theological ſtate of Nature* exactly parallel to a like piece of Phantaſtry in the *Leviathan*. For as the *Leviathan's ſtate of Nature* is antecedent to Humane Society, and to the Foundation of Humane Society: So this imaginary *Theological ſtate of Nature* is antecedent to God-Society (or Holy Society) and to the Foundation of ſuch Society. As the *Leviathan's ſtate of Nature* is antecedent to *Humane Government*, and to all Promiſes, Pacts and Covenants between Man and Man: So this *Theological ſtate of Nature* is antecedent to the *Holy Government*, and to all Promiſes, Pacts and Covenants between God and Creature. As the *Leviathan's* Atheiſm foundeth Humane Society and Government upon the arbitrary Promiſes of Men and Declarations of their Will, (called Pacts, Covenants, relinquiſhing and transferring of Rights;) ſo this miſtaken Theiſm foundeth the Holy Society and Government upon the arbitrary Promiſes of God and Declarations of his Will. As in the *Leviathan's ſtate of Nature* there is no ſuch thing as Friendſhip between Man and Man, nor any Relation of Friendſhip and Alliance, *the ſtate of Nature is the ſtate of War*; (b) *for although Men are not always engag'd in actual fighting, yet there is no aſſurance to the contrary, and they are in continual Jealouſies:* So in the Theological ſtate of Nature there is no ſuch thing as Friendſhip between God and the Creatures, nor any Relation of Friendſhip and Alliance (as that of Father and Children, Benefactor and Beneficiary, Sovereign and Subject, God and People,) the Deity perhaps is not actually engag'd in fighting againſt them, yet there is no aſſurance to the contrary, and they muſt neceſſarily live *in continual Jealouſies*, which is plainly a ſtate of War and Hoſtility. Moreover, if the Creator ſhould make uſe of that exorbitant Power, which is aſcrib'd to him, *of damning his innocent Creatures*, He muſt neceſſarily abdicate them from being his Liege-People in Society and Polity, (c) *conſiſtere enim ſimul non poſſunt voluntas imperandi & voluntas perdendi* (the Will of deſtroying a People is inconſiſtent with the Will of being their governing Head;) and if the Creator ſhould attempt to treat his innocent Creatures at ſuch a rate of Barbarity, they would have juſt cauſe to rebell (which ſpeaketh a Condition of War;) and probably the fear of it (d) *would put them into the poſture of Gladiators:* Upon which account it is farther apparent, that the *Theological* as well as the *Hobbeian* ſtate of Nature is a ſtate of War. In both theſe Hypotheſes War hath the priority, Society and Government, Order and Peace, are conſequent upon it (agreeably to *Heraclitus*'s Maxim before cited touching a wild kind of ſtrife, πόλεμος πάντων πατὴρ, *War is the Father of all things*;) which is ſuch a Theological Method of founding the Univerſe, as *Epicurus* took in Philoſophy, deriving this beauteous and harmonious Frame of things from the Juſtles and Rencounters of Atoms. In the *Leviathan*'s ſtate of Nature the Societive Bonds and Alliances that are in Nature, are diſcarded, Men are ſuppos'd, to be altogether ſegregated, diſunited and diſſociated both from one another, and from a governing Head; but afterwards they are link'd into a Polity by certain arbitrary Covenants: So in the Hypotheſis of *a Theological ſtate of Nature* the Holy-Societive Bonds and Alliances are diſcarded, the Univerſe of Rationals are ſuppos'd, to be diſſociated from one another and from a governing Head; but afterwards they are link'd and combin'd into a Polity by an *arbitrary Law or Covenant*, according to which God declareth, that he will govern his Creatures. As in the *Hobbeian* ſtate of Nature there is no ſuch thing as Law; (e) *where there is no common Power there is no Law; nor can any Law be made, till they have agreed upon the Perſon that ſhall make it:* So in the *Theological* ſtate of Nature there is no proper Law (as it is ſuppos'd) for there can be no Law till God ſubſtitute his *Ordinate Will* inſtead of his *Abſolute Right*, and take upon him the Relation of *Rector*. Accordingly a Law is thus defin'd; (f) *The ſignification of the Will of a Governour* (or Rector) *making the Subjects duty, and determining of Rewards to the Obedient and Puniſhments to the Diſobedient.* But if there be no Law in the Theological ſtate of Nature, there can be no Religion (for Religion is Law;) and if there be no Religion in the Univerſe, there can be no God in the Univerſe; and what can the *Leviathan* do worſe than to conſtitute an Univerſe without a Religion? If there be no Law in the Theological State of Nature, *whence is it, that Man is bound to acquieſce in God's Severity, if he ſhould ſink him into the deep Abyſs of Hell, ſo ſoon as he is created?* Whence is it, that Man is bound to Piety towards God as his Owner? and why are Men taught a Religion towards him in that Relation antecedently to his Relation of Rector? For we are told, (g) *that it is the duty of every reaſonable Creature, to bethink him, that God is his abſolute Owner, and there-*

(b) *Leviathan, par.* 1. *ch.* 13.

(c) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 1. *c.* 4. *S.* 11.

(d) *Leviathan ſup.*

(e) *Leviathan ſup.*

(f) *Mr. Baxter Reaſ. of the Chriſt. Rel. par.* 1. *ch.* 8.

(g) *Ibid. c.* 7.

thereupon to make a deliberate reſolved Reſignation of himſelf to God, without any Exceptions or Reſerves. That God ſhould be ſerv'd with his own, and that entirely without dividing; for we are not in part but wholly his. No Man ſhould repine at God's diſpoſal of him, but all Men ſhould acquieſce in the diſpoſing Will of God. All Men ſhould avoid all ſelfiſh Affections and Partiality, and be more affected with God's Intereſt than their own. No Man ſhould do any thing for ſelfiſh Ends, which is injurious to the Will and Intereſt of God our abſolute Owner. No Man ſhould diſpoſe of his Eſtate or any thing he hath, in any way, but for the Intereſt of his abſolute Lord. All Men ſhould make it the very care and labour of their Lives, to ſerve the Will and Intereſt of this their abſolute Owner. If ſuch a Syſtem of Law and Religion is in this State, ſomething is in it ſelf Law (which none may violate;) and if Man in this ſtate is God's Religioniſt, God muſt neceſſarily (in this ſtate) be related unto Man as his God. But as in the *Hobbeian* ſtate of Nature, becauſe there is no Law, there can be no Juſtice, *(h) the Notions of Right and Wrong, Juſtice and Injuſtice, have there no place; every Man hath Jus ad omnia* (right to all things) *to do whatſoever he liſteth, to whom he liſteth, to poſſeſs, uſe and enjoy all things he will and can:* In like manner, in this imaginary *Theological* ſtate of Nature on the Creator's part there is no place for *Right and Wrong, Juſtice and Injuſtice; his Power over his Creatures is infinite*, and it is not poſſible for any thing that he can do (in the exerciſe of arbitrary Will and Power) to be an Injury; every one may do with his own what he liſteth; where there is no right no wrong can be done, although the whole Univerſe of ſinleſs Creatures be made as miſerable, as they are capable to be!

XII. In this imaginary *Theological* ſtate of Nature the Univerſe of Rationals (having no Rights) are no better (at leaſt in reſpect of God) than the oppoſite to *liberi & ingenui*, ſuch as the Law calleth *Slaves and Villains. Liber eſt qui Jus habet ſuiipſius: Servus qui nullum Jus habet, ſed eſt alterius.* This is the notion of a Slave, *Servus eſt, qui Jus non habet, (i) ſervile caput Jus non habet, One of ſervile condition hath no* (civil) *right.* He hath not right to conſult of buſineſs in any Aſſembly, nor to bear any Office; nor right of ſuffrage, to give a vote in any Election; nor to give teſtimony as a Witneſs; nor hath he right, to enjoy any Eſtate; nor to make a Will or Teſtament to diſpoſe of it. But whatever he acquireth, accrueth to his Lord, Himſelf, his Wife (or rather his Mate) and Children being his Lord's Goods and Poſſeſſions; and whatſoever he getteth by his labour, is his Lords. He hath not *Jus connubii*, or *Jura ſanguinis*, as the Jews ſay of their Commonwealth; *(k) There was no ſuch thing as Marriage or Kindred amongſt Slaves, the Slave might have to do with his Mother or Daughter, the Bond-woman given him by his Lord for Iſſue was not a Wife, but only contubernalis; and in this matter there was no difference between Slaves and Beaſts. A Slave ſhould marry a Wife after he is manumis'd, although he hath Children; for to a Slave* אין לו יוחס *there is no Family, or Kindred, or Pedigree.* So amongſt the *Romans* in the elder times *(l)* ſuch as were *Servi* or *Capite diminuti* (as baniſh'd Men or otherwiſe capitally condemn'd) *were excluded from having Gentem or the Title of Gentiles among them* (they were not of any National Stock or Family) *and in this Senſe* Horace *hath* ſine Gente *for one that is a Slave, or at leaſt had Servile Anceſtours.*

Qui quamvis perjurus erit, ſine Gente cruentus.

A Slave having no Rights was amongſt the *Romans* liable to all manner of hard uſage from his Lord (till certain Laws were made, to remedy that hardſhip,) and accordingly we read of *Pollio* in the time of *Auguſtus Cæſar*, that he ordinarily caus'd his Slaves to be ſlain, to feed his Lampreys with, in certain Ponds near his Houſe. A Slave is in ſome ſenſe *a Man*, but not in the condition of a Man; whence a proud Dame in *Juvenal* ſaith, *(m) O Demens! ita ſervus homo eſt? It* was ordain'd by the Conſtitution of Nations, *(n) that none ſhould kill another, but he that was taken in Battel ſhould remain Bond to his Taker for ever, to do with him and all that ſhould come of him, his Will and Pleaſure, as with his Beaſt or any other Chattel, to give, or ſell, or to kill.* Having no right in the Common-wealth, *he is decapitated* or wanteth an Head (he is not of number or reckoning in it;) * *Status capitis eſt libertas: nam ſoli liberi caput habere, ſervi ſine capite eſſe in ſervitute cenſentur.* Having no Head or Poll of his own, he is *deperſonated* (ἀπρόσωπος) being ſwallow'd up in fiction of Law in the perſon of another. If any hurt be done him, he is not ſuppos'd to be hurt, but his Maſter by him; what is given to him, is not ſuppos'd to be given to him, but to his Maſter by him; and what is taken from him, is taken from his Lord by him. In Law conſideration his Lord can do no Injury or Injuſtice to him; nor exerciſe any Juſtice towards him (which conſiſteth in giving to every one that which is his) unleſs he can do *Injuſtice*, or exerciſe *Juſtice* to himſelf. For as *Ariſtotle* ſaith; *(o) The Lord is only the Slaves Lord, He is not his; but the Slave is not only* Servus Domini, *but ſimply* Domini (ἄλλου ἄνθρωπος,) *he is not only a Servant of his Lord's, but ſimply his Lord's, being wholly another's. (p) Nihil ſuum poteſt habere*, the miſerable Slave muſt ſay in a miſerable ſervile kind of Senſe, *Nothing is mine, either of my Party-things, or my abſolute Maſter's; there is no ſuch thing as being mine, nothing is exempt from being another's as meer Lord or Proprietor.*

Such a State of full and abſolute Slavery is neceſſarily a State of the moſt ſervile Dread and Fear (ſuch ſervile Fear as *Arnobius* calleth *(q) pavibundæ trepidationes*) devoid of ingenuous Love and Friendſhip; and becauſe ſuch kind of Fear is complicated with *hatred*, therefore ſuch a ſtate is in its own Nature an Hoſtile inimical State (whence the Proverb ſaith, *quot ſervi, tot hoſtes*;) and hence again it appeareth, *that the Theological State of Nature is, agreeably to the Leviathan's, a State of War.* It is alſo the State of *Death*; Slaves are as it were in the State of the Dead; for having no Rights they are as to matter of Law and Right *(r) nulli, incogniti, mortui, none, unknown, dead-in-law to all intents and purpoſes.* Slavery is as Death *(s)* ſaith the Law, and many have choſen Death rather than Slavery. This therefore could not be the State of Rationals by the original Creation of God. The State of Slaves is alſo the depth of vileneſs, abjectneſs, ignobleneſs; and as their baſe diſhonourable Condition is that of Beaſts below Men: So they are look'd upon as *filthy, ſordid, ignominious, informous* and *deteſtable* Var-

lets

h) *Leviathan ſupr. de Corp. polit. c.* 1.

) Zouch. l. Juriſ- ud. par. S. 2.

)Selden. J. N.& l. 5. c. 7.

) Idem tles of n.p. 709. l. 3.

(m) *Sat.* 6.

(n) *Cook Inſtit.* 1. *part of Villen.*

* *Turneb. Adverſ. l.* 6. *c.* 20.

(o) Ὁ μὲν δεσπότης τοῦ δούλου δεσπότης μόνον, ἐκείνου δ᾽ οὐκ ἔστιν· ὁ δὲ δοῦλος, οὐ μόνον δεσπότου δοῦλός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλως ἐκείνου. *Polit. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(p) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 3. *c.* 7.

(q) *Adv. Gent. l.* 7. *p.* 221.

(r) *Corvin. de verb. ſignif. lex* 68.

(s) *Zouch. ſupr.*

lets (*turpe & ſervile* are in common Speech the ſame, and denote that which claſheth with Ingenuity and a Free-man,) whence the way of Manumiſſion amongſt the Romans was a Mode of Luſtration or Expiation, (t) *& ſervum à contagio ſervitutis liberum eſſe indicabat, and it ſignify'd the Slave, to be free from the Contagion of his Servitude.* Upon account of their filth and ſordidneſs Slaves in many places were debarr'd from touching the Images of the Gods or entring the Temples, as *Plutarch* ſaith; (u) *In Chæronea the Guardian of the Temple taking a Whip in his Hand proclaimeth, No Slave muſt enter into the Temple of* Leucothea. Wherefore if the State of Sanctity and Religion was the original Condition of the Univerſe of Rationals, (w) if they were God's Servants in the Senſe of Religon (whoſe Service is perfect Freedom,) if they were nobly Born and deſcended (as doubtleſs all Rational Souls are,) it is impoſſible, that ſlavery ſhould be their original Condition. And why is Chriſtianity deſign'd, to unenſlave a World of Rationals, and to ennoble and dignifie them in reſpect of God, if abſolute ſlavery was their Native and original State? All Mankind ſuppoſe, (x) that ingenuity was before ſlavery; and therefore the manumiſing a Slave and ennobling a Plebeian is called by the Lawyers *reſtitutio natalium*: Therefore the Univerſe of Rationals were originally in reſpect of God in a State of ingenuity not of ſlavery. (y) τὸ δὲ κρεῖττον φύσει πρῶτον, *that which is more excellent was firſt exiſtent.* The Chriſtian Theology is a Friend to the Philoſophers generous Sentiments *that every virtuous Perſon is in a State of Liberty* (ὅτι πᾶς σπουδαῖος ἐλεύθερος,) and that (z) *the Souls of Men were produc'd in a State of Liberty.* Although it rectifieth their Miſtakes touching the Native State of Man in his fallen Condition, yet it agreeth with them, (a) that (in more Senſes than one) *Men are originally the Sons of God.* So vile and calamitous a thing as ſlavery is not the Iſſue of Divine Goodneſs, God was not the Author of it any otherwiſe than as a Puniſhment for Sin, (b) *Conditio ſervitutis jure intelligitur impoſita peccatori, a Criminal may rightly be puniſhed with ſlavery*; and if it oweth its Original to the Sin of Man, it cannot be the Original Creation of God. Nor is it any thing better than a vile Reflection upon the ever bleſſed Creator, to ſuppoſe him the Founder and the Head of an Univerſe of Slaves, nor can ſuch an Univerſe be an holy kind of Univerſe, nor can they be abſolutely his Slaves unleſs by *ſuch a Fiction as is in Law*, which cannot be in the Theological State of Nature; and if it was there, it would exclude all Juſtice and Injuſtice towards our Neighbour there. But although Mankind by their Law-fictions have deperſonated Slaves, and deprived them of all Rights, ſo that as to *exteriour Right* (impunity of the fact and defence of Law) their Lords may deal with them as they pleaſe, (c) yet they acknowledge, that as to *internal Juſtice* their Lords have no ſuch Licenſe, and that they ought to treat them agreeably to Juſtice and Equity, as the Apoſtle enjoineth. Nor is it poſſible, that Rationals in reſpect of God ſhould have *no Rights*, that they ſhould be related to him as *their abſolute meer Lord or Owner*, or that he ſhould have right to deal with them otherwiſe than agreeably to the Juſtice of their rightful Liege-Lord; that he ſhould have as great right to inflict upon them Penal kind of Things before Tranſgreſſion as after, or ſhould rightfully puniſh them for Sin beyond their demerit. If theſe things cannot be juſtly done, God cannot have right to do them, and the Rational Creatures have right to have them not done. Wherefore ſuch extravagant Suppoſitions touching the *Divine Dominion*, and all the Notions upon which that *impure Dogma* of abſolute reprobation is founded, ought to be exterminated out of the Chriſtian Theology

(t) Boxhorn. Qu. Roman. p. 128.

(u) Ibid. p. 205.

(w) Tiraquell. de Nobil. p. 54.

(x) Ibid. p. 63.

(y) Plotin. En. 5. l. 9. c. 4.

(z) Simplic. in Epict. p. 2.

(a) Epict. Diſſ. l. 1. c. 3.

(b) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 19. c. 15. S. Chryſ. T. 6. p. 643.

(c) Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 3. c. 14. l. 2. c. 5. §. 28.

CHAP. II.

1. *An Agreement of the Scripture-Theology and the Pagan in attributing to governing Providence the Names of Lord, Potentate and King. Of the Name Lord.* 2. *The Ambiguity of the Name Lord.* 3. *Of the Scriptural Aſcriptions of the Names King and Kingdom, Dominant and reigning Condition unto God.* 4. *Of the Pagan Theologers Aſcriptions of the Name King and of reigning Condition to their Deities. Conſect.* 1. *From this Agreement; that there is a great Agreement touching the Divine Attributes. Conſect.* 2. *That this Name* God *denoteth the King, Lord or Potentate, which governing Providence is. Proofs of it.* 2. *More Arguments to Prove it. Conſect.* 3. *That the God-head is the Kingdom-Eſtate.* 1. *As being the Magnificent reigning Eſtate.* 2. *As being the Unabject and Unſubject Eſtate.* 3. *As being the Regial Celſitude of Condition.* 4. *As being the height of Honour and Nobilitation of Eſtate.* 5. *As being the Eſtate of Royalty.* 6. *As being the height of Glory.* 7. *As being the height of Proſperity and Beatitude.* 8. *As being the height of Rule and Government.* 9. *As being the height of Power and Puiſſance.* 10. *As being the height of Liberties, Immunities and Priviledges.* 11. *As being the Eſtate of Sacredneſs.* 12. *As being the Monarchy.* 13. *As being the Subject-tranſcendent Eſtate. Conſect.* 4. *Theſe Theologies agree, that the ſupreme Potentate's Kingdom-Eſtate is God-head of Condition.*

I. THE *Scripture-Theology and the Pagan agree in attributing to governing Providence the Names of Lord, Potentate and King; both Theologies contemplate governing Providence under thoſe Names and Notions, and both agree (but in different Senſe,) that governing Providence as Lord and King is Dominant and Regnant over all (in Fact and of Right,) which Sovereignty of Domination is his Kingdom in an uſual Senſe of Language.*

Some of the Learned have ſuppos'd, (d) *that* κύριος *Lord, the frequent Name of God in ſacred Writ, is not to be found ſo us'd by any of the old Greek Authors.* But others have ſhew'd, (e) *that in the Writings of the Greekiſh Pagans* (both the more

ancient

(d) B Pear the C Art. 2 290.

(e) D Cudw. Intel. p. 454

ancient and thoſe of later times) *the ſupreme God is often called* κύριος, *or Lord. For* Plato *in his Sixth Epiſtle* ad Hermiam, &c. *ſtileth his firſt Divine Hypoſtaſis* τοῦ ἡγεμόνος ϗ αἰτίου πατέρα κύριον, *the Father of the Prince and Cauſe of all, the Lord.* Menander *in J. Martyr calleth the ſupreme God* τὸν ὄντα πάντων κύριον, *him that is Lord of all. Oſiris* in *Plutarch* is called ἁπάντων κύριος, *Lord of all, and in the beginning of his Book* de Iſide & Oſiride *we read of* τοῦ πρώτου ϗ κυρίου ϗ νοητοῦ γνῶσις, *the knowledge of the Firſt, the Lord, the Intelligible. And* Oromaſdes *is called* ὁ κύριος, *the Lord in* Plutarch's *Life of* Alexander; *as* νοῦς, *alſo* κύριος, *by* Ariſtotle, *that is, the ſupreme Ruler of all. From* Arrianus's Epictetus *we learn, that the very Form of Prayer, which hath been now ſo long in uſe in the Chriſtian Church, Kyrie Eleeſon, Lord have Mercy upon us, was anciently part of the Pagans Litany to the ſupreme God, either amongſt the Greeks, or the Latins, or both.* Τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλούμενος, (ſaith *Epictetus*) δεόμεθα αὐτοῦ, κύριε ἐλέησον, *invoking God we pray to him after this manner, Lord have Mercy upon us.* Jamblichus *writeth thus of the ſupreme God*; δεῖν ὁμολογεῖται παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἀγαθὸν ζητεῖν, *it is confeſs'd, that good ought to be asked of the Lord.* Clemens Alexandrinus *alſo tells us, that the ſupreme God was called, not by one only Name, but by divers diverſly, namely,* ἤτοι Ἓν, ἢ τ' Ἀγαθὸν, ἢ Νοῦν, ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ θεὸν, ἢ κύριον, *either the One, or the Good, or Mind, or the very Ens, or the Father, or the Lord.* To this heap of Teſtimonies (collected to my hand) if I ſhould add any more, they might juſtly be thought Supernumeraries: But that the Pagan Theologers Lord be not confounded with the Chriſtian, it is requiſite, to remark, that the Name κύριος, *or Lord*, in the Pagan Theology is not appropriate to any determinate Deity; but is ſometimes attributed to the ſupreme Deity of the *Acroamatical Theology* (as in *Plato*;) ſometimes to the ſupreme Deity of the *Exoterical Theology* (as in *Menander* and *Epictetus*;) and ſometimes to ſubordinate Deities both *Acroamatical* and *Exoterical.* It is attributed to an *Exoterical Subordinate* Deity in thoſe Inſcriptions that are made (*f*) κυρίῳ Ἀσκληπίῳ, *to Lord Æſculapius.* And in the Eaſtern parts *the Sun* (uſually called *the Lord of Heaven*) was worſhipp'd under the Names of (*g*) *Adon, Adonis, Adoneus*, which ſignifie *the Lord* (*Adon* in Hebrew is Lord,) whence *Heſychius* ſaith, Ἄδωνις δεσπότης ὑπὸ φοινίκων, *the Phenician* Adonis *is the ſame with Lord.* The *Spartans* (as he ſaith) called *Adonis* κῦρις, and κύρις, that is, κύριος, *Lord.* The Sun is alſo ſtiled δεσπότης, in that memorable Prayer, which the Egyptian Embalmers made for a dead Man; (*h*) Ὦ δέσποτα ἥλιε, ϗ θεοὶ πάντες, *O Lord the Sun, and all ye Gods.* So *Bacchus* is ſaluted (*i*) Δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε Βάκχε, *Lord* Bacchus *lover of Laurel.* So *Apollo* is ſaluted (*k*) Ὦ δέσποτα Ἄπολλον, *Lord* Apollo. Some Inſcriptions to the Sun run in this form, (*l*)

Domino Soli V. S. TI Claudius.

Jamblichus attributeth the Name *Lord* to a Subordinate *Acroamatical* Deity, who was ſuppos'd to Preſide over the Demons, and by whom the Theurgiſts invok'd them. (*m*) Καθ' ἕνα τὸν κύριον θεὸν τῶν δαιμόνων ἡ κλῆσις αὐτῶν γίνεται. *The Invocation of them is made by one Lord* (a God) *of the Demons.* (*n*) The *Arabians* in the times of their old Religion before they undertook a Buſineſs (marrying a Wife or going a Journey) us'd a ſort of Divination by Arrows, upon one of which was inſcrib'd *Juſſit me* רבי *Dominus meus, my Lord hath bidden me: Another had this Inſcription, Probibuit me Dominus meus, my Lord hath forbidden me.* To the ſupreme Deity of the Exoterical Theology the Name Lord is attributed in the known Titles of *Baal, Bel, Marnas*; (*o*) *Mithras* alſo is by interpretation δυνάστης, *ſive Dominus, Potentate or Lord.* And in *Plutarch*'s Life of *Ariſtides, Arimneſtus* who commanded the *Platæans*, is ſaid to have dream'd, *that* Jupiter *the Saviour ask'd him, what the Grecians had reſolved to do? And that he anſwer'd, to morrow, Lord, we march our Army to* Eleuſis. So *Diphilus* the Comedian ſtileth the ſupreme Deity of the Exoterical Theology πάντων δεσπότης, *Lord of all.* (*p*)

——————ἔστι ϗ ἅδου κρίσις
Ἥνπερ ποιήσει θεὸς ὁ πάντων δεσπότης.
There is a Judgment in the other World,
Which God will make the Lord of all.

To the Deities in common Supreme and Subordinate *Xenophon* (in Oeconomico) attributeth the Name and Power of Lords. (*q*) *You ſeem to me, rightly to teach, that we ſhould take care, to begin every Action with the Gods, they being no leſs Lords of the Affairs of Peace than of War.*

II. In the Name *Lord* there is a conſiderable ambiguity and variety of Senſe. In the Civil Law it denoteth *a ſuperior Proprietor of Things and Perſons* (*Domini appellatione continetur, qui habet Proprietatem,*) as *Matth.* 20. 8. *The Lord of the Harveſt.* Matth. 9. 38. *The Lord of the Vineyard.* Therefore ſuperior Proprietors of Perſons of the regular, amiable and natural kind are Lords: * As Children call their Father, *Gen.* 31. 35. the Wife calleth the Husband, 1 *Pet.* 3. 6. the Sheep call the good Shepherd (whoſe own they are, *Joh.* 10. 12.) *their Lord.* So an Houſholder (οἰκοδεσπότης) is call'd by thoſe of his Family *Lord.* Matth. 24. 48. Servants unenſlav'd have *their Lord.* Gen. 44. 5. Matth. 10. 25. And becauſe *Lord* and *Servant* are Relatives, hence the Names are in frequent uſe as terms of Reſpect and Reverence in civil intercourſe, where though there be no ſuch Relation as *Maſter* and *Servant*, yet ſomething like it is profeſs'd. *Oh my Lord, let thy Servant ſpeak.* Gen. 44. 18. So *Jacob* calleth *Eſau Lord*, Gen. 33. 8. and *Abraham* the Angel, *Gen.* 18. 3. and *Rebekah Abraham*'s Servant, *Gen.* 24. 18. As ſuperior Proprietors of the regular and natural kind are ſtiled *Lords*: So the Name uſually ſignifieth thoſe of the irregular and unnatural kind, or any others, that Lord it over Men in the Senſe of inſlaving them. (*r*) *Qui pater patriæ eſt, quomodo Dominus eſt? He that is a Father of his Country, how is he Lord?* So *Pliny* in his Panegyric to *Trajan* abandoneth the Title, *nè ſit Domino locus, let there be no Lord.* Amongſt ſuperior Proprietors of Perſons governing Powers ought to be reckon'd (for they have a Propriety in their People, as Parents have in their Children, the Husband in the Wife,) and upon that account they are Lords: But beſides as maſterly and ruling Powers and of unſubject Condition they are called Lords in Law-Senſe; for *Dominus eſt qui habet poteſtatem. Tertullian* thinketh, that (*s*) *Deus ſubſtantiæ ipſius nomen eſt, id eſt divinitatis: Dominus verò non ſubſtantiæ, ſed poteſtatis. God is a Name of the Subſtance it ſelf, that is, the Divinity: But the Name Lord*

(f) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 13.

(g) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

(h) *Porph. de Abſt.* 4. *S.* 10.

(i) *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 14

(k) *Plutarch de Pyth. orac. p.* 403.

(l) *Beyer. Addit. ad Seld. de D. Syr. p.* 52.

(m) *De Myſt. p.* 172.

(n) *Pocock Spec. p.* 327.

(o) *Voſſ. ſupr.*

(p) *Theodoret.* θεραπ. *Ser.* 6. *Clem. Str.* 5. *p. m.* 442.

(q) Καλῶς μοι δοκεῖς λέγειν, κελεύων πειρᾶσθαι σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς ἄρχεσθαι παντὸς ἔργου, ὡς τῶν θεῶν κυρίων ὄντων οὐδὲν ἧττον τῶν εἰρηνικῶν ἢ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων.

* *This is true notwithſtanding what* Cujacius *ſaith, l.* 10. *obſerv. c.* 76.

(r) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 35.

(s) *C. Hermog. c.* 3.

doth not denote the Divine Subſtance, but his Power over others. Amongſt the Sons of God (t) *unicus habet poteſtatem, adoptati miniſterium. None but one hath the Power or is Lord* (ſaith S. *Auſtin,*) *to the adopted Sons Miniſtery and Service belongeth.* Dominant Powers may want due Authority (of ſuch the Jews complain, *Iſa.* 26. 13. *other Lords have had Dominion over us,*) but the licentious Linguiſts are to ſeek for a *duly authoritative Dominator.* Pſal. 12. 4. *Our Lips are our own, who is Lord over us?* But ſuch a *Lord* or authoritative Dominator is the Maſter of a Family, and the General of an Army, Magiſtrates alſo Supreme and Subordinate (that in reſpect of ſome are Dominant, in reſpect of others are Servient) old *Eli*, *Joſeph* in the Land of *Egypt*, as Ruling Powers are intituled Lords. For *Domination, Empire, Dominion* (which conſtituteth Lords and conſtituted *Babylon* Lady of Kingdoms, *Iſa.* 47. 5.) ſignifieth *bearing Rule*, which is an unſubject, unabject Condition; (*u*) and therefore the authoritative Power to command over, uſe and order Things and Perſons, is a *Legitimate* Domination. Agreeably to which Senſe in common Language we are ſtiled *Domini*, *Lords* of Things and Perſons, to ſignifie, that we have them in our Power or Diſpoſal. (*w*) The Divine Nature is (as *Tertullian* ſaith) *Domina juvandi & nocendi, the Miſtreſs of helping and of hurting.* (*x*) *Animus qui eſt rationis capax, non eſt ſuarum Paſſionum Dominus, ſed repreſſor. The Rational Mind is not* (plenarily) *Lord of the Paſſions, but the Repreſſor of them.* To the Civil Sovereignty the Law attributeth a publick *Lordſhip* and *Domination* conſiſting in thoſe great Preheminences and Powers *the Rights of Sovereignty*, which are ſummarily compris'd in this one, *a ſupreme Right to Command in the Affairs of Government.* And becauſe the Civil Sovereigns (having full Empire and free Juriſdiction, and therefore ſtiled *ſupremi Domini in terrâ ſuâ*) have Right to command and diſpoſe of every Man's Eſtate, ſo far as the publick Exigences require, therefore the Lawyers ſay, *Ad Cæſarem poteſtas omnium pertinet, ad ſingulos Proprietas. Cæſar omnia imperio poſſidet, ſinguli Dominio: The Power of all things belongeth to Cæſar, the Propriety to every Subject: Cæſar poſſeſſeth all things by Command, the reſt by Dominion.*

In *Feudal* Law *the Lord* is contradiſtinguiſhed to his *Beneficiaries*, the *Tenants, Clients, Feudataries*, and *Vaſſals*, that hold of him in *Fee*, and are bound to him by *Homage* and *Fealty.* Theſe are ſtiled his *Lieges* (bound to Love and Reverence him and to do him faithful Service,) and he is related to them as their Patron and Protector. And becauſe there is in every regular Polity the ſame mutual Obligation between the Party imperant and the Party ſubject (although they do not formally make any Bond of Homage or Fealty,) therefore I have called every regular Society-Lord *a Liege-Lord*, and his Societiſts his Liege-People. In *Nobility-learning*, which conſidereth *Titles of Honour*, (*y*) none but the greater Dominant or more unſubject Eſtates of a Commonwealth or Kingdom are ſtiled *Lords*, (ſuch as *Artaxerxes*'s Lords, the Lords of the Philiſtins, *Herod*'s Lords, *Lord-Emperor*,) Proprietors or ruling Powers of mean Rank, although they be Lords in Law-Senſe, yet are not ſuch in the Senſe of Nobility-Learning. In which Senſe the Jews ſeem to ſay, *Jer.* 2. 31. *we are Lords*, or thoſe that have the Dominion (the unſubject Eſtates,) *we will come no more unto thee.* For this reaſon, becauſe the Name κύριος, is the attribution of a more unſubject Eſtate to the Perſon ſo denominated, Inferiors call their Superior Relatives by the Name κύριε, (as Scholars their Præceptor or Maſter, 2 *King.* 6. 5, 15.) and in common Converſation it is a Title of reſpectful civility to Acquaintance and to Strangers. As in *Plautus's Pænulus*, *Havo Donni* (*Ave Domine mi*;) ſo among the Muhammedans (z) *Sultan* is an Appellative in their common Salutations, and in Scripture κύριε, or *Sir.* *Job.* 4. 11. ch. 5. 7. ch. 9. 36, 38. ch. 12. 21. ch. 20. 15. From theſe Notices of Human Lordſhip (which are moſt of them competible to the Godhead) it appeareth, that governing Providence may be ſtiled *Lord* in a conſiderable variety of Senſe: But the Senſe here intended is, *that he is of Dominant condition over the whole Univerſe as a ſupreme authoritative Power* (Lord or Potentate) *actually exerciſing that authoritative Power over all things and perſons*, as *Tertullian* ſaith. (*a*) *Deum exiſtimo ubique notum, ubique præſentem, ubique dominantem. I ſuppoſe God every where known, every where preſent, every where dominant.* So *Cicero* calleth the Gods (*b*) *Dominos omnium rerum ac moderatores. The Lords and Moderators of all things.*

III. Any dominant condition over things and perſons may in a large Senſe be called *a regnant or reigning Condition:* As the dominant condition of Sin (which hath the Maſtery over unregenerate Mankind, *Rom.* 6. 14. is called the Reign of it, *Rom.* 6. 12. ſuch is the Reign of Death, *Rom.* 5. 14. (*Death reigned from* Adam *to* Moſes;) or in the Language of the Book of *Wiſdom*, ch. 1. 14. *the Kingdom of Death upon the Earth*, is a Phraſe expreſſive of its actual and jural Domination over Mankind. Becauſe Man is of dominant condition in this lower Region, *and all things are put under him* according to *Moſes*; therefore *Euſebius* ſaith of *Moſes*; (*c*) *he affirmeth, that Man was made, to Rule and Reign over all things on Earth.* He is ſaid by the Poet, to be of regnant condition here, and the Image of God.

Nunc hominem facimus ait, qui regnet in orbe
Et ſit Imago Dei.

In a more reſtrict and proper Senſe the dominant condition of ſupreme Powers over Things and Perſons is a regnant or reigning condition. In Diſcourſes of ſuch Powers ἄρχειν, ἀνάσσειν, βασιλεύειν, κρατεῖν, κυριεύειν, *to bear rule, to be regnant, imperant, dominant*, are promiſcuouſly us'd both in Scripture and in profane Authors. (*d*) So *Venice* is intituled *Domina & Regina Maris Adriatici, The Lady* (Sovereign Lady) *and Queen of the Adriatic Sea. Caſſandra* foretold to the Roman People (*e*)

Γῆς ϗ θαλάσσης σκῆπτρα ϗ μοναρχίαν.
The Sceptre and Monarchy of the Earth and Sea.

Of the Emperor *Theodoſius Themiſtius* ſaith, (*f*) *What would you ſay of him, that reigneth over almoſt all the Earth and Sea. The Earth and Sea* δεδούλωται, *is of ſervient and ſubject condition to the Roman Emperor*, ſaith *Procopius.* Which is to ſay, that he is

Γῆς ϗ θαλάσσης κύριος ϗ Δεσπότης.
Lord and Dominator of the Earth and Sea.

(t) *S. Aug. Tract.* 7. *in Joann.*

1 *Sam.* 1. 15. *Gen.* 42. 30. *and* 41. 43.

(u) *Gen.* 27. 40. *Judg.* 5. 13. *Rom.* 6. 14.

(w) *Tertull. ad nation. l.* 2.

(x) *S. Ambroſ. de Jacob. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

(y) *Selden Titles p.* 36. *ed.* 3. *Ezra.* 8. 25. 1 *Sam.* 5. 8. *Mark* 6. 21. *Act.* 25. 26.

(z) *Selden Titles p.* 71. *ed.* 3.

(a) *Ad nation. l.* 2.

(b) *De Leg.* 2.

(c) Ἀρχικὸν φησιν αὐτὸν ϗ βασιλικὸν γενέσθαι τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς πάντων. Pr. ev. l. 11. c. 27.

(c) *Selden Mare clauſ. l.* 1. *c.* 10. 11, 12, & 16. *p.* 67.

(c) *Ibid. c.* 14. *p.* 56, 57.

(f) Τί φαίης ἂν περὶ τοῦ πάσης σχεδὸν βασιλεύοντος γῆς ϗ θαλάττης.

In the ſtile of Sovereign Princes the Attributes of *Lord* and *King* are of the ſame importance; as when our King *Edgar* ſtileth himſelf; (g) *I* Edgar *King of the Engliſh and of all the Kings of the Iſlands and of the Ocean about* Britain, *and of all the Nations included therein Emperor and Lord.* The Grand Signior becauſe he is (h) *Sultan Olem* Lord of the World is King of the World. So *Sultan Selim* writing in barbarous Greek ſtileth himſelf, Αὐθέντης ϗ βασιλεὺς ὅλονο ϗ πᾶσα τȣ̃ οἰκεμένȣ ἢ τὸ τῶν λιόν. *Lord and King of what is comprehended in our ſight under the Sun.* In the Language of the Fathers (i) μία βασιλεία, and μία κυριότης, *one Kingdom and one Domination* are ſynonymous Expreſſions. (k) So amongſt the Hebrew Doctors רבונו של עולם *Lord of the World* and מלך העולם *King of the World* are ſynonymous Expreſſions; for to be King of the World is nothing elſe, but to be Sovereign Lord of it. So in the ſtile of the Scriptures *his Kingdom and his Dominion* (or Domination) are ſynonymous Expreſſions. *His Kingdom is an everlaſting Kingdom, and his Dominion is from Generation to Generation. His Kingdom is that which ſhall not be deſtroy'd, and his Dominion ſhall be even to the end. They ſhall ſpeak of the glory of thy Kingdom and talk of thy Power. To make known to the Sons of Men his mighty Acts and the glorious Majeſty of his Kingdom. Thy Kingdom is an everlaſting Kingdom, and thy Dominion endureth throughout all Generations. The Kingdom is the Lords, and he is* מֹשֵׁל *Dominator among the Nations. The Lord hath prepared his Throne in the Heavens, and his Kingdom ruleth* (or is dominant) *over all.* In this Notion of the word *Kingdom* (as it ſignifieth Sovereignty of Dominion) the devotional Doxologies in holy Scripture aſcribe *the Kingdom* to God. 1 *Chron.* 29. 11. *Thine O Lord, is the greatneſs, and the power, and the glory and the victory, and the majeſty.*—— *thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all.* Matth. 6. 13. *Thine is the Kingdom, and the power and the glory.* Which devotional Doxologies of holy Scripture the courtly Language us'd to mundane Princes reſembleth. For the Embaſſadors of *Michael Curopalata to* Charles *the Great* for the confirmation of a League came to him at *Aix*, (l) *& more ſuo, id eſt Græcâ Linguâ laudes ei dixerunt, Imperatorem & Baſileum appellantes. After their manner, that is, in the Greek Tongue they gave him laudatory Aſcriptions, calling him* (which is the greateſt ennoblement and perfection of Condition) *Emperor and King.* And as a Greek Emperor *Emanuel Commenus* blazoneth his own greatneſs (m) ſtiling himſelf *Regnator potens, excelſus & ſemper Auguſtus*, (powerful Reigner, high and always Auguſt:) So God's Religioniſts uſually magnifie him by the laudatory Aſcriptions of the Name *King* (ſometimes ſtiling him *the King*, ſometimes *the Lord the King*, ſometimes *the King of Glory*, ſometimes *the great King*, ſometimes *the King Eternal*) and the ſupreme Condition of *reigning*, which is the uſual ſtile of the Pſalmiſts Devotions. *The Lord moſt high is terrible, he is a great King over all the Earth. God is the King of all the Earth* (which is of the ſame ſignification with that other Attribute *the Lord of the whole Earth*, or the Dominator over it,) *God reigneth over the Heathen. He ruleth by his Power for ever, his Eyes behold the Nations. The Lord ſitteth upon the Flood, yea the Lord ſitteth King for ever. The Lord is King for ever and ever. The Lord ſhall reign for ever. The Lord reigneth, let the Earth rejoice. The Lord reigneth, let the People tremble. The Lord is a great God, and a great King above all Gods. The Lord reigneth, he is clothed with Majeſty. Let Men ſay among the Nations, the Lord reigneth. Say among the Heathen, the Lord reigneth.* Pſal. 47. 2, 7, 8. and 97. 5. and 66. 7. and 29. 10. and 10. 16. and 146. 10. and 97. 1. and 99. 1. and 95. 3. and 93. 1. 1 *Chron.* 16. 31. *Pſal.* 96. 10. *God ſitteth upon the Throne of his Holineſs* (which denoteth his ſupreme Condition of reigning) *Pſal.* 47. 8. *Thy Throne is eſtabliſh'd of old.* Pſal. 93. 2. *Moſes* in like manner celebrateth the Divine Majeſty. *Exod.* 15. 18. *The Lord ſhall reign for ever and ever.* And *Jehoſaphat* 2 Chron. 20. 6. *O Lord God of our Fathers, art not thou God in Heaven, and ruleſt thou not over all the Kingdoms of the Heathen?* This Branch of the Scripture-Theology (which every where repreſenteth *governing Providence over all* as dominant and regnant over all) is well expreſs'd by *Euſebius.* (n) *Such is the Theology of the Hebrews; it teacheth, that all things were made by God's demiurgic word, and that then the Univerſe was not forſaken by its Founder, as an Orphan left by its Father: But is perpetually adminiſtred by the Providence of God, ſo that he is not only the Maker of the Univerſe, but the Conſervator, and Prefect, and King and Prince, for ever preſiding over the Sun and Moon and Stars, the whole Heaven and the World, by a vaſt Eye and a Divine Power inſpecting all and being preſent with all things Celeſtial and Terreſtrial, and ordering and adminiſtring all things in the World.* The ſaying of God in the Prophet, *the Heaven is my Throne, and the Earth is my Footſtool*, is well expounded by the ſame Author. (o) *He that ſaith, Heaven is his Throne, diſcriminateth God the King of all as tranſcendent to the Throne, and ſupreme above the Univerſe, not exempting the Earth from his Providence.*

IV. The like Aſcriptions of the honourary Name *King*, of *a reigning Condition* and of *Kingdom* the Pagan Theologers make to their Deities *Acroamatical* and *Exoterical*, *Supreme* or *Subordinate.* For the Platoniſts (as we have ſeen) ſtile their Triad of Archical Hypoſtaſes *three Kings*; (p) their *Ontology* ſuppoſeth τὴν νοερὰν βασιλείαν ἐν τοῖς ȣ̓̃σι, *an intellectual Kingdom amongſt Beings*, and they attribute to their firſt Archical Hypoſtaſis βασιλείαν τῶν ὄντων, *the Kingdom of all Beings.* (q) Βασιλέα μὲν ὁ Πλάτων τὸν θεὸν ἀποκαλεῖ, Plato *calleth God* Baſileus. The Name ſeemeth not agreeable to *Plato*'s ſupreme God; for governing Peovidence is not his work; he is ſaid, to be (r) ἀργὸς ἔργων ξυμπάντων, *altogether inoperative:* But the Platoniſts diſtinguiſh a twofold Providence, the one *General*, the other *Particular:* And the former is done (s) κελεύσει ἀπράγμονι, ἐπιϛασίᾳ βασιλικῇ, *by an inoperative command a regial prefectſhip.* *Apuleius* thus mitigateth the harſhneſs of the Platonic Language, Apologizing for his *Baſileus.* (t) Maximus *underſtandeth, who it is, that is not firſt called by me, but by* Plato, Baſileus, *the cauſe, reaſon, and firſt origin of the whole nature of things, the Supreme Genitor of the Soul, the eternal Conſervator of Animals, the aſſiduous Opificer of his World, but an Opificer without labouring* (or working) *a Conſervator without care, a Genitor without propagation, neither comprehended in Place nor Time, nor any Word* (or Speech) *and therefore cogitable but by few, ſpeakable by none.* He is ſuppos'd, to be abſolutely the King of all; therefore the *Platoniſts* ſtile him *King* in a Senſe of Eminence, ſometimes (u) *the great King*, and ſometimes *the King of Kings.* (w) *The Supernal King* (a Myſtic-Metaphyſical King of the like Kings) *doth not bear rule over the things of others, but hath the moſt juſt and natural Empire, and the true Kingdom, as being King of what is Truth* (the Platonic Ideas) *and being naturally Lord of the All of his own Off-ſpring, and the Syſtem of Gods, King of the King, and of Kings.* The Philoſophers prove the Exiſtence of one Supreme Deity, by ſuch reaſons as imply, that he is a King or Emperour; for ſo *Zeno Eleates* argueth; (x) τοῦτο θεὸς καὶ θεοῦ δύναμις κρατεῖν ἀλλὰ μὴ κρατεῖσθαι; *This is God and the power of God, to rule and tranſcend, not to be outvy'd and rul'd.* *Plato* ſuppoſeth it a dictate of common Reaſon, (y) τὸ μὲν θεῖον ἄρχειν τε καὶ ἡγεμονεύειν πεφυκέναι, *that which is Divine, is to be imperant and bear rule.* And *Socrates* argu'd, (z) *That Souls ought to bear rule and have domination over Bodies, becauſe of their ſimilitude to the Gods.* For the Subordinate Deities are of a Regial Dignity, as well as the Supreme, (*a*) and therefore are intituled βασιλικοὶ θεοί, *Kingly Gods*; and ſome of them were pictur'd with a Crown an Enſign of Empire. (*b*) *In the elder times of the flouriſhing* Roman *Empire the Crown radiant, or* Radiatum Caput *was a Character of being accounted as a God*; (*c*) *and thence it is, that in diverſe of the Heads of* Julius *and* Auguſtus's *Coins* (*after their Conſecration into Deities*) *we find Radiant Crowns*; *and in the following times alſo it occurreth in the Coins of divers others, and that while ſome of them liv'd too, becauſe the Name or Dignity of a God was attributed to them.* In the Ancient Times of Paganiſm they worſhipp'd Spears as Symbols of the Gods, and in after-times they added Spears to their Images, (*d*) thoſe Spears being inſtead of Scepters, Symbols of their *Regal Power*, and denoting the Gods to be σκηπτοῦχοι βασιλῆες, *Sceptigerous Kings.*

(g) *Ego Edgarus Anglorum Baſileus omniumque Regum inſularum Oceanique Britanniam circumjacentis, cunctarumque nationum quæ intra eam includuntur Imperator & Dominus.* Ibid. p. 178.

(h) *Idem Titles p.* 71.

(i) S. *Athanaſ. de com. Eſſen.* p. 375. *Com. Epiphan. Hær.* 62. *S.* 3.

(k) *Hotting. Diſſ.* p. 284.

Dan. 4. 3. and 6. 26. *Pſal.* 145. 11, 12, 13. and 22. 28. and 103 19.

(l) Selden Titles p. 14.

(m) Ibid. . 105. *Pſal.* 20. . *and* 99. . *and* 98. . *and* 24. . *and* 48. . *Mal.* 1. 14. *Matth.* 5. 35. *Tim.* 1. 17.

(n) Τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ καθ' Ἑβραίȣς θεολογία λόγῳ θεȣ̃ δημιȣργικῷ τὰ πάντα συνεϛάναι παιδεύȣσα. Ἔπειτα δὲ, οὐχ ὧδε ἔρημον ὡς ὀρφανὸν ὑπὸ πατρὸς καταλειφθέντα, τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ὑπὸ τȣ̃ συϛησαμένȣ διδάσκει, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἀεὶ, ὑπὸ τῆς τȣ̃ θεȣ̃ προνοίας αὐτὸν διοικεῖσθαι, ὡς μὴ μόνον δημιȣργὸν εἶναι τῶν ὅλων ϗ ποιητὴν τὸν θεὸν, ἀλλὰ ϗ σωτῆρα, ϗ διοικητὴν, ϗ βασιλέα, ϗ ἡγεμόνα, ἡλίῳ αὐτῷ, ϗ σελήνῃ, ϗ ἄϛροις, ϗ τῷ σύμπαντι ȣ̓ρανῷ τε ϗ κόσμῳ δι' αἰῶνος ἐπιϛατȣ̃ντα, μεγάλῳ τε ὀφθαλμῷ, ϗ ἐνθέῳ δυνάμει πάντ' ἐφορῶντα, ϗ τοῖς πᾶσιν ȣ̓ρανίοις τε ϗ ἐπιγείοις ἐπιπαρόντα καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν κόσμῳ διατάττοντά τε καὶ διοικȣ̃ντα. Pr. Ev. l. 7. c. 11.

(o) Ὁ μὲν τὸν ȣ̓ρανὸν εἰπὼν θρόνον, ἐπέκεινα τȣ̃ θρόνȣ ϗ ἀνωτάτω τῶν ὅλων τὸν παμβασιλέα θεὸν ἀφωρίσατο, ȣ̓δὲ τὴν γῆν τῆς προνοίας αὐτȣ̃ χωρίσας.

(p) *Procl. Plat. Th. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 7.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 2. *p.* 103.

(r) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 11. *c.* 18.

(s) *Plotin. en.* 4. *l.* 3. 8. *c.* 2.

But the Sceptre amongſt the Ancients was uſually (*e*) a Symbol of *Jove* himſelf (the Supreme Deity of the Exoterical Theology) *the greateſt King.* And (as *Servius* upon *Virgil* reporteth) in ſwearing to Solemn Leagues the Cuſtom was, to have the Statues of *Jupiter* brought to the place, where the Oath was taken, (that ſo it might be taken in his preſence;) but this being found troubleſome, the *Pater Patratus* or King of Heralds held a Sceptre in his Hand, which was ſubſtituted in the ſtead and ſupply'd the place of the Statue of *Jupiter.* He is commonly ſaluted Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, in *Ariſtophanes*, and Ζεῦ ἄνα, *Jupiter-King* in *Homer*, who alſo calleth him ὕπατον κρειόντων, *the Supreme of Rulers*; and in *Plautus* we read, (*f*) *per ſupremi regis regnum juro, I ſwear by the Kingdom of the Supreme King.* All the Earth agreeth, ſaith the Philoſopher, (*g*) ὅτι θεὸς εἷς πάντων βασιλεὺς καὶ πατήρ, *that there is one God the King and Father of all*, and conſequently, βασιλεύεσθαι τὸ ὅλον, *that the Univerſe hath a King or Monarch over it.* He is therefore *the King of Gods and Men*, becauſe their Father, as *Ariſtotle* ſuppoſeth, (*h*) *The Rule of a Father over his Children is regial; therefore* Homer *hath well intituled the King of all theſe things, the Father of Gods and Men.* The *Egyptians*, ſaith *Plutarch*, (*i*) expreſs or denote τὸν βασιλέα καὶ κύριον Ὄσιριν, *the King and Lord* Oſiris (governing Providence) *by a Scepter with an Eye in it*, by the former ſignifying his Power, and by the latter his Providence. *Oſiris* is called by *Apuleius Maximorum Regnator, the Reigner over the greateſt* (which ſpeaketh his Supreme Condition of Reigning;) and as the Scriptures call Heaven *the Throne of Governing Providence*, ſo *Julian* affirmeth, that the common Senſe of Mankind (*k*) *ſeateth the King of the Univerſe in that more honourable part of the Univerſe, and ſuppoſeth him from thence to inſpect the things that are here.* So *Archilochus* in *Clemens* ſaith; (*l*) O Jupiter, *thine is the Empire of Heaven, but in Heaven thou beholdeſt the Works that are improbous and juſt.* Agreeably to the *European* the Oriental Pagans gave to their Deities (Supreme and Subordinate) the Name of *King*, as appeareth from *Moloch, Milcom, Malcham, Adramelech, Anamelech, Malachbelus* (before-mention'd;) the *Phenicians* intituled *Hercules* (*m*) *Melicarthus*, that is, מלך קרתא *the King of the City* (as one of the *Arabian's* Gods is called (*n*) *Dyſares*, to denote him *Dominus Sharæ*;) the *Amathuſii* in *Cyprus* call'd him *Malika*, that is, King; and the *Greeks* commonly prefac'd their Speeches (by way of good luck) with Ἡρακλῆς Ἄναξ, *Hercules King.* Such Attributions of the name King to governing Providence being uſual in both Theologies (the Scriptural and the Pagan,) we will infer from this their agreement *four Conſectaries.*

CONSECT. I.

The acknowledgment of *a Supreme Potentate* in both Theologies inferreth a great Agreement between them touching the *Divine Attributes*, ſome of which are coincident with that Name. As the *moſt High*, for *the moſt High* in Senſe of Scripture ſignifieth *the Supreme Potentate*; Pſal. 83. 18. *Thou, whoſe Name alone is Jehovah, art the moſt High over all the Earth.* This Divine Attribute is denoted by the name *Shamajim* (Heaven) which is not only a Rabbinical, but an uſual Name of God in Scripture. *After that thou ſhalt have known, that the Heavens do rule.* Dan. 4. 26. *A Man can receive nothing, except it be given him from Heaven.* Joh. 3. 27. *The Baptiſm of* John, *whence was it? from Heaven, or of Men?* Matth. 21. 25. *Father, I have ſinned againſt Heaven and in thy ſight.* Luk. 15. 21. So the Jews ſpeak; *Profanatur nomen cœli, the name of Heaven is profan'd*; *adjutorio cœli, by the Aid of Heaven*; *mors per manum cœli, Death by the Hand of Heaven.* Touching this Name of God *A. Ezra* noteth, (o) *That the ſignification of* Shamajim *in Arabick* (which is for the moſt part agreeable to the Hebrew) *is Highneſs and Eminence.* Sama *in that Language ſignifieth to be high and eminent, and every thing that is Super-eminent, is call'd* Samao; therefore God's being call'd *Shamajim* denoteth his Eminence and Super-eminence, that he is *the moſt High*, agreeably to *Prov.* 25. 3. *the Heaven for height.* In the Pagan Theology this Attribute ſometimes occurreth; for *Philo Byblius* from *Sanchoniathon* mentioneth a certain God, whoſe Name is Ἐλιοῦν or ὕψιστος, *the moſt High. Rimmon* (from רום) ſignifieth the moſt High. (p) *Servius* (ſpeaking the Senſe of the Popular Pagans) ſaith, *Jupiter ſummus eſt*, Jupiter *is the moſt High*; and *Æſchylus* (as he is cited by (q) *J. Mart.* and *Clemens*) ſaith, —— δυνατὴ γὰρ δόξα ὑψίστου θεοῦ, *potent is the Glory of the moſt high God.* As both Theologies acknowledge *a moſt High*; ſo they agree in ſtiling Governing Providence παντοκράτωρ (an Attribute which is ſaid to occur in the Bible no leſs than ſeventy times) which our Tranſlation rendreth *Almighty*; but *Ruffinus* ſaith, that God is ſo intituled, (r) *quòd omnium teneat potentatum, becauſe he hath the Potentacy of all*; and *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem* expoundeth it to the ſame Senſe. (s) Pantocrator *is he that hath the Empire of all, Authority over all.* The Name properly ſignifieth *Omni-imperial* or *All-Emperour*; κύριος παντοκράτωρ, is *All-imperial Lord*, 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. Agreeably to which Senſe he is ſtiled by Eccleſiaſtic Writers (t) παμβασιλεύς, πανηγεμών, *King, Prince or Ruler of all.* And the Jews in their Benedictions often repeat (u) רב העולם and מר דעלמא and מלך העולם and אלהי עולם and רבון עולמים *Lord, King, God of the World and of the Worlds*, accounting this ſort of Attributes honourary to God at the greateſt rate. So *Horus Apollo* ſaith of the *Egyptians*, that they acknowledg'd a παντοκράτωρ, *one that is imperial over all the World*, whom they repreſented by a Serpent, in the midſt whereof they painted a great Houſe, by which they repreſented the World, ὁ γὰρ βασίλειος οἶκος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, *for his Kingly Houſe is the World.* Beſides theſe Attributes of *moſt High* and *All-imperial* the Pagan Theologers (agreeably to the Chriſtian) aſcribe to the Supreme Potentate the Attribute of *Ingenit, Incorruptible, Immortal*, and of *exiſtence from Eternity to Eternity*, and therefore ſtile him —— (w) *O Hominum Divumque æterna poteſtas, the Eternal Potentate of Gods and Men.*

(t) *Maximus intelligit, quiſnam ſit ille, non à me primo, ſed à Platone nuncupatus* Βασιλεύς, *totius rerum naturæ cauſa & ratio & origo initialis, ſummus animi genitor, æternus animantium ſoſpitator, aſſiduus mundi ſui opifex, ſed enim ſine opera opifex, ſine cura ſoſpitator, ſine propagatione Genitor; neque loco, neque tempore, nec ulla voce comprehenſus, eòque paucis cogitabilis, nemini effabilis.* Apol. p. 515. ed. Beroald.

(u) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 3.

(w) Ὁ δὲ ἐκεῖ βασιλεὺς, οὐκ ἀλλοτρίων ἄρχων, ἀλλ' ἔχων τὴν δικαιοτάτην καὶ φύσει ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ βασιλείαν, ἅτε τῆς ἀληθείας βασιλεὺς, καὶ ὢν κατὰ φύσιν κύριος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀθρόου γεννήματος καὶ θείου συντάγματος, βασιλεὺς βασιλέως καὶ βασιλέων. *Plotin. ibid.*

(x) *Ariſtot. l. de Xen. Zen. & G. c.* 3.

(y) *Ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 12. *c.* 27.

(z) *Procl. ſupr. l.* 6. *p.* 374.

(a) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 7. *Dion. Voſſ. in Maim. de Idol. c.* 7. *s.* 8.

(b) *Selden Titles. p.* 120.

(c) *Ibid. p.* 127.

(d) *Ibid. p.* 137.

(e) *Selden ibid. Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 12. *c.* 6. *S.* 2.

(f) Amph. Act. 2. Scen. 2.

(g) M. Tyr. diss. 1.

(h) Ἡ δὲ τῶν τέκνων ἀρχὴ βασιλική· διὸ καλῶς Ὅμηρος τὸν Δία προσηγόρευσεν, εἰπὼν— πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, τὸν βασιλέα τούτων ἁπάντων. Politic. *l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(i) *De Iſ. & Oſir. p.* 354.

(k) Ὡς εἰς τιμιώτερον τοῦ παντὸς ἐκεῖνο τὸν βασιλέα ὑψοῦσι τῶν ὅλων, ἐφορᾶν ἐκεῖθεν ὑπολαμβάνει τὰ τῇδε. S. Cyr. c. *Jul. l.* 2. *p.* 52.

(l) Ὦ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος· σὺ δ' ἔργα ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾷς λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, Strom. *l.* 5. *p. m.* 444.

(m) ler. Miſc. l. 3. c. 17.

(n) Pocock. Spec. p. 105.

—— (x) Ὡς ἀγέννητον ἐὸν καὶ ἀνώλεθρον ἐστίν.

Being both ingenerate and unperiſhable.

So *Thales* being ask'd, what is the Divinity? made anſwer; (y) *That which hath neither beginning, nor end.* The Attributes (z) *Inviſible*, (a) *Immenſe*, (b) *Incorporeal*, (c) *Unchangeable*, as alſo (d) of *Simplicity* (e) and of *Unlikeneſs to all things viſible* (and therefore not to be repreſented by Images) are uſual amongſt the Pagan Theologers; nor is it unuſual with them, to ſtile the Supreme Deity (f) τελειότατον καὶ αὐταρκέστατον, *moſt perfect and ſelf-ſufficient*, (g) *Beatus, nihil indigens, Bleſſed, wanting nothing*, (*Deo nihil præſtantius*, ſaith *Cicero*) *the Supreme Excellence*, (h) κακοῦ παντὸς ἀνεπίδεκτον, *uncapable of any Evil*, (i) Ἀγαθῶν τοσούτων εὑρετὴν καὶ κτίστην, *The Inventor and Creator of ſo many Goods*, τὸ πολὺ πέλαγος τοῦ καλοῦ, *the vaſt Ocean of Pulchritude*, (as *Plato* in his *Sympoſium* ſeemeth to call his Supreme Deity;) and the Popular Pagans acknowledge the Attribute of Sanctity in their uſual Compellation *Sancte Jupiter!* Beſides theſe Divine Attributes which are honourary to a Deity, but are on this ſide Government, both Theologies aſcribe to the Supreme Potentate, which they acknowledge, another ſort of Divine Attributes, that are requiſite, to qualifie him for the Government of the Univerſe; wherefore *Goodneſs* muſt be complicated with *Power* and *Greatneſs* in the Supreme Potentate, as the Pagan Theiſts acknowledge, intituling *Jupiter optimus maximus.* (k) *Governing Providence ought to be both maſterly and good; for both are ſalutary; the one as chaſtiſing, the other as doing good in a way of Beneficence.* Juſtice is eſſential to the Supreme Potentate. (l) *For* Jupiter *may not ſo much as will what is the worſer*, (nor is it conſiſtent with the rectitude of his Nature;) and in all his proceedings (m) *God is in no wiſe unjuſt, but moſt juſt; nor is any thing more like him than ſuch an one of us that is moſt juſt.* Perfection of *Underſtanding* and of executive *Power* (to inſpect, direct, protect, reward and puniſh) is alſo requiſite in the great governing Authority, acding to that of *Epicharmus*; (n) *you ought to know, that nothing eſcapeth the Eye of God; He is the Inſpector of us, God can do all things.*

Consect. 2.

I. Both Theologies agree, that this Name *God denoteth the King, Lord or Potentate, which Governing Providence is. Tertullian* (before cited) hath reſtrain'd the word *Deus*, to ſignifie nothing more than *the Divine Conſtitutive Eſſence or Subſtance*; but it is certain, the Name is of greater Latitude and Extent, and that the Divine *Potentacy* which Governing Providence is, is the *Deity, Divinity* or *Godhead*, upon the account whereof Governing Providence is denominated *God.* (o) *Deus enim Naturæ nomen eſt & Poteſtatis, The Name God denoteth both the Nature and the Potentacy.* (p) *Deus eſt nomen ſummæ poteſtatis, God is the Name of the Supreme Potentacy*, ſaith *Lactantius*; whoſe Notion of the Unity of the Godhead is *one Divine Potentacy*; for thus he diſputeth for it, (q) *licet philoſophi diverſis nominibus ſint abuſi, ad unam tamen poteſtatem quæ mundum regeret, concurrerunt.—— omnem divinam poteſtatem neceſſe eſt in uno eſſe, cujus nutu & imperio regantur omnia. Although the Philoſophers abus'd divers Names* (in their Polytheiſm) *yet with concurrence to one Power or Potentacy Governour of the World. All Divine Potentacy muſt neceſſarily be in one, by whoſe beck and command all may be govern'd.* (r) *Unus omnium Dominus eſt Deus, neque enim illa ſublimitas poteſt habere conſortem, cum ſola omnem teneat poteſtatem. God is one Lord of all; for that Sublimity admitteth of no Conſort, ſeeing it alone poſſeſſeth all Potentacy.* So the Apoſtle noticeth God as *the bleſſed and only Potentate*; (s) and we read in the Book of *Tobit* τοῦ Βάαλ τῇ δυνάμει, *to* Baal *the Power*, that is, *the God.* So one of the Rabbins Names of God is הגבורה *the Power*, under which Name and Notion the Godhead is ſet forth *Matth.* 26. 64. *Mark* 14. 62. which Divine Name ἡ δύναμις, muſt be underſtood agreeably to *Principalities and Powers* (δυνάμεις) and agreeably to δυνάςης (a Potentate) to ſignifie the *Authoritative* as well as the *Executive* ſort of Power; in which Senſe the French Kings ſpeak of (t) *their pleiner puiſſance* and *puiſſance abſolute.* In S. *Paul*'s ſtile, *Rom.* 1. 20 *his Eternal Power* (Potentacy) *and Godhead* are Terms ſynonymous; and ſo in the Book *Coſri* (*u*) אלהותו ומלכותו *his Godhead and his Kingdom* are Terms ſynonymous; (*w*) for the Rabbins by his אלהות (Godhead) *imperium maximè denotant, chiefly denote his Dominion and Imperial Potentacy.* In the Holy Scriptures the Greek name Θεὸς anſwereth to the Hebrew names *El, Eloah, Elohim*; which Hebrew names ſignifie *a Potentate*; therefore God's Divine Potentacy is his Divinity and Godhead; which alſo appeareth from the Godſhip of created Potentates; for they are uſually intituled *the Gods:* as the Angels (Supernal Potentates) and the Judges in the Land of *Iſrael* are called *Elohim*; *Pſal.* 8. 6. and 82. 1, 6. *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. *Exod.* 21. 6. and 22. 8, 9. *v.* 28. *Thou ſhalt not revile the Gods, nor curſe the Ruler of thy People*: Exod. 15. 11. *Who is like unto thee,* O *Lord, among the* (Elim) *Gods?* that is, the Potentates; for the Greek Interpreters make no nice diſtinction between *Elim* and *Elohim*, but ſometimes render (*x*) *Elim* agreeably to *Elohim*, ἄρχοντες, ἡγούμενοι, *Ruling Powers or Potentates.* And becauſe theſe Sublimities are Underlings to the Divine Tranſcendence; therefore God is ſtiled, *A God of Gods, a Lord of Lords, a great King above all Gods*, Deut. 10. 17. Joſh. 22. 22. Pſal. 95. 3. and 97. 7, 9. 2 Chron. 2. 5. As Potentates are ſtiled Gods, ſo to be the God of any thing, ſometimes ſignifieth, to have the Potentacy, Dominion and Authority over it; as in thoſe Divine Attributes, *The God of Hoſts*; *The God of Heaven and Earth*; *The God of the Spirits of all Fleſh.* A Deity therefore is ſuch a Superiority, as Lords, Kings, Potentates are (thoſe whom *Moſes* calleth Gods, *Exod.* 15. 11. the Pſalmiſt calleth *the Sons of the Mighty* or Potentates, *Pſal.* 89. 6.) and therefore may not unfitly be ſtiled (*y*) מלך אללה *Rex Deus*, as the *Samaritan* Verſion rendreth the Tetragrammaton. Agreeably whereunto (*z*) *orientalibus ferè omnibus uſu receptum eſt, Deo imponere nomen ab abſoluto in omnes creaturas dominio: In almoſt all the Oriental Nations the Names which anſwer to our Name God, are ſuch as ſignifie Dominion* (abſolute Dominion) *over all Creatures.* As in the Æthiopick Tongue there are two principal Names of God (*a*) *Egſiabher* and *Emlac*, the former denoteth Dominion over all Creatures, the latter Power and Authority. *Emlac* alſo ſignifieth both the Divine Worſhip, and the Reverence due to Kings: And the Divinity or Godhead is called מלכות (*Malcuth*) which implieth, that it conſiſteth in *Imperial Potentacy* agreeably to the Rabbins Notion of *Elohuth.* Of the Name *Elohim* the Rabbins ſay, (*b*) it ſignifieth, *a Dominator over any thing and a Judge.* So the Latin word *Deus* ſignifieth *a Divine Dominator or Potentate* in that of the Poet touching *Cæſar Auguſtus* (*c*).

(o) Pocock. Not. Miſc. p. 35.

(p) In 11. Æn.

(q) J. Mart. de Mon. p. 104. Clem. ſtr. l. 5. p. m. 445.

(r) Petav. T. 1. l. 5. c. 5. S. 1, 2.

(s) Παντοκράτωρ ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων κρατῶν, ὁ πάντων ἐξουσιάζων.

(t) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 7. c. 15.

(u) L. Cappel. in 1 Tim. 3. 17.

(w) Virgil. Æn. 10

(x) Clem. Str. l. 5. p. m. 439.

(y) Ibid. p. 434.

(z) Ib. p. 427, 428.

(a) Ib. p. 426.

(b) Ib. p. 438.

(c) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 13. c. 3.

(d) Simplic. in Epict. p. 9.

(e) Clem. ſupr. p. 445.

(f) M. Tyr. diſſ. 22.

(g) Apulei. de dogm. Plat.

(h) Laert. in Zenon.

( ) Clem. ſupr. p. 445.

(k) Δεῖ τὴν διοικοῦσαν πρόνοιαν κυρίαν τε εἶναι καὶ ἀγαθήν· ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ἡ δύναμις οἰκονομεῖ σωτηρίαν· ἡ μὲν κολάσει σωφρονίζουσα ὡς κυρία· ἡ δὲ, δι' εὐποιΐας χρηστευομένη ὡς εὐεργέτις. Clem. Str. l. 1. p. m. 259.

(l) Οὐ γὰρ θέμις Διῒ βούλεσθαι ἄλλο τι ἢ τὸ κάλλιστον. M. Tyr. diſſ. 22.

(m) Θεὸς οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς ἄδικος, ἀλλ' ὡς οἷόν τε δικαιότατος· καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ ὁμοιότερον οὐδὲν, ἢ ὃς ἂν ἡμῶν αὖ γένηται ὅτι δικαιότατος. Plato ap. Jambl. προτρεπτ. p. 90.

(n) Οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον, τοῦτο γιγνώσκειν σε δεῖ· Αὐτὸς ἔσθ' ἁμῶν ἐπόπτης· ἀδυνατεῖ δ' οὐδὲν θεός. Clem. Str. l. 5. p. m. 435.

(o) S. Ambr. in cap. 3. Ep. ad Galat.

(p) Lactan. l. 1. c. 3.

(o) De Ira Dei c. 11.

(r) S. Cypr. de Idol. van.

(s) Druſ. Not. in Rom. 11. 4.

> *An Deus immenſi venias maris, ac tua Nautæ*
> *Numina ſola colant; tibi ſerviat ultima Thyle,*
> *Teque ſibi generum Tethys emat omnibus undis.*

In the ſame Notion the word Θεὸς muſt neceſſarily be underſtood, when God is intituled ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸς, *God over all*, or (as the Fathers uſually ſtile him) ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς, *God of the Univerſe of things.* Accordingly, a late Writer of our own faith, (*d*) *This Name and Title is nomen poteſtatis, a Name of Potentacy*; and *Reuchlin* ſaith, (*e*) *negare non poſſumus, quin imperatoriam majeſtatem Dominus ſignificet, & Rex & Deus, ſi Damaſceno Joanni obſequimur: If* John Damaſcen *be of Authority with us, we muſt acknowledge, that this Name, Lord, and King, and God, denoteth Imperial Majeſty.* In Diſcourſes of Matters of Religion theſe Names are us'd promiſcuouſly; for the Name *Lord* is ſynonymous with the Name *God*, and is us'd to expreſs the Divinity or Godhead, *Deut.* 6. 4. *The Lord thy God is one* κύριος, *Lord.* Satan is ſometimes known by this Name, *the God of this World*, and ſometimes by this Name, *The Prince of this World*; Exod. 4. 16. *Thou ſhalt be to* Aaron לאלהים *for a God*, לרב *for a Prince*, * ſaith the Chaldee. In *Iſa.* 36. 19. *Rabſhakeh*'s words are thus repreſented; *Where are the Gods of* Hamath *and* Arphad? *Where are the Gods of* Sepharvaim? In *Iſa.* 37. 13. they are thus repreſented; *Where is the King of* Hamath, *and the King of* Arphad, *and the King of the City of* Sepharvaim? If this Interpretation of a Paſſage in the Prophet *Iſaiah* be ſomewhat uncertain, yet it is certain, that theſe two Names *God* and *King* are uſually conjoin'd in the *Old Teſtament* (*Iſa.* 43. 15. *Zech.* 14. 17. *Mal.* 1. 14. *Pſal.* 5. 2. and 20. 9. and 44. 4. and 68. 24. and 89. 18. and 95. 3. and 98. 6, *&c.*) that in the Prophet *Ezekiel*'s Viſion of a Chariot call'd by the Jews *Mercavah*, God is repreſented *as an Imperial Lord or Potentate*; (*f*) that the *Cherubins* in the Sanctuary were inſtituted, to be his Regial Throne; that God dwelt and kept Houſe amongſt the *Iſraelites* as a Regial Majeſty, having his Regial Houſe or Palace with its Utenſils and Furniture, his Regial Throne, his Regial Family of Servitors; (*g*) that the Pagans worſhipp'd their Kings with Divine Worſhip, and honour'd their Gods after the mode of doing honour to Kings (particularly by the Kiſs of Homage;) that God dwelt among the *Iſraelites*, not only as a King, (*h*) but as a Military King or Potentate, the Lord of Hoſts;) and that the *Roman* Emperours (as alſo other great Princes) becauſe high and mighty Potentates were intituled *Gods*; (*i*) which Title they alſo aſſum'd to themſelves, and continu'd it even after the Empire became Chriſtian; for thus the Chriſtian Emperours ſpake and wrote; *Noſtra Divinitas, Noſtra Æternitas, Noſtrum Numen, Noſtrum Divinum Præceptum, our Divinity, our Eternity, our Numen, our Divine Precept.* From theſe extravagant Titles of Mundane Princes we may infer a true Notion of the Divinity or Godhead. For *noſtra Divinitas, noſtrum Numen*, are manifeſtly Synonyma's; *noſtrum Numen* ſignifieth our *Divine Potentacy*; this therefore is (doubtleſs) *the Divinity or Godhead.* Moreover from the abuſe of this Name *Deus* in the *Roman* Empire (and other great Governments) it appeareth to be *a Divine Imperial Name*; therefore it denoteth the Divine Potentacy; our Saviour's *Apotheoſis* is called by the Apoſtle *the giving him a Name above every Name*, Phil. 2. 9. (*k*) Name in the Apoſtle's ſtile ſignifieth *Poteſtas, Potentacy*; therefore the Divine Potentacy is the Divinity or Godhead.

II. In Eccleſiaſtic Writers that diſcourſe of the Trinity, (*l*) *una Deitas, Poteſtas, Divinitas, Dominatio, Imperium, one Deity, Potentacy, Divinity, Domination, Imperial Power*, are ſynonymous Expreſſions; as alſo *Dominatus tres, tres Deitates, three Dominations, three Deities.* So in charging the *Arrians* with Polytheiſm, (*m*) which they call πολυαρχία, *Polyarchy*, whereas themſelves aſſert μοναρχίαν, *Monarchy* (that there is but one God) they expreſs the Godhead by *Potentacy* and *Rule*; *(n)* as the counterfeit *Dionyſius* calleth the Divinity θεαρχία, *Divine Principality.* Their aim is, ſo to ſtate a Trinity of Hypoſtaſes in the Godhead, *(o) ut Monarchia dominatus in diverſas divinitates non ſecetur, that the Monarchic Domination be not divided into ſeveral Divinities.* Agreeably whereto S. *Cyril* aſſerteth, *(p)* θεότητα καὶ κυριότητα μίαν, *one Divinity and Domination*, which he ſuppoſeth ſynonymous Expreſſions. S. *Baſil* diſcourſeth, that the Chriſtian form of Baptiſm *(q) unius eſt Divinitatis Teſtimonium, is a Teſtimony of one Divinity*; and his Senſe *Fauſtinus* expreſſeth in theſe terms; *Unum nomen poſuit dicens, In nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, ut una principalis auctoritas crederetur indiviſibilis & perfectæ Trinitatis. But one Name is mention'd, ſaying, In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, that we might believe one Principal Authority* (or Potentacy) that is, one Divinity *of the indiviſible and perfect Trinity*. The ſame S. *Baſil* ſuppoſeth, that the Divinity or Godhead is a Regial Dignity; for thus he expreſſeth the order of Perſons in the Holy Trinity, *(r)* τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα, *Regial Dignity* (the Divinity) *paſſeth from the Father through the Son upon the Spirit.* So *Euſebius* ſaith of the Hebrews; *(s) They reckon the Holy Spirit in the firſt and regial Dignity and Honour, the Principality of the Univerſe.* Hence all ſorts of Theiſts aſſociate and combine theſe two Names of Honour *King* and *God*; as *Conſtantine*'s Soldiers in their Prayer. *(t) We own thee for the only God; Thee we acknowledge to be the King.* The *Thracians* call'd *Zamolxis, our King and God*, (*u*) as *Plato* ſaith. The *Magi* worſhipp'd Chriſt *quaſi Deum & Regem, as God and King*, (*w*) ſaith *Tertullian*. The Chriſtian Apologiſts ſtile their God, *ſummum Regem, ſummum Imperatorem, the ſupreme King and Emperour*, and thus deſcribe their Religion, *(x) Nihil ſumus aliud Chriſtiani, niſi magiſtro Chriſto ſummi Regis ac Principis veneratores: We Chriſtians are nothing elſe but the Worſhippers of the Supreme King and Prince according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt.* They ſay, that all Mankind have this innate Notion, *(y) eſſe Regem ac Dominum cunctorum quæcunque ſunt moderatorem, that there is a King and Lord, the moderator of all things that are*; as *Cicero* calleth *Jupiter, rerum omnium præpotens, cujus numini parent omnia, He that hath the Power over all, whoſe Divine Power all things obey.* For this is that which all Religioniſts mean by a Deity, (*z*) משל ומצוה *a Dominator and Legiſlator*; *(a)* or *the firſt Cauſe that hath regard to all Creatures, and is their Lord*, as the Hebrew Doctors notice the Deity. The Divine Attributes of *Greatneſs* and *Goodneſs* ſpeak the Deity *a King, Lord or Potentate*; for thoſe of the latter ſort (Liberality, Graciouſneſs, Lenity, Mercy, Manſuetude, Clemency) are ſo many glorious princely Virtues, which all our Books of Learning highly praiſe in Mundane Potentates, and which make them as great in the Love of their People, as they are in their Rule and Command. So the Inſcription upon a Marble not long ſince digg'd up at *Rome* repreſenteth them (*b*).

(t) Selden Titles p. 434. ed. 3.

(u) P. 181.

(w) Grot. Not. in Rom. 1. 20.

(x) Exod. 15. 15. Ezek. 31. 11. and 17. 13.

Amos 4. 13. Gen. 24. 3. Numb. 16. 22.

(y) Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p. 280.

(z) Idem diſſ. p. 299.

(a) Ibid. p. 296.

(b) Coſri. p. 256.

(c) Virgil. Georgic. l. 1.

(d) Brydall a Glimſe of God. p. 8.

(e) De Verb. mirif. p. 254.

2 Cor. 4. 4. Joh. 12. 31. and 14. 30. and 16. 11.

* Selden de Synedr. l. 1. c. 16. p. 654.

(f) Spencer de Leg. Hebr. l. 3. diſſ. 5. c. 7. S. 1. & l. 1. diſſ. de Theocrat. Jud. c. 5. S. 1.

(g) Ibid. c. 3.

(h) Ibid. c. 1. S. 2. & c. 5. S. 3.

(i) Selden Titles par. 1. c. 4. Voſſ. de Idol. l. 3. c. 17.

(k) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 12. S. 10.

(l) Ibid. l. 4. c. 13. S. 14, 17, 20.

(m) Ib. l. 3. c. 1. S. 8. & l. 1. c. 6. S. 3. & c. 12. S. 7. & l. 8. c. 9. S. 6.

Potentiſſima dos in Principe Liberalitas & Clementia.

True Religioniſts alſo conſider the Deity as an *Imperial Eſtate* in their Doxologies, and Laudatory Aſcriptions of *Might, Majeſty, Glory, Dominion* and *Power*, wherein they intentionally aſcribe unto God the Divinity or Godhead; *Jude* 25. *To the only wiſe God be Glory and Majeſty, Dominion and Power.* 1 Pet. 4. 11. *To whom be Praiſe and Dominion.* Nor is it any thing elſe than his Divinity and Godhead, which the Jews expreſs and acknowledge in their Benediction; *(c) Bleſſed be the Lord, and let the Glory of his Kingdom be for ever and ever.* This Diſcourſe about the meaning of the Name *God* is now drawn out to ſome length, but not without cauſe; for it is a matter of infinite importance, that the Godhead be rightly underſtood; which can never be, unleſs our Idea and definitive Notion of God be the Idea of *a Lord, King or Potentate, an Imperial or Kingdom-eſtate, The Imperial Eſtate of God.* To aſcertain which Idea, we will add nothing more in this place ſave only this Remark, That all true Religioniſts muſt neceſſarily underſtand by this Name *God, The Divine King or Potentate*, becauſe they underſtand by it *the Divine Majeſty*, which is the Divinity or Godhead.

CONSECT. 3.

Both Theologies acknowlede a great Affinity and reſemblance *between the King, Lord or Potentate that governing Providence is, and the Kingdom-eſtate of ſecular Sovereign Princes. (d) The King having ſupreme unaccountable Rule, and being a living Law, is a reſemblance of God amongſt Men*, ſaith a Pythagorean. When *Themiſtocles* fled out of Greece to the King of *Perſia*, he was admoniſhed by *Artabanus*, that if he intended to go to the King, (*e*) he ſhould adore him after the *Perſian* mode; *for you* (ſaid he) *are reported, to be very great lovers of Liberty and Tranquillity: But we among other excellent Laws have this moſt excellent one,* τὸ τιμᾶν βασιλέα ϗ προσκυνεῖν εἰκόνα θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα σώζοντος, *to do honour to the King, and to worſhip the Image of God that conſerveth all things.* So the Chriſtian Theologers uſually ſtile the King εἰκὼν ἔμψυχος θεοῦ, *a living Image of God*; and S. *Baſil* ſaith; *the King is* ὁρατὸς θεός, *a viſible God*, and God is βασιλεὺς ἀόρατος, *an inviſible King.* The Kingly Form of Government is called by *Ariſtotle (f)* πρώτη καὶ θειοτάτη, *the principal and moſt Divine. (g) Plato* calleth the Regial Dignity θεῖον ἀγαθὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *a Divine Good amongſt Men*; and the Pythagoreans ſay, θειότατος ὁ βασιλεύς, *the King* (in reſpect of his condition) *is moſt Divine*, becauſe of his great affinity and reſemblance unto God. For the ſame reaſon the Scripture calleth *Magiſtrates* (as alſo the holy Angels) *Gods* and the *Sons of God*. For as in Paganiſm *the Men-ſuperiorities* are called *the Gods*: So in Scripture *The High ones above Men and the Sons of Men* are ſtiled *the Gods and the Sons of God*, being a reſembling Progeny of the moſt High as he is the *moſt High*. Pſal. 82. 6. *I have ſaid, ye are Gods* (or the Gods, that is, the Race of High ones above Men,) *and all of you Children of the moſt High* (a reſembling Progeny of the moſt High as ſuch:) *But ye ſhall die like Men*; that is, like Men that are not Gods. *Potentates* called *the Sons of the Mighty*, Pſal. 89. 6. are in the Septuagints Tranſlation there called *the Sons of God*; which Name may

be

) *Idem* 4. *l.* 2. 3. *S.* 14.

) *Idem Trin. l. c.* 13. 1.

) *Ibid. l. c.* 9. *S.* 8.

) *Ib. l.* 2. 4. *S.* 5, 6.

) *Ibid.* 7. *c.* 11. 13.

(s) Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ ώτῃ καὶ βασιλικῇ τ̃ τῶν ὅ- ν ἀρχῆς ἀξίᾳ καὶ τιμῇ καταλα- γουσιν. *Pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 15.

(t) Σὲ μόνον οἴδαμεν θεόν· ὲ βασιλέα γνωρίζομεν. Eu- *b. de vit. Conſt. l.* 4. *c.* 20.

) *In Char.*

w) *C. Marion. l.* 3. 13.

x) *Arnob. Gent. l. p.* 14.

y) *Ibid.* 18.

(z) *Coſri* 181.

(a) *Menaſ. en Iſr. Qu. n Lev. p.* 284.

(b) *Tiraquill. de Nobil. p.* 534.

(c) ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד *In Joma ch.* 6. *fol.* 66. *a.*

(d) Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀρχὰν ἔχων ἀνυπεύθυνον, ϗ αὐτὸς ὢν νόμος ἔμψυχος, θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις παρεσχημάτισται. Diotegen. de regn.

(e) *Plut. in Themiſtocl.*

(f) *Polit. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(g) *Syneſ. de regno, p.* 19.

Pſal. 97. 7. *Job* 1. 6. *and ch.* 38. 7. *Dan.* 3. 25.

be meant either of the holy Angels (ſometimes called *the Gods*, and ſometimes *the Sons of God*,) or of the Magiſtrates and ruling Powers among Men. If ſubordinate Magiſtrates are the Sons of God, Sovereign Princes are eminently ſuch, as the Pſalmiſts words imply, *Pſal.* 89. 7. *I will make him my Firſt-born, higher than the Kings of the Earth.* He that is made higher than *the Kings of the Earth*, is made the Firſt-born of thoſe Sons of God; and according to this Senſe the Apoſtle may be underſtood, *Heb.* 1. 9. (*thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladneſs above thy fellows*,) that God hath dealt more magnificently with Chriſt, and more royally treated him than any of his Aſſociates (the other Kings,) having magnify'd and dignified him far above all other Potentates, when *he ſet his King upon his holy Hill of* Sion, and ſtil'd him his Son; *thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Kings are therefore the Sons of the higheſt (the Sons of his Highneſs, and eminence of Majeſty, Regial Dignity and Authority, *Iſa.* 10. 33.) whoſe Eſtate is the ſupreme Supremacy, the Sovereignty abſolutely Sovereign. And (*h*) *Si Deus eſt nomen ſummæ poteſtatis, incorruptibilis eſſe debet, perfectus, impaſſibilis, nulli rei ſubjectus. If God be the Name of the ſupreme Potentate, he muſt be incorruptible, perfect, impaſſible, of condition unſubject to any.* And therefore *independent, unaccountable, abſolute and unlimited by any, uncontrollable and irreſiſtible, All-commanding and diſpoſing, peerleſs and ſupereminent, the fulleſt height of Dominion and Power*, holding of none (and therefore accountable to none,) acknowledging no Superior (to preſcribe Laws to him or lay a reſtraint upon him,) having right to manage Affairs in the ſupreme way of Regency, and abſolute Right to do what he pleaſeth (to do what ever may be done,) whom none may, none can reſiſt in his abſolute Determinations, having plenary Right to command all, and to demand their Service and Obedience, and having the diſpoſal of all things in his hand, all things and perſons being ſubordinate, ſubject, underlings and ſervient to him, and none of them co-ordinate, compeers or co-partners with him, his Empire over the Univerſe and its Inhabitants the Poet thus celebrateth. (*i*)

Pſal. 2. 6, 7.

(h) *Lactant. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(i) *Æſchyl. ap. Clem. Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 425.

> Ὑπηρετεῖ δ' αὐτῷ θάλασσα καὶ πέτραι.
> Καὶ πᾶσα πηγὴ χ' ὕδατος συστήματα.
>
> *All things are of ſubject and ſervient condition to him,*
> *The Sea and Rocks, and Fountains and Collections of Water.*

To governing Providence alone the Glories of Empire appertain in the full and abſolute Senſe, *Regni culmen, the culminant condition of the Kingdom*; *Celſitudo Regalis, Regal Celſitude*; *imperialis apicis dignitas, the ſummity and pinacle of Imperial Dignity* (which is the perfection and conſummation of Dignity;) *faſtigium Majeſtatis, the height of Majeſty*; *ſuprema poteſtas, ſupreme Power*; *ſupremum Jus regiminis ab omni ſubjectione liberrimi, the ſupreme Right of Government without any meanneſs of Subjection to diſparage it.* But theſe Glories of Empire (which in the full and abſolute Senſe are Divine Prerogatives) mundane Potentates in ſome reſpect and in a narrow limited Senſe rightly pretend to, and really poſſeſs and enjoy. (*k*) *For the ſupreme Title King or Emperor, is diſtinguiſh'd from other Dignities in this, that it acknowledgeth no ſuperior, but according to the various Inſtitutions of ſeveral Kingdoms, is accompanied with the higheſt Rights of Majeſty and Sovereignty.* Such ſecular Sovereignties are lively Images of the Divine Sovereignty, (as things ſenſible are imitations of the things ſupra-ſenſible,) their Kingdom-eſtate is an expreſs reſemblance of the Godhead. For

(k) Selden Titles c. 1.

I. *A Kingdom is a magnificent reigning Eſtate, and ſuch the Godhead is.* To be a King and to be of condition *reigning*, are ſynonymous Expreſſions. *Judg.* 9. 8. *Apoc.* 5. 10. So in this Inſcription; *regnante D. N. Theodorico fœlix Roma. When our Lord Theodoric reigned* (or was King) *at* Rome, Rome *was happy.* Joh. 18. 36. *My Kingdom is not of this World*, ſaith our Saviour; that is, *my Eſtate of reigning* (being King) is not Mundane, but Celeſtial. As the Name King denoteth *a reigning Eſtate*, ſo it denoteth alſo *a magnificent Eſtate.* 2 Sam. 24. 23. *All theſe did Araunah as a King* (a magnificent Eſtate) *give unto the King.* Iſa. 10. 8. The Aſſyrian boaſteth; *are not my Princes* (Chieftain Eſtates) *altogether Kings?* that is, equal to the great and magnificent reigning Eſtates of the World. Hence *Ulyſſes* in *Homer* indoctrinateth a King, to tranſcend others in bounty, becauſe he is a magnificent Eſtate.

> ——————ἐπεὶ βασιλῆϊ ἔοικας
> Τῷ σε χρὴ δόμεναι καὶ λώϊον ἠέπερ ἄλλοι.
> *Becauſe you are like a King, you ought to*
> *Tranſcend others in Bounty.*

Odyſſ. l. 17.

Becauſe a King is a magnificent reigning Eſtate, hence a good Author will not allow the King of *Bohemia*, to be properly called a King, (*Regem Bohemiæ improprie dici exiſtimat, quod competenti provincia careat,*) *becauſe the King of* Bohemia *wanteth a Province, to which ſo magnificent a Title may be applicable.* (*l*) *There are ſome Lords* (ſaith *Thuanus*) *quorum anguſtæ ditiones Regni titulo dignæ non habentur, whoſe narrow Territories and Provinces are not thought worthy of the Name of a Kingdom*, although the Polity be free and independent, and the Government Monarchical. A ſorry Diſtrict (a Kingdom of *Tvetot*) is a Kingdom, not a Kingdom, a Kingdom in a vulgar, not in a Senſe of ennoblement or honorary acceptation. *Ezek.* 16. 13. *Thou didſt proſper into a Kingdom*, that is, into the glory, pulchritude and amplitude of a magnificent Monarchic Polity; for the Name Kingdom ſometimes ſignifieth the Territory, ſometimes the whole Polity, and ſometimes that part of the Polity *the reigning Eſtate.*

(l) Seld Titles p. 77. ed. 3

II. From hence it followeth, that *a Kingdom is the Un-abject, Un-ſubject Eſtate*, and ſuch the Godhead is. For the reigning Eſtate is oppos'd to the mean and abject, underling and ſubject Eſtate. So *Grace reigneth, Righteouſneſs reigneth, Peace reigneth*, when it is in the un-abject, unſubject condition, and in the ſame ſenſe Sin is ſaid to Reign: But when it is ſubdu'd and ſubjugated, and reduc'd to an abject languiſhing condition (like a Weed trodden down) it reigneth not. When the Saints in Heaven are ſaid to *Reign*, the Phraſe denoteth their magnificent ſublime condition (which is oppos'd to their low and ſuffering Eſtate 2 *Tim.* 2. 12.) and in ſuch ſenſe *Deo ſervire regnare eſt, to be a Servant of God*, is to be in reigning condition. As the *Reigning*, ſo the *Regal* Eſtate, is the oppoſite to the abject ſubject Eſtate; for the Poets uſually oppoſe *King* and *Caytiff*: So βασιλικὴ, *Kingly* is oppos'd to πτωχικὴ, *ſorry or beggarly*, βασιλὶς φύσις, *the regial Nature* (m) is oppos'd to δούλη φύσις, *the ſerving Nature.* Yet the Jews ſay (not amiſs,) *ſervus Regis etiam ipſe Rex eſt*, (the Servant of a King is himſelf a King,) being not of abject, ſervile and plebeian *Condition*, but in compariſon of the generality of Mankind of ſublime and magnificent (that is Regal) Condition. Suppoſing themſelves perfectly unſervilized and unenſlav'd, and becauſe by their mighty Priviledges and Preheminences they tranſcend an abject ſubject Eſtate, they ſay of themſelves *omnes Iſraelitæ ſunt filii Regum, all Iſraelites are Kings* (Regalities of Eſtate;) and at their Paſſover they behave themſelves with a certain State and Greatneſs (n) בדרך מלכים *after the mode of ſecular Kings.* When they were God's People, they were ſtiled *a Kingdom of Prieſts*, Exod. 19. 6. which Name denoteth them both a *Regality* and a *Prieſthood* (ἱεράτευμα as the Septuagint have it;) for the Name *Kingdom* ſignifieth a *Regality*; and as a *Prieſthood* ſignifieth a Collection, Multitude or Nation of Prieſts: So a *Regality* ſignifieth a Collection, Multitude or Nation of Regalities (Kings) ſuch as are of Regal Eſtate. The new *Iſrael* in like manner (the Chriſtianiz'd Family) are intituled *a Regal Prieſthood*, 1 Pet. 2. 9. becauſe in reſpect of Spirituals they are in this Life of Regal Eſtate, and the *white Raiment* which they wear in the other Life denoteth them both of *Regal* and *Sacerdotal* quality. *Apoc.* 3. 4. Agreably to the ſtile of Scripture the Lexicographers have obſerv'd from *Euſtathius* upon *Homer*, that all Perſons of eminent and illuſtrious Eſtate are called Kings.

III. By *a Kingdom* the Philoſophers underſtand *a regial or imperial Celſitude of Condition, and ſuch is the Godhead.* The Stoicks rightly ſuppoſe, that *a Kingdom Eſtate* is the higheſt remove from Servility or Servitude; that it is a Regial Celſitude of Condition, not to be baſely, diſhonourably or incommodiouſly ſubjected to any thing (to Money, Fame, Fortune, Fear, to any vicious Appetite or Paſſion.) and therefore they ſtile their wiſe Man *a King, the only King.* (o)

—————— Qui pectore magno
Spemque metumque domat, vitio ſublimior omni
Exemptus Fatis———

Rex eſt qui poſuit metus
Et diri mala pectoris,
Qui tuto poſitus loco
Infra ſe videt omnia.

Rex eſt qui metuit nihil,
Rex eſt qui cupiit nihil.
———*Rex eris, ajunt,*
Si rectè facies. Horat.

Qui rectè faciet, qui non dominatur, erit Rex. Auſon.
Regium eſt, nulli ſervire cupiditati. Cic.

'He that wanteth nothing, is not liable to be hurt by external Evils, that is under no inſlaving Powers external or internal (his vicious and corrupt Affections) is a Philoſophic kind of King. And it muſt be acknowledg'd, that theſe are Regial (or Imperial) kind of Things, that they ſpeak a Regial Celſitude of Condition, and that all who are under the Rule of their vicious Inclinations, are ſo far from being Kings, that they are not Free-men. Whence Philoſophers, Poets and Divines have diſputed Political Kings out of much of *true Regality*, becauſe they are not manumiz'd from the vileſt ſervitude (being *judiciorum Domini cupiditatum ſervi*;) for where vicious Appetites, Affections and Paſſions reign, having a ſort of Empire and Dominion, they are the Kings, and their Subjects Slaves. But this hindreth not *Political Supreme Princes* from being a ſort of Kings.

IV. Their Kingdom-Eſtate is *the height of honour and nobilitation of Eſtate* (and conſequently of Perſon) *and ſuch the Godhead is.* Our Schools of Learning content themſelves with extremely imperfect notices of *Honour* and *Diſhonour*, which are of far greater extent than they imagine. *For to be or to be made vile, ignoble, ſordid and baſe really or reputatively, is Diſhonour* (our being of worth, dignity, precioſity, may be really, and it may be only repreſentatively deſtroy'd:) On the contrary; *to be or to be made unvile, excellent, noble, unſordid really or reputatively, is Honour.* But our Maſters uſually confine their notices of *Honour* and *Diſhonour* to *eſteeming* and *diſeſteeming*, *valuing* and *undervaluing*, which is nothing more than *reputatively* honouring and diſhonouring. (p) *Honour* (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) *is a ſign or expreſſion of the Opinion which we have of another's Beneficence.* For (as the Philoſopher addeth) *it is ſuch as are Beneficent*, that are honour'd and rightly honour'd by Monuments, Temples, Statues, honourary Salutations, Hymns, Sacrifices, Gifts and Preſents, which are parts of Honour. *Honor eſt exhibitio reverentiæ in teſtimonium virtutis. Honour is the exhibition of reverence in teſtimony of Virtue.* The Schoolmen in their definitive notices of Honour make a nice diſtinction between *Honour* and *Worſhip*; for Honour (ſay they) *eſt quædam recognitio excellentiæ alicujus, a certain acknowledgement of one's Excellency*: But *Cultus* or Worſhip *in quodam obſequio conſiſtit, conſiſteth in obſequiouſneſs or ſubjection.* But theſe are rude imperfect notices of *Honour*, not commenſurate to the Nature of the thing, not at all accommodate to the ſtile of the Scripture (q) in ſeveral inſtances, nor are they applicable to the Matters of *Nobility-Learning.* The reputative Honour which the Schoolmen define, is a certain Nobilitation or Ennoblement to the party honour'd: But *Honours* ſo called in Nobility-Learning both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical (of which there are large Liſts and Catalogues) are certain *real Nobilitations of Eſtate*, ſuch as *the Honour of the High-Prieſt*, Heb. 5. 4. (which was the top-Flower and Crown of Eccleſiaſtical Nobility amongſt the Jews,) *the Honour of the Kingdom*, Dan. 11. 21. which is the height of mundane Honour; for it is matter of pure Honour unmix'd or unſtain'd with any vileneſs or ſordidneſs, as a Pythagorean hath handſomly diſcours'd touching the Sanctity (unpollutedneſs) and Divinity of the Honour of the Kingdom. (r) *The Kingdom is a thing ſincere and incorrupt, and becauſe of its tranſcendency moſt Divine, of difficult acceſs to Man. One in that Station muſt be of a moſt pure Nature, and luminous Qualities, that he may not darken and ſully the moſt illuſtrious thing by the ſpots that are in him, as ſome commaculate the moſt holy places, and polluted Perſons thoſe that meet them. But a King muſt be partaker of an unpolluted Nature and know, how much more*

(m) Iſidor. l. 1. ep. 109.

(n) Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. Lex. 13. n. 14.

(o) Lipſ. manuduc. l. 3. diſſ. 13. Grot. Not. in 1. Pet. 2. 9.

(p) Τιμὴ δ᾽ ἐςὶ μὲν σημεῖον εὐεργετικῆς δόξης. Rhet. l. 1. c. 5. Aquin. 22æ qu. 102. art. 2. Buridan. Eth. p. 318.

(q) *Numb.* 24. 11. 1 *Cor.* 12. 23, 24. 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 4. *&c.*

(r) Αὐτὰ μὲν ὦν βασιλεία χρῆμα εἰλικρινές τε καὶ ἀδιάφθορον ἐντὶ, καὶ δι᾽ ὑπερβολὰν θειότατον, δυσέφικτον ἀνθρώπῳ· δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐς αὐτὰν καταστάντα καθαρώτατόν τε ἦμεν καὶ διαυγέσταλον τὰν φύσιν, ὡς μὴ τὸ λαμπρότατον ἀφανίζῃ ἐν σπίλοις τοῖς ἐφ᾽ αὐτῷ· Καθὼ καὶ τὼς ἁγιατάτως τόπως ἐκαλίδωσάν τινες, καὶ τῶν ἀντιασάντων ἔνιοι μιαροὶ τὼς ἀντιάσαντας αὐτοῖς. Βασιλῆα δὲ τὸν ὁμιλήσαντα φύσιός τε ἀχράντω δεῖ μετέχειν, ἐπιστάμεν τε αὐτὸν ὅσῳ τῶν ἄλλων ἐντὶ θειότερος, ὅσα τε ἅτερα αὐτῷ. Ὅς δὲ κατὰ λόγον ἀπεικάζων ἑαυτὸν,

Divine

ἄριστ' ἂν ἑαυτῷ τε χρῷτο, καὶ τοῖς ὑποτεταγμένοις. Ecphantus de regno.

Divine he is than others, and others than he, to whom aſſimilating himſelf according to reaſon, he will uſe himſelf and his Subjects after the beſt manner. In ſecular Nobility-Learning (which is not of ſo noble a ſtrain as the Pythagoric Divinity) the King is conſidered as the height and fountain of Honour, and *all Honour ceaſeth in the preſence of the King.* In the Imperial Lawyers Liſts of Honours *inter Nobiles primus eſt Imperator, the Emperor is prime of the Nobility* (the Nobilitations of Eſtate;) and thoſe uſual honorary Expreſſions βασίλειον γένος, *the Royal-kind,* ἐξ αἵματος βασιλικοῦ, *of the Blood-Royal, Domini Sanguinis, the Princes of the Blood, Porphyrogenniti of the Imperial Family,* expreſs the Honour of the Royal Perſon by the ennoblement of the Family. *Go, ſee now and bury this curſed Woman, for ſhe is a King's Daughter.* 2 King. 9. 34. Among the Jews (as their Writers ſay) an unſtainedneſs of Birth and Pedigree was requiſite, to capacitate one for the Regial Dignity. (*s*) They commonly reproach the *Herodian* Family with Servility. *Quotquot dixerint ſe à domo Haſmonæorum ortos eſſe, reverà ſunt ſervi. Thoſe that after the Haſmonæi were extinct, got the Judaical Kingdom, were of ſervile quality and condition.* So *Mariamne* reproach'd *Herod's* near Kindred, his Mother and Siſter, *quod non eſſent de ſemine Iſrael, ſed eſſent profanæ & ignobiles, that they were not of the Seed of* Iſrael, *but profane and ignoble.* They ſuppoſe the Honour of the Kingdom ſo pure and unſtain'd, that 'tis one of their Maxims, (*t*) *He that hath been imploy'd but one day in ſervile work is unfit for the Kingdom.*

(s) *Regiam nullibi ritè conſtare ajunt, niſi ubi è parentibus quorum filiæ nuptiis ſacerdotalibus fuerint idoneæ (quales tantummodo in Synedriis locum habere poterant) Rex ipſe natus eſſet, id eſt optimo atque puriori jure Iſraelitis originariis, non ſolum non è Proſelyto & Proſelyta, ſed nec è profanis aut Mamzeribus.* Seld. de J. Nat. & G. l. 5. c. 20.

(t) *Schickard. de jur. reg. c. 1. Theor. 3.*

V. The *Royalneſs* of this Eſtate ſpeaketh it the height of Honour, and reſembleth the Godhead. For although in a vulgar or indifferent acceptation the Name *Regial* or *Royal* importeth nothing more than a Relation to the King; as *Regia Via the Kings High-way, Regium ferculum, a meſs of Meat from the King,* and the *Royal City* (2 Sam. 12. 26.) may ſignifie nothing more than the City where the King dwelt: Yet the word *Regial* or *Royal* uſually ſignifieth in a ſenſe of Excellency (an honorary acceptation,) and in ſuch ſenſe *Royalneſs* is the height of Nobleneſs, as *Royal Dainties* are the beſt of Delicacies, *Gen.* 49. 20. The Law of God is in ſuch ſenſe *Royal* (*Jam.* 2.8.) and his Royalneſs is *the Royal kind of Royalneſs*; whereas mundane Royalneſs is of kind the mean and vile, not the Royal: As mundane riches are the poor and beggarly, ſecular Nobleneſs is of kind the Ignoble and Plebeian. (*u*) *I know, that theſe things are meer Shells, and have nothing within,* ſaith the *noble-ſervile* Philoſopher. At this rate of *ignoble Nobilitation* ſecular ſupreme Princes Royalize in their whole Eſtate: Their Dignity is the Royal, their Title, Stile, Attributes, Prerogatives, the Enſigns of their Dignity (Crown, Scepter, Diadem,) their Palace, Throne, Apparel, Attendance, and their way of living (like *Solomon* in his Royalty) are intitled *Royal,* and they are uſually of *Royal Bounty,* as the Scripture ſpeaketh. The Royalneſs of their Eſtate is a Law to their Qualities and Actions, which muſt be conſentaneous thereto, if they fill up the Idea of a King. For if they be of place and exteriour Condition Royal, but in their Qualities and Behaviour vile and ſervile, they are unkingly Kings (Kings with great limitation) *Kings-no-Kings,* and it is too poſſible, that they may be worſe than none. If they are *Tyrannical* not *Regial* (μὴ βασιλικοὶ ἀλλὰ τυραννικοὶ, (*w*) as the Philoſopher diſtinguiſheth,) they are of kind unkingly. The Character of King *Antiochus* ſirnamed *Epiphanes* ſpeaketh him leſs than a King. *Servili ingenio præditus erat, nihilque regium vel heroicum præ ſe tulit; he was of a ſervile Diſpoſition, devoid of every thing truly Royal or Heroical.* But the Philoſopher's Character of a King ſpeaketh him more than a King of Human kind. (*x*) *A Tyrant ſeeketh his own profit, a King the good of his Subjects. For he is not a King, that is not ſelf-ſufficient and eminent in all goods. Such an one wanteth nothing, and therefore looketh not at what is profitable to himſelf, but to thoſe whom he governeth.*

(u) Ἐγὼ δ' οἶδα, ὅτι ὀστρακινά ἐστιν, ἔσωθεν δὲ οὐδὲν ἔχει. Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 22.

Beneficence is regial. *Plutarch. de orac. def.* p. 417.

(w) Ariſtot. polit. l. 5. c. 11.

(x) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ τύραννος τὸ ἑαυτῷ συμφέρον σκοπεῖ· ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων. οὐ γάρ ἐστι βασιλεὺς ὁ μὴ αὐτάρκης καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὑπερέχων· ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος οὐδενὸς προσδεῖται· τὰ ὠφέλιμα οὖν αὑτῷ μὲν οὐκ ἂν σκοποίη, τοῖς δὲ ἀρχομένοις. Ariſt. Eth. Nicom. l. 8. c. 12.

VI. The Kingdom-Eſtate is *the height of Glory, and ſuch the Godhead is.* For the Glory of the Lord in Scripture (*y*) ſignifieth God himſelf. *Bleſſed be the Glory of the Lord from his place.* Ezek. 3. 12. The Godhead is called *the excellent Glory.* 2 Pet. 1. 17. *his Glory.* Iſa. 3. 8. Eph. 1. 12. *The Glory of the incorruptible God.* Rom. 1. 23. כבוד *the Glory is* one of the Jews Names for God, by the *Schecinah* they underſtand *the Divine Majeſtatick Glory,* and ſome ſuppoſe, (*z*) that כסא כבור *the Throne of Glory* denoteth the Divine Majeſty. Agreeably whereunto mundane Potentates are ſtiled δόξαι, *Glories,* 2 Pet. 2. 10. *Solomon* is renown'd for his Glory, *Matth.* 6. 29. and the Kingdom-Eſtate is called *the Glory of the Kingdom.* Dan. 11. 20. *There was given him Dominion and Glory and a Kingdom.* Dan. 7. 14. *The God of Heaven hath given thee a Kingdom, and Power and Strength and Glory.* Dan. 2. 37. Kings are unſtain'd with Meanneſs and Underlingneſs, and may not be ſtain'd with Infamy or Reproach. Their ſublime ſhining Eſtate is the furtheſt remove from Vileneſs or Sordidneſs of exteriour Condition (nothing ſordid muſt be found there, *Matth.* 11. 8.) the brightneſs and refulgency of it ſtriketh and dazleth the weak Eyes of Men; and reſtleſs Ambition which will break through all Laws Divine and Human for a Kingdom, can climb no higher than to this height of Glory. It is *ſummum ambientis animi quaſi ſolſtitium, the full ſtop, and as it were the Solſtice of an ambitious Mind.*

(y) Maimon. mor. nev. par. 1. c. 64.

(z) Grot. Not. in Heb. 8.

VII. The Kingdom-Eſtate is *the height of Proſperity, Felicity and Beatitude, and ſuch the Godhead is.* For there can be no greater Beatitude of Condition than Divinity and Godhead. *Beatitudo eſt ipſa Divinitas, Beatitude is the Divinity it ſelf* (ſaith *Boethius*;) whence the Divine King is denominated *the bleſſed and only Potentate.* 1 Tim. 6. 15. As the Godhead, ſo a Kingdom is the ſupreme Nobilitation and Beatitude of Eſtate. For when Men are arriv'd at the height of Felicity, they are ſaid to be in *their Kingdom*; as an Heir of the Kingdom ſpeaketh to our Saviour, *Luk.* 23. 42. *Lord remember me, when thou comeſt into thy kingdom.* The reigning Eſtate (in the honorary Acceptation)

Perſarum vigui rege beatior. Horat.

tion) is a magnificent proſperous Eſtate. 1 *Cor.* 4. 8. *Ye have reigned as Kings without us.* A commanding, flouriſhing, victorious and triumphant Condition is *a reigning Condition*, and ſuch is the Kingdom. *A King ſhall reign and proſper.* Jer. 23. 5. A Kingdom is ſuppos'd to exempt its Poſſeſſors both from *Miſcreancy* and from *Miſery*, whence a mundane Kingdom is called *the height of Fortune*, as the barbarous Maxim in *Tacitus* ſtileth it (*in ſummâ Fortunâ id æquius quod validius, In the height of Fortune might and right are confounded,*) and the Greek Orator ſpeaketh the common Senſe of Mankind touching the Kingdom-Eſtate. (*a*) *All Men confeſs the Kingdom is the greateſt and moſt reſplendent of Divine and Human Goods, and worth the fighting for to the utmoſt.* Although theſe are blind Conceits, which the Spirit of the World ſuggeſteth touching the felicitative Eſtate of mundane Kings (which ſeveral of them have relinquiſh'd, to ſeek their felicity in privacy and retirement and in a better World,) yet it ſeemeth reaſonable, to ſuppoſe their Superlative Eſtate *the top of mundane Felicities*; for the World hath no higher Beatitude of Eſtate, to propoſe to its Admirers. And to be a King (or in the Kingdom-Eſtate) is the ſame thing, as to be in an highly felicitative Eſtate; whence the Philoſopher ſaith, (*b*) *There is no ſuch thing as a miſerable King, no more than there is a miſerable God.*

VIII. The Kingdom-Eſtate is *the height of Rule and Government, and ſuch the Godhead is.* For although (*c*) amongſt the Athenians an under-Officer was called *King* (abuſively, the People enjoying full Liberty play'd upon the Name,) the Title is not ſeldom communicated to Subject-Princes, (who tranſcend ordinary Subject-Eſtates, and that great Title *King of Kings* is no rarity in the Eaſtern Parts; yet in the more generally receiv'd and uſual ſignification the Name of *King* denoteth the ſupremacy of bearing Rule; in which Notion the Lion is called *King of Beaſts* (the Poet ſtileth him κλυτὸν βασιλῆα λέοντα,) the *Leviathan a King over the Children of Pride* (faſtuous Animals,) Death is denominated *the King of Terrors*, (to denote it the ſupreme Terror,) amongſt the Romans *Rex Convivii the King of the Banquet* had the ſupreme Rule of the Affairs of the Banquet, (and preſcrib'd the meaſures of drinking,) and every Man is ſaid to be King in his own Houſe, becauſe ſupreme Ruler there. (*d*)

Αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οἴκοιο ἄναξ ἔσομ' ἡμετέροιο.

In this Notion ſupreme Princes *Reign*; for their reigning denoteth *bearing Rule*, both as it is matter of *Eminence* (meerly ſuch,) and as it is *matter of Office*. As it is matter of Eminence, the Holy Ghoſt ſaith of *Rome*, *ſhe reigneth over the Kings of the Earth.* Apoc. 17. 18. As it is matter of Office, *Wiſdom* ſaith of her ſelf, *Prov.* 8. 15. *By me Kings Reign, and Princes decree Juſtice.* That is, by Wiſdom they diſcern between good and evil, right and wrong, they have the Science of governing well, which *Plato* calleth τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐπιστήμην, *the Regial Science.* It belongeth to the Officiary Dignity (Rectorſhip or Prefectſhip) of Kings, that are in Society with a Liege-people as the regnant and regent party, to adminiſter wiſe and good, juſt and faithful, holy and happy Government, (that all things may go well, and all may live well and happily in Society, which is the end of Government,) and therefore to make wholſome Laws, to exerciſe Judgment, to diſtribute due Rewards and Puniſhments, to protect their People, to ſubdue their Enemies, and to eſtabliſh Piety and Peace in their Borders. Such a King or Sovereign-Eſtate of Government (for his Throne is the Seat of Government, and his Sceptre the Rod of Government) is related to his People as their Sovereign Friend, Father, Guide, Shepherd, State-Phyſician, Patron, Saviour and Benefactour, (being plac'd (*e*) ἐν ὑπεροχῇ εὐεργεσίας, *in an headſhip of Beneficence,*) and the Philoſopher calleth him οἰκονόμον, ἐπίτροπον, φύλακα, *a diſpenſer of Affairs, Tutor and Royal Guardian to his Liege-People.* But the meer Eminence of bearing Rule over a People is ſeparable from the Officiary Dignity of a King over a Liege People; for God *reigneth over the Heathen*, whom he is not in Society with as their King (in which Senſe the Prophet ſaith, *thou never beareſt Rule over them*;) and in ſome Human Governments they that Reign, pretend not to the Officiary Dignity of a King over a Liege-People, but to the meer eminence and grandeur of Reigning, (*f*) *regnare ſuper colla nationum, to be Regnant upon the Necks of the Nations.*

IX. The Kingdom-Eſtate is *the height of Power and Puiſſance, and ſuch the Godhead is.* For the Power Imperial of Sovereign Princes (if fully Imperial) is the fulleſt height of Power, and accordingly they ſpeak of their *plenitudo poteſtatis Regiæ, fulneſs of Kingly Power*, which fulneſs of Kingly Power is made up of their *Regalia majora & minora, greater and leſſer Regalities* (or Rights of Sovereignty,) which are too numerous to be eaſily recounted. Their *Jus Imperii & Regendi, Right of Empire and Government*, compriſeth the *Legiſlative Power* (which ſome call the Nomothetical or Architectonical,) *poteſtas judiciaria, the Power of deciding Controverſies* (beyond whoſe Sentence there is no Appeal) and the Power of Execution. They have the Power of the Sword, the Power of Life and Death (they have Life and Member in their Power, as our Law ſpeaketh,) the Power of pardoning Criminals and condemned Perſons, of appointing Magiſtrates, giving and limiting their Authority (the King is *Caput Republicæ* and of all ſubordinate Authorities,) the Power of making War and Peace, of demanding Tribute, of raiſing to Honours and Dignities, with ſuch more. The vaſtneſs and amplitude of their commanding Virtue and Power maketh them ſhadows and reſemblances of the Almighty Sovereign, whoſe height and fulneſs of Power is abſolutely without any want of Power, as his Majeſty is without any Meanneſs, his Excellency without any Vileneſs, his Beauty without any Blemiſh, his Perfection without any allay of Imperfection.

X. The Kingdom-eſtate *is the height of Liberties, Immunities and Priviledges, and ſuch the Godhead is.* For as a *Lord* or *King* is made ſuch by his Eſtate of Liberty and unſubject Condition; as Servitude is ignoble, but Ingenuity or Liberty in Law-ſenſe (that is, free Citizenſhip, or to be civilly unſerviliz'd and unenſlav'd) is noble: So *Franchiſes, Freedoms, Exemptions, Priviledges, Preheminences, Prerogatives*, are Nobilitations,

Tacit. Annal. 15.

(a) Νῦν δὲ πάντες ἂν ὁμολογήσαιεν, τυραννίδα καὶ τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων μέγιστον καὶ σεμνότατον καὶ περιμαχητότατον εἶναι. Iſocrat. in Evagor.

(b) Ἀτυχὴς βασιλεὺς οὐ γίνεται οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀτυχὴς θεός. Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 22.

(c) *Syneſ. de regn. p.* 19.

Job 41. 34. *Ibid. c.* 18. 14.

(d) *Telemach. ap. Homer. Odyſſ.* 3.

(e) *Ariſtot. Eth. Nicom. l.* 3. c. 13. *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 253.

(f) *Selden Titles p.* 105. *ed.* 3.

tations, they ennoble and dignify Eſtates and Perſons. Hence a Rank of *Barons in Germany* (g) have the name of Frye, that is, *Liberi or Freemen*, the ſeveral Honours and Dignities which Nobility-Learning treateth of, are Syſtems of ſeveral *Liberties* and *Priviledges* (as the Charter of *Hydalguia* or Gentry in *Spain* giveth freedom from all Taxes; according to the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe, and as *Junius* obſerveth, to make a Man's *Father's Houſe free in Iſrael*, was to give him what we now call the Priviledges of Nobility,) and a King of our own Nation pretended to nothing leſs than Imperial Dignity upon this ground; *Ipſe omnes Libertates habebat in regno ſuo, quas Imperator vindicabat in Imperio, He had all thoſe Liberties in his Kingdom, which the Emperour challeng'd in the Empire.* The Ills that ſuch Supreme Princes are priviledg'd from, are *Tribute, Taxes, burdenſome Charges, the Wants and Inconveniencies of Life*, (as they are inveſted with the Authority, ſo they are habited with the Pomp of reigning Eſtates, and live in the greateſt affluence of the Secular Accommodations of Life, having all things under them, and their Courts furniſh'd with all varieties of Pleaſure;) they are priviledg'd and exempted from *Beggary, Varletry, Meanneſs, Commonneſs, Vulgarneſs, Contempt, Vilipendency, Infamy*; for their eximious exalted Condition is unſtain'd both in a *real* and *legal* Senſe; they are unſtain'd with Meanneſs and Vulgarneſs, and may not be ſtain'd with any imputation of matter of Infamy or Reproach; which ſpeaketh the height of Nobilitation. They are priviledg'd and exempted from Imputation of *erring, dying, doing wrong, no Laches, Folly or Imperfection may be found in the King, all juſt Attainders are purg'd by the Crown.* And becauſe they are God's Officers, not the People's, Supreme in Government, and the Civil Sovereigns, theſe Magnificent Priviledges neceſſarily belong to their Eſtate (which yet ought to be limited by Natural Equity) they are priviledg'd from Hoſtile Reſiſtance, Forfeiture of their Eſtate, Subjection to any Civil Authority, and to the Laws or Commands of any, none may ſit in Judgment upon them, call them to account for Male-adminiſtration, inflict Depoſition or Death upon them. They are denominated αὐτόνομοι, αὐτοκέφαλοι, ἀδέσποτοι, αὐτοκράτορες, *Self-Sovereigns*, as well as παντοκράτορες, *Sovereigns over others*; which Independency of their Condition is of greater precioſity in the Eyes of two many Secular Kings than their Beneficent Superintendency and Superviſorſhip over others, if a Biſhop of our own hath not wrong'd them in this Character of them. (b) *They are exalted above Men, not to conſult the good of Men, but that they may live as they liſt; for this is the Prerogative of Kings.* The right alſo of interpreting and of diſpenſing with the Execution of Laws (upon due accounts) belong to this Eſtate, and the power of altering the Laws (when governing Juſtice will allow it) as alſo diſobligedneſs from the Laws, according to that known reſcript of the Emperours *Severus* and *Antonine*; *Licet Legibus ſoluti ſimus, attamen legibus vivimus, We live by the Laws though diſoblig'd from the Laws.*

But although this Prerogative of *Diſobligedneſs from the Laws* (which doth not extend to thoſe Laws that are fundamental to the Society of the Empire, (i) as the Imperial Lawyers affirm) maketh a great ſhew, yet in a juſt compute of things it amounteth to little. For the Emperour is only ſo far and in ſuch Senſe diſoblig'd from the Civil Laws, that he is not of condition ſubject to them, but he is not diſoblig'd from ſuch an obſervance of them, as the Philoſopher's Maxim requireth; (k) δεῖ δ' ὁ ἄρχων φύλαξ τοῦ νόμου, *The Ruler is of place the Keeper and Guardian of what is Law, Right and Due.* He is not diſoblig'd from the Law of juſt and equal Government in all things that are matter of Civil Law; and it ſignifieth little, that he hath power to change particular Laws, ſeeing the Society ought to have either the preſent equal Laws, or other Laws every way as good or better than they. He is not diſoblig'd from the Law of due agency in all Circumſtances, the Law of Royal Qualities and Practices, the Law of religiouſly wiſe, faithful and regular governing, nor from the Law of his Place and Office, *Beneficence in Government*; upon all which accounts the Emperour is vaſtly oblig'd to a cloſe and faithful adherence to the Laws, that are Laws indeed, not *peſtes Reipublicæ* (as *Cicero* ſpeaketh) *the Plagues of the Publick Weal.* The Law alſo of the moſt illuſtrious Virtue and Goodneſs belongeth to this Eſtate. (l) *It muſt be thought the vitioſity of a private Man, to do things that are ill and worthy of Puniſhment, which are under the Severity of the Law; but of a Ruler or Prefect not to be ſuperlatively good.* The Regency of a King and Emperour is that of a *Guide* and *Shepherd*: *He is a Benefactor to his People, if being good himſelf, he taketh care of their well-doing, as a Shepherd of his Sheep*, (m) ſaith *Ariſtotle*;) to be the Regent and Lawgiver in a City, Army or Family, importeth much more than the verbal commanding others; it is ſo to command them, as to conduct them (and the great comprehenſive duty of the Subject-eſtates, Children, Souldiers, Diſciples and Flocks of People, is to imitate and follow, to act in conformity to their Leader and Pattern;) the Emperour therefore ought to live by the Laws, that he may be an exemplary Guide and Pattern unto thoſe, to whom the Laws are given (that they may be well guided and govern'd) and that may be properly call'd *his Law*, which he liveth by himſelf, and which all muſt live by, that are of his Society. As the People have conſented to the Lawgiver's Government, ſo he hath conſented to be their Leader and Governour; therefore the Legiſlative-eſtate is the Eſtate of making the Laws, of governing by the Laws, of living by the Laws. It is alſo an Eſtate of living in Society with others, (n) as συμπολῖται, *Fellow-Citizens* (conjoyn'd in community of life and living;) therefore the Lawgiver hath conſented, to live by one and the ſame City Law with his People, (o) *if there be the ſame reaſon for himſelf as for others*; for Laws are made for the ſake and for the good of the whole (the Emperour and his Citizens) and what is uſeful and neceſſary for the whole, is taken care of in the Laws; wherefore all are concern'd to obſerve them in point of common Intereſt, Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Faithfulneſs. If it be Wiſdom and Goodneſs to make them as a Governour, it is Wiſdom and Juſtice, to obſerve them as a Citizen. In Popular Governments the Law is *formally*, in

Monarchies

(g) *Ibid. p.* 353, 483, 18, 432.

1 *Sam.* 17. 25.

(h) *Qui ſunt* ἐπὶ βαθμῶν *conſtituti, non ut hominum ſaluti conſulant, ſed ut vivere poſſint ipſi ut velint.* —— τὸ γὰρ γέρας εἶναι ἀνάκτων. *Montacut. Orig. T.* 1. *p.* 199.

(i) *Vinn. Com. in Inſtit. p.* 320.

(k) *Ariſtot. Eth. Nicom. l.* 5. *c.* 10.

(l) Ἀλλ' ἡγεῖσθαι ἰδιώτου μὲν εἶναι κακίαν τὸ φαῦλα πράττειν, καὶ ὅσα κολάσεως ἄξια, ὧν ὁ νόμος βαρὺς δεσπότης, ἄρχοντος δὲ ἢ προεστῶτος τὸ μὴ ὡς ἄριστον εἶναι. *Gr. Naz. Or.* 1.

(m) *Eth. Nicom. l.* 8. *c.* 13. *Dio Chryſoſt. Orat.* 1. *de regno. Duck de uſu & authorit. Jur. Civil. p.* 37.

(n) *Ariſtot. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 10.

(o) *Suarez de Leg. l.* 3. *c.* 35. *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *S.* 12. *& c.* 20. *S.* 24.

Monarchies the Law is *virtually and equivalently*, (p) *a common Agreement of the City according to which all muſt live, that are in the ſtate and relation of Citizens* (as *Demoſthenes* defin'd it, and from him *Marcianus* in the *Pandects*;) in making the City-Law of living none are Diſſenters, none may be Diſſenters in Practice. The Emperour is a Conſenter for the whole (himſelf and his People) his Conſent including theirs that have conſented to his Government. And as the Party Regent in any common Buſineſs being Agent in conſort with others is moſt of all concern'd, to obſerve the Law of that Affair (which is his own Law,) as the Regent of Muſicians at a Muſic-Exerciſe, the Governour of a Ship or Army, or the Biſhop of an Aſſembly of Chriſtians. The Paſtor having choſen and determin'd a way of agency for all his Collegues and Aſſociates, not ſeparately, but in conjunction with himſelf and he with them in one Society, *ſtante ea lege*, while it continueth the Law of the Aſſembly the Paſtor muſt not fail to obſerve it (what is proper for him to obſerve) not as a Subject-Agent in that Affair, that muſt obey *juſſu imperantis*, but as the Agent-Regent, that is bound to govern the Affair, and be Agent in it in conſort; nor is it otherwiſe in conducting the Affairs of Civil Life. (q) *When you have preſcrib'd to others, you have preſcrib'd to your ſelf*, (ſaith S. *Ambroſe* to *Valentinian*;) virtually and equivalently the Emperour maketh Laws, for himſelf to keep in the firſt place, and he is to ſee that others obſerve them, if he preſideth over the Commonwealth, (r) *as a Charioteer over a Chariot, a Governour over a Ship*, to ſteer it and take care of its welfare. Some Rules of Agency (like the Rules of Muſic) the Nature of things maketh Law, and there is no doing otherwiſe in point of Aptitude or tolerable Agency. What is againſt due Order is againſt Law, ἡ γὰρ τάξις νόμος, *for Law is Order and due Order is Law*: What is not equal, but the contrary, is againſt Law; for as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, ὁ νόμος τὸ μέσον, *what is in due meaſure, is Law*; to order all things, ſo as is the beſt, is Law; for doing otherwiſe, is oppoſite to well-doing. Well-doing will be what it is denominated, and *intolerable acting amiſs* will be ſo, whether we will or no; wherefore it is impoſſible that the Emperour (whoſe ſuppos'd Authority is call'd by *Zoſimus* ἄλογος ἐξουσία, *Brutal Authority*) ſhould be exempted from living or governing by good and juſt Laws; and if it was poſſible, it would be a Penalty, not a Priviledge. The maxim of Law touching his *diſobligedneſs from the Laws*, is a ſlur to the Laws, but ſignifieth little to his real advantage: Nor is it for his real advantage, that his bare Edicts ſhould have the force of Laws (a Priviledge which is deny'd unto Kings in leſs deſpotical and more regular-regial Governments;) for liberty and power to good only is deſirable.

XI. The Kingdom is *an Eſtate of Sacredneſs, and ſuch is the Godhead*. For the Perſon, Majeſty and Life of the King is uſually intituled *Sacred* (whence aroſe that ancient evil cuſtom of ſwearing by Kings and Emperours;) about *Juſtinian*'s time the faſhion was, when an Emperour was crown'd at *Conſtantinople*, (s) to make a Croſs with holy Oyl on the Emperour's Head, the Patriarch in doing it crying aloud Ἅγιος, *Sacred*, (the People alſo follow'd him with the ſame Acclamation,) and we read at the crowning of *Juſtin* II.

> —— ·—— *Sacro Diademate juſſit*
> *Auguſtum ſancire caput.*———

In the later times of the Empire the Attribute *Sacred* is affix'd to almoſt every thing appertaining to the Emperour (as in theſe following Expreſſions, *Sacrum Imperium*, *ſacrum palatium*, *obſequia ſacra*, *largitiones ſacræ*, *ſacratiſſimus Imperator*, *ſacra Equi ejus Lupata*, and ſuch more,) and in the ſame ſtile they uſually ſpeak in the *German* Empire, which is call'd by the Name of *The Holy Empire*. Such extravagant ſacrating the matters of Secular Pomp and Grandeur is not without a ſtrong tang of *Grecanic* Vanity; which appeareth alſo in ſacrating little honourary Matters; as *conſecrare militem* is us'd to ſignifie the making a Knight; (t) the Heralds are look'd upon *tanquam ſacrorum cuſtodes & templi Honoris æditui, as the Keepers of the ſacred things, and Guardians of the Temple of Honour*: And the Poet *Statius* (u) is ſaid to be crowned in the *Quinquatria* —*ſanctoque indutus Cæſaris auro, and inveſted with* Cæſar's *ſacred Gold*. But although there is much of Vanity in ſacrating theſe Secular Vanities, yet many things that are meerly Secular or Civil (the things of Civil Society and Civil Life) are, and ought to be, intituled *Sacred*; *(w)* as *Sacri Tribuni, the Tribunes of the People amongſt the* Romans *were ſacred, ſancti Legati, ſacred Embaſſadours, Laws made by due Authority* are *leges ſanctæ, leges ſacræ, Sacred Laws*, as the Profeſſors of the Laws ſtile them; and they uſually ſtile themſelves *Sacerdotes*, becauſe they teach and miniſter about *Sacred things*. *Theodoric*'s Charge to a Judge (in *Caſſiodorus*) ſpeaketh the Sacredneſs of his Perſon and Imploy; *Eſto innocentiæ templum, temperantiæ ſacrarium, ara juſtitiæ, Be thou the Temple of Innocence, the Sanctuary of Temperance, the Altar of Juſtice.* The Sacredneſs of many Civil Things and Perſons of inferiour quality inferreth, that *Kings* are Sacred at a great rate (being Sovereign Lords and Powers, *Dei Vicarii*, God's Repreſentatives and Vicegerents, deputed to repreſent his Perſon, and to act in his ſtead, and being the Lord's anointed, whether anointed with material Oyl or not;) accordingly their Regalities are intituled their *Sacra Sacrorum, Superlative Sacreds*. In our Law it is high Treaſon to imagine only, or intend the Death of the King, or to kill any of his Judges or Crown-Officers, becauſe by theſe the King's Perſon is repreſented. Of ſuch Sacredneſs is the King's Perſon, that High-Treaſon againſt it is puniſh'd with loſs of Life and Honour, the real and perſonal Eſtate of the Criminal, and his Heirs alſo loſe the ſame for ever. Such Sacredneſs the Law may put upon other Perſons that are no Kings (as the Tribunes of the People among the *Romans* were made *Sacroſanct* by the Law;) for *Sacredneſs* is nothing elſe but *the Inviolableneſs of Things or Perſons ſegregate and remote from common*, and the greater Inviolableneſs they are of, the greater is their Sacredneſs.

XII. The Kingdom-eſtate is a Monarchy (or ſingularity of Rule) *and ſuch is the Godhead*. For the Writers of Politicks underſtand nothing elſe by theſe Names *King* and *Kingdom*, but a certain Species of Political Government called *Monarchy* (contradiſtinct to Ariſtocracy

(p) Πόλεως συνθήκη κοινή, καθ' ἣν ἅπασι προσήκει ζῆν τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει.

q) *S.Am- roſ.Ep.* 2.

) *Dioto- nes de gn.*

) *Seld. tles, p. o. ed.*3.

(t) *Preſent State of* England, *Par.* 2. *p.* 256.

(u) *Selden ſupr.p.*339.

(w) *Macrob. Saturn. l.* 3. *c.*3. *Forteſcue de laud. leg. Angl. p.* 8, 9. *Ferdin. ABDvenſ. orat. pro Jur. Civil. p.* 7. *Caſſiodor. l.* 1. *var.* 12. *Holiday in Juven.p.*7.

and Democracy) which they thus define; (x) *A Kingdom is a Monarchy or the Chieftainſhip of one adminiſtring the publick Affairs to the common good.* (y) *The Government of a ſingle Perſon by virtue of Law or Cuſtom undertaken and manag'd for the good of the obedient Subjects.* From which Political Definitive Notices of King and Kingdom it appeareth; that in Politicks they are contemplated under one Notion, and in Nobility-Learning under another. For in Nobility-Learning by *King* and *Kingdom* we underſtand ſuch a Nobilitation and Perfection of Eſtate, as thoſe Names import: But uſually the Writers of *Politicks* by King and Kingdom underſtand only ſuch a Species of Political Government, as thoſe Names denote. And not conſidering *King* and *Kingdom* under this Notion as ſuch an *Honour and Nobilitation of Eſtate*, but only as ſuch *an Office and ſuch a Species of Political Government*, they have over-look'd much of the Primary Importance of thoſe great Names, and have form'd a very maim'd, partial, inadequate Idea of the things, robbing them of a principal part of themſelves.

XIII. The Kingdom-eſtate is *the Supra-ſubject or Subject-tranſcendent Eſtate, and ſuch the Godhead is.* The Eſtate of the Civil Sovereign is Subject-tranſcendent in reſpect of his Stile, Titles, Attributes, Badges and Enſigns of Dignity, Port and Preſence, Rights and Prerogatives, Power and Proweſs, Revennes and Poſſeſſions, Circumſtances of Life, State and Order of Service, the reſpects of Honour and Homage, and Subjection that are due to Him, requiſite Endowments, Abilities, Virtues and Behaviour (*magnum eſt in Republicâ tueri perſonam principis*; *It's a great thing, to maintain and expreſs in every thing the Perſon of the Prince*, the Perſon of Quality that he beareth) as alſo in reſpect of his Employment or Part to act, the Rank and Graduality, the Sacredneſs and Precioſity of his Perſon. *Thou art worth ten thouſand of us*, 2 Sam. 18. 3. (z) If the *Habaſſines* (as ſome affirm) call their Emperour by a Name that ſignifieth *a precious Stone, or incomparable Gem* (Belul Gian) as alſo by another that ſignifieth *Elect or the Bridegroom* (Haze) thereby they denote a peerleſs eſtimation that they have of their Civil Sovereign. But we need not travel ſo far as *Ethiopia*, to learn the juſt Eſtimation, that we ought to have of him: For in our *Engliſh* Law his Perſon and Life is ſo precious, that every Subject is bound by his Allegiance, to defend it with his own Life and Limbs; the Sovereign is at ſuch a rate Subject-tranſcendent, that the Law ſaith, *The Life and Member of every Subject is at the Service of the Sovereign.*

The Application of theſe and our other Notices of Civil Sovereigns to the Godhead is ſo eaſie and obvious, that I forbear it as in great part needleſs; and will remark nothing more touching the Correſpondences between *Godhead of Eſtate and the Eſtate of Secular Sovereigns*, ſave only the Diſcourſe of a Pythagorean who from the Divine Attributes inferreth a reſemblance between the Godhead and the Kingdom-eſtate of Secular Sovereigns. (a) Jupiter *the Supreme Potentate is venerable and honourable, both becauſe of his Celſitude and the greatneſs of his Virtue. Good, as being Beneficent and communicative of Goods, whence he is rightly called by the* Ionic *Poet The Father of Gods and Men. Formidable, both becauſe he puniſheth the Unjuſt, and becauſe he is dominant and imperant over all. He hath alſo a Thunderbolt in his Hand a Symbol of his Formidableneſs: Upon the account of all this it ought to be remembred, that the Kingdom-eſtate is an Imitamen of God.* From theſe numerous Correſpondences between *Godhead of Eſtate* and the *Kingdom-eſtate* of Secular Princes, it appeareth, that God muſt be contemplated as *a Lord, King or Potentate, an Imperial or Kingdom-eſtate, That Imperial Eſtate the Godhead, which is the Kingdom-eſtate.*

CONSECT. 4.

Touching the Supreme Potentate both Theologies agree, that his Imperial or Kingdom-eſtate is *Divinity, Deity or Godhead of Condition*; for both account it (b) τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς θείας ὑπεροχῆς, *the Dignity of the Divine Tranſcendence.* In the Pagans Theology the great Eſtate of the Supreme Potentate is more than meer Deity. It is Supreme Deity of Condition; to which Divine Tranſcendence they rais'd their *Jupiter* ἱστορικῶς (hiſtorically) ſuppoſing him *the Lord of all things*: And to this Divine Tranſcendence *the Imperial Eſtate of the Supreme Potentate* the Scripture-Theology raiſeth our Bleſſed Saviour, *exalted by God's right hand to be a Prince*, Act. 5. 31. *Whom he hath made both Lord and Chriſt*, Act. 2. 36. *The Lord of all*, Act. 10. 36. His exaltation to the Place, Eſtate and Dignity of *Lord of all*, denoteth his advancement to the Kingdom-eſtate of the Supreme Potentate; and this Exaltation is his Ἀποθέωσις, *Divinity, Deity or Godhead of Condition*; for *He is over all God bleſſed for ever, Amen*; Rom. 9. 5. In the Pſalmiſts Deſcription of our Saviour's Exaltation both theſe Notions are conjoyn'd, *Pſal.* 45. 6. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* For his advancement to the Throne (which is the Seat of Majeſty) ſpeaketh his exaltation to the Imperial Eſtate of the Supreme Potentate: And from his Honourary Stile or Title, *O God*, it appeareth, that this Exaltation is his Ἀποθέωσις, *Deity or Godhead of Condition.* The Prophet in like manner hath conjoyn'd theſe two Notions, *Iſa.* 9. 6. *The Government ſhall be upon his Shoulder, and his Name ſhall be called* (that is, he ſhall be) *the mighty God.* Whence it appeareth, that to poſſeſs the Throne of the holy Government, is to be of Imperial Condition *God*, and that theſe two Notions are but two Notions of the very ſame thing. If the Name God denoteth the Supreme Potentate, his Imperial Eſtate or Condition muſt neceſſarily be Deity or Godhead of Condition. The Metaphorical (or Analogical) Deity or Godhead of Condition which Secular Sovereign Princes enjoy, is the ſame thing with their Imperial or Kingdom-eſtate; therefore the proper Deity or Godhead of Condition which the Supreme King enjoyeth, is the very ſame with his Imperial or Kingdom-eſtate. As one perſon is of Imperial Condition King, another is of Imperial Condition Pope: So God is of Imperial Condition God; therefore if one be rais'd to be of his Imperial Condition, he is rais'd to Deity or Godhead of Condition. Agreeably whereunto our Saviour's *Exaltation and Seſſion at the right hand of God* muſt

(x) *Regnum eſt Monarchia, ſive unius principatus adminiſtrantis Rempublicam ad utilitatem communem.* Calvin. Lex. Jurid. in voce Regnum.

(y) *Unius imperium moribus aut legibus delatum, ſuſceptum geſtumque parentium bono.* Lipſ. Polit. l. 2. c. 3.

(z) *Selden Titles*, p. 64, 85.

(a) Ὁ κρατίων πάντων Ζεὺς σεμνὸς μὲν ἐντὶ καὶ τίμιος, διά τε τὰν ὑπεροχὰν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τᾶς ἀρετᾶς. χρηστὸς δὲ διὰ τὸ εὐεργετικός τε ἦμεν, καὶ ἀγαθοδότας ὅκως δὴ καὶ λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶ ἰωνικῶ ποιητᾶ, ὥσκ' εἴη πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. δεινὸς δὲ διὰ τὸ κολάζεν τὼς ἀδικεῦντας, καὶ κρατὲν καὶ κυριεύεν πάντων. ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὸ κέραυνον μετὰ χεῖρα σύμβολον τᾶς δεινότατος. ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις μναμονευτέον δεῖ, ὅτι θεόμιμόν ἐντι πρᾶγμα βασιλεία. Diotogenes de regno.

(b) Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. c. 3. p. 4.

muſt be underſtood; for he doth not ſit there as a meer Favourite (as *Bathſheba* ſat on King *Solomon*'s right hand) but as a King, Lord or Potentate, that is rais'd to Conſortſhip with God in his Imperial Eſtate, as amongſt the *Roman* Emperours the Father ſometimes admitted the Son to a Conſortſhip with him in his Empire. His *Seſſion on the right hand of God* importeth, that *He is rais'd to ſit in his Father's Throne*, that he rightfully poſſeſſeth the Kingdom-eſtate of the Supreme Potentate, and (which is the ſame thing) τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς θείας ὑπεροχῆς, *the Dignity of the Divine Tranſcendence.* For this the holy Writers mean and plainly enough expreſs in their accounts of our Saviour's Exaltation; *who is gone into Heaven, and is at the right hand of God, Angels, and Authorities and Powers being made ſubject to him. God hath ſet him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion* (all created Potentacy) *and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but alſo in that which is to come. He is ſet on the right hand of the Throne of the Majeſty on high, and made higher than the Heavens* (the utmoſt height of created Nature:) *But to which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, ſit on my right hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footſtool? are they not all miniſtring Spirits?* By our Saviour's Exaltation to the right hand of God therefore the holy Writers underſtand his rightful Poſſeſſion *of the Kingdom-eſtate of the Supreme Potentate* (the Divine Sovereignty) that he is *of Imperial Condition*, and that *his Imperial Condition* is no leſs *than the Godhead.*

*Apoc.*3.22.

1 *Pet.*3.22.
Eph. 1. 20, 21.
Heb. 1. 3, 13, 14. *and ch.* 7, 26. 8, 1.

In this Notion of our Saviour's *Seſſion at the right hand of God* the many regial Eminences that are aſcrib'd to him, and which are Branches of his Exaltation, are manifeſtly compris'd; for becauſe he is rightfully poſſeſs'd of the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead (which is Godhead of Eſtate) therefore he is rightfully poſſeſs'd of the peerleſs ſupereminent reigning Eſtate. *He muſt reign, till he hath put all Enemies under his Feet*; therefore *He is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, the Lord of Glory, the Lord of Life, the Lord from Heaven*, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, the Sovereign Lord and Judge of Men and Angels; therefore He is *Heir of all things* (Lord of all things as Heir,) *all things are ſubjected to him, put under his Feet* (He only is excepted which did put all things under him) and his right of Empire is co-extended with the Univerſe; therefore *God hath highly exalted him* (ὑπερύψωσε, hath exalted him above all Highneſſes) *and hath given him a Name* (a perſonal Eminence and Dignity) *which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth, and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord.* Becauſe he is rais'd to the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead (inſtated in it, inveſted with it) therefore all created Beings are underlings to him, all Rationals ought to pay him their Homage and Subjection as to their Divine Sovereign Lord; therefore *all Power in Heaven and Earth is given unto him*, his Dominion and Power over the Univerſe is full and plenary, without Reſtriction or Limitation. All Things and Perſons are under his command, having plenary right to poſſeſs, uſe and imploy them to his own ends, to manage Affairs unaccountably (in the ſupreme way of regency) to make and annul Laws, to exerciſe Judgment, to pardon or condemn, to ſave or deſtroy the Souls of Men, to diſpoſe of all their Spiritual-eternal Intereſts, and to conſtitute Principalities and Powers, as being *the Head of all Principality and Power, and upholding all things by the word of his power, by him all things conſiſt.* All which Height of Imperial Power is nothing leſs than Deity or Godhead of Condition: Accordingly, the Son of God in his Deiform Condition is ſaid to be *the Image and Pourtraiture of the inviſible God*, He beareth the Stile and Title, carrieth the State and Majeſty of God, hath the honourary Rights and Dues of God, ought to be reſpected, and reverenc'd, and lov'd, and ſerv'd with the uncommon incommunicable Honour and Worſhip of God, and muſt be joyn'd with God in the religious Adorations of Saints and Angels; *Apoc.* 5. 13. *Every Creature which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and ſuch as are in the Sea, heard I ſaying, Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* As the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead is the fulleſt height of *Dominion* and *Power*; ſo (agreeably to our Notices of the Kingdom-eſtate) of *Honour*, *Glory*, *Royalneſs* and *Illuſtriouſneſs*, *Nobilitation* and *Perfection Celeſtial and Divine*; this therefore our Bl. Saviour is poſſeſs'd of by his exaltation to *the right hand of God.* Whence the Scripture uſually ſtileth it, *His Glorification*, *His being crown'd with Glory and Honour*, *His being taken up into Glory*, *His entrance into Glory*, that is, *into the Glory* of the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, whereby he is *ennobled*, *unſerviliz'd*, *unvulgariz'd*, *unſordify'd* in abſolute Perfection, his Imperial Perſon is abſolutely *unvile* and *unvileable*; and becauſe He is ſo glorify'd, and muſt be accordingly glorify'd by us, therefore He is deify'd in Eſtate and Condition. In his Kingdom-eſtate which is his *Glory* and *Magnificence* (according to that of the Prophet, *Dan.* 7. 13. *There was given him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom.*) He alſo enjoyeth the fulleſt height of *Beatitude*, and all felicitative honourary Priviledges and Exemptions from Sin, Sorrow, Sufferings, Wants, Weakneſſes, Imperfections, Inſufficiency, from all Miſcreancy and Miſery, being Immortal, Impaſſible, Incorruptible as God is, and at the rate of God, and living in uninterrupted never-dying Joy, as God liveth. And becauſe He is ſo Beatify'd *really*, and *legally* muſt be Beatify'd by us (as the Apoſtle ſtileth Him *bleſſed for ever*, *Rom.* 9. 5.) therefore he is Deify'd in Eſtate and Condition. Much more might be added touching this Illuſtrious Argument, The Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead; but thus much may ſuffice for a competent Explication of this *fourth Conſectary*, which is ſelf-evident, *That to be the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, is Divinity, Deity or Godhead of Eſtate.*

1 *Cor.* 15. 25,28,47.
Apoc. 19. 16.
Act. 3. 15.
Heb. 1. 2. *and* 2. 8.
1 *Cor.* 15. 27.
Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11.
*Matth.*28. 18.
Col. 2. 10. *and* 1. 17.
Heb. 1. 3.
Col. 1. 16.
*Joh.*7. 39. *and* 12.16, 23. *and* 17. 5. *and* 13. 31.
Heb. 2. 9.
1 *Tim.* 3. 16.
Luk. 24. 26.

CHAP. III.

1. The Scripture-Theology (as well as the Pagan) ſuppoſeth, that God is King or Monarch of the Univerſe, but in a limitted ſenſe. Firſt, So far as to be the King of Kings. Secondly, So far as that the Deity is a Monarchy, not a Paganical Monarchic Polyarchy. Thirdly, So far as that his Dominion is Univerſal. Fourthly, So far as that he exerciſeth an Univerſal governing Providence. Fifthly, So far as to Rule the Univerſe by an irreſiſtible authoritative Power. Sixthly, So far as to be the Imperial Eſtate of God to the Univerſe of Rationals. 2. According to the Scripture-Theology (which is Diſſonant from the Pagan) God is not ſo the King or Monarch of the Univerſe, as to be the Mundane or Pagano-mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate. The firſt Illuſtration of this great Principle. The ſecond Illuſtration. The third Illuſtration. A fourth Illuſtration. A fifth Illuſtration with an account of the Fall of the evil Angels. A ſixth Illuſtration with ſeveral Explications of this Specific Comprehenſion, Theiſm of Religion and Condition.

I. THAT God is King or Monarch of the Univerſe, is matter of Agreement between the Scripture-Theology and the Pagan; not abſolutely, but with due diſtinction and limitation of Senſe. For according to the Scripture-Theology,

(1.) God is ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe, he is the Sovereign Potentate of all Potentates, *the King of Kings*. For the whole Univerſe is neceſſarily of Subject-condition to him, that is the great King, *the King of all Kings, and the Lord of all Lords*. In ſuch Senſe the *Spaniards* fanſie their King *the Catholic King*, as if all other Kings were his Vicegerents or Viceroys holding their Crowns from him *in Fee*. So the Pagans intituled their ſupreme Deity *Jupiter omnipotens Regum Rex* —— whence again it appeareth, that there is a great reſemblance between the Godhead and the Eſtate of ſecular Sovereign Princes; for the Eaſtern Monarchs of elder and later times have affected theſe Attributes of Grandeur (c) *King of Kings, and the great King*, as the Turkiſh Emperor is ſtiled *the Grand Seignior*. So *Plutarch* reporteth in the Life of *Themiſtocles*, that in his Addreſs to the King of *Perſia* he told him of the *Dodonean Jupiter*'s Oracle, which bade him go πρὸς τὸν ὁμώνυμον τοῦ θεοῦ, *to one that was of the ſame Name with God*, which he interpreted of the *Perſian* King, becauſe *He in common with* Jove *is intituled the great King*.

(2.) God is ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe, as that *the Deity is a Monarchy, not a Paganical Monarchic Polyarchy.* (d) *We muſt affirm in the firſt place, that no Being is equaliz'd to God, but there is one Ruler and Prince and King, to whom only it belongeth, to govern and adminiſter all things; for that ſaying, the Government of many is not good, let there be one to Govern, one King, is not more accommodate to Men and Cities than to God and the World; for one muſt neceſſarily be the Maker, Father and Lord of one.* So *Philo* diſputeth for a Monarchy over the Univerſe, and ſo the Pagan Theologers uſually plead for a mundane Monarchy as well as *Philo* (who ſymbolizeth with them in their Polytheiſm;) for their multitude of Deities are ſubordinate, and they aſſert a ſupreme Deity over all, which is a Monarchy; but ſuch a Monarchy, which is more properly call'd a *Monarchic Polyarchy*. The Fathers call it a *Polyarchy*, and aſſert a Monarchy oppoſite thereto. (e)

Then let us laud the glorious
Monarchy,
And let us loath of Gods a
Polyarchy,
Which ſeems to me no better
than Anarchy.

True Religion reſerveth unto God all Divine-potentacy and God-propriety. (f) *Omnem divinam poteſtatem neceſſe eſt in uno eſſe, cujus nutu & imperio regantur omnia. All Divine Potentacy muſt neceſſarily be in one, by whoſe beck and command all may be govern'd.* In ſuch Senſe true Religion is rightly defin'd. (g) *A Doctrine or Diſcipline touching the Monarchy of one God over all* oppoſite to a Paganical Monarchic Polyarchy. But the Pagan Theiſts Hypotheſis would be much more groſly a *Polyarchy*, if they ſuppos'd the Univerſe to be conſtituted according to the Opinion of *Xenophanes Colophonius*, as it is repreſented in *Euſebius*. (h) *He affirmeth touching the Gods, that there is no Rulerſhip amongſt them; for it is not a Religious thing, that any of the Gods ſhould have a Lord over them.*

(3.) God is ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe, as that *his Kingdom* (or Dominion) *is Univerſal*. Some of the Atheiſtic Philoſophers called the Elements θεοὶ, *Gods*, becauſe they attributed to them *Primacy*, *Independency* and *Supremacy* of Condition. If the Univerſe of Creatures had not a Lord of them and over them, they would be of Condition Gods not Creatures; and if God was not *the Lord, the King, the Potentate* as to the Univerſe, he could not be God as to the Univerſe. We are to him (not as Gods, but) as the Creatures, his Creatures, of Condition Creatures, and he is to us *as God*, which denoteth his Relation of Dominion, which therefore he cannot alienate. (i) *The Name God denoteth Relation* (the Relation of the Lord) *to thoſe things that are of ſervient Condition and of a created Nature.* Being the ſupreme Proprietor of the Univerſe of Creatures, Dominant and Regnant over them, having Right to poſſeſs and diſpoſe of them, to command

(c) *Selden Titles* p. 27.

(d) Λεκτέον οὖν ἐκεῖνο πρῶτον, ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν ὄντων ἰσότιμον ὑφέστηκε θεῷ· ἀλλ' ἔστιν εἷς ἄρχων ϗ ἡγεμὼν ϗ βασιλεὺς, ᾧ πρυτανεύειν ϗ διοικεῖν μόνῳ θέμις τὰ σύμπαντα· τὸ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω, Εἷς βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ πόλεων ϗ ἀνθρώπων λέγοιτ' ἂν ἐν δίκῃ μᾶλλον, ἢ ἐπὶ κόσμου ϗ θεοῦ, ἑνὸς γὰρ ἕνα ποιητήν τε ϗ πατέρα πάλιν, ϗ δεσπότην ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι. Philo περὶ συγχυσ. διαλεκτ. p. 233. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(e) Τῷ δὲ μονοκρατίην ἐριλάμπτα κυδαίνωμεν
Μηδὲ θεῶν ἀγορῇ τερπώμεθα τῇ πολυάρχῳ.
Ἶσον γὰρ πολύαρχον ἐμοὶ καὶ πάμπαν ἄναρχον.
Gr. Naz. Arcan. Car. 3. p. 165.

(f) *Lactant. de Ira.* c. 11.

(g) Περὶ μοναρχίας ἑνὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ διδασκαλία. Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 1. c. 4.

(h) Ἀποφαίνεται δὲ ϗ περὶ θεῶν, ὡς οὐδεμιᾶς ἡγεμονίας ἐν αὐτοῖς οὔσης· οὐ γὰρ ὅσιον δεσπόζεσθαί τινα τῶν θεῶν. Pr. ev. l. 1. c. 8.

(i) Θεὸς μὲν, ὡς πρὸς τὰ δοῦλα ϗ τὰ γεννητὴν ἔχοντα τὴν οὐσίαν ἔχει τὴν σχέσιν. S. Cyr. Theſ. p. 39.

mand over, uſe and imploy them (according to his good Pleaſure,) he is juſtly denominated παμβασιλεὺς, *King of all*, παντοκράτωρ, *Omni-imperial*, and κύριος σαβαὼθ, *the Lord of Hoſts*. Which great Attribute muſt be underſtood in a two-fold Senſe: For ſometimes it ſignifieth in a Military Notion, as *R. Bechai* ſaith. (k) *When God judgeth the Creatures, he is called* Elohim: *When he maketh War upon the impious, he is called God of Hoſts*. The World of Creatures are unto God as ſeveral Hoſts or Armies (he hath his ſuperior and inferior Hoſts, as the Jews diſtinguiſh,) and when commanded they fight the Battels of this great Military Potentate in defence of his People and againſt his Enemies. The Tribes of *Iſrael* were more eſpecially his Hoſts, *Exod.* 6. 26. and 12. 41. And he was to them a Military King, the Lord-General of their Armies (1 *Sam.* 17. 45.) and fought their Battels for them (in the Wilderneſs eſpecially,) whence the pious Men of the Old Teſtament uſually celebrate his invincible Proweſs and Puiſſance in War. *Exod.* 15. 3. *The Lord is a Man of War* (a Military Hero,) *the Lord is his Name*. Pſal. 24. 7, 8. *Who is the King of Glory? the Lord ſtrong and mighty, the Lord mighty in Battel, the Lord of Hoſts he is the King of Glory.* But oftentimes in Scripture the Name of Hoſt or Hoſts hath no Relation at all to War or Military Affairs, it denoteth nothing more than *an orderly Multitude or Multitudes of the Creatures*; as *Gen.* 2. 1. *The Heavens and the Earth were finiſh'd, and all the Hoſt of them.* From whence it appeareth, that this great Name ſometimes ſignifieth nothing more, than that God is *the Lord or Potentate over the orderly multitudes of the Univerſe of Creatures* (which ſpeaketh his univerſal Empire;) in which Notion this Attribute is in Senſe coincident with παντοκράτωρ, *All-Emperor*, and accordingly the one is rendred by the other both in the Greek Interpreters of the Old Teſtament and the Writers of the New Teſtament. Compare *Iſa.* 6. 3. with *Apoc.* 4. 8.

(k) *Hotting. Diſſ.* p. 279.

o Deut. .19. *Act.* 7. 42. *Iſa.* 34. 4. and 0. 26. *Pſal.* 33. 6. and 03. 21. nd 148. .

(4.) God is ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe, as to *exerciſe a governing univerſal Providence*, ſuperintending the whole Univerſe and all its Affairs, and diſpoſing of them like a legitimate King. (l) *For God is not a Tyrant exerciſing cruelty and violence, and doing the things of an hard deſpotical kind of Government: But a King whoſe Government is placid, and of the Legal kind, with Juſtice he adminiſtreth the Univerſe.* His governing Providence is perfectly wiſe and good, and juſt and equal in all its proceedings; of a Parental Nature (conſerving all things as well as producing them into Being;) it is ſtupendious Manſuetude, Patience and Beneficence in Government, the unwearied Exerciſe of *loving kindneſs, judgment and righteouſneſs in the Earth.* Jer. 9. 24. In great part it is his care and vigilance for our Welfare; and becauſe God reigneth (or beareth rule) in the Exerciſe of his governing Providence, therefore blind chance doth not Reign, nor do fond and evil Men Reign as Sovereign Lords of Affairs: But the guidance and managery of them is in his hands, who is the faithful Friend and Patron of oppreſſed Innocence and Juſtice, *the King of Heaven, all whoſe works are truth, and his ways judgment, and thoſe that walk in pride he is able to abaſe. He hath prepared his Throne for Judgment, and he ſhall judge the World in Righteouſneſs, he ſhall miniſter judgment to the People in Uprightneſs. The Lord alſo will be a Refuge for the oppreſſed, a Refuge in times of trouble.* Which ſhould be matter of Joy and Exultation (as it is matter of general felicity) to the whole Earth, and matter of ſatisfaction to the Minds of good Men in all Events. —— Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλὴ, *The Will and Counſel of God was fulfill'd.*

(l) Ὀυ τύραννος γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς, μότητα ϗ βίαν, ϗ ὅσα δεσπόης ἀνημέρου ἀρχῆς ἔργα ἐπιτεδευκὼς, ἀλλὰ βασιλεὺς ἥερον ϗ νόμιμον ἀνημμένος ἡμονίαν, μετὰ δικαιοσύνης τὸν μπαντα οὐρανόν τε ϗ κόσμον ραβεύει. Philo ap. Euſeb. pr. v. l. 8. c. 14.

an. 4. 7. *Pſal.* 9. 7, 9. and 7. 1.

(5.) God is ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe, as to rule the Univerſe of Beings in a way of *irreſiſtible authoritative Power* (which is ſo far irreſiſtible, that it aſcertaineth the determined Event; for ſo he ruleth ſome of them conſtantly, and all of them occaſionally, even the unruly Wills and Affections of Men. The Frame of univerſal Nature and Fabrick of the viſible Univerſe was at firſt ſettled, and is ſince continu'd by the command of his irreſiſtible authoritative Power, whereby he hath ſettled Laws for the heavenly Bodies, and for this Terraqueous Globe, which he will not change, and which none other can change. *For he commanded and they were created, he hath eſtabliſhed them for ever and ever: He hath made a Decree, which ſhall not paſs.* But upon occaſion *he rebuketh the Sea and maketh it dry, and drieth up all the Rivers. He ſhutteth the Heaven, and openeth the Windows of it, maketh the ſhadow of the Sun and the Waters of* Jordan, *to go backward, and Iron to ſwim, ſuſpendeth the operation of the fire, and turneth the Rock into a ſtanding Water.* By the word of his irreſiſtible authoritative Power (in the ordinary courſe of Nature) *he ſaith to the Snow, be thou on the Earth, likewiſe to the ſmall Rain and the great Rain of his ſtrength. He bindeth the ſweet influence of* Pleiades, *and looſeth the bands of* Orion. *He covereth the Heaven with Clouds, Fire and Hail, Snow and Vapour, and ſtormy Wind fulfil his Word.* And (upon extraordinary occaſion) by the ſame irreſiſtible authoritative Power *he divideth the Sea by a ſtrong Eaſt-wind*, maketh uſe of *the treaſures of the Hail* (*reſerved againſt the time of trouble, againſt the day of battel and war,*) maketh the Inſects *his great Army* (and an invincible Army they are, when the Lord of Hoſts is their General,) reſtraineth the ravenous Nature of the Lions, and commandeth the Ravens to feed a Prophet. The Fates of Men and Kingdoms iſſue from his authoritative irreſiſtible Power, the Devil and his Agents are inchained, the Devices of Politicians fruſtrated, the Counſels of Princes are infatuated by it, and *the heart of the King* (how much more of meaner Perſons) *is in the hand of the Lord, as the Rivers of Water, he turneth it whitherſoever he will.* By an authoritative Power which aſcertaineth the Event (and is ſo far irreſiſtible) the Eyes of the Jews were blinded that crucified their Meſſiah; the heart of *Pharaoh* was hardened; *Ahab* was perſwaded to go up againſt *Ramoth Gilead*; ſome have ſtrong deluſions ſent them, that they ſhould believe a Lye; and of ten Kings the Holy Ghoſt ſaith; *God hath put in their Hearts to fulfil his Will, and to agree, and give their Kingdom unto the beaſt, until the words of God ſhall be fulfilled.* God preſideth over the Univerſe as an irreſiſtible authoritative Power, and nothing can come to paſs without his Commiſſion or Permiſſion; therefore he is a ſort of Univerſal Monarch ruling and over-ruling all.

Pſal. 148. 5, 6. *Nahum* 1. 4. *Luk.* 4. 25. *Gen.* 7. 11. *Iſa.* 38. 6. *Pſal* 114. 3. 2 *King.* 6. 6. *Pſal.* 114. 8. *Dan.* 3. 27. *Job* 37. 6. and 38. 31. *Pſal.* 147. 8. *Pſal.* 148. 8. *Exod.* 14 21. *Job* 38. 22, 23. *Joel* 2. 25. *Dan.* 6. 22. 1 *King.* 17. 4.

Prov. 21. 1.

Joh. 12. 39. *Act.* 4. 28. 1 *King.* 22. 19. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 11. *Apoc.* 17. 17.

(6.) God is ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe of Rationals, as that he is in ſeveral Degrees *an Imperial Eſtate, the Imperial Eſtate of God* to this divided Univerſe; and conſequently he is in ſome degree *the Sovereign Ruler and Governour* of the Univerſe of Rationals by a Rule and Government proper to Rationals. For an Imperial Eſtate to Rationals is an Eſtate of Imperial Rule and Government proper to Rationals, who alone are capable of *Moral Good and Evil, of diſcerning Right and Wrong, Juſt and Unjuſt, of Holineſs and Wickedneſs, of Duty and Sin* (being intelligent free Agents, whereas meer Animals are but vital Engines, neceſſitated by Objects and their Inclinations, their Agency is not their free Self-determining Agency) *of proper Rewards and Puniſhments* (which reſpect Duty and Sin) *of Law-obligation*, of *authoritative Doctrine or Diſcipline, of Rational Propoſals, of the Relation between Sovereign and Subject, Lord and Servant, of the State and Order of Empire, of a Settlement of right and due conſtitutive of a Body Politick, the Parts whereof are held together by the Bonds of Law and Juſtice, of Right and Due, and which is a Region of Law and Juſtice.* In the uſual Senſe of Politicks therefore God can be no Imperial Eſtate to any Beings on this ſide Rationals: But if his Name (God) denoteth an Imperial Eſtate, the God of the Univerſe muſt neceſſarily be an Imperial Eſtate to the vaſt Univerſe of Rationals conſiſting of Angels and of Men good and bad. Theſe are not their own Maſters, they are under a ſuperior Authority; it belongeth to their rightful inviſible Sovereign Lord, to Rule and Reign over them. He is the Lord, the King, the great Imperial Potentate, and they are of Right and by obligation his Liege-Subjects and Servants. The State of his Liege-Subjects and Servants is the State that they ought to be in; the Life of his Liege-Subjects and Servants is the Life which they ought to live; and they owe unto him all the *Dues* and *Rights* of the Imperial Eſtate of God, which are the All of Piety, Religion and God-Service. As an Imperial Eſtate (Lord, King or Potentate) to the Univerſe of Rationals he is *the Law-giver and Judge of all* (of Right and in Fact,) *of the Heavenly Citizens, of the Apoſtate Angels, and of Mankind* both in reſpect of their *Spiritual-eternal* and their *Secular* Intereſts, in their *ſingle* and their *ſocial* Capacity. All Men have ſome Notices of his holy Law, which ſpeaketh him univerſal Law-giver. *Mic.* 6. 8. *He hath ſhew'd thee,* O *Man, what is Good.* As univerſal Judge he obſerveth and inſpecteth the Hearts and Works of all Men, and is righteous in his retributions. Prov. 24. 12. *Doth not he that pondereth the Heart conſider it? and he that keepeth thy Soul doth not he know it? and ſhall not he render to every Man according to his Works?* With reſpect to his Judgment of Life and Death both Temporal and Eternal his words in the Prophet may be underſtood, *Ezek.* 18. 4. *All Souls are mine*; they belong to his Juriſdiction, and therefore to his Diſpoſal. And becauſe his Judgment is univerſal, therefore the buſineſs of Piety is every Man's Work and of univerſal Concernment. *Eccl.* 12. 13. *Fear God and keep his Commandments, for this is the whole of Man. For God ſhall bring every work into Judgment.* Accordingly, in his Adminiſtration of things and Gubernation of Men God hath regard to the promoting Piety, and the deterring Men from Vice and Wickedneſs by Methods proper to Rationals; *Documents, Chaſtiſements, bounteous Bleſſings, extraordinary Deliverances*, and ſometimes *formidable Judgments, that Men may hear and fear and may do no more any ſuch Wickedneſs.* Thus far God is King or Monarch of the Univerſe of Rationals.

II. But God is not ſo far King or Monarch of all Rationals, as he is of his Liege-People, whom he is in Society with as King and People, and to whom he is oblig'd to do all the Offices of their King. Nor is he ſo far King or Monarch of the Univerſe of Rationals as to conſtitute it one City, Kingdom or Monarchic Empire. Nor is there any ſuch Republick as a mundane Monarchy or Kingdom of God. Nor is he ſo far the Sovereign Ruler and Governor of Mankind, as that this World is (in the uſual Senſe of Politicks) a Kingdom, whereof God is the King. Nor muſt we imagine, that God hath the Government of this World, ſo as to be an intrinſic Imperial Eſtate of it, or a Political Head of the Government; that its Form of Government is properly a Theocracy; that Mankind are now the Native Citizens and Deniſons of that Polity which is his Kingdom; that nothing is more requiſite, to conſtitute them the free Subjects of his Kingdom, but their Conſent to his Government in Nature and Providence; and that the Law of his Kingdom is nothing more than the Law of Nature commonly ſo called. All theſe are enormous Miſtakes touching the State of the Univerſe (deſtructive to Chriſtianity,) in oppoſition whereto we will lay down this following Principle touching *the Holy Empire*, whereby I mean *the Church or Kingdom of God* (in the largeſt Notion thereof) according to our Religion.

The Scripture-Theology ſuppoſeth, that God is ſo the King or Monarch of the Univerſe of Rationals, as to be only the Holy Empire's (Cities or Kingdoms) *Imperial Eſtate, not the mundane or Pagano-mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate; which is a principal matter of difference between the Scriptural and Pagan Theology.* This great Principle deſerveth the Name, which the Jews have given to one of their Articles of Faith; it is *Columna Sapientiæ, a Pillar of Wiſdom.* But that this Pillar may be firmly eſtabliſh'd, the Senſe and Truth of it muſt have theſe following Illuſtrations.

The Firſt Illuſtration.

Firſt, This Principle may be illuſtrated *from Human Imperial Eſtates.* For every Imperial Eſtate amongſt Men is ſome Polity's Imperial Eſtate, *as being of it, intrinſick to it, conſtitutive of it as the Regent Party thereof.* Thus the Father or Maſter of a Family, the King of a City or Kingdom is that Polity's Imperial Eſtate. So the *Perſian* or *Roman* Emperor is that Empire's Imperial Eſtate, *as being of it, intrinſick to it, conſtitutive of it as the Regent Party thereof.* In like manner the holy Imperial Potentate (or the Godhead) is the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate. The holy People are his Domeſticks, Citizens, Societiſts, Collegues and Intercommoners as the Servient and Subject-party, of the ſame Family, *Polity*, *City*, and Kingdom that God is of *as the Imperial Eſtate thereof.* God and his People are conjoin'd into one Political Syſtem, one Family or Houſhold, *Eph.* 2. 19. and 3. 15. 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. one City or Corporation, *Eph.* 2. 19. *Heb.* 12. 22. one Kingdom of Saints, *Jo.* 3. 5. *Apoc.* 15. 3. one Holy-popular Common-wealth, *Eph.* 2. 12. one holy Catholick Church and Communion of Saints; for God ſtandeth at the head of that renown'd Syſtem and Republick, *Heb.* 12. 23. 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. *Act.* 22. 28. Nothing can be more evident and certain, than that the Imperial Eſtate of God is that Empire's Imperial Eſtate (peculiarly,) which conſiſteth of God's People; that the God-kind of Imperial Eſtate is the holy kind of Imperial Eſtate, and therefore is of kind the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate: As Chriſt being the Chriſtian kind of Imperial Eſtate is of kind the Chriſtian Empire's Imperial Eſtate. None but an holy Empire can be his kind of Empire. If he is of Right an Imperial Eſtate in the Univerſe of Rationals, it muſt be an Empire of holy People, that he hath Right to; and if he actually becometh the Imperial Eſtate of a Polity, that Polity thereby becometh an holy Polity. Therefore it is the holy Empire's (or the Holy-popular Empire's) Imperial Eſtate that God is. Thus far this great Principle appeareth to be unexceptionably clear and intelligible, and of demonſtrable Truth both from the Teſtimony of Scripture and the Nature of the thing. But becauſe it may ſeem a difficulty, to reconcile this Principle with *God's being King or Monarch of the whole Univerſe* (to which the holy Empire, as the Univerſe is now conſtituted, is not commenſurate,) therefore to make a ſufficient Illuſtration of it, we muſt have recourſe to ſuch an Imperial Eſtate, which is not meerly Secular, but Religious, of which Nature the *Papacy* is. The Pope is ſometimes intituled *Vice Deus* (Vice-God,) and he pretendeth, to be a Monarch of our Univerſe. His Holineſs (as being Vice-God) may have Dominion over all, Exerciſe an univerſal Providence, Govern our Univerſe of Beings by an irreſiſtible authoritative Power, may be an Imperial Eſtate to our Univerſe of Rationals in ſeveral degrees, yet ſuppoſing Popery to be the true Religion, and the Papal Church or Kingdom (of which he is the Imperial Eſtate) to be the holy Empire, his genuine Legitimate Idea muſt be this, *the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate*; and we muſt affirm, that *the Pope is not the Mundane, but the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* So the Lord Chriſt is according to his true Idea *the Chriſtian Empire's Imperial Eſtate, not the Mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate*; and yet in a duely limited ſenſe he is King or Monarch of the whole Univerſe. In like manner during the time of the Judaical Typical Oeconomy God was of the ſame Polity with the *Iſrael* of God, he was their holy Polity's Imperial Eſtate, peculiarly and appropriately their God and King, and they were his Liege-people and Citizens (they alone * and no other People:) yet the holy Writers of the Old Teſtament celebrate the God of *Iſrael* as King or Monarch over the whole World, and King *David* ſaith, 1 *Chron* 29. 11. *Thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as Head above all.* For becauſe of his Eminence above them as a ſupreme Power God is an Head to extraneous Rationals and their Polities (that are without his Church and Kingdom,) but an *Extrinſic or Extraſocietive Head:* whereas to the Citizens and Deniſons of his Celeſtial Common-wealth *he is an intrinſic political Head of Government*, as Imperial Eſtates amongſt Men are in their ſeveral Polities. God is in the State of Society with them, and they with him, as King and Subjects, as Lord and Servants, as Father and Children, as God and People. But God cannot be the Imperial Eſtate of any other Kingdom ſave only that of the People of God. If Chriſt be in his Kingdom-eſtate amongſt Men, there muſt be ſuch a Polity amongſt us as Chriſt's Kingdom: So if God be in his Kingdom-eſtate amongſt Men, there muſt be ſuch a Polity amongſt us as the Kingdom of God, of which he is the Imperial Eſtate.

* *Amos* 3. 2.

The Second Illuſtration.

This great Principle may be illuſtrated from *the Atheiſm and Nonſenſe* of the contrary Suppoſition, *that God is the Mundane or Pagano-mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* For the *mundane Empire* ſignifieth *a Polity conſiſting of a ſupreme Deity as the Imperial Eſtate and of unholy mundane Mankind as the Subject-party:* Which mundane Empire is the ſame with *the Pagano-mundane Empire*, the World of unholy mundane Mankind being the ſame with the Pagan World. Which World is ſuppos'd to be *a Kingdom, whereof God is the King*; and if ſo, God is this ſupreme Deity, *the mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* The holy God therefore is *of the World*, of the profane and unholy, of the godleſs and ungodly World; he is of it *as to his kind of Polity*; he is of it *as intrinſic to it, conſtitutive of it as the Regent Party and Imperial Eſtate thereof.* Therefore the holy kind of Imperial Eſtate (God) is the Imperial Eſtate of an unholy kind of Polity, of an Empire that doth not own his Imperial Government (and conſequently not his Imperial Perſon,) that doth not acknowledge his holy Law and Religion, that himſelf doth not acknowledge but as an Alien and an Enemy, that is oppoſite and deſtructive to his Empire. Which is, as if we ſhould ſuppoſe, that Chriſt is the Imperial Eſtate of an Un-Chriſtian and Anti-Chriſtian Empire; or that the Pope is the Imperial Eſtate of a Proteſtant Empire. If God is the Imperial Eſtate of this mundane Empire, he is *the Kingdom of Darkneſs's* Imperial Eſtate; for ſuch is the World. And if the World is *the Kingdom of God*, then it is *the City of God* (a City whereof God is the King;) and conſequently the Heathen World and a worſer ſort of Beings are God's Citizens, as the Pagan Theologers ſuppoſe. For this was the Idea of the Univerſe of Rationals, which they had in their Minds; *One City, Kingdom or Empire conſiſting of Pagan Gods, Demons and Men* (orderly link'd together,) *which mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate is the ſupreme Deity.* From which Paganical Hypotheſis touching the State of the Univerſe it appeareth,

(1.) *The Pagans have ſo conſtituted the Univerſe, as to ſhut out of Being the holy Empire, the Church and Kingdom of God.* For if the Univerſe of Rationals is one City, Kingdom or Empire; if all Rationals are Fellow-Citizens, if they be orderly link'd together and united into one Political mundane Syſtem (as conſtitutive Parts and Members of one Empire;) if the Univerſe conſiſteth of Pagan Gods as the Imperant and Pagan Men as the Subject-party; if it be wholly a mundane kind of Monarchy (which is oppoſite to a Church of God-kind of Polity;) if all Men be of Right in Political Society with their Demons; if themſelves and the impure Rabble of their Deities be God's Citizens; if theſe Mundane-Syſtem Theiſts are Citizens πόλεως τῆς ἀνωτάτης, *of the Supernal City*; if all or any one of theſe Paganical Maxims be true, there can be no ſuch Monarchic Syſtem as Gods Church or Kingdom, *which is a Polity Segregate from*

from the World, that God is appropriately of as the regent party thereof. The Church hath its Name from *calling forth*; that part of it which is on Earth, is *cœtus evocatus, a Congregation called out of the World.* But if the World be God's Society, Family, City and Kingdom, it will be Schiſm and Apoſtacy, to *go forth* out of the Mundane Syſtem into a Society ſegregate from the World. Nor is there any need, that Pagan Mankind ſhould remove their Quarters, to enjoy the ſtate of Society with God, if, as *Celſus* ſuppoſeth, (*m*) ὅγε μὴν θεὸς ἅπασι κοινὸς, *God is common unto all:* This Monarchic Head is link'd and combin'd with the Univerſe, and the Univerſe with this Head (*n*) as a General with an Army, and a Choragus with his Chorus; and the Platoniſts ſay of their Acroamatical Supreme Deity, (*o*) ὃ μηδὲν ἐστὶν ἐπέκεινα, καὶ ὃ πάντα ἐφίεται, θεὸς τοῦτο, *The ſupreme of all, which all Beings deſire, This is God.*

(m) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 392.

(n) *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. c.* 3. *p.* 4.

(o) *Procl. Inſtit. Theol. c.* 113.

(2.) They that ſhut out of Being any Kingdom or Empire, neceſſarily ſhut out of Being that Empire's Imperial Eſtate as it is ſuch; therefore the Pagans ſhut out of Being the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate as ſuch. And conſequently they ſhut out of Being the true kind of God, and God according to his true Idea; as if any do ſhut the Pope out of Being, as he is the Papal Empire's Imperial Eſtate, theſe ſhut out of Being the true kind of Pope, and the Pope according to his true Idea. The truth of this Conſequence may be further illuſtrated from the Papacy and the Papal Empire. For let us ſuppoſe, that the *Saracens* (whoſe *Chaliphs* are famouſly known) had no Notices of the Papal Empire, and that they could not know the Pope as the Imperial Eſtate of that Empire: yet (ſuppoſing his Holineſs Vice-God and Monarch of our Univerſe) this hindreth not, but they might have a general indeterminate Notion of a Vicarious Divine Potentate and Imperial Power over them, and they might have Notices of ſeveral Laws of the Papal Empire. In like manner; if the Pagans had no Notices of the Holy Empire, if they knew not God as that Empire's Imperial Eſtate, yet they had a general indeterminate Notion of a Divine Potentate and Imperial Power over them, and they had Notices alſo of ſeveral Laws of God's Empire. But ſuppoſe the *Saracens* having a general indeterminate Notion of a Vicarious Divine Potentate and Imperial Power over them, ſhould, inſtead of improving, make a perverſe uſe of their dark confus'd and imperfect Notion, if they ſhould ſet up a *Saracenical Chaliph* (or form an explicit Idea of ſuch a Chaliph) *who is a Saracenical Empire's Imperial Eſtate*; if they ſhould take ſuch a *Chaliph* for the *Pope*, and give him that Name (meaning thereby a Vicarious Divine Potentate and Imperial Power over them,) it is manifeſt, that by this mode of Theologizing they ſet up another kind of Pope from the true Pope, who is another and a contrary kind of Empire's Imperial Eſtate. In like manner, the Pagans made a perverſe uſe of their general indeterminate Notion of a Divine Potentate and Imperial Power over them, they form'd an explicit Idea of a Pagano-mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate, which they called God; by which impure mode of Theologizing they ſet up another kind of God from the true God, who is *of proper kind the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* The Pagan Theiſts agree with us in the general and indeterminate Notion of God; but the God of our ſpecific and individual Determination, ſo far as He is ſuch, Their Principles ſhut out of Being, and not without horrendous Criminality. For let us ſuppoſe, that they could not know him to be the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate actually, as not knowing the Holy Empire; yet they might know Him, and had Notices of Him *as of kind and quality ſuch.* And if He is of kind and quality ſuch, He cannot be the Imperial Eſtate of a Polity, but that Polity muſt thereby become *the Holy Empire and the Divine City*; ſuch the Mundane Empire muſt be, if God is the Imperial Eſtate of it.

The Third Illuſtration.

Another Illuſtration of our great Principle is from the Scripture-notices of our *Pagan ſtate.* For (according to the Scriptures) the World of Heathen Mankind are not God's Citizens, but in the ſtate of Aliens from and Enemies unto God; therefore He is, and ought to be conſider'd as *the Holy Empires, but not the Mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* Without this Hypotheſis it is impoſſible, that the Horrors of our Gentile State ſhould be underſtood, or that any tolerable Senſe ſhould be made of the Scripture-Names and Notices of the Heathen People; but upon this Hypotheſis they are all hugely plain and intelligible. For if God is peculiarly the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate, He muſt be conſider'd in conjunction with that Republick (as the Apoſtle plainly conſidereth Him in his Deſcription of our Gentile-ſtate, *Epheſ.* 2. 12, 19.) and the Univerſe of Rationals muſt neceſſarily be divided into thoſe two oppoſite parties, which S. *Auſtin* uſually confronteth, *Civitas Dei & Cives hujus mundi, the City of God and the meer Mundane Citizens.* Agreeably to which Diſtribution of Rationals *Origen* (who was not wanting in reſpect to the Gentile World, nor in the obſervation of his own Rule (*p*) *to borrow of the* Egyptians *Materials, to adorn the Houſe of God*) giveth this excellent account of the true Religioniſts. (*q*) *They ſeparate and break themſelves off from thoſe that are aliens from God's Polity and Strangers to his Teſtaments, that their Societive Life may be that which is the Celeſtial Citizenſhip, coming to the Living God and the City of God, the Heavenly Jeruſalem, and to an innumerable company of Angels, and the Church of the firſt-born that are written in Heaven.* If they were not ſuch Religious Separatiſts from the Gentile World, they muſt neceſſarily be Separatiſts of a criminal Character, (*r*) ἑαυτοὺς χωρίζοντες τῆς τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοῦ μερίδος, *ſeparating themſelves from the Portion of the God over all.* This therefore is the Scripture-notion of the Pagan State; they that are in it are the *Aliens*, extraneous as to God and the holy Polity which is his Empire, *Strangers and Foreigners as to the City and Houſhold of God, alieni à Deo & ab Eccleſia, aliens from the Commonwealth of Iſrael* (both the typical and true *Iſrael*,) *Strangers uncircumciſed in Heart and uncircumciſed in Fleſh, Thoſe that are without*, as the *Jews* call the Philoſophers Books חיצונים *extraneous*, and *Gr. Naz.* uſually when he citeth an Heathen Author, ſtileth him ἀλλότριος, τὶς τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, *an Alien.* So our Saviour repreſenteth the State of the Gentiles. *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen Man*, who is of Character an Alien, *one*

that

(p) Phil cal. p.

(q) Ἀποχωρίζουσι καὶ ἀπορρηγνύουσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ξένων τῶν διαθηκῶν αὐτοῦ· ἵνα τὸ οὐρανοῖς πολίτευμα πολιτεύωνται, προσερχόμενοι θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ πόλει θεοῦ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανῷ. C. Celſ. l. 8. p. 382.

(r) Ibid. p. 383.

Heb. 11. 34.

Eph. 2.12, 19.

Ezek. 44.

Nehem. 13. 30.

1 Cor. 5. 13.

Matth. 18. 17.

that belongeth not to the Holy-popular Fraternity. Hence the Heathen are call'd *The World, this World, the Nations of the world* (אמות העולם as the Jews ſpeak) as being the Mundane-kind of People that are the Aliens from God, *no People* (no People of God) *the Wild Olive*, and thoſe *that are far off*; for they are as remote and diſtant from God as from the Holy Citizens, whom the Mundane-kind of People have not Alliance and Cognation with, but they are of another Region, and other Countrey-men. Becauſe they are out of the ſtate of Religion or Saintſhip (which is the ſtate of Society with God and his People) they are denominated *the Sinners* (the Unholy People) as their proper Character, and as contradiſtinct to the Holy People (who are בקדושה *in Sanctity*, as the Jews ſpeak) *profanæ gentes, profani homines*, (s) which ſtand oppos'd to *conſecratus populus* (the conſecrated People;) *unclean Perſons* repreſented by unclean Animals, *Iſa.* 52. 1. *Act.* 10. 12. as in S. *Barnabas*'s Epiſtle (t) impious Men are ſaid to be denoted and ſignify'd by impure Animals, and the Jews ſay, that in their Law unclean Animals ſignifie אמות העולם *the Nations of the World.* Enemies they are to God, to true Religion and Piety as *Aliens*; for not to be faithful Friends to Piety, is to be Enemies; and it muſt be ſaid of Piety, as *Tertullian* ſaith of Truth, (u) *Tot hoſtes ejus quot extranei, ſo many as are Aliens are its Enemies.* But beſides, they are many ways hoſtile and inimical to God, being not only ἄνομοι, *without Law*, (1 *Cor.* 9. 21.) but profeſs'd Adverſaries to his *Law, his Life, Service, Godhead, Government and Liege-people*, (treading under foot the Holy City, *Apoc.* 11.2.) of the inimical Kind, Family and Kingdom, inimically affected and addicted, *walking in the Vanity* and Villainouſneſs of their Mind, abominably nefarious and flagitious both in their Religion and their Lives, which is to be inimical to God (to that Imperial Eſtate of Religion and Government that God is) at a ſuperlative rate; and therefore they are uſually call'd his Enemies (the hoſtile and inimical People) both in the Old and New Teſtament; *Judg.* 5. 31. *Pſal.* 68. 1. 1 *Sam.* 2. 10. *Deut.* 32. 27. *Nah.* 1. 2. *Rom.* 1. 30. *Col.* 1. 21. Another of their Names is ἄθεοι, (the atheous People) which may beſt be underſtood from what *Hierocles* ſaith of lapſed Souls; (w) *they are become atheous*, διὰ τὸ βουληθῆναι φυγεῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ϗ ἀπομερίσαι αὐτοὺς τῆς τούτου ὁμιλίας, *becauſe they would flee from God, and ſeparate themſelves from Society with him.* So the Gentiles being ſeparated from God's Society became *Athe-iſts, without God in the World*; for God was not to them a God, they were not to him a People. And as S. *Auſtin* ſaith of ſuch an Angelical nature, which pretendeth to teach Religion to Mankind; (x) *ſi colit Deum, non vult ſe coli pro Deo: ſi non colit Deum, miſera eſt, quia Deo privatur* (if it worſhippeth God, it will not be worſhipped for God; if it doth not worſhip God, it is miſerable, becauſe depriv'd of God:) So the ſtate of us Gentiles was therefore extremely both Criminal and Calamitous, becauſe we were not God's Religioniſts (not calling upon his Name, nor being called by his Name,) depriv'd of God and of all the infinite Good which He is in himſelf and to his People, ſubjected to all the contrary Evils, *Children of Wrath, and having no portion nor right in* Jeruſalem (either the typical or the true,) there *was no hope for us*, that things would be well with us for ever.

Of this Horrendous Pagan-popular ſtate (the ſtate of Athe-iſts and Antithe-iſts) there are leſſer or greater degrees, as Men make more or leſs approaches to the *Holy-popular ſtate*, which muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into *the viſible, the typical and the true.* For multitudes are in *a viſible holy-popular ſtate* (being within the pale of the viſible Church) that are not the true and genuine People of God, nor his legitimate Citizens, whoſe ſtate muſt be call'd *the true holy-popular ſtate:* Nor was the State of the greateſt part of the Jews (during the times of their Commonwealth) any thing more than a *typical holy-popular ſtate.* But to this holy-popular ſtate (which muſt be thus variouſly diſtinguiſh'd) the σεβόμενοι, *Gentile-worſhippers*, or Proſelytes of the Gate (whom the Jews call *the Pious of the Gentiles*) made a great approach; for theſe Gentile-Converts (y) renounc'd the Gentile Idolatries, and betook themſelves to the worſhip of the God of *Iſrael* in hope of the Life to come; and the Jews ſay, they took upon them the obſervation of the Precepts of the Sons of *Noah*. Of this ſort of Proſelytes were *Naaman*, 2 *King.* 5. 17. the Centurion of *Capernaum*, *Luk.* 7. 5. the Eunuch of *Ethiopia*, *Act.* 8. 27. *Cornelius*, *Act.* 10. 2. *Lydia*, *Act.* 16. 14. the Father of *Timothy*, *Act.* 16. 1. the worſhipping Greeks, *Act.* 17. 4. and thoſe that fear'd God, *Act.* 13. 16. Theſe Religious Proſelytes (as they are call'd, *Act.* 13. 43.) although they ſtill retain'd the Name of Gentiles (becauſe not circumcis'd) and were by the Ceremonial Law unclean Perſons, yet they were imperfectly in the ſtate of God's People (the Holy-popular ſtate;) for they are ſtiled *Religious worſhippers, ſuch as fear God, ſuch as joyn themſelves to the Lord, to ſerve him and to love the Name of the Lord, to be his Servants.* As their place of Prayer was a part of God's Houſe (according to our Saviour's Argument;) ſo themſelves were a part of God's People. The ſtate of *Job* and his Friends (who probably liv'd before the time that the Commonwealth of *Iſrael* was founded) was doubtleſs the Holy-popular; but not the typical Holy-popular, for that was peculiar to *Abraham*'s holy Line. The ſame account muſt be given of *Eſau*'s and *Iſhmael*'s Poſterity, and of *Abraham*'s Off-ſpring by *Keturah*, if the worſhip of the true God was preſerv'd amongſt them, of which we have no Memoirs. To theſe may be added *Melchizedek, Abimelech, Jethro, Nahor* and *Laban* (as ſome ſuppoſe) *Hiram, Nebuchadnezzar*, and *Nebuzaradon*, of whom we are told, (z) that he was a *Proſelyte of Juſtice*, and therefore was emerg'd out of *the Pagan-popular ſtate.* The ſtate of the preſent rejectaneous Jews muſt be called *Pagano-Judaical*, and another of like nature *Pagano-Muhammedan*, and a third muſt be called *Pagano-Chriſtian.* None of theſe is the Heathen ſtate ſimply and without addition; but ſome of them are not better or more deſirable. The ſtate of the *Ninevites* is plainly diſtinct from that of meer Heathens (they were not ſo far alienated from God;) but it is not probable, that they emerg'd out of the Pagan State at the ſame rate with the σεβόμενοι, *Gentile-worſhippers.* The ſtate of the Heathen Philoſophers (ſo far as appeareth) was no other than that of meer Heathens (there is no reaſon, that any of them ſhould be reckon'd amongſt the σεβόμενοι, *Gentile-worſhippers*) only their Philoſophy diſtinguiſheth them from the Popular Pagans.

The Fourth Illuſtration.

Our great Principle may be further illuſtrated from the *Native* ſtate of Mankind (oppoſing *Native* to *Factive*;) for if God is the Mundane

1 *Cor.* 1. 21. and 5. 10. *Joh.* 16. 11. *Luk.* 12. 30. *Deut.* 32. 21. *Rom.* 11. 17. *Eph.* 2. 13.

Matth. 26. 45. *Gal.* 2. 15.

(s) *Jul. Firmic.* p. 60, 61.

(t) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *S.* 2.

(u) *Apol. c.* 6.

Eph. 4. 17.

Eph. 2. 12.

(w) *In aur. Car.* p. 261.

(x) *De C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 14.

Jer. 10. 25. *Iſa.* 65. 1. *Eph.* 2. 3. *Nehem.* 2. 20. *Eph.* 2. 12.

(y) *Mr. Mede on Act.* 17. 4. *Mark* 11. 17. *Dr. Hamm. on Matth.* 23. 15. *Act.* 10. 4.

Iſa. 56. 6.

Mark 11. 17.

(z) *Selden de J. Nat. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

Empire's Imperial Eſtate, Mankind will be *natively* the Citizens of the Kingdom of God. And if ſo, there can be no ſuch Religion as Judaiſm or Chriſtianity. If the Jews had their ſtate of Society with God as Men and as his Creatures, (a) *all the Sons of Men* הלבן והשוער *White and Black would be equal* (as themſelves argue) all being his Creatures as well as they. The Chriſtians pretend not, to have their ſtate of Society and Citizenſhip with God by their firſt birth, but by their new birth. (b) *Non naſcimur, ſed renaſcimur Chriſtiani, we are not born, but new born Chriſtians.* The Native State of Mankind is the State of Unregeneracy, which is the Heathen State, as being the State of the *Carnal Mundane* kind of People. For this the Religion of a new birth and the nature of the thing demonſtrateth, that Mankind are, *not thoſe that are born after the Spirit, but thoſe that are born after the Fleſh* (not the holy kind of People, but an exotick kind, as they are now originated,) *that their Birth and their Nativity is of the Land of* Canaan (the Pollutions and Foulneſſes of their Unregeneracy requiring a Laver, as Infants are waſh'd from the Pollutions of the Womb;) which native unregenerate ſtate of Mankind is the ſame with the Heathens, *that are in the Uncircumciſion of the Fleſh*, both in the literal and myſtical Senſe of the Phraſe. Their Gentiliſm was their Uncircumciſion, and that Uncircumciſion (myſtical) was their Unregeneracy; in which Native Heathen State the Holy Spirit is not in us, but *the Fleſh is in us* (with its Sence, Phancy, Appetites, Affections and Paſſions, that make up the Animal Senſitive Nature) which is a native prevalent Diſpoſition to that Maſs of Error, Sin and Ungodlineſs, which is carnality of Mind and Life, and which conſtituteth Mankind the carnal kind of Livers. Carnality of Mind and Life is the ſame with Heatheniſm of Mind and Life, and ſo far as carnality of Mind and Life is native to Man, Heatheniſm of Mind and Life is native to Man; accordingly, in *Clemens*'s Notion a Believer is one (c) that emergeth ἐξ ἐθνῶν καὶ τῆς προτέρας βιότητος, *from amongſt the Gentiles, and the former* (Heathen) *Life*, which was the Life of our Unregeneracy. In which State we were not *the Divine*, but *the Mundane-kind* of People, agreeably to what the Pagan Theologers diſcourſe touching the Origination of Mankind. (d) *Begin to live according to Nature* (ſaith the Philoſophic Emperour) ἔσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἄξιος τοῦ γεννήσαντος κόσμου καὶ παύσῃ ξένος ὢν τῆς πατρίδος, *thou ſhalt be a Man worthy of that World that generated thee, and ſhalt ceaſe to be a Stranger in thine own Country.* (e) *The World generateth Man* (ſay the Stoicks) *there is one Parent of all, namely, the World: Whether by ſplendid or ſordid Gradations the firſt original of every one's Stemm is carried up ſo high as this.* And ſo the Hebrew Doctors call Mankind, (f) בני העולם *Sons of the World:* Unregenerate Mankind can reaſonably pretend no higher than to the Mundane-kind of Birth, the Mundane Family, and the Mundane Citizenſhip; their native Genius and Diſpoſition alſo is *the Mundane* (*ut ex regionis ingenio ſit & cultoribus ejus ingenium, ſo that the Genius of the Inhabitants is a Native of the Region which they inhabit*, as *Apuleius* ſaith of Demons;) for they are the worldly affected and addicted, the World's admirers and lovers, are mainly intent upon the Intereſts of it, walk after the courſe of it, and are the World's Partiſans and Adherents againſt God and Godlineſs. They are therefore originally and of kind and quality *the Mundane People*, oppoſite to another Family and Progeny; (g) *and this twofold Progeny of diſtinct Generations ſheweth, that there are two Cities, one of the Earthborn* (the Mundane-born,) *the other of the Regenerate* or Heaven-born. The one are *Mundani generis, originally of the World and the Mundane-kind*; the other are *Divini generis* (as *Arnobius* ſpeaketh) *originally of God and the God-kind* (holy kind) *of People.* Mankind therefore altogether in their Unregeneracy (which is their native ſtate) are of an oppoſite kind to the genuine Citizens of that holy Polity which is God's Kingdom (*Civitas regeneratorum*;) they are thoſe that are of the World, not thoſe that are of God; thoſe that are from beneath, not thoſe that are from above; The Children of this World, not the Children of God, nor of the Saint of God-kind and quality. They are therefore neceſſarily Aliens and extraneous to God's kind of Kingdom (which is the native ſtate of Mankind;) for the Kingdom of God muſt be enter'd into, and that by a new birth, *Joh.* 3. 5. It muſt be ſought, *Matth.* 6. 33. it muſt be *receiv'd*, *Mark* 10. 15. it muſt be *taken*, *Matth.* 11. 12. Mankind muſt be tranſlated into it, *Col.* 1. 13. endeniz'd and infranchis'd, *Joh.* 8. 36. for they are not free-born. The things of God's Kingdom (h) are not τὰ πάτρια, *our Country-inſtitutes*, but ξένα καὶ ἀλλότρια, *things alien and foreign to us.* The holy Life is not innate in us, nor doth the ſtate of Holineſs naturally appertain to us, nor are they diſpens'd in Nature and common Providence. Regenerate Believers *come to the City of the living God*, but are not natively Citizens or Deniſons thereof. From whence it followeth, that God is not the Mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate; that there is no entring into God's Kingdom but by coming out of the World of degenerate Mankind (who cannot be Citizens of his kind of Kingdom;) that God is ſo the King of the World, as not to be the King of the World (in different Senſe and Notion he is King of the World and not King;) that Heathen Mankind are ſo his Subjects, as not to be his Subjects (for they are not the Subjects of that holy Polity his Kingdom;) that God is their Father, but ſo as not to be their Father; that they are his Family, but ſo as not to be his Family (they are not his Domeſticks;) ſo Magiſtrates are *God's Miniſters* in one Senſe of the Phraſe, not in another; all Men bear his Image in one Senſe, not in another; all Men are taught of God (*Iſa.* 28. 26.) but ſo as not to be taught of God; and the old Moſaic Creation of Mankind is, and is not *the Creation of God*; for it is not the Creation that is of his kind and quality.

The Fifth Illuſtration.

Our great Principle may be illuſtrated from the Polity of *Evil Angels* according to Chriſtianity, which the Pagan Theology (although it maketh fair approaches towards it) doth not acknowledge. (i) *The Chriſtians err moſt impiouſly* (ſaith *Celſus*) *their ſuperlatively great Ignorance having its riſe from a miſtake of the Divine Enigms; They make a certain Adverſary to God, whom they call the Devil,*

(a) *Coſri* p. 19, 261. *ed. Buxt.*

(b) *S. Hieron. Ep.* 53.

Gal. 4. 29. *Ezek.* 16. 3, 4, 5, 6.

Col. 2. 13.

Eph. 2. 2, 3. *and* 4. 17.

(c) *Strom. l.* 2. *p. m.* 282.

(d) *M. Ant. l.* 12. *S.* 1.

(e) *Unus omnium parens mundus eſt: ſive per ſplendidos, ſive per ſordidos gradus, ad hunc prima cujuſque origo perducitur.* Sen. de Ben. l. 3. c. 28. *Mundus generat hominem.* V. Lactant. l. 2. c. 6.

(f) *Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. Lex* 62 *p.* 71.

(g) *Iſta utraque progenies diſtinctis generationibus duas inſinuat Civitates, unam terrigenarum, alteram regeneratorum.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c. 2

Joh. 3. 4. *Joh.* 8. 23. *Luk.* 16. 8. *Joh.* 15. 19.

(h) *Orig. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 48.

Heb. 12. 22.

(e) Σφάλλονται δὲ ἀσεβέστατα ἄττα καὶ περὶ τήνδε τὴν μεγίστην ἄγνοιαν ὁμοίως ἀπὸ θείων αἰνιγμάτων πεπλανημένην ποιοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ ἐναντίον τινὰ διάβολόν τε καὶ γλώττῃ Ἑβραΐδι Σατανᾶν ὀνομάζοντες τὸν αὐτὸν. Orig. C. Celſ. l. 6. p. 303. & vid. l. 2. p. 89.

vil, and in the Hebrew Tongue Satan. With reſpect to the Heathen World (and to the Jews alſo,) in great degree the Devils are rightly called by *Arnobius* (k) *ante Chriſtum incogniti, & ab ſolo ſciente detecti, unknown before Chriſt, and detected by him that only knew them.* For as in Temptations, if Satan ſhould diſcover himſelf, and viſibly appear, ſuch a diſcovery would ſpoil his Game, and he would not invite, but affright the tempted: So the knowledge of Satan's Polity in the Pagan World muſt neceſſarily have unpaganiz'd it, and ruined its Religion and Theopolity. The Hypotheſis alſo of a Diabolical Empire is inconſiſtent with the grand Maxims of the Pagan Theology; *that the Univerſe of Rationals is of one piece, one City, Polity or Republick; that the viſible Univerſe is one magnificent Houſe or Temple; that there ought to be no diviſion from the one Corporation of Rationals; that the World is the Kingdom of God* (in the ſenſe of a Polity;) *that all things are held together by the Bond of Love:* Whereas, if there be a Diabolical as well as a Divine Empire, there are two Kingdoms (of Light and Darkneſs) oppoſite to each other, and the Univerſe is in a State of War. But although the Pagan Theologers do not acknowledge the Imperial Polity of Devils or Satanians, yet themſelves, their Theology and Religion are an uncontrollable Evidence of its Exiſtence. For beſides, that the Theory of it is unexceptionably Rational according to the Pagan Theologers Ratiocinations, *that there are in the Univerſe* (viſible and inviſible) *the contrarieties of Light and Darkneſs* (of the two famous Sects amongſt the *Chaldeans*, the *Orcheni* and *Borſippeni*, the former was addicted to the Worſhip of the Principle of *Light*, the latter worſhipp'd the Principle of *Darkneſs*;) *that in this World of Evils there muſt be a Principle of Evil; and that this lower Air* (as all the Regions of the Univerſe) *is full of Inhabitants:* I ſay, beſides theſe Ratiocinations, (which plainly infer a Polity of Satanians according to the Scriptures) the Pagan World is an uncontrollable demonſtration of the Exiſtence of a Polity of Satanians, who being *Diabolici generis, Angelical Natures of the Devil-kind*, can be no Citizens of God's Kingdom; and conſequently God cannot be the *mundane Empires Imperial Eſtate.* (l) *Illud verò ubi dicitur Deus Deorum, non poteſt intelligi Deus dæmoniorum, when the Divine Majeſty is ſtiled God of Gods, the Phraſe cannot ſignifie, that he is God of Devils.* For the Potentates of the Dark Kingdom belong not to the Scale of Potentates ſupreme and ſubordinate; and becauſe they are of the Dark Kingdom, they are of Godleſs Condition, nor doth God Reign over them otherwiſe than as Enemies, agreeably to their Name *Diabolus*, which ſome of the learn'd ſuppoſe, (*m*) to be deriv'd from διαβάλλεσθαι, as it ſignifieth (in ſome Authors) in the Notion of ἀπεχθάνεσθαι, and therefore denoteth, not *a falſe Accuſer or Caluminator*, but an *Enemy or Inimical one*, as the Devil's Hebrew Name *Satan* ſignifieth ὁ ἐχθρὸς, *the Enemy.* The Devil and his Angels cannot be God's Citizens becauſe of their *criminal* Condition, nor can they be ſuch upon account of their *Penal* Condition, being totally and finally exil'd from God's Kingdom, as appeareth from the Scripture-Notices of their Fall. *Jude 6. The Angels which kept not their firſt Eſtate, but left their own Habitation, he hath reſerved in everlaſting Chains under darkneſs, unto the judgment of the great day.* 2 Pet. 2. 4. *God ſpared not the Angels that ſinn'd, but caſt them down to Hell, and delivered them into Chains of darkneſs, to be reſerved unto Judgment.* Having compar'd theſe Scripture-notices of the Fall of Angels with the Notices which we have of their Empire, I am of Opinion, that this is the true account of their Lapſe; *Satan* (together with Myriads of his accomplices) *totally relinquiſh'd God, Sanctity and the Kingdom of God, for that mundane Empire, Godhead, unſubject Domination and unbounded ſenſual Liberty, which he hath ſince enjoy'd in this lower World.* To juſtifie this account of the Fall of Angels,

(1.) It is obſervable, that all accounts of the Devil's Sin (whereby he fell,) that are on this ſide *Apoſtacy*, are manifeſtly inſufficient. Such as thoſe of the Ancients, (*n*) *that he fell by envying Man, or by ſwelling with a conceit of his own Power and Excellency, or by inordinate Self-admiration and Self-complacence, or by an Arrogance and Self-attribution* (making himſelf the Author of the Goods that he enjoy'd, and as ſome ſay, *of his own Being*,) *or by Luciferian ambition affecting to be equal unto God*, and as ſome ſay, *greater than he; or by aſſuming the Godhead to himſelf, ſaying, that he was God, and the Angels in Heaven muſt Worſhip him; or by affecting an extravagant Liberty and Domination, to be above all and ſubject to none.* All theſe accounts (which yet are not without good Notices) are inſufficient, becauſe the Devil's Sin and Fall can be nothing leſs than a grand total Revolt from God's holy and happy Government, *a total and final Apoſtaſy from his Kingdom.* Whence the Rabbins call the Devil מָרוּד *the Apoſtate.* (o) *J. Mart.* thinketh, that his Name *Satanas* ſignifieth ἀποστάτης, *the Apoſtate.* Himſelf and his Angels are uſually intituled *Angeli deſertores, the Apoſtate Angels*, and the holy Text ſaith, *he abode not in the Truth*, Joh. 8. 44. *They left their own Habitation.* Jude 6.

(2.) All thoſe accounts of the Devil's Sin and Fall are manifeſtly inſufficient, which are on this ſide *the Deſign of Empire and Dominion.* Such are thoſe of the Ancients (but now mention'd,) that the Devil's Sin was *Envy*, or *Self-admiration*, or *Self-attribution*; and ſuch is the accouut of a late Philoſopher and Divine, (*p*) *that the Fall of Angels was their giving up themſelves to the Animal Life and forſaking the Divine* (which is ſuppos'd to have happen'd through a Luxuriant growth of the plaſtick Life, by a fond careleſneſs and indulgence thereto:) theſe Accounts are not ſufficient, becauſe there is nothing in them, that looketh like *a deſign of Empire and Dominion.* Had his Sin been nothing elſe but *an addicting himſelf to a ſenſual Life, or a priding himſelf in his own conceit*, he might have enjoy'd his Fool's Paradice alone, or ſinn'd with a few ſelect Companions; at leaſt, a world of Accomplices was not requiſite to the Devil's ſenſualizing Trade; nor is it probable, that he ſeduc'd them, to conſpire with him in a vain Imagination; nor is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Parties were made, Seditions rais'd, Governments over-turn'd, and new Monarchies erected from any ſuch Principles: But becauſe the Devil ſeduc'd Myriads of Angels, to be his Partiſans, and to ſubſerve his Deſign, thence it plainly appeareth, that the deſign of his Apoſtaſy and Revolt from God's Kingdom, was Kingdom, Empire and Dominion. Such a deſign he hath accompliſh'd (he hath erected a mighty Empire in the Univerſe,)

(k) *Adv. Gent. l.* 2. *p.* 53.

l) S. Aug. C. D. l. c. 23.

m) Dr. eric. Casaubon. ot. in E. Ench. 84. oto non acet peccatum Angelorum iſſe ſuperbiam: edo, ob ſolum, d D. nme acuerat. ves in S. g. de D. l. 12. 6.

(n) *Petav. T.* 3. *l.* 3. *c.* 2.

(o) *Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 331.

(p) *D. H. More Myſt. of Godlin. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

niverſe,) therefore ſuch a deſign was his Original Intention. Such a deſign is uſual in all Kingdoms and Common-wealths, and therefore it is not unlikely, to have happen'd in God's Kingdom. Such a Deſign was Capital, High-Treaſon againſt his Sovereign Lord, his Crown and Dignity, and therefore the more likely to have been the Devil's Sin. Such is the Devil's principal Deſign at this day (to uphold and enlarge his Kingdom,) therefore it was originally his principal Deſign. And how doth God countermine and baffle the Devil's Deſign, but by erecting an oppoſite Empire, the Kingdom of his dear Son? *Col.* 1. 13. (q) *Dominandi Cupido cunctis affectibus flagrantior eſt, the conceit and deſire of Empire and Dominion is tranſporting to Mankind, nothing ſo much*; they will ſwim through a Sea of Blood for a Crown, and account nothing unlawful for Dominion. Therefore the conceit or Phantaſm of Empire and Dominion in a ſublime Angelical Nature might excite a vigorous appetite after it, an high Opinion and Valuation of it, and then the Mind or Will comply'd, and form'd a deſign to attain it, *ſo Sin entred into the Angelical World.*

(q) *Tacit. Annal.* 15.

(3.) The Kingdom or Empire, which the Devil deſign'd at his Revolt, was in appearance poſſible or feaſible, otherwiſe he could not deſire and deſign it. Being a little finite Creature (although a mighty Angel) *he could not deſign to be greater than God, or in all reſpects equal to the Almighty*; for he could not be ignorant, that this was impoſſible: Nor could be he ignorant, that it is impoſſible, *to erect a Diabolical Empire in Heaven*, and therefore he never deſign'd it. For as *Alexander* told *Darius*, *one World cannot have two Suns* (nor one Empire two Emperors;) if therefore Satan hath an Empire, it muſt not be in the heavenly Regions, but in another World. He laid his Plot, and began his Revolt in Heaven, but he knew well enough, that there could be no abiding for him there; for as the Jews ſay, an impure Perſon may not *ingredi caſtra Divinæ Majeſtatis* (enter the Tents of the Divine Majeſty,) but muſt be baniſh'd from thoſe Divine Territories. Heaven could not be Heaven, if a Diabolical Empire was erected there; for the Place, State, Society, Imployments and Enjoyments of Heaven are diametrically oppoſite thereto. (r) *It is impoſſible, that Evils ſhould be wholly deſtroy'd, or that they ſhould exiſt among the Gods* (the Celeſtials:) *but they muſt neceſſarily exiſt about this Terreſtrial place and this Mortal Nature*, ſay the Platoniſts.

(r) Οὐδὲ ἀπολέσαι τὰ κακὰ δυνατὸν, οὔτε ἐν θεοῖς εἶναι, περὶ δὲ τόνδε τὸν τόπον, καὶ θνητὴν φύσιν περιπολεῖν ἐξ ἀνάγκης. Hierocl. in aur. Car. p. 257.

(4.) All accounts of the Devil's Sin and Fall are inſufficient, which are on this ſide *the Deſign of a Godhead*, or *ſuch an Imperial Eſtate as being a God importeth.* For it cannot be ſuppoſed, that his deſign of a mundane Empire was nothing more than a ſubjecting the World unto himſelf in civil Society, ſuch an Empire is incompetible to an Angelical Nature, and the deſign of it is on this ſide a total Apoſtaſy from God. He deſign'd for himſelf a Creature-tranſcendent Eſtate, to erect a Kingdom oppoſite unto God's, and that the World ſhould be his Religioniſts. For it appeareth from Hiſtory (both ſacred and profane,) that the Devils extremely affect the Divine Honours, (whence they are called by *Tatianus* (s) λησαὶ θεότητος, *Thieves of Deity*,) and *the King of the Children of Pride* cannot be thought leſs ambitious of them (in his deſign of Empire) than Popes and Secular Princes uſually are. His ambition could not be leſs than *Luciferian* (as the Fathers rightly ſuppoſe,) *I will be like the moſt High.* Iſa. 14. 14.

(s) *Or. c. Græc p.* 151.

(t) ——— μεγάλοιο θεοῦ βασιληΐδα τιμὴν
Ἤλπιζο. *He hop'd for the Regial Honour of the great God.*

(t) *Gr. Naz. Arcan. Car.* 6.

He tempted our firſt Parents with the Hopes of a Godhead; which is an Indication, that this was his own Temptation; therefore he deſign'd for himſelf an higher State than is competible to Man or Angel or any other Creature. He hath actually attain'd to a Godhead, and enjoy'd it ſome thouſands of Years; therefore he originally deſign'd it; for it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that he hath attain'd to ſuch ſublimity of Condition, as he never deſign'd. One of his Names in Scripture, *the Prince of this World*, inferreth, that his Original Deſign was a mundane Empire. ——— (u) Πλεόνεσσι κακοῖσιν ἔχων πόθον ἐμβασιλεύειν, *having a deſire of Empire over Multitudes of the wicked.* Another of his Names in Scripture, *the God of this World*, inferreth, that his Orignal Deſign was ſuch an Imperial Eſtate, which is a mundane Godhead. As *Porphyry* ſaith of his evil Demons. (w) *They deſire to be Gods, and their Preſidentiary Power, to be thought the greateſt God.*

(u) *Naz. ſupr.*

(w) Βούλονται γὰρ εἶναι θεοί, καὶ ἡ προεστῶσα αὐτῶν δύναμις δοκεῖν θεὸς εἶναι ὁ μέγιστος. De Abſt. l. 2. S. 42.

(5.) It is obſervable, that there are but two primary Objects of fleſhly Concupiſcence in Man (which is the ſource of all Diabolical Practices;) the one is the matter of *Honour*, the other is the matter of *ſenſual Pleaſure*; for Riches are not ordinarily deſir'd for themſelves, but in ſubſerviency to *Honour and Pleaſure.* Whence we may reaſonably infer, that the Devil's Sin was an enormous Appetite after *unſubject Domination* and an unbounded *ſenſual Liberty out of God's Kingdom.* Not that he ſuppos'd it poſſible, to exempt himſelf from all Subjection to omnipotent Power (for in his higheſt Pretenſions to a mundane Sovereignty, to diſpoſe of all the Kingdoms of the World, he yet acknowledgeth his Dependence, in ſaying, *They are deliver'd to him*, Luk. 4. 6.) But he preferred the mundane Empire which he hath obtain'd (and which is a Revolt from under God's holy Government) before the State of a Subject in God's heavenly Kingdom, which he relinquiſhed and abandon'd. The State of a Subject in God's Kingdom is inconſiſtent with that unbounded ſenſual Liberty which Mankind are too prone to affect, *to walk in the way of their Heart and in the ſight of their Eyes*, without any reſtraint upon them from Law, Government, or a Maſter over them; *a Faculty to live as they pleaſe*, they are apt to think a deſireable Liberty.

Eccl. 11. 9.

Ἔχω λογισμὸν πᾶν ὃ βόλομαι ποιεῖν,
Ναὶ βασιλικόν γε. *I am thinking to do*
Whatever I liſt, that is Royal.

It is not unuſual with Secular Princes, to affect ſuch abſoluteneſs and unlimitedneſs of Agency as *Baſſianus* expreſs'd; *quod libet, licet.* He reſolv'd, to do what he pleas'd. To ſuch an extravagant appetite of Liberty it is reaſonable, to impute the Fall of Angels (called by *Tatianus* ἄσωτοι καὶ λίχνοι, *luxurious and addicted* *ed to delicacies*;) they ſhook off the Yoke of the holy Government, that they might be at liberty to ſwagger and domineer at Pleaſure, to rant, revel and ſenſualize (ſo far as their Nature is capable) in another World.

(6.) It is obſervable, that the Apoſtate Angels by their Apoſtaſy *choſe their Proſcription from Heaven and excommunication from the Church Triumphant*: As Apoſtates from Chriſtianity, and the impure ſhole of *Gnoſticks who ſeparated themſelves* (Jude 19.) choſe their Baniſhment and Excommunation from the Church Militant. Or (to illuſtrate this matter by an Inſtance nearer Home) as we Proteſtants have choſen a Proſcription and Excommunication from the Church of *Rome*. For having revolted from under the Pope's Government, we have choſen a Baniſhment and Excommunication from that Church materially, which is neceſſarily follow'd by a formal Papal Sentence of Excommunication (which cutteth us off from all Memberſhip, Priviledges and Right of Communion in that Church, anathematizeth and damneth us,) ſo that in the true ſtating of things *& fugimus, & fugamur, we both go out and are caſt out.* In the ſame ſenſe we may juſtly ſay of the Apoſtate Angels, *that God caſt them out of Heaven* (though no Scripture ſaith ſo;) for they are excommunicated with the greateſt Excommunication (*Anathema Maranatha*,) which is a total and final Exciſion, nothing leſs than final Reprobation, a devoting them irreverſibly to deſtruction, a cutting them off from all Hope and Comfort. But although in ſome ſenſe God caſt the Apoſtate Angels out of Heaven, this hindreth not, but that it was their own Choice, they formally caſt themſelves out; for their Apoſtaſy is the ſame thing with that part of their Puniſhment *pœna damni, the loſs of God and Heaven.* Accordingly the Scripture ſaith; *they kept not their firſt Eſtate, but left their own Habitation.*

Ipſam cauſam naturæ tranſgredientium neque Scriptura aliqua retulit, nec Apoſtolus dicit, nec Dominus docuit. Iren. adv. Hær. l. 2. c. 49.

(7.) It is obſervable, that this lower World and caliginous Air (wherein the Apoſtate Angels have their abode,) is both Satans *Kingdom* and his *Priſon*. (x) *Regnum ejus quod putas, Carcer ejus eſt. That which thou thinkeſt his Kingdom*, (and which himſelf thinketh ſo,) is his Priſon or place of * Confinement. Such is God's Ordination, and ſuch is the Nature of things, that Sin in many reſpects is its own Puniſhment, and the Sinner's Paradiſe is his Purgatory. As it is his Paradiſe, it is his own criminal Election: As it is his Purgatory, it is God's penal infliction. The ſame account muſt be given of Satan's Kingdom and Priſon. For as this lower World is Satan's Kingdom, it is his own criminal Election: As it is his Priſon, it is God's penal infliction.

(x) S. Aug. in Pſal. 103.

* *The World is as well the Devil's Field, as the Devil's Gaol. The Tryals of ſeveral Witches in New-England.* p. 32.

(8.) The learned are not well agreed touching the Tranſlation of thoſe places of Scripture (before cited) which treat of the Fall of Angels. *Jude* 6. 2 *Pet*. 2. 4. The word ταρταρώσας, occurreth not in Scripture ſave only in this one place of S. *Peter*: If we expound it according to its uſe in Heathen Authors, it muſt ſignifie *having condemn'd to Tartarus, or caſt into Tartarus, or impriſon'd in Tartarus.* * Which *Tartarus* (or Hell) of the Apoſtate Angels may either denote their preſent or their future place of abode. If it denoteth their preſent place of abode, it ſignifieth this lower caliginous Air. If it denoteth their future place of abode, it ſignifieth the Lake or Region of Fire and Brimſtone, which is deſign'd for them; and accordingly ſome would have the word ταρταρώσας, rendred, *cùm ad Tartari ſupplicia damnaſſet, when he had condemn'd them to the puniſhment of Tartarus*, meaning by *Tartarus* the great Hell of Fire and Brimſtone. In like manner σειραῖς ζόφου, *Chains of darkneſs* in S. *Peter*, and δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις, *everlaſting Chains* in S. *Jude*, may have reſpect either to their preſent or future State. If they reſpect their preſent State, they are *Dativus inſtrumenti*, and the holy Apoſtles mean (as our Tranſlation rendreth their words,) that the Apoſtate Angels are already *deliver'd into Chains of darkneſs*; and are now *reſerv'd in everlaſting Chains under darkneſs*; for that infernal Crew are fetter'd and inchain'd in this caliginous Air, which is the place of their Impriſonment. But if theſe words reſpect their future State, then they are *Dativus Acquiſitionis* or *Finis*, σειραῖς is put for εἰς σειρὰς, and δεσμοῖς, for εἰς δεσμὺς, the one being govern'd of τετηρημένυς, *reſerved*, and the other of τετήρηκεν, *he hath reſerved*; and ſo the Apoſtles ſenſe is, *catenis caliginis ſervandos tradidit ad Diem Judicii, he deliver'd them to be kept for Chains of darkneſs at the Day of Judgment.* This various rendring and ſenſing the Apoſtle's words concerneth not at all our Hypotheſis, which is fairly compliant with any tolerable Senſe or Tranſlation of theſe Texts of Scripture. For that great Excommunication, which (as we ſuppoſe) ſhutteth the Apoſtate Angels out of Heaven, neceſſarily condemneth them to *Tartarus*, or caſteth them into *Tartarus*; and becauſe *Tartarus* is downwards, therefore we may retain our Engliſh Tranſlation of the word ταρταρώσας, *that God caſt them down to Hell.* According to our Hypotheſis they are deſign'd and *reſerved for Chains of darkneſs*, and in the mean time they are in a place and ſtate of Impriſonment: But as the *Stoicks* call a great Eſtate in this World *a commodious Captivity*, ſo the Apoſtate Angels account their *Priſon their Kingdom*, and have choſen it for their Empire. The Current of things running thus clear from the beginning to the end, it ſeemeth, that no Theory in Philoſophy or Religion can be more unexceptionably clear and intelligible than this Theory *of the Fall of Angels.* For as to the change of their Bodies or Vehicles (of which I have ſaid nothing,) it is not hard, to ſalve that Phænomenon from the known ſaying of *Minucius Felix* touching Demons. (y) *Simplicitatem ſubſtantiæ ſuæ, onuſti & immerſi vitiis, perdiderunt. Being laden with and immers'd in vicioſity, they loſt the ſimplicity of their Subſtance.*

* Τὸ δὲ βάθος τὸ πολλὸν τοῦ ἀέρος τάρταρος καλεῖται. Lucian. περὶ ἀστρολογίας.

(y) p. 242. *V. Ficin. Com. in Plotin.* p. 198.

The Sixth Illuſtration.

Our great Principle may have a further and a great Illuſtration from *the ſpecific comprehenſion of Religion and Condition that God is of*; for God is appropriately the Imperial Eſtate *of ſuch a ſpecific comprehenſion, which is Theiſm of Religion and Condition*; and therefore he cannot be *the mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* This mode of contemplating things by way of ſpecific Comprehenſion is wanting in our Books of Logick, but is uſual in common Language and Converſation, and may be illuſtrated from *Grammar*, *Philoſophy* and *Religion*. From *Grammar* the Senſe of our words may be underſtood; for as a Party of Jews who made uſe of the Greek Tongue, were called Ἑλληνισταί, *Helleniſts* or *Greciſts*, they were ſaid Ἑλληνίζειν, *to Hellenize* or *Grecize* in Language, and the comprehenſion of their peculiarities or proper kind of Language is called Ἑλληνισμὸς, *Helleniſm* or or *Greciſm* of Language: So a party of Religioniſts muſt be ſaid, to *Theize* in Religion and Condition, and the comprehenſion of their Peculiarities or proper kind of Religionizing, muſt be called *Theiſm of Religion and Condition*, and themſelves *the Theiſts of Religion and Condition*, which are diſtinct from *meer Theiſts*, or *Theiſts ſimply and without addition ſo called*, who have that Name only becauſe they hold a Deity and a Religion. In Philoſophy there are ſeveral ſpecific Comprehenſions; *Platoniſm*, *Stoiciſm*, *Carteſianiſm*, and ſuch more. Theiſm of Religion and Condition anſwereth to *Platoniſm*, the Theiſts of Religion and Condition to *Platoniſts*, and Theizing to *Platonizing*. In Religion alſo we diſtinguiſh ſeveral ſpecific Comprehenſions; ſome minuter, as *Sadduciſm*, *Arianiſm*, *Lutheraniſm*, *Calviniſm*: Some larger, as *Judaiſm*, *Paganiſm*, *Muhammediſm*, *Papiſm*, *Chriſtianiſm*, which is Theiſm of Religion; (genuin) Chriſtianiſts are Theiſts in Religion and Condition, and Chriſtianizing (ſuch as conſtituteth a genuin Chriſtian) is Theizing. Theſe are general Notices of this ſpecific Comprehenſion, but notwithſtanding theſe it will be ſhaded with obſcurity without theſe following Explications.

(1.) Theiſm of Religion muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie *Religion that is according to God, which conſorteth and ſymbolizeth with him* (without limitation of Senſe,) *the proper matters of it, what is of Kind and Quality ſuch, and the comprehenſion thereof.* This may be illuſtrated from the ſignification of *Iſlamiſm* amongſt the *Muhammedans.* (z) The Angel *Gabriel* in the Habit of an *Arabian* is ſaid to have ask'd *Muhammed*, *Quid eſt Iſlamiſmus? What is Iſlamiſm?* To which *Muhammed* anſwer'd; *to confeſs, that there is no God but that God, and that I am the Apoſtle of God, and to obſerve the appointed times of Prayers, and to give Alms, and to Faſt the Month Ramadan, and if you can conveniently, to go on Pilgrimage to the Temple at* Mecca *for Religion ſake.* Theſe are the principal and *proper matters of Iſlamiſm, what is of Kind and Quality ſuch, and the comprehenſion of them is called by that Name.* So by *Judaiſm* we underſtand *the proper matters of it, what is of Kind and Quality ſuch* (the old Ceremonioufneſs and Rituality,) when we complain with **Lud.** *Vives* of *reductus in Eccleſiam Judaiſmus, that Judaiſm is reduc'd into the Church.* So when the Father ſaith a) that ὁ θεῖος λόγος, *the Divine Word or Doctrine* produceth πράξεις θείας, *Divine Practices*, (b) and teacheth τὴν θείαν ἀρετὴν, *the Divine Virtue*; by theſe Divine Practices and this Divine Virtue we are to underſtand *Theiſm of Religion, the proper matters of God's kind of Religion*, which may be called *Divinity* (or Sanctity) *of Religion.*

(z) *Pocock. Spec.* p. 52, 53.

(a) *J. Mart. paræn.* p. 40.

(b) *Idem, Apol.* 1. p. 42.

(2.) Theiſm of Religion muſt be underſtood to ſignifie (in the ſame Latitude with other abſtract Names of ſpecific Comprehenſions) *both what is ſuch as to the Nature of the thing, and what is ſuch as to perſonal Condition and Qualification; not only materially, but formally*, that is, *the being God's kind of Religioniſt*, which is *the being a Theiſt of Religion and Condition.* For in this divided State of the Univerſe God muſt be conſider'd as the Founder of a Sect and peculiar way of Religion; whence the Primitive Chriſtians call themſelves (c) οἱ θεῷ παιδαγωγούμενοι, *the Diſciples of God, or thoſe that are inſtituted by him*, (d) *Dei Secta, the Sect of God.* And agreeably to their Senſe our Saviour ſaith, *Matth.* 5. 16. *Let your light ſo ſhine before Men, that they may ſee your good works and glorifie your Father which is in Heaven.* For uſually amongſt the Jews the followers of any great Rabbi (thoſe that were of his Sect and way) called him *Father*; as the Diſciples of *Hillel* and *Sammai* are called *Domus Hillel & Sammai, their Family*; *Pirke Avoth Capitula Patrum* is a Book of the wiſe Sayings of their Doctors; *Jubal* is called *the Father* (the Inſtitutor, Teacher and Founder (*of ſuch as handle the Harp and Organ*; *Eliſha* calleth the Prophet *Elias* (his Maſter and Teacher) *his Father*; and our Saviour ſaith, *Matth.* 23. 9. *Call no Man your Father upon the Earth: for one is your Father which is in Heaven.* A great Rabbi amongſt the Jews was called Father by his Sectators, that received all his Dictates, own'd him for the Prince of their School, the Author and Founder of their Dogma or Inſtitution; and in ſuch ſenſe our Saviour calleth God *the Father of his Religioniſts.* As therefore *Platoniſm* ſignifieth, not only what is *materially* ſuch, but *formally* the being Platoniſts, which importeth a perſonal Relation of Alliance to *Plato*, the being his γνώριμοι, (as the Philoſophers ſpeak) *his Followers or Aſſociates that are of his Sect:* So Theiſm of Religion ſignifieth *the being Theiſts of Religion* (without limitation of Senſe) or *God's kind of Religioniſts*, ſuch as ſymbolize with him in Sentiment, Diſpoſition, Profeſſion, Practice, State, Relation, are his Domeſticks, Diſciples, Citizens, Servants, Subjects, Partiſans and Allies. Theizing maketh the Theiſts of Religion, as Platonizing maketh the Platoniſts. And as *Plato*'s Inſtitution is neceſſarily an Inſtitution of Platoniſm: So God's Inſtitution is neceſſarily an Inſtitution of Theiſm of Religion. And which is God's Inſtitution of Religion, is not hard to be diſcern'd by them that can make a Judgment in caſe of competition, (e) ὁπότερα μᾶλλον πνεῖ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ, *which more breatheth of the true God.*

(c) *Clem. pædag.* l. 3. c. 11. p. m. 180.

(d) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 39.

Gen. 4. 21.

2 *King.* 2. 12.

(e) *Orig. c. Celſ.* l. 8. p. 428.

(3.) Theiſm of Religion and Condition importeth Society with God and his People in the ſenſe of Alliance. For as the Papiſts are thoſe that are in Communion with the Pope: So the Theiſts of Religion and Condition may be call'd *the God-Societiſts*, they are in the State of Society with God and his People; and are therefore אנשי קדש *Men of Holineſs, the Saints or holy People*, the comprehenſion of whom is called the Church, the Church being of definitive Notion (*f*) τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἁγίων, *Societas ſanctorum, the Univerſality or Society of the Saints.* The reſt of Mankind are viſibly (but in different degrees) in the State of Eſtrangement and Hoſtility; and not a few of thoſe that are ſo far God-Societiſts, that they are within the Pale of the viſible Church, are in the main the Exotick and Inimical kind of People (that belong to another Region,) not the God-kind of People; nor could God be the God-kind of God, if (in a Spiritual Oeconomy of things) *he was their God. God is Light, and in him is no Darkneſs at all. If we ſay, that we have Fellowſhip* (Society) *with him, and walk in Darkneſs, we Lye and do not the Truth. He that doth good* (that is an holy Well-doer) *is of God* (originally and as to Kind and Quality:) *But he that doth evil* (he that is an Evil-doer) *hath not ſeen God*, he is an Alien from knowing him, and is in the State of Eſtrangement. *He that committeth Sin is of the Devil*; he that is one of the Committers of Sin (the Evil-doers) is of Kind and Family *a Diaboliſt* (and therefore in the State of Hoſtility,) not a Theiſt of Religion and Condition.

Exod. 22. 31.

Dan. 12. 7.

1 *Cor.* 6. 1.

(f) *Iſidor. Peluſ.* l. 2. *ep.* 246.

S. Aug. ep. 23.

1 *Joh.* 1. 5, 6.

3 *Joh.* 11

Such are not of God's Alliance or Acquaintance; but of a contrary Alliance, Kindred and Party. Yet ſo far they are God's-Societiſts; ſome profeſs his Faith, receive his Sacraments, take an Oath of Allegiance to him, communicate in his Service, make a viſible pretenſion to be his Religioniſts (as thoſe ancient Hereticks did in a ſeraphic degree, who yet for their Filthineſs were ſtiled βορβορῖται) they have a Station in his viſible Church, and are in a bare Political State and Relation (without Affinity, Alliance and Friendſhip) of his *Subjects* and *Servants*; as appeareth from *the wicked and ſlothful Servant*, and the drunken reprobate Servant *that beateth his Fellow-ſervants*. *Matth.* 25. 26. *and* 24. 49. Such a Servant is in the Political State and Relation of a Servant to his Lord; but he is an Unſubject-kind of Subject (being a Rebel and a Traytor) *a diſſerving kind of Servant*, that is, in juſt computation no Servant, *no better than none, worſe than none.* A Servant in the meer Political State and Relation of a Servant without Affinity and Alliance to his Lord (ſuch as faithful Servants have) is one of thoſe pretending Acquaintance, to whom his Lord will profeſs, *I never knew you.* *Matth.* 7. 23. Such Servants are (in different Senſe) in and out of Society with their Lord at the ſame time. They are in Society, as being in ſome degree in a State and Relation of Society with Him. They are out of Society, as being for the main Aliens, none of his Allies, but *the Tares that are the Children of the wicked one*, Matth. 13. 38.

(4.) Theiſm of Religion and Condition is oppos'd both to *Athe-iſm* of Religion, and to *Antithe-iſm* of Religion; or it is oppos'd to *Athe-iſm* of Religion, both as that Name ſignifieth *privatively*, what is not of Quality or Pretioſity, but *meer viliſm*; and as it ſignifieth *oppoſitively*, *villainiſm* alſo. Meer *viliſm* of Religion is *Athe-iſm*, *Villainiſm* is *Antithe-iſm*; but both may be called *Athe-iſm* in the uſual acceptation of the word. For ἄθεος, uſually ſignifieth *without God.* (g) Ψυχὴ ἀφώτιστος ἄθεος, *the Soul not illuminated is Godleſs*, or devoid and depriv'd of God. And ἄθεος uſually ſignifieth *Impious* and ἀθεότης *Impiety*; (h) τοῦτο μὲν ἀθέων δίκη τῶν μολυνάντων τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς θεῖον, *This is the Puniſhment of the Atheous or Impious, who have defiled that which is Divine in them.* Taking *Athe-iſm* in a large Senſe, and compriſing in it both the Notions of *Atheous* (which ſignifieth both what is *Godleſs* and what is *Ungodly*) Religion muſt be diſtributed into ſuch Religion which is *Theiſm of Religion and Condition*, and ſuch Religion which is *Athe-iſm of Religion and Condition.* (i) Diagoras *the* Mileſian, *Theodorus* the *Cyrenean*, *and* Euhemerus *of* Tegea, *who deny'd the Being of any Gods* (as *Plutarch* ſaith) *are not the only Athe-iſts*; *but* Homer *alſo and* Heſiod *and the Tribes of Philoſophers, who have their fabulous Orders of many Gods, ſome of them of Servile Condition, and whom themſelves affirm to be Slaves of Humane Paſſions.* (k) *Theſe are the Myſteries of the Athe-iſts. I rightly call them Athe-iſts, who know not the true God, but a Boy torn in pieces by the* Titans, *a crying Woman and bodily Members not to be nam'd for ſhame, theſe they impudently worſhip*; *being involv'd in a twofold Athe-iſm*; *the one is the Ignorance of God, not knowing Him that is God indeed*; *the other is this ſecond Error*; *they ſuppoſe and call them Gods, that are not really ſuch, or rather that have no real being.* A Religion (*l*) *of Atheous Polytheiſm*, (*m*) *of Error nothing differing from Athe-iſm*, ſuch was the Religion of the Gentiles. The beſt of it was on this ſide Theiſm of Religion and Condition, and therefore but *Viliſm*; and the worſt of it was *Villainiſm* and *Antithe-iſm.* But it is not the Heathen alone, that are concern'd in this diſtribution of Religion; for as their *Naturaliſm* of Religion, ſo the *Jews Legaliſm*, the *Muhammedans* Deiſm, the *Samaritans* blind Devotion (that worſhipp'd they knew not what) is on this ſide Theiſm of Religion and Condition. And which is infinitely to be lamented, much of the Religion of degenerate Chriſtendom (reformed as well as unreformed) is not God's kind of Religion, nor do they *Theize* as they ought, but in great degree *Atheize* in Life and Religion. For (to ſay nothing of that ſhole of Heatheniſm which hath invaded Pagano-Chriſtendom, and which is Athe-iſm in the Nature of the thing) the greater part of Religioniſts called Chriſtians do but Chriſtianize in Externals, which is an unchriſtian kind of Chriſtianizing, an Irreligious kind of Religioniſm. Such is the ſubſtituting an Heatheniſh Perfunctorineſs and Lip-labour, a dead external Formality (or other Mock-religion) inſtead of the genuine and legitimate Service of God; and a conjoyning with the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith a wicked Life, which maketh an Athe-iſt, as the *Stoicks* ſay; (*n*) *That themſelves are Divine*; *for they have God in themſelves as it were: but a wicked man is an Athe-iſt*; *and that an Athe-iſt is twofold*; *both he that is contrary unto God, and he that* (after the mode of Speculative Atheiſm) *contemneth God.* Speculative Atheiſm pretendeth not to a Religion, but *Hereſies* do (which are ſuch Criminalities in the Faith, as are called by *Tertullian*, (*o*) *adulteræ doctrinæ*, *wicked adulterous Doctrines* remarkable in the profligate Hereticks of ancient times) and theſe are repreſented by the Apoſtle as a ſort of Athe-iſm of Religion and Condition, 2 *Joh.* 9. *Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the Doctrine of Chriſt, hath not God.* He is in Athe-iſm, not having God for his God, nor being one of his People.

(5.) Theiſm of Religion and Condition muſt be diſtributed into that which is in *Type* and that which is in *Truth* ſuch: For ſo God introduc'd it into the World, (*p*) *agreeably to the Painters, who draw the Lines in the Tablet, and make that Deſcription the Shadow, and then they lay upon it the truth of the Colours.* In the elder times of the World Theiſm of Religion *in Type* was ſometimes conjoyn'd and complicated with Theiſm of Religion *in the Truth ſuch*; but if it was ſolitary and ſeparate (as it uſually happen'd) it was ſo far Athe-iſm of Religion. The generality of the Jews therefore, although during their Church-ſtate they were Theiſts of Religion and Condition in reſpect of the Externals of Judaiſm, yet as to the main they were Atheiſts of Religion and Condition; for their Theiſm of Religion and Condition was but *that which is in Type*, not that which is in the *Truth* ſuch. *He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly* only; he is a Jew, no Jew, no Jew as to Judaiſm in the Truth ſuch, no genuine legitimate kind of Jew, no Theiſt of Religion and Condition as to the Spirituals and Subſtantials: *That is not Circumciſion, which is outward in the Fleſh*; it is not Circumciſion in *the Truth* ſuch; it is not the genuine and legitimate kind of Circumciſion (Regeneracy) which alone conſtituteth a genuine and legitimate kind of Theiſt of Religion and Condition. From whence it followeth, that all ſuch Religionizing which is but meer *Naturaliſm*, as that ſignifieth meer *Unregeneracy* of Religion and Condition, (ſuch as the Apoſtle enumerateth, *Phil.* 3. 5, 6.) is on this ſide *Theiſm of Religion and Condition in the main*, and ſo far is Athe-iſm; which Heathen-ſtate was the ſtate of the Carnal Jews alſo, and is too viſibly the ſtate of that Profane Rabble, which degenerate Chriſtendom mainly conſiſteth of, which ought to conſiſt of Churches of regenerate and ſanctify'd Chriſtians.

(g) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 17.

(h) *Syneſ. de Inſomn. p.* 144.

(i) Οὐδὲ μόνοιγε ἄθεοι Διαγόρας ὁ Μιλήσιος, ϗ ὁ Κυρηναῖος Θεόδωρος, ϗ Εὐήμερος ὁ Τεγεάτης, ϗ οἱ τούτοις ἠκολουθηκότες, παντάπασι φάντες μὴ εἶναι θεοὺς, ὡς ὁ Πλούταρχος ἔφη· ἀλλὰ ϗ Ὅμηρος ϗ Ἡσίοδος, ϗ αἱ τῶν φιλοσόφων ξυμμορίαι· παμπόλλους μὲν θεῶν μυθολογήσαντες ὁρμαθοὺς, ἀνδραποδώδεις δέ τινας, ϗ παθῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἀποφήναντες δούλους. *Theodoret.* θεραπ. *Ser.* 3.

(k) Ταῦτα τῶν ἀθέων τὰ μυστήρια. ἀθέους δὲ εἰκότως ἀποκαλῶ τούτους, οἳ τὸν μὲν ὄντως ὄντα θεὸν ἠγνοήκασιν, παιδίον δὲ ὑπὸ τιτάνων διασπώμενον, ϗ γύναιον πενθοῦν, ϗ μόρια ἄῤῥητα ὡς ἀληθῶς ὑπ' αἰσχύνης, ἀναισχύντως σέβουσιν· διττῇ ἐνεσχημένοι τῇ ἀθεότητι· προτέρᾳ μὲν, καθ' ἣν ἀγνοοῦσι τὸν θεὸν, τὸν ὄντως ὄντα μὴ γνωρίζοντες θεόν· ἑτέρᾳ ϗ δευτέρᾳ ταύτῃ πλάνῃ, τοὺς οὐκ ὄντας νομίζοντες, ϗ θεοὺς τούτους ὀνομάζοντες τοὺς οὐκ ὄντως ὄντας, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ὄντας. *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 11.

(l) Τῆς ἀθέου πολυθεότητος. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 5.

(m) Πλάνης κατ' οὐδὲν ἀθεότητος διαφερούσης. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 16.

(n) Θείους τε εἶναι, ἔχειν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς οἱονεὶ θεόν· τὸν δὲ φαῦλον ἄθεον· διττὸν δὲ εἶναι τὸν ἄθεον, τόν τε ἐναντίως τῷ θείῳ λεγόμενον, ϗ τὸν ἐξουθενητικὸν τοῦ θείου. *Laert. in Zenon.*

(o) *De præſcript. c.* 6.

(p) Καθάπερ οἱ ζωγράφοι ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πίνακι τὰς γραμμὰς περιάγουσι ϗ τὴν σκιὰν γράφουσι, ϗ τότε τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν χρωμάτων αὐτῷ ἐπιτιθέασιν. *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 5. *p.* 557. *ed. Savil.*

Rom. 2. 28.

(6.) God is neceſſarily the Imperial Eſtate of the Comprehenſion of his Religion, which is *Theiſm of Religion and Condition*; but cannot be the Imperial Eſtate of the comprehenſion of ſuch a Religion, which is *Athe-iſm* of Religion and Condition; therefore God cannot be *the Mundane or Pagano-mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* As *Plato* appropriately belongeth to this Specific Comprehenſion *Platoniſm of Philoſophy*, and we may call him the Imperial Eſtate thereof; ſo God appropriately belongeth to that Specific Comprehenſion, which is *Theiſm* of Religion and Condition as the Imperial Eſtate thereof. As the Platoniſts kind of *Plato* cannot be tolerably notic'd out of Platoniſm, nor can we ſuppoſe him to exiſt as an Imperial Eſtate out of Platoniſm, without making him a *Platoleſs kind of Plato*: So the Saint of God-kind of God cannot be tolerably notic'd in Athe-iſm of Religion and Condition, nor can we ſuppoſe him to exiſt in it as an Imperial Eſtate, without making him *a God-leſs kind of God*; therefore the Scripture noticeth him as appropriately *the King of Saints*, *Apoc.* 15. 3. The Pope appropriately belongeth to this Specific Comprehenſion *Papiſm of Religion* as the Imperial Eſtate thereof; and as none but Papiſts of Religion have him for their Pope; ſo none but the Theiſts of Religion and Condition have God for their God, and He appropriately belongeth to this Specific Comprehenſion Theiſm of Religion and Condition as the Imperial Eſtate thereof. In like manner our Lord Chriſt appropriately belongeth to this Specific Comprehenſion *Chriſtianiſm of Religion and Condition* as the Imperial Eſtate thereof: He cannot be found out of Chriſtianiſm of Religion and Condition, nor can he be notic'd as out of it; for if ſo, He would not be the Chriſtian kind of Chriſt. So if God did not appropriately belong to this Specific Comprehenſion *Theiſm of Religion and Condition*, if He might be found out of it, or be notic'd as out of it, He would not be the Saint of God-kind of God. Our Lord Chriſt is a Kingdom-eſtate over the World, and a Kingdom-eſtate to the World, but he is not the Kingdom-eſtate of the World, or the Mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate. The ſame we muſt affirm of the true God; but with this difference, God is a governing parental Providence to the Animal-World, which Chriſt is not.

CHAP. IV.

A Conſectary from the foregoing Chapter, *That the Pagans were ſo far ignorant of the true God, that He is not to be found amongſt the Supreme Deities of their Theopolity.* This is prov'd by ſeveral Arguments; 1. *The firſt Argument, A Supreme Deity in Paganiſm is the Supreme of Pagan Deities.* 2. *The ſecond Argument, Such a Supreme Deity is the Deity of Religion in Paganiſm.* 3. *The third Argument, A Supreme Deity in Paganiſm is the Deity of a Paganical Religion.* 4. *The fourth Argument, The true God was the unknown God at* Athens. 5. *The fifth Argument, The Pagan and Antipagan Religioniſts do not acknowledge each others Supreme Deity.* 6. *A Reflection upon the Arguments of the foregoing Chapter.* 7. *Additional Remarks to what is before diſcours'd touching the Platonic Hen or T'Agathon.*

OUR great Principle inferreth, *That the Pagans were ſo far ignorant of the true God, that he is not to be found amongſt the Deities or Supreme Deities of their Theopolity.* This great Conſectary is ſo well founded, that it muſt be thought a want of Conſideration in ſome Pious and Learned Writers, to maintain Aſſertions, which are implicit Contradictions unto it. (q) *That the Pagans did worſhip the true God and the ſame God with the Chriſtians; that a Supreme Being* (in the Pagans Theopolity) *Creator and Governour of the World is the true God.* (r) *That thoſe who direct their Worſhip to a Supreme and Sovereign Being conſider'd as abſolutely Supreme, infinite in all Perfections, the Maker and Governour of the whole World, can under this Notion worſhip no other but the Lord Jehovah, becauſe there is no other Supreme God but He.* (s) *When the Supreme God commands us to worſhip himſelf, the meaning muſt be, that we pay our Worſhip and Adorations to a Supreme Being conſider'd as Supreme; and he who worſhips ſuch a Supreme Being, worſhips the true God, whom we can diſtinguiſh from falſe Gods only by this Character, that he is Supreme.* (t) *There is no other Supreme God but the Lord Jehovah, and thoſe who worſhip but one Supreme God, worſhip him and none elſe: It is abſolutely impoſſible, that he who worſhips a Supreme and Sovereign God, ſhould worſhip any other God. Thoſe who worſhip the Supreme God under this Notion as Supreme, worſhip him and no other Being.* If theſe Aſſertions are true and ſolid, our *great Principle* and *great Conſectary* iſſuing from it muſt be thought great miſtakes. For every one of theſe Aſſertions plainly importeth, that the true God is *the Pagano-mundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate*, and is (not one of the Subordinate Deities, which are ſuppos'd to be created Beings, but)

(q) *Intell. Syſt.* p. 279. *Def. of the Diſc. concern. the Idol. of the Church of Rome*, p. 5, 7.

(r) *A Preſervative againſt Popery.* p. 31.

(s) *Ibid.* p. 30.

(t) *Ibid.* p. 29.

but) *a Supreme Deity of the Pagans Syſtem of Deities or Theopolity.* But that this cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, we will endeavour to demonſtrate by theſe following Reaſons and Arguments, which are deſign'd to prove, *That a Supreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity is not the true (or true kind of) God.*

I. The Supreme Deity in the Pagans Theopolity is *the Supreme or Chieftain of Pagan Deities*, of the ſame Kind, Kindred and Family (as is before ſhew'd) and therefore *a Paganical kind of Deity*, and the Head of the Family of Pagan Deities. The Rabbins *Judaical* Theology acknowledgeth a *Meſſiah*, but not the true kind of *Meſſiah*; the Gentile Theology acknowledgeth *a Supreme God*, but not the true kind of *Supreme God*; whereas the Chriſtian Theology acknowledgeth both, according to that of our Saviour, *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* The true God can no more be found in the Pagan's Theology, than the true Chriſt can be found in the Jews Theology, or than the true kind of Paradiſe can be found in *Muhammediſm*. For they Atheiz'd the Godhead, ſometimes into an *Herological* or a *Pneumatological* kind of *Jove*, ſometimes into *a Myſtic-Metaphyſical firſt Nature*, ſometimes into *Mundane Animative Nature* (a deifying Mind or Soul of the World) the viſible Univerſe or Animated Heaven, and ſometimes into the *viſible animated Sun*. *Pliny* and *Anaximander* proceeded but a little further, the one in Atheizing the Godhead into plaſtick unknowing Nature, the other into infinite Matter. But they did well in acknowledging a Deity in the Notion of an Imperial Eſtate, which is the genuine Theiſts Notion (they were therefore a ſort of Theiſts, becauſe they were a ſort of Religioniſts) as the Jews do well in acknowledging a Meſſiah in the like Notion (they call him the King Meſſiah) and the *Muhammedans* do well in acknowledging a Paradiſe in the Life to come: Yet as the Paradiſe of the one and the Meſſiah of the other are of oppoſite kind to the true (the one being Senſitive the other Secular;) ſo not one of the whole Syſtem of the Pagans Deities is *the Sanctity or true Religion-kind of God*, but all of them (though called by them Holy) are of kind and quality Atheous and Vile, at beſt *Mundane*, and at worſt *Diabolical*, Fabulous, without any God-kind (or Saint of God-kind) of thing; and ſuch is their *Jove* or *Jupiter* (the beſt and greateſt of them) who was their kind of God, but never was a truly godly Man's kind of God. (u) *It is much more eaſie, to deviate from the true God than from the true (partial) Notion of the Deity; for the Gentiles, how good ſoever their Notion of the Divinity was which they had in their Mind, yet in this they ſeem to have miſcarry'd in the firſt place, they did not attribute it to Him, to whom it belong'd.* The Gentiles had as good a Notion of the Deity, as the Jews have of the Meſſiah; the Notion of both of them underſtood without *ſpecific* or *individual* determination is true and good; but herein both of them alike miſcarry, *they do not apply their Notion to him, to whom it belongeth*, becauſe they apply it not to ſuch a kind of Imperial Perſon as He is, to whom it belongeth. The Rabbins have this true Notion of the Meſſiah; they ſuppoſe him, to be *the King of the Jews, the Redeemer and Conſolation of* Iſrael, *and the Star of* Jacob (whence an impoſtorous Meſſiah was ſtiled *Barchocab*;) yet every Ideal or Imaginary Meſſiah that is of theſe Attributes, is not the true Meſſiah, nor the true kind of Meſſiah, nor is the Jews Meſſiah ſuch. In like manner, the Heathen had a true Notion of the Deity; they ſuppos'd him, to be *the grand Father of Nature, the Former of the Univerſe, the Hegemonic Principle and Governour of the World*; yet every Ideal or Imaginary Deity that is of theſe Attributes is not the true God, nor the true kind of God, nor is the Heathens Deity ſuch. The ſame Judgment muſt be made touching theſe Attributes *the Supreme Being or the Supreme God.*

The Ancient Heretical Pagans (the Gnoſticks and others) had their *Supreme Deity or Deities*, but it is not poſſible for an intelligent Man, to pitch upon any one of them, and to affirm, that this is the true God. (w) *Almoſt all Hereſies confeſs one God, but they change the true, and ſet up another God by their wicked Opinion.* (x) *Every Heretick feigneth what he pleaſeth, and adoreth his own Figment; as* Marcion *a good God and an idle, as* Valentinus *thirty Æons* (his Supreme Deity was *Bythus*) *as* Baſilides, *who calleth an Omnipotent God by a portentous Name* Abraxas. S. *Auſtin* ſaith of himſelf when a *Manichee*, (y) *It was not thou, which was my God, but a vain Phantaſm of mine, which mine Error deify'd.* The *Cerinthians*, *Marcionites* and others are called by *Tertullian*, *alterius Divinitatis Hæretici, The Heretical Religioniſts of another God.* And if this was the caſe of the *Hereticks*, who are in ſome degree within the City of God, (z) as *Maimonides* conſidereth them; is it not much more the caſe of the *Infidels*, who are conſider'd by the ſame Author as altogether without the City? The Heretical Pagans were the Religioniſts of another *Supreme Deity*, therefore the perfect Pagans were ſo. As the Heretical Pagans had various Supreme Deities, ſo the perfect Pagans had four (at leaſt) the *Herological*, *the Pneumatological*, *the Coſmical* and the *Acroamatical*. And is it poſſible for an intelligent Man, to pitch upon any one of theſe different kinds of Supreme Deities, and to affirm, that this is *the one true God and the only Supreme Deity?* If every imaginary *Supreme Deity ſuppos'd to be the Maker and Governour of the World*, (a) *and infinite in all Perfections*, is the one true God; then the Supreme Deity of the Pagans *Acroamatical Theology* (the Platoniſts T'Agathon) is the one true God. Again, If every imaginary Supreme Deity ſuppos'd to be *the Maker and Governour of the World and Infinite in all Perfections*, is the one true God; then the Supreme Deity of the Pagans *Exoterical Theology* (the Popular-Pagan *Jove*) is the one true God. But if the former of theſe Paganical Supreme Deities be the one true God, then the one true God was not *at all known, nor at all worſhipp'd throughout almoſt the whole World of Pagan Religioniſts.* On the contrary, If the latter of theſe Paganical Supreme Deities be the one true God, then the one true God *was familiarly known and ſedulouſly worſhipp'd throughout the whole World of Pagan Religioniſts.* Both theſe Paganical Supreme Deities therefore cannot be the one true God, the one Supreme Deity. Nor can either of them be the one

(u) *Proclivius eſt à vero Numine quàm à vera Deitatis ratione deviare; Gentiles enim qui utcunque probam Divinitatis notionem mente erant complexi, in hoc primum impegiſſe videntur, quod illam non cui debebant attribuerunt.* Arminii orat. de object. Theolog.

(w) *Omnes ferè quotquot ſunt Hæreſes Deum quidem unum dicunt, ſed per ſententiam malam immutant.* Iren. adv. Har. l. 1. c. 19.

(x) *Unuſquiſque fingit quod voluerit, & adorat figmentum ſuum: ut Marcion bonum Deum & otioſum, ut Valentinus* αἰῶνας *triginta, ut Baſilides qui omnipotentem Deum portentoſo nomine appellat* ἄβραξας. S. Hieron. in Amos 3. T. 5.

(y) *Non tu eras, ſed vanum Phantaſma & error meus erat Deus meus.* Confeſſ. l. 4. c. 7.

(z) *Mor. Nev. par.* 3. c. 51.

(a) *Procl. Th. Plat.* p. 101. *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 12.

one true God, the one Supreme Deity. Not the *former*; for if ſo, the World of Pagans did not (as it is ſuppos'd) worſhip the true God. Not the *latter* of them; for if ſo, the Worſhippers of the true God did ſet a Supreme Deity above the one true God, the one Supreme Deity, which cannot be ſuppos'd. But the Pagans agree not among themſelves touching the Supreme Deity. One that the moſt of them account the Supreme Deity, their ſublime Sects (the Pythagoreans and Platoniſts) deny to be the Supreme Deity. Theſe ſuppoſe therefore, *That Men may worſhip a Supreme God under this Notion as Supreme*, and yet not worſhip the true Supreme God. And this they rightly ſuppoſe; for the moſt of the Pagans worſhipp'd the Supreme God of the *Exoterical Theology* under this Notion as Supreme; but the Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theologers worſhipp'd the Supreme God of the *Acroamatical Theology* under this Notion as Supreme; whereas both theſe Deities cannot be the one Supreme Deity, nor the one true God. They are indeed two oppoſite kind of Supreme Deities; the one being *an abſolutely Unpopular-Pagan Supreme Deity*, the other being *a perfectly Popular-Pagan Supreme Deity*; but becauſe the one is an *abſolutely unpopular kind of Supreme Deity*, He is not the *true kind of God*; and becauſe the other is a *Popular-Pagan kind of Supreme Deity* (not the Holy-popular kind) neither is He *the true kind of God*. Nor can ſuch a God be thought an Aſſociate of the Wicked Herological and Pneumatological *Jupiter*.

II. The true God could be no Deity or Supreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity, becauſe *He was not the Deity of Religion amongſt the Pagans*. Which cannot be ſaid of the Jews in the worſt times of their Idolatry, nor of the Ten Tribes in the times of their partial Apoſtacy. But if the Ten Tribes have totally apoſtatiz'd and degenerated into perfect Heatheniſm, (as doubtleſs they have done) the true God is no longer the Deity of a Religion amongſt them; therefore He was not the Deity of a Religion in the World of Heathens, and conſequently was not a Deity of their Theopolity. A Supreme Deity of their Theopolity muſt be *that People's God and an Imperial Eſtate of Religion amongſt them*, as the *Capitoline Jupiter* was amongſt the *Romans*; to which Supreme God they perform'd their *Sacra*, (*b*) as a Learned Man hath ſhew'd, who ſuppoſeth, that this Supreme God was the true God. But if ſo, the Pagan *Romans* were the People of the true God, as well as the Jews; *Rome* Pagan was the City of God, as well as *Jeruſalem*; the *Capitol* was his Houſe or Temple as well as *Solomon*'s Temple; He was ſerv'd and worſhipp'd with as much State, Magnificence and Solemnity upon the *Tarpeian* Mountain as upon *Mount Moriah* (or *Mount Sion*;) and we muſt ſuppoſe, that the true God had the *Flamen Dialis* for his Prieſt, the *Augurs* for his Prophets, the Birds for his Angels, the Plays and Agones were his holy Solemnities, and *Juno* and *Minerva* (plac'd on each ſide of him) were his Cherubims of Glory. But the *Capitoline Jupiter* had his Nurſe alſo for one of his Conſorts, which ſheweth, that the Fables of the Gods were far from being duely rejected at *Rome*, that the *Cretian* and *Coſmical Jupiter* were confounded by the *Romans*; and what great miſtake was there in confounding two ſuch Supreme Deities, that are both of the ſame Paganical Kind and Religion? But where is our Sagacity and Senſe of Diſcernment, if we confound the true God with thoſe Rival and Inimical Supreme Gods, that deſtroy his Religion, and whom he threateneth to deſtroy? *Jer.* 10. 11. The Capitoline *Jupiter* of *Rome* is the very ſame Supreme God with *Bel* of *Babylon* threatned *Jer.* 51. 44. the very ſame Supreme God with *Jupiter-Olympius*, whom *Antiochus Epiphanes* endeavour'd to ſubſtitute inſtead of the true God, and to have the Temple in *Jeruſalem* call'd the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius*, who is therefore call'd *the Abomination that maketh deſolate*; *Dan.* 11. 31. 2 *Maccab.* 6. 2. The *Capitoline Jupiter* is the very ſame Supreme God with *Baal*, *Moloch*, *Milchom* or *Malcham*, which are Names that ſignifie a Supreme God ſo extremely diſſonant from the true God, that an attempt to reconcile them, would be much like the *Old Monks*, who endeavour'd to reconcile God and the Devil; but the Devil (as 'tis ſaid) bade him ſpare his pains, for they were everlaſtingly fallen out. The *Capitoline Jupiter* is the very ſame (*c*) with *Jupiter Ammon*, the chief God of the *Egyptians*, and of their City (anciently their Metropolis) *No* or *Dioſpolis*, whom God threatneth to viſit, *Jer.* 46. 25. *The Lord of Hoſts, the God of* Iſrael, *ſaith, behold I will viſit* Amon de No, that is, *not the Multitude of* No, as our Tranſlation rendreth it, but *Amon* (or *Ammon*) *the God of* No, as the Learned underſtand it. The God of *No* was alſo the God of *Athens* and of *Rome*, the *Capitoline Jupiter*, the Conſort of *Summanus*, as S. *Auſtin* deſcribeth him. (*d*) *Amongſt the ancient* Romans, Summanus, *to whom they attributed the Nocturnal Thunderbolts, was had in greater veneration than* Jove, *to whom the Diurnal belong'd; but after that a magnificent Temple* (the Capitol) *was built to* Jove, *there was ſuch a conflux of the People to him, becauſe of the Magnificence of his Temple, that the Name of* Summanus *is now no more heard of, ſcarce any one remembreth, that he hath read of it. Summanus (Summus Manium)* is a proper name for the *Capitoline Jupiter* himſelf, and denoteth what he is in the beſt Notion of him, *the Chieftain of the Family of Pagan Deities.* For this is he, that in the beſt Notion of him is ſaid (*e*) *to have* Hercules *for his genuine Son.* And this is he, that in the beſt Notion of him is ſaid to be *left alone in the general Conflagration*, (*f*) *having neither* Juno, *nor* Minerva, *nor* Apollo *with him, neither any Brother, nor Son, nor Nephew, nor Kinſman.* The Supreme of theſe Deities is this Supreme God, who is a Deity ſo perfectly Paganical, that no Chriſtian dareth to give him Religious Worſhip; therefore the *Romans* muſt not be thought to worſhip the true God, becauſe they were his Religioniſts. This is not agreeable to the Senſe of the Fathers, nor do the Fathers ſuppoſe, that the true God was *the Deity of a Religion* in Paganiſm, but the contrary. (*g*) *Omnia colit humanus error præter ipſum omnium conditorem: The Error of Mankind worſhippeth all things except the Creator of all things.* (*h*) *Apud vos quodvis colere jus eſt, præter verum Deum; with you* Romans *any thing may be worſhipp'd ſave only the true God.* (*i*) *Solus diſplicet Dei cultor, no Religioniſt is diſpleaſing but only a Religioniſt of the true God. Deus ſolus in terris aut non colitur, aut non eſt impune quod colitur; the true God only either is not worſhipp'd upon Earth, or is not worſhipp'd without Puniſhment and Perſecution.* (*k*) The *Romans* that would be the Religious Worſhippers of all Gods, and made them their Gods, that made their City a *Pantheon* or Receptacle of them all (a Sink of all Superſtition) yet would not be the Religioniſts of the one true

God,

(b) Dr. *Stilling-fleet Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol.* p. 33, &c.

(c) *Octav. in Min. Fel.* p. 155.

(d) De C. D. l. 4. c. 23.

(e) *Epict. Diſſ.* l. 2. c. 16. l. 3. c. 24.

(f) *Ibid.* l. 3. c. 13.

(g) *Tertul. de Idol.* c. 4.

(h) *Idem Apol.* c. 24

(i) *S. Cypr. ad Demetr.*

(k) *Arnob.* c. *Gent.* l. 6. p. 194. *Min. Fel.* p. 49.

God, becauſe his Deity and Religion is unſociable with the Pagan Deities. (l) *Why is not the God of* Iſrael *one of the number of their Deities ? Why is he alone not worſhipp'd by them ? Who is that ſo unknown a God, that in ſuch a multitude of Gods he alone is not found ?* (He is not one of the Deities of the Pagan Theopolity.) *The only reaſon they can pretend, why they receive not his Religion, is, becauſe he appropriateth Religious Worſhip to himſelf, forbidding the Worſhip of their Gods.* Had the *Romans* receiv'd the true God for their Deity, he muſt have been the Deity of a Religion amongſt them, as *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Ops*, *Iſis*, *Cybele*, and other Deities were; they muſt have received his Religion, as they did the Religion of thoſe other Gods; for where the Religion of a God is rejected, the God is rejected. But the Religion of the true God being ruinous to the Pagan Theiſm, the true God could be no Deity of a Religion in Paganiſm.

Clemens indeed (forgetting ſeveral of his own Sayings) from an idle Book *the Preachment of* S. *Peter*, would ſhuffle off the buſineſs in this manner. (m) *The Preachment of S.* Peter *doth not ſay, do not Worſhip the ſame God that the Greeks Worſhip, but do not Worſhip as the Greeks; changing the manner of the Worſhip of God, not ſhewing or preaching another God. He plainly declareth* (ſaith Clemens) *the one only God, to be known by the Greeks Paganically, by the Jews Judaically, but by us newly and ſpiritually. And that the ſame God who gave the two Teſtaments*, (to the Jews and Chriſtians,) *gave the Grecanic Philoſophy to the Greeks*, δι᾽ ἧς ὁ παντοκράτωρ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν, δοξάζεται, *by which the Almighty is glorified amongſt the Greeks.* But in this Philoſophic-Pagan *Preachment* there are groſs abſurdities and an inconſiſtence with it ſelf. For it is groſly abſurd, to ſuppoſe the Greek Philoſophy *a Religion* like the two Teſtaments, which are the Jews and Chriſtians Religion (whereas the Greek Philoſophy pretended not to any Religion but that of the Popular Pagans;) and it is groſly abſurd, to ſuppoſe *Philoſophic Heatheniſm*, to be God's Religion as well as Judaiſm and Chriſtianiſm; and it is not leſs abſurd, to ſuppoſe, that the Greeks did *know and worſhip God Paganically* (for there is no ſuch *Species* of knowing and worſhipping God;) and it is a Self-inconſiſtence, to ſuppoſe, that it was by the Greek Philoſophy only, that the Almighty was glorified amongſt the Greeks, and yet that the Greekiſh Popular Pagans, who underſtood it not, did Worſhip God as well as the Jews and Chriſtians. Theſe are Philoſophic-Pagan Preachments, that have no Affinity with the Scripture-Theology; for throughout the whole of it the Gentiles are ſaid to worſhip Idols, but never to be God's Worſhippers (the Aſſyrian Colonies in their perfect Heatheniſm *feared not the Lord*, 2 King. 17, 25.) all the Deities of a Religion amongſt them are conſtantly intituled *no Gods*, *Idols*, *other Gods*, *ſtrange Gods*, themſelves are called *the People of a ſtrange God*, the true God is conſtantly oppos'd to the Gods of the Heathen Nations, and is repreſented as to them an alien Deity, (n) ἔρημα γὰρ ἦν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ, *for all the Nations were without the true God.* The Apoſtle ſaith *Rom.* 1. 21. *When they knew God* (had Natural notices of *the true Deity of Religion*) *they glorified him not as God* (they did not acknowledge him for their God, nor make him the Deity of their Religious Worſhip) *Creaturas pro Creatore venerati*, *worſhipping the Creature inſtead of the Creator*, as the Author of the Commentaries under S. *Hierome's* Name ſaith of them. And the Apoſtle ſaith the ſame, v. 25. ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, which our Tranſlation thus rendreth; *they worſhipped and ſerved the Creature more than the Creator.* The words are capable of this other rendring; *they worſhipp'd and ſerved the Creature beſides the Creator.* And according to either of theſe Verſions, as ſome obſerve, (o) *it is ſuppos'd that the Pagans did worſhip the true God, though they worſhipped the Creature alſo beſides him, or perhaps in ſome ſenſe above him and more than him alſo.* But the words are capable of a third rendring (moſt probably the true;) for the Præpoſition παρὰ, is by the *vulg. Lat.* and the Latin Fathers rendred *potius quàm rather than* (as it uſually ſignifieth,) and in this Verſion there will be no difficulty, if the word *Creature* be underſtood to ſignifie *that which is not the Creator* (and therefore of vile Rank and Quality;) for according to this third rendring the Apoſtle's words will run thus. *They worſhipped and ſerved that which is not the Creator rather than the Creator.* This Verſion is unexceptionable, and manifeſtly ſpeaketh the Apoſtle's Senſe, as appeareth from his words v. 28. *They did not like to retain God in their knowledge.* Therefore they choſe the Creature-worſhip as more agreeable, rather than the Creator-worſhip. The true God therefore was not the Deity of their Religious Worſhip, nor the Deity of a Religion amongſt them; and therefore he was not one of the Deities of their Theopolity. They lik'd a governing Providence, but not a Deity which is to them and all the World a Deity of true Religion and Godlineſs.

III. A ſupreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity is neceſſarily *the Deity of a Paganical Religion*: But ſuch is not the true God; therefore he is no Deity or ſupreme Deity of their Theopolity. All their Deities ſupreme and ſubordinate were Deities of a Paganical Religion and God-ſervice (for in perfect Paganiſm there was no other Religion or God-ſervice:) But their Paganical God-ſervice was *falſe God-ſervice*, as the Apoſtle argueth, *Act.* 17. 24, 25, 29. *God that made the World and all things therein, ſeeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with hands. Neither is worſhipp'd with Men's hands, as though he needed any thing, ſeeing he giveth to all life and breath and all things. Foraſmuch then as we are the offſpring of God, we ought not to think, that the Godhead is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone, graven by art and Man's device.* The Apoſtle inſiſteth, that the Athenians Paganical God-ſervice was not agreeable unto God, who is *no Mechanic-Temple Deity* (nor was he ſuch during the Moſaic Oeconomy ſave only κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν, *by way of Adminiſtration* and typical Adumbration, not in the real truth of the thing:) But their Religion was the Religion of *a Mechanic-Temple Deity.* For the Heathens look'd upon their Temples as (p) θεῶν οἶκοι, *the dwelling Houſes of the Gods* (and in ſuch ſenſe called them ἱεροὶ δόμοι, *ſacræ Ædes*, *ſacred Houſes*,) and theſe Mechanic-Temples were connex'd with their Mechanic-Idols (no Temple properly ſuch could be with-

out

(l) *Cur à numero cæterorum iſte rejectus eſt ? Cur ab eis ſolus non colitur ? Quis eſt Deus iſte ita ignotus, ut in tam multis Diis ſolus adhuc non inveniatur ? Nihil reſtat, ut dicant, cur hujus Dei ſacra recipere noluerint, niſi quia ſolum ſe coli voluerit, illos autem Deos gentium quos iſti jam colebant, coli prohibuerit.* S. Aug. de Conſenſ. Evangel. l. 1. c. 17, 18.

(m) Μὴ τοίνυν φησὶ, σέβεσθε οὐκ εἶπεν, θεὸν ὃν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀλλὰ μὴ κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας· τὸν τρόπον τὸν τῆς σεβήσεως ἐναλλάττων τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐχὶ δὲ ἄλλον καταγγέλλων. Strom. l. 6. p. m. 458.

Pſal. 96. 5. *Gal.* 4. 8. *Jer.* 7. 9. *Joſh.* 24. 20. *Mal.* 2. 11. *Iſa* 63. 19. *Jer.* 2. 11. 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 9.

(n) *J. Mart. Apol.* 2. p. 88.

(o) *Intellect. Syſt.* p. 472, 473.

(p) *Herald in Arnob.* p. 233.

out the Image or Statue of a Deity,) both which are oppoſite to the Godhead in truth ſuch. (*q*) ὐ περιγράφεται τόπῳ θεὸς, ὐδὲ ἀπεικονίζεται ποτὲ ζώυ σχήματι, *God cannot be incloſ'd in a place, nor can he be repreſented by any Animal-Form.* The Athenians Paganical God-ſervice was alſo oppoſite unto God, *as his Worſhip conſiſteth not in bodily Miniſteries, the ſervices of Mens hands*, which was the Heathen mode of God-Service. (*r*) *Ritus ejus in manu & digitis eſt, its Rite is in the Hand and Fingers*, not in the Soul. (*s*) *You amplifie the Gods with new Meats*, (ſaith *Arnobius*) *and honour them with Nidours and Juices: And becauſe the things that are nutritive to you, are pleaſing and grateful to you, do you think it is ſo with the Gods, that like Dogs they are appeas'd by Morſels, and fawn upon them that reach to them often?* The *Athenians* Paganical God-ſervice was alſo incongruous unto God, *who is not worſhipped with Men's hands, as though he needed any thing*; for the Services of Men's hands relate to bodily Neceſſities; as the Apoſtle ſaith, *theſe Hands have miniſtred to my Neceſſities.* But the Heathens Religion was ſuch a God-ſervice, as if they were miniſtring to the bodily Neceſſities of their Gods, providing Houſes for them, inlightning their Dwellings, clothing them, adorning them, incenſing them, offering them Food (as the Papiſts worſhip the Saints,) ſuch was their God-ſervice. (*t*) *They meaſur'd the Gods by Human Neceſſities. To what uſes of the Gods are Temples neceſſary? To ſhelter them from the Winter-cold, and Summer-heat, and Wind and Rain? Is not this the greateſt contumely, that the Gods ſhould have their little Cottages, Apartments and Cells, and that ſuch things ſhould be thought neceſſary for them, that are neceſſary for Men and other Animals?* (*u*) *If the Divinity be of the ſame form with Man, he will need the ſame things with Man, nutriment and indument and houſe and the conſequent Human Paſſions. They that are of like Form and like Paſſions will need the like Diet.* In this reſpect therefore the Athenians God-ſervice was oppoſite unto God; *we ought not to think, that the Godhead*, which is the *σίβασμα the object of Religious Worſhip, is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone graven by art and Man's device:* But they worſhipping Images or Statues did think the *σίβασμα* (the object of Religious Worſhip) ſuch. And of this their Paganical Religious Worſhip their *Jove* was their Deity, who never made any, the leaſt Proteſtation againſt it: But the true God is not the Deity of it; therefore he is not the Pagan *Jove*.

But the principal thing obſervable in this Diſcourſe of the Apoſtle is the drift and deſign of it; and this muſt be debated with thoſe learned Men, who ſuppoſe, that the Pagans worſhipp'd the true God, and that he is the ſame with their *Jove*. For theſe ſuppoſe alſo (*w*) *that the Athenians worſhipp'd the true God by their Images*; and conſequently the drift and deſign of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe was not to perſwade the *Athenians* to change the great object of their Worſhip, but only their corrupt mode of worſhipping him. Which caſe of the *Athenians* is the very ſame with that of the ten Tribes of *Iſrael* in their partial Apoſtaſy (when they worſhipp'd God in their Calves,) yet it is acknowledg'd, (*x*) that their Caſe was different from the Idolatry of meer Heathens, as is alſo the Caſe of our Pagano-Chriſtians. If this was the Caſe of the *Athenians*, it muſt be acknowledg'd, that they were in ſome degree within the ſpecific Comprehenſion of Theiſm of Religion, that God was in ſome degree the Deity of a Religion amongſt them and the Deity of their Religion (and conſequently in ſome degree they were his People:) But they ought to have been told, that Religion was very much corrupted amongſt them, and the State of it needed a great Reformation, ſuch as ought to be made in Pagano-Chriſtendom, or as was requiſite in the degenerate ten Tribes. The Apoſtle ſhould not have preach'd to them in ſuch a ſtile as he doth, telling them of *their profound Ignorance of God*, that his deſign was *to declare God to them*, and exhorting them, *to ſeek the Lord, if happily they might feel after him* (the word ſignifieth, to grope after him like blind Men, or Men in the dark) *and find him.* Which ſheweth their horrendous alienation from God, that they did not acknowledge him to be their God, nor make him the Deity of their Religious Worſhip, that they did not erect and worſhip their Idols (a Wooden *Jupiter*, a Stone *Diana*, a Brazen *Ceres*, a Golden *Anaitis*) with intention and deſign, that thereby they might give the Religious Worſhip to him, that is the only true God, but to the imaginary Deities of their Theopolity, according to that of *Seneca.* (*y*) *They dedicate* (to be worſhipp'd) *the ſacred, immortal and inviolable God's in the vileſt matter and that which cannot move, and put upon them the Habits of Men, and wild Beaſts and Fiſhes. Seneca* as well as S. *Paul* condemneth the Heathens mechanical Idols, but with different deſign. For as it is one thing, to reform the Religion of God and his People corrupted by Idolatry; and another thing, to take away an *Idol-Inſtitution* ſimply and without addition ſo called: So *Seneca* deſigneth the Pagan Theiſm, not corrupted, but reform'd; S. *Paul* deſigneth, that there be no Pagan Theiſm neither corrupted nor reformed. The one accounteth the Religion of Paganiſm *Theiſm of Religion and Condition*; the other accounteth it *Athe-iſm.* And therefore the Senſe and Deſign of his Diſcourſe to the *Athenians* is, not only to Convert them from a wrong mode of ſerving God; but to ſhew them, that they were Aliens from God and his Service at the Heathen rate, and that their Religion was an *Idol-Religion* ſimply ſo called. So *to turn them from the Power of Satan unto God.* Act. 26. 18. to make them his People, that were none of his People. 1 Pet. 2. 10. *To turn them to God from Idols, to ſerve the living and true God.* 1 Theſſ. 1. 9. For they were Gentiles *that knew not God, and did ſervice* (not to the living and true God, but) *unto them which by Nature are no Gods.* Gal. 4. 8. The Apoſtle therefore deſign'd, that the *Athenians* ſhould make a change, not only in their mode of God-ſervice, but in the great object thereof; as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, (*z*) ἵνα μὴ νομοίσωσιν ἕνα τῶν πολλῶν εἶναι, *that they may not think the true God, to be one of their many Gods* (one of their Theopolity,) *the Apoſtle addeth, that God dwelleth not in Temples made with hands, nor is worſhipp'd with Mens*

(q) *Clem. Str.* 7. p. m. 514.

(r) *Lactant. l.* 4. c. 3.

(s) *Cibis novis auctificatis Deos, nidoribus cohoneſtatis, & ſuccis: Et quia vobis jucunda & grata ſunt, ea quæ vos alunt, Deos etiam creditis in eorum affluere voluptates, latratorum & canum ritu offis ſævitias ponere, atque alludere porrigentibus ſæpius?* Arnob. c. Gent. l. 7. p. 224. Sen. Ep. 95. S. Aug. de C. D. l. 6. c. 10. Lactant. l. 6. c. 1.

(t) *Arnob. ſupr.* p. 191, 192.

(u) Εἰ δὲ ἀνθρωποειδὲς τὸ θεῖον, τῶν ἴσων δεήσεται τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, τροφῆς τε καὶ σκέπης, οἰκίας τε καὶ τῶν ἀκολούθων παθῶν, οἱ ὁμοιοσχήμονες γὰρ καὶ ὁμοιοπαθεῖς τῆς ἴσης δεήσονται διαίτης. Clem. Str. l. 7. p. m. 514.

(w) *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol.* p. 350, 351, 358, 373, 374, 380, 382.

(x) *Ibid.* p. 778, 779.

Act. 17. 23, 27, 30.

(y) *Sacros, immortales, inviolabileſque Deos in materia viliſſima atque immobili dedicant, habitus illis hominum ferarumque & piſcium induunt.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 6. c. 10.

(z) *Hom.* 38. *in Act.* p. 820.

Mens hands. But they that ſuppoſe the *Athenians* to have worſhipp'd the true God by their Images, (a) cite this Father *as condemning the Greeks for their folly in ſeeking a ſpiritual and incorporeal Being* (the true God) *in corporeal Images.* But who can imagine, that the Greeks which *did not like to retain God in their knowledge,* ſhould be ſo intent in ſeeking after him, as to ſeek him in corporeal Images? Doubtleſs ſuch interpretations of Scripture are a ſubſtituting *white for black, and black for white.*

Candida pro nigris & pro candentibus atra.

IV. The true God is intituled *the unknown God at Athens* in the *ordinary*, not in an *honourary* Senſe; therefore he is not to be confounded with *the Grecanic Zeus or Jupiter* in the beſt Notion of him, nor is he *a ſupreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity.* In the Theology of the Gentiles the Epithet *unknown* is us'd in an *ordinary* Senſe, (without any intention of honouring,) and ſometimes their Deities are called *unknown* in an *honourary* Senſe, and there is ſomething *honourary* in the Title. As when the Platoniſts ſtile their firſt Deity (b) παντελῶς ἄγνωστος, *altogether unknown.* And of the *Peruans* ſupreme Deity (*Pachacamac*) we have this account. (c) *They ſaid, he was to them inviſible and unknown, not daring to pronounce his Name; if at any time they muſt do it, they did it with the greateſt Reverence, having often kiſs'd the Air and Earth, and ſcarce without trembling.* Probably in an honourary Senſe the ſupreme God was intituled by ſome of the Heathen πάγκρυφος, *one altogether hidden,* (d) as *J. Mart.* ſaith. The Egyptians intituled their ſupreme Deity *Ammon* or *Amûn*, which ſignifieth *Occult*; and the ſame ſignification is in the Name *Saturn* according to its uſual Etymology from סתר *to hide.* So the *unknown God* in the Athenians Inſcription is rendred by the *Syriac the hidden God* (doubtleſs) in an honourary Senſe: As ſome of the Learned ſuppoſe, that the *Athenians* deſign'd it to ſignifie (e) *the Deity inviſible and incomprehenſible by Mortals, of whom* Joſephus *againſt* Appion *writeth, that he is knowable to us only by the Effects of his Power, but as to his Eſſence is unknowable.* As the Attribute *unknown* ſometimes ſignifieth in an honourary Senſe, ſo when any Deity was to the Pagans *Foreign, Alien, and not of their Acquaintance,* when they knew not the Name of a Deity; nor to what determinate individual Diety to attribute a Benefit or Diſaſter, (f) they ſignified ſo much by ſtiling the Deity *unknown* in an ordinary Senſe. (g) *So moſt learned Expoſitors* (ſaith a Divine of our own) *probably think that Altar which S.* Paul *found at* Athens, *had been erected upon occaſion of ſome famous Victory, whoſe procurement the Athenians not knowing by any circumſtance unto what known God it might be aſcrib'd, and hence fearing leſt by attributing it to any of thoſe Gods whom they worſhipped, the true Author of it might be wronged or neglected, they aſcrib'd it* Ignoto Deo *to the unknown God, or to an unknown God.* Theſe learned Expoſitors ſuppoſe, that the Athenians intended their Altar-Inſcription, to ſignifie in the ordinary Senſe (that the Deity to whom that Altar was erected, was to them Foreign and Incognito;) and ſo in all other Altar-Inſcriptions of like Nature, which were uſual amongſt the Pagans, as appeareth from *Pauſanias* and ſeveral other Authors (whence we read of (h) *Ara ignoti Dei,* ἀγνώστων θεῶν βωμός, *the Altar of the unknown God or Gods* in divers places, with other the like Inſcriptions) the Epithet *unknown* always ſignifieth in the ordinary Senſe. And thus all Eccleſiaſtical Writers have underſtood it to ſignifie. *Nam & Athenis ara eſt inſcripta ignotis Diis, colit ergo quis quod ignorat? There is an Altar at* Athens *inſcrib'd to the unknown Gods, doth any one Worſhip what he doth not know?* (i) ſaith *Tertullian. J. Mart.* ſaith (k) that *Socrates* (he ought to have ſaid S. *Paul*) exhorteth the *Athenians,* πρὸς θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς ἐπίγνωσιν, *to the knowledge and acknowledgment of God to them unknown.* According to *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* the Inſcription upon their Altar was θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ καὶ ξένῳ, *to an unknown and ſtrange God,* the Inſcription was, ſaith S. *Hierome* (upon *Titus*) *Diis Aſiæ, Europæ & Africæ Diis ignotis & Peregrinis. To the Gods of* Aſia, Europe *and* Africa, *the unknown and ſtrange Gods.* The Eccleſiaſtical Writers underſtand *the unknown God* in the Athenian Inſcription, to ſignifie in the ſenſe of *M. Antoninus* in *J. Mart.* (l) who ſpeaking of the thundring Legion ſaith, they pray'd θεῷ ᾧ ἐγὼ ἠγνόουν, *to a God to me unknown.* Thus it is ſaid in *Min. Fœl.* (m) *Aras extruunt etiam ignotis numinibus, they erect Altars even to unknown Gods.* (n) *Athenienſibus ignotus Deus, in Judæa notus, ſed non receptus. To the Athenians* (ſaith S. *Ambroſe*) *God was unknown; in* Judea *known, but not receiv'd.* S. *Chryſoſtom* alſo and (o) S. *Auſtin* underſtand the Epithet *unknown* in the Athenians Inſcription in the ordinary Senſe; and their mode of ſacrificing τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ, *to the God to whom theſe matters appertain,* and their βωμοὶ ἀνώνυμοι, *Altars without a Name,* as alſo the Title which the Pagans gave to the God of Hebrews, ſtiling him in *Lucan, the uncertain God,* (for an uncertain God to them was an unknown God) confirm that interpretation. Which may be further confirm'd both from an extravagant devout Humour amongſt the Pagans generally, and from the Athenians eſpecial ſuperlative Paganical Devotion together with the Effects thereof. The Heathens generally were ſo extravagantly devout, (p) that in their publick Adorations after the Invocation of particular Deities they uſually added ſome general Clauſe comprehenſive of all their Deities (*Dii Deæque omnes,*) that they might not offend any of them by ſeeming to neglect them and paſs them by. So S. *Chryſoſtom* thinketh, that the *Athenians* erected their Altar ὑπὲρ πλείονος ἀσφαλείας, *for the greater ſecurity, fearing, leſt there might be ſome other God not known to them, but worſhipp'd elſewhere, they erected an Altar to this God,* ſtiling him the unknown God. (q) One that is no Enemy to Paganiſm, will entertain no other account of this Athenian Inſcription ſave only this; *ne aliquis forſan incultus apud illos eſſet Deus, that no God might miſs of his Worſhip there.* For agreeably to the extravagant devout Humour of the Heathen in general, the Athenians are known to have been moſt exceſſively addicted to Paganical Devotion (Idolatry, Superſtition, Polytheiſm,) which cauſed an extraordinary Commotion in S. *Paul.* *Athens* was reputed (r) *the chief head of Piety,* there was nothing almoſt there, which was not ſacred (ὅλη βωμός,) the ſeveral parts into which the City was divided, were called by the Name of their Gods, and

(a) *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol.* p. 381.

(b) *Procl. Th. Plat.* l. 3. c. 7, 14.

(c) *Dicebant inviſibilem ſibi & ignotum, nomen non auſi pronunciare, ſi quando ad id compulſi, ſummâ reverentiâ, oſculato ſæpius aere & terrâ, ferè tremuli id faciebant.* Hoffman. Umbr. in Luc. p. 72.

(d) *Paræn.* p. 37.

(e) *Intell. Syſt.* p. 474. *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol.* p. 151.

(f) *Beyer. addit ad Seld.* p. 139. *Seld. de Synedr.* l. 3. c. 13. S. 1.

(g) *Dr. Jackſon Orig. of Unbelief,* c. 17.

(h) *Annot. in Min. Fœl.* p. 52. *Beyer ſupr. Voſſ. de Idol.* l. 1. c. 2.

(i) *Ad Nation.*

(k) *Apol.* 1. p. 48. *Petav. de Trin. præfat.* c. 3. S. 4.

(l) *Apol.* 2 *ſub. fin.*

(m) p. 52.

(n) *Ibid.* p. 332. in *Annot.*

(o) *C. Creſcon.* l. 1. c. 29.

(p) *Dr. Cave Life of S. Paul.* p. 77.

(q) *De Rel. Gentil.* p. 166.

(r) Τὸ μέγιστον τῆς εὐσεβείας κεφάλαιον. Phot. cod. 243. col. 1086. Dr. Hamm. of ſuperſtit. S. 11. Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p. 358. Owen Θεολογουμ. παντοδ. l. 3. c. 12.

Idols were not only in their Temples, but in the Streets and *Forum*, where (as *Thucydides* ſaith,) there were twelve Altars. This ſuperlative Paganical Devotion of the Athenians had this Effect, θεοὶ ξενικοὶ, *ſtrange Gods* (as *Heſychius* ſaith) were honoured at *Athens*. (s) *They were not more fond of novelties and ſtrange things, than apt to entertain foreign Deities*, ſaith *Strabo*. *Apollonius Tyanæus* looketh upon the Athenians erecting an Altar to an unknown God as an effect of their ſuperlative Paganical Devotion (as S. *Paul* alſo look'd upon it;) for he telleth *Timaſion*, (t) that the ſafeſt way was, to ſpeak well of the Gods, eſpecially at *Athens*, *where Altars were dedicated even to unknown Gods.* He underſtandeth this Epithet in the ordinary ſenſe; and ſo doth an honourable Perſon of our own, who ſpeaking of this Inſcription ſaith, (u) *By which immediately they fell into the Worſhip of the true God, before they were aware; for the unknown God among them was indeed the true God.* In this Senſe S. *Paul* himſelf underſtandeth and interpreteth the *Athenians* Inſcription, as manifeſtly appeareth, not only from his uſual Character of the Gentiles (*the Gentiles that know not God*,) but from his Diſcourſe to the Athenians, *Act.* 17. 23. *As I paſſed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an Altar with this Inſcription, to the unknown God.* * *Whom therefore ye worſhip not knowing, him declare I unto you.* That is, I make him known. Therefore he was unknown to the Athenians in the ordinary ſenſe; and it was no *unknowable* Deity whom *Paul* preach'd to them, nor one that they knew to be *unknowable*. Having thus aſcertain'd the common and genuin Senſe of the Athenians Inſcription, we may deduce from it theſe three remarkable Conſectaries.

(1.) The true God cannot be one of the Deities or ſupreme Deities of the Pagans Theopolity (ſpeaking of the popular Pagans Theopolity, as hitherto we have done;) for all theſe were ſufficiently well known Deities. All the Deities of the Athenians Theopolity were to them well known Deities; therefore the true God could not be one of them, whom S. *Paul* hath intituled τὸν Ἄγνωστον ἐν Ἀθήναις, *the unknown God at* Athens. And this probably was the reaſon, why the *Philopatris in Lucian*'s Works (written ſince the times of Chriſtianity) uſeth this Name, to ſignifie the ſupreme Deity.

(2.) The true God had amongſt the Pagans at ſome time and in ſome places *ſome Particles of Worſhip* given to him as to *a foreign ſtranger Deity.* For an Altar was erected to him at *Athens* as to the unknown God. And if beſides this Rite of Worſhip another was us'd amongſt the Athenians, if ſome did him Worſhip (w) by ſtretching out their hands towards Heaven (as the *Philopatris* ſeemeth to ſay,) yet if theſe Rites were all his Worſhip, this inferreth and demonſtrateth, that he was not the Deity of a Religion amongſt the Pagans, not one of their Deities, which had a full ſtated Religious Worſhip amongſt them. An Altar to an *unknown God* was probably erected upon ſome extraordinary emergence and occaſion (as the Romans upon an Earthquake appointed Religious Rites to an uncertain God,) and if ſo, he was (in a very ſlender degree) worſhipp'd at Athens (x) οὐ προηγουμένως, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περίστασιν, as the Stoicks diſtinguiſh) *not primarily and out of choice, but his worſhip was an occaſional thing, and as the Exigence of the time required.*

(3.) Some very learned Writers are doubly miſtaken; for they miſinterpret the Epithet *unknown* to an honourary Senſe (ſuppoſing it in the Athenian Inſcription to ſignifie an *inviſible* and *incomprehenſible* Deity;) and having miſinterpreted the Name they confound theſe Diſſonant things, *the unknown God at* Athens *with the Grecanic Zeus.* The Apoſtle citing *Aratus*'s *Hemiſtichium* —— τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν, (for we are his Off-ſpring,) is ſaid (y) to interpret it of the true God; which is ſuppos'd to be *a plain Scripture-acknowledgment, that by the Zeus of the Greekiſh Pagans was ſometimes at leaſt meant the true God.* (z) *Jupiter is the true God bleſſed for evermore.* If *Jupiter* is the true God, he is neceſſarily the ſame with *the unknown God at* Athens; from whence it followeth, "That the Athenians intituled their own Popular-pagan *Jupiter the unknown God*, that they were in profound ignorance of their own *Jupiter*, that they worſhipp'd him not knowing him, that they ought to have grop'd after him, that S. *Paul*'s buſineſs at *Athens* was to preach the Pagan *Jupiter*; to declare him and make him known to them, that in ſome reſpect were better acquainted with him than himſelf; that the Pagan and Pagan-Religion *Jupiter* is the great Anti-pagan Deity, the Deity of thoſe Anti-pagan Religions *Judaiſm* and Chriſtianity; that the great crime of the Gentiles was, they knew not their own *Jupiter*, nor glorified him as God, nor made him their God (the Deity of their Religious Worſhip,) nor the Deity of a Religion amongſt them; that they did not like to retain in their Knowledge their own *Jupiter*, but went a whoring after other Gods, were Aliens from him and Enemies to him (to his Laws, Life, Service, Godhead, Government and Liege-people) and extraneous to his Republick; that they impriſon'd in Unrighteouſneſs their Natural Notices of their own *Jupiter*, the true Deity of Religion, whoſe Worſhip is the Worſhip of God, whoſe Temple is the Temple of God, whoſe Prieſts are the Miniſters of God, whoſe People are the People of God, whoſe Oracles are the Oracles of God, whoſe Imperial Polity is the Kingdom of God, and who is ſuppos'd to be the holy jealous God, though all the Pagan Deities *are Good-fellows.* Can the mind of Man excogitate or entertain more portentous Conceits than theſe (and innumerable ſuch as theſe,) which muſt unavoidably follow from an irreligious confounding *Aratus*'s *Zeus* with the unknown God at *Athens* and from this bad Aſſertion, that *Jupiter is the true God bleſſed for evermore?* To Patronize this Aſſertion, the Teſtimonies of the Fathers are produc'd in great plenty (a) by the learned Author of it. But they do not reach home to the purpoſe. For although the Fathers from the Writings of the Pagans do prove their knowledge and acknowledgement of a ſupreme God, yet they do not prove, nor was it their intention, to prove, *that the ſupreme God underſtood with the Pagans ſpecific and individual determination is the true God.* Such an intention and deſign would have made the Fathers Pagans, not Chriſtians. Moreover, though ſeveral of the Fathers (agreeably to that extravagant Philoſophic-paganizing humour which very eaſily invaded the Church) *J. Mart. Clemens*, *Origen* and S. *Auſtin* do too plainly and expreſly ſay, *that the Platoniſts Acroamatical Deity* is the true God (which is deſtructive to

this

(r) Ὥσπερ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενοῦντες, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοὺς θεούς. Strabo l. 10. p. 325.

(t) *Philoſtrat. l.* 6. *c.* 2.

(u) *Sir Ch. Wolſley Reaſ. of Script. Belief. p.* 100.

* Ὃν οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, *whom therefore ye Worſhip not knowing (not knowing him.)*

(w) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 8. *c.* 2.

(x) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 14. *Schmid. Not. in Heb.* 12. 1. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 4. *p.* 172.

(y) *Intel. lect. Syſt. p.* 475.

(z) *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 7.

(a) *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 6, 25, & 75, &c.

this Hypotheſis, that the Popular-pagan *Jove* is the true God,) yet ſcarce one of the Fathers doth plainly and expreſly ſay, that the *Zeus* of the Exoterical Theology is the true God, moſt of them plainly and expreſly ſay the contrary, all of them did believe the contrary, as ſhall be prov'd preſently. In S. *Auſtin*'s Works indeed I find this ſaying; (b) *the Apoſtle when he diſcours'd to the Athenians, manifeſtly ſhew'd, that the wiſe Men of the Gentiles found out the Creator; for having ſaid, that in him we live and move and have our being, he added, as certain alſo of your own have ſaid.* But this ſaying muſt not be thought of any great regard; both becauſe it is not wiſe (for it is an unwiſe thing, to ſuppoſe the Philoſophic Pagans the Diſcoverers of the Popular-pagan *Jupiter*,) and becauſe it is contrary to S. *Auſtin*'s known and uſual Senſe, to ſuppoſe the Popular-pagan *Jove* the true God. (c) So ſome Modern learned Writers (*Grotius* and *Voſſius*) who have entertain'd this Conceit, that *Aratus*'s *Zeus is the true God*, expreſly contradict themſelves, they ſay it (d) and unſay it, which maketh their ſayings of no regard. And that this Conceit touching *Aratus's Zeus* (or the Pagan *Jupiter* in the Coſmical notion,) *that he is the true God bleſſed for evermore*, is a miſtake altogether groundleſs, will manifeſtly appear from this following Parallel of the Gentiles Caſe.

(b) *Expoſ. quarund. prop. ex. ep. ad Rom. T.* 4.

(c) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 1. *in Annot. Not. in Act* 17. 27, 28. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(d) *Grot. Not. in Act* 17. 23. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *ſub fin. ignotus diſtinctè & actu.*

The Gentiles acknowledge *a Deity* or a *ſupreme God*, as the Rabbins acknowledge a Meſſiah; and in the Gentiles Theology there are many true deſcriptive Notices and other Documents of the Deity, which ought to be interpreted of the true God, as in the Rabbins Theology there are many true Notices of the Meſſiah, which ought to be interpreted of the true Meſſiah. They that believe the true Meſſiah, muſt ſay of this Name and theſe Notices, they are all meant of him. Not as if this was the meaning of the Hebrew Doctors, but this is the meaning of their Names and Notices; for they properly denote and ſignifie him, and the Name is his honourary Name. But the Hebrew Doctors have no ſuch *diſtinct determinate meaning*, they do not determinately mean them of him, nor of any ſuch kind of Meſſiah. Unleſs they ſpeak of the Meſſiah in a general indeterminate Notion, they mean a Judaical kind of Meſſiah (but touching the Meſſiah underſtood in a general indeterminate Notion their Notices are the ſame with ours;) And if they do ſpeak of the Meſſiah in a general indeterminate Notion (without ſpecific or individual determination) they cannot mean their Name and Notices of him otherwiſe than *generally* and *indeterminately*. So the *Muhammedans* by their Name and Notion of *Paradiſe* cannot mean that which is really and materially ſuch, nor ſuch a kind of Paradiſe any otherwiſe than *generally* and *indeterminately*; which is ſo to mean it, as not to mean it, to mean it without knowing or underſtanding it. Now the Name *God*, *ſupreme God*, *Zeus*, *Jupiter*, *Dios*, (which are Synonymous) in the Heathen Doctors is in the ſame Senſe meant or not meant of him that is the true God, as the Name Meſſiah in the Hebrew Doctors is meant or not meant of him that is the true Meſſiah; or as the Name *Paradiſe* amongſt the *Muhammedans* is meant or not meant of that which is the true Paradiſe. He that believeth the Theology of the true God, muſt ſay of *thoſe Names and theſe Notices, we are the Off-ſpring of Zeus or God, and live and move and have our Being in him*, that they are all meant of him. Not as if this was the meaning of the Heathen Doctors: But this is the meaning of their Names and Notices, they properly denote and ſignifie the true God, who is *comprehenſively* and incluſively *the great Father of Nature and Vivificator of the World*, and muſt be conſider'd as ſuch without ſetting up *ſuch a mundane animative Nature kind of Deity* (a mundane or undivine kind of Divinity,) as the Heathen imagined. And as the Chriſtian Theologer diſcourſeth of the Meſſiah from a Jewiſh Author to Jewiſh Auditors, citeth the Sayings of a Rabbi touching the Meſſiah as true Notices of him, that is of Kind and Quality the true Meſſiah (which are ill applied to and underſtood of a Judaical kind of Meſſiah, but are rightly applied to and underſtood of him that is the true Meſſiah,) repreſenting him according to their own Notices, but without affirming or intending to ſay, that by the Meſſiah the Rabbi *determinately* meaneth him, that is the true Meſſiah: So the Apoſtle diſcourſeth of the Deity from an Heathen Author to Heathen Auditors, citeth the Saying of a Poet touching the Deity as a true Notice of him, that is of Kind and Quality the true God (which is ill apply'd to, and underſtood of an Heathen kind of Deity, but is rightly apply'd to and interpreted of him that is the true God,) repreſenteth him according to their own Notices, but doth not affirm, or intend to ſay, that by *God*, *the ſupreme God*, *Zeus*, *Jupiter* or *Dios* the Poet meaneth determinately him that is the true God. No Logick can infer from S. *Paul*'s interpretation of a paſſage in Aratus, *a plain Scripture-acknowledgment, that the Greekiſh Pagans did by their Zeus ſometimes mean the true God*, or that their *Jupiter is the true God bleſſed for evermore*. Is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that *a deifying Soul of the World* (which their *Zeus* or *Jupiter* is in the beſt Notion of him) is *God bleſſed for evermore*?

V. The Pagan and Anti-pagan Religioniſts do not acknowledge each others ſupreme Deity, therefore *the true God is not a ſupreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity*. This Argument is not ſo unexceptionably clear and firm, but that ſeveral objections may be rais'd againſt it, for the removal of which it is requiſite, to diſtinguiſh the occaſional Sayings of particular Perſons both from the general ſenſe of the Community, and from their own Principles of Belief and Practice. Things alſo as they were in themſelves muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from what they are, as they are ſpoken of and repreſented in the ſtile of Scripture-Writers. For as the Writers of the New Teſtament ſpeak of Old Teſtament things in New Teſtament-language: 1 *Cor.* 10. 9.
So it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe that Paganical things are ſometimes in Scripture repreſented *Heb.* 11. 26.
and related in the Holy-popular ſtile, all People naturally ſpeaking in their own ſtile. *Gen.* 39. 3. *Joſeph's Maſter ſaw, that the Lord was with him, and that the Lord made all that he did to proſper in his hand. Adoni-bezek*'s acknowledgment of the Juſtice of Providence ſeemeth, to have ſomething of the Holy-popular ſtile in it. *Judg.* 1. 7. *Adoni-bezek ſaid, threeſcore and ten Kings having their Thumbs and their great Toes cut off, gathered meat under my Table: as I have done, ſo God hath requited me.* The Proclamation of King *Cyrus* was either written Originally in, or afterwards was put into the Holy-popular ſtile; for it is evident beyond all contradiction, that

the Stile of it is Holy-popular and Anti-pagan, diametrically oppoſite to the very Pagan Polytheiſm; *Ezra* 1. 2, 3. *Thus ſaith* Cyrus *King of* Perſia, *The Lord God of Heaven hath given me all the Kingdoms of the Earth, and he hath charged me, to build him an Houſe at* Jeruſalem, *which is in* Judah. *Who is there among you of all his People? his God be with him, and let him go up to* Jeruſalem *which is in* Judah, *and build the Houſe of the Lord God of* Iſrael, *He is the God*; which is to acknowledge him the true and only God. It may be ſuppos'd, that *Cyrus* and ſome other Inſtances of like nature were not meer Heathens, that they made an approach to the Holy-popular State, at leaſt in a lucid Interval, which was (doubtleſs) the caſe of the great *Nebuchadnezzar.* But thoſe Learned Pagans *Themiſtius* and *Symmachus* (of which the former was really a Perſon of great Moderation, *Gr. Nazianzen*'s Friend and *Theodoſius*'s Favourite) do not appear to have made any approach to the Holy-popular State; but being Politick Men and deſigning to gain their Point (a Toleration for Paganiſm) they invented a Plea accommodate for their purpoſe; *That the ſeveral Parties of Religioniſts worſhip one and the ſame Supreme God* (all agreeing in the acknowledgment of one Supreme, one Prince of the Univerſe, one governing Mind or Providence) *that the diverſities of his Religious Worſhip are wholly indifferent*, *and that* (in reſpect of his ſpecific or individual Determination) *He is wholly unknown. Themiſtius* pretendeth, (*e*) *That the Prince of the Univerſe is delighted with this variety of worſhip*; *He would have the* Syrians (or Chriſtians) *to religionize one way*, *the* Greeks *another*, *and the* Egyptians *another. Symmachus* pleadeth, (*f*) *It is reaſon to think, that what all Worſhip is one and the ſame*; *we all behold the ſame Stars, have the ſame Heaven in common, the ſame World involveth us. What matter is it, by what methods of Prudence every one ſeeketh the Truth? By one only way there is no coming at ſo groat a Secret.* But before the *Roman* Empire became Chriſtian (while Chriſtianity was under the Hatches) Paganiſm did not talk at this rate; the Sayings of theſe Authors are not the Senſe of the Community of the Pagans, nor the Principles of their Belief and Practice as Pagan Religioniſts; but they are occaſional Sayings and politick Fetches, to ſerve a Deſign. Nor ought we to think, that this is the true Supreme God which theſe *Mundane Syſtem Theiſts* acknowledge; for it is nothing better than *a Godleſs-kind of God*, not a Supreme Deity of our Specific Determination. They groſly impoſe upon themſelves, or ſeek to impoſe upon others in over-looking the ſpecific and individual Determination of the Supreme Deity, as if a Supreme Deity could exiſt without it, or as if it was wholly unknown. (*g*) *How can I believe you* (ſaith S. *Ambroſe*) *who acknowledge that you know not what you worſhip?* But agreeably to theſe Pagans and on a like Deſign, a ſuppos'd Jewiſh Proſelyte, *Ariſtæus* in *Joſephus*, that he might procure from *Ptolomee Philadelph* liberty for the Jews to return to their own Country, thus pleadeth with him on their behalf: (*h*) *For both they Jews and we Greeks do worſhip the God that conſtituted all things, fitly calling him* Zene *or* Zeus, *becauſe he inſpireth Life into all:* But this occaſional Saying (agreeably whereunto (*i*) a ſuppoſititious *Ariſtobulus* diſcourſeth) is not agreeable to a Jewiſh Proſelyte's Principles of Belief and Practice, nor to the Senſe of the Community of the Jewiſh Church: It is a politick Pretenſion, accommodate to ſerve a Deſign, and as accommodate to the Humour of *Joſephus*, a known Flatterer of the Pagans.

Some of theſe Anſwers that we give to *Joſephus*'s *Ariſtæus*, are alſo an Anſwer to another Objection againſt our Argument from the Sayings of the Modern Rabbins; for theſe alſo ſay, (*k*) that *the Gentiles worſhipp'd the true Supreme God* together with his Subordinate Miniſters; but this their Saying is not agreeable to the Senſe of the Jewiſh Church, nor to the Principles of their own Belief and Practice; beſides, they ſay it, and gainſay it, as the Humour taketh them, or as may beſt ſerve their turn, and commonly their Sayings are none of the wiſeſt. They generally ſay, (*l*) *that in proceſs of time, till* Abraham *was born* (*the Pillar of the World and our Father*) *the venerable and terrible Name was loſt* מפי ומדעת *out of the Mouth and out of the knowledge of all Men, and they did not acknowledge it.* They ſuppoſe therefore, that the Gentiles in the elder times (and in after-times they did not amend their Manners) were not Worſhippers of the true God. If the Jews of old had thought them ſuch, if they had ſuppos'd, that the *Capitoline Jupiter* (in any Notion under which the *Romans* worſhipp'd him) was *the true Jehovah*, they might with great ſatisfaction have paid *their Temple-tribute to the Capitol at* Rome, as *Veſpaſian* order'd it: The Emperour *Adrian* would ſcarce have provok'd them to a Rebellion by erecting *a Temple to Jove* in the place where their former Temple ſtood. Had they but diſtinguiſh'd the ſeveral Pagan Notions of *Jove*, and pitch'd upon the beſt (rejecting the other) which is the Coſmical or that of *Aratus*, it is ſuppos'd, that they had pitch'd upon the true God. In this Notion therefore they might and ought to have own'd *Jove* for the true *Jehovah*, and *Jupiter Olympius* for the *God of Heaven*, which would have gone a great way to ſave them harmleſs in the times of *Antiochus Epiphanes*; but for want of underſtanding an happy diſtinction the Church of the Jews (*thoſe that knew their God*) ſuffer'd a tragical Perſecution. They thought none of the Heathen Deities were real, and therefore ſome Heathens accounted them Atheiſts, ſuch as ſay, there are no Gods (as *Ariſtides* in *Photius* (*m*) reproacheth them;) and thoſe of them that liv'd at *Rome* could not be believ'd upon their Oath, when they ſware by *the Capitoline Jupiter* (ſirnam'd the Thunderer) therefore the Pagans thought it requiſite, that they ſhould ſwear by their own God, neither Jews nor Pagans ſuppoſing, that the *Paganical Jove* was the *Iſraelitical Jehovah.*

(*n*) *Ecce negas, juraſque mihi per Templa Tonantis,*
*Non credo, jura Verpe per * Anchialum.*

As the Jews ſometimes, ſo the Primitive Chriſtians uſually were charg'd with Atheiſm by the Pagan Religioniſts; the common cry in the Amphitheatres was αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους, *away with the Atheiſts.* And the Chriſtian Apologiſts are ſo far from denying the Charge, that they acknowledge themſelves Atheiſts (*o*) with reſpect to the

(c) *Orat.* 12.

(f) *Æquum eſt, quicquid omnes colunt, unum putari: eadem ſpectamus Aſtra; commune Cœlum eſt; Idem nos mundus involvit: Quid intereſt, qua quiſque prudentia Verum inquirat? uno Itinere non poteſt perveniri ad tam grande ſecretum.* L. 10. Ep. 54.

(g) *Quomodo poſſum vobis credere, qui fatemini vos ignorare quod colitis?* S. Ambr. l. 5. Ep. 31.

(h) Τὸν γὰρ ἅπαντα συστησάμενον Θεὸν καὶ οὗτοι καὶ ἡμεῖς σεβόμεθα, Ζῆνα καλοῦντες αὐτὸν, ἐτοίμως ἀπὸ τοῦ σύμπασιν ἐμφύειν τὸ ζῆν τὴν ἐπίκλησιν αὐτοῦ νοήσαντες. *Grot. Not. in Act.* 17. 27.

(u) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 13. *c.* 12.

(k) *Intell. Syſt. p.* 457, *&c.*

(l) *Maimon. de Idol. c.* 1. *S.* 5.

(m) *Cod.* 248. *ſub fin.*

(n) *Martial. l.* 11. *Ep.* 95.

* *Id eſt per Elohim Hebræorum. v. Scalig. de emend. Temp. in Append. Harmenop. in Plin. l.* 5. *c* 27.

(o) *J. Mart. Apol.* 2 *p.* 56.

νομιζόμενοι θεοὶ, reputed Heathen Deities univerſally and without exception. (*p*) They pretend not to worſhip any of the ſame Gods with them, expreſly and in terms they diſavow the Worſhip of *Jove* without any diſtinction or limitation, which they could not have done without the Conſcience of Atheiſm and of Blaſphemy, if they had ſuppos'd, that the *Zeus* or *Jove* of the Exoterical Theology is in any Notion of him the true God. (*q*) *Nec Romani habemur, quia non Romanorum Deum colimus*; *we are not counted* Romans, *becauſe we worſhip not the God of the* Romans, ſaith *Tertullian.* (*r*) *Deum tangimus, & cum miſericordiam extorſerimus, Jupiter honoratur: We move God to ſhew mercy* (by our Prayers in Droughts and other publick Calamities) *and* Jupiter *getteth the praiſe.* (*s*) *Quid aliter feciſſet Ethnicus, qui Jovem Deum credidit? would an Heathen have done otherwiſe, who believ'd* Jupiter *to be God?* (*t*) *Why is the mention of our Name ſo horrid to you, if we worſhip the ſame God with you? that our God is not* Jove, *is plain from the Anger of your Gods againſt us.* Theſe Sayings of the Chriſtian Apologiſts are of the greater Remark, becauſe they are not occaſional (for the ſerving an Hypotheſis or Deſign, as many are in *Clemens Stromata*) they ſpeak the Senſe of the Community of Chriſtians, they are the Principles of their Faith and Practice, and upon theſe Principles (for refuſing the worſhip of *Jove* in any of the Pagans Notion of him) the Martyrs laid down their lives. None of the Chriſtian Theiſts dareth to worſhip the Pagan *Jove* as the true Supreme God; though ſome of them have fallen into miſtakes in Speculation (through the difficulty and intricacy that is in this Theory) and though all of them ſpeak not as *Origen*, yet all of them believe and live, as *Origen* ſpeaketh, (*u*) *we will rather undergo any Torment, than confeſs* Jupiter *to be God.* For ſuch a Deity is of this Specific Determination, a Pagan and Pagan-religion kind of Deity, and ſuch Theiſm is Pagan-kind of Theiſm, incompetible to any genuine and legitimate Theiſt, conſtitutive and characteriſtical of a Pagan-kind of Theiſt; as in the elder times of Judaiſm when *Baal, Moloch, Milchom,* was reputatively the Supreme Deity, to confeſs ſuch a reputed Deity to be God (meaning thereby either a diſtinct Deity from the God of *Iſrael*, or confounding him with the God of *Iſrael*) muſt neceſſarily conſtitute a Pagan-kind of Theiſt. (*w*) *Light hath nothing in common with Darkneſs*, not a God in common. Therefore the Pagan Polytheiſm was *a paſſing by* the true God, as *Prudentius* telleth his Pagan Adverſary in another caſe.

Tu me præterito meditaris numina mille.

As no genuine Jew or Chriſtian Theiſt acknowledgeth any one of the Heathen Deities; ſo no meer Heathen can acknowledge the Deity of theſe Anti-pagan Religioniſts; for if he did, he would be no meer Heathen. A meer Heathen muſt either deny him and explode him, or if he doth diſtinctly and determinately acknowledge him in any wiſe, he muſt account him one of his Paganical Deities; but ſuch an acknowledgment of him the Anti-pagan Religioniſts do not count an acknowledgment of their God. *Celſus* (who is not wanting in devout acknowledgments of the Heathen Deities) wholly denieth him and explodeth him; (*x*) *jeereth at the Jews Altiſſimus, moſt High*, preſaging how ill the *Romans* were likely to fare, if relinquiſhing their ancient Rites they ſhould receive his Worſhip, whoſe People having promiſes of great things, and hoping for the Dominion of the World, were left deſtitute of Houſe and Land. Of the Platoniſts Supreme Deity he ſaith, (*y*) the Jewiſh Nation *knew not the great God.* Of the Chriſtians Supreme Deity he ſaith, (*z*) *Like Father like Son.* (*a*) *Nonne Romani ſine veſtro Deo imperant, regnant, fruuntur orbe toto, veſtrique dominantur? Do not the* Romans (ſaith *Cæcilius*) *without your God rule, reign, enjoy the World, and Dominion over you?* But the Learned *Varro* did not thus rudely explode the God of the Hebrews; he ſo far acknowledgeth him, as to make him one of his Paganical Deities; for he is of Opinion, (*b*) that the God of the Hebrews is the ſame with (the higheſt Deity of his Acquaintance) *the Capitoline Jove* in the beſt Notion of him, which is that of *Aratus.* S. *Auſtin* himſelf in anſwer to that uſual demand of the Pagans, *Quis iſte Deus eſt? who is that God that ought alone to be worſhipp'd?* maketh anſwer; *Ipſe eſt Deus quem Varro doctiſſimus Romanorum Jovem putat, quamvis neſciens quid loquatur: He is the God, whom* Varro *the moſt Learned of the* Romans *thinketh* Jove, *although not knowing what he ſaith.* And thus he bewaileth *Varro*'s Infelicity. (*c*) *The Supreme Deity or the true God (for the true God is not the Soul of the World, but the maker of Soul) thy ſo learned and ingenious Soul could by no means arrive at. Clemens* ſaith (not without miſtake) of the Father of the Peripateticks, (*d*) *Not underſtanding the Supreme Father, he ſuppoſeth the Soul of the World to be God. Him I pronounce moſt extremely impious*, ſaith *Euſebius*, (*e*) *that ſaith the Parts of the World are the Members of God*; *Him much more, that affirmeth God and the World to be one and the ſame thing*; and laſtly, τὸν ἡγούμενον τοῦ κόσμου νοῦν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸν, *Him that ſuppoſeth the Mind of the World, to be the Opificer of all things.* (*f*) The Apoſtate *Julian* is not ſo reſpectful to the God of the Hebrews as the Learned *Varro*; for although in an humour he pretendeth, to worſhip *the God of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob *the greateſt and moſt potent God* (he ſaith it, and ſweareth it alſo:) yet in another humour he maketh the God of the Hebrews nothing higher than one of his *Topical Preſidentiary Deities*; yet is not unwilling to ſuppoſe him *the next and immediate Opificer of the World* in the Platonic Notion. Whatever his Exteriour Pretenſions were, his Interiour Sentiments are evident from his Character; for being an Apoſtate Pagan Theiſt, he either thought the God of the Hebrews no Deity, or one of the Pagan Deities. Being an Apoſtate Pagan Platoniſt, he either thought the God of the Hebrews no Deity, or one of the Platonic Syſtem of Deities, amongſt which Platonic Deities *the next and immediate Opificer of the World* is of a Rank below the Supreme Deity. (*g*) The grave and judicious *Plutarch* is far more out in his Notices of the God of the Hebrews than *Varro* or *Julian*; becauſe the Jews were notoriouſly addicted to Drunkenneſs (as they are at this day) revelling

(p) *Ibid. p.* 68.

(q) *Tertul. Apol. c.*24.

(r) *Ibid. c.* 40.

(s) *Idem de Idol. c.* 21.

(t) *Quid ut ominis peſſimi, noſtri nominis inhorreſcitis mentione, ſi quem Deum colitis, eum & nos? quem Jovem non eſſe, ipſis clarum eſt indignationibus numinum.* Arnob. c. Gent. l. 1. p. 19.

(u) Πᾶσαν αἰκίαν ὑπομένειν μᾶλλον αἱρούμεθα, ἢ τὸν Δία ὁμολογῆσαι Θεόν. *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 262.

(w) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 7.

(x) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 423, 424.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 5. *p.* 259.

(z) *Ibid. l.* 7. *p* 355, 358.

( ) *Min. Fæl. p.* 105.

(b) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 19. *c.* 22. *de Conſenſ. Evangel. l.* 1. *c.* 22.

(c) *Anima tua tam docta & ingenioſa ad Deum ſummum (Deus enim verus non Anima, ſed Animæ eſt effector & conditor) nullo modo potuit pervenire.* De C. D. l. 4. c. 31. l. 7. c. 5.

(d) Οὐ νοήσας τὸν πατέρα τὸν καλούμενον ὕπατον, τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ψυχὴν θεὸν ὑπολαμβάνων. Προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 33.

(e) *Pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 10.

(f) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 10. *p.* 354. *l.* 4. *p.* 142.

(g) *V. Cunæum de Rep. Hebr. l.* 2. *c.* 24.

upon the Sabbath, *Plutarch* entertain'd a Conceit, that the God whom they worſhipp'd was *Bacchus*, and that their Sabbath had its Name from *Sabi*, a word which was uſual in the Feaſts of *Bacchus*. Some other Paganical Conceits of like nature touching the God of the Hebrews will occurr preſently.

VI. If a Supreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity *is the true God*, or (which is the ſame thing) if God is a Supreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity, then God is *the Mundane or Paganomundane Empire's Imperial Eſtate*; but if this Hypotheſis be falſe (as we have plainly demonſtrated) God cannot be a Supreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity. The difference between the Pagan and Anti-pagan Theology is a Diſpute between two pretending *Wholes or Catholic Syſtems*, *the Church* (or the Kingdom of God) *and the World*. Both Theologies have the ſame Notion of a City, Polity and Kingdom; both agree touching the Rules and Meaſures of Duty to the whole, and both agree, that there is a Catholic Syſtem, which is the City and Kingdom of God. But theſe Attributes the Pagan Theology appropriateth to *the World*, the Chriſtian Theology appropriateth them to the Church. The Diſpute between theſe two Theologies, (h) *de intelligentia veri Dei, touching the underſtanding the true God*, is really a Diſpute, to which of theſe two Catholic Syſtems the true Supreme God belongeth? Both Theologies agree, that He cannot belong to both theſe Catholic Syſtems; for they are ſuch pretending Catholic Syſtems, that are manifeſtly inconſiſtent. The Pagans Catholic Syſtem ſhutteth out of Being *the Holy Empire*, the Church of God. And the Hypotheſis of this Holy Empire is of a ruinous nature to their Whole or Catholic Syſtem, to the Supreme Deity of their Theopolity, to their native ſtate of Mankind (for they ſuppoſe, that Pagan Mankind are (i) God's Societiſts, Fellow-Citizens, Domeſticks and Sons) to their Duty unto their Whole, to their Bravery and Virtue, and to their Inſtitution thereof. (k) *All good Inſtitution* (ſay they) *is compris'd in this; in conjoyning one's ſelf with the Whole, in willing to be wholly univerſaliz'd, not to make a Diſcerption of one's ſelf from the Whole, and circumſcribing one's ſelf into a parvitude and nullity, to be repugnant to the Univerſe, willing the Univerſe to be obſequious to a part of ſuch Vilities.* An appearance there is of a ſublime and generous Sentiment in this Abridgment of the Philoſophic Pagans Inſtitution of Virtue; but it is founded upon a falſe imaginary ſtate of the Univerſe. Upon this they founded their Rules of Active and Paſſive Virtue; (l) *to have ſuch Citizenſhip with the Gods and Men, as neither to complain of them for any thing, nor be condemn'd by them; always and in all things to obey the City-Law; for one little Shank* (ſaith *Epictetus*) *wilt thou find fault with the World? wilt thou not ſurrender it to the Whole?* (m) *Man is part of a City, the City which conſiſteth of God's and Men, (as the Foot is part of an Humane Body) and muſt conflict with Poverty and Danger, be ſick and die* ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅλου, *for the whole.* Some of them thought it ſuch a Bravery, to be a Coſmopolite (a Citizen of the whole) that they would be initiated into all Paganical Religions; others of them religiouſly obſerv'd the Rites of all ſuch Religions, making their own Religion (what the Stoicks (n) call the World) τὸ παμμιγὲς, *a Meſs of all together*; for *Marinus* ſaith of *Proclus*; *that moſt Religious Man uſually ſaid*, (o) *That a Philoſopher ſhould not only be a religious obſerver of the Inſtitutes of ſome one City, or the Country-rites of a few; but he ſhould be in common a Prieſt of the Sacra of the whole World.* Such is their Catholic Syſtem, not the Catholic Church, but the grand oppoſite thereto the Paganomundane Empire, of which the true God cannot be the Imperial Eſtate. Paganiſm can no more admit of ſuch a Deity for its Imperial Eſtate, than it can admit of ſuch an holy Polity or Monarchic Syſtem as the Church or Kingdom of God (according to Chriſtianity;) for He is the Kingdom of God-kind of Imperial Eſtate, and may be denominated *The Kingdom of God-kind of God.*

VII. There is nothing in Paganiſm ſo like to the true God as *the Popular-pagan Jupiter in the Coſmical Notion*; from whence it followeth, that there is nothing more unlike the true God than that Clandeſtine, hidden and unpopular Deity, the Platoniſts *Hen or T'Agathon*; of which a competently good account hath been given already; but becauſe ſeveral of the Fathers have ſuppos'd, that this Platonic Principle is the true God, and this is a matter that nearly concerneth the Theory of the Chriſtian Trinity, therefore we will make ſome additional Remarks touching this Deity.

Remark I.

This Platonic Supreme Deity is *Idiotically Philoſophic* (or Unpopular) and never was, nor ever can be any *People's* Deity, as the true God is. If Philoſophers will have ſuch a Deity, they muſt have him alone, appropriate to themſelves and their Schools, according to a celebrated Saying of *Plato* in his *Timæus*. (p) *It is a difficulty to find out the Opificer and Father of this Univerſe; and when he is found out, it is impoſſible to declare Him to the generality of Men.* Whether this Saying is meant of *Plato*'s Supreme Deity, (q) as *Origen* and *Celſus* underſtand it; or of ſome other of his Deities, (as the moſt and beſt of the Platoniſts underſtand it;) there can be no doubt, but that his Supreme Deity is of this Character, *He is wholly an Unpopular-kind of Deity*, as this celebrated Saying repreſenteth him. But although the Saying is manifeſtly abſur'd, becauſe the true God is certainly no ſuch Deity, (r) yet *Origen* thinketh it generous, and *Clemens* ſuppoſeth, that *Plato* ſpake thus of God, (s) *becauſe he had heard, that when* Moſes *aſcended the Mountain by holy Contemplation, he forbad all the People to go up with him. Minucius Fœlix* having applauded *Plato* for *his plain and clear Speeches of God* (whereas nothing can be more obſcure and unintelligible than his Deity) citeth this Saying in the *Timæus*, and parallels therewith the Religion of Chriſtians. (t) *Those things are almoſt the ſame with ours; for we*

also

(h) Oroſ. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 1.

(i) Sen. Ep. 94. Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 24. l. 1. c. 9.

(k) Συνεκτικὸν δὲ ὅτι τοῦτο πάσης εὐαγωγίας, τὸ συντάττειν ἑαυτὸν τοῖς ὅλοις, καὶ θέλειν ὅλον εἶναι μετ' ἐκείνων, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅλου ἀποσπῶντα, καὶ εἰς μικρὸν καὶ οὐδὲν περιγράφοντα, ἀντιτείνειν τοῖς ὅλοις, καὶ βούλεσθαι καὶ τὰ ὅλα τῷ οὕτως εὐτελῶν μέρει ἀκολουθεῖν. Simplic. in Epict. Ench. c. 78.

(l) Θεοῖς τε καὶ ἀνθρώποις οὕτω συμπολιτεύεσθαι, ὡς μήτε μέμφεσθαί τι αὐτοῖς, μήτε καταγινώσκεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν. M. Ant. l. 10. S. 1. Ἀεὶ τῷ νόμῳ τῆς πόλεως πείθεσθαι ἐν παντί. Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 24. Δι' ἓν σκελύδριον τῷ κόσμῳ ἐγκαλεῖς; οὐκ ἐπιδώσεις αὐτὸ τοῖς ὅλοις; Ibid. l. 1. c. 12.

(m) Epict. Diſſ. l. 2. c. 5.

(n) M. Ant. l. 11. §. 48.

(o) Ὅτι τὸν φιλόσοφον προσήκει, οὐ μιᾶς τινος πόλεως, οὐδὲ τῶν παρ' ἐνίοις πατρίων εἶναι θεραπευτήν· κοινῇ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου κόσμου ἱεροφάντην. In Vit. Procl. ſub fin.

(p) Τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον, καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν.

(q) l. 7. p. 360.

(r) Ibid.

(s) Str. l. 5. p. m.

(t) Eadem ferè & iſta quæ noſtra ſunt. nam & Deum *vimus, & parentem omnium dicimus, & nunquam publice niſi interrogati prædicamus* P. 144, 145.

alſo know God, and call him the Parent of the Univerſe; and never publickly declare him, unleſs we be queſtion'd. From which Saying of a Chriſtian Apologiſt (and many other like Inſtances) it is manifeſt, that the elder times of the Church were guilty of unskilful tampering with the Chriſtian Religion, to accommodate it to the Sentiments of the School of *Plato.* For what can be more Unchriſtian than this Platonic-kind of Chriſtianiſm, *never to ſpeak of God publickly unleſs queſtion'd!* And in this Apologiſt *Plato*'s applauded Saying is thus rendred; *in publicum dicere impoſſibile eſt, it is impoſſible to declare God publickly:* Whereas all Mankind have their natural Notices of the true God, and the light of the true knowledge of God (true Piety) is indiſpenſably and univerſally neceſſary, and ought to be as publick as the Light of the Sun, and Chriſtians are bound to do their beſt, to make it ſo. The Rabbins (that are Acroamatical Theologers, yet) ſay; (u) *ſummè neceſſarium eſt, at the higheſt rate it is neceſſary, that this Doctrine be diffus'd amongſt the Vulgar, and Children be initiated in it, that God is one, and that no other is to be worſhipped but He alone.* So the Pagan Theologers ought to have begun their Number-Theology, not like Mathematicians from a Point or an Arithmetical Unite, but like Theiſts, *from one God*, who is the true Unite, the oppoſite to the Polytheiſts number. (w) *Duo enim non ſunt, quod pertineat propriè ad numeri retractatum; for there are not two Gods, which would be Number and Multitude.* But inſtead of *one God* the old Metaphyſical Theologers ſubſtituted *a meer Henotety or Unite-Nature*, that is nothing but *Ipſum Unum*, which none have reaſon to concern themſelves about, ſave only they that philoſophize (ſpeculate the World of Platonic Intelligibles) which can be of no concern to the unphiloſophic generality of Mankind, and that is ſuch a *Super-metaphyſical Tranſcendental*, to which the People can make no approach, nor the Metaphyſicians themſelves otherwiſe than by blind methods of Enthuſiaſm. (x) *Plato ſaith of his Supreme God, as* Apuleius *affirmeth, that it is He alone, who cannot by the Poor nothing of Humane Language be in the leaſt meaſure comprehended in any Speech; ſcarce to the Wiſe Men, when by the vigour of the Mind they have removed themſelves as far as may be from the Body, the Perception of this God* (appeareth) *as a candid Light with a moſt rapid Brightneſs, and that ſometimes as ſhining in the midſt of deepeſt Darkneſs.*

REMARK 2.

This Supreme Deity is *Idiotically Philoſophic* in a ſecond Senſe, as *Philoſophic* is oppos'd to *Religious*; for it never was, nor can be *a Deity of Religion*, as the true God is. The Deity muſt be worſhipp'd (y) Νόμῳ πόλεως, *according to the Law of our City*, and κτ̀ τὰ πάτρια, *according to the Inſtitutes of our Country*, (as the Pagan Theologers agree;) therefore ſuch an Acroamatical Unpopular kind of Deity, which City-Laws and Country-Inſtitutes can have no acquaintance with (which yet *Numa* might have reſpect to in ſome of his Inſtitutes) could never be *a Deity of Religion.* Religion is the Duty and Intereſt of the Publick, the common concern of Mankind and of all Societies of Men; ſuch a Deity therefore *that cannot be publickly declar'd*, can never be *a Deity of Religion.* Mankind are not thought to be under any Law or Obligation, to be Religious to this kind of Deity, *to know him, ſerve and obey him*; for which reaſon it was, that *Plato* made no mention of him in *his Book of Laws* or his *Epinomis*, and not for that fooliſh reaſon which *Joſephus* imagineth, (z) *That the Greek Philoſophers had right Apprehenſions concerning God, but durſt not ſpeak them out.* The generality of Mankind have no Notices at all of this Deity, following their natural Notices they deny his Exiſtence; for (as the Chalday Oracles obſerve) *all Mankind ſuppoſe, that Mind or Intellect is the firſt and ſupreme Deity*, ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν πατρικὴν ὑπεροχήν, *not knowing the Eminence of the Father* (ſaith *Pſellus*;) therefore this Deity cannot be a Deity of Natural Religion. Nor was he ever, or is now, the Deity of any Religion Pagan or Anti-pagan; and not being the Imperial Eſtate of a Religion (although the Platoniſts aſcribe to him βασιλείαν τῶν ὄντων, a Kingdom or Headſhip over their *Entia*,) he is not ſo much as a counterfeit reſemblance of that Imperial Eſtate which the true God is. Nor doth he pretend to any thing like a Religion or God-ſervice; (a) for *Temples, Sacrifices, Solemn Invocations, Hymns of Praiſe, all Material Worſhip, all External Worſhip, all Publick Worſhip* (as the chief of the Platoniſts ſay) are incompetible to this Metaphyſical Super-tranſcendental. One that is his Devotioniſt muſt (b) ὁμιλῆσαι τῷ ἀγαθῷ μόνῳ μόνος, *ſolitarily converſe with the ſolitary T'Agathon*; and an aſpire after Union with this Principle is (c) φυγὴ μόνου πρὸς μόνον, *the flight of a ſolitary one to the ſolitary one.* His Philoſophic Devotioniſts exerciſe a rapturous Love (which is ſtiled (d) ἐρωτικὴ μανία, *amatorious Madneſs*;) but will allow no ſuch thing as Fear; for as the Oracles ſay, (e) πατὴρ οὐ φόβον ἐνθρώσκει, *The Father doth not cauſe Fear. Not being the cauſe of Evil to any, to make him fearful, He is belov'd by all* (ſaith *Pletho*;) therefore the impious Heathens were *no haters* of this kind of Deity. Had they known him, there is no cauſe imaginable, why they ſhould not *like to retain him in their knowledge:* but the generality of them not knowing him at all, this could not be the God, *whom they did not like to retain in their knowledge.* Nor could this be the *unknown God at* Athens; for that was a Deity *declarable to the People by preaching*, this is *undeclarable* and not to be preach'd to the People. The Athenian Philoſophers were no Acquaintance of that *unknown God*; but the Principal of them were the great Intimates of this, and his *Hierophantæ*, ſo far as he is capable of any. That *unknown God* is the σέβασμα, *the worſhip of Religion objectively*; ſcarce any thing of Religious Worſhip (not ſo much as an Altar at *Athens*) is competible to this Arcane Deity.

REMARK 3.

This Supreme Deity is not only an *Idiotically Philoſophic*, but an *Idiotically Platonic Deity*, peculiar to the School of the *Platoniſts* and *Pythagoreans*, which cannot be ſuppos'd to have inclos'd and monopoliz'd the true God, nor can it be ſuppos'd, that the other Philoſophers were Atheiſts, who rejected this Platonic Monad, affirming, that Mind (or Intellect) was the firſt and higheſt Principle. If *Proclus* (f) and *Apuleius* (g) ſay true, Plato's *Theology and Sect* inveſtigated this Deity, which was certainly excogitated by ſubtil Metaphyſical Theologers, who agreeably to their faculty invented a Deity more thin and ſubtil and leſs ſolid than *Epicurus*'s monogrammous Deities. Excogitating this Deity they robb'd the Metaphyſicians *Ens* of two of its Attributes, *Unum & Bonum* (one and good,) but they omitted the third, *Verum* (or True,) which they have degraded unto a ſecond Nature. And the reaſon of their omiſſion is plain; for if they had conjoin'd *Verum* with *Unum & Bonum*, they muſt have made their *firſt Principle* an object of Underſtanding and Science; whereas now it is ſo highly elevated a Principle, that they ſay of it, (*h*) *ſupereminet genus intelligibile, eſt igitur Ente ſuperius, it ſurmounteth the intelligible kind, and is therefore beyond Ens.* But if it is *no Entity*, *no Eſſence*, *no Verity*, it can be no true reality, and therefore is but a Figment. Which alſo appeareth from the Queſtion between the Platoniſts and the other Philoſophers thus rightly ſtated. (*i*) *Whether beyond Soul-Nature and beyond Intellectual Nature there is not a third kind of incorporeal Nature* (or Subſtance,) *which is Un-intellectual, Super-intellectual, meer Henotety, Unity and Indiſtinction?* They that deny it, have great reaſon on their ſide; for to the Intellectual Nature the ſupreme Guidance and Government of all things manifeſtly belongeth (which ſheweth, that there can be no higher incorporeal Nature;) and if there may be an higher kind of incorporeal Nature or Subſtance than the Intellectual, there muſt be ſome Perfection incompetible to the Intellectual Nature: But all poſſible Perfection (Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs, Holineſs, the Life Divine) is competible to the Intellectual Nature; there can be therefore no higher kind of Incorporeal Nature. On the contrary, the Platoniſts (*k*) alledge divers Reaſons (without any ſound Reaſon,) to prove, *that Intellect, Intellection and Knowledge* cannot belong to the firſt and higheſt Principle. Which is ſo monſtrous a Paradox, that the Platoniſt *Simplicius* rejecteth it, and a learned Abettor of the Platonic Theiſm thus deſcanteth upon it. (*l*) *Shall we ſay, that the firſt Hypoſtaſis or Perſon in the Platonic Trinity is* ἄνους, *and* ἄλογος, *ſenſleſs and irrational, and altogether devoid of Mind and Underſtanding? Would not this be to introduce a certain kind of myſterious Atheiſm?* Doubtleſs ſuch an unintellectual kind of Deity is a grand abſurdity: But if ſuch a Deity muſt be exploded, what will become of the Platonic Triad? And of the 'Εμπεριχώρησις, *Circuminſeſſion of the Perſons of it*, (*m*) which is explain'd by ſuppoſing *the firſt Archical Hypoſtaſis unintellectual?* Is it not far better, that the learned Abettors of Platonic Theiſm ſhould throughly contradict it and abandon it, rather than contradict themſelves in maintaining it? And it is abandon'd at a great rate by ſuppoſing with *Simplicius*, (*n*) *that the firſt and higheſt Principle is not devoid of Wiſdom, but hath the moſt perfect Knowledge*; for according to this Hypotheſis this ſublime Principle is *Intellect* (νοῦν γὰρ δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἵνα νοῇ, (*o*) *for it muſt be Intellect, or it cannot underſtand*) not a pure Tranſcendental to Mind and Intellect; not a Divinity of Nature becauſe it is tranſcendental to intellectual Nature; not the firſt in the Number-kind of Theology, but Multitude and Number; not a Myſtic-Metaphyſical firſt Nature devoid of all Multiplicity, Duplicity, Form, Species and Idea; the Hypotheſis of the Anti-platonic Philoſophers is the true Hypotheſis, that Mind and Intellect is the firſt and higheſt Principle; and there are not theſe three Ranks of ſubordinate incorporeal Natures, *Soul-Nature*, *Intellectual-Nature*, and the *Unity*. All the Platoniſts Notices of it, Diſputes about it, Modes of honouring it, and Methods of enjoying it, would be Nonſenſe, if this Deity was *Intellectual Nature*: Nor could he be an Acroamatical and purely Platonic kind of Deity, if he was eaſily intelligible *Intellectual Nature*: To ſuppoſe him ſuch, is ruinous to the Platonic Trinity; for it deſtroyeth one of the three incorporeal Natures; the ground of introducing the firſt Archical Hypoſtaſis (which is introduc'd upon this ground, becauſe, there muſt be a pure ſimple Monad before Multitude and Intellect;) and 'tis a jumbling into one Hypoſtaſis what is conſtitutive and diſtinctive of two, whereby one Archical Hypoſtaſis is neceſſarily loſt. For ſo it fareth with *Simplicius* in his account of the Deity (*p*) becauſe he attributeth to the firſt Hypoſtaſis *a moſt perfect Knowledge* and therefore an intellectual Nature (which no genuin Platonic Triadiſt ever did,) he is neceſſitated wholly to omit and leave out *the ſecond Hypoſtaſis*, contenting himſelf with two Hypoſtaſes and two Natures; the one *Moveable* (which is Soul-Nature,) the other *immoveable* and *unchangeable*. Some profeſs'd Platoniſts pervert the Platonic Philoſophy, as *Origen* (not the Chriſtian *Origen*) enormouſly did; who was a profeſs'd Platoniſt, yet in his account of the Deity he aſcended no higher than *Mind* making that the firſt and higheſt Principle: But *Proclus* demonſtrateth, (*q*) that his Opinion was extremely Diſſonant from the Platonick Philoſophy, and that *Plato* would not own him for one of his Allies. Such Platonizing is Anti-platoniſm, it is a taking part with the Platoniſts Adverſaries in the great Diſpute, *whether Mind be the Senior of all things?*

(u) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. par.* 1. c. 35.

(w) *Tertul. c. Marcion. l.* 1. c. 5. & 7.

(x) *Deum ſummum ſic à Platone prædicari aſſeverat Apuleius, quod ipſe ſit ſolus, qui non poſſit penuriâ ſermonis humani quavis oratione vel modice comprehendi; vix autem ſapientibus viris, cùm ſe vigore animi, quantum licuit, à corpore removerint, intellectum hujus Dei, & id quoque interdum velut in altiſſimis tenebris rapidiſſimo coruſcamine lumen candidum intermicare.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 9. c. 16.

(y) *Marcil. com. in car. Pythag. p.* 344.

(z) *Ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 8. *c.* 8.

(a) *See p.* 141, 142. *and Gale in Jambl. p.* 199.

(b) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 22. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 65.

(c) *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 11.

(d) *Procl. Th. Plat. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(e) *P.* 49. 50 *Procl. Plat. Theol. p.* 105.

(f) *Eugub. de per. Phil. l.* 2. *c.* 8.

(g) *Apolog. p.* 515. *ed. Beroald.*

Which Diſpute we have hitherto conſider'd only with deſign, to reflect upon the Platoniſts Acroamatical ſupreme Deity: But this Diſpute is of more large extent and uſe; for it effectually ruineth the Aſſertion of ſome Divines, *that every ſupreme Deity ſuppos'd to be infinite in all Perfection and Maker of the World, is the one true God.* For here we have two Parties of Philoſophic Papans diſputing, whether *Mind* or a *ſupra-mental Monad* (both ſuppos'd to be infinite in all Perfection and Makers of the World) is the ſupreme God? Both cannot be the true ſupreme God (if Mind is the ſupreme God, the Platoniſts Monad is but a figment;) therefore every imaginary ſupreme Deity (ſuppos'd to be infinite in all Perfection and the Maker of the World) is not the one true God. The ſame Concluſion may be inferr'd from another Diſpute amongſt the Platoniſts themſelves. (*r*) For *Proclus* and *Jamblichus* alſo (as ſome ſuppoſe) diſputeth, and pretendeth to demonſtrate that before *Plato*'s Triad of Archical Hypoſtaſes, and conſequently before his ſupreme Deity, *there is a Monad ſtanding alone by its ſelf, and the head of all.* This Monad is a ſuperiour Monad to *Plato*'s, a Deity beyond his ſupreme Deity; both theſe ſupreme Monads or Deities cannot be the true ſupreme God; therefore every imaginary ſupreme Deity (ſuppos'd to be infinite in all Perfection and the Maker of the World) is not the one true God. This doubtleſs is a Demonſtration, or elſe there is no ſuch thing in Mathematicks; and who would Deifie ſuch Platonic Monads, of which every phanciful Platoniſt can be a *Demiurgus*?

RE-

(h) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 525.

(i) *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 1. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(k) *Intell. Syſt. p.* 584, 585.

(l) *Ibid. p.* 585.

(m) *Ibid. p.* 591.

(n) *Ibid. p.* 558, 586.

(o) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 6. *c.* 2. *Mentem tranſcendere, nihil aliud eſt, quam ab ipſa mente jam cadere. Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 9.

(p) *In Epictet. p.* 210. *ed. Cantabr.*

(q) *Plat. Th. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *p.* 89, 90.

(r) *Intell. Syſt. p.* 626, 627. *Petav. de Trin. l.* 1. *p.* 3, 4.

Remark 4.

This ſupreme Deity is *an Idiotically Philoſophic-pagan Deity*; and being of Kind and Quality Pagan, upon that account (as well as the Popular-pagan *Jove*) he cannot be the true ſupreme God. For agreeably to the Popular-pagan *Jove* this ſupreme Deity is the ſupreme of Pagan Deities, one of them and Head of the Family. And accordingly he is called by the Names of Pagan Deities; (s) for the Pythagoreans called him *Apollo* (as being *unum non multa, one the oppoſite to multitude,*) the *Egyptians* called him *Eicton*, and the Platoniſts call him *Cælius* or *Uranus*, interpreting of this Deity this piece of their impure fabulous Theology, *Saturnus caſtrat Cælium, id eſt ipſum bonum.* Is this God's *Name and Honour*, which is the holy Name and Honour, that is to be hallowed and ſanctified by Men and Angels? They are profane Deities, that are ſuppos'd, to iſſue from this ſupreme Deity, (t) the Univerſe of Pagan Gods and Demons are united to this central Deity (u) they were Pagans, that ſtiled themſelves *his Prieſts*, and the World his Temple; it is they that pretend to have Union with him and the enjoyment of him, ſome in the *Philoſophic* and ſome in the *Hieratic* way; and to the Pagan Theamatiſts this Deity is ſaid, to make his appearances, (w) which *Plotinus* reſembleth to the Spectacles that they enjoy'd in the Idol-Temples, and to the converſe which *Minos* had with *Jove*. This Monad is ſuppos'd to be the cauſe and ſource of infinite Pagan Polytheiſm; (x) *He is the cauſe of all Godſhip; for all the Gods have their being Gods becauſe of* (or by) *the firſt God.* In the *Proclo-Platonic* Theology the ſuper-eſſential *Henades* and *Agathotetes* (by Union with which, and by Participation of whom other Platonic Beings become Gods) are therefore ἁπλῶς θεοὶ, *ſimply and primarily Gods*, (y) *becauſe Hen is God.* The *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* univerſally reject the *Monothé-iſm* of one God, and are hugely taken with Polytheiſm, becauſe they ſuppoſe, that the ſublimity and tranſcendency of this their ſupreme Deity requireth it. (z) *Such as ſay, there is but one God, not many, do err* (ſaith a Pythagorean;) *for they do not conſider the ſupreme Dignity of the Divine Tranſcendence, which conſiſteth in bearing Rule and being Imperial over the like, in precellency above all and being ſuperior unto others.* Celebrate above all (a) *the great King, whoſe greatneſs is chiefly ſhew'd in a multitude of Gods. For not to contract into one, but to ſhew and expand very much the Divinity, as much as himſelf hath expanded it, this is the part of them that know the Power of God.*

Remark 5.

This ſupreme Deity is *an Idiotically Myſtic Philoſophic-pagan Deity* (whoſe Theology and Religion is that of the Philoſophic-pagan Myſtics;) therefore he is extremely Diſſonant from the true ſupreme God. The Myſtic Character of this Deity (that ſpeaketh him a Deity not leſs irrational than irreligious) appeareth in his uſual Names and Notices; as it will further appear by conſidering what he is *ſubjectively, objectively and in reſpect of his Congruities and Correſpondences*; whence we will infer *the impoſſibility of his Exiſtence.*

(1.) Agreeably to *Plato*'s account in his *Parmenides* of his Enigmatical *unum* ſome Chriſtian Platoniſts (from the counterfeit *Dionyſius*) have dar'd to ſay of God; (b) *he neither ſtandeth, nor moveth, nor reſteth, neither hath Vertue, nor is Vertue, nor Life, nor Subſtance, nor Science, nor Sapience, nor Unum, nor Unity, nor Deity, nor Bonity, nor Spirit* (*ſo far as we know*) *nor Son, nor Father, nor any of thoſe things that are not, nor of thoſe that are, nor Darkneſs, nor Light, nor Error, nor Truth.* This doubtleſs is very edifying Doctrine from them that deſire a Deity of inconſiſtences (that is no Deity at all;) and for this purpoſe the Platoniſts Acroamatical Deity is of excellent uſe; he ſerveth the idle Sophiſts, to make Riddles of, and is the ſubject of innumerable inexplicable Subtilities and unintelligible *Myſticks*, which do not ſpeak him Light, but rather make him a blind Principle like the *Valentinians blind Æon.* For the Platonic *Myſticks* deſcribe their Principle as perfectly beyond the Orb of *Reaſon*, underſtanding and intellectual Light. (c) *There is nothing for it to underſtand* (no νοητὸν *intelligible,*) *becauſe it ſelf is the firſt. T'Agathon ought not to underſtand any thing,* (d) *for there is not any thing, to be a Good to it.* (e) *Before Mind the Unity muſt neceſſarily be. For Mind although immoveable is not Henotety. For it underſtandeth it ſelf and operateth about it ſelf.* But nothing of this is competible to the firſt Principle; (f) *It is beyond and better than Self-conſciouſneſs or conſenſe with it ſelf, and all underſtanding. It is not abſurd, to ſay, that it knoweth not it ſelf,* (g) *for it hath nothing in it ſelf to learn, nor ought it to know other things.* (h) *But there is a certain watchfulneſs beyond Eſſence, Intellect and a wiſe Life, a Super-intelligence, and theſe he is.* As the Principle is not an Eſſence, ſo the Platoniſts will not ſay, *It is* (exiſteth;) for this they ſuppoſe incompetible to it. (b) Ἐπεὶ ϗ τὸ ἔστιν ἀφαιροῦμεν, *even this that we call Is we abſtract from it.* As it is not *a Life*, ſo Affection and Deſire are incompetible to it, (i) τὸ δὲ οὐδενὸς ἐφίεται, *it is incapable of deſiring any thing.* As it is not an Underſtanding, ſo neither is it a *Will*; for they affirm it (k) μείζονα παντὸς τοῦ θέλειν, *tranſcendent to all willing*, and that it doth not act according to goodneſs, (l) οὐκ ἐνεργοῦντα κατὰ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, *not operating according to good.* (m) *Liberty of Agency is alſo a thing Poſterior to the Principle:* Nor is he Lord and Maſter of his own Actions. (n) *For his Subſtance and Operation are altogether indiſtinct, we may not make two there though diſtinct only in Reaſon.* If this fecund Principle procreateth all things, it is neither *fotuitouſly*, nor yet with *Wiſdom* and *Counſel* ſuiting means to End and Deſign. (o) *For he muſt not be thought, to produce by chance, nor yet thinking with himſelf what to do.* He is ſaid to produce without Power or Operation. (p) *Let him therefore be T'Agathon only, before Power and before Operation; for all Operation is from Faculty or Power.* Although the Platoniſts uſually call him *Unum, One*, yet ſometimes they find fault with that Name, (q) as not ſignificative of the firſt Nature, (r) κρεῖττον γὰρ καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς, *for he tranſcendeth One it ſelf.* Uſually they call him *Cauſe* and *Principle*, but ſometimes (s) they refuſe thoſe Appellatives. And ſometimes they call it by theſe abſtract Names (which in the judgment of common Senſe cannot be thought to ſignifie any perſonal or ſubſtantial reality) *Unitas ipſa, ſimplicitas ipſa, primitas ipſa, cujus ratione cætera ſunt priora; Unity it ſelf, ſimplicity it ſelf, primity it ſelf, by reaſon whereof all others have priority.*

(s) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 6. & *l.* 8. *c.* 13.

(t) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(u) *Porph. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 46.

(w) *En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 7, 11.

(x) Πάσης ἐστὶ θεότητος αἰτία· τὸ γὰρ εἶναι θεοὶ πάντες οἱ θεοὶ διὰ τὸν πρῶτον ἔχουσι θεόν. Procl. ſupr. l. 3. c. 7. p. 132.

(y) *Idem Inſtit. Theol. c.* 113.

(z) Τοὶ δὲ λέγοντες ἕνα θεὸν εἶμεν ἀλλὰ μὴ πολλῶς, ἁμαρτάνοντι. Τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον ἀξίωμα τῆς θείας ὑπεροχῆς οὐ συνθεωρεῦντι. Λέγω δὴ τὸ ἄρχεν, ϗ καθηγέεσθαι τῶν ὁμοίων, ϗ κράτιστον, ϗ καθυπέρτερον ἦμεν τῶν ἄλλων. Onat. ap. Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. c. 3.

(a) Τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα ἐν τῷ πλήθει μάλιστα τῶν θεῶν τὸ μέγα αὐτοῦ ἐνδεικνυμένους. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ συστεῖλαι εἰς ἕν, ἀλλὰ τὸ δεῖξαι πολὺ τὸ θεῖον, ὅσον ἔδειξεν αὐτὸς, τοῦτ᾽ ἐστι δύναμιν θεοῦ εἰδότων. Plotin. En. 2. l. 9. c. 9.

(b) *Mut. Panſa de Oſc. Ethn. & Chriſt. Philoſ. c.* 24.

(c) Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει ὃ νοήσει, αὐτὸ γὰρ πρῶτον. Plotin. En. 5. l. 6. c. 6.

(d) Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλο αὐτῷ τὸ ἀγαθόν. Ibid. c. 5.

(e) Ἀλλὰ μὲν πρὸ τοῦ νοῦ τὸ ἕν· νοῦς γὰρ εἰ ϗ ἀκίνητος, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ἕν· νοεῖ γὰρ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ἐνεργεῖ περὶ ἑαυτόν. Procl. Inſt. Theol. c. 20.

(f) Ἀλλ᾽ ἔστι τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ συναισθήσεως, ϗ πάσης κρεῖττον νοήσεως. Plotin. En. 5. l. 6. c. 5.

(g) Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ ὃ μάθῃ εἷς ὤν. Ibid. c. 6.

(h) Ἡ δὲ ἐγρήγορσίς ἐστιν ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας ϗ νοῦ ϗ ζωῆς ἔμφρονος [ϗ ὑπερνόησις] ταῦτα δὲ αὐτός ἐστιν. Idem En. 6. l. 8. c. 16.

(h) *Ibid. c.* 8.

(i) *Idem En.* 3. *l.* 9. *c.* 3. *En.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 12.

(k) *En.* 6. *l.* 8. *c.* 9.

(l) *Ibid.*

(m) Ὕστερον ϗ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον. Ibid. c. 8.

(n) Ὅτι μὴ ἕτερον ἐνέργεια ϗ αὐτός. Οὐ ποιητέον, οὐδ᾽ ὡς εἰς ἐπίνοιαν δύο. Ibid. c. 12, 13.

(2.) As this Deity *ſubjectively* conſider'd is repreſented as a blind Principle: So *objectively* conſider'd he is as dark as *Jacob Behmen*'s Deity, who is *a dark Vale.* For as *Non Ens* is an intelligible Notion, but is not the Notion of any thing intelligible: So this Platonic Notion τὸ καθαρῶς ἓν, *meerly and purely one*, ἁπλῶς ἓν, *one ſimply and without addition*, τὸ μόνως ἓν, *that which is only one*, μὴ πλέον ἑνὸς, *nothing more than one* (μόνον γὰρ ἓν ἐκεῖνο, ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲν, *for the Principle is nothing more than one, one is the All that it is*) ἓν καθ' αὑτὸ, *one without Participation of another's Nature*, πάντη ἁπλοῦν, πάντη ἓν, *altogether ſimple, omnimodouſly one*; this Platonic Notion (I ſay) is an intelligible Notion, but is not the Notion, of *any intelligible, conceivable or explicable kind of thing.* (t) *The Principle neither underſtandeth, nor is there any underſtanding of it.* (u) *For to know, is knowing one ſomewhat* (one Subſtance or Accident, one Star or Plant:) *But the Principle is without an one ſomewhat; for if it was an one ſomewhat, it could not be one it ſelf.* (w) *Making it a cognoſcible, we make it many*; for in knowing and ſaying any thing of it, ſomewhat muſt be known and ſaid of it: Nor can this be without diſtinguiſhing or disjoining, concourſe or compounding; all which is making it many or more than one. (x) Λόγος γὰρ ἡ ἐπιστήμη, πολλὰ δὲ ὁ λόγος, *Knowledge or Science is Reaſon, and Reaſon is Multitude* (the Soul therefore doth not reach the Principle by Science, but miſſeth it, being fallen into Multitude and Number;) for in every intelligible *Species, Form or Idea*, in every νόημα, *definite or determinate Conception, in Definition, Deſcription, Character, Judgment, or Enunciation, Diſcourſe and Illation*, (y) there is variety of Perception; ſo that all our ſeveral Knowledges or Intellections are incompetible to the Principle. It affordeth no matter for knowing and underſtanding; it is not qualified to exerciſe, entertain and imploy the Mind in her ſtudious reſearches in the knowing and underſtanding way; (*Socrates* complain'd that *Non Ens* was a troubleſome Contemplation, and the Principle is eminently ſo;) for whatever is a determinate Intelligible, or of the kind of Intelligibles, this the Principle is not. (z) *There can be no Knowledge without ſeveralty or alterity.* (a) *Intelligible is neceſſarily conjoin'd with Intellect; if therefore it is not the Intellect, it is not an Intelligible.* But the ſecond Hypoſtaſis being the *firſt Intellect*, and the *firſt Ens* or *Eſſence* (οὐσία ἡ πρώτη τὸ νοητὸν, *the firſt Eſſence is that which is intelligible*) is neceſſarily the *firſt Intelligible.* The Principle therefore by the Frame and Contexture of this Philoſophy is mounted up beyond the Region of Intelligibility (it may not be called (b) *the intelligible Good*;) yet in a large Senſe this *Non-intelligible* and *Super-intelligible* is ſometimes called Νοητὸν, *Intelligible.* For the ſecond Hypoſtaſis is ſuppos'd to turn it ſelf to the firſt *by its Unity*, and this is called (c) *Intelligence beholding the Intelligible and turned to it. Looking unto T'Agathon it underſtandeth it, and underſtanding it is Boniform.* So the Chalday Oracles call the Principle Νοητὸν, *Intelligible*, becauſe it is capable of ſimple Viſion or intuition, and may be underſtood by *the Flower of the Mind* (the Unity) though not by Intellect, as *Pſellus* ſaith. (d) *For the primary Hen is in ſome ſort apprehenſible by our Henotety, but not by Mind or Intellect.* Wherefore the Principle is by Equivocation of words *Intelligible* and not *Intelligible*; ſo there is (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) Ἰδέα Τ'Ἀγαθοῦ, *an Idea of T'Agathon*, and yet *T'Agathon* is not any intelligible Species or Idea. So μέγιστον μάθημα, *the the greateſt Diſcipline* (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) is competible to *T'Agathon*; for there are ſeveral Notices antecedent to the Viſion of it, (e) ἀναλογίαι, *Analogies*, ἀφαιρέσεις, *Negations*, γνώσεις τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, *the knowledges of things that iſſue from it*, ἀναβασμοί τινες, *certain Scales of aſcent to it*: Yet in the proper Senſe of Language no *Learning*, *Doctrine* or *Diſcipline* is competible to T'Agathon. For Underſtanding, Reaſon, Speech, Name, is as incompetible and unapplicable to this Principle, (f) as ſeeing is to audibles, or hearing to things viſible. (g) *All Knowledges, all Cognoſcibles, all Speeches and all that may be compris'd in Speech were produc'd by him,* (and therefore he is none of them;) *himſelf being not knowable by any Beings, nor ſayable by any of them: But exempt from all Knowledge and all Speech, unapprehenſible.* (h) *As ignote as the informous Matter*, or as naked Subſtance without any Attribute, Property, Habitude, Aptitude, Operation or Relation. He can neither be known, nor made known (*Super-ignote* is the counterfeit *Dionyſius*'s Language;) for uſually he is denominated (i) *unſayable by any Speech, and inexpreſſible, unknowable by all Knowledge and unapprehenſible, altogether unknown,* (k) *not ſuſceptible of any either Speech or Knowledge.* (l *He is above the Name Father as well as other Names:*

(o) Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔτυχε, μηδ' ἐνθυμηθεὶς ὃ ποιήσει, ποιήσει ὅμως. Idem En. 5. l. 3. c. 15.

(p) Μόνον οὖν τ' ἀγαθὸν ἔστω, καὶ πρὸ δυνάμεως, καὶ πρὸ ἐνεργείας· Πᾶσα γὰρ ἐνέργεια δυνάμεως ἐστὶν ἔκγονος. Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 2. c. 4.

(q) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 6.

(r) *Procl. Plat. Theol. p.* 132.

(s) *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 8. *c.* 8. *Gale Not. in Jambl.* 301.

(t) Οὐδ' αὐτὸ νοεῖ, οὔτε ἐστὶ νόησις αὐτοῦ. Plotin. En. 5. l. 3. c. 13.

(u) Ἓν γὰρ τι καὶ τὸ γινώσκειν· τὸ δὲ ἐστιν ἄνευ τοῦ τὶ ἕν. εἰ γὰρ τὶ ἕν, οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸ ἕν. Τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ πρὸ τοῦ τί. Ibid c. 12.

(w) Πολὺ αὐτὸ ποιοῦμεν γνωστόν. Ibid. c. 13. Confer En. 6. l. 9. c. 3.

(x) *Ibid. En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 4.

(y) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 730.

(z) Ἑτερότητος μὴ οὔσης, μηδὲ γνῶσις ἐστι. V. Gale in Not. in Jambl. p. 186.

(a) Τὸ νοητὸν συνέζευκται τῷ νῷ· εἰ οὖν μήτε νοῦς, μήτε νοητὸν εἴη. Plotin. En. 3. l. 8. c. 8.

(b) *Ficin. Supr. p.* 17.

(c) Νόησις τὸ νοητὸν ὁρῶσα καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο ἐπιστραφεῖσα. Plotin. En. 5. l. 4. c. 2. Πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν βλέπων αὐτὸ νοεῖ, ἀγαθοειδὴς τῷ τὸ ἀγαθὸν νοεῖν. Ibid. l. 6. c. 4, 5.

(d) Τὸ γὰρ πρώτως ἓν μόνῳ τῷ παρ' ἡμῖν ἑνὶ ληπτόν πως ἐστὶ, καὶ οὔτε Διανοίᾳ οὔτε νῷ. Orac. Mag. p. 98.

(e) *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 7. *c.* 36. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 360.

(f) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 12.

(g) Οὔτε γνωστὸν τοῖς οὖσιν, οὔτε ῥητὸν οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων· ἀλλὰ πάσης γνώσεως ἐξῃρημένον, καὶ παντὸς λόγου, καὶ ἄληπτον ὑπάρχον. Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 2. c. 4. p. 95.

(h) *Idem de An. & Dæm. p.* 232.

(i) Ἄρρητος μὲν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἄφραστος, ἄγνωστος δὲ πάσῃ γνώσει καὶ ἄληπτος, παντελῶς ἄγνωστος. Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 3. c. 7, 14.

(k) Τὸ μηδενὸς λόγου μηδὲ γνώσεως δεκτικόν. Ibid. l. 2. c. 4.

(l) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 16. *p.* 2

Nor is he properly called T'Agathon or Hen διὰ τὴν ἄῤῥητον ἑαυτοῦ ϗ ἄγνωςον ὑπεροχὴν, *because of his unſpeakable and unknowable Eminence.* He is unſpeakable in the Platonic Senſe, (m) *in truth unſayable*; *for whatever you ſay, you will ſay ſomewhat*, (and thereby make the Unity one ſomewhat;) therefore *Plato* ſaith of this Primogenial and fontal Unite, *there is no ſpeaking it, no writing it. Nor is there Science, or Opinion, or Senſe, or Speech, or Name of it.* as his *Parmenides* ſaith.

(m) Διὸ ϗ ἄῤῥητον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Ὅτι γὰρ ἂν εἴπῃς, τὶ ἐρεῖς. Διὸ οὐδὲ ῥητόν, οὐδὲ γραπτόν, φησιν. Plotin. En. 5. l. 3. c. 13. En. 6. l. 9. c. 4.

(3.) The Principle is of ſuch Congruity with Numbers, that *Numenius* ſaith, (n) to contemplate Numbers, and to ſtudy the Number *One*, is a good way, to get ſome acquaintance with it. But reaſoning and underſtanding is ſo incongruous to the Principle, that it muſt be intirely ſtifled and ſilenced, (o) *ſo to touch it by Congruity.* (p) *It is not audible, to be underſtood by any Hearer, but only by the intuitive Beholder.* (q) *Who muſt be careful, to put off all Multitude, to expell all Motion, multiplicity and determinateneſs out of his Mind, all inclinations to any thing out of his Phanſie, all rational Diſcourſings, intellectual Species, congeries and ſeveralities from Intellect, that ſo the Soul may loſe her intellectual Form, and be transform'd into Henotety.* (r) *For we ſay, that like is every where known by like. The Soul therefore muſt contract and reduce her ſelf into her own Unity* (which is the Signature of the Principle) ϗ τὸ μὲν νοεῖν ἀφίησιν, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ὕπαρξιν ἀναδραμοῦσα, *and then ſhe diſmiſſeth underſtanding, having betaken her ſelf to her Unity, which is beyond her Faculties.* (s) She muſt ſufflaminate all further Motion *and intirely reſt in Uniteneſs, not at all receding from it*; for the beholding the Principle muſt be *by a ſudden and ſimple intuition*; and it is not known as other Intelligibles, but κατὰ παρουσίαν ἐπιςήμης κρείττονα, *by a Preſence better than Knowledge, to touch it* (ἐφάψασθαι ϗ θίγειν,) is the way of Commerce with it. And now we are got into a Region of *perfect Myſticks* (ſuch are the matters of Commerce with this Platonic Principle,) where nothing is talk'd of but σιγὴ, *Silence*, πίςις, *Platonic Faith*, ἕνωσις, *Union*, ἄῤῥητος ἕνωσις, *ineffable Union*, συναφὴ ὡς ἑνὸς πρὸς ἕν, *the Conjunction as of one unto one*, σύγκρασις ἑνοποιὸς, *unific Conjunction*, ϗ τὸ μηδὲν γινώσκειν, ὑπὲρ νοῦν γινώσκων, *not to know any thing, as knowing above Mind*, (t) φῶς ἀγαθοειδὲς μεῖζον ἢ κατὰ νοῦν, *Boniform Light, which is beyond that which is intellectual*, and (that which is the ſcope of all) *the Deification of the Soul.* Although this Deity is ſaid to be (u) *exempt both from Silence and Speech*, yet theſe Myſticks ſay, (w) *Let this be venerated by us by Silence, and by Unity antecedent to Silence.* For this Deity is (x) *more unſayable than all Silence*, and more unknowable than all naked *Subſtance.* Silence is the Fruit of the *Platonic Faith*, (y) which is operating, not according to Mind and Intellect, *but the Unity of the Soul.* Whence *Picus Mirandula* thus deſcribeth it. *Sicut Fides quæ eſt Credulitas, eſt infra ſcientiam; ita Fides quæ eſt vere Fides, eſt ſuperſubſtantialiter ſupra ſcientiam & intellectum, nos Deo immediate Conjugens. As the Faith which is Credulity, is below Science; ſo Faith which is truly ſuch, is ſuperſubſtantially above Science and Intellect, immediately conjoining us to God.* Becauſe it is ſuper-intellectual and unitive with *T'Agathon*, (z) *it ſurceaſeth our Operations and Motion*, and therefore is the Myſticks *Quietiſm*; for thoſe *Myſticks* are Deſcendents from the Platonic Myſticks, and ſuch are alſo the more ancient *Myſticks* of the Chriſtian Church. One of which in the Commentary of *Nicetas* on *Gr. Nazianzen's* forty ſecond Oration preſcribeth this Myſtic-Platonic Method of attaining Deification. *Not he that turneth himſelf to Soul, nor he that turneth himſelf to Intellect attaineth Deification (for the one maketh but an Animal, the other but an Intellectual Man;) but if he penetrateth into that Arcane darkneſs, and is converſant with God, then he is ſaid, to be carry'd ſo high as God, to attain the Divinity, to behold the ſplendor of God, and to be made Deiform.*

Quòd ſi per mentem in arcanam illam caliginem penetraverit, ac cum Deo verſetur, tum verò ad Deum jam ferri, & divinitatem aſſequi, & Dei ſplendorem intueri, ac juxta effingi atque efformari dicitur.

(n) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 11. *c.* 22.

(o) Ὥσπερ ἐφαρμόσαι ϗ θίγειν ὁμοιότητι. Plotin. En. 6. l. 9. c. 4.

(q) *Idem En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 6.

(q) Ficin. in Plotin. p. 342, 515, 527, 769, 727.

(r) *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 3. & 25.

(s) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 4. *En.* 6. *l.* 7. *c.* 39. & *l.* 9. *c.* 4. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 4. *c.* 9. & *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 185, 280, 290.

(t) *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 8. *c* 5.

(u) *Procl. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 28.

(w) Αὕτη μὲν ἡμῖν σιγῇ ϗ τῇ πρὸ σιγῆς ἑνώσει τιμάσθω. Procl. ibid. l. 3. c. 7

(x) Πάσης σιγῆς ἀῤῥητότερον, ϗ πάσης ὑπάρξεως ἀγνωςότερον. Ibid. l. 2. c. 11.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(z) *Ibid. p.* 61.

(4.) From this Remark touching the Platoniſts ſupreme Deity it appeareth, that he is peculiarly the Myſtick Theologers kind of Deity, that no other Theology is competible to him but the Myſtic-philoſophic-pagan; this therefore muſt be the true Theology, or this Deity cannot be the true God. It appeareth alſo, that this Deity is a dark Principle as to any intellectual kind of Light; inſomuch, that the Platoniſts themſelves, who call their Principle *Light* (comparing it to the light (a) which a Man ſeeth when he preſſeth his Eye, when he ſeeth a light, but no luminous object) acknowledge and inſiſt, that its abſolute *Indiſtinctneſs* is abſolute darkneſs as to the Underſtanding. Whence the Egyptians denominated this Principle *unknown darkneſs, or darkneſs beyond all Underſtanding, making this Acclamation three times:* But becauſe they made three Acclamations touching their *unknown darkneſs*, hence *Eugubinus* (like himſelf) maketh this Inference; (b) *claruiſſe priſcis ſeculis magnam de Tribus illis Lucem, that thoſe ancient times* (times of darkneſs undoubtedly) *enjoy'd great Light touching the Chriſtian Trinity.* From this account of the Platoniſts Myſticks we muſt infer further; that this dark Deity neither hath, nor can have *any ſpecifick or individual determination*; and therefore it neither doth, nor can exiſt. It is not τὸ δέ τι, *any ſomewhat*, any thing definite or determinate; therefore it is neither *Man, Demon, nor God.* It is incapable of any additional; for it is meerly and purely *One*; not *one Ens*, or *Mind*, or *Soul*, or any thing elſe; therefore it cannot be *one God.* It is neither, *a great One*, nor *a little One*, nor *an high One*, nor *a low One*, *an holy One*, nor *a common One*, (c) ὅτι μηδὲν κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ, *for nothing can be predicated of it.* It is no kind of thing; neither of *God-kind*, nor *Angel-kind*, nor *Mankind* (nor of any other kind;) therefore it is neither *the true God*, nor any true reality. Nor is it any true *Good*; neither an *intelligible*, nor *ſenſible*; neither *a Divine*, nor an *Human Good* (nor any other kind of Good; and conſequently this *Ipſum Bonum* is no reality, but only a Notion of the Mind. Theſe things are ſo plain and demonſtratively certain, that it is marvellous, ſo many good Underſtandings both in the ancient and later times of the Church ſhould be impos'd upon by *Platonic Theiſm* (againſt other parts of Platoniſm I diſpute not,) and that excellent Men and great

(a) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 5. *c.* 7.

(b) *De Per. phil. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

(c) *Plotin. En.* 5 *l.* 3. *c.* 13. *vid. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 1.

Lights of the Church ſhould ſubſtitute a Theology of wild Myſticks inſtead of what is truly Divine and Chriſtian. And it is the more marvellous, becauſe all Philoſophers explode the Platonic *Monad* or *Unity* in their Contemplations of the Soul of Man; and they have like reaſon to explode it in their Contemplations of the Univerſe.

REMARK 6.

This Supreme Deity is *an Heretical-Pagan kind of Deity, the Deity of an Heretical-Pagan Cabala*, being the ſame with the Supreme Deity of the *Gnoſticks* (who introduc'd their *Cabala* containing their fabulous *Genealogies* and *Pleroma* or *Fulneſs* of the Godhead in oppoſition to Chriſtianity;) this Deity therefore cannot be the true God. Many Affinities and Reſemblances between *the Gnoſticks* and the *Platoniſts* (*d*) are before obſerv'd; yet they were far from being genuine *Platoniſts*; but as *Plotinus* ſaith of the *Gnoſticks*, which he diſputeth againſt. (*e*) *Several things they take from* Plato, *other things they innovate, to make a Philoſophy of their own.* They differ'd from *Plato touching intelligible ſubſtance, the Mundane Soul, the Rectours of the World*, and many of their Deities were Innovations; but their Supreme Deity could be no Innovation, nor any other than *Plato*'s Supreme Deity, as appeareth from *Plotinus*'s Argument againſt them. (*f*) *He that loveth any thing, loveth every thing that is congenial thereto. He loveth the Children that loveth the Father; now every Soul is the Daughter of that Father.* The Gnoſticks were wanting in reſpect to *the Mundane Soul* (for they vilify'd it, ſuppoſing it degenerate) which diſreſpect of theirs was inconſiſtent with their great reſpect to the Father, as *Plotinus* argueth; therefore they pretend a great reſpect to the *Platonic Father*; from whence it followeth, that their Supreme Deity (uſually call'd *Propator* or *Bythus*) is the ſame with the Platoniſts Father, *Hen* or *T'Agathon*. (*g*) The Gnoſticks Platonize in ſtiling their Principle *Bythus* and *Propator* (for the Platoniſts ſay, that the principle is beyond the name Father, (*h*) and they attribute thereto, not *Exiſtence* but *Pre-exiſtence*, not *Intelligence* but *Pre-intelligence*, which mode of Theologizing the Gnoſticks imitated) and they agree with the Platoniſts in ſtiling their Supreme Deity ἄγνωστος, ἀκατανόμαστος, ἄῤῥητος, *unknowable, innominable, undeclarable, unſayable.* The *Valentinians* Copulation of (*i*) *Sige* or *Ennœa* with their *Bythus*, their making *Nous* his next Production or Emiſſion, his Son and his Unigenit (with whom they coupled ἀλήθεια, *Truth*) demonſtrate, that their great Principle is the very ſame with the Platonic; for theſe are expreſs Marks and Characteriſticks thereof. But there are many more, that are much more clear and expreſs; (*k*) for the Gnoſticks ſtile their *Ignote Father* (or Propator) *Eſſentiam non habens, Non-eſſence, Super-eſſence*; they call him *Proonta before On or Ens*, and they ſay, *He is the Center* (or as a Center) *in the immenſe greatneſs of the Univerſe*; which are expreſs Characteriſticks of the Platoniſts *Henotety*, which they ſuppoſe to be (*l*) the Center of the Univerſe. *Irenæus* ſaith of them, (*m*) *Omnia ad numeros deducunt, & ex unitate ac dualitate univerſa conſtare aſſerunt, & ab unitate uſque ad quatuor numerantes, ſic denarium generant. They draw all things to Numbers*; as the Pythagoric and Platonic Theology is a Number-kind of Theology; therefore *Hen* or *One it ſelf*, the Head and Origin of Number, is the Firſt and Supreme Deity of the School of *Gnoſticks. They ſay, that all things conſiſt of Unity and Duality* (ſaith *Irenæus*;) which Saying of theirs is exactly the Senſe of *Plotinus*; (*n*) *wherefore it is ſaid, that Ideas and Numbers have their original from infinite Duality and Unity.* The Gnoſticks *number from One to Four, and ſo generate the Denary* (ſaith *Irenæus*) therefore they affected the *Tetractys* (and conſequently their Theology was *Pythagoric*) which was the four firſt Numbers as conſtituting the Denary. The principal Dogma of the Heretical Gnoſticks was; (*o*) *Their Supreme Deity was a Deity different from, and ſuperiour to the Creator of all things* (ſo accounted by themſelves or by others;) they pretended to *a recondite God far above* (our) *God.* And ſo we have ſeen, that the Platoniſts ſay of the Hebrews, *that they knew not the great God*, and they make our God no higher than *the next immediate Opificer.* They ſuppoſe their Supreme Deity in ſome ſort the maker of the World (for they derive all Beings from him;) yet they alſo ſuppoſe him ἀνενέργητος, *above all Operation* (as *Plotinus* ſaith,) and they will not allow him to be counted *the Opificer of the World*; (*p*) *for it is not meet* (ſaith *Numenius*) *to count the Firſt God the Opificer.* How highly their firſt God tranſcendeth *our God the Creator*, appeareth from the ſwelling nonſenſical Grandiloquies, which the Platoniſts of the Chriſtian Church derive from their School; for they do not only entitle God (*q*) οὐσία ὑπερούσιος, *the ſuper-ſubſtantial Subſtance*, ὑπερούσιος ἀοριστία, *the ſuper-eſſential Infinitude*, *but* τὸ ὑπερούσιον, τὸ ὑπεραγαθὸν, τὸ ὑπέρζωον, τὸ ὑπέρσοφον, τὸ ὑπέρθεον, *ſuper-ſubſtantial, ſuper-good, ſuper-living, ſuper-wiſe, ſuper-God.* The Attribute of αὐτοτελής, *independently perfect* is not enough, but they will have him intituled ὑπερτελής, *beyond all Perfection*; not only αὐτοκαλόν, *the Pulchritude it ſelf and of it ſelf*, but ὑπερκαλόν, *beyond Pulchritude*; αὐτοαγαθότης, *Self-goodneſs and Goodneſs it ſelf* is not ſufficient, but they proceed to *ſuper-deifying Tranſcendentals* (as Phantaſtry knoweth no Bounds) ſtiling the Deity τὴν ὑπερηνωμένην ἑνάδα, *the Super-unite Henotety*, αὐτο-ὑπεραγαθότητα, *Super-bonity itſelf*, ὑπέρθεον θεότητα, *Super-God Deity.* The Platoniſts differ'd from the Heathen World, as the *Gnoſticks* differ'd from the Chriſtian Church, for the Popular Pagans acknowledg'd no higher Deity than *the Former* of the Univerſe. (*r*) *For they doing Service to the Creature rather than the Creator, and to thoſe things that are no Gods, yet attribute the true firſt-place of the Deity to the God the Former of this Univerſe.* The Gnoſticks therefore did not ſymbolize with the Popular, but with the Philoſophic-Pagans and the ſublimer ſort of them; their Supreme Deity was Acroamatical and a Philoſophic-Pagan Cabala (as their Name importeth;) therefore it was the Platoniſts Supreme Deity. But their Impiety in blaſpheming the Creator was tranſcendent both to the Philoſophic and Popular Pagan Religioniſts, as *Irenæus* obſerveth.

Theſe were the Anti-Judaical and worſer ſort of Gnoſticks, that blaſphem'd the Creator; but if their Supreme Deity was the ſame with the

Platoniſts,

(d) P. 129, 138.

(e) Τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῦ Πλάτωνος εἴληπται· τὰ δὲ καινοτομῦσιν. *En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 6.

(f) Ὁ γὰρ φιλεῖν πρός ὁτουοῦν ἔχων, καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς πᾶν ὃ φιλεῖ, ἀσπάζεται· καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ὧν τὸν πατέρα ἀγαπᾷ. Ψυχὴ δὲ πᾶσα πατρὸς ἐκείνου. *Ibid. c.* 16.

(g) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 301, 190.

(h) *J. Bapt Criſp. p.* 9. *Fcin. in Plotin. p.* 510.

(i) *Gale ſupr. & p.* 213, 298.

(k) *Iren. adv. Hær. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *l.* 2. *c.* 1. & *c.* 57.

(l) *Procl. Plat. Th. l.* 1. *c.* 25. & *p.* 57.

(m) *L.* 1. *c.* 15.

(n) Διὸ καὶ εἴρηται, ἐκ τῆς ἀορίστου δυάδος καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς τὰ εἴδη καὶ οἱ ἀριθμοί. *En.* 5. *l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(o) *Iren. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 3. &c. & *l.* 2. *c.* 10, &c.

(p) Καὶ γὰρ οὔτε δημιουργεῖν ἐστι χρεὼν τὸν πρῶτον. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 18.

(q) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 6. & *p.* 431, 442, 292, 386, 161. & *T.* 2. *p.* 410.

(r) *Illi enim creaturæ potius quàm creatori ſervientes & his qui non ſunt Dii, verum tamen primum Deitatis locum attribuunt Fabricatori hujus univerſitatis Deo.* Iren. l. 2. c. 9.

Platoniſts, it muſt be the ſame with that of the *Judaical* and better ſort of *Gnoſticks*, who, although they had a Philoſophic-Pagan *Cabala*, and Speculations touching an Arcane Supreme Deity, yet they adher'd to the God of the Jews Religion, and were not profeſs'd Adverſaries to the Creator of all things. For the Supreme Deity of this ſort of *Gnoſticks* was a Philoſophic-Pagan *Cabala*, they were *Chriſtiano-Judaical Pythagoriſts* (as the Apoſtle's Character ſpeaketh them;) therefore their Supreme Deity could be no other than the *Pythagoric* or *Platonic*; which is the more probable, becauſe the Platonic Supreme Deity is (for the main) of the ſame Nature and Notices with the Supreme Deity of the *Cabaliſtical Jews* of later times, (*s*) as *Reuchlin* and *Picus Mirandula* ſuppoſe. The ten *Sephiroth* or *Numerations* of theſe *Cabaliſtical Jews* are Emanations from a Myſtic or Arcane Supreme Deity call'd *Enſoph* (אין סוף) *Abyſs or Infinitude.* Their ſecond *Sephirah* is of the ſame Names with the Platoniſts ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis; for it is called *Ens*, *Eſſentia*, *Semitæ Idearum*, *Being*, *Eſſence*, *the Paths of Ideas.* The Supreme Deity is called *Enſoph*, *Arich Arpin* (the ſame with *Enſoph*) *Aleph tenebroſum*, *privatio*, *color niger*, *Nihil*, *Tenebroſe Aleph*, *Privation*, *Colour of Black*, *Nihility*; which Cabaliſtical Appellatives are (*t*) rightly parallell'd with the Pythagoreans Appellatives of their Firſt Principle, βάραθρον, χάσμα, ἀλαμπία, σκοτωδία, *Gulf*, *Chaſm or wide Vacuity*, *Obſcurity*. *Tenebroſity.* This firſt Principle is called אין *Non-Ens*, (*u*) *becauſe it cannot be apprehended, nor can we have any notion thereof* (*Non Ens eſt privatio apprehenſionis*) *in Non Ens, neither Eſſence, nor Quiddity, nor Difference is apprehended.* Agreeably to the Platoniſts theſe Cabaliſts ſay of their Primordiality or Supreme Deity, (*w*) *Neither the number One, nor Multitude, nor Exiſtence is predicated of it*; and thus the Wiſe Men of the *Cabala* deſcribe it. (*x*) *This is the Firſt without beginning, and this is the laſt without end, whither our very thoughts cannot reach, and is nam'd Enſoph, that is, Infinitude, which is a certain ſupreme thing, in it ſelf incomprehenſible and ineffable, retracting and covering it ſelf in the moſt remote retreat of its Divinity, and the moſt inacceſſible Abyſs of Fountain-light, ſo that nothing is to be underſtood to proceed therefrom, as a moſt abſolute Deity without Imployment remaining in it ſelf by an omnimodous ſhutting up of it ſelf in it ſelf, naked without any Veſtment, and without the Cloathing of any thing circumſtant, not profuſe of it ſelf, nor having its Goodneſs and Splendour dilated, indifferently Ens and Non-Ens, and as a ſegregate and free Unite moſt ſimply implying all things, which as to our reaſon ſeem contrary and contradictory to one another.* The Myſtic Theology of the Cabaliſts being manifeſtly a deſcendent from the Pythagoric and Platonic (agreeably whereunto the *ten Sephiroth* (*y*) are ſaid to be *the Type and Form of all Being*) it is not ſtrange, that *the Anti-Judaical Gnoſticks* ſhould *Cabalize* as well as *Platonize* in their Notices of their Deities, as the *Valentinians* manifeſtly did in calling one of their *Æons Achamoth*, (*z*) which is the ſame Name with the Cabaliſts חכמה *Chokmah* (Sapience) or according to the *Egyptian* Termination *Chokmoth.*

REMARK 7.

Although this Supreme Deity conſider'd only with reſpect to *a realizing* his Names and Notices muſt be called *a Figment*, yet the Philoſophick Pagans under thoſe Names had to do with a perſonal Reality, with reſpect unto whom this Deity muſt be call'd *a Magical kind of Deity.* For he is the Theurgiſts Deity (their God) the Arcane Deity of *the Magic Oracles* (the Arcane Philoſophic Theurgical Theology;) and as a Deity whoſe Theology is *the Heathen*, *the Chriſtian*, *the Myſtical*, *Acroamatical*, or *Exoterical*, is neceſſarily an *Heathen*, *Chriſtian*, *Myſtical*, *Acroamatical*, or *Exoterical* kind of Deity: So a Deity whoſe Theology is *the Magical*, is neceſſarily *a Magical* kind of Deity. The ancient *Magi* introduc'd this Deity, he is of their Inſtitution of Theurgy (as the Supreme Deity thereof,) they reach'd him by their *Theurgic Myſticks*, though the pureſt Reaſon cannot. It is they, and ſuch as they, that were of his Acquaintance, Alliance and Correſpondence, and that had *Divine Light*, *Enthuſiaſms* and *Divination* from him. His Saintiſts and Theologers amongſt the Pagans of greateſt remark were eminent Theurgiſts (ſuch as *Zoroaſter*, *Numa*, the *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts*) and the Heretical Pagan Gnoſticks are known to have been great Magicians. *Porphyry* ſaith of *Plotinus*, *That his End and Scope was to be united to, and conjoyn'd with the God that is above all; which Scope he attain'd four ſeveral times whilſt I was with him. That God ſometimes appear'd to him, who hath neither Form nor Idea, but is plac'd above Intellect, and all that is Intelligible. To whom I* Porphyrius *affirm my ſelf, to have been once united and conjoyn'd in the ſixty eighth Year of my Age.* A Judgment may be made of this Deity from ſuch an Acquaintance, as *Porphyry* was; from the End and Scope of *Plato*'s Philoſophy, (*a*) *which was to conduct Men to ſee God*; and from the kind and quality of thoſe Deities wherewith he is conjoyn'd and aſſociated in the *Chalday Oracles.* For that Arcane Theurgical Theology's Syſtem of Deities is an immenſe rabble of Deities manifeſtly *Magical* (if the *Hecatine Circle* is manifeſtly Magical;) and to conſort the Chriſtian Trinity with this Paganical Rabble, to ſuppoſe, that the true God ſtandeth at the Head of this Magical Syſtem, is to make ſuch a Compoſition as the Fable or Fiction of *Scylla*, *which is a comely Virgin in the upper parts, but downwards all is deformed Monſtroſity.*

Candida ſuccinctam latrantibus inguina monſtris.

Nor is it poſſible to have Society with God (the true God) in Theurgy; but the Society, Appearances, Gifts and Communications of this Supreme Deity are in Theurgy; therefore he is *a Magical-Pagan* kind of Deity in the Senſe of the Chriſtian Apologiſts, who tell the Pagans, (*b*) *That evil Spirits ſubſtituted themſelves inſtead of their Gods, and receiv'd the Honour of Sacrifice under their Names.* To this Supreme Deity the Theurgiſts had reſpect in compounding together the things of Nature, to attract Influxes upon themſelves, convoke their Deities into preſence, and to make their Statues receptive of them. (*c*) *Ipſi componendo unum ex multis conficiebant, aſſimilabant ipſi Uni, quod eſt ſuper multa: They by compounding made One of many, aſſimilated to One it ſelf, which is above many.*

(s) *Reuchlin. de Art. Cabal. fol.* 22, 23. *Hotting. Theſ. Philol. p.*442.

(t) *D. H. Mori oper. Vol.* 1. *p.* 433, 441.

(u) *Rittangel. in libr. Jezirah p.* 43, 52, 167.

(w) *Ibid. p.* 61.

(x) *Hic eſt primus abſque initio, & hic eſt ultimus abſque termino, ſane quo nè cogitatus quidem noſtri pertingere poſſunt, & nominatur Enſoph, id eſt Infinitudo, quæ eſt ſumma quædam res ſecundum ſe incomprehenſibilis & ineffabilis, in remotiſſimo divinitatis ſuæ retroceſſu & in fontani luminis inacceſſibili abyſſo ſe retrahens & contegens, ut ſic nihil intelligatur ex ea procedere, quaſi abſolutiſſima Deitas per otium omnimoda ſui in ſeipſa clauſione immanens, nuda ſine veſte, ac abſque ullo circumſtantiarum amictu, nec ſui profuſa, nec ſplendoris ſui dilatata bonitate, indiſcriminatim Ens & non Ens, & omnia quæ rationi noſtræ videntur inter ſe contraria & contradictoria, ut ſegregata & libera Unitas ſimpliciſſimè implicans.* Reuchlin. ſupr. Fol. 21.

(y *Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. Col.* 1535.

(z) *Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 444. *Windet. de vit. funct. p.* 37.

(a) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 219.

(b) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 4. *p.* 134.

(c) *Proclus de Magia.*

CHAP. V.

1. *The Pagans Character, that they are Gentiles that know not God. The various Senſes of knowing God.* 2. *How far the Gentiles did know God.* 3. *In what Senſe they did not know God.* Conſect. 1. *We are in Atheous Ignorance while we are in Heatheniſm.* Conſect. 2. *In Heatheniſm our Life is the Atheous.* Conſect. 3. *Man is ſo Atheous, that Heathen Religion is agreeable. In theſe* Conſectaries *an Account is given of Unregeneracy as the State of reigning Ignorance. Of Original Sin. Of Heatheniſm as our Original Condition. Of Paganiſm's Foulneſs and Purity.*

I. THE Pagans *Theopolity* (rightly underſtood) enlightneth and explaineth this their Character; *That they are ſo far ignorant of God, as to be juſtly denominated the Gentiles that know not God.* Such is their Character and their Definition; for that which maketh them the Heathen (which conſtituteth, diſtinguiſheth and denominateth them) is their being *the extraneous People, the People that know not God.* The *not knowing God* is diſtinguiſhable into ſeveral ſorts and kinds; that which is *Unprophetick*, that which is *Unphiloſophick*, and that which is *Irreligious.* That which is *Unprophetick* relateth only to matters of Intercourſe between God and his Prophets, and his methods of manifeſting himſelf to them; 1 *Sam.* 3. 7. Samuel *did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet reveal'd unto him.* That which is *Unphiloſophick* relateth only to Philoſophick Diſquiſition, Contemplation and Comprehenſion; *Job* 36. 26. *God is great and we know him not, neither can the number of his Years be ſearched out.* That which is *Irreligious*, is the oppoſite to *ſuch knowing God*, which belongeth to Religioniſts as ſuch, and conſtituteth *the Theiſts* of Religion and Condition; 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7, 8. *The Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty Angels, in flaming fire, taking Vengeance on them that know not God.* A truly Religious *knowing God* (a knowing him, ſo as to be truly Religious towards him) is the Eſſence and Summary of true Religion, the whole of Piety; (*d*) therefore ſome judicious Interpreters expound the knowledge of God *by Piety* (or Godlineſs;) and the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe expoundeth it by *the Fear of God.* It ſignifieth the knowing God, ſo as to be truly Religious towards him (which is Piety) *Hoſ.* 4. 1. *There is no Truth, nor Mercy, nor knowledge of God in the Land.* Jer. 9. 6. *They refuſe to know me, ſaith the Lord.* Jer. 22. 16. *Was not this to know me? ſaith the Lord.* In this Senſe the knowledge of God is preferr'd before Burnt-Offerings; *Hoſ.* 6. 6. and this knowledge of God will make holy and happy Times: *Iſa.* 11. 9. *They ſhall not hurt nor deſtroy in all my holy Mountain; for the Earth ſhall be full of the knowledge of the Lord.* When God foretelleth by the Prophet, *Jer.* 24. 7. *I will give them an Heart to know me, that I am the Lord*; the meaning is, they ſhall be *true Pietiſts* towards him; and by another Prophet, *Hoſ.* 2. 20. *Thou ſhalt know the Lord*; it is to ſignifie, that he on his part would enter into a League of Amity with them, and make himſelf known to them at a more than ordinary rate; and they on their part ſhall be true Pietiſts. But the Sons of *Eli* were gigantick *Impietiſts* and their being ſuch was *a not knowing the Lord*, 1 *Sam.* 2. 22. They knew not the Lord, as *David* chargeth his Son *Solomon, Know the Lord God of thy Father, and ſerve him with a perfect Heart*, 1 Chron. 28. 9. (*e*) So *Kimchi* explaineth the Hebrew Verb לרעת *to know*, by לעבדו *to ſerve him*, which is a knowing God as we ought.

Sometimes the Phraſe of *knowing God* is beſt expounded by *Theoſophy* (which is an Interpretation near to the former) meaning by *a Theoſophiſt* one that is wiſe in the matters of God; 1 *Cor.* 15. 34. *Some have not the knowledge of God. Col.* 1. 10. *Increaſing in the knowledge of God.* So *he that underſtandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord* (*Jer.* 9. 24.) denoteth a genuine Theoſophiſt, *Dan.* 11. 32. the genuine Theoſophiſts are intituled *the People that do know their God.* And God foretelleth by the Prophet, that the meaneſt Chriſtian ſhall be a Theoſophiſt, *Jer.* 31. 34. *They ſhall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, ſaying, Know the Lord; for they ſhall all know me, from the leaſt of them unto the greateſt of them.* In Theoſophy there muſt be θεογνωσία (the Comprehenſion of what is and ought to be known of God) conjunct with Piety.

Sometimes the Phraſe of *knowing God* muſt be expounded by that Affinity which we commonly call *Acquaintance*; for when our holy Writers ſay of evil Men, *that they know not God*, this is uſually part of their Senſe, that God and they are not of an Alliance and Acquaintance, they are not ſuch as the Philoſophers call γνώειμοι, but as to God they are Aliens and of the Exotick kind; 1 *Joh.* 4. 7, 8. *Every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is Love.* His Family of Alliance and Acquaintance is the Divine Love-family, who in reſpect of their Genius and Diſpoſition, their Life and Practice, are of Cognation with God, and Symbolize with him. And as the Prophet ſaith of crooked Paths, *whoſoever goeth therein ſhall not know Peace* (ſo as to have any dealings therewith) *the way of Peace have they not known*; the Apoſtle ſaith of Chriſt, *He knew no Sin* (ſo as to have any dealings with it;) and our Saviour will ſay to ſome as being none of his Acquaintance) *I never knew you:* So our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of that *Cognition*, which is the *Cognation* of Acquaintance, when he ſaith, 1 *Joh.* 2. 4. *He that ſaith, I know him, and keepeth not his Commandments, is a liar.* This is part of his Senſe; but this is alſo his meaning, that atheous and wicked Men can be no genuine *Gnoſticks* in reſpect of God (or Chriſt;) for they are not of his Specific Comprehenſion, but of another Region, where God is not ſeen or known. Accordingly he ſaith, 1 *Joh.* 3. 6. *Whoſoever ſinneth* (is a committer of Sin) *hath not ſeen him, neither known him.*

The Phraſe of *knowing God* therefore muſt ſometimes be expounded of *that due diſcernment and underſtanding of God* (what he is) which is conſtitutive of the Spiritual and Divine Family. For their knowing God and ſuch kind of things, their proper kind of knowing them (which is incompetible to the Unregenerate) is nothing elſe but *the due diſcernment and underſtanding of*

them

(d) *Grot. Not. in Hoſ.* 4. 1.

(e) *Pocock on Hoſ.* 6. 3, 6.

Iſa. 59. 8.

Rom. 3. 17.

2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

Matth. 7. 23.

them, which is requiſite to conſtitute them the Spiritual and Divine-kind of People (the oppoſite to the Mundane and Carnal) who muſt be Spiritual and Divine in their diſcernment and
Joh. 8. 12. underſtanding of things, and their being ſo is
2 *Cor.* 4.6. that *Light*, *Wiſdom and Knowledge*, which ma-
Eph. 5. 8. keth a great part of their Character; 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. *The Son of God is come, and hath given us an Underſtanding, that we may know him that is true.* Which due underſtanding and diſcernment of God conſtituteth them that have it the Regenerate Children of God and the Sons of the Heavenly Family, as the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *Ch.* 2. 13. *I write unto you little Children, becauſe ye have known the Father.* Not only the Gentiles, but the Jews alſo in their Carnality of Mind and Life were deſtitute of this knowing God, as our Saviour telleth them; *Joh.* 8. 55. *Te have not known him.* Joh. 15. 21. and 16. 3. *Theſe things will they do unto you, becauſe they have not known the Father nor me.* The World (being in the Specific Comprehenſion of Athe-iſm) is in Atheiſtic Ignorance of God, *Joh.* 17. 25. *O righteous Father, the World hath not known thee.*

Sometimes the Phraſe of *knowing God* muſt be expounded of *knowing him as a People know their God*, (or as the Theiſts of Religion and Condition know him) as when the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Pſal.* 9. 10. *They that know thy Name will put their truſt in thee.* When our Saviour ſaith, *Joh.*17.3. *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God*; the meaning is, *that to know God as* (in truth, not in type only) *one of his Pietiſts, Theiſts, Theoſophiſts, Acquaintance and Divine Familiſts, is Life Eternal to a Man.*

But ſometimes the Phraſe of *knowing God* muſt be expounded by *Intelligence of God and his Matters* (ſpeaking of God in ſuch a Senſe as we ſpeak of Kings and great Governments) as our Saviour ſaith, *Matth.* 11. 27. *No Man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any Man the Father ſave the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.* As to that great and only ſaving Revelation of himſelf *the Chriſtian Religion*, God did not make himſelf known to any meer Man,
Joh. 1.18. *the only begotten Son which is in the Boſom of the Father*, (highly beloved by him and moſt intimate with him) *he only hath declar'd him.*

And ſometimes Mens *knowing God* muſt be expounded of his being barely notic'd to them (of their having Notices of him) which is competible to the greateſt Athe-iſts of Religion and Condition; as when the Apoſtle ſaith of the Gentiles, *Rom.* 1. 21, 28. *They knew God, but did not like to retain God in their Knowledge*, or to make an acknowledgment of him (as the words may be rendred) which is a Religious knowing God. But thus the Gentiles knew him not; for as the acknowledg'd Deity of a Religion and People, *there is no God in all the Earth but in* Iſrael, 2 *King.* 5. 15.

II. The Gentiles therefore in a certain Senſe *knew God*, but ſo as *not to know him* in the more uſual Senſe; *Rom.* 1. 19, 20. *That which may be known of God is manifeſt in them; for God hath ſhew'd it unto them; for the inviſible things of him from the Creation of the World are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made, even his Eternal Power and Godhead.* (f) *We all naturally know the Exiſtence of God; whether we make Exclamation, O God, or ſuppoſe God a Witneſs of the Facts of the Improbous, and as ſeeing us liſt up our Face unto Heaven.* (g) *For ſome things are known naturally, as the Immortality of the Soul amongſt the generality, our God amongſt the univerſality of Men.* (h) *We worſhip one God* (ſay the Chriſtian Apologiſts) *whom ye all naturally know. All Men ſpeak on this manner, which God grant, God ſeeth, I commend to God, God will recompenſe, which forms of Speech are a teſtimony, that the Soul is naturally Chriſtian.* (i) *An Heathen ſaith, God bleſs thee, as readily as a Chriſtian.* (k) *It is the natural Language of the Vulgar.* (l) When they Swear, or Wiſh, or Pray for help, they name God, and their form of begging is *by God.* (m) *Hæc eſt ſumma delicti, nolle agnoſcere, quem ignorare non poſſis: This is the Summary of the World's Criminality, they will not acknewledge that God whom they cannot but know.* Agreeably to theſe Apologiſts (n) the Metaphyſicians (and others) diſpute, that *God is knowable by natural Light, and is actually known by all Nations*; nor is it reaſonable, or religious, to contradict what they ſay. But the Intereſt of true Religion requireth, that their Sayings be underſtood with due Diſtinctions and Limitations touching the Bounds and Meaſure of the Gentiles knowledge of God; ſuch as theſe following.

(1.) The Heathen World knew God *as underſtood without Specific and Individual Determination.* (o) *They were not ſo ignorant, but that they acknowledg'd one Cauſe or Principle, whence all things have their origin, the things Celeſtial, Terreſtial and Infernal.* (p) *Both our Eye-ſight and the Law of Nature teacheth us, that God is,* (or that there is a God) *a Cauſe efficient and conſervant of the Univerſe.* This is ſo conſpicuous in Nature, that Natural Light cannot miſs of him; nor is this his Exiſtence matter of Faith ſo much as of common Reaſon or Demonſtration by Argument. (q) *The pulchritude of the World and the order of the Celeſtial Bodies forceth an acknowledgment, that there is a certain excellent eternal Nature, which is to be honour'd and ador'd by Mankind.* The Pagan Theologers (in Terms) agree with the Chriſtian, that the viſible World proclaimeth the inviſible God, and ſpeaketh audibly *with a Voice that is gone out through all the Earth*, (r) ὡς ἐμὲ πεποίηκε θεός, *that God made me.* One that was no undergraduate in Atheiſm, yet in a lucid interval ſaith; (s) *If any Man ſhall view throughly all the Organs both of Generation and Nutrition, and doth not perceive them to have been made, and order'd to their reſpective Offices by ſome Mind, he is to be reputed himſelf void of Mind.* To ſuppoſe therefore, that the Exiſtence of God is not diſcoverable by meer Reaſon or natural Light, is a grand Extravagance in *Socinus*, with whom ſome of the Schoolmen Symbolize, who aſſert, (t) *Lumine naturali non poteſt cognoſci dari aliquod Ens ſupernaturale. It cannot be known by natural Light, that there is a ſupernatural Being.*

(f) *Deum eſſe omnes naturaliter ſcimus ſive cùm exclamamus, ô Deus, ſive cùm illum teſtem Deum conſtituimus improborum, & quaſi nos cernat, faciem ſublevamus ad cœlum.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 2. p. 43.

(g) *Quædam enim & natura nota ſunt, ut immortalitas animæ penes plureis, ut Deus noſter penes omneis.* Tertull. de Reſur. Carn. c. 3.

(h) *Nos unum Deum colimus, quem omnes naturaliter noſtis.* Idem ad Scap. *Quod Deus dederit, omnium vox eſt. Judicem quoque conteſtatur illum, Deus videt, & Deo commendo, & Deus mihi reddet. O teſtimonium animæ naturaliter Chriſtianæ!* Idem Apol. c. 17.

(i) *Benedicat te Deus tàm facile pronuncias, quam Chriſtiano neceſſe eſt.* Idem de Teſt. Anim. c. 2.

(k) *Vulgi iſte naturalis ſermo eſt.* Min. Fœl. p. 144.

(l) *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *vid. Scultet. Exercit. Evangel. c.*106.

(m) *Tertul. Apol. c.*17. *S. Cyprian. de Idol. van.*

(n) *Th. Barlow exercit. Metaphyſ.* 4.

(o) *Uſque adeo non ignoraverunt, ut faterentur unum eſſe principium, à quo omnia initium ſortita ſint, cæleſtia & terreſtria & inferna.* S. Ambroſ. com. in Rom. 1. 21.

(p) Τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἶναι θεὸν καὶ τὴν πάντων ποιητικήν τε καὶ συνεκτικὴν αἰτίαν, καὶ ὄψις διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ φυσικὸς νόμος. *Gr. Naz. orat.* 34.

(q) *Eſſe præſtantem aliquam æternamque naturam, & eam ſuſpiciendam adorandamque hominum generi, pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum cœleſtium cogit confiteri.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(r) *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 3.

(s) *Hobbs de Hom. c.* 1.

(t) *Gonet. Clyp. Theol. Thom. T.* 1. *Tr.* 2. *Diſp.* 1. *p.* 565.

(2.) God as of *the true ſpecific and individual determination* (being plainly noticed unto them in the Nature of the thing) † *was in Nature fairly notic'd to the Heathen World.* For as in the Old Teſtament a Meſſiah is notic'd and reveal'd to the Jews, not without, but with true ſpecific and individual determination (the true Meſſiah, the true kind of Meſſiah is there in good degree reveal'd,) and in like manner a Paradiſe is notic'd to the *Muhammedans* : So in Nature God is fairly notic'd to the Gentiles, not without, but with true ſpecific and individual determination. They are blind and unintelligent in the *Nature of things*, that do not diſcern in caſe of competition, which is the *true Paradiſe* and which is the *true Meſſiah :* and in like manner, they are blind and unintelligent in the Nature of things, that do not diſcern in caſe of Competition which is the true God. The *Muhammedans* Senſualiſts-kind of Paradiſe in the future State is an Unparadiſaical, an Anti-paradiſaical kind of Paradiſe. The Jews mundane kind of Chriſt a Chriſtleſs and an Anti-Chriſt kind of Chriſt. So the Gentiles Paganical kind of God (their *Jove*) being in one part meerly *mundane*, and in the other Diabolical and wicked, and being the Deity of a Religion that is in one part meerly mundane, and in the other diabolical and wicked, *is a God-leſs and an Anti-God kind of God.* All theſe matters are ſo plain in the Nature of the thing, that it muſt be ſaid, *a Chriſt* is in Scripture ſo notic'd to the Jews, as that the true Chriſt (the true kind of Chriſt) is fairly noticed unto them ; a future Paradiſe is in Nature ſo notic'd to the Muhammedans, as that the true Paradiſe (the true kind of Paradiſe) is fairly notic'd unto them ; a God is in Nature ſo notic'd to all Mankind, as that the true God (the true kind of God) is fairly notic'd unto them. (u) *A Philoſopher is no other than a true Philoſopher, but becauſe ſome counterfeit Philoſophy, therefore the Epithet of true was added.* So Paradiſe is no other than the true Paradiſe, Chriſt is no other than the true Chriſt, God is no other than the true God : If God therefore (or a God) was in Nature made known to the Gentiles, the true God muſt neceſſarily be notic'd unto them. And ſome learned Men ſomewhat miſtake the Caſe, when they ſay. (w) *As* Oedipus *knew himſelf to have a Father, yet did not know, that* Laius *was he : So the Gentiles by the light of Nature might reach ſo far as to know, that there is one God, and that he is the Fountain of all Good, without knowing who was this God, as ſuppoſe the God of* Iſrael. For in the caſe of *Oedipus* there was no Competition between two pretending Fathers, whereas in the Gentiles caſe there was a Competition between two pretending Gods. And *Laius* (being but a particular Man) could not be known but only by an individual Determination : Whereas in caſe of Competition the true God is diſtinctly and certainly notic'd by *a meer ſpecific Determination* ; for as the *God-kind* or *Divine* kind of Paradiſe and Meſſiah is the true Paradiſe and the true Meſſiah : So the *God-kind* or *Divine-kind* of God (and the Deity of ſuch a kind of Religion) is the true God, but the Godleſs and Ungodly kind of God (and the Deity of ſuch a Religion) is the falſe God. It is not *a Divine Being*, nor *a Supreme Being*, nor *a Supreme God*, that is the ſpecific Determination of the true God, but the *God-kind*, or *the Divine-kind of God* (and God being an Imperial Eſtate, this is the ſame with the holy Empire's kind of Imperial Eſtate,) which ſpecific Determination is plainly notic'd in the Nature of the thing ; and therefore *God as of true ſpecific Determination* is in Nature fairly *notic'd to the Reaſon of all Men.* For ſuppoſe, that *Oedipus* could not know, that the Man *Laius* was his Father, yet in the Nature of the thing this was plainly notic'd, *that one of Mankind was his Father* : So in the Nature of the thing (and therefore in Nature) this is plainly notic'd to the Reaſon of all the World, that God is (not a vile or unholy and ungodly, but) the God-kind or the Divine kind of God. If this God (the Deity of true Holineſs and Godlineſs) was not as ſuch fairly notic'd to the Heathen World, if they had not much of the knowledge of him and of his Truth (touching his Service, their Duty and their Sin, his Rewards and Puniſhments) *this Knowledge* could not be ſaid, *to be manifeſt in them, becauſe God hath ſhew'd it unto them :* Nor could they be ſaid, *to hold the Truth* (ſtifled, ſmother'd and impriſon'd) *in Unrighteouſneſs.* This being their great Criminality, from thence it appeareth, that the true God was ſo far notic'd to them, as that they were under an obligation, to erect an holy Empire (imperfectly ſuch) by being in common his Religioniſts.

(3.) As the Jews reject the true Divine kind of Meſſiah, and the Muhammedans the true Divine kind of Paradiſe (which are notic'd unto them) theſe not being grateful and agreeable to them, nor ſuch as they like and love ; they are for a Meſſiah and a Paradiſe of another kind : So the Gentiles did not like that of the true Divine kind of God his Truth and his God-ſervice, which was notic'd unto them, they were for another kind of ſupreme God, which was more grateful to them, becauſe of their own Kind and Quality ; and ſo far (in ſetting up their *Jove* of ſeveral Notions jumbled and confounded together) they transform'd the Godhead into their own Similitude. According to that of *Xenophanes* the *Colophonian* ; (x) *if Horſes and Oxen could draw Pictures, they would pourtray the Gods like Horſes and Oxen, as of their own Form and Family.* The ſame Philoſopher obſerveth, (y) *that the Ethiopians paint the Gods black and flat noſ'd, the Thracians paint them reddiſh and cæruleous,* (aſſimilating alſo the Minds or Morals of the Gods to their own, ſaith *Clemens,*) *the Barbarians ſuppoſe them wild and ferine, the Greeks ſuppoſe them more gentle and placid.* So mundane and ungodly Mankind form'd a mundane and ungodly kind of Deity, as their God-ſervice was alſo a ſort of *Anthropomorphitiſm.* (z) *They fell into ſuch Conceits, that they form'd the Gods from themſelves as the Pattern, and ſuch as their Nature is, they ſuppos'd, that the Nature*

of

Scripturarum locis dicuntur. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. par. 3. Theſ. 6.

† *Licet exceptum ſibi populum ſpecialibus ad pietatem direxerit inſtitutis, nulli tamen nationi hominum bonitatis ſuæ dona ſubtraxit, ut Propheticas voces & præcepta legalia convincerentur in elementorum obſequiis ac teſtimoniis accepiſſe.* Script. de vocat. Gent. l. 1. c. 2.

(u) 'Ουδ' ἄλλο μὲν φιλόσοφος, ἄλλο δὲ ὁ ἀληθινός· ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ ὑποδυόμενον ἦν φιλοσοφίαν, ἡ προσθήκη τȣ͂ ἀληθινȣ͂ ἐγένετο. Plotin. En. 3. l. 7. c. 5.

(w) *Quemadmodum Oedipus, cùm ſe, ut Poetæ ajunt, patrem habere ſciret, eum tamen Lajum eſſe ignorabat : Itidem gentes eo naturæ lumine pertingere potuerunt, ut unum eſſe Deum cognoſcerent, eúmque omnis boni fontem ; nec tamen, quis Deus ille foret, noviſſent : Unde & hunc* ἄγνωςον θεὸν, *annuntiari iis opus fuit.* Act. 17. 23. *Duplex igitur Dei cognitio eſt : Prior ſimplex, qua ſcitur eſſe Deum, eumque ſapientem, bonum, potentem, colendum, juſti remuneratorem, injuſtitiæ vindicem : Altera vero applicata ad certum ſubjectum, puta Deum Iſraelis. Generalem illam notitiam gentibus concedimus : Poſteriorem non item, quia præclaras illas de Deo notitias in mendacio & impietate detinuerunt, tribuentes illas non vero, ſed falſo numini : Unde non noviſſe Deum plurimis*

(x) Clem. Strom. l. 5. p. m. 438.

(y) Ibid. l. 5. p. 511.

(z) *In eas ſunt opinationes lapſi, ut Deos ex ſe fingerent, & qualis ſibi natura eſt, & illis talem darent actionum, rerum,* *of the Actions, Affairs and Volitions of the Gods is the ſame.* (a) *The more of Ornament the Temples have, and the more of Pulcbritude the Images, ſo much more of Majeſty they are thought to have, ſo that the Religion of the Gods is nothing but the things admir'd by Human Appetite.*

voluntatumque naturam. Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 7. p. 239.

(a) *Quanto fuerint ornatiora Templa, & pulchriora ſimulachra, tanto plus Majeſtatis habere creduntur. Adeo Religio Deorum nihil aliud eſt, quam quod cupiditas humana miratur.* Lactant. l. 2. c. 7.

(4.) The Heathen having form'd their Theopolity, and ſet up *Jove* as Chieftain of their Deities, the true God was hid from the Eyes of their Mind, and although he was notic'd to them and known by them yet no otherwiſe than as an extraneous and Stranger-Deity (Foreign to their Theopolity,) as they were extraneous and the Aliens from knowing him. For ſuch a degree of knowing is knowing not knowing, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 10. 19. *did not Iſrael know?* They knew, but ſo as not to know. The Heathens knowing not knowing conſtituted them the Heathen People. For (b) *aberrantes à notitia Dei gentes eſſe cœperunt, they began to be Gentiles by loſing the Knowledge of God.* To ſuch a degree the *Athenians* knew God, when they erected an Altar to the unknown God. To ſuch a degree the Kings of the *Amorites* and the *Canaanites* knew God, whoſe Hearts melted, *when they heard that the Lord had dried up the Waters of Jordan from before the Children of Iſrael.* Joſh. 5. 1. And the God of *Iſrael* ſaith of himſelf, *Mal.* 1. 14. *My Name is dreadful among the Heathen.* To ſuch a degree thoſe Pagan Magicians *knew God,* who made uſe of this Name *the God of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob in their inchantments, (c) as *Origen* reporteth. And *Arnobius* ſuppoſeth, that the Magicians ſometimes experimented his Power, when he telleth the Heathen; (d) *Ask the* Egyptians, Perſians, Indians, Chaldeans, Armenians, *and all thoſe others that have ſeen and known theſe things in their interiour Arts; ſo you ſhall learn, who is the one God.*

(b) Lactant. l. 2. c. 14.

(c) C. Celſ. l. 4. p. 184.

(d) *Egyptios, Perſas, Indos, Chaldæos, Armenios interroget, omneſque illos alios, qui in interioribus viderunt, & cognoverunt hæc artibus; jam profectò diſcetis, quiſnam ſit Deus unus.* Adv. Gent. l. 4. p. 134.

III. That extraneous People the Gentiles *knew not God as a People know their God,* who is the Imperial Eſtate of their Religion, and who are *none of the Strangers, Foreigners and Aliens from his Theology and Religion.* In ſuch Senſe the Gentiles Character ſignifieth in Scripture, wherein *the Gentiles that know not God* are oppo'd to God's People, (the Theiſts of Religion;) and in ſuch Senſe the God of *Iſrael* ſaith to *Cyrus,* Iſa. 45. 5. *I girded thee, though thou haſt not known me.* So in Eccleſiaſtical Writers the Converſion of a Pagan to be one of God's People, is expreſs'd by a Tranſition (e) *from the Heatheniſm of the World to the acknowledgment* (or knowledge) *of the true God.* So *Tatianus* expreſſeth his Converſion. (f) *Being inſtituted at firſt in your Theology, but now knowing who God is, and what is his Creation.* (g) *For the Pagans Mythologize many thouſands of Gods, but are totally ignorant of the one God really and truly ſuch.* Which words of the Alexandrian *Cyril* muſt be underſtood with diſtinction and limitation of Senſe, or elſe he hath overſtretch'd the String. But the ſame Father ſaith of the dealings of the Apoſtate-Angels with the Pagans; (h) *Not ſuffering them to know at all, who is really and in truth the God and Lord of the Univerſe, that hath eſſentially the Empire over all, they perſwaded them to Worſhip the Creature rather than him.* In which Paſſage of S. *Cyril* it is obſervable, that the Præpoſition παρὰ, muſt be rendred *Præ* or *Potius* (the Gentiles were perſuaded, to Worſhip the Creature rather than the Creator; for he ſuppoſeth, *that the Gentiles did not at all know God,* which is true in this Senſe, *they were not at all Theiſts of Religion. Origen* calleth them (i) *ſuch as before the reception of Chriſt's Theology were in darkneſs concerning God and Ignorance of the Creator.* And although he was a Platoniſt, and ſuppos'd *Plato*'s Deity to be the true God, yet (contradictorily to himſelf) he ſaith of his Adverſary *Celſus* (who was no Stranger to *Plato*'s Deity,) *that he knew not God;* and of Paganiſm, (k) *that it is a Region devoid of the knowledge of God and the Life according to him, and hugely alien from Divinity.* (l) The Pagans (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) had their felicity and proſperity *à quodam Deo quem neſciebant; ipſe ergo quæratur, ipſe colatur, & ſufficit. From a certain God whom they knew not; let him therefore be ſought, let him be worſhipp'd, and it ſufficeth.* So S. *Chryſoſtom* repreſenteth their State, expounding the *Athenians* Inſcription to the unknown God. *Of whom may this properly be ſpoken* (ſaith he) *of the Creator or the Demon called* Zeus? *It is manifeſt of the Creator; for him they knew not, the other they knew. Paul* therefore (one of the Martyrs in *Paleſtine*) exhorted at his Martyrdom (m) *the Gentiles that are in Error and Neſcience of God, to come to Knowledge.* Their uſual Quære, *Quis iſte Deus eſt, who is that God, which ought alone to be ſerv'd?* Demonſtrateth their prodigious alienation from the Knowledge of God, and that the true God was no Deity of their Theology or Theopolity. Which alſo appeareth from their wild Conceits touching the God of the Hebrews. (n) *One of the Philoſophers upon inquiry into the Jews Religion pretended, to have found out what God they worſhipp'd, namely, one that preſideth over the Elements, which this viſible World conſiſteth of; for in the Scriptures of the Prophets the People of* Iſrael *are commanded to Worſhip that God, that made Heaven and Earth. Cicero* hath remark'd the wild Conceits of the Stoicks touching (the Hegemonicon of the World, or) the Godhead. (o) *Zeno and the generality of the Stoicks ſuppoſe, that the Ether is the ſupreme God, having a Mind whereby all things may be govern'd.* Cleanthes *a prime Stoick and Scholar of* Zeno *thinketh the Sun hath the Dominion, or is Lord of us and all and ſwayeth all. Therefore by the Diſſenſion of the wiſe we are neceſſitated to ignore, who is Lord over us, for we know not whether to pay our ſervice to the*

(e) *A Seculari errore ad agnitionem veræ Divinitatis.* Pontius in vit. S. Cypr.

(f) Παιδευθεὶς μὲν πρῶτον τὰ ὑμέτερα· γινώσκων δὲ λοιπὸν τίς ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ τίς ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν ποίησις. Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 10. c. 11.

(g) Μυρίους γὰρ ὅσους μυθολογοῦσι θεοὺς, τὸν ἕνα δὲ φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς εἰσάπαν ἠγνοήκοτες. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 7. p. 232.

(h) Οὐκ ἐφιέντες ὅλως εἰδέναι, κἂν γοῦν τίς ὁ φύσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν ὅλων ἐστὶ Θεὸς καὶ κύριος, καὶ τὸ κατὰ πάντων κράτος οὐσιωδῶς ἀνημμένος, λατρεύειν ἀναπεπείκασι παρ' αὐτὸν τῇ κτίσει. Ibid. l. 4. p. 122.

(i) Τοὺς πρὸ τῆς παραδοχῆς τῶν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δογμάτων ἐν σκότῳ τῷ περὶ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀγνοίᾳ τῇ περὶ τοῦ κτίσαντος ἐνδιατρίψαντας. C. Celſ. l. 8. p. 380.

(k) Ἔνθα ἐρημία ἐστὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν βίου, ἢ ἔνθα πολύς ἐστιν ὁ τῆς θεότητος ἀλλότριος. Ibid. p. 399.

(l) *S. Aug. de C. D. l. 4. c. 25.*

(m) Τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ καὶ ἀγνωσίᾳ Θεοῦ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὄντας, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἐλθεῖν αὐτούς. Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 8. de Mart. Pal. c. 8.

(n) *S. Aug. de Conſ. Evang. l.* 1. c. 29.

(o) *An ipſis inter ſe diſceptare, mihi cum iis non licebit? Zenoni & reliquis ferè Stoicis æther videtur ſummus Deus, mente præditus, quâ omnia regantur. Cleanthes, qui quaſi majorum eſt gentium Stoicus, Zenonis auditor ſolem dominari & rerum potiri putat; igitur cogimur diſſentione ſapientum dominum noſtrum ignorare: Quippe qui neſciamus, ſoli an ætheri ſerviamus.* Acad Qu. l. 4.

Sun or Æther. Theſe were a principal Sect of the Philoſophers, (*p*) who are ſuppos'd to have *attain'd the Knowledge of God by the Works of Creation: The Philoſophers* had the true Knowledge of God, (*q*) as ſome ſay. But the Apoſtle ranketh their Theoſophy with the Popular Pagan. 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. *Seeing that in the Wiſdom of God* (that inſtructive Wiſdom which God furniſheth in Nature) *the World by Wiſdom knew not God* (by Philoſophy they did not attain to that Knowledge the Knowledge of God,) *it pleas'd God by the fooliſhneſs of preaching to ſave them that believe.*

Clemens ſometimes ſaith of them, (*r*) *but as it ſeemeth, the Greek Philoſophers that Name God, do not know him; for they do not Worſhip God according to God.* Uſually he ſaith (*s*) *They knew and worſhipp'd God*, οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν γνῶσιν, *not according to Agnition or Cognition*, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περίφασιν, περίφασιν ἀληθῆ, περίφρασιν τὴν ἑλληνικὴν, *but according to Periphaſis, true Periphaſis, Grecanic Periphraſis.* In this Author *Periphaſis* (or Periphraſis) ſeemeth to ſignifie *the circumdeſcription of a Thing or Perſon*, whereby he meaneth *the true notionality as underſtood without the true reality* (without the true ſpecific and individual Determination,) which is on this ſide the Knowledge of the true reality, to which that notionality belongeth. This Idea *the King, or he that reigneth over us*, may be underſtood and taken either *without* or *with* that individual Perſon who is King and doth Reign; it admitteth both of an *indefinite* and *incomplex*, and alſo of a *definite* and *complex* acceptation, as ſome Logicians ſpeak. He that knoweth and honoureth the King only, as that Idea is underſtood and taken *indefinitely* and *incomplexly*, according to *Clemens* he knoweth and honoureth the King κατὰ περίφρασιν, *according to his circumdeſcription* (the true notionality as underſtood without the true reality,) οὐ κατὰ τὴν γνῶσιν, *not according to knowledge* of the true determinate reality or individual who is the King. Many are for *Truth*, for *Juſtice*, *Virtue* and *Piety*, κατὰ περίφρασιν, *according to their Circumdeſcription* (the true notionality as underſtood without the true reality,) that are not for them κατὰ τὴν γνῶσιν, *according to knowledge of the true reality to which that notionality belongeth*: But are adverſaries to that which is *really* and *materially* the *Truth*, *Juſtice*, *Virtue* and *Piety*. So Mankind have in their Mind the Notion of *Good*, *the chief Good* (ſummum bonum,) *Happineſs* and *Beatitude*: But they ſeek it (*t*) *as Men that are ſeeking Gold and Silver in the dark, and through their Expectation and Ignorance of good* (conjoin'd) *bring upon themſelves innumerable Evils; for God hath enkindled in Mankind this live Spark, the expectation of Good*, ἀπέκρυψε δὲ αὐτῶ τὴν εὕρεσιν, *but hath not taught them where to find it.* S. *Auſtin* was puzzled with this difficulty, *beatitudo amatur ab omnibus, nec tamen ſcitur ab omnibus, beatitude is belov'd by all, yet not known by all:* But he might have ſalv'd the difficulty, if he had diſtinguiſh'd the knowing it into knowing it κατὰ περίφασιν, *according to Periphaſis* and κατὰ γνῶσιν, *according to Knowledge.* The Heathen that are ſaid, to know and honour God, κατὰ περίφρασιν, according to *Periphraſis* only, had this or the like honourary Idea in their Mind, *the King of the World, the Lord of all that ſwayeth all*; but with this honourary Idea ſome of them inveſted *a Star*, others *an Hero*, others *a Demon*, and others a *Platonic Idea.* Some apply'd it to the viſible Univerſe (being Pan-Theiſts.) others were altogether uncertain to what *definite ſpecific-individual Nature* it ought to be apply'd (and therefore were *Vago-Theiſts*, or Theiſts at random, not determin'd πρὸς ἕν, *to any one thing*;) *Tu Jupiter, ſive Cœlum es, ſive Æther, ſive Terra, Thou* Jupiter, *whether thou be Heaven, or the Ether, or the Earth*, ſaith one in the Poet. Such Theiſts although they have this true Notion of God in their Mind, *the Lord of the World, the Lord of all* (or the like,) yet becauſe they apply it not to him, to whom it belongeth, they are not *Theo-Theiſts*, they do not know or acknowledge him, *who is Lord of the World, or Lord of all.* So *Clemens* ſaith of *Homer*, (*u*) *he talketh of the Father of Gods and Men, not knowing who is the Father, or how he is the Father*, Of the Heretical-Pagan *Gnoſticks* he ſaith, (*w*) Τὸν ὄντα μὴ γνώσκουσαι θεὸν, *Thoſe Hereſies know not the true God.* If this great Author contradicteth himſelf in this Argument, it is no more than is uſual with the Jewiſh Rabbins; for *Abarbinel* (agreeably to many others of his Fraternity) diſcourſeth, (*x*) *that the Gentiles did acknowledge the true God, only they err'd in ſetting up Mediatours.* Yet he alſo ſaith; *in aliis locis quia non agnoverunt Iſraelem, etiam non cognoſcunt Deum. In other places becauſe they have not known* Iſrael, *they alſo know not God.* So in the *Talmud* the Iſraelites are often oppos'd unto עובדי כוכבים ומולות *the Gentiles the Worſhippers of the Stars and Planets*, (*y*) *quaſi Deus à ſolis Iſraelitis agnoſceretur, as if God was known or acknowledg'd by the Iſraelites alone.* The Jews are known to be Idiotical and abſurdly fond of their own Nation: But without any thing of that extravagant Humour they may juſtly ſtile the Gentiles, as ſome of them have done (*z*) *not Gods Portion*, but חלק חאלילים *the Portion of the Idols whom they ſerve.* (*a*) *The Jews* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *in time paſt belonged to God, afterwards ejected for their Crimes they began to be without. The Gentiles were never within as to God, but as a drop out of the Bucket, and duſt out of the Floor, and always without.* A Biſhop therefore and a Confeſſor in one of the Councils of *Carthage* hath very much miſtaken the Gentiles Condition, Religion and Profeſſion. (*b*) *Gentiles quamvis Idola colant, tamen ſummum Deum Patrem Creatorem cognoſcunt & confitentur. Although the Gentiles worſhip Idols, yet they know and confeſs the ſupreme God the Father, the Creator.* If this account of Gentiliſm be not a foul miſtake, Jews, Heathens and Chriſtians are well agreed touching their Deity of Religion, as a certain Paſſage in the Emperor *Adrian*'s Epiſtle to *Servianus* ſeemeth to repreſent them. (*c*) *Unus illis Deus eſt. Hunc Chriſtiani, hunc Judæi, hunc omnes venerantur & gentes. They have one God* (Serapis,) *him the Chriſtians and the Jews and all the Nations Worſhip.* But this Paſſage (as alſo ſome others of the ſame Nature in that Epiſtle) ſpeaketh the Senſe and Practice of no other Jews and Chriſtians ſave only of certain *Egyptian Mongrel Pſeudo-Jews and Pſeudo-Chriſtians.* The genuin Jews and Chriſtians are no Religioniſts of *Serapis* (the ſame with *Jupiter Olympius*:) Nor is it poſſible, that God's Religioniſts ſhould have the ſame Deity of a Religion in common with the Gentiles *that know not God.* Which

being

(p) *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 21.

(q) *Ibid. p* 378. *v. Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 4. *p.* 181. *l.* 7. *p.* 364.

(r) Ἀλλ' ὡς ἔοικεν οἱ φιλόσοφοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, θεὸν ὀνομάζοντες οὐ γινώσκουσιν· Ἐπεὶ μὴ σέβουσι κατὰ θεὸν, τὸν θεόν. Strom. l. 6. p. m. 495.

(s) *Ibid. p.* 231, 446, 457.

(t) *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 39.

(u) Μὴ εἰδὼς τίς ὁ πατὴρ, ἢ πῶς ὁ πατήρ. Strom. l. 6. p. m. 497. v. Theodoret. Θεραπ. Ser. 2.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 7. *p.* 543.

(x) *Ap. Vorſt. de cap. Fid. p.* 76, 45.

(y) *L'Emper. not. in Jacchiad. p.* 209.

(z) *Jac. chiad. Paraphr. in Dan.* 7. 3.

(a) *Judæi retro penes Deum fuerant, dehinc ejecti ob delicta, extra Deum eſſe cœperunt. Nationes verò nunquam penes Deum, niſi ſtillicidium de ſitula, & pulvis ex area, & foris ſemper.* Tertull. de *Præſcript.* c. 8.

(b) *Sentent. Epiſc. Concil. Carth. inter op. S. Cypr. p.* 232. *ed. Pamel.*

(c) *Vopiſc. in Saturnin. Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 768.

being their genuin and uſual Character we may infer from it by way of *Conſectary* theſe five Branches of their and our Heatheniſm. 1. *Our atheous darkneſs as to matter of Underſtanding.* 2. *Our atheouſneſs and flagitiouſneſs of Life.* 3. *Agreeableneſs of Religion.* 4. *The badneſs of our Virtue and Goodneſs.* 5. *The deadlineſs of our State and Condition.* For all theſe are our Criminal *not knowing God* (that Deity of Religion which he is) and our State of not knowing God (which is the atheous State) is all theſe.

CONSECT. I.

Our Heatheniſm is the State of Atheous Ignorance.

I. THE Heathen World that abounded with common Learning and Knowledge, yet being in the Atheous State was in the State of Ignorance. The Ignorance of the Atheous State as ſuch is not meer Ignorance, but an *Atheous kind of Ignorance*, which Men emerge out of by their Converſion to God; as they that were initiated into the Gentiles Myſteries, are ſaid to have relinquiſh'd (*d*) τὴν ἄθεον δόξαν, *the Atheous Sentiment.* To this foul and criminal blemiſh of the Mind the ancient Theologers (*e*) both the Pagan and the Chriſtian have thought fit to apply the Name of *Darkneſs*, which is the Enemy both to *Light* and *Sight*, and hideth and obſcureth every thing. For the *Light* which Heatheniſm ſtandeth oppos'd to in the Chriſtian Theology, is not meer Knowledge, but the Saint of God-kind of Knowledge, which is *Theiſm of Religion and Condition.* Which Saint of God-kind of Knowledge and Wiſdom is conſiderable under a twofold Notion (agreeable to the Schools diſtinction of *Logica docens & utens*) as *Inſtitutive* and as *Conſtitutive.* As *Inſtitutive it is the Law of Light*, Prov. 6. 23. (An Inſtitution which is that which is Knowledge, Truth and Wiſdom.) As *Conſtitutive* (conſtitutive of the Saints of God) it denoteth univerſal Sanctity on our part, but more eſpecially that eminent Branch of it *the Light of Knowledge* which reſideth and ſhineth in holy Souls and conſtituteth *the Children of Light*, 2 Cor. 4. 6. So Heatheniſm conſider'd as a Diſcipline and Inſtitution (which may be called Heatheniſm inſtitutive) is the oppoſite to the Light of *the Law of true Religion*, and therefore is made up of that which is really and materially *Atheous Ignorance, Error and Folly.* And Heatheniſm of Mind (as to matter of Underſtanding) is the oppoſite to the Saint of God-kind of Knowledge and good Underſtanding *Conſtitutive*, and therefore is *the Atheous kind of Ignorance, Error and Folly.*

(d) *Clem. Str. l.* 7. *p. m.* 513.
(e) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 57.

II. As the Platoniſts therefore and the ancient *Magi* confront and oppoſe two contrary Natures which Man conſiſteth of, Soul and Body (*f*) τὴν μὲν θείαν, τὸν δὲ σκοτεινὸν ϗ ζοφώδη, *the one divine and luminous, the other dark and caliginous:* So the Chriſtian Theology contradiſtinguiſheth *two oppoſite Specific Comprehenſions, two oppoſite States and Conditions, and two oppoſite kind of People, Parties and Families, the one Divine and of Light, the other Atheous and of Darkneſs.* Matth. 5. 14. Luk. 4. 18. Joh. 9. 6. and 12. 46. 2 Cor. 4. 6. Col. 1. 13. 1 Theſſ. 5. 5. 2 Pet. 1. 9. 1 Joh. 2. 8, 9. Apoc. 3. 17. As amongſt (*g*) the Theurgical Philoſophers, ſo in the Scripture-Theology τὸ θεῖον ϗ τὸ λαμπρὸν, *that which is Divine, lucid and luminous*, ſtandeth oppos'd unto τὸ ἄθεον ϗ σκοτεινὸν, *that which is Atheous and Tenebricoſe.* So the Apoſtle of the Gentiles was ſent upon this Errand, *to turn them from Darkneſs to Light*, from Heatheniſm to Theiſm and Chriſtianiſm of Religion and Condition; which was *a calling them out of Darkneſs into marvellous Light.* As Heathens they were their *Heatheniſm* (Darkneſs,) and therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *ye were ſometimes Darkneſs, but now are ye Light in the Lord.* Heatheniſm is *the Darkneſs of this World*, of which the infernal Powers are the Rulers, *Eph.* 6. 12. and becauſe it is Atheiſm, the oppoſite to Theiſm and Chriſtianiſm of Religion and Condition, therefore the Apoſtle asketh, *what communion hath Light with Darkneſs?* 2 Cor. 6. 14. The Specific Comprehenſion of *Theiſm of Religion and Condition* is the Region of Light, and the Specific Comprehenſion of Athé-iſm is the Region of *outer Darkneſs*; which Phraſe ſignifieth *the blindneſs of the wicked*, as *Origen* thinketh. His Allegorical Interpretation is not amiſs; for this is the Region of *Blindneſs* (undiſcerningneſs) as well as of *Darkneſs*, and the Inhabitants of it are *the Fools and blind* (ſo called by our Saviour,) *the blind Leaders of the Blind, the blind People that have Eyes and ſee not* (ſeeing with their bodily Eyes, but as to the Eyes of their mind not ſeeing,) *the wretched and miſerable Poor and Blind*, ſuch as want their Eye-ſight. *He that lacketh theſe things* (Divine Graces) *is blind.* 2 Pet. 1. 9. All Mankind called *Heathens, Jews* or *Chriſtians*, that are in the State of *Graceleſneſs* and *Wickedneſs*, are in the main *of the Atheous People, in the Atheous State*; in the main they are in the Region of Darkneſs (the Specific Comprehenſion of Athé-iſm) and are thoſe that want their Eye-ſight. Such is their Caſe, their Character, and their Crime.

(f) *Julian. Hymn. in Sol.*
(g) *Hierocl. in aur. car. p.* 173.
Act. 26. 18.
1 *Pet.* 2. 9.
Eph. 5. 8.
Matth. 13; 13. *and* 15. 15. *and* 23. 19
Iſa. 43. 8.
Apoc. 3. 17.

III. The Heathen in their State of *Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſneſs* wanted their Eye-ſight; for they had need to have their Eyes open'd. *Act.* 26. 18. They were Prodigies of blindneſs and unintelligentneſs in the matters of Sanctity and Salvation, *walking in the* (heatheniſh or atheous) *vanity of their Mind, having the Underſtanding darkned* (being heatheniz'd and atheiz'd as to underſtanding things, having obliterated or at leaſt obſcured their natural Notices of the matters of God and Godlineſs,) *being alienated from the life of God through the* (Atheous kind of) *Ignorance that was in them, becauſe of the blindneſs of their Heart.* Their wiſe Men *profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, became Fools* (unwiſe and unintelligent in the Matters of God,) *and becoming vain in their Imaginations* (full of heatheniſh and Idolatrous Conceits which are Atheous) *their fooliſh Heart was darkened.* They liv'd (*h*) *as in deep Darkneſs, a Moon-leſs and a Winter-night*, or rather as in a be-nighted Sun-leſs Region, like that of the *Cimmerians in Homer*, which was never irradiated by the Sun-beams.

Eph. 4. 18.
Rom. 1. 21, 22.

(h) Ὡς ἐν σκότῳ βαθεῖ ϗ ἀσελήνῳ ϗ χειμερίῳ νυκτί. S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. Hom. 26.

—— οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺς
Ἠέλιος φαέθων ἐπιδέρκεται ἀκτίνεσσιν.

This had been our Caſe, (*i*) *if we had not known the Word and been illuminated by it: As if the Sun was not, notwithſtanding that there are Stars there would be nothing but an univerſal Night.* According to that of *Heraclitus*, εἰ μὴ ἥλιος ἦν, εὐφρόνη ἂν ἦν, *if the Sun had not been, Night* would

(i) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 52.

would have been. The words of *Philo* are lively expreſſive of the ſad benighted Eſtate of the Heathen World; (k) *the Region of the Wicked, where there is no Sun, but depth of the Night, endleſs Darkneſs, and vaſt multitudes of Shades, Ghoſts and Spectres, and Dreams.* Theſe are always ſtirring in the Night-time of ſottiſh Superſtition (the Day-light profligateth them) they are the Iſſue and reſembling Progeny of the dark Region of Paganiſm, wherein Mankind ſeem *to have been fettered by a long Night as Priſoners of Darkneſs*, Wiſd. 17. 2. Such Darkneſs as may well be called in *Plotinus*'s Language (l) βόρβορος σκοτεινὸς, *tenebricoſe Dirt*; for their Deities were אלילים & גלולים *Nothings, and Dunghill-Gods*; an ancient Writer ſaith, (m) *The Mind is ſordifiſ'd and dirtifiſ'd by evil Concupiſcences*; and another ſaith, (n) *The Mind of the Heathen was replete with the Dirt of Deceit.* Such was their foul Idolatry and blind Superſtition, which ſheweth, that they wanted their Eye-ſight; for, as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith to an Heathen, (o) *When thou goeſt into a Temple, and ſeeſt a naked Statue, a Mute Stone, and ſayeſt, This is a God, haſt thou Eyes? haſt thou not need that I ſhould make thee Eyes, to ſee Stone to be Stone, and Wood to be Wood?* Had the *Egyptians* Eyes, (p) who deify'd that blind Animal *Mus Araneus* (becauſe they ſuppos'd Darkneſs older than Light?) or the generality of the Pagans, were they not as blind as that Egyptian Deity, (q) who affix'd all manner of Infamy and Villainy to their Gods, yet thought themſelves Pious? They had a Notion of *Piety*, *Purity*, *Sanctity* and *Juſtice* towards their Deity; but their *Sanctity* was Sin, their *Piety* was Villainy, their *Purity* Pollution, their *Laver* was their Stain, and their *Righteouſneſs* the higheſt Wickedneſs; they counted *Evil Good*, and *Good Evil*, *Darkneſs Light*, and *Light Darkneſs*; as *Hierocles* intituled his Nefarious Book againſt Chriſtianity *Philalethes*, (lover of Truth;) whereupon *Lactantius* juſtly exclaimeth, (r) *O cæcum pectus, O mentem cimmeriis tenebris atriorem! O blind Mind, more black than the Cimmerian Darkneſs!* So *Zoſimus* ſuppoſeth, that *Theodoſius*'s forbidding the exerciſe of the Pagan Religion was downright Atheiſm and Irreligion. (s) *Thoſe were times of danger* (ſaith he) *to all that thought there were any Gods, or that look'd up at all unto Heaven.* Theſe virulent Pagans were like the *Night-birds*, (t) *they eſchew'd the Light as inimical, and embrac'd Darkneſs as Salutary*, the Darkneſs of the Atheous State, which is juſtly call'd by the ancient Writers of the Church, (u) *nox cæca, blind Night*; (w) *oculi ſuperfuſi nigroris tenebris & nocti contecti, Eyes cover'd with black Darkneſs and with the Night*; (x) *tenebrarum profundum, the Deep of Darkneſs*; (y) ἀγνοίας ὕπνος βαθὺς, *the profound* (and therefore pleaſing) *Sleep of Ignorance*; (z) *Nox media, Midnight*; (a) *horrenda quædam profunditas ignorantiæ, ex qua omnis error exiſtit, qui omnes filios Adam tenebricoſo quodam ſinu ſuſcipit, ut homo ab illo liberari ſine labore, dolore, timore, non poſſit: An Horrendous Deep of Ignorance, whence all Error ariſeth, which infoldeth all the Children of* Adam *as a tenebricoſe Cavity or Boſom, ſo that Man cannot be freed from it without Labour, Dolour, Fear.*

IV. All Mankind therefore natively and originally *want their Eye-ſight*, and muſt be denominated ſuch *as are born blind*; for this horrendous Deep of Ignorance (as S. *Auſtin* ſuppoſeth) is an effect of Man's original lapſe, and ſome degree of it is a Branch of his Original Corruption and Vitioſity: Which Hypotheſis Platoniſm hath ſome affinity with; for it ſuppoſeth, (b) ἄγνοιαν, νηπιότητα, παραφροσύνην, σκότωσιν, *Ignorance, Fooliſhneſs, Madneſs, Obtenebration*, to be the Conſequents of the Souls deſcent into the Body. The Man in the Goſpel that was born blind and recover'd his Eye-ſight, would not be an Emblem of our Saviour's Cures, nor would there be any need of a Divine Phyſician, to heal and open the Eyes of Men; nor of Divine Illumination, nor of a New-birth, (whereby we are born into the Region of Light) if Mankind were not in ſome degree born blind. (c) *Regenerate Chriſtians are brought forth into one and the ſame Light of Truth out of one Womb of the ſame Ignorance.* No account can be given of that Midnight Darkneſs, which for many Ages invelop'd the World of Mankind, but from this Hypotheſis, that they are born without their Eye-ſight; as without the *Life*, ſo without the *Light* Spiritual; as in ſome degree Heathen Ungodly Sinners, ſo Heathen Sons of Darkneſs. *Darkneſs* Metaphorical and Spiritual ſignifieth both *the privation of Light and the oppoſitive thereto.* For the Soul of Man in her degenerate condition having loſt the Divine Image hath loſt her Clarity and Brightneſs, her Purity and Vital Sanctity, and that Light which is a Branch of it, whereby ſhe is become devoid of the Saint of God-kind of Knowledge and Wiſdom *conſtitutive*; and thoſe kind of things which are peculiarly the matters thereof, are now an unknown Land; *as they that have been always ſick, never ſaw the Face of Health; as a Fiſh that hath been always under Water, knoweth not any thing of the Fire* (ſaith *Maimonides*;) whence the ſtate of degenerate Souls is that of Heathens, (d) μηδὲ φαντασιωθέντων τὴν θείαν αἴσθησιν, *that* (uſually) *have not ſo much as a thought, which is Divine Senſe and Diſcernment* Upon the loſs of the Divine Image (which is the Soul's Life and Light) an *oppoſitive Darkneſs* ſucceedeth; for ſuch is the Reign of the Animal Senſitive Nature (the Fleſh) which is blind and fooliſh, unintelligent and unreaſonable, and is cauſally blindneſs, error and folly to the Mind; as ſuggeſting atheous Conceits (vain and heatheniſh Imaginations, *Rom.* 1. 21.) as being full of (e) vile and corrupt Affections; as being parturient of all Vice and Wickedneſs (*their own Wickedneſs hath blinded them*, Wiſd. 2. 27.) and the Mind ſymbolizing therewith and being Uniſon thereto becometh *a fleſhly Mind*, Col. 2. 18. Rom. 8. 5. Eph. 2. 3. For being moulded *after the Fleſh*, ſhe becometh *carnally minded* (affected and addicted) of an Atheous, Carnal and Mundane Genius and Diſpoſition, which is an Ineptitude and Indiſpoſition of the Soul, *to theize* and ſymbolize with God in any reſpect (in her Diſcernments, Apprehenſions and Conceits, Opinion and Judgment, Sentiment and Eſtimation of things, as alſo in her Deſigns, Elections and Purſuits,) and an aptitude or diſpoſition to *Atheize* in all reſpects; which importeth a Propenſion to the blind and carnal Conceits of Mundane Religioniſts, and to the various ſorts of Atheous Error and Folly. Such an Atheous and Heathen-kind of Genius is now in a degree of Inchoation native and original to Mankind (who therefore ought to be reputed of the Atheous Heathen and Mundane-kind and Family) which by degrees is increas'd, as vitious Affections grow to greater height, and as ſinning againſt God becometh their Trade and Practice; for (f) *the evil Life cauſeth Mens ignorance of that knowledge the knowledge of God.* Bad Education alſo, Converſe and Company, Example, prevailing Cuſtom, publick reigning Error and Vice, bad Government and Laws, beget, confirm and increaſe Atheouſneſs of Mind, and by the Tempter's Artifices and Impoſtures, (g) ἡ ψυχὴ ἀσαφείας ἐμπέπλησται, *the Soul becometh opacous and caliginous, and is replete with Darkneſs.* From theſe concurrent cauſes (all or many of them) Act. 17. 30. the ancient times of the Heathen were *the times of Ignorance:* And thence it is, that the generality of Mankind in all times are criminally involv'd in Atheous Darkneſs, Error, Ignorance and Fooliſhneſs touching *matters of Good and Evil, Right and Wrong, Juſt and Unjuſt, Virtue and Vice, Gallantry and Baſeneſs, Sanctity and Sin, God and his Service, and the God-kind of things*; (h) *for they that know not God, are neceſſarily ignorant of the Matters of God, becauſe no Treaſure lieth open to the extraneous. Touching the World alſo and its ſenſitive Goods and Evils, touching themſelves, their Intereſt, and their Happineſs, their Souls and their future ſtate,* they prodigiouſly deceive themſelves (through Pride and Self-love) *and touching* their preſent ſtate and their ways, Luk. 23. 34. *not knowing what they do, nor whither they are going, becauſe the Darkneſs hath blinded their Eyes,* 1 Joh. 2. 11.

(k) Ἀσεβῶν ἀνήλιος χῶρος, ὃν ἐπέχουσι νὺξ βαθεῖα, σκότος ἀτελεύτητον, καὶ εἰδώλων καὶ φασμάτων καὶ ὀνειράτων ἔθνη μυρία. Περὶ ὀνειρ. *l.* 3. *opuſc. p.* 163.

(l) *En.* 1. *l.* 8. *c.* 13.

(m) *Mens malis cupiditatibus ſordidatur.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 20.

(n) Τῆς ἑλλήνων διανοίας τοῖς τῆς ἀπάτης βορβόροις ἐμβεβυσμένης. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 5. *p.* 172.

(o) *Phot. Cod.* 277. *Col.* 1557. *v. Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 322.

(p) *Plut. Sympoſ. l.* 4. *c.* 5.

(q) *Arnob. c. Gent. l.* 4 *p.* 147.

(r) *L.* 5. *c.* 3.

(s) *Hiſt. p.* 245.

(t) *Theodoret.* θεραπ. *Ser.* 2.

(u) *S. Cypr. Ep.* 2.

(w) *Idem de oper. & eleemoſ.*

(x) *Min. Fel. p.* 6.

(y) *Clem. pæd. l.* 2. *c.* 10.

(z) *S. Aug. de verb. Dom. Ser.* 29.

(a) *Idem de C. D. l.* 22. *c.* 22.

(b) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 86. *Gale Not. p.* 241, 242.

(c) *Chriſtiani de uno utero ignorantiæ ejuſdem ad unam lucem expiraverunt veritatis.* Tertull. Apol. c. 39.

(d) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 391.

(e) *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 9. 6.

V. The principal and ſummary reaſon of the Heathens Blindneſs was, *They did not emerge out of the ſtate of Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs,* and therefore they were in the ſtate of Atheous Ignorance. From whence it followeth, that all Men who are in the ſame ſtate of Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs (although they do not Atheize ſo enormouſly as the Heathen, yet) are in *the ſtate of Atheous Ignorance* and want their Eye-ſight as well as they. Flaſhes of Light and ſome convictions of Mind are conſiſtent with this eſtate; and there may be in it a ſuperficial, ineffectual and graceleſs kind of knowing the matters of Sanctity and Saving Religion (all ſuch knowledge which is a knowing not knowing them, 1 *Cor.* 13. 2.) yet becauſe all that are in it, (i) *in nocte peccatorum vitiorumque velantur, are hoodwink'd in the Night of their Sins and Vices, and have a Vail upon their Minds,* they are neceſſarily in the ſtate of Atheous Ignorance: Reigning Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs is *formally* and *efficient-cauſally* reigning Ignorance, Darkneſs, Error, Deceit, Fooliſhneſs. Οὐδὲν οὕτως ποιεῖ μωροὺς ὡς πονηρία, *S. Chryſoſt. in Joh. Hom.* 41. *Nothing ſo maketh Fools as Wickedneſs.* The Wicked and Ungodly could not be ſuch, if they were not the Ignorant and Unintelligent, the Fooliſh and Unwiſe, the Blind and Undiſcerning, erroneous, deceived and deluded; *Fools in the main and therefore Fools in grain.* And if in the main they are the Ignorant and Unintelligent, they are neceſſarily ſuch in the matters of Sanctity and Saving Religion. They have not the due knowledge and underſtanding of them, which conſtituteth the Men of Knowledge and Underſtanding; they know them but ſo, as to be in the ſtate of Ignorance concerning them; as thoſe falſe Religioniſts the Carnal Jews were; who if they had had their Eyes, muſt have diſcern'd *the Light of the World ſhining* in their view, could not have miſtaken God for the Devil, nor could they have miſtaken ſhews for ſubſtance; or thought themſelves Virtuous when they were Vile, or Wiſe when they were Fools; or ſafe, when they were in their Sins; nor could they have made their Religion their Sin and Deluſion. Both Jews and Gentiles ſhew, what Man is in his (now) Original and Unregenerate State; that this being the ſtate *of reigning Wickedneſs and Ungodlineſs,* is the ſtate of *reigning Atheous Ignorance, Error and Fooliſhneſs*; whence all the Ungodly are ἀπειρόκαλοι, *lamentably unskilful in the Science of Good and Evil.*

Deut. 32. 28, 29. Job 28. 28. Pſal. 111. 10. Prov. 4. 19. and 15. 21. and 24. 9. Iſa. 27. 11. and 44. 20. Dan. 12. 10. Rom. 3. 11. Matth. 23. 17. Eph. 4. 22. 1 Tim. 6. 9. Tit. 3. 3. Heb. 3. 10. and 9. 7. Jam. 5. 20. 2 Pet. 2. 18.

VI. If *Atheous Ignorance,* Error and Folly together with Sin and Wickedneſs reigneth in Unregenerate Mankind, a Syſtem of that which is *Unreaſonableneſs* neceſſarily reigneth, (not as if we wanted the natural faculty of Reaſon and Underſtanding, but the good underſtanding is wanting,) whence the ancient Writers ſay, (k) *By the coming of Chriſt Man, who was unreaſonable* (unreaſonably affected and addicted) *is made reaſonable; before we were like the Brutes that know not reaſon, we were carnal, we were terrene.* Atheous Mankind being themſelves (in great degree) unreaſonable, the things of the Holy Spirit (thoſe which are originally and of kind and quality ſuch) ſeem to them abſurd, fooliſh, unreaſonable, as the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *The natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are Fooliſhneſs to him; neither can he know them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcern'd.* He that is *Non-ſpiritual* both as to extraordinary Spiritual Revelation, and as to ordinary Spiritual Regeneration, is *the Natural Man.* But he is here conſider'd as oppos'd to the Spiritual Man of extraordinary Spiritual Revelation, who hath Intelligence of the things of the Holy Spirit, and communicateth them; which the Natural Man (without being better qualify'd) *receiveth not; neither can he know them* (as the World cannot receive the Holy Spirit,) *but they are Fooliſhneſs in his Eyes,* 1 *Cor.* 1. 18, 21, 23, 25. *Joh.* 14. 17. Mankind in their Mundane Naturaliſm (antecedently to their Converſion) are ſo atheouſly affected, that the Apoſtle ſpeaking their Senſe of things in his time, calleth the Word of the Croſs (*profundum Crucis, the deep Myſtery of the Croſs,* as S. *Auſtin* ſpeaketh) *the fooliſhneſs of Preaching.* Time was when the Chriſtians thought it ſo, as their Apologiſts tell the Heathen; (l) *Theſe matters of the Chriſtian Faith we have ſometime derided as well as you, for we were of you, being made, not born Chriſtians.* So the matters of the Holy Chriſtian Life have always ſeem'd ridiculous and fooliſh to Men of the Atheous, Mundane and Profane Genius, which ſo prevaileth in Nations called Chriſtian, that ſerious Piety is not matter of Honour and Eſtimation, but of Diſparagement with the moſt and greateſt, and to be a Chriſtian indeed, is to be vile in their Eyes, if not to have the uſage, which ſuch as departed from Iniquity in ancient times had * τὸν γέλωτα καὶ τὴν χλευασίαν,

---

(f) Τὸ δὲ ἀγνοεῖν τὸν θεὸν, ἡ τοῦ βίου πολιτεία παρίστησιν. *Clem. Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 324.

(g) *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 28.

(h) *Ignorantes quique Deum rem quoque ejus ignorent neceſſe eſt, quia nullus omnino theſaurus extraneis patet.* Tertull. de Pœnit. c. 1.

(i) *S. Aug. de Mor. Eccl. Cathol. c.* 2.

(k) *Per adventum Christi, homo qui erat irrationabilis, rationabilis factus eſt. Ante eramus ſimiles beſtiarum, quæ rationem neſciunt, eramus carnales, eramus terreni.* Vid. Petav. T. 4. par. 1. l. 2. c. 7. p. 152. & par. 2. l. 12. c. 15. p. 242. & ibid. p. 540. Montacut. Apparat. p. 25.

(l) *Hæc & nos riſimus aliquando, de veſtris fuimus; fiunt, non naſcuntur Chriſtiani.* Tertull. Apol. c. 18.

* *S. Chryſoſt. in Gen. Hom.* κγ. p. 165.

Laughter and Deriſion. (m) *Amongſt Chriſtians they that will be the more diligent and better, muſt be inſulted over by Chriſtians,* (n) *the bad Chriſtians that tranſcend all* (Jews and Pagans) *in wickedneſs of Life.* Theſe ſuppoſe, that they may be leud, ſenſual and worldly, yet genuine Chriſtians; that Sin is a very ſmall matter (and accordingly their Life is the Sinning Trade;) that God is the God and Patron of the Ungodly, that it is needleſs and ridiculous to be a Saint of God, and a ſneaking thing to be Religious; that Heatheniſh Perfunctorineſs and Outſide Modiſhneſs in God's Service is good Devotion, that high Profaneneſs is Gallantry, that a Life of Fleſh-pleaſing Vanity is better than an Holy, that the World's deluſive Phantaſms are the great and goodly things, that the Concernments of this Animal Senſitive Life are chiefly to be minded; and that (o) it is madneſs to bear the Croſs and to ſuffer for Righteouſneſs ſake. In Chriſtendom, in Reform'd Chriſtendom, ſuch Atheous Ignorance, Error and Folly prevaileth, which is (as *Plato* in his *Sophiſta* defineth Ignorance) οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν παραφροσύνη, *nothing elſe but Madneſs*; for that which is an high degree of Unreaſonableneſs (highly contrary to underſtanding Agency) both Philoſophers and the Vulgar call Madneſs, Phrenzy and Deliration. "It is Madneſs, for Men to dream of "a worldly happy Eſtate, and a ſenſual Feli"city, and to make it their chief End and "Good; to be the World's admirers and lovers, "that are deluded by Shadows (at the rate of "*Plato*'s Cave-men) and idolize momentaneous "phantaſtick nothings, and purſue a Feather, "and dote upon Dung and Carrion, and Thorns "and Briars, (making them the chief or All of "their regard and concern) but neglect and loſe "the true ineſtimable Goods of the Kingdom of "God and of the Soul; to chuſe the Evil and re"fuſe the Good, running counter to their own "intendment (deſigning to be honourable and "happy, yet making themſelves vile and miſe"rable to extremity;) to ſin againſt God "(which is an Immenſity of Madneſs;) in a ſtate "of preſent danger wherein they are ſurroun"ded with Enemies, to be regardleſs of their "Safety, and as regardleſs of the future over"whelming Calamities, which few forecaſt to "prevent; to be merry and jovial in a mourn"ful ſtate, and fearleſs and careleſs in a fear"ful caſe; to loſe their Salvation for want of "a little ſerious care and pains (an Hog for an "Half-penny worth of Tarr) to ſpend their "care and time (their only time of making "themſelves) about that which is not worth the "while, to part with their All for nothing "(*Hoc aliquid nihil eſt*) to ſell their Salvation "for an old Song, and for a Moments Foolery "and Gullery (the Pleaſures of Sin and Vani"ties of the World) to plunge themſelves into "endleſs Miſeries; to be deluded and befool'd "in the plaineſt things, and in all their great "concerns, not knowing what is good for "themſelves, preferring a Cup of Ale before "Immortality, *ſporting themſelves in their own* "*deceivings*, and to manage their Affairs at ſo "mad a rate, as to loſe themſelves and be "caſt away! Ignorance by ſome of the Ancients was accounted *(p) μανίας εἶδος, a Species of Madneſs:* So the Heathen that were in the ſtate of Atheous Ignorance, are reproach'd with Madneſs by the Chriſtian Apologiſts. (q) *They are mad rather than drunk, that make haſt to the Temples, and do worſhip to Statues or Animals as Gods; nor are they leſs mad, who ſuppoſe, that ſuch Works and Devices of ſordid and nefarious Artifices are honourary unto true Gods.* (r) *Mankind are taken with Madneſs* (one of the greateſt Blemiſhes and Calamities,) which Chriſtianity is deſign'd to cure them of, and to reduce them to Godly-mindedneſs.

CONSECT. 2.

In Heatheniſm we live the Atheous Life.

I. A Theizing in Life and Practice is connex'd with Atheizing as to Underſtanding both as *an Antecedent Cauſe, a Concomitant* and *a Conſequent thereof.* For the Atheous kind of Life and Practice *cauſeth* the Atheous kind of Ignorance, Error and Fooliſhneſs, (s) as Steams and groſs Exhalations from the Earth cauſe a Caliginous Air. Sins and Vices, Luſts and Paſſions are to the Mind, (t) what a Suffuſion is to the Eye, (u) what Ruſt and Corruption is to a Looking-Glaſs (which fouleth it and eateth away its Brightneſs) an Atheous Temper and Diſpoſition is prone to Atheous Conceits and affecteth Atheous Opinions, Carnal Affections ſo powerfully blind the Underſtanding and biaſs the Judgment, (w) that evil Men muſt be ſuppos'd to have bad Notions of God. All Men judge as they are affected, (he that hateth any Man, is prone to believe and judge all manner of Evil of him; and when he is otherwiſe affected towards him, he will be prone to believe and judge the contrary;) therefore the Lovers of the World magnifie the things of the World; they ſee no Errors in their Patrons that raiſe them to Wealth and Greatneſs, and they form to themſelves a worldly kind of Religion: So the lovers of Fleſhly Pleaſures are averſe from believing a Reſurrection and Future Judgment, and (as *Chaucer* ſaith of the People of *England*) *what they not like they never underſtand*; the Truth is againſt the Improbous (whilſt ſo affected and addicted) and they are againſt the Truth. The Jews ſay, (x) that the Sin of *Eve* ſo extinguiſh'd the Light of the Sun, that it ſhineth not now, as it did before (for they ſuppoſe, that it ſhone before, as it will ſhine to the Juſt in the other Life;) which is a true ſaying, if it be underſtood of the lapſe of the Soul into Vice and Wickedneſs, and the extinction of her Intellectual Sun, which is an unavoidable Conſequence thereof. For the Soul in the Atheous State and Life and of the Atheous kind is neceſſarily bereft of the Saint of God-kind of Knowledge and Wiſdom *conſtitutive*, and hath but an obſcure diſcernment of the turpitude of Sin and Vice, or of the pulchritude of Virtue. (y) *Vitiis circundati non poſſunt videre virtutes, they that are ſurrounded with and involv'd in the Vices, cannot ſee the Virtues.* (z) *One of an impure Life knoweth not the Virtue of Temperance or Chaſtity, nor the Pulchritude of Philoſophy.*

Ignorance is connex'd with Vice and Wickedneſs as a *Concomitant* (inſeparable;) for it is impoſſible to be wiſe and wicked at the ſame time; (a) *Nor is there any improbous Man, in whom Ignorance is not predominant and reigning,* as Plato and

---

(m) *Inter Chriſtianos qui voluerint eſſe diligentiores & meliores, ab ipſis Chriſtianis audituri ſunt inſultationes.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 90.

(n) *Omnibus* (Paganis Judæis) *pejus vivunt mali Chriſtiani.* Idem in Pſal. 30. con. 2.

(o) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 27. *Lactant. l.* 5. *c.* 19.

(p) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 56.

(q) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 157.

(r) Μεμηνὸς δὲ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Idem ibid. l.* 4. *p.* 172.

(s) *Clem. Str. l.* 2. *p. m.* 200.

(t) *Idem pædag. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(u) *Theophil. ad Autol. l.* 1. *p.* 70.

(w) *Clem. Str. l.* 7. *p. m.* 811.

(x) *Buxt. Syn. Jud. c.* 10. *p.* 249.

(y) *S. Hieron. in Jonam. c.* 3.

(z) Ὁ βίον ἀκάθαρτον ἔχων οὐκ οἶδε τῆς σωφροσύνης τὴν ἀρετὴν, οὐδὲ τῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸ κάλλος. *S. Chryſoſt. Hom.* 5. *in Joh.*

(a) *Nec ullus eſt malus, in quo ignorantia non dominatur, ſicut Plato & eum ſecutus Ariſtoteles docent.* Vives in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 11. c. 11.

Ariſtotle *following him both teach.* The being wicked is to be a Fool, the greateſt of Fools; reigning Wickedneſs therefore is neceſſarily connex'd with the greateſt Ignorance, Errour and Fooliſhneſs: Nor do any commit a ſinful Fact (preferring the Evil before the Good,) but upon their Repentance they acknowledge themſelves, to have been deceiv'd and befool'd (in making a falſe Valuation of ſome appearing Good connex'd with great Evil) according to that of *Menander.*

Οἴ μοι τάλας ἔγωγε, ποῦ ποθ' αἱ φρένες,
Ἡμῶν ἐκεῖνον ἦσαν, ἐν τῷ σώματι
Τὸν καιρὸν, οὐ ταῦτ' ἀλλ' ἐκεῖν' αἱρομένοις.

O miſerable I! where was our Mind,
In what part of our Body? When ſo blind,
That we thoſe Ills choſe, and thoſe Goods
declin'd.

Atheizing in Life and Practice is alſo connex'd with atheous Ignorance as *a Conſequent* thereof. For (*b*) *Ignorance introduceth Wickedneſs.* The groſly ignorant in matters of true Religion and Godlineſs do not know them, and therefore can neither will nor do them, nor decline the oppoſite Evils; their ſinful Ignorance therefore is both in it ſelf and in its Conſequence * κακία ἐναργής, (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) *manifeſt Wickedneſs.* The whole of true Religion, Virtue and Duty is matter of Wiſdom and Knowledge; for they muſt be Men of good Underſtanding, that know the Divine Empire and the Laws thereof, and underſtand the matters of the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Philoſophy; that know the great things, which alone are worthy to be known, and underſtand the true Nature, worth and uſe of things; that diſcern between Truth and Falſhood, true and falſe Religion, between Good and Evil (chuſing the one and declining the other,) between Realities and Reſemblances, and are not impoſ'd upon by ſhews and appearances, that eſcape Error, Deceit and Deluſion (in their Opinions, Elections, Hopes and Confidences) and the many tempting Baits of Sin; that underſtand the true Rates of Things and eſtimate them aright; that know their Bounds and obſerve them, their Dangers and avoid them, their Enemies and how to vanquiſh them, their Diſeaſes and how to cure them; that conduct themſelves by wiſe Maxims, and do well and wiſely; that know how to demean themſelves aright in all Caſes and Circumſtances, and do their Buſineſs and Office well; that are not fooliſhly and viciouſly affected, but agreeably to the Nature of things (contemning what is contemptible, fearing what is really fearful, loving what is aimable in due degree and meaſure,) that govern themſelves well, and are well adviſ'd in their doings, foreſeeing and preventing the great Evils, making ſure of their true Happineſs, and ſo ſucceſsfully managing their Affairs, that they are eternally ſafe and ſecure. But they that *lack Underſtanding*, are like Children, *who through Ignorance touch the fire* (*Clem. Strom. l. 7. p. m.* 530.) they underſtand not their Sin, fear not their Danger, regard not their great Intereſts, diſcern not the things that differ, are cheated with falſe Wares in the dark, miſtake Traſh for Treaſure, and delirous Fables for Truth and Wiſdom. (*c*) Ἀκρότητες ἄρα ἀμαθίας ἀθεότης καὶ δεισιδαιμονία, *to live in impiety, is one extremity of Ignorance, and Superſtition is another.* Their Mind in the State of Ignorance and Blindneſs is replete with ignorant and fooliſh Cogitations, Conceits and Opinions; their jugdments and eſtimations of Things, their deſigns and elections are ignorant and unwiſe; they run upon thoſe Evils, which in general they deſire to avoid (for they wiſh well to themſelves;) their atheous Life ingendreth atheous Opinions and Errors, and their atheous Opinions and Errors neceſſarily lead to atheous Life and Practice.

II. Ignorance and Unintelligentneſs is ſo prolific a Principle of Sin, that as an ancient Writer ſaith, (*d*) *It floweth from it as a Stream from a Fountain. The Philoſophers ſuppoſe, that every thing which the ignorant and fooliſh do, is unholy and impious,* (*e*) ſaith *Clemens.* And himſelf ſaith, (*f*) *whatever is done by the knowing and skilful* (in well-doing) *is good Practice,* (as in Writing or Limning what the skilful do is well done;) *but whatever the ignorant and unskilful doth, is bad Practice.* The Practice of Well-doing is neceſſarily wanting there, where the requiſite Skill or Science of Well-doing is wanting. In which ſenſe the Saying of *Lactantius* may be underſtood, and may be made a true Propoſition. (*g*) *He that is ignorant and fooliſh, knoweth not what is Juſt and Well-doing, and therefore always doth amiſs.* As *Minerva* in *Homer* ſaith *Plato* (*Alcibiad.* 2.) *took away the Cloud of darkneſs from* Diomedes's *Eyes.*

Ὄφρ' εὖ γιγνώσκοι ἠ μὲν θεὸν ἠ δὲ ϗ ἄνδρα·

That he might well diſcern a God from a Man:

So thou oughteſt to have the Cloud of darkneſs taken away from thy Mind, which is now upon it, and then to apply thoſe Faculties by which thou mayeſt know — ἠ μὲν κακὸν, ἠ δὲ ϗ ἐσθλὸν, *Good and Evil, that ſo thou mayeſt know, how to behave thy ſelf towards the Gods and Men. How great an evil Ignorance is,* this Philoſopher obſerveth, *ſeeing Men through Ignorance deſire and pray for what is hurtful to themſelves, ſuppoſing it to be good and profitable:* (*h*) *and becauſe of Ignorance we know not, that we do Evil.* Nor do evil Men know what they are (abject, baſe and miſerable) as this Philoſopher ſaith in his *Theætetus,* τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον εἰσὶν οἷοι οὐκ οἴονται, ὅτι οὐχὶ οἴονται, *They are the more ſuch as they think not themſelves to be, becauſe they do not think themſelves ſuch;* for none would be wicked and unjuſt, if they thought, that being ſuch, they are abject, baſe and miſerable to extremity, as indeed they are. For (*i*) *there being two Paradigms in the order of things, the one divine, the moſt happy; the other atheous, the moſt miſerable; they not ſeeing this, through their ſtolidity and extreme unintelligentneſs, unwittingly by their unjuſt Practices they become like to this, and unlike to that, for which they ſuffer puniſhment, living a life like that*

to

(b) Ἡ ἄγνοια τὴν κακίαν εἰσηγεῖται. Hier. in aur. car. p. 178.

* *Plato in his Theætetus ſaith of his good Doctrine concerning God,* (*that he is moſt juſt, and nothing more like him than a Man that is moſt juſt.*) ἡ μὲν τούτου γνῶσις, σοφία ϗ ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή· ἡ δὲ ἄγνοια, ἀμαθία καὶ κακία ἐναργής. *To know this is Wiſdom and true Virtue: But to be ignorant of it is illiterateneſs and manifeſt wickedneſs.*

(c) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. p. 12.

(d) *Ap. Petav. T.* 4. *Par.* 2. *l.* 11. *c.* 1. *S.* 3.

(e) Προτρεπτ. p. *m.* 56.

(f) Πᾶσα ἡ διὰ τοῦ ἐπιστήμονος πρᾶξις, εὐπραγία· ἡ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἀνεπιστήμονος κακοπραγία. Strom. l. 7. p. m. 527.

(g) *Qui enim Stultus eſt quid ſit juſtum ac bonum neſcit, & ideo ſemper peccat.* l. 5. c. 18.

(h) Λελήθαμεν ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς διὰ ταύτην καὶ πράττοντες.

(i) Παραδειγμάτων ἐν τῷ ὄντι ἑστώτων, τοῦ μὲν θείου εὐδαιμονεστάτου· τοῦ δὲ ἀθέου ἀθλιωτάτου· οὐχ ὁρῶντες, ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει, ὑπὸ ἠλιθιότητός τε ϗ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας λανθάνουσι τῷ μὲν ὁμοιούμενοι διὰ τὰς ἀδίκους πράξεις τῷ δὲ ἀνομοιούμενοι. Οὗ δὲ τίνουσι δίκην, ζῶντες τὸν εἰκότα βίον ᾧ ὁμοιοῦνται.

to which they are aſſimilated. They degenerate into Brutiſts, but ſee not their own vileneſs, (*k*) nor their own true Intereſts (at moſt but obſcurely and ineffectually,) *and ſuppoſing themſelves, to hurt others, they hurt themſelves moſt of all, not knowing it,* (*l*) *which is extreme unintelligentneſs.* (*m*) *Knowledge and Prudence being that in the Mind, which the Eye is in the Body* (the Hegemonic,) *and as the Sun in the Firmament,* the Ignorant muſt neceſſarily travel in the Night (or according to the ancient Proverb πλεῖν ἐν τῇ νυκτί, *navigate in the Night,)* without ſeeing their way or their end, running upon Snares and Temptations, and Sin and Puniſhment, as upon Rocks and Shelves, eaſily ſeduc'd or miſled, or of themſelves wandring out of the way, *through the greatneſs of their folly going aſtray,* ſtumbling and tumbling into the Ditch. So (*n*) *through Ignorance of God Men are many ways impious againſt God, defrauding God of his due Honours, attributing them to no Gods, deifying the parts of the World, and ſome ſuppoſing two repugnant Opificers thereof.* So the Jews through ignorance crucify'd their Meſſiah, and the *Samaritans* worſhipp'd they knew not what. (*o*) Ἁμαρτάνομεν ἀπαίδευτοι ὄντες, *we do Sin not being the Men of Learning in matter of Good and Evil.*

Which is not to be underſtood in the Senſe of *Arnobius,* who from the School of the *Platoniſts* and the *Stoicks* deriv'd this Conceit, (*p*) *that Mankind do not Sin by Will, but only by ignorance and weakneſs of Judgment; that really we would not Evil, nor do we chuſe it, but through ignorance we judge that Good, which yet is really Evil.* But this Conceit is a grand Extravagance; for nothing is more apparent, than that Men uſually *will and chuſe,* intend and deſign (which is a perverſe Appetite and Will) the Evil of manifeſt injuſtice for carnal Self-gratification and advantage; a Conceit therefore which ſuppoſeth all their Sins, *to be Sins of excuſable Ignorance,* is it ſelf a Branch of Ignorance inexcuſable. Yet becauſe there is Ignorance in every actual Sin, and it is in part the Principle of it, the Maxim is true, (*q*) *All Sin hath its riſe from Ignorance and Unintelligentneſs,* (*r*) *whereby Men are filled with all Evils, as Knowledge is the Fountain of all Goods to them.* The Nature of Well-doing requireth, that the Mind be duely knowing as to her Agency; and to the Mind it belongeth, to guide and govern the whole Man, and to ſteer our whole courſe: But how exorbitantly and unhappily will that Man, or that Ship be ſteer'd, whoſe Pilot is ignorant and blind? They that are ignorant (in Phyſick, Navigation, Architecture or the like) and conſcious to themſelves of their own Ignorance, will not Practiſe, and therefore they commit no Errors, ſaith *Plato* (*Alcibiad.* 1.) But they that are ignorant and yet ſuppoſe themſelves knowing, will take upon them to Practiſe, αὕτη ἄρα ἡ ἄγνοια τῶν κακῶν αἰτία, *this Ignorance therefore is the cauſe of all Evils.* So the World of fooliſh Sinners taking upon them to practiſe, yet remaining in the State of atheous Ignorance, their Practice is that of Sin and Iniquity; for this is the Practiſe of that State, wherein they are. And the only remedy for theſe Evils is the care and cure of their Eyeſight (the want of which is the deadly Evil and the ſource of other deadly Evils;) for none are hurt by being *deceiv'd* (and therefore blinded,) *they do not well underſtand what they are, or what they do.*

III. So in Heatheniſm (*s*) τοῦ ἡνιόχου διαφθαρέντος, *the Charioteer being ſpoil'd, all was overturn'd.* For being in the State of atheous Ignorance (and therefore Aliens from that Knowledge, the Knowledge of God and the Life according to him) all were improbous deadly Sinners and liv'd the ungodly Life, *being alienated from the Life of God through the Ignorance that was in them.* The atheous Life of profane Drunkards, Swearers, Whoremongers, and Worldlings mainly intent upon the Concerns of this Animal ſenſitive Life was the *Heathen Popular Life* (notwithſtanding the Inſtitutions of Virtue and Philoſophy and the arcane Inſtitutions of Religion that were in Paganiſm;) their brutal Appetites concurr'd with the ignorant Conceits of their Minds touching a ſenſitive Felicity, to inſtigate them to *unclean Practiſes*; and being *paſt feeling* (having loſt the ſight and ſenſe of the turpitude and criminality of their Practices, which ſhould have reſtrain'd them, *adimit nox atra colorem*) *they gave themſelves over unto laſciviouſneſs, to work all uncleanneſs with greedineſs.* The Sins of Uncleanneſs were the Pagans eminent Vice; for although there are amongſt them (*t*) Inſtances and Inſtitutions of *Continence,* yet ſo generally and outragiouſly were thoſe Heathen Sons of darkneſs addicted to the Sins of Unchaſtity of all ſorts (ſome of which were not only thought allowable, but gentile and creditable) that the Pagan World may juſtly be thought nothing better than a Brothel-Houſe of Uncleanneſs. The principal *Corruption* in the World was through this ſort of Luſt (wherein the Heretical-pagan Gnoſticks wallowed alſo,) and becauſe of theſe things (principally) *the Wrath of God came upon* (theſe nefarious Sinners) the *Children of Diſobedience.* The Gentiles are characteriz'd by *the Luſt of Concupiſcence,* as a conſequent of their *Ignorance* and their *not knowing God.* And the New Teſtament in its black Catalogues of atrocious Sins commonly conjoineth the Sins of Uncleanneſs with *Heathen Idolatry, and eating things offer'd to Idols* with *committing Fornication* (which in a large Senſe ſignifieth all Whoredom, and which was a principal allective to Apoſtaſy from Chriſtianity and defection to Gentiliſm,) the Gentile Converts are by a ſpecial Decree forbid Fornication as a Rite of groſs ſymbolizing with the Gentiles, who are uſually called by the holy Writers οἱ πόρνοι, (Fornicators) the Heathen World *being a World of impure Fornicators.* (*u*) Their Doctrine did not condemn *Fornication* and *Stews,* (*w*) both Sexes were proſtituted in their *Stews,* which were every where allow'd and pay'd their Tribute, (*x*) the *Perſians, Egyptians* and *Athenians* are infamous for inceſtuous Marriages, (*y*) the *Stoicks* and *Chryſippus* for allowing them, (*z*) they are infamous alſo for unnatural Luſts, (*a*) their wiſe Man is not averſe from Love, (*b*) community of Women was practis'd in ſeveral Pagan Nations, (*c*) ſome are ſuperlative Inſtances of Scor-

tation

(k) *Hier. in aur. Car.* p. 250, 253.

(l) *S. Chryſoſt. Hom.* 41. *in Joh.*

(m) *Clem. Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 324. *Jambl.* προτρεπτ. p. 12.

(n) Ἕνεκεν ἀγνοίας Θεοῦ πολυτρόπως ἀσεβοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι. J. Mart. Qu. & R. ad Græc. p. 167.

(o) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 63.

(p) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 50. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 26. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 357.

(q) Πᾶσα πονηρία ἐξ ἀγνοίας ἔχει τὴν ἀρχήν. S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 41. in Joh.

(r) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 57.

(s) *S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. Hom.* 5.

Eph. 4. 18, 19.

(t) *Theodoret. Serm.* 12. *Tertull. de exhort. caſtit. ſub fin.*

2 *Pet.* 1. 4. *Eph.* 5. 6. 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 5. 1 *Pet.* 1. 14.

Act. 15. 20

(u) *Spencer. Not. in Orig. p.* 5

(w) *J. Mart. Apol.* 2. *p.*

(x) *Min. Fel. p.* 304, 305.

(y) *Orig. C. Celſ. l.* 4. *p.* 4. 15 *Laert. in Chryſip.*

(z) *Holyday on Juv. p.* 29.

(a) *Caſaubon. Not. in Laert. p.* 96.

(b) *Sext. Emp. Pyr. Hyp. l.* 1. *c.* 24, 25. *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 6. *c.* 10.

(c) *El. Cretenſ. in Gr. Naz. or.* 3. *n.* 83, 84.

tation and Maſculine mixtures, (*d*) the Lacedæmonians are noted for lending their Wives, (*e*) *Plato* for countenancing Perjury in Love-matters, *Plato* and *Lycurgus* baniſh'd Modeſty from their Commonwealth (for they will have Men Spectators of naked Women,) *Plutarch* was ſhameleſs, when he wrote his *Amatorius*; (*f*) the Greek Philoſophers are remark'd for their impure Maſculine Amours, (*g*) not only the *Athenians*, but the Roman Senators were addicted to that atrocious Villany; (*h*) and the Oracle of *Apollo* alloweth it. (*i*) Their 'Αῤῥητοποιῖαι, not to be named are uſually mention'd in their own Authors, and the Apoſtle hath remark'd their Monſtroſities of Uncleanneſs (*Rom.* 1. 28.) which he looketh upon as the Conſequents of a *reprobate Mind.* Which Phraſe ſignifieth *a Mind utterly deprav'd and ſpoil'd and loſt and gone* (as to the good diſcernment and ſenſe of things;) for things or perſons finally reprobated are utterly loſt and gone in a twofold Senſe: They are utterly vitiated and ſpoiled (like the depraved ground, *Heb.* 6. 8.) which bringeth upon them the Curſe of Reprobation, whereby they are caſt away. But theſe foul Carnalities (the Sins of Uncleanneſs) are only one eminent Limb or Member of the Heathen old Man, that hath *his Converſation in the Luſts of the Fleſh, fulfilling the Deſires of the Fleſh and of the Mind, walketh according to the courſe of this World, according to the Prince of the Power of the Air, in Laſciviouſneſs, Luſts, exceſs of Wine, Revellings, Banquettings, and abominable Lewdneſſes*, which were ſo faſhionable in the Heathen World, that it was an unwonted admirandous thing, that the Chriſtians (who ſeem'd an odd heterogeneous People) *did not run with them to the ſame exceſs of Riot. Being fill'd with all Unrighteouſneſs, Fornication, Wickedneſs, Covetouſneſs, Maliciouſneſs, full of Envy, Murder*, (Homicide was the Gladiators Diſcipline and matter of Glory, they ſlew their Slaves at Pleaſure, uſually expos'd their Children, *Romulus* made a Law, that Children born deform'd ſhould be expos'd and ſtifled, and their unrighteous Wars were publick Murders,) *Debate, Deceit, Malignity, Whiſperers, Back-biters, Haters of God, Deſpiteful, Proud, Boaſters, inventors of evil Things, diſobedient to Parents, without Underſtanding, Covenant-breakers, without natural Affection, implacable, unmerciful.* Such were the worſer and the greater part of them, and of all of them it muſt be ſaid, that by ſeveral degrees of Wickedneſs they conſtituted a World of flagitious People, *an evil World* (a World of Evil Men and a World of Evils), *a World of the Luſt of the Fleſh, and the Luſt of the Eyes, and the pride of Life* (that take place and are predominant in it,) *which are not of the Father* (of the Divine Family,) *but are of the World*; they are originally and of Kind and Quality mundane, as regenerate Chriſtians are originally and of Kind and Quality *thoſe that are of God. We know, that we are of God, and the whole World lieth in Wickedneſs.* As a drunken Man is ſaid to be in Drink, in the ſame ſenſe the World *is in Wickedneſs*; and this being its permanent Poſture and Situation it is ſaid, *to lie in Wickneſs.*

The Heathen World were generally ſuch lewd Debauchees, of ſo enormouſly wicked Lives, that for this reaſon in Contradiſtinction to the Jews (as alſo becauſe they were Heathen Idolaters and not of the holy People) they are intituled *Sinners*, they are join'd with Publicans, both being Sinners (the lewd and profane,) and they are called ἄνομοι, *lawleſs Perſons*, being without and againſt the Law of God. They are the Heathen kind of Livers, that are under a damnatory Sentence. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. *Eph.* 2. 2. and which are excluded from Citizenſhip in the New *Jeruſalem* and doom'd to *Sodom*'s Lot, *Apoc.* 21. 8. *The fearful and unbelieving and the abominable* (that perpetrate ſome abominable Sins of Uncleanneſs) *and Murderers, and Whoremongers, and Idolaters and all Liars ſhall have their part in the Lake which burneth with Fire and Brimſtone.* (*k*) *The Heathen were not only Satanical in their Dogma, but* (in ſeveral degrees) *Diabolical in their Life.* (*l*) *When Man liveth according to Man* (or the Fleſh,) *not according to God, he is like unto the Devil. And hence there emergeth two Cities different from and contrary to each other; ſome live according to the Fleſh, others according to the Spirit.* The Carnal and the Spiritual kind of Livers conſtitute two contrary Parties, Alliances, Kindreds, Families, Cities and Societies; the one this *mundane*, the other the *heavenly*. For originally and of Kind and Quality the Carnal kind of Livers are thoſe, *that are of the World, of this World, the Children of this World, the Men of this World* that conſtitute it and walk after the courſe of it; and therefore the World of Mankind (as contradiſtinct to the heavenly Citizens) is a World of carnal, atheous mundane kind of Livers. They are thoſe that *are in the Fleſh* (devoid of the holy Spiritual Life,) *after the Fleſh, that mind the things of the Fleſh and are carnally minded*; thoſe *that walk after the Fleſh, and bring forth the Fruits thereof*, which are *Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanneſs, Laſciviouſneſs, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Hereſies, Envyings, Murders, Drunkenneſs, Revellings and ſuch like.* Thus the Converts from Heatheniſm ſometime liv'd; they were the atheous, carnal and mundane kind of People in Genius, Life and Practice, *walking in Darkneſs, living in Errour, the vain Converſation, uncircumciſed and unclean, not waſh'd nor ſalted at all*, the vile Perſons in Temper and Converſation, *the Friends of the World and Enemies of God*, not of the God-kind but the *Brute-kind* (the Dogs and Swine) and *Diabolici generis of the Satanical Cognation and Alliance.* At their ſerious Undertaking Chriſtianity and Godlineſs they ceas'd to be *the Servants of Sin, they put off the old Man with his Deeds, the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh*; therefore in their unheatheniz'd State they were in the State of Servitude unto Sin, *the whole Maſs or Body of Sin, Vice and Wickedneſs liv'd and reign'd in them, and they liv'd in it.* Which comprehenſion of Sin, Vice and Wickedneſs the holy Writers fitly call *the Darkneſs*; for as vital Sanctity (the life of Grace) is the pure immaculate kind of thing, the vital brightneſs and beauteouſneſs, a luminouſneſs of Mind and Practice, and therefore is fitly called *the Light*: So the vital carnality and wickedneſs (the Fleſh) is of the Nature

---

(*d*) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 2. *c.* 13.

(*e*) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 187.

(*f*) *Voſſ. de Idol.* 1. *c.* 4. *Grot. ſupr.*

(*g*) *Tatian. or. c. Grec. p.* 165.

(*h*) *Theodoret.* θεραπ. *Ser.* 10. *p.* 141.

(*i*) *Spencer in Orig. p.* 59.

Eph. 2. 2, 3.

1 *Pet.* 4. 3, 4.

Rom. 1. 29, 30, 31.

Joh. 2. 5.

Joh. 5. 9.

Math 26. 45. *Gal.* 2. 15. *Math.* 18. 17.

(k) Ου τὸ δόγμα αὐτοῖς Σατανικὸν μόνον ἦν, ἀλλὰ ϗ ὁ βίος διαβολικός. S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 4. in Rom.

(l) *Cum vivit Homo ſecundum hominem* [Carnem.] *Non ſecundum Deum, ſimilis eſt Diabolo. -- hinc extitiſſe diximus Civitates duas diverſas inter ſe atque contrarias; quod alii ſecundum Carnem, alii ſecundum Spiritum viverent.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 14. c. 4.

1 *Joh* 4. 5. *Joh.* 8. 23. *Luc.* 16. 8. *Pſal.* 17. 14.

Rom. 8. 1, 5, 6. *Gal.* 5. 19.

1 *Joh.* 1. 6. 2 *Pet.* 2. 18. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. *Iſa.* 52. 1. *Ezek.* 16. 4. *Iſa.* 32. 6. *Jam.* 4. 4. 2 *Pet.* 2. 22. 1 *Joh.* 3. 8, 10, 12. *Rom.* 6. 17. *Col.* 2. 11. and 3. 9.

of *Darkneſs*; for all the Branches of it ariſe from the dark unintelligent Nature, darken the Mind; and it feareth and ſhunneth Diſcovery, and is full of Fears and Terrours, as darkneſs is. And (which is more conſiderable) in all the Branches of it, it is a vital foulneſs, uglineſs, horridneſs, (*m*) μέλαν ἦθος, *the black kind of Morality* (the foul Fiend-kind of thing) Ἀλαμπία, *Un-illuminouſneſs* and *Anti-luminouſneſs* of Mind and Practice. In oppoſition unto which ſort of *Darkneſs* God is ſometimes ſaid, to be *the Father of Lights*, the things that are of ſpiritually good and unvile Quality, which are the lucid luminous kind of things. Sometimes he is ſaid to be *in the Light* (the Light which vital Sanctity is, in which all that Theize in Life and Practice are and walk,) and out of it there is no Society with him. Sometimes he is ſaid to *be Light*, this Light which vital Sanctity and Purity is (which is his kind of Excellency,) which admitteth of no defilement, vicioſity or criminality; and therefore in him *there is no Darkneſs at all.* But in this ſort of Darkneſs (which is vital Atheouſneſs) the World of Mankind are ſo invelop'd, that *Euſebius* had too much cauſe, to ſay of the Heathen (*n*) *Through an omnimodous obtenebration of Soul they ſunk to the bottom of Wickedneſs.*

(m) *M. Ant. l.* 4. *S.* 48.

Jam. 1. 17.

1 *Joh.* 1. 7.

1 *Joh.* 1. 5.

(n) Παντοίᾳ ψυχῆς ἀμαυρώσει περιβαπέντες κατὰ βυθὸν ἀσεβείας ἠνέχθησαν. Pr. ev. l. 2. c. 6.

IV. This degenerate ſunken Condition of the World of Mankind is an uncontrolable Evidence of *Original Sin* in ſome ſignifications of it. For in the *Firſt* place, *Original Sin* may ſignifie, that *Mankind antecedently to their being holy* (which *Prior* Condition may be called their *Original* Condition) are ungodly *Sinners.* Of this original Sinnerſhip the current of Scripture, the frame of Chriſtianity and Judaiſm, the frame of Man, the degenerate Condition of the World, the order and courſe of things in it is an uncontrolable Evidence. For Darkneſs is now before Light, antecedently to learning we are unlearn'd, antecedently to Sanctity we are unholy, antecedently to Circumciſion the Jews were uncircumcis'd, and the Proſelytes were Aliens antecedently to their Proſelytiſm, in Chriſtianity Unregeneracy is before Regeneracy, the Old is before the New Man, Servitude is before Liberation, all the holy People were of the World before their coming out of the World, their original Condition is that of the *meer mundane* People, and in that Condition their Life cannot be *the holy Popular*, but is neceſſarily the *mundane Popular*, which is the ſame with the *Heathen-popular.* Eph. 2. 2. The Religion alſo of a *Saviour-King, of Redemption* and an *Expiatory Sacrifice, of ſaving Faith, Repentance and Converſion to God, of a new Covenant and a new Kingdom of God, of Regeneration and Remiſſion of Sins, of Juſtification and Sanctification,* proclaimeth this Original Sinnerſhip, which inferreth the Exiſtence of Original Sin in another Notion. For

In the *Second* place, Original Sin may ſignifie, *That Mankind are now, natively and originally ungodly Sinners in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent tendency that way:* Or (which is the ſame thing) *Original Sin* may ſignifie, *that the Original of Sin, both the privative and the oppoſitive* (which is Concupiſcence) *is in ſuch degree originally in Man.* If Mankind are now the Fleſh-born and mundane People in all Reſpects, in reſpect of what is *privative*, being born without the life of Grace (or the Divine Love,) and in reſpect of what is *poſitive*, a vicious carnal ſelfiſhneſs of Nature being now our Nature (which is vital carnality and wickedneſs, and ſo far as it is ſuch, is called by the Schools Concupiſcence;) if this *Original of Sin* is now natively Original to Mankind (ſo that they are natively ungodly Sinners in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way,) this Moral Vicioſity of Nature muſt be counted an *Original Sin.* And an Original Sin of this Nature and Notion muſt be look'd upon, not as the whole, but as a Branch of the Article of Original Sin, and is certainly a Branch of the Chriſtian Religion. *Joh.* 3. 6,7. *That which is born of the fleſh, is fleſh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit. Marvel not, that I ſaid unto thee, ye muſt be born again, or born from above.* Our Saviour plainly affirmeth (as the New Teſtament ordinarily doth,) that there are two oppoſite Families of Men: The one *thoſe that are born of the Spirit, the Heaven-born; the other thoſe that are born of the Fleſh only, the Mundane-born.* That by Natural Generation none are *of the Spirit-born or Heaven-born*, but all are of *the Fleſh-born or Mundane-born Family.* That thoſe of this Family are ſo in reſpect of what is *privative*; for they have not that which is born of the Spirit, *our Divine vital Nature*; and alſo in reſpect of what is *poſitive*; for they have that which is born of the Fleſh, *our Animal-vital Nature.* Natural Generation originateth this Family (the fleſhly or mundane vital Family) and thus it originateth them. Becauſe it originateth this Family, therefore Mankind are natively the Family of ungodly Sinners in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way. Becauſe it thus originateth them, therefore they have in them natively that which is an Original of Sin, and that which is vital Carnality and Wickedneſs in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way. *That which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh*, it is that which conſtituteth the Animal-vital Family: *That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*, it is that which conſtituteth the Spiritual-vital Family. Man is therefore natively ſo conſtituted, as to be one of the Animal-vital, not one of the Spiritual-vital Family. And of Man ſo conſtituted impartial Chriſtian Reaſon cannot but pronounce, that he is natively a carnal and mundane kind of Man, a carnal and mundane kind of Liver in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way.

V. Agreeably to our Saviour the Apoſtles Confront two oppoſite Families. *Gal.* 4. 29. *As he that was born after the Fleſh* (that was of Natural Generation) *perſecuted him that was born after the Spirit* (who was of ſupernatural Generation) *even ſo it is now.* Rom. 9. 8. *They which are the Children of the Fleſh* (of *Abraham*'s Linage by Natural Generation) *theſe are not the Children of God.* Joh. 1. 13. *Which were born, not of Blood, nor of the Will of Fleſh, nor of the Will of Man, but of God.* From this Apoſtolic diſtribution of Mankind into two oppoſite Families, it appeareth, that the firſt Birth originateth a Family that are of *Natural Generation, the Children of the Fleſh, born of or after the Fleſh* in the diviſive or contradiſtinctive Senſe; that Infants by their firſt Birth belong to that Family, which is the oppoſite to the Spiritual and Divine Family, (both as Natural and as Carnal is oppos'd to Spiritual,) they belong to the Family of thoſe that *are in the Fleſh* devoid of the holy Spirit. At the time of their Conception and

Σύμπτ [illegible]
Sopater
Grot. Di
Poet. in Proleg.
Σῶμα [illegible]
[illegible] Plo
tin. ibid

Nativity thus far they are of this Family; *They are then the carnal and mundane kind of Livers in a degree of Inchoation and of prevalent Tendency that way.* And in ſuch ſenſe the Pſalmiſts words may commodiouſly be interpreted as a proper Speech containing a manifeſt Truth (and therefore ought not to be look'd upon as a meer Hyperbolical Expreſſion) *Pſal.* 51. 5. *Behold I was ſhapen in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother conceive me.* The Animal-vital Nature in Brute-animals is the Comprehenſion of vital Carnality and Wickedneſs (according to that Saying of the counterfeit Triſmegiſt, ἡ κακία σύμφυτος τοῖς θηρίοις, *Wickedneſs is congenial and connatural to the Btute-animals*;) the Animal vital Nature in Mankind is manifeſtly the ſame with that in Brute-animals; therefore it is the comprehenſion of vital Carnality and Wickedneſs. This Animal-vital Nature as it is ſuch vital Carnality and Wickedneſs predominant and reigning, is in Infants (before the uſe of Reaſon and Underſtanding) in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way; therefore they are in ſuch degree (imperfectly and inchoatively) the carnal and mundane kind of Livers, and conſequently they are in ſuch degree *by Nature the Children of Wrath.* (o) σαφῶς γὰρ φαίνεται, ὅτι πάντες μὲν ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν πεφύκαμεν, ἔνιοι δὲ οὐ μόνον πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰθισμένοι εἰσὶν ἁμαρτάνειν. *For it is manifeſt, that all of us Men practiſe Sin by our Nature, ſome not only by Nature, but by Cuſtom alſo.* Which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if Mankind committed Sin φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ, *by a faulty Nature and not through the fault of their Will* (which was the Conceit of one called *Aram* (p) refuted by *Theodorus Antiochenus*,) for all the Servants of Sin are more or leſs Volunteers, the Sins which they commit at the time of their commiſſion are their Will and Choice, although at other times (uſually in their ſober retired Thoughts) they are otherwiſe minded. But Man's Nature is full of Inclinations to that which is Evil (all ſort of Wickedneſs iſſueth from the *Heart* or inward Man, and Man is warn'd to take heed of walking *in the ways of his Heart and in the ſight of his Eyes*;) and not only ſo, but the Soul having loſt her Life, unregenerate Mankind are become graceleſs and unholy, and there is now no other vital Nature in them ſave only the Fleſh (which is full of evil Concupiſcence) in reigning Power and Puiſſance, whereby it is with prevalent Power and Puiſſance ſpontaneouſly parturient of all ſorts of actual Sin and Wickedneſs. Whence *Origen* rightly inferreth, (q) κακίαν ὑφίστασθαι ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *Wickedneſs ſubſiſteth amongſt Men in the firſt place, and* (morally ſpeaking) *it cannot be otherwiſe.* If (morally ſpeaking) it cannot be otherwiſe, or if *de facto* it never is otherwiſe; if all Men in their Unregeneracy live in that which is Carnality and Wickedneſs of Mind and Life, and it liveth and reigneth in them; if they are the Servants of the Fleſh (of Sin and Vice) and under the Power of it, this is a demonſtration, that Infants at their Birth are the Servants of Sin *in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way.*

All the Wickedneſs that is in the Animal Nature involveth in it an inordinate *Self-love*, whence it iſſueth and ariſeth. The Schools therefore ſay, (s) *A certain general Concupiſcence which is an inordinate appetite of our Self-good is the root and Principle of all Sins.* Others ſay, (s) *A Propenſion to Sin from Self-love is Original Sin.* S. *Auſtin* diſcourſeth, that the ſeveral ſorts of vital Carnality and Wickedneſs (the Luſts and Paſſions of the Fleſh) are ſo many Branches of vicious carnal ſelfiſhneſs of Life and Nature, which is virtually and radically all ſuch Sins in one. (t) *They are Evils that ariſe from that root of perverſe Love, wherewith every Child of* Adam *is born.* Self-love is unqueſtionably innate in all, and a vicious carnal Self-love is innate in all *in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way* (for it is a root of bitterneſs in all Men;) therefore in that degree the ſourſe and ſummary of Wickedneſs is innate in all Men; and ſo are the reigning Luſts and Paſſions of the Fleſh, which are nothing elſe but its prevalent ὁρμαὶ, *impetuous Propenſions and Tendencies.* The Fleſh is in Man a live-vicioſity of Nature (which may be called (u) ἡ τῆς ἁμαρτίας φύσις, *the Live-ſin Nature*,) in the unregenerate there are frequent conflicts between the upper and lower Soul, (w) τὰ τῆς ἀλόγου κινήματα φύσεως, *the Motions of irrational Nature*; and in the regenerate the holy Spiritual Life conflicteth with a live-vicious Nature, which is contrary, inimical and deadly to God and Holineſs, to the Law and Life of God. *Gal.* 5. 17. *Rom.* 8. 7. *Rom.* 7. 20. And ſeeing this vital vicious Nature (proud, ſenſual and worldly) is a diſtemper'd irrational vital Nature (not cuſtom in Sin,) which in ſome degree is coeval with Man, groweth up with him, is his corrupt Nature, Diſpoſition, Life, Temper, and maketh his Genius and Temper of Mind in his Unregeneracy, hence it is evident, both that Man in his (now) Original and Natural Condition is in ſome ſort and degree an improbous ungodly Sinner, and that there is in him originally in ſome degree *a Body of Sin and of Death.* Rom. 6. 8. and 7. 24. and 8. 10.

VI. Agreeably whereunto, (x) as ſome of the Learned ſuppoſe, the *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* diſcourſe of ἔρις σύμφυτος, *a Strife innate in Man*, τὸ συμπεφυκὸς ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως ἀλλότριον ζῶον, *an alien Animal agnate to us from Generation*, which ſome call πολυκέφαλον θηρίον, *the many headed Beaſt*, others call it θνητόν τι ζωῆς εἶδος, *a certain mortal Species of Life*, and others call it φύσιν γενεσιουργόν, *Geneſiurgic Nature.* They talk of cutting off (y) τὰς τῆς γενέσεως ξυγγενείας, *the things cognate to generation.* They ſuppoſe, that every Man from his birth hath a bad Genius inclining him to Evil, that a Purgation is neceſſary for Humane Souls, that they have loſt their Wings, are eſtrang'd from God, obnoxious to Inordinate Paſſions (and are infeſted with other before-mention'd Evils conſequent upon Generation) and *Archytas* the Pythagorean ſaith, *We cannot arrive at the top of true Good* διὰ φύσιν μοχθηράν, *becauſe of a bad Nature.* So the Hebrew Doctors ordinarily ſpeak of (z) שאר שבעסה *the Ferment which is in the Maſs* (evil Concupiſcence) and יצר הרע *the evil Formation or Figment*, of which they ſay; *The evil Figment is born with a Man, and goeth about with him all his Days, as* 'tis ſaid, *The Imagination of Man's Heart is evil from his Youth:* Which Character of Mankind ſpeaketh an high degree of Wickedneſs of Life through a powerful proclivity in Man's Nature to that which is evil; which implieth both an averſation from and an impotency to that which is good. Touching which Impotency an Hebrew Doctor, when he had ended his Prayers, was wont to ſay, (a) *Lord of the World, thou knoweſt my Will is to do thy Will, but who hindreth me?* שאר שבעסה *the Ferment which is in the Maſs.* Agreeably whereunto the Apoſtle ſaith, *The Law was weak through the Fleſh*, therefore the Fleſh was more powerful, to make Men improbous ungodly Sinners, than the Law was to reform them. And if they are improbous ungodly Sinners through the Fleſh, then through the Fleſh they are of kind and quality *Carnal, ſold under Sin, not doing what they like, the Good they would, but what they hate, the Evil that they would not, a Law in their Members warring againſt the Law of their Mind, and bringing them into captivity to the Law of Sin, which is in their Members.* Againſt their Knowledge and Convictions of Mind, againſt the Dictates of Prudence and of Conſcience, againſt their own Reſolutions and Vows, Mankind in their Unregeneracy are frequently carry'd Captive to perpetrate Wickedneſs; Convictions of the Mind are not a match for the Fleſh, Life againſt Notion is an unequal Conteſt. *Lucilius*'s words in *Varro* (b) rightly repreſent their caſe, if one of his Expreſſions be ſomewhat mollify'd.

(o) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 151.

(p) *Phot. cod.* 177. *Col.* 395.

Matth. 15. 19. *Prov.* 4. 23. *Eccl.* 11. 9.

(q) *Supr. p.* 149.

Rom. 8. 6, 7.

(r) *Cupiditas quædam generalis quæ eſt inordinatus appetitus proprii boni, principium eſt omnium peccatorum.* Aquin. apud Davenant. Determin. Qu. 1. p. 1.

(s) *Eſt ergo iſta ad peccandum amore ſui propenſio, peccatum originale:* Zuingl. ap. Bellarm. de Amiſſ. Grat. l. 4. c. 2.

(t) *Mala ab illa perverſi amoris radice venientia, cum qua omnis filius Adam naſcitur.* De C. D. l. 22. c. 22.

(u) *Orig. c. Celſ. ſupr. p.* 150.

(w) *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 3. *S.* 27.

(x) *Grot. Not. in Luc.* 2. 22. *Caſaubon. in Perſ. Sat.* 5. *p.* 439.

(y) *Jambl.* προτρεπτ. *p.* 100.

(z) *Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. col.* 2303. *v. Dr. Ham. on Pſal.* 51. *not. b. Spencer Not. in Orig. p.* 88.

) Buxt. pr.

m. 8. 3.

Rom. 7. 14, 15, 19, 23.

(b) Orig. Lat. l. 4.

Vis eſt vita vides, quæ nos facere omnia cogit.
Life is a certain vivid force, which maketh us do every thing.

Servitude under Sin therefore, with all the other Evils of an Unregenerate Condition, is as it were our Inheritance by our firſt birth (whence the Saints do not celebrate their Birthday, none of them keep it Feſtival, (c) as *Origen* ſaith) without which Hypotheſis no tolerable Senſe can be made of the Chriſtian Religion, no tolerable Account can be given of the World's Wickedneſs. For what is this Lower World but the Sink of all Impurity, a vaſt Sea of Wickedneſs, a Stie of Senſualiſts, a *Sodom* of Uncleanneſs (*O Munde immunde*, (d) as S. *Auſtin* exclaimeth) a Den of the Sons of Darkneſs, a Shop of Frauds, a Cockpit of Contention, an *Egypt* for Oppreſſion, a *Bedlam* for Delirations, an Amphitheatre of Gladiators, a Wilderneſs of noxious and venenate Animals; inſomuch that an Hebrew Doctor had reaſon (e) to ſtile it קרוב לגיהנם *very near to Hell.* Mankind univerſally in all times and places are degenerate into Vice and Wickedneſs, it operateth early, uſually it beareth down all Obſtacles, fruſtrateth all Remedies, it floweth in upon the World with ſo high a Tide and ſo ſtrong a Torrent, that in all Ages, not only Vice and Wickedneſs, but Prodigies and Outrages of Vice and Wickedneſs, have been the general currant practices, as one of the Fathers hath drawn the World's Character. (f) *Madet orbis mutuo ſanguine. —— Paratur gladiatorius ludus. —— Contagia in theatris. —— Forum videatur. Flagrant ubique delicta.* (g) *With ſo great Ignorance of the Truth and ſuch vain Worldly Deſires Man cometh into this Life, that if left to his liberty, to do as he pleaſeth, and live as he liſteth, he will not fail to run into multifarious Enormities.* The Age of Youth is rude, unskilful and unwiſe (without governing Prudence, of little inſight into things, and leſs foreſight) incautelous, careleſs and inconſiderate, raſh, heady and fearleſs, full of Confidence and fooliſh Hopes, hardly governable or manageable by the greateſt Wiſdom; or capable of good Counſel, of vehement and fervid Deſires, Purſuits and Paſſions, of flagrant Luſts, enormouſly addicted to ſenſual Mirth and Pleaſure, of gay and wanton Humour, averſe from Seriouſneſs (as apt to contemn and deride ſerious Piety as to contemn Danger) extremely proud and apt to take a pride in Pranks of Lewdneſs * and Injuriouſneſs (nor is there any ſort of Wickedneſs, to which untam'd Youth is not apt to be carry'd by Pride) full of diſorderly Motions and Appetites, and abounding with Vice, as fat and rank Grounds abound with Weeds. (h) As the Age of Manhood ſucceedeth that of Youth, ſo the Manly Vices ſucceed the Youthful; and ſo groſs and palpable Vice gradually ariſeth in the Nature and Life of Man commencing its Reign from his Birth. Several particular Temperaments alſo ſtrongly incline to ſeveral Vices, ſome are naturally of a bad temper, and ſome are obſerv'd (i) to be of *a natural Malignity*; which common Obſervations befriend the Hypotheſis of Original Sin.

(c) Spencer. Not. in Orig. p. 54. Annot. in Min. Fel. 310.

(d) De Symbol. ad Catechum. l. 2.

(e) Hotting. diſſ. de reſur. mort. p. 33. v. Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 2. p. 72, &c.

(f) S. Cypr. Ep. 2.

(g) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 22. c. 22.

* By inju-ring and a-buſing they ſeem [illegible] Herald. in Arnob. p. 54.

(h) Grot. Not. in Matth. 12. 3, 4.

(i) Lord Bacon Eſſay of Goodneſs.

VII. Againſt this Name the *Pelagians* object (their principal Objections reach not to the thing, but the name only) that no defect in Infants without the uſe of Reaſon and Underſtanding can be truly and properly Sin; *for Sin is ſo voluntary, that if it is not voluntary, it is not Sin.* Sin is alſo *that which is the Tranſgreſſion of a Law, where no Law is, there is no Trangreſſion*; but Laws are not given to meer Infants that are not capable of Law-obligation, or as the Jews ſay, they are not *Sons of the Precepts*, no more than Brute-Animals; for *Leges non dantur Infantibus & Amentibus, Laws are not given to Infants, nor to any that have loſt their Underſtanding.* Theſe are great Objections, but thus they may be anſwer'd.

Adeo voluntarium eſt peccatum, ut ſi non ſit voluntarium, non ſit peccatum.

(1.) The inordinate Concupiſcence of which our Animal-nature is full, may be contemplated in Brute-Animals; for in them there is a Pravity of Nature, which being predominant conſtituteth many of them *Evil Beaſts*; as in Mankind there is a Pravity of Nature, which being prevalent in them conſtituteth them *Evil Men.* In Brute-Animals we may contemplate the very Nature and Idea of the ſeveral Branches of Vice and Wickedneſs (of inordinate *Selfiſhneſs*, *Luſt*, *Pride*, *Wrath*, *Cruelty*, and ſuch more;) for there the very Face and Form of them appeareth, Evil Men may ſee their own Face in this Glaſs, and every Man may diſcern what inordinate Concupiſcence is in his own Animal-Nature, that *the Luſt of the Fleſh, the Luſt of the Eyes, and the Pride of Life* is ſeminally and radically there. The Morals of degenerate Mankind that *live after the Fleſh* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) have the ſame origin with thoſe of Brute-Animals, which they lively reſemble, (k) ſome being *Wolves*, others *Foxes*, others *Serpents*, others *Neighing Horſes*, others *Dogs* and *Swine*, or other filthy and unclean Animals.

(k) S. Chryſoſt. T. 5. p. 645. S. Cyril. Catechiſm. p. 80.

(2.) The inordinate Concupiſcence of which our Animal-Nature is full, is *Sin* with due Limitation of Senſe. For it muſt be thus deſcrib'd; *It is the very Nature of that which is Sin, Vice, and Wickedneſs, ſo far imputable to us, as it is in any degree voluntary and no further.* As it is in the Animal-nature of Brutes, it is the very Nature of that which is Sin, Vice and Wickedneſs; the Pride and Selfiſhneſs which we contemplate there, is the very Nature of the Sins of Pride and Selfiſhneſs, and ſheweth the odious

Face of them: Theſe therefore have in Brutes the *materiality* of Sin, without the *formality*; for they are not imputable to them as Sin, nor do they conſtitute them in a proper ſenſe Sinners. But in Man inordinate Concupiſcence is imputable as Sin, Fault and Crime ſo far as it is in any degree voluntary; in Man therefore it muſt be accounted Sin, Vice and Wickedneſs at a great rate, as the Apoſtle repreſenteth it, who often calleth it Sin, ſometimes *Sin that dwelleth in me*, and ſometimes *Sin in the Fleſh*. The Fleſh (our Animal-nature) with its inordinate Appetites and Inclinations, Affections and Paſſions, is Sin and Pravity in our Nature, our Sinful Nature, Innocent Nature in the courſe of Lapſed Nature become unnatural (or inordinate) againſt the rectitude of our Nature (our Rectitude) that conſtituteth our *being Evil* (which is worſe than meer doing Evil) the Seminary of all Wickedneſs, (as containing the Seeds of it or Propenſions to it) the Fountain of actual Sins (the inordinate motions whereof are a beginning of thoſe Sins) the Maſs or Body of Sin conſiſting of many Members, *the very nature of that which is Sin* (therefore extremely *odious*, and which muſt be mortify'd as Sin) the live-nature of Sin, vital Carnality and Wickedneſs, touching which the *Stoicks* would think it reaſonable to ſay, (*l*) *Wickedneſs is ſubſiſtent*, *becauſe it is the* (Vital) *oppoſite to Virtue*. Sin liveth and reigneth in them, it reigneth in their Mortal Body (which *Plotinus* calleth θηρίον ζωωθὲν, *an enlivened Brute*) that have not *crucify'd the Fleſh with the Affections and Luſts*, and conſtituteth them improbous ungodly Sinners.

Rom 7. 17. *and* 8. 3.

(3.) This Branch of Original Sin which we have under conſideration, doth not imply, that inordinate Concupiſcence or the Reign of it is actually inexiſtent in meer Infants, much leſs doth it imply, that inordinate Concupiſcence is imputable to them as their Sin, Fault and Crime, or that they offend againſt any Law of God, or any commanded Duty. It only ſuppoſeth, that by a Fall or Lapſe inordinate Concupiſcence and the reign of it is in them in *ſuch a degree of Inchoation, which is in prevalent tendency that way*. So that if Grace doth not interpoſe, the Infant will be like the reſt of unregenerate Mankind, an Alien and an Enemy, living the Carnal and Mundane-kind of Life, loving that kind of Life, and inordinately loving the Gratifications thereof, having a Soul deſtitute of its true Pulchritude, Health and Vigour, naked, deformed, diſeaſed, weak and languiſhing, and that is a Dungeon of ſuch Darkneſs, Foulneſs, deadly Impiety and Impurity, as ſhe cannot otherwiſe extirpate (*m*) ἡ μακρὰ φιλοσοφία παιδαγωγήσασα, *but by the Inſtitution and Exerciſe of a long Philoſophy*.

Consect. 3.

Mundane Mankind are ſo Atheous, of ſuch an exotic and extraneous Kind and Family, that Heatheniſm of Religion is their Religion, and is to them agreeable.

I. THE Mundane-popular and the Heathen-popular Religion is the ſame as the Mundane-popular and the Heathen-popular State, Life and Genius is the ſame; which is a plain demonſtration of *Original Sin*; for it ſheweth, that Mankind are born the Heathen-kind of Religioniſts *in a degree of Inchoation and a mighty tendency that way*. All Mankind without a preternatural adventitious Inſtitution of Religion would be of the Heathens Religion (or none at all;) for other Religions were introduc'd by extraordinary ſupernatural Methods of Providence, under the œconomy of meer Nature and general Providence this Religion was univerſal; the World of Mankind therefore may juſtly be ſaid to be born *Heathen Religioniſts*. This appeareth alſo from the continued Hiſtory of the *Jewiſh Church*, the riſe and the progreſs of it; (*n*) for the Progeny of *Noah*, the Offſpring of *Shem* even in the Family of *Heber* (the Father of the Hebrews) while *Noah*, *Shem* and *Heber* were yet alive, fell to Heathen Idolatry, *Joſh.* 24. 2. *Abraham* was (doubtleſs) bred an Heathen, the God of *Nachor* is thought an Heathen Deity, *Gen.* 31. 53. *Laban*'s Images (called his Gods) ſhew, that he was not clear of Heathen Idolatry, and *Jacob*'s Houſe was infected with it, *Gen.* 31. 30. and 35. 2. When the Children of *Iſrael* went into *Egypt*, they fell to Egyptianize in Idolatry; and when they came out of *Egypt* they were far from caſting away the Idols of it (the Abominations of their Eyes) as they were charg'd, for they made them a Molten Calf, they worſhipp'd the Hoſt of Heaven, they joyned themſelves to *Baal-peor* and ſacrific'd to *Sehirim*. When God had brought them out of their Wilderneſs-Condition into a Canaan-eſtate, and caſt out the Heathen Nations for their Idolatries and Impieties, and warn'd the *Iſraelites* to take heed of their Abominations, and of doing as they had done, yet they *forſook the Lord God of their Fathers*, *ſerved* Baalim *and the Groves* (Idols in the Groves) and ſucceeded the Heathen Nations in their Morals as well as in their Land. Thus they Religioniz'd during the time that they were govern'd by *Judges*; their Heathen Idolatry brought them into heavy Calamities, and no ſooner were they deliver'd, but they relapsd to their old trade again. For this was the ſtate of things in *Samuel*'s Days. *Solomon* the wiſeſt of their Kings (though the Lord appear'd unto him twice, and warn'd him againſt the Idolatry of the Heathen, yet) fell to this foul Impiety. After his Days the Ten Tribes fell to the Idolatry of *Jeroboam* (who turned *Bethel* into *Bethaven*) whoſe Idolatry was in part *Heathen* and *Egyptian*, and uſually complicated with the Idolatry of *Baal*; and after they were plung'd into this Idolatry, they never emerg'd out of it, but continu'd it (during the Succeſſion of Nineteen Kings) ſo long as their Commonwealth ſtood. Nor were things much better in the Tribe of *Judah*, that adher'd to the Houſe of *David*; for although *Rehoboam* had loſt the greateſt part of his Kingdom for the Heatheniſm of his Father, yet he (together with *Maacah* his Wife) trod in his Father's Steps, as *Abijam* his Son did in his, and was like Father like Son. The Tribe of *Judah* being thus ſeiz'd with the Diſtemper of Heathen Idolatry, could never after during Life perfectly recover its Health again, but was always obnoxious to the Diſeaſe; for although ſome good Princes attempted the cure of it, yet they made but imperfect Reformations of the State of Religion, nor were they long laſting, but the Diſeaſe preſently return'd again. For after *Aſa*'s and *Jehoſhaphat*'s imperfect Reformations *Jehoram* (*Jehoſhaphat*'s Son) and *Ahaziah* his Son, ſymboliz'd with the Houſe of *Ahab*, the latter of them having *Athaliah* his Counſel-

Ezek. 23. 2. *and* 20. 7, 8. *Exod.* 32. 31. *Act.* 7. 43. *Pſal.* 106. 68. *Lev.* 17. 7.

Judg. 2. 11. —19. *and* 3. 7. *Ezek.* 16. 3.

1 *Sam* 7. 3. 1 *King.* 11. 7, 10.

2 *Chron.* 12. 1. 1 *King.* 14. 22, 23. *and ch.* 15. 3, 13.

2 *Chron.* 21. 6, 10, 11. *and ch.* 22. 3, 4. *and ch.* 24. 7. 18. 21. *and ch.* 25. 14.

(l) Εἶναι δὲ τὴν κακίαν ὑπαρκτικὴν διὰ τὸ ἀντικεῖσθαι τῇ ἀρετῇ. *Laert. in Zenon.* p. 492.

(m) *Gr. Naz. or.* 1. p. 36.

(n) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pelag. l.* 3. *par.* 3. *Theſ.* 6.

Counſellour, to do wickedly. *Joaſh* who ſucceeded her in the Government, was courted out of his Religion by the Princes of *Judah*. *Amaziah* (*Joaſh*'s ſucceſſour) after ſome time of reigning lapſed into Heathen Idolatry at a great rate. *Uzziah* and *Jotham* ſucceeding *Amaziah* the Affairs of Religion were in a tolerable good poſture; but *Ahaz* (*Jotham*'s Son and Succeſſour) was *mad after his Idols*, and proceeded to the height of Idolomany. In the Days of *Hezekiah* true Religion recover'd its Luſtre (which had ſuffer'd a ſad Eclipſe in the Days of *Ahaz*) and a conſiderable Reformation was made; but no ſooner was *Hezekiah* dead, but all things ran to ruin again in the Days of *Manaſſeh*, whom *Amon* his Son imitated in his outragious Heathenizing. *Joſiah* made a great Reformation, but his Reformation was a ſtriving againſt the Stream; for the People ſtill retained their Affection for their old Heatheniſm, and thoſe Heatheniſh Practices were in his Days, which God menaceth by the Prophet, *Zeph.* 1. 4, 5. *I will cut off the Remnant of* Baal *from this place,* (Jeruſalem) *and the Name of the* Chemarims *with the Prieſts; and them that worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven upon the Houſe-tops; and them that worſhip and that ſwear by the Lord, and that ſwear by* Malcham. After the Death of *Joſiah* God began to do unto *Judah* as he had done to the Tribes of *Iſrael*, they being alike obſtinate in their Heathenizing. No Perſwaſions, no Menaces, no Warnings, no Puniſhments or Diſaſters which befell them, were of avail to reclaim them, as if Heatheniſm was bred in their Bone, and could not be got out of their Fleſh. The ſucceeding Kings of *Iſrael* took no warning by their Predeceſſour's Calamities; the Tribe of *Judah* took no warning by the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, they would not deſiſt from their Heatheniſm of Religion, when they were upon the brink of Ruine; they went on in their old track in the very times of their *Babylonian* Captivity, and thoſe of them that went into *Egypt* (after their City and Temple was ruin'd) were reſolv'd Heathen Idolaters, *Jer.* 44. 17. The prevalency of this Religion amongſt God's ancient People ſpeaketh it a Darling to Animal Senſitive Nature; ſo agreeable to its Inclinations and Intereſts, that it affecteth nothing more. And as it is from this Nature that Mankind are (not ſpeakers or practiſers, but) the atheous-kind of ſpeakers and practiſers; ſo it is from this Nature that Mankind are (not Theiſts, Religioniſts or Pietiſts, but) the Atheous-kind of Theiſts, the Irreligious kind of Religioniſts, the Impious-kind of Pietiſts; they beſtow their Devotional Eſteem, Affection and Service upon what Animal Senſitive Nature liketh, and accounteth fine things. By an Idolatrous Superſtition (the Adulterous kind of Devotion) their Devotional Propenſion is gratify'd, and the way of doing it is pleaſing to Senſitive Nature, which they follow.

2 King. 16. 10, 11.
2 Chron. 28.
2 Chron. 33. 22.
2 King. 25. and ch. 21. 21, 22.
2 Chron. 4.
2 King. 23.

II. As from the Hiſtory of the *Jewiſh*, ſo from the Hiſtory of the *Chriſtian* Church the proneneſs and addictedneſs of Mankind to the Religion of Idolatry is apparent; for although in the three firſt Centuries and ſometime after there is no appearance of *a lapſe of the Church into Idolatry* (or into any thing more than an incongruous Rituality) yet the time was not long before *the holy City was trodden under foot by the Gentiles*; when the World was come into the Church, the Church became *Mundane-popular*, and then ſhe began by degrees to Religionize after the old Heathen Guiſe, and degenerated at ſuch a rate into Paganiſm, that the Religion of unreform'd Chriſtendom hath been for many Ages *an Imitation of the Rites and Vices of that Idolatrous Religion*, and muſt be denominated (yet not without Limitation of Senſe) *An Heathen-popular kind of Religion*. It is manifeſtly a Parallel for old Heatheniſm in atheous Blindneſs, Darkneſs and Ignorance; in its Ghoſts, Spectres and Dreams; in blind Heatheniſh Superſtitious Conceits, Apprehenſions and Opinions; in the Heathen-popular Life and all the Limbs and Branches of the Old Man; in Swearing, Revelling, Drunkenneſs, Debauchery; in Fornication, Harlotry, Inceſt, Sodomy, Stews, Curteſans, Carnavals, and in making the World a Brothel-houſe or *Sodom* of Uncleanneſs; in encouragements as well as practiſes of looſeneſs and lewdneſs of Life, and the old Heathen Profaneneſſes; in Heatheniſh pretenſions to Antiquity, Duration, Univerſality, Unity; in Heatheniſh Worldlineſs, Pride and Ambition, State and Grandeur; in Heatheniſh Infidelity, and an Heatheniſh Traditional kind of Faith; in Heatheniſh Vice and an Heatheniſh kind of Virtue; in numerous Feſtivals celebrated at the Heathen rate; in unclean Inſtitutions of Continence and Virginity; (o) in a Phariſaical kind of Monaſticks and Aſceticks (the Inſtitution whereof (p) is originally Paganical;) in the Theology and Devotion of the Myſticks; in lying Stories and Legends; in proceſſionary Pomps and Jubilees (which anſwer to the ancient *Ludi ſeculares*;) in ſlight methods of obtaining Pardon for Sin; in the extravagant Pomp of their God-ſervice, the Conſecration of their Altars and of their Temples, and Celebrations of the Dedication of them; in their holy Water, the ſhaven Crowns of their Prieſts, and injoyned Celibacy; in their barbarous Rites (ſuch as Flagellation) and monſtrous Barbarity and Cruelty; in their Purgatory (q) and Funeral Rites; in their Reliques and Theurgical Conſecrations (of Grains, *Agnus Dei*'s, and other Trinkets;) in the external Modiſhneſs and Perfunctorineſs of their God-ſervice; in ſubſtituting ſilly exteriour Rituality inſtead of true Religion, and Antick inſtead of true Devotion (*for ſuch are their multifarious turnings, bowings, croſſings, changes of poſture, mutterings, droppings of Beads, kiſſing the Pax, praying in an unknown Tongue, praying for Souls in Purgatory, ſaying ſo many Maſſes, offering Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead, repeating the name Jeſus ſo many times in a Breath, tranſlating Reliques, making Pilgrimages to Images and Shrines, and making Oblations to them; holy Veſtments, holy Scapularies, holy Oyl, Anointings, holy Salt and Candles, with many the like uſages*;) In their Incenſe, lighted Candles and Tapers in their Temples, Proceſſion with burning Candles in their Hands (on *Candlemas-day*,) conſecrated Bells and Baptiſmal Spittle; in the Canonization, Patronage and Offices of the Tutelar Saints or Deities (*for ſo* Eugubinus *telleth the Pope*, (r) *Deorum Templa exornas*, *which is* (s) *a dividing the Divine World* אל מדרגות *into degrees, making a Sovereign and ſubordinate Deities*;) in conſecrating the *Pantheon* at *Rome* to them, and the ſeven Hills of the City to ſo many Saints; in aſcribing miraculous Feats to them, making magnificent Preſents and Oblations to them, ſwearing profanely by their Names (as the Heathen did by their Gods;) in conſecrating, adorning, adoring their Images,

Apoc. 11. 2.

(o) V. Bernald. in Apul. p. 984.

(p) L. Holſten. de vit. & ſcr. Porphyr. p. 72.

(q) J. Bapt. Criſp. Quinar. 1. p. 441.

(r) De per. Phil. ep. dedicat.

(s) Coſi p. 38

Images, carrying them in Proceſſion, and concealing them in Lent (as the Heathen for ſome time conceal'd their Idols from the People;) in having (t) *inhoneſtas imagines, impure and profane Images* in many of their Churches (like the Heathen;) in the whole buſineſs of Church Demonolatry, (u) the deſign of it and method of introducing it, whereby the Idolatrous *Roman* Empire recover'd of its deadly Wound, and Paganiſm liv'd again. A principal method of introducing Paganiſm (in ſeveral Branches of it) was by (w) impoſtorous Viſions, Apparitions, Revelations, Miracles; and by the ſame Artifices *Demonolatry* was re-introduc'd, and Chriſtianity was chang'd into a Chriſtiano-Paganiſm. For theſe Inſtitutes, Uſages and Vices, are not only originally Paganical (as the Learned Men of the Church of *Rome* (x) generally acknowledge;) but they are alſo of kind and quality Heatheniſh and Paganical. Some of the Learned of that Communion endeavour to perſwade their Brethren, to make uſe of the ſame Prayer to the Bl. Virgin which *Apuleius* uſeth to the Goddeſs *Iſis*. (y) *Innumeri ſunt hymni, precationes, orationes, compoſitæ à doctiſſimis ad Divam Virginem: ſed nihil eſt (quod bona cum venia illorum dictum ſit) cum hac Apuleianâ precatione comparandum. hæc doctrinæ & elegantiæ omnis eſt refertiſſima, hàc rogata Dea noſtra non minus placaretur, fieretque propitia, quam omnibus ſanctorum orationibus. Innumerable Hymns and Prayers are compos'd by the moſt Learned to the Goddeſs Virgin; but there is nothing (with their good leave be it ſpoken) to be compar'd with this Prayer of* Apuleius. *This is full of all Learning and Elegance; our Goddeſs would be no leſs placated and propitious, if ſupplicated and intreated by this Prayer than by all the Prayers of the Saints.* According to this Learned Author the Bl. Virgin is ſubſtituted in the place of the Goddeſs *Iſis*, is to be ennobled with the ſame Attributes, deify'd at the ſame rate, ſerv'd with the ſame Devotions, wherewith that ancient Goddeſs was ſerv'd, whoſe Religion was undoubtedly a Paganical Idolatrous kind of Religion (there is the ſame reaſon for other deify'd Patron-Saints) which is to ſay, that the Chriſtian Church hath imitated the ancient Jewiſh Church in her lapſe into a Religion of Idolatry, and hitherto ſhe continueth to imitate her Obſtinacy and Irreclaimableneſs.

III. But *Mundane Mankind* moſt properly and plenarily ſuch, are thoſe that are without the Pale of the viſible Church, the Univerſality of whom in ancient times were the *Mundus Humanus*, and this World of Men were either of no Religion, or of *the meer Heathen Religion.* This was the Religion of the World of Mankind (which was of kind and quality Mundane) whoſe addictedneſs thereto appeareth from the great Antiquity of it, its ample diſpread, the long uninterrupted duration of it, the World's reſolved and firm adherence to it (for the Heathen World reſolved (z) not to change the Religion of their Anceſtors) the Laws that were made in favour of it (a) and againſt the Introduction of any new Religion (which was thought a thing not to be endur'd according to *Mecænas*'s advice to *Auguſtus ap. Dion l.* 52.) the many violent Perſecutions which Chriſtianity ſuffer'd in its attempts to undermine and ruine it. (b) *Ecce in eo eſt errore Civitas, vel potius orbis ipſe totus, ut bonos & juſtos viros tanquam malos & impios perſequatur, excruciet, damnet, occidat: The City or rather the whole World it ſelf is in this error, to perſecute, torture, condemn and kill good and juſt Men as evil and impious,* becauſe they were Adverſaries to its Religion. Nor was it only the Popular-Pagans, that were ſo vehemently addicted to their Heatheniſm of Religion; for the Philoſophic Pagans were (for the main) of the ſame Mind in Religion with the Popular; their Rule was (c) *to worſhip the Divinity according to the Law and Rites of their Country, and the Cuſtom of their Anceſtors.* Some few Branches of this Heathen-Popular Religion were diſlik'd by the Philoſophers (*Socrates, Plato, Plutarch, Cicero, Seneca, Porphyry, Varro* and the *Stoicks*;) but themſelves were in good earneſt Pagan Religioniſts, Pagan Theologers, the eminent Pagan Saintiſts, and the Champions for Paganiſm. They were far from deſigning a change of Religion (as *Plato* affirmeth in his Apology for *Socrates*;) *Plutarch* ſtileth it, (d) *the Pious Faith deriv'd from their Anceſtors.* And again, (e) *the Divine Dignity of Piety receiv'd from their Anceſtors.* He ſuppoſeth it a plain caſe, that their Deities were truly ſuch, and their Religion of right Catholick; (f) *that the Sun and Moon are animate, whom all Men ſacrifice and pray to and worſhip.* Others of them ſtile their Paganical Devotion, (g) *the pure worſhip of the Divinity.* They affect an higher ſtrain of Devotion towards their Deities than the Popular-Pagans, and it was thought a grand Incongruity in a Philoſopher, to violate their Religious Rites; whence *Stilpo* the Philoſopher ſleeping in the Chappel of the Mother of the Gods contrary to Law (which forbad any Garlick-eater to enter thither) was thus reprimanded by the Goddeſs in a Dream; (h) *Philoſophus es, O Stilpo, & ſacras leges violas? Art thou a Philoſopher, and doſt thou violate the Sacred Laws?* (i) Philoſophers were leaſt of any addicted to change their Religion; yet *Plutarch* who maketh ſuch high Elogies of his Heathen-Popular Religion ſometimes ſaith of it: (k) *The ridiculous Practiſes and Paſſions of Superſtition, and Speeches, and Geſtures, and Inchantments, and Magical Tricks, and Circumſitations, and Drummings, and impure Luſtrations, and ſordid Purifications, and barbarous and abſonous Caſtigations in the Temples and contumelious uſages give occaſion unto ſome, to ſay, That it is better there were no Gods at all than ſuch Deities, that accept, and are pleas'd with ſuch things as theſe, of ſo petulant, ſo mean, ſo peeviſh an Humour: Were it not better for the* Gauls *and* Scythians, *to have no Notion at all, no Imagination, no Hiſtory of Gods, than to ſuppoſe, that there are Gods which delight in the Blood of ſacrific'd Men, and account that the moſt perfect Sacrifice and Religious Service? Had it not been better for the* Carthaginians *at the firſt, to have taken* Critias *or* Diagoras *for their Lawgiver, to ſuppoſe, that there is neither God nor Demon, rather than to make ſuch Sacrifices as they do to Saturn?* (l) *It is not eaſie to judge, which of*

theſe

(t) *Baron. ad ann.* 392. *n.* 60.

(u) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 273.

(w) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 124, 126 *l.* 3. *p.* 113. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 26. *Val. Max. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *Baron. ad ann.* 324. *n.* 115. *ad ann.* 392. *n.* 57.

(x) *Idem ad an.* 44. *n.* 86, 87, 88. *ad an.* 53. *n.* 76, 77.

(y) *Beroald. in Apul. p.* 1008.

(z) *Witzii Ægypt. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 43. *Clem.* Στρωμ. *p. m.* 42.

(a) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 189. *Cic. de Leg. l.* 2. *Lex eſto antiquiſſima, æternæque auctoritatis in Attica, venerandos eſſe Deos atque Heroas patrios & indigenas publice ſecundum patriæ ſanctionem. Lex Attica.*

b *Lactant. l.* 5. *c.* 12.

(c) Ὥς κε πόλις ῥέζῃσι· νόμος δ' ἀρχαῖος ἄριστος, *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 18. *Marcil. com. in Car. Pythag. p.* 344.

(d) Τὴν εὐσεβῆ καὶ πάτριον πίστιν. *De Pyth. orac. p.* 402.

(e) Τὸ θεῖον καὶ πάτριον ἀξίωμα τῆς εὐσεβείας. *De Superſtit. p.* 166.

(f) Τὸν ἥλιον ἔμψυχον εἶναι καὶ τὴν σελήνην, οἷς πάντες ἄνθρωποι θύουσι καὶ προσεύχονται καὶ σέβονται. *Adv. Colot. p.* 1123.

(g) Ἡ περὶ τὸ θεῖον εἰλικρινὴς θεραπεία. *Procl. Plat. Theol. l.* 5. *c.* 36.

(h) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 5. *c.* 46.

(i) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 155.

(k) *De ſuperſtit. p.* 171.

(l) *Vix prope eſt judicare, utrum magis conducat generi hu-*

mano, quando aliis nullus eſt Deorum reſpectus, aliis pudendus. Plin. Nat. Hiſt. l. 2. c. 7.

theſe two extremes is moſt conducive to Mankind, ſome have no reſpect for any Gods, the God-ſervice of others is ſhameful.

IV. Such was the Heathens Idolatry, *an abominable ſhame*, as their Idols are called *Shikkutzim, abominable things, Tognebotb, abominations, Gillulim, Dii Stercorei, Dunghil-gods,* or excrementitious Deities (Dung contaminateth) and *Boſheth, ſhame* (whence *Jerubbaal* and *Jerubeſheth* are the ſame Name, 2 *Sam.* 11. 21;) *They went to Baal-Peor and ſeparated themſelves unto that Shame.* Hoſ. 9. 10. Their mode of ſerving their fictitious Deities was extremely ſhameful and abominable, as is viſible in their *Lupercalia, Floralia, Bacchanalia*, the uſual drunkenneſs of the Women amongſt the Romans, when they ſacrific'd to *Bona Dea*; the infamous drunkenneſs, madneſs and antic geſtures of *Cybele*'s Prieſts, *Priapus*'s Sacra, their Worſhip of the Goddeſs *Venus*, their naſty *Eleuſinian* Myſteries, their putid unclean Fables touching their Deities, and their Images of them, (*m*) which ſometimes repreſented the Painters Harlots (and uſually in their Houſes they ſet up the repreſentations of nefarious Luſt,) τῶν φαλλῶν στάσις ϗ αἰσχρολογία, (*n*) *the obſcene Spectacles and Speeches uſual in their Sacra* (of which their Theologers ſay, that they were deſign'd to cure them of their filthy Affections by gratifyng them,) their perpetrations of Uncleanneſs and Sodomy in honour of their Deities and under pretext of Holineſs and Religion in many places, the Memoirs in Scripture of *Sodomites doing according to the abominations of the Nations*, and the conjoining of Idols with Sodomites. 1 *King.* 14. 24. and 15. 12. 2 *King.* 23. 7. S. *Auſtin* having ſeen and heard the horrible obſcenities both of Words and Actions uſual in the *Megaleſia*, on the day of *Cybele*'s waſhing, had great reaſon to ask the Pagans, (*o*) *what are things ſacrilegious, if thoſe be ſacred? Or what is Inquination, if that be Lavation?* Uncleanneſs, Drunkenneſs, Revelling and Debauchery were not only the Sins of their Lives, but of their Religion; for their principal Religious Myſteries were (*p*) αἶσχος κοσμικόν, *the ſhame of the World.* The Hiſtories of their impure Deities inſtigated them to the Practices of Uncleanneſs, their ſhady Groves were an invitation to perpetrate them, they perpetrated them in their ſacred places, Fornication was annex'd to their Revelling Idol-Feaſts, their Idolatries are ſtiled abominable becauſe attended with the *abominations* of Uncleanneſs; and ſo great an Affinity have the Sins of Uncleanneſs with their Idolatry, that they are called by that Name in the New Teſtament. For in many places of it (*q*) πλεονεξία, muſt be interpreted, to ſignifie (not *Covetouſneſs*, as our Tranſlation rendreth it, but) *the inordinate Concupiſcence* eſpecially and eminently ſo called, of which the Apoſtle affirmeth, that it is *Idolatry*, and that every one who is a πλεονέκτης, or one that followeth that inordinate Concupiſcence *is an Idolater*. Col. 3. 5. Eph. 5. 5. which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if the Notion of *Devotional Idolatry* was competible to the Sins of Uncleanneſs: But *the inordinate Concupiſcence* (eminently ſuch) is of that party of things the things of Idolatry (a proper Branch of them,) it is Idolatry in the ſame ſenſe, that *Stews* and *Curteſans* are *Popery*, and every one that liveth in it, is an Idolater in this ſenſe; *he is one of the Party of Idolaters*, as he that keepeth a Curteſan is a Papiſt; (*r*) *id enim facit, quod ad Idolorum mancipes pertinet, for he doth that, which properly belongeth to the Servitors of Idols.* The Luſts of Uncleanneſs to the height of Prodigy were a part of the Spawn and Iſſue of the Heathen Idolatry, and but a part of it; for as the Jews ſay (*s*) all Vices and Crimes iſſue from it (*Idololatria eſt radix omnium iniquitatum,*) it is the inlet to a deluge of all ſorts of Wickedneſs. *Wiſd.* 14. 23 – 27. As it is a falſe Religion, it is like the Oriental Languages, and muſt be read backward; for its Holineſs in many parts of it is the groſſeſt Lewdneſs and Profaneneſs; its Deities are abominably Profane, as is alſo their Service and their Sacra; (*t*) it maketh the Divinity a *Drama*, Heaven a *Scene*, and *Religion a Stage-Play*; it venerateth its Deities in the Temples, and expoſeth them to deriſion upon the Theater; its καθαρμοὺς, *Purifications Clemens* calleth (*u*) ἀκαθάρτους, *impure and unclean* (agreeably to that of the Prophet;) *They that ſanctifie themſelves and purifie themſelves in the Gardens behind one in the midſt* (an Idol) *eating Swines fleſh, and the Abomination and the Mouſe* (an unclean and a magical Animal) *ſhall be conſumed together*, Iſa. 66. 17. and in the main it is devoid of Religion, Truth and Righteouſneſs, and is made up of *Lyes, folly and madneſs and conſummate Wickedneſs.* Yet this their Religion (*Religio Deorum immortalium*) the Pagans counted their Glory; not themſelves but the Chriſtians they counted (*w*) μιαροὺς ϗ βδελυρωτάτους, *nefarious and moſt flagitious*; they furiouſly perſecuted them (*x*) calling them *impios* (the impious) *ipſi ſcilicet pii, ſuppoſing themſelves the pious.* (*y*) *How great Caliginouſneſs, how great a cloud of Darkneſs and Errors hath invelop'd the Minds of Men, who when they think themſelves the moſt pious* (worſhipping the Gods ſedulouſly) *are then the moſt impious?*

(y) *Quanta caligo, quanta tenebrarum & errorum nubes hominum pectora obduxit, qui cùm ſe maximè pios putant, tùm maximè fiunt impii?* Lact. ibid. c. 10.

V. The Pagans Religion (as bad as it was, yet) was hugely agreeable to their Genius and Humour; which ſpeaketh the World of Mankind a blind and improbous Generation, extremely atheous, ſunken and degenerate from God, and ſuch as *Seneca* calleth (*z*) the Herd of Pagan Religioniſts, *inſanientium turba, a mad Rabble.* For the Pagan Writers themſelves uſually impute madneſs to the *Egyptians* (a learned Nation, but a Fountain and Store-houſe of Idolatry as well as of Grain) becauſe of their portentous Worſhip of Animals. And what were *Hercules's Sacra* at *Lindus* but height of madneſs, (*a*) which were celebrated with Evil-ſpeakings and Curſes, and if any one by chance let fall a good word, it was thought a violation of them? In this wild Religion there was a great mixture of profane frolick and jovialty (as the *Sibylline* Oracles injoin touching the *ludi ſeculares*, (*b*) σπουδὴ γέλως τε μεμίχθω, *that ſeriouſneſs and laughter ſhould be commix'd,*) which rendred it hugely agreeable to the humour of the Popular Pagans. Whence it is generally reported of *Greg. Thaumaturgus* (who in this was far from imitating the Apoſtles,) that he obſerving (*c*) that corporeal Delights and Pleaſures allur'd the vulgar, and caus'd them to perſiſt in their Idolatry, permitted them in lieu of their former Jollities to jovialize in memory of the holy Martyrs. The Heathen had their numerous

Feſtivals

(m) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. p. 26, 30.

(n) *Jambl. de myſt.* p. 21, 22.

(o) *Quæ ſunt ſacrilegia, ſi illa ſacra? aut quæ inquinatio, ſi illa lavatio?* De C. D. *l.* 2. c. 4. *Hæc ſacra Sacrilegiis omnibus tetriora.* Min. Fel. p. 88.

(p) *Clem. ſupr.* p. 16. *Iſa.* 57. 5. 1 *Pet.* 4. 3.

(q) *V. Dr. Hammond of Idolatry.*

(r) *Tertull. de Idol.* c. 1.

(s) *Buxt. Lex. Talm.* col. 1653.

(t) *Jul. Firmic. de er. prof. rel.* p. 26. *Lactant. l.* 5. c. 21.

(u) *Strom. l.* 7. p. m. 512.

(w) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 8. p. 252.

(x) *Lactant. l.* 5. c. 9, 12.

(z) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 6. c. 10.

(a) *Lactant. l.* 1. c. 21.

(b) *Zozim. Hiſt.* p. 77.

(c) *Baron. ad an.* 44. n. 45. *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 1. c. 8. S. 2.

Feſtivals celebrated (after the Iſraelites mode, *who ſate down to eat and drink and roſe up to play*, Exod. 32. 6.) with Sports, Dancings, Shews, Pomps, Muſick, Banquets, (*d*) Drunkenneſs, Laſciviouſneſs. (*e*) Their Gods gave them no Precepts of good Life, but licens'd Wickedneſs, authoriz'd Vice, encourag'd Lewdneſs (their Oracles patroniz'd it,) and therefore it was a Fleſh-pleaſing kind of Religion. Which alſo had the glories of Antiquity, Univerſality, uninterrupted Duration and Succeſſion, and ſhews of Sanctimony. It abounded with Inſpirations, Viſions, Revelations, Oracles, Miracles, Prophets, Saints, and which is extremly taking and deſirable (*f*) *The Pagans had their Gods nigh unto them*, to ſpeak to them, to converſe with them, to conſult them in difficulties, to have preſent acceſs to them and their help at hand; by viſible Signs their Gods teſtify'd their Preſence, they ſaw them in their Effigies, and often had ἐμφάνειαι, appearances of the Gods themſelves. Their Religion was alſo *a Temple-kind of Religion*, the Religion of a Temple-ſtate and Statelineſs, ritual and external, pompous and ſplendid, which is a Religion after the mode that unregenerate Mankind affecteth. Their Temples, Altars, Images (groſs and viſible objects of Worſhip which ſenſitive Souls dote upon,) their Prieſts, Sacrifices, Feaſts, Aſperſions, Luſtrations (eaſie methods of cleanſing themſelves from Sin) belong to their Temple-ſtate of Religion. Which when it was got out of its Infancy, (*g*) was pompous and ſplendid (the Heathen affected * State and Grandeur,) they had their ſplendid and magnificent Temples, (*h*) their Idols ſumptuouſly adorn'd, their mode of God-ſervice ſtately, with Lights, Muſick, Odours, Veſſels ſhining with Pearl, and the Prieſts Garments ſhining with precious Stones, *the proceſſionary pomps of their Gods alſo, their Triumphs, Games* and *Sights*, (*Sword-fightings, Scenical Plays*, and *ludi ſeculares*, which were in Honour of their Gods,) were part of the *Pomps and Vanities of this World*, which are hugely taking to a carnal Mind. As themſelves were a mundane kind of People, ſo the principal deſign of the Heathen-popular Religion was a mundane Felicity. (*i*) *The mundane City hath its chief good here. And this is proper to the mundane City, to worſhip a God or Gods, by whoſe aid ſhe may Reign in Victories and mundane Peace.* The Idolatry both of *Rome* Pagan and Pagano-Chriſtian is in the deſign of it a worldly Religion, (it deſigneth to ſwim in worldly Felicity and the Enjoyments of this preſent Life,) both have been attended with ſecular Pomp and Grandeur, Plenty and Proſperity. Idolatry hath her τὰ λαμπρὰ καὶ τὰ λιπαρὰ, *fair and fat things* (which make Mens Mouths water, and which ambitious and worldly Minds longingly hanker after,) all things that are dainty and godly are to be found in the Religion of Idolatry, and therefore it is the Temptation of a very fine and brave Religion.

VI. Debauch'd Paganiſm had a further recommendation; for there was in it *not only ſhews of Sanctimony*, but a great regard for the Heathen *Piety*, *Purity* and *Sanctity*. Which may ſerve, to exprobrate, to debauched Chriſtendom (both reformed and unreform'd) its profane neglect and contempt of real *Piety*, *Purity* and *Sanctity*. For the Pagan Theologers ſay, (*k*) *the head and ſummity of Virtue is Holineſs about the Gods*. Their Gods could not have been their Gods, if they had not reputed them holy: Nor could their Religion have been their Religion, if it had not been an Inſtitution of their Holineſs. No Name was more honourable in Paganiſm than the Name of *Holineſs* (this was the Glory of *Athens*, that it was *all Holy*, and *Vir ſanctus* was a Philoſopher's Title of Honour,) as no Name was more infamous than that of *profane* and *polluted*. It was with deſign to be, and be accounted more Holy that the Pagans were (by Expiations and Luſtrations) initiated into their Myſtic-Religious Inſtitutions; and great numbers of them became *Monaſticks* and *Aſceticks* (ſuch as the *Gymnoſophiſts*, the *Hylobii*, the *Druids*, the *Bactrian Samanæi*,) who by their ſevere Abſtinences, Auſterities and bodily Rigours, abſtract Philoſophic Life, renouncing Marriage and ſecular Affairs, and devotedneſs to the Service of the Gods gain'd to themſelves a great Reputation for *Sanctity*. The Indian *Bramans* are ſaid to have in their publick Devotions (*l*) long Leſſons about the Lives and Miracles of their Saints. (*m*) A ſorry Indian Gymnoſophiſt of late times was thought ſo great a Saint, that the King of the Iſland where he liv'd, religiouſly drank the Water wherein he waſh'd his Feet. So *Sidonius Apollinaris* and ſome other Writers of the Chriſtian Church (*n*) admire and celebrate the Sanctity of *Apolloneus Tyanæus* upon the account of his Philoſophic Life, and others applaud *Symmachus* for his rare Sanctimony of Manners. The *Egyptians* had ſo high an Eſteem of their own Sanctimony, that they counted it *an Abomination*, to eat with the Hebrews, as ſuppoſing them unclean. *Gen.* 43. 12. And of late ſome Chriſtian Travellers in the Kingdom of *Caſubi* (*o*) were thought polluted by the Pagan Prieſts there, who refus'd to eat the Meat which the Chriſtians had touch'd, and after diſcourſing with them waſh'd their Clothes becauſe of Defilement.

When *Apuleius* was to be initiated and made a Prieſt of *Iſis*, he made difficulty of it, conſidering (*p*) *he muſt obey his Superiors and attend upon his Miniſtery, which is a difficulty; he muſt be pure from Women, Wine, Fleſh* (and the like,) *and renounce the care of any thing but his Gods and their Service, and his Life muſt be with Caution and Circumſpection.* (*q*) The Prieſts of *Iſis* had their Heads ſhaven upon the account of Purity, and all the Egyptian Prieſts had their whole Bodies ſhaven and ſcrap'd every third day, leſt any ſordes ſhould lie under their Hair, who miniſtred to the Gods. Their Garments were Linen newly waſh'd, (not Woollen) for Purity ſake; and their Bodies were waſh'd twice every Day and twice every Night; they daily waſh'd their Cups alſo, and their Circumciſion was καθαριότητος ἕνεκεν, *for Purity ſake*. The uncircumcis'd they look'd upon as *unclean* (whence *Pythagoras* was circumciſed, that he might converſe with them,) none might have acceſs to them, unleſs they purg'd themſelves and abſtain'd from many things, and in the time of their Purifications they were ſhy of their Friends, leſt they ſhould contaminate their Purity. The Water which they us'd for cleanſing themſelves, was none but that whoſe Purity the Bird *Ibis* (the moſt cleanly Bird) had

---

(d) *Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8. p.* 393.

(e) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *Theodoret.* Θεραπ. *Ser* 10. *p.* 141.

(f) *Spencer ſupr. c.* 2. *S.* 3. & *diſſ.* 6. *c.* 1. *S.* 2, 5, 7. *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 234.

(g) *Spencer ſupr. diſſ.* 1. *c.* 2. *S.* 5.

* *Gr. Naz. or.* 3. *p.* 103.

(h) *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(i) *Terrena civitas hic habet bonum ſuum. Et hoc eſt proprium terrenæ civitatis Deum vel Deos colere, quibus adjuvantibus regnet in victoriis & pace terrena.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c. 4, & 7.

(k) Τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἡ περὶ θεοὺς ἐςὶν ὁσιότης. Procl. in Tim. p. 65.

(l) *Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 116.

(m) *Maffeius Indic. l.* 4 *p.* 626.

(n) *Beroald in Apul. p.* 697.

(o) *Spencer ſupr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 3. *c.* 3. *S.* 1.

(p) *Difficile religionis obſequium & caſtimoniorum abſtinentiam ſatis arduam, cautoque circumſpectu vitam.* Beroald. ſupr. p. 1002.

(q) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 165. *Herodot. l.* 2. *c.* 37. *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 4. *S.* 6, 7. *Spencer ſupr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 3. *c.* 1.

had approv'd by drinking of it. They abſtained from exotick Meat and Drink, from carnivorous Birds, ſeveral fourfooted Beaſts, from Fiſhes alſo (which are not ſacrific'd to the Gods, and being drench'd in the Deep look not up to Heaven, whence in ſome Pagan Nations it was an inſtitute of their Sanctimony, to abſtain from them,) and they would not endure the ſight of *Beans* ſuppoſing them unclean. Their Abſtinences were extraordinary in the time of their Purifications, and when they prepar'd themſelves for the ſacred Worſhip, in which Preparation they ſpent ſeveral Weeks or Days at leaſt. They are celebrated for their Gravity (not laughing,) for their Frugality, Temperance, Juſtice, Tolerance, Continence (never uſing the Maſculine mixtures,) they were always ſeen amongſt the Images of the Gods, relinquiſhing other Buſineſs and ſecular Negotiations they gave themſelves through their whole Life to the ſtudy of Wiſdom and the Service of the Gods. The Pagan Prieſthood therefore was not without an eximious Pagan Sanctity and Diſcipline of ſtrictneſs of Life, which the Apoſtate *Julian* endeavour'd to improve, forbidding them the Theaters, lightneſs of Behaviour, drinking in Taverns, injoyning them daily Devotion, to be Religious towards the Deity and Lovers of Mankind.

The Diſcipline which (not only the Philoſophic, but) the Popular Pagans exercis'd in their Religion, is very memorable, and ought to be proclaim'd upon the Houſe-tops, to ſhame and awaken (if poſſible) the degenerate Chriſtian Church, that is defin'd *the City of God and his Saints*, but hath in great degree loſt her God, his Grace and her Sanctity, and ſo aboundeth with Prodigies of Vice and Wickedneſs; and her People (of all Ranks and Degrees) are ſo generally wicked, that nothing is more unlike its definition than the Church is, through the loſs of *her ſalutary Diſcipline*. Whereas the Pagans generally in their Religion exercis'd a ſtrictneſs and ſeverity of Diſcipline againſt all ſuch Lewdneſs and Wickedneſs or other impurity, (which as they ſuppos'd) unqualify'd Men for their *Sacra*; for they that were ſo unqualify'd were by the Diſcipline of their *Sacra* interdicted their *Sacra*, and many of them were interdicted by a Penal Law beſides. Which twofold *Interdiction* is called by ſome (r) *the Commonitory and the Compulſory*: But theſe Terms are not accommodate. Thoſe that were *Profane*, that had not *pure Hands* and *pure Garments*, that were polluted or conſcious to themſelves of any Lewdneſs, and not purg'd, were by the Diſcipline of their *Sacra* (which was in ſome ſort, Compulſory) admoniſh'd and warn'd, to depart and be gone from their *Sacra*, or not to enter their Temples. As in this Inſcription upon the Front of the Temple of *Epidaurus*. (s)

> Ἁγνὸν χρὴ ναοῖο θυώδεος ἔνδον ἰόντα
> Ἐμφᾶναι,
>
> *Be clean, or elſe to go do not preſume*
> *Into this Temple of odorous Fume.*

Some heinous Criminals were made *Infamous* and prohibited from entring their Temples or partaking of their *Sacra* by a Penal Law (beſides that they were interdicted by the Diſcipline of their *Sacra*:) As *Plato* would have one that beateth his Parents πάντων ἱερῶν εἴργεσθαι, *to be by a Penal Law debarr'd and driven from all Sacra*.

VII. The ſame Author (in his Fourth of Laws) ſaith; *it is neither fit for a God, nor a good Man, to accept of Gifts* παρὰ μιαρῦ, *from one that is unholy and polluted, therefore the unholy in vain take a great deal of pains about the Gods*; τοῖς δὲ ὁσίοις ἐγκαιρότατος ἅπασι, *but their Service is moſt fit to be done by all that are Holy.* Whence it hath been the cuſtom of all Nations, λευχειμονεῖν, *to wear white Garments* (ſignificative of Sanctity) in their *Sacra*. (t) If any was defiled by *Homicide, by the Dead*, or by the *Pollutions of Child-Birth*, even *Diana Taurica* (who admitted of Human Sacrifices) repell'd them from her Altars as impure and abominable. The Gentiles therefore pretended not to approach their Gods without cleanſing and purifying; and the mighty regard which their foul Superſtition had for their Purity (for the moſt part meerly Ritual and External) appeareth (u) from their waſhing their whole Body, their Heads or their Hands before their Prayers, Sacrifices, and before they entred into their Temples, their Aſperſions after their Waſhings, their luſtral or purgative Water and the Aſperſions thereof when they entred their Temples, and elſewhere; their purifying waſhings from Blood (and great Crimes,) from the uſe of the Conjugal Bed, and the Purifications proper to every God; their uſe of Marine Water (which was thought to purifie effectually, becauſe it hath ſomewhat igneous in it) for their waſhings and aſperſions, or mixing Salt with Water in lieu thereof, and ſometimes Aſhes for more effectual cleanſing; the Preparations that they made for their *Sacra* by being ſhaven, by faſting and various abſtinences; the abhorrence of many Pagan Nations from Swine becauſe of their impurity, and their care to purifie themſelves from the Pollution of the Night, of things incident to the Night, of contact and the exonerations of Nature; (w) the Inſtitutes of the *Zabii* (who had laborious obſervances about Pollutions, ſaith *Maimonides*) and the old *Arabians* Rites of gargarizing the Mouth, purging the Noſtrils, rubbing the Teeth, paring the Nails, and cleanſing other parts of the Body; the Traduction of their Children through the fire to *Moloch* for initiation and Purgation, and the Rite of purging thoſe that were initiated into their Myſteries by Water, wherein a burning Torch taken from the Altar was extinguiſh'd, *which was their Luſtral Water*; (x) their three remarkable Modes of Luſtration in their Sacra, by the *Air*, *Water* and *the Fire*; their *Apocathartic* Sacrifices; their uſual Mode of purging the polluted with Eggs, or Bitumen, Sulphur and a lighted Torch made of the unctuous Pine-tree; their mixing Sulphur with Marine Water for Purification; their carrying and rubbing about the Body the Plant *Scilla* for Expiation, or a ſacrific'd *Whelp* (περισκυλακισμός,) their ſtrange ſuffumigations, and their Luſtrations by Spittle and Duſt mix'd together; (y) their numerous Rites of Expiation and Luſtration for places, things and perſons, their ſcrupulous care for the cleanneſs and immaculateneſs of their Sacrifices, their abhorrence of the profane and polluted, and their Opinion, that *pure Souls make one Commonwealth with the Gods, that we are to come to the ſupreme God by the inferiour* (non ſine Sacris Purificatoriis) *not without the purifying Rites*; the *Purgative Virtues* of the Philoſophers with the deſign of their ſublime Philoſophy (which was to purge themſelves from the foulneſs and feculency of the Body and the Contagion of this material World;) their Methods of purging the upper and lower Soul and the Vehicle alſo by the *Teleſtick*

Recedente diſciplina receſſit & gratia. S. Cypr.

(r) *Selden de Synedr. l. 1. c.* 10.

(s) *Porph. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 19.

(t) *Gale not. in Jambl. p.* 283, 259, *Spencer ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *S.* 3.

(u) *Spencer ibid l.* 3. *diſſ.* 3. *c.* 3, 4, 5, & 1. & *c.* 8. *S.* 3.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *S.* 2. & *l.* 3. *diſſ.* 3. *c.* 3. *S.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 10. *S.* 4. & *c.* 15. *S.* 5.

(x) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 14. & *l.* 5. *c.* 9. *Berald. in Apul. p.* 982. *Caſaub. in Theophr. p.* 221. *in Perſ.* 201. *Gale ſupr. p.* 276. *Alex. ab Alex. l.* 5. *c.* 27.

(y) *Ibid.* & *l.* 4. *c.* 17. *Marſham. Can. chr. p. m.* 213, &c. & *p.* 331. *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 115. *S. Aug. Ep.* 21.

ſtick Catharms, and their recourſe to *Theurgic Arts* (that is to the Devil) for Sanctity and Purity.

The Heathen World having ſuch a ſuperlative regard for their Heathen Purity, the debauch'd World called Chriſtian ſhould learn from hence an high Eſteem and zealous Concern for the *Purity* that is in their Religion, (eſpecially for the ſtrictneſs and Purity of the Chriſtian Life,) and that without it they are atheous at a more than Heathen rate. Nor is it unreaſonable, to go to School to the Pagans, to learn what is *Purity*; for although Paganiſm is like Popery, wherein are conjoin'd extreme Pomp and Riches with extreme Poverty, extreme Luxury with extreme Auſterity, prodigious Uncleanneſs with extravagant Caſtimony, ſubſtantial Villainy with ceremonial Purity and Sanctity; and for the moſt part the Paganical Purity is either meerly Rituality, or what is nothing better than ſo; yet there are amongſt the Pagan Theologers ſeveral good and laudable Notices and Recommendations of real ſubſtantial Purity, which abſtracted from their Application to the Service of their Deities are ſound Theology. (z) Such is *Menander*'s Theology.

(z) *V. Grot. de V. R. C. l. 4. S. 12. cum Annot. Clem. Strom. l. 7. p. m. 513. Simplic. in Epict. p. 196. Hierocl. in aur. Car. p. 25, 26. Porphyr. de antro p. 260.*

Εἴ τις δὲ θυσίαν προσφέρων, ὦ Πάμφιλε,
Ταύρων τε πλῆθος, ἢ ῥίφων, ἢ νὴ Δία
Ἑτέρων τοιούτων· ἢ κατασκευάσματα
Χρυσᾶς ποιήσας χλαμύδας, ἤτοι πορφυρᾶς,
Ἢ δι᾽ ἐλέφαντος, ἢ σμαράγδου ζώδια
Εὔνουν νομίζει τὸν θεὸν καθεστάναι,
Πεπλάνητ᾽ ἐκεῖνος, ϗ φρένας κούφας ἔχει·
Δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα χρήσιμον πεφυκέναι,
Μὴ παρθένους φθείροντα ϗ μοιχώμενον,
Κλέπτοντα ϗ σφάττοντα χρημάτων χάριν.
——Θεῷ δὲ θῦε διατέλους
Δίκαιος ὤν, ϗ λαμπρὸς, ὡς ταῖς χλαμύσι
Τῇ καρδίᾳ——

Clem. Strom. l. 5. p. m. 441, 442

He that great Sacrifices brings
Of Bulls or Goats or ſuch like things,
Or of things which Art deviſeth,
Purple Veſtments ſacrificeth,
Or elſe ſome ſplendid ones of Gold,
Of Ivory or of Emerald
The Animals, to get thereby
The Favour of the Deity,
He is beſool'd, and nothing can
Wiſely diſcern; for 'tis the Man
That muſt be good, no Deſlowrer }
Of Virgins or Adulterer, }
Or Thief or Cut-throat for lucre. }
Without and eke within be bright
To Sacrifice to God aright.

So *Charondas* the Law-giver injoineth ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν καθαρὰν πάσης κακίας, *to have the Soul pure from all Wickedneſs; for the Gods delight not in the Sacrifices and coſts of evil Men, but in the juſt and good Practices of good Men.* This leadeth us to contemplate and examine *our Heathen Virtue and Goodneſs*, touching which our *Fourth Conſectary is, that it is a bad kind of Virtue and Goodneſs.*

CHAP. VI.

1. *Of ſome fond pretenſions of Philoſophy.* 2. *Of the Philoſophic Pagans Divine Virtue.* 3. *Of the Stoicks Divine Virtue, that it was Pride.* 4. *Their Pride miſtaken and miſrepreſented.* 5. *Of the Philoſophers acquaintance with Humility.* 6. *Their Virtue of no better kind than the Popular Pagan.* 7. *Of the Platoniſts Divine Virtue.* 8. *Of a late Pretenſion touching the ſuitableneſs of the Agenda of our Religion to the Philoſophic-Pagans Reaſon.* 9. *The Chriſtian Apologiſts Cenſures of them.* 10. *Of the Pelagian Controverſie touching the Gentiles Virtues and good Works.* 11. *A true account of them.* 12. *Of their Principles of laudable Practice.* 13. *That their Virtue and Well-doing was an unholy degenerate kind of Virtue and Well-doing.*

I. OUR *Fourth Conſectary* (touching the badneſs of our Heathen Virtue and Goodneſs) concerneth in the firſt place the Pagan Philoſophy, which was not a leſs formidable Adverſary to Chriſtianity, at the riſe of it, than the Pagan Religion; for then it had obtain'd a very great Reputation in the World by its magnificent Pretenſions to Virtue; *to Virtue* commonly called *Moral*, whereby the Philoſophers mean (a) *What is of good and laudable Quality in matter of Life and Practice*, which conſtituteth the *virtuous Livers*, and according to which Men are denominated, not good Mechanicks, or good Scholaſticks, but ſimply *good Men*, as *Ariſtotle* ſpeaketh. For their Philoſophy is defin'd *the art of living ſo as to be good, wiſe and excellent, and ſo as to live in Felicity and Beatitude.* (b) *Certa vivendi diſciplina, per quam benè beatéque vivitur, a certain Diſcipline how to live well as to Virtue and Felicity.* Uſually they call it *Sapience*, and not without Reaſon; (c) *for all of us would be Good and Happy; accordingly ſuch as are furniſh'd and adorn'd with all Virtues, we call both wiſe and good Men.* And uſually they ſtile it (d) *The Guide and Rule of Life, the School-miſtreſs of Virtue and of Manners, the Science of living* (honeſtè) *without baſeneſs of Manners, the ſanative Medicine of the Diſeaſes of the Soul, the Medicine of the Mind and the Culture of it, which plucketh up Vices by the Roots, the Inveſtigatreſs of the Virtues, the Exterminatreſs of the Vices, the Inventreſs of Laws and of the Dues and Rights of Men.* Sometimes they intitle it (e) *the Founder of the Worſhip of the Gods and the Rights of Men, of Cities, Families, Marriages and Laws.* In which high Elogies of their Philoſophy (Moral) there is the ſame ineptitude and injuſtice towards the Popular Pagans, as in the Stoicks magnificent Pretenſions touching their wiſe Man; for they fondly pretend, that their wiſe Man is *a Taylor* and *a Shooemaker, and that all the Mechanic Arts which are in uſe were invented by Philoſophy.* (f) Every thing that looketh like Wiſdom the Philoſophic Pagans arrogate it to themſelves. They pretend, (g) *it is their Philoſophy that muſt teach Mankind, what is honeſt and what is baſe, what is juſt and unjuſt, what they ought to chuſe and refuſe, and how they ought to carry themſelves towards the Gods, their Parents, Seniours, the Laws, Strangers, Magiſtrates, Friends*,

(a) *Decorum quod elucet in vita* Cic. Off. 1. *Quod decet honeſtum eſt, & quod honeſtum eſt decet. Idem.*

(b) *Cic. Off.* 1.

(d) *Lactant. l. 3. c. 13, 15. Lipſ. Manud. l. 2. diſſ. 6. Sen. Ep.* 90. *Cic. Tuſc.* 2. & 5.

(e) *Idem Tuſc.* 1. & 5.

(f) *Quintil. Inſt. or. Arg. p.* 3.

(g) *Plutarch. de Lib. Educ. p.* 7.

(c) *Omnes enim bonos & beatos eſſe volumus, omnibus autem virtutibus inſtructos & ornatos cùm ſapientes tum bonos viros dicimus.* Cic. Tuſc. 5.

Friends, *Wives*, *Children*, *Servants*; whereas they were manifeſtly beholden to the Popular-Pagan Doctors for much of their Moral and Political Wiſdom (*Homer*'s Sayings were as Oracles with *Socrates* himſelf;) themſelves ſay, (*h*) that Philoſophy was but of late original; their Religion, their Cities and Commonwealths (with their Laws and Inſtitutes) were founded by Popular Men long before Philoſophy was born; (*i*) many wiſe and good Men flouriſh'd in the World long before there was any Philoſophic Inſtitution, or the Name of Philoſophy was known (*k*).

——— Fuit hæc ſapientia quondam
Publica privatis ſecernere, ſacra profanis,
Concubitu prohibere vago, dare jura maritis,
Oppida moliri, Leges incidere ligno.
Sic honos & nomen divinis vatibus atque
Carminibus venit.———

In ancient times Poets were Men of Sence,
And taught the rude Herd of Men, to difference
Publick from Private things, Sacred from Profane,
To ſettle Marriage, Luſt vagrant to reſtrain,
Laws to deſcribe in Tables, Towns to found,
Thus Honour to inſpir'd Sonnets did redound.

The Philoſophers (who amongſt the Greeks ſucceeded the Poets in the Profeſſion of teaching Virtue) made Improvements in *Moral Diſcipline*, they reduc'd it into the form of an Art, enrich'd it with variety of Argument, fortify'd its Precepts with great Reaſons, propos'd many wiſe Conſiderations for ſubduing exorbitant Affections and Paſſions, they ſet forth the Praiſes of Virtue, its Excellency and Importance with great Vigour and Eloquence, and (in ſeveral Inſtances) excellently declaim'd againſt Vice, with great Wit and Judgment, they diſparag'd the Vanities of the World and the Follies of Humane Life. (*l*) *Aliens from the Faith ſay many things of a ſound Life agreeable to us*; (*m*) there is amongſt them an unpopular kind of Virtue, which although hugely diſſonant from the holy Life, yet in ſeveral reſpects doth reſemble it; their Diſcipline and Inſtitution had a conſiderable effect upon ſome of themſelves, ſome of the Philoſophers were great Examples of the Virtue which they taught; of a ſort of *Temperance*, *Abſtemiouſneſs*, *Poverty or Frugality*, *Equanimity and Contentment of Mind*, *Apathy*, *Generoſity*, *Magnanimity and Contempt of the World*, *its Smiles and Frowns*. (*Gr. Naz.* calleth a great Man (*n*) Ἕλληνα μὲν τὴν θρησκείαν, τὸν τρόπον δὲ ὑπὲρ Ἕλληνα, *A Gentile as to Religion, but as to his Manners above a Gentile*,) their Doctrine had a conſiderable effect upon others, they made ſome few Converts from Debauchery to Philoſophy, (*o*) *Pythagoras* made a notable Reformation of the Pride and Luxury of the *Crotonian* Women, (*p*) ſome few Commonwealths had their uſeful Laws from Philoſophers (*Zaleucus* and *Charondas*;) the Philoſophers therefore may ſeem to have done a great deal of Service to the Intereſt of Virtue; but if their Diſſervices be ſet againſt their Services; if the bad that is in their *Polypus*'s Head be confronted with the good; their Infection with their *Antidote*; if their Ignorance, Vice and Extravagance be compar'd with their Virtue, it may juſtly be doubted (upon a full Computation of things) whether they have done any real Service at all to *Virtue* and *Goodneſs*. The mighty Prejudices which they have done to the Intereſts of it, clearly enough appear in the Accounts already given of their Theology, Philoſophy, and of the Heathen Life; but for a further Elucidation of them we will here take a brief Survey both of their *Moral Learning* and of their *Life*.

II. The ſublimer ſort of them diſtribute Mankind (*q*) into three Claſſes; thoſe that live παρὰ φύσιν, *againſt Nature*, κατὰ φύσιν, *according to Nature*, ὑπὲρ φύσιν, *above Nature*. Agreeably to which diſtribution of Mankind they make a partition of Virtues into ἠθικαὶ, *Ethical*, πολιτικαὶ, *Political*, θεῖαι, *Divine*. The Ethical and Political Virtue may be call'd the common Morality, being the ordinary ſort of virtuous Morals, (*r*) *which conſtitute a good Man*; but the Divine Virtue is ſuppos'd to be *his Aſſimilation to God and his Deification*. The Stoicks uſe not the Phraſe of *living above Nature*, yet pretend to be (*s*) *Divine Men*, to live εὔρουν ϗ θεουδῆ βίον, *a proſperous and deiform Life*, (*t*) *naturam vincere*, *to have the better of Nature, as the Cynicks exceed it*, (*u*) *to live above Man and at the rate of* (Pagan) *Gods in this Mortal Body*. This Divine Virtue is purely Philoſophic-Pagan (the Popular-Pagans had no concern in it,) and was the Invention of Philoſophy, but was not for the Intereſt of Virtue, but was rather to its prejudice and diſſervice; for it is not truly *Divine-Moral Vertue* (which conſtituteth Divine Good Men) but an Impoſture, Unpopular Humour, Phantaſtry, and an improbous humane ſort of Bravery is made the End, the chief Good, the Divine Virtue and Beatitude of Man, his Aſſimilation to God and his Deification. *Apollonius* ask'd the *Brachmans* what they were? *Jarchas* the Prince of them anſwer'd, *They thought themſelves Gods*. The Pagan Gods are above Paſſion; (*w*) παντελὴς ἀπάθεια μέγα ϗ θεῖον, *omnimodous Apathy is a great and divine thing*: Such an Apathy the more judicious Philoſophic Pagans admire as a grand Perfection of their Divine Man, to be troubled at nothing no more than the Hog in the Ship, that undiſturbedly ate his Barly in a Tempeſt, (*x*) *to live in the Body as the Mundane Soul* (the Siſter of our Souls) *liveth in the World, which cannot be ſtruck or impreſs'd upon from without*. (*y*) *He is devoid of Grief, is not a compound of Soul and Body, accounteth not the Death of Mortals or the ruine of his Country any great matter, he is above the fear of any thing*, (*z*) *truſting to himſelf, that he ſhall have nothing of Evil* (he oppoſeth the ſufficiency of his Virtue againſt all Externals) *ſo he ſhall be fearleſs of any thing*. (*a*) As *Fiducia ſui* is one of the Popular-Pagans Virtues, ſo an Irreligious Self-confidence is one of the Philoſophic-Pagan; but to be thus unapprehenſive of danger is Folly and Foolhardineſs; ſuch an Apathy unnatural, inhumane and irreligious is ruinous to all true Virtue and Goodneſs (which is founded upon Nature, and is a Divine kind of Nature) it ſpeaketh the Philoſophic Pagans Divine Virtue, *a Gigantick Impiety*, that their temper of Mind was *Gigantic*, and that in an impious Senſe they deify'd themſelves and their Virtue by their *Self-ſufficiency*, *Self-ſecurity* and *Confidence*: (*b*) *They that are furniſh'd with the Virtues, living in greatneſs and celſitude of Mind are alway in beatitude. Philoſophy ſetteth them intirely in the Fortreſs of Virtue, and ſetteth them above Grief and Fear.*

III. There

(h) *Lactant. ſupr. c.* 16.

(i) *Ibid. c.* 15.

(k) *Horat. de Art. Poet.*

(l) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 411.

(m) *Plut. de profect. virt. ſent.*

(n) *Or.* 3. *p. m.* 90.

(o) *Jambl. de vit. Pythag. c.* 11.

(p) *Sen. Ep.* 90.

(q) *Salmaſ. in Epict. p.* 15, 16.

(r) *Hierocl. in aur. car. p.* 2, 6.

(s) *M. Ant. l.* 7. *s.* 67. *l.* 2. *s.* 5.

(t) *Sen. de Brev. vit. c.* 14.

(u) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 9. & *l.* 3. *c.* 21.

(w) *Plut. de profect. virt. p.* 82, 83.

(x) *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 18.

(y) *Idem En.* 1. *l.* 4. *c.* 7, 14, 15.

(z) Πιστεύσας ἑαυτῷ, ὅτι μηδέν ποτε κακὸν ἕξει, οὕτω ϗ ἀδεὴς ἔςαι περὶ πάντα. *Ibid.*

(a) *Valer. Max. l.* 3. *c.* 7.

(b) *Virtutum compotes magno erectoque animo viventes ſemper ſunt beati. totos in ſolido virtutis munimento confirmat Philoſophia, potentiores metu ac dolore faciens.* Cic. de Fin. 5. lege Tuſc. 1. & 5. Val. Max. l. 3. c. 3.

III. There is much of Pride and Arrogance (complicated with other Vices) in the Philoſophic Pagans Rampant and Luciferian affectation of Divinity; (c) *We ſee, that the Philoſophers are not of the Humble, nor of the Meek, but Arrogant and Self-conceited, and therefore diſpleaſing to God.* They are famous for their (d) ὀφρὺς ἑλληνικὴ, *Greganic Arrogance and faſtuous Temper*, and are rightly ſtiled, (e) οἱ σοβαροὶ ϗ κατωφρυωμένοι, *the Inſolent and Supercilious*, as highly conceited of their own Merits as *Diogenes* was, who ſuppos'd that he merited his Alms. (f) In *Ariſtotle*'s Compoſition of *Magnanimity* there is a large doſe of Pride; (g) and *Celſus*'s Generoſity is of the ſame Character, who objecteth to the Chriſt of God, τὸ Ἀγεννὲς, *Ungenerouſneſs.* Much of the *Stoicks* Philoſophy is a rant and huff of Pride (*Typhus humani generis*, as S. *Auſtin* ſpeaketh) the *greatneſs* and *height* of Mind to which they pretend, is bloted and unſound, and their *Conſtantia Sapientis* (Philoſophic Conſtancy) is a Syſtem of ſuch Maxims, which are the very Smoak of the Bottomleſs Pit of Pride. (h) *The Wiſe Man is not obnoxious to any Injury. The Wiſe Man can ſuffer no Evil. An Injury detracteth and diminiſheth, whereas nothing can be taken from the Wiſe Man* (who hath all in himſelf.) *Wickedneſs is not ſo ſtrong as Virtue; therefore the Wiſe Man is not hurt by Malice. None can benefit the Wiſe Man* (who wanteth nothing) *therefore none can hurt him. An Injury is from Hope or Fear, the Wiſe Man is touch'd with neither. None receiveth an Injury unmov'd, the Wiſe Man is not mov'd. A Contumely is a Contempt and thence hath its Name; which the Wiſe Man doth not look upon as belonging to him, who knows his own Greatneſs. He thinketh alſo, that all others are ſo much inferiour, that they have not boldneſs to deſpiſe things ſo high above them. If he once debaſeth himſelf, ſo as to be mov'd with Injury or Contumely, he can never be ſecure; whereas Security is the proper good of the Wiſe Man.* If Pride and Stomachfulneſs had not been one of the Stoicks Cardinal Virtues, they could not have applauded **Cato**'s barbarous *Self-murder*, (i) *who ſcorn'd to be a Petitioner to any either for his Death or his Life, and was a* (Stomachful) *contemner of all Power.* (k) They call themſelves *great Men*, and accordingly found their Beatitude (not upon the Favour of God and true Piety, but) upon their *Animi magnitudo, Bigneſs or Elation of Spirit*, (*Animi excelſi atque invicti magnitudo & robur, the greatneſs and ſtoutneſs of an high invincible Mind*;) whence their Virtue becometh a ſort of Self-magnifying and Self-deifying, (the Life and Soul of it is an illegitimate kind of Bravery of Spirit,) incongruous to their Condition as Creatures, much more incongruous to frail miſerable Men, (l) and moſt of all incongruous to improbous miſerable Sinners. Nor is there any thing more diſtaſtful to a truly pious Mind than the haughty Phariſaical Humour of theſe Philoſophic-Pagan Magnifico's ſwaggering with their *Virtue*, their *Magnitude*, their *Celſitude*, their *Altitude*, their *Fortitude*, their *Beatitude*, their Philoſophy *magnanima & altiloqua*, their *Honeſtum, generoſum, ſublime, altum, ſplendidum, illuſtre, magnificum.* Pride ſuggeſted that Stoical Maxim of *Heraclitus*, (m) *The Wiſe need not any Friends:* Whence all the wonderful proviſion which Divine Grace hath made for a World of improbous Sinners was loſt upon theſe Philoſophers; for they that need no Friend, need no Saviour-King, nor the Salvation which is in his Religion and Kingdom. They were able to live of themſelves, and had an imaginary Beatitude of their own making, (wherein they took Satisfaction and Content;) they look'd upon their Philoſophy as the Perfection of Wiſdom and Virtue (in it ſelf and to them) and thought both themſelves and their Inſtitution far paramount to popular Mankind, and therefore it was but agreeable to their Philoſophic Grandeur and Magnificence, to contemn Chriſtianity, *which is a popular Inſtitution deſign'd for and adapted to the Salvation of miſerable Sinners*; whereas they were rais'd to a Superiority above Sin and Miſery, and ſuppos'd themſelves nothing leſs than *Divine Men and Kings*, Jupiter's *Sons and Peers and petty Deities.* (n) *It muſt be ſomething Super-Humane, Celeſtial and Magnificent, that conſtituteth the Wiſe Man. If thou ask what that is? as God and his Beatitude is conſtituted, ſo is the Wiſe Man*; for *Chryſippus* affirmeth, (o) *That the Beatitude of* Jove *is in no reſpect more eligible, nor more fair, nor more venerable than that of the Wiſe Men.* (p) Virtues are thought to be true and genuine, when they are lov'd and deſir'd for their own ſake; but it appeareth from the Stoicks Elation of Mind, that when Vertues are deſir'd for their own ſake in a way of Separation from God and without a Religious Relation to him, they are proud and tumid, and are rather Vice than Virtue. *Plato* is much more modeſt in his Accounts of Virtue than the Ruffian-like *Stoicks*, yet ſome of the Stoicks principal Maxims which nothing but Pride inſpir'd (particularly that eminent one, τὸ σοφὸν αὐτάρκη εἶ), *the Wiſe Man is ſelf-ſufficient*) are deriv'd from *Socrates* and *Plato.* Pride made *Plato* (q) an envious Man, *Socrates* an ireful Man, the Cynick a boaſter of his brave Atchievements in the Conqueſts of Vice. The beſt of theſe Maſters (r) alloweth us, μεγαλοφρονεῖν, *to be proud of the Conqueſt of any Vice. In virtute rectè gloriamur, we rightly glory in our Virtue*, ſaith *Cicero* (a great Wit, but a very Vain-glorious Pagan) who alſo complaineth to his Wife, (s) *neque Dii quos tu caſtiſſimè coluiſti, neque homines quos ego ſervavi ſemper, nobis gratiam retulerunt: Neither the Gods whom thou haſt moſt chaſtly ſerv'd, nor Men whom I have conſtantly ſav'd, have requited us.*

IV. From the Grandeur of their Character it appeareth, that theſe Philoſophers (the Stoicks) are a Mundane ſort of Bravo's, but ſuch as muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the Virtuous Hero's amongſt the Popular Pagans, *Epaminondas, Miltiades*, ***Themiſtocles*** (and ſuch more) whom the Orator calleth (t) φιλοτίμους ϗ μεγαλοψύχους, *the lovers of Honour and the Magnanimous*, that affected the Popular-Pagan Bravery and Glory, to ſave the Grecians, to be crown'd and renown'd for their Wiſdom

---

(c) *Philoſophos nec humiles eſſe nec mites, ſed ſibi multum placentes, & hoc ipſo quod ſibi placeant Deo diſplicentes.* S. Cypr. de bono Patient.

(d) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. p.* 4.

(e) *Ibid. l.* 1. *p.* 28.

(f) *Eth. Nicom. l.* 4. *c.* 7, 8. *Eudem. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

(g) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 47.

(h) *In ſapientem non cadit Injuria. Sapiens nullius mali patiens; injuria detrahit & diminuit, ſapienti nihil eripitur. Fortis ab infirmo non læditur, non ergo à malitia virtus. Sapienti nemo prodeſt, ergo nec lædit. Injuria à ſpe aut metu eſt, ſapiens neutro eorum tangitur. Injuriam nemo immotus accipit, non movetur ſapiens. Sapiens magnitudinem ſuam novit, non ergo contumelia ad eum pertinet, quæ nomen & rem habet à contemptu. ſimul illud cogitat, omnes inferiores eſſe, quàm ut illis audacia ſit tanto excelſiora deſpicere. ſi ſemel demiſerit eo, ut aut Injuria moveatur aut contumelia, non poterit unquam eſſe ſecurus; ſecuritas autem proprium bonum ſapientis.* Sen. de Conſt. ſap.

(i) *Id. de provid. c.* 2. & *Ep.* 24

(k) *Idem Ep.* 92. & *Vid. Cic. Tuſc.* 5.

(l) *Squalor & hæ ſordes conveniunt miſeris.* V. Ba-on. ad nn. 325. .50.

(m) Οἱ σοφοὶ μὴ δεῖσθαι φίλων.

(n) *Quæris, quæ res ſapientem facit? quæ Deum. des oportet & illi aliquid divinum, aliquid cæleſte, magnificum.* Sen. Ep. 97.

(o) Κατὰ μηδὲν αἱρετωτέραν εἶ), μήτε καλλίω, μήτε σεμνοτέραν τὴν τῆ Διὸς εὐδαιμονίαν τῆ τῶν σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν. *Stob. Ecl. Eth. l.* 2. *p.* 178.

(p) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 19. *c.* 25.

(q) *P. Crinit. de hon. diſc. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 2. *Annot. ad S.* 18. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 94.

(r) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 18.

(s) *Ep.* 4. *ad Terent.*

(t) *Iſocrat. Evag. initio.*

Wiſdom and great Exploits, to die glorioſly and leave behind them a great Name. To theſe *Popular Bravo's* S. *Hierom's* Character of a Philoſopher (*u*) eminently belongeth; for theſe were eminently *the Animals of Glory.* To theſe *Tertullian* might more properly have apply'd his Title of (*w*) *Famæ negotiatores* (the Factours of Fame) than to the Philoſophers; for although theſe haughty Philoſophers were very culpably *Animals of Glory and Factors of Fame*, yet this is not their true Character without this Addition and Limitation; *They were ſo the Factors of Fame and Animals of Glory, as yet to be great Adverſaries to the Appetite of Vain-glory*, as appeareth from the tenour of their Philoſophy. (*x*) They deſpis'd the Popular Pagans, their Judgment, Fame, Pomp, Acclamations and Applauſe at a great rate; (*y*) they obſerve and diſcourſe the *Inanity* of Fame, as alſo how *narrow*, *inconſtant* and *evanid* it is, and devoid of Judgment, and the Folly and Iniquity of thoſe that affect it; (*z*) that we ought to conſider the quality of Perſons that praiſe and diſpraiſe, that Fame is one of the *aliena* (others give it and take it away at pleaſure) and therefore they are Fools that affect it, that deſire to be eſteem'd beneficent for doing good, *quibus famæ major ſitis eſt quàm virtutis* (who are more thirſty after Fame than Virtue;) who ſuppoſe, that the applauſe of ſuch is of great moment, that know not themſelves, that deſire to pleaſe them, who are not pleas'd with themſelves, and would be had in admiration by thoſe, whom themſelves call Mad; (*a*) that Fame and Honour is not worth the while (it is but κρότος γλωσσῶν, *a noiſe and clatter of Tongues*, τίς τινι ταῦτα λέγει, *ſome body telleth theſe things to ſome body*; they that praiſe another will ſoon diſpraiſe him, and both will quickly be buried in oblivion,) Good is not the better for being praiſed; we ſhould be indifferent, whether we do our duty *in Cold or Heat*, diſpraiſed or praiſed; the Lovers of good practiſe it as Lovers enjoy one another, ſecretly without deſiring any Hearers or Spectatours to praiſe them; (*b*) that we ought not to accept the praiſe and approbation of ill Men, nor guide our Life by the Opinion of the Injudicious, nor place our Happineſs in the Minds and Thoughts of others, nor regard their Opinion touching our ſelves ſo much as our own, nor ſo much as take into our thoughts what others ſay or think of us. (*c*) The Stoicks reckon Honour and Diſhonour things indifferent, pretend to diſmiſs τὸ δοξάριον, (*gloriolam*) to ſtudy τὸ ἀκενόδοξον, *to be devoid of affecting Vain-glory*, to exerciſe themſelves to an indifferency as to praiſe and diſpraiſe, (ſome that are not of their Sect, count themſelves mean Proficients unleſs their Apathy be ſuch, (*d*) that a Reproach is as welcome to them as μέγα χαῖρε,) and notwithſtanding their Phariſaical Humour in other reſpects, in all things to avoid τὸ ἐπιδεικτικὸν, *Oſtentation*, and to do nothing for Opinion. (*e*) They are urgent with Men to chuſe that which is good, becauſe it is good, and not for popular Opinion; (*f*) and ſome of them will not ſtretch out a Finger for a good Fame. (*g*) They deride the Ambitious and Vain-glorious, ridicule their Folly that are puffed up with Honour, neither admire nor deſire Greatneſs (ſome think Riches and Principalities inconſiſtent with virtuous living, *Simplic. iu Epict. p. 69.*) hugely diſparage a great Name and Fame after Death, forewarn all that will be Philoſophers to expect Deriſion and Reproaches at their entrance upon the Philoſophic Life, teach them to bear Reproaches well (a great Perfection) with great Equanimity and Benevolence, to do well though it expoſe them to diſgrace, and not to deſiſt from good Practice, nor to fear Contempt, but to contemn Infamy; *Antiſthenes* ſaid, *Infamy is good as Labour*; of their Inſtitution of Philoſophy they ſay, (*h*) *It is not a popular Artifice, nor adapted to Oſtentation.* In their Principles they ſeem more ſevere than thoſe that allow the Vain-glory of the Popular-Pagan Hero's, (*i*) τοῦ πρακτικοῦ τὸ φιλότιμον, *the practick Principles love of Mundane Honour*, (as *Xenophon* commendeth *Cyrus* for being φιλοτιμότατος, *extremely deſirous of Honour*;) and more ſevere than thoſe who ſuppoſe, (*k*) *Ambition to be of uſe for correcting the other vicious Affections, but muſt it ſelf be put off in the laſt place, as* Plato *hath called it the laſt Coat.* They are not to be thought like the Emperour *Julian*, whoſe height of Empire and Mundane Glory was not higher than his Popular Vain-glory; the main of their Pride was an *Unpopular Pride and Faſtuouſneſs* (of a moſt malign Aſpect, becauſe againſt God;) and with this their *Unpopular Pride* and Arrogance was complicated *a vicious Affectation of Popular Vain-glory*; (*l*) for the Greek Philoſophers uſually reproach'd one another with their Vain-glory; thus *Antiſthenes*, *Crates*, *Diogenes*, *Plato*, *Pyrrho* were reproach'd by their fellow Philoſophers; *Socrates* eſpy'd it through the Holes in *Antiſthenes's* Cloak; and of *Socrates* himſelf perhaps *Cardan* hath made a right Judgment, (*m*) *that he was extremeey deſirous of Glory, although he moſt of all diſſembled this.* They glory'd in their contempt of Popular Mundane Glory, (*n*) but ſuppos'd (as ſome of themſelves ſaid) that a neglect and contempt of that Mundane Glory (the vain Faſhions of the World) was the beſt way of obtaining a Mundane Glory. Let them therefore be accounted *Animals of Popular Glory*, yet it muſt be acknowledg'd, that their Philoſophy is a great adverſary to the Appetite of it (as the Popular-Pagan Hero's were not) and they reproach'd one another with it as a vicious Affection.

V. This implieth, that the Philoſophic Pagans were not wholly unacquainted with the Virtue of *Humility*, although it is commonly ſaid, (*o*) *that there is no footſtep nor ſhadow of it to be found in the Pagans Writings; but the Vice contrary to it is accounted a laudable Virtue.* (*p*) *This is a great Virtue unknown almoſt to all the Philoſophers.* (*q*) *The Wiſe Men and Philoſophers of the World were altogether ignorant of the Virtue of Humility, ſo that they have not left us any Name in Latin or Greek, whereby they might ſignifie it.* But the Name of this Virtue (though not the Abſtract) plainly enough occurreth in *Plato's fourth of Laws*, where he telleth us, *That Juſtice followeth God, (r) which Juſtice, he that ever becometh happy adhereth to, and followeth humble*

(u) *Mundi philoſophus eſt gloriæ animal & popularis auræ venale mancipium.*

(w) *Apol. c.* 46, 47.

(x) *Gat. in Ant. p.* 76, 97, 125, 332.

(y) *Ibid p.* 125, 159, 229, 292, 113, 126, 230.

(z) *M. Ant. l.* 3. *S.* 4. *l.* 7. *S.* 34. *Gat. Not. p.* 292, 317. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 21.

(a) *M. Ant. l.* 9. *S.* 30. *l.* 8. *S.* 44. *l.* 6. *S.* 2. *Gat. Not. p.* 138, 139, 340.

(b) *Ibid. p.* 126, 97, 214, 254, 422, 363, 359.

(c) *Ibid. p.* 19, 135, 138. *M Ant. l.* 6. *S.* 16. *l.* 8. *S.* 1. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 16. *Ench. c.* 68, 69, 70.

(d) *Plut. de profect. virtut. p.* 82.

(e) *Simpl. in Epict. p.* 260.

(f) *Gat. ſupr. p.* 138.

(g) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 19. *Ench. c.* 26, 29, 30, 31. *M. Ant. l.* 3. *S.* 10. *l.* 4. *S.* 3, 16, 33, *l.* 5. *S.* 33. *l.* 11. *S.* 9. *Gat. Not. p.* 398. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 24, 25. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *Laert. in Antiſthen.*

(h) *Non eſt philoſophia populare artificium nec oſtentationi paratum.* Sen. Ep. 16.

(i) *Plut. Non poſſe ſuavit. viv. &c. p.* 1107.

(k) *Simpl. ſupr. p.* 55.

(l) *Gat. ſupr. p.* 434, 435.

(m) *Fuit Socrates gloriæ cupidiſſimus, tametſi maximè hoc diſſimulaverit.* De rer. var. l. 16. c. 93.

(n) *Gat. ſupr. Dr. Jackſon of Juſtif. Faith c.* 13.

(o) *Amyrald. Treat. of Relig. par.* 2. *c.*

(p) *Magna hæc virtus eſt, philoſophis ferme omnibus incognita.* Grot. Not. in Eph. 4. 2.

(q) *Mundi ſapientes ac philoſophi* [Humilitatem] *penitus ignorarunt, ut ne nomen quidem ullum, quo eam ſignificarent, Latino vel Græco nobis ſermone reliquerint.* Petav. T. 4. par. 1. l. 2. c. 11.

(r) Ἧς ὁ μὲν εὐδαιμονήσ μέλλων, ἐχόμενος, ξυνέπε

and

ταπεινὸς ϗ κεκοσμένος, εἰ δέ τις ἐξαρθεὶς ὑπὸ μεγαλαυχίας, ἢ χρήμασιν ἐπαιρόμενος, ἢ τιμαῖς, ἢ ϗ σώματος εὐμορφίᾳ, ὡς μήτε οὔτε ἄρχοντος οὔτε ἀν- ἡγεμόνος δεόμενος, — καταλείπεται ἔρημος θεοῦ.

and well compos'd, but if any one be elated by Pride, or puffed up by his Riches or Honours, or Beauty of Body, as if he needed no Ruler or Leader, he is left forſaken of God. The Philoſophers therefore were not altogether unacquainted with the Name of this Virtue, and that they were not without conſiderable Notices of the Virtue it ſelf, appeareth (s) from their known Virtue of *Modeſty*, from their uſual declaiming againſt Pride, Inflation, Tumor, Inſolence, Boaſting, Arrogance, Elation, Faſtuouſneſs, Ambition, Oſtentation, Vain-glory, (t) and *Celſus* thinketh, *that the Chriſtian Humility was taken from the Doctrive of* Plato; therefore he acknowledgeth ſuch a Virtue by Name. The Philoſophers generally inſiſt upon a Virtue, which they call Ἀτυφία, *Unfaſtuouſneſs* (which is an Humility,) which the Cynicks accounted (*u*) their chief Excellency (*Antiſthenes* placed the chief good in it;) *Socrates* is celebrated for his (*w*) ἀτυφία ϗ ἀφέλεια, *Unfaſtuouſneſs and Simplicity*. *Xenocrates* in *Laertius* is commended as being ἀτυφότατος, *hugely remote from Faſtuouſneſs*; τῦφος *Faſtuouſneſs* is of all things moſt unbecoming (*x*) ſaid *Zeno*; whence *Plato* (as it is reported in his Life) alighted down from an Horſe which he had got upon, μὴ ἱπποτυφίᾳ ληφθῇ, *leſt he ſhould become faſtuous as Horſes are.* *Socrates* accounted it the great Crime, *to think our ſelves wiſe, when we are not; and of ſome value, when we are nothing ſo.* Accordingly the Maſters of Philoſophic Inſtitution begin their Philoſophy from a *certain Self-humbling*; (*y*) for the entrance into the Wiſdom of it and the Life of it (without which none will begin to learn or change their Life) is ἀποβαλεῖν οἴησιν ϗ τὸν τῦφον, *to abandon Self-opination and Faſtuouſneſs*, συναίσθησις τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀσθενείας ϗ ἀδυναμίας περὶ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα, *a conſciouſneſs of our imbecillity and inability* (of underſtanding) *about the neceſſaries to Felicity*; *if thou wilt be good, firſt believe, that thou art bad*, ſaith the great Stoick. They were not altogether unacquainted with the Philoſophy of *Pride*, (*z*) they well obſerve the grand Impoſture that is in it (it corrupteth the Judgment and befooleth the Mind,) the folly and madneſs of the Popular Pagans Pride and Arrogance upon the account of Externals (Birth, Riches, high Places and ſuch more,) and that as Philoſophers grew upwards in Virtue, they grew downwards in unfaſtuouſneſs, according to that Jeſt of the Cynick *Menedemus*; (*a*) *thoſe that came to ſtudy at* Athens, *at firſt ſeem'd to themſelves Sophi, next Philoſophi, afterwards Rhetoricians, and in Proceſs of time Plebeians*; for the more inſight they had into Learning, the more they depoſited *Self-opination and Faſtuouſneſs*. The *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* were the devouteſt Sect of Philoſophers, and amongſt the motives to Devotion (their Enthuſiaſtic Devotion) which they make uſe of, a principal one is the vility of Man's Nature. (*b*) *The Conſciouſneſs of our own nothingneſs maketh us ſpontaneouſly turn to Supplications. We cannot ſpeak a word touching the Gods without the Gods; for Man's Nature is infirm and ſmall, and hath nullity connate.* Theſe ſound like ſuperlative humbling Expreſſions, and ſeeing they are Heathen Philoſophers, that vilifie and nullifie Man at ſuch a rate, it muſt not be ſaid, *that they were altogether Ignorant of the Virtue of Humility, and that no footſtep or ſhadow of it is to be found in their Writings.* Some Branches of it appear in the Writings of the Stoicks (beſides the oppugning the appetite of vain-glory) who had as little of acquaintance with Humility as any Sect of Philoſophers. For with them the Name always ſignifieth a Vice; and when they initiate a Philoſopher, their way is, to teach him, to abandon one Branch of *Pride*, and one Branch of *Humility* both together, (*c*) τὴν οἴησιν ϗ ἀπιστίαν *Self-opination and Self-diffidence*. The *Stoicks* and *Cynicks* (in ſeveral reſpects) renounc'd both Pride and Humility; for they abandon'd the Popular-pagan Faſtuouſneſs, and thereby introduc'd an Ἀτυφία, *Unfaſtuouſneſs*: But with deſign, to aſſume their Philoſophic τῦφος, (Faſtuouſneſs,) which was really worſe than that which they renounc'd. It muſt be acknowledged therefore (not that no footſtep or ſhadow of it is to be found in their Writings, but) that in the whole compute of things their Humility amounteth to little or nothing or worſe than nothing, and that the Service which they did unto that Vertue was not ſo great as the dis-ſervice. *Socrates*'s Humility (or Unfaſtuouſneſs) amounteth to little; for it was rather an Academical and humourſom ſort of wit than *Humilis Pietas*: But the Platoniſts diſparagements of Human Nature were an Heathen ſort of Piety and an Humility towards their Gods. (*d*) They that live under *Government, muſt exerciſe an Humility towards it*; and *Plutarch* ſaith of the Romans *tribunus Plebis*, (*e*) *by how much more humble he is in his Deportment, ſo much more he increaſeth in Power.* There is no living in Civil or Religious Society without an *Humility*; which therefore muſt be ſaid (as well as Charity, Purity, Sanctity, Temperance, Patience) to have been one of the Philoſophic Pagans Virtues (although they have not inſerted the Name of it into their Catalogue of Virtues,) nor were the Popular Pagans (notwithſtanding the vain-glory of their Hero's) leſs acquainted with it and with the other Virtues than the Philoſophic Pagans. *Ille in imperio fuit humillimus.* Spartian. de Ddio Julian.

VI. For the Philoſophic Pagans were as great Strangers to truly divine moral Virtue as the Popular Pagans, nor was their Virtue of any better Kind and Quality than that of the Popular Pagans, who ſeem to have been better Practitioners of Humility than they. For the *Pride, Inflation, Tumor, Inſolence, Boaſting, Arrogance,* τῦφος, *Faſtuouſneſs*, which is againſt common Prudence, Decency and good Behaviour, is odious and intolerable in the Eyes of all Men, (*f*) the *Comedians, Poets, Orators* (Popular-pagans) declaim againſt it at the ſame rate with the Philoſophic Pagans. The Emperor *Tiberius* at the beginning of his Reign (becauſe of the inſtability of Human Affairs) either really exercis'd, or at leaſt pretended as great an Humility, as any of the Philoſophic Pagans ever practis'd. Nor is there any thing in Paganiſm, which looketh ſo like an act of truly virtuous Humility, as that of *Titus Veſpaſian*, (*g*) who having ruin'd *Jeruſalem*, refus'd to accept of a Crown, ſaying, *he was unworthy of it, for the thing was not his doing, he had only lent his hand* to

(s) *Stob. Ecl. Eth.* p. 184.

(t) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. p. 285. & v. l. 3. p. 149.

(u) *Plutarch. de profect. virt.* p. 82.

(w) *Idem de Socrat. Gen.* p. 582.

(x) *Laert. in Zenon.*

(y) *Gat. ſupr.* p. 7, 416. *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 2. c. 14.

(z) *M. Ant. l.* 6. S. 13. *l.* 3. S. 6. *l.* 12. S. 24, 27. *Gat. Not.* p. 209, 281.

(a) *Plutarch. de profect. virt.* p. 81.

(b) Ἡ μὲν συναίσθησις περὶ ἑαυτοὺς οὐδενείας ποιεῖ τρέπεσθαι πρὸς τὰς λιτὰς αὐτοφυῶς. Οὐδὲ λόγον περὶ θεῶν ἄνευ θεῶν λαλεῖν δυνατόν. Τὸ γὰρ ἀνθρώπινον φῦλον ἀσθενές ἐστι, καὶ σμικρὸν συμφυτὸν τε οὐδὲν κέκτηται. Jambl. de Myſt. p. 26, 27, 84.

(c) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 3. c. 14. πολλὴ γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἡ ἀναίδεια. *Multa eſt in hominibus arrogantia.* *Plotin. En.* 2. *l.* 9. c. 9.

(d) Ταπεινοὺς μὲν εἶναι χρὴ πρὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν ἐμήν. Iſocrat. Nicocl.

(e) Ὅσῳ δὲ μᾶλλον ἐκταπεινοῦται τῷ σώματι, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον αὔξεται τῇ δυνάμει. Quæſt. Rom. p. 283.

(f) *Gat. ſupr.* p. 328, 343, 357, 209. *Macrob. Saturn. l.* 1. c. 22.

(g) *Phot. cod.* 241. *col.* 1026.

to the Execution of Gods Anger. The *Stoicks* were too ſtout and magnanimous, to humble themſelves under the afflictive hand of Providence; (*h*) the Platoniſts will not always allow this Suppoſition, *that Human Calamities are from a Divine Hand*, or that God is the Diſpenſer both of Goods and Evils to us: But the Popular Pagans were not too high to be humbled, they look'd upon their Calamities as (*i*) Effects of the Anger of their Gods, acknowledg'd their Dependence upon them, and in any great diſtreſs of their Affairs (to atone their Diſpleaſure and gain their Favour) betook themſelves to the moſt humble Supplications, (*k*) *and with their kiſſings of the Ground ſwept the Entry of the Temples of their Deities.*

One of the braveſt Exploits which the Philoſophic Pagans conſtantly Renown and Celebrate, is the killing of Tyrants and delivering Cities and Nations from them. The Practice of this applauded Virtue occaſion'd the Torture of *Zeno Eleates*, who is ſaid, to have kept the Doctrine of *Parmenides* inviolate as Gold in the fire, (*l*) *and by his Deeds he ſhew'd, that a great Man feareth nothing but to be baſe; that it is Children and Women and Men who have the Souls of Women, that are afraid of Pain.* From which Idea of a great Man it appeareth, that the Philoſophic-pagan *Fortitude* is of no better kind than the common Military Fortitude, (*m*) or the Fortitude of thoſe celebrated Popular Pagans, *Mutius* and *Regulus*, of *Cleopatra* and *Aſdrubal*'s Wife (who threw her ſelf and Children into the fire,) or of that famous Harlot at *Athens*, who knowing of a Conſpiracy againſt the Life of the Tyrant there, with great bravery ſuffer'd her ſelf to be tortur'd to death, rather than ſhe would diſcover the Conſpirators, and biting off a piece of her Tongue ſpit it out into the Tyrants Face. Such was the Fortitude of *Zeno Eleates*, *Empedocles*, *Anaxarchus*.

Philoſophy cannot boaſt of many great Examples of *Patience*; the Grandees of the Stoical Family *Cato* and *Brutus* falling into troubles fell into Tranſports of Rage and Impatience. So *Hierocles* (according to *Suidas*) being whipp'd at *Byzantium* till the Blood came, he took the Blood in the hollow of his Hand and threw it upon the Judge, Saying,

Κύκλωψ, τῆ, πῖ οἶνον, ἐπεὶ φάγες ἀνδρόμεα κρέα.

Cyclops, there is Wine for you, ſeeing you have eaten Man's Fleſh. Some indeed of the Philoſophic Pagans have expreſs'd an admirable Apathy and Conſtancy of Mind in ſhaking Circumſtances. (*n*) As *Cleanthes*, who ſtood unmov'd without changing Countenance, when he was publickly reproach'd in the Theater by the Poet *Soſitheus*. And *Polemo* did not ſo much as wax Pale, when his Leg was torn by a mad Dog (or as ſome accounts of his Life ſay, his Privy-members;) yet becauſe this Philoſophic Apathy was but of the ſame kind with (*o*) *Epicurus*'s in his Strangury, or the Sceptick *Pyrrho*'s; (who endur'd Sections and Uſtions with great conſtancy of Mind,) or that of well diſciplin'd Gladiators, and the *Spartan* Boys (who were whipp'd at the Altar, till the Blood guſh'd out of their Bowels without whimpering,) therefore the Fathers have rightly pronounc'd touching the *Patience* which Philoſophy profeſſeth, that it is (*p*) *a proud ſullenneſs or ſenſeleſneſs; the Patience as well as the Wiſdom there is ſpurious*, and as Beatitude is there fram'd *by a Virtue ſo much the more falſe as it is more proud. Lipſius* therefore (otherwiſe an extravagant admirer of Stoiciſm) lying upon his Sick-bed and conflicting with grievous Pain, diſcarded the Stoical Patience, and having our Saviour's Picture hanging near his Bed, he pointed to it, and gave his Patience its due Character, *iſta eſt vera patientia, that is the true Patience.*

Several of the Philoſophers have diſcours'd againſt *retaliating Injuries* (Revenge,) for the bearing them with Manſuetude, (*q*) and for univerſal Benevolence; (*r*) and there are ſeveral inſtances of theſe Virtues amongſt the Greek Philoſophers (that were Pagan Saintiſts:) But their Practice of them looketh more like unpopular Humour than ſerious Goodneſs; in laying the Foundation of them they intermix much of Pride and Paradoxical Stoical Conceit (that the wiſe Man can ſuffer no injury;) and the moſt conſiderable inſtances of theſe mighty Virtues are *Ariſtides* and *Phocion*, who may juſtly be reckon'd amongſt the Popular Pagans. *Ariſtides* after great Services being baniſh'd by his Citizens unjuſtly, at his departure pray'd the Gods, that the *Athenians* might never by any trouble or diſtreſs be forc'd to recall him. And *Phocion* being unjuſtly condemn'd charged his Son *Phocas*, that he ſhould never Revenge his Death. But theſe Reſemblances of Chriſtian Virtue in Heathen good Men did not iſſue from a Divine kind of Charity, but were Branches of their Human-Societive Virtue, and iſſu'd from a mighty Love to their Country which is moſt eminent in Heathen People. The Virtue of theſe Popular Pagans pretendeth not to be Divine, nor do they deſerve to be celebrated as Divine Men upon account of it: But the Philoſophic Pagans by far leſſer Matters than theſe got the Reputation of Divine Men. One of their principal Virtues was their λιτότης, *abandoning the ſuperfluities of Life.* Whence *Diogenes* ſeeing one take Water out of a River with his Hand, and drinking it out of his Hand, threw away his diſh, which he us'd to carry about him, to drink Water in, reſolving thenceforth to drink it out of the hollow of his Hand; (*s*) and for this freak (with others of like Nature) this unpopular Humoriſt is celebrated by his Fellow-Philoſophers as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ, *Divine kind of Man.*

The Philoſophic Pagans were like the Popular in not diſcerning what is truly Divine and Holy from what is atheous and unholy. Although they lived in groſs Criminalities (beſides their Paganical Religion,) yet they had not the diſcernment of Sin and Sanctity, being invelop'd (*t*) *with dirt deeply and with the unirradiated caliginouſneſs of Error and Ignorance.* They were *Self-juſtitiaries* at the rate of the Phariſaical Saintiſts, and therefore infinitely indiſpos'd for ſuch a Religion, that is a Religion for Sinners; and they were too high for Repentance, which the Popular Pagans were not, who had a ſenſe of Sin and of their need of Pardon, which they often expreſs'd at Death: But *Apuleius* pretendeth (*u*) *that he always accounted all Sin a thing deteſtable*; *Xenophon* ſaith; *no one ever ſaw* Socrates *do, or heard him ſpeak any thing that was impious and irreligious*; *Socrates* himſelf had no ſenſe of Sin at his Death,

(h) *Porph. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 38, 41.

(i) *Tiraquell. de Nobil. p.* 326.

(k) *Herald in Arnob. p.* 49.

(l) Καὶ ἀπέδειξεν ἔργοις, ὅτι τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἀνδρὶ μεγάλῳ φοβερόν ἐστιν. Ἀλγηδόνα δὲ παῖδες ϗ γύναια ϗ γυναίων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες ἄνδρες δεδίασι. Plutarch. adv. Colot. p. 1126.

(m) *Tertull. ad mart. & Apol. c.* 49. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 5. *c.* 18.

(n) *Ap. Laert.*

(o) *Cic. Tuſc.* 2.

(p) *Superbiæ ſtupor —— tam illic patientia falſa eſt, quam & falſa ſapientia eſt. —— quanto ſuperbiore, tanto mendaciore virtute.* S Aug. de C. D. l. 19. c. 4. S. Cypr. de bon. patien. Tertull. de patien. c. 2.

(q) *Simpl. in Epict. p.* 140. *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 44, 45.

(r) *See Mr. Cl. Not. on Dr. Jackſon B.* 10.

(s) *Simpl. ſupr. p.* 243, 244.

(t) Βαθεῖ βορβόρῳ ϗ ἀφεγγεῖ ζόφῳ πλάνης ϗ ἀγνοίας. Gr. Naz. or. 3. p. 67.

(u) *Apol. p.* 450.

Death, nor expreſs'd any Repentance; (*w*) nor is there any appearance of either in *Epictetus's* Preparatives for Death, ſuch inept Teachers of Virtue were theſe mundane Sages, that they thought themſelves made Gods by ſuch a Virtue, that could not make them the people of God (which was a very blind miſtake, and) which ſpeaketh their Philoſophy, to be no better than (*x*) σοφία κοσμική, *a mundane kind of Wiſdom*, and their Virtue could be of no better a Character than their Philoſophy, which therefore was (*y*) *non illa cœleſtis, ſed tota terrena, not at all the celeſtial, but wholly the mundane.* By their introducing their Philoſophy true Religion was much more prejudic'd, than it was before by their Pagan Religion, they made an additional prejudice to it, they rais'd up a new Enemy, they furniſh'd the Kingdom of Darkneſs with two Legs (like thoſe which *Galen* ſaith, the Body of Phyſick ſtandeth upon, Experience and Reaſon,) they introduc'd a Mountebank, who pretendeth to do all Cures that a Divine Phyſician might be thought needleſs and uſeleſs. So *Plato* ſaith; *that no greater good ever did or ſhall come from the Gods to Men than Philoſophy.*

VII. But that Philoſophy and its Divine Virtue may not be injur'd; it muſt be conſider'd, that not only *the ſuper-Ethical Virtue* is called *the Divine Virtue*, but alſo *the ſublime Ethical Virtue* (which may be practis'd in higher or lower degree;) which ſublime Ethical Virtue is either *the ſpurious ſublime Ethical* (as the Stoical Apathy,) or *the true ſublime Ethical*, (*z*) as *the Heroical*, which is called *the Divine.* The true ſublime *Ethical Virtue* (of which there are many Documents in *Stoiciſm*, *Pythagoriſm* and *Platoniſm*) may be conſider'd either as Philoſophic-paganiz'd (conſtitutive of the Philoſophic-pagan Saintiſts and Divine Men,) or as *unphiloſophic-paganiz'd*; and ſo conſider'd the parts of it and the Documents of it are ſo many Branches of the *truly Divine Moral Virtue*, and therefore ſo conſider'd they are of value ineſtimable. But conſider'd as Philoſophic-paganized they are of Kind and Quality ſpurious and illegitimate, and are ſo commix'd and complicated with what is bad, that in the whole compute of things they ſignifie little or nothing to the conſtituting a Divine good Man. Thus far this ſort of the Philoſophic-pagans Divine Virtue ought to be diſparag'd and no further: But the reſt of their Divine Virtue is a complication of phantaſtry and groſs vicioſity, which is the Character (not only of the *Stoicks*, but) of the Platoniſts Divine Virtue in all theſe parts of it.

Such is their Divine Virtue as it is *their intellectual Form of Life, Theoretic of the Platonic intelligibles* and *Viſionary* of their *T'Agathon*, which cannot be diſcern'd but by (*a*) φῶς ἀγαθοειδὲς μεῖζον ἢ κατὰ νοῦν, *a Boniform light, which is beyond all that is intellectual.*

Such is their Divine Virtue as it is *Theurgic*; for they pretend (*b*) by a converſe with the Gods in Theurgy, to have liberation from Paſſion and what is cognate to Generation, to partake of their Perfections and to have a Deific Union; which one party of them pretendeth to in the Myſtic-Metaphyſical way. And theſe ſay, (*c*) *the end and ſcope is, not to be without Sin, but to be a God.*

Such is their Divine Virtue, as it is the Platonic *Faith* and *Love*; for this Love is (*d*) ἐρωτικὴ μανία, *amatorious madneſs.* (*e*) *When the Mind becometh unmental* (or mad) *being drunk with Nectar, this is the Mind that is in Love.* Much of this ſort of Divine Virtue there is in Platoniſm, a Neſcience that is better than knowledge, a madneſs that is better than ſobriety of Mind, (*f*) θεία μανία, *a Divine Madneſs.*

Such is their Divine Virtue, as it is the Virtue of the *Myſticks* and *Quietiſts*, (*g*) *who being ſeated in the Bay of ſuper-eſſential Goodneſs enjoy a ſuper-natural Quietiſm*, to which *Iſidore* the Platoniſt pretendeth. (*h*) *He ſaid, that his Soul it ſelf in ſacred Prayers became wholly a Divine Sea* (or Ocean of Divinity,) *having in the firſt place collected her ſelf from the Body into her ſelf; having in the next place* (extatically) *parted with her own Morals and betaken her ſelf from Rational Notions to thoſe that are congenial to Intellect; and in the third place being poſſeſs'd with Divine Afflation and chang'd into an extraordinary ſerenity deiform not human.*

Such is their Divine Virtue as it is *Entheal* and *Bacchical.* For as the Fathers ſpeak (*i*) it muſt be ſaid of them, *that they were inſpir'd by Demons, by whom their Soul had a Bacchical Afflation.*

Such is their Divine Virtue, as it is the *Paradigmatical* (beyond the Soul-intellectual,) as it is the *Cathartic* (which is initially their Divine Vertue) and as it is the *Teleſtic.* (*k*) As *Proclus* purify'd himſelf with the Inſtitutes of *Orpheus* and the *Chaldeans* and the *Sacra* of the Mother of the Gods.

Such is their Divine Virtue, as it is a Platonic Averſation and Separation from terrene material and mortal Nature, and an Affectation of Incorporeouſneſs and Immaterialiſm (as ſuppoſing, that the Soul muſt be freed from her adventitious Corporeouſneſs, (*l*) that the Intellectual and Immaterial Soul as ſuch and in its own Nature is of ſufficient purity and pulchritude, only it contracteth turpitude and deformity by mixing and blending with the Body and the matter;) for this their Affectation of immaterial intellectual Nature and to be meer intellectual Souls, is an unholy Philoſophic vanity and an extravagance; and it is complicated with a Magical vanity. For in order to the purity of the Soul *Pythagoras* preſcrib'd ſtrict Abſtinence from ſeveral ſorts of Meats, allowing greater liberty to ſuch, (*m*) *whoſe Life was not to be altogether purg'd, and ſacred and Philoſophic.*

The Platoniſts agree, (*n*) that according to *Plato* in his *Theætetus* Virtue is a Similitude to God or the Gods; (*o*) *which Aſſimilation conſiſteth* (ſaith *Plato*) *in becoming Holy and Juſt with Prudence.* But to what God or Gods this Divine Similitude relateth, in this they do not agree; nor wherein

---

(w) *Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

(x) *Baron. ad an.* 361. *n.* 19.

(y) *Lactant. l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(z) *Ariſtot. Eth. Nicom. l.* 7. *c.* 1. *Epict. Ench. c.* 21.

(a) *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 8. *c.* 15.

(b) *Jambl. de myſt. p.* 13, 27, 56.

(c) Ἀλλ' ἡ σπουδὴ οὐκ ἔξω ἁμαρτίας εἶναι, ἀλλὰ θεὸν εἶναι. Plotin. En. 1. l. 2. c. 6.

(d) *Procl. Plat. Th. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(e) Ὅταν ἄφρων γένηται νοῦς μεθυσθεὶς τοῦ νέκταρος τότε ἐρῶν γίνεται. Plotin. En. 6. l. 7. c. 35.

(f) *Niceph. in Syneſ. p.* 383.

(g) *Procl. ſupr. p.* 62.

(h) Αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς εὐχαῖς πρὸς ὅλον τὸ θεῖον πέλαγος ἔλεγε· τὰ μὲν πρῶτα, συναγειρομένην ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος εἰς ἑαυτήν· αὖθις δὲ ἐξισταμένην τῶν ἰδίων ἠθῶν, καὶ ἀναχωροῦσαν ἀπὸ τῶν λογικῶν ἐννοιῶν ἐπὶ τὰς τῷ νῷ συγγενεῖς· ἐκ δ' αὖ τρίτων, ἐνθουσιῶσαν καὶ παραλλάττουσαν εἰς ἀήθη τινὰ γαλήνην θεοπρεπῆ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην. Phot. cod. 242. col. 1068.

(i) Ὑπὸ δαιμόνων ἐμπνευσθέντες. Theophil. ad Autol. l. 2. p. 87. Ἡ ψυχὴ ὑπὸ δαιμόνων ἐκβακχευθεῖσα. S. Chryſoſt. T. 6. p. 637.

(k) *Marin in vit. ejus.*

(l) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 5, 6. *Hierocl. ſupr. p.* 297.

(m) Ὅσοις ὁ βίος μὴ πάνυ ἦν ἐκκεκαθαρμένος καὶ ἱερὸς καὶ φιλόσοφος Jambl. de vit. pyth. c. 24.

(n) *Procl. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 11.

(o) Ὁμοίωσις δὲ δίκαιον καὶ ὅσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως γενέσθαι.

this Similitude conſiſteth. (*o*) For ſome ſay, that this Divine Similitude relateth to the Pagan Deities in general; others ſay, that it relateth to the Platoniſts Divine Intellect; and others are of Opinion, that it relateth to their T'Agathon. (*p*) Some place this Divine Similitude in their Theoretic Virtue and intellectual Form of Life: Others place it in the Practic Virtue (the Ethical and Political) which ſeemeth to be the ſenſe of *Plato*; for *Prudence*, *Holineſs* and *Juſtice* is the Practic Virtue; and (as he ſaith in his *Euthyphro*) *Holineſs is that part of Juſtice, which is converſant about the Gods, the other part of it is converſant about Men.* In his *Fourth of Laws* he placeth the Divine Similitude *in Temperance* (taken in a large Senſe,) and in his *Phædo* (as *Alcinous* ſaith) he placeth it in *Temperance* and *Juſtice*; thus ſaying, *Are not they moſt happy and bleſſed, and ſuch as go to the beſt place,* οἱ τὴν δημοτικήν τε ϗ πολιτικὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιτετηδευκότες, *that have exercis'd the Popular and Political Virtue, which we call Temperance and Juſtice? Plato* therefore ſeemeth to place the Divine Similitude in the Popular-pagans Holineſs and Juſtice: But this the generality of his Followers will not endure to hear of; they are far from counting the Civil Virtue of the Popular Pagans the Divine Similitude and the Divine Virtue: They ſay (*q*) it is but the way to get the Divine Similitude, and that this is the ſenſe of *Plato*. But whatever may be thought of his Senſe, his account of Virtue and of the Divine Similitude is an inſtance, that the Philoſophic Pagans may in Words agree with our Religion, when in ſenſe there is an extreme diſagreement. For *Plato*'s Divine Similitude (howſoever it is interpreted in his School,) is extremely alien from, and oppoſite to, that truly Divine Similitude which is *Wiſdom, Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs*, wherewith he had no acquaintance. For had he been acquainted with that truly Divine kind of Juſtice of Righteouſneſs, he could not have been a Pagan Religioniſt; nor could he have inſtituted a Community of Women and of Goods in his Republick; nor would he have taken care, (*r*) to regulate the drinking in the Feaſts of *Bacchus* without endeavouring to aboliſh them; nor could he ſo groſly have miſtaken himſelf, as in a Book of Juſtice (his *Fifth de Republicâ*,) to Diſcourſe in this manner touching the Greeks and Barbarians. (*s*) *All Greeks are near of Kin, but extraneous and different from Barbarians. When the Grecians and Barbarians fight with one another,* μαχομένους τε φήσομεν, ϗ πολεμίους φύσει εἶναι, ϗ πόλεμον τὴν ἔχθραν ταύτην κλητέον, *this is properly called fighting, for they are Enemies by Nature, and ſuch a feud muſt be called a War: But if Grecians that are Friends by Nature, quarrel with Grecians, this is an unnatural Diſtemper, and Greece muſt be ſaid* στασιάζειν, *to be troubled with Sedition, and ſuch a feud muſt not be called a War, but a Sedition.* The Greeks had their Philoſophy from the *Barbarians* (as they called them,) and yet they commonly reproach'd them (although ſometimes to ſerve a turn, they diſcourſe otherwiſe, as *Themiſtius* doth in an Oration to *Valens*,) uſually they were ſo uncivil and unjuſt towards them, that they look'd upon them, (*t*) *as Enemies by Nature and as* θηρία, *wild Beaſts. Plato* follow'd his Popular Pagans in their injuſtice, as well as in their irreligious Religion. So *Plutarch* (in the Life of *Lycurgus*) can find no injuſtice in the *Lacedæmonians* Commonwealth, which was inſtituted for War and fighting, not for Peace, (*u*) as *Ariſtotle* obſerveth and blameth; the *Spartans* Virtue was the love of Glory; they were train'd up and exercis'd, to be expert Thieves; expos'd and murder'd their weak and deform'd Infants, and even this horrible Injuſtice *Plutarch* approveth. *Ariſtotle* alſo is known to teach (*w*) μηδὲν πεπηρωμένον τρέφειν, *to expoſe* (not to educate) *Children that are maimed, and Women to abort, that they may not exceed their number*; and he ſymbolizeth with his Maſter *Plato* in ſuppoſing, (*x*) *that War is a natural thing between the Greeks and Barbarians. Plato* is juſtly chargeable with a bad diſcernment in matters of Juſtice, becauſe he patronizeth lying (notwithſtanding that ſome Chriſtian Caſuiſts pretend to juſtifie ſeveral ſorts of lying,) wherein he followeth the general ſenſe of the Heathen, which was, that a Lye is not bad, if it be expedient, and not pernicious in the Affairs of Men, *ubi expedit mendacium dicere, dicatur.* So in his *Third* and *Fifth de Republicâ Plato* would have Governors, (*y*) *to make uſe of frequent lying and deceit for the benefit of the Subjects; this muſt be granted to publick Governors, but not be touched by private Men.* If the Platoniſts Human Juſtice is ſo bad, it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that in their Divine (or ſuper-human) Virtue they were not very good.

VIII. *Ariſtotle* pretendeth not to an Inſtitution of Divine Virtue, or to inſtitute a Divine good Man. For although he acknowledgeth *a Divine Virtue*, yet it is in ſo ſlender a degree, that he denieth, that there can be any friendſhip between God and Man; the Beatitude that he inſiſteth on is but the Civil, (*z*) as the Virtue that he inſiſteth on is but the Civil and Military; his Ethicks are but a Branch of the mundane Politicks, his active Virtue conſiſteth in that *mean*, which the worldly Man's Prudence determineth, and what can living well (*bene vivere*) ſignifie in a Civil worldly Mans Inſtitution of Virtue, but to live without Vice or Crime in the Notion of the Civil World? It is not marvellous therefore, (*a*) that *Ariſtotle* diſſonantly from the ſenſe of other Philoſophers patronizeth Revenge, or that *Cicero* ſymbolizeth with him (for this muſt be acknowledg'd, notwithſtanding (*b*) what a learned Biſhop hath ſaid to the contrary;) for the former of theſe did not pretend, to be a Philoſophic-pagan Saintiſt, and the latter of them (although a Philoſopher, yet) was not of any Philoſophic Inſtitution, and was ſo uncertain an admirer of Philoſophy, (*c*) that ſometimes he preferreth that one little Book of the Twelve Tables before the Libraries of all the Philoſophers both for weight of Authority and plenty of Utility. So *Tribonian* upon the *Pandects* ſaith, (*d*) *Juſtice and the notice of what is good and equal is our Profeſſion, ſeparating and diſcerning equal from unequal, lawful from unlawful, deſiring to make Men good, not only by fear of Puniſhments, but by the exhortation of Rewards, following the true, not counterfeit Philoſophy.* The Lawyers (not without Reaſon) prefer their Inſtitution to their Civil Virtue before the Philoſophers Inſtitutions to their Divine Virtue; which yet

muſt

(o) *Procl. ibid. Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 2. *Alcin. c.* 27. *Simpl. in Epict. p.* 140.

(p) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 3. *Hierocl. ſupr. p.* 222. 257. *Simplic. ſupr. p.* 4, 140. *Alcin. ſupr.*

(q) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 9.

(r) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 12. *c.* 24.

(s) *V. Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 43.

(t) *Iſocrat. Panathen. p. m.* 572.

(u) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 2. *S.* 12, 14.

(w) *Polit. l.* 7. *c.* 16.

(x) *Grot. ſupr.*

(y) Συχνῷ τῷ ψεύδει καὶ ἀπάτῃ χρῆσθαι ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τῶν ἀρχομένων, ἰδιώταις δὲ οὐχ ἁπτέον.

(z) *Eth. Nicom. l.* 10. *c.* 7.

(a) *Grot. ſupr.*

(b) *Bp. Wilkins Ser. on Rom.* 12. 19.

(c) *Lactant. l.* 3. *c.* 16.

(d) *Juſtitiam colimus, & boni & æqui notitiam profitemur, æquum ab iniquo ſeparantes, licitum ab illicito diſcernentes, bonos non ſolum metu pœnarum verum etiam præmiorum quoque exhortatione efficere cupientes, veram niſi fallor Philoſophiam, non ſimulatam affectantes.*

muſt be acknowledg'd, to have a meaſurable and limited ſuitableneſs and agreeableneſs to the truly divine moral Virtue: But ſo that in the whole compute of things the Diſagreement is far greater than the Agreement. Whence we may make a Judgment *(e)* of this Saying of a learned Biſhop (and ſuch like;) *all the Agenda of Chriſtianity are ſo far from being oppoſite, that they are moſt agreeable to human Reaſon, as 'tis cultivated and heightned to its utmoſt improvement by Philoſophy.* If this Saying be converted thus; *all the Philoſophers improv'd Reaſon* (which is their Divine Virtue) *is ſo far from being oppoſite, that it is moſt agreeable to the Agenda of Chriſtianity,* it will be a monſtrous Propoſition. For nothing can be more oppoſite to the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity than a great part of the Philoſophers Divine Virtue, therefore the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity are not ſo ſuitable to the Philoſophers Reaſon, as is pretended. That this Saying (which will hereafter recur to conſideration) may have any appearance of Truth, it muſt be limited to the particular *Agenda* of Chriſtianity; for theſe general *Agenda* of Chriſtianity (which are alſo in part the general Agenda of *Judaiſm*) are directly aud expreſly oppoſite to the Philoſophers improved Reaſon: *To have no other Gods but me; to Worſhip the Lord thy God and to ſerve him alone; to ſeek the Kingdom of God and his Righteouſneſs; to take the Kingdom, enter into it and buy it at any rate; to put off the Heathen old Man, and to put on the new Man in the* (Chriſtian) *new Birth and the new Covenant; to come out of the mundane Society, and the State of Sin and of Death, to paſs into the State of Life, to incorporate with the Divine Family, and become a Citizen of the holy Empire; not to adhere to, but to abandon the Kingdom of Darkneſs, and to manage an holy War againſt its Powers, Intereſts and Adherents; to live to him that died for us and that roſe again; to live for God and his Service, and to make it our daily Care and Prayer, that his Name may be hallow'd and his Kingdom may come.* All which fundamental *Agenda* of the Chriſtian Inſtitution (and ſuch more) are altogether alien from and oppoſite to the Philoſophic Pagans Sentiments (as they are Pagans:) Nor is that plain Principle aud Summary of Piety *the Fear of God* ſuitable to their Reaſon; for they deſtroy'd it (which the Popular Pagans did not) by their Maxim *(f) Ira Deorum nulla eſt.* Yet a learned Man ſaith, *(g) He knows not any Evangelical Precept or Duty belonging to a Chriſtians Practice, which natural Men of beſt account* (the Philoſophers) *by the meer ſtrength of Human Reaſon have not taught and taken upon them to maintain as juſt and reaſonable.* But it would be far better to ſay; there is not any of the particular *Agenda* of Chriſtianity, the reaſonableneſs whereof may not be illuſtrated by what they have ſuppos'd to be juſt and reaſonable. So the Chriſtian Martyrs contempt of Death may be ſhew'd, to be reaſonable, which yet was ſo unſuitable to their improv'd Reaſon, that it is called by one of them *(h)* ψιλὴ παράταξις, *meer Obſtinacy,* and another of them imputeth it to *Madneſs and Cuſtom.* The Agreement therefore between Chriſtianity and Philoſophy touching this Virtue, *the Contempt of Death,* is complicated with ſuch Diſagreement, that the Chriſtians Virtue of that Name Philoſophy diſcardeth as Vice and Folly, and the Philoſophers Virtue of that Name Chriſtians diſcard as Self-murder or profane bravery.

(c) *Bp. Wilkins ſupr.*

(f) *Cic. de off. l.* 3.

(g) *Dr. Meric. Caſaub. pref. to M. Antonin. in Engliſh.*

(h) *M. Ant. l.* 11. *S.* 3. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 4. *c.* 7.

IX. The Philoſophers therefore being Gentiles that knew not God and aliens from the truly divine moral Virtue (the Life of God) are juſtly cenſur'd by the Chriſtian Apologiſts (yet not without ſome Self-inconſiſtence) as thoſe that wanted their Eye-ſight the Science of Good and Evil. *(i) It is paſt doubt, that all thoſe were ignorant of what is Good and Evil, that neither had the knowledge of God, nor of the Adverſary of God.* (*k*) They reproach them, that pretending to form Inſtitutions of Virtue, they foully miſtook Vice for Virtue and by their foul miſtakes overturn'd Religion. They obſerve, that if the Philoſophers had found out God, (*l*) they could not have been Heathen Polytheiſts; *(m)* that their Theories and Diſcourſes were oppoſite and uncertain and their Differences endleſs about the end or chief Good; (*n*) that they were Men of abſurd Paradoxes (which they delighted to maintain) introduc'd Scepticiſm, and that the vulgar were often wiſer than they; that their Precepts wanted Authority and Sanctions of Rewards and Puniſhments, that their Motives to a virtuous Life were inſufficient, that their Philoſophy was devoid of Divine Grace and Aſſiſtance for the Acquiſition of Virtue; that the ſupports which it affordeth under affliction and its conſolations againſt Death are mean and abſurd; that it did no (great) good in the World, nor was it a Law of Life to themſelves (as *Lacydes* the Philoſopher told his Servants, (*o*) we diſcourſe one way in the Schools and live another;) that the Popular Pagans who knew it not, excell'd them in Goodneſs, and of all Men they had moſt need, to be taught a virtuous Life, that were the profeſs'd Teachers of Virtue. (*p*) They are charg'd with henious Crimes, the Popular Pagans repreſent them as Hyprocrites and Creatures of wind and emptineſs (the Stoicks are ſaid to be as painted as their *Pœcile* (ποικίλη,) Porticus wherein they philoſophiz'd:) But we will content our ſelves with this modeſt Character of their Morals; *the univerſality of them were but Counterfeit Saintiſts and Divine kind of Men.* But although all of them of ſeveral Inſtitutions (not alike, nor alike bad) are of this bad Character; yet worth and uſefulneſs there is both in their Perſons and in their Diſcipline ſo great and valuable, that ſeveral of them ought to be had in great Eſteem. Several of the Philoſophic and many of the Popular Pagans alſo were of great Abilities, of great Humanſocietive and Paganical Virtue (ſuch Virtue as is competible to Heathen Mankind,) of conſiderable uſefulneſs to the World, and therefore were deſervedly had in Honour in their Generations, as ſeveral of them were ſince the times of Chriſtianity. There is therefore an Exceſs and Extravagance on both hands in characterizing the Philoſophers Morals. For one ſaith, (*q*) *we ſee the great Attainments of* Socrates *and other Heathens, and what height of Goodneſs they roſe to by the aſſiſtance of the Divine Spirit.* Another ſaith of them without excepting any (r) *nihil contaminatius ac depravatius genere iſto bipedum fuiſſe, nothing was more contaminate and deprav'd than that ſort of Men the Philoſophers.*

(i) *Non igitur dubium eſt, quin illi omnes quid eſſet bonum & malum ignoraverint, qui nec Deum nec adverſarium Dei ſcierint.* Lactant. l. 6. c. 6.

(k) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 10. *l.* 3. *c.* 28.

(l) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 360.

(m) *Theodoret.* Θεραπ. *Ser.* 1. *Lactant. l.* 3. *c.* 7.

(n) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 5. 28, 27, 20, 19, 15, 16, 30.

(o) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 14. *c.* 7.

(p) *Min. Fel. p.* 350. *Tertull. Apol. c.* 46. *Caſaub. in Perſ. p.* 166. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 37, 366. *Grot. not. in* 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. *Phot. cod.* 258. *col.* 1311. *Holyday on Juv. p.* 29.

(q) *Dr. Hezek. Burton* 2 *Vol of Diſc. p.* 17.

(r) *Petav. T.* 4. *Par.* 2. *l.* 13. *c.* 18. *S.* 13.

X. In ſuch a way as to avoid both theſe Extravagances, we muſt reſolve this Branch of the *Pelagian* Controverſie; *whether the ſeeming Virtues and good Works of the Gentiles are true or falſe, Sins and Vices, or Virtues and Well-doings, in what ſenſe and how far they are ſo?* If we ſay, that all their ſeeming Virtues and good Works are in no ſenſe true, we contradict the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 2. 14. *The Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the Law*; (*s*) which muſt be underſtood of the Gentiles antecedently to their Converſion to Chriſtianity. But if we ſay, *That the true Virtues and good Works are found in the Gentile World*, we deſtroy the neceſſity of Chriſtianity, we contradict the Senſe of all true Chriſtians, we confound Nature and Grace, Law and Grace, Gentiliſm and Chriſtianiſm, the State and Life of the Gentiles with that of the Saints of God, the Atheous World with the City of God and the Divine Family; we contradict the Nature of things (by ſuppoſing, that Men do what is truly Holy and Pious antecedently to an Inchoation of their true Piety and Sanctity;) we contradict the Scriptural Account of the *Heathen-popular* State and Life, and the whole Stream of the Scriptures; which affirm, *that without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, *Heb.* 11. 6. which muſt not be underſtood of ſuch a Faith that is common to Infidels (as ſome pretenders to Theology (*t*) underſtand it:) but of the Faith which conſtituteth Divine Believers (who alone belong to the Apoſtle's Catalogue) and *God's Religioniſts that come unto God.* The Gentiles *have their Hearts purify'd by Faith.* The Mind and Practice of Unbelievers is *defiled, impure and unholy. The Carnal Mind is no keeper of the Law of God; they that are in the Fleſh cannot pleaſe God. Te are marry'd to another* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *to have your Fruit unto Holineſs, and to bring forth Fruit unto God. We are created in Chriſt unto good Works.* The genuine kind of Virtues are, *the Fruits of the Holy Spirit. A corrupt Tree cannot bring forth good Fruit, of Thorns Men do not gather Figs, nor of a Bramble-buſh gather they Grapes. When ye were the Servants of Sin, ye were free from Righteouſneſs*, the practice whereof is *a walking*, not *after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit. Every one that doth Righteouſneſs, is born of God.* The true and genuine kind of Virtue, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs is that which is of *the Kingdom of God*, of *the Divine Image* and *the new Man that is renewed in knowledge* (which is inconſiſtent with the ſtate of Atheous Ignorance) *which is of a new Creature, a new and divine birth unto Righteouſneſs*, of *the new Covenant* and diſpenſation of things, *of the true Vine*, and of *a Divine Charity*, which is the Eſſence and Summary of the truly Divine Moral Virtue and the genuine kind of good Works. *Though I beſtow all my Goods to feed the Poor, and give my Body to be burned, and have not Charity, it profiteth me nothing.* The natural Man's kind of Virtue, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs therefore is (according to theſe Notices of Scripture) on this ſide that which is the true and genuine kind of Virtue, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs (the Saint of God-kind of Virtue, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs;) nor can the true Virtue, Goodneſs and Juſtice exiſt without being truly virtuous, juſt and good as to God (which is true Piety and Sanctity,) nor can that be the true kind of Virtue, Goodneſs and Juſtice, which cannot conſtitute Men of the truly good and virtuous kind, God's kind of virtuous, good and juſt Men, whoſe Judgment is according to truth. But as there is a Secular and Mundane kind of Wiſdom and Prudence in it ſelf laudable, ornamental and uſeful (ſuch is the common *Juris Prudentia*) yet *originally* it is baſe and vile being but Mundane-born (not of the Divine and Heaven-born things in the diviſive or contradiſtinctive Senſe) *objectively* it is baſe and vile (not being converſant about the Saint of God-kind of things,) of kind and quality alſo it is baſe and vile (being of kind common, graceleſs and unholy) and *effectively* it is not *Wiſdom* (for it cannot conſtitute any Man *truly wiſe*, not wiſe as to the main, but it continueth him where it found him, in the ſtate of Ignorance, Errour and Fooliſhneſs) upon which accounts it is fitly call'd by *Gr. Naz.* (*u*) *ἄσοφος σοφία, unwiſe Wiſdom*; ſo there is a Secular and Mundane-kind of Virtue and Goodneſs, which in its own nature is laudable, ornamental and uſeful at a great rate, yet *originally*, *objectively*, and alſo of *kind and quality* it is but baſe and vile, and *effectively* it is not *Virtue*, *Juſtice* and *Goodneſs*; for it cannot conſtitute any Man Virtuous, Juſt and Good, not *Virtuous*, Juſt and Good as to the main, but it continueth him where it found him, in the ſtate of (reigning) Sin and Unrighteouſneſs. His Works are not *wrought in God*, which is a Phraſe us'd by our Saviour, and is ſeveral times us'd by *Philo*, (*w*) whoſe Senſe is of no great concern, but (doubtleſs) our Saviour meaneth by it *Theiſm of Religion and Condition.* Thoſe therefore are the true and genuine kind of good Works, that are the holy and godly kind of good Works (for theſe are wrought in Theiſm) and that is the true and genuine kind of Virtue, which is the holy and godly kind of Virtue, which is of a different kind from ſuch Virtue and Well-doing, which is meerly Humane, Secular and Mundane, Atheous and Unholy; which is the only kind of Virtue, that is competible to the Atheous and Unholy (continuing ſuch) and to altogether Unregenerate Mankind. Their *Goodneſs*, *Charity*, *Benignity*, *Liberality*, *Almſgiving*, *Clemency*, *Juſtice*, *Temperance*, *Patience*, *Probity*, *Fortitude*, *contempt of the World*, *Piety and Devotion*, are not *the truly Divine kind of Moral Virtue*, but theſe their Virtues are of an alien Kind and Family from thoſe that are true Holineſs and Godlineſs as to the kind of them. They are not truly Holy and Religious towards God in any thing (nor can they be ſo till they begin to be ſo;) but are Atheous, Graceleſs and Unholy, not only in their indifferent Actions and their evil Doings (that are ſuch in the Matter of them) but in their Religious Actions in their Virtue and Duty, their Goodneſs and Well-doings (that are materially ſuch;) theſe are not of kind and for the main *the truly good and holy kind of Virtues, Duties and good Works.* Their kind of doing what is materially good (commonly call'd the manner of doing it) ſymbolizeth not with the truly good and holy in the main Principle, Motive, End and formal Object. They are not right in thoſe grand Ingredients, which are eſſential to every one of the truly good Actions; but their Virtue, Juſtice, Goodneſs and Good-works are devoid of the neceſſary Ingredients, and are impoyſon'd with the contrary Ingredients. Nor can their virtuous living be the Life of Piety and Sanctity (they live not to God as his Servants in the exerciſe of all Divine Virtues,) they ſin in practiſing their Virtue, and they do not only ſin, but ſin at ſuch a rate as is inconſiſtent

(s) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. par.* 2. *ch.* 23.

(t) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pelag. l.* 3. *par.* 3. *Theſ.* 11.

Act. 15. 9. *Tit.* 1. 15. *Rom.* 8. 7, 8. *and* 6. 22. *and* 7. 4. *Eph* 2. 10. *Gal.* 5. 22. *Matt.* 7. 8. *Luk.* 6. 44. *Rom.* 6. 20. *and* 8. 1. 1 *Joh.* 2. 29. *Rom.* 14. 17. *Eph.* 4. 24. *Col.* 3. 10. *Gal.* 6. 15. *Joh.* 1. 13. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. *Heb.* 8. 10. *Rom.* 13. 10. 1 *Cor.* 13. 3.

Vita bona noſtra nihil aliud eſt quàm Dei Gratia. S. Aug. de Grat. &. lib. Arbit. c. 8.

(u) *Or.* 3. *p.* 50.

Joh. 3. 21.

(w) Ζῇ δὲ τὴν ἐν Θεῷ ζωὴν εὐδαίμονα. *Quod deter. inſid. potior. p.* 111. *Ed. Gr. Pariſ.* Πρός γε τὴν ἐν Θεῷ ζωὴν ἄψυχος καὶ νεκρός. Περὶ φυγάδ. p. 312.

Bonum eſt ex omnibus cauſis eſſentialibus.

ſiſtent with Sanctity; and therefore they are wicked and ungodly in all their virtuous practice and well-doing.

With this Account of the Virtues and good Works of the Gentiles the general Senſe of Chriſtians thus far agreeth; (x) *It is a plain and granted truth among all that are truly pious, that without true Piety, that is, the true Worſhip of the true God, no Man can have the true* (kind of) *Virtue.* The Pagan Theologers themſelves ſay, (y) that Piety is μήτηρ τῶν ἀρετῶν, *the Mother of the Virtues*; their Virtues therefore could not be of the Holy and Godly Kind, if their Religion and Piety was of a contrary kind and Family. The Schoolmen therefore (agreeably to the general Senſe of Chriſtians) univerſally determine, that no Theological Virtues nor any good Works theologically ſo called (wherein Piety and Religion conſiſteth, and which are ſaving) are competible to Infidels; but *whether all the Actions of Infidels be Sins or not, whether ſeveral of them be not morally good and honeſt, ſo as not to be Sins*, this is matter of diſpute amongſt them, and they agree not with one another. The Fathers concern'd in the Pelagian Controverſie agree with one another, but do not well agree with themſelves; (z) for ſometimes they diſcourſe, *That the Gentiles have their good Works, which are praiſe-worthy, that they do ſome things, vel ſapienter vel ſanctè, even wiſely or holily, that for their good Works they are rewarded* (with ſecular Bleſſings in this Life and with abatement of Puniſhment in the Life to come:) And ſometimes they diſpute, *That all the Gentiles Works are Sins* (although ſome are ſplendid and glittering,) *that all their Virtues are Vices and Sins, not true but falſe Virtues, non veræ ſed veriſimiles, ſuch as carry an appearance only of true Virtues.* (a) S. *Auſtin*'s account of the Gentiles Virtues and good Works is founded upon the Apoſtle's Text, *Rom.* 14. 23. *Whatſoever is not of Faith, is Sin*; which muſt be underſtood of Sin ſimply ſo called (without addition or limitation of Senſe;) yet the ſame Father ſaith, *habent quædam opera bona in vita impia, they have ſome good Works in their impious Life.* The Divines of the Reformation reſemble theſe ancient Fathers in their Accounts of the Gentiles Virtues and good Works; *the ſame Men do not well agree with themſelves.* For ſome affirm, (b) *that whatſoever the Wicked do is altogether ſinful*; yet they alſo affirm, that in ſeveral of their Works *there is Goodneſs Ethical and Moral in relation unto Manners and in order to Men*; (c) that in their ſtate of Sin many things may be done *civiliter bona & honeſta, that are civilly good and honeſt.* In ſome reſpect alſo Reformed Divines are like the Schoolmen, they are of ſeveral Parties and Perſwaſions, and in their Accounts of the Gentiles Virtues and good Works they do not agree with one another: For the far greater number of them are of Opinion, *That all the Works of the Unregenerate have the nature of Sins* (as the Church of *England* determineth) *and are not good Works* (wanting ſome Eſſentials thereto) *but Sins in the ſight of God, although they be materially good.* Some of them *Pelagianize* at a ſuperlative rate; they ſuppoſe, (d) *That ſome perfect Heathens were good, the lovers of Piety and honeſty of Manners, that they eſchew'd Sins and gave themſelves to good Works, and did good Works acceptable to God; had true Virtue, follow'd Sanctity, perſever'd in the ſtudy of it, wrought that which is good, and by patient continuance in well-doing ſought Glory, Honour and Immortality.* Others who ſuppoſe, (e) *that ſo far as any good Work is agreeable with Reaſon, ſo far it muſt needs be pleaſing to the God of Reaſon; ſo far as it anſwereth the Rule, ſo far it is accepted of him that made it; who will not call the Temperance, and Patience, and Chaſtity of the Heathen Sins, but rather the ſame Virtues with thoſe that commend Chriſtians*; yet acknowledge, *that they were as the Rainbow before the Flood, of no uſe* (unprofitable to Salvation) *becauſe they were not ſeaſon'd with Faith.* Amongſt the Fathers that liv'd before the *Pelagian* Controverſie there is a like diverſity of Conceit touching the Virtues and good Works of the Gentiles: For *J. Mart.* ſuppoſeth, (f) *that* Socrates, Heraclitus, *and ſuch more were virtuous at the rate of Chriſtians*; (g) but *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* call the *Patience, Chaſtity*, and other Virtues of the Gentiles *falſe* (not meaning that they were *imperfect*, as *Voſſius* miſtaketh, but that they were ſpurious and illegitimate;) *Theophylact* accounteth none of the Gentiles good, (h) S. *Chryſoſtom* compareth the ſpecious Works of them that know not God, to the Reliques of dead Men (ſpeciouſly adorn'd;) S. *Baſil* thinketh the doing Righteouſneſs a thing incompetible to the Servants of Sin; (i) *Lactantius* reproacheth and explodeth the Pagans Virtue and Juſtice as not true; (k) S. *Hilary* accounteth the Philoſophers *Aſceticiſm* nothing better than *Inanity*; (l) *Clemens* himſelf intituleth the Philoſophers Continence ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐγκράτεια, *the Humane Continence*, and ἡ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἐγκράτεια, *the Continence according to truth* is by him oppos'd to *that which is taught by the Philoſophers.* But this great Author meaneth not (as the other Fathers) to reject the Philoſophers Continence as ſpurious and adulterate, but only as imperfect, agreeably to that grand Dogma of his, (m) *that the Greeks were made juſt by Philoſophy in a degree of Inchoation.*

XI. It is not reaſonable to attempt a reconcilement of all theſe diſſonant Accounts of the *Pagans Virtues and Good Works* (for none can reconcile Contradictions;) but the moſt of them may commodiouſly be reconciled and brought to a good conſiſtence with one another, by conſidering *their Ethical and Political Virtue* (which may be called the Humane-Moral or Humane-Societive Virtue) and repreſenting the true Character thereof. This ſort of Virtue (which ſeparate from the truly Divine Moral Virtue is manifeſtly competible to Heathen Mankind) is a wild, a vile and exotick, an atheous and unholy kind of Virtue, and therefore is of Character *a virtue-leſs kind of Virtue, a bad kind of Goodneſs.* The nature of it may be illuſtrated from the wild *Olives*, not conſider'd as meerly an illegitimate vicious Fruit, *but as an illegitimate virtuous Fruit.* For as wild *Olives* muſt be called *Olives*, and are a degenerate kind of *Olives*; ſo the *Goodneſs Juſtice, Benignity, Clemency, Integrity* and *Chaſtity* of Heathens, and altogether unregenerate Mankind muſt be call'd *Virtue, Duty and Well-doing*, and is a degenerate kind of Virtue. The wild Olives are ſo far and in ſuch a ſenſe true Olives, they are truly and really a (degenerate) kind of Olives; ſo this Exotick Virtue is truly and really a (degenerate) kind of Virtue. But the Wild Olives are ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe falſe Olives, *they are not the true and genuine kind of Olives, in ſuo genere* (in their kind) they are Olives, but ſo as to be of kind *Olives no Olives*: In like manner this Exotick Virtue is a ſpurious and illegitimate,

(x) *Conſtat inter omnes veraciter pios, neminem ſine verâ pietate, id eſt, veri Dei vero cultu, veram poſſe habere virtutem.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 5. c. 19.

(y) *Hierocl. in aur. Car.* p. 126.

(z) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pelag.* l. 3. par. 3. *Theſ.* 10. & 12.

(a) *Petav. Dogm. Th.* T. 4. par. 2. l. 13. c. 12. S. 12.

(b) *Dr. Reynold's ſinfulneſs of Sin*, p. 249, 237, 243.

(c) *Le Blanc. Theſ.* p. 491.

(d) *Curcell. diſſ. de Neceſſit. cognit. Chriſt.* S. 6, 16, 24, 35.

(e) *Farind. Ser.* 1. *Vol.* p. 375. and 3. *Vol.* p. 346.

(f) *Apol.* 2. p. 83.

(g) *Voſſ. ſupr.*

(h) *Caſſan. conſul. Art.* 6. *de oper. impior.*

(i) *L.* 6. *c.* 6, 9.

(k) *In Pſ.* 64.

( ) *Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 328.

(m) *Voſſ. ſupr. Theſ.* 11.

Rom. 11. 24.

legitimate, not the true and genuine kind of Virtue; yet Virtue it is *ſui generis* of a certain kind, but ſo as to be *a virtue-leſs kind of Virtue*. As the wild Olives are worthleſs, refuſe and ſordid ſtuff, devoid of the choiceneſs and precioſity which is in the genuine kind of Olives, and a certain Plant thought by ſome *a Baſtard-Vine* hath the Name of *Dulcamara* (or *Amaradulcis*) *Bitter-ſweet*: So the Heathen Man's kind of Virtue is comparatively but riff-raff ſtuff, devoid of the choiceneſs and precioſity which is in true Holineſs; the whole of it is *a graceleſs and unholy kind of doing though well-doing*; *it is an evil kind of well-doing, a vicious kind of practiſing Virtue, a ſinful kind of doing Duty*. But amongſt the ſinful kinds of doing Duty (the evil kinds of doing what is materially good) there is this remarkable difference; in ſome of them that which is materially good, is done in ſo criminal a manner, and out of Ends and Principles ſo vitious, that the Nature of Virtue is loſt out of the Action, and it becometh not Virtuous, but Sin and Vice ſimply ſo called (*the Sacrifice of the Wicked is an Abomination*, and Phariſaical Holineſs is not Goodneſs but Wickedneſs;) it is otherwiſe in this Exotick Virtue and Well-doing, which is a different evil kind of doing what is materially good; for the nature of Virtue and Well-doing is really preſerv'd and retain'd in it, as the nature of an Olive is in the wild Olives. Conſider it as contradiſtinct to the former evil kind of doing what is materially good, and ſo it appeareth, to be for the main and of kind a ſpurious and illegitimate ſort of Virtue and Well-doing. The Virtues and Well-doings of the Gentiles therefore are Sin in one Senſe but not in another. He that ſaith, They are Sin, Vice and Crime, not Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, but an oppoſite thereto, ſaith true; but he that ſaith, They are Sin, Vice and Crime, not any ſort of Virtue, Duty and Well-doing, ſaith falſe; for they are a degenerate kind of Virtue, Duty and Well-doing; of kind and for the main they are not the holy kind of Virtue and Well-doing, but an oppoſite thereto, and therefore are Sin and Vice; but they are not of kind and for the main ſo Sin and Vice, as not to be of kind and for the main *unholy Virtue and Well-doing*. They are not of definitive Notion and Denomination either *Vice* or *Virtue*, *Sin* or *Duty*, *good* or *evil Works* ſimply without addition and limitation of Senſe; but they are to be conſider'd *ſub duplici genere boni moralis*; for they are not the true and genuine but a ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Good Works.

In like manner, if we conſider them with reſpect to the Law or Rule of Virtue and Duty, we muſt affirm, that they are ſo far a conformity to it, as to be a ſort of Virtue and Well-doing; but they are ſo far a receſſion and degeneracy from it, as to be nothing better than a ſpurious and degenerate kind of Virtue and Well-doing, which cannot be ſaid to be Sin, ſo as not to be any ſort of Virtue and Duty; which muſt be ſaid, to be Sin, not Holineſs. For as the holy kind of *Duties*, *Virtues and good Works* are of kind and for the main according to the Law of our Piety and Holineſs towards God (who is the formal Object of our Obedience, whom we ought to obey out of dutiful Affection to him, and to make the pleaſing him, his Honour and Service the chief End of our doings and buſineſs of our Lives:) So the atheous, unholy kind of Duties, Virtues and Good-works are of kind and for the main againſt the Law of our Piety and Holineſs towards God, and therefore have the nature of Sins; they are againſt the Law of our Piety and Holineſs privatively and oppoſitively; for the not living unto God is an undeifying him, a being inimical to him, and a living to our ſelves; the not regarding God dutifully and the not dutifully affecting him, is a diſregarding and diſaffecting him, and a regarding and affecting ſomewhat elſe above him and againſt him; and therefore the Natural Man by his unholy kind of Virtue is no otherwiſe virtuous, than ſo as to be a villainous graceleſs Miſcreant and a grand Impietiſt towards God. But although this unholy kind of Virtue and Well-doing is of ſo bad a Character, yet Vice and Virtue muſt by no means be confounded, the Fathers count it *praiſe-worthy* and ſtile it *Good Works*; the Apoſtle ſtileth it *a doing the things contained in the Law*; God himſelf hath ſo much reſpect to it, that he rewardeth it ſeveral ways: No Man upon his Converſion ſo repenteth of it, as he doth of his Sins ſimply ſo called; which Conſiderations plainly ſhew, *that it is ſo Vice and Sin, as yet to be an unholy and degenerate kind of Virtue and Well-doing*. It is not only a doing what is materially good (which is of good example to others, and may be of good effect, hugely beneficial to the World:) but in its principle, impulſive Cauſe and End there is ſo much good, as ſerveth to conſtitute it *a ſpurious and degenerate kind of Virtue and Well-doing*, as will appear from the Heathen Man's Principles of laudable Practice, which may be reduc'd to theſe four. 1. *Good Nature and natural Inſtinct*. 2. *Humane and Mundane Societiveneſs*. 3. *An unholy kind of reſpect for Worth and Virtue, Honeſty and Duty, Juſtice and Equity, Reaſon and Ingenuity, Civility, Decency and Order, and a like reſpect for himſelf, his own Perfection and Felicity*. 4. *Religion on this ſide Religion*.

XII. In the firſt place, *Animal Temper and the kindly Inſtincts* which are in Animal Nature may be called *Good Nature* (which is a Principle of laudable Practices;) for Mankind ſymbolize with the Brute Animals, of whom ſome are tame and tractable and of a placid Humour, others are fierce and ſavage, and have the Name of *Evil Beaſts*; which Name implyeth, that there are *good-natur'd Beaſts*. *Cato* was of a good nature, if (as *Cicero* ſaith of him) *Nature had fram'd him to Gravity and Temperance*; or if (as *Velleius Paterculus* ſaith) *He was therefore virtuous, quia aliter eſſe non potuit, becauſe he could not be otherwiſe*. Some are by Natural Temper and Conſtitution averſe from certain Vices (Sordidneſs, Cruelty, Impudence) and diſpos'd to the contrary Virtues (Generoſity, Clemency, Modeſty:) So amongſt the *Romans* ſome Virtues are obſerv'd to have been hereditary in certain Families in a continu'd ſucceſſion, and great Vices (Fury, Luxury, Libidinouſneſs) in others. (n) *Ego mores naſci puto, & propriam cujuſque naturæ virtutem: I am of opinion*, (ſaith *Quintilian*) *that the Morals of all are born with them and the proper Virtues of every Nature*. *Plato* in his *Tenth of Laws* ſpeaketh of a ſort of good-natur'd Atheiſts; (o) *who think, that there are no Gods at all, yet are by nature of a juſt diſpoſition, hating bad Men and Injuſtice, they will do no ſuch practices themſelves, and thoſe Men that are not juſt they ſhun, and love them that are juſt.* Although Inſtances of Ferity

and

Inter vepres roſæ naſcuntur, & inter feras nonnullæ miteſcunt. Am. Marcell. l. 16.

(n) *Quintil. Declam.* 268.

(o) Οἷς μὴ νομίζουσι θεοὺς εἶναι τὸ παράπαν, ἦθος φύσει προσγίνεται δίκαιον, μισοῦντές τε γίγνονται τοὺς κακοὺς, καὶ τῷ δυσχεραίνειν τὴν ἀδικίαν, οὔτε τὰς τοιαύτας πράξεις προσίενται πράττειν, τούς τε μὴ δικαίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων φεύγουσι, καὶ τοὺς δικαίους στέργουσι.

and Barbarity are no Rarities amongſt Men, yet a certain Goodneſs, Kindneſs, Benignity and Tenderneſs is part of our natural Conſtitution, and an effect of our bodily Temper (according to that of *Ariſtotle*, οἱ μαλακόσαρκοι εὐφυεῖς, *the ſoft-skinn'd are good-natur'd*,) which ſo far prevaileth in the World of Mankind, that it commonly beareth the Name of *Humanity*, Cruelty is called *Immanity*, and the Rod of Manſuetude, *the Rod of Men*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. As Bodily Temper, ſo the kindly Inſtincts which are in Animal Nature, are Principles of laudable Practices: Such as *natural Affection towards Children and near Kindred, Commiſeration for the Afflicted, a natural Sympathy, Gratitude or Kindneſs for our Friends and Benefactors* (remarkable in Dogs and Lions) *common Sociableneſs and Friendlineſs, particular Friendſhip, a propenſion to pleaſe and oblige others, a natural Ingenuity and Generoſity, deſire of our own Welfare and Happineſs, care of our Reputation, averſation from Infamy, Miſery and Death.*

A *Second* Principle of laudable Practices is *an Humane and Mundane Societiveneſs*, (which is a Goodneſs of Nature and in great degree an innate Inſtinct in Man;) for all the Humane-Societive and Humane-Moral Virtue and Duty commonly call'd the *Ethical* and *Political*, is compris'd in and may be inferr'd from this one Principle, *Humane and Mundane Societiveneſs*. For all Political Virtue and Duty towards Mankind in general, towards our Country, (*p*) all Civil-ſocietive Charity and Juſtice, the common Offices of Humanity and civil Neighbourhood, the œconomical Duties, Duties of near Relations and of Friendſhip belong to Man *as Societive*, *as Humane-Societive*, (*q*) and he is not Man without the Humane-Morals. In this great Law, great Virtue and Duty of *Man's being Humane-Societive, Civil-Societive, Mundane-Societive* (not Anti-Societive) is manifeſtly compris'd *a Civil-Societive kind of* (*r*) *univerſal Benevolence to our ſelves and all Mankind, which affecteth and endeavoureth the good of the Publick* (what is beneficial unto all) *and is oppoſite to what is hurtful*, (without which we are not of the *Societive*, but Anti-ſocietive Diſpoſition and Practice,) from which Benevolence univerſal (*caritas humani gentris*, (*s*) as *Cicero* ſpeaketh) all Mundane Political Virtue is deducible. As it is alſo from another great Principle manifeſtly compris'd in the Pagan Mundane Societiveneſs, namely, (*t*) *The ſubordination and relation of all Men and leſſer Cluſters of Men to the great Body of Mankind as of parts to the whole, and of Citizens to the Mundane City.* From theſe Principles both the Popular and Philoſophic Pagans practis'd civil Virtue, as the *Bees* do in ſome ſort, that have Political Order and Government amongſt them (*Plutarch* ſaith of *Lycurgus*, that he accuſtomed his Citizens, not to live ſeparately, *but as the Bees*, always to adhere to the Community, to move in conjunction about their Chieftain, and in a tranſport of Ambition and Glory to be almoſt unmindful of themſelves and to be wholly their Countrey's:) And this their practice of Political Virtue conſtituted and denominated *a good and juſt Man of their Idea.* (*u*) One *Antenor* that wrote the *Cretian* Hiſtories was nam'd Δέλτα, (amongſt the *Cretians* δέλτος ſignify'd good) διὰ τὸ ἀγαθὸς εἶναι καὶ φιλόπολις, *becauſe he was good and a lover of his City.* (*w*) *To live well is to live ſocietively, and friendly, and temperately, and juſtly.* The generality of the Pagans ſuppos'd, that the obſervance of their Political Laws conſtituted them juſt Men. (*x*) *Hi ſe juſtos putant, ſi contra leges ſuas nihil faciant: Theſe think themſelves juſt, if they do nothing againſt their Laws.*

A *Third* Principle of laudable Practices (*ſecundum quid* or in ſome reſpects ſuch) is *an unholy kind of reſpect for Worth and Virtue, Honeſty and Duty, Juſtice and Equity, Reaſon and Ingenuity, Civility, Decency and Order; and a like reſpect for our ſelves, our own Perfection and Felicity.* For as there is an *Humane-Societive Virtue*, which is on this ſide *the Holy-Societive*; ſo there is a regard for *Worth* and *Virtue*, *Honeſty*, *Reaſon* and *Juſtice*, which is on this ſide true Holineſs and Godlineſs. The Pagans practis'd the Virtue which they teach, (*y*) *fugiendæ turpitudinis cauſâ, to eſchew that which is baſe and ſhameful*, (*z*) τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα, *becauſe it was juſt and good, virtuous or honeſt*, (Anti-baſe, Anti-criminal;) their maxim was *Honeſtum per ſe expetendum, that which is virtuous, honeſt* (or Anti-baſe) *is ſelf-deſirable*; and ſome of them have ſaid, (*a*) ἑορτὴ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν, ἢ τὸ τὰ δέοντα πράττειν, *a Feaſt is nothing elſe, but the doing one's duty.* Out of regard to common Decency and Order they practis'd the *ſmall Morals* (that may well be defin'd, as the Stoicks define Modeſty, (*b*) *the Science of decent Motion*) which are the oppoſites to Rudeneſs, Ruſticity, agreſtickneſs and impoliteneſs of Behaviour. And for their great *Morals* (although their practice of them and regard for them was but a common unholy kind of thing) their regard was ſo high and generous, that they profeſs'd a contempt of Life, (*c*) *and to throw the Body into the Fire, when Reaſon, when Dignity, when Fidelity requireth it.* (*d*) *A virtuous Man will die for his Friends and Country, he will throw away his Money and Honours, and all the Goods that Men conteſt about*, περιποιούμενος ἑαυτῷ τὸ καλὸν, *acquiring or conſerving to himſelf that which is of claritude and pulchritude in matter of Life and Practice.* (*e*) *Miltiades* taught the *Athenians*, *to acknowledge no Lord but the Laws, and to be afraid of nothing more than that which is evil and unjuſt*; and of *Themiſtocles* the Orator ſaith, (*f*) *That willingly he would not ſet any thing* (Riches, Safety or Children) πρότερον τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ προσήκοντος, *before Virtue and his Duty.* (*g*) To be Virtuous is a great Accompliſhment, and every Virtue is an Accompliſhment. The Philoſophic Pagans therefore (at leaſt the better ſort of them) betook themſelves to the ſtudy and exerciſe of Virtue out of regard to their *Perfection and Felicity*, which they ſuppoſed to conſiſt in their Virtue, which in many Inſtances was (in ſome reſpect) very laudable and imitable practice. Such was the *Platoniſts* diſaffecting τὰ τῇδε, *the things that are here* (as *Plotinus* ſpeaketh) the not deſiring or uſing them any further than ὅσον ἀνάγκη, *ſo far as there is need* (as the ſame Philoſopher ſpeaketh,) and the *Stoicks*, (*h*) γαστὴρ κεκολασμένη, *reſtrict and caſtigated Belly and narrow bounded Appetite.* The Pagans (both Popular and Philoſophic) had alſo a regard to *Self-approbation* and the Tranquility of their own Mind, (*i*) *There is no greater Theatre for Virtue than our own Mind approving and applauding.* They had alſo a *Self-reverence* or regard to their own dignity of Perſon. ——Πάντων δὲ μάλιστ' αἰσχύνεο σαυτόν· *Above all others revere thy ſelf.*

A *Fourth* Principle of laudable Practices is *Religion on this ſide Religion* (on this ſide the State and Life of true Religion;) for it was from a Principle of Religion and out of regard to a Deity (*k*) that Heathen Men thought themſelves

---

Rom. 1. 31.

(p) *Stob. Ecl. Eth* p. 185, 186. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 10, 17.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 5. *l.* 1. *c.* 13.

(r) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 141.

(s) *De Fin.* 5.

(t) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 5.

(u) *Phot. cod.* 190. *col.* 485.

(w) Τὸ δὲ εὖ ζῆν, ἐστι κοινωνικῶς ζῆν, καὶ φιλικῶς καὶ σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως. *Plutarch. adv. Colot.* p. 1108.

(x) *Lact. l.* 6. *c.* 9.

(y) *Cic. Tuſc.* 2.

(z) *Ariſtot. Eth. Nicom. paſſim.*

(o) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 392.

(b) *Stob. ſupr. p.* 184.

(c) *Sen. Ep.* 14.

(d) *Ariſtot. Eth. Nicom. l.* 9. *c.* 8.

(c) *Ariſtid. ap. Phot. cod.* 246. *col.* 1282.

(f) *Ibid. col.* 1292.

(g) *Stob. ſupr. p.* 185, 187.

(h) *Gat. in Ant. p.* 110.

(i) *Nullum theatrum virtuti conſcientiâ majus eſt.* Cic. Tuſc. 2.

(k) *M. Ant. l.* 2. *s.* 17

themſelves oblig'd, to do nothing againſt their Conſciences, but to keep them intemerate; (*l*) that they look'd upon the Dictates of their practical Reaſon as Laws, (*m*) that they had Hopes and Fears, Peace and Perplexity, Joys and Anxieties from their Conſciences. (*n*) That they look'd upon themſelves as bound to *Innocence* (Un-injurioufneſs,) to *Gratitude*, to keep *Faith*, to take care of their *Children* and *Parents*, to have a ſpecial *kindneſs for their near Kindred*, to do the Offices of Humanity towards Mankind in general, and acts of *Heroical Virtue* for the good of Mankind, (*o*) that they thought Men criminal and puniſhable, not only for Facts of Wickedneſs (ſuch as Adultery, Theft, Homicide,) but for the Will of Evil-doing; (*p*) that they eſchew'd the Perpetration of Wickedneſs in ſecret, dreaded Perjury, rever'd an Oath; (*q*) that they accounted injuſtice towards Men and all vicious Errors in Life and Practice (which they called ἁμαρτήματα, Sins) nothing leſs than Impieties; (*r*) that the Philoſophic-pagan Saintiſts thought themſelves oblig'd, to practiſe all the Virtues which were in their Inſtitution, and to eſchew all the Vices; (*s*) that they propos'd to themſelves an imitation of the Deity, and ſuppos'd, that nothing could be well done ἄνευ τῆς ἐπὶ τὰ θεῖα συναναφορᾶς, *without having reſpect to the things Divine*, (*t*) and therefore (as ſome of themſelves ſay) *they had an Eye to the Deity* ἐν πάντι μικρῷ ϗ μεγάλῳ, *in every thing great and little*; (*u*) and laſtly, that they look'd upon themſelves as bound to an intire Subjection to the Coſmical Regent, and to all the Branches of active and paſſive Obedience to him real or imaginary. The Natural Man therefore in a conſiderable degree hath Notices of what is good and bad, virtuous and vicious, right and wrong, juſt and unjuſt (towards the Deity as well as towards Men,) of what is worthy and unworthy, that ſome things are very vile and diſhonourable, others are becoming, excellent and honourable; and although he is a nefarious Impietiſt, yet he hath his Virtues and Well-doings, (*w*) *that are from Conſcience, not Vain-glory.* The Heathen Man conjoineth Religion and Juſtice towards Men; as *Nicias* (of whom *Thucydides* ſaith, (*x*) *he was the Man of all the Grecians of my time that leaſt deſerv'd to be brought to ſo great a degree of Miſery,*) who falling into a great Calamity in *Syracuſe*, told his afflicted Army, *I have worſhipp'd the Gods frequently according to the Law, and liv'd juſtly and unblameably towards Men.* The Heathen Man will be juſt, becauſe (in his way) he is Religious. (*y*) Ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀσεβεῖ· *He that is unjuſt, is impious. For the Nature of the Univerſe having made all Rationals* ἕνεκεν ἀλλήλων, *for one another, ſo as to benefit one another, as they are worthy, but in no wiſe to hurt; he that tranſgreſſeth the Will hereof, is manifeſtly impious towards the moſt ancient of the Gods.*

XIII. It is one thing, to ſay, that a Man is an ungodly Heathen, and another thing to ſay, he is *an ungodly virtuous Heathen*: And it is one thing, to ſay of an Action of his, *it is an ungodly Action*, and another thing to ſay, *it is an ungodly virtuous Action.* When the Natural Man doth what is materially good, it may be done (for the main) from ſuch good Principles and for ſuch good ends, as are competible to the meer natural Man. An Heathen Man may venture into the fire, to pull his Child out, partly from a Principle of *good Nature and natural inſtinct, partly for the Conſervation of Human Society, partly out of an unholy reſpect to Fortitude, and partly from Religion on this ſide Religion*; and this Action of his in venturing into the fire for his Child, is of an oppoſite Nature both to the Sin of expoſing his Child, and alſo to the Sin of venturing into the fire (like the Indians) for Vain-glory. Both the Actions of this latter ſort are Sin ſimply ſo called: But to declaim againſt the former as ſuch, is the voice of a Barbarian, not of a Chriſtian. A Maxim of the Schools therefore needeth a limitation; (*z*) *that the ſame Action cannot be both morally Good and Evil.* For although the ſame Action cannot be *a true and genuin kind of morally good Action, and a morally evil Action*, yet one of the Heathen Man's kind of good Works is therefore Sin, becauſe it is oppoſite unto Holineſs, and it is ſo far Sin (and therefore morally Evil,) as to be oppoſite unto Holineſs (it is not a true and genuin kind of morally good Action, but oppoſite thereto, and is ſo far morally evil, as to be oppoſite thereto;) yet this hindreth it not from being *a ſpurious and degenerate kind of morally good Action.*

On the other hand; although it is of kind and for the main *a ſort of Virtue and Well-doing*, yet no carnal, wicked, unholy kind of Man (remaining ſuch) doth any thing, *that is of kind and for the main Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs*, no holy kind of Duty or good Work (no Saint of God-kind of good Work:) But when he doth what is materially good out of his kind of virtuous Principles and for his kind of virtuous Ends, yet he is *carnal, wicked and unholy-virtuous* in thoſe his doings; and they are like himſelf of kind and for the main *wicked, carnal and unholy kind of virtuous doings*; or they are the carnal, wicked and unholy Man's kind of doings, not ſimply ſo; but they are *the carnal, wicked, unholy Man's kind of virtuous doings.* His kind of living is an atheous kind of living, his virtuous kind of living is *the atheous-virtuous kind of living*; the ſeveral parts of his virtuous kind of living are ſo many branches of *his atheous virtuous kind of living*, which is not that kind of Life *the living unto God as his Servant*, but is a kind of Life oppoſite thereto, *an ungodly kind of virtuous living, of which his ſeveral virtuous doings are ſo many Parts and Branches.* Let us ſuppoſe, that *Hercules* undertaketh immenſe Labours, to ſave Mankind from Monſters and Tyrants, out of no better Principle than *good Nature, natural inſtinct of kindneſs for his Relations, regard to the conſervation of Human Society, an unholy regard to an unholy kind of Fortitude, and from ſomething of Religion on this ſide Religion* (ſuppoſe an imitation of *Jove* called his Father,) this the Pagans accounted (*a*) *Heroical Virtue.* But *Hercules*'s virtuous living was an atheous kind of virtuous living, every one of his Labours or virtuous Doings was an atheous kind of virtuous living (for it muſt be conſider'd as a part of the whole and of the ſame Nature with it,) it was devoid of true Piety and Holineſs, repugnant to the life of true Piety and Holineſs; privatively and oppoſitively of kind and for the main *graceleſs, unholy, ungodly doing, yet ſo that it was of kind and for the main graceleſs, unholy, ungodly virtuous doing.* The Character therefore of the ungodly Man's virtuous

tuous

(l) *Sharrock. de Offic.* p. 12.
(m) *Ibid.* p. 22.
(n) *Ibid.* c. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.
(o) *Ibid.* p. 92.
(p) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 14.
(q) *Stob. ſupr.* p. 181
(r) *Ibid.*
(s) *M. Ant. l.* 3. *S.* 13. *Gat. not.* p. 360.
(t) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 12. *c.* 1. 9.
(u) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 14.
(w) *Virtutis fructum ſapiens in conſcientia ponit, minus perfectus in gloria: Unde Scipio perfectionem cupiens infundere nepoti auctor eſt, ut contentus conſcientiæ præmio gloriam non requirat.* Macrob. in Som. Scip. l. 2. c. 10.
(x) *L.* 7.
(y) *M. Ant. l.* 9. *S.* 1.
(z) *Durand. l.* 2. *diſtinct.* 40. *Qu.* 3.
(a) *Cic. Off.* 3. *de Fin.* 3.

tuous or well-doings conſiſteth of two Parts: For every one of them being conſider'd as a part of his whole living appeareth to be privatively and oppoſitively unholy and ungodly, and ſo is complicated with Sin; and is ſo complicated with Sin, that it is a vitiated kind of Virtue, and is ſo vitiated, that it muſt be denominated *a ſpurious illegitimate kind of Virtue and Well-doing.* Such Virtue may in a certain ſenſe be called *rather Vice than Virtue* (as S. *Auſtin* calleth the Philoſophers Virtues,) which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if it was not Virtue (of any ſort:) But becauſe in reference to God it is not Virtue, but Sin and Vice, in ſuch ſenſe it may be called rather Vice than Virtue. And if thoſe virtuous doings of the Pagans are ſo vicious, which iſſu'd from Principles, that ought to be conjoin'd with and ſubordinated to true Piety and Holineſs (good Nature, natural inſtinct and Human ſocietiveneſs,) what foul Vicioſities are the greater part of their virtuous doings, which manifeſtly iſſued from, and were ſubordinated to, one of the fouleſt of Vices, *the inordinate appetite of Vain-glory?* For ſo the Orator *Iſocrates* (whom *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſ.* preferreth before the Philoſophers as a Teacher of Morality,) who calleth himſelf a Philoſopher, and a great acquaintance and admirer of *Socrates*, profeſſedly maketh Vain-glory the Principle, End and Rule of all his Actions and of other Mens.

As for the Fact of the Egyptian Midwives (which is alledg'd, (*b*) to prove, that meer Heathens do good Deeds, that are not for the main and of kind ſinful) it is not difficult, to anſwer ſuch Allegations. For either the Egyptian Midwives were God's Religioniſts, or they were not. If they were God's Religioniſts (imperfectly or more perfectly) their Caſe is no Parallel for meer Heathens. If they were not, then their Fact was for the main and of kind ſinful, yet being of kind and for the main ſpurious and degenerate Virtue and Well-doing, it was rewarded with temporal Bleſſings. It is commonly ſaid, *that God doth not ſo much regard what we do, as why we do it:* But we ought rather to ſay, *the thing that God regardeth is, of what kind our doings are.* For unleſs we our ſelves be holy and godly Perſons (of kind and for the main ſuch,) unleſs our doings be of kind and for the main holy and godly doings, neither we nor they (otherwiſe than in a limited improper ſenſe) can be pleaſing and acceptable in God's Eyes. The Philoſophers were not holy and godly kind of Perſons, their Divine Virtue was not the holy and godly kind of Virtue, it was not a faithful ſerving and pleaſing God: (*a*) But) agreeably to *Janſenius*'s Character of it) in reſpect of its chief end and buſineſs, it was *a Self-ſerving, Self-pleaſing, Self-adorning, Self-excellence, Self-beatitude,* ſeparate from and contrary to the life of true Piety and Holineſs. Yet it is not reaſonable, to ſuppoſe with ſome, (*d*) that the Source and Principle of all the Actions and good Works of unregenerate Mankind is the evil Principle of *inordinate carnal Self-love* (the Eſſence and Summary of all vital Wickedneſs;) for Human Nature is not ſo inordinately ſelfiſh; as to be devoid of *good Nature, natural Inſtinct, Human Societiveneſs, an unholy reſpect for an unholy kind of Worth and Virtue, Religion on this ſide Religion.* All which are Principles of Human Actions; and therefore a ſpurious and degenerate kind of Virtue and Well-doing is competible to unregenerate Mankind. But no other Virtue is competible to Men of that Character, than ſuch as is conſiſtent with *the Reign of the inordinate carnal Self-love* (which reigneth in all that are devoid of the Divine kind of Love, the Eſſence and Summary of all divine vital Virtue;) the atheouſneſs of their virtuous and well-doings is imputable to the inordinate carnal Self-love (which cauſeth the want of the love of God;) and becauſe they are devoid of the Love of God and are none of his Servants, therefore their virtuous and well-doings (from whatever Principles they iſſue,) *are a certain Self-ſerving and Self-pleaſing, not a ſerving and pleaſing God.* Their ſpecious Well-doings therefore ſymbolize with the reſt of the ſpecious things of this World, they are not what at firſt ſight they ſeem to be. (*e*) The Jews tell us, that *R. Jehuda* and *R. Simeon* (*ben Jochai*) ſitting together, the firſt of theſe Doctors fell to admiring and commending the Works of the Roman people. *How fine are the works of theſe people* (ſaid he,) *they have made Market-places, they have made Bridges alſo and built Baths.* But the other (*R. Simeon*) anſwer'd; *whatever they have made, it is but for their own Commodity. They have made the Market-places for Trades-men to reſide in, the Baths for their own Voluptuouſneſs, the Bridges to receive Tribute from them.*

b) *Gr. de alent. T. Diſp.* 1. .10. *unct.* 2.

(c) *Le Blanc Theſ. p.* 487.

(d) *Ibid. p.* 493.

(e) *Buxtorf. de Abbreviat. p.* 164, 165.

CHAP. VII.

Of the deadlineſs of our Heathen-popular State, and the principal parts of it. 1. *The Firſt part of it is, we are deadly Criminals upon a firſt account.* 2. *We are deadly Criminals upon a ſecond account.* 3. *The Second Part of it is, we are look'd upon in Scripture, not as alive and living, but as thoſe that are dead.* 4. *The ſeveral Reaſons why we are look'd upon as Dead.* 5. *Proofs that our Heathen-popular State is the State of Death.* 6. *Of the Diſpute touching the Salvation of the Heathen as it is Matter of Fact.* 7. *Of the Diſpute touching their Salvation as it is Matter of Law and of Right.* 8. *Of a Third and Principal Part of the Deadlineſs of our Heathen-popular State, we are the Subjects of Satan's Kingdom, and are three ways ſubjected to his Domination.* 9. *We are ſubjected by way of Penal Subjection.* 10. *We are ſubjected by way of Criminal Subjection.* 11. *We are ſubjected by way of Criminal-religious Subjection.*

OUR *Fifth* Conſectary is touching *the Deadlineſs of our Heathen-popular State* (which is not only the State of the Popular, but of the Philoſophic Pagans alſo, the Philoſophers being in a large ſenſe Heathen People;) for the Scripture looketh upon us in the Heathen-popular State (antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion) *as deadly Criminals, as thoſe that are not alive and living but dead,* and *as the Subjects of Satan's Kingdom*; of which three principal parts *the Deadlineſs of our Heathen-popular State conſiſteth.* As deadly Criminals our Character conſiſteth of two Branches, which imply and infer one another. For (in our Heathen-popular State) *we are aliens from the life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, deadly criminal Sinners in Life and Practice.* And *we are not the faithful Friends to God and Holineſs, nor faithful Enemies to Sin and Wickedneſs, which is deadly Criminality.* If we were not the aliens from Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, and deadly criminal Sinners in Life and Practice, we ſhould be the faithful Friends to God and Holineſs, and faithful Enemies to Sin and Wickedneſs. And if we were the faithful Friends to God and Holineſs, and the faithful Enemies to Sin and Wickedneſs, we could not be the aliens from the life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, and deadly criminal Sinners in Life and Practice. So that one Branch of our Character manifeſtly implieth and inferreth the other. And indeed they are the ſame thing in different Expreſſions. For to be a faithful lover of Righteouſneſs and a faithful doer of Righteouſneſs is the ſame thing: And to be a faithful hater of Sin and Iniquity, and a faithful eſchewer of it is the ſame thing.

I. Mankind are divided into two oppoſite Parties and Families (that are contrary kind of
Pſal. 1. 1. People, of a contrary Genius and Temper, con-
and 7. 11. trarily affected and addicted, that walk in con-
and 32. trary ways, are contrary kind of Livers, be-
6. *and* long to contrary Cities and Societies and are
116, 15. of a contrary Alliance and Kindred,) which
Pro. 14. are known by the Names of the *Righteous* and
19. *and* the *Wicked*, the *Juſt* and the *Unjuſt*, the *Godly*
29. 27. and the *Ungodly*, the *Pious* and the *Impious*, the
Marc. 6. *Holy* and the *Unholy*, the *Good* and the *Evil*, the
20. *Luc.* *Saints* of God and *Sinners* that are *not Saints*,
6. 45. *Act.* the *Children of Light* and the *Children of this*
24. 15. *Rom.* *World*, (the mundane kind and the holy kind)
8. 5. *Luc.* *the Children of God and the Children of the Devil*,
16. 18. (the Divine kind and the Satanical brood and
1 *Tim.* 1. race,) the *Carnal* and the *Spiritual* kind, thoſe
9. 2 *Tim.* *that are of God* and thoſe that are *of the World*
3. 12. *and the wicked one*, the *Amical* and the *alien Ini-*
Jude 15. *mical* kind; all which diſtinctive Names and
1 *Joh.* 3. deſcriptive Notices of two oppoſite Parties and
10, 12. *and* Families of Men denote their diſſonant Life
ch. 4. 4, 5. and Practice (internal and external,) *for he that*
Joh. 15. *doeth Righteouſneſs, is Righteous*, 1 Joh. 3. 7. The
14. *Col.* 1. one of theſe contradivided Parties are *the Doers*
21. *of Righteouſneſs, not the Committers of Sin: The other are the Committers of Sin, not the doers of Righteouſneſs.* 1 Joh. 3. 7, 8. The one are *the Servants of Sin, not the Servants of God and of Righteouſneſs*; The other are *the Servants of God and of Righteouſneſs not the Servants of Sin.* Rom. 6. 18, 20, 22. The one are *the Workers of Iniquity, not the Practiſers of Righteouſneſs*: The other are *the Practiſers of Righteouſneſs, not the Workers of Iniquity.* Pſal. 14. 4. and 15. 2. Of this Kind, Quality and Character are all that are in the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion; notwithſtanding that they are guilty of weakneſſes of Piety, Sins of Ignorance, Surprize and Precipitation, although they have intermixtures of blemiſh in their Soul and (perhaps) of blame in their Lives, yet as Righteouſneſs is Anti-wickedneſs, and ſtandeth oppos'd to it (as rectitude to obliquity,) ſo their Life is not the wicked, ſinning unrighteous kind of Life, but the contrary, the holy, ſinleſs and the righteous; their tenour, courſe and way of living is *the way of Righteouſneſs.* Not only in ſome particular Acts, but of kind and for the main of their Life and Living they are
the Doers of Righteouſneſs, *the religious Doers of* 3 *Joh.* 11.
Good, not the irreligious Doers of Evil, living ac- 1 *Pet.* 4.
cording to God, and not according to the courſe *Pſal.* 119.
of this World, *after the Fleſh and the old Man*, 1, 3.
the wicked, carnal and worldly kind of Life. *Gen.* 6. 9.
They perpetrate no heinous Iniquity, no dead- *Job* 1. 8.
ly atrocious Sin, ſo far they are faultleſs, un- *Pſal.* 5.
criminal, perfect and undefiled. They keep no 10. *Iſai.*
Favourite-ſin, allow of no Sin, nor allow them- 1. *Heb.*
ſelves in any, nor can they diſpenſe with ſin- 11. 4. *Tit.*
ning againſt God; and therefore they are not 3. 12.
in any reſpect *Children of Diſobedience*, nefari- *Matth.* 5.
ous Rebel-kind of Sinners. They are alſo the 20.
Doers of Righteouſneſs both towards God and Man; and the Righteouſneſs which they Practiſe, is not the counterfeit and illegitimate; but the true and ſaving kind of Righteouſneſs, contradiſtinct to the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees. From which Account and Character of the *Righteous* is appeareth, that the Life and Practice of all Mankind antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion is of a deadly black and criminal Character. For they are not of that kind of People,
the Righteous, the Juſt, the Holy, the Godly: But 1 *Pet.* 3.
of the oppoſite Kind, Party and Family, *the* 18.
wicked, unrighteous and unjuſt, the unholy and ungodly (not the Godly affected and addicted, but the Ungodly affected and addicted;) not the ſinleſs Livers (of kind and for the main ſuch,) but atrocious, flagitious and nefarious Sinners (though not all alike ſuch,) not the truly Religious and Dutiful towards God, that eſchew the Evil which true Religion forbiddeth, and do the Good which it commandeth, but the horribly undutiful and irreligious. In ſeveral degrees they are ſuch as the Old Teſtament characterizeth and complaineth of; *that are eſtranged and are far from God, that forſake him and live in forgetfulneſs and contempt of God, and have not the fear of God before their Eyes, that are altogether become filthy and do abominable Works, that are far from Righteouſneſs and deſire not the knowledge of God's ways, preſumptuous Sinners that ſin with an high hand and make a mock of Sin, Sons of* Belial *that know not the Lord, lewd Debauchees, Ruffians, revelling voluptuous Senſualiſts, nefarious transbounders in matters of Uncleanneſs, venenate evil Speakers, Lyars, Slanderers, falſifiers of Truſt, Oaths and Contracts, unjuſt Dealers, the Children of Pride, Sons of Violence and of Blood, diſobedient to Parents, perpetrating the horrid Sins againſt God* (Atheiſm Idolatry, Blaſphemy, Magick) *the horrid Sins againſt Nature* (Sodomy, Beaſtiality, Inceſt, unnatural Pollution) *the horrid Sins againſt Human Society* (Robbery, Rapine, Murder,) *the heinous violaters of the Duties of both Tables, the Duties of Piety, Charity, Juſtice, Sobriety.* They are not thoſe that *walk with God* in the Duties of Religious Society, but thoſe that walk contrary to him; not thoſe that have *clean Hands* and *a pure Heart*, but thoſe that are *corrupt* with deadly Vicioſities, and polluted with deadly Criminalities; they are not of the Family of *the holy Well-doers*, but are a Generation of Evil-doers towards God and Man.

In the New Teſtament all Mankind antece-
dently to the State and Life of true and ſaving *Rom.* 5. 8,
Religion are repreſented as *Sinners* (deadly Sin- 6. 1 *Joh.*
ners,) *the Ungodly* (a wicked Brood and Race,) 1. 10.
both Jews and Gentiles *all under Sin* (as dead- *Rom.* 3. 9,
ly criminal Livers are under it,) *a guilty World* 19, 23.
(ſubjected to Condemnation) *before God*; *for all* *Gal.* 3. 22.
have

have (deadly) *ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God* (of the Glory that he is, as to the having with him Glory,) all are concern'd to remove their Quarters and to enter into that State of Righteouſneſs, which God hath provided; for the carnal Jews are no better than Heathen Sinners, (*f*) *and none doubt but the Heathen are overwhelmed with Sins and Impieties, that all the Greeks are guilty of Death; whereby the whole World is laid as guilty before God.* So far both Jews and Greeks are from having any Reaſon, to glory before God, that they are *Filii Mortis, Filii Iræ, Filii Vindictæ, Filii Pœnæ, Filii Gehennæ, juſtly the Heirs of Death, the Children of Wrath, the Sons of Perdition* (as the Fathers ſpeak agreeably to the Scriptures) by their deadly Criminalities. (*g*) *Before we came to the knowledge of God, we were unrighteous, evil and noxious, aliens from the Knowledge and Works of Righteouſneſs.* (*h*) *We were Carnal* (of that kind,) *we were Terrene.* As we were Carnal, *thoſe that are after the Fleſh,* ſo we liv'd after
Eph. 2. 3. it, and brought forth the Fruits of it, *fulfilling the deſires of the Fleſh and of the Mind.* As we were thoſe that are of *the World* (of the mundane kind,) ſo we liv'd *after the courſe of it,* not living a Life of doing God Service, but of
Tit. 3. 3. ſerving Sin (the Fleſh) and *divers Luſts, the Luſt of the Fleſh, the Luſt of the Eyes and the Pride of Life.* Which live and reign in unregenerate Mankind, are Predominant and Regent (the Law of their Life,) and their Life is a ſerving, pleaſing and gratifying them. They are not of the Child of God-kind of Nature, but of an alien Nature and the inimical kind (and ini-
1 Joh. 3. 10, 12. 1 Joh. 2. 15. 1 Joh. 3. 13.--17. mical to God by doing Evil Works, *Col.* 1. 21.) not the Lovers of God, but the World's Lover's; not the Family of Divine Lovers of God and of their Brother, but graceleſs Miſcreants that have not *the love of God in them, Man-haters, Man-ſlayers,* that are in the deadly venenate, malign, malevolent and hurtful Nature (devoid of the Salutary) and *have not eternal Life abiding in them.* Their Morals con-
Apoc. 22. 15. Matth. 7. 6. and 3. 7. and 23. 33. ſtitute many of them *Dogs, Swine, Serpents, Vipers,* (an inimical, peſtilent and poiſonous Generation,) and becauſe they are of the Evil kind, they are neceſſarily the Children of the evil One, and his reſembling Off-ſpring. As they have not the holy ſpiritual Life in them, ſo they live not that kind of Life in the Exerciſe of Divine Affections and the Practice of the Duties of Piety, ſubduing ſenſitive Nature and dying unto Sin: But Sin liveth in them, and they live in Sin, ſo as not to live the holy Life, but a ſenſual Fleſh-pleaſing kind of Life, in the exerciſe of vile Affections, in the Practice of that which is carnality and wickedneſs of Nature, Mind and Life, *ſowing to the Fleſh* (its Intereſts) and not *to the Spirit* (the ſpiritual Intereſt,) making a worldly happy Eſtate, or a carnal ſelfiſh intereſt of Credit, Proſperity, or ſenſual Delight, their chief Good, their chief End and Buſineſs, and preferring it before the Favour of God, the Intereſt of his Service and Kingdom and their everlaſting Happineſs. Themſelves, their Virtue and Religion (for all Men pretend to Virtue, and almoſt all to Religion) have their Propriety and Character from the three grand Enemies of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs (the Devil, the Fleſh and the World;) for they are *the wicked, carnal and worldly kind of Men* (the wicked, carnal and worldly kind of Livers,) *the wicked, carnal and worldly kind of virtuous Men, the wicked, carnal and worldly kind of Religioniſts.* Their Righteouſneſs is of kind illegitimate, and continueth them in their *Wickedneſs, Carnality* and *mundane Alliance.*

II. Mankind antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion are deadly Criminals alſo upon account of a *ſecond Branch* of their Character; for (whether they be open Aliens and Enemies or Pretenders to God and Holineſs) *they are not the faithful Friends of God and Holineſs, nor the faithful Enemies of Sin and Wickedneſs.* In all Relations of Friendſhip *Unfaithfulneſs* is the ſummary of all Vice and Crime, and *Faithfulneſs* is the ſummary of all Virtue and Duty; for *Unfaithfulneſs* is *faileur of Duty in Mind, Will and Meaning,* and therefore it is ſuch faileur of Duty, wherein there is *Iniquity, vile Improbity* and *Criminality* of Mind, Will and Meaning: *Faithfulneſs is Non-faileur of Duty in Mind, Will and Meaning;* it conſiſteth in being right and without iniquity, faultleſs and unblameable without Vice or Crime (without any vile Improbity or Criminality) as to Mind, Will and Meaning. If a Subject or a Souldier be not ſo good and virtuous, and every way accompliſh'd as he ought to be, yet if he be without Iniquity as to Mind, Will and Meaning, he is *upright in Heart, loyal, faithful,* and therefore not condemnably Criminal, but highly laudable. So if a Wife or Servant be not every way ſo well qualified as they ought to be, if they come not up to the ridge of their Rule and Meaſure of Duty, ſo as to be peccant and deficient in nothing, yet if they be not guilty of groſs faileur of Duty in Mind, Will and Meaning, they are ſo far from being villainous, wicked, nefarious and condemnably Criminal, that they are highly commendable for their unſtain'd Integrity and Faithfulneſs.
So in Religion, they may well be called *the Upright,* that is, *the Right and without Iniquity* (without Vice and Crime,) *the blameleſs, the perfect* and unexceptionable (for the *Upright* and *Perfect* are known to be ſynonymous Expreſſions in Scripture, as a *perfect Weight and Meaſure* and an *upright Weight and Meaſure* are both one,) Gen. 6. 6. Job 1. 8. Luc. 1. 6. Dan. 6. 4. Deut. 25. 15.
who are ſo far from being condemnably Criminal in God's account, that they are highly laudable upon the account of their *Faithfulneſs.* They are without *Guile* and therefore *the Righteous,* the *Uncriminal* and *Uncondemnable* (in the Judgment of Equity;) God's People having no
Guile, have no *Guilt,* (no ſuch Guilt as maketh a condemnable Criminal,) if no Guile be imputable to them, no *Guilt* is imputable, they are either abſolutely ſinleſs or innocuous (as in the future State,) or at leaſt unchargeable with Apoc. 14. 5. Rom. 4. 8. Pſal. 32. 2. Nehem. 9. 8.
Wickedneſs and Villainy. *Bleſſed is the Man, unto whom the Lord imputeth no Iniquity, and in whoſe Spirit there is no Guile.* Of this truly noble Character is every faithful Adherent to God and Righteouſneſs, ſuch as *Abraham was, whoſe Heart was faithful before God.* He forſaketh Iniquity in Will and Affection univerſally and unreſervedly, ſo that he is not dead in Sin, nor in the State of reigning Sin, nor of the wicked ſinning kind and party, nor a Doer of Iniquity, but of Righteouſneſs, and his courſe of Life

is

(f) *Nulli enim dubium eſt, quia pagani obruti ſunt delictis & impietatibus, ac per hoc totus mundus Deo proſtratus eſt.--- ——— dubium non eſt omnes Græcos reos eſſe mortis.* S. Ambroſ. com. in Rom. 3. 19.

(g) *Ante cognitionem Dei injuſti, mali & nocentes eramus, à juſticiæ notione atque operibus alieni.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 26.

(h) *Eramus carnales, eramus terreni.* S. Ambroſ. in Luc. c. 17.

is the holy and ſinleſs. Wittingly and willingly he doth no Iniquity (therefore is no Villain, no Traitor,) practiſeth no heinous downright ſinning, no nefarious deadly ſinning. His Mind and Will (the bent of the Man) is not partially, mutilately and dividedly (which is a traiterous withholding our Love and Affection,) but fully and intirely for God and Righteouſneſs and againſt Sin and Wickedneſs. God and Holineſs have (in Truth and Honeſty) his utmoſt Eſteem and Affection, they are no underling Goods with him, Sin and Wickedneſs is no underling Evil; nothing is ſo dear to him, but he will part with it for God and Holineſs; he ſerveth him with his Beſt and his All (and will live the holy Life notwithſtanding all its difficulties and incumbrances,) he is for God and Holineſs and againſt Sin and Wickedneſs at any rate, elſe he could not be dutifully, loyally and uprightly affected towards them, but his Heart would be alien'd from God and Piety. And as a Maſter or a Sovereign cannot repute ſuch Men that ought to be his Subjects and Servants, *Upright*, *Honeſt*, *Sincere and Faithful*, that are not dutifully affected and diſpoſed towards him and his Service: So God cannot repute any Man *Upright in Heart*, *Honeſt*, *Sincere and Faithful*, that is not *dutifully*, *uprightly*, *ſincerely and faithfully* affected and diſpoſed towards him and his Service. We ought to conſider therefore, who they are, that may be denominated ſimply and without addition *the faithful Friends of God and Holineſs, and the faithful Enemies of Sin and Wickedneſs*; for theſe can be no deadly Criminals: But all others are ſuch, that are devoid of this *intire Integrity and Faithfulneſs* (which alone is conſtitutive of the truly Righteous) notwithſtanding a partial, limited or diminutive Integrity and Faithfulneſs which they have. They are ſo far from being dutifully and rightly affected, that they are the diſaffected; ſo far from being faithful Friends to God and Righteouſneſs, that they are Enemies (uſually deadly Enemies, and ſuch as may be called faithful Enemies,) their Mind, Will and Meaning is inexcuſably amiſs, and there is vile improbity and iniquity, vicioſity and criminality in it, becauſe they are not (ſimply and without addition) *the faithful Friends of God and Righteouſneſs, and the faithful Enemies of Sin and Wickedneſs*.

Many are loyal and faithful to a ſecular Maſter or Sovereign, that are not God's *Fideles*. Robbers and Drunkards (ſome of them) will be faithful to thoſe of their own Gang. Many Men of Civil-Societive Virtue only, will be faithful in Matters of ordinary Juſtice, and in ſome particular Affair or Imploy, *faithful Meſſengers*, *Servants*, *Soldiers*. If we ſuppoſe *Abimelech* an evil Man (as ſome will have him,) yet as to the buſineſs *of Abraham*'s Wife, there was no iniquity, no pravity in his Mind, Will or Meaning, he meant no wrong, nor wrong to *Abraham*, whoſe Wife ſhe was (to him altogether unknown,) and therefore in that particular Affair he was *upright*, *right and without Iniquity*. *(i) We Modern Chriſtians may hate Chriſt as much as we do the Memory of ſuch Jews as crucified him; albeit we be ready, if we were called to formal Trial, rather to die, than openly deny him or his Goſpel.*

There is a Faithfulneſs in *Judaiſm* as well as in Chriſtianity; for when any one will change his Religion, and become a Proſelyte of Juſtice, the Jews require, (k) *that he do it not for the Vanity of the World* (any ſecular Emolument,) *but out of Love* ומלב שלם *and from the whole Heart*. Such a Faithfulneſs and Integrity in adhering to their God in oppoſition to Idols and falſe Gods was requir'd of the Jews in the ancient times of their Commonwealth as the condition of their temporal Bleſſings. A Faithfulneſs to their Inſtitution as it was carnal Judaiſm, thoſe Jews had, who thought, they did God good Service in killing Chriſtians, *Joh.* 16. 2. And thus the Apoſtle when he outragiouſly perſecuted the Chriſtians, was faithful to his Inſtitution, he never wilfully violated the Rules of Well-doing according to carnal Judaiſm, and therefore had *the carnal Judaical Man's good Conſcience*, as he profeſſeth, *Act.* 26. 9. *I have liv'd in all good Conſcience before God until this day.*

There is a Faithfulneſs in Paganiſm as well as in Judaiſm. For *Numa* conſecrated a Temple to Faithfulneſs. *Regulus* is a known Inſtance of Faithfulneſs. (*l*) *Pyrrhus* ſaid of *Fabritius*, that it was harder to turn him out of the way of Juſtice, than the Sun out of his courſe. (*m*) *Papinianus* the Lawyer was ſo far faithful to Righteouſneſs; being commanded to defend the wicked fact of the Emperor *Caracalla*, who had barbarouſly kill'd his Brother *Geta*, he choſe rather to die than to do it. (*n*) In *China* there is a Temple of Chaſtity, erected in Commemoration of five Virgins, who being taken by Thieves, laid violent hands upon themſelves, and took away their own lives, rather than they would ſuffer themſelves to be defiled. Several of the Heathen were ſo far faithful and uprightly diſpoſed, that in ſeveral particular Actions nothing could prevail with them (not Shame, Torment, Exile, Death) to violate the Dictates of their Minds; and ſeveral of them were (*o*) *falſorum deorum non fallaces cultores*, *true Worſhippers of falſe Gods*; they were faithful to their Inſtitution of Heatheniſm, and theſe may be ſaid, to have *the Heathen Man's good Conſcience*.

Yet in the unſound Profeſſion of Chriſtianity in carnal Judaiſm and in Heatheniſm there are no ſuch Perſons as *the Upright*, *the Sincere* and *Faithful*; and conſequently there is no ſuch thing as the *Uprightneſs* of the *Upright*, the *Sincerity* of the *Sincere*, the *Faithfulneſs* of the *Faithful*. For in theſe Regions all are the wicked and ungodly; whereas if any of them were *the Upright* and the *Faithful*, theſe muſt neceſſarily be *the Righteous* (the Doers of Righteouſneſs and not the Doers of Sin and Iniquity) and in the State of juſtify'd Perſons. Wherefore the Natural and Heathen Man's Uprightneſs, Sincerity and Faithfulneſs is of the ſame Nature and Character with the reſt of his Virtue, *it is of a ſpurious and degenerate kind* (as being on this ſide Holineſs and Godlineſs,) not *the intire Integrity, not the right kind of Uprightneſs, not the holy and godly kind of Sincerity* (2 Cor. 1. 12.) *but a faithleſs kind of Faithfulneſs*. And this is that which Divines mean, when they call it (*p*) *a natural and moral Integrity*. Which ſort of Integrity is competible to Rebel-Sinners, to ſuch as are revolted from God and his Kingdom, and from true Righteouſneſs and Holineſs; in whom it is neceſſarily complicated with the moſt heinous diſloyalty and diſhoneſty, villainy and unfaithfulneſs; for none can be excuſ'd from theſe Criminalities that are not (as his Liege-Subjects and Servants) loyally affected unto God and unſinning Righteouſneſs towards him. The ignorance of the Jews and Gentiles did not excuſe

---

Gen. 20.6.

(i) Dr. *Jackſon of Juſtif. Faith. c.* 14.

(k) *Cartwright Mellif. Hebr. c.* 8.

(l) *Gat. in Ant. p.* 410.

(m) *Spartian. in Caracalla.*

(n) *Hoffman. Umbr. in luc. p.* 134.

(o) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 1. *c.* 24.

(p) *Bp. Sanderſon Ser. on Gen.* 20.6.

cuſe them from being deadly Criminals in thoſe their horrendous Sins which they accounted Well-doings. They might have known better, and would have known better, if they had been ſo far as they might have been the faithful Friends of God and Righteouſneſs, and the faithful Enemies of Sin and Wickedneſs. With this limitation the Philoſopher's Rule ought to be propos'd, which otherwiſe is not univerſally a ſafe Rule of Practiſe. (q) *That which appeareth to thee* (as a faithful adherent to God and Righteouſneſs and a faithful Enemy to Sin and Wickedneſs) *to be the beſt, let that be to thee a Law inviolable.*

This diſcourſe touching the *Upright* and the *Faithful* we may not diſmiſs without obſerving, that ſome who are not properly and formally ſuch, are *aptitudinally* and in an *initial* degree ſuch; and that the *Faithful* and *Upright* properly ſuch are Religioniſts of ſeveral degrees. Thoſe who are but *aptitudinally* (and in ſuch an initial Degree) the *Faithful* and the *Upright*, are thoſe that mean well towards God and Righteouſneſs, with reſpect to whom our Propoſition muſt be underſtood with ſome abatement of Senſe, for although they muſt be look'd upon as out of the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion and as deadly Criminals, yet not without an abatement of Senſe. Theſe are they that are denominated Chriſts Sheep, *Joh.* 10. 4, 10. thoſe that *are of the Truth*, Joh. 18. 37. and *Luk.* 8. 15. thoſe that have *an honeſt and good Heart*; which is a degree of that Integrity, which conſtituteth *the faithful and upright in Heart ſimply ſo called.* The Phraſe denoteth *an honeſt and good Heart* in reſpect of the word of true and ſaving Religion and the receiving thereof (an honeſt and good Heart ſo far) by receiving which *honeſtly, ſincerely and faithfully* (that is, without Vice or Crime as to Mind, Will and Meaning) the Receiver becometh one of the faithful and upright in Heart in a plenary Senſe, whereas at the firſt he is only ſo *initially, aptitudinally* and by way of *Preparatory Diſpoſition.* The Faithful and Upright in a plenary Senſe are Religioniſts of ſeveral degrees. For many holy and good Men under the Moſaical Oeconomy were the faithful Lovers of God and of Righteouſneſs, yet were very imperfect Religioniſts agreeably to that Oeconomy. Our Saviours Diſciples while he was on Earth, that betray a great deal of ignorance, weakneſs and many imperfections at every turn, were the faithful and ſincere Lovers of God and of Righteouſneſs, but ſo as to be Religioniſts of a very mean Rank. And this ſeemeth to have been the Caſe of *Nathaniel* alſo, who was of the true Religion, and was ſuch a true and faithful Religioniſt, that he is celebrated as *an Iſraelite indeed, that was without guile*, Joh. 1. 47. And as the faithful Lovers of God and of Righteouſneſs are Religioniſts in ſeveral degrees: So they that are in the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion, are ſo in ſeveral degrees. For they ought not to be look'd upon as totally out of it, that are paſſing into it, or that are imperfectly in it. And it ſeemeth reaſonable, to ſuppoſe touching *Cornelius* a Gentile and a Proſelyte (and ſuch more,) that God from the beginning of the World having made Proviſion in Chriſt, that his Religioniſts and Chriſts Religioniſts ſhould be in the State of Remiſſion of Sins, the State of Righteouſneſs and Salvation, *Cornelius* was imperfectly in this Divine Condition before his Converſion to Chriſtianity: But after the Goſpel-ſettlement was made, his Converſion to Chriſtianity was neceſſary, both for the continuance of what he had, and the completion of what he wanted.

III. The Scripture looketh upon Mankind (antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion) not as *alive and living, but as dead or in the State of the Dead*, Matth. 8. 22. Luc. 2. 34. Rom. 6. 17. Eph. 2. 1, 5. and 5. 14. Col. 2. 13. 1 Tim. 5. 6. 1 Pet. 4. 6. Joh. 5. 24. 1 Joh. 3. 14. Jude 12. Apoc. 3. 1. So *Clemens* hath obſerv'd, that in the Barbaric (Oriental) Philoſophy they call thoſe Men dead, (r) *that are fallen from the Dogmata* (are become aliens from the diſcipline of Truth and Virtue, whence the Soul hath her Life) *and have ſubjected their Mind to the Animal Paſſions.* As when any one was ejected out of the *Pythagoreans* Society, they ſet up a κενοτάφιον, empty Coffin in his place, to ſignifie, that he ought to be look'd upon as dead. The *Platoniſts* ſometimes ſay (agreeably to their Theoretic Virtue,) *that the death of a rational Subſtance is* (s) *to be devoid of God and of Mind.* And ſometimes they ſay, that the Death of the Soul, ſo far as ſhe can die, is (t) *to be immers'd in the matter and replete with it.* *Philo* giveth a better account of the Death of the Soul, that it is (u) *the loſs or deſtruction of Virtue and the Aſſumption of Vice. The Death of the Soul is to live with vicioſity. Only the pious are accounted the living, the reſt are dead. The bad Man living the life in vicioſity, is dead to the happy life.* But this exceſſive Allegoriſt proceedeth further to ſay, (w) *the true Hell is the life of one that is improbous and miſerable, pernicious, peſtilent and ſubject to all Execrations.* The *Perſians* and *Arabians* of the *Muhammedan* Religion (amongſt many other good Sayings) have ſome touching the dead Eſtate of the improbous. (x) *The impious is dead, although he liveth, but the pious liveth, although he be in the Manſions of the Dead.* The Hebrews uſe this Symbolic way of expreſſing the Condition of the improbous. (y) *The improbous are dead, whilſt they live.* Of the Gentiles they ſay, (z) עמי דארצות אינן חיים *the People of the Earth are not to be reckon'd with the living.* Our Saviour ſpeaketh according to their Notion of things, and imitateth their mode of Expreſſion, when he ſaith *Matth.* 8. 22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* For his meaning is; *leave it to them, to buſie themſelves about the dead bodily Carcaſe or cadaverous kind of things* (res mortales,) *who are dead in the Body.* (Such are they that live in it in ſuch a Senſe as *Celſus* chargeth the Chriſtians, *that they have lame and maimed Souls,* (a) *living in the Body which is the cadaverous part.*) And as the Jews will not allow the Gentiles, to be reckon'd amongſt the living: So the Apoſtle looketh upon the World of Heathen Sinners as in the State of the Dead. 1 *Pet.* 4. 6. *The Goſpel was preach'd to them that are*

(q) Τὸ βέλτιστον φαινόμενον νόμος ἔστω ἀπαράβατος. Epict. Ench. c. 75.

(r) Τοὺς ἐκπεσόντας τῶν δογμάτων καὶ καθυποτάξαντας τὸν νοῦν τοῖς πάθεσι τοῖς ψυχικοῖς. Grot. Not. in Matth 8. 22.

(s) Ἀθεΐα καὶ ἄνοια. Hierocl. in aur. Car. p. 14.

(t) Ἐν ὕλῃ καταδῦναι καὶ πλησθῆναι αὐτῆς. Plotin. En. 1. l. 8. c. 13.

(u) Ἀρετῆς μὲν φθορά ἐστι, κακίας δὲ ἀνάληψις. Ὁ μετὰ κακίας ἐστὶ βίος. Ὁ δὲ φαῦλος ζῶν τὸν ἐν κακίᾳ βίον τέθνηκε τὸν εὐδαίμονα. Νομ. ἀλληγ. 1. p. 40. Περὶ φυγάδ. p. 311. 317. τὸ χεῖρ. τῷ κρεῖτ. ἐπιτίθ. p. 111. Ed Gr. Pariſ.

(w) Ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ᾅδης, ὁ τοῦ μοχθηροῦ βίος ἐστὶν, ὁ ἀλάστωρ καὶ παλαμναῖος καὶ πάσαις ἀραῖς ἔνοχος. Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ προπαιδ. συνοδ. p. 293.

(x) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. l. 2. c. 5. p. 315. ed. 1.*

(y) *Grot. ſupr.*

(z) *Lightfoot Hor. in Luc. 8.* 60.

(a) Τῷ σώματι ζῶντες, τουτέστι τῷ νεκρῷ. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 363, 367.

are dead, that they might be judged according to Men in the Fleſh (ſuffer Death, the death of Mortification, to which they are ſentenc'd by the Goſpel, that they who are dead in their Carnality, by the death of it might live Spiritually.) And this plain Notion of *the Dead* ſufficiently explaineth a very obſcure Phraſe, which this Apoſtle uſeth ſpeaking of Chriſt. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18, 19, 20. *Being put to death in the Fleſh, but quicken'd by the Spirit. By which alſo he went and preach'd to the Spirits in Priſon. Which ſometime were diſobedient, when once the Long-ſuffering of God waited in the days of* Noah.

The Apoſtle ſaith that Chriſt *being rais'd, from the dead went and preach'd to the dead*; this is the elegancy of his Expreſſion and this is the Senſe of his Phraſe; for he uſeth this Phraſe *the Spirits in Priſon*, as it ſignifieth *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead.* All Religious Mankind look upon them that are dead, if they be dead in a bad condition (the wicked when they are dead) *as the Spirits in Priſon, Matth.* 18. 30. And the Phraſe ſo manifeſtly ſignifieth thoſe that are *in the State of the Dead,* (*b*) that many of the Ancients, thoſe of the Church of *Rome* and ſome reformed Divines are of Opinion, that this is the Apoſtle's meaning, *that Chriſt after his Death went in his Soul and preach'd to them, that were literally in the State of the Dead in the other World.* Now, if inſtead of this Phraſe *the Spirits in Priſon*, the Apoſtle had made uſe of this Expreſſion, *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead*, there had been no difficulty in his Words, every Interpreter would have ſaid, *thoſe who are in the State of the Dead*, is a Phraſe expreſſive of the ſadly degenerate condition of Mankind, who are dead in a myſtical and moral Senſe (ψυχῆς ἐντυμβευομένης κακίαις ἁπάσαις, *the Soul being Dead and buried in all Vicioſities*, as *Philo* ſpeaketh,) *that this Generation, thoſe that are in the State of the Dead, was ſometime diſobedient to the preaching of* Noah (ſadly degenerate Mankind were then incredulous and now are ſo,) and that Chriſt by the Spirit after his Reſurrection *going preach'd to them*, not in his own Perſon, but by his Apoſtles, in which Senſe S. *Paul* ſaith, *he came and preach'd*, Eph. 2. 17. If there had been no difficulty in the Apoſtle's words, ſuppoſing that he had made uſe of this Phraſe, *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead*, the difficulty in them muſt not be thought great, although the Apoſtle uſeth this Phraſe *the Spirits in Priſon* (which is of more Affinity with *the Spirit* that he was ſpeaking of than the other,) becauſe *the Spirits in Priſon* and *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead* (meaning the badly dead or thoſe that are dead in a bad condition) are plainly ſynonymous Expreſſions. And becauſe they are ſynonymous Expreſſions, therefore the one may be put for the other (as the Writers of the New Teſtament in citing places of the Old often ſubſtitute one equipollent Expreſſion for another;) becauſe they are Synonymous Expreſſions, therefore they may be us'd in the ſame latitude and extent of ſignification, even though the one of them of it ſelf be not of ſo large and various a ſignification as the other (for ſo the Hebrew Grammarians obſerve, (*c*) that when a Greek word is ſynonymous to an Hebrew, the Writers of the New Teſtament uſe it in the ſame latitude and variety of ſignification with the Hebrew word, although of it ſelf it was not of ſo large and various a ſignification;) becauſe they are ſynonymous Expreſſions, therefore (as in a Metalepſis) *the Spirits in Priſon* may be put for *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead*; and thoſe that are in the State of the Dead may ſignifie thoſe that are myſtically and morally ſo; becauſe they are ſynonymous Expreſſions, therefore as any would interpret the one, ſo they ought to interpret the other. Now, if the Apoſtle had ſaid, *that by the Spirit Chriſt preach'd to thoſe that are in the State of the Dead*, every one would have ſaid, the Apoſtle is his own Interpreter, he meaneth nothing but what himſelf ſaith in the compaſs of a few Verſes (1 *Pet.* 4. 6.) *that the Goſpel was preach'd to the dead*; therefore when the Apoſtle ſaith, *that by the Spirit Chriſt preached to the Spirits in Priſon*, every one ought to interpret his meaning, by what himſelf ſaith a few Verſes after, that *the Goſpel was preach'd* τοῖς νεκροῖς, *to them that are in the State of the Dead.* Thoſe that are in the State of the Dead (badly dead) *are the Spirits in Priſon*; therefore the Spirits in Priſon are *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead.* The Spirits in Priſon in a literal meaning are *the Dead* in a literal meaning, the Spirits in Priſon in a Myſtical meaning are *the Dead* in a Myſtical meaning. The Phraſe ſignifieth *thoſe that are in the State of the Dead*, or we may ſay *the Souls of the dead* (which is a ſynonymous Expreſſion.) Dead Sinners in reſpect of their Souls are the Souls of the Dead (οἱ ἄθλιοι τὰς ψυχὰς τεθνήκασιν, (*d*) *the wicked are dead in their Souls*, ſaith *Philo*,) therefore dead Sinners in reſpect of their Souls are *the Spirits in Priſon*, as that Phraſe ſignifieth *the Souls of the Dead.* What Ratiocination can be more certain? What Expoſition of Scripture more plain and intelligible?

IV. Antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion Mankind muſt be look'd upon, not as alive and living, but as dead; *for in ſeveral reſpects they are dead, they ſymbolize with and reſemble the dead, and they are in death, the comprehenſion of thoſe Evils that are death to the Soul, which is the State of death.*

(1.) In ſeveral reſpects they are alive and living; for they live φυσικῶς, *phyſically* (as other Animals are alive,) they are alive in reſpect of the Human and Human-ſocietive Life, they are alive unto Sin, and to their worldly and fleſhly Intereſts and concerns, they are not without their happy Life, as Chriſtians are (upon which account the Apoſtle ſaith, *they are dead*, Col. 3. 3.) and in reſpect of their own Conceit they are alive: But *in reſpect of God and the Life of living to him* they are dead; as the Prodigal Son that was quite gone away from his Father (as the dead are gone into another Region,) he had none of his Society, or Service, no Duty from him, or Comfort in him, but as to his Father he was dead. So Chriſtians are *dead to Sin*, becauſe they are wholly parted from it (never more to have any thing to do with it,) and in like Senſe they are *dead from the rudiments of the World.* So the Pythagorean ſaid to his Fellow, if thou do'ſt not repent, *mihi mortuus es, thou art dead to me.* The Prodigal Son was alſo dead to his Father, becauſe in all appearance he was irrecoverably gone, and therefore was given over for loſt: So the Primitive Chriſtians put on the Habit of Mourners, wail'd over thoſe whom they caſt out of the Church (*e*) *as loſt and dead unto God.* As ungodly Sinners are departed from God, and therefore are dead to

him;

(b) *Petav. T.* 4. *Par.* 2. *l.* 13. *c.* 18. *Bp. Uſher Anſwer to the Jeſ Chall. of Limb. Patr. Dr. Prideaux Lect.* 8. *p.* 278.

(c) *Sixt. Amama par.en. Gram. Ebr. præmiſſ. in fine.*

(d) *V. Jo. Pric. Annot. in Luc.* 15. 24. 1 *Tim.* 5. 6. *Joh. Druſi Adag. cl. l.* 3. *S.* 42.

Luk. 15. 24.

Rom. 6. 2. *Col.* 2. 20.

2 *Cor.* 12. 21.

(e) Ὡς ἀπολωλότας κα τεθνηκότας τῷ Θεῷ. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 3. 142.

him; ſo God is departed from them, upon which account alſo they are dead, as the Body is dead when the Soul is departed; (*f*) *animæ mortuæ, hoc eſt à Deo deſertæ, Souls forſaken and devoid of God are dead.* The Impious are dead in reſpect of the proper Life of the Soul, (which is ſuperiour to that Life or Vitality wherewith ſhe animateth the Body) they live the Life of the Body, but are dead in their diviner part. (*g*) *The Life of the Impious in their Bodies is not that of Souls, but the Life of their Bodies, which even dead Souls can confer upon them.* They are therefore dead in reſpect of the true and only valuable Life, which is the Souls proper Excellency and Felicity (and the Life of living unto God) as a Father ſaith of the Pagan Hero's, (*h*) *qui nec cùm viverent, verè vixerunt*; and another thus deſcribeth the Impious, (*i*) οἱ τ̃ ὄντως ȣ̓́σης ἀμέτοχοι ζωῆς, *thoſe that partake not of Life truly ſuch.* So the Platoniſts ſay touching Humane Souls, (*k*) *They die ſometimes to the divine felicitative Life by fleeing from God.* In reſpect of the main (Spirituals and Eternals) the Impious are not alive but dead: *She that liveth in Pleaſure, is dead while ſhe liveth*; for ſuch kind of living is to be dead in the main.

(2.) Ungodly Sinners ſymbolize with and (in many reſpects) reſemble the Dead; (*l*) as the People of the Town *Caunus* (an unhealthful place in *Caria*) look'd pallid and reſembled the Dead, and therefore *Stratonicus* ſaid, that in that place οἱ νεκροὶ περιπατȣ̃σι, *dead Men walk.* As the Dead are thoſe that have loſt the Light and are in the State and Region of Darkneſs; ſo the Ungodly are without the Light, which true and ſaving Wiſdom is, and are in the Heathen Atheous kind of Darkneſs, (*m*) *in tenebris ac morte verſantur, they are in Darkneſs the Region of Death.* Ecclus. 22. 11. *Weep for the Dead, for he hath loſt the Light; and weep for the Fool, for he wanteth Underſtanding.* They have a quick and lively Senſe of their Reputation and Secular Intereſts, but have not that vital Nature in them, which would make them perceptive (affectively and vitally perceptive) of the true Goods and Evils, the matters of the Kingdom of God and their Soul-Intereſts, and therefore are as thoſe that are dead, ſtupidly Senceleſs and Imperceptive, (*n*) ἀναισθήτως διάκεινται, *they are in a ſtate of Inſenſibleneſs (which is an heavier thing than if a Graveſtone lay upon them) as the Body is when the Soul is departed.* (*o*) *A Man drowned in Ignorance is more ſenſeleſs than the Stones.* As the Dead are wholly bereft of their Sences, of Seeing, Hearing, Smelling, Taſting, Feeling, and they that are nigh unto death, are in great degree depriv'd of them (as old *Barzillai* was, 2 *Sam.* 19. 35.) ſo unholy Mankind are devoid of that holy vital Senſation and Perception, which anſwereth to the Bodily Sences (that are called (*p*) by *Simplicius*, ζωαὶ, *Lives*) they ſee not, nor hear, nor feel, nor ſmell, as holy Souls do, *they ſavour not the things that are of God*, they are dry and ſapleſs and diſpirited like a *Caput mortuum*, a meer piece of dull Earth, that hath loſt its Oyl and Salt and all its rich Principles. *All holy vital Warmth and Fervour, Livelineſs and Vigour* is extinct in them, they are cold as the Dead, (Key-cold, dead as a Door-nail;) and if they are reputed dead, that are torpid, remiſs and negligent in matters of Piety, and have *frigidum in religione pectus* (*Apoc.* 3. 1.) how much more muſt they be reputed dead, that are wholly without any holy vital Motion or Operation, and are totally inactive in the Buſineſs of Piety? (*q*) *to be wholly inactive, to do nothing, to whom doth it agree, but to the Dead? Mortui nihil agunt,* (*r*) *the Dead will not praiſe God, as it is ſaid in the Pſalms,* ζώντων γὰρ τὸ ἔργον, *for this is the work of the Living.* The Dead neither eat, nor drink, nor ſpeak, nor breath Spiritually, nor do any holy ſpiritual good Action; for Wickedneſs is, (*s*) *inanimate and dead to the Life which is in God, and* (as one ſaith) *more rejectaneous than Dung; therefore the Dead* (ſaith *Philo*) *may not come into the ſight of God.* (*t*) *He is Lifeleſs and Soul-leſs, that doth not pray unto God, and deſire continually to enjoy the Divine Converſe; for I ſuppoſe, as the Soul being gone our Body is dead and ſtinking, ſo if the Soul doth not move her ſelf to prayer, ſhe is dead and miſerable and noyſom.* But if the Souls of the Dead do move themſelves to prayer, or other Religious Practice, yet if their Religious Practice be on this ſide true Piety and Sanctity, if it is not at all animated with holy Affections and holy Mindedneſs, ſuch Religious Practice is but the Carcaſs of good Works, of the ſame Character with the dead, ſoul-leſs, lifeleſs, ſapleſs and unſavoury, taſtleſs like *the white of an Egg*, as *a dry Tree*, or as (*u*) ξύλον ξηρὸν, *dry Wood*; (*x*) *as the Body without the Soul is dead, and can do nothing; ſo the Soul as to the Kingdom of God is dead and can do none of the things of God,* ἄνευ τῆς ἐπȣρανίȣ ψυχῆς, χωρὶς τȣ̃ θείȣ πνεύματος, *without the Celeſtial Soul, the Divine Spirit.*

Democritus ſuppos'd, that (*y*) a dead Carcaſs hath a ſort of Soul (that the Heat and Spirit remaining after Death is the proper Soul of the Carcaſs;) the *Pythagoreans* held, (*z*) that every thing that groweth hath a Soul; and a Philoſopher argueth, (*a*) *that there is ſomething vital in dead Bodies, becauſe the Hair and Nails grow.* Such are the productions of unholy Mankind, uſually and in reſpect of God they are nothing better than the excrementitious productions of Hair and Nails; and therefore as the Dead, they are vile, worthleſs and unuſeful; for *a living Dog is better than a dead Lion,* (*b*) ἄχρηστος ὁ νεκρὸς, *one that is dead is of no uſe.* The Gentiles therefore becauſe they are dead, are ſaid to be (*c*) *the other People* (contradiſtinct to regenerate Chriſtians) *that is, of no uſe.* The Jews ſay, (*d*) *A poor Man, a Leper and a Childleſs-man are reputed for dead,* becauſe their Condition is look'd upon as a lifeleſs Condition; ſuch is the forlorn and deſolate ſtate of the Wicked, who are debarr'd from all true Peace and Comfort. (*e*) *Their Souls are corrupt and putrid, what they breath out through their whole life is of a noyſom Scent or Savour, and their filthy Words are* νεκρȣ̃ δυσωδέστερα, *of a worſe ſmell than a dead Body; but they perceive not this noyſom Scent, ſo long as they remain accuſtomed to it, they carry about a dead Soul in the Body as in a Sepulchre* (and they are τάφος ἀκάθαρτον, a Sepulchre

of

(f) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 2.

(g) *Impiorum in corporibus vita, non animarum ſed corporum vita eſt, quam poſſunt eis animæ etiam mortuæ, hoc eſt à Deo deſertæ, conferre.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 2.

(h) *Ibid. l.* 18. *c.* 18.

(i) *Clem.* προτρ. p. 3.

(k) Ἀποθνήσκουσί ποτε τὴν θείαν εὐζωΐαν τῇ ἀπὸ Θεȣ̃ φυγῇ. *Hierocl. in aur. Car. p.* 13, 14.

1 *Tim.* 5. 6.

(l) *Gat. in Ant. p.* 379.

(m) *Lactant. l.* 6. *c.* 1.

(n) *S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. p.* 193. *in* 2 *Cor. p.* 582.

(o) Πρὸς δὲ καὶ λίθων ἀναισθητότερος ἄνθρωπος ἀγνοίᾳ βεβαπτισμένος. *Clem.* προτρεπ. p. 2.

(p) *Com. in Epiſt. p.* 162, 163.

(q) Ἀπραγμοσύνη τίνος ἂν ἄλλȣ εἴη πλὴν νεκρȣ̃; *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 5.

(r) *Philo* περὶ φυγάδ. *p.* 312.

(s) Πρὸς τὴν ἐν Θεῷ ζωὴν ἄψυχον καὶ νεκρὸν, καὶ κοπρείων, ὡς ἔφη τις, ἐκβλητότερον. *Philo ibid.*

(t) Ὅστις ȣ̓ προσεύχεται τῷ Θεῷ, ȣ̓δὲ θείας ὁμιλίας ἀπολαύειν ἐπιθυμεῖ συνεχῶς, νεκρός ἐστι καὶ ἄψυχος· ὥσπερ γὰρ, οἶμαι, τὸ σῶμα τȣ̃το τὸ ἡμέτερον ψυχῆς μὴ παρȣ́σης νεκρόν ἐστι καὶ δυσῶδες· ὕτω ψυχῆς μὴ κινȣ́σης ἑαυτὴν εἰς προσευχὴν νεκρά ἐστι, καὶ ἀθλία, καὶ δυσώδης. *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *p.* 155.

Job 6. 6.

Iſa. 56. 3.

(u) *S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. p.* 193.

(x) *Macar. Hom.* 30.

(y) *Plut. de placit. l.* 4. *c.* 4.

(z) *Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p.* 7.

(a) *Plotin. En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 29.

(b) *Ariſt. Eth. Eudem. l.* 7. *c.* 1.

(c) Λαὸς ἄλλος ἐθνικὸς, ἀχρεῖος. *Clem. pædag. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

(d) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 744.

(c) *S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. p.* 193, 459. *in Rom. p.* 109, 110. *in* 2 *Cor. p.* 582, 583.

of Uncleanneſs ſmelling of Abomination;) *although Worms devour them not, yet the vicious Paſſions of the Soul lacerate them more fiercely than wild Animals; they are bound in the Chains of their Sins, and as thoſe that lie in the Grave are bound Head, and Hands, and Feet, the Devil being their* ἐνταφιαςὴς (he that burieth them) *who bindeth them exactly. The Soul is incapable of a diſſolution into ſerous matter, Duſt and Aſhes, as the Body; but it is diſſolv'd into things more noyſom, into Drunkenneſs, and Wrath, and Covetouſneſs, into abſurd Loves and immoderate Appetites. In the Soul of the Cruel and Unmerciful all the kindly warmth of love to their Brother is extinguiſh'd, and it is more dead than an Inanimate Body.* * *The Life of the Wicked is alſo worſe than Death* (worſe than being meerly dead, *Ecclus.* 22. 11.) *they are in a far more wretched plight than a dead Body, the Life of the Drunkard is worſe than thouſands of Deaths*; (*f*) of whom this Father ſaith (becauſe his Sences are ſhut up and bound) νεκρός ἐςιν ἔμψυχ☉ ὁ μεθύων, *the Drunkard is an animate or living dead Man:* So the meer Animal Man νεκρός ἐςιν ἔμψυχος, *is a living dead Man.* (*g*) *As when the Soul departeth, Stench, Corruption, Putrefaction, the Worm, Aſhes, Horrour and all things deteſtable to the Sight ſucceed in the Body; ſo God's departure from the Soul is ſucceeded preſently by the Stench of Sins, the Corruption of Crimes, the Rottenneſs of Vices, the Worm of Conſcience, the Aſhes of Vanities, the Horrour of Infidelity, and the Soul is bury'd in the live Sepulchre of the Body.* The Son of the Stranger is uncircumcis'd in Heart, and uncircumcis'd in Fleſh; that is, ſaith *Clemens*, (*h*) *He is unclean both in Body and Spirit:* Degenerate Mankind therefore in this reſpect reſemble the Dead, they are impure, unclean, abominable, and defiling. For as in Judaiſm ſo in Paganiſm, τὸ νεκρὸν ἀκάθαρτον, *a dead Body was unclean, Numb.* 19. 11. *Eccluſ.* 34. 25. If any touch'd a dead Body he was defil'd; they that were preſent at a Funeral, made a Luſtration of themſelves by paſſing through the Fire; the Houſe where a dead Body lay had Water ſtanding at the Door, wherein the People that came out, waſh'd themſelves, and *Plutarch* (in his *Qu. Rom.*) reporteth of the Greeks, *That they accounted thoſe profane, and did not aſſociate themſelves with them, nor ſuffer'd them to approach to their Sacrifices, who were once carry'd out and interr'd as dead:* So degenerate Mankind and dead Sinners are καθαρσίων δεόμενοι, *ſuch as need Luſtration.*

3. *They are in Death, the comprehenſion of thoſe Evils that are death to the Soul, which is the ſtate of Death*; according to that of our Saviour, *Joh.* 5. 24. *He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that ſent me,—— is paſſed from Death unto Life*: So 1 *Joh.* 3. 14. *We know that we have paſs'd from Death unto Life, becauſe we love the Brethren; he that loveth not his Brother, abideth in Death.* Two oppoſite Eſtates are here repreſented, which all Mankind are in (according to Chriſtianity:) The one is *Life* (the ſtate of Life;) the other is *Death* (the ſtate of Death;) the one is the comprehenſion of all thoſe Goods that are Life to the Soul, the other is the comprehenſion of all thoſe Evils that are Death to the Soul. In which horrendous ſtate of Death (according to the Laws of true and ſaving Religion) are all unholy Mankind, *that do* (the deadly Sins) *the things worthy of Death, Rom.* 1. 32. that are the Servants of Sin unto Death, *Rom.* 6. 6. that live after the Fleſh and ſhall die, *Rom.* 8. 13. that are the carnally-minded, which is Death, *Rom.* 8. 6. that bring forth Fruit unto Death, *Rom.* 7. 5. All that are not the faithful lovers of God and the lovers of their Brother, 1 *Joh.* 3. 14. All that deadly err from the Truth, that are not converted from their ſinning trade, *Jam.* 5. 19, 20. And all the World of ungodly Sinners till they practiſe a ſaving Repentance from Dead (Mortiferous) Works, *Heb.* 6. 1. (*i*) *Death cauſal is that conjunction of the Soul in the Body, which is her being given to Sin: Life is her Separation from Sin.* In the ſtate of Life there is nothing of Death, (*Joh.* 8. 51.) and in the ſtate of Death there is nothing of Life, nothing but Death and what is deadly, the deadly kind of things, *deadly* Enemies, *deadly* Sins, the *deadly* Sentence and *deadly* Puniſhment. They that are in it have no Life in them, nor (without removing their Quarters) is there any Life for them; but as they are dead in Sins, ſo if they die in them, they muſt die for them; ſo the Scripture noticeth the ſtate of death, *Joh.* 8. 21. *Rom.* 6. 23. *Jam.* 1. 15. 1 *Joh.* 5. 12. The deadly Evils of this Eſtate are multifarious and variouſly diſtinguiſhable (into Criminal and Penal, Inherent and Adherent, Privative and Poſitive,) but the Summary of them is *the deadly criminal Life, the deadly penal State, the reign of the deadly Ghoſtly Enemies.*

The *deadly criminal Life* (the Region of deadly Evils to the Soul) importeth *a privation* of the Holy Life, and of all the ineſtimable Goods which Spiritual Life is, and a *poſition* of all the contrary criminal Evil; for it is a privation of the true *Light* and *Life*, the ſaving *Truth* and *Wiſdom*, the true *Health*, the *Beauty* and *Brightneſs*, the *Order* and *Rectitude*, the *Liberty* and *Freedom*, the *Nobleneſs* and *Unvileneſs*, the *Vigour* and *Puiſſance*, the *Eaſe* and *Reſt*, *Peace* and *Serenity*, *Delight* and *Pleaſure*, the *Goodneſs*, *Worth*, *Uſefulneſs*, the *Innocence* and *Purity*, the *Divinity* and *Beatitude* of the Soul (which is Death;) and it is a Poſition of the deadly *Life* and *Diſpoſition*; the deadly criminal *Darkneſs*, *Error*, *Fooliſhneſs*, *Mortal Diſeaſes*, *Deformity*, *Crookedneſs* and *Diſorder*, *Sordidneſs* and *Servitude*, *Vileneſs* and *Villany*, *Weakneſs* and *Wickedneſs*, *Inquietude* and *Diſſatisfaction*, *Cloudineſs* and *Tumultuouſneſs*, *Diſturbance* and *Perplexity* (commix'd with the pleaſures of Pride and Senſuality, which are *mortiferæ ſuavitates, deadly Sweets*, as *Lactantius* calleth them) the deadly criminal *Foulneſs*, *Noxiouſneſs*, *Pravity*, *and Venenate Malignity*, *the Atheouſneſs*, *Selfiſhneſs*, *Carnality*, *Worldlineſs and Diaboliſm* of the Soul. Such are the deadly criminal Evils.

They that are in the deadly criminal Life, are neceſſarily in *the deadly Penal State* (which belongeth to the deadly Criminals;) they are penally depriv'd of all the true ſaving Goods Spiritual and Eternal, and are ſubjected to all the contrary deadly penal Evils. This Eſtate therefore importeth a Penal Privation of the Eſtate of *Remiſſion of Sins* and of *Righteouſneſs*, of *Peace* and *Reconcilement*, of *Grace* and *Favour*, of Divine *Alliance* and *Acceptance*, of the *Election* and *Adoption*, of the *Inheritance*, of *Freedom* and *Citizenſhip* in the *Kingdom of God* (with all the Honour and Nobilitation, Riches, Rights,

---

* *V. Gat. in Ant. p.* 323. 359.

(f) Ανδριαντ. α. p. 452.

(g) *Recedente anima mox corpori fœtor, corruptio, putredo, vermis, cinis, horror & omnia viſu deteſtanda ſuccedunt; diſcedente Deo confeſtim venit in animam peccatorum fœtor, corruptio criminum, vitiorum putredo, conſcientiæ vermis, vanitatum cinis, infidelitatis horror, & fit in corporis ſepulchro vivo funus animæ jam ſepultæ.* P. Chryſolog. Ser. 19.

(h) *Strom. l.* 4. *p. m.* 391.

(i) Θάνατ☉ μὲν ὅτι ἡ ἐν σώματι κοινωνία τῆς ψυχῆς ἁμαρτητικῆς ὄσης· ζωὴ δὲ, ὁ χωρισμὸς τῆς ἁμαρτίας. *Clem. Strom. l.* 4. *p.* 349.

Priviledges and Immunities, Safety and Impunity which that Eſtate is:) And as it is the ſtate of *Non-remiſſion of Sins*, *Non-reconcilement*, of *Diſtance* and *Eſtrangement*, ſo it is *poſitively* the Penal State of ungodly Sinners (their Reputation, Relation and Penal Dues are ſettled upon the Criminals,) the ſtate of being under *deadly Debts* and *damnable Criminalities*, deadly *Infamy* and *Villainy*, *Condemnation* and *Divine Wrath*, of *Deſertion*, *Baniſhment*, *Beggary*, *Slavery*, *Hoſtility*, of *Execration*, *Reprobation* and *Perdition*; of not having *the Favour* of God and of being under his Diſpleaſure; of not being in *the Kingdom of God*, and of being in *the Kingdom of Satan*; of not being *the Heirs of Life*, and of being *the Heirs of Death*; for they that are finally in it, muſt never ſee Life, but muſt be put to death, *Joh.* 3. 36.

The ſtate of Death is *the Reign of the deadly ghoſtly Enemies*; for in this eſtate *Sin reigneth*, *Satan reigneth*, *the Law reigneth*, (the Law of Sin and of Death, *Rom.* 8. 2.) and becauſe Sin *reigneth unto Death*, therefore Death reigneth, *Rom.* 5. 21. The World of unholy Mankind therefore muſt be look'd upon as a World of *deadly* Sinners, and of *dead* Sinners alſo, as the Apoſtle argueth (for this Senſe of his Words is unexceptionable, and is plainly imply'd in his Argument) 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. *If one died for all, then were all dead. He died for all, that they which live*—— therefore they were dead. We Gentiles were eminently ſo; for we were dead (*k*) in ſuch a ſenſe as a Man, whoſe ſafety or recovery is look'd upon as deſperate and hopeleſs, is ſaid to be a dead Man, *Eph.* 2. 1, 5. *You hath he quicken'd, who were dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins. Col.* 2. 13. *You being dead in your Sins, and the Uncircumciſion of your Fleſh*; that is, in your Gentiliſm, the State and Life thereof.

V. So the Church-Writers repreſent our Heathen-popular ſtate as the ſtate of Death. (*l*) *He hath adopted us Gentiles into the Society of the Patriarchs and the Portion of his elect Flock, who were periſhing under the profound Night of the old Ignorance.* (*m*) *Not to know the Father, is Death, as to know him, is Life Eternal; to recede from the knowledge of God bringeth Deſtruction.* (*n*) *None but an irreligious Perſon doubteth, that they are ſuch as deſerve to be punitively tormented, as impious and unjuſt, who know not God, ſeeing it is as great Wickedneſs, not to know, as to hurt him that is the Parent and Lord of all.* (*o*) *The Nations in the whole World alien from God were ſubjected to Death; for you may rightly account them dead, who not knowing the Donor of Life, and depreſſing their Souls from Heaven to the Earth, run into the Snares of Eternal Death.* If we had been God's Believers and Religioniſts (imperfectly or more perfectly) as we might have been, our State had been (in ſome degree) Holy Popular, we ought to have been reckon'd God's People; and ſome of the Ancients, as alſo many of the Moderns might have pleaded, (*p*) *That Faith in Chriſt was not neceſſary in our Circumſtances, it was ſufficient to relinquiſh Idolatry*, and to be the Religioniſts of the one true God. But in *Philo*'s mode of ſpeaking, (*q*) ἔκθεσμος, *a nefarious Man*, and ἔκφυλος, *an Alien from the People of God*, are terms ſynonymous; (*r*) ſuch are ἀπόλιδες ϗ σποράδες, *without holy Citizenſhip and Society.* And as the word *Hoſtis* which now ſignifieth an Enemy, in ancient times ſignify'd a Stranger; ſo in our Heathen-popular State we were related to God as *Aliens* and *Enemies*, no People (no People of God) and therefore we could have no rights in the Holy City, nor to the Holy Deity thereof. Nor was it poſſible, that God ſhould look upon us, as his Allies, Subjects, Servants or Liege-people; but our ſtate was that of total Apoſtates from, Traitors and open Rebels againſt our Sovereign Leige-Lord, which is the ſtate of Death. (*s*) *The Devils withdraw Men from the knowledge of the true God, by which alone Death Eternal is avoidable.* If any of the Heathen (remaining ſuch) might be ſav'd, it muſt be by a Deity; but there is no Deity, whereby they can be ſav'd, who are not the People of the true God. The true God being the Deity of true Religion and Godlineſs, cannot fail to be condemning and punitive to the Atheous and Ungodly. And if it is by a Deity that Mankind muſt be ſav'd, then they muſt be ſav'd by being ſavingly Religious; therefore both the Popular and Philoſophic Pagans that acknowledg'd a future Happineſs foully miſtook the way thither; for they rely'd upon their *Myſtic Metaphyſical Sanctity*, their *Teletæ* and the *Hieratic* way, their *Theurgic* Methods of the Soul's *Purgation*, *Liberation*, *Reduction*; they promis'd themſelves a future Happineſs from *an initiation into their Myſtic-religious Inſtitutions*, their Heathen Piety (*t*) and Civil-ſocietive Virtue (of which their *bene merita in patriam* were a principal Branch) and it was ſuppos'd, that by theſe Paganical Methods *Julian* the Apoſtate triumphantly aſcended to the Supernal Regions (*u*).

Et patriam æthereæ lucis remeabat ad aulam.

But the *Virtue* of the Heathen is far from being ſaving; ſomething of it is found in all Men (all are in ſome ſort Virtuous, Honeſt, Sincere;) if therefore it was ſaving to any, all Men would be ſav'd. It continueth Men in their Ungodlineſs, and is competible to them that are in their Sins, *the ſtate of Sin and of Death.* (*w*) *No doubt, he is impious that doth not acknowledge God, and all the Virtues which he thinketh he hath, are found in that mortiferous Life, which is nothing but Darkneſs.* The *Religion* of the Heathen which ſhould have been ſaving to them, was of a contrary nature, deſtructive to Life and Salvation, (*x*) πάσης ἀθεότητος οὖσα μεστὴ, *being full of all Atheouſneſs*, it conſtituted them Athe-iſts and Antithe-iſts, and the main Branches of it are ſo many mortal Sins. (*y*) ποία δὲ τούτοις ἐλπίς; *what hope is there for theſe?*

(*z*) *The Devil leading them by the Hand as a blind Man* εἰς ἕν τι θανάτου ϗ ἀπωλείας βάραθρον κατεκρήμνιζε, *precipitated them into one certain Gulf of Death and Perdition.* (*a*) *They firſt deſtroy themſelves by doing ſervice to damned Demons, whom God hath doom'd to Eternal Puniſhments. And then they ſuffer*

(k) *Grot. Not. in Eph.* 2. 1.

(l) *Nos ſub veteris quondam ignorantiæ profunda nocte pereuntes, in patriarcharum ſocietatem & ſortem electi gregis adoptavit.* Leo M. Ser. 4. de paſſ. Dom.

(m) Τὸ δ' ἀγνοεῖν τὸν πατέρα, θάνατός ἐστιν, ὡς τὸ γνῶναι ζωὴ αἰώνιος.—— Φθορὰν δὲ ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώσεως ἀπόστασις παρέχει. *Clem. Strom.* l. 5. p. m. 421.

(n) *Eos meritò torqueri, qui Deum neſciunt, ut impios, ut injuſtos, niſi profanus nemo deliberat, cùm parentem omnium & omnium Dominum, non minoris ſceleris ſit ignorare, quàm lædere.* Min. Fel. p. 332, 333.

(o) *Gentes in orbe toto alienæ à Deo ſubjectæ morti fuerunt;—— Eos enim rectè mortuos exiſtimaveris, qui datorem vitæ neſcientes, atque animas ſuas à cælo in terram deprimentes, in laqueos æternæ mortis incurrunt.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 26.

(p) *Montacut. Apparat.* 1. p. 30, &c.

(q) *Quod deter. inſid. potior.* p. 112. *Ed. Gr. Pariſ.*

(r) *Idem de congreſſ. Quær. Erud. gr.* p. 293.

(s) *Avocant dæmones à veri Dei notione, per quam ſolam poteſt mors æterna vitari.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 27.

(t) *Macrob. in ſom. Scip. l.* 1. *c.* 1, 4, 9.

(u) *Baron. ad ann.* 363. *n.* 59.

(w) *Non eſt dubium, quin impius ſit, quiſquis Deum non agnoverit, omneſque virtutes ejus quas habere aut tenere ſe putat, in illa mortifera vita reperiuntur, quæ eſt tota tenebrarum.* Lactant. l. 6. c. 9.

(x) *S. Athanaſ. c. Gent. or. p.* 25. *com.*

(y) *Ibid. p.* 13.

(z) *Gr. Naz. or.* 34. p. 47.

(a) *Seipſos primum jugulant perditis dæmonibus ſerviendo, quos Deus in æterna ſupplicia damnavit, deinde nec ab aliis Deum coli patiuntur, ſed averte-*

re homines ad mortifera ſacra contendunt. Lactant. l. 5. 20.

not God to be worſhipp'd by others, but ſtrive to turn them away to their mortiferous Sacra.

(b) *As he that in a dark Night attempteth to travel in a ſtrange Way, or to ſail at Sea, will not only miſs of his Journey's end, but will preſently be loſt: So theſe attempting to go the way to Heaven, and bereaving themſelves of Light, and inſtead thereof committing themſelves to the Darkneſs of their Minds,—— ſuffer'd a moſt grievous Shipwrack.* (c) *If we had not known the Word and been illuminated by it, we had not differ'd from Birds, fatned in Darkneſs, and nouriſh'd for Death.* The benighted ſtate of the Heathen therefore is ſuppos'd, to be univerſally and without exception the ſtate of Death; and not without great reaſon, for their Eſtate is no other than the ſtate of Unregeneracy, which is the firſt Eſtate of the Univerſality of Mankind, and is (doubtleſs) the ſtate of Death. All of them needed *a Repentance unto Life* (which ſpeaketh them dead) and a ſaving Converſion to God, *that they might obtain Remiſſion of Sins, and an Inheritance among them that are ſanctify'd.* All of them were devoid of true Piety and Sanctity (Grace and Holineſs) without which the Soul is dead; (d) *for as the Soul being departed from the Body it becometh a dead Body, noyſom and unclean; ſo if the fear of God be departed from the Soul, ſhe becometh a dead Soul, noyſom and unclean.* All of them were deadly Criminals in Religion, liv'd the deadly criminal Life (the Heathen Life is the Reign of Sin) and in ſuch Sins which are inconſiſtent with Sanctity, and are under a damnatory Sentence, which ſpeaketh their ſtate to be the ſtate of Death; (e) *for Sin is Death Eternal;* (f) *for he that is devoid of* (the Holy Life of) *Virtue, he that is overcome by evil Luſts, and Cupidities, is not ſubjected to* Cupid (*as the Poet hath feign'd*) *but to Eternal Death.* There is not any Settlement of Religion, whereby Heathen Mankind (remaining ſuch) can be ſav'd; but on the contrary, the Penal Dues of nefarious Sinners are manifeſtly ſettled upon them; and they are under the Domination of all their deadly ghoſtly Enemies. If any by the Keys of the Church are continued in or caſt into the Heathen-ſtate, *their Sins are not remitted but retained*; therefore the Heathen ſtate is the ſtate of *Non-remiſſion of Sins*; and if Sin be not pardon'd, by the force of a Contradiction it muſt be puniſh'd according to its demerits. If any Chriſtian maketh a total defection to Heatheniſm, his defection is a total Apoſtaſie from the true God, and the ſtate of ſuch an Apoſtate is the ſtate of Condemnation *irreverſibly*, the ſtate of Death *irrecoverably*; which ſpeaketh the Heathen ſtate, to be the ſtate of Death. But from this Hypotheſis (without which the neceſſity of Chriſtianity is not maintainable, nor can the Grace of God towards us Chriſtianiz'd Gentiles be duely illuſtrated without it) a terrible Concluſion will be inferr'd, *that all who die in the Heathen ſtate are finally loſt*; which ſeemeth to be a grand difficulty in Providence, and they that think it ſo (if they be Wiſe and Religious) ought to be allow'd great liberty of thought, to ſalve the Phænomenon. We will content our ſelves to obſerve, that the Diſpute in the Church touching the *Heathens Salvation*, is partly concerning *matter of Fact*, and partly concerning *matter of Right and of Law*.

(b) *S. Chryſoſt. in Rom.* p. 20.

(c) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 52.

Act. 11. 18. *and* 26. 18.

(d) Ὥσπερ γὰρ χωρισθείσης τῆς ψυχῆς, νεκρὸν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ δυσῶδες καὶ ἀκάθαρτον· οὕτως χωρισθέντος τοῦ φόβου τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς, νεκρὰ ὑπάρχει ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ δυσώδης καὶ ἀκάθαρτος. *J. Mart. Qu. & Reſp. ad Orthod.* p. 429.

(e) Θάνατος γὰρ ἀΐδιος ἁμαρτία. *Clem.* προτρ. *p. m.* 53.

(f) *Qui enim virtutis eſt expers, qui cupiditatibus ac libidinibus malis vincitur, non cupidini (ut ille finxit) ſed morti ſubjectus eſt ſempiternæ.* Lactant. l. 1. c. 11.

Heb. 6. 6. 1 *Joh.* 5. 16.

VI. If the Salvation of any be call'd in queſtion as *Heathens*, the matter of Fact ought to be debated in the firſt place; whether they were Heathens in this definitive Notion, *The Mundane Theiſts that do not acknowledge the true God?* Uſually they that plead for the Salvation of Heathens Unheathenize them in Religion and Morality, (making them God's Religioniſts and as good as Chriſtians) and yet ſuppoſe, that they plead for the Salvation of Heathens, whereas they alter the Subject of the Queſtion, and contradict themſelves as well as apparent matter of fact. Thus in the Church of *Rome* the Patrons of their Salvation ſuppoſe, (g) *That the Philoſophers were abhorrent from Polytheiſm, worſhipp'd one only God, whom with all their might they inquir'd after and inveſtigated, always ſtudying to pleaſe him, and therefore they were not deſtitute of that Faith and Knowledge of God, whereby the Impious are juſtify'd and the Juſt liveth:* (h) *That many Philoſophers were ſav'd, becauſe they did not worſhip Idols, believ'd one only God, the Puniſher and Rewarder, and eſchew'd the deadly Sins, which natural Reaſon dictateth to be Sins: That many Heathens had the true knowledge of God, and a Faith touching his Providence, in which Faith of theirs touching Divine Providence* (which taketh care of Man's welfare) *a Faith touching Man's Redemption by Chriſt is implicitly contain'd.* Amongſt the Reform'd *Zuinglius* patronizeth the Salvation of groſs Heathens, *Hercules*, *Theſeus*, *Numa*, *Camillus*; but he reckoneth them among the Faithful (*quotquot in Fide hinc migraverunt*,) he calleth *Seneca a moſt holy Man*, and therefore he maketh them no Heathens; as in the Stile of his Apologiſt *Numa*'s Studies are ſaid to *be Pious and Holy*, which is a making him no Heathen. (i) A late Remonſtrant to patronize the Salvation of the Heathen, repreſenteth ſeveral of them as truly Pious and Holy at the rate of Regenerate Chriſtians; which is a groſs contradiction; for (in the main at leaſt) ſuch could be no Heathens. (k) Not a few of the Hebrew Doctors allot a Portion in the World to come to the חסידי אמות *Pious of the Gentiles*, whereby they mean thoſe that receive and obſerve their ſeven Precepts of the Sons of *Noah*. (l) A late Rabbi proceedeth further, and alloweth a Portion in the World to come to *Socrates*, *Plato*, and ſuch more; for he ſuppoſeth, *that they were right in their Opinion concerning God, and liv'd piouſly and honeſtly*, and therefore were no worſe than thoſe, who obſerv'd the ſeven Precepts of the Sons of *Noah*, that were God's Religioniſts. *J. Mart.* ſaith, *That thoſe who liv'd according to Reaſon were Chriſtians, although they were accounted Atheiſts*; meaning by Chriſtians God's Religioniſts, and by *Reaſon* the Reaſon of true Piety, whereupon he affirmeth, *That* Socrates, Heraclitus, *and ſuch more were Chriſtians.* (m) *They that have liv'd with Reaſon are Chriſtians, although they were accounted Atheiſts; as among the Greeks* Socrates, Heraclitus, *and the like to them, among the Barbarians* Abraham *and* Ananias. This holy Man's Opinion of *Socrates*, *Heraclitus* (and ſuch like) is founded upon a miſtake touching a matter of fact; for he following the Vulgar Error, that *Socrates* * (who was charg'd with Atheouſneſs) died a Martyr for one God, entertain'd a Conceit,

(m) Καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν· οἷον ἐν Ἕλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς· ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀνανίας. Apol. 2. p. 83.

(g) *Andrad. ap. Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 6.

(h) *V. Montacut. Apparat.* 1. *S.* 84, 86. *Collii. l.* 1. *c.* 11, 12. *de anim. Pagan.*

(i) *Curcel. de Neceſſ. cognit. Chriſt. S.* 6, 15, 24, 36.

(k) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 1. *c.* 1. 16. *Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 344. *Mena. ben Iſr. Qu. in Deut. p.* 221.

(l) *Idem de Reſur. mort. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

* *Spencer. Not. in Orig. c. Celſ. p.* 9.

ceit, that ſeveral of the Philoſophers whom the worſer Heathen reputed Atheiſts, were God's Religioniſts (or Chriſtians;) therefore he maketh them no Heathens. The Eccleſiaſtic Legendaries have very much concern'd themſelves about the Salvation of the Heathen; and one of their methods of ſaving them is by attributing to them a more *than Implicit, an Explicit Faith touching Man's Redemption:* For *Aquinas* ſaith, (*n*) *It is recorded in the* Roman *Hiſtories, that in the time of* Conſtantine *and* Irene *his Mother, a certain Sepulchre was found, wherein a Man lay* (an Heathen Man) *having a Plate of Gold on his Breaſt with this Inſcription,* Chriſtus naſcetur ex Virgine, & ego credo in eum, O Sol, ſub Irenæ & Conſtantini temporibus iterum me videbis; *Chriſt ſhall be born of a Virgin, and I believe on him. O Sun thou ſhalt ſee me again in the times of* Irene *and* Conſtantine. This fabulous Sepulchre is ſuppos'd to be *Plato*'s; but the Legend hath been ſo little believ'd, that ſome have thought of other methods of *Plato*'s Salvation. A Divine of our own thus expreſſeth the Senſe of *Johannes Euchaitenſis* together with his own concerning it. (*o*) *I muſt profeſs my ſelf ſo much raviſh'd with the Morality of that Divine Man's Diſcourſes, that would my Religion permit it, as it will not, I could yet joyn my Devotion to the Petitions of* Johannes Euchaitenſis, *for the Salvation of* Plato *and* Plutarch; *but I am apt to think, that there is no need to pray for that, which for ought I know to the contrary, may be already accompliſh'd.* Some who were unſatisfy'd, that *Plato* had accompliſh'd his Salvation by his own Faith, deſign'd to help him out by their Prayers; but others, becauſe they could not find him a Chriſtian Believer on Earth, they have made him one in Hell; for *Nicetas, out of the Hiſtories of the Fathers,* (as *Petavius* ſaith) reporteth of *Plato,* (*p*) *that being reviled by a certain Chriſtian as improbous and impious, he came in the Night-time to his Reviler, and accus'd the Man as reviling him unjuſtly; for I will not at all deny, that I am a Sinner* (ſaid he) *but when Chriſt deſcended into Hell, none came to the Faith before me.* The like Legendary Accounts we have (*q*) of the Emperour *Trajan.* But ſome of great Learning and Piety, no Friends to Legends, nor guilty of the Vice and Folly of Chriſtianizing groſs Heathens, yet have thought the Condition of ſome of the better ſort of Pagans not deſperate, but that their future Happineſs is hopeful upon account of their Paganical Virtue; and ſome doubt not of the Happineſs of all of them that were ſincere. Touching which Opinion (that carrieth a ſhew of Charity and Goodneſs) I will only ſay; *That our Heathen-ſtate is certainly the ſtate of Death, that all the better ſort of Pagans are ſaveable, if any be ſo; that the meer Paganical Virtue is not available to Salvation; that the Pagans Sincerity is of no better quality than the reſt of their Virtue; that we are apt to have an extravagant eſteem for their Virtue, and every one hopeth well touching his particular Favourite* (ſo ſome of the Learned have expreſſed their hopes (*r*) of *Cicero*'s ſafety, who was far from being ſeriouſly Virtuous, as appeareth from his vile Flattery and Time-ſerving, (*s*) his putting off a groſs Lye with a Jeſt, (*t*) his Office of *Ædile* who exhibited the *Romans Ludos ſanctiſſimos,* his Office of *Augur* inconſiſtent with common Honeſty, his infinite fondneſs of Vain-glory and other Blemiſhes;) but we are incapable of pronouncing any thing touching their future Happineſs, ſave only, *that in reſpect of us and our Notices their Condition is not at all hopeful;* yet not knowing what Tranſactions there may be between God and their Souls, who in external appearance die groſs Heathens; not knowing whether Death rendreth every one's Condition, and particularly theirs who were never try'd with the Goſpel, as remedileſs and deſperate, as it doth theirs, who have been try'd with it and have fruſtrated the Remedy (for it is not Hereſie to doubt of this;) not knowing but that all Ages of the World as well as that Age wherein the Apoſtles preach'd (*Act.* 18. 10.) have afforded many Souls prepar'd for Chriſtianity, touching whom one may doubt, whether they will finally periſh or not; not knowing what their Condemnation will amount to, who have been in all Ages invincibly ignorant of Chriſtianity, and are unconcern'd in the Condemnation which it denounceth againſt *Hypocrites* and *Unbelievers*; ſuch Myſteries of Providence being to us unknown, there is an appearance of grand Indiſcretion in a Chriſtian Biſhop's treatment of an Heathen King of *Frieſland, Rabod* by name, (*u*) who being inſtructed in the Faith of Chriſt by Biſhop *Ulfran,* promis'd to be baptiz'd, and appointed the time and place; where being come and ſtanding in the Water, he ask'd the Biſhop where all his Fore-fathers were, that in former Ages were deceas'd? the Biſhop anſwer'd; that dying without the knowledge of the true God, &c. they were in Hell; then quoth *Rabod,* I hold it better and more praiſe-worthy, to go with the greater Multitude to Hell, than with your few Chriſtians to Heaven, and therewith he went out of the Water unchriſten'd, and return'd both to his wonted Idolatry and to his Evil Life.

(n) 2a. 2æ. Qu. 2. Art. 2. Prideaux Lect. 8.

(o) Remar. relat. to the ſtate of the Ch. of the firſt Cent. p. 141.

(p) Petav. T. 4. par. 2. l. 13. c. 18. S. 9.

(q) Ibid. S. 10. M. Weſtm. an. 605.

(r) Montacut. ſupr. S. 79. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. par. 3. Theſ. 11.

(s) Beroald. in Apul. Aſ. p. 717.

(t) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 2. c. 27. Gat. in Ant. p. 19.

(u) Verſtegan's Antiqu. p. 336.

VII. The Diſpute in the Church about the Heathens Salvation is touching Matter of *Right or of Law* complicated with Matter of Fact. For (to ſay nothing of the *Pelagians* in this place) *Clemens* is ſaid to affirm, (*w*) *That the Greeks were juſtify'd to Salvation by Philoſophy. S. Chryſoſtom* (with whom *Epiphanius* ſymbolizeth) aſſerteth, *That the acknowledgment and ſervice of Chriſt was not requir'd before his coming, it was ſufficient to relinquiſh the Worſhip of Idols, and to acknowledge one only God the Creator.* The common Opinion (which hath prevail'd in the Church) is, *That none ever were or could be juſtify'd and ſav'd without the knowledge of Chriſt and Faith in him*; but ſeveral Pontificians ſay, *That ſuch an Implicit Faith touching Chriſt as is before-mention'd* (abſurdly call'd by that Name) *was ſufficient for the Gentiles.* To reconcile theſe Diſputes (ſo far as they are reconcileable) the words of *J. Mart.* are worth the conſidering, who calleth all the true and genuine kind of Theiſts *Chriſtians* (in a large ſenſe) as being the Chriſtian-kind of Theiſts and Religioniſts. So *Tertullian* citeth the Phraſes that were ordinary in the Heathens Mouths, and which were expreſſive of the one true God, (*x*) as *Teſtimonium Animæ naturaliter Chriſtianæ, a teſtimony that the Soul is in ſome degree naturally a Chriſtian Theiſt.* So S. *Hierom* ſaith, (*y*) *There is in all by nature a notice of God, nor is any born without Chriſt.* In this large Senſe it muſt be acknowledg'd, that the Earth and Heavens, the Sun, Moon and Stars, the Works of Nature and of Providence have always preach'd *Chriſtianiſm* to the World of Heathens; that from the beginning of the World *Chriſtianiſm* hath been the

(w) Montacut. ſupr. S. 44, 45, 62, 64, 65, 79, 80, 86, 97. v. Curcell. de Neceſſ. cognit. Chriſt. S. 36.

(x) Apol. c. 17.

(y) *Naturâ omnibus ineſſe Dei notitiam, nec quenquam ſine Chriſto naſci.* Com. in Gal. 1.

only way to Righteouſneſs and Salvation; for Mankind could never attain them otherwiſe than by being *God's Believers and Religioniſts* (the Men of Faith and faithful Religioniſts,) which is to be in great degree *Chriſt's Believers and Religioniſts*, as this way to Righteouſneſs and Salvation is in great degree Chriſt's Religion, and thus it may be expreſs'd. *The way to Righteouſneſs and Salvation from the beginning of the World was, to be Chriſt's Believers and Religioniſts, ſo far as the being God's Believers and Religioniſts importeth.* If therefore the World of Mankind which was Heathen, had been God's Believers and Religioniſts (ſuch as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *Heb.* 11. 6.) they could not have fail'd of a State of Alliance and Favour, of Righteouſneſs and Salvation (more or leſs perfect;) for God in providing Chriſt had made Proviſion, *that his Divine Believers ſhould be in that Divine Condition.* And as that Divine Condition which Divine Believers in the ancient times enjoy'd, was founded upon Chriſt: So the coming of Chriſt was reveal'd to thoſe Divine Believers, and they had Prophetic Notices of it. But thoſe Prophetic Notices cannot be call'd the way to Remiſſion of Sins and Salvation, they were not propos'd as the Condition of a Treaty and Covenant, nor was the Knowledge of them requir'd of thoſe, to whom they were not at all reveal'd; but different Obligations ariſe from different Revelations. The generality of Mankind in thoſe elder times of the World (antecedently to any Revelation of the Meſſias to them) were no farther oblig'd, to be God's Believers and Religioniſts than according to natural Revelation. And becauſe they were not ſo far his Believers and Religioniſts, the Apoſtle looketh upon them as inexcuſable. *Rom.* 1. 20. for nothing hindred them from being ſuch but their own Wickedneſs (wicked Unwillingneſs or averſeneſs from Godlineſs,) nor could they pretend any other impotency but the *Moral Impotency*, which is not an Excuſe but an Aggravation. *Elſe how ſhall God judge the World?* Rom. 3. 6. If the Exiſtence of God be fairly notic'd to all Mankind (not without, but with ſpecific and individual Determination,) if they do, or may eaſily know, that his being God conſiſteth in having the Rights and Dues of his Godhead (as the being King conſiſteth in having his Rights and Dues, which to bereave him of, is a making him no King;) if they are oblig'd to be virtuous, good, juſt and grateful, and cannot but know, that of Right and by Obligation they are his Liege-People, Subjects and Servants; Mankind muſt neceſſarily be inexcuſable, if they do not *ſerve and glorifie him as God*, and if they become not his Believers and Religioniſts, which is a relinquiſhing their Heatheniſm. The Heathen could not plead, that they were ſo deſtitute of Means, that it was naturally impoſſible, for them to be God's Believers and Religioniſts, or that their becoming ſuch would be in vain; for his Parental Providence towards them demonſtrated, that he had not abandon'd all care and concern for their Welfare. *Act.* 14. 16, 17. *In times paſt he ſuffer'd all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheleſs he left not himſelf without witneſs* (a Teſtimony of his care for their Welfare, and that he had not abandon'd all concern for it, although he ſuffer'd all Nations, to walk in their own ways,) *in that he did good, and gave us Rain from Heaven, and fruitful Seaſons, filling our Hearts with Food and Gladneſs.* 1. Tim. 9. 10. *He is the Saviour of all Men* (taketh care of their Welfare) *eſpecially of thoſe that believe.* His Goodneſs and Patience towards the World of Mankind hath a mighty tendency to their Repentance, and is deſign'd to induce them to it, which is an aſſurance that their Repentance, if not illegitimate, ſhall not be ineffectual; and if God commandeth them the Practice of the Duties of Religion in order to this end, that ſo they may obtain a future Happineſs, they are bound to Believe, that ſuch Practice will not be in vain. *Act.* 17. 26, 27. *They are planted on the face of the Earth, that they ſhould ſeek the Lord, if happily they might feel after him and find him.* Which demonſtrateth God's will and intention to be found of them, if they did faithfully ſeek him, and his willingneſs to be a God to them: Nor is it poſſible, that God ſhould diſown and damn any, that is a faithful Religioniſt towards him; *but in every Nation he that feareth him and worketh Righteouſneſs, is accepted with him. Glory, Honour and Peace to every Man that worketh good, to the Jew firſt, and alſo to the Gentile.* (z) *The Gentiles that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of in this place, are not the Idol-worſhippers, but Gods Worſhippers, that obey the natural Law, that beſides the Judaical Inſtitutes obſerve all things conducive to Piety, ſuch as* Melchiſedek, Job, *the* Ninevites, Cornelius. From which Expoſition of the Apoſtles words by one of the Fathers a true and juſt account may be given of the unanimous Senſe of all the Fathers touching the Heathen Salvation.

Rom. 2. 4.

Act. 10. 35.

Rom. 2. 10.

For S. *Chryſoſtom* is commonly alledg'd (*a*) as a Patron of the Salvation of Heathens, which (as appeareth from his own words) is a very foul and groſs miſtake. *Epiphanius*'s ſenſe is the ſame with *Chryſoſtom*'s, and *Theodoret*'s Expoſition of the Apoſtle's words is exactly the ſame with his. *Origen*'s Expoſition of the place (diſtorting the ſenſe of it) diſtributeth Mankind into three ſorts: To Chriſtians only he allotteth eternal Life; to them that obey not the Truth, but obey Unrighteouſneſs he allotteth Indignation and Wrath; to Jews and Gentiles that do not as yet believe (*nondum credentibus*) yet Work that which is good, he allotteth, Glory, Honour and Peace, that is, a Remuneration. But the Gentiles whom he thinketh worthy of a Remuneration, are only thoſe *that know God and glorifie him as God*, and he inſtanceth particularly in *Cornelius* a Gentile, but a Proſelyte. The Senſe of *Clemens Alexandrinus* hath been much miſtaken; (*b*) for it was not his Opinion, that Philoſophy of it ſelf *juſtified the Greeks to Salvation* (he is ſo far from this Opinion, that he ſuppoſeth, the Gentiles could not be ſaved without Chriſtianity, and therefore Chriſt or his Diſciples went down to Hell, and preach'd the Goſpel to them, and converted ſo many as were fit for Converſion:) But only that the Greek Philoſophy was a foundation laid for the Chriſtian Philoſophy, and the Juſtice which it afforded a ſtep to the Juſtice which is according to Chriſt. Not one of the Fathers therefore is of Opinion, that any of the ἕλληνες εἰδωλολατρεῦντες, *Heathen Idolatrous Religioniſts* were qualified for Salvation; they allow Salvation to no other Gentiles but the ἕλληνες θεοσεβοῦντες, *Gentiles that were God's Believers and Religioniſts* (which is their unanimous Senſe,) *thoſe that*

(z) Ἕλληνας δὲ ἐνταῦθά φησιν, οὐ τοὺς εἰδωλολατρεῦντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοσεβοῦντας, τοὺς τῷ φυσικῷ πειθομένους νόμῳ, τοὺς πλὴν τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν παρατηρήσεων πάντα τὰ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν συντελοῦντα διατηροῦντας· οἷοι ἦσαν οἱ περὶ τὸν Μελχισεδὲκ, οἷος ἦν ὁ Ἰὼβ, οἷοι ἦσαν οἱ Νινευῖται, οἷος ἦν ὁ Κορνήλιος. S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. Λογ. 1.

(a) Montacut. ſupr. S. 71. Prideaux Lect. 8. Curcell. ſupr. S. 36.

(b) Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. Par. 3. Theſ. 11. Petav. T. 4. Par. 2. l. 13. c. 13. Montacut. ſupr. S. 63.

were either really ſuch, or whom they ſuppos'd to be ſuch; for if any of them allow Salvation to any that were ἕλληνες εἰδωλολατρεῦντες, (idolatrous Heathen Religioniſts,) it is through miſtake in Matter of Fact, becauſe they ſuppos'd thoſe Gentiles not to be ſuch Heathens. Touching whoſe Salvation and the method of obtaining it we will only add a wiſe and good Saying of a Divine of our own. (c) *If any amongſt Heathens had done what he could, in ſeeking and ſerving God, he ſhould either for Chriſts ſake have been accepted with that little Knowledge he could attain*; *or elſe* as Calvin *ſaith, Comment*, Act. 8. 13. *Rather than he ſhould have periſhed, God would have ſent an Angel to reveal further things to him.*

(c) *Mr. Truman of Nat. and Mor. Impotency. p. 113. ed. 2.*

VIII. A principal Branch of the deadlineſs of our Heathen State is *our being the Subjects of Satan's Kingdom*; which implieth, that the Heathen World of Mankind were under the Imperial Rule and Domination of Satan (ſeveral ways the Subjects of the Kingdom of Darkneſs) conſtituting his mundane Empire. So the Jews ſay of the Angel of Death (d) *the whole World is in his Power except the Nation of* Iſrael. His uſual Names denote him an Imperial Potentate; for he is ſtiled *the God* (Imperial Potentate) *of this World, the Prince* (that hath the Principality) *of this World.* Himſelf and his Angels are called ἀρχαὶ ϗ ἐξουσίαι, which Names ſpeak them *Principalities and Powers of a mundane Empire*, κοσμοκράτορες, *mundi Potentes, the Rulers*, or ruling Powers of this World. They are therefore mundane Principalities and ruling Powers, but ſuch as are *Aerial-mundane*; for being fallen from the Heavenly Manſions their Reſidence now (e) *is in the Region of the Air*, where they conſtitute amongſt themſelves a Kingdom or Empire conſiſting of lower and higher Orders, ſome being of inferiour and others of ſuperiour Rank and Condition, *Principalities and Powers*, but all of them ſubjected to, and united in one imperial Head, their great Lord and Maſter, *the Prince of Devils, the Prince of the Power*, (or Powers,) *of the Air.* The Wiſdom and Juſtice of Providence by baniſhing them out of Heaven hath plac'd them in the Air, in a Region of vicinity to, and a Station of ſuperiority above Mankind; and accordingly maketh uſe of them, to do the work of *publick Officers* in the Polity of our Syſtem. (f) *As there are Executioners in Cities, and ſuch as are ſet over ſad but neceſſary buſineſſes in Commonwealths: So evil Demons are ſet over certain Affairs by him that adminiſtreth all things.* But this Power which the evil Demons exerciſe over Mankind (by divine *Conceſſion*, by a probational or penal Tradition of Men into their hands and ſometimes by divine mandate and appointment) is rather *Miniſterial* than *Imperial.* 2 *Chron.* 18. 20, 21. *Job* 1. 12. and 2. 6. *Pſal.* 78. 49. *Matth.* 5. 25. and 18. 34. *Luc.* 22. 31. 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. and 10. 10. 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. *Apoc.* 12. 10. Beſides this Power of meer *Officers* and *Executioners* they have acquir'd a Power of Empire and Sovereignty over Mankind; which Power is (morally ſpeaking) in great degree unavoidable ſuppoſing their evil Neighbourhood to degenerate Mankind. For as theſe Aerial Powers are in place and ſtation ſuperiour to Mankind: So their Spiritual Nature, Angelical Order, Policy and Strength is ſuperiour to the Human (Spiritual unbody'd Wickedneſs is paramount to ſorry weak Fleſh and Blood;) they are alſo vaſtly numerous and cloſely united amongſt themſelves (which addeth to their Power,) and therefore if not confin'd by an higher Power they can Domineer and Lord it over Mankind, and doubtleſs they want not will to do it, ſeeing Empire and Dominion is their great Intereſt, Deſign and Buſineſs, Strength with them is the Law of Juſtice, and therefore as amongſt the Brute-animals the ſtronger beareth Rule over the weaker, ſo the ſtronger wicked Angels will have the Maſtery and bear Rule over the weaker wicked Mankind, *menſuraque juris vis erit.* They are alſo the moſt accompliſh'd Tempters imaginable, and have the greateſt advantages to make Mankind wicked (of themſelves prevalently prone to be wicked;) for they are not wanting in depth of Malice, in great intellectual Abilities, in knowledge of us and our Affairs, in large experience, cunning and dexterity, activity and aſſiduous Diligence, Hypocriſie, Impoſture, Cloſeneſs and Secrecy, in variety of Methods and Artifices; they are furniſh'd with all ſorts of Agents and Inſtruments, aſſiſted with the World's tempting Objects, and with the many and great weakneſſes and vicioſities of Man's Nature; in their Temptations they are mighty in Operation, (*working efficaciouſly, with ſtrong deluſions, carrying captive,*) ſometimes acting the Fox, and ſometimes the roaring Lion, ſometimes the old Serpent, and ſometimes the bloody red Dragon; upon all which accounts what can be reaſonably imagin'd, but that they will inveigle and vanquiſh the World of Mankind, and ſubject them to live under their Domination? As the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, *Apoc.* 12. 9. *The old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, deceiveth the whole World.* The Heathen World therefore muſt be contemplated *as Satan's mundane Empire*, which he reigned over as an *Imperial Potentate*, and which was ſubject to his Rule and Domination; whence it is plain, that his magnificent pretenſion to our Saviour was not altogether groundleſs or devoid of Truth, *that the Kingdoms of the World the Power and Glory of them was his and at his diſpoſal.* (And hence (g) S. *Hilary* taketh the boldneſs to ſay of mundane Kings *à Diabolo in regnum ſunt deputati.*) Apoc. 13. 2. *The bloody red Dragon* (the Pagano-Roman Beaſt) maketh the *Panther-like Beaſt* (the Pagano-Chriſtian Roman Beaſt) his Succeſſor, and is ſaid to give him *his Power and Seat and great Authority.* So the Devil and his Angels are ſtiled, *Eph.* 6. 12. *the Rulers of the Darkneſs of this World*, to ſignifie, that they are the Rulers of that Darkneſs which Heatheniſm is, and conſequently of the dark benighted Heathen World. Agreeably whereunto the Doctor of the Gentiles is ſent to them upon this Errand, *to open their Eyes, and to turn them from Darkneſs to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God*, Act. 26. 18. So the Converts to Chriſtianity (that were tranſlated into the Kingdom of God's dear Son) are ſaid to *be deliver'd from the Power of Darkneſs*, to which they were ſubject, *Col.* 1. 13. But this Subjection to the *Power of Darkneſs* is not to be confin'd to Heathens commonly ſo called, it is the common Condition of Mankind in general antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion, as will appear from an enumeration of the ſeveral ways, whereby Mankind are ſubjected to Satan's Kingdom and Domination,

(d) *Lightfoot Hor. in Joh.* 12. 31.

2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Joh.* 12. 31. *and* 14. 30. *and* 16. 11. *Rom.* 8. 38. 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. *Eph.* 6. 12. *Col.* 2. 15.

(e) Ἀερίων ϗ ἐπιγείων πνευμάτων. Ignat. Ep. ad Epheſ.

Matth. 9. 34. *Eph.* 2. 2.

(f) Ὡς οἱ δήμιοι ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι ϗ οἱ τεταγμένοι ἐπὶ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν μὲν, ἀναγκαίων δὲ, ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις πραγμάτων, οὕτως εἰσὶ τεταγμένοι μοχθηροὶ δαίμονες ἐπί τινων ὑπὸ τοῦ διοικοῦντος τὰ ὅλα. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 338. v. p. 398.

Eph. 6. 12.

Eph. 2. 2. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 11. 2 *Tim.* 3. 26.

Luc. 4. 5, 6.

(g) *Enarr. in Pſal.* 2. *p. m.* 451.

which are theſe *three* : *By way of penal Subjection, by may of criminal Subjection, By way of criminal-religious Subjection.*

IX. All Mankind (antecedently to their being true and ſaving Religioniſts) belong to Satan's Kingdom and are under his Domination *by way of penal Subjection.* For the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 2. 14. expreſly attributeth to the Devil the Power or Empire of Death (τὸ κράτος) as his Empire. Which is an Empire agreeable to his Name *Apollyon*, and to thoſe Names which the Jews give him, אשמודי *the Deſtroyer*, *Angelus Mortis*, *the Angel of Death.* This Empire of Death, which the Apoſtle attributeth to the Devil, *Chriſt died to deſtroy*; therefore it muſt not be underſtood of temporal Calamities and bodily Death only: But principally of the penal Death of the Soul, which is Death everlaſting. Antecedently to Chriſts deſtroying his Empire, he had over Mankind dying in their Sins and in the State of Death and Condemnation this deadly Imperial Power, *a Power to detain them* under *his Power*, which is Death everlaſting. And becauſe he had this Branch of his Imperial Power by *the Law-ſettlement*, therefore a principal Branch of his Empire was not by meer Uſurpation, but ſo by Uſurpation, as to be withal by Law-authority. It was by a Power accruing to him from *the Law-ſettlement*, which is the Settlement of the Penal State of Death upon ungodly Sinners and deadly Criminals (all whoſe Sins are upon them,) that the Devil had Power to detain them under his Power after Death, and from the ſame Law-ſettlement he had Power, to detain them under his Power in their Life-time (ſo long as they continu'd ungodly Sinners, and if God in Chriſt had not made Proviſion for their Liberation;) this being the State of Death, *to belong to his Kingdom, and ſo to be under his Domination and Power.* Therefore they that are in the State of Death do belong to his Kingdom and are under his Domination and Power by Law. They that muſt be detain'd in the State of Death, muſt continue to belong to his Kingdom, and muſt be detain'd under his Domination and Power by Law. If without a Redemption-liberation by Chriſt Mankind would have remain'd in the State of Death, then without this Redemption-liberation they would have remain'd under Satan's Domination and Power by Law. So far as Chriſt hath redeem'd them from being in the State of Death, ſo far he hath redeem'd them from being under Satan's Domination and Power by Law either in this Life or after their Death. From which plain and intelligible explication of a principal Branch of the State of Death the *Collect for Eaſter-day* in our Engliſh Liturgy becometh plain and intelligible: *Almighty God, who through thine only begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt, haſt overcome Death, and opened unto us the Gate of everlaſting Life.* —— The Apoſtle's triumphant account of Chriſt's Victory upon the Croſs becometh eaſie and intelligible (which otherwiſe is unintelligible) *Col.* 2. 15. *Having ſpoiled Principalities and Powers, he made a ſhew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.* (h) *All we were under Sin and Puniſhment, he being puniſh'd diſſolv'd both the Sin and Puniſhment.*

Vid. Macar Hom. 22.

Not only the Souls of Men, but their Bodies alſo are penally ſubjected to Satan's Domination and Power, as appeareth from unqueſtionable Inſtances *of diabolical Poſſeſſions and Infeſtations of the Body*, which have great Analogy and Agreement with Temptations of the Soul. For as all Temptations (according to S. *Chryſoſtom*) are not from the Devil: So bodily Diſeaſes ordinarily are from Natural Cauſes. The evil Demons are of various kinds, adapted to various Imployments, and as their Temptations are various, ſo are the Impreſſions which they make, and the Diſeaſes which they produce in an Human Body. As ſome by their Wickedneſs of Nature tempt the Tempter, invite and draw wicked Spirits to aſſociate with them: So ſome are of ſuch a diſpoſition of Mind and Body, that evil Demons as naturally enter into and inhabit them, as the Form entreth the prepared Matter, or as in Peſtilential times People that are prediſpos'd catch the Contagion. Sometimes it is not diſcernable, whether a Temptation be meerly from depraved Nature, or in part Diabolical (who knoweth *quid cordi, quid hoſti tribuat, what to charge upon his own Heart, and what upon the Tempter?*) So in ſome Caſes it is not by us diſcernable, whether a Diſeaſe of Mind and Body be meerly Natural, or in part Diabolical; and therefore Diabolical Poſſeſſion and Infeſtation is a matter liable both to wilful Impoſture and innocent Miſtake. But as ſome Temptations are manifeſtly Satan's Suggeſtions, and have the Marks and Characters of a Diabolical Original: So in ſome that are diſtemper'd in Mind and Body there are evident Marks and Characters of a Diabolical Poſſeſſion and Infeſtation; as when they ſpeak Latin, Greek or Hebrew, which they never learn'd, tell People their Secrets, diſcover ſuch things done at a diſtance, and things to come, which are beyond Human Cogniſance, or when they are oppreſs'd, afflicted, abuſed in meaſure and manner beyond the reach of Natural Cauſes, or when from the Nature, Symptoms, Cauſes and Circumſtances of a Diſtemper it plainly appeareth to be nothing better than a Diabolical Poſſeſſion and Infeſtation. By theſe Indications *Demoniacks* and *Energumeni* (Men acted by an evil Spirit) are diſcernable by us, who have no extraordinary Faculty of diſcerning them: But as the Jews in the latter times of their Commonwealth were much addicted to Magick, (i) ſo in thoſe times they had their Magical Exorciſts (ſome of their Exorciſts were of a better Character,) who had an extraordinary Faculty of diſcerning *Demons* and *Demoniacks.* And theſe Magical Exorciſts ſet up a Trade of diſcovering and curing *Demoniacks*; which is an Argument, that they very much abounded in thoſe Magical times. As Ignorance, Atheiſm, Fanaticiſm and Witchcraft, (with other Vices and Diſeaſes) abound much more in ſome times than in others, ſo do Diabolical Poſſeſſions and Infeſtations; which Providence might permit to abound about our Saviour's time, to give occaſion for his glorious Miracles. If they had not abounded in thoſe times, it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Jews would generally have entertain'd this Opinion, (k) that their more grievous Diſeaſes were from the operation of evil Demons or complicated with them. Which Judaical Notion is ſo far entertain'd by the Phyſicians of our own Nation, that of the common Opinion, which is, that the Devil doth *immiſcere ſe in ſeveral Diſeaſes* (l) *Sir* Theodore Mayern *gave a notable Inſtance, concerning a Maid in his Houſe, that had been bitten by a mad Dog, who alſo died of it: to whom when he came in a Morning with*

S. Bernard.

a

(h) Πάντες ἦμεν ὑφ᾽ ἁμαρτίαν ϗ κόλασιν, αὐτὸς κολασθεὶς ἔλυσε ϗ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ϗ τὴν κόλασιν. S.Chryſoſt. in loc.

(i) V. Dr. Hammond on Matth. 12. 27. Spencer in Orig. c. Celſ. p. 17, 18.

(k) Lightfoot Hor. in Matth. 17. 15. & in Luc. 13. 11.

(l) Dr. Mer. Caſaubon of Credul. and Incredul. p. 3

a Looking-glaſs (to make trial of what he had read, but not yet experienc'd himſelf) under his Gown, before he was in the Room, ſhe began to cry out, and told him what it was he had about him. Another ſaith of the *Epilepſie*; (m) *Indeed in this Diſtemper there appear ſo obſcure footſteps or rather none at all of a morbific Matter, that we may deſervedly ſuſpect here the Afflation of a maleficent Spirit.* The much greater part and more eminent ſort of Demoniacks which our Saviour had to do with (though not the only) were *Epileptical, Melancholical, Lunatic* and *Maniacal* Perſons (as appeareth from the Goſpel,) whoſe horrible Diſtempers were either originally caus'd by or complicated with evil Demons. He gave a demonſtration both of his Divine Goodneſs and Power in giving them relief from their hideous Calamities, reſcuing them from under the Domination and Power of the infernal Goblings, beating Satan out of his Quarters, vanquiſhing him in his own Territories, and therefore the Apoſtle's celebrate him for this Godlike Atchievement. *Act.* 10. 38. *He went about doing good and healing all that were oppreſs'd of the Devil.* His Diſciples experimented the Divinity of his Power, and that his Empire was ſuperior to the Diabolical; and therefore after he had ſent them abroad, they returned to him with Exultation and Triumph, *Luk.* 10. 17. *Lord, even the Devils are ſubject unto us through thy Name.*

X. All Mankind (antecedently to their being true and ſaving Religioniſts) belong to Satan's Kingdom, and are under his Domination and Rule *by way of criminal Subjection.* For in this Senſe the Fathers ſay, (n) *The evil and apoſtate Demons got for their ſhare the Inhabitants of the Earth.* Atheous Mankind muſt not think, to live alone out of the State of Society with the inviſible World. The Devil's uſual Name, *the wicked and evil One*, denoteth him the Prince or Chieftain of all wicked and evil Ones. They are his Partiſans and Societiſts, he is the Head of their Party, the Leader and they are the Followers (*that are turned aſide after Satan,*) the Ring-leader that began the wild Riſque of ſinning againſt God, and they dance after his Pipe. He ſounded the Trump of Rebellion, and all Rebel-ſinners conſort with him and are his Fellow-Rebels. (o) *He ruleth the Men and Nations that do his Will.* He ruleth them in making them atheous and wicked, and when they become ſuch, their Life is an obeying, pleaſing him, doing him Service, *and his Servants they are, to whom they obey.* His Rule and Empire therefore is commenſurate with the Reign of Sin, and is no leſs invincible. He reigneth and is in Empire and Domination over all Mankind, over whom Sin reigneth; and *his Kingdom* (the comprehenſion of all that are his as his Portion and peculiar Poſſeſſion,) is (p) *the City, that is the Society, of the impious.* He is the imperant Party (that hath the Rule,) wicked Men and Angels are the ſubject Party; he is the General, theſe are his Army; occaſionally they are his Agents imploy'd in his Affairs, and they are the Adherents to his Cauſe and Intereſt, which is Sin and Impiety; for where Wickedneſs prevaileth and reigneth, there he prevaileth and reigneth, and there his Throne is, *Apoc.* 2. 13. The World therefore that *lieth in Wickedneſs*, lieth ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ, *in the wicked One*, as many would have the words rendred. 1 *Joh.* 5. 19. For as they that are in Chriſtianiſm of Life, are in Chriſt, becauſe they are in that ſpecific Comprehenſion of things, which Chriſt is of as the imperial Eſtate thereof; they that are Theiſm of Life, are in God (their Works are wrought in God:) So they that are in Diaboliſm of Life and Practice, are *in the wicked One*, becauſe they are in that ſpecific Comprehenſion of Darkneſs and Wickedneſs, which the Devil is of as the imperial Eſtate thereof. His Empire is the Kingdom of Wickedneſs and of the wicked (which ſheweth the Extent and Boundary of it;) therefore *the whole wicked World* belongeth to his Empire. So far they are under his Rule and Domination, he governeth their Life and Praſtice (and therefore governeth them,) he maketh them to do what he would have them to do, to be what he would have them to be, and what himſelf eminently is, *atheouſly dark, vitally black, ugly and horrid,* (q) *poiſonouſly malevolent, deadly inimical to Goodneſs, enormouſly ſelfiſh, proud, ambitious, imperious, ſcornful, hurtful, ferine, murtherous, lying, treacherous, unclean, brutiſh, worldly in Diſpoſition and Practice.* They walk *according to the Prince of the Power of the Air* (walking according to the courſe of this World,) which Prince and Power taken collectively are *a Spirit mightily operative in the Sons of Diſobedience* by way of Inſpiration, Afflation, internal Motion, Perſwaſion and Suggeſtion. *Eph.* 2. 2, 3. They are animated by the Agency of that *great One that is in the World* (and *Origen* thinketh, (r) that the Chriſtians Perſecutors had Souls full of evil Demons;) they are therefore a ſort of *Energumeni*, that are acted by a Diabolical Spirit; for ſo Satan governeth their Life and Practice; not only by tempting Objects, external Agents and Means, but by internal Operation, *blinding the Mind, putting into the Heart, filling the Heart*, prevalently inſtigating them to atheous Conceits and Opinions (which are of his Motion and Inſpiration) to vile and nefarious Affections, Paſſions and Practices, (s) and a μαινόμενον ϛόμα, *mad raging Mouth*; averting them from Holineſs and their true Happineſs, prompting, perſwading and deceiving them to Sin and Wickedneſs (to their ruin,) ſometimes impelling them into the fire of Luſt, and ſometimes into the water of Drunkenneſs (*Matth.* 17. 15.) for they are not only in Servitude under Sin, but alſo in Servitude, Bondage and Vaſſalage under the wicked One. 2 *Pet.* 2. 19. *Of whom a Man is overcome, of the ſame is he brought in Bondage.* He hath overcome them, when he hath drawn them into any courſe of Wickedneſs, they are then in a Snare of the Devil, and are as Captives to a Conqueror (ἐζωγρημένοι, 2 *Tim.* 2. 26.) as Slaves to a Maſter, he hath them in Poſſeſſion and hath them for an Habition, *Matth.* 12. 43. Like a mighty *Pharaoh* he commandeth them, and commandeth over them with reigning prevalent Power and Puiſſance, whereby they are enthrall'd and enſlav'd; he putteth upon them the vileſt Practices, the baſeſt and moſt painful Drudgeries, and they ſerve and obey (not conſidering what a Maſter they ſerve, uſually deſigning only to ſerve their own Luſts, in the fury whereof he hurrieth them like the Swine to Perdition;) they are ſubjected to his

ruling

Matth. 13. 19. 1 *Joh.* 2. 13. 1 *Tim.* 5. 15.

1 *Joh* 4. 4.

2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Joh.* 13. 2. *Act.* 5. 3.

(m) *Revera in hoc affectu materiæ morbificæ adeo obſcura aut prorſus nulla veſtigia apparent, ut meritò hic Spiritus malefici afflatum ſuſpicemur.* Dr Willis Pathol. Cerebr. cap. 2.

(n) Διεμοιρήσαντο μὲν τὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οἱ πονηροί τε καὶ ἀποϛάται δαίμονες. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 150.

(o) *Imperat Nationibus voluntatem ejus facientibus.* S. Ambr. Hexaem. l. 1. c. 4.

(p) *Civitas, hoc eſt, Societas impiorum.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 9.

(q) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 7. *c.* 16.

(r) *C. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 406.

(s) *Jambl. de myſt. S.* 3. *c.* 31. *Gale not. p.* 224.

ruling Policy and Power, and are in the Condition of Bondſlaves in his Kingdom. (t) *Men are the work of God in as much as they are Men; but in as much as they are Sinners, they are under the Devil.*

They are alſo in various degrees and meaſures *the Children of the wicked one*, originally and of kind and quality they are *of the wicked one*, of the Devil *as the Father of their Family*, a *Serpentine* Brood and Race, *diabolici generis* (of the Diabolical Kind and Kindred) as Martial Men are the Sons of *Mars*, and Phyſicians are the Sons of *Æſculapius*, of the ſame Alliance and Cognation are all Evil Ones to the Evil One. They muſt refer their Original (as the ancient *Gauls* (u) did) *ad Ditem*, *unto* Pluto, the oldeſt in Wickedneſs and wicked to the height of being ſo, who is the Head of their Anceſtry and Alliance, the top of their Kin, and Father of their Diſpoſition and Practice, the maker of a World of Sinners (as ſuch) the Founder of their Race, the Inventor of their ſinning Trade; they ſymbolize with him and are of his Genius and Humour, of his Footmark and Phyſiognomy; as Children are of a Father, ſo are they his living Images, and reſemble him in rebellious ſinning againſt God, which is his *Diabolism*, 1 Joh. 3. 8. *He that committeth Sin* (is a committer of Sin) *is of the Devil; for the Devil ſinneth from the beginning*; the meaning whereof is, *that he is the Father of the ſinning Family, and that ſinning is peculiarly his kind of thing.* The deadly ſinning Family muſt not think themſelves injur'd, if they are denominated *the Mankind of Ophites* and the *Juniour Satanians*, of the ſame Kingdom, Kind and Family with the Seniour Diaboliſts and Satanians (w) *Every one that chuſeth Wickedneſs and followeth the Life which is according to it, he doing the contraries to Virtue, is a Satan, that is, an Adverſary to the Son of God.* (x) *In ſinning he chuſeth the ſame things with the Demons, and thereby becometh a Demonic Man. In thy Execrations,* ſaith *Tertullian* to an Heathen, (y) *a Man of Uncleanneſs, Malicionſneſs, Inſolence, or other Blemiſh which we attribute to Devils, is called Devil.* The ſting of this Reproach is the truth of it; for our Saviour ſaith of a nefarious Miſcreant amongſt his Diſciples, *Have not I choſen you twelve, and one of you is a Devil?* Joh. 6. 70. Such is *a Son of Belial* (for Belial is one of Satan's Names, 2 *Cor.* 6. 15.) and ſuch are *the Children of the wicked one* (in various degrees) and all that belong to the Synagogue of Satan, who are neceſſarily under his Domination *by way of Criminal Subjection.* (z) *Man in the time of his Infidelity, and of his Sins ariſing from Infidelity is under the Angels of Satan, the malignant Spirits and unclean Devils.*

XI. Almoſt the whole World of Mankind was ſometime under Satan's Domination and Power by way of *Criminal-Religious Subjection*, as being the Religioniſts of his Inſtitution and his Religious Worſhipers. One ſort of theſe Diabolical Religioniſts are *Witches* and *Magicians*, (that do Religious Worſhip to the Devil or to ſome principal Officers of his Kingdom;) for theſe are ſo uſual in all Countries, their Exiſtence is ſo well atteſted by common Experience, and by Perſons of unqueſtionable Learning and Veracity, ſo acknowledg'd by Heathens, by all wiſe Laws and Governments, and by the Holy Scriptures, is of Theory ſo unexceptionably rational, and the Objections againſt it are ſo trifling and inconſiderable, that it can be nothing but diſaffection to Religion, which cauſeth any to deny their Exiſtence, the confident Exploders of Witches muſt be (worſe than Heathens) either *Seniour or Youngling Atheiſts*, which will be *no Believers* (in a virtuous ſenſe,) yet are the moſt ſuperlative Believers; for they believe the groſſeſt Abſurdities, and may juſtly be denominated *the Non-ſenſe Believers.* Another inſtance of Diabolical Religioniſts are the *Heretical-Pagan Gnoſticks*, that infeſted the Primitive Church, who not only (like other Magicians) aſſociated themſelves and confederated with the Devil, but they alſo excogitated a Recondite-Theology and Religion, which was *Magick* and *Demonolatry*, a doing Religious Worſhip to certain Principalities which they allotted to their fictitious Heavens (a) *Ialdabaoth*, *Thauthabaoth*, *Thartharaoth*, and ſuch more. Some Branches of them upon the account of their Religious Worſhip were called *Ophitæ*, *Serpent-worſhippers*; *Sataniani*, *Satan's Religioniſts*; which is the heavy Character of the whole World of Heathen Religioniſts, as appeareth from the Hiſtorical Accounts of Heathen Countries, from their Theology and Religion, from the nature of Chriſtianity and the ſenſe of all Chriſtians, and from this Teſtimony of Holy Scripture, which is the acknowledgment of ſeveral Learned Pagans and the Heretical Pagans alſo, *That what the Gentiles and the Gentilizing Iſraelites ſacrific'd, they ſacrific'd to Devils, not to God*; Levit. 17. 7. Deut. 32. 17. Pſal. 106. 37. 1 Cor. 10. 20. (b) *We have determin'd to eſchew as Perdition the worſhip of Demons* (or Devils,) *and we affirm, that all the ſuppos'd God-worſhip of the Greeks, which is converſant about Altars, Statues and Temples, is the worſhip of Devils.* (c) *The worſhip of thoſe whom the Gentiles call Gods, is the worſhip of Evil Demons.* The Chriſtians uſually call their Doctrines, (d) *Doctrines of Devils*, their Altars (e) *the Devil's Altars*, the Crown wherewith their Altars, Sacrifices, Prieſts (and Doors alſo) were adorn'd, (f) *the Devil's Crown*, their Prieſts (g) *the Devil's Prieſts*, their Religion (h) *the Devil's Inſtitution*, their Inſpirations, Afflations and Methods of Divination (i) *Diabolical*, their Sacrifices (k) *the Food and Delight of Devils*, their Gods (l) *abominable and unclean Demons, improbous Spirits that are God's Adverſaries*; their Oracles (m) *the Oracles of deceiving impoſtorous Demons*, their Feſtivals, Prayers, Hymns, Praiſes, Oblations, Thank-offerings (n) *not Services to God at all, but to improbous deteſtable Demons, to whom alſo their Temples were erected*; the lighting of Candles and all things that were done in honour of their Idols, their Amulets and Inſcriptions on Leaves

---

(t) *Homines opus ſunt Dei in quantum homines ſunt; ſed ſub Diabolo ſunt, in quantum peccatores ſunt.* S. Aug. contr. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 1. c. 18.

Matt. 3. 7. *and* 13. 38. *and* 23. 33. *Joh.* 8. 44. 1 *Joh.* 3. 8, 10.

(u) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 62.

Gen. 4. 31.

(w) Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ τὴν κακίαν ἑλόμενος, καὶ τὸν κατ' αὐτὴν βίον, ὡς τὰ ἐναντία πράττων τῇ ἀρετῇ, Σατανᾶς ἐστι, τουτέστιν ἀντικείμενος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 306.

(x) Τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ τοῖς δαιμονίοις κατὰ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν αἱρούμενος —— Γίνεται ἄνθρωπος δαιμονικός. *Clem. Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 438.

(y) *Dæmonium vocas hominem aut immunditia, aut malitia, aut inſolentia, aut quacunque macula* (affectum) *quam nos Dæmoniis deputamus.* Tertull. de Teſt. An. c. 3.

(z) *Eſt homo quidem in tempore infidelitatis ſuæ & peccatorum ſuorum ex infidelitate naſcentium ſub Angelis Satanæ & ſpiritibus malignis & immundis dæmoniis.* Origen. ap. Spencer. Not. in Orig. c. Celſ. p. 82.

(a) Spence ſupr. p. &c.

(b) Διὸ δέδοκται ἡμῖν φεύγειν ὡς ὄλεθρον τὴν τῶν δαιμόνων θεραπείαν· δαιμόνων δὲ θεραπείαν εἶναί φαμεν πᾶσαν τὴν νομιζομένην παρ' Ἕλλησι περὶ βωμοὺς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ ναοὺς θεῶν θρησκείαν. Orig. c. *Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 378, 373.

(c) Θεραπεία δαιμόνων ἐστὶν ἡ θεραπεία τῶν ὀνομαζομένων θεῶν. *Ibid.*

(d) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 14. c. 9.

(e) S. Cyp. Ep. 52.

(f) Idem de Lapſis.

(g) Tertull. de exhort. caſt. c. 13. S. Aug. enar. in Pſ. 94.

(h) Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l. c. 16. Gr. Naz. or. 3. p. 547.

(i) S. Cypr. de Idol. van.

(k) P. Pantin. not. de vit. Thecl. p. 381. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 125.

(l) Ibid. & Euſeb. ſupr. l. 4. c. 4. Lactant. l. 2. c. 15. Jul. Firmic. de err. prof. rel. p. 42, 44.

(m) Euſeb. ſupr. l. 3. c. 17. & l. 4. & l. 5. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p.

(n) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 121, 124.

(*o*) λατρεία τȣ̃ διαβόλȣ, *the worſhip of the Devil*; their Games, Spectacles, ſplendid Shews, and the like Vanity (*p*) πομπὴ τȣ̃ διαβόλȣ, *the Devil's Pomp*. Agreeable whereunto is that Deſcription of Heatheniſm compris'd in our abrenunciation of it at our Chriſtian Baptiſm (which was anciently in moſt places larger than it is now,) *I renounce Satan and his Angels, and all his Works and his Pomps* (the Expreſſion anciently was not *the Pomps of the World*, but *the Devil's Pomps*) *and all his Worſhip*. So the Apoſtle confronteth and oppoſeth *the Cup and Table of the Lord to the Cup and Table of Devils* in the Heathen Idol-Feaſts, 1 *Cor.* 10. 21. So the Pagano-Roman Empire is ſaid to be (*q*) *Satanæ principi ejuſque Angelis Dæmonibus, religionis nomine ſubditum, ſubjected to Satan the Chieftain, and to his Angels the Demons by way of Criminal-Religious Subjection*; by the Holy Ghoſt it is repreſented as *a Demonarchy* (Satan and his Angels were in reigning Condition, whilſt Paganiſm flouriſh'd, but Chriſtianity threw them down, *Apoc.* 12. 8.) and all that Empire's Idol-worſhip is ſtiled *the Worſhip of Devils*, *Apoc.* 9. 20. Chriſtianity therefore ſuppoſeth, that the World of Heathens through their own Weakneſs and Wickedneſs, and the Artifices of Satan (Viſions, Prodigies, (*r*) Oracles, Vaticinations, Healings and moving the Images,) were ſeduc'd into an Opinion, that the improbous Demons were Gods, (*s*) that they proſtituted their Souls, to be corrupted by them, (*t*) were enſlav'd to them and ſubjected to their Domination and Power as the Religioniſts of Satan, who had at *Rome* and in other places as it were his Imperial Seat and Throne, *Apoc.* 2. 13. and 13. 2. The Infants of the Heathen are call'd by *Tertullian*, (*u*) *genimina dæmoniorum candidata*, becauſe the Heathen from their birth by multifarious idolatrous Rites were dedicated to Evil Demons. Theſe they invited, to be the Inmates and Inhabitants of their Souls; theſe they deputed to be the Guardians of their Life: To theſe they attributed a Mundane Preſidency, pay'd the Divine Honours and a Religious Subjection, managing both their Civil and Religious Affairs by their Conduct. And ſo abſolute and univerſal was the Reign and Domination of Satan in this World, that in ſome ancient forms of *Abrenunciation* at Baptiſm, it is called *his World*. (*w*) *Renuncio Satanæ & Mundo ejus.* Some *Abrenunciations* were of this form; (*x*) *Renuncio tibi & pompæ tuæ, & vitiis tuis, & mundo qui in maligno poſitus eſt, I renounce thee* (the Prince of this World) *and thy Pomps, and thy Vices, and the World which lieth in the Wicked One.*

Not only the Chriſtian Church, but the *Gnoſtick* Hereſie in ſome ſort ſuppoſeth the Domination of Satan over this World (of which near two third Parts are ſaid to be at this Day groſs Heathen Idolaters;) for in their Scheme of Powers (*y*) *Diabolus* hath a place, and they called him κοσμοκράτορα, *Ruler of the World*. And in the Dialogue againſt the *Marcionites* (by ſome attributed to *Origen*) *Marcion* is repreſented as holding three Principles; (*z*) One is ἡ ἀγαθὴ ἀρχὴ, *the good Principle, the Father of Chriſt, which preſideth over the Chriſtians*: Another is ἡ δημιουργικὴ, *the Demiurgic Principle which made the World and preſided over the Jews*: A third is ἡ πονηρὰ, *the Evil Principle which preſideth over the Gentile*. The Learned Writers of the Gentiles do not only inform us, (*a*) that they worſhipp'd *Arimanius, Cacodæmones, Vejoves*, whom they knew to be Evil Spirits; but ſome of their Learned Theologers were of Opinion, that a conſiderable part of their Religion was the Religion of Evil Demons, whom the generality of the Pagans ignorantly worſhipp'd. (*b*) *Porphyry* diſcourſeth at large of Evil Demons, of their Religious Worſhip amongſt the Pagans, and of their delight in Cruentous Sacrifices. *Plutarch* diſcourſeth, that the Order of Demons is obnoxious to Paſſion, and of Brutal Affections, which are Properties (*c*) *of which there are footſteps and marks in their Sacrifices and Myſteries*. And having enumerated ſeveral Rites of their Religion, *the tearing and devouring raw Fleſh, and other Diſcerptions, Howlings, Obſcene Speeches in their Sacra, Madneſſes excited with noiſe and jactation of the Neck*, he ſaith of them, (*d*) *They are not the Worſhip of any of the Gods, but are inſtituted, to ſweeten and placate Evil Demons.* Theſe Acknowledgments of Learned Pagans are great approaches to the Chriſtian Hypotheſis (that the Heathen World were Satan's Religioniſts, the Religioniſts of his Mundane Empire) of the truth whereof there are many plain Appearances in the Religion of Paganiſm, we will content our ſelves to remark ſome of the moſt conſiderable of them.

(o) *Cyril. Catechiſm. p.* 229.

(p) *Ibid.*

(q) *Mr. Mede Clav. Apoc. ad c.* 6, 11.

(r) *Euſeb. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *l.* 7. *c.* 16.

(s) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 19. *c.* 25.

(t) *Idem c. Jul. l.* 4. *c.* 3. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 5. *p.* 172.

(u) *De Anim. c.* 39.

(w) *Mr. Mede Clav. Apoc. ad c.* 14. 1.

(x) *Dr. Hammond paræn. c.* 2. *S.* 15.

(y) *Spencer. not. in Orig. p.* 77.

(z) *P.* 4.

(a) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 4. *S.* 3. *Windet. de vit. funct. S.* 3.

(b) *De Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 42, 43.

(c) Ὧν ἴχνη καὶ σύμβολα πολλαχȣ̃ θυσίαι καὶ τελεταὶ σώζȣσι. *De orac. def. p.* 417.

(d) Θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ, δαιμόνων δὲ φαύλων ἀποτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ' ἂν τελεῖν μειλίχια καὶ παραμύθια. *Ibid.*

CHAP. VIII.

1. *In Paganiſm there is a plain appearance of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire in the Character and Quality of its Supreme Deity.* 2. *In the Character and Quality of its Supreme Deity conſider'd as conjunct with the Subordinate Deities.* 3. *In the Pagans mighty Veneration of Serpents.* 4. *In their* ἀνθρωποθυσίαι, *Humane Sacrifices.* 5. *In their Sorcery and Wizzardiſm reported by the Scriptures and by the Pagans themſelves, who ſo far miſtook it, that they counted much of Diabolical Magick innocent and laudable Practice.* 6. *Of the Univerſal Empire and Domination of Magick in Paganiſm.* 7. *Of the Pagans Inchantments.* 8. *Of their Inchantments, Spells and Charms procuring Good and averting Evil.* 9. *Of their Medical Inchantments, Spells and Charms.* 10. *Of their univerſal addictedneſs to Divination.* 11. *Of their Modes of Divination that were Magick.* 12. *Other Modes of Divination of the ſame nature.* 13. *Of the Divinatory Enthuſiaſm and Magical Statues.* 14. *That the Pagan Religion was Magick in many reſpects.* 15. *Of the Jews, Muhammedans and pretended Chriſtians Magick.* 16. *A Sixth plain appearance of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire in the Magick of the Philoſophic Pagans, that were Magical Saintiſts.* 17. *Of* Socrates *and the Platoniſts, that they were Magical Saintiſts.*

I. THE Learned *Origen* (although his Antipathy againſt the Popular-Pagan Theiſm is laudable Piety, yet) is culpably deficient in his reaſonings againſt *the Pagan Jove, whoſe Character and Quality is one plain appearance of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire.* (*e*) *Celſus* ſuppoſeth it a matter of Indifferency, whether we call the Supreme God *Dia* or *Zena* as the *Greeks*, *Adonai* or *Sabaoth* as the *Hebrews*, *Ammoun* as the *Egyptians*, or as the *Scythians Pappæus*. *Origen* replieth (not like a Philoſopher) that Names do not ſignifie by inſtitution, as *Ariſtotle* ſuppoſeth; that certain Names *Adonai* or *Sabaoth*, which are of great force in Magical Inchantments, loſe their Virtue, if turn'd into another Language (which is an Anſwer altogether impertinent to the Buſineſs of Religion;) that becauſe of the many impure Fables touching *Jupiter* Chriſtians would not call the Supreme Deity by ſuch a Name, approving the Saying of *Plato* in his *Philebus*, *to be Religious about the Names of the Gods*; as if the Conteſt between the Chriſtian and Pagan Theiſts was a Diſpute about the uſe of a Word or Name. Theſe are ſome defects of Reaſon in the Reaſonings of ſo great a Man, who notwithſtanding his antipathy againſt the Popular-Pagan *Jove*, yet hath ſo great a kindneſs for the Platoniſts *Jove*, (*f*) that he alloweth him to be the true God; which goeth a great way towards making the Conteſt between the Chriſtian and Pagan Theiſts a Diſpute about a Word or Name only. (*g*) But as the Schools ſay of the Angels, that (by a diſcontinuous motion) *they can paſs from one extreme to another without paſſing the middle:* So *Origen* from granting too much immediately proceedeth to grant too little; (*h*) *we do not ſuppoſe Jove and Sabaoth the ſame, nor do we ſuppoſe Jove to be at all any God, but a certain Devil, that delighteth in that Name, no Friend to Men, nor to the true God.* As if the Pagans *Jove* was of no more Notions than one, or as if Paganiſm was intirely nothing elſe but Diaboliſm. The Humane Naturaliſm that is in Paganiſm, muſt not be confounded with the Diaboliſm that is in it; nor muſt their *real* Jove (the real Imperial Eſtate of their Theopolity) be confounded with their *but Ideal* and *but Imaginary Joves*. The Name underſtood in a general indeterminate Notion (abſtracting from Specific and individual determination) is the very ſame with this Name, *the Supreme God underſtood in the ſame manner*; and this *but Ideal Jove* is Humane Naturaliſm (agreeable to true Religion) without any thing of Diaboliſm. But with this Name, Notion and Idea the Pagans inveſted *the Mundane Soul, a Platonic Principle,* Jupiter *of* Crete *and the Sun*; and theſe *Joves* that were *but Imaginary Joves*, muſt not be called *Evil Demons*. But their only *real Jove*, the real Imperial Eſtate of their Religious Imperial Polity, the Kingdom of Darkneſs, becauſe he is the Imperial Eſtate of the Kingdom of Darkneſs, could be no other than the grand Evil Demon, who made himſelf an Imperial Eſtate of Religion and God-head to the World of Heathen Mankind. So *Clemens* (*i*) calleth *Serapis* (the *Jupiter* or Supreme Deity of the *Egyptians*) τὸν μεγαλοδαίμονα, *the great Evil Demon.* (*k*) *King* Jupiter *himſelf ſweareth religiouſly by the* Stygian *Waters; for with horrour he preſageth the puniſhment that is deſtinated to him and his Worſhippers.* (*l*) *The unjuſt ſhall riſe to Torments eternal. Theſe are the Idol-worſhippers, that have not known, or have deny'd the Lord and Parent of the World. Their Lord alſo will be taken with his Officers, and condemn'd to Puniſhment.* (*m*) *Shall* Jupiter *be called a God*, that (in his Oracles *Dodonean* or *Ammonian*) *affixeth the crime of Impiety upon ſuch as ſerve the Supreme King, or wreſteth his Majeſty to himſelf?* (*n*) None but the *Stygian Jupiter* can be a *Jupiter Elicius* (*modum eliciendi Jovem Numa edoctus,*) no other had his Imperial Seat at *Rome* in the Capitol. (*o*) *Titus Latinus* or *Atinius* (mention'd by many *Roman* Authors) a *Roman* Plebeian, was in a Dream commanded by *Jupiter*, to go and charge the Senate, to reſtore the Scenical Plays, telling them, that if they neglected it, ſome great Calamity would befall the City. But the Man through fearfulneſs neglected *Jupiter*'s command; whereupon his Son was preſently ſnatch'd away by death. And in another Dream the God expoſtulated with him, whether he had not been ſufficiently puniſh'd for neglecting his Command? The Man ſtill continuing his fearfulneſs and neglect, was ſeiz'd with

(e) *L.* 5. *p.* 259. *l.* 4. *p.* 196.

(f) *L.* 6. *p.* 276.

(g) *Liv. Galant. l.* 5. *p.* 159.

(h) Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὅλως θεόν τι τὸν Δία, Δαίμονα δέ τινα.

(i) Πρ *p. m.* 23.

(k) *Ipſe Rex Jupiter per torrentes ripas & atram voraginem jurat religioſè; deſtinatam enim ſibi cum ſuis cultoribus pœnam præſcius perhorreſcit.* Min. Fel. *p.* 330.

(l) *Excitabuntur injuſti ad cruciatus ſempiternos. Hi ſunt qui manu facta coluerunt, qui Dominum mundi ac Parentem vel neſcierunt vel abnegaverunt. Sed & Dominus illorum cum Miniſtris ſuis comprehendetur, ad pœnamque damnabitur.* Lactant. l. 7. c. 26.

(m) *Arnob. adv.* Gent. *l.* 1. *p.* 14.

(n) *Ibid. l.* 5. *p.* 155.

(o) *Val. Max. l.* 1. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.* 26.

with an horrible Diſeaſe in his Body; whereupon, by the Advice of his Friends, he was carry'd to the Senate in a Litter, and having told his Dream to them and deliver'd his Meſſage, immediately he recover'd his Health. The Senate aſtoniſh'd with ſuch a Miracle, were of Opinion, that the Plays ought to be reſtor'd with quadruple Money. (p) *Quis non videat, qui ſanum ſapit, ſubditos homines malignis dæmonibus? What Man of ſenſe may not ſee, that Mankind are ſubjected to malign Demons?*

II. A ſecond plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is the Quality and Character of the Supreme Deity and the Subordinate Deities in conjunction; for the Subordinate Deities are call'd by *Celſus* (q) ἐναέριοι ϗ ἐπίγειοι σατράπαι, *the Aerial and Terreſtrial great Rulers*, which are the ſame that Chriſtianity calleth *the Principalities and Powers* of the dark Kingdom. Theſe ſeduc'd Mankind from true Religion and Piety, and from the worſhip of one only God, were Adverſaries to his Religion and Religioniſts, and no Wickedneſs of Practice or of Principle was intolerable to theſe reputed Deities, *nor any thing but God's Religion.* Theſe Gods were celebrated amongſt the Heathen for all manner of lewd Pranks: Theſe fill'd the Earth and Air with atrocious Wickedneſs; (r) theſe undertook to gratifie Mens Amours in drawing others that were averſe to be in love with them; (s) Theſe inhabited and animated Statues, (t) Theſe were wicked and impoſtorous oracular Deities; (u) Theſe were Magical Deities, that taught Magick, were ſubject to Magick Inchantments and Necromantic θεαγωγίαι (Evocations of the Gods;) and ſo manifeſtly were many of theſe Subordinate Deities *Evil Demons*, that the beſt learned of the Pagan Theologers account them ſuch. Of theſe Paganical Deities *Jove* is the Societive King, one of them as their Head and Chieftain, as he is repreſented by a late Deiſt in his Maxims of Theology, (w) *Eſſe ſupremum aliquod Numen, ſupremum aliquod in Deorum claſſe, That there is a Supreme Deity, a Supreme in the Claſſis of the Gods.* In the Claſſis of the Gods all the other Deities are manifeſtly Evil Demons, and ſhall the Supreme of them be counted the true God? (x) *Deus deorum non poteſt intelligi Deus dæmoniorum, & rex magnus ſuper omnes deos abſit ut dicatur rex magnus ſuper omnia dæmonia: The God of Gods cannot be deem'd the God of Devils, and the great King above all Gods may not be called the great King above all Devils.* The true God is not of that Alliance, nor of their Society; but the Pagans Supreme God (y) diſtributeth particular Offices, Nations and Cities to *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Minerva* (and ſuch more) is their Societive Head, and muſt be reckon'd one of them, (z) οἱ Δαίμονες μετὰ τοῦ ἡγουμένου αὐτῶν Διός, *the Demons with their Captain Jove.* (a) *What is the reaſon that the Evil Demons are afraid of Chriſt, not afraid of Jove, but becauſe thoſe are Evil Demons, who are commonly ſuppos'd to be Gods? adjur'd by the Name of the true God preſently they fly away. If they ſuppoſe, that we are not to be believ'd, let them believe* Homer, *who reckoneth that Supreme Jove with the Demons.* This is the Senſe of all the Ancient Writers of the Church (without exception of any,) all of them cite the Pſalmiſts words, *Pſal.* 96. 5. according to the Verſion of the LXX. and thus underſtand them, πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια, *all the Gods of the Heathen are Devils.* The Heathens *Jove* therefore (whom they inveſted with this Idea, The Supreme God) is ſuppos'd to be the King of Devils; which Hypotheſis involveth this other; *That the true God was not the Deity of a Religion amongſt the Pagans, or one of their Deities of Religious Worſhip.* The Evil Demons that conducted their Affairs, aim'd at nothing leſs, (b) *than to extinguiſh the knowledge of God in the World*, to rob him of his Honour and Service amongſt Men, and that he might have no People upon Earth, but that all might be like themſelves, *Satanians* and Enemies to God. Their deſign was, (c) *to have themſelves worſhipped, God's worſhip being wholly excluded.*

III. A third plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is *the mighty Veneration of Serpents amongſt the Pagans.* For although in Mankind there is an innate enmity againſt Serpents (the whole kind of them) (d) although their noxious Nature and Qualities were not unknown to the Heathen, (among the *Egyptians* that worſhipp'd Serpents the Bird *Ibis* was alſo worſhipped for deſtroying them, as both the Sheep and the Wolf were worſhipp'd amongſt them;) yet ſo univerſally did the Worſhip of Serpents prevail in Paganiſm againſt the common Inſtincts of Nature, that there was no Heathen Nation, Greek or Barbarian, wherein the Serpent was not Sacred, uſually he was more Sacred than other Animals. (e) The *Egyptians*, *Indians*, *Phœnicians*, *Arabians*, *Babylonians*, *Carthaginians*, *Bœotians*, *Epirots*, *Sicyonians*, *Epidaurians*, *Romans* and the Inhabitants of *America* were Serpent-worſhippers, and that great ancient Nation of the *Chineſe* (f) worſhippeth the *Dragon*, proveth and recommendeth their Worſhip by Prodigies; and the moſt ancient *Ethiopians* (g) worſhipp'd a Serpent *Arwé* (which in their Language ſignifieth a Serpent) either as the Supreme Deity or as a Symbol thereof; which ſheweth, that Paganiſm is *Ophitiſm* both literal and myſtical. The *Roman* Emperour *Adrian* (h) in the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius* which he had moſt ſumptuouſly erected at *Athens*, put for the *Numen* a Dragon brought out of *India*, a Symbol hugely agreeable to the *Jove* of the Pagan Religion. (i) A Dragon was alſo the Symbol of *Serapis*, and *Plutarch* in the Life of *Alexander* reporteth, that an Oracle charg'd King *Philip* chiefly to apply himſelf to the worſhip of *Jupiter Ammon*, informing him, that this God had to do with his Wife *Olympias* in the form of a Dragon; which ſheweth (how-much-ſoever of Impoſture there may be in the Story) that the Heathen themſelves ſuppos'd a cognation between their Supreme Deity and the Dragon. A like account we have of the generation of *Scipio Africanus* and of *Auguſtus* (in *Suetonius*;) but with this difference, *Apollo* was ſuppos'd, to have to do with *Auguſtus*'s Mother in the form of a Dragon. (k) The fabulous Theology copulateth *Jupiter* and *Rhea* both in the form of Dragons, and *Jupiter* in the ſame form with *Proſerpina*; and *Orpheus* fableth, that his God *Phanes* generated a Birth, which was for the main a Viper. *And what Man of underſtanding can believe a God to generate a Viper?* But with theſe Atheo-Theiſts

Serpents

(p) S. Aug. ibid.

(q) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 400.

(r) Ibid. l. 7. p. 378. Grot. de V. R. C. l. 4. S. 8.

(s) Orig. ibid.

(t) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 4. & 5.

(u) Ibid. l. 5. c. 8, 12, 14.

(w) De veritate, p. 210, 211.

(x) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 9. c. 23.

(y) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 115.

(z) Tatian. or. c. Græc. p. 147.

(a) *Quæ ratio eſt, ut Chriſtum timeant dæmones, Jovem autem non timeant, niſi quòd iidem ſunt dæmones, quos vulgus deos eſſe opinatur? adjurati per nomen Dei veri protinus fugiunt.—— ſi nobis credendum eſſe non putant, credant Homero, qui ſummum illum Jovem dæmonibus aggregavit.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 27.

(b) *Nè quis poſſet ad divini nominis pervenire notitiam.* Lactant. l. 3. c. 29. l. 4. c. 27.

(c) *Ut ipſi colantur, & Deus non colatur.* Ibid. l. 2. c. 15. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 124.

(d) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 9. c. 14, 40. & l. 4. c. 63.

(e) Pignor. Menſa Iſ. p. 23.

(f) Mart. Sinenſ. Hiſt. l. 1. p. 102. Hotting. diſſ. p. 286.

(g) Ludol. Hiſt. of Ethiop. B. 3. c. 3.

(h) Baron. ad an. 145. n. 15.

(i) Cun. de Rep. Hebr. l. 3. c. 4.

(k) Athenag. Apol. p. 20.

Serpents were in ſo great veneration, (*l*) that they were ſacred to many of their Deities, to *Jupiter Sabazius, the Sun, Ceres and Proſerpina, Hecate, Æſculapius* and the Heroes. They that were initiated into the Sabazian Sacra, had a golden Serpent put into their Boſom, which was drawn out by the lower Parts. The *Bacchæ* in their *Origia* were crown'd with wreathed Serpents. (*m*) *Herodotus* mentioneth ſacred Serpents about the Egyptian *Thebes*, who when they dy'd, were buried in the Temple of *Jupiter*. A live-Serpent was the Symbol of *Æſculapius*, and ſuch a Serpent was brought to *Rome*, when the Romans (to remove the Peſtilence from their City) ſent a ſolemn Embaſſy to fetch *Æſculapius*'s Symbol from *Epidaurus*; the Embaſſadors brought back with them *a live-Snake, in quo ipſum Numen eſſe conſtabat, in whom that Deity himſelf manifeſtly was* (ſaith the Hiſtorian;) the Tranſlation therefore of *Æſculapius*'s Symbol is juſtly thought (*n*) *a Tranſlation of the Devil from* Epidaurus *to* Rome *in his own Form without diſſembling the Matter.* A Serpent was alſo the Symbol of the Genius of a Place or Country, (*o*) of *Minerva* alſo (and was added to her Image;) a live Serpent was kept in her Temple, and if that Serpent was gone, the Athenians (as appeareth from *Plutarch*'s Life of *Themiſtocles*) thought, that their Goddeſs was gone. A Dragon was alſo the Keeper of their Fortreſs, to whom they offer'd a Cake of Honey.

The grand Symbol of Sanctity, Divinity and Godhead in Paganiſm was a Serpent; whence they affix'd the Pictures of Serpents (*p*) *Diaboli inſignia*, to places conſecrated to the Gods or *Heroes*, as a proper Note of their Sacredneſs, according to that of the Poet. (*q*)

Pinge duos angues: Pueri, ſacer eſt locus.

With all your ſuppos'd Gods (ſaith *J. Mart.* to the Heathen) *you always paint a Serpent*, which was done, to denote their Divinity. The Scholiaſt upon *Ariſtophanes* ſaith the ſame of their Heroes; and amongſt the Egyptians the form of a golden *Baſilisk* was put about their Gods. (*r*) The Diadems of their Kings were alſo inwrapp'd with Aſps (doubtleſs) to denote their Divinity. (*s*) So the Head of *Iſis*'s Image was girt about and crown'd with that ſacred Aſp called by the Egyptians *Thermutis*, a Silver Serpent was plac'd near her Image, a Serpent was carry'd about in her Pomp (*t*) and the Handle of her Urn had an Aſp upon it. This direful venenate ſort of Animals the Egyptians worſhipp'd with great Veneration, and (*u*) their Images alſo; they made them ſo familiar, that they educated them with their Children, entertain'd them at their Tables, and thoſe that were bitten by them, they eſteem'd Happy and Divine. Their God *Oſiris* is not to be ſeen in any Table without a Serpent; *Hecate* in *Euſebius* preſcribeth the winding of Serpents about her Statues: (*w*) So the monſtrous Idols in *America* were adorn'd with Serpents, or the Parts of Serpents, and great golden Snakes were adjoin'd to ſome of their Idols. But Serpents amongſt the Pagans were not only the grand Symbols of Divinity, their Phantaſtry proceeded further; for they attributed to them *a Divinity of Nature, ſuppoſed them of mighty* uſe in Divination, and in ſome places they attributed to Serpents *a proper Deity and Godhead.* Serpents were called (*x*) ἀγαθοὶ δαίμονες, *good Demons*, which ſpeaketh them of a more excellent Nature than the Human. (*y*) *Taautus* himſelf (whom the Egyptians and Phœnicians follow'd) attributed a Divinity to the Nature of the Dragon and of Serpents. (*z*) The Body of *Cleomenes* therefore being hang'd upon a Croſs by order of the King of *Egypt*, both himſelf and his People were poſſeſſed with a mighty Fear, that a divine Man and one dear to the Gods was kill'd, when it was obſerv'd, that a Dragon had wrapp'd himſelf about *Cleomenes*'s Head and cover'd his Face. To the Body of a winged Serpent the Egyptians affix'd the Head of an Hawk, and this was a Symbol of that *ingenit* and *immortal* God of theirs called *Cneph* (whom the Phœnicians called *Agathodemon* good God, whence *Epies* an eximious *Hierophanta* of *Egypt* affirm'd, *that the moſt Divine of all Serpents was that which had the Head of an Hawk.* Accordingly *Zoroaſter* thus deſcribeth God. Ὁ δὲ θεός ἐστιν κεφαλὴν ἔχων ἱέρακος, *God hath the Head of an Hawk.* *Orpheus* in like manner made one of his Principles to be (*a*) *a Dragon having the heads both of a Bull and a Lion, and in the midſt the Face of a God with Wings upon his Shoulders.* Agreeably to which Portentous *Zoroaſtrian* and *Orphic* Theology *Kircher* interpreteth an Egyptian Hieroglyphick in the *Pamphilian Obelisk*; for he ſuppoſeth (*b*) that a Serpent in that Hieroglyphick repreſenteth and ſignifieth the ſecond Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity (the Son of God,) which all wiſe Men ſuppoſe, to be the Devil's Symbol. But the Pagan Theologers (who were *Draconicolæ*) are conſiſtent with themſelves in their portentous Imaginations of *Ophiomorphite* and *Dragon*-like Deities, and in attributing Divinity of Nature to Serpents and Dragons, which they did at ſuch an extravagant rate, that *Porphyry* ſaith, (*c*) *Perhaps we and all Men ſhould underſtand the Language of all Animals, if a Dragon purg'd our Ears.* (*d*) If a Serpent lick'd any Man's Ear, he was thought to hear the Counſels of the Gods, and to be endow'd with the Faculty of Divination. The Serpent in ancient times was ſo eminently of uſe in Matters of Divination, that נחש *to Divine*, is deriv'd from נחש *a Serpent*, and οἰωνίζεσθαι, *to Divine*, is from οἰωνὸς, *a Serpent*; ὄφις, *a Serpent*, ὀυβαῖος, *the Baſilisk*, are both deriv'd from אוב *ob* (which ſignifieth a Spirit of Divination, or one that is poſſeſs'd with it,) the moſt ancient Diviner is called *Ophion*, and in all probability the Delphic *Apollo* (the God of Divination) was worſhipp'd by the ancient Greeks under the Form or Symbol of a Serpent, whence he was called *Pythius* and *Python* from פתן *Pethen* a Serpent. (*e*) The *Ruſſians* at this day retain this Branch of Heatheniſm Divination by Serpents; for not long ſince when a couple of Serpents glided by the Anchor into the Ship, wherein the Duke of *Holſtein*'s Embaſſadors were carry'd, the Watermen rejoiced and cry'd, let in the Serpents, keep and feed them, they are good Meſſengers, S. *Nicholas* will ſend favourable Winds, which will eaſe us of the labour of plying the Oars, and accordingly it came to paſs. Among theſe Northern Nations (there are the like Inſtances among the Southern) the *Boruſſi, Samogitians* and *Lithuanians* are known (*f*) to have worſhipp'd Serpents as *Deities*, every Family kept a Serpent as their Houſhold God, to whom they offer'd Sacrifice, and paid their Religious Adorations; to violate ſuch a Sacro-ſanct Serpent-Deity,

---

(l) *Marſh. can. chr.* p. 255. *Huet. Dem. Ev. prop.* 4. c. 4. s. 3.

(m) *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 267.

(n) *Vives in S. Aug. de C. D.* l. 10. c. 16.

(o) *Voſſ. ſupr.* l. 9. c. 24.

(p) *Jul. Firmic. de err. prof. rel.* p. 11.

(q) *Dion. Voſſ. in Mann. de Idol.* c. 6. S. 2. *Heinſ. Ariſt.* p. 18.

(r) *Cauſin. ad Hor. Apol. Hierogl.* p. 80.

(s) *Voſſ. ſupr.* l. 9. c. 12. *Pignor. ſupr.* p. 26, 27.

(t) *Beroald. in Apul.* p. 968.

(u) *Voſſ. ſupr.* l. 9. c. 38.

(w) *Hoffman. umbr.* p. 103, 160. *Gage Survey.* p. 117.

(x) *Grot. ad Hiſt. Bel. & Drac.*

(y) *Euſeb. pr. ev.* l. 1. c. ult.

(z) *Phot. cod.* 245. *col.* 1210.

(a) Δράκοντα κεφαλὰς ἔχοντα προσπεφυκυίας ταύρου καὶ λέοντος, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ θεοῦ πρόσωπον, καὶ ἐπὶ ὤμων πτερά. Dr. *Cudw.* Intell. Syſt. p. 298.

(b) *Witſii Ægypt.* l. 1. c. 3.

(c) *De Abſt.* l. 3. s. 4.

(d) *Bochart. de Anim. par.* 1. l. 1. c. 3.

(e) *Hoffman. umbr.* p. 123.

(f) *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 267.

Deity, or to neglect the keeping ſuch a Deity, was ruinous to a Family; the Houſholders loſt their Goods, or were cruelly lacerated to death. *Wiſd.* 11. 15. *They worſhipp'd Serpents.*

IV. *A Fourth* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is the ἀνθρωποθυσίαι, *Human Sacrifices* with ſome other cruel and bloody Inſtitutes of that Religion. (g) *It was the manner of the Ancients* (ſaith *Philo Byblius* from *Sanchoniathon*) *in great Calamities, for the Governours of a City or Nation to give a moſt beloved Child, to be ſlaughter'd, as a Ranſom of the publick ruin, unto punitive Demons.* Paganiſm was a Religion of Human Sacrifices, and it was ſuch in the ancient rude and barbarous times (as the World became civiliz'd, this barbarous Rite (h) declin'd by degrees;) whence *Euſebius* juſtly inferreth, that the firſt and moſt ancient Inſtitution of Heathen Idolatry was from evil Demons. So *Plutarch* argueth. (i) *It is probable, that the Gods neither require, nor accept the Human Sacrifices, that were in uſe in ancient times, yet 'tis not for nothing that Kings and great Captains give their Children to be ſacrificed, themſelves beginning and obſerving the Sacrifice: But they do it, to avert and ſatisfie the Anger of malign and direful Demons. And to ſatisfie the mad and tyrannical Loves of ſome, that neither can nor will commix Body with Body. But as* Hercules *oppugn'd* Oechalia *for a Virgin: So ſtrong and violent Demons deſiring an Human Soul incloſ'd in a Body, and being incapable of bodily Congreſs therewith, they bring Peſtilences and Sterilities upon Cities, aud raiſe Wars and Seditions, till they obtain the Soul which they Love.* (k) *The Carthaginians ſacrific'd their own Children, and they that had no Children bought them of the Poor, and ſlaughtered Children as Lambs or Chickens. The Mother ſtood by without a Sigh or a Tear, or if ſhe ſigh'd and cry'd, ſhe loſt the Price, and the Child was nevertheleſs ſacrific'd. All was fill'd with noiſe of piping and drumming before the Image, that the lamentable cries* (of the Infants) *might not be audible. If certain Typhons or Giants having ejected the Gods had the rule over us, what other Sacrifices or Sacra would they deſire?* As the Phænomena of Nature are a manifeſt demonſtration of the Exiſtence of God: So the Phænomena of Paganiſm are a manifeſt demonſtration of the Exiſtence and Domination of evil Demons; for a Religion of the Human Sacrifices and τεκνοφόνοι τελεταὶ, *Child-killing Rites* (Parents killing their Children with their own Hands *Wiſd.* 12. 5, 6. and 14. 23.) can be nothing better than originally, of Kind and Quality and objectively Diaboliſm. *They ſacrific'd their Sons and Daughters unto Devils, and ſhed innocent Blood, even the Blood of their Sons and of their Daughters, whom they ſacrific'd unto the Idols of* Canaan. *Pſal.* 106. 37, 38. The vaſt and ample diſpread of theſe Man-killing Sacrifices over the Heathen World demonſtrateth the Devil's mundane Domination; for theſe Barbarities were in uſe (l) amongſt the *Indians*, *Perſians*, *Arabians*, *Syrians*, *Phenicians*, *Albanians*, *Scythians*, *Egyptians*, *Carthaginians*, *Cretians*, *Cypriots*, *Ionians*, *Thracians*, thoſe of *Rhodes*, *Chios*, *Salamis*, *Tenedos*, the *Lacedæmonians*, and the old *Grecians* generally, the *Romans* themſelves and the *Aborigines* in *Italy*, the *Normans*, *Danes*, *Germans*, *Sclavonians*, the ancient *Gauls*, *Britains* and elſewhere. Amongſt the *Japoneſe* and Eaſtern *Indians* (m) they uſually Sacrifice themſelves to their Idols, and gain the Reputation of Saintſhip by it. In the *Weſt-Indies* the Rite of Human Sacrifices prevail'd at a ſuperlative rate (in *Florida*, *Peru*, *New-Spain*, *Necaragua* and many other parts;) at a certain Solemnity in *Peru* their way was, to Sacrifice two hundred young Children at a time. The *Mexicans* are ſaid to have ſacrific'd more than twenty thouſand of Mankind in a Year to their Idols. (n) They had dark Houſes full of Idols wrought of ſundry Metals. Theſe were all bathed and waſh'd with Blood, the Blood of Men, and the Walls of the Houſes were an Inch thick with Blood, and the Floor a Foot; the Prieſts went daily into theſe Oratories (or Slaughter-houſes of the Devil, as *Purchas* calleth them,) and ſuffer'd none other but great Perſonages to enter with them. And when any of ſuch Condition went in, they were bound to offer ſome Man as a Sacrifice, that the Prieſts might waſh their Hands, and ſprinkle the Houſe with the Blood of the Victim. The *Normans* and *Danes* every Year in the Month of *January* ſacrificed ninety nine Men to their Gods. (o) Our ancient *Britains* uſually ſacrificed Men, to make *Divination*, and to conſult the Gods by their Entrals; and what can be more apparent, than that ſuch Religioniſts are the Devil's Religioniſts? (p) If any of the *Gauls* were in imminent danger by Sickneſs or in the Wars, Men were offer'd in Sacrifice for their Safety and Welfare (ſuch Sacrifices were ſuppos'd to be of mighty Value and Efficacy) by the miniſtery of the *Druids*, who are infamous for the prodigious ferity and barbarity of their Human Sacrifices. Some of thoſe Sacrifices they ſtruck with the Sacrificing Sword, others were ſtruck through with Darts, and faſten'd to a Croſs or Stake; others were incloſ'd in huge *Colloſſus*-like Images, whoſe Members were of ſuch a contexture as Hurdles are, which being ſet on fire they were burned. They not only did all grievous things to Captive-men, but naked noble honeſt Women they hang'd up, and cutting off their Paps hang'd them at their Mouths, that they might ſeem to eat them (ſaith *Dio*;) they transfixed ſharp Stakes through the length of their whole Body, and all this they did in Divine Service, feaſting and carrying themſelves ſuperciliouſly both in other ſacred places and eſpecially in the Grove of *Andata*.

As the monſtrous Barbarity of theſe Rites of *Druidiſm* and *Zabiiſm* is enough to ſatisfie Infidels and Scepticks touching the Exiſtence and Domination of evil Demons: So it plainly demonſtrateth, that the ſupreme Deity in Paganiſm (in reality ſuch) is no other than the Devil; for his Religion is a bloody diabolical Superſtition. (q) By the Rite of Human Sacrifice the *Gauls* worſhipp'd *Taranis* the ſame with *Jupiter*, the ſupreme Deity in Paganiſm. (r) The *Lycians* in *Crete* ſacrificed a Man to *Jove*; *Ariſtomenes Meſſenius* offer'd at once three hundred Men to *Jupiter Ithometes*. At *Rome* a Man was ſacrific'd in the Feſtival of *Jupiter Latialis*, and (as *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſ.* relateth) both *Jove* and *Apollo* requir'd and exacted Human Sacrifices. (s) ἀξιάγαστοι ἐντεῦθεν ὁ τῶν θεῶν ὕπατός τε ϗ ὑπέρτατος, *hence it appeareth, that the ſupreme of the Pagan Deities*

(g) Ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῶν κινδύνων, ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς, τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους εἰς σφαγὴν ἐπιδιδόναι λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσιν. Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 4. c. 16.

(h) *Porph. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 54. *Lactant. l.* 1. *c.* 21.

(i) Τὰς πάλαι ποιουμένας ἀνθρωποθυσίας οὔτε θεοὺς ἀπαιτεῖν ἢ προσδέχεσθαι πιθανόν ἐστιν, οὔτε μάτην ἀνέχονται βασιλεῖς ϗ στρατηγοὶ παῖδας αὐτῶν ἐπιδιδόντες ϗ ἀρχόμενοι ϗ φυλάττοντες, ἀλλὰ χαλεπῶν ϗ δυστρόπων ὀργὰς ϗ βαρυθυμίας ἀποσειόμενοι ϗ ἀποπιμπλάντες ἀλαστόρων. De Def. or. p. 417.

Hæc ſacra ſacrilegiis omnibus tetriora. Min. Fel. p. 88.

(k) *Plutarch. de ſuperſtit. p.* 171. *Fiunt miſeris & religioſa delicta. S. Cypr. Ep.* 2.

(l) *Euſeb. ſup & de laud. Conſtant. c.* 13. *Grot. de ſatisfact. p.* 200 *&c. de V. R. C. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *Lipſ. in Tacit. p.* 439.

(m) *Purchas.*

(n) *Purchas and Gage Survey of the W. Ind. p.* 115.

(o) *Cambden Britan. p* 22.

(p) *Sharrock de Offic. S.* 16. *n.* 4. *Strabo l.* 4. *Diodor. l.* 5. *Dio. l.* 62.

(q) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 295. 296. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 35.

(r) *Clem.* προτρ. *p. m.* 20. *Porphyr. & Euſeb. ſupr.*

(s) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 4. *p* 128.

Deities is an admirable Deity. This their ſupreme Deity (*Jupiter Pater*) was anciently (t) called *Saturnus*, and under that Name he was worſhipp'd with the Rite of Human Sacrifice (u) by the *European* Pagans. To this ſupreme Deity the *Rhodians* ſacrific'd a Man, the *Sardi* their Captives, and the *Cretians* their Children. The *Carthaginians* were a Colony of the *Phenicians*, and imitated them in ſacrificing their Children to *Saturn*; and the *Phenicians* muſt be ſuppos'd to Symbolize with the *Canaanites* and other Neighbour Nations; who ſacrificed their Children *as Burnt-offerings* to *Moloch* or *Baal* (the ſame Deity) *Lev.* 18. 21. and 20. 2. *Deut.* 18. 10. 2 *King.* 23. 10. *Pſal.* 106. 37, 38. *Jer.* 19. 5. and 7. 31. and 32. 35. *Ezek.* 16. 20, 21. and 23. 37, 39. *Moloch* or *Baal* therefore muſt be thought the ſame Deity with *Saturn*, which is agreeable to the Senſe of Antiquity and the general Senſe of the Learned (although a learned Man of our own diſſenteth, (w) but without any valuable Reaſon;) for the *Phenicians* being part of the *Canaanites*, it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the other *Canaanites* and Neighbour Nations ſacrificed their Children to the ſame Deity with the *Phenicians*, and that the immolation of Children was eminently (if not peculiarly) *Saturn*'s Rite of Worſhip in the Eaſtern Parts. And amongſt the *Romans* he muſt be thought eminently a Deity of bloody Rites, if as S. *Cyril* ſaith, (x) when the gladiatory Sports were celebrated, a *Saturn* was hid under ground, to receive the Blood of the Slain. The *Saturn* to whom the *Carthaginians* ſacrificed their Children, was by them called (y) *Amilcar*, which is ſo near to *Moloch* or *Milcom*, that they may well be counted the ſame Name. The *Carthaginians* alſo in ſacrificing to *Saturn* uſed Pipes and Drums, to drown the cries of the ſacrificed Children, as the *Canaanites* and Idolatrous *Iſraelites* did in ſacrificing their Children to *Moloch* (the Valley of *Hinnom* was called *Tophet* from the beating of Drums;) therefore we have great aſſurances, that the Oriental *Baal* or *Moloch* to whom Children were burned, is *Saturn*. Which confirmeth our Conjecture touching *Adrammelech* and *Anammelech*, to whom the *Sepharvites* burned their Children, that the one was a *ſupernal*, the other an *infernal Saturn*. 2 *King.* 17. 31.

Of Kin to theſe Barbarities *the Human Sacrifices and burning Children alive* (which carry horrour in their Aſpect,) are many other barbarous and bloody Rites of God-ſervice uſual amongſt the Pagans; ſuch as their frantic and barbarous wounding and caſtrating themſelves, their Rite of ſacrificing with their own Blood, their rude and bloody Pennances and Pilgrimages, the antick and barbarous Auſterities of their Aſceticks, (z) their initiations into the Myſteries of *Mithras*) by no leſs than fourſcore Torments) as alſo the bloody Spectacles of their Gladiators, which could make Sport for none but the Devil and his Children. (a) *Is it not better for Mankind, to live as Brutes* (without Religious Worſhip) *than to Worſhip ſo impious, ſo profane, ſo ſanguinary Deities?* Whoſe Chieftain or Sovereign could be no other than *Abaddon the Deſtroyer*.

V. *A Fifth* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is *the Sorcery* and *Wizardiſm* of the Heathen both that of their common Practice and that of their *Sacra* or Religion; for the Pagan Religioniſts were (more or leſs) dealers in Sorcery and foul Diabolical Magick, as the Scripture uſually repreſenteth them. *Exod.* 7. 11. *Lev.* 19. 26, 31. and 20. 6. *Deut.* 18. 10--14. 1 *Sam.* 6. 2. 2 *King.* 1. 2. and 17. 17. and 21. 6. and 23. 24. *Iſa.* 2. 6. and 19. 3. and 47. 9, 12. *Ezek.* 21. 21. *Dan.* 2. 2. *Hoſ.* 4. 12. *Zech.* 10. 2. *Apoc.* 9. 21. and 18. 23. and 21. 8. and 22. 15. In great degree they were blind and undiſcerning in matters of *Magick*, and their Ignorance of it inſnar'd them in it. For the Popular Pagans were not without Notices of an evil Correſpondence with the inviſible Powers, they puniſh'd with great Severity the maleficent Witchcraft, and ſuch private clandeſtine Magick which was noxious to civil Society; Magick in the Roman Empire uſually ſignified in an evil Senſe and in our Senſe (what is of more than natural Operation in the foul Senſe,) the Name of a *Magician* was amongſt them a Name of Crime and Infamy, whence *Philoſtratus* is ſolicitous, to vindicate *Apollonius* and *Apuleius* to vindicate himſelf from the Charge of *being a Magician*, (b) ſome of the greateſt Magicians in Paganiſm declaim againſt a Magick of jugling Tricks, ſo far they agree with true Religion: But much of that which the Scripture counteth Magick (in the foul Senſe) was with them of another Notion; what is really execrable Magick, was with them Myſtery and *Sacra*; publick Magick was with them of great veneration, and true Theiſm was with them Magick and Atheiſm. (c) Chriſt is reproach'd by *Celſus* as a Magician, (d) *Moſes* as a Magician, (e) *Oſius* is called a Magician by *Zoſimus*, (f) Chriſtians ſuffer'd as Magicians, (g) all the Apoſtles are reproach'd as Magicians, and *Paul* as a tranſcendent Magician by the Apoſtate *Julian*, who was himſelf a ſuperlative Magician. But from the Apology which his Hiſtorian and admirer maketh for his Magick, it appeareth, that the moſt damnable Rites and Correſpondences in Magick paſs'd for very innocent and laudable Practices in Paganiſm. *Becauſe ſome malevolent Perſons* (ſaith *Ammianus* l. 21.) *attribute to this learned Prince ſtudious of all Knowledges evil Arts of fore-knowing things to come, we muſt briefly advertiſe, whence this no light kind of Learning may happen to a wiſe Man.* (h) *The Spirit of all the Elements being always and every where in livelineſs by the preſent Motion of the ever moving Bodies, amongſt thoſe things that we affect by ſeveral Diſciplines, participateth with us the gifts of divining; and the ſubſtantial Powers being placated by divers Rites Vaticination is conveyed from them to Mankind as from the perpetual Veins of Fountains.* It is not the Chriſtians that raiſe and relate Stories of the Heathens Magick: But themſelves or their own Authors relate their own Magick and Glory in it. *Eunapius* relateth the magical Arts, the magical Company (or Demon-ſociety) and the Magical-miraculous Pranks of his Philoſophers for their Honour. *Marinus* wrote *Proclus*'s ϑεουργικὰ, *Theurgicks*. (i) *Damaſcius* reporteth the *Hydromancy* of a Magical Woman called by him Γυνὴ ἱερὰ ϑεόμοιρον ἔχουσα φύσιν, *a ſacred Woman whoſe Nature was a Portion of the Divinity; having powred pure Water into a Glaſs-cup, ſhe ſaw in it the ſpecies*

(t) *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 209.

(u) *Seld. de D. Syr. Synt.* 1. c. 6. *Porphyr. ſupr. Grot. in Deut.* 18. 10. *Purchas Par.* 1. B. 6. c. 8.

(w) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr.* l. 2. c. 10.

(x) *C. Jul.* l. 4. p. 128.

(y) *Seld. ſupr.*

1 *King.* 18. 28.

(z) *Spencer. not. in Orig.* p. 11.

(a) *Nonne ſatius eſt pecudum more vivere, quàm Deos tàm impios, tàm profanos, tàm Sanguinarios colere?* Lactant. l. 1. c. 21. vid. Min. Fel. p. 226, 227.

(b) *Jambl. de Myſt.* p. 94.

(c) *Orig. c. Celſ.* l. 1. p. 30.

(d) *Ib.* l. 5. p. 23

(e) *Baron. ad an.* 324. n. 27.

(f) *Idem ad an.* 363. n. 4.

(g) *Spencer in Orig.* p. 7.

(h) *Elementorum omnium ſpiritus, utpote perennium corporum præſenti motu ſemper & ubique Vigens, ex his quæ per diſciplinas varias affectamus, participat nobiſcum munera divinandi; & ſubſtantiales poteſtates ritu diverſo placatæ velut ex perpe*[illegible] *fontium venis vaticina mortalitati ſuppeditant verba.*

(i) *Phot. cod.* 242. col. 105

ſpecies of things to come, and thence foretold them. Of this we our ſelves alſo made experiment. Human Nature is not without Propenſions to Magical Correſpondence; there is nothing in Paganiſm, to reſtrain Men from the main of it; there is much in Paganiſm to induce Men to it, for the Pagans ſuppoſe it God-ſociety; (*k*) their Gods taught them to play the Magicians for they taught them, that their Gods being bound by Fate, muſt be looſ'd by Art-Magick; (or as ſome underſtand the Oracle, that Men muſt deliver themſelves by it from their Fate and Deſtiny;) Mankind are ſo eargerly addicted to Divination, to converſe with the Gods, and to have Gods, which they may converſe with, that it is not ſtrange, that the Heathen World ſhould be a World of Sorcery and Magick. And if the foul diabolical Magick was every where in Empire and Domination amongſt the Pagans, if both in their common and Religious Affairs they were dealers in Magick, if Magick was the Skill and Trade of Princes, Prieſts and People, if their Religion in reſpect of its Original and Ingredients was Magick, what greater aſſurance can we deſire of the Exiſtence and Domination of evil Demons, of Satan's mundane Empire, and that the World of Heathen were his Religioniſts?

VI. Magick (ſaith *Pliny*) *many Ages mightily prevail'd through the whole World, was of greateſt Authority, and grew to ſuch an height, that in the Eaſtern Parts it govern'd the King of Kings.* And he obſerveth (*l*) *that anciently and almoſt always the higheſt Renown and Glory for learning was gain'd by the Science of Magick.* So others obſerve, (*m*) *In ancient times Magick was accounted the Summity of Learning.* (*n*) *Nothing ſeem'd more excellent and illuſtrious than thoſe Arts.* (*o*) *We muſt take a curſory view of Aſtrology, Mathematick, Magick, Goety; for all the Greeks do boaſt of theſe as of the greateſt Sciences,* ſaith Clemens. (*p*) *What ſhall we ſay of their admir'd Magick? Before the coming of Chriſt* (ſaith *Athanaſius*) *it prevail'd amongſt the* Egyptians, Chaldeans *and* Indians, *and amaz'd the Beholders.* Theſe learned Nations the ſame Father calleth (*q*) τὺς φρονῦντας μὲν μαγικὰ, *the Magical-minded*, that minded the things of Magick as their Wiſdom; (*r*) for they did not account any thing Wiſdom, that was not of more than vulgar Quality; nor did they ſuppoſe themſelves wiſer than others, unleſs they could do more than others, (ſome prodigious Magical Feats;) therefore *Theſpeſion* the Gymnoſophiſt caus'd a Tree to ſalute the wiſe *Apollonius*, to demonſtrate, that himſelf and his Fellows were Maſters of Wiſdom. Such was the Wiſdom and ſuch was the Magick of the Oriental *Magi*, *Indian*, *Perſian* and *Chaldean*, who were of Affinity with our *Britannick* and *Gallick Wizards* (the *Druids*,) that had (*s*) *Zoroaſter* for the grand Maſter of their Learning and Religion, and whoſe Rites were thoſe of the *Zabii*, which were not only Idolatrous, but Magical. Learned Men that follow *Ariſtotle*'s account of the *Magi* in *Laertius*, ſuppoſe, that their Magick was at firſt only lawful and laudable Science, and that afterwards, it degenerated into diabolical Magick. But ſeeing the *Magi* were originally not only the Philoſophers, but the Prieſts, Theologers, Saintiſts and eminent Religioniſts of the Oriental Pagans, hence we may certainly infer, that their Magick was natively and originally Diabolical; for ſuch was the Wiſdom and Learning of the Pagan Prieſthood, (*t*) *The Greeks ſuppoſe, that Magick is a Faculty of very great Power, and that it is the laſt Portion of the Prieſthood.* The Relation of *Ruffinus* therefore deſerveth the Credit of Hiſtorical Truth, (*u*) that at *Canopus* in *Egypt* there was a publick School of Art-Magick, which was taught under the Name of *Sacerdotal Learning.* Nor can we reaſonably diſcredit what others affirm touching the *Indian Brachmans*, (*w*) that they taught Magick and Inchantments in their Schools. (*x*) The *Indian Brachmans* and *Gymnoſophiſts* had their efficacious Magical Names in common with the *Egyptians* and *Perſians*, (*y*) they were *Diviners*, *Inchanters*, *Necromancers*, and ſuch conſummate Magicians, that the *Perſians* were improved by their converſe (as *Ammianus* relateth,) and *Apollonius* acknowledgeth, that they were his Maſters. Such great and real Effects of Magick are ſaid to be found amongſt them, as may ſeem, but are not beyond its Power ſometimes to Effect. For in *Damaſcius*'s Life of *Iſidore* (*z*) it is reported, that the *Brachmans* by their Prayers could procure Rain, and alſo avert Rain and Famine and Peſtilence and other incurable Evils.

The *Chaldeans* Magick is viſible in their Names *Chartummim*, *Aſhaphim*, *Mecaſhephim*, *Chaſdim*, *Goſrin.* Dan. 2. 2. and 4. 7. The firſt of theſe Names חרטמים is not improbably deriv'd from the Perſic חרד (the Daleth being chang'd into Teth,) which ſignifieth *to know*, and therefore the Name denoteth the *magically knowing or cunniug Men*, and in the Singular Number it is the ſame with the Hebrew ידעוני γνώςης, *a knowing Man.* (*a*) So ἐλύμας, *Magus* is from עלים *ſciens, knowing.* The ſecond of thoſe Names אשפים is doubtleſs the ſame with the Greek σοφοὶ, and denoteth the Wiſe-men or Wizards, an higher degree of the knowing Men. *Gen.* 41. 8. *Exod.* 7. 11. The third of thoſe Names מכשפים is deriv'd from the Arabic כשף and ſignifieth the Revealers or Diviners. But touching the firſt of theſe Names חרטמים I am prone to think, that the true Etymology of it is from חרט *a Pen*, or Writing Inſtrument, that in its primary ſignification it denoteth γραμματεῖς, *Scribes*, a Name that in Scripture uſually ſignifieth *Literati*, the Men of Learning; and that theſe three ſorts of *Chaldean* Magicians in reſpect of their Names anſwer to the *Scribes*, *Wiſe-men and Prophets.* Matth. 23. 34. For *Scribes* are the *Literati*, *Wiſe-men* are an higher degree of thoſe *Literati*, and *Prophets* are the *Revealers.* But becauſe the Chaldean *Literati* were the skilful in Magick, thoſe Scribes were of the ſame Character with *Jannes* and *Jambres* (choſen to conteſt with *Moſes*,) who were amongſt the Egyptians ἱερογραμματεῖς, *Scribes of their Sacra* (as *Numenius* the Philoſopher (*b*) in *Euſebius* ſaith;) therefore the Name *Chartummim* may be fitly rendred *the knowing Men*, *Aſhaphim the wiſe Men* or Wizards, *Mecaſhephim* the

Diviners

(k) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 5. *c.* 14. *l.* 6. *c.* 4. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 309. *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 126.

(l) *Summam literarum claritatem gloriamque ex ea ſcientia antiquitus & penè ſemper petitam.* Nat. Hiſt. l. 30. c. 1.

(m) *Priſcis ſeculis Magia doctrinæ culmen habebatur.* Marſham. Can. Chr. p. m. 142.

(n) *Nihil his artibus clarius aut excellentibus videbatur.* Sheringham de Angl. Gent. Orig.

(o) Περὶ τε ἀστρολογικῆς καὶ μαθηματικῆς καὶ μαγικῆς, γοητείας τε ἐπιδραμητέον. Αὐχῦσι γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς δὲ οἱ πανέλληνες, ὡς μεγίσταις ἐπιστήμαις. Clem. Str. l. 2. initio.

(p) Τί δὲ περὶ τῆς θαυμαζομένης παρ' αὐτοῖς μαγείας ἄν τις εἴποι; πρὶν μὲν ἐπιδημῆσαι τὸν λόγον, ἴσχυε καὶ ἐνήργει παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ χαλδαίοις καὶ Ἰνδοῖς αὕτη καὶ ἐξέπληττε τὺς ὁρῶντας. S. Athanaſ. de Incarn. Verb. p. 74. Comm.

(q) *Ibid. p.* 77.

(r) *Reuchlin. de verb. mir. p.* 115.

(s) *V. Mr.* Stanley *Hiſt. of Or. Philoſ. B.* 1. *S.* 1 *c.* 2, 3.

(t) *Magia verò facultas quædam Græcis viſa eſt poteſtatis plurimæ compos, tradunt enim hanc eſſe extremam Sacerdotii portionem.* Pſellus de Dæmon. ſub fin.

(u) *Baron. ad an* 389. *n.* 96.

(w) *Heurn. Barb. Phil. p.* 147.

(x) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 291.

(y) *Montacut. or. Eccl. T.* 1. *Par.* 1. *p.* 172, 169, 193.

(z) *Phot. cod.* 242. *col.* 1041.

(a) *Druſ. in Act.* 13. 8.

(b) *Pr. ev.* 8. c. 8

Diviners. The two laſt of the Chaldeans Names are of eaſy interpretation; for גזרין ſignifieth *Aruſpices, Soothſayers by the Sacrifices*, and כשרים *Chaldeans*, ſignifieth the Aſtrologers, as a *Canaanite* ſignifieth a *Merchant*, and an *Arabian* a *Thief.* (c) The *Chaldeans* were addicted to *Aſtrology* and *Augury* at a ſuperlative rate. Amongſt other methods of Divination (d) *Diodorus* relateth their Divination *by Birds*, and *by the Sacrifices*, and their interpretations of Dreams and Prodigies. *Arnobius* (e) calleth the Arts of Magick the recondite Diſciplines of the *Chaldeans.* Some that are admirers of their Theology celebrate alſo their Magick, which they ſuppoſe (f) to have been *mighty potent in ancient times amongſt the Orientals, and that they underſtood the nature of Demons, the methods of calling them forth, and of making them to do portentous things in their ſight.* (g) They are more eſpecially famous for their *Aſtrological-magical* contrivances of *Teleſms* and *Teraphim*, and for their *Theurgick Magick*, or *Teleſiurgick Rites* (whereby they had converſe with Spirits, and by virtue whereof *Julian* the Chaldean Philoſopher compos'd a Phylactery for every Member,) amongſt which the *Hecatine Sphere* or *Circle* is of principal note, whence the *Rhombus Magicus* mention'd both by Greek and Latine Poets (of great uſe amongſt the Witches of ancient times) deriv'd its original. (h) *Demons are drawn out of the Air and Earth by certain Stones, or Herbs, or Voices, or Figures which they call Characters, every one of which is every Demons proper cogniſance. Theſe I ſuppoſe, were originally found out by the* Chaldeans *and* Egyptians.

The *Chaldeans* are not more famous for Arts of Magick than their Neighbours the *Perſians*, (i) from whoſe Magi (before ſpoken of) Sorcery and Witchcraft hath the Name of Magick. Theſe were in common with the *Chaldeans* the followers of *Zoroaſter*, (k) and are deſcrib'd by *Cicero*, *Strabo*, *Lucian*, *Ælian*, *Ammianus* and the ancient Writers of the Church as a γένος μαντικὸν, *Generation of Diviners* addicted to *Necyomancy*, *Lecanomancy*, *Hydromancy* and *Inchantments*; as *R. Benjamin* in his Itinerary relateth of the Prieſt of the *Dugbjim* (Fire-worſhippers as the ancient *Perſians* were) that they are great כשפנים *Inchanters, and that there is none like them in the whole Earth.* *Pauſanias* (an Eye-witneſs of what he relateth) in his Deſcription of the *Perſian Pyratheia* ſaith; (l) that in *Lydia* the *Magus* having laid Wood on the Altar firſt, putteth a Mitre on his Head, then (m) *he maketh an Invocation of ſome God in a barbarous form not underſtood by the Greeks* (which Invocation is an Incantation) *he readeth his Charm out of a Book, and without making uſe of Fire all the Wood is ſet on fire* (this *Pauſanias* ſaw) *and ſendeth forth a manifeſt Flame.* For many other great and real effects of Magick, for many ſtrange and true Divinations the *Perſians* and *Chaldeans* are celebrated. (n) Theſe forewarn'd *Alexander* not to enter *Babylon*, becauſe it would be fatal to him; and when *Darius* would have the Sheath of his *Perſian* Acinace chang'd into the *Greek* form, they foretold the tranſlation of Empire from the *Perſians* to the *Greeks.* The *Perſian Magi* (as *Cicero* relateth) foretold from *Cyrus*'s Dream, that he ſhould reign thirty Years; and touching *Ochus* they predicted, that in his time there ſhould be plenty of Victuals and of his Slaughters. When *Xerxes* open'd the Sepulchre of *Belus*, he found in an Urn of Glaſs a dead Body lying in Oyl (the Urn not being full) and withall a little Pillar adjoyning, whereon was written this Prediction; that it ſhould fare ill with him, who open'd the Sepulchre and did not fill up the Urn; whereupon unhappy *Xerxes* did all that he could to fill up the Urn, but was unable to do it. In *Ammianus* (o) it is reported, that the *Roman* Souldiers having burnt the City of *Seleucia*, upon ranſacking a Temple they found a narrow Hole (which they opened, hoping to find Treaſure) from a ſecret place whereof which was ſhut up by the *Chaldeans Arcana*, ſuch a Contagion iſſu'd forth, as fill'd all with Diſeaſes and Deaths in the times of *Verus* and *M. Antoninus*, and ſpread it ſelf from the *Borders* of *Perſia* to the *Rhine* and *France.* (p) *Porphyry* tells of a good Man in *Chaldea*, who complain'd, *that his great attempts to purge his Soul were all fruſtrate, becauſe another Man of the ſame Faculty out of Envy had adjur'd the Powers, and bound them not to grant his Requeſts*; which was no inconſiderable effect of Magick.

The *Egyptians* were ſo eminent for *Magick*, that the Name (q) of an *Egyptian* ſignifieth a Magician, as the Name of a *Chaldean* ſignifieth an *Aſtrologer.* Hence *Arnobius* bringeth in the Heathen thus objecting againſt our Bl. Saviour; (r) *He was a Magician, he did all thoſe things* (his Miracles) *by clandeſtine Arts, from the Secrets of the* Egyptians *he ſtole the Names of potent Angels and remote Diſciplines.* At the ſame rate *Celſus* blaſphemeth, (s) *That Chriſt in* Egypt *became expert in certain* (wonder-working) *Powers.* And the Talmudiſts tell us, that the *Egyptian* Magicians ſaid to *Moſes*, (t) *Fœnum tu importas in Aphrajim? doſt thou bring Straw into* Aphrajim *a City full of Straw? doſt thou bring Inchantments into* Egypt, *which aboundeth therewith?* The *Egyptians* exceeded all Men in Magical Skill, (u) ſaith the Book *Zohar.* (w) *Ammianus* celebrateth *Egypt* as the origin of Religion and of Divinations, (x) almoſt all the Wiſe Men in *Egypt* were call'd by the Name of Prophets, and *Origen* obſerveth, that the Law of *Moſes* counteth all thoſe Animals unclean, from which the *Egyptians* and others took their Preſages. *Syneſius* ſaith, *An* Egyptian *Man hath an Art as to the Gods*, and certain ἴυγγας, *Allectives, ſo that when he pleaſeth, (y) mumbling a little ſome barbarous words it hath been found, that he hath drawn down the whole Divinity that is apt to follow certain Attractions.* Good Authors report, (z) *That the* Egyptians *bring down Birds from Heaven* μαγείᾳ τινι ἐπιχωρίᾳ, *by a certain Magick peculiar to their Country, and that they eaſily draw Serpents out of their Holes* ἐπαοιδαῖς τισι καταγοητεύσαντες, *having firſt bewitch'd them by certain Inchantments.* (a) The Statue of *Memnon* at *Thebes* in *Egypt* yielded a Sound (as moſt Authors ſay) at the riſing of the Sun, as ſoon as the Beams of it ſtruck upon the Mouth of the Statue; ſome ſay, that with an Humane Voice it uſually ſaluted the Sun and the King, till *Cambyſes* coming thither and deſtroying the City caus'd it to be opened, that he might diſcover the cauſe of it; after which, though it continu'd to ſalute the Sun, it ſuddenly left off to ſalute the King. *Strabo* an inquiſitive Man was with *Ælius Gallus* at this Statue, and heard the ſound, but acknowledgeth, that he could not underſtand the cauſe, conjecture attributed it to Magick. (*b*) *Benjamin* the Jew in his Itinerary reporteth, That there are ſuch magical ſounding Statues in the Eaſtern *Indies*, (*c*) and that one of the *Egyptian* Pyramids was built by Magick; but that is of greater regard which many good Authors relate touching the ſtrange conveyance of an Epiſtle from *Alexandria* in *Egypt* to *Byblus* in *Phœnicia* at the Feſtival of *Adonis*; (*d*) namely, that on the Day when the People of *Byblus* yearly lamented *Adonis*, the *Alexandrians* ſent them an Epiſtle incloſ'd in a Junceous or Papyraceous Veſſel (to give them notice, that *Adonis* was found,) having perform'd over it certain *Teletæ* or Myſterious Rites they committed this their Papyraceous Veſſel to the Sea, and of it ſelf meerly by the Sea and Wind it was carry'd to *Byblus*.

(c) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 1. p. 17.

(d) Stanley ſupr. B. 1. S. 2. c. 23.

(e) Adv. Gent. p. 5.

(f) Eugub. de Per. Phil. l. 1. c. 3. l. 8. c. 28.

(g) Stanley B. 1. S. 2. c. 26, &c. Selden. de D. Syr. Synt. 1. c. 2.

(h) Δαίμονες ἐξ ἀέρος ϗ γῆς θέλγονται τοῖς ἢ τοῖς λίθοις, ἢ ταῖς βοτάναις, ἢ ταῖς ἢ ταῖς φωναῖς, ἢ τοῖς ἢ τοῖς σχήμασιν, ἃ ϗ χαρακτῆρας καλοῦσιν· οἶμαι δὲ ταῦτα παρὰ χαλδαίων ϗ Αἰγυπτίων ἀρχῆθεν εὑρῆσθαι ἕκαστον ἑκάστῳ δαίμονι γνωριστικὸν σημεῖον. Niceph. Schol. in Syneſ. p. 360. v. Gale in Jambl. p. 277.

(i) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 330.

(k) Cic. de Divin. l. 1. Stanley ſupr. B. 2. c. 7. Montacut. ſupr. p. 169, 191, 193, &c. Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 245.

(l) Dr. Ham. on Matth. 12. 27. Montacut. ſupr. p. 194.

(m) Ἐπίκλησιν ὅτου δὴ θεοῦ ἐπᾴδει βάρβαρα, ἐπᾴδει δὲ ἐπιλεγόμενος ἐκ βιβλίου, ἄνευ δὲ πυρὸς ἀνάγκη πᾶσα ἀφθῆναι τὰ ξύλα.

(n) Stanley ſupr. B. 2. c. 7. B. 1. S. 1. c. 4. Heurn. Barb. Phil. p. 171.

(o) L. 23.

(p) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 9.

(q) Baron. ad an. 324. n. 27.

(r) *Magus fuit, clandeſtinis artibus omnia illa perfecit. Ægyptiorum ex adytis angelorum potentium nomina & remotas furatus eſt diſciplinas.* Adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 25.

(s) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 1. p. 30.

(t) Buxt. Lex. Talm. col. 946.

(u) Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l. 2. c. 11. S. 1.

(w) L. 22.

(x) Gale in Jambl. p. 184, 245.

(y) Μικρὸν ὑποβαρβαρίσας ἅπαν εἵλκυσεν ὅσον ἔστι τὸ θεῖον τὸ πεφυκὸς ὁλκαῖς τισιν ἕπεσθαι. Calv. Encom. p. 73.

(z) Marſh. ſupr. p. 142.

(a) Holiday on Juv. p. 272.

Such Magical Phænomena (of which there are many Inſtances in Paganiſm) plainly demonſtrate, that Magick is no πρᾶγμα ἀσύστατον, nor meer Inanity, that there is too much of reality in it, and that it was in Empire and Domination in the great, and learned, and ancient Heathen Nations; from whence a Judgment may be made of the reſt of the Heathen World. But the Domination of Magick may further appear from the great Eſteem and Honour which Magicians had in the Heathen Nations, as *Strabo* obſerveth; (*e*) for the Heathen Kings and Princes were generally attended by their *Magi*, *Aſtrologers*, *Augurs*, *Diviners*, theſe were their Companions, Counſellors and Guides: Not a few of the Heathen Kings and Emperours are known to have ſtudy'd and practis'd the Magick Arts, the *Perſian* Kings were all initiated into the Diſcipline of their Magi, *Conſtantine* himſelf retain'd for ſome time ſomewhat of the Magical Genius and Humour of the Pagan Princes; (*f*) uſually he inſerted ſome Oracle in what he wrote, *Sopater* (a Magician) for a time was his Favourite: In one of his Reſcripts he tolerateth ſuch Magick, which is not maleficent and injurious, but uſeful and profitable for Mens Health and worldly Affairs; and another of his Reſcripts is in favour of *Aruſpicina*, *Soothſaying*. (*g*) *Clemens* hath recounted a large Catalogue of famous and renowned Diviners among the Greeks and other Heathen Nations, which ſheweth, that the Heathen World was not thin ſtock'd with ſuch Cattel, that Mankind govern'd their Affairs by Magick, that many Men gain'd a great Fame and Reputation by it, and not a few obtain'd the Reputation of Gods by it, (*h*) as *Euſebius* obſerveth. (*i*) *Saxo Grammaticus* maketh the ſame obſervation touching the deify'd Hero's of the Northern Nations; and in the time of *Auguſtus Cæſar* the *Getæ* had like to have done Divine Honours to *Ceneus* a Magical Impoſtor. Magick therefore was in Empire and Domination in the World of Heathen Religioniſts, which muſt be look'd upon as a World of Sorcery and Wizardiſm upon account of the ſeveral Branches of their Magick.

VII. Their Inchantments of Things and Perſons are an eminent Branch of their Magick (for which *Theſſaly* of old was much celebrated) and the matters of *Homer*'s *Odyſſes*, the Transfigurations of *Proteus*, the *Siren*'s Songs, *Circe*'s Cups, and *the Evocations of the Dead*, are matters of Magical Incantation, (*k*) as the Criticks ſuppoſe. (*l*) *Execeſtus* Tyrant of the *Phocenſes* δύο δακτυλίους φορῶν γεγοητευμένους, *wearing two enchanted Rings, by the ſounding of one againſt the other diſcern'd the time of doing any Action; but he was killed by treachery, although the Sound fore-ſignify'd it, as* Ariſtotle *ſaith in his Account of the Polity of the* Phocenſes. (*m*) *Theoſebius* the Philoſopher having an averſation from Generation, gave his Wife τὸν τῆς σωφροσύνης δακτύλιον, *a Ring of Continence* (as before he had given her a Wedding Ring) *which ſhe willingly receiv'd, and liv'd the reſt of her time with him without bodily conjunction.* (*n*) Amongſt the Species of Magicians *Jamblicus* reckoneth μάγον ἀκρίδων καὶ μάγον λεόντων, &c. *the Magician of Locuſts, the Magician of Lions, the Magician of Mice, the Magician of Hail, and the Magician of Serpents*; to which he might have added *the Magician of Gods*; (*o*) for by magical Figures and Characters they could inchant, bind and detain their Gods; (*p*) ἐκκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γοητεῖαι θεῶν, *there are Evocations and Inchantments of the Gods*, by virtue whereof the *Romans* are ſuppos'd to have brought over their Enemies Gods to themſelves (and that they might not be ſo ſerv'd, they conceal'd the Name of their own Tutelar God:) They ſay, (*q*) that their Gods were adjur'd, terrify'd and bound by Sacred Prayers, that *Cybele*'s Temple was not opened by the Hand, but by Prayers (as *Servius* ſaith;) by Sacred Prayers they brought down their Deities, as alſo by Sacrifice; but *Tullus Hoſtilius* attempting to bring down *Jove* by the ſame Sacrifice which *Numa* made uſe of, and failing in ſome Rite was Thunder-ſtruck. Their Gods that came down, or were preſent at their Sacrifices, ſay, (*r*) that they were neceſſitated and conſtrain'd ſo to do (which is not to be underſtood of a Neceſſitation ſimply ſuch, but of a πειθανάγκη, *perſuaſive Neceſſitation*,) and that this Neceſſitation was cauſed by their Inchantments. They that could inchant their Deities, may well be allow'd to inchant a Sieve. (*s*) *The Prayer of* Tuccia *the Veſtal Virgin reputed unchaſt is extant, which having us'd ſhe carry'd Water in a Sieve*, ſaith *Pliny*; who although he diſputeth, that Magick is a meer Inanity, yet is forc'd to contradict himſelf, and to acknowledge a real efficacy in Charms and Inchantments. (*t*) *Are not the Words in the Law of the twelve Tables touching thoſe that make maleficent Inchantments, to hurt, deſtroy or remove other Mens Corn?* for in thoſe ancient times it was believ'd, that Witches and Magicians (*u*) had power to remove a Crop of Corn from one Man's Field to another.

Atque ſatas alio vidi traducere meſſes.

But as *Tuccia* by an Inchantment approv'd her Chaſtity; ſo *Claudia* another Veſtal Virgin accus'd of Unchaſtity did the like, (*w*) for when the Symbol of the Mother of the Gods was brought to *Rome* in a Ship, which ſtuck faſt in *Tiber*, and could not be mov'd by the ſtrength of Men or Oxen, ſhe by her Girdle only drew it which way ſhe pleas'd. (*x*) To amatorious purpoſes alſo Inchantments were commonly made uſe of amongſt the Heathen (ſuch as *Virgil* deſcribeth in his *Pharmaceutria*) whence *Porphyry*

(b) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.*17. *Hoffman.umbr. p.* 100.
(c) *P.*119.
(d) *Selden. de D. Syr. Synt.* 2. *c.* 11.
(e) *Montacut. ſupr. p.* 174, 193, 195, 198. *Stanley, B.* 2. *c.* 4, 7. *Jacchiad. in Dan. p.* 222.
(f) *Baron. ad an.*319. *n.* 15. *ad an.* 321. *n.* 16, 19.
(g) *Str. l.* 1. *p. m.* 244.
(h) *Pr. Ev. l.* 2. *c.* 5.
(i) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 38, 39. *Sheringham ſupr. p.* 302.
(k) *Beroald. in Apul. Aſ. in præfat.*
(l) *Clem. Str. l.* 1. *p. m.* 245.
(m) *Phot. cod.* 242. *col.* 1073.
(n) *Ibid. cod* 94. *col.* 241.
(o) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 234, 260.
(p) *Plut. Qu. Rom. p.* 278.
(q) *Gale ibid. p.* 287, 281, 199. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.*10. *c.* 26.
(r) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 5. *c.* 8.
(s) *Extat Tucciæ Veſtalis inceſtæ precatio, quâ uſa aquam in cribro tulit.* Plin. Nat. Hiſt. l. 28. c. 2.
(t) *Non & legum ipſarum in duodecim tabulis verba ſunt, Qui fruges excantaſſet, & alibi, Qui malum carmen incantaſſet?* Ibid.
(u) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 10.
(w) *Lact. l.* 2. *c.* 8. *S. Aug. ſupr. l.*10. *c.*16.
(x) *Gale ſupr. p* 248, 260, 261.

phyry ſaith, (y) *making uſe of Stones and Herbs they bind ſome* (in the way of effaſcination) *and open Doors that are ſhut, or do ſome ſuch wonderful thing by Inchantments.* (z) Many Heathen Nations are famous for a magical faculty of inchanting Serpents; not only the *Marſi* and *Pſylli*, but the *Egyptians*, *Indians*, *Melindenſes*, *Nigritæ*, *Peruans*, as alſo the *Colchi* and *Theſſalians*. *Philoſtratus* reporteth that the *Indians*, who buſie themſelves in catching Serpents, account the Apple of their Eyes their chief prize, *it being a fiery Stone, florid and ſparkling out all manner of Colours, and of recondite virtue*, ſuch as *Gyges*'s Ring is ſaid to be (mention'd by *Plato* and *Cicero*) whereby he render'd himſelf inviſible, and which was doubtleſs *an inſtance* of the efficacy of Magical Incantation. But this Hiſtorical Truth, *The Inchantment of Serpents*, is not founded upon *Philoſtratus*'s Teſtimony, the Scriptures ſuppoſe the truth of it, *Pſal.* 58. 5, 6. *Eccl.* 10. 11. *Jer.* 8. 17. And beſides it is beyond all contradiction atteſted (a) by ſeveral learned and unqueſtionable Eye-witneſſes: Nor can we reaſonably diſcredit what *Damaſcius* reporteth touching the Philoſopher *Theoſebius* (whoſe exorciſm illuſtrateth thoſe Ejections of Demons recorded in Scripture) that *ſeeing his Wife's Demon would not go out by the more gentle words*, Theoſebius *adjur'd him*, (b) *alledging the Sunbeams and the God of the Hebrews.* The *Tartars* and *Cathayans* are ſaid to be (c) Witches, Sorcerers, invokers of the Devil. When the Sky is cloudy and threateneth Rain, their Aſtrologers or Necromancers will aſcend the Roof of the Palace of the *grand Can*, and cauſe the Rain and Tempeſts to fall round about without touching the ſaid Palace.

VIII. The Heathen World made uſe of *Inchantments*, *Spells* and *Charms* for the ſucceſsful management of their Affairs Civil and Military, for averting Evil and procuring Good, for defending themſelves and oppugning their Enemies. (d) *The* Aſſyrians *and* Bactrians, Ninus *and* Zoroaſter *being the Leaders, did not only fight with Swords and plain Strength, but alſo by Magick Arts, and out of the recondite Diſciplines of the* Chaldeans. (e) In the Sea about the Iſle *Zeilan* they fiſh for Pearl; but certain great Fiſhes would devour the Fiſhers, if they had not Magicians to charm them. (f) *The* Greeks *relate, that when thoſe Winds the Eteſiæ failed, and the Calamity was great, the Heat burning all up, the Winds not blowing that us'd to refrigerate the Fruits,* Ariſteus *in* Ceos *ſacrificing to* Jupiter Iſthmius, *eaſily recalled them. When* Xerxes *warred againſt* Greece, *and* Pythia *bade the* Delphi *ſupplicate to the Winds, they built an Altar and did Sacrifice to the Winds and had them their Helpers; for blowing ſtrongly about the Promontory* Sepias *they brake all the Preparation of the* Perſian *Naval Expedition.* Empedocles *the* Agrigentine *was ſirnam'd* κωλυσανέμας, *the Wind-ſtiller; for a Wind blowing from the Hill* Agragas, *which was grievous and morbific to the People of the* Country, *and alſo the cauſe of Barrenneſs to their Wives, he made that Wind to ceaſe. They ſay, that the Magi at* Cleonæ *watch the Clouds and obſerve, when they are about to dart out Hail, and by their Cants and Sacrifices that minaciouſneſs ceaſeth. And if an Animal for Sacrifice be wanting, they make their Fingers bleed, which ſufficeth for a Sacrifice.* (g) *Seneca* relateth this Story of the χαλαζοφύλακες, *Hail-obſervers* at *Cleonæ* (a *Town* in *Peloponneſus*) and ſeemeth in a raſh and ignorant Philoſophic Huff to explode the thing as incredible, *that Cants and Sacrifices have power to avert Hail.* But if this be his meaning, it is not the only ignorant Bravado that *Seneca* is guilty of, who was neither good Naturaliſt, Religioniſt, nor Theurgiſt, and therefore no competent Judge in the caſe. However, he acknowledgeth, that this Phænomenon was under diſpute, that Men were inquiſitive about the cauſe of it, that the Judges at *Cleonæ* puniſh'd the Hail-obſervers, if through their negligence their Vineyards or Corn were endamag'd by the Hail. And (doubtleſs) the atteſtation of Laws and Government is of far greater value than the Opinion of a very injudicious Philoſopher, who is not to be compar'd with *Clemens*, nor with *Jamblichus* (who ſpeaketh of the Hail-magicians;) nor with *Plutarch*, (h) who ſpeaketh of the Hail-magick as a thing acknowledg'd, but whoſe cauſe was not known. Nor is his Opinion to be confronted with the Teſtimony of *Pauſanias*, who ſaith, (i) That he hath ſeen Men, who by certain Sacra and Inchantments could avert Hail: Nor is he to be compar'd with *Simplicius* the Philoſopher, who touching external things offer'd and dedicated to the Gods by a pure Life and in due manner ſaith; (k) *They partake of the Divine Goodneſs, ſo that the Divine Energy is conſpicuouſly ſeen. One confeſſeth himſelf thereby freed from the Epilepſy, and by partaking of ſuch things hath ſtill'd Hail-ſtorms and the Waves of the Sea.* But a further Credibility will yet accrue to the Hail-magick, and to the uſe and efficacy of Charms and Inchantments in Paganiſm, from what a Learned Man hath diſcours'd of theſe matters, not from Credulity (as ſome vain Men ſuppoſe) but from ſound Reaſon and good Authority. (l) "There be Spells againſt
" Hail, and Diſeaſes, and Burnings (ſaith *Pli-*
" *ny*) ſome of which have been try'd, or by
" experience prov'd true. Extraordinary Storms
" of Hail very prejudicial to the Fruits of the
" Earth, which ſeem'd ſupernatural, *Seneca* ſpeaks
" of as happening very frequently. Country
" People ſought for remedy to ſuch as did deal in
" thoſe things by whom they were taught Rites
" and Sacrifices, as alſo Spells and Charms, which
" prov'd very helpful, and therefore were us'd
" very frequently, inſomuch as they that did
" write of *Agriculture* or *de Re ruſtica* in thoſe
" days, did not think, they did acquit themſelves
" of what they promis'd ſufficiently, if ſilent in
" theſe things, as particularly may appear by
" *Columella*, and the Receipts that he hath in his
" 10*th Book*. Certain it is, that Spells and Charms
" were in ſuch credit in thoſe days for ſuch uſes,
" that even *Conſtantine the Great*, a Chriſtian Em-
" perour, when he made Laws againſt Inchant-
" ments, he doth except thoſe that were for the
" preſervation of the Fruits of the Earth, and
" thoſe that were made againſt Hail particu-
" larly. (m) The Opinion of miſchief done
" by Witches and Magicians by Storms of Hail
" particularly, did continue long after *Conſtan-*
" *tine*'s Law was repeal'd, as appears by Laws
" made

(y) *Lapidibus & herbis adhibitis & alligant quoſdam & aperiunt clauſa oſtia, vel aliquid ejuſmodi mirabiliter operantur.*

(z) *Bochart. de An. par.* 2. *l.* 3. *c.* 6. *Marſham. ſupr. p.* 148, 149.

(a) *Bochart. ſupr. Caſaubon of Credul. and Incredul. p.* 99, *&c.*

(b) Τὰς τοῦ ἡλίου προτείνων ἀκτῖνας, καὶ τὸν Ἑβραίων θεόν. *Phot. cod.* 242. *col.* 1037.

(c) *Purchas Pilgr. Par.* 1. *B.* 4. *c.* 13.

(d) *Inter Aſſyrios & Bactrianos Nino quondam Zoroaſtreque ductoribus non tantum ferro dimicatum & viribus, verùm etiam magicis & Chaldæorum ex reconditis diſciplinis.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 5. S. Aug. de C. D. l. 21. c. 14.

(e) *Le Blanc's Travels. par.* 1. *c.* 20.

(f) *Clem. Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 654, 655.

(g) *Nat. Qu. l.* 4. *c.* 6.

(h) *Sympos. l.* 7. *c.* 2.

(i) *L.* 2.

(k) Μεταλαμβάνει καὶ αὐτὰ τῆς θείας ἀγαθότητος, ὡς καὶ θείας ἐνεργείας ἐπιδείκνυσθαι. καὶ γὰρ ἐπιληψίας τις ὡμολόγησεν ἀπηλλάχθαι. καὶ διὰ τῆς τῶν τοιούτων μεταλήψεως καὶ χαλάζας καὶ θαλάσσης κλύδωνας ἔπαυσε. *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 197. *Ed. Lond. an.* 1670.

(l) *Caſaub. of Credul. and Incredul. p.* 55, 62, 63.

(m) *Ibid. p.* 64.

“ made againſt them in after-ages, particularly by *Ludovicus* King of *France* and Emperour of *Germany*, his Additions to the *Capitula* made by him and his Father *Charles the Great*. (*n*) *Dion Caſſius* a very ſerious Hiſtorian hath a relation of plenty of Rain in time of greateſt neceſſity, by which a *Roman* Army was as it were miraculouſly preſerved, procured by Magick. (*o*) If we ſearch the Records of Antiquity, we ſhall find, that as it was very ordinary for them, who did ſtrive for Victories publickly, either in the *Circus* by racing or any way elſe, by any kind of Game or Exerciſe, to apply themſelves to Witches and Magicians, that by their help they might be ſure of the Game; ſo not unuſual alſo for Men to prevail by theſe Arts, which gave occaſion to *Conſtantius*'s Law *de Maleficis comprimendis*, where Learned *Gothofred*'s Note is; *Moſt Horſe-racers of thoſe times by Magical Arts, at times did hinder their Adverſaries Horſes, and made their own ſwifter. Ammianus Marcellinus* in his 26 Hiſtory doth record, that one *Hilarion* a Horſe-racer was put to death by *Apronianus* then Governour of *Rome*, for being convicted, to have ſent his Son to a Magician, to be taught by him certain ſecret Spells and Charms, by which, without any Man's knowledge, he might be aſſiſted and enabled to compaſs his deſires in the way of his Profeſſion. S. *Auſtin* writeth of himſelf, that at a time when he prepar'd to make a Party in a ſinging Prize or Match upon the Theatre, an *Aruſpex* or Magician offer'd him for a good Reward, to make him Victor. (*p*) We read beſides, that at the Olympick Games, the greateſt and moſt ſolemn conflux of Mankind that hath been known either before or ſince, the Records whereof were accounted moſt authentick, a certain *Mileſian* of known Valour or Ability being to wreſtle with an *Epheſian*, he could do nothing. becauſe the *Epheſian* had about him Ἐφέσια γράμματα, that is, certain Spells or Charms ſo called, *The Epheſian Letters*, which being ſuſpected and taken from him, he was thrown by his Adverſary no leſs than thirty times. *So* Euſtathius *upon the* 10 *Odyſſie.* To this Account of the Uſe and Efficacy of Charms and Inchantments amongſt the more civiliz'd Pagan Nations it is needleſs to ſubjoyn an Account of their Uſe and Efficacy amongſt the Savage and Barbarous Heathen Nations; for in all our Geographical and Hiſtorical Deſcriptions of thoſe Nations what do we read of but Rites of *Soothſaying, Witchcraft and Inchantments?* (*q*) Amongſt the *Virginians the Prieſts are Witches, of whom the People ſtand in great awe. If they would have Rain, or have loſt any thing, the Prieſt at their requeſt conjureth and often prevaileth.* We are told from good Authors of greater things than theſe (*r*).

(r) *Tartarorum Confinia tenent Muſcovitæ idololatræ, percelebre eſt illis Idolum Aurea Vetula dictum. Si qua gravior calamitas gentem premit, veluti fames, bellum vel peſtis, idolum ſuum ſtatim conſulunt, quod hoc modo faciunt. Coram ſimulachro proſtrati preces fundunt, mox tympanum in medio ſtatuunt, Hoc ſorte læti circumſtant argentium bufonem tympano imponunt, dein bacillo concutitur tympanum. Ac cui circumjacentium circumſtat bufo, protinus interficitur. Statim neſcio quibus idoli præſtigiis vitæ reſtitutus malorum cauſas exponit. Itáque placato Idoli numine, non ita multo poſt publica calamitate liberantur.* Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 39.

IX. Inchantments, Spells and Charms were one part of the Pagans *Pharmacy*, and were found to be of efficacy, as were ſeveral others alſo of their Magical Remedies for private and publick Calamities. Their Magical Remedies muſt be underſtood in a large Senſe; for many of their Medicines in themſelves no more than natural, were to them magical, becauſe their way of having them was magical. (*s*) *The Devil in the Oracles of* Amphiaraus, Amphilochus, Trophonius *and the like, taught Men in Dreams what Herbs and Druggs were proper for ſuch and ſuch Diſeaſes.* The like was done (*t*) in *Æſculapius*'s Temple, and it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that there was nothing of a Phyſick-ſhop in his Temple. Nor can any thing be rationally objected againſt that eminent Magical or Diabolical Miracle, (*u*) *the expulſion of the Peſtilence from* Rome *by bringing* Æſculapius's *Symbol thither*, for the matter of fact is reported by very good Authors, the cauſe was manifeſtly Diabolical, and by the ſame cauſe the ſame fact hath been done in *Rome* Papal, which was then done in *Rome* Pagan. For *Quercetanus* out of *Paulus Jovius* relateth, (*w*) *The Plague raging at* Rome, *was made to ceaſe by the Inchantments of one* Demetrius, *a noted Grecian Magician in the Year* 1522.

(w) *Peſtem Romæ graſſantem ſedatam fuiſſe incantationibus cujuſdam Demetrii.* Caſaubon. ſupr. p. 112.

It is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that all the ſtrange things reported of the Pagans *Teleſms*, are nothing more than meer Legend and Romance. (*x*) The *Arcadians* ſacrific'd and pray'd to *Myiagrus* (as *Pauſanias* relateth) and by that means were freed from danger by Flies. *Pliny* reporteth, that at the Olympic Games they ſacrific'd a Bull to *Myiodes*, which done, Clouds of Flies departed out of that Territory. And he ſheweth, that the *Cyrenians* ſacrific'd to the God *Achor*, when the multitude of Flies caus'd a Peſtilence, all which Flies thereupon preſently dy'd. (*y*) Pythagoras, Empedocles, Apollonius Tyanæus *cur'd Diſeaſes by Charms. The Ancients knew* (ſaith *Apuleius*) *that Charms are a Remedy for Wounds; for ſo in* Homer *the Blood flowing out of* Ulyſſes's *Wound was ſtopp'd by an Inchantment. So* Serenus Sammonicus, Marcellus Burdegalenſis *and* Vindicianus (three Phyſicians) *writing to a Chriſtian Emperour, preſcribe a Charm as a certain remedy for the ſtopping of Blood.* Cato *the Cenſor preſcribeth a Charm in caſe of Luxation*, Varro *for the Gout*, Theophraſtus *for a Sciatica.* Pliny *mentioneth Charms as a Remedy for Diſeaſes, and a Magical Remedy againſt the Spleen. The Emperour* Adrian (a Magician) *by an Inchantment drew out the Water in an Anaſarca, and by the ſame Artifice* Synalus Hannibal's *Phyſician, drew Iron out of the Body and out of the Wounds.* Plato *affirmeth, that Diſeaſes are cur'd by Incantations, and* Pindar *writeth, that* Æſculapius *cur'd many* μαλακαῖς ἐπαοιδαῖς, *by ſoft Inchantments.* (*z*) Amongſt the Eaſtern *Indians* and elſewhere, they that were bitten by Serpents, were cur'd by Charms.

—— *Peſtis nigris inſerta medullis*
Excantata perit. Lucan.

By this method *Orpheus* cur'd *Eurydice* ſtung by a Serpent, and therefore he is fabled to have reduc'd her from the Dead to Life again. (*a*) So the Ἐφέσια ἀλεξιφάρμακα, *Epheſian medicinal Inchantments* are famous to a Proverb, (*b*) the *Samothracians* are famous for their *Amulet-Rings*, (*c*) the Egyptians Amulets were a Branch of their Magick, and Sorcerers have the Name of φαρμακευταὶ from φαρμακείαι, *Medicines*, the Magicians being of Old the Phyſicians in Paganiſm; as at this day in the barbarous Heathen Nations the Prieſts and Magicians are their Phyſicians, which ſpeaketh the addictedneſs of the Heathen World to the Magical Pharmacy.

(*d*) *Ammianus*

(n) *Ibid.* p. 67.

(o) *Ibid.* p. 69, 70.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 71.

(q) *Purchas* par. 1. B. 8. c. 6.

(s) *Sir W. Raleigh Hiſt.* par. 1. B. 1. c. 11. S. 2.

(t) *Gale in Jambl.* p. 218, 219.

(u) *Elmenh. in Arnob.* p. 191.

(x) *Purchas ſupr.* B. 1. c. 17.

(y) *Tiraquell. de Nob.* p. 323, &c. *Ficin. Arg. in Cratyl. Sinnert. oper.* T. 4. l. 6. par. 9. c. 8. *Voſſ. de Idol.* l. 1. c. 8. *Grot. in Lev.* 19, 31.

(z) *Bochart. de An.* par. 2. l. 3. c. 5. *Marſham. ſupr.* p. 148, 149.

(a) *Grot. in Act.* 19. 19.

(b) *Scalig. in* 5. *Manil.*

(c) *Hoffm. umbr.* p. 173, 174.

(d) *Ammianus* relateth, that a ſimple old Woman was wont to cure *intervallatas Febres leni Carmine* (intermitting Fevers with a gentle Charm,) which is an inſtance of the Uſe and Efficacy of Charms. But he complaineth, that this Magical old Woman was put to Death (as a Witch,) and that a young Man (*e*) being ſeen in the Bath, to put the Fingers of both his Hands ſometimes to a Marble-ſtone, and ſometimes to his Breaſt, rehearſing withal the ſeven Vowels, imagining this to be a good Remedy againſt the pain of the Stomach, was tortur'd and put to Death; (*f*) and that in *Conſtantius*'s time if any one did wear any thing about his Neck, as a Remedy for a Quartan Ague or other Malady, he was puniſh'd capitally as practiſing Witchcraft. The ſeverity of which Proceedings aroſe in part from the fears and jealouſies of the Government, that was attempted upon and in Danger by Arts of Magick, which prevail'd notwithſtanding the extreme Severities againſt them; inſomuch that in the Reign of *Conſtantius*, *Valentinian* and *Valens* the Roman Empire was filled with Magical Artifices, to which the Pagans were irreclaimably addicted, and which they counted ſinleſs Practices, according to that of *Apuleius*, *Nihil quod ſalutis cauſa fit, criminoſum eſt*, *Nothing is criminal, that is done for the weal of Men.*

Hence Charms and Inchantments are in the Four and Twentieth Canon of the *Ancyran* Council called συνήθειαι ἐθνικαὶ, *Heathen Cuſtoms*; and that we may know, who are Inchanters, they are thus defin'd by *Balſamon* upon the Six and Thirtieth Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*. (g) *Inchanters are Magicians, that ſay Inchantments, and thereby attract Demons, to do their Wills.* So the *Egyptians* ſuppos'd, (*h*) that having diſtributed the Body of Man into Six and Thirty parts, and allotted the Preſidency of them to Six and Thirty Demons, theſe being invok'd, would heal the Diſeaſes of every part. *Tatianus* is of Opinion, (*i*) that the Roots and Herbs which Magicians make uſe of, are not of themſelves operative, but they are a στοιχείωσις τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων μοχθηρίας, *an Elementary Inſtitution of the improbous Art of Demons, who appoint, to what purpoſe every one of them ſhall be available and efficacious.* Whether ſo or otherwiſe, the Greeks found ſo much Efficacy in Magick and Magical Medicines, and ſo much admir'd it, (*k*) that at their Banquets they had certain Singing-men, who ſet forth the Power of Art-magick, and the wonderful things that were done by it, as alſo the Virtues and Powers of the Magicians Herbs and Medicaments, whoſe Songs they called Μαγῳδίαι. So *Alex. Trallianus* (*l*) recommendeth the Virtue of his Charms from much *Experience*, and *Cardan* experimented the Virtue of a Charm for the ſtopping of Bleeding. In the Country where I live, ſome irreligious Perſons have ſeveral times made uſe of an horrible Charm for the cure of their Swine endanger'd by Diſtempers, and it did not fail of curing them. The Virtue and Efficacy of the barbarous and inſignificant Words made uſe of in Charms, and by Magicians in their Conjurations, (*m*) hath as numerous and great Atteſtations as almoſt any matter of Fact in the World. A Phyſician of good Note *Antonius Benivenius* relateth what he ſaw, (*n*) that a Soldier had an Arrow ſhot into his Breaſt, ſo that the Iron of it ſtuck in the Bone of his Shoulder, and that no Phyſicians or Chyrurgeons could give him relief. Whereupon he applied himſelf to a Conjurer, by whoſe Charms the Iron came out, and the Soldier was cur'd. The like Cures are related by others. But inſtead of purſuing that Argument I will ſubjoin to this account of the Pagans Inchantments a Branch of the Law of *Moſes* Lev. 19. 19. *Thou ſhalt not let thy Cattel gender with a diverſe kind*, or (as the words may beſt be rendred,) *Thou ſhalt not make thy Beaſt gender with a diverſe kind.* He that hath read what prodigiouſly abſonous Rites and Materials Magicians make uſe of, will be prone to believe, that this Law is deſign'd againſt a Rite of the *Zabii*, namely, the Copulation of an Aſs and a Cow together, by which unnatural gendring a Fœtus was produced, that was for their purpoſe in making Compoſitions for their Feats of Witchcraft and Inchantment. (*o*) Such a Reaſon of this Law *Guil. Pariſienſis* hath aſſign'd.

X. Divination muſt be thought a principal Branch of the Heathens Magick, not only becauſe of the Ample diſpread of it (being commenſurate with the Heathen Religion,) the great authority and eminency of the Perſons imploy'd in it, its great eſteem and uſe among the Pagans, and the multifarious (or rather innumerable) kinds of it, but chiefly becauſe it was a grand Fundamental of the Heathens Religion, from whence alone it appeareth, that the Heathen World *was a World of Sorcery and Wizardiſm.* (*p*) For although ſome of the Philoſophic Pagans, that were either no Religioniſts at all, or no genuin Heathen Religioniſts, totally exploded Divination, (*q*) although ſome of the diſcreeter Pagan Religioniſts rejected and ridicul'd ſome Branches of their Divination, yet theſe Heterodoxies in Paganiſm are ſuch little Singularities, that they ſcarce deſerve to come into conſideration in repreſenting a Character of the World of Heathen Religioniſts. For Origen (*r*) often noteth it as a peculiarity of the Jewiſh Nation (which diſcriminated them from the Heathen and made them God's peculiar) *they deſpis'd all Divinations as proceeding from evil Demons.* And becauſe they were the only people without Divination (the Gentiles Arts of Divination being to them prohibited,) therefore he thinketh it neceſſary, that they ſhould have Prophets of their own, otherwiſe they would not have adher'd to their Law, but would have deſpis'd their own Religion and Condition (as having nothing Divine,) and out of a longing deſire of knowing Futurities would have made a Defection to the Heathen Gods. *Ælian* argueth, that the barbarous Nations are not impious, becauſe they affirm, (*s*) *that there are Gods, that they are Provident of us, and that they foreſignifie things to come*; which is to ſay, they are ſound in the Fundamentals. And indeed they are ſo ſound in believing Divination, (*t*) *that they are addicted to it at the rate of madneſs.* (*u*) *Zoſimus* relateth it as the beginning of *Conſtantine*'s Wickedneſs (Defection) τὴν μαντικὴν ἔχειν ἐν ὑποψίᾳ, *he ſuſpected Divination.* (*w*) *Xenophon* proveth, that *Socrates* was an Orthodox Religioniſt, becauſe *he uſed Divination*; and *Socrates* look'd upon *Ariſtodemus* as an Atheiſt, becauſe he underſtood him to be one, that neither ſacrific'd to the Gods, ὔτε μαντικῇ χρώμενος, *nor uſed Divination.* (x) *All Cities and all Nations* (ſaith *Xenophon*) *Conſult the Gods by Divination, touching what they ſhould do, and what they ſhould not do.* So *Cicero* obſerveth, (y) *that no* (Heathen) *City or Nation was without the methods of Divination. The Romans that they might neglect no kind of Divination, made uſe of the Diſcipline of the Etrurian Soothſayers.* This Diſcipline is ſaid (z) to have had its origin amongſt the *Etrurians* from one *Tages* a Youth, that ſeemed to riſe out of the Earth, as the Husbandmen were Plowing (which may be Hiſtory, not Fable,) who taught them the Rules of *Soothſaying*, and compris'd them in certain Books, which they rightly called *Libri Acherontici*, and his *Sacra* they called *Sacra Acherontia.* From theſe Etrurian Soothſayers the *Romans* deriv'd many of their Ceremonies and Superſtitions, to theſe they had recourſe for the interpretation of publick Prodigies, (a) to theſe they ſent the Sons of their principal Men, to be inſtructed in their Diſcipline. The Founder of their City was himſelf an *Augur* and the Founder of a College of *Augurs* of greateſt Eſtimation and Authority, who were to interpret *the Signs of the Gods.* They were eſtabliſh'd by a Law of the Twelve Tables and ſtil'd *Interpretes Jovis Opt. Max.* and together with the matters of their Prieſthood and Soothſaying they had a Tranſcendency of Power in the Affairs of the Commonwealth. (b) *Amphilochus* and *Mopſus* Kings of the *Argives* (c) were both *Augurs*, and before them *Amphiaraus* and *Tireſias* were ſuch, who were eminent and illuſtrious Perſons, of whom the former was not only honoured, but deify'd by the Greeks. *Helenus* and *Caſſandra* were the Children of a King, and one of them was an *Augur*, the other a *Sibyl.* (d) *Diviners were had in great Honour and Eſtimation, ſuch was* Trophonius *and* Orpheus, *and* Muſæus *and* Zamolxis *the Pythagorean anciently* (*a God among the* Getæ) *and in our times* Decænius *at* Byrebiſta, *and* Achaicarus *among the* Boſphorani, *the* Indian Gymnoſophiſts, *the* Perſian Magi *and* Necromancers, *the* Chaldeans *among the* Aſſyrians (the *Druids* and *Bardi* among the *Gauls*, the *Galleotæ* among the *Sicilians*) *and ſuch were the* Etrurian *Soothſayers among the* Romans. (e) And ſuch was their *Tanaquil* (ſo much commended by them for her Honeſty and Huſwifery) a Woman of great remark for Aſtrological-magical Divination. Divination was of ſo great eſteem and uſe with the Pagans, (f) that they derive their God-Society and Inſtitutes of Religion from it, (g) they ſuppoſe, that without it we had not had Phyſick, (h) and their Rule was, to do nothing of moment, *ſine auſpiciis without conſulting the divinatory Signs.* Thence the Athenians had certain Prieſts who were Diviners in all their publick Councils, the Lacedæmonian Kings muſt have an *Augur* for their Aſſeſſor, the Eaſtern *Magi* were Counſellors and Aſſeſſors to their Kings, all publick Affairs were adminiſtred by their Conduct and Councel, and among the Romans we find a *Soothſayer* at every Wedding, if any Man was to Marry a Wife, to Travel, to Plant a Vineyard, or to diſpatch any Buſineſs, the *Fortune-tellers* and *Southſayers* muſt be conſulted, and if a City was to be built, the *Magi* muſt determine the time. The Heathen World was full ſtock'd with *Oracles*, *Sortes*, *Augurs*, *Soothſayers*, *Prophets*, *Propheteſſes*, *the wiſe Women*, *Necromancers*, *Fortune-tellers* (and ſuch like,) that plainly ſpeak it, to have been a World of *Sorcery and Wizardiſm*; which alſo appeareth from the World of its modes of Divination (i) *by the Sacrifices, Flames and Entrails, by preſaging Prodigies, by Lots, by Dreams, by Oracles and by the Stars, Necromancy, Enthuſiaſm, Hydromancy, Lecanomancy, Geomancy, Aeromancy, Capnomancy, Libanomancy, Coskinomancy, Axinomancy, Aleuromancy, Arithmomancy, Stoikeiomancy, Lithomancy, Dactylomancy, Crithomancy, Lychnomancy, Chiromancy, Phyſiognomy, Sternomancy, Tephromancy, Rabdomancy, Catoptromancy, Gaſtromancy, Alectruomancy, by Omens, Sneezings, Palpitations, caſual Occurſations, Ooſcopy, by Bones, Reeds, the Nail of a Boy* (Onychomancy,) *by ſeveral ſorts of Animals* (as Birds and Serpents,) *by Viſions, Apparitions,* θεαγωγία, *evocation of Gods.* This vaſt collective is one of the principal conſtitutive Ingredients of Heatheniſm; whence *Clemens* exhorteth (k) *relinquiſh Thebes and Divination.*

(d) *L.* 29.

(e) *Ibid.*

(f) *L.* 19.

(g) Ἐπαοιδοί οἱ γοήτευται, οἱ τὰς ἐπῳδὰς λέγοντες, καὶ διὰ τούτων ἐφέλκοντες τοὺς δαίμονας εἰς τὰ οἰκεῖα θελήματα.

(h) *Orig c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 416.

(i) *Or. c. Græc. p.* 156.

(k) *Sheringham ſupr. p.* 300.

(l) *Spencer. not. in Orig.* 18.

(m) *Gale in Jambl. p.*290.293.

(n) *Tiraquell. ſupr. p.* 325.

(o) *Spencer de Leg. Hebr. l.* 2. *c.* 20.

(p) *Spencer. not. in Orig. p.*28, 29.

(q) *Cic. de Divin. l.* 1, & 2.

(r) *C. Celſ. l.* 1 *p.* 2[illegible]. *l.* 3. *p.* 113. *l.* [illegible] *p.* 2[illegible].

(s) Καὶ εἶναι θεοὺς, καὶ προνοεῖν ἡμῶν, καὶ προσημαίνειν τὰ μέλλοντα. *Var. Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 31.

(t) *Auguria & ſortes quibus ad amentiam omnis ferè barbaries dedita eſt.* Maffei Indic. p. 22.

(u) *Hiſt. p.* 104.

(w) *Apom.* 2.

XI. But it would be an extravagance, to ſuppoſe, that all the Heathen modes of Divination are downright Magick; ſome of them are nothing more than Magical kind of Vanities: But a very great number of them are in leſſer or greater degree Magick. (l) The Fathers and Councils of the Chriſtian Church ſuppoſe, that the Heathen *Vates* had to do with Demons, and they reckon Aſtrology amongſt the Species of Magick and δαιμονιώδη ἔργα, *Demoniacal Works.* The Chriſtian Emperors in their Edicts (m) make the Heathen Divination in general no leſs than Capital; and therefore they ſuppos'd it no better than Magick. So the holy Scripture repreſenteth it as an eminent Branch of the Heathens Magick. *Deut.* 18. 10, 11, 12. *There ſhall not be found amongſt you any one* ——— *that uſeth Divination, or an obſerver of times* (rather (n) *an Obſerver of Signs* for Divination,) *or an Inchanter* (rather a Soothſayer,) *or a Witch, or a Charmer, or a Conſulter with familiar Spirits, or a Wizard, or a Necromancer; for all that do theſe things are an abomination unto the Lord.* 2 King. 17. 17. *They cauſed their Sons and their Daughters to paſs through the fire, and uſed Divination.* That Law of *Moſes* Lev. 19. 26. which in our Tranſlation prohibiteth *Inchantments*, is a Law againſt *Divination*, and the words are beſt rendred in this manner; *ye ſhall not practiſe Soothſaying, nor obſerve Signs* (the Signs of the Gods, as the Heathen call'd them,) which practice of Soothſaying is join'd with downright Magick, and therefore cannot be remote from it. *Mich.* 5. 12. *I will cut off witchcrafts out of thine hand, and thou ſhalt have no more Soothſayers.* Jer. 27. 9. *Hearken not to— your Diviners, nor to your Dreamers, nor to your Enchanters, nor to your Sorcerers.* The Sorcery and Magick which was in the Heathen methods of Divination, will beſt appear, by diſtinguiſhing it into *Magick of the interiour dealing or the more intimate Magical Correſpondence. And Ma-*

(x) Πάσαι αἱ πόλεις καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη διὰ μαντικῆς ἐπερωτῶσι τὺς θεὺς, τί τε χρὴ, καὶ τί ὐ χρὴ ποιεῖν. *Ibid.*

(y) De Divinat. l. 1.

(z) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 18. [illegible] Arnob. l. 2. p. 87. Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 55.

(a) Heurn. Phil. Barb. c. 31.

(b) *Quid enim majus eſt, quàm poſſe à ſummis imperiis & ſummis poteſtatibus comitia tollere, & concilia vel inſtituta dimittere, vel habita reſcindere? Quid gravius quàm rem ſuſceptam dirimi, ſi unus Augur aliter dixerit? Quid magnificentius, quàm poſſe decernere, ut magiſtratu ſe abdicent Conſules? Quid religioſius, quàm cum populo, cum plebe, agendi jus aut dare aut non dare? Quid Legem, ſi non jure rogata eſt, tollere.* Cic. de Leg. 2.

(c) *Idem de Divin. l.* 1.

(d) *Strabo l.* 16.

(e) Elmenh. in Arnob. p. 155.

(f) Jambl. de vit. Pyth. p. 1[illegible]9.

(g) Phot. Cod. 241. col. 1022.

(h) Cic. de Divin. l. 1.

(i) Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 7. c. 35.

(k) Προτρεπτ. p. m. 55.

(l) *M. Blaſtar. Syntagm. p.* 173. *Balſam. in Can.* 24. *Concil. An. Cyr. Montacut. ſupr. p.* 190, 199.

(m) *Baron. ad an.* 356. *n.* 1.

(n) *Dionyſ. Voſſ. in Maim. de Idol. c.* 11. *S* 4. Ἡ διὰ τινων σημείων μαντεία. *Divinatio quæ fit per ſigna. Balſam. in Can.* 65. *Concil.* 6. *in Trullo.*

gick of the more remote and ſuperficial dealing or correſpondence. Both theſe ſorts of Magick are viſible in King *Menaſſeh*'s methods of Divination, which he deriv'd from the Heathen 2 *Chron.* 23. 6. *He obſerved times* (Signs) *and uſed Inchantments* (rather *practic'd Soothſaying,*) *and uſed Witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar Spirit, and with Wizards.* A familiar Spirit is call'd in the Hebrew אוב *ob* (which properly ſignifieth a Bottle,) which Name is ſuppos'd to be given to ſuch Spirits, becauſe in ſome Human Bodies they are *Ventriloquous*, and ſome whom they inhabit are ἐγγαστρίμυθοι and ἐγγαστριμάντεις, *Ventriloquous Diviners:* But I do not ſuppoſe, that this is the only or the chief Reaſon of their Name. Thoſe familiar Spirits were ſo called for another Reaſon; becauſe themſelves being conſulted by Magicians (out of an Human Body) are in their Reſponſes uſually Ventriloquous, and ſpeak as thoſe that ſpeak out of the Belly (as it were) with a deep, low and hollow Tone. For ſo the words of the Prophet muſt be tranſlated and underſtood. *Iſa.* 29. 4. *Thou ſhalt be brought down, and ſhalt ſpeak out of the ground, and thy ſpeech ſhall be low out of the Duſt, and thy voice ſhall be* כאוב *as of a familiar Spirit out of the ground, and thy ſpeech ſhall whiſper* (or mutter) *out of the duſt.* It is not thoſe that deal with familiar Spirits, *which ſpeak out of the duſt, and out of the ground*, but it is the familiar Spirits themſelves, that ſo ſpeak (*o*) as *Maimonides* rightly deſcribeth them; therefore כאוב muſt be rendred, not *as of one that hath a familiar Spirit, but as of a familiar Spirit.* So the word may be render'd *Iſa.* 8. 19. *They ſhall ſay unto you, ſeek unto* האבות *Haoboth familiar Spirits, and unto Wizards that peep* (whiſper) *and that mutter.* Both the Familiar Spirits and the Magicians are mutterers in their Speech, the familiar Spirits, not only in, but out of an Human Body, are Ventriloquous, and therefore the words of *Saul* 1 Sam. 28. 8. *Divine unto me by the familiar Spirit*, are thus rendred by the Septuagint, μάντευσαι δή μοι ἐν τῷ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ, *Divine unto me by that which is Ventriloquous.*

Some that Divine by their familiar Spirits, have their Divination from them by way of *Afflation*, which was the Caſe of the Pythian Girl, the Sibyls and the Bacchicks; (*p*) others have it by a *Nidulation* of the familiar Spirit in ſome part of their Body *uttering Divination* (as *Act.* 16. 16.) of which ſort of Spirit there are ſeveral Inſtances in ancient and modern Authors of unqueſtionable Learning and Virtue. *Cælius Rhodiginus* atteſteth, that he knew a Woman, from the lower part of whoſe Belly there came forth a Demon's voice, that this voice himſelf and innumerable others heard (the Demon's name which he own'd and anſwer'd to, was *Cincinatulus,*) and for this mode of Divination *Eurycles* is famous amongſt the Greeks. Some have their Divination from familiar Spirits by an *unconfin'd Poſſeſſion*; (*q*) as one *Albicerius*, touching whom S. *Auſtin* relateth ſtrange Inſtances of his telling of ſtoln Goods, and of things unknown by any Human methods of Knowledge, and even of the very thoughts and imaginations of one Man. For being challeng'd by one of S. *Auſtin*'s Condiſciples, to tell him what it was he had in his Thoughts, this Diviner told him, he did think of *Virgil*, and (although ſcarce able to read) boldly and ſecurely pronounc'd the very Verſe of the Poet he had in his Mind. Who can doubt, but that ſo prodigious a Diviner (being a prodigious Villain in his Life) was really poſſeſs'd by a Devil? To this mode of Divination (becauſe Melancholic, Maniacal and Epileptic Perſons are prepar'd for a Diabolical Poſſeſſion and are often real Demoniacks) we may reduce the Divinations of diſtracted Melancholiſts, whom *Ariſtotle* ſuppoſeth to have in their Minds (*r*) *aliquid præſagiens atque divinum, ſomething Preſagient and more than Human.* But moſt uſually the Magicians have their Divinations by way of Conference with their familiar Spirits, in a way of Speech or by Signs equivalent to Speech. (*s*) The Prieſts and Witches in *Peru*, (who tell of things loſt, and of what is done in the fartheſt Parts before News can come) make themſelves drunk, *that they may be fit for the Devils conference. Purchas* in *London* ſpake with one *Tomocomo* (a great Man in *Virginia*, who came from thence to ſee *England*,) who inform'd him, that upon calling or conjuring their *Okeeus* came out of the Air, and often appear'd to them in his Houſe or Temple, and that he propheſied of the coming of the *Engliſh* to *Virginia*. They that conſulted *Teraphim* (as *Nebuchadnezzar* did *Ezek.* 21. 21.) were anſwer'd by Speech. (*t*) So were they that conſulted *the inchanted head of a dead man*, and ſo was the Necromancer דרש אל המתים *that conſulteth the dead* (ſo the Hebrew words ſignifie) *Deut.* 18. 11. (*u*) but the voice of the Souls of the dead, as alſo of the Demons that are conſulted, is ſaid to be, not plain and articulate, but rather an *hiſſing*, or *gnaſhing*, as *Homer* and *Horace* deſcribe it, and as *Hermolaus Barbarus* deſcrib'd the voice of that Demon whom he conſulted. (*w*) Several modes of conſulting the dead were uſually practis'd by the Pagans (Necromancy is called by *Tertullian publica literatura*,) and there were ſeveral places amongſt them of great fame for oracular Reſponſes of the Dead. (*x*) *Apollo* taught them a particular Magical Rite of ſacrificing for the purpoſe of Necromancy (mention'd by moſt of the Latin Poets, which ſheweth it to have been of ordinary Practice,) agreeably whereunto *Ulyſſes* in *Homer* and *Scipio* alſo made their Magical Sacrifices in a Ditch *ad evocandos Manes, to call forth the Souls of the Dead.* The horrible Inchantments of the *European* Pagans by the uſe of Blood to raiſe up a dead Body to give Reſponſes, is of Affinity to that Magical Rite of the Oriental *Zabii*, that poured the Blood of the Sacrifices offer'd to their Demon-Gods into a Ditch uſually, eating and feaſting about it, thereby convoking the Demons into preſence, and calling forth the Souls of the Dead, to conſult them for Divination. And as the *Zabii* had their Swords drawn, when they made their Magical Sacrifices and Feaſts for Divination: So *Ulyſſes* in *Homer* had his Sword drawn, when he called forth *Tireſias*'s Soul by his Rite of Blood. The Necromantick conſulting the Dead is probably meant by the Prophet *Iſa.* 8. 19. *For the Living to the Dead?* One mode of conſulting the Dead was by ſleeping among their Sepulchres for Dreams of Divination, as the paganizing Jews did, *Iſa.* 65. 4. *Which remain among the Graves and lodge in the Monuments.* (*y*) The Sepulchres of the Pagan Heroes were in Mountains and in Groves, in both which places the Pagans celebrated their *Sacra* and conſulted the Dead for Divination. The Pſalmiſts words therefore *Pſal.* 106. 28. *Of eating the Sacrifices of the Dead*, may commodiouſly be underſtood, not only of Sacrifices offer'd to the

(*o*) *De Idol. c.* 6. *S.* 2.

(*p*) *Leon. Allat. de engaſtr. ſynt. c.* 2. *Byer. addit. ad Seld. p.* 226.

(*q*) *Caſaub. of Credul. and Incred. p.* 148, 149.

(*r*) *Cic. de Div. l.* 1.

(*s*) *Purchas pil.* 1. *B. c.* 11. *S.* 2. *B.* 8. *c.* 5. *S.* 3.

(*t*) *Maimon. ep.*

(*u*) *Leo Allat. ſupr. c.* 5.

(*w*) *Dion. Voſſ. ſup. c.* 11. *S.* 4. *Peter. adv. fal. lac. Art. l.* 1. *c.* 11.

(*x*) *Niceph. in Syneſ. p.* 411. *Bernald. in Apul. Apol. p.* 55. *Pantin. in* [illegible] *S. Theol. p.* 335. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 35. *Amm. in Min. Fel. p.* [illegible]

(*y*) *Spencer. de Leg. Heb. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *S.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 15. *S.* 3. *Tertul. de An. c.* 57.

the *Dii Manes*: But as *Bodinus* interpreteth them (z) of the Necromantic Sacrifices for convoking the Gods and Demons into preſence, and calling forth the Souls of the Dead. —— *animas imis excire ſepulchris.*

XII. Although many of the Pagans modes of Divination in themſelves ſeem but ſlight things, yet uſually they were complicated with *Magick of interiour Dealing and Correſpondence.* Such was their *Rabdomancy* or *Belomancy* (Divination by Rods or Arrows) which was one of their moſt (*a*) ancient modes of Divination and of very large diſpread in Paganiſm, being us'd by many Nations (but with a great diverſity) from whom the Jews are ſuppos'd, to have learned it. *Hoſ.* 4. 12. *My people ask counſel at their ſtocks and their ſtaff declareth unto them.* In his War againſt the Jews *Nebuchadnezzar* made uſe of this mode of Divination, *Ezek.* 21. 21. *He made his arrows bright*, or as S. *Jerom* expoundeth the place, *he commix'd his arrows.* His Divination was *Chaldean*, and therefore muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been of the ſame Nature with that of the *Alani*, (*b*) whoſe mode of Divination was by Rods *cum incantamentis quibuſdam ſecretis, with certain ſecret Inchantments.* (*c*) An *Engliſh* Gentleman travell'd with certain *Tartars*, which divined by the Blade-bones of Sheep ſodden and then burnt to Powder, which being mingled with the Blood of the Sheep they writ therewith certain Characters, with divers Words and Ceremonies, and thence divined of their Succeſs, which they found true to their coſt. *Cingis Can* marching againſt **Uncham** enquir'd of his Aſtrologers and Diviners touching his Succeſs. They taking a green Reed cleft it aſunder, placing the parts thereof a good diſtance one from another, and writ upon the one the name of **Uncam**, and **Cingis** on the other, telling the King, that whilſt they were reading their conjuring Charms, theſe Reeds would fight together, and the Victory ſhould remain with him, whoſe Reed got the better, which accordingly came to paſs. *Spartianus* (*d*) relateth a *Catoptromancy of* Didius Julianus'*s*, that a Boy in a Glaſs ſaw the departure of *Julianus* and the coming of *Severus*, but it was by virtue of an Inchantment. (*e*) *Amongſt the* Germans *there were ſacred Women, who from the Circumvolutions and Noiſes of the Rivers foretold things to come. Theſe ſuffer'd them not to begin their fight with* Cæſar, *till the New Moon began to ſhine.* (*f*) *Varro* reporteth, that *Numa* made uſe of *Hydromancy*, and that the Images of the Gods appear'd to him in the Water, and inſtructed him, what Sacra to obſerve and appoint. *Actius Navius*'s *Augury* was doubtleſs complicated with Magick of interiour Dealing and Correſpondence. For many good Authors report of him, (*g*) that *Tarquinius Priſcus having a mind to know what there was in his Augury*, told him that he thought of ſomething, and would know of him, whether it could be done or not? *Navius* having perform'd his Augury, anſwer'd, that it might be done. Whereupon *Tarquinius* told him, that this was the thing which he had in his Thoughts, *that a Whetſtone might be cut in two with a Razor. Navius* bad them make trial. A Whetſtone therefore was immediately brought into the place of Aſſembly, and in the ſight of the King and People was cut in two with a Razor. S. *Auſtin* acknowlegeth, (*h*) that Aſtrologers *mirabiliter multa vera reſpondent*, (anſwer many true things wonderfully:) But he ſuppoſeth, that it is done by the ſecret inſtinct of evil Spirits. (*i*) In ancient times they were careful to lay the Foundation of their Cities under a fortunate Configuration of the Heavens, they Aſtrologically inveſtigated and predicted the Life and Fortune of their Cities, as they did of Men: But theſe Aſtrological trifles were complicated with real Magick; for they propitiated the Genius of the place, they offer'd a pure Virgin in Sacrifice, erected a Statue with a new and ſecret Name inſcrib'd unto which they ſacrific'd, and wherein they inclos'd the Fortune and Genius of the City. So Cities and Nations were dedicated to their Tutelar Gods *peculiari & arcano ritu*, which may ſignifie *ſomething of Magick of interiour Dealing and Coreſpondence.* (*k*) Such was the Divination of *Antoninus* the Philoſopher the Son of *Ædeſius*, who foretold, that after his Death the Temple of *Serapis* and other Pagan Temples in *Egypt* ſhould be demoliſh'd, and that Temples ſhould be turn'd into Sepulchres; which Prediction gained him the Reputation of a Prophet, and the Heathen Deities the Reputation of Divine Preſcience, which occaſion'd the writing of S. *Auſtin*'s Diſcourſe *de Divinatione Dæmonum of the Divination of Demons.*

But the Pagan modes of Divination eſtabliſhed by the Laws muſt be called *Magick of a more remote and ſuperficial Dealing and Correſpondence.* In this abatement of Senſe it was Magick; for the Pagan Theologers and the Chriſtian Apologiſts agree, (*l*) that the Pagan methods of Divination were the Invention and Inſtitution of Demons, that all (Heathen) Divination cometh by them, that the circumterraneous Demons predict Events that befall Men and Cities (as *Celſus* ſaith,) and that Demons govern the ſeveral methods of Divination. *Afflatu ſuo vatum pectora inſpirant, extorum fibras animant, avium volatus gubernant, ſortes regunt,* (*m*) *Divinationes cunctas & magorum miracula gubernant. They inſpire the Prophets, animate and mark the Entrails, govern the Birds in Augury, and the Lots and all Divinations, and the Miracles of the Magi.* If therefore the Chriſtians underſtood Heatheniſm, if the wiſeſt of the Heathen underſtood their own Affairs, or if the Nature of the thing be conſidered, it appeareth, that there was a Magical Dealing and Correſpondence (more remote and ſuperficial) in the publick Divination eſtabliſhed by the Laws; for who can doubt, but that they conſulted the Gods, who conſulted the Signs of the Gods? Which Signs of the Gods (although there was much of uncertainty, fallacy and fraud in the Heathen Divination, nor could any thing better be reaſonably expected in an Inſtitution of Human Vanity and of Diabolical Wickedneſs and Impoſture) were oftentimes a ground of true Divination. (*n*) For *Chalchas* rightly foretold the number of Years, that the Trojan War ſhould laſt from the number of Sparrows, which a Serpent deſtroyed in the Neſt. When *Scylla* ſacrific'd, a Snake came out from the bottom of the Altar, which the Soothſayer rightly interpreted to be a fortunate Preſage, and prayed him to lead forth his Army. So when *Cæſar* a little before his Death ſacrific'd an Ox, and among the Entrails the Heart was wanting, he was told by *Spurinas* the *Aruſpex*, that the prodigy concerned his Life, which was a true Divination. There are ſeveral conſiderable Inſtances in Pagan Hiſtory (*o*) of true Divinations from Birds, Beaſts, Inſects, Prodigies, which may be illuſtrated from a remarkable prognoſtick in modern Hiſtory, wherein there was nothing of Magick, and which doth not demonſtrate the Domination of Evil Demons, but of Divine Providence. (p) *The ſtrangeſt thing that I have read of in this kind, being certainly true, was, that the Night before the Battel at* Novara, *all the Dogs which follow'd the* French *Army, ran from them to the* Switzers, *leaping and fawning upon them, as if they had been bred and fed by them all their lives,* and in the Morning following, Trivulzi *and* Tremoüille *Generals for* Lewis *the Twelfth were by the Imperial* Switzers *utterly broken and put to ruine.* If this divinatory Sign and divining by it had been a Rite of Demonolatry, it muſt have been of the Magical Character, as the Heathens Divinations were of which a principal one eſtabliſh'd by their Laws was their *Aruſpicina* or *Extiſpicina*, the Magical Nature whereof may be illuſtrated from an uſual Practice of the *Roman* Emperours and their curſed Magicians; (q) they ſacrific'd and diſſected tender Infants, Women and Women with child, and ſearch'd their Entrails for Divination, which are manifeſtly the Rites of Magick and of Magicians, *becauſe they conſulted Demons in their Sacrifices.* For the ſame reaſon the Sacrificing Children to *Moloch*, to make Divination (for that was (*r*) one deſign of it,) as alſo the Rites of the *Cimbrians*, *Gauls*, *Luſitanians*, and many other of the Heathen Nations, (*s*) who ſacrific'd Men and ſearched their Entrails to make Divination, were the Rites of Magick and of Magicians. And the ſame reaſon inferreth, that the Heathens ſacrificing Animals, their diſſecting them and ſearching their Entrails, to make Divination, were the Rites of Magick and of Magicians. And if their *Aruſpicina* was no better than a Rite of Magick, ſhall not their *Augury* (ſtrictly ſo called) be of the ſame Character? therefore as *Ammianus* relateth, (*t*) *Athanaſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* was juſtly remov'd from the Sacrament by a Synod, becauſe throughly underſtanding *Augury*, and what the Augural Birds portended, he had more than once foretold future Events, which was no leſs a Crime than a playing the Magician.

(z) *Demoman. l.* 2. *c.* 3.

(a) *Grot. in Ezek.* 21. 21. *Pocock on Hoſ.* 4. 12. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 230, 238.

(b) *Ammian. l.* 31.

(c) *Purchas ſupr. B.* 4. *c.* 13. *and c.* 11. *S.* 1.

(d) *In Did. Jul.*

(e) *Clem. Strom l.* 1. *p. m.* 224.

(f) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 35.

(g) *Cic. de Div. l.* 1.

(h) *De C. D. l* 5. *c.* 7.

(i) *J. Gregor. Not. & obſerv. c.* 7. *v. Appian. in Syriacis de Seleucia.*

(k) *Baron. ad an.* 389. *n.* 75, 77, 81.

(l) *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 17. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 417. *Eugubin. de Per. phil. l.* 8. *c.* 22. *Min. Fel. p.* 248. *S. Cypr. de Idol. van. Tertull. Apol. c.* 22, 23.

(m) *Apul. Apol. p.* 491. *ed. Berould.*

(n) *Cic. de Div. l.* 1. *Val. Max. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(o) *Alex. ab Alex. Gen. dier. l* 5. *c.* 13.

XIII. As the being *a Prophet* in the Jewiſh or Chriſtian Church did not only or chiefly conſiſt in predicting things to come (which was but one part of a Prophet's work) but in being *a Teacher by Inſpiration* (thus knowing and ſhewing the Mind of God;) ſo to be a like Interpreter of the Gods in Paganiſm (having acquaintance with their Mind,) this was to be *a Diviner*, and this (*u*) was their *Mantice* or Divination, of which the Prediction of Futurities was a Branch. And becauſe a ſupernatural Afflation was uſually and eminently the way, whereby the Interpreters of the Gods became ſuch, therefore *Plato* in his *Phædrus* will have *Mantice* anciently called μανικὴ, as being *a Divine Fury and Madneſs*, or maniacal kind of Enthuſiaſm; for ſuch was their ſupernatural Afflation; (*w*) *they that are in an Enthuſiaſm, are not ſui compotes.* The Poets are Prophets (called Vates, *Tit.* 1. 12.) were the Pagans ſacred Writ as it were, from them they deriv'd their Divinity, them they ſuppos'd divinely inſpir'd; *Plato* in his *Io* looketh upon them *as the Organs and Interpreters of the Gods*, agreeably to his Etymology of the Name *Mantice* he uſually calleth their Enthuſiaſm μανίαν, *Madneſs*, and he diſputeth in his *Phædrus*, *that the Divine Madneſs is better than Humane Sobriety.* So the Divination by this Afflation which *Cicero* (*x*) attributeth to the *Sibylls* and *Pagan Prophets* is called *Fury* and *Madneſs*, becauſe their Extaſies (*y*) were a violent diſtraction and alienation of Mind, an ὀλιγοχρόνιος μανία, or a fit of Madneſs. Such maniacal kind of Extaticks, Enthuſiaſts and Prophets (z) were uſual in the Pagans Temples, whence they had the Name of *Fanatici* (which is the ſame with ἱερόδουλοι, *Temple-Servants*) at their *Orgia* they were uſually inſpir'd with a *Corybantick* and *Bacchical* Enthuſiaſm, (*a*) their Prieſts uſually had it, even thoſe of that filthy Goddeſs *Cotytto* amongſt the *Athenians* were wont to be inſpir'd with furious Raptures. The Prieſt of *Iſis* is deſcrib'd by *Apuleius*, (*b*) *fatigatos anhelitus trahens*, *panting for Breath, not becauſe he was tir'd with any bodily labour*, but becauſe he was full of a Divinatory Fury and Afflation; for ſo the *Sibylls* are deſcrib'd by the Poets, *becauſe full of God.* If theſe Reports of the Pagan Theologers touching their own Affairs may be credited, they had amongſt them a ſupernatural Afflation and Enthuſiaſm (to which they were hugely addicted) in great plenty; and from the Account which themſelves have given of it, it is not hard to diſcern the true origin, kind and quality of their Divinatory Enthuſiaſms. For they deſcribe them (*c*) as Operations of their Theurgy, to which ἐπῳδαὶ, *Charms or Inchantments* are preparatory. (*d*) Some have Vaticination and become extatical by the ſound of Muſical Organs, Cymbals, Drums and Pipes (as the *Corybantes*, *Bacchicks*, and thoſe that celebrate *Cybele's Sacra*) ſome by drinking Water (as the Prieſt of *Apollo Clarius* at *Colophon*) ſome by ſitting on the Mouth of a Den (as the Delphic Vates) ſome by the Steams of Water (as the Propheteſſes at *Branchidæ*,) ſome ſtand upon Characters (Magical Characters) others to raiſe the Phantaſie (whereby they become Entheous) make uſe of Darkneſs, others uſe certain Potions, others Charms and a Compoſition of ſeveral Species. The order of Demons (*e*) *buſie themſelves and take care of, either the conformation of Dreams, or the opening and ſearching of the Entrails, or the Erudition of the Birds, or the Inſpiration of the Prophets, or the Jaculation of Thunders, and the other things whereby we have Divination.* The Chriſtian Theologers agree with the Pagan, that their *Vates* were inſpir'd (*f*) *inſtinctu Dæmonis*, (*g*) and by *the incorporation of Demons*, (*h*) that *Julian* was made partaker of Demons, ὃν ἐνθουσιασμὸν ἐκεῖνοι καλοῦσι, *which they call Enthuſiaſm*; but the Chriſtian Theologers thus difference the Inſpiration of the Pagan Diviners from that of true Prophets. (*i*) *If any had a Correption and Occupation by an unclean Spirit, and utter'd Divination, as one that ſuffereth a rapture, ſo he was drawn and bound by the Spirit, not knowing any thing of what he ſaith; for this is one property of a Diviner, to be extatical* (maniacally extatical) *to ſuffer Violence, to be hurry'd, drawn, pull'd as a mad Man. But with all true Prophets it is not ſo, with ſober underſtanding and conſiſtence of Mind, and knowing what he ſaith, he ſpeaketh all things.* That theſe ancient Theologers (Chriſtian and Pagan) have made a right Judgment touching the Origin of the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm, may appear from *the magical nature of their Statues*; for it is not reaſonable, to ſuppoſe an Incorporation of Demons

(p) Sir W. Raleigh. Hiſt. par. 1. B. 4. c. 2. S. 7. v. S. Aug. de C. D. l. 3. c. 23.

(q) Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 10. Gr. Naz. or. 3. p. 91. Baron. ad ann. 309. n. 9. & ad ann. 363. n. 37. Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 8. Lampr. in Heliog.

(r) Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l. 2. c. 10. S. 4.

(s) Alex. ab Alex. ſupr. l. 6. c. 26. Porphyr. de Abſt. l. 2. S. 51.

(t) Baron. ad ann. 355. n. 39.

(u) Jambl. de vit. Pyth. p. 129.

(w) Ἀπαρακολουθοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς οἱ ἐνθουσιῶντες. Jambl. de myſt. p. 24. Gale not. p. 246.

(x) De Div. l. 2.

(y) Caſaub. of Enthuſ. p. 62.

(z) Herald. in Arnob. p. 21, 23.

(a) Lactan. l. 1. c. 21.

(b) P. 580. Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 252.

(c) Jambl. de myſt. p. 85, 88, 8

(d) Porph. Ep. ad Aneb.

(e) *Curant ſingula, vel ſomniis conformandis, vel extis fiſſiculandis, vel oſcinibus erudiendis, vel vatibus inſpirandis, vel fulminibus jaculandis, cæteriſque adeo per quæ futura dignoſcimus.* Apul. de Deo Socrat.

(f) Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 452.

(g) Orig. περὶ ἀρχ. l. 3. c. 3

(h) Gr. Naz. or. 3. p.

(i) S. Chryſoſt. in 1 Cor. Hom. 2 Euſeb. H. l. 5. c. 1 S. Hieron. in Iſa. Præfat. Cont. Rep. Hiſt. l. 3. c. Gale in Jambl. p. 219.

mons in Statues of Divination, and to deny it in the inſpir'd Men of Divination. (k) *Thoſe Idols which the ancient* Arabians *believ'd to be inſpir'd with Life from God, or to be the* (Sacella) *Sacred Habitacles of Angels, and to be animated by them, they call'd* Dei Filias, *the Daughters of God.* Such were the animated Statues (before-mention'd) ſpoken of by *Triſmegiſt*, which had a Demon inclos'd in them, whereby they became as it were *Theomantic*, furniſh'd with ſuch a Virtue as the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm.

To this Divinatory Enthuſiaſm of Men awake we will ſubjoyn their *Divinations by Dreams*, which were of the Magical Character. For as the ſleeping amongſt Sepulchres for Dreams of Divination was a Rite of Magick and of Magicians (whence the Chriſtians were counted *Magi* (l) becauſe of their watchings at the Sepulchres of the Martyrs ;) ſo their Rites of preparing themſelves by Faſting and certain Abſtinences, the ſleeping in the Temples of their Gods with Laurel or the like fatidical ſtuff about their Heads, their ſacrificing a Ram to *Amphiaraus* (or other Deity) and ſleeping upon the Fleece for a Revelation or Dream of Divination, can be thought nothing better than the Rites of Magick and of Magicians. Not that all their Divinatory Dreams were ſuch ; (*m*) for Heathen Men ſometimes and in extraordinary caſes had their Divinatory Dreams (as alſo their Preſaging Prodigies) from Divine Providence which interpos'd in their Affairs (in Sleep they were in Retirement, and in ſome degree in another World, and therefore prepar'd to receive Divination ;) but their ſeeking Divination by Dreams was magical, and ordinarily their divinatory Dreams were the Suggeſtions of thoſe Demons, of whom ſome have the Name of (*n*) ὀνειροπομποὶ, *Suggeſters of Dreams.* Theſe may ſometimes ſuggeſt Medicines in Dreams (*M. Antoninus* ſpeaketh of ſome ſuggeſted to him, and *Ariſtides* the Orator wrote a Book of his Dreams,) and either theſe or no better than theſe ſuggeſted thoſe Dreams, which to countenance Divination, are alledg'd by one, who deriveth the Art of Phyſick from Medicines ſuggeſted in Divine Dreams ; namely, (*o*) that the City *Aphutis* being ſtraitly beſieg'd by King *Lyſander*, was deliver'd by Dreams ſent them by *Jupiter Ammon* ; and that *Alexander*'s whole Army had been loſt, if *Bacchus* had not appear'd in Sleep, and by Dream ſhew'd them a cure for grievous Calamities. Such Cures were in the Pagans Religion, which will appear to be *Magick* in many reſpects.

XIV. (*p*) *All the ſuppoſed Religion of the Greeks about Altars, Images and Temples of the Gods is Demonolatry* ; which ſpeaketh it magical dealing and correſpondence. (*q*) *And this is manifeſt from hence. In thoſe Temples which are thought of greateſt efficacy there are magical Reſidences and Repoſes* (pulvinaria deorum) *which are contemporary with the founding the Images and Temples ; which Reſidences are made by thoſe that attend to the worſhip of Demons by fallacious Arts or Inchantments.* In this reſpect the Religion of Paganiſm was Magick, the Demons by magical methods were made to reſide in their Temples. Its Idolatry was connex'd with Magick (according to the Phraſe of Scripture ; *They ſhall ſeek to the Idols and to the Charmers, and to them that have familiar Spirits, and the Wizards,* Iſa. 19. 3.) and it was not only connex'd with Magick, but ſo far as it was a worſhipping Evil Demons directly, it was Magick at leaſt of the more remote and ſuperficial dealing and correſpondence ; whence the Prieſts Prayers are called by *Prudentius*, (*r*) *Zoroaſtræi ſuſurri*, Zoroaſtrian *Whiſpers or Mumblings* ; the portentous Terms which the *Romans* us'd in their *Sacra*, are call'd by *Arnobius*, (*s*) *Magorum cohærentia diſciplinis*, *conjuring kind of words* ; and when a Law was made prohibiting nefarious Prayers and *Magic Apparatus*, *that none ſhould celebrate them in the Night-time*, (*t*) the Pagans interceded with *Valentinian* the Emperour for the reverſing that Law, becauſe it prohibited τὰ συνέχοντα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος ἁγιώτατα μυστήρια, *the moſt holy Grecian Myſteries that conſerve Mankind.* The Religion of the *Romans* is diſtributed by *Cicero*, (*u*) *in Sacra, in Auſpicia & in Monita* ; and accordingly there were three chief Colledges of Prieſts ; the *Pontifices* who look'd after the Rites of Sacrificing, the *Augures* and *Aruſpices* who were the Judges in Divination, which was a principal part of their Religion, as *Ammianus*'s ſaying of *Julian* implieth. (*w*) *He pretended to continue in the Chriſtian Worſhip, from which he had clancularly made a defection (few being acquainted with his Secrets) giving himſelf to Soothſaying and Auguries and the other things which the Worſhippers of the Gods always practis'd.* So *Cæcilius* ſaith of our (Heathen) Anceſtors ; (*x*) *they employ'd themſelves either in obſerving Auguries or conſulting the Entrails.* So the Jews when they forſook the true God, and did Sacrifice and Service to *Julian*'s Gods, (*y*) *then ſleeping amongſt Sepulchres they practis'd the Viſion of Dreams, and Divinations and Goety.* The Sacrifices of the Heathen Religion cannot be thought to be without Magick, whether we conſider the Object of them, or the Effect of them, or ſome ſtrange Phænomena that are reported of them. For in reſpect of the Object of them they were (*z*) *Dæmoniaci Ritus, the Rites of Evil Demons.* (*a*) *We pray God always by Jeſus Chriſt, to be kept from thoſe Demons,* οἷς πάλαι προσεκυνοῦμεν, *which anciently we worſhipp'd.* The Demons which we pray againſt, are the Aerial, of whom *Plato* in his *Epinomis* ſaith ; (*b*) *The Aerial kind having the third and middle Seat amongſt Animals the cauſe of interpretation, we ought to honour with Prayers, becauſe of their laudable mediation.* (*c*) Τὸ δραστήριον τῶν θυσιῶν, *the efficacy of the Sacrifices* for removing Peſtilences, Famine, Drought, Hail, is nothing more than what may be done by *Goety* (as *Diogenes Laertius* ſaith) and thereto we ought to impute theſe following matters of fact, that are competently well atteſted, to have been ſuch. (*d*) To Goety we muſt impute the fact of *Mantinica Diotima*, who procur'd for the *Athenians* that ſacrific'd before the Peſtilence a ten years reſpit from that Diſeaſe ; and the efficacy of *Epimenides*'s Sacrifices, who procur'd by them for the *Athenians* ten years reſpit from the *Perſian* War ; and the efficacy of *Æacus*'s Prayers, who in a time of great Drought and Scarcity procur'd by them a plenteous Rain for the *Grecians*, who had conſulted *Pythia*, and were bid by her, to make uſe of *Æacus*'s Prayers. (*e*) To Goety we muſt impute the efficacy of the Pagans *devotiones & devotiones Sepulchrales* (which they us'd at the Sepulchres of the Dead,) they devoted Men and Cities with direful Inchantments and Magick Cants, invoking certain formidable Gods by way of Imprecation (*Valerius Cato's diræ* are ſtill extant, who was bereav'd of his Patrimony in *Sylla*'s time,) ſuppoſing, that the Party ſo devoted and damned muſt neceſſarily be afflicted with abundance of misfortune; *Annon putas Devotionibus meis poſſe Diras invocari* (ſaith an *Egyptian* Prophet in *Apuleius*) *doſt thou not think, that the Diræ may be invok'd by my devoting Devotions?* that is, by my Inchantments, as *Beroaldus* expoundeth it. The Heathen had alſo amongſt them (*f*) certain commendatory Prayers and magical Rites (*ſecretarum artium ritus*,) whereby their *Magi* pretended to beſpeak and ſweeten certain Powers, and to make them placid, ſo as to afford an eaſie way to thoſe that are flying up to Heaven, and not to oppoſe their return into their own Country. And the Etrurian Acherontic Books pretended, that by the Blood of certain Animals given to certain Deities Souls are made Divine and exempt from the Laws of Mortality. But this was the extremity of Madneſs, to promiſe themſelves ſafe conduct for their Souls from the efficacy of Magick; which yet was of ſuch efficacy, that theſe ſtrange Phænomena are reported touching their Sacrifices. Some of them were conſum'd by Fire of Magical Operation; for ſo were thoſe of the *Perſian Magi* before-mention'd from *Pauſanias*; ſo was a known Sacrifice offer'd up to *Jupiter* by the *Rhodians*; and *Solinus* reporteth of the *Vulcanian Hill* in *Sicily*, that when the Sacrifice is prepar'd there, *ab ipſo numine fit accendium, Fire is kindled by the Deity it ſelf.* Agreeably to their Sacrifices the Luſtrations and Purgations of the Heathens Religion were not without Magick. (*g*) *In* Heſychius *we have* περίεργα καθάρσια, *the word denoteth their Heathen Rites of Purgation. Of their Luſtrations and Purgations the Heathen Books are full,* Porphyry, Jamblichus, Hierocles, Marinus de vita Procli *and others, all which are nothing but* γοητείαι and θεουργείαι, *Magick and Sorcery.*

(k) Pocock. Spec. p. 89.

(l) Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 288.

(m) Tertul. de An. c. 45. Phot. cod. 242. col. 1030. Gale in Jambl. p. 216.

(n) J. Mar. Apl. 2. p. 65.

(o) Jambl. de Myſt. p. 63. Gale not. p. 218.

(p) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 378.

(q) Δῆλον δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ εἰς τὰ δοκοῦντα ἐνεργέστερα τῶν νενομισμένων ἱερῶν κατακλίσεις πολλὰς γεγονέναι, αἱ κατὰ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἱδρύσεως τῶν τοιῶνδε ξοάνων καὶ νεῶν· ἅς τινας κατασκευάσαντες οἱ τῇ τῶν δαιμόνων διὰ μαγγανειῶν θεραπείᾳ σχολάζοντες πεποίηνται. *Ibid.*

(r) Baron. ad an. 362. n. 21.

(s) Adv. Gent. l. 7. p. 229.

(t) Baron. ad an. 364. n. 19. Zoſim. Hiſt. p. 202.

(u) De N. D. l. 3.

(w) *Inhærere cultui Chriſtiano fingebat, à quo jampridem occultè deſciverat, arcanorum participibus paucis, aruſpicinæ auguriiſque intentus, & cæteris quæ deorum ſemper fecere cultores.* Baron. ad an. 361. n. 1.

(x) Min. Fel. p. 54.

(y) Τότε καὶ μνήμασιν ἐννυχίζοντες τὰς ὀνείρων θέας, μαντείας τε καὶ γοητείας ἐπιτετήδευον. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 10. p. 341.*

(z) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 16.

(a) J. Mart. Dial. p. 247.

(b) Ἀέριον δὲ γένος, ἕδραν ἔχον τρίτην καὶ μέσην τῆς ἑρμηνείας αἴτιον, εὐχαῖς τιμᾶν μάλα χρεὼν χάριν τῆς εὐφήμου διαπορείας.

(c) *Gale in Jambl. p. 253.*

(d) Clem. Str. l. 6. p. m. 254, 255.

The Religion of Paganiſm was originally Magical, being inſtituted by magical kind of Men (that dealt in Divination) and by Demons; as in *Hecate*'s Oracle (*h*).

Ἤλυθον εἰσαΐουσα τεῆς πολυφράδμονος εὐχῆς
Ἣν θνητῶν φύσις εὗρε θεῶν ὑποθημοσύνῃσι.

I'm come at call of thy full wiſe Precation,
Which Men found out but by the Gods monition.

Of the Oblations of external things to the Gods, *Simplicius* ſaith; *So many of theſe as are legitimate and according to Law* (*i*) *God hath without exception ſhew'd unto Men, as Hiſtories declare.* Every God (according to the Maxim of *Socrates*) ought to be worſhipp'd, as himſelf doth appoint: (*k*) *Thoſe things are to be done which God is pleas'd with; but thoſe things it is not eaſie to know, unleſs one hear the Gods, or acquire the knowledge of them by the Divine Art.* Of the Gods it is obſerv'd, (*l*) ὅτι τὰ ἀγάλματα μαγικῶς αὐτοὶ κατασκευάζειν ἐδίδαξαν, *that themſelves have taught the magical making of their Statues,* preſcribing various materials and ſpecies of things with ſuch a mode of compounding them and making them into a Statue, which is plainly magical: From *Numenius* the Pythagorean *Origen* giveth this account of the Statue of *Serapis* in *Egypt*. (*m*) *It partaketh of the ſubſtance of all things adminiſtred by Nature, both Animals and Plants; ſo that the God ſeemeth to be made, not by Statuaries alone with profane Sacra and Inchantments, that call Demons, but by the Magicians, the Sorcerers, and the Men of that Character, that by Inchantments call Demons.* Theſe were their Deities, and therefore their Deities were the Magical as well as their Statues. Theſe taught them Magick and the Inſtitutes of their Religion; for their betaking themſelves to Divination, to interpret the Mind of the Gods, was a betaking themſelves to conſult the Demons, *from whom all Divination cometh to Men, and the Sacerdotal Art about Sacrifices and Religious Myſteries and Inchantments*, as *Plato* ſaith in his *Sympoſium*. Upon an extraordinary occaſion ſome of their Religious Rites had an extraordinary Inſtitutor, that was no better than *a Demon*; as *Zoſimus* giveth this account of an Altar built to *Pluto* and *Proſerpina*: (*n*) The *Romans* being about to fight with the *Albans*, a Spectrum appear'd with a prodigious Countenance, clothed with a black Skin, and crying, that *Dis Pater* and *Proſerpina* commanded them, to offer Sacrifice to them under Ground, before they joyned Battel, and ſo vaniſh'd away. As Magick pervadeth the Pagans Religion, ſo it is viſible in their Civil Affairs; for they joyn'd it with their Agriculture; ſo the *Zabii* ſeeth'd a Kid in the Mother's Milk, to ſprinkle therewith and fertilize their Fields and Trees, *Exod.* 21. 19. And for the like purpoſes the *Etrurians* (*o*) would have the Skull of an Aſs plac'd in Gardens.

XV. But the Crime of Sorcery and Magick is of much greater extent than the denomination of Idolatrous Heathen; for there are ſad complaints in Scripture of the Jews addictedneſs both to the Heathen Idolatry and Sorcery; and not only they, but the *Muhammedan* Religioniſts and the Chriſtian Church it ſelf have been, and are, ſadly over-run with Magick. In the elder times of their Commonwealth the Jews in conſort with the Ten Tribes us'd *divination and inchantments*, 2 *King*. 9. 17. 17. Not a few of them were *workers with Familiar Spirits and with Wizards, and Teraphim and Idols*, 2 *King*. 23. 24. (*p*) they are obſerv'd, to have been addicted to *Capnomancy* and to *Necromancy*, *Iſa*. 65. 4. They defiled themſelves *with the Mouſe*, a magical Animal, *Iſa*. 66. 17. (*q*) ἑτοιμάζοντες τῷ δαιμονίῳ τράπεζαν, *preparing a Table for the Demon*, as the LXX. render *Iſa*. 65. 11. They are tax'd with *Witchcraft* and *Soothſayers*, *Mich*. 5. 12. Soothſayers in abundance, *Iſa*. 2. 6. with *Diviners*, *Inchanters*, *Sorcerers*, *Jer*. 27. 9. *Zech*. 10. 2. *Hoſ*. 4. 12. In the later times of their Commonwealth under the Second Temple Idols were out of requeſt with them, but in thoſe times and the after-times of their diſperſion they were extremely addicted to the Arts of Magick; as appeareth from ſeveral paſſages in Scripture, *Act*. 13. 6, 8. and 19. 14. And from *Joſephus* alſo (whoſe relations are exploded by *Cunæus* (*r*) with a very vain and fooliſh confidence;) from their

Bath

(e) Beroald. in Apul. metam. p. 54. Sheringh. de Angl. Gent Orig. p. 301.

(f) Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 2. p. 52, 87.

(g) Dr. Ham. not. on Act. 19. 19.

(h) Gale in Jambl. p. 199.

(i) Ὁ θεὸς πάντως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐξέφηνεν, ὡς ἱστορίαι δηλοῦσιν. Com. in Epict. p. 196.

(k) Jambl. de vit. Pyth. p. 129.

(l) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 5. c. 12.

(m) Ὡς ἄρα πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ φύσεως διοικουμένων μετέχει οὐσίας, ζώων καὶ φυτῶν· ἵνα δόξῃ μετὰ τῶν ἀτελέστων τελετῶν, καὶ τῶν καλούντων δαίμονας μαγγανειῶν, οὐχ ὑπὸ ἀγαλματοποιῶν μόνων κατασκευάζεσθαι θεὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ μάγων, καὶ φαρμακῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐπῳδαῖς αὐτῶν καλουμένων δαίμονας. C. Cell. l. 5. p. 250.

(n) Hiſt. l. 2. initio.

(o) Holiday on Juv. p. 221.

(p) Gale in Jambl. p. 248.

(q) V. Seld. de D. Syr. Synt. 1. c. 1.

(r) De Rep. Hebr. l. 1. c. 12.

Bath Col (s) partly magical and partly fictitious, their frequent Viſions of the Prophet *Elias* (as ordinarily ſeen amongſt the Rabbins as the Bl. Virgin is in the Church of *Rome*,) their addictedneſs to Divination by Dreams, Lots and Omens; their Rabbins divining by their Shadow in the Moonſhine on the Night of the ſeventh day of the month *Tiſri*, their magical *Amulets*, *Ligatures*, *Seals*, *Charms*, *forms of Inchantment* and *Exorciſms* (to all which they are hugely addicted;) their magical conceits of an occult virtue in the figures of their Letters, and of the wonder-working Power of Names, eſpecially the Name *Tetragrammaton* (which they ſuppoſe to be θαυμαςȣ̃ργον;) their confident Opinion, that God hath given Power to his Name, Attributes, and parts of their Law, when apyly'd in their Magical manner, to cure Diſeaſes and to work Signs and Wonders (which are not ſo great Rarities with them as ſound Reaſon;) the Rabbins boaſt of their Miracles, the Stories which their Talmud telleth of their Wonder-working Faculty, and the marvellous Feats that have been done by them, which are plainly of a Magical Nature (ſome of them have beaten Magicians at their own Weapons;) their wild Conceits of *Solomon*'s Wiſdom (from whom they derive the Iſraelites Skill in Magick, Inchantments, Adjuration of Demons, *Teleſms* and Images endow'd with Spiritual Virtue;) a principal Endowment requiſite in every Member of their *Sanhedrin*, which was Skill in the Arts of Magick, to qualifie him, to be a Judge in ſuch matters (accordingly *R. Benjamin* when he maketh Elogies of Men, he ſaith of them, *they are Men-wiſe Philoſophers, skill'd in all Science, knowing in all Magick and Witchcraft*;) their Magical Pharmacy (t) which they call a *Cabala*, and their Book *Schimmuch Tehillim officium Pſalmorum* (wherein out of every *Pſalm* almoſt they have collected Cabaliſtic Symbols or Characters for the cure of certain Diſeaſes;) the Magical Humour and addictedneſs of their Phyſicians (upon account whereof S. *Chryſoſtom* diſſwadeth Chriſtians from making uſe of the Jewiſh Phyſicians;) the Magical Phantaſtry of their Cabaliſts, (u) who ſuppoſe, that each of the Patriarchs had an Angel for his Preceptor, and who invoke the Angels by a Name complicated with the Name of God, ſuppoſing, that by Angels they may be join'd unto God, and that by theſe Invocations they may do wondrous things (they have alſo an Aſtrological method of finding out the Name of an Angel, to ſet over any Work, to accompliſh it and bring it to paſs;) their Practic Cabala (by which one Jew cur'd a Fever, and another extinguiſh'd a Scale-fire, as *Myllerus* affirmeth,) which compriſeth thoſe Magical Contrivances *Baculum Moſis*, *Al Mandel Salomonis*, and is compriſed in thoſe Cabaliſtic Books *Pirke Ehalot*, *Raziel* and ſuch more.

To the Jews Magick and Magical Books we muſt annex their Aſtrology founded upon certain Hypotheſes of their Rabbins, (w) that we are ſubjected to certain Angels acting by the influences of the ſuperiour Bodies, (x) that the Stars indicate at every one's Nativity what ſhall befall him, and on the firſt day of the Month *Tiſri* when they begin their courſe, they indicate what ſhall befall the World, whence the Jews call that day יום הדין *the Day of Judgment*, becauſe then by the Celeſtial Conſtellations all things are judg'd and determined. (y) *The Jews* (as is viſible in the Poet *Juvenal*) *were marvellouſly addicted to Aſtrology and the other kinds of Divination*, which is an Indication of their Magical Genius, and that Magical Genius is one principal cauſe of their infidelity. For one of their Rabbins ſaith; (z) *The Iſraelites did not believe* Moſes *upon the account of Miracles; for they that believe on that account, do it not without retaining a ſuſpicion of Magick.* A like Magical Genius amongſt the Muhammedan Religioniſts is viſible (*a*) in their *Amulets, their Magical Coins* and *Gemms*, the Apparitions of their Saints departed and the miraculous things that are done by them for the relief of their Suppliants Neceſſities, (*b*) their uſe of *Hydromancy* and other methods of Divination (one of which chiefly practic'd in *Fez* in *Africa* is of great Fame, and is ſaid to require great Learning,) and the *Arabians* notorious Addictedneſs to Magick. But it were happy, if ſo foul a practice was confin'd to *Muhammedans*, *Jews* and *Heathens*, if Magick was no where to be found ſave only *in partibus Infidelium amongſt open Infidels*; for a little acquaintance with Church-Hiſtory will acquaint us with a more ample diſpread of it, and that the Chriſtian Church hath been and is at this day ſadly blackned with the Black-art. To ſay nothing of the Heretical-Pagan Gnoſticks, nor of the great abundance of Witches and Magicians, that have been convicted and executed in ſeveral Chriſtian Countries (wherein at ſometimes they abound, at other times they are ſcarce heard of;) in the elder times of the Church many that were called Chriſtians, yet retain'd ſeveral of the Pagan Rites of Magick (*c*) *Augury*, *Divination by paſſing through the fire* (or rather by leaping over it) *and by Lots*. (*d*) Some conſulted the Pagan Inchanters and Diviners, ſome practis'd their impure Arts, and inſtead of the Pagan *Sortes Homericæ & Virgilianæ*, *Sortes Biblicæ*, were ſubſtituted to make Divination. Many Profeſſors of Chriſtianity were as Magical as thoſe of *the holy League*, (*e*) whoſe fury againſt *Henry* 3. of *France* grew to that degree, *that ſome of them by an abominable mixture of Sacriledge, Parricide and Magical Inchantments made Images of Wax reſembling the King, which they placed upon the Altars, and prick'd them in divers parts, pronouncing certain Diabolical words at every one of the forty Maſſes, which they cauſed to be ſaid in many Churches, to make their Charms more powerful, and at the fortieth they pierc'd the Image to the heart, intending thereby to give their King the ſtroke of Death.* It may ſeem ſtrange or ſurprizing, that any of the reputed Saints of the Chriſtian Church ſhould be foul and abominable Magicians, yet it is much to be ſuſpected, that ſuch Saints the Eccleſiaſtic Legendaries have Canoniz'd, and renown'd with many Stories of Miracles. For thus we read. (*f*) *Palladius telleth, how S.* Macarius *learned all things by conſulting the Skull of a dead Man, which Rite was in uſe amongſt the Hebrews, as appeareth from the Talmud.* The Miracles of the

---

(s) *Lightfoot Hor. in Matth.* 3. 17. & *c.* 17. 10. & *c.* 24. 24. & *in Marc.* 8. 12. *Coch. in* 2. *Tit. Talm. p.* 18. *Voyſin. obſ. in Raym. p.* 557, 558. *Dion. Voſſ. in Maim. de Idol. c.* 11. *S.* 5, 13. *Buxt. Syn. Jud. c.* 16. *p.* 363. *Reuchl. de Art. Cab. l.* 3. *fol.* 78. *Hotting. diſſ. p.* 281, 285. *Coſri p.* 29, 304, 314. *Lib. Jezirah p.* 148. *R. Benjam. Itin. p.* 75, 91.

(t) *Hotting. Theſ. phil. p.* 439. *Buxt. Biblioth. Rab. p.* 329. *S. Chryſ. or.* 6. *c. Jud. Baron. ad an.* 363. *n.* 7.

(u) *Reuchl. ſupr. l.* 1. *fol. l.* 3. *fol.* 58. *lib. Jezir. p.* 14. *Hotting. Theſ. phil. p.* 447. *Hornbeek. c. Jud. p.* 304.

(w) *L'Emper. in Abarb. com. in Iſa.* 30. *p.* 61.

(x) *Men. ben. Iſr. Qu. in Deut. p.* 220.

(y) *Sanè Judæi Matheſi ſive Aſtrologiæ divinatrici & cæteris divinandi generibus mirè erant addicti, unde Juvenal.* Sat. 6. *Cophino fœnoque relicto, &c.* Voſſ. com. in Plin. ep. p. 111.

(z) *Iſraelitas non credidiſſe Moſi propter miracula, quia illi qui eam ob cauſam credunt, ſemper aliquam ſuſpicionem Necromantiæ & præſtigiarum retineant.* Menaſſ. ben Iſr. ſupr. p. 232.

(a) *Hoffman. umbr. p.* 171, *&c. Hotting. Cip. Hebr. p.* 150. *&c. Hiſt. or. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *S.* 6. *ed.* 1.

(b) *Dion. Voſſ. ſupr. S.* 7. *Caſaub. of Credul. and Incredul. p.* 139. *Purchas Par.* 1. *B.* 6. *c.* 9. *S.* 2.

(c) *Balſ. in Can.* 65. *Syn.* 6. *in Trullo. Gale ſupr. p.* 249. *Grot. in Deut.* 18. 10.

(d) *Van Dale de Orac. p.* 369. *ad p.* 378. *M. Blaſtar. Syntagm. p.* 173. 175.

(e) *Maimbourg. Hiſt. p.* 451.

(f) *Palladius Epiſcopus libro ad Lauſum præpoſitum memorat, quo modo S. Macarius* πρὸς τὸ ξηρὸν κρανίον πυθόμενος. Winder. de vit. funct. p. 56. ed. 3.

Legendaries Lives of the Saints and thoſe of the Hebrew Rabbins (as alſo thoſe that introduc'd Church-demonolatry and thoſe that occur in the Church of *Rome*) ſeem to be of the ſame Character, neither of them are wholly fictitious, both ſeem to be in part realities; but ſuch realities, that are no better than the Feats of Magick. (*g*) Of the Catalogue of Popes no leſs than four and twenty are ſaid to have been addicted to the Magic Arts. *Sylveſter* 2. (ſurnamed *Necromanticus*) is famous (*h*) for making under a certain Configuration of the Stars *the Head of a Statue*, which gave him oracular Reſponſes, and this ambiguous one amongſt others, *that he ſhould not die, till he had ſung Maſs in* Jeruſalem. *Robert* Sirnamed *Groſſteſt* in the Reign of *Hen.* 3. Biſhop of *Lincoln* ſpent ſeven Years labour in framing a Brazen-head —— *which ſhould tell of ſuch things as befell:* But he is ſaid, to have loſt all his labour, becauſe he fail'd of half a Minute of time. *Faſciculus temporum* reporteth, that in the *Tenth* Century *Magick* and the Art of making Charms and bewitching People was almoſt the only Learning of the Prieſts. *Sennertus* thus beginneth the 24*th Ch.* of his Book *De Vulneribus. Whereas there is nothing more ordinary now adays among Soldiers, than by certain Pentacula and Seals and Characters to Fence themſelves and to make themſelves inviolable againſt all kind of Arms.* In Countries that are call'd Chriſtian the vulgar uſually deal in Charms for the cure of Diſeaſes. In *Spain* (*i*) they call them *Enſalmas*, and in that Country the learning of Magick was ſometime publickly allow'd and profeſs'd; (*k*) for in the Academy of *Salamanca* they taught both Theurgy and Goety in the publick Schools. Aſtrology is in Chriſtendom an uſual Profeſſion, in great credit at *Rome* and in *Italy*, and was made uſe of in *Paul the Third*'s Inſtauration of *Rome*. (*l*) *Gauricus* erected a Figure of the Heavens, *Vincentius Campanatius* obſerv'd the time with his Aſtrolable (crying the preciſe Hour is come,) and then *Ennius Verulanus* the Cardinal laid the firſt Stone, which was a Rite of the Pagans Aſtrological Magick. (*m*) A Biſhop very dear to Pope *Nicolaus* 5. was bewitched into an incurable Diſeaſe; whereupon application was made unto that Pope, to grant a diſpenſation to a Witch, who undertook (if it might be allow'd,) to bewitch her to Death, that had bewitch'd the Biſhop; the Pope granted the diſpenſation, and the buſineſs was done, the firſt Witch died and the Biſhop recover'd.

Magick is no ſtranger at *Rome*; much of her Religion conſiſteth in Magical Rites and Superſtitions, which if without Divine Inſtitution they produce Effects beyond natural Agency (or if ſuch Effects be produc'd by Reliques, or at Shrines and Images,) they are of Magical Operation. (*n*) Much of Magick there is in the Buſineſs of her Images, the uſual Apparitions of the Bl. Virgin in that Church ſeem to be a Magical Phænomenon, ſhe retaineth the Rites of Paganiſm, which were Magical in that Religion; ſhe aboundeth in *Conſecrations*, *Exorciſms*, *Inchantments* of Images, Crucifixes, Water, Salt, Oyl, Candles, Bells, Agnus Dei's, Roſes, Grains, (and among the reſt (*o*) of *Cramp-rings*,) pretending to repleniſh them with Virtue for driving away Devils, for being a ſecurity both to Soul and Body, and a Remedy againſt all ſecular and ſpiritual Evils. Every one of which Conſecrations is a Magical kind of Buſineſs, and is as to the form of Words and the reality (if not as to the real Magical Virtue) *a perfect Conjuration and Inchantment.* Her *Flagellum Dæmonum* and *the Treaſure of the dreadful Conjurings* are of the ſame Character; (*p*) and a Cardinal of her own hath well expreſs'd the Buſineſs of her Figures and Croſſings, *it is to make a Charm a Bleſſing.* (*q*) In a Voyage of the *Portugueze* to the *Eaſt-Indies* a great Whale applied his Body to one of their Ships, his Fins to the Sides of it, his Tail to the Rudder, arreſting the motion of the Ship to the great affrightment of the Mariners (who durſt not irritate the Beaſt:) But they got rid of this terrible Animal by this Expedient; (*r*) *A Prieſt came forth with his Surplice, Stole and Crucifix* (or the Sign of the Croſs,) *and he by ſacred Charms and Exorciſms made the Beaſt tame and placid.* (*s*) The Jeſuit *Gaſpar* was ſent for to a Woman nigh unto Death by Spectres, inſtead of viſiting her perſonally (which his Buſineſs would not allow) he ſent her a Schedule *Inſcripto Divi Johannis Evangelio to be hang'd about her Neck*, which immediately recovered her. How ſlight ſoever theſe matters may ſeem, yet they are certainly Magical kind of Rites (according to that Rabbinical Maxim, *in quocunque eſt aliquid de Medicina, in eo nihil eſt de via Amoræorum*;) but theſe are of a low Form in compariſon of ſome other inſtances of Magick, wherewith the Chriſtian Church is defiled. (*t*) In the Greek Church when the Foundation of an Houſe is laid, the Work-men kill a Cock or Sheep, the Blood of which they bury under the firſt Stone they lay (it is not always, but very frequently practis'd,) in which they imagine, that there is ſome lucky Magick, or a Spell, to attract good Fortune to the Threſhold. They call it θυσίας, or Sacrifice, and therefore I believe (ſaith mine Author,) that this is a piece of ancient Heatheniſm. Thoſe who have malice or quarrel to any particular Perſon, do oftentimes bring the breadth and length in Thread or Wood of him, againſt whom they entertain malice, to a Carpenter or Maſon, who is ready to lay the Foundation of an Houſe, the which for a little Money is bury'd under one of the firſt Stones, after which they ſay, the Perſon dieth, or at leaſt macerateth away, as the Thread or Wood decayeth, which is a moſt certain piece of Magick of the ancient Gentiliſm. (*u*) Amongſt the Greeks of the Iſlands of the *Archipelago* there is a piece of Witchcraft, which they call δῆμα, which is the tying up a Man from accompanying with any Woman, unleſs it be with her, to whom he hath faulter'd in his Faith. The Greek Church is not more ſadly over-run with Ignorance and Slavery, than with Sorcery and Magick, which hath not only prevail'd upon *that Heel of the Woman*, the lower and more ignorant part of the Greek and Latin Churches, but ſeveral of the learned Men that have flouriſh'd in them, are known to have been defil'd with Magick of interiour Dealing and Correſpondence. (*w*) Such as *Hermolaus Barbarus*, the Jeſuit *Petrus Cottonus* (whoſe Magick *Thuanus* giveth an account of,) *Cornelius Agrippa*, *Hieronymus Cardanus* and his Father, and the Advocate at *Bourdeaux* who kept a Demon in a Glaſs. (*x*) *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* is ſaid to have been a great Diviner, and to have foretold to *Juſtinus*, that he ſhould ſucceed *Juſtinian* in his Empire; to *Tiberius* that he ſhould

ſucceed

(g) *Arrowſmith Tactic. p.* 26.

(h) *Seld. de. D. Syr. Synt.* 1. *c.* 2. *& vid. Notas ejus præmiſſ. Arth. Hopton. libello de Annor. concordant.*

(i) *Gale ſupr. p.* 293.

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(l) *Joh. Gregor. Not. & obſerv. c.* 7.

(m) *Caſaub. ſupr. p.* 88.

(n) *Saul and Sam. at Endor p.*366, *&c.*

(o) *Burnet Hiſt. of the Reform. Par.* 2.

(p) *Saul and Sam. at End. p.* 328.

(q) *Maſſeius Indic. l.* 7. *p.* 366.

(r) *Sacerdos cum linteo & ſtola & ſigno Crucis in medium prodiit, ab eo ſacris carminibus & exorciſmis delinita bellua.*

(s) *Maſſeius ibid. l.* 14. *p.* 613.

(t) *D. Rycaut. pref. State of the Greek Church p.* 371, 372, 373, *&c.*

(u) *Ibid. p.* 313.

(w) *Arrowſmith Tactic. p.* 27. *Beyer. addit. ad Seld. p.* 212.

(x) *Crakanthorp. vigil. dormit. p.* 343.

ſucceed *Juſtinus*; and to *Mauritius*, that he ſhould be *Tiberius*'s Succeſſor. Strange things have been done by Hereticks and Impoſtors ſince the times of the Heretical Pagan Gnoſticks, which are generally imputed to Magick. (*y*) For a Biſhop is ſaid to have worſhipp'd a Young Man in *Spain* as Chriſt, being ſeduc'd thereunto by his Magical Signs. Magick therefore appeareth, to have been of great diſpread even in the Chriſtian Church, which may illuſtrate our Idea of the Heathen World, *that it was a World of Magick, Sorcery and Wizardiſm.* Which Idea muſt not be thought a mean and contemptible Theory (but of infinite value and importance,) for it implieth *Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire*; and therefore is ſo according to the Scriptures, as nothing can be more; and it is ſo according to Chriſtianity, that it is one half of it. And becauſe we have ſhew'd that the Heathen World doth implicitly notice and atteſt the Truth of this Theory, therefore it muſt be called *the Heathen World's Atteſtation to the Truth of the Scriptures, and to one half of the Chriſtian Religion.* The many well atteſted Hiſtories that we have, of great numbers of particular perſons guilty of maleficent *Magick* and *Witchcraft* in theſe latter ages, are not (by far) ſo great an Atteſtation of *the Exiſtence and Domination of evil Demons*, as the Heathen World's addictedneſs to Sorcery and Magick for many ages, therefore we will further purſue this Argument, which upon this and other accounts is hugely advantageous to Chriſtianity.

XVI. A *Sixth* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is *the Sorcery and Wizardiſm of ſuch Philoſophic Pagan Saintiſts*, who were Magical in a degree of eminency and ſingularity (above the ordinary rate of popular Pagans,) and therefore are fitly called *the Magical kind of Saintiſts.* Some of the Philoſophers that were Pagan Religioniſts, yet were in ſuch a degree Irreligioniſts, that they ought not to be called *Pagan Saintiſts*; ſuch were *Ariſtotle*, *Cicero* and *Seneca.* (z) The Firſt of whom acknowledg'd no Demons and for the main exploded Divination. (*a*) The Second was of a Sceptical Humour in matters of Religion and Divination. (*b*) The Third was an extravagant Exploder of the Rites of Religion and of his own Religion, an applauder of the *Epicureans*, (*c*) and although a Stoick, yet not without ſome Propenſion, to be a Coſmo-plaſtic Atheiſt. But the Sect of the Stoicks for the moſt part were genuin and legitimate Pagan Religioniſts, and therefore Magical kind of Religioniſts at the rate of the generality of the popular Pagans, (*d*) *vel duces populorum vel ſectatores, being either the Leaders or Followers of the People.* And ſome of them ſeem to have been magical *to a degree of eminency and ſingularity*, and ſuch as muſt be called *the Magical kind of Saintiſts.* For there are ſeveral Paſſages in the Life of *M. Antoninus* (the Philoſophic Emperour,) which make me prone to believe, (notwithſtanding his excellent Book and the immoderate Elogies which are given of him,) that he was one of this Character. (*e*) For otherwiſe he could not perfectly reſemble *Numa*, which was the thing that he affected: Nor be an agreeable Pattern for the Emperour *Julian*, who propos'd him as his Exemplar. In his War with the *Quadi* he was accompanied with *Arnuphis* an Egyptian Magician (as *Dio* relateth,) and (as *Suidas* ſaith) with *Julian* the Theurgiſt. (*f*) He was educated *in Adriani gremio, in the Lap of the Emperor* Adrian, who was a Magician, and who made him one of the College of the *Salii* in his younger Years, wherein he was *& Sacerdos & Vates & Præſul & Magiſter, a Pagan Prieſt and Prophet and Præſul and Maſter.* The whole carriage of his Life (and his initiation into the Eleuſinian Myſteries towards the end of it) demonſtrateth, that he was addicted to his Heathen Religion and Heathen Gods at an extraordinary rate, and therefore it is ſtrange, if he did not proceed to more than ordinary Magical Correſpondences, of which there are ſome intimations in his Book. (*g*) For he ſpeaketh of being familiar with the Gods δι ἔργων ὁσίων ϗ ἱερουργιῶν, *by holy Works and ſacred Services*, (*h*) he telleth of *Medicines which they had indicated to him in Dreams, and that he had from them Suggeſtions, Helps, Inſpirations, Submonitions, and almoſt plain and expreſs Inſtructions.* His Philoſophic Goodneſs and Virtue is foully blemiſhed by the Conſecration or ἀποθέωσις, (with all the Honourary Rites thereto appertaining) which he gave to his naughty Collegue *Verus* and his naughty Wife *Fauſtina*; for what goodneſs is that, which doth not hate known and acknowledged Vice and Wickedneſs? What Philoſophic Virtue is that, which ſetteth up ſuch Deities as *Socrates* and *Plato* would have pull'd down? It could not be therefore any ſingular abhorrence of Vice and Wickedneſs, which he had above other Heathens, that reſtrain'd him from being addicted to the Magicians and their Goety (as *Xiphilin*, *Scaliger* and *Voſſius* (*i*) ſuppoſe,) but only a principle of Philoſophic Prudence. (*k*) *He learned from* Diognetus, *to diſtruſt wonder-working Magicians and their Inchantments*, there being much of illuſion and impoſture in Magick. And if he abſtain'd from dealing with Magick and Magicians ordinarily out of Philoſophic Prudence only, might not Political Prudence put him upon dealing with them and experimenting the Power of their Inchantments in a great and extraordinary caſe, when himſelf and his Army was ready to periſh by drought? And is it not likely, that in ſo great a caſe *Marcus* conjoin'd his own Prayers with thoſe of the Magicians, who invok'd *the aerial* Mercury *and other Demons with certain incantations*, as *Dio* relateth? therefore the prodigious Rain which reliev'd the Roman Army, (*l*) and which both *Dio* and *Lampridius* (in Heliogabalo) wholly attribute to the Magicians, is by *Julius Capitolinus* attributed to *the Emperour's Prayers*, and the Poet *Claudian* attributeth it both to the Emperour's Piety and the Magicans Charms. There is great Reaſon, to believe (*m*) the Heathen Writers account of this prodigious Rain; for had it been procur'd by the Prayers of Chriſtians, it could not have fail'd to produce ſome great Effect to the advantage of Chriſtianity; (*n*) *M. Antoninus*'s Pillar erected at *Rome* in Memory of it, attributeth it *Jovi Pluvio*; (*o*) it hath the Complexion and Phyſiognomy of a Magical Miracle, as *Dio* relateth it. And if it was Magical, what can be thought of *M. Antoninus*, but that he was (not a Magician of the higher Form and Degree, yet) a Man of magical Dealing and Correſpondence at a more than ordinary Heathen rate, and therefore muſt be denominated *a magical kind of Saintiſt?* Agreeably whereto *Jul. Capitolinus* maketh him, to Symbolize with the old Magicians; for being dead and deify'd it was reported of him (ſaith he,) *that he truly foretold many things by Dreams.* (*p*) So *Trophonius*, *Empedotimus*, *Ariſtæus* (and *Amphiaraus* alſo) being dead, an Oracle is ſaid to have

(y) *Baron. ad an.* 382. *n.* 22.

(z) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 215.

(a) *Cic. de Divin. l.* 2.

(b) *Sen. ep.* 95. *de vit. beat. c.* 13.

(c) *Nat. Qu. l.* 3. *S.* 29.

(d) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 14. *c.* 28.

(e) *Baron. ad an.* 64. *n.* 7.

(f) *Jul. Capitolin.*

(g) *L.* 12. *c.* 5.

(h) *L.* 1. *S.* 17.

(i) *Com. in Plin. ep. p.* 122, 123.

(k) *L.* 1. *S.* 6.

(l) *See them cited Witſii Ægypt. p.* 437, 440, *&c.*

(m) *Valeſ. Annot. in Sozomen. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(n) *Witſ. ſupr. p.* 436.

(o) *Baron. ad an.* 175. *n.* 5.

(p) *El. Cret. Com. in Gr. Naz. or.* 3. *n.* 56.

riſen in the place where they dy'd. The Pagan Magick in general and the magical Practice of *M. Antoninus* may be further illuſtrated from a Note of *Salmaſius* upon the Emperour *Aurelianus.* (q) *Under the Roman Emperours it was commonly thought, that by Sacrifices made, or Charms ſpoken, or Statues ſet in certain places, the Barbarians might be hindred from making incurſion into the Roman Empire. This Remedy they often made uſe of, calling it Conſecration, which Conſecration* Marcus *made uſe of againſt the* Marcomanni. Heliogabalus *was told by ſome, ſaith* Ælius Lampridius, (r) *that* Marcus Antoninus *by the Chaldeans and Magicians took a courſe, that the* Marcomanni *ſhould be always devoted and friends to the Romans; this he did by Charms and a Conſecration.* Conſecration (ſaith *Caſaubon* upon the place,) is the Form which they make uſe of *in defixionibus magicis, in Inchantments of Things or Perſons.* From whence it followeth, that *M. Antoninus* is not excuſable from magical Practice at a more than ordinary Heathen rate.

M. Antoninus's Family deriv'd it ſelf from *Numa,* who was undoubtedly a Saintiſt of the magical kind; for his Story is full of magical Practice, (s) *Hydromancy, Commerce with Demons,* (t) *the frequenting a Den for that purpoſe, and the conjuring down* Jupiter. (u) His *Ancilia* and *Palladium* (which were *ſecreta quædam imperii pignora, ſecret Pledges of the Proſperity of the Empire,* ſo long as the Romans kept them) were plainly magical Artifices. (w) *Having call'd his Gueſts, he cauſed the Tables to be preſently furniſh'd with all ſorts of Diſhes by Art Magick. Plutarch* mentioneth one *Caſtor,* who wrote a Volume τὰ ῥωμαϊκὰ τοῖς πυθαγορικοῖς συνοικειῶν, *reſembling the Roman Inſtitutes to the Pythagoric,* which argueth, that both of them were originally magical, if the one of them was ſo.

Orpheus the Founder of the Religion of the *Thracians* and conſequently of the Greeks (for it is not reaſonable, to ſuppoſe with *Ariſtotle,* that there never was ſuch a Man) is of the ſame Character with *Numa.* (x) *He incited* Men ἐν τέχνῃ τινὶ γοητείᾳ, *by a certain artificial Goety,* yet muſt be reputed a Saintiſt; (for *Celſus* ſaith of him (y) *that without doubt he had the holy Spirit. Philochorus* relateth, (z) that he was a Diviner; and *Tzetzes* ſheweth, (a) that he had the Art of inchanting Serpents. He is famous for the Theurgic Luſtrations and Expiations which he introduc'd, as being believ'd (ſaith *Pauſanias*) to have found out ἔργων ἀνοσίων καθαρμὺς, νόσων τὰ ἰάματα, καὶ τροπὰς μηνιμάτων θείων, *Expiations for wicked Actions, Remedies for Diſeaſes, and Appeaſements of the Divine Diſpleaſure. Reuchlin* affirmeth, (b) that in ancient times there were thoſe, who are ſaid to have done the wonderful things of Magicians, not only by *Egyptian* and *Aſſyrian,* but by Greek words. *Orpheus* the follower of *Hermes* the Egyptian being one of the *Argonauts,* averted a mighty Tempeſt, into which they were fallen, by his Sacra, yet in his Invocations he made uſe of none but Greek words.

In the Story of *Zoroaſter* there is little of certainty, ſave only that there were ſeveral of that Name, and one an eminent Magician, of great Antiquity, who is generally reputed *the Prince of Magicians. Pliny* ſaith of Magick, (c) *Without doubt it had its riſe from* Zoroaſter, *as Authors agree. Juſtin* ſaith of *Zoroaſter* (d) *primus dicitur artes magicas inveniſſe, he is ſaid to be the firſt Inventor of Arts magical.* But doubtleſs the Arts magical are of greater antiquity than he (how ancient ſoever he be;) the report aroſe from the eminency of *Zoroaſter*'s fame for Magick, (e) and becauſe the Magicians father'd their Books upon him, and becauſe he was a Father to the Oriental Magi (who were the Saintiſts of the magical kind,) that deriv'd their Diſcipline from him, as the Egyptians did theirs from their *Hermes.* The commonly receiv'd Opinion which the *Perſians* and *Arabians* had of him, was, (f) that he was a Magus or Prophet, and he is ſaid to have eſtabliſh'd his Law by Miracles. But becauſe the Miracles which are reported of him ſeem to be meer Fabuloſities, we will only take Notice of the Theurgic καθαρμοὶ, *Luſtrations and Expiations* which were uſual amongſt the Diſciples of *Zoroaſter.* Theſe καθαρμοὶ, *Purgations* were not only private, but *publick,* by which whole Cities were purg'd, to drive away the Plague, War, noxious Animals out of the Region, and other impending Evils. That *Pythagoras* uſually made ſuch Purgations, *Jamblichus* writeth in his Life. *Cap.* 19. (g) *It is ſaid, that when he came to any place, he made Purgations, and drove away Peſtilences and noxious Winds from thoſe Cities that deſir'd his help for that purpoſe. So we have heard, that after he had made a Purgation of* Lacedæmon, *that City was no more troubled with the Peſtilence, whereas before it was frequently ſubject to that Calamity.*

Pythagoras (who deriv'd his Diſcipline and Inſtitutes from *Zoroaſter* and the Oriental Magi, from *Orpheus* alſo and the Egyptians) muſt be thought a Prince amongſt the Saintiſts of the Magical kind. (h) He is reckon'd by *Pliny* amongſt thoſe that were eminently addicted to Magick; (i) *Tzetzes* alſo reckoneth him among the Magicians; and S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith of him, (k) *he ſhew'd innumerable ſorts of Goety. Ammianus* ſpeaking of the Egyptian Wiſdom giveth this account of him. (l) *Pythagoras inſtituted in this Wiſdom worſhipping the Gods in a clandeſtine way, made every thing that he ſaid to be Authoritative, often ſhew'd his golden Thigh at* Olympia, *and was often ſeen talking with an Eagle. Apuleius* ſaith of him, (m) that he learned from the Egyptian Prieſts *ceremoniarum incredendas potentias, the incredible Powers of Ceremonies;* and *Varro* informeth us, (n) that Hydromancy was deriv'd from the *Perſians,* and that *Pythagoras* made uſe of it, as *Numa* had done before him. Conformably to *Numa* and *Zoroaſter* he had his Den at *Samos,* wherein he ſtay'd for the moſt part Night and Day according to *Porphyry;* who alſo relateth, that he was not only purged amongſt the *Chaldeans* (from the *Sordes* of his former Life,) but in *Crete* he was purged alſo by the *Idæi Dactyli* (who are called by the Poets γόητες, *Magicians;*) theſe purged him by the *Lapis Ceraunius,* he lying along by the Sea in the Morning, and by a River at Night crown'd with the Wooll of a black Lamb; and having his black Wooll he deſcended into the Idæan Den (ſo called,) and tarry'd there thrice nine Days according to the Inſtitution. Amongſt the *Chaldeans*, *Egyptians*, *Arabians* and the *Hebrews* he learn'd the exact skill of interpreting Dreams (ſaith *Porphyry*,) and he was the firſt that made uſe of *Libanomancy*, (*o*) which ſome think, he learn'd among the Hebrews. But hence S. *Cyril* telleth *Julian*, (*p*) that his Anceſtors did not neglect τὸ μαγγανεύειν, *the buſineſs of inchanting*, but ſtudy'd it and admired it, and undertook long Peregrinations ταύτης τῆς γοητείας ἕνεκα, *to learn this Goety*; *for* Pythagoras *was converſant with the Egyptian Prieſts and learned their Wiſdom and Language.* (*q*) He cur'd Diſeaſes both of Soul and Body by *Cants*, μαγείαις, *Magical Methods and Inchantments*; by ſome of them he remov'd Sorrow, by others he mitigated Anger, and by others he took away abſurd Luſts and Appetites. He is ſaid to have predicted many things, and all of them came to paſs (as the anonymous Writer of his Life in *Photius* reporteth,) his Predictions of Earthquakes are celebrated, as alſo his preſentaneous Depulſions of Peſtilences, Suppreſſions of violent Winds, and Hail-ſtorms, and his ſtilling of tempeſtuous Waves both in Rivers and the Sea for the ſafe Paſſage of his Friends; which skill *Empedocles*, *Epimenides* and *Abaris* being Partakers of, they alſo did the like things. *Cicero* in his Book of Divination ſaith of him, that he was an *Augur*; the Writers of his Life ſay, that he attended to *Omens* and Vaticinations, was addicted to Divination (himſelf and his followers were great Eſteemers and Teachers of Divination,) he conſulted all Oracles and was a great Friend of *Apollo*'s, and in *Laertius* he is ſaid, to have had his Name *Pythagoras*, becauſe he did ὡς πύθιος ἀγορεύων, *ſpeak as the Pythian Oracle and his Sayings were as unqueſtionable* (his Readings alſo were behind the Curtain in imitation of *Apollo*,) which becauſe he pretended to, he became ſuſpected of Magick. A certain Author in *Clemens* (*r*) will have *Pythagoras*, to have been an Hearer of the *Gauls* and *Brachmans*; whether ſo or otherwiſe, *Druidiſm* is for the main the ſame with *Pythagoriſm*; the *Druids* are by *Ammianus* and others reckon'd a Branch of the *Pythagoreans*; therefore (although the Primitive Chriſtians had a more than ordinary kindneſs for them, becauſe of the nobleneſs of ſome of their Tenents, their ſeverity of Life, and abhorrence from bloody Sacrifices, all which deſerv'd a great reſpect, yet) they could be no better than Saintiſts of the magical kind. (*s*) *Nemo unquam verè Pythagoricus fuit, qui non Deos ſenſerit. Never was there a true Pythagorean, who had not commerce with Spirits.* *Pythagoras* ſymboliz'd with the Magicians in his Garment (for they in their Conjurations wore a Linnen Garment;) his Inſtitutes of Sanctity are of the ſame Nature with that of the *Zoroaſtrian* Magi, (*t*) that had the Terreſtrial Urchin in great Veneration; and what is that Pythagoric Inſtitute of ſacrificing ſomewhat to *Venus* on the ſixth Day, but *Aſtrological-magical*? If his Character ſpeaketh him a grand Magician, (*u*) the wondrous things that befell him, and the prodigious things that are ſaid to have been done by him, cannot be thought *meer Impoſtures*, but *magical Impoſtures*. He indoctrinated and perſwaded a ravenous Bear, to abſtain from the fleſh of Animals as himſelf and his followers did; and whiſpering in the Ear of an Ox, prevail'd with him ever after, to abſtain from Beans. In the Olympick Games he called down an Eagle, that was flying aloft, and ſtroak'd it and let it go. Paſſing over the River *Caucaſus* (or *Neſſus* as ſome ſay) with many of his Aſſociates, the River ſaluted him with a clear voice (all of them hearing it) *Salve Pythagora.* Before a Ship came to Shore, he told what Fraight it was charg'd with, and of another Ship ſailing with a fair Wind he foretold, it would be drown'd. He told ſome Fiſher-men, as they were dragging their Net, before it came to the Shore, what number of Fiſhes they ſhould draw; and a Serpent that killed People, he took in his Hand and ſent it away. He convers'd with his Friends at *Metapontium* and *Tauromenium* (the one a Town in *Italy*, the other in *Sicily*) in one and the ſame Day; and ſhew'd his golden Thigh to *Abaris* the Prieſt, who thereupon pronounc'd him, to be *Apollo Hyperboreus*, (*w*) and the *Crotonians* called him ſo. The great Eſteem (*x*) which he had in *Italy*, argueth, that there was ſome reality in theſe pretended Miracles; for he was reckoned with the Gods, ſome thought him one of the Celeſtial Gods, others one of the Demons that inhabit the Moon.

(q) *Hiſt. Auguſt.* p. 849.

(r) *Per Chaldæos & Magos Antoninum Marcum id egiſſe, ut Marcomanni P. R. ſemper devoti eſſent, atque amici, idque factis carminibus & conſecratione.*

(s) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 34, 35. *Lactant. l.* 1. *c.* 22. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 193

(t) *L. Holſten. de vit. & Scr. Porph. p.* 73.

(u) *Flor. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(w) *Vocatis convivis vi magicâ effecit, ut repentè fercula omnifaria præſto eſſent, & menſæ omni apparatu convivali inſtructiſſimæ ſpectarentur.* Beroald. in Apul. met. p. 385.

(x) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p.* 2.

(y) *Orig. c Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 367.

(z) *Clem. Str. l.* 1. *p. m.* 245.

(a) *Marſham. Can. Chr. p. m.* 149.

(b) *De verb. mirif. p.* 139.

(c) *L.* 30. *c.* 1.

(d) *Stanley Hiſt. B* 1. *S.* 1. *c.* 2. & *l.* 2. *c.* 1.

(e) *Huet. Dem. ev. pr.* 4. *c.* 5.

(f) *Ibid. & Stanley ſupr.*

(g) Καὶ προσβαλὼν, ὡς ἱ- γος, καθαρμὺς τε ἐπιτελ, λοιμὺς ἀπεδίωκε, καὶ ἀνέμους, ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τοῦτο ἀξιούντων βοηθεῖν αὐτὴν γιν, Λακεδαίμονα γῦν παρειλήφαμεν μετὰ τὸν ὑπ' ἐκείνου γενόμενον καθαρμὸν μηκέτι λοιμῶξαι, πολλάκις πρότερον τῷ παθήματι περιπεσοῦσαν.

(h) *L.* 30. *c.* 1.

(i) *Montacut. or. Ec. T.* 1. *p.* 189.

(k) Πυθαγόρας γοητείας ἐπιδείξας εἴδη μυρία. *In Joan. Hom.* 2. *p.*561.

(l) *Hac inſtitutus prudentia Pythagoras colens ſecretius Deos, quicquid dixit aut voluit, auctoritatem eſſe inſtituit ratam, & femur ſuum aureum apud Olympiam ſæpè monſtrabat, & cum Aquila colloquens ſubinde viſebatur. L.* 22.

(m) *Florid. l.* 2.

(n) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. *c.* 35.

The Character of *Pythagoras* may be further underſtood from the Magick of his Aſſociates and Followers, *Empedocles*, *Epimenides*, *Abaris*, *Zamolxis*, who were notorious and eminent Magicians. (*y*) For *Empedocles* was ſirnam'd ἀλεξάνεμος, *the driver away of noxious Winds*, *Epimenides* was called καθαρτής, *the purger of Men and Cities*, and *Abaris* was entitled αἰθροβάτης, *Air-walker.* (*z*) *Gorgias Leontinus* ſaid, that he was preſent, when *Empedocles* practis'd Goety (γοητεύοντι,) and in his Poems *Empedocles* pretendeth, to teach certain *Pharmaca*, *whereby you may raiſe or calm tempeſtuous Winds at Pleaſure, cauſe Rain or fair Weather, and raiſe a dead Man's Ghoſt.*

Ἄξεις δ' ἐξ Ἀΐδαο καταφθιμένου μένος ἀνδρός.

Empedocles is reckon'd by (*a*) *Tzetzes* amongſt the Magicians, and of *Epimenides* the Diſciple of *Pythagoras* *Jamblichus* writeth, (*b*) that by invoking the *Erinnyes* he made his Inſidiators kill themſelves. The Writers of the Life of *Pythagoras* reckon amongſt his Diſciples *a Cretian Epimenides*: But one of that Name was ſomewhat Senior to *Pythagoras*; and this *Epimenides* is intituled by the Heathen Writers (*c*) *a Divine Man, a Prophet, a Deſtiny-teller, expert as to Divine Matters, a Divine, one dear to the Gods, and wiſe in Divine things, having the Enthuaſiaſtic and Teleſtic Wiſdom, that came to* Athens *by the Monition of God, and made certain Sacrifices according to the anſwer of the Oracle* (his Book was alſo intituled χρησμοὶ Oracles) *a moſt knowing Man, one that made luſtrations by Cants or Charms.* He is celebrated for his ſtrange Predictions of Events, that ſhould befall (*d*) *the Athenians* and *Lacedæmonians* (*e*) and the *Perſians* in their War againſt Greece, (*f*) for a voice alſo that he heard from Heaven, when he was building a Temple to the Nymphs, commanding him to dedicate it to *Jupiter*; for his Luſtrations alſo of Houſes and of Fields, and for driving away the Peſtilence from *Athens* by expiating the City; all which magical Exploits of his ſpeak him an eminent Inſtance of *the*

(c) Ἀνὴρ θεῖος, προφήτης, Fatidicus, δεινὸς τὰ θεῖα, θεολόγος, θεοφιλὴς καὶ σοφὸς περὶ τὰ θεῖα, τὴν ἐνθουσιαστικὴν καὶ τελεστικὴν σοφίαν, ἐλθὼν —— κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μαντείαν, θυσίας τε ἐθύσατό τινας, ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἀνεῖλε, γνωστικώτατος, καθαρμοὺς διὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ποιῶν. *Grot. Not. in Tit.* 1. 12.

(o) *Gale in Jambl.* p. 249.

(p) *L.* 10. p. 341.

(q) *Porph. & Jambl. de vit. Pythag. Herald. in Arnob.* p. 53.

(r) *Strom.* l. 1. p. m. 223.

(s) *Reuchlin. de verb. mirif.* p. 89.

(t) *Plutarch. Sympl.* l. 4. *Qu.* 5.

(u) *Porph. & Jambl. ſupr. Plutarch. in Numa.*

(w) *Ælian. var. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 26.

(x) *Jambl. ſupr.* c. 26.

(y) *Porph. ſupr. Jambl. ſupr.* p. 128.

(z) *Laert. in Empedocl.*

(a) *Montacut. or. Eccl.* T. 1. p. 189.

(b) *Supr.* p. 188.

(d) *Laert. in Epimen. Plutarch. in Solon*

(e) *Plato de Leg.* 1.

(f) *Laert. ſupr. M. Tyr. diſſ.* 22

Sorcery and *Wizardiſm* that prevail'd in Paganiſm. (*g*) *Abaris* was intituled αἰθεροβάτης, *Air-walker*, becauſe riding upon an Arrow of the Hyperborean *Apollo*'s (whoſe Prieſt he was) he paſs'd through the Air over Rivers and Seas and impaſſible places, as *Jamblicus* affirmeth, and as *Celſus* believeth. (*h*) His abode was in Temples and ſacred places, his conſtant imployment was about his ἱερουργήματα, *Sacred Operations*, and he is ſaid to have been ſo grand an Aſcetick, that he was never ſeen to eat or drink, and therefore muſt be thought a Saintiſt of the magical kind. The Incantations of this Hyperborean *Abaris* and of *Zamolxis* are mention'd by *Plato* in his *Charmides*; (*i*) and *Zamolxis* is ſaid to have been a Servant and Diſciple of *Pythagoras*, afterwards a Lawgiver to the *Getæ*, and by them accounted the greateſt of the Gods. (*k*) He is reckon'd by *Strabo* amongſt the eminent and celebrated *Diviners*, and therefore may be thought (what many of the Pagan Gods were, and what *Empedocles* affected to be) *a deify'd Magician*. Amongſt the Inſtances of Pythagoric Magick we will not over-look what *Aſignotus* a Pythagorean related of himſelf; (*l*) namely, that coming to *Corinth* he heard, that the Houſe of *Eubulidas* was made uninhabitable by a Spectre; but he entred the Houſe alone, and having plac'd his Candle in a great Court, ſate upon the Ground and ſilently read, whereupon a frightful Demon came upon him, that chang'd himſelf into ſeveral Shapes; but this Pythagorean *carmine horrendo voceque Ægyptiâ*, *by an horrendous Charm and an Egyptian Voice*, forced him into a dark corner, where he hid himſelf, and the place being digg'd the next day a dead Body was found there. To theſe Magical Pythagoreans we may reaſonably ſubjoyn (*m*) the *Jewiſh Eſſens*, who Pythagoriz'd in their *white Garments*, *Silence*, *abſtinence from Animals*, and ſeveral other of their Inſtitutes (which they might derive either from *Egypt*, as *L. Holſtenius* thinketh, or from the oriental *Magi*,) and were in common with the *Pythagoreans* very much addicted to Divination *and Saintiſts of the magical kind.* They are ſaid, to have foretold things to come, and to have been Prophets by their Abſtinence, ſaith *Beroaldus*.

XVII. *Socrates* is not like the wonder-working *Pythagoras* juſtly chargeable with any Magical Miracles, nor doth it appear, that he practis'd the Magic Arts, yet becauſe of his extraordinary Magical Correſpondence in all reaſon he ought to be reputed *a Saintiſt of the Magical kind*. Some of the Pagans proceeded further, and reputed him a Magician upon the account of his Demon, as appeareth from (*n*) *Apuleius* (*o*) and *M. Tyrius*. The moſt of the Chriſtian Apologiſts ſuppoſe, that he had really ſuch a δαίμων πάρεδρος, *Demon-Aſſeſſor*, or Familiar Spirit, as himſelf pretended to. (*p*) Socrates *publickly profeſs'd, that he was inſtructed and govern'd by a Demon. Clemens* in his Catalogue of eminent and celebrated Diviners reckoneth *Pythagoras*, the Hyperborean *Abaris*, the Cretian *Epimenides*, *Zoroaſter*, *Empedocles*, ἐπί τε τούτοις Σωκράτης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος μάλιστα, *and beſides theſe chiefly the* Athenian Socrates; *for in* Plato's *Theages* Socrates *ſaith; I have from my Childhood (which befell me by Divine Fate) a Demonial Sign, which is a Voice, that when it cometh, reſtraineth me from what I am about to do* (becauſe it would not ſucceed well) *but never putteth me upon any thing.* Some without pretending to any Reaſon (*q*) explode *Socrates*'s Demon as a meer Figment, judging of the truth of things arbitrariouſly, as they are agreeable to their Wills, not their Underſtandings. But *Socrates*'s Demon muſt not be thus exploded; which would be a foul reflection upon the Underſtanding or Integrity of that great Philoſopher. Nor can there be any reaſon, to explode his Demon-Regent, his pretenſion thereto being hugely agreeable both to the Chriſtian and Pagan Hypotheſis; for Chriſtianity ſuppoſeth, that unregenerate Mankind are under the Domination and Government of Evil Demons (who are of various Humours and Tempers) and that the Pagans dedicated their Children to impure Demons, (*r*) *Sic igitur & Socratem puerum adhuc Spiritus Dæmonicus invenit*, *ſo a Demonical Spirit found* Socrates *when but a Child.* The Pagan Theologers ſay of Demons, (*s*) *They have ſeveral Bodies for their Habitation, one hath* Socrates, *another* Plato, *another* Pythagoras, *another* Zeno, *and another* Diogenes. But *Socrates* peculiarly was of ſuch a Temperament, as might invite and attract an Aſſociate Demon; for he was a ſuperlatively Enthuſiaſtical and Extatical kind of Man; whence he was ſaid to be εἰς ἀρετὴν θεόληπτος, *one that had a Divine Correption and Afflation to Virtue.* (*t*) Saluting and adoring the riſing Sun he divers times fell into an Extaſie. (*u*) As *Pythagoras* is ſaid to have continu'd in the ſame poſture two Nights and three Days, not eating, drinking or ſleeping; (*w*) ſo it was uſual with *Socrates*, to ſtand immote without any alteration in any part of his Body (as in a Trance or Extaſie) from the Sun-riſing of one Day till Sun-riſing the next Day. *Plato* in his *Sympoſium* relateth, that *Socrates* was once obſerv'd, to continue in this extatick poſture from Morning till Night, and then ſome *Ionian* Souldiers lay down by him, and they found, that he continu'd without any motion till next Morning. He ſeemeth ſtrangely Extatical in his Platonic Love-paſſions, which is imputed to his Demon-Regent; (*x*) *for* Socrates *had never led ſo right an amatorious Life, unleſs by the Afflation of his Demon he had choſen it, and kept to his choice.* So *Plato* in his Apology ſaith, that *Socrates* inſtituted his Life according to the Oracle of *Apollo* and the Vaticination of his Demon. Theſe he combin'd in his Pretenſions, theſe he conjoyn'd in the Government of his Life; and if he may be ſuppos'd, to have counterfeited touching the Regency of his Demon, he may as well be ſuppos'd, to have counterfeited touching the Regency of his God, which is not imaginable; for in *Plato*'s Apology he profeſſeth, that God (the Delphic God) injoyn'd him his Buſineſs of Philoſophizing by Vaticinations, Dreams, and by every other method whereby any Buſineſs can be divinely injoyn'd a Man; and that if the *Athenians* would diſmiſs him upon condition of deſiſting from his philoſophizing, he would not accept the condition, but would rather die than deſiſt, becauſe he muſt obey God. His God (*y*) and his Demon were of one kind, and both of the bad kind, with both he had extraordinary correſpondence, upon the account

of

(g) *Or. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 129.

(h) *Jambl. ſupr. p.* 131, 136.

(i) *Ibid. p.* 155.

(k) *L.* 16. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 93, 94.

(l) *Gaſſend. T.* 2. *p.* 657.

(m) *Luc. Holſten. de vit. & ſcr. Porphyr. p.* 72.

(n) *Apol. p.* 453, 454

(o) *Diſſ.* 8.

(p) *Socrates inſtrui ſe & regi ad arbitrium Dæmonis prædicabat.* V. S. Cyr. de Idol. van. Tertull. Apol. c. 22. Min. Fel. p. 243. S. Aug. de C. D. l. 8. c. 14. Lactant. l. 2. c. 15. Clem. Strom. l. 1 p. m. 245.

(q) *Outzel. in Min. Fel. p.* 244. *Van Dale de Orac. p.* 154.

(r) *Tertull. de Anim. c.* 40.

(s) Εἴληχε δὲ ἄλλος ἄλλην ἑστίαν σώματος· ὁ μὲν Σωκράτην, ὁ δὲ Πλάτωνα, ὁ δὲ Πυθαγόραν, ὁ δὲ Ζήνωνα, ὁ δὲ Διογένην. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 26.

(t) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 423.

(u) *Jambl. ſupra p.* 34.

(w) *Gat. in Antonin. p.* 287, 288.

(x) *Socrates nunquam amatoriam vitam uſque adeo rectam peregiſſet, niſi afflatu quodam Dæmonis elegiſſet eam & tenuiſſet electam.* M. Tyr. diſſ. 8. Procl. de An. & Dæm. p. 154.

(y) *V. Cardan. de rer. varietat. l.* 16. *c.* 93. *p.* 1137.

of both which Correſpondences he muſt be denominated *a Magical kind of Saintiſt.* And he ought to be ſo denominated for a *third* Reaſon, *becauſe of his extraordinary addictedneſs to the Heathen Divination*, which appeareth throughout *Xenophon*'s Memoirs. (z) He made uſe of Divination himſelf, and ſuppos'd it neceſſary for Mankind, to manage their Affairs well, becauſe of themſelves they could not diſcover, how things would fall out, well or ill, and that to found and govern Houſes and Cities well (and in all ſuch caſes) Divination is needful, and to act contrary to what the Gods ſignifie, is as if one ſhould chuſe a blind Guide and one that knoweth not the Way, inſtead of a ſeeing one and one that knoweth it. He prov'd to *Ariſtodemus*, that the Gods regard Men and their Affairs, becauſe they declare things to the *Athenians* by Divination, when they inquire, and foreſignifie to the Greeks and to all Men by Prodigies. He accus'd them of folly that act contrary to what the Gods ſignifie, fearing diſgrace amongſt Men, αὐτὸς δὲ πάντ' ἀνθρώπινα ὑπερεώρα πρὸς τὴν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ξυμβουλίαν, *but as for himſelf he contemn'd all Humane things in compariſon of the Counſel of the Gods.* (a) He look'd upon Divination as one of the Benefits, which the Gods beſtow upon Mankind, whereby they aſſiſt and cooperate with Men, and advis'd thoſe that would have help beyond the reach of Humane Wiſdom, to apply themſelves to Divinination; for he that underſtandeth the Signs that the Gods make, will never be deſtitute of the Counſel of the Gods. *Himſelf was pious indeed*, ὥστε μηδὲν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν θεῶν γνώμης ποιεῖν, *ſo as to do nothing without conſulting the Mind of the Gods. Socrates* was not only moſt religiouſly addicted to the Heathen Divination, but himſelf was an Heathen Prophet or Diviner; (b) he attributed to himſelf nothing leſs than propheſying (*præſagitionem divinam,*) *Antipater* made a Collection of *the many things wonderfully foretold by* Socrates. *Cicero* mentioneth ſome of his Divinations, and *Plato* in his *Theages* relateth ſeveral Inſtances of Men, that ſadly miſcarry'd, becauſe they would not take *Socrates*'s advice, who (by his Demon's Voice) foretold them, that their Undertakings would have bad Events. (c) *He precaution'd many of thoſe whom he convers'd with, touching ſome things that they ſhould do, and ſome things that they ſhould not do, as from his Demon foreſignifying; and they that obey'd, found it was for their advantage; but they that obey'd not, repented of it.* To this Account of *Socrates*'s Magical Character, we will ſubjoyn an Inſtance of Magick, which occurreth in his Life. (d) *Ariſtotle* reporteth, that a *Magus* came from *Syria* to *Athens*, who reprehended *Socrates* for ſeveral things, and predicted, that he ſhould die a violent death.

Plato ſeemeth not to have been Saintiſt enough, to be juſtly accounted a magical Saintiſt; nor is there in his Life any appearance of *magical Miracles*, or of *extraordinary magical Correſpondences*; yet he was ſuſpected of Magick, becauſe of his T'Agathon, (e) as *Apuleius* informeth us; and *Pliny* reckoneth him amongſt thoſe that were eminently addicted to magick. (f) Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato, *ſail'd into foreign Countries, to learn Magick, undertaking Exiles rather than Peregrinations: This they extoll'd at their return and kept as a choice Secret.* Not without ſome reaſon *Plato* might be ſuſpected of Magick, as being both a *Pythagoriſt* and a *Socratiſt*, a great admirer of the Oracles (that taught Magick) and of Inchantments and Divination. He deſign'd, to have convers'd with the Oriental Magi (if the Wars had not hinder'd,) and did actually converſe with, and learn of the *Egyptian Prieſts* and Prophets, to whom he travelled in company with *Euripides*, whom they cur'd of a Diſtemper by a *Catharm* with Marine Water, (g) which occaſion'd that Verſe of his,

Θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τ' ἀνθρώπων κακά.

So *Plato* (h) in his *fourth de Republica* hath his curative ἐπῳδὰς, *Charms or Incantations*, and in his *Charmides* ἐπῳδὰς τὰς ὑγιεῖς παρὰ Θρᾳκῶν, *ſanative Charms from the* Thracians (as *Clemens* (i) calleth them, and *Ficinus* ſaith of him; (k) Plato *in his* Alcibiades *calleth* Zoroaſter's *Wiſdom Divine, and in his* Charmides *curative of the Diſeaſes of Mind and Body.* (l) Plato *in his* Charmides *ſignifieth, that the Sickneſs of Mind and Body may be cur'd; and laſtly, that Immortality may be gain'd by Magick.* Nothing rationally could reſtrain him from extraordinary magical Correſpondences, who believ'd no Evil Demons, who deriveth Religion from the Inſtitution of Demons (and in his *Phædrus* (m) he aſcribeth the Invention of Learning to the Demon *Theuth*:) nor is it eaſily conceivable, how any of thoſe, that aſpir'd after the higheſt and moſt familiar Converſation with their Heathen Gods, could avoid extraordinary magical Correſpondences. (n) *It is moſt certain, that thoſe Philoſophers in the impious mundane City, who ſuppos'd themſelves to have friendſhip and ſociety with the Gods, fell upon the Evil Demons, to whom that whole City is ſubjected.* The *Magi* that were at *Athens* when *Plato* died, and did Sacrifice to him, ſuppoſing him to be more than a Man, (o) as *Seneca* reporteth, (doubtleſs) did ſuppoſe him to be a magical Saintiſt. But whether *Plato* was ſo, or otherwiſe, there is great reaſon to think, that *Plotinus* was one of this Character; for his extraordinary magical Correſpondence appeareth, (p) *in his ſeeing Demons and their Pulchritude*, of whom he ſaith, (q) καὶ θέλγεσθαι φυσικῶς ἀγομένους, καὶ κατακούειν καλούντων, *that they are naturally attracted and hear thoſe that call them.* (r) He is celebrated for reſembling *Socrates* in a ſingular goodneſs of Nature, which was a proneneſs to become extatical preſently; and according to *Ammianus* (s) *Pythagoras*, *Numa*, *Socrates*, *Hermes Triſmegiſt*, *Apollonius Tyanæus* and *Plotinus* were alike in this reſpect, each of them had a (*Genius familiaris*, or) *Familiar Spirit*. But *Plotinus*'s Genius or Demon was one of the ſuperiour Order; (t) as appeareth from the Demon which the *Egyptian* Prieſt ſhew'd him, and from his Superiority over the Magician *Olympius* in Magical Feats. He might be conjoyn'd therefore with *Jamblichus* in doing Magical Exploits, as he is conjoyn'd with him by *Ficinus* in Magical

(z) Ἀπομν. α.

(a) Ἀπομν. δ.

(b) *Cic. de Divin. l.* 1. *ſub fin.*

(c) Καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν ξυνόντων προηγόρευε τὰ μὲν ποιεῖν, τὰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖν, ὡς τοῦ δαιμονίου προσημαίνοντος. καὶ τοῖς μὲν πειθομένοις αὐτῷ συνέφερε, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθομένοις μετέμελε. *Xenoph.* Ἀπομν. α.

(d) *Laert. in Socrat.*

(e) *Apol. p.* 474.

(f) *Certè Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato ad hanc* (Magiam) *diſcendam navigavere, exiliis veriùs quàm peregrinationibus ſuſceptis, Hanc reverſi prædicavere, Hanc in arcanis habuere.* L. 30. c. 1.

(g) *Tiraquell. de Nobil. p.* 486.

(h) *Ibid. p.* 324.

(i) Προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 34.

(k) *Zoroaſtris ſapientiam Plato in Alcibiade divinam appellat, & in Charmide morborum animi & corporis curatricem.* Arg. in Cratyl.

(l) *Poſſe verò per magiam valetudinem animi corporiſque curari, & immortalitatem denique comparari, in Charmide Plato ſignificat.* Idem com. in Plotin. p. 126.

(m) *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 14. *c.* 9.

(n) *Illos quidem philoſophos in impia civitate qui deos ſibi amicos eſſe dixerunt, in dæmones malignos incidiſſe certiſſimum eſt, quibus tota civitas ſubditur.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 19. c. 9.

(o) *Ep.* 58.

(p) *En.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 17. *En.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 7.

(q) *En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 43.

(r) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 233.

(s) *L.* 21.

(t) *Gale ſupr. p* 310.

gical Sentiment. (u) *In certain Statues compos'd in a certain order and method Demons are in a ſort included, as* Mercury Triſmegiſt *taught at firſt, and long after him* Plotinus *and* Jamblichus. The cloſe of his Life is a manifeſt Indication of extraordinary magical Correſpondence; for he is not only celebrated by an Hymn of *Apollo* after his deceaſe (who calleth him his Friend,) but when he lay upon his Death-bed *a Serpent appear'd under it,* which paſſing into an Hole in the Wall, and there hiding it ſelf and diſappearing, *Plotinus breath'd out his Soul.* If this Philoſopher was of the Magical Faculty, is it not reaſonable, to attribute thereto his ſtrange predictions and diſcernments of Perſons that ſtole Goods, for which *Porphyry* celebrateth him in his Life?

Plotinus's Scholars were Magical Saintiſts, which is an argument that their Maſter was ſuch. (w) *In that Age almoſt all the Platoniſts and Pythagoreans practis'd, or at leaſt affected Magick or Goety, and chiefly the Diſciples of* Plotinus. *Some of which are ſaid by* S. Auſtin, *to have been deprav'd by Magick Arts. The Lives of moſt of them written by* Eunapius *declare it.* Marinus *relateth the ſame of* Proclus *in his Life, the latter part whereof, which largely treateth of the Theurgicks, hath not yet been publiſh'd. And to ſay nothing of* Apuleius *and* Apollonius Tyanæus, Porphyry *relateth, that* Pythagoras *himſelf learn'd theſe vain Arts of the* Egyptians, (x) All Men of Learning obſerve, that the later Platoniſts were addicted to the Magick Rites and Correſpondences (at a more than ordinary Heathen rate,) and S. *Auſtin* obſerveth, that their magical dealing with Demons was the principal thing that hindred them from becoming Chriſtians; but it did not hinder them from being eximious Pagan Saintiſts (for they are deſcrib'd and repreſented as ſuch;) which ſheweth, who it is, that is in Empire and Domination in the Religion of Paganiſm, and that theſe Philoſophers are of Character *the Magical Saintiſts.* Such was *Proclus*, whoſe Life written by *Marinus* and lately publiſh'd, ſaith; (y) that this Philoſopher being purg'd by Chaldaic Luſtrations was an αὐτόπτης, of the lucid appearances of *Hecate*, as himſelf reporteth in a Commentary of his; that by moving an *Iynx* or Hecatic Sphere he drew down Rain, and deliver'd *Attica* from calamitous Droughts; and that he ſet φυλακτήρια σεισμῶν, *Amulets*, as it were (Teleſms) againſt Earthquakes, which reſtrained them. (z) *Julianus* the *Chaldean* (the Father of *Julian* the Theurgiſt) is a parallel for *Actius Navius*; for by virtue of a Charm he is ſaid, to have been able to divide a Stone with his Hand; which is not ſo great a thing as is reported of *Jamblichus* (in his Life;) that in his Devotions he ſeem'd to be lifted up and rais'd above Ground more than ten Cubits, his Body and his Garments being chang'd into a golden colour; which ſpeaketh him of ſuperlative magical Sanctity. Such as we may contemplate in *Iſidore* the Philoſopher, (a) whoſe Language is a ſtrain of Seraphic Enthuſiaſtic Magical Sanctity, ἡ ἱερὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐγὴ, *the divine ſplendor of the Soul*; τῆς θείας ἀστραπὴ, *the Coruſcation of the Divinity*; θεία ἀπόῤῥοια, *Divine Influence*; τὸ θεῖον φῶς, *the Divine Light.* The Philoſophic-Pagan Magical (or Theurgical) Sanctity is thought by Learned Men a Divine Cabala, becauſe it is a reſemblance of true and genuine Sanctity. Of *Heraiſcus* the Philoſopher *Damaſcius* ſaith; (b) There was ſomething in his Nature τοὺς μολυσμοὺς τῆς γενέσεως ἀναιρούμενον, *expulſive and abolitive of the pollutions of Generation; for upon hearing a Woman utter any unclean talk, preſently his Head ach'd.* Of *Antoninus* the Son of *Edeſius*, *Eunapius* ſaith, (c) *He wholly apply'd himſelf to the Gods and to Myſtick and Arcane Sacra, and was ſpeedily receiv'd into the Society of the Immortal Gods.* By Methods of Theurgy and a Magical Sanctity the Platoniſts ſought for Immortality and Bleſſedneſs; and this Platonic way was preferr'd before the Chriſtian Religion by the Apoſtate *Julian.* In whom we may contemplate the Vanity of all Humane Accompliſhments on this ſide true and ſaving Religion; for *Zoſimus* ſaith of him, (d) *He excell'd all the Men of his Age.* In him we may alſo contemplate the Vanity of Humane Honour; for he dy'd highly lamented by many, and with this honourary Epithet;

> Ἀμφότερον βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής.
> *Both a good Emperour and a valiant Warriour.*

To this Tribe of Magical Saintiſts *Syneſius* and *Ficinus* may reaſonably be ſubjoyned, as of the ſame Family and Foot-mark; for if *Syneſius* did not practiſe Theurgy, (e) it was only the fear of the Laws that reſtrain'd him. (f) *Ficinus* ſeemeth both to have underſtood and practis'd the Arts of Magick.

CHAP.

(u) *Statuis quibuſdam ordine certo compoſitis dæmones quodammodo includuntur, quemadmodum ab initio docuit Mercurius Triſmegiſtus, ac diu poſtea Plotinus & Jamblichus.* Ficin. Arg. in Cratyl.

(w) Τὴν κακότεχνον γοητείαν *eo ſeculo Platonici & Pythagorici ferme omnes exercuerunt vel affectarunt, & inprimis Plotini diſcipuli. Quorum aliquos magicarum artium curioſitate depravatos fuiſſe D. Auguſtinus affirmat Ep. 56. ad Dioſcurum. Et teſtantur plerorumque vitæ ab Eunapio ſcriptæ. Idemque de Proclo Marinus refert in ejus vita, cujus pars poſterior, quæ prolixè* περὶ θεουργικῶν *agit, hactenus non fuit edita. Et ne quid de Apuleio & Apollonio Tyanæo dicam, ipſum Pythagoram ab Ægyptiis vanas haſce artes didiciſſe Porphyrius teſtatur.* L. Holſten. de vit. & ſcript. Porphyr. p. 55.

(x) *Baron. ad an.* 362. *n.* 17. *Montacut. Orig. Eccl. T.* 1. *p.* 189. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *&c. Sennert. de Conſ. & Diſſenſ. c.* 18. *S. Aug. de ver. rel. c.* 4.

(y) P. 56, 57.

(z) *Sozom. Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(a) *Phot. cod.* 242.

(b) *Ibid. col.* 1050.

(c) *In Ædes.*

(d) *Hiſt. p.* 145.

(e) *Syneſ. de Inſom. p.* 135.

(f) *Ficin. de Vita. l.* 3. *& vid. Com. in Plotin. p.* 436 437.

CHAP. IX.

1. A Seventh plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire is the Pagan Oracles and Miracles: Of Van Dale's *Epicurean Hypotheſis touching the Oracles, and the badneſs of his Cauſe and Arguments. 2. The firſt Argument againſt his Hypotheſis. 3. A ſecond Argument againſt his Hypotheſis. 4. A third Argument againſt his Hypotheſis. 5. A fourth Argument againſt his Hypotheſis. 6. A fifth Argument againſt his Hypotheſis. 7. A ſixth Argument againſt his Hypotheſis. 8. More Argumentations againſt his Hypotheſis, and a Conſideration of the Difficulties that incumber the common Hypotheſis. 9. An eighth plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire is the Sibylline Oracles, which plainly confute* Van Dale's *Epicurean Hypotheſis. 10. The Sibylline Oracles did not predict the coming of Chriſt and the Times of Chriſtianity. 11. A ninth plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire is the Pagans Anomalous Sanctity. 12. A tenth plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-Mundane Empire is the Quality and Character of an Empire of the Heathen Religion, which hath the Marks and Characters of a Satanical Empire. 13. The Sufferings of the Primitive Chriſtians were in part an effect of the Philoſophic Pagans Wiſdom and Virtue.*

I. THE many *Oracles* and *Miracles* that are in Paganiſm, are *a ſeventh* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire; for theſe being (in part) plainly Magical, *ſuch as cannot be the effect of meer Humane Artifice and Impoſture*, plainly demonſtrate the Exiſtence of Evil Demons and their Domination over the Heathen World. They that ſuppoſe the Heathen Oracles, to be meerly from Humane Artifice and Impoſture, muſt not be thought, to befriend the Chriſtian Religion, they bereave it of its Supports, they take part with the *Epicureans*, joyn with the Atheiſts (who triumph in their Books as unanſwerable,) and they contradict Religious Antiquity (both Pagan and Chriſtian) which ought not to be done but upon firm and ſolid grounds; whereas their Hypotheſis is groundleſs and founded upon weak ſurmiſes; for they do not proceed upon firm and ſolid grounds, that have nothing to object againſt the commonly receiv'd Hypotheſis, *that the Heathen Oracles were in part magically Divine*, *(g)* but only the Frauds of the Pagan Prieſthood, and the Folly and Credulity of the Vulgar; that becauſe ſome Oracles have been convicted, *(h)* to have nothing more in them than Humane Artifice and Impoſture, thence infer, that this was the common condition of them all; as if they ſhould infer, that there is no true Money, becauſe ſome is counterfeit; *(i)* that becauſe ſome Oracles aſcrib'd to Demons are ineptly jocular, and others ſo fooliſhly fraudulent, that they are incompetible to Demons, thence argue, that there were no Demons or Demonial Inſpirations in the Oracles; as if they ſhould argue, that there was no Divine *Bath Kol* amongſt the Jews, becauſe ſeveral things inept and fooliſhly fraudulent are aſcrib'd thereto; that becauſe the Pagans *(k)* ſometimes refus'd to obey their Oracles, when they were extremely againſt their Humour, and when they apprehended them, to be extremely againſt their Intereſt, thence infer, that they did not believe their own Oracles to be Divine; as if there were not the like Inſtances of the Jews behaviour towards their own acknowledg'd Prophets: *(l)* That reckon *Alexander* amongſt the leſs ſuperſtitious Princes, and becauſe an Oracle was attributed to his *Hephæſtion*, to *Adrian*'s *Antinous*, and to many others after their *Conſecration*, thence argue, that all the Heathen Oracles were meerly the Inſtitutes of Humane fraud; and might they not as well argue, that all the Heathen Deities and their Religion were meerly Inſtitutes of Humane Fraud, becauſe theſe new Deities were ſuch? that have read *Cicero de Divinatione*, yet have the confidence to alledge on behalf of their Hypotheſis, not only the *Epicureans* and *Academicks*, *(m)* but all the *Cynicks* and *Peripateticks*, becauſe *Euſebius* hath committed ſuch a miſtake; that alledge *Cicero*'s ſecond Book *de Divinatione* *(n)* as ſerious Argument, which is but an exerciſe of Wit and Humour in an Academical way; that applaud all his Reaſonings, ſome of which are groſly unreaſonable and irreligious, particularly his Diſcourſe againſt Divination by Dreams: *(o)* That applaud the idle Atheiſtic Drollery and Buffoonry of *Lucian* (a known Atheiſt and ſcoffer at all Religion and ſupernatural Operations) and vilifie the Sage Theories of the Great and Learned, and (in their way) Religious Schools of Philoſophers, the *Platoniſts* and *Pythagoreans*; *(p)* that alledge *Clemens* as one of their Partiſans (and *Origen* alſo) who often citeth the *Sibylls* and *Sibylline* Oracles as Pagan-divine, who reciteth a large Catalogue of χρησμολόγοι, *Oracle-ſpeakers* (Diviners) whom he accounteth Magicians, and who looketh upon the Oracles as a Magical Juggle; *(q)* that conclude, there was nothing of Sorcery in the Oracles, becauſe politick Men made uſe of them as Tools and Engines, to ſerve their Deſigns, and becauſe they were liable to be corrupted by Money or otherwiſe; as if this was not the caſe of *Balaam* an undoubted Sorcerer; that exclude Demons from preſiding in the Oracles, *(r)* becauſe *Crœſus* conſulted ſeveral diſtant Oracles, and found *a diverſity in their Anſwers, ſome more, ſome leſs intelligent, and becauſe they did not anſwer the truth of the thing*, as if ſome of thoſe Oracular Reſponſes might not proceed from meer Humane Artifice, and others from correſpondence with Demons; as if there was not a diverſity amongſt Demons in Knowledge and Temper as amongſt Men; as if they might not take ſeveral methods to hide their Ignorance of future Events; or as if Truth was always to be expected from the Father of Lyes and his Agents: Such craſs Miſtakes and irreligious Paralogiſms are foul Reflections upon the Learning and Underſtanding, the Integrity, Modeſty and Ingenuity of the Patrons of this Epicurean Hypotheſis, *That there was no Demon in the Heathen Oracles, nothing more than meer Humane Artifice and Impoſture.*

II. This

(g) *Van Dale de Orac.* p. 303, & 326, &c.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 216. & *præfat. ad Lect.*

(i) *Ibid.* p. 415, 444.

(k) *Ibid.* p. 418, 419.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 430, &c.

(m) *Ibid.* p. 207, 217.

(n) *Ibid.* p. 194, 261, &c.

(o) *Ibid.* p. 190, & 185.

(p) *Ibid. præfat. ad Lect.* & p. 200.

(q) *Ibid.* p. 404, &c. & p. 412.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 382, 383.

II. This Epicurean Hypotheſis is *Anti-Scriptural* and againſt the Faith of Gods Church and Kingdom. For have they a due veneration for the Scriptures, (s) that impute the whole Transaction of the Witch of *Endor* meerly to the Artifice and Impoſture of a Woman? (t) that with *Pliny* explode Magick as a meer Imagination of no Power or Operation? Are the Scriptures ſilent touching *Witches*, *Witchcraft*, *Inchantments*, *Divination*, *familiar Spirits*, *and the Sorcery* of the Pagan Religioniſts and the idolatrous Jews? Nor are they ſilent touching the Pagans *Teraphim* (which Name occurreth in Scripture no leſs than fifteen times,) which plainly anſwer (u) to the holy-popular *Urim* and *Thummim*, and were of the ſame general Nature and Uſe. For as the holy-popular *Urim* was an Oracle, whereby God gave anſwers to thoſe that enquir'd of him, whence the High Prieſt's Breaſt-plate is called by (w) the Septuagint, *Joſephus* and *Philo*, λόγιον and λογεῖον, *Oracle*: So the Pagans *Teraphim* were their Oracular Statues, as appeareth manifeſtly, (x) not only from the Opinion of the Hebrew Doctors, (y) but from the expreſs Teſtimony of Scripture. *Ezek*. 21. 21. *Zech*. 10. 2. 2 *King*. 23. 24. 1 *Sam*. 15. 23. In which places *Nebuchadnezzar* is ſaid to have conſulted *Teraphim*, they are ſaid to have ſpoken by way of Divination, they are join'd with the *familiar Spirits* and *Wizards*, and in the laſt of thoſe places *Teraphim* is beſt tranſlated *Wizardiſm*. *Rebellion is the Sin of Divination*, ואון ותרפים הפצר *and Diſobedience is Idolatry and Wizardiſm*. In this rendring of the words the latter part of the Verſe anſwereth to the former (which is the Scripture-way of ſpeaking,) and becauſe the *Teraphim* were (paganically) oracular and divinatory, hence all oracular and divinatory Statues in general are in a large ſignification called *Teraphim* in Scripture. *Hoſ*. 3. 4. *Judg*. 17. 5. The Scripture alſo relateth, that the Pagans conſulted their Idols and counterfeit Deities. 1 *Sam*. 6. 2. 2 *King*. 1. 2. *Iſa*. 19. 3. *Hoſ*. 4. 12. and that one of their Idols was called *Nebo*, whoſe Name denoteth him to have been *Prophetick*, Iſa. 48. 1. therefore ſome of their Idols at leaſt were divinatory and oracular. One of theſe places may be underſtood, not of Rhabdomancy, but of the Jews conſulting their wooden Idols. For *the Staff* may ſignifie not properly and literally, but figuratively and ſynecdochically *a wooden Tool or Utenſil*; ſo that the ſenſe of the place runneth thus; *Hoſ*. 4. 12. *My people ask counſel of their ſtock* (block or wood,) *and their wooden tool* (their Idol) *declareth unto them*. The Jews imitating the manners of the Heathen (from whom they deriv'd their Idolatry) conſulted their Idols; therefore the Heathen had their divinatory Statues, which is yet more plain from the expreſs Teſtimony of Scripture, that the Pagans were *Magicians*, *Sorcerers*, *Charmers*, *Inchanters*, *Soothſayers*, *Wizards*, *Diviners*, *Necromancers*, *dealers with familiar Spirits*; for theſe following places of Scripture are oppos'd to the manners of the Heathen. *Exod*. 7. 11. *Lev*. 19. 31. *Deut*. 18. 10, 11. 1 *Sam*. 6. 2. 2 *King*. 17. 17. and 21. 6. and 23. 24. *Iſa*. 2. 6. and 19. 3. and 47. 9, 12. and 65. 4. *Dan*. 2. 2. *Apoc*. 9. 21. and 18. 23. and 21. 8. and 22. 15. If the Heathen were of this Character, they muſt have magical dealing and correſpondence with their Gods for Divination, and their Gods muſt be to them oracular and divinatory; from whence it followeth, that their Oracles were at leaſt in part *magically Divine* or Divination by Magick. The Scripture alſo plainly affirmeth, both that there are magical Oracles or Anſwers by Divination, and that the way of ſpeaking in them is magical (z) *murmur magicum*, *ſuſurrus magicus*, *ſtridor magicus*, Iſa. 8. 19. and 29. 4. 1 *Sam*. 28. 8. therefore they might do well, to be Readers of the Scripture, before they become Writers of Oracles, that thus argue againſt the common Hypotheſis touching the Pagan Oracles, (a) *Sacram Scripturam nihil tale quid nos de Ethnicorum oraculis docere*, *the holy Scripture teacheth us no ſuch thing touching the Heathen Oracles*. But the Epicurean Hypotheſis of this modern Writer of Oracles involveth in it yet further degrees of Anti-Scripturiſm. For ſeeing the Pagans Affairs were chiefly govern'd by their Oracles, if there was no evil Demon in thoſe Oracles, the evil Demons were not *the Rulers in chief of the darkneſs of this World*, as the Apoſtle affirmeth. *Eph*. 6. 12. The Scripture alſo expreſly affirmeth, that the Heathen idolatrous Worſhip was the Devil's Inſtitution. *Apoc*. 12. 9. and 13. 2, 4. From whence it followeth, that they were inſtituted by the Devil in ſome of his Oracles; and it followeth alſo, that thoſe Oracles which inſtituted ſeveral main Parts and Branches of the Heathen idolatrous Worſhip, were the Devil's Oracles. And ſuch are the Oracles of which *Euſebius* (b) hath made a Collection. The Inſtitutes of the Pagan Idolatry (like the Pagano-Chriſtian, *Apoc*. 13. 11. and 16. 13. and 19. 20.) were originally Pſeudo-Prophetic; and in this ſenſe they were Pſeudo-Prophetic, they were eminently *the Doctrine of ſeducing Spirits and of Devils*. 1 Tim. 4. 1. It is the Intereſt of evil Demons, to ſet up the Inſtitutes of Demonolatry (the Religion of Paganiſm;) and accordingly the Inſtitutes of Paganiſm are derived from Demons and Divination (and conſequently from ſome ſort of Pagan Oracles) by the wiſeſt of the Pagan Theologers. And *Plato* in his *Fourth de Republ.* will not take upon him, to Inſtitute the Sacra in his Commonwealth, but referreth the ordering of them to *Apollo*, namely, *the founding of Temples*, *the Sacrifices and other Services of the Gods*, *Demons and Heroes*, *the Sepulchres of the deceas'd*, *and the Miniſteries that are requiſite*, *to have them propitious*. (c) *For ſuch things we know not our ſelves*, *and in ordering a City if we be wiſe*, *we ſhall give credit to no other*, *nor uſe any other Interpreter but our Country-Interpreter*. *For as to ſuch things this God is to all Mankind a Country-Interpreter*. It muſt be ſaid of ſeveral Branches of Paganiſm, they were the Inſtitutes of the Devil and of the Delphic *Apollo*; therefore the Delphic Oracle was his Oracle, and who ſeeth not, that this Oracular *Apollo* is the ſame with *Apollyon*, and that the Devil is called *Apollyon* with reſpect to the Delphic *Apollo*? As Expoſitors agree. *Apoc*. 9. 11. Accordingly *Origen* ſaith of this Oracular *Apollo* (d) ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς δαίμων, *with us he is a Demon*; and he thus defineth the Pagan Divines or Diviners. (e) *They call thoſe Divine*, *by whom through the Incorporation of thoſe Demons that preſide over them Reſponſes are made in Verſes modulated by Art*. *Thoſe alſo whom they call Magi and Malefici having*

(s) *Ibid*. p. 202.

(t) *Ibid*. p. 507.

(u) See Mr. *Mede on Deut*. 33. 8. *Spencer*. *de Leg. Hebr*. l. 3. *Diſſ*. 7. c. 3. S. 2, 3, &c.

(w) *Spencer*. *Ibid*. c. 1. S. 1. & c. 3. S. 1.

(x) *Ibid*. S. 6.

(y) *Ibid*. S. 9.

(z) Herald. in Arnob. p. 53. L. Allat. de Engaſtr. c. 5.

(a) Van Dale præf. ad Lect.

(b) Præp. l. 4. & 5.

(d) C. Celſ. l. 3. p. 127.

(c) Τὰ γὰρ δὴ τοιαῦτα οὔτ' ἐπιστάμεθα ἡμεῖς, οἰκίζοντές τε πόλιν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ πεισόμεθα ἐὰν νοῦν ἔχωμεν, οὐδὲ χρησόμεθα ἐξηγητῇ ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ πατρίῳ. Οὗτος γὰρ δήπου ὁ θεὸς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις πάτριος ἐξηγητής.

(e) *Divinos appellant*, *à quibus per incorporationem Dæmonum eorum qui eis præſunt*, *verſibus arte modulatis reſponſa proferuntur*. *Sed & hi quos Magos vel Maleficos dicunt*, *aliquoties dæmonibus invocatis ſupra pueros adhuc parvæ ætatis*

made

verſu eos dicere poemata admiranda omnibus & ſtupenda fecerunt. Περὶ ἀρχ. *l.* 3. *c.* 3. *made ſeveral times an Invocation of Demons over young Boys, have made them ſpeak Poems wonderful to all and ſtupendious.*

III. This Epicurean Hypotheſis touching Oracles is *Anti-Analogical*, being oppoſite to the deſign'd Analogy and Correſpondence between the Rites of Paganiſm and Judaiſm. For a deſign'd Correſpondence there is between the Sacra of theſe two Religions; "the Jews in Correſpondence to the Pagan Religioniſts having a Tabernacle or portatile Dwelling-place for their Deity, afterwards a fixt magnificent Temple built in a City upon a Mount with its Front to the Eaſt, and its *Sacrarium* to the Weſt; a ſacred Ark or Cheſt and Symbols (Hieroglyphical and of Egyptian Cognation,) in the inmoſt part of the Temple Altars and thoſe with Horns, Linnen (not Woollen) Veſtments for their Prieſts made and girt after the Egyptian faſhion, the *Nazarites* Conſecration of their Hair unto God, Feſtival Solemnities celebrated with Feſtival Mirth and Entertaiment, New Moons (Monthly and Annual) ſolemniz'd with Trumpets, feſtivity and Jubilation, oblation of the firſt Fruits (which the Jews obſerv'd in over-much Conformity to the Pagans,) the paying of Tithes and dedicating part of their Spoils in War, Sacrifices in great abundance of various Things and Kinds and feaſting upon the Sacrifices for God-Society, multifarious Luſtrations and Purifications of Things and Perſons, a mighty Pomp and Splendour in their Religion, an Oracle of *Urim* anſwering to the Pagans *Teraphim*, a Tabernacle and Temple-Oracle anſwering to the Pagans Temple-Oracles, oracular and divinatory Prieſts and Prophets anſwering to ſuch amongſt the Pagans, the water of jealouſie like the Pagans waters of Probation, Divorces alſo and a King with abſolute Power *agreeably to the Nations* round about them, and a ſenſible preſence and nearneſs of their Deity, which is hugely taking and deſirable." So great a Conſonance and Correſpondence of theſe two Inſtitutions of Judaiſm and Paganiſm could not be meerly fortuitous and undeſign'd, nor could it be the Effect of meer Human Artifice, for the Jews Religion was not of their own deviſing, nor did the Gentiles deviſe their Religion according to the Pattern of Judaiſm; for the Jews were not ſo well known, nor ſo well lik'd amongſt the Heathen, that they can be ſuppos'd of their own accord, to have affected ſo great a Conformity to the Jewiſh Rites (if they were ſo well affected towards them and their Sacra, why did they not affect a Conformity to them in all their Sacra? At leaſt in all their principal Rites? And why not in thoſe Rites that were oppoſite to Gentiliſm? And why did they not reliquiſh Gentiliſm for Judaiſm? And how is it, that the correſpondence between Gentiliſm and Judaiſm is ſo bounded, that yet a requiſite Diſſonance and Diſagreement is kept between theſe two Religions;) therefore one of theſe two Suppoſitions muſt neceſſarily be entertain'd, *either the Devil inſtituted Paganiſm in great part an Imitamen of Judaiſm, or God inſtituted Judaiſm in great part correſpondent to Paganiſm.* Some ſuppoſe, *that Paganiſm is Judaiſm degenerate, that the Devil inſtituting Gentiliſm was God's Ape, that in many particulars he emulated the Judaical Rites, and tranſcrib'd them into his Inſtitution, ſo that Paganiſm was in great part a deſign'd imitamen of Judaiſm.* But againſt this account of the Correſpondence between Judaiſm and Paganiſm one principal Objection is the great Antiquity of Paganiſm, which gave occaſion to the Opinion of ſome (f) *qui deorum cultus ab exordio rerum fuiſſe contendunt, & priorem eſſe gentilitatem, quàm Dei religionem*; *who diſpute, that the worſhip of the Gods hath been from the beginning of things, and that Gentiliſm was before God's Religion.* Others therefore ſuppoſe, (g) that Judaiſm is in great part a deſign'd Correſpondence to Paganiſm, *that God tranſcrib'd many Rites in uſe amongſt the Pagans into the Moſaic Inſtitution* (or inſtituted ſuch as were anſwerable thereto,) *ſuch as the Jews affected, were addicted and accuſtomed to, and which were requiſite Ingredients in the frame of their Religion, that it might be attemper'd and accommodate to their Genius.* Theſe accounts of the deſign'd correſpondence between Judaiſm and Paganiſm ſeem and really are diſſonant and contrary, yet they may be ſo underſtood, as to be perfectly conſonant and harmonious, and ſo underſtood both of them are true. For if by Judaiſm we mean *the initial Judaiſm*, this was from the beginning of the World, old Gentiliſm was this Judaiſm degenerate, and a deſign'd Imitamen of it. But if by Judaiſm we mean the conſummate Judaiſm (the Judaiſm of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*,) in this Judaiſm God tranſcrib'd many Pagan Rites, and it was in great part a deſign'd correſpondence to Paganiſm. To this Judaiſm we muſt confine our conſideration, that we may thus make a Judgment touching the Pagan Oracles.

One of the forementiōn'd Suppoſitions muſt be entertain'd: If we entertain the former of them (that the Devil inſtituted Paganiſm in great part an Imitamen of Judaiſm,) this implieth, *that the Heathens Oracles were the Devils Oracles erected in imitation of the Jews Oracles.* If we entertain the latter Suppoſition (that God inſtituted Judaiſm in great part a correſpondence to Paganiſm,) this implieth, *that the Heathens Oracles were really a ſort of Oracles and Divinatory, elſe God would not have furniſh'd the Jews with various Oracles anſwering to, and inſtead of the Heathen Oracles, and that the Jews in ſo great a priviledge as Divination might not come behind the Heathen Nations.* Some obſerve, (h) that after the Law againſt Wizards, *Lev.* 20. 27. a Law touching the Prieſts immediately followeth. *Lev.* 21. 1. *That ſo the Iſraelites might have no temptation, to tolerate or conſult Witches and Magicians, ſeeing God had given them Prieſts, who might have recourſe to him, and in doubtful caſes conſult him by Urim.* The like obſervation may be made touching the *Jewiſh Prophets*; for the Moſaic Text plainly ſheweth, that they were inſtituted in correſpondence to the Heathen Wizards and Magicians. A Law is made *Deut.* 18. 9 — 12. prohibiting *Diviners, Obſervers of times* (Signs,) *Inchanters, Witches, Charmers, Conſulters with familiar Spirits, Wizards, Necromancers*; *for all that do thoſe things are an abomination unto the Lord, and becauſe of theſe abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee.* It was a Generation of Heathen Nations, that was driven out before *Iſrael*: But the Law ſaith, it was a Generation of Sorcerers and Wizards that was driven out from before them; therefore the Lawgiver looketh upon the Heathen Nations as a Gene-

(f) *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

(g) *Dr. Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3; *diſſ.* 1 *c.* 1, 2, &c.

(h) *Dr. Spencer. ſupr. c.* 2; *S.* 3.

Generation of *Sorcerers* and *Wizards.* Having thus characteriz'd the Heathen Nations, the Lawgiver immediately confronteth and oppoſeth the Iſraelites to thoſe Heathen Nations in this manner. *v.* 13, 14. 15. *Thou ſhalt be perfect with the Lord thy God. For theſe Nations which thou ſhalt poſſeſs, hearkened unto obſervers of times* (Signs) *and unto diviners: But as for thee the Lord thy God hath not ſuffer'd thee ſo to do. The Lord thy God will raiſe up unto thee a Prophet from the midſt of thee.* Upon which words *P. Fagius* thus commenteth. (*i*) *He ſaith, that ſuperſtitious Diviners are to be avoided, becauſe God will give true Prophets* (a Prophet in Succeſſion,) *of whom you may ſafely learn all things.* But *Jonathan* the Paraphraſt applieth this Text to the Jewiſh Prieſts and their Oracle of *Urim*; for thus he paraphraſeth it. (*k*) *Becauſe the people which you are to poſſeſs, are addicted to Inchantments and Divinations: But ye ſhall not be like to them, but the Prieſts ſhall ask Counſel by* Urim *and* Thummim. There is the ſame reaſon for the Jewiſh Prieſts (conſider'd as Conſulters of *Urim*,) as for the Jewiſh Prophets, which were inſtituted in correſpondence to the Heathen χρησμολόγοι, *Oracle-ſpeakers* or Diviners, as *Philo* ſaith. (*l*) *Becauſe there is innate in all Men a deſire of knowing things future, whence they betake themſelves to Soothſaying by Sacrifices and other ſorts of Divination —— He vehemently forbiddeth them, to follow theſe, but ſaith, that if they be truly pious, they ſhall not be deſtitute of the knowledge of things future, but a Prophet divinely inſpired ſuddenly appearing* θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει, *ſhall ſpeak Oracles and Propheſie.* So *Maimonides* ſaith, *God by ſending Prophets, hath made us not to need Aſtrologers, Diviners, Soothſayers; for we may conſult them* (Prophets) *touching our Affairs.—— This is that which the Scripture ſaith; the Nations which thou driveſt out hearkened to Jugglers and Diviners: But it ſhall not be ſo with thee; the Lord thy God hath given thee a Prophet from the midſt of thee.* Prophets were neceſſary for the Jews, as *Origen* argueth. *They that object fooliſhneſs to the Jews and Chriſtians, let them ſhew how the Jewiſh Nation could conſiſt, having no promiſes of* (προγνώσεων,) *preſciences amongſt them. And when every one of the Nations round about them, was believ'd to receive Oracles and Vaticinations according to the cuſtom of their Country from their reputed Gods, if theſe only that were taught to deſpiſe all the Gentiles reputed Gods, as no Gods but Demons, —— had none promis'd to be a Prophet, that might be able to withdraw them, who by a deſire of fore-knowing were ready to go to the Demons of other People.* If they had had no knowledge of things future, they would have betaken themſelves (ſaith this Father) ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν μαντεῖα ϗ χρηστήρια, *to the Gentiles Oracles.*

IV. This Epicurean Hypotheſis touching Oracles is criminally *Anti-pagan*, as *Epicurus* and his Philoſophy was, (*m*) who (as appeareth from the Patrons of this Hypotheſis) wanteth not his applauders in the Chriſtian Church. It is a ſlender recommendation of their Hypotheſis, that ſome few irreligious Pagans maintain'd it againſt the Senſe of all the Learned and Religious both Popular and Philoſophic Pagans, the Poets, Hiſtorians, Orators, the Stoicks, the Religious Peripateticks, the Followers of *Socrates*, the Platoniſts and Pythagoreans. *Cicero* reporteth (*n*) that none of the Philoſophers, who ſuppos'd, that *there were Gods*, wholly took away Divination except *Xenophanes* the Colophonian, all the reſt prov'd it and approv'd of it (although in different Notions) and who ſhall be thought the moſt competent Judges of the Divinity of the Oracles, the Religious or the Irreligious Pagans? (*o*) Is *Diogenianus* (a Diſputer againſt Divination) for Religion and Learning to be compar'd with *Socrates* an aſſerter and admirer of Divination, and who thought them no better than mad, that exploded the Oracles as meerly from human Artifice and Impoſture? (*p*) *Thoſe that ſuppos'd all theſe things to be meerly of Human contrivance and that nothing of them was Demonial, he called Demoniacks.* (*q*) Is *Oenomaus*, who irreligiouſly ridiculeth *Apollo* and his Oracles, comparable to the learned and judicious *Plutarch*, who hath a great Veneration for them, who ſaith of the Delphic Oracle, ποικίλων ἀγαθῶν τουτί τὸ μαντεῖον αἴτιον γέγονε τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, *this Oracle hath been the cauſe of various Goods to the Grecians,* (chiefly by helping them in difficulties?) Or is he of like regard with ſo eminent a Philoſopher as *Plato*, who always expreſſeth an high eſteem of the Oracles? A learned Man of our own indeed hath given a very diſſonant account of the Senſe of *Plato*, the *Platoniſts* and *Stoicks* alſo; for ſpeaking of the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm (which was maniacally Ecſtatical) he telleth us, (*r*) *that* Plato *and other wiſe Men had a very low Opinion of this Spirit, and of the gift of Divination, and of conſulting the Oracles.* (*s*) *The Platoniſts generally ſeem'd to reject or very much to ſlight all this kind of Revelation, and to acknowledge nothing tranſcendent to the naked Reaſon and Underſtanding of Man.* And this Story which is as remote from Truth, as the *Japaneſe* imagin Paradiſe to be (who ſay it is remote from them (*t*) *decies millies millenis milliaribus*) is countenanc'd by ſome few impertinent Allegations from *M. Tyrius*, *Porphyry*, *Epictetus*, *Simplicius*, and *Plato*'s *Timæus*. But they that converſe with the Platoniſts, cannot but know, that they ordinarily acknowledge *ſome things and ſome Revelation alſo tranſcendent to the naked Reaſon and Underſtanding of Man* (even *Ariſtotle* ſo far ſymbolizeth with them, (*u*) that he acknowledgeth λόγυ τι κρεῖττον, *ſomething better than Reaſon,*) that they deriv'd their Philoſophy from the Enthuſiaſts of the elder times, and themſelves Philoſophiz'd both from a ſedate intellectual Enthuſiaſm, and alſo from a *Bacchical* ſort of Enthuſiaſm, which is the ſame with that of the Oracles. If *M. Tyrius* ſaith, (*w*) *that the Vaticination of God and the Mind of Man are a thing congenial,* this is no diſparagement to the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm, which was ſuppos'd to communicate the Mind of God to the intelligent Minds of Men that conſulted it. And *Porphyry* is ſo far from rejecting or ſlighting the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm, (*x*) that he wrote a Book περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας, *touching Philoſophy from the Oracles, to promote Theoſophy, and to ſettle Doubts, ſuppoſing them the Oracles of Gods and good Demons*; he did not therefore ſuppoſe, that all Oracles were from evil Demons,

(y) as

(i) *Vitandi, inquit, ſunt Divini ſuperſtitioſi, quia Dominus veros daturus eſt prophetas, à quibus tutò omnia didiceris.*

(k) *Quoniam populi iſti quos poſſeſſuri eſtis præſtigiis & divinationibus auſcultant: Vos autem non ſimiles illis eritis, ſed ſacerdotes interrogabunt per Urim & Thummim.*

(l) *Ap. Spencer. ſupr. c.* 2. *S.* 3.

(m) *Van Dale p.* 207. & *præf. ad Lect.*

(n) De Divin. l. 1.

(o) Euſ. pr. ev. l. 4. c. 3.

(p) Τὺς δὲ μηδὲν τῶν τοιύτων οἰομένυς εἶναι δαιμόνιον, ἀλλὰ πάντα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης γνώμης, δαιμονᾶν ἔφη. Xenoph. Απομν. α.

(q) *Euſeb. ſupr. l.* 5.

(r) Mr. Smith of Prophecy c. 4. Contents of the ch.

(s) Ibid. p. 195.

(t) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 25.

(u) Eth. Eudem. l. 7. c. 14.

(r) Θεῦ δὲ μαντεία καὶ ἀνθρώπων νῦς χρῆμα συγγ *Diſſ* 3.

(x) Euſ. ſupra l. c. 5, 7.

(y) as a late writer of Oracles miſtaketh. *Euſebius* obſerveth, (z) That in his Book of *Abſtinence from Animals* he is repugnant to himſelf, to his Philoſophy from the Oracles, and indeed to his own Religion, yet in this Heterodox Book (a) he acknowledgeth *a Divination from good Demons*, that a Philoſopher both needeth it and hath it, (b) and he retaineth his great eſteem for *Apollo* and for *Pythia*, and conſequently for the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm. But he ſuppoſeth a Philoſopher, to be an abſtract *Mentaliſt*, *Intellectualiſt* and *Immaterialiſt*, (c) ἀφιστάμενον τῶν ἐκτὸς, *ſegregate from the things External*, and therefore one that *needeth not the vulgar Diviners*, becauſe he ſlighteth and diſcardeth thoſe external things which vulgar Diviners and their Conſulters are buſied about (Marriage, Servants, Merchandice) deſiring to be Διὸς μεγάλου ὀαριστὴς, *one that converſeth with great* Jove inſtead of being ſuch a Diviner. (d) *Epictetus* and *Simplicius* follow *Socrates*, having a great eſteem for *Apollo* and for *Pythia* (and conſequently for the Pagans divinatory Enthuſiaſm;) but theſe Philoſophers were *abſtract Mentaliſts*, and agreeably to their Character they ſuppoſe, that the things external are things indifferent, that the *Vates* or Diviners ought to be conſulted with a Travellers indifferency (who when he inquireth the way hath no greater propenſion to the right than to the left,) and that in certain caſes it is imprudent to conſult them. (e) *Plato* is ſaid, to look upon the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm *as inferiour to Wiſdom, becauſe in his* Timæus *he citeth a Law, that Prophets ſhould be ſet as it were Judges over theſe Enthuſiaſtic Divinations, which Prophets were none elſe but wiſe and prudent Men.* But the Prophets which *Plato* ſpeaketh of, are only *Vaticiniorum Interpretes* (as *Ficinus* rightly rendreth his Words) and is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe *the Oracle inferiour to its Interpreter?* or could *Plato* believe the Oracles to be Divine, and yet magnifie Humane Prudence above them? But becauſe the Pagan Divinatory Enthuſiaſts were under an alienation of Mind, underſtood not their own *Viſa*, nor knew what they ſaid, therefore (not ſimply, but) in ſome reſpect, namely in reſpect of the Seat of it, their Divinatory Enthuſiaſm was inferiour to Humane Wiſdom; for it was ſeated only in the Imagination and the Faculties inferiour to Reaſon; but theſe Inferiour Faculties were not only or chiefly *their Divining Spirit*; for they ſuppos'd their χρησμῳδοὺς καὶ μάντεις ἐπίπνους καὶ κατεχομένους ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, *Oracle-ſpeakers and Diviners, to have an Afflation and Correption from God*, as *Plato* ſaith in his *Meno*: Of theſe inſpir'd Diviners ſome were really ſuch, but becauſe others were counterfeit, therefore there was a further uſe of *Humane Wiſdom and of the Prophets appointed by Law to diſcern* τοὺς ἀλαζόνας, *vain Oſtentators*, τοὺς δὲ ὡς ἀληθῶς μάντεις καθιστάναι προφήτας τῶν μελλόντων, *and to conſtitute Diviners truly ſuch the Prophets of things to come*, as the ſame Philoſopher ſpeaketh in his *Charmides*.

From which Account of *Plato*'s Senſe it is manifeſt, that there is nothing in theſe Paſſages of his *Charmides* and *Timæus*, which looketh like a diſparagement of the Pagans Oracles or their Divinatory Enthuſiaſm: On the contrary in his *Sympoſium* he calleth *Mantice* (Divination) φιλίας θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων δημιουργὸς, *the maker of Friendſhip between the Gods and Men*, and according to him it is converſant about τὴν περὶ θεοὺς τε καὶ ἀνθρώπους πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνίαν, *the Society between the Gods and Men*. In his *Meno* he calleth the Pagans Maniacal Diviners Θεομάντεις, and ſuppoſeth them to be Divine Men. And in his *firſt of Laws* he ſaith of *Epimenides* (who deliver'd the *Athenians* from great Evils) that he came to *Athens* κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μαντείαν, *by the Oracle*. In his *Phædrus* he ſaith; (f) *We have the greateſt Goods by that Madneſs, which is of Divine Gift; for the Propheteſs at* Delphos *and the Prieſteſſes in* Dodona *in their Madneſſes have done many and great utilities to the Greeks privately and publickly; but in a ſober mood they have done little or nothing.* Many Paſſages of this nature occur in *Plato*, ſeveral of which are before cited; but we will here content our ſelves with *Ficinus*'s Account of Platoniſm. (g) Plato *and all the Platoniſts following the ancient Theologers acknowledge the truth of the Oracles and prove it by Reaſons.* Plato *accounteth Humane Wiſdom as nothing in compariſon of that which is had from Oracles and Divine Madneſs; and he would have a Philoſopher cautelous of affirming any thing about Divine Matters, but ſo far as it is confirm'd by Divine Oracles. There are abundance of things in* Plato *of this nature.* *Celſus*'s Account of Oracles ſpeaketh him a genuine Platoniſt. (h) *It is needleſs to enumerate how many things Prophets, Propheteſſes and other Men and Women having a Divine Afflation, have foretold by an inſpir'd voice out of the Oracles, how many wonderful things have been heard out of the inmoſt places of the Temples, how many things have been ſhew'd by the Sacrifices to them that conſulted them, how many things by other wonderful or prodigious Signs, and to ſome there have been manifeſt appearances of the Gods: Humane Life is full of theſe things; how many Cities have been erected by Oracles, and got rid of Diſeaſes and Famines? how many neglecting or forgetting them have been loſt? how many Colonies have been ſent by them, who obſerving what was commanded them have flouriſh'd? how many Princes and private Men have far'd well or ill according to theſe meaſures? how many troubled for want of Children, have got what they wanted? how many eſcap'd the Anger of Demons? how many have been heal'd of Lameneſs of Body? how many behaving themſelves contumeliouſly, have been preſently ſeiz'd in the Temples, ſome loſing their Wits there, ſome telling what they had done, ſome diſpatching themſelves, and ſome being taken with incurable Diſeaſes? to which we may add, that an horrendous Voice out of the inmoſt parts of the Temples hath ſtruck ſome dead.* No Chriſtian Apologiſt could have made a more effectual Plea for the Truth and Intereſt of Chriſtianity than this Philoſopher's Plea for Paganiſm is; becauſe it aſcertaineth the exiſtence of Evil Demons and their Domination over the Heathen World. But to ſuppoſe, that the Heathen Religion and the Heathen Oracles were nothing more than the Cheat and Artifice of Prieſts and Politicians, is groſs Irreligion both Anti-Chriſtian and Anti-Pagan (worſe than Paganiſm) oppoſite both to the Senſe of the Church of God and of the Heathen World. (*i*) *The Diviners full of God* (ſaith *Cæcilius*) *predict Futurities, give caution to Dangers, Medicine to Diſeaſes, Hope to the afflicted, Solace to Calamities, and Eaſe to Labours.*

(y) *Van Dale* p. 188.

(z) *Supr.* c. 10.

(a) *L.* 2. *S.* 53.

(b) *Ibid. S.* 15, 16, 29, 59, &c.

(c) *Ibid. S.* 52.

(d) *Enchir.* c. 39. *diſſ.* l. 2. c. 7.

(e) *Mr. Smith ſupr.* p. 195.

(f) Νῦν δὲ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡμῖν γίγνεται διὰ μανίας θείᾳ μέντοι δόσει διδομένης. ἥτε γὰρ δὴ ἐν Δελφοῖς προφῆτις, αἵτ' ἐν Δωδώνῃ ἱερεῖαι, μανεῖσαι μὲν πολλὰ δὴ καὶ καλὰ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ, τὴν Ἑλλάδα εἰργάσαντο· σωφρονοῦσαι δὲ βραχέα, ἢ οὐδέν.

(g) *Profectò & ipſe Plato antiquiores Theologos imitatus, & Platonici omnes, oraculorum hiſtoriam ubique tanquam veram accipiunt, rationibuſque confirmant. Mitto quantam his in Phædro adhibeat fidem, quantam & in Timæo, in Phædro quidem humanam ſapientiam præ illa quæ ab oraculis furoribuſque divinis habetur, nihili pendens: in Timæo autem dicens eatenus à philoſopho de rebus divinis affirmandum eſſe, quatenus divinis oraculis confirmetur. Mitto quam plurima apud Platonem ſimilia.* Arg. in Apol.

(h) Τί δεῖ καταλέγειν ὅσα ἐκ χρηστηρίων, τοῦτο μὲν προφῆται καὶ προφήτιδες, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι κάτοχοι καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἐνθέῳ φωνῇ προεῖπον· ὅσα δὲ ἐξ ἀδύτων αὐτῶν ἠκούσθησαν θαυμάσια· ὅσα δὲ ἐξ ἱερείων καὶ θυμάτων τοῖς χρωμένοις ἐδηλώθη· ὅσα δ' ἐξ ἄλλων τεραστίων συμβόλων· τοῖς δ' ἐναργῆ παρέστη φάσματα. μεστὸς τούτων ὁ πᾶς ἐστι βίος, πόσαι μὲν πόλεις ἐκ χρηστηρίων ὠρθώθησαν καὶ νόσους ἀπέθεντο καὶ λιμούς; πόσαι δ' ἀμελήσασαι τούτων, ἢ ἐκλαθόμεναι, κακῶς ἐφθάρησαν; πόσαι δ' εἰς ἀποικίαν ἐστάλησαν, καὶ μελεληθέσαι τὰ προσταχθέντα εὐδαιμόνησαν; πόσοι δυνάσται, πόσοι δ' ἰδιῶται, διὰ τοῦτο ἄμεινον ἢ χεῖρον ἀπήλλαξαν; πόσοι μὲν ἀπαιδίας δυσφορήσαντες, ὧν ἐδεήθησαν τυχόντες; πόσοι δαιμόνων μῆνιν διέφυγον; πόσοι σωμάτων πηρώσεις ἰάθησαν; πόσοις δ' αὖ πρὸς τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὑβρίσαντες αὐτίκα ἑάλωσαν, οἱ μὲν ἔκφρονες αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ κατασχεθέντες, οἱ δὲ ἐξαγγείλαντες ἃ ἔδρασαν, οἱ δὲ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς διεργασάμενοι, οἱ δὲ νόσοις ἀνηκέστοις ἐνδεθέντες; ἤδη δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀδύτων φωνὴ βαρεῖα κατεῖλεν αὐτούς. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 407.

V. This Epicurean Hypotheſis touching Oracles is *Oracle Anti-Oracle*, implying a repugnant Account of them; for ſeveral of the Pagan Oracles on this ſide the eminent and famous Oracles muſt be thought *magically Divine*, namely, *The Perſonal Oracles*, *the Theurgic Oracles*, *and ſeveral of the Pagan Methods of Divination*; therefore unleſs Oracle be ſelf-inconſiſtently ſet againſt Oracle, the eminent and famous Oracles muſt be of the ſame Character. (*k*) The Patron of this Epicurean Hypotheſis acknowledgeth *Diabolical Poſſeſſions*, and that *the Damſel poſſeſs'd with a Spirit of Divination*, Act. 16. 16. *was one of the Devil's Oracle-ſpeakers*; therefore ſhe muſt be called *a Perſonal Oracle* (contradiſtinct to thoſe Oracles which were *Local-perſonal*, as being fix'd to a certain place,) and if ſuch Perſonal Oracles be ſuppos'd *Magically Divine*, it is a groſs ſelf-inconſiſtence, to ſuppoſe, that the *Local-perſonal Oracles* were nothing more than Humane Artifice and Impoſture; for the *Local-perſonal Oracles* were nothing elſe but ſuch *Perſonal Oracles* train'd up to be ſuch and reſiding in ſacred places, as at *Delphos*, *Dodona*, *Colophon*, *Lebadia*. And as the Jewiſh Prophets would have the ſame Inſpiration, if we ſuppoſe, that ſome of them were train'd up to be ſuch, and reſided in certain Colledges, and others of them liv'd at large: So the Pagans *Perſonal* and *Local-perſonal* Oracles had both the ſame Spirit of Divination, and were both alike *Fatidical Men and Women.*

If the famous Heathen Oracles were nothing more than Humane Artifice and Impoſture, then the Learned and Civiliz'd Heathen Nations came behind the Barbarous Heathen Nations in the Gift and Priviledge of Divination; for amongſt the Barbarous Heathen Nations generally the Prieſts are Magicians and *Perſonal Oracles* to the People; they conſult the Devil and receive Oracular Reſponſes from him, which the People depend upon in all their proceedings, and whereby they are directed in all their Affairs. Thus it is in (*l*) *Cumana*, and thus the Barbarous *Samoyeds* are directed what they ſhall do, and whither they ſhall go. The Savage Nation of the *Tapuiæ* (*m*) do nothing of any moment without conſulting the Devil, whereby they acquire a Faculty of Divination beyond all humane foreſight, of which there are ſeveral Inſtances in *Voſſius*. (*n*) Amongſt the *Braſilians* Witches are their Oracles: (*o*) Such an Oracle was *Velleda* and ſeveral other Fatidical Women to the ancient *Germans*, as is related by *Statius*, *Dio*, *Tacitus*, whoſe words import, that the *Germans* conſulted thoſe ſuppoſed Divine Women *pro Apollinari & ſimilibus oraculis*, *inſtead of the Oracle of* Apollo *and the like Oracles*: (*p*) So the *Gallican Dryades* were conſulted as the Delphic Oracle (one of them foretold to *Alex. Severus* his final misfortune, whoſe Prediction he contemn'd to his prejudice,) and at *Carthage* there was a Fatidical Woman intituled by *Julius Capitolinus* (*q*) *Vates cæleſtis, quæ Deo repleta ſolebat vera canere*, *a Celeſtial Propheteſs, who being fill'd with God was wont to make true Vaticinations.* Such a Fatidical Woman *Alexander* had with him in his Expedition into the Eaſt (as *Arrianus* relateth) ſuch an one *Marius* carry'd along with him in his Expedition againſt the *Cimbri*, whoſe Sayings he call'd *Oracles* (as *Plutarch* relateth,) and ſuch a Perſonal Oracle was the Sorcerer *Barjeſus*, *a falſe Prophet*, Act. 13. 6. who is called in the Syriac Verſion (by a Name agreeable to the Name *Elymas*) בר שומא, which may beſt be render'd (*r*) *the Son of a ſecret or hidden thing.* All Hiſtories, all Nations afford Inſtances of ſuch oracular and divinatory Perſons. (*s*) In our own Nation there are notorious ones (ſo well atteſted, that no rational doubt can be made of them) one Inſtance of many we will recite. (*t*) One *Adrianus* ſent into *Scotland* by Pope *Innocent* the Eighth (by his ſingular Wiſdom in the World) came to be in favour with *Hen.* 7. King of *England*, whereby he was promoted to the Biſhoprick of *Bath* and *Wells*: Return'd to *Rome* and in great imployment under *Alexander the Sixth* he was made a Cardinal, and flouriſh'd in the Times of Pope *Leo the Tenth.* This Man became acquainted with a Woman, in whom was *a Spirit of Divination*, and who amongſt many things which ſhe foretold both publick and private (which in all reſpects fell out accordingly) ſhe alſo foretold, That one *Adrian* by name, born of mean Parentage, preferr'd merely for his Worth, ſhould be Pope after *Leo.* This exactly agreeing with his caſe, and having had, as he thought, ſufficient proof of the truth of her Predictions, he confidently apply'd her Prediction to himſelf, and made no queſtion, but he was the Man, that ſhould ſucceed Pope *Leo.* In this confidence he began to think the time long before the Pope died, and to haſten it, with ſome others, conſpir'd againſt his Life, but was prevented and pardon'd alſo, and afterwards liv'd and dy'd obſcurely. But *Adrianus the Sixth*, a Man of mean Parentage and of great Worth, was choſen being abſent to ſucceed Pope *Leo*, and ſo the Woman's Prediction was againſt all likelyhood (for no ſuch thing was intended, and when it was done it was ſcarce believ'd) verify'd and fulfill'd. In concurrence therefore with the Teſtimony of Scripture the Teſtimony of the World of Mankind, the Barbarous Heathen Nations, their Religion and the Conduct of their Affairs, notorious Inſtances in all Nations of Divinations manifeſtly more than Humane, do all aſcertain us, that the perſonal Oracles (which we diſcourſe of) are Magically Divine; from whence it followeth, that *the local-perſonal* Oracles were (in part at leaſt) of the ſame Character, the *perſonal* Oracles being in ſome Heathen Nations the very ſame that the *local-perſonal* were in others. The original alſo of the *local-perſonal* Oracles ſpeaketh them in ſubſtance the very ſame with the *perſonal.* For the *Dodonean* Oracle (the moſt ancient of the *Grecian*) and the *Ammonian* in *Libya* were founded by certain Pagan *Prieſteſſes*, and *Propheteſſes*, as appeareth from the beſt accounts that are given of the *Dodonean* πελειάδες, *Doves*, (*u*) from the Relation of the *Egyptian* Prieſts in *Herodotus* and *Herodotus*'s own Opinion, wherewith *Hermias* agreeth. And the moſt probable Account

of

(i) *Pleni & mixti Deo vates futura præcerpunt, dant cautelam periculis, morbis medelam, ſpem afflictis, ſolatium calamitatibus, laboribus levamentum.* Min. Fel. p. 66.

(k) *Van Dale* p. 201.

(l) *Purchas par.* 1. *B.* 9. *c.* 2. *S.* 2. *B.* 4. *c.* 17.

(m) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(n) *Purch. B.* 9. *c.* 5. *S.* 2.

(o) *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

(p) *Hiſt. Aug* p. 588, 584.

(q) *In Opil. Macrin.*

(r) *Schindler. Lex. in voce* [illegible]

(s) *V. Beyer. Addit. ad Selden.* p. 226.

(t) *Caſaub. of Credul. and Incredul.* p. 145, &c.

(u) *V. J. Opſop. Teſtim. de oracul. Plutarch. de Def. orac.* p. 435.

of the origin of the *Delphic* Oracle is that in *Pauſanias*, That certain Diviners or magically Divine Men that came from the *Hyperboreans* were the Founders of it.

Παῖδες Ὑπερβορέων πηγασὸς ϗ δῖος Ἀγυιεύς.

which Account of the Origin of Oracles inferreth, that they were magically Divine, as the *Chalday* or *Magick* Oracles undoubtedly were. For there are no Strictures of Chriſtianity in them (as there are in the Counterfeit *Triſmegiſtick* Books,) it doth not appear, that the Learned Fathers of the Primitive Church before *Syneſius* knew any thing of them (although they were publiſh'd in Verſe by *Julian* the Theurgiſt in the Times of *M. Antoninus*,) they never mention or acknowledge them, but they are the Adverſaries of Chriſtianity that acknowledge them (ſuch as *Hierocles* and *Porphyry*,) the Fathers never make uſe of them in Argumentation (as they do of the Sibylline Oracles,) and the groſs Magick that pervadeth thoſe Oracles, maketh it altogether unlikely, that they ſhould be the Forgeries of Chriſtians. (*w*) The barbarous exotick Phraſes that are in them, the genuine remains that are in them of the Theology and *Aſtrological-magical Philoſophy* of the oriental *Magi*, ſhew, that they are not originally *Greek*. They are plainly the Philoſophic-pagan Theurgiſts Oracles, and the Oracles of their Theurgy, none but they in the elder times were acquainted with them, (*x*) they were the admirers of them, and believ'd them to be Divine (the Platoniſts generally were of that Opinion) and the Dogmata of thoſe Oracles, their Teleſtick Rites of purging and perfecting the Soul (by Woods, Stones, Herbs; Inchantments,) their Rites of convoking Gods and Demons into preſence, and of driving away the *Material Demons*, the lucid and fiery Apparitions and other Spectres which they ſpeak of; their *Hecatine Circle*, their eſteem of barbarick conjuring Words, and their mode of diſtinguiſhing true from falſe Divination, are manifeſtly groſs Theurgick Magick, which Magick was practis'd by the Philoſophic-Pagans, who were a ſort of Men extremely alien and remote from the Popular-Pagans, and conſequently from the vulgar Witches and Magicians, and their Goety, and therefore it is not reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that they laid their Heads together, to forge the Phænomena, that are ſaid to be in Magick; yet we find the like Phænomena in the Theurgy of the one as in the Goety of the other; (*y*) for as *Medea* in *Seneca* boaſteth of her Art, ſo the *Chalday* Oracles deſcribe the Phænomena in Theurgy. Theſe Oracles therefore cannot be ſuppos'd, to be a meer Humane Forgery, unleſs we will ſuppoſe Theurgy it ſelf, to be a meer Humane Forgery. And if ſo, how is it that ſo many Learned Philoſophic Pagans (who were grand Theurgiſts and well acquainted with the Myſteries of it) for many Ages thought it to be truly Divine? did they never make any Experiments of its Power? did they never make uſe of their Eyes and Ears, to diſcern whether there were any Apparitions of *Gods* and *Demons*, any wonderful appearances of *Light* and *Fire*, of *Thundrings* and *Lightnings* in Theurgy? or were all theſe wonderful Phænomena nothing more than the Gulleries of Pagan Prieſts, who impos'd upon the Philoſophers for many Ages, as the Patrons of the Epicurean Hypotheſis (touching Oracles) ſuppoſe them, to have abus'd and impos'd upon the Popular Pagans? This Abſurdity implieth, that unleſs we will be groſly ſelf-inconſiſtent, we muſt acknowledge, that the Popular-pagan Oracles were not meer Humane Artifice and Impoſture, ſeeing the Philoſophic Pagans had their Oracles magically Divine.

Of one of the Philoſophic Pagans Oracles touching the Emperour *Valens*'s Succeſſour we will give an Account from *Ammianus*, becauſe of its affinity with the Popular Pagans Oracles. *Hilarius* as the truth was, made this Confeſſion before the Judges; (z) *We made this unhappy Table which you ſee, a Similitude of the Delphic Tripos, with dire Solemnities of Inchoation, of Laurel-rods, and by imprecation of ſecret Prayers or Inchantments, and having ritually conſecrated it by a multifarious and continu'd Apparatus, at length we mov'd it for uſe, (which was to be ſo often, as things arcane were conſulted about) in this manner. It was plac'd in the midſt of an Houſe every where emaculated by Arabic Odours, cleanly or purely placing upon it a Diſh or Baſon made of divers Metallic Materials, in the outmoſt Circumference whereof were the four and twenty Letters skilfully cut, disjoyn'd by Spaces accurately meaſur'd. Theſe one, having done divine ſervice to* Apollo *by formal Prayers or Charms, with exact ceremonial Skill ſtandeth over, being cloath'd with Linnen Veſtments, and having Linnen Socks for Shooes, and a Woman's Torulus about his Head, and carrying in his Hand Leaves or Branches of the happy Tree, poyſing a Penſil Ring ty'd by a very ſlender Carpathian Thread, initiated* (or conſecrated) *by myſtick Diſciplines: which hitting on the Letters in a leaping way, every one of which by diſtinct intervals maketh a Renitency, thereby it maketh Heroic Verſes agreeable to the Queſtions that are ask'd, without defect in Number and Meaſure, ſuch as thoſe of* Pythia, *or thoſe of the Oracles of the* Branchidæ. *There we that were then preſent inquiring, who would ſucceed the preſent Emperour, becauſe it was ſaid, He would be e~~very way~~ accompliſh'd, and the Ring hitting upon the Letters had touch'd upon two Syllables of his Name with the ſuper-addition of a Letter* (Θεοδ,) *one that was preſent cry'd out, That* Theodorus *was portended by Fate.* What Religious, what Honeſt Man can deny, that this whole proceſs of *Dactylomancy* is a direful form of Conjuration, or as *Socrates* the Hiſtorian ſtileth it, (*a*) μαγική τις μαγγανεία, *a certain Magical Inchantment of the Philoſophers?* who by Divination underſtood

---

(w) *Stanley's Hiſt. of Phil. or. l.* 4. *in Proœm.*

(x) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 203.

(y) —*Nemoris antiqui domus*
Amiſit umbram vocis imperio meæ
Die relicto Phœbus in medio ſtetit,
Hyadeſque noſtris cantibus motæ labant.
Valerius Flaccus ſaith of *Medea.*
Illius ad fremitus ſparſoſque per avia ſuccos
Sydera fixa pavent, & avi ſtupet orbita ſolis,
Mutat agros fluviûmque vias.—
The Chalday Oracles ſay.
Οὔτε γὰρ οὐράνιος κυρτὸς τότε φαίνεται ὄγκος
Ἀστέρες οὐ λάμπουσι, τὸ Μήνης φῶς κεκάλυπται
Χθὼν οὐχ ἕστηκε, βλέπεται δὲ τὰ πάντα κεραυνοῖς.
Neque enim cœli rotunda moles tunc apparet,
Aſtra non ſplendent, Lunæ lumen occultatum eſt
Terra non ſtat, videntur omnia fulminibus plena.

(z) *Conſtruximus ad Cortinæ ſimilitudinem Delphicæ, diris auſpiciis, de laureis virgulis, infauſtam hanc menſulam quam videtis: & imprecationibus carminum ſecretorum, choragiiſque multis ac diuturnis ritualiter conſecratum movimus tandem. Movendi autem, quoties ſuper rebus arcanis conſulebatur, erat inſtitutio talis, conlocabatur in medio domus emaculatæ odoribus Arabicis, undique lance rotunda, pure ſuperpoſita, ex diverſis metallicis materiis fabrefacta: cujus in ambitu rotunditatis extremo elementorum viginti quatuor ſcriptiles formæ inciſæ peritè, disjungebantur, ſpatiis examinatè dimenſis. Has linteis quidam indumentis amictus, calceatuſque itidem linteis ſoccis, torulo capite circumflexo, verbenas felicis arboris geſtans, litato conceptis carminibus numine præſcitionum auctore, cæremoniali ſcientia ſuperſiſtit cortinulas, penſilem annulum librans arctum ex Carpathio filo perquàm levi, myſticis diſciplinis initiatum: qui per intervalla diſtincta retinentibus* [renitentibus] *ſingulis literis incidens ſaltuatim Heroos efficit verſus interrogationibus conſonos, ad numeros & modos plenè concluſos: quales leguntur pythici, vel ex oraculis editi Branchidarum. Ibi tum quærentibus nobis, qui præſenti ſuccedet imperio, quoniam omni parte expolitus fore memorabatur, & adſiliens annulus duas perſtrinxerat ſyllabas cum adjectione literæ poſtrema, exclamavit præſentium quidam Theodorum præſcribente fatali neceſſitate portendi.* Am. Marcell. l. 29.

(a) *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 4. *c.* 19.

derſtood both their own and the Emperour *Valens*'s Tragical Fate, and half of his Succeſſour's Name; and ſhall a Similitude of the Delphic Oracle be thought Magical, and muſt the grand Exemplar, the Delphic Oracle it ſelf, be thought to have nothing of Magick in it? or, were thoſe Philoſophers and Learned Men, concern'd in this Imitamen of the Delphic Oracle, and put to death for it (*Maximus*, *Hilarius*, *Patricius Lydus*, *Simonides*, *Andronicus* of *Caria*) meerly gull'd and impos'd upon by the Artifices and Forgeries of the Pagan Prieſts, that attended the Oracles, as the Patrons of the Epicurean Hypotheſis ſuppoſe, that the Popular Pagans were? What have they to ſay to ſuch a notorious Inſtance of Philoſophic-Pagan and Oracular Sorcery and Wizardiſm? (*b*) Truly one of them reciteth it more than once, and glibly paſſeth it over with a *nihil dicit*; but ſeemeth to ſymbolize with *Zoſimus*, who ſlubbereth over the matter, and ſlightingly putteth this Magical Tranſaction upon certain *Agyrtæ*, as being ſenſible, that a juſt account of it would be a foul blemiſh to his Religion.

But *Zoſimus* hath a great Veneration for the Methods of Divination uſual in his Religion (which the Patrons of the Epicurean Hypotheſis explode as meer Humane Impoſtures,) and *Jamblichus* thus proveth, that they were Divine. (*b*) *The Entrails are variouſly chang'd, as it pleaſeth the Gods. They are often found without an Heart, or ſome other of the principal parts, without which the Animals could not live. The Birds often cruſh and kill themſelves, which is againſt Nature, Supernatural, and the Work of ſome other that doth theſe things by the Birds*; therefore the Birds are mov'd as it pleaſeth the Gods. *Sometimes God maketh a fooliſh Man to ſpeak the words of Wiſdom, whereby it is manifeſt to all, that this is not an Humane, but a Divine Work.* (*c*) Porphyry *moveth a Queſtion, whether in thoſe that make Divinations and do certain wonderful things, their Souls be more than ordinarily powerful, or they have the extrinſecal aſſiſtance of ſome Spirits, whereby they are able to do theſe things? And he rather ſuppoſeth, that they have the extrinſecal aſſiſtance of Spirits, becauſe making uſe of Stones and Herbs, they bind ſome, and open Doors that are ſhut, or do ſome wonderful things of like Nature.* Theſe Theologers were grand Adverſaries of the Chriſtian Religion, but they ſymbolize with the Principles of it at anotherkins rate than the Epicurean Exploders of Magick. And not only the Pagan Theologers do ſo, but that worſt of Pagans, and belluine Monſter rather than a Man, *Heliogabalus* himſelf. (*d*) *All ſorts of Magicians were with him and at work daily, he exhorting them and giving thanks to the Gods, that he had found their Friends.* Never any Man gave a truer Character of the Heathen Gods.

VI. This Epicurean Hypotheſis touching Oracles is *Anti-hiſtorical*, as contradicting well atteſted Hiſtory touching their *magical* and *miraculous* doings. For the Chriſtian Apologiſts in their Diſputes againſt Paganiſm are far from denying, that miraculous things were done in it; (*e*) *that in divers Places, and Cities, and Nations ſome* [wonderful] *Operations are done in the Name of Idols, we do not deny. Lactantius* hath enumerated a large Catalogue of miraculous things done in Paganiſm, ſuch as theſe; (*f*) that *Caſtor* and *Pollux* appear'd, and told the *Romans* of their Victory in the *Macedonic* War, on the Day that they obtain'd it, which *Tertullian* alſo admitteth for true Hiſtory; that *Appius Claudius* loſt his Eyes, the Cenſor *Fulvius* loſt his Wits, the Family of the *Potitii* were extinguiſh'd for violating the Sacra of the Gods, and *Turullius* was ſlain in the ſame place where he committed Sacriledge. *Pyrrhus* having robb'd *Proſerpina* of her Treaſure, was Shipwrack'd on the Shores nigh unto this Goddeſs, and nothing was found ſafe but her Money. The *Mileſian Ceres* gain'd to her ſelf a great Veneration amongſt Men; for when the City was taken by *Alexander*, and the Souldiers brake in to ſpoil (her Temple) ſuddenly there was a Light of Fire before their Eyes, which put them out. In the Civil War with *Brutus Auguſtus* having a great Diſtemper determin'd not to go into the Battel; but the Species of *Minerva* appearing to his Phyſician *Artorius* admoniſh'd him, that *Cæſar* ſhould not becauſe of his Diſtemper keep himſelf in his Tent; whereupon he was carried in a Litter into the Battel, and the ſame Day his Tents were taken by *Brutus*. Theſe (and ſuch more) may ſeem little Stories, but they were great things in Paganiſm, and conciliated a great Veneration to the inviſible Powers, to whoſe Operation the Pagans imputed them, and whoſe Doings we may reaſonably ſuppoſe them to have been, but (with this difference) accounting ſome of them *undoubtedly* ſuch, others only *probably* ſo. Of which nature are the miraculous things, that are ſaid to have been done at thoſe *Lakes* or Fountains the *Sicilian Palici*, at which whoſoever perjur'd himſelf (*g*) is reported, to have ſuffer'd immediately ſome grand Puniſhment. (*h*) And the *Indians* of old are ſaid, to have had *τὴν λίμνην δοκιμαστικήν, a Lake of Probation*, where Perſons accus'd were try'd by the *Brachmans*; if they were innocent, they paſs'd through the Lake unhurt, and the Water reach'd no further than their Knees; if they were guilty, after they had gone a little way in it, they were immers'd in Water to the Head. (*i*) Some tell of another Water of Probation, which they had, that was ſweet and pleaſant ſave only to thoſe that perjur'd themſelves; but if drunk by them, it would get into their Eyes, Hands and Feet, and fill their Body with *Puſtulæ* and *Apoſtems*. And *Pauſanias* reporteth, that the ancient Greeks try'd their Prieſteſſes accus'd of Harlotry by a Draught of *Bulls Blood*, which was preſent death to them, if they had violated the Law of Chaſtity. Theſe miraculous methods of Probation (or Trial) in Paganiſm are ſo well atteſted, that although it would be raſhneſs and folly, to ſuppoſe them certainly true, yet it would be no leſs unreaſonable, to pronounce them certainly falſe, to explode them as Fables and Stories of credulous Antiquity, which are far more eaſily rejected with contempt, than rationally convicted of falſhood. So certain great and ſtrange things touching the Divinatory Enthuſiaſts being matters of fact reported to us by Learned Pagan Philoſophers, ought to be entertain'd with ſome degree of Reſpect and Aſſent; as when they diſpute, that their Divinatory Enthuſiaſm is not meerly from Humane Artifice, Impoſture and Diſtemper, but the Afflation is Supernatural, as appeareth from theſe Supernatural Effects. (*k*) *Many of them* (the Enthuſiaſts) *if Fire be put to them, are not burn'd, the Fire*

(b) *Van Dale*, p. 127, 357.

(b) *De myſt.* p. 79, 80, 82, 97.

(c) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 11.

(d) *Omne magorum genus aderat illi, operabaturque quotidie, hortante illo, & gratias Diis agente, quòd amicos eorum inveniſſet.* Hiſt. Aug. p. 468, 469.

(e) Τὸ μὲν δὴ κατὰ τόπους καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη γίγνεσθαί τινας ἐπ' ὀνόματι εἰδώλων ἐνεργείας, οὐδ' ἡμεῖς ἀντιλέγομεν. *Athenag. Apol. p.* 25.

(f) *L.* 2. *c.* 8. *Tertull. Apol. c.* 22.

(g) *Bochart. Geogr. ſacr. par.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 28.

(h) *Porph. de Styge*, *p.* 282.

(i) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 1 *c.* 2. *s.* 3.

(k) *Jambl. de myſt. p.* 64. *Gale not. p.* 220.

Fire not being able to touch them becauſe of the Divine Afflation. Many being burn'd feel it not, becauſe at that time they do not live the life of an Animal. Some having Spits transfix'd through their Bodies, ſome ſtruck on the Back with an Hatchet, ſome lancinating their Arms with Knives, yet feel not at all: their Operations are not at all Humane; for being θεοφορούμενοι, *carry'd by a Divine Afflation, impaſſable places are to them paſſable, they are carry'd into the Fire and paſs through it, and miraculouſly paſs over Rivers* [and tread on Fire] *as the Prieſteſs of* Caſtabala. But of ſome oracular miraculous Phænomena reported by *Hiſtorians*, it is not eaſie at this diſtance to make a Judgment, whether the matters of Fact are true; for of this Nature are the ſtrange Phænomena of a Lake near the Temple of *Venus Aphacitis*, (*l*) in which Lake (as *Zoſimus* reporteth) Gifts and Oblations were made in honour of the Goddeſs, which if they were accepted, ſunk in the Lake (of whatever Materials they were;) but would not ſink, but ſwim upon the Surface of the Lake, if they were rejected, which portended ſome bad event. Of the ſame nature are the Phænomena of the Oracle at *Apollonia*, which was conſulted in this manner, as *Dio* relateth: (*m*) The Conſultor took Incenſe, and making a Prayer for the things he deſir'd, caſt it out of his Hand, that it might carry his Prayer to the Fire. If he was to ſucceed in what he deſir'd, the Fire preſently receiv'd the Incenſe, or if it fell beſides the Fire, the Fire ran preſently to it, ſnatch'd it up and conſum'd it; but if he was to fail of what he deſir'd, the Fire would not make any approach to the Incenſe, and if the Incenſe was caſt into it, the Fire would recede from it and avoid it. It is reaſonable, to doubt of theſe Matters of Fact, and in ſome of the Phænomena of Oracles, if the Matter of Fact is acknowledg'd, it is reaſonable, to doubt of the cauſe of it. For amongſt the Pagans as well as amongſt the Pagano-Chriſtians Statues were mov'd by Humane Artifice and Impoſture as well as by the Agency of Demons; and therefore one may reaſonably doubt touching the cauſe of this reputed Miracle of the Heathen Gods; (*n*) *That the Images of the Houſhold-Gods which Æneas flying from* Troy *brought with him to* Italy, *are ſaid, to have remov'd themſelves from one place to another.* Of the ſame nature is the *Impulſe* and *Motion* of thoſe Images which *Macrobius* ſpeaketh of in his Account of the Proceſſionary Pomp of the *Aſſyrian Heliopolitan Jove. The chief Men of the Province* (with a ſhaven Head and pure by a long Caſtimony) *are ſaid to bear up the Image.* (*o*) *And they are carry'd by a Divine Spirit, not of their own mind, carrying the Image whither the God impelleth, as we ſee the Images of the Fortunes at* Antium *are carry'd to give Reſponſes.* But although there are dubious and infirm parts in the Hiſtory of Oracles, yet it is not without great Firmitude and Certitude; for there are in it ſuch magical and miraculous Doings, of which there is no ſufficient reaſon to doubt, and which therefore may be called, *The undoubted magical and miraculous Doings of Oracles. Such are*

(1.) The Incorporation of Demons in Statues and their Agency in them. Demons were certainly introduc'd into the Pagans Temples and Statues and made to reſide there, (*p*) ὑπό τινων μαγγανειῶν, *by certain Artifices of Inchantment.* Accordingly *Zoſimus* ſaith, (*q*) that their Gods were τελεταῖς ἁγίαις καθιδρυθέντες, *ſet up with holy myſtical Rites.* The Gods themſelves ſay, (*r*) *that Magical Figures and Characters detain them in certain places of the Earth.* As the Theurgiſts made Statues of proper and accommodate Matter (by compounding ſeveral Species of things) πρὸς θεῶν ὑποδοχήν, *for the reception of the Gods*, ſo the Sacrifice of ſuch Matter (*s*) *exciteth the Gods to appear, induceth them preſently to be comprehended, and it receiveth them when they are come.* *Olympius* the Philoſopher therefore perſwading the People to die, rather than to relinquiſh their Country-rites, told them, (*t*) *that certain Divine Powers dwelt in their Statues.* Hence the Jews ſuppos'd, (*u*) that not plane or depreſs, but only protuberant Images are forbidden in the Second Commandment, becauſe theſe only are capable of being inhabited by Spirits, and of giving oracular Reſponſes. (*w*) The *Serapes* of the *Egyptians* were as the *Teraphim* and the *Aſſyrian Nebo*, Statues of oracular Reſponſes, they worſhipp'd them and conſulted them for Divination, as *Abeneſius* reporteth, agreeably to what the Scripture ſaith of them, that they conſulted their Idols, *Iſa.* 19. 3. (*x*) *Maimonides* ſaith, *he read two Volumes of ſpeaking Images and their Fabrication.* The words of *Virgil* —— *agitataque numina Trojæ* are thus expounded by *Servius*; *Simulachra brevia, quæ portabantur in lecticis, & ab ipſis mota infundebant vaticinationem, ſhort Images carry'd in Litters* (or little Chariots,) *which being moved or agitated did infuſe Vaticination.* From good Authors we have the relation (*y*) of a talkative Image at *Veii* (the Image of *Juno Moneta*,) and of another at *Rome* (the Image of *Fortuna Muliebris.*) *Pſellus* ſaith, (*z*) *In Theurgy there often appeareth a skipping of the Celeſtial Fire, and then the Statues ſeem to ſmile, and the Lamps are lighted of themſelves.* (*a*) The *Zemes* in *Hiſpaniola* were Images animated by Demons; every little King had one of them, and one of theſe Kings had a *Zemes*, that (upon taking a diſtaſt) often us'd, to deſcend from the top of the Houſe, where he was kept cloſe bound, and to lie hid for certain Days. Another of theſe *Zemes* often went from the place, where he was worſhipp'd, into the Woods; when they perceiv'd that he was gone, a great multitude gather'd together, to ſeek him with devout Prayer, and when they had found him, they brought him home religiouſly on their Shoulders to the Chappel dedicated unto him. Theſe *Zemes* were Statues of *Divination*; for the King conſulted them in their Chappels touching the Events of War and other Affairs of Life: They foretold the coming of the *Spaniards* into *Hiſpaniola*, that they ſhould deſtroy the Images of their Gods, and ſlay the Children, which was a true Divination. (*b*) The barbarous *Americans* were upbraided by Friar *Gage* for worſhipping an Idol of black Wood, which they plac'd in a Cave of the Earth; but inſtead of putting them to ſilence, he had this Anſwer from them; That themſelves believ'd the Image to be but Wood of it ſelf; but they knew alſo by their own Ears, that it had ſpoken to them, from whence they concluded, that a God was in it. The Stories of the ancient *Bætuli* are thought fabulous; but (perhaps) without ſufficient reaſon. *Damaſcius* in the Life

of

(l) *Van Dale de orac.* p. 107.

(m) *Ibid.* p. 105.

(n) *Quòd effigies Deorum Penatium quos de Troja Æneas fugiens advexit, de loco in locum migraſſe referuntur.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 16.

(o) *Feruntúrque divino ſpiritu, non ſuo arbitrio, ſed quo Deus propellit, vehentes, ut videmus apud Antium promoveri ſimulachra Fortunæ, ad danda reſponſa.* Saturn. l. 1. c. 23.

(p) *Orig. c. Cel. l.* 7. p. 374.

(q) *Hiſt.* p. 351.

(r) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 5. *c.* 15.

(s) Ἀνεγείρει τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν ἔμφασιν, καὶ προσκαλεῖται εὐθέως πρὸς κατάληψιν, χωρεῖ τε αὐτοὺς παραγινομένους. *Jamblich. de myſt. p.* 138, 139.

(t) *Sozomen. Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 15.

(u) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 5. *c.* 7. *S.* 1.

(w) *Ibid. diſſ.* 7. *c.* 3. *S.* 10.

(x) *Ibid. & S.* 9. *& Seld. de D. Syr. Synt.* 1. *c.* 6.

(y) *Valer. Max. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 8.

(z) *De Dæmon. ſub fin.*

(a) *Purch. par.* 1. *B.* 9. *c.* 14. *S.* 2. *Hoffman. umbr. p.* 86.

(b) *Gage Survey, c.* 20. *p.* 391, *&c.*

of *Iſidore* ſaith, (c) that one *Euſebius* had an oracular ſpeaking *Bætulus*, which ſome ſuppoſed to be a Divine Oracle, but *Iſidore rather ſuppoſed it to be Demonial, for it was ſome Demon that mov'd it, not of the noxious, nor very material order.*

(2.) Many Hiſtorical Paſſages touching the magical and miraculous doings of Oracles which are of ſuch a Nature and ſo well atteſted, that they ſeem unexceptionable. Of this ſort a competent number is before recited from *Celſus*; and *Plutarch* in the Perſon of *Demetrius* relateth, (d) "That the Prefect of *Cilicia*, a bad "Man, that had certain Epicureans about him, "who becauſe of their excellent Phyſiology ri"dicul'd ſuch things as Oracles, had a mind, "to make an experiment of the Oracle of *Mop"ſus*. He ſent therefore one that had been his "Servant (as a Spy into the Enemies Quar"ters) with a Queſtion in writing, and the "writing was ſealed, none knowing what the "Queſtion was. This Man (as the cuſtom was) "having tarry'd all Night in the Temple and "ſlept, when it was day related, that he had "this Dream. An handſom young Man ſeem"ed to ſtand by him, and to ſay to him this "one word Μέλανα, *Black*, and ſo was gone "preſently. This ſeem'd to us an abſurd An"ſwer (ſaith *Demetrius*:) But the Prefect was "aſtoniſh'd and ador'd, and opening the wri"ting ſhew'd, that the Queſtion written there"in was, ποτερόν σοι λευκὸν ἢ μέλανα θύσω ταῦρον, "*Whether ſhall I ſacrifice to you a white or black* "*Bull?* So that the Epicureans were ſtruck "with ſhame, the Preſident did his Sacrifice, "and continu'd always a worſhipper of *Mop"ſus*. This Oracular Phænomenon may reaſonably be called *undoubtedly Magical*, and it ſeemeth the Epicureans of thoſe elder times had a greater ſhare of Ingenuity and Modeſty than thoſe of their Foot-mark and Fraternity in theſe later ages. Of the ſame Character (undoubtedly Magical) was the Anſwer of the Oracle at *Delphos* to King *Cræſus*, which *Tertullian* looketh upon as an inſtance of the Celerity and great intelligence of evil Demons. (e) *Teſtudinem decoqui cum carnibus Pythius renunciavit. Cræſus* contriv'd a thing, which he thought none could imagine or declare (to make trial of the Oracle,) clancularly in his own Houſe he chopt and boil'd together a Snail and a Lamb in a Braſs-kettle with a Braſs-cover upon it, and this *Pythia* at *Delphos* declared. *Suetonius* relateth of *Tiberius*, (f) that he ſought to throw down all the Oracles that were near the City, but deſiſted from that attempt, being affrighted by the Majeſty of the *Sortes Prœneſtinæ*, which were ſeal'd up and carry'd to *Rome*, but could not be found in the Ark (wherein they were uſually kept,) unleſs it was carry'd back to the Temple to which it belonged. *Tacitus* giveth this account of the Oracle of *Apollo Clarius*. (g) There is no Woman in this Oracle as at *Delphos*, but a Prieſt (choſen out of ſome certain Families) heareth the Name and number of thoſe that conſult the Oracle, then going into a Den, and having drunk the Water of an arcane Fountain, giveth them anſwer touching thoſe things, which every one hath conceiv'd in his mind, and being ignorant of Letters and of Verſes for the moſt part, yet giveth Reſponſes in compoſ'd Verſes. *Celſus* affirmeth, (h) that at the Oracles of *Trophonius*, *Amphiaraus*, and *Mopſus*, the Gods were ſeen in Human form (which ſort of Relations the Epicureans derided,) and there are many Memoirs in Paganiſm (i) of the ἐπιφάνειαι *Apparitions* of the Gods. Which appearances whoſoever believeth, will not diſbelieve their coming to their Temples ſometimes in an extraordinary manner, (k) attended with an unuſual ſplendor and refulgency, thundrings, bellowings and frightful Noiſes, which therefore ought not to be imputed meerly to Human Artifice and Impoſture. *Cæcilius* affirms, (l) that they had the ſight of the Gods in ſleep. So when a great golden Bowl was ſtoln out of *Hercules*'s Temple, the God himſelf appeared to *Sophocles* in ſleep, and told him, who had ſtoln it. When *Veſpaſian* conſulted the God *Serapis* in *Egypt*, *Baſilides* a principal Man amongſt the Egyptians (m) was ſeen by him in the Temple, whom upon inquiry made (by ſending certain Horſemen) he found to have been fourſcore Miles diſtant at that moment of time, and this Apparition he took for an oracular Reſponſe. By a Monition or Oracle of the God *Serapis* a blind Man and a lame Man made their application to him, *ſtatim converſa ad uſum manus eſt, & cæco reluxit dies, the lame Man had preſently the uſe of his hand, and the blind Man regain'd his ſight. Apollonius Tyanæus*, who was one of *Veſpaſian*'s acquaintance and was with him in *Egypt*, is celebrated for his Magical-miraculous doings; and *Philoſtratus* ſaith, (n) that many asking health of the Oracle, the God bad them betake themſelves to *Apollonius*; as the *Delphi* were bid by the Oracle, to Sacrifice to the Winds, the Greeks to make uſe of *Æacus*'s Prayers, and *Epimenides* came to *Athens* by the Monition of the Oracle with miraculous Succeſs. (o) In a Table of Greek Inſcriptions that was hung up in the Temple of *Æſculapius* at *Rome*, it is recorded of one *Lucius* a Pleuritic Man, and one *Julianus* who vomited Blood, *both of them deſpair'd of by all*, that they were directed by the Oracle of that God, to certain Medicines that recover'd them. The cure of one *Caius* a blind Man was *Magical-miraculous*. This blind Man was bid by the Oracle to come to the ſacred Altar, and to kneel there, then to go from the right ſide to the left, and to put his five Fingers upon the Altar, then to lift up his Hand and to put it upon his Eyes. *And again he ſaw aright, the People being preſent, and congratulating, that great Miracles were done under our Emperor* Antoninus.

(3.) The extatick Violences of the divinatory Enthuſiaſts, which they ſometimes ſuffered unto Death; for they felt within themſelves a violent Correption, Obſeſſion and extatic Motion from another (p) diſtinct from themſelves (ὅτι ἔχουσι μεῖζον ἐν αὐτοῖς, *that they have ſomething grand within them,*) and that a Spirit from without agitated them, as *Apollo*'s Oracle deſcribeth the Spirit of Divination. (q)

An influence from Phœbus *fair*
Hid under breathings of fine
Air
Drawn forth by Cants and
words Arcane
Fell on the pure Receivers Brain,
Deſcending down it fill'd the
Veſt,

Recur-

(c) *Phot. cod.* 242. *col.* 1061, 1063.

(d) *De Def. orac. p.* 434.

(e) *Tertul. Apol. c.* 22.

(f) *C.* 63.

(g) *Annal. l.* 2. *p.* 63.

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 355.

(i) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 1. *c.* 2. *S.* 3. *Diodor. Sic. l.* 1. *p.* 14, 15 *Cic. de N. D. l.* 3. *Dion. Halicarn. l.* 2. *p.* 128.

(k) *Jam mihi cernuntur trepidis delubra moveri*
Sedibus, & clarum diſpergere culmina lumen,
Adventum teſtata Dei, &c.
Claudian. De rap. Proſerp. l. 1.
Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 5. c. 13.

(l) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 65.

(m) *Tacit. Hiſt. l.* 4. *ſub fin. Sueton. c.* 7.

(n) *L.* 4. *c.* 1.

(o) *Gruter. Theſaur. p.* 71. *Van Dale p.* 100, 101.

(p) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 14. *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 65.

(q) Ῥεῦμα τὸ φοιβεῖης ἀπονευμενον ὑψόθεν αἴγλης
Πνοιῇ ὑπὸ λιγυρῇ κεκαλυμμένον ἠέρος ἁγνοῦ
Θελγόμενον μολπαῖσι καὶ ἀῤῥήτοις ἐπέεσσι
Κάππεσεν ἀμφὶ χέρνιον ἀμωμήτοιο δοχῆος
Λεπταλέων ὑμένων, μαλακὸν δ' ἐνέπλησε χιτῶνα

Αμϐολάδην διὰ γαςρὸς ἀνεκπύμενον παλίνορσον
Αὐλῆ δ' ἐκ βροτέοιο φίλην ἐτεκνώσατο φωνήν.
Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 5. c. 8.

Recurring upwards to the Breaſt
By Human voice it ſelf expreſt.

So the Pagan Theologers attribute their divinatory Enthuſiaſm to (r) ἀναβακχεύοντα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πνεύματα, *Spirits deriv'd from the Gods that make Men Bacchical.* And *Plutarch* relateth upon his own Knowledge, (s) that an oracular *Pythia* died by extatic Violence. She deſcended into the Oracle unwillingly and with reluctance, preſently it appear'd in her firſt Anſwers by the aſpirity of her voice, that ſhe was impell'd as a Ship with Wind and unable to bear it, ἀλάλου ϗ κακοῦ πνεύματος οὖσα πλήρης, *being replete with a mute and malign Spirit.* In the iſſue being all in a commotion, and impell'd to go out, with a terrible cry ſhe threw her ſelf down, ſo that not only they that conſulted the Oracle fled, but alſo *Nicander* the Prophet, and thoſe of the Holy (τῶν ὁσίων,) that were preſent. After a while entring in they took her up diſtracted, and ſhe lived a few days. Theſe extatic Violences are thus deſcrib'd by *Lucan l. 5.*

——— ſi qua Deus ſub pectora venit,
Numinis aut pœna eſt mors immatura recepti
Aut pretium: quippe ſtimulo fluctuque furoris
Compages humana labat: pulſuſque Deorum
Concutiunt fragiles animos. ———

(4.) *More than human Divinations.* For the perſonal Oracles were in ſuch Reputation amongſt the Heathen, that they called their Vates (t) *Veratores*, and in the old *Burgundian* Laws *Veratura* ſignifieth Divination. Of the Delphic Oracle *Plutarch* affirmeth, (u) οὐδένα καθ' αὐτῆς ἔλεγχον ἄχρι νῦν παραδέδωκεν, *not any one hath produced a conviction of falſhood againſt it unto this day.* The Oracles therefore were managed by more than human Politicks, and there are in this Author (*Plutarch de Pyth. Orac.*) ſeveral great inſtances of more than human Divination. In *Cicero de Fato* we are told, that this was the Doctrine of *Diodorus* touching neceſſity and contingency, *Non neceſſe fuiſſe Cypſelum regnare Corinthi, quanquam id milleſimo ante anno Apollinis oraculo editum eſſet, that it was not neceſſary,* Cypſelus *the Tyrant ſhould Reign at* Corinth, *though that was a thing predicted by* Apollo's *Oracle a thouſand years before. Voſſius* therefore ſtrenuouſly argueth, (w) *To reſolve the Oracles into the Artifice of the Prieſts only, is inſufficient, becauſe they predicted many things, to which the Mind of Man cannot reach.* But to this unanſwerable Argument the admirers of *Lucian* and *Epicurus* make anſwer. (x) *Quomodo conſtat ea non poſt eventum fuiſſe conficta? How doth it appear, that thoſe Predictions of the Oracles were not fram'd after the Event?* Which is the Anſwer of Men that are baffled and driven to an abſurdity; for the ſame abſurd Anſwer *Porphyry* made, when preſs'd with the Vaticinations of the Prophet *Daniel*, he ſaid, they were made after the Event.

(5.) The Pagans methods of obtaining their Divinatory Enthuſiaſm; for which their oracular Vates prepar'd themſelves with great and ſolemn Sanctimony. *Pythia* might not go to her Tripos, *nor offer her ſelf to be an Organ to God* (y) *not being pure in all reſpects as a prepared Organ and well ſounding, but in perturbation and incompoſ'd.* The oracular Vates at *Colophon* (z) *faſted a whole Day and Night, before he drank his divinatory Water, and was retired himſelf alone* ἐν ἱεροῖς τισιν ἀβάτος τῷ πλήθει, *in certain ſacred places inacceſſible to the multitude. The oracular Woman at* Branchidæ *holdeth in her hand a Rod* (the Diviners proper bearing as a Scepter is the King's,) *which originally came from ſome God. And from the multitude of Sacrifices, the Law of Sanctimony, the waſhings of the Propheteſs, and her faſting three whole days, and retirement in ſecret places, it appeareth* (ſaith *Jamblichus*) παράκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ ὥστε παραγενέσθαι, *that God is called upon to be preſent.* (a) To prepare the Phantaſie, to receive God (in order to Divination,) ſometimes they made uſe of καταπόσεις, *the Sorcerers Potions*, ſometimes ἐπῳδαὶ, *Charms*, ſometimes συςάσεις, *magical Compoſitions.* (b) *To prepare themſelves for ſeeing things Divine, the Egyptians are ſaid to anoint their Eyes, either with Tarrum* (Aloes probably) *or a Liquor of Frankincenſe, or Bdellium: But the Aſſyrians by Characters, and certain arcane Names, ſanctifying themſelves by myſtic Letters, in ſacerdotal Spangles. Theſe things are ſaid by* Porphyrius *and* Jamblichus, *ſaith* Pſellus. We are blind, if we ſee not Magick in theſe Preparatives for Divine Viſions and Oracular Divination. Whence it appeareth, that *Origen* was not miſtaken in ſtiling the Extaſie of *Pythia* (c) μαγικὴ κατάςασις, *a magical State of Mind:* Nor did *Theodoret* take his meaſures amiſs in calling the Oracles (d) τὰς μαντικὰς μαγγανείας, *divinatory Inchantments.*

VII. This Epicurean Hypotheſis touching Oracles is *Anti-rational* as being contrary to the plain Reaſon of things. For if there be evil Demons, that affect a Divinity and God-head over Mankind, and to have them their Religioniſts, they muſt neceſſarily require from them a Religion and God-Service; and therefore Mankind muſt have from them a λόγος προφορικός, *Word or Revelation*, which is an Oracle. And conſidering how outragiouſly Heathen Mankind are addicted to Divination, (e) *Auguriis & ariolis ad inſaniam dediti*, (and at the ſame rate they are addicted to near converſe with their Gods,) it is manifeſtly impoſſible, that thoſe evil Demons ſhould have them and keep them for their Religioniſts, unleſs they afford them Oracles and Divination. The Heathen Oracles and Divination therefore are a neceſſary conſequence of the Exiſtence of evil Demons, that affect a Divinity and God-head over Mankind. And conſequently the exploding their Oracles and Divination as meer human Forgeries, is a denying the Exiſtence of ſuch evil Demons, which is a total ſubverſion of Chriſtianity and of Paganiſm alſo, which is an Inſtitution of the Pagan Gods and Demons. The Pagans underſtood very well, that it belonged to the Gods, to inſtitute the matters of their Religion and God-ſervice, (f) *and there is not any one thing, but Mankind hath learned it of them, and ſo hath done them Religious Service.* If the Pagans had their oracular

(r) *Jambl. de Myſt. p.* 71.

(s) *De Def. Orac. p.* 438.

(t) *Salmaſ. Not. in Hiſt. Aug. p.* 431.

(u) *De Pyth. orac. p.* 408. *See Dr. Barrow on the Creed, Ser. 9. p.* 13..

(w) *Non ſatis eſt, ſi in ſacerdotum ſubſiſtatur ſolertia, quia multa prædicerentur, ad quæ non pertingeret mens humana.* De Idol. l. 1. c. 6.

(x) *Van Dale p.* 223.

(y) Μὴ παντάπασι καθαρὰν ἶναι, ὥσπερ ὄργανον ἐξηρτυμένον ϗ εὐηχὲς, ἀλλ' ἐμπαθῆ ϗ ἀκατάςατον. *Plutarch. de Def. Orac. p.* 437.

(z) *Jambl. de myſt. p.* 73, 74.

(a) *Jambl. ibid. p.* 77, 78. *Gale not. p.* 233, 240.

(b) *Ad divinas viſiones percipiendas parabant ſe Ægyptii, ut ferunt, vel tarro, ſic enim vocant, oculos oblinentes, vel thuris liquore, vel bdellio. Aſſyrii verò teſſeris quibuſdam infandiſque* (ἀῤῥήτοις) *nominibus, myſticiſque literis in ſacerdotalibus bracteis ſeipſos ſanctificantes. Hæc Porphyrius & Jamblichus.* Gale ibid. p. 231.

(c) *C. Celſ. l. 7. p.* 333.

(d) Θεραπ. *Ser.* 10. *initio.*

(e) *Magini Geograph. in Braſil.*

(f) Καὶ ὅλως ἓν οὐδέν ἐςιν, ὃ μὴ παρ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτως αὐτοὺς ἐτίμησαν. *Porphyr. ap. Euſeb. l.* 5. *c.* 11.

Documents touching matters of Religion, not from their Gods, but from their Prieſts only, Paganiſm muſt be thought the Religion, not of evil Spirits, but of evil Prieſts and evil Men only; and the Religion of Demonolatry muſt not be thought originally the Religion of evil Demons. The Religion of *Serpents*, to which Human Nature hath an antipathy, muſt be thought a meer Human Inſtitution; and the ſame judgment muſt be made of the Pagans ὠμοφαγίαι κὴ αἰσχρολογίαι πρὸς ἱεροῖς, *tearing and devouring raw fleſh and filthy obſcene Speeches in their Sacra*, and of other monſtrouſly abſurd Rites, which ſome of the Pagan Theologers derive from evil Demons, pronouncing them *Cyclopic* and unnatural, (g) as *Porphyry* doth the ὠμοφαγία, *tearing and devouring raw fleſh*. And that Judaiſm may be ſubverted by this Epicurean Hypotheſis (as well as Chriſtianity and Paganiſm) the Inſtitutes of the *Zabii* muſt be thought only *fondly ritual not religious-magical*; for if they were magical, the Oracles that inſtituted them, muſt be magical. If the Rite of pouring Blood into a Ditch to the *Dii inferi* was magical, (h) the oracular *Apollo* that inſtituted it, muſt be thought *a Magick Oracle*. If the invoking *Mercury*, *the Sun*, *the Moon*, *Saturn* and *Venus* on their ſeveral days κλήσεσιν ἀφθέγκτοις, *with words arcane found out by the beſt of the Magi*, are Aſtrological-magical Rites, (i) the Oracle that injoin'd theſe Rites was magical. And ſuch were the Oracles that injoin'd a Religion of ἀνθρωποθυσίαι and τεκνοθυσίαι, *ſacrificing Millions of Men to the Heathen Gods, ſlaughtering, ſacrificing and burning their own Children*; for theſe prodigious inhumanities could not be the Inſtitutes of meer Humanity. The Heathen Writers that ſpeak of them, generally exclaim againſt them as *horrible*, *nefarious*, *monſtrous*, *of dire immanity* (as *Tacitus* calleth them;) therefore they are matter of horror to natural Light and the kindly inſtincts of human Nature. Yet they prevailed all over the World of degenerate Mankind, which is a plain demonſtration, that they were of more than human Inſtitution. It is far more credible (k) that a Cow ſpake at *Rome* with an human voice (*Roma cave tibi*,) than that meer humanity inſtituted the inhumanities of the Heathen Religion. (l) Some explode the *Roman Plebeian*'s *Dream from* Jupiter, the Apparition of *Caſtor* and *Pollux*, the *attraction* of a Ship by *Claudia*'s Girdle, and all the Prodigies reported by *Livy*, *Dio*, *Pliny*, *Valer. Max.* as things fabulous and incredible: But are any of theſe portentous things half ſo portentous or incredible as the *prodigioſa Sacra* (as *Pliny* calleth them) of the Heathen Religion, of which no Man is incredulous? Theſe are Tranſcendentals and of a ſtrain paramount to meer human Inſtitutes of Wickedneſs: Nor can the Origin of them be deriv'd meerly from ſuch Principles or Propenſions as are in the human Nature. For if Mankind had a mind to expreſs their higheſt devotional Eſteem and Affection for their Gods, if they thought it the beſt way of obliging them, to offer to them the deareſt things they had which ſome ſay (m) was the Origin of τεκνοθυσία, *ſacrificing Children*,) yet this could be no inducement to them, to Sacrifice Captives, Strangers, and poor Shipwrack'd Refugees, which were ſacrific'd to *Diana Taurica*. If we derive the Original of the human Sacrifices from an Opinion, which they had in ancient times, (n) that the Life of Man and human Sacrifices were of far greater Dignity and Precioſity than the Sacrifices of inferiour Animals, and of far greater Efficacy and Avail with the Gods, we give a true account of their Original indeed, but we derive it from ſomething higher than *the human Nature*, becauſe Mankind in thoſe ancient times could not have had ſuch an Opinion of the efficay and avail of the human Sacrifices, unleſs they had underſtood the mind of their Gods, and been impos'd upon by their Artifices. Had they not been impos'd upon by their Artifices, their Opinion of the Precioſity of the Life of a Man muſt neceſſarily have produc'd a contrary effect, and deterr'd them from their Man-killing Trade, from butchering and cutting Throats, burying and burning alive innocent Men, Women and Children. Had they not underſtood the mind of their Gods, they muſt neceſſarily have ſuppos'd, that their barbarous and bloody Murders were the way to incenſe, not to appeaſe the Divine Vengeance, to provoke the diſpleaſure, not to gain the favour of the Gods (whoſe Vengeance is ſuppos'd by the Barbarians to purſue Murderers *Act.* 28. 4.) therefore the Heathens ἀνθρωποθυσίαι, τεκνοθυσίαι, *Sacrifices of Men and Children*, muſt be deriv'd from their Oracles and Divination, and thoſe Oracles muſt be Magical and Diabolical.

Such was that ancient Oracle in *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſ.* (o) that requir'd human Sacrifices for *Jupiter* and *Apollo*, (p) the Delphic Oracle order'd the Athenians, to ſend twice ſeven Boys and Virgins to the *Cretians*, to be ſacrific'd. The *Locri* were directed by their Oracle, for the aſſwaging a Peſtilence, to ſend every Year two Virgins to *Troy*, which had their Throats firſt cut, and then were burnt in Sacrifice to *Pallas Trojana*. And the butchering of *Iphigenia* at the Altar of *Diana* in *Aulis* was by direction of the Oracle. (q) Amongſt the *Romans* a certain Virgin *Elbia* was Thunder-ſtruck, and three Veſtal Virgins polluted, which being look'd upon as atrocious Accidents they conſulted the *Sibylline Oracles*, wherein thoſe things were foretold, and that they would prove calamitous to the Common-wealth: But thoſe Oracles directed them by way of prevention, to bury alive two Men and two Women, *Greeks* and *Gauls*, as an Oblation ἀλλακότοις τισὶ δαίμοσι κὴ ξένοις, *to certain alien and ſtrange Demons*. It appeareth abſurd (ſaith *Plutarch*,) to reproach the Barbarians as doing things nefarious, yet they themſelves do the ſame things, προσταχθέντες ἐκ τῶν Σιβυλλείων, *being commanded ſo to do by the Books of the Sibylline Oracles*. Such was the Origin of the human Sacrifices. (r) *The Devil ſuggeſted to the Mexican Prieſts, to go to their Kings, telling them, that their Gods dy'd for hunger, and therefore ſhould be remembred. Then aſſembled they their People to Wars, to furniſh their bloody Altars.* The Rite of τεκνοθυσία, *Parents burning their own Children alive* (s) is ſo monſtrouſly inhuman, ſo outrageouſly barbarous and cruel, and ſo prodigiouſly contrary to natural Affection, that it is not imaginable, it could ever have been practis'd by Mankind, if the Devil had not put them upon it. This Inſtitute atrocious and flagitious to the height of Wickedneſs is of Affinity with another Inſtitute of the ſame Author of Oracles. (t) The *Pelaſgi* devaſtated a City of *Bœotia*, which the *Thebans* defended, and ſent to conſult the Oracle at *Dodona* touching the Victory in the War. The Oracles Anſwer was, that the *Thebans* ſhall be victorious, εἰ μέγιστον ἀσέβημα ἀσεβήσουσι, *if they do the greateſt of Impieties*. It ſeem'd to them, that this

was

(g) Spencer de Leg. Hebr. l. 2. c. 4. S. 2.

(h) Niceph. in Syneſ. p. 411.

(i) Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 5. c. 14.

(k) Van Dale p. 193.

(l) Ibid. p. 192.

(m) Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 293.

(n) Grot. de ſatisfact. p. 200. Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l. 2. c. 10. S. 3.

(o) Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 4. c. 16.

(p) Ibid. 5. c. 19.

(q) Plutarch. Qu. Rom. p. 283, 284.

(r) Franc. Pa. l. B. 8. c. 11. S. 1. & vid. ibid. c. 7. S. 4.

(s) Spencer ſupr. l. 2. c. 10. S. 4.

(t) Phot. cod. 239. col. 539.

was the greateſt of Impieties, τὸν χρησμὸν ἀνελεῖν, *to ſlaughter the Oracle* (or the Vates that deliver'd it,) and accordingly they did it.

VIII. This Epicurean Hypotheſis touching Oracles is *Anti-probable* and *Anti-poſſible*. For as a learned Man argueth; (u) it is altogether improbable, that the Nations of old would have worſhipp'd their Images at ſuch a rate as they did, and have given them the Names of their Gods, unleſs Demons had often entred into them, and thence afforded them Oracles, and given other Teſtimonies of their Preſence. Of the Delphic Oracle *Cicero* ſaith; *never would that Oracle have been ſo renown'd, nor ſo ſtufft with the Gifts of all Nations and Kings, if every age had not experienc'd the truth of thoſe Oracles.* This hath ſomething of improbability; for the Hebrew Book *Coſri* ſaith; (w) that the Jews were ſometime drawn to the uſe of Images and ſpiritual Virtues (*Teleſms*,) *becauſe they were in thoſe times approv'd by Experiments.* And is it probable, that the Pagan World ran after *Oracles* for many ages together, which were never approv'd by Experiments? (x) It is probably thought that the *Dodonean* Oracle had its Name from *Dodanim* the Son *Javan*, and that the *Ammonian* had its Name from *Ham:* Whether ſo or otherwiſe, thoſe Oracles were doubtleſs of very great antiquity (for they were in the time of *Mycerinus* King of *Egypt*,) and can it be imagin'd, that they ſhould hold up a great Reputation in the World, with learned and unlearned, with Princes and People, till about the times of Chriſtianity at leaſt, if there had been nothing of the reality of Oracles in them, nothing more than human deluſion? To ſuppoſe the Oracles ſuch (a meer human Artifice and Impoſture,) is to ſuppoſe, that a great multitude of People of very diſtant and remote Countries, who never convers'd together, conſpir'd in a Plot, to abuſe and impoſe upon Mankind, that this Conſpiracy was carry'd on from one Generation to another, for many ages, without being reveal'd by any one (although innumerable Perſons of different Sex and Condition, Inclination and Intereſt, were concern'd in it;) that they conſpir'd, to abuſe and impoſe upon, not only the rude and ignorant, but the wiſe, the learn'd, the Philoſophical World of Mankind in *Greece*, *Egypt*, *Babylon*, and that ſilly Men and Women carry'd on the groſſeſt of Impoſtures with ſuch artifice for many ages, that the great and learned and religious Pagans could not diſcover it; all which are not only improbable, but impoſſible Suppoſitions. They that entertain this Hypotheſis, *that the Oracles were a meer Artifice and Impoſture of the Pagan Prieſts*, muſt think the Pagan Prieſts but ordinary Men, no *Sorcerers* or *Wizards*, yet they are ſuppos'd to carry on a Plot which hath no Parallel. They muſt think (y) *Apuleius*'s Βασιλεὺς, or wooden Seal but an ordinary piece of Wood. They muſt ſuppoſe, that the Oracles were ſubſervient to a meer human Intereſt, which manifeſtly ſubſerved a grand Intereſt of Religion, the Intereſt of Satan's Religion and Kingdom; and how ſhould he deceive all Nations, if he did not imploy all his Policy and Power to inveigle them? They muſt ſuppoſe, that the Heathen Gods were not near unto them, nor animated their Statues, nor inhabited their Temples (which were called *Fana*, becauſe their Gods were wont in them *fari*, *to give oracular* Reſponſes,) and have theſe atheous Sentiments any likelihood or appearance of Truth? Notwithſtanding the eager Conteſts that were between the Pagan and the Chriſtian Theologers in the Primitive times touching matters of Religion, yet both Parties retained ſo much ingenuity, they did not deny plain and well atteſted matter of Fact, each Party acknowledg'd *the Miracles* of their Adverſaries Religion, but at the rate that *Porphyry* (z) acknowledg'd the Miracles of the Martyrs, who look'd upon them as *Præſtigiæ Dæmonum*, *the falſe Miracles of Demons.* He made a right judgment (as I ſuppoſe) touching the Miracles that introduc'd Church-Demonolatry, of which the Devil was certainly the Founder and Promoter. And therefore the anſwer (*a*) of *Apollo Daphnæus* to *Julian* touching his ſilence (*that his Neighbour dead hindred him from giving an oracular-Reſponſe*) may reaſonably be thought a Politick Trick of the Devil, to lapſe the Church into Idolatry hy a pretended Miracle (that he was fetter'd by the Martyr *Babylas*'s Bones,) agreeably to his method in thoſe times, which was, to introduce *the Worſhip of Reliques* by his illegitimate Miracles. That there are ſuch kind of Miracles the Scripture ſo frequently affirmeth, *Exod.* 7. *Deut.* 13. *Matth.* 24. 24. *Act.* 8. 10, 11. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 9. *Apoc.* 13. 13. that it muſt be thought inconſiſtent with the Chriſtian Profeſſion, to explode *the Pagan oracular Miracles.* And it appeareth (*b*) from the Emperors *Veſpaſian*, *Adrian*, and the times of *M. Antoninus*, that the Pagans affected Miracles, ſo that to gratifie the Propenſions of his Religioniſts, the Devil was oblig'd to afford them *Oracles* and *Miracles*, ſuch as tranſcend meer human Artifice and Impoſture, and which might impoſe upon Heathen Mankind, who muſt be allow'd to be Men of Senſe and common Prudence. And if we allow them, to have been ſuch, it will appear, that thoſe many methods of human Artifice, (*c*) whereby ſome ſuppoſe the Pagan Prieſts to have impos'd upon them *Oracles and Miracles*, were in great part impracticable and impoſſible things (things that never were, nor ever can be in human Affairs,) and therefore their *Oracles* and *Miracles* muſt be reputed in great part (ſuch as *Porphyry* reputeth the Miracles of the Martyrs) *Præſtigiæ Dæmonum*, *the Artifices and Impoſtures of evil Demons.*

Which Religious Hypotheſis is incumbred only with theſe two Difficulties, which incumbred the Speculation of Oracles in *Plutarch*'s time; namely, *the Ceſſation of Oracles, and* Pythia's *ceaſing to anſwer in Verſe.* The latter of theſe Difficulties is now no difficulty, for *Plutarch* himſelf (*de Pythiæ Oraculis*) hath ſufficiently aſſoil'd it. And as to the former of theſe Difficulties, *the Ceſſation of Oracles*, if we ſpeak of Oracles in general; ſeeing the Divinations of Witches and other modes of Divination were by the Pagans rightly called *Oracles*, it is manifeſt, that there never was, nor ever will be, a total Ceſſation of Oracles till Witchcraft and Magick ceaſeth. But if the Name of Oracles be reſtrain'd to the eminent and famous *local Oracles of the Pagans*, it muſt be acknowledg'd, that there was a partial Ceſſation of thoſe Oracles ſomewhat before the time of our Saviour's coming, and a total Ceſſation of them in and after the time of the Emperour *Theodoſius*, when the Religion of Paganiſm was ruin'd in the Roman Empire. Which Ceſſation of Oracles cannot be attributed to our Saviour's injoining them ſilence, (*d*) as ſeveral ancient Wri-

(u) Spencer ſupr. l. 3. Diſſ. 5. c. 7. S. 1.

(w) P. 300, 301.

(x) Spencer ſupr. Diſſ. 6. c. 2. S. 3.

(y) Seld. de D. Syr. Synt. 1. c. 2.

(z) S. Hierom. adv. Vigilant.

(a) Theodoret. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 10.

(b) Baron. ad an. 311. n. 45.

(c) Van Dale de orac. p. 314, 320, 331, &c.

(d) V. Van Dale de orac. Diſſ. 1. Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p. 45, 46. Theodor. Θεραπ. Ser. 10.

ters of the Church ſuppoſe, nor is the Anſwer of *Apollo Delphicus* to *Auguſtus* (that an Hebrew Child had commanded him to remove from his Dwelling) any thing better than Eccleſiaſtic Legendary Stuff; but the true reaſon both of the partial and total ceſſation of theſe Heathen Oracles may reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to be this; *The God of this World hath his proper times and ſeaſons for Oracles and Miracles as well as the true God.* Before our Saviour's coming there was a ceſſation of *Oracles, Miracles, Prophets and appearances of Angels in the Church of God*, which were uſual in the ancient times of the Church, and continu'd for many Ages. And although upon our Saviour's coming they were reviv'd again, yet now they are totally ceaſed, and this ceſſation of them hath been for many Centuries of Years. Upon the ceſſation of miraculous and prophetic Gifts in the Chriſtian Church Satan had a proper time and ſeaſon for his Oracles and Miracles, ſuch Oracles and Miracles as introduc'd *Church-Demonolatry* (the generality of the degenerate Chriſtian Church running mad that way:) but thoſe Oracles and Miracles of his declin'd, and either have totally vaniſh'd, or at leaſt have been Rarities in degenerate Chriſtendom for many Ages. So the elder times of Paganiſm were a proper time and ſeaſon for the Devil's Oracles, when Heathen Mankind ran mad after them; but about and ſomewhat before the time of our Saviour's coming, (*e*) they ſlighted them, and grew averſe from them (finding much of Illuſion and Impoſture in their Diviners and their Divination, as there is in all Magick,) and the Devil found that was not a proper time and ſeaſon for Oracles, which muſt neceſſarily cauſe a partial Ceſſation of them, as the ruin of the Pagan Religion in the *Roman* Empire by *Theodoſius* muſt neceſſarily cauſe a total ceſſation of them. Agreeably to this Account of the ceſſation of the Pagan Oracles (namely, *that the God of this World hath his proper time and ſeaſon for Oracles as well as the true God*) the Apoſtate *Julian* diſcourſeth touching the Pagans Divinatory Enthuſiaſm, which was a principal Fountain of Oracles. (*f*) *The Spirit or Inſpiration which cometh from the Gods to Men, is but ſeldom and in a few. It is not eaſie, for every Man to be partaker of it, nor at every time; accordingly it is ceas'd among the Hebrews, nor hath it continu'd among the Egyptians until now. It ſeemeth alſo, that thoſe Oracles, which were of Divine Original, yield to the Revolutions of Time; which our Lord and Father* Jupiter, *a lover of Men, conſidering, that we might not be altogether deſtitute of Communion with the Gods, he gave us the ſacred Arts* (of Divination) *and the Inquiry that we make by them, that thereby we might have ſufficient help for our needs.*

IX. An *Eighth* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is *the Sibylline Oracles*, which were an eminent Branch of that impure Magick and Wizardiſm that reign'd in Paganiſm and govern'd the Heathen World. The Name *Sibylla* ſignifieth an Oracle, (*g*) for it is deriv'd from Σιὸς (which in the Æolick Dialect is the Name for God) and βουλὴ, *Mind*, and therefore denoteth *the Mind of God made known* (in the way of Divination) which is an Oracle. The Sibylls were ſo many perſonal Oracles, and every ἔνθους ϗ μαντικὴ γυνὴ, *inſpir'd, fatidical or divinatory Woman* (as *Strabo* calleth a Sibyll) might have been called by their Name; but uſe hath appropriated the Name to ſome of them (the Number is uncertain) that were eminently ſuch. *Divinitas & quædam cœlitum ſocietas nobiliſſima ex fœminis in Sibylla fuit: Amongſt Women Divinity and a moſt noble Society of the Celeſtials, was in the Sibyll*, ſaith *Pliny*. So the Poet *Virgil* deſcribeth the Sibyll.

—— *Magnam cui mentem animumque*
Delius inſpirat Vates, aperitque futura.
Who by Apollo's *Inſpiration*
Hath a great mind for Divination.

The Eminency of their Magical Divination appeareth in the place of their abode; for they liv'd ſequeſtred from common Converſation in ſome ſpacious Grot or Den (as Goddeſſes in their Temple,) which was an uſual place amongſt the Pagans for Magical Correſpondences (*for this is one of their Modes of Divination*, (*h*) *to converſe with ſubterraneous Demons in a caliginous Den about things future*, ſaith Gr. *Naz.* whence the ſame Poet ſaith of the Sibyll,

Horrendas canit ambages antroque remugit.

Reſiding in their Dens they were conſulted and gave Oracular Anſwers at the ſame rate with *the Local-perſonal Oracles* (the Delphic, Ammonian or the like:) So *Æneas* in *Virgil* conſulted the *Sibyll*, who is ſaid to have foretold him all that ſhould befall him.

—— *Horrendæque procul ſecreta Sibyllæ,*
Antrum immane petit. ——

The divinatory Enthuſiaſm of other Oracles is well atteſted; but the divinatory Enthuſiaſm of the *Sibylls* hath ſo great and many Atteſtations, that to ſuppoſe it nothing more than Humane Artifice, Impoſture or Diſtemper, is to prefer *Lucian* and *Epicurus* before all the Learned Heathen Writers, *Philoſophers*, *Poets* and *Hiſtorians*. Nor do theſe Learned Writers give a bare Atteſtation to the *Sibylls* and their Oracles; but they rationally prove, and give Inſtances of their more than Humane Divination. (*i*) *Boethus* the Epicurean derideth the *Sibylls* Predictions as nothing more than words fortuitouſly thrown out, ſome of which were fortuitouſly fulfill'd. But *Plutarch* (in the Perſon of *Serapio*) anſwereth; (*k*) *Not only the future Event is foretold, but how and when, in what order and with what concomitants*; and ſuch a Prediction is more than a fortuitous throwing out words, and more than a bare Conjecture, it is τῶν πάντως ἐσομένων προδήλωσις, *a premonſtration of the things that will certainly come to paſs.* Thus the Sibyll foretold (ſaith he) the *Romans* Conqueſt of the *Carthaginians* with the emerſion of a new Iſland (that ſhould emerge with much Fire and boyling of the Waves) and their making War with all Nations together five hundred Years before the time. (*l*) The Sibyll (ſaith *Pauſanias*) οὐκ ἄνευ θεοῦ, *not without God* foretold to the *Macedonians* —— ἀγαθὸν ϗ πῆμα Φίλιππος, *that a* Philip *ſhould be both their Good and their Damage, that by one* Philip *they ſhould gain Power and Glory, and by another they ſhould loſe it.* The *Athenians* alſo cite the Sibylline Oracles (as the ſame Author reporteth)

(e) Cic. de Div. l. 2. Strabo, l. 16, 17.

(f) Τὸ γὰρ ἐκ θεῶν εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἀφικνούμενον πνεῦμα, σπανιάκις μὲν ϗ ἐν ὀλίγοις γίνεται, ϗ οὔτε πάντα ἄνδρα τούτου μετασχεῖν ῥάδιον, οὔτε ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ· ταύτῃ τοι ϗ τὸ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἀπέλιπεν, οὐκ οὖν οὐδὲ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις εἰς τοῦτο σώζεται· φαίνεται δὲ ϗ τὰ αὐτοφυῆ χρηστήρια ταῖς τῶν χρόνων εἴκοντα περιόδοις. ὁ δὴ φιλάνθρωπος ἡμῶν δεσπότης ϗ πατὴρ Ζεὺς ἐννοήσας· ὡς ἂν μὴ παντάπασι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποστερηθῶμεν κοινωνίας, δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τεχνῶν ἐπίσκεψιν, ὑφ' ἧς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἕξομεν τὴν ἀποχρῶσαν βοήθειαν. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 6. p. 198.

(g) Orac. Sibyll. p. 2, 129. Montacut. Apparat. 5.

(h) Gr. Naz. or. 3. p. 71.

(i) Plut. de Pyth. orac. p. 399.

(k) Οὐ μόνον λέγεται τὸ γ νησόμενον, ἀλλὰ ϗ πῶς ϗ πότε ϗ μετὰ τί ϗ μετὰ τίνος. Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l. 1. c.

(l) Orac. Sibyll. p. 415.

eth) that foretold their defeat at *Ægos Potamos*, and that it ſhould befall them,

——Δολεροῖσι τρόποις κακότητι νομήων.

by the treacherous dealings of their Leaders.

The Sibylls and their Oracles therefore have not only the Atteſtation of particular Men, but of great States and Governments, eſpecially of the greateſt Government in the World; for (*m*) *no holy or ſacred thing is ſo kept amongſt the* Romans (ſaith *Dionyſ. Halicarn.*) *as the Sibylline Oracles.* Theſe Oracles were kept recondit from the People, whence a Pontifician Theologer (*n*) taketh occaſion to commend the Pagans as wiſer than the Hereticks, and to applaud the Equity and Sanctity of his *Roman* Church *in not granting the People liberty to read the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue*; which is a fair acknowledgment, that the Religion of the Church of *Rome* is Pagano-Chriſtian, and that ſhe ſymbolizeth with *Rome* Pagan; which for the cuſtody of her Sibylline Oracles (that were not always the ſame; for the *Romans* firſt Sibylline Oracles were burned in the burning of the Capitol, to ſupply the place whereof, they ſent abroad, and made a Collection of ſuch Sibylline Oracles as they could get) appointed the *Quindecim viri ſacris faciundis*, theſe they conſulted, when any danger threatned their Commonwealth; and by the (real or pretended) direction of theſe Oracles they placated their ſeveral Deities, built Temples to them, dedicated Images, made Vows, Prayers, Supplications, Oblations, Sacrifices, Luſtrations, Expiations, Proceſſions about the City, ſang Verſes, inſtituted Feſtivals, Faſts, Holy-days, Sacred Times and Solemnities, *Lectiſternia*, and publick Spectacles in honour of their Deities. By theſe Oracles (*o*) τρία κάππα κάκιστα, *the three worſt of Cappa's* were predicted, by their monition the Symbol of the Goddeſs *Cybele* was ſent for from *Peſſinus*, and the Symbol of *Æſculapius* from *Epidaurus* (to recover the Salubrity of the City) and brought to *Rome*. And by the direction of theſe Oracles the *Romans* made thoſe extraordinary Sacrifices (which *Livy* calleth *minime Romanum ſacrum*) their ἀνθρωποθυσίας, *Humane Sacrifices*, which Sacrifices ſhew, that in ſome caſes at leaſt they really had and follow'd the direction of the Sibylline Oracles, that their Sibylline Oracles were of Magical or Diabolical Original, and that the *Roman* Empire was under the Domination and Government of Satan, who can make great and ſtrange Predictions upon this account amongſt others, becauſe (though not without limitation) he hath ſo great a ſtroke in the Affairs of this World, that he can fulfill his own Predictions.

X. This account of the Sibylls and their Oracles is not well conſiſtent with their Opinion, who ſuppoſe them, to have been ſo ſupernaturally aſſiſted (or inſpir'd) as that *they predicted the coming of Chriſt and the times of Chriſtianity*. This Opinion is grounded upon the *fourth Eclogue of Virgil* (a Prophecy of the Cumæan Sibyll,) that ſeemeth to be meant of Chriſt (although the Poet flatteringly applieth it to *Saloninus Pollio's* Son,) upon a Sibylline Oracle in *Cicero*'s time, which predicted a King, and upon a Saying of *Cicero* himſelf, who would have the Sibylline Oracles made uſe of, *for the taking down, rather than the taking up Religions.* To countenance this Opinion (which hath the Suffrage of S. *Auſtin* and of ſeveral other ancient Writers of the Church) the Prophecies of *Balaam* are alledg'd; for why might not the Sibylls be ſupernaturally aſſiſted, to predict Chriſt's coming among the Pagans in the Weſt, as well as *Balaam* the Aramitick Sorcerer in the Eaſt? This Opinion is well deſign'd (to recommend Chriſtianity) and is the iſſue of pious and good Affection, but the Grounds of it are not ſolid. For (ſuppoſing *Balaam*'s Prophecies to be meant of Chriſt, which is not probable) there is a great diſparity between the Aramitick Sorcerer and the meer Paganical Witches and Wizards. *Balaam* had the knowledge of the God of *Iſrael*, whereas the Sibylls were perfect Pagans. In reſpect of his Behaviour *Balaam* was ἐπαμφοτερίζων, ſometimes ſiding with God and his People, and ſometimes with their Adverſaries; and therefore as *Bellarmine* ſtileth *Eraſmus* but *Semi-Chriſtianus*; ſo *Balaam* may be called but *Semi-Paganus*, although the worſer half of him was the better half and the more prevalent, upon which account he muſt be conſider'd as a Pagan Sorcerer. But in his Prophecies he was joyn'd with the People of God, he was imploy'd to propheſie by their God on their behalf, his Prophecies were Oracles given to them, and are a part of the Jews Oracles, to whom alone were committed the Oracles of God, and who alone had the promiſe of the Meſſiah. If we ſuppoſe, that the Heathen World was not *without Chriſt, without the Promiſe, without the Covenants, without the Oracles, that Chriſt was preach'd to them before the Goſpel was preach'd*, we ſpeak ſelf-contradictions, and expreſly contradict the Scripture; and therefore the caſe of *Balaam* and of the *Sibylls* are far from being parallel. The Propheſie of the *Cumæan Sibyll* in *Virgil's fourth Eclogue* may ſeem at firſt ſight to be meant of Chriſt and the times of Chriſtianity; but upon a thorough inſpection it will appear, to be nothing elſe but a Branch of pure Pagan Theology, and ſuch a Branch of it which was pure Paganical Phancy.

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas,
Magnus ab integro ſeclorum naſcitur ordo,
Jam redit & virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto, &c.

In this Poem ſeveral Branches of the Poetic Fabulous Theology, the Platonic *magnus Annus* (great Year) and the Cumæan Sibylls Prophecy are complicated together. The ſeveral Branches of the Poetic Fabulous Theology are *The fabulous Virgin* Aſtræa, Saturn's *reign and the Golden Age*, which the Pagans phancy'd to be an Age of ſenſitive mundane Felicity, (*p*) and therefore the Poets call their *Elyſium* (where ſoft and pompous ſenſitive Delights abound) τὴν Κρόνου τύρσιν, *the City of* Saturn, and deſcribe it by the Golden Age. (*q*) As the Men of the Golden Age are call'd by *Heſiod*, *the Men of the Golden-kind:* So *Aurea progenies* in the Poet *Claudian* (*ſurgit gens aurea mundo*) is the ſame with *Nova progenies* in the Poet *Virgil*.

Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto.

The Poetic Phancy of the Golden Age is complicated by *Virgil* with the Phancy of the Platonic *magnus Annus* or great Year, (*r*) according to *Servius*, and as the Poet's words import.

Magnus ab integro ſeclorum naſcitur ordo.

(m) Ibid. p. 464.

(n) P. Lanſel. calumn. Caſaub. diſp. c. 6. inter oper. J. Mart.

(o) Orac. Sibyll. p. 480, 482, 486, 492.

Rom. 3. 2. and 9. 4. Eph. 2. 12.

(p) Pindar. Olymp. od. 2.

(q)——*Illic pretioſior ætas Aurea progenies habitat.*— Claudian. de rapt. Proſerp. l. 2.

(r) *Dixit etiam finitis omnibus ſeculis rurſus eadem renovari. quam rem etiam philoſophi hac diſputatione colligunt, dicentes, completo magno anno omnia ſidera in ortus ſuos redire, &*

referri rurſus eodem motu, quod ſi idem ſiderum motus, neceſſe eſt, ut omnia quæ fuerunt habeant iterationem.

The Poetic Phancy of the Golden Age and the Platonic Phancy of a great Year is complicated by *Virgil* with the Prophecy of the *Cumæan Sibyll*, who divided the Ages of the World by the Metals:

Ultima Cumæi venit jam Carminis ætas.

The *Cumæan Sibyll* therefore (according to *Virgil*'s account of things) foretold the reſtitution of the *Poets Golden Age, Golden kind, the return of their Virgin* Aſtræa, *of the Reign of* Saturn, and nothing more. She predicted an Age of Pagano-mundane Virtue and of Pagano-mundane Felicity; which implieth, that her Predictions were touching things and perſons, that have no connection at all with *Chriſt*, *Chriſtians* and *Chriſtianity*, but are wholly alien and of a diſſonant kind. Chriſt and Chriſtianity were no conſtitutive Ingredients of the firſt Paganical Golden Age, nor muſt they be thought conſtitutive Ingredients of that Golden Age reſtor'd. If the *Cumæan Sibylls* Prophecy was meant of things and perſons Chriſtian, whence is it, that it was never ſo underſtood, till the Theologers of the Church affix'd ſuch a Senſe to it? For her Predictions were not only as intelligible by Pagans as by Chriſtians, but they had far greater advantages of underſtanding her Senſe; yet none in the Heathen World ever underſtood the Sibylls Prophecies to be meant of the things and perſons of Chriſtianity; and we muſt not ſay, *that the Sibylls were ſupernaturally aſſiſted, to predict Chriſt among the Pagans in the Weſt*, ſo as that no body could ever underſtand them, to ſpeak of any thing Chriſtian. They that interpret the *Cumæan Sibylls* Prophecy to be meant of Chriſt, may as well interpret the *Virgo* in *Virgil*, (s) to be meant of the Virgin *Mary* (as a great Man hath interpreted it;) and at the ſame rate of confounding things Paganical and Chriſtian, they may interpret *Plato*'s ἀποκατάστασις (Reſtitution) to be the ſame with the Chriſtian *Reſtitution of all things*, Act. 3. 21. But there is no appearance, no probability, that the *Cumæan* Sibyll in this Prophecy predicted the Birth or Coming of any perſon particularly; but that Pagan Propheteſs having foretold *a Golden Age and a Golden Kind* (to commence after the Iron,) *Virgil* in complement and flattery to *Pollio* dateth the *Epocha* of that *Golden Age* and the Inchoation of that *Golden Kind* from the birth of his Son *Saloninus*, whom he ſtileth (ſpeaking nothing but groſly Paganical Senſe and Language)

Clara Deum ſoboles, magnum Jovis incrementum.

There is no appearance, that the *Cumæan Sibyll* foretold ſo much as *the Birth or Coming of a King*; for the Poet *Virgil* ſaith nothing of it (he only ſaith, that *Apollo* reigneth, becauſe of the completion of his Prediction in the commencing of the Golden Kind;) but about his time in *Cicero*'s Days a Rumour was ſpread about by *Cæſar*'s Party (who deſign'd for him the Honour of King) that the *Sibylline Oracles* pronounc'd, (t) *The* Parthians *could never be vanquiſh'd but by a King*, as the *Roman* Hiſtorians relate. *Cicero* giveth this Account of that Sibylline Oracle, which *Cæſar*'s Party alledg'd on his behalf. *Eum, quem revera Regem habebamus, appellandum quoque eſſe Regem, ſi ſalvi eſſe vellemus*; which words (that plainly enough concern the Diſpute of thoſe times, whether *Cæſar* ſhould be ſaluted and called King or not) are thus render'd into Engliſh by a Learned Man: *That if we would be ſafe, we ſhould acknowledge him for a King, who really was ſo.* *Grotius* ſaith, (u) *In thoſe ſame Sibylline Oracles this was contained, that we muſt acknowledge him for King, who was indeed our King.* Thus by a careleſs repreſenting and tranſlating a Sibylline Oracle, it is made to carry a ſhew of being meant of Chriſt. But beſides that the Senſe is diſtorted, there is great reaſon to believe, that this Sibylline Oracle, as *Cæſar*'s Party called it, was not genuine. *Dio* and *Plutarch* ſpeak ſlightly of it; *Cicero* argueth, that the pretended Sibylline Verſes containing this Oracle are counterfeit, becauſe of the *Acroſtick* that is in them. The Learned *Varro* and *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſ.* are of *Cicero*'s mind, they pronounce them Suppoſititious, and make the Acroſtick an Indication of their Spurioſneſs. But if we ſuppoſe, that this Sibylline Oracle was not Suppoſititious, the utmoſt that can be inferr'd from thence, will be nothing more than thus much. *The* Romans *found ſomething in their Sibylline Oracles, that favour'd the change of their Government from a Commonwealth into a Monarchy*; for that this Sibylline Oracle (real or pretended) concern'd the *Roman* Monarchy and nothing more, plainly and undeniably appeareth from that Branch of it before cited from *Dio*, *Plutarch* and *Suetonius*, *that the* Parthians *could never be vanquiſh'd but by a King*. If the *Roman* Hiſtorians had reported to us a Sibylline Oracle, which foretold the riſe of *a new King and Kingdom* diſtinct from the *Roman* Monarchy, or if *Virgil's Eclogue* had reported to us ſuch a Sibylline Oracle, there had been juſt ground for this Hypotheſis, *that the Sibylls* foretold *the coming of Chriſt and the Kingdom of Chriſtianity*; but in all the *Roman* Hiſtorians and in that miſtaken *Eclogue* there is *nec vola nec veſtigium* of ſuch a Sibylline Oracle. Nor can the Patrons of that Hypotheſis relieve themſelves by that Saying of *Cicero* touching the Sibylline Oracles; (w) *Valeant ad deponendas potius, quàm ad ſuſcipiendas religiones*, *let them be of avail for the taking down, rather than the taking up Religions.* For *Cicero* in this Saying doth not at all intimate, *that thoſe Oracles of themſelves rather tended to the leſſening than the increaſing the Pagans Superſtitions*; or, *that thoſe Oracles predicted a change of the Pagan Religion, to be introduc'd by the worſhip of one God*. It is not poſſible, that *Cicero* ſhould intimate any ſuch thing, who knew very well, that a vaſt abundance of the *Roman* Superſtitions were introduc'd by the Sibylline Oracles. His words have plainly this meaning; *He would have the* Roman *Senate, to put their State-Oracles to a contrary uſe, than they had hitherto been put to, not to the increaſing Superſtition* (of the overſpreading whereof he ſadly complaineth in his ſecond Book *de Divinatione*,) *but the abating and retrenching it*. His words are; (x) *Let us have the Sibyll, not expos'd, but hidden, that as our Anceſtors enjoyn'd, the Books may not be ſo much as read without the command of the Senate, and let them* (the State-Oracles) *be put to this uſe, the taking down, rather than the taking up Religions or Superſtitions.* *Cicero* had a mean Opinion of the Sibylline Oracles, and would have them ſubordinated to the Intereſt of the Commonwealth; but the

more

(s) *Orac. Sibyll.* p. 442.

(t) *Nunquam Parthos aliter quàm à Rege ſuperari poſſe.*

(u) *In iiſdem Sibyllinis erat, pro rege agnoſcendum, qui verè rex noſter eſſet.* De V. R. C. l. 4. S. 9.

(w) Intell. Syſt. p. 283.

(x) *Sibyllam quidem ſepoſitam & conditam habeamus, ut, id quod proditum eſt à majoribus, injuſſu Senatus ne legantur quidem libri, valeantque ad deponendas potiùs, quàm ad ſuſcipiendas religiones.*

more Religious Romans had a like veneration for them, as the Greeks had for their Delphic *Apollo*. The Apoſtate *Julian* ſpeaketh their Senſe. (y) *It appeareth that* Jupiter *gave theſe* (mighty beneficial) *things to the City by Divine Correption and Inſpiration, by the Sibylls Oracles and thoſe others, that were in their Country-language Oracle-ſpeakers.* Their Sibylls were had in greateſt Eſteem agreeably to their Divinations, which were great and extraordinary. Nor is their Credit blaſted by our Interpretation of the *Cumæan* Sibyll's Prophecy, which underſtood only in a general Senſe as a Prediction of a future happy State of things upon Earth muſt be allow'd to be a true Prediction.

But like the reſt of the Pagan Oracles the Sibylline muſt be deriv'd from the God of this World; yet not without the over-ruling, ordering and diſpoſal of the Divine Providence, which in ſome Caſes more eſpecially concern'd it ſelf for the fulfilling its own Decrees and Deſigns, as an ancient Writer diſcourſeth. (z) *It was not without Divine Providence, that the Nations truſting their Oracles were deceiv'd by them, made War with the Aſſyrian and fail'd of their hopes.* Iſa. 10. 5. *Or that the Aſſyrian was incourag'd by his Oracles, to undertake his proſperous Wars. In the Wars between* Alexander *and* Darius *Divine Providence confirm'd the oracular Predictions which the one had, and fruſtrated the Oracles of the other.* The King of *Babylon* ſtood at the parting of the Way, at the head of the two Ways, to uſe Divination, to know which way to lead his Army with good Succeſs, againſt the *Ammonites*, or againſt the *Jews*, and by the diſpoſal of Divine Providence his Divination directed him, to lead his Army againſt *Jeruſalem*. Ezek. 21. 21, 22. So by the diſpoſal of Divine Providence (*a*) there might be a Prodigy at *Rome* a little before *Auguſtus* was born, which portended (according to *Jul. Marathus*) *regem pop. Rom. Naturam parturire, that Nature was parturient of a King for the People of* Rome. The Romans might have a *Sibylline Oracle*, which perſwaded them to a King (as *Cæſar*'s Party pretended) at ſuch a time, when Divine Providence deſign'd the Erection of the Roman Empire or Monarchy. And as *Auguſtus*'s ſhutting the Temple of *Janus* may well be thought a prelude deſign'd by Providence, to uſher in the King of Peace: So the Erection of the Roman Empire or Monarchy, the Preſages, Sibylline Oracles and buſie Expectations of Men touching a King in *Jul. Cæſar*'s time, may reaſonably be thought a prelude deſign'd by Providence, to uſher in a Divine King and his Divine Empire; and this is all the Chriſtianity that I know of in the *ancient genuine Sibylline Oracles*. As for the Sibylline Oracles which we now have, they are doubtleſs the compilement of ſuch Chriſtians, (*b*) whom the better ſort of Chriſtians reproach'd with the Name of *Sibylliſtæ* (becauſe of their extravagant addictedneſs to Sibylline Oracles;) but there is in this *Farrago* of Oracles, (*c*) the Forgeries of ſome Jews in the later times of their Commonwealth. A craſs Impoſture theſe Sibylline Oracles are, yet there are thoſe in the Chriſtian Church, that ſay of God, (*d*) *as by his Son he illuminateth the impious as well as the pious, ſo by a wonderful Counſel he gave much more clear Revelations touching the Meſſiah to the Prophets of the Pagans, as may appear from the Sibylline Oracles, than to the Prophets of the Jews themſelves.*

XI. A *Ninth* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is the monſtrous *anomalous* Sanctity of the Pagan Religioniſts, which ſpeaketh them Satan's Religioniſts, and that the Rites of their Religion were of his Inſtitution. (*e*) Such were the Rites of the *Zabii* (ſo monſtrouſly anomalous, that they could never have come into any Man's Head, if the Devil had not invented and inſtituted them,) *the plowing with an Ox and an Aſs together* (probably to make their Agriculture proſperous, *Deut.* 22. 10.) the making thoſe kind of Animals copulate and gender together, *Lev.* 19. 19. *The ſeething a Kid in his Mother's Milk* (making the Mother deſtructive of her own Off-ſpring by her own Milk, *Exod.* 21. 19.) and their defiouring a young Woman in a Preternatural way at the preciſe time, when they grafted a Sciens into any Tree, as *Maimonides* relateth. Of like abſurdity and anomaly to theſe magical Rites were many Inſtitutes of the Heathen Religion; for what can be more prodigiouſly abſurd and anomalous than *their Holineſs of Uncleanneſs and Filthineſs, their Sanctity of Sodomy and Beaſtiality?* Such was the Sanctity of thoſe ſolemn Religious Inſtitutions the *Dionyſiaca*, *Cybelaica*, *Iſiaca*, *Eleuſinia*, and the like, (*f*) *the ſenſleſneſs on the one ſide and the beaſtlineſs and wickedneſs on the other, of thoſe things that were performed and obſerv'd under the Name of Religion being beyond all exaggeration, nay beyond any ſober Man's Imagination. Their hidden Myſteries that were called* Opertanea, *were not inſtituted at one time, nor by one; they differ'd in ſome certain Rites and Ceremonies: But in point of Brutiſhneſs and Licentiouſneſs were otherwiſe ſo like, that though we diſtinguiſh the Founders by Names, yet we muſt needs acknowledge them all guided by one Spirit, ſtiled in the Goſpel an unclean Spirit.* S. *Auſtin* maketh this Inference from the Romans Scenical Plays (having been a Spectator of them,) wherein were celebrated and repreſented both by acting and ſinging (full of obſcenity) the flagitious things that were perpetrated by their Deities, (*g*) *By being pleas'd with ſuch things as theſe they confeſs themſelves to be unclean Spirits.* *Strabo* relateth of the multitude of People, that went from *Alexandria* in *Egypt* to the feſtival Conventions at *Canopus*, where the God *Serapis* had his Temple, (*h*) that they behav'd themſelves μετὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀκολασίας, *with the moſt extreme laſciviouſneſs.* And of the City *Comana* in *Cappadocia* he relateth, (*i*) *that it was a little* Corinth, *and that there was there a multitude of Women, that traded and got Money with their Bodies, the moſt of which were ſacred.* Above a thouſand ſuch Women liv'd in the Temple of *Venus* at *Corinth*, who traded with their Bodies, and as Prieſteſſes thus did ſervice to their Goddeſs. For theſe ſacred Harlots were conſecrated to their Deities, and committed Harlotry as an Act of Religion and God-ſervice in honour of their Deities, to whom alſo their impure gain was conſecrated, as *Herodotus* relateth, agreeably to that account which the Apocryphal Epiſtle of *Jeremy* giveth

---

(y) Ταῦτα μὲν ἐκ καλῆς ἐπιπνοίας θείας, ἔκ τε τῶν τῆς Σιβύλλης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, οἳ δὴ γεγόνασι κατὰ τὴν πάτριον φωνὴν χρησμολόγοι, φαίνεται δοὺς ὁ Ζεὺς τῇ πόλει. S. Cyr. c. *Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 194.

(z) *J. Mart. Q. & R. ad orthod. Qu.* 146.

(a) *Sueton. in Auguſt. c.* 94.

(b) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 272.

(c) *Joſeph. Antiquit. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

(d) *Ut ſole ſuo impios æque ac pios illuſtrat, ita vatibus Ethnicorum admirando conſilio multo clariores de Meſſia Revelationes dedit, ſicut ex Sibyllinis conſtare poteſt, quàm ipſiſmet Judæorum Prophetis.* Præfat. Typograph. Plotin. oper. præmiſſ.

(e) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 2. *c.* 8, 19, 20.

(f) *D. Mer. Caſaub. of Enthuſiaſm. p.* 6, 7.

(g) *Se hujuſcemodi voluptatibus immundos ſpiritus eſſe confitentur.* De C. D. l. 2. c. 26.

(h) *L.* 17.

(i) *V. Spencer. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 22, 23.

of the Babylonian ſacred Women, *v.* 43. *The Women alſo with cords about them ſitting in the ways burn bran for perfume, but if any of them, drawn by ſome that paſſeth by, lye with him, ſhe reproacheth her fellow, that ſhe was not thought as worthy as her ſelf, nor her cord broken.* “The Babylonians (ſaith *Herodotus*) have this moſt filthy Law; every Woman of that Country ſitting in the Temple of *Venus* muſt once in her Life-time have to do with a Man that is a Stranger. But many being Rich, and thereby puffed up, diſdaining to aſſociate with the other Women, being carry'd in the arched or vaulted part of Waggons, ſtand before the Temple, their multitude of Servants following. The moſt do in this manner. In the Temple of *Venus* there ſitteth crown'd with a ſmall Cord about their Head, a multitude of Women, of which ſome come, others go away. Extended Lines or Cords diſtinguiſh their places, which have every way a paſſage to them becauſe of the Women-Strangers thereby paſſing they are choſen out. If any Woman ſitteth there,. ſhe may not return home, till ſome Stranger throwing Money into her Lap have had to do with her without the Temple. When he caſteth the Money into her Lap, he muſt ſay, Ἐπικαλέω τοι τὴν θεὰν Μύλιττα, *I invoke thee Goddeſs Mylitta*, for the Aſſyrians call *Venus Mylitta.* This Money how much ſoever it is, ſhe may not refuſe, for this Money becometh ſacred, nor doth ſhe reject any, but followeth the firſt that caſteth Money into her Lap. After ſhe hath had to do with him, being conſecrated to the Deity (or having done the Sacra of the Deity) ſhe is at liberty to return Home, and from thenceforth no ſuch great matter is requiſite to enjoy her. So many of theſe as are very beautiful, are ſpeedily ſet at liberty: But thoſe of them that want beauty ſtay a great time, not being able to fulfil the Law; for ſome of them ſtay the time of three or four Years. Somewhere in *Cyprus* there is a like Law. (*k*) Amongſt the *Cypriots* it was a Cuſtom for young Women to gain themſelves a Portion by playing the Harlot before Marriage, conſecrating part of their gain to their unclean Goddeſs, and there were the like Cuſtoms amongſt the *Lydians*, *Armenians*, *Phœnicians*, *Egyptians*, *Africans.* And as there were in Paganiſm Women, that were ſacred Harlots, ſo there were Men alſo that were *ſacred Pathicks* (or Sodomites) agreeably to that γενέσεως ἐναλλαγή, *change of Kind*, which the Book of *Wiſdom* remarketh in Paganiſm. And both theſe ſorts of ſacred Scortators (the Feminine and Maſculine) are probably thought to be the Perſons prohibited in the Moſaic Law, *Deut.* 23. 17. *There ſhall be no* קדשה *Whore of the daughters of Iſrael, nor a* קדש *ſodomite of the ſons of Iſrael.* But ſuch ſacred Sodomites appertain'd to the Religion of Heathen Idolatry. (*l*) “In ſome part of *Peru* there were Boys conſecrated to ſerve in the Temple, and at the times of their Sacrifices and ſolemn Feaſts the Lords and principal Men abus'd them to that deteſtable filthineſs. And generally in the Hill-Countries the Devil under ſhew of Holineſs had brought in that Vice. Every Temple or principal Houſe of Adoration kept one Man or two or more, which were attir'd like Women, even from the time of their Childhood, and ſpake like them, imitating them in every thing under a Pretext of Holineſs and Religion their principal Men on principal Days had that helliſh Commerce. A Friar dealt with two of theſe *Ganimedes* about the filthineſs of this Vice: And they anſwer'd, that they held it no Fault; for from their Childhood they had been plac'd there by their *Caciques*, both for that imployment, as alſo to be Prieſts and to keep the Temple. (*m*) The Temple of *Venus Aphacitis* in *Phœnicia* demoliſhed by *Conſtantine* was a School of Wickedneſs, where the Men were Women rather than Men, having relinquiſh'd their venerable Nature θηλείᾳ νόσῳ τὴν δαίμονα ἱλεῶντο, *by ſuffering what Women do, they propitiated the She-demon.* (*n*) *Men may be ſeen in the very Temples, to ſuffer the things that are proper to Women, and to make oſtentation of that foul blemiſh of an impure and unchaſt Body.* Some of the Heathens Religious Inſtitutes therefore reſemble their Deities, both were Prodigies of Uncleanneſs. (*o*) Their Groves of Idolatry were *ſacra proſtibula ſacred Brothel-houſes*, nor were their Temples of a better Character. (*p*) *So great was the fooliſhneſs of the Minds of Men, and ſo prone and precipitant was the rude vulgar to fleſhly Luſt, that almoſt all Mankind thought it no Wickedneſs, to perpetrate nefarious Unchaſtities in their Temples, ſuppoſing, that in ſo doing (becauſe the Seminary of Procreation) they did a ſacred thing.* As Harlotry and Sodomy were Branches of their Sanctimony: So their Religion ſanctified an immodeſt Rite bordering upon theſe Impurities, which the Moſaic Law (in oppoſition to their unclean Superſtition) prohibiteth, *Deut.* 22. 5. *The woman ſhall not wear that which pertaineth to a man, neither ſhall a man put on a womans garment: For all that do ſo, are abomination unto the Lord thy God.* (*q*) The *Phœnicians*, *Aſſyrians*, *Greeks*, *Aſiaticks*, and the generality of the Heathen Nations chang'd their Garments, when they perform'd the Sacra of ſome of their Deities, the Men putting on the Womens Apparel, and the Women the Mens Apparel (and ſometimes putting on the Mens Military Habiliments above their Feminine Apparel,) which leſſer Rites of Impurity iſſu'd in thoſe greater and more ſubſtantial Impurities Harlotry and Sodomy. (*r*) *It is not hard to conjecture, whence every one of theſe Impurities had its birth, ſeeing it is certain, that the moſt of the Gentiles ſacra had their Original from the unclean Spirit.* From this Original not only the Heathens groſſer Pollutions, but alſo their Rites of cleanſing and purifying (their Luſtrations, Purifications, Expiations) manifeſtly derive themſelves. (*s*) *For theſe* (ſaith *Procopius Gazæus*) *were wont to be made with Inchantments.* (*t*) *They have in veneration red Wooll and Grains of Salt, and Torches and Scilla and Sulphur inchanted by Magicians according to certain unclean Catharms.*

XII. A *Tenth* plain appearance in Paganiſm of Satan's Pagano-mundane Empire is the quality

---

(k) *Spencer. ſupr. Vives in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 4. *c.*10.

Ch. 14. 26.

1 *King.* 14. 24. *and ch.* 15. 12. 2 *King.* 23. 7.

(l) *Purchas par.* 1. *B.* 9. *c.* 11. *S.* 2.

(m) *Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. l.* 3. *c.* 55.

(n) *Videre eſt in ipſis Templis* ——— *viros muliebria pati, & hanc impuri & impudici corporis labem glorioſa oſtentatione detegere.* Jul Firmic. ap. Spencer. ſupr. c. 17.

(o) *Spencer. ſupr. c.* 15. *S.* 3. *c.* 23. *S.* 3.

(p) *Tanta animorum inſipientia fuit, & tam præceps libido imperiti vulgi, ut omnes ſere mortales in templis coire, & nefariis libidinibus immiſceri, ac pudendis genitalibus ſacram facere, quod procreationis ſeminarium forent, nefas non putarent.* Al. ab Alex. Gen. Dier. l. 6. c. 26.

(q) *Spencer. ſupr. c.* 17.

(r) *Unde mos ille natus eſt, conjectu non eſt difficile, cum certum ſit pleraque Gentium ſacra ſpiritui impuro principia ſua debuiſſe.* Spencer. ibid. c. 22.

(s) *Spencer. ibid. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 1.

(t) Ἔρια πυῤῥὰ ϗ ἁλῶν χόνδρυς, ϗ δᾳδας, σκίλλαν τε ϗ θεῖον δεδίασι πρὸς τῶν γοήτων καταγοητευθέντας κατά τινας ἀκαθάρτους καθαρμούς. *Clem. Strom.* 7. *p. m.* 512.

lity and character of the Roman Empire (an Empire of the Heathen Religion;) for by the bloody War which this Empire manag'd againſt the Religion of Chriſtianity and on behalf of its Heathen Gods and Religion, it is manifeſt, that the Univerſe of Rationals is in a divided State, divided into two oppoſite Kingdoms, which are in a State of War; which two oppoſite Kingdoms can be no other but the Kingdom of God and of Satan, the Divine and the Diabolical Empire. And if there be two ſuch oppoſite Kingdoms, they are eaſily diſtinguiſh'd by their oppoſite Nature and Character, and by their ſymbolizing with God and with Satan, who are alſo of oppoſite Nature and Character. For in the Divine kind of Kingdom the holy and Divine Life reigneth: But Satan's Kingdom is the Empire of atheous Darkneſs, of Fraud and Falſhood, of Lyes and Fables, of Luciferian Pride, Ambition and Domination, of Worldlineſs and Wickedneſs, of Lewdneſs and Uncleanneſs, (complicated with a Mock-Sanctimony and Civil Virtue) of ſottiſh ſervile Superſtition, of Idolatry, Demonolatry and Sorcery, of deadly Malignity and barbarous Cruelty; and ſuch was the Empire of *Rome* Pagan (as it was an Empire of the Heathen Religion,) and it were Happy, if the Empire of *Rome* Pagano-Chriſtian was not an Image of that Pagan Empire, and did not Symbolize with Satan's Kingdom in the main of its Characters, as it too manifeſtly doth; ſo prodigiouſly have his Artifices prevail'd againſt Chriſtianity. Which no ſooner began to diſpread it ſelf in the World, but there were plain appearances of an inviſible and deadly inimical Power vigorouſly oppoſing it and endeavouring the ruin of it, partly by introducing *monſtrous Hereſies* (the great ſcandal and prejudice of Chriſtianity) and partly by raiſing *tragical Perſecutions*. For the ſhole of the Gnoſtick Hereſies in the Primitive times were ſo monſtrous, that they are not to be thought on without horrour and amazement, the wickedneſs both of their Principles and their Practices was portentous to the height of wonder and aſtoniſhment, they exceed all thought and imagination of Man; and therefore every Man that can think a wiſe thought, will think them of Diabolical Original. A like portentous, unimaginable and unſpeakable were the tragical Sufferings of the Primitive Chriſtians from the Heathens of the Roman Empire, which therefore muſt be deriv'd from the ſame Original, the ſame Author that inſtituted their bloody Spectacles of Gladiators, that were a Rite of Human Sacrifices (u) *the Romans thereby intending to ſatiate their Deities with Human Blood.* If their Deities were of this Nature, the Roman Empire muſt be look'd upon as (w) *Dæmonarchia mundana, a mundane Demonarchy*, the Regent Party whereof was *the bloody truculent red Dragon* (*ſanguinolentum Numen*) and from him the Chriſtians tragical Perſecutions muſt be deriv'd, as will further appear from ſome other Conſiderations.

(1.) The tragical Perſecutions of the Chriſtians were ſuch an immenſity of Evils, as muſt in all Reaſon be deriv'd from an inimical hurtful Potentate or evil Power of a Superiour Nature to Man, and conſequently from *the evil One* (the eldeſt of all evil Ones, the Ringleader of them, who is evil to the height of being ſo, the Author, Artificer, and Promoter of all Evil;) therefore ſuch a Power exiſteth in the World and preſided *in the* Roman Empire. No other Hypotheſis can Salve this otherwiſe unaccountable Phænomenon. And with this Hypotheſis a great number of the Pagan Theologers (thoſe that are Ditheiſts and thoſe that are no Ditheiſts) ſo far agree, they acknowledge in the Univerſe both a Principle of Good, a beneficent Power, and alſo a Principle of Evil, an evil Power, which they call *Oromaſden & Arimanium, Oſirin & Typhonem, Jovem & Vejovem,* θεὸν ϗ δαίμονα, *God and Demon.* The Chalday Oracles make a conſiderable approach to the Chriſtian Hypotheſis; (x) *for the Chaldeans take Hades in various ſenſe and ſignification. They account Hades a God, who hath the Principality of the laſt and circumterraneous Lot or Portion.*

(2.) The tragical Perſecutions of the Chriſtians were for Religion and meerly for their Religion; for although the Heathens of the Roman Empire (y) charg'd them with *overturning the Commonwealth*, yet that was only, becauſe they were Adverſaries to the old eſtabliſh'd Religion, and introduc'd a new Religion, which they ſuppos'd, to be (in the conſequence of it) an overturning the Commonwealth. They ſuffer'd for Religion and God-ſervice, for appropriating it to the true God and his Chriſt, and for denying it to the Heathen Polity of Gods; which ſheweth, that their Perſecutions were a mighty Conteſt between two oppoſite Imperial Powers, both claiming their Religion and God-ſervice. They ſuffer'd for the Religion of the One only true God diſcarding all the Heathen Gods (whence they got the Name of Atheiſts,) which provok'd the diſpleaſure of the Heathen Gods, and enrag'd them againſt the Chriſtians, as the Heathen Romans ſuppos'd. Whence a Chriſtian Apologiſt thus ſpeaketh of our Religion. (z) *Is this that audacious and outragious wickedneſs, for which your heavenly Powers bend the Stings of their Anger and Indignation againſt us? For which your ſelves when you will exerciſe Cruelty, deſpoil us of our Goods, baniſh us, inflict upon us capital puniſhments, torture us, tear us* (with Whips, Shells, the Ungula) *torment us by Fire, and at laſt throw us to be torn in pieces by the wild Beaſts?* If the Heathens Deities were enrag'd againſt the Chriſtians, their horrendous ſufferings neceſſarily iſſu'd from the rage and truculency of the ſupreme of the Heathen Roman Deities.

(3.) The tragical Perſecutions of the Chriſtians were for the Religion of the Son of God, who in his Doctrine reproacheth and ſtigmatizeth Satan at the higheſt rate imaginable, it breaths and ſpeaks forth the greateſt Enmity and Hoſtility againſt him poſſible or conceiveable, and deſcribeth him in the blackeſt Character (as horribly odious and pernicious,) that none may conſort with him, but all may abominate him, abandon and reſiſt him, and take heed of the ruinous Miſchiefs he is doing againſt them. At the firſt of his coming into the World he profeſs'd an open Hoſtility againſt Satan, entred the Liſts and fought a Battel with him (as it were) Hand to Hand, repell'd and vanquiſh'd his Temptations, expell'd him out of his Poſſeſſions, beat his Troops out of their Quarters, and trampled upon his Power. His deſign and buſineſs was againſt Satan *as he is the Prince of this World*, to oppoſe his Deſigns and Intereſt, to diſcover him (that he may be hated, forſaken and reſiſted,) to *deſtroy his Works* (the deadly criminal and penal Evils of Men,) to deliver Mankind from being under his Reign and Power (and therefore from being under the Reign of Sin and the Law,) to withdraw them from being the Subjects of his Kingdom, to take his Kingdom from him, to ſet up an oppoſite Kingdom, to diſſipate his heatheniſh darkneſs, to aboliſh his Idol-worſhip, to ruin (by degrees) his mundane Domination, and at the long run to burn him and his Adherents. Agreeably to his deſign and buſineſs Chriſt ingageth all his Religioniſts, to follow the Captain of their Salvation in an Hoſtility againſt Satan, to be his deadly Enemies at the higheſt rate imaginable, to manage an Holy War againſt him (Offenſive and Defenſive,) againſt his Temptations, Intereſts and Deſigns; and he promiſeth to Crown them, if they be faithful and victorious in this War. Chriſtianity therefore pretending to raiſe a deadly and deſtructive War againſt an adverſe Power, if we ſee ſuch a War rais'd againſt Chriſtianity, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that it was rais'd by this adverſe Power, which would not be behind hand with Chriſt and Chriſtians in acts of War and Hoſtility; that as Chriſt's deſign and buſineſs was againſt this adverſe Power, ſo his deſign and buſineſs was againſt Chriſt, to ruin utterly his Religion and Kingdom, which was the deſign of the Roman Emperours in perſecuting Chriſtianity, and ſeveral of them thought that they had accompliſh'd it. And conſidering that this War was at the moſt prodigious rate *bellum internecinum, deadly, bloody and ſlaughtering*, it is but reaſonable to believe that this adverſe Power which rais'd it, is of Character *Abaddon, Apollyon*, (*a*) *our daily* Antiochus (*Epiphanes*) ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ϗ μισόκαλος, *a Man-ſlayer from the beginning and hater of that which is good.*

(u) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. c. 35.

(w) *Mr. Mede on Apoc.* 6. 12, 13, *&c.*

(x) Τὸν γὰρ ᾅδην πολλαχῶς καλοῦσι Χαλδαῖοι· θεόν τε γὰρ ἡγοῦνται τοῦτον, ϗ τῆς ἐσχάτης ϗ περιγείου λήξεως ἀρχηγόν. *Niceph. Schol. in Syneſ.* p. 383.

(y) *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 103.

(z) *Hoccine eſt audax illud facinus & immane, propter quod maximè cælites aculeos in nos intendunt irarum atque indignationum ſuarum? Propter quod vos ipſi, cùm libido inceſſerit ſæva, exuitis nos bonis, exterminatis patriis ſedibus, irrogatis ſupplicia capitalia, torquetis, dilaceratis, exuritis, & ad extremum nos feris & belluarum laniatibus objectatis?* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 1 p. 14.

(4.) The tragical Perſecutions of the Chriſtians were an *Inhumanity more than Human*, Human Nature is ſo abhorrent from it, that it could not have been in Man unleſs actuated by a Diabolical Spirit: As the Fortitude and Patience of the Chriſtians was plainly *Divine*, and could not have been in Man unleſs animated by a Divine Spirit. For the Torments and Executions of the Chriſtians (Racks, Croſſes, Wheels, Grid-irons, red-hot Iron Chairs, Brazen Bulls, wild Beaſts and innumerable others) are not to be thought on without horror, Human Nature is abhorrent from inflicting them upon any ſave only real or ſuppos'd Malefactors of the higheſt Demerit: But to inflict them upon the Innocent and the Righteous, becauſe they are the Innocent and the Righteous, upon vaſt multitudes of them of all Ages, Sexes and Conditions (which was really the Caſe of the Roman Empire,) this muſt be thought an *Inhumanity more than Human*, ſuch a Prodigy of Wickedneſs as could not be in Man unleſs acted by a Diabolical Spirit. (*l*) *This is* (otherwiſe) *unaccountable, that their Man-killing Trade is againſt thoſe that know not to do Evil.* This Conteſt in reſpect of the Intereſt conteſted about was a Tranſcendental to Human Wars. For the Chriſtians Tribulations were their Temptations to Apoſtacy from their God and Saviour; they militated for their Soul-Intereſts; and therefore they had great Reaſon to apprehend, that their Tribulations iſſu'd from ſuch an evil Power, which is the Fountain of Temptations, and that *they wreſtled not againſt Fleſh and Blood, but againſt Principalities, againſt Powers, againſt the Rulers of the darkneſs of this World.* And this is the more credible, becauſe the Chriſtians Fortitude was plainly *Divine-heroical*, (*c*) and ſuch as both in reſpect of Kind and Degree, and in reſpect of the vaſt multitudes that exercis'd it (who were of all Ages, Sexes and Conditions) far tranſcended any Fortitude, that is to be found in meer Human Nature. They made this noble Challenge; (*d*) *If God will have us combat again for Piety, let our Antagoniſts come, to whom we will ſay, I can do all things through him that ſtrengtheneth me.* (*e*) *Let the Ungula's dig us, the Croſſes hang us, the Fires be put to us, the Swords cut off our Throats, the Beaſts leap upon us, a Chriſtian is prepar'd for all torments.* (*f*) They entertain'd and bare their Sufferings, not only without Regret and Trouble, but with Joy and Exultation, laid down their Bodies for Piety more readily than a Philoſopher would put off his Cloak, and through an inſpir'd Patience (as themſelves ſay) the fire could not extort a Sigh from them. This ſtrange ſublimity of Virtue (*g*) ſtumbled ſome of their Adverſaries, convinc'd others of their Innocency, ſatisfy'd others, that ſomething of God was in them; ſo that in this tragical Conteſt with the Pagan Empire that of the Apoſtle was viſible, *greater is he that is in us, than he that is in the World.*

XIII. The Sufferings of the Primitive Chriſtians may reaſonably be thought an Effect, not only of the Popular Pagans Vice and Folly, but of the Philoſophic Pagans Wiſdom and Virtue; for their truly great and generous Maxims of Virtue in their ſenſe and application lead to the Perſecution of the Chriſtian Church and Religion, and make it Virtue and Duty. Their moſt noble and generous Maxims of Virtue are touching the Societive Duty of Man, Duty to the *Publick*, to the *Whole*, to the *Univerſe* of Rationals. For they ſuppoſed, that every particular Man is a Member of the *Publick* and of the *Whole* conſiſting of Heathen Gods and Men, a part of that whole; and that as a part he is for the whole intirely (for himſelf only as a part of the whole) for its Being and Well-being, to conſtitute and conſerve it, and to be uſeful and ſubſervient to its Intereſt, according to that ſaying of *Plato* in his *Tenth* of Laws, μέρος μὴν ἕνεκα ὅλου, *the part is for the whole.* (*h*) So the Phyſician cutteth off morbid Parts of the Body ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ ὅλου, *for the ſafety and welfare of the whole.* (*i*) *God hath ſhewed Human Phyſicians, to cut ſome Parts, burn others, putrifie others, divide others for the conſervation of the whole.* (*k*) *Both Nature and Art contemneth the Parts for the Whole. Nature driveth out the Humours that annoy her from the principal into the extimous Parts (from the Heart, Brain, Liver, and the Belly, into the Feet, Hands and Skin)*

(a) *Gr. Naz. or.* 22. p. 408. & *or.* 12. p. 199.

(b) *Hoc inenarrabile eſt, quod fit adverſus eos, qui malefacere neſciunt.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 9.

(c) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 2. p. 86.

(d) Ibid. l. 8. p. 424.

(e) *Nos ungulæ fodiant, cruces ſuſpendant, ignes lambant, gladii guttura detruncent, beſtiæ inſiliant, paratus eſt ad omne ſupplicium Chriſtianus.* Tertul. Apol. *c.* 30.

(f) *Ibid. c.* 2. & 50. Orig. *ſupr. l.* 7. *p.* 357. *Min. Fel. p.* 339.

(g) Tertull. *ibid. c.* 50. *J. Mart. Apol.* 1. p. 50. *Lactant. l.* 5. c. 13.

(h) M. Tyr. *diſſ.* 30.

(i) Τὰ μὲν κόψαι τῶν μερῶν, τὰ δὲ καῦσι, τὰ δὲ σήψαι, τὰ δὲ διελεῖν σωτηρίας ἕνεκα τοῦ ὅλου. *Porphyr. ap. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 5. *p.* 155.

(k) *Simplic. in Epict. c.* 13, 34.

Skin) by Puſtula's and Tetters, and maketh, putrifying Apoſtems in the Parts διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὅλου σωτηρίαν, *for the ſafety of the whole. The Medicinal Art imitating Nature putrifieth Apoſtems, and cutteth and burneth, and diſtendeth and cutteth off Parts* διὰ τὸ σῶσαι τὸ ὅλον, *for the ſaving the whole.* (l) *The Foot muſt ſometimes enter the Dirt, and tread on Thorns, and ſometimes be cut off* ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅλου, *for the whole. So thou being a Man, the part of an whole, it is requiſite, that for that whole thou ſhouldeſt ſometimes be Sick, and ſometimes Navigate, and ſometimes be in Danger, and ſometimes in Want, and at ſometime Die.* (m) *The part ought not to complain of any of thoſe things that are done* ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅλου, *for the whole.* (n) *Thoſe things that we call Evils and Corruptions, which are matter of Lamentation to us, thoſe the Artificer of the Univerſe calleth the Conſervation of the whole; for his care is for the whole: But the part muſt neceſſarily ſuffer for the whole.* (o) *He that would be happy, let him not be diſpleas'd at any thing, that may befall him, and let him wiſely conſider, that thoſe very things which ſeem to hurt him, appertain to the Conſervation of the Univerſe.*

As particular Men (and leſſer Syſtems) muſt ſuffer for the whole: So they are deſign'd and oblig'd, faithfully to affect, take care of, and co-operate unto the weal of the whole (and of their Fellow-members and Fellow-citizens their near Kindred,) wherein their own Welfare is involv'd as a part in the whole. (p) *A City or Body Politic conſiſteth of all parts co-operative, as the Body natural which conſiſteth of many parts, and to which many are needful* (the Feet to carry it, the Hands to work, the Eyes to ſee, the Ears to hear,) *is conſtituted and conſerved by the ſeveral parts contributing to the ſervice of the whole.* The good of many (the publick and univerſal good) is the great good; the doing good to many is the great doing good; the vile and villainous ſelfiſhneſs is the great evil and the ſumm of all evil, therefore virtuous Princes (q) ſeek the publick and common utility, diſcard private advantage for the ſake of it, regarding the concerns of their Subjects as their own, as the Poet indoctrinateth a Prince, —— *Conſule cunctis, non tibi.* Or as *Cato* was minded

Non ſibi ſed toti genitum ſe credere Mundo.

So the Philoſophic Emperor conſidereth Mankind as his Fellow-members, Fellow-citizens, Fellow-commoners, join'd and link'd together into one Body, one City or Society, of the ſame Original, Nature and Kind, of near Cognation or Kindred, and therefore looketh upon himſelf as oblig'd (agreeably to the inſtincts and inclinations of Nature,) to bear them and do them kindneſs, to take care of them, and to the utmoſt of his power to promote the common Utility. (r) *Becauſe I am of Kin to thoſe parts of the Univerſe, that are of the ſame kind, I will practiſe nothing unſocietive: But rather I will take care of thoſe that are Congenial and Cognate, and incline my whole Man to the common utility, and avoid the contrary.* (t) *Often ſay to thy ſelf,* ὅτι μέλος εἰμὶ τοῦ ἐκ τῶν λογικῶν συστήματος, *that I am a Member of the Syſtem of Rationals:* ἐὰν δὲ μέρος εἶναι ἑαυτὸν λέγῃς, *But if thou ſay, I am a* (diſtinct) *part of that Syſtem, thou do'ſt not yet love Men from the Heart, nor conſider thy ſelf as comprehended in the whole.* As the parts are comprehended in the whole, ſo every particular Man's good and happineſs, or evils and calamities, are involv'd in the publick, nor can they have peace and ſafety but in the publick ſafety and peace. (u) *Alteri vivas opportet, ſi vis tibi vivere, thou muſt live to others, if thou wilt live to thy ſelf. The Nature of the Rational Animal is ſo fram'd by* Jupiter, (w) *that he cannot obtain any of his own Goods, unleſs he contributeth to the publick utility.* (x) *That which is not good for the Bee-hive, cannot be good for the Bee.* Τοῦ ὅλου οὐ καλῶς ἔχοντος, ἀδύνατόν ἐστι τὸ μέρος εὖ ἔχειν. *If the whole be not well* (ſaith *Plato* in his *Charmides*,) *it is impoſſible, that the part ſhould be ſo.* Self-intereſt therefore obligeth all Men, to affect and endeavour the Common-weal (he that will not contribute to the Safety and Protection of others, cannot reaſonably expect that they ſhould contribute to his; or that any body ſhould care for him, who careth for no body; let him fend for himſelf and ſtand upon his own Legs;) and for this reaſon Mankind live in Society, that they might be helpful and uſeful, auxiliary and beneficent to one another, that every one might contribute and co-operate to the good of every one (*ut eadem ſit utilitas unius cujuſque & univerſorum*, Cic.) as the Hands, Eyes and Feet are made to co-operate together for their mutual benefit, as the rows of the upper and lower Teeth are made for one common Operation, ſo all are made and deſign'd (adapted alſo and oblig'd) for one common operation, to conſpire together for the common Welfare. And he that is not thus affected, is not *naturally* affected (as to the beſt of Nature,) not *well* nor *juſtly* affected, not *charitatively*, nor *ſocietively* affected, not *honourably*, not *humanly* affected, ἀπώλεσε τὸν ἄνθρωπον, *he hath loſt the Man*, as the Philoſophers ſuppoſe.

But although theſe Notices and Maxims of theirs touching *Virtue and Duty to the whole* are all of them hugely ſolid and truly generous, if apply'd and determin'd to a genuine and legitimate ***Whole*** or ***Univerſe***, yet in their Paganical application and determination of them to their *Whole*, *Univerſe* or *Catholick* Syſtem (conſiſting of Heathen Gods and Men) they are horribly falſe and wicked, and manifeſtly lead them to perſecute the Chriſtian Church and Religion. For the Chriſtians were a People ſeparated or broken off from their *Whole* or *Univerſe*, and conſequently were ſuch as *M. Antoninus* calleth *Apoſtems of the World.* It was but to their own mundane Tribe therefore that the Popular and Philoſophic Pagans were charitatively and ſocietively affected (the World will love its owns) the Chriſtians that were Aliens, and who profeſs'd, that *Jeruſalem* was their Country, (y) *they treated as thoſe that were no longer Men.* The Philoſophers thought themſelves oblig'd στοχάζεσθαι τῶν ὁμογενῶν, *to have regard for Rationals, that were Congenial and Cognate to them*; and accordingly they ſuppos'd themſelves oblig'd, to take care of their Gods and Demons; for theſe they look'd upon as Congenial and Cognate. But Chriſt and Chriſtians erected and conſtituted a ***Whole*** or ***Univerſe*** oppoſite and deſtructive to their *Whole Univerſe* or *Catholick* Syſtem, which

it

(l) Epict. diſſ. l. 2. c. 5.

(m) M. Ant. l. 9. S. 39. Gat. not. p. 195.

(n) M. Tyr. diſſ. 25.

(o) *Nihil indignetur ſibi accidere, ſciatque illa ipſa quibus lædi videtur, ad conſervationem Univerſi pertinere.* Sen. Ep. 74. M. Ant. l. 10. S. 7. Simplic. in Epict. c. 78.

(p) Πόλις δέ ἐστι πρᾶγμα ἀνακεκραμένον ἐκ πάντων συνεργούντων, καθάπερ ἡ τοῦ σώματος χρεία, πολυμερὴς τε οὖσα καὶ πολυδεὴς σώζεται τῇ συντελείᾳ τῶν μερῶν πρὸς τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν τοῦ ὅλου. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 5. *v. Epict. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 10.

(q) Gat. ſupr. p. 31, 123.

(r) Καθόσον δὲ ἔχω πως οἰκείως πρὸς τὰ ὁμογενῆ μέρη, οὐδὲν πράξω ἀκοινώνητον· Μᾶλλον δὲ στοχάσομαι τῶν ὁμογενῶν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον πᾶσαν ὁρμὴν ἐμαυτοῦ ἄξω, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου ἀπάξω. *M. Ant. l.* 10. *c.* 6.

(t) Idem l. 7. S. 13.

(u) Gat. ſupr. p. 387, 354.

(w) Ἵνα μηδενὸς τῶν ἰδίων ἀγαθῶν δύνηται τυγχάνειν, εἰ μή τι εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ὠφέλιμον προσφέρηται. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

(x) *M. Ant. l* 6. *S.* 54.

(y) *Euſeb. H. E. l.* 8. *c.* 10. *& de Mart. Palæſt. c.* 11.

if they look'd upon themſelves, oblig'd to take care of and uphold, they muſt neceſſarily think themſelves oblig'd to deſtroy Chriſtianity. Every Man muſt promote the Intereſt of their *Mundane Demonarchy*, and with *Celſus*, *Zoſimus*, *Julian* and the reſt of their Aſſociates (z) *muſt ſtrenuouſly endeavour to maintain the old Religion of their Anceſtors, ſuccour the ruinous Empire of the Gods* (which Chriſtianity came to demoliſh) *and to reſtore it to its Grandeur and Magnificence.* The Hebrew Doctors have the ſame Notices and Maxims with the Philoſophic Pagans touching Virtue and Duty to the Publick and to *the Whole*, and are alike perſecutive of Chriſtianity. (*a*) *A particular Man is in the whole Congregation, as one Member is in the whole Body. If the Arm ſhould be ſparing of its Blood, when there is a neceſſity of Phlebotomy, this would be an hurt to the Body and to the Arm it ſelf. A particular Man therefore muſt be ready, to bear Dolours unto Death for the welfare of the whole. And the principal thing that a particular Man ought to have in his Eye, is, that a Part of the Whole muſt contribute thereto, and not withdraw from it.*

(z) *V. Mr. Mede on Apoc.* 6, 12, 13, *&c.*

(a) Coſin 183, 184. Ed. Baſ.

BOOK III.

An Idea of God and of his Original Creation and Kingdom.

CHAP. I.

1. *The Idea of God of the contracted Form with a recapitulation of the foregoing Proofs of it.* 2. *Proofs of it from the Hebrew Names of God and from the Hebrew Tongue.* 3. *Proofs of it from the Senſe of the Fathers.* 4. *Proofs of it from their Senſe touching the Perſons of the Godhead.* 5. *Proofs of it from the Nature of Religion* 6. *Proofs of it from the Pagans Theology and Religion.* 7. *Proofs of it from the Religion of Jews and Chriſtians:* 8. *A principal Proof of it, that this Name God belongs to Nobility-Learning.*

I. OUR Account of *the Kingdom of Darkneſs* hath this great good in it, *The firſt Notice or Idea of God* in Religion (which is his true Idea of the contracted Form) is repreſented in it and enlightned by it. For this Name God (in the ſtrictly religious Senſe) ſignifieth,

> *The Imperial Eſtate, the Sovereignty, the Kingdom-eſtate, the Lord, the King, the Potentate Divine.*
>
> Whereby we mean
>
> *The Imperial Eſtate (the Lord, the King, the Potentate) Creature-tranſcendent,*
>
> *The Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent,*
>
> *The Lord of the Univerſe (that ſtands againſt and is over the Univerſe of Creatures)*
>
> *So as to be the God-kind of Sovereignty.*

For we have ſhew'd from our Saviour's *Apotheoſis* (his being Deify'd in Eſtate and Condition,) that Deity or Godhead of Eſtate conſiſteth in having the Place, Eſtate and Dignity of *Lord of all* (the Kingdom-eſtate of the Supreme Potentate) *in being the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, over all bleſſed for ever, in having all Power in Heaven and Earth and having all things under his Feet, in being the Head of all Principality and Power, and being far above all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion, and every Name that is named* (all created Potentacy) *in this World and the World to come, in having a Name* (Potentacy) *which is above every Name, Angels, Authorities and Powers being ſervient and ſubject thereto, in reigning and being rais'd higher than the Heavens*, the utmoſt height of created Nature, *Heb.* 7. 26. The God-head of Eſtate therefore (which God is as his Eſtate) is this Sovereignty, *The Sovereignty or Kingdom-eſtate, Creature-tranſcendent*, which we have prov'd and illuſtrated by comparing it with the Sovereignty or Kingdom-eſtate of Secular Sovereigns; for the Godhead is ſubſtantially, fully and abſolutely what their Kingdom-eſtate is in an umbratile and limited Senſe, *The magnificent and reigning, un-abject and un-ſubject Eſtate, The Regial and Imperial Celſitude of Condition, The height of Honour and Nobilitation of Eſtate, The fulleſt height of Glory, Proſperity, Felicity and Beatitude, The height of Rule and Government, of Power and Puiſſance, of Liberties, Immunities and Priviledges, An Eſtate of Sacredneſs, of Monarchy or ſingularity of Rule.* And as the Kingdom-eſtate of Secular Sovereigns is in a limited Senſe, *the ſubject-tranſcendent Eſtate*, they are ſubject-tranſcendent in all reſpects, ſo far as they are capable (in their Titles, Rights and Prerogatives, Powers, Enſigns of Dignity, Reſpects of Honour and Service, and ſuch more:) So Godhead of Eſtate is abſolutely *the Subject-tranſcendent* and therefore the *Creature-tranſcendent* Eſtate, and is in all reſpects Creature-tranſcendent. The Doxologies in Scripture (which are Aſcriptions of Divinity and Godhead) manifeſtly ſignifie *a Creature-tranſcendent Sovereignty* or *Imperial Eſtate*, and without conſidering this Sovereignty they are unintelligible; for what can be thought of that Doxology, which concludeth our Lord's Prayer, *Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory*, but that it is an Aſcription of *the Creature-tranſcendent Kingdom-eſtate and the Glory of the Kingdom?* Dan. 11. 20. The other uſual Doxologies in Scripture run in the ſame Stile and are of the ſame Importance; for they are Aſcriptions and Attributions of *the Kingdom over all* (the Church and the World) *the Majeſty, the Glory, the Greatneſs, and the Power, the Might and Dominion, of the Throne and of*

Reigning, *of Creature-tranſcendence and of God-eminence. Thou art exalted far above all Gods*, Pſal. 97. 9. We have ſhew'd alſo, that God is the Name of the Supreme Potentacy, that his *Potentacy*, *Sovereignty* and *Domination* is the ſame thing with his Divinity or Godhead (of Eſtate and Condition,) that God's People profeſs themſelves the Religioniſts *ſummi Regis*, *Principis*, *Imperatoris*, *of the Supreme King*, *Prince*, *Emperour* (ſuch Titles and Attributes of God expreſſive of his Nobilitation and Perfection of Eſtate and Condition uſually occurr in Scripture, as *the great King*, *the King Eternal*, *the bleſſed and only Potentate*,) and ſome of them expreſly call the Divinity τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα, *the Regial Dignity*. Agreeably whereunto we have argu'd, that the Attributes of Goodneſs inherent and ſhining in the Deity (Liberality, Clemency, Mercy and ſuch more) ought to be conſider'd as ſo many glorious Princely Virtues, without which God could not be a legitimate kind of Potentate.

The Names of God uſual in Scripture and among the Eaſtern People ſpeak his Idea. Such as *The Power*, *The moſt High*, παντοκράτωρ, *Omniimperial*, *The Lord of Heaven*, *The Lord of Heaven and Earth*, *The Lord of Hoſts*, which the Jews diſtinguiſh into צבאות מעלה *the upper Hoſts viſible and inviſible* and צבאות מתה *the inferiour Hoſts*. Agreeably to which Name the *Alexandrian Cyril* intituleth God, (b) *The King and Legiſlator of the Supernal Spirits*, *and of Men on Earth likewiſe*, *commanding over the Elements*, *and as it pleaſeth him*, *turning the nature of things*. The moſt uſual Name of God is *Adonai the Lord*, the ſame with the Greek κύριος, by which the *Septuagint* render the Hebrew יהוה *Jehovah*. The Lexicographers ſay of this Name (*Adonai*) that God is ſo called (c) becauſe he is ארון העולם *Lord of the World*, ſo the words which in *Gen.* 21. 33. we render *the Everlaſting God*, (d) *Maimonides* rendreth *Deus Mundi*. The Orientals are obſerv'd, to call God by ſuch Names, as denote and ſignifie univerſal and abſolute Domination, ſuch as the Chaldee רבון עלמא *Lord of the World*, and the Syriack אחיר כל *All-imperial*. All ſuch Names plainly denote and ſignifie *The Creature-tranſcendent Lord*, *King or Potentate*; and if theſe other Names plainly denote this Idea of him, the Name God muſt neceſſarily denote and ſignifie the ſame Idea; for S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerveth and proveth, (e) *that theſe Names God and the Lord* are promiſcuouſly us'd, and that the Name God doth not at all tranſcend the Name *Lord*. From S. *Chryſoſtom*'s obſervation touching the Equivalence of theſe two Names we may infer alſo, that the Name *God is a Divine Imperial Perſonal Name*; for this Name *the Lord* is manifeſtly ſo. Agreeably whereunto we have before obſerv'd, that the Imperial Potentates of this World are reſemblances of God, that they are prone, to conceit themſelves *Gods*, and to aſſume to themſelves the Name of *God*, as it is a Divine (Creature-tranſcendent) Imperial-perſonal Name (in which Senſe it is *the incommunicable Name*, Wiſd. 14. 21.) and that *Noſtra Divinitas*, *Noſtrum Numen* in the Stile of the *Roman* Emperours ſignifieth *our Divine Potentacy*. We have alſo obſerv'd, that theſe Names *God*, *the Lord*, *the King*, are uſually conjoyn'd in Scripture and by Interpreters as exegetical of one another, and identical in ſignification, which is an Indication, that this Name God ſignifieth *the Creature-tranſcendent Potentate as ſuch*: So to be *a God unto Pharaoh*, Exod. 7.1. is to be as a God in the Buſineſs of *Pharaoh*, an high and mighty Potentate, (whence the Chaldee ſubſtituteth (f) רב *a Prince*, and the Gloſs of *Jarchy* expoundeth it by *exerciſing Domination over him*,) having *Pharaoh* under his miraculous Power, and being one, on whom he muſt depend in the managery of his Affairs, and to whom he muſt have recourſe and become a Suppliant. To have ſuch a Potentacy over him, is a Metaphorical or Analogical Godhead of Eſtate: So the Imperial Eſtate of Secular Kings is a metaphorical or analogical Godhead of Eſtate, which conſtituteth and denominateth them (analogically) Gods. So the Lord of all, or (as the Fathers uſually ſpeak) παμβασιλεύς, *the King of all*, ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός, *God over all*, ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεός, *the God of the Univerſe*, is properly God by that *Creature-tranſcendent Potentacy*, which is Godhead of Eſtate. The Godhead of Eſtate is the Creature-tranſcendent Potentacy, and the Creature-tranſcendent Potentacy is the Godhead of Eſtate; for it is τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς θείας ὑπεροχῆς, *the Dignity of the Divine Tranſcendence*.

II. The Name God in Hebrew is ſometimes of a large Acceptation (it is not always לשון קרש of a ſtrictly Religious Acceptation, as the Hebrew Grammarians teach;) but the Signification of it in the ſtrictly Religious Acceptation may be underſtood from the Signification of it in the large Acceptation; in which Acceptation *the high Ones above Men* are call'd *Gods* and *the Gods*. And theſe high Ones above Men that are ſo called, are ſaid to be (g) *Principes ſive Potentes*, *Princes or Potentates*, Angels, Judges or Rulers, Secular Sovereigns. Whether theſe be properly and primarily called *Elohim* (Gods) and the Name is from them tranſlated to Angels and to the Creator (as *Maimonides* and *Aben Ezra* think, whom *Mercerus* followeth;) or the Name *Elohim* primarily and properly ſignifieth God (as *Abarbinel* diſputeth) is not much material, ſeeing theſe Hebrew Names *El*, *Eloah*, *Elohim* (which anſwer to the Name God) both in their large and ſtrict Acceptation are of this one ſignification, they denote *a Ruling Power*, *Potentate*, *or Potentates*, *the High Ones above Men*. Of the Name *Elohim Grotius* obſerveth, (h) *Whereſoever Elohim occurreth in the Hebrew Text*, *Empire is ſignify'd*. This Name *God* therefore is a Name of Empire, Lordſhip and Domination, and is the ſame with this Name *Divine* (or Creature-tranſcendent) *Lord*. A Learned Interpreter of our own ſaith, (i) *That El is the Title God*, *is ſufficiently known*, *taken from his Supreme Power*, *which he hath over all the World*. *The word Elohim* (ſaith he) *is by the Chaldee rendred Judges*, *and by the Syriack Kings*. *Vatablus* noteth, (k) that ſome of the Hebrews ſay, that God is called *Elohim*, *quòd ſit Dominus & Judex omnium*, *becauſe he is Lord and Judge of all*. But the Senſe of the Hebrews is beſt underſtood from theſe Sayings of *R. Salomon*, (l) *The Name* Elohim *every where ſignifieth a Judge*. *Non eſt Elohim niſi Judex*, *there is no Elohim but a Judge*. So *R. David* ſaith, *Omne Elohim ſignificationem habet Judicis*, *Elohim always ſignifieth a Judge*. Theſe Sayings imply, that *Elohim* muſt be diſtinguiſh'd as an ancient Jew diſtinguiſheth them, and that there is no fault in ſaying with *Maimonides*, that God is called *Elohim* in a Senſe

(b) Τῶν ἄνω πνευμάτων βασιλέα ϗ νομοθέτην, ϗ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ὁμοίως, ϗ δεσπόζοντα τῶν στοιχείων, ϗ πρὸς τὸ αὐτῷ δοκοῦν μετακλίνοντα τῶν ὄντων τὴν φύσιν. *Com. in Amos T.* 3. p. 300.

(c) *Schindler in voce* ארון *Hotting. Diſſ. de nom. Dei*, p. 299.

( ) *Mor. Nev. par.* 3. c.29. & *par.*2.c.30.

(e) *In* 1 *Cor.* λογ. κ. *vid. Petav. in Trin. l.*3. c.1. *S.*12.

(f) *Selden. de synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 16. *p.* 655.

(g) *Druſ. de voce Elohim. Hotting. Hexaem. p.*20.

(h) *Ubicunque eſt* אלהים *in Hebræo*, *ſignificatur imperium*. Expl. Decal. ad Exod. 20. 2.

(i) *Dr. Ham. on Pſal.* 82. *not. a, b.*

(k) *In Gen.* 1. 1.

(l) *Druſ. ſupr.*

of Eminence: An ancient Jew ſaith, *Elohim eſt Epitheton Dominatoris aut Judicis: & talis eſt vel univerſalis, dominium habens in mundum univerſum; vel particularis, & Judex inter homines; Elohim is an Epithet or Appellative of a Dominator or Judge; and ſuch an one is either the Univerſal, having dominion over all the World; or Particular, as a Judge amongſt Men. Maimonides* ſaith of God; (*m*) *He is the God of Gods, that is, the God of Angels, and Lord of Lords, that is, the Lord of the Spheres and of the Stars, which are Lords of all other Bodies.*

The Name *God* is manifeſtly a Name of *Eminence* and *Highneſs*, which Highneſs and Eminence we are to underſtand in ſuch Senſe, as when we ſpeak of *High Ones above Men*; therefore this Name God denoteth and ſignifieth *Potentacy* and *Domination*. For it is ſo manifeſtly a Name of *Eminence* and *Highneſs*, that it is the Cuſtom of the Hebrews (as all Hebrew Grammarians teach) to expreſs the Superlative Degree by the Name of God; as *the Cedars of God* (the higheſt Cedars,) *Lions of God*, *trembling of God*, *ſopor Domini* (*i. e.* maximus) *Civitas magna Deo*, which denoteth a very great City. So things ſuperlative, ſublime and tranſcendent are uſually ſtiled *Divine* (θεῖα ϗ τιμιώτατα) and perſons of Highneſs and Eminence are called in *Homer* θεοειδεῖς, θεοείκελοι, ἰσόθεοι, *Deiform*, they are as Gods amongſt Men (*Plato* is called by *Cicero*, *Deus noſter Plato*,) whence *Homer* ſaith *Odyſſ.* θ.

Ἐρχόμενον ἀνὰ ἄστυ θεὸν ὡς εἰσορόωσιν.
One of theſe Men is look'd upon as a God.

The *Phœnicians* are ſaid (*n*) to have called God *Halonium*: So in *Plautus*'s *Pœnulus* the Gods and Goddeſſes are called עליונים ועליונות which Names denote *their Highneſſes*. The Pagans had ſuch an apprehenſion of the Highneſs of their Deities, that they thought it requiſite upon the account of Congruity, to perform their *Sacra* in high places (which are frequently condemn'd in Scripture becauſe of their Idolatry, as is alſo another Rite of theirs, the eating of the Sacrifices upon the Mountains,) which high places were the tops of Mountains furniſh'd with Altars and other Requiſites for performing their *Sacra*. (*o*) But the *Perſians* (ſaith *Strabo*) *erect neither Altars nor Statues, yet ſacrifice in an high place*. They ſacrifice to *Jupiter* (ſaith *Herodotus*) ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλότατα τῶν ὀρέων ἀναβαίνοντες, *aſcending the higheſt Mountains*. The tops of Mountains were to them inſtead of Altars, and from thoſe במות *high places*, the Greek word βωμοὶ (Altars) is commonly deriv'd. Upon the account of Congruity alſo (*p*) the Heathen erected very high Altars to their *Dii ſuperi*, ſuch as they plac'd in Heaven, and look'd upon as Supernal Potentates; and S. *Hierom* noteth of them, (*q*) *omne quod ſupra ſe eſt, Deos putant, all that is above them they account Gods.* They had a Notion of God's Eminence, and therefore were prone, to deifie every thing that was ſublime and eminent, as *Acoſta* ſaith of the *Americans*, that they were wont to venerate *ipſos montes & quicquid communem naturæ ordinem egreditur, the Mountains themſelves and whatever is eminent beyond the common rank of Nature.* Ὕψιστος, *moſt High*, was one of the Attributes of the Supreme God amongſt the Pagans, and *Simplicius* preſcribeth this method of inveſtigating the true Idea of God, (*r*) not to ſtop in our Abſtractions and Aſcenſions, ἕως ἂν εἰς τὰς ἀκροτάτας ἐννοίας ἔλθωμεν, *till we come to the top and the ſublimeſt thing conceivable.*

III. S. *Auſtin* obſerveth, that all Men who have any thoughts of God (although very remote,) think him to be of *Summity* and *Supremacy*; (*s*) *their thought reacheth at ſomething, than which there is nothing better and more ſublime.* If we ask of *Tertullian* an Idea or definitive Notion of God, his Anſwer is, (*t*) *So far as Man can define touching the Deity, I make a definition of it, which the Conſcience of all Men will acknowledge, God is the Supreme Great.* (*u*) *That which is God, muſt neceſſarily be of Summity or Supremacy*, ſaith an ancient Writer, ſuppos'd to be *Novatianus*. And this is that which is call'd by *Arnobius* (*w*) *Vocaminis hujus eminentia, the Eminence which this Name God importeth.* The common Notice therefore and the firſt Notice that Mankind have of God (according to theſe ancient Writers) is *the higheſt Eminence*; which Notice or Idea of God is not rightly underſtood, unleſs we ſuppoſe it to be the ſame with *the Supreme Potentate*, according to that of S. *Ambroſe*, (*x*) *God and Lord the Name of Magnificence is a Name of Potentacy.* The ſame Father's Senſe the Commentaries in his Works that bear his Name, ſpeak, when they thus expound *the Name above every Name given to our Saviour*, which is the *Supreme Potentacy*; (*y*) *certè nomen quod ſuper omne nomen eſt, Dei nomen eſt; certainly the Name which is above every Name, is the Name of God.* The Name of God is the Supreme Potentacy; whence this is *Clemens*'s definitive Notion of God. (*z*) *To me it is ſufficient to ſay, that God is the Lord of all.* And this according to a Chriſtian Apologiſt is our innate Idea of God. (*a*) *Is there any of Mankind, who did not enter upon the firſt Day of his Nativity with a Notion of that Prince? Who hath it not innate in him, affix'd to him, yea in a manner impreſs'd upon him in the Womb of his Mother? Who hath it not implanted in him, that there is a King and Lord the Moderator of all things? If the mute Animals had the uſe of Speech, if the Trees, Clods, Stones were animated and could ſpeak, having Nature for their Guide and School-miſtreſs, and not having corrupted their Simplicity, or the Faith that accompanieth it, would they not underſtand, that God is, and proclaim, that the Lord of all things alone exiſteth?* When the ancient Theologers of the Church contemplate the Fabrick of the World and of Man, the Order, Harmony and uſe of things, to prove the Exiſtence of God againſt Atheiſm, they expreſs this firſt Notice or Idea of God (which implieth and involveth in it the Nobilitation of the Creator) intituling him, (*b*) *The Lord of the Creation and Maker of all that ſubſiſteth, a Lord that combin'd things together,*

whom

(m) *Ipſe eſt Elohe haelohim, Deus Deorum, h. e. Deus Angelorum, & Dominus Dominorum, h. e. Dominus Sphærarum & Stellarum, quæ ſunt domini omnium aliorum corporum.* Mor. Nev. par 2. c. 6.

(n) *Huet. Dem. Ev. prop. 7. S. 14. p. 516. ed. 2.*

(o) *Dion. Voſſ. in Maimon. de Idol. c. 1. S. 2. Spenccr. de Leg. Hebr. l. 1. c. 8. S. 1. & l. 2. c. 11. S. 2.*

(p) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 7. S. 1.*

(q) *Com. in Dan. c. 2.*

(r) *In Epict. c. 38. p. 207.*

(s) *Ut aliquid quo nihil melius ſit atque ſublimius illa cogitatio conetur attingere.* De Doctr. Chriſt. l. 1. c. 7.

(t) *Quantum humana conditio de Deo definire poteſt, id definio, quod & omnium conſcientia agnoſcet, Deum ſummum eſſe magnum.* C. Marcion. l. 1. c. 3.

(u) *Quod Deus eſt, ſummum ſit neceſſe eſt.* Novatian. de Trin. c. 4.

(w) Adv. Gent. l. 7. p. 251.

(x) *Deus & Dominus nomen magnificentiæ, nomen eſt poteſtatis.* De Fid. ad Grat. l. 1. c. 1.

(y) S. Ambr. com. in Phil. 2.

(z) Καίμοι ἀπόχρη [illegible] θεὸν εἶναι τὸν κύριον πάντων. *Strom. 6. p. m.* 446.

(a) *Quiſquámne eſt hominum qui non cum iſtius principis notione diem primæ nativitatis intraverit? cui non eſt ingenitum, non affixum, imò ipſis penè in genitalibus matris non impreſſum, non inſitum, eſſe Regem ac Dominum, cunctorum quæcunque ſunt moderatorem? Ipſa denique hiſcere ſi animantia muta potuiſſent, ſi in linguarum noſtrarum facilitatem ſolvi: imò ſi arbores, glebæ, ſaxa, ſenſu animata vitali vocis ſonitum quirent & verborum articulos integrare, ita non duce natura, & magiſtra, non incorrupta ſimplicitatis fide, & intelligerent eſſe Deum, & cunctorum Dominum ſolum eſſe clamarent?* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 18, 19.

(b) Τὸν τ̃ κύριον ϗ πάσης ὑποστάσεως δημιουργὸν, τ̃ συνδήσαντα κύριον, ᾧ ϗ αὐτὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα, ὥσπερ δοῦλα διαπίπτει *whom the Elements obey as Servants their Lord, the Ruler of the Creation, the Lord of theſe things, and Prince, and Moderator, and King.* In their Diſputes for the Unity of the Godhead againſt Polytheiſm they alſo expreſs this firſt Notice or Idea of God. (c) *Unum Dominum communis natura teſtatur, common Nature* (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) *teſtifieth, that there is but one Lord, becauſe there is but one World. If there had been many* τῆς κτίσεως ἄρχοντες, *Princes or Rulers of the Creation* (ſaith *Athanaſius*) *there could not have been kept ſuch an Order of the Univerſe as we ſee.* Several of the Fathers ſuppoſe, that Man's being the Image of God conſiſteth ἐν τῷ ἀρχικῷ, *in his being dominant and imperial* (in having Empire and Denomination as a Prince in this Creation;) agreeably whereto *Nemeſius* calleth God ἐξουσίαν ϗ φύσιν ἐξουσιαστικὴν, *Imperial Authority, and the Nature Imperial-authoritative.*

IV. But the ancient Writers moſt clearly expreſs our Idea of God (the firſt part of it) in their Diſcourſes of Idolatry and of the Divinity of our Saviour and the Holy Spirit. (d) *I underſtand* (ſaith Gr. Naz.) *two higheſt differences of Beings, Domination and Servientneſs. The one is call'd God, the other is with us and is call'd Creature.* So S. *Baſil* ſaith; (e) *There being two things, the Creature and the Deity, and it belonging to the Creature to be of ſervient and obedient Condition, but to the Deity, to have Rule and Domination: He that taketh away from the Son the Dignity of Domination, and throweth him down into the lowneſs of Servientneſs, doth he not thereby manifeſtly rank him with the Univerſality of the Creature?* (f) *The nature of created things is ſaid to be beneath* (ſaith S. Cyril) *as being ſubject and neceſſarily ſervient to God calling it to exiſtence; but the Divine and Ineffable Dominant Nature is ſaid to be above, as having all created things under its Feet, and ſubject to the Yoke of its Authority.* (g) *The Supreme Nature is beyond all viſible and inviſible Creatures;* and (h) ὁ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν, *he that tranſcendeth the Univerſe of Creature,* is this Father's periphraſis of God. (i) *We ſee God and Creature* (ſaith he) *and nothing beſides theſe; for what is ſhort of being God is a Creature, or a thing that is made, and what is exempt from being a Creature, is within the Boundaries of the Godhead.* Or as this Father ſometimes ſpeaketh, (k) *it tranſcendeth the meaſure of things ſervient, ſo as to be within the Boundaries of the Dominant Eſſence,* which is called by him (l) κύριος ϗ θεὸς, *Lord and God,* and is oppos'd to τὰ δοῦλά τε καὶ ποιήματα, *the Creatures that are of ſervient condition.* The Name God therefore ſignifieth *the Lord and Potentate tranſcendent to Creature* (whoſe Notion implieth much of Vileneſs and Imperfection) and *the Lord of all Creatures,* as in *Iſidore Peluſiota.* (m) *How doſt thou teach, that the Holy Spirit is a thing made or created, or of ſervient Nature, and not of the Lordly and Creative and Regal Eſſence? for if it is of the Servient Condition, let it not be reckon'd with the Lord.* (n) *Whatever exiſteth* (ſaith the Expoſition of Faith in *J. Mart.* Works) *is either created or uncreated Nature. That which is uncreated, is dominant and free from all Neceſſity; but that which is created, is of Servient Condition, and under the command of its Lord.* Thus the Godhead ſtandeth againſt the Univerſe of Creatures, thus God and Creature are rightly contradivided and confronted. The one Name denoteth τῆς δεσποτείας τὸ ἀξίωμα, *the Dignity of Lord, King or Potentate, not* τῆς δουλείας τὸ ταπεινὸν, *the lowneſs of the Servient Condition:* The other Name denoteth τῆς δουλείας τὸ ταπεινὸν, *the lowneſs of the Servient Condition, not* τῆς δεσποτείας τὸ ἀξίωμα, *the Dignity of Lord, King or Potentate.* Of the Beings call'd by theſe Names one muſt be nothing leſs than Tranſcendence above the lowneſs of the Servient Condition, not Creature in any reſpect: The other muſt be nothing at all of that Tranſcendence (nothing more than the lowneſs of the Servient Condition) not God in any reſpect. By Idolatry (the Sin of Idol-making) they are made God in ſome reſpect; for (o) *Idololatria Dei honorificentiam uſurpat & vindicat creaturæ, Idolatry unrightfully taketh what is properly honorificent to God, and aſſerteth* (or giveth) *it to the Creature.* Idols are therefore made Gods, becauſe ſome of God's honorificent Properties or Peculiarities are given to the Creatures, whereby they are made the *Creature-tranſcendents or Gods.* So God is God by his Creature-tranſcendence, and his Name denoteth and ſignifieth it. It denoteth τῆς δεσποτείας τὸ ἀξίωμα, *the Dignity of Lord, King or Potentate* over the Univerſe of Creature, and therefore denoteth *the Creature-tranſcendent Lord, King and Potentate.*

Every Supreme Lord, King or Potentate is neceſſarily a Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate; if therefore God is notic'd to us as *the Lord, King or Potentate Creature-tranſcendent,* he muſt neceſſarily be notic'd to us as (that Sovereignty) *the Sovereignty or Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent.* To call God the Sovereignty which is over all, is to call him by the ſame Name that *Tertullian* doth, (p) *ſumma majeſtas, the Supreme Imperial Majeſty.* His Name being a Divine (Creature-tranſcendent) Imperial-perſonal Name, himſelf being of Divine Imperial Eſtate and of Divine Imperial Rank and Quality (as King, Emperour, Sovereign Lord or Humane Imperial Perſonal Names,) he ought to be notic'd as Men are, that are of Imperial Eſtate, who are commonly called (q) *The great Eſtates, the great Governments,* and ſome of them are call'd by the Name of that Sovereignty which they are; for by the *Papacy* we underſtand that Sovereignty *(real and perſonal)* which the Pope is: So by *the Deity, the Divinity* or *Godhead* muſt neceſſarily be underſtood *that Sovereignty of Eſtate which God is and which is Godhead of Eſtate.* And as by this Name *the Papacy* we underſtand both the real Sovereignty of Eſtate and the Perſonal Nature or Eſſence which is inveſted with it (and which are ſeparable in Humane Sovereignties:) So *the Deity*

ταχθέντα, εἴκει ϗ πείθεται, τὸν κτίσεως ἄρχοντα, τὸν τούτων δεσπότην ϗ ἄρχοντα, ϗ κοσμήτορα, ϗ βασιλέα. S. Athan. c. Gent. p. 31, 32, &c. Comm.

(c) Petav. T. 1. l. 1. c. 3, 4. & T. 3. l. 2. c. 3. & c. 4. S. 5.

(d) Δύο διαφορὰς ἐν τοῖς οὖσι γινώσκω, τὰς ἀνωτάτω, δεσποτείαν τε ϗ δουλείαν.——καλεῖται δὲ ἡ μὲν θεός, ἡ δὲ μεθ' ἡμῶν τε ἐστὶ ϗ καλεῖται κτίσις. Gr. Naz. or. 24. p. 428.

(e) Δύο γὰρ ὄντων πραγμάτων, κτίσεως τε ϗ θεότητος· ϗ τῆς μὲν κτίσεως ἐν δουλείᾳ ϗ ὑπακοῇ τεταγμένης, ἀρχικῆς δὲ οὔσης ϗ δεσποτικῆς τῆς θεότητος, ὁ ἀφαιρούμενος τῆς δεσποτείας τὸ ἀξίωμα, ϗ εἰς τὸ τῆς δουλείας ταπεινὸν καταβάλλων, οὐχὶ δῆλός ἐστι ϗ διὰ τοῦτο συστοιχοῦντα αὐτὸν τῇ πάσῃ κτίσει δεικνύς; S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l. 2. p. 73.

(f) Κάτω μὲν γὰρ τὴν τῶν γενητῶν φύσιν εἶναι φησιν, ὡς ὑποκειμένην, ϗ ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγκης δουλεύουσαν τῷ πρὸς τὸ εἶναι καλοῦντι θεῷ· ἄνω δὲ πάλιν τὴν θείαν ϗ ἄρρητον δεσπόζουσαν φύσιν, ὡς πάντα ὑπὸ πόδας ἔχουσαν τὰ γενητὰ ϗ τῷ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑποθεῖσαν ζυγῷ. S. Cyr. Com. in Joan. p. 165.

(g) Idem c. Jul. l. 7. p. 231.

(h) Com. in Oſe. T. 3. p. 164.

(i) Θεὸν ὁρῶμεν ϗ κτίσιν, ἕτερον δὲ παρὰ τούτοις οὐδὲν, ὃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκπίπτει τοῦ εἶναι θεὸς κατὰ φύσιν, τοῦτο πάντως ἐστὶ γενητόν· ϗ ὅπερ ἂν τὸν τοῦ πεποιῆσθαι διαφεύγει λόγον, εἴσω πάντως ἐστὶ τῶν τῆς θεότητος ὅρων. In Joan. p. 52.

(k) Τὸ δουλικὸν ἀναβεβηκὼς μέτρον, ὥστε ϗ ἐντὸς ὅρων τῆς δεσποζούσης οὐσίας ὑπάρχων. Theſaur. l. 32. p. 301.

(l) Ibid. p. 55.

(m) Πῶς διδάσκεις ποιητὸν, ἢ τῆς δούλης φύσεως εἶναι; ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς δεσποτικῆς καὶ δημιουργοῦ καὶ βασιλίδος οὐσίας;——εἰ γὰρ δοῦλον, μὴ ἀριθμείσθω μετὰ τοῦ δεσπότου. L. 1. Ep. 109.

(n) Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν, ἢ ἄκτιστος φύσις ἐστὶν, ἢ κτιστή· ἡ μὲν ἄκτιστος δεσποτικὴ καὶ πάσης ἀνάγκης ἐλευθέρα· ἡ δὲ κτιστὴ, δουλικὴ, καὶ νόμοις δεσποτικοῖς ἑπομένη. p. 374.

(o) S. Ambroſ. com. Epheſ. 5.

(p) Apol. c. 6.

(q) Fulbeck prepar. to the ſtudy of the Law, p. 13.

Deity denoteth in complication both the Sovereignty or Godhead of Eſtate which God is, and alſo (r) τὴν δεσπόζουσαν οὐσίαν, *that Eſſence which is Imperial over all*, and is in Dominion and Sovereignty over the Univerſe.

V. The firſt notice of God that introduceth Religion amongſt Men, is *a Sovereignty over them Creature-tranſcendent* (which human Sovereignties reſemble;) for God as ſuch is the object and reaſon of Religion, of Religious Homage, Subjection, Service, Obedience, Hope and Fear. The Nature of Religion noticeth God to be *the Creature-tranſcendent Sovereignty*; for Religion is his peculiar Homage as ſuch; where there is ſomething of that Homage, there is ſomething of Religion; and where there is nothing of that Homage, there is nothing of Religion, but perfect Atheiſm. Religion may be conſider'd as matter of *inſtinct and innate Propenſion*; for indeliberately and without any reaſoning upon the matter Mankind in Caſes of Injuſtice and great Oppreſſion appeal to *a ſuperiour Power*, and invoke it to vindicate their Innocence; in caſe of extremity of Danger, which is beyond human Help, they invoke a ſuperiour Power for their Relief; in great Caſes they naturally put ſomething ſacred upon their Aſſeverations and Atteſtations, they invoke a ſuperiour Power by way of Imprecation upon themſelves, and to be a Witneſs and Judge of their Fidelity and Veracity. Mankind naturally ſpeak Religious Language, (s)*Benedicat te Deus, Deus videt omnia, Deo commendo, Deus reddet, Deus inter nos judicabit, God bleſs you, God ſeeth all things, I commend it to God, God will recompenſe, God will judge between us.* Mankind are by way of inſtinct the devotional Suppliants of a ſuperior Power, and of ſuch a ſuperiour Power whom they ſuppoſe Supreme and Sovereign, the Maker, Monarch and Governour of all; ſo far therefore natural inſtinct noticeth God to Mankind in the firſt place *as the Sovereignty over them Creature-tranſcendent.* But Religion muſt be conſider'd as matter of Law and Obligation (of Diſcipline alſo and Inſtitution,) and ſo it denoteth *the whole buſineſs of being God's Servants*, and conſequently the whole matter of *God-ſervice* owing to God. Religion therefore in Nature and Notion of it noticeth God to Mankind in the firſt place as *a Sovereign Power over them* (Sovereign, uncreated, and creative of all things, and therefore Creature-tranſcendent,) who is to them the Law of Subjection, Duty and God-ſervice. *Epicurus* (as he pretendeth) would have Men, to Worſhip the Gods (only) becauſe of the excellency of their Nature; which pretence is a Branch of his Atheiſm and Irreligion; for it deſtroyeth all Mens bounden Duty and Service to God. Notwithſtanding ſuch Deities which are *no Governments, no authoritative Powers*, they are left fully at liberty, to do what they liſt, for *who is Lord over them?* The Criticks ſay, (t) *that Religion properly ſignifieth a certain dread or horrour which things Divine tranſcending human Power impreſs upon us, whereby we are held bound and reſtrain'd.* (u) Jacob *ſware by the Fear* (God) *of his Father* Iſaac, *and ſome great Grammarians derive the word* Deus *from the Greek* Θεὸς, *which ſignifieth Fear*, which Critical accounts of the word *God* and *Religion* are not deſign'd to befriend Atheiſm, but to ſhew what Religion in general is, and what is the Origin of it; *that it is a natural Awe which Mankind have of an inviſible Sovereign Power.* (w) *A Sovereign Power which only God is, his Wrath and Judgment the Soul of Man is naturally conſcious of, and feareth to offend him.* This Fear of a Deity which is natural to Mankind, and which profeſs'd Atheiſts cannot totally extinguiſh (*naturalis Timor animæ in Deum*) noticeth God to Mankind as *the ſupreme Potentate or Sovereignty over all*; and becauſe of this natural Notice and the Fear that accompanieth it, the Univerſality of Mankind are in ſome kind and degree Religioniſts.

VI. Paganiſm in a conſiderable degree retaineth the true Idea of God; but ſo, that many prejudices are done to it by the Follies and Impieties of that Religion and Theology. For in the *firſt place*, the Popular-pagan Theology doth not acknowledge one unmix'd Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate, *that ſtands againſt and is over an Univerſe of Subjects* (as is uſual in Human Kingdoms and Empires,) but it mixeth, combineth and aſſociateth together various ſupreme Deities (of ſeveral Kinds and Notions;) and it alſo mixeth and aſſociateth ſubordinate Deities in one and the ſame Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate with the ſupreme Deity (συνάρχοντες αὐτῷ, *Co-reigners with him*;) which is an effacing the Idea of God at an horrible rate. In the *next* place Paganiſm ſubſtituteth an Univerſe of *Gods and Men inſtead of an Univerſe of Creatures*, whereby we mean *Creatures that are not God*, which therefore have the meanneſs, inferiority and imperfection of Creatures They are of the ſubject and ſervient Condition, and as ſuch have a Lord over them, whoſe they are, whoſe Beneficiaries they are, and to whom they are accountable, as they are not of themſelves, ſo they are not for themſelves, but are ſubordinate and ſubſervient to an higher end. As what they have is not primarily and originally, but dependently and at the Will and Pleaſure of another, and by Participation; ſo they have but a meaſure of Dignity and Excellency, their Prefection is mix'd with Imperfection, inſufficiency and diſparaging Properties; they are but particular, finite Beings, not univerſal, not comprehending or compriſing All in their Eſſence, Operation, Power or Authority (for they are but ſome Excellency and Power,) they *are abject Underlings, mean and low in compariſon.*

In the *third* place (x) all the ancient Philoſophers (not the later Platoniſts) held an Opinion, that the matter was innate and unproduc'd (becauſe nothing could be produc'd out of nothing,) and that God did only contrive and frame this orderly Syſtem of the Univerſe out of Præexiſtent Matter which is no ſmall prejudice to the Idea of God. Nor is it an inconſiderable prejudice that is done to this Idea by the Opinion of the *Chaldeans*, of *Ariſtotle* and the later *Platoniſts* (y) touching the Worlds Exiſtence from

(r) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *S.* 4.

(s) *Tertull. de Teſtim. Anim.*

(x) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 14. *c.* 16. *Coſri p.* 35, 286. *Windet. de vit. funct. p.* 62. *Tertull. adv. Valentin. c.* 15. *Theodoret. Serm.* [illegible] *Ser.* 2. *Plutarch. de An. procreat. p.* 1016. *M. Ant. l.* 5. *S.* 13. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 303. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 117. & *Plat. Theol. p.* 281.

(y) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 5. *S.* 4.

(t) *Religio proprie horrorem ſignificat, quem res divina & vim humanam ſuperantes nobis infligunt: quo fit ut quaſi conſtricti teneamur.* Herald. in Arnob. p. 176, 221.

(u) *Juravit Jacob per* פחד *Pahad patris ſui Iſhac, quod interpretatum eſt Timor.*—— *primus in orbe Deos fecit Timor. Et ſunt nonnulli, & iidem nobiles Grammatici, qui Deos à timore tranſtulere. Nam* Θεὸς *Græcè Timor eſt Latinè.* Reuchlin. de verb. mirif. p. 181.

(w) *Quid timetur niſi ira? Unde ira niſi ex animadverſione? Unde animadverſio niſi de Dei judicio? Unde judicium niſi de Poteſtate? Cujus poteſtas ſumma niſi Dei ſolius?* Tertullian. ſupr.

from Eternity, (z) of which Opinion *Plato* himſelf was (at ſome times;) for in his *Phædrus* he diſputeth, that the Soul is not generated or made in time. The Platoniſts ſuppoſe the Human Soul *Siſter to the Soul of the World*, and the ancient Philoſophers coupled God and the Matter as Brother and Siſter, or rather as Husband and Wife together.

In the *fourth* place the higher rank of Beings in the Philoſophic-Pagan Theology are ſuppoſed to be (a) ἀπόρροιαι τινὲς καὶ προϐολαὶ τȣ͂ πρώτȣ αἰτίȣ, *certain Emanations, Prolations or Emiſſions of the firſt Cauſe*, ſo that God and the Beings of the World are of one piece, one continu'd Web of Being, or one Ladder of Entity, of which God is the higheſt round (πάντων ἀκρότης,) *the top of all*, ſaith *Simplicius*,) they are an Expanſion, Evolution and Explication of the Deity like the Cabaliſts *Mundus Azilutbicus World of Emanation.* (b) In Stoiciſm the Souls of Men are Parts and Decerptions of God, to be refunded into him again. In the commonly received Pagan Theiſm the viſible mundane Syſtem is a God, as animated is the ſupreme Deity, *God is all things, all things are God, every thing muſt be called by his Name; and he by the Name of every thing, the ſeveral parts of the World are the ſeveral Parts and Members of God*; and at this rate of Theologizing there can be neither Creator nor Creature properly ſo called.

In the *fifth* place, as Paganiſm furniſheth a multitude of Beings with the Attributes of God, ſo it ſpoileth his Idea in great degree by a multitude of *Makers of the World*. As *Cicero* ſaith, that the World was conſtituted *Providentiâ Deorum, by the Providence of the Gods.* Which Polytheiſtic Language being Popular Pagan, is not to be interpreted of *Plato*'s eternal Ideas, (which the Popular Pagans knew nothing of:) But of the College of Sempiternal Deities. So *M. Tyrius* muſt be underſtood, to ſpeak of the Gods of the Poetic and Popular Pagan Theology in his Devotional Exclamation, (c) O Jupiter *and the Gods, the Fathers and Makers of the Earth and Sea.* The Ditheiſtic Conceit (the Opinion of two Self-exiſtent Deities, the one the Principle of Good, the other of Evil) was alſo in ſome Pagan Nations a Branch of their Theiſm, which is an Hypotheſis that ſpoileth the Idea of *an Increate Sovereignty, which ſtands againſt and is over the Univerſe of Creatures.*

But although Paganiſm aboundeth with atheous Conceits prejudicial to the Idea of God, and doth (d) *Dominationem obumbrare, obſcure and efface the Domination*, yet in a conſiderable degree it retaineth this Idea. For it acknowledgeth (e) a ſupreme Deity, that is, πάντων βασιλεὺς ϗ πατὴρ, King and Father of all, (or as *Heſiod* ſpeaketh πάντων βασιλεὺς ϗ κοίρανός ἐστιν, *he is King and Lord of all*,) and this ſupreme Deity is ſuppos'd to be *a Sempiternal Lord*, who is the Law of Religion to Mankind. For this was the Quarrel which the Epicureans had with the Pagan Theiſts, (f) *impoſuiſtis cervicibus noſtris Sempiternum Dominum, ye have put upon our Necks* (a Deity) *a Sempiternal Lord, whom we muſt fear Night and Day.* Such a Sovereignty of Religion the Epicureans thought grievous and intolerable, and therefore they roſe up in Arms to demoliſh and pull it down, which *Epicurus* is ſaid to have attempted and atchiev'd with great bravery, as one of his Diſciples repreſenteth him.

Humana ante oculos fœdè cum vita jaceret
In terris oppreſſa gravi ſub Religione,
Quæ caput à Cœli regionibus oſtendebat,
Horribili ſuper aſpectu mortalibus inſtans
Primum Grajus homo mortales tollere contra
Eſt oculos auſus, primuſque obſiſtere contra.
Quare Religio pedibus ſubjecta viciſſim, &c.

When human Life was filthily caſt down
On Earth, oppreſs'd by grievous Religion,
Which ſhew'd its head from Heavens Region high
With dire aſpect, drudging Mortality
Firſt a Greek Man dar'd to lift up the head
Againſt it, and Religion proſtrated.

VII. The Religion of Jews and Chriſtians noticeth God in the firſt place as *the Sovereignty over us Creature-tranſcendent*; as appeareth from his moſt uſual and obvious Name in Scripture *Adonai* (the Lord) of which the Jews ſay, (g) *there is no way in the World to ſee the face of the bleſſed King but by his Name* Adonai. *No Prayers or Supplications are admitted but by the Name* Adonai. *Therefore the Ancients ordain'd it in the beginning of all Prayers, as* Adonai (Lord) *open my Lips. It is a Treaſure, wherein are all the ornaments of the King.* In the Proem of the Ten Commandments God is call'd by the Name *Elohim*; and ſo it was requiſite, that in his Legiſlation (making the Laws of Religion) he ſhould be called by ſuch a Name, which denoteth his Imperial Power. And for this reaſon perhaps the Greek Interpreters choſe to render the Names אליהם and יהוה rather by the Greek Κύριος than Θεός, (at leaſt this is a more probable reaſon than *Grotius*'s Conjecture, (h) that they wav'd the Name Θεός, becauſe the Greeks called their Demons Θεοί,) becauſe in Religion it is requiſite, that God ſhould be very plainly and perſpicuouſly notic'd *as a Potentate over Men Creature-tranſcendent.* Accordingly his Laws to the Jews were commonly inacted in this form *I am the Lord.* And that Religion noticeth him as ſuch in the firſt place, is plain from hence, becauſe the firſt thing which it demandeth of us, is to acknowledge his Lordſhip and Domination, and actually to become his Subjects and Servants. Hence the Jews conceive, (i) that the Preface or Proem to the Ten Commandments (*I am the Lord*) is the Firſt Commandment, which injoineth them *receptionem imperii divini, the reception or acknowledgment of the Divine Empire, jugum regis cœleſtis ſcil. obedientiam divinorum mandatorum, the Yoke of the heavenly King, namely, Obedience to the Divine Commands.* For (ſay they) Princes ſeek to eſtabliſh their Authority in the firſt place, before they proceed to make Special Laws and Conſtitutions, the Law which determineth, who ſhall be the Sovereign, and who ſhall be the Subjects, is in all Governments the general and fundamental Law, which preceedeth all particular Laws. Some of the Hebrew Doctors ſuppoſe that the Proem to the Ten Commandments is *Præceptum Fidei, a Precept of Faith*; accordingly the Chriſtian Church in the very entrance of the firſt Article of our Creed propoſeth God to us as of this Notice or Idea in the firſt place παντοκράτωρ, *All-imperial.* And *Ruffinus* in his Expoſition of the Creed ſaith of the Name God (k) *God is the Name of the Nature or Subſtance which is above all. He is called Omnipotent, becauſe he hath the Potentacy of*

z) S. Aug. le C. D. l. o. c. 31.

(b) Euſeb. r. ev. l. 13. c. 15.

(b) M. Ant. l. 4. S. 14.

(c) Ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ θεοὶ πατέρες καὶ ποιηταὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάττης. Diſſ. 34. Confer. Diſſ. 29.

(d) Tertull. c. Marcion. l. 1. c. 10.

(e) M. Tyr. diſſ. 1.

(f) Cic. 1. de N. D.

(g) Hotting. Diſſ. de nom. Dei p. 277, &c.

(h) Explic. decal. ad Ex. 20. 1.

(i) P. Burgenſ. addit. 1. in Exod. c. 20.

(k) *Deus naturæ ipſius vel ſubſtantiæ quæ eſt ſuper omnia eſt Appellatio. Omnipotens dicitur, quod omnium teneat potentatum.*

All. So our Lord's Prayer in the entrance of it noticeth God *as the heavenly ſupernal Potentate* (for the coming of whoſe Kingdom we Pray;) and from the Chriſtian Apologiſts account of their Doctrine and Devotions we learn what is the firſt Notice or Idea of God in Religion. (*l*) *We diſpleaſe, becauſe we Preach one ſole* Lord (or God) *by this one ſole Name, from whom are all and under whom are all*, ſaith *Tertullian.* In noticing the true God to the Heathen (which is alſo the method of other Apologiſts for Chriſtianity) and confuting their Polytheiſm *from the Teſtimony of the human Soul* (to which he ſpeaketh,) he firſt conſidereth Godhead of Eſtate and then proceedeth to the Nature of God. *Omnem illi confiteris poteſtatem, ad cujus ſpectas voluntatem. Thou aſcribeſt all Potentacy to him, to whoſe Will thou haſt reſpect.* ——— *de Natura quoque Dei quam prædicamus, nec te latet. Nor is the Nature of God which we preach unknown to thee.* The Devotion of Chriſtians is (*m*) ἡ θρησκεία εἰς τὸν ἕνα ϗ πάντων δεσπότην, *Devotion towards one and Lord of all.* This Idea of God is eaſie and familiar to the meaneſt Underſtandings, that are inſtructed in the true Religion. A certain Beggar in our Nation ask'd an Alms of a Gentleman that was an Atheiſt, in the form that Beggars commonly uſe, *for the Lord's ſake.* The Atheiſt ask'd him, *who is your Lord?* The poor Man made an anſwer *the Lord of Heaven and Earth.* The Atheiſt reply'd, *I thought ſo, for I never ſaw any of his Servants better clad.* Thus the Atheiſts in Chriſtendom underſtand their Enemy, and the Poor in Chriſtendom underſtand their Patron, under this Notion or Idea, *the Lord, King or Potentate, Creature-tranſcendent.* (*n*) *By God is underſtood the Cauſe of the World.* Which implieth, that his Idea is *the Lord of the World.*

VIII. The ancient Theologers (both Pagan and Chriſtian) have excogitated ſeveral Etymologies of the Greek Name Θεὸς God, (*o*) ſome deriving it ἐκ τοῦ αἴθειν, *from burning or enkindling* (whence the Stars were call'd Θεοὶ, Gods,) others deriving it ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν vel ἀπὸ τοῦ θεᾶσθαι, *from running, pervading, or from beholding*, (*p*) others will have God called θεὸς παρὰ τὴν θέσιν, *from ſetting all things in order.* One of theſe Etymologies ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν, *from running or pervading* (which is *Plato*'s) is judiciouſly (*q*) confuted by *Tertullian.* And it muſt be ſaid both of that and the other Etymologies of the Greek Name (which alſo may be ſaid of almoſt all the Etymologies of the Latin *Deus* and the Engliſh *God*,) that they cannot reaſonably be thought any thing better than Etymological pedantry and trifling. For this Name God (as it is expreſs'd in the ſeveral Languages) is certainly a Name of *Honour* and *Nobilitation*, and belongeth (together with the Idea which it denoteth) to a ſort of Learning, which we have call'd *Nobility-learning.* It denoteth and ſignifieth *Honour and Nobilitation, Honour and Nobilitation of Eſtate, an Honour and Nobilitation of Eſtate, an Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation, Creature-tranſcendent*, and his being God conſiſteth in being *the Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent*; therefore his Name God denoteth and ſignifieth *the Lord, King or Potentate Creature-tranſcendent, and his being God conſiſteth in being the Sovereignty or Kingdom-Eſtate Creature-tranſcendent.* To explicate the Senſe and aſcertain the truth of this Argument, we will ſhew three things. (1.) That the Name God is a Name of Honour and Nobilitation in general. (2.) That it is the Name of an Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation. (3.) That it is the Name of an Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent.

(1.) In Paganiſm the Names of *God, Gods, Goddeſſes*, are manifeſtly Names of Honour and *Nobilitation* in general; for the Nobility which the Greek and Latin Poets celebrated, was *Deity*, or *Divinity.* (*r*) *The Men of ancient times that chiefly glory'd in the Nobility of their Anceſtors, accounted this the ground and foundation of their Ennobliſhment, that themſelves or their Anceſtors were immediately deſcended from Gods and Goddeſſes, as we ſee every where in* Homer *and* Virgil *and the reſt of the Poets. And if the Poets would praiſe any Perſons upon the account of their Nobility, they refer their Pedigree to the Gods.* Hence *Virgil* ſo oft inculcateth *Nate Dea, Goddeſs-born*, and *Homer* conſtantly calleth Kings and others eminently Noble διογενέας, διοτρεφέας, *Jove's Offſpring and Nurſlings.* The ſame Poet calleth Noblemen δίους, and Noble-women δίας, uſually, that is, *Divine. Nam & δῖος & δίαι, utramque habent ſignificationem & nobilis & divini ſive divinæ. The ſame word ſignifieth both Noble and Divine.* And in *Homer* (*s*) Διογενὴς ὀδυσσεὺς, *God-born* Ulyſſes, δῖος ὀρέστης, *Divine Oreſtes*, δῖα 'Ανδεία, *Divine Andia*, with the like, uſually occur. *Servius* interpreteth *Dia generoſa*, εὐγενὴς, *noble generous. Græcis Nobilis non ſolum* διογενὴς, *ſed &* δῖος, *dicitur. A Perſon of Honour and Nobility is called by the Greeks not only God-born, but Divine.* Φαίδιμος, is of the ſame ſignification (ſaith *Tiraquell*,) as when *Hector* is called Φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ, *Illuſtrious* Hector, Ajax, Φαίδιμος Αἴας, *Illuſtrious* Ajax. So are κλυτὸς, ἀγαυὸς, ἀγλαὸς, *Noble, Glorious, Reſplendent*, which are uſual ornamental Epithets in *Homer.* To ennoble *Ulyſſes* (*t*) *Ovid* ſaith of him ——— *Deus eſt in utroque Parente*, whereby is meant, that he was Noble by both Parents. (*u*)

Θείων δ' ἀμφοῖν ἐκγόνων ῥιζωμάτων
Τίς ἂν προσειπεῖν ἀξιώσειε χάτριν.

The infamous Name of a Servant is incompetible to One, both whoſe Parents were Divine or Noble.

In the holy Scriptures (which are in great part Nobility-learning) the Names *God, Gods, Sons of God*, are manifeſtly Names of Honour and Nobilitation; whence ſome ſay, that by the *Sons of God*, Gen. 6. 2. are meant (*w*) *Principes populorum vel Judices, the Princes of the People or the Judges*, or as *the Chaldee, Filii magnatum, the Sons of the Grandees*, or as the *Arabick, Filii illuſtrium viderunt Filias Plebis pulchras, the Sons of the Illuſtrious ſaw that the Daughters of the Plebeians were fair*; and in *Aben Ezra*'s Expoſition the Sons of God are *Filii Principum & Judicum, the Sons of the Princes and Judges.* (*x*) *Leo M.* ſpeaketh the Senſe of the New Teſtament, when he ſtileth the Children of God *adoptiva Nobilitas, the adoptive Nobility, Genus electum & regium, the Elect and Royal Race.* In *Arnobius*'s Diſcourſe touching the Origin of Human Souls (*y*) to ſuppoſe them *Dei Progenies, Regia Soboles, Dominica Proles, a Progeny of God, a Royal Offſpring, of Lordly Deſcent*, are ſynonymous Expreſſions; and he argueth, that they could not be weak and wicked, *ſi generoſitas eos aſſereret principalis, & ab rerum capite deſcendentium ducerent honeſtamenta natalium, if the higheſt Nobility*

(l) *Non placemus Dominum prædicantes hoc nomine unico unicum, à quo omnia & ſub quo univerſa.* Tertul. de Teſt. An.

(m) *J. Mart. de Monarch. Dei init.*

(n) *Leviathan. Par. 2. ch.* 31. p. 190.

(o) *Zanch. de Nat. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 11. *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 8. *c.* 8. *Simpl. in Epict. c.* 38.

(p) *Clem. Str. l.* 1. *in fine.*

(q) *Ad nation. l.* 2.

(r) Tiraquell. de Nobil. p. 24, 25.

(s) Ibid. p. 183.

(t) Metamorph. l. 13.

(u) Tiraquell supr. p. 85.

(w) Bever. Addit. ad Seld. de Syr. p. 109.

(x) Ser. 6. de Nativ. c. 3.

(y) Adv. Gent. l. 2. p. 68, 75, 78.

lity did vouch them for his Off-ſpring, and if they deriv'd the illuſtriouſneſs of their Pedigree and Deſcent from the head of all. Such Notices of God (abounding in Books of Learning) are a palpable Indication, that the Name and Idea of God belongeth not to vulgar Science, but to *Nobility-learning* as the proper Seat of it.

(2.) The Name God is manifeſtly (not only a Name of Honour and Nobilitation in general, but) one of the Names of Honour, Dignity and Nobilitation of Eſtate, which Nobility-learning treateth of, and which ſecular Nobility-learning calleth *Titles of Honour.* Some Names are indifferent, neither honourary nor diſgraceful, as *Socrates, Speuſippus*; others are terms of infamy, vilipendency, indignity, diſgrace and diſreſpect; and others are graceful and honourary to thoſe that bear them, they are *definitiones cum laude*, as defining and denoting Perſons with a mark of Praiſe and Honour; and theſe in a large Senſe may be call'd *Tituli Honorarii, Titles of Honour.* So the Title *moſt Excellent* given to *Theophilus* in S. *Luke*'s Goſpel may be called a *Title of Honour*, which yet denoteth not any Dignity of Eſtate. (y) *Moſt Excellent is not here the Name or Note of a Dignity*, ſaith *Camerarius.* But Titles of Honour in this Notion are of a large and general acceptation; in a ſtricter acceptation by *Titles of Honour* are meant the Names of Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation, whether they be the *Honourary* or the meerly *Officiary.* And in the ſtricteſt acceptation *Titles of Honour* are confin'd to the *Honourary Dignities* Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, of which there are large Liſts and Catalogues ſome importing more, others leſs, of Honour and Dignity of Perſonage. (z) As amongſt Scholars רבן *Rabban* is the Name of a more excellent Dignity than רב *Rab* or רבי *Rabbi*, ſay the Jewiſh Writers. So in Governments, (a) *Deſpote* was a Title, that ſometime ſignified τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ἔγγιστα ἀξίωμα, *the Dignity next to the Imperial.* In this ſort of Learning it is diſputed (b) *an divitiæ, virtus, ſcientia nobilitent? Whether Riches, Virtue, Learning do ennoble their Poſſeſſors?* To which the Anſwer is, that they do conciliate a ſort of Nobility, Pulchritude and Precioſity of Perſon, they are of ſingular value that are Wiſe and Virtuous. (c) *An excellent Man cannot be ignoble*, although his Dignity or Quality is not to be found in the Liſts of thoſe Honours and Nobilities, that are the Subject of *Armory-nobility-learning.* Mundane Riches ſo far Nobilitate, they conciliate a regard to their Poſſeſſors, and render them of great account in the World. (d) *For a ſervile Miſcreant, if Rich, will be much ſet by in the minds and carriage of Men.* But although Virtue, Learning and Riches in ſome ſort ennoble their Poſſeſſors, they do not conſtitute them ſuch Eſtates of Nobilitation, that are contradiſtinct to the *Plebeians* of a Kingdom. Amongſt which Nobilitations of Eſtate thoſe meer Officiary Dignities muſt be reckon'd, (e) that in ſome ſort ennoble (as the Office of Chancellour:) But principally and eminently *the honourary Dignities* are the Honours and Eſtates of Nobilitation, and they only are ennobled with *Titles of Honour* in the ſtricteſt acceptation. For in this ſort of Learning *Titles of Honour* are oppos'd to *Titles of* (meer) *Office*, and *the Honourary Dignities* (which are certain collectives of matter of Honour) are oppos'd *to the meer Officiary Dignities*, which differ as the High-Sheriff of a County differeth from a Saxon Earl of the County. They diſtinguiſh *Honourary* from *Officiary* Dignity, that ſay, *The Peers in* England *ſit in Parliament, non ratione Nobilitatis ſed Officii, not upon account of their Honour, but their Officiary part in the Government*; and that *Officium eſt imperare, non regnum, to be a Governour, is not a matter of Regnancy, but of Office.* (f) In the Roman Empire they that had well diſcharg'd an Office of Service, Charge and Truſt (a meer Officiary Dignity,) were uſually rewarded with an Honourary Dignity, (g) which in other Nations hath been uſually the Reward of great Virtues and great Atchievements. Agreeably to which Uſages in the Kingdoms and Empires of this World our Bl. Saviour muſt be ſuppos'd for his great Virtues and great Atchievements and after the faithful diſcharge of an Officiary Dignity, to be rewarded with an *Honourary Dignity*, when he was Crown'd with *Glory and Honour*, Heb. 2. 9. which Honour being both the Crown-dignity and the Godhead, from thence it appeareth, that the Godhead of Eſtate is of generical Notion *an Honourary Dignity* in the ſtricteſt Senſe of Armory-nobility-learning, for ſuch is the Crown-dignity. Accordingly, the Maſters of this ſort of Learning (h) amongſt the greater Honourary Dignities and the Titles of Honour that denote them, reckon θεὸς, θεότης, *Dii, Divi, God, Gods, Deity, Divinity*, κύριος, βασιλεὺς, *Numen, Lord, King, Divine Potentacy.*

(3.) To be a King is Honour and Nobilitation in general, it is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation, it is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation Subject-tranſcendent, and all this the Name King denoteth and ſignifieth: In like manner, *to be a God*, is Honour and Nobilitation in general, it is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation, it is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation (Subject-tranſcendent) Creature-tranſcendent, and all this the Name God denoteth and ſignifieth. The Gods in Paganiſm muſt be conſider'd in reſpect of what they were really and on their Part, and in reſpect of what they were aſcriptitiouſly and on our part. If they had been really and on their part *Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent*, they had been true Gods: But becauſe they were only aſcriptitiouſly and on our part *Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent*, therefore they were but Idols and Idolatrouſly made Gods. And as in Human Governments Men are ennobled by being made Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation in civil Society: So the Pagans way of ennobling Men was by making them (on our part and aſcriptitiouſly Gods) the Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation in Religious Society. So the Emperour *Nero* could create Gods, as eaſily as the King can create Barons.

> *Stultè verebor, eſſe cum faciam Deos.*
> *It were Non-ſenſe for me to fear Gods, that make Gods.*

So *Libanius* the Sophiſt promis'd a Godſhip to *Julian*, Σοὶ δ' ἔσται μὲν, ὅτε θύσουσιν ἄνθρωποι καὶ βωμοὺς ἱδρύσονται, *The time will be, when Men ſhall do Sacrifice to thee and erect Altars.* So *Demades* the *Athenian* ἐψηφίσατο θεὸν τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, *decreed, that* Alexander *ſhould be a God.* The Name God therefore

(y) *Nec Epitheton* κράτιστος *hic Dignitatis nota eſt, magis quàm apud Latinos optimus.*

(z) *Buxtorf. de abbreviat. p.* 153.

(a) *Selden Titles of Hon. p.* 236. *ed.* 3.

(b) *Tiraquell. ſupr. c.* 3, 4, &c.

(c) Ἀνὴρ ἄριστος οὐκ ἂν εἴη δυσγενής.

(d) Καὶ δοῦλος ὢν γὰρ, τίμιος πλουτῶν ἀνήρ.

(e) *Selden ſupr. p.* 717.

(f) *Ibid.*

(g) *Ibid. p.* 455.

(h) *Ibid. p.* 32, *and p.* 43.

therefore in Paganiſm denoteth and ſignifieth *a Religion-kind of Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation*, which (the Religious Honour and Worſhip being proper to God) is the ſame with *a Creature-tranſcendent Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation.* So in Holy Scripture the Name God denoteth (which is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent) *the Religious kind of Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation.* For a God and a Σέβασμα (a Religious Honour or Worſhip objectively underſtood) are terms ſynonymous; 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 4. *Who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf* ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, *above every thing that is called God or a* Σέβασμα. So *Photius* mentioneth (*i*) τὰ τῆς ἑλληνικῆς θρησκείας σεβάσματα, θεὺς, *the Greeks Religious Honours or Worſhips* (objectively underſtood) *that is, their Gods:* οἰκεῖον ἐδυσφήμησε σέβασμα, he reproach'd his own Σέβασμα or God. So *Wiſd.* 14. 20. σεβάσμα is tranſlated a God; and *Act.* 17. 23. the *Athenians* σεβάσματα ſignifieth their Devotions objectively underſtood, or their Devotional Honours and Worſhips. The Pagans Image σεβάσματα were (objectively) their Devotional Honours and Worſhips, and therefore are intituled Gods; *Iſa.* 46. 6. *He maketh it a God, they fall down, yea they worſhip.* They proceeded to ſuch madneſs, (*k*) ὡς τ' ἐλαΐνον κορμὸν θεῶσαι, *to deifie a piece of Olive-wood*, becauſe they made it a Σέβασμα. Some of the beſt learned in the Oriental Languages derive the Hebrew Name (*l*) *Eloah* and *Elohim* (God) from the Arabick אלה which ſignifieth *to venerate or worſhip*; ſo that *Eloah* and *Elohim* (God) is the ſame with Σέβασμα. And to be a Σέβασμα, is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent, according to *Apoc.* 4. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honour, aud Power, for thou haſt created all things: Apoc.* 14. 7. *Worſhip him that made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Water.* His being God therefore (properly and formally ſuch) is his being *an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent*; as the King's being properly and formally ſuch, is to be an Honour, Dignity and Nobilitation of Eſtate Subject-tranſcendent.

(i) *V.* Dr. *Ham. in* 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 4.

(k) Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l. 5. c. 36.

(l) *Hotting. Hexaem.* p. 20. *Diſſ. de nom. Dei*, p. 258.

CHAP. II.

1. *Conſectary from our Account of the Name of God and his Idea, that the Name God is in different Senſes a Proper and not a Proper Name.* 2. *Conſectary, that the Metaphyſical Ens is not the moſt proper or accommodate Name of God.* 3. *Conſectary, the Hebrew Name Jehovah is not the ſame with the Metaphyſical Ens, although it ſeemeth to be ſo.* 4. *A Conſideration of the Dignity of that Name.* 5. *A Conſideration of the full Expreſſion of it.* 6. *A Conſideration of the Senſe and Reaſon of it, and that this Name is not of the Metaphyſical, but of a Popular-Religious Interpretation.* 7. *The firſt Argument againſt the Metaphyſical Interpretation.* 8. *A ſecond Argument.* 9. *A third Argument.* 10. *A fourth Argument.* 11. *A fifth Argument.* 12. *A ſixth Argument.* 13. *A ſeventh Argument.* 14. *An eighth Argument.* 15. *A ninth Argument.* 16. *Of the Promiſſory* ὁ ὢν *or Ens.* 17. *Of the Prophetic* ὁ ὢν *or Ens.* 18. *Of the Metaphyſical* ὁ ὢν *or Ens.*

I. From our Account of the Name of God and his Idea many Conſectaries are deducible, and ſome of them are of great importance; others are of leſs value and the lower Houſe. Such is this, which hath the firſt place. *Conſect.* 1. *The Name God muſt be accounted a proper Name, and not a proper Name in the Senſe of Nobility-Learning.* The Scholaſtick Divines both Jews and Chriſtians make a Diſpute, whether the Name God be a *Proper* Name or an Appellative? But (agreeably to the Metaphyſical and Philoſophic-Pagan kind of Theologizing) in a Senſe and Notion quite alien from that of Nobility-Learning; (*m*) for by a Proper Name they mean שם עצם *nomen ſubſtantiæ, a Name of the ſubſtance of God*; by an *Appellative* they mean שם תאר *nomen Attributi, the name of an Attribute*; and in this Senſe ſome of the Fathers affirm, others deny, that the Name *God* is a Proper Name. Thus the Senſe and Notion of a Proper Name according to Nobility-Learning is not at all taken notice of in this ſort of Theology, which yet ought not to be overlook'd. For according to *Nobility-Learning* the Titles of Honour and Dignity are diſtinguiſh'd from the Proper Names; (*n*) as a late Greek Writer ſaith of the Names *Gylas* and *Carchan*, They are not ὀνόματα κύρια, ἀλλὰ ἀξιώματα, *Proper Names but Dignities.* In the ſame Senſe the Name God is not *a Proper Name*; for it is certainly a Title of Honour and Dignity. But it muſt be called *a Proper Name* in ſuch Senſe as Titles of Honour are; and in the ſtrictly religious Senſe it is *the incommunicable Name*, Wiſd. 14. 21. In ſuch Senſe therefore it is a Proper Name; and accordingly *Tertullian* affirmeth, (*o*) it is *Nomen proprium Divinitatis, the proper Name of the Divinity.*

(m) Petav. T. 1. l. 8. c. 8, 9.

(n) Selden. *Titles*, p. 66.

(o) Ad Nation. l. 2.

II. *Conſect. The Name* ὁ ὢν, *Ens or he that is*, τὸ ὂν *or* αὐτοὸν, *Ipſum Ens* (Being it ſelf) τὸ ὄντως ὄν, *that which truly and properly is*, οὐσία, *Eſſence* (underſtood as a Metaphyſical or Platonic Name) *is not the moſt proper or accommodate Name of God.* The Platonic School (as we have ſeen before) calleth its ſublime Intelligibles and Incorporeals, the Platonic Ideas and the comprehenſion of them (their ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis) αὐτὸ τὸ ὂν μετ' ἀληθείας, *that which is indeed with truth*, becauſe it is the ſuppoſed Nature and Eſſence of thoſe abſtract Natures and Eſſences, *to be ſempiternally and immutably.* (*p*) This Branch of the Platonic Scholaſticiſm or Ontology hath been appply'd to God both by the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Theologers, who although they ſuppoſe *the Eſſence and Nature of God*, to be altogether *unknowable* and *inexplicable*, yet thus much they underſtand of it, that this is his Nature and Eſſence, *He is id quod eſt, an Eſſence to which the whole of Eſſence and Exiſtence is appropriate*, the infinite fulneſs of real Eſſence and neceſſarily exiſtent. And becauſe they ſuppoſe, that this is chiefly eſſential unto God, and the primary Notice which they have of him, therefore they

(p) Petav. T. 1. l. 1. c. 6. H. Zanch. de Nat. Dei, l. 1. c. 11.

they ſuppoſe, that the Name which denoteth it, ὁ ὤν, or *Ens*, is the moſt proper and accommodate Name of God. So *J. Damaſcen* ſaith, *There are two principal Names of God*, ὁ ὤν, *Ens*, and ὁ θεός, *God*; the firſt of which Names he calleth, κυριώτερον πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ θεοῦ λεγομένων ὀνομάτων, *the moſt proper of all the Names of God.* Even *Gr. Naz.* ſaith of thoſe Names, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ θεὸς, *Ens and God*, that they are τῆς οὐσίας ὀνόματα, *the Names of the Eſſence*, καὶ τούτων μᾶλλον ὁ ὤν, *and chiefly* (above the other) *Ens is ſo.* In this Metaphyſical Name and Notice of God, ſimply conſider'd, there is nothing but what is laudable, common Reaſon diſcerneth, that ſomething is neceſſarily exiſtent, and that God is in ſuch Senſe ὁ ὤν, *he that is*; and to ſay, that *he alone is*, that created Beings are not *truly and properly*, is nothing but truth, and what is really honourary to God. Neverthelеſs this Branch of Scholaſtic Theology cannot be excus'd from a twofold Criminality.

(1.) The one is a Criminal Platonizing in the uſe of this Name ὁ ὤν, or *Ens*, which iſſueth in Abſurdity and Impiety; (*q*) for the Platoniſts uſually affirm, that the Supreme Deity of their School their Monad or Myſtic-Metaphyſical firſt Nature) is not *Mind*, *Ens*, *Eſſence* or *Intelligible*, but above and beyond all theſe, and that theſe Names are appropriate to their ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis (the Archetypal World,) which is *Ens it ſelf and the comprehenſion of Entia.* The Platonizing Scholaſticks of the Church therefore, after they have ſaid, that *Ens is the moſt proper Name of God*, think themſelves oblig'd, in expreſs terms to unſay it; (*r*) for they will have God intituled ἀνύπαρκτος, *without Exiſtence*, ἀνούσιος, *without Eſſence*, ἄνους, *without Mind or Intelligence*, ἄζωος, *without Life*; and *J. Damaſcen* ſaith, He is ὑπὲρ τὸ εἶναι, *above Being.* (*s*) *Innumerable the like places of the ancient Fathers might be produc'd* (ſaith Petavius) *which affirm, that the Divine Eſſence cannot be declar'd by any Affirmation* (or affirmative Attribute,) *ſo that Being, Eſſence or Subſtance cannot be predicated of it.* *Euſebius* Platonically ſaith of God, (*t*) ἁπάσης ὢν ἀνωτάτω οὐσίας, *He is beyond all Eſſence. Plato* (ſaith he) *admirably declar'd T'Agathon*, μὴ εἶναι οὐσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας, *not to be Eſſence, but beyond Eſſence*, ὃν δὴ καὶ μόνον εἰκότως θεὸν τὰ Ἑβραίων ἀναγορεύει λόγια, *whom the Hebrew Oracles declare to be the only God.* (*u*) *Conſtantine the Great* ſaith of *Plato*, Πρῶτον μὲν θεὸν ὑφηγήσατο τὸν ὑπὲρ τὴν οὐσίαν καλῶς ποιῶν, *He rightly taught the firſt God, to be above Eſſence or Subſtance.* All the Fathers who ſuppoſe the Platonic Triad a deſcendent from the Hebrews, muſt ſuppoſe, that the Platoniſts Myſtic-Metaphyſical firſt Nature is the true God, and therefore Authorities more than a few (although not one good Reaſon) may be alledg'd in favour of this Platonic Conceit, that the Name *Ens* or οὐσία is not agreeable unto God; from whence it will follow, that (according to the Scholaſtic Theologers themſelves) *Ens is not the moſt proper Name of God, that in great degree it is an improper Name, and that* (according to them) *it is a diſputable caſe, whether Ens or Non Ens be the moſt proper Name of God. Maximus* the Interpreter of the counterfeit *Dionyſius* ſaith, (*w*) that τὸ εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι, *being and not being are neither of them properly ſaid of God*; but he alſo ſaith, τὸ μὴ εἶναι μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ ὑπερεῖναι, *becauſe of his ſuper-Being Not being* (Non Ens) *is rather to be apply'd to God as the more proper.* (*x*) *So ſome Platoniſts, to ſhew, that the Divine Majeſty differeth from every thing that can be thought, call it Non Ens.* So we have ſeen, that the Name which the Jewiſh Cabaliſts (Platonizing and making Riddles of God) uſually give the Deity, is אין *Non Ens. The Deity* (ſaith *Reuchlin*) *is called by the greateſt Maſters of Contemplation Non Ens, as it is written* Exod. 17. *is Adonai, among us Ens or Non Ens?* (*y*) *Some ſay, that he is both Ens and Non Ens, becauſe both the things that are and are not, are from him and after him. In like manner he is* non Unum, *Not-One, being the cauſe of every Unite, and Unity is after him, and he is none of them, neither of thoſe that are after him, nor of thoſe that are not; as* R. Hamai *ſaith, that all things are deriv'd from his Unity, and he is not like One it ſelf. This not only the Judaical Wiſe Men ſay, but the Chriſtian ſay the ſame thing; for* Dionyſius *the* Areopagite *in his Book of Myſtical Theology ſaith, The Deity is neither Number, nor Order, nor One, nor Henotety; what then is the Deity? Simonides* anſwer'd *Hiero, the more I think, the leſs I underſtand; and ſo it fareth with me.* (*z*) *When having paſs'd over or caſhier'd all created things, I mount above Ens, I find nothing but an infinite Sea of Nihilitude, and the Fountain of all Entity flowing from the Abyſs of Darkneſs perpetually.* This is a mode of Theologizing worthy the Wiſe Men of the *Cabala*; this is the conſequence of *Philoſophic-Paganizing the Matters of Theology*; this is the iſſue of applying *the Platonic Scholaſticiſm* to the true God. It hath fill'd the Chriſtian Theology with profane Jargon, Abſurdities and Impieties; of which number this muſt be thought one: To diſpute, that ὁ ὤν, *Ens* (or he that is) *is the moſt proper Name of God*, and then to play Platonic Tricks with that Name of God, and (in great degree) to bereave the Divine Majeſty of his *really proper* and *ſuppos'd moſt proper Name.*

(2.) A ſecond inexcuſable Criminality there is in this Branch of Scholaſtick Theology, which is *a ſcurvy Reflection upon and Diſparagement of the Name God.* For the Scholaſtick Theologers have a peculiar fondneſs for the Name *Ens*, as being moſt agreeable to their Metaphyſical and Scholaſtick Genius, whoſe Theology is very much of kin to the Philoſophic Pagan (that was but an higher ſort of Phyſiologizing,) and accordingly they love to contemplate God (*a*) as πέλαγος τῆς οὐσίας ἄπειρον, *an interminate Ocean of Eſſence, that hath and comprehendeth in himſelf* ὅλον τὸ εἶναι, *the whole of Being.* Upon account of this Congruity to themſelves and not upon any rational or religious account the Metaphyſical Name ὁ ὤν, *Ens*, is made the primary and principal Name of the Deity, ὁ θεός, *God*, is but δεύτερον ὄνομα (as *J. Damaſcen* calleth it) *a Name that muſt come in the ſecond place*, and lacky after the other; for which the Reaſons alledg'd by Schoolmen and Scholaſtic Divines (*b*) have nothing in them, that looketh like Reaſon. For if this Name *Deus* (God) denoteth the Divine Eſſence (as all Schoolmen affirm) no Name can be more eſſential to God. If ὁ ὤν, or *Ens*, be

---

(q) Petav. ſupr. S. 10. & ibid. c. 5. S. 11.

(r) Ibid. c. 5. S. 9.

(s) *Poſſunt alia generis ejuſdem innumera proferri loca veterum Patrum, quæ divinam eſſentiam nulla prorſus θέσει vel καταφάσει, hoc eſt, affirmativè, declarari poſſe perſuadent; adeóque nec ipſum eſſe, aut οὐσίαν de illa prædicari.* Ibid. c. 6. S. 13.

(t) Dem. Ev. l. 5. c. 11. & pr. Ev. l. 11. c. 21.

(u) Orat. ad ſanct. cœt. c. 9. vid. Gale in Jambl. p. 300.

(w) Petav. ſupr. c. 6. S. 12.

(x) *Sic quidam Platonici divinæ majeſtatis ab omni re quæ cogitari poſſit, diſcrimen oſtendentes, appellant eam Non Ens.* Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l. 7. c. 5.

(y) *Legitur in libro de via fidei & expiationis, quod ſit utrumque* היש ואין *Ens & Non Ens, quoniam ea quæ ſunt & ea quæ non ſunt, ex ipſo ſunt, & poſt ipſum ſunt.* Reuchlin. de Art. Cab. l. 3. fol. 65. b.

(z) *Cùm exactis omnibus creatis aſcendero ſupra Ens, non invenio aliud quam infinitum pelagus Nihilitudinis, & fontem omnis Entitatis ex abyſſo tenebrarum manantem perenniter.* Ibid.

(a) *Petav. ſupr. c. 6. S. 7.*

(b) *Aquin. 1a. Qu. 13. Art. 11. P. Burgenſ. Addit. in Exod. c. 3.*

be more the Name of *meer Eſſence* (as Gr. *Naz.* affirmeth,) yet it is not more the Name of *the Divine Eſſence*. If this Name *Qui eſt* (he that is) denoteth the Eſſence of God *more at large, and is leſs determinative*, that ſpeaketh it leſs *definitive* and *deſcriptive*, and therefore leſs proper and accommodate. If this Name *Qui eſt* denoteth the ſtanding duration of God) without flux or temporary ſucceſſion,) that ſignification of it importeth but one particular Attribute of God. If the Name God be communicable *metaphorically*, *analogically*, *opinionatively*, ſo is the Name *Ens*. If the Name *Ens* is more *intimous* and leſs *extraneous*, and therefore a more proper Name of God than *Deus* (as *Cajetan* (c) expoundeth *Aquinas*'s Text,) how is it, that Piety is leſs abhorrent from the Attribute ὑπερούσιος, *ſuper-eſſential* (or ſuper-ſubſtantial) than from the Attribute ὑπέρθεος, *ſuper-God? Marius Victorinus* who ſaith of God, (*d*) *nec* ὂν *ſed magis* προὸν, *he is not to be intituled Entity, but rather Præ-entity*, would ſcarce think it tolerable, to attribute to him προθεότητα, *Præ-Divinity and Præ-Godhead*; which ſheweth, that the Name God is more intimous and leſs extraneous (of cloſer coherence and connection with the Deity) than the Name *Ens*. If *Ens* is a more proper Name than God, how is it, that Scholaſtick Divines in great degree deny unto God the Name *Ens?* Or dare they in great degree deny unto him the Name God? They attribute to him μὴ εἶναι, *not Being*, as more proper than εἶναι, *Being*, but do they think it more proper, to attribute to him μὴ εἶναι θεὸν, *not being God?* As the counterfeit *Dionyſius* (*e*) intituleth God ἀλογία, καὶ ἀνοησία καὶ ἀνωνυμία, *vacuity of Speech, of Mind and of Name:* So according to *Marius Victorinus* he muſt be intituled ἀνουσία, *Vacuity of Eſſence*; but they muſt be more than ſubtil Metaphyſicians that enſtyle him Ἀθεΐα, *Atheonſneſs and Vacuity of God*. Yet to theſe Sublimities of Madneſs and Impiety the counterfeit *Dionyſius* proceedeth, and *Eugubinus* doth not diſallow them; (*f*) *apud Dionyſium eſt negatoria Theologia, quod Deus non ſit Deus: there is a negative kind of Theology in* Dionyſius (ſaith he) *that God is not God*. The Platonic *Philo* is not much ſhort of the counterfeit *Dionyſius*; for he affirmeth, (*g*) *That this Saying, I am thy God, is ſpoken Catachreſtically, not properly; for Ens as being Ens, is not of the number of Relatives*. The Reward which he allotteth to the virtuous is of the ſame ſtrain. (*h*) *What more florid and becoming Garland can be made for the virtuous and victorious Soul than that, whereby it may with acute Eye-ſight contemplate Ens?* But the Beatitude which the truly Religious aſpire after, is (not to ſee *Ens*, but) to ſee *God*, which is a Name that they much prefer before the Metaphyſical and Platonic *Ens* (wherewith the Scholaſticks make wild work in Theology,) as being far more *ample, definitive, comprehenſive, deſcriptive, auguſt and venerable*, and of kind *the Holy, Religious and Divine Name*, which the Metaphyſical Name *Ens* is not. What thing ſoever belonging to God, the Name ὁ ὢν *Ens*, denoteth (from whence that Name is given him) the Name ὁ θεὸς, *God*, denoteth the ſame and much more. It denoteth his *Divinity* of State and Nature, of Kind and Degree, his being God both on his part and ours, the whole of his being God. And as Noble Mens Titles of Honour are in a certain Senſe their Proper Names; for they are called by them, as other Men are by their Proper Names, and thoſe Names are the Proper Names of that Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation which they are: So the Name *God* is in a certain Senſe the Divine Majeſty's proper Name; it is the Name whereby he ought to be called, as Men are by their Proper Names, and it is the Proper Name of that Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation which he is (which cannot be ſaid of the Metaphyſical Name ὁ ὢν, *Ens*) according to that excellent Saying of *Greg. Nyſſen.* (*i*) συμφυὲς ἐστὶν ἀξίωμα τῷ θεῷ αὐτὴ ἡ θεότης, *the Godhead it ſelf is a Dignity connatural to God*. The Name God therefore is his definitive Name, if the Name *Ens* be ſubſtituted inſtead of it, God is deſtroy'd, as will appear preſently.

III. *Conſect. The Hebrew Name* Jehovah *cannot be thought of inferiour condition to the Name God, and therefore cannot be the ſame with the Metaphyſical Ens; but it ought to be look'd upon as the proper diſtinctive Name of the true God, ſignifying his being God in reality* (and therefore comprehenſively and incluſively whatever the Metaphyſical Name Ens ſignifieth) *and his being a God in reality to the Hebrews*. It is generally agreed, that the Name *Jehovah* (or *Jah*, or *Ehjeh*, which may juſtly be reckon'd the ſame Name) ſignifieth ὁ ὢν, *he that is*, or τὸ ὄν, *id quod eſt* (that which is) or ὁ ἐσόμενος, *he that will be*; for it is deriv'd from הוה or היה, which ſignifieth, *to be or exiſt*. In *Exod.* 3. 14. the Septuagint render the Name *Ehjeh* ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, *I am he that is*, ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με, *he that is hath ſent me*. An ancient Interpreter *Theodotion* rendreth the Name *Jah* τὸ ὄν, (*k*) *Hallelu Jah* he rendreth αἰνεῖτε τὸ ὄν, *praiſe that which is*. (*l*) In *Clemens Alexandrinus* the Name *Tetragrammaton* or *Jehovah* is interpreted ὁ ὢν καὶ ἐσόμενος, *he that is and will be*. (*m*) Euthymius *interpreteth the Name Jah in like manner as the Name Jehovah* τὸν ὄντα, *he that is*. (*n*) *Origen* accounteth Ἰὰ and Ἰαὰ the ſame word in Senſe, becauſe ὁ ὢν *utroque ſignificatur, the ſignification of both of them is Ens or he that is*: So *Druſius* in his *Tetragrammaton* calleth that Name, and thoſe other *Jah* and *Ehjeh*, *nomina* τοῦ ὄντος, *the Names of Ens or he that is*. And becauſe all the Learned agree, that the Hebrew Name *Jehovah* cometh from a Root, which ſignifieth nothing but *Eſſence* or *Exiſtence*, (*o*) hence one of them will have the Greek Name κύριος (by which the LXX render the Name *Jehovah*) deriv'd from κύρω or κυρῶ in its ancient ſignification, in which ſignification it is the ſame with εἰμὶ or ὑπάρχω, *ſum, I am*, ſo that κύριος immediately deriv'd from thence muſt be ὁ ὢν or ὁ ὑπάρχων (he that is) *and conſequently the proper Interpretation of Jehovah*. Thus that Hebrew Name at firſt ſight ſeemeth to be the very ſame Name with the Metaphyſical ὁ ὢν or *Ens*, and accordingly both amongſt the Hebrew Doctors and in the Chriſtian Church they have been taken for the ſame Name (ſome counting them abſolutely the ſame Name, others making them for the main the ſame;) to rectifie which miſtakes in the Scholaſtick Theology, we will illuſtrate this *Conſectary* by taking into conſideration three things touching the Name Jehovah. 1. *The Dignity of it*. 2. *The full Expreſſion of it*. 3. *The Senſe and Reaſon of it*.

IV. The *Dignity* of this great Name would be as *unſpeakable*, as the Name it ſelf is ſuppos'd to be by the Jews, if the ineffable Myſteries which

(c) *In Aquin.* 1. *par. Qu.* 13. *Art.* 11.

(d) *Petav. ſupra*, c. 5. *ſ.* 9.

(e) *Ibid.* c. 6. *ſ.* 11. & c. 5. *ſ.* 9.

(f) *Ubi ſupr.*

(g) Ὅτι τὸ ἐγώ εἰμι θεὸς σὸς λέγεται καταχρηστικῶς, οὐ κυρίως· τὸ γὰρ ὄν, ᾗ ὄν ἐστιν, οὐχὶ τῶν πρός τι. *Opuſcul.* p. 9.

(h) Τίς δ' ἂν εὐανθέστερος, ἢ ἐπιτηδειότερος πλέκοιτο νικηφόρῳ ψυχῇ στέφανος, ᾗ δι' οὗ τὸ ὄντα δυνήσεται θεωρεῖν ὀξυδερκῶς; *Ibid.* p. 29.

(i) C. *Eunom. l.* 1. p. 117.

(k) *S. Amam. Antibarb. Bibl.* p. 475.

(l) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. c. 32.

(m) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 4. c. 13.

(n) *Ibid.*

(o) *Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed, Art.* 2.

which they imagine to be in the Letters of it, were not meerly imaginary. (*p*) *Menaſſeh ben Iſrael* hath given a large Account of the *Grammatical*, *Arithmetical*, *Muſical*, *Cabaliſtical* Myſteries, which the Jews find or fancy in the Letters of the Name of *Jehovah*, and of the wonder-working Power, which they aſcribe to it (as that when King *Menaſſeh* ſought to ſlay the Prophet *Iſaiah*, he by pronouncing this Name incloſ'd himſelf in a Cedar-tree;) ſo *Moſes* and Chriſt himſelf wrought Miracles by their knowledge and uſe of this Name, as the Jews ſuppoſe. The Chriſtians following the Jews Example have alſo diſcover'd many Myſteries in the Name *Jehovah*, which were never there; ſuch as (*q*) the Myſtery of the Trinity, the two Natures of Chriſt, and the origin of the Name *Jeſus*. The Letters of it (*r*) which the Jews call *flatus literæ* (that are pronounc'd meerly by the Breath) are ſaid, to indicate, that all have their Life and Breath from God; and its quieſcent Letters are ſaid to indicate, that in him only is true and ſolid reſt: All which are groundleſs Imaginations. (*s*) The ſignification alſo of three times, *paſt*, *preſent* and *to come*, conceiv'd to be in this Name (in the contrivance of the Letters and Vowels of it) ſeemeth to be deſtitute of any good and ſolid Foundation. Of the ſame nature is that Conceit of ſome Learned Men, (*t*) that this Hebrew Name according to one mode of pronouncing it in Greek is *Jeova*, and that in this mode of pronouncing it the ſeven Greek Vowels are contain'd; and therefore this Name ſo pronounc'd in Greek is the celebrated Name of *Seven Vowels*. It is much more probable, that this Name as it is in the Hebrew, was call'd by ſome Ancients the Name of *Seven Vowels*; for although its Letters are all *Conſonants*, that doth not hinder, but that this Name might be call'd the Name of *Seven Vowels* anciently, if thoſe Conſonants were reputed *Vowels*. Now, *Jod* and *Vau* are by S. *Hierom* call'd *Vowels*, (*u*) and *He* ſeemeth to have been a *Vowel* (before the uſe of Points) among the ancient Hebrews. (*w*) *P. Burgenſis* ſaith, *Literæ omnes ſunt vocales*, *all its Letters are Vowels*; and *Joſephus* ſaith, That the *Tetragrammaton* is τέσσαρα φωνήεντα, *four Vowels*. Now, there is little reaſon to doubt, but that (howſoever the Name *Jehovah* was read and pronounc'd) with theſe four Letters reputed Vowels three real Vowels were conjoyn'd for the reading and pronunciation of them; for although ſome Grammarians will ſcarce allow *Scheva* to be call'd a Vowel, yet a better Hebrician than any of them (*x*) expreſly calleth it by that Name; therefore the Hebrew Name *Jehovah* may be the Name of *Seven Vowels* (*y*) mention'd by *Euſebius*, if we admit the Hebrew Vowels, to be called Letters in Greek, as the Greeks call their own Vowels.

Ἑπτά με φωνήεντα θεὸν μέγαν ἄφθιτον αἰνεῖ
Γράμματα, τὸν πάντων ἀκάματον πατέρα.

I a great God, immortal, perpetual,
Father of the great Machine Univerſal
Have my Name form'd of Seven Letters vocal.

The Jews know not (*z*) the Pronunciation of the Name *Jehovah*, but have wholly loſt it from about the time of the deſtruction of their Second Temple; (*a*) which ſeemeth to have been (not meerly an effect of their Superſtition, but) an adorable Providence, that when they loſt their God and ceas'd to be his People (at the deſtruction of their Temple a ſolemn Divorce was given them,) they ſhould alſo loſe his Name *as their God*, and be thenceforth ignorant of his proper Name; (*b*) for they have rightly call'd this Name המיוחד *his proper Name*, *to him alone attributed*, *whereas the Name Elohim is a Name communicated to others*; *but as for this Name* (ſaith *Kimchi*) *none partaketh with him*. Names may be called *Proper Names* in ſeveral Senſes and Notions, which the Jews are not careful to diſtinguiſh: But from the Account which they give of this Proper Name, it is manifeſt, that they look upon it as a Proper Name in the common ordinary Senſe, as *Iſaac* or *Jacob* is a Proper Name; for they obſerve (and all the Learned in Hebrew agree with them,) that it hath all the Characters of ſuch a Proper Name; it admitteth not the demonſtrative *He* at the beginning of it, nor an Affix at the end of it, nor of the Plural Number, nor of the ſtate of Conſtruction, or to be *in regimine*, (*c*) *ſicut non dicitur* ὁ Σωκράτης μȣ *Socrates mei*, ſo it is not ſaid *Jehova Abrahæ*, *Jehova Iſaaci*. Sometimes indeed *Jehova Zebaoth* occurreth in Scripture; (*d*) but that is an elliptical form of Speech (wherein the Name *Elohim* or *Adonai* is underſtood), which fully expreſs'd is *Jehova Elohe exercituum*, *Jehovah the God of Hoſts*, 1 King. 19. 10, 14. Some of the Learned ſay, (*e*) *it is certain*, *that ſometimes it* (the Name Jehovah) *hath the nature of an Appellative*, as *Deut*. 6. 4. *The Lord our God is* יהוה אחד *one Jehovah*, which our Engliſh Tranſlation rendreth *one Lord*. There is no fault in this Tranſlation; but the meaning of the Text is miſtaken, when an Argument is founded upon it, to prove, that the Name Jehovah hath the nature of an Appellative; for the Text is a Law againſt *Polytheiſm* and *Idolatry*; it ſaith, *the Lord our God is one Jehovah* (but one, and that one is Jehovah) in oppoſition to any more, or any other Gods. The Name Jehovah therefore in this Text hath not the nature of an *Appellative*, but is the *proper diſtinctive Name of the true God, the God of Iſrael*. Agreeably to this Text *Moſes* ſaith to *Iſrael*, *Deut*. 4. 35. *Unto thee it was ſhew'd, that thou mighteſt know, that* יהוה *Jehovah he is God, there is none elſe beſides him*. *Iſrael* therefore muſt have but one God, and that one God muſt be Jehovah, which is the meaning of that great Law, *Deut*. 6. 4. *Hear*, O *Iſrael*, *Jehovah our God* is (but) *one* (and that one is) *Jehovah*. Much of the Buſineſs of the Old Teſtament is, to declare, who *is the one true God by his one Proper Name Jehovah*, (*f*) *which is not communicated to any other*, *but appropriated to him alone*, as *Maimonides* and all the Rabbins ſay, and as *Abarbinel* operoſely demonſtrateth.

Exod. 20. 2, 3. *I am Jehovah thy God* (or I Jehovah am thy God,) — *thou ſhalt have no other God before me*. Pſal. 81. 9, 10. *There ſhall no ſtrange God be in thee, neither ſhalt thou Worſhip any ſtrange God. I Jehovah am thy God.* 1 King. 18. 39. *Jehovah he is the God, Jehovah he is the God.* Pſal. 83. 18. *That all Men may know, that thou whoſe Name alone is Jehovah, art the moſt High over all the Earth.* Deut. 7. 9. *Know therefore, that Jehovah thy God, he is God.* 1 King. 8. 60. *That all the People of the Earth may know, that Jehovah is God, and that there is none elſe.* Iſa. 43. 11, 12. *I, even I, am Jehovah, and beſide me there is no Saviour.* —— *ye are my Witneſſes, ſaith Jehovah, that I am God.* Iſa. 44. 6. *Thus ſaith Jehovah the King of Iſrael,* —— *I am the Firſt, and I am the Laſt, and beſides me there is no God.* Iſa. 45. 6. *I am Jehovah and there is none elſe, there is no God be-*

ſides

(p) *In Exod. Qu.* 3.

(q) *P. Fagius in Exod.* 28. 30. *v. Druſ. Not. in Tetragram.*

(r) *P. Fagius in Exod.* 6. 3.

(s) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

(t) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 13.

(u) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 8. *c.* 9. *S.* 4.

(w) *Addit. in c.* 3. *Exod.*

(x) *Coſri p.* 143. *ed. Buxt.*

(y) *Pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 6.

(z) *Pocock on Hoſ.* 12. 5.

(a) *Walton Proleg.* 8. *S.* 19.

(b) *Pocock ſupr. v. Druſ. Tetragr. c.* 2. & 5. *Hotting. Diſſ. p.* 251. *Zanch. de Nat. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 13.

(c) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 8. *c.* 9. *S.* 3.

(d) *Zanch. ſupr.*

(e) *Biſhop Pearſon, ſupr. p.* 302. *ed.* 1.

(f) *Hotting. Diſſ. p.* 251, 252 *Hoornbeck. c. Jud. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 394.

ſides me. v. 21, 22. *Who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? Have not I Jehovah? And there is no God elſe beſide me.* —— *I am God and there is none elſe.* Jer. 32. 17. *Behold I Jehovah am the God of all Fleſh.* Hoſ. 13. 4. *I am Jehovah thy God from the Land of Egypt, and thou ſhalt know no God but me; for there is no Saviour beſide me.* The Name *Jehovah* pervadeth the Old Teſtament as the proper diſtinctive Name of the one true God; for of this Nature and Notion it is, when it is the proper diſtinctive Name of the moſt high God, *Gen.* 14. 22. *I have liſt up mine hand unto Jehovah the moſt high God*, or when it is the proper diſtinctive Name of the God of Heaven and Earth. *Gen.* 24. 3. *I will make thee ſwear by Jehovah the God of Heaven, and the God of the Earth.* Jon. 1. 9. *I am an Hebrew, and I fear Jehovah the God of Heaven.* Or when it is the proper Name of the God of Hoſts. *Hoſ.* 12. 5. *Jehovah the God of Hoſts, Jehovah is his Memorial.* Or when it is the proper Name of the mighty God. *Pſal.* 50. 1. *The mighty God Jehovah hath ſpoken.* Or when it is the proper Name of the God of Gods. *Joſh.* 22. 22. *Jehovah the God of Gods.* Or when it is the proper Name of the holy God. *Joſh.* 24. 9. *Ye cannot ſerve Jehovah, for he is an holy God.* Or when it is the proper Name of the God of Iſrael. *Exod.* 3. 18. *Jehovah God of the Hebrews.* 1 King. 8. 23. *Jehovah God of Iſrael, there is no God like thee.* And that we ought to conſider *Jehovah* as the Name of the one true God, appeareth from the Prophet. *Jer.* 10. 10. *Jehovah is the true God, he is the living God and an everlaſting King.* God uſually noticeth himſelf by it as by his proper Name. *Gen.* 15. 7. and 28. 13. *Exod.* 34. 6. He calleth it *his Name*, thereby to diſtinguiſh himſelf the one true God from all pretending Deities. *Iſa.* 42. 8. *I am Jehovah, that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another.* So *Moſes* intendeth, to notice him as the one only true God, when he ſaith, *Exod.* 15. 3. *Jehovah is his Name.* Whereſoever therefore the Name Jehovah occurreth in Scripture, when it ſpeaketh of *calling upon the Name of Jehovah, the Way of Jehovah, the Houſe of Jehovah* (multitudes of the like Expreſſions occur in Scripture;) when the Ark ſeemeth to be called by this Name, or when it is the ingredient of a Title put upon an Altar, or a City, or when it is put upon *the Angel of God's Name*, in theſe and all other Inſtances it muſt be conſider'd as *the proper diſtinctive Name of the one only true God.* From whence it followeth, that the Name *Jehovah* is equivalent to this Name *the one true God*; and therefore it can be nothing leſs than this Name *God*; for this Name *God* and *the one true God* are the ſame Name, according to that of *Plotinus* (g) ὐδ' ἄλλο μὲν φιλόσοφος, ἄλλο δὲ ὁ ἀληθινὸς, *a Philoſopher and a true Philoſopher is the ſame.* The Name *Jehovah* therefore being no leſs than the Name *God* may juſtly be call'd by the *Jews* (h) השם *the Name* (in a Senſe of Excellence,) הנכבד *the Name to be honour'd*, יתעלה *the Name to be extoll'd*, יתברך *the Name to be bleſſed*, שמא רבא *the great Name*, הנורא *the reverend or fearful Name*, שם כבודו *his glorious Name, or the Name of his Glory.* Becauſe this Name was of peculiar Reverence anciently, when it was pronounc'd, hence (as I ſuppoſe) the Jews have call'd it שם המפורש, *Shem hammephoraſh, Nomen explicatum.* For this Epithet ſeems to ſignifie *a Name that being pronounc'd is of great Reverence.*

V. The full expreſſion of this Name is *the God* (or the Lord) *Jehovah.* For as the proper Name of any *Honour* or Dignity (Lord, King or Emperor) muſt in the full expreſſion of it be conjoin'd and complicated with the Name of his Honour and Dignity (as the Lord *Jeſus*, King *David*, the Emperor *Theodoſius*;) for that is his Name fully expreſs'd: So the proper Name of any God real or reputative, muſt in the full expreſſion of it, be conjoin'd and complicated with this Name God or Goddeſs (as the God *Berith*, the Goddeſs *Diana*;) for that is his Name fully expreſs'd. If therefore the Name *Jehovah* is the proper Name of a God (as all the Learned agree,) that Name fully expreſs'd muſt be *the God* (or the Lord) *Jehovah*, as all the Heathen Writers expreſs it. (i) *Sanchoniathan* (ſaith *Porphyry*) receiv'd his Information of the Jews Affairs from *a Prieſt of the God Ieuo* or Jehovah (παρὰ τῦ ἱερέως Θεῦ τῦ Ιευὼ:) And *Diodorus Sic.* ſaith of *Moſes*, that he feigned τὸν Ἰάω ἐπικαλέμενον θεὸν, *the God called Iao* (or Jehovah,) *to have deliver'd his Laws to him.* The Oracle of *Apollo Clarius* was conſulted, *Quis Deorum habendus ſit, qui vocatur* Ἰάω, *who of the Gods that is which is called* Iao? The Name *Iao* therefore fully expreſs'd according to the Heathen Writers is this Name *the God* Iao. And in like manner both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Writers ſometimes expreſs the Name *Jehovah.* For *Zanchy* looketh upon it as an effect of Providence, that the Name God in all Nations conſiſteth of four Letters, and therefore he ſaith of it, (k) *Certè non ſine ſingulari Providentia Dei Jehovæ hoc factum eſt, ſurely this was not done without the ſingular Providence of the God Jehovah. R. Jehuda Levita* ſaith, as *Men. Ben. Iſrael* repreſenteth him. (l) *If any one asketh what God is to be worſhipp'd, the Sun, Moon, Heavens, Stars, Planets, Signs, Fire, Air, the Genii or the like, becauſe every one of theſe hath his Empire and his force in the generation and corruption of things: The anſwer muſt be, that our Worſhip ought to be done to the Lord Tetragrammaton* (Jehovah,) *in the ſame manner as we diſtinguiſh* Reuben, Simeon *and other Men from the reſt by their proper Names.* In this Diſcourſe of an Hebrew Doctor we may obſerve in the *firſt* place; that if the Queſtion be ask'd *quis Deus colendus ſit, to what God muſt we do our Religious Worſhip?* It ſuppoſeth, that the Anſwer ought to be *Deo Jehovæ, to the God Jehovah*; for this Anſwer beſt ſuiteth to the Terms of the Queſtion, and thus he intendeth to anſwer, that uſeth an equivalent expreſſion *Domino Tetragrammato* to the Lord Tetragrammaton or Jehovah; and therefore he ſuppoſeth, that the Name of God fully expreſs'd is *the God or the Lord Jehovah.*

A *Second* thing is obſervable in our Hebrew Doctor's Diſcourſe; that the Name *Jehovah* is not equivalent to the Name God in every Notion; for then there could be no occaſion for the Queſtion, *Quis Deus colendus ſit, to what God muſt we perform our Worſhip?* The Pagan Polytheiſts by the Name God uſually mean (m) τὶς τῶν θεῶν, *ſome one of the Gods.* But the Name Jehovah is equivalent to the Name God *in the true and holy Popular Notion and the ſtrictly Religious Senſe.* Accordingly, the Name God is often us'd in Scripture inſtead of the

---

(g) *En.* 3. *l.* 7. *c.* 5.

(h) *Druſ. Tetragram. c.* 5.

(i) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

(k) *De Nat. Dei l.* 1. *c.* 13.

(l) *Si quis quærat quis Deus colendus ſit, Sol, Luna, Cœli, Stellæ, Planetæ, Signa, Ignis, Aer, an Genii aut ſimilia, quia cuique horum ſuum imperium & ſua vis ſit in generatione & corruptione rerum: Reſpondendum eſſe, Domino Tetragrammato perinde atque Reubenem ac Simeonem, & mortalium alios propriis nominibus à cæteris diſtinguimus.* In Exod. Qu. 3.

(m) *Jamb. de vit. Pythag. c.* 1.

Name *Jehovah.* (*n*) As 2 *Sam.* 7. 3. *Jehovah is with thee.* For which is written 1 *Chron.* 17. 2. *God is with thee.* 2 King. 11. 10. *The Houſe of Jehovah:* For which in 2 *Chron.* 23. 9. *is the Houſe of God.* So the Mouth of Jehovah *Deut.* 8. 3. is interpreted *the Mouth of God*, Matth. 4. 4. Belief in Jehovah, *Gen.* 15. 6. is *Belief in God*, Rom. 4. 3. Jam. 2. 23. Jehovah hath given me, *Iſa.* 8. 18. is, *God hath given me*, Heb. 2. 13.

A *Third* thing is obſervable in our Hebrew Doctor's Diſcourſe; *that the Name Jehovah is ſuch a proper Name, as* Reuben *and* Simeon, *and that by this Name one God is diſtinguiſh'd from another* (the true from the fictitious,) *as Men are diſtinguiſh'd from one another by their proper Names.* From whence it followeth (the proper Names of Gods being of the ſame Nature with the proper Names of Men,) that as the Heathen Gods were diſtinguiſh'd from one another by their proper Names (*Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, and ſuch more,) ſo the God of the Hebrews was diſtinguiſh'd from them all by his proper Name Jehovah. And as the Name of an Heathen God is not fully expreſs'd, unleſs his proper Name be conjoin'd and complicated with the Name God (as the God *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Bacchus* :) So the Name of the Hebrew God is not fully expreſs'd but in this manner *the God or the Lord Jehovah.* Accordingly he is ſtiled in Scripture אדני יהוה *Lord Jehovah*, and יהוה אדני *Jehovah the Lord*, and יהוה אלהים *Jehovah God*, which is ſuch a Name as *Antiochus*, ϑεὸς, *Antiochus God.*

When *Moſes* was commanded to tell the Iſraelites in *Egypt*, *the God of your Fathers hath ſent me unto you*, he foreſaw that they would ask, *what is his Name*? The Iſraelites in *Egypt* were laps'd into Heathen Idolatry and Polytheiſm, and therefore their interrogatory muſt be underſtood in the Senſe of Heathen Idolaters and Polytheiſts. Now, if Heathen Polytheiſts ask, what is the Name of a God? They mean a proper Name ſuperadded to the common Name God (like a Cognomen,) whereby that God is diſtinguiſh'd from all other Gods. And that this was the Senſe of the Iſraelites Queſtion (*o*) is plain from the like Queſtion, which the Heathen uſually ask'd the Chriſtians in the Primitive times. The Primitive Chriſtians could not tell the Heathen any ſuch proper diſtinctive Name, which their God had: But *Moſes* was furniſh'd with ſuch a proper diſtinctive Name, *God ſaid unto* Moſes, *thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of* Iſrael, Ehjeh *aſher* Ehjeh, and again *Ehjeh hath ſent me unto you.* This Name being deſign'd for an anſwer to the Idolatrous and Polytheiſtic Iſraelites, cannot be underſtood, to be the Name of God *ſingly* and *ſeparately*, but only in Conjunction and Complication with the Name God in this manner; *the God Ehjeh aſher Ehjeh*, or *the God Ehjeh* (the ſame Name with the God Jehovah) *hath ſent me unto you.*

VI. The Senſe and Reaſon of this Name is *that twofold verity and reality of being* (or being in verity and reality,) which it denoteth and ſignifieth: Namely, *the verity and reality of being A God and what is God-eminence* (which comprehendeth and includeth whatever the Metaphyſical Name *Ens* denoteth;) *and the verity or reality of being a God to the Hebrews.* For upon this account and for this reaſon, to denote *both theſe realities of being*, the God of the Hebrews would be called *Jehovah*. All the Learned agree, that this Name *Jehovah* is the ſame with ὁ ὢν, or *Ens*, (*Buxtorf* in his Hebrew Lexicon, and *Schindler* alſo render it *Ens*;) they alſo agree, that the Name ὁ ὢν, or *Ens*, as it is the ſame with Jehovah, denoteth and ſignifieth (emphatically) *verity and reality of being* (the oppoſite to nothingneſs, ſhew and figment;) that it ſignifieth (*p*) *him that is in truth and reality*, (*q*) *that which indeed is*, (*r*) *him who alone truly is*, *that hath true and ſincere being*, *and not only hath the Name*, *but truly is.* They ſuppoſe therefore, that the Name *Jehovah* denoteth *truth and reality of being*, and that this is the Engliſh of it, *he that is in truth and reality.* And becauſe the Name *Ehjeh* or *I am*, *Exod.* 3. 14. muſt neceſſarily involve in it the ſame Notion, therefore it muſt neceſſarily ſignifie *I am in truth and reality.* Thus far there can be no matter of debate touching the ſignification of the Name *Jehovah*; for God himſelf implicitly affirmeth, *Exod.* 6. 3. that his Name denoteth *truth and reality of being.* But from this acknowledg'd ſignification of his Name this debate ariſeth; *whether the truth and reality of being which the Name Jehovah denoteth, muſt be underſtood only or mainly in the Metaphyſical ſenſe touching Eſſence and Exiſtence Metaphyſical*, (conformably to the Metaphyſical Name *Ens*, or *id quod eſt*,) *or primarily and principally in a Popular-religious Senſe touching the truth and reality of being God* (and what is God-eminence,) *and the reality of being a God to the Hebrews?* The former of theſe Interpretations of the Name *Jehovah* (the Metaphyſical) is liable to many and great exceptions, and the latter of them (the Popular-religious) will appear, to be the true and genuine by many Arguments, ſuch as theſe following.

VII. The Rabbins that are the Metaphyſical Interpreters of the Name *Jehovah*, and the great Patrons of that Interpretation, uſually diſtort the Scriptures from *the Popular-religious Senſe to a common Metaphyſical and Philoſophical Senſe*, and ſo far criminally *Philoſophic-Paganize the Scripture-Theology.* So *Maimonides* buſieth himſelf to prove, (*s*) *that God alone is true or truth, and there is no truth in any like his truth* (whereby he meaneth, that nothing elſe truly is.) *For though we ſay, that created things exiſt, yet the word exiſt is not Univocal, but Equivocal* (we ſay Analogical, not equally Predicated,) *when attributed to God and created things. For they have* Potentia *mix'd with Act, and Neceſſity with Contingence, and Exiſtence with Privation: But there is none of this in God, and therefore his Truth and theirs is not alike.* And this he proveth from a Saying of the Prophet *Jeremiah*, *Dominus Deus veritas eſt*, *Jehovah God is Truth.* Jer. 10. 10. *Moſes* ſaith *Deut.* 4. 35. *Jehovah he is God, there is none elſe beſides him.* Which words plainly mean, that there is *no other God* beſides him: But the Rabbins have found out another meaning of them, (*t*) *that nothing is in Exiſtence beſides him.* The ſeparate Intelligences (ſay they) are called *Elohim*, how then can it be ſaid, that there is no other *Eloah* (God) beſides him? *Tetragrammaton docet de Exiſtentiæ veritate*, *the Tetragrammaton ſpeaketh of the truth of Exiſtence*; and therefore the meaning of the word is, *there is*

(n) *Ainſworth on Gen.* 2. 4.

Exod. 3. 13, 14.

(o) *Euſeb. H. E. l.* 5. *c.* 1. *Min. Fel. p.* 143, 144.

(p) Τὸν ὄντα μετ' ἀληθείας.

(q) Τὸ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ὄν, τὸ ὄντως ὄν. *Druſ. Tetragram. c.* 5.

(r) Τὸν ὄντως μόνον ὄντα, *Eſſe verum, eſſe ſincerum, eſſe germanum, quod vocatur, & non ſolum vocatur, ſed verè eſt. Hic ſolus verè eſt, & ideo veritas eſt. Ipſe ſolus eſt. Eſt enim verè ſolus.* Petav. T. 1. l. 1. c. 6. S. 6, 9.

(s) *V. Abravanel. de cap. Fid. ap. Vorſt. p.* 95.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 97, 98.

no Exiſtent of neceſſary Exiſtence beſides him. Non eſt verum Exiſtens præter illum ſolum, nomen enim Jod, He, Vau, He de veritate docet. There is no other true Exiſtent beſides him only, for the Name Tetragrammaton meaneth truth of Exiſtence. Thus the Rabbins interpret Scripture, not like ſerious Religious People, but like (themſelves) Profane Sophiſts and Scholaſticks. And ſeeing they have manifeſtly perverted ſeveral places of Scripture by interpreting them in favour of their Metaphyſical Conceits touching the Name *Jehovah*, it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe (the Scriptures being Homogeneous,) that they have perverted the Scripture in all places, which they interpret to that purpoſe.

VIII. The Rabbins in their account of the Name *Jehovah* are ſuperlative Metaphyſicians; for they ſuppoſe, both that God is ſo denominated from his *Eſſence and Exiſtence in the Metaphyſical Senſe*, and that the Name denoteth *his naked Eſſence abſtracted from his Godhead of Eſtate and from the Divine Attributes*, which yet are no leſs Eſſential to God, nor leſs neceſſarily Exiſtent than his naked Eſſence or Subſtance. Theſe are great Metaphyſical Subtilties, and who can believe that the Holy Bible ſhould oblige Men to buſie their Heads about ſuch uſeleſs Metaphyſical Abſtractions, which the generality of Religious People are incapable of, which properly belong to the common Learning of Metaphyſicks, and are of no concern in Religion? yet thus the Hebrew Doctors ſay; *Other Names are attributed to God according to his various actions and the effects of them: (u) But the Tetragrammaton denoteth only the very Eſſence of the Divinity. The Name Ehje and the Tetragrammaton are Names of the Divine Eſſence. The Tetragrammaton is called the Name explicated or expounded, becauſe clearly and without any equivocation it denoteth the Subſtance of the Creator. I am that I am is in Hebrew a Name deriv'd from the verb Hajah, which ſignifieth Eſſence or Exiſtence.* The Hebrew Doctors therefore ſuppoſe, that the Tetragrammaton denoteth *the Self-ſubſiſtent Eſſence as ſuch*, and conſequently it denoteth *Neceſſity, Eternity, and verity of Exiſtence. It ſignifieth ſomething* (ſay they,) *that hath neceſſary Exiſtence, the Eternity and Exiſtence of God.* God bad *Moſes* tell the Iſraelites, *Ehjeh* (I am) hath ſent me, as if he had bid him, *ſhew and prove to them, (w) Me to be who am* (ſaith *Maimonides*,) *that is, my Eſſence to be ſelf-ſubſiſtent, and not dependent on another, as all other which exiſt, becauſe they had their origine from me, and ſo are that they might not, and yet may not be.* One Branch of the Rabbins account of the Name Jehovah is not eaſily reconcileable with the other; for they ſay, it denoteth *Neceſſity, Verity, Eternity of Exiſtence*, that are Attributes which ſeemeth to claſh with that grand Scholaſtick Notion of theirs; *(x) Between the Tetragrammaton and the other Names of God there is this difference; they denote not the Subſtance of God only, but as having Attributes or Properties; the Tetragrammaton denoteth his Subſtance only.* This Rabbinical Scholaſticiſm is entertain'd by the Schoolmen, the learned Philologers and Modern Divines of the Chriſtian Church. *The Names Jehovah, Ehjeh, Jah, are intituled (y) the Names that denote the Eſſence of God. (z) It ſignifieth the pure Eſſence of God, which is not intelligible or explicable, therefore the Jews think it unlawful to pronounce this Name Jehovah. (a) It was impoſed, to ſignifie the very incommunicable and ſingular Subſtance of God. (b) It ſignifieth an Eſſence the moſt Simple and Eternal. (c) This Name alone is deſign'd, to ſignifie the Eſſence of the Divine Majeſty, plainly, expreſly and abſolutely. (d) I am that I am is the proper and eſſential Name of God (all Divines agree in this, I know none that differ,) becauſe it expreſſeth him in his Eſſence without any limitation or modification.* (e) Many learned Men ſuppoſe, that the Name *Ehjeh* and *Jehovah* doth not only ſignifie τὸν ὄντα, *him that is or ſubſiſteth*, but alſo τὸν οὐσιοῦντα, *Him that giveth Eſſence and Subſiſtence to all things elſe*: But this Interpretation is altogether groundleſs.

IX. The ancient Fathers in their Interpretations of Scripture which concern the Name *Jehovah*, follow'd *Philo*, who was little better than a Philoſophic Pagan; and who ſeemeth to have been the firſt Author of the Metaphyſical Interpretation of the Name *I am that I am.* His uſual Name for God is τὸ ὄν, *Ens*, (underſtood as a Metaphyſical or Platonic Name,) which Name he hath a peculiar kindneſs for, (*f*) becauſe he ſuppoſeth, that we cannot know, who God is (being better than Good, more ſimple than a Monad,) *but only that he is and ſubſiſteth; and becauſe no other Name can be properly attributed to God.* Therefore *Moſes* (ſaith he) was commanded, to tell the Iſraelites, when they inquir'd, what is his Name that ſent thee, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, *I am he that is. (g) That having learned the difference between Ens and Non Ens* (as *Gelenius* rendreth the words of *Philo*,) *they might alſo be taught, that no Name can properly be attributed to me, to whom only being is competible.* It is ſcarce credible, that Divine *Moſes* was imploy'd, to teach Mankind the difference between *Ens* and *Non-Ens*, or to read to thoſe poor Slaves the Iſraelites in *Egypt* a Lecture of Metaphyſicks, of ſuch Metaphyſicks which are no where proper but in the Schools, and which the generality of Mankind would nauſeate as uncouth Scholaſticiſm; although it muſt be acknowledg'd, that there is a Metaphyſical diſparagement of created Beings involv'd in it, which (in ſome degree) is true and laudable. For upon this account (ſaith *Philo*) God ſaith of himſelf Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, *I am he that is, (h) ſignifying, that thoſe things which are after him, are not indeed, but only* (which is too much to be ſaid of the Spiritual and Eternal things) *are reputed to ſubſiſt by Opinion.* (i) Agreeably to *Philo Epiphanius* ſaith of God, that he is αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὄν, *illud ipſum quod eſt, that very thing that is,* as *Moſes* ſaid to the Children of *Iſrael,* ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με, *he that is ſent me.* (k) *He that is, is Ens, and Ens is Eſſence or Subſtance.* *Euſebius* diſcourſeth, that τὸ ὄν, *the Ens* of *Moſes* is the very ſame with τὸ ὄν, *the Ens of* Plato, *Numenius* and *Plutarch,* and that *Plato* deriv'd his Metaphyſical τὸ ὂν ἀεὶ, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον, *that which ſempiternally is without Geneſis,* and his ἀΐδιος οὐσία, *eternal Subſtance,* (l) to which the ſucceſſive parts of time *Erat, Eſt, Erit,* are not applicable, (only τὸ ἐστι, *it is,* may be applied thereto,) from the holy Scriptures; and therefore he concludeth his Diſcourſe with the ſaying of *Numenius,* τί γὰρ ἐστι Πλάτων, ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων; *what is* Plato *but* Moſes *in Greek?* Becauſe τὸ ὄν (*that which is*) is ſo much celebrated in the School of *Plato,* (m) S. *Auſtin* is prone, to think, that he was acquainted with the Books of *Moſes,* and with that Name of God in them *Ego ſum qui ſum, qui eſt miſit me ad vos.* A Modern Writer *Druſius* (n) having obſerv'd that the Name *Jah* is the ſame with τὸ ὄν, *Ens,* proceedeth to ſay, *Ita Plato Deum nominat, ſo Plato calleth God. Nota vox Ariſtotelis, quam moriens emiſiſſe fertur, Ens Entium miſerere mei. The words of* Ariſtotle, *which he is reported to have utter'd dying, are known, Being of Beings have Mercy on me.* (o) *Gr. Naz.* thinketh the Name *Ens* (ὁ ὢν) *the name of Eſſence* a more accommodate Name for the Deity than the Name *God,* for this reaſon (amongſt others,) becauſe he put upon himſelf this Name, when he bad *Moſes* tell the People ὁ ὢν, *he that is hath ſent me.* S. *Cyril* alſo Philonizing ſaith of God (p) *to whom* (the Metaphyſical) *Ens is the moſt proper Name.* By degrees this Metaphyſical Name came to be of ſuch repute in the Church (Scholaſticizing and Philoſophic-paganizing in her Theology,) that the ſame Father ſaith of the Son of God, (q) ἔστι τοίνυν ἐξ Ὄντος ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὄνομα τοῦτο προσφυέστατον αὐτῷ, *he is Ens from Ens, and that is the moſt accommodate Name for him.* So *Clemens* ſaith of the Father appearing in the Son, (r) ἐπεφάνη ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ὤν, *he that is appeared in him that is.* (s) *Athanaſius* proveth againſt the *Arians,* that according to the Scriptures God may be ſaid, to have an *Eſſence,* becauſe himſelf ſaith in *Exodus* ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὤν, *I am Ens.* (t) *there is one* ὄντως οὖσα οὐσία, *Eſſence that truly and indeed is,* which ſaith ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὤν, *I am Ens.* So (u) *Origen,* (w) S. *Cyril,* (x) S. *Hierom,* S. *Hilary,* S. *Ambroſe,* S. *Auſtin,* and ſeveral other ancient Writers of the Church interpret that Name, to ſignifie, *that the Divine Nature alone truly is,* and that the Deity only is τὸ ὄντως ὄν, *that which indeed is,* becauſe his Being is ſelf-originate, ſempiternal, immutable, without temporary flux and ſucceſſion, and our Being is in compariſon not Being. All which Notices of God how good ſoever they may ſeem, yet are no better than the Scholaſticiſm of the Philoſophic Pagans, to whom they are accommodate, but not to the People of *Iſrael,* not to their Conduct, not to their Caſe (in which Metaphyſical Notions were a very cold Comfort,) and being made the chief and only Interpretation of the Name of God, they are an impoſing upon him an unholy Philoſophic-pagan Name (*Ens*) to the injury, degrading and diſparagement of his Religious and holy Name.

(u) *Tetragrammaton nonniſi ipſam Eſſentiam Divinitatis denotare. Ehje & Tetragrammaton Divinæ Eſſentiæ vocabula.* שם המפורש *nomen explicatum vel expoſitum, quia clarè & citra ullam æquivocationem de ſubſtantia Creatoris docet. Ehjeh aſcher Ehjeh eſt nomen derivatum à verbo Hajah, quod ſignificat Eſſentiam vel Exiſtentiam. Significat aliquid quod neceſſariam habet Exiſtentiam. Æternitatem & Exiſtentiam Dei ſignificat.* Men. ben. Iſr. in Exod. Qu. 3. Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par. 1. c. 61, 63.

(w) *Me eſſe qui ſum, hoc eſt meam eſſentiam à ſeipſa ſubſiſtere, nec ab alio dependere, ut cætera omnia quæ exiſtunt, quia à me proveniebant, & ita ſunt, ut potuerint & adhuc poſſint non eſſe.*

(x) *Docet de ſubſtantia Dei, reliqua verò nomina omnia docent de attributis, h. e. non de ſolâ ſubſtantiâ, ſed de ſubſtantiâ proprietates vel attributa habente.* Maimon. ſupr. c. 61.

(y) *Nomina eſſentialia.* Hotting. Diſſ. p. 351, &c. Petav. ſupr. l. 8. c. 9. S. 2.

(z) *Significat puram Dei Eſſentiam.* Druſ. Tetragram. c. 6, 7, 17, 18. & vid. Not.

(a) *Eſt impoſitum ad ſignificandum ipſam Dei ſubſtantiam incommunicabilem & ſingularem.* Aquin. 1. Qu. 13. Art. 11.

(b) *Eſſentiam, eamque ſimpliciſſimam & æternam ſignificat.* Zanch. de Nat. Dei, l. 1. c. 1.

(c) *Nomen hoc ſolum præter cætera ad Divinæ Majeſtatis eſſentiam planè, diſertè & abſolutè ſignificandam eſt deſtinatum.* Fuller. Miſc. l. 4. c. 13.

(d) Dr. *Preſton* 1 Ser. on *Exod.* 3. 13.

(e) *Hotting. ſupr.* p. 265. & *Amam. Antibarb. Bibl.* p. 477. P. *Fagius in Exod.* 6. 3.

(f) Petav. ſupr. l. 1. c. 6. S. 5.

(g) Ἵνα μαθόντες διαφορὰν ὄντος τε καὶ μὴ ὄντος, προσαναδιδαχθῶσιν, ὡς οὐδὲν ὄνομα ἐπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ παράπαν κυριολογεῖται, ᾧ μόνῳ πρόσεστι τὸ εἶναι.

(h) Ὡς τῶν μετ' αὐτὸν ὄντων κατὰ τὸ εἶναι, δόξῃ δὲ μόνον ὑφεστάναι νομιζομένων.

(i) Petav. ſupr. S. 9.

(k) Ὁ ὢν ἓν ἐστὶ τὸ ὄν· Τὸ δὲ ὂν ἡ οὐσία τυγχάνει.

(l) Pr. Ev. l. 11. c. 9, 10. vid. Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 8. c. 11.

(m) De C. D. l. 8. c. 11.

(n) Tetragr. c. 1.

(o) Orat. 36. p. 589.

(p) Ὧ καὶ τὸ εἶναι κυριώτατον ὄνομα. Theſaur. p. 133.

(q) C. Jul. l. 8. p. 266.

(r) Προτρεπτ. p. m. 5.

(s) Ep. ad African.

(t) Or. 5. c. Arianos.

(u) Περὶ ἀρχ. l. 1. c. 3.

(w) C. Jul. l. 1. c. 23.

(x) Petav. ſupr. c. 6. & l. 3. c. 3. S. 8.

X. Although the ancient Writers uſually follow the Metaphyſical Interpretation of the Name *Ehjeh* and *Jehovah,* yet ſometimes they hit upon *the Popular-religious* Interpretation. For S. *Auſtin* expounding thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt (y) *& cognoſcant quia nomen tibi Dominus* (Jehovah,) expreſſeth the genuin ſenſe of the Hebrew Name. *Cognoſcant, inquit, quia nomen tibi Dominus, tanquam nec vero nec ſuo nomine nuncupentur, quicunque alii Domini nominantur. Let them know* (ſaith he) *that thy Name is the Lord* (Jehovah,) *as if they are not called by a true, nor by their own Name, whoſoever elſe are called Lords.* Which Interpretation of the Pſalmiſt's words implieth, that God's Name and Title *Dominus* (Jehovah) denoteth and ſignifieth, *he that is the Lord in truth and reality.* So in *Jer.* 14. 13. and ch. 32. 17. the Septuagint render אדני יהוה ὁ ὢν κύριε, *O more than pretended Lord, the Lord indeed!* Inſtead of *Ehjeh aſher Ehjeh Iſidore* uſeth the Name *Ejeje,* (z) which is interpreted *qui eſt Deus, he that is God* (in truth and reality,) which is *the Popular-religious* Interpretation of the Name *Jehovah.*

(y) Enarr. in Pſal. 82. ſub. fin.

(z) Petav. T. 1. l. 1. c. 6. S. 9. p. 43.

XI. Jehovah the proper Name of God is primarily and principally deſign'd to denote him in oppoſition to falſe Gods; therefore the *truth and reality* which it ſignifieth is primarily and principally deſign'd to denote his truth and reality in oppoſition to falſe Gods; and what is his *truth and reality* in oppoſition to falſe Gods, but the truth and reality of his being God? Nothing can be more apparent throughout the Old Teſtament, than that Jehovah the proper Name of God is primarily and principally deſign'd, to denote him in oppoſition and contradiſtinction to falſe Gods. *Schindler* in his Lexicon thus expoundeth it. *Nomen Dei proprium quo diſtinguitur ab Idolis. It is the proper Name of God, whereby he is diſtinguiſh'd from falſe Gods. Zanchy* ſaith (a) *perpetuò apud Prophetas hoc nomine Jehovæ ſeſe diſcernit ab omnibus Diis fictitiis. Perpetually in the Prophets God by this Name Jehovah diſtinguiſheth himſelf from all fictitious Deities.* If this Name is primarily and principally deſign'd to be diſtinctive of him from fictitious Deities, the truth and reality which it ſignifieth, muſt be that which is primarily and principally diſtinctive of him from fictitious Deities (the truth and reality which is diametrically oppoſite, not to *Non Entia, Metaphyſical,* but to falſe Gods;) therefore it muſt ſignifie (not only *he that is,* but) primarily *he that is God in truth and reality.* Agreeably whereunto the Book *Coſri* hath taught us, (b) that if the Queſtion be ask'd, *what God is to be worſhipp'd?* The Anſwer muſt be יהוה *Jehovah.* Which is an appoſite Anſwer indeed, if that Name ſignifieth, *he that is God in truth and reality.*

Jehovah is the Name of the one true God as oppoſite unto falſe and fictitious Deities; therefore it is the Name of the one true God as ſuch, and conſequently muſt ſignifie *he that is God in truth and reality.* Iſa. 42. 8. God ſaith, *I am Jehovah, that is my Name, quo a Diis gentium diſcernor, whereby I am differenc'd from the Gods of the Gentiles,* * ſaith Grotius. The following words *my Glory will I not give* to

(a) De Nat. Dei, l. 1. c. 13. S. 4.

(b) P. 257, 258.

* Vid. Not. in Matth. 22. 44.

to another, nor my Praiſe to Graven Images. Grotius thus expoundeth; *Eſt* λιτότης, *vult enim dicere, ſe vindicaturum ſeverè in eos, qui nomen quod ipſius eſt dant Belo, Neboni, Meraducho & aliis,* τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς. *God intendeth to ſay, that he will ſeverely puniſh thoſe, who give his proper Name to* Bel, Nebo, Merodach, *and others that in reality are no Gods.* Thus the God Jehovah throughout the *Old Teſtament* ſtandeth confronted and oppos'd to *falſe Gods*: And the Name Jehovah ſtandeth confronted and oppos'd to this Name οἱ μὴ φύσει ὄντες θεοὶ (thoſe that in reality are no Gods, but Idols only,) which Antitheſis between the two Names cannot be compleat and full, unleſs the Name Jehovah ſignifieth *He that is God in reality.*

XII. Moreover, God ſaith, *I am Jehovah, that is my Name,* in a caſe of Diſpute and Conteſt about *who is God truly and really ſuch.* For this was the thing in Diſpute and Conteſt in the Times of the Old Teſtament; and to determine this Diſpute, God by the Prophet challengeth the Heathen Religioniſts and their Deities, to produce Witneſſes on their part, *Iſa.* 43. 9. *Let them bring forth their Witneſſes* (Witneſſes of the real Divinity of the Heathen Gods; *that they may be juſtified; or let them hear and ſay, It is truth.* It was but reaſonable, if they were deſtitute of Witneſſes, that they ſhould yield the Cauſe, acknowledge the Truth to be on the God of *Iſrael's* ſide, that he was truly God, and their Deities were Idols and Figments; for the God of *Iſrael* could produce ſufficient Witneſſes of the truth and reality of his Divinity and Godhead; *Iſa.* 43. 12. *I have declared, and have ſaved, and I have ſhewed, when there was no ſtrange God among you; therefore ye are my Witneſſes, ſaith Jehovah, that I am God. Quòd Deus verè ſim* (ſaith *Piſcator*) *that I am truly and really God.* In this caſe of Diſpute and Conteſt God ſaith (in oppoſition to Idols and falſe Gods,) *Iſa.* 42. 8. *I am Jehovah, that is my Name.* Iſa. 43. 11. *I even I am Jehovah*; whereby nothing leſs, nothing elſe can be meant, but that I am truly and really God; therefore the Name *Jehovah* ſignifieth *He that is God in truth and reality.*

XIII. Although the Jews have now the *Tetragrammaton* in ſuch Superſtitious Reverence, that they have made it capital to pronounce it according to the Letters of it, yet this is the Name, that God would have conſtantly in the Minds and Mouths of his ancient People in oppoſition to falſe Gods. (c) *None that is converſant in reading the Old Teſtament in Hebrew can doubt, but that God would have that Name moſt familiarly known to the Jews from their Infancy, yea us'd daily in their Speech, as a ſhort, ſingular and moſt obvious Memorial of his moſt holy Majeſty,* Exod. 3. 15. *God indeed prohibited the Iſraelites with the greateſt ſeverity, to make any the leaſt mention of falſe Gods,* Exod. 23. 13. *make no mention of the Name of other Gods, let it not be heard in thy Mouth; but he commanded his moſt holy Name Jehovah, to be always in their Mind, Mouth and Eyes,* Exod. 3. 15. *This is my Name for ever, and this is my Memorial unto all Generations; as if he had ſaid, I deſire all Memory of Idols to be bury'd in eternal oblivion; but I ought to be perpetually remembred and celebrated; to which purpoſe chiefly, ye muſt know, that this ſingular and peculiar Name is adapted and deliver'd unto you. On this account he would not have the leaſt token or footſtep of any fictitious Deity extant amongſt his true Worſhippers, that they might be every where daily and wholly taken up with the remembrance of his moſt auguſt Name.* The God of *Iſrael* would have his People continually to acknowledge him by the Name Jehovah; and it is certain, that he would have them, continually to acknowledge him under this Notion *the one true God*; but it is not certain or probable, that he would have them continually to acknowledge him under this Notion *the one true Ens.* In calling himſelf by this Name *Jehovah* he contriv'd a proper ſignificative Name, which ſhould be of continual uſe amongſt his People (doubtleſs) for the promoting true Religion, and to be a preſervative againſt Idolatry. A ſignificative Name contriv'd and deſign'd for ſuch ends by Divine Wiſdom muſt be thought, to be of ſuch a ſignification, as tendeth moſt effectually to thoſe good and holy Ends. And which of theſe two ſignifications of the Name *Jehovah* hath the moſt effectual tendency to thoſe good and holy Ends, *He that is Ens in truth and reality, or he that is God in truth and reality?* The proper Name *Jehovah* muſt in all reaſon be thought to denote what is chiefly and eminently remarkable concerning God, as the proper ſignificative Names which God impoſeth upon eminent Perſons, denote what they are chiefly and eminently remarkable for (ſuch as *Melchizedek, Abraham, Iſrael, Joſhua, Jeſus*;) now, what was it, that the *Iſraelites* were chiefly and eminently to remark concerning God? Was it τὸ ὄντως μόνον ὄντα, *that he alone truly exiſteth,* or τὸ μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν, *that he is the only true God?* He is not ſo ſolicitous, to have one Ens diſtinguiſh'd from another, *the true from the falſe,* as to have one God diſtinguiſh'd from another, *the true from the falſe.* Although he concerneth himſelf, to have one *Ens* diſtinguiſh'd from another, yet it is only ſo far as is of concern to his Godhead, that created Beings be not idoliz'd and deify'd; which plainly argueth, that the Name Jehovah was not primarily intended, to be a diſtinctive Name of the true *Ens* (as ſuch) from the Fictitious, but of the true God from Idols. And this further appeareth from the full expreſſion of that ſacred Name, which is *the God Jehovah.*

XIV. The Name *Jehovah* is the great *Holy-popular Name*; but the Metaphyſical Name *Ens* is neither *Holy* nor *Popular.* It is not *Holy*; for it belongeth to the common unholy Learning of Metaphyſicks (whereas the Name *Jehovah* belongeth to the Diſcipline of Sanctity and true Religion,) and that which it denoteth (according to the Rabbins) is not God in any conſiderable degree; for abſtract from God the Godhead of Eſtate and the Divine Attributes, and leave nothing but bare *Eſſence ſelf-exiſtent,* and what have we left but the *Caput Mortuum* of a Deity? meer *Ontotety* or *Entity* in the higheſt degree is on this ſide Sanctity. If the Name Jehovah therefore be meerly a Name of *Entity*, it will be far inferiour to the Name *God* (as the Metaphyſical *Ens* is,) and cannot be the Holy Name. This will clearly appear from a fabulous Story, which the Rabbins tell of a Conference between *God* and *Adam*: (d) *That when* Adam *had given Names to all Creatures, God ask'd him, Quodnam eſt nomen meum, what is my Name?* Adam *made anſwer* יהוה (Jehovah) *quia tu es* המהות לכל המציאות *Quidditas omnis exiſtentiæ, becauſe thou art the Quiddity of all Exiſtence.* If *Adam* had thus Scholaſticiz'd with God, he muſt have been thought a ſubtle Metaphyſician; but would God have thought him a ſerious Religioniſt? Such toying with God and with the Name of his Glory is not tolerably Religious; nor can it be doubted, but that thoſe Mundane Sophiſts the Rabbins by their Metaphyſical Crotchets profane that holy Name. And as their Metaphyſical *Ens* is an Unholy Name, ſo it is of kind and quality *Unpopular*; for they ſuppoſe, that when *Moſes* was ſent to the *Iſraelites* he ask'd of God, what he ſhould ſay, (e) *Si quærerent Iſraelitæ de Eſſentia ejus à quo mitteretur, if the* Iſraelites *ſhould make inquiry touching his Eſſence that ſent him?* מה שמו *quid eſt nomen ejus, ſignificat* מה מהותו *quæ eſt eſſentia ejus? what is his Name, ſignifieth what is his Eſſence?* The People of *Iſrael* muſt be Metaphyſical and Scholaſtick kind of Men, if they propounded a Queſtion touching his Eſſence, that ſent *Moſes*; and they muſt be deeply skill'd in Scholaſtick Learning, if they underſtood the Metaphyſical Name, that is ſuppos'd to be given in anſwer to their Queſtion, *Nomen* ὐσιώδης, *an eſſential Name,* τὸ ὄν, *id quod eſt,* αὐτοών, (f) as *Junius* rendreth the Name Jehovah. (g) The Book *Coſri* ſuppoſeth, that when God in anſwer to *Moſes* (asking what he ſhould ſay to the *Iſraelites* touching his Name that ſent him) call'd himſelf by the Name *Ehjeh*, his meaning was, to tell them, *that they ought not to inquire of that which is beyond their Capacities* (the Verity of his Eſſence being impoſſible to be known; and it is as reaſonable to ſay, that ſuch an Anſwer which is beyond their Capacities, ought not to be given to their Queſtion, as to ſay, They ought not to buſie themſelves about a Queſtion, which is beyond their Capacities.

(c) *Nulli dubium eſſe poteſt, qui modo mediocri cum diligentia in veteris Inſtrumenti Scripturarum Hebraicarum lectione ſit verſatus, quin Judæis olim, prima ab infantia, Deus notiſſimum eſſe voluerit nomen illud, imò ſermone quotidiano uſurpatum, tanquam ſanctiſſimæ majeſtatis ſuæ* καθ' ἐπιτομὴν (ut ita dicam) μνημόσυνον, *vel monumentum ſingulare maximéque obvium, Exod.* 3. 15. *Summâ quidem ſeveritate Iſraelitis interdixerat Deus, ne ulla Deorum falſorum vel tenuiſſima fieret mentio. Nomen inquit, Exod.* 23. 13. *Deorum alienorum nè recordamini, nè auditor in ore tuo, ſed* יהוה *ſanctiſſimum nomen ſuum ſemper eis in animo, in ore, in oculis eſſe juſſit, Exod.* 3. 15. *Hoc eſt nomen ſuum in ſeculum, & hoc memoriale meum in generationem & generationem, q. d. Idolorum quidem memoriam omnem oblivione ſempiterna deleri & penitus obrui cupio: Me verò perenni celebratione memorari par eſt: ad id autem efficiendum, ſingulare hoc & peculiare Nomen imprimis comparatum vobiſque traditum ſcitote. Nullum enim propterea, ne minimum quidem, indicium aut veſtigium ficti alicujus & commentitii Numinis exſtare voluit apud veros ſui cultores, ut auguſtiſſimi nominis ſui memoriâ eos aſſiduè & ubique totos poſſideret.* Fuller. Miſc. l. 4. c. 13.

Maimonides ſaith, (h) *When God appear'd to* Moſes, *and commanded him, to ſpeak to Men in his Name, and to diſcharge the Function of his Embaſſadour, preſently he thought with himſelf, that before all things they would deſire him, to prove the Being of a God in this World; for at that time all Men, except ſome few, were ignorant of the Exiſtence of God; their higheſt Speculation conſiſted in the Contemplation of Heaven and of its Virtues and Operations, and reach'd no further; they ſuffer'd not themſelves to be withdrawn from things ſenſible, nor were perfect in the Perfection intellectual; wherefore God gave him a Science to deliver to them, which might perſwade them, that God is, namely, the Name Ehjeh aſcher Ehjeh; which Name is deriv'd from the Verb Hajah, which ſignifieth Eſſence or Exiſtence, for Hajah ſignifieth, to be or exiſt. All the Myſtery of which Name conſiſteth in the Repetition of the ſame Word, which ſignifieth Exiſtence by way of Attribute or Predicate; for the Relative Pronoun Aſcher importeth the mention of an Attribute inherent in it, and the firſt Name is as the Subject, Ehjeh I am or will be, and the ſecond Name which is the Attribute thereof in like manner is called Ehjeh (plainly in ſubſtance the ſame Word with the former) as if he would ſhew, the Subject and Attribute to be one and the ſame in ſubſtance, which is nothing elſe but what we ſay, that God exiſteth but not by Exiſtence; wherefore the Explication and Expoſition of that Ehjeh aſcher Ehjeh is, The Exiſtent who is Exiſtent, that is, who neceſſarily exiſteth; for this is that which he ought to prove and demonſtrate, that God is a Being neceſſarily exiſtent.* In this Rabbinical Account of the Name of God and the Embaſſie of *Moſes* (which is almoſt wholly an enormous miſtake) we may contemplate the Way and Genius of Scholaſticks, at what a rate they interpret the Holy Bible, ſubſtituting inſtead of the things *Holy-popular* things Unholy and Unpopular, Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical: Of this nature is the Platonic *Ens* (ὁ ὢν or τὸ ὄν;) therefore *J. Mart. Euſebius* and *Theodoret* are very much miſtaken in ſuppoſing it a Deſcendent from the holy Scriptural *Ehjeh* or *Jehovah*.

XV. The Name Jehovah interpreted according to the Phraſeology of Scripture (the Popular-religious mode of ſpeaking) denoteth and ſignifieth, *He that is God in truth and reality.* For this Name muſt be interpreted in the firſt place according to *Grammar* and *Dictionary*, and ſo interpreted it ſignifieth *he that is in truth and reality.* In the *next place* the different Senſes of this Grammatical Signification of the Name muſt be diſtinguiſh'd; for this Grammatical ſignification of it may be underſtood in the *Metaphyſical* and *Philoſophical* Senſe, and it may be underſtood in *the Popular-religious Senſe.* If the Grammatical ſignification of the Name be underſtood in this latter Senſe, *He that is in truth and reality* and *He that is God in truth and reality*, are ſynonymous Expreſſions; as will appear by conſidering, *the Being that is ſo denominated, the End of the Denomination, and the Matter to which it relateth.* The Being that is denominated ὁ ὢν, τὸ ὄν, *Qui eſt, Id quod eſt* or Jehovah (He that is in truth and reality) is a *pretending or imagin'd Deity*, touching whom to affirm, that *he is in truth and reality*, is the ſame thing, as to affirm, that *he is God in truth and reality.* 1 Cor. 8. 4. *We know* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is none other God but one.* 1 Cor. 10. 19. *Say I then, that the Idol is any thing? An Idol* hath a real Eſſence and Exiſtence, yet hath no real Eſſence or Exiſtence; it is a Subſtance, yet is nothing ſubſtantial; it is Matter, yet is nothing material; it is a Thing, and yet is Nothing; for as a Deity it is wholly fictitious and imaginary, and being wholly fictitious and imaginary, it hath no real Eſſence, or Exiſtence, or Subſtance, or Matter, or Entity, but is a very Nothing, as

(d) *Buxt. not. in Coſri, p.* 54.

(e) *Men. ben Iſr. in Exod. Qu.* 3.

(f) *S. Amam. Antibarb. Bibl. p.* 477.

(g) *P.* 262.

(h) *Cùm Deus Moſi apparuiſſet, & ipſi in mandatis dediſſet ut ſuo nomine mortales alloqueretur, hancque legationem apud ipſos expediret, ſtatim apud ſe cogitavit, illos ante omnia petituros, ut probet Deum eſſe in hoc mundo.——Omnes etenim homines, paucis quibuſdam exceptis, neſciebant tum temporis Deum eſſe: ſed ſumma ipſorum ſpeculatio conſiſtebat in contemplatione cœli ac virtutum & operationum ejus, neque ulterius ſe extendebat. à rebus ſenſibilibus abſtrahi ſe non patiebantur, neque perfecti fuerunt perfectione intellectuali. proinde docuit ipſum Deus ſcientiam, quam ipſis traderet, & quæ ipſis perſuaderet Deum eſſe. Nomen ſcil. hoc Ehjeh aſcher Ehjeh. Eſt autem hoc nomen derivatum à verbo Hajah, quod ſignificat Eſſentiam vel Exiſtentiam; Hajah enim ſignificat Eſſe vel Exiſtere. Myſterium verò ejus omne latet in iteratione vocis ejuſdem, quæ ſignificat exiſtentiam per modum attributionis vel prædicationis. Nam pronomen relativum Aſcher continet in ſe mentionem Attributi alicujus inhærentis ſibi, & poſitum eſt nomen primum, quod ſubjecti vicem ſuſtinet, Ehjeh ero, & Nomen ſecundum, quod Attributum ejus eſt, itidem vocatur Ehjeh ero, vox plane in ſubſtantia eadem cum priore, quaſi oſtendere vellet, Denominatum ſive ſubjectum & Attributum unum idemque eſſe in ſubſtantia, quod nihil aliud eſt, quàm quod nos dicimus, Deum exiſtere ſed non per exiſtentiam. Quare explicatio & expoſitio illius Ehjeh aſcher Ehjeh eſt, Exiſtens qui eſt Exiſtens, h. e. is qui neceſſario exiſtit. Hoc enim eſt, quod probare & demonſtrare debuit, Deum eſſe Ens neceſſariò Exiſtens.* Mor. Nev. par. 1. c. 63.

every one muſt affirm, that believeth it to be an Idol. But if any one affirmeth the contrary touching this pretending or imagin'd Deity, if (as ſuch) he intituleth it *id quod eſt, that which is in truth and reality*; this is the ſame thing, as to deny it to be an Idol, and to affirm, that it is *a God in truth and reality*. Theſe things are eaſily apply'd, and evidently true, if they be apply'd to any pretending or imagin'd Deity (true or falſe;) if therefore the God of *Iſrael* be denominated *Qui eſt, he that is in truth and reality*, or *Id quod eſt, that which is in truth and reality*, This Name denoteth him to be no Idol or falſe Deity, *but a God in truth and reality*. His Name Jehovah ought to be interpreted agreeably to his Pretenſions in a caſe of Debate and Conteſt in the ancient Times; which Debate and Conteſt was not, whether other Beings were *Entia* or not, but whether any other Beings were Gods or not? *The End of the Denomination* and the reaſon why he would be called *Jehovah*, was to diſcriminate him from *the Idol-Gods*, that are called אלילים *No things, things of nought, meer Vanities, Lyes and lying Vanities* (as pretending or imagin'd Deities they are wholly ſuch,) and the place of their worſhip is not *Bethel* (the Houſe of a God,) but *Bethaven, an Houſe of Vanity*, *Iſa.* 2. 20. and 44. 9, 20. and 41. 24. *Jer.* 14. 22. *Jon.* 2. 8. *Hoſ.* 4. 15. When Names of *Nullity* and *Non-entity* are given to Idols, all Men ſuppoſe, that thoſe Names denote them, to be *no Gods*, and that thoſe Names are given them upon that account, becauſe they are *no Gods*; thus the Name אלילים *No things* is expounded, (*i*) *non Dii, no Gods*; *eſſe ex nihilo, eſt eſſe fictitios Deos, to be of nothing, is to be Fictitious Gods.* If Names of *non-entity* or *not-being* given to Idol-Gods denote their *not-being Gods in truth and reality*, and are given them upon that account, ſhall it not be thought, that Names of *Entity and reality of Being* given to the true God, denote his being God in truth and reality, and that they are given him upon that account, ſeeing there is the ſame reaſon for both ſorts of Names, and there is alſo a manifeſt Antitheſis between the Names, as there is between the things to which they are apply'd? (*k*) When *Origen* and *Cedrenus* call an Idol-God οὐκ ὄν, *that which is not*, the meaning of that Name is, *it is no God in reality*; therefore when the Scripture calleth the true God τὸ ὄν, *that which is*, the meaning of that Name is, *he is God in reality*. Agreeably to which Account of the Names of the true God and of Idols, the Words of *Schindler* muſt be underſtood, who thus expoundeth the Name *Jehovah*. *Nomen Dei proprium, quo diſtinguitur ab Idolis, quæ non ſunt, non exiſtunt, ſed finguntur: It is the proper Name of God, whereby he is diſtinguiſh'd from Idols, which are not, exiſt not, but are fictitious.*

Our Interpretation of the Name *Jehovah* will further appear, to be true and genuine, if we conſider *the Matter to which it relateth*, which is *Matter* of God-exiſtence and *God-eminence*. The Scripture uſing the Name *Jehovah* ſpeaketh touching matter of *God-exiſtence* and *God-eminence*, and the Name Jehovah, or ὁ ὢν (*he that is*) muſt be underſtood with relation thereto; therefore that Name muſt ſignifie *he that is* as to matter of *God-exiſtence* and *God-eminence*; as when *Moſes* and *Solomon* ſay, *Jehovah he is God, and there is none elſe*; the meaning is not, *there is none elſe in exiſtence*, (as the Rabbins ſuppoſe;) but the plain Senſe is, *that as to being God or as to matter of God-eminence there is none elſe*. So the devotional words of *Hannah*, 1 *Sam.* 2. 2. *There is none beſide thee*, relate to matter of *God-exiſtence and God-eminence*, and therefore muſt be thus expounded, *As to the being God, or as to matter of God-eminence* (which is the ſame thing) *there is none beſide thee*. The words are not the Speech of a Scholaſtic Metaphyſician, but of a genuine Devotioniſt, and therefore they do not mean, that *ſolus Deus reverâ eſt, God only is truly in exiſtence* (as ſome Criticks fondly and Rabbinically expound them;) but the Arabick Verſion rightly expoundeth their meaning, *Non eſt Deus præter te, there is no God beſides thee*. So the antecedent and ſubſequent words expound their Senſe: *There is none holy as the Lord* (there is none elſe of the holy Honour, which is to ſay, none elſe is God,) *for there is none beſide thee; neither is there any Rock like our God*: which laſt words mean, that as to the being *an Helper and a Saviour* (which is God-eminence) there is none but Jehovah, *Iſa.* 43. 10, 11. *That ye may know and believe me, and underſtand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither ſhall there be after me. I even I am Jehovah, and beſide me there is no Saviour.* Upon thoſe words *underſtand that I am he*, *Forerius* thus commenteth: (*l*) *Here is an alluſion to thoſe words of the Lord in* Exodus, *He that is hath ſent me unto you; and the Etymology of the Name Jehovah it ſelf is explain'd; for the place may be render'd, that ye may underſtand, that I am he that is; for this is the force of the Pronoun Hu.* If the Pronoun *Hu* is in the Prophet of the ſame ſignification with *Qui eſt* or *Jehovah*, then the Name Jehovah muſt ſignifie *he that is God* (in truth and reality;) for ſo the Pronoun *Hu* ſignifieth in the Prophet, as *Grotius* rightly expoundeth it, (*m*) *Ego ipſe ſum, Nempe Deus, I am he, to wit, I am God.* He that is God in truth and reality may as ſuch be fitly call'd for diſtinction-ſake *The Popular-religious* ὁ ὢν (he that is in truth and reality,) which Popular-religious ὁ ὢν, muſt neceſſarily be *the promiſſory* ὁ ὢν, (he that is in truth and reality,) *the Prophetic* ὁ ὢν, (he that is in truth and reality,) *the Metaphyſical* ὁ ὢν, *he that is in truth and reality.*

XVI. The *Promiſſory* ὁ ὢν (he that is in truth and reality) denoteth him, to be *real in performance as in promiſe*, agreeably to what himſelf ſaith, *Exod.* 6. 3. *I appear'd unto* Abraham, *unto* Iſaac, *and unto* Jacob, *by the Name of God Almighty, but by my Name Jehovah was I not known to them.* God was known to them by this Name in one Senſe (they knew the Name Jehovah,) but not in another Senſe; for he was not known to them *by that which the Name Jehovah importeth*, namely, *a Realizer of his Promiſe by Performance.* (*n*) *I did not ſhew my ſelf as in fact a Fulfiller of my Promiſe.* This Interpretation of the Name Jehovah (in this place) is almoſt generally entertain'd by Learned Men of the Chriſtian Church of late Times; and one of the Rabbins ſaith; (*o*) *God was not known to the former Patriarchs by that which that Name importeth (for it is only us'd concerning God, when he fulfilleth his Promiſes,) becauſe he had not yet made good his*

word

(i) *V. Druſ. & Grot. in* 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. *Forer. in Iſa.* 41. 24.

(k) *Grot. ſupr.*

Deut. 4. 35. 1 *King.* 8. 60.

(l) *Alluſio eſt ad* verba illa *Domini in Exodo, Qui eſt* miſit *me ad vos: & ipſius* nominis *Jehovah etymologia* explicatur. *Reddi namque poteſt, &* intelligatis, *quòd ego ſim ille* qui eſt. *Hæc eſt enim vis illius* pronominis הוא.

(m) Not. in *Iſa.* 43. 10.

(n) *Non oſtendi me eum eſſe qui reipſa implerem.* Grot. in loc. v. P. Fag. in locum. Zanch. de Nat. Dei, l. 1. c. 13. Pocock on Hoſ. 12. 5.

(o) *Nequaquam* Deum ſe prioribus *Patriarchis* notum feciſſe *per id, quod ſignificet* iſtud vocabulum *(etenim illud* tantum *uſurpari de Deo* cùm promiſſa ſua *implet,) quia nondum* datam fidem *impleverat*, de eripiendis *ex ſervitute Ægyptiaca Iſraelitis, ut terram promiſſam illis daret.* R. Salomo ap. Men. ben Iſr. Qu. in Exod. p. 53.

word touching the deliverance of the Iſraelites *out of the Egyptian Bondage, that he might give them the Land of Promiſe.* Of the ſame Interpretation with the *Promiſſory Jehovah* is the Name *Ehjeh* (I am) both in the more large and more contracted form. For when God ſaith to *Moſes* (in anſwer to the *Iſraelites* Queſtion, what is his Name that ſent thee? *Exod.* 3. 13, 14.) *Ehjeh aſcher Ehjeh, I am that I am*; the meaning is, *That I am in promiſe, I am in performance*, without any variation, real both in making and performing: Or, *I will be what I have promis'd I will be.* And when he addeth (ſpeaking in the more contracted form,) *Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of Iſrael, I am* (or I will be) *hath ſent me unto you*, his meaning is, *I am* (or I will be) *truth and reality of performance.* The Name *Ehjeh* therefore and *Jehovah* denoteth him, to *be a God in truth and reality to the Hebrews*, as appeareth from the words that follow the Name *Ehjeh*; for God having called himſelf by that Name, immediately ſubjoyneth, *Exod.* 3. 15. *Thus ſhalt thou ſay unto the Children of Iſrael, Jehovah the God of your Fathers, the God of* Abraham, *The God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob, *hath ſent me unto you*; *this is my Name for ever, and this is my Memorial unto all Generations.* God intituleth himſelf the God of the Hebrews (by intituling himſelf the God of the Patriarchs,) and as ſuch he denominateth himſelf *Ehjeh* and *Jehovah*; that Name therefore denoteth him, to be *a God in truth and reality to the Hebrews.* The Name was *his Memorial unto all Generations*; (p) *for upon the hearing of that Name Men ought to remember that God, who brought the People out of* Egypt. In ſo doing he was φερώνυμος, anſwerable to his Name (Jehovah) as it denoteth him to be *veracem in præſtandis atque implendis promiſſis, true in performing and fulfilling his Promiſes*, (q) as *Menaſſ. ben Iſrael* ſaith from *R. Solomon.* Which veracity in performing his Promiſes whence God is denominated *Jehovah*, peculiarly relateth to the Hebrews (to the miraculous bringing them out of *Egypt*, the giving them their Land, erecting their Theocracy, and becoming a God to them in Society, according to his Promiſes made to the Patriarchs;) the Name Jehovah was theirs by peculiar priviledge, as the Book (r) *Coſri* affirmeth, agreeably to what God ſaith to *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Exod.* 6. 6, 7. *Say unto the Children of Iſrael, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the Burdens of the Egyptians. ——And I will take you to me for a People, and I will be to you a God, and ye ſhall know, that I am Jehovah your God.*

(p) *Quo audito homines meminiſſe debent in perpetuum Dei illius, qui eduxit populum ex Ægypto.* Zanch. ſupr.

(q) Qu. in Exod. p. 53.

(r) P. 261.

XVII. By the Prophetick ὁ ὢν, (he that is in truth and reality) I mean that Prophetick or Apocalyptick Name ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *he that is, and that was, and that is to come.* The Conſtruction of this Prophetick Name of God is obſerv'd, to be againſt the Rules of Grammar, but is eaſily reconcileable thereto, if theſe words *who is*, or *who is named*, be underſtood, as they ought to be; for the only reaſon, why it is not agreeable to Grammar, is, becauſe it is a Name of God; as when *Plotinus* ſpeaking of Numbers ſaith, (s) μένοντος μετὰ τοῦ ἓν, the Senſe is, *That which is named One remaining.* So when the *Apocalypſe* ſaith, *ch.* 1. 5. καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς, the Senſe is, *And from Jeſus Chriſt, who is, or who is named, the faithful Witneſs.* In like manner this Prophetick Name of God is expreſs'd, *Apoc.* 1. 4. *Grace be unto you, and Peace,* ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and the Senſe is, *from him that is, or that is named, he that is, and that was, and that is to come:* Which Prophetick Name is commonly ſuppos'd, to be a full and juſt Interpretation of the Name Jehovah (wherewith it hath a manifeſt conſonance;) but this Opinion is uncertain, or rather is certainly a miſtake; for it is not a Name of ſuch celebrated Dignity as the Name Jehovah, and it would be abſurd, to uſe it ordinarily and conſtantly, as the Name Jehovah was uſed in ancient times. The Name Jehovah in the full expreſſion of it is, *The God Jehovah*; the like cannot be ſaid of this Prophetick Name. The Name Jehovah is the proper Name of God as contradiſtinct to falſe Gods, and was deſign'd to be *didactical* or doctrinal of true Religion in oppoſition to Polytheiſm and Idolatry; but ſuch is not this Prophetick Name. The Name *Jehovah* relateth to the Affairs of the Literal and Carnal *Iſrael*, to whom it was *eminently a Promiſſory Name*; but this Apocalyptick Name relateth to the Affairs of the Myſtical and Spiritual *Iſrael*, is a magnificent Preface to a Prophecy touching their Affairs, and is eminently (not a *Promiſſory*, but) a *Prophetick* kind of Name; as will appear from a particular account of that variety of Notions which may reaſonably be ſuppos'd to be compriſed in it. For it is manifeſt, that this Name denoteth *God's co-exiſtence with all Time* (paſt, preſent and to come,) and therefore it may reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to be a Name equivalent to ἀεὶ ὢν, *he that ever is*, and to be deſign'd, to celebrate *God's Eternity of Duration*, which the Rabbins thus expreſs; (t) *Ipſe fuit, ipſe eſt, & ipſe erit glorioſe!* By the like Expreſſions the Heathen aſcrib'd Eternity of Duration to *Jupiter* (u).

(s) En. 5. l. 5. c. 5.

(t) *Lud. Cappell. Not. in Apoc.* 1. 4.

(u) *S. Amam. Antibarb. Bibl.* p. 477.

Ζεὺς ἦν, Ζεὺς ἐστι, Ζεὺς ἔσσεται, ὦ μεγάλε Ζεῦ.

Jupiter was, Jupiter is, Jupiter ſhall be; O *great Jupiter!*

It denoteth alſo an impoſſibility of failing *to co-exiſt with all Time*; for as this Name *He that liveth for ever and ever*, doth not only denote, that God actually liveth for ever, but alſo an impoſſibility of failing ſo to do (in which Senſe *he only hath Immortality*:) So this Divine Name, *he that is, and that was, and that is to come*, denoteth this God-eminence and Peculiarity *an impoſſibility of failing to co-exiſt with all time.* It denoteth alſo God's *Invariableneſs* in all the Succeſſions of Time (that he is always the ſame;) for the Rabbins Explication of the Name *Ehjeh* in *Elle Shemoth rabba* may reaſonably be thought a true Interpretation of this Name. (w) *The bleſſed God ſaid unto* Moſes, *ſay unto them, I that have been, and I the ſame now, and I the ſame for time to come.* Theſe honourary Notices of God are (doubtleſs) compris'd in this Apocalyptick Name.

(w) *Ainſworth on Exod.* 3. 14.

But the principal thing which it is deſign'd to ſignifie, is his *God-like ordering Affairs and what cometh to paſs in time*, which belongeth to him as *rerum Dominus*, the Lord of Affairs. It denoteth his unfailing and unvariable co-exiſtence with Time as *the God-like orderer of Affairs and the Events of time paſt, preſent and to come*; as appeareth from the Doxology of the four and twenty Elders, *which ſat before God on their Seats, and falling on their Faces worſhipp'd God, ſaying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and waſt, and art to come, becauſe thou haſt taken*

Apoc. 11. 16, 17.

to thee thy great Power and haſt reign'd. It is for the God-like ordering Affairs that the four and twenty Elders give Thanks; which is a plain indication, that this Divine Name relateth thereto. They conjoin alſo this Divine Name with the Divine Attribute *Omni-imperial*, which ſheweth, that God is intituled *that art, and waſt, and art to come*, not in reſpect of an idle and inactive co-exiſtence with time, but in reſpect of a God-like ordering Affairs in the ſeveral Succeſſions of time. Sometimes this Divine Name is conjoin'd and ſurrounded with ſeveral other Names of Divine governing Agency. *Apoc.* 1. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, ſaith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* All theſe Divine Names *Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending* (of Affairs,) *the Lord the Almighty* (All Imperial) are Names of Divine governing Agency; therefore this Divine Name (*that is, and that was, and that is to come*) is alſo a Name that denoteth Divine governing Agency; and God is ſo denominated, not meerly upon account of an inactive co-exiſtence with time, but in reſpect of his God-like governing, ordering and carrying on Affairs through the ſeveral Succeſſions of time. To what purpoſe ſhould this Divine Name be inſiſted on in Prophecy, if it denoteth nothing of Divine governing Agency in Affairs?

The genuin Interpretation of this Divine Name will further appear by illuſtrating thoſe other Divine Names, with which it is combined and aſſociated, *Alpha* and *Omega, the beginning and the ending, the firſt and the laſt.* God is intituled by theſe Names, to ſignifie *his management of Affairs from the beginning to the end*; and not meerly to ſignifie that management of Affairs, but to ſignifie his *actual and jural management of Affairs in the ſupreme way of Regency from the beginning to the end, or from firſt to laſt.* They denote him therefore to be *the ſupreme Potentate, unſubject, independent, unaccountable, uncontrollable,* αὐτοκράτωρ, *Self-ſovereign,* παντοκράτωρ, *actually and jurally the Commander of all and the Diſpoſer of all things.* So in the Prophet God often intituleth himſelf, *I am the Firſt and I am the Laſt*, thereby intending to ſay, *I am He*, or *I am God.* So our Saviour in his deified condition often intituleth himſelf *Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the firſt and the laſt.* Which Apocalyptic Names denote the Godhead *as actually and jurally adminiſtring Affairs in the ſupreme way of Regency from the beginning to the end through the various Succeſſions of time.* Of the ſame import is the other Apocalyptick Name *he that is, and that was; and that is to come*, which therefore is a Prophetick kind of Name, and conſequently can be no more than a partial Interpretation of the Name *Jehovah.* But becauſe it hath a manifeſt conformity, reſemblance and alluſion thereto, (as the Apocalypſe deſcribeth the New *Iſrael* and their Affairs with alluſion to Old *Iſrael* and their Affairs,) it muſt be ſuppos'd at leaſt a partial Interpretation of the Name Jehovah, and the Name Jehovah muſt be ſuppos'd in part a Prophetick Name. So far without prejudice to our other Interpretations of the Name Jehovah we may comply with the common Opinion, and with the Paraphraſt *Jonathan*, who thus interpreteth the Name *Ehjeh.* (x) *Ego ille qui ſum, & qui futurus ſum, I He that am and that am to come. The bleſſed God* (ſaith *R. Bechai*) *hath the Rule of three times, the paſt, preſent, and to come, and the Name* Ehjeh *alone compriſeth thoſe three times. In the proper Name* (Jehovah) *alſo thoſe three times are compriſed, as is known unto all.*

XVIII. The Popular-religious ὁ ὤν, (he that is in truth and reality) is comprehenſively and incluſively *the Metaphyſical* ὁ ὤν, or *Ens*; for to be God in truth and reality, is to be appropriately and peculiarly the truth and reality of *Eſſence* and *Exiſtence* Metaphyſical. The God at *Delphos* admoniſh'd every one that approach'd his Temple (ſaith *Plutarch*) γνῶθι σεαυτόν, *know thy ſelf,* ἡμεῖς δὲ πάλιν ἀμειβόμενοι τὸν θεὸν, Εἶ φαμὲν, *and we ſay again in anſwer to God, thou art, giving him the Appellation of Being.* (y) *To God the Name of Eſſence or Being truly belongeth and to him alone* (ſaith S. *Hierom,*) *becauſe he is Eternal, that is, without beginning. God truly is* (ſaith an ancient Writer,) *therefore is truth. The Creature in compariſon is not, and therefore is to God as falſity to verity. Nothing is underſtood, to be more proper to God, than to be* (ſaith S. *Hilary*;) *for that which is, muſt be underſtood of that which neither hath ending, nor beginning.* The Metaphyſical *Ens* therefore muſt be ſuppoſed a Name and Attribute of God. But as if we ſuppoſe (with the Alexandrian *Cyril*) the Metaphyſical Ens, to be a Name and Attribute of Chriſt, this will not infer, that it is his true definitive Name, Notion and Idea; to ſuppoſe it ſuch, is indeed to deſtroy Chriſt and his true Idea, and to ſet up in his ſtead a Metaphyſical Name and Notion (therefore it muſt be a Name and Attribute of Chriſt only in due Conjunction with and Subordination to his true definitive Name, Notion and Idea:) So if *Ens* be ſuppoſed the moſt proper and principal Name of God, a Metaphyſical Name and Notion is ſet up inſtead of his legitimate Idea and his true definitive Name, of which *Gr. Naz.* ſometimes ſaith, (z) *the Name above every Name* τί ποτε ἄλλό ἐστιν ἢ θεός; *what is it elſe but the Name God?* The Name Jehovah may be called *the Eſſential Name*; for in part it is ſuch; the *Eſſence* and *Exiſtence* which the Metaphyſical *Ens* denoteth, is comprehended and included in the Hebrew and Holy-popular Interpretation of it, but is not the primary importance of that Divine Name, which is primarily deſign'd to ſignifie *the God of the Hebrews, that he is God in Truth and Reality.* If this Popular-religious Interpretation of it be exploded or over-look'd, if this ſacred Name be criminally diſtorted towards Metaphyſicks, if the Interpretations that are made of it be only or mainly of Kind and Quality Metaphyſical (ſuch as that of *Maimonides*, who ſaith, (a) *de nulla alia re vel proprietate docet, niſi de Eſſentiâ Dei, it denoteth nothing of any thing or property, but of the Eſſence of God,*) or if this Popular-religious Name be confounded with the Philoſophic-Pagan Metaphyſical Names; ſuch Interpretations of it cannot be acquitted of the Vice and Folly of *criminal Scholaſticizing and Philoſophic-paganizing* the matters of Theology. Which Vice and Folly hath been the Peſt and Bane of the Chriſtian Theology almoſt ever ſince the Apoſtles times; for the principal Articles of our Faith have been *criminally*

Iſa. 41. 4. *and* 44. 6. *and* 48. 12.

Apoc. 1. 11, 17. *and* 2. 8. *and* 22. 13.

(x) *Buxtorf. Lex. Hebr.* in *rad.* הוה *p.* 148.

(y) *Deus ſolus quia æternus eſt, hoc eſt, quia exordium non habet, eſſentia nomen verè tenet. Deus verè eſt, igitur veritas eſt. Creatura autem ei collata quaſi non eſt. Et idcirco quaſi falſitas ad veritatem eſt. Non enim aliud proprium magis Deo quàm eſſe intelligitur; quia id ipſum quod eſt, neque deſinens eſt aliquando, neque cæpit.* Petav. T. 1. l. 1. c. 6.

(z) Orat. 36.

(a) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 1. c. 63.

minally Scholaſticiz'd and *Philoſophic-paganiz'd* at the ſame rate with the Name Jehovah. Of which having given a large account we will proceed to deduce ſome other Conſectaries from the Name and Idea of God before repreſented.

CHAP. III.

1. A Fourth Conſectary touching the Plenary Idea of God, that it doth not belong to Metaphyſicks, but to the Science of Sanctity. 2. The Science of Sanctity defin'd. 3. The Tranſcendency of it. 4. The ſpuriouſneſs of the Scholaſtic Theology. 5. It is rather Neſcience than Science of God. 6. It is no friend to affirmative Attributes, nor acquainted with the true Ideas of things. 7. It claſheth with common Reaſon and with Sanctity. 8. A Fifth Conſectary, that God is not duely notic'd in the Scholaſtick way without duely noticing the Sovereignty that God is. 9. A Sixth Conſectary that Men may have an Idea or definitive Notion of God.

I. OUR *Fourth* Conſectary is, *That the Plenary Idea of God doth not belong to the Science of Metaphyſicks, but to the Science of Sanctity.* In the Metaphyſicks of the Philoſophic Pagans (*Platonic* and *Ariſtotelian*) the great things which are ſpeculated, are *certain ſublime Incorporeals of theirs*, which are meer Philoſophic-Pagan Deities; and inſtead of theſe Philoſophic-Pagan Deities the Schools of Chriſtendom have ſubſtituted *God and his Attributes and the Angels*, which fall within the compaſs of the ſubject of Metaphyſicks (as they ſuppoſe,) becauſe *Metaphyſica eſt Scientia de Ente ſecundum rem & rationem abſtracto à materia. Metaphyſicks is the Science touching Ens both really and notionally abſtracted from Matter.* And becauſe God is knowable by natural Light, therefore ſo far as he is ſuch, his Plenary Idea ought to be treated of in ſome natural Science which muſt be the *Metaphyſicks*, as the Maſters of this ſort of Learning argue, (*b*) who have the ſame Conceits of its Excellency, that the Philoſophic Pagans had of old; for they have intituled it θεῖόν τι ϗ θαυμάσιον, *divine and wonderful*, *nobiliſſima Scientia*, *the moſt noble Science*, becauſe the moſt noble Beings *God and Angels* are the Subject thereof. But although they treat of Angels, they pretend not to treat of *Holy* Angels as ſuch, nor of an Angel that is a Sovereignty (of the Kingdom of Darkneſs,) nor of Angels that are made God's (Religion-kind of Honours;) theſe things being quite beyond the bounds of their Science, they muſt pretend to treat of Angels only *reſpectivè* as being immaterial and incorporeal Eſſences; and not without the like limitation they ought to treat of God, whoſe Plenary Idea (both according to natural Light and ſupernatural Revelation) is manifeſtly quite beyond the bounds of their Science. And as out of the Science and Diſcipline of Chriſtianity no ſuch thing as Chriſt can be found: So out of the Science and Diſcipline of Sanctity and Religion no ſuch thing as God can be found. They that cannot pretend to treat of any Human kind of thing, cannot pretend to treat of Man, who is neceſſarily an Human kind of Thing or Being. They that cannot pretend to treat of any Chriſtian kind of thing, cannot pretend to treat of Chriſt, who is eſſentially a Thing or Being of the Chriſtian kind. So they that cannot pretend to treat of any *God-kind of thing*, how can they pretend to treat of the Plenary Idea of God, who is eſſentially a Thing or Being of the God-kind? But the Metaphyſicians might not only be pardon'd, but would deſerve our Thanks, although in treating of God they tranſgreſs'd the bounds of their Science, if they had promoted the true knowledge of God and illuſtrated his Idea: But they are ſo far from underſtanding the true Idea of God, that in *Samnio Samnium* you may ſeek God in the Metaphyſicians God, and in great degree not find him. Much of his Idea they underſtand nothing of, and what they do underſtand of it they miſunderſtand. For it muſt not be thought that God is denominated *Ens primum*, *Ens ſummum*, *Ens independens*, *Ens à ſe*, *Ens increatum*, *Ens purè neceſſarium* (the prime, ſupreme, independent, ſelf-originate, increate, neceſſarily exiſtent Being) meerly as an Eſſence or Subſtance, as the Metaphyſicians ſuppoſe; but as *an Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation*, and as the Sovereignty; for the Sovereignty as ſuch is neceſſarily *Ens primum*, *Ens ſummum*, *Ens independens*. If the Metaphyſicians had thus rightly underſtood the moſt obvious Attributes of God, which themſelves treat of, they could not have fail'd to diſcern, that God is as Alien from their vulgar Science, as *the Sovereignty*, *the God-Sovereignty*, *the Holy Sovereignty*, *the Sovereignty of Sanctity and Religion* implieth. His Idea therefore, ſo far as he is ſuch by natural Light, belongeth to *natural Religion* and *Sanctity*, of which *Cicero* ſaith (*c*) *Sanctitas eſt Scientia colendorum Deorum*, but in better Language *Sanctitas eſt Scientia colendi Numinis*, *Sanctity is the Science of ſerving and worſhipping God.* By the *Science of Sanctity* the true God is diſcriminated from the Deities of the Philoſophic Pagans; for *Plato* held a *ſupreme Monad*; *Ariſtotle* ſuppos'd that the ſupreme Deity was *a ſupreme Mind, Intellect* or *abſtract Intelligence*; and *Anaxagoras* held *an infinite active Mind free from all mixture of Matter:* But none of theſe Philoſophic Deities were of any concern to the buſineſs of Sanctity and Religion, and therefore none of them was the true God. *Cicero* underſtandeth the Deity to be (*d*) *a certain looſe and free Mind ſegregate from all mortal Concretion, perceiving and moving all things. Sext. Empir.* ſaith, that the Deity was thought (*e*) *a certain happy Animal* (or Vitaliſt) *and incorruptible and perfect in happineſs, and incapable of any evil.* But none of theſe ſuppos'd Deities in Paganiſm was of kind *the Deity or Sovereignity of true Sanctity and Religion*; and therefore none of them was the true kind of God. Nor muſt we only oppoſe the Science of Sanctity (which is in great part Nobility-learning) to the Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans: But to the Metaphyſical

(b) *Th. Barlow Exercit. Metaphyſ.* 3. & 4.

(c) *De N. D. l.* 1.

(d) *Mens ſoluta quædam & libera, ſegregata ab omni concretione mortali, omnia ſentiens & movens.* Tuſc. l. 1.

(e) Μακάριόν τι ζῶον ϗ ἄφθαρτον, ϗ τέλειον ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ, ϗ παντὸς κακοῦ ἀνεπίδεκτον. *Petav. T. 1. l. 1. c. 2. S.9.*

phyſical and Scholaſtic Theology of Jews and Chriſtians, which is not a Theology from natural Light only, but is the Scripture-Theology turn'd into a criminally Metaphyſical and Scholaſtic Theology. Which is but a natural and neceſſary conſequence of the Metaphyſicians pretenſion to treat of the Plenary Idea of God. For if this belongeth to the Science of Metaphyſicks, the true and genuin kind of Theology muſt be of Kind and Quality Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical. But how mean and vile, how uſeleſs and unprofitable, how criminal and miſchievous, how ſpurious and illegitimate, this ſort of Theology is, and how oppoſite to the Science of Sanctity (the only true and genuin kind of Theology) will appear, if we compare together theſe two ſorts of Theology, and make ſome few remarks upon them.

II. *The Science which Sanctity is* (underſtanding thereby both that which is of Nature and that which is by Divine Grace) belongeth to the Saints of God as ſuch, and is *the Saint of God-kind of Learning*. Which Notion of it ſufficiently diſtinguiſheth it from all Arts and Sciences of the *common unholy kind*, the *Pædagogical*, *Metaphyſical*, *Phyſiological*, *Mathematical*, *Medicinal*, *Political*, *Juriſprudential*, *Mechanical*. In ancient Latin Authors *Sanctity* and *Religion* (f) are terms ſynonymous; and to ſuppoſe the Gods to be of Religion and of Sanctimony is the ſame thing. Whence *Cicero* ſaith, *ad Deorum Religionem Sanctimoniamque migrare, to remove to the Religion and Sanctimony of the Gods*. (g) *Servius ſulpitius* deriv'd the word Religion *à relinquendo, from leaving us*; for he ſuppoſ'd it, to denote *That which being of Sanctity is therefore remov'd and ſegregated from us*. Religion importeth Sanctity,. and is of the ſame import with it. The *Science which is Sanctity*, is the ſame with *the Science of Religion*, which ſignifieth *inſtitutively* the Doctrine, Diſcipline or Inſtitution of Religion; and *conſtitutively* univerſal Sanctity on our part (conſtitutive of the Saints of God) and more eſpecially of the *intellectual Virtue*, which Sanctity or Religion is, and without which (intellectual Virtue, Knowledge or Science) none can be Holy and Religious. In both theſe Notions (as Inſtitutive and Conſtitutive) it is called in Scripture *the knowledge of the Holy*, which implieth, that it is *the Science which belongeth to the Saints of God* (the holy People) *as ſuch, and is the Saint of God-kind of Learning*. Prov. 9. 10. *The knowledge of the holy is underſtanding*. Prov. 30. 3. *I never learned wiſdom, nor have the underſtanding of the holy*. The Knowledge of the Holy (*Scientia Sanctorum*) ſo plainly ſignifieth the Science of Sanctity or Religion, that the Septuagint explicate the meaning of the Phraſe by this annexed Clauſe τὸ γνῶναι νόμον, *to know the Law*. The Science of Sanctity therefore in reſpect of the Subject to which it belongeth, is *the Holy Learning*; for it belongeth to none, but as they are or ought to be Holy. In reſpect of the Subject alſo in which it reſideth, it is *the holy Learning*; for it conſtituteth and denominateth them that profeſs it *holy by profeſſion*, and diſtinguiſheth them from the unholy; and unleſs they have it in ſo ſlender a degree, as that in the main they have it not, it maketh them and denominateth them *really Holy*. In them that are really Holy it is *of ſpecific Nature the holy Learning*; and it is alſo the holy Learning *objectively*, or in reſpect of the matter which it is converſant about, which is Holineſs of State, Life, Society, holy Perſons and holy Things (the matters of God-ſociety,) agreeably whereunto *Munſter* obſerveth, that this Phraſe *the knowledge of the Holy* is rendred by the Hebrews *intelligentia rerum ſanctarum, the underſtanding of holy things*. It is *originally* Holy; for it is of God as Father of the holy Family, and Founder of the holy Empire; and the End, Uſe and Effect, to which it is deſign'd and adapted, is to make Men holy; upon all which accounts it muſt be denominated *the holy Learning*. For as the way of the righteous and the righteous way, *ſo the knowledge of the holy and the holy knowledge* are ſynonymous Expreſſions. The wiſe Man ſtileth it *Knowledge*, *Wiſdom*, *Underſtanding*, Prov. 2. 5. ſimply and without addition (which Names ſignifie what is good Underſtanding) *and the knowledge of God*, which ſpeaketh it to be the genuin *Theoſophy* (the Holy and Divine kind of Learning,) which is the Holy and Divine kind of Good and Excellency, the comprehenſion of all Holy and Divine kind of Goods and Excellencies.

(f) *Qui Sancti? qui Religionem colentes?* Cic. orat. pro Planc. *Nihil ſanctius, nihil omni religione munitius*. Idem orat. pro Dom. *Nonne omnem religionem funditus ſuſtulerit? quæ enim poteſt eſſe ſanctitas?* Idem de N. D. l. 1. *De ſanctitate, de pietate adverſus Deos libros ſcripſit Epicurus*. Ibid.

(g) *Servius ſulpitius religionem eſſe dictam tradidit, quæ propter ſanctitatem aliquam remotum ac ſepoſitum à nobis ſit; quaſi à relinquendo dicta*. Macrob. Saturn. l. 3. c. 3.

III. From which definitive Notices of *the Science of Sanctity* its Tranſcendence appeareth; for the Name of *a Learning*, *Knowledge* or *Science* ſpeaketh it to be *the Knowledge of a comprehenſion of things, that are of worth to be learned*; and thoſe only a Philoſopher accounteth ſuch, which belong to the Pythagoric Inſtitution and Science of Sanctity. (h) *Thoſe things only are worth the Learning, which carry us to the Divine Similitude, which make us conſult before action, that fooliſh things be not done; that ſuffer us not to be drawn aſide by any, by Word or Deed, which inable us, to diſcern the difference between Diſcourſes that occur, which perſwade to bear calmly the Calamities ſent by Providence, and to make Medicinal applications to them, to bear well Death and Poverty, to practice Juſtice, and ſtrictly to bound the Belly and the things about it; which introduceth the Laws of Friendſhip, and the Honour of Parents, and which ſhew the Worſhip of the ſuperiour kinds of Beings*. Another Philoſopher will not allow, that any thing is worthy the Name of Learning and Erudition on this ſide the Stoical Inſtitution and Science of Sanctity (Sinleſneſs) and Beatitude. (i) *Why do'ſt thou call thy ſelf Learned? What is thy Erudition Man? Is it becauſe thou haſt made Syllogiſms? Wilt thou not unlearn, if it be poſſible, all theſe things, and beginning again agree with me, that until now thou haſt not touch'd the buſineſs?* For thou art to learn, not to envy, not to pity, not to emulate, not to tremble, not to deplore thy fate or fortune.

(h) Ἄξια δὲ ἐκεῖνα μόνα [μαθήσεως] ὅσα πρὸς τὴν θείαν ὁμοίωσιν ἡμᾶς ἄγει· ἃ ποιεῖ βουλεύεσθαι πρὸ ἔργου, ὅπως μὴ μωρὰ τέληται· ἃ οὐκ ἐᾷ παράγεσθαι ὑπ' οὐδενὸς οὔτε λόγῳ οὔτε ἔργῳ· ὅσα διακρίνειν ἱκανοὺς ποιεῖ τῶν προσπιπτόντων λόγων τὸ διάφορον· ὅσα τὰς δαιμονίας τύχας πρᾴως φέρειν καὶ ἰᾶσθαι πείθει, καὶ τὴν θανάτου καὶ πενίας διδάσκει, καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἄσκησιν, καὶ γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν γαστέρα τὴν ἐγκράτειαν· ὅσα τοὺς τῆς φιλίας νόμους εἰσηγεῖται καὶ τὴν γονέων τιμήν· ὅσα τῶν κρειττόνων γενῶν τὸ σέβας ἀποδείκνυσι. *Hierocl.* in aur. Car. p. 174.

(i) Τί ἐπιλέγεις πεπαιδεῦσθαι; ποίαν παιδείαν ἄνθρωπε; ὅτι συλλογισμοὺς ἔπραξας μεταπίπτοντας; οὐ θέλεις ἀπομαθεῖν, εἰ δυνατὸν, πάντα ταῦτ καὶ ἄνωθεν ἄρξασθαι συναισθόμενος ὅτι μέχρι νῦν οὐδ' ἧ τοῦ πράγματος. *Epict.* Diſſ. 2. c. 17.

(*k*) *Give me a young Man, that cometh into the School ſaying, I bid adieu to all things elſe, this one thing is to me ſufficient, if I may live without being liable to impediment and without trouble.* So in *Cebes*'s Table nothing is accounted ἀληθινὴ παιδεία, *true Erudition*, but that which ſaveth Men from their great Evils, and conducteth them to Virtue and Beatitude. All other Learning is called ψευδοπαιδεία, *falſe Erudition*, becauſe comparatively and unleſs it be conjoin'd with and ſubordinated to the true Erudition, it deſerveth no other Name. (*l*) *A Man that can ſpeak as well as* Demoſthenes, *and unlooſe Syllogiſms as well as* Chryſippus, *nothing hindreth* ἄθλιον εἶναι, πενθεῖν, φθονεῖν, ἁπλῶς ταράττεσθαι, κακοδαιμονεῖν, *but that he may be miſerable, may lament and envy, and* (to ſpeak compendiouſly) *may be in perturbation and infelicity.* Much of this Nature occurreth (*m*) in *Philo* and the Pagan Divine Philoſophers; agreeably whereto the Church of God ſuppoſeth, that her *Saint of God-kind of Learning* is the only valuable and important Learning. (*n*) *In hac nulla eſt hominis ſapientia niſi Pietas, quâ rectè colitur verus Deus. In the Church there is no Wiſdom but Piety, whereby the true God is truly Worſhipp'd.* All other Arts and Sciences (although of good uſe in the Church yet) are τὰ ἔξωθεν, μαθήματα, *exoterical Learning* (as *Sophronius* calleth them,) they are on this ſide Religion, which is *totum Hominis*, the whole of Man (the whole of his Duty and of his Intereſt,) and therefore they are like the things of this Life, but τὰ πῶς ἀναγκαῖα, *in ſome ſort needful* (they are not like the grand Neceſſaries for Man his Holineſs and his Happineſs,) comparatively they are little worth, of ſlender importance, and in great degree needleſs and ſuperfluous. (*p*) *Quæ neque ſcire compendium, neque ignorare detrimentum eſt ullum, which there is no* (great) *profit in knowing, nor detriment in not knowing.* In themſelves they are vile and ſorry kind of things (as are alſo the things which they are converſant about,) common, graceleſs and unholy (therefore but of common price,) common to the wicked and atheous, conſiſtent with Diaboliſm (and therefore on this ſide what is choice and precious,) but notional and ſhadowy, jejune and ſuperficial (not like the holy-vital, the ſavoury and ſubſtantial Knowledge,) empty and unſatisfactory, flatulent and tumid, always dangerous, uſually miſchievous, in great degree imperfect, and impertinent to our true excellency and felicity. The Exoterical Arts and Sciences are the beſt of Human Goods, and ought to be eſteem'd according to their worth and uſefulneſs: But they are no better than the human, ſecular and mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies (that Chriſtians duely deprecate and relinquiſh,) which are * *the paganical and mundane kind of glories.* As *Julian* challengeth the Chriſtians, (*q*) to produce a Man of theirs that might compare with *Hippocrates* for Learning in Phyſick: To which S. *Cyril* well replieth, what is that to Religion? The whole of Exoterical Learning without Sanctity is Exoterical to our true Wiſdom, it maketh none wiſe in the main (the Men of Knowledge and Underſtanding,) but the greateſt proficients in it remain Fools in the main notwithſtanding their Exoterical Learning, and in the whole computation of things are not the wiſer and better for it; agreeably to what *Cicero* ſaith of *Antonius*, *he gave his Maſter a great reward, to teach him to be never the wiſer.* The Chriſtians of old ſaid in their Prayers to God, (*r*) *although any one be perfect among the Sons of Men, yet if he be devoid of the Wiſdom that cometh from thee, he muſt be reputed as nothing.* There is no compariſon, no proportion between the common, human, ſecular and mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies (Learning, Wiſdom, Riches, Honours, Peace and Safety, Comfort and Felicity,) and the Holy, Spiritual, Divine and ſaving Goods and Excellencies. For what are evanid Shadows to the great ſubſtantial Realities? A counterfeit Eye or Pearl to that which is true and genuine? Traſh to Treaſure? Things exoterical and vulgar to the ſaving Precioſities? The beggarly Riches and ignoble kind of Honours to the truly noble and Divine? What is a trifle to a Kingdom? *Athens* to the heavenly *Jeruſalem*? The Saint of God-kind of Learning and Wiſdom (the Science which Sanctity is, and which is Sanctity) is of no leſs value and importance than God, his Religion, his ſaving Truth and true Worſhip, his Life and Kingdom, and the immenſe Goods thereof, and the whole being of a Saint of God (both here and hereafter;) for it is all theſe ineſtimable Goods and Excellencies in it ſelf and to us. And becauſe it compriſeth univerſal Sanctity and Piety (in compariſon whereof all things are vanity,) it is *ſummum bonum, the Sovereign and peerleſs Good, ſummum bonorum, the ſummary and aggregate of all our true and great Goods*, which bring along with them the Goods of the lower Houſe. The Saint of God-kind of Learning and Wiſdom (objectively and ſubjectively ſuch) is ſuch a knowledge of the Saint of God kind of things (which are of Excellency invaluable and infinite importance,) as ſaveth Mankind from all their great Evils, and therefore *J. Mart.* had reaſon to ſay, (*s*) *This I found the only certain and profitable Philoſophy.*

IV. If any Inſtitution calleth it ſelf *a Theology*, which is not of Kind and Quality *the Inſtitution and Science and Sanctity*, it is not of Kind and Quality *genuin, but ſpurious and illegitimate.* For although it be as the Name Theology ſignifieth (*t*) תורת האלהות *the Doctrine or Inſtitution of the Divinity*, חכמת האלהות *the Wiſdom touching the God-head*, yet if it is not the Diſcipline and Science of Sanctity, but on this ſide it, and of an Alien-kind from it, It muſt be counted illegitimate, becauſe it is not *the Saint of God-kind* (and therefore not the God-kind) of Learning and Wiſdom concerning God. That is not the genuin kind of Theology, which is not the true and genuine *Theoſophy*; and that is not the true and genuin Theoſophy, which is not the true and genuine kind *of Wiſdom*, which is *the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Wiſdom.* If Theology is Theoſophy, it muſt be *the Knowledge of God* (the comprehenſion of what is and ought to be known of God;) and if it is the genuin Knowledge of God, it muſt neceſſarily be coincident with that which alone is ſuch, *the Science of Sanctity.* Theology is *Divina Scientia* (the Divine Science) which if genuin muſt neceſſarily be the Holy and Divine kind of Learning and Science, which is the ſame with the

---

(k) Ἐμοὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα χαιρέτω, ἀρκεῖ δὲ εἰ ἐξέσται ποτὲ ἀπαραποδίστῳ ϗ ἀλύπῳ διαγαγεῖν. *Ibid.*

(l) *Epict. ſupr. c.* 23.

(m) *Philo opuſc. p.* 22, 23. *Lipſ. Manud. l.* 1. *Diſſ.* 1. *l.* 2. *Diſſ.* 6. *Epictet. Diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 19. 21. *Gat. in Ant. p.* 9, 14, 44, 45.

(n) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 14. *c.* 28.

(p) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 2. *p.* 86.

* *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 5. *p.* 179.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 7. *p.* 223.

(r) Κἂν γάρ τις τέλειος ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων, τῆς ἀπό σου σοφίας ἀπούσης, εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθήσεται. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 283, 284.

(s) Ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε ϗ σύμφορον. *Dial. cum Typh. p.* 225.

(t) *Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 69.

the Inſtitution and Science of Sanctity. Theology is *Divinity Doctrinal*, and what can be more plainly illegitimate than a Divinity which is not of kind and quality *Divinity* (and therefore is not φερώνυμος, the truth of its Name?) an Inſtitution of God which is not of the God-kind and ſymbolizeth not with him? An unholy and undivine kind of Divinity, which is not (u) ϑεία ϑεολογία, *Divine kind of Theology* (as *Clemens* ſpeaketh,) is like an unchriſtian kind of Chriſtianity, an unplatonic kind of Platoniſm; it is an atheous kind of Theiſm, and the Deity in ſuch an Inſtitution muſt neceſſarily be (in great degree) an Atheous kind of God. Theology touching the Godhead belongeth to *Sanctity* or *Religion* (as it is an Inſtitution or Science) as properly as the Theology touching Chriſt belongeth to the Chriſtian Religion; and as the Chriſtian Religion (the Goſpel of Chriſt) is *Chriſtology*, ſo the Inſtitution, Diſcipline and Science of Sanctity is Theology. The Theology of a Saint properly belongeth to *the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Philoſophy*, how much more doth the Theology of the Godhead properly belong thereunto, ſeeing God is (w) *Sanctus Sanctorum* (the Saint of Saints,) which is his being God? Wherefore it fareth with the Idea of God as with an obſcure Book, which *Heraclitus* wrote touching Nature or Phiſiology; for as one interpreted that obſcure Book touching things *Politick* or *Moral*, miſtaking the very kind of Learning of which it treated; ſo they that form their plenary Idea of God in *Phiſiology*, *Metaphyſicks*, or any unholy Learning (as the Philoſophic Pagans did) miſtake the very kind of Learning to which it belongeth.

(u) *Clem. ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *ſub ſin.*

(w) *Petav. T.* 4. *par.* 2. *l* 11. *c.* 14. *S.* 4.

So our Chriſtian Apologiſts very much miſtake the Idea of God, when (confounding ἱεροῖς βέβηλα, *the Holy with the Profane*) at this rate they follow and applaud the Philoſophic-Pagan Theology of the Godhead. (x) *I have expos'd* (ſaith one of them) *the Opinions of almoſt all the more illuſtrious Philoſophers, that they denoted one God although by many Names; ſo that one may rationally think, either that the Chriſtians now are* (Pagan) *Philoſophers, or that the* (Pagan) *Philoſophers of former Ages were then Chriſtians.* They that ſuppoſe ſuch an Harmony between the Chriſtian and Philoſophic-Pagan Theology of the Godhead, are criminally deficient in underſtanding either one or both of them; which is too viſible in this Apologiſt, who with the reſt of the Chriſtianizing Philoſophic-Pagans reckoneth *Democritus*, *Strato* and *Epicurus*. It is much, that the Chriſtian Apologiſts ſhould not be ſolicitous for other Notices of the Godhead, (y) than ſuch as their Pagan Adverſaries might and did acknowledge, and yet continue Pagans ſtill. But thus *Lactantius* ſometimes ſuppoſeth, (z) *That the Philoſophers touch'd upon the whole Truth and all the recondite Learning of Divine Religion.* In the elder times of the Chriſtian Church the Platonic Scholaſticiſm was criminally introduc'd into our Religion. (a) *The Chriſtian Schools drew ſome of their Articles through the Limbecks of* Plato's *Philoſophy, and to this Day the reliſh remaineth upon ſome of them.* (b) *Some of the Philoſophers betook themſelves to the Chriſtian Religion upon the riſe of it, chiefly of the Platonic Sect, which then was the principal, and coming into the Church they left not their Platoniſm behind them, but transferr'd many things from their Philoſophy into the Chriſtian Religion, eſpecially in the matter of the Trinity, of which there is ſome reſemblance in that Philoſophy.* But in after-times as *Ariſtotle* grew into credit, the Theorems of Theology (*Dogmata Theologica*) and the method of handling them was accommodated to the *Ariſtotelian* mode of philoſophizing; (c) *and in the Year* 1629, *the Parliament of* Paris *gave Sentence againſt ſome extravagant Chymiſts, upon remonſtrance of the Sorbon, who held, that to oppoſe the Principles of* Ariſtotle's *Philoſophy, was to oppoſe thoſe of Scholaſtick Divinity receiv'd in our Church.* (d) The *Colonienſes* wrote a Book *de Salute Ariſtotelis*; and *Thannerus* ſaith, *that* Ariſtotle *was Chriſt's forerunner* in naturalibus, *as* John Baptiſt *was* in gratuitis. At this Day ſome ſay, (e) *Senza Ariſtotele noj mancarono di molti Articoli di Fide, without* Ariſtotle *we ſhould fail in many Articles of our Faith.* But *Ariſtotle* is not every where rever'd as the great Oracle of Wiſdom: *Platoniſm* of late hath reviv'd and made head again. And not a few diſcarding the over-fond admiration both of *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*, have generouſly betaken themſelves, to contemplate Divine Matters with great freedom of Mind, but in a method remote and alien from the Science of Sanctity, *Carteſianiſm* alſo (not content with its Mechanicks) pretendeth to a Metaphyſical Theology, to form Ideas of God and of Spirits, and of the Chriſtian Trinity it ſelf, which (according to the Genius of that Philoſophy) muſt be (f) *tres modi cogitandi, three modes of thinking.* Such unholy and exotick modes of Theologizing being introduc'd into the Church, a Metaphyſical and Scholaſtick kind of Theology of ſeveral Forms and Denominations (and agreeable to ſeveral Schools of Metaphyſicians,) ſhe hath chang'd her Science of Sanctity (in her Theology of the Godhead) and ſubſtituted inſtead of it an illegitimate kind of Theology.

(x) *Expoſui opiniones omnium fermè philoſophorum, quibus illuſtrior gloria eſt, Deum unum multis licet deſignaſſe nominibus: ut quivis arbitretur, aut nunc Chriſtianos philoſophos eſſe, aut philoſophos fuiſſe jam tunc Chriſtianos.* Min. Fel. p. 155.

(y) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 32.

(z) *Totam veritatem & omne divinæ religionis arcanum Philoſophi attigerunt. L.* 7. *c.* 3.

(a) *Biſhop Taylor Duct. Dub. B.* 1. *c.* 2. *r.* 3.

(b) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 3 *S.* 1.

(c) *The compariſon of Plato with Ariſt. p.* 192, 193.

(d) *Dr. Tuckney. None but Chriſt. p.* 60.

(e) *Palavicin. l.* 8 *c.* 19.

(f) *Liber de S. Amore Ep. Theol. p.* 105.

So the Metaphyſical Rabbins (that are now no more the holy People) have chang'd their Science of Sanctity by criminally Scholaſticizing and Philoſophic-Paganizing the Theology of the Godhead at an enormous rate; (g) their *Mercavah* or Science of God and Spirits is *Metaphyſica*, and compriſeth their *Hyper-phyſical* Contemplations (as mine Author ſpeaketh,) which are not thoſe of the high-flown *Platonic*, but of the *Ariſtotelian* Form and School. Not but that the Platonic Metaphyſicks are entertain'd amongſt the Jews, and were ſo of ancient times (they appear in *Joſephus*, *Philo* and the *Cabaliſts*;) but the more receiv'd Philoſophy of the Judaical Schools from ancient times (the times of *Antiochus*, as Learned Men ſuppoſe) hath been that of *Ariſtotle*, his Hypotheſis of Celeſtial Orbs and Spheres occurreth in *Jonathan ben Uzziel*'s Paraphraſe upon *Ezekiel*'s Viſion of the Wheels (which Paraphraſe was written many Years before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*,) and in the *Jezirah*, which is thought the moſt ancient Book they have, (h) and a Relique of the ancient Judaical Philoſophy. Agreeably to the Genius of their Philoſophy the Rabbins ſuppoſe, (i) that the Celeſtial Orbs are living, rational and intelligent, and the holy Angels are in their account the ſame with *Ariſtotle*'s Abſtract, Intelligences that move the Spheres. And as they paganize the holy Angels into *Ariſtotelian abſtract Forms and ſeparate Intelligences:* So (agreeably to *Ariſtotle*) they repreſent the Deity as *a great ab-*

ſtract

(g) *Vorſt. in Maimon. de fund. Leg. p.* 23.

(h) *Coſri, p.* 301.

(i) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. par.* 2. *c.* 4.

ſtract Intelligence, that is, above the Intelligences of the ſeveral Orbs or Spheres, and the ſame with *Ariſtotle*'s τὸ πρῶτον κινοῦν ἀκίνητον, *firſt immoveable Intellect*, to which he attributeth the motion of the *Primum Mobile*; (*k*) for the Rabbins ſtile the Deity *Intelligentia abſtracta, an abſtract Intelligence*, and one of theſe Doctors ſaith, (*l*) *I have ſeen in a moſt ancient Book, that* Socrates *whom they call Divine, firſt found out by Philoſophy*, quod ſit Ens aliquod abſtractum, *that there is a certain abſtract Being.* (*m*) *The firſt Cauſe moveth the Primum Mobile*, ſaith *Abarbinel*, (*n*) *whirling the World about without Hand and Body*, ſaith *Maimonides. Alex. Aphrodiſ.* and ſome others of *Ariſtotle*'s Interpreters are of Opinion, that the (*o*) *Intellectus agens* (which is ſaid to illuminate the Mind of Man in the act of underſtanding) *is God himſelf or the Supreme Mind that moveth all the Orbs.* Agreeably to this Branch of Peripatetick Philoſophy the Rabbins ſuppoſe, (*p*) that God is the *Intellectus agens* at leaſt to their Nation, and of this they underſtand the *Pſalmiſts* words, *In thy Light ſhall we ſee Light.* As theſe ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Theiſts criminally follow *Ariſtotle* in their Notices of the Deity; ſo their Notion of Theology agreeth with the Philoſophic Pagan. For their *Mercavah* is that which they call (*q*) חכמת האלהות or *Knowledge Theological. Thoſe things that are wholly ſegregate from Nature, and from all Matter and Motion eſſentially, they call Theological.*

(k) *Ibid. par.* 1. *c.* 67. *& par.* 3. *c.* 9.
(l) *Buxtorf. in Coſri, p.* 31.
(m) *Abarb. ap. Menaſſ. ben Iſr. Qu. in Gen. p.* 51. *& de cap. Fid. ap. Vorſt. p.* 98.
(n) *Ibid.*
(o) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 42. *Gaſſend. T.* 2. *l.* 9. *c.* 1.
(p) *Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 9.
(q) *Quæ à natura prorſus & ab omni materia & motu ſunt eſſentialiter abſoluta & ſeparata, dicimus Theologica.* Reuchlin. de Art. Cab. l. 1. fol. 5. & 14.

V. The Metaphyſical and Scholaſtic kind of Theology is rather *Neſcience* than *Science* of the Godhead and of the Matters of genuine Theology. For ſo far as it is remote from the genuine knowledge of God and the good underſtanding of things (which is in great degree,) ſo far as it is a ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Theology, ſo far it is *Neſcience*, not *Science*. It underſtandeth not, nor can explicate the principal and moſt obvious Names of the Deity (as God and Jehovah;) nor is it poſſible, that they ſhould be underſtood and explicated aright but in the Science of Sanctity. It perverteth the one of theſe ſacred Names (the holy-popular Name Jehovah,) and it commonizeth and profaneth the other (the holy Name God) both by its trifling Etymologies, and by dignifying above it the Metaphyſical *Ens*; whereby this filthy abſurdity emergeth, that his Being is not ſo much the being God (which is Sanctity on his part and on ours,) as Metaphyſical *Entity*, which is dignify'd above *Sanctity*, that is a very great ſtranger in this Theology. It underſtandeth not *the Holineſs of the Name of God* (which is his Godhead,) nor well underſtandeth *his Holineſs of Nature*; and having *brought Greeks into the Temple it hath polluted this holy place*, by confounding (in great degree) the *Platonic* or *Ariſtotelic* Theiſm with the Scripture-Theology. (*r*) It frequently confoundeth the true God with the Platonic *Hen* or *Monad*, which is altogether *unconceivable*, *unintelligible*, *unſayable* (innominable alſo,) and the object of *Neſcience*, not of *Science*. Accordingly this Theology aboundeth with φλεγμαίνοντα ὀνόματα, *turgid Expreſſions* deriv'd from the Platoniſts, which are no better than Superintelligible Grandiloquies (intituling the Deity ἑνὰς ὑπερηνωμένη, *ſuper-unite Unity*, ὑπερούσιος, *ſuper-eſſential*, (*s*) ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας, *beyond Mind and Eſſence*; (*t*) προαιώνιος, *præ-eternal*; ὑπερτελής, *ſuper-perfect*; ὑπέρθεος, *ſuper-God*,) all which Platonic Metaphyſical Names and many ſuch more are like that Title of Honour in Nobility-Learning *ſuper-illuſtris*, of which ſome Lawyers ſay, (*u*) *that in truth there is no ſuch Title.* This Theology fanſieth a *docta ignorantia, Learned Ignorance*, it imitateth *Plato*'s *Parmenides*, and affecteth to make the Deity unintelligible, as *Cuſanus* doth in his Book *de Docta Ignorantia* (and even *Gr. Naz.* hath compos'd an Oration, to render the Deity as unintelligible, as his excellent Wit could make him, *Orat.* 34.) it affecteth alſo to make Riddles of God, and to attribute to the Deity inconſiſtences; (*w*) ſuch as ἑνὰς καὶ οὐχ ἑνάς, *an Unity and not an Unity*, νοῦς ἀνόητος, *mindleſs Mind*, τὸ προούσιον ὄν, *the præ-eſſential Ens*, which is *Syneſius*'s Name for God. None that affect not *Neſcience* and Obſcurity in Divine Matters, will admire *Scaliger*'s Subtilty (for which he admir'd himſelf) in excogitating this Name for God αὐταυτός, *ipſiſſimus ipſe*; or that of *Boethius*, (*x*) *Ipſiſſima Ipſeitas*, or that of the Book *Coſri*, (*y*) *a definition conſiſteth of the generical notion and difference, which are incompetible to the firſt Cauſe, from whence it followeth*, שיהיה הוא הוא *quòd ipſe ſit ipſe.* It is not for the Intereſt of Religion, that the Godhead ſhould be repreſented as *unknowable* and *unintelligible*; for it is really a ſad Story to the truly Religious, and a foul blemiſh to Theology (as if the deſign of it was not to teach the knowledge of God, but to indoctrinate Men with this dark Conceit, that God cannot be known,) and very edifying Doctrine to the Atheiſts, who deſire nothing more, than to have Religion and the Notion of a Deity repreſented as a bundle of Inconſiſtences, and who pretend, that a Deity is *impoſſible*, becauſe *unconceivable* and *unintelligible*. But this Theology loveth, to expatiate in repreſenting the Deity *unintelligible*, eſpecially the Divine Nature and Eſſence; for it ſuppoſeth, (*z*) that thoſe Perfections which in our way of conceiving and underſtanding are attributed unto God, οὐ τὴν φύσιν δηλοῖ, ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ φύσιν, *do not declare his Nature, but what is about his Nature.* (*a*) *His Being is ſimple, unknowable, inacceſſible to all, and altogether inexplicable.* (*b*) *This one way we may know, how to underſtand what God is, if we think him to be that, which cannot be underſtood, nor ſo much as enter into thought, of what ſort it is and how great it is. His Eſſence is ſaid to be* (*c*) *utterly unknown* (*d*) *of God, what he is in himſelf, nothing can be ſaid by us, nor ſo much as thought.* In this Theology he is intituled *Non Ens*, (*e*) as ſuppoſing him the ſame with the Platoniſts *Hen* or *Monad*, which is an Acroamatical Deity, that tranſcendeth all *Entia*, and all *Form* and *Idea*. (*f*) And as no Name is competible to that Platonic primordiality (for nothing is ſayable of him;) ſo this Theology intituleth the true God *innominable*, as ſuppoſing him ſo *unknowable*, *inexplicable*, and *undeclarable*, and that no Name is agreeable to him. In the Inſtitution and Science of Sanctity *the Name of God* is of higheſt regard; but in this Scholaſtic Theology the Deity muſt be ἀνώνυμος (he muſt have no Name)

(r) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 6. *S.*10. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. *S.* 8. *ibid. c.* 6. *S.* 6. *&c.*
(s) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 357.
(t) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 1. *c.* 13.
(u) *Selden. Tit of Hon. p.* 102.
(w) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 8. *vid. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *S.* 6. *& c.* 6. *S.*11.
(x) *De Trin. c.* 4.
(y) *P.*313.
(z) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *S.* 12. *v. ibid. c.* 11. *S.* 9.
(e) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *S.* 12.
(f) *Ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 6. *S.* 6.

(a) *Simplicem & ignorabilem* (ἄγνωστον) *atque inacceſſam omnibus & prorſus inexplicabilem habet exiſtentiam.* Petav. ibid.

(b) *Quomodo intelligere licet quid ſit Deus, uno modo mente capiemus, ſi cogitaverimus id illum eſſe, quod quale & quantum ſit, non poſſit intelligi, ne in ipſum quidem cogitationem poſſit venire.* Petav. ibid. l. 1. c. 6. S. 3.

(c) *Funditus ignota.* Ibid. l. 2. c. 5. S. 4.

(d) *De Deo cujuſmodi in ſe eſt, nihil à nobis dici, ac nè cogitari poteſt.* Ibid. l. 1. c. 6. S. 3.

for the ſame reaſons (g) that the Platoniſts will allow none to their firſt Principle of all things. (h) *The Deity is innominable.* (i) *The Name is a certain definition of a thing. How is he ſayable or expreſſible, who is neither Genus, nor Difference, nor Species, nor Individuum? By Names we ſignifie things that are known; but who can notifie by a Name* τὸ ἀγνοούμενον, *that which is unknown* (k)?

Μοῦνος ἐὼν ἄφραστος· ἐπεὶ τέκες ὅσσα λαλεῖται.
Μοῦνος ἐὼν ἄγνωστος· ἐπεὶ τέκες ὅσσα νοεῖται.

Seeing all ſpeakable things are from thee, thou art
ſole unſpeakable.
Seeing all knowable things are from thee, thou art
ſole unknowable.

(l) *We are ſo far from the knowledge of that Supreme, that we do not know his Name: It is his own Increpation, why inquireſt thou my Name, which is wonderful? and* Damaſcen *ſaith, the Divinity is altogether incomprehenſible* (unapprehenſible) *and innominable. This ſoundeth high,* (m) *but how much more auguſt and worthy of God is that confeſſion, unſpeakable, unſayable, not to be expreſs'd but by Silence?* I add a third reaſon (ſaith *Lipſius*) from *Damaſcen*, to ſhew, that the knowledge of God is obſcure and impenetrable: (n) *Knowledge is of thoſe things that have Eſſence; but God is above Eſſence, therefore above Knowledge, or without Cognoſcibility.*

In conſort with theſe Scholaſticks of the Chriſtian Church the Hebrew Doctors affirm; (o) *our Minds cannot apprehend God, nor can any one apprehend what God is, except God himſelf.* (p) *All ſound Philoſopers acknowledge, that a Definition is incompetible to God.* (q) *We apprehend nothing of God but his Being, namely, that he is an Exiſtent, to whom nothing is like in the Univerſe of Beings, and that he hath nothing in common with any other;* (r) *whoſe Eſſence is altogether hidden and unconceivable* (yet the Tetragrammaton is ſaid, to expreſs and explicate it.) They deny, that we have any proper formal Conceptions of any thing that God is, and that *Life*, *Wiſdom*, *Will*, *Power*, *Mercy* and *Grace* are attributed to God and other Beings *univocally*, or ſo much as *analogically*, but they are attributed only ὁμωνύμως, *equivocally*, as they ſuppoſe; (s) *If we ſay, that God is living, our Intention is, to deny, that the attribute of Death belongeth to God; for as a Stone is of too low a condition, to be capable either of Folly or Wiſdom, ſo the Divine Eſſence is too ſublime, to be receptive either of Life or Death: If we ſay, that God hath Life, but not as our Life, we mean, that we have no conception of any other Life but our own, and it is as much, as if we ſhould ſay, that we do not know, what the Life of God is.* If they ſay, that God is *merciful* or *gracious*, they do not mean, that Grace or Mercy is inherent in the Divine Eſſence; but that God doth that which Men do through inherent Grace or Mercy (or is effectively merciful and gracious,) namely, he relieveth the Miſerable, or ſheweth Favour to ſuch, to whom he is not oblig'd. (t) So they admit not, that *Life*, *Wiſdom*, *Will* or *Power*, are formally in the Divine Eſſence (but God is conceiv'd to be *powerful*, becauſe effective of all things in the Creation, and *willing* or *volitive*, becauſe he maketh to exiſt, what is in being,) nor that any thing which we conceive of as *Perfection* is properly and formally in God, or any thing analogous thereto. And this Metaphyſical Theory is thought, to be of ſuch importance, that the People muſt be taught it by way of *Cabala.* Agreeably to which *Cabala* of miſchievous Metaphyſicks (that render the Deity unknowable) their Cabaliſts have denominated God (as is before remark'd) *tenebroſe Aleph*, *colour of Black*, and *Non Ens*, (u) *becauſe we have no apprehenſion of the Deity,* (w) *nor any Notion at all.* (x) *To whom will ye liken me?* ſaith God, *for ye can have no apprehenſion of me.* If we ask the Cabaliſts, how any Name (ſuch as the Lord of the Worlds) can be given to their recondite primordiality, if ſo totally unknown? their anſwer is; we know thus much דאנת הוא *thou art he.* As the Platonic Scholaſticks of the Chriſtian Church ſay, (y) *The Deity is inexpreſſible and innominable, therefore to be venerated and ador'd in ſilence:* So the Hebrew Doctors ſay, (z) *Tibi ſilentium laus eſt*, whereby they mean, *that it is better to be ſilent, than to ſpeak forth God's Praiſes.* Thus the Scholaſtick Theology is come to a very fair Iſſue!

VI. The Metaphyſical and Scholaſtic kind of Theology is no Friend to *affirmative Attributes*, and ſo far is no Friend to the knowledge of God, nor to true Piety, which is the knowledge of God; (a) for *Maimonides* wholly diſcardeth *affirmative Attributes* as falſe Affirmations, and of the *negative Attributes* he ſaith, (b) *A Negation doth not notifie to us the nature of that thing, touching which we deny ſomething.* If therefore Theology muſt admit of none but negative Attributes, God muſt remain unknown for the main at leaſt, and conſequently for the main at leaſt he muſt not be of our acquaintance, intercourſe and correſpondence, nor muſt he be regarded, or eſteem'd, or fear'd, or loved, deſir'd or imitated, prais'd or worſhip'd aright; the beſt People muſt remain an atheous kind of People for the main at leaſt, God being to them ſo far an unknown God. (c) *Abarbinel* agreeth with *Maimonides*, that God cannot be deſcrib'd by any affirmative Attribute; and to this purpoſe he expoundeth this Saying of the Preacher, *Eccl.* 5. 2. *God is in Heaven*; that is (ſaith he) *extremâ occultatione à nobis abſconditus, hid from us by the utmoſt occultation, his Exiſtence is vaſtly remote from our Exiſtence as Heaven from Earth, and therefore his Attributes are not as ours, but there is the wideſt difference between them; and therefore we ought not to aſcribe any but negative Attributes to the Deity.* In the diſtributions which the Rabbins make of the Divine Attributes *the affirmative Attributes* are not named. (*d*) *The Attributes of God* (ſay they) *are ſome Active, ſome Acceſſory, ſome Negative. The Active are taken from the Works or Doings of God, as making poor, rich, bringing low, lifting up, merciful, gracious, jealous, vindictive, potent, munificent, and the like. The Acceſſory* (or Aſcriptitious) *are bleſſed, praiſed, holy, high, exalted, which are taken from the exaltation of devout Perſons that ſpeak of God. The Negative are ſuch as Living, One, Firſt, Laſt, which are attributed to God, not to affirm thoſe things of God, in ſuch a manner as we underſtand them, but to deny the contraries.* (*e*) The Rabbinical Scholaſticks expreſs a great zeal againſt the uſe of *affirmative Attributes*, and in this Extravagance they are ſingular and alone; (*f*) but the Scholaſticiſm which hath prevail'd in the Chriſtian Church is no friend to affirmative Attributes, it is rather againſt them than for them, and therefore is for *Neſcience* rather than *Science*, according to that of the *Alexandrian Clemens*, (*g*) *non id quod eſt, ſed quod non eſt cognoſcentes, not knowing what he is, but what he is not. Plotinus* contemplateth the Godhead blindfold and by obliterating all things ἄφελε πάντα, (ſaith he,) agreeably whereunto a good Man hath taught this bad method of contemplating God; (*h*) *Caſt every thing out of your Mind, deny whatever occurreth, know your own weakneſs, and whatever occurreth that is cogitable, ſay, He is not That.* This rule of contemplating God muſt interpret ſome other Sayings of the ſame Father touching God, (*i*) *qui ſcitur melius neſciendo, who is better known by neſcience* (ſaith he) *cujus nulla ſcientia eſt in anima, niſi ſcire quomodo eum neſcias, of whom there is no other Science in the Soul but the Science of Neſcience. Petavius* thus apologizeth for the uſe of Negative Attributes in Deſcriptions and Notices of God. (*k*) *It is more tolerable in treating of God than of created things, that the Negative Attributes ſhould ſtand for the Eſſential, becauſe his Nature is altogether unknown, and may better be declar'd by removing what is not, than by affirming what ſeemeth to be, as* Dionyſius *affirmeth.* This mode of Theologizing is a deſcendent from the School of *Plato*, whoſe Supreme Deity is incapable of Affirmative Attributes; for theſe Scholaſticks do not contemplate God as *the Holy Imperial One* (as the Science of Sanctity doth,) but as if God was a Platonic Metaphyſical kind of *Primum Unum* (becauſe *Primum Ens*,) they have given him the Platonic Metaphyſical Name, (*l*) *The Monad and Henotety*; and ſome of them ſo exactly tranſcribe the Phantaſtry of the Platoniſts touching their *Monad*, that he who readeth their Scholaſticiſm, cannot but imagine, that he is reading ſome Platonic-Pagan, not any Chriſtian Author. (*m*) *This Hen or Unum is unſayable and innominable* (ſaith *Eulogius* of *Alexandria*) *as being the cauſe of one it ſelf, and the maker of every Henad to be one, and ſuper-ſimplify'd above all Unite and Multitude; becauſe it is properly one and in all, and is known above all, the Eſſence-maker of all Beings, ſeated above in ſuper-eſſentiality, and proper monotety* (ſingularity) *and is Theologically called the Henad and the Monad.* The Monad is σκότος ἄγνωστον, *Darkneſs beyond all ken* (as the Platonic Monad was intituled) and ſuch was the conſequence of introducing this *Monadic* Theology into the Church; for like an opacous Body it eclips'd the light of the knowledge of God in the Chriſtian Theology, and introduc'd ſuch a Darkneſs into it, that in the times of the counterfeit *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* and *J. Damaſcen* it reſembled the ſtate of Man after the Fall, when he became according to *Gr. Naz.*

(g) *Ibid.* & *l.* 1. *c.* 6. *S.* 10.

(h) Τὸ θεῖον ἀκατονόμαστον. *Gr. Naz. orat.* 36. *p.* 589.

(i) *Nomen certa rei definitio eſt.* Πῶς ἂν εἴη ῥητὸν, ὃ μήτε γένος ἐστὶ, μήτε διαφορὰ, μήτε εἶδος, μήτε ἄτομον; *Petav. ſupr. l.* 8. *c.* 6. *S.* 6, 7, &c.

(k) *Gr. Naz. Carm. Jamb. ſub fin.*

(l) *Adeo à cognitione ſummi illius remoti ſumus, ut ignoremus & nomen. ipſe increpat: cur quæris nomen meum, quod eſt mirabile? & Damaſcenus:* Τὸ θεῖον ἀκατάληπτον πάντως καὶ ἀνώνυμόν ἐστι.

(m) *Sed quanto auguſtior & Deo dignior illa confeſſio,* ἀνεκλάλητος, ἄρρητος, σιωπῇ φωνούμενος, *ineffabilis, non dicendus, ſilentio exprimendus?* Lipſ. not. ad cap. 2. l. 1. polit.

(n) *Cognitio eorum eſt quæ ſunt, at Deus ſuper eſſe eſt, ergo eſt ſupra atque extra notitiam, quia ſupra eſſentiam.* Ibid.

(o) *Mentes noſtras Deum non poſſe apprehendere, nec quenquam apprehendere quid ſit* (Deus) *niſi ipſemet Deus.* Maimon. Mor. Nev. par. 1. c. 59.

(p) *In confeſſo eſt apud omnes ſanæ rationis philoſophos Deum definiri non poſſe.* Ibid. c. 52.

(q) *De eo nihil niſi* τὸ εἶναι *ejus apprehendimus, quòd videlicet ſit exiſtens, cui nihil ſit ſimile in univerſa rerum natura, & quod cum nullo alio ulla in re communicet.* Ibid. c. 58.

(r) *Cujus eſſentia penitus occulta eſt, neque concipi poteſt.* Menaſſ. ben Iſr. in Exod. Qu. 3.

(s) *Coſri*, p. 77, 78.

(t) *Maimon. ſupr. par.* 1. *c.* 53. *Petav. ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *S.* 8.

(u) *Propterea quod non apprehenditur.* Lib. Jezirah, p. 42.

(w) *Nec ulla omnino notio.* Ibid. p. 167.

(x) *Cui me aſſimilabitis? quia nulla vobis datur apprehenſio mei.* Ibid. p. 165.

(y) *Ineffabilis & innominabilis Deitas eſt; ſilentio igitur veneranda & adoranda.* Mut. Panſ. de oſc. Ethn. & Chriſt. Philoſ. p. 102.

(z) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. par.* 1. *c.* 59.

(a) *Mor. Nev. par.* 1. *c.* 57, 58.

(b) *Negationem nobis non notificare de veritate ſive natura illius rei de quâ aliquid negamus.*

(c) *Ap. Vorſt. p.* 14.

——ὅλον σκότος ἀντὶ Θεοῖο.
All Darkneſs inſtead of a God.

Although the Scholaſtic Theology ſeemeth to put a great value upon *the Negative Attributes* (which it preferreth before the *Affirmative*,) yet really it doth not ſuppoſe them, to be of any conſiderable uſe for the purpoſe of notifying God; for it pretendeth, that the Deity is (*n*) ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ θέσιν. *above all Ablation and Poſition, Negation and Affirmation.* It contemplateth the Godhead much what at the ſame rate, that *Ariſtotle* and *Ptolomee* have contemplated the viſible Syſtem of the World; for as they (by their Orbs, Epicycles and Eccentricks) have made the World a moſt intricate ill-favour'd Bungle: So the Schools in their Theology have made the Godhead a moſt perplex'd, unintelligible and unlovely Object of Contemplation.

The genuine expreſſive Idea of God is neceſſarily loſt in this Theology, which is ſuch a prejudice to Religion, as the loſs of the Hypotheſis of the Earth's motion would be to Aſtronomy or Natural Philoſophy; for as the knowledge of the true Syſtem of the World is neceſſarily loſt, if the Hypotheſis of the Earth's motion is loſt out of our Philoſophy: So the Schools of Chriſtendom having loſt the genuine expreſſive Idea of God, have loſt alſo (in great degree) the Theology of the Kingdom of God, and the knowledge of the Kingdom of God-kind of things. They are unacquainted with the true Ideas of things, monſtrouſly miſtaken in their Notions, and uſually they ſubſtitute what is alien and ſpurious inſtead of the true and legitimate Notices of things. Thus a late Thomiſt propounding this Queſtion; *Per quid natura divina, ſub ratione naturæ, & radicis Attributorum, formaliter conſtituatur? What is it that formally conſtituteth the Divine Nature as a Nature and the Root of the Attributes?* after a long debate maketh this Anſwer; (*o*) *The Divine Intellection under the formal conception of ultimate compleat actuality, and ſubſiſting by it ſelf in the intellectual kind, is the formal conſtitutive of the Divine Eſſence or Nature. As to one that asketh, what is Humanity? the anſwer is a rational Nature: So to him that asketh, what is the Deity? the Anſwer is, A Nature at the fulleſt height and moſt perfectly underſtanding.* The Conſequence of this illegitimate kind of Theology touching the Godhead is nothing leſs than the Introduction of Paganical Deities and of a Philoſophic-Pagan kind of Trinity (Platonic or Ariſtotelian) into the Church of God. And in its own nature it is a Theology that

(d) *Coſri*, p. 76, 77.

(e) *Maimon. ſupr.* c. 59.

(f) *Petav.* l. 1. c. 5. S. 6, &c.

(g) *Ibid.* S. 11.

(h) *Totum ab animo rejicite, quicquid occurrerit negate, cognoſcite infirmitatem cordis veſtri, & quicquid occurrerit, quod cogitari poſſit, dicite, non eſt illud.* Ibid. c. 6. S. 12.

(i) *S. Aug. de ord.* l. 2. c. 16, 18.

(k) *Hic autem eo magis in Deo quàm in creatis rebus permittimus, ut hæc* ἀφαιρετικὰ *pro eſſentialibus habeantur, quod illius natura penitus ignota ſit, meliuſque negando ac removendo quod non eſt, quam quod eſſe videtur affirmando, declarari poſſit, ut in libro de divinis nominibus Dionyſius affirmat.* De Trin. l. 5. c. 2. S. 8.

(l) Petav. 1. l. 2. 8.

(m) Ἄῤῥητον γάρ ἐστι, καὶ ἀνωνόμαστον τοῦτο τὸ ἕν· ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτό τε ἑνός ἐστιν αἴτιον, πάσης ἑνάδος ἑνοποιόν· καὶ παντὸς ἑνὸς πλήθους ὑπερηπλωμένον. διὰ κυρίως ἓν εἶ), καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ναι καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντα γινώσκεαι, οὐσιοποιὸν μὲν τῶν ἁπάνν τῶν ὄντων, ὑπεριδρυμένον δὲ τῇ ὑπερουσίῳ, καὶ ἰδίᾳ μονότητι· άς καὶ μονὰς θεολογούμενον. id. S. 22.

(n) *Petav. ibid.* c. 5. S. 6. & c. 6. S. 12.

(o) *Intelligere divinum ſub conceptu formali ultimæ actualitatis completæ, & per ſe ſubſiſtentis in genere intellectuali, eſſe conſtitutivum formale Eſſentiæ vel naturæ divinæ. Sicut interroganti quid ſit humanitas? rectè reſpondetur natura rationalis: ita quærenti quid ſit Deitas? rectè reſpondebitur, natura ſummè & perfectiſſimè intelligens.* Gonet. Clyp. Theol. Thomiſt. T. 1. Diſp. 2. Art. 1. S. 5.

that is on this ſide the genuin Theology and knowledge of God, which maketh Men believe, that they know God as well as others, although they are in the State and Life of alienation from him. It is devoid of ὁ θειασμὸς τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ, *the Divine Excellency that is in the Chriſtian Theiſm*, and like *Ariſtotle*'s *Sapience*, it is buſied about τὰ χαλεπὰ, *difficult things*, but ſuch as are (in great part) ἄχρηστα, *of no utility*. It changeth Theology, and maketh it of the ſame Nature with the common Arts of ſecular Learning, and is the Learning of the Schools of Sophiſts, not the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Philoſophy. Inſtead of the matters of Science of Sanctity (in great degree) it ſubſtituteth jejune and barren Theories (a Pedlars Pack of Small-wares) *Logical Subtilty*, *Spinoſity*, *Futility* and *diſputative Brangling*, which is the Seed of innumerable Miſchiefs to the Church. It turneth every thing in Religion into matter of brangling and trifling Altercation, the buſineſs of it is a *Technical Trick* of diſputing, the worſt Men may be beſt at it, nor is it principally deſign'd to make Men truly Good and Holy; for the diſputacious Pretenders to it ſay of it, (p) *magis eam eſſe ſpeculativam quàm practicam, it is more ſpeculative than practical*. Thus as in Peſtilential Diſeaſes ſome few fermentative Particles being admitted into the Body change the whole Craſis of the Blood and Juices: So the Introduction of ſome Branches of the Philoſophic-pagans Scholaſticiſm into the Church of the Primitive times hath by degrees chang'd the whole Body of her Theology from *Divine* into *Dialectical*, her *Precioſities* into *Spinoſities* and *Futilities*, her Learning of *Sanctity* into *Sophiſtry*, and her holy *Science* into *unholy Neſcience* of God. If we ask the Scholaſtick Theologers, whence it is, that Mankind are ſo exremely incapacitated for the knowledge of God? (q) They impute it chiefly, (not to any Vicioſity, but agreeably to the Philoſophic-pagan Metaphyſicians) to their corporeal Conſtitution, and the corporeal Phantaſms which they make uſe of in Intellection. So Maimonides ſaith, (r) *The Matter is a great Partition-Wall and Veil hindring the true apprehenſion of the abſtract Intelligence*. Which ſaying ſeemeth to call God by ſuch a Name, as none but an Ariſtotelian Scholaſtick would give him, *an abſtract Intelligence*.

VII. The Metaphyſical and Scholaſtick-kind of Theology in many inſtances and ſeveral of its Theorems concerning God claſheth with *common Reaſon and the Science of Sanctity*, which ſpeaketh it a bad kind of Theology. (s) For *Philo* (a principal Scholaſtick Theologer) is ſo fooliſhly and profanely Platonic that he ſuppoſeth the Deity to have about him a Guard of Platonic Ideas (which he calleth δυνάμεις, *Powers*,) and introduceth God making an inept Oration to *Moſes* touching the *inviſibleneſs* and *incomprehenſibleneſs* of his Ideas. He undeifieth God and maketh him one of the Guardian Powers to his τὸ ὂν, or *Ens*. (t) *He cometh neareſt the Truth, that ſaith, the Father of all is in the middle, who in holy Scripture is called by the proper Name Ens. On each ſide him are the ancienteſt and neareſt Powers of Ens, of which the one is called the Opificiary, the other the Regial. The Opificiary is alſo called God, for by this he ſet in order and adorn'd the Univerſe; but the Regial is called Lord.* In *Philo*'s Deity therefore *Ens* hath the Grandeur and the Majeſty. *God* and *Lord* are ſtated as Attendants upon *Ens*, which may ſay of them (as the Roman Emperours ſpake of their Attendants) *Quos noſtri lateris comitatus Illuſtrat*.

—Τὸ ὄντος ὂν
Θεὸς] [Κύριος

The Rabbins are great Men at Metaphyſicks, and pretend to have nothing leſs than demonſtration for their Maxims; and therefore they make no bones of expreſly contradicting the Scripture. For they ſuppoſe, (u) that Creatures are no Similitude of God, (w) that God is not truly ſaid to be Eternal, (x) and they bereave the Deity of all Paſſion and Compaſſion at the Stoical rate. Their Notices alſo of the *Unity* or *Simplicity* of the Divine Eſſence and of the *Immutability* of God are deſervedly cenſur'd as extravagantly Metaphyſical by ſome that are none of the beſt Friends to God and true Religion. (y) *The Jews and Arabians egregiouſly Philoſophize touching the Unity and Simplicity of God, although in my Opinion too Metaphyſically.* But theſe Metaphyſical over-doings are of much greater extent than the *Rabbinical* and *Arabian* Schools; for the Scholaſtick Theology of the Chriſtian Church ſymbolizeth with them in their Extravagances. It excludeth from the Divine Eſſence (that it may not be a compound kind of thing) not only what is really a compounding, but (z) all *Plurality*, *Multitude* or *Multiplicity*, *Variety*, *Diverſity*, *Diſtinction*, *Duplicity*, *Binality*, *Number* (whatever looketh like compoſition, although it is really not compounding,) and attributeth thereto a phantaſtick, incongruous and impoſſible *Unity* and *Simplicity*. (a) *God is neither ſaid to be properly Intelligent, nor known by Underſtanding, leſt he be thought compounded. For that which is Intelligent, connoteth a power of Underſtanding, and that which is known by Underſtanding, connoteth a Power or Capacity to be underſtood. Nor is he Intellection; for Intellection hath naturally a Subject-ſubſtance, which is receptive of it.* The Platoniſts attribute a greater *Unity* and *Simplicity* to the firſt Principle of all in (ſuppoſing it above the multiplicity of Knowledge and Underſtanding,) than is competible to any intellectual Nature; and doubtleſs thoſe Scholaſticks are guilty of the like abſurdity, who ſuppoſe, (b) that there is no diſtinction between Will and Underſtanding in God, and conſequently, that he willeth all the Evil which he knoweth. *Voluntas in Deo idem eſt quod Intellectus, & velle idem quod intelligere. Will in God is the ſame with Intellect, and to Will and Underſtand is the ſame.* The Acts of the Divine Will which are free, are in this Theology ſuppos'd not to be at all different from the very Subſtance of God (which is abſolutely neceſſary) Scholaſtically underſtood. (c) *This is the principal thing, we ought to hold touching the Divine Will, that neither the Faculty nor the Action, (both which the Name Will compri-*

ſeth)

(p) *Gonet. ſupr. Diſp. proœm. Art.* 4.

(q) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 5. *S.* 2, 7.

(r) *Materia eſt veluti Maceria magna & velum impediens veram apprehenſionem intelligentiæ abſtractæ.* Mor. Nev. Par. 3. c. 9.

(s) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 4. *c.* 9. *S.* 12.

(t) Ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὡς ἄν τις τῆς ἀληθείας ἐγγύτατα ἱστάμενος εἴποι, πατὴρ μὲν τῶν ὅλων ὁ μέσος, ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς κυρίῳ ὀνόματι καλεῖται ὁ ὤν. Αἱ δὲ παρ' ἑκάτερα πρεσβύταται καὶ ἐγγύταται τοῦ ὄντος δυνάμεις. Ὧν ἡ μὲν ποιητική, ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ προσαγορεύεται. Καὶ μὲν ποιητικὴ θεός. Ταύτῃ γὰρ ἔθηκέ τε καὶ διεκόσμησε τὸ πᾶν. Ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ κύριος. Περὶ Ἀβραάμ. p. 249. & περὶ θυόντων. p. 585. Ed. Gr. Paris.

(u) Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par. 1. c. 56.

(w) Ibid. c. 57.

(x) Ibid. c. 54.

(y) Simon. Hiſt. Crit. l. 3. c. 6.

(z) Petav. T. 1. l. 2. c. 8. S. 15, 23, &c.

(a) *Deus neque Intelligens dicitur, neque Intelligentiâ captus, nè compoſitus exiſtimetur. Nam & quod Intelligens eſt, is cum unà conſideratam habet intelligendi potentiam, & quod intelligitur, potentiam ut intelligatur. Sed neque eſt Intellectio; nam Intellectio naturâ ſuâ ſubjectam ſibi habet capacem ſui ſubſtantiam.* Petav. ibid. l. 5. c. 11. S. 4.

(b) Reg. de Sch. de Theol. Nat. p. Aquin. 1. Qu. 27. Art. 3.

(c) *Hoc ante omnia de Dei voluntate ſentiendum eſt, neque facultatem ipſam, neque actionem, quod utrumque voluntatis nomine continetur, ab ipſa Dei differre ſubſtantia. Eſt*

ſeth) is at all different from the very Subſtance of God. For the Action of free Will in its own Nature is immanent in him, from whom it proceedeth. Wherefore, ſeeing nothing is accident or adherent to the Subſtance of God (or is ſuperadded to it,) *but all that is in God, is God, that Action of Will is God, and of the ſame Eternity with God. Otherwiſe he will not be ſimple, but compounded, and made up of two.* (d) *What God willeth, he willeth not only from Eternity but ſimply and abſolutely, and his volition is identical with his Divine Eſſence,* (Scholaſtically underſtood;) *for to ſuppoſe any real difference between God and his Will and Decrees, is to ſuppoſe accidents in God, and to overthrow his Simplicity.* But without theſe extravagances the Divine Simplicity is ſufficiently preſerv'd *in the Science of Sanctity,* which ſuppoſeth, that *the Actions of the Will of God are God as ſomething of him, and as ſomething of his truly Divine Eſſence, which is Eſſential Sanctity, the life that God is and liveth.*

The external Action and Efficiency of the Deity this Scholaſtic Theology calleth (*e*) *a created thing and produc'd by God in time:* But the interiour and immanent Action is ſuppos'd, to be altogether indiſtinct from the Divine Subſtance. (*f*) *The Platoniſts held the ſame, that Action or Operation in God is not diſtinct from his Subſtance, for ſeeing Action is the ultimate Complement of the Subſtance, as the end for whoſe ſake it is, as alſo its Powers and Faculties, if this in God be adventitious and additional to his Subſtance, the Subſtance will be maimed and defective, and of it ſelf will want its ultimate perfection.* Agreeably to this account of the Divine ἐνέργεια, *Action or Operation,* this Theology maketh the Deity rather *Omni-efficient* than *Omni-potent*; for it ſuppoſeth his infinite Power, always to be in Act (immanently at leaſt) *ad ultimum poſſe.* (*g*) *God is a meer and ſimple Act without any meer Power* (which is on this ſide Action) *of effecting any thing. What is this but a Turning, and a certain groſs mutation, to paſs from a meer Power of Agency into Act?* But although this Theology ſuppoſeth Omnipotency in God, to be always active, yet it maketh the Deity (like a *mare mortuum*) altogether immoveable, for it affirmeth, (*h*) *that God is of ſuch ſtability of State and Conſtancy, as to admit of no kind of Motion. For this Reaſon there can be no Motion in God, becauſe he ſuffereth no Mutation.* No vital Nature can be without vital Sympathy and Antipathy. But this Theology ſaith, (*i*) *There is nothing new in God, nothing which is not Eternal, no interiour Motion, and impulſe upon occaſion of things. If any thing be riſen in the Subſtance of God, which was not before, it is not truly called that eternal Subſtance.*

Of the truth and ſolidity of theſe Branches of the Scholaſtic Theology (and ſuch more) a Judgment may be made by conſidering what is Perfection unto God (in whom is no Imperfection;) and what is Perfection unto him or otherwiſe, may be determin'd by conſidering what is *Nobilitation to a Divine Potentate,* ſuch as God certainly is. For it is not Nobilitation to ſuch a Potentate, to be a *Monad,* that is without all diſtinction of Ideas, without all multiplicity of Knowledge and Underſtanding, without all diſtinction of Will and Underſtanding, without all liberty of Will and freedom of Agency, without all Motion, and that is incapable of moving (and therefore of acting *ad extra*) or of being moved as a Log or Idol. (*k*) *Deus non eſt Deus, ſi non movetur, quod eſt proprium viventis. He is not God, if he is not moved, which is the property of one that is alive.* To be unmoveable by Prayers and Devotional Addreſſes, to be incapable of being affected with any thing or mov'd to favour or diſpleaſure, to be unconcern'd whether Men be Holy or Sinful, and to be incapable of acting towards them, as there is occaſion, are not the Properties and Perfections of a Deity, but are Incongruities, Blemiſhes and Imperfections utterly incompetible unto God. Who alſo cannot but perceive and animadvert the things that are done in the World in the Succeſſions of time (perceiving things paſt, that they are paſt; things preſent, that they are preſent; things to come, that they are yet to come;) ſo that new Perceptions cannot fail to be in God but without any blemiſh or imperfection. And it muſt not be ſuppos'd, that the Attributes of *Simplicity* and *Immutability* do belong unto God, any further than they are his Perfections, and therefore no further than they are Nobilitations to a Divine Potentate. A like judgment muſt be made touching that difficult Attribute, which perplexeth the learned Expoſitor of our Articles. (*l*) "That infinite " Perfection excludeth from the Idea of God " ſucceſſive Thoughts as well as ſucceſſive Du- " ration; which ſeem inconſiſtent both with E- " ternity and with infinite Perfection. There- " fore the Eſſence of God is one perfect Thought, " in which he both vieweth and willeth all " things. And though his tranſient Acts that " paſs out of the Divine Eſſence (ſuch as Crea- " tion, Providence and Miracles) are done in " a ſucceſſion of time, yet his immanent Acts, " his Knowledge and his Decrees, are one with " his Eſſence. Diſtinct Thoughts are plainly " an Imperfection, and argue a Progreſs in " Knowledge, and a deliberation in Council, " which carry defect and infirmity in them. " To conceive, how this is in God, is far above " our Capacity, who though we feel our Im- " perfection in ſucceſſive Acts, yet cannot ap- " prehend how all things can be both ſeen " and determin'd by one ſingle Thought. A " vaſt difficulty alſo ariſeth here; for if theſe " Acts are one with the Divine Eſſence, which " is neceſſarily exiſtent, they are neceſſary " (not free;) and ſince all God's tranſient Acts " are the Effects of his immanent ones, if " theſe are neceſſary, the tranſient muſt be " likewiſe ſuch; and ſo every thing muſt be " neceſſary, a Chain of neceſſary Fate muſt " run through the whole order of things, and " God himſelf is no free Being, but acteth by " a neceſſity of Nature. If Fate is eſtabliſh'd, Induſtry is deſtroy'd and all Prayers and En-

---

ctio libera voluntatis ſuapte natura manens in eo, à quo proficiſcitur. Quare cùm nihil aut ccidat aut adhæreat ſubſtantiæ Dei, ſed omne id quod ineſt Deo, ſit ipſe Deus, etiam illa quæ dicitur actio voluntatis, Deus eſt, & eâdem æternitate cenſetur. lioqui Simplex non erit, ſed ompoſitus, & ex duobus conſtatus. Petav. ſupr. l. 5. c. 14. S. 12.

(d) *Hulſ. Theol. Jud. l.* 1. *Par.* 2. p. 240.

(e) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 11. *S.* 11.

(f) *Idem & Platonicis viſum eſt Philoſophis, non eſſe* ἐνέργειαν *à Dei ſubſtantia diſtinctam. Cùm enim actio ultimum ſit ſubſtantiæ complementum tanquam finis, cujus gratia tàm eſt ipſa quàm ejus vires ac facultates, ſi adventitium quiddam in Deo ſit, ejuſque ſubſtantiæ additum, ea manca erit ac defecta, atque ex ſeſe carebit abſolutione ſui ultima atque perfecta.* Ibid. S. 10.

(g) *Deus merus ac ſimplex eſt actus, non* δύναμις, *id eſt potentiam habens rei alicujus efficiendæ. Quid hoc aliud eſt quàm converſio, & craſſa quædam veluti viciſſitudo, à potentia migrare in actum?* Ibid. l. 5. c. 11. S. 8. & 3.

(h) *Eâ ſtabilitate ſtatus ſui & conſtantia Deum eſſe præditum, nullum ut motionis admittat genus. Ideo nullam in Deo motionem eſſe, quia nullam commutationem patitur.* Ibid. S. 2, 3. & v. l. 3. c. 1. S. 13, 15.

(i) *Nihil in Deo novum, nihil non æternum eſt; nullus ex rerum occaſione ſuſceptus interior motus & impulſus. Si exortum eſt aliquid in Dei ſubſtantia, quod prius non erat, non veraciter dicitur æterna illa ſubſtantia.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 2. S. 16. & l. 5. c. 13. S. 3.

(k) *Lactant. de ira Dei, c.* 4, & 17. *V. Epiſcop. Inſtit. Theol. l.* 4. *S.* 2. *c.* 26.

(l) *P.* 26, 27.

deavours. Theſe Difficulties plainly ſhew, that all things ought not to be determin'd by one ſingle Thought in God; nor is ſuch an *All-knowing* and *All-determining* Thought a Perfection of one that is a Divine Pontentate and Government, who muſt live to Eternity in the exerciſe of wiſe and governing Thoughts, which muſt not be ſuppos'd in vain or ſuch as can have no place. So far as this Eſſential Perfection requireth, there muſt be *diſtinct* and *ſucceſſive* Thoughts in God (without Progreſs in Knowledge or ſuch Imperfection as is in our Deliberations,) and the contrary Hypotheſis muſt be thought a Branch of that Metaphyſical over-doing, which is extremely injurious to Religion, and which hath produc'd theſe pernicious Conceits, that none but Scholaſticks could ever have excogitated. *That God knoweth Creatures, not in themſelves, but in his own Eſſence. That God might have made a reaſonable Creature not oblig'd. That there is nothing in its own Nature juſt or unjuſt. That if God damneth the Innocent, his Will is the Rule of Juſtice. That all Truths which are not God himſelf, wholly depend upon the arbitrary determination of his Will, and are only therefore true, becauſe he appointed them to be ſo. That God may command a Man to hate him, and make it meritorious. That God willeth* mala culpæ. *That God is the Author of every Sin of Commiſſion, becauſe in Commiſſion there is ſomething poſitive, which is forbidden by the Law directly.* Doubtleſs ſuch Scholaſtick and Metaphyſical Theology touching the Godhead is (as *Euſebius* ſpeaketh of the Egyptian Theology) ἀθεότης μᾶλλον ἢ θεολογία. *Atheiſm rather than Theology.* But we will now proceed to ſome few other *Conſectaries* from our account of the Name and Idea of God.

Conſect. 5. *God is not duly notic'd in the Metaphyſical way of repreſenting God, by noticing the Divine Eſſence and Attributes, unleſs it proceedeth to a due noticing the Sovereignty that God is.* It is an irregular Method to begin the Theology of the Godhead with the Divine Eſſence and its inherent Attributes; for they that deſcribe *a Prince* or *Prelate*, do not conſider his Eſſence and inherent Attributes in ſeparation from, but in Conjunction with his *Honour* and *Dignity*, and this they notifie in the firſt place. Yet it is poſſible, that in the other method (obſerv'd by Philoſophers, Divines and Schoolmen) the Sovereignty that God is may be duly notic'd at the long run: But without the due notices thereof our Theology of the Godhead is criminally imperfect and defective, either in greater or leſſer degree, either totally omitting, or elſe imperfectly noticing the Sovereignty that God is. It may be totally omitted, as in theſe following definitive or deſcriptive notices of God. (m) *Deus eſt Spiritus æternus, God is an eternal Spirit.* (n) *God is a Spirit eternal, infinite in Eſſence and Goodneſs, Omniſcient, Omnipotent, and of himſelf neceſſarily exiſtent.* Our Catechiſms deſcribe God in this manner. *God is a Spirit infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his Being, Wiſdom, Power, Holineſs, Juſtice, Goodneſs and Truth. There is one only God* (ſaith a pious Catechiſt,) *an infinite Spirit of Life, Underſtanding and Will, moſt perfectly powerful, wiſe and good.* In our publick Confeſſions of Faith God is thus notic'd. *We believe in Heart and confeſs with the Mouth, that there is one only and ſimple ſpiritual Eſſence, which we call God, eternal, incomprehenſible, inviſible, immutable, infinite, who is wholly wiſe, and a moſt plentiful Well-ſpring of all good things,* ſaith the Confeſſion of *Belgium.* (o) *God is a Spirit* (ſaith an ancient Author) *an inviſible Eſſence, incomprehenſible to every Creature, poſſeſſing the totality of Life, and of Wiſdom, and all Eternity together: Being Life, Wiſdom, Truth, Juſtice, Eternity it ſelf.* (p) *That there is one God according to Nature and in Truth* (ſaith S. *Cyril,*) *above all Intellect and Reaſon, Incomprehenſible, without Figure Vivificative, and the Principle of all things, ingenit and incorruptible, is plainly teſtified by the Divinely inſpir'd Scripture.* The Idea of God thus repreſented is criminally defective and irregular, becauſe of a total Omiſſion of the Sovereignty that God is, which ought to be notic'd in the firſt place, becauſe the Divine Attributes (commonly ſo called) appertain thereunto. For God is not meerly an Eſſence, but an *Honour, Dignity and Sovereignty,* that is of thoſe Attributes. *Exod.* 34. 6. *The Lord merciful and gracious.* 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. *The King Eternal, Immortal, Inviſible.* (q) *All the Divine Attributes together are ſignificative of his Power and Perfection, who is omni-imperial.* Some ſay, that whatever belongeth to God, is either his Eſſence or his Operations; not conſidering, that his Godhead of Eſtate (which is adherent) is as Eſſential unto God as the inherent Attributes of his Eſſence. *The moſt High* therefore (agreeably to the high Ones above Men) muſt not be contemplated, as if we were contemplating *Squares* and *Triangles,* wherein we only regard their inherent Properties.

If the Sovereignty that God is be not totally omitted, yet if it is very defectively noticed in our definitive or deſcriptive Notices of God, *they are criminally imperfect and defective.* As if we ſay, (r) *there is one God, an Almighty, Eternal, Infinite, Good, Merciful, Righteous and Holy Spirit, who made the World and all things therein out of nothing, and is the ſupreme Ruler and Governour thereof.* (s) *This is the firſt Theorem in Theology, that God is, that is, an eternal Mind, moſt good, powerful and wiſe, which is the cauſe of all things on which they depend, and by which they are govern'd.* If theſe imperfect Notices of the Sovereignty that God is, were only propos'd as ſuch, if they were deſign'd to be nothing more than inchoations of a more expreſs and perfect Idea thereof, there would be nothing of criminal defect in them: But they are ſuppos'd, to be ſufficiently perfect and without any defect, a juſt and legitimate Idea thereof. For a learned Divine of our own faith; (t) *God is the one ſupreme infinite Spirit, that by Almighty Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs made and governs the World. If Men entertain'd ſuch a Notion of God inſtead of thoſe rude and falſe draughts which are pictured in their vain and falſe Imaginations, they would pay him an Homage more agreeable to his Divine and their own reaſonable though human Nature. They would then ſerve him with the pure Religion or ſincere Chriſtianity, which is not adulterated either with Idolatry or*

(m) Crell. *de Deo & Attrib. c.* 15.

(n) *Dr. H. More Immort. of the Soul. B.* 1. *c.* 4.

(o) *Deus Spiritus eſt, Eſſentia inviſibilis, omni creaturæ incomprehenſibilis, totam vitam, totam ſapientiam, totam æternitatem ſimul eſſentialiter poſſidens: Idem ipſa vita, ipſa ſapientia, ipſa veritas, ipſa juſtitia, ipſa æternitas exiſtens.* Auth. de cognit. ver. vit. inter op. S. Aug. c. 8.

(p) Εἷς μὲν ὢν ὅτι Θεὸς, κατὰ φύσιν τε καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐςὶ, παντὸς ἀνωτάτω νῦ καὶ λόγυ, ἀπερίληπτος, ἀνείδεος, ζωοποιὸς, καὶ πάντων ἀρχὴ, ἀγένητος, ἄφθαρτος, γενεσιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων, μεμαρτύρηται σαφῶς παρὰ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς. S. Cyr. *c. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 32.

(q) Ἀθρόως ἅπαντα ἐνδεικτικὰ τῆς τῦ παντοκράτορος δυνάμεως. *Clem. Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 428.

(r) Mr. *Gouge's Cat. ſub fin.*

(s) *Primum totius Theologiæ Theorema illud eſt, eſſe Deum, hoc eſt Mentem æternam, optimam, potentiſſimam, & ſapientiſſimam, quæ ſit cauſa rerum omnium, & è qua omnia pendeant & regantur.* Le Blanc. Theſ. p. 90.

(t) Dr. *Teniſon of Idolatry,* p. 1, 2.

Superſtition. But it is not imaginable, that this Idea of God would work any great Cures, if all Men entertain'd it in their Minds; it would not effectually ſave them from Idolatry and Superſtition (but rather leave them immers'd in it;) for it only noticeth the Sovereignty that God is *as a governing Providence.* The Jews Muhammedans and Pagans are not cur'd of their Idolatry and Superſtition (by acknowledging *a governing Providence*;) Nor is it reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that ſuch an Idea of God will effectually ſave Men from Paganiſm, and make them *Chriſtian Worſhippers*, which hath nothing of Sanctity or Chriſtianity in it, and which (conſider'd without ſpecific and individual determination) is common to us and to the Pagan Religioniſts.

Conſect. 6. *Men may have a true Idea or definitive Notion of God.* Some have rais'd a Diſpute againſt the Name *Idea*, which they ſuppoſe, to be incompetible to God in the proper Senſe, becauſe it properly denoteth and ſignifieth the Image of an object in the Phantaſy. (u) *The forms of things the Greeks call Ideas* (ſaith a late Diſputant againſt the Carteſian Metaphyſicks,) *do you underſtand what Form or Species the immenſe Majeſty of God is of?* (w) *God hath no Species* (ſaith another,) *nor is the Deity conceived by a Species, but by multifarious Conceptions of various Attributes inadequate, partial and imperfect.* But in this Diſpute againſt *the* Name Idea, there is much of Vanity; for they that oppoſe the Name as incompetible to God, do not deny, that we have intelligible Notion and Conception of the Diety; and therefore their Diſpute is meerly *a Logomachy* and Strife about the uſe of a Word. There is much of miſtake alſo in their Diſpute againſt the Name Idea; for they deny unto God *Form* and *Species*, (x) which even the Scholaſtick Theology in Conſort with the Scriptures attributeth to the God-head. They miſtake alſo in affirming, that there is no conceiving of God but by multifarious Conceptions of various Attributes. For God as well as Man may be apprehended under one Adequate or total Notion, which is uſual and familiar in the Minds and Mouths of his Religioniſts, namely *the Divine Majeſty*, which is the ſame with *the Divine Sovereignty.* And if we underſtand *the Divine Sovereignty*, to ſignifie both *the Creature-tranſcendent Sovereignty* and *the Divine or God-kind of Sovereignty*, this Name *the Divine Sovereignty* is a true Idea and definitive Notion of God of the more contracted form. For as *Chriſt* is rightly defin'd *the Chriſtian Sovereiguity*, the *Devil* is well enough defin'd *the Diabolical Sovereignty*, and the *Pope* is well enough defin'd *the Papal Sovereignty:* So *God* is rightly defin'd *the Divine Sovereignty.* And if the word *Divine* be underſtood, as we have explain'd it, this definition of God is more than *Expoſitio nominis.* It is ſtrictly a regular definition conſiſting of *generical Notion and Difference*, which are not incompetible to God (as the Schools ſuppoſe,) nor is God incapable of a regular definition (as they pretend,) nor is this Scholaſtic Maxim of any regard, *Non eſt in Deo generis ac differentiæ compoſitio, the compoſition of generical Notion and Difference* (Metapyſical Parts) *is incompetible to God.*

A difference there is between this Idea and that uſual Idea of God, *a Being abſolutely perfect*: But there is only this difference between them; *they are two Ideas of one and the ſame thing according to ſeveral modes of conſidering it; the one is its genuin expreſſive Idea and the other its laudatory Idea. A Circle* (as *Euclid* defineth it) *is a plain Figure contain'd by one Line called the Circumference, to which all the right Lines drawn from a point within the Figure are Equal.* This *Euclidian* definition is the true Idea or Notion of a Circle. But ſo is alſo *the moſt perfect Figure*; the one is its *genuin expreſſive Idea*, the other is its *laudatory Idea. A Rational Animal* is the true Idea or Notion of a Man: But ſo is alſo (y) τῶν ζώων τιμιώτατον, *the moſt perfect or moſt excellent Animal*; the one is its *genuin expreſſive Idea*, the other is its *laudatory* Idea. The Chriſtian Life is *the Life of Regeneracy*, and this is the true Idea and Notion of it: But ſo is alſo *the moſt perfect Life.* In like manner *the Divine Sovereignty* is the true Idea or Notion of God: But ſo is alſo *a Being abſolutely perfect.* Which latter Idea doth not particularly expreſs any thing that God is (in Nature or State,) and therefore is not *the genuin expreſſive Idea of God:* But it is a general comprehenſive Notice of what God is, and it is his laudatory Idea, which is expreſs'd in other Terms very variouſly. (z) *If you ask, what is God? the anſwer is, than whom nothing better can be thought of.* (a) *All Conteſt for the Excellency of God: Nor is there any Man to be found, who believeth that to be God, which is not the Beſt. Therefore all in this agree, that is God, which they ſet before all other things.* (b) *We have this Anticipation concerning God, that he is not inanimate, and that in univerſal Nature there is nothing more excellent.* As the reaſoning mind of Man naturally and neceſſarily formeth ſeveral Principles of knowledge (the whole is greater than the part, two contradictories cannot be true:) So it naturally and neceſſarily formeth a true general Idea of God; ſuch as *the moſt excellent Being poſſible and conceivable, a Being abſolutely perfect*; which is not only a *Formal*, but a *Normal* Idea of God. For according to this general Notice or Idea all Conceptions of the Deity according to particular conſiderations ought to be regulated, and thereby they muſt be try'd and examin'd. But becauſe this *Normal* Idea is wholly general, and remote from particular conſiderations of what God is, Mankind may be in the depths of atheous Ignorance nowithſtanding this their *Normal* Idea of God; for how ignorant is ſuch a Man of a Circle, that knoweth nothing of it but the Name, and that it is the moſt perfect Figure? Nor will the genuin expreſſive Idea of God ſave Men from their atheous Ignorance, unleſs it be well underſtood.

CHAP.

(u) *Quas Latini rerum formas, Græci ἰδέας vocant. Tu igitur quâ formâ, quâve ſpecie ſit immenſa Numinis Majeſtas intelligis?* Dr. Parker Diſp. de Deo p. 550.

(w) *Deus ſpeciem non habet, neque per ſpeciem ſui concipitur, ſed per variorum attributorum conceptus multiplices, inadæquatos & imperfectos.* Hoornbeck. Irenic. p. 28.

(z) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 1. *ſub fin.*

(y) Jamb. προτρεπτ. p. 57.

(z) *Quid eſt Deus? Quo nihil melius cogitari poteſt.* S. Bernard. de conſid. l. 5. c. 7.

(a) *Omnes pro excellentia Dei certatim dimicant: Nec quiſquam inveniri poteſt, qui hoc Deum credat eſſe, quo melius aliquid eſt. Itaque hoc omnes Deum conſentiunt eſſe, quod cæteris rebus omnibus anteponunt.* S. Aug. de Doctr. Chriſt. l. 1. c. 7.

(b) *Talem eſſe Deum certa notione animi præſentimus, primùm ut ſit animans, deinde ut in omni natura nihil eo ſit præſtantius.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

CHAP. IV.

1. *Againſt our genuine expreſſive Idea of God it will be objected, That God was not Lord and King from Eternity, as many affirm.* 2. *The contrary demonſtrated,* 3. *God was Lord and King the Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent from Eternity in a large Senſe.* 4. *God was from Eternity Lord and King the Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent in the Senſe of Nobility-Learning.* 5. *God was from Eternity Lord and King the Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent in a limited Senſe, according to Political Learning.* 6. *The uſefulneſs of this Theory for ſhewing the ground of God's Dominion and Sovereignty over Man and over the Creatures.*

I. OUR genuine expreſſive Idea of God is liable to this Objection, *That God was not a Sovereignty, not Lord and King from Eternity:* Which great Objection obligeth us, to take into conſideration a Queſtion in Theology, which ſome great Divines look upon as a very great difficulty, namely, (c) *Whether theſe Divine Names Lord and King be always and meerly* nomina σχετικὰ, *Names which import a relation of God to the Creatures, and whether God was of theſe honourary Names from everlaſting?* Some look upon them as meerly *relative Names*, yet ſuppoſe them neceſſarily to belong to God from Eternity; whence they infer the Creation and Exiſtence of the World from Eternity. Others look upon them as meerly *relative Names*, but ſuppoſe them incompetible to God from Eternity, becauſe the World had not its Exiſtence and Creation from Eternity. Others ſuppoſe, that they are not *meerly relative Names*, and that they are competible to God from Eternity without ſuppoſing the World's Eternity. Others are afraid, to determine any thing touching theſe Divine Names, and look upon this Queſtion in Theology as beyond humane reach; for ſo S. *Auſtin* (d) is ſometimes overcome with the difficulty of it, and thinketh it a Queſtion not to be ask'd or anſwer'd. But ſome (as *Proclus*) are too forward in determining, (e) *that the World exiſted from Eternity, becauſe the opificer and maker of the World was actually ſuch from Eternity.* So *Origen* argueth, (f) *As a Father cannot be, if there is not a Son; a Lord cannot be without a Poſſeſſion; ſo God cannot be called Pantocrator or Omnipotent, if there are none, on whom he may exerciſe Power; and therefore all things muſt ſubſiſt, that God may be called Pantocrator.* At the ſame rate the Heretick *Hermogenes* argu'd for the Eternity of Matter: (g) *He could not be counted always Lord, as always God, if there had not been always ſomething, of which he might be counted Lord. Tertullian* that hath written a Book againſt *Hermogenes* and his *Dogma* touching the Eternity of Matter, yet thus far agreeth with his Adverſary: He aſſerteth this Divine Name *Dominus*, to be meerly and neceſſarily *a Relative Name:* but he ſuppoſeth it incompetible to God from Eternity, becauſe the World was not exiſtent from Eternity. (h) *We ſay, that the Name God always was, but the Name Lord not always; for they are of different condition. God is the Name of the Subſtance it ſelf; that is, of the Divinity; but Lord is not the Name of the Subſtance, but the Potentacy. The Subſtance always was with its Name, which is God, Lord was not till afterwards being the Name of an Accident, or Acceſſional; for he was both made and called Lord by an acceſſion of Power, from the time that thoſe things began to exiſt, on which he might exerciſe Power. As God is both Father and Judge, yet he is not therefore alway Father and Judge becauſe always God: for he could not be a Father before a Son, nor a Judge before Sin; but there was a time, when neither Son nor Sin exiſted, which might make him a Father and a Judge. So he was not Lord, before theſe things exiſted, of which he is Lord; but his being Lord was future, as a Father by a Son, as a Judge by Sin, ſo a Lord by thoſe things which he had made to be ſervient to him.* (i) To prove, that his Account of this Divine Name is legitimate, he obſerveth, that in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation God is not called by the Name *Lord* till the Story of the Creation is perfected; for *Moſes* ſaith, *In the beginning God made Heaven and Earth*, and throughout that Hiſtory he is only called by the Name God; *God ſaid, God made and God ſaw*; but when all was perfected (and chiefly Man) then and not before he is called *Lord*. Agreeably to *Tertullian, Ruffinus* in his *Symbolum* ſaith; (k) *No one is called Lord, unleſs he hath a Poſſeſſion or Servant under his Domination.* The Commentators upon *Gr. Naz.* thus rightly repreſent his Senſe touching the Names of God. (l) *The Names God and Ens ſignifie more the Eſſence; but the Names King and Lord the Power, as being conſider'd in a certain Relation. Reuchlin* ſaith, (m) *We cannot deny, but that Lord ſignifieth Imperial Majeſty, and King, and God, if we follow* J. Damaſcen. Gr. Nazianzen *placeth them amongſt Relatives; for we read of Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, and Holy of Holies, and God of Gods: Ens only, as he ſuppoſeth, is chiefly the Name of God without Relation.* S. *Auſtin*, who is ſometimes reſerv'd and modeſt, and thinketh it dangerous, either to affirm or deny, that God is Lord from Eternity, yet elſewhere thus diſcourſeth,

---

(c) Petav. T. 1. l. 3. c. 2. S. 5. & Proleg. c. 6. S. 6.

(d) De C. D. l. 12. c. 15.

(e) Petav. ſupr. l. 3. c. 2. S. 6, 10.

(f) Ibid. S. 5.

(g) *Nullo modo potuiſſet ſemper dominus haberi, ſicut & ſemper Deus, ſi non fuiſſet aliquid retrò ſemper, cujus ſemper dominus haberetur.* Ibid. S. 6.

(h) *Dei nomen dicimus ſemper fuiſſe apud ſemetipſum, Dominum verò non ſemper: diverſa enim utriuſque conditio. Deus ſubſtantiæ ipſius nomen, id eſt, divinitatis; Dominus verò non ſubſtantiæ, ſed poteſtatis: ſubſtantiam ſemper fuiſſe cum ſuo nomine, quòd eſt Deus, poſtea Dominus accidentis ſcilicet rei mentio. nam ex quo eſſe cœperunt, in quæ poteſtas Domini ageret, ex illo per acceſſionem poteſtatis & factus & dictus eſt Dominus: Quia & pater Deus eſt, & judex Deus eſt, non tamen ideò pater & judex ſemper, quia Deus ſemper. Nam nec pater potuit eſſe ante filium, nec judex ante delictum: Fuit autem tempus, cum & delictum & filius non fuit, quod judicem, & qui patrem Dominum faceret. Sic & Dominus non ante ea, quorum Dominus exiſteret, ſed Dominus tantum futurus quandoque, ſicut pater per filium, ſicut judex per delictum, ita & Dominus per ea, quæ ſibi ſervitura feciſſet.*

(i) *Deus quidem quod erat ſemper, ſtatim nominat: In principio fecit Deus cœlum & terram. Ac deinceps quamdiu faciebat quorum Dominus futurus erat, Deus ſolummodo ponit, & dixit Deus, & fecit Deus, & vidit Deus, & nuſquam adhuc Dominus. At ubi univerſa perfecit, ipſumque vel maxime hominem qui propriè Dominum intellecturus erat, Dominus etiam cognominatur.*

(k) *Nemo dicitur Dominus, niſi habeat vel poſſeſſionem vel ſervum, cui dominetur.* Inter oper. S. Hieron. T. 9.

(l) *Dei & Entis vocabula magis quodammodo eſſentiam declarant: hæc autem nomina Rex & Dominus potentiam, ut quæ in relatione quadam conſiderentur.* El. Cret. com. in or. 23.

(m) *Negare verò non poſſemus, quin imperatoriam majeſtatem Dominus ſignificet, & Rex & Deus, ſi Damaſceno Joanni obſequemur. Gregorius certè ille Nazianzenus inter ea collocat, quæ ad aliud referuntur. legimus enim Dominus Dominantium, & Rex Regum, & Sanctus Sanctorum, & Deus Deorum, ſolum ὢν, id eſt Qui eſt, potiſſimum per ſe eſſe Dei nomen arbitratur.* De Verb. Mirific. p. 254.

courſeth. (n) *We ſay, his being Lord is not from Eternity, leſt we conſequently ſay, that the Creature is from Eternity; for he could not be dominant from Eternity, unleſs this be ſervient from Eternity. As he cannot be a Servant, that hath not a Lord, ſo he cannot be a Lord, that hath not a Servant.* *Syneſius* ſaith, (o) *There is no Name found out, which reacheth the Eſſence of God; Men being unable to declare it, endeavour to reach it by the things that are from him. Whether you call him Father, or Maker, or Principle, or Cauſe, all theſe are habitudes or reſpects to all thoſe things that are from him.* (p) *If you call him King, you endeavour to apprehend his Nature, not from what he is in his own Perſon, but from thoſe that are ſubjected to him.* The Name of a King according to *Philo* is neceſſarily a Relative Name, (q) βασιλεὺς γὰρ τινός, *for a King is the King of ſome body.* So the Schools ſay, (r) that the Name *Dominus* denoteth a *relation of God to the Creatures conſequent upon the action of Creation*, and that ſuch Names *ex tempore de Deo dicuntur, are not ſaid of God from Eternity.* Agreeably to the Schools Divines uſually ſay; (s) *The Names which denote a Relation between God and the Creatures, as Creator, Lord, and the like, are predicated of God in Time, but not from Eternity.* (t) *Without inconvenience or crime he may be ſaid, to have been then made Lord, when he made the Creature, of which he ſhould be Lord.* Yet this Author counteth it *abſolutely unlawful, to ſay, that he was made God.* (u) *Before the World was fram'd, there was nothing but God himſelf, properly nothing is ſaid to have dominion over it ſelf; this is a Relative Attribute reflecting on the Works of God.*

II. It appeareth, that ſince the Humour of Scholaſticizing and Philoſophic-paganizing the Matters of Theology hath been regnant in the Church, ſhe hath (in great degree) loſt the true meaning of the Names of God to the infinite prejudice of true Theology: For theſe miſtakes touching the Divine Names muſt not be thought ſlight matters (as *Petavius* thinketh the Queſtion about them of ſmall importance;) for they are deſtructive of the true and genuine Idea of God from Eternity. If our Idea of God was only an Idea of what he is in the Univerſe of Beings and ſince the Creation, it would be of no extraordinary value; but we have prov'd the truth of it by many ſuch Arguments (and will prove it by ſeveral ſuch more,) as plainly demonſtrate it, to be the genuine Idea of what God is not only from Time, but from Eternity. Theſe Arguments appear in our Notion of *the Godhead-eſtate* (which is neceſſarily the Kingdom-eſtate, and therefore is Eternally ſuch,) in our Account of thoſe Honourary Names *Lord* and *King*, in our ſeveral Accounts of the Name *God*, and of the Identity of theſe Names *God*, *Lord* and *King*, *Divinity*, *Potentacy* and *Kingdom*, in our Account of ſeveral Divine Attributes and Honourary Titles of the Godhead (*The moſt High, The Power*,) and of the *Scripture-Doxologies*. No Demonſtration in Mathematicks can be of greater certitude than theſe following Arguments. *The Godhead of Eſtate conſiſteth in being the Lord, King and Potentate Creature-tranſcendent. The Supreme Being is neceſſarily the Supreme Potentate. The dominant and regnant Eſtate of Might, Majeſty, Power and Dominion eſſentially belongeth unto God. He is God from everlaſting, The Potentate Creature-tranſcendent; therefore from Eternity he is the Lord and King, Creature-tranſcendent.* His is *the Power*, and His is *the Glory* from Eternity; therefore His is *the Kingdom* from Eternity, according to our uſual Doxology. No Mind of Man can evade the force of this Argument, which I will propoſe in form of a Syllogiſm.

To be a God is an Honour and Dignity of Eſtate.
It is the Sovereign and Supreme Honour and Dignity of Eſtate (which is the Kingdom-eſtate.)
Therefore God is the Kingdom-eſtate neceſſarily and from Eternity.

The Epicureans complain'd, that the Religious Pagans would impoſe upon them *Sempiternum Dominum, a Sempiternal Lord*; and the Supreme Deity was intituled by thoſe Religious Pagans *Hominum Divumque æterna poteſtas* (the Eternal Potentate of the Gods and Men;) therefore the World of Religious Pagans acknowledgeth, that God is *Lord and King* from Eternity. The Hebrew Doctors tell us a Saying of the ancient Wiſe Men: (w) *Ante creatum mundum Deum & nomen ejus tantum extitiſſe, before the World was created, God and his Name only did exiſt.* This Name which is ſuppos'd to have been before the World is the Name יהוה which the Septuagint always render κύριος, *Lord* (the Apoſtles alſo following the Septuagint ſo render it) and S. *Hierom*, *Dominus*; therefore the Hebrew Doctors (implicitly at leaſt) acknowledge, that God was Lord from Eternity. So the Commentaries under S. *Ambroſe*'s Name expreſly ſay, (x) *Deus non poteſt non eſſe Dominus, God is neceſſarily the Lord.* So ſome of the Schoolmen ſay, (y) *Sicut divina voluntas æterna eſt, ità & imperium, As the Divine Will is eternal, ſo is Empire.* So S. *Ambroſe* attributeth to Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, (z) *imperiale jus æternæ poteſtatis, the imperial right of eternal Potentacy.* Mankind cannot but have this conception of things, that Godhead of Eſtate is (a) *the Eſtate of Liberty and Domination*, whence the Divine Nature (that is called by *Iſidore Peluſiota*, *the dominant and regial Eſſence*) is ſtiled by *Tertullian*, *Domina juvandi & nocendi*, and doubtleſs it was ſuch from Eternity. The ſame Father affirmeth, that God created the World (b) *for the honour of his Majeſty*; and ſo S. *Hilary* ſaith, (c) *The Dignity of the Works ſhew his Majeſty that made them.* Theſe Fathers ſuppoſe, that there was a proper Majeſty before the World, which could not be, if there was not an Imperial Eſtate before the World, agreeably to what *Theodoret* ſaith of God, (d) *He hath Empire connate to his Eſſence.* S. *Ambroſe* ſaith of our Saviour, (e) *As Man he was a Servant, as God he was the Lord.* And as it is falſe, to ſay of our Saviour, that he was not

---

(n) *Eccè Dominum eſſe non*
mpiternum habet, nè cogamur
tiam ſempiternam creaturam di-
ere, quia ille ſempiternè non do-
inaretur, niſi etiam iſta ſempi-
ernè famularetur. Sicut au-
ernè non poteſt eſſe ſervus, qui
em non habet Dominum, ſic nec Do-
inus qui non habet ſervum.
e Trin. l. 5. c. 16.

o) De Regn.
. 8.

(p) Καὶ βασιλέα τοίνυν εἰ-
ὼν, ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλευομένων,
λλ' οὐκ αὐτοπροσώπως ἐπιχει-
ῶς τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ δεῖξα-
ι.

(q) *Ap. Petav. T. 1. l. 8.*
7. S. 6.

(r) *Valent. T. 1. Diſp. 1. Qu.*
3. punct. 4.

(s) *Nomina quæ relationem in-*
er Deum & res creatas indi-
ant, uti eſt nomen creatoris,
omini & ſimilia, in tempore,
n autem ab æterno prædicantur
Deo. Zanch. de Nat. Dei,
1. c. 10.

(t) *Citra incommodum aut pi-*
culum dici poteſt tunc factus
ominus, quando fecit ipſe Crea-
ram, cujus eſſet Dominus.
loppenburg. compend. Socin.
. 39.

) *Char-*
ck of the
x. and
ttrib. of
od, p. 708.
r. Stough-
n. right.
an's plea.
r. 6. p.
8.

(w) *Men. ben Iſr. in Exod. Qu. 3. Druſ. Tetragram. c. 5.*

(x) *In 1 Cor. 8.*

(y) *Suarez de Leg. l. 2. c. 1. S. 6. & ibid. c. 4. S. 2.*

(z) *De Sp. Sanct. l. 2. c. 12.*

(a) *Tertull. ad Nation. l. 2.*

(b) *In ornamentum majeſtatis ſuæ.* Apol. c. 17.

(c) *Operum dignitas majeſtatem ejus, qui ea ſit operatus, oſtendit.* Enarr. in Pſal. 65.

(d) Αὐτῷ τῷ εἶναι συμφυὲς ἔχει τὸ κράτος. *L. 1. de provid.*

(e) *Servitus carnis, dominatus autem divinitatis eſt.* T. 3. l. 7. Ep. 47.

the Lord, till ſuch time as by ſome fact of his he became *the Lord:* So it is equally falſe, to ſay of God, that he was not *Lord*, till he made himſelf ſuch by his Creation. Divines acknowledge, (f) *an Eternal Sovereignty*, which is ἐξουσία (Authority,) which the ancient gloſſes Greek and Latin render *Majeſtas*, *Ditio*, *Poteſtas*, *Majeſty* or *Potentacy*. They that aſſert the Decree of *abſolute Election* and *Preterition*, found it upon the Doctrine of God's Sovereignty; therefore they ſuppoſe, that there was a Dominion and Sovereignty from everlaſting. (g) *Abſolutum, liberum & æternum jus habet in omnia*, from Eternity God hath abſolutely the height and fulneſs of Power both of *Right* and *Might* (which is abſolutely the Sovereign Power,) an abſolute and plenary Right and Authority to command (*jus imperandi*,) and to make a diſpoſal of all Things and Beings as Sovereign Lord of Affairs (ſo Kings are *rerum Domini*;) God did actually make a due diſpoſal of them in his Decrees and Counſels, before the World was. The Apoſtle celebrateth *his eternal Potentacy and Godhead*, ſtileth him *The King Eternal*, which honourary Title the beſt Expoſitors parallel with that in the Prophet *Daniel*, *The ancient of Days*; therefore (if they miſtake not) it ſpeaketh God to be Lord and King from everlaſting. So do theſe other honourary Titles, *The high and lofty one that inhabiteth Eternity*, *An everlaſting King*. The Pſalmiſt plainly affirmeth, that God is Sovereign Lord and King from everlaſting, when he ſaith, *Thy Throne is eſtabliſh'd of old, thou art from everlaſting*, Pſal. 93. 2. (h) *If the Throne of God be mention'd, it ſignifieth his Kingdom. The Throne, that is, the Principality and Kingdom.* (i) *The Throne of God is the Name of an Eſtate of Dignity*, which can be nothing leſs than the Supreme and Sovereign. Whether we contemplate God therefore as now exiſting in the Univerſe of Beings, or as pre-exiſting from Eternity, his Idea (but not without ſome little diſtinction and limitation of Senſe) muſt be one and the ſame. For,

III. God was from Eternity *Lord and King* (the Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent) *in a large Senſe*. In one Senſe he may be King from Eternity and not in another; for the Criticks obſerve, (k) that the Hebrew word מלך and the Greek βασιλεύειν (to be King) are ſometimes taken in a large Senſe. (l) Some ſay (and with great reaſon,) that thoſe who tranſcend in Dignity, Authority and Power are called Kings in Scripture, *Pſal.* 2. 10. and 148. 11. *Act.* 4. 26. *Apoc.* 6. 15. and 19. 18. that *Penelope's* Suitors, becauſe they were of principal Dignity and Authority, are called *Kings* in *Homer*; and that *Heſiod* calleth τοὺς κρείοντας, *Judges and Potent Men* by the Name of Kings. Such illuſtrious Eſtates in the World are a ſort of *Supra-ſubjects* (beyond the mean and underling Eſtates) and therefore a ſort of Kings. And (doubtleſs) God is ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe a King from Eternity, as to be *tranſcendent in Dignity*, *Authority and Power*. In ſuch Senſe alſo he is undoubtedly a King from Eternity, as the Soul of Man is ſaid to be a King: (m) *That the Soul of Man is of ſublime and regial Dignity, and her diſtance from a Plebeian abject condition, is ſeen in her free unſubject Eſtate and the Government of her Affairs imperially, by her own Volitions; for to whom is this proper but a King? and to be an Image of that Nature that ruleth all, what is it but to be a Regial Nature?* The Saints are called Kings becauſe of their *reigning condition* in a large Senſe of that Phraſe; their Celeſtial and Divine Condition is called *a Crown* and *a Kingdom*, which ſpeaketh them Kings; and who can doubt, but that God is a King from Eternity in that Notion, wherein the Saints of God are Kings? *Apoc.* 1. 6. and 5. 10. and 20. 4, 6. when Death is called *the King of Terrors*, and the Leviathan *the King over all* (faſtuous Animals) *the Children of Pride*, the Name of King ſignifieth only *a Chieftain* or *Supreme*; and in this Senſe God is undoubtedly *a King* from everlaſting. In a large Senſe All are called *Kings*, that are of *maſterly and dominant condition in chief*, although but diminutively and in ſlender degree; (n) for *Maſter*, *King*, *Commander*, are of identity of Senſe both in Greek and Latin, and what one Author calleth *Kingdoms*, another calleth *Magiſteries*. So the Lions are *Kings* amongſt the Beaſts becauſe of their maſterly dominant condition amongſt them, according to that of the Poet —— κλυτὸν βασιλῆα λέοντα, *Noble King Lion*. So *Telemachus* in *Homer* ſaith, (o) *I will be King of mine own Houſe*. All Mankind are a ſort of Kings becauſe of their maſterly dominant condition in this lower World; they are ſaid to have (p) τὸ κατὰ πάντων τῶν ἐπιγείων βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα, *a Kingly Dignity* (or Eminency) *over all things upon Earth*. So many of the Fathers are of Opinion, that the Image of God, in which Man was created, (q) conſiſteth ἐν τῷ ἀρχικῷ καὶ βασιλικῷ, *in Empire*, *Domination and Rule* (over the lower Creation,) and there are ſeveral Paſſages in Scripture, which favour their Opinion, *Gen.* 2. 26, 28. 1 *Cor.* 11. 7. Man ſhould therefore contemplate God as *Lord* and *King* from Eternity, ſeeing himſelf was made the Image of a great Lord and King; for it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the *Ectype* is as old as the *Archetype*, and the Picture as the Exemplar; or that God began to be Lord and King but at that time, when he made Man the Image of his Domination and Regality. *Theodorus Mopſueſtenus* ſaith, that when God made Man (r) *this was if a certain King having built a great City, and adorn'd it with many and various Works, after he hath perfected all, ſhould command a very great and beauteous Image of himſelf, to be ſet up in the midſt of the City, to ſhew, who was the Builder of it.* Kings are uſually the Founders of Cities, but they are Kings before they found them, and ſet up Statues in the midſt of them, to repreſent their Greatneſs. According to the courſe of Humane Affairs therefore God muſt be ſuppoſed *King*, before he founded the World, or ſet up Man, to be his Statue, to repreſent the Founder. If Men and Animals are called *Kings*, becauſe they are of maſterly dominant condition diminutively and in ſlender degree, there is great reaſon, that God ſhould be accounted King from Eternity, to whom it belong'd from everlaſting, to be of maſterly dominant Condition plenarily and abſolutely, and of whom it may be ſaid, (s) *that he was his own Kingdom.* As the Name *King* belongeth unto God from everlaſting; So with great aſſurance we may affirm, that in a large Senſe he is Lord from everlaſting. For as S. *Auſtin* himſelf ſaith, (t) *Quid eſt dominari, niſi propria poteſtate gaudere? What is it for God to be a Lord, but to be a Potentate by his own Power?*

(f) D. H. Mori oper. vol. 1. p. 433.

(g) Zanch. de nat. Dei l. 1. c. 17.

Rom. 1. 20.
1 Tim. 1. 17.
Dan. 7. 9.
Iſa. 57. 15.
Jer. 10. 10.

(h) Θρόνος εἰ λέγοιτο Θεοῦ, τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν κατασημαίνοι ἄν —— Ὁ θρόνος τουτέστιν ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 2. p. 70.

(i) Ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀξιώματός ἐστιν ὄνομα. S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l. 1. p. 35.

(k) Spanhem. Dub. 86.

(l) Ravanel. Bibliothec. Sacr. p. 440. col. 2.

(m) Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ψυχὴ τὸ βασιλικόν τε καὶ ἐξῃρημένον δείκνυσι πόῤῥω τῆς ἰδιωτικῆς ταπεινότητος κεχωρισμένον, ἐκ τοῦ ἀδέσποτον αὐτὴν εἶναι καὶ αὐτεξούσιον, ἰδίοις θελήμασιν αὐτοκρατορικῶς διοικουμένην. τίνος γὰρ καὶ ἢ βασιλέως ἐστίν; καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις τὸ τῆς δυναστευούσης τῶν πάντων φύσεως εἰκόνα γενέσθαι, οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἢ εὐθὺς βασιλίδα δημιουργηθῆναι τὴν φύσιν. Gr. Nyſſ. de Hom. opif. c. 4.

Job 18. 14. and 41. 34.

(n) Of the *Rex convivii & menſæ*, called alſo [illegible] *Imperator Modimperator*, Voſſius obſerveth, *Quem Latini vocant Magiſtrum, eum Græci dicunt βασιλέα ita quæ* Cicero in Ca*tone appellat magiſteria*, hæc Ho*ratius regna appellat.* nec regna *vini ſortiere talis.* imo ab hac *conſuetudine eſt, quod* paraſiti eos *à quibus ad convivium* vocaren*tur, reges nominabant.* Etymol. Lingu. Lat. in voce Modimperator.

(o) Αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οἴκοιο ἄναξ ἔσομ' ἡμετέροιο. *Odyſſ.* α.

(p) Petav. T. 3. l. 2. c. 3, 4.

(q) Ibid. & Euſeb. p. Ev. l. 7. c. 4. l. 11. c. 27. Voſſ. Idol. l. 3. c. 40.

(r) Ap. Petav. ſup.

IV. God was from Eternity *Lord and King* (the Kingdom-Eſtate Creature-tranſcendent) *in the ſenſe of Nobility-Learning.* For it belongeth to Nobility-Learning (peculiarly,) to treat of Honours and Dignities of Eſtate, as they are meerly matter of Eminence (not of Office;) in the Senſe therefore of this ſort of Learning God is from Eternity Sovereign Lord and King, if he is ſuch as to Honour and Dignity of Eſtate. And he is manifeſtly ſuch as to Honour and Dignity of Eſtate, that is of the Sovereign dominant and imperial Eſtate (the fulleſt height of Eminence and Dignity,) *the bleſſed and only Potentate*, deriving from none, holding of none, Αδέσποτος, *unſubjected to any Lord*, Αυτόνομος, *unſubjected to any Law*, Αυτοκέφαλος, *unſubjected to any Head*, Ανυπεύθυνος, *unſubjected to any account*, Αυτοκράτωρ, *unſubjected to any Rule*, and ſo far παντοκράτωρ, *Omni-imperial*, as to have all things in his Hands and ſubjected to his diſpoſal. To his Honour and Dignity of Eſtate (neceſſarily and from Eternity) thoſe honourary Names belong, which in Nobility-learning denote and embelliſh the Kingdom-Eſtate, (u) *The ſupreme Power, the fulleſt height of Majeſty, the imperial celſitude and culminant Eſtate, the higheſt ennoblement and perfection of Condition, the ſummity and conſummation of Dignity.* To be a God therefore is that Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation, the Imperial Eſtate (Subject-tranſcendent and Creature-tranſcendent;) ſuch Nobilitation and Perfection which is conſtitutive of the Kingdom-Eſtate, from Eternity belongeth to the God-head-Eſtate; therefore God was King and ſupreme Lord from Eternity, although no Subject or Servant was then Exiſtent. Upon account of his Honour and Dignity of Eſtate he was from Eternity noble and unvile in abſolute Perfection; which could not be, if his Honour and Dignity of Eſtate was not the Kingdom-Eſtate (which is Matter of pure Honour unmix'd and unſtain'd with any Vileneſs;) this therefore was Præ-exiſtent to his Creation. (w) *Erat omnitenens Conditor & Dominus ſinè habitudine, he was without Relation the Omnitenent Creator and Lord.* In reſpect of his Perfections and Diſpoſition, his Creature-tranſcendence of Condition, becauſe he was always the Creator-party, it always appertain'd to him to create actually, and as to (meer) Honour and Dignity of Eſtate, he was from Eternity the Creator, as *Adam* was the Genitor of Mankind, before he generated any.

V. In Political Learning the Kingdom-Eſtate (to be Sovereign Lord and King) is not meerly an Honour and Dignity of Eſtate, but a Relation and an Office or Officiary Dignity. In the ſenſe of this Learning therefore God cannot be ſaid, to be the Kingdom-Eſtate (Lord and King) from Eternity without diſtinction and limitation of Senſe. Which diſtinction and limitation of Senſe may be illuſtratated from what a late Writer of Politicks hath diſcours'd touching the origin of Government. (x) *By the appointment of God as ſoon as* Adam *was created, he was Monarch of the World, though he had no Subjects; for though there could not be actual Government, until there were Subjects, yet by the right of Nature it was due to* Adam, *to be Governour of his Poſterity: Though not in Act, yet at leaſt in Habit,* Adam *was a King from his Creation.* This learned Writer was too learned, to think, that there can be either a Conſtitution or Adminiſtration of Civil Government without the Exiſtence of both Parties (*pars imperans & pars ſubdita*:) He ſaith therefore, *that* Adam *was a King from his Creation, though not in Act, yet in Habit.* But thus he might better have expreſs'd his Senſe; *that* Adam *as to meer Honour and Dignity of Eſtate* (without Relation) was King from his Creation; and ſuch was God from Eternity in the ſame Senſe. As *Adam* from his Creation (according to this Author) had this right and due, to be a Sovereign Governour of his Poſterity, and was by Divine appointment the Monarch of the World of Mankind; So God from Eternity had this right and due, to be the Sovereign Governour of his Creatures, and if he had his being God from Eternity by appointment, he would be from Eternity Lord of the World (or of the Creature) by appointment. But as his being God from Eternity is Eſſential to him: So it is Eſſential to him (to his being God,) to be from Eternity (anſwerably to *Adam*'s ſuppos'd Monarchy from his Creation) *Lord of the World.* And as *Adam*'s ſuppos'd Right of Government is a Right to be *the Imperial Eſtate or Sovereignty in civil and human Society, and in the State and Relation of King there*: So God's Right of Government from Eternity is a Right to be *the Imperial Eſtate or Sovereignty in God-Society*, which is to be the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate. Theſe Notices of God agreeable to Political Government remove all difficulties from our Idea, ſatisfie all Objections, and the conſideration of Political Government ſuggeſteth an argument (to be added to the large heap of many others,) which plainly ſheweth, that our Idea is the true Idea of God from Eternity.

This Argument ariſeth from the conſideration of thoſe three illuſtrious eternal Attributes *Wiſdom, Goodneſs and* (executive,) *Power*, two of which are royal princely Virtues, and all three eſpecially belong to Government, are of eſpecial uſe in it and eſpecially neceſſary, and therefore muſt be intituled *the Attributes of Government.* For that there may be the good of Government in the Univerſe, there muſt be *Goodneſs* to deſign it, *Wiſdom* to direct to it, and *Power* to accompliſh it. Government is deſpicable without *Power*, which protecteth, rewardeth and puniſheth, manageth the *jus gladii*, and is like *Talos* (a Man of Braſs or of Iron,) to look to the obſervance and execution of *Minos*'s Laws. The Kingdom-Eſtate is celebrated for its Strength or Power, *Dan.* 2. 37. *Apoc.* 5. 12. But *Power* alone maketh no better Governours than ferine Animals (ſuch as the four Monarchies are compar'd to Lions, Bears, Leopards,) it is *Goodneſs* that maketh them *Sovereign Friends* and *Fathers*, (Shepherds, Guardians, Saviours and Beneficent Rulers,) their

Diſpoſi-

(s) *Eſt ipſe regnum.* P. Chryſol. Ser. 72. *Regnum erat ipſe ſuum.* Claud. vict. ap. Lipſ. Phyſiol. Stoic. l. 2. Diſſ. 8.

(t) *De Verb. Dom Ser.* 33. *V. Zanch. de Nat. Dei, l.* 4. *c.* 5. *Qu.* 2.

(u) *Suprema Poteſtas, faſtigium Majeſtatis, culmen Majeſtatis, apex imperii, imperialis apicis dignitas, &c.*

(w) *Hugo Etherian. ap. Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 9.

(x) *The Anarchy of a limit. or mix'd Monarchy.* p. 13.

Diſpoſition and Behaviour conſentaneous to their Dignity, their Government tolerable and deſirable (and as ſome of the wiſe have defin'd Government (y) *cura ſalutis alienæ, care of the Welfare of others,*) but without it Government is not Rule, but Miſ-rule. *Eccl.* 5. 8. *Jer.* 9. 24. *Mic.* 3. 9, 10. *Wiſdom* is Queen Regent, muſt ſit at Stern, and regulate all in Government. *Eccl.* 10. 10. *Prov.* 8. 15. *By me Kings Reign,* (ſaith Wiſdom) *and Princes Decree Juſtice.* They diſcern between right and wrong, good and bad, they make and execute Righteous Laws, (z) and Govern well by Wiſdom the Science of Government, which *Plato* calleth τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐπιστήμην, *the Regial Science.* Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs are the Regial accompliſhments; therefore God (in whom they are infinitely and eſſentially inherent and ſhining from Eternity, and of whoſe Attributes they are a ſummary) ought to be contemplated as *the Sovereignty or Kingdom-Eſtate* from Eternity.

VI. This Theory containeth in it a clear Reſolution of this difficult Queſtion in Theology and Politicks, *What is the ground of God's Dominion and Sovereignty over Man and the Creatures?* The Atheiſtical Politicians aſſign no other ground of it but omnipotent Power; for they ſuppoſe, that irreſiſtible Power can do no wrong. Nor is it to be expected, that they ſhould aſſign any other ground of this Divine Dominion but Will and Power, who ſuppoſe, that there is nothing Good or Evil in its own Nature, but that all Good and Evil is made ſuch by the arbitrary Will of God. Inſtead of theſe Extravagances ſome have ſubſtituted this extravagant Suppoſition; (a) *That God's right of Dominion over the Creatures could not be founded upon the Benefits of Creation, but upon the abſolute unlimitedneſs of his Power; becauſe God from Eternity was inveſted with a Power of doing any thing that was not misbecoming his Divine Perfections; which Power could not be made greater, and therefore he acquir'd not any new right from his Creation.* But although God acquir'd no new Power from his Creation (for he had always the right of Dominion and Sovereignty over his Creatures, when they ſhould become his Exiſtent Creatures,) yet this right of Dominion muſt be conſider'd, *as it is a Relation*, and ſo conſider'd it is neceſſarily founded upon his Creation, whereby the Creatures are related to him as his Property, Men are related to him as of right and by obligation his Subjects and Servants, and are bound to acknowledge him their Lord. The nature of which Obligation ſheweth, that this Divine Dominion is not founded meerly upon *the Benefits of Creation,* (b) as ſome others ſuppoſe. For the greateſt Benefits can oblige to nothing more than *Gratitude*, they are no Title to Propriety in ſtrict Juſtice, nor can they ſo much as found a Political Sovereignty, becauſe Sovereign and Subject are neceſſarily link'd together by the Bond of ſtrict Juſtice. A Child is oblig'd to his Parent by the Benefit of Generation and of Education, but beſides this Obligation the Parent hath (in ſome degree) ſuch a ſtrict right of Property to his Child, as he hath to his Houſe and Land (which are not capable of being oblig'd by Benefits, but are for his Uſe and Benefit;) and if Benefits are not the ſole ground of Parental Dominion, they cannot be the ſole ground of this Divine Dominion. The buſineſs of Piety towards God is not only *Gratitude*, but Debt of Juſtice (Debt is but another Name for Duty,) it is *ſtricti Juris*, as a Servants Duty to his Lord is; if rational Beings revolt from God, they alienate themſelves from their natural Lord; if they live as their own Maſters, their Impiety is not meer ingratitude, but is ſuch foul diſhoneſty as the robbing a Man of his own. Obedience and Service is due to all Authority (Divine and Human) not meerly out of Gratitude, but out of Conſcience and Senſe of Due, in rigour of Law and Juſtice. Innumerable Creatures are incapable of Benefits, yet God is related to them as their Lord, which is an uncontrolable Argument, that the Benefits of Creation are not the ſole ground of his Dominion and Sovereignty over Man and the Creatures. Nor can the Divine Dominion be chiefly founded in the Divine ὑπεροχῇ, *Tranſcendence, Excellence* or *Supereminene,* (c) as ſome ſuppoſe. For they that far tranſcend others, are not neceſſarily Lords of them and their Eſtates, their inferiours may owe them an honourary Reſpect, but thoſe ſuperiours have no right to take away their Liberty from them. Dominion over others is Tranſcendence, but Tranſcendence at large is not Dominion over others. For it is no ſuch Honour and Dignity of Eſtate, that implieth Dominion (ſuch as Lord and King,) no Right of Juſtice, no Political Relation, no Title to Property. To ſuppoſe, that God is Lord of the Creatures chiefly becauſe of the Tranſcendence of his Perfections, is like *Cyrus*'s Error, who allotted the biggeſt Coat to the biggeſt Boy, although it was not his.

In a late learned Author's account of *the Law of Nature* the Divine *Dominion* and *Sovereignty* is deriv'd *meerly from the neceſſity of publick good*, and upon this alone it is founded. For his Senſe, (d) *It is neceſſary for the common good and in order thereto, that a ſupreme Power of governing all Creatures be aſſum'd by God, and this is the ground of his Dominion* and *Sovereignty.* Which Propoſition involveth in it this Paradox; *that it is neceſſary for the common good and in order thereto, that God ſhould aſſume to himſelf the being God* (for without ſo great a Perfection as *univerſal Dominion and Sovereignty* he is not God,) *and upon this prudential Aſſumption his Dominion is founded.* This is extremely amiſs (upon ſeveral accounts:) But there are ſeveral other Paradoxes of like Nature involv'd in this Propoſition, which will be diſcours'd of in another place. We will here only add, that it is Eſſential to God, to be *the Lord of all* (the Lord of all Creatures;) and this being his great Eſſentiality (whereby he is defin'd by *Clemens*) common Senſe ſheweth, what is the true ground of the Divine Dominion and Sovereignty. (e) Some ſuppoſe, *that the Production of any thing maketh it his who produceth it, and if he formeth it out of his own matter, it is wholly his*; and this is the ground which they aſſign of the Divine Dominion. But although this account of it is agreeable to the Senſe of the imperial Lawyers, it muſt not be thought a juſt account of it. For if an Opificer maketh a piece of Work (having firſt made the matter of it) at the command of another, if he maketh it not at all for his own, but meerly for that other's uſe and ſervice, if he hath not right ſo to produce it, as to be the Proprietor of it, his Production of it cannot be a

---

(y) *Am. Marcellin. l.* 29.

(z) *Eraſm. Inſtit. princip. præfat.* & *p.* 22.

(a) Dr. *Sa. Parker of God's Dominion. p.* 148.

Pſal. 24. 1, 2. *Act.* 17. 24.

(b) *Curcell. de Jur. Dei, in Creatur. innocent.*

(c) *Amyrald.*

(d) Dr. *Cumberland. de Leg. Nat. c.* 7. *p.* 342, 343, 344.

(e) *Opus quodvis quâ tale eſt, natura ſua opificis eſt, & ſi ex ſua, non aliena materia id formarit, totum eſt ipſius.* Crell. de Deo & ejus Attribut. c. 23.

Title to the Property, as appeareth from that principal ground of Propriety alledg'd by *Pharaoh* in his vain boaſt. *My river is mine own, and I have made it for my ſelf*, Ezek. 29. 3. If the Maker of all things is the Proprietor of all things upon the account of producing them, he muſt be abſolutely *ſui Juris*, which is an Honour and Dignity of Eſtate. If he was but a ſubordinate Agent in Creation, as *Plato*'s Demons are ſuppos'd, to have been, he could not be the Owner of all things upon the account of creating them. If *Adam* had begot Children for another Man, as Slaves generate for their Maſters, he could not have been Lord of them; which ſheweth, that his Honour and Dignity of Eſtate was in part the ground of his (limited) Dominion and Sovereignty over them. It is not therefore the meer fact or benefit of Creation, which is the ground of the Divine Dominion; but it is Creation in Conjunction with God's eſſential Honour and Dignity of Eſtate, which is to be *Lord of the Creature*; and to be ſuch in *Relation* ſuppoſing the Creature to exiſt. His right of Dominion and Sovereignty over Man and the Creatures muſt be conſider'd both as it is *a meer eſſential Honour and Dignity of Eſtate* antecedent to the Creation, and as it is *a Relation* conſequent upon it. As it is a meer Honour and Dignity of Eſtate (being his eſſential Nobilitation,) it is not founded upon any thing: As his prerogative of acting independently, unaccountably, and managing all things in the Sovereign way of Regency, is not founded upon any thing. But as it is *a Relation*, it is like *Adam*'s (ſuppos'd) Sovereignty over his Poſterity, which was founded upon his Generation of them, yet not only upon his Generation of them, but upon his Generation of them in Conjunction with his antecedent Honour and Dignity of Eſtate.

CHAP. V.

1. Of the expanded Idea of God and the two parts of it. 2. That God is (peculiarly) all Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection in general. 3. That God is (peculiarly) all Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection of State and of Nature. 4. That God is (peculiarly) all Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection meerly Gradual and Specific-gradual. 5. Of the ſecond part of the expanded Idea of God, and that God is Politically and of kind the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate. 6. That God is the Sanctity Imperial. 7. That God is the Sanctity Vital. 8. That God is the Sanctity Imperial-perſonal. 9. One Explication of it confuted.

I. IN repreſenting the Idea of God it is not unuſual with Men of Learning, to begin with ſome more rude and imperfect notice of God, ſuch as all Men are apt to conceive in their Minds upon the firſt hearing of the Word. At the next ſtep they proceed to a definitive Notice of God or ſomething like a definitive Notice. And at the third ſtep they proceed to a large expanded Idea, a more full and explicit deſcription of the Deity. The whole of this expanded Idea we are oblig'd to glance at, and it will be ſufficient, only to glance at a great part of it: But ſo much of it as needeth explication, we will carefully explicate and ſet in clear Light. This expanded Idea (if it be regular and legitimate) muſt conſiſt of two parts anſwerable to the two main Branches of the contracted Idea of God; and thus it ought to be ſummarily repreſented.

1. *The Creature-tranſcendent Sovereignty (which God is) is peculiarly of all Creature-tranſcendent*

Nobilitation and perfection, whether it be
in general or particularly ſo,
in State or of Nature
meerly gradual or ſpecific-gradual.

2. *The God-kind of Sovereignty which God is Politically and Societively, is the holy Empire's*

Sovereignty (or Imperial Eſtate,) *which is*
the Sanctity Imperial,
the Sanctity Vital,
the Sanctity Imperial-perſonal.

II. (f) *Accurately inquiring into the Nature of Beings we ſee God and Creature and nothing beſides theſe.* As in Human Sovereignties (which conſiſt of the Party imperant and the Party ſubject) to be of the Subject-tranſcendent degree, is to be of the Sovereignty: So to be of the Creature-tranſcendent degree, is to be of the Godhead. All ſuch Nobilitation therefore which is Creature-tranſcendence (whether it be meerly Gradual or Specific-gradual) properly and peculiarly belongeth unto God. In Human Sovereignties all are either of the Subject-party or of the Sovereignty, becauſe to be of the Subject-tranſcendent degree, is to be of the Sovereignty, and is proper to the Sovereignty: So in the Univerſe of Beings all are either of the Godhead or of the Creature-party (which is the ſubject and ſervient Party,) becauſe to be of the Creature-tranſcendent degree, is to be of the Godhead and proper unto the Godhead. If any thing be rais'd to Creature-tranſcendence (as in Idolatry) it is made a God; for Creature-tranſcendence is that which maketh and conſtituteth a God truly and really ſuch; and therefore he is God, becauſe he is of Graduality, Perfection and Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent. Such Perfection and Nobilitation therefore which is of Creature-tranſcendent degree, properly belongeth unto God; and all ſuch Nobilitation which is of Creature-tranſcendent degree properly belongeth unto God; and if it properly belongeth to him, it doth belong to him, and muſt be an Ingredient of his expanded Idea. One ſort of theſe Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations are theſe *general Notices* of God (and ſuch more,) *a Being of infinite Perfection, abſolutely without any defect or imperfection, excellence without any want of excellence, abſolutely unvile and unvileable, infinitely valuable, amiable, honourable, meer unſtain'd Nobilitation and Perfection, Brightneſs unſully'd with any Cloud,* (g) παγκαλὲς καὶ αὐτοτελές, *of abſolutely pure and perfect* Pulchritude *and* Precioſity, *Self-perfect, abſolutely exempt from all miſcreancy and miſery, the higheſt remove from and the moſt perfect oppoſite to all Evil. No acceſſion can be made to God* (ſaith

(f) Τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάζοντες φύσιν, θεὸν ὁρῶμεν ϗ κτίσιν καὶ ἕτερον ἐπὶ τούτοις οὐδὲν. S. *Cyr. in Joan.* l. 1. c. 6. p. 52.

(g) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 4. p. 120.

S. *Auſtin,*) *nor can he ſuffer any diminution. For if he be capable of any Acceſſion, he is not perfect: and if he be diminiſh'd, he is not God.* (h) *And this is that which the Schools ſay,* (in this ſenſe ſaying truly,) *that God is a pure Act without any mixture of potentiality or capability of Perfection. He is whatever he can be.* (i) *He muſt be that which is moſt ſufficient* (All-ſufficient) *not indigent or inſufficient as to himſelf or as to any other.* It belongeth unto God, to be *the infinite and abſolutely perfect good,* (k) *Qui non ſolum ſummè bonus eſt, ſed etiam ſummum atque incommutabile bonum eſt, quia æternum bonum eſt, nullum habens defectum. Who is not only ſupremely Good, but the ſupreme and unchangeable Good, becauſe the eternal Good, having no deficiency.* To theſe general Notices and Nobilitations of the Deity (wherein God is abſolutely not comparatively conſider'd) another ſort muſt be added, which are general Notices and Nobilitations of compariſon between God and Creatures, which are as nothing in compariſon of God. *Iſa.* 40. 14, 15, 17. (l) *there is none like him* with a likeneſs of compariſon. The God-head ſtands ſingular and alone without any Compeer or Co-partner, is Creature-tranſcendent in all Reſpects, ſeparated and diſcriminated from all (all Creatures and created Eminences) by way of Eminence, incomparably Paramount, Peerleſs and Super-eminent, *the beſt and greateſt poſſible or conceivable,* infinitely better than all the World (being the unfathomable Abyſs of good without bounds or bottom.) the only one in the Univerſe, *whoſe Name alone is excellent.* Pſal. 148. 13. All which are general Notices and Nobilitations of compariſon between God and Creatures.

III. All Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations and Perfections of *State* and of *Nature* do belong (and peculiarly belong) unto God; who is *the Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent, the ſupreme Supremacy. The Sovereignty abſolutely Soveraign, the great King* (the great Eſtate of Kingdom and Empire,) *the fulleſt height of Dominion and* (authoritative) *Power, the Lord and the Poſſeſſor of Heaven and Earth, All-commanding, All-diſpoſing, ſuperintending and governing all things, the one Lawgiver, the Judge of all, the Lord of Life, the King of Glory, the Lord of the Spirits of all Fleſh, the Father of Spirits, the Alpha and Omega, the Maker and Preſerver of all things, the Saviour, the univerſal Benefactor.* A reſemblance of his Godhead of Eſtate is viſible in that Eccleſiaſtic Monarch, who in a Paraſitical Addreſs is adorn'd by *Morinus* with theſe ſwelling Titles and Attributes. (m) *Thou art conſtituted by God the Keeper and Preſident of the Church's Treaſure, the Diſpenſer of Eternity, the Interpreter of the Mind of God, the Arbiter of the Chriſtian Laws, the Judge of all Men, Self-maſter and Vindicator alone.* His bigotted Partiſans have intituled him (n) *Vice-God, the Vicar of the Immortal God;* and in the gloſs of the Canon Law he is ſtiled *Dominus Deus noſter Papa, our Lord God the Pope.* Some of the Decretory Sentences of *Greg. the Seventh* are, (o) *that all Princes kiſs the Feet of the Pope alone. That he only may uſe the Enſigns of Imperial Dignity. That there is but one Name in the World, that of the Pope.* In the laſt *Lateran* great Synod under his Noſe and in his hearing the Pope was ſtiled by one Biſhop (p) *The Prince of the World;* another Orator called him *King of Kings, and Monarch of the Earth.* Another great Prelate ſaid of him, *that he had all Power above all Powers both of Heaven and Earth.* And the ſame Man told *Leo* X. *To thee is given all Power in Heaven and in Earth.* His Theologers celebrate *the Papal Omnipotence,* and one of them ſaith, *the Power of the Pope is greater than all created Power, and extendeth it ſelf to the things Celeſtial, Terreſtrial and Infernal.* So great a reſemblance there is between the God-head of Eſtate and the Papal Sovereignty, that in many Inſtances (with great Reaſon) we ſhall make uſe of it, to illuſtrate the Theory of God. To whom all Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations of *Nature* as well as *State* do belong (and peculiarly belong;) as *to be abſolutely infallible and impeccable* (which attributes are extravagantly pretended to by the Papacy,) *incapable of lying and of dying, impaſſible, incorruptible, unchangeable, of infinite Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power, the excellent Glory* (which as dwelling amongſt Men the Jews call *Schecinah,*) *Immenſe* alſo or *Omnipreſent,* according to that of *Epictetus,* (q) *God and your Genius is within.* It belongeth alſo to the God-head, to have Life in himſelf *primarily, originally, eſſentially* and in *infinite fulneſs.* (r) *For the Divinity is everlaſting, not as participative of Life, but as ſuppletive or communicative to others of Life Divine.* Several Divine Attributes belong to the Deity both in reſpect of his State and Nature, as *increate, bleſſed, almighty, irreſiſtible.*

IV. All Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations and Perfections do belong (and peculiarly belong) unto God, whether they be meerly *Gradual* or *Specific-gradual.* Thoſe Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations and Perfections I call *meerly Gradual,* which tranſcend not meer Creatures in the kind of them, but only in the degree of them; and as to the kind of them they are no better *than common Excellency.* For if by *Omniſcience* we mean nothing more than Creature-tranſcendence in common kind of Knowledge and Underſtanding, this Attribute is nothing better than *Creature tranſcendent Graduality.* Such is infinite Might and Strength, and ſuch is infinite Goodneſs, if by *Goodneſs* we mean nothing better than common kind of Goodneſs. To be abſolutely independent, a ſupreme Being, a ſupreme Mind, an infinite Spirit, an Ocean of Eſſence, denoteth nothing more than common kind of Excellence: Nor do theſe great Attributes in the Notion of the Pagan Theologers ſignifie any thing more than

---

(h) *Hoc eſt quod Scholæ dicunt, Deum eſſe, Actum purum, id eſt, quod nullam habet potentiam admixtam.* Petav. T. 1. l. 6. c. 7. S. 3.

(i) Δεῖ τι αὐταρκέστατον εἶναι—— μήτε πρὸς αὐτὸ, μήτε πρὸς ἄλλο ἐνδεὲς εἶναι. *Plotin. En.* 6. *l.* 9. *c.* 6.

(k) *Fulgent. ap. Petav. T. l.* 6. *c.* 2. *S.* 10.

(l) *Exod.* 8. 10. *and* 9. 14. *and* 15. 11. *Deut.* 33. 26. 2*Sam.* 7. 22. 1 *Chron.* 17. 20. *Pſal.* 86. 8. *and* 89. 6, 9. *Iſa.* 40. 25. *and* 46. 5, 9.

(m) *Divinitùs conſtitueris Theſauri Eccleſiæ Cuſtos & Præſes, æternitatis diſpenſator, mentis divinæ interpres, legum Chriſtianarum Arbiter, omnium mortalium Judex, unicus tui Dominus & Vindex.* Vita J. Morini. p. 6.

(n) *Vice Deus, vicarius immortalis Dei.* Roderic. Zamorenſ. Spec. hum. vit. l. 2. c. 1.

(o) *Quòd ſolius Papæ pedes omnes principes deoſculentur. Quòd ſolus uti poſſit imperialibus inſigniis. Quòd unicum eſt nomen in mundo, Papæ videlicet.* Baron. ad ann. 1076. n. 31.

(p) *Orbis Princeps. Regum Rex & Orbis terrarum Monarcha. In quo erat poteſtas ſupra omnes poteſtates tàm Cœli quàm Terræ. Tibi data eſt omnis poteſtas in Cœlo & in Terra. Omnipotentiam Pontificiam. Papæ poteſtas eſt major omni poteſtate creatâ, extenditque ſe ad Cœleſtia, Terreſtria & infernalia.* D. Barrow of the Pope's Suprem. p. 4. D. Sclater on 2 Theſſ. 2. 4. Pool's Synopſ. in loc.

(q) Ὁ θεὸς ἔνδον ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ ὑμέτερος δαίμων. *Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 14.

(r) Οὐ γὰρ ὡς μετέχει τοῦ ζῆν, ἀλλ' ὡς παρεκτικὸν τῆς θείας ζωῆς, τὸ θεῖον ἀθάνατόν ἐστι. *Procl. Plat. Theol.* p. 65.

Creature-tranſcendent Graduality, *to be abſolutely perfect, ſelf-full, the beſt and greateſt of Beings,* τὸ πέλαγος τοῦ καλοῦ, *the Ocean of Pulchritude.* Theſe Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations *the Lord of all, the Prince of Life, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords,* if they be underſtood and conſider'd in the general indeterminate Notion, abſtracted from Chriſt's true Specific and individual determination, which is Chriſtianity, they are meerly his Graduality (Creature-tranſcendent Graduality,) and not that which he is of proper kind. If theſe Creature-tranſcendent Attributes *Vice-God, Prince of the World, the Potentate above all created Potentates,* be conſider'd as abſtracted from the *Pope*'s Specific and individual determination, they may as well be a Bravado of the Grand Segnior or of one of the old Roman Emperours, as the rightful Imperial Stile of our holy Father (whoſe Specific and individual Determination is Popery,) and they are meerly his Graduality, not that which he is of proper kind. So to be *the ſupreme univerſal King, the moſt High, ſupreme Governour and Lord of the Univerſe (ſummus Rector & Dominus,)* ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸς, *the God above all, the Parent of the World (Mundi Parens)* ὁ τῶν ὄντων πατὴρ ϗ δημιουργὸς, *the Father and Maker of Beings, Ingenit, Immenſe, Beate, Immortal,* all this Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation underſtood in the general indeterminate Notion, abſtracted from God's true Specific and individual Determination (which is true Sanctity) is nothing more than Creature-tranſcendent Graduality, not that which he is of proper kind. That which he is of proper kind, is *the God-kind of Excellence,* and the God-kind of Excellence is the ſame with *the Saint of God-kind of Excellence,* (ſo the Saint of God-kind of Life is the God-kind of Life, *Eph.* 4. 18. and the Saint of God-kind of Love is the God-kind of Love, 1 *Joh.* 4. 7, 8.) and the Saint of God-kind of Excellence is manifeſtly the ſame with *Sanctity or Holineſs.* Holineſs or Sanctity is *the uncommon kind of Excellence* (or Unvileneſs,) this uncommon kind of Excellence is *the Saint of God-kind of Excellence,* this Saint of God-kind of Excellence is *the God-kind of Excellence* (each one of theſe Notices of it is the definition of it;) and becauſe it is *the God-kind of Excellence,* therefore it is the *Creature-tranſcendent kind of Excellence,* which is *the Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection ſpecifical.* This Specific Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection Creatures do partake of, but not in the Creature-tranſcendent degree; ſuch Nobilitation and Perfection which is Creature-tranſcendent both in kind and degree (the Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection *Specific-gradual*) belongeth unto God and peculiarly belongeth unto God.

Theſe Notices of *Sanctity* may be very much illuſtrated from the Writings of the Fathers, wherein the Saints are uſually called *Gods,* to which purpoſe they uſually cite thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, *I have ſaid ye are Gods, and all of you Sons of the moſt High.* So *Clemens* ſaith of Chriſt, (s) *by his heavenly Doctrine he maketh Man a God.* The Scriptures he calleth (t) *the deifying Writings.* Of an heavenly Converſation he ſaith, (u) *thereby being made Gods.* And of one aſſimilated to God he ſaith, (w) *ſuch a Man is made a God.* Heraclitus *therefore rightly ſaid Men-Gods and Gods-Men.* (x) Of the end of Chriſt's coming he ſaith; *the Logos of God was made Man, that thou mighteſt learn of Man, how Man may be made a God.* So *Gr. Naz.* ſaith; (y) *the commixture of God and Man in our Saviour was for this end, that I might be made as much a God, as he was made a Man.* (z) His Solitude he calleth θεοποιὸς, *that which maketh a God of a Man,* (a) and the holy Spirit θεοποιοῦν, *that which deifieth a Man.* (b) *If the holy Spirit is not God, how doth he make me a God by Baptiſm?* (c) *God ſtanding and judging in the midſt of the Gods that are ſaved,* is the Language of the Father; and he reckoneth theſe Benefits of God; *to be made a Son of God, a Coheir of Chriſt,* (d) *I will ſpeak boldly, and to be made a God.* (e) *I will not endure to Worſhip a Creature* (ſaith he) *being commanded to be a God.* S. *Baſil* ſaith of the holy Spirit, (f) *Every one of the Saints is a God by him.* (g) *Hence is our Similitude to God, hence is the chief of all deſirables, to be made a God.* (h) *We are called the Temples of God and Gods, and we are ſo,* ſaith S. *Cyril.* (i) *We are ſaid to be born of God, and therefore are called Gods.* (k) *Being made conformable to the natural Son, we are called Gods in Conſort with him and Sons of God.* (l) *Chriſt hath impreſs'd a Divine Illumination as it were a Divine Image on thoſe that believe on him, that they might be called according to his Similitude Gods and Sons of God.* (m) *In him we were firſt deify'd.* (n) *Doth it profit us nothing, to be called Gods and Sons of God and Brothers?* (o) Of the holy Spirit he ſaith; *by him we are called Gods alſo, as participating of the Divine and ineffable Nature by Conjunction with him.* He argueth, that the holy Spirit cannot be a Creature, (p) *which maketh us Gods.* So *Athanaſius* proveth, that the Logos was God, (q) becauſe Man hath his θεοποίησις, *Deification from him.* The Salvation of Man is called by this Father his θεοποίησις, *Deification;* therefore he ſaith of Chriſt, that being God he became Man, (r) *to deifie us. So many as were Sons of God* (s) *were by the Logos made Sons and Gods. The Word was made Fleſh, that we being partakers of the Spirit* (t) *might be deify'd.* Of the holy Spirit he ſaith, (u) *by which we are made Gods and the Temples of God.* Of God S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (w) *he maketh his Worſhippers Gods.* (x) *Created Gods are Gods by a Participation of the true God.* By S. *Cyprian* Chriſtianity is called, (y) *the Deifying Diſcipline*; and *Paulinus* ſaith of our Saviour, (z) *in reſpect of ſo much as is in him, he ſaid unto all Men, ye are Gods, and all the Sons of the higheſt.* So *Andreas Cæſarienſis* ſaith, *that Chriſt was made Man,* (a) *that Man may be made a God.* So the Church of *Rome* in her Breviary ſaith, (b) *He was made Man, that he might make Men Gods.* By *Simeon Theſſalonicenſis*, one of the later Greeks, Chriſtians are called, (c) *κατὰ χάριν θεοί, Gods by Grace becauſe κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, partakers of God.* So S. *Hierom* ſaith; (d) *If any one is a Saint, he is made a God.* (e) *Our Saviour was found in faſhion as a Man, that we might be made Gods of Men.* Much of this Nature occurreth in the Writings of the Fathers, it is their ordinary Language (as ordinary as the High-way,) they look upon the Saints both in reſpect of their Grace *(f)* and alſo in reſpect of their Glory, as made Gods.

(s) Οὐρανίῳ διδασκαλίᾳ θεοποιῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Προτρεπ]. p. m. 53.

(t) Τὰ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα. Ibid. p. 41. & vid. p. 57.

(u) Καθ' ἣν ἐκθεούμενοι. *Pædag. l.* 1. c. 12.

(w) Θεὸς δὲ ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄνθρωπος γίνεται. Ὀρθῶς ἄρα εἶπεν Ἡράκλειτος, Ἄνθρωποι θεοί· Θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι. *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 1.

(x) Ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γινόμενος, ἵνα δὴ ϗ σὺ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μάθῃς μήποτε ἄρα ἄνθρωπος γίνεται θεός. Προτρεπ]. p. m. 6.

(y) Ἵνα γένωμαι τοσοῦτον θεὸς, ὅσον ἐκεῖνος ἄνθρωπος. *Or.* 35.

(z) *Or.* 2.

(a) *Or.* 37. p. 610.

(b) Πῶς ἐμὲ θεοῖ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος. *Or.* 34. p. 429.

(c) Θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ θεῶν τῶν σωζομένων. *Or.* 36. p. 579.

(d) Τολμήσας εἴπω, καὶ θεὸν αὐτόν. *Or.* 16. p. 253.

(e) Θεὸς εἶναι κεκελευσμένος. *Or.* 20. p. 349.

(f) Θεὸς ἐστὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἕκαστος τῶν ἁγίων. *Adv. Eunom.* p. 140.

(g) Ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ὁμοίωσις, τὸ ἀκρότατον τῶν ὀρεκτῶν, θεὸν γενέσθαι. *Ibid. p.* 165.

(h) Ναοὶ δὲ θεοῦ ϗ θεοὶ κεκλήμεθα ϗ ἐσμέν. *S. Cyr. Dial. de Trin. p.* 639.

(i) Ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννῆσθαι λεγόμεθα, ϗ θεοὶ διὰ τοῦτο χρηματίζομεν. *Idem in Joann. p.* 93.

(k) Σύμμορφοι γεγονότες τῷ κατὰ φύσιν υἱῷ θεοὶ κατ' αὐτὸν ϗ υἱοὶ κεκλήμεθα θεοῦ. *Dial.* 7. *de Trin. p.* 644.

(l) Κατ' αὐτὸν θεοί τε καὶ θεοῦ υἱοί. *Idem in Joan. p.* 70.

(m) *Idem T.* 2. *p.* 44.

(n) Τὸ ϗ θεοὺς ὀνομάσθαι ϗ θεοῦ τέκνα ϗ ἀδελφούς. *Idem c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 214.

(o) Κεκλήμεθα δι' αὐτὸ καὶ θεοί, ἅτε δὴ τῇ θείᾳ τε ϗ ἀπορρήτῳ φύσει τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸ συναφείᾳ κεκοινωνηκότες. *Dial de Trin. p.* 639.

(p) *Ibid. p.* 644.

(q) *Or.* 3. *c. Arian. p.* 241. *com.*

(r) Ἵνα ἡμᾶς θεοποιήσῃ.

(s) Διὰ τοῦ λόγου υἱοποιήθησαν καὶ θεοποιήθησαν. *Ibid. p.* 166.

(t) Θεοποιηθῆναι δυνηθῶμεν. *De Syn. Nic. decret. p.* 411.

(u) Δι' οὗ ϗ θεοποιούμεθα ϗ θεοῦ ναοὶ καθιστάμεθα. *In Ep. Cathol.*

(w) *Facit cultores ſuos Deos.* De C. D. l. 10. c. 1. *Dii eſſent.* Ibid. p. 159. ed. Lugd.

(x) *Dii creati veri Dei participatione ſunt Dii.* Ibid. l. 14. c. 13.

To juſtifie this uſual Language of the Fathers, *Caſanbon* argueth, *(g) Who but a God, can be a Son of God?* Agreeably whereto S. *Auſtin* ſaith; (h) *He deifieth, that is of himſelf God, not by participation of another. Now he that juſtifieth* (ſanctifieth,) *he deifieth, becauſe by juſtifying he maketh Sons of God. If we are made the Sons of God, we are made Gods.* So the Maſter of Controverſies ſaith of our firſt Parents, (i) *They were rais'd to the Dignity of being Sons of God, and certain Gods, that is, partakers of the Divine Nature.* This ſort of Language is allow'd by Proteſtant Divines; for *Calvin* ſpeaketh it with ſome ſmall limitation. (k) *Let us note, that this is the end of the Goſpel, to render us conformed to God* (God-like) *which is as it were, to be deify'd. Bucer* ſpeaketh with greater freedom, (l) *That in theſe we may approve our ſelves his Sons and true Gods.* An eminent Chriſtian Philoſopher argueth; (m) *Becauſe Men are made bleſſed by getting Beatitude, which Beatitude is Divinity it ſelf, it is manifeſt, that they are made bleſſed by acquiring Divinity. And as they are by the acquiſition of Juſtice made juſt, by the acquiſition of Wiſdom made wiſe: So by parity of reaſon they are neceſſarily made Gods by the acquiſition of Divinity. Every bleſſed one therefore is a God; for although there is by nature but one God, yet nothing hindreth but that by participation there may be very many.* Theſe Allegations from Learned Writers of the Chriſtian Church are therefore of great remark, becauſe they imply, that the *Excellence, Nobilitation* and *Perfection* of the Children, Sons and Saints of God as ſuch is of *the God-kind.* For they are not called Gods (as others are) meerly upon account of certain gradual reſemblances of the Deity, but on account of their kind; as appeareth from the Epithets and Appellatives uſual in profane Authors. (*n*) For this Appellative *the Sons of Mars* ſignifieth the *Martial-kind* of Men; and this Appellative *the Sons of Neptune* denoteth the Savage and Tyrannical kind of Men. So in Holy Writ the Wicked are intituled *Serpents, a Generation of Vipers, Devils and the Children of the Wicked One*, upon account of their kind, and to ſignifie, that they are a Serpentine and Viperous Brood and Race, *Diabolici generis, of the Diabolical kind.* When they are ſtiled *thoſe that are of the Devil, of their Father the Devil, of that Wicked One, born of the Will of the Fleſh, thoſe that are of the World, the Children of this World*; theſe Appellatives ſignifie what they are originally, and alſo of kind and quality (Diabolical, Carnal, Mundane;) therefore when the Holy People are ſtiled *thoſe that are of God, born or begotten of God, the Children of God* (and Gods,) theſe Appellatives denote, not only what they are originally, but of kind alſo, and that they are *Divini generis* (as *Arnobius* ſpeaketh,) of the Holy, Godly and Divine kind as God is, who is the Parental Head, Father and Founder of the holy Kind and Family, *Eph.* 3. 15. And as all genuine Chriſtians are thus far *Chriſts*, they are of kind and family *Chriſts*, or of the Chriſt-kind and Family, *(o)* whence they are called *Chriſts*, and S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *(p) He maketh us his Members, that we alſo might be Chriſts in him:* So all the Saints of God are thus far Gods; they are of kind and Family Gods, or of the God-kind and Family, for which reaſon they are denominated Gods by the ancient Writers; for by this Name they mean, that they are *the Sons of God.* They are denominated *Gods* upon account of their kind; and it is upon account of their kind, that they are a Race of *high ones above Men* (or Gods;) therefore their Name of *Gods* denoteth them, to be of the God-kind. They are called *Gods* (as the ancient Writers ſay,) becauſe they are born of God; and they are not born of him meerly as Men and other Animals are, that have their original from him by an equivocal Generation; but the Generation of the Children, Sons and Saints of God is thus far a propagation of kind; they are *θεῖον γένος, of God's Kind and Family, the Sons of the Divine Family that God is of.* Their Excellence and Nobilitation therefore is of the God-kind, becauſe it is of the Saint of God-kind; for to be the Saints and Sons of God, and to be Gods, are identical Expreſſions with the ancient Writers: Who are Authorities ſufficiently great, to warrant us, to call the Saint of God-kind of Nobilitation and Perfection *The God-kind of Nobilitation and Perfection.* And in all reaſon it ought to be ſo called becauſe of its *Creature-tranſcendence ſpecifical*; for Sanctity belongeth not to any Creature, Man or Angel as ſuch; and it conſtituteth every one in whom it is found, *one of the God-kind and Family, either God or a Child of God.* If it be in any one in the Creature-tranſcendent degree, ſuch an one muſt neceſſarily be God in the ſtrictly Religious Senſe (an Object of Religious Worſhip;) but the Saints have it not in the Creature-tranſcendent degree, and therefore are not in this ſenſe Gods.

(y) *Deifica diſciplina.* p. 191. Ed. Pamel.

(z) *Quantum in ipſo eſt, omnibus dixit hominibus, Dii eſtis, & filii excelſi omnes.* Petav. T. 4. l. 13. c. 2. S. 10.

(a) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 8. S. 2.*

(b) *Ut homines Deos faceret, factus homo.* In Feſt. Corp. Chriſt. Lect. 4.

(c) *V. H. Dodwell. Proleg. Apol. præfix. J. Stearn. libell. de obſtinat. S. 63. p. 264.*

(d) *Si quis ſanctus eſt, Deus efficitur.* Com. in Pſal. 115.

(e) *Salvator habitu inventus eſt homo, ut nos Dii fieremus ex hominibus.* 2 Com. ad Galat. 4.

(f) *J. Mart. paran. p. 40. Theophil. ad Autol. p.* 101, 103. *S. Baſil. adv. Eunom. l. 2. p.* 41. *Gr. Naz. or.* 42. *p.* 680. *Voſſ. not. in S. Greg. Thaumaturg. p.* 127.

(g) *Quis niſi Deus poteſt eſſe filius Dei?*

(h) *Ille deificat, qui per ſeipſum, non alterius participatione Deus eſt. Qui autem juſtificat, ipſe deificat, quia juſtificando filios Dei facit. ſi Filii Dei facti ſumus, & Dii facti ſumus.* Enarr. in Pſal. 49.

(i) *Primi parentes evecti fuerunt ad eam dignitatem, ut eſſent filii Dei & Dii quidam, id eſt, divinæ conſortes naturæ.* T. 4. de Grat. 1. Hom. c. 6. ſub fin.

(k) *Notemus hunc eſſe Evangelii finem, ut aliquando Deo conformes reddamur, id verò eſt quaſi Deificari.* In 2. Ep. Petri c. 1. v. 4.

(l) *Ut in his nos filios ejus, veroſque Deos præſtemus.* In Rom. 2. Concil. 2. p. 120.

(m) *Quoniam beatitudinis adeptione fiunt homines beati, beatitudo vero eſt ipſa divinitas, divinitatis adeptione beatos fieri, manifeſtum eſt. Sed uti juſtitiæ adeptione juſti, ſapientiæ ſapientes fiunt, ita divinitatem adeptos Deos fieri, ſimili ratione neceſſe eſt. omnis igitur Beatus Deus; ſed natura quidem unus, participatione verò nihil prohibet eſſe quàm plurimos.* Boeth. de conſol. Phil. l. 3. p. 157.

(n) *Dr. Hamm. in Matt.* 5. 9.

(o) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 33

(p) *Faciens nos membra ut in illo & nos Chriſti eſſemus.* Enar. 2. Pſal. 26.

V. The ſecond part of our expanded Idea repreſenteth God *as politically and ſocietively The Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate* (or Sovereignty,) *and that he is of proper kind ſuch.* Which Notices of God are not ſhaded with ſuch obſcurity, but that they are clearly intelligible and evidently true, as if written by a Sun-beam: For (according to his Idea) God is *the Sovereignty Creature-tranſcendent and over the whole Univerſe*; which implieth, that the Univerſe of Rationals are or ought to be his Subjects in a Society or Polity, and conſequently he is of right the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate. If any number of theſe Rationals are actually in the State of Society with God as their Sovereign, he is actually their God politically and ſocietively, and is in fact the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate. The true God is the Deity or Sovereignty of the true Sanctity or Religion, of which the Holy Empire is the Region and Comprehenſion; therefore the true God is of the Holy Empire as the Imperial Eſtate thereof ſocietively and politically. So the Scripture repreſenteth God as *the Church's Sovereignty* (the ſame with the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate,) which is a neceſſary conſequence from his Idea, that repreſenteth him as a Sovereignty: For if he is properly a Sovereignty or Kingdom-eſtate, he is neceſſarily *the Imperial Eſtate of his own Empire* (politically and ſocietively ſuch) which Empire of his is *the Church, the Church being the Church of God.* The Old Teſtament proclaimeth (p) *& eſſe principem mundi & unius electionem gentis, both the exiſtence of a Prince of the World and the election of one Nation, to be the People of God:* For God was *an Extrinſic Imperial Head, an Extra-ſocietive Lord and King* as to the Heathen World; but to *Iſrael* (the Holy-popular Commonwealth) he was an Eſtate of Sovereignty ſocietively and politically, an Intrinſick Imperial Head conſtitutive of their Polity. The State of *Iſrael* inferreth the Conſtitution of the Catholick Church, which partly reigneth in Heaven, and partly ſojourneth on Earth (of which *Iſrael* was a Type,) that it conſiſteth of God's People as the Subjects and Citizens, and that God is an Intrinſick Sovereignty the Imperial Eſtate thereof. Whence in the New Teſtament he is intituled *the King of Saints, Apoc.* 15. 3. which Attribute ſpeaketh him to be *the Church-Sovereignty*, according to that of S. *Auſtin*; (q) *Ex quo vocantur Sancti, eſt Eccleſia in terra: There is a Church on Earth from the time that Men are called Saints.* The Saints or Holy People are of definitive Notion *the God-ſocietiſts*, whereby they are in the ſtate of Religion and Sanctity, and are diſtinguiſh'd from the Atheous, the Common, Profane and Exotick People, that are no People, but are in the ſtate of Aliens and Enemies, whereas the Saints (or the Holy People) are in the ſtate of Alliance and Society with God as the Subjects and Citizens of his Empire and Commonwealth (the Holy Commonwealth,) as his Domeſticks, the Children and Servants of his Family. They are his Liege-people and he is their God, *Eph.* 2. 12, 13, 19. *Rom.* 9. 25. *Heb.* 8. 10. *Apoc.* 22. 3. They are therefore of the ſame Polity, City and Kingdom that God is of as the Imperial Eſtate thereof, the Divine Majeſty is the Political Head of their Illuſtrious Republick, *Heb.* 12. 22, 23. *Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the City of the living God, the Heavenly Jeruſalem; and to an innumerable Company of Angels, to the general Aſſembly and Church of the Firſt-born, which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all.* The Nature of the thing (as well as the Tenour of Holy Scripture) plainly ſheweth, that God is ſocietively and politically of the Holy Empire as the Imperial Eſtate thereof.

Act. 20. 28. 1 *Cor.* 15. 9. *Gal.* 1. 13. 1 *Tim.* 3. 5. 15.

As there are ſeveral Empires and Sovereignties; ſo every one of them is of its proper kind. And as he that is an *Humane Empire's, the Papal Empire's, the Diabolical Empire's, the Chriſtian Empire's* Sovereignty is that kind of Empire's Imperial Eſtate: So God is the *holy kind of Empire's* Imperial Eſtate. A like Judgment alſo muſt be made of his ſpecific and individual Determination as of other Imperial Eſtates. For if God is (ſocietively and politically) a Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate, he is neceſſarily a kind of Sovereignty (an Imperial Eſtate which is of his proper kind) as other Sovereignties are of their proper kind. And as the Chriſtian Empire's Sovereignty (that kind of Sovereignty) is the ſame with *the Chriſt-kind of Sovereignty* (Chriſt in Sovereignty ſocietively and politically being the Chriſtian Empire's Sovereignty:) as the Diabolical Empire's Sovereignty (that kind of Sovereignty) is the ſame with the Devil-kind of Sovereignty (the Devil in Sovereignty ſocietively and politically being the Diabolical Empire's Sovereignty:) So the Holy Empire's Sovereignty (that kind of Sovereignty) is the ſame with the God-kind of Sovereignty, God in Sovereignty ſocietively and politically being the Holy Empire's Sovereignty. He is of proper kind the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate, as Chriſt is of proper kind the Chriſtian Empire's Imperial Eſtate, as the Devil is of proper kind the Diabolical Empire's Imperial Eſtate, as the Pope is of proper kind the Papal Empire's Imperial Eſtate. The Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate is the ſame with *the Holy Imperial Name and Honour* and with *the Holy kind of Sovereignty*, which God of proper kind is, as is plain from the Notion of *Holineſs* (which is the God-kind of Excellence,) and may be illuſtrated from the Nature and Notion of his Kingdom. (r) *His Kingdom, I ſay, which is ſuch according to Cognation (not according to meer Creation) which is peculiar to him, becauſe it is like unto him in Holineſs, and as it were Homogeneal, not that which only by Creation belongeth to him.* As Chriſtians becauſe they are of kind and quality Chriſtian, are of kin, and as it were Homogeneal to Chriſt; which inferreth, that he is of proper kind the *Chriſtian* or *Chriſtian Empire's* Sovereignty: So the Saints becauſe they are of kind and quality *Sancti* or the Holy, are of kin and as it were homogeneal to God; which inferreth, that he is of proper kind *the Holy or Holy Empire's* Sovereignty. He is no ſuch kind of Sovereignty as a God (no God-kind of Sovereignty,) if he is not a Sovereignty of Sanctity and Religion; therefore as he is God (the true God) the truly God-kind of Sovereignty, he is the Sovereignty of true Religion and Sanctity; and conſequently he is of proper kind *the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate.* He is ſo in relation and in actual Society and Polity ſince the Univerſe was conſtituted; and he was ſo without Relation and without actual Society and Polity before the Univerſe was conſtituted (from Eter-

(p) *S. Hilar. enar. in Pſal.* 61.

(q) *In Pſal.* 128.

(r) *Regnum in quam,* τὸ κατ᾽ οἰκείωσιν, *non* τὸ κατὰ δημιουργίαν, *quod illi propter ſanctitatis ſimilitudinem peculiare eſt, & quaſi germanum: non quod ſolo creationis ad eum jure pertinet.* Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 3. S. 15.

nity,) as appeareth from what we have diſcours'd of his Dominion and Sovereignty from Eternity. Thus far we have inveſtigated what God of proper kind is.

VI. Chriſt (the Chriſtian Empire's Imperial Eſtate) may be fitly and definitively denominated *The Chriſtianity Imperial as a Sovereignty, The Sovereignty thereof:* And in the ſame ſenſe God (the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate) may be fitly and definitively denominated *The Sanctity Imperial as a Sovereignty, the Sovereignty thereof.* For as Chriſt's Religion is the Inſtitution of a Polity, which is Chriſtianity Imperial; ſo God's Religion is the Inſtitution of a Polity, which is Sanctity Imperial. As the Chriſtian Empire is the Comprehenſion of all Chriſtians and of their Chriſtianity Imperial: So the Holy Empire is the Comprehenſion of all Saints and of their Sanctity Imperial. Popery Imperial is the Pope's ſpecific Comprehenſion, and Sanctity Imperial is God's ſpecific Comprehenſion. It is the Comprehenſion, that he is of (Societively and Politically) as the Imperial Head thereof; and it is the Comprehenſion of his kind of things and perſons, his imperial kind of things and perſons. The Pope is Popery Imperial as his kind of thing, his Imperial kind of thing; and God is Sanctity Imperial as his kind of thing, his Imperial kind of thing (the God-kind of thing) and the thing of which *he is politically and of kind the Imperial Eſtate and Sovereignty.* Popery Imperial on our part is to the Pope his Kingdom, Intereſt and Eſſence Imperial; and with due limitation of Senſe it muſt be ſaid, that Chriſtianity and Sanctity on our part is unto Chriſt and unto God his Kingdom, Intereſt and Eſſence Imperial; thereby he is actually in his Imperial Eſtate and hath the Glory of the Kingdom, enjoyeth and exerciſeth his Sovereign Prerogatives, ruleth and reigneth, adminiſtreth Government, and receiveth the Tribute of Honour and Service according to the mode of Society and Polity. And this ſtate of things is ſuch *an Eſſence or Being Imperial*, as Imperial Eſtates have in Society and Polity. His being *actually* Imperial ſocietively and politically is actual Sanctity Imperial on our part; and his being *jurally* Imperial (ſocietively and politically) which is his eſſential right and due, is Sanctity Imperial on our part by way of Law and Obligation. God is therefore fitly denominated *The Sanctity Imperial* (the Sovereignty that is Sanctity Imperial) for many reaſons, and he ought to be ſo denominated for theſe additional reaſons.

(1.) To ſignifie what a God-kind of Sovereignty is true or falſe; for the Empire of ſuch a Sovereignty is conſtituted an Empire (an Imperial Polity) by a Religion or a Sanctity. An Imperial Polity may be Religious, yet not an Imperial Polity of Religion ſtrictly ſo called; for ſuch it is not, unleſs a Religion maketh it a Polity. *Livy* ſaith of *Rome* Pagan, *Nulla unquam Reſpublica vel major vel ſanctior, never was there a Republick of more Greatneſs or of greater Sanctity.* If we ſuppoſe the *Roman* Empire, to have been of this Character, it was a Religious Imperial Polity, yet a Religion did not make it a Polity; it was but a Civil kind of Polity (which muſt be *Religious*) not a Polity conſtituted ſuch by Religion, which is God-ſociety. But the Pagans Imperial Polity was no Civil kind of Polity, it was an Imperial Polity made ſuch by a Religion (called *Religio deorum immortalium*:) The *Muhammedan* Empire is an Imperial Polity of Religion (made by a Religion called *Iſlamiſmus*;) ſuch is the Chriſtian and ſuch is the Papal Empire; but the *Judaical* Polity was of both kinds, both a Civil kind of Polity and an Imperial Polity of Religion made by the Religion of *Judaiſm.* (s) *Iſrael* was in the ſtate of Society with God both as a Civil-ſocietive King, and as the King of an Imperial Polity of Religion (ſo God was to them a God, and they were to him a People,) which is the Nature and Conſtitution of the Holy Empire. It is an Imperial Polity made ſuch by a Religion or Sanctity.

(s) V. Spencer. diſſ. de Theocrat. Jud. c. 1.

(2.) To ſignifie what his God-kind of Sovereignty is, that it is *the genuine Saint of God-kind of Sovereignty* and the true Sanctity Imperial. All Religions have their Saintiſts real or imaginary; and if Satan's Empire is an Imperial Polity of Religion, he hath his Saintiſts and his Sanctity, ſuch as the Pagan Theologers magnifie. (t) Κεφάλαιον τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἡ περὶ θεοὺς ὁσιότης, *The Head of Virtues is Sanctity about the Gods.* The Pagans Religion was an Inſtitution of their Sanctity Imperial.

(t) Gale in Jambl. p. 280.

(3.) To ſignifie, that he is on his part ſuch Sanctity Imperial, which peculiarly belongeth to the Imperial and Governing Party; whereas Sanctity Imperial on our part is ſuch as belongeth to the Subject and Servient Party, which is thus defin'd by *Clemens*, (u) ὁσιότης ἡ θεραπεία τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sanctity is the worſhip of God.*

(u) Strom. l. 4. p. m. 3[illegible]

VII. God muſt be definitively denominated *The Sanctity Vital*; for Vital Sanctity is *The Divine Vital Nature, The Saint of God-kind of Nature, The God-kind of Nature*; therefore he is Vital Sanctity it ſelf (or Vital Sanctity primary, original, eſſential and in infinite fulneſs) as *his kind of conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence.* Our uſual Theology reckoneth *Life* amongſt the Attributes of God, and is careful, to inform us, that God is alive and living; but proceedeth not to conſider, what kind of Life it is, that *God is and liveth*, which is a monſtrous defect in Theology. Many Scholaſtick Divines allow not *Sanctity* a place amongſt the Divine Attributes (which they treat of,) it is not reckon'd one of the Number, nor maketh a Figure in their Accounts of the Divine Eſſence and Attributes; yet ſome of theſe (*in tranſitu* and by the way) have ſpoken excellent things touching the holy Life of God. (w) *The Divinity is Grace it ſelf, or Sanctity, whereby God is Holy. The Divinity is Sanctity it ſelf. Man is gilded; God is Gold: That which is Grace in Man, is Nature in God.* The Schools commonly ſay, (x) *Sanctifying Grace* (Vital Sanctity) *is a participation of the Divine Nature.* The Divine Nature is neceſſarily *the Divine Vital Nature* (as the Animal Nature is neceſſarily the Animal-vital Nature,) which muſt be Vital Sanctity, if Vital Sanctity in Man is a participation of it. Where there is ſomething of Grace and Holineſs, there is ſomething of God; if there be nothing of Grace and Holineſs in a Man, there is nothing of God (no God-kind of thing, nothing of that which is of God as to kind and quality;) therefore Vital Sanctity is his proper kind of thing, and that which he of proper kind is, as Chriſt is Vital Chriſti-

(w) *Divinitas ipſa gratia eſt, ſive ſanctitas, qua Deus ſanctus eſt.* Petav. T. 4. par. [illegible] c. 7. S. 4. *Divinitas ipſa ſanctitas eſt.* Ibid. p. 134. *Homo deauratus eſt: Deus aurum eſt; quod in homine gratia eſt, in Deo natura eſt.* Idem de Trin. l. [illegible] c. 4. S. 10.

(x) *Gratia ſanctificans eſt divinæ naturæ participatio.* Aquin. 122. Qu. 110. Art. 3. Conc. Clyp. Theol. Thom. T. [illegible] p. 632.

Chriſtianity. In making us Holy, he maketh *us partakers of his Holineſs*; therefore he is Holineſs (without want of Holineſs) in himſelf and to us. (y) *Sibi qui eſt ipſa ſanctitas, quodammodo ſimiles nos reddit: He maketh us in ſome ſort like himſelf, who is Holineſs it ſelf.* He is Holineſs, as he is of God-kind and quality (as a Saint of God is holy, as he is of Saint of God-kind and quality,) whence Grace and Holineſs is look'd upon by Divines as another kind of Communication than common Excellencies, and as ſuch is uſually called *a Stream from that Fountain, a Beam from that Sun, Light and Life flowing from that Eternal Light and Life, the beaming forth of his Glory, a Sparkle of the Divinity, the Radiancy of the Divinity, a Ray of his Eternal Excellency.* The holy Vitaliſts are peculiarly thoſe *that are of God originally, and of Kind, Quality and Family*; they are of his Family, his Children and Sons, and are born and begotten of him in reſpect of their Vital Sanctity; therefore *he is the Holy and Divine Vitaliſt, who is Vital Sanctity.* Becauſe they are come out of their Vital Carnality and Wickedneſs, and dwell in *Vital Sanctity, Holineſs and Godlineſs*, therefore they are ſaid, *to dwell in God and to have God dwelling in them*; which ſpeaketh him, to be Vital Sanctity in himſelf and to us. And as he is the Original, ſo he is the Pattern and Exemplar of Holy Vitaliſts and of Vital Sanctity: For the buſineſs and deſign of true Religion is our Aſſimilation to God (*ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ*) ſuch an Aſſimilation (z) which conſiſteth in being Holy as he is Holy. He is the Archetype according to which the Holy Vitaliſts (who are Tranſcripts from that Divine Copy) are moulded and faſhion'd; (a) every ſanctify'd Soul is ἄγαλμα θεῖον ϗ Θεῷ προσεμφερὲς, *a Divine Statue like unto God*; and it is Vital Sanctity that conſtituteth ſanctify'd Souls; this therefore is the Nature of God. The holy Vitaliſts as ſuch are his live Images, as Children are of a Father. Children have (b) ὁμοιότητα φυσικήν, *a ſimilitude of Nature to their Father*; therefore the Divine Vital Nature which is in the Regenerate Children of God, is likeneſs to God (to his Divine Vital Nature;) their Child of God-kind of Nature being his Vital Image and Effigies, ſheweth, that Vital Sanctity is the Nature of God as his kind of Nature, and that Holineſs and Godlineſs is his kind of thing, as the Orientals mode of ſpeaking implieth; for when any one hath put on Holineſs and Godlineſs, he is ſaid to be (c) *Indutus Deo, one that hath put on God.* If God is not devoid of the only true and genuine kind of Virtue, he muſt be *Vital Sanctity*; his Virtue muſt be of the ſame legitimate kind with that of his Regenerate Children; ſo far we muſt grant what *Cicero* and others affirm, (d) *Virtus eadem in Homine ac in Deo eſt, Virtue is the ſame in Man and in God.* If Holineſs was not his Specific Nature, Holineſs in Man could not be a participation of the Divine Nature, no more than the deriving common Excellencies and Perfections from God (Arts, Parts and Power) is a participation of it. Theſe are the Vile and Godleſs kind of Goods and Excellencies (*dona Dei ſine Deo,*) that are on this ſide Sanctity and Godlineſs (which is Godlikeneſs;) they are no Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies; and if they cannot conſtitute a Saint of God, they cannot conſtitute him a God. His being God implieth, that he is his own kind of Goods and Excellencies as ſuch, the Holy and Divine kind of Goods and Excellencies (as Chriſt is the Chriſtian kind of Goods and Excellencies,) which alone are the choice kind of Goods and Excellencies and of ineſtimable Pretioſity. The Humane and Mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies (without the Sovereign and Peerleſs Excellencies that are in Sanctity) can make no Man truly excellent; they are vile in themſelves, and they ſave none from their Vileneſs; but they that have them are *the Vile Perſons* (for the Unholy are the Vile, of vile Eſtimation not of Pretioſity,) and though they ſpeak with the Tongues of Men and Angels, yet in juſt valuation and in God's account they are nothing, 1 *Cor.* 13. 1, 2. None can be unvile till they be ſanctify'd; therefore a God muſt be Vital Sanctity, and he muſt be ſo of proper kind.

His Vital Sanctity of proper kind ſuch appeareth from his vital (and therefore deadly) antipathy againſt all Sin and Wickedneſs (and the wicked ſinning kind;) and from theſe Scriptural Notices, that *God is Light* (the Light that Vital Sanctity is, 1 *Joh.* 2. 9, 10, 11.) and *God is Love*, the holy Love-nature and Practice. God is Love as his kind of Nature and Eſſence, and in ſuch ſenſe Love is God, (e) as S. *Auſtin* affirmeth. As it is in God, it is αὐτὸς ὁ Θεός, *God himſelf*, that which he of proper kind is (and therefore characteriſtical and diſtinctive of him;) and this Love in Man is ſo far God, as is ſomething of that which he is as his proper kind of thing, as the Apoſtle plainly declareth, 1 *Joh.* 4. 7, 8. *Beloved, let us love one another, for Love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God* (he is an Alien) *for God is Love.* The Love that God of proper kind is, is neceſſarily *the God-kind, the Saint of God-kind of Love*, the ſame kind of Love which dwelleth in regenerate Souls, and which is *Divine Charity*, (f) the ſame thing with Vital Sanctity; for Vital Sanctity (poſitively) is the pure ſinleſs kind of Love, that knoweth no Evil, but is perfectly oppoſite thereto. God is therefore Vital Sanctity, becauſe he is the holy kind of Love, which is his proper Vital *Species*, Specific Nature and Difference, his Divine kind of Nature (the God-kind of Nature) and the Divine Family's Nature (their kind of Nature,) which conſtituteth, denominateth and diſtinguiſheth thoſe that are of that Family, the holy Angels from the Devils, the Saints above from the Infernal Ghoſts (without it the Saints would be Devils,) and if God himſelf was devoid of it, he would be a Godleſs kind of God, a vile and villainous kind of Being and indeed an Almighty Devil. The Divine Charity (the Life of Grace and Holineſs) is in Man, (g) *Pulchritudo animæ, the Pulchritude of the Soul* (perfect Love is perfect Lovelineſs) God is therefore Vital Sanctity as his Divine Beauty. And he is it as his Divine Luminouſneſs and Clarity; (h) *for he that is regenerate, is always in the Light. Do you not think, that he is in the Light, who hath Chriſt's Charity abiding in him? whence the Apoſtle* Paul *knew no Night?* By this Apoſtle Vital Sanctity (both as it is in God and in Man) is called *the Life of God*, and the Schools ſay, It is both the Life of Grace and of Glory. (i) *Grace is nothing elſe but a certain Inchoation of Glory in us.* As it is in the Saints of God it is a Divine Nature

diſtinct

(h) *Qui renatur, ſemper in luce eſt, an tibi non videtur in luce, qui Chriſti in ſe continet charitatem? unde nec Paulus Apoſtolus noctem ſciebat.* S. Ambroſ. Enar. in Pſal. 43

(i) *Gratia nihil aliud eſt quam quædam inchoatio gloriæ in nobis.* Aquin. 22æ. Qu. 24. Art. 3.

(y) *Piſcator in Heb.* 12. 10.

1 *Joh.* 3. 9, 10. and 4. 6. and 5. 19. *Joh.* 1. 13. 1 *Joh.* 3. 9. and 2. 29. and 5. 1. 18. 1 *Joh.* 3. 24. and 4. 15, 16.

(z) Annot. in Boeth. de Conſ. Phil. p. 35, &c.

(a) Clem. Strom. l. 7. p. m. 529.

(b) Procl. in Tim. p. [illegible]

(c) [illegible] p. 27. [illegible]

(d) [illegible] Not. in Orig. c. Cels. p. 52.

[illegible] in Dei [illegible] Lactant.

Pſal. 15. 4. 1 *Tim.* 1. 9. 2 *Tim.* 3. 2.

1 *Joh.* 1. 5. and 4. 16.

(e) *De Verb. Apoſt. Ser.* 13.

(f) *V. Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. *c.* 12. *S.* 5. & 10.

(g) *S. Aug. Expoſ. in Ep.* 1. *Johan. Tr.* 9.

diſtinct from their human Nature; and as it is in God, it muſt be conſider'd as his *Divine vital Eſſence* diſtinct from his Metaphyſical or Scholaſtick Eſſence; for as the Nature of a Saint is of a twofold conſideration, ſo is the Eſſence of God. If in our accounts of his Eſſence and Attributes we attribute to him no other *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs* but what is on this ſide vital Sanctity, we attribute to him nothing more than *the Fool's kind of Wiſdom*, and nothing better than *the bad kind of Goodneſs*. God can be no leſs holy than the holy Spirit, of whom S. *Baſil* ſaith, (*k*) τῷ μὲν φύσις ἡ ἁγιωσύνη, *his Nature is Sanctity*; and therefore he is not of *a Nature that can fall and change*. In the three Hypoſtaſes (of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt) ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμὸς θεωρεῖται, *we contemplate Sanctity which is by Nature*, and which is not ἐπιγεννηματική, *additional to Nature and Eſſence*. We may add, that in God vital Sanctity is *Sempiterna Vitalitas*, *Sempiternal Vitality*, and that thoſe holy Souls, in which it reſideth, *have eternal Life abiding in them.*

VIII. God who is of proper kind (or in reſpect of his Idea as Specific) *the Sanctity Imperial*, and *the Sanctity Vital*, is alſo *the Sanctity Imperial-perſonal*, and muſt be ſo denominated becauſe of *the Holineſs of his Name*, which is the moſt celebrated and illuſtrious, and yet the moſt obſcure of all his Attributes. Nor is it only obſcure in the common Senſe of Language (becauſe it is of difficult Contemplation,) but in the Senſe of Nobility-Learning; for although in the Scripture-Theology it is of all the Divine Attributes the moſt illuſtrious and refulgent, yet there is little appearance of it in the Theology of the Chriſtian Church, nor hath it made any great figure in it ever ſince the Apoſtles times; which muſt be attributed to the indiſcreet Introduction of the Pagan Scholaſticiſm into the Church. The ancient Fathers knew little of it, the Schoolmen treat not of it, Divines uſually (although they treat of the Divine Eſſence and Attributes) either take no notice of it, or if any take notice of it, they have no notion of it, or fall ſhort of the true notion of it, as the Hebrew Doctors do at a great rate. For they ſay; (*l*) *The Epithet Holy ſignifieth him, to be more Holy and Sublime than that any of the Properties of the Creatures can be apply'd to him, and if he be called by them, it is improperly and metaphorically. Therefore Iſaiah heard it innumerable times ingeminated Holy, Holy, Holy*, Iſa. 6. 3. *The Reaſon is, becauſe he is ſo Holy and Sublime, that no Pollution of that People, among whom his glory dwelleth, can reach him.* But this cannot be the Holineſs of the Name of God; and therefore this Notion of the Rabbins is like themſelves alien and afar off. They add, that by the Epithet Holy is ſignified *that which is Spiritual, wherein there can be nothing of corporeity, and in which there is nothing of thoſe things, which are in Bodies, as our wiſe Men ſay.* Their great concern is to remove from God all corporeity, and therefore they preſcribe to their Devotioniſts, (*m*) *to exalt, ſanctifie and magnifie him from every thing corporeal*; as if Incorporeity or Spirituality in the common Philoſophical Senſe, which is not properly a Divine Attribute (being common to created Spirits both good and bad) was the ſame with the Holineſs of God. With this Attribute ſome Divines are ſo unacquainted, that they have no Notion at all of *the Holineſs of the Name of God* (as it muſt be called for diſtinction ſake,) but confound it with vital Sanctity thus defining it. (*n*) *It is the infinite rectitude and perfection of the Will of God, whereby he doth Will and Work all things ſuitable to the infinite Excellency of his own Being.* Others have ſome Notion of this Divine Attribute, but it is ſcarce better than none at all. (*o*) *A thing is ſaid to be Holy, when it is ſeparated from common uſe to the ſervice of God. In this regard the Lord our God is Holy; for from all Eternity he was ſeparated from all other Objects to himſelf, to love himſelf, to take delight in himſelf. God is dedicated to himſelf from everlaſting, he is all for himſelf.* This rude miſtaken Idea of this Divine Attribute may contribute (in ſome degree) to a right interpretation of the meaning of others in their definitive Notices of it. (*p*) *The Holineſs of the firſt Being conſiſteth in his ſeparation from all Creatures by that Tranſcendency which maketh him their End.* (*q*) *Sanctitas divina ſignificat tranſcendentiſſimam ejus excellentiam & magiſtatem ejus eſſentialem.* (*r*) *He is called Holy, as he is tranſcendently above and ſeparated from all the Creatures, in compariſon of whom the Heavens are not clean, and from whom all things ſtand at an infinite diſtance.* Theſe definitive Notices are rather a general Idea of God than juſt Notices of his Holineſs. But others have made a greater approach to the true notion of it. (*s*) *The word Holy us'd concerning God often ſignifieth the ſame with auguſt, venerable, inviolable, as other learn'd Men have obſerv'd before us. Which ſignification it hath eſpecially in ſuch places, where God is called, not ſimply Holy, but the holy One of ſome other, as for inſtance of* Iſrael, *which Name is given him as often elſewhere, ſo moſt often in* Iſaiah. *The holy One of* Iſrael *therefore ſeemeth to ſignifie the auguſt and venerable Numen of* Iſrael, *glorious and full of Majeſty. Whence one of the Modern Interpreters rendreth it more than once the auguſt One of* Iſrael. *So* Habakkuk *calleth him his holy One, that is, his only colendous and venerandous One. In the ſame ſignification the word ſeems to be taken, when in Scripture often the Name of God is ſaid to be Holy, ſo that holy Name is the ſame with auguſt and venerandous.* (*t*) *The word Holy denoteth that Majeſty, which is conſpicuous in all kind of Excellence, namely, in the higheſt Wiſdom and Power, and ſupreme Dominion over all, whence God is worthy of all kind of Praiſe and Worſhip. So that Holy is often the ſame with Great, verendous and venerandous. Which kind of Holineſs the ſacred Writers attribute to God, when they call him the holy One of* Iſrael, *or his Name Holy. For the holy One of* Iſrael *is the ſame with that venerandous Numen of his, who alone was to be worſhipped by* Iſrael. *And the Name of God is called Holy, becauſe it is to be in-*

vok'd

(k) *C. Eunom. l.* 3. *p.* 81, 83.

(m) Coſri p. 181.

(n) Mr. *Jer. Burroughs Ser. on Exod.* 1. 5.

(o) Mr. *Larkham of the Attrib. p.* 48.

(p) Mr. *Baxter Reaſ. of the Chriſt Rel. Par.* 1. c. 5.

(q) *Idem Meth. Theol. Par.* 1. c. 2. p. 39.

(r) *Idem of the Knowledge of God. c.* 8.

(s) *Crellius de Deo & ejus Attribut. c.* 25.

(l) קדש *Sanctus cognomen eſt, quo ſignificatur Ipſum Sanctiorem eſſe & Sublimiorem, quàm ut proprietas aliqua creaturarum ei adæquari poſſit, & ſi illis appellctur, id fieri per tranſlationem ſeu metaphoricè. Ideo audivit Eſaias innumeris vicibus ingeminari Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus. Eſa.* 6 3. *Ratio, quia ipſe Sanctior & Sublimior eſt, quàm ut immunditia aliqua populi illius inter quos gloria ejus habitat, eum poſſit comprehendere. Hinc vidit eum ſuper ſolio excelſo & elevato. Ver.* 1. Per τὸ קדש *Sanctus enim intelligitur Spiritualis, qui non poteſt incorporari, & in quo nihil eorum exiſtit, quæ in corporibus exiſtunt, ut ſapientes noſtri aiunt.* Coſri p. 263, 264. Hotting. diſſ. de Nom. Dei or. p. 327.

(t) *Ea voce intelligitur Majeſtas illa, quæ in omni excellentiæ genere, ſumma ſcilicet in ſapientia, & potentia, ſummaque in omnia dominio cernitur. Quibus rebus fit, ut Deus omni laudis genere, omnique cultu dignus ſit. Ut ſanctum idem ſæpe valeat quod magnum, verendum & venerandum. Quale autem Sanctitatis genus Deo tribuunt Scriptores ſacri, quoties eum ſanctum Iſraelis, nomenve ejus ſanctum vocant. Nam ſanctus Iſraelis idem valet quod venerandum Numen ejus, qui Iſraeli unicê colendus erat. Denique nomen ſanctum dicitur, ut ſummâ reverentiâ invocandum. Id quod docet Davidis illud, confiteantur nomini tuo magno, quoniam terribile & ſanctum eſt. Quo in loco ſanctum idem eſt, quod venerandum & laude dignum.*

um. Dr. Outram de Sacrific. c. 1.

vok'd with the higheſt Reverence. As we learn from that of David, *let them Praiſe thy great Name, for it is terrible and holy. Where Holy is the ſame with venerandous and worthy of all praiſe.* But although this account of the Holineſs of God is in ſome degree commendaable, yet there are many defects in it (for it doth not explicate the Nature of Sanctity in general, not clearly diſtinguiſh the ſeveral kinds of it, nor the ſeveral acceptations of the Epithet *Holy*,) it only maketh a Lexicographer-like Interpretation of the word *Holy*, and this Interpretation is not very rightly made; for the Epithet Holy cannot ſignifie *meerly auguſt*, *venerandous*, *colendous*, but neceſſarily ſignifieth *religiouſly venerandous and colendous*.

A Divine of our own (in a Diatriba written on purpoſe) thus explicateth the Notion of *the Holineſs of God, and of ſanctifying his Name.* He obſerveth from the Hebrew Doctors (*u*) that every word of Sanctity imports a thing ſeparated or divided from other things by way of Exaltation and Pre-eminence. “ From the “ Scripture-notices of the holy Oyl, the holy “ Perfume, the holy People, this he obſerveth, “ that to be ſacred or holy, is to be ſeparated “ or ſet apart from other things by way of “ Excellence, or which is all one, to be ſet in “ ſome State of Singularity or Appropriatedneſs, “ whereby it is advanc'd above the com- “ mon condition of things of the ſame order. “ If Sanctity or Holineſs be a condition of “ diſcretion and diſtinction from other things, “ to ſanctfie, muſt either be, to put a thing in- “ to that State (which we call to Conſecrate,) “ or if it be ſuch already, to uſe and do unto “ it, as becometh the Sanctity thereof, that is, “ *Habere cum diſcrimine*, to put a difference be- “ tween it and other things by way of Ex- “ cellency or in a dignifying wiſe, by appro- “ priating it and ſevering it in the uſe there- “ of from things of ordinary and common “ Rank: Or which is all one, to uſe it ſingu- “ larly, appropriately, and in a word uncom- “ monly. Holineſs, which is original, abſo- “ lute and eſſential in God, is nothing elſe but “ the incommunicable Eminency of the Divine “ Majeſty, exalted above all and divided from “ all other ἀξιώματα, or Eminences whatſoever. “ For that which a Man taketh to be, and “ maketh account of as his God, he aſcribeth “ unto it in ſo doing a condition of Eminency “ above, and diſtinct from all other Eminences “ whatſoever, that is of Holineſs. Hence it “ cometh, that we find the God of *Iſrael* in “ Scripture ſo often ſtiled *the holy One of* “ Iſrael, that is, *Iſrael*'s moſt eminent and “ incommunicable one, or which is all one, his “ God. Thus as Holineſs in general imports “ a State of Eminency and Separation, ſo this “ of God diſagreeth not from that general No- “ tion; for it conſiſteth in a State of Peerleſs “ incommunicable Majeſty. But would you “ underſtand it yet better? Apply it then to “ his Attributes, whereby he is known unto “ us, and know, that *the Lord is Holy*, is as “ much as to ſay, he is a Majeſty of peerleſs “ Power, of peerleſs Wiſdom, of peerleſs Good- “ neſs, and ſo of the reſt. Such a one is our “ God, and ſuch is his Holineſs. Now, to “ ſanctifie this peerleſs Name or Majeſty of his, “ muſt be by doing unto him, according to “ that which his Holineſs challengeth in reſpect “ of the double importance thereof; namely, “ to ſerve and glorifie him becauſe of his E- “ minency; and to do it with a ſingular, ſe- “ parate and incommunicated Worſhip, becauſe “ he is Holy. Not to do the former, is Irre- “ ligion and Atheiſm, as not acknowledging “ God to be the chief and Sovereign Eminency: “ Not to obſerve the ſecond, is Idolatry. For “ as the Lord our God is a ſingular and peer- “ leſs Majeſty, diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted “ above all things and eminences elſe whatſo- “ ever: So muſt his Worſhip be ſingular, in- “ communicable, and proper to him alone. “ Thoſe who communicate the Worſhip given un- “ to him, with any beſides him, are deemed to “ deny his incomparable Sanctity, and there- “ fore are ſaid to Prophane his holy Name. In “ a word, all that whole immediate Duty and “ Service which we owe unto God, whether “ inward or outward, contain'd under the “ Name of Divine Worſhip (when either we “ confeſs, praiſe, pray unto, call upon or ſwear “ by his Name,) yea all the Worſhip both of “ Men and Angels, is nothing elſe but to ac- “ knowledge in Thought, Word and Work “ this peerleſs pre-eminence of his Power, of “ his Wiſdom, of his Goodneſs and other At- “ tributes, that is, his Holineſs, by aſcribing “ and giving unto him that which we aſcribe “ and give to none beſides him, that is, to “ ſanctifie his moſt holy Name. The ſumm of “ all that the four *animalia* did in ſinging the “ *Triſagium Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God Almighty*, “ was but to agnize his Sanctity or Holineſs.

(u) Mr. Mede on Matth. 6. 9.

IX. In this large Explication of the Holineſs of God and of ſanctifying his Name there are many and great miſtakes, ſome of which will be mention'd hereafter, at preſent we will remark theſe following.

(1.) This Explication confoundeth *Sanctity* and *Sacredneſs*, which are ſo diſtinct, that they are really ſeparable; for in all Kingdom-eſtates amongſt Men the imperial Perſon is in ſome degree *conſecrate*, *ſacred*, *inviolable*: But in the Kingdom-eſtate of God the imperial Perſon is not only *conſecrate*, *ſacred*, *inviolable*, but this Sacredneſs is complicated with *Sanctity* of the imperial Honour-perſon, of which there is nothing in human imperial Eſtates.

(2.) In this Explication the definitive Notion of Sanctity is not commenſurate to the thing defin'd. For if Sanctity doth conſiſt *in Diſcretion* and *Diſtinction* from other things by way of Exaltation and Pre-eminence, there can be no ſuch Species of Sanctity as *Sanctity vital.* But notwithſtanding this Objection the Author of this Explication affirmeth, *that all Notions of Sanctity and Sanctification in Scripture are deriv'd from Diſcretion and Separation, and that this now mention'd is likewiſe deriv'd thence. For it is a requiſite of that which is Holy, to be uſed in a peculiar and ſingular manner, and not as things common. Hence it is, that the obſervation of that peculiar and different form of Life, which God hath commanded thoſe whom he hath called and ſet apart from the World unto himſelf, in Scripture carrieth the Name of Holineſs or Sanctity.* But this Anſwer is extremely inſufficient; for the vital Sanctity of holy People is not only *a different form of Living*, but *a new Nature*, which is in its own Nature vital Sanctity, as corrupt Nature is vital Carnality and Wickedneſs. The one is vital foulneſs, ſordidneſs, horridneſs: The other is *the pure* and immaculate kind of Love, a vital *purity*, *brightneſs* and *beauteouſneſs* (perfectly oppoſite to all Wickedneſs,) which as ſuch is *vital Sanctity.* So *purity of Heart* as ſuch is vital Sanctity; ſo the Divine Nature in God (which is not a peculiar and different form of Life, that God hath commanded thoſe whom he hath called) is *Original* and *Eſſential* Sanctity (vital,) and the exemplar thereof. Sanctity therefore muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into *Sanctity of Purity* and *Sanctity of Dignity.* The holy Life and Nature is *Sanctity of Purity*: The State of Sanctity which *God's* People are in, and *the Holineſs of the Name of God* is *Sanctity of Dignity.* From which legitimate diſtribution of Sanctity it appeareth, *that Sanctity in general is not a diſcretion from other things by way of Exaltation and Pre-eminence.* This cannot be the definitive Notion thereof, if there be any ſuch Species of Sanctity as *Sanctity of Purity.*

(3.) As this definitive Notion of Sanctity is too narrow, to be the definition of Sanctity in general, becauſe it comprehendeth not that eminent Species thereof *Sanctity of Purity*: So it is too looſe and general to be the definitive Notion of that other Species of Sanctity, which is *Sanctity of Dignity*, and therefore it is not the definition either of Sanctity in general, or of any one Species thereof. For there are innumerable things and Perſons in common civil Society (which is on this ſide Sanctity) that have *a diſcretion and diſtinction from other things and perſons by way of Exaltation and Pre-eminence, and which are ſeparated and ſet apart from others by way of Excellence.* All Gentlemen, Noblemen, Magiſtrates, Judges, Kings eſpecially, their Life, Honour, Diadems, Edicts, Palaces (and many other things appertaining to them which in the declining time of the Empire were called ſacred) have a *diſcretion* and *ſeparation* from other things and perſons by way of *Excellence* and *Exaltation.* Their diſcretion and diſtinction is from *common* (vulgar) *things and perſons in a dignifying wiſe*, they are in a State of *Singularity* or *Appropriatedneſs*, they muſt be us'd *ſingularly, appropriately, uncommonly* (which is *habere cum diſcrimine, to ſever them in the uſe of them from things of ordinary and common Rank,*) and if this be not Sanctity, it cannot be legitimately defin'd meerly by *a diſcretion and diſtinction from other things* (which may be called *common* without relating to Religion) *by way of Excellence and Pre-eminence.* Things and perſons may be put into a State and Condition of *Diſcretion* and *Diſtinction* from others of ordinary and common Rank without any thing of Sanctity or Sanctification in the Scripture-Notion thereof. *R. Kimchi*'s definition therefore (as Mr. *Mede* calleth it) is not the definitive Notion of Sanctity: Nor is it ſafe, to rely upon the Authority of a Rabbi; for he is not ordinarily a Man of any great depth and reach of Thought.

(4.) From the Holineſs of the *holy People* and *holy Things* it cannot be inferr'd, that the Holineſs of God conſiſteth meerly *in being diſcriminated from and exalted above all*: But the contrary muſt be inferr'd; for the Holineſs of the holy People and the holy things doth not conſiſt meerly *in being diſcriminated from and exalted above all.* The holy People are a People ſeparated and ſet apart (a peculiar People,) they are in a State of *Diſcretion, Diſtinction* and *Separation*: But their Holineſs doth not conſiſt meerly in a State of *Diſtinction* and *Separation* from other People, but in being *ſeparated* and *ſet apart* for God, to be unto *him a People*, for God to Poſſeſs, Uſe and Enjoy, according to that uſual Maxim *quicquid ſanctum eſt, Deo ſanctum eſt, whatever is Holy, is Holy unto God. Ye ſhall be Holy unto me; for I have ſevered you from other People, that ye ſhould be mine.* Lev. 20. 24, 26. The holy People are in a State of *Exaltation* and *Pre-eminence* above other People: But their Holineſs doth not conſiſt in *a meer Exaltedneſs* and *Pre-eminence* above other People: But in being *the peculiar People of God*, which is an eſpecial kind of *Exaltedneſs* and *Pre-eminence* above other People. *Deut.* 26. 18, 19. *The Lord hath avouch'd thee this day to be his peculiar People, —— and to make thee high above all Nations in Praiſe, in Name and in Honour, and that thou mayeſt be an holy People unto the Lord thy God.* The holy People therefore are *diſcriminated from and exalted* above all *People*: But meerly in this their Holineſs doth not conſiſt; if it did, the old *Romans* muſt rather be intituled the holy People than the old *Iſrael* of God. The ſame account muſt be given of the Holineſs of things (of the holy Oyl, the holy Perfume) as of Perſons; they were *diſcriminated from and exalted above all other things* of the ſame Name: But meerly in this their Holineſs did not conſiſt; therefore the Holineſs of God doth not conſiſt *meerly in being diſcriminated from and exalted above all.*

(5.) To prove, that the Holineſs of God conſiſteth meerly *in being diſcriminated from and exalted above all*, this Explication alledgeth a Reaſon, which is utterly devoid of Truth and Reaſon. *The firſt Original or abſolute Holineſs* (ſaith this Explication) *is nothing elſe but the incommunicable Eminency of the Divine Majeſty, exalted above all, and divided from all other Eminences whatſoever. For that which a Man taketh to be, and maketh account of as his God (whether it be ſuch indeed, or by him fanſied only,) he aſcribeth unto it in ſo doing, a condition of Eminency above, and diſtinct from all other Eminences whatſoever, that is, of Holineſs.* The ſenſe of this Propoſition is not, that whoſoever duly taketh the true God for his God, doth aſcribe unto him a condition of Eminency above and diſtinct from all other Eminences whatſoever (which is his Sovereignty in reality and in our due Eſtimation;) for this Senſe is not to the purpoſe of proving the foregoing Notion of the Holineſs of God, nor do the Terms of the Propoſition admit of this Senſe. But three things this Propoſition may be underſtood to affirm, which are groſly abſurd. *Firſt, That whatever a Man taketh to be, and maketh account of as his God (whether it be ſuch indeed or by him fanſied only,) he aſcribeth unto it in ſo doing a condition of Eminency above and diſtinct from all other Gods whatſoever* (which are Eminences real or fanſied,) ſo that there never was, nor can be, any ſuch thing as ſuppos'd ſubordinate Deities. *Secondly*, This Propoſition may be underſtood to affirm, *that whatever a Man taketh to be, and maketh account of as his God (whether it be ſuch indeed, or by him fanſied only,) he aſcribeth unto it in ſo doing a condition of Eminency as to Honour and Worſhip above and diſtinct from all other Eminences whatſoever (or σεβάσματα,)* ſo that there is no ſuch thing as *a ſubordinate Religious Worſhip. Thirdly*, This Propoſition plainly affirmeth, that *Holineſs* is the ſame thing with a condition of Eminence above and diſtinct from all other Eminences whatſoever; and that every Man who *intentionally* aſcribeth to any *the Holineſs of a God and of his God*, aſcribeth unto it in ſo doing

Omnem Deum videri cultori ſuo magnum, tametſi ſolus Jupiter magnus ſit. Servius ap. Gale in Jambl. p. 222.

doing *intentionally* a condition of Eminency above and diſtinct from all other Eminences whatſoever. So that if a Pagan did intentionally aſcribe unto any thing (an Onion or an Animal, an Hero or a Demon) *the Holineſs of a God and of his God*, he aſcribed unto it, in ſo doing, intentionally the Eminence and Tranſcendence of the ſupreme *Jupiter*.

(6.) To be the Imperial Honour-perſon of God, is to be *a ſingular and peerleſs Eminency diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted above all*: But meerly to be *a ſingular and peerleſs Eminency diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted above all*, is not to be *the Imperial Honour-perſon of God*. The difference between theſe two Notions may be underſtood by comparing a Pagan Idol and a Pagan Emperour, the Babylonian *Bel* and the Babylonian *Nebuchadnezzar*. Each of theſe may be ſuppos'd to be within the compaſs and comprehenſion of the Babylonian Empire *a ſingular and peerleſs Eminency diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted above all*: But the one of them muſt be ſuppos'd, to be meerly a ſingular and peerleſs Eminency diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted above all, (ſuch was *Nebuchadnezzar*;) the other of them (*Bel*) muſt be ſuppos'd, to be a ſingular and peerleſs Eminency diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted above all, ſo as to be withall the Honour-perſon of a God (the Imperial Honour-perſon of a God) which is Sanctity and Holineſs of Honour-perſon. There is therefore a viſible difference between theſe two Notions: *The Honour-perſon of God* (the Imperial Honour-perſon of God) and *a meer ſingular and peerleſs Eminency diſtinguiſh'd from and exalted above all*. From whence it followeth, that this learned Divines Explication of the Holineſs of God is viſibly diſtant from the true Notion thereof. His Language alſo is ſometimes irreconcilable with tolerable good Senſe. For if *Sanctity* and *peerleſs Eminency* is the ſame thing, it is not proper to attribute to God *incomparable Sanctity*, becauſe incomparable peerleſs Eminencey is an inept Tautology. Yet this learned Divine (ſpeaking of God) ſaith; *in Scripture thoſe who communicate the Worſhip given unto him with any beſides him, or together with him, by way of object, that is, whether immediately or but mediately, are deem'd to deny his incomparable Sanctity*.

(7.) His Explication is not made out of Nobility-Learning, it doth not conſider God as *an Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation*, whence the true Notion of his Holineſs is unavoidably loſt. Nor doth he underſtand his true Notices of God in the Senſe of Nobility-Learning; for he ſuppoſeth, that *the Name of God* (which is to be hallow'd) ſignifieth *the Divine Majeſty*, which Divine Majeſty ought to be conſider'd as *the Divine Honour-perſon*: But he doth not ſo conſider the Divine Majeſty, but only (in the Scholaſtick way) as the Majeſty that is of theſe Attributes *peerleſs Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power*. So great an infelicity it is, not to be well acquainted with Nobility-Learning.

CHAP. VI.

1. The Firſt Illuſtration of this great Attribute the Holineſs of God is from the Name of God. 2. A Second Illuſtration of it from certain Notices of Honour and of Nobility-Learning. 3. A Third Illuſtration of it is from the Holy of Holies and his Honour-perſon that is ſo. 4. A Fourth Illuſtration of it is from an identity of Things and Expreſſions. 5. A Fifth Illuſtration of it is from the Pagan Theology and the agreement of the Scripture-Theology therewith. 6. A Sixth Illuſtration of it is from ſeveral ways of contemplating God. *7. A Confutation of the Reaſon which ſome aſſign, why* God *demandeth Honour from us.*

I. IF the ancient Fathers were unacquainted with this Theory, if Divines of modern times that have attempted it (with great Learning) have miſtaken it, it muſt neceſſarily be a vaſtly abſtruſe and difficult Theory, which is the beſt *Salvo* for our Credit (that I know of,) who pretending to the Science of Theology have not yet been able, to give a good account of the firſt Petition of our Lord's Prayer, which cannot be underſtood without the true Notion of the Holineſs of God. To take away this reproach from Theology, and to finiſh our Explication of the Idea of God, we are oblig'd, to make a due Illuſtration of this illuſtrious Attribute *Holy*, and to ſhew that it denoteth that God of proper Kind and Quality is ſo as to the Honour and Nobilitation of his Imperial Perſon (or as an Honour-perſon,) and his being ſo is *Sanctity Imperial-perſonal*. The *Firſt* Illuſtration that we will make of this great Attribute, is from *the Name of God* (which we pray may be hallow'd;) *his Name ſignifieth the Honour-perſon of God, his Imperial Honour-perſon*. For there are three Significations of the word Name (and no more,) which appertain to the matter in hand. It ſignifieth *the Perſon, the Honour*, and (both in Conjunction) *the Honour-perſon*. Uſually it ſignifieth *the Perſon* (being underſtood *ſubjectively*, or *ſignum* is put *pro ſignato*,) as *Act*. 1. 15. *the Number of the Names* is the number of the Perſons. (*w*) Θηβαῖον ὄνομα, *the Theban Name* ſignifieth the *Thebans, nomen Romanum*, the Romans. So amongſt the Writers of the Latin Church (*x*) *Latinum nomen*, ſignifieth the Party of the Latines, *Catholicum nomen*, the Catholic Party. Agreeably whereunto S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (*y*) *in nullum nomen Religionis coagulari poſſunt Homines, i. e. in nullam Religionem*. So when the Scripture ſpeaketh of *believing on the Name of Chriſt*, of being *reproach'd for the Name of Chriſt*, and of *calling upon his Name*, the word Name ſignifieth the Perſon. *Act*. 4. 12. *There is no other Name given amongſt Men, whereby we muſt be ſaved, that is, there is no other Saviour*. So the Name of God ſignifieth the Perſon. *Pſal*. 8. 1. *How excellent is thy Name in all the Earth?* (Thou art excellent in thy Works throughout all the Earth.) *Pſal*. 7. 51. *Thy Name is near*. Pſal. 5. 11. *Let them that love thy Name*. Pſal. 44. 5. *Through thee will we puſh down our Enemies, through thy Name will we tread them under*. Mal. 1. 6. *Wherein have we deſpis'd thy Name?* The meaning whereof is thus expreſs'd in the next Verſe, *wherein have we polluted thee?*

(w) *Voſſ. Inſtit. or. Par.* 2. *l*. 4. *c*. 7. *S*. 11.

(x) *Petav. T*. 2. *l*. 7. *c*. 3. *S*. 1. & *T*. 4. *Par*. 1. *l*. 6. *c*. 4. *S*. 1.

(y) *C. Fauſt. l*. 19. *c*. 11.

Name ſignifieth the *Honour* and *Dignity* as well as the Perſon; and we have both theſe ſignifications, *Phil.* 2. 9,10. *God hath highly exalted him and given him a Name, which is above every Name; that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow.* The Name of Jeſus ſignifieth the Perſon of Jeſus. (z) *When it is ſaid,* Phil. 2. *that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, Name doth not ſignifie the word Jeſus, but by a Metonymy it ſignifieth Chriſt himſelf, as* Theophylact, Theodoret *and* Oecumenius *expound it.* But when the Apoſtle ſaith, that *God hath given him a Name, which is above every Name,* the word Name ſignifieth *Honour, Dignity, Eminence;* as *Eph.* 20. 21. *He hath ſet him on his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all Principality and Power, and Might and Dominion, and every Name that is named.* (a) Beza *in his Annotations upon ſeveral places of Scripture, that ſpeak of the exaltation of Chriſt above every Name, by Name underſtandeth Dignity.* (b) *Amongſt the* Hebrews *Name often ſignifieth Dignity.* There are many names, that are not ὀνόματα κύρια ἀλλ᾽ ἀξιώματα, *Proper Names but Dignities,* which the Poets call *magna nomina, great Names,* (*nomina magna fuge, magnum Reginæ nomen obumbrat,*) and of ſuch a Name the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, when he ſaith of Chriſt, *Heb.* 1. 4. *Being made ſo much better than the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent Name* (Honour and Dignity) *than they.* So in Heraldry, *the Dignity, State, Degree, the Name and Stile* of Perſons of Honour are terms ſynonymous.

But oftentimes the Name doth not ſignifie meerly *the Perſon,* nor meerly *the Honour,* but in a third Acceptation both in conjunction, *the Perſon as connoting the Honour,* or *the Honour as connoting the Perſon, The Honour-perſon.* As amongſt Men theſe Names *Lord, Prince, the King, his Majeſty, his Highneſs, his Honour* (and ſuch more) denote the Honour and the Perſon in conjunction, and ſignifie *the Honour-perſon.* (c) So *Excellentia tua pro te:* Of this Nature is *the Name of the Lord,* which ſignifieth the Perſon of the Lord, *that Honour-perſon* (that Imperial Honour-Perſon) in the uſual Phraſe of the holy Writers; *to call upon the Name of the Lord, to truſt in the Name of the Lord, to praiſe the Name of the Lord, to fear the Name of the Lord, the Name of the Lord cometh from far,* Iſa. 30. 27. (d) *Glorificemus te, O nomen Domini, let us glorifie thee, O Name of the Lord,* ſaith *Rupertus.* So the Name of God ſignifieth *the Honour-perſon of God* (that Imperial Honour-perſon,) *the Name of the God of* Jacob *defend thee,* Pſal. 20. 4. Agreeably to the honourary Notion of theſe Names, *his Name* (ſimply and without addition) ſignifieth *the Honour-perſon that he is* in the uſual Language of the Holy Writers; *to blaſpheme his Name, to pollute his Name, to prophane his Name, to ſwear by his Name, to glorifie his Name, to build an Houſe to his Name, for his Name to dwell there,* which the Pſalmiſt calleth *The place where his Honour dwelleth,* Pſal. 26. 8. If his Name ſignifieth his Honour-perſon in the uſual Language of the Holy Scriptures, it muſt be more eſpecially of that honourary Notion in our *Lord's Prayer,* which ſpeaketh of his Name *being honoured, and ſo honoured as to be holied.* So the *glorious Name,* Pſal. 76. 29. *The great Name,* Jer. 44. 26. (e) The Jews השם *the ſupereminent Name, Nomen benedictum, the bleſſed Name; Nomen excelſum, the high Name;* and in like manner, *Nomen ſanctum, the holy Name,* do all of them denote *The Honour-perſon* (the Imperial Honour-perſon) that God is. There are other ſignifications of the word Name, which occurr in Scripture, touching which (becauſe they appertain not to the matter in hand) I will remark nothing, ſave only that the Name of Things and Perſons is their due Appellation; and ſo the word Name ſignifieth in that ſomewhat obſcure place, *Pſal.* 138. 2. *Thou haſt magnify'd thy Word above all thy Name.* The meaning is, that by his Power, Goodneſs and Faithfulneſs, which was conſpicuous in fulfilling his Word God had made it more illuſtrious than any thing that ought to be named of him, attributed to him, celebrated in him, than any of his other due Appellations.

II. A *Second* Illuſtration of this great Attribute *Holy* is from Notices of Honour and Nobility-Learning, which plainly ſhew, that this Attribute belongeth to God as an Honour-perſon, that it is of this meaning, *He is holy* as to his Honour and Nobilitation of Imperial Perſon, *and is Sanctity Imperial-perſonal.* For as a Lord, a Prince, a King, ſo a God muſt be conſider'd as of generical Notion an Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation, *Deus* and *Divus* (according to the beſt Authors) are terms ſynonymous; and it is well known, that the Pagano-Chriſtians *Divi* are certain Honours and Nobilitations of Eſtate, into which deceaſed Men are created, and whereby they are ennobled. So the Gods in Paganiſm muſt be conſider'd as certain *Honours, Dignities* and *Eſtates of Nobilitation,* into which Men were created, and whereby they were ennobled. (f) The *Roman* Emperours (for the moſt part) before their ἀποθεώσεως, or Conſecration were but Mankind of Honours and Dignities; but by their Conſecration they were (aſcriptitiouſly) made the God-kind or the Religion-kind of Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation, and were therefore made Gods, becauſe they were made *of Honour-perſon, the God-honours,* and therefore Sanctities and Religions of Honour-perſon. A God therefore is a *God-honour perſonal, to whom belongeth the God-honour real;* for Honour is ſometimes of a Perſonal Acceptation (it denoteth a Perſon,) and ſometimes it denoteth the Thing, not a Perſon, as when Honour is ſaid to be given, received or ſought, when Wiſdom is ſaid to have in her Hand *Riches and Honour,* Honour ſignifieth in the real Acceptation. But ſometimes it ſignifieth in the perſonal Acceptation; as *Gen.* 49. 6. *Unto their Aſſembly mine Honour be not thou united.* Pſal. 26. 8. *The place where thine Honour dwelleth.* Of both theſe Acceptations is *the God-honour,* which is manifeſtly the ſame with *the Holy Honour;* therefore a God is *an Holy Honour* (or a God-Honour) perſonal, to whom *the Holy Honour* (or the God-honour) real appertaineth; and herein his being a God doth conſiſt. If he is not an Holy Honour (a God-honour) perſonal, he is not (although never ſo great) of kind and quality a God; and if he is of kind and quality a God, the holy Honour (or God-honour) real is his kind of thing, his God-kind of thing, and his Imperial kind of thing, of which he is politically and of kind the Imperial Eſtate and Sovereignty. Theſe Notices of Honour and Nobility-Learning plainly direct and guide us, to interpret the Attribute Holy, to ſignifie what God is as an Honour-perſon, an Imperial Honour-perſon; *that his being God Imperial-perſonal is Sanctity Imperial-perſonal.*

(z) *Phil* 2. *Dum dicitur, In nomine Jeſu omne genu flectatur, per nomen non vox Jeſus, ſed per metonymiam figuram res ipſa, ſcil. Chriſtus intelligitur: ut explicant Theophylactus, Theodoretus & Oecumenius.* Vaſqu. in 3. par. Th. T. 1. Diſp. 108. c. 11.

(a) *Beza in annotationibus ad Eph.* 1. 21. *& Phil.* 2. 9. *de exaltatione Chriſti ſuper omne nomen, ut & Heb.* 1. 9. *nomen accipit ſignificatione Dignitatis &* ἀξιώματος. Mr. Mede Clav. Apoc. ad c. 11. v. 13. vid. S. Chryſoſt. in Philip. Hom. 7.

(b) שם *nomen apud Hebræos Dignitatem ſæpe ſignificat.* Grot. Not. in Phil. 2. 9, 10.

(c) Buxtorf. *Lex. Talm. col.* 1612.

(d) *Petav. T.* 1. *Proleg. c.* 9. *s.* 8.

(e) P. F gius in Lev. 24. 11.

(f) *Amt. in Mon. R. p.* 215, 221.

A God is *a Sanctity, Holineſs and Religion of Imperial Honour-perſon*; for ſo the true God is intituled in Scripture *his Holineſs Imperial-perſonal*, or *his Holineſs of Imperial Honour-perſon*, Pſal. 30. 4. *Give thanks at the remembrance of his Holineſs* (Imperial-perſonal) *God ſitteth upon the Throne of his Holineſs* (Imperial-perſonal Holineſs, or of Majeſty) *Pſal.* 47. 8. *In the Mountain of his Holineſs* (of Imperial Honour-perſon) *Pſal.* 48. 1. *In the Courts of my Holineſs* (of Imperial-Honour-perſon.) *Iſa.* 62. 9. *Behold from the Habitation of thy Holineſs* (Imperial-perſonal.) *Iſa.* 63. 15. *The People of thy* (Imperial-perſonal) *Holineſs.* Iſa. 63. 18. *Becauſe of the words of his* (Imperial-perſonal) *Holineſs*, Jer. 23. 9. His being a God, is to be an Holineſs as to Honour and Nobilitation of Perſon. He cannot be a God, unleſs he is *a God-honour* (as an Honour-perſon) and this again is an Holineſs as to Honour and Nobilitation of Perſon: It is ſuch an Holineſs on his part, which requireth that Holineſs on our part, of which *Clemens* ſaith; (g) *Juſtice being Humane is a common thing, and muſt be ſubjected to Sanctity, which is according to Divine Juſtice.* As Sanctity on our part is our Ennoblement, and denoteth our Ennoblement; ſo it denoteth God's Ennoblement, and therefore denoteth what God is as to Honour and Nobilitation of Perſon. It denoteth his being a God as to Honour and Nobilitation of Perſon, and therefore muſt be look'd upon as the reſult of his other Attributes, and the ultimate complement of his Deity. So high an Eminence is this God-eminence.

A God as to his Nature muſt be *what is Sanctity of Purity*; and as to his Honour (or Honour-perſon) he muſt be *what is Sanctity of Dignity.* His being a God is Sanctity as to Honour and Dignity; for it is the God-Nobility (of kind ſuch,) which is the definitive Notion of Sanctity. His Imperial Majeſty therefore is not meer Imperial Majeſty, but his being a God is Sanctity or Holineſs of Imperial Majeſty and Honour; and this Holineſs is that which is plainly meant by this great Attribute *his being Holy.*

III. A *Third* Illuſtration of this great Attribute is from *the Holy of Holies and the Honour-perſon that is ſo*, for although *Holineſs* is the God-kind and therefore the Creature-tranſcendent kind of *Excellence, Unvileneſs and Nobilitation*, yet Creatures partake both of Sanctity of Purity and Sanctity of Dignity. Which latter ſort of Sanctity belongeth to all the Saints of God, who are in the ſtate of *Sanctity* and *Holineſs*, which is the God-kind of Honour and Nobilitation of Eſtate. God therefore the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial muſt be contemplated, both as to what he is *comprehenſively*, and what he is *diviſively.* As Chriſt the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial muſt be contemplated both as to what he is *comprehenſively*, and what he is *diviſively.* And the Pope the Imperial Eſtate of Popery Imperial muſt be contemplated, both as to what he is *comprehenſively* and what he is *diviſively.* God being the Imperial Eſtate of the Specific Comprehenſion of Sanctity and Religion Imperial, he is to the Subjects of the Holy Empire the ſtate of Sanctity and Religion, and therefore is (ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe) the ſtate of Sanctity and Religion *comprehenſively* conſider'd and underſtood. And he is the ſtate of Sanctity and Religion *diviſively* conſider'd and underſtood, as being the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity and Religion contra-divided to the Creature and Subject-party of the Holy Empire. His being their God in State and Place, in Majeſty and Honour, is his being *the Holy of Holies (Sanctus Sanctorum,) the Holy One of the Holy Ones*, as this Name *the Holy One of Iſrael* (the holy People) denoteth and ſignifieth. His being therefore the Honour-perſon, that is, *the Holy of Holies*, is his being *the Honour-perſon of their God*, who is the Honour-perſon ſeparate and diſcriminated from all, and exalted above all, ſo as to be the God-kind (the Holy-kind) of Honour-perſon, whoſe Honour is the Holy-kind of Honour, whoſe Majeſty is the Holy-kind of Majeſty, whoſe Worſhip is the Holy-kind of Worſhip, whoſe honourary Name is the Holy-kind of honourary Name, who in all reſpects is to be ſo honoured, as to be *holied*, and who as to his Honour and Nobilitation of Imperial Perſon is *what is Sanctity Imperial-perſonal.* As the *Holy of Holies* he is the Honour-perſon of being Holy (or of Sanctity and Holineſs) in all reſpects as to Honour of Perſon; the Honour-perſon of Sanctity and Holineſs of Honour-perſon.

But becauſe *the Holy of Holies* (the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial) muſt be contemplated, both as to what he is *comprehenſively* and as to what he is *diviſively*; therefore *Holineſs*, which is the God-kind of *Excellence* or *Unvileneſs*, muſt be called (as it is) *The uncommon kind of Excellence or Unvileneſs*; and this muſt be diſtinguiſhed into that Excellence or Unvileneſs, which is meerly *the uncommon*, and that which is not only *the uncommon but the incommunicable.* Things and Perſons peculiarly dedicated, conſecrated and related to God, and which appertain to God-ſociety, are called *The Holy* (becauſe they are not without this uncommon kind of Excellence or Unvileneſs,) *his People are the Holy People, his Day is the Holy Day, his Book is the Holy Bible; his Temple is the Holy Temple, the Utenſils of his Service are called Holy, his Worſhip is the Holy Worſhip, his Law is the Holy Law, his Government is the Holy Government, his Empire is the Holy Empire, his Covenant is the Holy Covenant.* But although innumerable Things and Perſons are Holy, yet the Stile of God's Devotioniſts appropriateth this illuſtrious Epithet to him alone, *Thou only art Holy*; which is an attributing to him the God-honour and Excellence not only as it is *the uncommon*, but as it is *the incommunicable*; ſuch is the God-honour of the Holy of Holies. So many things fall under the Name of *Sanctity, Holineſs* and *Religion*; but in all Diſputes about Idolatry Religion uſually ſignifieth (in a ſtrict acceptation) *The God-honour*, not only as it is *the uncommon*, but *the incommunicable.* (h) *You know, that the Religion of the Creature* (the God-honouring it) *is under a Curſe.*

Apoc. 15. 4.

IV. A *Fourth* Illuſtration of this great Attribute is this Identity of Things and Expreſſions; *The being God as to Honour and Worſhip is the ſame with being Holy or of Religion as to Honour and Worſhip.* For this is one of the principal Do-

(g) Ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀνθρωπίνη ἔστι, ὡς κοινότητι ὑποβέβληκε τῇ ὁσιότητι, κατὰ θείαν δικαιοσύνην παρεχέσῃ. Strom. l. 6. p. m. 487.

(h) *Non ignoras quin in maledicto ſit religio creaturæ.* S. Hilar. de Trinit. c. 8.

ctrines of the *Bible*, and a principal Article both in Judaiſm and Chriſtianity (which the Unity of the Godhead inferreth,) *That the Worſhip and Service of Religion is due unto God and to him alone.* (*i*) *Religion is only the Worſhip of God. This we ſay, is due to that God only, who is the true God.* The Religion of the Creature is therefore horrendouſly criminal, becauſe it is a making the Vile Creature *the Honour-perſon of God:* For if we ſay of a Lord or King, that he is Sanctity, Holineſs, Religion of Honour-perſon, thereby we affirm, that he is the God-honour Perſon. And if we ſay, that he is the God-honour Perſon, thereby we affirm, that he is Sanctity, Holineſs and Religion of Honour-perſon. None can be Religious as to Honour and Worſhip without being Holy as to Honour and Worſhip: None can be Holy as to Honour and Worſhip without being God as to Honour and Worſhip; for Sanctity, Holineſs and Religion as to Honour and Worſhip, and the being God as to Honour and Worſhip, are but two Expreſſions of one and the ſame thing. They are of the ſame ſenſe and meaning in the Stile of the Prophet, *Habak.* 1. 12. *Art not thou from everlaſting, O Lord my God, mine Holy one?* To be my God (my God-one) as to Honour and Worſhip, and to be mine Holy One as to Honour and Worſhip is the ſame thing. So *Iſrael*'s God (or God-one) as to Honour and Worſhip, and *Iſrael*'s *Holy One* as to Honour and Worſhip, are ſynonymous Expreſſions, *Iſa.* 29. 23. *They ſhall ſanctifie the Holy One of* Jacob, *and ſhall fear the God of* Iſrael. Hoſ. 11. 9. *I am God and not Man, the Holy One in the midſt of thee. Grotius* is thus far right in his Interpretation of the Epithet *Holy*, he ſuppoſeth it to relate to Honour and Worſhip; for thus he expoundeth theſe laſt words of the Prophet *Hoſea.* (*k*) *Holy, that is, ſanctify'd, honour'd by your Anceſtors with agreeable Worſhip.* But this is a very ſlender and mutilate account of this great Name *the Holy One*; for the Pſalmiſt exhorteth to worſhip God with the Religious (or Holy) Worſhip, becauſe he is Holy as to Honour and Worſhip, *Pſal.* 99. 5. *Exalt the Lord our God, and worſhip at his Footſtool, for he is Holy:* v. 9. *Exalt the Lord our God, and worſhip at his holy Hill; for the Lord our God is holy.* The ſame reaſon is alledg'd in the Book of the *Apocalypſe* for giving the Religious Worſhip unto God and to him only, *Apoc.* 15. 3, 4. *Great and marvellous are thy Works, Lord God Almighty, juſt and true are thy Ways, thou King of Saints; who ſhall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorifie thy Name? For thou only art Holy: for all Nations ſhall come and worſhip before thee*; that is (ſaith Mr. *Mede*) *they ſhall relinquiſh their Idols and plurality of Gods, and worſhip thee as God only.* From which excellent Expoſition of the holy Text it appeareth, that to be the Honour-perſon of God, is to be Holy as to Honour and Worſhip; and that to be God only as to Honour and Worſhip, and to be him that only is Holy as to Honour and Worſhip, are the ſame thing. When the Seraphims cry, *Iſa.* 6. 3. *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hoſts*, their meaning is to ſay, (and religiouſly acknowledge,) that he is the Honour-perſon of God, and that being ſuch he is Holy as to Honour and Worſhip (which is God-honour) to the fulleſt height of being ſo. Of the ſame meaning is the *Triſagium*, *Apoc.* 4. 8. *The four Beaſts* (which repreſent Bodies or Syſtems of Divine Devotioniſts) *reſt not Day and Night, ſaying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.* Theſe four Beaſts therefore may well be ſaid, *to give glory and honour to him that ſate on the Throne*; for they give unto God the height and fulneſs of the God-honour (which is the being Holy as to Honour and Worſhip,) which is the ſublimeſt ſtrain of honouring God. In like manner *Hannah* glorifieth God (and withall celebrateth the God of *Iſrael* as the only true God and aſſerteth the Unity of the Godhead againſt Polytheiſm,) when ſhe ſingeth, 1 *Sam.* 2. 2. *There is none Holy as the Lord* (none elſe is of the God-honour, which is the being Holy as to Honour and Worſhip; *for there is none* (no God) *beſides thee.* Agreeably to theſe laudatory Hymns and Doxologies which uſually occurr in Scripture, the Song of *Moſes* ought to be underſtood, *Exod.* 15. 11. *Who is like unto thee, O Lord, amongſt the Gods? who is like thee? glorious* (or magnificent) *in Holineſs, fearful in Praiſes, doing Wonders.* If this Song muſt be interpreted agreeably to the uſual Doxologies in Scripture, That *Holineſs* of God which he celebrateth, muſt not be underſtood of *his Sanctity of Purity*, (*l*) as Expoſitors miſtake, but of *his Sanctity of Dignity.* The Song of *Moſes* ought to be interpreted agreeably to the Stile of Honour, Magnificence and Illuſtriouſneſs (which is the Stile of Doxologies) and agreeably to the Titles of Honour, wherewith Honours, Dignities and Eſtates of Nobilitation are ennobled; therefore that Holineſs of God which he celebrateth, muſt not be underſtood of his *Vital*, but of his Imperial-perſonal Sanctity. The words which we tranſlate *Glorious in Holineſs* are better render'd *Magnificent in Holineſs*; therefore *Moſes* ſpeaketh of that *Holineſs of God*, which is his Honour and Magnificence. *Moſes* conſidereth the Lord as contradiſtinct to Creature-Potentates and Lords, and as the ſole Honour-perſon of God amongſt the Gods (for he ſaith, *Who is like unto thee, O Lord, amongſt the Gods?*) therefore that Holineſs of God which he ſpeaketh of, is the Holineſs of his Honour-perſon. *Moſes* ſpeaketh of that Holineſs of God, which rendreth him *fearful in Praiſes*, which is *the Holineſs of his Name*, as appeareth from the Pſalmiſt, who exhorteth us, to praiſe God with Religious Fear and Reverence, becauſe of the Holineſs of his Name, *Pſal.* 99. 3. *Let them praiſe thy great and terrible Name; for it is Holy*; therefore he is fearful and reverend in Praiſes, becauſe *holy and reverend is his Name*, Pſal. 111. 9. Holineſs in the Song of *Moſes* muſt ſignifie, as it doth in their Hymn, that ſing the Song of *Moſes*, *Apoc.* 15. 3. therefore when he celebrateth God as *Glorious* or *Magnificent in Holineſs*, his intent is to ſay, that he is not only Glorious or Magnificent in Imperial Eſtate, Majeſty and Honour, but in Holineſs of Imperial Eſtate, Majeſty and Honour, *which is the God-honour.* And becauſe Holineſs is the God-honour, therefore God ſometimes ſweareth by it; as amongſt Men perſons of Honour often ſwear by their Honour, *Amos* 4. 2. *The Lord God hath ſworn by his Holineſs.* Pſal. 89. 35. *Once have I ſworn by my Holineſs, that I will not lye unto* David.

V. A *Fifth* Illuſtration of this great Attribute (Holy) is from the Pagan Theology, which ſome Divines (through a miſunderſtanding the Holineſs of God) have ſtrangely miſtaken. For they

(*i*) *Religionem non eſſe niſi Dei cultum.—— Hanc ei tantum Deo deberi dicimus, qui verus eſt Deus.* S. Aug. de C.D. l. 10. c. 1.

(*k*) *Sanctus, i. e. ſanctificatus, cultu conveniente à majoribus veſtris honoratus.*

Apoc. 4. 8.

(l) Rivet. in loc.

they ſay, (m) *The Gods of the Nations were not properly and truly Holy, becauſe but partially and reſpectively only; for as much as the Divine Eminency which they were ſuppos'd to have, was, even in the Opinion of thoſe who worſhipp'd them, common to others with them, and ſo not diſcriminated from, nor exalted above all. —— Wherefore it is to be obſerv'd, that although the Scripture every where vouchſafes the Gentiles Dæmons the Name of Gods, yet it never, I think, calls them Holy Ones, as indeed they were not.* (n) *None of the Heathen Gods were ever ſeen, to make reckoning of Sanctity, nor ever commanded himſelf to be worſhipped under the Name of Holy.* In which Accounts of the Pagan Deities there are no leſs than four miſtakes. For,

(1.) It is a miſtake, to affirm, *That the Heathen Gods were not properly and truly Holy, but partially and reſpectively only; becauſe the Divine Emenency which their Worſhippers attributed to them, was common to others with them, and ſo they were not diſcriminated from and exalted above all.* If we ſpeak according to the truth of the thing the Heathen Gods were not *partially and reſpectively Holy*; for they were not at all Holy. If we ſpeak according to the Opinion of the Pagan Religioniſts, their Gods were more than *partially* and *reſpectively Holy*; for they ſuppos'd them *truly and properly Holy*. They did not ſuppoſe, that the Holineſs of their Gods conſiſted *in being diſcriminated from and exalted above all*; but if this is the true Notion of Holineſs, ſome of the Pagan Gods *according to the Opinion of their Worſhippers* were truly and properly Holy; for their ſeveral ſorts of Supreme Deities were ſuppos'd, to be *diſcriminated from and exalted above all*.

(2.) It muſt be reckon'd a miſtake, to affirm, *That the Scripture every where vouchſafes the Gentiles Demons the Name of Gods, yet never calleth them Holy Ones*; for in ſtiling them *their Gods* the Scripture (implicitly at leaſt) ſtileth them *their Holy Ones*. Their *God Ones* as to Honour and Worſhip and their *Holy Ones* are ſynonymous Expreſſions, as the Author of this miſtake acknowledgeth, when he giveth this account of *the Holy One of* Iſrael, (o) *which is all one his God.*

(3.) It is a miſtake, to affirm, *That the Heathen Gods made no account or no great account of Sanctity.* For Religion and Sanctity are terms ſynonymous; the Heathens Inſtitution of Religion was the Inſtitution of their Sanctity. A *Roman* Prieſt told a *Roman* Virgin, *coli Deos ſancte magis quàm ſcitè, the Gods are worſhipp'd by ſanctity rather than wittily.* The Pagan Religioniſts Rites of Sanctity are innumerable, a ſuppos'd Sanctity was their great care and regard, the deſign of their Religious Inſtitution in general, of their Myſtic-religious and their Philoſophic Inſtitutions, and it was the Glory both of the Popular and Philoſophic Pagans.

(4.) It is a miſtake, to affirm, *That no Pagan Deity ever commanded himſelf to be worſhipp'd under the Name of Holy.* For the Pagan Deities that affected the Name and the Worſhip of God, affected the Holy Name and the Holy Worſhip; and their Religioniſts according to their Inſtitution (which was the Inſtitution of their Gods) gave unto their ſeveral Deities this honourary Epithet *Sanctus* or *Sanctiſſimus*. The Supreme Deity in the Acroamatical Theology is ſtiled (p) ἅγιος ἐν ἁγίοις, *Holy in the Holies.* The Supreme Deity of the *Egyptians* is called (q) σεμνὸς καὶ ἅγιος, *Venerable and Holy*; and *Plutarch* (as *Eugubinus* tranſlateth him) ſtileth the Supreme Deity (r) *immutabiliter ſanctus, immutably Holy. J. Mart.* affirmeth, that a Statue at *Rome* on *Tiber* between the two Bridges was erected to *Simon Magus*, and inſcrib'd *Simoni Deo ſancto, To Simon the holy God.* If this Inſcription to *Simon Magus* be a miſtake (as is moſt likely) yet it is certain, that the Pagans uſually made ſuch Inſcriptions to their Deities; for ſuch are theſe following.

(s) *Deo ſancto Belatucardo*
(t) *Sanctiſſimo Herculi.*
Herculi Pacifero, Invicto, ſancto ſacrum.
Herculi ſancto ſac.
(u) *Soli ſanctiſſimo*
(w) *Aurea ſanctorum potuiſſent Templa Deorum Urere.*

The moſt vile and ridiculous Deities amongſt the Pagans had the honourary Epithet of *Holy* given them; for one of them was intituled *Sanctiſſimus Deus Riſus, the moſt holy God Laughter.* They accounted their Gods Holy, and therefore they accounted them Holy, becauſe they were their Gods, as ſuppoſing *their Gods, their God-honours* and their *Holy Honours* to be terms ſynonymous. To be a God as to Honour and Worſhip, was in their Notion of things, to be Holy (or Religious) as to Honour and Worſhip. Their Gods were their *God-honours*, and this they accounted the ſame thing, as to be their Holy (or Religious) Honours. They look'd upon their Gods as ſuch Honours and Nobilitations of Eſtate, that were perſonal *Sanctities* and *Religions* as to Honour; whence they often ſpeak of them in this form; *Deorum Sanctitates, Deorum Religiones, The Sanctities of the Gods, the Religions of the Gods.* Agreeably to which Paganical Language the only true God (according to the Scripture-Theology) muſt be ſtiled *The Imperial-perſonal Sanctity*, and his Epithet *Holy* muſt be thus expounded; *Holineſs is the God-kind of Honour, Excellence or Unvileneſs; therefore his being God as to Honour and Worſhip, is his being Holy as to Honour and Worſhip*, which is his Propriety.

VI. A *Sixth* Illuſtration of this Divine Attribute *Holy* is from ſeveral ways of contemplating God, whoſe Holineſs of Name admitteth of ſeveral diſtinct Conſiderations, and yet needeth ſome Elucidations: For the fuller Explication of it therefore,

(1.) God muſt be contemplated antecedently to Society and Polity, and wholly abſtracting from it; for he is *The God-excellence, Imperial-perſon, The Sanctity of Honour-perſon abſolutely* (or in himſelf) as well as *reſpectively* to created Beings. The Pſalmiſt therefore conſidering him abſolutely or as in himſelf from Eternity, ſaith; *Before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadſt formed the Earth and the World, even from everlaſting to everlaſting thou art God.* If he was God from everlaſting, he was the Honour-perſon of God from everlaſting, and his being ſuch was Sanctity of Honour-perſon (the God-honour and Nobilitation of Honour-perſon,) ſuch Sanctity which is primary, original, abſolute, eſſential and infinite Sanctity of Dignity. His being a God in Dignity is a Sanctity of Dignity, without which he could not be from Eternity deify'd (which is to be unvilify'd in abſolute Perfection,) and which is eminently (x) *his ſingular Eminency, whereby he alone is God.*

(m) Mr. Mede on Matth. 6. 9.

(n) *Nullus è Deorum Ethnicorum grege ſanctitati pretium ſtatuere viſus eſt, nec unquam ſub ſancti nomine ſe coli juſſit.* D. Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l. 1. c. 5. §. 2.

(o) Mr. Mede ſupr.

(p) Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 2. c. 11.

(q) Jambl. de Myſt. p. 151.

(r) Eugub. de Per. Phil. l. 6. c. 7.

(s) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 17.

(t) Elmenh. in Arnob. p. 144.

(u) Beyer. Add. in Seld. p. 53.

(w) Ovid. de Amor.

Pſal. 90. 2.

(x) *Singularis ſua excellentia, quâ ſolus eſt Deus.* Cajet. in Aquin. 2. 2. Qu. 94. Art. 3.

The Jews ſay of his Name הוא שמו ושמו הוא *he is his Name, and his Name is he.* And the ſame muſt be ſaid of *the Holineſs* of his Name, and of his proper Honour and Dignity, which the Book of Wiſdom calleth *the incommunicable Name.* Ch. 14. 21. *They aſcrib'd unto Stones and Stocks the incommunicable Name.*

(2.) God muſt be contemplated with reſpect to us and to Society and Polity *jurally*, his Holineſs of Name being Law and Obligation to all Rationals, to be his Religioniſts, to exerciſe ſuch Piety towards him, and to give unto him all ſuch Religious Honour and Worſhip, whereby *his Name is hallow'd.* Unto us Men and Angels he is *the Honour-perſon that is to be holied by having the God-kind of Honour.* And the ſenſe of the word *Holied* ſo expounded may fitly be thus expreſs'd *Holy-honoured*; for *God-honouring is Holy-honouring.* Hereby he his differenc'd from all other Honours and Nobilitations of Eſtate, *he is jurally the God-honour of Honour-perſon*, and his Name therefore is legally *the Holy-honour'd Name.* For as his Honour-perſon muſt be beatify'd by way of honouring, ſo it muſt be (Holied) Holy-honour'd, and muſt not be any way unholied, which is to be profaned. *Lev.* 22. 32. *Neither ſhall ye profane my holy Name, but I will be hallowed* (Holied or Holy-honour'd) *amongſt the Children of Iſrael.* If he is Holied or Holy-honour'd, his Honour-perſon is *Sanctified* according to the ſenſe of the word in Scripture. *Lev.* 10. 3. *I will be ſanctified* (either by their Doings or by their Sufferings for their Profaneneſs I will be Holy-honour'd) *in them that come nigh me.* Numb. 20. 12. *The Lord ſpake unto Moſes and Aaron; becauſe ye believed me not, to ſanctifie me* (to Holy-honour me) *in the eyes of the Children of Iſrael.* Iſa. 29. 23. *They ſhall ſanctifie my Name* (Holy-honour my Honour-perſon,) *even Sanctifie the holy One of Jacob, and ſhall fear the God of Iſrael.* They ſanctifie him or holy him by way of honouring, that are pious and religious towards him; and they that (objectively) make him their religious fear and their dread, make him the Honour-perſon of their God. *Iſa.* 8. 13. *Fear ye not their fear, neither dread ye it* (the Gentiles Gods:) *But ſanctifie the Lord of Hoſts himſelf, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.* The Apoſtle maketh uſe of theſe words of the Prophet but in a ſomewhat different ſenſe, to ſignifie, that the Chriſtians ſhould not make the minacious things of the World the matter of their Fear comparatively with God, but ſhould religiouſly make him their fear and their dread, which is an *holying him* (by way of honouring) *in our Heart*, 1 Pet. 3. 15.

(3.) God muſt be contemplated as actually in Society with a Liege-people, amongſt whom he is *the Imperial Honour-perſon of God*, and it is not only his Propriety, but his Poſſeſſion, to be *the hallow'd Name.* For to be *the Honour-perſon of a God* in Society with his Religioniſts, is unto him *Sanctity, Holineſs* and *Religion* of Imperial Honour-perſon; and unto them it is ſuch Sanctity, Holineſs and Religion, as is competible to the Subject-party. Accordingly the Jews (who were under ſevere Injunctions, to ſanctifie the Honour-perſon of their God) profeſs *to Worſhip in him the beauty* (or magnificence) *of Holineſs.* Pſal. 29. 2. and 2 *Chron.* 20. 21. they are ſaid, *to praiſe the beauty of Holineſs*, as our tranſlation rendreth the words. But becauſe the Particle ל ſometimes ſignifieth *in*, therefore the words ומהללים להדרת קדש may be rendred conformably to the Pſalmiſts, *and to praiſe in the beauty of Holineſs.* Meaning by Holineſs, *Holineſs of Service, Worſhip and Miniſtration* according to the Jews Inſtitution, which had much of external Pulchritude and Magnificence in it. Holineſs of Worſhip (ſuch Service, Worſhip and Miniſtration which is Holineſs) is unto us Holineſs (we are Holy by it,) and it is unto God *Holineſs of Imperial Honour-perſon.*

(4.) God muſt be contemplated as being in his tranſcendent Judgments and Mercies *Self-magnifying* and *Self-magnified*, and therefore *Self-ſanctifying* and *Self-ſanctified*; for this *God-magnifying* (as being the God-honouring) is *ſanctifying*; and a God's being thus *magnified* (having the God-honour and Illuſtriouſneſs) is being ſanctified. The Prophet therefore repreſenteth God as *ſanctified* (becauſe God-magnified) in his Righteous Judgments upon the wicked. *The* Iſa. 5. 16.
Lord of Hoſts ſhall be exalted in Judgment, and God, that is holy, ſhall be ſanctified (or holied) *in Righteouſneſs.* This Language is uſual in the Prophet *Ezekiel* and no where elſe in Scripture. *I will plead againſt Gog with Peſtilence and with* Ezek. 38.
Blood, and I will rain upon him and upon his 22. 23.
bands, and upon the many People that are with him, and v. 16.
an over-flowing rain and great hail-ſtones, fire and and ch. 28. 22.
brimſtone. Thus will I magnifie my ſelf, and ſanctifie my ſelf, and I will be known in the eyes of many Nations, and they ſhall know, that I am the Lord. When I ſhall be ſanctified in thee, O Gog. O Zidon, *I will be glorified in the midſt of thee, and they ſhall know, that I am the Lord, when I ſhall have executed Judgments in her, and ſhall be ſanctified in her.* As in his Judgments on Heathen Nations, ſo in his wondrous deliverances of his People, God is ſaid, *to ſanctifie his great Name*, which is to magnifie it with the God-kind of magnifying; and *to be ſanctified*, which is to be magnified with the God kind of being magnified. *Ezek.* 36. 23. *I will ſanctifie my great Name, which was profaned among the Heathen, which ye have profaned in the midſt of them, and the Heathen ſhall know, that I am the Lord, ſaith the Lord God, when I ſhall be ſanctified in you before their eyes.* Ezek. 39. 27. *When I have brought them again from the People, and gather'd them out of their Enemies hands, and am ſanctified in them in the ſight of many Nations.* So *Ezek.* 20. 41. and ch. 28. 25. God is the great Exemplar of our ſanctifying his Name, which ought to be our greateſt Concern.

VII. It ought not to be ſaid, *that God demandeth Honour of us meerly out of Goodneſs to us, for our benefit and advantage*; ſuch Notions proceed from great miſapprehenſions touching the Godhead. For God Imperial is neceſſarily the Law of true Religion and Godlineſs to the whole Univerſe, and without true Religion and Godlineſs he cannot be God Imperial. The Duties of Religion are founded upon his being God, which (ſuppoſing our Exiſtence) is to be unto us a Sovereign Liege-Lord, the Imperial Eſtate of God, the God-kind of Sovereignty, the Sanctity and Religion of Honour-perſon. They are founded upon the Rights and Dues of his Godhead (which are ſingular, proper, incommunicable, inviolable, unalienable and eſſential to his being God,) upon the immutable Nature of Good and Evil, Right and Wrong, upon Gratitude and ſtrict Juſtice, and his Intereſt as well as our Intereſt. The Religious acknowledgment of his Rights and Dues is the Intereſt of his Pleaſure and Contentment, of his Honour, Service and conveniency of Living, of his Kingdom and Government and of his being God. If we make not a Religious acknowledgment of them, if we irreligiouſly oppoſe them and trample on them, this is a doing him the moſt real and deadly diſpleaſure and annoyance, injury and inconvenience, miſchief and prejudice, it is a denying him and bereaving him of his Subjects and Service, a villainous θεομαχία, *fighting againſt him* (as his mortal Enemies,) an infaming and vilifying him, and pouring Indignities upon him, a deſpoiling him of his Worth and Excellence, and of his Attributes and Perfections, a depoſing him and dethroning him, and (in an horrendous degree) a deſtroying his Life and Being, an undeifying him and a taking away his Kingdom from him. It is God's Intereſt therefore at an immenſe rate, that we ſhould do him Honour, as Kings and Fathers count it their Intereſt and Concern, that their Subjects and Children ſhould Honour them (the being of a King and Father is in great degree deſtroy'd, if they be not honour'd;) they do not require that the Subject-party ſhould Honour them meerly for that Party's Benefit and Advantage, but for the common and publick Intereſt. If meerly out of Goodneſs to us and for our Benefit and Advantage he requireth, that we ſhould Honour him, then it is meerly out of Goodneſs to us and for our Benefit and Advantage, that he requireth of us, not to diſhonour him. For not to ſlight him and to prize him, not to diſaffect him and to love him, not to diſhonour him and to honour him, are the ſame thing. But is it probable, that meerly for our Benefit and Advantage he forbiddeth us, *to abuſe him, and undeifie him, and to make him a Lyar? Or to Crucifie the Son of God afreſh and to put him to open Shame?* It cannot be ſuppos'd, that out of meer Goodneſs to us, he forbiddeth us to Diſhonour him, and commandeth us to Honour him; that his Honour and Intereſt is ſubordinate and meerly ſubſervient to our Commodity and Benefit; for what is Man to God, or the Creature to the Creator? As his Honour is his Intereſt (at an immenſe rate,) ſo his Intereſt is Paramount and Tranſcendent to ours. Whence ſome of the Pontificians in a ſtrain of great Piety ſay, (y) *Sin againſt God ought not to be done for an infinite Good. Every offence of God is of infinite avoydance. All manner of penal Death and Annihilation ſhould be ſuffer'd, rather than commit any, how little ſoever, offence againſt God.* His Honour and Intereſt muſt be our chief End and Buſineſs, Deſire and Deſign, and muſt be ſought above all, agreeably to the order of that καλὴ συνωρὶς, *illuſtrious Pair* the two great Commandments, the firſt of which requireth our Superlative Love for God, the ſecond injoineth the Love of our Neighbour in due Equality with our ſelves. So our Lord's Prayer allotteth the ſecond place to the matters of our Benefit and Advantage (properly ſuch) in the three laſt Petitions: But the firſt place (the Primacy and Supremacy) to the matters of God's Intereſt. In the three laſt Petitions the Stile is ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς, *for our Bread, the forgiveneſs of our Sins, and lead us not into Temptation*: But in the three firſt Petitions the Stile is σοῦ, σοῦ, σοῦ, *thy Name be hallowed, thy Kingdom come, thy Will be done.* That his Name may be hallow'd, it is to be wiſh'd, that debauch'd Chriſtendom would go to School to the Jews, and learn ſomething of Sanctity from them, who when they ſpeak of God, uſually intitle him הקדוש ברוך הוא *that holy bleſſed One.* With which Remark we will conclude our Explication of the expanded Idea of God, and will now proceed, to deduce from it ſome uſeful Conſectaries of Theory and of Practice.

(y) *Pro infinito bono non debet fieri offenſa Dei. Omnis offenſa Dei eſt infinitæ fugibilitatis. Quia potiùs toleranda eſſet omnis mors pœnalis & annihilatio, quàm committenda eſt quantumlibet parva offenſa in Deum.* V. Petav. T. 4. l. 2. c. 14. S. 7. Gerſon. Lect. 1. de vit. ſpir.

CHAP. VII.

1. *The firſt Conſectary, that God muſt be contemplated not meerly as a Nature, but as a Name.* 2. *God muſt be contemplated as within the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial.* 3. *God muſt be contemplated as of the City* (or Empire) *of the Regenerate.* 4. *Our ultimate Idea of God muſt be of the God-kind.* 5. *God ought not to be repreſented as unknowable by any but the Sons of Carnality and Unregeneracy.* 6. *The Godhead may be Atheiz'd in various degrees.* 7. *God is in himſelf and unto us a kind of Knowledge, which is his kind of Knowledge.* 8. *This Divine kind of Knowledge conſiſteth in being Wiſe and Intelligent in the main in the matters of Sanctity and ſaving Religion.* 9. *It ſaveth from the State of Blindneſs and blinding things.* 10 *It conſtituteth the State of Light and Knowledge.* 11. *It is our Spiritual Eye-ſight analogous to our Bodily.* 12. *It conſiſteth in being Holy and Spiritual in reſpect of our Intellectuals.* 13. *It is not meerly Intellectual, but Vital.* 14. *This Knowledge is of ſuch a Nature, as ſpeaketh it of great clearneſs.* 15. *And of Certitude.* 16. *And the incapacity of unholy Mankind for knowing and judging of Divine things.*

1. THE Idea of God inferreth, *that he ought to be contemplated and notic'd in Theology, not meerly as a Nature, but as a Name, not meerly as an Eſſence, but as an Honour*; for ſo he is notic'd in the entrance of our *Lord's Prayer* (call'd by *Tertullian, breviarium totius Evangelii, the breviary of the whole Goſpel*;) which ſheweth, that this is *primaria ejus notio, the primary Notion of him, conceptus Dei fundamentalis, the fundamental Conception of God.* God muſt be notic'd as (of kind and politically ſuppoſing our Exiſtence) *the Imperial Eſtate of God, the Imperial Honour-perſon of God*; for ſo the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſt is the very Notion of him; and the Pope muſt be contemplated as *the Imperial Eſtate of the Pope, and that Imperial Honour-perſon.* So according to the light of Nature *God muſt be glorified as God*; therefore he muſt be contemplated as the Imperial Honour-perſon of God, the being which is *Sanctity Imperial-perſonal.* An Honour-perſon muſt be contemplated under the Notion of his Honour-perſon; our method

therefore of contemplating God is extremely amiſs, if we Contemplate only the Divine Eſſence with its inherent Attributes.

II. The Idea of God inferreth, that he muſt be contemplated *as within the Specific comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial* or the holy Empire. As our method of contemplating God is extremely amiſs, if we contemplate only the Divine Eſſence with its inherent Attributes: So if we only add thereto certain Names of Honour and Dignity, which are on this ſide Sanctity Imperial (ſuch as *Lord of all*, Sovereign Rector) our method of Contemplation is extremely amiſs. For as Chriſt is Lord of all, yet ſo as to be of kind and politically *the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial*: So God is the Lord of all, yet ſo as to be of kind and politically *the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial.* And as Chriſt muſt be look'd for and contemplated as within the Specific comprehenſion of Chriſtianity Imperial, of which he is the Imperial Eſtate: As the Pope muſt be look'd for and contemplated as within the Specific comprehenſion of Popery Imperial, of which he is the Imperial Eſtate: So God muſt be look'd for and contemplated as within the Specific comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial, of which he is the Imperial Eſtate. A principal difficulty in contemplating God ariſeth from our uſual Ideas of God, which leave the Mind to rove in uncertainty, not knowing where to fix, or which way to look, or where to find God, nor is he ſo notic'd, as to be an Object ſufficiently determinate for Contemplation. But if we contemplate God as of kind and politically the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial, this doth *infinitatem rei ejicere, take away the indeterminateneſs of the thing and of the mind* (as the Lawyers ſpeak,) it directeth her where to look for God, where ſhe may certainly find him, and may ſteddily fix her Eye upon him as upon an Object ſufficiently determinate for Contemplation. And where ſhould we look for the Imperial Eſtate of a God but in the comprehenſion of the Inſtitution of his Religion? Where elſe can we find the *Holy of Holies* but in the Communion of Saints? Within this Comprehenſion God is, as *Gr. Naz.* ſaith from *Plato* (z) ὅπερ ἐςὶ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ἥλιος, *what the Sun is in the viſible World.*

III. The Idea of God inferreth, *that the City* (or Empire) *which hath God for its Imperial Eſtate, is only the City of the Regenerate, and that he is of the comprehenſion of Regeneracy*, which is the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial and the Kingdom of his Saints. For this is the comprehenſion of the Things and Perſons of Regeneracy, *oppoſite to the World and the Kingdom of Darkneſs*, which is the comprehenſion of Unregeneracy; and theſe two Specific comprehenſions ſhare the Univerſe of Rationals between them. As he is *the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial*, his kind of City and Kingdom cannot be conſtituted by unregenerate Mankind, that are not the holy People (not the holy kind of People,) that are Aliens and Enemies, and cannot become his Subjects, Saints and Citizens, of his Alliance and Divine Family, nor be accepted and reconcil'd, ingrafted and infranchis'd but by entring into the State and Life of Sanctity, which is their Regeneracy. And as he is *the Sanctity Vital*, the wicked and mundane kind (nefarious Varlets in their Unregeneracy) are a deadly oppoſite and inimical kind unto God, and cannot be his Saints and Citizens, unleſs their kind be chang'd by Regeneration, and they become of the Saint of God-kind. The City of God therefore which is of his Kind and Quality, and of which he is the Imperial Eſtate (a) *is the City of Regeneration, Generation is ſufficient for making an earthly City, but this heavenly City needeth Regeneration alſo to conſtitute it.* The Citizens and Deniſons of it are natively *Strangers and Foreigners*, and they are endeniz'd by their Regeneration. They are natively improbous Sinners (of the unſanctify'd and unregenerate Maſs of Mankind,) and are made Saints by Regeneration. By this Door they enter into the City of God. (b) *For how can an Alien be permitted to enter? But when he is enroll'd and made a Citizen, and hath receiv'd the Father, then he ſhall be amongſt the Sons of the Father, then he ſhall be thought worthy to inherit, then he ſhall have ſhare of the Father's Kingdom with his own Son the beloved.* The Children of God, the Divine Family (that conſtitute this Divine City) are originated by Regeneration, which is Spiritual and Divine Generation (whereby an holy vital Nature, the Life of Grace is ingendred in them;) they are Gods deſcendents, thoſe that are *of God* originally, and becauſe they are *the new and Divine born*, they are denominated *the Church of the Firſt-born.* Heb. 12. 23. For this Phraſe *the Firſt-born* denoteth the Perſons of Excellency and Precioſity, of Honour, Eminence and Dignity (ſuch were the Firſt-born in ancient times,) which are the ſame with the Regenerate and Divine Family; for all that are of Ennoblement, Excellency and Precioſity in Religion, derive it from Regeneration, whence they have all their Sanctity, which is their Nobility. *Ezek.* 16. 3, 4, 5, 6. Thence it is, that they are the truly ennobled and unſordified People, of the Divine Birth and Pedigree, Alliance and Kindred, of the Divine kind and Divine Worth and Precioſity, of the truly Noble and Divine Spirit and Sentiment, Nature and Practice, Qualities and Properties, Imployments and Atchievements, Deſigns and Intereſts, Rights and Priviledges; and thence it is, that they are the truly Noble and Divine kind of Religioniſts, and the Goods which in the whole kind of them are peculiarly theirs, are the truly Noble and Divine kind of Goods. If therefore the City of God is the truly Noble and Divine kind of City, it muſt be of Kind and Quality the City of Regeneracy, and the Church of the *New-born* may fitly be intituled the Church of *the Firſt-born* (becauſe they are the Perſons of Excellency and Precioſity,) as *Clemens* interpreteth the Apoſtle. (c) *For this is the Church of the Firſt-born, which conſiſteth of many good Perſons New-born.* The Church of the Jews and the Literal *Jeruſalem* (often called the City of God in type and ſhadow) cannot juſtly be called the Church *of the New-born*: But the Church of the Holy Angels may be juſtly ſo intituled; for they have the thing that Regeneration denoteth (which is *Generatio ex Deo, ſupernal Generation or to be Born of God*) although without our mode of having it, which is by being *Re-born.* They conſti-

tute

(z) Orat. 21.

Joh. 1. 12, 13. Eph. 1. 5, 6. Rom. 5. 10. Joh. 8. 35. Rom. 11. 24. Eph. 2. 19.

1 Joh. 3. 1? 12, 10. Gal. 4. 22. Joh. 3. 3

Eph. 5. 26. 1 Pet. 2. 9. 1 Cor. 13. 2. Heb. 11. 38. Joh. 20. 17. Eph. 2. 15. 2 Pet. 1. 4. Matth. 5. 48. Phil. 2. 15. 1 Joh. 3. 9, 10. Rom. 8. 14, 21, 33. 1 Joh. 5. 1 Tim. 2. 1. Heb. 11. 10, 13. Gal. 4. 25, 26. Eph. 1. 3. and 2. 6. Heb. 3. 6. 1 Cor. 3. 21.

(a) *Civitas Regenerationis. Terrena Civitas generatione tantum modo, Cæleſtis autem etiam regeneratione opus habet.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c. 20. & 16.

(b) Πῶς γὰρ εἰσελθεῖν ἐπιτέτραπται τῷ ξένῳ; ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν, οἶμαι, ἐγγραφῇ καὶ πολιτευθῇ καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἀπολάβῃ, τότε ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς γενήσεται, τότε κληρονομῆσαι καταξιωθήσεται, τότε τῆς βασιλείας τῆς πατρῴας κοινωνήσει τῷ γνησίῳ, τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ. Clem. Protrept. p. m. 40.

(c) Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πρωτότοκος ἐκκλησία, ἡ ἐκ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν συγκειμένη παιδίων. Ub. sup. p. 40.

tute therefore together with the Saints on Earth *the City of Regeneracy*, which is the comprehenſion of all the Goods and Excellencies of Regeneracy, of that *Nobility* and *Honour*, that *Light* and *Love*, that *Life* and *Liberty*, which are oppoſite to the Evils of Unregeneracy, and of that *Righteouſneſs*, *Peace and Joy* which the Kingdom of God is, and which God is as his kind of Goods and Excellencies (the truly Noble and Divine kind of Righteouſneſs, Joy and Peace,) which are (d) *the Treaſure of the Kingdom and of the State of Salvation.*

IV. The Idea of God inferreth, that he muſt be notic'd and repreſentented as of the God-kind, *and if our Idea of God doth not ſo repreſent him, it is ſpurious and illegitimate.* S. *Chryſoſtom* calleth the Jews Synagogue (e) τῶν δαιμόνων καταγώγιον, *a place of reception for Devils*, εἰδωλολατρείας τὸ χωρίον, *the place of Idolatry*, and he affirmeth, that οὐδεὶς Ἰουδαῖος προσκυνεῖ τὸν Θεὸν, *no Jew worſhippeth God*, proving it from our Saviour's Saying, *Ye neither know me, nor my Father: If ye had known me, ye ſhould have known my Father alſo.* This Father contenteth himſelf to have prov'd his Aſſertion from Teſtimony of Scripture without inquiring into the Reaſon of it, which muſt be deduc'd from our preſent Theory. For the only Reaſon imaginable why the God whom the Jews Worſhip, is not the true God, is becauſe he is not *the God-kind of God* (but ſpecifically different,) *not the Sanctity Vital, not the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial*, from whom the carnal Jews are of Religion and Condition aliens and extraneous. The *Muhammedans* are as ſpeculative and ſubtle Diſputants about the Divine Eſſence and Attributes, as the Jews are. (f) Their *Al Calam* or Metaphyſical Theology (as they define it) *is the Learning which maketh inquiries about the Eſſence and Attributes of God.* Their Sect of the *Sephatii* and *Motazali* are ingag'd in a Diſpute about *eternal Attributes*; and in theſe Scholaſtic Diſputes and Diſquiſitions they come not behind the Schools of Chriſtendom, nor do they come behind us in acknowledging a governing Providence, which the Pagan Theiſts alſo acknowledged. Yet Chriſtian Divines thus cenſure the Muhammedans God. (g) *We call every thing an Idol, that a Man worſhippeth as God (ſimply or in ſome reſpect,) which is not the true God. Which may be either a thing really exiſtent, or imaginary only. The former is a real Idol: The latter is only an imaginary Idol, and ſuch is that God, whom the Jews and the Turks Worſhip.* If Chriſtian Divines muſt not be ſuppoſed to Blaſpheme in reproaching the *Muhammedans* Deity, their God muſt be ſuppos'd, to be a falſe God, as not being the God-kind of God. for they expreſly deny any ſuch God, that is the Imperial Eſtate of the holy Empire, ſymbolizing with the Pagans in their fundamental Errour, *that God hath no Kingdom but the mundane Empire.* (h) *They reject the ſecond Petition in our Lord's Prayer, becauſe* (ſay they) *God is every where; therefore it is inept to pray for his Kingdom to come.* As the Muhammedan Scholaſtics Symbolize with the Pagans touching a mundane Kingdom of God: So the Chriſtian Scholaſticks Symbolize with them in their method of forming the Idea of God. For in forming this Idea the Platoniſts proceeded (i) κατ' ἀφαίρεσιν, *by removing imperfections*, and κατ' ἀναλογίαν, *by analogy to things ſenſible.* So the Chriſtian Scholaſticks in forming their Idea of God proceed *via remotionis*, removing from God the ſeveral imperfections we find in our ſelves; and *via eminentiæ*, adding infinity to all the Perfections we find in our own Natures. An Idea of God thus formed may ſerve well enough in Diſputes againſt Atheiſm, but if ſuch an Idea is our ultimate Idea of God, we are (ſpeculatively) Aliens from the true Idea of God much what at the rate of Jews and Muhammedans.

V. The Idea of God inferreth, that he ought to be repreſented as *unknownable* by the Sons of Carnality and unregeneracy, but not in the extravagant Senſe of Atheiſts and Metaphyſical Theologers, who pretend, (k) *that they can give him no Name, nor any definition or deſcription, whereby it may be declar'd what he is.* (l) *The beſt Terms for Men to manifeſt their Underſtanding God by, are thoſe which manifeſt, that they underſtand him not.* The great Lights of the Church were unhappily poſſeſs'd with theſe dark Conceits. For *Gr. Naz.* having cited this Saying of *Plato*, Θεὸν νοῆσαι μὲν χαλεπὸν, φράσαι δὲ ἀδύνατον, (it is difficult to reach God by any Preception of the Mind, but to declare him by Speech is impoſſible,) he ſubjoineth Φράσαι μὲν ἀδύνατον, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος· νοῆσαι δὲ ἀδυνατώτερον. *I would rather ſay, it is impoſſible, to expreſs God, more impoſſible, to underſtand him.* (n) *Whatever occurreth to your Mind, whatever you can think of, ſay, he is not that; for if he was that, it had not occurred to my Mind.* Which is to ſay, that God is not any thing cogitable by Man. (o) *Whatever Conceptions or Expreſſions we can have concerning God, are proper only to Human things. The one certain way of underſtanding God is, to know and think, that Man can ſay nothing of God.* The Extravagance of this Apologiſt (*Arnobius*) may fitly be reproved and refuted by his own Reaſonings againſt the Pagans. (p) *How can it be known, that any God is, if it ſhall be unknown what he is? For every one that becometh a ſuppliant to a Deity, neceſſarily ſhould know, to whom he maketh Supplication, whom he imploreth, of whom he deſireth aid for human Affairs and Neceſſities.* They that pretend, to know, that God is, without knowing *what he is*, pretend to know him no otherwiſe (q) than the beholder of an excellent Harp knoweth the Harp-maker, of whom he hath no perſonal Notices, but only knoweth in general, that there is an excellent Harpmaker, (r) or as we know a Man with a Viſard on his Face, whom we know to be a Man in general only, but know not definitely and determinately who it is, or as a blind Man going into the Sun and finding himſelf warmed, knoweth in general, that there is a calefactive Principle, that warmeth him, but knoweth not the Sun definitely and determinately.

(d) Ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς σωτηρίας. Clem. ſupr. p. 44.

(e) T. 6. p. 369.

Joh. 8. 19.

(f) Pocock. Spec. p. 198.

(g) *Idoli nomine intelligimus, quicquid homo tanquam Deum, vel ſimpliciter, vel* κατά τι *& ex parte, ſibi extra verum Deum proponit fingitque colendum. Id autem eſſe poteſt, aut res vera & in rerum natura exiſtens; aut falſa & imaginatione tantum concepta. Si illud, reale fuerit Idolum; ſi hoc, imaginarium tantum: Qualis eſt ille Deus quem ſibi Judæi, Turcæ---- colendum proponunt.* Zanch. T. 4. l. 1. c. 17.

(h) Hoornbeck Theol. pract. T. 2. l. 9. c. 16. p. 251.

(i) *Alcin. de Doctr. Plat. c.* 10.

(k) *Gaſſend. T.* 1. p. 295, 296, 302, 303.

(l) *Scalig. de ſubtil. Exerc.* 365. *S.* 2.

(n) *Quicquid occurrerit quod cogitare poſſitis, dicite, non eſt illud. Non enim ſi illud eſſet, mihi jam occurriſſet.* S. Aug. Enar. 2. in Pſal. 26.

(o) *Quicquid de Deo dixeris, quicquid tacitæ mentis cogitatione conceperis, in humanum tranſilit & corrumpitur ſenſum. ---- unus eſt hominis intellectus de Dei natura certiſſimus, ſi ſcias & ſentias, nihil de illo poſſe mortali oratione depromi.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 3. p. 111.

(p) *Quemadmodum poterit an ſit Deus aliquis ſciri, ſi ignorabitur & neſcietur quid ſit? Omnis enim qui quærit alicujus numinis implorare reſponſum, debet neceſſario ſcire cui ſupplicet, quem imploret, à quo rebus auxilia & neceſſitatibus expoſcat, humanis.* Ibid. l. 3. p. 124, 125.

(q) *Gr. Naz. ſupr.*

(r) *Gaſſend. T.* 1. p. 295.

So Men may know, that there is a God in general only, without knowing definitely and determinately *who, or what he is, that is God.* But the knowing only thus much of God, is not to be call'd *the knowing God* (it is really a not knowing him;) for he knoweth not the King, who knoweth only, that there is a King in our Nation, but knoweth not *who, or what he is, that is King*; and he that knoweth no more of the King, may do his Honour to one that is but a Kitchin-boy inſtead of the King. It is one thing to know in general only, that there is a God, and another thing to know, *that God is* (that he exiſteth who indeed is God:) He that knoweth in general only, that there is a God, is but a Theiſt in general only, *a Vago-Theiſt* (a Theiſt at random,) and muſt be a Religioniſt in general only without being of any definite or determinate Religion. But the great concern of ſerious Religioniſts is, to be of the true Religion, the Deity whereof is the true God, who is ſufficiently notic'd to us by the true Religion, as appeareth (more eſpecially) from that illuſtrious Idea of his *ſpecific* and *individual* determination, which we have repreſented, namely, that God as to what he is of kind and politically, is

The Sanctity Imperial,
The Sanctity Vital,
The Sanctity Imperial-perſonal.

I will not ſo far debaſe Theology, as to compare this Idea with thoſe noble Theories in Secular Learning, *The Circulation of the Blood, the Motion of the Earth, and the true Syſtem of the Viſible World*; for what is the World to God? Earth to Heaven? Humane Blood to Holineſs? or Secular Learning to the Science of Sanctity the Saint of God-kind of Learning? There is no Compariſon, no Proportion between Mundane and Divine kind of things, between the Secular and the Spiritual, the Vile, Common and Exotick, and the Choice, Special and Saving, between Humane Speculation and the Beatific Viſion, natural Theory and the genuine expreſſive Idea of God. *It cannot be valued with the Gold of* Ophir, *with the precious* Onyx *or the Sapphire.* (s) *To reach a little of the Divine Things* (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) *is more delicious, than to know all theſe kind of things that are about us,* διὰ τὴν τιμιότητα, *becauſe of their tranſcendent Excellency and Pretioſity.* The ſame Philoſopher wrote to *Antipater* concerning *Alexander*, (t) *That it did not belong to him alone, to be elated in Mind, becauſe he had rule over many,* ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἧττον εἴ τις ὀρθῶς γινώσκει περὶ θεῶν, *it doth no leſs belong to any Man, that hath attain'd the right knowledge of the Gods.* But from this high and happy attainment *the due diſcernment and underſtanding of God* our Idea excludeth all the Sons of Carnality and Wickedneſs; for although God is notic'd to them many ways, in the plaineſt manner and with the loudeſt Voice, and Multitudes of them may profeſs his Theology and Religion, yet in the main they are neceſſarily aliens from God and from knowing him, being in the main aliens from the thing that God is, and from knowing it, extraneous to that Specific Comprehenſion which he is of, and not of his Correſpondence.

VI. The Idea of God inferreth, *That the Godhead is Atheiz'd in various degrees by unregenerate Mankind*; which is too viſible in the Pagan Theology, the Deities whereof are all of them *ſpecifically* different from the true God, all of them belong to the Specific Comprehenſion of Man's Unregeneracy, and had their riſe from his fall. Whence the Birds in *Ariſtophanes*'s *Avibus* may well be allow'd to boaſt, that they being the firſt Off-ſpring of winged *Cupid*, were the Fore-elders of all the Gods of the Poets, πάντων τε θεῶν μακάρων γένος, *and the whole Generation of the Gods* were their Juniors. The Gentiles atheiz'd the Godhead (which was their great Crime) by their Image-σεβάσματα, *changing the Glory of the Incorruptible God into an Image made like to Corruptible Man, and to Birds, and four-footed Beaſts and creeping things.* Their Painters and Statuaries (*u*) oftentimes made the Images of their Goddeſſes in the form and ſhape of their own Harlots, whom they moſt fancy'd (ſuch as *Phryne* and *Cratina*,) *Cicero* ſheweth, (*w*) that the Image conſecrated by *Clodius* in his Houſe under the Name of the Goddeſs of Liberty, *Tanagræam fuiſſe meretricem*, *was a* Tanagræan *Harlot*. In great degree the Godhead was atheiz'd by that common Sentiment of the Pagans, (*x*) *Naturam eſſe Deum*; *that Nature is God* (underſtanding by Nature, not meerly the Corporeal Univerſe, but an Intelligent Mundane Animative Nature:) And in a leſſer degree the Godhead was Atheiz'd by *Anaxagoras*; for his *infinite active Mind free from all mixture of Matter* was not the Deity (or Sovereignty) of true Religion and Sanctity. *Clemens* and *Lactantius* applaud the Pagans for calling God Nature; but if meer Mundane Nature be deify'd, the Deity is atheiz'd (being deſpoil'd of every thing that is of God-kind,) our Theiſm can be no better than Athe-iſm, and it may be no better than the groſſeſt Atheiſm imaginable. Such is the Theiſm of the wiſeſt of the Sect of *Xaca* in *China*; (*y*) "they place their whole Intent on "the underſtanding the firſt Principle, whom "they believe, to be the ſame in all things, "and all things to be the ſame with him without any eſſential difference, operating according to the extrinſic qualities of the Subject, "as Wax is formed into ſeveral Figures, the "which being diſſolv'd by liquefaction remain "in ſubſtance the ſelf ſame Wax. They divide Mankind into ten Claſſes, the four firſt "whereof are good, that is, *Principiantes* or *Beginners*, *Proficientes* or *Proficients*, *Provecti or "thoſe that have advanced*, *Conſummati or they "that are accompliſh'd*. The three firſt do walk "well, although they are but yet in the way; "but the fourth is arriv'd at perfection by "means of contemplating the firſt Principle, "and by mortification of their Paſſions, which "did diſquiet them with Perturbations and "Scruples; and do already enjoy ſuch an internal quiet and peace of Mind, that nothing "doth give them any remorſe or trouble for "whatever they think, ſay or do; aſſuring "their Conſciences that after Death they are to "expect neither Reward nor Puniſhment, but "that every thing ſhall return to its Principle, "as it was at firſt. (*z*) Amongſt the Jewiſh Cabaliſts the Deity is transform'd into the moſt hideous Monſter imaginable (called *Arich Anpin* and *Adam Cadmon*,) their *Idra Rabba* hath made a deſcription of 9000 Myriads of Worlds in his Brain, 375 in his Noſe, and 208 elſewhere. If *Muhammediſm* is deriv'd in great part from Rabbinical Cabaliſm, (*a*) as ſome ſuppoſe; it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that in the *Muhammedans* Notion of God there is a mixture of Rabbinical Phantaſtry and monſtrous Imagination. And this may the more reaſonably be thought, becauſe (*b*) their Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith is ſtuffed with the Monſtroſities of *Moncari* and

Naciri,

(s) *Ariſt. de part. Anim. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

(t) *Plut. de Profect. p.* 78.

Rom. 1. 23.

(u) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 26. *Plin. N.H. l.* 35. *c.* 9.

(w) *Or. ad Pontif. pro dom.*

(x) *Voſſ. de Idol. Ep. ad Lect.*

(y) *Semedo Hiſt. par.* 1. *ch.* 18.

(z) *See Dr. H. More against the Book Drachin, T.* 1. *p.* 44 [illegible]

(a) *Simon. Hiſt. Crit. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(b) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 274.

Naciri, of *Muhammed's watering-place, a Bridge to Paradiſe not ſo broad as an Hair-breadth, and a Balance as big as the Surface of the Earth and the Heavens alſo.* In the Ideas of God that are currant in the Schools of Chriſtendom, there is nothing of monſtrous Imagination, unleſs this may be thought a monſtrous Imagination, They have nothing of God in them, *no God-kind of thing*. If a Man is deſpoil'd of his Virility, we call him, (c) *abſciſſum & ſpoliatum viro:* So if in our Ideas of God he is Deſpoil'd of his Divinity (of kind ſuch) we have reaſon to complain, that he is *abſciſſus & ſpoliatus Deo*. If a Child of God is deſpoiled of the things of Regeneracy, he is no longer a Child of God but a vile kind of Perſon: So if our Ideas of God deſpoil him of the things of Regeneracy (of his Sanctity Vital and Imperial,) he is no longer God, but a vile kind of Being.

The Rabbins ſay, *Orbem ſupremum & quicquid in eo eſt, Virum quendam eſſe, præditum membris, ſicuti Reuben ac Simeon.* Vorſt. in Maim. de Fund. Leg. p. 30.

VII. The Idea of God implieth and inferreth, *That in his own Nature and unto us he is a Knowledge* (peculiar to Regeneracy,) *that is fitly called his kind of Knowledge.* For there is a Knowledge, that God is, and that is of God, as he is *the Sanctity Vital and Imperial*, the Father and Founder of the Regenerate and Divine Family, who in reſpect of their Knowledge are his *living Images, the New Man being renew'd in knowledge after the Image of him that created him.* To be renew'd into this Knowledge, is to be renew'd into the Similitude of God (which is the Life of Grace,) which therefore is not a common Humane kind of thing (as all other Knowledge is,) but it is a Divine Grace, and that which of kind and quality is of God, and a participation of his *Godly Wiſdom*, as our Engliſh Liturgy ſpeaketh. The Nature of this Divine kind of Knowledge will in part appear from theſe definitive Names of it.

(1.) This Divine kind of Knowledge is *the Light of Life* (ſo call'd by our Saviour,) which is a principal conſtitutive Ingredient of the Regenerate and Divine Family, (*d*) and differenceth them from the comprehenſion of *Darkneſs*, the benighted World of Unregenerate Mankind. Their *Light of Life* neceſſarily denoteth one of their Spiritual-vital Goods, and therefore denoteth (*e*) the Light of their Holy Spiritual Life, which leadeth unto Life Eternal. Not the whole of their Vital Sanctity, but the Intellectual Light of that Life, the Light of Knowledge, of Truth, and of Underſtanding is the Light of Life, *Eph.* 5. 8. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. 1 *Joh.* 2. 27. and 5. 20. (2) It is *Scientia Sanctorum, the Knowledge peculiar to and conſtitutive of the truly Holy*; which is contradiſtinct not only to Secular and Humane Learning and Knowledge commonly ſo called, but to the common and unholy kind of knowing the matters of Holineſs and true Religion; for as there is (*f*) an Infidel kind of believing on the Name of Chriſt: So there is an unholy kind of knowing the Matters of Holineſs and Religion. Hypocrites and unſanctify'd Perſons within the Pale of the Church have a ſort of knowledge of the Doctrines and Propoſitions of the Science of Sanctity (and may compoſe Syſtems of Theology;) but this their knowledge is an *Exoterical* and *School-kind* of knowledge, of different kind and quality from *the knowledge of the Holy*; which is the Saint of God-kind of knowing the things of God, the Holy-virtuous kind of knowing the things of Holineſs. The knowledge which unſanctify'd Perſons have of divine things is no better than an humane kind of thing; but *the knowledge of the Holy* is the divine kind of knowing the things Divine, the godly kind of knowing the things of Godlineſs, the knowledge of the matters of Sanctity which is in Sanctity, and which is Sanctity (a Branch of it,) it is the Science of Sanctity, which is ſubjectively Sanctity of Science; for the truly Holy are uſually characteriz'd by their Science of Sanctity, 1 *Joh.* 2. 13, 14, 21. and 4.7. and 5.20. 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. *Col.* 3.10. *Matth.* 16.17. *Joh.*6.44,45. (3.) *It is the knowledge of the Holy in a ſtrict acceptation*; for as the Inſtitution of Religion and Sanctity is a Learning and Erudition (which *Plato* defineth, (*g*) εἰς ἀρετὴν παιδείαν, *Erudition to Virtue*:) So the whole of true Religion and Sanctity on our part is *the Holy kind of Learning and Knowledge*, and all the Ingredients of our Piety and Sanctity are *the Science of Sanctity*, in the ſame ſenſe that good Orations are Rhetorick, good Arguments are Logick, and decent Motions are the Science of decent Motion. The whole of Religion and Sanctity on our part conſiſteth in learning and knowing God as we ought, (whence it is uſually called in Scripture, The knowledge of God,) and the not knowing God as we ought, is the Eſſence and Summary of all Wickedneſs: (*h*) *Not to know God, is Death, as to know him, is Life Eternal.* In a large ſenſe, *The knowledge of God* or *The Science of Sanctity conſtitutive* compriſeth univerſal Sanctity on our part; but in a ſtrict acceptation it is not the whole of the Holy Life, but the Holy Light thereof, *The Light of the knowledge of God*, 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. (4.) The Science of *Sanctity inſtitutive* and the *Science of Sanctity conſtitutive* are one and the ſame Science; for the *Science of Sanctity inſtitutive become a Divine Intellectual Virtue of the Mind is the Science of Sanctity conſtitutive.* Both are (*i*) the ſame Divine Knowledge, Truth and Wiſdom, and Divine Intellectual Light, which barreth all pretenſion to extravagant Enthuſiaſm; for this Divine kind of knowledge conſtitutive is nothing elſe but *quod veritas eſt in verbo, what is revealed Truth in the Divine Oracles.* Clemens thus deſcribeth it: (*k*) *It is not meer Words that we call Knowledge, but a certain Science, and that Light ingendred in the Soul by obeying according to the Commandments, that maketh all things manifeſt, the things in Generation and Man himſelf, fitting him to know himſelf, and teaching him to aim at God and making him an adeptus* (in the knowledge) *of God*; *for what the Eye is in the Body, that Knowledge is in the Mind.* (5.) A Name accommodate for this Divine Knowledge may be deriv'd from the ſublimer Philoſophers, which is, *the Divine Right Reaſon.* For although the Stoicks account the

(c) Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 24.

Col. 3. 10.

Joh. 8. 12.

(d) *Joh.* 1. 5. *and* 11. 10. and 12. 46. *Act.* 26. 18. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Eph.* 4. 18. *and* 6. 12. Col. 1. 13. *and* 3. 10. 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 5. 1 *Pet.* 1. 14. *and* 2. 9. 1 *Joh.* 2. 10, 11.

(e) *Joh.* 1. 4, 9. *and* 12. 35, 36. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4, 6. *and* 3. 14. *Eph.* 5. 8, 14.

(f) Dr. Jackſon of Juſtif. Faith, c. 13.

(g) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 12. *c.* 18.

(h) Τὸ δὲ ἀγνοεῖν τὸν πατέρα θάνατός ἐστιν, ὡς τὸ γνῶναι ζωὴ αἰώνιος. *Clem. Strom l.* 5. *p. m.* 521. Of the knowledge of God, vid. 2 *Chron.* 28. 9. *Prov.* 2. 5. *Iſa.* 11. 9. *Jer.* 9. 24. *and* 22. 16. *and* 24. 7. *Hoſ.* 4. 1. *and* 6. 6. *Joh.* 17. 3. *Eph.* 4. 20. *Phil.* 3. 8.

(i) *Pſal.* 19. 8. *and* 119. 130. *Prov.* 6. 23. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4, 6. *Joh.* 1. 9. *and* 12. 36. *Eph.* 4. 23. *and* 5. 8. 1 *Pet.* 2. 9.

(k) Οὐ γὰρ λόγον ψιλὸν εἶναι τὴν γνῶσιν φαμὲν, ἀλλά τινα ἐπιστήμην θείαν, καὶ φῶς ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐν ψυχῇ ἐγγινόμενον ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς ὑπακοῆς, τὰ πάντα καταδηλα ποιοῦν, τά τε ἐν γενέσει, αὐτόν τε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἑαυτόν τε γινώσκειν παρασκευάζον, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπήβολον καθίστασθαι διδάσκον. ὡς γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι, τοῦτο ἐν τῷ νῷ ἡ γνῶσις. *Strom. l.* 3. *p. m.* 324.

Reaſon of Mankind, (*l*) a Divine Thing, define God (*m*) by meer Reaſon or by common Right Reaſon (they ſuppoſing, that the Divine Nature is of no better kind than common Rational Nature,) yet the ſublimer Philoſophers thus diſtinguiſh; *We ſhall not live according to Nature, which we all ſuperlatively deſire,* (*n*) *if we do not live according to Reaſon both Divine and Humane.* (*o*) According to *Empedocles* the *Criterion of Truth is not Sence, but Right Reaſon: Right Reaſon is of two ſorts, the one* θεῖος, *Divine, the other* ἀνθρώπινος, *Humane, of which the Divine is inexplicable, but the Humane is declarable.* It is not to be expected, that the Philoſophers ſhould give an intelligible account of their *undeclarable Myſticks*; but from the Notices of the Chriſtian Religion a clear intelligible account may be given of Right-Reaſon both Divine and Humane; for if the reaſoning intelligent Mind be right, (without Ignorance, Error, Fooliſhneſs) this is Right Reaſon. The common Humane kind of Knowledge therefore (*p*) is the common Humane kind of Right Rreaſon, and the Holy Divine kind of Knowledge is the Holy Divine kind of Right Reaſon; which Holy and Divine kind of Right Reaſon conſiſteth in being divinely virtuous in our Reaſon (the oppoſite to Atheous Ignorance, Error, Fooliſhneſs,) and this Divine kind of Knowledge or Right Reaſon God is as his kind of Knowledge or Right Reaſon; for all that are imbu'd with it are θεοδίδακτοι, *taught of God and taught divinely, Matth.* 16. 17. *Joh.* 6. 45. (6.) It is Knowledge (good apprehenſion and diſcernment of things) and it is *Faith* alſo; it may be conſider'd as it is Faith, and it muſt be contemplated as knowledge and good underſtanding (*q*) εἰς ἐξομοίωσιν θεοῦ, *which is Man's aſſimilation to God.* The following deſcriptive Notices of it ſpeak its Divine Nature and Properties.

VIII. It conſtituteth its Poſſeſſours *the Wiſe and Intelligent in the main, and therefore the Wiſe and Intelligent in the main in the matters of Sanctity and Saving Religion, without which none can be wiſe and intelligent in the main.* The abſtract terms *Knowledge, Wiſdom and good underſtanding* (as others of like nature) ſignifie both in *an abſtract material acceptation* what is Knowledge, Wiſdom and good underſtanding of things (as a Man is ſaid, *to intermeddle with all Wiſdom,* Prov. 18. 1.) and in *a concrete formal Acceptation,* the being wiſe, knowing and of good underſtanding; for ſo *the fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wiſdom,* becauſe it is the beginning of being Wiſe, *Prov.* 1. 7. In both theſe Acceptations *the knowledge of the Holy* pretendeth to the Name of *Wiſdom,* and to be (comparatively ſpeaking) the only valuable Wiſdom, becauſe no other Wiſdom and Knowledge ſaveth Men from being ignorant and fooliſh in the main (which is the main of Folly) this only maketh them wiſe and intelligent in the main. No Man is perfectly wiſe and knowing (the *Jews* ſay, (*r*) *There are ſixty Gates of Science, and all were deliver'd to* Moſes *one excepted,*) none have good underſtanding in all things (therefore *Socrates* ſaid, None but God is wiſe;) but they that are of good underſtanding in the main, are the truly (though not perfectly) wiſe; and he that is not ſo far wiſe, muſt be called by the Name, which the Wiſe Man hath given him, *The ſimple Man that lacketh underſtanding,* Prov. 9. 4. Wiſdom conſiſteth in being wiſe in the main, which is to be wiſe in reſpect of the main Intereſt, *to be holy and happy for ever.* It conſiſteth therefore in being wiſe and intelligent in the main in the matters of Sanctity and Saving Religion, *which is the knowledge of the Holy.* Whence ariſeth an eminent Note of difference between Holy and Unholy Mankind; who could not be unholy, (*s*) if they were not in the main unintelligent of the matters of Sanctity, their true Idea, Reality and Worth, Excellency and Importance, of the wiſe Choice and the wiſe Bargain, of their own foul and deadly erroneous Conceits and Self-deluſions, of the true rates of things and the difference between the things momentous and momentaneous; nor could they be impos'd upon by deadly counterfeit ſhews of Truth, Piety and Sanctimony, and deluſive appearances of Felicity, *did they ſee with their Eyes and underſtand with their Hearts*; (*t*) *their Eyes are holden* ὑπὸ τῆς περὶ θεοῦ ἀγνοίας, *by their ignorance of God.* (*u*) *It is impoſſible for them, to have the knowledge of God, who are ſway'd by their vitious Paſſions and Luſts, which are cauſally Atheous Ignorance, Error and Fooliſhneſs:* (*w*) *As Ruſt in a Looking-glaſs ſuch is Wickedneſs in Man;* οὐ δύναται ὁ τοιοῦτος ἄνθρωπος θεωρεῖν τὸν θεόν, *ſuch a Man cannot diſcern God. Art thou an Adulterer, a Fornicator, a Thief, a Raptor, a Defrauder, a Sodomite, a contumelious Perſon, a Reviler, Wrathful, Envious, Proud, contemptuous of others, a Striker, a lover of Money, diſobedient to Parents, a ſeller of thy Children,* τοῖς ταῦτα πράσσουσιν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐμφανίζεται, *to them that do ſuch things as theſe God doth not appear, unleſs they firſt cleanſe themſelves from all Pollution.* (*x*) *He is miſtaken, that thinketh he knoweth the truth* (the Saint of Godkind of Learning and Philoſophy) *being yet wicked in his Life*; for he is in the main deficient in knowing it being in the main in the ſtate of Atheous Ignorance, Error and Fooliſhneſs. *Plato* would have all other Learning ſlighted and neglected in compariſon of that Diſcipline, (*y*) which rendreth a Man βίον καὶ χρηστὸν καὶ πονηρὸν διαγινώσκοντα, *diſcerning of a good and a bad Life.* In this principal Learning and Diſcipline unregenerate Mankind would be better ſkill'd than they are, if they were not unintelligent in the main. Of their prodigious deficiency in it the *Jews* are an Inſtance, (*z*) who boaſt of the unſtained ſinleſs Life of their Doctors, and tell us of one of them, (*a*) who was ſo great a Saint, *that he committed no ſin all the Days of his Life, this one misfortune excepted, once he put on his Frontal Phylacteries before thoſe of his Arm.*

IX. It ſaveth from the ſtate of *Blindneſs* and *blinding things:* For as they that are devoid of the Holy Life, are in the ſtate of Carnality and Wickedneſs; ſo they that are devoid of *the Light of Life,* are in the ſtate of Blindneſs; which criminal and calamitous Blindneſs (according to the Chriſtian Theology) may be very much illuſtrated from the Philoſophers Complaints of the Blindneſs of Mankind, which they account one of their greateſt Calamities.

(l) *Sen. Ep.* 65.

(m) *Chryſippus ait vim divinam in ratione eſſe poſitam.* Cic. de N. D. l. 1. Ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενος, *Laert. in Zenon.*

(n) Ἐὰν μὴ κατὰ λόγον ζῶμεν τὸν θεῖον καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον. *Jambl.* προτρεπ. *p.* 18.

(o) *Dr. Cudw. Intell. Syſt. p.* 23.

(p) *Secundum rectam rationem civilem vivebant.* Cic. de Invent.

(q) *Clem. Str. l.* 6. *p. m.* 496.

Prov. 9. 10. *Pſal.* 111. 10. *Matt.* 25. 2. *Luc.* 1. 17. *Col.* 1. 9. *and* 2. 3. 1 *Cor.* 1. 20, 30. 2 *Tim.* 3. 17. *Jam.* 3. 13. *Prov.* 8. 5. *Pſal.* 119. 130. 1 *Cor.* 3. 18.

(r) *Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. p.* 208.

Luc. 1. 77. *Joh.* 17. 3. 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. *Heb.* 8. 11. 1 *Joh.* 2. 13, 14, 20, 27.

(s) *Prov.* 4. 19. *and* 30. 3. *Pſal.* 119. 18, 27. *Iſa.* 51. 7. *Matth.* 13. 15, 44. *and* 23. 19. *Luc.* 4. 18. *Joh.* 9. 39. *and* 12. 15. *and* 14. 17. *and* 16. 2, 3. *and* 17. 25. 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. 2 *Cor.* 3. 14. *Eph.* 4. 18. 1 *Joh.* 2. 11. *and* 5. 20. *Apoc.* 3. 17, 18. *Dan.* 9. 13. *Prov.* 2. 9.

(t) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 321, 322.

(u) *Clem. Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 324.

(w) *Theophil. ad Autol. l.* 1. *initio.*

(x) *Errat quiſquis veritatem ſe putat cognoſcere, cum adhuc nequiter vivat.* S. Aug. de Agon. Chriſt. c. 13.

(y) *De Rep. l.* 10. *ſub fin.*

(z) *Coſri, p.* 240.

(u) *Lightfoot Hor. Luc.* 15. 7.

mities. (*b*) *He is a blind Man, that hath the Eye of his Mind ſhut. Men are in ſome ſort to be pitied,* (*c*) *becauſe of their ignorance of Goods and Evils, which is not a leſs defect or blindneſs, than that which depriveth us of diſcerning White and Black.* A Thief and an Adulterer the Philoſopher calleth, (*d*) *One in Error and deceiv'd about the greateſt things, and blinded, not as to the Eye-ſight which diſcerneth White and Black, but as to the Mind's diſcerning Goods and Evils. Philo* ſaith of the *Egyptians* who worſhipp'd Vile Animals; (*e*) *they were without Eye-ſight (the moſt neceſſary Sence,) not that of the Body, but that of the Soul, whereby alone true and falſe is diſcern'd.* So the Scripture (*f*) looketh upon Mankind in the ſtate of Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs, as in the ſtate of an Atheous kind of Blindneſs (not ſeeing, not knowing the Saint of God-kind of things,) which ſtate of Blindneſs is alſo the ſtate of *blinding things*, that abound, prevail and reign in it, whereby it becometh, not only a ſtate of *not ſeeing, not knowing* actually, but alſo a ſtate of *ineptitude* and *indiſpoſition* to ſee and know. (*g*) *Exhalations from the Earth make a caliginous Air: So none have the Light of their Mind, if the Fumes of fleſhly Luſts are continually ariſing.* Τυφλώττει ἡ πονηρία, *all Wickedneſs is blinding*, the love of any Sin, cuſtom in Sin, all the vicious Affections that reign and bear ſway in unholy Mankind, (Pride, Arrogance, Self-conceit, the admiration and love of the World, and over-valuing the Favour of Men,) to be ungodly affected (and addicted in any reſpect) indiſpoſeth the Mind for well diſcerning the matters of Godlineſs. (*h*) The Cuſtom and Faſhion of the World, Prejudice, Superſtition, Science falſly ſo called, are blinding things, and they are eaſily blinded by Impoſture, that are of themſelves prone, to miſtake the true nature, worth and uſe of things, to doat upon Gauds and Trifles, to a ſenſual Life and a ſenſitive Felicity, to Raſhneſs, Inconſiderateneſs, Security, Preſumptuouſneſs, Careleſneſs and Improvidence touching their great concerns, to deceive themſelves, and *to ſport themſelves in their own deceivings.* (*i*) As the *Turks* when they fall to their Cups, and are reſolv'd, to fill themſelves with ſuch Liquor, as they know, will intoxicate and make them drunk, are wont to make a great and unuſual noiſe, with which they call down (as they ſuppoſe) their Soul to the remoteſt part of their Body, that it may be as it were at a diſtance, and ſo not conſcious of their brutiſh Intemperance. The Divine Truth is unwelcome to the generality of Men (as being againſt the quiet of their Minds, their fleſhly Inclinations and worldly Intereſts, againſt what they eſteem and affect, and telling them unpleaſing things,) they like it not, and therefore will be of a different Opinion; for as the *Athenian* Orator ſaid, (*k*) *What every one liketh and willeth, that he maketh his Opinion.*

X. It conſtituteth the ſtate of Light and Knowledge; for by this Divine kind of Knowledge, (*l*) νὺξ φεύγεται, θάνατος οἴχεται, *the Night is driven away, death is profligated*; all deadly ſin is inconſiſtent with it, it ſaveth from all ſoul-damning Error (which is mortal Blindneſs;) for it is the knowledge of all things neceſſary to the ſtate of Life and Salvation, 1 *Joh.* 2. 20, 27. So far every one that is Spiritual (by ordinary Regeneration only) ἀνακρίνει μὲν πάντα, *hath the cognizance of all things*, 1 Cor. 2. 15. (*m*) Chriſtians diſcern and reject what is falſhood and impoſture, διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα, *by that Spirit that is in them*, which they have by their New-birth; for they are born into this Divine Knowledge, and their Divine Generation is according to *Plutarch*'s Notion of Generation, (*n*) *Generation is the going out of Darkneſs into the Sun and Light.* They could not be in the ſtate of Life and Salvation, if they had not *the Light of Life*, which they that are totally devoid of, (*o*) *are in the Region of Darkneſs and of Death.* They may be Strangers to the common Sciences, but not to the *Science of Sanctity and Salvation*; and although they are unacquainted with the Wiſdom of gaining the Riches, Preferments and Honours of the World, yet they are emerg'd out of βαθὺ σκότος ἀφροσύνη, *that deep Darkneſs their Fooliſhneſs* (as *Philo* ſpeaketh,) and it is always and univerſally true, (*p*) *the Soul of the Juſt is the Seat of Wiſdom. Their Body being dedicated to God is his Temple,* (*q*) *it becometh ſuch by their pure Sentiment touching the Creator.*

XI. It is the Spiritual Eye-ſight, (*r*) which is analogous to the Bodily Eye-ſight; for as the Light which is in our Bodily Life, is our Bodily Eye-ſight, which is the Light of this Life, is from natural Generation, thereby we guide our Steps, and it is cauſed by an irradiation of the Light of this World into the Eye: So the Light which is in our Spiritual Life, is our Spiritual Eye-ſight, *which is the Light of Life*, is from Spiritual Generation, thereby we walk in ſafe Paths, and it is cauſed by an irradiation of the Light which God is into the Mind, 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. (*s*) *It is Sun-light* ϗ φῶς τοῦ θεοῦ, *and the Light of God.* And as this Name the Bodily Eye-ſight denoteth not only actual ſeeing, but the Eye as it is a luminous Senſory (apt to ſee;) ſo *the Light of Life* ſignifieth not only the actual knowing the things Divine, but alſo the Mind as it is a luminous Principle of knowing them, which muſt be called *The Spiritual Eye-ſight.* The renew'd Mind is (*t*) ὀφθαλμὸς καινὸς ϗ καλὸς, *a new and good Eye*; which Deſcription of it ſpeaketh it our Spiritual Eye-ſight: (*u*) *We have the Eye of the Mind free, unobſtructed and lucid* (ſaith *Clemens*,) *whereby alone we behold that which is Divine.* As *Plato* ſuppos'd, that there is an innate Light in the Eye, and that by conjunction thereof with the External Light (or a συναύγεια) Viſion is perform'd: So if the Mind hath not put off the blinding things, if Obſtructions are not remov'd, if the Intellectual Eye is not made lucid and diaphanous (ἵνα τῷ φωτὶ καταλαμβάνηται φῶς, (*w*) *that Light may be enter-*

tain'd

(b) Τυφλὸς, ὁ καταμύων τῷ νοερῷ ὄμματι. *M. Ant. l.* 4. *s.* 29.

(c) Δι' ἄγνοιαν ἀγαθῶν ϗ κακῶν· οὐκ ἐλάττων ἡ πήρωσις αὕτη τῆς στερισκούσης τοῦ διακρίνειν τὰ λευκὰ ϗ μέλανα. *Idem l.* 2. *S.* 13.

(d) Τὸν πεπλανημένον ϗ ἐξηπατημένον περὶ τῶν μεγίστων, ϗ ἀποτετυφλωμένον, οὐ τὴν ὄψιν τὴν διακριτικὴν τῶν λευκῶν ϗ μελάνων, ἀλλὰ τὴν γνώμην τὴν διακριτικὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ϗ τῶν κακῶν. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(e) Ὄψιν τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην τῶν αἰσθήσεων πεπηρωμένοι· λέγω δὲ, οὐ τὴν σώματος, ἀλλὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, ᾗ τὸ ἀληθὲς ϗ ψεῦδος μόνῃ γνωρίζεται. Περὶ βίου θεωρητ.

(f) *Matth.* 13. 13, 15. *and* 15. 14. *and* 23. 19. *Joh.* 9. 39, 40. *and* 12. 40. *Act.* 28. 26, 27. *Eph.* 4. 18. 2 *Pet.* 1. 9. *Apoc.* 3. 17.

(g) *Clem. Str. l.* 2. *p. m.* 300.

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. p.* 322.

(i) *Mr. Farindon* 1. *Ser. on Gal.* 6. 7.

(k) Ὃ βούλεται τοῦθ' ἕκαστος ϗ οἴεται. *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 30.

(l) *Clem. ibid. p. m.* 55.

(m) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 4.

(n) Γένεσις δὲ, ἡ εἰς ἥλιον ϗ φῶς ἐκ σκότους πορεία. *Ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 1.

(o) *In tenebris & morte verſantur.* Lactant. l. 1. c. 5.

(p) *Anima juſti ſedes eſt ſapientiæ.* V. Petav. T. 4. l. 4. c. 13. S. 7.

(q) Τοιοῦτον ἀπὸ τῆς καθαρᾶς περὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἐννοίας γινόμενον. *Orig. ſupr. l.* 4. *p.* 177.

(r) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 6 22.

(s) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 38.

(t) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 322.

(u) Ἐλεύθερον ϗ ἀνεμπόδιστον ϗ φωτεινὸν ὄμμα τοῦ πνεύματος ἴσχομεν, ᾧ δὴ μόνῳ τὸ θεῖον ἐποπτεύομεν. *Clem. Pædag. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(w) *Gr. Naz. orat.* 34. *of the Excellency of the Eye.* vid. Jamb. προτρεπτ. p. 12, 13.

tain'd and comprehended by Light, the external by the internal,) we cannot be ſaid to have recovered our Eye-ſight; without which Eye-ſight (at leaſt in ſome degree and *in fieri*) we ſee not the things Divine, although external Light ſhineth round about us: *But the Light ſhineth in Darkneſs, and the Darkneſs comprehendeth it not.* Joh. 1. 5. So in reform'd Chriſtendom multitudes are as blind as Owls and Night-birds in the Day-light, and their Practices ſpeak them (in the main at leaſt) Heathen Sons of Darkneſs. They diſcern not the Cheat and Impoſture of ſenſitive things, nor the boundleſs Excellency and Importance of the things inviſible, nor the Pulchritude of Divine Virtue, and the horrid aſpect of Sin and Wickedneſs: But they wallow in Uncleanneſs, and Swear and Drink and Revel at the old Heathen Rate. *Fools know not that they do Evil.* So the Romaniſts kill the Innocent ſuppoſing it God-ſervice. *Joh.* 16. 2.

XII. It conſiſteth in being *Holy-virtuous and duly Spiritual in our Intellectuals.* For it is the holy Underſtanding. 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. the holy Underſtanding is the *holy Light.* (x) *That which is Holy, properly called Light is amical to him* (the Father of Lights) *from whom it deſcendeth.* To introduce this Divine Knowledge into the Mind, is (y) *to remove out of the way thoſe Sins, which are of a caliginous Nature, and darkned* (the Mind) *the Divine Spirit*, (z) *to purifie the Mind by the Light of Truth, her diveſting her ſelf of thoſe Pollutions wherewith ſhe was replete, the abſterſion of her Eye to ſee clearly.* All which Expreſſions (underſtood agreeably to the Scripture-Theology) import a Sanctity of the Intellectuals. Which Sanctity of the Intellectuals is one Branch (a) *of the Sanctification of the whole Man, of the Renovation of the Mind*; that eminent part of it, *to be renewed in Knowledge*, and *to diſcern ſpiritually*, manifeſtly conſiſteth *in being holy and duly Spiritual in reſpect of our Intellectuals.* Unholy Mankind are unholy in their Intellectuals, they are carnal and groſly erroneous in their Ideas of Things and Perſons (which are ſuch as the carnal Jews have of *Abraham* and the *Meſſiah*, and the vulgar Papiſts have of *Jeſus* and the *Bl. Virgin*,) inſtead of God they ſet up (b) an Old Man or a Golden Calf which they may dance about, as the *Iſraelites* did (a God indifferent to Sin and Holineſs,) and their Heaven is no Heavenly-kind of Heaven. They conceit themſelves and their Partiſans *Wiſe*, when they are *Fools*, *Righteous* when they are *in their Sins*, the *Virtuous* when they are the *Vile*, the only *Saints*, when they are *Villains*, and that to be their *Sanctity* and *Religion*, which is their *Sin* and *Deluſion*. They are beſool'd by groſly impoſturous Religions, deluded by Shews, miſtake Shadows for Subſtance, dream of Golden Mountains, delude themſelves into a Fool's Paradiſe, and not knowing what is good for themſelves (not ſeeing the Illuſion of the Pleaſures of Sin, nor foreſeeing the Fates that are to come,) their whole Life is one continu'd Error. Τοίη μοῖρα βροτῶν βλάπτει φρένας, *ſuch is the blindneſs of Mankind!* They *Judge after the Fleſh* (as the Fleſh inclineth and ſuggeſteth,) and in their Sentiments are as Darkneſs to Light oppoſite to the Divine Family, that ſymbolize with God in their Sentiments, and ſee no Riches but in Righteouſneſs, no Beauty but in Holineſs, no Treaſure but in the Kingdom, no Felicity but in Piety. That deprecate and diſcard all mundane Goods and Excellencies, ſo far as they come in Compariſon and ſtand in Competition with the Divine Goods and Excellencies; that ſee an immenſe diſproportion between immortal Joys and empty Bubbles, write *Loſs and Dung* upon the goodly admir'd things of mundane Religioniſts, and fallacious deadly Vanity upon the gay and ſpecious things of the World; that diſcern a recondite Wiſdom in the fooliſhneſs of the word of the Croſs, immenſe Riches under a veil of Poverty, and Divine Glory under a cloud of Diſgrace; that diſdain the Fleſh-pots of *Egypt* (the Senſualiſts Felicities,) make light of the Favours and Frowns of the World, and the Sin which unholy Mankind count but a trifle, is in their Eyes of aſpect *as the Face of a Serpent*, and in their eſtimation as *the Poyſon of Dragons and the cruel Venom of Aſps.* Theſe two Families are (in ſeveral Inſtances) extremely diſſonant in their Accounts; what the one counteth *Wiſdom*, (c) the other counteth *Folly*; what the one counteth *Religion*, (d) the other calleth *Abomination*; what the one counteth Poverty, the other (e) accounteth *Riches*; what the one accounteth Pearls and Treaſure, the other accounteth Pelf and Traſh; what the one calleth Martyrdom, the other calleth *Perverſneſs and inflexible Obſtinacy*; and him whom the one accounteth a Villain and naileth to a Croſs, the other adoreth as the Life of God in Fleſh. What one Man idolizeth, another trampleth on, and the other trampleth on what he adoreth. *Denique non omnes eadem mirantur.*——

(x) Φίλον δὲ τὸ ἅγιον τῷ ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ δὴ κυρίως κέκληται φῶς. Clem. ſupr.

(y) Τὰς ἐπισκοτούσας ἁμαρτίας τῷ θείῳ πνεύματι ἀχλύος δίκην ἀποτρίβεσθαι. Ibid.

(z) Τῷ φωτὶ τῆς ἀληθείας καθαίρειν. *Jambl.* Προτρεπτ. p. 145. Ἡ ἀπόθεσις ὧν ἂν ἐπλήσθη μολυσμῶν. *Hierocl.* in aur. Car. p. 297. Τὸ ὄμμ. πρὸς ὀξυωπίαν ἑαυτῆς διασμήξασα. *Ibid.* p. 237.

(a) 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 23. Rom. 12. 2. Eph. 4. 23. Col. 3. 10. 1 Cor. 2. 14.

(b) Gaſſend. Inſtit. Log. Par. 1. Can. 3.

Joh. 8. 15.

Phil. 3. 8. Luc. 16. 15.

Eccluſ. 21. 2. Deut 32. 33.

(c) 1 Cor. 1. 23, 24. (d) Luc. 16. 15. (e) Apoc. 3. 8.

XIII. It is not meerly *Intellectual*, but *Vital* alſo (holy Vital kind of knowledge) *vitally Perceptive*, *Affective* and *Effective*. For it is a Branch of Spiritual Living (as the atheous Blindneſs is a Branch of Vital Carnality and Wickedneſs,) of ſuch a Nature as the Platoniſts fanſied Light to be. For they ſuppos'd, *that Light in Heaven is Sence, and that the Celeſtial Bodies by the Protenſion of their Rays have the Perception of Objects.* So this Divine kind of Knowledge is both *Light* and *Life*, a Tree of Knowledge and a Tree of Life. (g) Θεία αἴσθησις, *Divine Sence* is one of the Names of it: So the wiſe Man's Saying *The Fear of the Lord is the beginning of Knowledge*, is thus paraphras'd by the Septuagint, εὐσέβεια εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως, *Piety towards God is the beginning of Sence.* The Divine Knowledge is Divine Sence, φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, *the ſence and reliſh of a ſpiritual Mind*, or (as ſome have defin'd *ſapientia*) *ſapida Scientia, ſavoury Science*; for it is not a meer Theoretic inſipid kind of Knowledge, but a ſavour and reliſh of the things known; not a Syſtem of aerial Notions cold as the Moon-ſhine, but *the Light of Life.* They that are ſpiritually alive *ſavour the things that are of God* (others *nihil ſapiunt niſi terram*, (h) *ſavour nothing but the Earth*,) they are vitally perceptive of Sin and Sanctity, having a vital Antipathy and diſplicence againſt the one, and a vital Sympathy with, and Complacence in the other. Divine things are to them (not a dry Chip, or an empty Shell, but) ineffably agreeable, grateful and delicious, (the flower

(f) Ficin. com. in Plotin. p. 250.

(g) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 322.

Matth. 1 23.

(h) Lactant. l. c. 1.

flower of their delight,) their knowledge of them is lively and affectionate, and ſuch a taſt they have of them, as Men have of delicious Meats and Drinks, of fragrant Odours or melodious Sounds (*they are ſavoury Meat ſuch as they love,*) and this kind of knowing the things Divine the Schools (agreeably to the Scriptures) call *Scientia Guſtûs, the Knowledge of Taſt.* The Divine kind of Knowledge therefore is duly *Affective* being always accompany'd with Affections ſuitable to the things known, which is a knowing them as they ought to be known, and as they are propos'd to be known. For the odiouſneſs of Sin is propos'd to be hated, the worthleſneſs of the World to be diſaffected, the Majeſty of God to be rever'd, his Juſtice and Power to be fear'd, and his infinite Amiableneſs to be belov'd. *Neſcit Divina, qui non optat, qui non amat.* The Divine Knowledge muſt be conſider'd alſo as duly *Effective* and *Efficacious* (productive of all other Branches of Sanctity in the Soul and Life) agreeably to the Stile of Scripture, which by Knowledge uſually meaneth efficacious Knowledge. So an Heathen Theologer ſaith of his Paganical Divine Knowledge. (i) *The Knowledge of the Gods is Virtue and Wiſdom, and perfect Felicity, and maketh us like the Gods.* The Knowledge of Divine things is not to purpoſe, if it doth not make us Holy and Divine. Which can be effected only by the Divine kind of Knowledge; for the attainment whereof a principal Requiſite is (k) τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς νεκρούμενον, *the ſence and reliſh of the carnal Mind muſt be deadned*; ſenſitive Delights muſt become dull and inſipid, the Joys of this bodily Life dilute and evanid, and worldly Glory muſt be wither'd in our Eyes, if the Soul becometh vitally-perceptive of the Divine things.

n. 27.4. al. 34. and 19.103. ob.4 34. eb. 6. 5. Pet. 2.3.

ob 13. Ezek. 6. 2. ſal. 143. Pro. 2. 9.

(i) Ἡ μὲν γνῶσις τῶν θεῶν ρετή ἐστι κ̀ σοφία κ̀ εὐδαι- νία τελεία, ποιεῖ τε ἡμᾶς θεοῖς ὁμοίους. *Jambl.* προ- τρεπτ. p. 7.

(k) Orig. Celſ. l. p. 334.

XIV. The Nature of the Divine kind of Knowledge ſpeaketh it *of great clearneſs*; for there are in it all Conditions requiſite for a clear and evident diſcernment of things. If Men have their viſive Faculty ſound and pure, if they are in a luminous Region, if the Objects of Sight be unveil'd (not hid and cover'd,) and at a due diſtance, they have a clear Viſion; all which Conditions concur in this Divine Knowledge. For all the Regenerate and Divine Family (Regenerate in ſeveral degrees) have in the main recover'd their Eye-ſight, and may juſtly be called τὸ ὁρατικὸν γένος, *the ſeeing Generation*, as *Philo* interpreteth the *Iſraelites* Name, which is good Divinity, although it be bad Grammar. They are alſo within the ſame Specific comprehenſion, that God is of (in Theiſm of Religion and Condition,) which is the luminous Region. And to them the Divine Objects are not hid and cover'd, but open'd to their view and unveil'd. Their ſeeing *Eye to Eye* and *with open Face* (without the covering of a Veil) denoteth a clear Viſion of them, and that they are evident and apparent. Nor are the Objects too remote; for they have not only certain remote Notices of the matters of Sanctity, which are competible to the atheous: But an acquaintance with the things themſelves, which is incompetible to unholy Mankind. For they have *not ſeen*, nor *known* the Divine Objects. 1 *Joh.* 2. 3, 4. and 3. 6. and 4. 7, 8. 3 *Joh.* 11.

Matth. 11. 25. and 16, 17. Cor. 4. and 3. 4, 18. Job. 14. Iſa. 2. 8.

XV. The Nature of the Divine kind of Knowledge ſpeaketh it of *great Certitude*; for it is *Science* and *clear knowledge*, which aſcertaineth the things Divine to the notice and apprehenſion of its Poſſeſſors. They know, *that they are* (as well as what they are,) are not pendulous and heſitant about them, nor only ſuſpect that they are true, nor have they only a weak and wavering opinionative Belief of them: But (although Doubts and Temptations to Infidelity may ſometimes aſſault them, yet) in the main they are firmly and throughly perſwaded of them; they affirm, that they are matters of *infallible Proof and Aſſurance, ſure, firm, faithful, ſtedfaſt, without all controverſie, and that they know their verity and reality.* Nor is the verity of theſe Divine Matters aſcertain'd to their Notice and Apprehenſion in their own Conceit only: But the Proofs and Reaſons of their Verity are as great, as Human and Divine Affairs will admit, and are abundantly ſufficient to aſcertain it to every well diſpos'd Mind, that conſidereth them. For no Paradoxical Scepticiſm is clogg'd with greater abſurdities than ſpeculative Atheiſm, no Theories in Natural Philoſophy are comparable for certainty to the Articles of Natural Religion, *the grounds of Law* (and conſequently of Religion) are as firm and impregnable as the grounds of Science. There are alſo in Humane Nature mighty propenſions to a Religion; and if Mankind muſt be Religious, it is not hard to diſcern, which is the true and ſaving Religion, ſeeing the Nature of the things which it conſiſteth of, and the State of the World, internal Excellency, Congruity, Affinity with God, and external Teſtimony (from God and Man, from Heaven and Hell,) Providence in its Propagation, Prophecies and their Completion, ancient Types and their Correſpondences, ſo plainly recommend and aſcertain it. The Divine Family therefore are aſcertain'd by *objective Evidence*, and (as *Cicero* ſaith) *nihil clarius* ἐναργεία, *nothing is clearer than Evidence.*

Luc. 1. 1. Joh. 6. 69. and 17. 8. Act. 1. 3. Col. 2. 2. 1 Theſſ. 1. 3. 1 Tim. 1. 15. and 3. 16. 2 Tim. 3. 14. Heb. 6. 19. 2 Pet. 1. 19.

But as the things Divine are aſcertain'd to their Notice and Apprehenſion: So their own Notice and Apprehenſion (in Conſort with other Evidences) doth alſo aſcertain them, in like manner as every Man's Apprehenſion and Notice of things by external Sence (or what is equivalent thereto) aſcertaineth the truth of things to his Mind. The internal Sence of holy Men (which is as certain as external Sence) is a grand Atteſtation to the *Verity* and *Excellency* of their Religion, and is ἐπιστήμη, *Science*, according to *Ariſtotle*'s Etymology of the word; for it cauſeth στάσιν κ̀ ἠρεμίαν τῆς διανοίας, *a ſteddy fixation and acquieſcence of the Mind.* Their acquaintance with Divine Objects is a ſort of *ſeeing them with their Eyes, looking upon them and handling them. If any Man will do his Will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God. The Spirit it ſelf beareth Witneſs with our Spirit, that we are the Children of God. He that believeth on the Son, hath the Witneſs in himſelf*, which illuminateth his Mind, begetteth and confirmeth Faith in him, ingendreth a new and Divine Nature, which is plainly of a Divine Original, carrieth the Print of a Divine Hand, and maketh the Heart of a Man (his ſtrongeſt Love, Deſires, Delights and Hopes) oppoſite to Infidelity, and is a vital Cognation to the things known. It fareth with him that hath made a conſiderable Progreſs in Regeneration, as the Hebrew Book *Coſri* ſaith of one that is arriv'd

1 Joh. 1. 1. Joh. 7. 17. Rom. 8. 16. 1 Joh. 5. 10.

at the *Viſio Prophetica*, which alone is ſufficient, to beget the Fear and Love of God in Men, as that Author ſuppoſeth. (*l*) *Then the Doubts which a Man had before concerning God vaniſh; and he is poſſeſs'd with ſuch a Veneration of him, and Love for him, as to lay down his Life for the Love of him, becauſe of the mighty Pleaſure that he hath found in adhering to him, and grief and loſs in being eſtrang'd from him.* They that find and feel themſelves Regenerate, can they be unſatisfied touching the true God, or whether their Inſtitution be from God, which hath ingendred in them the Life of God? Can they queſtion the Exiſtence of a Regenerate and Divine Family in Heaven and Earth? Or can they make doubt of the Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs of Unregenerate Mankind? *We know, that we are of God, and that the whole World lieth in Wickedneſs.* Having acquaintance with the Divine Objects they doubt no more of the Heavenly Felicity than of the World's Vanity; nor of the Excellency and Conſolations of Sanctity (which they find and feel) than of the horror of Sin, (which is of a frightful aſpect in their Eyes:) Nor are they at a loſs for the true Paſtor and the true Religion; for they can diſtinguiſh good Wine from ſophiſticate and adulterate Stuff, what is wholſom from what is poiſonous and wicked (as the Cattel in the Paſture will leave poiſonous Weeds and eat the wholſom Graſs and Herbs,) their holy Nature is a great antidote againſt and preſervative from all ungodly Errours. Impoſtours and their fraudulent Ware are Alien from them and diſagreeable to them. *The Sheep follow the true Shepherd, for they know his voice; and a Stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of Strangers.* Joh. 10. 4, 5.

XVI. The want of this kind of Knowledge of Divine things in unholy Mankind, implieth *their unacquaintedneſs with the things themſelves*, which ſpeaketh *their great incapacity of knowing* (and judging of) them. For touching the knowledge of things in general, all Men reckon, that they are not well known without experience, obſervation and acquaintance with the things themſelves. Touching many things they reckon, that they cannot be known but by acquaintance with the things themſelves (at leaſt with that kind of things,) without which we have but ignorant Conceits of them. And all Religioniſts reckon, that there are choice *Arcana* in Religion (as well as Nature,) which are not obvious and expoſ'd, nor known but by Enjoyment. (*m*) *If any one ſhould ask me, what a Bed-ſtaff or a Joint-ſtool is, the only way to acquaint him what they are, is not to amuſe him with fine artificial Definitions, but to ſhew him the things themſelves.* The things teach the Knowledge of their Definitions, better than the Definitions teach the Knowledge of the things. *The Definitions of things are known by experience and acquaintance with the things themſelves.* (*n*) *They that are awake* (ſaith *Porphyry*) *may diſcourſe many things touching him that is aſleep: But what ſleep is, what it is to ſleep, the true Notion thereof, will then be clearly diſcern'd, when you your ſelf ſleep, and by ſleeping have learn'd what it is to ſleep.* The Rabbins ſay, (*o*) *Judge not your Brother till you come to be in his Condition.* For they that have been always rich and healthful, do not rightly judge of the ſick and poor. Nor are they likely to underſtand Health aright, that never ſaw the Face of it: Nor are they likely to underſtand Divine things aright, that are not ſo much as initiated into the Science of Sanctity (nor doth their Genius ſtand that way,) that are as great Strangers to them as *Lucian* s poor Man (always us'd to courſe Diet) is to delicious Fare, of whom he ſaith, (*p*) *he never ſo much as dream'd of being fill'd with white Bread.* Plato ſaith (in his *Theætetus*,) that *Diana* did not allow barren Women to be Midwives, becauſe of their want of Experience in matters of Child-birth; *Anacharſis* derided immuſical Men, that took upon them to judge of Muſicians. The unexperienc'd in things are generally thought unskilful in them.

Many things cannot be known but by Experience and Obſervation, they are unconceivable and unimaginable to them, that have not ſeen them, nor known any thing like them, to which they may be compar'd. (*q*) *Quos vidimus nunquam, qui ſint, ſcire quemadmodum poſſumus? Thoſe whom we never ſaw, how can we know who they are?* Can we know their Make and Mould, their Phyſiognomy and Complexion, if in their whole kind they are Diſſonant from all that we are acquainted with? How then can we know the Nature of God (the Divine Nature) the Divine Image, the Divine Affections and Tranſactions of the holy Life (their true Species and Idea,) if we have no acquaintance with any thing of like Nature? (*r*) *We learn ſome things by the teaching of others, and ſome things by ſight. If one telleth you, that in* India *there is an Animal of a Nature heterogeneous to all other, but ſuch or ſuch, multiform and various,* ὐκ ἂν πρότερον εἰδείης ἢ ἴδοις αὐτό· *You cannot know it, till you ſee it, nor have you a word to ſay of it, unleſs you hear him that hath ſeen it.* (*s*) *As if we had not ſeen the ſenſitive fair things and apprehended them (which they cannot do that are Born blind,) we could not expreſs them in words: So neither the Pulchritude of Studies and Sciences (and ſuch like things) if we were not poſſeſs'd of it.* So vital goods and Evils cannot be known otherwiſe than by Senſe and Experience, and acquaintance with the things themſelves. (*t*) *For who can teach by Words and Names the difference between the ſweetneſs of a Date and a Fig?* (*u*) *What is ſweet, or not ſweet, is not apprehended but by Experience.* This the Jews obſerve, and upon this ground ſome of their beſt Writers build the Pre-eminence of their Nation; for they ſuppoſe, (*w*) that God was known to their Nation only בטעם וראיה *by Taſt and by Viſion*, according to that of the Pſalmiſt, *taſt and ſee, that the Lord is good.* But the vital Good that God is, deprav'd Palates cannot Taſt; it fareth with them as with thoſe in the Jaundies, (*x*) τοῖς ἰκτεριῶσι τὸ μέλι πικρόν. *to them Honey is bitter.* Nor can the Divine Pulchritude, which is the beauty of Holineſs, appear to the unholy (as white cannot appear to the Eye infected with an Icteriſm,) the blind cannot know Colours (but have ignorant Conceits and Apprehenſions of them,) nor they the things *that are ſpiritually diſcerned.* The only way therefore to have the knowing diſcernment of things Spiritual and Divine, is to become Spiritual and Divine, agreeably to that Maxim of the Philoſophic Pagans τὸ ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ γινώσκεται, *like is known by like.* So *Empedocles* wrote. *We know Earth by Earth, Water by*

(l) P. 279. 293, 294.

1 *Joh.* 5. 19.

(m) S. *Parker Cenſure of the Plat. Phil.* p. 67.

(n) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 1 c. 11.

(o) *Pirke Aboth* c. 2.

(p) 'Ου δ' ὄναρ λευκῶν ποτε ἄρτων ἐμφορηθεὶς. Iraquel. de *nobil* p. 169.

De ſapientibus ſolus ſapiens poteſt judicare.

(q) Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 7. p. 211.

(r) J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 221.

(s) Plotin. En. 1. 6. c. 4.

(t) Τίς γὰρ δύναται ὀνομα διαφορὰν δεῖναι ποιότητος γλυ κύτητος φοίνικος καὶ γλυκύτητ ἰσχάδος; *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. p. 320.

(u) *Coſri* p. 343.

(w) Ibid. p. 295.

(x) V. Gat. in Ant. p. 255.

by Water, Air by Air, and Fire by Fire; Friendſhip by Friendſhip, and Contention by Contention.

Γαίῃ μὲν γὰρ (φησι) γαῖαν ὀπώπαμεν ὕδατι δ' ὕδωρ, &c.

Vital Sanctity * is as neceſſary for the knowing diſcernment of the matters of Vital Sanctity, as the Sence of Seeing, Hearing, Smelling is for the knowing diſcernment of Sights, Sounds and Odours. Who can know what Muſical Harmony is, that never heard Harmony, nor hath a Muſical Ear? No Catechiſms or Syſtems of Theology can teach the knowing diſcernment of ſpiritual vital Goods, but S. *Auſtin*'s Saying of Honey belongeth to thoſe Divine Sweets. *Qui non guſtaverit, non intelliget, he that taſteth it not, can never have the knowing diſcernment of it.* Unholy Mankind therefore (through their unacquaintedneſs with the things themſelves) are incompetent for knowing and judging of the matters of Sanctity; of which there are ſome ſo Arcane, that the Holy Ghoſt ſaith of them, *no Man knoweth them ſaving he that hath them.* So in all Religions there are ſome things ſo Arcane, that none know them but the ἐπόπται, *interiour Spectators.* The Chriſtian Rites are called (y) *Secreta Cœleſtia, Celeſtial Secrets.* From a certain Goſpel *Clemens* citeth this ſuppos'd Saying of our Lord, (z) *Myſterium meum mihi & filiis domus meæ, my Myſtery* (or Secret) *is to my ſelf and to the Sons of my Houſe.*

* *Sentitur antequam diſcitur.* S. Cypr. Ep. 2.

Apoc. 2. 17.

(y) *Selden. de Synedr.* l. 3. c. 15. S. 4.

(z) *Strom.* l. 5. p. m. 421.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *The firſt Conſectary of Practice from the Idea of God. His Subjects and Servants owe unto him ſuch Honour and Service which is proper to his degree.* 2. *They owe unto him whatever is Honour and Service to him.* 3. *They owe unto him the Utmoſt and Total of their Honour and Service.* 4. *They owe unto him their Sovereign Soul-honour and Service.* 5. *They owe unto him the Honour and Service, which is not communicable without the Crime of Idolatry.*

I. DUTY to God is a due Correſpondence to his Idea. *This Conſectary of Practice* therefore naturally iſſueth from it in *the firſt place; his Subjects and Servants* (of Right and by Obligation ſuch) *owe unto him ſuch Honour and Service, which is proper to his Degree.* They owe unto him Honour and Service that of Right and by Obligation are his Subjects and Servants. All Rationals are under the vaſteſt Obligations, to be Good and Dutiful, Virtuous and Religious towards God. There is ſufficient Cauſe and Reaſon, why it muſt be ſo, and it may not be otherwiſe. There is no doing otherwiſe, ſo as to do well (tolerably well,) or to be and fare tolerably well. For the Name of an *Atheiſt* (Speculative or Practical) and of *an ungodly Sinner,* are Names that involve in them a Troop of the moſt foul atrocious Names imaginable. They denote *an Ignaro, a Fool, a Clown, an Owl and Night-bird, an infamous Slave, a baſe Varlet,* (devoid and depriv'd of all Spiritual and Divine Goods, and replete with and ſubjected to all the contrary Evils,) *a foul polluted execrable and abominable Miſcreant, a Brutiſt, a Leper, a Dog, a Swine, a Viper, a profane ſacrilegious and contumelious Wretch, a blackned Criminal, a capital Malefactor, an Alien, a deadly Enemy, a Rebel, a Traytor, a Villain* (as doing the moſt villainous things and being in the State of a Villain,) *a Liar, a Thief, a Cheat, a Regicide, a Deicide, a Reprobate, a Diaboliſt, a Child of Hell,* (a) *iniquitate feralium Criminum, by his horrendous Criminality.* Mankind may not act repugnantly to the *Aptitude* and *Congruity* of things, nor contrary to their End and Uſe; nor may they do any thing not *allowable* or *tolerable,* nor do ſuch foul things towards God, that are *intolerable* to be done to Men; nor may they do the *Evil* and *Devil-kind* of things, nor may they be horridly *unnatural, ungrateful, unjuſt, baſe and unworthy towards him*; nor may they deſpoil him of his Godhead and of all his Excellency, or deſpoil themſelves of all true Worth and Excellency; they may not make themſelves ſordid infamous Varlets, or make the holy God ſuch by putting Diſgraces and pouring Contumelies upon him; nor may they make themſelves vile and odious to extremity in Diſpoſition and Practice, State and Condition. They are therefore under the vaſteſt Obligations, to be Good and Virtuous towards God. If there were no Dues to God on our part, there could be no Dues amongſt Men (to Parents or Magiſtrates,) no humane Society and Government, no Order, no Laws, no tolerable living in the World. The Nations of the World therefore (as the Jews ſpeak) have their Religion, they have it in high Eſteem, Glory in it, and eagerly Conteſt about it. Their natural Inſtincts, the diſcernments of their Underſtanding, the dictates of their Reaſon, their Sence of Conſcience, their Hopes and their Fears proclaim, that they muſt be Religious. Nature furniſheth them with many fair Notices of the Exiſtence of a Divine Potentate over the Univerſe and an immenſe Benefactor (whoſe Subjects, Dependents and Beneficiaries they are,) and that they ought to be affected and behave themſelves becomingly and ſuitably to thoſe tranſcendent Excellencies which he is in himſelf and to them; and accordingly it is the voice of the World of Mankind (as bad as it is,) and of the worſt of Men when they fall into Adverſity, *that they owe Honour and Service unto God.*

(a) S. Cyr. ad Demetrian.

The Honour and Service which we owe unto God, is ſuch as is proper to his Degree and Dignity; for this is his Honour and Service (it belongeth to him,) he is worthy of it, may reaſonably require it, it is Juſt and Due, that he ſhould have it; to deny it to him is multifarious Wickedneſs, and no other is agreeable to him but this alone. His Degree and Dignity is the Creature-tranſcendent Soverignty, the Rights and Dues whereof (that belong to it and Conſtitute it) are the Creature-tranſcendent. His Dues of Honour and Service therefore are *in degree the Creature-tranſcendent Honour and Service.* If he is a God he is *a Creature-tranſcendent Honour and Eſtate of Nobilitation*; and he alone is ſo, if he is God alone. His Tranſcendence therefore of Degree and Dignity challengeth from us all the Creature-tranſcendent Honour, rendreth all other Honour incongruous to him, and maketh this Tranſcendent Honour peculiar to him alone. He is not honour'd but by ſuch Honour, which is Creature-tranſcendent. To love him with an *underling under-graduate Love*, is not to love him, but to be alienated from him and inimical to him; not to be his Lovers, but the Lovers of his Corrivals; not to be well-affected towards him, but villainouſly diſaffected. (It is not the Virtue and Duty of loving him.) Such Honour is to him an heinous Diſhonour, a nefarious deſpiſing, undervaluing and vilifying him, a degrading him into vile rank and place. (b) *This is the ſhort and true definition of Virtue, it is the ordinate placing of things in our eſteem and affection.* A due diſtance muſt be made between God and Creatures, as the Pagan Theologers ſay of Humane and Divine things, (c) *to ſeparate them from each other according to the difference of the Excellent from the Vile.* The Creatures muſt not be rais'd above their Rank and Degree, God muſt not be degraded: His Honour the *Roman Clemens* calleth, (d) τὴν μεγαλοπρεπῆ καὶ ἔνδοξον θρησκείαν τοῦ ὑψίστου, *the magnificent and glorious worſhip of the moſt High.* Such is *the Religious Worſhip*, which in all the Branches of it involveth ſomething of Creature-tranſcendence. It muſt be called *The God-honourary Service and Worſhip*, and contradiſtinguiſh'd to *the Man-honourary Service and Worſhip*; for there are but theſe two legitimate Species of Honourary Service and Worſhip. A great eſteem and affection we owe to the glorify'd Saints and the holy Angels; but this is no ſuch thing as *a Saint-honourary Service and Worſhip, an Angel-honourary Service and Worſhip.* An Inſtitution of ſuch Honourary Service and Worſhip is neceſſarily an Inſtitution of *the God-honourary Service and Worſhip* miſplac'd upon undue Objects; for there is no middle Sovereignty between the Divine and Humane.

II. We owe unto God (which is proper to his Degree) *whatever is a doing Honour and Service to him.* For by the ſame reaſon that we are bound to any thing that is a doing Honour and Service to God, we are bound to all and every thing, that is a doing Honour and Service unto him. Piety may be defin'd *the Buſineſs of doing Honour to God*; (e) for the whole of duty to Superiour Relations is compris'd in the Name Honour. And Piety may be defin'd *the Buſineſs of being his Servants*; who are bound to neglect nothing, that is a real ſerving him *internally or externally, actively or paſſively, by way of abſtinence or performance.* Their bounden duty (which immediately reſpecteth God) is, to regard him and be mindful of him, to take him into their thoughts and meditate upon him, to contemplate his Works admiring him and them, to ſeek acquaintance with him and to know him, to have right apprehenſions of what he is, to believe his Exiſtence, and not to diſcredit and diſhonour him by any Unbelief, but to credit and honour him by Faith; to acknowledge him to be God, the one only true God and our God, to become his Religioniſts and Adherents, his Subjects and Servants both in ſtate and fact; to repent and be converted unto him, to abandon whatever is contrary or inimical to him, or that cometh in competition with him (all Evil Religion as well as Evil Life, and together with Sin all other oppoſites to an Holy Life,) to eſteem and value him aright, and to love him, as all his friendly Relations muſt love him; to make him and his holy felicitative things the Objects of their Deſire and Delight, to be his Confidents and Dependents, rightly to hope and truſt in him, to fear him and be duely humble towards him, to be duely reſign'd to his Will, ſubmitted to his Diſpoſals, patient under thoſe of them that are afflictive, and the better for them; to have a reſpectful Eye to him in their Affairs and Ways and in his Providences, duely to imitate and be aſſimilated to him, to be duely thankful for his Favours, obſervant of his Inſtitutions, obedient to his Laws, and out of a virtuous regard to him to practiſe all Virtues and Duties towards themſelves and others; to confeſs his Name and Religion, and to conciliate Honour to it; to be loyal and faithful to him and his Service and faithful Stewards of his Goods; to be duely concern'd for his Concerns, to have a due Zeal and Fortitude in his Cauſe, and to make him and his Intereſts the end of their Doings and of their Life; to be throughly devoted to him and to his Service, truly devout Perſons, ſuch as miniſter the Divine Service of Prayer and Praiſes (and other Sacrifices,) and pay a due devotional Reverence unto God; which devotional Reverence muſt expreſs it ſelf in a due honourary reſpect to the Things and Perſons that are peculiarly related to God. (f) The Diſciples of *R. Eliezer* made a viſit to him, and amongſt other things ask'd of him this great thing; *Rabbi* (ſaid they) *teach us the way which may lead us to Life Eternal:* His Anſwer was; *When you would make your Prayer, bethink your ſelves firſt, before whom you ſtand, ſo doing you ſhall come to Life Eternal.* Theſe enumerated duties of Piety occur in numerous places of Scripture; *Eccl.* 12. 1. *Job* 22. 21. *Prov.* 8. 6. *Pſal.* 10. 4. 50, 22. 25, 15. 14. 7, 8. 31, 24. 37, 4. 42, 1. 63, 6. 76, 11. 69, 9. 77, 12. 73, 25. 119, 94. 128, 148. 84, 10. 89, 7. *Exod.* 15, 11. 20, 3. *Apoc.* 15. 3. 1 *Chron.* 28, 9. *Act.* 17, 27. 20, 21. 26, 20. *Job.* 4. 22. 24. 15, 14. *Numb.* 20, 17. *Deut.* 6, 4. 10, 20. 26, 17. *Dan.* 6, 23. *Joſh.* 24, 15. *Heb.* 11, 6. 12, 9, 10. 13, 15. *Iſa.* 2, 3. 44, 5. 5, 12. 56, 6. *Hoſ.* 14. 8. *Jer.* 24, 7. *Act.* 24, 14. 8, 2. 13, 2. *Matth.* 15. 8, 9. 3, 15. 5, 16. *Gal.* 4, 30. 2, 19. *Jam.* 4. 8, 15. *Ruth.* 2, 12. *Mic.* 6, 8. *Luc.* 21, 42. *Rom.* 1, 21. 12, 12. *Eph.* 5. 1. 1 *Pet.* 1, 15. 2, 13. 2 *Cor.* 8. 5.

III. We owe unto God (which is proper to his Degree) *the utmoſt and total of our Honour and Service*; for it is not enough, to ſerve God a little (as *Jehu* ſpeaketh of ſerving *Baal*,) nor is it enough, to ſerve him a great deal with ſuch Extrinſicks (multitudes of Sacrifices,) which are on this ſide our being his faithful Servants; they give nothing valuable to him, that give not themſelves to him *abſolutely, intirely* and *unreſervedly* (without making any exception or with-holding any thing from him,) to ſerve him with their All (all that they are, have and can do;) that dedicate not their whole Man, Soul and Body and all that is theirs, to be wholly for his uſe and ſervice; for to be partially and mutilately affected towards his Honour and Service, is to be villainouſly and traiterouſly diſaffected. His loyal adherents faithfully devote themſelves, to live a Life of doing him ſervice, and to make that the whole of their Buſineſs, Drift and Scope, which is *the whole of Man*, *Eccl.* 12. 13. *Rom.* 14. 8. Their Heart is not divided, but is *fully*, *ſingly* and *intirely* for God and his Service; and their Rule is, to ſerve him, not remiſly, perfunctorily and by halves (ſuch little Piety is a great deal of Impiety,) but with all their Faculties and Affections, their Time and Talents, Abilities and Intereſts (all which muſt be given to him and imploy'd for him) *and with all their Mind and Might.*

(b) *Definitio brevis & vera virtutis, ordo eſt amoris.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c. 22.

(c) Κατὰ τὴν ὅλην τὰ τιμιώτερα διαφορὰν χωρὶς τιθέναι ἑκάτερα. *Jambl. de Myſt. S.* 1. c. 21.

(d) *Ep. ad Corinth.* p. 59.

(e) *Exod.* 20. 12. *Matt.* 15. 6. *Eph.* 6. 1, 2. 1 *Tim.* 6. 1. 1 *Sam.* 2. 30. *Pſ.* 50. 15. *and* 86. 9. *and* 96. 7, 8, 9. *Prov.* 3. 9. *and* 14. 31. *Iſa.* 25. 3. *and* 29. 13. *and* 43. 20, 23. *Matth.* 15. 8, 9. *Joh.* 8. 49. *Numb.* 14. 24. *Deut.* 1. 36. *and* 13. 4. 1 *King.* 11. 34. 2 *King.* 10. 32. *Iſa.* 56. 6. *Ezek.* 18. 21. *Matth.* 22. 23. *Rom.* 6. 20. *and* 14. 8. 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. *Heb.* 12. 4.

(f) Bux Syn. Jud. c. 5. p. m. 157.

2 Kin 18.

Τοῖς ἀνι- προςτάγ- μασι ἀνα- κειμένοι consecrated to his Precepts. Epict. diſſ. l. 2. c. 16.

God hath the utmoſt of their *Eſtimation and the total of their appreciative Love*; for they reckon, that the fulneſs of eſteem belongeth to the fulneſs of all Worth and Excellency (both of degree and kind;) that God is an infinite Good both in himſelf and to his People; that in having him (as their God) they have all that is worth the having, and in loſing him they loſe all that is worth the enjoying; that there is but one thing needful, to make their Happineſs and Miſery compleat and conſummate, which is his Favour and his Diſpleaſure; and they chuſe him and the Goods of his Kingdom for their whole portion and ſhare of Goods, the fulneſs of their Felicity. (g) *That which he hath ſaid by the Prophet, I will be their God, what meaneth it, but that I will be That to them, whence they may be ſatiated: I will be all things to them that are honeſtly deſir'd by Men, Life, Health, Livelihood, Plenty, Glory, Honour and Peace, and all manner of Goods: So that of the Apoſtle is rightly underſtood, that God may be All in All.* (h) In the uſual Expreſſions of devout Souls this high and raiſed eſteem for God appeareth, and in that of *Paulinus*, who when the *Goths* had ſack'd *Nola*, and plunder'd him of all, lifting up his Eyes to Heaven ſaid, *Domine, ubi ſunt omnia mea, tu ſcis.* A *Muhammedan* Devotioniſt may be allow'd, to ſpeak the Senſe of holy Souls. (*i*) The Son of one of that Profeſſion (*Abu Obeidalla Sitrenſis*) had an Hogſhead of Oyl, which brake as he was carrying it out of the Houſe into the Market-place, whereupon he made a great complaint, as having loſt his whole Stock, but his Father thus ſpake to him, *O Son, get to your ſelf the ſame portion of Goods which is your Father's; verily I have nothing at all but God in the life preſent and that which is to come.*

(g) *Quid eſt enim aliud quod per prophetam dixit, Ego ero illorum Deus.—niſi, ego ero unde ſatientur: ego ero quacunque ab hominibus honeſtè deſiderantur, & vita, & ſalus, & victus, & copia, & gloria, & honor, & pax, & omnia bona. ſic enim & illud rectè intelligitur, quod ait Apoſtolus, ut ſit Deus omnia in omnibus.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 22. c. 30.

(h) *Deus meus & omnia. Tu ſatis es nobis & ſine te nihil. habet omnia, qui habet habentem omnia.*

(i) *Erpen. Gram. Arab.* p. 209

As God hath the fulneſs of their *Appreciative Love*; ſo their Rule and Practice is to love him with *the utmoſt* and *total* of their * *affectionate Love* (with nothing leſs than their whole Heart and Soul, *Matth.* 22. 37.) to let out the fulneſs of their Affections towards him without any ſtint or limitation. They have Love and Friendſhip for God *in the Integrity* of it (elſe they are not his Lovers,) they cannot duely with-hold or alienate any of their Love from him; they owe therefore the *utmoſt* and *total* of their Love to him. So the chief of the Schoolmen interpret that principal Law of God's Society and Sovereignty. (*k*) *Unicuique præcipitur, ut Deum diligat quantum poteſt, every one is commanded to love God, as much as he can love any thing.* S. *Auſtin* and his Followers ſuppoſe, that this Divine Law requireth *the perfection of Charity* (which is the perfection of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs,) which is a reaſonable Interpretation; for the Divine Law is the perfect Rule of Righteouſneſs (of what ought to be done,) all Sin is a Deviation from that ſtraight Rule, which therefore can allow no ſinful failure or deficiency, nor require any thing leſs than abſolute ſinleſs Perfection. But the Rule of the Law of God muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the terms of his Acceptance; for as he accepteth Sincerity in Piety, ſo he accepteth the utmoſt and total of our Love in Sincerity and Faithfulneſs, which is an Evangelical Perfection of Charity, 1 *Joh.* 2. 5. *Whoſo keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected.* If he keepeth his word in abſolute ſinleſs Perfection, he hath abſolute ſinleſs Perfection of Charity: If he is a faithful keeper of his word, there is no groſs or horrible flaw or defect in his Charity, in the main and according to the terms of God's acceptance (though not in rigour of Law) his Love is without defect, and what is without defect *is perfected.* In the ſame Senſe God muſt have (objectively) the utmoſt and total of his People's Love, and that in a threefold conſideration; as it is conſider'd *intenſively*, *extenſively* and *comprehenſively*. For the ſeveral words of this Divine Law that are heap'd upon one another (requiring that God be lov'd with all the Heart, Soul, Mind and Strength) denote the utmoſt and total of our *Intenſive Love*, (*l*) which is Love the moſt ardent and fervent (ſuch as the Pſalmiſt expreſſeth, *Pſal.* 18. 1. *Erchomcha*, *I will love thee from the Bowels:*) Nor is cold and languid Love to be counted Love ſo much as want of Love. The total of our Love conſider'd *extenſively* (which the Divine Law requireth) is Love as it extendeth it ſelf to all ſorts of Virtuous Love (the Love of *Friendſhip*, *Deſire*, *Benevolence*, *Complacence*, *Gratitude* commonly ſo diſtinguiſh'd) and to all the Duties and Offices of Love. The love of God muſt be *for his own ſake* and no viciouſly *ſelf-intereſted Love* (the love of Friendſhip;) it muſt be *a deſiring ſeeking Love*, *an ardent benevolent Love* (which earneſtly deſireth and endeavoureth, that no Evil, Injury or Prejudice be done to God, but that all Honour and Service may be done to him, as he that loveth any one hath a great concern for his Goods and Evils,) *a complacential delighting Love*, *a returning thankful Love*, *an active diligent Love*, and (occaſionally) *a paſſive Love*, *a generous and bounteous Love* (that ſticketh at nothing, but readily parteth with any thing for his ſake,) an *Heroic Love* (that contemneth and wreſtleth through all Difficulties and Hardſhips) *a conſtant never-failing Love.* His Friends and Lovers muſt not be deficient in the Duties of Piety; for this is Love and Friendſhip to him, *faithfully to do the part of his Friends, to relinquiſh all contrary Friendſhips, to adhere to God and his holy Laws, ſtudiouſly to imitate and reſemble his bleſſed Nature and Practice,* (eadem velle, eadem nolle,) *to befriend his Intereſt, never to ſide with his Enemies, to love that which is related to him, to be the Lovers of Righteouſneſs and haters of Sin and Iniquity* (ſo to have common Friendſhips and Enmities with God,) *to be careful to pleaſe him and to keep his Commandments with Vigilance and aſſiduous Diligence, with Zeal and Alacrity, and* בכל מאד *with all exceeding*, as the Hebrews ſpeak, *Deut.* 6. 5. The total of our Love is of a *third* Conſideration, as it is *comprehenſive*; for Charity to our Neighbour, our Selves and all (capable) Creatures is comprehended in *the love of God*, which is loving him for his own ſake and them for his ſake. We ought to love our ſelves from a Principle of love to God; which Divine Charity to our ſelves is not privative of Natural Self-love, but accumulative thereunto.

* *Modus diligendi Deum eſt ſine modo diligere.* S. Bernard. de diligendo Deo.

(k) *Aquin.* q. *Davenant. præl. de Juſtit. actual.* c. 42.

(l) *Grot. in loc.*

Amor Amicitiæ, Deſiderii, Benevolentiæ, Complacentiæ, Gratitudinis.

(m) Confeſſ. l. 10. c. 29.

unto. S. *Auſtin* therefore may be allow'd to ſay unto God, (*m*) *Minùs te amat, qui tecum aliquid amat, quod non propter te amat*; *His love to thee is defective, who loveth any thing with thee, which he doth not love for thee.* So the Subjects of God's Sovereignty ſuppoſe, who do not give to him a degree and meaſure of their Love and Friendſhip (which is Love with abatement,) but the utmoſt and total of their Love and Friendſhip; and conſequently they give unto him the utmoſt and total of their *Honour and Service* (which is beyond any ſtinted imperfect degree of Honour and Service,) for Man hath nothing more to give than *the All of his Love.* He that giveth the All of his Love, giveth the All of himſelf and all things with himſelf (his Will and his Love commandeth all the reſt, and carrieth all that he hath and can do along with it,) whence a Schoolman ſaith; *Amor eſt primum donum, in quo omnia alia continentur: Love is the firſt gift, which compriſeth all other.*

The Divine Law (according to this Expoſition of it) which requireth *the All, the Whole, the Total of our Love*, to be given unto God, doth not mean in *a Senſe of Compoſition*, nor in *a Senſe of Confinement*, but in *a Senſe of Indeficiency and Perfection*. It doth not mean in a Senſe of *Compoſition*, that all the parts of our Love compounded into one whole muſt be given to God (according to the Logical Definition of *Totum*:) Nor doth it mean in a Senſe of *Confinement*, (*that we ought to love nothing but God, and ought not to have one degree of love for any Creature*;) but it meaneth in a Senſe of *Indeficiency* and *Perfection*, that God muſt be lov'd *without any abatement and diminution of Love, which is the utmoſt poſſibility of Man.* So the *Marianolatriſts* profeſs to worſhip their Goddeſs *totis Medullis cordis, totis præcordiorum affectibus, totis deſideriis, with all their Heart and Deſire.* So the Pope pretendeth, to have the All or Whole of *Eccleſiaſtical Power*; and in ſuch Senſe our Saviour had *the All or Whole of Power* conferr'd upon him at his Reſurrection, *Matth.* 28. 18. And as this his *Fulneſs* or *Intireneſs* of Power doth not hinder, but that there is a ſubordinate Power of Creatures: So the *Fulneſs* or *Intireneſs* of our love to God doth not hinder, but that there is and ought to be in us a ſubordinate love of Creatures. To love the Creatures ordinately and regularly in conjunction with and due ſubordination to God, is not inconſiſtent with the Perfection of Charity in Man; for it maketh *no Abatement or Diminution* of the love of God, which is no more prejudic'd thereby than if the Creatures were not lov'd at all.

Prov. 4. 23. Matt. 7. 17. and 12. 35. and 19. 19.

IV. We owe unto God (which is proper to his Degree) *our Supreme and Soveraign Soul-honour aud Service.* The Honour and Service which the Subjects of God's Soveraignty owe unto him is their *Soul-honour and Service*; for the Piety and Sanctity of the inward Man is in it ſelf and its effects the All of Piety and Sanctity; as the Wickedneſs and Pravity of the Inward Man is in it ſelf and its Effects the All of Wickedneſs; as the Philoſophers call Man, (*n*) ψυχάριον βαςάζον νεκρὸν, *a Soul carrying a Corps*, and Chriſtian Writers call Men *Animæ corporibus clauſæ, Souls inclos'd in Bodies*: So to conceive aright of Piety and Sanctity, it muſt be conſider'd as the Piety and Sanctity of the Inward Man expreſs'd in External Actions; for it conſiſteth in the Piety and Sanctity of the Inward Man, and in External Acts only ſo far as they have the Piety and Sanctity of the Inward Man in them. The Inward Man is the only Seat and Subject of it, and it is the Virtue and Goodneſs, or the Vitioſity and Wickedneſs of the Inward Man, that maketh the Man and his Life, either Pious and Holy, or Impious and Wicked. The Piety and Sanctity of the Inward Man the Divine Lawgiver primarily and principally requireth, *Prov.* 3. 1. and 23. 26. *Matth.* 22. 37. It is both the Duty-part and the Benefit-part of his Covenant, *Ezek.* 18. 31. and 36. 26. thereby he maketh a Judgment and Eſtimate of Men, 1 *Sam.* 16. 7. It is the Piety and Sanctity of the *True Man* and *Truth* of Piety and Sanctity, *Pſal.* 51. 6. the Soul of Piety and Sanctity whereby all External Acts muſt be animated, elſe they are Soul-leſs, Lifeleſs, Heartleſs, Sapleſs, a Skeleton or Carcaſe. No Honour and Service done to God is valuable without it, but all ſemblances of Piety that are devoid of it, are Hypocriſie and Villainy, *Matth.* 15. 8. and 23. 25. This the Subjects of God's Sovereignty owe unto him peculiarly; for his Sovereignty is peculiarly *the Soul-Sovereignty*, and his Laws are the Laws of that Sovereignty. Humane Lords and Sovereigns are but *Maſters after the Fleſh*, their Sovereignty may be ſtil'd the Bodily Sovereignty, they pretend not to make Laws for Soul-concerns (peculiarly ſuch,) nor can they take cogniſance of the Inward Man (in the Territory of the Soul we have none to fear, or pleaſe, or approve our ſelves to, but God only,) nor have they power to inflict Soul-evils, or to beſtow Soul-goods (properly ſuch,) nor ought they to be ſerv'd with the Soul-honour and Service as the Sovereigns of our Hearts and Souls. All theſe are his Prerogatives, whoſe Sovereignty is *the Soul-Sovereignty*, to which Sovereignty Men and Angels owe a due Subjection of the Soul, who ought to have *the Supremacy and Sovereignty in the Soul*, and accordingly his genuine Subjects give unto him ſuch Honour and Service, which is *the Supreme and Sovereign Honour and Service of the Soul*; *honouring him with the Sovereign Regard and Eſtimation, loving him with a Sovereign Love, fearing him with a Sovereign Fear, and making him their Sovereign Truſt. They give unto him that Obſervance and Regard, that Faith and Hope, that adherence and Dependence, thoſe Deſires and Delights, Intentions and Deſigns, that Veneration, Submiſſion and Subjection, which are the Sovereign Honour and Service of their Souls*; *and all ſuch Soul-honour and Service which is their Sovereign Honour and Service*, *they account his proper Honour and Service*; for by this Honour he is ſet up in the place of God, (in that Sovereignty which belongeth to him) and is in the Soul, as he is in the Univerſe, Subject-tranſcendent and *over all*, *Rom.* 9. 5. By this Honour he is Deify'd (made God and our God) in Honour and Service, and we are conſtituted his genuine Subjects and Servants. From which account of Interiour Piety we may deduce a more particular account of *the Love* that is indiſpenſably due unto God (the like account muſt be given of other Duties of Piety;) for if God's Subjects and Servants muſt neceſſarily give unto him *the Sovereign Love of their Souls*, they muſt neceſſarily give unto him all ſuch Love, which is *the Sovereign Love* of their Souls; therefore they muſt give unto him peculiarly,

(1.) *Their prime and chief Love.* If God is not lov'd *above all*, if they give him not the Summity

(n) M. Ant. l. 4. S. 41.

Gen. 6. 5. 2 Chron. 22. 9. Pſal. 7. 10. and 58. 2. and 66. 18. Ezek. 18. 32. Matt. 5. 8. and 11. 29. Luc 8. 15. Acts 8. 37. and 11. 23. and 15. 9. Rom 10. 10. Heb. 3. 12. and 10. 22.

Gen. 15. 6. and 22. 1
1 Sam. 2. 2. and 3. 18 2 Chr
15. 15. Pſal. 4, 6. 20, 7. 6
1, 3. 73, 25. 76, 7. Prov. 3
Iſa. 8. 13. Matth. 6. 24.
10. 28, 37. and 13. 44.
14. 33. Rom. 14. 7, 8. Phil.
7, 8. Jam. 4. 4. 1 Joh. 2. 1
Apoc. 22. 9.

Summity and Top-flower of their Eſteem and Affection, if he is not uppermoſt in their Regard and deareſt to their Affection (the chief and ſovereign good of the Soul,) they can be none of his Friends and Lovers. (o) *The loweſt degree of Divine Love is, that nothing be lov'd above or againſt God or equally unto him: Whoſoever falleth ſhort of this degree of Perfection, doth not at all fulfill the Precept.* The Philoſopher ſaith of *Hercules*; (p) *His Familiars were his Friends, but he ſuppos'd, that nothing muſt have more friendly Affection from him than God.* So the devouter Pagans gave the Supremacy of their Eſteem and Affection to their Idol Gods. (q) *One that was initiated into the Myſteries of Mithras had a Crown offer'd him, which he took and put upon hisHead, and preſently took it off again ſaying, Mithram eſſe coronam ſuam, that Mithras* (his God) *is his Crown.*

(2.) *Their predominant and prevailing Love.* For he that weareth the Crown and ſwayeth the Scepter, is neceſſarily the chief Ruler. God is not ſet up in the Sovereignty that belongeth to him in any Soul that is not rul'd and ſway'd by him: Nor are any ally'd to him as his Subjects and Servants, that are Rebel-ſinners, or under the Reign of Sin; that are not obedient to him as his Subjects aud Servants, but live as their own Maſters, or are under the rule and ſway of the contrary inimical Powers, to which they belong and whoſe Partiſans they are, that are *the Children of Diſobedience.* The Servants of Sin cannot be his Servants, whoſe Service is (r) *better not only than Liberty, but than the greateſt Kingdom:* Nor can the World's Adherents be at the ſame time his Adherents, *Matth.* 6. 24. *Jam.* 4. 4. In his Subjects and Servants therefore (that are actually of his Ligeance and Obedience) not the worldly and fleſhly intereſt, not mundane and fleſhly Concupiſcence is regnant, predominant and prevailing (where theſe are the prevalent and regnant things, the Man is in the State of Carnality and Wickedneſs:) But a Love for God is regnant, predominant and prevailing againſt all oppoſites in the Soul and Life (for the main at leaſt,) the prevalent bent and byaſs of the Soul is for God and his Intereſt, which conſtituteth them his Subjects and Servants, *Godly affected and addicted in prevalent degree*, and ſuch as live the Life of living unto God. The Pagan Theology maketh every Man's Genius a God, and to this God the Philoſopher would have Men make ſuch an Oath as the Soldiers did to *Cæſar.* (s) *They Swear, that they will prefer the Welfare of* Cæſar *before all things.* So the Subjects of Gods Sovereignty in their holy Covenant abandon and relinquiſh all things, ſo far as they come in Compariſon or ſtand in Competition with their Divine Sovereign, ingaging themſelves to prefer and pleaſe, and ſerve him *above* and *before All*, which ſpeaketh the Supremacy of their Eſteem and Affection for him.

Joh. 8. 34. Rom. 6. 16, 22.

(3.) *Their peerleſs and incomparable Love* (t) according to the uſual Sayings of holy Men, for they reckon that there muſt be no compariſon between the regard which they have for Creatures, and that which they have for the Creator, that his Name alone is Excellent (all other are comparatively vile and contemptible;) that Creatures which are in Dignity and Power, are to be regarded, valu'd and fear'd as nothing in compariſon of God; that their Racks and Inquiſitions are but Flea-bitings compar'd with Divine Wrath; that Sin is therefore *exceeding ſinful*, becauſe it is ſinning againſt God; that a little of God (of the Good that he is as his kind of Good) is better than all the World, that Millions of Worlds cannot compenſate the loſs of God, that they are ſafe and happy, invincible and invulnerable having his Favour, and miſerable to extremity under his Diſpleaſure; that his Preſence turneth their Priſon into a Paradiſe, but to be forſaken of God and under his Frowns, is the Quinteſſence of Hell. All which Religious Computations of things ſpeak a regard and love for God *incomparable* beyond all Competition. What is Earth to Heaven? A Moment to Eternity? The World to God, or mundane Friends compar'd with this Sovereign and Divine Friend? All theſe Externals are riff-raff Stuff (σπιλὸς ὁ θησαυρὸς,) not worthy to be named in the ſame day with God and Piety; yet theſe are the things that prevail and ſway, that have more intereſt in Men, and can do more with them, to divert them from their Duty, than God and his Commands to enforce it; which ſpeaketh them *lovers of Pleaſure* and of their worldy Concerns and Precioſities more than lovers of God. 2 *Tim.* 3. 4.

(4.) *Their only great Love* (the total of that Love which is aloft and exalted in the Soul;) for all external things that are on this ſide God and his Kingdom, muſt have only a depreſs'd and ſubordinate Love. They are not the Divine Lovers, that part not with their Earthly All for the Kingdom of God's Sake. His Adherents muſt look upon all worldly human Excellencies and Precioſities (Wit, Parts, Power, Wealth, Beauty, Pomp, Splendor,) all worldly Felicities and voluptuous Enjoyments (all things that Fleſh and Blood doateth upon and admireth,) this mortal Life and all its Intereſts and Accommodations, *as vile forſaken things*; in due and great degree they muſt be alienated from them, never more having any great Concern or Affection for them (to the prejudice of Piety,) nor making any great account or reckoning of them, nor having any thing more than a mean and underling regard for them. All theſe things muſt be depreciated and ſet at nought, abandon'd (in Eſtimation and Affection) and called *Nebuſhtan*, σκύβαλα, and a dead Carcaſe. The Lovers of God and Piety count the worſt things in Piety (the reproaches that attend it) better than the World's beſt things (all its Preferments and Precioſities,) they look for no great matters here below, nor are theſe things of great conſideration in their Eyes; what others magnifie they make light of, and they are ſaid (u) *to relinquiſh their mundane Relations, Subſtance and all their Poſſeſſions, becauſe they live without* (mundane) *Affection.* The World muſt be to them in great degree *a nigrum nihil* and loathſom Spectacle, its Treaſures as Pelf and Traſh, its Glory as Pageantry, its Fineries as Fancies, its ſenſitive delights as Dreams, its buſineſs as (comparatively) trifling Impertinence, its Subſtance as a Shadow,

Matth. 19. 21, 22, 27. *and* 16. 24, 25. *and* 13. 44, 45, 46. *Luc.* 14. 26, 33. 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. *Gal.* 6. 14. *Phil.* 3. 7, 8. 1 *Cor.* 13. 1, 2. *Matth.* 8. 22. *Heb.* 11. 26. 2 *Cor.* 4. 17.

(o) *Infimus Divinæ dilectionis gradus eſt, ut nihil ſupra Deum, aut contra Deum, aut æqualiter Deo diligatur: à quo gradu perfectionis qui deficit, nullo modo implet præceptum.* Aquin. 2. 2. Qu. 184. Art. 3.

(p) Συνήθεις ἔσχε φίλους, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν φίλτερον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Epict. *Diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 16.

(q) *Tertull. de cor. mil. in fine.*

(r) Τῆς μεγίστης ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ἐλευθερίας μόνον ἀμείνων. *Philo* περὶ φυτουργ.

(s) Ὀμνύουσι πάντων προτιμήσειν τὴν τοῦ Καίσαρος σωτηρίαν. Epict. *Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 14.

(t) *Cuncta parvi deputo præter Deum. Omnis copia quæ Deus meus non eſt, egeſtas mihi eſt.*

(n) Ἀπολιπεῖν μὲν γένος τὸ κοσμικὸν, ἀπολιπεῖν δὲ οὐσίαν καὶ κτῆσιν πᾶσαν, διὰ τὸ ἀπροσπαθῶς ζῆν. *Clem. Strom. p. m.* 351.

(w) *Porphyr. in vit. Platin.*

(x) *The ſelf taught Philoſ.* p. 149.

(y) *Pocock. Spec.* p. 297.

Shadow, and this earthly Life (*w*) as πικρὸν κῦμα, *a bitter Wave*, or God is not lov'd. The *Muhammedan* Devotioniſts ſay, (*x*) *the two Worlds* (this and the other) *are like two Wives belonging to one Husband, the one whereof if he ſeeketh to pleaſe, he provoketh the other to anger.* (*y*) *Qui ſe mundi & creatoris ejus amorem in corde ſuo pariter fovere dicit, mentitur.* If a Man be infected and impoiſon'd with a worldly diſpoſition, his Heart is neceſſarily alienated from God and Piety. The Godly affected and addicted, and the Worldly affected and addicted are two contrary kind of Men. Chriſtians forſake the World in ſo great a degree, that this is the Language of their common Profeſſion, (z) *we have no Concern in this World but* (well and) *ſpeedily to get out of it. A Chriſtian can deſire nothing of the World being greater than the World.* God and Piety ſtand ſingular and alone in their eſtimate, their chief and only regard and obſervance is towards him, their chief and only care is to pleaſe him, their chief and only Hope and Truſt is in him, their chief and only Joy is in his Favour and Felicities, their chief and only buſineſs is his Service, their chief and only deſign is the Intereſt of his Kingdom, their chief and only deſire is after him and the Goods of his Kingdom, they ſee no valuable and conſiderable Wealth or Honour, Pleaſure or Proſperity, Safety or Felicity but in Piety and all things on this ſide Piety they account Vanity.

(z) *Nihil noſtra refert in hoc ævo, niſi de eo quàm celeriter excedere.* Tertull. Apol. c. 41. *Nihil appetere jam, nihil deſiderare de ſeculo poteſt, qui ſeculo major eſt.* S. Cypr. Ep. 2.

(5.) *The unbounded fullneſs of their Love.* For there is no Good beyond Piety, to which it ought to be ſubordinated, and by which it muſt be bounded and limited. God and Piety ought to be lov'd as much as any thing can be lov'd, deſir'd as much as any thing can be deſir'd, priz'd as much as any thing can be priz'd, according to that of *Gr. Naz.* (*a*) *tunc dignè æſtimatur* (Deus) *cùm inæſtimabilis dicitur, God is then rightly eſteem'd, when he is counted ineſtimable.* A Canoniſt ſaith; *In donationibus factis Eccleſiæ optima menſura eſt rerum donatarum immenſitas.* So if we would know in what degree and meaſure God is to be lov'd, the Anſwer is, God cannot be over-valu'd, nor overlov'd, *therefore Immenſity is the meaſure.*

(a) *Orat.* 49.

(6.) *Their Love at the deareſt rate of Love.* For ſo God muſt be lov'd and ſerv'd at the *deareſt* and *coſtlieſt* rate, *whatever we loſe, do or ſuffer, whatever becometh of us in this World.* At this rate *Abraham* ſerv'd God, when he offer'd up his only Son, and ſo did that excellent Woman, that lov'd her ſeven Sons moſt affectionately, yet when their temporal Proſperity came in Competition with Piety, ſhe choſe to have their Skin flead off, to have them fry'd in a Pan, and boiled in a Chaldron, rather than they ſhould diſobey God and his Law. So all that will be God's Servants and have him for their God, muſt chuſe his Service with all its Difficulties and Incumbrances, not declining the moſt hazardous, coſtly fleſh-diſpleaſing and diſcountenanc'd Duties, cutting off the Right-hand, plucking out the Right-eye, rather than they ſhould withdraw them from his Service; the World muſt be forſaken for him and their deareſt ſecular Intereſts (as Piety requireth) they muſt count nothing too much for him, nothing too good for him, ſtick at no Labour or Sufferings for the gaining his Kingdom, buying it at any rate, but at no rate muſt loſe or part with him, or do him any diſſervice; nothing muſt hire them (not all the Treaſures of *Egypt*) to offend him by any wilful Sin; they muſt not break with him upon any terms, but be always ready to let all go and caſt all over-board, that they may ſtick to him, and nothing may intercept their Love and Obedience. Sanctity and Piety muſt be with them no underling good, Sin muſt be no underling Evil, but an Evil above all Evil, a Calamity greater than any other Calamity; they muſt be for Sanctity and Piety and againſt Sin and Iniquity (all Sin and Iniquity) at any rate; they muſt make it their one thing and their All to be God's Servants, and muſt ſerve him with their All, and with the loſs of all their worldly Enjoyments (when they are called to it) *reſiſting even unto Blood, ſtriving againſt Sin.* There are ſome Sayings of Chriſtian Theologers, that ſpeak a dearer and coſtlier rate of love to God, than I have mention'd, which ſeem to be generous and pious, although God doth not put his Servants upon ſo hard an Election, as to be willing to be damn'd for his Glory, or to chuſe Hell rather than Sin. But it is reported in the Life of *Anſelm*, that his Friends often heard him ſay, If he ſaw with his bodily Eyes the horrour of Sin on the one hand, and the pains of Hell on the other, and muſt neceſſarily immerſe himſelf in one of them, he would chuſe Hell rather than Sin. *Zuinglius* ſaith, (*b*) *Quas non oportet mortes præ-eligere, quod non ſupplicium potius ferre, imò in quam profundam inferni abyſſum non intrare, quàm contra conſcientiam atteſtari?* Theſe Sayings expreſs an infinite and boundleſs hatred of Sin, agreeably whereto a Romiſh Pamphlet ſaith, *If a venial Sin would ſave a Nation and the World it ſelf from being deſtroy'd, it is ſo far from being lawful to commit it, that we ought to periſh rather than to do it.* (*c*) *S.* Thomas *and other Doctors teach, that if the burning of the whole World and the eternal Damnation of all Mankind might be avoided by telling one Lye, the deſtruction of the World and ruin of Mankind ought rather to be permitted, than wittingly to tell a Lye, were it in a matter of ſmall moment.* A better Author than the School-Doctors ſaith; (*d*) *although Hell ſeemeth terrible to many, yet I will not ceaſe to ſay continually with a loud voice, that this thing* (to offend Chriſt) *is more grievous and formidable than Hell.* S. *Chryſoſtom* exhorteth all his Auditors, to be thus minded; and if to holy Men Sin is more grievous and terrible than Hell it ſelf, it cannot reaſonably be thought hard meaſure, to be oblig'd, to prefer God and Piety before all worldy Advantages, and practically to count Sin and Wickedneſs worſe than all ſecular Evils. At this rate Pagan Philoſophers profeſs an Averſation from Vice and Improbity; (*e*) *nothing ſhould deter them from practiſing what is virtuous, nothing ſhould allure them, to do what is vicious.* But he that loveth his Riches better than God, will rather Sin than ſuffer Poverty. He that loveth his Credit better than God, will rather deny and forſake him than ſuffer Diſgrace. He that hath any thing higher in his eſteem

2 *Maccab.* 7. *Gen.* 39.9. *Numb.* 14. 24. *Job* 36. 21. *Prov.* 23. 23 *Matth.* 5. 29, 30. *and* 7. 13, 14 *and* 10. 37, 38. *Marc.* 14. 4. *Luc.* 7. 38. *Act.* 4. 34, 35. *Gal.* 1. 10. *and* 5. 24. *Rom.* 14. 8. *Phil.* 1. 21. 2 *Tim.* 2. 5, 12. *Heb.* 12 4. *Apoc.* 2. 2, 3. *and* 14. 4.

(b) Ep.

(c) *Fulv. Androt. devout conſider. of frequent. the Bl. Sacram.* p. 225.

(d) 'Ει γὸ ϗ πολλοῖς ἡ γέ εννα φοβερὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἀλ ἐγὼ ἐ παύσομαι συνεχῶς, βοῶ ὅτι τῦτο (τῷ χριςῷ προσκρ) γεέννης ϗ χαλεπώτερον ϗ φο βερώτερον. *S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. Hom.* 36.

(e) *Vir bonus quod hone facturum putaverit, faciet, e amſi laborioſum erit; faciet e amſi periculoſum erit. Rur quod turpe erit, non faciet, e amſi pecuniam affert, etiam voluptatem, etiamſi potentia ab honeſto nullâ re deterrebit ad turpia nullâ ſpe invitabit* Sen. Ep. 76. *Nemo juſtus poteſt, qui mortem, qui dolore qui exilium, qui egeſtatem met, aut qui ea quæ*

and

traria æquitati anteponit. Cic. de Off. l. 1.

and dearer to his Affections than God, is at the Heart a Traytor to him, and will openly forſake him at a time of trial. To love and ſerve God therefore in an underling, undergraduate and diminutive way, (who muſt be lov'd and ſerved in the Soveriegn and Supreme way,) this is not to be his Subjects and Servants, but Aliens and Enemies. Such are all Hypocrites, that will go a little way in Religion, and ſerve God a little heartleſly, remiſly, unfaithfully, and upon the bye only, allowing him no other God-ſervice but what wicked and worldly kind of People can well ſpare, which is conſiſtent with their Convenience and with their Carnality and Wickedneſs of Mind and Life. God and Piety are not the things that their Hearts are ſet upon, they will not ſerve him with their beſt and their all and at any rate, nor allow him the total of his Honour and Service, not the utmoſt and total of their Honour and Service, not their Sovereign and ſupreme *Soul-Honour and Service:* But the mundane things and their fleſhly felicitatives have the chief of their Regard, Eſteem and Affection, and of their Care and Endeavour.

V. We owe unto God (which is proper to his degree) *ſuch Honour and Service, which is not communicable without the Crime of Idolatry.* Idolatry (which is *εἰδωλοποιΐα, the making an Idol*) may fitly be diſtinguiſh'd into two Kinds: *The Devotional* and the *Spiritual*; the one of which conſtituteth *an evil Religion*, the other conſtituteth *an evil Life*. Of the Devotional Idolatry there are three eminent Branches; for part of it is *idolatrous Opinion* (or Attribution,) part of it is *idolatrous Affection*, and part of it is *idolatrous honourary Practice*. Of theſe three Ingredients the Pagans and Pagano-Chriſtians *devotional Idolatry* is compounded; for in their Mind, interiour Opinion and Eſtimation they give unto Creatures and Figments the incommunicable Excellencies of God. And they give to them *that Devotional* Submiſſion and Subjection of Soul, repoſe that Truſt and Hope in them, exerciſe that dependence upon them, and have that mighty regard and love for them, which is proper to God alone, whereby they become their Idols. The Prophet heapeth Expreſſion upon Expreſſion, to ſet forth the immenſe devotional Affection, which Idolaters have for their Gods, *Jer*. 8. 1, 2. A *Third* part of the Pagans and Pagano-Chriſtians Devotional Idolatry is their *idolatrous honourary Practice* in erecting to the illegitimate Objects of their Devotion Temples and Altars, burning Incenſe, making Oblations, Prayers, Hymns, Thankſgivings and Vows to them, ſwearing by their Names, paying them the Religious Adoration in the geſture of their Mind and Body, appointing Prieſts and celebrating Feſtivals for their Honour and Service, conſecrating their Images (giving to them alſo the Religious Worſhip,) *and doing Service unto them which by Nature are no Gods.* Gal. 4. 8. The Pagano-Chriſtians ſuppoſe a middle Service and Worſhip (called *Dulia*) between the Divine and Human: But in this they delude themſelves; for they that tranſcend *the Man-honourary Service and Worſhip* immediately and neceſſarily proceed to the *God-honourary Service and Worſhip*, as appeareth from that *Man-Idolatry*, of which Princes, Popes and other great Perſons are the Objects; and from the account which one of their own Hiſtorians giveth of the entrance of the *Duke of Guiſe* into *Paris* and the Peoples manner of receiving him. (*f*) *There was a kind of Madneſs in this Tranſport, or rather in this furious torrent of Joy, which was ſo extravagant, that it paſs'd even to Idolatry.* —— *ſome there were amongſt them, who kneeled to him, when he was paſſing by, and others, who when they could not reach him with their hands, endeavour'd to touch him with their Chapelets, which they kiſs'd, when they had receiv'd that honour, as the cuſtom is in adoration at the ſhrines of Saints.* Something of like Nature with this Idolatry is not unuſual in the World; for its Grandees uſually arrogate to themſelves ſomething of a Deity, and the People of ſilly, weak, degenerous Minds (ſtruck with the admiration of mundane Gauds) are as prone, to aſcribe it to them, as they are to arrogate it to themſelves; and this ſort of Idolatry is called by *Fileſacus Idololatria Politica*. Iſa. 47. 8. Ezek. 28. 2. and 29. 3. *Act.* 12. 22.

The Political Idolatry may be reduc'd to the *Devotional*, and (in many Inſtances) *the Spiritual Idolatry* reſembleth the Devotional. (*g*) For we are told of a People (*Carabaroi*) in the Southern *America*, who believe, that there is a Numen in Gold. At certain times of the Year they imploy themſelves in gathering it, and all the time of gathering it they abſtain from Venery and all Pleaſure and Eat and Drink ſparingly. According to the Religion of their Anceſtors none may gather it but thoſe that are expiated and pure. As theſe barbarous Religioniſts devotionally Deify and Idolize Gold: So all the worldly avaricious ſpiritually Idolize and Deify *Mammon*. It is their *Numen*, *ſummum bonum*, their *optimus maximus* and their *Jove*. —— *clauſum poſſidet arca Jovem.* The Servitors of *Mammon* (that are none of God's Servants) by an idolatrous Eſteem and Affection, and Service and Truſt (ſuppoſing, that it will maintain them in a mundane happy Eſtate, which they count their Happineſs) make it their Idol and their *Jove*, their God and their All. That Law therefore *ye ſhall not follow Idols*, *Philo* interpreteth figuratively, to be of this meaning; ὅτι πλούτῳ τιμὰς ἀπονέμειν ἰσοθέους οὐ προσήκει, *we may not give the Honours proper to God to worldy Riches.* The World is to its Admirers and Lovers the great God *Pan*, and of ſome Senſualiſts the Apoſtle ſaith, *their God is their Belly*, (*h*) they deifie it in Honour and Service, it is their God and their All. The Life of unholy Mankind is an Idolatrous loving, ſerving and pleaſing the Fleſh (their Animal Senſitive Nature;) the pleaſures of it are their Sovereign Good, and they ſerve it with their All and at any rate. To make *Fleſh our Arm*, is alſo a Branch of Spiritual Idolatry, and much of it appeareth in the *Self-idolizing* Sin of Pride. The old Heathen Gods (*Bacchus*, *Venus*, *Pluto*) have their Worſhippers and Servitors in great number in all Religions. (*i*) *Thou wilt ſay, thou do'ſt not Worſhip* Venus, Mars, Mammon, *becauſe thou do'ſt not bow thy ſelf to them: But thou giveſt them Worſhip much more by Works and Deeds; for this is the greater Worſhip. Conſider, who it is, that more Worſhip God; is it they that only ſtand in Prayers, or is it not they that do his Will? So it is with* Mammon (or *Bacchus*,) *It is they that do his Will, that more Worſhip him.* (*k*) *To Sacrifice the Soul to a Vice, is far more than to Sacrifice Sheep and Oxen to Images.*

(f) *Maimbourg. Hiſt. of the League* p. 338.

(g) *Hoffman. umbr. in luce* p. 115.

De Monarch. l. 1.

(i) S. Chryſoſt. in Epheſ. Hom. 16.

(h) *Avarus aurum, guloſus ventrem, libidinoſus penem & Beelphegor colit: Laſciva mulier, quæ cùm ſit in delitiis vivens mortua eſt, adorat venereas voluptates.* S. Hieron. com. in Amos c. 2.

(k) Τοῖς μὲν ξοάνοις βοῦς καὶ πρόβατα θύουσιν· Ἡ δὲ φιλαργυρία λέγει, θῦσόν μοι τὴν σαυτοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ πείθει. Idem in Joan. Hom. 65.

CHAP. IX.

1. The Second Conſectary of Practice from the Idea of God, that our Piety and Religion muſt be ſuch as is of his Kind and Quality. 2. The firſt deſcriptive Notice of ſuch Piety; it is what is Truth of Piety and Religion. 3. A Second deſcriptive Notice of it; it is what is Truth of Piety according to the Religion of Soul-Intereſts. The Moſaic Law was a Civil-religious Inſtitution. 4. The great Precepts of it expounded according to that Hypotheſis. 5. The Moſaic Law was a Covenant of Civil-religious Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins. 6. Agreeably whereto the Doctrine of the Prophets is repreſented. 7. The Civil-religious Truth of Piety requir'd by this Law was both the Real and Perſonal. 8. A Third deſcriptive Notice of God's kind of Piety, it is the true and genuin kind of Piety.

I. A *Second Conſectary* of Practice naturally iſſueth from the Idea of God; *that our Piety, Religion and Godlineſs muſt not be a Piety-leſs kind of Piety, a Religion-leſs kind of Religion, a Godleſs kind of Godlineſs, which is not of his Kind and Quality.* It is like ἄλας ἄναλον, *Salt without Salt*, βίος ἄβιος, *a Life-leſs Life* (that is Life in one ſenſe not in another,) φίλος ἄφιλος, *a Friendleſs kind of Friend*, δῶρον ἄδωρον, *a Giftleſs Gift*, μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ, *a Motherleſs Mother* (in *Sophocles*,) and the *Idol-ſhepherds*, that are Shepherds not Shepherds: So a cowardly Souldier is a Souldier no Souldier, a wicked and ſlothful Servant is a Servant no Servant; (*l*) the Proverbs of *Ben Sira* call a profligate Son בר דלא בר *a Son no Son*, and the Greek Riddle calleth an Eunuch (*m*) *a Man no Man*. So the Philoſophers uſually ſay, that in a bad Man ἀπώλετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος, *the Man is loſt*, becauſe of his Morals he is *a Man-no-man, a Man-beaſt, a Man-wolf, or a Man-ſwine*, (*n*) θηρίον ἀνθρωπόμορφον, *a Beaſt in the ſhape of a Man.* (*o*) *Some of us* (ſaith the Philoſopher) *are great Beaſts, and others little ill-moral Beaſts. The inordinate Domination of the Paſſions* (p) *doth not ſuffer Men to be Men. Non omnes homines homines ſumus. Eſt homo homo; & homo non homo. All of us Men are not Men*, ſaith *Origen. There is Man-man, and there is Man not-man.* The greateſt part of Mankind conſider'd as Men are an *unmankind* of Men; conſider'd as Religioniſts they are an Irreligious kind of Religioniſts; and the greateſt part of pretending Chriſtians are an Unchriſtian kind of Chriſtians. Religioniſts therefore muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into two oppoſite Kinds and Families: God's kind of Religioniſts, and the mundane kind of Religioniſts, whoſe Religion is *a Religion-leſs kind of Religion.* For it is not by being no Religioniſts that the greateſt part of Mankind are loſt (almoſt all the World are ſome ſort of Religioniſts,) but by being none of *God's kind of Religioniſts*, who alone are ally'd to him, own'd and accepted by him to the purpoſe of eternal Life and Salvation. The reſt of Mankind are Religioniſts *alienæ familiæ*, not of his Alliance and Cognation, but of an Exotic kind, to whom he is Alien and Inimical. Such ſpurious kind of Religioniſts were the Heathen World, whoſe Piety was (*q*) *Pietas impia, an impious kind of Piety*; and ſuch Religioniſts were the carnal Jews, that needed a total Repentance and Converſion to God, were *the Children of the Fleſh, not the Children of God*, not *Abraham*'s genuin Children, but *the Servants of Sin*, a Diabolical Brood, and *an adulterous Generation.* Which Phraſe Synecdochically denoteth a very *naughty Generation*, as in our Language a very naughty Woman ſignifieth an adulterous Woman. Such are the wicked, carnal and mundane kind of Religioniſts, who (being in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs) are in the main none of God's kind of Religioniſts, whoſe Piety therefore muſt be denominated *a Piety-leſs kind of Piety, a Religion-leſs kind of Religion*, which is not conſtitutive of God's kind of Religioniſts, the truly Holy, Spiritual and Divine kind of Religioniſts. But his kind of Piety and Religion is *that which is conſtitutive of his kind of Religioniſts* (the Saint of God-kind of Religioniſts) and this is a general definitive Notice of it. With which general Notice we will not content our ſelves, but to give a clear and particular account of it, we will add *theſe three deſcriptive* Notices of it. *It is what is Truth of Piety and Religion* (both the Real and the Perſonal,) *it is what is truth of Piety according to the Religion of Soul-intereſts, it is the true and genuin kind of Piety, Religion and Virtue.*

Marc. 9. 50. *Zech.* 11. 17. *Ezek.* 14. 5, 8.

(l) *Druſ. Proverb. Ben Sir. initio.*

(m) *Plato* 5. *de Rep. ſub fin.*

(n) S. *Chryſoſt. in* 2 *Cor.* λογ. 5.

(o) Οἱ μὲν ἡμῶν μεγάλα θηρία εἰσὶν, οἱ δὲ θηρίδια κακοήθη. *V. Gat. in Ant. p.* 302, 356, 360.

(p) Οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπους ἐφίησιν εἶναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. *Ibid.*

(q) *Lactant. l.* 5. *c.* 21. *Act.* 3. 26. *Rom.* 9. 8. *Joh.* 8. 34, 39, 44. *Matth.* 12. 39.

Matth. 7. 21, 22, 23. *Luc.* 13. 26, 27. *Rom.* 8. 9, 14. 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Gal.* 5. 24. 1 *Joh.* 1. 6. and 2. 4. and 3. 2. and 4, 7, 8. 3 *Joh.* 11. *Joh.* 15. 14. *Rom.* 6. 20. *Apoc.* 2. 9.

II. In the firſt place *his kind of Piety is what is truth of Piety and Religion both the real and the perſonal*, for true Religion denoteth both what is truth of Religion *ex parte rei* (or the real,) and what is truth of Religion *ex parte perſonæ, or the perſonal.* The former of theſe may be underſtood from what the Father ſaith; (*r*) *Religion is not to be ſought either in the blundering of Paganiſm or the blindneſs of Judaiſm.* The latter of them may be underſtood from the ſame Father's Appellation of ſome Pagans, (*s*) *the true Worſhippers of falſe Gods.* The truth of Piety and Religion *real* is the Inſtitution of the true Religion, which the one true God is the Deity of, which acknowledgeth him and is acknowledged by him. (*t*) *Nor are they likely to make Progreſs to Salvation, who miſſing the true ſalutary way, the further they walk, the further they go out of the way.* The more Righteous they are according to the guiſe of falſe Religion, the more wicked and unrighteous they are; for their Religion it ſelf is Unrighteouſneſs. A true Religioniſt therefore muſt be of the true Religion real, and therewith he muſt combine the truth of Piety and Religion perſonal (which is, to be faithful to God and his Service;) for without Integrity and Uprightneſs of Heart Mens honouring God is not true honouring him, but an henious deſpiſing him and con-

(r) *Neque in confuſione Paganorum, neque in cæcitate Judæorum quærenda eſt religio.* S. Aug. de ver. rel. c. 5.

(s) *Falſorum Deorum non fallaces cultores.* De C. D. l 1. c. 24.

(t) *Nec ambulando proficiunt ad ſalutem, qui ſalutaris* [illegible] *non tenent veritatem.* S. Cypr. de Unit. Eccleſ.

Joſh. 24. 14. 1 *Sam.* 12. 24. 1 *King.* 2. 4. and 3. 6. 2 *King.* 20. 3. *Pſal.* 51. 6. and 97. 11. *Joh.* 1. 47. *Pro.* 15. 8. *Pſal.* 66. 18. *Iſa.* 1. 11, 12. *Matth.* 15. 8. *Luc.* 16. 15. 1 *Tim.* 4. 2.

temning him; their ſerving God is not due ſerving him, but mocking and abuſing him; their Religion is both a Vanity and a Villainy in Maſquerade; their Sanctity is not Sinleſneſs, but double Iniquity; their Sacrifices are not Atonements, but Sins and Provocations; their Piety is not truth of Piety, but an abominable Lye, and deadly Wickedneſs and Hypocriſie.

Truth of *Piety* and *Religion* therefore is oppoſite to a twofold Species of Irreligious Religion: *Superſtition* and *Hypocriſie*. Superſtition is falſe Religion, as falſe Religion is oppoſite to what is Truth of Religion real: Hypocriſie is falſe Religion, as falſe Religion is oppoſite to what is Truth of Religion perſonal. The former is *Cheat-religion* in reſpect of the truth of the thing; the latter is *Cheat-religion* in reſpect of the Perſon's Truth and Honeſty of Heart. It would be Pedantry and Trifling, to make a Diſpute about the uſe of the Greek word δεισιδαιμονία, or the Latin word *Superſtitio* (which doubtleſs (u) have been us'd in a good Senſe,) or to confine the Notion of them to what they ſignifie according to their Etymologies: (*w*) Which overſight hath occaſion'd Learned Writers (both Pagan and Chriſtian,) to overlook the true and general Notion of *Superſtition*, as it ſignifieth in a bad Senſe. If Men would conſult their own Minds, what they mean, when they reproach any thing by the Name of *Superſtition*, they would eaſily diſcern, that Superſtition is not only *the worſhip of Demons*, nor only δειλία πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, *an over-timerouſneſs and exceſs of fear of the Deity*, nor only a criminal *nimiety and exceſs in Religion*; but whatever Men account *Falſe Religion* (as Falſe is oppos'd to Truth of Religion real,) they uſually brand with the reproachful Name of *Superſtition*. (*x*) *Religio veri cultus eſt, ſuperſtitio falſi, Religion is the Name of the true Worſhip, Superſtition of the falſe.* So ſome Lexicographers interpret the word (*y*) *falſus Dei cultus*, and from *A. Gellius*, *inepta religio*, *inept Religion*. So *Varro* muſt be underſtood, when he ſaith; (z) *Majores noſtri ſuperſtitionem à religione ſeparaverunt, our Anceſtors diſtinguiſh'd Religion from Superſtition.* So Learned Men of the Church of *Rome* ſay, (*a*) *Religio in virtute, ſuperſtitio in vitio ponitur, Religion denoteth the Virtue, Superſtition the Vice.* So in *Philo* and *Clemens*, εὐσέβεια, *Piety*, ſtandeth oppos'd to two Vices, ἀθεότης or ἀσέβεια, which is *no Religion*, and δεισιδαιμονία, *Superſtition*, which is *falſe Religion*. (*c*) So in S. *Hierom* and the Latin Fathers generally (in whoſe Writings the word Superſtition frequently occurreth) every thing is called Superſtition, which they account falſe or inept Religion. (*d*) The Chriſtians call the Pagan God-ſervices *Stultæ atque Irreligioſæ Superſtitiones*, (e) *Mimus Religionis, fooliſh and irreligious Superſtitions, the Ape of Religion*, (*f*) they condemn *omnia ſuperſtitionum genera quæ extra religionem Dei ſunt, all kinds of Superſtitions, which are without God's Religion*; (*g*) they complain, that *Superſtitionibus falſis religio vera ſubvertitur, true Religion is ſubverted by falſe Superſtitions.* And the Pagans return upon them the ſame Language, and call their Religion, (*b*) *nova & malefica ſuperſtitio, exitiabilis ſuperſtitio, a new and maleficent and peſtilent Superſtition.* Superſtition and falſe Religion are manifeſtly terms ſynonymous in this Saying of *Tacitus*, (*i*) *Gens ſuperſtitioni obnoxia, religionibus adverſa*, and in this other Saying of an Hiſtorian; (*k*) *nulla res efficaciùs multitudinem regit quàm ſuperſtitio. —ubi vanâ religione capta eſt, meliùs vatibus quàm ducibus ſuis paret: Nothing more effectually governeth the Multitude than Superſtition. When they are taken with vain Religion, they obey their Prophets better than their Commanders.* Magical Spells therefore, Ligatures and Characters (matters of the Religion of Demonolatry) are rightly call'd by S. *Auſtin* (*l*) *Execrable Superſtition*. The Heathens Obſervations of lucky and unlucky Days, of Divinatory Signs and Omens (matters of their Religion of the Gods which govern'd their Divination) are rightly call'd by the ſame Father, *ſignificationes ſuperſtitioſæ*, *ſuperſtitious ſignifications*; and the ſame Vanities amongſt pretending Chriſtians ought to be reputed, not only *an exceſs of Credulity* (as a Learned Man (*m*) ſuppoſeth) but properly *Superſtitious*; for which a very good reaſon is given by an ancient Writer, (*n*) *Qui hæc ſervat, ex parte paganus eſſe dignoſcitur, he that obſerveth theſe things, is known to be in part a Pagan.* The *Chaldeans* Aſtrological Divinations (matters of their Religion of Aſtrolatry) are rightly call'd by S. *Ambroſe* (*o*) *Vain Superſtition*: (*p*) As the ſetting up Images of the Gods is called by another Father *Superſtition*, and whatever appertaineth thereto he rightly calleth *Superſtitious*. The Phariſees (that conceited themſelves mighty Saintiſts becauſe of their Fringes and Phylacteries) are call'd by S. *Hierom* (*q*) *ſuperſtitioſi Magiſtri, the ſuperſtitious Maſters*; and for the ſame reaſon the Aſceticiſm of the Philoſophic Pagan Saintiſts is call'd by S. *Hilary* Superſtition. (*r*) *We ſee the Philoſophers cold and naked, they abſtain alſo from the very uſe of Marriage: Hereticks alſo live on dry Bread; but what advantage is there of this idle Inſtitution? the whole of it is vain and ridiculous, and to be lamented together with the cauſes of the Superſtition.* The Opinion which the Phariſees had of their Phylacteries, that as holy and religious things they were of Virtue, to drive away Diſeaſes and Devils, and their wearing them from ſuch Opinion, was vain and falſe Religion; S. *Hierom* therefore rightly calleth certain Women (*s*) *ſuperſtitioſæ mulierculæ*, to whom little Goſpels and the Wood of the Croſs were the ſame thing that Phylacteries were to the Phariſees. Criminal Externalneſs and Rituality in Religion (*t*) is rightly call'd Superſtition; whence S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (*u*) *Dicitur ſuperſtitioſis regnum Dei intra vos eſt, the Superſtitious are told, the Kingdom of God is within you.* To make thoſe things Sanctimony and Religion (or matters of Sanctity and Religion) which are not really ſuch, is therefore Superſtition, becauſe it is falſe Religion. Whence S. *Auſtin* (*w*) calleth the religious obſervance of our own Phantaſms and *timiditas in cæremoniis, an over-timerous ſcrupuloſity about indifferent Rites* by the reproachful Name of Superſtition. So they that obſerv'd the Rite of waſhing before Prayer (*x*) are call'd by *Tertullian* Superſtitious. (*y*) *And becauſe we have mention'd one thing* (ſaith he) *which is a vain Obſervation, we will take notice of the reſt alſo, that are deſervedly accounted Vanities, ſeeing they are done without the Authority of any Precept of our Lord or his Apoſtles*, hujuſmodi enim non religioni ſed ſuperſtitioni deputantur, *for ſuch things are not to be accounted Religion, but Superſtition.* (z) So the Jews reverence in entring the Temple and for the Name Jehovah is called *Superſtition*.

A Learned Man therefore is extreamly beſide the Cuſhion, (*a*) who will ſcarce allow the Follies and Vanities of the Church of *Rome*, to be called Superſtition; and he can find no other Superſtition amongſt Proteſtants ſave only

the

(u) Dr. Ham. of Superſtit. and on Act. 17. 22.

(w) Plut. M. Tyr. Mr. Smith. Dr. H. More Ench. Eth. l. 2. c. 5.

(x) Lactant. l. 4. c. 28.

(y) Calepine.

(z) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 6. c. 30.

(a) Petav. T. 4. par. 2. l. 15. c. 1. S. 7.

(c) In Iſa. 57. 10.

(d) S. Hier. in Pſ. 34.

(e) Lactant. l. 2. c. 19.

(f) S. Hier. in Pſal. 4.

(g) S. Cypr. ad Demetr.

(h) Sueton. in Neron. Tacit. 15. Annal.

(i) Hiſtor.

(k) Q. Curt. 4.

(l) Ep. 73.

(m) Dr. Hammond ſupr.

(n) De rectitud. Cathol. Converſ. inter op. S. Aug. T. 9.

(o) De Abraham, l. 1. c. 4.

(p) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 4. c. 30.

(q) In Matth. 23. 5.

(r) In Pſal. 64.

(s) In Mat. 23. 5.

(t) Grot. de V. R. C. l. 5. S. 8.

(u) De ver. Rel. c. 3.

(w) Ibid. & Ep. 118.

(x) De orat. c. 11.

(y) Ibid. c. 12.

(z) Cunæus de Rep. Heb. l. 2. c. 13. Epiſcop. Inſt. Theol. l. 3. S. 1. c. 1.

(a) Dr. Ham. Tr. of ſuperſtit. S. 42, 43.

the dogmatizing miſtake (the impoſing as things neceſſary ſuch as the Law of Chriſt hath not made neceſſary;) whereas *Cicero*'s complaint is not out of date, *that Superſtition hath overſpread all Nations.* Good Men (eſpecially thoſe of weaker Judgment) have in ſeveral Inſtances their Superſtitions, (b) S. *Auſtin* lamenteth one of them, wicked carnal Religioniſts, that only ſo far profeſs the true Religion, as to be devoid of the Truth of it (of which they are regardleſs) uſually ſubſtitute inſtead thereof ſome vile Superſtition; Proud Ignorant Religioniſts have their *Helena*'s of fond Conceits and Modes, which are a Religion of their own deviſing; the ſeveral Sects and Churches into which Chriſtendom ſtandeth divided, diſtinguiſh themſelves by their Superſtitions. (c) *The* Armenian *Patriarch of* Jeruſalem, *being deſirous to prove the Sanctity of his Church and Religion, to be greater than that of the* Greeks *or any other, brought it for an Argument, that they not only abſtain from Fleſh and Fiſh in* Lent, *but even alſo from Beans and Peaſe, which the* Greeks *allow'd of, conſulting more the Inclination of their Appetite than true Religion.* (d) *This I am very much troubled at* (ſaith S. *Auſtin,*) *that many Salutary Precepts in the Bible are little regarded, and Preſumptions every where ſo abound, that he is more grievouſly reprehended, who in his Octaves toucheth the Ground with his bare Foot, than he that burieth his Soul in Drunkenneſs.* Superſtitioniſts are of various degrees; for many are Superſtitioniſts in ſmall Inſtances, that are not ſuch in the main: Nor can any (within the Pale of the Church) be Superſtitioniſts in the main, unleſs they be alſo *Hypocrites* in the main; nor would their Superſtition be deadly, if it was not complicated with deadly Hypocriſie. Such a Superſtitioniſt was *Lewis the Eleventh* of *France*, who was wont to ſwear and kiſs his Crucifix, to ſwear again and to kiſs it again, which ſpeaketh him both a deadly Superſtitioniſt and a deadly Hypocrite. An Hypocrite in Religion is in the main devoid of faithfulneſs to God and his Service, and therefore is fitly defin'd *a perſonated Pietiſt*, (e) as the word ſignifieth, and as ſome have called the Philoſophers (f) *Philoſophos perſonatos, perſonated Philoſophers.*

III. *Secondly*, God's kind of Piety is *what is truth of Piety according to the Religion of Soul-intereſts*; which is ſuch a truth of Piety and Virtue, as ſaveth from Carnality and Wickedneſs, and is eternally ſaving to the Soul. To this truth of Piety and Virtue, which muſt be denominated, *The Spiritual-religious*, we muſt confront and oppoſe another truth of Piety and Virtue, which muſt be denominated *The Civil-Religious*; which although it is far from being abſolutely and according to the Religion of Soul-intereſts *truth of Virtue and Piety*, yet it is *truth of Piety and Virtue both real and perſonal according to the Religion of Secular Intereſts.* To illuſtrate theſe diſtinct ſorts *of truth of Virtue and Piety*, it is neceſſary to ſurvey the *Moſaic* Law.

Which was —— { A Spiritual-Religious Law covertly.
A Civil-Religious Law expreſly.

Conſider'd as a Spiritual-Religious Law it was { Old Spiritual-religious Law, *Rom.* 7. 14. and 8. 4.
In ſome reſpects New Spiritual-Religious Law, 1 *Cor.* 10. 11. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. *Col.* 2. 17.

As a Spiritual-Religious Law therefore it muſt be conſider'd { In a larger Notion as comprehending and including the Goſpel.
In a narrower Notion as contradiſtinct and oppoſite to the Goſpel.

This Delineation of the *Moſaic* Law ſuppoſeth (what is evident,) that it was a Law of Religion, which requir'd Piety, and conſequently *Truth of Virtue and Piety.* Accordingly, as a Spiritual-religious Law it requir'd the Spiritual-religious Truth of Virtue and Piety, and many that liv'd in the Times of it were true and genuine Saints of God (ſuch as the Patriarchs were before the Law,) whoſe Truth of Virtue and Piety was the Spiritual-religious (according to the Religion of Soul-intereſts,) although they were *Symbolical and Holy-land kind of Pietiſts*, whoſe Piety was in ſeveral Inſtances diſſonant from the Piety of the *New Teſtament.* But as it was a Spiritual-religious Law (which is an Inſtitution of Holy Spiritual Life in order to Spiritual and Eternal Soul-intereſts:) So all acknowledge, and the thing is manifeſt, that it was *the Political or Civil Law of the Jews*; which implieth, that it was *a Civil-religious Law*, which is an Inſtitution of Civil-religious Life in order to Secular Intereſts; for unleſs there can be a Commonwealth of *Atheiſts*, if Religion is the Foundation of the Commonwealth (as *Plato*, *Xenophon*, *Plutarch* and others have diſcours'd,) the Civil Law of every Common-wealth muſt neceſſarily be *a Civil-Religious Law*; and conſequently the Civil Law of the *Jews* muſt be *Civil-religious*; but Religious at an higher rate than ordinary Civil Laws as containing an expreſs Contract between God and them, that he would be their King and their God (in Society,) and that they would live in Society with him as his People. Such a Contract muſt neceſſarily found and conſtitute an *Holy-popular Commonwealth*; yet not an Holy-popular Commonwealth meerly ſuch (for the People of *Iſrael* were not as the Chriſtian Church is, meerly an Holy-popular Commonwealth,) *but ſuch a Civil Society and Government as was alſo an Holy-popular Commonwealth.* Ordinary Commonwealths take care of the ſame things with the Law of *Moſes*, of the Conſtitution and Adminiſtration of the Republick, of Magiſtrates and Judges higher and lower and their Offices, of Liberty and Servitude, of Inheritances, Contracts and Commerce, of Juſtice (the Fountain of Civil Happineſs,) of Civil and Criminal Cauſes, of War, Marriage and Divorce, of the Rights of Citizens, their Virtue and good Behaviour, but eſpecially of Religion, its Prieſts, Temples, Sacrifices, Ceremonies, which muſt be accompany'd with Moral Duty and Virtue. *Ariſtotle* (no great Religioniſt) ſpeaketh the common Sentiment of the Heathen World in conſtituting a Commonwealth; (g) πρῶτον ἡ περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐπιμέλεια, *the firſt and principal care is Religion.* The Founders and Lawgivers of Pagan Commonwealths conſtituted them agreeably to their Notices of the end of man, (h) *that he is made to live without Inordinacy, and for Religion no leſs than for Civil Juſtice.* The Laws of Pagan Commonwealths therefore agree with the Law of the Jews in this their general Nature, *they were Civil-religious*, νόμος πόλεως, *the Law of the Civil-Society*, Civilis Diſciplina, *their Civil Diſcipline*; Jus Civile, *their Civil Law*, and are called by *Varro*

(b) *Ep.* 118.

(c) *S. P. Rycaut. preſ. ſtate of the Greek Church. p.* 35.

(d) *S. Aug. Ep.* 119.

(e) *Grot. Not. in Matt.* 6. 2.

(f) *Betul. in Lactant. de ira Dei, c.* 22.

Exod. 19. 5, 6, 8. *Deut.* 5. 2, 27. and 26. 17, 18. and 20. 12, 13. *Ezek.* 16. 8.

(g) *Pol. l.* 7. *c.* 8.

(h) Πρὸς ἰσότητα κ̀ θεο- βειαν κατεσκευάσθαι, ὐκ ἧττον πρὸς δικαιοσύνην. *M. Ant. l.* 11. *c.* 20.

Varro their *Civilis Theologia*, *Civil Theology*, as the Jews Religious Inſtitutes were the Law of their Commonwealth, *Reſ-publica Judaica.* The *Attick* and *Roman* Laws agree with the Law of the *Hebrews* touching things Civil, the Ritual Inſtitutes of the Law of the Hebrews anſwer to the Ritual Inſtitutes of Pagan Commonwealths, and in the Civil Law of ſome Pagan Commonwealths there was an Immenſity of Religious Inſtitutes much what at the ſame rate with that of the Hebrews. *Babylon* that was *mad upon her Idols*, the *Egyptians* (that were (i) θεοσεβέες περισσῶς μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, *exceſſively Religious above all Men*,) *Athens* alſo and *Rome* (whoſe δεισιδαιμονία ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐκτετραγώδηται, *Superſtition is rais'd to ſuch a pitch*, (k) ſaith the Hiſtorian) ſeem not to have come behind *Judea* in numeroſity of Religious Inſtitutes. *Plato* in his *fourth of Laws* inſtituting a Commonwealth after the *Cretian*, *Athenian* and *Lacedæmonian* Model appointeth Prayers, Oblations and other Divine Worſhip firſt for the Celeſtial Gods and thoſe that preſide over the City, next for the Terreſtrial Gods, and in the next place, Sacrifices for the Demons and Heroes, and then follow the Statues of the Country Gods conſecrated κατὰ νόμον, *according to Law*. At this rate the Heathen Lawgivers and Founders of their Commonwealths purſu'd their Maxim (that in conſtituting a Commonwealth the firſt and principal thing is Religion,) the Humour of the World in thoſe times was, to multiply their Gods and their *Sacra* to an immenſe Rabble, which ſeemeth to be one reaſon of the vaſt Numeroſity of the Rites of Religion in the *Moſaic* Inſtitution. The Heathen Lawgivers and Founders of Commonwealths propos'd to themſelves *Rempublicam ſanctiſſimam*, *a moſt holy Commonwealth*, (l) ſuch a Commonwealth *Moſes* erected, they pretended, to derive their Laws from ſome God or Goddeſs (at leaſt they would have their Laws recommended by an Oracle, as *Lycurgus*'s were,) *Moſes* really deriv'd his Laws from the true God; as he erected a *Theocracy*, (m) ſo the *Athenians* by the Advice of the Oracle conſtituted *Jupiter* their King. As the *Moſaic* Inſtitutes are not meer Ritualities, but Ritualities with a mixture of Morality both towards God and Man; ſo the Civil Laws of Heathen Commonwealths took care of both Tables; the Imperial Laws injoyn'd the great Moralities towards Man (*honeſte vivere, neminem lædere, pactis ſtare, to live honeſtly, to hurt none, to keep Covenants*, and it is Moral Duty towards the (Heathen's) Deity, which the twelve Tables injoyn, *Ad Divos adeunto caſte, pietatem adhibento, opes amovento, let the Gods be worſhipp'd chaſtly, with Piety, not with Riches.* In the Civil Laws of ſeveral Pagan Commonwealths (n) there are ſome things that belong to the Morality of the Mind; and generally their Civil Laws are capable of that diſtribution, which is uſually made of the *Moſaic* Law, they may be divided into *Ceremonial, Moral and Judicial.* As the Law of the Pagans Religion therefore (being their Civil Law) muſt be called *Civil-Religious*, ſo the Law of the Hebrews muſt be denominated. And as thoſe Religious Societies, the Pagan Commonwealths, were all of them Civil Societies, and yet were ſo many Churches or Synagogues of Satan; ſo the Commonwealth of *Iſrael* was both a Civil Society and the Church of God, agreeably to the Character of their Law which was *Civil-Religious.*

Jer. 50. 38.

(i) Herod. l. 2. c. 37.

(k) Polyb. l. c.

(l) Cunæus de Rep. Hebr. l. 1. c. 1.

(m) Spencer. diſſ. de Theocrat. Jud. c. 3.

(n) *In Zaleuci & Charondæ legibus & 12 Tabulis quædam inſerta erant, ad animi caſtimoniam pertinentia.* Grot. Not. in Matth. 5. 17.

IV. The truth of this Character of their Law is viſible in the Sanction of it; for that literal old Covenant as ſuch was meerly a Settlement of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, and of the Bleſſings of the Land of *Canaan*. God undertook to be their God, *that they ſhould be a Theocracy*, and to give them all the Bleſſings of the Holy Land, and they undertook to acknowledge him for their God, and to worſhip and ſerve him according to the Law which he gave them, which implieth truth of Virtue and Piety. But this truth of Virtue and Piety which they promis'd on their part, was but the Civil-religious, as the Priviledges and Bleſſings which God covenanted for on his part, were but the Civil-Religious and Secular; for the *Moſaical* Covenant in the whole tenour of it covenanteth for nothing but Civil-religious Priviledges and Bleſſings; all the Promiſes of that Covenant are nothing more than Secular Felicities, and freedom from Temporal Calamities, and the Threatnings of it are nothing more than Temporal Calamities, *Exod.* 15. 25, 26. and 23. 25, 26. *Lev.* 25. 18, 19. and 26. 3, 4, &c. *Deut.* 7. 12, 13, &c. and 28. 2, 3, &c. and 29. 1. 24, 25. *Heb.* 7. 19. and 8. 6. and 9. 15. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9, 10. The Law as it is the literal *Law-Covenant*, *Old Teſtament* or ſettlement of things (the Law of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*) is an Inſtitution of the Civil-religious Virtue and Duty in order to the Intereſts of this World, which are the only Sanction thereof. The grand Precepts of it therefore muſt be ſo expounded, as to have a different Senſe and meaning; the one according to the *Spiritual-religious* or *Spiritual-moral Law* (both the Old and New, which is Spiritual and Divine Morality: The other according to *the Civil-religious Law and Life*, which is but a Judaical Humane kind of Morality; for it is not imaginable, that the Spiritual Religious Virtue and Duty ſhould be requir'd meerly in order to Secular Intereſts. The Precept of *loving God with all the Heart and Soul*, as it is the Condition of the Civil-religious Covenant, requireth of the *Iſraelites* nothing more, than to be Adherents unto, and Religioniſts of the God of *Iſrael in the Civil-religious way with all the Heart and Soul, in oppoſition to the being Revolters or Worſhippers of falſe Gods*, who alone are ſaid to hate God, (o) as *Maimonides* affirmeth. So the great Law of *loving thy Neighbour as thy ſelf*, as it is the Condition of the Civil-religious Law, requireth of the *Iſraelites* nothing more than this Humane kind of Morality, *to love their Neighbour in a Civil-religious way with a civil neighbourly kind of Love, and ſo far as Civil Society and the good Neighbourhood thereof requireth* (according to thoſe Meaſures) *every one's Neighbour muſt be unto him as himſelf.* So the great Commandments of the Decalogue as they are a Condition of a Civil-religious Covenant, require only a Civil-religious abſtaining from *Murder*, *Adultery*, *Theft*, *Falſe Witneſs*, *coveting that which is another Man's*, an eſchewing thoſe Criminalities ſo far as they are oppoſite to that Righteouſneſs which is requiſite in Humane Society and Morality. So the young Gentleman that came to our Saviour, underſtood them, when he pretended to have kept them from his Youth; and ſo ſeveral of the Hebrew Doctors (p) miſtake their Law for want of underſtanding the different Conſiderations of it.

(o) *Mor. Nev. par.* 1. c. 36.

(p) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 20.

V. The *Moſaic* Law in the Letter of it is *a Covenant of Civil-religious Repentance* (Reformation of Life) and of *Civil-religious Remiſſion of Sins.*

That it is a Covenant of Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins is viſible throughout the Old Teſtament, wherein God is repreſented *as a God of Pardons, that taketh away Iniquity, putteth away Tranſgreſſion as a Cloud, covereth it, blotteth it out, caſteth it behind his Back, caſteth it into the depths of the Sea, as gracious, and that waiteth to be gracious, not keeping Anger for ever, but in Wrath remembring Mercy, repenting him of the Evil, delighting in Mercy, and abundantly pardoning.* To *Moſes* he proclaim'd his Name *The Lord merciful and gracious, forgiving Iniquity and Tranſgreſſion*; and this Proclamation of his Name was made upon Mount *Sinai*, and immediately ſubjoyn'd to the renewing the two Tables of the Law, which ſheweth it, to be a part of the *Moſaical* Covenant (as the Jews have always ſuppos'd it,) and that the *Moſaical* Covenant aſſureth a certain Pardon of Sin upon a ſort of Repentance. One Branch of this proclaim'd Name of God which our Tranſlators render *that will by no means clear the guilty*, is thus rendred by *Onkelos* in his *Targum*, *ſparing them that turn to his Law*; and thus the ancient Hebrews underſtood it (ſaith *P. Fagius*,) they ſuppos'd their Law to be a Covenant of Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins. So the proclaim'd Name of God is uſually alledg'd (*q*) in the Old Teſtament as virtually his Promiſe and Covenant; which is a competent proof, that the *Moſaical* Covenant is a Covenant of Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins. But the expreſs tenour of it is a plain demonſtrative proof of it (that putteth the matter quite out of doubt,) and it plainly demonſtrateth alſo, that this Covenant's Remiſſion of Sins is (not pertaining to the Conſcience, *Heb.* 9. 9.) but Civil-religious which is obtained by a like Repentance, 2 *Chron.* 7. 13, 14. *If I ſhut up Heaven, that there be no Rain, or if I command the Locuſts to devour the Land, or if I ſend Peſtilence among my People: If my People which are called by my Name, ſhall humble themſelves and pray, and ſeek my Face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven, and will forgive their Sin and will heal their Land.* So God himſelf repreſenteth his *Moſaical* Covenant and Diſpenſation of things, ſo it is repreſented in the Books of *Moſes*, *Lev.* 26. 40, 41, 42. *Deut.* 4. 27, &c. *Deut.* 30. 1, 2, 3. So it is repreſented by *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* 30. 9. So King *Solomon* repreſenteth it in great variety of Expreſſion, 2 *Chron.* 6. 24.—40. *If thy People Iſrael be put to the worſe before the Enemy, becauſe they have ſinned againſt thee; when the Heaven is ſhut up and there is no Rain, if there be Dearth in the Land, if there be Peſtilence, if there be blaſting or Mildew*, &c. *if they ſin againſt thee, and thou be angry with them, yet if they turn and pray, ſaying, We have ſinned, if they return to thee with all their Heart and all their Soul, then hear thou from Heaven, and forgive thy People which have ſinned againſt thee.* The Light of the Day is not more clear than theſe Scriptural Accounts of the *Moſaical* Covenant, which plainly demonſtrate it an expreſs Covenant of Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins, of ſuch a Remiſſion of Sins which concerneth Secular Intereſts only, and therefore the Repentance which it requireth as neceſſary in order thereto, is only *a Civil-religious Repentance*; which Civil-religious Repentance is not without a like Integrity, and muſt be a truth of Repentance; for the Covenant requireth of the Jews this Integrity as eſſentially requiſite to their Repentance and their Pardon, *to ſeek the God of their Fathers and to turn to him with all their Heart and Soul.*

From the Writings of the Prophets (who were the Succeſſors of *Moſes*, whoſe Doctrine was not diſſonant from his, and who preach'd no other Covenant than the *Moſaical*, although they propheſy'd of another,) and from the Errands that the Prophets were ſent upon, it appeareth, that the *Moſaical* Covenant was *a Covenant of Civil-religious Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins*, Iſa. 1. 17.---20. *Ceaſe to do Evil, learn to do Well, ſeek Judgment, relieve the oppreſſed, judge the Fatherleſs, plead for the Widow.—— Though your Sins be as Scarlet, they ſhall be white as Snow.—— If ye be willing and obedient, ye ſhall eat the good of the Land; but if ye refuſe and rebell, ye ſhall be devoured by the Sword.* Jer. 36. 3. *It may be, that the Houſe of Iſrael will hear all the Evil which I purpoſe to do unto them, that they may return every Man from his evil way, that I may forgive their Iniquity and their Sin.* Jer. 7. 5, 6, 7. *If ye throughly amend your ways and your doings; if you throughly execute Judgment between a Man and his Neighbour, if ye oppreſs not the Stranger, the Fatherleſs and the Widow, and ſhed not innocent Blood in this place, neither walk after other Gods to your hurt; then will I cauſe you to dwell in this place.* Ezek. 6. 11. and 18. 30. *The Houſe of Iſrael ſhall fall by the Sword, by the Famine and by the Peſtilence: Repent and turn your ſelves from all your Tranſgreſſions, ſo Iniquity ſhall not be your ruine.* All the Prophets have one and the ſame Voice, they are ſo many Heralds proclaiming to *Iſrael* (*r*) Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins. Uſually they were ſent to *Iſrael* and *Judah* upon this Errand, to induce them to Repentance, and ſo to prevent their (Temporal) Ruine, 2 *King.* 17. 13. 2 *Chron.* 36. 15. One of them was ſent upon the ſame Errand to *Nineveh*, whoſe caſe ſheweth, that governing Providence is πρόνοια ἱλάσιμος, *a placable Providence*, and that God in his providential Government of the World governeth by the like meaſures as he govern'd *Iſrael* and *Judah*, by calling to Repentance and pardoning upon Repentance. So the Pagans, (*s*) *they call* Jupiter *placid, as being very placable to them that relinquiſh Injuſtice and become Juſt.* Their Soothſayers ſay, (*t*) *That Eruption of Lightning which* Jupiter *alone ſendeth, is placable.* Agreeably to which Heathen Notices of *Jupiter* the Prophets deſcribe the goodneſs of governing Providence with reſpect to the *Ninevites*, *Jon.* 4. 2. and to the Nations (who as ſuch can only be judg'd, puniſh'd and pardon'd in this Life,) who are promis'd a Pardon upon their Civil-religious Repentance, *Jer.* 18. 7, 8. (*u*) *Many a natural Man* (ſaith a Divine of our own) *by the care he hath to deal juſtly with Men, and by his good Works, the Works of Charity that he doth, avoideth many Temporal Judgments of God, that do fall upon other Men. That is the reaſon, why the Prophet having threatned Deſolation againſt the* Moabites, Eſa. 16. 3. *adviſeth them, that by executing Judgment and ſhewing Mercy to the Oppreſſed they would labour to prevent it. And the Prophet* Daniel, Dan. 4. 27. *giveth hope unto* Nebuchadnezzar *himſelf, that by Righteouſneſs and ſhewing Mercy to the Poor he might obtain a lengthening of his Tranquility.* The Prophet adviſeth him,

Exod. 34. 6, 7.

(q) *Numb.* 14. 18, 19. 2 *Chron.* 30. 9. *Nehem.* 9. 17. *Pſal.* 86. 15. *Joel* 2. 23. *Deut.* 4. 31.

(r) *Iſa.* 55. 7. *Jer.* 4. 14. *and* 20. 13. *Ezek.* 18. 21, 27. *and* 33. 12. *Hoſ.* 14. 1, 2. *Joel* 2. 12.—18. *Amos* 4. 6, 11. *Mic.* 6. 6. *and* 7. 18. *Zeph.* 3. 7. *Hagg.* 2. 17. *Zech.* 1. 3, 4. *Mal.* 3. 9, 10.

(s) Προσαγορεύουσι μειλίχιον τὸν Δία, εὐμείλικτον ὄντα τοῖς ἀδικίας μεταπιθεμένοις. Phurnut. de nat. Deor. p. 17.

(t) *Id fulmen quod ſolus Jupiter mittit, placabile eſt.* Sen. nat. Qu. l. 2. c. 49.

(u) Mr. Hilderſham in Pſal. 51. p. 252.

him, to redeem himſelf from his Sins by Alms-deeds (*redeem thy Sins by Righteouſneſs*;) for *Alms delivereth from Death and from all Affliction.* Tobit 4. 11. and 12. 9. *Eccluſ.* 3. 33. and 29. 15. Alms-giving belongeth both to the *Spiritual-religious* and *the Civil-religious Repentance* (the truth of them:) But that Alms-giving which is of no avail, ſave only to ſave from Affliction and Temporal Death, can be no better than a Branch of *Civil-religious Repentance*, to which impunity is promis'd in the Old Teſtament.

VI. For as the Civil Law of a Nation (*w*) tendeth and deſigneth, to make Men internally and really good and virtuous (which through the pravity of Men cannot be obtained,) but ſo that it appointeth temporal Rewards and Puniſhments according to their exteriour Innocence and Criminality: So the Doctrine of the Law and the Prophets did tend and deſign, to make Men *Spiritual-religious* and that the truth of their Virtue and Piety ſhould be *Spiritual Religious*, but ſo that it ſettleth temporal Felicities upon their Civil-religious truth of Virtue and Piety, and temporal Calamities upon the contrary Enormities. If the Virtues and good Works of the Gentiles were available to their ſecular Intereſts (*temporale habent præmium*, (*x*) as the Fathers concern'd in the Pelagian Controverſie ſuppoſe,) it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that a Jew was juſtified and indemnified as to his ſecular Intereſts by his Civil-religious Obedience and truth of Piety, as the Scripture plainly declareth. *Ezek.* 18. 5---18. *If a Man do that which is lawful and right, and hath not eaten upon the Mountains, neither hath lift up his Eyes to the Idols of the Houſe of* Iſrael, *neither hath defiled his Neighbours Wife, neither hath come near to a menſtruous Woman, and hath not oppreſs'd any, hath given his Bread to the hungry, hath not given forth upon Uſury*, &c. *He is juſt, he ſhall ſurely live.* By their Civil-religious Obedience the Jews had a Juſtification of Life (were exempted from being put to Death by the Sword, by the Famine and the Peſtilence,) by ſuch pureneſs of Heart and Hand they were qualified for right of Citizenſhip in the literal *Sion*, thereby they held their ſplendid and delicious Temporalties, and ſecur'd the Intereſts of this Life, which are the Intereſts that the Prophets Sermons ſo intirely concern themſelves about, (*y*) that ſcarce one of them expreſly mentioneth any other Intereſt. Yet as the Jews diſtinguiſh the Precepts of their Law into מצות and חקים (ſuppoſing ſome things to be commanded, becauſe they are well-doing, and other things to be well-doing becauſe they are commanded:) So the Prophets uſually oppoſe the ſubſtantial Duties of Piety to the Sacrifices and Ceremonies of the Law, which were inſtituted in vaſt number, and therefore may ſeem, to have been highly pleaſing to God, and accordingly the Jews were apt to ſuppoſe themſelves eximious Pietiſts, becauſe they abounded in Sacrifices and Ceremonies, although they liv'd in the moſt nefarious Immoralities. The Prophets therefore inſiſt and inculcate, that Piety and acceptable Service to God conſiſteth not in Sacrifices and Ceremonies, that disjoin'd from what is truth of Piety real (the ſubſtantial Duties thereof) they are ſo far from being acceptable, that they are abominable, and that they are not at all acceptable, but as inſtances of Obedience and in Conjunction with better Obedience. They diſparage Sacrifices and Ceremonies (comparatively,) they urge and inculcate the weighty things of the Law, they lay the weight and ſtreſs of the Jews Piety, not upon Sacrifices and umbratile Ritualities, but upon the great Moralities and their covenanted Obedience. *Jer.* 7. 21, 22, 23. *Thus ſaith the Lord put your Burnt-offerings upon your Sacrifices and eat fleſh* (take your Burnt-offerings to your ſelves and devour them as well as your other Sacrifices;) *for I ſpake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the Land of* Egypt, *concerning Burnt-offerings or Sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, ſaying, obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye ſhall be my People: And walk ye in the ways that I commanded you, that it may be well with you.* When the Children of *Iſrael* were brought out of *Egypt*, God did ſpeak unto them about Sacrifices, but did not covenant with them for the Offering Sacrifices, *as for the thing that conſtituted them his Liege-people*; for the thing that conſtituted them ſuch muſt neceſſarily be *a covenanted Obedience to his Government and Commandments.* The performance whereof was requiſite, that it might be well *unto them*, and it is requiſite, that it may be *well unto you*, ſaith the Prophet; for if Men perſiſt in Rebellion againſt God's Government, their Sacrifices are not Atonements, but Provocations. The Prophets manifeſtly ſpeak the Senſe and Language of the Law of *Moſes*, which is their Text, and their Sermons are Comments upon it. If therefore the Law of *Moſes* muſt be underſtood, to teach Spiritual Religious Obedience, but ſo as to ſettle temporal Felicity and Impunity upon *the Civil-religious Obedience*, ſo the Doctrine of the Prophets muſt be underſtood. The ſubſtantial Duties of Piety (the great Moralities) which they inculcate, muſt be conſider'd as done by a People that are of Kind and Quality *Spiritual-religious*, and ſo they are *the Spiritual-religious truth of Virtue and Piety:* And they muſt be conſider'd as done by a People, that are of Kind and Quality *meerly Civil religious* (ſuch as the moſt of the beſt of the Jews were,) and ſo they are only *the Civil-religious truth of Virtue and Piety. Saul* might have ſecur'd the Kingdom to himſelf by his Obedience (in compariſon whereof the Prophet *Samuel* diſparageth Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices,) although his Obedience had been meerly *Civil-religious*; and in the ſame manner the Jews might have ſecur'd their ſecular Intereſts, which the Prophets inſiſt upon.

VII. According to the Moſaical Covenant and as the Condition of it *the Civil-religious truth of Piety real* muſt be in a Jew combin'd with *the Civil-religious truth of Piety perſonal*; and without this Integrity, which is the Duty-part of the Covenant, he is not intitled to the *Benefit-part.* Deut. 11. 13 — 17. *If you ſhall hearken diligently unto my Commandment, which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God and to ſerve him with all your Heart and all your Soul: Then will I give you the Rain of your Land in his due ſeaſon, the firſt Rain and the latter Rain, that thou may'ſt gather in thy Corn, and thy Wine and thy Oil. And I will ſend you Graſs in thy Fields for thy Cattel, that thou may'ſt eat and be full. Take heed to your ſelves, that thy Heart be not deceiv'd, and ye turn aſide and ſerve other Gods and Worſhip them: And then the Lords wrath*

(*w*) Grot. Not. in Matth. 5. 17.

(*x*) Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. Par. 2. Theſ. 10.

(*y*) Grot. Not in Matth. 5. 20.

Iſa. 1. 10, 20. and 58. 6. and 65. 3. Jer. 9 24. and 22. 15, 16. Hoſ. 6. 6. Mic. 6. 8. Pro. 21.3.

be kindled againſt you, and he ſhut up the Heaven, that there be no Rain, and that the Land yield not her Fruit, and leſt ye periſh quickly from off that good Land. 1 Sam. 12. 20, 21, 24. *Samuel ſaid unto the People, fear not; ye have done all this Wickedneſs, yet turn not aſide from following the Lord, but ſerve the Lord with all your Heart; and turn ye not aſide; for then ſhould ye go after vain things which cannot profit nor deliver, for they are vain. Only fear the Lord and ſerve him in truth with all your Heart.* So *Solomon* is urgent with the People; 1 *King.* 8. 61. *let your Heart be perfect with the Lord our God.* The meaning of which Phraſe may be underſtood from the Law of *Moſes*, wherein the People are ſaid *Deut.* 13. 3. and 18. 13. *to be perfect with the Lord their God, and to love him with all their Heart and all their Soul*, when they will not be withdrawn from him and his Commandments, to Worſhip other Gods. And it may be underſtood from the Character, which the Scripture giveth of *Jehu, that he did not walk in the Law of the Lord God of Iſrael with all his Heart* 2 *King.* 10. 31. (becauſe of his groſs and heinous failure in Civil-religious Obedience;) of *Solomon* in his latter days, 1 *King.* 11. 4. *that his Heart was not perfect with the Lord his God (for his Wives had turn'd it away after other Gods:)* Of *Amaziah*, 2 *Chron.* 25. 2. *that he did that which was right in the ſight of the Lord, but not with a perfect Heart*, becauſe of his lapſing to Idolatry. But if theſe Princes had not ſo enormouſly lapſed, the Scripture would have ſaid of them as of *Aſa*; 2 *Chron.* 15. 17. 1 *King.* 2. 4. *the high places were not taken away out of* Iſrael, *nevertheleſs the Heart of* Aſa *was perfect all his days.* Such an Integrity was the condition of the ſecular Proſperity of *David*'s Poſterity, and as *Deut.* 30. 2, 3, 10. it was a neceſſary ingredient of the Jews Civil-religious Repentance, ſo in their great and ſolemn Repentances and Reformations they ingag'd themſelves, to keep God's Commandments (the words of the Covenant) with all their Heart and Soul, which was the condition of the Covenant. 2 *King.* 23. 3. 2 *Chron.* 15. 12, 15. and 34. 31. But in this Integrity they were notoriouſly deficient, when *their Heart was divided* *Hoſ.* 10. 2. (they gave part of it to their Idols,) when they halted between two Opinions (God and *Baal*;) when their Heart *was not right with God*, but they dealt unfaithfully with him *becauſe of their high places and graven Images.* Pſal. 78. 37, 57, 58. A Civil-religious Integrity was neceſſary, to conſtitute them the literal and carnal *Iſrael*, ſuch an Integrity was in *Paul* before his Converſion (for as to a Civil-religious Integrity he was no Hypocrite:) But the Spiritual-religious Integrity muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the Civil-religious, as the Spiritual *Iſrael* muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the literal and carnal *Iſrael.* The truth of Virtue and Piety according to the Religion of ſecular Intereſts is figurative and ſignificative of the truth of Virtue and Piety according to the Religion of Soul-Intereſts.

VIII. *God's kind of Virtue and Piety* according to our *third* deſcriptive Notice of it is *the true and genuin kind of Virtue and Piety*, which is *the genuin virtuous People's kind of Virtue, the genuin pious Men's kind of Piety*, and is like οἶνος οἰνώδης, *vinous Wine*, it doth not want Virtue, to make it the true and genuin kind of Virtue; it doth not want Piety, to make it the true and genuin kind of Piety. But to be virtuous only ſo far, as to be deadly vicious and criminal; to be pious only ſo far, as to be deadly impious; to be good no otherwiſe, than ſo as to be deadly bad; and to live well only ſo far, as to be a deadly ill Liver; this is not the true and genuin kind of *Virtue*, *Piety*, *Goodneſs or good Life*; this is *a Virtue-leſs kind of* Matth. 15. 9. Jam. 1. 26. *Virtue, a Piety-leſs kind of Piety, a Religion-leſs kind of Religion, a bad kind Goodneſs and good Life.* Which conſtituteth vain kind of Religioniſts, Baſtard and Pſeudogeneous (that are heterogeneous from the Divine Family and are not Religious to purpoſe,) the Virtue-leſs kind of virtuous People, the bad kind of good Men, and naughty kind of good Livers, which are not God's kind of (virtuous) People, nor of his Alliance and Kindred (not ſymbolizing with him in Genius and Practice,) nor the genuin and legitimate kind of Pietiſts, as their Epithet declareth. For they are ſtiled ἀδόκιμοι, 2 Cor. 13. 5. *Reprobate or Rejectaneous*, in the ſame ſenſe as we call counterfeit and adulterate kind of Money ἀδόκιμον νόμισμα, *rejectaneous Money.* If any therefore that pretend to be virtuous and pious, are in reſpect of their Soul-intereſts ἀδόκιμοι, *rejectaneous with God* (who judgeth of all things as they are,) if their Virtue and Piety doth not ſave them from being deadly Sinners (aliens from the Life of God,) if it doth not conſtitute them ſuch as belong to God (or God's Elect,) this demonſtrateth, that it is of Kind and Quality ſpurious and illegitimate, which ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Virtue and Piety (and conſequently the true and genuin) may be illuſtrated from

(1.) The Caſe of the Heathen, the great pretenders to *Virtue*, which in general may be defin'd *what is the good and laudable Quality of an Agent as ſuch.* It muſt be defin'd what is of *laudable Quality* (if there be any Virtue, and if there be any Praiſe, ſaith the Apoſtle;) and it muſt be defin'd *what is the laudable Quality of an Agent as ſuch*; for according to *Ariſtotle* (z) Virtue is the laudable Quality ὅσων ἐστί τις χρῆσις ἢ ἔργον, *of ſuch things that there is ſome uſe* (z) Eth. ad Eudem. l. 2. c. 1. *of, or ſome work that they do.* The good and laudable Qualities of Man's Underſtanding are *intellectual Virtues*; and his laudable Qualities in reſpect of *Morals according to which a Man is ſaid to be a good Man* (not a good Architect, or a good Pilot, but a good Man,) theſe are *Moral Virtue*, which may be defin'd what is εὐπραξία, *Well-doing.* This muſt be diſtributed into two *Species, the one the true and genuin, the other the ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Virtue*; for it is not reaſonable to ſay, with (*a*) a late (a) The falſhood of Human Virtue. *French* Author (and many others,) *that the human Virtue is that which is no better than Vice, not any kind of Virtue, nothing better than Self-love and Self-intereſt*, which in human Judgment and Eſtimation is culpable and Criminal, not laudable and commendable. For if an Heathen Child doth Honour to his Parents only or chiefly out of *Self-love* or *Self-intereſt*, to get a Portion from them, this in human judgment is Vice and Crime, not Virtue (being manifeſtly vicious and inordinate Self-love:) But if an Heathen Son payeth his θρεπτήρια, or requiteth his Parents (which the Heathen were extremely careful to do) chiefly out of *Gratitude, natural Conſcience of Duty, and an unholy kind of Regard to an unholy kind of Worth and Virtue*, ſhall this be thought any thing leſs than an humane and mundane kind of Virtue? (*b*) *Non eſt Virginitas quæ precio emitur, non virtutis ſtudio poſſidetur.* (b) S. Ambroſ. c. Symmach. Ep. 2. If a veſtal Virgin keepeth her Virginity only or chiefly becauſe ſhe is hired to do it, this is not Virtue: But if ſhe keepeth her

Virginity, or if *Ariſtides* keepeth to Juſtice, if Pagans Practiſe what is materially virtuous (not meerly out of Self-love and Self-intereſt, but) out of *Cicero*'s Principle, (c) *an Averſation from turpitude and for the ſake of Honeſty*, what Lover of Virtue will not allow them (with due limitation) the Name of Virtue? (d) *We have read, or known or heard* (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) *of certain Deeds of Impietiſts, that truly Worſhip not God, which according to the rule of Juſtice we cannot only not diſpraiſe, but we alſo rightly and deſerv'dly Praiſe them. Although if we diſcuſs for what end they are done, ſcarce any can be found that deſerve the due Praiſe or Defence of Juſtice.* It muſt be acknowledg'd, that the Pagans were far from being right in the end of their Actions: But thus far the Philoſopher is right. *If you read a Lecture*, ſaith he, (e) *See that you refer it aright. Would you profit others or be prais'd?* (f) *If you read and ſtudy much for Glory, I call you a lover of Glory*; if for Money, *I call you a lover of Money, not induſtrious. Neither praiſe nor diſpraiſe the Actions of any from what is common, but from the purpoſes of their Mind; for theſe are proper to every one, and theſe make the Actions baſe or honeſt.* (g) The Philoſopher earneſtly endeavoureth, *that we ſhould chuſe that which is good, becauſe it is Good* (Well-doing,) *and not becauſe of the Opinion of the multitude.* (h) When the *Greeks* at *Troy* were put to flight, *Diomedes* choſe rather to run the greateſt hazards than ignominiouſly to flee, that *Hector* might not ſay, he had put *Diomedes* to flight; which ſeem'd an extraordinary Fortitude: But *Ariſtotle* denieth, that this was true Fortitude, becauſe its end or impulſive cauſe was not, as it ought, τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα. *for Honeſty ſake.* The Pagans having ſuch Notices of what is laudable and of the end of their Actions, and in many inſtances practiſing accordingly, it is but reaſonable that their ſplendid doings ſhould in ſuch inſtances have the Name of Virtue, but not without the additional diſparagement of *ſpurious and illegitimate*, as being no better than *the graceleſs ungodly Man's kind of Virtue*, not the Child of God-kind, nor the holy Man's kind of Virtue. For it is the holy virtuous kind of Virtue, that conſtituteth holy virtuous kind of Men.

(2.) The ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Virtue and Piety may be illuſtrated from the Caſe of *the carnal Jews*; for the Apoſtle contradiſtinguiſheth two oppoſite kinds and Families of Pietiſts and Religioniſts: The one are the Carnal, the other the Spiritual *Iſrael*; thoſe of the Literal and thoſe of the Spiritual Circumciſion; the Jews outwardly and the Jews inwardly; thoſe that are of the Earthly, and thoſe that are of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*; thoſe that are of Mount *Sinai*, and thoſe that are of Mount *Sion*; the one are thoſe that are Born after the Fleſh only (are of meer natural and human Generation,) the other are thoſe that are Born after the Spirit; the one are thoſe that belong to the Law-religion, the other are thoſe that belong to the Religion of ſaving Grace, and are in the State and Life of Grace; the one are the old Covenants Religioniſts and the old Covenant's kind of Religioniſts; the other are the new Covenant's Religioniſts and the new Covenant's kind of Religioniſts; the one are thoſe that ſerve in the oldneſs of the Letter, the oldneſs of Law-religion (which is meer Letter, Spiritleſs and Lifeleſs, without the newneſs of Spiritual Life,) the other are thoſe that ſerve in newneſs of Spirit; the one are the ſervile Family, the other are the free and noble Family; the one are alive and live unto God (as his kind of Religioniſts,) to whom the other bring forth no fruit. They are therefore Nature's Religioniſts (being but of natural and human Generation,) the Laws kind of Religioniſts, the World's kind of Religioniſts, ſo as not to be God's kind of Pietiſts and Religioniſts. Agreeably to their Character the Virtue and Piety of this ſpurious kind of Religioniſts is not the true and genuin kind, but the ſpurious and illegitimate, (i) *terrena carnaliſque Juſtitia, a terrene and carnal kind of Righteouſneſs*, ſuch a Righteouſneſs are *the Works of the Law* (the Works of Law-religioniſts) or *the Righteouſneſs which is of the Law*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh. By which ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Righteouſneſs he doth not mean meerly an obſervance of the Precepts of the Ceremonial Law; for the Apoſtle treateth of the Law in general, and diſputeth, that the Law-religioniſts cannot be juſtify'd by the *Moral Law* or by their doing the Deeds and Works thereof. *Rom.* 3. 19, 20. The legal and carnal Man's Law-religious Practice in general (his Law-life and Converſation) his kind of obſerving the Laws Moral Precepts and Precepts of Civil Juſtice (all his Virtue and Piety) is *the Righteouſneſs which is in the Law*, the terrene and carnal (the carnal Man's) kind of Righteouſneſs. (k) Ἡμεῖς φαμὲν παλαιὸν μὲν ἄνδρα τὸν νόμον. καινὸν δὲ τὸ ἐυαγγέλιον. *We Chriſtians call the Law the old Man: But the Goſpel* (Chriſtianity) *the new Man.* From which Apoſtolical account of the true and genuine, and of the ſpurious illegitimate kind of Virtue and Piety we will deduce a fuller Explication of both.

1 *Cor.* 10. 18. *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. *and* 3. 27. *and* 4. 14. *and* 6. 14. *and* 7. 4, 5, 6. *and* 8. 2. *and* 9. 6. *Gal.* 2. 19. *and* 3. 12. *and* 4. 3, 25, 26, 29. *and* 5. 18. *and* 6. 16. *Eph.* 28. 9, 11. *Phil.* 3. 3. *Heb.* 12. 22. *Joh.* 8. 23.

Phil. 3. 6.

(c) *Si omnia fugiendæ turpi-*
dinis adipiſcendæque honeſta-
e cauſa faciamus. Tuſc. 2.

(d) *Etiam impiorum nec De-*
m veraciter colentium quædam
ſta vel legimus, vel novimus,
el audivimus, quæ ſecundum
ſtitiæ regulam non ſolum vitu-
erare non poſſumus, verùm eti-
m merito rectéque laudamus.
Quanquam ſi diſcutiatur quo fine
ant, vix inveniantur, quæ ju-
itiæ debitam laudem defenſio-
ne mereantur. Voſſ. Hiſt.
Pel. l. 3. Par. 3. Theſ. 8.

(e) Ἐφ' ὅ, τι ἀναφέρεις. σκέ-
αι εἰ ἐφ' ὃ δεῖ, ὠφελῆσαι θέ-
εις ἢ ἐπαινεθῆναι; *Epict. Diſſ.*
l. 3. *c.* 23.

(f) Φιλόδοξον, φιλάργυρον, ὀ
ιλόπονον. Μηδέποτε γὰρ ἀπὸ
τῶν κοινῶν μήτ' ἐπαινεῖτε, μή-
τε ψέγετε· ἀλλ' ἀπὸ δογμά-
των. Ταῦτα γὰρ ἐστι τὰ ἴδια
ἑκάστου, ϗ τὰς πράξεις αἰσχρὰς ἢ
καλὰς ποιοῦνται. *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 4.
id. c. 8.

(g) Τὸ ἀγαθὸν δι' αὐτὸ τὸ
ἀγαθὸν αἱρεῖσθαι, ϗ μὴ διὰ τὴν
τῶν πολλῶν δόξαν. *Simplic.*
in Epict. c. 57.

(h) *Oſor. de Nob. Chriſt. l.* 2. *p.* 399.

(i) S. *Aug.* T. 4. *Expoſ Ep. ad Gal. c.* 3.

(k) *Clem. ſtr. l.* 3. *p. m.* 336.

CHAP. X.

1. According to the Apoſtle's Account of the genuine kind of Virtue and Piety it is not to be found in Mankind that are totally Unregenerate. 2. It is the Divine kind of Faith and Charity. 3. It is not any kind of Vertue and Piety, that is on this ſide Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. 4. It is the holy-vital Virtue and Piety or vital Sanctity. 5. It is oppoſite to the baſe and ſervile kind of Piety. 6. It is the Spiritual-Religious Worſhip and God-ſervice.

I. According to the Apoſtle's account of the genuine kind of Virtue and Piety *it is not to be found in Mankind, that are totally Unregenrate.* For at the riſe of Chriſtianity the Name of (Carnal) Jews and Gentiles compriſed the whole World of Unregenerate Mankind; and as all Mankind that are totally Unregenerate into the holy Life, are of the ſame Kind and Family with the (carnal) Jews and Gentiles (a carnal and mundane kind of People:) So their Virtue and Piety is of the ſame Kind and Quality with theirs, who at the riſe of Chriſtianity were *all under Sin*, and could not be juſtified by their doing the Deeds of their Law-religion. The Virtue and Piety of Unregenerate Mankind was then *the ſpurious and illegitimate*; therefore ſo it is now, and ſo it will be for ever. Unregenerate humane Nature is like the Nation of carnal Jews (*l*) ἄγονος ἄκαρπος, ὐδὲν δὲ ὅλως καρπογονῦσα, *ſteril, unfruitful, bringing forth no fruit at all*; for the fruit which it bringeth forth, is either *what is Vice, or what is not Virtue, or what is no genuine kind of Virtue.* The natural Man's *Hope and Truſt* is not the holy-virtuous, but unholy vicious (what is Vice,) his Love is a graceleſs, carnal Affection (what is not Virtue,) and the *Japoneſe* Practiſe not any genuine kind of Virtue, although (*m*) many of their Virtues are ſaid to be their uſual Practice. As the Jews call Idolatry עבודה זרה *ſtrange Worſhip*: So the natural Man's Virtue and Piety is an Alien and a Foreigner, not of Kin to the Divine Family. Who ſeeth not, what a ſorry Counterfeit and Reſemblance the Hebrew Doctors Humility is of the true and genuine Humility? For they ſay, (*n*) *you muſt not go with your Stature erect, becauſe it is ſaid, the whole Earth is full of his Glory.* The natural Man's Virtue and Piety is of ſo bad a Character, that it ought to be of no conſideration in the Chriſtian ſettlement and diſpenſation of things, nor is it (in this Divine Settlement of things) of any conſideration with God; for he accounteth none Righteous upon the account of any *good Works* or *Works of Righteouſneſs* that they have done in their Unregeneracy; (*o*) *But as Men pull down an old Houſe, to build a new one in its ſtead, ſo God hath not built any thing upon us* (our unregenerate Virtue and Piety,) *but hath new made us by the holy Spirit.* His Counſel and Deſign is, that Mankind ſhould not attain Righteouſneſs and Salvation by their good Works in their Law-religion (their unregenerate Religious Practice,) but that they ſhould be Chriſtianiz'd and become *his Workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good Works.* Eph. 2. 10. Accordingly all that enter into Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, duly abandon that Virtue and Piety, which is of the old Houſe; they ſo far abandon *their own Righteouſneſs which is of the Law*, that they build not upon it; they account it of no worth or value as to Life eternal; they repute it Rags not Robes, and *have no Confidence in the Fleſh* (in the fleſhly Human kind of things of Unregeneracy,) the Virtue and Piety which alone is of Precioſity in their Eyes, is that which is of the Divine Family. *For they are Born, not of Blood, nor of the Will of the Fleſh, nor of the Will of Man, but of God.* The Apoſtle Characterizeth the truly Chriſtian Family by theſe four Properties; *they are not originally and of Kind and Quality, an human natural Generation, an human carnal Generation, an human moral Generation, but a divine and ſpiritual Generation of Men.* For Blood is (*p*) τῦ ἀνθρωπίνυ σώματος ἡ ὐσία, *the ſubſtance of an human Body.* So it ſignifieth *Act.* 17. 26. *He hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men.* So it ſignifieth in common Speech (as when we ſpeak of the Blood of both Parents, and conſidering Families as of one Blood we ſpeak of *Jus Sanguinis, tainted Blood, noble Blood, the Blood-royal*, and they that derive their Honour from many Progenitors are ſaid *longo Sanguine cenſeri*;) to be Born of Blood therefore, is to be originally of *human natural Generation*, ſo as to be of Kind and Quality *an human natural Generation.* The *Will of the Fleſh* ſignifieth fleſhly Luſts, corrupt Appetites and Carnalities, *Eph.* 2. 3. To be Born of the Will of the Fleſh therefore, is to be originally of *human carnal Generation*, ſo as to be of Kind and Quality *an human carnal Generation.* The human Morality is *the human Will*, Diſcipline and Inſtitution, that Virtue is the human, and the rule of it is but human; (*q*) *there is one rule of human Virtues* (ſaith *Seneca*,) *which is one right Reaſon.* To be Born therefore *of the Will of Man*, is to be originally of *human moral Generation* (or Inſtitution,) ſo as to be of Kind and Quality *an human moral Generation.* But the Children of God derive their Deſcent and Pedigree from nothing on this ſide God (like the ancient Heroes that are ſaid to be *è ſtirpe Deorum, the God's Progeny*,) they are originally *of ſpiritual and divine Generation*, ſo as to be of Kind and Quality *a ſpiritual and divine Generation of Men in reſpect of their Virtue and Piety.* Their Virtue and Piety therefore is of Kind and Family diſſonant from *the Human-moral*; and if the one is the true and genuin, the other can be nothing better than ſpurious and illegitimate. (*r*) *Regeneration is the Origin of the true Life and the true Righteouſneſs; when a Man is regenerated, the truth of the Virtues ariſeth*, which are nothing elſe but the Life of Grace. (*s*) *touching the Life of Grace in us, examine, whether many of us*

are

Rom. 3. 9, 19, 20.

Eph. 2. 9. Tit. 3. 5.

Phil. 3. 3 9.

Joh. 1. 13.

(l) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 348.

(m) *Maffeius Indic. l.* 12. *p.* 531.

(n) *Non eſſe erectâ Staturâ incedendum, propterea quod dicitur, plena eſt tota terra gloriâ ejus.* Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par. 3. c. 52.

(o) *Theophylact. in Tit.* 3.

(p) Clem. Pædag. l. 1. c. 6.

(q) *Una inducitur humani virtutibus regula, una enim e recta ratio.* Sen. Ep. 66.

(r) *Origo veræ vitæ veræ justitiæ in regenerationis est po ta Sacramento, ut ubi homo n naſcitur, ibi etiam ipſarum vir tutum veritas oriatur.* Scri de vocatione Gentium l. c. 5.

(s) *Dr. Hammon.* Ser. 1 *Act.* 17. 30.

are not as arrant Heathens, as meer Strangers from Spiritual Illumination, and ſo from the myſtical Commonwealth of Iſrael, *as any of them.* Clem. Strom. 2. *calls the Life of your unregenerate Man an Heathen Life, and the firſt Life we have, by which we live and move, and grow and ſee, but underſtand nothing; and 'tis our Regeneration by which we raiſe our ſelves* ἐξ ἐθνῶν, *from being ſtill meer Gentiles.*

II. The genuine kind of Virtue and Piety according to the Apoſtle's account of it is *a Saving Faith and a Divine kind of Charity*; the former of which is *Intellectual*, the latter is (in ſtrict acceptation) *Vital Virtue*, Gal. 5. 6. *In Chriſt Jeſus neither Circumciſion availeth any thing, nor Uncircumciſion, but Faith which worketh by Love.* Faith conſiſteth in *being Godly Believers*; for ſuch only are God's kind of Believers; and *Love* is *the Godly-virtuous loving* God and Chriſt, for this only is the Chriſtian kind of loving him, and that which the Diſcipline of Godlineſs requireth. Ungodly and Mundane kind of People have a love for Chriſt, (*t*) becauſe it is creditable, the Faſhion of their Country, bringeth them Worldly Advantages, out of reſpect to their Forefathers, and becauſe it is the Religion wherein they were educated, or out of reſpect to the Authority of the Church; they have ſuch a reſpect and love for Chriſt, as Mundane People have for an eminent extraordinary Perſon, or as the Heathen had for their great Benefactors, or as any Natural Man would have for one, that he thinketh will be a Saviour to him (from a natural deſire of Salvation,) or for one that he counteth good to him and no way offenſive; but this their Love for him and their Faith in him are vile graceleſs kind of things, that have no Cognation with *the Faith of God's Elect* or *with Divine Charity*, each of which may juſtly be denominated *the Univerſal Grace*. For God hath no genuine Religioniſts but his Believers of the Divine Family, that are ſanctify'd by Faith, and live the Life of Sanctity by Faith. The true nature of Piety and Sanctity, what is Sanctity and Sin, the mighty reaſons inducing to Sanctity, the right Principles, Motives and Ends of the Duties of Sanctity, the Means and Helps of performing them, and of attaining Piety and Sanctity, are notic'd to them by Faith, and only by Faith, which is the prime leading part of their Sanctity, and is *radically* and *virtually* all Divine Duties and Virtues for they flow from it as Streams from a Fountain. Divine Charity is connex'd with Faith as the Heart and the Brain (the Vital and Animal Functions) are connex'd in Man, or as a Plant is connex'd with its Root; for Faith (that worketh Love and worketh by Love) is the Root of *Charity*, which is the Divine Nature (the Life of Grace and Holineſs) the Child of God-kind of Nature, the Summary and Abridgment of all holy Duty which the Divine Moral Law requireth, and of all Divine (Vital) Virtues; for all Virtues and Duties are either *the Requiſites to it, or Parts of it, or Modes of exerciſing it* (as all the variegated Colours of the Rainbow are but one ſimple Light variouſly modify'd and diverſify'd:) All Virtue therefore without this Divine Virtue (which is peculiar to Regenerate Souls) can be nothing better than Graceleſs, Spurious and Illegitimate. Fortitude as great as that of *Peregrinus* or *Calanus* the *Indian* (who gave his Body to be burned;) Liberality and Beneficence ſo great and generous as to give all my Goods to feed the Poor (as great as that of *Cimon* the *Athenian*, * *Nulli fides ejus, nulli opera, nulli res familiaris defuit*) if devoid of Divine Charity, which is our new Nature, hath nothing of Divine Worth in it, nor doth it conſtitute the Agent a Perſon of any Divine Worth. Our Saviour's Intention is, to tell the Jews, that they were Wicked and Ungodly, and totally devoid of the holy virtuous kind of Virtue, when he ſaith to them, *Joh.* 5. 42. *I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you.* This is *the Truth* of Religion; for the grand Indiſpenſables of it, the Chief and Main of it, the Soul and Vitals of it, the Eſſence and Subſtance of it, are fitly call'd the Truth of it. And ſpeaking as the Lawyers do of Niceties in a Cauſe, we may ſay of all things in Religion, that are on this ſide the Eſſence and the Main of it, *veritatem negotii non tangunt*, *they touch not the truth of the Buſineſs.* But the love of God and of Man is rightly call'd the Truth of Religion. (*u*) *This is God's worſhip, this is true Religion, this is right Piety, this only is due ſervice to God.* (*w*) *The Scripture forbiddeth nothing but Luſt, commandeth nothing but Love.*

(t) Dr. *Jackſon* of *Juſtif. Faith.* S. 2. c. 13, 14.

Heb. 11. 6. *Joh.* 1. 12, 13. *Rom.* 3. 3. *Gal.* 3. 9. and 2. 20. *Act.* 15. 9. and 26. 18.

1 *Joh.* 4. 7, 8. *Rom.* 13. 10. 1 *Cor.* 13.

* Corn. Nepos.

Non eſt fructus bonus, qui de charitatis radice non ſurgit. S. Aug. de ſp. & lit. c. 15.

(u) *Hic eſt Dei cultus, hæc vera religio, hæc recta pietas, hæc tantum Deo debita ſervitus.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 4.

(w) *Scriptura nihil præcipit niſi charitatem, nihil culpat niſi cupiditatem.* Idem de Doctr. Chriſt. l. 3. c. 10.

III. Such Virtue and Piety which is wholly exteriour to *the Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs of the inward Man*, is not the genuine kind of Virtue and Piety according to the Apoſtle's account of it, *Eph.* 4. 24. All Chriſtians agree, that *the Carnal* Jews *Righteouſneſs* is an *External Righteouſneſs*; but we do not agree, in what Senſe and Degree it is *External*: For it may be *External* in the greater Degree, as being Exterior to any Virtue and Piety in the Soul: And it may be *External* only in the leſſer degree, as being only Exteriour to *the Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs* of the inward Man. But it is commonly ſuppos'd to be External in the former ſenſe and in the greater degree; for *Grotius* thus repreſenteth the Senſe of the Jews touching that great Commandment, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart and Soul.* (*x*) *The Jews greatly err, who ſuppoſe, that this Precept is ſufficiently obſerv'd, as alſo that other, Thou ſhalt not covet, if by External Acts of Diſobedience they depart not from the Law.* So the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees is ſaid to be (*y*) *an uncriminality as to External Facts, which are ſubjected to the cogniſance of Law-courts, which* Paul *had when he was a Phariſee.* To juſtifie this account of the Phariſees Righteouſneſs, *R. D. Kimchi* is cited, who expoundeth the Pſalmiſts words, *If I had ſeen Iniquity in my Heart, the Lord had not heard*, to this Senſe, *that if Men conceive Iniquity in their Heart, and fully purpoſe it in their Mind, yet if they do not act it, God will not hear it, that is, will not impute it to them as Wickedneſs; for an evil thought God doth not account as the fact, unleſs it be conceiv'd againſt his Faith and Religion.* Such an Opinion there was amongſt the Phariſees in our Saviour's time, as appeareth from *Joſephus*; and according to this Interpretation the Jews Law exactly reſembleth *the Civil-religious Law of our* Engliſh *Nation*, which doth not condemn any but for the Overt Act except in the caſe of Treaſon. But from this Rabbinical Opinion and Interpretation of the Law it appeareth, that *Righteouſneſs according to the Scribes and Phariſees* is ſomething more than *External Facts according to Law*, and

(x) *Not. in Matth.* 22. 37. *ſo Bellarm. T.* 4. c. 3.

(y) *Grot. Not. in Matt.* 5. 20. *Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex.* 225. p. 337.

that it is a miſtake, to ſay, (z) *that the Obedience which the Law of the Jews requir'd of them, as the Condition of their Temporal Happineſs, was meerly the outward Obſervation of its Precepts*; for their Civil-religious Law as ſuch requireth of them, to be the Religioniſts of the God of *Iſrael* in the Civil-religious way *with all the Heart and Soul*, which Internal Integrity was the Condition of their Temporal Happineſs; and if *evil Thoughts were* imputed in the caſe of Idolatry and Irreligion, their Law muſt neceſſarily require more than *External Facts and the outward Obſervation of its Precepts*. Their Civil-religious Law obliged them alſo, to take heed of *a Thought in their wicked Heart* prejudicial to their poor Brother, *not to harden their Heart againſt him, that their Heart be not grieved, when they give unto him, that their Eye be not evil againſt him, and that he ſeem not vile unto them*. So *Petavius* is of Opinion, (a) that by the generality of them (that were not rude Plebeians) evil Cogitations and Volitions were always accounted Sins; and he is of this Opinion, notwithſtanding that ſome Fathers ſuppoſe, Chriſt to have perfected the Law upon this account, becauſe the Jews thought, that thoſe were not Sins, which were committed by the Will, unleſs the Fact was committed; and he citeth the expreſs Aſſertion of *Maimonides*, *that their Law forbiddeth every Cogitation that may ſhake their Faith in any of the Fundamentals of their Law*; they may not harbour thoughts of an Idol, (b) and *Philo* and *Joſephus* (in their Accounts of the Judaical Polity) are afraid, that they ſin, when they think of any Impiety againſt God. *Joſephus* (a Man inſtituted in Phariſaiſm) ſaith; *This was their one Virtue, not to do nor think any thing* (μήτε πρᾶξαι, μήτε διανοηθῆναι) *contrary to their Law-ſettlement*. The Preface to the Decalogue (c) is counted a Precept of *Faith* (an Internal Virtue;) and they have ſuch a regard for Internal Purity, that *Maimonides* giveth this account of their Phariſaical Solicitude, to avoid External Pollution. (d) *Separation from Things and Men profane keepeth the Body clean from Evil Actions, the cleanneſs of the Body conciliateth to the Mind a cleanneſs from Evil Opinions, and the Purity of the Mind maketh Men like to God, which is the Commandment, Be ye holy, for I am holy. I am the Lord that have ſanctify'd you. The Saying of the Wiſe Man, Let thy Garments be always white, we underſtand touching the Purity of the Mind*, (e) ſaith another Rabbi; who alſo thus proveth the perfection of his Law. *The Law commandeth a Man to be pure in Heart, to love his Neighbour as himſelf, not to hate his Brother, not to revenge, not to retain Anger, not to covet his Neighbour's Wife or Goods, to circumciſe his Foreskin; all which incite a Man to Innocence and Purity of Mind*. Another Hebrew Doctor ſaith, (f) *God multiply'd his Precepts to* Iſrael, *that he might imbue all our Cogitations with them, and that all our Operations might be conſecrated to them. A Man is moulded according to his Works; if he applieth himſelf to the perpetual ſtudy of the Law, although he doth not at firſt apply himſelf to that which is good from the love of God, yet his Operation that is not from the love of God, doth elicit an Operation that is from the love of God; for by virtue of his Works he killeth evil Cogitations*. (g) The Jews have an uſual Saying (as *Maimonides* affirmeth,) *That the Cogitations of a Sin are worſe than the Sin it ſelf*; becauſe by thoſe thoughts a Man ſinneth againſt his own Soul. *R. Hananiah* ſaith, (h) *He that waketh in the Night, or that walketh alone in the way, if he giveth his Mind to Idleneſs, he ſinneth againſt his Soul.* The Notion that theſe Doctors have of ſinning *againſt a Man's own Soul*, ſpeaketh their Opinion, that they think themſelves oblig'd to an Internal Virtue and Piety: Which alſo appeareth in their ſevere prohibitions of looking upon a Woman; (i) *That it is not lawful to look upon an Hair of a prohibited Woman, or her Heel or little Finger, nor to hear her Voice with intention to have pleaſure from it. To look upon a Woman with intention, is the ſame thing as to have to do with her. Nothing may be done, that begetteth the Cogitation of Women; for the Cogitation impelleth to the Fact.* Theſe Doctors alſo ſeverely declaim againſt (tolerated) wandring thoughts in Prayer and reading the Law. (k) *If thou moveſt thy Lips in Prayer, and turneſt thy Face to the Wall, but thinkeſt of thy Buſineſs and Merchandiſe; or if thou readeſt the Law of God with thy Tongue, but thy Heart is in thine Edifices and Grounds: Or if thou performeſt a Precept of the Law with thy Members, without conſideration of what is done, or of him who commanded it, or of the end of it; thou art one of thoſe, of whom it is ſaid, Thou art near to their Mouth, but far from their Reins.*

There is a great Scrupuloſity amongſt theſe Doctors touching the Principle and End of Men's Actions; (l) *for if one firmly believeth the Reſurrection of the Dead, yet doth not believe it to be of the Law, he is as an Infidel. Make not the Law a Crown* (to get Glory by it,) *nor a Tool to dig with* (to get Riches by it,) *the Law muſt be ſtudied, not to get Riches, or to be called Rabbi, nor to gain a Reward in the World to come, but for its own ſake and purely out of love*; (m) which is a grand point with *Maimonides*, who calleth this degree the degree of *Abraham*. The Vulgar are allow'd to obey for hope of Reward and fear of Puniſhment, but he liketh no Religioniſt ſave only *him that ſerveth out of Love only*, citing with approbation the Saying of *Antigonus Socenſis* (whence the Sect of the Sadduces is thought to have had its Original) *Be ye not like Servants that ſerve their Lord on condition to receive a Reward.* (n) One Branch of the Phariſees in our Saviour's time was called *Phariſæus ex amore* (becauſe he was ſuppos'd, to keep the Precepts out of love only,) of whom the Jews ſay, *Ne ſit tibi carus præ cæteris, niſi Phariſæus amoris*; (o) *he that ſerveth for Reward, ſerveth himſelf not his Maſter*. (p) The Jews took care, to explore their Proſelytes of Juſtice, whether they undertook Judaiſm *out of Love and Integrity of Heart* (מאהבה ומלב שלם) not out of love of Secular Honour, or Riches, or Worldly Fear; and they tell us, that no Proſelytes were made in the time of *David* and *Solomon*, when Men paſs'd out of Gentiliſm *ob vanitatem ſeculi* (for the Vanity of the World,) and ſuch are not to be numbred amongſt Proſelytes of Juſtice. They are ſo far from ſuppoſing, that the Precept of loving God with all the Heart and Soul is ſufficiently fulfill'd by External Facts, that the chief of them diſtinguiſh *a twofold love and fear of God*: (q) *One when we love God for ſomething elſe, the other for his own Excellency and Pulchritude (without reſpect to any Good or Felicity receiv'd or hop'd for from him; and this is true Love and worthy the Creator. So there is a Fear which cometh from the apprehenſion of Puniſhment, or ſome Evil, as excluſion from Paradiſe; and this is the Fear of the Vulgar, of Women and Children; there is another that ſpringeth from the Conception of the Supreme Majeſty of the Creator, which is rather to to be called Reverence.* (r) *R. Akiba* (accounted by the Jews a Seraphic lover of God) at the time when he was to be put to Death, ask'd his Diſciples, If it was not time to read that Leſſon *Audi Iſrael?* they anſwer'd, *Magiſter, huc uſque? do you remit nothing of your Zeal, but ſtill perſevere in it?* He reply'd, *All the Days of my Life I have been ſolicitous touching thoſe words,* בכל נפשך *with all thy Soul.* Such Love they pretend to in their uſual Maxim, (s) *let all thy Works be done for God,* הכל לשם שמים *all for God, for the Glory of the Divine Name.* Theſe things are Evidence more than enough, that the Righteouſneſs of the generality of the beſt of the Carnal Jews (the Scribes and Phariſees) neither is, nor ever was * meerly *an uncriminality as to external Facts* (although anciently there was and ſtill is ſuch an Opinion amongſt them as that of *R. D. Kimchi*:) Nor is this all the Righteouſneſs which *Paul* had in his Judaiſm, when he ſo liv'd in *all good Conſcience*, that his Obedience and Righteouſneſs muſt be thought *a ſort of internal Virtue and Piety*. Such was the Virtue which the *Stoicks* taught, who were near of kin to the Phariſees and generally as great Hypocrites as they: But if both had not pretended to a Soul-virtue and Piety, they had not been ſo great Hypocrites as they were; they pretended to it, yet were devoid of the truth and main of it; and therefore their Virtue and Piety was but outſide, umbratile and ſuperficial (not becauſe it was wholly exteriour to the Soul, but) becauſe it was exteriour to the Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs of the inward Man. (t) Ἔνδον βλέπε, ἔνδον ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, *look within, there is the Fountain of Good*; there is the Spring of Action, there is the Seat of Vice and Virtue, and there is the Truth of things. If the Inward Man is not really Holy, the Religioniſt is like the *Egyptian Temples*, that were fair and ſpecious without, but within there was nothing better than a Cat or a Crocodile. Under an appearance of great Sanctity and a Severity of Life as great as his was, that dwelt amongſt the Tombs, Legions of Devils may inhabit.

(z) Mr. *Thorndike Epil. B.* 1. c. 12.

Deut. 15. 7, 9, 10. and 25. 3.

(a) T. 1. *l.* 10. *c.* 24. *S.* 12. *Maimon. de Idol. c.* 2. *S.* 4.

(b) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 8. *c.* 7, 8.

(c) *Abravan. de c. Fid. apud Vorſt. p.* 85.

(d) *Pocock. port. Moſ. p.* 452.

(e) *Men. ben Iſr. Qu. in Lev. p.* 192.

(f) *Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. Lex.* 20. *p.* 30.

(g) *Maimon. mor. nev. par.* 3. *c* 8.

(h) *Pirke aboth, p.* 13, 14.

(i) *Hotting. ſupr. Lex.* 188. *p.* 279.

(k) *Maimon. mor. nev. par.* 3. *c.* 51.

(l) *Pocock. not. miſc. p.* 98.

(m) *Port. Moſ. p.* 137, 138. *Ainſworth on Exod.* 20. 6.

(n) *Druſ. de* 3. *Sect. l.* 2. *c.* 22.

(o) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 3.

(p) *Selden. de J. nat. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(q) *Vorſt. in Maim. de fund. leg. p.* 12.

(r) *Coſri, p.* 245, 312. *P. Fag. Deut.* 6. 5.

IV. The true and genuine kind of Virtue and Piety is *the Holy-vital* according to the Apoſtle's account of it; for he uſually confronteth two oppoſite Kinds and Families of Religioniſts; *the one the Dead Formaliſts, the other the Holy Vitaliſts*, Rom. 7. 6. they that *ſerve in the oldneſs of the Letter*, (which is Spiritleſs and Lifeleſs) are *the dead external Formaliſts*; they that ſerve *in newneſs of Spirit*, are thoſe that ſerve *in the newneſs of Spiritual Life*, and therefore they are *the Holy Vitaliſts.* So *Gal.* 4. 29. thoſe that are *born after the Spirit*, are *the Spiritual-vital Religioniſts* (for the Spirit giveth Life:) Thoſe that are *born after the Fleſh* (ſo as not to be born after the Spirit) are *the carnal kind of Religioniſts ſpiritually dead*, and therefore the dead Formaliſts. A Carnal Judaical Religioniſt is one of this Character, *Rom.* 2. 19. for to ſay of a conceited great Religioniſt, that he hath *the form of knowledge and of the truth in the Law*, and reſteth in it, is to ſay, *he is one of meer exteriour Formality in Religion*, no Vital Religioniſt. In all his Accounts of the two Covenants the Apoſtle inſiſteth upon this as a principal difference between them; by the New Covenant (the Religion of Saving Grace) the Religioniſts have *the Holy Spirit, Spiritual Life, Sanctifying Grace*, and are ſaved from the Domination of Sin: But the Old Covenant of Law-Religion (that ſettlement and diſpenſation of things) is nothing better than a bare dead Letter and an outward Rule, not vital to its Religioniſts; which ſheweth, that the New Covenant's Religioniſts are the Vital Religioniſts, and the Law-religioniſts can be nothing better than the dead Formaliſts: (u) *The Law is Spiritual, but did not afford the Spirit. By the commanding and threatning Letter the Old Man was not cur'd, and therefore that is called the Old Teſtament; but this the New, becauſe of the newneſs of the Spirit, which cureth the New Man of his Vitioſity of Oldneſs.* The Grace of the Holy Spirit is peculiar to the New Law, which (although it be written as well as the Old Law, yet) is principally, not *Lex ſcripta, a Law externally written*, but *Lex indita, a Law internally* written, (w) as *Aquinas* diſputeth: (x) Whence it is called *the Spirit*, διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος, *the miniſtration of the Spirit*, and *the Law of the Spirit of Life*, and they that are animated by the Holy Spirit, are ſaid, *not to be under the Law*; for the Law is called *the Letter*, διακονία τοῦ γράμματος, *the miniſtration of the Letter*, and in contradiſtinction to the New Law is ſaid, to be *written and ingraven in Stones*, becauſe it was meerly a dead external Script (that conſiſted *in verbis* not *in virtute*,) it communicated no Aſſiſtance, no Energy or Vigour, no Vital Principle (a Fountain of Vital Acts) to the Souls of Men. But the New Law is of a contrary Character; for whether we conſider it in a *jural* Notion (as a Settlement and Diſpenſation of things,) or in a *Vital* Notion (as a new live-nature in Man,) it is *the Law of the Spirit of Life* and of Man's Regeneration into the Holy Life; and conſequently, it is the Divine Moral Law *not written in Tables of Stone, but in fleſhly Tables of the Heart*, 2 Cor. 3. 3. Thus the Apoſtle clearly ſtateth the difference between the Law (in the narrower Notion) and the Goſpel Religion, as the Old and New Covenant are alſo differenced in the Prophet, *Jer.* 31. 31---33. *I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael *and with the Houſe of* Judah. *Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers.——But this ſhall be the Covenant, that I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their Hearts.* If the Divine Law be written in the Heart of a Religioniſt, it cannot be alienated from God and Piety; he muſt be a faithful lover of them (which cannot be without a fervour of Affection;) and the Virtues and Duties which the Law injoyneth, muſt be implanted in him (elſe the Characters of the Law are not imprinted upon the Heart,) the Conſtitution and Diſpoſition of his inward Man which is the Spring of Action (σπέρμα τῶν πράξεων ἡ διάθεσις, ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγή, (y) *the Diſpoſition is the Seminary, Principle and Fountain of the Actions*) muſt be conformable to the Precepts of the Divine Law (and muſt anſwer thereto as Wax to the Seal,) and his inward Inclination muſt be ſuited to the external Rule. And if the Divine Law (which is a Law of Life,) be written in his Heart (the Fountain of Life) by the Holy Spirit (that giveth Life,) this internal conformity to the Divine Law muſt be *a living Law, an holy vital Nature*, whence the Religioniſt neceſſarily becometh one of *the holy-vital Nature and Diſpoſition, of the holy vital kind* (not one of the Profane and Sinning, but the Holy and Sinleſs; not one of the Wickedly and Worldly, but the Godly and divinely affected and addicted; not one of the leud and filthy, but the pure and abhorrent from all Filthineſs; not one of the proud and haughty, but the meek and lowly; not one of the hating and hurting, the envious and murtherous, but the harmleſs, benign and beneficent; not one of the crafty and deceitful, but the truly honeſt and faithful; not one of the baſe and ſordid, but the truly noble and unvile, by innate diſpoſition and by kind;) what is truly good and holy muſt neceſſarily be connatural and agreeable to him, he cannot fail to have a vital ſympathy with it, and a deadly Averſation from and Antipathy againſt all Sin and Wickedneſs. His Divine Vital Nature (becauſe it is a Nature and a Vital Nature) is a permanent and laſting, ſtable and uniform, conſtant and uninterrupted diſpoſition to the Duties of Godlineſs, wherein he findeth a vital Sweetneſs, as healthful Men do in their Meat and Drink (*ſapor nobis vitalis infunditur*, (z) *a vital Savour is infus'd into us*, ſaith *Ennodius Ticinenſis*) and his motion in the ways of Piety is free and ſpontaneous, eaſie and with alacrity, pleaſant and delightful.

(s) Pirke Aboth, c. 2.

* See Bellarmine puzzled de cult. ſanctor. T. 2. l. 3. c. 4. cir. med.

(t) M. Ant. l. 7. ſ. 59.

(u) Ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστὶ, ἀλλ' οὐ πνεῦμα παρεῖχεν. *S. Chryſoſt. in 2 Cor. or. 6. Propter veteris hominis noxam, quæ per literam jubentem & minantem minimè ſanabatur, dicitur illud Teſtamentum vetus: hoc autem novum propter novitatem ſpiritûs, quæ hominem novum ſanat à vitio vetuſtatis.* S. Aug. de ſp. & lit. c. 20.

(w) 12*dæ* *Qu. qu.* 106. *Art.* 1.

(x) 2 *Cor.* 3. 6, 7, 8. *Rom.* 8. 2. *Gal.* 5. 18. *Tit.* 3. 5.

(y) *Plut. de adulat.*

Such is the conſtitutive Nature and Properties of the Holy-vital Religioniſts (but in ſeveral Degrees and not without exception of the diſtempers to which they are ſubject,) and theſe conſtitute that Vital Sanctity (the Life of Grace and Holineſs,) which is peculiar to the Divine Family of New-Covenanters: For the Old Law-Religioniſts are Graceleſs, Lifeleſs, Sapleſs kind of Religioniſts, Spiritually dead, wholly devoid of the Spirit of Grace and of Life, of all Vital Sanctity, without any Sence or Savour of Life, and like *the Eunuch a dry Tree*, Iſa. 56. 7. Their Piety hath no Heart in it, no taſte in it, but is like an Husk, or Shell, or Skeleton, or a Carkaſs, dry and jejune, dilute and diſpirited, Soul-leſs, Lifeleſs and inſipid form, that covereth a rotten and cadaverous Soul, which, *like the Body without the Spirit*, is dead and in the ſtate of Sin and of Death, *Rom.* 8. 2. It is Life that is the Sovereign Good; all Animals make ſome kind of Life their principal concern; but the chief concern of Man is (*a*) θεῖον βιῶσαι βίον, *to live the Holy and Divine kind of Life*, and therefore to be Spiritually and Divinely alive. The Letter of the Law ſerv'd to regulate Humane Life and Manners (as Civil Laws and Humane Inſtitutions of Morality do,) but being ineffectual, to ingender an Holy and Divine kind of Life in the Souls of Men, it was altogether inſufficient, to reach their great concerns, to make them truly Divine and Holy, and to incorporate them into that Divine and Heavenly Family, which conſiſteth of (as *Proclus* calleth ſome of his Deities) ζωαὶ ζέουσαι, *fervent Lives*; they are not meerly *alive* but *lively* (Vivacity is the good eſtate of Life:) So a Chriſtian and a Chriſtian Prieſt (as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith) muſt be ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, *fervent in Spirit.* Chriſt is ſaid, to baptize his Followers, not only with Water, but with *the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire*; which denoteth, (*b*) *that according to Chriſt it is not enough, that we abſtain from evil-doing, which was intimated by waſhing; there muſt be alſo an internal force, which carrieth to that which is good and holy with great* (but an holy-virtuous) *Impetuoſity.* If Chriſtians become tepid and Luke-warm, their Piety is nauſeous; if they were wholly dead, it would be as *Vappa* or *Carrion.* Such is our Piety, if it is of no better Kind and Family than the Law-religioniſts, if we are carnal and mundane kind of Religioniſts in the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, if there is no lively affectionate and ſerious Piety towards God in our Souls, if our Holy Duties are inanimate and but the dead Images of living Piety, and if there is *mors in ollâ, Death in the Pot* (that which impoyſoneth every thing that cometh out of it, the old Leaven that ſoureth and defileth every thing,) if deadly Carnality and Wickedneſs liveth in us and we live in it. And if we ſuppoſe, that ſuch a ſpurious and mortiferous kind of Piety is ſufficient to ſave Men, if we make true Religion but a ſlight overly Buſineſs on this ſide the Holy Life, we are deadly and damnable Opinioniſts, nefarious Hypocrites and Traytors to the Intereſts of God's Kingdom and of the Souls of Men; and are ſo far from being piouſly affected, that we are villainouſly diſaffected.

V. The true and genuine kind of Piety is oppoſite to *the baſe and ſervile* according to the Apoſtle's account of it, *Gal.* 4. 30. In common Speech, the Senſe of the Philoſophers and Language of Holy Scripture any *baſe incommodious ſubjectneſs* (or reſtraint) is called *Servitude* and *Bondage.* To be ſubjected to a Tyrannical Government, to be chain'd to an Oar, to be held, to tug at a Gally, or to dig in the Mines; (*c*) to be Servants to any Luſts, (to obey, ſerve and gratifie them;) to be ſubjected to any external things (Drink, Women, Honour or Diſhonour, Riches or Poverty, Pleaſure or Pain) to be ſubjected to the Dominion of Fortune or any Humane Power (ſo that you cannot be in Proſperity, unleſs your Externals proſper,) is to be baſely and miſerably ſubjected; and to be peſter'd with vitious and calamitous Affections, to be timid, querulous, ireful, envious, diſcontented, full of Grief and Care, to flatter the great ones of the World, that have theſe external things in their power, this is to be baſely and miſerably ſubject (to be abject and baſe,) and is not ineptly called *a Slavery* (a baſe and miſerable Subjection,) although it is no Slavery in the ſtrict ſenſe of *Civil Law*, which by a Slave meaneth *one that hath no right.* So the Apoſtle (ſpeaking in a large ſenſe) ſaith; *The Creature was ſubjected to the Bondage of Corruption, a Brother or a Siſter is not under Bondage, I will not be brought under the Power of any*; (*d*) that is, I will not loſe my Freedom and be brought into Bondage. So if Men were Great and Noble in the World, yet the Philoſophers call'd them *Slaves*, if they had not attain'd to freedom from all that they accounted baſe and miſerable Subjection. And at the ſame rate our Saviour treated the Jews (which put them into a great huff;) for notwithſtanding their pretenſions to Nobility and Freedom, and their high Conceits of the Prerogatives of their Nation, yet Chriſt counted them in Bondage, minded them of their want of *Freedom*, (alluding to a Civil-Law Senſe) call'd them by the infamous Name of *Slaves*, told them, that their abode in the Viſible Church was but like that of Bondmen in a Family, and that their uſage muſt be the ſame with theirs; for they muſt be caſt out of the Family, unleſs they were made free by the Son, who maketh all his Freemen Sons, *Joh.* 8. 32—36. Our Saviour therefore ſuppoſeth, that as Families uſually in thoſe times conſiſted of *Chil-*

(z) *Ap. Petav. T.* 4. *par.* 1. *l.* 9. *c.* 3. *S.* 9.

(a) *M. Ant. l.* 2. *S.* 5.

Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 5. *c.* 1.

(b) *Non ſatis eſſe, Chriſto judice, ſi malis factis abſtineamus, quod lotio indicabat; ſed requiri vim ad bona opera agentem magno quodam impetu.* Grot. Not. in Matth. 3. 11.

(c) *Lip. manuduct. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 12. *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 1. & *l.* 3. *c.* 24, 26. *Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 52, 296, 347. *Dr. Jackſon Com. B.* 10 *c.* 19, 21.

Rom. 8. 21. 1 *Cor.* 7. 15. *and* 6. 12.

(d) *Grot. Not. in loc.*

dren and *Servants*, *Sons* and *Slaves*: So in the viſible Church there are two Kinds and Families of Religioniſts; *the one the Free and Filial, the other the Baſe and Servile.* Such were the carnal Jews eſpecially and eminently, and ſuch are all carnal and mundane kind of Religioniſts, that (in the main) ſymbolize with them, and are of their Kind and Character. For the carnal Jews muſt be conſider'd as a Branch of ungodly and unregenerate Mankind; their Servitude (for the main of it) was not peculiar to themſelves, it belong'd to them in common with the reſt of ungodly Mankind, who are therefore a baſe and ſervile Family, and in the State of Spiritual Servitude, becauſe they are under the Reign and Domination of Sin. *Joh.* 8. 34. *Whoſoever committeth Sin* (is a committer of Sin) *is the Servant of Sin* (he is ſubjected to the Rule and Domination of it,) which is a baſe and miſerable Subjection. The Servants of Sin can be none of God's Servants ſimply ſo called: But they may be a *Servile* kind of Servants unto God, and may do unto him a Servile kind of God-ſervice. And ſuch is the Piety of the *baſe-born carnal Legaliſts*: Much of their Piety is in its own Nature *Servile Task*; what is not ſuch in its own Nature, they make it ſuch by performing it without gracious, ingenuous and kindly Affection; whence the whole of their Piety muſt be called *the baſe and ſervile kind of Piety*. The Judaical Ceremonies were in their own Nature ſlaviſh Tasks and Burdens, *weak and beggarly Elements* (of no Efficacy as to the Soul, devoid of the Richneſs and Precioſity of Grace,) the Religioniſts of the old Houſe were *in Bondage under the Elements of the World* (mundane Rites.) Mount *Sinai gendreth to Bondage*, the old *Jeruſalem* was a *Bond-woman*, and by her incommodious Subjection to theſe mundane Rites was *in Bondage with her Children*. The Ritualiſts Piety therefore, although it looketh very pompous, is really no better than vile Servility and Bond-ſervice, *the Servile Family's kind of Piety*. They are far from being duly unſerviliz'd and unenſlav'd in Religion, that ſink it into vile external Rites and frigid Inſtitutes, ſuch as the Inſtitutes of the Scribes and Phariſees, the Inſtitutes that make a great part of the Romiſh Religioniſts Piety, and thoſe of the *Kaloirs* or Greek Monks, (*e*) who are under an Obligation to perform their μετάνοιαι, that is, their bowings and kiſſings the Ground Three Hundred times every Four and Twenty Hours. There are other Branches of the Servile Family's Piety, which they make ſuch by performing them without Gracious-ingenuous and kindly Affection; for all ſuch doings (that Men preſcribe to themſelves or are preſcrib'd by others,) which claſh with Ingenuity, are *Servility* (of Kind and Quality ſuch) Servile Task and Drudgery. Such are the doings of Slaves in the Civil-law Senſe; they are ſervilely task'd by their Maſters, and the Services which they do them, are plodding Task and Drudgery (like that of the Carrier's Horſes upon the Road;) and ſuch are the Services which the Slaves of Sin do unto God. Their ſaying their daily Prayers upon the ſame Score, that the *Iſraelites* made Brick in *Egypt*, *to fulfull their daily Task*; their crouching Devotion and worſhipping God (as the *Americans* do the Devil) *ne noceat*, *that he may not do them an ill turn*; their caring for no more Religion than will juſt ſave them from Hell (which are vile diſingenuous things;) their repentance of *Attrition*, their flattering Humiliations. *Pſal.* 78. 36. (*f*) "The Prieſts of the Greek-Church run over their Offices, as the School-boys do their "Tasks, pronouncing their words ſo ſwift and "thick, as rendreth them inarticulcate and "unintelligible, and are of no ſavour or energy to Perſons that deſire to profit in Devotion. (*g*) The Ethiopick Monks have certain "Prayers, of which they ſay ſuch a number "believing their Piety fully ſatisfied, if they "finiſh their Task, which that they may "make the more haſt to accompliſh, they hnddle over the Pſalms of *David* with ſuch a "dextrous celerity, that I who have heard "them at *Rome*, holding the ſame Copy in my "Hand, could never follow them with my "Voice, and hardly with my Eyes. Such is the Piety and Devotion of the Slaves of Sin, the *opus operatum* of Religious Duties.

Act. 15. 10. Gal. 4. 9. and 5. 1. and 4. 3.

Gal. 4. 24. 25, 30.

(e) Sr. P. Rycaut of the preſ. State of the Gr. Church, p. 2.6.

(f) Ibid. p. 320.

(g) Ludolph. Hiſt. of Ethiop. B. 3. c. 3.

The Slaves of Sin under the Law (which ſaveth none from being ſuch) ought to be kept in ſlaviſh fear; for the Principle that diſpoſeth them to Obedience, is the ſlaviſh fear of Menaces, ſtern Correction and Puniſhment, (*b*) φεύγοντες ȣ̓ τὸ αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ λυπηρὸν, *they eſchewing not the Sin but the Puniſhment*. Accordingly, the Law impos'd its Works and Tasks upon them rigorouſly, minaciouſly and imperiouſly (ſo as might impreſs great fear and terrour,) with great ſeverity it exacted the performance of them, thundring out Curſes if they were not done. As the Pagans Religion therefore was baſe and ſervile, becauſe of their ſlaviſh fear, dread and horrour of their Deities, (*i*) which was a principal Ingredient of their Piety: So in the legal and ſervile State and under the legal and ſervile Diſpenſation of things the carnal Jews were affected, and carry'd themſelves towards God as Slaves. *Rom.* 8. 15. *Ye have not receiv'd the Spirit of Bondage* (the ſervile Diſpoſition in Religion,) *again to fear* (to fear as Slaves do, that are kept in ſervile Awe and Fear;) for they that are of this Spirit, are the Religioniſts of the unregenerate and legal State, who are the vile Serviliſts, not the genuin Pietiſts. Theſe are alſo reſtrain'd and hamper'd by a ſervile awe and fear from running into groſs Enormities, and are forc'd to do their Tasks (the Deeds of the Law) contrary to their own Inclinations and Deſires, upon which account they are in Slavery; for as the Philoſopher ſaith, (*k*) *where any one is againſt his Will, that place is a Priſon to him.* As legal *Juſticiaries* alſo theſe Judaical Slaves of Sin are Serviliſts; for they will not have Righteouſneſs with God in the free and noble way, but will have it in their (proud yet) mercenary and ſervile way, by performing their legal ſervile Tasks, and as being thereby *legally Righteous*, which is inconſiſtent with their being God's kind of Religioniſts.

(h) Grot. Not. in Rom. 8. 15.

(i) Plutarch. de ſuperſtit.

(k) Epict. Diſſ. l. 1. c. 12.

VI. The true and genuin kind of Piety is the true and genuin kind of *Religious Worſhip* (or God-ſervice) and the true and genuin kind of Religious Worſhip is *the Spiritual-religious* (the being God's Religioniſts in that way of Worſhip) according to the Apoſtle's account of it. *Rom.* 7. 6. *That we ſhould ſerve in newneſs of Spirit.* Phil. 3. 3. *We Worſhip God in the Spirit.* Of this genuin kind of Religious Worſhip our Saviour diſcourſeth to the Woman of *Samaria*. *Joh.* 4. 21, 24. *Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye ſhall neither in this Mountain, nor yet* *at Jeruſalem Worſhip the Father. Te Worſhip ye know not what: We know what we Worſhip: For Salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh and now is, when the true Worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in Spirit and in Truth: For the Father ſeeketh ſuch to Worſhip him. God is a Spirit, and they that Worſhip him, muſt Worſhip him in Spirit and in Truth.* It is not probable (*l*) that the *Samaritans* were *Image-worſhippers* and worſhipped God under the corporeal form of a Dove, which was hid in Mount *Gerizim*, as the Rabbins relate. For what Idolaters ever kept their Image-σεβάσματα *in the Earth*, and would have Worſhip pay'd to them under Ground? But they were Idolaters (although no Image-worſhippers;) for our Saviour ſaith, *ye Worſhip ye know not what.* In their Temple-worſhip they worſhipped their Temple-deity; if therefore their Temple was *numine vacuum*, the Object of their Worſhip muſt neceſſarily be a figment of their own, not the true Godhead. And ſo it fareth with thoſe Religioniſts, that are totally out of Theiſm of Religion and Condition: But God and Salvation were to be found in the Jewiſh Church and Religion, wherein there were ſome that were initially, imperfectly and in a lower degree true and genuin Worſhippers; and our Saviour declareth it, to be the deſign of his coming, to raiſe up a Generation of Worſhippers, that ſhould *be eminently true and genuin* (ὡς ἂν πνευματικοὺς ἀποδείξῃ προσκυνητὰς (*m*) *to make Spiritual Worſhippers,*) who ſhould Worſhip God, not in what is *Carnality* of Religion, but *Spirituality*; and with that which is *Truth of Worſhip*, not *Figure and Shadow*, which was the *Jews* and *Samaritans* Worſhip. The worſhipping God *in Spirit*, being thus confronted to the Jews and Samaritans Worſhip with deſign to aboliſh it, neceſſarily ſignifieth

(1.) *Oppoſitively* to the Judaical Worſhip, which was *that which is Carnality of Religion.* (*n*) *By theſe words our Saviour hath taught us, that God muſt not be worſhipped* ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ σαρκίναις θυσίαις, *carnally and with carnal Sacrifices.* (*o*) Οὐδὲ διὰ συμβόλων καὶ τύπων, *nor by Symbols and Figures.* (*p*) *Our Saviour manifeſtly ſignifieth thus much, that we ought to ceaſe from the uſages of the Judaical legal Worſhip*; which (abſtracted from the matters of Chriſtianity that they typified) were meer *carnal Ordinances.* (*q*) *For theſe Inſtitutes, Circumciſe the Fleſh, anoint the Fleſh, waſh the Fleſh, cleanſe the Fleſh, ſhave the Fleſh, bind things on the Fleſh, nouriſh the Fleſh, reſt from labour as to the Fleſh, are they not all Carnal? And hearken what goods the Law promiſeth. Long Life to the Fleſh, Milk and Honey to the Fleſh, Peace to the Fleſh, Delicacies to the Fleſh.* The Jews Ceremonial Worſhip conſiſted of outward bodily Rites and Actions, that concern'd the Fleſh only, and could not ſanctifie the Souls of Men, nor could their Sacrifices cleanſe them from the Guilt of Sin, but only from ſome outward legal Defilement, that rendred them incapable of coming to the Tabernacle or ſubjected them to temporal Puniſhment: But as to their Soul-condition they remain'd ſtill in their criminal State; for theſe Sacrifices did but cleanſe as to *the purifying the Fleſh* (the outward Man,) they made not the Religioniſt *perfect* (expiated) *as pertaining to the Conſcience.* The Ordinances about their Levitical Prieſthood and Temple-worſhip mainly conſiſted in bodily Labour and Expence (putting the inward Man to no ſtreſs at all,) the obſervance of them was competible to meer carnal People, was devoid of any Spiritual Grace, conſtituted them nothing more than a carnal kind of Religious People, and by accident ſubſerv'd the Intereſt of Carnality. For ritual and trivial obſervances are commonly made uſe of, to ſupply the place of ſubſtantial Piety, to excuſe from it, to make amends for their real Sins, and to purchaſe a Reward which they deſpair of obtaining by the regular method of real Holineſs.

(2.) *Poſitively* the Chriſtian-worſhip, this being *that which is Spirituality of Religion.* (*r*) *We Chriſtians having abandon'd the craſs Judaical Worſhip, are injoin'd to perform a Spiritual Worſhip.* This is the Worſhip, which our Saviour meaneth by *Spirit*, which is of a twofold Notion in the New Teſtament. For ſometimes it ſignifieth *vital Sanctity*, and ſometimes *what is Spirituality of Religion*: Anſwerably whereunto *the Fleſh* (which ſpeaketh an Antitheſis to *Spirit*) ſometimes ſignifieth *vital Carnality*, and ſometimes *what is Carnality of Religion.* Rom. 8. 9. To be in the Spirit, not in the Fleſh, is to be in *vital Sanctity*, not in *vital Carnality*; and to be in *the Fleſh* (*Rom.* 7. 5.) is to be in vital Carnality, devoid of vital Sanctity. *Joh.* 3. 6. *That which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh*, it is vital Carnality: *That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*, it is vital Sanctity. *Joh.* 6. 63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing; the words that I ſpeak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* They are meant of that which is Spirit, *vital Sanctity into which the Spirit quickeneth*; and they are meant of that which is Life, *Life Spiritual and Eternal.* To *live in the Spirit*, and *walk in the Spirit*, is to live and walk in vital Sanctity, and the Combat between Fleſh and Spirit is a Combat between two contrary Lives, of which the one is vital Carnality, the other is vital Sanctity. (*s*) *The Name Spirit denoteth Spiritual Grace.* But ſometimes it denoteth *what is Spirituality of Religion* (which vital Sanctity manifeſtly is,) as *Gal.* 3. 3. *Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the Fleſh?* What is Carnality and vile Externalneſs of Religion the Apoſtle calleth the Fleſh. *Rom.* 4. 1. *What ſhall we ſay then, that* Abraham *our Father as pertaining to the Fleſh hath found?* Phil. 3. 3. *We rejoice in Chriſt Jeſus, and have no confidence in the Fleſh.* What is Spirituality of Religion the Apoſtle in this place calleth *Spirit. We are the Circumciſion* (Spiritual Jews,) οἱ πνεύματι Θεῷ λατρεύοντες, *that Worſhip God in Spirit*, (*t*) τουτέστιν οἱ πνευματικῶς λατρεύοντες, *that is ſuch as Worſhip ſpiritually*, and ſo as to be the Spiritual and Divine kind of Worſhippers. The Regenerate and Chriſtian Family Worſhip God with all that is real Honour and Service unto him, and the whole of their Chriſtian Piety towards him is what is *Spirituality of Religion*; the Sacrifices and Oblations which they offer (as a Spiritual Prieſthood) are of Kind and Quality *the Spiritual*, of which the carnal legal Sacrifices were Figures and Shadows. They offer the Sacrifice

of

(l) *Hotting. Exercit. Antimorin. S.* 16, 17.

(m) *S. Cyril. Dial.* 1. *de Trin. p.* 399.

(n) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. p. 324.

(o) *Euſeb. Dem. Ev.* l. 1. c. 6.

(p) *S. Cyr. Alex. T.* 1. *l.* 1. *p.* 3.

(q) Τὸ γὰρ λέγειν, περίτεμε τὴν σάρκα, χρῖσον τὴν σάρκα, λοῦσον τὴν σάρκα, καθάρισον τὴν σάρκα, περίκειρον τὴν σάρκα, ἐπίδησον τὴν σάρκα, θρέψον τὴν σάρκα, ἄργησον τῇ σαρκὶ, ταῦτα εἰπέ μοι, οὐχὶ σαρκικά; εἰ δὲ θέλεις μαθεῖν καὶ τίνα ἃ ἐπηγγέλλετο ἀγαθὰ, ἄκουε· πολλὴ ζωὴ, φησι, τῇ σαρκὶ, γάλα καὶ μέλι τῇ σαρκὶ, εἰρήνη τῇ σαρκὶ, τρυφὴ τῇ σαρκί. *S. Chryſoſt. in Ep. ad Hebr. or.* 13.

Heb. 9. 9, 13.

Rom. 7. 5, 6.

(r) Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν οὕτω παχεῖαν ἀφέντες λατρείαν— πνευματικὴν ἀποπληροῦν προστετάγμεθα. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 10. *p.* 345. *V. Lactant. l.* 6.

Gal. 5. 16, 17, 25.

(s) *Intelligimus Spiritus nomine donum Spiritualis gratiæ deſignari.* Fulgent. l. 2. ad Monim. c. 2.

(t) *S. Chry- ſoſt. in Philip.*

1 Pe 5. *Pſal.* 17.

of a broken Heart and the Sacrifice of themſelves, (u) *hoc eſt Sacrificium Chriſtianorum.* They offer the Sacrifice of their Goods and the Sacrifice of Prayer anſwerable to the Judaical Incenſe, *Pſal.* 141. 2. (w) *Prayer proceeding from a chaſt Body, an innocent Soul and from the holy Spirit.* They offer the Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thanſgiving (x) ἀληθινοὶ καὶ πνευματικοὶ αἶνοι ϗ εὐχαριστίαι, *true and ſpiritual Praiſes and Thankſgivings*, together with whatever Oblations the holy Euchariſt compriſeth, which is the Crown of their ſolemn Miniſteries. (y) *Their bodily Worſhip is the Spiritual, as proceeding from Spiritual Devotion and ordinated thereto.*

(3.) *Poſitively* the holy Spiritual Man's kind of Worſhip, which is ſuch Worſhip *as is in vital Sanctity*, and ſuch is the Chriſtians kind of Worſhip, who are holy Spiritual kind of Men. (z.) *The holy Spirit infuſeth the Gift of Spiritual Grace* (vital Sanctity) *in which God is worſhipped.* Vital Sanctity is the ſpecific Nature and Excellency of the Chriſtian Religion and Diſpenſation and of the Chriſtian Religioniſts. *Rom.* 7. 6. and 8. 2. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3, 6. *Gal.* 4. 29. *Heb.* 8. 10. The Spirit of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation as in himſelf, and as in us is of definitive Notion vital Sanctity, *Rom.* 1. 4. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. All authentic accounts of the Chriſtian Worſhip ſpeak it of proper kind *the Worſhip that is in vital Sanctity*, and this is that which conſtituteth it, denominateth and diſtinguiſheth it from all other. For becauſe of their vital Sanctity Regenerate Chriſtians are appropriately and peculiarly the Spiritual and Divine kind of Religioniſts, the true and genuin kind of Worſhippers; their Virtue is the Spiritual and Divine kind of Virtue, their Worſhip is the Spiritual and Divine kind of Worſhip, they know and worſhip God (a) καινῶς ϗ πνευματικῶς, *newly and ſpiritually*; they ſerve not in their old dead Religion, but in *newneſs of Spiritual Life.* Rom. 7. 6. they *Worſhip God in the Spirit* (in the Grace of it) *Phil.* 3. 3. their Prayer and Supplication is *in the Spirit, in the holy Ghoſt* (in vital Sanctity) *Eph.* 5. 18. *Jude* 20. their Oblation and Sacrifice (b) *is not offer'd up by Smoak and Nidor, nor by Blood and Waſhings, but by the Grace of the Spirit*; their Religion and Religious Worſhip is of proper kind the Spiritual-vital. *Joh.* 7. 39. *Rom.* 8. 2. and 12. 1. *Apoc.* 3. 1.

(4.) *Oppoſitively* to the carnal Man's (the carnal and mundane Religioniſt's) kind of Worſhip. Some of thoſe blind Seers the Hebrew Doctors although they are doating Ritualiſts, (c) yet hugely diſparage the material Incenſe and Sacrifices of their Temple-worſhip in compariſon of their Moralities and Moral Duties of Religious Worſhip. But ſeeing they are *carnal Jews, the Slaves of Sin, the old Man's Religioniſts*, it is not to be ſuppos'd, that their Moralities and Moral Religious Duties are *fruit unto God, the holy kind of good Works, or ſpiritual Sacrifices:* But at beſt they are ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Virtue and Piety. The Sacrifices of Chriſtians therefore muſt not be thought *Spiritual Sacrifices*, (d) meerly becauſe they are not οὔπω παχεῖαι ϗ ἔνυλοι, *ſo craſs and material* as the Jews Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices; for if this incorporiety and immateriality was ſufficient, to conſtitute them Spiritual Sacrifices, the carnal legal Religioniſts would offer up Spiritual Sacrifices as well as the Chriſtian; for they alſo offer *Prayers, Praiſes and Alms-deeds.* But the Judaical Incenſe was not a Figure and Adumbration of any ſort of Prayers, but of the Prayers of Saints only. *Apoc.* 5. 8. therefore the Worſhip of God in Spirit and Truth is only that kind of Worſhip, which is in vital Sanctity; all that are totally devoid of it, muſt neceſſarily be ſuch Religioniſts, that Worſhip in their vital Carnality with ſuch Worſhip, which is but the carnal Man's kind of Religious Worſhip and vile Externalneſs of Religion. Who can be none of God's kind of Religioniſts, as appeareth from our Saviour's Rule of Worſhip, and more eſpecially from that part of it, which is the Reaſon of it, πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς, *God is Spirit.* Which words are marvellouſly miſunderſtood by Expoſitors and in our Books of Theology, which ſuppoſe them to ſignifie, that *God is a Spirit* in the Senſe of common Philoſophy (immaterial or incorporeal;) whereas they ought to be interpreted (not from common Philoſophy, but) from the Science of Sanctity; and ſo interpreted they plainly ſignifie, that God (being vital Sanctity and of God-kind) is of Kind and Quality *what is Spiritual-religious*, and therefore muſt be worſhipp'd with the Spiritual-religious Worſhip. That this is the true Senſe of them, and the commonly received Senſe is a great miſtake, will appear by theſe following Arguments.

(1.) Amongſt the ancient Writers of the Church the word *Spirit* ſometimes ſignifieth *what is of Kind and Quality Spiritual-religious*, and it ſo ſignifieth, when God is denominated *Spirit.* For S. *Auſtin* ſaith; *Quoniam Deus Spiritus eſt, qui Legem dedit, proculdubiò Lex Spiritalis eſt. Becauſe God is Spirit, who gave the Law, doubtleſs the Law is Spirital.* Which place *Petavius* thus expoundeth. (e) *The Word Spirital doth not ſo much ſignifie the Nature and Subſtance either of God or his Law, as the Moral Quality of both, that is, the Sanctity. As the word Carnal (the oppoſite thereto) doth not denote the Subſtance but the Vicioſity. So Spirit and Fleſh, Carnal and Spirital are contraries, not by a conſtitutive Nature, but by Affection. Spirit is the ſame with Holy or Sanctity: Or it is the ſame with Spirital, and if I might ſo ſpeak, Spiritality.* He ſheweth, that unleſs Spirit be thus underſtood, S. *Auſtin*'s Argument will ſignifie nothing; and doubtleſs our Saviour's will ſignifie as little. Many of the ancient Writers read our Saviour's Text, *Joh.* 3. 6 with this addition *quia Deus ſpiritus eſt.* (f) *Quod natum eſt ex carne caro eſt: Quod natum eſt de ſpiritu, ſpiritus eſt, quia Deus ſpiritus eſt. That which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh: That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit; becauſe the Spirit is God.* If that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit (that is, vital Sanctity, or Spiritual-vital,) becauſe the Spirit is God, then God is *Spirit* as being vital Sanctity, or Spiritual-vital, and he ought to be ſo denominated in the Senſe of the Science of Sanctity. Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς τȣτέςιν πνευματικὸς, *God is Spirit, that is, Spiritual,* ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom.* If our Saviour had ſaid, that *God is Spiritual*, all would expound the Epithet, to ſignifie his

(u) S. Aug. de .D. l. 10. c. 6.

(w) *Oratio de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de Spiritu Sancto profecta.* Tertull. Apol. c. 30.

(x) J. *Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 345.

(y) *Adoratio corporalis in Spiritu fit, in quantum à Spirituali devotione procedit, & ad eam ordinatur.* Aquin. 2. 2. Qu. 84. art. 2.

(z) *Spiritus donum gratiæ Spiritalis infundit, in quo adoratur Deus.* S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l. 3. c. 12.

(a) Clem. Str. l. 6. m. 458.

(b) Οὐ διὰ καπνȣ̃ ϗ κνίσσης, ἀλλ' διὰ αἱμάτων ϗ λύτρων, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τȣ̃ πνεύματος προσάγεται χάριτος. *S. Chryſ. T.* 6. p. 335.

(c) Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par. c. 32. Men. Ben. Iſr. Qu. in Levit. 181, 182.

(d) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 4. p. 126.

(e) T. 1. l. 10. c. 24. S. 7.

(f) S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l. 3. c. 11. Concil. Carthag. inter oper. S. Cypr. Ed. Oxon. p. 231. P. Chryſol. Ser. 145.

Sanctity; therefore they ought ſo to expound the Attribute *Spirit*.

(2.) Spirit in the ſenſe of common Philoſophy (as is before noted) is no Divine Attribute, being common to Creatures, the worſt of Creatures, *the unclean Spirits*. It is no Divine Attribute either of Degree or of Kind. Whereas our Saviour is arguing for the Spiritual-religious kind of Worſhip; he is ſhewing what God is as to the buſineſs of Religion and Sanctity (on our part,) that not the Carnal, but the Spiritual-kind of Religion and God-ſervice is his kind of Religion and God-ſervice; and that not the Carnal, but the Spiritual-kind of Worſhippers and Religioniſts, are his kind of Religioniſts. This cannot be ſhew'd but from ſome Divine kind of Attribute; therefore the Attribute *Spirit* muſt be of ſuch ſignification in our Saviour's Argument. Elſe he alledgeth a Reaſon for the Spiritual kind of Worſhip, which can be no Reaſon; he foundeth the Spiritual and Divine kind of Worſhip upon a Spirituality, which is not of Spiritual and Divine kind; which is not peculiar to God or his kind of Religioniſts, nor is any thing of Virtue, nor the oppoſite to the Vice of Carnality, but is very well conſiſtent with Carnality of Mind, Life and Religion. For the Devil and the Souls of the wicked notwithſtanding their Philoſophic Spirituality are very well pleas'd with Carnality of Life and Religion.

(3.) Spirit in the latter part of our Saviour's Rule of Worſhip muſt neceſſarily correſpond to *Spirit* in the former part of it (the one being the Reaſon of the other;) if therefore Spirit in the former part of our Saviour's Rule of Worſhip ſignifieth what is *Spiritual-religious*, it ſo ſignifieth in the latter part of it. And it muſt ſo ſignifie; for if we ſuppoſe our Saviour thus to argue; God is a Spiritual Subſtance in the Senſe of common Philoſophy; therefore his Worſhip muſt be Spiritual in the Senſe of the Science of Sanctity; we make him to argue *à baculo ad angulum*, to infer *quidlibet ex quolibet*, and μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἄλλο γένος, *in arguing to run from one thing to another of another kind.*

(4.) *Spirit* in the Senſe of common Philoſophy is an Attribute, that moſt agreeably foundeth a wild Philoſophic Pagan Worſhip, ſuch as the Platoniſts gave to their *Monad*, which was a purely immaterial and incorporeal Worſhip. So ſome allot (g) a material Worſhip to their material Deities (thoſe that preſide over the matter,) but they ſuppoſe a Worſhip purely immaterial moſt agreeable to thoſe Deities that are purely immaterial. But we may as well ſuppoſe, that becauſe like loveth like, therefore God (being a Mind and Spirit) loveth every Mind and Spirit, as ſuppoſe, that becauſe God is meerly incorporeal, therefore his Religious Worſhip muſt be meerly incorporeal. Yet to a purely immaterial Mind and incorporeal Subſtance as ſuch no Worſhip can be ſo ſuitable, as that which is purely mental and incorporeal. *Euſebius* therefore in his criminally Philoſophic-paganizing ſtrain hath made our Religious Worſhip incorporeal at the Philoſophic Pagan rate. For what Worſhip is that but the Philoſophic-pagan, which conſiſteth (*h*) ἐν ἀπαθείᾳ ψυχῆς, *in an apathy of the Soul*, or vacuity of Perturbation (which is exactly (*i*) Philoſophic-pagan Language,) and which offereth unto God (*k*) ὐδὲν μὲν γεῶδες καὶ νεκρὸν,—— ὐδέ τι τῆς φθαρτῆς καὶ ὑλικῆς ὐσίας, *nothing terrene and dead, nor any thing of corruptible and material Subſtance?* S. *Chryſoſtom* interpreteth the Worſhip of God *in Spirit*, to be meant of Sacrifices and Oblations (*l*) *that are offer'd by the Soul, by the Spirit of a Man, that need not the Body, nor corporeal Organs, nor places.* But if this was our Saviour's meaning in his Rule of Worſhip, what would become of all the external part of the Acts of Religious Worſhip? And how groſly doth this excellent Perſon contradict himſelf? For having enumerated many Virtues, which are acceptable to God, he proceedeth to ſay, that *there are other Sacrifices which are really whole Burnt-offerings*, τὰ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων σώματα, *the Bodies of the holy Martyrs*, τὸ σῶμα νεκρῶν, ὐχὶ ὁλοκαύτωσίς ἐστι; *to mortifie the Body, is it not offering a whole Burnt-offering?* Chriſtianity requireth the ſerving God with our Body and the Organs thereof, in due time and place, habit, geſture and poſture; our Saviour hath inſtituted ſome few laudably external Rites of Worſhip, which are of Kind and Quality Spiritual-religious; therefore his great Rule of Worſhip doth not mean, that God's Service muſt be purely incorporeal, nor is it founded upon τὸ ἀσώματον, *the meer incorporeity of God.*

(5.) Spirit underſtood in the common Senſe of Philoſophy ſo perverteth the Senſe of our Saviour's Rule of Worſhip, that it doth not reach the Caſe, which was in debate amongſt Religioniſts in our Saviour's time. For let us ſuppoſe with *Grotius* (*m*) that our Saviour's Reaſon of his Rule of Worſhip is the very ſame with *Cato*'s, *Deus eſt Animus*, and that *ſimilia ſimilibus gaudent*, and that the conſequence is (as *Grotius* will have it,) that our Saviour's Rule of Worſhip is the very ſame with *Cato*'s, *God muſt be worſhipp'd, purâ mente, with a pure Mind.* So the Pagan Poets, their Laws and Lawgivers, their Oracles and Philoſophers, *Cicero* and *Seneca, Charondas and the Law of the Twelve Tables*, Epicharmus, Menander, Perſius, Plato, Porphyry, Simplicius, Hierocles, Julian, and the Inſcription on the Temple of *Epidaurus* teach, that the Deity muſt be worſhipp'd with a pure Mind (a Mind that is not impious and wicked,) which is ſo uſually and univerſally the Senſe of the Pagan Theologers, that *Lactantius* cannot be excus'd from over-ſtretching the String, when he ſaith of the Pagan Worſhip, (*n*) *non officio mentis, ſed miniſterio corporis conſtat* (it is not mental, but bodily Miniſtery,) and that he could find nothing in it but *Ritus ad manum & digitos pertinentes, Rites appertaining to the Hands and Fingers. Plato* ſaith, (*o*) *It would be a grievous thing, if the Gods have reſpect to our Gifts and Sacrifices, and not to the Soul, whether it be juſt and holy. To this I ſuppoſe the Gods have much more reſpect than to theſe coſtly Pomps and Sacrifices, which nothing hindreth, but a great Criminal as to the Gods and Men, both private Men and Republick may yearly perform. But they being* ὐ δωροδόκοι, *incorrupt by Gifts deſpiſe all theſe things.* A Law of the *Twelve Tables* is, *Pietatem adhibento, opes amovento*, which a Modern Author (agreeably to the Senſe of *Grotius*) thus interpreteth. (*p*) *Piety is of the Mind, whereby God is worſhipp'd: According to that, God is a Spirit, therefore to be worſhip'd in Spirit and Truth.* The Law ſuppoſeth, that Piety is an Act of the Mind, ſo far the Law is rightly interpreted.

(g) Iamb. de Myſt. Sect. 5. c. 14.

(h) Pr. Ev. l. 3. c. 13. & l. 4. c. 4.

(i) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 2. p. 61.

(k) Euſeb. ibid. l. 4. c. 10.

(l) Τὰ διὰ ψυχῆς, τὰ διὰ πνεύματος, ὅσα μὴ δεῖται σώματος, ὅσα μὴ δεῖται ὀργάνων, μὴ τόπων. In Hebr. or. 11.

(m) Not. in Joh. 4. 24.

(n) L. 4. c. 3. & l. 5. c. 20.

(o) V. Betul. Annot. in Lactant. l. 5. c. 21.

(p) Pietas animi eſt, quo D us colitur: Juxta illud, De Spiritus eſt, adorandus ergo Spiritu & veritate. Betul. ſup. v. Lactant. l. 6. c. 2.

preted. But who can ſuppoſe, that the Senſe of this old Heathen Law is the ſame with the Senſe of the new Chriſtian Law, *that God muſt be worſhipp'd in Spirit and Truth?* That the Law of the Twelve Tables is the ſame with our Saviour's Inſtitution of the Chriſtian Worſhip? Wherefore it muſt be acknowledg'd, that Men may Worſhip the Deity with what they call *a pure and pious Mind*, yet ſo as to be no better *than mundane and carnal kind of Religioniſts*, as the Pagans undoubtedly were. And ſuch are the Hebrew Doctors, who yet pretend to (q) *a clean Heart and a pure Soul towards the God of* Iſrael. The whole World of Religioniſts, *Jews*, *Pagans* and *Chriſtians*, agree, that God muſt be worſhipp'd with the Mind and with that which they call a pure Mind; if this therefore is our Saviour's Senſe and the whole of it; if his Rule of Worſhip is the ſame with *Cato's*, *Cicero's*, *Seneca's*, *and the Law of the Twelve Tables*, he hath ſaid nothing new, nothing properly Divine and Chriſtian, nothing that reacheth his purpoſe (which was to introduce the new and regenerate Religioniſts kind of Worſhip,) nothing that reacheth the debate between the Spiritual aud Carnal kind of Religioniſts. For was this the debate between them, *whether God muſt be worſhipp'd by the Mind and a pure Mind?* Or was this the matter in debate (as others (r) expound our Saviour's words,) *whether the Soul muſt be join'd with the external Performances?* If theſe plain and obvious Principles of natural Religion were always commonly acknowledg'd, and never were matters of debate amongſt Religioniſts, our Saviour's Rule of Worſhip cannot be thought, to relate to any other debate than that grand one, which commenc'd with the riſe of Chriſtianity, namely, *whether Men muſt be Chriſtian or no Chriſtian, Regenerate or Unregenerate, new or old, the new or old Man's, the Spiritual or Carnal kind of Religioniſts?* Our Saviour began this Debate, and if his Rule of Divine Worſhip was deſign'd to put an end to it, that Rule muſt be founded upon a better Reaſon than *Deus eſt Animus.* This Debate compriſeth a Debate touching *a pure Mind* (for the Spiritual Religioniſts do not acknowledge the carnal Religioniſts pure Mind, they call it atheous, carnal, polluted,) but is of larger comprehenſion than it; for our Saviour's Rule muſt be underſtood *oppoſitively*, as deſigned to take away the mundane and carnal Religioniſts kind of Worſhip; and alſo *poſitively*, as deſign'd to introduce in its ſtead the Spiritual-religious Worſhip of the Spiritual Jews (purely and eminently ſuch) which is the Worſhip of the genuin Chriſtian Church.

But the degenerate Chriſtian Church hath badly underſtood and worſe practiſed our Saviour's Divine Rule of Worſhip. For the ſecond Nicene Council and their Followers (s) allot to Images a more overly and inferiour degree of Religious Worſhip (which is called *τιμητικὴ*, *Honourary*,) but the ſupreme and eminent Devotion they reſerve for God alone. And this Devotion, as they ſuppoſe, is that which our Saviour meaneth by *latria in Spiritu & Veritate*, *Worſhip in Spirit and Truth.* Which Expoſition of our Saviour's words ſuppoſeth, *that Worſhip in Spirit and Truth* doth not ſignifie God's kind of Worſhip, but God's peculiar degree of Worſhip; that it is not oppos'd to the Jews and Samaritans (the carnal Religioniſts) kind of Worſhip, but to a Branch of the Chriſtian Worſhip; that the whole of the Chriſtian Worſhip is not Worſhip in Spirit and Truth, but part of it only; and that their Image-worſhip is Chriſtian Worſhip, yet not Chriſtian Worſhip; for it is not Worſhip in Spirit and Truth. *Card. Beſſarion* maintaineth, that *Plato* worſhipp'd God *in Spirit and Truth*, becauſe he ſaith in his *Epinomis*, that the moſt ſuitable Worſhip of God is, to think honourably of him. But the Worſhip in Spirit and Truth according to our Saviour's Senſe is, that which is competible to none but God's kind of Religioniſts. One would think, that ſo much blindneſs and ſtupidity is ſcarce incident to humane Nature, as that any inſtructed in Chriſtianity ſhould ſuppoſe the groſs umbratil Judaical Rite of Incenſe a Spiritual Sacrifice; yet in the Liturgy called S. *Chryſoſtom's* the Prieſt ſaith. Θυμιαμά σοι προσφέρομεν Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας πνευματικῆς, *We offer Incenſe to thee, O Chriſt God, for a ſmell of Spiritual Fragrancy.* In the Chriſtian Worſhip (according to our Saviour's Rule) there muſt be nothing but what is of Kind and Quality *Spiritual-Religious:* But degenerate Chriſtendom hath deviſ'd a Religion of ſuch Uſages and Obſervances, that are vile external Rites (External to what is Spiritual-religious Worſhip,) of an Unchriſtian Nature, of Kind and Quality mundane, the Ritual Religioniſts kind of Religious Worſhip, and which are ſo numerous, that they make their Religion as Ritual as old Judaiſm was. But in any Profeſſion of Religion Men may be carnal kind of Religioniſts, which can be none of God's kind of Religioniſts.

(q) Coſri p. 384.

(r) Dr. Hammond.

(s) Petav. T. 4. Par. 2. l. 15. c. 17. s. 2.

CHAP. XI.

1. A Third Conſectary of Practice from the Idea of God; that a mundane Temple Religion is not his kind of Religion. Of the difference between Temples and Synagogues. 2. A Temple defin'd. 3. What it is that maketh our Churches Temples according to the mundane Temple Religioniſts. 4. Of Popery as it is a mundane Temple Religion, of the Senſe of the Primitive Chriſtians and the Philoſophers touching Temples. 5. Of the Name Altar. 6. Of the Rites of mundane Temple-religion. 7. Of the Church-Lights, Muſick, and the Ritual Conſecration of Churches. 8. Of the Religion of Holy Places and of Reverence belonging to Churches. 9. Of that Reverence in the Church called bowing to or towards the Altar. 10. Of the pompous God-ſervice.

1. FROM the Idea of God we muſt deduce *a Third Conſectary of Practice, that God cannot be* (otherwiſe than typically, by way of Oeconomy and for a time) *the Deity of a mundane Temple-Religion, which is not his kind of Religion, but oppoſite thereto.* This Conſectary naturally iſſueth from the Idea of God as it is repreſented by our Saviour; for he diſcourſeth

with the Woman of *Samaria*, that within a while the occaſion of the Diſpute between the *Jews* and *Samaritans* ſhall be taken away. Their Diſpute was, whether the Temple at *Jeruſalem* or that on Mount *Gerizim* was the right Temple or Place of Worſhip; but within a while (ſaith our Saviour) neither the one nor the other Temple ſhall be the holy place of Worſhip; for there ſhall be no ſuch holy place of Worſhip (no place of God's Symbolical Preſence and Reſidence,) all Holineſs of places and diſtinction between them (s) ſhall utterly ceaſe, the Spiritual Worſhip of the true Worſhippers ſhall be as holy and acceptable to God in one place as in another under the Goſpel; *when the true Worſhippers ſhall worſhip God according to his Idea, there ſhall be no Temple nor Temple-worſhip.* From the Idea of God our Saviour inferreth his kind of Religion, which is oppoſite to the Jewiſh Temple-worſhip, that was Carnality of Religion, Figure and Shadow. Judaiſm was a Mundane Temple Religion, and ſuch was Paganiſm; but both are oppoſite to God's kind of Religion. If a Deity hath a Mundane Temple (a Worldly Sanctuary,) he muſt take upon him and ſuſtain the Perſon of *a Worldly Imperial Eſtate of Religion*, the Imperial Eſtate of a Mundane Religious Polity and Republick, of a Civil-religious People, and of a Civil-religious kind of Sanctity and God-ſervice. The true God therefore, if he will inſtitute a Mundane Temple, muſt inſtitute Carnal Judaiſm; for in Chriſtianiſm there can be no ſuch thing. If any make it (more or leſs) a Mundane Temple Religion, it loſeth its Nature by this impious depravation of it, and (more or leſs) ceaſeth to be the Chriſtian Religion: For the holy Founders of it expreſly affirm, that there is no ſuch thing as a Mundane Temple in it, *Joh.* 4. 21. *Act.* 7. 48. and 17. 24. *Apoc.* 21. 22. (t) ſo do the ancient Apologiſts; and accordingly S. *Chryſoſtom* reckoneth (u) a Mundane Temple amongſt the Mundane Elements. The Chriſtian Apologiſts have the ſame Opinion of the true God, that the Poet had of the Goddeſs *Concordia* at *Athens*, which for this reaſon (as he ſuppoſeth) had no Image in her Temple, (w) — *mentes habitare ac pectora gaudet, ſhe delighteth to dwell in Souls.* (x) *Doſt thou deſire, to ſee a Temple? do not run to the Synagogue, but be thou a Temple. God hath deſtroy'd one Temple in* Jeruſalem, *and hath rais'd up innumerable others much more excellent. Ye are the Temple of the living God, ſaith the Apoſtle: Beautifie this Houſe, expell every evil reaſoning, that thou mayeſt become an honourable Member of Chriſt, a Temple of the Spirit.* (y) *This New Teſtament far tranſcendeth the Old, for in this there is nothing ſhadowy; not a Corporeal Temple, not Carnal Sacrifices, not Legal Obſervances, but all things are more ſublime and perfect; for this Teſtament wholly conſiſteth of Spirituals.* (z) *The Chriſtian Temple is a pure Body; their Altar an holy Soul; their Images are all ſorts of Virtues.*

(a) *The Temple of God is one great, which is the Church; the other little, which is a Man, that is of the Seed of* Abraham. (b) *The way of the Ancients was, to attribute Temples* (ſuch material Edifices) *to the Heathen, Churches to Chriſtians.* So long as the Chriſtian Church continu'd tolerably Chriſtian, ſhe acknowledg'd no other Temple of God upon Earth ſave only her ſelf and her living Members; but upon her lapſe into Judaical Superſtition and Pagan-like Idolatry, then *a Mundane Temple Religion* (in ſeveral reſpects) was introduc'd. The Chriſtians did not only build their magnificent Churches after the Pattern of *Solomon*'s Temple (which might be done without crime,) nor did they only call them Temples (which in an improper Senſe might be allow'd; but they ſuppoſe their Churches to be properly Temples as the Judaical and Pagan Temples were,) and inſtead of one Mundane Temple which was deſtroy'd, there roſe up in degenerate Chriſtendom Mundane Temples innumerable. The Chriſtians ſymboliz'd with the Jews, and became as they *Mundane Temple Religioniſts*; but with this difference, the Jews were ſuch by Divine Inſtitution, the Chriſtians were inſtituted ſuch by vain and ſinful Imaginations.

For the Chriſtian Churches are not of the ſame Nature and Notion with the Judaical Temple, but with the Jewiſh Synagogues, which were many (whereas there muſt be but one Temple,) and were not inſtituted by the Law of *Moſes*, but were founded in Natural Religion, as the Chriſtian Churches are. (c) *Synagoga* is commonly interpreted *Eccleſia*, a Chriſtian Aſſembly is called *Synagoga*, *Jam.* 2. 2. both the Jewiſh Synagogues and the Chriſtian Churches are Εὐκτήρια, *Oratories*, *Domus Congregationis*, *the Houſes of Aſſembly*, (d) διδασκαλεῖα σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης, *the Schools of Temperance and Juſtice*, and a Synagogue may be called by the Jews (e) בית יהוה *the Houſe of the Lord*, in the ſame ſenſe that Chriſtian Churches are rightly called *Domus Dei*, κυριακά, *God's or the Lord's Houſes*. The Worſhip of God in the Synagogues by the Moral Duties of Religion is of much more affinity with the Chriſtian Worſhip than the legal Ceremonies of the Temple-worſhip. This Temple-worſhip was topical and confin'd to that one place; but the Synagogue-worſhip was like the Chriſtian, acceptable to God in any place. The Temple, its Holineſs and Ritual Inſtitutes of Worſhip are typical; but the Synagogues, their Holineſs, and Inſtitutes of Worſhip were not typical, which ſpeaketh them of like nature with the Chriſtian Churches. * The Temple was the holy place of Worſhip; a Church or a Synagogue is not the holy place of Worſhip, but the place of the Holy Worſhip. Of the Temple we muſt ſay, The Holy Worſhip is appropriated to the Holy Place, and thereby becometh the Holy Worſhip (for the Altar ſanctifieth the Gift:) But of a Church or a Synagogue we muſt ſay, The Place is appropriated to the Holy Worſhip, and thereby it becometh an Holy Place. As the Holy Worſhip is appropriated to the Temple, ſo is the Σέβασμα, or Holy Worſhip objectively underſtood; whence it is no leſs than *the Holy of Holies*; but ſuch Holineſs is incompetible to Synagogues and Churches.

(s) *Euſeb. Dem. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

Heb. 9. 1.

(t) *Selden. de Synedr. l.* 3. *c.* 15. *Grot. Not. in Act.* 7. 48. *Herald in Arnob. p.* 229, 237.

(u) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 6. *præfat.*

(w) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 9. *c.* 38.

(x) Ναὸν ἐπιθυμεῖς ἰδεῖν; μὴ δράμῃς εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, ἀλλὰ γενοῦ σὺ ναός. ἕνα καθεῖλε ναὸν ὁ θεὸς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, καὶ μυρίους ἀνέστησεν ἐκείνου πολλῷ σεμνοτέρους. ὑμεῖς ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστὲ ζῶντος, φησί, καλλώπισον ταύτην τὴν οἰκίαν, ἀπέλασον πάντα λογισμὸν πονηρὸν, ἵνα γένῃ μέλος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τίμιον, ἵνα γένῃ ναὸς τοῦ πνεύματος. *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *c. Jud. or.* 3.

(y) *Multò melius eſt teſtamentum hoc quàm vetus: quia nihil in hoc eſt imaginarium, ut puta non templum corporale, non victimæ carnales, non obſervationes legales, ſed altiora & perfectiora omnia: quia totum quicquid eſt, in ſpiritualibus eſt hujus teſtamenti ratio.* S. Ambroſ. Com. in Heb 4.

(z) *Templum Chriſtianis eſt corpus purum; altare animus ſanctus; ſimulachra verò omnis generis virtutes.* Grot. Not. in Act. 7. 48.

(a) Ναὸς δὲ διττὸν, ὁ μὲν μέγας, ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία· ὁ δὲ μικρὸς, ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ τὸ σπέρμα σώζων τοῦ Ἀβραάμ. *Clem. Str. l.* 7. *p. m.* 538.

(b) *Mos fuit veteribus templa Ethnicis adtribuere, Eccleſias Chriſtianis.* Pamel. Not. in Tertull. de exhort. caſt. c. 1.

(c) *Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. col.* 302, 1983, *&c. Deus dedit mundo Synagogas, quas Eccleſias nominamus.* Theophil. ad Autol. l. 2. p. 93.

(d) *Grot. Not. in Luc.* 7. 5.

(e) *Buxt. de Abbrev. p.* 75.

* *V. Dr. Sherlock preſerv. againſt Popery, par.* 2. *p.* 3 *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 2 *c.* 9.

As the Apoſtles therefore follow'd the Pattern of the Synagogue, and the Government of the Chriſtian Church correſpondeth, not to the Temple Hierarchy, but to the Government of the Synagogues: So the Chriſtian Churches anſwer not to the Judaical Temple, but to the ancient Jewiſh Synagogues; for they ought not to anſwer to the later Jewiſh Synagogues, becauſe the Jews wanting a Temple, yet extremely fond of a Mundane Temple Religion, *(f)* make their Synagogues (by an imitative Ark in them) irregular Imitations of a Temple, and beſtow upon them ſeveral Attributes proper to a Temple.

II. A Mundane Temple is not only *God's Houſe* ſo far and in ſuch a ſenſe as a Synagogue is, *which is an Edifice ſet apart for the uſe of ſerving him, of which he is ſo far the Proprietor:* But it is alſo God's Houſe as *his Houſe-keeping Eſtate and his Houſe-keeping Seat and Manſion.* When God had a Mundane Temple, he was a Mundane Imperial Eſtate, and had Houſe and Lands, and a Revenue of his own, and liv'd in State and Grandure, having his Domeſtick Attendants as Mundane Kings have. God was in his Temple as a King in his Royal Court, or as a Lord in his own Caſtle; it was appropriated to him, as a Mundane Houſe-keeping Eſtate is appropriated to Men, and ſo his Revenue was appropriated: But now God hath no ſuch Houſe, nor Land, nor Revenue; whence a difference muſt be made between conſecrated Goods under the Goſpel and under the Law: For to imploy the Goods of a Temple to charitable uſes, is to be charitable of that which is another's, and is Sacrilegious; but Church-goods being only appropriate to God for the uſe of publick ſerving him, may and muſt be made uſe of as the Service of God requireth; and therefore the Church *(g)* hath always made uſe of *her conſecrated* Goods, to ſerve charitable purpoſes, which is the beſt ſervice to God. Tithes are God's Revenue under the Goſpel as well as under the Law, but not in the ſame Notion; for under the Law they were appropriated to God as an Houſe-keeping Revenue is appropriated to the Owners of it, God out of his own Revenue maintain'd his Domeſtic Servants the Miniſters of his Temple, whereas now they are appropriated to God only as ſet apart for maintaining his Service and Servants. Whence under the Law God was ſole Proprietor of thoſe *bona ſacra* (as being Temple-goods,) his Houſhold Servants were no Proprietors (as the King's are not;) but under the Goſpel they that miniſter the Divine Service are Sub-proprietors of them, *(h)* as appeareth from the uſual forms of their Donation.

A Temple is God's Houſe as being *his Regial Seat of Habitation and eſpecial preſence* (*ſedes & domicilium Dei*;) and in this Notion a Chriſtian Church is ſuppos'd to be a Temple by the Mundane Temple Religioniſts; whence it is intituled, *(i) A Sacred Houſe which is the Lord's Palace*, (the Palace of the great King,) *an Houſe of God wherein he dwelleth in a peculiar manner; The Seat of his eſpecial Preſence: A Temple in the ſame Notion with that of* Solomon (and which is conſecrated in like manner,) *Holy and Venerable and furniſh'd with Divine Virtue, an Image of Heaven, as the Heavenly Sanctuary, or a certain Terreſtrial Heaven.* The Church of S. *Sophia* is by the Vain and Superſtitious Greeks not only compar'd with, but preferr'd before, *Solomon*'s Temple, which they call *(k)* προεκτύπωμα, *a prefiguration of it.* They ſtile their magnificent Church παμμέγιστον τέμενος, *the altogether greateſt Temple*, νέα Σιών, *new Sion*, ἡ τῦ ἁγιάσματος κιβωτὸς, *the Ark of Sanctification, the Church of our Saviour which the Holy Spirit hath built truly firm and inconcuſs upon the Rock of the Apoſtolic Mandates*, τὸ τῆς τῦ Θεῦ σοφίας ἐνδιαίτημα, ὁ τῆς τῦ Θεῦ σοφίας οἶκος, *the Houſe and Habitation of the Wiſdom of God.* They ſuppoſe a Church alſo, to be the Habitation of the Holy Spirit; as appeareth from this form of Conſecration in *Metaphraſtes*; *May it pleaſe the Merciful God, that his moſt holy Spirit may dwell in this Houſe, which we have built in his Name.* The Chancel (that part of the Church) is called by the Greeks *(l) Adytum, not to be enter'd*, ἱερατεῖον, *the Prieſts Peculiarity*, ἱλαστήριον, *the Propitiatory*, *Nec aberraveris, ſi ſanctum ſanctorum dixeris; nor will you miſtake, if you call it the Holy of Holies.* So the Greeks call it, *(m) The Holy of Holies, the Seat and Place of God and his Reſt.* None might enter this holy Place (commonly called the *Bema* or Tribunal) but the Prieſts only, not Women, not Laicks, not the Emperour himſelf, except when he made his Oblations. *(n) But oh grievous* (as one complaineth) *in our Days, wherein Heaven and Earth ſeem to be jumbled, all are at liberty to enter this ſacred Bema contrary to the Religious Conſtitution of the Church Primitive.* Much of this Mundane Temple Religion occurreth in ſome parts of Reform'd Chriſtendom; for uſually in Books of Devotion a Church is confounded with *the Sanctuary* of God; and ſome call it, *(o) The Houſe of his abode, the place where his Honour dwelleth.* When our Saviour ſaith to the Woman of *Samaria*, *Ye ſhall neither in this Mountain, nor yet at* Jeruſalem *worſhip the Father*; ſome ſay, the meaning is, *(p) in all places you may build a Temple, and God will dwell in it. God hath often declared that he loveth ſuch places, that he will dwell in them, holy places being the Reſidence of God's Name upon Earth, there where he hath put it. (q) All our Churches are called Sanctuaries, our greater and Mother Churches* Baſilicæ, *the Palaces where the King of Heaven dwelleth, and where God is a Refuge to his People. In this Houſe God hath put his Name, and made Promiſes to it above all places. I have hallowed this Houſe which thou haſt built, to put my Name there for ever, and mine Eyes and my Heart ſhall be there perpetually. God's Houſe is a little Heaven on Earth, here dwells the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. (r) The place ſet apart for Divine Worſhip is the place where God records his Name. (s) The holy Table or Altar in our Chriſtian Churches anſwers unto the Ark or Mercy-Seat in the Jewiſh Temple, being* ſolium Chriſti, *or in the Language of Antiquity the Chriſtian* Sanctum Sanctorum.

III. But our Chriſtian Churches are much more anſwerable to ſome jejune Temples of the

---

(f) *Buxt. Syn Jud. c. 5.*

(g) *Nam & de vaſis Dominicis propter captivos & quàm plurimos indigentes frangi & conflari jubebat* (S. Auguſtinus,) *& indigentibus diſpenſari.* Poſſid. de vit. S. Aug. c. 24.

(h) *Coke's Inſtit. par. 1. l. 2. c. 6. S. 133. Simon's Hiſt. of Eccl. Reven. p. 47.*

(i) *Domus illa ſacra Domini palatium eſt, Eſt Domus Dei, in qua ipſe peculiari modo inhabitat. In Templis ſacratior & commendatior eſt præſentia Domini. Quod Deus promiſit templo Solomonis ſine dubio promiſit etiam templis Chriſtianorum: nam quod petiit Solomon cùm Templum dedicavit, idem petit Eccleſiâ cùm nova Tèmpla dèdicat. Templum conſecratum merito ſanctum & venerabile, ac divina quâdam virtute præditum exiſtimari debet. Templum Chriſtianorum eſt imago quædam Cœli, quaſi regia Cœli, ſive terreſtre quoddam Cœlum.* Bellarm. de cult. ſanct. l. 3. c. 4, 5. l. 2. c. 9.

(k) *Balſam. in Can. 12. Concil. 7.*

(l) *Guil. Bevereg. Annot. in Can. Concil. Nic. 1. p. 75.*

(m) *Mr. Smith Acc. of the Greek Church, p. 67.*

(n) *Noſtris autem, proh. dolor! diebus, quibus cœlum & terra commiſceri videntur, omnes pro libitu ſacrum hoc bema ingrediuntur, contra ac à primitivâ Eccleſiâ religioſè conſtitutum eſt.* Guil. Bevereg. ſupr.

(o) *Joh. Gregor. Not. & Obſ. c. 31.*

(p) *Dr. Jer. Taylor Great Exempl. p. 222, &c.*

(q) *Mr. Shelford of God's Houſe p. 4, 7, 14, 15.*

(r) *Mr. Mede on Eccl. 5. 1.*

(s) *Idem in Pſal. 132. 7.*

Pagans than to the opulent Temple of God, wherein there was Houſe-keeping and Regial Houſe-keeping, as there muſt be in his Palace or Regial Houſe; (t) wherein there were all things requiſite for a Dwelling-houſe and Houſe-keeping (Regial Houſe-keeping,) a Candleſtick with its Lamps continually burning (to illuminate it,) a Fire continually burning in the Focus of it, a Table with its Diſhes, and Spoons, and Bowls, and Covers, always furniſh'd with Bread upon it, and (as ſome ſuppoſe) with Salt alſo, a numerous train of Attendants having their ſeveral Miniſteries and gorgeouſly apparelled (as in Kings Houſes,) with ſome to keep Watch, Muſick, Odours, Feſtival-days, Meat alſo for the Family, of which one part (conſum'd upon the Altar by the holy Fire that came down from Heaven) was God's Meſs, the other part belong'd to the Prieſts (who being God's Domeſticks ought to be maintain'd by him,) and this Meat was accompany'd with Bread and Drink (Minchah and Libamen,) and with Salt alſo that it might not be unſavoury. But of all theſe things our Chriſtian Churches are ſo extremely unprovided, as ſheweth, that there is no Houſe-keeping there, nor is there any Food in them ſave only what is Spiritual and Celeſtial (as Chriſtians are a Spiritual Houſe and their Sacrifices Spiritual,) which ſymbolizeth not with Mundane Edifices and Dwelling-Houſes; therefore no Mundane Edifice is God's Dwelling-Houſe. If *the Law is now alter'd from Material things to Spiritual*, (u) as ſome ſay, that agreeth not with the Hypotheſis of a Material Temple, but deſtroyeth it; for it implieth, that a Material Temple is chang'd to a Spiritual: Nor are theſe Mundane Temple Religioniſts agreed amongſt themſelves touching that ſpeciality of Divine Preſence, which inhabiteth their Mundane Temples. For,

(1.) Some ſay, it is the Grace of the Holy Spirit, which inhabiteth theſe conſecrated places; and ſo a Material Temple is made to be of the ſame Nature and Notion with a Spiritual Temple.

(2.) Sometimes they ſay, (w) *that a King is there, where his Court is, where his Train and Retinue are: So God is there eſpecially preſent, where his Train and Retinue of Angels encamp and keep their ſtation, which is the true ratio of the Shecinah or Speciality of the Divine Preſence in one place more than another; by this the Shecinah and Special Preſence of the Divine Majeſty is to be defined, and in this only it conſiſteth.* Learned Men have unawares entertain'd this Notion of the *Shecinah*, not conſidering, that it is a meer Device of its Author, excogitated without any reaſon, againſt plain and demonſtrative Reaſon, meerly to ſerve the Intereſt of that Mundane Temple Religion, which prevail'd in his time. For it is a true and proverbial Saying, *that where the King is, there is the Court*; but to ſuppoſe, that the King is there, where-ever his Courtiers are, and that the King's preſence is meerly the preſence of his Train and Retinue, is againſt plain Reaſon, and contradictory to what this Author himſelf ſometimes ſaith; (x) *the Preſence of God is attended with multitudes of Angels, the Guard attending and miniſtring unto his Preſence; whereſoever he keepeth his Station, they pitch round about him.* It claſheth with the moſt plain and demonſtrative Reaſons imaginable: For the Train and Retinue of Angels is either not at all, or not principally the Shecinah and Special Preſence of the Divine Majeſty. In many Inſtances it is not at all the Shecinah or Special Preſence of the Divine Majeſty; as when the Divine Majeſty appeareth to be abſolutely ſolitary (without any Angelical appearance,) or when his Glory maketh a diſtinct appearance from any Angelical appearance, *Matth.* 17. 2. and 18. 10. *Joh.* 1. 14. *Act.* 7. 55, 56. and 26. 13, 16. 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. 1 *Pet.* 4. 14. *Apoc.* 1. 14, 15. *Ezek.* 1. 28. and *ch.* 10. 19, 20. In ſome Inſtances the ſpecial Preſence of the Divine Majeſty is ſo far ſolitary, that it is without any Train or Retinue of Angels, yet it is not abſolutely ſolitary, nor doth it make a diſtinct appearance from an Angelical appearance, but is complicated with one Angel of his Name and Preſence, and in theſe Inſtances (before diſcours'd of) the Train and Retinue of Angels is not at all the Shecinah. There may be a Train and Retinue of Angels without any Shecinah (and in ſuch Inſtances the Train and Retinue of Angels is not at all the Shecinah) *Pſal.* 91. 11. *Dan.* 10. 13. *Matth.* 13. 41. *Apoc.* 12. 7. In thoſe *Shecinahs* which uſually occur in Scripture there is a Train or Retinue of Angels (or a viſible brightneſs which is accounted the appearance of Angels,) which in reſpect of us belongeth to the Shecinah, but is not *principally* the *Shecinah*; for there is in theſe Shecinahs the Divine Majeſty eſpecially preſent (either as complicate with the Angel of his Name and Preſence or otherwiſe,) paramount to, diſtinct from, dwelling amongſt, and attended by the Train and Retinue of Angels; and this Divine Majeſty is principally the Shecinah, *Deut.* 33. 2. 1 *King.* 22. 19. *Iſa.* 6. 1. *Ezek.* 1. 28. *Dan.* 7. 10. *Jude* 14. He that ſitteth between the Cherubims, dwelleth and is eſpecially preſent amongſt the Angelical Hoſts, *Pſal.* 68. 17. *The Chariots of God are twenty thouſand, even thouſands of Angels, the Lord is among them, as in* Sinai, *in the holy place.* Which words of the Pſalmiſt are thus rendred in the Chaldee, *The Shecinah of the Lord reſteth upon them.* The Divine Majeſty eſpecially preſent, dwelling and inthron'd amongſt the Angelical Hoſts, reſting upon them, and attended by them is the Shecinah in the Celeſtial Temple or Tabernacle, *Apoc.* 4. 2. and 5. 8. and 7. 15. Nor was it otherwiſe in the Judaical Temple or Tabernacle (an Image of the Heavenly,) if a Train and Retinue of Angels did conſtantly encamp there. In the firſt Temple a viſible bright ſhining Cloud (a Sign or Symbol of the Divine Majeſty's eſpecial preſence, and wherein the Divine Majeſty was eſpecially preſent) ſeemeth to have reſided upon the Ark between the Cherubims (which δόξα, or Glory was the Shecinah, *the Divine Majeſtatick Glory as dwelling amongſt Men*:) But becauſe there was no ſuch viſible Glory in the Second Temple, therefore the Jews ſay, that the Shecinah was one of the five things that were wanting in it; yet withall they affirm, (y) that in ſome ſort the Shecinah (the Divine Majeſty) did inhabit the ſecond Temple, otherwiſe it could not have been a *Temple*, a place *wherein God recordeth* (or putteth) *his Name.* By the *Shecinah* that inhabited it the Temple or Tabernacle (which was a Portatile Temple) became a *Sanctuary*, and deſerved the Name, which the Idolatrous *Iſraelites* gave to their *Bethel* (Houſe of God) מקדש מלך ἁγίασμα βασιλέως, *the King's Sanctuary*, *Exod.* 25. 8. *Amos* 7. 13. thereby it became the Seat and Habitation of *his Holineſs* (Imperial-perſonal) and of *his Glory*, his Imperial Palace, *the Seat of the Imperial Eſtate of Religion*, where he was peculiarly preſent (as in his place of Reſidence,) to

receive

(t) *Spencer. diſſ. de Theocr. Jud. c.* 5. *l.* 1. *Outram. de Sacrif. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

Pſ. 134. 1.

(u) *Shelford ſupr. p.* 5, 6.

(w) *Mr. Mede on Eccl.* 5. 1. *and on Deut.* 16. 16.

(x) *On Deut.* 16. 16.

Tit. 2. 13. *Matth.* 16. 27.

Exod. 4 34. 1 *Sam.* 4 21. *Pſal.* 85. 1 *King.* 10, 11. *Rom.* 9.

(y) *Buxt Lex. Tal in voce Shecina*

receive Honour and Worſhip, Addreſſes and Oblations, to hear Prayers and to relieve the Needs of Men. And it is not hard, to conceive, how this Speciality of the Divine Preſence was competible to the Judaical Temple; that the Divine Majeſty every where preſent may exhibit himſelf as preſent in one place and not in another, and this he may do according to various modes of preſence, as *viſibly* preſent, as *graciouſly* preſent, as *punitively* preſent, or as *gloriouſly* preſent. So he may exhibit himſelf as *majeſtatically* preſent and inthron'd in a Regial Seat (refulgent with Gold) above the Ark (called his Footſtool) and between the Cherubims, that repreſented the Holy Angels, which attend upon and about the Throne of God. The Throne of God belongeth to his Temple, becauſe his Temple is his Regial Seat of Habitation, whence the Temple is called *the place of my Throne*, and the Throne is mention'd as a principal part of the Temple, *Ezek.* 43. 7. *Iſa.* 6. 1. *Jer.* 17. 12. *Apoc.* 6. 17. The Throne of God therefore and the *Shecinah* are two grand Ingredients of a Temple, both which being utterly incompetible to the Chriſtian Churches, it is certain, they are no Temples. The Temple was a Type; if therefore the Shadows of the Law are vaniſh'd, the Shecinah now reſideth not in any Mundane Temple. If the Jews of old had the preſence of God attended with multitudes of Angels at their Synagogue-worſhip, if the Angels prais'd God with them (as the Jews ſuppoſe they do at this day,) no one would imagine, that this Divine and Angelical Preſence is any ſuch thing as *the Temple-Shecinah*, or that thoſe places are alike Sacred and Venerable as the Temple: Nor may we entertain ſuch Conceits touching Chriſtian Churches meerly upon this ground and reaſon, becauſe *the holy Angels are there* (who are not there as in an holy place, but meerly as in a place of holy Worſhip, and only during the time of it, not with reſpect to the Place, but to the holy People and their holy Service;) much leſs may we ſuppoſe, that the holy Angels take *livery* and *ſeizin* of theſe Houſes and *poſſeſs them in right of God*; or that *the Heavenly Guard encamp in Churches and keep their Rendezvous there as in their Maſter's Houſe*; for if the Heavenly Guard encamp in Churches, they muſt be (z) *caſtra divinæ majeſtatis, the Camp of the Divine Majeſty* (as the Jews call'd their Temple;) which ſpeaketh a Temple-ſacredneſs incommunicable to Synagogues and Churches.

(3.) The Preſence of Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt is ſuppos'd to make our Churches Holy at the rate of the Judaical Sanctuary; Chriſt is ſaid to be *as much preſent here as the Lord was upon the Mercy-Seat between the Cherubims*; the Holy Euchariſt is ſaid to *be the true Ark or Propitiatory, and the Holy Table* is ſaid to be *ſolium Chriſti, and the Chriſtian Sanctum Sanctorum*; which marvellous Imaginations involve in them theſe Abſurdities. Chriſtians may do their Religious Worſhip towards Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt, as well as the Jews did theirs towards the Lord in the Mercy-ſeat. They muſt or may uſe ſuch ſigns of Reverence towards their Churchs, (*a*) as the Jews did towards their Temple. The Elements in the Sacrament are in a Philoſophical Senſe really and ſubſtantially that Body and Blood of Chriſt which is his Perſon, yea they are his Imperial Perſon, and the Holy Table is the Throne whereon he ſitteth. As he ſitteth on this Throne, he is the σέβασμα, *Object of Religious* Adoration; and being preſent in the Euchariſt as much as the Lord was upon the Mercy-ſeat, Chriſtians muſt or may worſhip Chriſt in the Euchariſt; for the Jews worſhipp'd God as in the Mercy-ſeat between the Cherubims. The Holy Table is both an Altar and a Throne; the Holy Euchariſt doth not only repreſent Chriſt in his Humiliation as a Lamb ſlain and ſacrific'd; but Chriſt is there inthron'd in his Majeſtatick Preſence and Exaltation. The real corporeal Body and Blood of Chriſt is ſo far *ubiquitarian*, that it is in all Chriſtian Churches; and Chriſt hath his Imperial-perſonal Reſidence, not only in one place or in Heaven only, but on Earth alſo and in places innumerable. Every Church is Chriſt's Temple, and in this ſenſe a *Baſilica*, it is Chriſt's Palace and Regial Seat, where the intempled and inthron'd Meſſiah ought to be ſerv'd in ſtate and honour, and conſequently in ſome ſuch guize, as the intempled and inthron'd Godhead was ſerv'd on the holy Mount. He is of Mundane Imperial Eſtate, being here externally inthron'd, and every Church and Holy Table in it is the Imperial Seat of our Religion. Chriſtians muſt have their Worldly Sanctuary and *Sanctum Sanctorum* (an Image of the Heavenly,) as the Jews had, and proper Rites of Carnal Judaiſm muſt remain, only the Name Chriſtian muſt be added to them. Not only a Church, but a Crypt, or Vault, or Gravel-pit, wherein the Chriſtians uſually celebrated the Sacrament, is Holy at the rate of the Judaical Sanctuary. Not only Chriſt ſacrific'd, but the Commemoration of Chriſt's Sacrifice is the Chriſtian ἱλαστήριον, or *Propitiatory*. Chriſt's repreſentative Body (the Holy Euchariſt which repreſenteth and exhibiteth his Body) is as properly a Temple as his real Body, and is much more Holy; for it communicateth an Holineſs to the place where it is, which his real Body never did; and this Sanctity which it communicateth (*b*) is a ſemblable Holineſs to that of the Judaical *Sanctum Sanctorum*. But the *Sanctum Sanctorum* of a Mundane Temple is inſeparably connex'd with another eſſential part and property of it, which is *the Oracle*. The *Sanctum Sanctorum* (which is eſſential to a Temple, becauſe it is the Reſidence of the Godhead) may not be actually Oracular; but is neceſſarily (becauſe it is the Reſidence of the Godhead) the place of the Oracle, 1 *King.* 6. 16, 19. and 8. 6. *Pſal.* 28. 2. If there be no ſuch thing as *the Debir* (Oracle) which the *Sanctum Sanctorum* neceſſarily is, there can be no ſuch thing as the *Sanctum Sanctorum* in our Chriſtian Churches.

IV. Mundane Temple Religion is the Soul of Popery. The Religion of unreformed Chriſtendom mainly conſiſteth of the Parts and Ingredients of Mundane Temple Religion; for ſuch are their *Temples, Altars, Super-altars, their Religion of holy Places, the Inſtitution of them, and the Solemnities of their Dedication, their Shecinah, Throne, Propitiatories, their extravagant Conceits touching Burial in holy Places, and the greater availableneſs of private Prayers in them, their Conſecration of Temples to the* Divi, *intempled* Divi, *Images* (ἀγάλματα,) *Pilgrimages, Reliques, holy Oil, Anointings, conſecrate Aaronical Veſtments, their expiation and ſatisfaction for Sin by external Rites, their putting Holineſs and Religion in Meats and Drinks and divers Waſhings* (Sprinklings) *and*

(z) Outram. ſup.

(a) *Nemo in montem Templi veniat cum baculo, aut calceamentis pedum, neque cum mantiſa, neque cum pulvere pedibus adhærente, aut pecuniis linteo involutis.* Cunæus de Rep. Hebr. l. 2. c. 12. Outram. de Sacr. l. 1. c. 3.

(b) *In Euſeb. H. E. l. 7. c. 15. The Chancel or place where the Altar ſtood in a Church is called* ἁγίασμα, *the Sanctuary.*

carnal Ordinances, their Incenſe and Feſtival Days, Church-lights, Muſick, Reverence of Churches, extravagant Rituality, illegitimate Kibla, their Sacrifice, ſacrificing Prieſts, mundane High Prieſt, ſenſitive pleaſing and mundane pompous Religion. Of all which Branches of mundane Temple Religion it would be tedious to diſcourſe; but of ſome of them we ought to make Remarks, eſpecially of thoſe principal ones, without which the Chriſtian Churches cannot be mundane Temples, *Sacrifice, Prieſt and Altar*; for *Temple, Sacrifice, Prieſt and Altar* are Relatives inſeparably connex'd, the one cannot be without the other. The Temple-ſervice properly ſuch is the Service of *Sacrifice* (literally and properly ſuch) with the Appendages thereof. The Miniſters of the Temple are *Prieſts*, and *Temple-Prieſts* miniſter the Divine Service of Sacrifice. *Heb.* 5. 1. An *Altar* is God's Table (the Table of his Meat or Meſs) whereon his Sacrifice muſt be laid and offer'd by his Prieſts. (*c*) Upon theſe Terms the Pontificians pretend, that their Churches are Temples; which plainly ſheweth, that the grand depravation of the Chriſtian Religion is the turning it into *a mundane Temple-religion*, of which *Sacrifices, Prieſts* and *Altars* (in the literal ſtrict and proper Notion) are proper parts and ingredients. For it is a great miſtake, to ſuppoſe, (*d*) that the holy Euchariſt (which is *Epulum Sacrificiale*) is in the proper Senſe *a Sacrifice*. And it is alike miſtake, to ſuppoſe, (*e*) that *Lactantius* calleth a Church *Dei Templum* (for he meaneth not the place (*f*) but the holy People;) and that the Chriſtian Apologiſts, when they deny, that they had any *Temples*, mean only, that they had no Temples according to the Pagan Notion of a Temple, which was an 'Ειδωλεῖον, *an Edifice wherein a Deity was incloyſter'd by an Image.* Agreeably whereto ſome are prone to think, (*g*) that this was the univerſal Senſe of the Pagans, that there can be no Temple without an Image. And ſome ſay, (*h*) *this was the Reaſon why the Chriſtians deny'd, they had any Temples, becauſe the Heathens ſuppos'd, there could be no proper Temples without Images.* But who knoweth not, (*i*) that the Romans had Temples many Years before they had any Images? The old Egyptian Temples (*k*) had no Statues. The People of *Mengibir* have no Idols in their Temples, (*l*) ſaith *Le-blanc.* It is not reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, (*m*) that thoſe many *Indian* and *Bactrian Brachmans* were without Temples, who yet diſallow'd the Worſhip of Images. This was not the Reaſon therefore, why the Chriſtian Apologiſts deny'd that they had any Temples, becauſe the Heathens ſuppos'd, there could be no proper Temples without Images. And this could not be the Reaſon for another Reaſon; becauſe the Chriſtian Apologiſts had the ſame reaſon to diſtinguſh themſelves from Jews as from Pagans; and they manifeſtly intended, to diſtinguiſh themſelves from both by this ſingularity in their Religion; *they had no proper Temples or Altars.* So the Pagans underſtood them, and thus they underſtood their Religion; *that the Jews had a Temple without Images, but the Chriſtians had none.* Therefore *Cæcilius* (looking upon them as heterogeneous from all other Religioniſts) objecteth againſt them; (*n*) *the ſole and miſerable Nation of the Jews they alſo worſhipp'd one God, but they did it openly, with Temples, Altars, Sacrifices and Ceremonies.* (*o*) *It is manifeſt* (ſaith Mr. *Selden*,) *that theſe words do not at all concern the Chriſtians Rejection of the Gentiles Altars, Statues and Temples:* Cæcilius *blameth the Chriſtians, becauſe they had no Temples, no not ſuch as the Jews had, that is, without Images.* (*p*) *Clemens* (with others) applaudeth the Philoſopher *Zeno*'s Dogma, μὴ δεῖν θεοῖς οἰκοδομεῖν ἱερά, *Men ought not to build Temples to the Gods; for that which is but the Work of ſordid Mechanicks cannot be holy and unvile, of any great precioſity or worthy the Gods.* (*q*) Τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τῆς ἀργῆς γίνεται, *theſe are things made of vain and vile Matter: But the Church* (the holy People) *is a Temple of God of great precioſity, not made by any ſordid Artificers Art.* (*r*) *Do not think Wood and Stones to be holy, and Men not ſo: But on the contrary think Men to be truly holy, and Stones to be what they are.* He that diſcourſeth at this rate, certainly meaneth, that there are now no holy places (ſanctify'd by the Sanctity of the Divine Majeſty eſpecially and peculiarly there preſent) contradiſtinct to places of holy Worſhip meerly ſuch. And when he diſcourſeth, that every place is holy, (*s*) wherein we are mindful of God, (*t*) that the Man of Knowledge honoureth God οὔτε ἀφωρισμένον τόπον, *neither in a determiate place*, οὔτε ἐξαίρετον ἱερὸν, *nor in an eximious Temple*, but ἐν πάντι τόπῳ, *in every place*, doth he not manifeſtly diſcourſe againſt the topical Piety of all mundane Temple Religioniſts? When *Origen* diſtinctly anſwereth theſe three Heads of Crimination (*u*) the defect of *Altars, Images, Temples* in our Religion, when he copiouſly diſcourſeth, that our *Altars, Images, Temples* are the Spiritual and Metaphorical, that the holy People are *unicum Dei Templum*, that they do not Worſhip God παρ' ἀναισθήτοις ναοῖς, *in ſenceleſs Temples*, and that they do not build unto God (the Donor of Life) ἀψύχους καὶ νεκροὺς νεώς, *dead and inanimate Temples*, doth he not expreſly diſcard out of our Religion all ſorts of Temples, whether with or without Images, Paganical or Judaical? The Chriſtian Apologiſts well underſtood the Notion of a Temple, and when they affirm, that Chriſtians had no Temples, this is plainly their meaning, (*w*) They had no conſecrate Edifices for Sacrifice; for ſuch Edifices are Temples. (*x*) They had no ſuch conſecrate Edifices, to which *Prieſts, Altars, Images* appertain; for ſuch are Temples, (*y*) they had no ſuch conſecrate Edifices, that are the Habitations of a Deity; for ſuch are Temples. The Habitation of a God is the definitive Notion of a Temple, in this Notion the Chriſtian Apologiſts underſtand it, and therefore affirm, (*z*) that there is no Temple (on Earth) but the Church of Chriſtians, which is qualify'd εἰς παραδοχὴν μεγέθους ἀξίας τοῦ θεοῦ, *for the reception of the greatneſs of the Divine Worth and*

Excellency.

(c) *Bellarm de cult. ſanctor. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *de Miſſa l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(d) *Mr. Mede on Malach.* 1. 11.

(e) *Idem Proofs for Churches.*

(f) *Seld. de Syn. l.* 3. *c.* 15. *S.* 5.

(g) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *Diſſ.* 5. *c.* 6.

(h) *Dr. Stillingfl. Def. of the Diſc. concern. Idol. p.* 476.

(i) *Selden. ſupr. c.* 13. *S.* 4. & *v. Baron. T.* 1. *præfat. S.* 12.

(k) *Marſham. Can. Chr. p.* 34 *Ed. Lipſ.*

(l) *Travails Par.* 2. *c.* 14.

(m) *Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l.* 6. *c.* 10.

(n) *Judæorum ſola & miſera gentilitas unum & ipſi Deum, ſed Palam, ſed Templis, Aris, Victimis Cærimoniiſque coluerunt.*

(o) *Seld. ubi ſupr. c.* 15. *S.* 5.

(p) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 426. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 6.

(q) *Clem. Str. l.* 7. *p. m.* 513.

(r) *Idem* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 42.

(s) *Str l.* 7. *p.* 520.

(t) *Ibid. p.* 517.

(u) *C. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 389. &c.

(w) *Numquid delubris aut Templorum conſtructionibus Deum honoramus? Numquid & beſtias cædimus?* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 6. p. 190. & l. 7. p. 122.

(x) *Quid opus eſt ſupervacuis extructionibus occupare, quæ poſſint humanis uſibus cedere? Quid Sacerdotes conſtituere? Quid ſibi Templa, quid Aræ volunt, quid denique ipſa ſimulachra?* Lactant. l. 1. c. 20. & l. 2. c. 2.

(y) *Templum, inquit, hoc Martis eſt, hoc Junonis & Veneris, hoc Herculis, Apollinis, Ditis: Quid eſt aliud dicere quàm domus hæc Martis eſt, hæc Junonis & Veneris, Apollo hîc habitat, in hac manet Herculea illa ſummanus. Ita non prima & maxima contumelia eſt, habitationibus Deos habere diſtrictos?* Arnob. ſupr. p. 191.

(z) *Clem. ſupr. p.* 514.

Excellency. And uſually thus they anſwer the Pagans Crimination the want of Temples in our Religion, (*a*) that God's true Temple is built of living Stones, his Habitation is the Souls and Bodies of the Juſt, that he ought to be ſeated (intempled and inthron'd) not in vile material Edifices, but in our own Souls; and that our principal care ſhould be, to cleanſe and adorn and repleniſh with God this inward Temple.

The Chriſtian Apologiſts therefore muſt be underſtood, to deny and diſpute againſt all Temples *in the Senſe of mundane Temple Religion, and which are a Branch of mundane Temple Religion*; for this mundane Temple Religion (Judaiſm and Paganiſm) was that which oppoſed and diſputed againſt them, and that which they oppos'd and diſputed againſt: So when they deny and diſpute againſt *Sacrifices*, *Prieſts*, *Altars*, they muſt be underſtood, to deny and diſpute againſt *Sacrifices*, *Prieſts*, *Altars* in the ſenſe of mundane Temple Religion, and which are Branches of mundane Temple Religion. Chriſtianity admitteth of no *Temples*, but Spiritual and Metaphorical, and in a large improper Senſe (in which Senſe our τόποι θρησκεύσιμοι, *places of Worſhip*, may be called Temples;) it admitteth of no *Sacrifices*, *no Prieſts*, *no Altars*, but Spiritual and Metaphorical and in a large improper Senſe, in which Senſe our holy Euchariſt may be call'd *the Sacrifice*, our Presbyters *the Prieſts*, and our Lord's Table *the Altar*. Theſe Names were not unuſual in the Church in thoſe very times when the Chriſtian Apologiſts liv'd, and declaim'd againſt *Temples*, *Sacrifices*, *Prieſts* and *Altars*. But Chriſtians were in thoſe times and are in all times at Liberty, to make uſe of thoſe Names, or not to make uſe of them, to apply them to the Inſtitutes of our Religion, or not to apply them, if their uſe of them doth not befriend the Intereſt of mundane Temple Religion, which is the common cauſe of Judaiſm, Paganiſm and Popery againſt Chriſtianity. During the three firſt Centuries the uſe of theſe Names ſeemeth to have been innocuous: But the Conſequence in after-times, was Fatal and Tragical. For no ſooner was the World come into the Church, but Chriſtianity began to be deprav'd into a mundane Temple Religion conformable to the guize of Judaiſm and Paganiſm. And if the unwary uſe of thoſe ambiguous Names was one occaſion of this horrendous Lapſe and Apoſtaſie of the Church, what can be the effect of perpetuating the unwary uſe of them, but the perpetuating the Church's Lapſe and Apoſtaſie? They properly belong to mundane Temple Religion, ſo far they are Alien from Chriſtianity; and although they may be apply'd to the Inſtitutes of it, yet where there is danger, this ought not to be done without expreſſing a due abatement diſtinction and limitation of Senſe. But to perpetuate and recommend the unwary uſe of them, and to diſpute for the propriety of them (as they are apply'd to the Inſtitutes of our Religion,) what is it leſs than a criminal depraving our Religion, a turning it into a mundane Temple Religion, which it was deſign'd to turn out of Doors.

V. Allegations from Church-antiquity (*b*) to ſhew, that ſome of the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries call the Lord's Table *the Altar* (*Ara*, *Altare*, θυσιαςήριον,) ſignifie little, ſeeing it is manifeſt, that they call it ſo in a large improper Senſe only; and it is plainly demonſtrable, that they could not call it ſo in the ſtrict and proper Senſe without palpable miſtake. (*c*) *For it was never known amongſt the Jews or Heathens, that thoſe Tables upon which they did eat their Sacrifices, were called by the Name of Altars. It is true, an Altar is nothing but a Table, but it is a Table upon which God himſelf eateth, conſuming the Sacrifices by his holy Fire: But when the ſame Meat is given from God unto us, to eat of, the Relation being chang'd, the place on which we eat is nothing but a Table.* In Scripture there is nothing to countenance the Application of the Name *Altar* to the Lord's Table ſave only that place of the Apoſtle. *Heb.* 13. 10. (*We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat, who ſerve the Tabernacle*,) where Altar metonymically denoteth Sacrifice (Chriſt's Sacrifice;) and that of our Saviour, *Matth.* 5. 23. *If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there remembreſt, that thy Brother hath ought againſt thee, leave there thy Gift before the Altar, and go thy way, firſt be reconciled to thy Brother.* This Precept of our Saviour is doubtleſs an Evangelical Conſtitution, but ſuch an one that muſt be underſtood as a *Synecdoche Speciei*; for it doth not oblige the Jews only (during their Polity,) but extendeth it ſelf (*d*) to all God's Religioniſts and to all their Sacra which they muſt bring unto him. They have *Moſes and the Prophets* that have the New Teſtament only (for *Moſes* and the Prophets denoteth in general the ordinary ſtanding means of Salvation,) although they have not *Moſes and the Prophets* literally, ſtrictly and properly ſo called. And our Saviour's Rule touching hearing the Scribes and Phariſees and doing what they ſay *Jure Cathedræ*, extendeth to all Chriſtians and to all times, but doth not imply, that there ſhall be *Scribes and Phariſees* literally, ſtrictly and properly ſo called in the times of Chriſtianity: So our Saviour's Rule touching *bringing our Gift to the Altar* extendeth to all Chriſtians and to all times, but doth not imply, that there ſhall be either *Gift* or *Altar* literally, ſtrictly and properly ſo called in the times of Chriſtianity; for as *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, ſo *Gift* and *Altar* literally, ſtrictly and properly ſo called are meerly things Judaical. So the Greek word us'd in this Text of our Saviour θυσιαςήριον (Altar) in the beſt ſignification of it can ſignifie nothing properly but a Judaical Altar. But this is the Name, which the mundane Temple Religioniſts peculiarly apply to the Lord's Table; for they will have it called θυσιαςήριον, not βωμός. And of theſe two Names they ſay, (*e*) *the difference is real not verbal only; for* θυσιαςήριον, *is the Altar of the true God*, βωμὸς, *ſignifieth ſuch an Altar as the Gentiles were which were* Scabella Sculptilium & Simulachrorum, *Idol-ſtools or Foot-ſtools of their Images, their Idols being placed before, upon or above their Altars.* If this Criticiſm was true and ſolid (as it is not,) it would ſignifie nothing, to recommend the Name *Altar*. For notwithſtanding this difference of the words θυσιαςήριον, is as proper a part of mundane Temple Religion as βωμός, and in the beſt ſignification of it doth not properly ſignifie any thing but a Judaical Altar. The

---

(1) *Clem. Orig. Lactant. ſupra. vid. etiam Lactant. de Ira Dei in fine. Min. Fel. p.* 344. *Tertull. de pudicit. c.* 16. *Cypr. Ep.* 2. *Quod Idola Dii non ſint.* p. 62. *de Diſc. & Hab. Virg. n.* 8. *J. Mart. Apol.* 2. *p.* 101.

(b) Mr. *Mede of the Name Altar. Maſius in Joſ.* 22. 11.

(c) Dr. *Cudw. Right Notion of the Lord's Sup. p.* 55.

(d) *Diſſidentes nullum boni operis ſacrificium Deo immolant, quamdiu à proximorum charitate diſcordant. Scriptum namque eſt, ſi offers munus tuum ad altare, &c.* Gregor. M. in Paſtorali par. 3. c. 23.

Matth. 23. 1, 2.

(e) *Mr. Mede ſupr. Bp. Fell Annot. in Cypr. de Idol. van. p.* 15.

true God and his holy Oracles do not acknowledge any other θυσιαστήριον, but a Judaical Altar; and is not a Judaical θυσιαστήριον, intolerable in Chriſtianity as well as a Pagan βωμός; but ſome mundane Temple Religioniſts of the Chriſtian Church Symbolize rather with the Judaical, others rather with the Paganical Temple-religion. Thoſe of the former ſort are concern'd, that θυσιαστήριον, ſhould be reputed a better word than βωμός; therefore they ſay, that θυσιαστήριον, is the Altar of the true God. But they might as well have ſaid, that θυσιαστήριον, is an *Idol-Altar*; for an Idol-Altar is uſually called by that Name in the Greek Bible. *Judg.* 2. 2. and 6. 25, 28, 30, 31, 32. and 1 *King.* 12. 32, 33. and 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 32. and 16. 32. and 18. 26. 2 *King.* 11. 18. and 16. 10 — 15. and 21. 3, 4, 5. and 23. 12, 15, 16, 17, 20. 2 *Chron.* 14. 3, 5. and 23. 17. and 28. 24. and 30. 14. and 33. 3, 4, 5, 15. and 34. 4, 5, 7. *Ezek.* 6. 4, 5, 6, 13. *Hoſ.* 8. 11. and 11. 1, 2, 8. *Amos* 2. 8. and 3. 14. As θυσιαστήριον, in a vaſt number of places is the Altar of an Idol: So βωμός ſignifieth the Altar of the true God (*f*) in *Philo* ordinarily, (*g*) in *Joſephus*, (*h*) in *Hecatæus*, and in ſome parts of the Greek Bible, namely the Book of *Eccleſiaſticus*, and the ſecond Book of *Maccabees*. But in other parts of the Bible the Greek Interpreters deſignedly abſtain from calling the Altar of the true God βωμός (Bamoth high places being every where infamous except 1 *King.* 3. 4.) But they could not ſuppoſe, that every Altar which they call βωμος, was *the Footſtool of an Image*; for the Altar of the *Reubenites* was manifeſtly no ſuch Footſtool, which Altar is by them called βωμὸς and *an Imitamen of the Altar of the Lord*, *Joſ.* 22. 28. It doth not appear from any of the Pagan Theologers, that their βωμὸς, was neceſſarily *the Footſtool of an Image*: But the contrary is apparent; for thoſe Pagan Temples which had no Images, yet had their βωμοὶ, (Altars,) which are a part of a Temple ſo eminently conſtitutive of it, that in good Authors (as in *Sophocles*) a Temple is ſynecdochically called βωμός. The Name βωμὸς is accommodate to the Altar in Chriſtian Churches; for the place where it ſtandeth, is by the Greeks called βῆμα, which ſurely is near of kin to βωμὸς: Therefore it is the intereſt of all mundane Temple Religioniſts, not to diſparage that Name.

(f) Περὶ μέθης, περὶ βίου Μωσ. περὶ θυόντ. &c. c. 6.
(g) *De Bell. Jud. l.* 6. *c.* 6.
(h) *Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l.* 9. *c.* 4.

VI. Inſtead of the true Light and Lamp of Life, the true Oil and Incenſe, the true Sacrifices and Altars, the true Sprinklings and holy Veſtments, mundane Temple Religion ſubſtituteth umbratil Rituality, myſtical and ſymbolical Rites, and vile Externalneſs of Religion, agreeably to the old mundane Temple-ſervice, which ſtandeth oppos'd to Chriſtianity, (*i*) τὸ μὲν ἦν σκιά, τὸ δ' ἡ ἀλήθεια, *that was ſhadow, this is the truth of things adumbrated by thoſe ſhadows.* As the Day is not a Compound of Light and Shadow (the Shadow of the Night is gone in the Day-time:) So Chriſtianity is not a Compound of Truth and of Shadow, but the Truth and Spirituality of its Worſhip is *oppoſitive* and *excluſive* to the umbratil Rituality of mundane Temple Worſhip (admitteth it not;) ſo that all the care and concern of Chriſtian Religioniſts muſt be about real Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs (*k*) *The whole of their Religion is, to live without any ſtain of Wickedneſs.* But the care and concern of degenerate Chriſtendom hath not been for Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs; they have dealt with the true God, as *Hercules* dealt with the God *Saturn*, (*l*) inſtead of ſacrificing true Men and living Men their blind Superſtition hath ſacrific'd unto God Men of Straw. What *Caſſiodorus* ſaith of the Pagans, is true of the Chriſtians, (*m*) *Religionem ſuam ludicrâ ſimilitudine profanarunt. They have inſtituted ludicrous Similitudes and Reſemblances of the matters of their Religion, whereby they have profan'd it and loſt the Subſtantials of it.* So the Poets Fable, that *Prometheus* offer'd in Sacrifice to *Jupiter* two Bullocks: In the Skin of the one he inclos'd all the Fleſh and Fat of both, the Skin of the other he ſtuffed with Bones. The former of theſe is an Emblem of ſincere Religion, there is Fat and Fleſh in it, Zeal and Charity: The other is an Emblem of the mundane Temple Religion of the degenerate Chriſtian Church, (*n*) which is a bulk of Ritualities, that are dry inſipid Sterilities, which ſtuff a Skin and make a ſhew of a magnificent Sacrifice, but have nothing of ſubſtantial Good in them. They make a ſhew like *Xerxes*'s golden Vine, but are like it, wholly unfruitful. They ſubſerve not the intereſts of Piety, but are in themſelves Vanities and make a vain Religion, which like the vain Luſts of Men is *not of the Father but is of the World.* For it is acknowledg'd, (*o*) that they are Deſcendents from thoſe old mundane Temple Religioniſts the *Jews* and *Pagans*, whence they muſt be called *the Rudiments of the World* (the mundane Religioniſts Rudiments,) and they ought to be depreciated and diſparaged at the ſame rate with the things of the World; for they are τὰ κοσμικὰ πράγματα, *the things of the World*, as S. *Chryſoſtom* calleth thoſe Judaical Gayeties, which S. *Paul* admir'd in his Unregeneracy. *Phil.* 3. But upon his Converſion to Chriſtianity, he forſook both the goodly admir'd things of the World and of his mundane Religion, accounting them (*p*) ἀδιηγήτου φλυαρίας, *of inexpreſſible Triviality.* And he expoſtulateth with the *Coloſſians* ch. 2. 20. *If ye be dead with Chriſt from the Rudiments of the World, why as though living in the World, are ye ſubject to Ordinances?* They that are in the State of Chriſtianity, are in the State of *the dead from the Rudiments of the World* (parted from them, no more ſubjected to them, to regard or obſerve them,) at their entring into the State of Chriſtianity they become *dead with Chriſt* (in Society with him and by Virtue of his Death, whereby the mundane Religion which was the Religion of their Unregeneracy was aboliſh'd, and the new Settlement was made, wherein nothing hath place, but what is new, ſpiritual, heavenly and divine,) yet as if they were *living in the World*, not in the Chriſtian State of the Dead, ſeveral of the *Coloſſian* Chriſtians were ſubject to the mundane Religioniſts Ordinances, which was an heinous inconſiſtence with their Chriſtianity. Chriſtians therefore that anſwer their Name, are far from being alive to them, fond of them, living in them, conteſting for them, making them their Righteouſneſs, multiplying them (as *Lucullus* did his Cloaks,) and are ſo far from doating on theſe ſanctimonious Trinkets, that they are wholly alienated and diſaffected from the mundane Temple

(i) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 5. *p.* 557.

(k) *Quorum omnis religio eſt, ſine ſcelere ac ſine macula vivere.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 9.

(l) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 9. *c.* 28.

(m) *L.* 3. *var. ad Fauſt.*

(n) *In altero nihil præter oſſa arida & nuda reperiuntur quæ nihilominus pellem farciunt, & hoſtiam pulcherrimam & magnificam imitantur. Per quæ rectè notantur externi & inanes Ritus & Cæremoniæ jejunæ, quibus homines cultum divinum onerant & inflant. Res ad oſtentationem potius compoſita quam ad pietatem facientes.* Id. Bacon de Sap. Veter. p. 159.

(o) Baron. ad an. 34. n. 85. & ad an. 58. n. 72, 77. Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep. p. 159. Ed. Oxon.

(p) Jamb. [illegible] 52.

Temple Religioniſts Ritualities. Nor may they admit of any ſuch Rites, which are proper to mundane Temple Religion.

VII. The Church of *Rome* hath Candles burning in her Churches and upon her Altars, (*q*) and in the Greek Church they burn Lamps for the moſt part before the Altar; which although it may ſeem a ſlight Ceremony, yet becauſe (like Incenſe) it is properly a Rite of mundane Temple Religion, it is criminally introduc'd into Chriſtian Churches (*r*) *ad ſacram myſteriorum pompam, to make a pompous God-ſervice.* In mundane Temple Religion this Rite was agreeable, to illuminate and garniſh the Houſe of a Deity, according to that of *Homer*

'Αἰθομένȣ δὲ πυρὸς γεραρώτερος οἶκος ἰδέσθαι.

But it is expos'd and exploded (*s*) not only by ſome Chriſtian Apologiſts, but by the Stoicks alſo, who were no Friends to mundane Temple Religion. Some of them count it madneſs (*t*) *medio lucernam die præferre*, (*u*) *nec lumine Dii egent, & ne homines quidem delectantur fuligine.* As burning Day-light is one incongruity, ſo Candles ſtanding upon Altars that burn neither Day nor Night, ſeem to be another incongruity, and an umbrage of mundane Temple Religion.

Church-muſick (inſtrumental) is diſlik'd by *Aquinas*, (*w*) both as being a ſenſitive Delectation rather than conducive to a good Diſpoſition of the Soul, and as being a *Judaical Rite* peculiar to the Jews Terrene Religion. The Schoolmen upon him ſay, (*x*) that Organs and Muſical Inſtruments were not us'd in the Church in his time (they ſhould have ſaid, not generally uſed,) in Token whereof the Roman Church to this day doth not uſe an Organ before the Pope, ſaith *Cajetan*. The Primitive Chriſtians do not only declaim againſt (*y*) the Pagans Muſick in their God-ſervice, but were ſo abhorrent from ſenſitive Pleaſure, that there was no ſuch thing as Muſick amongſt them. (*z*) They declaim againſt *Pſalteries, Cymbals, Timbrels, Fiſtulæ, Tibiæ* (which the Pagans us'd in their Religious Worſhip,) they acknowledge no other Pſaltery for praiſing God but the *Tongue*, no other *Harp* but their own Spirit, no other *Organ* but their Body. (*a*) *We uſe only the pacific word, whereby we honour God, not any more the old Pſaltery, and the Trumpet and Timbrel and Pipe.* The Author of the Queſtions and Anſwers under *J. Mart.* Name (*b*) diſliketh the uſe of ſinging with ἄψυχα ὄργανα, *inanimate Inſtruments*, and ſaith, it was rejected by the Church. In *Theodoret's* Therapeuticks the ſame account is given of Sacrifices and of Muſical Inſtruments; (*c*) τὰ τῶν εὐήχων ὀργάνων ἠνέσχετο, *he indulg'd them Muſical Inſtruments, not as delighting in their Harmony, but* (as he indulg'd them Sacrifices) *by little and little ſupreſſing Idolatry.* Theſe ancient Writers look upon Church-muſick as a proper Rite of mundane Temple Religion, which yet ſeemeth not to have ſuch a Connexion therewith; and therefore ſeemeth allowable, if it be really ſubſervient to Devotion. But of that ſubſerviency *Card. Cajetan* diſcourſeth very dubiouſly, and not without Reaſon; for even the Organ drowneth the melodious Harmony of Voices, which is better Muſick than it ſelf, and more efficacious to excite Devotion. Which muſt neceſſarily be hugely wanting in thoſe Churches, where the Service of God (the divineſt part of it) is miniſtred by idle Boys and leud Men (that know not God nor his true Worſhip) to the horrible Profanation of Religion, which muſt be God's kind of God-ſervice.

With theſe Rites of mundane Temple Religion (real or reputed) we will connect *the ſolemn Ritual Dedication and Conſecration of Churches*, which muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from their *meerly real* Dedication. If any ſurrender and appropriate an Edifice to the publick Service of God, by Word, Writing, or an Inſcription (as the Pagans uſually made Dedications,) affixing a Title thereunto (which being uſually affix'd in ancient times hath given Churches (*d*) the Name of *Tituli*) this is a Dedication meerly real. But the Temple of *Solomon* had a ſolemn Ritual Dedication (which involv'd in it a Conſecration) with ſolemn Prayer, Sacrifice and Feaſting, which were its *Encænia.* 1 *King.* 8. 63, 64. So the Pagan Temples had a ſolemn Ritual Dedication and Conſecration (*e*) by Sacrifice, Prayer, Sports, Banquets (and many other Heatheniſh Religious Rites:) And as the Birth-day of Princes is annually celebrated, ſo the day of the Dedication of their Temple was an anniverſary Feſtival amongſt them. So the Chriſtian Churches in the time of the Emperour *Conſtantine* are generally ſaid (although a certain Author (*f*) denieth it,) to have had a ſolemn Ritual Dedication and Conſecration, (*g*) the Biſhops far and near were conven'd to *Jeruſalem*, to Conſecrate the magnificent Churches, which that Emperour had erected there; which Conſecration was accompany'd with a πάνδημος ἑορτή, *a Feaſt for all People*, and theſe *Encænia* were celebrated by an anniverſary Feſtival at *Jeruſalem*, whence it ſoon became a cuſtom in all Churches, annually to celebrate the Dedication of their Church. But this whole buſineſs *the ſolemn Ritual Conſecration of Churches* was a novelty introduc'd in the Reign of this Emperour, the Primitive Chriſtians knew nothing of it, as a Divine of our own faith. (*h*) *I do not remember, that I have met with the Footſteps of any ſuch thing in any approved Writer till the Reign of* Conſtantine. If Churches are deſign'd meerly for places of holy Worſhip, a ſolemn Ritual Conſecration of them ſeems not more needful than the ſolemn Ritual Conſecration of Lands, Tythes, Garments, the Veſſels of Miniſtery and other Utenſils of God's Service, of which S. *Auſtin* ſaith (*i*) *ipſo Miniſterio conſecrata ſancta ſunt.* But if the ſolemn Ritual Conſecration of Churches deſigneth to make them holy Places (more than places of holy Worſhip meerly ſuch,) ſuch Conſecration is altogether unlawful; for it is a proper Rite of mundane Temple Religion. In the Church of *Rome* the Conſecration of Churches (*k*) is rather Conjuration than a Conſecration.

VIII. Holy places are ſuppos'd, to recommend the Devotions of thoſe that viſit them, and unclean places are thought ſo inept for Devotion, (*l*) that the Jews dare not utter or think of the Name of God in a place that is not pure; and they ſay, (*m*) *The Heart and Soul cannot be clean an pure, but in a place that* (in imitation of their Temple) *is dedicated to God.* So in the Church of *Rome* Men are allow'd to pray out of conſecrated Churches, (*n*) but not without exception of unclean places. And the Pope's Canon-Law ſaith; (*o*) *It is better not to conſecrate,*

(q) Mr. *Smith Acc.* p.59.

(r) *Baron. ad an.* 58. n. 70, 77. *Betul. in Lactant.* p. 321. *Dall. de Rel. cult. obj.* l. 2. c. 15.

(s) *Lactant.* l. 6. c. 2.

(t) *Sen. de vit. beat.* c. 27.

(u) *Idem. Ep.* 95.

(w) 22æ *Qu.* 91. *Art.* 2. *ad* 4.

(x) *Cajetan. Valent.* T. 3. *Diſp.* 6. *Qu.* 9.

(y) *Arnob. adv. Gent.* l 7. p. 237.

(z) *Clem. pæd.* l. 2. c. 4. *Herald. in Arnob.* p. 104. 274.

(a) Τῷ λόγῳ μόνῳ τῷ εἰρηνικῷ ἡμεῖς κεχρήμεθα, ᾧ γεραίρομεν τὸν Θεόν· οὐκ ἔτι ψαλτηρίῳ τῷ παλαιῷ, καὶ τῇ σάλπιγγι καὶ τυμπάνῳ καὶ αὐλῷ. *Clem. ſupr.*

(b) P. 462.

(c) *Ser.* 7. p. 105, 106. v. *Eraſm. in* 1 *Cor.* 14. 19. *Plutarch. ſept. ſap. Conviv.* p. 150.

(d) *Seld. de Syn.* l. 3. c. 15. S. 4.

(e) *Ibid.*

(f) *Dallæus de rel. cult. object.* l. 3. c. 15. p. 435.

(g) *Seld. ſupr.* S. 6.

(h) *Dr. Cave prim. Chriſtian. Par.* 1. p. 150. *So Selden. ſupr.*

(i) *Ennar. Pſal* 113. *Conc.* 2.

(k) *Dr. Brevint Saul and Sam.* p. 319.

(l) *Buxt. Syn. Jud.* c. 4 & 8.

(m) *Coſri* p. 384.

(n) *Bellarm de Sanct. cult.* l. 3. c. 4.

(o) *Selden. ſupr.* c. 16. *Ariſt. in Can.* 7. *Concil.* 7.

crate, than to conſecrate in a place not hallowed. If Mankind had acquaintance with true Sanctity, they would alſo have a Senſe of their own Excellency, (*p*) and a juſt eſtimate of themſelves, as the Primitive Chriſtians had. But it far'd with the Chriſtians of after-times as with the World of Pagan-religioniſts, who being aliens from true Sanctity loſt alſo the juſt ſenſe of their own Dignity, (*q*) which was a principal Source of their Vice and Wickedneſs in general, but eſpecially of their Idolatry and Superſtition in ſubjecting and debaſing themſelves to things below them; *for having Life, Sence and Reaſon, and deriving their original from Heaven, they ador'd things inanimate, ſenceleſs, irrational and terrene.* And the Chriſtians alſo in the time of the Emperour *Conſtantine* ſo enormouſly debas'd themſelves and their Religion, that they ſunk it into that craſs Superſtition, *the Religion of holy places*; for the ſumptuous and magnificent Churches which that Emperour erected at *Jeruſalem* (*r*) were erected with reſpect to the holy places there. All the places whereon our Saviour's Footſteps were impreſs'd, and the Temple wherein he taught, were reputed Holy; the place where *Abraham* dwelt near the Oak of *Mamre*, was thought a place of eximious Sanctity, and *Paleſtine* was reputed *the Sacro-ſanct Land.* Hence aroſe the blind devotion of making Pilgrimages, and the blind Zeal of going to war for the recovery of the Holy Land, which was thought a work ſo meritorious, (*s*) that it was an undoubted maxim in the Divinity of thoſe times, that whoſoever was ſlain in thoſe Wars by the *Turks* and *Saracens* merited Eternal Life and ſhould wear a Martyr's Crown. In thoſe times the Religion of Holy Places prevail'd amongſt the Chriſtians at the ſame rate with the Jews, (*t*) who ſay of their holy places (which they ſuppoſe inhabited by the *Shecinah*, and that the Angels encamp about them,) *We are bleſſed in them and in the Duſt and Stones of them.* Amongſt the *Muhammedans* a certain Preacher made this Prayer for the Emperour; (*u*) *O God be the helper of our Lord Selim Cham, the Miniſter of* (Mecca and Medina) *two illuſtrious ſacred places:* Which Title was ſo grateful to the Emperour, that at his return from the Temple putting off his own Garments of great value, he ſent them to the Preacher. So all Mundane Religioniſts have their mundane holy places, which they viſit in great Devotion, and by viſiting them ſuppoſe themſelves more holy and bleſſed. A Mundane Temple Religioniſt of our own Nation ſaith, (*w*) *In obſerving Saints Days and in dedicating Temples to God in their Names we have the bleſſed Saints ſtill living and dwelling among us, oh bleſſed we!* To which Exclamation our Saviour will warrant us, to ſubjoyn another, *oh Fools and Blind!*

Of the Religion of Holy Places a principal Branch is an extravagant *Reverence* for Churches (to which yet we owe a reverential reſpect,) which by degrees mounted ſo high, that the Reverence which Chriſtians had for their Churches was ſuch as properly belong'd to the Jews Sanctuary. (*x*) *For a man may not come into the Mountain of the Houſe, with his Shooes on his Feet. It is unlawful for him to ſpit in any part of the Mountain of the Houſe, but he muſt wrap up his Excrements in his Handkerchief. He may not make the Mountain of the Houſe a thorow-fare, to go in at one Door and out at another. Whoſoever had accompliſh'd his ſervice and went his way, did not go out with his Back on the Temple, but went backward by little and little, and went ſoftly ſidelong, till he was out of the Court-yard. All this was for reverence of the Sanctuary. And whoſoever aſſembled into the Court-yard, went ſoftly unto the place, whither it was lawful for him to come, and he was to conſider, that he ſtood before the Lord* (*as he hath ſaid, mine Eyes and mine Heart ſhall be there all Days,*) *and he was to go with dread and with fear and trembling.* The Pagans ſymboliz'd with the Jews in the Rite of *Diſcalceation*, (*y*) they put off their Shooes when they enter'd their Temples. The Turks follow the example of the Jews and Pagans; for when they enter their *Moſques*, they leave their Shooes at the Door, and enter ſome barefooted, others having on a clean kind of Sandal, which they call *Meſth.* At this Day among moſt of the Eaſtern Nations it is accounted a piaculary crime, to tread upon the Pavement of their Temples with their Shooes on their Feet. (*z*) The Pontificians like this ancient Symbolical Rite, and the *Habaſſine* Chriſtians zealouſly practiſe it. None are permitted, to go into their Churches but barefooted, nor is it lawful for them, to ſpit, hawk, or hem in the Church; becauſe the Churches of *Ethiopia* (as they ſay) *are like unto Mount Sinai, where God ſpake unto* Moſes, *ſaying, put off thy Shooes from thy Feet, for the Ground whereon thy Feet tread is Holy.* (*a*) If any of them be riding a Journey, and in great haſte, yet coming near a Church, in reverence to the place, they alight off from their Horſes, and walk on Foot, till they have left the Church a great way behind them. The Turks in their Moſques ſtand as it were immoveable (*nulla tuſſis, nullus ſcreatus, nulla vox, nullus circumacti corporis aut reſpicientis motus,*) if a Turk doth but ſcratch his Head with his Finger, he thinketh his Prayer loſt. (*b*) Amongſt the Pagans it was unlawful, *πτύσαι ἢ ἀπομύξασθαι, to ſpit, or wipe their Noſes in their Temples.* (*c*) It was uſual amongſt them, *to creep on their Knees* towards the Temple; and with *Pythagoras* it was a point of Religion, (*d*) to *kill a Louſe* in a Temple. (*e*) *Saxo Grammaticus* telleth of a certain Prieſt (*Arcon,*) who ſo rever'd the Houſe of his Idol, that he thought it unlawful to draw his Breath in it, as oft as he had occaſion ſo to do, he ran to the Door, that he might not pollute the Preſence of a God with the Contagion of mortal Breath. All theſe Rites of Reverence towards Mundane Temples are of one and the ſame Character, they are the proper Rites of Mundane Temple Religion; and ſeeing there is but one ſort of them (that of the Jews,) that is true Mundane Temple Religion, all the reſt of them muſt neceſſarily be of this Character, they are *baſe and ſervile Superſtition*, of the ſame Nature with theſe other Rites of the Pagans, who in ſome cariers of Devotion towards their Gods (*f*) *lick'd the Soles of their Feet and kiſs'd their Footſteps.* Such illegitimate Devotion is no exemplary Pattern for Chriſtians, who are no Mundane Religioniſts, nor Mundane Temple Religioniſts, and therefore learned and good Men ſhould not teach them (*g*) *to come into the Church as into the Palace of the great King with fear and trembling* (ſo as the Jews are ſaid to come into their Synagogues, (*h*) *horrentes & trementes:* Nor may we with *Gr. Naz.* praiſe his Mother *Nonna* for this, (*i*) *that ſhe never turn'd her Back upon the Altar, nor ſpit upon the ſacred Pavement*, which latter Rite of Reverence implieth a Suppoſition of *Holy Ground*, and both of them are proper Mundane Temple Rites Judaical and Paganical.

IX. *Bowing*

(p) *Lactant. l. 2. c. 1.*

(q) *Ibid. c. 12. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 8. c. 9.*

(r) *Baron. ad an.* 326. *n.* 27, 37, 38, 67.

(s) *Dr. Jackſon of juſtif. Faith pref.*

(t) *Coſri, p.* 55. 58.

(u) *Pocock. Supplem. Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 49.

(w) *Shelford Ser. of God's Houſe p.* 27.

(x) *Maimon. ap. Ainſworth on Lev.* 19. 30.

(y) *Mr. Mede on Eccl.* 5. 1. *Grot. in Exod.* 3. 5.

(z) *Maſius in Joſ.* 5. 15.

(a) *Joh. Gregor. not. & obſ. c.* 31. *Tanta Gentium in rebus frivolis plerumque religio eſt. Plin.*

(b) *Epictet. Diſſ. l.* 4. *c.* 11.

(c) *Sen. de vit. beat. c.* 27.

(d) *Jambl. de vit. Pythag. c.* 28. *p.* 140.

(e) *Joh. Gregor. ſupr.*

(f) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 249, 250.

(g) *Dr. Cave Prim. Chriſtian. par.* 1. *p.* 156.

(h) *Buxt. Syn. Jud. c.* 5.

(i) *Mr. Mede on Eccl.* 5. 1.

IX. *Bowing to or towards the Altar* is alſo a proper Mundane Temple Rite; for they that write in defence of it call it, (k) *bowing towards the Altar whereby we worſhip God, at our ingreſs into his Houſe, and likewiſe at our egreſs, and as oft as we ſtand before the Altar for the performing of Divine Service.* But the Canon recommendeth only (l) *the doing Reverence and Obeyſance both at our coming in and going out of the Church:* Whence it appeareth, that as Men uſe *a Salutatory Bowing* towards one another, when they meet, and when they take their leave: So the thing deſign'd by the Canon is, that we ſhould uſe the like behaviour towards God in his Houſe. This appeareth alſo from the Senſe and Reaſon of this Rite, which one of its principal Aſſerters hath thus expounded: (m) *God's Houſe hath ſomething ſingular from the reſt; ſhould we then come into it as into a Barn or Stable? It was not once good manners ſo to come into a Man's Houſe; for our Bleſſed Saviour, when he ſent forth his Diſciples to preach the Goſpel,* Matth. 10. *ſaid, when ye enter into an Houſe ſalute it; why ſhould we not think it a part of Religious Manners, to do ſomething anſwerable, when we come into the Houſe of God?* In this Account of the Senſe and Reaſon of this Rite it is ſaid, to be *ſalutatory of God in his Dwelling-houſe* (and like the Salutatory Bowings which Men have from us in their Dwelling-houſe,) and if this be the mind and meaning of it, it is a proper Mundane Temple Rite, which cannot lawfully be admitted into the Chriſtian Worſhip. But the Name of a proper Mundane Temple Rite apply'd to this Ceremonial Bowing muſt be underſtood with Limitation; for although it is ſo far a proper Mundane Temple Rite, it involveth the ſuppoſition of a Mundane Temple, and is not receivable into any Religion, which admitteth not a Mundane Temple, yet it is no pious Mundane Temple Rite, as will appear by a ſecond Criminality that is in it.

A *ſecond* Criminality which is in it, is its Original, Kind and Quality; for it is not of *Scriptural* and *Hebraical*, but of *Grecanical* Original, Kind and Quality, (n) ἐξ ἀγέλης ἑλληνικῆς, *of the Grecanic Herd*, τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἀβελτηρίας, *the Grecanic Levity and Vanity* (as a Father ſpeaketh;) which is not the leaſt of its Criminalities. For the Scriptural and Hebraical Bowings were a ſubſtantial worſhipping and ſerving God, as the Hebrew word שחה (to bow) uſually ſignifieth, to do unto God the Duties of his immediate Worſhip and Service. But the Grecanical bowing is ſuch bowing, *which is a turning the ſubſtantial worſhipping and ſerving God into external ceremonial bowing:* For a late Account of the Greek Church ſaith; (o) *A great part of their Worſhip conſiſts in External Adorations, which they call* μετάνοιαι *of which they make two ſorts; the greater, which they call* στρωτὴ *or* ἐδαφιαῖα, *bowing the Body very low almoſt to the Ground; and the leſs, with a little Inclination of the Head and Knee. This they do, when they come into the Church, or when they are in ſight of a Church or Chappel, either upon Land or Sea, repeating theſe words* Ἐλέησόν με κύριε, *or ſuch like.* In the Liturgy call'd S. *Chryſoſtom*'s the Prieſt and Deacon injoyn in the performance of Divine Service προσκυνήματα ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, *that bowings be made before the Holy Table* to the number of forty at leaſt, and there are the like ſupernumerary bowings in the Church of *Rome*. So the *Kaloirs* or Greek Monks (before-mention'd) are under an obligation to perform their μετάνοιαι, or bowings three hundred times every twenty four hours. Of theſe Grecanical Bowings it muſt be ſaid, that they are a turning Religion into impertinent and incongruous cringing and congeying; and ſeeing the Rite of bowing towards the Altar is one of theſe Grecanical προσκυνήματα or μετάνοιαι (Bowings,) as all its Aſſertors acknowledge, it muſt be counted of the ſame Nature and Denomination.

A *third* Criminality is in it; for it introduceth into the Chriſtian Worſhip an illegitimate *Kibla* or *Kebla:* For Chriſtians have this ſingularity in their Inſtitution, which diſtinguiſheth them from all Mundane Religioniſts (Jews, Pagans, Muhammedans,) neither any Quarter of the Sky, nor any Mundane Edifice, nor any Part or Furniture of a Mundane Edifice is the *Kibla* of their Worſhip: Nor do they acknowledge any other *Kibla* ſave only the Throne of God in the Heavenly Sanctuary, where God exhibiteth and preſentiateth himſelf in a poſture for our Addreſſes, *Matth.* 6. 9. *Joh.* 11. 41. and 17. 1. *Heb.* 4. 16. and 10. 19, 20, 21. Hence the Chriſtian Apologiſts reprehend the Pagans (p) not only for the Idolatry of their Worſhip, but becauſe they made ſome terrene thing the *Kibla* of their Worſhip, and did not ſuſpend and lift up their Eyes and Minds to Heaven, where they ought to ſeek God. (q) For not only by paying Religious Adoration to Walls, Stones and Wood, or the Corners of an Earthly Edifice, but by making theſe terrene things the *Kibla* of our Salutatory Adorations (as the Mundane Temple Religioniſts (r) do profeſſedly) in a Criminal Degree εἰς τοὔδαφος καταφέρομεν τὴν εὐσέβειαν, *we draw down Piety from Heaven to Earth*, as *Clemens* ſpeaketh. The Chriſtian Apologiſts therefore diſcourſe, that Heaven is our only *Kibla*; but this the Pagans deny'd, (s) ὡς πρὸς μόνα ὁρᾷν δέον τὰ οὐράνια, *as if our Eyes were only to be turn'd to the Celeſtials*; for that their Gods might be nigh unto them (and live in Society with them) they erected Statues of their Deities, and theſe were their *Shecinah* and *Temple-Kibla*. Beſides which *Temple-Kibla* they had another, which may be called their *Coſmical Kibla:* (t) For although the Accounts which ancient Authors have given of the Situation of their Temples are contradictory to one another, and although in their Religious Worſhip they turned themſelves towards ſeveral parts of the World, yet the *Eaſt* (the Quarter of Sun-riſing) ſeemeth to have been for the main their *Kibla*. (u) So *Zaraduſht* (*Zoroaſter*) appointed for his Fire-worſhippers, that the *Eaſt* ſhould be their *Kibla*. *At the Door of the Temple of the Lord, between the Porch and the Altar, were about five and twenty Men, with their Backs towards the Temple of the Lord, and their Faces towards the Eaſt, and they worſhipp'd the Sun*

(k) Of worſhip. God towards the Altar, p. 2.

(l) Can. and Conſtit. c. 7. 1640.

(m) Mr. Mede on Eccl. 5. 1. S. 3. and on Pſ. 132. 7.

(n) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 6. p. 213. & l. 7. p. 248.

(o) Mr. Smith, p. 213.

(p) V. Dall. de rel. cult. object. l. 1. c. 20. initio.

(q) *Quicunque ſacramentum hominis tueri, rationemque naturæ ſuæ nititur obtinere, ipſe ſe ab humo ſuſcitet, & erecta mente oculos ſuos tendat in cœlum: non ſub pedibus quærat Deum,*—— *ſed quærat in ſublimi. cur oculos in cœlum non tollitis? cur ad parietes, & ligna & lapides potiſſimùm quàm illò ſpectatis, ubi Deos eſſe creditis? Ille* (Deus) *vobis ſublimem vultum dedit, vos in terram curvamini. Humi etenim miſeri volutamini, cùm deorſum quæritis, quod in ſublimi quærere debuiſtis.*

O curvæ in terras animæ & cœleſtium inanes.

Quanto rectius eſt, omiſſis inſenſibilibus & vanis, oculos eò tendere, ubi ſedes, ubi habitatio eſt Dei veri? ne hunc cœleſtem vultum projiciamus ad terram, ſed oculos eò dirigamus, quò illos naturæ ſuæ conditio direxit. Lactant. l. 2. c. 19, 2, 5, 18. *Quia orantes oporteat dicere, pater noſter qui es in cœlis, quid aliud videtur oſtendere, niſi Deum in melioribus mundi partibus requirendum?* Orig. περὶ ἀρχ. *l.* 2. c. 4. *Rectum te Deus fecit, & cùm cætera animalia prona, & ad terram ſitu vergente depreſſa ſunt, tibi ſublimis ſtatus, & ad cœlum atque ad Deum ſurſum vultus erectus eſt; illuc intuere, illic oculos tuos erige, in ſupernis Deum quære.* S. Cypr. ad Demetrian.

(r) *Mr. Mede on Pſal.* 132. 7.

(s) *Phid. ap. Dion. Chryſoſt. Ser.* 12.

(t) *Selden. de Syn. l.* 3. *c.* 16. *S.* 2. *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 6. *c.* 2. *S.* 4.

(u) Pocock Spec. p. 148.

toward the Eaſt, ſaith the Prophet, *Ezek.* 8. 16. *Moſes autem & Hebræi occidentem ſpectari conſuerunt*, (*w*) ſaith *Alexander ab Alexandro.* (*x*) The Jews ſay, *that* Abraham *dedicated the* Weſt, *which is the Region towards which Men ought to pray*, *majeſtas divina eſt in occidente*; which is ſo far true, as that the Entrance of their Temple was towards the *Eaſt*, and their *Sanctum Sanctorum* (which was their *Kibla*) was ſituate in the *Weſt*, (*y*) the Stairs of their Altar alſo looked towards the *Eaſt*, that ſo the Prieſt in his miniſtration might turn his Face towards the *Weſt*, *Ezek.* 43. 17. But if we will ſpeak accurately as things ſtood in the Jews Religion, we muſt affirm, that neither *Weſt* nor *Eaſt*, nor any other part of the World, was the Jews *Kibla*, nor had they any Coſmical *Kibla*; (*z*) but (as the Book *Coſri* diſcourſeth) *The* Iſraelites *bowed themſelves before the* Shecinah, *when they ſaw it. As the Pagans directed their Devotion to an Image, ſo the* Iſraelites *when they came ought of* Egypt, *look'd towards and bow'd before the Pillar of a Cloud and of Fire*; *and in like manner they had before them the Pillar of a Cloud which deſcended upon* Moſes, *when God talked with him. Afterwards the Ark was made, to be to them a viſible thing, before which they might perform their Devotion.* The *Shecinah* therefore reſiding in their Temple and more eſpecially in their *Sanctum Sanctorum*, was their *Kibla*; and conſequently, if any of them had their abode *Weſt* of their Temple, they muſt neceſſarily worſhip towards the *Eaſt*; for in performing their Religious Worſhip they were bound to turn their Faces towards their Temple, 1 *King.* 8. 44. *Pſal.* 5. 7. and 28. 2. and 138. 2. *Dan.* 6. 10. 3. *Eſdr.* 4. 54.

X. The Inſtitution of the Old Temple Service (by the Grandeur and Ornaments of the Structure, the Richneſs and Coſtlineſs of the Utenſils, the Splendor and Sumptuouſneſs of the Prieſts Veſtments, their ſtately mode of Miniſtration, and the Silver Trumpets ſounding over the Sacrifices ſuperlatively Pompous and Magnificent) was agreeable to the Mundane Religioniſts Genius, that magnifie and admire the goodly ſpecious things of the World, deſpiſe Sanctity in an homely dreſs, and where they ſee not a Temple-ſtate and Stateline ſs of Religion, are prone to imagine, (*a*) *that there is none at all.* So it far'd with the Pagans (who counted the Primitive Chriſtians Atheiſts or without a God and a Religion, becauſe they were without a Temple-ſtate and Statelineſs of Religion;) and for the Jews that were (*b*) περὶ τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἐπτοημένοι, *aſtoniſh'd admirers of the things ſenſible*, a ſtately and magnificent God-ſervice was requiſite, that they might be admirers of their own Religion, and thereby might be kept from being allur'd to the Pagans Idolatrous God-ſervice by the Splendor and Gaiety thereof; (*c*) for their God-ſervice ſeem'd to be as ſumptuous as Riches could make it, they oſtentated their Magnificence in it, beſtow'd all their Pretioſities upon it (*laviſhing Gold out of the Bag*, Iſa. 46. 6.) and at the ſame rate the Pagano-Chriſtians adorn and furniſh their Mundane Temple-ſervice. (*d*) *This Error is deriv'd unto us, to ſuppoſe Religion in Riches.* (*e*) It is thought a Pious Work, to adorn the Temples of God at an immenſe rate, becauſe the Tabernacle and Temple, and the Garments of the Prieſts appertaining thereto were refulgent with Gold, Silver, precious Stones, Silk, Purple, fine Linen and Cedar. They were made of the choiceſt Materials and with the moſt exquiſite Art, and ſeem to have outvy'd the Pagans Mundane Pomps, as much as the Chriſtians Mundane Pomps ſeem to outvy the Judaical; (*f*) for the Glory of the latter Houſe (which is the Church of the Gentiles) *in reſpect of* the Mundane Pomp of her Churches is ſaid to be greater than the Glory of the former. (And accordingly, to keep a decorum, the Prieſthood in the Church of *Rome* have deriv'd upon themſelves (*g*) that extravagant Pomp and State which the *Roman* Prieſts had in the time of Paganiſm.) So *Juſtinian* ſuppos'd, when upon the dedicating his Temple of S. *Sophia* he boaſted in a rapturous tranſport of Joy, (*h*) O Solomon, *I have got the better of thee.* But ſuch a rapturous Gloriation (doubtleſs) had better become a Pagan than a Chriſtian Emperour; for to glory in the Magnitude and Pulchritude, the Splendor and Richneſs of Temples, is properly a Pagan, not a Chriſtian Gloriation; or rather it is proper to the worſer ſort of Pagans; for the better ſort of them were ſo wiſe, and had Virtue in ſo high eſteem, that they deſpis'd and diſaffected External Mundane Glories (*totam cum auro ſuo terram*;) they ſuppos'd, that there is a wiſe and virtuous deſpiſing and diſaffecting Mundane Pomps in Religion as well as Life (wherein their great Virtue was εὐτέλεια, *to abandon all Superfluities*, and to be (*i*) πόῤῥω τῆς πλουσιακῆς διαγωγῆς, *far from the rich and opulent way of living*;) ſome of them were ſo far from adorning their Temples with Gold, (*k*) that they made it unlawful, to bring any Gold into their Temples, they that entred into them muſt lay aſide their Gold;) and ſome of them ſatyrically inveigh againſt offering to the Gods thoſe Mundane Pretioſities, for which they have neither eſteem nor uſe, and againſt ſuppoſing them to be delighted with a ſumptuous and delicate Worſhip. (*l*) *Plato* caſteth Gold and Silver out of Temples, as ἐπίφθονον κτῆμα, *an invidious Poſſeſſion*, Ivory he rejecteth as οὐκ εὐχερὲς ἀνάθημα, *an inept Donative*, Iron and Braſs he diſcardeth as πολέμων ὄργανα; *the Inſtruments of Wars*; he alloweth the Images of the Gods to be made only of Wood and Stone, and no other Oblations to be made to the Gods ſave only ἀναθήματα ἐμμελῆ, *moderate Donatives.* He alloweth not therefore the heights of Mundane Pomp, to be introduc'd into the Pagans publick God-ſervice; which is a good Rule and a juſt Meaſure fit to be obſerv'd in the Chriſtian's Religious Worſhip.

For they muſt be alien from the ſenſitive pleaſing and mundane pompous way of living (which carnal and mundane kind of Men eſteem and affect,) ſo far as it is alien from Chriſtian Sanctity; and in the ſame degree and meaſure they muſt be alien from a ſenſitive-pleaſing and mundane pompous way of God-ſervice, which carnal and mundane kind of Religioniſts affect and admire: For although nothing of this World's Pretioſities and Pomps is too much for God and his Service, nor is any of them too much for the Saints of God; yet as God hath not alloted to his Servants a ſenſitive pleaſing

and

(w) Genial. Dier. l. 4. c. 17.

(x) Selden. ſupr. S. 1.

(y) Spencer. ſupr. l. 2. c. 7. S. 1. in fine.

(z) Coſri, p. 186, 55, 267.

(a) Lactan. l. 2. c. 7.

(b) S. Chryſoſt. T. 5. p. 514.

(c) Herald. in Arnob. p. 232, 254.

(g) Ibid. n. 79.

(h) Mr. Smith Acc. of the Gr. Church, p. 58.

(i) M. Ant. l. 1. S. 3.

(k) Caſaub. in Perſ. Sat. 2. p. 219, 220.

(l) Spencer. Not. in Orig. p. 10. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 3. c. 8.

Τὸ εἰκὸς ἡ φύσις ἐπιποθεῖ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τὸ πολυτελές. Nature affecteth what is fit, not what is fine. Myſt. Epiſt.

(d) *Qui quidem error ad nos uſque tranſivit, ut religionem in divitiis arbitremur.* S. Hieron. com. in Jer. 10. 4.

(e) *Opus bonum & pium ex genere ſuo eſt, ingentibus ſumptibus Templa Dei ædificare aut ornare, probatur primò ex Teſtamento veteri: nam Deus voluit Tabernaculum ornatiſſimum eſſe, ita ut omnia ferè inſtrumenta ſanctuarii aurea eſſent, uſque ad emunctoria lampadum; cortinas autem Tabernaculi & veſtes ſacerdotis eſſe voluit pretioſiſſimas ex ſerico, byſſo, purpura, gemmis.* Bellarm. de cult. ſanct. l. 3. c. 6.

(f) *Ex quibus omnibus plane apparet, hac quoque ex parte noviſſimæ domus, nempe Eccleſiæ gentium, eſſe gloriam majorem quàm primæ, cum ſuperet numerus & pretium vaſorum Romanæ Eccleſiæ (ut prætermittam de cæteris ubique locorum in orbe diffuſis Eccleſiis) vaſa Templi à Solomone collata.* Baron. ad an. 324. n. 71.

and mundane pompous Life, but he hath appointed a contrary kind of Life to be their Life: So he hath not allotted to them, or appointed for them ſuch *a ſenſitive-pleaſing and mundane kind of God-ſervice*, as the Old Temple-ſervice was (both Judaical and Paganical,) but a contrary kind of God-ſervice; for ſuch is the Holy Spiritual God-ſervice, which is the Chriſtian Sanctity. The Chriſtian Sanctity is ſo far alien from theſe ſenſitive pleaſing and mundane Pomps, that it admitteth not a Mundane Temple, of which they are the proper Ornaments and Furniture; it totally aboliſheth all the Pomps of the Judaical God-ſervice, ſlighteth and diſaffecteth them as mundane Pomps and looketh upon them as ἀλλότρια, *things alien*. So the Chriſtian Apologiſts vilifie and diſparage all the Pagans Mundane Pomps in Religion, (*m*) *as Earth and of the Earth*, & *ex fæce ultima vilioris materiæ concreta*, (*n*) their Temples refulgent with Gold, *as ſenceleſs Temples admir'd by ſenceleſs Men*; and teach that Virtue conſiſteth (*o*) in abſtaining from and contemning theſe Vanities, that are the proper Portion of the Wicked, & *calcanda terrena ut cœleſtia conſequamur*. Chriſtians muſt be alien from them, ſo far as their Sanctity is alien from them, which is in great degree; it eſſentially conſiſteth in *deſpiſing and diſaffecting them*, which cannot be without diſcarding the Heights of them out of their Lives and Religion. This they are oblig'd to by every Branch of their Character (as they are humbled Sinners, Chriſt's followers, the Religioniſts of the Croſs, regenerate and mortify'd Chriſtians, Aliens from the World and crucify'd to it, Spiritual and Divine Religioniſts;) for if they are humbled Sinners, a God-ſervice that is in great degree delicate and mundane Pompous is to them as incongruous, (*p*) as Oyl and Frankincenſe (which import Delicacy and Magnificence) were to *the Sin-offering*, *Lev.* 5. 11. (*q*) The Jews were not the Religioniſts of the Croſs and of a crucify'd Saviour, whoſe true admirers and lovers cannot be the World's admirers and lovers, the thoughts of his Croſs put them out of conceit with Mundane Pomp and Pleaſure; nor can they think highly of a mundane proſperous Condition as the moſt excellent and deſirable Condition and the way to Happineſs (theſe things being alien from him, and incongruous to him, who had nothing of them, but was in the quite contrary State, and only taſted of the World's Adverſities;) if the Church affecteth, to be very high and pompous in the World (even in her God-ſervice,) ſhe doth not affect Aſſimulation and conformity to Chriſt (nor a Chriſt-like Condition) which is her true Excellency and Felicity. *Celſus* reporteth, (*r*) That it was uſual with every one of the Chriſtians in his time, to ſay, *The World is crucify'd unto me, and I unto the World*. They have renounc'd the World and look upon it with Eſtrangement, in great degree they are alienated from it and out of love with it, (*s*) διαπτύοντες κόσμον. τὰ φαινόμενα κάλλη διαπτύοντες. *ſpitting upon the World and theſe appearing Fineries* (which Phraſes denote a very great Diſdain and Vilipendency,) deſiring it but little, and but little of it (and that little for God and Piety,) not making any great reckoning of this World, nor caring much for it (no more than Piety alloweth and requireth:) but do they renounce the Pomps and Vanities of the World at this Chriſtian rate, who at an high rate introduce them into Religion? into the Religion of renouncing and deſpiſing them? Do they underſtand their Buſineſs, their true Excellency and Glory (which is to contemn and overcome the World,) whoſe Glory is to ſhine in Mundane Pomp and Glory? Or do they believe the World, to be ſo vain, and vile, and bad as it is, who mix with it ſo intirely, that they will have the Church a Mundane Gallant, and count it her Excellency, to be like the World? So one of *Apelles*'s Scholars that was to draw *Helena*'s Picture, painted her πολύχρυσον, and made a Golden *Helena*; whereupon his Maſter told him, (*t*) *O young Man, not being able to paint* Helena *beauteous, thou haſt made her rich:* And in like manner the Church inſtead of ſhining in her native beauty hath been bedeck'd conformably to the World *with the luſt of the eye and the pride of life.*

The Church's native beauty is her Chriſt-like Sanctity (Innocence, Humility, Purity, Devotion, Heavenly-mindedneſs and Contempt of the World, due Severity and ſtrictneſs of Life, Self-denial, Patience and Charity that ſeeketh not her own;) and as a Chriſtian's habit ought to be ſuch (*u*) as ſheweth his Humility (the virtue of his Mind:) ſo the Church's exteriour Ornaments ought to be ſuch, that her Divine Virtues (not the contrary Vices) be reſplendent therein: elſe they will claſh with her Sanctity, as that gorgeous apparel did, and thoſe gariſh dreſſes wherewith Women profeſſing Chriſtianity in the primitive times adorn'd their Bodies, which made them ſo fine, that they were the worſe for it (ſo the Jews (*w*) ſpoil Letters by adorning them,) a faſtuous or voluptuous ornamental pompouſneſs is not the grace, but the diſgrace of a Chriſtian Church, like that of the feminine Gallants, who were (*x*) δι' εὐσχημοσύνην ἀσχήμονες, *made vile by their pulchritude*. So if Chriſt had been adorn'd with this World's pulchritudes and pretioſities, his Ornaments would have vilify'd him, not adorn'd him (for they would have made him a mundane and mundane pompous Prince:) So the Jews Temple-worſhip was a mundane pompous Sanctity, and therefore is not to Chriſtians venerable but contemptible. (*y*) So ſome ſlender Ornaments and Accompliſhments (ſinging and dancing) are to great Perſonages unornamental and uncomely, as puerile Ornaments are to grown Men according to the Arabick Proverb (*z*) *Major eſt Amrus quàm ut torque induatur.* The Chriſtian Sanctity refuſeth all faſtuous and voluptuous pompous Ornaments, (*a*) as Virtue and Philoſophy refuſeth all faſtuous pompous Rhetorick: So the Legend ſaith (*b*) that our Saviour's Footſteps remain'd upon Mount *Olivet* (whence he aſcended to Heaven,) and when a Temple was built upon it, that place was left without a pavement, becauſe the Ground threw off *quicquid ad ornatum loci deſuper poneretur, whatever was laid upon the place, to adorn it.* Sanctity in its native Simplicity is the Church's Ornament; the mundane Goods and Ornaments, (*c*) which are but ſordid ſecular trifles, theſe are not the valuable and deſirable Ornaments, nor the Churches proper Goods and Ornaments. But they

that

Heb. 9. 1.

(m) Clem. Προτρεπ. p. m. 28. Arnob. l. 6. p. 191.

(n) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 391.

(o) Lact. paſſim & l. 2. c. 19.

(p) Hottin. de Jur. Heb. Lex. 129. p. 171, 172.

(q) *Neque vero mihi aliquis opponat dives in Judæa templum, menſam, lucernas, thuribula, patellas, ſcyphos, mortariola, & cætera, ex auro fabrifacta. hinc hæc probabantur à Domino, quando ſacerdotes hoſtias immolabant & ſanguis pecudum erat redemptio peccatorum. Nunc vero cum paupertatem domûs ſuæ pauper dominus conſecrârit, cogitemus crucem ejus & divitias lutum putabimus.* S. Hieron. ad Nepotian. Ep. 2.

(r) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 273.

(s) Nilus de cauſ. Diſſ. Eccl. l. 1. & de primat. Pap. l. 2.

(t) Ὦ μειράκιον, μὴ δυνάμενος γράψαι καλὴν, πλουσίαν πεποίηκας. *Clem. pædag. l.* 2. c. 12.

(u) *S. Baſil. Reg. fuſ. diſp. interrog.* 22.

(w) *Simon. Hiſt. Crit. l.* 1. c. 23.

(x) *Gr. Naz. or.* 19. p. 300.

(y) *Tiraquell. de nobil. p.* 502.

(z) *Pocock. ſpec. p.* 347.

(a) *Plut. de profect. p.* 78, 79.

(b) *Baron. ad an.* 326. *n.* 40.

(c) *Res vulgares, rerum ſordes, mundanæ ſordes, indigna, plebeia, frivola, humilia, ſtultiſſima, caduca, prophana, ethnica, aliena, peſtifera.* Eraſm. Adag. chil. 3. cent. 3. 1.

that reliſh not the Divine Goods and Ornaments, have Notions of the Church's Goods and Ornaments like thoſe Ideas, which are in the Church of *Rome* of Chriſt and the holy Apoſtles. Who are thought to have inſtituted, (d) that Biſhops in their ſacred Miniſtrations ſhould wear a rich and coſtly Mitre, (ſhining with Gold and precious Stones;) and it is thought, that the Apoſtles themſelves wore a Plate of pure Gold, like that which the Jews High Prieſt had on his Head (which is call'd a Crown, *Exod.* 29. 6.) in Token that they were Kings and Prieſts, and that they wore this Golden Plate or Crown, when they miniſtred Divine Service. So our Saviour's ſeamleſs Coat is thought to have been of precious Stuff and of a curious Texture; the Cup wherein he gave the Wine at his laſt Supper is thought, to have been a Silver Cup; and a rich Charger is thought to have been the Diſh wherein he had his Diet ſerved. (e) So the Church is thought to be adorn'd, not by the Sanctity of the People, the holy Doctrine and holy Life of the Prieſthood, but by their ſumptuous Houſes, high Living, pompous Equipage, and ſplendid Gallantry, *and by Altars ſhining with Gold and precious Stones. O marvellous Luſtre of the Church!* (f) But *Solon* ſeeing the Houſe of *Crœſus* richly adorn'd, did not preſently ſuppoſe, that the Maſter of it dwelt happily; for he deſir'd rather, to ſee Goods that were in him, than thoſe about him. He did not τὰ τεκτόνων ϗ λιθοξέων ἔργα περινοστεῖν, *look about the Works of Artificers and Lapicidaries*, but his Eye was upon the internal Ornaments. So the wiſer Pagans did not think, (g) that ſumptuous Buildings were Ornaments of a City comparable to virtuous Citizens. So the exteriour Ornaments of the Church are but a trifle in compariſon of the Holineſs and Happineſs of Souls, which is the buſineſs of the Chriſtian Prieſthood, and not their own external Glory, nor the Splendour and Glory of Churches. (h) *If a Phyſician cometh into a Sick Man's Houſe* (ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom*,) *and inſtead of taking care of the Sick, falleth to whiten the Walls and incruſtate the Roof with Gold, would you not ſay to him, Man raiſe up the Sick*, τί τὴν οἰκίαν καλλωπίζεις; *what is your meaning to adorn the Houſe?* Throughout the Chriſtian Religion and Diſpenſation of things God hath diſparag'd all mundane Splendour; a moderate degree of it may well ſuffice a Divine People (i) *that are in another manner wiſe, rich and potent than the World is*; this therefore ought to be the Church's Meaſure, and they are no Friends to God and the Intereſts of Religion, that will deny her ſuch a meaſure.

CHAP. XII.

1. An Idea of the Original Creation of God. The Firſt Notice thereof. 2. A Second Notice thereof. 3. A Third Notice thereof. Some unwiſe Conceits of Heaven rejected. 4. The Adumbrations of Heaven in Scripture. 5. The Heaven of Beatitude defin'd. 6. A Fourth Notice of God's Original Creation. 7. A Fifth Notice of the Original Creation, that it founded a City and Polity, with the Proofs of it. 8. A Sixth Notice of it, that it founded the Original Kingdom of God, which is an uſeful Name of the Church or City of God. 9. Of the Law of the Original Kingdom of God.

1. THE Original Creation of God is in the main of it a matter of great certainty, but as in other matters of remote Antiquity there are ſome things in it, that are only matter of probable Conjecture. There muſt be therefore a mixture of great Certainties with ſome little Uncertainties in our Idea thereof. The Summary of which we will compriſe in this following Theorem.

God's Original Creation
- Produc'd
  - The Starry and Planetary corporeal Univerſe.
  - An Univerſe of Intelligent Minds or Souls.
  - The Heaven of Beatitude and Immortality.
- Iſſued from Paternal Sanctity and from Parental Providence.
- Was Political (Theopolitical) as well as Phyſiological.
- Founded the Original Kingdom of God, which is an uſeful Name of the City or Church of God.
- Was Anti-Moſaical or disjunctively antecedent to the Formation of our Earth.
- Produc'd human Souls as well as the holy Angels.

Of this Original Creation *the Firſt Notice* is of great certainty; for the vaſt corporeal Univerſe which now is, and which in great part we behold with our Eyes, conſiſteth of an Heaven of fix'd Stars and of ſeveral Planetary Regions Primary and Secondary. Of which vaſt Univerſe there are ſome Inhabitants, that might be produc'd, and ſome parts of it that might be form'd and furniſh'd not till long time after the Original Creation of the Univerſe (the firſt Conſtitution of it:) But the Heaven of fix'd Stars mainly conſtituteth the corporeal Univerſe, and therefore neceſſarily belongeth to the Original Creation of it. So an ancient Writer obſerveth (k) *that God's Works are not like ours, for we begin at the bottom, but God beginneth at the top*; whereby he meaneth, that Heaven was made in the firſt place, which may be argu'd from the Excellency and (ſuppos'd) Divinity of it. For the Pagans ſtruck with Admiration of its amplitude, pulchritude, ſublimity, influence and regular Motion (real or apparent) attributed nothing leſs than Deity to it; the Excellency of it was the grand occaſion of their Idolatry. (l) *Anaxagoras* ſpent many Nights in the Contemplation of it, and thought it the principal good of Life θεωρῆσαι τὸν οὐρανὸν ϗ τὴν περὶ τὸν κόσμον τάξιν, *to ſpeculate the Order of the World and Heaven eſpecially*, which is aptly called by *Philo* (m) κόσμος ἐν κόσμῳ, *an ornamental World in a World.* (n) The Pythagoreans made it a Rule of their Life, *every Morning to look up to* (the Starry) *Heaven, to mind thoſe things that are always the ſame, and are always doing their Work in the ſame manner,* and to learn from them *Order, Purity and Nudity,* οὐδὲν γὰρ προκάλυμμα ἄστρου, *for a Star hath no veil or covering.* The Religious Philoſophers therefore as they attributed Divinity unto, ſo they learned much of their Divinity from the Starry Canopy of Heaven; and they that were no great Religioniſts, yet look'd upon the Starry Region of Heaven as σῶμά τι θεῖον, *a certain Divine Body,* (o) as *Ariſtotle* calleth it. Who alſo ſaith, (p) *this was the Opinion of all the Ancients, that Heaven is a Divine thing and appertaining to the Divinity.* Chriſtians do not ſymbolize with *Ariſtotle* and the ancient Pagans in their extravagant Aſcriptions of Divinity to the celeſtial Matter and the heavenly Bodies, yet they make uſe of the ſame Phraſes that the Pagans did, to expreſs a ſuperlative Nobleneſs and Excellency, *Cœlo lapſum, è Cœlo deſcendit* γνῶθι σεαυτόν. In Conſort with the Pagan Theologers they ſuppoſe the heavenly Bodies the moſt noble and excellent of all things ſenſible, that Heaven is the Seat of the Divinity of Beatitude and of the Bleſſed, (q) ὁ τῶν θείων θησαυρὸς ἀγαθῶν, *the Treaſury of the Divine Goods,* and that there is no compariſon between Earth and Heaven. Whence ordinary Reaſon will infer, that we ought to attribute (r) τῷ μὲν οὐρανῷ τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς γενέσεως, *the Honourary Seniority of generation unto Heaven. Philo* inferreth from Paganical Grounds (chiefly,) that Heaven was firſt created. (s) *For it was reaſonable, it ſhould be firſt generated, as being the beſt of the things that were made, and conſiſting of the pureſt ſubſtance; whence it was deſtinated, to be the moſt ſacred Houſe of the Gods, both the inviſible and viſible.* The Houſe of the viſible Gods is chiefly the Region of the fix'd Stars, of which none can reaſonably make doubt, but that it belongeth to the Original Conſtitution of the Univerſe: But ſome are prone, to think, that in this Original Conſtitution of the Univerſe there were only lucid Stars, no Planets (Primary or Secondary,) but that the dark Planetary Globes emerg'd by the extinction of ſome Stars, that were invelop'd by the Concretions of opacous Matter, and were abſorpt and drawn into our Vortex (or Syſtem) and ſo made the Sun's *Satellites.* But this Hypotheſis is not reconcileable with Providence; for it is not likely, that the immenſe Wiſdom and Goodneſs of Providence fram'd an Univerſe without providing an Habitation for the Brute-animals; nor could the Univerſe be a beauteous Syſtem without Planetary Earths; nor could the Sun (who may reaſonably be reckon'd amongſt the fix'd Stars) or his Light and Heat be to any purpoſe in the Original Univerſe, if there were no Planetary Earths in it. If the Planets had their Origin from the fortuitous Abſorption of incruſtated fix'd Stars, the Univerſe in reſpect of ſome principal parts of it was made by Chance. And ſhall it not be thought, that the principal parts of the Univerſe had their places aſſign'd them by the Laws of Prudence and Providence as well as the parts of Animals? (t) *For the Eye was not by its Levity forc'd into its place in the Body, nor did the Heart ſliding fall into the Breaſt by its gravity, but becauſe it was for the beſt, that both theſe parts ſhould be ſo plac'd.*

(d) *Baron. ad an.* 34. *n.* 293, 298. *Mr. Hales Ser. on* 1 *Cor.* 6. 13.

(e) *Ornatam & cohoneſtatam vocant Eccleſiam, non cùm in populo gliſcit Pietas, vitia decreſcunt, boni mores augeſcunt, cum ſacra doctrina viget: Verum cùm auro gemmiſque lucent altaria, imò cùm his neglectis, prædiis, famulitio, luxu, mulis, equis, ſumptuoſis ædium, vel magis palatiorum ſubſtructionibus, ac reliquo vitæ ſtrepitu, ſatrapas æquant Sacerdotes. In ornamentum Eccleſiæ jubentur Epiſcopi, Sacerdotes & Clerici, purpurâ ſericiſque veſtiri. O miram Eccleſiæ dignitatem!* Eraſm. ubi ſupr.

(f) *Plutarch.* 7. *Sap. Conviv. p.* 155.

(g) *Simplic. in Epict. c.* 31.

(h) S. *Chryſoſt. ap. Phot. cod.* 277. *Col.* 1557.

(i) *Eraſm. de ratione ver. Theolog.*

(k) *Theophil. ad Autol.*

(l) *Gat. not. in Ant.*

II. God's Original Creation (according to our Second Notice thereof) produc'd *an Univerſe* (of Rationals) *of intelligent Minds and Souls.* For as if the Univerſe of Rationals which now is, was deſtroy'd, it might juſtly be ſaid, the Univerſe is deſtroy'd: So it could not be ſaid, to have been originally conſtituted, till the Univerſe of intelligent inviſible Beings was exiſtent in the corporeal Univerſe. Nor could the immenſe Goodneſs of Providence do any great good by Original Creation, if an Univerſe of Minds and Souls was not produc'd by it. If Wiſdom buildeth an Houſe or City (locally underſtood,) it is built for the ſake of its intended Inhabitants, and thoſe Inhabitants are the only valuable and conſiderable Houſe or City: So the Univerſe of Minds and Souls is the only valuable and conſiderable Univerſe, for whoſe ſake the corporeal Univerſe was made, to whoſe utility and conveniency it manifeſtly referreth. And although ſome parts of it might be reſerv'd uninhabited for ſome time and for ſome ſpecial uſe, yet if the whole of it had not been made to be inhabited, it had been made in vain. For what the Prophet ſaith of the Earth, is applicable to the whole corporeal Univerſe. *Iſa.* 45. 18. *God himſelf that formed the Earth and made it, he hath eſtabliſh'd it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited.* (u) *God Created the Univerſe, not to be a vacuum (according to the vain imaginations of ſome) nor to be deſtroyed, but to exiſt and be inhabited.* So the Pagan Theology furniſheth Heaven with Inhabitants (ſuch as they are,) it ſuppoſeth a multitude of inviſible Gods (w) in *ſublimibus palatiis cœli habitare,* (x) *in intimis penetralibus cœli,* (y) *deſcribuntur Dii veſtri in tricliniis cœleſtibus, atque in Chalcidicis aureis cœnitare, potare, & ad ultimum fidibus & vocum modulationibus mulceri.* The Poets take care, that none of the vaſt ſupernal Regions be void and waſt, empty and deſolate without Inhabitant, (for ſuch they ſuppoſe worthleſs and uſeleſs;)

> (z) *Neu Regio foret ulla ſuis animantibus Orba*
> *Aſtra tenent cœleſte ſolum formæque Deorum.*

Many of the Fathers ſuppoſe, that *an intelligible World of holy Angels* was produc'd not only long before the Formation of our Earth, but long before the Creation of the whole or any part of the viſible and corporeal Univerſe (of this Opinion are S. *Baſil, Gr. Naz.* S. *Chryſoſtom, Joh. Damaſcen. Joh. Philoponus, Olympiodorus,* S. *Hilary,* S. *Hierom,* S. *Ambroſe, Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis, Bede, Caſſianus* and others:) But doubtleſs it is a miſtake, to ſuppoſe, that God's Original Creation did not produce the Starry and Planetary corporeal Univerſe. Their Hypotheſis therefore muſt be thus rectified; that toge-

(m) Περὶ Ἀβρααμ.

(n) M. Ant. l. 11. S. 27.

(o) De Cœlo l. 2. c. 3 S. 17.

(p) *Eam fuiſſe omnium Antiquorum opinionem, ut cœlum divinum quid ſit, & ad divinitatem pertinens, etiam ipſe Ariſtoteles teſtatur.* Lud. Molinvill. Exam. Phil. Plat. p. 619.

(q) Philo Quis rer. divin. hæres ſit.

(r) S. Baſil. Hexaem. Hom. 1.

(s) Καὶ γὰρ εὔλογον τῷ ὄντι πρῶτον εἰς γένεσιν αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν, ἄριστόν τε ὄντα τῶν γεγονότων, ἐκ τῆς καθαρωτάτης τῆς ὐσίας παγέντα· διότι θεῶν ἀφανῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν ἔμελλεν οἶκος ἔσεσθαι ἱερώτατος. Περὶ κοσμοποι.

(t) Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐνταῦθα τῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὑπὸ κουφότητος ἐκπεσθεὶς, ὐδὲ ἡ καρδία τῷ βάρει ὀλισθοῦσα πέπτωκεν εἰς τὸ στῆθος, ἀλλ' ὅτι βέλτιον ἦν ὕτως ἑκάτερον τετάχθαι. *Plutarch. de fac. in orbe Lun. p.* 928.

(u) Ὄντως γὰρ ὐκ εἰς κενὸν, ὐδὲ εἰς μάτην πρὸς ἀπώλειαν ἔκτισε κατὰ τὺς φρονῦντας μάταια τὸ πᾶν ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναί τε καὶ οἰκεῖσθαι. *Method. ap. Epiphan. Hær.* 64.

(w) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 3. *p.* 125.

(x) *Ibid. p.* 123.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 4. *p.* 149.

(z) *Ovid. Metam. l.* 1. *v. Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 8 *c.* 3.

ther with the corporeal Univerſe Original Creation produc'd its Inhabitants *an Univerſe of intelligent Minds and Souls.* This Univerſe is the Univerſe of *Vitaliſts* (that have perceptive Life, Cogitation and Underſtanding,) who alone are capable of the great vital Goods and Evils. This Univerſe (ſpeaking comparatively) is the only noble Univerſe, which alone is of Cognation with God, and of ineſtimable Value and Pretioſity; for the Soul of Man is thought by the Wiſe (a) *a nobler and more valuable Being than the whole corporeal World.* This Univerſe is the only holy and happy Univerſe, ὁ κοσμὸς ἀληθινὸς, *the true World* (as the Platoniſts call their intelligible World,) in which alone are τὰ θεῖα καὶ τιμιώτατα, *the things Divine and of the moſt excellent and honourable Nature*; and τὰ ὄντως ὄντα, *the things that indeed are*; for it is inviſible Minds and Souls and their proper Goods and Evils, that are the great ſubſtantial Realities, the things ſenſible and external are but umbratil Phænomena. This is the Univerſe, which Theology contemplateth, leaving to Naturaliſts the Contemplation of the Phænomena of the corporeal Univerſe.]

III. God's Original Creation (according to our *Third* Notice thereof) *produc'd the Heaven of Beatitude and Immortality*, which is the heavenly City locally underſtood. For Heaven is not meerly a State, but a place, (b) as the common Notices of Mankind in Conſort with the holy Scriptures repreſent it. There is a mixture therefore of Truth and Errour, of Wiſdom and Folly in the account which *Chemnitius* giveth of Heaven. (c) *This obſervation is not to be deſpiſed, that the Angels which Miniſter to the little ones, guard them, carry them in their Hands and encamp about them, do all theſe Offices here on Earth, and yet are ſaid to ſee the Face of the Father in Heaven. Whence it is moſt evident, that Heaven in which God reſideth with his Majeſty, is not diſtant beyond this ſupreme viſible Heaven ſo many Myriads of Miles as the Calviniſts fondly talk of it. Elſe the Angels, becauſe they cannot be in ſeveral places at the ſame time, could not miniſter to the little ones on Earth and perform their Services to God in Heaven. Heaven therefore Earth and Hell are not diſtinguiſh'd by diſtance of places, but in reſpect of Beatitude and Infelicity.* It is wiſely ſaid, that the Heaven of Beatitude is not ſo many Myriads of Miles diſtant beyond the ſupreme viſible Heaven, as ſome imagine: But to ſuppoſe, that the Angels perform their Offices of Miniſtery to Chriſt's Servants here on Earth, and at the ſame time behold the Face of God in Heaven, is a great Miſtake. And 'tis a like Miſtake, to ſuppoſe, that Heaven, Earth and Hell are not diſtinguiſh'd by diſtance of Places, but only in reſpect of Beatitude and Infelicity. A like Miſtake the Alexandrian *Cyril* ſeemeth to commit, when he ſaith of God, (d) *the Nature of God is ſuperiour to all and above the meaſure of every thing created, not by ſublimity of place, but by tranſcendence of Glory and incomparable Power.* For the many Notices that are in Scripture of our Saviour's Aſcenſion and Glorification imply, that God is above every thing created both by ſublimity of place and alſo by tranſcendence of Glory and Power. The Scripture Theology alſo that uſually celebrateth God as the Creator of *Heaven* and *Earth* and of all things that are therein, implieth, that the whole frame of things is divided into theſe two Syſtems, that they are diſtinct places, that both are habitable and inhabited, and that the one is an Earthly kind of World, the other a Divine and Heavenly.

The Hebrew Name שמים *Heaven* (e) is moſt probably deriv'd from the Arabick שמה which ſignifieth to be *high and eminent*; whence the Name Heaven in Scripture uſually ſignifieth *the higher part of the World in reſpect of us*, and the ſeveral parts of this higher part of the World (the Air, the Sky, the Region of the Stars) are often called in Scripture by that Name; ſo is God himſelf and the Region of the Bleſſed. Which happy Region was ſo far known to the Pagans, (f) they promis'd themſelves an happy *Elyſium* after Death, although they were extremely uncertain where to place it. (g) The beſt Souls are placed by ſome of them in the Company of their Gods in Heaven, by others in the *Galaxias* or Milky Circle, by others about the Moon, by others in the lower Air, by others beyond the Ocean, and by others under the Earth. Old *Ennius* placeth *Romulus* in Heaven in Company with the Gods.

Romulus in Cœlo cum Diis agit ævum.

So the vulgar Pagans (as a reward for their good Life) promis'd themſelves, (h) that they ſhould live in *Jupiter*'s *Hall*, and in Conſortſhip with the Gods in Heaven, ſuppoſing it the Seat of the Deity and of Beatitude according to *Homer*'s deſcription of *Olympus*.

> Οὐλυμπόνδ', ὅθι φασὶ θεῶν ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
> Ἔμμεναι, οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται, οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρῳ
> Δεύεται, οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται· ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη
> Πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἀναδέδρομεν αἴγλη.
>
> *Olympus is the Gods untroubled Seat,*
> *Which neither Winds moleſt, nor Showers wet;*
> *No ſleets of Snow fall there, there Air ſerene,*
> *Unclouded Sky, and conſtant Splendors ſhine.*

The popular Pagans conceits of Heaven were rude and groſly carnal, but have not more of folly and abſurdity in them than thoſe of the Philoſophic Pagans; who not contenting themſelves with the common and general Notices of Heaven, but deſcending to a particular Chorography of it and determining the Place and Situation of it, fall into enormous Follies and Abſurdities. Such as the Platoniſts Fancy touching *the Super-cœleſtial place* (which Souls arrive at by their aſcent to the top of Heaven,) touching *the return of Souls to their Social Star* (i) their diſtributing Souls, ſome to have their Reſidence in the ſeveral Planets, others in the Firmament of the fix'd Stars (k) *Plato*'s Fancy of *a pure Earth* (replete with all Goods) *in the Starry Heaven* (l) and *Ariſtotle*'s Fancy of certain Beings beyond the *primum mobile* and the extreme circumference of the Univerſe, which are *unchangeable and impaſſible living always the beſt Life and the moſt Self-ſufficient through all Eternity.* It is probable that this Ariſtotelian Fancy (m) gave riſe to the conceit of a *Cœlum Empyreum*, which both the Hebrew Doctors and many Chriſtian Theologers have entertain'd.

(a) *Mr. Boyle of the Excell. of Theol. p.* 54, 55.

(b) *Zanch. de oper. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 4. 2 *King.* 2. 11. 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. *Pſal.* 11. 4. *Iſa.* 63. 15. *Matth.* 5. 8, 12. *and* 6. 9, 20. *Marc.* 16. 19. *Luc.* 16. 22. *and* 23. 43. *Joh.* 3. 13. *and* 14. 2. *and* 17. 24. *Act.* 3. 21. *Eph.* 1. 20. *Heb.* 11. 10, 16. 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. *Apoc.* 2. 7.

(c) *Harmon. Evang. c.* 92. *p.* 1333.

(d) Θεοῦ φύσις τὸ πάντων ἐπέκεινα, καὶ οὐ τοπικοῖς ὑψώμασιν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τῆς εὐκλείας ὑπεροχαῖς καὶ ἀσυγκρίτῳ δυνάμει παντὸς γεννητοῦ μέτρον ὑπερκείμενον. *Com. in Amos. T.* 3. *p.* 295.

(e) *Pocock. Not. Mis. p.* 35.

(f) *Windet. de vit. funct. c.* 7.

(g) *Ainsw. to the Je. Chal. p. m.* 25

(h) *Arno. adv. Gent. l.* 2. *p.* 86. *Orig. c. Cels. l.* 3. *p.* 157.

(i) *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 4. *c.* 6.

(k) *Vid. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 21. *c.* 27. *Orig. c. Cels. l.* 7. *p.* 350.

(l) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(m) *V. J. Magiri Physiolog. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *in Com.*

The Heaven of Beatitude is ſuppos'd to be above, beyond and without the circumference of the Starry Heaven. For the Hebrew Doctors divide the whole frame of things (n) into three Worlds. The firſt is התחתון *the lower World*, which is this World. The ſecond is עולם התיכון *the middle or inmoſt World*, which is the World of the Sphears containing *the Aerial Region* and the Starry Heavens. The *third* is עולם העליון *the higheſt or ſupreme World*, which is the World of *Angels*, of *God* and of *Souls*, the *Spiritual* World, which is above the fix'd Stars. And ſo ſeveral of the Fathers have this Idea of Heaven. (o) They ſuppoſe a ſupreme inviſible Heaven beyond and above the viſible Starry Heaven, which is the dwelling place of Angels and bleſſed Souls, and that ἔξωθεν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, *above and without Heaven there is a Light which cannot be obſcured, incorruptible and eternal, in which the Angels live.* This Light is the *Empyreal* Heaven, of which ſome ſay (p) that it was created a day before the inferiour Celeſtial Orbs, (q) *that it is at leaſt* 160 *Millions of Miles from Earth to Heaven, and ſome that have calculated curiouſly have found it five Hundred Years Journey unto the Starry Heaven for an ordinary Traveller. Therefore certainly the Seat of Angels and bleſſed Souls is at an huge diſtance from us; for from the height of the Stars you may gueſs at the vaſt diſtance of* Cœlum Empyræum, *which is* ſedes Beatorum. But doubtleſs it would be far better, to content our ſelves with general Notices of Heaven (without particularly determining any thing touching the Place and Situation of it,) than to introduce into Theology ſuch injudicious conceits of it, which in rudeneſs are not much inferiour to *Anaxagoras*'s conceit touching the Origine of the Stars. (r) *That the igneous Ether by the rapidity of its Circumgyration ſnatched away Stones from the Earth, and ſetting them on fire ſo turn'd them into Stars.* If the Heaven of holy Angels and bleſſed Souls is Situate quite beyond the fix'd Stars, all the vaſt ſupernal Regions of the viſible Univerſe (except the Earths that are there) muſt neceſſarily be empty, and deſolate (without Inhabitant) they muſt be created in vain (or to little purpoſe) they muſt be uſeleſs and unfit to be inhabited (like the Lybian Sands;) all which Suppoſitions are againſt the Conſtitution of the Univerſe, for they are *a depopulation* of it. Natural Light knoweth no Heaven beyond the Starry Heaven, *cujus circumflexu teguntur cuncta* (as *Pliny* ſpeaketh,) ὁ πάντα περιέχων οὐρανός, *the Heaven that encompaſſeth all things.* The Book *de Mundo* in *Ariſtotle*'s Works (s) defineth the World *the Syſtem of Heaven and Earth and of the Natures contain'd in them.* And we cannot doubt what this Author meaneth by Heaven; for he ſaith, it is τὸ ἀνώτατον, *the higheſt and is full of* σωμάτων θείων, *Divine Bodies, which we are wont to call Stars.* So when the Scripture denoteth the Univerſe or comprehenſion of all things by this Phraſe *Heaven and Earth and the things that are therein*, in all Reaſon *Heaven* in theſe places of Scripture muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie, as it doth in this Book *De Mundo*; becauſe it defineth the World or Univerſe in the very ſame manner, becauſe Heaven in theſe places muſt be underſtood, in the uſual Senſe, and it muſt be underſtood to ſignifie τὸν κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν οὐρανόν, *Heaven eminently ſo called* (t) which is the Starry Heaven. And if in theſe places it ſignifieth the Starry Heaven, the Heaven of Beatitude muſt be in or within the Starry Heaven, or elſe it cannot be in the Univerſe of things, and conſequently there can be no *Cœlum Empyræum.* When the Scripture ſpeaketh of the *higheſt Heaven*, it plainly meaneth the Starry Heaven. *Nehem.* 9. 6. *Thou haſt made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Hoſt.* It knoweth no higher created altitude than that of the Stars. *Is not God in the height of Heaven? And behold the height of the Stars, how high they are.* Job 22. 12. *Though thou ſet thy Neſt among the Stars, thence will I bring thee down.* Obad. 4. *Lucifer* indeed boaſteth, *I will aſcend into Heaven, I will exalt my Throne above the Stars of God.* But his meaning is not, that he would aſcend into an Heaven above and beyond the Stars, but that he would aſcend ſo high, as to be Dominator over the Stars, as God is. The Starry Heaven is the *viſible Heaven*, and if the viſible World every where containeth the inviſible (as it doth in our earthly Region) the Heaven of Beatitude muſt be in or within, not beyond or without the Starry Heaven. Nor is it likely, that the Heaven which was open'd to S. *Stephen*, was an Heaven beyond the fix'd Stars: Or that the Voices from Heaven which came to our Saviour, and the ſound from Heaven (as of a ruſhing mighty Wind) that came amongſt the Apoſtles, came from ſo immenſe a diſtance, as from an Heaven beyond the fix'd Stars. Nor is there any indication of ſuch an Heaven, but of the contrary, in that ſublimity of Phraſe, which the Scripture uſeth to ſet forth our Saviour's Exaltation to the Divine imperial celſitude of Condition (his Apotheoſis,) that he is aſcended ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, *over above all the Heavens*, and is *become higher than the Heavens.* For the holy Writers ſpeak of the viſible Heavens. *Pro.* 25. 3. *The Heaven for height. Cœlum extreme altum. Mercer.* The viſible Heavens are look'd upon by the holy Writers as the utmoſt height of created Nature; for our Saviour's Apotheoſis is deſcrib'd by tranſcending them. A *Cœlum Empyræum* therefore (which tranſcendeth all viſible Heavens) can be no part of created Nature. If the Saints and Angels were in a *Cœlum Empyræum*, they muſt have an Apotheoſis proper to the Son of God; for they muſt neceſſarily tranſcend all viſible Heavens. And if their Abode was in an Heaven ſo vaſtly remote and diſtant, it is not imaginable, that there could be any (much leſs a conſtant) intercourſe between Earth and Heaven, Us and the Angels of Heaven.

IV. The Adumbrations of Heaven that are in Scripture, do not infer an Empyreal Heaven, but the contrary; for no ſuch Heaven was repreſented by the Judaical *Tabernacle* and *Temple*, which was an Adumbration (umbratil Repreſentation) of Heaven, as Jews and Chriſtians agree. The Hebrew Doctors ſay (u) *the lower Sanctuary mas made* ad ſimilitudinem ſuperioris, *a reſemblance of the upper or heavenly Sanctuary. Joſephus* and *Philo* account it ſuch, and the Book of Wiſdom ſaith, *Ch.* 9. 8. *Thou haſt commanded me to build a Temple upon thy holy Mount, and an Altar in the City wherein thou dwelleſt, a reſemblance of the holy Tabernacle, which thou haſt prepared from the beginning.* So the holy Writers ſpeak of the *Tabernacle* and *Temple* of God in Heaven (w), agreeably to the ſenſe of the Hebrew Doctors; they look upon *the holy Places made with Hands as Figures of the true*, and call them *Shadows*,

---

(n) Buxt. Lex. Talm. Col. 1620.

(o) Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 1. c. 2. S. 7, 8. & T. 1. l. 3. c. 10.

(p) Ibid. T. 3. l. 1. c. 10. S. 5.

(q) Dingley of the Deput. Angels p. 147, 182.

(r) Plutarch. de placit. Phil. l. 2. c. 13.

(s) C. 2.

(t) Grot. Not. in Eph. 4. 10.

Iſa. 14. 13.

Eph. 4. 10. Heb. 7. 26.

(u) Grot. Not. in Heb. 9. 24. Lud. Capell. Not. in Heb. 9. 1. Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l. 1. c. 11. S. 2. Buxtorf. de Arca. c. 6.

(w) Apoc. 7. 15. and 11. 19. and 15. 5. and. Heb. 8. 2, 5. and 9. 8, 11, 12, 23, 24. and 10. 19.

Examples and Patterns (Delineations and Imitamens) of heavenly things; and Heaven they call *the true, the greater and more perfect Tabernacle*, where alſo they ſuppoſe, to be the true *Sanctum Sanctorum, the Holieſt of all.* Agreeably to the Jews and Chriſtians (x) the Pagans call Heaven —— *templum magnum Jovis altitonantis*, and the Heavens *magna Templa Cœlitum.* And as Heaven (y) is one of the Names of God in Scripture, (z) and is an uſual Name of God amongſt the Jews: So the Pagans ſometimes expreſs themſelves in the ſame manner; as in *Petronius*, *Nemo Cœlum putat, no Man thinketh there is a God.* So in the Poet *Cœlum* ſignifieth the Celeſtials. —— *Cœlo gratiſſimus amnis.*

The Origin of this ſort of Language is from that general Perſwaſion, which Mankind have, that Heaven (the ſupernal illuſtrious Region contradiſtinct to our Earth) is the Reſidence of God (his Regial Seat of Habitation,) as the Poet ſaith, (a) ——ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει, *he that inhabiteth the moſt ſupernal Houſes.* So the Deity is called by *Galen*, ὁ κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν νοῦς, *the Mind that is in the Heavens*, and *Sophocles* calleth the Ether οἴκησιν Διὸς, *the Habitation of* Jupiter. So the Book *de Mundo* in *Ariſtotle*'s Works obſerveth, that all Mankind lift up their Hands to Heaven, when they pray, ſuppoſing it the Seat of the Deity. Agreeably to which natural Notion of God (as *Simplicius* calleth it) the holy Writers have called Heaven *his Dwelling-place, his Houſe, his Seat and Throne* (the Seat of his Majeſty) *his Holy Heaven* (ſanctify'd by the Sanctity of the Divine Majeſty, who is there as in his Seat and Temple,) and the *Habitation of his Holineſs*, which ſpeaketh it his *Temple* and *Sanctuary*, *Pſal.* 102. 19. and 2. 4. and 20. 6. 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. *Iſa.* 63. 15. and 66. 1. So *Varro* ſaith of Heaven, (b) it is *naturâ templum cætera ſimilitudine, a Temple by Nature the reſt by Similitude.* Accordingly there was a great ſimilitude and analogy between the *Celeſtial* and the *Judaical* Sanctuary. (c) *The Supreme Heaven was repreſented by the Holieſt of all (which* Abrabenel *hath obſerv'd,) here was the Propitiatory as the Footſtool of God, here were the Cherubims as the Celeſtial Servitors, among whom God is ſaid to have dwelt, and hence to have given forth Oracles.* (d) *The Ark according to Cabala is a Repreſentation of the Throne of the Glory of the Lord*, ſay the Hebrew Doctors. (e) *The Colours of the Tabernacle* (ſaith *Joſephus*) *did ſhine, as if one had beheld Heaven.* Theſe are wiſe and good Notices touching the Myſterious Symbolical Nature of the Judaical Sanctuary; but ſome Miſtakes there are amongſt Jews and Chriſtians in ſtating the Reſemblance between it and the Celeſtial Sanctuary.

(1.) One miſtake is a Branch of *Criminal Philoſophic paganizing* (of which *Joſephus* and *Philo*, and the Hebrew Doctors are generally guilty;) for *Joſephus* ſuppoſeth the Judaical Tabernacle and Temple (not purely and intirely a Repreſentation of the Heavenly Tabernacle and Temple, but) an Adumbration (f) τῆς τῶν ὅλων φύσεως, *of univerſal Nature or the whole World*; and that the two parts of it which were permitted to the Prieſts, ſignifie our *Earth and Sea* in a profane place, which all promiſcuouſly tread upon. But if our ſordid polluted Earth is a profane place, it cannot be thought the conſtitutive part of a Temple, much leſs of an Heavenly Temple. What worſe confounding of things can there be, than to jumble together Holy and Profane, Heaven and Earth, and paganically to make the Univerſe of one piece? Yet in this enormous miſſtating things *Grotius* ſymbolizeth with *Joſephus*, (g) for he affirmeth, that the Judaical Tabernacle and Temple was a Reſemblance and Adumbration of the whole World; and he ſuppoſeth, that the Judaical Sanctuary is call'd by the Apoſtle *a Worldly Sanctuary*, to ſignifie, *that it was an Image and Reſemblance of the whole World.* (h) So *Philo* maketh the High Prieſts Cloathing a Repreſentation of the whole World, and its parts of the ſeveral parts of the World, *his Robe of Blue* expreſſive of the Air, the *Flowers* of it expreſſive of the Earth, the *Pomegranates* of the Water, and the *Bells* of the Harmony of theſe Elements Earth and Water. (i) *Joſephus* thinketh, that *Aaron's Bells* denoted ſomewhat elſe than Harmony; for he maketh them the Repreſentation of *Thunder and Lightning* (which is agreeable to the Sky-colour of the Robe, to which they were annex'd, and to the Nature of the Legal Diſpenſation:) But if *Aaron's Bells* did denote *Harmony*, is it not far better to ſay, that they denoted *Harmonicon Cœleſte* than the Harmony of Earth and Water?

(2.) A ſecond miſtake is touching the three Heavens ſuppos'd to be repreſented by the three Partitions of the Judaical Sanctuary; (k) for the Jews diſtinguiſh three Heavens, *Cœlum nubiferum* (the Aerial Heaven,) *Cœlum aſtriferum* (the Starry Heaven,) *Cœlum angeliferum* (the Heaven of Heavens, above the Starry Heaven, where the Angels reſide;) and the three Partitions of the Judaical Sanctuary are ſuppos'd, to repreſent theſe three Heavens; *The Court* the *Aerial*, the *Holy Place* the *Starry*, and the *Holieſt of all* the *Heaven of Angels* (which is above the Starry Heaven;) by which account of things an *Empyreal Heaven* (called by ſome *Supercœleſte*, and by others *Superæthereum*) is introduc'd. But there is no reaſon to imagine, that *the Holy Place* in the Judaical Sanctuary did repreſent *Cœlum Aſtriferum, the Starry Heaven* (at large,) or the viſible World (as ſome (l) ſpeak,) unleſs either ſome ſuch thing be ſaid of it by the Holy Writers, or there appeareth in the thing it ſelf ſome ſemblance and ſimilitude of the fix'd Stars. But the Holy Writers are wholly ſilent concerning it; and if we examine the thing it ſelf, if we ſurvey *the Holy Place, the Structure of it, the Veſſels, Utenſils* and *Furniture* of it, there appeareth not any the leaſt ſimilitude and reſemblance of the fix'd Stars. This Hypotheſis therefore *that the Holy Place repreſented the Region of the fix'd Stars*, is wholly without Reaſon: But there is a worſe flaw in it; for it is againſt very plain Reaſon. For the *Golden Candleſtick* which was in the *Holy Place* (and an eminent part of the Furniture of it) plainly ſheweth, that *the Holy Place* was deſign'd to repreſent not *Cœlum Aſtriferum, the Starry Heaven* (at large,) but only *Cœlum Planetiferum, the Planetary Heaven.* (m) *The ſeven Lamps and Lights* (ſaith *Philo*) *were Symbols of the Planets ſo called by Naturaliſts.* (n) *The holy Candleſtick with the ſeven Lamps upon it* (ſaith he) *is a reſemblance of the courſe of the ſeven Planets.* So *Joſephus* obſerveth, (o) that in the Golden Candleſtick there were *ſeven Branches* and *ſeven Lights* according to the Number of the Planets. None of the Jewiſh Writers have been able to find in the Golden Candleſtick any reſemblance of the fix'd Stars; but ***Grotius*** attempteth, to ſupply what is wanting in them. (p) *The ſeven Planets* (ſaith he) *were ſignify'd by the ſeven Lamps of the Temple, and the fix'd Stars by the other parts of the Candleſtick.* But it had been worth the while, for this Learned Man to have ſhew'd, what other parts of the Candleſtick repreſented the fix'd Stars; was it the *Bowls*, or the *Knops*, or the *Flowers*, or all theſe together that repreſented thoſe inerratick Stars of Light? What affinity and reſemblance have thoſe leſſer Ornamental parts of the Candleſtick with thoſe vaſtly numerous and vaſtly great Globes of Light the fix'd Stars? And what are *ſeven Planets* for *Number*, *Magnitude* and *Quality* (if the Sun be reckon'd one of them, ſix of them are opacous Bodies) in compariſon of the illuſtrious Luminaries of the Starry Firmament? Is there any thing more incongruous and diſproportionate, than that *ſeven Wanderers* ſhould far outſhine in the Holy Place the immenſe and glorious Region of the fix'd Stars, if it was deſign'd to be repreſented there? That the *ſeven Planets* ſhould have all the Lamps and illuſtrious parts of the Candleſtick allotted to them, to repreſent their Glory, and the great, and glorious, and numerous Lights of the Univerſe ſhould have nothing glorious to repreſent them, but ſhould be made obſcure and inglorious, as if they were but Skypebbles and ſcarce worthy of any notice? *Grotius* is ſometimes in a wiſer mood, than to run upon theſe Rocks of Abſurdity; for ſometimes he expoundeth the Myſtery of the Golden Candleſtick as *Philo* and *Joſephus* had done before him. (q) *It was an Image of the Planets; for it had ſix Branches and one Shaft in the midſt, as* Philo *and* Joſephus *explain it.* The Region of the fix'd Stars therefore was totally omitted and not at all repreſented in the Judaical Sanctuary (which ſheweth that the *Cœlum Angeliferum* and conſequently the Heaven of Beatitude is not to be plac'd beyond it;) yet this Region of Stars is the Heaven, which the Jews ſware by, and which is ſo ſacred (r) that our Saviour calleth it *God's Throne*; and amongſt the Pagan Theologers by Heaven (s) *pars ſiderea mundi* is underſtood. With reſpect to the Corporeal Univerſe therefore the three Heavens are thus very well diſtinguiſh'd by an ancient Writer, (t) *Cœlum Nubiferum, Cœlum Planetiferum, Cœlum Aſtriferum.* In the Judaical Sanctuary they are thus diſtinguiſh'd; *Cœlum Nubiferum*, *Cœlum Planetiferum, Cœlum Angeliferum.* And this laſt is that *third Heaven*, into which S. *Paul* was caught up, and which he calleth *Paradiſe*, to denote it the Heaven of Beatitude, 2 *Cor.* 12. 2.

(x) *Grot. Not. in Apoc.* 11. 19.

(y) *Dan.* 4. 26. *Matth.* 21. 25. *Luc.* 15. 18.

(z) *Homo timens cœli. mors per manus cœli. omnia ad cœlum. omnes actiones tuæ ſint in nomine cœli. Omnia ſunt in manu cœli præter timorem cœli. Cœli miſereantur tui*, ſo he that viſiteth the Sick ſaith. *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 2440. *Beyer. Addit. ad Seld. p.* 348, 349.

(a) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 34.

(b) *Outram de ſacrific. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *S.* 8.

(c) *Ibid.*

(d) *Buxt. exercit. de Arca. c.* 6.

(e) *Joſeph. Antiqu. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

(f) *Ibid. c.* 8.

(g) *Non minùs Tabernaculum illud quod pro Templo fuit, quàm ipſum Templum à Salomone ſtructum figuram gerebat Univerſi.* Not. in Heb. 8. 2. *Tentorium Moſis temporibus, Templum verò poſt Salomonem, nihil aliud erant quàm umbræ totius Univerſi, & gubernationis Dei in Univerſo, cujus pars præcipua eſt regio illa ſuperætherea.* Ibid. Not. in v. 5. *Habuit pactum illud ſanctuarium ſuum mundanum, i. e. mundi totius imaginem.* Not. in Heb. 9. 2.

(h) *De vit. Moſis, l.* 3.

(i) *Grot. Not. in Exod.* 28. 34.

(k) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *S.* 2. *Pool's Synopſ. in* 2 *Cor.* 12. 2.

(l) *Spencer. ſup.*

(m) *Philo de vit. Moſ. l.* 3.

(n) *De Hæred. rer. div. p.* 347. *ed. Gr. Paris.*

(o) *Antiqu. l.* 3. *c.* 7.

V. The Fathers diſtinguiſh (u) a *Celeſtial* and *Sub-celeſtial Paradiſe*, which latter Paradiſe cannot reaſonably be thought higher than the higher Region of the Air; for our Saviour's Soul was in it before his aſcenſion into Heaven, *Luc.* 23. 43. Such a ſituated Paradiſe (w) the Pythagoric Verſes call αἰθὴρ ἐλεύθερον, *the free Ether* (confounding Air and Ether,) and here they promiſe the ſeparate Soul an happy Immortality; for *the place next under the Moon* (ſaith *Hierocles*) ***the Pythagoreans*** *call the free Ether.* (x) *Virgil* calleth the free Ether *Aeris campos* (the Fields of the Air,) and the Poet ***Lucan*** (y) deſcribeth this *Elyſium* as Sublunary, but as igneous rather than Aerial. (z) Such the Stoicks ſuppos'd the Regions properly *Celeſtial* and *Ethereal* (Superaerial;) in which Ethereal Regions it is reaſonable to look for *the Superiour Paradiſe*; for a ſublunary Manſion (Igneous or Aerial) is comparatively mean and inglorious, and ſubject to the Fates of the Earth; and therefore can be no ſuch Heaven of Glory and Immortality, as Chriſtianity promiſeth. The Veſt wherewith Holy Souls ſhall be cloath'd at the Reſurrection, is an Ethereal Body (which is their Houſe from Heaven, 2 *Cor.* 5. 2.) which demonſtrateth, that they are deſign'd to live in the Ethereal Regions, and that there is their Heaven of Beatitude and Immortality, as *Origen* diſcourſeth. (a) *The Soul which in its own nature is incorporeal and inviſible, in whatever corporeal place it exiſteth, needeth a Body ſuitable to the nature of that place; which Body it ſometimes beareth, having put off that which before was neceſſary, but now is ſuperfluous for the following State; and ſometimes again putting on ſomething which before it had, having need of a better cloathing, to fit her for thoſe more pure ethereal and heavenly places.* As they that are cloath'd with theſe animal terreſtrial Bodies, muſt be Inhabitants of this animal terreſtrial Region: So they that have put on their Heavenly Veſt, and are cloath'd with their Ethereal Body, muſt be Inhabitants of *the ethereal and heavenly places*, as Origen calleth the Heaven of Beatitude. The lapſe of Angels alſo into this lower caliginous Air and the change of their Bodies ſhew, that the Heaven of Beatitude is in the Ethereal Regions; (b) *for thoſe Rebels before their Sin had Celeſtial Bodies, which by way of Puniſhment were chang'd into Aerial.* Suppoſing therefore the Superiour Paradiſe, to be in the Ethereal Regions, we may connect this Judaical Notion with that other of *Cœlum Angeliferum*, and define the Heaven of Beatitude to be *the Ethereal Regions as they are the vaſt Empire of the Holy Angels, or the vaſt Empire of thoſe that are in the Heavenly ſtate of Life.* The Beatitude promis'd unto us is the Crown of Life Immortal (to be perfectly freed from all the Weakneſſes, Meanneſſes and Miſeries of this Mortal Life, and rais'd to that unſtain'd Pulchritude and Glory *Immortality*,) which is the Heavenly ſtate of Life. As God is in the Heavenly ſtate of Life, ſo are the perfected Saints of God, whoſe Bodies are Celeſtial, Luminous and Glorious, not Terreſtrial and Vile Bodies, Spiritual kind of Bodies not groſs and craſs, vegete and lively not dull Mortality, without Spot or Blemiſh, Weakneſs or Imperfection (no

(p) *Septem quæ vaga dicuntur Sydera ſignificata per ſeptem Templi lampadas; & deinde τὰ ἀπλανῆ ſignificata per cæteras Lychni partes.* Not. in ſap. Salom. c. 7. 19.

(q) *Imago Planetarum. erant enim rami ſex & unus in medio ſcapus, ut Philo explicat, nec aliter Joſephus.* Not. in Heb. 9. 1.

(r) *Grot.* Not. in *Matth.* 5. 34.

(s) *Macrob. in ſom. ſcip. l.* 1. *c.* 9.

(t) *Hic aer primum cælum hiſtorialiter vocatur, ſicut habetis volucres cæli, quia in cælo, id eſt, in aere volare videntur. ſecundum cælum æther vocatur, ut habetis ſtellæ cæli, quia in eo planetæ vago curſu feruntur. Tertium cælum firmamentum appellatur, ſicut habetis, Aſtra Cæli, quia in eo ſidera fixa traduntur.* Author de cogn. ver. vit. inter op. S. Aug. c. 43.

(u) *Tertull. c. Marcion. l.* 4. *c.* 34.

(w) *In fine.*

(x) *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 21. *c.* 27.

(y) *Quodque patet terras inter Lunæque meatus ſemidei Manes habitant, quos ignea virtus Innocuos vita patientes ætheris imi fecit.*

(z) *Lipſ. Phyſ. Stoic. l.* 2. *diſſ.* 11.

(a) Ἡ τῇ ἑαυτῆς φύσει ἀσώματος καὶ ἀόρατος ψυχὴ, ἐν παντὶ σωματικῷ τόπῳ τυγχάνουσα, δεῖται σώματος οἰκείου τῇ φύσει τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου. ὅπερ ὁτὲ μὲν φορεῖ ἀπεκδυσαμένη πρότερον ἀναγκαῖον μὲν, περισσὸν δὲ ὡς πρὸς τὰ δεύτερα· ὁτὲ δὲ ἐπενδυσαμένη ᾧ πρότερον εἶχε δεομένῃ κρείττονος ἐνδύματος εἰς τοὺς καθαρωτέρους καὶ αἰθερίους καὶ οὐρανίους τόπους, *C. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 353.

Supra lunam pura ſunt omnia ac diuturnæ lucis plena. Plin.

(b) *Tranſgreſſores illi antequam tranſgrederentur, cæleſtia corpora gerebant, quæ converſa ſunt ex pæna in aeream qualitatem.* S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 3. c. 10.

Matth. 25. 31.

Luc. 20. 36. 1 Cor. 15. 40, 42. Phil. 3. 21. 1 Joh. 3. 2. more ſubject to Hunger and Thirſt, Cold or Pains, or any of the Frailties and Infirmities that now adhere to us, but) they are Immortal, Incorruptible and Impaſſible (as to any Evil) live in a deiform condition and an affluence of never-dying Joys; and in this Heavenly ſtate of Life their Beatitude conſiſteth. It conſiſteth therefore in being ἰσάγγελοι, *equal to the Angels*, (c) *when our Body ſhall be Celeſtial and Spiritual, an Angelical Body in the Society of Angels*. This ſeemeth to be therefore the beſt Idea, that we can have of the place of Heaven (the Heaven of Beatitude) in our preſent ſtate; to ſuppoſe it *the Ethereal Regions, as they are the vaſt Empire of the Holy Angels*; which is agreeable to S. *Hierom*'s Notion of the Creation. (*d*) *He ſtretched out the Heavens, that the multitudes of Angels might dwell above, and Men might have their abode beneath, and ſo made as it were a great Houſe for Rational Creatures*. If the Corporeal Univerſe was deſign'd to be an Houſe for Men and Angels, the Ethereal Regions of it cannot be uninhabited by the Holy Angels; which argueth, that the Heaven of Beatitude muſt be plac'd within the circumference of the fix'd Stars. But it muſt not be diſſembled, that there are ſome Phænomena amongſt the fix'd Stars, which ſhew, that there is Mutation and Corruption in thoſe Regions; which ſeemeth to infer, that the Heaven of Beatitude (exempt from all Mutation and Corruption) muſt be beyond and not within their Circumference. To which Objection it may be anſwer'd; that as the Mutations of Matter and Corruptions that are in the Univerſe, do not hinder the Sub-celeſtial Paradiſe from being ſuch: So they do not hinder the Celeſtial Paradiſe from being ſuch, there is the ſame reaſon for both.

(c) *Cùm fuerit tale corpus noſtrum, corpus jam cœleſte, & ſpirituale, corpus angelicum in ſocietate Angelorum.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 145.

(d) *Qui extendit cœlos & expandit eos, ut vel ſupra habitarent angelorum multitudines, vel ſubter homines morarentur, & quaſi magnam rationalibus creaturis fecit domum.* Com. in Iſa. c. 40.

VI. God's original Creation (according to our *fourth* Notice thereof) *iſſu'd from Paternal Sanctity and from Parental Providence*; for God muſt be conſider'd under this twofold Notion; both as *the Father and Founder of the Divine Family* (the Saints and Sons of God) and as *a Parental Providence to the World of Animals*: Both which Notions of God are compris'd in that honourary Attribute, which all Religioniſts give unto God, ſtiling him (as *Plato* doth in his *Timæus*) πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς, *the Father of the Univerſe*. For the Regenerate and Divine Family always was comprehended in the Univerſe, and always was the greateſt part of the Univerſe of Rationals; if God therefore was by Original Creation the Founder and Father of the Univerſe, he was neceſſarily by Original Creation the Founder and Father of the Regenerate and Divine Family. Which Divine Family ſtandeth oppos'd to the Diabolical, 1 *Joh.* 3. 10. And as it cannot but be Satan's Deſign, Intereſt and Buſineſs (becauſe of his Wickedneſs) to be a Father, and to raiſe up a Diabolical Family: So it cannot but be God's Deſign, Intereſt and Buſineſs (becauſe of his Holineſs and Goodneſs) to be a Father, and to raiſe up a Divine Family.
Rom 8. 29. Eph. 1. 4, 5. In his new Creation and his eternal Predeſtination of it his great deſign is the originating and raiſing a Divine Family; and if this is now and was from eternity his grand Deſign, it muſt be ſuppos'd his Deſign and Buſineſs in his Original Creation. That Creation produc'd into exiſtence the Divine and Heavenly both Things and Perſons; therefore it produc'd into Life *the Family in Heaven*; by which Name the Apoſtle denoteth the Holy Angels, which together with Regenerate Chriſtians conſtitute one Regenerate and Divine Family, *Eph.* 3. 15. Of the Holy Angels therefore we muſt affirm,

(1.) They are the Sons of God as of his Kind and Family. God is ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe the Father of *all Creatures*, as to produce them into Being, and therefore is πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων, *the Father of all*. So *the Rain hath a Father*. Job 38. 28. He is ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe the Father of all *living Creatures*, as to produce them into Life, (*e*) *vitam, ſalutem, victum præſtat ut pater, To all Animals he giveth Life, Health and Suſtenance as a Father*. To Mankind (the chief of Animals) God is ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe a Father, as to be productive of them into Humane Life, *the Father of Spirits* (peculiarly productive of them,) paternal in the courſe of his Providence towards Mankind, (*f*) τροφεὺς, *a nurſing Father to them*, and they muſt be conſider'd as in nature a reſembling Progeny of God. So Magiſtrates and Potentates are conſider'd as a ſort of reſembling Progeny of the moſt High (the Sons of his Highneſs and Majeſty, Eminence and Authority,) when they are denominated the Sons of God, 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. *Pſal.* 29. 1. 82. 6. 89. 6, 27. The Nation of old *Iſrael* had a ſort of Sonſhip unto God. *Out of* Egypt *he called his Son*, Hoſ. 11. 1. Exod. 4. 22. *Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer*, Iſa. 63. 16. Deut. 32. 6. *To them pertained the Adoption*, Rom. 9. 4. Deut. 14. 1. God was eſpecially and eminently the Founder and Father of their Nation. He *made* and *formed* them, not only as Men, but as *Iſrael*, his redeeming them out of Thraldom and making them the Holy Nation, was a ſort of *generating* them or producing them into Life: They had a National Adoption, they were the Son, and God took upon him the Relation of their God and Father according to the Inſtitution of their Civil-religious and Secular-kind of Theocracy. But all this diverſity of Sonſhip unto God is extremely mutilate and partial and in the main is no Sonſhip, as being on this ſide Sonſhip unto God in the proper plenary ſenſe, *the Divine kind of Sonſhip*, which (according to Chriſtianity) conſiſteth in an Adoption into his Heavenly Family, and in having ſuch a Divine Generation from him, which is analogous to Natural Generation, whereby Children are ὁμογενεῖς, *of the ſame kind* with their Parents, *Homo ex Homine, Bos ex Bove, propriiſſimum opus viventis eſt generare ſibi ſimile*. So Fathers beget Children in their own likeneſs. So generous Animals procreate generous Animals. So the Holy Angels are the Sons of God as being θεῖον γένος, *of the Divine Kind and Family*, *Job* 1. 6. and 38. 7. *Pſal.* 29. 1. *Dan.* 3. 25. *Luc.* 20. 36. *Eph.* 3. 15. *Heb.* 12. 22.

(e) Lactant. l. 4. c. 3.

Luc. 3. 38. Jer. 2. 27. Malach. 2. 10. Zech. 12. 1. Heb. 12. 9. Act. 17. 28.

(f) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 4. c. 21.

Nec degenerem feroces progenerant aquilæ columbam.

(2.) They are the truly Noble, Royal and Illuſtrious Family, as appeareth from their Names, all which are expreſſive of Honour and Nobilitation. Such is the *Angelical* Family, *Pſal.* 78. 25. *Man did eat Angel's Food*. Such is the *Heavenly* Family, (*g*) for the *Chineſe* call their Emperour, *Thien Zu, the Son of Heaven*, to denote the higheſt Nobilitation; and in ſuch ſenſe we ſay, *forma auguſta multum de cœlo trahit*. Such is *the Divine* Family; for the Epithet *Divine* denoteth what is ſuperlatively Noble and Excellent. (*h*) *Ariſtotle* commonly calleth every

(g) [illegible]

(h) [illegible]

every thing eximious Divine, the *Lacedæmonians* call'd a perſon whom they much admir'd θεῖος ἀνὴρ. *a Divine Man*, (*i*) *Heraclitus* and *Diogenes* θεῖοι ἦσαν, *were Divine* (ſaith the Philoſopher,) and *Democritus* ſaid, that *Homer* could not have written ſo good Verſes ἄνευ θείας καὶ δαιμονίας φύσεως, *without a Divine* (more than Humane) *Nature.* The Divine Family of Angels are alſo entitul'd The Sons of God, which Name denoteth, (*k*) τὴν εὐγένειαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ χαρακτῆρα τὸν βασιλικὸν, *Birth-Nobility and Honour, and the Royal Character.* (*l*) *If* Cæſar *did adopt thee, thou wouldeſt be elated beyond meaſure; and if thou knoweſt thy ſelf, to be the Son of God, wilt thou not carry it high?* To have the Dignity of the Sons of God, is the height of Honour and Dignity; to have it in the Heavenly State of Life, is to be God-like both in reſpect of Interiour Virtue and External Glory and Magnificence; their Deſcent and Parentage is the truly Noble and Royal, and they are of the truly Noble and Royal Spirit; their Rights and Priviledges are the truly Noble and Illuſtrious (being priviledg'd and exempted from all Spiritual and External Evils and Heirs of the Heavenly Royal Goods,) ſuch are alſo their Imployments and Enjoyments, their Company and Converſe and all their Circumſtances of Life truly Royal and Son of God-like. Their Divine Filial Relation and Condition implieth, that they are a Family perfectly unſerviliz'd and unenſlav'd, which is the higheſt Ennoblement. Jeruſalem *which is above is free, which is the Mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. They are the Family of *God's Elect* (ſo related, dignify'd and priviledg'd as God's Elect are, of eximious Quality and Condition, Eſteem and Worth,) and to all of them (in the larger ſenſe) the Name of *Elect Angels* belongeth, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21.

(i) Epiſt. Ench. c. 21.

(k) S. Chryſoſt. in Job. Hom. 1.

(l) Epiſt. diſſ. l. 1. c. 3. vid. etiam S. Chryſoſt. Hom. in Matth. 18. p. 137.

(3.) They are *the Holy* Family (and uſually intituled the Holy Angels;) for they are born into the Holy Life (Heaven-born,) live the Holy Life in ſinleſs Perfection, and in their Nature and Practice are of immaculate Sanctity and Purity, not having any Vice or Imperfection commix'd with their Virtue, any thing that ſullieth, diſcoloureth and defileth it. But this Holy Family are not intituled *Holy* meerly upon the account of their Interiour Sanctity and Virtue; but to denote in general, that (in ſeveral reſpects) they are *of ſuch noble and illuſtrious Quality and Condition, which is of the Holy kind.* So they that have part in the firſt Reſurrection (and therefore are the Sons of the Reſurrection) are denominated *Holy*, to ſignifie, that they are of Heavenly Sacerdotal Condition: They are ſo dignify'd, imploy'd and priviledg'd, as to be Prieſts unto God (Prieſts unto God are thoſe, that have the Holy Dignity and Office, to miniſter the Divine Service, to which they are conſecrate and ſet apart;) and becauſe they are Heavenly Prieſts, they are of Immortal Condition, exempt from and beyond whatever is Stain and Blemiſh, Pollution and Corruption, *Apoc.* 20. 6. *Bleſſed and holy is he, that hath part in the firſt Reſurrection; on ſuch the ſecond Death hath no power, but they ſhall be Prieſts of God and of Chriſt.* The Holy Angels are in this ſenſe Holy (for the Sons of the Reſurrection are not more than ἰσάγγελοι, *equal to Angels*;) they are alſo intituled *The Holy Ones as Potentates*, and to diſtinguiſh them from Humane Potentates; for ſo in the Book of *Daniel* this Name *the Holy Ones*, ſignifieth, *Thoſe Potentates the God-kind of Noble and Illuſtrious Ones.* And they are *Holy* in the ſame ſenſe, that the Saints of God on Earth are Holy, whoſe ſtate of Sanctity is an Eſtate of Nobilitation (or Unvileneſs;) they are therefore a Family of *Saints*, and are uſually called by that Name, *Deut.* 33. 2. *He came with ten thouſand of Saints*, which the *Jeruſalem Targum* and *Jonathan* render *Myriads of Holy Angels.* So *Zech.* 14. 5. *Dan.* 8. 13. *Job* 15. 15. compar'd with *Job* 4. 18.

Matth. 25. 31. Marc. 8. 38. Luc. 9. 26. Act. 10. 22. Apoc. 14. 10.

Dan. 4. 13, 23. and 4. 17.

(4.) They are the *Holy Love-Family*, and conſequently the lovely Family; for perfect Love is perfect Pulchritude and Lovelineſs of Soul and Deportment. And as the Infernal Tribe are therefore vile and ſordid, foul and ugly, malign and noxious Fiends, wretched and miſerable to extremity, becauſe they are wholly devoid of it: So the Perfection and Felicity of the Heavenly Saints conſiſteth in it, and their Life of Divine Charity is Life Eternal, 1 *Cor.* 13. Their love to God diſpoſeth them to live the Life of *doing his Will* (which is the Life of Heaven, the Heavenly Angelical kind of Life, and which is Heaven the height of Felicity;) they are the Family of Divine Lovers of God and of their Brother, the Commonwealth of everlaſting Friends, that have no ſuch corrupt Affections and Intereſts, which are the Make-bates and Incendiaries amongſt Men, but their *Jeruſalem* is (according to its Name) *the Viſion of Peace.* Their Government is the Love-government, all orderly do their duty in their place, by Love ſerve one another, and *an Angel doth not envy an Archangel*, becauſe he is in the higher place. They are not without their Conteſts indeed, as we read, *Dan.* 10. 13, 20. but theſe are only certain Diſputes in the Heavenly Court on behalf of thoſe ſeveral Nations, which the Holy Angels are imploy'd about, and amount not to any ſuch thing as breach of Unity, Love and Concord, which cannot fail to be Triumphant in the Church Triumphant (*Eccleſia triumphans in patria,*) where Love is Queen-regent, and where the Wills of all fully correſpond to the Divine Will, and they live in perfect conformity thereto (in their Sentiments and Affections, in their Motion and their Reſt, their Work and their Refreſhment;) they are therefore all one in God, and harmoniouſly ſerve and praiſe him for evermore.

Angelus non invidet Archangelo. S. Aug.

(5.) They are *the happy* (as well as the holy) Family; for the heavenly State which they are in, is the State of their Perfection (in all reſpects,) they are *the Angels of Light* interiourly and exteriourly, and their abode is in the Region of Light and Brightneſs unſully'd with any Cloud, of undiſturb'd Peace and Serenity. They are ſafe and exempt from all Evils, Evils of all kind (as the place of their abode is ὁ τῶν κακῶν καθαρὸς τόπος, *a place pure from all Evils* ſo called by *Plato* in his *Theætetus,*) an Heaven of Glory and Felicity is their Country, where there is nothing vile, ſordid and inglorious, nor any want of Goods, of the true and heavenly kind of Goods. The Inhabitants of Heaven are *the Bleſſed*, the Inheritance of Heaven is the Inheritance of *Bleſſedneſs*, the Joys of Heaven are not only the greateſt conceivable, but ſo great that to meer Men they are unconceivable. They live with God and conformably unto God (agreeably to the Heathens Notion of Bleſſedneſs (*m*) μετὰ θεῶν δίαιτα, *to live with the Gods* and as the Gods live,) and our Saviour ſaith of the Angels, which guard his Servants, that they enjoy *the Viſion of God*, wherein the Schools place Bleſſedneſs. *Matth.* 18. 10. But it is probable, that Heaven is deſcrib'd

2 *Cor.* 11. 14.

1 *Cor.* 2. 9.

(m) *Clem. Str. l.* 7. *p. m.* 526.

deſcrib'd by an Alluſion and Analogy to the Court of *Perſia* wherein there were *ſeven Princes that ſaw the King's Face* (the Officers of the Preſence, Preſidents and Princes, the principal Perſons at Court, *Eſther* 1. 14. *Ezra* 7. 14. *Dan.* 6. 3.) that our Saviour ſpeaketh of certain Angels of the higheſt Dignity, whoſe prerogative it is, *to ſtand in the Preſence of God* (*Luc.* 1. 19.) and (when they are in Heaven) *always to behold the Face of his Father which is in Heaven.* Matth. 18. 10. This may be the Prerogative of certain Angels of the higheſt Rank, yet the holy Angels in common muſt be ſuppoſed, to have ſuch a Viſion and Fruition of God, as belongeth in common to all that are holy, and is eſſential to their Beatitude. *Bleſſed are the pure in Heart, for they ſhall ſee God.* Matth. 5. 8. From this ſupernatural Beatitude of Angels the Schools have taken occaſion, to raiſe ſeveral Diſputes about their Original Condition. (n) *Whether the Angels were created in Grace or meer Nature? Whether the evil Angels were created in the final Beatitude? Whether the good Angels were created in ſupernatural Beatitude?* Touching theſe momentous Theories they are not wanting in Altercations and Argumentations; but their Argumentations are ſo trifling, that they deſerve not a ſerious conſideration, and the reaſons which they alledge for this their Dogma, *that the holy Angels have their ſupernatural Beatitude by Merit* (which they maintain with great Conſent,) are ſo extremely weak and frivolous, that we will not ſtick to affirm the contrary, that the holy Angels have their ſupernatural Beatitude by Inheritance (as Sons and Heirs,) and we will conſider them as by Original Creation (o) τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων τὴν μακαρίαν πληθὺν, *the bleſſed multitude of holy Angels.*

(n) *Utrum Angeli ſint creati in gratia? Utrum mali Angeli fuerint in beatitudine patriæ creati? Utrum boni Angeli fuerint in beatitudine patriæ vel beatitudine ſupernaturali creati?* Eugubin. de per. Phil. l. 8. c. 38. Aquin. 1a Qu. 62. Vaſqu. in Th. T. 2. Diſp. 226. Petav. T. 3. de Angl. l. 1. c. 16. Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 12. c. 9.

(o) *S. Cyr. Com. in Amos p.* 345.

(6.) They are the vaſtly great and *numerous* Family, which as far exceedeth in number the infernal Family of evil Angels, as the numerous Subjects of a mighty Kingdom exceed the Malefactors in a Gaol. The holy Writers intend not to define their number, but only to ſay, that they are vaſtly numerous, when they mention *more than twelve Legions of Angels*, when the Pſalmiſt reckoneth *Thouſands of Angels* (in the Margin it is many Thouſands *Pſal.* 68. 17.) *Thouſand thouſands miniſtring to God, and ten thouſand times ten thouſand ſtanding before him; the number of the Angels about the Throne was ten thouſand times ten thouſand and thouſands of thouſands; Myriads of Angels*, which our Tranſlation rendreth *an innumerable company*, Heb. 12. 22. (p) *There are ten thouſand Myriads of Angels above* (ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom*,) *and ten hundred thouſand of Archangels, Thrones alſo and Dominions, Principalities and Powers, and infinite People of the incorporeal Virtues and Nations innumerable.* It is not for Man or any finite Underſtanding to define their number, but ſome eſtimate may be made of their vaſt numeroſity from what *Æneas Gazæus* ſaith (q) μεςὸς δὲ ὁ αἰθὴρ ἀγγέλων, *the Ether is full of Angels.*

Matth. 26. 53.

Dan. 7. 10. *Apoc.* 5. 11.

(p) Μύριαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν ἀγγέλων ἄνω, ϗ χίλιαι χιλιάδες εἰσὶν ἀρχαγγέλων, ϗ θρόνοι ϗ κυριότητες ϗ ἀρχαὶ, ϗ ἐξουσίαι, ϗ ἄπειροι δῆμοι ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων, ϗ φῦλα ἀμύθητα. *S. Chryſoſt. T. 6. de Incomprehenſib. Hom. 2. p.* 399.

(q) *Ap. Petav. ſupr. c.* 14.

(7.) They are *the ſtable durable immortal and eternal* Family. Their Flouriſhing knoweth no Fading, their Glory no Sullying, their Age no Wrinkles, their Pleaſure no Pain, their Treaſure no Moth nor Ruſt, nor Thief; their Eſtate is liable to no Diſſeiſure, their Inheritance to no Ejection by fraud or force, their Health knoweth no Sickneſs, their Life (the fulleſt height of Life) no death or dying, no withering or decaying. The Sons of the Reſurrection *cannot die any more, for they are equal unto the Angels.* Luc. 20. 36. Though ſome Branches of this Angelical Family are broken off and are now ſpiritually Dead (which ſheweth, that it was not always in a confirm'd State in Goodneſs,) yet the main of it continuing in good are now in a confirm'd State, and are as Mount *Sion* (a Figure of this ſupernal Family, *Heb.* 12. 22.) *which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever.* This is the Family that iſſu'd from *Paternal Sanctity* and is *named of God the Father.* Eph. 3. 15. Whence *Epiſcopius* (r) might have learn'd, that God is call'd the Father of Angels.

(r) *Inſtit. Theol. l.* 4. *c.* 33.

(8.) They are the Family into which all muſt be incorporated, that claim the Alliance of God's Children, and Pray in the Stile of the Lord's Prayer (which importeth a Family-alliance and Kindred) calling God *Father.* (s) *That this Prayer belongeth to the faithful, both the Laws of the Church teach, and the beginning of the Prayer; for he that is not initiated, cannot call God Father.* (t) *Nor any that hath not remiſſion of Sins; the taking away the Puniſhment, Righteouſneſs, Sanctification, Redemption, Adoption, the Inheritance, Fraternity with the only begotten, and the holy Spirit. For he that hath not obtain'd all theſe Goods, cannot call God Father.* (u) *We teach this Prayer to thoſe that are initiated, not to thoſe that are not initiated, for none of them dareth to ſay Our Father.* (w)

(s) S. *Chryſoſt. Hom. in Matth.* 18. p. 133. (t) *Ibid.* p. 137.

(u) *Theodoret. heret. fab* 5 c. 28.

(w) *Homo novus, renatus & Deo ſuo per ejus gratiam reſtitutus, Pater primo in loco dicit, quia filius eſſe jam cœpit.*——— *Pater noſter, id eſt eorum qui credunt, eorum qui per eum ſanctificati & gratiæ ſpiritalis nativitate reparati, filii Dei eſſe cœperunt.*——— *Nec peccator populus poteſt eſſe filius (Dominus eos confundit & redarguit, dicens vos de Diabolo patre nati eſtis, omnis qui facit peccatum ſervus eſt peccati,) ſed quibus remiſſa peccatorum datur, eis filiorum nomen adſcribitur* ———*Quanta autem Domini indulgentia, quanta circa nos dignationis ejus & bonitatis ubertas, qui ſic nos voluerit orationem celebrare in conſpectu Dei, ut Deum Patrem vocemus, & ut eſt Chriſtus Dei Filius, ſic & nos Dei Filios nuncupemus. S. Cypr. de Orat. Domin. Felices qui Patrem agnoſcunt. Tertull. de Orat. Pater noſter utatur populus* [illegible] *Teſtamenti voce; populus novus ad æternitatem vocatus, Pater Noſter.* S. Aug. Ser. 182. de Tempore.

VII. God's Original Creation according to our *Fifth* Notice thereof was *Political* (Theopolitical) as well as *Phyſiological.* For it was not meerly a producing into Exiſtence an Univerſe of Creatures and of Rationals (which is a Phyſiological Creation,) but it was the making a vaſtly great Polity, *the Catholic Church*, which is the City of God. (x) *The word Creation ſometimes ſignifieth in a Phyſiological Senſe, ſometimes in a Political Senſe, and as the place requireth, it may be expounded in either Senſe or in both.* (y) In Latine Authors ordinarily (as in *Livy*, *Cæſar*, *Cicero*,) Conſuls, Captains, Magiſtrates are ſaid to be created, and in Nobility-Learning (z) we read of Letters of *Creation* (a) and *Creatio in Imperatorem*. A meer political Ordination or Conſtitution (b) is called by the Apoſtle ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, *an human Creation*, and in good Authors a meer Political Syſtem is called κόσμος, which is a word that

(x) Κτίσις *ſignificationem habet & Phyſicam & Politicam, ac perinde ut locus requirit, exponi poteſt alterutro ſenſu vel utroque.* D. H. Mor. Script. Philoſ. T. 2. p. 643.

(y) *Voſſ. Theſ. p.* 2.

(z) *Seld. Titles p.* 262, 289. (a) *Ibid. p.* 15. (b) *Grot. Not. in* 1 *Pet.* 2. 13.

that uſually ſignifieth the whole Creation. (c) for in *Thucydides*, *M. Antoninus* and *Heſychius*, κόσμος ſignifieth a Conſtitution or Polity, and the Name is hugely accommodate thereto. (*d*) For it ſignifieth an orderly ornamental diſpoſition of parts conſtitutive of one whole or Syſtem. Such a Syſtem every Polity is, and ſuch is that great Polity and Theopolity *the Univerſal Church*, which was made by the Orginal Creation of God, as will appear from theſe following Coſiderations.

(1.) God's Original Creation was analogous to the Creation of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, of which Political Creation Interpreters uſually expound thoſe many Texts of Scripture (*e*) which ſpeak of the Creation of old *Iſrael*. Iſa. 45. 11. *Thus ſaith the Lord, the holy one of Iſrael and his Maker, ask of me things to come concerning my Sons* (*f*) *and concerning the Work of my Hands.* Iſa. 43. 1. *Thus ſaith the Lord* (*g*) *that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Iſrael.* Malach. 2. 10. *Have we not all one Father?* (*h*) *hath not one God created us?* Iſa. 43. 15. *I am the Lord, your holy One,* (*i*) *the Creator of Iſrael, your King.* To underſtand theſe Texts of the Political Creation of *Iſrael*, is a faultleſs Interpretation: But wholly to confine them to this Interpretation (in which reſpect (*k*) *Calvin* exceedeth) is not faultleſs and unexceptionable. For the People of *Iſrael* did acknowledge God their Creator by a Common and Special, a Phyſiological and Political Creation. *Pſal.* 95. 6, 7. and 102. 18. *Iſa.* 17. 7. and 27. 11. So *Calvin* ſometimes interpreteth the Scripture. (*l*) *Fictorem ſe vocat Eccleſiæ ſuæ, non tantum quòd eam ut reliquos homines crearit, ſed quia eam adoptare dignatos eſt in peculium. God calleth himſelf the Maker of his Church, not only becauſe he created it as the reſt of Men, but becauſe he adopted it, to be his peculiar.* So by adopting a people (*angelorum populum as* S. *Auſtin* calleth them) God was the Maker of his Church in his Original Creation.

(2.) God's Original Creation was of the ſame general Nature with his other magnificent Creations and not leſs magnificent than they; therefore it was the making a Political (Theopolitical) World, as his creation of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael* was. For the ancient Hebrews not having any one word in their Language properly ſignifying *the World* (or Univerſal frame of created things) did uſually expreſs it by a Collection of the chief parts of it *Heaven and Earth*. By Heaven and Earth therefore in Scripture is underſtood the World or Univerſe, but not always the Phyſiological Univerſe, but the Creation of a Political World is ſometimes called the *Creation of Heaven and Earth*. (*m*) So the Creation of the Jewiſh Polity is called *Iſa.* 51. 15. *I am the Lord thy God, that divided the Sea whoſe Waves roared, the Lord of Hoſts is my Name. And I have put my words in thy Mouth* (given thee my Law) *and have cover'd thee in the ſhadow of my Hand, that I might plant the Heavens, and lay the foundations of the Earth, and ſay unto* Sion, *thou art my People.* That is to ſay, that I might make you a Political World or Univerſe (Theopolitical,) who were but ſcatter'd Perſons and Slaves in *Egypt*. So *new Heavens* and *a new Earth*, uſually ſignifie in Scripture a new Political World (Polity or Republick,) as *Iſa.* 65. 17. *For behold I create new Heavens and a new Earth, and the former ſhall not be remembred, nor come into my mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: For behold I create Jeruſalem a rejoicing and her People a joy.* Iſa. 66. 22. *As the new Heavens and the new Earth which I will make, ſhall remain before me, ſaith the Lord, ſo ſhall your Seed and your Name remain.* Apoc. 21. 1. *And I ſaw a new Heaven, and a new Earth.* Which Propheſies are generally underſtood to Predict, *novum Mundum, novum Orbem Politicum, a new Political World*, and of this Notion is the *new Creation*. God's Original Creation therefore was of the ſame Nature and Notion, *the making a Political* (Theopolitical) *World*. Which we may alſo infer from the Sayings of ſome ancient Writers, (*n*) *who look upon no Work ſo worthy of a God as the conſtituting a well ordinated Polity, nothing more pleaſing to God than Societies which are called Cities.* If the Inſtitution of Polity is ſo acceptable to God, ſo God-becoming, it could not be neglected in his Original Creation. If he was not in that Creation *Fundator Imperii, the Founder of a mighty Empire*, his Creation was not duly Honourary; nor could it be a κόσμος (an orderly ornamental Syſtem) unleſs Society and Polity was founded by it. And it muſt be an holy kind of Polity, which he founded in this Creation; for he had nothing leſs in deſign, and this is that which is deſign'd in his new Creation. Creating is Building, *Heb.* 3. 4. God's Church is his Building. 1 *Cor.* 3. 9. *Eph.* 2. 21. It is a City whoſe Builder and Maker is God. *Heb.* 11. 10. therefore when *he built all things*, he muſt be ſuppos'd, to have built this Divine City (the only choice and infinitely valuable building) nor could he then neglect the building his own *Houſe* and *Family*, as the Church is called 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Eph.* 2. 19. He that generateth a Family, createth a Polity; for creating and *generating* are in a large ſenſe terms ſynonymous. As in *Cicero*. (*o*) *Patria antiquior eſt parens, quàm is qui, ut ajunt, creaverit.* So in *Virgil*. —— *quem Nympha crearat.* If the Divine Family was generated in God's Original Creation, an holy Polity was founded thereby, and God did thereby κτίζειν πόλιν, *create or make a City*, as the Greeks uſually ſpeak.

(3.) The Pagan Theologers ſuppoſe, that the Univerſe is by its Original Conſtitution one mundane City conſiſting of the Gods and Men, that all Rationals are parts of this one whole, Members of this great *Body Politick* (cognate Fellow-members) and Citizens of this great City. They ſuppoſe therefore, that the making

---

(c) Gat. not. in M. Ant. p. 183.

(d) Κόσμος non tantum ornamentum ſignificat, ſed diſpoſitionem ordinem, θέσιν καὶ τάξιν, cùm res ſuo quæque ordine ac loco ponitur. *Heſychius.* Κόσμος τάξις. Inde & pro ornamento, quod tunc ſolet eſſe, cùm res aptè ſuis in locis poſitæ ſint & collocatæ. Hinc διακοσμος & διακόσμησις diſpoſitio & ordinatio. Inde & μετακόσμησις eodem modo tranſpoſitio. —— eodem modo & Egyptiis cùm verbum χω poſitionem & ſitum ſignificet, pro mundo etiam uſurpatum eſt. Salmaſ. Not. in Epict. p. 168, 169.

(e) Epiſcop. Inſtit. Theol. l. 4. c. 33.

(f) *Opus manuum ejus proprium Eccleſiæ Elogium.* Calvin. in Iſa. 19. 25.

(g) *Creationem & peculiarem formationem quando videlicet gentem illam ſibi in peculiarem populum in patribus elegit, commemorat. Forer. formans te, legibus & ſanctis inſtitutis. Tanquam vas in honorem, ut eſſes mihi in remp. fidelem.* Menoch. Sim. Tirin.

(h) *Creavit*, i. e. *formavit in populum, educendo patres noſtros ex Egypto. Sic vox* ברא *ſumitur.* Pſal. 102. 19. Eſa. 43. 1. & 45. 8. *Grot. Creavit, nempe ut eſſent ſacer populus & peculium Dei.* Calvin.

(i) *Nomen Creatoris non eſt referendum ad univerſalem creationem.* Calvin.

(k) *V. Com. ejus in Iſa.* 17. 7.

(l) Iſa. 54. 5.

(m) Mr. Mede Clav. Apoc. de Sigill. 6.

(n) Ουθὲν ὅτω κοσμοπρεπὲς καὶ θεῶν ἄξιον ἔργον ἀνθρώποις πέπρακται, ὡς πόλιος εὐνομουμένας συναρμογά, καὶ νόμων καὶ πολιτείας διακόσμησις. *Eurypham. Pythagor. Nihil eſt illi principi Deo qui omnem hunc mundum regit, quod quidem in terris fiat acceptius, quàm conſilia cœtuſque hominum jure ſociati, quæ civitates appellantur.* Cic. in Somn. Scip.

(o) Voſſ. Theſ. p. 2. Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 1.

Πρὸς κοινωνίαν γεγοναμεν. M. Ant. l. 5. S. 16.

the World was the making a vaſtly great Polity and their Theopolity; that Rationals are made to live in Society, in God-ſociety, and to live ſocietively (in ſocietive Virtue and Practice,) doing the Duties and enjoying the Benefits of Society, which are innumerable and invaluable. Δεινότατον ἡ ἐρημία, *Solitude is a ghaſtly horrendous thing* (*Archytas Tarentinus* would not live in Heaven, if he was to live there alone,) there is no living but in Society, nor is there any living in Society without ſuch Order and Government, as is in Cities and Polities. The City of God therefore muſt neceſſarily be founded in his Original Creation; for Rationals muſt live in the State of Citizenſhip and Society with God and with one another as God's People. Their Obligations are innumerable and infinitely great, to live in the State of Society with God (their rightful Sovereign, their natural Leige-Lord and their God) as his Subjects and Servants. And as the firſt Duty of a Child (when he cometh to Diſcretion) is to acknowledge his Father, and the prime fundamental Duty of a Subject (of Right and by Obligation ſuch) is, to acknowledge his Sovereign, and to conſent to his Sovereignty and his own Subjection: So the prime fundamental Duty of all Rationals in Heaven and Earth is, to conſent to be God's People. (p) *Primum officium juſtitiæ eſt, conjungi cum Deo: Secundum cum homine. The firſt Duty of Juſtice is, to have Conjunction with God* (to be join'd unto the Lord, 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. *Jer.* 50. 5.) *The ſecond with Man.*

(4.) God's original Creation was a ſettlement of rights and dues, upon which Political Societies are Founded, whereby (by the bonds of right and due) they are held together, and without which there could be no Families, no Cities, no Kingdoms, no Juſtice, no Government. In a Family there muſt be a Settlement of Rights and Dues; the Father and the Maſter hath right to Govern, and it belongeth to the Children and Servants, to be ſubject and obey; he oweth unto them Protection and Maintenance, and they owe unto him Obedience and Service. A *City* is not a rude Multitude, a Chaos, or unformed Maſs, not a rout or herd of People, but a body Politick (like the body Natural, which hath the beauty of a Man, *Iſa.* 44. 13.) is a regular and comely Structure, conſiſting of Head and Members, (orderly united into one whole) by a ſettlement of Rights and Dues, which determineth, who ſhall be the Party Imperant and the Party Subject, what ſhall be due from us, and what ſhall be due to us. Such a Settlement of Rights and Dues is the Religion of the City of God (which conſiſts of a Duty and of a Benefit-part) which foundeth that holy Polity, wherein the Subjects and Citizens have the Right and Priviledge of Subjects and Citizens, and owe the Duty of Subjects and Citizens. Such a Settlement was neceſſarily made by God's Original Creation, whereby an Univerſe of Rationals was produc'd; for God's Production of ſuch an Univerſe and of his Univerſe was neceſſarily a making this Settlement of Rights and Dues, *that he ſhould be to them a God, and they ſhould be to him a People.* In this State and Relation all of them were created, and therefore by their Creation the City of God was conſtituted: Nor is it imaginable, that an Univerſe of Rationals could be created but out of the ſocietive Deſign and for the State of Society and Citizenſhip with God and with one another, upon which account (and many other) the Creation of an Univerſe of *Slaves that have no Rights*, is as impoſſible as undeſirable.

(5.) The Philoſophers look'd upon Heaven *as a City* (and the popular Pagans had the ſame Notion of it;) for the Stoicks ſay, (q) *that Heaven is properly a City, but that theſe on Earth are not Cities; they are called ſuch, but are not.* (r) Earth and Heaven are by a Platoniſt reſembled to thoſe two Cities, which *Vulcan* in *Homer* is ſaid to have graven in a Golden Buckler, whereof the one was joyous and triumphant, in the other were Wars and Seditions, Rapines and Fightings, ὀλόλυγαι καὶ οἰμωγαὶ καὶ ϛόνοι, *Howlings, Lamentations and Groans. When the Soul leaveth the Body* (s) *ſuch a Soul is now called a Demon, an Ethereal Nurſling, tranſlated thither from the Earth as from amongſt the Barbarians to the Grecians, and as out of a City that is lawleſs, under Tyranny and Seditions, into another that hath good Laws and a juſt King and is a City of Peace.* Agreeably to theſe Notions of Pagan Religioniſts Chriſtianity diſtinguiſheth and deſcribeth two oppoſite Cities (t) *unam Cœleſtem alteram terrenam, the one Heavenly the other Terrene* (which is but improperly a City,) theſe are *Civitas Dei & Civitas hujus Mundi, the City of God and the City of this World.* The City of God is called Mount *Sion the ſupernal Jeruſalem.* Heb. 12. 22. (u) ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἡ ὑψουμένη, ἡ ὑπερνεφὴς, ἡ ἁπτομένη οὐρανῶν, τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος, *the Church on high, above the Clouds, that toucheth the Heavens, the holy Mount,* (w) οὐράνιος ἐκκλησία, *the Heavenly Church,* (x) ἡ ἀνωτάτω ἐκκλησία, *the Church in the higheſt place* (y) ἡ μὴ βλεπομένη νοουμένη δὲ πόλις, *the City that is not viſible, but intelligible* (z) *Civitas æterna, ubi nullus oritur quia nullus moritur, the eternal City, in which none is born, becauſe none dieth.* Heaven is repreſented as a City by our Saviour, when he telleth his Diſciples, *that their Names are written in Heaven.* Luc. 10. 20. For the Phraſe relateth to the cuſtom of well order'd Cities, which kept Rolls or Regiſters of the Citizens or Freemen (as diſtinct from the ſervile ſort of People,) every one who had *jus Civitatis, the Right of a Freeman,* had his Name enroll'd. So *the Book of Life* is (as it were) *Heaven's Regiſter*, thoſe that have their Names written therein, are naturaliz'd, endeniz'd, infranchis'd, and made Free-men of the heavenly Corporation, they are enroll'd Citizens of Heaven, are Heirs of Heaven and for them eternal Life is deſign'd. The Scripture repreſenteth *the Book of Life* as Heaven's Regiſter (the Regiſter of the holy City, *Heb.* 12. 23.) for to blot any ones Name out of the Book of Life, is to disfranchiſe him, and turn him out of Citizenſhip. *Apoc.* 22. 19. On the contrary, to have his Name written therein, is to be enroll'd a Citizen, as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith of ſome, that were converted to the Faith and baptiz'd, that they were that day πολιτογραφηθέντες, *written Citizens of the* Jeruſalem *above.* So a late Writer ſaith of ſome, (a) *being imbu'd with the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion and baptiz'd, of Strangers, Servants of Devils and Slaves of Men, they preſently became Fellow-citizens with An-*

(p) Lactant. l. 6. c. 10.

Cœtus hominum jure ſociati. Cic.

(q) Clem. Str. l. 4. in fine.

(r) M. Tyr. d. 27.

(s) Καλεῖται ἡ τοιαύτη ψυχὴ δαίμων ἤδη, θρέμμα αἰθέριον, μετοικισθὲν ἐκ γῆς ἐκεῖ, ὥσπερ ἐκ βαρβάρων εἰς Ἕλληνας, καὶ ἐξ ἀνόμου καὶ τυραννουμένης καὶ ϛασιαϛικῆς πόλεως, εἰς εὐνομουμένην καὶ βασιλευομένην καὶ εἰρηνικὴν πόλιν. M. Tyr. Ibid.

(t) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 14. c. 15. & l. 15. c. 2.

(u) Clem. προλεγτ. p. m. 55.

(w) Idem Pædag. l. 2. c. 1.

(x) Idem. Str. l. 5. p. 481.

(y) Gr. Naz. or. 11 p. 179.

(z) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 5. c. 16.

(a) *Myſteriis Chriſtianæ Religionis imbuti, & cæleſti lavacro expiati, è peregrinis dæmonum ſervis, hominumque mancipiis, Angelorum Cives, & Domeſtici Dei repente evadebant.* Maffeius Indic. l. 1. p.

gels and Gods Domeſticks. Eph. 2. 19. The regenerate and divine Family muſt be look'd upon as (*b*) οὐρανοπολῖται, *Heaven's Citizens*; for as the Romans did *donare Civitate, give the Right* of Citizenſhip to many, who had not *Domicilium in Urbe*, and theſe were called *Municipes*, that had Right to bear Offices in the Commonwealth and the Freedom of Citizens, yet liv'd in the Provinces: So many that are in the State of Peregrination here on Earth, yet have the Freedom of Citizens of Heaven, which is *Sanctorum Metropolis, the Mother-City of all Saints.* Gal. 4. 26. Heb. 12. 22. The heavenly City therefore (*Civitas Sancta Dei*) admitteth of different acceptations. For in the large acceptation it comprehendeth all Saints, thoſe that are here on Earth as well as thoſe that are *in ſuperna Patria, their ſupernal Country.* In the ſtricter acceptation it denoteth only thoſe Saints, that have *Domicilium in Urbe* and are in the heavenly State of Life. In the ſtricteſt acceptation it denoteth only thoſe Saints, that were originally in the heavenly State of Life, and never were in a State of Peregrination. If the heavenly City be taken in any of theſe various Senſes, it is Theopolitical, (*c*) *Civitas Regis magni, the City of the great King* (the Church;) and if it be taken in the ſtricteſt Senſe, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that God was by original Creation (*d*) *ſupernæ Hieruſalem fabricator atque regnator, the Maker of the ſupernal* Jeruſalem *and the imperial Eſtate thereof. Cœleſtis & ſempiternæ conditor Civitatis, the Builder of the heavenly and eternal City*, as S. *Auſtin* celebrateth the Divine Majeſty. (*e*) *Deus eſt qui condidit Civitatem. Pulchra & decora Civitas quàm pulchriorem habet conditorem!*

VIII. God's Original Creation (according to our *Sixth* Notice thereof) *founded the Original Kingdom of God*, which is an uſeful Name of the City or Church of God. For

(1.) The Name of the Kingdom of God importeth, that his Divine City muſt be conſider'd as the *Polity, which God is of as the true and proper intrinſic Imperial Eſtate and Regent Party thereof, whence it is denominated his Kingdom.* God was not the true and proper, but a typical and adumbrative imperial Eſtate of the carnal Judaical Polity, their Theocracy was adumbrative only of the true and proper Theocracy, whence (*f*) *the Kingdom of Heaven* (the Kingdom of God) *is not nam'd in the Old Teſtament.* In the New Teſtament the Name is frequent, and God is there repreſented as *the true and proper intrinſic imperial Head of a Polity*, but of no other Polity ſave only *his holy Catholic Church* the Communion of Saints. *The Head of every* (Chriſtian) *Man is Chriſt, and the Head of the Woman is the Man, and the Head of Chriſt is God.* 1 Cor. 11. 3. and ch. 3. 23. As the Church is (*g*) *Societas Sanctorum, the Society of the Saints* (the holy People or the People of God,) ſo her King peculiarly is (*h*) *Sanctus Sanctorum, the Holy of Holies*, and his Kingdom is definitively (*i*) *Reſpublica Sanctorum, the Commonwealth of the Saints*, which is alſo a true and genuin definition of the Church. (*k*) *Civitas magni Regis non eſt niſi Eccleſia. Hæc domus Dei, hoc Templum Dei, hoc Regnum Dei, regnumque Cælorum. It is the Church only, that is the City of the great King. This is the Houſe of God, this is the Temple of God, this is the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of Heaven.* (*l*) *Dei Eccleſia, nonne Dei eſt Regnum, Patrimonium, Deliciæque omnes? God's Church is it not his Kingdom, Patrimony, and all his Delights?* Such is the State of things by the new Creation of Chriſtianity; from whence (and from the Nature of things) it appeareth, that God by his Original Creation was the true and proper intrinſic imperial Eſtate of the City of God; that when the Original City of God was founded, the Original Kingdom of God was founded; that theſe were then commenſurate and ſo they will be for ever.

(2.) The Name of the Kingdom of God denoteth *the Unity* of the Church or City of God; *that as there can be* but one Kingdom of God at one and the ſame time, ſo the Church of God on Earth and that in Heaven are *one Body Politic, one Family, one City, one Church, one holy Empire.* The Unity of the Church is the Unity of a Body Politic (an animated Body Politic,) the many Members of it are one (*m*) *propter unitatem corporis, becauſe they are united into one Body.* The Unity of the Church therefore may be clearly underſtood from the Pagan Theologers Notion of the Unity of the Univerſe of Rationals, which they ſuppos'd to be (*n*) *one great City*, one κόσμος, *ordinate Syſtem, one animated whole and great Body*, and that all individuals were τὰ μέρη τοῦ ὅλου, *the parts of this great whole*, τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος, *membra corporis magni, mundi totius Cives, Citizens of this great City* (the World,) all nearly ally'd, conjoin'd and link'd together into one City and one Body as Fellow-citizens and Fellow-members. In which account of the Univerſe of Rationals, if the Pagan Theologers had not been miſtaken in their Whole or Catholic Syſtem, their Theology had been unexceptionable; for the account which the Scripture-Theology giveth of the Univerſe of holy Rationals, perfectly correſpondeth to their account of the Univerſe of common Rationals, and is an exact Paralleliſm thereto. From whence it followeth, that the City and Church of God which the Chriſtian Theology contemplateth and treateth of, is not to be confin'd to the holy Rationals of our diminutive Syſtem (this Mole hill of the Earth,) that they extremely miſrepreſent it, who upon frivolous and trifling Reaſons diſpute (*o*) that the holy Angels are not parts of the Church (*p*) that Theology is to be defin'd *the Doctrine of the Kingdom of God over Men*, which pretendeth not to give an account of *God's univerſal Kingdom.* This mutilate and diminutive Mode of Theologizing bewrayeth a great narrowneſs of Mind and Thought, bereaveth Theology of a moſt noble and principal part, ſpoileth the Rational Frame and Contexture of it, bereaveth the City of God of far the greateſt and nobleſt part of it ſelf (the Metropolis,) it claſheth with the definitive Notion of the City of God (which is *Civitas Cœleſtis*) and with the definitive Notion of *the Church* in the large acceptation (which is *omnium Sanctorum Congregatio*, (*q*) *Eccleſia Univerſa in Cœlo & Terra, Eccleſia Angelorum & noſtra*) it manifeſtly claſheth with the New Teſtaments Senſe and Notion of things, and with the Senſe and Notion of the Fathers (who look upon the Angels as part of the Church (the object of Theology) although the Theology of them is imperfect in our imperfect State. (*r*) *This Angelical Church will then be known to us, as it is, when we are conjoin'd therewith, to poſſeſs together eternal Beatitude. That which is in Peregrination*

on

(b) Iſidor. Peluſ. l. 2. Ep. 251.

(c) S. Hieron. T. 7. in Pſal. 47.

(d) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c. 20.

(e) Idem Enar. in Pſal. 64.

(f) S. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 15. in fine.

(g) Idem Ep. 23.

(h) Idem de prædeſt. Sanct. c. 15

(i) Bucer in Matth. 5. 19.

(k) S. Aug. de unit. Eccl. c 24. & in Johann. Tract. 68.

() Acontii Strateg. p. 162.

Rom. 12. 4, 5. 1. Cor. 12. 12, 13, 20. Eph. 4. 4.

(m) S. Aug. Enar. in Pſal. 102. Conc. 1.

(n) Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 264, 113.

(o) Curcell. Tr. de Eccleſ. c. 1. Bp. Pearſon on the Creed Art. 1.

(p) Mr. Baxter Meth. Theol. Par. 1. c. 1.

(q) S. Aug. Ench. ad Laurent. c. 56.

(r) *Hæc quæ ex Sanctis Angelis & virtutibus Dei eſt Eccleſia, tunc nobis, ſicuti eſt, innoteſcet, cùm ei conjuncti fuerimus in unum ad ſimul habendam beatitudinem ſempiternam.*

on Earth, is therefore more known to us, becauſe we are in it, and becauſe it conſiſteth of Men, which we are. Theology therefore conſidereth the Church as *Angelical* and as *Humane*, and giveth a much larger account of it as *Humane* than as *Angelical*; but it ſuppoſeth this *Angelical-humane* Church, to be one Divine Family, *Eph.* 3. 15. one Houſhold of God and Society of Saints, *Eph.* 2. 19. One holy Polity and Kingdom of Saints, *Eph.* 1. 10. *Apoc.* 15. 3. One City of God and therefore one Church conſiſting of Men and Angels, *Heb.* 12. 22, 23. (s) *For we are together with them one City of God, to which it is ſaid in the Pſalm, glorious things are ſpoken of thee,* O *City of God; part of which in us ſojourneth, part in them ſuccoureth.* They deſtroy the Unity of the Church therefore, that diſpute the holy Angels out of the Church; for thus they divide the one Kingdom of God into two Kingdoms. (t) *As when two Kingdoms before inimical are ſubjected to the Rule of one Prince, and therefore are reconciled and made amical, this doth not infer, that they piece together into one Kingdom.* So theſe Diſputants ſuppoſe, that although holy Men and Angels are both ſubjected unto Chriſt, yet they are not aſſociated into one City and Kingdom, nor into one Houſhold of God: *Sed Chriſtus duas domos habet, but Chriſt hath two Houſes, one Celeſtial the other Terreſtrial, whoſe Laws and Government are very much different.* No doubt the Laws and Government of the Church on Earth are in ſome ſort different from thoſe of the Holy Angels: So the Pagan Theologers underſtood very well, that there is a great diverſity between Heaven and Earth. But they did not ſuppoſe, that the Laws and Government of this World were ſo different from thoſe of Heaven, as that Heaven and this World were not incorporated into one City and Kingdom; for they affirm, that there is *one Law* of the Univerſe of Rationals and *one King* of Gods and Men. So the Chriſtian Theology doth not ſuppoſe, that there is ſuch a difference between the Laws and Government of the Church on Earth and thoſe of the Holy Angels, as that they are not incorporated into one City and Kingdom; for it ſuppoſeth, that the Law of both is for the main the ſame, that there is but one King of both without any ſubordinate Head of Government; and therefore they are one City and Kingdom. They that affirm the contrary, and diſpute the Holy Angels out of the Chriſtian Church, muſt ſuppoſe vaſt and numerous Abſurdities: *That Regenerate Chriſtians are not Citizens of Heaven, nor of the* Jeruſalem *above, nor are their Names written in Heaven, nor are they Fellow-citizens and Fellow-ſubjects with all Saints but with ſome Saints only; that this one Name, The City or Kingdom of God doth not ſignifie one City or one Kingdom, but two Cities and Kingdoms; that Men may be of one Kingdom of God and not of another, in the Kingdom of God and not in the Kingdom of God at the ſame time; out of the Kingdom of God, yet not of the World or of the Kingdom of Satan; that there are two different Covenants or Settlements of God's Kingdom both in full force at the ſame time, two ſaving Religions, two Empires of Saints aliens and exoticks to each other, of both which God is the Imperial Eſtate; that there are two Kingdoms of Light and Grace, two Books of Life, two Spiritual Temples* (two Houſes,) *two holy Lives* (and conſequently two holy Spirits,) *that the Divine Family is not one whole Family* (contrary to *Eph.* 3. 15.) *and that the City and Kingdom of God is not one whole, of which all Saints are Parts and Fellow-members,* wherein the *Unity* of the Church conſiſteth.

(3.) The Name of the Kingdom of God denoteth *the Amplitude* of the Church (for without due Amplitude, Grandure and Magnificence there can be no Kingdom,) which principally conſiſteth in the vaſt and immenſe Numeroſity of the Holy Angels. (u) *An indefinite and a definite number of the Supernal Citizens is expreſs'd in Scripture, to ſhew, that they who are to God numerable, are unto Men innumerable.* The Church on Earth is hugely diſproportionate to the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*, and at her riſe was of ſlender Dimenſions; but a Kingdom was then initially founded (though not plenarily formed,) and now ſhe wanteth not the Amplitude requiſite for a Kingdom; although her Dimenſions are ſtill too narrow by much, to anſwer the gracious Deſigns of God and the Needs of Men; and *Cælius Secundus Curio* had no very inviting Subject to write upon, when he wrote *de Amplitudine regni Dei, of the Amplitude of the Kingdom of God.*

(4.) The Name of the Kingdom of God denoteth *the Holineſs* of the Church or City of God; that it muſt be conſider'd as the Kingdom of God and his Saints, the Kingdom or Imperial comprehenſion of Sanctity (of the Learning of it, of the Law of it, of the State and Life of it, the Government of it, the Goods of it, the Duties and Benefits of it) and as the God-kind or Saint of God-kind of Kingdom. (w) *This City of God is as a Land and Region of the Sanctiſy'd,* (x) *the Houſe and City of the moſt holy God,* (y) *the Sacred and Divine Sheepfold.* The Celeſtial City and Kingdom is neceſſarily the Holy City (*Hieruſalem Sancta*) and to her King the ancient definition of a Kingdom cited and approv'd by S. *Baſil* peculiarly belongeth. (z) *Some have defin'd a Kingdom to be a legitimate Prefecture or Rule over all not abnoxious to ſin.* As the holy King is worthy of the Name of a King, ſo the Heavenly *Jeruſalem* is worthy of the Name of a City; (a) *for ſome define a City to be a Syſtem ſettled and eſtabliſhed, adminiſtred according to Law: Which definition of a City agreeth to the* Jeruſalem *above, the Heavenly City; for there is the Syſtem of the Firſt-born, of thoſe that are written in Heaven; and this Syſtem is ſettled and eſtabliſhed becauſe of the immutable Life of the Saints; and it is govern'd according to the Law of Heaven.*

(5.) The Name of the Kingdom of God (being the ſame with the Kingdom of Heaven) denoteth *the Heavenlineſs* of the Church and City of God; that as her Original and her Seat is in Heaven, ſo ſhe is of kind and quality and in all reſpects Divine and Heavenly, extremely diſſonant

Iſta verò quæ ab illa peregrinatur in terris, eo nobis nobis notior eſt, quod in illa ſumus, & quia hominum eſt, quod & nos ſumus. S. Aug. ibid. c. 61.

(s) *Cum ipſis enim ſumus una Civitas Dei, cui dicitur in Pſalmo, glorioſa dicta ſunt de te Civitas Dei: cujus pars in nobis peregrinatur, pars in illis opitulatur.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 7.

(t) *Curcell. ſupr.*

(u) *Supernorum Civium numerus infinitus & definitus exprimitur: ut qui Deo eſt numerabilis eſſe hominibus innumerabilis demonſtretur.* Gregor. expoſ. in Job c. 25. l. 17. c. 7.

(w) Αὐτὴ δ' ἂν εἴη ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ πόλις γῆ τις ὥσπερ ἐστὶ καὶ χώρα τῶν ἡγιασμένων. *S. Cyr. com. in Mich. T.* 3. p. 438.

(x) Οἶκος καὶ πόλις τοῦ παναγίου Θεοῦ. *Ibid.* p. 360.

(y) Ἱερὰ καὶ θεία αὐλή. *Ibid.* p. 124.

(z) Ὡρίσαντο δέ τινες βασιλείαν τὴν ἔννομον ἐπιστασίαν· τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀρχὴν ἀνυπεύθυνον ἁμαρτίᾳ. *Homil. in Pſal.* [illegible]

(a) Ὁρίζονται γάρ τινες πόλιν εἶναι σύστημα ἱδρυμένον, κατὰ νόμον διοικούμενον. ἐφαρμόζει δὲ καὶ τῇ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῇ ἐπουρανίῳ πόλει ὁ ἀποδοθεὶς ὅρος τῆς πόλεως. σύστημα γὰρ κἀκεῖ τῶν πρωτοτόκων, τῶν ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς· καὶ ἱδρυμένον τοῦτο, διὰ τὸ ἀμετακίνητον τῆς διαγωγῆς τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ κατὰ νόμον τὸν οὐράνιον διοικούμενον. *Idem. Hom. in Pſal.* 45.

nant from and tranſcendent to Mundane Cities and Kingdoms, wherein there is nothing higher or better than the Humane and Mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies. (*b*) *That City in which we are promis'd to reign, is as far diſtant from this Mundane City, as Heaven is from Earth, Life Eternal from Temporary Joy, ſolid Glory from vain Praiſes, the Society of Angels from the Society of Mortals, and from the Light of the Sun and Moon his Light who made the Sun and Moon.* But the Attribute *Heavenly* is not appropriate to the Church which is in Heaven; (*c*) for *the* (genuine) *Church on Earth is an Image and Reſemblance of that which is in Heaven.* One of the ancient Writers ſaith, ἐκκλησία ἐστὶν οὐρανὸς ἐπίγειος, *the Church is an Heaven upon Earth*; which is of great conſideration to her Governours, to excite them, to take care of her Purity; and to her Members, to deter them from defiling her Sanctity; (*d*) *for the City of God is the Church. He ſinneth againſt Heaven, that contaminateth the Heavenly City, and violateth the Sanctity of this immaculate Body by the filth of his Vices.*

(6.) The Name of the Kingdom of God denoteth, that the Church conſtituteth it, as it is *the Kingdom of God perſonal*; and is conſtituted by it, as it is *the Kingdom of God real.* The Kingdom of God is of various acceptations (which muſt be conſider'd hereafter,) we will here only obſerve, that it ſometimes ſignifieth in *the perſonal* acceptation *That holy Polity* which conſiſteth of God and his People, and ſo it ſignifieth the Church, and the Church conſtituteth it; for the holy People conſtitute it as the Subject-party thereof, *Apoc.* 15. 3. But the Kingdom of God ſignifieth alſo in *the real* acceptation, and muſt be conſider'd as it is the Kingdom of the real ſaving Goods, namely, *of ſaving Grace and of Glory, of the State and Life of Sanctity and of Salvation,* in which ſenſe we are commanded, to *ſeek the Kingdom of God in the firſt place*; and in this Senſe the Church is conſtituted by it; for it is by theſe ſaving Goods of the Kingdom that the Saints of God are conſtituted ſuch. In this Senſe the Kingdom of God (*e*) *is the Kingdom of Righteouſneſs, the Kingdom of the Spirit and of ſolid Piety; for there is in it an heavenly and incomparably ſupra-terrene Power, whereby we are ſet at liberty from Sin and Death, enjoy Eternal Peace and an affluence of all Goods.* In this Senſe this holy kind of Kingdom is not only a Kingdom to God (whoſe Laws and Government take place in it,) but to all its Citizens alſo it is a Kingdom (their Kingdom,) this height of Good accrueth to them (*f*) τὸ φυῆναι βασιλέας, *to be made Kings*; for it is to them *the height of Honour and Happineſs, they are of reigning condition, of regial and unſervile condition, of royal and illuſtrious quality and condition in it*; whence they are juſtly reputed a ſort of Kings, which the magnificent Names of *a Kingdom, a Crown* and *Throne* denote and ſignifie; *regnare eos dicimus, qui bonis omnibus affluunt & beati ſunt,* 1 Cor. 4. 8. *We ſay, that they reign, who live in beatitude and affluence of all Goods,* in Safety, Plenty and Proſperity (not in Beggary and Slavery and the Inconveniences of a mean Condition) not ſubjugated and held at an under in a weak and languiſhing Condition, but in high, magnificent and puiſſant Eſtate: So Grace reigneth, Righteouſneſs reigneth, Peace reigneth in God's Kingdom, and the Citizens of it reign in Life Eternal, which is a Kingdom-eſtate. (*g*) *Nihil aliud eſt regnum quàm vita æterna.* (*h*) *This therefore is the Kingdom of God: Where Sin is vanquiſh'd, Death is deſtroy'd, the Enemy reigneth not; for Death reigned from* Adam *to* Moſes; *and the Apoſtle ſaith, Sin doth not now reign in you, the Kingdom of Sin being deſtroy'd, and we our ſelves being now Kings, the adverſe Kingdom being taken away, this Kingdom of God ſhall be, when all the Stings of our Vices being waſted, the blemiſh of Bodily Infirmity ſhall be ſwallow'd up.*

In the whole computation of things the Kingdom of God appeareth to be no underling and undergraduate good, nor hath it any match, compeer or coequal, it ſtandeth ſingular and alone as the higheſt ſoveraign good, the boundleſs and immenſurable good (or rather abyſs of goods) *the Height of Good to the fulleſt Height of Ennoblement*; for as a Kingdom ſignifieth *the Height of Good,* (*i*) τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὄντων, *it is of Pulchritude above all things* (*Lactantius* miſtaketh (*k*) in diſputing, that a Kingdom is not the Supreme Good:) So in the Chriſtian Theology *the height of Good* (the chief Good and the comprehenſion of the chief Goods) is known by the Name of the Kingdom of God. (*l*) It anſwereth to the Elogies of Virtue in the School of the *Stoicks,* who ſtil'd it *Summum bonum, Unicum bonum,* ἓν τοῦτο πολλοῦ ἄξιον (this one thing that is of any great regard,) *ineſtimabile bonum, ſibi ſufficiens, regnum, beata vita,* εὔρους καὶ θεουδὴς βίος, *the Proſperous and Divine Life,* and (*m*) ἅπας ὁ ὑπὲρ γῆς καὶ ὑπὸ γῆς χρυσὸς οὐκ ἀντάξιος ἀρετῆς κατὰ Πλάτωνα, *according to* Plato *all the Gold above the Earth and under the Earth is not comparable to Virtue.* A Man muſt ſtick at nothing (no Loſſes, Labours, Prayers or Sufferings,) count nothing too much, nothing too good for the purchaſe of ſo tranſcendent a Good; he muſt gain it at any rate, part with it at no rate, but part with All that he hath, to buy it * (*Tanti tibi valet quantum habere poteris,*) all the common external Goods and humane Excellencies muſt be counted but as Traſh and Riff-raff Stuff in compariſon of it, whatever Fleſh and Blood admireth and doateth upon, this Mortal Life and all its Intereſts, this whole World and all its Accommodations muſt be depreciated, diſaffected, forſaken and caſt away (ſo far as they come in competition with it) for the Kingdom of God's ſake, which cannot be bought too dear; for if God is the abſolutely perfect Good, his Kingdom can be no leſs than ſo, which is the enjoyment of God to the Citizens thereof, to whom he is all friendly Relations, and to whom in his Teſtament he bequeatheth his whole Eſtate; all things are theirs ſo far as to be ſubſervient to their welfare; they are ſav'd from their deadly ghoſtly Enemies, exempted from the true and great Evils, entitled to (and initially at leaſt poſſeſs'd of)

(b) *Illa Civitas in qua nobis regnare promiſſum eſt, tantum ab hac diſtat, quantum diſtat cœlum à terra, à temporaria lætitia vita æterna, ab inanibus gaudiis ſolida gloria, à ſocietate mortalium ſocietas angelorum, à lumine ſolis & lunæ lumen ejus qui fecit ſolem & lunam.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 5. c. 17.

(c) Εἰκὼν τῆς οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας ἡ ἐπίγειος. *Clem. Str. l.* 4. p. m. 354.

(d) *Civitas Dei Eccleſia eſt. peccat in cœlum, qui cœleſtis civitatis jura contaminat, & immaculati corporis violat ſanctitatem ſuorum colluvione vitiorum.* S. Ambroſ. in Pſal. 118. Ser. 15.

Matth. 6. 33.

(e) *Regnum eſt juſtitiæ, regnum ſpiritus atque ſolidæ pietatis —— Viget enim in eo cœleſtis & omni terrenæ incomparabiliter præſtans potentia, qua nimirum à peccato & morte vindicamur, æternâque pace ac omnium bonorum affluentiâ fruimur.* Bucer. in Matth. 3. 2.

(f) Clem. Str. l. 6. p. m. 496.

1 Pet. 2. 9. Jam. 1. 12. and 2. 5. 2 Tim. 2. 12. Apoc. 1. 6. 3, 21. 20. 4, 6. Rom. 5. 17.

(g) S. *Aug. de verb. Apoſt. Ser.* 14.

(h) *Hoc itaque regnum Dei eſt: ubi peccatum vincitur, ubi mors perimitur, ubi non regnat hoſtis. Mors enim regnavit ab Adam uſque ad Moyſem. & Apoſtolus ait: jam non regnat peccatum in vobis. per hoc regnum Dei regno peccati diſſoluto, ipſiſque jam nobis regibus, regno adverſante ſublato, hoc erit regnum Dei, cùm omnibus vitiorum noſtrorum aculeis contuſis, labes erit corporeæ mortalitatis abſorpta.* S. Hilar. in Pſal. 2.

(i) *Iſocrat. Evagor.*

(k) *L.* 3. c. 11.

(l) *Matth.* 13. 43. *and* 19. 24. *and* 26. 19. *Mark* 9. 47. *and* 10. 15, 53. *and* 14. 25. *Luk.* 12. 28, 29. *and* 14. 15. *and* 22. 16. *Act.* 14. 22. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. *and* 15. 50. *Gal.* 5. 21. *Eph.* 5. 5. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 5. 2 *Pet.* 1. 11.

(m) *Plut. de cap. ex In. util.* p. 92.

* *S. Aug. in Pſ.* 102. *Matth.* 13. 44, 46. *Mark* 9. 47. *Luc.* 14. 26, 32.

Ἀκρότης τῶ καλῶ. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 305.

of,) the true and great Goods, the State of Bleſſedneſs, the Life of Bleſſedneſs, the Inheritance of Bleſſedneſs, and the Society of the Bleſſed: They have right to all the Heavenly Royal Goods (the Goods of the Kingdom,) ſhall be ſtated and habited as the Sons of God, cloath'd with their Royal Apparel, and their Manſion ſhall be Divine and truly Royal, the ſame with that of the Holy Angels the Original Citizens of the Original Kingdom of God.

IX. The Original Kingdom of God is contradiſtinguiſh'd to the new Kingdom of God (the Kingdom of God that now is, which is of a new Foundation and Creation;) for as *Plato* in his *Politicus* diſtinguiſheth *διττὰς κατακοσμήσεις, two Eſtates of the World*, the one under *Saturn*, the other under *Jupiter*: So Theology muſt conſider a twofold Eſtate of God's Kingdom, the one under God as *meer Creator*, the other under *God-Redeemer* (or new Creator,) and the former of theſe muſt be called *The Original Kingdom of God*. A King, ſaith a Philoſopher, (*n*) is *δημιουργὸς, the maker of his Kingdom*: Such was God of his Original Kingdom, in which there was no Mediatory Saviour-King, no Expiation of Sin, no Settlement of the State of Remiſſion of Sins, no Diſpenſation of Sanctifying Grace, to make the dead alive, and to heal and cleanſe vitiated Nature; for (whatever there is now) when this Kingdom was founded, there was *no poſitivity of Sin*. Then there were no lapſed Rationals, and therefore this Church was truly and fully Catholic, as compriſing the whole Univerſe of Rationals. Then there were no Saints but *Saints native*; for as the Citizens of the Jews Commonwealth were diſtinguiſh'd into *Jews native* (who were Jews born) and *Jews factive* (which were Gentiles born, but ingraffed and incorporated into the Jews Commonwealth:) So the Citizens of the Kingdom of God muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into *Saints Native and Factive*: The former are Citizens of the Kingdom of God, that were never Aliens; the latter are Aliens naturaliz'd and endeniz'd. But of this latter ſort of Saints there were none in being, when the Original Kingdom of God was founded (then it conſiſted only of holy Souls natively and originally ſuch,) nor is it poſſible, that any of that ſort of Saints ſhould be afterwards introduc'd into it; for *Saints Factive* cannot be of Original Creation, but are neceſſarily of New Creation, and therefore cannot belong to the Kingdom of God, as it was of Original Creation. In this Original Kingdom there was no Law or Settlement, which maketh *Saints Factive*: On the contrary, *the Law-Settlement* of this Kingdom ſo far obſtructeth the making Saints Factive, that it excludeth from Citizenſhip lapſed Sinners (improbous ungodly Sinners,) and is the Settlement of their Condemnation, ſo as not to be the Settlement of their Liberation, as the Goſpel Settlement is. *It is Law ſo as not to be Saving Grace the Settlement and Diſpenſation thereof*. But it is *the Settlement of the holy ſpiritual and divine Moral Law*; for ſuch a Law muſt neceſſarily be in the Original Kingdom of God (the Law of unſinning Sanctity) with the Sanction thereof by Rewards and Puniſhments. As the Law of Chriſt is the Law of his Sovereignty, Government and Kingdom; ſo the Law of God is the Law which his Sovereignty and Government is. *It is his Law, as he is the Imperial Eſtate of his Original Kingdom of Sanctity Imperial*. And as the Chriſtian Sovereignty cannot but be *the Chriſtian Law*; ſo the Divine Sovereignty cannot but be *the Divine Law* to the Univerſe of Rationals. It is the Law of the Divine Juſtice in Sovereignty and Government, which cannot but require of the Subject-party unſinning Righteouſneſs, and alſo neceſſarily ſettleth upon them ſuch premiant and penal Goods and Evils as are right and due. The Divine Juſtice in Sovereignty and Government is in it ſelf (virtually and implicitly) the Settlement of Righteouſneſs and of Life upon them that fulfil the Law; and to Rebel-ſinners it is the Settlement of Condemnation, to deadly Sinners the Settlement of Death. This Settlement of things (of Soul-intereſts) muſt be in Juſtice, and things in Juſtice cannot be otherwiſe. So that Divine Juſtice (without Evangelical Grace) in Sovereignty and Government is *the Settlement of the Original Law* (the Law of the Original Kingdom of God) *the Law-ſettlement of things*. And as the Goſpel muſt be defin'd *The Religion of Saving Grace* (of Evangelical Grace) *ſuch a Religion of Soul-Intereſts*: So the Original Law muſt be defin'd *The Religion of Law-juſtice* (of Legal Juſtice) *ſuch a Religion of Soul-intereſts*. That this is a true definitive Notion of it will appear from theſe following Conſiderations.

(1.) From the Condition of Righteouſneſs and of Life, which it requireth. For the holy Spiritual Law muſt neceſſarily be the Law of the holy Spiritual Life, which the Apoſtle calleth *the Righteouſneſs of the Law*, because the Law requireth it. Rom. 8. 4. It condemneth therefore all ungodly Sinners, that are of the carnal kind and party, Aliens from the holy Spiritual Life, whoſe *carnal mind is not ſubject to the Law of God, nor indeed can be*. Rom. 8. 7. and 7. 14. All Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs it requireth in Sinleſs Perfection; for the holy Law is the perfect Rule of Righteouſneſs, that forbiddeth all Vice and Sin, commandeth all Virtue and Duty (alloweth no failure of it in any degree,) Sin is therefore Sin, because it is a violation of the Holy Law. Rom 4. 15. and 5. 13. 1 Joh. 3. 4. And this ſtrictneſs of Obligation is not any extraordinary Severity in it; for no Law alloweth Men to ſin againſt its own Precepts, the Law of Grace neceſſarily requireth perfect, exact, unſinning Obedience (and is a perfect Rule of Righteouſneſs,) but this is not the condition of it, as it is a Covenant, and containeth the terms of our acceptance with God: whereas the Original Law as it is a perfect rule of Righteouſneſs in the utmoſt extremity and rigour of it is ſuppos'd to be the Condition of Life and Salvation. The Condition of the firſt Covenant is ſaid to be (*o*) *no leſs than a perfect, exact, unſinning Obedience, the never offending in any one point: The Obedience was to be ſo perfect, that there was no Mercy upon the leaſt tranſgreſſion; but the Offender became immediately liable to the threatned Puniſhment*. (*p*) It is ſuppos'd, that no Sin is venial, but all is mortal according to this Covenant (or Settlement,) and that it doth not admit of any Repentance (total or partial,) but is ſo wonderfully ſtrict and ſevere (as one ſpeaketh,) that the Favour of God and all Bleſſings are unavoidably loſt, and all the contrary Penalties are unavoidably incurr'd by every the leaſt Tranſgreſſion. But if this is the tenour of it, it is not to me imaginable, how it can be matter of Juſtice and of Law; for Mr. *Calvin* (uſually noted for overmuch Rigour) ſaith of *Adam*'s Sin, (*q*) *Non leve delictum, ſed deteſtabile fuiſſe ſcelus oportet, quod*

tam

(n) *Diotogen. de regno.*

(o) Dr. Hamm. pract. cat. p. 3. Lect. upon the Church Cat. Lect. 23.

(p) *Lex ob quodlibet unum vel leviſſimum peccatum morte afficit, & præmio vitæ non coronat niſi eum, qui omnibus numeris abſolutam obedientiam præſtiterit.* Davenant. prælect. de Juſt. hab. & act. c. 30. Le Blanc. Theſ. p. 575. *Fœdus operum ſeu legale, quo Deus homini vitam æternam promiſit ſub conditione perfectæ obedientiæ legi præſtitæ, cum annexa mortis æternæ comminatione, ſi obedientiam perfectam non præſtiterit.* Wendeln. Theol. l. 1. c. 21.

(q) [illegible]

tam ſeverè ultus eſt Deus. (r) Several of the Ancients think, that the Angels which ſinned, might have had Pardon upon Repentance, but refus'd it. Whether they ſpeak without Book or not, it is certain, that God would not have doom'd the Angels to Hell, unleſs they had been nefarious Criminals; that he cannot juſtly puniſh any Sin beyond the demerit of it, or inflict Eternal Death upon an Holy Soul for every the leaſt Tranſgreſſion; nor can he hate, forſake or caſt into Hell a Soul that is a true lover of him (or for ever withdraw his Grace and Love from ſuch a Soul;) nor can he count ſuch a holy Soul unholy and ungodly, or account every failure of ſuch a Soul a total breach of Covenant. Such Severities are harſh Incongruities, Exorbitancies and Exceſſes, as remote from Law and Juſtice as Right is from Wrong. Regenerate Chriſtians that live the holy ſpiritual Life, fulfil not the Righteouſneſs which the Law requireth, in abſolutely ſinleſs Perfection, yet they ſo far fulfil it, that *againſt them there is no Law.* If they had been always ſuch, as now they are, they would be in the main ſinleſs, uncriminal and uncondemnable (and therefore juſtifiable and rewardable) in Law; for no juſt Law condemneth any otherwiſe than proportionably to their Criminality. According to Mr. *Calvin* (s) the holy Angels themſelves are not uncriminal and uncondemnable in Law; for he ſtileth them *non ſatis juſti, not ſufficiently Righteous and Uncriminal: The Stars are not pure in his ſight*, Job 25. 5. (t) *Gr. Naz.* looketh upon abſolute ſinleſſneſs as the Prerogative *μόνου θεοῦ, of God only*; and he ſaith, that he will add nothing concerning Angels, leſt he ſhould give occaſion to improbous Cogitations. So *Tertullian* ſaith, *Our Lord knew himſelf only* ſine delicto eſſe, *to be without Sin.* Diſcourſing againſt the *Pelagians* S. *Hierom* ſaith, (u) *Hath God commanded me, to be as high as the Creator? higher than the height of Angels? that I ſhould have that which the Angels have not?* If the holy Angels are not abſolutely without Sin, how is it, that they are not caſt down to Hell with the wicked Angels, if the Law doometh them to Eternal Death for the leaſt Tranſgreſſion or Imperfection in Sanctity? The Apoſtle intimateth indeed a great Severity in the Law of *Moſes* in general, and in the holy ſpiritual Law (which is part of it,) when he ſaith, *Gal.* 3. 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curſe; for it is written, curſed is every one, that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them.* But his Senſe is (the ſame with another Apoſtle, *Jam.* 2. 19.) *Every one is curſed by the Law, who is a nefarious tranſgreſſour of it* (as Civil-religious, or as Spiritual-religious) *in any one point.* None have right to Life by the Law, none are juſtifiable and rewardable by it, none of its Religioniſts can eſcape the curſe of it, unleſs they be thoſe that are Righteous, uncriminal and uncondemnable in Law; and therefore none but they that fulfil the Righteouſneſs of the Law, ſo far at leaſt as not to be nefarious tranſgreſſours of it in any one point; ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe it requireth unſinning Sanctity and perfect Obedience as the Condition of Life. All ſuch therefore are condemnable and condemned by the Law, that are nefarious tranſgreſſours of it (nefarious Sinners) in any reſpect; for this is the Condition of Life, which it requireth, that we be none of that Character. But of this Quality and Character are the Law-religioniſts, the nefarious tranſgreſſours of it, and ſuch as are in the ſtate of Condemnation by it: The Jews were under the curſe of it as Civil-religious; and as Spiritual-religious the Evil World is ſubjected to Condemnation by it.

(r) Petav. T. 3. de Ang. l. 3. c. 3. S. 11. &c.

Rom. 8. 4 and 13. 10. Gal. 5. 23.

(s) Inſtit. l. 3. c. 17. S. 9.

(t) Voſſ. Hiſt. pel. l. 5. par. 1. Antitheſ. 2.

(u) *Nunquid præcepit mihi Deus, ut nihil inter me eſſet & Dominum Creatorem? ut major eſſem angelorum faſtigio? ut haberem quod angeli non habent?* Voſſ. ibid.

(2.) From the Penal Dues therefore which it ſettleth upon us, it appeareth to *be matter of Law-juſtice:* For degenerate Mankind being in their now Original State a World of improbous, graceleſs and deadly Sinners, they are under all deadly penal Evils (the Evils of an unpardon'd and an unregenerate condition) by the Law; namely, to be depriv'd of the Favour of God, of the ſtate of Remiſſion of Sins, of Peace and Reconcilement with God, of Life and Bleſſedneſs, of Citizenſhip in the Kingdom of God, of all the Immunities, Rights and Priviledges of his Children, of the holy Spirit and the Heavenly Inheritance; and to be under the Divine Wrath, the Guilt of Sin, the Reign of Sin, the Domination of Satan, and in the State of Death, where there is nothing but all deadly things to the Soul. Such are the Dues that belong to ungodly Mankind in Law-juſtice, and which are ſettled upon them by the Law, which is to them the Law of Death and Condemnation, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6, 9. It is not a Law that giveth Life, but excludeth from Life, *Gal.* 3. 21.

(w) *By the deeds of the Law ſhall no Fleſh be juſtify'd in his ſight; for by the Law is the knowledge of Sin*, Rom. 3. 20.

(w) *Claudit in ſe negationem gratiæ & hominem ſibiipſi in ſua carnalitate relictum.* Cajetan. in Rom. 7. 5.

It is not the Religion of making them uncriminal, for the knowledge of their Criminal Evil, whereby they are guilty Sinners, is by the Law, which is the Religion of condemning, but not of ſaving Sinners; for through the Law Sin is imputed and they are under the Divine Wrath, *Rom.* 4. 15. *The Law worketh Wrath* through Mens non-performance of it and ſinning againſt it. *The ſtrength of Sin is the Law*; for Sin is ſtrong through the weakneſs of the Law to prevail againſt it; and it hath its condemning power and puiſſance by the Law, thereby bringing Men to Death everlaſting, 1 *Cor.* 15. 56.

(3.) The Name of it ſheweth, that it is *matter of Law-juſtice*; for this Name *The Law* denoteth *The comprehenſion of what is right and due, not according to Grace, to which it is oppos'd* (and which is free and gratuitous favour above and beyond Law) but in Juſtice, (x) agreeably to the Definitions which the Ancients make of an ordinary Law, which imply, that it is a Settlement of things, as in juſtice they ought to be ſettled, *κανὼν δικαίων ϗ ἀδίκων, juſti injuſtique regula* (y) *juris atque injuriæ regula.* In the Inſtitutes *Juriſprudentia* is defin'd *The Science of what is juſt and unjuſt.* The Lawyers ſay, (z) that *Law* and *Juſtice* are the ſame thing; and *Laertius* ſaith of *Plato*, (a) *τὴν δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ νόμον ὑπελάμβανεν, he ſuppos'd Juſtice to be the Law of God.* The Original Law therefore (which is Original Religion) muſt neceſſarily ſettle the concerns of Souls agreeably to theſe Maxims; *All muſt have their due and be treated according to their deſert, Criminals muſt be dealt with as Criminals, The ſinleſs and the juſt muſt be juſtify'd, They that have done well according to Law, muſt fare well; They that have done ill, muſt fare ill; and they that have done the Work* (what they ought) *muſt have the Reward.* Such are the Maxims of Law-Religion, which muſt be underſtood as Maxims of Law-Religion; for the like Maxims are in the Religion

(x) *Martini Lex. in Voc. Lex.*

(y) *Cic. de Leg.*

(z) *Ferd. ABDvenſ. orat. pro jur. civ. p. 23.*

(a) *Eugub. de Per. Phil. l. 1. c. 5.*

gion of Grace, but ſo as to be the Maxims of the Religion of Grace. In the Religion of Grace a State of Righteouſneſs is provided for degenerate Mankind: But there is not any way for them to obtain the State of Righteouſneſs (or to be juſtified) by the Law, ſave only by way of legal Juſtice. If they become the uncriminal and uncondemnable, the juſtifiable and rewardable by the Law, they muſt have this their Righteouſneſs as their legal Due (or in Law-juſtice) and as their Merit by their meritorious Worthineſs and Well deſervings; for the Law is the Religion of Law-juſtice. Which is no inconvenience to juſtified and ſanctified Chriſtians, nor is it any inconvenience to the holy Angels, that are natively in the State of Righteouſneſs: But the Law muſt be conſider'd as the Law-way of Mankind's obtaining the State of Righteouſneſs, which is no other than by way of *Law-juſtice* and meritorious Worthineſs.

(4.) It appeareth therefore, to be the Religion of *Law-juſtice* from another uſual Name of it *the Law or Covenant of Works* (of the Works of the Law;) for antecedently to Chriſtianity this Law (which is the Divine Moral Law *(b)* the ſame Law whereby the holy Angels are govern'd) was reveal'd in Nature and Scripture both to Jews and Gentiles, and was to all Mankind *vivendi regula, regula agendorum, the Rule of Life and of Duties to be done.* But the Duties which it requir'd, were nothing elſe but thoſe Works of Righteouſneſs which belong to the Law; it was ſo the Law of Works (of the Works of the Law) as not to be *the Law of Grace and of the Faith thereof*; for the Law is not of this Faith, nor is this Faith of the Law, *Gal.* 3. 11. This Faith ſignifieth nothing in Law, but it requireth the Works of Obedience to its Precepts, ſo as to be *the Religion of Law-juſtice.* The Righteouſneſs therefore which its Religioniſts follow after, is *the Righteouſneſs of Works* (to be juſt and righteous in an uncriminal and uncondemnable Condition by the Law and by their doing the Works thereof;) which Righteouſneſs of Works by the Law (becauſe the Law is the Religion of Law-juſtice) is meritoriouſly rewardable Work. He that hath them, hath whereof to boaſt and to glory as being a meritoriouſly rewardable Perſon, whoſe happy Eſtate is his Purchaſe, not an Alms. Having the Benefit *by Work*, he cannot have it by Grace, becauſe his Work is meritoriouſly rewardable, is Righteouſneſs to him by legal Juſtice, and *the Reward is reckon'd to him, not of Grace, but of Debt* (as due in Law-juſtice,) as the Apoſtle argueth, *Rom.* 4. 4. whence it is manifeſt, that the Law in the Apoſtle's Notion of it is *the Religion of Law-juſtice, ſuch a Religion of Soul-intereſts*; and that the *working, work* and *works* which he ſpeaketh of, are ſuch as are *the Righteouſneſs of Works by the Law* (the oppoſite to the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith,) which was the matter in diſpute with the Law-religioniſts.

(b) *Ameſ. Medul. Theol. l.* 1. c. 11.

Rom. 3. 27. *and* 9. 32. *and* 10. 3, 5, 6. *Gal.* 3. 12. *Eph.* 2. 9. *Phil.* 3. 9.

It is much more reaſonable, to ſuppoſe this Original Law, to be the Law of the Original Sovereignty and Kingdom of God, than to call it *the Law of Innocency*, ſuppoſing it to be *the firſt Covenant* (or Covenant of Works,) which was firſt made with *Adam and Eve*, when they were created; for theſe Notions have no Foundation in Reaſon or Scripture: Nor are they agreeable to the Nature of it, as will appear from an *Explication of the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe*, which muſt be premis'd, before we can give an account of our remaining Notices of *God's Original Creation.* For thoſe remaining Notices muſt be (in great degree) illuſtrated and proved from the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe, which cannot be made argumentative till it be explained.

CHAP. XIII.

1. *The Firſt Article of our Explication of the Hiſtory of Paradiſe. Objecters againſt the Truth of the Hiſtory.* 2. *A Firſt Proof of the Truth of it.* 3. *A Second Proof of the Truth of it.* 4. *A Third Proof of the Truth of it.* 5. *A Fourth Proof of the Truth of it. The Second Article of our Explication, the Character of the Moſaic Paradiſe with the ſeveral ſorts of Paradiſes. The Third Article of our Explication, the Character of the Moſaic Creation.* 1. *The Firſt Proof of it.* 2. *The Second Proof of it.* 3. *The Third Proof of it.* 4. *The Fourth Proof of it.* 5. *The Fifth Proof of it.* 6. *The Sixth Proof of it. A diſtinct view of the ſeveral Parts of the Hiſtory. The Fourth Article of our Explication, the Character of our firſt Parents.* 1. *The magnificent Ideas of them amongſt the Jews.* 2. *The Chriſtians magnificent Ideas of them.* 3. *A Branch of them examin'd, and thoſe magnificent Ideas ſhew'd to be groundleſs.* 4. *A Difficulty that incumbreth our Character of their Uprightneſs, with an Enumeration of many Difficulties that incumber the contrary Character. The Difficulty that incumbreth our Character ſalv'd. The Fifth Article of our Explication, that the Moſaic Paradiſaical Oeconomy is in all the Branches of it reaſonable and accommodate according to our Hypotheſis, but not according to the common Hypotheſis.* I. *A Firſt Reaſon that recommendeth this Oeconomy according to our Hypotheſis and diſproveth the other.* II. *A Second Reaſon of the ſame Nature.* III. *A Third Reaſon ſhewing the end of this Oeconomy.* IV. *A Fourth Reaſon with a Vindication of the Hiſtory.* V. *A Fifth Reaſon.* VI. *A Sixth Reaſon.* VII. *A Seventh Reaſon containing the Jews Objections. The Sixth Article of our Explication, the Remarkables touching the Serpent. The Seventh Article of our Explication, that the Hiſtory ſpeaketh of the Brute-Serpent* Specificativè *and* Comprehenſivè. *The Eighth Article of our Explication touching a threefold Aſpect of the Doom of the Serpent.* 1. *As it relateth to the Brute-Serpent. A Solution of ſeveral Difficulties in it as it ſo relateth, and ſome matters*

of Natural Philoſophy remark'd in it. 2. As it relateth to the tempting Serpent, the ſeveral Branches of whoſe Doom are diſtinctly conſider'd. 3. As it relateth to Chriſt and Chriſtians and is a Prophecy, the Contents whereof are ſhewed. The Ninth Article of our Exlication touching the viſible appearance of God.

I. THAT our Explication of the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe may proceed clearly and orderly, as it ought (to make one of the moſt difficult parts of the Bible clearly intelligible) we will diſtinguiſh it into ſeveral *Articles* compriſing in them the whole of the Hiſtory.

ARTICLE I.

The Moſaic Text in the Literal Senſe is true Hiſtory, not meer Myſtery or Fable.

THE Literal Senſe of the Text may be exploded two ways; *by expounding it as meer Myſtery, and by expoſing it as meer Fabuloſity.* As if we ſuppoſe, that *Philo*'s interpretation of *Adam, Eve and the Serpent* is the only true Interpretation; that the Serpent ſignifieth nothing but ſenſitive Pleaſure, *Eve* nothing but ſenſitive Nature, and *Adam* nothing elſe but the intelligent Mind, ſuch a Suppoſition would be a deſtroying the reality of the Hiſtory by a Myſtic Expoſition. So *Origen* counteth it Ideotical, to ſuppoſe, (c) *that God like an Huſbandman planted Trees in Paradiſe Eaſtward in* Eden, *and planted the Tree of Life there, that is, a viſible and palpable Wood of ſuch a Nature, that one eating of it with his bodily Teeth gain'd the benefit of Life from it; and on the other hand eating the other Tree gain'd the knowledge of Good and Evil. As alſo that God walk'd in Paradiſe in the cool of the Day, and* Adam *hid himſelf under the Tree. I ſuppoſe* (ſaith he) *that none can doubt, but that theſe things are ſpoken by a figurative Trope, and to indicate certain myſterious things.* A ſecond way of exploding the literal ſenſe of the Hiſtory is, not by expounding, but by expoſing it as (in whole or in part) meer Fabuloſity with *Celſus* (*Origen*'s Adverſary,) who reproacheth the Jews for compoſing (d) theſe ἀπιθανώτατα ϗ ἀμουσότατα, *moſt incredible and unlearned things, that a certain Man was form'd by the Hands of God, and was blown into, and a Woman was formed out of his Side; that they had Commandments from God and a Serpent withſtood them, and the Serpent was too hard for the Commands of God. Thus telling an old Wives Fable, and moſt impiouſly making God at the beginning of things weak and impotent, not of ſo much Authority as to be able to perſwade ſo much as one Man, whom himſelf form'd.* So *Simplicius* thinketh (e) this Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe no better than a Poetic Fable, and the Moſaic *Coſmopœia* is called by him μυθικὴ παράδοσις, *a fabulous Tradition deriv'd from the Egyptian Fables.* So the Apoſtate *Julian* ſaith of a part of the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe, (f) ταῦτα γάρ ἐστι μυθώδη παντελῶς, *theſe things are altogether fabulous.* And of the Serpent's ſpeaking to *Eve* he ſaith; τί διαφέρει τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι πεπλασμένων μύθων τὰ τοιάδε; *ſuch things as theſe how do they differ from the fictitious Fables of the Greeks?* So of late ſome of the Philoſophic Family (without any ill deſign ſave only to introduce the golden Legend of an Ante-diluvian Paradiſaical Earth) have repreſented this Moſaic Hiſtory as one of *thoſe Fables, that are not totally meer Figments, for they have a foundation of Truth; but by additaments thereto and aſcititious Ornaments they become Fables.* Which Notion of it maketh it of the very ſame Nature with the Heathen Poetick Fables, which were built upon a foundation of a Truth, but by additaments and aſcititious Ornaments they became Fables. (g) So the Fables of *Jupiter, Mars, Neptune, Minerva* (and many more) are not without ſome Hiſtorical Truth, which is their foundation: The Fables of *Saturn, Bacchus, Mercury, Prometheus* (and ſuch more) are not without ſome Scripture-hiſtorical Truth, which is their foundation. Yet by ornamental Additaments they are become ſhameful Figments and putid Fables. But againſt them that thus parallel the holy Scripture with the Heathen Mythology the Chriſtians thus Apologize. (h) Μυθικὸν ἐν αὐτῇ παντελῶς οὐδέν. *There is nothing at all fabulous in it, but all things are full of Truth.* Of this Character is the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe although a great ſtumbling Block to Unbelievers. For

II. *Firſt*; The Profeſſion of Chriſtianity will not allow any Diſpute touching the literal and real Truth of it, which hath many Atteſtations from the holy Writers of the New Teſtament, *Matth.* 19. 5. *Act.* 17. 26. *Rom.* 5. 12—19. 1 *Cor.* 11. 8. and 15. 45—49. 2 *Cor.* 11. 3. *Eph.* 5. 29, 30. 1 *Tim.* 2. 14. *Apoc.* 2. 7. Beſides this external Teſtimony of infallible Witneſſes there are in the Hiſtory it ſelf many Characters of its Truth and Divinity, one of which is *the Congruities that are in it.* For it is agreeable to the Moſaic *Coſmopœia* and of one piece with it, and it is an agreeable part of the Old Teſtament, which is thus differenc'd from the Goſpel by *P. Lombard* (i) *the Letter of the Law is different from the Letter of the Goſpel, becauſe the Promiſes are different: There things Terrene, here things Celeſtial are promiſed.* So this Moſaic Hiſtory in the Letter of it is confin'd meerly to things Terrene (the Terrene things of our firſt Parents,) which like thoſe of old *Iſrael* are order'd and diſpens'd in a way agreeable to that Divine Wiſdom, which ſhineth in the Oeconomy of the New Teſtament. For it is hugely agreeable, to the Methods of Divine Wiſdom, that our Concerns as Terreſtrial Animals ſhould be ſettled by the Terreſtrial *Adam*, as our Spiritual Concerns are ſettled by the Heavenly *Adam*; that the Settlement of Nature ſhould be made by the doings of one, as the Settlement of Grace is made by the doings of the other; and that Mankind ſhould have their Evils in Nature from the firſt, their humane and their natural Head, as they have their Goods of Grace from their Divine and Supernatural Head. The *Origin of Evil* alſo is a remarkable Congruity in this Moſaic Hiſtory, and is in the general Nature of it unexceptionable. For it deriveth the Evil of Puniſhment from the Evil of Sin, and the Evil of Sin from the evil One, ὁ Ἀρχέκακος δαίμων, (as S. *Chryſoſtom* calleth him) *the Devil the be-*

(c) Περὶ ἀρχῶν l. 4. c. 2. V. Petav. T. 3. de op. 6. dier. l. 1. c. 7.

(d) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 4. p. 186.

(e) Curcell. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 13. & c. 6, 7.

(f) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 3. p. 75.

(g) *Non res ipſas geſtas finxerunt poetæ: Sed rebus geſtis addiderunt quendam colorem.* Lactant. *In his ergo diſtinguere oportet quæ hiſtoricâ fide, quæ item poeticâ dicuntur.* Voſſ. de Idol. l. 1. c. 14. & vid. Indicem in voce Fabulæ.

(h) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 3. p. 86.

(i) Voſſ. Reſp. ad judic. Ravenſp. c. 23.

ginner of Evil. Through Envy of the Devil (quem ſub Serpentis figura Moſes intelligi voluit, ſaith *Grotius) came Death into the World.* Wiſd. 2. 24. If from the Serpent in this Hiſtory *Pherecydes Syrus* deriv'd his ὀφιωνεὺς, *Princeps mali* (*k*) as *Origen* thinketh (although *Philo* giveth another account of the Origin of Ὀφιωνεὺς,) he did not ſuppoſe this Moſaic Hiſtory fabulous. (*l*) And if *Plato* deriv'd from it his Story of *Jupiter*'s Garden and of *Porus* circumvented by *Penia* (as ſome have thought,) this was true Hiſtory turn'd into a Fable. This Hiſtory is all of one piece, and there is nothing heterogeneous in it, that may be thought to betray its Fabuloſity.

III. The Symbolical and Hieroglyphical Nature of it ſpeaketh it Hiſtory, and ſuch Hiſtory which is true and of God, for ſo good Interpreters ancient and modern agree, (*m*) *that the Moſaic Narrative is of Hiſtorical Truth, and that Paradiſe was a moſt delicious place viſible and ſenſible, yet ſo as to contain the ſignification of arcane Spiritual and Myſtical things.* The Hebrew Doctors ſay (*n*) that there are ſome things in this Hiſtory, that are abſurd and paradoxical according to the Letter: But they admire *quanta Sapientia in illa lateat, how great recondite Wiſdom is in it.* They ſuppoſe it therefore an Hiſtory, which repreſenteth great Myſteries, which (doubtleſs) was a principal deſign of inſtituting the Moſaic Paradiſe. For it cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, that God's principal deſign in erecting it was to provide an earthly Happineſs for Man: Nor can it reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to have been deſign'd for any long continuance; for it was deſign'd, to continue no longer than Man continu'd in Innocency, which the Divine Wiſdom foreſaw, would not be long, and therefore thought it ſufficient, to make one place in *Eden* Paradiſaical, and that one place was but a larger Garden of no very great extent. If therefore *Adam* in his Innocency had generated a vaſtly numerous Poſterity, where muſt they have dwelt? For the Terreſtrial Paradiſe could not have been the place of their abode, and how ſhould that numerous Poſterity have come by the Tree of Life, that grew no where but in the Garden of *Eden*? Some ſay (*o*) *it had been as eaſie to have planted all parts of the World with the ſame Tree, as with the Poſterity of* Adam, *had he continu'd in Obedience. Who being not driven out of* Eden, *(as upon his Diſobedience,) but ſending his Poſterity, to do that in the reſt of the World, which he did there, had made all the World* Eden, *by placing the Paradiſe of God whereſoever Innocence dwelt.* But as this is ſpoken without any good Authority, ſo it is not agreeable to ſound Reaſon. For it was always impoſſible in Nature, that ſeveral Climes of the Earth ſhould be Paradiſaical: Nor can there be many Terreſtrial Paradiſes and Trees of Life without ſpoiling the Analogy between things corporeal and thoſe ſpiritual things repreſented by them, *the Tree of Life that is in the midſt of the Paradiſe of God.* Apoc. 22. 2, 14. Paradiſe therefore muſt be confin'd to the Garden of *Eden*, in which our firſt Parents continu'd but for a little time. (*p*) The Schoolmen and the Hebrew Doctors think, that they fell the ſame day that they were created. (*q*) Some think it probable, that they continu'd in Innocency and in Paradiſe for ſome Years, but none think, that they ſo continu'd for any long time. The courſe of Nature alſo was in ſome degree under a ſuſpenſion during the Paradiſaical State, and therefore things do not look, as if it was deſign'd to be permanent and laſting. *Oſtendunt terris hæc tantum Fata, nec ultra eſſe ſinunt.* A principal deſign therefore of the Divine Wiſdom in erecting Paradiſe was, that (like *Janus* with two Faces looking πρόσω ϗ ὀπίσω, *forward and backward*) it might repreſent the great myſterious things of the Kingdom of God paſt and to come. Whence *J. Mart.* ſaith (*r*) it is not poſſible, to underſtand clearly any of the things ſpoken by *Moſes* ἐκτὸς μυστικῆς θεωρίας, *without myſtick or arcane Theory.* The Terreſtrial Paradiſe and the happy Eſtate of our firſt Parents there, their Sin in it and Expulſion out of it, may reaſonably be thought, to repreſent and ſignifie the heavenly Paradiſe and the Original happy State of Souls, their Sin and their Lapſe and their Exile from Heaven. And as the Tree of Life, the Brute Serpent, and the Enmity between Mankind and Brute Serpents are unqueſtionably Symbolical: So the Nakedneſs of our firſt Parents and their Shame, as alſo their Coats of Skins may (with great reaſon) be thought of the ſame Nature.

IV. The numerous Types of the matters of Chriſtianity which are in this Hiſtory, demonſtrate, that it is ſuch Hiſtory, which is true and of God. Theſe alſo are an uncontrollable Evidence both of the Truth of the Scriptures and of the Chriſtian Faith. For it is evident and palpable, that here in the beginning of the Old Teſtament there are many Types of the matters of the New Teſtament; which is a plain demonſtration, that one and the ſame God was Author both of the Old and New Teſtament, ſeeing the one exactly typifieth the other. They are alſo a demonſtration, that Chriſtianity is no fiction nor invention of Men; for it could not be Men that inſtituted the Terreſtrial Paradiſe, or that invented the Hiſtory of it, to prefigure the matters of Chriſtianity: But it muſt be the wonderful Wiſdom of God, that order'd all theſe things in the Old Teſtament-times and from the beginning of the World; therefore our Religion is from no other Original but from the wonderful Wiſdom of God, that conducted the Affairs of the moſt ancient times. So marvellous a Correſpondence and Agreement there is between the things of *Moſes* and of *Chriſt*, as plainly ſheweth, that his coming was deſign'd in the firſt times, that things were then order'd with regard to him, and there can be no fallacy, no counterfeiting in the caſe, no rational Anſwer can be deviſ'd to ſo plain and evident a proof. The Affairs of *Adam* and his Paradiſe were plainly Types of Chriſt and the Matters of Chriſtianity; none but God could inſtitute in thoſe ancient times illuſtrious Types of Chriſt; and if God inſtituted them, then Chriſt was fore-ordain'd of old time and is the Chriſt of God; if God inſtituted them (and none but God could do it,) then the Hiſtory of *Adam* and his Paradiſe is no Fable (as profane Unbelievers dream;) for no part of the Old Teſtament of ſo ſmall a bulk hath ſo many illuſtrious Types of Chriſt and Chriſtianity in it as this Hiſtory of *Adam* and his Paradiſe.

Adam himſelf was an eminent Type of Chriſt, *a Figure of him that was to come.* Rom. 5. 14. The firſt *Adam* was a Type of the ſecond, the earthly

---

(k) C. *Celſ. l.* 6. p. 304.

(l) *Ibid. l.* 4. p. 104. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 12. c. 11.

(m) *Petav. T.* 3. *de op.* 6. *dier. l.* 2. c. 5.

(n) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par.* 2. c. 30.

(o) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 2. c. 10.

(p) *Seld. de ſyn. l.* 1. c. 11. *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 8. 44.

(q) *Jurieu Theſ. de Cabal. Coral.* 18. *v. Petr. Mart. in Gen.* 2. 18. *Petav. ſupr. l.* 2. c 10. *Curcell. Inſt. l.* 3. c. 13. *Bp. Patrick on Gen.* 3. *initio.*

(r) *Paræn.* p. 28.

earthly of the heavenly. 1 *Cor.* 15. 45. *So it is written, the firſt Adam was made a living Soul, the laſt Adam a quickening Spirit.* There is a Correſpondence between things Natural and Spiritual and the one is a Type of the other, *Adam* is the Head of old Mankind by Nature and carnal Propagation; and therein he is a Type of Chriſt the Head of new Mankind by Grace and Spiritual Regeneration. *Adam* had an earthly Life and Body and from him we derive an earthly Life and Body (a living Soul:) So Chriſt is to us *a quickning Spirit* raiſing us to an heavenly Life and from him 1 Cor. 15. 49. we derive an heavenly glorious Body. *As we have born the Image of the earthly, ſo we ſhall alſo bear the Image of the heavenly*, and the one is a Type of the other. The firſt *Adam* is called *the Son of God* becauſe of his immediate Creation from him, and becauſe he was made after his Image; and herein he was a Type of Chriſt, who is the only begotten Son of God *the brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Character of his Perſon. Adam* by a Tree brought in Death, and Chriſt by a Tree deſtroy'd him that had the Power of Death. *Adam* naked brought in Death, and Chriſt hanging naked upon the Croſs deſtroy'd Death. In theſe reſpects there is ſo great a reſemblance between the two *Adams*, that no Man can reaſonably doubt, but the one was intended to be a Type of the other. But there are other Typical Reſemblances between them, as the holy Writers ſhew. For *Adam* had Dominion given him over the Creatures, and herein he was a fore-ſhadowing Type and Repreſentative of Chriſt. And therefore what the ancient Scripture ſaith of *Adam* and the ſubjecting to him this World of Creatures, the Apoſtle applieth to Chriſt's Exaltation and the ſubjecting the other World of Creatures unto him. *One in a certain place teſtifieth, what is Man that thou art mindful of him? Or the Son* Heb. 2. 6, 7, 8. *of Man that thou viſiteſt him? Thou madeſt him a little lower than the Angels, thou crownedſt him with Glory and Honour, and didſt ſet him over the Works of thy Hands. Thou haſt put all things in Subjection under his Feet.* As God gave unto the firſt *Adam* Dominion over this earthly World and the Creatures therein contain'd: So he hath given to the ſecond *Adam* Dominion over the heavenly World and the Creatures therein contain'd. *Adam* was made a little lower than the Angels, yet crown'd with Glory and Honour becauſe of his Dominion over this World: So Chriſt was made a little lower than the Angels, yet now is crown'd with Glory and Honour becauſe of his Dominion over the heavenly World. The Apoſtle hath diſcours'd another Similitude between the two *Adams*, which is ſuch a Similitude that is complicated with direct Oppoſition, and ſo the two *Adams* anſwer to one another, and the Goods of the one Rom. 5. 18, 19. anſwer to the Evils of the other. *As by the Offence of one Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation: Even ſo by the Righteouſneſs of one the free Gift came upon all Men unto Juſtification of Life. For as by one Man's Diſobedience many were made Sinners: So by the Obedience of one ſhall many be made Righteous.* As by old *Adam* we have a Settlement of Condemnation: So by the ſecond *Adam* we have a Settlement of Juſtification. By the one we have a Settlement, whereby we are made Sinners, have the Reputation, State and Nature of Sinners (in a ſober Senſe:) By the other we have a Settlement, whereby we are made the Righteous, have the Reputation, State and Nature of the Righteous. *Through the Offence of one many are* Ibid. v. 15, 16. *Dead. The Judgment was by one to Condemnation.* As ruinous things came by one, ſo our reparation is by one. *By Man came Death, by Man came alſo the Reſurrection of the Dead. As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22.

Adam and *Eve* in conjunction are an illuſtrious Type of Chriſt and his Church. The *V. Dr. Cudworths Diſc. of the Union of Chriſt and the Church.* Apoſtle therefore would have the Wife to look upon the Husband as bearing the Image of Chriſt (of whom the Husband in Paradiſe was a Type and Shadow,) and the Husband to look upon the Wife as an Image of the Church, which the Wife in Paradiſe was inſtituted to typifie and reſemble. *Eph.* 5. 22, 25. He deriveth the Reaſon of all Marriage-duties of the Husband to the Wife and of the Wife to the Husband from the Relation and Union between Chriſt and the Church, of which *Adam* and *Eve* were typical Adumbrations, and there is a lively Reſemblance between them. For the Church of Regenerate Chriſtians hath its Original from Chriſt ſleeping upon the Croſs, and is contain'd in him, as Woman was taken out of Man ſleeping and was ſeminally and virtually contained in him. The Church is nothing *Eva in Typo Eccleſie de coſtâ viri ædificata eſt.* S. Hieron. elſe but *Chriſtus explicatus* (what we are and have as Chriſtians is ſomething of Chriſt,) as *Eve* was *Adam*'s Subſtance dilated and expanded. The Woman was ſo of the Man, that ſhe was conſtitutively a part of his Body and a Participation of his Subſtance, *of his Fleſh and of his Bone:* So Regenerate Chriſtians are conſtitutively a Participation of Chriſt and ſomething of him; the ſame in reſpect of Chriſt that *Eve* was in reſpect of *Adam, the members or parts of his Body, of his Fleſh and of his Bones.* Eph. 5. 30. In the Marriage of Man and Woman there is a Coalition and Union of their Fleſh, upon which account they twain are ſaid to be *one Fleſh* (in ſuch Senſe and ſo far as the State of Marriage importeth:) So to ſignifie a Spiritual Union and Conjunction between Chriſt and Chriſtians, they are ſaid to be one Spirit. 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. Man and Wife are *one Fleſh* (acording to the Inſtitution of Marriage in Paradiſe) in opoſition to *Divorce*, to Type out the indiſſoluble and inſeparable Union between Chriſt and the Church. And they two are *one Fleſh* in oppoſition to Polygamy and Plurality of Wives (each muſt be join'd to one and no more:) So Chriſt hath but one only Church, and can no more have many Churches, than Man in Paradiſe might have many Wives. Theſe are marvellous Correſpondences, which clearly demonſtrate, that both the Inſtitution of Marriage in Paradiſe and the Chriſtian Religion were Effects of the wonderful Wiſdom of God; which alſo inſtituted the Tree of Life in Paradiſe (which had a Virtue to continue *Adam*'s Life and to preſerve him from Death) to be a lively Type of the Chriſtians heavenly Immortality. *Apoc.* 2. 7. And in the Paradiſaical State a *Sabbath* was alſo inſtituted, which was a Type of the Chriſtians Reſt. *Heb.* 4. 4, 9, 10. *He ſpake in a certain place of the ſeventh day on this wiſe, and God did reſt the ſeventh day from all his Works. There remaineth therefore a reſt to the people of God. For he that is entred into his reſt, he alſo hath ceaſed from his own works, as God did from his.*

V. The ancient Prophecy which is in this Hiſtory, demonſtrateth, that it is ſuch Hiſtory, which is true and of God. For ancient Prophecy and the Chriſtian Religion compar'd together mutually illuſtrate and demonſtrate the Divinity of each other. Ancient Prophecy cannot but be from God, becauſe it ſo clearly predicteth the Chriſtian Religion many Ages before its appearance in the World : And the Chriſtian Religion cannot but be from God, becauſe it is ſo clearly predicted by ancient Prophecy, which clearly demonſtrateth, that *Jeſus is the true Meſſiah*. For which Reaſon Chriſtians have an high value for ancient Prophecy, and for this Reaſon they ought to have a great value for this Moſaic Hiſtory, becauſe an ancient Prophecy of the Meſſiah (the moſt ancient of Prophecies) is a part of it. For ſuch is the Serpent's Doom, *Gen.* 3. 14, 15. *The Lord God ſaid unto the Serpent, becauſe thou haſt done this, thou art curſed above all Cattel and above every Beaſt of the Field : Upon thy Belly ſhalt thou go, and Duſt ſhalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed : It ſhall bruiſe thy Head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his Heel.* In this moſt ancient Prophecy all the principal matters of the Moſaic Narrative of Paradiſe are involv'd (namely the Paradiſaical State of our firſt Parents, and their eating the forbidden Fruit through the Serpents Temptation ;) if therefore this ancient Prophecy is genuine and legitimate (which it is moſt certainly and demonſtratively,) then the Moſaic Narrative of Paradiſe is ſuch Hiſtory, which is true and of God, and there is nothing of Fabuloſity in it.

ARTICLE 2.

The Moſaic Paradiſe was of Kind and Quality Terreſtrial-animal, ſo as to be Symbolical.

THE word Paradiſe is of no known Etymology, (s) nor is it certain from what Language we have it, whether it be originally *Perſic* or *Armenian :* But the ſignification of it is very well known ; for in common acceptation it denoteth *an eximiouſly and ſuperlatively delicious place.* In which Notion of the word a threefold Paradiſe occurreth in the Writers of the Chriſtian Theology. *A Terreſtrial, a Supernal, a Metaphorical Paradiſe.*

(1.) By a Metaphor an ancient Writer calleth the Books of Scripture (t) παράδεισόν τινα νοητὸν, *a certain mental Paradiſe.* And another ſaith (u) *The joy of a good Conſcience is a Paradiſe. The Church in the holy People that live temperately, juſtly and piouſly, is rightly called a Paradiſe, becauſe of its affluence of Graces and chaſt Delights.* So the Chriſtians are ſtiled by a truly Divine Writer (w) παράδεισος τρυφῆς. *a delicious Paradiſe that have made to grow in themſelves ſuch green Trees as bear all manner of Fruit, adorn'd with variety of Fruit.* Agreeably to the Chriſtians Metaphorical Paradiſe *Philo* ſaith (x) *Virtue is tropically called Paradiſe. The proper place of Paradiſe is* Eden, *that is, Delight or Pleaſure. To Virtue agreeth Peace, Pleaſure and Joy, in which is the true deliciating.* (y) *The ſacred Paradiſe of Piety* we have in the Chalday Oracles.

(2.) The Supernal Paradiſe is called by *Tertullian* (z) *the place of Divine Pleaſantneſs deſign'd for the reception of the Souls of the Saints.* The Jews oppoſe Paradiſe and Hell and thus define it. (a) *Paradiſe is a place, wherein the Souls of the Pious departed enjoy the Rewards of their good Works.* Three Names they uſe, to expreſs the State and Place of thoſe happy Souls ; for they diſpoſe of them into *Abraham*'s Boſom, under *the Throne of Glory* and into גן עדן *the Garden of* Eden *or Paradiſe. Grotius* ſaith, (b) they ſometimes call Paradiſe *Paradiſus inferior* in contradiſtinction to a ſuperiour Paradiſe *:* But their *inferiour Paradiſe* is *Adam*'s corporeal Paradiſe. In the Paradiſe of Souls there are ſeven degrees of Felicity (or ſeven Palaces) as they ſuppoſe ; yet they ſeem not to concern themſelves, to make any diſtinction between the Happineſs of Paradiſe and that of the World to come after the Reſurrection, nor do the *Muhammedans* ; for all the Happineſs of the World to come they compriſe under this one Name *Paradiſe.* But in the Chriſtian Theology *the Supernal* Paradiſe is diſtinguiſh'd into the *Celeſtial* and the *Sub-Celeſtial.* For the Kingdom of Heaven (of Glory and Immortality) the Chriſtians call *Paradiſe.* (c) *The Promiſe of Paradiſe is the Kingdom of the living God. Chriſt reſtoreth us to Paradiſe, he carrieth us to the heavenly Kingdom.* So the Jews are ſaid to place Paradiſe (d) *in the ſupreme Heaven.* So Paradiſe ſignifieth in ſome places of the New Teſtament: But the Chriſtian Theology acknowledgeth alſo a *Sub-celeſtial Paradiſe.* (e) *I call that Region the Boſom of* Abraham, *which, although not Celeſtial, yet is higher than thoſe that are called the infernal parts, and affordeth refreſhment to the Souls of the Juſt until the plenitude of Reward at the general Reſurrection. All the faithful, when they go out of the Body, ſhall be reſerved by the Lord's Cuſtody for that entry into the Kingdom of Heaven, being in the mean time plac'd in the Boſom of* Abraham *(whither the wicked cannot come becauſe of the Gulf interpos'd,) until the time of entring into the Kingdom doth come.* The Boſom of *Abraham* in the Senſe of the Ancients is the ſame with Paradiſe (according to that of S. *Baſil* (f) *do'ſt thou not ſee* Lazarus, *how he entred by faſting into Paradiſe?*) They ſuppoſe therefore a *Sub-celeſtial Paradiſe*, wherein the generality of the Saints departed in the New Teſtament-times enjoy an inferiour State of Happineſs antecedently to the day of Judgment : As wicked Angels and the Souls of wicked Men departed are but in an initial State of Miſery until that day. And becauſe the generality of the Saints departed in the Old Teſtament-times cannot be ſuppos'd, to have been in a better State after their departure than the Saints of the New Teſtament-times, therefore they alſo muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been antecedently to our Saviour's coming in no higher State than that of a Sub-celeſtial Paradiſe, as the ancient Writers of the Church affirm with great conſent. (g) Yet not without a conſiderable diſſent and the intermixture of very ſtrange Conceits. For although uſually all of them affirm, that none of the Pious before Chriſt's coming entred the Kingdom of Heaven, yet ſome of them ſometimes ſay otherwiſe, and confound the Boſom of *Abraham* with the Kingdom of Heaven. Some of them ſuppoſe the Boſom of *Abraham* (the receptacle of the Saints of the Old Teſtament-times,) to have been no part of Hell, but an higher Region, yet a Sub-celeſtial Paradiſe: Others of them will have it a part of Hell, yet a Region of Bliſs and Happineſs: Others thought the Pious before Chriſt's coming were ſo in Hell, as to be in Griefs and under the Devil's Power; and (which is a marvellous conceit) ſome of them of good Note thought the Paradiſe which is the receptacle of the Saints departed, and into which *Enoch* and *Elias* were tranſlated, (h) to be the *Adamical* Paradiſe, where the firſt Man was plac'd. Not duly to diſtinguiſh theſe diſſonant kind of Paradiſes is a grand Incongruity in the ancient Writers: But it is a worſe confounding things that differ, not duly to ſeparate an heavenly kind of Paradiſe from the Hell of the damned, to ſhut up both the Souls of Sinners and of the Juſt in Hell, and to ſeat Paradiſe there. Which inexcuſable miſtake of ſome of the Fathers the learned *Grotius* hath choſen to Patronize in his Explications of the *New Teſtament-hades*, which comprehendeth, as he ſuppoſeth (i) both the Paradiſe of the Saints and the Hell of the damned. Whence he inferreth, that both *Dives* and *Lazarus* were in *Hades diſterminatis ᾅδου regionibus* in different Regions of *Hades*, and that S. *Auſtin* needleſly perplex'd himſelf in his inquiry, *how Chriſt could be at the ſame time in Hell, that is, in Hades, and in Paradiſe, ſeeing the one is comprehended under the other. For both Paradiſe and Hell, or as the Greeks ſpeak,* Elyſium *and* Tartarus *are in* Hades. To juſtifie this Interpretation of *Hades* in the New Teſtament (that it ſignifieth that whole inviſible Region, which is the Manſion of Souls in common) numerous Citations are produc'd from the Pagan Theologers and from *Joſephus* (a Paganizing Jew:) But nothing that looketh like a Teſtimony, is or can be produc'd from the holy Writers of the New Teſtament, wherein there are two Notions of *Hades* and no more. One is the Old Teſtament-notion of *Hades*, wherein it ſignifieth *that Region which is the Region of Darkneſs and Deſtruction to viſibles. Hades* was ſuppos'd to ſwallow up all; when viſibles diſappear'd, they were ſuppos'd to be in Darkneſs and Deſtruction and in the Region thereof, which is *Hades*, the ſame with the Hebrew *Sheol*; and this is the Notion of *Hades* in thoſe places of Scripture, wherein it is join'd with Death (the Gates of *Hades* are the ſame with the Gates of Death or Deſtruction,) as it is in ſeveral places both of the Old and New Teſtament and of the *Apocrypha*. But there is another *Hades* in the New Teſtament, which is not in the Old; for in one place (and no more) it ſignifieth *the Place or Region of unhappy departed Souls.* Luc. 16. 23. The reaſon why it ſo ſignifieth in the New Teſtament, is, becauſe the Jews in the later times of their Commonwealth borrow'd ſeveral Notions from the Pagans. *Hades* was us'd in their ſenſe amongſt the Jews in our Saviour's time (as appeareth from *Joſephus*;) and it was but reaſonable, that our Saviour and the Evangeliſts ſhould ſymbolize with the Jews in their Notion of *Hades*, ſo far as was not unfit and incommodious. But to uſe *Hades*, to ſignifie in the large ſenſe of *Joſephus* and the Pagan Theologers, was extremely unfit and incommodious, and therefore the holy Writers abſolutely decline it; inſomuch that S. *Auſtin* with all his diligence could not find, that *Infernus* (the ſame with *Hades*) was ever taken in Scripture in a good ſenſe or ever ſignified Paradiſe. And he argueth with great Reaſon from the Saying of *Abraham* to *Dives*, *between us and you there is a great Gulf fix'd*; (k) *it may ſufficiently appear (as I ſuppoſe,) that the Boſom of* Abraham, *the place of ſo great Felicity, is not any part or member of Infernus.* In the Nature of the thing it is a grand Incongruity, to ſuppoſe, that Paradiſe is a Region of the Infernal Parts (the Manſions below;) and if the holy Writers did comprehend Paradiſe in the Name of *Hades*, would they without any limitation of Senſe diſcourſe of *caſting* Hades *into the Lake of Fire?* If *Hades* in our Religion muſt ſignifie in the large Paganical Notion, we muſt jumble and confound things at an unholy Paganical rate; we muſt ſay with the Pagans; the Souls both of good and bad go to one *Hades*, Rewards and Puniſhments are in one *Hades*, Paradiſe and the Hell of the damned are but ſeveral Provinces of one Kingdom of *Hades*, and it is moſt agreeable to this Notion of *Hades*, to ſuppoſe the Divine Judicature, Rewards and Puniſhments and the Boſom of *Abraham*, to be all Subterraneous. The Seat and receptacle of the Souls of the Pious (l) *Joſephus* ſometimes calleth χῶρον οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἁγιώτατον, *the moſt holy place of Heaven.* Heaven therefore muſt be reckon'd a Region of *Hades*, and our Lord's Prayer may run thus in Greek (ſome ſay, that it hath run thus in vulgar Greek,) πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν ᾅδῃ, *Pater noſter qui es in Inferno.*

(s) *Lex. Heptaglot. in voce* פרדס

(t) *S. Cyr. in Johann.* p. 2.

(u) *S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l.* 12. *c.* 34.

(w) *J. Mart. Ep. ad Diognet. p.* 502.

(x) *Alleg. l.* 1. *p.* 35. *ed. Gr. Paris.*

(y) Μέλλων εὐσεβίης ἱερὸν παράδεισον ἀνοίγειν.

(z) *Locus divinæ amænitatis recipiendis ſanctorum ſpiritibus deſtinatus.* Apol. c. 47.

(a) *Hoornbeck c. Jud. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *Lightfoot Hor. in Luc.* 16. 22. *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 1802.

(b) *Not. in Luc.* 23. 43. *v. Windet. de vit. ſanct. p.* 133.

(c) *Promiſſio Paradiſi viventis Dei regnum eſt. S. Hilar. de Trin. l.* 10. *Hic ad Paradiſum reduces facit, hic ad cœlorum regna perducit. S. Cypr. ad Demetr. Patriam noſtram Paradiſum computamus.* Idem de mortal.

(d) *Lightfoot Hor. in Luc.* 23. 43.

(e) *Eam regionem ſinum dico Abrahæ, etſi non cæleſtem, ſubliviorem tamen inferis interim refrigerium præbituram animabus juſtorum. Donec conſummatio rerum reſurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. Tertul. c. Marcion. l.* 4. *c.* 34. *Exeuntes de corpore, ad introitum illum regni cæleſtis, per cuſtodiam Domini fideles omnes reſervabuntur, in ſinu ſcilicet interim Abrahæ collocati: Quo adire impios interjectum Chaos inhibet, quouſque introeundi rurſum in regnum cælorum tempus adveniat.* S. Hilar. in Pſal. 120.

(f) Hom. 1. de Jejun.

(3.) As ſome ancient Writers of the Church have placed the ſupernal Paradiſe in the infernal Region, ſo by a like untoward conceit others of them have placed the Moſaic Paradiſe in the ſupernal Parts, conceiving it to have been far higher than our Earth and raiſed near the Orb of the Moon. Even S. *Baſil* hath compoſed a moſt Romantic Elogy of Paradiſe ſtiling it ἀνεπισκότιστον διὰ τὸ ὕψος, *not liable to any obſcuration becauſe of its altitude*; and *Gr. Naz.* ſpeaketh of it, as if he knew not what to make of it, (m) ὅς τίς ποτε ἦν ὁ παράδεισος οὗτος, *whatſoever this Paradiſe was.* S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerveth (n) *that* Moſes *nameth the place of the Situation of Paradiſe, that triflers might not vent their Fabuloſities* and deceive the Simple, affirming μὴ εἶναι ἐν τῇ γῇ τὸν παράδεισον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, *that not Earth but Heaven is the place of Paradiſe; for if notwithſtanding the holy Scripture hath us'd ſo much accuracy, yet ſome highly conceited of their Eloquence and ſecular Philoſophy have not forborn to contradict the Letter of Scripture, and to affirm, that Paradiſe was not upon Earth, where would they have ſtopp'd, if* Moſes *had not deſcrib'd it with accuracy and without all loftineſs of ſtyle?* To raiſe the Moſaic Paradiſe to the Orb of the Moon, or to make it a penſile Garden hanging between Earth and Heaven, was an approach to *Origen*'s extravagance, who raiſed it to the Third Heaven

---

(g) Grot. ...r. Mon... Ap... ...rat. 1. ... c3. ...c. Anſw. ...the Jeſ. Challenge ...Limb ... Per... ...v. T. 1. ...7 c. 14.

(h) Sixt. Amain. Antib. Bibl. p. 949. Bellarm de Grat. 1. hom. c. 12. Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 1. c. 5. & T. 1. l. 7. c. 14. Joh. Gregor. Not. & obſ. c. 18.

(i) Not. in Luc. 16. 23. & in c. 23. 43.

Pſ. 27. 20. Iſ. 5. 14. In the Chalday Oracles we have ζήτησον παράδεισον, i. e. τὸν ἀμφιφαῆ τῆς ψυχῆς χῶρον, the lucid receptacle of the Soul, ſaith Pletho.

(k) *Satis, ut opinor, appareat, non eſſe quandam partem & quaſi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis ſinum.* De Gen. ad lit. l. 12. c. 33. & Ep. 99.

(l) *Grot. Not. in Luc.* 16. 23.

(m) *Or.* 38. p 618.

(n) *In Gen.* λογ. ιγ.

Orig. Periarch. l. 2. c. 12.

(which is called by S. *Auſtin*, *Paradiſus Paradiſorum*) to an immenſe diſtance from the Nature of our firſt Parents, (who having Terreſtrial Animal Bodies were incapable of inhabiting any other Paradiſe but a Terreſtrial-animal) from the ſenſe alſo and ſtyle of *Moſes* and the Nature of his Hiſtory. His Hiſtory is part of the Old Teſtament, which (o) *directè ordinabat ad bonum ſenſile & terrenum, directly tended to the ſenſible and terrene good*; and is ſuch a part of the Old Teſtament, which is ſymbolical and typical, and therefore conſiſteth of *temporalia quidem, in figura tamen ſpiritualia, things Temporal that are Figures of things Spiritual.* His Paradiſe was a Terreſtrial Garden, as the Name of it importeth, for גן which ſignifieth what we commonly call a Garden, is uſually rendred by the LXX παράδεισος, and παράδεισος ſignifieth a Garden in the Story of *Suſanna* and the Book of *Eccleſiaſticus*, and פרדס (Paradiſe) ſignifieth a Garden or Orchard in the *Targum* frequently and in holy Scripture. *Neh.* 2. 8. *Cant.* 2. 13. *Eccl.* 2. 5. His Paradiſe was *the Garden of God*, which in the Old Teſtament ſignifieth *a Terreſtrial Animal kind of Paradiſe*, a place on Earth furniſh'd with delicious accommodations for this Animal ſenſitive Life in a ſuperlative degree according to the Hebrew mode of expreſſing the ſuperlative degree by the Name of God. So the Prince of *Tyre* becauſe of his ſuperlative riches, affluence and delicioſneſs is ſaid, to have been *in* Eden *the Garden of God*. So the King of *Aſſyria* is called the higheſt Tree in the Garden of God (a Prince who over-topp'd all others that were in flouriſhing ſtate) to ſignifie his ſuperlative ſecular Sublimity and Proſperity. *The Cedars in the Garden of God could not hide him. Not any Tree in the Garden of God was like unto him. Becauſe of the multitude of his Branches all the Trees of* Eden, *that were in the Garden of God envied him.* The Plain of *Jordan* becauſe it was well watered, rich and fertile, is ſaid to have been *as the Garden of the Lord.* A rich and beauteous Country is by the Prophet *Joel* compar'd to *the Garden of* Eden. And to *Iſrael* God promiſeth, *he will make her Wilderneſs like* Eden, *and her Deſart like the Garden of the Lord.* Iſa. 51. 3. So it far'd with the Land of *Canaan*, when *Iſrael* was reſtor'd from their Captivity, the Land was reſtor'd from its Waſts and Deſolateneſs, and became *like the Garden of* Eden, *Ezek.* 36. 35. They muſt be very dull of apprehenſion, or blinded by prejudice, who underſtand not from theſe Scripture-notices of Paradiſe, that it was a Terreſtrial Garden (and that its Trees, Rivers, Gold, precious Stones were really what they are called,) or as *Moſes* deſcribeth it, that is was *a Garden planted Eaſtward in* Eden, which appeareth from other places of Scripture, to have been the Name of a Country and of a Country about *Babylon*, and it is join'd with other places that are very well known (*Haran* and *Rezeph*,) and appeareth to have retain'd its Name for many Ages. *Gen.* 4. 16. 2 *King.* 19. 12. *Ezek.* 27. 23. *Eden* in Hebrew is not only the proper Name of a Country, but an Appellative that ſignifieth Pleaſantneſs (the Greek ἡδονὴ is doubtleſs derived from it,) the Country of *Eden* was ſo denominated from its pleaſantneſs and delicacy, the Garden of *Eden* is tranſlated by the Greek and Latin Interpreters *Paradiſus voluptatis*, and *every Tree that is pleaſant to the ſight and good for food* is ſaid to have grown there, which ſpeaketh it to have been a Terreſtrial-animal kind of Paradiſe. The richneſs of *Eden* and its Garden was in great degree owing to the beauteous River that water'd it, which *Moſes* deſcribeth *as a River that became into four heads*, that were heads of diviſion, and conſequently the Rivers of Paradiſe were theſe four diviſions *Piſon*, *Gihon*, *Hiddekel* and *Euphrates*. Two of theſe diviſions (*Hiddekel* and *Euphrates*) are famouſly known; and in *Paſitigris* there is a remainder of *Piſon*, which is ſaid to compaſs or run along by the whole Land of *Havilah* (a Country well known,) and *Gihon* is ſaid to compaſs or run along by the whole Land of *Cuſh*, which in all probability is the ſame with *Suſiana* call'd by the *Perſians* Chuzeſtan or the Province of *Chus*. The Moſaic Paradiſe therefore ſeemeth to have been ſituated upon the Canal or great ſtream which *Tigris* and *Euphrates* join'd together make betwixt their coming together and ſeparating from one another; for this great Stream is *the River that went out of* Eden *to water the Garden, and below the Garden was parted* (into *Piſon* and *Gihon*) *and became into four heads*, there being but two (a great way above the Garden) antecedently to this Partition. In which account of the Situation of Paradiſe there is nothing that will ſeem to claſh with the ſenſe of *Moſes*, if we are acquainted with his way of repreſenting things: Nor is there any thing in his deſcription of Paradiſe, which importeth, that four Rivers iſſu'd from one Fountain in *Eden*, or that *Piſon* and *Gihon* were the primary Rivers of Paradiſe (which are only mention'd in the firſt place becauſe neareſt the Writer, and becauſe *Euphrates* needed no deſcriptive Notices,) ſo that theſe Objections againſt the Geographical part of the Moſaic deſcription of Paradiſe vaniſh into nothing. But from this part of his deſcription it appeareth, to have been ſituated in thoſe parts of the World, which were firſt inhabited, and which are renowned for their Beauty and luxuriant Fertility, (p) where pleaſant Fruits abound, and their Trees are always Green; where the Palm-tree (one great Wonder of Nature) groweth of its own accord, and affordeth the People Bread, Wine, Honey, Vinegar and Garments; where their Corn yieldeth two hundred fold, the Leaves of Wheat and Barly are almoſt four Fingers broad, *Millet* and *Seſame* are in height like unto Trees; where they are conſtrained twice to mow down their Corn-fields, and a third time to eat them up with Sheep, and the Seeds of Corn falling afford them a ſecond Year's Harveſt; and where they drive their Cattel from Paſture, leſt they ſhould deſtroy themſelves by ſatiety.

'Ου μὲν τοι κείνης γε νομεὺς ὀνόσαιτο βοώτης
'Ουδ' ὅστις σύριγγι κερώνυχα πᾶνα γεραίρων
Μήλοις ἀγραύλοισιν ἐφέσπεται. 'Ουδὲ μὲν ὕλην
Παντοίην φυτοεργὸς ἀνὴρ ἀθερίσσαιτο καρπῶν.
Τοίη ἐπὶ κείνης ἄροσις πέλει· 'Εν μὲν ἀέξειν
Ποίην, ἐν δὲ νομεὺς εὐανθέας· 'Εν δὲ ϗ ἀνδρῶν
Φύτλην καλλίστην τε ϗ ἀθανάτοισιν ὁμοίην.

The Cattel there have feeding opulent,
And Pan's *brisk Piper's Flocks find full content.*
All ſtore of Fruits the Planter's pains Rewards,
And ploughing there a vaſt increaſe affords.
There Paſtures flouriſh, Herbs grow great, and (Men
Surpaſſing fair and like the Gods are ſeen.

The Moſaic Paradiſe ſeemeth the more Paradiſaical, becauſe of the richneſs of the Neighbouring

(o) *Aquin.* 1. 2. *qu.* 91. *Art.* 5. *S. Aug. ſup. Johan. Tract.* 25.

Ezek. 28. 13. and 31. 8, 9.

Gen. 13. 10.

Joel 2. 3.

See Hætius of Paradiſe and Bp. Patrick on Gen. 2.

(p) *Sir W. Raleigh. Hiſt. B.* 1. *c.* 3. *S.* 12, 15. *Grot. Not. in Gen.* 2. 10.

bouring Country, that border'd upon it; of *Havilah Moſes* ſaith, (q) *there is Gold, and the Gold of that Land is good* (eximious,) *there is Bdellium* (Pearls) *and the Onyx Stone*, which is a precious Stone. As the Richneſs of this neighbouring Country addeth to the Luſtre of the Garden of *Eden*, ſo being celebrated by *Moſes* in the Deſcription of his Paradiſe, it is thereby repreſented as a Terreſtrial Animal and Mundane kind of Paradiſe. The erecting ſuch a kind of Paradiſe was (as ſuch) an Inſtance of the Bounty of Providence; but the making it Symbolical and Typical was an effect of the wonderful Wiſdom of God. So the Wiſdom of ancient Times was (r) ἡ διὰ συμϐόλων φιλοσοφία, *a Philoſophy by Symbols.*

(q) Bochart. de Animal. par. 1. l. 1. c. 9.

(r) Philo de vit. Moſ. l. 1. p. 412. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

ARTICLE 3.

The Moſaic *Creation was no higher than Terreſtrial-animal, but ſo as to be Symbolical.*

FOR the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation in the whole of it is nothing elſe but an Hiſtory of the Production of a World of Terreſtrial Animals and of God's making proviſion for them as ſuch. All things that are in it are but Terreſtrial Animal things in the Nature or Deſign of them; for there can be nothing in it, that is an higher Good than its Paradiſe (the *Summum Bonum,*) which is meerly Terreſtrial-animal (it knoweth no heavenly kind of Paradiſe Celeſtial or Sub-celeſtial;) therefore it aſcendeth to nothing higher than what is Terreſtrial-animal. (s) The ancient Hebrews reckoned ſeven things, that were created before the World, and one of theſe was Paradiſe; they could not find therefore any Notice of their Supernal Paradiſe in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation; of which no imaginable reaſon can be aſſign'd but this only, *It aſcendeth not to things of that Nature*; therefore it aſcendeth to nothing higher than what is Terreſtrial-animal. This aſſuredly is its genuine Character, as may be clearly demonſtrated from ſeveral other Heads of Argument.

(s) P. Fagius in Gen. 2. 8.

I. The Apoſtle contradiſtinguiſheth the two *Adams* and their two Conſtitutions of things: the one is the Heavenly and the Spiritual, the other is the Earthly and the Animal. The Earthly and the Animal is that which is ſuch *contradiviſively* and *ſpecificative* (of proper kind and quality;) therefore the firſt *Adam's* conſtitution of things is nothing higher than that which is of kind and quality *the Terreſtrial Animal*. This all Men will grant touching that conſtitution of things, which was conſequent upon the Fall of our firſt Parents; but the Apoſtle is not ſpeaking of that conſtitution of things, which was conſequent to their Fall, but of that which was antecedent to it, and which was the ſame with their Terreſtrial Creation, 1 *Cor.* 15. 45.—49. *The firſt Man* Adam *was made a living Soul*, which is the higheſt production in the Hiſtory of the *Moſaic* Creation; therefore it aſcendeth to nothing higher than what is Terreſtrial-animal. (t) נפש חיה *aliud nihil eſt quàm* חיה, ζῶον, *vivens*, per animam ſcilicet, *uno ergo verbo reddi poteſt animal.* A living Soul is in Hebrew the ſame with ζῶον in Greek or *Animal* in Latin, whence every Brute-animal is call'd *a living Soul* as living by a Soul, *Gen.* 1. 24. (u) *We find both a living Soul and the Breath* (or Spirit) *of Life attributed to Brute-animals in Scripture. By the Breath of Life and a living Soul; the Phraſe of Scripture ſignifieth Animals, that is, animated Bodies.* So the Text of *Moſes* muſt be underſtood, *Gen.* 2. 7. *The Lord God formed Man of the Duſt of the Ground, and breathed into his Noſtrils the Breath of Life; and Man became a living Soul.* For the Breath of Life breath'd into Man's Noſtrils can ſignifie nothing elſe but the Breath of Reſpiration. *Mercerus* acknowledgeth, that *Job* alludeth to this place of *Moſes*, when he thus expreſſeth his vital Breath of Reſpiration; *while my Breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my Noſtrils.* The Breath of Reſpiration therefore is the Spirit or Inſpiration of God. The Breath of Reſpiration is alſo *the Breath of Life*, and nothing elſe is ever called in Scripture by that Name, *Gen.* 6. 17. *Job* 12. 10. *Pſal.* 104. 29. and 135. 17. and 146. 4. and 150. 6. *Iſa.* 2. 22. *Jer.* 10. 14. *Dan.* 5. 23. *Hab.* 2. 19: *Act.* 17. 25. when God in the Prophet expreſſeth his Intention, to make the dry Bones live, he uſeth theſe Phraſes, *I will cauſe Breath to enter into you, and put Breath in you, come, O Breath, and breath upon the ſlain:* Therefore the making *Adam* alive conſiſted in cauſing Breath (the Breath of Reſpiration) to enter into him. A late Phyſician ſaith, (w) *The Life of Man in this World runneth parallel with his Breath*, Pſal. 104. 29. Job 27. 3. *and the Death of Man is ſtill ſignify'd by the departure of his Breath. It is ſaid of the Widow's Child, his Sickneſs was ſo ſore, that there was no Breath left in him. Plainly throughout the whole word of God, Breath, and Life, and Soul, and Spirit are ſynonymous, and often made exegetical one of another.* If an Intellectual Soul might be called Breath and the Breath of Life (although none will call it ſo unleſs the Stoicks and their Followers,) yet what Breath is that which is breath'd into Man's Noſtrils, and is the Breath of his Noſtrils, but the Breath of Reſpiration only? *Gen.* 7. 22. 2 *Sam.* 22. 16. *Iſa.* 2. 22. *Lam.* 4. 20. This *Moſaic* Phraſe therefore *Niſchmath chajim, the Breath of Life* doth not ſignifie an Intellectual Soul (although this was neceſſarily conjoyn'd with *Adam's* Body) but only his vital Breath (his Animal-vital Agitation,) which conſtituted him a living Soul. Other Animals have vital Breath in common with Man, but *Moſes* particularly remarketh it, to have been inſpir'd into Man becauſe of Man's Dignity: For although the Breath of Life implieth nothing of Man's precellency above other Animals, yet the Name of Man doth; who having the Breath of Life inſpir'd into him became animated as to the Life of an Animal, and conſequently became ſuch a noble Animal, as Man eſſentially is. (x) *Nondum tamen ſpiritualem hominem debemus intelligere, qui factus eſt in animam viventem, ſed adhuc animalem: But we ought not to think, that as yet he was ſpiritual, who was made a living Soul, as yet he was but Animal.* S. *Auſtin* thinketh, that afterwards he became Spiritual (when he was plac'd in Paradiſe:) but in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory there is no ground for his Imagination: Nor ought we to think, that he was made Spiritual, becauſe *Moſes* ſaith, *God created Man in his own Image*; for the Image of God muſt here ſignifie in the Old Teſtament Notion of it; but it cannot be ſhew'd, that the Image of God in the Old Teſtament ever ſignifieth *the Divine Virtuous Image of God.* No ſuch Notion of it appeareth in the Old Teſtament; but on the contrary,

(t) Hotting. de Creatione. p. 228.

Job 27. 3.

Ezek. 37. 5, 6, 9.

(w) Mr. Smith King Sol. Picture of old age. p. 135.

Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 51.

(x) S. Aug. de Gen. c. Manich. l. 2. c. 8.

(u) *Et animam viventem & ſpiritum vitæ etiam in pecoribus invenimus.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 24. *Intelligimus ſpiritum vitæ & animam viventem ſcripturam ſuo more dixiſſe, cùm animalia, id eſt corpora animata vellet intelligi.* Ibid.

contrary, Mankind that are meerly Animal, are ſuppoſ'd to bear God's Image, *Gen.* 9. 6. *Jam.* 3. 9. 1 *Cor.* 11. 7.

II. As this *Moſaic* Hiſtory touching the Creation of Man aſcendeth to nothing higher than the making ſuch a Terreſtrial Animal (not aſcending to the Creation of his Intellectual Soul:) So the Hiſtory aſcendeth not to the Creation of any living Creatures higher than Terreſtrial Animals; for it ſaith not a Syllable touching the Creation of the *Animalia Sanctitatis* (as the Jews call them) *the Holy Angels.* In reſpect of Animals therefore the whole of it falleth within the comprehenſion of Terreſtrial Animals; for the Jews obſerve, that *in Geneſi nulla mentio eſt creationis Angelorum*; yet on the other hand the generality of them ſay, there is mention of the creation of thoſe noble Creatures though not expreſs: ſome of them ſay, that (becauſe of their ſwiftneſs) they are ſignify'd by the Fowl that fly in the midſt of Heaven, which were created the *fifth* Day. Others think, they are ſignify'd in the word Heaven; and ſome think, they are ſignify'd in the word *Elohim*, as if the Senſe was, *He whoſe Eſſence is unknown created the Angels.* Others ſay, the Spirit of God moving upon the Face of the Waters ſignifieth the Angels; and ſome ſay, they are ſignify'd by *the Light* created the firſt Day. But the more Judicious of them ſay, (y) *In the Hiſtory of the Creation only viſibles* (quæ viſu percipiuntur) *are treated of, ſuch as Heaven, the Earth, Sun, Moon, Stars, Plants, Animals and ſuch more; not ſuch things which being immaterial are only diſcerned by the Mind.* So Chriſtian Divines ſay, (z) Moſes *did not propoſe to himſelf, to write of the Creation of all things, but only of the things viſible and corporeal, as* Baſil *affirmeth and* Philoponus *after him. He hath therefore treated of the Production of the Corporeal World only, touching the origin of Angels he is altogether ſilent.* (a) *We ought to remember, that* Moſes *in his ſix Days Creation-Work hath not meddled with the creation of any thing Spiritual and Incorporeal; but of ſuch things only which are Corporeal and fall under Senſe. No mention of Angels therefore is to be look'd for there.* In this Creation Man is (*b*) *creaturarum omnium coronis & ultima meta, the ſummity and the laſt end.* Yet he hath not ſo much as a particular Day allotted him for his Creation; but he is created on the ſame ſixth Day with the reſt of the Terreſtrial Animals, having a like Generation with them, and dying as they, as *Abarbinel* diſcourſeth.

III. If the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation is totally ſilent touching the creation of Angels, it cannot be the Hiſtory of the creation of the Heaven of Angels (the Heaven of Beatitude,) nor of the City and Kingdom of God, the Commonwealth of Saints, the Catholick Church (which mainly conſiſteth of the Holy Angels, and conſequently it cannot be an Hiſtory of creating Men Saints (the Sons of the Divine Family and Citizens of the Kingdom of God:) but it muſt be nothing more than an Hiſtory of creating Men as ſuch a Species of Terreſtrial Animals in conſort with the reſt of the Terreſtrial Animals. Accordingly things are repreſented in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory; for after the Brute-animals were produc'd, Man (the Rational Animal) is immediately created, to have dominion over them, *Gen.* 1. 26. Such a Production we have elſewhere called *Zoogony.*

IV. The Deſign of the *Moſaic* Creation (as the Hiſtory repreſenteth it) was not to build an Habitation for the Holy Angels but meerly for Terreſtrial Animals, of which Man is the Chieftain; in ſuch Senſe therefore it is meerly a Terreſtrial Animal Creation. (*c*) *If any one* (ſaith *Lactantius*) *conſidereth the Adminiſtration of the whole World, he will diſcern, how truly the Stoicks ſay, that the World was made for our ſake: for all things of which the World conſiſteth, and which it generateth out of it ſelf, are accommodated to the Utility of Man. Man uſeth Fire for Warmth and Light, for dreſſing Meat and making Iron Inſtruments. He uſeth Fountains for Drink and Waſhing: Rivers to water the Fields and terminate Countries: He uſeth the Earth for variety of Fruits, the hilly parts for Vineyards, the Mountains for Trees and Woods, the Plains for Corn: He uſeth the Sea not only for Commerce and to carry Riches out of far diſtant Regions, but for plenty of all manner of Fiſh. And if he maketh uſe of theſe Elements that are very near him, doubtleſs Heaven is of uſe to him; for the things Celeſtial have their Offices conducive to the Fertility of the Earth, whence we have our Suſtenance. The Sun by reſtleſs courſes and unequal ſpaces maketh his annual rounds, and either riſing openeth the Day for Labour, or ſetting bringeth the Night upon us for Reſt: and by his further departure to the South, and his nearer acceſs to the North maketh the Viciſſitudes of Winter and Summer, that by the Winter-moiſture and Froſt the Earth may be fatten'd, and by the Summer-heats the Graſs, and Corn, and Fruits may have their due Concoction, Maturation and Induration. The Moon alſo the Governeſs of the Night loſing and recovering her Light by turns thereby meaſureth the Monthly Spaces, and by her Brightneſs illuminateth the horrid Darkneſs of the Night, that Labours and Journeys may commodiouſly be done in that time. The other Stars alſo by their riſing or ſetting determine certain Seaſons and commodious Times, and conduce to Navigation (that Ships may not wander in the Ocean,) the Pilot rightly obſerving them arriveth at his deſigned Port. By the Winds the Clouds are gather'd, that ſo the Plants and the Seeds that are ſown may be water'd, and the Vineyards and Orchards may abound with Fruit. Theſe things are exhibited by turns and in a round, that ſo the Life of Man may never fail of Suſtenance.* This World is deſign'd by Parental Providence, to be a commodious Habitation for Man, and the ſame bounteous Providence *hath repleniſh'd the Air with Fowls, the Sea with Fiſhes, the Earth with fourfooted Beaſts.* (d) *It appeareth therefore, that the World was made for Animals, for they* (having perceptive Life) *enjoy thoſe things of which it conſiſteth; which that they might live and ſubſiſt, all things neceſſary are afforded them at certain times: The other Animals are made for Man.* So the ancient Writers of the Church ſuppoſe (that the other Animals were made meerly for the uſe and ſervice of Man:) but they might better have ſuppos'd with *Socrates*, that the World was made by a wiſe Opificer and *a Lover of Animals*, who alone are capable of enjoying it.

V. As the Hiſtory of the *Moſaic* Creation aſcendeth to no Animals higher than Man, ſo (in the Letter of it) it maketh not any proviſion for Man, but what is meerly Terreſtrial-animal; which ſpeaketh it nothing more than a

---

(y) *Men. ben Iſr. Qu. in Gen. p.* 21.

(z) *Petav. T.* 3. *de Ang. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *S.* 1.

(a) *Ibid. de op. l.* 2. *c.* 3. *S.* 8.

(b) *Hotting. de creat. p.* 258, 263.

(c) Lactan. de ira Dei, c. 13.

(d) *Apparet ergo Animantium cauſa Mundum eſſe conſtructum, quoniam rebus iis quibus conſtat, animantes fruuntur: qua ut vivere, ut conſtare poſſent, omnia his neceſſaria temporibus certis ſubminiſtrantur. cæteras autem animantes hominis cauſa eſſe fictas.* Lactant. Inſtit. l. 7. c. 4.

Terreſtrial-animal kind of Creation. For if we ſurvey the Moſaic *Hexaemeron*, we ſhall find, that the Product of every day's work (as it is ſuch) is nothing more than an Utility and Conveniency provided and deſigned for this Terreſtrial Animal Life. *The firſt Day's* Work is a Creation of the Viciſſitude of our *Day and Night*, which is manifeſtly nothing more than a conveniency for Terreſtrial Animals. So the ſecond Day's Work meerly reſpecteth their Utility (as ſuch;) for it is the Creation of our *Firmament* for the diviſion of the upper from the lower Waters; without which diviſion of Waters the Earth could not be a frugiferous Region, nor could it be a luminous Region without a diaphanous Firmament. The *third Day's* Work is nothing elſe but a ſeparation of our Sea and dry Land, and a production of our Vegetables; as the *fifth* and *ſixth* Day's Work is nothing elſe but a production of our Terreſtrial Animals. The *fourth Day's* Work at the firſt ſight looketh great; but as it is ſuch (the fourth Day's Work) the Product of it is nothing more than an Utility and Conveniency provided and deſign'd for this Terreſtrial Animal Life, as is apparent from the Sacred Text. *And God ſaid, let there*
Gen. 1. 14—19. *be Lights in the Firmament of the Heaven, to divide the Day from the Night: and let them be for Signs, and for Seaſons, and for Days, and Tears. And let them be for Lights in the Firmament of Heaven, to give Light upon the Earth; and it was ſo. And God made two great Lights; the greater Light to rule the Day, and the leſſer Light to rule the Night; he made the Stars alſo. And God ſet them in the Firmament of the Heaven, to give Light upon the Earth: And to rule over the Day and over the Night, and to divide the Light from the Darkneſs: and God ſaw that it was good.* Throughout the whole of it the ſacred Text ſo apparently reſpecteth the Utility and Conveniency of this Terreſtrial Animal Life of Man, that S. *Chry-*
(e) In Gen. Hom. n. *ſoſtom* ſaith of him; (e) *for him all theſe things were produc'd, the Heaven, the Earth, the Sea, the Sun, Moon, Stars, creeping things, Cattle, all Irrational Animals.* Theſe are great things; but they are not a ſufficient enumeration of all the Utilities and Conveniences, which the Divine Beneficence provided for Man in the *Moſaic* Creation; for God provided a Wife for him (becauſe it is not good for Man to be alone;) *And*
Gen. 1. 28, 29, 30. *God bleſſed our firſt Parents, and ſaid unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and repleniſh the Earth, and ſubdue it; and have Dominion over the Fiſh of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the Earth. And God ſaid, behold I have given you every Herb bearing Seed, which is upon the Face of all the Earth, and every Tree, in the which is the Fruit of a Tree yielding Seed: to you it ſhall be for Meat. And to every Beaſt of the Earth, and to every Fowl of the Air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the Earth, wherein there is Life. I have given you every green Herb for Meat: and it was ſo.* But the Divine Beneficence to Man did not ſtop here; for not content to have aſſign'd him in general Plants and Fruits of the Earth for his Food, God moreover provided an Earthly Paradiſe for him repleniſh'd with Plants and Trees of the moſt excellent kinds, a Terreſtrial Garden garniſh'd with Fruits (delicious both to the Eye and Taſt) well water'd and beautify'd with a River and bordering upon a Land of Gold and Pearls and precious Stones. And this is all the Proviſion that is made for Man in this *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation and of Paradiſe; the ſumm total whereof is nothing but Accommodations for this Terreſtrial Animal Life: But where is there any Proviſion made of Light and Life, of Food and Suſtenance, of Solace and ſuitable Society, of the Bread and Water of Life, of Gold and Treaſure, of Pretioſities and Felicities, and of an Inheritance for the Soul? Where is there the leaſt Syllable of notice or mention of any concern for the Soul and the Soul-goods throughout the Hiſtory of the *Hexaemeron* and of Paradiſe? was the ſtate of Life and Salvation provided for the Soul of the firſt Man, when he was made a living Soul? was the holy Spirit provided to guide and animate him? or was he made a Citizen of Heaven, of the Society of the Bleſſed, and an Heir of Life Eternal (as he muſt be, if he was a Saint of God,) when he was plac'd in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe? If this *Moſaic* Hiſtory aſcendeth not to ſuch things as theſe, it tranſcendeth not the line and level of a Terreſtrial Animal Creation.

VI. In the Books of Divines we have a *Theologia primi hominis*; it is ſuppos'd, that he was created in the Divine Virtuous Image of God, and that the Covenant of Works touching his Soul-Intereſts was made with him and in him with all Mankind; but we may pore out our Eyes, before we can find the leaſt Syllable of theſe matters in this whole *Moſaic* Hiſtory. Further than as an Hiſtoriographer of what concerneth Terreſtrial Animals *Moſes* in this Hiſtory ſaith nothing of the knowledge of God, nothing of his Eſſence and Attributes, nothing of his Divine Nature and Imperial Eſtate, nothing of his Rights, Dues aud Prerogatives, nothing of his Kingdom and Soul-ſovereignty, nothing touching his true Worſhip and Service, nor any thing touching his Worſhip and Service in general, not ſo much as any thing touching the Service of Sacrifice. Man is eſſentially (more or leſs) a Religious Animal, he is neceſſarily under the Law of Religion, and the Law of Nature is ſuppos'd to be written in the Heart of Man: Yet even of the Law of Nature and the multifarious Branches thereof here is no notice in this *Moſaic* Hiſtory, here is no Moral Philoſophy (as there is no Natural Philoſophy,) no Divine Morality, nor any thing of the Divine Moral Law, the great Rules and Precepts of Sobriety, Righteouſneſs and Godlineſs. Man muſt be ſuppos'd, to have an Heaven-born Soul and Soul-intereſts, yet in this Hiſtory (the Letter of it) there is as little notice of the Heaven-born Soul of Man, as there is of the Creation and Fall of Angels (that is, none at all;) here is nothing touching the Origin or Immortality of the Incorporeal Soul of Man, nothing touching care of the Soul, nothing touching Soul-concerns, nothing touching the End and Buſineſs, the Holineſs and true Happineſs of Man; nothing of Salvation and the way to it, nothing of an Heaven of Beatitude or an Heavenly Life, nothing of Hell and Damnation, nothing of another World, nothing of Spirituals and Eternals. This *Moſaic* Hiſtory therefore can be nothing elſe (in the Letter of it) but *an Hiſtory of what belongeth to God's creating Terreſtrial Animals* (as they are ſuch) *and making proviſion for them.* But the more to aſcertain this Article, we will not content our ſelves with a general view of this *Moſaic* Hiſtory, we will diſtinctly ſurvey the ſeveral parts of it.

(1.) The firſt part of it is the Summary of the *Hexaemeron*, which is thus repreſented by

(f) In Gen. λογ. 3.

S. *Chryſoſtom*; (f) *That you may underſtand the Superlative Philanthropy, which the Lord of all ſheweth to our kind, he ſtretched out the Heaven, expanded the Earth, made the Firmament as a middle Wall dividing the Waters, then he commanded a collection of the Waters, which he called Seas, and the dry Land Earth, which he adorn'd with the productions of Seeds and Herbs, and then paſs'd to the making two great Lights and the variety of the Stars thereby making the Pulchritude of Heaven; then out of the Waters he produc'd live Creatures and Fowls that fly upon the Earth in the open Firmament of Heaven; and having fulfill'd the number of five Days, becauſe it was requiſite, that Land-animals ſhould be made, he commanded theſe alſo to be produc'd, both thoſe that are fit for Food and thoſe that are uſeful for Service, Beaſts and creeping things; then at laſt (having formed all things, having ſet Viſibles in due order, having prepar'd a ſumptuous Table repleniſh'd with all manner of Food in abundant Richneſs and Affluence, and as one may ſay, having made things all about of regial illuſtrious form, variouſly adorning things above and below and making them reſplendent, then at laſt he maketh him that was to enjoy all theſe, giving him the Dominion of all Viſibles, and ſhewing how far this Animal excell'd all things that were made, ſeeing he commanded them all to be under his Power and Adminiſtration.* In this Summary of the *Hexaemeron* a mighty goodneſs and goodneſs towards Man is viſible; but the Products of it in the Creation and Furniture of the World are only ſuch Benefits which are *common to our kind* (as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaketh;) for the Lights of Heaven are imparted to all Nations under Heaven, and the Earth God hath given to the Children of Men. The goodneſs of God to Man in this *Moſaic Hexaemeron* (abſtracting from what is Typical and Symbolical in it) is ſeen only in making proviſion for his Natural Life, not in providing the Goods of the Kingdom of God for his Soul, of which there is no notice in this Summary of the *Hexaemeron*, but all is Mundane and appertaining to this Terreſtrial Animal Life. *That was not firſt which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural (*Animal;*) and afterward that which is Spiritual*, 1 Cor 15. 46.

Deut. 4. 19. Pſal. 115. 16.

(2.) A ſecond part of the Hiſtory is an Appendix to the Summary of the *Hexaemeron* (part of which Appendix is mention'd by S. *Chryſoſtom* in his Summary) *Gen.* 1. 28, 29, 30. (g) *The Matters of this part of the Hiſtory are contained under three Heads: One is, touching the Benediction of Marriage and the power of begetting Children, which God gave to the firſt married Couple, and in them to others ſucceſſively. Another Head is touching the ſubjecting the Earth to Men, and the Domination which God gave unto them over all Animals terreſtrial, volatile and aquatile. A third Head is touching the Food which they ought to eat, as alſo touching thoſe things which Brute Animals muſt feed upon.* All theſe things belong to God's creating Terreſtrial Animals as they are ſuch; to take order for their Propagation and the conſervation of their Species; to appoint Man the Ruler over the Inferiour Animals; and to take care for the Food and Suſtenance both of Man and Beaſt. The Jews ſay, (h) *Increaſe and multiply* is מצוה גדולה *the great Precept, for the ſake whereof all other Precepts in the World are conſtituted, and that the Deſign of it is, that the World may be inhabited* (to repleniſh the Earth:) Accordingly they look upon themſelves as oblig'd by it at a great rate. It recommendeth Marriage and ſuiteth with their Animal Propenſions, which is the reaſon, why they magniſie ſuch a Precept.

(g) *Zanch. T.* 3. *de Hom. creat. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *S.* 22.

(h) *Hottin. de Jur. Hebr. Lex.* 1.

(3.) A third part of the Hiſtory is touching the impoſing Names upon the ſeveral Species of Animals; which ſheweth, that the Maker of the World concern'd himſelf at a great rate in ſettling the Affairs of the Animal-World, otherwiſe it might ſeem very ſtrange, *that every Beaſt of the Field, and every Fowl of the Air* ſhould be brought unto *Adam, to ſee what he would call them* (and as the Text ſaith, they were brought by the Lord God,) and that the firſt uſe which *Adam* was appointed to make of his Underſtanding, ſhould be the naming of Animals. Some have from thence inferr'd his profound skill in Nature and Philoſophy, and that he underſtood the Natures of thoſe Animals; but there is no reaſon for the making ſuch an Inference. (i) *The inferring the boundleſs Skill of* Adam *from his impoſing upon all things Names ſo apt and ſignificative of their Nature, ſeemeth not to me at all a neceſſary conſequence. There is no need of any great skill or inſight into things, to give any a ſufficiently fitting Name; it may be done well enough from ſome Faculty or Property which is obvious at firſt ſight; as appeareth in thoſe Names of Animals and other things which are extant in Holy Writ.* The Names of Animals in Scripture are not taken from their Inferiour Nature, but from ſome Exteriour Properties and Notes of difference, and therefore the impoſing Names on them is not ſo much an argument of *Adam*'s profound knowledge in Nature, as δεσποτείας σύμβολον, *a Sign of his Dominion* (as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaketh;) for it belongeth to a Lord and Maſter, to impoſe Names upon his Servants. And as in the new Creation when the ſecond *Adam* was inſtated in his Dominion, it was but reaſonable, that all the Creatures of the Heavenly World ſhould pay their Homage to him (all the Angels of God were bid to worſhip him, *Heb.* 1. 6.) So in this Terreſtrial Animal Creation it was but reaſonable, that the firſt *Adam* ſhould in this manner be inſtated in his Dominion; *The ſeveral Species of Terreſtrial Animals were aſſembled, to pay* (as it were) *their Homage to him and to receive their Names from him.* The one (in all reaſon) muſt be thought a Typical Adumbration of the other; but abſtracting from this Typical Adumbration, the aſſembling the Terreſtrial Animals, to receive their Names from the Terreſtrial *Adam* (probably by a Mandate and ſecret Inſtinct,) to difference and diſtinguiſh them one from another, is nothing more than *what belongeth to God's creating Terreſtrial Animals as they are ſuch.*

Gen. 2. 19, 20.

(i) Gatak. c. Pfocher. P. 43.

(4.) A fourth part of the Hiſtory is a diſtinct Account of the Formation of *Woman* (her being made of a Rib taken out of *Adam*'s Side, when he was aſleep, the Fleſh being clos'd up in ſtead thereof) and the Inſtitution of Marriage; which Branch of the Hiſtory hath given occaſion to many little Inquiries (which S. *Auſtin*, the Jews, and the Schoolmen have made,) one of which was thought of great difficulty by Card. *Cajetan*; for he relinquiſh'd the literal truth of the Hiſtory, and betook himſelf to meer Allegory, becauſe of this difficulty; *It ſeemeth not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Rib taken out of* Adam's *Side was ſuperfluous* (for all things were at firſt made in Number, Weight and Meaſure,) *and if it was one of thoſe that are natural and neceſſary,* Adam *muſt be mutilate ever after.* But he ought to have conſider'd, that ſome natural parts of an Humane Body are not neceſſary (in any great degree,) as the ערלה which is taken away

Gen. 2. 20—25.

S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 9. c. 13.

in Circumciſion: So Anatomiſts find in ſome Humane Bodies (*k*) 13 pair of Ribs on a Side, in the generality of Men only 12 pair on a Side, and in ſome but 11. So trifling a difficulty is this that gravell'd Card. *Cajetan.* And alike trifling is that difficulty which another Objector urgeth, (*l*) *how the whole Bulk of the Body of a Woman could be made* (or built) *of but one Rib? for one Rib doth not equalize the hundredth or thouſandth part of the whole Body. And if you ſay, the reſt of the Matter was taken from elſewhere,* Eve *may be more truly ſaid, to have been formed of that alien Matter than of a Rib of* Adam. For in this difficulty there is no difficulty ſave only what ariſeth from the ambiguity of words. *Moſes* ſaith, *The Rib which the Lord God had taken from Man made he* (or built he) *a Woman*; which is a ſort of Architecture contradiſtinct to the forming her out of nothing, or out of the Duſt of the Ground or other alien Matter. Theſe are ſeveral contradiſtinct ways of producing an Humane Body: it may be a Rib formed into a Woman; it may be produc'd meerly *ex nihilo*, it may be form'd out of the Duſt of the Ground or other alien Matter. The firſt of theſe is the Woman's proper way of production; ſhe was a Rib form'd into a Woman, as Nature formeth an Acorn into an Oak, a Grain of Muſtard-ſeed into a Tree, an Egg into a Giant: Which is not done without the acceſſion of a great deal of alien matter; for it is by the acceſſion of a great deal of alien matter, that an Acorn is formed into an Oak; but as this acceſſion of alien matter doth not hinder, but that an Acorn may be properly ſaid to be formed into an Oak: So the acceſſion of alien matter doth not hinder, but that a Rib may be properly ſaid to be formed into a Woman. And it muſt not be ſaid, that ſhe was formed of alien matter; for that is not her proper way of production, but contradiſtinct thereto; nor had ſhe at all a formation out of it formally as ſuch, but only materially and conſiſtently with her proper way of formation, and ſo far as it was requiſite for the forming a Rib into a Woman.

In order to the taking out one of *Adam*'s Ribs (or a pair of them) it was requiſite, that he ſhould be caſt into a deep Sleep, that he might not withſtand and be reluctant to the Operation. Expoſitors think, that the whole Operation was reveal'd to *Adam* in his Sleep; but it is more probable, that he was told of it, when *Eve* was brought unto him; and being told of it he impos'd upon her an agreeable Name (the impoſing Names belonging to him by Divine Appointment) expreſſing alſo the reaſon of it, *Gen.* 2. 23. *And* Adam *ſaid, This is now Bone of my Bones and Fleſh of my Fleſh; ſhe ſhall be called Woman, becauſe ſhe was taken out of Man.* The ſacred Hiſtorian informeth us, that theſe were the words of *Adam*; but he doth not inform us, who was the ſpeaker of the next words, which contain the Inſtitution of Marriage; only our Saviour informeth us, that they were God's words, *Matt.* 19. 4, 5. And becauſe there is no appearance, that *Adam* was a Divine Meſſenger imploy'd to ſpeak God's words, therefore an Ellipſis (uſual in Scripture) muſt be ſuppos'd in the Hiſtory, which muſt be thus ſupply'd; *Therefore* (ſaid God) *ſhall a Man leave his Father and Mother and ſhall cleave to his Wife, and they twain ſhall be one Fleſh.* As our Saviour informeth us, that theſe were God's words, ſo the nature of the thing requireth it; for it is certain, there was a Divine Inſtitution of Marriage at the beginning of the World; and we can hear of no other Divine Inſtitution of it but this alone, which is in the Moſaic Hiſtory; therefore this part of the Hiſtory is literally true and of Divine Original. All things in it are ſo well, that it is not imaginable, how they could be better, ſave only that (*m*) S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerveth in it (which indeed pervadeth this whole Hiſtory) τὴν παχύτητα τῶν λέξεων, *a groſſneſs of ſpeaking.* It giveth another-kins account of the origin of Women than *Plato* hath given in his *Timæus.* It repreſenteth Man and Wife as parts of one whole, to ingender mutual love and indearment; and as *one Fleſh* in oppoſition to Poligamy and Divorce, which are the Peſts and Bane of Marriage. If it recommendeth Marriage at a great rate, this is no more than it deſerveth in this Terreſtrial Animal State: For a Family (*n*) is the firſt of Societies, and without Marriage it is ἀτελὴς, *mutilate in its upper parts:* The Philoſopher therefore commendeth the Society of Man and Wife as κάλλος τῆς οἰκίας, *the Ornament and Furniture of an Houſe* (which looketh ſomewhat deſolately without it;) and according to him it compriſeth the Solaces and Aſſiſtances of Society and Friendſhip, and is founded in Nature, which hath not only made us συναγελαστικοὺς, *ſuch as are inclin'd to live in Flocks,* but συνδυαστικοὺς, *ſuch as love to live together by Pairs.* And this is the Summ total of this part of the Moſaic Hiſtory, which (in the Letter of it) is nothing elſe but an Inſtitution of Woman and of Marriage, (*o*) which are meer Accommodations of this Terreſtrial Animal Life.

(5.) The fifth (and great) part of this Moſaic Hiſtory is *the Paradiſaical Oeconomy* conſiſting of two large Branches: *The one of which containeth the Topography of the Earthly Paradiſe, the Law of it, and the Sanction thereof: The other containeth the Temptation and the Sin of our firſt Parents in their Earthly Paradiſe with the penal conſequent effects thereof.* The whole of this Paradiſaical Oeconomy was a Terreſtrial Animal kind of Buſineſs; for the purport of it was, to ſettle the Terreſtrial Animal concerns of our firſt Parents (and in them of Mankind,) eſpecially the chief of thoſe Terreſtrial Animal concerns which *is Bodily Life and Death.* This appeareth from the unſettled condition of our firſt Parents terreſtrial animal concerns before their Tranſgreſſion; for the immortality and mortality which they had, (*p*) was not the plenary, but mutilate and partial; they cannot be ſaid, either to have been immortal or mortal without diſtinction or limitation of Senſe. They were ſo far mortal, they had an Animal Body, which of its own nature is mortal; and they were ſo far immortal, that if they had not ſinned, they had not died. Antecedently therefore to the Paradiſaical Oeconomy neither the perpetual Life nor the neceſſary Death of our firſt Parents was determin'd, the matter was in ſuſpence, and they were in the ſtate of Probationers; but the Paradiſaical Oeconomy in the whole nature and tendency of it appeareth, to have been a method of determining this matter which was in ſuſpence. The Law of Paradiſe (againſt eating the Fruit of a Tree) containeth the Terms and Conditions of this Settlement, and the Sanction of that Law is the Settlement of our firſt Parents terreſtrial animal concerns eſpecially that chief of them Bodily Life and Death; for the generality of Expoſitors underſtand nothing more than Bodily Death to be ſignify'd by the

Commination.

(k) Biſhop Patrick on Gen. 2. 21.

(l) Archæol. Phil. p. 286. V. S. Chryſoſt. in Gen. λογ. 12. Curcell. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 7.

Such an Ellipſis there is Mark 10. 6, 7.

(m) In Gen. λογ. 12.

(n) Hierocl. Fragment. p. 211.

(o) P. Fagius in Gen. 2. 18.

Gen. 2. 8—17.

Gen. 3.

(p) Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 2. c. 6, 7.

Comination, *in the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* (q) *To me it ſeemeth more probable* (ſaith *Petavius,*) *that the Lord expreſs'd only the death of the Body; not that of the Soul. In that very day thou ſhalt begin to be Mortal, and ſubject to corruption,* ſaith *Clarius. Thy ſtrength before ſuſtain'd by the Tree of Life ſhall fail* (ſo Grotius,) *which is the way to death. The Syriac Interpreters here had it, thou ſhalt be Mortal: Which is noted by S.* Ambroſe *and S.* Hierom. *Symmachus* rendreth the words θνητὸς ἔσῃ, *thou ſhalt be Mortal*; and to this ſenſe they are expounded in the ſequel of the Hiſtory, *Duſt thou art and unto Duſt thou ſhalt return.* The Death threatned in this Paradiſaical Oeconomy is only the oppoſite to that Life, which was the Fruit of the Tree of Life (literally underſtood,) and which was conſequent upon *Adam*'s being debarr'd from eating of the Tree of Life; therefore it was nothing more than bodily death. The Settlement of things in the Old Teſtament is not literally and expreſly a Settlement of the Spiritual and Eternal Life and Death, but of what is figurative thereof. In the Style of the Old Teſtament this Phraſe *thou ſhalt ſurely die*, ſignifieth nothing more than bodily death. *Gen.* 26. 11. 1 *Sam.* 14. 39. Accordingly S. *Paul* muſt be underſtood, to ſpeak of bodily Death only, when he ſaith, *by one Man Sin entred into the World and Death by Sin, Death reigned from* Adam *to* Moſes, *by one Man's Offence Death reigned by one.* For ſo he expoundeth his ſenſe. *In Adam all die, by Man came Death, by Man came alſo the Reſurrection of the Dead.* 1 Cor. 15 21, 22. The Book of Wiſdom alſo and the Son of *Sirach* ſpeak his Senſe. *Through Envy of the Devil came Death into the World Of the Woman came the beginning of Sin, and through her we all Die.* The Sanction of the Law of Paradiſe was bodily Death only; therefore the Purport and Buſineſs of the Law of Paradiſe was, to ſettle our firſt Parents Terreſtrial Animal concerns, eſpecially the chief of them bodily Life and Death. Moreover, the Paradiſaical State of our firſt Parents depended upon their Obſervance of the Law of Paradiſe; the Purport of it was, to determine, whether they ſhould continue in their earthly Paradiſe or be ejected out of it, which was their great Terreſtrial Animal concern. All their Terreſtrial Animal concerns *their ſubjection to bodily Death, Diſeaſes, Sickneſſes and Pains, the Womans Subjection and Pains of Child-bearing, the Shame of Nakedneſs, the Dwelling out of Paradiſe, the Sterility of the Earth and the Toils of this earthly State,* are Parts of this Paradiſaical Oeconomy, and the ſettling of them was the effect of the Penal part of the Law of Paradiſe. And if all the concerns of our firſt Parents as they were Terreſtrial Animals, were actually and effectually ſettled by this Paradiſaical Oeconomy, it muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been introduc'd for this Reaſon, becauſe it was needful for ſettling their concerns, as they were Terreſtrial Animals.

(q) *Idid. c.* 10.

V. Curcell. Inſtit. l. 3. *c.* 13.

V. Grot. Not in Rom. 5. 14.

Wiſd. 2. 24. *Eccluſ.* 25. 24.

ARTICLE 4.

Our firſt Parents are repreſented in the Hiſtory as two Terreſtrial Animals of the Rational Species in the State of Natural Innocency not of Supernatural Grace.

I. THE Terreſtrial *Adam* was no more than the Terreſtrial *Adam*: But the Jews and the generality of Chriſtian Writers ſuppoſe him to have been (by his Terreſtrial Creation) rather a Spiritual and Celeſtial kind of *Adam.* (r) *The Rabbins ſay, that his Body was lucid and of a very high ſtature, but that by his Sin both that light and ſtature was diminiſh'd or loſt.* They argue, (s) *that* Adam *was moſt perfect without all exception,* becauſe immediately made by God. He was born חכם גדל *a great wiſe Man* or Philoſopher (as they ſuppoſe) having an underſtanding in perfection, underſtanding things without Inſtitution (by cogitation only,) having alſo the Sciences Divine and Humane in their perfection, he knew and underſtood all Worlds. (t) *The firſt* Adam *was the light of the World.* Agreeably to which extravagant Elogies and their prodigious Phantaſtry they ſay (u) *the ſtature of* Adam *was from the Earth unto Heaven, and from one end of the World to the other. Calcaneus primi hominis obſcurabat Sphæram Solis, the Heel of the firſt Man darkned the Sphere of the Sun. Philo* argueth, (w) that the firſt Man born of the Earth, the Prince of our kind, far excell'd all Men, that are or have been, both in the Ornaments of Soul and Body; becauſe other Men have their Generation from Men, but God made *Adam, and ſo much better as the Workman is, ſo much better is the Work that is made.* Both the Jews and Muhammedans account him a great Prophet, (x) the latter ſtile him נבי אללה *the Prophet of God*, and they ſay, that he receiv'd the firſt Books which were ſent down from Heaven. His Sanctity (as the Jews ſuppoſe) was that of the degree of Prophets (he adher'd to God and the things Spiritual,) and as they ſuppoſe his Sanctity to approach to the Angelical: So his Body (as they ſay) was not an ordinary Humane Body, but approach'd to the Angelical ſubtilty and Purity. *Creatura fuit ſubtiliſſima & puriſſima, proxime accedens ad corpus Spirituale.* Anciently the Jews began their Sabbatarian Faſts (as it is ſaid) by looking on their Nails and paring them; (y) the reaſon of which cuſtom *R. Bechai* conceiveth to be this; *that a Man ſhould think of the excellency of the firſt Man* Adam, *whoſe Garment before his Fall was like a Man's Nail of a white and ruddy colour.* But before his Fall *Adam* had no Garment ſave only his own Body, and this indeed might be ruddy if (as is commonly thought) he was formed of red Earth, and had his Name *Adam* from *Adamah*, which ſignifieth red Earth. But *Muhammed* deriveth his Pedigree from a worſe complexion'd Mould than that of red Earth; for in his *Alcoran* he telleth of him this incredible Story. *God revealed to the Angels his formation of Man out of Clay or Dirt, and ſo ſoon as he had breathed into him a Portion of his Soul, all the Angels except* Beelzebub (*God ſo commanding*) *adored Man: But God demanded of the Devil, why he refus'd to Worſhip the Work of his Hands? Becauſe* (ſaid he) *thou haſt created him out of Dirt and black Mudd, but me out of Fire.*

(r) *Men. ben Iſr. ap. Hornbeck c. Jud. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(s) *Coſri p.* 49, 52.

(t) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 1321. *V. S. Cyril. in Johan. p.* 75.

(u) *Maimon. de fund. Leg. ap. Voſſ. p.* 35.

(w) Περὶ κοσμοπ. *p.* 21. *ed. Gr. Paris.*

(x) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. p.* 15. *ed.* 1.

(y) *Gaf. far. Ep. before Leo Modena's Hiſt.*

(z) *V. Spencer. de Leg. Heb. l.* 2. *c.* 5. & *l.* 3. *diſſ.* 7. *c.* 5. *S.* 3.

II. The Jews are not alone in their Sublimities touching the firſt *Adam*; for he is celebrated by Chriſtian Writers as a great Prophet, the greateſt of Schollars, the greateſt of Philoſophers, the greateſt of Divines, the greateſt of Saints, and as nothing leſs than Angelical and Celeſtial. (a) *One of the principal Ornaments and Prerogatives of the ſtate of Innocency was the Science of* Adam *and his Underſtanding both Supernatural and Natural: And this Divines ſuppoſe, to have excell'd in three Reſpects. Firſt in* the

(a) *Montacut. orig. Eccl. T.* 1. *Par.* 1. *S.* 88. *p.* 50.

the extenſive amplitude of his Science : For ſo ſoon as he was created, he was imbu'd with the perfect knowledge of all natural things, a knowledge not acquir'd, but infus'd from above, which (Chriſt excepted) none ever had, nor could have, not Solomon, *not the Sons of the* Eaſt. *Secondly, whereas our acquir'd Science for the moſt part proceedeth from the Effects and not the Cauſes of things, and therefore is, either not at all, or very rarely demonſtrative, but only founded upon probable Reaſon and Conjecture,* Adam *had the abſolute knowledge of every thing, and that* à priori *or from the Cauſes. Which Science infus'd from above could not be at all loſt or obſcur'd, ſo long as* Adam *remain'd in that State.* (*b*) *The firſt Man had all Science, knew the Cauſes of all things, not from any other Teacher but from God he received all wiſe Diſcipline of Life.* (*c*) *His knowledge extended to heavenly as well as earthly things, was not ſo fallible as ours is, and was not acquir'd by tedious diſcurſiveneſs or obſervation, but by Divine Illumination, which was not given him tranſiently, but by way of connatural Habit, and ſhould have paſs'd to his Poſterity.* (*d*) *He came into the World a Philoſopher, which ſufficiently appear'd by his writing the Nature of things upon their Names : He could view Eſſences in themſelves, and read Forms without the Comment of their reſpective Properties.* In the Vatican Library (as it is ſaid) there is this Inſcription ; *Adam divinitùs edoctus primus ſcientiarum & literarum Inventor.* Adam *taught of God the firſt Inventor of Sciences and Letters. Kircher* thinketh it certain, that God wrote a Book and gave it to him. And *Eugubinus* thinketh, (*e*) that *Adam* and *Eve* were ſo great Divines, that all their diſcourſe was Theology, *omnem magni genitoris illius & magnæ genitricis Sermonem, Theologiam fuiſſe credendum eſt, ut perpetuò de rebus ante caſum ſuis, de ortu, habitu, formis Angelorum & Dæmonum loquerentur. Baleus* ſaith (as he is cited by the Author of the Court of the Gentiles,) *that from* Adam *all good Arts and Human Wiſdom flow'd as from their Fountain. He was the firſt that diſcover'd the motions of the Celeſtial Bodies, the Natures of Plants, of living and of all other Creatures. He firſt publiſh'd the forms of Eccleſiaſtic, Politic and Oeconomic Government. From whoſe School proceeded whatever good Arts and Wiſdom were afterward propagated by our Fathers unto Mankind. So that whatever Aſtronomy, Geometry and other Arts contain in them, he knew the whole thereof.* The like Elogies of our Father *Adam* are cited from *Hornius* by the ſame Author. *Adam being conſtituted in this Theatre of the Univerſe, he was ignorant of nothing, that pertain'd to the Myſtery of Nature. He knew exactly and without Errour the Natures of all Animals, the Virtues of Herbs and the Cauſes of things. The light of Reaſon which we now call Logic, altogether unſpotted and without Cloud, overcame the obſcurity of things, and diſpell'd darkneſs, if there was any. Now there was the higheſt* ἀκρίβεια, *exactneſs of the Oeconomicks and Politicks ; for Man was never ſo much as then* ζῶον πολιτικὸν, *a ſociable Creature. The Seat of this moſt noble Philoſophy is in the ſacred Scriptures ſtiled the Garden of* Eden. *All Arts, as Mankind, had their beginning from* Adam, *who among the pleaſures of Paradiſe learned Philoſophy even from God himſelf.* (*f*) *The holy Scriptures ſay, that the firſt Man* Adam *had a free and unbaſhful Mind as to God, and liv'd with the Saints in the Contemplation of the Intelligibles.*

Thus we father upon the Scriptures our own Conceits, and inſtead of naming *Senſibles* ſubſtitute the Contemplation of the *Intelligibles.* So *Euſebius* calleth the Goods of a Terreſtrial Animal Paradiſe (*g*) ἀθάνατα ϗ αἰώνια ἀγαθὰ, *immortal and eternal Goods.* So S. *Ephram* thinketh (*h*) that *Adam*'s Paradiſe with its Wood and Trees is of eternal duration and continuance, *that its Senſibles are an everlaſting enjoyment, and that God inveſted Heaven and Earth with the ſame Grace.* Αἰσθητὸς ὁ παράδεισος, ἀλλ' οὐ πρόσκαιρος, *Paradiſe was Senſible but not Temporary. Gr. Naz.* calleth *Adam* in his Paradiſe (*i*) φυτῶν ἀθανάτων γεωργὸν, *the Cultivator of immortal Plants :* But theſe he interpreteth (allegorically) Divine Cogitations, as he alſo interpreteth the Tree of Knowledge, to ſignifie Contemplation. (*k*) Divine Contemplation was the only Food of Paradiſe according to *Jo. Damaſcen* ; and he ſuppoſeth it the only Occupation and Imployment that our firſt Parents had there. *Gr. Nyſſen* and *Theodoret* argue, that our firſt Parents in Paradiſe were of an *immortal Nature,* and therefore needed no bodily Food : Nor is eating bodily Food agreeable to any but mortal Creatures. (*l*) Some others argue, that their Life in Paradiſe was like the Life of Angels, that are above terrene and corruptible Food. And even S. *Chryſoſtom* (who diſputeth for the literal Senſe of the Hiſtory) attributeth to Man in Paradiſe (*m*) ἀγγελικὴν κατάστασιν, *an Angelical Conſtitution,* ἀγγελικὸν βίον, *an Angelical Life,* and ſaith, that God would have him to live on Earth without any bodily needs ὡς ἄγγελον ἐπίγειον, *as an Angel upon Earth.* Of our firſt Parents he ſaith, ἀνώτεροι ἦσαν τῶν σωματικῶν ἁπάντων (τῶν σωματικῶν ἀναγκῶν,) καθάπερ τὸν οὐρανὸν οὕτω τὴν γῆν ᾤκοον, ϗ ἐν σώματι τυγχάνοντες τὰ τῶν σωμάτων οὐχ ὑπέμενον. Οὔτε γὰρ στέγης, οὔτε ὀρόφου, οὔτε ἱματίου, οὔτε ἄλλου οὐδενὸς τῶν τοιούτων ἐδέοντο. *They were above all bodily Neceſſities, they inhabited the Earth as if it was Heaven, and being in the Body they ſuſtain'd not the things of the Body. For they needed not either Houſe or covered Room or Garment or any ſuch thing as theſe.* Which implieth, that they needed not Sleep, or any bodily Food. So great Angelical perfection ſpeaketh them of ſuperlative Sanctity, which *Irenæus* illuſtrateth by introducing *Adam,* (*n*) confeſſing *habuiſſe ſe à Spiritu Sanctitatis Stolam, that he formerly had from the Spirit the Robe of Sanctity.* (*o*) *Luther* gave this account, how *Adam* came to know, that *Eve* was Bone of his Bone, and Fleſh of his Fleſh, *becauſe he was full of the Holy Ghoſt.* And in ſuch ſenſe *J. Mart.* ſeemeth to call him (*p*) οἶκος τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, *the Houſe of Divine Inſpiration.* (*q*) The Greek Fathers (*S. Baſil, Gr. Naz. Cyrill. Alex.* and *Severianus*) expound the breath of Life, which was breath'd into *Adam* (whereby he became a living Soul) to mean τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μετουσίαν, *the Participation of the holy Spirit. Procopius* (*ad Gen.* 1.) ſaith ; *from the beginning of the Creation the Virtue which affordeth Life entred into Man, ſimul cum Spiritu Sancto, together with the holy Spirit, that this Creature might be according to the Image of God.* (*r*) The generality of the ancient Writers ſuppoſe, that *Adam* had natively that divine virtuous Image which conſtituteth Regenerate Chriſtians ; which Divine

(b) Oſor. de Nobil. Chriſt. l. 1. p. 394.

(c) Mr. Scrivener Body of Divin. p. 268.

(d) Dr. South Ser. on Gen. 1. 27.

(e) De Per. Phil. l. 1. c. 1.

Gale Court of the Gent. Par. 2. l. 1. c. 1.

(g) Pr. Ev. l. 7. c. 10.

(h) Ap. Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 2. c. 5.

(i) Or. 38.

(k) Petav. ſupr. c. 7.

(l) S. Ambroſ. de Paradiſ. c. 9.

(m) In Gen. λογ. 16, 15 & 18.

(n) Adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 17.

(o) Fuller's Lives p. 51.

(p) Dial. cum Tryph. p. 259.

(q) Petav. de Trin. l. 8. c. 5.

(r) Idem T. 3. de op. l. 2. c. 2.

(f) Τὸν πρῶτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγουσιν αἱ ἱεραὶ γραφαὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνεπαισχύντῳ παῤῥησίᾳ τὸν νοῦν ἐσχηκέναι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ συνδιαιτᾶσθαι τοῖς ἁγίοις, ἐν τῇ τῶν νοητῶν θεωρίᾳ ἣν εἶχεν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ τόπῳ, ὃν ϗ ὁ ἅγιος Μωϋσῆς τροπικῶς παράδεισον ὠνόμασεν. *S. Athanaſ. c. Gent. or. p.* 3.

vine Image was refulgent in him, if as S. *Ambroſe* ſaith he had (s) *virtutum gratiam renitentem, ſplendorem pietatis, ſplendorem gloriæ, & paternæ imaginem ſubſtantiæ, the pulchritude of Virtues ſhining, the ſplendor of Piety, the brightneſs of Glory, the Image of the paternal Subſtance.* The ſame Father ſaith (t) *Adam cum in Paradiſo eſſet, cœleſtis erat: Poſt lapſum autem terrenus eſt factus.* Adam *when he was in Paradiſe, was Celeſtial: But after his Lapſe he became Terrene.* Again he ſaith; (u) *ubi lapſus eſt depoſuit imaginem Cœleſtis, ſumpſit terreſtris effigiem. When he lapſed, he put off the Image of the Celeſtial Man, and took upon him the Image of the Terreſtrial.* This Father hath tranſlated S. *Baſil*'s ſaying of *Adam.* (w) Ἀποβαλὼν τὴν εἰκόνα τȣ̃ ἐπȣρανίȣ, ἀνέλαβε τὴν εἰκόνα τȣ̃ χοϊκȣ̃, *having caſt away the Image of the heavenly Man, he put on the Image of the earthly.* A Council of *Carthage* ſaith, (x) that *Adam* had Fleſh, but not ſuch as it is now, before his Sin it was not Craſs, nor by Nature Mortal.

III. Of theſe magnificent Ideas (which have been more or leſs entertain'd in the Church) it is eaſie for any, to make a Judgment, that will compare them with the Hiſtory. One Branch of them we may be allow'd to examine, becauſe it is matter of Debate amongſt Divines, whether *Adam* was created in an Eſtate of Supernatural Grace or of Natural Life only? (y) This the moſt rigid Adherents to the Senſe of the Fathers Debate with great freedom (not allowing either part of the Queſtion, to be an Article of Faith;) and they that ſuppoſe it the more probable Opinion, that *Adam* was created in the Eſtate of Supernatural Grace, yet acknowledge, that God might have created him in the State of meer and pure Nature, and that being ſo created he muſt have been devoid of inordinate Concupiſcence, which cannot be the Work of God as Author of Nature; for then Chriſtians would be oblig'd to mortifie the Work of God. Which good Conceſſion we may make uſe of, to anſwer a principal Argument, that is alledg'd on behalf of the magnificent Ideas of *Adam.* For as being firſt of his Kind he is ſuppos'd, *to have been the Standard and Meaſure of all that follow'd, as having all the agreeable perfections of human Nature.* But ſeeing none of the Saints of God did ever look upon the firſt *Adam* (as they look upon the ſecond) *as the Pattern of their perfection,* it is but reaſonable, that this Propoſition ſhould be thus limited; *Adam was the Standard and Meaſure of all that follow'd as to meer and pure Nature.* And ſuch he was as being the firſt of his Kind, if God (according to this Conceſſion) did create him in the State of meer and pure Nature without Supernatural Grace. And it is moſt reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that he was ſo created; for the Indowments Supernatural (Supernatural Science, Grace, Glory) do not iſſue from the great Parent of Nature as he is ſuch; nor did the Terreſtrial *Adam*'s Creation (like that of the holy Angels) iſſue from Paternal Sanctity: (z) He ſpake ſomething Prophetical (when he ſaid of *Eve, this is Bone of my Bone, and Fleſh of my Fleſh*: But there is no certainty, that he underſtood it, to be Prophetical; for he might ſpeak it as *Caiaphas* did, when he propheſied. The conceit of the ancient Writers, that God infus'd into *Adam* the holy Spirit and the Life of Grace (when he breath'd into him the Breath of Life) is well reproved and refuted (a) by S. *Auſtin.* Throughout this whole Hiſtory there is not the leaſt Indication, that God infus'd into the firſt Man the Life of Supernatural Grace: Nor is any ſuch thing imply'd in the Moſaic Phraſe of Man's being created after God's Image. For Man as Man is the Image and Reſemblance of God. 1 *Cor.* 11. 7. Man as ſuch beareth not the Supernatural Image of God in Grace or Glory: But as he is *the Lordly Animal* (the God-like Animal) he is the Natural Image of God, and he is ſuch in reſpect of his Mind or Soul and its Faculties, in reſpect of his Stature alſo and his Domination over the inferior Creation. The Poet is no contemptible Interpreter of the Senſe of *Moſes*, when he ſaith,

Finxit in Effigiem moderantum cuncta Deorum.

Some ſay (b) *that rectitude wherewith Man was created, as* Solomon *teacheth, was Natural, not Moral perfection.* Which mode of expounding the words of *Solomon* is equivalent to an expunging them. For the word *upright* which *Solomon* uſeth (when he ſaith *God made Man upright*, Eccl. 7. 29.) in the general Notion of it ſignifieth right, ſtraight and without obliquity (*Ezek.* 1. 7.) and being oppos'd by *Solomon* to the bad Inventions of Men (*God made Man upright, but they have ſought out many inventions*) it neceſſarily denoteth ſome ſort of moral Rectitude, and muſt be underſtood to ſignifie in the uſual Scripture-notion of it, right, ſtraight and without iniquity. So it ſignifieth, when applied to God and to his Ways and Judgments (which are faultleſs and uncriminal) *Pſal.* 92. 15. and 119. 137. So it ſignifieth, when apply'd to Men and to their Ways and Practices (which are not Upright, if there be any thing of heinous Sin and Iniquity, Vice and Crime in them) *Pſal.* 37. 37. *Gal.* 2. 14. *Uprightneſs* is the ſame with *Perfection*, and accordingly the Hebrew word תם is by our Tranſlators ſometimes rendred *Uprightneſs* and ſometimes *Perfection.* So a *Perfect* Man and an *Upright* are terms ſynonymous in Scripture, and a perfect Weight and Meaſure is the ſame with an Upright. *Gen.* 6. 6. *Job* 1. 8. *Deut.* 25. 15. To be Upright therefore is to be right and ſtraight in matter of Morality, if not abſolutely and in all reſpects, yet ſo far as to be without heinous Criminality. Which is not to be underſtood without diſtinction and limitation of ſenſe; for there is a Civil-religious and a Spiritual-religious, a common and an holy, a partial and a plenary kind of Uprightneſs. Which plenary kind of Uprightneſs (the ſame with the Spiritual-religious) is that which conſtituteth the Righteous in the Religion of Soul-intereſts: But a common and a partial kind of Uprightneſs is competible to a bad Man; for ſuch an one may do and ſay with *Abimelech* (whether he was ſuch an one or not,) *in the Integrity of my Heart and Innocency of my Hands have I done this.* Gen. 20. 5. As Uprightneſs is not to be underſtood without due diſtinction of Senſe: So the Uprightneſs wherein Man was created, muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the Uprightneſs, wherein the Saints of God are created, God made Man *Upright*, ſo far as belong'd to the making a Man: But not ſo far as appertain'd to the making an holy heavenly kind of Man. God made *Man Upright* (right without any pravity) as having innocent and ſinleſs Nature in Perfection, ſuch rectitude, innocence and ſinleſneſs,

(s) *Hexaem. l.* 6. *c.* 7.

(t) *In Pſal.* 118.

(u) *Hexaem. ubi ſupr.*

(w) *Hom. in Pſal.* 48. *Macar. Hom.* 12.

(x) *Bevereg. Synodic. T.* 1. *p.* 645.

(y) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 2. *c.* 20. *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 2. *Par.* 1. *Theſ.* 1.

(z) *Tertull. de An. c.* 11.

(a) *De C. D. l.* 13. *c.* 23, 24.

(b) *Cur. cell. Inſtit. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

neſs, ſimplicity and integrity. The firſt Man in his Nature and Conſtitution (wherein inordinate Concupiſcence had no place) was right and without any pravities, nor were there (at his Creation) any pravities in his Mind, Will and Meaning: *But they have ſought out many Inventions* (many pravities,) the many pravities that are in the World, are not the Work of God but the Inventions of Men. (*c*) *Naked in Simplicity and a Life without Artifice and without any covering and defenſative, ſuch it was fit he ſhould be, that was firſt created.* The Simplicity and Innocence of our firſt Parents was a Reſemblance of the Chriſtian Innocency and Simplicity. For they knew no Sin, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. they were devoid of the guileful Skill and Wiſdom (as the Simplicity of the Dove is a ſingle mindedneſs, that is without any guileful Skill or Craft, ſuch Wiſdom as hath Guile in it,) they *were ſimple concerning Evil*, not knowing how to do Evil, or any arts or ways of doing it. *Rom.* 16. 19. S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith of Chriſtians, *they muſt not know how to remember ill Turns, they muſt not Skill to be vain, they muſt not have learn'd to Lye*, they know not this wicked Skill and Craft, which is the Serpent's Politicks. A genuine Chriſtian is ſo far from doing Wrong to any, that he knoweth not how to do it. But this Simplicity and Innocency of Regenerate Chriſtians is Sanctity, that of our firſt Parents was innocent and ſinleſs Nature.

IV. A difficulty on both hands incumbreth this Theory; for if we ſuppoſe, that our firſt Parents did not live the Life of Sanctity and perfectly fulfil the Law thereof, it ſeemeth that they muſt be counted Sinners from the very day that they were created. But the difficulty is greater on the other hand. For

(1.) If Man was created in the State of Supernatural Grace, he muſt be ſuppos'd to have been created not only holy and heavenly, but conſummate in the holy heavenly Life at the rate of ſinleſs Perfection, or elſe he muſt be unavoidably a Sinner the very firſt day that he was created. And if he was created perfect and conſummate in the holy heavenly Life, ſo peerleſs and tranſcendent a Saint ought (in Congruity) to have had his Formation, not amongſt the Terreſtrial Animals, nor of *Limus Slime or Mud* (the Duſt of the Ground mix'd with Water) but amongſt the *Cherubim* and *Seraphim* (the holy Angels of God) he muſt have had an higher kind of Inſpiration than that of vital Breath, and an higher kind of Life than that of a living Soul. An ethereal Body and the heavenly Manſions would be much more fit for the holy Soul of ſo Angelical and Celeſtial a Creature than a vile Animal Body and this gloomy Terreſtrial Region: Nor could ſo Divine a Soul have any Buſineſs to do in our World, unleſs to be a Saviour to the World. As the Platoniſts ſay, (*d*) that ſome Souls (which they call 'Αχράντους ψυχὰς, *incontaminate Souls*) deſcend hither, *to declare the Gods, for the Welfare, Purification and Perfection of the things that are here.*

(2.) If the Soul of the firſt *Adam* had been alike holy and heavenly as the incontaminate Soul of our Saviour, how little would an earthly Paradiſe have ſignified to his felicity, and all the accommodations of this Life, (*e*) *Quæ contemnenda eſſe docuit filius Dei, which the Son of God hath taught us, are things to be contemned?* An earthly Dominion and Inheritance was given to the Terreſtrial *Adam*, the conveniencies of this Terreſtrial Animal Life were provided for him, and Terreſtrial Animal Work (the Propagation of his Species) was appointed him: But if he was ſuperlatively an holy heavenly kind of Man, whence is it, that no holy heavenly kind of Goods were provided for him? No holy heavenly kind of Work was appointed him? Nothing holy and heavenly is in the Deſcription of him? If he was a ſuperlative Saint of God, whence is it, that throughout his whole Hiſtory there is not the leaſt mention of the Saint of God-kind of Goods, Excellencies and Felicities, nor (otherwiſe than ſymbolically) of any Soul-intereſts? That it aſcendeth to nothing higher than the formation of a Terreſtrial Man and his Wife, their Marriage and their Garden (or Orchard) and the Tranſactions that were there about their Terreſtrial Animal Concerns?

(3.) *Moſes* ſaith, that God made Heaven the ſecond day of the Hexaemeron, (*f*) but the Hebrew Doctors ſay, that God made Hell on that ſecond day. The darkneſs which according to *Moſes* was upon the face of the Deep (antecedent to his Coſmopœia) *Maimonides* thus interpreteth. (*h*) *Per tenebras nihil aliud debes intelligere quàm ignem elementarem, by darkneſs you ought to underſtand nothing elſe but the elementary fire.* At this rate of contradiction to the holy Scriptures we form our magnificent Ideas of the firſt *Adam* and his Perfections; for the Scripture calleth him *Terreſtrial-animal*, and we make him *Angelical-celeſtial*. If he was natively a Saint of God, and was poſſeſs'd of the holy heavenly Life, as the Regenerate Children of God are, he muſt have been an heavenly kind of Man as to his Soul, and he muſt have had a divine and heavenly Body within his exteriour earthly Body (as the Regenerate Children of God have:) And if in ſo great a degree he was divine and heavenly, the Apoſtle ought not to have contradiſtinguiſh'd the firſt *Adam* to the ſecond *Adam* as earthly to heavenly, he would not have ſaid, *the firſt Man is of the Earth earthly*, but rather the firſt Man is from Heaven heavenly. Natural and Spiritual were conjunct in *Adam* at a great rate, if he was created a ſpiritual and heavenly kind of Man as to his Soul and the Virtues of it, and alſo as to an interiour ſpiritual and heavenly Body: But the Apoſtle plainly ſuppoſeth, that Natural and Spiritual were not conjunct in the Terreſtrial *Adam*, when he ſaith, *that was not firſt which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural.*

(4.) If *Adam* was created with the endowment of Supernatural Grace, it muſt be ſuppoſed, that he receiv'd it for himſelf and his Poſterity: But as God cannot ſettle the Kingdom of Glory upon any meer Man and his Heirs requiring his perfect Obedience as the Condition of it; for it dependeth upon every ones perſonal Qualifications and muſt be matter of every one's Choice: So for the ſame Reaſons God cannot ſettle the Kingdom of Grace upon any meer Man and his Heirs requiring his perfect Obedience as the Condition of it. God could not therefore upon that Condition ſettle the State and Life of Grace or Original

(c) Γυμνὸν τῇ ἁπλότητι, καὶ ζωῇ τῇ ἀτέχνῳ καὶ δίχα παντὸς ἐπικαλύμματος καὶ προβλήματος, τοιοῦτον ἔπρεπεν εἶναι τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. *Gr. Naz. or.* 38. *p.* 619. *Nudi erant propter morum ſimplicitatem & quod amictum fraudis natura neſciret.* S. Ambroſ. de Paradiſ. c. 13.

(d) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 271.

(e) *S. Aug. de Ag. Chriſt. c.* 11.

(f) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 67.

(g) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 2. *c.* 30.

nal Righteouſneſs in the Senſe of the Schools) upon *Adam* and his Poſterity.

(5.) As *Adam* is ſuppos'd, to have receiv'd Original Righteouſneſs for himſelf and his Poſterity; ſo he is ſuppos'd, by his Tranſgreſſion to have loſt it for himſelf and his Poſterity: and conſequently the Souls of all the Children of *Adam* have loſt their Spiritual Life, are deſpoiled of the Divine Nature, and are ſubjected to all the Evils of an unregenerate condition, not through any fault of their own, but meerly through the fault of another (to which they were no way acceſſory,) which ſeems not credible or poſſible: for it is not poſſible, that *Adam* by his Tranſgreſſion ſhould merit for the Souls of all his Poſterity the ſtate of Blindneſs, Pravity, Spiritual Death, to be depriv'd of the Holy Spirit and the Divine Image (with all the Honours and Felicities thereof) the Divine Favour, the Divine Sonſhip and Citizenſhip, and to be ſubjected to Eternal Puniſhment in the World to come: for it never was, nor can be in any Man's power, to kill Souls without their own conſent.

(6.) It is not credible, that the greateſt of Philoſophers and of Saints ſhould be ſo eaſily vanquiſh'd as *Adam* was, by ſuch a Temptation which was nothing more than the ſpecious Fruit of a Tree; and it is incredible, that he ſhould be the greateſt of Wiſe Men and of Saints (a fit Conſort for the Seraphim) and yet the great Duty that God impos'd upon him, the great trial of his Obedience, and the great Condition of his Happineſs, was only his abſtaining from the ſpecious Fruit of a Tree. *Theophilus ad Autolycum* aſſigning the Reaſom of this Law of Paradiſe ſaith, *(h)* ὁ Ἀδὰμ νήπιος ἦν *Adam was yet an Infant*. Agreeably whereto theſe Words of the Hiſtory *They were both naked, the Man and his Wife and were not aſhamed*, are thus expounded by a late learned Commentator, *(i) they did not bluſh, no more than little Children do, when they behold one another naked, and embrace with an innocent affection.* Our firſt Parents are rightly repreſented as in no higher condition than that of natural Innocency. For although we cannot infer from the Law of Paradiſe, that *Adam* was *a meer Infant in Underſtanding*; yet there is great reaſon to infer from it, that he was no ſuch great proficient in Wiſdom and Sanctity, as to be arriv'd at the height of ſinleſs Perfection in the Holy Life.

(7.) Agreeably to this Account of our firſt Parents *Clemens* ſaith of *Adam*, *(k) He was not made perfect, but fit for the endowment of* (Divine) *Virtue*. The Maſter of Controverſies ſaith, *(l)* that *Pet. Lombard*, *Scotus*, and ſome others ſeem to hold, that *Adam* had not originally *gratiam illam gratum facientem, quæ filios & amicos Dei efficit, quæque ad vitam æternam promerendam neceſſaria eſt; that Grace called by the Schools* gratia gratum faciens, *which maketh Men the Sons and Friends of God, and is neceſſary for meriting Eternal Life.* The learned *Grotius* is known to be of this Opinion, *(m) that Man when he was firſt created, had no promiſes of a Celeſtial Life, but only of a Terreſtrial. To obtain the Celeſtial Life, God requireth an eximious Sanctity of Life, which far exceedeth, not only the ſtate of* Adam *after his fall, but that wherein he was created. Alia enim eſt imago Dei, ad quam Adamus eſt conditus, alia ad quam per Chriſtum renaſcimur: That Image of God after which* Adam *was created, is one thing, and that unto which we are regenerated by Chriſt is another.* This Idea of our firſt Parents and their Condition I look upon as far more unexceptionable and recommendable than the commonly receiv'd Idea; not becauſe it is incumbred with no difficulty, but becauſe it is incumbred with the ſmalleſt difficulty, and the difficulty which incumbreth it, admitteth of a good ſolution. *If our firſt Parents before their Tranſgreſſion were not truly holy, and ſo holy, that they liv'd the Life of Sanctity in ſinleſs perfection, they were neceſſarily Sinners and deadly Sinners. He that loveth God as God is truly holy; for this love of God is Sanctity it ſelf. But* Adam *lov'd God as God, otherwiſe he had mortally ſinned from his very Creation; for the Love of God is the Summary or Compendium of the Law of Nature.* This is the difficulty; which we will conjoyn with another difficulty that the Ancient Writers urge: for they argue, that *Adam* muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been made after the ſimilitude of God in reſpect of Divine Virtue, becauſe without it Man is like the Beaſts in his Morals. And it muſt be acknowledg'd, that he is ſo now, becauſe Humane Nature is now fill'd with inordinate Concupiſcence; but this was not the caſe of our firſt Parents, and becauſe it was not their caſe, they might be devoid of the Divine Virtuous Image without being Beaſts in their Morals. So if Man liveth not the Holy Spiritual Life required by the Holy Spiritual Law (which is the Divine Love,) he is a deadly Sinner: but the caſe was otherwiſe with our Father *Adam*, when he was in the ſtate and liv'd the Life of innocent ſinleſs Nature in Paradiſe: for then although he did not perform certain ſupernatural Duties of that Holy Law, yet he did ſo non-perform them, as not to depart from his natural Innocency; and then he could be no deadly Sinner, ſimply ſo called, for this other plain demonſtrative Reaſon, ſo long as he liv'd the Life of innocent ſinleſs Nature, he had right to the Tree of Life, and could not be liable to be put to death. As his Intereſts in Paradiſe were not the Soul-intereſts, but the Terreſtrial-animal: So the Holy Spiritual Law (or the Law of Nature as it is that Law) was not the Law of God's proceedings with him, the Law of his Life and Death; theſe were determined by the Law of his Paradiſaical Oeconomy, which was a particular Oeconomy, and ſuch an one that is an exception from the general Rules of Theology: for Man is made for a ſupernatural Happineſs, but in the Paradiſaical Oeconomy of things he was made only for a Natural Felicity (that of the Earthly Paradiſaical State;) and Man is made to live the Life of Sanctity (which conſiſteth in the ſaving knowledge, love and ſervice of God;) but in the Paradiſaical Oeconomy he was deſign'd only to live a Life of natural Innocency towards God and in all other reſpects. Sanctity is in order to Salvation, and is inſeparably connex'd therewith; but neither Sanctity nor Salvation is (otherwiſe than Symbolically) of any Notice, Conſideration or Regard in the Paradiſaical Oeconomy. It did not require, that our firſt Parents ſhould be the Saints of God: but to retain their Natural Innocency, Sinleſſneſs and Uncriminality, was the only condition of their Happineſs; and ſo long as they retain'd it, they could not by any Law be ſo oblig'd to ſupernatural Virtue and Duty, as to be conſtituted deadly Sinners by the want of it. Their Life and State in Paradiſe exempted them from being

Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 2. par.3. Theſ. 1.

Οὐδεὶς ἀλλοτρίου ἡγεμονικοῦ κυριεύει. *Epict. Diſſ. l. 4. c. 5.*

(h) *P.* 102.

(i) *Biſhop Patrick on Gen.* 2. 25.

(k) Ὅτι τέλειος κατὰ τὴν κατασκευὴν οὐκ ἐγένετο, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ἀναδέξασθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιτήδειος. *Strom. l. 6. p. m.* 477.

(l) *De Grat. prim. hom. c.* 3.

(m) *Annot. ad Conſult. Caſſandr. Art.* 2.

ing ſuch; and if we will call them unholy, that muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie nothing worſe, than that they were in the ſtate of Natural Innocency. Their State therefore may without abſurdity be called *Status medius inter ſanctum & culpabilem, a middle ſtate between that of Saints and of ungodly deadly Sinners.*

ARTICLE 5.

The Moſaic Paradiſaical Oeconomy is therefore in all the Branches of it reaſonable and agreeable, fit and accommodate, becauſe (in the Letter of it) it is of kind Terreſtrial Animal and aſcendeth no higher than to Natural Innocency.

CElſus in *Origen* having cited ſome Paſſages of the Moſaic Hiſtory of the Creation and of Paradiſe ſaith, (*n*) *the more moderate both Jews and Chriſtians endeavour to turn them into an allegorical ſenſe,* ὅτι τούτοις αἰσχυνόμενοι, *being aſham'd of theſe things in the literal ſenſe.* But they ought rather to have been aſham'd of allegorizing away the plain and literal ſenſe of words and of turning real Hiſtory into Parable and Fable: (*o*) *For they that admit not the Senſe of Scripture according to the common ſignification of words,* τὸ ὕδωρ οὐχ ὕδωρ λέγουσιν, *ſay, that Water is not Water but ſome other fluid nature, they interpret a Fiſh to what they fancy, and the generation of creeping things and of Beaſts they turn to their own Allegories, making their Interpretation of Scripture as the Interpreters of Dreams make their Interpretations of the appearances in Sleep, to their own purpoſe. But I, if I hear the word Hay or Graſs, underſtand Hay or Graſs, and a Plant, and a Fiſh, and a wild Beaſt, and Cattle. I take all things as they are ſpoken,* καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, *for I am not aſham'd of the Goſpel.* There is no cauſe to be aſham'd of the Moſaic Paradiſaical Oeconomy, if we ſuppoſe it a Terreſtrial Animal kind of Oeconomy, that aſcendeth no higher than to Natural Innocency; but there is too much cauſe, to be aſham'd of it, if it muſt be thought ſuch an Oeconomy of Sanctity and Soul-intereſts as is commonly ſuppos'd. For,

(n) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 4. p. 187.

(o) S. Baſil. in Hexaem. Hom. 9.

I. It is an Oeconomy fit and accommodate *for two Terreſtrial Animals of the Humane Species in their ſtate of Natural Innocency.* Much of this their Character appeareth in the ancient Writers deſcriptions of the firſt Men; (*p*) *primum inter homines mali neſcia & adhuc aſtutiæ inexperta ſimplicitas: At firſt there was amongſt Men a ſimplicity that knew not Evil, and which was unacquainted with Craft and Cunning:* They are ſaid to have been γυμνοὶ καὶ ἄστρωτοι, *naked without Cloaths and Bed-cloaths; to have liv'd* in incuria ſilveſtri, *without care in Woods,* and to have been nouriſh'd *glande & baccis, with Acorns and Berries.* If the Men of the firſt Times, living in this manner and in theſe circumſtances, had ſuch an Inſtitution as our firſt Parents had in their Earthly Paradiſe, *an Inſtitution by Trees and their Fruits,* every one would acknowledge it very reaſonable and agreeable; as alſo, that they ſhould have a Law given them, as our Parents had, injoyning them upon pain of death not to depart from their natural Innocency and Simplicity; for this is certainly the meaning of the Law of the Terreſtrial Paradiſe, *Gen.* 2. 16, 17. *The Lord God commanded the Man ſaying, of every Tree of the Garden thou mayeſt freely eat; but of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou ſhalt not eat of it; for in the Day that thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely die.* Some think this Symbolical Tree had its Name, becauſe it was to prove our firſt Parents, and thereby it would be known, whether they would be good or bad. It is commonly thought, to have had its Name from what came to paſs afterwards; either becauſe the Tempter pretended to our firſt Parents, that it would make them ſo wiſe as to know all things; or from the Event, becauſe upon the eating this Fruit they did actually know by miſerable Experience the great difference between obeying and diſobeying God's Commandment, and how grievous a thing it was to incur his Diſpleaſure. Others think, the Tree had its Name as a *Caveat* to our firſt Parents, not to ſtudy Craft and Subtilty, but to content themſelves in a ſimple and plain way of Life (wherein God made them) without any curioſity to know more than was needful for them. That the Tree had its Name as a *Caveat*, is more than probable. (*q*) *Lignum enim tale nomen accepit, ut eo ſecundum prohibitionem non tacto caveretur, quod eo contra prohibitionem tacto ſentiretur: For it was ſo called by way of Caveat, that the Prohibition being obey'd by not touching it, that might be avoided which was felt by touching it.* This Symbolical Tree was a Tree of Inſtruction, and was inſtituted, to be a ſtanding document to our firſt Parents, to eſchew a departure from Innocency to the knowledge of Good and Evil, how ſpecious ſoever the Temptations were that allur'd them to it. The Law of Paradiſe was the Law of Innocency, it requir'd that our firſt Parents ſhould continue in the ſtate of Innocency without proceeding to the knowledge of Good and Evil: for they that are in their natural Innocency know not Sin or Evil (they know not any ſuch thing) nor the difference between Good and Evil. (*b*) *Qui non cognoſcit bonum & malum, nihil à parvulo diſtat. Parvuli autem apud juſtum judicem nulla eſt culpa.— — Parvulus ſine ullo eſt crimine prævaricationis & culpæ: He that knoweth not Good and Evil, differeth not from a little Child. A little Child is guilty of no fault or crime, nor is reputed ſo to be by a juſt Judge,* Deut. 1. 39. *Your little ones, which ye ſaid, ſhould be a prey, and your Children which in that Day had no knowledge between Good and Evil, they ſhall go in thither, and unto them will I give the Land,* Iſa. 7. 16. *Before the Child ſhall know, to refuſe the Evil and chuſe the Good.* Little Children are not come to that Diſcretion and underſtanding of things, as to be able to diſcern Good from Evil (and therefore cannot be guilty of doing any Sin or committing any Crime;) for the knowledge of Good and Evil is the oppoſite to the ſtate of Natural Innocency. Such was the ſtate of our firſt Parents before their Tranſgreſſion; they were ſuch Innocents as little Children are (but without the Ignorance and Indiſcretion of Children,) ſo far the *Pelagians* ſaid true: *Quod Infantes nuper nati in illo ſtatu ſint, in quo fuit Adam ante prævaricationem; that Infants newly born are in that ſtate, in which* Adam *was before his prevarication.* The ſtate of *Adam* before his Tranſgreſſion could not be the ſtate of Sanctity, the Paradiſaical Oeconomy could not be an Oeconomy of Sanctity and Soul-intereſts; for *the knowledge of Good and Evil* (which the Law of Paradiſe prohibiteth) is not the oppoſite to the ſtate of Sanctity, but to the ſtate of Natural Innocency. The knowledge of Good and Evil is a departure from Natural Innocency (it is

(p) V. Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 2. c. 1. S. 2. & de V. R. C. l. 1. S. 16. in Annot. Macrob. ad Som. Scip. l. 2. c. 10.

(q) S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 8. c. 14.

(h) S. Ambroſ. de Paradiſ. c. 6.

incompetible to ſuch Innocents as little Children:) but this leaving our Natural Innocency and proceeding to the knowledge of Good and Evil may be only Notional and Intellectual, and it may be alſo Practical and Experimental, which is the only culpable knowledge of Good and Evil; and this culpable knowledge of Good and Evil is a figurative if not a literal *eating of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil.* The Law of Paradiſe therefore was not (as is commonly thought) a meer poſitive Law touching a ſlight matter, a thing indifferent neither Good nor Evil (the meer abſtaining from eating the Fruit of a Tree:) but it was the wiſe and great Law of Innocency, comprehending the whole Duty of our firſt Parents, as *Tertullian* truly ſaith of it; (i) *Quæ lex eis ſufficeret, ſi eſſet cuſtodita, which Law would have been ſufficient, had they kept it*; for had they kept their Innocency, they had not loſt their Paradiſe. But it is one thing, to depart from Sanctity as ſuch to the doing Evil; and another thing, to depart from meer Innocency as ſuch to the knowledge of Good and Evil. If our firſt Parents had been in the ſtate of Sanctity, the Law of Paradiſe muſt have been the Law of Sanctity againſt doing Evil, and not this Law of Innocency, *of the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil thou ſhalt not eat.*

II. The Paradiſaical Oeconomy was fit and accommodate for *a Terreſtrial Animal Paradiſe*, which with great reaſon and congruity was appointed to be the Manſion of our firſt Parents; for as the Saints of God by their Sanctity are entitled to an Heavenly Paradiſe: So our firſt Parents by their Natural Innocency (wherein they were created) were entitled to a Terreſtrial Animal Paradiſe: And as by Sanctity we are exempted and priviledg'd from Spiritual Calamities, Spiritual and Eternal Death: So our firſt Parents by their Natural Innocency were priviledg'd and exempted from External Calamities and from Bodily Death. A Terreſtrial Paradiſe therefore with a Tree of Life in it ought to be their Habitation. (k) *That God which gave unto Meal and Oyl* (Humane Food) *ſuch an admirable Virtue, that they ſhould refreſh others without waſting, can we doubt, but that by the Food of a certain Tree he gave this higher Grace unto Man, that his Body by Infirmity or Age ſhould not be chang'd for the worſe or decline unto Death?* The Tree of Life afforded an Immortality unto Man in his Innocency and Earthly Paradiſe; and it is not imaginable, how an Earthly Paradiſe could be without a Tree of Life; nor could it be without a Tree of Danger and of Death: for a Tree of Life was eſſential to it, as it was a Paradiſe; and a Tree of Danger and of Death was eſſential to it as it was a Paradiſe for Innocency, and not to be enjoy'd but upon condition of a non-departure from Innocency. The Paradiſaical Oeconomy therefore correſpondeth to the Oeconomy of Religion and Sanctity (and conſequently is a wiſe and rational Oeconomy;) for as Religion conſiſteth of a Benefit-part and a Duty-part, ſo doth the Paradiſaical Oeconomy. The Tree of Life is the Benefit-part of it, and the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil (under an Interdict with a Commination) is the Duty-part of it and the Law of Paradiſe. (l) *In which there were three ſorts of Trees: Some were given unto Man* ἵνα ζῇ *that he might live, others* ἵνα ἀεὶ ζῇ, *that he might always live,* εἶχε δὲ τὸ εὖ ζῆν ἐξ ὧν ἐκώλυσεν, *but his living well was from thoſe which God prohibited, for he was to live well by not touching thoſe that were under an Interdict.* The Paradiſaical Oeconomy therefore (like the Oeconomy of Religion) conſiſteth of איסור והתר *ligatum & ſolutum vetitum & permiſſum.* The Law of Paradiſe is a Law of great Licence and Liberty, *Gen.* 2. 16. *The Lord God commanded the Man, ſaying, of every Tree of the Garden thou mayeſt freely eat.* So in the Oeconomy of Religion God doth not deny unto Man the free uſe and enjoyment of any of his Creatures, nor the fitting uſe of all his Natural Faculties and Affections, nor the juſt ſatisfaction of any of his natural Appetites, nor any deſirable Liberty, nor any honeſt Pleaſure, nor any thing that is really good for him; for Religion deſigneth not his hurt and detriment, but to ſave him from every thing that is hurtful and detrimental to him. Yet Religion is a Law of great and ſevere Reſtraints (which are Boundaries to Liberty;) for Man is confin'd by it, to walk in the ſtrict and narrow Way, to live the holy ſinleſs Life (without any Exorbitancy or Expatiating,) to be duely alienated from the World, to eſchew the ſenſual fleſh-pleaſing courſe of Life, to mortifie Senſitive Nature, to have a reſtrict caſtigate and ſubdued Body and Spirit, to abandon inordinate Affection, Bodily Superfluities and Exceſſes, to make only a lawful uſe of lawful things, and not to touch with Sin and Iniquity upon pain of Death. So the Law of Paradiſe was to our firſt Parents a Law of ſevere Reſtraints; for they might not eat nor (in order to eating it) touch the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge; it reſtrain'd them from Concupiſcence and gratifying the ſenſitive Appetite, from affecting unlawful Knowledge, and from degenerating into the ſtate of lapſed Nature (which is the ſtate of knowing Good and Evil) *Non licet, non licet impune, in the Day that thou eateſt of the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* The Oeconomy of Religion maketh a propoſal of Life and Death to Men's choice, and perſwadeth them, to make a wiſe choice: So in the Paradiſaical Oeconomy Man had Life ſet before him by the Tree of Life, and by the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil he had Death ſet before him, which he was ſtrictly injoyned to avoid. Of the Oeconomy of Religion one neceſſary Ingredient is that Branch of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, *Excommunication*, (m) of which *Adam*'s ejection out of Paradiſe hath been thought an Example; for the Jewiſh Writers ſay, that for his offence he was under the Sentence of Excommunication 130 Years. But ſome diſpute, that his expulſion out of Paradiſe was not properly an Excommunication, but a Baniſhment. Suppoſing it ſuch, yet becauſe of the affinity and reſemblance which it hath with Excommunication, S. *Hierom* may be allow'd to ſay touching thoſe that were excommunicated in his time, *Prævaricati ſunt pactum Dei in Eccleſia, ſicut Adam prævaricatus eſt in Paradiſo, & imitatores ſe antiqui parentis oſtendunt, ut quomodo ille de Paradiſo, ſic eſti ejiciantur de Eccleſia: They have tranſgreſſed the Covenant of God in the Church, as* Adam *tranſgreſſed it in Paradiſe, and they ſhew themſelves the followers of the old Father in being caſt out of the Church, as he was caſt out of Paradiſe.*

As the Paradiſaical Oeconomy is part of the Old Teſtament; ſo it more eſpecially correſpondeth to the Oeconomy of Religion in the Old Teſtament-times, in two reſpects. For (firſt) agreeably to the Ceremonial Nature of the Old Teſtament which conſiſteth of Typical and

(i) *C. Jud. c.* 2.

(k) *S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l.* 8. *c.* 5.

(l) *Severianus Gabalitanus Hom.* 5. *p.* 625.

(m) *Selden. de Synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 11.

and Hieroglyphical Inſtitutes, the Law of Paradiſe was Symbolical, the Precept againſt eating the of Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil being a Prohibition of Man's departure from his natural Innocency. And for this Reaſon (as may reaſonably be ſuppos'd) the trial of Man's Obedience was made by this Symbolical Precept; both becauſe ſuch an Oeconomy of things was agreeable to the Paradiſaical Condition of our firſt Parents, and becauſe it was agreeable to the Oeconomy of Religion in the Old Teſtament-times. Unleſs *Adam* had been a Saint of God, his Obedience could not be congruouſly try'd by the Law of Sanctity (as the Obedience of the Angels in Heaven was,) his Eſtate was no higher than that of Natural Innocency; therefore his Obedience muſt by try'd by the Law of Innocency, and if that Law be a Symbolical Inſtitute, it is the more agreeable to the Moſaic Inſtitutes and Laws. In another reſpect the Paradiſaical Oeconomy more eſpecially correſpondeth with the Moſaic Oeconomy of Religion, one uſual Branch whereof is the Commination of כרת *Exciſion* or cutting off, whereby is meant (as the Hebrew Doctors ſay) *Exciſion per manum Cœli* (by the hand of Heaven) *Mors* θεήλατος, *Death inflicted by God.* Agreeably whereto it is reaſonable to underſtand the Penal Treatment of *Adam*, which concludeth the Paradiſaical Oeconomy. Gen. 3. 22, 23, 24. *And the Lord God ſaid, behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil. And now leſt he put forth his hand, and take alſo of the Tree of Life, and eat and live for ever. Therefore the Lord God ſent him forth from the Garden of* Eden, *to Till the Ground, from whence he was taken. So he drove out the Man: and he placed at the Eaſt of the Garden of Eden Cherubims and a flaming Sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the Tree of Life.* If *Adam* had been a lapſed Saint (an horrid total Apoſtate,) he had not been an object of Deriſion, but of fiery Indignation. If his Oeconomy had been an Oeconomy of Sanctity and Soul-intereſts, if his Offence had bereav'd himſelf and all the World of all their ſpiritual and eternal Goods, and plung'd them into Death temporal, ſpiritual and eternal, ſo amazingly tragical and tremendous a Diſaſter could not have been a proper buſineſs for ſuch an Irony, ſuch a Taunt and Sarcaſm as this, *behold the Man is become as one of us!* But ſuch a ſcornful Treatment was proper enough for a Man of very fooliſh Aſpires and Expectations; that aimed at Golden Mountains and caught nothing but a Fall; that came but the other day out of the Earth, and now was aſpiring after a Godhead, and who to pleaſe his Palate, would loſe his Paradiſe! Accordingly he is ſententially depriv'd of it, and not only ſo, but he is by force expelled out of Paradiſe, which expulſion is complicated with his Sentence of Condemnation to bodily Death. And becauſe he could not but have a great concern for his Life (as all Animals have,) and conſequently would not fail, to make an attempt upon the Tree of Life (to ſave his Life) therefore *at the Eaſt of the Garden of* Eden *were placed Cherubims and a flaming Sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the Tree of Life. By Cherubims,* S. *Auſtin* underſtandeth Angels (or *Cæleſtes Poteſtates*) ſome of which at the Eaſt of the Garden of *Eden* vibrated a fiery flaming Sword, and brandiſh'd it every way, thereby to deter *Adam* from re-entring into Paradiſe and attempting the Tree of Life; for an Angel brandiſhing a fiery flaming Sword is plainly a commination of Death or Exciſion *per manum Cœli, by the hand of Heaven.* Such was the literal ſignification of this frightful Phœnomenon: (*n*) But S. *Auſtin* ſaith undoubtedly *ſignificat aliquid etiam de Paradiſo ſpiritali, it ſignifieth ſomething touching the ſpiritual Paradiſe.* S. *Baſil* ſaith (*o*) *doſt thou not know, that a fiery Sword keepeth the way of the Tree of Life, which to Unbelievers is terrible and flammeous?* σὺ δὲ πῶς ἐπανέλθῃς εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, μὴ σφραγισθεὶς τῷ βαπτίσματι; *how wilt thou return into Paradiſe, if not ſealed by Baptiſm?* A Commination of Death *per manum Cœli* belongeth to all that belong to old *Adam*, they can have no admiſſion into Paradiſe, none can enter into it by the Original Law of Religion, that way is become utterly impervious and unpaſſable. Such myſterious Truths of Chriſtianity may reaſonably be thought, to be ſignified *by the Cherubims with a flaming Sword placed at the entrance of the Garden of* Eden. But it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Cherubims continu'd in that poſture (*p*) *for I know not how many Ages*, ſeeing it is not probable, that the Terreſtrial Paradiſe with its Symbolical Trees was of any long continuance.

(n) De Gen. ad lit. l. 11. c. 40.

(o) Exhort. ad Bapt. p. 478.

(p) Archæol. Philoſ. p. 293.

III. The Paradiſaical Oeconomy is an Oeconomy, that belongeth to a Terreſtrial Animal Creation, which ſpeaketh it *a fit and reaſonable and agreeable Oeconomy.* For becauſe it aſcendeth to nothing higher than what is Terreſtrial Animal, therefore it is agreeable to, and commenſurate with, a Terreſtrial Animal Creation. And it was requiſite and neceſſary for ſettling the Affairs of ſuch a Creation, and was accommodate for that purpoſe, which is the deſign and end of it. For although the Affairs of the great World were ſufficiently ſettled meerly by the Creation of it, yet it was otherwiſe with the Affairs of the little World of Man. If we conſider the Creation abſtractedly from the Paradiſaical Oeconomy (which belong'd to it, and was begun in the time of the Hexaemeron) it left the courſe of Nature under a Suſpenſion (as is before ſaid) and the concerns of Mankind in great degree unſettled and undetermin'd. The State of the natural World was ſettled, when God made an end of his Creation-work: But the State of the human moral World was not ſettled. As appeareth from the ſequel of the Hiſtory, and from thoſe inquiries which Divines make. (*q*) *Whether Man muſt not have been tranſlated, whether there muſt not have been departures and ſucceſſions of Mankind, what muſt have been the courſe of Generation, and what ſort of Children Parents muſt have had, if our firſt Parents had not ſinned?* A Settlement muſt be made of the Terreſtrial Animal concerns of our firſt Parents, and in them of the Terreſtrial Animal concerns of all Mankind; which that it may be a wiſe and juſt Settlement, it muſt depend upon their ſinning or not ſinning, and muſt be made according to their merits and demerits; ſo that by their Sin a Penal Settlement of things in Nature ſhould take place and continue to the Worlds end. But Penal Evils could not regularly be inflicted upon Man in his natural Innocency; ſuch a Penal Settlement of things could not regularly be introduc'd but upon account of the Sin of Man; God muſt not be thought, *to have made Death nor the Kingdom of Death upon Earth.* Beſides, the

(q) Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 2. c. 8.

Wiſd. 1. 13, 14.

the Wiſdom of God deſign'd, that the Settlement of things introduc'd by the firſt *Adam* ſhould carry a Correſpondence to the Settlement of things, which was to be introduc'd by the ſecond *Adam*. Upon which accounts the Paradiſaical Oeconomy was neceſſary for ſettling the Affairs of this Terreſtrial Animal Creation. And as this was the end and deſign of it, ſo it was ſufficiently accommodate thereto; for the Mind and Senſe of the whole of it is compriſed in this juſt and reaſonable determination; *ſo long as our firſt Parents continu'd in their State of Innocency, their Paradiſaical State and the Suſpenſion of the courſe of Nature ſhould be continu'd: But upon their Lapſe from the State of Innocency their Paradiſaical State ſhould become forfeited, the courſe of Nature ſhould take place, and themſelves and their Poſterity be ſubjected thereto.* During their Paradiſaical State (r) *nullis agitabantur perturbationibus animorum, nullis corporum lædebantur incommodis, they were agitated by no Perturbations of their Minds, nor hurt by any Incommodations of their Bodies.* The courſe of Nature was then under a Suſpenſion in reſpect of bodily Pains, Diſeaſes and Death, and alſo in reſpect of inordinate Concupiſcence. Not as if our firſt Parents had that *Frænum*, which the Schools call Original Righteouſneſs, and which is the ſame thing with the Life of Grace and Holineſs (for as their Immortality was not the heavenly Immortality, ſo their Original Rectitude was not the holy heavenly Life:) But the *Frænum* which they had, was nothing greater or better, than what the Conſervation of the State of pure Nature and natural Innocency implieth. For whereas in the courſe of Nature, humane Nature is now by degrees filled with that inordinacy commonly called *Concupiſcence*, this courſe of Nature was ſuſpended during the Paradiſaical State of our firſt Parents. But upon their Tranſgreſſion this *Frænum* was taken away, that is, themſelves and their Poſterity were ſubjected to the courſe of Nature both in reſpect of Sin and in reſpect of bodily Death. The courſe of Nature (of Terreſtrial Animal Nature) took place by way of Settlement both in reſpect of a *Criminal* and *Penal* ſort of Evils. In reſpect of a *Criminal* ſort of Evils (which yet are in ſome reſpect Penal) the courſe of Nature took place by way of Settlement upon our firſt Parents relinquiſhing their State of natural Innocency; for now humane Nature in the courſe of Nature is filled with inordinate Concupiſcence, which is Hereditary to Mankind. But our firſt Parents had nothing of it in their State of Innocency. (s) *Nudi erant & non confundebantur: Non quod eis ſua nuditas eſſet incognita, ſed turpis nuditas nondum erat. They were naked and were not aſhamed: Not becauſe they knew not their nakedneſs, but becauſe as yet there was no ſhameful nakedneſs.* And what doth this denote and ſignifie? It doth not ſignifie, that our firſt Parents antecedently to their Tranſgreſſion were in the State of Sanctity, but that they were in the State of natural Innocency; and the ſight and ſenſe of *bodily Nakedneſs* which now cometh upon all Men in the courſe of Nature, plainly ſheweth, that their Lapſe was from the State of natural Innocency, the conſequence whereof was, *the courſe of Nature took place by way of Settlement.*

IV. In the Hiſtory of Paradiſe *Moſes* concerneth himſelf at a great rate, to relate to us the matters that concern *the Nakedneſs* of our firſt Parents; which is a demonſtration, that his deſign was to inform us, that antecedently to their Tranſgreſſion their Eſtate was (not the State of Sanctity, but) the State of natural Innocency. For elſe to what purpoſe doth he in ſo ſhort an Hiſtory harp upon this ſtring no leſs than three ſeveral times? *Gen.* 2. 25. *They were both naked, the Man and his Wife, and were not aſhamed.* After their Tranſgreſſion he ſaith *Gen.* 3. 7. *And the Eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked: And they ſowed Fig-leaves together, and made themſelves Aprons.* Gen. 3. 10, 11. *I heard thy voice in the Garden: And I was afraid, becauſe I was naked; and I hid my ſelf.* (Our firſt Parents, as other Animals do, hid themſelves in the Thickets (t) *per nimium pudorem ac timorem*, becauſe of a ſenſe of Shame upon account of their Nakedneſs, and fearfulneſs upon account of their Tranſgreſſion.) *And he ſaid, who told thee, that thou waſt naked?* That is, how cameſt thou to know bodily Nakedneſs in the ſenſe that we know it, who are aſham'd of it? Shame (u) *eſt imaginatio de ignominia.* It ariſeth from turpitude and deformity criminal or penal, moral or natural. *Menelaus* was aſham'd to appear in publick, becauſe of his ſordid ragged Garments.

Κρύπτων ὑπ' αἰδοῦς τὰς τυχάς. *Euripid.*

So Mankind are aſham'd of that natural Turpitude and Deformity commonly called our Nakedneſs, and cover it with Cloaths, *leſt they walk naked and Men ſee their Shame.* Apoc. 16. 15. But our firſt Parents wanted no bodily clothing having no ſhameful ſenſe of bodily Nakedneſs, no *pudor circa genitalia & res venereas*, which is now a marvellous Affection and property of humane Nature in general, and which immediately diſcover'd it ſelf in them upon their Tranſgreſſion. Which ſpeaketh them fallen by their Tranſgreſſion from the State of Innocency; But that their Fall was not from the State of Sanctity (a total falling from Grace or a total Apoſtacy from God,) appeareth from the kind Proviſion which was made for covering their Nakedneſs. For whereas they had made but a ſorry Proviſion for themſelves (in connecting together Fig-leaves to make themſelves Aprons) the Hiſtory ſaith; *unto* Adam *alſo and his Wife did the Lord God make Coats of Skins, and clothed them*, Gen. 3. 21. It may ſeem ſtrange, that the Lord God (ſo called in the Hiſtory) ſhould concern himſelf about making Cloaths for our firſt Parents, if in this Hiſtory there was nothing of Myſtery: But it will ſomewhat abate the ſeeming ſtrangeneſs of it, if we conſider, that the making their earthly Body was a ſort of making Cloaths for them, (w) *nam hoc quoque Natura, ut quandam veſtem animo circumdedit, for Nature hath clothed the Soul with a Body as with a Garment.* The Skin of an humane Body is alſo called by *Tertullian Carnis tunica, the Coat of the Fleſh.* The making an human Body therefore is near of kin to the making Coats and Cloaths for our firſt Parents, eſpecially ſuch Cloaths which were Coats of Skins. And as we may fitly call our own humane Body and the Skin thereof *our Cloaths and ſuch Cloaths which are of God's making*: So the Coats of Skins that have undergone no human Artifice or Elaboration (or are ſuch in the main at leaſt, as they were, when they were taken from the Backs of Animals) muſt be called *Coats and Cloaths of God's making*, in contradiſtinction to ſuch Coats and Cloaths which are of human Artifice and Elaboration. Such were the Coats and Cloaths of our firſt Parents; *therefore the Lord God made their Coats and Cloaths.* But it may reaſonably be ſuppos'd, that the Lord God (ſo called in the Hiſtory) did much more towards their clothing; that he directed and commanded them, to take off the Skins (wherewith they were clothed) from the Backs of Animals, to adapt them to their Bodies, or at leaſt to inwrap their Bodies in them. And if the Lord God did all this towards the clothing our firſt Parents, may not the Hiſtory juſtly ſay, *unto them the Lord God made Coats, Coats of Skins and clothed them?* The Animals that afforded theſe Skins, are commonly thought to have been killed in Sacrifice: But it may be thought, that they were killed in the Scuffles and Rencounters of Animals amongſt themſelves. Howſoever that be, if our firſt Parents were not unfurniſh'd with Means and Inſtruments for killing Sacrifices (as all agree) they may be ſuppos'd, to have taken off the Skins of Animals for their Clothing (according to Divine Command) and there is no need of ſuppoſing, that this was done by an Angel's hand. Setting aſide therefore a vulgar uncertain Conceit, (that but two of every kind of Animals were at firſt created) this following Objection hath nothing of force in it. (x) *God or an Angel gave our firſt Parents Coats made of the Skins of Animals. He kill'd the Animals therefore and took off their Skins, or elſe flead them alive. But this is the part of a Butcher or an Executioner, not of an Angel. Beſides, by this Butchery whole Kinds of Animals muſt have periſh'd, there being but two created of every Kind, as is commonly ſuppoſed.* A like Exception is made againſt our firſt Parents connecting Fig-leaves, to cover their Nakedneſs, which is all that is meant by ſewing them together. (y) *Behold the Primordials of the Taylor's Art! but whence had they Needle and Thread (the Arts that furniſh theſe not being invented) in the firſt day of their Creation?* At this rate of arguing if *Moſes* had ſaid, that our firſt Parents knit together Fig-leaves, we ſhould have ask'd, whence had they their Knitting-needles? But thus to Cavil at words in human Authors is not ingenuous; and to be thus bold with the holy Scriptures, is not Religious. There is no reaſon to think that the Primordials of the Taylor's Art are contain'd in this Hiſtory: But the Primordials of Clothing are certainly contain'd in it, and the account which it giveth of them is a conſiderable recommendation of this Moſaic Hiſtory. If the Author of it had ſaid; that the Lord God clothed our firſt Parents in Linen or Wollen Garments (ſuch as we wear,) this would have betray'd its Fabuloſity: But Skins were *materia facilè parabilis*, ſuch rude clothing ſerv'd well enough to teach them the way of clothing, Coats of Skins were ſuitable to Terreſtrial Animals, and agreeable to the way of clothing in ancient times (which was by the Skins of Animals *Heb.* 11. 37.) which in all probability had its Origine from our firſt Parents *Tunicæ pelliceæ, Coats of Skins.* Which might be deſign'd, to reproach them with brutiſhneſs (as is commonly ſuppoſed,) yet in ſome reſpect they might deſerve the Apoſtle's Name of *Honour* (1 *Cor.* 12. 23.) and accordingly they are ſtiled by *Onkelos* in his Paraphraſe *Veſtes Honoris, Veſtments of Honour,* whereby our firſt Parents might cover their Nakedneſs.

(r) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 14. c. 10.

(s) S. Aug. ibid. c. 17.

(t) Idem de Gen. ad lit. l. 11. c. 33.

(u) Ariſt. Rhet. l. 2. c. 6.

(w) V. Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 351

V. Touching the *Penal* Evils conſequent upon the Sin of our firſt Parents it is obſervable, that they are *Nature*, nothing but the courſe of corporeal Nature; and conſequently, if the Sin of our firſt Parents was a total falling from Sanctity and ſaving Grace, there was no proportion, no congruity between the Sin and the Puniſhment; which is a demonſtration, that their Sin was not a falling from Sanctity, but only from the State of natural Innocency. The firſt of theſe Penal Evils is the Woman's Penalty, *Gen.* 3. 16. *Unto the Woman he ſaid, I will greatly multiply thy Sorrow and thy Conception: In Sorrow thou ſhalt bring forth Children: And thy Deſire ſhall be to thy Husband* (or ſhall be ſubject to thy Husband) *and he ſhall rule over thee.* The Woman is here by Sentence ſubjected to two inconveniences of a married Woman's Condition: The one of which (Subjection to her Husband) is her natural condition as a Wife, the other (the Pains of Child-bearing) cometh upon her in the courſe of Nature. Both theſe inconveniences ſo inſeparably attend her Sex, that it is not imaginable, but that (more or leſs) they muſt have taken place in Paradiſe (ſuppoſing her married and to be Child-bearing) if the courſe of Nature took place there. But no Law of Settlement touching theſe matters was made till after her Tranſgreſſion, whence it is manifeſt, that the deſign and end of the Paradiſaical Oeconomy was the Settlement of the Affairs of a Terreſtrial Animal Creation. The Pains of Child-bearing are peculiarly the Woman's Portion, but ſhe is not unconcern'd in thoſe other Penal Evils, that are denounc'd upon Man, namely, *the ſterility of the Earth, the toil of this Life, and the certainty of Death*; Gen. 3. 17, 18, 19. In which Settlement of things (made after the Sin of Man) Man is doom'd to a certain Death (*Duſt thou art and unto Duſt ſhalt thou return*:) But thereby no mutation was made in Nature; for the Sentence only ſignifieth, that the Nature of an human Animal Body (the courſe of its Nature) ſhould take place by way of Settlement, and as the Puniſhment of Sin, and that Man ſhould be ſubjected thereto. So it is moſt reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that by curſing the Ground no mutation was made in Terreſtrial mundane Nature (the Nature and Fertility of the Earth:) But the Sentence only meaneth, that the Earth ſhould be ſo Parental unto Man, as yet to be of the Nature of a Step-mother to him, and this courſe of Nature ſhould take place and that by way of Penal Settlement; ſo that by the Sentence (*curſed is the Ground for thy ſake*) the Earth was not firſt made, but only penally ſettled of the Nature of a Step-mother unto Man. The make and frame of the Earth ſheweth, that it was at firſt made with a meaſurable Fertility and Sterility, and that it was originally of a Nature that is productive of Thorns and Thiſtles, as well as better Plants: But the Earth was made of this Nature and natural Condition with deſign, to make it, (this Nature and natural Condition of it) the Puniſhment of Man in caſe of Sin and Tranſgreſſion.

(x) *Deus vel Angelus dedit iis Tunicas, factas nempe ex pellibus animalium. Necuit igitur & excoriavit animalia, vel innocuis & vivis pelles detraxit. Sed hoc Lanii & Carnificis eſt, non Angeli. Prætereà ex hâc lanienâ periiſſent integra genera Animalium.* Archæol. Phil. p. 293.

(y) *En primordia artis ſutoriæ! ſed unde illis acus: Unde filum, in primo die ſuæ Creationis? Linificio vel Arte ferrariâ nondum inventis. Ibid.*

Accordingly upon his Tranſgreſſion, becauſe of his Sin and for his Puniſhment a Settlement was made of this Nature and natural Condition of the Earth, that it ſhould be a Step-mother unto Man (it was curſed by way of Settlement, in a Settlement and as part of the Settlement) *which was a ſettled Curſe upon the Ground.* The dooming Man therefore to a life of Agriculture, of hard labour and toil to get his Bread, doth not neceſſarily import any mutation in Nature, but only a great mutation in Man's Condition, who before liv'd Paradiſaically, but muſt now live in wearifom Toil and Travail, and eat his Bread in the Sweat of his Brows *becauſe of the Ground which the Lord* (by way of Settlement) *hath curſed.* Gen. 5. 29. In this Settlement of things (which is unexceptionably Wiſe, Juſt and Good) the Paradiſaical Oeconomy iſſu'd, and this Iſſue of it ſheweth, what was the end and deſign of it.

VI. It appeareth, that the matters of this Oeconomy are hugely remote and alien from the matters of an Oeconomy of Sanctity and Soul-intereſts, that it is not at all accommodate for making a Settlement of Soul-goods and Evils; for there are no ſuch kind of things in this Oeconomy. The formation of Woman and Marriage, the bodily Nakedneſs of our firſt Parents (without and with Shame,) the buſineſs of eating or not eating of two Trees in an earthly Garden, the pains of Child-bearing, the toils of a Life of Agriculture and the certainty of bodily Death, are things as remote and diſtant from the great Concerns of Souls (their Light and Life, their State and Citizenſhip, their Priviledges and Puniſhments,) ———ὅσον ὐρανὸς ἐσ' ἀπὸ γαίης, *as Earth is from Heaven.* The Story of *Jupiter's* Garden in *Plato* and the Garden of *Alcinous* in *Homer* (z) are thought to be imitative derivatives from this Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe (ſo *Euſebius* and *J. Mart.* have diſcours'd :) But in thoſe Paganical Fables there is nothing that looketh like an Oeconomy of Soul-concerns: Nor is it otherwiſe with this Moſaic Hiſtory. The Jews Religion (in the Letter of it) was but mundane and ſecular, yet it was God's Teſtament and the Inſtitution of a Religion (containing the Doctrines, Precepts, Promiſes, Conditions and Penalties of a Religion :) But this Moſaic Paradiſaical Oeconmy (although correſpondent to the Oeconomy of Religion) cannot be called the Inſtitution of a Supralapſarian Religion. The Jews call the Fundamentals of Religion (a) *the Plants of Paradiſe* (whence they ſay of one that is become an Heretick, *abſcidit Plantas* :) But if we had a Catalogue of the Plants of this Moſaic Paradiſe, it would not be found a Catalogue of the Fundamental *Credenda* and *Agenda* of Religion. They have a Conceit, that if *Adam* had perſever'd in his Innocency, a ſupernal Paradiſe was prepar'd for him; for thus ſometimes they define Paradiſe. *The Garden of* Eden *is that degree, which was prepar'd for* Adam, *and in which he had remained for ever, if he had not ſinned.* So in the Chriſtian Church it is ſuppoſed, (*b*) that our firſt Parents were deſign'd to continue in Beatitude ζῶντες τὸν ἀληθινὸν ϗ ὄντως τῶν ἁγίων ἐν παραδείσῳ βίον, *living the true Life and that of Saints indeed in Paradiſe.* (*c*) *God introduc'd them into his Paradiſe and gave them a Law, that if they did not loſe, but keep the Grace that was given them, they might live in Paradiſe a life without Grief, Sorrow and Care, beſides that they had a Promiſe of the Immortality in Heaven.* But it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that nothing more ſhould be requir'd, to qualifie them for an heavenly than for an earthly Paradiſe; that the life of Grace was indiſpenſably requiſite, to qualifie them for a Paradiſe of ſenſitive Nature; or that they muſt not poſſeſs an earthly Paradiſe without being the real Saints of God (and that in ſinleſs Perfection,) whereas the *Iſraelites* might rightfully poſſeſs their earthly *Canaan* meerly by a Civil-religious obſervance of their Law. *Procopius* well illuſtrateth this Oeconomy from the Judaical Oeconomy, and rightly affirmeth concerning God, when he commanded *Adam* to abſtain from the Tree of Knowledge. (*d*) *He did not ſhew unto him the Kingdom of Heaven: Seeing he did not promiſe it to the Jews a great while after : But as to Infants ſhew'd them a Land flowing with Milk and Honey.* The Paradiſaical Oeconomy in the Letter of it, did not tranſcend an earthly Paradiſe, as the Judaical Oeconomy in the Letter of it did not tranſcend an earthly *Canaan* : And both are alike unſuited to the Heaven-born Nature of the Saints of God and alike below their Oeconomy. (*e*) *If thou art Spiritual and mindeſt higher things than bodily Enjoyments, aſcend in thy Mind to the Pulchritudes of Angels; conſider their fruits of Righteouſneſs; contemplate the River of God that is full of Water, whoſe Streams make glad the Divine City, whoſe Builder and Maker is God.* If the Terreſtrial *Adam* was a Saint of God, he muſt be ſuppos'd, to have had the Promiſe of an heavenly Immortality : And if he had the Promiſe of an heavenly Immortality, it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe him, to have been a Saint of God.

VII. If according to the common Hypotheſis we ſuppoſe him a Saint of God and his Oeconomy an Oeconomy of Sanctity and of Soul-intereſts, it cannot be thought a wiſe and reaſonable and agreeable Oeconomy *in reſpect of his Sin and Puniſhment and the Law* which he violated : But the Jews Objections againſt this Hypotheſis (notwithſtanding ſome infirm parts that are in them) are in the main firm and unanſwerable. (*f*) *How can you imagine, that the Lord came with ſuch ſeverity againſt the firſt Man, as for a ſmall matter (the biting one Apple) to deſtroy him both in this and the other World, and not only him, but all his Poſterity alſo? Who yet did this ignorantly, ſeeing he was without Knowledge, as it is ſaid, the Eyes of them both were opened, and they knew, that they were naked. Which opening was in the Eye of Wiſdom. Moreover,*

the

(z) *J. Mart. Paræn.* p. 27.

(a) *Coſri* p. 245. & p. 72.

(b) *S. Athanaſ. de Incarn. verb. non procul. ab initio.*

(c) Εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παράδεισον αὐτοὺς εἰσαγαγὼν (ὁ θεὸς) ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς νόμον· ἵνα εἰ μὲν φυλάξαιεν τὴν χάριν, ϗ μένοιεν καλοί, ἔχωσι τὴν ἐν παραδείσῳ ἄλυπον ϗ ἀνώδυνον ϗ ἀμέριμνον ζωὴν πρὸς τῷ ϗ τῆς ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίας αὐτοὺς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχειν. *Idem ibid.*

(d) *Non ei Cælorum oſtendiſſe regnum.——— cùm nè Judæis quidem tanto poſt tempore illud promiſerit : Sed ſic tanquam infantibus terram melle ac lacte manantem oſtenderit.* Ap. Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 2. c. 9.

(e) Εἰ πνευματικὸς εἶ καὶ ὑψηλότερα φρονεῖς τῶν σωματικῶν ἀπολαύσεων, ἀνάβα τῇ διανοίᾳ πρὸς τὰ κάλλη τῶν ἀγγέλων· Καταμάθε τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς τῆς δικαιοσύνης καρποὺς· Θεάσαι τὸν ποταμὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν πεπληρωμένον ὑδάτων, Οὗ τὰ ὁρμήματα εὐφραίνουσι τὴν πόλιν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός. *S. Baſil. de Paradiſ. ſub fin.*

(f) *Quomodo aſcendit ſuper cor veſtrum, quòd venerit Dominus cum tanta ſeveritate contra primum hominem, ut illum vinctum teneret, propter rem exiguam, nempe propter morſum pomi unius, illumque perderet in hoc ſeculo atque in futuro, & non ipſum tantum, ſed & omnes poſteros ejus? Qui tamen errans hoc fecit, cùm non fuerit adhuc in eo cognitio, ſicut dicitur. Et aperti ſunt oculi amborum & cognoverunt, quòd nudi eſſent. Hæc autem apertio fuit in oculo ſapientiæ. Quin in occiſione Habel fuit tranſ-*

ſſio illa mille partibus major àm iſta, & tamen non an- ctitur illi pœna tanta. Au- or Nizachon. ap. Hoornbeck Jud. l. 4. c. 2.

the Murder of Abel *was a thouſand times a greater Tranſgreſſion, which yet had no ſuch great Puniſhment annex'd to it.*

If the Law of Paradiſe be conſider'd as a Precept of Religion and Sanctity, it will not be thought one of the (*magnalia Legis*) great Commandments. The Violation of it will not ſeem one of the great Sins much leſs *a Sin unto Death* in the Apoſtle's Senſe. 1 *Joh.* 5. 16. *Adam* (a ſuppos'd Saint) will not ſeem by his Tranſgreſſion, to have fallen into worſe Eſtate than *David* fell into by his Murder and Adultery (whoſe State of Grace is commonly thought not to have been totally deſtroy'd by his foul Facts, but only ſuſpended;) and in this way of conſidering and eſtimating things the Puniſhment of *Adam's* Sin according to the common Hypotheſis will ſeem immenſly incongruous and diſproportionate, utterly irreconcileable with Wiſdom, Juſtice and Goodneſs. A Covenant may be ſuppos'd to have been made with *Adam*; for God's appointment and ſettlement of things of a preceptive, promiſſory and penal Nature may be called a Covenant: But ſuch a Covenant may not be ſuppos'd, to have been made with *Adam* touching ſpiritual Affairs, which is wholly alien from due, divine and reaſonable Methods of procedure in ſpiritual Affairs. Nor is there any conſideration of the ſpiritual Affairs of our firſt Parents and their Poſterity properly ſuch (otherwiſe than typically and ſymbolically) in the Paradiſaical Oeconomy; although our firſt Parents muſt be ſuppos'd, to have had their ſpiritual and eternal Intereſts as well as the reſt of Mankind. But if theſe had been the buſineſs of their Paradiſaical Oeconomy, the Divine Moral Law muſt have been the trial of their Obedience; and it ſeemeth ſtrange in the Eyes of all Men, that the Divine Law-giver did not make it ſuch. For the aſſoiling of which difficulty ſome ſay, the Moral Law was not made the trial of their Obedience, becauſe they were not capable of violating it. But if *Adam* was a Saint of God, he was capable of the ſame Sin and Temptation with the Angels in Heaven and of violating the holy Moral Law as well as they. And conſequently the Law of Paradiſe cannot be ſhew'd, to have been wiſe, reaſonable and requiſite, if we ſuppoſe *Adam* in Innocency, to have been a Saint of God.

ARTICLE 6.

That Species (or Kind) *of Animal the Serpent is of great Remark in Scripture.*

THEY that write of Animals and deſcribe their Natures and Properties (ſuch as the Lion, the Leopard, the Elephant, the Wolf and the Sheep) mean not only one individual Animal, but the ſeveral Species of Animals called by thoſe Names. So when we ſay, the Horſe is a War-like Animal, we mean that Species (or Kind) of Animal. When we ſay, the Tyger is a fierce Creature, the Lamb is a tame and innocent Creature, the Fox is a ſubtil Creature, we do not mean only one Lamb, or Fox or Tyger, but we ſpeak *ſpecificativè*, and mean the whole Kind, that all Lambs, Tygers and Foxes are of ſuch a Nature and Properties. So when we ſpeak of *the Serpent*, we diſtinguiſh Animals into ſeveral Kinds, and conſider this Animal as contradiſtinct to the other Kinds, and do not mean only one ſingular individual Serpent, but all Serpents; for this Name *the Serpent* denoteth the whole Kind and Family. There are many Kinds of Serpents, the Viper, the Aſp, the Baſilisk, the Dragon, the Hyæna, the Acontias (a leaping Serpent) the Ceraſtes (that hath Quaſi-horns,) many Kinds of Serpents there are, for ſome of which we have no particular Name in our Language: But all theſe various ſorts of Serpents are comprehended under this Name *the Serpent*; for thereby we mean all ſorts of Serpents. Only the fiery flying Serpent (the Saraph) is not comprehended under this Name, the Serpent (but muſt be excluded out of the number of Serpents) in the ſtrict acceptation. For a Serpent in the ordinary definitive Notion is (g) ζῶον ἑρπετὸν, *Animal reptile, a creeping-crawling Animal.* Wherewith the Etymology of the word agreeth; for *Serpens* is from *Serpo* to creep. This Species or Kind of Animal is of great remark in Scripture.

I. As being the crafty, ſubtil and politick kind of Animal. *Gen.* 3. 1. 2 *Cor.* 11. 3. There are ſeveral inſtances of the Serpents ſubtilty and policy; for when he layeth himſelf to ſleep, he wrappeth his whole Body about his Head (as a Bulwark to defend it,) and in all conflicts and dangers he will be ſure to have a care of his Head (to ſecure that part,) and will expoſe all the reſt of his Body, to ſecure it; which is great Prudence, to preſerve his Life. By putting out his *Quaſi-horns*, which are like the Grains of Corn, he catcheth the Birds, that flee to them for Food. His inſidious way of hurting is an inſtance of his Policy; the *Ceraſtes* lieth hid in Sands of the ſame colour with himſelf and biteth the Horſe-heels. *Gen.* 49. 17. When the Serpent feeleth himſelf grown old, he creepeth through the Crevices of a Rock, and ſo getteth off his old Skin, and when he findeth his Sight grown dim (as is generally reported of him) he anointeth his Eyes with the Leaves of Fennel, and recovereth his Sight; and if he findeth his Scales dull and in a bad poſture, he ſcratcheth himſelf with the Prickles of Juniper. Such prudential Inſtincts are in Serpents, which are ſo remarkable for their ſubtilty, that *Ariſtotle* calleth them μάλιστα ἐπιβούλους, *the moſt inſidious Animals.* And in *Æſop's* Fables the Crab-fiſh perſwadeth the Serpent μεταβάλλεσθαι τῆς πονηρίας, *to change his craftineſs and ſubtilty*, but he will not be perſwaded to it. He is watchful for his ſafety, and careful to obſerve the Feet of Men, that they may not tread on him; and is remarkable for his τὸ ὀξυδερκὲς, *quickſightedneſs* (a branch of Prudence) —— *tam cernis acutum quam aut Aquila aut Serpens Epidaurius.* Hence the Poets appoint Dragons to keep the golden Apples, as being moſt quick-ſighted, Serpents among the Heathen were ſacred to *Æſculapius*, becauſe a Phyſician muſt be Circumſpect; and the Romans had a Dragon for their Enſign (to ſignifie, that Soldiers muſt be quick-ſighted, they that carried it were called *Draconarii*, whence the Name *Dragoons* is deriv'd. To theſe prudential Faculties and Inſtincts of Serpents our Saviour hath reſpect, *Matth.* 10. 16. *Be ye wiſe as Serpents.* We ſhould learn of them, duly to love and look to our ſelves, to proſecute our own true good and decline our real evil; to take heed to our ſafety and preſervation

(g) *Bochart. de Animal. P.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 4. *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 4. *c.* 52.

vation (both of Soul and Body) and to keep out of harm's way; to walk circumſpectly and to have our Eyes in our Head; to be quick-ſighted in eſpying things and perſons that are dangerous, and careful to avoid them. And this our prudential care muſt extend to Bodily as well as Soul-dangers. For our Saviour would have us, not to be fooliſhly prodigal of our Eſtates and Lives, not to throw them away upon trivial and frivolous accounts: But to ſecure our temporal Intereſt, ſo far as is conſiſtent with our ſpiritual and eternal Intereſt. He would have us to be Martyrs, but not Hectors; Valiant, but not Fool-hardy; Faithful, but not Raſh and Precipitant, duly Circumſpect and Prudent to preſerve our ſelves, if we be alſo faithful to preſerve our Souls. *Beware of Men.* Matth. 10. 17. Men, who, if you be not aware of them, will circumvent, betray and ruin you. *Behold, I ſend you forth as Sheep in the midſt of Wolves*; therefore *be wiſe as Serpents*, be duly Circumſpect to look to your temporal Safety, and ſo far as honeſtly you may decline Danger. So the Apoſtle admoniſheth *Timothy*, to beware of a dangerous Man. 2 *Tim.* 4. 15. Himſelf was in danger by falſe Brethren (2 *Cor.* 11. 26.) and ſo are the upright and faithful in all times. They are concern'd therefore, to learn a Wiſdom of the Serpent: But there is alſo a Serpentine Wiſdom, which they are concern'd to eſchew and avoid; ſuch is the guileful Skill and Wiſdom repugnant to the ſimplicity and innocuouſneſs of the Dove, which is eſſential to a Chriſtian. Who muſt not be a proficient in the old Serpent's Politicks (whoſe ſubtilty is malign and was a beguiling Man) nor have acquaintance with the Wiles and Stratagems of the World, ſave only to avoid danger *from the ſleight of Men and their cunning* Eph. 4. 14. *Craftineſs, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. They* Jer. 4. 22. *are wiſe to do Evil* (wiſe to be diſhoneſt and unjuſt, and have many fetches and many wiles to ſupplant and circumvent the Innocent:) But a Chriſtian muſt be a ſtranger to their evil Arts, and to all the ways and methods of doing evil.

II. The Scripture remarketh the Serpent (that kind of Animal,) *as the hurtful, venenate* (h) Voſſ. ſupr. c. 58. *and poyſonous kind of Animal.* (*h*) For although in ſome places there are Serpents that are not hurtful and venenate, yet theſe being few and rare in compariſon, they muſt not alter our account of the Serpents Nature, which is noxious, poyſonous and venenate. *Eccluſ.* 25. 15. *There is no head above the head of a Serpent.* (i) Bochart. ſupr. & Par. 2. l. 3. c. 14. The words ſhould be rendred, (*i*) *there is no poyſon above the poyſon of a Serpent*; for *Roſch* ſignifieth both an Head and Poyſon. *Deut.* 32, 33. *Their wine is the poyſon of Dragons and the cruel venom of Aſps.* *Pliny* ſaith of the Dragons, that they have no poyſon in them; and it is true of the Dragons in *Greece*: But in *Aſia* and *Africa* the Dragons have in them a moſt deadly poyſon. And the venom of Aſps is ſo deadly and incurable, that *the Bite of an Aſp* is a Proverbial Phraſe, to ſignifie an incurable wound. (k) Ibid. c. 2. & 1. (*k*) A Serpent in general is called *venenata Beſtia*, *a venomous Beaſt*, and the Greek word θηρίον, ſo ſignifieth, whence oftentimes it ſignifieth a Serpent, and thence it is, that the Antidotes or Remedies againſt Poyſon are called in Phyſick θηριακὰ, *Theriaca*. The poyſon of Serpents is ſaid to lie partly in their Gall, partly in their Teeth, and partly in a Bag under their Tongue; whence in the Book of *Job* the deſtruction of the wicked is thus ſignified. *He ſhall ſuck the poyſon of Aſps: The Viper's Tongue ſhall ſlay him.* Job 20. 16. As if the Viper did ſlay with his Tongue; whereas he deſtroyeth with his Teeth, yet his Poyſon is under his Tongue, and he biteth with his Tongue put out. So the Son of *Sirach* amongſt the deadly deſtructive things of the World reckoneth *Teeth of wild Beaſts and Scorpions, Serpents and the Sword.* Eccluſ. 39. 30. The Bite of a Viper is ſo deadly, that it killeth the greateſt Beaſts in the World, and but for a Miracle it had been deadly to S. *Paul*, Act. 28. 3. *When Paul had gather'd a bundle of ſticks and laid them on the fire, there came a Viper out of the heat, and faſtned on his hand.* Out of Sticks and Fewel Serpents uſually come forth (there are many inſtances of it,) ſo did S. *Paul*'s Viper, which is counted *nequiſſimum genus beſtiæ*, *one of the moſt poyſonous of all Serpents*, many of which are ſo deadly poyſonous, that no one can tread on them, but he is in danger of loſing his Life. Whence the Pſalmiſt ſaith of the Man, whom God will protect, *he ſhall tread upon the* Pſal. 91. 13. *Adder* without being hurt, which is a great and miraculous thing. No one can come near the Hole of an Aſp or a Baſiliſc, but he is in danger of loſing his Life. Whence the Prophet ſaith, *The ſucking Child ſhall play on the Hole of* Iſa. 11. *the Aſp, and the weaned Child ſhall put his hand on the Cockatrice Den.* Which implieth, that it is a dangerous and deadly thing, to come near their Holes and Caverns. (l) Voſſ. ſupr. c. 58. (*l*) If any one ſtriketh a *Baſiliſc* with a Staff (as good Authors report,) his Poyſon will propagate it ſelf by the Staff and kill the Man. The Venom of an Aſp is ſo quick and penetrative, and deadly to the Vitals, that his biting is ſaid to kill within four Hours; and therefore at *Alexandria* they were wont to kill with the biting of an Aſp thoſe Malefactors, whom they would have to die a quicker ſort of Death. Fearful Symptoms ariſe in an humane Body from the Poyſon of theſe venenate Animals (Convulſions, Vomitings, Blindneſs, grievous Inflammations and Death;) and the more fiery they are the more poyſonous. That therefore muſt neceſſarily be a grievous Plague, which God ſent Numb. 2 6. amongſt the rebellious Iſraelites *fiery flying Serpents* (which muſt be reckon'd amongſt Serpents in a large acceptation,) who by their biting excited very fiery Inflammations. Of theſe we read alſo, *Iſa.* 30. 6. *The Viper and fiery flying Serpent*, that hath a mighty Virulency.

The Scripture remarketh the venenate poyſonous Nature of Serpents not only in a general way, but to ſeveral particular purpoſes. As, (1.) To ſet before us the Nature of Sin. *Iſa.* 59. 5. *He that eateth of their Eggs dieth, and that which is cruſh'd* (touch'd) *breaketh out into a Viper.* Serpents propagate their Poyſon, their Eggs are poyſonous, as themſelves are, and ſuch are the evil works of ungodly Sinners, which the Prophet calleth *their Eggs.* Their Sins are firſt conceiv'd in their Thoughts, and then brought forth into Act, and theſe are the Eggs that they lay, which are deadly and mortiferous. We ſhould look upon Sin therefore with horror, as of a direful Serpent-like (Dragon-like) Nature, and not dare to touch or have any dealings with it. *Flee from Sin as from the face of a Serpent.* Eccluſ. 21. 2.

ſet before us the fruit of ſenſual Pleaſures, eſpecially the Pleaſures of high drinking the Drunkards Royal Repaſt. *Prov.* 23. 31. *Look not thou upon the wine it is red, when it giveth his colour in the Cup, when it moveth it ſelf aright. At the laſt it biteth like a Serpent, and ſtingeth like an Adder.* The wiſe Man diſtinguiſheth between the Serpents biting and ſtinging. There are Serpents in the *Weſt-Indies* that hurt both ways, they both bite with their Mouth and ſting with their Tail like a Scorpion. Such are the Fruits and Effects of ſtrong Drink, that is deadly and mortiferous both to Soul and Body, both to the Life of Grace and of Nature; like an *Amphisbœna* it biteth both ways and killeth both here and hereafter. When the Wine moveth in the Cup, it promiſeth well, but payeth not what it promiſeth. It promiſeth Health, and payeth Sickneſs; it promiſeth Joy, and payeth Sorrow; it cometh with a ſmiling Face, but carrieth a Sting in the Tail of it. It produceth all manner of Sin and bitterneſs to the Soul, and Evils innumerable to the Body, Pains, Gouts, Palſies, Apoplexies, Lethargies, Dropſies, Vertigo's, Convulſions and Death. Therefore look upon a drunken Cup as a Cup of Poiſon, and be afraid of it as of the Venom of a Serpent. (3.) To ſet before us the evil Nature of Mankind in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs, that are deadly inimical to true Goodneſs, God-haters and Man-haters (in ſeveral degrees) a peſtilent Brood, of kin to the Toads and Serpents, and they are deſtroying others, as if they were deſtroying Toads and Serpents. The Prophet therefore compareth them to Aſps, Cockatrices, Adders. *Iſa.* 11. 8. *Their poiſon is like the poiſon of the Serpent.* Pſal. 58. 4. They are of the Serpents Brood, not of the ſalutary and kindly, the benign, the amical and helpful Love-nature, the innocent and beneficent Nature and Practice: But of the malign and malevolent, the noxious, and inimical, the pernicious *hating and hurting* Nature and Practice. But when they become Regenerate Chriſtians, they loſe their Poiſon, and ſo great a change is made in Nature, *that a ſucking Child may play on the Hole of the Aſp, and the weaned Child may put his hand on the Cockatrice Den.* They that were before hurtful, ferine and venenate, are now become innocuous, amical and beneficent. (4.) To ſet before us *the deadly Poiſon of Wickedneſs*, which eminently abounded in thoſe falſe Religioniſts *the Phariſees*; whence they are ſtiled *Serpents* and a *Generation of Vipers* (the moſt deadly ſort of Serpents;) of Kind and Quality they were a Viperine Generation, and like the Vipers they had a fine Skin, but were deadly poiſonous within, not of the Child of God-kind of Diſpoſition and Practice, but venenate Animals in their Qualities and Properties. (5.) To ſet before us the virulency of an evil Tongue, which is like the virulency of Serpents. Pſal. 140. 3. *They have ſharpened their Tongues like a Serpent, Adders poiſon is under their Lips.* The Serpent hath a ſharp tenuious kind of Tongue, and a very voluble one, and ſuch is an evil Speaker's Tongue. Generally it is a double Tongue alſo like a Serpent's; and the evil Speaker carrieth Poiſon under his Tongue, as the Serpent doth. *The Poiſon of Aſps is under their Lips.* Rom. 3. 13. One ſort of Aſps is called *Ptyas*, becauſe he ſpitteth Venom, and if he can come ſo near any Animal, as to ſpit upon it, he hath done his work (as 'tis ſaid) he hath poiſon'd the Animal. The evil Speaker reſembleth this ſort of Serpent; for he ſpitteth Poiſon with his villainous venenate Tongue (full of deadly Poiſon, *Jam.* 3. 8.) and as other Serpents give a deadly bite, ſo doth the evil Tongue. But it is more poiſonous than that of a Serpent; for a Serpent can Poiſon none, unleſs he cometh near him (to bite or ſtrike or ſpit upon him:) But an evil venenate Tongue hurteth in abſence as well as preſence, there is no fleeing from its Venom, nor any remedy againſt it. (6.) In one place (and no more) the Scripture remarketh the hurtful poiſonous Nature of the Serpent for good. *Iſa.* 14. 29. *Rejoice not thou whole Paleſtina, becauſe the Rod of him that ſmote thee is broken: For out of the Serpents root ſhall come forth a Cockatrice, and his fruit ſhall be a fiery flying Serpent.* *Uzziah* King of *Judah* warred againſt the Philiſtines and prevailed againſt them, brake down the Walls of their Cities and built Cities amongſt them. But he died and died a Leper, and *Jotham* and *Ahaz* ſucceeding him in their times the Philiſtines recover'd ſtrength; for they invaded the Cities of *Judah* and *Judah* was brought low. But *Ahaz* being dead (for whoſe impiety *Judah* was brought low) the Prophet foretelleth, that there ſhall be a great change of Affairs, and that the Philiſtines ſhould have no cauſe to rejoice, becauſe *Uzziah* was dead, who had bitten and ſtung them like a Serpent. Now ſaith the Prophet, rejoice no more; for you will have a worſe Serpent, to bite and ſting you, than King *Uzziah* was; one of his Race ſhall make heavier work with you than he did. *Out of the Serpents Root ſhall come forth a Cockatrice*, one that will be more deadly and deſtructive to you. *And his fruit ſhall be a fiery flying Serpent*, one that will ſwiftly and deadly afflict the Philiſtines. Such was *Hezekiah*, who ſprang from King *Uzziah*.

The Perſians in ancient times had a Feſtival day, wherein they were wont to go about and kill all the Serpents in the Country; and this day they called the death of Vices.

2 Chron. 26. 6. and ch. 28. 18, 19.

III. The Scripture remarketh the Serpent as *an Animal obnoxious to Inchantment.* (m) S. *Auſtin* thinketh, that God would have the Serpent of all Animals moſt ſubject to Inchantment, becauſe a Serpent ſeduc'd the firſt Man. But whether this was the cauſe or not, it is certain, that the Serpent is an Animal obnoxious to Inchantment, and that in ancient times amongſt the Heathen nothing was more uſual than the inchanting Serpents by magical Arts and Charms, of which they had many kinds. They had Inchantments, whereby they called Serpents out of their Holes and Caverns, and called them together into one place. They had Inchantments to drive away Serpents; Inchantments to ſtupifie them and lay them aſleep; Inchantments to take away their Venom, that they could not hurt; Inchantments to cure thoſe that were bitten or ſtung by a Serpent; Inchantments to make the Serpents burſt aſunder. Theſe Arts were uſed in the Heathen World, and it is probable, that God forbiddeth the uſe of them to the Iſraelites. *Deut.* 18. 11. *There ſhall not be found among you a Charmer.* For the word חיבר ſignifieth *a Conſociator*, one that calleth Serpents together by Charms. Such a Charmer there was of late Years at *Saltzburg* in *Germany*, who call'd together all the Serpents about the place, with deſign, to bring them all into one Ditch, to deſtroy them; but at length one great old Serpent leap'd upon him and kill'd him. So it

(m) *Bochart. de Anim. p.* 2. *l.* 3. *c.* 6. *Dr. Hammond Not. on Pſal.* 58.

was obſerv'd amongſt the Heathen, that many times the inchanting Serpents did not ſucceed, and then the Magician himſelf was in great danger, and commonly was killed by the Serpent. *And who will pity a Charmer, that is bitten by a Serpent?* Saith the Son of *Sirach*. Ch. 12, 13. Many times (I ſay) the Inchantment did not ſucceed, to which the Scripture alludeth, *Jer.* 8. 17. *Behold, I will ſend Serpents, Cockatrices among you, which will not be charmed, and they ſhall bite you, ſaith the Lord.* That is, cruel Enemies ſhall afflict you, that will by no means be appeas'd. To the charming Serpents the Preacher alludeth, *Eccl.* 10. 11. *Surely the Serpent will bite without enchantment, and a Babbler is no better.* For a Babbler (an evil Speaker) is not leſs pernicious, nor leſs virulent than a Serpent, who unleſs he be inchanted, will not fail to bite or ſting. To the unſucceſsful inchanting Serpents the Pſalmiſt alludeth, *Pſal.* 58. 4. *They are like the deaf Adder, that ſtoppeth her Ear: Which will not hearken to the voice of Charmers charming never ſo wiſely.* Some think, that the Adder called Deaf, is really deaf of one Ear, and uſeth to ſtop the other Ear with Duſt or with his Tail, to avoid the force of Charms or Inchantments, wherewith he is wont to be caught. Others think, that this is nothing better than vulgar Story, and that the Serpents called Deaf are not formally ſo, but only equivalently, the Inchantments can make no more impreſſion upon them, than if they were really and formally deaf. Which of theſe is the truer account of that ſort of Serpents called *Deaf*, is not neceſſary for an Expoſitor to inquire; for the Pſalmiſt only alludeth to the deaf Adder, thereby deſigning to ſignifie the unperſwadableneſs and irreclaimableneſs of the wicked, who will not be wrought upon by any Arts, by any methods of Perſwaſion, to forſake their ungodly Courſes, but fortifie themſelves, and are impregnable againſt all divine Artifices and Applications. *They will not frame their ways and their doings, to turn unto their God*, Hoſ. 5. 4. They will not give their minds to it.

IV. The Scripture remarketh the Serpent (that kind of Animal) as the Animal *that is inimical and deadly to Mankind*, as our Saviour repreſenteth him. *Luc.* 10. 19. *Mar.* 16. 18. It is to Mankind chiefly, that Serpents are hurtful and poiſonous; only the *Pſylli* and *Marſi* could not be hurt by their Poiſon (being fortified againſt it either by natural Temperament, Medicines or Magick) of whom *Hieron. Fracaſtorius* ſaith, (n) *cum Pſyllis & Marſis non ea Serpentium inimicitia eſt, quæ cum reliquo genere; with the* Pſylli *and* Marſi *there is not deadly Enmity of Serpents as with the reſt of Mankind.* Mankind and Serpents are Hoſtile and Inimical at the rate of an inbred deadly Enmity and Antipathy; as between the Dolphin and the Crocodile (and ſeveral other Animals) there is an innate Antipathy, and by inſtinct they have an averſion from and ſpight againſt one another. (o) *But between the Serpent and Man* (ſaith Mr. *Mede*) *is the moſt deadly Enmity, and the ſtrongeſt Antipathy that is amongſt the Beaſts of the Field: Such an one as diſcovereth it ſelf both in the natural and ſenſitive Faculties of them both. For the firſt, their Humours are Poiſon to each other; the Gall of a Serpent is Man's deadly Poiſon, and ſo is the Spittle of a Man affirm'd to Poiſon the Serpent. For the ſenſitive Antipathy, it appeareth, in that the one doth ſo much abhor the ſight and preſence of the other; Man's Nature is at nothing ſo much aſtoniſh'd as at the ſight of a Serpent; and like enough the Serpent is in like manner affected at the ſight of Man; and that more eſpecially, as the Naturaliſts affirm, of a naked Man than otherwiſe.* (p) A Serpent ſeen in a dream (according to the Onirocriticks) ſignifieth an Enemy; and accordingly Mankind ſtand affected towards Serpents. For *odiſſe æquè ac angues*, is a proverbial Phraſe in *Plautus*, that denoteth vehement hatred. And *Hyperides* in his Oration pronounceth τοὺς ὄφεις μισητοὺς εἶναι πάντας, *that all Serpents are odious.* Ἵππον ϗ τὸν ψυχρὸν ὄφιν τὰ μάλιστα δέδοικα, ſaith a Woman in *Theocritus*. *Ecce anguem cunctis maximè formidabilem eſſe ait*, (q) as *Cunæus* underſtandeth her words.

V. The Serpent is of great remark in Scripture as *being Satan's kind af Animal.* For there is ſuch a Cognation between the Myſtical Serpent and the Brute-ſerpents, that he is of their Kind and Family, and they are of his Kind and Family. He is not of their narrower Kind and Family, which is that of *Brute-ſerpents*: But he is of their larger Kind and Family, which is that of *Serpents*, and he is the head of it. For his Name in Scripture is *the Serpent*. Apoc. 12. 15. *The Serpent caſt out of his mouth water*, to drown the Church. The Jews call him *Nachaſh kadmoni, the old Serpent*: So in the New Teſtament his Name is *that old Serpent called the Devil and Satan.* Apoc. 12. 9. and 20. 2. Sometimes he is called *the Dragon that old Serpent*. Apoc. 20. 2. The Dragon is a bigger ſort of Serpent, whence the Greeks had a Proverb amongſt them, *unleſs a Serpent devoureth a Serpent, there will not be a Dragon.* Satan is a Serpent grown to bigneſs and oldneſs, and therefore fitly called the Dragon, and the great Dragon ſurmounting in bigneſs other Dragons. *Apoc.* 12. 3, 9. And he is called *the great red Dragon*, to ſignifie, that he is truculent, perſecutive and bloody. Agreeably to his Names his Qualities and Properties ſpeak him of the Kind and Family of Serpents. For this Veterator and old Deceiver is of celebrated Craft and Subtilty, the grand Maſter of wicked Politicks and Deceits. As a Serpent he is ſubtil above other Creatures, and being an old Serpent he is ſubtil above other Serpents. S. *Paul* therefore thus intituleth *Elymas* the Sorcerer; *O full of all Subtilty, thou Child of the Devil!* Act. 13. 10. To ſignifie his hurtful venenate Nature and Diſpoſition, (which is ſeen in his Temptations that are impoiſon'd Darts,) that he is inimical and deadly to Mankind (as the Serpents are,) poiſonouſly malevolent, full of κακίας ἰὸς, *the Poiſon of Wickedneſs and of all Malignity*, the Chriſtian Writers call him (r) *the Dragon and the Serpent. Black and crawling, that generateth the mortiferous Poiſon, the ferine Beaſt, and amongſt creeping things the Baſiliſc.* He is the grand *venenata Beſtia*, whoſe Venom and Virulency (in his direful Nature and Practice) far tranſcendeth that of Toads and Serpents; yet it appeareth from his Character, that he is of their Kind and Family and the head of it, the Chieftain and the eldeſt of all the Serpentine Family.

As Satan is of the Serpents Kind and Family, ſo the Brute-ſerpents are of his Kindred, Kind

(n) *Ap. Voſſ. ſupr. c.* 61.

(o) *Mr. Mede on Gen* 3. 13, 14, 15.

(p) *Bochart. ſupr. Par.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(q) *De Rep. Hebr. l.* 3. *c.* 1.

(r) Τὸν δράκοντα ϗ ὄφιν μελανάτι ϗ ἑρπυστικὸν, ἰῶ θανατηφόρου γεννητικὸν, θῆρά τε ἄγριον ϗ τὸν ἐν ἑρπετοῖς βασιλίσκον. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. c. 16.

Kind and Family (ſo great is the Affinity and Cognation between them,) and they may fitly be called *Ophites* and *Satanians*: for as Satan reſembleth the Serpents (the literal Brute-ſerpents,) ſo the Serpents reſemble Satan, as he is *ὁ ἐχθρὸς, the Enemy*, *Abaddon* and *Apollyon* (the Deſtroyer) the Man-hater and the Man-ſlayer (*Joh.* 8. 44.) being alike crafty and ſubtil, alike virulent and poyſonous, alike inimical and deadly to Man. Our Saviour therefore repreſenteth them as *Satanians*, Luc. 10. 19. *Behold I give you power, to tread on Serpents and on Scorpions, and over all the power of the Enemy.* By Serpents and Scorpions our Saviour doth not mean (*s*) as ſome ancient Writers of the Church miſtake, *Devils* or fallen Angels; but plain literal Serpents and Scorpions: as in a parallel place, *Mark* 16. 18. our Saviour ſaith of thoſe that believe in him, theſe Signs or Miracles they ſhall be able to do. *They ſhall take up Serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it ſhall not hurt them*; which is the ſame thing that the Pſalmiſt had ſaid before: *Thou ſhalt tread upon the Lion and Adder, the young Lion and the Dragon ſhalt thou trample under Feet.* Theſe Promiſes were fulfill'd in S. *Paul*, who ſhook off the Viper that ſeiz'd upon his Hand, without being at all prejudic'd by it. Our Saviour according to his promiſe had given him power, to tread on literal Serpents and Scorpions without being hurt by them; and theſe literal Serpents and Scorpions our Saviour calleth *the power of the Enemy*: which Name ſignifieth, that they are of Satan's Hoſt or Army; as *the power of the Air* (of which Satan is the Prince) ſignifieth the Aerial Hoſt or Army. *The Serpents are the Power of the Enemy*; therefore they belong to that Power (as part of his Hoſt or Army) which hath the power of Death. This Name alſo importeth, that they are of his Kind and Quality, of the inimical, hurting, deadly kind; for they belong to Satan, as he is the hurting deadly Power; they ſymbolize with him therefore, and are of his inimical noxious Kind and Quality, and of his Kindred and Family. Agreeably whereto *Rabbi Bechai* (on *Gen.* 3. 14.) ſaith of the literal Brute-ſerpents, they are *Toledoth hannachaſh hakadmoni, the offspring of the old Serpent.*

Satan therefore is *the Serpent*, but ſo as to be the Rational, not the Brute-ſerpent: yet ſuch is the Cognation between theſe, the Brute Serpent is of Satan's Species, Kind and Family (not as he is the Rational Serpent, but) as he is the Serpent; and Satan is of the Brute Serpent's Species, Kind and Family (not as he is the Brute-ſerpent, but) as he is the Serpent. There are Serpents, that are Men-ſerpents, and theſe are alſo Rational Serpents: but Satan is the Serpent, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *in a ſenſe of Eminency* and the Chieftain of the Family. He is the Myſtical and Metaphorical Serpent (as he is uſually ſtyl'd,) which doth not hinder, but infer, his being of the Species, Kind and Family of the Brute-ſerpent, as he is a Serpent. That Species, Kind and Family *the Serpent* comprehendeth both Satan (who is *Species individua*) and the Brute-ſerpent; becauſe Satan is of that Species, Kind and Family. As this Name *the Wolf* is the Name of a Species, Kind and Family, which Satan is of as well as the brutal Wolf (for he is of the Kind and Family of the Wolf,) ſo is this Name *the Serpent.*

ARTICLE 7.

The Hiſtory of Paradiſe conſidereth the Serpent as a Species of Subtiliſt (the eminent Species) *ſpeaketh of him* ſpecificativè, *and as conſider'd in his larger Specific Comprehenſion, in which Senſe it attributeth to him the tempting and deceiving our Firſt Parents.*

I. THE firſt Branch of this Propoſition is plainly enough expreſs'd in the Hiſtory, *Gen.* 3. 1. *Now the Serpent was more ſubtil than any Beaſt of the Field, which the Lord God had made.* If *Moſes* had ſaid, The *Wolf* or the *Fox* was more ſubtil than any Beaſt of the Field, which the Lord God had made, every one would have underſtood him, to mean *that Species or kind of Subtiliſt* called the Wolf or the Fox: in like manner, by *the Serpent* he muſt be underſtood to mean, *that Species or kind of Subtiliſt called The Serpent.* Some think, that the Wolf tranſcendeth the Serpent in Subtility, whence *Ariſtotle* calleth the Wolves, (*t*) πανούργους καὶ κακούργους, *Crafty and Maleficent*; and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that ſeveral Brute-animals are more ingenious than the Serpent: but no Animal is ſo much of the Nature and Character of a wily inſiduous Subtiliſt as the Serpent; for the Wolf is rather of another Nature and Character, being more eminently a ravenous Devourer than a wily inſiduous Subtiliſt. The Moſaic Character of the Serpent ſheweth, under what Notion he is conſider'd in the Hiſtory, and ſo do the Operations that are aſcrib'd to him. *The Serpent beguiled me*, ſaith the Woman, *Gen.* 3. 13. The doom of the Serpent ſaith, *Thou ſhalt bruiſe his Heel*, (or bite him by the Heel,) which is an underly inſidious way of hurting, *Gen.* 3. 15. The Hiſtorian therefore conſidereth the Serpent, that Species or kind of Animal) under the Notion of an eminent Species of malign Subtiliſt, and when he deſcribeth the Serpent by his eximious Subtilty, it is as much, as if he had ſaid, *The Serpent is the eminent Species of malign Subtiliſt.* The Apoſtle hath the ſame Notion of the Serpent, when he ſaith, *as the Serpent beguiled* Eve *through his Subtilty*; for by the Serpent he meaneth that eminent Species of malign Subtiliſt. But this is alſo the Apoſtle's Senſe; *The Serpent as to Species, Kind and Family beguiled* Eve; and ſuch is alſo the Senſe of *Moſes*, *Gen.* 3. 1. *Now the Serpent was more ſubtil than any Beaſt of the Field, which the Lord God had made: and he ſaid unto the Woman.* For by the Serpent *Moſes* meaneth that eminent Subtiliſt (the Serpent,) and as he ſpeaketh of the Serpent *ſpecificativè*, when he deſcribeth his Subtilty, ſo he continueth to ſpeak of him *ſpecificativè*, when he ſaith of him, *And he ſaid unto the Woman*: for the Senſe is, *The Serpent as to Species, Kind and Family ſuch ſaid unto the Woman.* The Serpent as to Species, Kind and Family was the tempter and deceiver of the Woman; for if Satan beguiled her, it was the Serpent as to Species, Kind and Family that beguiled her; and if Satan *ſaid unto the Woman*, it was the Serpent as to Species, Kind and Family that ſpake unto her: which Interpretation of the Text of *Moſes* and of the Apoſtle is altogether unexceptionable, and rendreth the Hiſtory of Paradiſe ſo. But we may add, that both *Moſes* and the Apoſtle, ſpeaking of the Serpent do not only ſpeak

(s) Bochart. ſupr. par. 2. l. 4. c. 29.

Pſal. 91. 13.

Act. 28. 5.

(t) Hiſt. animal. l. 1. c. 1.

2 Cor. 11. 3.

ſpeak of him *ſpecificative*, but ſo as to conſider what he is *comprehenſive* in his larger ſpecific comprehenſion, or the larger comprehenſion of his Species, Kind and Family. So that their Senſe is; *The Serpent as being in his* (larger) *ſpecific comprehenſion* (the comprehenſion of his Species, Kind and Family) intelligent and diſcurſive, *ſaid unto the Woman, beguiled* Eve. To illuſtrate this Expoſition of the Hiſtory, let us ſuppoſe, that Satan is of kind and quality a Toad, and that the Moſaic Hiſtory runneth thus; *Now the Toad was more poyſonous than any Animal, which the Lord God had made; and he by his Doctrine impoyſon'd the Woman.* Every Expoſitor of ſuch an Hiſtory would at the firſt ſight imagine, that there is an Ellipſis in it, which is thus to be ſupply'd, *and he, as being in his* (larger) *ſpecific comprehenſion rational and diſcurſive, impoyſon'd the Woman by his Doctrine.* So that the Senſe is, *It was the Toad as to Species, Kind and Family, that by his Doctrine impoyſon'd the Woman.* If theſe things are rational and of agreeable apprehenſion, the Moſaic Hiſtory muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak of the Brute-ſerpent *ſpecificative* and *comprehenſive*, and to mean his Species, Kind and Family as a Serpent.

II. This Moſaic mode of expreſſing and repreſenting things in the Hiſtory of Paradiſe is plainly a demonſtration, that in the Letter of it, it aſcendeth to nothing higher than the Terreſtrial-animal kind of things. For Satan was undoubtedly the Tempter of our firſt Parents, and to them that ask *quo teſte, quo authore hoc dicitur?* the anſwer is eaſie, that we have the Authority of the Book of Wiſdom, *ch.* 2. 24. the Authority of the holy Apoſtles, 1 *Joh.* 3. 8. *Apoc.* 12. 9. and we have our Saviour's Authority for it, who denominateth Satan *the Man-ſlayer and Murderer from the beginning*, Joh. 8. 44. But although amongſt Chriſtians it is paſt doubt, that Satan was the Tempter of our firſt Parents, yet no expreſs mention is made of him in this Moſaic Hiſtory, throughout the Cortex of it there is no ſuch appearance of him, but a ſmooth Story is told us of the Serpent *that was more ſubtil than all the Beaſts of the Field, and that was curſed above all Cattle and above every Beaſt of the Field, and was doom'd to go upon his Belly and to eat Duſt all the Days of his Life.* (u) *Chriſtian Expoſitors ſay, that for this reaſon* Moſes *did not make expreſs mention of the Devil, becauſe in his Hiſtory of the Creation he had ſaid nothing of the Creation and Lapſe of Angels.* The Moſaic Creation is meerly Terreſtrial-animal; the Hiſtory of Paradiſe therefore (which is an Appendix thereto) in the expreſs Letter of it ought to be of the ſame Character. (*w*) Moſes *goeth on in his way; as before he made no mention of Spirits, ſo here he doth not call the Devil by his proper Name, but mentioneth only a Brute-animal.* To keep a decorum, and becauſe the Hiſtory of Paradiſe muſt be of one piece with the Terreſtrial-animal Creation, and muſt not (in the expreſs Letter of it) tranſcend the Terreſtrial-animal kind of things, therefore the Devil muſt not be mention'd in it by his Proper Name, but muſt be vail'd under the Name of the Serpent. This was one reaſon of the Moſaic mode of expreſſing and repreſenting things. Another reaſon of it was, *To complicate the Brute-ſerpent with Satan* as the Symbol with the thing ſignify'd agreeably to the method of the Old Teſtament. (*x*) *In ſerpentis figura Diabolus eſt; the Devil is vailed in the Figure of the Serpent.* (*y*) *A moſt apt Symbol, to expreſs his wilineſs, evil arts, envy and machination againſt us.* A third reaſon of this Moſaic mode of expreſſing and repreſenting things is, becauſe *Moſes* writeth Hiſtory, not Philoſophy, nor any other Theology than Hiſtory, the Hiſtory of Paradiſe; in the Tranſactions whereof there was no known appearance of a fallen Angel, nor could our firſt Parents underſtand any thing of fallen Angels, or that there was ſuch a Being as the Prince of Apoſtate Angels (the Moſaic Hiſtory of the Creation having ſaid nothing of theſe matters,) nor is it likely, that *Eve* would have entertain'd a familiar Diſcourſe with the Tempter, if ſhe had ſuppos'd him to be the Devil in our Notion. Beſides, it is manifeſt from the Hiſtory, that ſhe took him to be *the Serpent*, and conſequently ſhe ſuppos'd him, either to be meerly a Brute-ſerpent, or a Rational of the larger Species, Kind and Family of the Brute-ſerpent. The *Alexandrian Cyril* is of Opinion, that our Mother *Eve* (z) ὑπ' ἁπλότητος τὸ ἄγαν, *through an exceeding ſimplicity thought, that other Animals could ſpeak as well as Man with an Humane Voice*; and conſequently that ſhe ſuppos'd the Tempter, to be meerly a Brute-ſerpent. A late Divine (D. *Rivet*) ſaith; *Ignorantia hæc erat puræ negationis, & potuit eſſe in ſtatu innocentiæ, ſicut in pueris: This Ignorance was purely negative, and might be in the ſtate of Innocency as in Children.* This is a fair acknowledgment, that our firſt Parents in Paradiſe were in no higher condition than the ſtate of natural Innocency, and that the uſual magnificent Ideas of their Perfections are Extravagances. But on the other hand it ſeemeth as great an Extravagance, to ſuppoſe either of them ſo bruitiſhly ſilly and devoid of common reaſon, as to ſuppoſe a Rational, to be a meer Brute, and to confound a Rational and Irrational Animal. This therefore muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been their Idea of the Tempter, *A Rational of the Species, Kind and Family of the Brute-ſerpent as a Serpent*, which is the Moſaic Notion of him.

III. The Brute-ſerpent and Satan (the old Serpent) may be complicated in a twofold Senſe; for they may be complicated *notionally* and *ſymbolically*, as literal and myſtical, as the Symbol with the things ſignify'd; and they may be underſtood to be complicated *phyſically* and *organically*, like Soul and Body, as the Agent and the Inſtrument. So the generality of Jews and Chriſtians are of Opinion, that the Tempter of our firſt Parents was *Serpens à Diabolo agitatus, a Serpent acted by the Devil and us'd as an Organ to deceive.* Some indeed have been of Opinion, that there was no Devil in the caſe, but that a meer irrational Brute-ſerpent was the only Tempter of our firſt Parents. So *Joſephus* ſaith, *That in Paradiſe there was no diſcord amongſt Animals, a Serpent liv'd familiarly with* Adam *and* Eve, *and envying their Felicity perſwaded them to eat the forbidden Fruit.* *Joſephus* is not alone in this Opinion; for *Aben Ezra* (a Learned Rabbi) is not only of the ſame Opinion, but he diſputeth, that it was not the Devil, but a Brute-ſerpent only, that ſpake to *Eve* and deceiv'd her; for the Curſe (ſaith he) is not competible to the Devil, who is a Spirit. The Brute-ſerpent only was puniſh'd (with the curſe of going upon his Belly and eating Duſt,) therefore he was the only Tempter and Deceiver. But is it poſſible, that a meer Brute-ſerpent ſhould have the Faculty of Speech, which amongſt Animals is proper to Man only? (whence the Jews commonly call Man *Animal loquens*, the ſpeaking Animal.) Is it poſſible, that a meer Brute Animal ſhould ſpeak ſuch Language as *Eve* underſtood? Some have thought, that Birds and Beaſts have ſomething like Speech amongſt themſelves, ſignifying their Mind one to another; but they did not think (as Mr. *Mede* ſaith,) that they ſpake the Language of a Man: Nor hath any Animal below Man the faculty of underſtanding and reaſoning; for to be an intelligent rational Animal, is to be a Man. Now, the Serpent that tempted our firſt Parents, was intelligent and rational, and not only ſo, but a great Sophiſter and a cunning Reaſoner, an Artiſt at tempting and ſeducing, and therefore was not meerly an irrational Brute-ſerpent, but one that had a great deal of Wit and Knowledge. Some of the Jews will ſay, (a) that God at firſt endow'd the Serpent with Underſtanding, Reaſon and Speech; but in ſo ſaying they ſpeak a Contradiction: For it is a Contradiction to ſuppoſe, that a Brute-animal ſhould have Underſtanding and Speech, and yet remain a Brute-animal: And how is it poſſible, that a Brute-animal ſhould underſtand the Commandment, that God had given to our firſt Parents? The Serpent that tempted them, ſheweth a great malignity againſt God, accuſeth him of Lying and of Envy; therefore it was ſome great Rebel againſt God, that tempted our firſt Parents, and not a meer Brute Serpent, as a Party of the Jews conceive. Nor are they alone in theſe Conceits; for S. *Baſil* (in his Diſcourſe of Paradiſe) thinketh, that there was in Paradiſe *a Brute Serpent of erect ſtature, that had the faculty of Speech and Diſcourſe*; and if one Brute Serpent had the faculty of Speech, it was not reaſonable, that all his Fellow-Serpents and Fellow-Brutes ſhould be deprived of it. He is of Opinion therefore, that all Animals in Paradiſe could ſpeak and underſtand one another, and that the Serpent was depriv'd of theſe Faculties for his foul fact. But if the Serpent was depriv'd of Underſtanding and Speech for his foul fact, *Moſes* would have mention'd the loſs of them as a principal part of his Puniſhment; and the other Brute Animals that had theſe Faculties, yet had perpetrated no foul fact, would not have ſuſtain'd the loſs of them.

(u) *Addunt noſtri Interpretes hanc ob cauſam conſulto Moſem Diaboli nomen tacuiſſe, quia prius nihil de angelorum creatione & lapſu dixerat.* Pareus in Gen. 3. 1.

(w) *Antea ſpirituum nulla eſt habita mentio: hic quoque in ſuo perſeverans inſtituto Moſes, Diabolum non proprio appellat nomine, ſed tantum beſtiæ meminit.* P. Martyr. Com. in Gen. 3. 1.

(x) *S. Ambroſ. de Paradiſ.* c. 2.

(y) *Symbolum aptiſſimum ad ejus verſutiam, malas artes, invidiam & machinationem in nos exprimenda.* P. Martyr. ſupr.

(z) C. Jul. l. 3. p. 86, 91.

IV. As for the common Opinion, that Satan in tempting *Eve* made uſe of a Brute Serpent as his Inſtrument, and ſpake by his Organ, there is no hurt in it; but there are ſeveral reaſons againſt it, that may incline us to think it not true or probable: for the Hiſtory ſaith no ſuch thing, it repreſenteth the Temptation as manag'd only by one Serpent, not by two Serpents (the one a Brute-ſerpent the other a Diabolical Serpent,) nor by one Serpent compounded of two Serpents of different kinds, which is a Monſter (like a Theſſalick Centaure,) and this frightful Monſter is introduc'd without any neceſſity or ground in Scripture. The meer appearance of a Serpent is to us frightful; a ſpeaking diſcourſing Brute Serpent is more frightful; and ſuch a Serpent acted by the Devil is ſtill more frightful. We read in the *Roman* Hiſtory of an Ox and a Dog ſpeaking; but we do not read of any Dog or Ox that manag'd a ſet Diſcourſe arguing and making anſwer, as the Serpent in Paradiſe did. A ſpeaking diſcourſing Brute is neceſſarily a great Miracle, and ſo great a Miracle muſt neceſſarily have made a great impreſſion upon the Minds of our firſt Parents; whereas *Eve* entertain'd a Diſcourſe and Colloquy with the Tempter, as if there was nothing miraculous, nothing monſtrous, nothing frightful in the caſe. This Opinion alſo repreſenteth God as curſing the Brute-ſerpent meerly for being a paſſive Inſtrument in the Temptation (which is a grand Incongruity;) and (as in the *Lutherans* Conſubſtantiation) it unskilfully jumbleth together the Symbol and the thing ſignify'd; for the Brute Serpent is the Symbol and Satan the thing ſignify'd. *All theſe Objections* lie againſt a late Conjecture of ſome Learned Men, who ſuppoſe, that the Serpent which Satan us'd as his Inſtrument in the Temptation, was *a Saraph*, *a fiery flying Serpent*, and that he choſe to make uſe of this ſort of Serpent, that thereby he might reſemble one of the Illuſtrious Angels, and might be taken for one of the *Seraphims*. But this Conjecture is ſo far from eaſing us of our Difficulties, that it increaſeth them: for beſides that it is liable to the ſame Objections with the common Opinion, it is incumbred with ſeveral other inſuperable Difficulties. If *Moſes* ſaith, that Satan made uſe of a Serpent in tempting our firſt Parents, or that he tempted them in form of a Serpent, this cannot be his meaning, that he transform'd himſelf into an Angel of Light. He that was wholly ſilent touching illuſtrious Angels and never mention'd them, (covertly or expreſly,) when he deſcrib'd the Creation, muſt not be thought to ſpeak of them now, when he only ſpeaketh of *a Serpent*, of a Serpent which is commonly defin'd *Animal reptile*, and that is no where in Scripture the Symbol of an Illuſtrious Angel. Is this reſemblance of one of the Heavenly *Seraphims* and the moſt Illuſtrious Angels, congruouſly reckon'd *one of the Cattle and the Beaſts of the Field*? Is he ſo harmleſs an Animal, that *Eve* had no cauſe to be afraid of him? Is that Species of Serpents degraded from their Sublimity, and doom'd to creep upon the Belly, or are they not fiery flying Serpents unto this day? Is a fiery flying Serpent of eminent and extraordinary Subtilty? and is this Species of Serpents or one of this Species of Serpents, the Head of the Generation of Serpents, and may they congruouſly be called his Seed? The Serpent which *Moſes* ſpeaketh of, was naturally a creeping crawling Serpent (as will appear preſently.) In his Account there is nothing that riſeth higher than a Terreſtrial Animal Serpent, there is nothing that ſoundeth towards *Seraphims* and the moſt Illuſtrious Angels, with whom (probably) our firſt Parents in Paradiſe had little acquaintance, ſeeing they had no acquaintance at all with fallen Angels: Upon which account they could not look upon the Tempter as an Angel, or as a fallen Angel; nor could they look upon him as a Man (for they knew that none of that Species was created but themſelves;) they muſt neceſſarily therefore look upon him as of the Kind and Family of Animals inferiour to Man, yet ſo as to ſuppoſe him a ſuperiour Species to the Irrational and Brute Animals. It was Satan's Intereſt, that *Eve* ſhould have this Notion of him (for the ſucceſs of his Temptati-

(a) *V. Helvic proteuangel. paradiſ.*

on depended upon it;) therefore in making his appearance to her he could not fail, to repreſent himſelf as of the Kind and Family of ſome ſort of Animals, and rather of a Serpent than of any other, to ingender in her the greater Opinion of his ſagacity and diſcernment of things. And it is probable (as Mr. *Mede* thinketh,) that it was the Law of Spirits in their commerce with Men, to preſent themſelves under the ſhape of ſome ſuch viſible thing, as may more or leſs reſemble their Condition; and therefore Satan could not appear to *Eve* without ſome badge and cogniſance of a Serpent. Yet it is no more reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that in his appearance he aſſum'd the ugly frightful ſhape of a Brute Serpent, than that he animated ſuch a Serpent. It ſeemeth more probable, that he appear'd in a form and ſhape approaching to the Humane, yet not without certain Marks and Characters of a Serpent; that his appearance was agreeable to S. *Baſil's* Notion of the Serpent in Paradiſe. (b) *The Serpent then was not horrid and terrible, but mild and gentle: not of a frightful fluctuating motion and crawling on the Ground, but lofty and going erect upon his Feet.* But if the Serpents in the time of Man's Innocency were of the ſame frightful ſhape and motion, which now they are of (which none can reaſonably doubt of,) a ſpeaking, reaſoning, diſcurſive Brute-ſerpent real or ſeeming was not a leſs frightful Monſter than the Serpent deſcrib'd by *Maimonides: The Brute-ſerpent* (ſaith he) *which Satan rode upon, when he tempted* Eve, *was of the bigneſs of a Camel.* It is not reaſonable therefore, to ſuppoſe, that Satan when he tempted *Eve*, aſſum'd the form and ſhape of a Serpent; although there might be ſo much of a Serpent in his appearance, as might notice to her, that he was of the Kind and Family of the Serpent: which ſhe might underſtand alſo from her own ſad Experience, when ſhe found her ſelf inveigled and circumvented by him; and the Hiſtory doth not ſay, that before that time ſhe underſtood him to be the Serpent. Then, as our Notion of Satan is the Prince of the fallen Angels, ſo the Notion of him in Paradiſe was *The Prince of thoſe evil Animals the Serpents:* With great reaſon therefore in the Moſaic Hiſtory, (c) *Per Serpentem ſimul intelligitur Diabolus uno complexu, velut Bachai recte obſervavit: By the Serpent the Devil is underſtood together with the Serpent in one Comprehenſion* (or Complication) *as* R. Bachai *hath rightly obſerv'd*, from whence we ſhould not infer, that the Devil animated a Brute-ſerpent in tempting our firſt Parents (which is a rude and groundleſs Conceit:) but that the Brute-ſerpent, that Species or Kind of Animal, is compar'd with, and diſtinguiſh'd from, the other Species of Animals, and that the tempting our firſt Parents is peculiarly imputed to the Serpent in contradiſtinction to the other Species of the Animal World, becauſe it was the Brute-ſerpent, that as to his Species, Kind and Family (his larger Species, Kind and Family) was the Tempter and Murderer of our firſt Parents. So far and in ſuch ſenſe the Hiſtory imputeth the tempting and deceiving our firſt Parents to (that Species or kind of Animal) the Brute Serpent. *Now the Serpent was more ſubtil than any Beaſt of the Field, which the Lord God had made: and he ſaid unto the Woman*, Gen. 3. 1 *The Serpent beguiled me, and I did eat*, Gen. 3. 13. In his (larger) ſpecific comprehenſion he comprehendeth the Tempter and Murderer of our firſt Parents.

ARTICLE 8.

The Doom of the Serpent is of a threefold Aſpect, and muſt be conſider'd, as it relateth to the Brute-Serpent, as it relateth to the myſtical tempting Serpent, and as it relateth to Chriſt and Chriſtians.

THE Doom of the Serpent is thus related by *Moſes*, Gen. 3. 14, 15. *And the Lord God ſaid unto the Serpent, becauſe thou haſt done this, thou art curſed above all Cattle and above every Beaſt of the Field: upon thy Belly ſhalt thou go, and Duſt ſhalt thou eat all the days of thy Life. And I will put enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed: it ſhall bruiſe thy Head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his Heel.* This Curſe muſt be ſuppos'd, to be pronounc'd upon the Brute-ſerpent, who is here compar'd with the other Cattle and Beaſts of the Field, and is counted to be of that number. The Matter of the Curſe alſo in the Letter of it (to go upon the Belly and to eat Duſt) is competible only to the Brute-ſerpent. But becauſe it is pronounc'd upon the Tempting Serpent, therefore it relateth to Satan, whoſe Name is the Tempter. And the Serpent and his Seed is here oppos'd *to the Woman and her Seed*, which denoteth Mankind in general, but more eſpecially the Meſſiah, who is the Woman's Seed in a ſenſe of Eminency. The Doom of the Serpent therefore is *Protevangelium, the firſt Goſpel*, for which reaſon it is one of the moſt illuſtrious parts of the Bible. *Luther* ſaid of it, (d) *Continet quicquid tota Scriptura eximium habet. It containeth whatever is eximious in the Bible.* He ſpake with reſpect to Theology only, but we ſhall find in it ſomething of eximious natural Philoſophy.

(1.)

Of the Doom of the Serpent as it relateth to the Brute-Serpent.

I. The Doom of the Serpent as it relateth to the Brute-animal Serpent, involveth in it ſeveral Matters of doubt and queſtion, that are not of eaſie Reſolution. One of theſe Difficulties is touching the congruity of pronouncing the Doom or Curſe upon a Brute-ſerpent; μεγάλη ϗ σφοδρὰ ἡ ἀγανάκτησις, *great and vehement is the Indignation* (ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom*,) that is expreſs'd in the Doom of the Serpent: but who can believe, that God ſhould have a great Wrath and Indignation, a great Judicial Wrath and Indignation againſt a Brute-animal, that can commit no Sin or Crime? that God ſhould ſpeak to and condemn in Judgment a Brute that hath no Reaſon or Underſtanding? *becauſe thou haſt done this*, ſaith the Text; that is, becauſe thou haſt done a nefarious thing, and haſt been a great Malefactor. But how could a Brute-ſerpent be a great Criminal and Malefactor? If Satan tempted our firſt Parents in a Brute-ſerpent, or in the form of a Brute-ſerpent, yet the Brute-ſerpent had no will to ſin, nor any knowledge of the Evil which the Devil did, and therefore could not be a Criminal. To this Difficulty Mr. *Mede* anſwereth, that the Earth was curſed for *Adam's* ſake, the Brute-animals were deſtroy'd in the Deluge which was cauſed by the Wickedneſs of Man; that if a Man committeth Abomination

(b) Ου φρικ]ὸς ὁ ὄφις τότε, ἀλλὰ προσηνὴς ϗ ἥμερος· ἐχὶ φοβερὸν ἐπικυμαίνων, τῇ γῇ, ϗ ἐφέρπων. ἀλλ' ὑψηλὸς ἐπὶ ποδῶν βεβηκώς. De Paradiſ. p. 627.

(c) Helvic. proteuang. parad. n. 26.

(d) Arro-ſmith Tactic. ſacr. l. 1. c. 1.

Omnis pœna propter culpam.

Abomination with a Beaſt, the Beaſt is commanded to be ſlain, as well as the Man, who only had ſinn'd. *Bochart* addeth, that if an Ox gored a Man or Woman, that they died, the Ox muſt be ſtoned. (e) *Ita judex falſarium und cum calamo damnat, & ſicarium cum ſuo telo. So the Judge condemneth a Forger of Writings together with his Pen, and a Murtherer with his Weapon.* So Men becomingly ſhew their deteſtation againſt horrid Wickedneſs, and ſo God may becomingly ſhew his deteſtation againſt Sin and Wickedneſs, by defacing or deſtroying the Inſtruments of it, the places wherein it is committed, and the Brute-animals alſo in a πανωλεθρία, or an univerſal deſtruction of Mankind. But when God thus deſtroyeth Brute-animals, he doth not ſit in Judgment on them, Arraign them, Charge them with an heinous Crime and paſs Sentence on them; yet ſuch is his method of Procedure in this Doom of the Serpent, to which therefore there is no parallel Inſtance in Scripture. Nor is there any thing ſo like it in Hiſtory, as the Law of the *Athenians*; that if a Wall by chance ſhould have fallen down and kill'd a Man, then the Judges ſhould ſit, and formally Arraign that Wall and condemn it, and caſt the Stones of it out of the Country. But neither is this Athenian ſeverity againſt the Man-killing Stones a parallel Inſtance for this Doom of the Serpent, becauſe of its different end and iſſue. For the end of the Athenians Proceſs and Judicature againſt the Man-killing Stones, was only to ſhew their deteſtation of the Crime of Murder, and to deter Men from committing it; and accordingly it iſſu'd in throwing the Stones out of the Country. But the end of this Doom of the Serpent was, not meerly to ſhew the Divine deteſtation of a Crime, and to deter others from committing it, nor did it iſſue in the deſtruction and extinction of Serpents (which had been the greateſt demonſtration of Divine deteſtation againſt them:) but the iſſue of it was meerly the Settlement of Nature (of the Serpents Nature and Condition) *upon thy Belly ſhalt thou go, and Duſt ſhalt thou eat all the days of thy life.* It might be juſt for God, to abaſe a Brute-ſerpent, and make him vile for the Service of Man, and in Mercy to our firſt Parents, that they might be ever mindful of the foulneſs of their Guilt, to move them to Repentance, and as an Emblem to know the Condition of their deadly Enemy the Devil (as Mr. *Mede* argueth:) But ſtill the grand difficulty remaineth. For if the Devil tempted our firſt Parents in a Brute-ſerpent (or in the form of a Serpent,) and if this abuſed Serpent was only *inſtrumentum* ἀπροαίρετον, and had neither Will to Sin, nor Knowledge of what the Devil had done, with what congruity can the Crime be charg'd upon this abus'd Serpent? And with what Wiſdom and Juſtice can this meer paſſive Inſtrument be condemned as an heinous Criminal and Malefactor? If we ſay, that this was done with the ſame Juſtice and Congruity, as the Athenians accus'd, criminated and condemned the Man-killing Stones, we parallel Caſes that are not parallel. Nor is it poſſible, that this difficulty can be otherwiſe aſſoil'd, than by conſidering the Serpent in his Doom or Sentence, in the ſame Notion as we have conſider'd him in tempting our firſt Parents. *The Brute-ſerpent in his Doom (wherein he is criminated, condemned and curſed as an heinous Criminal and Malefactor) is conſider'd* Specificative *and* Comprehenſive, *in which notion and conſideration all things contain'd in his Doom are well and wiſely, juſtly and agreeably ſaid and done to him.* They are alſo congruouſly ſaid and done to him upon this account, becauſe the Brute-ſerpent in his Doom is conſider'd as Satan's Symbol, and is complicated with him in the Doom and Sentence. A Settlement is penally made for him juſtly, congruouſly and agreeably to the Paſſion of hatred; for according to *Ariſtotle* hatred is πρὸς τὰ γένη, *againſt* the whole kind of its Object. The Serpents Curſe therefore ought to extend to the whole kind (and conſequently to the Brute-ſerpent) as *Adam*'s Maledictions extend to all Mankind, according to that of S. *Jarchi* (f) *In omnibus maledictionibus primi hominis omnes ejus generationes conveniunt, in all the Maledictions of the firſt Man all his Generations agree.*

II. From hence we may reſolve another matter of doubt, which the Doom of the Serpent (as it relateth to the Brute-ſerpent) involveth, whether the Curſe was pronounced only upon one individual Serpent, or upon ſome one only Kind, or upon all Serpents in general? For ſeeing hatred is againſt the whole Kind, the Crime is imputed to the whole Kind, and the Curſe is denounced upon the Serpent as Satan's Symbol; therefore it is pronounc'd upon all Serpents in general, *that is, upon that whole Species or Kind of Animal according to the ordinary definitive Notion of a Serpent.* Mankind have an enmity, not only againſt one indivial Serpent, nor only againſt ſome one kind of Serpents, but againſt all Serpents in general the Serpentine kind of Animal; therefore all Kinds of Serpents are *the Seed of the Serpent*, and conſequently the Serpent upon whom the Curſe is denounc'd, comprehendeth all Kinds of Serpents. Satan is of the Species, Kind and Family of the Serpent in general, and the Serpent in general is of his Species, Kind and Family; and ſeeing the Curſe is pronounc'd upon the Serpent as that kind of Animal, it muſt be pronounced upon the Serpent in general. The Doom of the Serpent is the Serpent's Settlement, it ſettleth upon him the Nature and Condition of a Serpent in general (what he muſt be as the Serpent-kind of Animal,) the Serpents Lot and Portion in the Animal World, which belongeth to him and to his Kind and Family. He muſt be a curſed kind of Animal, of the moſt vile and abject and odious Condition, of the vileſt Poſture (without any nobleneſs of Stature,) and have the vileſt Food, and muſt be at enmity with the Woman and her Seed, and bite them by the Heels, and muſt be trodden on in the Head by them. And who ſeeth not, that this Doom or Sentence is exactly expreſſive of the Nature and Condition of the Serpent in general? If this Doom was pronounc'd upon the Swine, *thou art foul above all Cattel, and ſhalt wallow in the Mire:* Or if this Doom was pronounced upon the Toad, *thou art ugly above all Animals, and ſhalt have thy abode in foul Holes and Caverns, and ſhalt be hateful and hurtful to Men, and they ſhall be hateful and hurtful to thee*; every one would interpret ſuch a Doom or Sentence, to be meant of the Swine in general, and of the Toad in general; therefore the Serpents Doom muſt be underſtood, to be meant of the Serpent in general, that is commonly defin'd *Animal*

Lev. 20. Exod. 21. 28.

(e) De Animal. Par. 1. l. 1. c. 4.

(f) L'Emper. in Iſa. 53. p. 17.

nimal reptile, the crawling Animal. If the Doom was pronounced upon any one Brute-ſerpent in Paradiſe as a Serpent, it neceſſarily extendeth to all Serpents.

III. Another difficulty which this Doom of the Serpent (as it relateth to the Brute-ſerpent) involveth, is touching the effect of it, whether it made an alteration in the Nature, Gate and Poſture of the Serpent? S. *Baſil*, S. *Ephrem*, *Bar. Cephas*, and many others affirm, that the Serpent had Feet to go upon (and conſequently in his firſt Creation did not go crawling on the Ground,) and it is ſaid, that in the Iſle of *Paphos* a Serpent was ſeen with two Feet. But theſe things have no ſhew of probability. If the Serpents Body before his Doom or Sentence was of the ſame ſhape that now it is of, he could not go otherwiſe than upon the Belly. *Ariſtotle* argueth, that a Serpents Body is of ſo enormous a length, that neither two nor four Feet could be ſufficient for it, to go upon, and more it cannot have. From whence he concludeth, that a Serpent neceſſarily wanteth Feet, and conſequently is neceſſarily a crawling Animal. *Grotius* and ſome others are of Opinion, that the Serpent by his Doom loſt much of his briskneſs and agility, and became much more torpid, ſluggiſh and groveling. But as this is no probable Expoſition of the words of the Text, ſo this mutation in the Serpents Nature is not probable. For Serpents are ſtill an hugely agile Animal, and ſo full of briskneſs of Spirit and Motion, that (g) *Taautus*, the *Phenicians* and *Egyptians* for this reaſon thought them of a Divine Nature. They counted a Serpent πνευματικώτατον, *the moſt ſpirituous* of all creeping Animals, ϗ πυρῶδες, *and of a fiery Nature*, by reaſon of which ſpirituous and fiery Nature the Serpent hath τάχος ἀνυπέρϐλητον, *a ſuperlative ſwiftneſs* without Feet or Hands or any ſuch Organs. Some others (as Mr. *Mede*) are of Opinion, that the Serpent before his Doom did go upon his Belly or the lower part of his Body, but not upon his Breaſt; that he went with his Head and Breaſt ſomewhat raiſed, erect and advanced: But by the Curſe upon him he loſt this more elevated Poſture, and was doom'd to greater baſeneſs of Poſture, to go upon his Breaſt: For ſo they would have the words of the Text rendred, *upon thy Breaſt thou ſhalt go.* This Opinion implieth, that the *Baſiliſc* is exempted from the Serpents Doom; for he goeth with his Breaſt and fore-part of his Body advanced, (h) as *Pliny* and *Solinus* report. But ſeeing the Baſiliſc is the Chieftain amongſt Serpents, and is thought the moſt poiſonous of all other, it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that he of all other is exempted from the Doom of the Serpent. Beſides, we have ſhew'd, that the Curſe is pronounced upon all Serpents in general (that are Serpents in the ſtricter notion,) and therefore upon the *Baſiliſc*, whom *Nicander* calleth ἑρπετῶν βασιλῆα, *the King of the creeping Animals.* Particular Objections (of great force) lie againſt all theſe ſuppoſed Mutations in the Nature of the Serpent: But beſides theſe particular Objections there are good Arguments in general againſt any Mutation in the Nature of the Serpent by his Doom. For ſeeing God doth not take away Naturals from wicked Men and Devils, it is not to be ſuppoſed, that upon the account of Sin he took away Naturals from the Brute-ſerpent. The Doom upon *Adam* and *Eve* did not change or deſtroy Nature; therefore it muſt not be ſuppos'd, that the Doom upon the Brute-ſerpent did change or deſtroy Nature. The Doom upon *Adam* and *Eve* did not change or deſtroy Nature, but ſettle and eſtabliſh it. For Sorrow in Child-bearing is as natural as Child-bearing is; and Earth to Earth, Aſhes to Aſhes, Duſt to Duſt is a natural Analyſis. So the Serpents going upon the Belly, feeding on Duſt, enmity to Mankind and biting them by the Heel, is Nature and the Serpent's natural Condition, as the learn'd *Bochart* conceiveth. (i) *It ſeemeth not probable to me, that God for the Sin of Man made any change in the Nature of the Serpent. Only that which was of Nature afterwards became Puniſhment, as Nakedneſs in Man, and Child-birth in Woman.* This learned Writer hath made a right Judgment touching the Serpent: But it is much that he did not conſider what a difficulty his Notion involveth in it, and that he did not attempt to aſſoil it. For if the Serpent did always go upon his Belly, what ſignifieth the dooming him to it? And is it not inept, to impoſe that upon him as a Puniſhment, which he always had by Nature? This difficulty may be ſalv'd from what is before diſcours'd of *curſing the Ground.* For as the Ground was at firſt made with a meaſurable Sterility, yet with deſign that this Sterility ſhould be made a Puniſhment, and ſettled as Penal in caſe of Sin and Tranſgreſſion: So the Woman's pains of Child-bearing and Subjection to her Husband, the Serpents crawling and abject Poſture, theſe are Nature and natural Condition, yet were ſo made with Deſign, that they ſhould be made Puniſhments and ſettled as Penal in caſe of Sin and Tranſgreſſion. When the Moſaic Creation was finiſh'd, yet a great Settlement of things remained ſtill to be made, and a Penal Settlement of things muſt be made in caſe of Sin and Tranſgreſſion; and that which is the Nature and natural Condition of the Earth, of Man, Woman and the Serpent, was fit matter for ſuch a Penal Settlement, and was deſign'd to be matter of a Penal Law of Settlement; and conſequently thoſe ſame things that were their Nature and natural Condition, were fitly ſettled upon them in a Penal Law of Settlement, and they were fitly ſubjected to them by way of Settlement. To illuſtrate the caſe of the Serpent, let us ſuppoſe, that our Father *Adam* was made a *Therſites* (and conſequently that this was his Nature and natural Condition,) but with deſign, that in caſe of Tranſgreſſion he ſhould be ſubjected to all his Deformities by way of Penal Settlement (by a Settlement made when things were only beginning, but which was to be perpetual;) if afterwards upon his Tranſgreſſion ſuch a Settlement was made, there was nothing of ineptitude and incongruity in it. For by ſuch a Settlement his Deformities would become *Penal* and matter of Settlement perpetual and unalterable (which they were not before) and he would be ſubjected to them both by Natural and Legal Neceſſity. There are many Inſtances, wherein there is a concurrence of *Natural* and *Legal* Neceſſity; for Virtue is productive

---

Bochart. de animal. P. 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(g) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 1. *c. ult.*

(h) *Celſus & erectus à medio incedens, media corporis parte Serpit, mediâ arduus eſt & excelſus.* Bochart. de Anim. Par. 2. l. 3. c. 10.

(i) *Mihi non ſit veriſimile, propter peccatum hominis Deum in naturæ Serpentis quidquam mutaſſe. Tantum quod erat naturæ ceſſit in pœnam, ut in homine nuditas, in muliere partus.* De Animal. Par. 1. l. 1. c. 4.

productive of Health and long Life, and the Wages of Sin is Death both by Natural and Legal Neceſſity: So Mankind are ſubjected to Death both by Natural and Legal Neceſſity. If Mankind were ſubjected to innumerable Calamities during their Life-time, and at length to the pains of Death, meerly by natural Neceſſity, this would be extremely harſh and incongruous (*profectò grave jugum ſuper filios Adam, à die exitus de ventre matris eorum, nullo modo juſtum eſſet*, as S. *Auſtin* argueth;) they ought therefore to be ſubjected thereto with reſpect to Sin and Demerit, and by *Legal* as well as *Natural* Neceſſity. And there is the ſame reaſon for the Woman's incommodious Subjection in her married Condition and her many Sorrows of Gravidation; ſhe ought to be ſubjected to them with reſpect to Sin and Demerit, and by a concurrence both of Natural and Legal Neceſſity. If therefore the Serpent was duly reputed a grand Criminal, he ought to be ſubjected to his vile and abject Condition of Poſture, Gate and Food, not meerly by natural Neceſſity, (but agreeably to the method of Procedure with our firſt Parents) with reſpect to Sin and Demerit, and by a Legal Neceſſity conjunct with a Natural. And there is nothing of ineptitude and incongruity in thus ſubjecting him to his vile and abject Condition, but it was done with the greateſt reaſon and congruity, becauſe in his Doom and Sentence he was conſider'd *ſpecificativè* and *comprehenſivè*, as Satan's kind of Animal, as a Symbol of him and complicated with him. The Brute-ſerpent thus conſider'd ought to be ſubjected to his baſe and abject Condition by Law-ſettlement and Legal Neceſſity, as is plain to any underſtanding.

IV. Having thus ſeen and ſalv'd the difficulties that are involv'd in the Doom of the Serpent, we will take a view of ſome matters of Nature and natural Philoſophy that are in it (as it relateth to the Brute-ſerpent,) which are of eaſie and delightful Contemplation. (1.) One Branch of the Doom of the Serpent *is the bruſing his Head*, which is a conſiderable Theory of natural Philoſophy. For it hath been the general Opinion of Phyſicians and Philoſophers, that the Heart is the principal Seat of Life (as being the firſt thing that liveth and the laſt that dieth:) But *Moſes* is of another Opinion, that the principal ſeat of Life in Animals is not the Heart, but the Head. *It ſhall bruiſe thy Head*, ſaith *Moſes*. Whereby he meaneth, *it ſhall give thee the moſt deadly wound and mortal hurt, which is nothing leſs than deſtructive to the principal ſeat of Life*. Such I found the Head to be, by a little obſervation which I made, when I was young and converſant in Anatomy; for having diſſected a Frog, and taken out the Heart and Bowels of it, the Frog notwithſtanding leap'd up and down vivaciouſly upon the Graſs for a conſiderable time, till I ſet my Foot upon the Head and cruſh'd it, and then the Frog immediately expir'd. Hence I made obſervation, that the principal ſeat of Life is (not in the Heart, but) in the Head of every Animal; which is matter of common obſervation touching the Serpent.
(k) Bochart. ſupr. (*k*) *Caput in Serpente longè potiſſima pars, in a Serpent the Head is by far the moſt principal part.* Therefore his principal care is to guard and ſecure his Head; and the Spider's way of killing the Serpent is, to bite him in the Head and then he dieth. But if his Head be unhurt, he will live, although very little of his Body be left him. Ἡ πᾶσα ζωὴ, *all his Life is in his Head*, ſaith *Epiphanius*. This *Epaminondas* repreſented to the *Thebans*, when he exhorted them to ſet upon a Band of the *Lacedæmonians*; he ſhew'd them the Head of a vaſt great Snake that he had cruſh'd; behold (ſaid he) the Body can do no hurt, now the Head is gone. Whereby he meant, that the *Lacedæmonians* were the Head of the Confederates, and if they were cruſh'd, the reſt could ſignifie nothing. (2.) Another Branch of the Doom of the Serpent is his feeding on Duſt. *Duſt ſhalt thou eat all the days of thy life.* Which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if the Serpents ate nothing but Duſt; for they eat Fleſh and Herbs, and are reckon'd amongſt the παμφάγα, that eat all ſorts of things. *Ariſtotle* ſaith, they are the moſt dainty in their Food of all Animals. But as dainty as they are, Duſt is aſſign'd them for their Food, and a ſort of Serpent in *India* is ſaid to feed upon Duſt only. The Water Serpent alſo when Water faileth him, eateth the Earth or Ground, and Serpents in general ſeeing they crawl on the Ground muſt neceſſarily eat much of Duſt with their Food. Duſt therefore is the celebrated Food of the Serpent. *Duſt ſhall be the Serpents meat.* Iſa. 65. 25. *They ſhall lick the duſt like a Serpent.* Mic. 7. 17. In
the Prophet to bow down to the Church *and* Iſa. 49. 23.
lick up the Duſt of her Feet, denoteth extreme Pſal. 102.
Demiſſion and Self-abaſement (for can we go 9. and 72.
lower than to the Duſt?) So the Pſalmiſt ex- 9.
preſſeth his own abject Condition *by eating Aſhes*, and the abject Condition to which the King's Enemies ſhall be reduc'd *by their licking the Duſt*. Duſt is the vileſt of Food, and the eating of it denoteth the extreme baſeneſs and abjectneſs of the Serpent's Condition: But this extreme baſeneſs of Condition is his natural Condition; for ſeveral other Animals naturally feed on Duſt, as Worms, the Moles, the hungry Wolves; and the Scorpions are ſaid to feed on Earth, and this according to Nature and natural Condition. (3.) Another Branch of the Serpent's Doom is his inſidious way of hurting Men, *the biting them by the Heel. It ſhall bruiſe thy Head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his Heel.* The Serpent's proper way of hurting is not to combat with a Man, nor to ſet upon him like a Lion or a Bear to devour him: But it is an underly inſidious way, biting Men and Horſes by the Heel. Gen. 49. 17. *Dan ſhall be a Serpent by the way, an Adder in the path, that biteth the Horſeheels, ſo that his rider ſhall fall backward.* None can reaſonably doubt, that this is the Serpent's Nature and natural Condition: But if you bruiſe the Serpent's Head, and he biteth you by the Heel, this is more apparently his Nature and natural Condition; for it is natural for any Animal, to turn again, when he is trodden on. If therefore you tread on the Serpent, it is natural for the Serpent to bite you by the Heel, and to pour his Venom on that part of your Body that hurteth him. Which plainly demonſtrateth, that this Doom of the Serpent is a Settlement of his Nature and natural Condition. (4.) A fourth Branch of the Doom of the Serpent is the Enmity between the Serpent and Mankind. *I will put* (by way of Settlement) *Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed.* Several of the ancient Writers of the Church are of Opinion, that there was no Enmity or Antipa-

thy between the Creatures before the Sin of Man, and that no venenate Animals were ſo made from the beginning, but whatever is poiſonous in Nature, is adventitious through the Sin of Man. But they might as well ſay, that no poiſonous Plants or Minerals were from the beginning, as no poiſonous Animals. And if there was no Enmity or Antipathy between the Creatures before the Sin of Man, there muſt be (before that time) no ſuch Animals as Wolves and Sheep, the Lion and the Leopard, the Dolphin and the Crocodile, the Horſe and the Bear, between whom there is a deadly Enmity and Antipathy, and the Locuſt will die at the ſight of the Polypus. Of the ſame Nature is that innate Antipathy, that is between Serpents and Mankind; which is another plain demonſtration, that the Doom of the Serpent did not make any mutation in his Nature, but was a Settlement of his Nature and natural Condition. It may be objected, that antecedently to the Sin of our firſt Parents there could be no innate Enmity or Antipathy between the Serpent and Mankind, becauſe the tempting Serpent found an eaſie acceſs unto *Eve*, and had a familiar Diſcourſe with her without any appearance of Horrour or Antipathy. Which is indeed a good Argument againſt the common Opinion, that Satan tempted our firſt Parents in the Organ of a Brute-ſerpent, or in the Form of ſuch a Serpent: But we (that have another Notion of things) may make anſwer, that the tempting Serpent was not of ſo groſly a frightful and Serpentine an appearance, as to excite Horrour and Antipathy in our Mother *Eve*, at moſt not in any great degree, whence he had ſo eaſie an acceſs to her and a familiar Diſcourſe with her.

(2.)

Of the Doom of the Serpent as it relateth to Satan.

The Doom being denounc'd upon the Serpent in general Satan is neceſſarily involv'd in it. In the whole of it therefore the literal is a Symbol of the Myſtical Serpent. It is literally expreſſive of the Brute-ſerpents Nature and Condition, that in this Glaſs we might contemplate the Nature and State, the Deſigns and Intereſt, the Practices and the Fate of the old Serpent. S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith (l) *that we might always have before our Eyes Memorials of his Puniſhment.* But his Puniſhment is not any thing like the putting to Death a Malefactor: His Penalty (agreeably to the Doom of the Brute-ſerpent) is only a Settlement of his Nature and Condition. For the Summary of it is *his being a Serpent criminally, and his being made a Serpent penally.* As if a Judge ſhould ſay to *a Man-ſwine*, thou art a Swine (criminally,) I will make a Swine of thee (penally,) thou ſhalt be of the baſe and odious Nature and Condition, and have the Uſage, the Lot and Portion that belongeth to a Swine. So this divine Doom muſt be underſtood, to ſay touching the tempting Serpent; *Thou art a Serpent in reſpect of the criminal Nature and maleficent Practice of a Serpent, I will penally make a Serpent of thee*, thy Allotment and Settlement ſhall be the baſe and infamous Nature and Condition of a Serpent. Theſe things cohere with great congruity; if Satan hath criminally play'd the Serpent, it is hugely reaſonable and agreeable, that the infamous Nature and Condition of a Serpent ſhould be ſettled upon him, and that in the Doom of the Serpent he ſhould be complicated with the Brute-ſerpent. (m) *Vide igitur quàm optimè Serpentis conditiones Diaboli naturam & pœnam exprimant, ſee therefore how mighty well the Conditions of a Serpent expreſs the Nature and Puniſhment of the Devil.* For, (1.) In the firſt Branch of his Doom the literal Serpent (that wily inſidious and malign Subtiliſt) is a Symbol of him as *criminally the Serpent*, acting the part of *the old Serpent that deceiveth the whole world.* Apoc. 12. 9. *The Lord God ſaid unto the Serpent, becauſe thou haſt done this.* (n) *In his verbis Tentator deſcribitur, the Crime of the Serpent was tempting others to Sin.* Which is ſinning at the Devil's rate of ſinning, who is (as *Tertullian* calleth him) *totius Erroris Artifex, the wily Artificer of all Sin.* (2.) In the ſecond Branch of his Doom the literal Serpent is a Symbol of him as *penally Curſed.* Bleſſing implieth Favour and Kindneſs, Curſing implieth abominating and deteſting. Bleſſing implieth enjoying good, and Curſing implieth blaſting one's Condition, the deprivation of good and poſitive evil. So the literal Serpent is a curſed kind of Animal (*curſed above all Cattel and every Beaſt of the Field* as being odious and to be had in deteſtation; and he is depriv'd of thoſe goods and dignities and conveniences of Life, which other Animals enjoy. And the myſtical Serpent is the foul execrable Fiend, the worſt and moſt accurſed of all Creatures; *curſed*, as being utterly to be hated, abominated and had in higheſt deteſtation; and as being of blaſted Condition, depriv'd of all true worth and comfort, and of the moſt baſe and wretched Condition (notwithſtanding his Domination and Power;) for to be the vileſt of *the Beaſts of the Field*, is to be of better Rank, Quality and Condition, than to be a Devil. But it is worth our Obſervation by the way (although impertinent to the Expoſition of the Moſaic Text,) that as there is a literal and myſtical Serpent, ſo there are the literal and the myſtical *Beaſts of the Field.* For the unclean Spirits (of whom Satan is Chieftain) are repreſented by our Saviour as a ſort of Beaſts of the Field. *Matth.* 12. 45. *When the unclean Spirit is gone out of a Man, he walketh through dry places.* Evil Spirits have their Name in Hebrew שרים probably from שרה *a Field*, becauſe they have their Haunts and Habitations in Fields and Deſarts, in Solitudes and deſolate Places. They are *the Satyrs that dance there, and there cry to their Fellows.* So *Babylon* when it is deſolated and ruin'd, becometh *the Habitation of Devils and the Hold of every foul Spirit.* (3.) In the third Branch of his Doom the literal Serpent is a Symbol of the myſtical in reſpect of his abject and groveling gate and poſture and the vileneſs of his Food. His groveling and crawling on the Earth repreſenteth Satan, who ſince his Fall is become a groveling crawling Serpent (a Serpent groveling and crawling on the Ground as it were) being meerly circumterraneous. For the evil Demons may be called (as the Chalday Oracles ſpeak) θῆρες χθονὸς, *the ferine Beaſts of the Earth. Origen* ſaith of them (o) τῆς καθαρωτέρας οὐ δύνανται ἐφάψασθαι χώρας καὶ θειοτέρας, *they cannot reach any purer and diviner Region.* And *Porphyry* deſcribeth them as (*p*) νέμοντες τὸν περίγειον τόπον, *poſſeſſing the circumterraneous place.* (*q*) *The Devil was by God created Upright, but abode not in the Truth, and therefore was caſt down into theſe loweſt places, and the dirt of Souls. Very agreeably therefore as a Serpent he creepeth by the Ground in his depreſſed Condition.* His low and depreſſed Condition is ſymbolically ſignified by the Brute-Serpents *going upon the Belly and eating Duſt* according to that of the Pſalmiſt; *our Soul is bowed down to the Duſt, our Belly cleaveth unto the Earth.* The Brute-ſerpent's *eating Duſt* (which uſually in Scripture denoteth humiliation and abaſement) may be interpreted, to ſignifie one Branch of his abaſement, as the *going upon the Belly* may ſignifie another. Which yet can ſcarce be called another, becauſe his going upon the Belly involveth and includeth his eating Duſt. The intent therefore of theſe two Phraſes (going upon the Belly and eating Duſt) may reaſonably be ſuppos'd to be the very ſame; both appear, to be deſign'd, to ſignifie only this one thing, *that the Brute-ſerpent ſhall be of abject groveling Condition.* And ſeeing there is ſuch a Coincidence between them, the latter of them (the eating Duſt) needeth not any diſtinct application to the myſtical Serpent. But it is capable of a commodious diſtinct application; for the Brute-ſerpent's eating Duſt importeth, that he is moſt vilely terrene and ſordid in his Food; and conſequently it may ſignifie, *that the myſtical Serpent ſhall be nothing better than moſt vilely terrene, baſe and ſordid in his Food, Solace and Enjoyments.* So the evil Demons (as well as the Brute-ſerpents) *terrenis paſcuntur ſordibus*, and if the ancient Theologers (Chriſtian, Judaical and ſome Pagan) do not miſtake (*r*) they are fed by the Steams of Blood, the Nidours and Fumes of the Sacrifices, τῇ μυσαρᾷ ϗ ἀκαθάρτῳ ὕλῃ, *by filthy and impure Matter*, Food as vile as the Terreſtrial Duſt of the Brute-ſerpent. The Jews ſuppoſe, that the old Serpent eateth proper literal Duſt. (*s*) For when they cut off the Fore-skin of a Child, they throw it into a Veſſel filled with Duſt (that ſtandeth hard by,) and this they do, to ſignifie, that they give it for Meat to the old Serpent, *for his Food is the Duſt of the Earth, as it is written, Duſt ſhall be the Serpent's Meat.* (4.) In the *fourth* Branch of his Doom, namely, *in reſpect of the mutual hatred and enmity between the Woman and her Seed* (as that ſignifieth Mankind) *and the Serpent and his Seed*, the literal Serpent is a Symbol and Repreſentative of the myſtical Serpent. *I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed.* (*t*) *There is an inbred malevolence and activity of hurting in thoſe evil Spirits. They rejoice at our Evils and if they can put a Cheat upon us, it is as their Food and their Feaſt.* (*u*) *All or almoſt all Men have an Horrour at the Name of Devils.* In Mankind naturally there is a fear and hatred of the Devil, (which is many ways prejudicial to the Intereſts of his Kingdom,) Nature is averſe from being reconcil'd to Satan, from eſpouſing his Intereſt, adhering to his Party, affecting his Service as ſuch, and from entertaining his known Temptations. What they hate and deteſt uſually they call the Devil, and pour all their Execrations upon it. Although they are commonly miſtaken in their application of the Name, yet from thoſe miſtakes this appeareth, to be their Senſe, that the Devil is to be had in greateſt Deteſtation and Execration, which inſtinct of Nature and general ſenſe of Mankind holy Men improve into an Enmity againſt Sin and Wickedneſs, which is that which the Devil is as his kind of thing, and which maketh him to be a Devil. (5.) In the *fifth* Branch of the Serpents Doom the literal Serpent is a Symbol of the myſtical in reſpect of the Antitheſis between *Head* and *Heel*, the Head of the Serpent and the Heel of the Woman's Seed. *It ſhall bruiſe thy Head and thou ſhalt bruiſe his Heel.* The myſtical Serpents way of hurting is like the Brute-ſerpents, *a biting by the Heel*, which is an underly guileful inſidious way. And as biting by the Heel, ſo to come behind one, and to *take him by the Heel*, is a deceitful and guileful way; (*w*) whence in the Hebrew Tongue to take one by the Heel, is to ſupplant and undermine him. *Gen.* 27. 36. *Eſau ſaith, is he not rightly named Jacob? for he hath ſupplanted me theſe two times. Jacob* had his Name from taking his Brother by the Heel, as he came out of the Womb. But becauſe to come behind one, to take him by the Heel, is the ſame thing, as to ſupplant him, therefore *Eſau* ſaith, *is he not rightly named* Jacob (that is, one that taketh by the Heel) *for he hath ſupplanted me theſe two times.* So the method of the old Sophiſter is a doing miſchief to Mankind deceitfully and inſidiouſly in a way of ſupplanting and undermining, ὑποσκελίζων, *tripping up their Heels* as it were. On the contrary Mankind (ſome of Mankind) ſhall *bruiſe his Head for him*, which will be beſt underſtood by conſidering the Doom of the Serpent under another Notion.

(l) Ἵνα διηνεκῶς πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχωμεν ὁρᾶν τῆς τιμωρίας αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπομνήματα. *In Gen. p.* 113.

(m) *P. Martyr. in Gen.* 3. 14.

(n) *S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l.* 11. *c.* 36.

Grot. Not. in Joh. 8. 44. *hath this conceit. Qui Adamum deceperat, non fuit ipſe ὁ ἄρχων, ſed aliquis ab eo ſubmiſſus, Angelus Satanæ.*

Iſa. 13. 21. *and* 34. 14. *Apoc.* 18. 2.

(o) *C. Cel. l.* 3. *p.* 132.

(3.)

Of the Doom of the Serpent as it relateth to Chriſt and Chriſtians.

The Doom of the Serpent is an illuſtrious Prophecy of the Meſſiah. A Prophecy it is without all Controverſie; and it appeareth not to be any thing more than a Prophecy or Prophetic Commination; (*x*) for it hath not the Nature of a Promiſe. It is not a Tranſaction between God and our firſt Parents, but this whole Tranſaction is between God and the Serpent, who is threatned with a deadly vanquiſhment by the Woman's Seed. But the Seed of the Woman is only predicted (ſo far promis'd,) and the vanquiſhment of the Serpent is not promis'd to our firſt Parents, but only predicted and threatned. The ſame words may be both a threatning and a promiſe: But if this Doom of the Serpent had been a Promiſe, this Promiſe muſt have been made to our firſt Parents (as the Promiſe,) and muſt have been a giving them right to the benefit promis'd. Whereas the words appear not to have been at all directed to them, nor to have convey'd to them any Right or Claim: But they ſeem to have been ſpoken in their hearing, and it was requiſite, they ſhould be ſo, as being

(p) *De Abſtin.* p. 83.

(q) *Diabolus fuit rectus à Deo conditus, ſed in veritate non ſtetit, unde uſque ad hæc infima dejectus eſt & loca & animarum ſordes. ——— bene ergo per terram ut Serpens repit dejectus.* P. Mart. Com. in Gen. 3. 14.

Pſal. 44. 25.

(r) Petav. l. 3. de Angel. l. 3. c. 1.

(s) Buxtorf. Synag. c. 2.

(t) *Eſt inſita malevolentia quædam & facultas nocendi iſtis malis Spiritibus: Guadent de malo hominum, & de fallacia noſtra, ſi nos fefellerint, paſcuntur.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 96.

(u) *Omnes vel penè omnes dæmonum nomen exhorrent.* Idem de C. D. l. 8. c. 14.

(w) *Mr. Mede on Gen.* 3. 13, 14, 15.

(x) *V. Dr. Bur t . Argument for Infants Bapt.* p. 102, &c.

being a Prophecy of nothing leſs than Man's Redemption by the Woman's Seed, conſider'd as ſuch.

(1.) The Prophecy importeth, that wicked Men and Angels are the Seed of the old Serpent, (y) S. Cyr. com. in Joh. 8. 41, 44. his Progeny and reſembling Off-ſpring, (*y*) who is ἁπάσης πονηρίας ἀρχὴ, *the beginning of all Wickedneſs*; for as *Jubal is the Father of them that handle the Harp and Organ*, becauſe he was the firſt Inventor of thoſe Inſtruments, others that have the art of uſing them are originated from him, are his kind and party of Men: ſo the Devil is the Father of all Impietiſts, becauſe he was the firſt Inventor of the ſinning trade, all other Practitioners of it have it from him, and are of his Kind and Party, his Family and Cognation. Matt. 13. 38. Act. 13. 10. 1 Joh. 3. 10, 12. Joh. 8. 44. All wicked ones are from the grand wicked one originally, and they are of his Kind and Quality, his Genius and Foot-mark, they ſymbolize with him, and he is the Father of their Diſpoſition and Practice, and therefore they are his Children. So *Cain* was of that wicked one (originally and of kind and quality,) and the Jews were of their Father the Devil. They are Diaboliſts therefore, but in various degrees; for ſome of them (as like loveth like) proceed to ſuch height of Wickedneſs, that they depoſit their native Enmity againſt the Devil, they like and love him, will be on his ſide, plead his Cauſe, deſire to be of his Society and affect his Converſe. So the *Euchites* are ſaid, to have eradicated out of their Souls τὰ πάτεικὰ σύμβολα, *all Principles of Moral Goodneſs*, that they might have full converſe with the Devil, and might propheſie. There are no greater Diaboliſts than theſe ſave only the impure Demons, every one of which, (z) S. Cyr. ſupr. (*z*) ὡς διαβόλου τέκνον σατανᾶς καλεῖται, *as being a Son of the Devil is called Satan*, according to that of our Saviour, *If Satan caſt out Satan*.

(2.) The Prophecy importeth, that Chriſt and Chriſtians (all the Faithful) are the Woman's Seed, which is confronted and oppos'd to the Seed of the Serpent. *Maimonides* obſerveth, (a) Mor. Nev. par. 2. c. 30. (*a*) a marvellous confronting and conjoyning of things in this Doom of the Serpent, *wherein the Serpent is joyn'd with* Eve, *that is, his Seed with her Seed, Head and Heel; that ſhe vanquiſheth him in the Head, and he vanquiſheth her in the Heel.* It is marvellous indeed, that in this Conteſt between the two oppoſite Parties the hurting the Head and the victorious Powers and Puiſſance is on the Woman's ſide; and the oppoſite Party can be but inſidious and underly miſchievous, which is the Serpent's way of hurting. But the moſt marvellous thing in the Prophecy is, that the Seed of the Woman is only mention'd in it, and not the Seed of Man. This *Maimonides* taketh notice of, but putteth it off in this manner; *It is not to be doubted, but that the Seed of* Eve *is the Seed of* Adam. But he ought to have conſider'd, that there muſt be ſome myſterious reaſon for this ſtrange unuſual Appellation of Mankind, *not the Seed of Man, but the Seed of the Woman; and that it is deſign'd, to ſignifie, that there is the Seed of the Woman in ſtrict and proper acceptation* (which is ſo the Seed of the Woman, as not to be the Seed of Man) *as well as in a large and common acceptation.* And he ought to have conſider'd, whoſe Name or Denomination this is, *the Seed of the Woman*. For when the Prophecy ſaith, *It ſhall bruiſe thy Head*, the Relative It referreth to the Woman's Seed beforegoing; and conſequently the meaning of the Prophecy muſt be underſtood by conſidering, whoſe Name or Denomination this is, *the Woman's Seed*. And every one muſt grant, that it is eſpecially, eminently and peculiarly his Name or Denomination, who is meerly and purely the Seed of the Woman (in ſtrict and proper acceptation ſuch) ſo as not to be the Seed of Man. It denoteth therefore in a ſenſe of Eminence the Chriſtian Meſſiah; and ſeeing in the Prophecy the Seed of the Woman is the confronted oppoſite to the Head of the Serpent, the bruiſing whereof muſt ſignifie ſome great Atchievement: This inferreth, that the Seed of the Woman denoteth ſome great and eminent Perſonage deſtructive to the Serpentine Family, but of a ſaving nature to Mankind, and conſequently it denoteth the Chriſtian Meſſiah. It is his Name in *the ſenſe of Eminence*, but in the meer *literal* ſenſe it ſignifieth all Mankind, and in the *myſtical* ſenſe it ſignifieth the Seed of the true Church (that myſtical Woman) which Satan warreth againſt, *Apoc.* 12. 17. Although there are ſome, who will not allow, (*b*) that any other Woman is meant in the Prophecy ſave only our Mother *Eve*, (b) Arrowſmith Tact. Sacr. l. 1. c. 2. nor will they allow our Mother *Eve*, to be a Type of the Church, but they ſuppoſe, that by the Seed of the Woman is meant all the Faithful (taken collectively,) and that all the Faithful are the Seed of *Eve*, which is a moſt unskilful mode of Interpretation, a jumbling together the literal and the myſtical ſenſe; for that *Adam* was a Type of Chriſt, and *Eve* a Type of the Church, the Apoſtle teacheth expreſly. Rom. 5. 14. Eph. 5. 31, 32. Agreeably whereto *Grotius* judiciouſly interpreteth the Prophecy; *Allegoricè mulier eſt Eccleſia, & illius ſemen qui ad Eccleſiam pertinent*, Gal. 4. 26. *The Woman allegorically is the Church, and her Seed is thoſe that belong to the Church.* The Seed of the Woman is oppos'd to the Seed of the Serpent, which muſt be taken collectively (to ſignifie Wicked Men and Angels;) therefore the Seed of the Woman muſt be taken collectively, to ſignifie all the Faithful: yet not ſo as to ſignifie Chriſt Myſtical or Chriſt and his Members (as Mr. *Mede* will have it;) for Chriſt is not the Seed of the Church, but her Lord, Head and Husband. The Seed of the Woman ſignifieth in a threefold ſenſe: *in the meer literal ſenſe, in the literal ſenſe which is the ſenſe of Eminence, and in the myſtical ſenſe.*

(3.) The Prophecy importeth, that the Univerſe of Rationals is in the ſtate of War; as appeareth from the mortal feud, that (by Divine Appointment) is commenc'd between the Woman and her Seed on the one ſide, and the Satanical Brood of Men and Angels (the Serpentine kind) on the other ſide; and from bruiſing the Head and Heel by the oppoſite Parties. Theſe are hoſtile and inimical at the rate of an inbred deadly Enmity and Antipathy, according to that Saying of *Luther*, Cain *will kill* Abel *to the World's end*. (*c*) *Abel* (the righteous *Abel* and a Shepherd) (c) S. Cyr. com. in Joan. p. 552. was a Type and forerunner of Chriſt (the juſt one and the great Shepherd,) againſt whom the old Serpent with his inviſible Accomplices are deadly inimical and every way inimical. His Nature is, to hate Holineſs, and to love that which is Evil; he is as eager to deſtroy Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, as Chriſt is, to promote it; and to promote the abounding of Sin and Wickedneſs, as Chriſt is to deſtroy it. His Evil Nature and Inclination and the Intereſt of his Kingdom ingageth him in a continual War and Hoſtility againſt God and Chriſt, the Sanctity and Salvation of Souls. And in like manner his viſible Partiſans the World of the Ungodly (who are more or leſs a Satanical Brood are inimical to Chriſt and the myſtical Woman's Seed; for the World hateth them *quâ mundus*, *as it is the World* (the Syſtem of the Mundane and Carnal kind of People, of the Mundane and Carnal kind of Religioniſts, the Aliens from God and true Piety,) they are hated by the World becauſe repugnant to the Spirit of the World; for the City of God (d) *mundi hujus dilectoribus odioſa eſt*, *is odious to the World's admirers and lovers.* Nor is the City of God wanting in due and virtuous returns of Hatred and Enmity; for they have not only a natural, but a divine kind of Enmity againſt Satan, his Intereſt and Works; they are liſted Souldiers to fight againſt him, his Temptations and his Kingdom to the Death. Their great Maſter warneth them of the danger, that they are in by this ſubdolous malicious Enemy, chargeth them, *to reſiſt him*, *not to give place to him*, *to ſtand againſt his Wiles*, to be vigilant and careful, to manage an offenſive and defenſive War againſt him; to do their utmoſt againſt his Intereſt, and promiſeth them a Crown, if they be faithful and victorious in their Chriſtian Warfare: Conſider'd as under Chriſt (who is their Prince and General) they conſtitute an Army and Kingdom, which ſtands oppos'd to another Army and Kingdom (of wicked Men and Angels) of which Satan is the Prince and General. So that the Univerſe ſtandeth divided into two oppoſite Kingdoms and Armies, between which there is the moſt irreconcileable Feud imaginable and the moſt deadly War.

(4.) The Prophecy importeth, that Satan *is and hath an Head*, which muſt be cruſh'd, as a bloody Jewiſh Rabbi would have the Gentiles treated: (e)*Optimus qui inter gentes eſt dignus eſt, ut caput illi conteratur tanquam ſerpenti*; *the beſt Man amongſt the Gentiles is worthy to have his Head bruis'd as a Serpent.* The old Serpent is an Head (the Head of an Empire,) and hath an Head, which is his Headſhip or Sovereignty (for the Head of a Serpent is the principal part;) and in this principal part he muſt have a deadly hurt, which denoteth the deſpoiling him of his Headſhip and Sovereignty (in part, and by degrees totally) which ſometimes extended almoſt over the whole World. But this his Mundane Empire muſt fall by the Hands of *the Woman's Seed in the ſenſe of Eminence*; whoſe deſign in coming into the World was againſt Satan, his Sovereignty and Kingdom in the World, and to ſet up a Kingdom oppoſite unto Satan's, *that the Prince of this World might be caſt out of his Rule*, *that Satan like Lightning might fall from Heaven* (from his high Rule and Empire over Mankind,) *that Mankind might be delivered from the power of Darkneſs and tranſlated into his Kingdom*; *to ſpoil Principalities and Powers and the ſtrong Man's Houſe*, *to deſtroy him that had the Power of Death and the Works of the Devil*, the principal of which was the ſetting up his Sovereignty and Kingdom in the World.

(5.) The Prophecy importeth, that the Woman's Seed *in ſeveral Senſes* of it ſhall deſtroy Satan's Sovereignty. The Seed of the Woman in the ſenſe of Eminence is deſtructive of Satan's Sovereignty in all the Branches of it; but the myſtical Woman's Seed is alſo deſtructive of it in conjunction with him (the Meſſiah) and in ſubordination to him; for in all times Chriſtians vanquiſh Satan, and *tread on the power of the Enemy*; but moſt remarkably in the bloody War which Satan and his Army manag'd againſt the Chriſtian Church in the *Roman* Empire, his Sovereignty was deſtroy'd by the myſtical Woman's Seed; for *the Man-child that was to rule all Nations* (that is, the *Roman* Empire,) was the myſtical Woman's Seed, and it was by that Man-child's ruling that Satan loſt his Sovereignty in the *Roman* Empire, *Apoc.* 12. 5. *Grotius* in his Notes upon that Chapter maketh this Obſervation. (f) *You ſee here, that the Seed of the Woman ſpoken of* Gen. 3. 15. *is myſtically underſtood of the Members of the Chriſtian Church: in which ſenſe* S. Paul *uſeth the words of the ſame place*, Rom. 16. 20. *Chriſt is the ſecond* Adam, *the ſecond* Eve, *that is, the Mother of the living, is the whole Church; her Seed is the Individuals that belong to the Church.*

(f) *Vides hic ſemen mulieris quod eſt Gen.* 3. 15. *μυστικῶς explicari de membris Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ: quo ſenſu verba ejuſdem loci uſurpat Paulus Rom.* 16.20. *Adam ſecundus eſt Chriſtus*; *Eva ſecunda, i. e. mater viventium, Eccleſia tota*; *ſemen ejus ſinguli qui ad Eccleſiam pertinent.*

(6.) The Prophecy importeth, that as Satan cauſed Man to fall by a Woman, ſo his own downfall ſhould come by a Woman; ſo far he ſhould be ſerv'd in his own kind, paid in his own Coin (which is called by the Rabbins *menſura pro menſura*,) his Puniſhment ſhould carry a wiſe correſpondence to his Sin. Not as if the bruiſing the Serpent's Head might be attributed to a Woman, (g) *Ipſa conteret caput tuum* is not the true reading, it would be Blaſphemy and Idolatry, to attribute to a Woman the proper work and prerogative of the Lord Meſſiah, the redeeming, reconciling and ſaving Mankind. But a Woman (the Bl. Virgin) muſt be ſaid, to have been the means of conveying theſe Benefits to us, and ſo far a *cauſa adjuvans* thereof.

(7.) *The bruiſing the Heel of the Woman's Seed* (mention'd in the Prophecy) underſtood in the myſtical and metaphorical ſenſe, muſt be interpreted by Analogy to the Brute-ſerpent's *biting the Heels of Men*; which is an hurting an underly part, and it is an hurting them in an underly way (inſidiouſly,) cauſing them to fall who ſtand upon their Feet, whereof the Heel is a part. So Satan and his Accomplices hurt the bodily and terrene part of the Woman's Seed by their venenate Perſecutions; and by their venenate Temptations they hurt them in an underly inſidious way; by theſe methods of Enmity cauſing ſome to fall into Sin and others into Sufferings. For in this War againſt Satan the Seed of the Woman doth not get the Victory without Wounds and Blood, *Apoc.* 12. 11. So the Seed of the Woman in the ſenſe of Eminence in bruiſing the Serpent's Head was himſelf eminently bruiſed, hurt and wounded; the Conqueſt coſt him a Fall, but by his Fall he overthrew the Adverſary and became Victorious. With this Expoſition of bruiſing the Heel S. *Ambroſe*'s Interpretation of the Phraſe exactly agreeth, if ſome light change be made in his ſenſe. (h) *Servatum eſt Serpenti, ut calcaneum mulieris & ſeminis ejus obſervet, quo noceat & venenum ſuum infundat. Non ergo ambulemus in terrenis, & ſerpens nobis nocere non poteſt. Sumamus Evangelicum calceamentum, quo venenum ſerpentis excluditur, morſus ejus hebetatur.* If we had no terrene or bodily part the Serpent could not hurt the Woman's Seed by his venenate Perſecutions, which is one way of bruiſing the Heel: And if we are fenc'd with the Shooe of the Goſpel, he cannot hurt the Woman's Seed by his venenate Temptations (in an inſidious way) which is the other way of bruiſing the Heel.

We have now paſs'd through all the Branches of the Moſaic Hiſtory of the Serpent in Paradiſe, and as we have carefully conſider'd, ſo we ſeem to have clearly routed all that Army of Objections, which is muſtur'd up againſt it, *Archæolog. Philoſoph. c. 7. p.* 289.

(d) S. Aug. de C.D. l. 5. c. 16.

(e) Ap. P. Fagium in Exod. 23. 1.

Joh. 12. 31. Luc. 10. 18. Col. 1. 13. and 2. 15. Matth. 12. 29. Heb. 2. 14. 1 Joh. 3. 8.

(g) Sixt. *Amama Antibarbar. Bibl.* p. 324, &c.

(h) De fuga ſeculi c. 7.

ARTICLE 9.

The Lord God ſo called in this Hiſtory was the viſible appearance of God by the Angel of his Name and Preſence in an Humane Form.

I. THE Moſaic Creation (to which the Hiſtory of Paradiſe belongeth) was not meerly a Creation, but was ſo the Creation of Mankind, as to be withall a Prophetic manifeſtation of God to our firſt Parents; and this Prophetic Manifeſtation was of the ſame Nature with other Prophetic Manifeſtations of God in the Old Teſtament. S. *Auſtin* affirmeth, (*i*) *that God ſpake to Man in Paradiſe, as afterwards he ſpake to the Fathers, to* Abraham *and to* Moſes, *in ſome bodily ſpecies: hence it is that they heard his Voice walking in the Garden of* Eden *and hid themſelves.* (*k*) *This was viſibly done* (God exhibited a viſible appearance of himſelf) *and by a Creature, as all ſuppoſe, that underſtand the Catholick Faith. The uſual appearance of God to our firſt Parents by a Creature fit for ſuch an Action in an humane form is ſufficiently probable.* (*l*) *In ſpecie hominis videtur Deus cum homine tunc locutus: God ſeemeth then to have talk'd with Man in the form of Man: for how ſuch an ambulation and collocution of God can be literally underſtood except in an humane form I do not ſee.* Some Expoſitors ſuppoſe, that the ſenſe of the Hiſtory is, *not that the Lord God did walk in the Garden, but that the Voice or Sound did walk:* (*m*) Others reject and well refute this Conceit; and S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *It cannot be ſaid, that only a Voice was made, ſeeing God is ſaid, to have walk'd; nor can it be ſaid, that he who walk'd was not viſible, ſeeing* Adam *ſaith, that he hid himſelf from the Face of God.* A viſible appearance of God was in Paradiſe (God did exhibit a viſible appearance of himſelf, and exhibit himſelf as eſpecially preſent therein as in the *Schecinah*,) and this viſible appearance was in an Humane Form, as *P. Martyr* ſaith, (*n*) *It is pobable, that God ſpake to* Adam *in an humane form; for he that had made him after his own Image, did not diſdain, to be frequently preſent with him* ſub ſuæ imaginis nota, *under the Character of his own Image. Piſcator* and *Oleaſter* are of the ſame Opinion, and *Lyra* ſaith, *that God walked in the Garden in ſome created likeneſs. Eſtius* ſaith, *It is probable, that both a Body and a Voice was formed by an Angelical Miniſtry.* The Senſe of all theſe Expoſitors combin'd and put together amounteth to this Propoſition; *God did exhibit a viſible* appearance *of himſelf in an Humane Form* (as in many other caſes) *by an Angelical Miniſtry.*

(i) De Gen. ad lit. l. 8. c. 18.

(k) *Ibid.* c. 26. & l. 11. c. 33, 34.

(l) De Trinit. l. 2. c. 10.

(m) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 3. c. 5.

(n) Com. in Gen. 3. 8.

II. In the times of the Old Teſtament an Angel did often appear, act and ſpeak in the Name and Perſon of God, (*o*) *per diſpenſationem perſonam Domini ſui gerebat, by diſpenſation he ſuſtain'd the Perſon of his Lord.* The inviſible God exhibited an appearance of himſelf (and exhibited himſelf as eſpecially preſent therein) by an Angel, would have that Angel to ſuſtain his Perſon and to bear his Authority, and ſuch an Angel did act and ſpeak as God, and had the Name of God attributed to him. Such an Angel was that which appear'd to *Moſes* in the Buſh, *Act.* 7. 35. *The ſame* (Moſes) *did God ſend to be a Ruler and a Deliverer by the Hands of the Angel, which appear'd to him in the Buſh,* Exod. 3. 2. *The Angel of the Lord appear'd to him in a flame of Fire.* It was an Angel that appear'd to *Moſes*; yet all along that Chapter the holy Hiſtorian ſpeaketh of him as God, and he ſpeaketh and acteth as God, *v.* 4. *When the Lord ſaw, that he turned aſide to ſee, God called unto him out of the midſt of the Buſh,* v. 6. *He ſaid, I am the God of thy Father, the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob. *And* Moſes *hid his Face, for he was afraid to look upon God.* v. 7. *And the Lord ſaid, I have ſurely ſeen the Affliction of my People which are in* Egypt. v. 11. *And* Moſes *ſaid unto God, who am I, that I ſhould go unto* Pharaoh? All this was ſpoken by and to an Angel, but ſuch an one, which was the Angel of God's Name and Preſence. *Gen.* 18. 2. we read of three Men that appear'd to *Abraham*; one of them in all his Diſcourſe with *Abraham* ſpeaketh as God, and is often called *The Lord*, v. 13, 14. *And the Lord ſaid unto* Abraham, *at the time appointed will I return unto thee, according to the time of Life, and* Sarah *ſhall have a Son.* v. 17. *And the Lord ſaid, ſhall I hide from* Abraham *that thing which I do.* v. 22. *And the Men turned their Faces from thence, and went toward* Sodom; *but* Abraham *ſtood yet before the Lord.* v. 26. *The Lord ſaid, if I find in* Sodom *fifty righteous within the City, then will I ſpare all the place for their ſakes.* v. 33. *And the Lord went his way, as ſoon as he had left communing with* Abraham. It was an Angel that thus ſpeaketh and is ſpoken of as God, as S. *Auſtin* (*p*) proveth from the Author to the Hebrews, who in praiſe of Hoſpitality alledgeth, *hereby ſome have entertain'd Angels unawares.* But becauſe one of theſe Angels ſpeaketh, and is ſpoken of as God, hence ſome infer, that he was Chriſt, *who was viſible before his Incarnation.* Againſt which Opinion S. *Auſtin* alledgeth, that the Angel with whom *Lot* diſcours'd, ſpeaketh and is ſpoken to as God, as well as the Angel with whom *Abraham* diſcours'd, *Gen.* 19. 18—21. Lot *ſaid, oh not ſo my Lord; behold now thy Servant hath found Grace in thy ſight, and thou haſt magnify'd thy Mercy, which thou haſt ſhewed unto me in ſaving my Life: and I cannot eſcape to the Mountain, leſt ſome evil take me, and I die. Behold now this City is near to flee unto, and it is a little one; oh let me eſcape thither. And he ſaid unto him, ſee I have accepted thee concerning this thing alſo, that I will not overthrow this City, for the which thou haſt ſpoken.* The Carriage and Behaviour of this Angel that diſcours'd with *Lot*, is of the ſame nature with that other's, which diſcours'd with *Abraham*, both of them carry it at the rate of God; which inferreth, that both of them (as alſo the third that accompany'd them) belong'd to one *Shecinah* and were both of them Angels of God's Name and Preſence. Such was the Angel that appear'd to *Gideon*, *Judg.* 16. 12. *The Angel of the Lord appear'd unto him, and ſaid unto him, The Lord is with thee, thou mighty Man of Valour.* But *v.* 14. the Hiſtory ſaith, *The Lord looked upon him and ſaid, Go in thy Might.* V. 16. *And the Lord ſaid unto him, ſurely I will be with thee.* So it was an Angel that *Jacob* wreſtled with, *Gen.* 32. 24. *Hoſ.* 12. 4. yet *Jacob* at the end of his wreſtling calleth the name of the place *Peniel: for I have ſeen God face to face,* Gen. 32. 30. There are many Inſtances of this nature: but I will only mention the Angel that deliver'd the Law upon *Mount Sinai*; for that it was a Maje-

ſtick

(o) *S. Aug. de Trin. l.* 2. c. 13.

(p) De C. D. l. 16. c. 29. de Trinit. l. 2. c. 12.

ſtick Angel attended with other Angels which deliver'd the Law upon *Mount Sinai*, many places of Scripture aſſure us: *Act.* 7. 53. *Who have received the Law by the diſpoſition of Angels.* Gal. 3. 19. *It was ordained by Angels in the Hand of a Mediator.* Heb. 2. 2. *The word ſpoken by Angels.* (q) *Our Mind ought not to deviate from the Authority of Scripture, nor ought we to leave that firm Ground and to fall into groundleſs Suſpitions of our own, which is* (as it were) *a falling down dangerous Precipices; for the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is moſt expreſs (when it diſtinguiſheth the Diſpenſation of the New Teſtament from the Old) that not only the Appearances to the Fathers, but the Speech of God was made by Angels. Then God ſpake by Angels, now by his Son.* The Apoſtle ſetteth the Goſpel far above the Law by this Argument; the Law was given but by Angels, the Goſpel was publiſh'd by the Lord, who is far above Angels, *Heb.* 2. 2, 3. yet the Angel which deliver'd the Law ſpeaketh as God, is ſpoken of, and ſpoken to, as God, and thus he ſpeaketh in the beginning of the Ten Commandments, *I am the Lord thy God.* All theſe things were tranſacted by Angels (*Miniſtris Angelis*, as S. *Auſtin* ſpeaketh;) for *no Man hath ſeen God at any time. The inviſible God no Man hath ſeen nor can ſee*; and God did not ſpeak unto us by his Son *until theſe laſt times.*

Joh. 1. 18. 1 *Tim.* 6. 16. *Heb.* 1. 2.

III. We will not therefore entertain that Opinion, which many of ancient and modern times have entertain'd, that the Appearances of God in the Old Teſtament-times were Chriſt the Son of God, and that he was the Legiſlator that gave the Law upon *Mount Sinai*; which is an Imagination of the ſame nature with this Conceit of *Zanchy*; (r) *who is very confident, that the Son of God in humane form took by the Hand that moſt beauteous Woman which he had formed, and led her to* Adam, *as the Parent of both, and the Match-maker (or Bride-leader,) that he eſpous'd her to him by expreſs words, and having requir'd the conſent of both Parties gave her in Marriage. For this Marriage between* Adam *and* Eve *was ſolemniz'd, and was not like that of other Animals, The Male's meer taking the Female without any Ceremony; but it was celebrated moſt religiouſly by the Son of God appearing in viſible form, all the Angels being Witneſſes, and before the whole Church of God.* A like Conceit *Eugubinus* hath, (s) *Acceſſit Filius ac Verbum Dei ad creationem humanam, in forma, imagine, habituque humano.* He ſuppoſeth, that the Son of God was the Creator of *Adam*, and that when he created him, himſelf was in humane form and ſhape, and with reſpect thereunto ſpake thoſe words, *Let us make Man in our image after our likeneſs*; which remarkable words are commonly thought to ſignifie the Chriſtian Trinity: but God uſeth no ſuch mode of ſpeaking in Chriſtianity, nor did this Terreſtrial Animal Creation iſſue from Paternal Sanctity or from the Divine Perſons of the Chriſtian Trinity, nor was this Summary of the Chriſtian Religion taught by *Moſes*, nor is it of Old Teſtament-Revelation; they that look for it there, ſeek it, where it cannot be found. Nor is it probable, that the words denote *a Conſultation*, or that they are meant *of God and his Houſe of Judgment* (a Senate or Council of Angels without whom God doth nothing) as ſome of the Jews ſay; agreeably to whoſe Senſe *Grotius* interpreteth the words, *Reges res magnas agunt de concilio primorum, ſic & Deus*, 1 Reg. 22. 20. *Kings act great things by the Council of their principal Men, and ſo doth God.* But this Judaical Conceit of God's conſulting with his Sanhedrim above hath no Foundation in Scripture, is contrary to the Holy Scripture: *for who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his Counſellour hath taught him? with whom took he Counſel?* But if God did make uſe of the Holy Angels, as his Counſellours, yet this would not ſatisfie the Text of *Moſes*; for if the words are meant of the Angels, they are not only made uſe of as Counſellours, but are call'd to be Social Creators, *Faciamus, let us make Man.* It is God's peculiarity, to be the Creator, and more eſpecially the Creator of Man, *Iſa.* 42. 5. and 44. 19. and 45. 18. and 54. 5. *Gen.* 5. 1. and although the Image of God is really the ſame with the Image of the Angels, yet there is no appearance, that Man was made after the Image of the Angels as ſuch, but after the Image of God only; rejecting therefore this Judaical Conceit, that God conſulted with the Angels when he made Man, we will conſider another account, which ſome of the Jews give of the uſe of the Plural Number in this Moſaic Text *Let us make Man.*

Iſa. 40. 13, 14.

IV. For ſome ſay, that God ſpeaketh after the manner of Kings and great Perſonages, who upon account of their Honour ſpeak of themſelves in the Plural Number (inſtead of the Singular) as *Nos Leopoldus jubemus*, *Nos Rudolfus mandamus.* Great Perſonages ſpeak of themſelves (t) κατὰ τιμὴν πληθυντικῶς, *plurally upon the account of Honour and Dignity* (as the Scholiaſt upon *Sophocles* ſaith;) and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that in the extraordinary uſe of it by extraordinary great Perſonages it is Honourary, carrieth in it ſomewhat of Amplitude and Auguſtneſs, an Air of Grandure and Magnificence. But againſt this account of the uſe of it in *Moſes* it is objected, that there is not an Example in Scripture of any King or Prince, that ſpeaketh of himſelf in the Plural Number (as *Aben-Ezra* obſerveth) and that this Cuſtom is later than the Days of *Moſes*; for *Pharaoh* ſpeaketh of himſelf in the Singular Number, *Gen.* 41. 41, 44. *I am* Pharaoh; *ſee I have ſet thee over the Land of* Egypt. So the King of *Perſia* writeth, *Ezra* 6. 8. *I Darius make a Decree.* Theſe are ſuch material Objections, that it ſeemeth neceſſary, to abandon this Judaical Account of the uſe of the Plural Number in *Moſes* (inſtead of the Singular,) and to diſtinguiſh the vulgar and common uſage of ſpeaking in the Plural Number inſtead of the Singular from the extraordinary uſage of it by Kings and Emperours and extraordinary great Perſonages. For all Mankind do ſometimes ſpeak of themſelves (ſingular Perſons) in the Plural Number, all Writers of Books and Preachers uſually do ſo, and (u) notwithſtanding what *Aben-Ezra* hath diſcours'd to the contrary, there are ſeveral Inſtances of this form of ſpeaking both in the Old and New Teſtament; *Job* 18. 2, 3. *Cant.* 1. 4. 2 *Sam.* 16. 20.

(q) *Extat auctoritas divinarum Scripturarum, unde mens noſtra deviare non debet, nec relicto ſolidamento divini eloquii, per ſuſpicionum ſuarum abrupta præcipitari. — Apertiſſimè quippe ſcriptum eſt in Epiſtola ad Hebræos, cùm diſpenſatio Novi Teſtamenti à diſpenſatione veteris Teſtamenti diſtingueretur, non tantum illa viſibilia, ſed ipſum etiam ſermonem per angelos factum — Tunc per angelos nunc autem per Filium ſermo factus eſt.* S. Aug de Trin. l. 3. c. 11.

(r) *Ego non dubito, quin Filius Dei, humani corporis ſpecie indutus, formatam à ſe formoſiſſimam fæminam manu apprehenſam, adduxerit in conſpectum Adæ tanquam utriuſque parens &* νυμφαγωγός *eamque illi diſertis verbis deſponſarit, & in matrimonium, exacto ab utroque, tam viro, quàm fæmina, conſenſu dederit. Fuit enim celebratum hoc connubium inter Adamum & Evam, non certè ut inter cætera animalia maſculum capiebat ſibi femellam, ſine ulla cærimonia; ſed celebratum fuit religioſiſſimè, per Filium Dei, viſibili forma apparentem, teſtibus omnibus Angelis, eoque coram tota Eccleſia Dei.* T. 3. de Hom. creat. p. m. 518.

(s) Ap. Petav. *T.* 3. de op. *l.* 2. c. 2.

(t) *Voſſ. Etymol. in voce Deus. Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. c. 7. *S.* 3.

(u) *Ap. Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 5 c. 2.

Dan. 2. 36. *Job.* 3. 11. 2 *Cor.* 10. 7. *Heb.* 13. 18. (*w*) *Arabes, Plebei etiam & Idiotæ, pluralem de ſe uſurpare ſolent, the Arabians, even the Plebians, are wont to ſpeak of their ſingular Perſons in the Plural number.* This being the common and general uſage of Mankind, it muſt not be thought ſtrange or myſterious, if *Moſes* ſometimes introduceth God ſpeaking of himſelf in the Plural number. *Gen.* 11. 7. *Let us go down.* Gen. 1. 26. *Let us make Man, and in our Image, after our Likeneſs.* Man is made after the Image of God, and this is Scriptural Theology: But to ſuppoſe, that Man is made in the Image of the Trinity, this is no Scriptural, nor ſound Theology; yet ſo Man muſt be made, if God's ſpeaking of himſelf in the Plural number denoteth a Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead. But it is much more reaſonable, to ſay, that the words of God at the Creation of Man ought in congruity, to run in the Plural number. For throughout the Hiſtory of the *Hexaemeron* God ſpeaketh in a commanding way, as the Apoſtle ſaith; *God commanded the light, to ſhine out of darkneſs.* 2 Cor. 4 6. So *Longinus* obſerveth (*x*) that *Moſes* introduceth God ſpeaking in a ſtile becoming his Dignity and Power, γενέσθω φῶς, ϗ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γῆ, ϗ ἐγένετο, *Let there be light, and there was light; let the earth be made, and it was made.* This ſtile of commanding is continu'd throughout the Hiſtory of the *Hexaemeron* to the Creation of Man, it conſiſteth of Mandates and authoritative words of command; therefore the form of Speech which God uſeth at the Creation of Man ought to be Self-authoritative and Self-commanding. But if the words had run thus in the Singular number, *let me make Man*, they would have ſounded like a Petition, and would have been nothing like a Self-authoritative, Self-commanding, Self-determining form of Speech, as now they are. S. *Baſil* objecteth (*y*) that no Artificer ſpeaketh ſo; which is a ſlender Objection; for it is not a meer Artificer that here ſpeaketh, but an Imperial Majeſty.

V. From the Moſaic Hiſtory it doth not appear, that the Son of God or the Chriſtian Trinity was concern'd in the Phœnomena of the Terreſtrial Paradiſe, otherwiſe than as the Chriſtian Religion was adumbrated and typified in it. It is moſt reaſonable, to ſuppoſe (interpreting this Moſaic Hiſtory agreeably to the reſt of the Old Teſtament and the Tranſactions of ancient times,) that the Lord God ſo called in the Hiſtory of Man's Creation and of Paradiſe was *the viſible appearance of God by the Angel of his Name and Preſence in an human Form.* For without this Notion of *the Lord God* the Moſaic account of the Creation of Man is not clearly intelligible. *Gen.* 2. 7. *The Lord God formed Man of the Duſt of the Ground, and breathed into his Noſtrils the breath of Life.* (z) Expoſitors obſerve, that God is here deſcribed as a Potter, who maketh his Veſſels, not of dry Earth, but of Clay: So the Body of *Adam* was formed, not of dry Earth, but moiſtned Duſt, χοῦς, *Limus, Duſt mix'd with Water. Deus corporis Adami quaſi manu ſua formavit ex limo. God as it were by his hand formed the Body of* Adam *of a moiſtned Maſs. And breathed into his Noſtrils the Breath of Life* (ſaith *Moſes*;) which ſome Expoſitors underſtand literally, (*a*) and illuſtrate it by our Saviour's breathing upon the Apoſtles. And if the Lord God that form'd *Adam*'s Body, having mix'd Duſt with Water to temper it, did then work it into a Statue-like human Body, and breathe into the Noſtrils (or Face) of that human Body the breath of natural Life, this muſt be the Idea of ſuch a Lord God, *the viſible appearance of God by the Angel of his Name and Preſence in an human Form.* And this is the Lord God, *that took the Man and put him into the Garden of* Eden; *that commanded the Man touching the two Trees; that brought all the Beaſts and Fowls to* Adam, *to ſee what he would call them; that cauſed a deep ſleep to fall upon him, took from him one of his Ribs* (cloſing up the Fleſh inſtead thereof) *made it into a Woman and brought her unto the Man; that made Coats of Skins for them and cloathed them; that walk'd in the Garden in the cool of the day* (which is the time when Men walk abroad to take the Air;) *that pronounced the Doom upon the Serpent and our firſt Parents, and drove the Man out of Paradiſe with this Irony or Sarcaſm; Behold the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil.* Gen. 3. 24. For the explaining which Ironical Speech it is not needful, or reaſonable, to have recourſe to ſo ſublime and divine a thing as the Chriſtian Trinity. Nor is it needful, to ſuppoſe, that the words were ſpoken to the Angels, ſo ſymbolizing with the Jews, (*b*) who interpret כאחד *as one of us* by כגבריאל *as the Angel Gabriel.* For the words unqueſtionably relate to the Promiſe, which the Serpent made to our firſt Parents; and the ſenſe of the Irony is, *ſee that which the Serpent promis'd, is come to paſs. He promis'd the Man, that he ſhould become as one of us* (*i. e.* as one of the Gods, ſo called by the Serpent,) *and now behold the Man is become as one of us* (*i. e.* as one of the Gods, ſo called by the Serpent.) This interpretation *Muſculus* maketh of the place. (*c*) *When he ſaith, the Man is become as one of us, he meaneth nothing elſe, but that he is become as a God.*

Thus we have ſurvey'd the whole Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe (without overlooking any Branch of it,) and have found much of it inconſiſtent with our uſual Theology, but nothing of it abſurdly extravagant, romantick, fictitious and inconſiſtent with true Hiſtory. *Metrodorus Lampſacenus* (*d*) *in his Book concerning* Homer *hath diſcours'd very fooliſhly* (ſaith *Tatianus*) *referring all things unto Allegory.* So ſome have dealt with this Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe: But we have ſalv'd the difficulties of it without at all diſtorting the Hiſtory or allegorizing away the literal Senſe of it. And if good Senſe may be made of this hardeſt part of the Bible (for ſuch is the Moſaic Hiſtory) we may confidently pronounce, that the whole ſacred Volume of the Scriptures and all the Theories that are in it, are of a Senſe rational and recommendable; and if to us any part of them ſeemeth otherwiſe, it ought to be imputed to the vicioſity or imperfection of our own Minds.

CHAP.

(w) *Hotting. Hexaemer.* p. 246.

(x) Περὶ ὕψους. p. 35.

(y) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. c. 7. *S.* 4, 5.

(z) *P. Fagius. P. Martyr. Grot. Pareus, Bp. Patrick.*

(a) *Qui volunt Filium Dei externa ſpecie aſſumpta plaſmaſſe Adamum, propriè interpretantur, quod anhelitu oris corpori animam infuderit, ſicut poſtea afflatu externo diſcipulis dedit Spiritum Sanctum.*

(b) *Coſri* p. 45.

(c) *Cùm dicit Ecce Adam factus eſt quaſi unus ex nobis nihil dicit aliud, quàm factus eſt quaſi Deus quidam.* Muſcul. in loc.

(d) Ἐν τῷ περὶ Ὁμήρ λίαν εὐήθως διείλεκται, πάντα εἰς ἀλληγορίαν μετάγων. *Tatian. Or. c. Græc. p.* 160.

CHAP. XIV.

1 Our Seventh Notice of God's Original Creation, that it was disjunctively antecedent to the Moſaic Creation, proved by a Firſt Argument. 2. The Second Argument. 3. The Third Argument. 4. The Fourth Argument. 5. The Fifth Argument. 6. The Sixth Argument. 7. The Seventh Argument. 8. The Eighth Argument. 9. The Ninth Argument. 10. The Tenth Argument. 11. The Eleventh Argument. 12. The Twelfth Argument. 13. The Thirteenth Argument. 14. The Fourteenth Argument.

I. THE Moſaic Paradiſe is of like Nature, and connex'd with the Moſaic Creation. If there is little reaſon, to ſuppoſe, that the Moſaic Paradiſe was the Original Paradiſe of God, there is as little reaſon, to ſuppoſe, that the Moſaic Creation was the Original Creation of God. Whence a Judgment may be made of the reaſonableneſs of our *Seventh* Notice of God's Original Creation, *that it was Ante-moſaical, or disjunctively antecedent to the formation of our Earth.* Some parts of the Creation might precede the Moſaical Formation of our Earth, and yet be only *conjunctively* antecedent thereto, as being only a prior part of the ſame Creation-work. (*e*) So ſome of the Ancients, who ſuppos'd, that the Angels were created before the firſt day of the Moſaical *Hexaemeron*, yet ſuppoſed that Creation of Angels to be only *conjunctively* antecedent to the *Hexaemeron*, as being the prior part of that Creation-work; they did not ſuppoſe it another Creation-work, which did not belong to the *Hexaemeron*, but was diſtinct from it and antecedent to it by a conſiderable tract of time. But we may conceive of a Creation *disjunctively* antecedent thereto, as being a diſtinct and ſeparate Creation-work, antecedent to it (at leaſt) a conſiderable tract of time, not belonging to the Moſaical *Hexaemeron*, nor any part thereof. In this Senſe I ſuppoſe, that the Original Creation was Ante-moſaical; which implieth, that the Moſaical *Coſmopœia* was not God's Original Creation, nor the Creation of the vaſt Univerſe, but a ſecondary Creation, a Creation of our Terreſtrial Syſtem only; and that our Planetary Globe, although in reſpect of the matter of it, It was part of God's Original Creation, yet as form'd and inhabited it did not belong to the Original Conſtitution of the Univerſe. The truth of this Hypotheſis appeareth,

Firſt from the Senſe of the Learned. (*f*) For many of the Greek and Latin Fathers are of Opinion, that an intelligible World of holy Angels was produc'd long before the viſible corporeal Univerſe. S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, that the Angels are πολλῷ ταύτης πρεσβύτεροι, *much more ancient than this Creation.* S. *Hierom* ſaith (*g*) *what Eternities, what Times (in which the Angels ſerv'd God) muſt we ſuppoſe, to have been made before our World, which hath not yet fulfilled the Age of ſix thouſand Years?* They that ſuppoſe the Creation of Angels much more ancient than the Creation of our viſible World, muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe it much more ancient than the Formation of our Terreſtrial Syſtem. Accordingly S. *Hilary* ſpeaketh of it as a thing generally acknowledg'd, (*h*) *cùm angelorum origo terræ creatione reperiatur antiquior.* *Caſſian* ſaith (*i*) *ante illud Geneſeos temporale principium omnes illas poteſtates cœleſtes Deum creaſſe, non dubium eſt.* The Hebrew Doctors ſay, (*k*) *the Throne of Glory was created before the Creation of the World*; which Throne of Glory may ſignifie the holy Angels. Some of them plainly ſuppoſe, (*l*) that the Angels were created before the corporeal World; and many Cabaliſts are of Opinion, (*m*) *that this World is not the firſt but the ſecond*, and that there was at leaſt one before it. Some modern Divines are of Opinion (*n*) that the holy Angels were Exiſtent a long time before the Formation of our Earth. And theſe alſo agree with our Hypotheſis, that the Earth in reſpect of the matter of it was created a great while before the Formation and Adornation of it in the Moſaic Coſmopœia. (*o*) *After Heaven was created and the Angels, and after their long continued Rebellion (as I ſuppoſe) and their Detruſion from Heaven into Tartarus by the juſt Vengeance of God that followed it, it pleaſed God to Form the Earth, which had laid deſolate and empty all the time, that the World or Republick of Angels ſtood, and which becauſe it was invelop'd with moſt profound darkneſs, was fit to be made the Tartarus or Abyſs of the rebellious Angels.* (*p*) *That a great ſpace of time interven'd from that Creation unto this, the following words intimate; the Earth was without form and void, and Darkneſs was upon the face of the Deep. Which words the divine Penman would not have added, if the Creation of it had been preſently followed by the Exornation of it, the Production of Plants and Animals and other things that are contain'd in it.* *Des Cartes* alſo is of this Opinion, that the Earth præ-exiſted a long time before it was inhabited. It præ-exiſted in a Chaotick State; for there being no uſe of it till the time of the Moſaic Creation, the exteriour Exornation and Furniture of it was deferr'd until that time.

II. On behalf of their Opinion (that the holy Angels were Exiſtent long before the viſible corporeal Univerſe) the Fathers uſually alledge a Text of Scripture, which according to the Tranſlation of the LXX. repreſenteth the holy Angels as Exiſtent before the Stars were created; according to our Tranſlation it repreſenteth them as Exiſtent, before our Terreſtrial Syſtem was founded. *Job* 38. 4, 6, 7. *Where waſt thou, when I laid the foundation of the earth? Or who laid the corner-ſtone thereof? When the morning Stars ſang together and all the Sons of God ſhouted for joy.* But from hence the Fathers

---

(e) *Petav. T.* 3. *de Ang. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *S.* 8. *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

(f) *Petav. ſupr. Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(g) *Sex mille nec dum noſtri orbis implentur anni, & quantas prius æternitates, quanta tempora, quantas ſeculorum origines feciſſe arbitrandum eſt, in quibus Angeli, Throni, Dominationes, cæteraque virtutes ſervierint Deo?*

(h) De *Trin. l.* 12.

(i) *Collat. l.* 8. *c.* 7.

(k) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par.* 2. *c.* 26.

(l) *Coſri p.* 314.

(m) *Hoornbeek. c. Jud. p.* 301.

(n) *Epiſcop. Inſtit. Th. l.* 4. *S.* 3. *c.* 3. *Curcell. Rel. Chriſt. Inſtit. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

(o) *Poſt creatum Cœlum & Angelos, eorumque diutinam uti ego quidem arbitror, rebellionem, quæque eam deinde juſtâ Numinis vindictâ conſecuta eſt, eorum è Cœlo in Tartarum detruſionem, viſum fuit Deo Terram, quæ toto iſto tempore, quo Angelorum, ut ita loquar, mundus ſive Reſpublica duravit, deſolata & vacua jacuerat (& quia tenebris profundiſſimis obſita erat, idoneæ fuerat, quæ rebellium Angelorum Tartarus ſive Abyſſus fieret) elaborare. Epiſcop.*

(p) *Ab illa autem creatione ad hanc magnum temporis ſpacium interceſſiſſe, innuunt verba ſequentia; terra autem erat inanis & vacua, & tenebræ erant ſuper faciem Abyſſi. Quæ non fuiſſent a divino illo vate addita, ſi terræ aut materiæ creationem è veſtigio excepiſſet illius exornatio, ſive plantarum, animalium, aliorumque quæ ea continentur, productio.* Curcell.

thers ought not to have inferr'd a Creation of Angels disjunctively *Ante-moſaical*; for notwithſtanding whatever this Text ſaith, the Angels might be created only as the *prior part* of the Moſaic Creation, *to behold the admirable Spectacle of the riſing World*, (q) As a Chriſtian Philoſopher ſuppoſeth. But another Chriſtian Philoſopher of the elder times argueth (r) that the holy Angels are of Ante-mundane Exiſtence, becauſe neither *Moſes*, nor any inſpired Writer that relateth the Creation of the World, ſaith any thing of the Production of Angels together with the World; becauſe they always behold the God-head, which no Being doth, that belongeth to this viſible corporeal World; becauſe they are neither Bodies, nor link'd with organical Bodies, as our Soul is; and becauſe even the human Soul is not Concreate with its proper Body; for this is from the Earth, but the Soul hath a diſtinct Diviner Production from God. If theſe reaſons ſeem to have no great ſtrength of reaſon in them, yet there is one reaſon alledg'd by many of the Learned, which is of invincible firmitude, and plainly demonſtrateth, that the intelligible World of Angels was Exiſtent a conſiderable time (at leaſt) before the Formation of this World. For the Lapſe of Angels is at leaſt as ancient as the Moſaical Formation of this World; and it is not likely, that a vaſt number of the Angels fell into Sin and Miſery immediately upon their Creation (ſome conſiderable time interven'd between their riſe and their ruin,) or that their Sin and Rebellion was but a ſingle Act (done in a moment,) or that ſo great a Conſpiracy and Revolt was made in a very little time. Therefore the Creation of an intelligible World of Angels (and of Heaven their proper Habitation, *Jude* 6.) was God's Original Creation disjunctively antecedent to the Moſaical Creation.

III. The Moſaic Hiſtory of the Creation muſt be thought to be well done, *Moſes* muſt be ſuppos'd, to have given a good Hiſtorical account of all things belonging to his Creation, which is the Subject-matter of his Hiſtory (for the Buſineſs of an Hiſtorian is *narrare res geſtas*:) But *Moſes* hath not given a tolerably good account of the Creation of the vaſt corporeal Univerſe, nor of the vaſt Univerſe of Rationals, nor of any thing more than our Terreſtrial Creation. His Creation therefore is not that which produc'd the vaſt Univerſe or the Original Creation of God. If he had given a tolerably good account of the Creation of the whole corporeal Univerſe, he muſt have particularly enumerated the vaſt number of the heavenly Globes, the vaſt Regions about them, the diſtributions of them into leſſer Regions, their Furniture and Inhabitants, in like manner as he hath deſcrib'd the Formation of the Earth. His account of the Creation of every Star and Planet muſt have been no leſs full and perfect than his account of the Creation of the Earth (that his Hiſtory might be regular and proportionate) he muſt have deſcrib'd the place of the heavenly City, and it muſt have made a greater figure in his Hiſtory than a Terreſtrial Paradiſe. And becauſe the heavenly Globes are parts of one whole, unavoidably he muſt have conſider'd them as ſuch, and conſequently he muſt have conſider'd and deſcrib'd the immenſity, magnificence and pulchritude of the viſible Univerſe, the true Syſtem of the World, as alſo the magnitude and decent Order of the heavenly Bodies, ſeveral Moons and ſeveral Earths muſt have had a place in his Narrative, he muſt have travell'd through the Univerſe, and we muſt have ſaid of him

Atque omne immenſum peragravit mente animoque.

But ſeeing his Hiſtorical account of the Creation is of a quite different Contexture, ſeeing it is wholly taken up with this lower World, and taketh no notice of Heaven or of the heavenly Bodies any further than they are of concern to this World, this is a manifeſt indication, that Heaven and the heavenly Bodies do not any further belong to his Creation-work, which is the Subject of his Hiſtory. Chriſtian Theologers (ancient and modern) obſerve, that he is wholly ſilent touching the Creation of Angels, and they give this reaſon of it, (s) becauſe he propos'd to himſelf, to relate the Production of things corporeal only. And if we inquire into the reaſon of this reaſon, if we ask, why did *Moſes* propoſe to himſelf, to relate the Production of things corporeal only? We are told, (t) *Moſes hath ſo temper'd his Narrative, as to ſtoop to the underſtanding of the People, and would not meddle with things more abſtruſe and remote from common uſe and ſenſe.* But are Angels ſo abſtruſe, that they are beyond the underſtanding of the People? Are incorporeal Angels of more difficult apprehenſion than an incorporeal Deity? Were the People in the time of *Moſes* unacquainted with *Apparitions*, *Oracles*, *Magic Arts*, *Tutelar Genii* and *Demonolatry*? Did he find or make the holy Angels eaſie and familiar to the apprehenſion of the People, when he made his Tabernacle, and were they not at all to be acquainted with them, when he made his Hiſtory? This Reaſon is no better than no Reaſon, meer irrational Will and Pleaſure, *non placuit*, (u) which ſome aſſign as the only Reaſon, why *Moſes* would not give us an Angelography. The only true Reaſon therefore why *Moſes* is totally ſilent touching the Creation of Angels, is, (as the Fathers have rightly judg'd,) becauſe they did not at all belong to his Creation. And becauſe he writeth no Hiſtory of the Creation or Fall of Angels, therefore (as Expoſitors ſay) he maketh no mention of fallen Angels in his Hiſtory of the Temptation of our firſt Parents, but of a Brute-ſerpent only.

IV. The Original Creation (which iſſu'd from Paternal Sanctity) is of a different kind from the Moſaic Creation, the Products whereof (abſtracting from their Typical and Symbolical Nature) are nothing higher than the Products of *Parental* Providence, as will appear from ſome excellent Diſcourſes of *Socrates* in *Xenophon*, which may paſs for a Commentary upon the Text of the Moſaic Creation. (w) *Socrates* asketh *Ariſtodemus*, who admir'd Poets and Painters for their Wiſdom, (x) *whether they that make Images devoid of Mind and Motion, or they that make Animals which have both, ſeem to you more worthy to be admir'd?* " He asketh him alſo touching thoſe
" things

(q) *Mr. Boyle of Final Cauſes. p.* 133.

(r) *Jo. Philoponus ap. Photium Cod.* 240.

(s) *Petav. T.* 3. *de Angel. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *S.* 1. *de opif. l.* 2. *c.* 3. *S.* 8.

(t) *Moſes narrationem ſuam ita temperavit, ut ſe ad popularem intelligentiam demitteret, neque abſtruſiora & ab uſu ſenſuque communi ſecreta vellet attingere.* Petav. ibid. de Angel. l. 1. c. 35. S. 1.

(u) *Hottinger Hexaem. c. primi diei. Qu.* 18.

(w) A-

(x) Πότερά σοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ ἀπεργαζόμενοι εἴδωλα ἄφ κ ἀκίνητα ἀξιοθαυμαστό εἶναι, ἢ οἱ ζῶα ἔμφρονά τε ἐργά.

“ things, that we cannot tell what they are, and thoſe things that are manifeſtly for Utility, which of theſe do you Judge, to be the Works of Chance and which the Works of Mind? πρέπει μὲν τὰ ἐπ᾽ ὠφελείᾳ γιγνόμενα γνώμης εἶναι ἔργα, *thoſe things that are for Utility muſt in reaſon be thought the Works of Mind.* And doth it not ſeem to you, that he who made Men at firſt, gave them all their Sences for Utility, Eyes to ſee things viſible, Ears to hear things audible; Smells or Odours had been of no Profit, if Noſtrils had not been added; nor could we have had any Senſation of Sweet and Sharp things, if a Tongue had not been fabricated, which hath the diſcernment of them. And ſeeing the Eye-ſight is weak and tender, doth it not ſeem to you a Work of Providence to fence it with Eye-lids (which we open, when there is need of uſing our Eyes and ſhut when we ſleep) with the Hairs that grow thereon and with the Eye-brows above the Eyes, that Sweat deſcending from the Head may not annoy them? The Hearing receiveth all Voices and yet is not filled. The Fore-teeth are Cutters, the *Canini* tear the Aliments, and the Broad-teeth are Grinders. The Mouth is plac’d near the Eyes and Noſtrils, and thereby all Animals let in what they deſire: But as to thoſe things that are troubleſome they ſhut the Channels and drive them away from the Sences. Theſe things being done ſo providentially, do you doubt, whether they be the Works of Chance or of Mind? No truly (ſaid *Ariſtodemus*,) it is altogether reaſonable, to ſuppoſe theſe things, to be the Workmanſhip of ſuch an Artificer that is wiſe and a lover of Animals. The innate deſire of procreating Children (ſaith *Socrates*) of Nurſing and Educating them, the great deſire in them to Live and a mighty fear of Death, are the contrivances of one ζῶα εἶναι βουλευσαμένου, *that hath conſulted and taken care for the being of Animals.* The Gods have made Men of upright Stature (whereby they can ſee things above, ſee before them and avoid what is injurious,) they have Hands (and thereby the moſt of thoſe things are done, whereby they are happy) and a Tongue of articulate ſounds, to ſignifie their Mind one to another. No other Animal diſcerneth, that there are Gods (that conſtitute the greateſt and moſt excellent things) or worſhippeth the Gods. Men have a Soul that can before-hand take care of Famine, and Cold and Thirſt, of Heat and Diſeaſes, and can Learn, and remember the things that are learned. (y) *Men live as Gods above the other Animals tranſcending them in Nature, Soul and Body.* Another Diſcourſe this Philoſopher hath with *Euthydemus* touching Parental Providence. He asketh *Euthydemus* (z) if he ever thought with himſelf ὡς ἐπιμελῶς οἱ θεοὶ ὧν οἱ ἄνθρωποι δέονται κατασκευάκασι, *How careful the Gods have been, to furniſh thoſe things that Men have need of?* “ He inſtanceth in Light, which we need in the firſt place, and without which we ſhould be like blind Men. We need reſt, and for this the Gods afford us the Night κάλλιστον ἀναπαυτήριον, *a moſt fine Repoſe.* And becauſe the Night is dark, they have given us the Stars (the Moon alſo) for the Night-time, and by this conveniency we do many things that we need. By the Moon alſo we have the Parts of the Month. Becauſe we need Food, they give us this out of the Earth, not only for neceſſity, but for delight, and agreeable ſeaſons ϗ ταῦτα φιλάνθρωπα, *and theſe things are Love to Mankind and are worthy of Thanks.* They afford us Water alſo, whereby Plants and Fruits grow, and all things that are profitable for us; we mix it with our Nutriment, whereby it becometh more profitable and more pleaſant. And becauſe we need Water in abundance, therefore they have given it ἀφθονέστατον, *in greateſt Plenty*, and this is the Work of Providence. They have given us Fire alſo, which is an help to us againſt Cold, and againſt Darkneſs, which is needful for all Mechanic Arts and all things that Men make for their uſe; for nothing that is profitable for the Life of Man is made without Fire. Ὑπερβάλλει ϗ τοῦτο φιλανθρωπία, *and this is ſuperlative kindneſs to Mankind.* The Sun alſo hath his turning, at ſome time of the Year he cometh nearer us, at another time he recedeth from us, that our heat and cold may not be too great, and as is moſt for our conveniency. And that we might not be hurt by an over ſudden change, therefore neither heat nor cold cometh upon us all at once, but leiſurely and by degrees. Men have Milk and Cheeſe and Fleſh from Animals, and making them tame they make uſe of them for their help in War and otherwiſe. We have Sences given us, whereby we enjoy all Goods. They have alſo ingendred Reaſon in us, whereby we ratiocinate about the things we diſcern by Sence, underſtand what they are good for, and contrive many things, furniſhing our ſelves with Goods and averting Evils. They have alſo given us the Power of Speech, whereby we impart our Goods, communicating and teaching one another, ϗ νόμους τιθέμεθα ϗ πολιτεύομεν, *and we make Laws and live in Society.* This vaſt variety of Goods Mankind have from Parental Providence, mundane Nature, *Mater Natura, optima Parens Natura* (as the Philoſophers ſpeak,) and theſe are ſuch Goods, as tranſcend not the Line and Level of Parental Providence. And ſuch are the Goods of the Moſaic Creation; which therefore ought to be intituled *the Terreſtrial-animal and Human-kind of Creation*, as being the Creation of the Terreſtrial-animal and Human kind of Goods only, not of the Goods of the Kingdom of God, as the Original Creation was, which therefore muſt be intituled *the Divine and Saint of God-kind of Creation.*

(y) Παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα ζῶα ὥσπερ θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι βιοτεύουσι φύσει ϗ τῷ σώματι ϗ τῇ ψυχῇ κρατιστεύοντες.

(z) Ἀπομν. δ.

V. That the Moſaic Creation was not the Original Creation of God, appeareth from the end and deſign of it; which was not to make and furniſh an habitable World for the holy Univerſe of inviſible Beings, but meerly for Terreſtrial Animals, of which Man is the Chief. So the ancient Writers of the Church having ſurvey’d all things that the World conſiſteth of, and all its Productions, Obſerve and Diſcourſe (*a*) that the World with all its Furniture was made for the Conveniency of Animals and of Man. *The Earth* (ſay they) *is their Habitation, and Heaven is the Roof or Covering thereof.* The World was created before Man, (*b*) ἔδει γὰρ ὥσπερ βασιλεῖ προϋποστῆναι τὰ βασίλεια, *for the Palace ought to be built before him*

and

(a) *Lactant. l. 7. c. 4. de Ira. c. 13. Theodoret.* Θεραπ. *Ser. 6. S. Chryſoſt. in Gen.* λογ. ς. & η.

(b) *Gr. Naz. or.* 43.

and for him as a King. (c) *Hominem ſexto die conſtituit, ut in Domum jam factam habitatorem introduceret.* The World is as an Alms-houſe, which God hath founded and richly furniſh'd for the Animal-Family, and eſpecially for the conveniency of Man; but this true Principle is a fond Conceit, if by the World we mean the immenſe Univerſe viſible and inviſible; for it cannot be imagin'd, that the Heaven of Glory and Felicity with the innumerable Citizens thereof was made for the conveniency of Terreſtrial Animals. (*d*) *And it ſeems not very likely, that a moſt wiſe Agent ſhould have made ſuch vaſt Bodies, as the Sun and the fix'd Stars, only or chiefly to illuminate a little Globe, that without Hyperbole is but a Phyſical Point in compariſon of the immenſe Spaces compriz'd under the Name of Heaven, whoſe Lights might as well illuminate the Earth, if they were a thouſand times leſſer than they are, provided they were plac'd at a proportionably leſs diſtance from it. And 'twill be very hard to aſſign, what conſiderable uſe the Terreſtrial Globe or its Inhabitants derive from that multitude of Celeſtial Globes that make the milky way; ſince each of thoſe Stars is ſo far from being ſingly able, to inlighten the Earth, that* Ariſtotle *and the generality of Philoſophers for many Ages took the whole Aggregate of them for a Meteor. And what Light or other known advantage can the Earth or its Inhabitants derive from thoſe many fix'd Stars, that the Teleſcope only can diſcover among the ſix or ſeven conſpicuous ones of the Pleiades, or among thoſe that the naked Eye can ſee in the Belt or Girdle of* Orion? *which Conſtellations I ſcarce ever look upon through a good Teleſcope without wonder.* The needs of Men are not proportionate to the vaſtneſs of the Celeſtial Globes and the Supernal Regions. (*e*) *Conſidera entia iſta corporalia, quanta ſit illorum menſura, quantus item numerus? ſi Terra tota nullam habeat menſuram ad orbem ſtellarum, quamnam quæſo ad creaturas iſtas omnes Homo proportionem habebit?* It is too much, to ſay of the Celeſtial Globes, that they were made only or chiefly for Man (although many of them were made with reſpect to the conveniency of Man;) but it is not too much, to ſay of our Terraqueous Globe, that it was made chiefly for the utility and conveniency of Man. And ſeeing the Moſaic Creation was ſuch a Creation, that was only or chiefly for the utility and conveniency of Man and other Animals; therefore this Creation muſt be limited to our Terreſtrial Syſtem with its Appurtenances.

The End and Deſign of the Moſaic Creation may be conſider'd under this Notion *The conveniency of our Terreſtrial Syſtem*: for all the Parts and Ingredients of the Moſaic Coſinopæia (ſo far as they are ſuch) are meerly and only for the conveniency of our Terreſtrial Syſtem (with reſpect whereto the Creator pronounc'd them Good;) therefore our Terreſtrial Syſtem is the Boundary of it. In the Hiſtory of the Hexaemeron the firſt, ſecond and third Days work hath manifeſtly reſpect to nothing but meerly the Conveniency of our Earth, to make it a well-adorn'd and commodious Habitation (this is written as in Capital Letters;) and the fifth and ſixth Days work is nothing elſe but a production of our Animals, the Inhabitants of our Terreſtrial Region, that are to enjoy the good things thereof. The fourth Day's work may ſeem to have been nothing leſs than a Production of all the vaſt ſuperiour Globes (and conſequently the Firmament of the ſecond Day muſt be all the immenſe ſupernal Regions:) but it is apparent from the Moſaic account of it, that it reſpecteth and deſigneth nothing more than the conveniency of our Earth and its Inhabitants, *Gen.* 1. 14---19. which Moſaic account of it directeth to a true Interpretation of the Moſaic Text by applying to it ſome diſtinctions touching *the making* the Celeſtial Luminaries. For,

(1.) *Moſes* teacheth the *real* making the Celeſtial Luminaries, as it is *matter of Faith*, but not as it is *matter of Philoſophy*. The great Celeſtial Luminaries are (doubtleſs) the conſtitutive central parts of certain vaſt ſupernal Orbs or Regions, and were certainly created ſuch in the original Conſtitution of the Univerſe, and Philoſophy conſidereth them as ſuch: but thus conſider'd they are no parts of the Moſaic Creation, nor do they belong to the Hiſtory of it, as is plain from this *Perioche* thereof, in which there is no mention or notice, not a Syllable of an account of them as ſuch. *Moſes* taketh not the leaſt notice of them, as they are the great conſtitutive parts of diſtinct Celeſtial Orbs or Regions (which is a plain demonſtration, that he never deſign'd an Hiſtorical Account of the great Univerſe as ſuch, or the Conſtitution thereof:) but he expreſly teacheth *the real making of them by God*, which is matter of Faith, *Gen.* 1. 16. *God made two great Lights: He made the Stars alſo.*

(2.) *Moſes* teacheth not only the *real* making the Celeſtial Luminaries (ſo far as it is matter of Faith,) but the *relative* making of them *on the fourth Day*, which is the making them, *as they are the Luminaries of our Firmament*, or ſo as to be the Luminaries of our Firmament. He doth not at all conſider the great Celeſtial Luminaries as the central parts of certain ſupernal Orbs or Regions, he only conſidereth them as *the Luminaries of our Firmament, as the Hoſt of our Heaven* (as the Conveniencies of our Earth) and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that in ſome ſort they are ſuch, in ſome ſort *they are ſet in the Firmament of our Heaven*. And this *relative* making the great Luminaries (the work of the fourth Day) is not privative of the *real* making them, but is *accumulative* thereto; and is in *Moſes*'s Text complicated with the *real* making them, *ſo far as it is matter of Faith*. So that *Moſes* in this *Perioche* teacheth two things: *Firſt*, the *real* making the great Luminaries, as it is matter of Faith. *Secondly*, The *relative* making them as the Lights of our Firmament on the fourth Day. *And God ſaid, let there be Lights in the Firmament of the Heaven, to divide the Day from the Night: and let them be for Signs, and for Seaſons, and for Days and Tears. And let them be for Lights in the Firmament of Heaven, to give Light upon the Earth; and it was ſo. And God made two great Lights; the greater Light to rule the Day, and the leſſer Light to rule the Night: he made the Stars alſo. And God ſet them in the Firmament of the Heaven, to give Light upon the Earth. And to rule over the Day and over the Night, and to divide the Light from the Darkneſs: and God ſaw that it was good. And the Evening and the Morning were the fourth Day*, Gen. 1. 14---19.

(3.) The *rigorous truth* of the things of Nature and Philoſophy muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from *the regular repreſentation* of them (in the Diſcourſes of Holy Writers and Preachers; for the regular repreſentation of them is that which is according to vulgar apprehenſion, which is often diſſonant from the rigorous truth of them: for according to regular repreſentation the Heavens are an arched Roof (Tent or Tabernacle,) and the Earth is the Floor of the Mundane Edifice, of a Plane Figure, *Pſal.* 104. 2. *Iſa.* 40. 22. there are *the Ends of the Earth and of Heaven*, and the Earth is bounded by the Heavens touching it, *Deut.* 30. 4. the Sun was riſen upon the Earth, *Gen.* 19. 23. *His going forth is from the End of the Heaven, and* (without any motion under the Earth) *his Circuit unto the Ends of it*, Pſal. 19. 6. The Scripture ſpeaketh accommodately to vulgar Apprehenſion (*rudiſſimis quibuſque ſe accommodans intra oculorum experientiam ſe continet*, ſaith *Calvin*,) and accordingly ſome have laid down this Rule for the Interpretation of the Moſaic Hiſtory of the Creation. (*f*) *In ſpeaking of natural and corporeal things* Moſes *hath attemper'd his Stile to the Capacity and Ingeny of a rude and dull People: which is a caution the more to be remark'd, becauſe ſome apply their Philoſophical and Theological accuracies to the Interpretation of the Hexaemeron. But it was always my Opinion, that almoſt all things which* Moſes *here treateth of, are no higher than popular Speech and Underſtanding*. *Moſes* ought to repreſent the matters of the fourth Day's work agreeably to the Underſtanding of the People (for this is their regular Repreſentation;) and if he hath ſo repreſented them (which none can reaſonably doubt of) he hath not treated of the Creation of the vaſt Univerſe as ſuch. Nor can we ſuppoſe him, to have ſo treated of it, without making his Creation intolerably incongruous and diſproportionate: for in his account of the fourth Day's work he muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak of making the fix'd Stars as well as the Planets, as appeareth from the end and uſe of the Stars then made, and becauſe the Vulgar do not diſtinguiſh them, and becauſe the purport of his Writing is, to repreſent God as the Creator of the one ſort of Stars as well as of the other. But what proportion hath the Partition of our Sea and dry Land and the Production of our Vegetables (which is the third Day's work) to the *real* Creation and Production of all the Planets and fix'd Stars? And how vaſtly doth one fix'd Star tranſcend in bigneſs our whole Terraqueous Globe? How mean and dark a Manſion is our habitable Earth? And ſhall we ſuppoſe it the only auguſt Body in the Univerſe, the Creation whereof muſt imploy ſeveral Days, whereas all the Starry and Planetary Globes were created in one Day?

(c) *Script. Anon. de Qu. vet. & Novi Teſt. inter op. S. Aug. T.* 4. *Method. ap. Epiphan. Hær.* 64. *n.* 18.

(d) *Mr. Boyle of Final Cauſes*, *p.*109, 110.

(e) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. par.*3. *c.* 14.

VI. That the Moſaical Creation was not the original Creation, appeareth from the ſmall extent of the *Mundus Moſaicus*, which conſiſteth only of the Earth and the ſublunary Heavens, which S. *Auſtin* ſpeaking of the Heavens reſerv'd for Fire (*g*) calleth, *Cœlos Aerios, the Aerial Heavens*. If the Heavens reſerv'd for Fire are only the Aerial Heavens, *the Elements that ſhall melt with fervent heat* can be nothing higher than the Regions of the Air (vulgarly at this Day called the Elements) and the Meteors therein contain'd; thoſe Elements cannot be *the Celeſtial Luminaries*, as a Learned Interpreter ſuppoſeth; (*h*) who yet ſuppoſeth (diſcourſing inconſiſtently with himſelf,) that the World which is to be deſtroy'd by Fire, is no other than that which periſh'd by Water, *the Sublunary World*, the Heaven whereof is that which we call *the Air*. The Aerial Heaven is in the Old Teſtament celebrated for its highneſs (as if it was the higheſt thing in nature,) which ſheweth, that the *Mundus Moſaicus* is of no greater extent than our Terreſtrial Syſtem, *Pſal.* 57. 10. *Thy Mercy is great unto the Heavens, and thy Truth unto the Clouds.* Pſal. 36. 5. *Thy Mercy, O Lord, is in the Heavens, and thy Faithfulneſs reacheth unto the Clouds.* The Clouds are counted ſo high, that they are repreſented as the Seat or Dwelling-place of his Highneſs, who is the moſt High: *who layeth the Beams of his Chambers in the Waters, maketh the Clouds his Chariot, rideth upon the Heaven in his Excellency on the Sky. His Excellency is over* Iſrael, *and his Strength is in the Clouds* (or the Heavens,) thence *he doth ſend out his Voice* (which is Thunder) *and that a mighty Voice*, *Pſal.* 68. 33, 34. This mighty Voice (according to the Pſalmiſt) he ſendeth out riding upon *the Heaven of Heavens*, which therefore ſignifieth the Superiour Region of the Aerial Heavens; ſo that the Pſalmiſt's *Heaven* and *Heaven of Heavens* is no higher than the Sublunary Heaven, which is the Heaven of our Terreſtrial Syſtem. In which Cloudy Aerial Heaven the Pſalmiſt alſo repreſenteth the Sun as plac'd, when he ſtileth him, *Pſal.* 89. 37. *The faithful Witneſs* בשחק *in Heaven* or in the Sky; (*i*) *for the Hebrew word* Shechakim, *which the Interpreters hath rendred Heavens, properly ſignifieth the Clouds. Aben Ezra* thinketh *it the ſuperiour Air, which is interpos'd between the craſs cloudy Air and the Celeſtial Orbs; for it hath its Name, becauſe it is tenuious and ſubtil Air, whence the Verb* Shachak *ſignifieth to beat ſmall.* The Hebrew word שחק certainly ſignifieth the Clouds or the Region of the Air: if therefore the Sun, Moon and Stars (for of all theſe Expoſitors underſtand the Pſalmiſts words *a faithful Witneſs in Heaven*) are plac'd בשחק, they are neceſſarily plac'd in the Region of the Air, and conſequently the extent of the Moſaic World and Creation is no higher than our Terreſtrial Syſtem, which is the Boundary thereof.

VII. That the Moſaic Creation was not the Original Creation, appeareth from the ſmall extent of the Moſaic *Firmament* or *Expanſum*; for the Moſaic Text knoweth no other Firmament, but that which divideth the upper from the lower Waters, which can be nothing elſe but our *Cœlum Nubiferum*, that may juſtly be reckoned a Production of our Earth or Chaos. Agreeably whereto a Pagan Theologer ſaith, (*k*) *The Earth by Exhalations generated Heaven, the tenuious ſubſtance which is about it being commonly called Heaven.* Such an Heaven which is generated by our Earth or produc'd out of our Water (the Chaos) the Pagan Theologers celebrate in their Coſmogony; and this their Coſmogony is ſo conſonant to the Moſaical, (*l*) that the former is generally thought a traduction from the latter: for this is the Account, which the generality of the Interpreters of *Moſes* give of the Moſaic Creation, (*m*) that God created at firſt a rude indigeſted heap of Matter (which the Pagan Theologers call Chaos) a deep miry Abyſs, out of which pre-exiſtent Matter Heaven,

Pſal. 104. 3.

Deut. 33. 26.

Nahum 1. 3.

(f) *In naturalibus & corporeis exponendis rebus Moyſem rudis, hebetiſque populi ad captum & ingenium attemperaſſe ſtilum. Quæ cautio eo magis uſurpanda eſt, quòd nonnulli in hoc interpretando dierum ſex opificio, limatas & exquiſitas rationes adhibent, media ex Philoſophia Theologiâque depromptas. ſed hæc mea perpetuò ſententia fuit, omnia ferè, quæ hic Moſes attigit, Popularem ad uſum eſſe loquendi, intelligendique dimiſſa.* Petav. T. 3. de op. in proœm.

(g) De C. D. l. 20. c. 18.

(h) Mr. Mede on 2 Pet. 3.

(i) *Hebraica vox* שחקים *quam cœlos reddidit Interpres, propriè Nubes ſignificat. Aben Hezra ſuperiorem eſſe putat aerem, qui interjectus eſt inter cœleſtes orbes, & medium illum aerem craſſum & nubibus obſitum. Inde enim appellari ſic, quòd ſit aer tenuis & ſubtilis, unde & verbum* שחק *comminuere ſignificat.* Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 1. c. 10. S. 9.

(k) Ἐγέννησε δ' ἡ γῆ ἐκ τῶν ἀναθυμιάσεων τὸν οὐρανόν· οὐρανοῦ νῦν λεγομένου κοινότερον παντὸς τοῦ περὶ αὐτὴν λεπτομεροῦς. *Phornut. de nat. Deor. p.* 42. *Eugub. de Per. Phil. l.* 7. *c.* 11.

(l) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 1. *S.* 16.

(m) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 2, *&c. Zanch. de oper. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 2. *Eugubin. ſupr. c.* 8. *Grot. ſupr. B. Patrick, &c.*

ven, the Sun and Stars, our Earth, and Sea, and Plants, and Animals, and all the Material World was made: that there was no new Creation of Matter in the Moſaic Hexaemeron, but the work of the ſix Days was only a forming and faſhioning out of the pre-exiſtent Matter a commodious and beautiful World. From which account of the *Moſaical Coſmopæia* and its ſymphony with the *Paganical* a Judgment may be made of the Extent and Boundary of the Moſaical Heaven. For the Heaven which *Heſiod* deſcribeth as produc'd by our Earth or Chaos, can be of no greater extent than the Heaven of our Terreſtrial Syſtem.

> Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτα μὲν ἐγείνατο ἶσον ἑαυτῇ
> Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα, ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτῃ.
>
> *The Earth at firſt produc'd an Equal to it ſelf*
> *The Starry Heaven, to involve or cover it every way.*

The Pagan Theologers have not told us the Dimenſions of their Chaos: but the Water which made their Chaos could be nothing more than the Water of our Earth; (*n*) for ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἰλὺς καθέστη, *by the Water mix'd with Earth Mud was made*, which was the Chaos. And as *Thales* ſuppos'd, that Water was the principle of all things: So *Orpheus* and *Homer* affirm, that the Coſmogony was from our Ocean; therefore it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that in the Pagan Theologers Chaos there was no more Water than that which belongeth to our Terraqueous Globe. So the Moſaical Chaos was certainly nothing more than our Terraqueous Globe in its rude, confuſed and muddy ſtate; for *Moſes* calleth it *The Earth*, and thus deſcribeth it. *The Earth was* tohu vabohu, *Confuſion and Emptineſs* (a Chaos) *an Abyſs invelop'd with Darkneſs*, Gen. 1. 2. Out of this dark, and miry, and muddy Abyſs ſhall we ſuppoſe, *that all the Celeſtial Orbs and their Luminaries* were produc'd and extracted? (*o*) *Quis enim credat ignem factum ex aqua? Cœlum factum ex materia limoſa? Shall we believe, that the Celeſtial Globes of Fire were made of Water? That the pure, lucid, glorious Orbs and the bright and luminous Stars were produc'd out of Mud and Dirt?* That the immenſe ſupernal Regions with all their vaſt innumerable central Luminaries were made out of a little heap of Dirt (comparatively) no bigger than a Phyſical Point? *Immenſum aliquid ex nihilo?* wherefore the only Heaven that could be produc'd out of the Moiſac Chaos, was the Heaven of our Terreſtrial Syſtem; and if nothing more was produc'd by the Moſaic *Coſmopæia*, but what was produc'd out of the Chaos, then our Terreſtrial Syſtem was the Extent and Boundary of it.

VIII. Between the Academy of *Samai* and *Hillel* (grounding themſelves upon the different order of the words of *Moſes*) there was a Controverſie (*p*) touching the priority of the Creation of Heaven and Earth. The Academy of *Hillel* held, that the Earth was created firſt, then the Heaven; but the Academy of *Samai* held, that the Heavens were created firſt. And of this Opinion were thoſe wiſe Men that liv'd in the time of *Alexander the Great*, to whoſe Queſtion, whether the Heaven or Earth was firſt in being, they made anſwer *The Heavens.* They had great reaſon to be of this Opinion; for it is againſt the natural order and origination of things, that the Earth ſhould be produc'd before the Heavenly Univerſe, or that the Heavenly Univerſe ſhould be the Production of the Chaos (which is the Earth in the large acceptation;) as in the Orphick Coſmogony (*q*) οὐρανὸς, *Heaven*, is firſt produc'd out of the Chaos, and the Gods alſo ariſe out of the Water. But ſuch an Order and Origination of things is unnatural and incongruous: (*r*) ἐπειδὴ ἐν τοῖς γινομένοις, οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς τὸ ἄνω, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ κάτω χωρεῖν· *for in things generated the Proceſs is not upwards, but downwards.* Vinegar is generated out of Wine; but for Wine to be generated out of Vinegar, is as unnatural, as for *Nicepſus*'s Sheep to yean a Lion. To ſuppoſe the things Heavenly, to be generated out of things Earthly, is of kin to the Atheiſts Hypotheſis, who ſuppoſe Life, Sence and Mind, to have their origin from dead ſenſeleſs Matter. Of all this World's Pomps and Pretioſities it is reaſonable, to ſay, (*s*) *Quid aliud ſunt niſi terra, ex qua nata ſunt, What are they but Earth, whence they are originated?* but it is not reaſonable, to ſay the ſame of the things Heavenly. It ſuiteth not with the Honour and Dignity of the things Heavenly, to derive their Deſcent and Pedigree from the Dirt, or to make this ſordid Earth Seniour to the Heavenly Univerſe. If Men are to build a ſumptuous Houſe, they do not begin at the Kitchin and the Out-houſes. (*t*) *The better things are, the more deſirable.* The Fathers are of this Opinion, (*u*) *oportuit ut terrenas cœleſtis creatura præcederet; In the Creation the Heavenly Creature ought to precede the Earthly.* Although therefore we infer nothing from the order of the words of *Moſes* (as the School of *Samai* and *Hillel* did,) yet from the natural order and origination of things we may ſafely infer, that the Heavenly Univerſe was created before the Earth even in its large acceptation, and conſequently the Moſaic *Coſmopæia* (which was out of that Earth) was not the Original Creation.

Of this we have a great Indication in the Moſaic Text, which taketh no notice, giveth no account of the origin and production of the Chaos, of the creation of the *Matter*, of which corporeal things conſiſt: but it ſeemeth rather to repreſent it as increate and co-eternal with God, (*w*) as the Ancient and Modern *Materiarii* (who hold the Matter unmade and eternal) have obſerv'd. They obſerve alſo, that the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* hath reſpect to the Text of *Moſes*, when he ſaith, *The things which are ſeen, are made of things which do not appear* (not out of nothing, but out of things non-apparent;) for by things non-apparent he meaneth the rude Earth and Water immers'd in profound Darkneſs, which upon that account in the Greek Verſion is ſtiled ἀόρατος, *inviſible.* And touching the Proem of the firſt of *Geneſis* (In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth) they rightly argue; that thoſe words ſignifie the Creation of the World, that they do not ſignifie a Creation before the Hexaemeron (the Creation of Heaven and Earth being the work of the ſecond and third Day,) that they are as it were (*x*) the Contents of the Chapter, and propoſe in ſhort the whole buſineſs of the Creation, which is afterwards diſtinctly explain'd by parts; and that *Moſes* in the concluſion of the Hexaemeron expoundeth his Proem; *Thus the Heavens and the Earth were finiſh'd*, Gen. 2. 1. *Moſes* therefore no where affirmeth, that the Earth in its chaotick ſtate was created; there is in him no mention, no account of the Creation of the Chaos (the Matter of which corporeal things conſiſt;) which ſheweth, that the Creation of the Chaos did not belong to the Moſaical Creation; and that they who will not be *Materiarii*, muſt ſuppoſe it a part of an antecedent Creation; and conſequently the Moſaic *Coſmopæia* muſt not be thought the Original Creation. If the Creation

(n) *Eugub. ſupr. c.* 10. *Grot. ſupr.*

(o) *Pareus in Gen.* 1. 2.

(p) *Meraſſ. ben Iſr. Qu.* 1. *in Gen.*

(q) *Eugub. ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 10.

(r) *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 15.

(s) *Lactan. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(t) *Eugub. ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 2.

(u) *Petav. T.* 3. *de Ang. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *S.* 10.

(w) *Volkel. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *vid. Tertull. adv. Hermog. c.* 23, 24.

(x) *SoVa tabl. Pareus and Petav. T.* 3. *de op. l.* 1. *c.* 2, 3.

tion of the Chaos was part of the Moſaic *Coſmopœia*, there was great reaſon, that *Moſes* ſhould have given a clear and full and expreſs account of it, that he might eradicate out of the Minds of Men the perverſe and Irreligious Opinion of the *Materiarii*, which was not the Opinion of a few and thoſe mean and inconſiderable Perſons: but it was unanimouſly and without exception the Opinion of all the Philoſophers (the Wiſe Men) of the Heathen World in the elder times.

IX. Without the Hypotheſis of a Creation antecedent to the Moſaical no account can be given of that eminent part of it *The Primigenial Light ſuppos'd to be created the firſt Day:* for touching this Primigenial Light the many Learned Interpreters of *Moſes* have little to propoſe but unhappy Conjectures, that are as eaſily refuted as recited. S. *Auſtin* inclineth to interpret this Primigenial Light (y) *of Light ſpiritual and metaphorical the Holy Angels*; which is an allegoring away the literal ſenſe of Scripture, and a total receding from the Phraſe of it; for the Angels are never called Light. (z) *Gr. Naz.* (a) and S. *Baſil* call this Light ἀσώματον, ἄϋλον, *Incorporeal, Immaterial*, becauſe at firſt it was not combin'd and complicated with any Body, as it is now with the Body of the Sun: for they ſuppoſe, *it was given to the Sun, to inlighten the World.* But if this Primigenial Light was that ſame Light which is now imbodied in the Sun, it was always material and corporeal; and it muſt be ſuch, if it made a diſtinction between Day and Night. Some have ſuppos'd, (b) that this Primigenial Light was the Elementary Fire, and others have thought it the Splendor of the *Cœlum Empyreum*, both which are vain Imaginations, that have no exiſtence. Some ſuppoſe, (c) that it was a Light rais'd throughout all the Water of the Abyſs, which diſpell'd all the Darkneſs of it; but if all the Water of the Abyſs was the Seat of this Light, it could not make the diſtinction of Day and Night. Others therefore ſuppoſe, that this Light was ſeated only in a ſuperiour part of the Water of the Abyſs, which thereby became *corpus lucidum, nubes lucida, fons lucis*, and by its Circumvolution it made the Viciſſitude of Day and Night: and ſome ſay, that of this lucid Cloud (being condens'd) the Body of the Sun was afterwards formed. But it was meer Light, which made the firſt Day, which is a different thing from a lucid Body or lucid Cloud, as *Burgenſis* obſerveth. On the firſt Day no Clouds were yet made; if any lucid Body or lucid Cloud had been then made, it would have been a great and eminent and diſtinct part of the Creation, which the Hiſtorian would not have fail'd to have taken notice of. Such a lucid Body or lucid Cloud would have been a Luminary, of which Nature there was nothing till the fourth Day. To ſuppoſe the Body of the Sun form'd of a condens'd Cloud, is like the Conceit of forming the celeſtial fiery Globes out of Water. (d) Some are of Opinion, that the Sun was made at the beginning of the Moſaic Creation, but not perfectly form'd till the fourth Day; and that this Primigenial Light was the Light of the Sun not perfectly formed. But this Opinion (of *Aquinas* and others) implieth a grand Abſurdity, that the Sun was twice made in one and the ſame Creation. *Gr. Nyſſen* conceiveth, (e) that this Primigenial Light was *Fire*, which becauſe of its Vehemency and Agility ſuddenly brake forth out of the Chaos, ſo ſoon as the Maſs began to be digeſted, and made a great Illumination. Some of the Learned among our ſelves (f) have entertain'd this Conceit, and by this Light underſtood thoſe Particles of Matter which we call Fire, which were produc'd as the great Inſtrument for preparation and digeſtion of the Matter, for Rarefaction, Separation, and the reſt of the Operations, which were neceſſary to mould it into ſuch Creatures, as were afterwards made out of it. But againſt this account of the Primigenial Light *Petavius* well objecteth, *lucem ab igne nihil differe, cui tandem probabitur? doubtleſs, there is ſome difference between Light and Fire:* If it had been Fire, *Moſes* would have call'd it ſo; for he calleth every thing by its own Name. This Light was Day-light, and Day-light is not that which we call Fire. The Light of Fire muſt neceſſarily conſtitute a *corpus lucidum*, of which nature there was nothing produc'd the firſt Day. Fire for preparation and digeſtion of the Matter is a Philoſophical Notion, and therefore alien from the Senſe of *Moſes*. Such Fire ought to pervade and agitate the whole fluid Maſs of the Chaos; and if it did ſo, it could not make the diſtinction of Day from Night. Thus the Learned Interpreters of *Moſes* by their dark conjectures touching the Primigenial Light have involv'd us in Difficulties, out of which there is no way to extricate our ſelves but by entertaining this true and great Principle, *that the Moſaic Creation was not God's original Creation.* But that we may infer this great Principle from the Primigenial Light, we muſt lay down theſe three certainties concerning it.

(1.) The Primigenial Light was nothing elſe but that Phænomenon of Nature commonly called by the Name of Light: for all wiſe Men agree, that in the Cortex of the Moſaic Hiſtory there is nothing *Unpopular*, nothing but what is ſuitable to the common Apprehenſions of the People, and accordingly this is their rule of Interpreting *Moſes*, (g) *that our account of things be moſt ſimple and moſt accommodate to the Capacity of the Vulgar, not far-fetch'd and recondite.*

(2.) The Primigenial Light was *Day* or *Day-light*; for the Moſaic Text ſaith, *God called the Light Day*, Gen. 1. 5. (h) *It is the Day, that* Moſes *calleth the Light (the lucid Space of Time contradiſtinct to the Darkneſs of the Night) this God would have.* (i) *What is Light but a certain Brightneſs illuminating Obſcurities and diſpelling Darkneſs? that Light is called Day. So* Moſes *ſpecifieth what Light he ſpeaketh of.* (k) *The Light is the Day, or the Day-light, and all Men know what the Day is.*

(3.) The Primigenial Light was *Sun-leſs Day*, or *Sun-leſs Day-light*; for the Moſaic Firmament was not garniſh'd with the Celeſtial Luminaries till the fourth Day; this Light therefore is rightly called by *Gr. Naz.* (l) ἀνήλιον, *Sun leſs Light*, or *Sun-leſs Day-light*, which is very uſual in the World, eſpecially in our own Iſland becauſe of our caliginous Air. (m) *Britannia ſole deficitur.* To us therefore that have many Sun-leſs Days and abundance of Sun-leſs Day-light,

---

(y) *De C. D. l.* 11. *c.* 7, 9.

(z) *Or.* 43.

(a) *In Hexaem. Hom.* 6.

(b) *Fuller. Miſc. l.* 1. *c.*12. *Hotting. Hexaem. op. primi Diei Qu.* 38. *Petav. ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(c) *Petav. ibid. c.* 7, 8. *Hotting. ibid.*

d) *Petav.* pr. & c. 8.

e) *Petav.* d. *c.* 7.

(f) *Biſhop Patrick.*

(g) *Ut quam ſimpliciſſima & ad vulgi captum accommodatiſſima ratio quæratur, non arceſſita & recondita.* Petav. ſupr. l. 2. c. 3. S. 8.

(h) *Tutiſſimum eſt verbis Moſis illud appellare hoc loco lucem, quod diem ille vocat, ſpatium videlicet temporis lucidum, nocti ſive tenebris contradiſtinctum. Lucem ergo Deus eſſe voluit, i. e. diem.* Hottinger, ſupr.

(i) *Lux quid eſt aliud quàm claritas quædam, quæ obſcura ſunt illuminans & tenebras diſpellens? lux iſta dies dicta eſt. Sic enim ſpecificatum eſt à Moſe, de qua luce loquatur.* Muſcul. ab Hotting. ibid.

(k) *Lux ergo diem ſeu lucem diurnam hic propriè ſignificat, quid ſit dies ſatis notum eſt.* Pareus in Gen. 1. 3.

(l) *Orat.* 43.

(m) *Min. Fel. p.* 135.

the Moſaic Sun-leſs Days and primigenial Light may be eaſily explain'd and made clearly intelligible. For the Moſaic Sun-leſs Days were of the ſame Nature and from the ſame Cauſe as ours, *viz.* From the caliginouſneſs of the Air and the circumvolution of the Sun (or Earth,) which alone can be the Cauſe of the viciſſitude of our Night and Day. *Day-light is the Light of the Sun.* The Moſaic Sun-leſs Day-light could be no other than the Light of the Sun. (*n*) *For ſeeing it is moſt certain, that the Day* Gen. 1. 5. *was no other Light but that which had been created the firſt Day, and ſeeing that Light wherewith the Celeſtial Luminaries ſhone on the fourth Day is Day* Gen. 1. 14. *both this Light muſt neceſſarily be the ſame Light. But the Day-light of the fourth Day is Celeſtial and deriv'd from the Sun: Therefore ſo is that of the firſt Day.* All Mankind by Day-light underſtand the Light of the Sun. (*o*) All the learned define Day-light by the Light of the Sun. Several of them (*Aquinas*, *Eugubinus*, *Pererius* and others) ſuppoſe and diſpute, that the Moſaical primigenial Light was no other than the Light of the Sun. But becauſe the grand abſurdity objected againſt their Opinion (namely, that it maketh the Sun to be twice made in the Moſaic Creation) muſt be avoided, therefore the Creation of the Sun and of the great Univerſe muſt be ſuppos'd *disjunctively antecedent to the Moſaical formation of our Earth.*

(n) *Cùm certiſſimum ſit.* Gen. 1. 5. *diem non aliam eſſe lucem quàm eam quâ primo die condita fuerat, cùmque lux illa quâ die quarto corpora Cœleſtia mundum perfuderunt, dies ſit* Gen. 1. 14. *Profectò neceſſe eſt, ut lux utraque eadem omnino ſit. At diei quarti lux diurna Cœleſtis eſt & à ſole derivata: Ergo & primi.* Fuller. Miſc. l. 1. c. 12.

(o) S. *Baſil. Hexaem. Hom.* 2. p. 26.

This Hypotheſis is every way acommodate to the Moſaical deſcription of the Creation, of which this is a Branch, *darkneſs was upon the face of the deep.* Gen. 1. 2. The Moſaic Abyſs therefore had *a Face, Surface or Aſpect*, and conſequently was bounded, and ſo bounded, as to be of eaſie Conception to the People. But who can frame any tolerable Conception of the Face, Surface or Aſpect of the immenſe Univerſe? And if the Water of the Abyſs was extended throughout the ſpace of the immmenſe Univerſe (as they conceive, who ſuppoſe the Moſaic Creation, to be the Creation of the great Univerſe) there could be no proportion between the Aqueous and Terreous parts of the Chaos. (*p*) *Multò igitur plus Aquæ quàm Terræ partium habuit vaſta illa primæva Moles.* There is no avoiding this abſurdity but by ſuppoſing the Moſaic Abyſs or Chaos (the Hebrew word *Tehom* which we tranſlate *the Deep*, ſignifieth tumult and turbid confuſion,) to be nothing more than the Elements or Ingredients of our Terreſtrial Syſtem invelop'd with Darkneſs, as the Pagan Theologers repreſent the Chaos. (*q*)

(p) *Pareus* in Gen. 1. 2.

Χάος ἦν ϗ νὺξ Ἔρεβός τε μέλαν πρῶτον ϗ τάρταρος εὐρύς.

At firſt there was only Chaos and Night and black Erebus and huge Tartarus.

(q) *Grot. de V. R. C. l.* 1. *S.*16. *in Annot.*

All that was then to be ſeen (*r*) ἄβυσσος ἦν ὑδάτων σκότῳ κεκαλυμμένος, *was an Abyſs of Waters cover'd with darkneſs.* So the words of *Moſes* import (darkneſs was upon the face of the Deep) which are deſign'd to ſignifie the horrid face of the Chaos, that it was like a black and wet and tempeſtuous Night, the darkneſs whereof is not a meer privation of Light, but it is *oppoſitive Darkneſs* as poſitively oppoſing and excluding the Light. Such is the Darkneſs, which is uſually cauſed by the eruption of ſulphurous Mountains, whence iſſue black and pitchy Vapours, ſoultry Miſts, and dark Clouds (which ſometimes ſo darken the neighbouring Regions that Men cannot ſee one another (*s*) as *Cicero* relateth,) ſuch was the Egyptian Darkneſs, and ſuch is the Darkneſs that will invelop the Earth at the laſt day, *the miſt of Darkneſs, the blackneſs of Darkneſs*, the Darkneſs of caliginons *Erebus* (*t*) ἔνθα τὸν ἄπειρον ἐρεύγονται σκότον βληχροὶ δνοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ποταμοί, *there the mighty Rivers of dark Night eructate immenſe Darkneſs.* From which account of the Chaotick Darkneſs it is not hard to make an intelligible explication both of *the primigenial Light and the Sun-leſs Days of the Moſaical* Hexameron. Of theſe Sun-leſs Days the *ſecond* muſt be remark'd in the *firſt* place; for three remarkable things were done on that Day. One was a ſeparation of the parts in the fluid Maſs of the Chaos, the groſſer and heavier ſubſided, to make the Earth and Sea, the lighter and more tenuious parts remain'd above ſeparate from the other. On this ſecond Day therefore there was an Attenuation of the matter in the ſuperiour Region of the Chaos, it was reduc'd to a thinner conſiſtence. A *third* thing was alſo done on this ſecond Day (the Product of the two former) namely, the Partition of the Matter of the Chaos into two diſtinct Regions: The one *the Aerial-aqueous*, the other *the Terraqueous*. For the making *the Firmament* and the Diviſion of the upper from the lower Waters implieth this Partition of the Matter of the Chaos into two diſtinct Regions, *the Aerial-aqueous* and *the Terraqueous.* This Partition was the chief Phœnomenon of the ſecond Day, and thus far the ſeparation of parts in the Chaos and the Attenuation of the Matter in the ſuperiour Region of it proceeded that Day. But theſe Alterations in the Chaos which proceeded thus far on that Day, may reaſonably be thought, to have commenc'd before that Day. The ſeparation of parts in the fluid Maſs of the Chaos (the groſſer and heavier ſubſiding) and the Attenuation of the matter in the ſuperiour Region of it was begun the firſt Day; whereupon the Sun-beams gain'd an admiſſion (in ſome degree) into the dark Region of the Chaos, and caus'd ſuch a dim illumination thereof, as we ſee at Day-break (to which S. *Auſtin* (*u*) compareth the primigenial Light,) which dim illumination was the Light of the firſt Sun-leſs Day. The Day-light of the ſecond and of the third Day was alſo *Sun-leſs Day-light*, becauſe the ſeparation of parts in the fluid Maſs of the Chaos and the Attenuation of the Matter in the ſuperiour Region of it proceeded gradually, and did not proceed ſo far, as was requiſite, to make a clear Sky till *the fourth Day*, and then the Sun and the other Celeſtial Luminaries (in their order) appear'd garniſhing our Firmament. *Moſes* relateth the *Coſmopœia* like an Hiſtorian, and as a Spectator would have related it, that had ſtood in the Chaos and had ſeen the Creation. And he relateth it as a Religious Hiſtorian muſt neceſſarily relate it, that would not ſpoil his Religious Narrative with intermixtures of Philoſophy.

(r) S. *Chryſoſt.* in Gen. λογ η.

(s) De N. D. l. 2.

(t) Plutarch. An latenter ſit vivend.

(u) Apud Petav. ſupr. l. 1. c. 7. in fine.

X. That the Moſaic Creation was not the Original Creation, appeareth from the Typical and Symbolical Nature of it. For the Writings and Inſtitutes of *Moſes* are ſo agreeable to the Hieroglyphical Letters which he was inur'd to in *Egypt*, and to the Symbolical way of Philoſophizing which he learned there, that he may juſtly be denominated a Symbolical and Hieroglyphical kind of Man. As his Judaical Law and other parts of his Hiſtory abound with fore-ſhadowing Types of Chriſt and the matters of Chriſtianity: So his *Coſmopœia* is embelliſh'd with a Conſtellation of them. Some Divines ſay (*w*) that the Moſaic Creation was Typical, and that the thing typified by it was Man's Liberation from Sin and Miſery, or (as others ſay) *Eccleſia conſtituenda, the Church to be conſtituted in ſeven Periods.* (*x*) *Receptum apud Hebræos, opera creationis externa habere in ſe imaginem creationis interna.* The Light ſhining out of Darkneſs into the Chaos ſeemeth clearly to be a Type of Man's Regeneration. 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. And the Moſaic Creation out of a Chaos doth it not lively typifie and repreſent a new Creation out of the Chaos of a corrupted World? As *Adam* and *Eve* were illuſtrious Types of Chriſt and his Church: So the Sabbath, which was the cloſe of the Moſaic Creation, was an illuſtrious Type of the Chriſtians reſt. *Heb.* 4. 4, 9, 10. A worthy Author ſaith of Paradiſe (*y*) *in this there were as many Figures of Chriſt, as in all the Old Teſtament throughout.* Another ſaith of the Tree of Life in Paradiſe (*z*) *it ſerv'd to nouriſh the Soul by a lively repreſentation of that living Tree, whoſe Fruit is eternal Life, and whoſe Leaves ſerve to heal the Nations. O infinite Mercy! Man ſaw his Saviour before him, e're he had need of a Saviour; he ſaw in whom he ſhould recover an heavenly Life, e'er he loſt the earthly.* Our firſt Parents had loſt the heavenly Life in their Innocency, if the recovery of it by a Saviour was then typically adumbrated before their Eyes. In their State of Innocency they were like the reſt of Mankind (lapſed Souls,) but with this difference; the Souls of the reſt of Mankind are ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, which was not the caſe of our firſt Parents. (*a*) Yet *Adam* (ſaith *Parcus*) *had a Symbol of Life eternal, the Tree of Life, which was Chriſt.* (*b*) *Nobis allegoricè Chriſtum hac arbos refert, qui noſtra eſt vita.* (*c*) *Moſes Bar-Cepha* citeth one *Jacobus Sarugienſis*, who ſuppos'd, that the Tree of Life had an occult Virtue in it *ob Sacramentum Chriſti in arbore latens, becauſe of the Myſtery of Chriſt which was hidden in it.* If there were Types of Chriſt in Paradiſe (as undoubtedly there were ſeveral) our firſt Parents in their State of Innocency were thereby inſtituted to be Chriſt's Believers, and by Divine Inſtitution they were to be of the Chriſtian Religion; the ſuppoſal whereof is a monſtrous incongruity, if in their State of Innocency they were no lapſed Souls, or if in that State they were the Saints of God in Sin-leſs Perfection (without Chriſt) and the Heirs of Life eternal. From the Types in Paradiſe it appeareth, that the Adamical Inſtitution was of the ſame general Nature with other Inſtitutions of Religion in the Old Teſtament-times; that the Religion to which our firſt Parents were inſtituted, was not meerly the Original Law or Religion (for the Religion of a Redeemer was not the Original Religion;) therefore their Terreſtrial Creation was not God's Original Creation. The Jews had no available Promiſe of Life eternal, nor any Title to it abſtracting from Chriſtianity, and without it they could be no real Saints of God, but Saints only in Type and Shadow: Nor was it otherwiſe with our firſt Parents, as their Inſtitution to Chriſtianity demonſtrateth; for it would be a grand impertience, to inſtitute them to Chriſtianity, if they might be the real Saints of God without it. And if they could not be the real Saints of God without it, then they were not the real Saints of God by their Terreſtrial Creation; which therefore was not God's Orignal Creation. Thoſe Types (whereby in ſome degree they were inſtituted to Chriſtianity) demonſtrate, that Chriſt was not altogether ſuperfluous and unneceſſary to our firſt Parents in Innocency; and that *Oſiander*'s Opinion was no *delirium*, (*d*) that although our firſt Parents had not ſinned in their earthly Paradiſe, *Chriſtus futurus erat Eccleſiæ ſponſus, Chriſt ſhould have been the Bridegroom of the Church.* From the Types in Paradiſe and the typical Nature of the Old Teſtament in general *Picus Mirandula* thought, he had reaſon to maintain this Paradox, (*e*) *ſi non peccaſſet Adam, Deus fuiſſet incarnatus, ſed non crucifixus. And the ancient Jews ſeem to have been of that Opinion, when amongſt five things which they ſay were created before the World, they make Meſſiah the Son of* David *to be one, meaning thereby, as a learned Scholiaſt of their own expounds it, that he was abſolutely and primarily intended in the Creation of the World.* Paradoxes theſe are, but ſuch as (in the main) are not uncertain or incredible. For it is certain that God deſigning in his mind Chriſt and the matters of Chriſtianity did from the beginning of the World ſo contrive and order things, as to typifie, repreſent and adumbrate (by way of Skiagraphy before he came to Zoography) Chriſt and the matters of Chriſtianity, which were the things Primitive and Archetypal, and the matters of the Old Teſtament-times were the things Ectypal and derivative Tranſcripts fram'd according to thoſe Archetypal Copies. The coming of the Meſſiah therefore was abſolutely and primarily intended in the Creation of this World; the Oeconomy of our firſt Parents was Introductory to his Religion and the Knowledge of it; which muſt be thought a ſtrange unaccountable Oeconomy, if his Religion was to them altogether ſuperfluous and unneceſſary. *Aquinas* is ſo far from ſuppoſing it unneceſſary, that he ſaith of *Adam* before the State of Sin (*f*) *Man had an explicit Faith touching the Incarnation of Chriſt, as it was ordain'd to the Conſummation of Glory: But not as it was ordained to our Liberation from Sin by his Paſſion and Reſurrection.* We may not ſay ſo much as this great Schoolman doth touching *Adam*'s explicit Faith; for we are not told, how far our firſt Parents underſtood the meaning of their Types. But from the early Types which they had in Paradiſe, we may ſafely determine the extent of the Hiſtory of the Bible, that it aſcendeth no higher than to the Introduction of Chriſtianity, nor to any other Creation than that which is connex'd with the Introduction of Chriſtianity, *which cannot be the Original Creation.*

(w) *Jurieu accompliſhm. of Proph.* p. 327. ed. 2.

(x) *Grot. not. in Phil.* 2. 15.

(y) S. *W. Raleigh Hiſt.* B. 1. c. 3. S. 3.

(z) Bp. *Hall of Paradiſe* p. 777.

(a) *Pareus in Gen.* 2. 7. *V. S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l.* 8. c. 4, 5.

(b) *Pet. Mart. in Gen.* 2. 9.

(c) *Petav. T.* 3. *de op. l.* 2. *c.* 5.

(d) *Pareus in Gen.* 2. 24.

(e) Dr. *Cudw. of the Union of Chriſt and the Church.*

(f) *Ante ſtatum peccati homo habuit explicitam fidem de Chriſti incarnationè, ſecundum quod ordinabatur ad conſummationem gloriæ. Non autem ſecundum quod ordinabatur ad liberationem à peccato per paſſionem & reſurrectionem.* 22æ Qu. 2. Art. 7. vid. Gonet. Clyp. T. 11. Diſp. 5. Art. 1. S. 4.

XI. The Moſaic Creation was not the Creation of human Souls; which inferreth, that it was not the Original Creation. If it was a meer Terreſtrial-animal Creation, it could not be the Creation of human Souls; for although ſupernatural Grace is not Eſſential to Man's

Nature, or to human Souls, yet to affirm, that they may be created by God without ſupernatural Grace, is a falſe Propoſition. For as they cannot be created by Chriſt (who is Chriſtianity Imperial) without ſupernatural Grace, becauſe Chriſt cannot but make them the Subjects and Citizens of his Kingdom: So for the ſame reaſon they cannot be created without ſupernatural Grace by God, who is Sanctity Imperial. Upon the Original Creation of human Souls God is neceſſarily related to them as *the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial.* And they are of Right and by Obligation, and actually alſo in State and Relation, the Subject-party in Sanctity Imperial. They cannot therefore be originally devoid of ſupernatural Grace, without which none can be actually in the State and have the Rights of Citizens in God's Kingdom, or live the Life of holy Citizens. Human Souls were originally made, to live in the State and to live the Life of holy Citizens (and were under infinite Obligations ſo to live;) originally therefore they were not devoid of ſupernatural Grace; for without it they would have been inept for their end and uſe. They could not be made without it; for if they had been created without it, they would not have been made, but marr'd and deprav'd. For the Life of Grace and Holineſs is their Rectitude and Sanctity, their true Excellency and Felicity, Pulchritude and Precioſity, their true Light and Wiſdom, and their proper Life, their Greatneſs and Goodneſs, their Nobility and Liberty, their due Order and Amiableneſs, their Strength and Vigour, their Eaſe, their Peace and Reſt, their Joy and Satisfaction. The making of human Souls therefore is the creating them into the holy Life. *Eph.* 4. 24. The loſs of the holy State and the holy Life is the lapſe of Souls; and becauſe they have now loſt them, they are in a fallen Eſtate, which cannot be ſuppos'd their Original State without a contradiction. Their Criminal and Penal State (of Alienation from God and Hoſtility to him, of Darkneſs, Defilement and of Death, of Sin, Servitude and Condemnation) is neceſſarily introduc'd and emergeth upon their being out of the holy State and the holy Life; this therefore cannot be their Original State. Their Redemption and Regeneration demonſtrateth, that they may not be, nor can they tolerably be out of the holy State and the holy Life; it could not therefore be the Will of God in their Original Creation, that they ſhould be in ſo undue and wrong and tragical a State. The Creation of ſuch invaluably precious Souls was (ſurely) a Saint of God-kind of Creation (as their new Creation is,) they were created in the Divine Image according to Chriſtianity, as they are now regenerated into it. And accordingly they that are regenerated, do ſenſibly find that the holy Life (the Imployments and Enjoyments thereof) are to them kindly, congenial and connatural, and that their Regeneration is (as *Ariſtotle* defineth Pleaſure) ἀποκατάστασις εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν, *a reſtitution of their Souls from an Unnatural into their Original and Natural State.* If therefore the Moſaical Creation was but the Terreſtrial-animal and Human-kind of Creation, if our firſt Parents in their Terreſtrial Creation were not made the real Saints of God, the Moſaical Creation was not the Creation of Human Souls.

If the Creation of Human Souls was part of the Moſaical Creation, in all Reaſon it ought to have been part of the Moſaic Hiſtory; whereas *Moſes* in his Hiſtory (g) *did not deſign to write of the Creation of all things, but only of things viſible and corporeal,* as Baſil *affirmeth, and after him* Philoponus. *Moſes* is wholly ſilent touching the Origin of human Souls; whence Divines of the Chriſtian Church are extremely at a loſs *de Origine Animæ*, not knowing which of theſe three Opinions to prefer (h) that of the Præ-exiſtence of Souls, or that of their Creation and Infuſion by the immediate hand of God in ſucceſſive Generations, or that which deriveth them from Propagation. His total ſilence touching the Origin of Souls is a plain Indication, that the Creation of them was no part of the Moſaical Creation. Human Souls are of far greater worth and importance than all the animal and material World; if therefore the Moſaic Coſmopœia had been the Creation of ſuch Souls, the main concern of it muſt have been about the Goods and Evils, the Intereſts and Concerns of the Soul: But of theſe no Notice is taken throughout the *Hexaemeron* and the Hiſtory thereof. Parental Nature hath been hugely kind to Man, in the Faculties and Inſtincts wherewith ſhe hath furniſh'd his Body and Mind, in giving him the conveniences of human Society, and the many accommodations of Life, which the Earth affordeth, as ſome Philoſophers obſerve: But theſe obſerve alſo, that ſhe hath failed to furniſh Man with the chief Good of the Soul. (i) *Quod autem in homine præſtantiſſimum atque optimum eſt, id deſeruit.* (k) *Ut donum hoc divinum rationis & conſilii ad fraudem hominibus, non ad bonitatem, impertitum eſſe videatur.*

XII. The Inhabitants of this World and the Conſtitution of it infer, that the Moſaic Coſmopœia was not the Original Creation, but that it was a Creation conſequent upon a lapſe of Angels and human Souls. For *the Devil ſinneth and was a Murtherer from the beginning,* and *Cain was of that wicked One.* From about the Moſaical beginning of this World the evil Angels have been playing their Pranks in it; they have been lapſed therefore (at leaſt) from that time, and lapſed into this World, and ever ſince it hath been the Range and the Habitation, the Priſon and the Kingdom, the Territory and the Tartarus of evil Demons. Such it hath been, not fortuitouſly and by chance, but by the wiſe and juſt diſpoſal and allotment of Providence, as well as by the choice of the evil Angels themſelves. In a wiſe and juſt compliance with their Self-choſen Lapſe this World was framed, wherein for a time they might enjoy what they had choſen, and an Aerial Region of it was allotted them for their Manſion (l) *Providentiæ Lege*, by the Law of Providence. As other Beings have their proper Regions, (m) *ſo there is a Land and Country of Satan, where the Powers of Darkneſs and Spirits of Wickedneſs live and walk and have their reſting place.* Their Region and Country which is allotted them by Providence is ἐπουράνιος, *Aerial-heavenly* (as the Apoſtle ſtileth it;) whence it appeareth, that this

World

Joh. 8. 44. 1 *Joh.* 3. 8, 12.

(g) *Non omnium rerum productionem, ſed aſpectabilium duntaxat & corporearum inſtituebat ſcribere, ut Baſilius aſſerit, & poſt eum Philoponus.* Petav. T. 3. de Ang. l. 1. c. 15. S. 1.

(h) S. *Aug. de lib. arbitr. l.* 3. *c.* 21. *& alibi paſſim.* S. *Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruffin. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *Vid. Annot. in Nemeſ. p.* 20. *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 1. *p.* 16.

(i) Cic. de Fin. *l.* 5.

(k) Idem de N. D. *l.* 3. *ſub. fin.*

(l) S. *Aug. de Doctr. Chriſt. l.* 2. *c.* 23.

(m) Ὅυτως ἐστὶ γῆ καὶ πατρὶς Σατανικὴ, οὗ διάγουσι καὶ ἐμπεριπατοῦσι, καὶ ἐπαναπαύονται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ σκότους καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πονηρίας. *S. Macar. Hom.* 14.

World is ſo fram'd and conſtituted, as that Mankind are by the diſpoſal of Providence locally ſubjected to the evil Angels. (*n*) *To whom our infimous part of the World, according to the moſt beauteous order of things, is ſubjected by the Law of Divine Providence.*

Such is the Order aud Subordination of Beings in this World, and ſuch is the Conſtitution of it, as could not exiſt but upon a Lapſe of Angels; therefore the Moſaical Creation or Conſtitution of it could not be any part of the Original Creation. And from the Subordination of Beings in it we may infer further; that ſuch is the Conſtitution of it, as could not Exiſt but upon a Lapſe of human Souls; and therefore the Moſaical Creation could not be the Original Creation. For without ſuppoſing a Lapſe of human Souls it ſeemeth extremely harſh, that Mankind ſhould be ſituated as low as the Earth, and confin'd to creep as Shadows upon the Ground, while the Aerial Demons have their Seat aloft above them and (comparatively) their Dwelling on high. Such a Conſtitution of the World maketh them look like *Princes* (of eminent ruling Condition) *Principalities* (that have chief and principal Rule) *Powers* (Potentates) *κοσμοκράτορες, the Rulers of the World*, but Mankind as of underling and ſervient Condition. For theſe Luciferian Aſpirers after Empire and Greatneſs, that outragiouſly affect Domination over Mankind, and are diſpos'd to Domineer and Lord it over them, that far tranſcend them in Policy and Power (as alſo in reſpect of the Spirituality of their Nature,) for theſe to be plac'd near and about them, and in a Station above them, is a great ſtep towards ſubjecting Mankind to their Domination. Living by theſe bad Neighbours they are continually obnoxious to their Temptations, which Temptations are complicated with thoſe of the World and Fleſh. In this earthly Station Mankind muſt be ſurrounded and infeſted with theſe deadly ghoſtly Enemies, their Duty, Virtue, and the only way to their Felicity, is to reſiſt and vanquiſh them. But to this Warfare they are ſo great ſtrangers, this Victory is ſo hardly gained, theſe Temptations are ſo extremely dangerous and generally ruinous, that it cannot be thought reconcileable with the Goodneſs and Juſtice of Providence, to place the Souls of Men in ſuch ſad Circumſtances, if by ſome Fact or Fault of their own they had not ſubjected themſelves thereto. They that conſider what accompliſh'd Tempters Satan and his Aerial Accomplices are, how many and great their advantages are, to inveigle Souls, how many and great diſadvantages Mankind are under, and how great their Native Weakneſs and Wickedneſs is, cannot fail to pronounce, that it is morally impoſſible, that things ſhould be otherwiſe than they have been; but the World of Mankind are unavoidably the Subjects of Satan's Kingdom, and this is now their Original State.

XIII. That the Earth in the Moſaical Creation of it was created upon a Lapſe (which therefore was not the Original Creation) the multitude of noxious, ferine and poiſonous Animals that are in it, are an Indication. For who is not prone, to ask *Cicero's* Queſtion, *fecerit?* All things are well, as they ought to be (all things conſider'd) in the Natural and Brute-animal World; and things are, as they were made in the Moſaical Creation. Elſe it had not been the Conſtitution of Nature, nor had all things been made after their Kind, nor hath there been any thing like a Creation ſince, to alter and change Nature. Yet many Divines (Ancient and Modern) ſuppoſe, that noxious and venenate Animals and the Enmities amongſt Animals are not agreeable to the Original Creation and the firſt State. (*p*) *No noxious or venenate Animals were ſo made from the beginning; for nothing Evil was made by God, but all things were good and very good. The Sin of Man made them degenerate into Evil.* (*q*) *If there is any thing poiſonous in Nature this is adventitious through the Sin of Man.* Becauſe *Adam* gave Names to all Animals, thence S. *Chryſoſtom* argueth, (*r*) that they were not from the beginning terrible to Man. And there is another more manifeſt Sign of this (ſaith he,) the diſcourſe of the Woman with the Serpent, the ſight of which would have made her afraid, if thoſe Animals had been terrible to Man. S. *Auſtin* ſometime affirmed, that God is the Author of that Antipathy, which is amongſt Animals (as the Sheep and the Wolf) but afterwards retracted it. (*s*) This Father was alſo at a loſs for the Reaſon, why noxious Animals were created, which ſome of the ancient Writers have attempted, to give an account of: But from their account it appeareth, that although noxious, ferine and venenate Animals are commodious for Man, yet they are in far greater degree incommodious and dangerous, and therefore cannot be ſuppos'd, to have been made meerly for the uſe of Man, nor are they agreeable to Original Creation and the firſt State. Mankind have been always in no ſmall danger of their Lives from theſe their truculent Aſſociates and Fellow-inhabiters of the Earth; which as it was at firſt in great part Forreſt, ſo it was in great part a Wilderneſs of wild Beaſts. (*t*) *And it is a ridiculous thing, to find fault, that many Animals are wild and ſavage, ſeeing Men are ſo.* They may well be aſſociated with theſe ferine Animals, and they were made their Aſſociates in the Moſaic Creation, which ſpeaketh it a Creation upon a Lapſe.

XIV. That the Earth in the Moſaical Creation of it was created upon a Lapſe (which therefore was not the Original Creation) the final uſe and end of it is an Indication; for it was made with deſign, to be the great local Hell of lapſed Angels and their Aſſociates; *to be the place of their confinement firſt, and then of their final puniſhment.* As it is the place of their confinement, it is *the leſſer Hell*, which is now Exiſtent: As it is the place of their final puniſhment, it is *the great local Hell*, which will not be Exiſtent till the laſt Day. For the Fire of *the Earth's conflagration* is the ſame with *Hell-fire*, as appeareth from the Apoſtle's Text, 2 Pet. 3. 7. *The Heavens and the Earth which are now, are*

(n) *Quibus iſta pars mundi infima ſecundum pulcherrimum ordinem rerum divinæ providentia lege ſubjecta eſt.* S. Aug. ſupr.

(o) Lactant. l. 7. c. 4.

(s) Hottinger. ſupr.

(o) *Cur Deus tantam vim natricum viperarumque*

(p) Οὐχ ὡς κακὰ ἀρχῆθεν γεγεννημένα ζῶα ἢ ἰοβόλα· οὐ γάρ τι κακὸν γέγονεν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα καλὰ, ϗ καλὰ λίαν: Ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κεκάκωκεν αὐτά. *Theophil. ad Autol. l.* 2. *p.* 96.

(q) Εἰ δὲ ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς φυομένοις δηλητήριον, τοῦτο διὰ τὸ ἐνάμαρτον ἡμῶν ἐπισυμβέβηκεν. *Tatian. Or. c. Græc. p.* 158. *Certè pulices & ſimiles vermes qui jam in hominibus ſunt, tunc creari, contrarium fuiſſet feliciſſimo innocentiæ ſtatui, quanto longius abeſſe debuerunt lupi?* Hotting. Hexaem. p. 229.

(r) *In Gen. p.* 53.

(t) Γελοῖον δὲ ϗ ὅτι ἄγρια πολλὰ αὐτῶν μέμφεσθαι γινομένων ϗ ἀνθρώπων ἀγρίων. *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 9.

are reſerv'd unto Fire againſt the Day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly Men. The Fire of the Earth's Conflagration and the Fire of the Day of Judgment are one and the ſame Fire: The Fire of the Earth's Conflagration and the Fire of the Day of Judgment is the ſame with that Fire, which is the utter Perdition and final Puniſhment of the Ungodly; therefore the Fire of the Earth's Conflagration, the Fire of the Day of Judgment and Hell-fire are one and the ſame Fire. So *Eſtius* commenteth upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *The Perdition of ungodly Men: Hoc addit, ut uſum illius ignis præcipuum oſtendat, qui eſt, iniquos in æternum cruciare: He addeth this to ſhew the principal uſe of that Fire* (the Fire of the Conflagration) *which is to torment the Wicked to Eternity.* One and the ſame Fire as it is the utter Devaſtation of this Sublunary World, is the Fire of the Conflagration; and as it is the utter final perdition of the Ungodly, is Hell-fire. *Gregor. M.* ſaith, (u) *The Fire of the Day of Judgment, the Fire of the Conflagration of the Aerial Heaven and the Earth* (the ſame Fire) *as it is the Fire of the Conflagration, it involveth Sinners; as it is the penal Fire of their Damnation, it breaketh them to pieces.* So by the *flaming Fire* at the Day of Judgment, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 8, 9. S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophylact* (upon the place) underſtand Hell-fire; and becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, that *when the Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from Heaven in flaming Fire, the Wicked ſhall be puniſh'd with everlaſting Deſtruction*, hence they prove the Eternity of Hell Torments. Everlaſting Deſtruction is the ſame mith *Everlaſting Fire* (Hell-fire) *Eternal Damnation*, ſaith *Grotius*. Agreeably whereto the Commentaries under S. *Ambroſe*'s Name thus expound the place: *Fire will be Chriſt's Miniſter in taking Vengeance on Jews and Pagans, the Majeſty of his Fire ſhall burn them, that they may ſuffer the due Puniſhments of Deſtruction to Eternity.* An *Engliſh* Commentator upon the place ſaith of this flaming Fire of the Day of Judgment, (w) *Generally it is reſolv'd to be material not metaphorical Fire, and the* Ignis conflagrationis *ſpoken of by S.* Peter, *whereby the Elements ſhall melt with fervent heat, and the Earth with all the Works therein ſhall be burnt up.* So *Vorſtius* ſaith, (x) *It is hugely probable, that this corruptible World will have a Conflagration by this very flaming Fire; and that this is the Fire which all the Wicked with the Devils will be caſt into.* *Tertullian* thinketh, (y) that Hell-fire will be partly ſuch Fire *as is from Heaven in Thunder and Lightning; and partly ſuih Fire as the ignivomous Mountains eructate:* Which account of it implieth, that Hell-fire will be the very ſame with the Fire of the Earth's Conflagration. The Vengeance that Chriſt will inflict upon the Ungodly in his Day (z) is *pœnale incendium, a penal burning*; this penal burning will be by πῦρ φλογὸς, *flaming Fire* (which is much more terrible than dull Fire,) this flaming Fire will be πῦρ αἰώνιον, *everlaſting Fire* (which is Hell-fire;) for he will burn the Wicked with ſuch Fire as burneth the Chaff, which is *flaming Fire* and *Fire unquenchable*, Matth. 3. 12. Upon the Wicked (who muſt be ſalted with Fire) the mighty Judge will rain down Showers of flaming Fire as upon *Sodom* (whoſe Fire and Brimſtone was mix'd with Salt) and this inflicted Vengeance of flaming Fire will be *the Vengeance of Eternal Fire*, Jude 7. So the *fiery Indignation which ſhall devour the Adverſaries* at the Day of Judgment, is according to *Junius* (a) *ignis æterni fervor, the hot Eternal Fire*, as it is laſting and everlaſting, it will be the Fire of a Lake of Fire and Brimſtone analogous to the Sulphurous Lake of *Sodom*; which Lake of Fire and Brimſtone is the great local Hell, *Apoc.* 19. 20. and 20. 10.

Many Conjectures have been made touching the time when Hell was created, and touching the place where it is ſituated, (b) which S. *Auſtin* thinketh, *no Man can know, unleſs the Spirit ſhew it unto him.* (c) Some have plac'd it in the Air, where the Apoſtate Angels are kept in Priſon till the great Aſſizes. (d) Others and the moſt have ſuppoſed Hell to be Subterraneous (as the Pagans called it *Subterranea regna*, and ſome of the Jewiſh Writers have called it, (e) *infima terræ, the loweſt parts of the Earth*) both which Names are agreeable and accommodate to the leſſer Hell that is now exiſtent; for the Evil Angels are *Aerial Inhabitants*, and the Hell which is now exiſtent is ſometimes repreſented in Scripture as a Subterraneous Region that is hot and fiery, *Apoc.* 9. 1. *Luc.* 16. 24. Some have plac'd Hell in the center and midſt of the Earth, and others have thought it *non intra ſed infra terram, not within but below the Earth*; which irrational Conceits gave *Lucretius* occaſion to argue; *that Hell cannot have a being; for what place can we ſay it hath, when under the Earth our Antipodes are ſaid to be? and that it ſhould be in the midſt of the Earth, the Solidity of it will not permit.* The only rational account that can be given of the place and ſituation of the great local Hell, is this Sublunary World, that in its horrendous ſtate of Exuſtion and Conflagration will *be a Furnace of Fire and yet a Region of Blackneſs and Darkneſs*, which by a Circulation and Rotation of combuſtible Matter upwards and downwards may eaſily be conceiv'd, to burn for ever and ever. Such is the final uſe of the Earth; in the Moſaic Creation it was made to be an everlaſting Priſon for certain Malefactors, and therefore was created upon a lapſe.

(u) *Ignis ille judicii qui cœlum aereum & terram concremat, peccatores jam in ſua ſuperbia non permittit erigi, ſed involvit, quos proculdubio in pœna ſuæ damnationis confringit.* L. 1. ſup. Ezech. Hom. 2.

(w) Sclater.

(x) *In loc.*

(y) *Apolog.* c. 48.

(z) *Min. Fel.* p. 532.

(a) *Parallel.* l. 3. p. 517.

(b) De C. D. l. 20. c. 16.

(c) *Vives in S. Aug. de C. D.* l. 8. c. 22. *Valentia* T. 4. *Diſp.* 11. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. S. 2.

(d) *Anſw. to the Jeſ. chall. of Limb. Patrum.*

(e) *Petav.* T. 4. *par.* 2. *l.* 13. c. 16.

Matth 13. 41. *Jude* 13.

CHAP. XV.

1. *That the Ante-Moſaical pre-exiſtence of Humane Souls may be counted a Branch of the Chriſtians Theology. The firſt Reaſon.* 2. *A ſecond Reaſon.* 3. *A third Reaſon.* 4. *A fourth Reaſon.* 5. *A fifth Reaſon.* 6. *A ſixth Reaſon.* 7. *A ſeventh Reaſon.* 8. *An eighth Reaſon.* 9. *A ninth Reaſon.* 10. *A tenth Reaſon.* 11. *An eleventh Reaſon.* 12. *A twelfth Reaſon.* 13. *A thirteenth Reaſon.* 14. *Objections againſt Pre-exiſtence anſwer'd.*

I. IF we ſuppoſe the Moſaic Creation conſequent upon a lapſe of Angels and Humane Souls (which ſeemeth to be prov'd by many great Arguments,) this inferreth, that Humane Souls are coeval with the Angels, that they were produc'd in God's Original Creation (when an Univerſe of Minds and Souls was produc'd,) and conſequently it inferreth *an Ante-Moſaical præ-exiſtence of Humane Souls*; which may be aſſerted without any of the Vanities of the Philoſophic Pagans, who yet muſt be acknowledg'd, to have diſcours'd touching Humane Souls, their original ſtate and their lapſe, *great and noble things*, which muſt be compar'd with the Chriſtians Vulgar-Hiſtorical Theology. And if we ſo compare them, the Pagan Theology in a principal part of it will ſeem great and noble, and the Chriſtians Theology in reſpect of an anſwerable principal part of it will ſeem very mean and ignoble: for touching thoſe great Theories in our vulgar Hiſtorical Theology we only ſay, (f) *That the firſt Man* Adam *was convicted of the crime of Diſobedience, and unexpectedly intangled in the Snares of Death, and fell under Sin by the impious Counſels of the impure Serpent, the Prince of Evil, Satan (for he it was that laid the whole Snare for him,) the Evil ſpread through all Mankind and Death reigned.* But if this is the ſumm total of the Chriſtians Theology, and all that we have to ſay touching thoſe great Theories (the firſt ſtate and the Introduction of Sin and Miſery,) who will not pronounce on the Philoſophic Pagans ſide, that touching thoſe ſublime Theories theirs is the ſublime Theology, and our Theology is comparatively very mean and ignoble? But this is an intolerable diſparagement to the Chriſtian Theology (to ſuppoſe, that the Pagan in ſo great a part of Theology far tranſcendeth it) from which therefore we will endeavour to vindicate it; not by ſhewing, that ſeveral of the Fathers have entertain'd the Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans touching the pre-exiſtence of Humane Souls (which hath been done by others;) but by ſhewing, that the Chriſtians in general have a ſublimer Theology than their *Vulgar-Hiſtorical*, and that they come not behind the Philoſophic Pagans in ſpeaking great and noble things *touching Humane Souls, their original ſtate and their lapſe*; whereby a Judgment may be made, how far Chriſtians acknowledge *an Ante-Moſaical pre-exiſtence of Souls*, which is our laſt Notice touching the original Creation of God. It is long ſince, that I made this Obſervation, that there is ſcarce a truly pious Book written touching Matters of the Chriſtian Theology, wherein the pre-exiſtence of Humane Souls is not either implicitly or in expreſs words acknowledg'd, although the Author is intentionally no Aſſertor of it. Of the truth of this Obſervation we will produce a competent number of Inſtances, which will be ſufficient to ſhew, *That the Ante-Moſaical pre-exiſtence of Humane Souls may be counted a Branch of the Chriſtians Theology*, which is not chargeable with Criminal Philoſophic-paganizing.

The ancient Writers of the Church attribute a Celeſtial and Divine Condition to *Adam* in his Innocency (as appeareth from their magnificent Ideas of him before repreſented;) they ſuppoſe therefore, that Mankind are laps'd from a Celeſtial and Divine Condition into a Terreſtrial Animal; which cannot be ſuppos'd, unleſs a Celeſtial and Divine Condition did belong to Humane Souls in their original ſtate. Many of them ſuppoſe the Adamical Paradiſe, to have been Supernal in reſpect of its Situation, and their Deſcriptions of the Goods and Delights of it are competible only to an Heavenly Region; which implieth, that Mankind are lapſed (not only from a Terreſtrial-Animal, but) from a Supernal Heavenly Paradiſe, and that the native place and ſtate of Humane Souls is Supernal-Paradiſaical. Such was our original ſtate, if Man in Paradiſe had an Angelical Conſtitution, and was above all Bodily Neceſſities, as ſome of the ancient Writers ſuppoſe; or if the Paradiſe, wherein Man was originally plac'd, is that Paradiſe, which is the Receptacle of the Saints departed, and into which *Enoch* and *Elias* were tranſlated, as others of the ancient Writers ſuppoſe. Their miſtaken Ideas of *Adam* and his Paradiſe ſhew, how prone holy Men are, to think, that the original ſtate of Man (of Humane Souls) was Supernal-Paradiſaical: they will turn a Terreſtrial Paradiſe into a kind of Heaven rather than not have Man Heavenly in his original ſtate.

II. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that the Souls of Men are *Heaven-born*, ſaying the ſame thing with the Pagan Theologers, who thought ſcorn, to derive the Origin of their Souls from the Dirt: their maxim was, *Noſtras animas deduci è cœlo, redire in cœlum: animorum nulla in terris origo inveniri poteſt*, ſaith *Cicero*. So many of the Hebrew Doctors (g) will have נשמה (the Soul) deriv'd from שמים (Heaven,) becauſe the Soul deriveth its Origin from Heaven. So Chriſtian Divines ſay, (h) *Corpus è terra & ſpiritum poſſidemus è cœlo, we have the Body from the Earth, our Soul* (or Spirit) *from Heaven.* (i) *Origo ejus de cœlo eſt, its Origin is from Heaven*; for this reaſon Chriſtian Theologers call Man, (k) *Cœleſte animal, a Celeſtial Animal*, as *Plato* calleth him, *οὐράνιον φυτόν, a Celeſtial Plant. Heaven is the place where Souls are produc'd*, (l) ſay the Chriſtian Theologers. (m) *The Soul is then moſt her ſelf and cometh nigheſt to her former eſtate, when forgetting the weight and hindrance of the Body, ſhe enjoyeth her ſelf, and taketh Wings, as it were, and ſoareth up in the Contemplation of God and his Goodneſs; cùm id ſe eſſe incipit, quod ſe eſſe credit*, as Cyprian *ſpeaketh, when ſhe beginneth to be that, which ſhe muſt needs believe her ſelf to be, of a Celeſtial and Heavenly beginning.* This is the Voice of all, ſaith *Tertullian*, (n) *God ſeeth, I commend it to God, God will recompenſe. O Teſtimony of the Soul naturally Chriſtian! pronouncing theſe things ſhe looketh not to the Capitol, but up to Heaven; for ſhe knoweth the Seat of the living God, from him and from thence ſhe deſcendeth.* Thus the Chriſtian Theologers in conſort with the Pagan derive the Origin and Deſcent of Humane Souls from Heaven; therefore they ſuppoſe them, to deſcend from Heaven, (o) *vel miſſi vel lapſi*, as *Arnobius* ſpeaketh. But ſeeing all Chriſtians are bound to believe, that the Souls of Men are in a lapſed condition, therefore they muſt ſuppoſe them lapſed from Heaven.

III. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that the Souls of Men are ſo Heaven-born, that their Cognation and Affinity is with the things Celeſtial: they attribute to the Soul (p) *τὴν πρὸς τὰ ἄνω συγγένειαν, a Cognation to the things Supernal.* So far a Chriſtian muſt aſſent to *Achilles Statius*'s account of the

(f) Ἁλόντος δὲ τοῦ πρώτου, ὅς ἐστιν Ἀδὰμ, τῇ τῆς ἀπειθείας γραφῇ καὶ τοῖς τοῦ θανάτου βρόχοις ἀδοκήτως ἐνισχημένου, καὶ μὲν τοῦ πεσόντος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐξ ἀνοσίων σκεμμάτων τοῦ μιαροῦ καὶ ἀρχεκάκου δράκοντος, φημὶ δὴ τοῦ Σατανᾶ· ὁ γάρ τοι τὴν πάγην αὐτῷ συμπήξας ὅλην ἐκεῖνος ἦν. καταvεμηθέντος δὲ τοῦ κακοῦ τὸ Ἀδὰμ σύμπαν γένος, βασιλεύοντος δὲ τοῦ θανάτου. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 8. p. 278.

(g) *P. Fagius in Gen.* 2. 7.

(h) *S. Cypr. de orat. dom.*

(i) *Lactan. l.* 2. *c.* 19.

(k) *Ibid. c.* 2.

(l) *Arrowſmith chain of princ. p.* 23.

(m) *Mr. Farindon Ser.* 1. *on Eph.* 5. 1.

(n) *Deus videt, & Deo commendo, & Deus mihi reddit, O teſtimonium animæ naturaliter Chriſtianæ! Denique pronuncians hæc, non ad capitolium, ſed ad Cœlum reſpicit. Novit enim ſedem Dei vivi, ab illo & inde deſcendit.* Apol. c. 17.

(o) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 1. *p.* 16.

(p) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 19.

Invention of Aſtronomy, who having recited ſeveral Opinions concerning it thus concludeth, (q) *It is not ſtrange, that ſuch a contemplative Science is found out by Men: for every immortal Soul being deſcended from Heaven, and looking back to her cognate Heaven, contemplateth all the things to which ſhe is accuſtom'd, and is drawn to that place, to which ſhe is urgent to be reduc'd.* The great Cognation which the Soul hath to the things Celeſtial demonſtrateth, that in her primitive Nobleneſs and Excellency her Nature and State was the Celeſtial, that ſhe is here out of her Element (her connatural, kindly and agreeable State,) that ſhe hath left her Kindred above (to whom (r) ſhe ought to haſten a return;) and ſeeing the things that are here (the things terrene, of this Animal Senſitive Life) are not the things of her Cognation and Affinity, wherewith ſhe ought to be link'd and conjoyn'd, this earthly ſtate of Life (even in an earthly Paradiſe) cannot be her Original State. The Original Creation of Souls (as their New Creation) deſign'd them their Soul-goods and their Soul-happineſs: but it is impoſſible for them to have that Soul-happineſs and thoſe Soul-goods ſave only in a very ſlender degree in an Earthly Body (an Heavenly Body being neceſſary for the Happineſs of the Soul;) therefore they had not their Being in an Earthly Body by Original Creation. The Proviſion of a Soul-happineſs was no part of the Proviſion that was made for Man (ſave only ſymbolically and typically) in the Creation of this World. It belong'd to an antecedent Creation; for all the Furniture of this Sublunary World what is it to the Soul? (s) *Conſider the Soul of it ſelf, and what relation or reference hath it to any earthly thing? care for Meats, and Drinks, and Apparel, for Poſterity, to heap up Riches, to be ambitious of Honours, all theſe rigid Publicans, which demand and exact ſo much of our Time and Labour, befell the Soul upon the putting on this cloathing of the Body.*

IV. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that the Souls of Men are ſo Heaven-born, *that Heaven is their Country, their primitive Home and Habitation*, which plainly and expreſly ſpeaketh their pre-exiſtence. (t) *How is the love of our City reviv'd in us, which we had forgot by a long peregrination? but thence our Father ſent us Epiſtles, God hath miniſter'd to us the Scriptures, by which Epiſtles a deſire of returning might be rais'd in us; for by loving our Peregrination we had turned the Face to the Enemies and our Back to our Country.* (u) *There* (in Heaven) *is our Country, which perhaps by a long Peregrination we have forgot: for our Voice in that Pſalm is; Alas! becauſe my Peregrination is made long.* (w) *The Chriſtian People is invited to the delights of Paradiſe: and to all the Regenerate a return is opened to their loſt Country.* (x) *By Chriſt crucify'd two great things are done; for he both opened Paradiſe and introduc'd the Thief: he reſtor'd to him his ancient Country, he reduc'd him to his paternal City.* (y) *Thoſe perſons who for offences wide of malice were deteined in the Cities of Refuge and prohibited to return home until the death of the High-prieſt, were afterwards reſtor'd to the Land of their poſſeſſion: whereby was intimated, that until after our Saviour's death no Man could return into Paradiſe his primitive home, from which Man for his Sin had been excluded; but that thenceforth all perſons in an Evangelical Account, not malicious or wicked, had a right and liberty to return thither.* So a Divine of our own repreſenteth the Senſe of the Fathers; who alſo citeth theſe words of *Gregor. M. Humanum genus, quod peccando ſibi mortem intulit, poſt mortem veri ſacerdotis, id eſt Chriſti, peccatorum vinculis ſolvitur, & in paradiſi poſſeſſionem reparatur. Mankind that brought Death upon themſelves by ſinning, after the death of the true Prieſt* (that is Chriſt) *is looſ'd from the Bonds of their Sins, and reſtor'd to the poſſeſſion of Paradiſe.* The ſame Divine ſpeaking of Chriſt's Nativity and ſpeaking his own Senſe ſaith, (z) *Paradiſe is ſet open* (from whence as he ſaith, *we are Exiles*) *Immortality retriev'd.* Divines that at this rate diſcourſe concerning Paradiſe, muſt be ask'd, what Paradiſe they mean? for the Terreſtrial Paradiſe of the Terreſtrial *Adam* is not opened by Chriſt, nor are we reſtor'd to the poſſeſſion of it. If therefore they ſpeak good Senſe, and mean as they ſpeak, they ſuppoſe, that we are Exiles from a Supernal Paradiſe, and are by Chriſt reſtor'd to ſuch a Paradiſe, of which we were ſometime the Poſſeſſors. This the words of another Divine of our own imply: (a) *Let us diſdain all baſe and ſordid, all low and unworthy ends of action, as things beneath our illuſtrious Rank and Station in the World of Beings, and live in a continual tendency towards, and preparation for that Heavenly State, which is the proper Orb and Sphere of our Natures.* Cicero ſpeaketh the ſame Senſe, *Animis æterna cœli ſedes quærenda, eaque propria illorum patria.*

V. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that the Souls of Men being Heaven-born are now in a State of Baniſhment from Heaven. The ſecond Petition of our Lord's Prayer (*thy Kingdom come*) *nos cogit propriâ fateri linguâ magnam exilii noſtri calamitatem, conſtraineth us to confeſs with our own Mouth, the great calamity of our Baniſhment,* (*b*) ſaith **Luther**. *We are totally* exheredati à bonis paternis, *diſinherited of our Father's Goods and the Eternal Inheritance*, ſaith *Raymond de Sabunde: (c) For the Sons of God ought to live upon their Father's Goods, which are the Spiritual and Inviſible: but we live as Brute-animals upon the Bodily and Viſible, and are extremely unlike the Sons of God, have loſt our Filiation, his Eternal Kingdom and the Conſortſhip of thoſe that ſerve him and attend upon him* (the Holy Angels,) *and are eternally*

(q) Οὐδὲν δὲ παράδοξον, ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων τοιαύτην εὑρεθῆναι θεωρίαν. ψυχὴ γὰρ πᾶσα ἀθάνατος κατελθοῦσα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἀνανεύουσα εἰς συγγενῆ τὸν οὐρανόν, πάντα τὰ συνήθη θεωρεῖ, καὶ ἐπισπᾶται πρὸς ὃν ἀναχθῆναι ἐπείγεται. *Ap. Bulliald. proleg. in Aſtron. Philol. vid. Clem.* περὶ εὐπ. *p. m.* 47. *Cic.* 1. *de Leg.*

(r) *Clem. Strom. l.* 4. *p. m.* 348.

(s) *Mr. Farindon Ser.* 3. *on Matt.* 6. 33.

(t) *Quomodo in nobis reformatur amor civitatis noſtræ, quam diuturna peregrinatione obliti fueramus? ſed miſit inde ad nos Epiſtolas pater noſter, miniſtravit nobis ſcripturas Deus, quibus Epiſtolis fieret in nobis redeundi deſiderium: quia peregrinationem noſtram diligendo, ad hoſtes faciem poſueramus, & dorſum ad patriam.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 64.

(u) *Ibi eſt patria noſtra, quam longa fortaſſe peregrinatione obliti ſumus. vox enim noſtra eſt in illo Pſalmo, Heu me quoniam peregrinatio mea longinqua facta eſt.* Idem in Pſal. 32. Conc. 2.

(w) *Invitatur ad paradiſi delicias populus Chriſtianus, & cunctis regeneratis ad amiſſam patriam patefactus eſt reditus.* Leo M. de paſſion. Dom. Ser. 13.

(x) Δύο τὰ μέγιστα κατορθώματα· καὶ τὸν παράδεισον ἀνέῳξε, καὶ τὸν λῃστὴν εἰσήγαγεν. ἀπέδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχαίαν πατρίδα, ἐπανήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν πατρῴαν πόλιν. S. Chryſoſt. T. 5. p. 570. εἰς τὸν σταυρόν.

(y) Dr. Barrow Ser. 31. on *Mark* 16. 19.

(z) *Ser. on Luc.* 2. 10.

(a) Dr. *Scott of the worth and excell. of the Soul. p.* 38, 39.

(b) *Ap. Hoornbeek Theol. practt. par.* 1. *l.* 5. *c.* 16.

(c) *Et hoc maximè manifeſtatur, quia cùm filii debeant vivere de bonis paternis, & cum bona patris noſtri ſint ſpiritualia & inviſibilia, & nullo modo corporalia, ideo debemus vivere de bonis ſpiritualibus & inviſibilibus, & tamen tota vita noſtra conſiſtit in bonis corporalibus, & ſolum vivimus ſicut animalia bruta de rebus corporalibus & viſibilibus, & ſic facimus vitam noſtram beſtialem & non ſicut filii Dei. & quia pater noſter non ſolum eſt pater, imò eſt rex etiam ſummus, & per conſequens habet regnum tantum & tale, ſicut pertinet ei, & palatium & aſtantes, & ſervientes ei juxta ſuam regiam majeſtatem, & ideo quia perdidimus formam ſuæ filiationis, quæ eſt ſummæ dignitatis & ſummi honoris, & acquiſivimus formam contrariam turpiſſimam & perverſam, ſequitur, quod perdidimus regnum ſuum æternum, & conſortium omnium eorum qui continuè cum eo aſſiſtunt & ſerviunt ei, & ſumus in æternum exules à regno ſuo & à domo ſuâ & à palatio ſuo.* Raym. de Sabund. Theol. natural. p. 440, &c.

baniſh'd from his Kingdom, his Houſe and his Palace. A Divine of our own thus diſcourſeth touching the original and preſent ſtate of Man. (d) *His being in the World is but a kind of being in a Wilderneſs, wherein he is eſtranged from the City of the living God.—— Now what it is, in this Senſe to be a Stranger, or baniſh'd Man, to be deny'd the priviledges and liberty of our natural Soil, and to go into Exile, flat Atheiſm and oppoſition to the true God, it may be ſomewhat diſcerned by the bitter and heavy Days that go over their Heads, who are but put out of their Earthly Country by Tyrants, and but for ſome ſhort time. The natural affection that every Man feeleth towards his own Country and proper Home, may ſufficiently teach us, what it is, to be Strangers from our Country of Heaven, and not for a ſhort time or life, but for ever. In other Baniſhments we may find ſome remedy, one place to us may be as good as another, and we are all* Socrates's *Country-men, that is (as he was wont to ſay) Citizens of the World, and therefore baniſh'd but out of one part of our Country into another; but he that is thruſt out of this City, is thruſt out of all, and though he dwell in the faireſt Cities of the World, yet doth he but live the life of one that wanders in a Wilderneſs, and hath no City to dwell in. Again, whereas in other Baniſhments we are denied but a temporal freedom, and ſuffer only the loſs of Goods and Livings, in this our Baniſhment from Heaven we are put from an everlaſting freedom, and loſe, not uncertain, but true Riches; nor ſome temporal, but an eternal Inheritance; nor living only, but life alſo; and not this ſhort life, but the life that endureth for ever, the life of Salvation, and the bleſſed life of the Saints in Glory. And whereas in other caſes our Baniſhment may be unjuſt, and our Exile for Righteouſneſs, and ſo we (the Baniſhed) may have, for the ſupply of our natural Soil, the pleaſant Paradiſe of our good Conſcience to walk in: In this caſe, to be caſt out of Heaven, is to be worthy to be caſt out; and in the Puniſhment it ſelf what good Conſcience can relieve us, when it is juſt and deſerved? And now, as the State of them, who are Strangers from the City of the Bleſſed is miſerable enough, ſeeing they are deny'd the Liberty that is ſo much worth: ſo is their Miſery doubled by this, that they have made themſelves worthy of it.* One of the Marianolatriſts thus ſpeaketh to his Patroneſs; (e) *I will in all my Spiritual Combats, Afflictions and Diſtreſſes have a confident recourſe unto thy Bowels of Mercy, as a Child to his Mother, as a Sinner to the Mother of Jeſus, and as an Outcaſt baniſh'd the Houſe of my Eternal Father.* What the Commentaries under S. *Ambroſe*'s Name ſay of one, that ſeparateth himſelf from Chriſt, is applicable to every Man, (f) *Exul eſt patriæ, civis eſt mundi, he is an Exile from his Country and a Citizen of the World.* Mankind are conſider'd as Exiles, when the benefit which they have by Chriſt, is thus repreſented; (g) *Ruptis mortis vinculis aditum nobis patefecit ad patriam cœleſtem, à qua tot annorum millibus exulavit totum genus humanum: Having loos'd the Bonds of Death he opened the way to our Heavenly Country, from which all Mankind had been baniſh'd ſo many thouſand Tears.*

VI. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that Mankind are fallen by Sin from an happy ſupernal ſtate and place: for one of the Devotioniſts of the Bleſſed Virgin ſpeaketh this their Senſe, when he beſeecheth her, to regard her Suppliants, (h) *in hanc mundi ſentinam de alto projectos, that are caſt from on high into the Sink of this World.* S. *Baſil* ſaith, (i) διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας εἰς γῆν κατεῤῥύημεν, *By Sin we are fallen to the Earth.* So the religious Monk *Nilus* ſpeaking of Chriſt's coming admireth theſe fruits of it: (k) *Being thrown down we were lifted up on high; being driven out we were reduc'd to Heaven.* They are great things which *Gregor. M.* ſpeaketh of our Original State and Place; ſome of his words import nothing leſs, than that our Fall was from Heaven: *When Man cometh to knowledge (l) he conſidereth whence and whither he is fallen, from the Joys of Paradiſe to the Troubles of this Life, from the Angelical Societies to the Cares of Neceſſities. He that was careleſs to ſtand without danger, conſidereth what danger he is now in, bewaileth the Baniſhment that he ſuffereth, being now condemn'd, and breaths after the State of Celeſtial Glory, which he might have ſecurely enjoy'd, if he would not have ſinned.*

VII. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that our gaining the poſſeſſion of Heaven is *our regaining it, our return, reduction and reſtauration* to our former ancient State and Place. This is that which by S. *Baſil* is attributed to the Holy Spirit, (m) *our reſtauration to Paradiſe, our return to the Kingdom of Heaven.* (n) *How wilt thou return to Paradiſe* (ſaith he) *not being ſealed by Baptiſm?* S. *Cyprian* ſaith of Chriſt, (o) *Hic ad Paradiſum reduces facit, hic ad cœlorum regna perducit; he reduceth us to Paradiſe, he carrieth us to the Kingdom of Heaven.* (p) *He reduceth us* (ſaith *Nilus*) *to the Celeſtial Heavens, where Harbours are.* (q) *For the Soul ought to be reſtor'd to that place, whence ſhe departed,* ſaith *J. Martyr.* So *Tatianus* expreſſeth our great Duty and Intereſt. (r) *We ought to flee unto our ancient Condition, and to reject every thing that is an hindrance thereto.* Our chief concern is, (s) *to have always a deſire after that firſt and thrice happy Life and Abode, and to haſten a return thither; praying to attain our firſt and thrice happy Life and Dignity, and to make haſt to a return and reſtitution of our own things.* The Paradiſaical Condition which we ought to deſire to be reſtor'd to, is no other than the Heavenly; this therefore is ſuppos'd to have been our original ſtate. So Modern Divines uſually call Heaven our own place. (t) *We ſee every thing reſteth in its own place: This is moſt true of Heaven.—— as a Bone is at eaſe in its own place, if out, reſtleſs: Heaven is our Place, Country, Center; we never reſt till there.* (u) *The motion of immortal Souls is like that of celeſtial Bodies purely circular. They reſt not without returning back to the ſame point, from whence they iſſu'd.—— Fiſhes are ſaid to viſit the place of their ſpawning yearly, as finding it moſt commodious for them; and ſick Patients are uſually ſent by Phyſicians to their Native Soil, for the ſucking in that Air, from which their firſt Breath was*

received

(d) Dr. Eccles Ser. on Eph. 2. 19, 20. p. 7, 8.

(e) The Virgin Mary miſrepreſent. par. 1. p. 132.

(f) Com. in Luc. 15.

(g) Laurent. Surii Homil. p. 379. in die paſchæ.

(h) Ibid. in nativ. B. Mariæ Ser. 1.

(i) De Sp. Sanct. c. 27. p. 213.

(k) Κατενεχθέντες ἤρθημεν εἰς ὕψος· ὠθέντες εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνηνέχθημεν. *Phot. cod.* 276. *col.* 1535.

(l) *Conſiderat unde, quo lapſus eſt: quod à paradiſi gaudiis ad ærumnas vitæ præſentis, ab angelorum ſocietatibus venit ad curas neceſſitatum. Penſat in quot jam periculis jacet, qui prius ſine periculo ſtare contempſit; luget exilium, quod damnatus patitur, & ſuſpirat ad cœleſtis gloriæ ſtatum, quo perfrui ſecurus poſſet, ſi peccare noluiſſet.* Expoſ. in Job 28. cap. 26.

(m) Ἡ εἰς Παράδεισον ἀποκατάστασις, ἡ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ἄνοδος. *De Sp. Sanct.* c. 15. p. 178.

(n) Πῶς ἐπανέλθῃς εἰς τὸν Παράδεισον. *Hom.* 13. *exhort. ad Baptiſm.* p. 478.

(o) *Ad Demetrian. in fin.*

(p) Πρὸς τοὺς οὐρανίους λιμένας ἀποκαθίστησιν. *Supr.*

(q) Δεῖ γὰρ ἀποκατασταθῆναι ὅθεν ἀπέστη. *J. Mart. Paræn.* 2. p. 40.

(r) Χρὴ λοιπὸν ἡμᾶς ἐπιποθήσαντας τὸ ἀρχαῖον Παραιτήσασθαι πᾶν τὸ ἐμποδὼν γινόμενον. *Orat. c. Græc.* p. 159.

(s) Φέρειν διαπαντὸς τὸν πρώτης καὶ τρισμακαρίας ἐκείνης διατριβῆς τε καὶ ζωῆς τὸν πόθον καὶ σπεύδειν παλινδρομεῖν. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. c. 10. & 18. Εὐχὴν ποιούμενοι τῆς πρώτης καὶ τρισμακαρίου ζωῆς τε καὶ ἀξίας τυχεῖν. σπεύδειν τε ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν οἰκείων ἀναδρομήν τε καὶ ἀποκατάστασιν.

(t) *Dr. Harris Ser.* 1. *on Matth.* 5. 3.

(u) *Dr. Arrowſmith Chain of Prin.* p. 23.

received. Heaven is the place where Souls were produced. (w) *In this World we are but Strangers, Heaven is our Native Country, where our Heart ſhould be, whilſt in Body we are kept here below. Would not an Engliſh Man by any Caſe exil'd much long to ſmell the Smoak of his own Native Country?* —— *All Creatures have an inclination to the place where they were bred.* A Divine Poet of our own clearly and fully expreſſeth the Hypotheſis of Præ-exiſtence. (*x*)

If Souls be made of earthly Mold
Let them love Gold;
If born on high,
Let them unto their Kindred fly.
For they can never be at reſt,
Till they regain their ancient Neſt.

Chriſtian Divines ſpeak the Sence of *Seneca.* (y) *Tunc Animus noſter habebit quod gratuletur ſibi, cum emiſſus his tenebris, in quibus volutatur, non tenui viſu clara proſpexerit, ſed totum diem admiſerit, & redditus Cœlo ſuo fuerit. Cum receperit locum, quem occupavit ſorte naſcendi. Surſum vocant illum initia ſua.*

VIII. Chriſtians ſuppoſe, that the Souls of Men iſſu'd from Paternal Sanctity, were originally poſſeſs'd of the Divine Image (which now they have loſt,) and that their Regeneration *is a Reduction and Reſtoration. Gr. Naz.* ſaith of the Soul (z) ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ θεία, καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν εὐγενείας μετέχουσα, *ſhe is from God and Divine, and partaketh of the ſupernal Nobility*, which is alſo her (*a*) ἀρχαία εὐγένεια, *ancient Nobility.* She is of God, not only in a general way, as all Beings are of God their Creator; nor only as being of more than human Original (God being peculiarly (*b*) ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ψυχῶν, *the Father of Souls or Spirits*:) But if ſhe was originally poſſeſs'd of the Divine Image, ſhe was of God as iſſuing from Paternal Sanctity. She is *Divine*, as of a Nobleneſs and Execllency tranſcending the things Human, and as (*c*) τὰ ἄϋλα καὶ ἀσώματα, *the things that tranſcend Body and Matter are ſtiled Divine.* An Hebrew Doctor calleth the Iſraelites Souls (*d*) *Divine* as being incorruptible and eternal; and in ſuch Senſe (*e*) *Socrates* ſpeaking as a Metaphyſical Theologer affirm'd, *Animos hominum eſſe Divinos, that the Souls of Men are Divine.* They are Divine as of Kin to God in ſublime Metaphyſical Properties and Perfections (being immaterial, immortal, intelligent, free agent, &c.) in ſuch Senſe all human Souls are Divine: But ſome of them are peculiarly denominated *Divine* as being divinely virtuous according to that of *Cicero.* (*f*) *Omnium quidem animos immortales eſſe, ſed fortium bonorumque Divinos, the Souls of all are immortal, but the Souls of the heroically Good are Divine.* In ſuch Senſe (as being divinely virtuous) the Souls of all Men were in their Original Creation Divine. For they have not ſo totally loſt the Divine Image, but that there are in unregenerate Mankind (*g*) *Reliquiæ imaginis Dei, the feeble Remains, the weak Relicks of the Image of God, the rudera or broken pieces of our firſt building.* Every Soul of Man therefore was once poſſeſs'd of the Divine Image, and was originally of the Divine Family. They were created for the buſineſs of Sanctity and Religion, in the State of Sanctity and Religion (which is the State of Citizenſhip and Society with God) and they could not be originally created inept for their end and uſe. The Soul-goods and the Soul-happineſs were deſign'd them in their Original Creation (as the Terreſtrial-animal Goods are deſign'd for Men in their Terreſtrial-animal Creation;) therefore they were created in an holy and divinely happy Condition. A Soul devoid of the Divine-virtuous Image is neceſſarily a lapſed Soul (a Soul fallen from its Original Condition, its true Excellency and Felicity,) which inferreth, that ſhe was originally poſſeſs'd of it. The deſign and end of the Chriſtian Regeneration is, that the degenerate Soul of Man may recover the Divine Image, Chriſtian Divines look upon it as a Reduction and Reſtauration of what was before, as *Paulinus* ſpeaketh. (*b*)

Ut mihi per Chriſtum Cœleſtis imago rediret.

(*i*) *What there is in our Regeneration, we muſt be ſuppos'd to have been poſſeſs'd of in the more ancient State.* The Souls of Men therefore exiſted antecedently to their now lapſed State. And this Inference may be made from *Grotius*'s excellent Note upon the Parable of the Prodigal Son. (*k*) *Homines omnes ortu Dei ſunt Filii, ut hæc Fabula declarat, ſed eo jure excidunt ſemet à Deo alienando. All Men originally are the Sons of God, as this Parable declareth, but they loſe that Priviledge by alienating themſelves from God.* Hence when a Man is converted and regenerated, he is ſaid to be (*l*) *Deo ſuo reſtitutus, reſtored to his God.* Therefore he did ſometime before belong to God as one of his Divine Family. So the *loſt Sheep* and the *loſt Groat* that afterwards were found, were ſometime before in the Poſſeſſion of their Owner.

IX. The mighty Benefits which Chriſtianity bringeth to the Souls of Men, are the recovering and reſtoring what was, not the Introduction of what never was, as both ancient and modern Divines pronounce with great conſent. (*m*) *We had not only blemiſh'd God's Image, but ſet the Devil's Face and Superſcription upon God's Coyn. For Righteouſneſs, there was Sin; for Purity, Pollution; for Beauty, Deformity; for Rectitude, Perverſeneſs; for the Man, a Beaſt; ſcarce any thing left, whereby God might know us. Venit Filius, ut iterum ſignet; the Son cometh, and with his Blood reviveth the firſt Character.* (*n*) *Cujus inſtaurandæ gratia miſſum à Patre eſſe Filium, plerique omnes antiqui prædicant. For the reſtoring whereof the Father ſent the Son, as the Ancients generally ſay.* Chriſt deſcended to us, that we might aſcend to him, ſaith *Paulinus* (*o*) *that we may be truly reformed to the Original Glory, if by the imitation of Chriſt we gain the Divine Similitude. Athanaſius* ſaith, that Chriſt came (*p*) *that being the Image of the Father, he might again create Man after his Image. The coming and Philanthropy of our Saviour* (*q*) *hath recalled us from the oppoſite Village into his heavenly City.* (*r*) *Chriſt ſendeth his Spirit into the Souls of Believers, transforming them* εἰς εἶδος τὸ ἐν ἀρχαῖς, *into the ancient and original form.* (*s*) Ἀποδοὺς τῇ φύσει τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα, καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἀξίωμα, *reſtoring this to Nature, to be after the Divine Image, and to have its firſt Dignity,* ſaith *Andreas*

(w) *The Power of Godlin. by Mr. John Ball. p.* 419.

(x) *Mr. Herbert Poems. p.* 104. *Ed.* 2. *Vanity.*

(y) *Ep.* 79. & 120.

(z) *Orat.* 1. *p.* 8.

(a) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 8. *p.* 145.

(b) *Simplic. in Epict. p.* 179.

(c) *Niceph. in Syneſ. p.* 377.

(d) *Jacchiad. in Dan.* 8. 4.

(e) *Cic. de Amicit.*

(f) *De Leg. l.* 2.

(g) *S. Aug. de Sp. & Lit. c.* 28.

(h) *In Panegyr. Celſ.*

(i) Ὅπερ ἡ ἀνακαίνισις ἔχει, τοῦτο κεκλῆσθαι πάντως καὶ τὴν ἀρχαιότητα προσήκει νοεῖν. S. *Cyr.* 13. *Theſ. p.* 135.

(k) *Not. in Luc.* 15. 19.

(l) *S. Cyprian. de orat. domin.*

(m) *Mr. Farindon. Ser. on Heb.* 2. 17.

(n) *Petav. T.* 4. *Par.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(o) *Ut verè ad originale gloriam reformemur, ſi divina ſimilitudinem Chriſti imitatio capiamus.* Ep. 2. p. 24.

(p) Ἵν' ὡς εἰκὼν ὢν τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρω ἀνακτίσαι δυνηθῇ. De Incar *verb. p.* 47. *Commel.*

(q) Ἀνεκαλέσατο ἡμᾶς ἐ τῆς κατέναντι κώμης εἰς τ ἐπουράνιον αὐτοῦ πόλιν. *In ill profect. in pag. p.* 777.

(r) *S. Cyr. Dial.* 7. *de Tri p.* 638.

(s) *Ap. P tav. p*

Cretenſis. So *Maximus* the Martyr ſaith, (t) *that the deſign of his Incarnation, was to make us partakers of a Divine Nature,* ὡς ἐπ' ἀρχῆς, *as in the beginning. Epiphanius* compareth God to a Potter, who taketh care of the Veſſel (the Body) which he had made, (u) *in the Regeneration* (the Reſurrection) *to form again the Veſſel into its ancient Splendor.* They are ſplendid, radiant and celeſtial Bodies, which holy Souls ſhall wear at the Reſurrection; if their Bodies were anciently ſuch, they could be nothing leſs than heavenly Citizens, that had *Domicilium in Urbe, their Manſion in the City.* In their new Creation they are deſign'd for heavenly Bodies and for the heavenly Regions; therefore they were deſign'd for ſuch in their Original Creation. By their new Creation and the Settlement of Chriſtianity they have the State of Sanctity and of heavenly Citizenſhip; therefore they had it by their Original Creation and the Settlement of Original Sanctity. *To reform* is to reſtore, according to our Saviour's rule, *from the beginning it was not ſo.* So the uſual and natural courſe of things is, to return to their Original. (w) The deſign of Chriſtianity to Regenerate Souls into the holy Life and to raiſe them to the heavenly State of Life, implieth, that they are fallen from both, as the Fathers implicitly affirm, when they ſuppoſe, that the Renovation of Souls into the Divine Image is their Reſtauration. For if their Regeneration into that Branch of the Divine Image *the Life Divine* is their Reſtauration, common Reaſon will ſuggeſt, that their Regeneration into that other Branch of the Divine Image *a Divine Body,* muſt neceſſarily be their Reſtauration alſo. For *Grace* and *Glory* are two Branches of one and the ſame Divine Image inſeparably connex'd, that differ only gradually (the one is a degree and inchoation of the other;) and all that are regenerate into the holy Life, are (in ſome degree) regenerate into an Heavenly and Divine Body.

We applaud therefore theſe Sayings of the Fathers, which affirm, that the intent of Chriſt's coming was our *Reſtauration:* But not ſuch as ſeem, to affirm, that the intent of Chriſt's coming was nothing more than to repair the Fall of *Adam* in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe. (x) *That we may regain in Chriſt Jeſus, that which we had loſt in* Adam, *the Image and Similitude of God. That by the Oeconomy of the Tree we might regain that, which we had negligently loſt by the Tree. That what was loſt of old in* Adam *by the Tree, might be reſtor'd by the Tree of Chriſt's Paſſion.* In the Acts of the Nicene Council (y) *Macarius* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* ſaith, that Chriſt came, *ut inſtauraret quæ per primorum parentum lapſum fuerant ſoluta.* In S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Works there is an Homily upon this Subject, *that the firſt Man caſt away the Divine Image, but Man who is now become Brute-like* πάλιν αὐτὴν ἀπέλαβε, *hath got it again by the new* Adam. If theſe Sayings mean, that Chriſt came only to reſtore what we loſt by the Sin of *Adam* in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe, they are far from deſerving applauſe. For the State of Sanctity and of heavenly Citizenſhip which Chriſtianity bringeth us, was not the State of the Terreſtrial *Adam* in his Innocency. There is no appearance of the Divine Image according to Chriſtianity ſhining in his Soul, nor was his Body any thing more than an Animal-kind of Body. (z) *O myſtic Miracle! the Lord was bowed down and Man roſe up: And he that fell but from Paradiſe, receiveth Heaven a greater reward of his Obedience.* Heaven is much more than the Reſtauration of an earthly Paradiſe loſt. If it muſt be counted nothing more than the Reſtauration of what was before, an heavenly State and an heavenly World of Souls muſt be Præ-exiſtent, and this World of Rationals muſt be made out of the ruins of the heavenly World.

X. Againſt the Chriſtians vulgar Hiſtorical Theology as extravagant in its account of Original Sin the Jews make this Objection, (a) *All Souls have their Origin, not from* Adam, *but from God the Creator. Hence this conſequence is certain and evident, the Souls of the Poſterity of* Adam *could not Sin in him.* This Argument is (by them that pretend to anſwer it) called a vulgar Objection, which doth not argue the Weakneſs, but the mighty Strength of it, and that it is a plain and obvious Truth, which all Men eaſily underſtand. For all Men eaſily underſtand the difference between the Body and the rational Soul of Man; and that as to what Man is *valuably, ſubſtantially, durably, moſt properly and in the main,* the Soul and the Soul only is the Man. That the proper Nature of Man conſiſteth in that which ſurmounteth the Nature of Brute-animals, and ſo doth his proper Happineſs. That by their rational Soul only Men are conſtituted intelligent and free Agents, capable of Duty and Virtue and of Sin, of Well-doing and Evil-doing, deſerving of Commendation and Blame, Rewards and Puniſhments, and are qualified to live under Laws and moral Government. That in all Government Juſtice is adminiſtred, Rewards and Puniſhments are diſtributed according to the Mind and Wills of Men; they are reputed evil Men and evil Doers becauſe of their evil Mind and Will; and if they do that which is Evil to others, but altogether unwittingly and unwillingly, againſt their Mind and Will, it is not imputed to them (nor are they thanked or commended for doing that which is Good, if they had no Mind, Will or Intention to do it;) ſo that as to what he muſt be judged by, a Man is his Mind and Will, and the Mind and Will and nothing elſe is the Man. As his Soul is affected and addicted, ſuch is the Man; his Soul is the Seat of his Vices and Virtues, the Principle, Motive and end of his Actions (whence they are chiefly denominated Good or Evil) is in the Soul, therein is the truth and reality of Goodneſs and Wickedneſs, and therein is the true nobleneſs, excellency and accompliſhments of Man. The Soul is ſo noble (in reſpect of her Nature, Faculties, Operations, Capacities, Kindred, Deſcent and Duration,) and of ſo vaſt Importance, that there is no compariſon between the World and the Soul. The chief (and in compariſon) the only care

(t) Ibid. Pet. 2. l. 12. c. 1. §. 15.

(u) Ἵνα αὖθις ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ἀνασκευάσῃ τὸ ἄγγος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν φαιδρότητα. T. 3. l. 1. Hær. 37.

(w) *Ortus cuncta ſuos repetunt.* Maximian. *Ita in fontem refluunt, & in ſemet omnia revolvuntur, nullo artifice, nec judice, nec auctore.* Min. Fel. p. 38. Boeth. de Conſ. Phil. l. 4. p. 226. *Semper enim ſimilis eſt finis initiis.* Origen. περὶ ἀρχ. l. 1. c. 6.

(x) *Ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id eſt ſecundum imaginem & ſimilitudinem eſſe Dei, hoc in Chriſto Jeſu reciperemus.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 20. *Ut quod per lignum negligenter amiſeramus, nec inveniebamus, recepturi eſſemus iterum per ligni diſpoſitionem.* Ibid. l. 5. *Ut quod perierat olim per lignum in Adam, id reſtitueretur per lignum Chriſti.* Tertull. adv. Jud. c. 13.

(y) P. 340. ed. col. 1605.

(z) Ὦ θαύματος μυστικοῦ! κέκλιται μὲν ὁ κύριος ἀνέστη δὲ ἄνθρωπος· καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου πεσὼν, μεῖζον ὑπακοῆς ἆθλον οὐρανοὺς ἀπολαμβάνει. Clem. προτρ. p. m. 51.

(a) Hoornbeek c. Jud. l. 4. c. 2.

of Mankind ought to be the Soul's Welfare (that ſhe be not deprav'd, loſt and caſt away;) the Work of Religion is Soul-work, and the buſineſs, end and deſign of it, is to ſave Souls, to make them holy and happy for ever. The main of the Lapſe of Mankind therefore is the Lapſe of the Soul from her Holineſs and Happineſs, and whether ſuch a lapſed Condition can accrue to the Souls of Men from the Fall of *Adam* in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe, was a grand Debate in the Pelagian Controverſie. (*b*) For the Catholicks found themſelves incumbred with this inſuperable Difficulty, and were not able to give a tolerably good account, how from *Adam* and his Fall the Souls of all his Poſterity deriv'd Original Sin? Some thought, that human Souls were by *Traduction*, and ſo the Souls of the Children received an Infection from the Souls of the Parents. But they might as well have ſaid, that there is no ſuch thing as a Soul properly ſo called, nor any thing in the World but Body and Matter variouſly modified; for the Soul muſt be ſuch, if one human Soul of a Parent can, Generate and Propagate Forty or Fifty human Souls of his Children. Others were of Opinion, that human Souls were immediately created by God in the Generation of Mankind. But S. *Auſtin* acknowledgeth, that this Opinion is irreconcileable with Original Sin. For thus he writeth to *Optatus*. *Se neque legendo, neque orando, neque ratiocinando invenire potuiſſe, quomodo cum animarum creatione peccatum originis defendatur. That neither by reading, nor praying, nor reaſoning, he could find out how Original Sin can conſiſt with the Creation of Souls.* But ſome think, that they have found out (what S. *Auſtin* could not) a method of reconciling Original Sin with the immediate Creation of Souls. (*c*) For they ſuppoſe, that Original Sin is propagated from *Adam* to his Poſterity, *not in a way of Phyſical efficiency, but morally and by way of Merit*. That by his Tranſgreſſion he merited this penal Evil for the Souls of all his Poſterity, that they ſhould be depriv'd of Original Righteouſneſs; accordingly, God in creating them depriveth them of it (imputing the Sin of *Adam* to all his Children,) which deprivation is on God's part Puniſhment, but on their part it is Sin (Sin Original) as being *carentia juſtitiæ ineſſe debitæ, a want of that Righteouſneſs which ought to be in the Soul.* Thus the State and Life of Grace (and conſequently the inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven) is ſuppoſed to have been entailed upon the Terreſtrial-animal *Adam* and his Terreſtrial-animal Heirs, muſt have deſcended to his Terreſtrial-animal Family, if he had not ſinned; and the holy heavenly Life muſt have been of earthly, fleſhly and natural Generation. Thus all our Spiritual and Soul-concerns are ſuppos'd, to have been entruſted in the hands of a Terreſtrial-animal Man (to ſave or loſe them,) and he is impower'd to blaſt, kill and ruinate the Souls of all Men without any Conſent or Fault of their own. Thus Regeneration muſt be ſuppos'd, to be the Reſtauration of the Divine Image in the Souls of Men, that never had it; the Souls of Men muſt be ſuppoſed to be created by God horribly inept for their end and uſe; and if we ask, whence is it, that the Souls of all Infants are (more or leſs) graceleſs, ſinful and wicked in Diſpoſition (privatively and poſitively) this Hypotheſis anſwereth, *God createth and maketh them ſuch.* But is this an honourary Character of the Deity? Is not this ſuppos'd Creation a making him the Cauſe and Author of Sin and that by way of Phyſical Efficiency? Is it conſiſtent with the Divine Sanctity, Goodneſs and Juſtice, to inflict theſe dreadful Spiritual Plagues, *Blindneſs, Pravity, Spiritual Death, a deprivation of the Divine Image and the Holy Spirit, the loſs of God and his Favour and of the Divine Sonſhip and Citizenſhip* (with all other Spiritual Honours and Felicities) upon the Souls of all Infants, that never did any thing to deſerve them? Or becauſe through the Sin of *Adam* the Animal Nature of Mankind is juſtly ſubjected to the courſe of Nature (and therefore to many Evils,) is it reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that for his Offence all Mankind may juſtly be depriv'd of all their Soul-goods, and be ſubjected to the contrary Evils? How much more agreeably both to Philoſophy and Religion doth the noble *Frenchman* affirm (*d*) *humana natura ſeſe ipſa corrupit, quatenus in ſeſe & ex ſeſe evanida facta eſt, & quodammodo evappuit. The human Soul hath corrupted her ſelf, as having in and of her ſelf become degenerate. In anima culpa generis humani fuerit, oportet. The fault and crime of Mankind muſt have been in the Soul.* S. *Auſtin* that was extremely heſitant touching the Origin of the Soul, yet was not heſitant touching the Origine of Evil. (*e*) *Certùs ſum, animam nulla Dei culpa, nulla Dei neceſſitate vel ſua, ſed propria voluntate in peccatum eſſe collapſam. I am certain, that not by any fault of God, not by any neceſſity of his or her own, but by her own Will the Soul is lapſed into Sin.* Lapſed Souls (devoid of the holy vital Nature) are ſubjected to the courſe of Nature (as well as our Terreſtrial-animal Nature,) their Lapſe in part conſiſteth in being ſubjected to the courſe of Nature: But to ſubject newly created Souls to the courſe of Nature, is to ſubject them to the Reign and Domination of Sin (that reigneth over all Mankind in the courſe of Nature,) which is extremely harſh and incongruous. And in Philoſophy it is incongruous, to ſuppoſe an immediate creative Agency and Operation of God in every Generation of a Child; as in Theology it is incongruous, to ſuppoſe, that God with his immediate creative Agency attendeth all the impure mixtures of Inceſt, Adultery (and ſuch more) ſo furniſhing them with human Souls.

XI. In the Lapſe of Mankind there is much more *Penal Evil*, than can be deriv'd from the Puniſhment of *Adam* in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe. For the Puniſhment which was laid upon *Eve* in Paradiſe (which the Jews call Ten Maledictions) and the Penalties which *Adam* was ſubjected to upon his Tranſgreſſion there (which as the Jews ſay, were Nine Puniſhments beſides Death) may not unfitly be called *Pœna Temporaria, a Temporary kind of Puniſhment*, (*f*) as *P. Fagius* calleth them. For as the beneficial part of his Paradiſaical Oeconomy was nothing elſe but *the enjoyment of his earthly Paradiſe, a ſuſpenſion of the courſe of Nature as to inordinate Concupiſcence, the Evils of this Life and bodily Death*: So the Penal part of it was nothing elſe but *the loſs of his earthly Paradiſe, his being ſubjected to the courſe of Nature as to the inordinacy of Concupiſcence, the Evils of this Life and bodily Death.* Theſe Evils reaſonably and agreeably to the holy Scriptures fairly interpreted may be deriv'd (either wholly or in great part) from the Fall of *Adam*: But there are other and greater Penal Evils in the Lapſe of Mankind, which are not at all derivable

from

(b) *Voſſ. Hiſt Pelag. l. 2. Par. 3. Theſ. 1.*

(c) *Voſſ. ſupr. Hoornbeek c. Jud. l. 4. c. 2 p.* 357.

(d) *Morn. Pleſſ. de V. R. C. c.* 16, 17.

(e) Ep. 28.

(f) *In Gen.* 3. 19.

from it. For the Souls of all the Children of *Adam* in their now Original State have loſt their proper Life and their holy State (which is in an Ocean of deadly Evils) they have loſt their God and themſelves, which muſt be their own doing. (g) *For as the Soul is the Life of the Body, ſo God is the Life of the Soul. God loſt is the Death of the Soul, as the Soul loſt is the Death of the Body. The Death of the Body is neceſſary, the Death of the Soul is voluntary.*

(g) *Sicut Anima eſt vita corporis, ſic vita Animæ eſt Deus. Deus amiſſus mors Animæ. Anima amiſſa mors corporis. Mors corporis neceſſaria, mors Animæ voluntaria.* S. Aug. de verb. Dom Ser. 6.

The ſpiritual Death of the Soul cannot be involuntary, (h) for it is ἀρετῆς φθορὰ, *her becoming vicious and the deſtruction of her Virtue*, which nothing can deſtroy but her own Sin; therefore it was not the Sin of *Adam* in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe, that depriv'd the Souls of his Poſterity of Original Righteouſneſs in the Senſe of the Schools. (i) *The Soul that ſinneth, it ſhall* (ſpiritually) *die. For it dieth as to the Lord, not by infirmity of Nature, but of Fault.* No place of Scripture affirmeth, that the Death of the Soul is the Effect or Puniſhment of the Terreſtrial *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion. If S. *Paul* had ſuppoſed, that all Men in their now Original State are not only ſubjected to bodily Death, but dead as to Spirituals and Eternals by *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, he would not have confin'd his Diſcourſes touching the State of Sin and Death which *Adam* introduc'd, *to bodily Death*, as he perpetually doth.

(h) Grot. not. in Luc. 15. 24.

(i) *Anima quæ peccat ipſa morietur. Moritur enim Domino: Non Naturæ infirmitate, ſed culpa* S. Ambroſ. de Fid. reſur. or. 2. & de Fide l. 3. c. 2. & de bono mort. c. 2.

XII. In the Lapſe of Mankind there is much more criminal Evil than the Sin of *Adam* in his Terreſtrial Paradiſe, which was neither more nor leſs than the eating of a Symbolical Tree, which cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd introductive of all the criminal and penal Evils that are in the Lapſe of Mankind. They that freely uſe their Reaſon, can ſcarce abſtain from nauſeating this vulgar Dogma, that the Souls of all Men are blaſted and ruinated meerly for the Fault of their Progenitor after the Fleſh, and that in ſuch Senſe

Adam primus Homo damnavit ſecula pomo.

His eating the forbidden Fruit is ſaid, to have been *a direct and formal Rebellion, a publick renunciation of Obedience, an univerſal Apoſtacy from God and Change of the laſt end, that extinguiſh'd the habit of Original Righteouſneſs.* Some ſay, (k) *It was an open Profeſſion, that he would not be under God, and renouncing of him to be his Lord.* Which Exaggeration of its Criminality will appear incredible, if we compare the Sin of *Adam* (who was a Rebel againſt his Soveraign Lord) with the many Rebellions of the ancient Iſraelites, particularly their Rebellion in worſhipping the Golden Calf. Of which the Book *Coſri* rightly ſaith (l) *that Sin was not an univerſal Apoſtacy from his Worſhip that brought them out of Egypt, it was only a Rebellion againſt part of his Precepts.* The Sin of *Adam* was a Rebel-kind of Sinning (as all the voluntary, choſen and deliberate kind of Sinning is,) but there is no appearance, that in eating the forbidden Fruit he became either an Atheiſt, or a Worſhipper of falſe Gods, or a Confederate with the Devil (as Witches are;) and he muſt become one of theſe, if his Sin was a renouncing God and an univerſal Apoſtacy from him. His Sin was a great Sin and involv'd in it many Sins (as all willfull and deliberate Sins do,) yet it cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed any thing more than a particular Act of Sin (or Rebellion:) But the Fall of Angels was much more than ſo; for they betook themſelves to a courſe and State of Rebellion, and made a total Revolt from God, his Service, Society and Kingdom. Their Apoſtacy therefore was a much greater Criminal Evil than *Adam*'s eating the forbidden Fruit, which was but a particular Act of Sin, done and paſt in a moment, and from which (m) if ſome miſtake not, he was reſtor'd the ſame day. Many Writers of Morality have diſcourſed, that *the Phyſical good*, (*bonum Phyſicum*,) of Mankind is the Reaſon, Root and Scope of *the Moral Good* (*Bonum Morale*,) which tendeth to the Phyſical Good (or the Happineſs and Advantage,) of Mankind in general, and is oppoſite to their Phyſical Evil. If this is a good account of Morality, ſuch a Sin, wherein there is a great Phyſical Evil, muſt be far greater *cætera ſi ſint Paria*, than ſuch an one, wherein there is nothing, or but little of Phyſical Evil; and conſequently the unlawful eating the forbidden Fruit muſt not be thought a Sin of ſuch a magnitude, as the crucifying the Son of God. The Sin of eating the forbidden Fruit had all its ſinfulneſs and all its aggravations from the Moral Evils, which it involv'd (Infidelity, Diſobedience, Pride, Contempt of God, Ingratitude, Senſuality;) and ſeeing all the choſen and deliberate, the rebel and preſumptuous kind of Sins do involve in them the ſame Moral Evils, it muſt not be thought (upon the account of thoſe Moral Evils) to tranſcend the ſize of other rebel and preſumptuous Sins. The literal eating the Fruit of a Tree in Paradiſe is generally thought the violation only of a poſitive Precept touching a thing in it ſelf wholly indifferent (that had no Phyſical or Moral Evil in it,) which therefore ſeemeth not the greateſt Sin that ever was committed. Chriſtians that have a lively ſenſe of Sin, and are affected with Horrour at the thoughts of it, (ſo far as I can diſcern) are affected with far greater Horrour at the thoughts of many other atrocious Sins than of this Adamical Tranſgreſſion, which even *Tertullian* ſtileth (n) *unius arbuſculæ delibatio*. Profane Perſons are apt, to have very ſlight thoughts of it, and uſually look upon it as a *Peccadillo*, as Pope *Julius* the Third did, when he thus excus'd his intemperate Anger. *If God was ſo angry with our firſt Parents* propter Pomum, *he might well be allow'd to be angry* propter Pavonem.

(k) Mr. Mede on Gen. 3. 13, 14, 15.

(l) P. 57. ed. Buxtorf.

(m) *The Patriarchal Sabbath by J. S.* p. 156.

(n) *Adv. Marcion. l.* 1.

XIII. The Old Teſtament-œconomy was deſign'd by Divine Wiſdom, to conſiſt of Symbolical and Typical Inſtitutes, of which many look *both backward and forward*, they are Adumbrations of Hiſtorical things paſt, and alſo Types and Adumbrations of Evangelical things to come. (o) The *Iſraelites* Paſſeover was (by ſignificative Rites) a lively Adumbration and Memorial of their *Egyptian* Thraldom and of their Deliverance out of it, which was paſt; and it was alſo a lively Adumbration and Type of the Chriſtians Paſſeover that was to come. The Judaical Sabbath was an Adumbration and Memorial of God's Creation-work, which was paſt; and alſo a Type and Adumbration of the Chriſtians reſt, which was to come, *Heb.* 4.4. So the Judaical Tabernacle and Temple as

(o) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *S.* 3.

it looketh backward, was a Symbol and Adumbration of Heaven, the Courts of it of the ſeveral Regions of Heaven, the Lamps of its Golden Candleſtick of the ſeven Planets: And as it looketh forward (towards things to come) it was a typical Adumbration of Chriſt Jeſus (who was the Temple of the Godhead, *Col.* 2. 9. *Heb.* 10. 20.) and of the Church of Regenerate Chriſtians, who are God's Spiritual Temple and Holy Habitation, 1 *Cor.* 3. 16, 17. 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. *Eph.* 2. 21. The ſame account muſt be given of the Moſaical Paradiſe, the Inſtitutes whereof are σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, *a ſhadow of good things to come*, as they look forward. And as they look backward, they are an Adumbration of an antecedent lapſe of Mankind, which the Fall of our firſt Parents in their Terreſtrial Paradiſe was deſign'd to repreſent. For the Terreſtrial Paradiſe with its delectable things was plainly an Adumbration of the Heavenly Paradiſe; their State in the Terreſtrial Paradiſe (wherein the courſe of Nature was ſuſpended) adumbrateth the Heavenly State of Life; their natural Innocency adumbrateth our original Sanctity; their eating the forbidden Fruit by the ſuggeſtion of a Serpent adumbrateth our criminal lapſe through the temptation of Satan; their expulſion out of Paradiſe adumbrateth our Exile from Heaven; and the Cherubims plac'd at the entrance of the Garden of *Eden* with a flaming Sword, to keep the way of the Tree of Life, ſignifie, that we have loſt our right to Life and Immortality, our excluſion from it and an impoſſibility of our regaining it. So thoſe Beaſt-Skins wherewith our firſt Parents were cloath'd, are ſymbolical and ſignificative of thoſe animaliſh and bruitiſh Bodies, wherewith Parental Providence cloatheth lapſed Souls, and which now we wear in our fallen Eſtate. (*p*) So *Origen* allegorically interpreteth the Cloathing of Beaſts Skins, and it is reaſonable (in this Inſtance) to follow his Interpretation; for who can doubt of an Interpretation grounded upon ſo appoſite a Correſpondence of things, the Contexture of the Moſaic Hiſtory of Paradiſe, and the Hypotheſis of an Ante-moſaical pre-exiſtence and lapſe of Humane Souls? which is thus far a matter of great certainty; it is certain, that the Chriſtian Theology is a ſublimer ſort of Theology than meerly our Vulgar-hiſtorical Theology. And it is certain, plain and demonſtrable, that the Hiſtory of the *Bible* aſcendeth no higher than to an Introduction to Chriſtianity, that ſuppoſeth an antecedent lapſe of Souls; which lapſe of Souls is thus deſcribed by S. *Athanaſius.* (*q*) *The Soul of Men did not continue ſuch, as ſhe was originally made; but ſuch as ſhe hath made her ſelf by defiling her ſelf, ſuch ſhe now is: for ſhe was made to ſee God and to be illuminated by him; but inſtead of God ſhe hath ſought out corruptible things and Darkneſs.* Divines generally ſay, That Heaven is the place, where Souls were produc'd; and whether is it more reaſonable, to ſay, that they were immediately exil'd from thence without any fault of theirs, or that they ſtay'd there for ſome time, and their Exile from thence was their lapſe?

XIV. The Hypotheſis of Pre-exiſtence muſt be cleanſed from the Paganical Vanities, that adhere to it; ſuch as thoſe that *Origen* heedleſly entertain'd; (*r*) that Souls for want of Mind came into theſe groſs Bodies, and that their Happineſs lieth in returning to Mind; that they are from Eternity; and that there is an endleſs Circuit of Souls aſcending and deſcending, and of alternate Beatitude and Miſery. The lapſe of Souls which Pre-exiſtence implieth, muſt not be conſider'd as Solitary, but as complicate with the lapſe of our firſt Parents in their Paradiſe. Men's Bodies muſt not be thought the Priſons of their Souls; nor ought we to ſay, that the lapſed Souls of Men are thruſt down into theſe Terreſtrial Bodies, to be puniſh'd for their former Prevarications, as the Pagan Theologers ſuppos'd; for thus S. *Hierom* hath rightly expreſs'd their Dogma: (*s*) *That the Souls of Men are lapſed from Heaven, and according to the diverſity of their Merits in ſuch and ſuch Bodies they ſuffer the Puniſhments of their ancient Sins.* So *Origen* (as S. *Auſtin* ſaith of him) *ſuppos'd, that the World was therefore made, that Souls for the Merit of their Sins might be penally inclos'd in Bodies as Priſons:* Diſcarding theſe Unchriſtian Extravagancies the Hypotheſis of Pre-exiſtence ought to be thus repreſented; *The Souls of Men by their lapſe complicated with the lapſe of our firſt Parents are now become ſubjected to the courſe of Nature and of Parental Providence the Author of Nature, whereby they are put to the beſt uſe that they are capable of, which is to conſtitute this World of civil Society* (and withall they are deſign'd to be recover'd from their lapſe according to Chriſtianity,) *which World of Civil Society was conſtituted by making our firſt Parents and deriving the reſt of Mankind from them.* There is not any Hypotheſis touching the Origin of the Soul, that is ſo Rational and Religious as the Hypotheſis of Pre-exiſtence thus repreſented; nor is there any, that is incumbred with ſo few Difficulties: for although a little Army of Objections is muſter'd up againſt it, yet not any of them is of any great ſtrength ſave one, which I will fully propoſe, and as fully anſwer. (*t*) *Juſtitiæ convenit, ut delictorum ob quæ ſontes plectuntur, non aboleatur memoria; cùm ut ad qualemcunque reſipiſcentiam ex reatûs conſcientia & pœnæ ſenſu perducantur, tùm ut Juſtitiæ ultricis majeſtatem agnoſcerent, diſcerentque juſtitiam moniti & non temnere Divos: quo ſpectat illud Tertulliani, Evacuabitur ratio judicii, ſi meritorum deerit ſenſus: igitur cùm olim peccatum eſſe non agnoſcimus, cur pœnam inde infligi cenſeamus?* (*u*) *It ſuppoſeth God, to inflict the Severities of his Juſtice without attaining any ends of Juſtice or of Puniſhment; for to what purpoſe is it, to inflict Penalties upon any Perſon for Offences, of which he is invincibly ignorant? as ignorant as if they had never been committed? If therefore the Calamities of this Life were inflicted upon us only as Puniſhments of Sins committed in another, Providence would have provided ſome effectual means, to preſerve thoſe Sins in our Memories. If they be not preſerv'd in our Memories, Mankind will have an invincible temptation to have hard thoughts of God's dealings with them; for if it will not conſiſt with his Righteouſneſs and Benignity, to place us in thoſe ſad Circumſtances which we are in, unleſs thereby to puniſh us for our former Prevarications (as the Patrons of Pre-exiſtence diſpute,) when we know our ſelves to be in this ſad plight, and yet are utterly deſtitute of all knowledge, how we deſerv'd it, what can we more reaſonably infer, than that God hath contrary to all the Laws of Juſtice and Equity made us wretched and miſerable?*

(p) *V. P. Fag. in Gen.* 3. 21. *Gataker. Cinn. p.* 202. *in Ant. p.* 351. *Gr. Naz. p.* 619.

(q) Ἡ ψυχὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐχ ὁποία γέγονε, τοιαύτη καὶ ἔμεινεν· ἀλλ᾽ ὁποίαν ἑαυτὴν ἐνέφυρε, τοιαύτη καὶ φαίνεται. γέγονε μὲν γὰρ, εἰς τὸ ὁρᾶν τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ φωτίζεσθαι· αὕτη δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ φθαρτὰ καὶ τὸ σκότος ἐζήτησεν. *Orat. c. Gentes p.* 6. *com.*

(r) Περὶ ἀρχῶν, l. 3. c. 5.

(s) *V. El. Cret. Com. in Gr. Naz. or.* 31.

(t) Dr. Barrow opuſcul. p. 44.

(u) Sa. Parker of the Pre-exiſt. of Souls, p. 176, 177.

This Objection is levell'd againſt Pre-exiſtence miſrepreſented; for the Hypotheſis of Pre-exiſtence is not ſo much deſign'd, to give an account of the Puniſhments that are here inflicted upon Mankind, as of the ſinful degeneracy of Mankind (the cauſe of thoſe Puniſhments,) whence it is, that Mankind are become a Generation of Ungodly Sinners and under the Domination of their ghoſtly deadly Enemies. The lapſe of Souls which it implieth, correſpondeth to the lapſe of our firſt Parents; they that make this Objection againſt Pre-exiſtence, may as juſtly make it againſt the Puniſhment of Mankind for the Prevarication of *Adam* and *Eve*; and if they can give an Anſwer to it, as it is an Objection againſt that generally receiv'd Hypotheſis, the ſame Anſwer may be given to it, as it is an Objection againſt Pre-exiſtence. For as our uſual Theology will not ſay, that lapſed Mankind are thruſt into this World, to be puniſh'd for the former Prevarication of our firſt Parents, although they are puniſh'd for that former Prevarication: So the Aſſerters of Pre-exiſtence ought not to ſay, that the lapſed Souls of Men are thruſt down into theſe Terreſtrial Bodies, to be puniſh'd for their former Prevarications, although they are puniſh'd for their former Prevarications. As lapſed Mankind are no otherwiſe puniſh'd for the former Prevarication of our firſt Parents, than to be ſubjected to the courſe of Nature: So the lapſed Souls of Men are no otherwiſe puniſh'd for their former Prevarication, than to be ſubjected to the courſe of Nature. As all lapſed Mankind are ſubjected to the courſe of Nature for the former Prevarication of our firſt Parents, yet God is not oblig'd, to give them all notice of that former Prevarication as the cauſe of their Puniſhment (for how ſmall a part of Mankind ever heard of *Adam* and *Eve*?) So all the lapſed Souls of Men are ſubjected to the courſe of Nature for their former Prevarication, yet God is not oblig'd, to give them notice of their former Prevarication, as the cauſe of the Puniſhment which they ſuffer. For ſuch Puniſhment which is ſubjection to the courſe of Nature, muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from ſuch Puniſhment, which is ſubjection to courſe of Law (Law-proceedings:) The former of theſe is the Puniſhment of lapſed Angels, *who are thruſt down into Priſon*; for to condemn and commit Malefactors to Priſon, is not courſe of Nature, but of Law. Such Puniſhment which is ſubjection to courſe of Law (in the Senſe of this Diſtribution) falleth not within the courſe of Nature; what falleth within the courſe of Nature, (w) all People diſtinguiſh from their Law. By their Law (Civil or Natural, Humane or Divine) Children and Fools are not ſentenc'd to Death; but by the eſtabliſh'd courſe of Nature they are ordinarily put to Death: They that incur the higheſt Penalties in Law (as the lapſed Angels have done) may be nothing more than *factive Criminals*: but Mankind are under this Puniſhment to be ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, whence they are neceſſarily *Native Criminals.* In ſuch Puniſhment which is Subjection to courſe of Law, the Fact original of the Puniſhment muſt be notic'd (elſe it will ſeem unjuſt, and will not conduce to its End:) but in ſuch Puniſhment which is Subjection to the courſe of Nature, it is not neceſſary, that the Fact original of the Puniſhment be notic'd, if Guilt enough beſides be notic'd, ſufficient to juſtifie Providence, and for the End of Puniſhment. If it be fairly notic'd to Mankind (who are ſubjected to Death and innumerable other penal Evils,) that in this Earthly State they are grievous Sinners, this is ſufficient to juſtifie Providence and for the End of Puniſhment, although they know not how they came to be Sinners, nor how their penal Evils were at firſt introduc'd (any otherwiſe than in general, that they are for their Sins,) although they never heard either of *Adam's* tranſgreſſion, or of the original lapſe of Souls. Cannot God juſtly puniſh Mankind in the courſe of Nature, unleſs he giveth them an account of the cauſes of the Phænomena of Nature? or unleſs he reſolveth that Problem, πόθεν τὰ κακά; *whence come Evils?* The lapſe of Souls (which Pre-exiſtence implieth) was introductory of the penal Evils of this State, but ſo as to be withall introductory of the criminal Evils of it, which deſerve the penal Evils: and if Mankind are not unacquainted with thoſe Criminal Evils, they cannot be ſaid, to be invincibly ignorant of the Sins, for which they are puniſh'd, or to be under an invincible temptation to have hard thoughts of God, who puniſheth them leſs than their known Iniquities deſerve. Is it not notice ſufficient for their amendment (which is the End of Caſtigatory Puniſhments,) to know, that their Puniſhments in the courſe of Nature are for their Sins (which therefore they are concern'd to repent of and eſchew) without knowing any thing that paſs'd in a former State, or in the Moſaical Paradiſe, which cannot be amended? If this was their caſe therefore, *to have no notice of their original lapſe*, yet the Hypotheſis of Pre-exiſtence would not claſh with the Juſtice of Providence; but this is not their caſe: For it is the Senſe of the generality of Pagans, Jews and Chriſtians (*in all Ages*) *that the Souls of Men are Heaven-born*; *and* (in great degree) *they agree in acknowledging their degeneracy.* The eminent Philoſophers in all Ages (ſo far as any Memoirs inform us) whether Pagans, Jews or Chriſtians, have in ſome ſort held the Pre-exiſtence and Lapſe of Humane Souls. Mankind therefore cannot be ſaid, to have no notice of their original lapſe, although it falleth not within the compaſs of their Memory (nor is it poſſible it ſhould without a Miracle,) nor doth the Tranſgreſſion of our firſt Parents fall within the compaſs of our Memory, for which yet we are juſtly puniſh'd in the courſe of Nature. But againſt the Theory of Pre-exiſtence another Objection is rais'd from *Rom.* 9. 11. *The Children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil.* To which the Anſwer is; that the criminal lapſe of Souls in the State of Pre-exiſtence doth not conſtitute us thoſe that in this State are the *factively* Criminals, but only thoſe, that are *the natively* Criminals. The Children yet to be born, are not ſo much as *meer Infants*, and meer Infants are not either the *factively* well-doers, or the *factively* evil-doers, in regular conſideration they are only the *natively* evil-doers, or originally Sinners, (which original Sinnerſhip is not now to be deriv'd immediately from the original lapſe of Souls, but from the Fall of *Adam* in his Paradiſe.) As to this State therefore, as to any thing, that is to be enjoy'd or ſuffer'd in it, as to Law and Religion, as to the matter which the Apoſtle diſcourſeth of (Juſtification by Works) meer Infants and the Children yet to be born *have done neither good nor evil.*

(w) *Coſri* p. 255.

CHAP. XVI.

1. Of the great excellency of the Final Cauſe, with a general Account of the Final Cauſe of the Creation of the Univerſe of Rationals. 2. The Univerſe was not created out of any ſelfiſh deſign or for vain-glory. 3. The Platoniſts *account of the Cauſe of the Creation, which is from meer communicative goodneſs. 4. This not fully legitimate, as appeareth from their bad kind of goodneſs. 5. From God's being the End of the Creation. 6. From his holy goodneſs of Will. 7. From the goodneſs of well-doing. 8. Of the Chriſtiano-Scholaſtic Account of the Cauſe of the Creation. 9. Of the Scholaſtic Rabbins account of it. 10. Of the Chriſtian account of the cauſe of God's creating Rationals, becauſe it was good, that they ſhould exiſt, and he was good. 11. His Goodneſs the holy imperial Goodneſs. 12. This requireth, that he ſhould be to them, the Sanctity Imperial, and what they are made for, as he is ſuch. 13. That he ſhould be to them a Parental Providence, and what they are made for, as he is ſuch. 14. An Inference touching the Preheminence of the Science of Sanctity above Scholaſticiſm. 15. Another Conſectary againſt abſolute Reprobation.*

I. THE knowledge of Things is the knowledge of their Cauſes, of which the Principal is (*cauſa cauſarum*) the Final Cauſe. (x) *From the Ignorance of the Final Cauſe of any thing ariſeth an Ignorance of the other Cauſes appertaining thereto; for this is the firſt Cauſe, the chief and moſt potent, for the ſake of which the efficient Cauſes do, and the things that are done are effected.* Whoſe Cauſality is properly the Mental and Rational, and which is the cauſe of all the Artifice, Aptitude, Regularity and Utility that is in Nature. As things artificial cannot be underſtood, if the final cauſe be over-look'd; ſo neither can the Works of Nature, which are plainly made for End and Deſign, and are manifeſtly the effects of admirable Skill and Artifice. (y) *In ordinary Animals there is a variety of ſtupendious Workmanſhip, which reacheth to the Fruits and Leaves of Plants.* (z) *Milk is generated of Graſs, and Cheeſe of Milk, and Wooll of the Skin; who is it that made and excogitated theſe things? No Body* (ſaith the Epicurean) ὢ μεγάλης ἀναισχυντίας καὶ ἀναισθησίας, *O great Impudence and Senceleſneſs!* (a) *Providence hath done nothing in the procreation of Animals; for neither were the Eyes made to ſee, nor the Ears to hear, nor the Tongue to ſpeak, nor the Feet to walk,* ſaith *Epicurus.* So *Democritus* phyſiologiz'd, τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα ἀφεὶς λέγειν, *altogether rejecting the final cauſe.* The Atheiſts therefore cannot be ſaid, to philoſophize ſave only very mutilately and partially (for to philoſophize, is to render the cauſes of things,) their Recondite Wiſdom is a contradiction to common Senſe, they contemplate no Wiſdom, they deſtroy (in great degree) Wiſdom and the knowledge of things by exploding the Final Cauſe out of Philoſophy, (b) ſome principal Theories whereof (as that of the Circulation of the Blood) had never been found out, if Sagacious Naturaliſts had not ſuppos'd, that Parental Nature acteth for Ends and Good, and that thoſe Ends may be inveſtigated. But it is not the Atheiſts alone, that are injurious to the Final Cauſe. *Anaxagoras* affecting rather to be a good Naturaliſt than a good Religioniſt did not in his Phyſiology inſiſt ſo much as he ought upon the Final Cauſe; whence he is blam'd by ſome other Philoſophers, as if he took no notice of it, although he acknowledg'd *Good* as well as *Mind*, to be a Principle, and therefore did not wholly neglect the Final Cauſe. A late *French* Philoſopher is not ſo ſound a Religioniſt as *Anaxagoras* was; for his Philoſophy totally rejecteth the conſideration of the Final Cauſe out of a frivolous Modeſty (counting it preſumption in Man, to think, that he knoweth the Ends of God) whereas it is really Impudence and Immodeſty, not to acknowledge End and Deſign, ſuperlative Wiſdom and Goodneſs in the Works of Nature, which demonſtrate, that they have a wiſe Author, and that Mankind owe unto him upon the account of his Works the Tribute of Admiration, Praiſe and Gratitude, (c) which is a principal Branch of Religion. *Plotinus* alſo is not a little injurious to the Final Cauſe, to the Wiſdom of God in his Works and to Religion (which is founded upon the exiſtence of a final as well as an efficient cauſe of the Univerſe;) for he ſuppoſeth, (d) that the firſt Principle procreateth all things (the Intelligible World or the Platonic Intellect) without *any Action, Intellection, Deſire or Precogitation* (as Light floweth from the Sun,) and that the Platonic Intellect or Intelligible World did not produce the viſible World by that Wiſdom, which chooſeth the End and ſuiteth the Means thereto, but fatally and naturally, as plaſtick Principles operate; (e) and therefore he ſuppoſeth it an impertinent Queſtion, *to ask why the World was created?* But this is really a Queſtion of no ſmall importance and no ſmall difficulty, as will appear by a ſummary reſolution of it, which we will compriſe in this following Theorem.

The Univerſe of Rationals was created, becauſe
- The Exiſtence of Good,
- The Exiſtence of that Good the Volition whereof is neceſſarily Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will.
- Goodneſs Imperial
  - The communicative,
  - That of well-doing in general,
  - That of the holy kind

did require it; And that God ſhould be unto them
- The Sanctity Imperial; ſo they are made
  - For God,
  - For the whole,
  - For their Holineſs and Happineſs.
- A Parental Providence alſo; and ſo they are made additionally to their other ends for Humane Society.

II. It

(x) *Procl. de An. & Dæm. p.* 236.

(y) Ἐν τοῖς τυχοῦσι ζώοις ἡ ποικίλη θαυμαστουργία· καὶ τὸ μέχρι τῶν ἐμφύτων καρποῖς, καὶ ἔτι φύλλοις. *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 13.

(z) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 16.

(a) *Lactan. l.* 3. *c.* 17.

(b) *Mr. Boyle of Final Cauſ. p.* 157.

(c) *Epictet. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 6, 16.

(d) *En. l.* 3. *c.* 12 & *ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 7. & *En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 1, 2, 3.

(e) *En. l.* 9. *c.* 8.

II. It is ſcarce credible, that the *Muhammedans* ſhould ſuppoſe, *(f)* that God made the World *παιδιᾶς χάριν, for Sport*; which yet is as credible, as that the Univerſe was made only or chiefly for Man, or that Man is his own ultimate End, and was made only or chiefly for himſelf. The School of *Epicurus* hath not more immoral Maxims than theſe, *(g) Finis ultimus cui Homins eſt Ipſe. Quilibet Homo reſpectu ſui omniumque ſuarum operationum eſt Finis ultimus Cui.* If every Man is his own ultimate End, there muſt be ſo many ultimate Ends as there are Men. Every Man muſt love himſelf above all. He is in order to nothing beyond himſelf. Not God's Honour and Intereſt and the publick weal, but a Self-intereſt muſt be the chief in his Eſtimation and Affection, Deſire and Deſign. All his Actions muſt be ultimately for ſelf-regard and reſpect, oppoſite to that Charity, that ſeeketh nothing for ſelf as ſelf. Every Man is chiefly for his own uſe, and conſequently is chief owner of himſelf, and in ſuch Senſe his own Man: And he that maketh himſelf in ſuch Senſe his own Man, maketh himſelf his own God. How poor an ultimate End is Self? to be chiefly devoted to? to acquieſce in? and how baſe is it, to pretend, to love God, and Virtue, and the Publick, but as the Country-man loveth his Cart and Horſes, ultimately for ſelf? If the vicious ſelfiſhneſs is ſo vile and odious in Man, nothing of it muſt be aſcrib'd unto God, nor made the End of his Creation: For God could not create the World out of any ſelfiſh Principle and Deſign, both becauſe of his God-like Nature and Agency, and becauſe *(h)* God wanteth nothing. If we ſuppoſe therefore, that God made the World out of no better a Principle than ſelfiſh Nature, or ſuch a Principle of Honour and Glory whence Mundane Monarchs erect their ſtately Structures and do their Acts of Beneficence (inſtigated thereto by τὸ ἐπιδεικτικὸν, the oſtentatious and vain-glorious Principle) this would be a foul Imputation upon the Divine Majeſty: who although in ſome Senſe he made the World for his Honour and Glory, yet his ſo making it was not of like Nature with the ſelfiſh Vanity of Humane Magnificence. This Saying of *Tertullian* therefore, that God made the World, *(i) in ornamentum majeſtatis ſuæ*, ſeemeth injurious unto God. And it is alike injurious unto God, to parallel his Creation-work with the Works of covetous and vainglorious Artiſans. *(k) The artificial Form is not the end of the Artiſt's Work, but rather inciteth the Spectator, to view and admire his Skill, from which his Gain or Fame may redound: And theſe (one or both) are the principal End of all his Labours; ſo is the Glory of the firſt and ſupreme efficient Cauſe the principal and utmoſt End of all the Works of Nature. Plotinus* deſervedly rebuketh this Compariſon. *(l) It is ridiculous to ſay, that he made the World, that he might be honour'd, this being to transfer the Affections of Humane Artificers and Statuaries upon him.* For as Humane Artiſts and Statuaries frame their Works with the greateſt Skill and Artifice poſſible, principally out of a ſelfiſh deſire and deſign of their own Gain or Honour and Applauſe; not ſo much out of love to Goodneſs and Well-doing, nor out of love to others whoſe Benefit they ſeek; and therefore how much ſoever Men may admire their Skill, yet they do not admire their Beneficence, nor pay Gratitude to them as their great Benefactors, nor do they admire their virtuous Diſpoſition and Practice: So if God frameth the Works of Nature with the greateſt Skill and Power imaginable, yet if this be done principally out of a ſelfiſh deſire and deſign of his own Honour and Glory, not ſo much out of love to Goodneſs, nor out of love to others whoſe Benefit he ſeeketh; how much ſoever Men may admire his greatneſs of Skill and Power, yet no body will have cauſe to admire his Beneficence, his God-like Diſpoſition and Practice, nor to pay Gratitude to him as the great and only Benefactor. It muſt not be ſuppos'd therefore, that God made the World for his Honour and Glory in ſuch Senſe, as Humane Artiſts and Statuaries make their Works for their Glory.

(m) The Chriſtian Doctrine doth not ſay of God any thing that importeth Humane Ambition or deſire of Honour; for God doth not make Oſtentation of himſelf to us, when he would have us know and underſtand his Eminence. Plato ſaith, *(n) It was not for any need that God made the World, that he might reap Honours from Men and other Gods and Demons.* If we are therefore the Authors of theſe many Sayings, which affirm, *that God's Glory is the final cauſe of his Works*, we ought to take care, that their Senſe be diſſonant from a ſelfiſh deſign of Honour and Glory.

(o) God reſolv'd, to make the World for himſelf, that is, for his own Glory. (p) Generalis quidem operum omnium divinorum finis & fructus Dei ipſius gloria, nominiſque claritas. (q) God loveth his own Glory as his principal End, and the preſervation of his Creature for his Glory.——— There is properly but one Love in God, which is the Love of himſelf (an enormous miſtake) *and God can love nothing but by that Love, ſince he can love nothing but in relation to himſelf. (r) All things are made for theſe two, God's Honour and his Creatures Profit. He is capable of nothing but the external good of Honour, therefore he ſeeketh his own Honour; more principally he acteth for his own Honour than the Creatures Profit; for as he is before the Creature (infinitely better,) he ought to look at thoſe things which belong to himſelf, before thoſe things which belong to his Creature. (s) God is as tender of his Honour, as any Man can be of his. Men will throw away Eſtates and Lives for their Honour, to defend it, to increaſe it; how much more will God do it, to whom Honour belongeth? A Man that loveth his own Honour, will not ſuffer his Honour to be diminiſh'd, much leſs will God. A Man hateth any Honour, that is againſt his own Honour: So doth God and will deſtroy it; and therefore God will make all things ſerve his own Honour and Glory. (t) God never made a Creature, but that himſelf might have Glory by its being.—— The end God's Glory is the utmoſt end of every Creature and Action in the World.* A Party of Divines ſay, *(u)* That the End or Cauſe of God's Creation was the glorifying his Mercy and his Juſtice in the Salvation of the Elect and the Damnation of the Reprobate.

III. The School of *Plato* (in conſort with the ancient Writers of the Church and many others) is ſuppos'd, to derive the Creation meerly from *communicative Goodneſs*. *(w) Plato plainly declareth, the reaſon of God's making the World at firſt, to have been no other than this,* ἀγαθὸς ἦν, ἀγαθῷ δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίνεται φθόνος, *be-*

cauſe

(f) Betul. in Lactant. l. 2. c. 5.

(g) Stearn. Anim. Medel. l. 1. c. 11.

(h) Pocock. ſpec. p. 240. Erpen. Gram. Arab. par. 2. p. 189, 195.

(i) Apol. c. 17.

(k) Dr. Jackſon The etern. Truth of the Script. B. 1. c. 16.

(l) Γελοῖον γὰρ ἵνα τιμῶται, καὶ μεταφερόντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαλματοποιῶν τῶν ἐνταῦθα. En. 2. l. 9. c. 4.

(m) Οὐδεμίαν θνητὴν φιλοτιμίαν ὁ χριστιανῶν λόγος καταμαρτυρεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιδεικτιᾷ ὁ θεὸς πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 4. p. 165.

(n) Ap. Clem. Strom. l. 5. p. m. 426.

(o) Mr. Thorndike Epil. B. 2. c. 26.

(p) Petav. T. 4. l. 2. c. 5.

(q) Malebranch Search after Truth, B. 4. c. 1.

(r) Raymund de Sabunde Theol. natur. p. 311.

(s) Ibid. p. 358.

(t) Larkham of the Attributes par. 2. p. 57, 58.

(u) Pareus in Gen. 1. 1. Dr. Twiſſ. vindic. Grat. p. 13.

(w) Dr. Cudw. Intell. Syſt. p. 659.

cauſe he was Good, and there is no manner of envy in that which is Good. (x) *For all other Cauſes which are aſſign'd of making the Univerſe beſides* (communicative) *Goodneſs are rather agreeable to thoſe that are in human Circumſtances than unto God.* (y) *Why did he make the things that were not? Becauſe he was Good and Communicative.* (z) *Conſider the World and thou ſhalt find, that the Cauſe of it is God,* τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς αἰτίαν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, *but the Cauſe of his making it was the* (Communicative) *Goodneſs of the Maker.* The Hebrew Cabaliſts have aſſign'd this Cauſe and Reaſon, why God created the World (*a*) *ad benefaciendum & bonitatem ſuam oſtendendam creaturis ſuis.* The Fathers generally go this way, they ſymbolize with *Philo*, and conſider no other Goodneſs as concern'd in the Creation but only the Communicative Goodneſs. (*b*) *It was not enough to Goodneſs, to be mov'd only by the Contemplation of it ſelf, but Good ought to be diffus'd and to go abroad, that ſo there may be many Beneficiaries.* So the counterfeit *Dionyſius* deriveth the Creation from (*c*) *ad benefaciendum proclivis amor, a Propenſion to Beneficence. God loveth giving ſo much (*Beneficence) *that for this reaſon he made all things* (*d*) ſaith Guillelm. *Pariſienſis. Having Goodneſs beyond meaſure he would give Being to Non-exiſtents* (*e*) ſaith *Theodoret.* (*f*) So S. *Auſtin*, (*g*) ſo S. *Hilary* and *Zacharias Mitylenæus*, and ſuch is the Senſe of (*h*) *Gr. Nyſſen, J. Damaſcen. Olympiodoras* (*i*) and S. *Chryſoſtom. He made all things, not for the ſake of any thing elſe, but Goodneſs only.* (*k*) *It is enough for a Chriſtian to believe, that the only Cauſe of the Creatures is the Goodneſs of the Creator.* (*l*) *God from the beginning created Man becauſe of his munificence, to have one, to beſtow his Benefits upon, ſaith* Irenæus. Some modern Divines ſpeaking their own Senſe rightly, expreſs the Senſe of the Ancients. (*m*) *We ſay that the reaſon, why God made the World, was from his overflowing and communicative Goodneſs, that there might be other Beings alſo happy beſides him, and enjoy themſelves.* (*n*) *His natural Benignity and Munificence was the pure Motive, that incited or invited him to this great action of communicating Exiſtence and ſuitable Perfection to his Creatures reſpectively: No benefit or emolument could hence accrue to him; he could receive no acceſſion of Beatitude; he did not need any profit or pleaſure from without, being full within, rich in all perfection, completely happy in the contemplation and enjoyment of himſelf. Can a Man, can any Creature be profitable to God? No, our Goodneſs doth not extend to him, we cannot any wiſe advance or amplifie him thereby; 'tis becauſe Goodneſs is freely diffuſive and communicative of it ſelf; becauſe Love is active and fruitful in Beneficence; becauſe higheſt Excellency is void of all Envy, Selfiſhneſs and Tenacity, that the World was produc'd.* Agreeably to this account of the Cauſe of the Creation, *Voſſius* ſaith of the Angelical and human Nature. (*o*) *Both which God created, not ſo much to have ſuch Exiſtent, that might praiſe and admire him (for God needeth not the praiſe of others) as becauſe it was agreeable to his Nature (who is Goodneſs it ſelf) that there ſhould be ſuch a Nature, which might be brought to Beatitude by Divine Grace, and therefore might know, love, worſhip, imitate the Author of the Univerſe, and ſo according to the meaſure of a Creature might be made like unto God.* (*p*) *Chriſtian Theologers agree with the Pagan, profeſſing with one Mouth, that God's* (Communicative) *Goodneſs is the cauſe of all things.*

IV. This Platonic account of the Cauſe of the Creation is highly laudable, true and good, but in a limited Sence; for withall it is falſe and alſo criminally defective, and giveth not a juſt account of the Creation of Religion. For there are *four things*, that we ought to affirm concerning it. *Firſt, that although the Creation iſſu'd from communicative Goodneſs, as the Platoniſts rightly ſuppoſe, yet they attributed* (as is before obſerv'd touching them and the *Stoicks*) *a bad kind of Goodneſs to the Deity. Cicero* ſaith (*q*) *that God is never angry, nor doth hurt; this is the common Sentiment of all the Philoſophers, not only of thoſe, who ſuppoſe, that God himſelf hath no buſineſs, nor giveth any trouble to others, but of thoſe alſo, who believe a Providence, and ſuppoſe, that God is always doing ſomething.* So the Platoniſts ſay of their Deities (*r*) *that they are good and replete with all Virtue and hurt no Body,* Οὔτε τὸ ἀγαθὸν βλάπτει ποτὲ, *That which is good never doth hurt.* (*s*) *It is the Nature of the Deity, to be beneficent but not to be angry and to do hurt.* So *Plato* in his Second *De Rep.* (quarrelling with *Homer*) ſaith (*t*) *We ought to contend by all means, that none ſay of God, who is Good, that he is the Cauſe of Evils to any.* This Philoſopher therefore (together with his Followers) ſuppoſeth, that all the Evils which the Gods inflict upon any in the other World, are meerly Caſtigatory and Medicinal, and this muſt be accounted his Opinion, although it is not his conſtant Sentiment. For he ſuppoſeth, that the grand Criminals in the other World that are incurable (*u*) *are puniſh'd to be Examples to others, and are caſt into Tartarus, whence they never come forth.* There is a manifeſt inconſiſtency therefore in this Philoſophers Senſe, (as *Euſebius* obſerveth,) which is alſo manifeſtly inconſiſtent with the Notices and Laws of his own Religion. For the publick Laws ſay, *Divorum iras providento. Perjurii Pœna Divina exitium.* And they preſcribe Sacrifices and Supplications, to appeaſe the anger of the Gods. The popular Pagans therefore in ſome reſpects were better Religioniſts than the Philoſophers, that had as little inſight into Religion as *Arnobius*, who maketh this one requiſite Property of a Deity (w) *non iraſci, calamitatem irrogare nulli, not to be angry, to inflict calamity upon none.* Such a Deity is *Marcion*'s Deity of the New Teſtament (x) *who is Good not Juſt*, not at all ſevere or punitive. Such is the ſupreme Deity of the *Chalday* Oracles (y) *who is not the cauſe of Evil unto any, that he ſhould be formidable.* And ſuch is *Philo*'s God, of whom he ſaith (z) *he is the cauſe of Goods only, not at all of any Evils*, τὰς μέν τοι κατὰ πονηρῶν κολάσεις διὰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βεβαιοῦσθαι, *the Puniſhments againſt the improbous are eſtabliſh'd by his Miniſters. Joſephus* underſtood God and Religion as little as *Philo*; for he ſaith of Prayer (a) it muſt be made to God οὐχ ὅπως διδῷ τὰ ἀγαθὰ, *not that he may give good things, for this he doth of his own accord* (omnibus paſſim ingerit) *but that we may be capable of receiving them and may conſerve them.* The Hebrew Doctors ſay (b) *Deus benedictus nihil eſt niſi Bonitas, Benignitas & Miſericordia*, and hence they infer one of their Maxims, *nihil mali supernè deſcendit, nothing of Evil deſcendeth from above.* So far they Symbolize with the Philoſophic Pagans, whoſe Gods are Deities of fond and carnal Conceit.

(x) Αἱ γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἀγαθότητα λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι τῆς δημιουργίας τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ἀνθρωπίναις μᾶλλον περιστάσεσιν ἢ τῷ θεῷ πρέπουσιν. *Hierocl. in aur. Car. p.* 21.

(y) Διὰ τί γοῦν ἐποίει τὰ μὴ ὄντα; ὅτι ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλόδωρος ἦν. *Philo opuſc. p.* 14.

(z) *Idem lib. de Cherub. v. Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 3.

(a) *Rittangel. lib. Jeziv. p.* 157, 186.

(b) Οὐκ ἤρκει τῇ ἀγαθότητι τὸ κινεῖσθαι μόνον τῇ ἑαυτῆς θεωρίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔδει χυθῆναι τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ὁδεῦσαι, ὡς πλείονα εἶναι τὰ εὐεργετούμενα. *Gr. Naz. Or.* 38.

(c) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 8.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 3.

(e) *Ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 2.

(f) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 9.

(g) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 3.

(h) *Hæſchel. not. in Philon. opuſc. p.* 220. *Lipſ. Phyſiol. l.* 1. *Diſſ.* 20.

(i) Ἐποίησε δὲ δι' ἕτερον μὲν οὐδὲν, δι' ἀγαθότητα δὲ μόνην. *T.* 6. *p.* 86.

(k) *Satis eſt Chriſtiano rerum creatarum cauſam nonniſi bonitatem credere creatoris.* S. Aug. Enchirid. c. 9.

(l) *Deus ab initio hominem plaſmavit propter ſuam munificentiam, ut haberet in quem collocaret ſua beneficia.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 28.

(m) *Dr. Cudw. ſupr. p.* 886.

(n) *Dr. Barrow on the Creed Ser.* 12. *So Mr. Smith Select Diſc. p.* 141, 142.

(o) *Quas ambas Deus creavit, non tàm ne deeſſent, qui eum laudarent & admirarentur, cùm Deus non ſit indigus laudationis alienæ, quàm quia Naturæ ejus qui optimus ipsaque bonitas foret, conveniret, ut Natura etiam foret, quæ Divinâ ad beatitudinem gratiâ perduceretur. Eoque cognoſceret Univerſi auctorem, eundem amaret, coleret, imitaretur; atque ita pro modo Creaturæ ſimilis redderetur Deo.* De Idol. l. 1. c. 10.

(p) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 3. *S.* 4.

(q) *Hoc quidem commune eſt omnium Philoſophorum, non eorum modo, qui Deum nihil habere ipſum negotii dicunt, & nihil exhibere alteri, ſed eorum etiam, qui Deum ſemper agere aliquid & moliri volunt. Nunquam nec iraſci Deum nec nocere.* De Off. l. 3.

(r) *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 8. *c.* 13. *Porphyr. de Abſt. l.* 2. *S.* 41. *Hierocl. de Fato p.* 209.

(s) Τὸ θεῖον ὅτι μὲν χαρίζεσθαι καὶ βοηθεῖν πέφυκεν, ὀργίζεσθαι δὲ καὶ κακῶς ποιεῖν οὐ πέφυκεν. *Plutarch. ap. Eugub. de Per. Phil. l.* 6. *c.* 9.

(t) Κακῶν δὲ αἴτιον φάναι θεόν τινι γίγνεσθαι ἀγαθὸν ὄντα, διαμαχητέον παντὶ τρόπῳ.

(u) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 13. *c.* 17.

V. A *Second* thing we ought to affirm, *that the Creation could not ſo iſſue from communicative Goodneſs, but that God is neceſſarily Lord of the Creatures, our Sovereign Liege-Lord, the Imperial Eſtate of God to us, and the End of the Creation.* For the Intereſt and Felicity of the Creatures muſt not be ſuppoſed his End (the End of his Being and his Operations) in the ſtrict ſubordinative Notion thereof. As there can be no Efficient, ſo there can be no final Cauſe of God. (c) *In Fine extremitatis conditio requiritur, ut reliqua ita propter eum ſint, ut ſuâ dignitate & præſtantiâ ipſa ſibi ſubordinet.* (d) *That God may have an end of his Being or of his Operation, it is requiſite, that himſelf or his Operation ſhould be in order thereto* (ſubordinate and ſubſervient thereto) *for there cannot be an end, unleſs one thing be in order to another. But God and his Operation cannot be in order to any thing; therefore they cannot have an end.* The Virtue and Duty of ſubſerving an End properly belongeth to Creatures, that are of ſubordinate and ſubject Condition (e) *Deus Dominator eſt non alterius Gratiâ.* In his Domination he could not be abſolutely free and diſoblig'd from any, nor could his Excellency be abſolutely the Supreme, unleſs he be abſolutely unſubordinate. For *Ariſtotle* thus compareth the Science of Metaphyſicks and a Free-man. *As he is a Free-man*, ὁ αὐτοῦ ἕνεκα, καὶ μὴ ἄλλου, *that is for his own ſake, not anothers: So this only is the free Science; for this only is for its own ſake.* The *Pythagoreans* ſay, τὸ χεῖρον ἕνεκα τοῦ βελτίονος, *the worſer is for the ſake of the better.* And the Stoicks uſually ſay (g) τὰ χείρω τῶν κρειττόνων ἕνεκεν, *the worſe are made for the better.* Agreeably to which Maxims the Fathers argu'd againſt the *Arrians* (h) who ſuppos'd, that God intending to make the Univerſe of Creatures firſt procreated one, to be an Inſtrument, to make the reſt, which one he called *his Son and his Word.* If this was ſo (ſay they) if the Son was procreated for this end and purpoſe, that he might make the reſt, then he was produc'd by the Father chiefly for our ſake and upon our account, and we are not ſo much made for him as he for us. We are therefore of more honourable Condition than he, and the Name of Son rather belongeth to us than unto him. Chriſtians ſubordinate themſelves to their Saviour, and ſo intelligent Theiſts ſubordinate the Univerſe of Beings unto God. For *Ariſtotle* having compar'd the ſupreme Deity to the General of an Army, and the order of the Univerſe to the order of an Army, he ſubordinateth that order to the ſupreme Deity and maketh him the end thereof. (i) Οὐ γὰρ οὗτος διὰ τὴν τάξιν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνη διὰ τοῦτόν ἐστιν. *For he is not for the Order, but the Order is for him.* So *Plato* ſaith of his ſupreme Deity (k) *about the King of all Beings all Beings are*, καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα πάντα, *and for his ſake are all things.* Which Platonic Maxim (not conſiſtent with the Platonic Origination of the Univerſe from meer communicative Goodneſs) ſuppoſeth, that *the firſt Cauſe is alſo the laſt End.* And as *Simplicius* diſcourſeth (l) *that which is abſolutely perfect and hath attain'd its own End, is* τέλος τῶν πάντων ὡς ἀρχὴ, *the end of all things as it is the beginning.* Of ſome Affinity with this Branch of Platonic Theology is an ancient Saying cited by *Plato* in his Fourth of Laws. (m) *God going about according to Nature ſtraightway diſpatcheth, having the beginning, middle and end of all things.* And of ſome Affinity with this ancient Pagan Saying is the Apoſtle's Divine Saying, which attributeth to God a threefold Cauſality in Affairs *Original, Mediate and Final*, Rom. 11. 36. *Of him and through him and to him are all things.* His intent in this high and rais'd Aſcription to God (as appeareth from the Context,) is, to attribute unto him the Sovereignty and Supremacy, the ſole intire Sovereignty in the Cauſality of Affairs; which Sovereign Cauſality is threefold. *Ordinative, Executive, Subordinative.* His Sovereign *Ordinative* Cauſality is neceſſarily *the Original Cauſality*; for all things are *of him* as of his ſole proper Motion, Volition and Ordination (without any Inſtructor, Counſellour and Perſwader) and of his Sovereign Ordination, who is of abſolutely independent Condition (the Firſt Cauſe of all himſelf being uncauſed both as to what he is and what he doth) and who ordereth all Affairs in the ſupreme Sovereign way unaccountably and as diſoblig'd from all and Debtor to none. His *executive Cauſality* is neceſſarily his *mediate Cauſality* (being intermediate between the Intention and the End) and this Sovereign Cauſality the Apoſtle's Phraſe δι' αὐτὸν, *by or through him*, properly ſignifieth; for the ſame Apoſtle ſaith of Chriſt as Mediator, we are δι' αὐτοῦ, *by him.* 1 Cor. 8. 6. God's *final Cauſality* which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, may not unfitly be ſtiled *the Subordinative*; for all things are *to him* in the way of agreeable Subordination and Subſerviency. The Creatures and their Goods are not the End which he is for, or which he is to be Subſervient to: But he is the End, which the Creatures and their Goods are for, and which they are to be Servient and Subſervient to. They were made by him, and they were made for him, *for him to have the Poſſeſſion, Uſe and Diſpoſal of them, to be every way Servient and Subſervient to him, to give him the Rights and Dues of his God-head, and to do the Duties conſtitutive of Religion and Godlineſs* (if they are Rationaliſts,) *to be pleaſing to his holy Will and to honour and glorifie his holy Name.* Thus all things and perſons are duly ſubordinated unto God (the Sanctity Imperial,

1 Cor. 8. 6. Col. 1. 16. Heb. 2. 10.

(w) Adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 10. & l. 6. p. 190.

(x) Petav. T. 1. l. 2. c. 1.

(y) P. 50.

(z) Περὶ συγχύσ. Διαλ. p. 224. ed. Gr. Paris.

(a) Ap. Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 8. c. 8.

(b) Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex. 169. p. 241.

(c) Ritchel. Metaph. Par. 2. c. 6.

(d) Valent. T. 1. Diſp. 3. Qu. 1. Punct. 3.

(e) Lex. Heptaglot. in rad. [illegible] Sam.

(f) Metaph. l. 1. c. 2.

(g) M. Ant. l. 5. S. 16, & 30.

(h) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 5. S. 16.

(i) Metaph. l. 14. c. 10.

(k) Procl. Plat. Theol. p. 104.

(l) Intell. Syſt. p. 389.

(m) Ὁ μὲν δὴ θεὸς ἀρχήν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἔχων, εὐθείαν περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος.

the Lord of all Creatures, who is infinitely better than they) and this due Subordination of all Creatures unto God is doubtleſs the meaning of the wiſe Man's words, *the Lord hath made all things for himſelf: Yea even the wicked for the day of evil.* Pro. 16. 4. For the words *propter ſe* and *propter ipſum* are of the ſame meaning; and as when the Scripture ſaith, that all things were created *propter ipſum*, it doth not mean, that all things were created for his *communicative Goodneſs*: So when the wiſe Man ſaith, that God made all things *propter ſe*, he muſt not be thought to mean (*n*) as ſome ſuppoſe, *that all things were created for his communicative Goodneſs.* If the wiſe Man had ſaid, that *God did his Works propter ſe*, he might be thought to mean, that God made them for his communicative Goodneſs: But when he ſaith, that *God made his Works propter ſe*, his words muſt be thought to denote the Uſe and End of the Works of God, the *Finis cui*, for whom they are made. Nor is the making them for his communicative Goodneſs of any Affinity with *making the wicked for the day of evil.* If therefore the Hebrew word *lammagnanehu* doth ſignifie *propter ſe ſive ſeipſum* (which is moſt probable, although there are ſome Grammatical Difficulties in it) the wiſe Man muſt be underſtood, to ſay of God, *that all things were made* (for him) *to be Servient and Subſervient to him* (*o*) *ut ſibi Servirent*, as *Menaſſ. ben Iſr.* interpreteth the place.

(n) *Annot. upon Lux Orient. p.* 49.

(o) *De vit. term. p.* 206.

VI. A *Third* thing we ought to affirm, that the Creation could not ſo iſſue from God's communicative Goodneſs, but that it muſt neceſſarily iſſue from his holy Goodneſs (or Holineſs and Godlineſs) of Will For Goodneſs in the moral Notion and the larger Acceptation is the ſame with Virtue (whence *Clemens* ſaith of God (*p*) ὀ τῷ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχειν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι λέγεται, *he is not ſaid, to be Good, becauſe he hath Virtue, but becauſe he is it,*) as Chriſtians know no other genuine kind of Virtue but the Holy (which is Holineſs and Godlineſs,) ſo they know no other genuine kind of Goodneſs. The Writers of Chriſtian Ethicks obſerve (*q*) that Holineſs is called *Goodneſs* in Scripture, and the Hebrew word חסיר ſignifieth both one that is *Good* and one that is *Holy*, both ſignifications concurring in a Saint (which alſo the word ſignifieth, (*r*) the Judaical *Haſidæi* were thoſe whom *Joſephus* calleth ὁσίους τοῦ ἔθνους, *the Saints of the Nation*;) for a Saint is an holy kind of good Man, *as Holineſs and Godlineſs is the holy kind of Goodneſs.* Our Tranſlation therefore following the LXX. rightly rendreth חסיר *Holy*, Pſal. 145. 17. *The Lord is righteous in all his ways and holy in all his works.* If the Lord is holy in all his works, then all his works (and conſequently his Creation-works) are the holy kind of good works, and ſo many Branches of his Holineſs of Life (of which alſo his communicative Goodneſs is neceſſarily a Branch:) As the good works of holy Men are the holy kind of good works, and ſo many conſtituent parts of their holy Life. Goodneſs of Nature and of Will (*s*) is to God Eſſential (Creatures are good ἐξ ἐπιγεννήματος, *adventitiouſly*, ſaith *Origen*) and this Eſſential Goodneſs, becauſe it is the God-kind (the Saint of God-kind) of Goodneſs, is neceſſarily the ſame with his Eſſential Holineſs of Nature and of Will. (*t*) *Deus natura ſua ſanctitas.* ——*id a voluntatis & τῆς προαιρέσεως, bonitate non diſcrepat. The Divine Nature is Sanctity, which is not different from the Goodneſs of his Will.* The Divine Will therefore is Holineſs and Godlineſs (the holy and godly Goodneſs) of Will. We are oblig'd to all Holineſs and Godlineſs of Nature, Will and exteriour Practice, *ex ſtudio imitandi, that we may be God-like.* And as the Divine Practice of our Redeemer (in doing the Will of God, doing good, laying down his Life) was his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will: So the Divine Practice of God the Creator ought to be conſider'd under this Notion as his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will. Such is his wondrous *Love* and *Kindneſs*, his *abundant Mercy*, his *rich Grace*, and *free Beneficence*, to which the Scripture attributeth our new Creation. And ſuch is his *good Pleaſure, the good Pleaſure of his Will, his own Will, the Counſel of his own Will*, to which the holy Writers attribute the Origin of all things. *Apoc.* 4. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour and power; for thou haſt created all things, and* διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου, *by thy Will or for thy Will they are and were created.* The Creation of Rationals had its Origin from the Holineſs and Godlineſs of his Will; for it was a Creation of Religion, and they were made for Holineſs and Godlineſs; their Creation therefore neceſſarily iſſu'd from a volition in God, that cannot be called his meer communicative Goodneſs, but muſt be called *his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will, an holy and godly kind of Goodneſs of Will.* Learned Men ſay of the World (*u*) *The whole was not properly made for any part, but the parts for the whole, and the whole for the Maker thereof.* But what ſenſe can they make of ſuch a Saying, ſuppoſing the Creation to have iſſu'd meerly from communicative Goodneſs? Was the World made for the Maker of it, *becauſe God made it from his overflowing communicative Goodneſs, that there might be other Beings alſo happy beſides him, and enjoy themſelves*? But if we ſay, that the Rational World was made, not only to be *Happy*, but to be *Holy*, and for the buſineſs of Religion towards God; this is a good intelligible account, why the Rational World may be ſaid to be made for the Maker of it.

(p) *Pædagog. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p. m.* 85.

(q) *Crell. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

(r) *Druſ. de* 3. *Sect. l.* 4. *c.* 12.

(s) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 5. *c* 4. *l.* 6. *c.* 2.

(t) *Ibid. l.* 6 *c.* 6. *S.* 4.

Eph. 2. 4, 7. 1 *Pet.* 1. 3. 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. *Eph.* 1. 5, 9, 11. *Jam.* 1. 18.

(u) *Intell. Syſt. p.* 875.

VII. A *Fourth* thing we ought to affirm, that the Creation could not ſo iſſue from communicative Goodneſs, but that it muſt neceſſarily iſſue from *the Goodneſs of Well-doing* (εὐπραξία, or Virtue) of which communicative Goodneſs is a Branch. For communicative Goodneſs as ſuch meerly reſpecteth the benefit and advantage of the Creatures as ſuch, whence it is called *propenſa voluntas benefaciendi aliis, ad benefaciendum proclivis amor, his Munificence, fruitful Beneficence* (contrary to Tenacity) *his love of giving* (or communicating) *a diffuſing his Goods, that there might be many Beneficiaries, and that there might be other Beings alſo happy beſides him.* If this communicative Goodneſs is a Branch of the Goodneſs of Well-doing (as certainly it is both in the All-good God and in truly good Men) then in the Creation reſpect was not had meerly to the Creatures intereſt and benefit as ſuch; for an atheous Goodneſs that hath no reſpect for God, cannot be the Goodneſs of Well-doing, nor can it do any holy good Work. If God was not the final Cauſe of the Creation, if all things were not made *for him and to him*, the Goodneſs of Well-doing was wanting in the Creation, and the Creation could not be well done. For let us ſuppoſe, that a good natured Man willeth *the vaſt good of a vaſt number*

Heb. 13. 16.

ber of Children, and deſireth, to procreate them meerly from a benign Volition of their benefit and advantage for their ſake, without deſigning or deſiring any thing on his own part, only to ſeek and ſerve their benefit and advantage (as ſuch) purely for their ſake: It is manifeſt, that this good natur'd Man by this benign Volition debaſeth himſelf into the rank of their Officer and Servitor, he diſcardeth the State, Rights and Dues of their Father-King, rejecteth his Ownerſhip of them, muſt connive at all their Undutifulneſs, ſave only ſo far as it is prejudicial to themſelves, and as ſuch, he muſt not puniſh them but medicinally, and he muſt not be averſe from all manner of injuries done to the perſon of a Father as ſuch. But ſuch an irregular beneficent Goodneſs is manifeſtly maleficent and inconſiſtent with the Goodneſs of Well-doing. And as it is a criminal abſurdity and a contradiction in ſuch a Man, to deſign the Procreation of a vaſt number of Children, without deſigning to be in all reſpects their Father-king: So it would be a criminal abſurdity and a contradiction, if God ſhould deſign, to create an Univerſe of Creatures without deſigning to be in all reſpects their God; and conſequently the Univerſe of Rationals muſt neceſſarily be made, to give unto him the Rights and Dues of his Godhead (for his ſake and not only upon account of their own Intereſt) and another ſort of Goodneſs muſt neceſſarily be concern'd in the Creation beſides communicative Goodneſs. Religioniſts ſuppoſe, that Rationals were made to ſerve God: But if their Creation was meerly and wholly from communicative Goodneſs, then they were created, to ſerve God meerly with reſpect to their own Intereſt and Advantage, and the thing deſign'd in their Creation was not (w) *that God ſhould be magnified, but only that they ſhould be magnify'd and beatify'd*, ut ipſis, non ſibi benè ſit. (x) *Service to God affordeth him nothing, nor doth he need the Obedience of Man. But for this Reaſon he requireth Service from Men, that being good and merciful he may beſtow Benefits on them that perſevere in his Service.* (y) *To the praiſe of his Glory, what is this? That ſome Body may praiſe him, that ſome Body may glorifie him, we, Angels, Archangels, the whole Creation? And what is this? Nothing. For the Deity wanteth nothing. He deſireth nothing of us, not Service, not Glory, nor any thing elſe but our Salvation, and for this he doth all things.* In this ſtrain ancient Writers (and others) nullifie Piety, and it is as reaſonable at the ſame rate to nullifie Sin and Impiety, to make nothing of it, as it is againſt God, whoſe communicative Goodneſs hath reſpect only to the Creatures advantage.

But it is not poſſible, that God can be God without the Rights and Dues of his Godhead. God hath reſpect to the Creatures Goodneſs as well as their Good. (z) *So much as any one is better, ſo much the more he loveth Goodneſs, and hateth Iniquity. Seeing God therefore is good, and not only good, but infinitely good, it followeth, that he loveth Goodneſs with an infinite love, and hateth Iniquity with an infinite hatred.* He that is ſo great a lover of Goodneſs, neceſſarily created us for doing as well as enjoying good. For enjoying the Felicity, but ſo as that withall he created us for doing the Virtue and Duty of his Servants, Subjects and holy Societiſts. But meer communicative Goodneſs foundeth no Society, maketh no Family, City or Kingdom of God: Nor are Societies created meerly for the advantage of the Subject-party. The ſtrict Right of Property or Ownerſhip is not founded by meer (Beneficence or) communicative Goodneſs. For ſuppoſe a great Architect, to build an Houſe meerly and wholly for his Friend (his behoof and advantage,) for him to have wholly and ſolely the Poſſeſſion, Uſe and full Diſpoſal of it; it is manifeſt, that this great Architect doth not ſo much as pretend to any Right of Property in the Houſe, which he hath built, or Claim any Title to it, but his Friend is the ſole Proprietor of it. The Caſe is the ſame, if this great Architect in the ſame manner buildeth a Perſon for his Friend. And the Caſe is the ſame, if that Friend himſelf is the Perſon ſo built by that great Architect; for if he is made meerly and wholly for his own behoof and advantage, to have wholly and ſolely the Poſſeſſion, Uſe and Diſpoſal of himſelf, he is manifeſtly thereby manumis'd (as it were) and ſet at Liberty; he is no Servant to any, but is *ſui Juris*, notwithſtanding the mighty Gratitude that he oweth to his creative Benefactor, and although his creative Benefactor did create him for the ſake of his communicative Goodneſs. (a) *The ultimate end giveth the greateſt Authority and Power. For the Authority of the end is greater than the Authority of the Efficient. As Men uſe Money and Meat and Cloaths as they will, which are made for their uſe.* Communicative Goodneſs (that obligeth to nothing more than Gratitude) cannot found the ſtrict Right of Property; the obedience of the Subject to the Sovereign as it is *ſtricti Juris*, is not founded upon it; unleſs his Godhead of Eſtate and all his Rights and Intereſts are meerly Subſervient to the Creatures Intereſt, ſomewhat elſe was intended in the Creation of God's Subjects than meerly *ut ipſis benè ſit*; ſomewhat elſe muſt be uppermoſt in their Eſteem and Affection; and the principal thing that maketh Sin horrendous in their Eyes, is ſomewhat elſe than its contrariety to their own Intereſt and Advantage. They are not their own, they are his that made them, and made them that they might be his; they are his as of Right and by Obligation his Servants, and the Servants are for their Lord's Uſe and Advantage, ſo far as he is capable of any.

To him indeed *our Goodneſs* (Beneficence) *extendeth not*, as the Pſalmiſt ſaith (which the LXX. the vulgar Latin, the Arabick and Æthiopick render *thou haſt no need of my good things*) *can a Man be profitable unto God, as he that is wiſe may be profitable unto himſelf? Is it any Pleaſure to the Almighty, that thou art Righteous?*

(w) *Manifeſtum eſt, quòd Deus æquè perfectus erat ante ullorum mundorum creationem, quàm erat poſtea. Quodque proinde ex nulla ſuiipſius ratione habita, quatenus ſuiipſius, factum ſit, quòd ullos mundos unquam crearet: ſed ex mera benignitate propensâque voluntate benefaciendi aliis, non autem magnificandi ſeipſum, quatenus ſeipſum, ſed ut creatio intellectualis magna fieri poſſit ac beata in contemplanda magnitudine bonitatis, ſapientiæ ac potentiæ divinæ, quæ ex operibus illius eluceſcunt.* D. H. Mori Oper. Phil. Vol. 1. p. 455.

(x) *Servitus erga Deum Deo quidem nihil præſtat, nec opus eſt Deo humano obſequio.* ——— *Propter hoc autem exquirit ab hominibus ſervitutem, ut quoniam bonus eſt, miſericors, benefaciat eis, qui perſeverant in ſervitute ejus.* Iren adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 28.

(y) Εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης. Τί ἐστι τοῦτο; ἵνα τις αὐτὸν ἐπαινέσῃ; ἵνα τις αὐτὸν δοξάσῃ; ἡμεῖς, ἄγγελοι, ἀρχάγγελοι; ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις; καὶ τί τοῦτο; οὐδέν. Ἀνενδεὲς γὰρ τὸ θεῖον. Οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἐφίεται τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἀλλ᾽ ἢ τῆς σωτηρίας μόνης, οὐ διακονίας, οὐ δόξης, οὐκ ἄλλου οὐδενὸς, καὶ πάντα διὰ τοῦτο ποιεῖ. *S. Chryſoſt. in Epheſ. Hom.* α.

(z) *Quanto quis melior eſt, tanto magis bonitatem diligit, oditque malitiam ſeu iniquitatem. Cùm itaque Deus bonus ſit, nec tantum bonus, ſed infinitè bonus, ſequitur, ut infinito amore bonitatem diligat, odioque infinito malitiam proſequatur.* Granatenſ. ap. Baron. de peccat. mort. & venial. Par. 3. S. 2.

(a) *Larkham on the Attributes. Par.* 2. p. 57.

teous? or is it gain to him, that thou makeſt thy way perfect? Job 22. 2, 3. *If thou ſinneſt, what doſt thou againſt him? or if thy Tranſgreſſions be multiply'd, what doſt thou unto him? If thou be Righteous, what giveſt thou him, or what receiveth he of thine Hand?* Job 35. 6, 7. It is with God as with an All-ſufficient Father, that procreateth a numerous Family of Children, with deſign, that they ſhould be happy, but withall that they ſhould be holy and virtuous towards himſelf and towards one another. Such a Father they can neither help nor hurt, benefit or damnifie *in reſpect of Inſufficiency and Indigence* (as they may benefit and damnifie one another) nor with *the real perfective kind of benefiting or the real deſtructive kind of damnifying.* But although the Almighty is above the being thus benefited or damnify'd by Men or Angels, yet it is not good or legitimate Reaſoning, to infer from thence, *that it was indifferent as to God, whether the World was created or not; and that the ultimate End which God intendeth in the Creation is only the Creatures good.* For as our well or evil-doing; ſo his own well or evil-doing is not matter of indifferency with God. Not to create the Univerſe at all, is contrary to all that God is, inconſiſtent with the Godlike Nature, Diſpoſition and Practice, (*b*) and oppoſite to what is worthy and laudable. The End alſo for which and unto which God created the Univerſe, could be no matter of indifferency with God: For the goodneſs of well-doing is wanting in the Creation, *if all things are not for him and to him.* This is an eſſential condition of the Creation, becauſe this is the eſſential condition of the Godhead, to be the ultimate final cauſe of all things. There is other Cauſe and Reaſon than *Need* therefore, why God ſhould intend and deſign his Intereſt in the Creation; and we have other Cauſe to ſerve and honour him, than to furniſh *his Needs.* Nor would he deſerve ſuch Honour as he hath, if he was one that needed it. *Ariſtodemus* to excuſe his neglect of Religion, told *Socrates,* (*c*) *I do not contemn the Deity, but I think it more magnificent, than to need my Worſhip.* To which *Socrates* made anſwer, (*d*) *How much the more magnificent that is, which vouchſafeth to take care of you, ſo much the more it ought to be honour'd by you.*

VIII. The Schools debate this Theory of the Final Cauſe, but they rather incumber it than rightly explicate it. (*d*) *God's proper ultimate End is Himſelf, he made all things for himſelf, and can have no lower End than himſelf; but how himſelf is his End, is hard to open: If we ſay, his Being as ſuch is his End, or that his Eſſential Glory is his End; we do but darken the matter and loſe our ſelves; for neither Redemption nor any other Work, can either cauſe, conſerve or add to that Being and Glory. If we ſay, his Being in the eſteem of the Creatures is his utmoſt End, we ſuppoſe him, to have an End infinitely below himſelf. If you ſay, that the communication of himſelf to his Creatures is his End, either you ſpeak of the Act of Communication as in God, and ſo it is himſelf efficiently and not finally conſider'd: or elſe you ſpeak of the Form produc'd by it, or as receiv'd by the Creature, and ſo it is* quid creatum & extra naturam divinam, *and too low to be his End. I conclude therefore, that Man is uncapable of a clear and full conceiving of the nature of God's End or Intending; but the Conception and Expreſſion which I judge to be moſt favour'd by Scripture and Reaſon, is, that God's Will is the beginning and end of all things: Whatſoever pleaſed him that did he, and when he hath done it, the pleaſing him is his End; and therefore he reſted after the Work of Creation, and expreſſeth himſelf well pleaſed by and in his Son in the Work of Redemption, as ſeeing his Work in both to be very good; and therefore inſtituted a Day of reſt in commemoration of both. The term Reſt expreſſeth the End; and his well-pleaſedneſs, Content or Will* (the fulfilling his Will) *is his Reſt and ſo his End.* Meer arbitrary Will is (in this Scholaſticiſm) ſuppos'd to be *the beginning and end of all,* agreeably to that great Scholaſtick Maxim, *Deus vult hoc eſſe propter hoc, ſed non propter hoc vult hoc: God willeth one thing to be for another, but he doth not will any one thing for the other.* (*e*) *The Will of God is reaſonable, not becauſe any thing is the Cauſe* (or Reaſon) *of his Volition, but becauſe he willeth one thing to be for another.* (*f*) *A Cauſe may be aſſign'd of the Divine Volitions in reſpect of the thing willed, in as much as God will have one thing to be for another; but not in reſpect of the Act of willing.* To make a Judgment of this great Maxim, we may conſider, that ſome great Aſſertors of it have yet expreſly contradicted it. (*g*) *For who doubteth* (ſaith one,) *but that God could have conferr'd upon Men the Heavenly Glory without the Merits of Chriſt? but why he would take this courſe in conferring Glory upon Men, the reaſon is eaſie; becauſe he would confer Glory upon Men ſo as to manifeſt his Mercy temper'd with Juſtice.* Scholaſtick Divines aſſign Cauſes or Reaſons of the Divine Will in reſpect of the *actus volendi;* for of his Will to create the World ſome ſay, (*h*) *Duæ hujus voluntatis docentur cauſæ, there are two cauſes of this Volition taught in Scripture; one the proximate, the Goodneſs of God; the other more remote and ultimate the Glory of God.* The Fathers agree, that God created the World out of a Principle of Goodneſs (in the moral Notion of it) they ſuppoſe therefore an Impulſive Reaſon moving the Divine Will (*ex parte actus volendi*) to create the World. And as the Fathers, ſo Religion and the Bible contradict this Scholaſtick Maxim, which affirmeth, *That no created thing is or can be a motive of the Divine Volitions in reſpect of the Act of willing;* which implieth, that God doth not do us good at all for our ſake, and therefore is not at all a Benefactor to us. God did will the Exiſtence of Food and Phyſick for the ſervice of Man, but not for Man's ſake (as this Maxim affirmeth;) and if this was ſo, Man is not oblig'd to God for his Food and Phyſick, nor hath God any real kindneſs for Man, according to that other Scholaſtick Maxim, (*i*) *Amor Dei erga Creaturas non eſt affectivus, ſed effectivus: The love of God towards the Creatures is not a loving them, but only a doing them good.* The Piety, Prayers and Interceſſions of *Noah, Daniel* and *Job,* and of the Son of God himſelf, the Merits of a Saviour, the Merits and Demerits of Men and Angels, no reaſon of Juſtice, no object of Mercy or of eſpecial Favour,

(b) *V. Epictet. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

(c) Οὐχ ὑπερορῶ τὸ δαιμόνιον, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον μεγαλοπρεπέστερον ἡγοῦμαι ἢ ὡς τῆς ἐμῆς θεραπείας προσδεῖσθαι.

(d) Ὅσῳ μεγαλοπρεπέστερον ἀξιοῖ σε θεραπεύειν, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον τιμητέον αὐτό. *Xenoph.* ἀπομν. α.

(d) *Mr. Baxter of Univerſ. Redemption, p.* 8.

(e) *Voluntas* Dei *rationabilis eſt, non quod aliquid ſit Deo cauſa volendi; ſed in quantum vult unum eſſe propter aliud.* Aquin. 1a. Qu. 19. Art. 5.

(f) *Non eſt aſſignare cauſam divinæ voluntatis ex parte actus volendi, ſed poteſt aſſignari ratio ex parte volitorum, in quantum ſcilicet Deus vult eſſe aliquid propter aliud.* Ibid. Qu. 23. Art. 5.

(g) *Quis enim dubitat potuiſſe Deum conferre hominibus gloriam cæleſtem ſine meritis Chriſti? quare verò hoc conſilium ceperit Deus, ut in conferenda hominibus gloria hanc viam ingredi voluerit, ratio in promptu eſt; quia ſcilicet conferre hominibus gloriam ipſi collibitum fuerit, ad manifeſtandam ſuipſius miſericordiam cum juſtitia temperatam.* Dr. Twiſſ. vindic. Grat. l. 1. par. 2. Digr. 3. S. 1. p. 161.

(h) Pareus in Gen. 1. 1.

(i) Gonet. *Clyp. T.* 3. *Diſp.* 2. *Art.* 1.

Favour, can move one Divine Volition, if no created thing can be a motive reaſon of the Divine Volitions. The Scripture throughout the whole of it aſſigneth Reaſons of the Divine Volitions (*ex parte actus volendi*) from created things. For the Jews *were belov'd for the Father's ſake.* Chriſtians are belov'd, *becauſe they believe in Chriſt and for Chriſt's ſake: Therefore doth my Father love me* (ſaith our Saviour) *becauſe I lay down my life.* God will'd the defence and ſafety of *Jeruſalem for* David's *ſake.* To *Jeruſalem* he ſaith, *Thou haſt forſaken me, therefore I will ſtretch out my Hand againſt thee.* To *Iſaac* he ſaith, *I will bleſs thee and multiply thy Seed for my Servant* Abraham's *ſake.* To *Iſrael* he ſaith, *I will not go up in the midſt of thee, for thou art a ſtiff-necked People*; and of the pious Man he ſaith, *Becauſe he hath ſet his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him.* But although the generality of the Scholaſtick Divines will not acknowledge, that the Will of God is mov'd by any created thing, yet one would think, they ſhould not ſtick to acknowledge, that it is mov'd by ſomething uncreated, as all Religioniſts ſuppoſe, when they beg Bleſſings of him for his Name's ſake, for his Mercy's ſake, for Chriſt's ſake, the Schoolmen themſelves ſay, (*k*) *Deus vult cætera omnia propter ſuam bonitatem, God willeth all other things for his Goodneſs* (the Good that He is, or his eſſential Perfection;) and they affirm alſo, (*l*) that this Goodneſs is unto God *Objectum motivum & ratio volendi per modum finis, the Motive, Object and the Reaſon of his Willing by way of the End.* They affirm therefore, that in a large ſenſe it is the cauſe of the Divine Volition (for in theſe Maſters *ratio* and *cauſa* (*m*) are terms ſynonimous) which is, to be inconſiſtent with themſelves (notwithſtanding an inſufficient Salvo (*n*) which they have excogiated, to ſave themſelves from Inconſiſtence) and to contradict their own Maxim, *that one thing is not the cauſe why God willeth another.* One part of this Maxim affirmeth, that what God willeth is Rational, Wiſe and Good (*vult hoc eſſe propter hoc*) God will have Cauſes and Effects, Means and Ends, due Order and Uſefulneſs amongſt the parts of the Univerſe; but the other part of it will not allow, that God willeth it, becauſe it is rational, wiſe and good, *Non propter hoc vult hoc.* The Divine Will therefore in creating the Univerſe was but half-rational; for in all rational procedure the Means are willed for the ſake of the End, to which they are ſubſervient (*ratio mediorum ſumitur à fine,*) whence ſome rigid Adherers to the School-Divinity ſay, (*o*) *Actus volendi finem in Deo dici poteſt cauſa actus volendi media ad finem; The act of willing the End in God may be ſaid to be the Cauſe of the act of willing the Means to the End.* If there is nothing of this rational procedure in God, what meaneth *his working all things after the Counſel* (which is wiſe and rational procedure) *of his own Will?* (*p*) *Nec ratio ſine bonitate ratio eſt, nec bonitas ſine ratione bonitas: Reaſon without Goodneſs is not Reaſon, nor is Goodneſs without Reaſon Goodneſs.* The true God is not *Marcion*'s Deity, *irrationaliter bonus.* Although he acteth in the God-like arbitrary way of Self-will, yet not in the irrational arbitrary way of Self-will, regarding nothing but the fulfilling of meer Will and Pleaſure, and willing becauſe he willeth. His Will and Pleaſure is *Good-will, Eph.* 1. 9. His moſt unaccountable doings he would not do, if they did not *ſeem good in his ſight* (and therefore they are really good, *Matth.* 11. 26.) And as his Creation-work was wiſe and good *ex parte volitorum, in reſpect of the things willed* and the *Finis operis:* So alſo *ex parte actus volendi, in reſpect of the act of willing* and the *Finis operantis*; for ſuch is all truly Virtuous and God-like Agency. To rational Beings in common good as good is the Object of the Will and the reaſon of willing. So the Philoſopher ſaith of good, (*q*) ἔνθεν ὥρμηται πᾶσα κίνησις ϗ ἀνθρώπου ϗ θεοῦ, *all motion of Man and of God is with reſpect to it.*

Hitherto the Scholaſtick Theology appeareth, to incumber the Theory of the Final Cauſe with inextricable difficulties touching the Divine Will, and the further we look into it the worſe it appeareth: For this Theology ſuppoſeth, that the Acts of the Will of God are all one with his Subſtance and therefore Eternal, yet ſome paſt, others preſent, and others to come; one (as being the ſame with his Subſtance) and yet many; neceſſary yet free; the Divine Volition of producing the future Creatures is free, but it is free only, as it is a free relation or habitude of the Divine Eſſence to the future Creatures, and yet their being future Creatures is a conſequent of that free Relation or Habitude; for the Divine Volition is the cauſe, the only cauſe, why they are future Creatures. By ſuch a Theology we are not likely to advance very far in the knowledge of *the Final Cauſe*, of which yet the Schoolmen have a right Notion in general, obſcurely and *in Confuſò*; for they rightly affirm, that *ſummè amatum, ſummum bonum* and *Finis ultimus* are the ſame, and that whatever God doeth *ad extra, propter ſe agit tanquam finem ultimum.* And if we ask, what *propter ſe* meaneth? they explain themſelves *propter bonitatem ſuam,* whereby they mean, the Good that God is or his Eſſential Perfections. (*r*) *Deus alia à ſe non vult niſi propter Finem qui eſt ſua Bonitas: God doth not will other things beſides himſelf, unleſs it be for the End, which is his Goodneſs.* But how the Creatures can be Means to ſuch an End as thoſe Eſſential Perfections of God which they treat of, this they cannot ſay; nor can they ſay, how there can be any Means to ſuch an End; nor can they ſhew, what motive force there is in God's Eſſential Perfections, to cauſe him to communicate them; and they fall into impertinent Diſcourſes, when they come to ſhew, how or in what Senſe God is the End of all. (*s*) *To the firſt Agent it is not agreeable, to act for the acquiſition of an End, but he intendeth only to communicate his Perfection, which is his Goodneſs; and every Creature intendeth, to gain its Perfection, which is a ſimilitude of the Perfection and Goodneſs Divine. So the Divine Goodneſs is the End of all things.* This account how God is the final cauſe of all things, is not pertinent to the Inquiry; for they that inquire touching the final cauſe of the Creation, underſtand very well, that God's Creation is the ſame thing with the Communication of his Perfection; but their Inquiry is touching the moving Reaſon and End of that Communication. *Cajetan* ſaith, The End of this Action or Operation is the Divine Perfection (or Goodneſs:) but this is moſt falſe, ſaith another Schoolman, (*t*) for this Action or Operation and the Divine Perfection (or Goodneſs) are all one.

Rom. 11. 28.

Joh. 14. 23. and 15 27. and 10. 17.

1 King. 11. 34.

2 King. 19. 34.

Jer. 15. 6.

Gen. 26. 24.

Exod. 33. 3.

Pſ. 91. 14.

(k) Vaſqu. in Thom. T. 1. Diſp. 80. c. 1, 2.

(l) Ibid. & Gonet. ſupr.

(m) Dr. Twiſſ. ſupr. p. 152.

(n) Valentia T. 1. Diſp. 3. Qu. 1. punct. 3.

(o) Dr. Twiſſ. ſupr. p. 153.

(p) Tertull. c. Marcion. l. 2. c. 6.

(q) Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 3.

(r) Aquin. 1a. Qu. 19. Art. 1, 2.

(s) *Primo Agenti non convenit agere propter acquiſitionem alicujus finis, ſed intendit ſolum communicare ſuam perfectionem, quæ eſt ejus bonitas, & unaquæque creatura intendit conſequi ſuam perfectionem, quæ eſt ſimilitudo perfectionis & bonitatis divinæ. Sic ergo divina bonitas eſt finis omnium rerum.* Aquin. ſupr. Qu. 44. Art. 4.

(t) Valentia T. 1. Diſp. 3. Qu. 1. punct. 3.

IX. The Hebrew Doctors (that are grand Scholaſticks) make very large Attributions of (moral) Goodneſs to the Deity, but in their Account of the cauſe of the Creation they overlook it: (*u*) yet they ſuppoſe, that the Works of God are good and for a propoſed End, and they manage a Diſpute againſt certain Maſters of Speculation, who derive them from Will without Wiſdom, and will not allow us to ask, *cur hoc fecerit?* The ſame Controverſie they have with thoſe Maſters of Speculation touching the Precepts of their Law. (*w*) *For ſome do not inquire into any cauſe of them, but they ſay, that all the Precepts are from his meer Will. Others ſay, that every Precept and Prohibition is from his Wiſdom and reſpecteth a certain End; all the Precepts have their Cauſes and Reaſons and are commanded for the ſake of ſome Utility, and this is the common Opinion of all the Wiſe Men.* (*x*) *Thoſe unwiſe perſons make Man more perfect than his Creator; for according to them whatever a Man ſaith or doth, he doth it for a certain End; but God doth otherwiſe, he commandeth us that which bringeth us no Utility, if we do it, nor detriment, if we neglect it. But far be this from the Creator. If his Precepts were of no utility, how could it be ſaid of thoſe that believe and do them, that they are wiſe, intelligent, great, and a wonder to all Nations?* The Hebrew Doctors therefore in their Account of the Final Cauſe conjoyn *Will* and *Wiſdom.* (*y*) *If we ſay, that all things were made for Man, and Man for the worſhip of his Creator, yet the Queſtion remaineth, What is the End of that worſhip? Seeing nothing accrueth to the Perfection of God, although all Creatures ſhould worſhip him, nothing goeth from him, although nothing beſides himſelf ſhould exiſt. If you anſwer, that this is not done for his Perfection, but for our Perfection; becauſe this is our chief Good and our higheſt Perfection: In like manner it may be ask'd, to what End is that Perfection of us? This End therefore muſt neceſſarily be aſſign'd at length;* Ita voluit Deus, vel ita decrevit ſapientia illius, *ſo is the Will of God, or ſo his Wiſdom hath determin'd.* (*z*) *The Throne is made for the King to ſit upon, and the End of his ſitting on it is, that he may be plac'd on high, and he is plac'd on high for this End, for Magnificence and Authority, and his Magnificence and Authority is for this End, that Men may fear and revere him, and Men muſt fear and revere him for this End, that they may obſerve his Commands; and his Commands muſt be obſerv'd for this End, that Men may live ſafe, free from Injuries, and that the Order and Society of Men may be conſerv'd. In like manner we are to carry on our Inquiry touching all Ends, till we come to the ultimate End, which is the Will or Wiſdom of the Creator* (ſic voluit Deus, ſic fuit decretum ſapientiæ Dei,) *which in our Opinion are nothing elſe but his Eſſence:* Wherefore we conclude, that *the bleſſed God is the ultimate end of every thing, and conſequently, that this is alſo the End of all things, to become like unto him in Perfection, ſo far as may be; for this is his Will, which is nothing elſe but his Eſſence: and in this reſpect it is ſaid of God,* quòd ſit Finis Finium, *that he is the End of Ends.* But the making God the End in this Rabbinical Senſe only, is really a making him the Beginning of things only, not the End. The reſolving all things into his meer Will (or Wiſdom in general) is a ſignifying, that the Reaſon and End of things is unknown. (*a*) *To ſuch Queſtions and Inquiries as theſe, Why God made one a Prophet and not another? Why he gave his Law to one Nation, not to another? Why he gave it at ſuch a time, not ſooner or later? Why he gave ſuch Precepts and Prohibitions? the ready Anſwer is this,* Ita voluit, vel ita decrevit ſapientia ejus. So *Abarbenel* ſaith, (*b*) that חפץ *voluit* is not us'd abſolutely, but touching a thing whoſe final cauſe is unknown. But if inquiry be made touching the Reaſon or Final Cauſe of things, and if it be apparent, or may be eaſily known, the uſual way of the Jews is to anſwer, *Ita voluit*; and they had better ſay ſo at the firſt than at the laſt, for thereby they ſave themſelves the labour of any further Inquiry. (*c*) *Mundum conditum quia Deo ita viſum fuit, dicunt Hebræi: The Hebrews ſay, the World was made, becauſe it pleaſed God. Maimonides* maketh God the ultimate End only in ſuch a Senſe, as doth not import the tendency of any thing to him, or that any thing is in order to him, or made for his ſake, or that he is in ſuch Senſe the End, as that all things are for him and to him. *Men. ben Iſr.* hath ſaid better in his forecited Interpretation of the words of *Solomon, The Lord hath made all things for himſelf.*

X. Nothing of Goodneſs appeareth in the Rabbinical Account of the Final Cauſe of the Creation, and nothing but Goodneſs appeareth in the Chriſtian. (*d*) Three things (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) ought principally to be known touching every Creature; *quis eam fecerit, per quid fecerit, quare fecerit.* If we ask therefore concerning Light, *quis fecerit? Deus eſt: Si per quid fecerit? dixit fiat & facta eſt. Si quare fecerit? quia bona eſt: nec cauſa melior, quam ut bonum crearetur à bono Deo. Hanc etiam Plato cauſam condendi mundum juſtiſſimam dicit, ut à bono Deo bona opera fierent.* God made Light, becauſe it was good and he was good, becauſe it was good, that the Light ſhould exiſt: And it was Goodneſs in God (not only the Platonic Communicative Goodneſs, but the Goodneſs of well-doing) to give it exiſtence, and this Goodneſs requir'd the giving it exiſtence; from which Conjunction of *objective* and *ſubjective* Goodneſs all created Beings derive their Exiſtence. All things were created for the ſake of Good, and conſequently for the ſake of that Goodneſs which requir'd it. If the created Univerſe was not an immenſity of Goods, if it had not been ſo repreſented before its Exiſtence *in Archetypâ Mente* (in the Archetypal Mind,) if the Exiſtence of it had not been thought good, it could not have been an Object of the Divine Volition. As it was (in its Ideal Exiſtence) an immenſity of Goods: So it was immenſe Goodneſs in God, to give it Exiſtence, and Goodneſs requir'd, that Exiſtence *ſhould be given it: (e) For what profit is there of good* (or what ſignifieth it) *that is not operative and doth no good? As they that are rich in this World* are charg'd to be communicatively good, and to be rich in good Works, ſo God *(f) is unceſſant in Beneficences being truly God and a good Father.* But Goodneſs muſt not be devoid of Juſtice. (*g*) *How much Injuſtice is an Evil, ſo much Juſtice is a Good. Nor is it only to be reputed a Species of Goodneſs, but the Defenſative thereof; for if Goodneſs is not govern'd by Juſtice, ſo that it is juſt, it is not Goodneſs, if it be unjuſt; for nothing is good that is unjuſt, and whatever is*

juſt

(u) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. par.* 3. c. 25.

(w) *Ibid.* c. 26.

(x) *Ibid.* c. 31.

(y) *Ibid.* c. 13.

(z) *Ibid. par.* 1. c. 69.

(a) *Ibid. par.* 2. c. 25.

(b) *Com. in Iſa.* 30. p. 38. & 205. *Ed. L'Emper.*

(c) *Grot. Not. in Eph.* 1. 5.

(d) *De C. D. l.* 11. c. 21.

(e) Τί γαρ ὄφελος ἀγαθοῦ μὴ ἐνεργοῦντος μηδὲ ἀγαθοποιοῦντος; *Clem. Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 480.

(f) Θεὸς ὄντως ϗ πατὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὤντε ϗ γινόμενος ἐν ἀδιαλείπτοις εὐποιΐαις. *Ibid.*

(g) *Quanto malum injuſtitia, tanto bonum juſtitia. Nec ſpecies ſolummodo, ſed tutela reputanda bonitatis; quia bonitas niſi juſtitia regatur, ut juſta ſit, non erit bonitas, ſi injuſta ſit. Nihil enim bonum quod injuſtum, bonum autem omne quod juſtum. ita ſi ſocietas & conſpiratio bonitatis atque juſtitiæ, ſeparatione earum non potes non carere —— A primordio creator tam bonus* *quam & juſtus : Pariter utrumque proceſſit. Bonitas ejus operata eſt mundum, juſtitia modulata eſt.* Tercull. c. Marcion. l. 2. c. 11, 12.

juſt is good. So if there be a Society and Conſpiration of Goodneſs and Juſtice, Marcion *muſt want the Separation of them, to make his two Gods. From the beginning the Creator was ſo Good as Juſt : There was a like Proceſs of both. His Goodneſs made the World, Juſtice order'd it.* The Creator practiſed (in his Creation-work) immenſe Beneficence, but ſo as to practiſe univerſal Juſtice. And it was but Juſtice, that all things ſhould be made for him and to him, and that all Rationals ſhould be made for the good of Holineſs and Godlineſs. (b) *Quid enim tam bonum quàm notitia & fructus Dei? For what is ſo good as the knowledge of God and the Fruit thereof?*

(b) Tertull. ibid. c. 3.

XI. His holy or divine kind of Goodneſs whence the Creation iſſu'd, muſt be conſider'd under the Notion of *Imperial*; for God is an Imperial Eſtate (the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate) and his creative Goodneſs muſt be denominated *his holy Imperial Goodneſs of Will*, to diſtinguiſh it from meer *univerſal Benevolence*. For his univerſal Benevolence is not meer univerſal Benevolence, but Benevolence with the addition and limitation of *the holy Imperial*. We may ſuppoſe *Prometheus* a good natur'd Rational, as one of the aggregate of Rationals, to produce a world of Rationals from meer Univerſal Benevolence, and for the common good of the whole aggregate of Rationals, that every one of them by univerſal Benevolence (Benevolence towards all) may endeavour and promote the common good of all, wherein every one's Happineſs is included : But it is manifeſt, that this *Promethean* Creation is not like God's Creation. For in this *Promethean* Creation the created Rationals are not made by the Creator proximately and immediately to be his, his Subjects and Servants, to be Servient and Subſervient to him, and for him to have the Poſſeſſion, Uſe and Diſpoſal of them: But they are proximately and immediately and meerly made for the publick good of all Rationals, to endeavour and promote it by a concurring univerſal Benevolence and the joint Endeavours of all. In this *Promethean* Creation the Creator doth not claim any Propriety in, nor Dominion and Sovereignty over the created Rationals as the Right and Due of his Honour and Dignity of Eſtate, and which belongeth to him upon his own account : He can aſſume to himſelf a ſupreme Power of governing all, only and meerly becauſe it is neceſſary for the publick good of all Rationals and in order thereto; and the created Rationals are not oblig'd to be his Subjects and Servants, but only in order to the publick good, and becauſe the publick good requireth it, which is their Intereſt to endeavour and promote. The truly Religious ſerve the publick out of reſpect to God and for his ſake: But this Scheme of the Creation inferreth, that they muſt ſerve God meerly out of reſpect to the publick and for its ſake. In this *Promethean* Creation the Creator (whoſe Principle is meer univerſal Benevolence and the publick good) is not ſupreme Lord of all, but only becauſe the publick good requireth it; and ſo far as the publick good requireth it, his Dominion and Sovereignty is deriv'd from it and limited by it (and conſequently he hath it derivatively and dependently:) Nor is he properly ſupreme Lord of all, but the publick is the Lord and Owner of all. The publick is alſo the ultimate final Cauſe of all; for the Creator (as every other Rational) is ſuppos'd, to be of underling Condition, a ſubordinate and ſubſervient means (and therefore a Servitor) to the common good, which is above him, the beſt and greateſt good and end, and which muſt be uppermoſt in the Eſteem and Affection of all. But (i) *Quis dixerit Deum ad fines officiorum certos actionum ſuarum decreta dirigentem? Who will allot unto God the meer Office of Governing with an obſervance of the limits thereof?* Such a *Promethean* Creation would be an undeifying God, who is not a meer Rational, nor are his Liege-people ſuch, nor can a City of God conſiſt of meer Rationals; for it neceſſarily conſiſteth of holy Rationals, that are ſet apart for God to have the Poſſeſſion, Uſe and Injoyment of them, and that prefer his Honour and Service before all things. If God doth create an Univerſe of Rationals, he is neceſſarily unto them a God immediately and in his own Right (and they are of Right and by Obligation his Liege-people;) he cannot therefore create an Univerſe of Rationals from meer univerſal Benevolence for the common good of the aggregate of Rationals, ſo as to be unto them a God, and to have Dominion and Sovereignty over them, only becauſe the common good requireth it. His Original Creation iſſu'd from an univerſal Benevolence, but the Benevolence which it iſſu'd from, was the Benevolence of his holy Imperial Good-will, which is ſo *good* as to be *juſt*, and which reſerveth unto God intirely the Rights and Dues of his Godhead. It deſigneth the common good by its deſigning our Holineſs and Godlineſs; for this is that which is every way good, the common good of the holy Empire. Which is a plain Reaſon, why God muſt be *the End of Ends* unſubordinated to any End, our *Holineſs* and *Godlineſs* requireth, that it ſhould be ſo.

(i) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 3. p. 111.

XII. His holy Imperial Good will requireth, that he be to the Univerſe of Rationals *the Sanctity Imperial* (the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial) which is the ſame thing with the Volition of the holy Empire and the Intereſts thereof : As Chriſt is deſign'd, to be unto us the Chriſtianity Imperial (the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial,) which is the ſame thing with the Volition of the Chriſtian Empire and the Intereſts thereof. Some of the Maſters of the Metaphyſical and Cabaliſtical Theoſophy ſay (k) that God therefore created the World, *ut ſit quod conveniret nominibus Jehovah atque Adonai :* And thus much of truth there is in their Saying, *His Original Creation was the Volition of the holy Empire*, which is the thing, that agreeth to his Names *Jehovah* and *Adonai*. His Original Creation therefore iſſu'd from his Holineſs and Godlineſs (holy Imperial Goodneſs) of Will; for the Volition of the holy Empire is neceſſarily Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will : As the Volition of the Chriſtian Empire is neceſſarily Chriſtian Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will. It is the Volition of all the matters of Holineſs and Godlineſs (of the holy Sovereignty and Government, the holy City, the holy Law, the State and Life of Holineſs, the Duty-part and Benefit-part of Religion) of all the God-kind (the Saint of God-kind) of Good and

(k) *Ap. D. H. More op. Phil. Vol.* 1. p. 455.

As a Parent's Goodneſs is Parental Good-will, and therefore is a Volition of his own Parental Eſtate, the Rights and Dues thereof : So the holy Imperial Goodneſs of God is his Imperial Good-will, and is a Volition of his own Imperial Eſtate the Rights and Dues thereof.

Excellency: As the Volition of the Chriſtian Empire is the Volition of all the Chriſtian and Divine kind of Good and Excellency. And as Chriſt cannot be Chriſt, ſo God cannot be God without the Volition of this Divine kind of Good, nor without a deadly hatred, a punitive and vindictive diſpleaſure againſt the contrary evil. Which deadly hatred of the contrary evil of Sin and Wickedneſs is the ſame thing with his love to Holineſs; he cannot therefore be ſuppos'd, to love Holineſs meerly with reſpect to us and our Welfare, and conſequently his Volition of the holy Empire muſt not be ſuppos'd, *mera benignitas propenſaque voluntas benefaciendi aliis, a meer Benignity and ready Will to benefit others.* When our Bleſſed Saviour founded the Chriſtian Empire, he was not wanting in Benignity of Will to us and our Benefit: But this Benignity of Will to us was neceſſarily connex'd with the Volition of his own Imperial Eſtate (of Chriſtianity) for his own ſake; and this whole Volition was his Chriſtian Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will, and without this Volition Chriſtian Holineſs and Godlineſs (holy Goodneſs) of Will would be wanting in Chriſt: In like manner, Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will would be wanting in God, if his beneficent Volition of the Exiſtence of the Subject-party of the holy Empire (the Univerſe of Rationals) was not connex'd with the Volition of his own Imperial Eſtate (of Sanctity Imperial) for its own ſake; for this whole Volition is his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will. God in his Original Creation muſt be conſider'd as *Fundator Imperii, the Founder of the holy Empire*, in the Religion whereof he is repreſented as the *Final* (as well as the Efficient) Cauſe of all things; and he is ſo chiefly for theſe three Reaſons, which may commodiouſly be mentioned in this place.

(1.) All things had Exiſtence given them for the ſake of Good, and conſequently for the ſake of Goodneſs, *his Goodneſs* (his being Good and doing Good) that requir'd it. In ſuch ſenſe all things are for God.

(2.) The Subject-party of the holy Empire is for the Exiſtence of that Good, the Volition whereof is Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will, and the Exiſtence whereof is for his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will, which requireth it, and is the final Reaſon thereof.

(3.) Although all things are made for this Reaſon *the Exiſtence of Good*, this doth not hinder, but that God's Creation is ſo made, as that all things are *for him and to him*, as Religion and Godlineſs requireth.

The Nature of the Original Creation (wherein God was *Fundator Imperii*) inferreth, that Rationals were originally created, to be Citizens of the holy Empire. They could not be originally created for the atheous State and Life and the Kingdom of Darkneſs: But were made, to be and live in the State of Religion and Sanctity, which is the State of Citizenſhip in the Kingdom of God. To this holy and happy Eſtate Chriſtianity deſigneth to reſtore extraneous and lapſed Rationals; therefore they were made for it in their Original Creation. They were made for God, to be his Subjects and Servants (and for the buſineſs of his Subjects and Servants, the ſerving, pleaſing and glorifying God) to be holy and happy, and each one of them was made, to be apart of the whole and for the whole. Our ultimate End is thus well expreſs'd. (l) *Ut ſummo Patri ac Domino in perpetuum ſerviamus, & ſimus æternum Deo regnum, to ſerve for ever the ſupreme Father and Lord, and to be unto God an eternal Kingdom.*

XIII. His holy Imperial Goodneſs of Will requireth, that God be a Parental Providence to this World of Terreſtrial Animals, and to Mankind eſpecially, who are made (additionally to the other Ends of their Creation) to live in Human and Civil Society, agreeably to their natural Inclination and Intereſt; for Man is (m) ζῶον νοερὸν ϗ κοινωνικὸν, *a Rational and Social Animal*, and without Society the Life of Man would be life-leſs, the World would be a Wilderneſs and a ghaſtly Scene, *nothing but darkneſs and dimneſs of Anguiſh.* Mankind being made for Society, it is manifeſtly the Will and Intention of Nature (Parental Providence) that the *mundus humanus* ſhould conſiſt of Families, Cities and Commonwealths with their ſeveral Governours (for things are ſo ordered in Nature, that it cannot be otherwiſe,) every one of which leſſer Syſtems is (n) κόσμος, *an ordinate Conſtitution and Polity.* But the aggregate of theſe leſſer Syſtems is not properly a Polity (as the leſſer Syſtems are,) yet in a large Senſe it may be called (o) *una omnium Reſpublica, one Commonwealth of all.* Mankind therefore are made, to be Citizens of this World (to do the Duties and enjoy the Felicities of Citizens) to do to one another (agreeably to the Bonds and Alliances that are in Nature) the Duties of Fellow-Citizens, to practice the Societive Virtue and Duty (which is their Excellency,) to ſeek their own good in their Social Capacity, to love themſelves in common with Mankind, to take care of one another's Welfare, to be mutually helpful and beneficent, and to ſeek and promote the Commonweal, the good of every one and of all. Which Scheme of excellent Virtue and Duty to the publick is not to be exploded upon a pretence, that a Man in all his Actions ought to ſeek the Acquiſition of his own ſupreme Good. Whence a Philoſophick Writer inferreth (p) *that the celebrated Saying of* Plato *touching Man, that he is not only born to himſelf, but partly to his Country, Parents, Friends and to all Mankind, is not only a falſe, but a deadly pernicious Dogma; and that in very Deed Man is deſtin'd by Nature to himſelf and his own good only.* But this is to Philoſophize at the old unpopular and paradoxical rate, and in contradiction to common Senſe. For what can be more plain and certain, than that Men are made for Civil Society, to be the Parts of an Whole, to ſubſerve the Intereſt thereof, and that a virtuous and dutiful promoting the good of Mankind in this World is one way of ſeeking the Acquiſition of our ſupreme Good in another World? If Mankind are made for civil Society, they are neceſſarily made for ſome degree of Religion (without which civil Society and Government cannot ſubſiſt:) But they are made for Religion at another-kins rate than may ſerve the turn of civil Society. For in general they have a knowledge of God, of his Law and their Duty; and God is notic'd to them as a Deity of true Religion and Godlineſs. And ſeeing they have

(l) *Lactant. l.* 7. *c.* 6.

(m) *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 2.

(n) *Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 183.

(o) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 38.

(p) *Eximium illud Platonis edictum tanto plauſu uſque ad nos reboans, Hominem non ſibi ſolummodò natum, ſed partim Patriæ, parentibus & amicis partim, imò toti Hominum genere, non falſum ſolùm ſed & exitiale dogma eſſe; & reipſe Hominem ſibi & ſuo duntaxat bono eſſe à Natura addictum & deſtinatum.* Tho. White Sutera Morum p. 60.

Hæc enim conditione gignimur, ut generanti nos Deo juſta & debita obſequia præbeamus, hunc ſolum noverimus, hunc ſequamur. Lactant. l. 4. c. 28.

have immortal Souls, which are deſign'd for endleſs Happineſs or Miſery in the World to come, thence it appeareth, that to take care of the Soul, to make Proviſion for a future State, to be ſavingly Religious, to do the work and buſineſs of Godlineſs, is every Man's work (which he hath to do in the World) the general calling of Mankind, of univerſal Concernment and infinite Neceſſity, and therefore every Man ought to look upon it as the main work and buſineſs for which he is made *an Inhabitant of this World.* Act. 17. 27.

XIV. The due Explication of *the final Cauſe* is peculiar to *the Science of Sanctity* which ſheweth the preheminence of it above the Philoſophic-pagan, the Rabbinical and the Chriſtian Scholaſticiſm. (q) *Nemo fuit Philoſophorum, quin confiteretur omnium rerum finem eſſe Deum. All the Philoſophers acknowledge, that God is the end of all things. Which will be clear by this reaſon. All things viſible ſerve the life and conveniences of Men, which ſheweth, that Man is their End. But it is clear, that Man hath ſome end, which can be none but God. Therefore Man is for God, and ſo are Human things, and all things are for the King of all.* We applaud this Platonic Maxim, but do not underſtand (and therefore muſt inquire) in what ſenſe and for what reaſon all things are for the King of all? Are they to ſupply his Needs, and to afford him Conveniences which he wanteth, as the lower Creation is for the Needs and Conveniences of Man? Who knoweth not, that ἀνενδεὲς τὸ θεῖον, *God hath no need*, and (as a Philoſopher ſaid) οὐδὲν ὠφέλιμον τῷ θεῷ, *nothing is profitable unto God?* Accordingly our Author ſaith of the King of all (r) *he is the End of the* (Platonic) *Mind, the Mind is the End of Men and Angels, and Man the End of the corporeal World: And all things tend to the Father (rightfully ſo) the firſt it ſelf, and the Head of Mind it ſelf. And this term* ἕνεκα, *for, doth not relate to the needs of God, but the neceſſity of things.* The Platoniſts therefore ſuppoſe, that all things are for the firſt King in this Senſe and for this Reaſon (s) *he is to them the chief Appetible, drawing all to him, all Beings are ultimately to look towards him, to tend to him as the chief Good unto indigent Beings, to participate of him and enjoy him.* Whence he is ſtiled ὁ πάντων τελῶν τέλος, *the End of all Ends*, τὸ τῶν ἐφετῶν ὅλων κέντρον, *the Centre of all deſirables.* . But if in this Senſe only they are ſaid, to be for him, they are not made to ſerve him, but only to ſerve themſelves of him. And if they only ſerve themſelves of him, they do but ſerve their own Ends, as the Brute-animals in a Family do, when they look to the Maſter of it as to their chief Benefactor, to ſupply them with Victuals. All Beings indeed (according to the Platoniſts) are produc'd for the ſake of the communicative Goodneſs of this firſt King: But if they are ſo produc'd, and yet are no way ſervient to him, this is not enough to Conſtitute him the final Cauſe of all. Our Author therefore ſubjoineth other Reaſons, why all things are ſaid to be for the firſt King. (t) *All things were produc'd for him, becauſe all things are ſervient to his Rule, and he is celebrated and prais'd by all things animate and inanimate. All things were alſo made, that his Majeſty might be manifeſted. All muſt come and bow to him, all whether they will or not, do acknowledge him.* But theſe Reaſons are no good account, why all things are ſaid to be for the Platonic firſt King. For in the main they are taken from the Chriſtian Writers, and are only applicable to the Chriſtians God (the Deity of true Religion) and are not agreeable to the Platoniſts ſupreme Deity, who is incapable of a Religion and Godſervice. Nor is it enough, to ſay of the true God, *that all things are ſervient to his Rule, that he is celebrated and praiſed by all, that they are made for the manifeſtation of his Majeſty, and all muſt acknowledge him, whether they will or not:* But a good Reaſon ought to be aſſign'd, why all are made to be Servient to his Rule, to celebrate his Praiſe, for the manifeſtation of his Majeſty and to pay him honourary Acknowledgments. This Reaſon is not aſſignable but from the Science of Sanctity; from whence we learn, *that he is the End or final Cauſe, as Religion and Godlineſs requireth, and becauſe Holineſs and Godlineſs and requireth it. His being the End or final Cauſe is Holineſs and Godlineſs, and the ſame thing with his being God as to Holineſs and Godlineſs. Our making him the End or final Cauſe* (living to pleaſe him and to honour him) *is our Holineſs and Godlineſs. He will be the End or final Cauſe, of all, not for any need or want, but becauſe it is Holineſs and Godlineſs, the Volition of his being ſo is the Volition of what is Holineſs and Godlineſs, and is Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will. And as Chriſt's being the final Cauſe is eaſily intelligible, if we conſider him as the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial* (for in this comprehenſion all things are manifeſtly for him and to him, *Col.* 1. 16.) *So God's being the End or final Cauſe is eaſily intelligible, if we conſider him as the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial. Des Cartes* ſaith, *that Men talk of God's Ends, as if they look'd upon God as a proud Man, who deſign'd his Works only to be prais'd for them.* That no occaſion may be given for ſuch Criminations, the Diſcourſes of Divines touching the final Cauſe ought to have (what they need) a due Explication. (u) *The choiceſt and laſt End which God propoſeth to himſelf in the Work of our Salvation, is the manifeſtation of his Perfection, that is, his Glory; which conſiſteth in the unfolding and diſplaying his eſſential Properties by Acts proper to them. And here they all meet and are concentred, his Juſtice, Wiſdom, Power, Mercy; his Juſtice ſatisfied, his Wiſdom manifeſted, his Power raiſeth us from the Dead, and his Mercy ſaveth us; and in all God is glorified.* (w) *He made them* (the Creatures,) *he preſerveth them, he forgiveth them, he deſtroyeth them, he puniſheth them, he rewardeth them, every other way he ordereth them, and diſpoſeth of them according to the good pleaſure of his Will, for his own Name's ſake, and for his own Glory's ſake. That ſo his Wiſdom and Power, and Truth and Juſtice and Mercy, and all thoſe other his divine Excellencies, which we are to believe and admire (but may not ſeek to comprehend,) might be acknowledg'd, reverenc'd and magnify'd. Thoſe two great Acts of his moſt ſecret and unſearchable Counſel, then the one whereof there is not any one Act more gracious, the Deſtination of thoſe that perſevere in Faith and Godlineſs to eternal Happineſs; nor any one Act more full of terrour and aſtoniſhment then the other, the deſignation of*

(q) Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l. 2. c. 4.

(r) *Ipſe finis mentis, Mens finis hominum & angelorum, Homo finis mundi corporei: Tenduntque omnia in Patrem (jure Patrem) &* τὸ πρῶτον *ipſum primum, ipſum caput, ſi quidem etiam mentis. Atque* ἕνεκα *propter ſive cauſa non Dei, ſed rerum neceſſitatem reſpicit.* Eugubin. ſupr.

(s) *Procl. Plat Theol.* p. 102, 104, 105. *Dionyſ. de divin. nom.* c. 4.

(t) *Illius cauſa omnia extiterunt, quia Sceptris ejus ſerviunt univerſa, & ab omnibus animatis exanimiſque rebus prædicatur, collaudatur. Factáque ſunt omnia, ut fieret Majeſtas ejus manifeſta. Venire ac flecti ad illum cuncta neceſſe eſt; omnes velint, nolint, eum confitentur.* Eugubin. ſupr.

(u) *Mr. Farindon Ser.* 1. *on* 1 *Cor.* 6. 20.

(w) *Bp. Sanderſon Ser. on Rom.* 15. 6.

ſuch as live and die in ſin and infidelity without Repentance, to eternal Deſtruction: The Scriptures in the laſt Reſolution refer them wholly to his Glory as the laſt End. Diſcourſes of this Nature touching God's Glory ought to be underſtood with this additional Explication, *as Religion and Godlineſs requireth and which is Holineſs and Godlineſs*, that ſo they may not ſeem to impute to the Deity any thing of human Vanity. His zealous regard for his Glory is manifeſtly nothing elſe, but what Holineſs and Godlineſs requireth (as againſt Idolatry; *my Glory will I not give to another, neither my Praiſe to graven Images*, Iſa. 42. 8.) and his Glory as coming from himſelf and from us (from himſelf by way of Manifeſtation, and from us by way of Aſcription) is juſtly reckon'd the ultimate End of things, as being ulteriour to our Salvation; for his Goodneſs to us is with Intention and Deſign, that we ſhould be good, and we are ſaved, *that we might be to the Praiſe of his Glory*, as Religion and Godlineſs requireth, *Eph.* 1. 6, 12, 14. In this Senſe and for this Reaſon all things are for the pleaſing and fulfilling his Will as their ultimate End, becauſe they are intirely for ſuch End and Good, ſuch Work and Uſe, as Holineſs and Godlineſs, his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will requireth. His being *the End or final Cauſe* is the buſineſs of Holineſs and Godlineſs, which requireth, that all things ſhould be for the ſerving, pleaſing and glorifying God.

XV. Another Conſectary we may infer from the Premiſes. For ſeeing all things were made for the Exiſtence of Good, and the Creation intirely iſſu'd from God's holy Imperial Goodneſs of Will, it is impoſſible, that Myriads of Rationals ſhould be originally created out of the higheſt Malevolence, the moſt ſpightful and malicious Deſign imaginable, in purſuance of an abſolute irreſpective Decree, which hath irreſiſtibly deſtin'd them to Damnation. The Philoſophers had better Sentiments. (*x*) Τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὸ εὖ εἶναι παράγει, *God produceth all things for their well being.* But if Men will be bad, God (for whoſe Uſe and Service they are made) will put them to a good uſe, whether they will or not. (*y*) Ἐκεῖνος μὲν πάντως σοι καλῶς χρήσεται ὁ τὰ ὅλα διοικῶν. *The Governour of the Univerſe will not fail, to uſe thee to good purpoſe.*

(x) *Hierocl.*

(y) *M. Ant.* l. c. S. 44.

BOOK IV.

An Idea of the Holy Spirit, and of the Holy Scriptures.

CHAP. I.

I. The Introduction, and of the difficulty of contemplating the Holy Spirit. Sect. 1 *Of the various ſignifications of the word Spirit.* 1. *The ſubtil and active Subſtances are called Spirits.* 2. *The operative unbodily Virtues are called Spirits.* 3. *What is vital Energy is called Spirit.* 4. *The operative unbodily kind of* (perſonal) *Beings are called Spirits.* 5. *Inſpirations are called Spirits.* 6. *Temper and Frame of Mind is called Spirit.* 7. *Spirit is of a peculiar Notion in the Science of Sanctity. Sect.* 2. *Of the various ſignifications of the Spirit of God and the definitive Notion of the Holy Spirit.* 1. *Of the ſignification of it in the Moſaic Coſmopœia.* 2. *Of the Spirit of God as of various ſorts and kinds.* 3. *In what Senſe the Holy Ghoſt may be called the* Shecinah. 4. *Of the larger and ſtricter Acceptation of it amongſt the Jews.* 5. *The Holy Spirit properly belongeth to Sanctity Imperial. Sect.* 3. *Of the various ſignifications of the Holy Spirit in the New Teſtament and chiefly of the Perſonal Acceptation.* 1. *The Holy Spirit in the New Teſtament ſignifieth in three Acceptations.* 2. *The Perſonality of the Holy Spirit not notic'd in the Old Teſtament.* 3. *External Miracles aſcribed to the Holy Spirit in the New Teſtament.* 4. *Objections againſt the Perſonality of the Holy Spirit from the New Teſtament.* 5, 6, 7. *The Perſonality of the Holy Spirit prov'd from the New Teſtament. Sect.* 4. *Of the Holy Spirit as it is vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us.* 1. *The Spirit is ſuch in the plenary Senſe.* 2. *The Spirit is oppoſed to the Letter.* 3. *The Spirit is the Efficient of the Chriſtians Regeneration.* 4. *The Spirit is conſtitutive of the Regenerate Eſtate.* 5. *The Spirit as Holy appeareth to be vital Sanctity.* 6. *The Holy Spirit as it is animative appeareth to be vital Sanctity.* 7. *The Virtues, Duties and Comforts of Regenerate Chriſtians ſhew, that the Holy Spirit is vital Sanctity.* 8. *The ſuper-eminent Good which the Holy Spirit is, ſheweth it to be vital Sanctity.*

I. THE Pagan Syſtem of the Univerſe hath been conſider'd *Politically*, as having a Political Imperial Head preſiding over it; and alſo *Phyſiologically*, as being animated by a mundane Soul. Agreeably whereto the Antipagan Syſtem (the holy Catholick Church) muſt be conſider'd *Politically* as being the Kingdom of God, which the Imperial Eſtate of God preſideth over; and alſo *Phyſiologically* (*z*) as being (ſaith a Divine of our own) *a Body Politique that hath the eternal Spirit of God for the Soul of it.* Of this Divine animative Spirit we are now to repreſent an Idea cleared of the mighty difficulties that incumber it. For that there is great difficulty and obſcurity in the Theory

(z) *Dr. Arrowſmith* Θεανθρωπο *p.* 143.

Theory of the Holy Ghoſt appeareth from the many Debates, that were about it in the elder times of the Church; for thoſe Debates plainly ſhew, that they knew not what to think of it. (*a*) *Some ſaying, that the Holy Ghoſt is a meer Energy, others that he is a Creature, and others that he is God: And ſome would not affirm, that he is any of theſe, revering the Scriptures, which* (as they ſay) *do not clearly ſhew, which of theſe he is. And therefore* ἔτε σέβȣσιν, ἔτε ἀτιμάζȣσι, μέσως πως περὶ ἀυτȣ̃ διακείμενοι. *they neither do him Honour nor Diſhonour, but are indifferently diſpoſed towards him. Some acknowledg'd, that a Ternary muſt be underſtood in our Religion, but they ſo far differenc'd the Perſons from one another, as to make one of them infinite in Subſtance and in Power; the other infinite in Power not in Subſtance; and the third circumſcrib'd in both.* (*b*) Some held, that the Holy Ghoſt is neither Lord nor Servant, ἀλλ' ἐλεύθερον, but they would have him called *Free*. (*c*) Some that in acknowledging the Deity of the Son were of the Catholick Faith, yet oppos'd the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt, and would not allow him to be annumerated with the Father and the Son in pronouncing the Trinity, but reproached the Catholicks with the Name of *Tritheites*. And not a few of the Catholicks themſelves, (*d*) who believ'd the Deity of the holy Spirit, yet would not admit of the Name, nor of certain forms of Speech uſed by other Catholicks. They would not have him called by the Name of God (as ſuppoſing that he is never ſo called in Scripture) whence S. *Baſil* for peace ſake and for fear of giving them Offence abſtain'd from calling him ſo openly and expreſly, as *Gr. Naz.* reporteth. Who alſo obſerveth (*e*) *that the Old Teſtament manifeſtly preach'd the Father, but the Son more obſcurely: The New Teſtament hath manifeſted the Son, but* ὑπέδειξε τȣ̃ πνεύματος τὴν θεότητα, *hath ſomewhat obſcurely ſhew'd the Deity of the Spirit.* His Theory being thus ſhaded with obſcurity and difficulty is not to be underſtood or illuſtrated by a ſlight view, a ſuperficial glance, it requireth a ſedulous Inveſtigation, a deep Reach, an holy Sentiment, and that we carefully conſult all the Notices of it, which the holy Scripture affordeth, and orderly repreſent them with all poſſible clearneſs and diſtinctneſs.

(a) Gr. Naz. or. 37. p. 595.

(b) S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c. 20.

(c) Gr. Naz. ſupr. p. 600.

(d) Petav. de Trin. l. 1. c. 14. S. 15, 16, 19. & l. 2. c. 7. S. 2.

(e) Supr. p. 608.

SECTION I.

Of the various ſignifications of the word Spirit.

I. In vulgar ſenſe the ſubtil or tenuious and active Subſtances (although bodily) are called *Spirits*. For ſo we ordinarily read in Phyſicians Writings of *Spiritus Salis Armoniaci*, *C. Cervi*, *Fuliginis* (and ſuch more) and in their Chymical Philoſophy they diſtinguiſh in Bodies *the Terreſtrial parts, the Water, the Sulphur, the fix'd Salt, the volatile Salt and the Spirit.* So in human Bodies there are the Vital and Animal Spirits, and the Air and the Wind are called *Ruach*, Spirit (*f*) ſaith *Maimonides*; and we uſually ſay of Wind and Thunder, that there is a ſwift Spirit in them. *Gen.* 3. 8. *They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden in the cool of the day.* In the Hebrew it is *in the Spirit of the day*, that is, in the Evening, when the cool Wind bloweth. The Eaſt-wind is in the Hebrew called *Spiritus Orientalis*, and the Weſt-wind *Spiritus Occidentalis*, *Exod.* 10. 13, 19. So uſually in Hebrew Spirit ſignifieth the Wind, and Latin Authors ſometimes ſpeak agreeably to the Hebrew. For *Columella* ſaith (*g*) *præſtat eligere ſationi ſilentis vel certè placidi Spiritus diem. For ſowing it is beſt to chuſe a day of a ſilent or at leaſt a placid Spirit.* Uſually alſo Spirit ſignifieth our Breath, which is a Wind or Vapor, *Job* 34. 14. *If he gather unto himſelf his Spirit and his Breath.* Πνεῦμα, and *Spiritus* primarily and properly ſignifie the Breath (as their Etymology ſheweth,) and as Πνεῦμα, (*Spirit*,) is the ſame with ψυχὴ, (*Soul*,) ſo ψυχὴ, in like manner as πνεῦμα, properly ſignifieth the Breath. (*h*) For *Pſyche* is properly that Spirit which is reciprocated by the Lungs (the vital Breath is the vital Soul) that is ſo called from Refrigeration, as *Anima* is from an ancient Greek word ἀνέμη, and *Animus* from ἄνεμος, *Wind* or Breath. And as *Pſyche* is derived from Refrigeration, and is the vital Air or Breath: So θυμὸς, which is the ſame with *Pſyche*, is in the *Æolick* Dialect φυμὸς, whence the Latin *Fumus* is deriv'd, hence θυμιᾶν, and θυμίαμα, *to Vaporate and Vapor.* Θυμὸς, therefore became a Name for the vital Soul of Man, becauſe it properly and primarily denoteth *our Life which is a Vapor.* So *Homer*'s Greek Phraſe (*i*) θυμὸν ἀποπνεύων, is anſwerable to the Latin Phraſes, *efflare animam*, *efflare extremum halitum*, and to this Greek Phraſe in Scripture ἀφιέναι τὸ πνεῦμα, *to give up the Ghoſt or Spirit.* Agreeably whereto the Philoſophic Emperor ſaith, that Man conſiſteth of three parts, (*k*) *the fleſhy part, the Spirit and the Hegemonic* (or leading) *part.* Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ ποιόν τι ἐστίν; ἄνεμος. *And the Spirit what is it? Wind or Air* (that of Reſpiration, which refrigerateth our innate heat) *which is every Hour expired and taken in again.* (*l*) *The Soul* (ſaith *Varro*) *is the Air received in at the Mouth, cooled in the Lungs, warmed in the Heart, diffus'd into the Body.* Such was the Senſe of the *Stoicks* touching the Life and Soul of Man; they ſuppos'd the Soul to be Air, or (as *Galen* ſaith of them) *a contemperation of aerial and igneous Subſtance*, or as moſt Authors ſay, they ſuppos'd it to be Fire, yet ſo as to be Aerial (Air being the Vehicle of the Fire;) and becauſe they ſuppos'd Air to be the Soul, thence it is, that in *Cicero Anima* ſignifieth the Air. For he ſaith (*m*) *inter ignem & terram aquam Deus animamque poſuit. Between Fire and Earth God hath placed Water and Soul*, that is, the Air. The Stoicks Soul therefore is Corporeal, and they prove it ſuch by an Argument that ſeemeth very ſtrange, ψυχὴν πνεῦμα εἶναι, διὸ ϗ σῶμα εἶναι, *the Soul is a Spirit*, (Air, Wind or Breath) *therefore it is a Body.* But they ſuppoſe it ſuch a Body, which in vulgar Senſe is a Spirit, σῶμα ἀεριότερον ϗ λεπτομερέστερον, *one of the tenuious and active Subſtances*, which are commonly called Spirits. It is Eſſential to a Spirit, to be without courſeneſs, craſsneſs, bulkineſs, not to be palpable * or tangible, to be interiour and remote from the groſs ſenſibles and viſibles. The Apoſtle therefore contradiſtinguiſheth *Spirits* to *Fleſh and Blood.* Eph. 6. 12. *We wreſtle not againſt Fleſh and Blood, but againſt ſpiritual Wickedneſs*, or wicked Spirits as it is in the *Syriac*, and our Saviour ſaith, *Luc.* 24. 39. *A Spirit hath not Fleſh and Bones, as ye ſee me have.*

Multis modis atque in diverſis ſignificationibus Scripturæ divinæ ſpiritum nominant. S. Aug. de Anim. & ejus Orig. l. 4. c. 22.

(f) Mor. Nev. Par. 1. c. 40.

(g) L'Emper. Not. in Jacchiad. in Dan. p. 116.

(h) Salmaſ. in Epict. p. 124, 125.

(i) Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 185.

(k) Τὰ σαρκία, ϗ πνευμάτιον ϗ τὸ ἡγεμονικόν. L. 2. S. 2.

(l) *Anima eſt Aer conceptus ore, defervefactus in pulmone, tepefactus in corde, diffuſus in corpus.* Lipſ. Phyſ. l. 3. diſſ. 9. Gat. ſupr. p. 51, 140, 186, 227, 323.

(m) De Univerſit.

* *The Hebrew Philoſophers call every true Eſſence Corpus palpabile.* Kimchi ὁ Δοιπορία. p. 42.

II. The operative unbodily Virtues therefore (whether they be ſtrictly and philoſophically unbodily, or only unbodily in a vulgar Senſe) are called *Spirits*. Such are the *Seminales Virtutes* (Seminales Rationes) the formative or plaſtic Principles of things, which Naturaliſts have in great admiration (for the Plaſtic is called by one, (*n*) *Vis enthea, principium divinum, vegetativæ animæ numen:* Another ſaith, (*o*) nothing more wonderful can be thought of,) who alſo have intituled the Plaſtic, (*p*) *Spiritus Architectonicus*, and diſcourſe of *Spiritus aurificus, ſpiritus & ſuccus lapideſcens*; for the δύναμις δραστικὴ, *Operative Virtue* is look'd upon as a Spirit. Of kin to theſe Plaſtic Virtues is the Stoicks Deity, which they define (*q*) πνεῦμα πυροειδὲς ϗ τεχνοειδὲς, *A Spirit igneous and artificial*, πνεῦμα νοερὸν ϗ πυρῶδες, *A Spirit intelligent and igneous*. Their dull Philoſophy went no further than (Philoſophically) Corporeal Subſtance; but the Pythagoreans and Platoniſts acknowledge Subſtance ſtrictly and properly Incorporeal, and in their Senſe the Poet calleth the Soul of the World (the Stoicks Deity) *A Spirit*. (*r*) So the *Egyptians* defined God, τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τὸ διῆκον πνεῦμα, *A Spirit that pervadeth the whole World*. A Spirit in the Senſe of the *Egyptians*, *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* is that Species of Subſtance, which in their Philoſophy and Metaphyſicks is the oppoſite to Body or Matter; ſo that there are two kinds of Subſtances in the Univerſe, *The Corporeal* and the *Incorporeal*, which may be thus contradiſtinguiſh'd and defin'd. The one is *the Quantitative and not the Vital*, *The other is the Vital and not the Quantitative kind of Subſtance*. So S. *Auſtin* from the Platoniſts calleth the Incorporeal Subſtance(*Vital*)*Life*. (*s*) *Quicquid eſt vel corpus eſt, vel vita; whatever exiſteth, is either Body or Life*. So *Alcinous* (*t*) explaineth the Senſe of *Plato*: He calleth the Soul αὐτοκίνητον, *ſelf moving*, ὅτι σύμφυτον ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν, *becauſe Life is innate to it*. The Vital Subſtance is oppoſite to the Quantitative Subſtance, and therefore doth not conſiſt of a *juxta-poſition* of parts with *ſelf-impenetrability* or ſelf-excluſiveneſs, diviſibility or diſcerpibility and ſelf-alterity (whereas every material Subſtance is another thing to it ſelf being a congeries of material Subſtance;) for theſe are the eſſential differencing Properties of the Quantitative Subſtance. But (poſitively) it is *the Vital* Subſtance, and therefore is φύσις δραστήριος, *the Energetic Nature*, ſelf-active or ſelf-moving, ſelf-penetrable with ſelf-unity and indiſcerpibility, the Subſtance to which Life, Perception and Cogitation are peculiar. Thus by confronting two oppoſite kinds of Subſtance *Incorporeal Subſtance* (philoſophically ſuch) appeareth to be of a very intelligible Idea, and nothing can perplex it but the Impoſtures of Imagination.

III. What is Vital Energy is called *Spirit*, as being (becauſe Vital) *operative unbodily kind of Virtue*; for even the Vivacity and Vigour of Bodily Life as well as Mental Vivacity and Vigour (Quickneſs of Parts, Fortitude, Animoſity) is the operative unbodily kind of Virtue, and therefore is Spirit. Of the former a great Naturaliſt ſpeaketh, when he ſaith, (*u*) *Gallus noſter ſemine ſpirituque plenus*, (*w*) *viribus, ſpiritu & generativâ potentiâ*. Of Vigour of Mind a late Divine ſpeaketh, when commending two of his Acquaintance he giveth this Character of the latter of them, (*x*) ***What he wanteth of the other in Time and Years, he maketh up in Courage and Spirit.*** Spirit the oppoſite to dead ſenſeleſs Matter or Body is Life, and Life is Spirit. (Life is uſually ſaid to be *actus animæ*,) whence one ſaith of God, (*y*) *He is called Spirit, not as Wind, but as being an incorporeal and vivific Subſtance*. (*z*) Ζωτικώτατον τὸ πνεῦμα, *that which we uſually call Spirit, hath much of Life in it*. To which uſual Notions of Life and Spirit our Saviour's words are agreeable, *Joh. 6. 63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing: The words that I ſpeak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* As in Nature, ſo in Chriſtianity it is *the Spirit that giveth Life*, 2 Cor. 3. 6. Accordingly our Saviour ſaith, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth*, which is to ſignifie, that his Diſcourſe was not meant of the literal eating his Corporeal Fleſh and Blood (that is of no avail,) but his words were meant of the eating and drinking which is *Spiritual-vital* (a Spiritual-vital Buſineſs both in reſpect of the Duty-part and the Benefit-part) in ſenſe and meaning they *are Spirit and they are Life*, and therefore Spiritual-vital. Himſelf is denominated *a Spirit*, becauſe he is that which is *Spiritual-vital* and that which is Vital Energy, 1 *Cor.* 15. 45. *The firſt* Adam *was made a living Soul* (as an Animal is) *the laſt* Adam *was made a quickning Spirit*. In his Heavenly and Divine Condition (becauſe of his Spiritual, Heavenly and Divine Body) He is externally that which is Spiritual-vital and that which is Vital Energy. This he is in himſelf, and he is alſo vivificative unto us, for being the Lord of Immortality he raiſeth his People to Life Immortal. And becauſe he raiſeth them to Immortality by communicating a Divine Spirit to them, whereby their Bodies are quickened (*Rom.* 8. 11.) therefore he is a Spirit both *conſtitutively* and *communicatively*; which duplicity of Senſe is involv'd in another deſcription, which the Apoſtle maketh of our Saviour, 2 *Cor.* 3. 16, 17. ***When it ſhall turn to the Lord, the Vail ſhall be done away; now the Lord*** τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν, ***is the Spirit.*** The Lord is the Majeſtatick Glory, (ſee *v.* 18.) and therefore is conſtitutively *the Spirit*; and (*a*) *ex converſione ad Spiritum qui Dominus eſt, Spiritus Domini emanat in converſos, quo fiant ſpirituales: By their converſion to the Spirit which is the Lord, the Spirit of the Lord floweth forth upon the converted, whereby they are made Spiritual.* The Chriſtian Majeſtatick Glory in this reſpect reſembleth the Judaical. The Jews *Ruach Hakkodeſh* (Holy Spirit) was the Spirit of the Majeſtatick Glory, and their Majeſtatick Glory was communicatively the Holy Spirit: So the Chriſtian Majeſtatick Glory is communicatively and originally *Ruach Hakkodeſh* (the Holy Spirit) whereby we are ſpiritualiz'd and ſav'd from Carnality of Religion.

IV. The unbodily kind of (Perſonal) Beings both good and bad, as alſo the Souls of Men and the ſeparated Souls both of good and bad are called *Spirits*. The Sadducees are ſaid by *Gr. Naz.* and *Epiphanius*, to have deny'd the Exiſtence of the Holy Spirit, and this they prove from a Text which ſaith nothing of it, *Act.* 23. 8. *The Sadducees ſay, that there is no Reſurrection, neither Angel nor Spirit.* The Reſurrection, Angel and Spirit which the Sadducees did not acknowledge,

---

(n) Dr. Harvey.

(o) Sennert.

(p) Sennert. T. 1. p. 208, 95.

(q) Lipſ. phyſ. l. 1. diſſ. 6, 7.

(r) —Cœlum & Terram camposque liquentes
Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque aſtra
Spiritus intus alit, totamque infuſa per artus
Mens agitat molem.

(s) De C. D. l. 8. c. 6.

(t) De Doctr. Plat. c. 25.

(u) Harvey de Gen. p. 87.

(w) Ibid p. 96.

(x) Dr. Martin Lett.

(y) Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς καλεῖται, οὐχ ὡς ἄνεμος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀσώματος ϗ ζωοποιὸς οὐσία. Anon. ap. Maldonat. in Joh. 4. 24.

(z) Philo ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 11. c. 23.

(a) Caietan. in loc.

knowledge, are the two Particulars of their Infidelity; for S. *Luke* addeth, that *the Phariſees confeſs both.* This therefore is that which the Sadducees (who probably never heard of the Perſonality of the Holy Spirit) are ſaid, to have disbeliev'd, the Exiſtence of the Souls of Men and of Angels, which were commonly believ'd to exiſt, and to be created Spirits. The Holy Angels (thoſe Celeſtial and Incorporeal Virtues, as the Fathers call them) are Spirits both in reſpect of their Exteriour and Interiour Subſtance; for in reſpect of their Exteriour Subſtance they are of Tenuity and Subtilty indiſcernible by us, of mighty force and velocity and of an igneous nature, whence the Pſalmiſt and the Apoſtle ſay of them; *Who maketh his Angels Spirits and his Miniſters a flame of Fire.* So the Demons or Genii amongſt the Pagans were counted Spirits, and they look'd upon Man as conſiſting of Body and Spirit: (*b*) *Vita corpore & ſpiritu continetur, our Life is compris'd in Body and Spirit. Eodem tempore ſuſcipimur in lucem, & hoc cæleſti ſpiritu augemur: At the ſame time that we are receiv'd into the Light, we are augmented by this Heavenly Spirit.* So the Scriptures conſider Man as compounded of Body and Spirit, *Matth.* 26. 41. *Luk.* 23. 46. *Act.* 7. 59. 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. *Jam.* 2. 26. The Souls of the Dead are an unbodily kind of Beings, and therefore are called *Spirits*, which is the uſual Name for Ghoſts or Apparitions, *Matth.* 14. 26. *Mar.* 6. 49. *Luk.* 24. 39. for Evil Angels as well as the Holy Angels, *Matth.* 12. 43, 45. 1 *King.* 22. 21. *Heb.* 1. 14. *Apoc.* 1. 4. and for the *Spirits in Priſon* as well as the Souls of the Juſt, 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. *Heb.* 12. 23. The reaſon of this their Appellation (which is becauſe they are unbodily kind of Beings) inferreth, that the intelligent Mind of Man is in a Senſe of Eminence *his Spirit.* (*c*) *Non eſt idem Mens & Anima.* (*d*) *Anima eſt quâ vivimus, Animus quo ſapimus; ſuperior ſcil. pars animæ: The Mind and Soul are diſtinct. The Soul is that whereby we live, the Mind is that whereby we are intelligent, namely, the upper part of the Soul.* So the Apoſtle ſuppoſeth, τὸ ὁλόκληρον ἡμῶν, *our whole Man*, to conſiſt of *Body, Soul and Spirit*; which is ὁ νοῦς, τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν, the ſuperiour part of the Soul, that is diſtinguiſh'd from the Soul, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 23. And this the Apoſtle (principally at leaſt) muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean, when he ſaith, *What Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of Man which is in him?* 1 Cor. 2. 11. So *Col.* 2. 5. *Though I be abſent in Body, yet I am with you in Spirit*, that is, *in cognitive Mind*, as the following words interpret the Apoſtle's Senſe, *joying and beholding your Order*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. *When ye are gathered together and my Spirit*, that is, my cognitive Mind (who am of Apoſtolical Authority) approving and injoyning what you do. (*e*) The intelligent Mind is eminently *Spirit* and our *Spirit*, becauſe the animative Soul (which yet is in a lower degree Spirit and our Spirit) is animative of the Body and complicated therewith, which ſpeaketh the intelligent Mind more eminently *our Souls operative unbodily Virtue*; which reaſon of its being called our Spirit demonſtrateth, that this is a genuine definitive Notion of *Spirits* (according to the Scriptures) *they are the operative unbodily Virtues.*

Pſal. 104. 4.
Heb. 1. 7.
(b) Cic. or. pro Mar. & de Haruſp. reſp.
(c) Lactan l. 7. c. 12.
(d) Holiday on Juvenal. p. 275.
(e) Grot. Not. in Matth. 26. 41.

V. Inſpirations both in the real and perſonal acceptation (as they ſignifie the perſons inſpir'd) are called Spirits, 1 *Joh.* 4. 1, 2, 3. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they be of God; becauſe many falſe Prophets are gone out into the World. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God. Every Spirit that confeſſeth, that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is of God. And every Spirt that confeſſeth not, that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is not of God.* Becauſe in the Apoſtle's Days there were many falſly inſpir'd Teachers, the Chriſtians are exhorted to try the Inſpirations, and they may be try'd by this mark of Diſcrimination; as in the Old Teſtament-times thoſe pretending Prophets that withdrew Men from the true God, were thereby known to be falſe Prophets; ſo in the New Teſtament-times the falſly inſpir'd Teachers are known to be ſuch, if they withdraw Men from the true Meſſiah, 1 *Cor.* 12. 3. *I give you to underſtand, that no Man ſpeaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jeſus accurſed; and that no Man* (that hath an Inſpiration) *can ſay, that Jeſus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghoſt.* In the Apoſtolical times ſome had an extraordinary faculty of diſcriminating falſly inſpir'd Teachers from the truly inſpir'd; and this faculty the Apoſtle calleth *diſcerning of Spirits*, 1 Cor. 12. 10. where *Spirits* ſignifie Inſpirations both in the real and perſonal acceptation. So the Spirits which S. *John* exhorteth the Chriſtians to try and reject, are deſcrib'd as Teachers that are of the World, 1 *Joh.* 4. 5, 6. *They are of the World, therefore ſpeak they of the World, and the World heareth them. We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us; hereby know we the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error.* The Spirit of Error is the ſame with thoſe Deceivers and Impoſtors that are entred into the World, 2 *Joh.* 7. and ſignifieth in the perſonal as well as the real Acceptation. But the πνεύματα πλάνα, *ſeducing Spirits*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. are moſt probably the Evil Angels the grand ſeducers of Mankind; for the Apoſtle conjoyneth *ſeducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils.* Of which ſort were the Magical Inſtitutes of the Pythagoric Pagans and the paganizing Gnoſticks that ſymboliz'd with them, the Pagan Demonolatry and (the Tranſcript thereof) the Church-Demonolatry; all which were introduc'd by Diabolical Illuſions and Afflations, that carry'd a ſhew of Divine Revelations and Inſpirations, which the Holy Writers call *the Spirit.* For the Prohibition of *quenching the Spirit* concerneth immediate Inſpirations (although not them alone) 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 19. So when the Apoſtle ſaith, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 1. *That ye be not ſoon ſhaken in Mind, or be troubled, neither by Spirit, nor by Word*; Spirit ſignifieth pretended or miſunderſtood Inſpirations, 1 *Cor.* 14. 12. *Ye are zealous of Spirits, that is*, of Inſpirations and thoſe Gifts that are Inſpirations, 1 *Cor.* 14. 32. *The Spirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets.* The Apoſtle ſpeaketh of Inſpirations which he calleth the Spirits of the Prophets: but when he ſaith, theſe are *ſubject to the Prophets*, his meaning is not (as I ſuppoſe,) that the Inſpirations of the Prophets were ſubject to the Judgment of other Prophets, but that thoſe Inſpirations were not *Pythonic*, ungovernly rapturous and ecſtatical, but ſo far they were ſubject to the inſpir'd Prophets themſelves, that they might avoid tumultuouſneſs and confuſion in their Aſſemblies, and orderly propheſy one after another. *For ye may all propheſy one by one: For God is not the Author of Confuſion*, v. 31, 33. In ſome places of S. *Paul's* Epiſtles (variouſly interpreted by Expoſitors) the word *Spirit* ſeemeth ſomewhat hard to be underſtood; but it certainly ſignifieth the Inſpiration of Languages, 1 *Cor.* 14. 14, 15, 16. *If I pray in an* *unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my Underſtanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the Spirit and I will pray with the Underſtanding alſo* (intelligibly:) *I will ſing with the Spirit, and I will ſing with the Underſtanding alſo. Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, ſay* Amen? *v.* 2. *He that ſpeaketh in an unknown Tongue, ſpeaketh not unto Men, but unto God: for no Man underſtandeth him; howbeit in the Spirit* (the Spirit of Languages) *he ſpeaketh Myſteries.* As when our Saviour ſaith touching the Meſſiah, *How doth David in Spirit call him Lord?* he meaneth the Spirit or Inſpiration of Prophecy: So when the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *praying and ſinging with the Spirit and ſpeaking in the Spirit*, he meaneth, the Spirit or Inſpiration of Languages and other ſupernatural Gifts. *Peter* knew *Moſes* and *Elias* that appear'd in the Mount by Inſpiration, and therefore *Tertullian* ſaith, (*f*) *How ſhould he have known* Moſes *and* Elias *but in Spirit?* So in the Old Teſtament *the Spirit of Wiſdom* ſignifieth that Inſpiration, *Exod.* 28. 3. *Deut.* 34. 9. and *the Spirit of Life* that was in the Wheels, *Ezek.* 1. 20. and that which ſet the Prophet upon his Feet, *Ezek.* 2. 30. may be interpreted, to ſignifie either that Inſpiration or that unbodily operative Virtue.

VI. Temper, Genius and Frame of Mind is uſually called *Spirit* (this being the Mind or Spirit as to the Frame and Temper of it;) for in this Notion the Scripture ſpeaketh of the *Spirit of Meekneſs*, *the Spirit of Jealouſie* (that *animi affectus*) and of *mixing a perverſe Spirit in the midſt of* Egypt: So we uſually ſpeak of the *Goſpel-Spirit, the Judaical Legal Spirit, the Old Teſtament Spirit.* (*g*) Famine and Peſtilence (a ſort of operative unbodily Virtues) are called *Spirits* by the Son of *Sirach* (as *Grotius* ſuppoſeth,) *Wiſdom*, an operative unbodily Virtue is called *a loving Spirit* by the Book of Wiſdom; a Lawyer ſaith, that a Statue is contain'd under *one Spirit*, meaning thereby either one ſubſtantial form, or one *frame* and *habit*, as the frame and habit of the Mind is uſually called *Spirit*. So the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *the Spirit of Slumber*, and our Saviour thus rebuk'd his two Diſciples, that would have called down Fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans, *Luk.* 9. 55. *Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of.* Ye miſtake your Zeal (ſaith our Saviour,) as if it was a Divine Motion, which is a ſinful humane Paſſion: Ye are ignorant Zealots and know not what a deadly criminal Spirit ye are of (a Judaical Legal Spirit,) repugnant to the Evangelical Gracious Spirit, which ye ought to be of. The burning Zeal of *Elias* (which theſe fiery Zealots pretended to imitate) is no Pattern for Goſpel-times, yet his ardor of Zeal is in part agreeable and imitable in all times; whence *John the Baptiſt* is ſaid to go before the Meſſias *in the Spirit and Power of* Elias, *Luc.* 1. 17. The words denote a mighty Power of the Spirit, and alſo a Similitude between *John the Baptiſt* and *Elias* in Zeal, and Courage, and temper of Mind, which is an *Elias-like* Spirit. So *the Spirit of Bondage* is the ſervile diſpoſition in Religion (the diſpoſition of the vile Serviliſts or ſervile kind of Religioniſts) and the *Spirit of Adoption* is the Child of God-kind of diſpoſition, the diſpoſition of (the Filialiſts) the unſervile or filial kind of Religioniſts, *Rom.* 8. 15. *God hath not given us the Spirit of Fear; but of Power, and of Love, and of a ſound Mind.* The Spirit of Fear in this place (as the Context ſheweth) denoteth the diſpoſition of Timidity and Cowardice; to which the Apoſtle oppoſeth the Spirit of Power (Fortitude) and of Love (which caſteth out cowardly Fear) and of a ſound Mind, which is oppoſite to a weak and timid Soul. To this uſual Notion of Spirit as it ſignifieth Temper and Diſpoſition, we may reduce another Scripture-notion of it near of kin to this; for ſometimes *Spirit* ſignifieth Interiour Propenſion, *Impetus* and Inclination, *Hoſ.* 4. 12. *The Spirit of Whoredom hath cauſed them to err.* And this (probably) is that which another Prophet calleth, *The unclean Spirit*, Zech. 13. 2. So a Spirit of Contradiction is a diſpoſition to contradict.

VII. Spirit is of a peculiar Notion in the Science of Sanctity (which in its Notion of Spirit tranſcendeth common Philoſophy;) for it denoteth that Spirituality and Spirituality of Religion, which is the oppoſite to Carnality and to Carnality of Religion, which ſignification of it is peculiar to the Science of Sanctity, *Joh.* 4. 24. *Gal.* 3. 3. *Phil.* 3. 3. Theſe various ſignifications of it we will conclude with a brief Illuſtration of that place of the Apoſtle, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Being put to death in the Fleſh, but quickned* τῷ πνεύματι, *in Spirit.* Expoſitors debate, whether by Spirit the Apoſtle meaneth the Soul or the Deity of our Saviour. But there will be no place for theſe Debates, if we conſider, that our Saviour is ſaid, *to have been quickened* (to have had Vivification) *in Spirit* (the Principle of his Vivification) as having within him the Spirit of Holineſs, wherein he had Life, the cauſe of his regained Life. His Fleſh was quickned, and therefore *ſubjectively* he was quickned in Fleſh (for that which was dead was raiſed to life) but not *cauſally*. In Spirit only (the oppoſite to Fleſh) he had Life, was quickened or had Vivification *cauſally*, thence his Fleſh regained Life.

SECTION II.

Of the various Significations of the Spirit of God, and the definitive Notion of the Holy Spirit.

I. THE firſt Scriptural Notice of *a Spirit of God* is in the Moſaic *Coſmopœia*, Gen. 1. 2. *Darkneſs was upon the Face of the Deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters.* The Abyſs or Chaos was in agitation, and this Agitation was from the Spirit of God (as *Moſes* affirmeth:) but this Moſaic Spirit of God whoſe Motion or Agitation was one of the Phænomena of the Chaos (if Motion in Darkneſs may be called a Phænomenon) is of very dubious uncertain Interpretation. (*h*) Expoſitors have various Opinions concerning it.

(1.) Several of the beſt Learned both Jews and Chriſtians think it *a mighty Wind*, (*i*) which is called the Wind or Spirit of God after the Hebrew

(f) *Quomodo Moyſen & Heliam cognoviſſet, niſi in ſpiritu?* C. Marc. l. 4. c. 22.

(g) *Sciunt qui in Hebræis literis verſati ſunt, quàm latè pateat ſpiritûs nomen. Origine ſua ventum ſignificat; ob cujus ſubtilitatem quæ viſum fugit, ad alia transfertur. primùm ad ſubſtantias: nam Deus, Angeli boni malique, deinde ipſe hominis animus eo vocabulo nuncupantur. Deinde ad Accidentia: nam Fames & Peſtis* πνεύματα *vocantur,* Ecclus. 39. 33, 34. *Ita & Paulus Juriſconſultus dixit, ſtatua uno ſpiritu continetur, quod Conon Mathematicus dixerat* ὑπὸ μιᾶς ἕξεως. *Sed maximè uſitatum eſt, ut pro affectibus animi ea vox ponatur: quomodo* πνεῦμα κατανύξεως *dixit poſt Eſaiam Paulus Apoſtolus. ita uſurpatur* רוח. *ſcriptor libri ſapientiæ* σοφίαν *ait eſſe* φιλάνθρωπον πνεῦμα. *Sic Clemens libro de prophetia* πνεύματα *vocat* τὰς ποιότητας τῆς ψυχῆς. *Grot. Not. in Luc.* 9. 55.

2 Tim. 1. 7.

(h) *Holting. Hexaem.* c. 1. *Qu.* 31. & 40.

(i) *P. Fag. in loc.*

Hebrew cuſtom of ſpeaking, which is, to expreſs things ſuperlative by the Name of God; as the Cedars of God, the Mountains of God, the Lions of God, the Trembling of God: Or the Spirit of God may ſignifie a Wind excited by God (ſaith *Vatablus*) agreeably to that, *Pſal.* 147. 18. *Flavit ſpiritus ejus & fluent aquæ.* Πνεῦμα καλεῖ τὸν ἄνεμον, *He calleth the Wind the Spirit*, (*k*) ſaith *Severianus Gabalitanus.* And this Interpretation will appear hugely probable, if we conſider the ſtate of the Chaos, and that the words of *Moſes* are deſign'd to deſcribe and repreſent it; for the Chaos is called *Tehom*, (*l*) which is *Abyſſus jam commota* (the Abyſs in commotion,) and the word properly ſignifieth *Tumult and turbid Confuſion.* The *Phœnicians* Chaos in *Sanchoniathon* is Ἀὴρ ζοφώδης καὶ πνευματώδης, *Air caliginous and ſtormy.* This ſtate of the Chaos *Moſes* deſigneth to repreſent and deſcribe, when he ſaith, *The Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters*; therefore he meaneth thereby, that a great Wind did blow upon the Face of the Waters. Againſt this Interpretation it is objected, that in the time of the Chaos there was no Air, and therefore then there could be no Wind: But this is a weak Objection; for the thinner parts of the watery Chaos might ſupply the place of Air, ſo far as was requiſite, to make a vehement Wind, that agitated the Chaos. Water and Air are of ſo near a kin, that *Cicero* ſaith, (*m*) *Air is Vapour from the Waters.* The Spirit of God therefore in the Moſaic Text and *Coſmopœia* may reaſonably be interpreted agreeably to the uſual Language of the Old Teſtament, wherein *his Spirit* ſignifieth Wind, *Exod.* 15. 10. *Thou didſt blow* Spiritu tuo. *Iſa.* 40. 7. *The Graſs withereth, the Flower fadeth, becauſe the Spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it.* So *Pſal.* 147. 18. (*n*) In *Sanchoniathon*'s Coſmogony the Wind is called κολπία, which is well interpreted קל־פי־יה *vox oris Dei.*

(2.) Some think, that this Moſaic *Spirit of God* is a Mundane Soul or Plaſtic Nature, which is S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Senſe, who thus expoundeth the Senſe of *Moſes*, ἐνέργειά τις ζωτικὴ προσῆν τοῖς ὕδασι, *the Waters had a vivific Energy, they did not ſtagnate, but were in motion, having* ζωτικήν τινα δύναμιν, *a certain vital or vivific Power.* The *Egyptians* alſo (as *Simplicius* ſaith) called the firſt Life ſymbolically ὕδωρ, *Water*, (*o*) whence ſome think, that what *Moſes* calleth Spirit they called Ζωήν, *Life*; for they ſuppoſe, that there is an affinity between the *Egyptian* Theology and the *Moſaic* Coſmopæia, becauſe *Simplicius* calleth this *Moſaic* Hiſtory an *Egyptian* Fable. Doubtleſs it is of affinity with the Pagan Coſmogoniſts Fables touching *Night*, *Chaos*, Ὠὸν ὀρφικόν, *the Orphic Egg*, and may ſeem to be of affinity with their *Love-Deity* (which they make the active Principle in the Coſmogony;) for if the Moſaic word *Merachepheth* be render'd *brooded upon the Waters* (as an Hen doth upon her Eggs) there is the Notion of Love in it. And if by the Pagan Theologers *Love-Deity* we underſtand their Celeſtial *Venus*, (*p*) this is their Mundane Soul, or that univerſal Spirit, which is an ἐνέργεια ζωτική, *vivific Energy* (of which S. *Chryſoſtom* interpreteth the Text,) and which they ſuppos'd, to infuſe Life into all. The Moſaic Spirit of God may moſt reaſonably be thought, to ſignifie this Mundane Soul (or a Plaſtic Nature) if the Pagan Coſmogoniſts *Love-Deity* was originally Moſaical, and that it was originally Moſaical, may as reaſonably be ſuppos'd, as that this other Conceit of the Pagan Theologers was ſuch, *that the Waters are divinely inſpir'd*, for which ſome later Platoniſts (*q*) cite the Text of *Moſes.* There is an appearance therefore that *the Moſaic Spirit of God* ſignifieth a Plaſtick Nature or a Soul of the World, ſuch as ſome Writers of the Church ſeem to ſuppoſe, when they affirm, (*r*) *That a Divine Spirit containing all things is every where diffus'd, that the Earth of it ſelf doth not generate Animals, nothing is generated without the Spirit of God.* (*s*) Foſſils and other things inanimate are ſuppos'd by *Voſſius*, to have a Plaſtic Spirit in them, and of ſuch a created Spirit he interpreteth the *Moſaic Spirit of God.* But although ſuch an Interpretation hath ſome little probabilities, yet on the other hand it muſt be conſider'd, that a Plaſtic Nature and a Mundane Soul is an Opinion of Philoſophy; that it is altogether alien from *Moſes*, to teach matters of Philoſophy; that his Hiſtory is purely popular and in great part craſly vulgar and plebeious: His Hebrew word *Merachepheth* may ſignifie *brooding*, and it may ſignifie nothing more than the motion and agitation of the Waters. The Pagans had broken Traditions of the *Chaos* originally Moſaical, but theſe were mix'd with a great deal of Phantaſtry of their own, one Branch whereof was their *Amor* γενεσιουργός, *generative Love*, which was but a Poetical Phancy, nor did it ſignifie the Celeſtial *Venus* or Mundane Soul of the Philoſophic Pagans. Their Conceit of the Waters *being divinely inſpir'd* was originally Idolatrous-paganical, not likely to be a deſcendent from *Moſes*, although he was in repute with the later Platoniſts, after that *Philo* by his Philoſophic allegorizing the Scriptures had recommended him to them.

(3.) Some think, that this Moſaic Spirit of God, is the Will and Appointment of God, which is ſometimes called his Spirit, *Pſal.* 33. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them*, ſpiritu oris ejus, *by the Breath of his Mouth.* The Heavens were made by his word of Will and Command, which is repreſented as a vocal word; for ſo the Breath of his Mouth ſignifieth. (*t*) So the Pſalmiſt explaineth his Senſe in the Ninth Verſe. *He ſpake and it was done, he commanded and it ſtood faſt.* His word of Will and Command is ſometimes called (not only the Spirit of his Mouth, but) ſimply and without addition his Spirit, *Job* 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me Life.* Of this Spirit ſome expound *Job* 26. 13. *By his Spirit he hath garniſhed the Heavens.* But it is more agreeable to the Context and to the uſual Language of Scripture, to interpret *Spirit* in this Text, to ſignifie his Underſtanding, which is elſewhere called his Spirit, as *Pſal.* 139. 7. *Whither ſhall I go from thy Spirit?* that is, from thy cognitive Mind; for ſo the cognitive Mind of Man is called his Spirit. And as our vital Breath is called

---

(k) S. Chryſoſt. T. 7. p. 591.

(l) Grot. de v. R. C. l. 1. S. 16. in Annot.

(m) Idem Not. in loc.

(n) Grot. de v. R. C. l. 1. S. 16. in Annot.

(o) Gale Not. in Jambl. p. 303.

(p) Plotin. En. 3. l. 5. c. 2.

(q) *Souls were ſuppos'd to reſort* τῷ ὕδατι θεοπνόῳ ὄντι, *to the Water divinely inſpir'd, as* Numenius *ſaith; whence he alſo affirmeth,* τὸν προφήτην εἰρηκέναι, ἐμφέρεσθαι ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος θεοῦ πνεῦμα, *the Prophet to have ſaid, that the Spirit of God moved upon the Waters.* Porphyr. de Antro. p. 256.

(r) *Divinum Spiritum eſſe ubique diffuſum, eoque omnia contineri.* Lactant. l. 7. c. 3. & l. 2. c. 9. *Animalia non terra per ſe gignit, ſed ſpiritus Dei, ſine quo nihil gignitur.* Vid. Grot. Not. in ſap. Solom. c. 1, 7.

(s) *Et ſane valde eo inclinat animus, ut à Moſe per ſpiritum Dei aquis incubantem, non quidem intelligatur tertia ſacroſanctæ Trinitatis perſona, ſed ſpiritus primo die à Trinitate creatus, ac poſtea etiam foſſilibus atque aliis, quæ inanima dicuntur, inditus, ut vehiculum foret facultatis motricis, cumque luce caloris vehiculo cauſa eſſet, per quam ſpecies quidem rerum conſervantur, nova autem individua generantur.* Voſſ. de Idol. l. 6. c. 1.

(t) *Spiritu oris, id eſt verbo, periphraſis qualis,* Eſa. 11. v. 4. & 2 Theſſ. 2. v. 8. *Alii per verbum intelligunt Filium Dei: per ſpiritum verò oris ſpiritum ſanctum. Sed noſtram expoſitionem confirmat tum repetitio ejuſdem ſententiæ aliis verbis prophetis uſitata, tum collatio verſus noni.* Piſcat. in loc.

called our Spirit, ſo it is ſometimes called *the Spirit of God* as being of his cauſation, *Job* 27.3. *All the while my Breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my Noſtrils.* The Spirit of God is that *ſpiraculum vitæ*, which God breathed into the Noſtrils of Man, as *Moſes* relateth. But as this Moſaic Spirit of God is very remote and diſtant from that other, which moved upon the face of the Waters: So is the will and appointment of God, which is the Cauſe of Cauſes, but could not be the immediate mover upon the face of the Waters.

(4.) Some think, that this Moſaic Spirit of God is Chriſt, as he is the abſtract Logos; for conſider'd as ſuch he is called by the ancient Writers of the Church *a Spirit*, *the Holy Spirit*, *the Spirit of God*, and according to *Prudentius* (*u*) this Abſtract Logos is the Moſaic Spirit of God, that moved upon the face of the Waters. A large Collection of ſuch Sayings of the ancient Writers is made by *Grotius*, to which it is eaſie to add many more. For others have obſerv'd (*w*) that *Hermas* calleth the Son of God *Spiritum Sanctum*, and that *Ignatius* calleth him *πνεῦμα ἄμωμον, an immaculate Spirit.* Such he was antececently to his Human-divine Generation, as the ancient Writers ſuppoſe; and therefore *the Holy Ghoſt* in theſe words of Scripture *the Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee* (*x*) the Author of the imperfect work upon *Matthew* interpreteth *ipſum unigenitum Deum, to be meant of the unigenit God himſelf. Scimus nihil Spiritum Dei paſſum*, ſaith S. *Hilary. We know, that the Spirit of God ſuffered nothing. Corpus ſublime in cruce pendebat* (ſaith *Euſtathius Antiochenus*) *at divinus ſapientiæ Spiritus & intra corpus degebat, & cæleſtibus inſidebat, & totum ambiebat terram, & abyſſos continebat, & ſingulorum animas perluſtrans dijudicabat, atque omnia uti ſolebat, tanquam Deus adminiſtrabat.* The Body did hang upon the Croſs on high, but the Divine Spirit of Wiſdom did both continue in the Body and alſo was ſeated on the Celeſtials, and encompaſſed the Earth, and contain'd the Deeps, and judicially view'd the Minds of every one, and as it was wont, adminiſtred all things as God. So *Stephanus Æduenſis* a Biſhop ſaith. *Qui Spiritus eſt in circumſcriptus, Sanctus Sanctorum, Deus homo factus, in utero Virginis circumſcriptus.* He that is an uncircumſcrib'd Spirit, Holy of Holies, God made Man, in the Womb of the Virgin circumſcrib'd. Such is the Language of the Scholaſtic Theology of the ancient Writers of the Church, which is extremely Diſſonant from the Language of the holy Writers of Sripture, wherein we never find the leaſt mention of an Abſtract Logos, that is called by any of theſe Names. [illegible] *Spirit, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of* [illegible] and is not ſo great a Diſſonance in the Language of the ancient Writers a plain Argument, that their Senſe is Diſſonant, that they have miſtaken the Conſtitution of Chriſt's Perſon and the Trinity of our Religion? Neither God the Father nor the Son ought to be called *the Holy Spirit*, *the Spirit of God*; for this is the definitive Name and Notion of the third Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity. The Son of God cannot be the Spirit of God ſo called in the Scriptures, and therefore is not *the Moſaic spirit of God.* If the Son of God may be called *the Holy spirit*, *the Spirit of God*, then the Spirit of God may be called the Son of God. And this is not all; for by as good Reaſon as the ſecond in the Trinity may be called *the Spirit of God*, the third in the Trinity may be called *the Son of God.* If the ſecond in the Trinity may be called the Spirit of God (*y*) becauſe *Spirare*, *προβολὴ*, *procedere*, are in a large ſenſe applicable to him: The third in the Trinity may be called the Son of God (*z*) becauſe *generare* in a large ſenſe is ſaid to be applicable unto him. But theſe are Confuſions and Incongruities intolerable and irreconcileable with the Doctrine of the Trinity. With the *Muhammedans* who are Anti-Trinitarians, it is no ſuch Incongruity, to call (*a*) *Iſa* (Jeſus) *Spiritus Dei fortis*, as it is with Chriſtians and Trinitarians.

(5.) Many are of Opinion, that this Moſaic Spirit of God is the Chriſtians Holy Ghoſt, for which Interpretation ſeveral Reaſons may be alledg'd, that are ſuch as deſerve to be conſider'd, but may be clearly anſwer'd. One of theſe Reaſons is the Saying of the Jews in their Bereſchit Rabbi and *R. Lakiſch*, who concerning the Moſaic Spirit of God ſay (*b*) *hic eſt Spiritus Regis Meſſiæ, as it is ſaid, the Spirit of the Lord ſhall reſt upon him.* The Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Pſal.* 33. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made: and all the Hoſt of them by the Breath of his Mouth.* Which laſt words (*c*) *R. Aharon* an eminent Cabaliſt interpreteth to be meant of the Holy Spirit. But to the Sayings of theſe Hebrew Doctors we may oppoſe the Sayings of many others, and particularly of *Maimonides* (*d*) who by the Moſaic Spirit of God and the Breath of his Mouth underſtandeth no ſuch thing as the Chriſtians Holy Spirit, nor would he be the judicious *Maimonides*, did he ſo interpret them. The Pſalmiſt ſaith again, *Pſal.* 104. 30. *Thou ſendeſt forth thy Spirit, they are created: And thou reneweſt the face of the Earth.* Which words ſeem to argue, that the Geneſis of mundane Nature was by the Agency of the Holy Spirit. But they that with Wiſdom and Judgment interpret theſe words of the Pſalmiſt, do not ſuppoſe, that by the Spirit of God he meaneth the Holy Spirit, but his *vivific influence* in ſecular Benedictions. As *Iſa.* 44. 3. *I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed, and my Bleſſing upon thine Off-ſpring; and they ſhall grow up as among the Graſs.* Iſa. 32. 15. *Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the Wilderneſs be a fruitful Field.*

But ſome argue, (*e*) that the Moſaic word *Merachepheth* denoteth ſuch Actions, that are attributed to the Chriſtians Holy Ghoſt; which are *overſhadowing*, *Luc.* 1. 35. and (appearing in the form of a Dove, *Matth.* 3. 16.) brooding or hatching כיונה as a Pigeon. Whence S. *Baſil* thus interpreteth the word ἐπεφέρετο. *He cheriſh'd and enliven'd the Nature of the Waters* κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωαζούσης ὄρνιθος, *after the manner that a Bird hatcheth, and put into them a certain vital Virtue.* (*f*) The Arabic word רק is the ſame with

---

(u) ——— *qui Spiritus olim*
Ore ſuperfuſus Patrio, volitabat in undis
Nondum diſcretis nec certo litore clauſis.

J. Mart. calleth this *Logos* τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Spirit and the Virtue which is from God. *Tatianus* intituleth him λόγος ὁ ἐπουράνιος πνεῦμα γεγονὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς the Celeſtial *Logos*, a Spirit generated by the Father, οὗτος ὢν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, this being the Spirit of God, ſaith *Theophilus*. *Verbum Patris & Spiritus Dei*, the word of the Father and Spirit of God, ſaith *Irenæus*. By *Tertullian* this *Logos* is intituled *Dei Spiritus & Dei Sermo & Dei Ratio, de Spiritu Spiritus & de Deo Deus, Spiritus Creatoris, Chriſtus Paternæ Perſonæ Spiritus. Jeſus de Cælo manare dignatus eſt, Spiritus ſalutaris. Semper Spiritus Dei fuit ante carnem. Carnem Spiritus Sanctus induitur*, ſaith S. *Cyprian*. *In corruptibilem & irreprehenſibilem Spiritum genuit, quem Filium nuncupavit*, ſaith *Lactantius*. *Teſtificamur illum bis eſſe natum* (ſaith he) *primùm in Spiritu, poſtea in carne. Deſcendens itaque de Cælo Sanctus ille Spiritus, Sanctam virginem cujus utero ſe inſinuaret, Elegit.* Grot. Not. in Marc. 2. 8.

(w) *Dr. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. S.* 1. *c.* 2.

(x) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 7. *c.* 5. *S.* 3. *& ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *S.* 4. *& ibid. l.* 10. *c.* 8. *S.* 4. *& ibid. c.* 9. *S.* 9.

(y) Grot. supr.

(z) Petav. de Trin. l. 5. c. 5. S. 11. & l. 7. c. 14. S. 12.

(a) Hotting. Hiſt. Or. l. 1. c. 4. p. 135. ed. 1.

(b) L'Emper. Not. in Jachiad. p. 248.

(c) Dr. H. More op. phil. vol. 1. p. 494.

(d) More Nev. Par. 1. c. 23. 40, 55.

(e) Hotting. Hexaem. c. 1. Qu. 32. p. 42.

(f) Item The. Phil. p. 2[illegible]

with the Hebrew רחף, which Arabic word in this place ſo plainly denoteth an Action of the Holy Spirit, that ſome Muhammedan Writers accuſe the Jewiſh Scriptures of corruption in this place, becauſe they make the Spirit of God a Body, attributing thereto a Motion proper to bodily things. Agreeably to theſe Argumentations which are deſign'd to prove the Holy Ghoſts brooding or hatching as a Dove doth, (g) *Grotius* citeth from *Nigidius* (in the Scholiaſt of *Germanicus*) theſe words. *Ibi ovum inveniſſe miræ magnitudinis, quod volventes ejecerunt in terram, atque ita columbam inſediſſe, & poſt aliquot dies excluſiſſe Deam Syriæ, quæ vocatur Venus.* In which Fable (h) the Egg is ſuppoſed to denote the Chaos and the Dove the Holy Spirit. So the Heathen Fables are interpreted by them, that ſuppoſe a Moſaic Philoſophic Cabala. But is it imaginable, that the Pagans Goddeſs *Venus* ſhould be the Off-ſpring of the Chriſtians Holy Spirit? Or that the Pagans (i) had any notice of our Holy Ghoſt? Or that either Jews or Pagans knew, that the Holy Ghoſt would appear in the form of a Dove, or that ſuch a form ſhould be the Symbol and Hieroglyphick thereof? For it cannot be ſuppoſed with *Grotius*, that the Holy Ghoſt was called a Dove, becauſe *Moſes* uſeth the word *Merachepheth*, which when it ſignifieth *Incubation*, ſignifieth the Incubation of any other Bird as well as a Dove. (k) But *Semiramis* was the Oriental *Venus* and the Syrian Goddeſs; the Name *Semiramis* ſignifieth a Dove, as *Heſychius* affirmeth; the Oriental Pagans therefore aſcrib'd the Origin of their *Venus* to the great Egg of a Fiſh in the River *Euphrates* and the Incubation of a Dove. They aſcrib'd it to an Egg, that being ἀρχὴ γενέσεως, *the beginning or principle of Generation*; they aſcrib'd it to the Egg of a Fiſh in the River *Euphrates*, the Origin of *Venus* being fom the Waters; and they aſcrib'd it to the Incubation of a Dove, becauſe of the Cognation of that Animal with their *Venus*, which was *Semiramis*. Thus to interpret a Paganical putid Fable, is much more Paganical (and therefore much more probable) than to interpret the Egg of a Fiſh to mean the Chaos, and the Incubation of a Pigeon the overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt. Of which overſhadowing or incubation there is not any Indication in the Text of *Moſes*: But the ſuppoſal of it claſheth with the Order and Texture of his Hiſtory. For if when the Creation was *in fieri*, as it was in every Days-work, or if in his account of the *fifth* Days-work (when the Waters brought forth abundantly) he had ſaid *the Spirit of God Merachepheth upon the face of the Waters*, the Context would have determin'd the word, to ſignifie brooding or incubation. But *Moſes* uſeth the word in his Deſcription of the turbid and tumultuous State of the Chaos. His Creation is on this ſide the Kingdom of God and the Chriſtians Holy Spirit (the Gifts and Graces thereof,) his Creation is not the Saint of God-kind of Creation (but meerly the Creation of mundane Nature;) therefore by the Spirit of God he doth not mean the Chriſtians Holy Spirit, nor doth *Merachepheth* ſignifie the incubation thereof. If he had deſign'd any account of the holy Spirit, the Agency and Operations thereof, and the Life which it inſpireth, he would have taken eſpecial Notice of it in his Hiſtory of the Creation of Man (his Sanctity and Spirituality:) But throughout that whole Hiſtory there is not the leaſt Syllable touching the Holy Spirit, the Agency and Operations thereof. His Hiſtory of the *Coſmopœia* is ſo alien from the things inviſible and ſublime, that it taketh no Notice of their Exiſtence (of the Exiſtence of the Holy Angels and the Heaven of Beatitude;) and is it likely, that an Hiſtory ſo Craſs and Plebeious doth reveal the Trinity and the Holy Spirit the ſublimeſt of Spiritual Myſteries? It is not probable therefore, that this Moſaic Spirit of God is the Chriſtians Holy Ghoſt, or that the Geneſis of mundane Nature was by the Agency thereof, or that there is ſuch an unlimited Truth in this uſual Maxim, as the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, (l) *producta ſunt omnia à patre, per filium, in ſpiritu, all things were produc'd by the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit.*

(6.) Some ſuppoſe (m) that this Moſaic Spirit of God is God himſelf, which is ſaid to be the Opinion of *R. Solomon*. And it muſt be acknowledg'd, that in many places of the Old Teſtament the Spirit of God ſignifieth his mental Self (for ſo we may ſpeak of God, ſeeing we may ſpeak of him ἀνθρωποπαθῶς) or the Spirit that he conſtitutively is, as *Zech.* 6. 8. *Thoſe that go toward the North-country, have quieted my Spirit in the North-country.* Gen. 6. 3. *My Spirit ſhall not always ſtrive with Man.* Iſa. 63. 10. *They rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit.* The ſenſe of which place may be underſtood by comparing it with *Numb.* 14. 11. *Pſal.* 95. 10. (n) *Nimirum Deus quia Sanctus eſt, impietatem ferre non poteſt.* Iſa. 40. 13. *Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his Counſeller hath taught him?* Mic. 2. 7. *Is the Spirit of the Lord ſtraitned* (as to Goodneſs, Wiſdom or Power?) *Iſa.* 59. 19. *When the Enemy ſhall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord* (the Spirit that he conſtitutively is exerting its Vigour and Puiſſance) *ſhall lift up a ſtandard againſt him.* Iſa. 63. 14. *As a Beaſt goeth down into the Valley, the Spirit of the Lord cauſed him* (Iſrael) *to reſt. Spiritus Domini, i. e. Deus ipſe, more Hebræo*, ſaith *Grotius*. Zech. 4. 6. *This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, ſaying, not by* (human) *Might, nor by Power, but by my Spirit*, that is, by my ſelf. So that the ſenſe of the place is Parallel to *Hoſ.* 1. 7. *I will have mercy upon the Houſe of Judah, and will ſave them by the Lord their God, and will not ſave them by Bow, nor by Sword, nor by Battel, by Horſes, nor by Horſemen.* Pro. 1. 23. *Behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you*, ſaith Wiſdom. *Spiritum meum, id eſt voluntatem, ſenſa*, ſaith *Mercerus*. When I pour out my Mind and Affection unto any, I pour out my Spirit unto them, and to this ſenſe that of the Prophet may be underſtood, *Ezek.* 39. 29. *Neither will I hide my face any more from them: For I have poured out my Spirit upon the Houſe of Iſrael, ſaith the Lord God.* But this acceptation of the Spirit of God is hugely alien from that which moved upon the Waters in the Moſaic Coſmopœia, which was below God's creative Agency, and could not be an Agency immediately agreeable to God himſelf.

II. If theſe Names *the Spirit* and *the Spirit of God* are hugely ambiguous and of great variety of Acceptations, this inferreth, that the Spirit of God is of various ſorts and kinds, and muſt be variouſly diſtinguiſh'd; and that ſome one is eminently called *the Spirit of God*, and is diſtinguiſh'd from all other by this Name *the Holy Spirit*. The Spirit of God muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into *Natural* and *Supernatural*, *Verbal*

(g) *Ubi ſup. de V. S. C.*

(h) *Burnet. Tell. Theor. Sacr. p.* 255.

(i) *V. Didym. de Sp. Sanct. initio.*

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 23. *l.* 2. *c.* 55, & 76. *l.* 4. *c.* 51. *Selden. de D. Syr. Synt.* 2. *c.* 3.

(l) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 3. *p.* 98.

(m) *Petav. T.* 3. *de op. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(n) *Grot. Not. in loc.*

and *Real*, that which God *conſtitutively* is, and that which God *communicatively* is. And this muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into that which God *communicatively is in Nature and ſecular Benedictions, and in Religious Inſpiration.* This latter is that which the holy People call *the Holy Spirit* or (Ghoſt being in the Saxon Language the ſame with Spirit) *the Holy Ghoſt.* Which Name is purely and peculiarly Judaical, the Chriſtian Church deriveth it from the Jews, the Pagans knew nothing of it, ſave only ſome few of them that learn'd it from the Jews and Chriſtians. (o) *The Name of the Holy Spirit is altogether unknown to them, that Philoſophiz'd without the holy Scripture.* (p) S. *Auſtin* thinketh, that the Heathen Philoſophers made mention of the Father and the Son, but *ſine Spiritu Sancto Philoſophati ſunt, their Philoſophy was wholly ſilent touching the Holy Spirit.* The Name being purely Judaical, in all Reaſon the meaning of it in the firſt place and in ſome degree muſt be learned from the Jews, from their Scriptures and their Doctors that ſtudy them, who give us this account of it. (r) *The Spirit ſignifieth that divine Intellectual influence inſtilled by God into the Prophets, by Virtue whereof they Propheſie. As* Numb. 11. 17, 26. *I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee and will put it upon them. And the Spirit reſted upon them.* (s) *The firſt degree of Propheſie is, when any one is by Divine aid* (auxilio divino) *moved and animated to do ſome great and heroical work, and diſcerneth in himſelf that Motion. This Endowment is called the Spirit of the Lord, and of the Man endow'd with that Virtue it is ſaid, the Spirit of the Lord came or reſted upon him, or the Lord was with him. This was the Caſe of the Judges, of* Saul, *of* Amaſai. 1 *Chron.* 12. 18. *Of Moſes and of David, whereby the one ſlew the Egyptian, the other prevail'd againſt the Bear, the Lion and the Philiſtin. But none of theſe were by this Virtue moved or excited to ſpeak or ſay any thing, that is a ſecond degree of Propheſie. When a Man feeleth a thing to ariſe in him, and to reſt upon him, which impelleth him to ſpeak, ſo that he ſpeaketh either of Sciences and Arts, or Pſalms and Hymns, or ſalutary Precepts of Life, or things Political, or laſtly things Divine, being awake and in the ordinary vigour of his Sences. And this is the Perſon, of whom it is ſaid, that he ſpeaketh by the Holy Spirit. By the inſtinct of this Species of the Holy Spirit* David *wrote his Pſalms,* Solomon *his Proverbs and his other Books. By this Afflation the Hagiographa were written, whence they are called Kethubbim, which ſignifieth, that they are written by the Holy Spirit.* 2 *Sam.* 23. 2. *The Spirit of the Lord ſpake by me, and his word was in my Tongue, ſaith David, to ſignifie, that he ſpake by the impulſe of the Holy Spirit.* Such was *Jahaziel, Zechariah, Azariah, and ſuch were all thoſe Prieſts, of whom Counſel was ask'd by* Urim *and* Thummim, *as our wiſe Men ſay,* Majeſtas divina habitat ſuper eum, & loquitur per Spiritum Sanctum. *The Divine Majeſty* (the Schecinah) *reſteth upon him, and he ſpeaketh by the Holy Spirit.* In this Rabbinical account of the Holy Ghoſt it importeth extraordinary ſupernatural Gifts, Abilities and Powers, and alſo an extraordinary ſupernatural impulſe and incitation. As in *Saul, when the Spirit of God came upon him, and his Anger was kindled greatly, there was an extraordinary impulſe and incitation.* 1 Sam. 11 6. In *Samſon* there was an extraordinary Power, *when the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and he rent a Lion, as he would have rent a Kid.* Judg. 14. 6. So the Prophet ſaith, *Mic.* 3. 8. *I am full of Power by the Spirit of the Lord.* So our Saviour chargeth his Diſciples, to tarry in *Jeruſalem, until they were endu'd with* (the Holy Spirit) *Power from on high.* Luc. 24. 49. Himſelf is ſaid, to be anointed *with the Holy Ghoſt and with Power.* Act. 10. 38. *In Spiritu Dei virtus* (s) ſaith *Tertullian.* So in the Book *Coſri* (t) the Holy Spirit is called אומץ *Robur Divinum* and העזר האלהי *Auxilium Divinum. Maimonides* therefore by his firſt degree of Propheſie call'd by him *Auxilium Divinum, and the Spirit of the Lord* meaneth a Species of the Holy Spirit. And this muſt be his Senſe; for he calleth his ſecond degree of Propheſie *a Species of the Holy Spirit.*

III. From this Rabbinical account of the Holy Spirit it appeareth, in what ſenſe (according to the mind of the chiefeſt Rabbins) the Holy Ghoſt may be called *the Schecinah,* namely in the ſenſe of this Rabbinical Maxim cited by *Maimonides, Majeſtas divina habitat ſuper eum & loquitur per Spiritum Sanctum.* Many have obſerv'd, that the Jews call the Holy Ghoſt the *Schecinah,* and there is great truth in the Obſervation. For *Elias* in his *Tisbi* ſaith (u) *our Doctors call Ruach Hakkodeſh* (the Holy Spirit) *Schecinah, becauſe it reſteth upon the Prophets,* Whence it is, that where the Hebrew Text ſaith *Gen.* 45. 27. *The Spirit of Jacob their Father reviv'd,* R. Solomon thus expoundeth it; *the Schecinah reſted on him, which had departed from him, becauſe of his Grief and Sorrow. Onkelos* thus rendreth it; *The Holy Ghoſt reſted upon* Jacob. Sometimes therefore the Jews uſe *Schecinah* and *Ruach Hakkodeſh* promiſcuouſly, as if they confounded them: But ſometimes they plainly diſtinguiſh them. For *Schecinah* and *Ruach Hakkodeſh* are reckoned as two of the five diſtinct Ornaments, in which the ſecond Temple came ſhort of the firſt. They inquire, why the word by which God ſignifieth, that he would be glorified in the ſecond Temple, *Hagg.* 1. 8. ſuffereth an Apocope of *He,* which is numerally Five? and their Anſwer is, that five things were wanting in the ſecond Temple, whereby it differ'd from the firſt. Namely, *the Ark* (with the Propitiatory and Cherubim) *the Schecinah, Ruach Hakkodeſh* (which is Propheſie) *Urim and Thummim and the Fire from Heaven.* Sometimes the Jews connect the Schecinah and the Holy Spirit. For whereas *Hannah* ſaith to *Eli* (who ſuppos'd, that ſhe was drunk) *no, my Lord, I am a Woman of a ſorrowful Spirit: R. Solomon* thus expoundeth the words. *Thou art not a Judge in this Cauſe, thou bewrayeſt thy ſelf, that the Holy Spirit doth not reſt upon thee.* But the *Talmud* thus expoundeth them; *Thou art not a Judge in this Cauſe: The Schecinah and the Holy Ghoſt is not with thee.* This Talmudical mode of ſpeaking is moſt accurate and accommodate, moſt agreeable to the ſenſe of the principal Hebrew Doctors; for their ſenſe is, *That the Holy Ghoſt is the Holy Inſpiration of the Schecinah.* In ſome ſort therefore (according to their ſenſe) it is the *Schecinah,* and in ſome ſort it is not the *Schecinah.* For being the Holy Inſpiration of the Schecinah (the Divine Majeſty) ſo far it is the *Schecinah,* and ſo far it is not the *Schecinah.* Secondarily alſo and conſequentially the Holy Ghoſt is the *Schecinah* and reſteth on the Prophets; for the Divine Majeſty with his

---

(o) *Appellatio Spiritus Sancti penitus ab his ignoratur, qui extra ſacram Scripturam Philoſophantur.* Didym. de Sp. Sanct. l. 1. Initio.

(p) *Qu. ſuper Exod. l.* 2. *Qu.* 25.

(r) *Maimon. Mor. Nev. Par.* 1. c. 40.

2 *Chron.* 20. 14. *and* 24. 20. *and* 15. 1.

(s) *De Carne Chriſt. c.* 19.

(t) P. 213.

(u) *Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. in Rad.* שכן *Col.* 2395. *&c.*

Holy Inſpiration (the Holy Ghoſt) is the *Schecinah* and reſteth on the Prophets: That Holy Inſpiration therefore ſecondarily reſteth on them and is the *Schecinah*. The *Schecinah* and *the Glory* of God are the ſame. (*w*) *For the Glory of God is his Majeſty, and the Majeſty of God is his Glory*. So *Gen.* 28. 16. *The Lord is in this place*, is in *Onkelos* thus rendred; *the Glory of the Lord dwelleth in that place*. The Glory of the Lord being the ſame with the *Schecinah*, the Spirit of the *Schecinah* muſt neceſſarily be *the Spirit of Glory*, as the Apoſtle ſtileth it. 1 *Pet* 4. 14. *If ye be reproach'd for the Name of Chriſt, happy are ye; for the Spirit of Glory and of God reſteth upon you.* The Spirit of Glory and of God is the ſame with the Spirit of God and of Glory (the Text muſt be expounded, as if there was in it an ὑστρολογία,) and accordingly the Syriack thus rendreth the words, *the glorious Spirit of God*. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of Glory in reſpect of God, as being the Spirit of the Schecinah (which is the Glory of God;) and to us it is the Spirit of Glory, as conſtituting us Illuſtrious, Magnificent, of Royal and Divine Condition (in reſpect of Endowments) and cauſing us to glory in Tribulation. By the Pſalmiſt according to the *ſyriac* Verſion, *Pſal.* 51. 12. it is called *thy glorious Spirit*, according to the *vulg. Lat. Spiritus tuus principalis*, which I would render *thy Royal Spirit*; for by *Clemens* it is intituled (*x*) χρυσὸς ὁ βασιλικός, *the Royal Gold*.

(w) *Idem ibid.*

(x) Strom. l. 5. p. m. 434.

IV. From this Rabbinical account of the Holy Spirit it appeareth, that amongſt the Jews it is of *a larger* and *ſtricter* Acceptation, but in both Acceptations it is *the Inſpiration of ſupernatural Gifts and Graces*. For although they diſtinguiſh but four Modes of ſupernatural Revelation, and call but one of them *the Holy Spirit*, namely, *Bath Kol*, *Urim* and *Thummim*, *Propheſie* (by Dream or Viſion) and *Ruach Hakkodeſh* (the Holy Spirit,) yet it muſt not be ſuppos'd, that they confine the Holy Spirit to this laſt Mode of ſupernatural Revelation. For *Maimonides* having defin'd it, calleth it *a Species of the Holy Spirit*; and he ſuppoſeth, that the Prieſts who were ask'd Counſel by *Urim* and *Thummim*, ſpake by the Holy Spirit. By his firſt degree of Propheſie alſo he meaneth *a species of the Holy Spirit*; and when the Jews mention the Holy Spirit as one of the five things, wherein the ſecond Temple was defective, thus they ſpeak of it, *ſpiritus ſanctus qui eſt Prophetia*. (*y*) *Sometimes the ancienteſt Monuments of Jewiſh Learning call all Propheſie by the Name of* Spiritus Sanctus, *which they attribute to* Eſaiah *and* Ezekiel, *which were known Prophets*. (*z*) *Certain Dreams conſider'd in themſelves they depreſs below any degree of Propheſie, yet the Interpretation of them they attribute to the* רוח הקדש *Holy Spirit*. So *Joſeph* becauſe of his *Oneirocriticks* is ſaid, to be a Man, *in whom the Spirit of God is*, that is, the Inſpiration of God (which inſpireth with ſupernatural Gifts) *ſpiritus prophetiæ à facie Dei*, ſaith *Onkelos*. And upon the ſame account it is ſaid of *Daniel*, *that in him was the Spirit of the Holy Gods*. The light and underſtanding and excellent Wiſdom that was found in him (ſupernatural Gifts and Abilities) his Heathen Admirers deriv'd from the Spirit of the Holy Gods, by whoſe Spirit they meant their Inſpiration, for the Pagan inſpired *Vates* becauſe they were inſpired, are called by *Apuleius* (*a*) *Numinis divino ſpiritu repleti, ſuch as were filled with the Divine Spirit of God.* So *Celſus* calleth the ſublime Philoſophers of ancient times (*b*) *Men that were filled with the Spirit, whereby they declared many good things.* And *Orpheus* becauſe inſpired he calleth (*c*) ἄνδρα ὁμολογουμένως ὁσίῳ χρησάμενον πνεύματι, *a Man undoubtedly endowed with an Holy spirit.* The Jews and Pagans therefore agree, that the Holy Spirit or Spirit of God is definitively *his Inſpiration*, which inſpireth ſupernatural Gifts. So in Scripture *the Spirit* ſometimes ſignifieth *that Gift the Inſpiration of Propheſie*, as *Hagg.* 2. 5. *According to the word that I covenanted with you, when you came out of* Egypt, *ſo my Spirit remaineth among you.* Sometimes the Spirit (the Spirit of God) ſignifieth the Prophetic Doctrine, which is of God's Inſpiration. *Iſa.* 30. 1. *They take Counſel but not of me, and cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add ſin to ſin.* Sometimes the Spirit ſignifieth the Eſtate of Prophetic Inſpiration. *Ezek.* 37. 1. *The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me out in the Spirit of the Lord.* Apoc. 1. 10. *I was in the Spirit* (the Prophetic Inſpiration) *on the Lord's day*. So *Apoc.* 4. 2. and 17. 3. and 21. 10. to be in the Spirit ſignifieth, to be in the Viſion and Inſpiration of Propheſie, which Inſpiration of Propheſie was an influx from God (*d*) but not without the Miniſtery of an Angel (that furniſhed the Prophetic Scene, and repreſented the Prophetic Viſions to the Phancy of the Prophet) as the generality of the Hebrew Doctors ſuppoſe agreeably to their Holy Scriptures. Which alſo repreſent the Holy Spirit as רוח החן *the Spirit* of Grace (which is the Title of (*e*) an Hebrew Doctor's Book) and as the Inſpiration of Graces as well as Gifts ſupernatural. *Zech.* 12. 10. *I will pour upon the Houſe of David and upon the Inhabitants of Jeruſalem the Spirit of Grace and ſupplications.* Iſa. 11. 2. *The Spirit of the Lord ſhall reſt upon him, the Spirit of Wiſdom and Underſtanding, the Spirit of Counſel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge and of the Fear of the Lord.* Ezek. 36. 27. *I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes.* Thus far the Jews and Pagans together with the Old Teſtament conduct us to a definitive Notion of the Holy Spirit; for according to theſe Notices of it this muſt be the definitive Notion of it; it is *the God inſpiration* (that Agency and Virtue) *which inſpireth ſupernatural Gifts and Graces. Or it is the ſupernatural Inſpiration, Agency and Virtue, that God communicatively is.* Ἀπόῤῥοια, *an Efflux or Aporrhœa* (*f*) ſaith *Athenagoras*.

(y) Mr. Smith of Propheſie. c. 6. p. 233.

(z) Ibid. c. 3. p. 189.

Gen. 41. 38.

Dan. 4. 8, 9. and 5. 14.

(a) Amict. min. el. p. 65.

(b) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 363.

(c) Ibid. p. 367.

(d) Mr. Smith. ſupr. c. 5.

(e) Buxtorf. Bibliothec. Rab. p. 323.

(f) P. 27.

V. It appeareth from this Rabbinical account of the Holy Spirit, that it properly belongeth to the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial, and is *the Inſpiration-virtue thereof*. For to this comprehenſion *the Schecinah, the Divine Majeſty, and the Glory of God* (wherewith the Holy Spirit is intimately connex'd) do properly belong; and the Name *Spiritus Sanctus* ſheweth, that it properly belongeth to this comprehenſion. The Holy Spirit is not a thing on this ſide Sanctity Imperial, or extrinſecal thereto, but it is intrinſecal thereto, and is of Sanctity Imperial as to Kind and Quality, and *conſtitutively* as being a principal conſtitutive Ingredient of the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial. It is the Spirit of God, not as he is Parental Nature or a Parental Providence, but as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial; It is the Spirit of the Holy Government, of the Holy People, and of the matters of their Holineſs,

(g) &

(*g*) *& eſſe apud profanos & extraneos non poteſt.* It is the Spirit of the Sanctity Imperial in the diviſive ſenſe, ſo as to be alſo the Spirit of Sanctity Imperial in the comprehenſive ſenſe. Upon which account (amongſt many other) it is denominated *the Holy Spirit*; whence it appeareth, how unskilful and irreligious a thing it is, (*h*) to aſſert in the firſt place, that the Moſaic Spirit of God, which moved upon the Waters, is the Holy Spirit, and in the next place, that it is the Platonic Soul of the World, ſo identifying the Holy Spirit with the Platoniſts Mundane Soul. So ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church that ſuppoſe the Platonic Triad the ſame with the Chriſtian Trinity, implicitly affirm, that the Holy Spirit is the Mundane Soul. Several of them (which will be hereafter cited) ſuppoſe the Holy Spirit, to be *Parental Nature*, and ſo far identify it with the Mundane Soul. *Gr. Naz.* is more modeſt than to call it ſo, yet is not uncriminal, when ſpeaking of the Holy Spirit he ſaith of the Pagan Theologers, (*i*) ἐφαντάσθησαν μὲν νοῦν τοῦ παντὸς προσαγορεύσαντες, *they had an Imagination of it calling it the Mind of the Universe.* But P. *Abailardus* expreſly taught, (*k*) *Spiritum ſanctum eſſe animam mundi, that the Holy Spirit is the Soul of the World.* Of this Sentiment are *Poſtellus* and *Eugubinus*, who ſaith of *Theodorus* the Platoniſt. (*l*) *The third Opificer he called the Fountain of Souls, than which nothing is more divine and profound: for our Theology calleth him the Creator of Spirits; and this is the Soul Vivificatreſs of the World, the Mother of Souls.* Of the Platoniſts in general he ſaith, *This third King they as it were, make (what our Theology ſo much proclaimeth) the Font of Souls: for that Soul is the Holy Spirit, as is plain, and we have every where taught. The Spirit we call the Vivificator, Creator, ſower of Souls: Thou art called the Paraclet, the Gift of the moſt High, the Living Fountain, Fire, Charity and Spiritual Unction.* At this rate the Kingdom of God is confounded with Mundane Nature, the Religion of the Chriſtian Trinity with Heathen Coſmolatry and Mundane Theiſm; the Chriſtian Theology is miſrepreſented, which is ſaid, to proclaim things that it knoweth nothing of (that the Spirit is the Creator and Font of Souls and Spirits) and thus an Irreligious Jumble is made of unholy, philoſophic, mundane things, the Platoniſts Vivificatreſs of the World and Fountain of Souls, with the Chriſtians Holy, Spiritual and Saint of God-kind of things, with their Spiritual Unction and Fountain of Living Waters, their Paraclet and Holy Spirit, which common ſenſe would diſtinguiſh from a Mundane Spirit, as *Tertullian* doth, * *à quo ſpiritum ſanctum poſtulem, à quo nec mundialis ſpiritus præſtatur?* So the Apoſtle oppoſeth *the Spirit of the World to the Spirit which is of God*, 1 Cor. 2.12. The Holy Spirit is not to be confounded with the Spirit of the World in the beſt Senſe imaginable, much leſs with a *Perſian Arimanius* or a Pagan Demon.

(g) *S. Cypr. Ep.* 74.

(h) *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. *c* 23. *Gale Court of the Gent. par.* 2. *p.* 60, 324, 334.

(i) *Or.* 37.

(k) *Vaſqu. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 22. *Qu.* 3.

(l) *Tertium opificem vocabat Fontem animorum, quo nihil divinius & profundius. Quippe & noſtra Theologia vocat eum Creatorem ſpirtuum; & hæc eſt Anima mundi vivificatrix, mater animarum.* De Per. Phil. l. 2. c. 7. *Hunc tertiam Regem quaſi faciunt (quod noſtra tantopere vociferatur Theologia) fontem animarum: eſt enim Anima illa ſpiritus ſanctus, ut apparet, & ut docuimus ubique. Spiritum autem nos vivificatorem, creatorem, ſatoremque animarum dicimus: Tu paracletus diceris, donum Dei altiſſimi, fons vivus, ignis, charitas & ſpiritalis unctio.* Ibid. c. 8. vid. Jacob. Thomaz. Diſſert. 21. & 14.

* *C. Marcion. l.* 4. *c.* 26.

Section III.

Of the various Significations of the Holy Spirit in the New Teſtament, and chiefly of the Perſonal Acceptation thereof.

I. THE Holy Spirit in the New Teſtament often ſignifieth in the *Imperſonal* Acceptation of the Old Teſtament (*That Agency the Inſpiration of God, or meerly the Holy Inſpiration-Virtue*:) but the New Teſtament ſuperaddeth thereto the *Perſonal* Acceptation; and ſo the Holy Spirit ſignifieth *the Holy Inſpiration-virtue perſonal*, the Agent (immediate yet mediate) of the Holy Inſpirations. For it muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie in the perſonal acceptation in all ſuch places, which are Characteriſtical of an *Inſpiration-virtue perſonal*; and it is moſt reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that it ſo ſignifieth in all thoſe places, wherein ſuch as ſpeak of it, and thoſe to whom it is ſpoken of, were ſuch to whom the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt was known: but in all other places it is moſt reaſonable, to underſtand it, to ſignifie only in the imperſonal acceptation, which is the Notion of the Jews and of the Old Teſtament. For the Hebrew Doctors (*m*) *non credunt.* As they believe not the Trinity, ſo they deny the Subſtantiality and Perſonality of the Holy Spirit, making it nothing more than a Quality or Energy (an *Afflatus*) although there are ſome fond Conceits amongſt them touching a *ſpiritus ſanctus* of another nature; for in one place of the Book *Coſri* (*n*) the *Intellectus agens* is called *ſpiritus ſanctus* and in ſome places (citing the Book *Jezirah*) that Author telleth us, (*o*) That the Spiritual Forms are created or formed out of a ſubtil Spiritual Body, which is called by them *ſpiritus ſanctus.* But theſe Philoſophic Fopperies touching a ſubſtantial or perſonal *ſpiritus ſanctus* are of no affinity with the Subſtantiality and Perſonality of the Chriſtians Holy Spirit: Nor is the Triad which that Author citeth from the Book *Jezirah* of any affinity with our Trinity. (*p*) By three God created the World ספר סיפור & ספר *Sephar*, *Siphur* and *Sepher*, *Mental Conception*, *Speech*, *or word of Command and Writing* (for ſo theſe Hebrew words are us'd to ſignifie in this Triad) *and theſe three are one, which in Man are three; for he conceiveth a thing in his Uunderſtanding, ſpeaketh it by his Mouth, and writeth it with his Hand: but the Writing of God is his Creatures, and the Speech of God is his Writing, and the Mental Conception of God is his Speech or Word.* This is the Triad of the Book *Jezirah*, which hath nothing in it remarkable but a Jingle of three Hebrew words, yet Learned Men and Chriſtian Divines Rabbinically infer from it, (*q*) *That the Jews had a Notion of three diſtinct Subſiſtences in the Deity ſuitable to theſe of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt.* As if the Creatures were ſuitable to the Holy Ghoſt, The word of command (let there be Light) to the Son, and Mental Conception to the Father. The ſame Inference is made from *Philo*, although he knew no other Trinity than that of the School of *Plato.* But great ſtreſs is laid upon the Chaldee Paraphraſt, in whom notwithſtanding there is not the leaſt ſhadow or indication of *three Subſiſtences in the Deity ſuitable to theſe of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt*: for it will hereafter appear, that ממרא דיי in the Chaldee Paraphraſt is of no affinity with the ſecond Perſon in our Trinity, and is there any thing in the Chaldee Paraphraſt touching the Perſonality and Deity of the Holy Ghoſt? (r) P. 113. Yes, ſaith *Rittangel*, (*r*) in ſeveral places of the Pentateuch יהוה ſignifieth the Holy Ghoſt, and in ſuch places it is render'd by the Chaldee Paraphraſt שכינתא. But this whole Pretenſion is moſt enormouſly falſe, that in the Pentateuch either the Name יהוה in the Hebrew Text, or the Name שכינתא in the Chaldee Paraphraſt is ever meant of the Holy Ghoſt; and therefore *Buxtorf* ſpeaking of the Holy Ghoſt's being called (s) Lex. Talm. col. 2396. *Shecinah* ſaith, (*s*) *ſic forte apud Rabbinos communes: non autem in Targum.* If the Shecinah in the Chaldee Paraphraſt is never uſed to ſignifie the Holy Ghoſt, it is to no purpoſe, to obſerve with *Rittangel*, that it is never us'd in this Paraphraſt, to ſignifie *the Divine Glory as ſuch.* It is not for this reaſon, becauſe he appropriateth it to ſignifie the Holy Ghoſt, that he doth not uſe it, to ſignifie the Divine Glory as ſuch; (t) Ibid. col. 2394. but he ordinarily uſeth it (*t*) to ſignifie the Divine Majeſty as a needful honourary Periphraſis of God, and to remove all ſuſpicion of Corporeity from him (for which *Maimonides* very much commendeth him) to this uſe he appropriateth it, and therefore doth not uſe it, to ſignifie the Divine Glory as ſuch, becauſe he ſuppos'd the Divine Glory ſo wholly the ſame with שכינתא, as that it ſuited not with that honourary Periphraſis. From the Chaldee Paraphraſt therefore it doth not appear, that the Jewiſh Church had any Cabala of the Trinity, or that the Jews had amongſt them a Notion of three Subſiſtences in the Deity ſuitable to theſe of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. But it ought to be acknowledg'd, that the Jews Philoſophic-paganiz'd in the latter times of their Commonwealth, that others of them beſides *Philo* might be as good Trinitarians as he was, and that the Jewiſh Cabaliſts ten *Sephiroth* (or Numerations) were deriv'd from the Platonic and Pythagoric Theology.

II. The Hebrew Doctors do not acknowledge the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe it is not notic'd in their Scriptures of the Old Teſtament; nor in that miſtaken place (whence ſome ſinfully infer, that Chriſt is inferiour to the Spirit, becauſe the *ſent* is inferiour to *the ſender*) *Iſa.* 48. 16. *The Lord God and his Spirit hath ſent me:* for the Text muſt be expounded as *Hagg.* 1. 13. *Then ſpake* Haggai *the Lord's Meſſenger in the Lord's Meſſage.* The Lord's Meſſage doth not ſignifie any thing of it ſelf *authoritative*, but only *declarative.* So *Zech.* 7. 12. *The words which the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent in his Spirit by the former Prophets.* The Prophetic Spirit here doth not ſignifie any thing of it ſelf *authoritative*, but only *declarative*, and ſo it ſignifieth in the Text under conſideration, which is rightly thus expounded by *Grotius*; *Dominus Deus miſit me & Spiritus ejus*, i. e. *Dominus per ſpiritum hæc mihi imperavit.* God ſent the Prophet (a Type of Chriſt) by his Spirit, which ſignifieth only his Inſpiration in the *actual* and *virtual* acceptation; for not any thing characteriſtical of a Perſon, not any thing of Perſonal Agency is aſcrib'd to the Holy Spirit in any place of the Old Teſtament. Nor was it needful, that his Perſonality ſhould be notic'd, till the times of the Religion of Chriſtianity, which is Spirituality of Religion and Piety, and the diſpenſation of the Holy Spirit; then and not before it was neceſſary, that the Theology of the Holy Ghoſt touching his Nature, Attributes, Offices, Operations, Worth, Importance, and our Duty towards him ſhould be introduc'd; and therefore then and not before it was neceſſary, that his Perſonality ſhould be notic'd; which Perſonality doth not hinder, but that the Holy Spirit is (for the main) of the ſame definitive Notion both in the Old and New Teſtament-times, only his contracted definition muſt be now enlarg'd and expanded. For when we define the Holy Ghoſt, *The Holy Inſpiration-virtue*, this muſt not be underſtood, to confine the Holy Ghoſt to internal Inſpirations, and to exclude external miraculous Operations; for theſe are attributed to the Holy Ghoſt in the New Teſtament. If according to the Senſe of Jews and Pagans we define the Holy Ghoſt, *the God-inſpiration*, this muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie not only *that Agency*, but *that Agent* (the God-inſpiration Agent) which is *Virtus Divina* in the perſonal acceptation. He is the Agent of the Holy Inſpirations (they are his Operations.) He is the Ghoſtly Agent of the Holy Inſpirations (as being his Spiritual Internal Operations;) he is an Agent of the Holy Inſpirations, ſo as to be Chriſt's (or God's) Agent, that is imploy'd to do his work, and ſo as to be his vicarious Agent, that adminiſtreth his Affairs in his place and ſtead. *Chriſto vicariam navat operam. miſit vicariam vim ſpiritus ſancti, qui credentes agat*, ſaith *Tertullian.* All which perſonal Agency is attributed in the New Teſtament to *the Spirit of Chriſt*, by which Name the Apoſtle calleth the Prophetic Spirit of the Old Teſtament-times, 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. which ſheweth, that then the Prophetic Spirit was *in eſſe reali* the Holy Ghoſt in the perſonal acceptation, but not *in eſſe cognito*, his Perſonality not being notic'd in the Old Teſtament. Nor doth the New Teſtament throughout a great part of it ſpeak of the Holy Ghoſt in any other Notion than that of the Old Teſtament, which is not the *perſonal*, but only the *actual and virtual* acceptation. So the Apoſtle ſaith of the Old Teſtament, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God.* He expoundeth himſelf therefore, and what he meaneth by the Holy Ghoſt, when he ſaith, *Act.* 28. 25. *Well ſpake the Holy Ghoſt by* Iſaias. Our Saviour, his Apoſtles, and other Holy Men and the Holy Angels ſpake and preach'd to the Jews touching the Holy Ghoſt, without giving them any new Notices of the Holy Ghoſt; and becauſe they muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak to them intelligibly, not in an unknown ſenſe and ſignification of the Holy Ghoſt, therefore they ſpake of the Holy Ghoſt to the Jews in their own Judaical Notion taking the Holy Ghoſt only in the *actual* and *virtual* acceptation. So it ſignifieth in the Angel's Meſſage to *Zacharias* Luk. 1. 15, 41, 67. touching *John the Baptiſt*; *He ſhall be filled with the Holy Ghoſt.* In the Narrative touching his Parents; *they were filled with the Holy Ghoſt* (the holy Inſpiration-Virtue real;) and in the like Narrative touching *Simeon* Luk. 2. 25, 26, 27. (for theſe Narratives were originally Judaical and ſpeak in the Phraſe and Senſe of the Jews) *the Holy Ghoſt was upon him, it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghoſt, that he ſhould not ſee Death, before he had ſeen the Lord's Chriſt. And he came by the Spirit into the Temple.* So it ſignifieth in our Saviour's arguing with the Jews touching the Meſſiah. David Mar. 12. 36. *himſelf ſaith by the Holy Ghoſt, The Lord ſaid to my Lord*; in S. *Peter*'s Sermon to the Jews, Act. 2. 38. *Repent and be baptized, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; Act. 5. 32. in his Diſcourſe with the Jewiſh Senators, *We are his Witneſſes, and ſo is alſo the Holy Ghoſt. Non nos tantùm ſed & ſpiritus S. virtus divina*, ſaith *Grotius.* In *John Baptiſts*

Sermon to the Jews touching Chriſt, both in reſpect of the Senſe of the Speaker and the Hearers, *The Holy Ghoſt* was only of the *actual* and *virtual* Matth. 3. 11. acceptation. *He ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire.*

III. So in the Sayings of the Angel unto Jews touching the conception and birth of our Saviour there is no appearance of an Intention, that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould be taken in the perſonal acceptation, *Matth.* 1. 20. *That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghoſt*; i.e. it is of the *virtus divina* commonly called the Holy Ghoſt by the Holy People, becauſe it is the Holy-inſpiration-virtue. Of the ſame ſenſe is *Luk.* 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee* (ſaith the Angel to the Bl. Virgin) *and the power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee:* For by the Power of the Higheſt is meant the *virtus divina* called the Holy Ghoſt by the Holy People. So our Saviour ſaith, that *by the Spirit of God* he wrought thoſe Miracles, which the Phariſees imputed to the Devil, whence he chargeth them with *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, Matth. 12. 28, 31. In which Diſcourſe of his to the Jews there is no appearance of his Intention, that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould be taken by them in the perſonal acceptation, nor is Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt compar'd with Blaſphemy againſt the Son univerſally (for it is ſuch Blaſphemy againſt God and Chriſt, which is againſt the Holy Ghoſt:) but this is plain and apparent in our Saviour's Diſcourſe, he repreſenteth the Holy Ghoſt as operative of external Miracles in Chriſtianity (calling it the Finger or Hand of God, that is, his doing, *Luk.* 11. 20.) whence it is manifeſt, that the Holy Spirit is, *The holy internal Inſpiration-virtue*, ſo as to be alſo *of external miraculous Efficiency and Power.* The Holy Luk. 24. 49. Act. 1. 8. and 10. 18. Ghoſt is in the New Teſtament ſignify'd by the Name of *Power* (divine) which Power operateth internally (as *Jeſus returned in the Power of the Spirit* (an holy Magnanimity) *into* Galilee; Luk. 4. 14. and 1. 17. Eph. 3. 16. John Baptiſt *went before him in the Spirit and Power* (the inſpir'd Virtue and Magnanimity) *of* Elias; *and Believers are ſtrengthen'd with all Might by his Spirit in the Inward Man*;) and it operateth alſo externally; *for the Goſpel came not unto the World in Word only, but alſo in Power and in the Holy Ghoſt*, confirmatum potentiâ & efficaciâ miraculorum, *confirmed by the Power and Efficacy of Miracles*, which the Preachers of it wrought by the Holy Ghoſt. Not only the ſupernatural Gifts of the Mind wherewith the Apoſtles were endow'd by Inſpiration (the Gift of Tongues, Prophecy, diſcerning of Spirits, and ſuch more) but all the External Miracles which they wrought (their cauſing the Blind to ſee, the Lame to walk, healing the Sick, raiſing the Dead, diſpo- 1 Cor. 2. 4. ſeſſing Devils) are called *the demonſtration of the Spirit and of Power.* They were a demonſtration of the Verity of Chriſtianity by Miracles wrought by the Power of the Holy Spirit. The truth of the Chriſtian Religion was demonſtrated and the World of Gentiles was converted Rom. 15. 19. (ſaith the Apoſtle) *through mighty Signs and Wonders by the Power of the Spirit of God:* Which words not only denote the external miraculous efficiency of the Holy Ghoſt, but are alſo a conſiderable Notice of his Perſonality; for it is not a meer Power, to which the Apoſtle attributeth Power.

IV. But to prove his Perſonality ſome places of the New Teſtament are commonly alledg'd, which are thought irrefragable proofs of it, that are really very great Objections againſt it. Theſe places are, *Act.* 10. 19. *The Spirit ſaid unto* Peter, *Behold, three Men ſeek thee. Ariſe therefore and get thee down and go with them, doubting nothing, for I have ſent them.* Act. 13. 2. *To the Prophets and Teachers at* Antioch *the Holy Ghoſt ſaid, ſeparate me* Barnabas *and* Saul *for the Work whereunto I have called them.* In theſe places multifarious perſonal Actions ſeem to be attributed to the Holy Spirit, namely, commanding, ſending, calling to a Work, taking care of and ordering the Affairs of the Goſpel and of the Church, (as elſewhere the Apoſtle ſaith, *Take heed unto your ſelves and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers*, Act. 20. 28.) and the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, *I have ſent, I have called*, which ſeemeth a direct and expreſs attribution of Perſonality to the Holy Ghoſt. But this cannot be the genuine Expoſition of theſe places; for God is manifeſtly the Doer of the things ſpoken of and the Speaker in one of them, *Act.* 10. 19. ὁ δὲ ποιεῖ ὁ θεὸς, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom* upon the place. It was God (not the Holy Spirit) who by his Angel ſent the Men, which came unto *Peter*. And ſeeing God was the Doer of the things ſpoken of, therefore God (yet by his Spirit) was the Speaker in this place, and the Spirit ſpeaketh not in its own perſon, but in the perſon of God. So that the place muſt be underſtood, as *Grotius* expoundeth it, εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, i. e. *Deus non per viſum ſed per afflatum: The Spirit ſaid unto him, that is, God ſaid unto him by Inſpiration.* The Inſpiration of God ſpeaking as the Inſpiration of God, which is the ſame with God ſpeaking by Inſpiration, ſaid unto *Peter*, *I have ſent them.* In the one of theſe places therefore the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh not in the perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, but in the perſon of God; and the other place being of the ſame Nature, is neceſſarily of the ſame Interpretation: which alſo the Phraſe of it inferreth; for it muſt be underſtood according to the Phraſeology of Scripture, which repreſenteth the Apoſtles as ſeparated, not to the Holy Ghoſt, but unto God (wherein Sanctity conſiſteth) to the Goſpel of God and to the Miniſtry of his Word. Nor (according to the Phraſe of Scripture) were they called and ſent by the Holy Ghoſt, as the Perſon from whom they had their election, calling and appointment to their Work, their Miſſion and Commiſſion, but by God. This whole Buſineſs being by his appointment, not by the Holy Ghoſt's, therefore the Text ſaith, *Act.* 13. 2, 4. *As they miniſtred to the Lord and faſted*, by his appointment the Holy Ghoſt (the Inſpiration of the Lord, ſpeaking as his Inſpiration, which is the ſame with the Lord ſpeaking by Inſpiration) ſaid, ἀφορίσατε δή μοι, *ſeparate to me* Barnabas *and* Saul *for the Work whereunto I have called them. So they being ſent forth by the Holy Ghoſt* (the Inſpiration of the Lord ſpeaking as ſuch, or the Lord ſpeaking by Inſpiration) *departed unto* Seleucia. This method of interpreting theſe two places is not only demonſtrable from themſelves (the Arguments which they afford) but from the whole tenour and current of the Holy Scriptures: for there is not any one place either in the Old or New Teſtament, wherein it can be ſhew'd, that the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh in the perſon of the Holy Ghoſt; but this Holy Ghoſt always ſpeaketh in the perſon of God or Chriſt, when it ſpeaketh in the firſt perſon I; as *Act.* 28. 27. *The* Holy Ghoſt ſaith, *leſt they ſhould* *be converted and I ſhould heal them:* but the words are manifeſtly ſpoken in the perſon of God, not of the Holy Ghoſt. So in the Apocalyptick Epiſtles to the Seven Churches, the words are manifeſtly ſpoken in the perſon of Chriſt and they are in ſuch ſenſe his words (*To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life; repent or elſe I will come unto thee quickly*) yet this is conſtantly the Phraſe in thoſe Epiſtles, *He that hath an Ear, let him hear, what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches.* The *Socinians* have objected againſt the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt, that he did never appear in the form of a Perſon; but they had made a ſtronger Objection, if they had obſerv'd, that the Holy Ghoſt never ſpeaketh in his own perſon (or of himſelf) when he ſpeaketh in the firſt perſon. This difficulty was diſcern'd by *Origen* diſcourſing of thoſe words of S. *Peter*; *The Scripture muſt be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghoſt foreſpake by the Mouth of* David *touching* Judas; *his Biſhoprick let another take.* (u) *If it is our Saviour* (ſaith he) *that ſpeaketh theſe words, how is it that* Peter *ſaith, The Scripture muſt be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghoſt foreſpake by the Mouth of* David? *Is this the thing, we ſhould learn from hence, that in the Prophets the Holy Ghoſt perſonateth? And if it perſonateth God, it is not God that ſpeaketh, but the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh in the perſon of God. And if it perſonateth Chriſt, it is not Chriſt that ſpeaketh, but the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh in the perſon of Chriſt.* Origen might have ſaid, that the Spirit ſpeaking is the ſame thing as the Inſpiration ſpeaking; that the Inſpiration ſpeaking is the ſame thing as God or Chriſt ſpeaking by Inſpiration; that his ſpeaking by Inſpiration is ſpeaking by his Inſpiration-Virtue and Agency (Real and Perſonal) which the Holy Ghoſt is; and that although the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon, yet he is ſuch a kind of Perſon, as that it doth not belong to him, to ſpeak in his own Perſon, but in the Perſon of God or Chriſt (as will hereafter appear;) and by this *Origenical Proſopopæia* the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt is not injur'd. For this *Origenical Proſopopæia* is not like the common Rhetorical Proſopopæia, which is deſtructive to the Perſonality of the Holy Spirit, as it is made uſe of by the Followers of *Socinus*, who ſuppoſe the Holy Ghoſt to be meerly *a Power*, *Virtue* or *Efficacy* of God, *a quality* and *unſubſtantial* kind of thing. On the contrary, we aſſert a certain Perſonality of the Holy Spirit, which we ſuppoſe, to be clearly notic'd in the New Teſtament.

2. 7,
17, 29.
3. 6,
22.

V. The Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt appeareth from our Saviour's Notices of him, *Joh.* 14. 26. *The Comforter* (or Advocate) *which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my Name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance.* Joh. 15. 26. *When the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtifie of me.* Joh. 16. 7, 8, 13, 14, 15. *It is expedient for you, that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will ſend him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the World of Sin, and of Righteouſneſs, and of Judgment. When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth: for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf; but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak: and he will ſhew you things to come. He ſhall glorifie me; for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.* In theſe Diſcourſes of our Saviour his deſcriptive Notices of the Holy Spirit are by perſonal Names, Offices, Attributes and Operations, which are plainly Notices of his Perſonality. *He ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf* (ſaith our Saviour,) and what can *He* and *Himſelf* ſignifie but a Perſon? Speaking of τὸ πνεῦμα τ̃ ἀληθείας (*the Spirit of Truth*) which is of the Neuter Gender, our Saviour doth not ſay, when it ſhall come, but ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τ̃ ἀληθείας, *when he cometh, the Spirit of Truth*; which would not be good *Grammar* and *Syntax*, nor an agreeable Expreſſion, if the Holy Ghoſt was not a Perſon; of an Imperſonal Quality or Energy it would be intolerably incongruous, to ſay (as our Saviour doth of the Holy Ghoſt) *he ſhall be ſent, he ſhall come, he ſhall hear, he ſhall ſpeak* (receive from one and communicate to another by way of hearing and ſpeaking) *he ſhall reprove, he ſhall inſtruct, he ſhall teſtifie*; for theſe and ſuch more are plainly perſonal Actions. An Office alſo is proper to a Perſon, and this our Saviour aſſigneth to the Holy Ghoſt; for he is appointed to be the Chriſtian's *Teacher*, and *Guide*, and *Comforter* (as the word παράκλητος properly ſignifieth, and as ſeveral of the Ancients render it,) our Saviour promiſeth them *another Comforter*, ἄλλον ὡς ἐμὲ, *another ſo as I am*, as S. *Chryſoſtom* well expoundeth his words. But the word παράκλητος ſignifieth alſo *an Advocate* (one that patronizeth another, pleadeth and maintaineth his Cauſe:) So the Holy Ghoſt was ſent (according to our Saviour's Notices of him) to be Chriſt's and the Chriſtians Advocate, to plead and maintain their Cauſe againſt their Adverſaries, that accus'd and perſecuted them; *even the Spirit of truth, whom the World cannot receive, becauſe it ſeeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and ſhall be in you,* Joh. 14. 17. The Holy Spirit is of kind and quality Holy, an Alien from and contrary to the World, and ſo the World is to him; not one of the World's Acquaintance, but peculiarly one of the Regenerate Chriſtian's Acquaintance; thus the Holy Spirit is notic'd by our Saviour; therefore he is deſcrib'd, not as a meer Quality, but as a Perſon of Quality. As he is the Chriſtians, ſo he is alſo Chriſt's Advocate, ſent and appointed, to plead his Cauſe againſt the World's Criminations and Tyranny, to teſtifie of the truth of his Meſſias-ſhip (as a convincing Evidence,) is by Office Chriſt's *Witneſs*, and therefore is a Perſon, as the other Witneſſes of Chriſt were, with whom he is conjoyn'd, *Joh.* 15. 26, 27. *He ſhall teſtifie of me, and ye alſo ſhall bear witneſs.* He doth not come of himſelf, (but is ſent, deputed and appointed,) nor ſpeak of himſelf (without antecedent Notice or Inſtruction from another,) but he ſpeaketh what he heareth (what is notic'd unto him) and receiveth the things of Chriſt, which he communicateth to his Apoſtles; therefore he is Chriſt's Agent and his Legate, and conſequently he is a Perſon. Nor can our Lord's Diſcourſe be expounded by *a Proſopopæia* (attributing to a meer Energy all the Properties and Deſcriptive Notices of a Legate) without Ineptitude intolerable.

Notandum Dei ſpiritui qui eſt παράκλητος *opponi ſpiritum malignum qui eſt* κατήγορος, *&* *ſic dicitur* Apoc. 12. 10. Grot. Not. in Joh. 14. 16

VI. The Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt appeareth from the Apoſtle's Notices of him; for when S. Paul ſaith, τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, *the things*

1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11, 12,

(u) Πῶς οὖν, εἰ ὁ Σωτήρ ἐστιν ταῦτα λέγων, φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος, δεῖ πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν, ἣν προεῖπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαβίδ; μήποτε οὖν διδασκόμεθα ἐνταῦθα πανταχοῦ προσωποποιεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις· καὶ ἐὰν προσωποποιήσῃ τ̃ Θεὸν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ λαλῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ λαλεῖ· καὶ ἐὰν προσωποποιῇ τ̃ Χριστὸν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ λαλῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλεῖ. Philocal. c. 7.

of God knoweth none but the Spirit of God, he plainly attributeth Knowledge and Underſtanding to the Holy Spirit, and the term οὐδεὶς, ſheweth, that he ſpeaketh of Perſons, and that the Holy Spirit belongeth to and is comprehended under the Genus of Perſons, and of Perſons diſtinct from God in the ſtrict Acceptation. For it is a Vanity, to argue (*w*) as ſome are prone to do, that if no Perſon knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God, then the Father and the Son are excluded; for the Apoſtle conſidereth the Spirit of God as diſtinct from God in the ſtrict Acceptation (that is, from the Holy Government in the ſtrict Acceptation) and touching all Perſons diſtinct from God in the ſtrict Acceptation he pronounceth, *that none of them knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God*. But touching the Spirit of God the Apoſtle affirmeth, that he knoweth the things of God, and can and doth reveal them; and this he affirmeth very plainly. For he compareth the Spirit of a Man and the Spirit of God, and affirmeth, that as (and in the ſame Senſe that) *the Spirit of a Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſo the Spirit of God knoweth the things of God.* He affirmeth it again, when he ſaith, *the Spirit ſearcheth all things* (penetrateth to the knowing them) *yea even the deep things of God.* Which words cannot be rightly expounded by a *Metalepſis* in this manner; *the Spirit is ſaid to ſearch the great myſterious things, becauſe he cauſeth Men to inveſtigate them*; for as theſe words are part of the Apoſtle's Reaſoning about the Holy Spirit, ſo they are manifeſtly his Reaſon, why the Holy Spirit revealeth the great myſterious things; and the Senſe of them is, *the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God, and therefore can and doth reveal them.* His Knowledge and Underſtanding is conjoin'd with Will and Affection; for *Will* the Apoſtle attributeth to the Holy Spirit, when to his Enumeration of ſupernatural Gifts (Gifts of the Spirit) he ſubjoineth 1 *Cor.* 12. 8,--11. *All theſe worketh that one and the ſelf-ſame Spirit, dividing to every Man ſeverally as he will.* His diſtribution of ſupernatural Gifts is from his own Volition (which ſpeaketh him a Perſon;) the Apoſtle alſo deſcribeth the Holy Spirit as an Agent of the Holy Inſpirations, and he is ſollicitous, that they ſhould be conſider'd as iſſuing *from one and the ſelf-ſame Spirit:* But if the Holy Spirit is not a Perſon, there is no reaſon, why as great a diverſity of Holy Spirits might not be acknowledg'd, as there is diverſity of Inſpirations, Afflations and Energies. But although there are diverſities of *Gifts* and *Operations*, yet there is but one and the ſelf-ſame Spirit (which therefore is not a meer Operation) and to this Holy Spirit the Holy Apoſtles attribute, *Act.* 5. 9. the Affection of Anger (he may be tempted or provok'd, which is incompetible to a meer Energy or Virtue) the Affection of Grief or Diſplicence, *Eph.* 4. 30. (and who can grieve a meer Virtue or Efficacy?) and how is it poſſible, *to lye unto* or go about to deceive a meer Energy or Power, that is incapable of underſtanding and judging? *Act.* 5. 3.

(w) *Crellius de uno Deo. l.* 1 *S.* 3. *c.* 14.

VII. The Perſonality of the Holy Spirit appeareth from the preſcript form of Baptiſm, and other Parallel places of the New Teſtament, for the form of Baptiſm preſcrib'd by our Saviour ſheweth, that there is a Ternary or Trinity in the Chriſtians Holy Sovereignty or Godhead, that theſe are the Imperial Party or of the Imperial Eſtate in the Kingdom of God (the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial) whereof Chriſtians become the Citizens and Subjects by their Baptiſm. They are Baptiz'd in the Name of every one of theſe three, as Diſciples and Religioniſts are Baptiz'd in the Name of the Perſon, to whom they become Diſciples and Religioniſts. 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. The Holy Ghoſt therefore (in whoſe Name they are Baptiz'd) is a Perſon, whoſe Diſciples and Religioniſts they become by Baptiſm: But ſo as primarily and immediately to be Chriſt's Diſciples and Religioniſts, ſecondarily and conſequentially the Holy Ghoſt's Diſciples and Religioniſts. Being in ſuch ſenſe Baptiz'd in his Name, and becoming (ſo far as is competible to him) his Diſciples and Religioniſts, they avow his Authority, his Superiority of Relation, his ἀξιωματικὴν προστασίαν, *honourary prefectſhip* which he hath as to themſelves and the Church; they enter into Covenant with him, own him for their Subrector (a kind of Sub-rector, and ſuch a Subrector which is of the Godhead) all which Notices of the Holy Ghoſt and of our Religion demonſtrate, that he is a Perſon. The form of Baptiſm ſheweth his Conſortſhip with the Father and the Son (as a Collegue) in the Holy Sovereignty and Government of Chriſtians (who are the Creature or Subject-party in the Kingdom of God) in the Benefits which they receive from this their Holy Sovereignty, in the Duties alſo which they owe unto it; and this Conſortſhip plainly proveth his Perſonality. It would be extremely incongruous, to join him with the Father and the Son (who are manifeſtly Perſons) in the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, if he was not a Perſon, and it would be extremely needleſs and ſuperfluous. For he that believeth and profeſſeth the Father or the Son, doth by ſo doing ſufficiently believe and profeſs his divine Virtue and Power; he that ſubjecteth himſelf to the Father or the Son, doth by ſo doing ſufficiently ſubject himſelf to his divine Virtue and Power: As he that acknowledgeth the Sovereignty of a Prince, doth by ſo doing ſufficiently acknowledge his Sovereign Virtue and Power. If therefore the Holy Ghoſt is nothing but the Sovereign Virtue and Power of God, this is ſufficiently acknowledg'd in the acknowledgment of the Father and the Son: And as it would be thought an abſurdity and an extravagance, for one that hath made an acknowledgment of the Sovereignty of a Prince, to be called to make a diſtinct acknowledgment of his Sovereign Virtue and Power: So after an acknowledgement of the Father and the Son to be called, to make a diſtinct acknowledgment of the Holy Ghoſt, muſt be thought abſurd and extravagant, if he is nothing but the Sovereign Virtue and Power of God. Our Saviour might as reaſonably appoint, that we ſhould be Baptiz'd in the Name of the Sovereign Goodneſs and Holineſs of God as of his Sovereign Virtue and Power; and conſequently if the Holy Ghoſt is nothing but that Sovereign Virtue and Power, his Inſtitution of Baptiſm muſt be thought extremely abſurd and incongruous. And we may juſtly ask touching the Holy Ghoſt, what doth he here in the Buſineſs of our Confederating with the Chriſtian Sovereignty, if he is not a Perſon of the Chriſtian Sovereignty? Why is he rank'd with Perſons, if he is altogether Heterogeneous and no Perſon? Why is he rank'd with Divine Perſons, that muſt be ador'd, if he is incapable of any Adoration? And if he is incapable of any Adoration, why is it, that he is ſo propos'd in Baptiſm, as that unavoidably he muſt be ador'd? For it is impoſſible, that an intelligent and pious Perſon ſhould be Baptiz'd in his Name without doing him ſome act of Adoration. His Conſortſhip with other Divine Perſons that muſt be ador'd, appeareth not only in the form of Baptiſm, but in divers other places of the New Teſtament, wherein he is one of the Enumeration of a Ternary, which is in the Chriſtian Sovereignty contradiſtinct to the Creature-party in the Kingdom of God. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Ye are ſanctified, ye are juſtified in the Name of the Lord Jeſus and by the Spirit of our God.* 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. *Now, there are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit. And there are differences of adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord. And there are diverſities of operations, but it is the ſame God, which worketh all in all.* 2 Cor. 13. 13. *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all.* Eph. 3. 18. *Through Chriſt we have an acceſs by one Spirit unto the Father.* Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body and one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all.* Three Divine Witneſſes our Saviour ſpeaketh of, which can be no other than three Divine Perſons. *Joh.* 8. 18. *I am one that bear Witneſs of my ſelf, and the Father that ſent me, beareth Witneſs of me.* Joh. 15. 26. *The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtifie of me.* Agreeably to our Saviour his belov'd Diſciple ſpeaketh of three Divine Witneſſes of Chriſtianity. 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt.* Some reaſon there is, to doubt of the Authentickneſs of this place, the Objections againſt it are not inconſiderable: But the Arguments for it are ſtronger than the Objections againſt it. The principal Arguments for its Authentickneſs are its exact Agreement with the Senſe of our Saviour, with S. *John*'s both Senſe and Phraſe, with the Context both Antecedents and Conſequents, with the form of Baptiſm, and with the Senſe of the Primitive Chriſtians, who were manifeſtly Trinitarians. Accordingly this Verſe is cited (x) by *Tertullian* and S. *Cyprian*, which ſheweth, that it was in the ancient Copies of the *African* Churches. But many of the ancient Fathers knew nothing of it, which ſheweth, that it was wanting in the ancient Copies of many other Churches as it is wanting in the *Syriac*, *Arabic* and *Æthiopic* Verſions. Which difference amongſt the ancient Copies muſt be thought caſual, not wilful and out of deſign, becauſe it was to no purpoſe. The Verſe therefore muſt be thought to have been caſually omitted, not inſerted; for it could not be inſerted but wilfully and out of deſign. And if it was not inſerted, it ought to be retain'd, and to be acknowledg'd genuine, not ſuppoſitious. Hitherto we have argu'd for the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt only from particular places of the New Teſtament: But the cleareſt and fulleſt demonſtration of it will be a Deſcription of the Nature of the Holy Spirit in the next Section.

(x) *Tertull. adv. Prax. c.* 25. *S. Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. c.* 4.

SECTION IV.

Of the Holy Spirit as it is Spiritual-vital formally and Efficient-cauſally, or as it is Vital-ſanctity in it ſelf and to us.

I. AS there are ſeveral Eſſentialities of a Man and a Chriſtian (without which he cannot be a Chriſtian in the Plenary Senſe:) So *the Spirit* without ſeveral Eſſentialities cannot be the Spirit in the Plenary Senſe of the Science of Sanctity. For it cannot be *the Spirit* without *Inviſibility*, which our Saviour ſignifieth by reſembling it to the *Wind*, which produceth very great and ſenſible Effects, and the force of it is very ſenſibly felt, yet cannot be ſeen by the Eye of Man. *Joh.* 3. 8. and becauſe (y) *the World regardeth only the things that are ſeen*, therefore he ſaith of the Spirit of truth, *the World cannot receive him* (for it regardeth not, mindeth not, nor affecteth the receiving him) *becauſe it ſeeth him not.* Joh. 14. 17. The Spirit cannot be the Spirit without *Operation.* (z) *For in all Languages the Name Spirit denoteth Motion and Agitation or the cauſe of it*; and therefore denoteth Operation. Nor can the Spirit be the Spirit, unleſs it be an operative unbodily kind of Virtue. (a) *For that is the Spirit, which moveth the Animal.* The Spirit muſt be an Energy, a Superlative and Creature-tranſcendent Energy, or elſe it cannot be the Spirit. (b) *The Holy Scripture every where attributeth Energy to the Spirit, whence the Spirit is called the Power of the higheſt.* The mighty Energy of this Divine Spirit was ſignified by *the ruſhing mighty Wind on the day of* Pentecoſt, and the appearance of *flaming Fire* that accompany'd it (Fire being of all things corporeal the moſt Energetical) and by *John the Baptiſt*'s Character of our Saviour, *he ſhall Baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire* (*Spiritu qui eſt veluti ignis quidam Spiritualis*) Matth. 3. 11. Act. 2. 2, 3. So ſome Expoſitors think, that this Divine Spirit is called *the Spirit of Judgment and of Burning*, Iſa. 4. 4. but it is more probable, that in this place of the Prophet the Spirit ſignifieth the Spirit that God *conſtitutively* is, which is a Spirit of punitive Severity, and was to the improbous Jews both in the times of the Old and New Teſtament in ſuch Senſe *a Spirit of Judgment and of Burning*. But to this Divine Spirit which God *communicatively* is, the Name of the *Spirit of Burning* is very accommodate, to ſignifie the holy Incitations and Ardours which it enkindleth, the mighty Energy and purifying Virtue thereof, by Reaſon whereof our Saviour (who diſpenſeth it) is *as a Refiner's Fire to purifie the Sons of Levi.* Malach. 3. 3. Which Energy of this Divine Spirit is *Vital* or *Vivificative*, otherwiſe it could not be *the Spirit*; for Vivification is from a Spirit both in Nature and in Religion. The one is called by *Irenæus* (c) *afflatus Vitæ qui animalem efficit hominem*, the other *Spiritus vivificans, qui ſpiritalem efficit eum.* The Spirit quickneth unto Spiritual Life, and therefore is *Spiritual-vital* or *Vital-ſanctity*, which is the grand Eſſentiality of

(y) *Grot.* not in *Joh.* 14. 17.

(z) *Nam nomen Spiritus, ait S. Thomas, in rebus corporeis impulſionem quandam & motionem ſignificare videtur.* Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 12. S. 6 *In omnibus linguis vocabulum Spiritus, Ruach, πνεῦμα, generaliter ſignificat vel motum & agitationem, vel naturam ſeu cauſam quamcunque agitantem & moventem.* Melanchon. Exam. Theol. p. m. 190.

(a) Τὸ πνεῦμα γὰρ κινεῖ τὸ ζῶον. V. Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 165.

(b) *Paſſim S. Scriptura Spiritui tribuit* τὸ ἐνεργητικὸν, *hinc idem Spiritus vocatur* δύναμις ὑψίστου. Grot. Not. in Matth. 12. 28.

(c) L. 5. c. 12.

it. For it cannot be *the Spirit*, unleſs it is *that Spirituality*, which is the genuine Sanctity, and which this Name *the Spirit* ſignifieth in the New Teſtament. Which Spirituality is Vital Sanctity: This therefore is that which the Holy Spirit is.

II. The Spirit is confronted and oppos'd to *the Letter* and to *the Fleſh*, which ſpeaketh it to be *Spiritual-vital* or *Vital-ſanctity* in it ſelf and to us. For the Apoſtle oppoſeth τὸ πνεῦμα & τὸ γράμμα, *the Spirit and the Letter*, meaning by the one the Goſpel-religion, and by the other the Law-religion. (*d*) For *Moſes* brought us not τὸ πνεῦμα, *the Spirit*, ἀλλὰ γράμματα, *but only dead external* Letters. There is a wide difference therefore between theſe two Religions. (*e*) *This is the difference of the Old and New Teſtament; there the Law is written in Tables of Stone, here in the fleſhy Tables of the Heart; ſo that there a Man is made a Sinner by the Letter that killeth, here he is made a lover* (of God and Holineſs) *by the Spirit that quickneth into Spiritual Life.* To the one of theſe oppoſite Religions the Apoſtle attributeth *Oldneſs, the oldneſs of the Letter*, which is without the newneſs of Spiritual Life: To the other he attributeth *Newneſs, the newneſs of the Spirit*, which denoteth *Vital Sanctity*; for it ſignifieth *the newneſs of Spiritual Life.* As the Spirit is oppos'd to the Letter, ſo it is uſually confronted and oppos'd to *the Fleſh, and theſe are contrary the one to the other* (in their Inclinations and Deſires) as the Apoſtle ſaith. (*f*) *Lucta & bellum inter hæc eſt, qualis inter lucem & tenebras, inter aquam & ignem.* This contrariety between Fleſh and Spirit (which ſpeaketh them of a contrary Nature) infeſreth, that if the one of them is known, the Nature of the other connot be unknown, the Inveſtigation of the one of them is the Inveſtigation of both. Now, the *Fleſh* is manifeſtly of a Vital Nature, and ſo far as it muſt be mortified and crucified, it is of a criminal Vital Nature; therefore it is definitively *Vital Carnality and Wickedneſs.* Which alſo appeareth from the Works of it; for all poſitive Sin and Wickedneſs is the Luſt of it, it is Prolific and Parturient thereof. All the Sins that Men commit, are from the Appetites and Inclinations, the Motions and Suggeſtions thereof, and are for Fleſh-pleaſing. And if the Fleſh is definitively *Vital Carnality*, the Spirit muſt be of this definitive Notion *Vital Sanctity.* Which alſo appeareth from the Fruits of it; for the Fruits of the Spirit are ſo many Branches of Vital Sanctity; *Love, Joy, Peace, Long-ſuffering, Gentleneſs, Goodneſs, Faith, Meekneſs, Temperance*, Gal. 5. 22, 23. Divines look upon it as a thing indifferent, whether by the Spirit we underſtand *the Holy Spirit, or the New Nature implanted in God's Children* (the Spirit may well be underſtood, to ſignifie both of them:) But our Argument muſt be underſtood touching the Holy Spirit; which is the Spirit, that the Apoſtle certainly meaneth, when he ſaith, *if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the Law* (which diſpenſeth not the Holy Spirit.) *Gal.* 5. 18. *Rom.* 8. 14.

Rom. 7. 6. 2 Cor. 3. 6.

(d) S. *Chryſoſt. in* 2 *Cor.* 3. 6.

(e) *Hæc apparet diſtantia veteris & novi teſtamenti, quòd lex ibi in tabulis, hic in cordibus ſcribitur, ibique fiat prævaricator per occidentem literam, hîc dilector per vivificantem Spiritum.* S. Aug. de Spir. & lit. c. 25.

(f) *Pareus in Gal.* 5. 17.

III. The Spirit is the Efficient of the Chriſtians Regeneration, which ſpeaketh it to *be Spiritual-vital* or *Vital Sanctity* in it ſelf and to us. *That which is born of the Fleſh is* (live) *Fleſh, and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*, ſaith our Saviour. Agreeably whereto the Fathers ſay (*g*) *Spiritus plerunque ponitur pro gratia Spiritali, the Spirit for the moſt part is put for Spiritual Grace*, which is Vital Sanctity. S. *Baſil* ſaith (*h*) when we conceive ἐνεργουμένην χάριν, *Grace to be wrought in us, we ſay, that the Spirit is in us.* *Origen* ſaith of one, that liveth according to Virtue (*i*) ἀποφαινόμεθα πληροῦσθαι ἢ μετέχειν θείου πνεύματος, *we pronounce him to be full of, or to partake of a Divine Spirit.* (*k*) Divines ſay, *that the Apoſtle by the Spirit meaneth our new Nature*, which according to our Saviour is Spirit (Spiritual-vital) of the ſame Nature with the Holy Spirit, who therefore is Spiritual-vital in himſelf and to us. A new Nature is ingendred in Regenerate Souls, which is a Vital Nature and an Holy Vital Nature. Their new and divine Birth is their noble Birth (whereby they are well-born indeed) their holy kind of Generation and Birth (whereby they are born of the holy kind and are holy by Birth and by Kind, as ſome are *ſtirpe & ingenio bellicoſi*) their heavenly kind of Generation and Birth (whereby they are born of the Divine Family, and are of another kind from Worldly Men;) and as in our Natural Generation and Birth Natural Life is ingendred, ſo in this Spiritual Generation and Supernatural Birth Spiritual Life is ingendred by the Spirit of Life; (*l*) ζωὴ γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ ἄνωθεν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γέννησις, *for the Supernal Generation from God is Life.* Interiour Grace and Holineſs is a Vital Nature, the Fountain of Vital Acts; and if this Effect reſembleth the Cauſe, if our Regeneration is (*m*) *conformis ſuæ appropriatæ cauſæ ſpiritui ſancto, conformable to its proper cauſe the Holy Spirit*, this Holy Spirit muſt be in it ſelf Spiritual-vital, as our Saviour repreſenteth it, when he ſtileth it *a Well of Water ebullient* (and therefore living)) *Job.* 4. 14. *A Fountain of Rivers of living Water.* Joh. 7. 38, 39. The ancient Writers of the Church ſuppoſe (*n*) that the Water of Baptiſm is made Vital or Vivificative unto us by the Spirit. Which is no extravagant Conceit, if it be ſeparated from an extravagance, which ſome of them have combin'd with it, that this benefit of Baptiſm was prefigured by the Moſaic Spirit of God, which moved upon the face of the Waters. So the *Syrians* in their forms of Baptiſm are ſaid (*o*) together with the Father and the Son to have made mention of the Spirit that brooded upon the Waters.

(g) S. *Ambroſ. de ſp. ſanct.* l. 3. c. 12.

(h) *De ſp. ſanct.* c. 26.

(i) C. *Celſ.* l. 4. p. 164.

(k) *Nomine Spiritus intelligit Apoſtolus naturam reformatam, ſeu gratiam Regenerationis per Spiritum Sanctum.* Piſcator in *Ep. ad Gal.* c. 5. *In antitheſi carnis & ſpiritus, quoties de moralibus agitur, Spiritus vel donum Spiritus Sancti, vel partem hominis Spiritu Dei renatam, ſeu novum hominem ſignificat.* Pareus in Gal. 5. 16.

(l) *Macar. Hom.* 30.

(m) *Cajetan. in Tit.* 3. 5.

(n) Bp. *Taylor great Exemplar* p. 154--162.

(o) *Hen. Ariſtarch.* p. 76, 77.

IV. The Spirit as it is conſtitutive of the Regenerate Eſtate, appeareth, to be Spiritual-vital or Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us. For Mankind are diſtributed into two contrary Parties, Kinds and Families, *thoſe that are in the Fleſh* (*that are after it, and live after it*) *and thoſe that are in the Spirit* (*that are after it, and live after it.*) Rom. 8. 8, 9. *They that are in the Fleſh, cannot pleaſe God. But ye are not in the Fleſh, but in the Spirit, if ſo be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.* The Spirit is in Regenerate Chriſtians, and they are in the Spirit: So the uſual Phraſe of Scripture repreſenteth a mutual and reciprocal inexiſtence and indwelling of Chriſt and Chriſtians, and an ἀλληλουχία, *a mutual having each other.* Joh. 15. 4. *Abide in me, and I in you.* Joh. 6. 56. *He that eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me* *and I in him.* 1 Joh. 3. 24. *He that keepeth his Commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him.* 1 Joh. 4. 15. *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs, that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.* He is in Society with God, and God is in Society with him, which is a mutual ſociative Inexiſtence. But the Phraſe denoteth alſo a mutual vital Inexiſtence according to that of the Evangeliſt. *Mar.* 1. 23. and 5. 2. *There was in the Synagogue a Man in an unclean Spirit.* The Man was in an unclean Spirit, and an unclean Spirit was in him, there was a mutual Inexiſtence. So in our Unregeneracy the Fleſh is in us (predominantly) and we are in the Fleſh. In our Regeneracy, we are in Chriſt and Chriſt is in us, we are in the Spirit and the Spirit is in us, and the Apoſtle uſeth theſe Phraſes as ſignifying the ſame thing, *ye are in the Spirit, if ſo be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.* Regenerate Chriſtians are in the holy Spiritual Life, if the holy Spiritual Life is in them (which is a mutual Vital Inexiſtence) and if the Spirit is in them, the holy Spiritual Life is in them. If the Spirit is in them, they are in the Light and Life and Love of it (in that Vital Sanctity which is conſtitutive of their Regenerate Eſtate) *they dwell in Love, and dwell in God and God dwelleth in them.* 1 Joh. 4. 16. (p) *Quia hoc agit ſpiritus ſanctus in homine, ut ſit in illo dilectio & charitas, for this is the Effect of the Holy Spirit dwelling in a Man, the Divine Love and Charity is in him.* By its Inexiſtence the new Nature exiſteth in the Regenerate, they have their Life in the Spirit and *live according to God in the Spirit* (living the holy Spiritual Life) 1 *Pet.* 4. 6. The Spirit exiſteth in them as a Spiritual-vital Principle, which ſpeaketh him Spiritual-vital in himſelf and to them.

(p) S. Aug. Tract. 6 Expoſ. Ep. 1. Joan.

V. The Spirit as *Holy* appeareth, to be Spiritual-vital or Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us. For as *the Spirit of Power and of Love and of a ſound Mind* ſignifieth the Efficient of them: So upon this account (amongſt others) the Spirit is called Holy, becauſe he is the Efficient of Grace and Holineſs; which is a ſufficient Reaſon for denominating him *our Sanctifier*, as the Apoſtle repreſenteth him, when he ſaith of God, *Tit.* 3. 5. *He ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.* Rom. 15. 16. *That the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable being ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt.* 1 Cor. 6. 11. *Ye are ſanctified, ye are juſtified in the Name of the Lord Jeſus and by the Spirit of our God.* So the Holy Spirit is by the ancient Writers of the Church denominated (q) *ἡ ἁγιαστικὴ δύναμις, virtus ſanctifica, the ſanctifying Virtue or Power*, and this they account his *ὑποστατικὸς χαρακτὴρ, or perſonal Property*, whereby he is diſcriminated from the other Perſons of the Holy Trinity. And ſo our uſual Theology teacheth, that although all Operations *ad extrà* are common to the whole Trinity, yet Creation is peculiarly attributed to the Father, Redemption to the Son, Sanctification to the Holy Ghoſt. But againſt theſe uſual Maxims of Theology the Anti-Trinitarians object (r) that God and Chriſt are ſeveral times in Scripture ſaid to Sanctifie us, but the Holy Ghoſt is never ſaid to Sanctifie us (the Phraſe in Scripture is, that we are ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt) that ſuch a Partition of Works or Offices amongſt the Perſons of the Trinity is altogether an unſcriptural Imagination. And it muſt be acknowledged, that the Holy Scripture knoweth no ſuch Partition, yet nevertheleſs our *Creator*, our *Redeemer*, our *Sanctifier*, may ſerve for good diſtinctive Names of the Perſons of the Trinity, and are legitimate differencing Notices of them. For although God the Father (of whom are all things) is all theſe, *Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier*, yet the Father is peculiarly Creator, the Son is peculiarly the immediate Redeemer, and the Holy Ghoſt is peculiarly the immediate Sanctifier. The Holy Ghoſt is never ſaid to Sanctifie us, nor is he ever ſaid to Comfort us: Yet becauſe of the Comforts of the Holy Ghoſt he is rightly denominated *the Comforter*, ſo becauſe of the Graces of the Holy Ghoſt he is rightly denominated *the Sanctifier*. And if that Name is competible to him, it ſpeaketh his Perſonality, and that he is Spiritual-vital in himſelf and to us. His Vital Sanctity appeareth from his Vital Sympathy with and Complacence in Holineſs, and his Vital Diſplicence and Antipathy againſt Sin and Wickedneſs. For that there is in the Holy Spirit ſuch a Vital Sympathy and Antipathy appeareth from his delighting to inhabit Holy Souls (*talia Pectora quærit ille Spiritus*, as *Grotius* ſpeaketh) and from the annoyance which Sin and Wickedneſs is to the Holy Spirit, which driveth him away from his Habitation, *ὥσπερ καπνὸς περιστερὰς ϗ δυσωδία μελίσσας φυγαδεύει*, (as S. *Baſil* ſpeaketh) *as ſmoke and ill ſavour driveth away Doves and Bees.* This Argument may be illuſtrated from the Book of Wiſdom. *Ch.* 1. 5, 6, 7. *The Holy Spirit of Diſcipline will fly Deceit and remove from Thoughts that are without Underſtanding; and will not abide when Unrighteouſneſs cometh in. For Wiſdom is a loving Spirit: And will not acquit a Blaſphemer of his Words: For God is a Witneſs of his Reins, and a true beholder of his Heart, and an hearer of his Tongue. For the Spirit of the Lord filleth the World, and that which containeth all things hath knowledge of the Voice.* By the Spirit of the Lord that filleth the World is meant the Spirit which God *conſtitutively* is, who ſeeth and heareth all things and is privy to all the Wickedneſs of the Ungodly. From whence it followeth, *that the Holy Spirit of Diſcipline will fly from the Ungodly and will not abide there, where Unrighteouſneſs entreth*; for by the Holy Spirit of Diſcipline is meant the Holy Inſpiration of inſtructive Wiſdom conſider'd as the Inſpiration of God, who knoweth all the Wickedneſs of the Ungodly, and hath a Vital Antipathy againſt it. Therefore his Holy Inſpiration (called his Holy Spirit, *ch.* 9. 17.) muſt not abide in them, that are a noiſome diſguſted Habitation.

(q) Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 13. S. 21, 22.

(r) Crellius de uno Deo l. 1. S. 3. c. 8.

VI. The Holy Spirit as it is animative of Regenerate Chriſtians and of the whole Church appeareth, to be Spiritual-vital or Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us. For as there is an Analogy between Divine and Human things, ſo the Hypotheſis of a mundane Soul illuſtrateth the Nature of the Holy Spirit, which is as a Soul, that animateth, informeth, enliveneth and actuateth the whole Church of God, uniting all the Members thereof. (s) *Chriſt with his whole Church, whether that on Earth, or that which reigneth with him in Heaven, is one Perſon; and as there is one Soul which enliveneth the divers Members of the Body, ſo one Holy Spirit vegetateth and illuminateth the whole Church.* (t) *What the Soul is to the Body of a Man, that*

(s) *Chriſtus cum tota ſua Eccleſia, ſive quæ adhuc verſatur in terris, ſive quæ cum eo jam regnat in cœlis, una perſona eſt; & ſicut eſt una anima quæ diverſa corporis membra vivificat, ita totam ſimul Eccleſiam unus ſpiritus ſanctus vegetat & illuſtrat.* Gregor. M. Explan. 4. Pſal. pœnit. adv. 1.

(t) *Quod eſt anima corpori hominis, hoc eſt ſpiritus ſanctus*

the

corpori Chriſti quod eſt Eccleſia: hoc agit ſpiritus ſanctus in tota Eccleſia, quod agit anima in omnibus membris unius corporis. S. Aug. de Temp. Ser. 186.

the Holy Spirit is to the Body of Chriſt, which is the Church: the Holy Spirit doth that in the whole Church, which the Soul doth in all the Members of one Body. Chriſt's univerſal Church is one Body conſiſting of many united Members; and becauſe it is a Spiritual-living Body, it muſt be animated by a Spiritual-vital Principle, which is animative and formally vital (as well as efficient-cauſally) for it is as a Soul, and thoſe are formally live-natures that are animative; ſuch therefore is the Holy Spirit, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* The Univerſality of Regenerate Chriſtians are every one of them implanted and joyned into one Body in Baptiſm, by being made to drink into one Spirit, which animateth, enliveneth and actuateth the whole Body, and connecteth all the Members thereof. They are vitally united (which they could not be, if this divine animative univerſal Spirit is not formally vital) and every true Member of this Myſtical Body is *joyned unto the Lord*, the imperial head of it, and is one with him, not ſo as to be one Fleſh, but ſo *as to be one Spirit*, 1 Cor. 6. 16, 17. The Fornicator that is joyned to an Harlot is one with her as to the Fleſh of them both, and therefore ſo as to be one Fleſh: but he that is joyned to the Lord, is one with him as to the Spirit of them both, and therefore ſo as to be *one Spirit*: which Union is not an Union of Subſtance and Accidents, but of Subſtance with Subſtance, of Live-ſubſtance with Live-Subſtance; for ſuch is the Union of a Fornicator's Fleſh with the Fleſh of an Harlot; therefore ſuch is the Union of the Spirit of a Man with the Spirit of Chriſt; and conſequently the Spirit of Chriſt is a live-ſubſtance, as the Fleſh of a Fornicator and his Harlot is, and as the Spirit of a Man manifeſtly is. With great reaſon the Humane Soul (which animateth, guideth and governeth the Body) is thought a Vital Subſtance, and there is the ſame reaſon, why the Holy Spirit ſhould be counted a Vital Subſtance, which is to the Soul of Divine Believers what their Soul is to their Body, which is Life, and Sence, and Motion to them, and Vigour and Vivacity, which exciteth and encourageth them to all the Duties of Godlineſs, reſtraineth them from Sin and Error, filleth them with an holy Ardour and Alacrity, upholdeth and ſtrengtheneth them in their holy Courſe (whereby the ways of God become eaſie and connatural to them) they are led and acted by its Animation and Conduct, its holy Inſtinct and Suggeſtions in all the Circumſtances of their Life, and their Holineſs conſiſteth in being thus guided and animated by the Spirit of Holineſs.

VII. The Virtues, Duties and Comforts of Regenerate Chriſtians ſhew, that the Holy Spirit is Spiritual-vital or Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us. For as they are ſaid, to be thoſe that *are in the Spirit*, ſo their Virtue is ſaid to be *in the Spirit*, to ſignifie, that it is Vital Sanctity, *Rom.* 15. 30. *I beſeech you for the Lord Jeſus Chriſt's ſake, and for the love of the Spirit.* Col. 1. 8. Epaphras *declar'd unto us your love in the Spirit.* The Chriſtian's Love is ſaid, to be *in the Spirit*, to ſignifie, it is that, which is Vital Sanctity (the Life of Grace;) therefore the Spirit is Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us, as *Theodorus Studita* in his Hymn to the Holy Spirit ſaith, (u) Σὺ ζωὴ, ἔρως, φῶς, *Thou art Life, Love, Light.* (w) *The Life which the Spirit produceth* (ſaith S. *Baſil*) *is not ſeparated from it; but as the heat of Fire is, partly that which remaineth in it, and partly that which it communicateth to the Water or ſome ſuch thing: So the Spirit* αὐτὸ ϗ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν, *hath both Life in himſelf, and they that are partakers of him live divinely,* ζωὴν θείαν ϗ οὐράνιον κεκτημένοι, *poſſeſſing a Divine and Heavenly Life.* So the ancient Writers of the Church generally ſay, (x) that not only the Graces of Sanctification are produc'd in holy Souls by the Spirit, but the Spirit it ſelf (in the Subſtance and Perſon of it) dwelleth in them, is united to them, and is in them, *tanquam forma ſanctificans, an informing ſanctifying vital Form as it were.*

(u) Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 12. S. 2.

(w) S. Baſil. adv. Eunom. l. 5. p. 141.

(x) Petav. ſupr. l. 8. c. 4, 5, 6.

Chriſtians are injoyn'd, *to worſhip God in the Spirit*, to pray *in the Holy Ghoſt*, and *in the Spirit*, the meaning whereof is, that their God-ſervice muſt be *in Vital Sanctity*, which Vital Sanctity is not ſeparate from, but conjunct with *the Spirit it ſelf* (which ſheweth, that the Spirit is Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us;) for the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. *We know not, what we ſhould pray for, as we ought; but the Spirit it ſelf maketh Interceſſion for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that ſearcheth the Hearts, knoweth what is the Mind of the Spirit, becauſe he maketh Interceſſion for the Saints according to the Will of God.* Chriſtians pray by the Holy Spirit and cry Abba Father, *Gal.* 4. 6. *Rom.* 8. 15. He is their παράκλητος, as that word ſignifieth, an *Intreator* or *Interceſſour* (that maketh Intreaty or Petition for another;) for they breath, and ſigh, and cry in Prayer by him; he exciteth in them Holy Deſires (whereby they ask thoſe things that are pleaſing to God) thoſe Holy Deſires are called *the Mind of the Spirit*, which is ſaid, *to be known unto God*; therefore the Holy Spirit *hath a Mind* and a Mind in ſome ſort *diſtinct from God*, and conſequently is of a certain Perſonality: which alſo appeareth from the Interceſſion of the Holy Spirit, which is a Perſonal Action, and ſuch a Perſonal Action that cannot be attributed to God; for although the Spirit intercedeth for the Saints according to the Will of God, yet it cannot properly be ſaid, that God intercedeth for them by his Spirit; therefore in this Attribution of Interceſſion to the Spirit ſuch a Perſonal Action is attributed thereto, which is certainly his Perſonal Action and a manifeſt proof of his Perſonality, and conſequently *that he is formally Vital Sanctity.*

Phil. 3. 3. Eph. 6. 18. Jude 20.

Chriſtians are ſaid, to have their *Joy* and *Conſolation* in the Holy Ghoſt, which (at leaſt for the greateſt part of it) is ſuch Joy and Conſolation, as ſpeaketh the Holy Ghoſt, to be Spiritual-vital in himſelf and to them. For the Holy Spirit as the Fountain of Holineſs (the Health of the Soul) of all Divine Graces (that are ineffably comfortable) of Light, Life and Truth (touching which the *Egyptian* Prieſts ſaid, γλυκεῖα ἡ ἀλήθεια, *ſweet is Truth*) as a ſure guide (that keepeth us out of harm's way) as ſhedding abroad the love of God in our Hearts, giving us a ſenſe of his Paternal Favour (and that we are his Children) as cauſing us to love and fear him with a Filial Love and Fear, as giving peace and ſatisfaction of Conſcience (to the afflicted and diſconſolate for their Soul-intereſts) as ſaving us from the thraldom of Sin and Servile Fears (that have Torment) as ſuſtaining us in our Holy Courſe and in Doubts and Diſtreſſes, as inabling us to bear up under all Afflictions,

Rom. 14. 17. Act. 9. 31. Gal. 5. 22.

to confeſs the Truth in the Face of Death and Torments, and making a ſtate of Sufferings tolerable, ſweet, joyous and triumphant, as diffuſing an Heavenly Sweetneſs in the Soul (which none knoweth, but he that hath it) as making Death eaſie, and as being an earneſt of our Heavenly Inheritance, an antepaſt and prelibation of Heaven (Heaven-begun) is to us an Immenſity of *Spiritual* and *Vital* Conſolation. And becauſe it is (*y*) as an ebullient Well of Water, a live Spring of Spiritual Solace and Refeſhment (a living Fountain of the Water of Life) therefore it is Spiritual-vital in it ſelf and to us.

(y) S. Chryſoſt. in Act. Hom. 4. p. 631.

VIII. The ſuper-eminent Good which the Holy Spirit is, ſheweth, that it is Spiritual-vital or Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us; for in the New Teſtament it is ſtiled (z) *The Promiſe* and *the Spirit of Promiſe* as being the great and eminent Promiſe. Our Saviour counteth it, (*a*) *The Gift of God* (the ſuperlative tranſcendent Gift) a greater good than his bodily preſence (better want his Body than his Spirit) and the Apoſtle accounteth it nothing leſs than *the Bleſſedneſs promiſed to* Abraham, *Gal:* 3. 14. It muſt be counted therefore the chief of Bleſſings, the ſummity and top-flower of them, the Sovereign Good (*apex & faſtigium bonorum*) and not only one of the Saint of God-kind of Goods (in compariſon of which all the common mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies ought to be depreciated and trampled into the Dirt) but the ſummary and comprehenſion of the choice and ſaving kind of Goods (more eſpecially of the holy vital Goods) in which ſenſe ſome ancient Writers might juſtly call the Spirit, (*b*) *plenitudinem donorum Dei, the plenitude of the Gifts of God*; *divitias & promptuarium bonorum omnium donorum, the plenty and Store-houſe of all good Gifts.* S. *Auſtin* argueth (not amiſs) that the Holy Ghoſt is Charity, becauſe Charity is the greateſt Gift of God and ſuch is the Holy Spirit. Chriſtianity knoweth nothing higher, nothing better than the Holy Spirit: therefore it ſelf is glorious, the only Religion of Saving Grace, of Life and Salvation, becauſe it is the Diſpenſation of the Spirit, which ſanctifieth foul Sinners, reneweth in them the Divine Image, planteth a new Life in them that were dead, maketh them the genuine Saints and Sons of God, the holy Habitation of God (and therefore bringeth them the preſence and enjoyment of God) is the Kingdom of God to them (*for the Kingdom of Heaven is the communication of the Holy Spirit*, (*c*) ſaith the *Alexandrian Cyril*) the Seal of God, the Reſt of God, the Royal Unction, whence they derive their Spiritual Light and Wiſdom, their habitual Grace and holy Agency, their Ghoſtly Might and Strength, their Chriſtian Heroical Magnanimity, Fortitude and Patience, their Divine Conduct, their ſolid Comforts, well-grounded Peace, and ſublime Joy, the Inchoation of their Eternal Joy. But if devoid of the Holy Spirit, they could be no better than putrid noyſom Fleſh, *Animal having not the Spirit*, unable to do any holy Duty, uncapable of any holy Comfort, aliens from Chriſt and Chriſtianity, as Chriſtianity, if devoid of the Holy Spirit, would be an Alien from it ſelf, no Diſcipline of the New Man, no Religion of Regeneration; the Laws of it would be no more than a dead Letter, and the Sacraments of it but *the Fleſh* that profiteth nothing.

(z) Luk. 24. 49. Act. 1. 4. and ch. 2. 39. Eph. 1. 13.

(a) Luk. 11. 13. Joh. 4. 10. and ch. 16. 7.

(b) Petav. de Trin. l. 8. c. 3. S. 5.

(c) Ibid. c. 4. S. 13.

The ineſtimable Goods which the Holy Spirit is, are not confined to this Life, nothing below Divinity can reach them, nothing ſhort of Immenſity can fathom them, nothing leſs than Eternity can meaſure them; for Chriſtians in conformity to Chriſt ſhall be raiſed by it to Life Eternal. Chriſt was raiſed by *the Spirit of Holineſs*, Rom. 1. 4. which is ſo called, not only with reſpect to Interiour Holineſs, but alſo with reſpect to the Exteriour Holineſs of our Saviour's Perſon in his Heavenly Sacerdotal Condition, wherein he is perfectly holied (made perfectly Illuſtrious or Unvile) exempt from and beyond every thing that is Stain or Blemiſh, Pollution or Corruption, whatever may ſoil or diſparage his glorious Perſonage; being made *holy, harmleſs, undefiled, and wholly ſeparate from Sinners*, never to know Sin, or Sorrow, or Death any more, *Heb.* 9. 14. *Through the Eternal Spirit he offer'd himſelf without Spot to God*, becauſe thereby he was perfectly ſacrated or holied, raiſed to a ſacerdotal condition indeed, freed from all Stain and Defilement (to live in perfect Sanctity, Holineſs and Unvileneſs as God liveth) and in this ſenſe the Spirit was unto him *the Spirit of Holineſs*, as Holineſs ſignifieth, *Apoc.* 20. 6. *Bleſſed and holy is he, that hath part in the firſt Reſurrection* (ſuch are beatify'd and perfectly holied or made unvile) *on ſuch the ſecond death hath no power; but they ſhall be Prieſts of God and of Chriſt*, ſhall live in a Divine Sacerdotal Condition. In the ſame Senſe therefore that the Spirit was unto Chriſt, it will be to Chriſtians the Spirit of Holineſs; as *Polycarp* at his Martyrdom hop'd for a Reſurrection to Life both of Soul and Body, (*d*) ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου, *in the Incorruption of the Holy Spirit.* Chriſtians have their Reſurrection by the Holy Spirit, which will be alſo unto them in Life Eternal (where Joy and Comfort will be in an Eternal Spring and ever-ever flowing) a Fountain of Joy and Conſolation, according to our Saviour's Promiſe, *Joh.* 14. 16. *I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.* The Holy Spirit therefore is at the higheſt rate the Water of Life, *Living Water* (as our Saviour calleth it) and is in a plenary, not in a ſcanty diminutive Senſe *Spiritual-vital*; which it cannot be, unleſs it be Spiritual-vital in it ſelf and to us.

Rom. 8. 11.

(d) *Daille de rel. cult. object. l. 3. p. 78.*

We have now ſufficiently prov'd and illuſtrated the Subſtantiality and Perſonality of the Holy Spirit and this eminent Branch of its Idea (which is overlook'd in the *Socinian* Theology) that the Holy Spirit is *Spiritual-vital or Vital Sanctity in it ſelf and to us.* This agreement there is in the Idea of all the Perſons of the Holy Chriſtian Trinity; *The Father is Sanctity Vital, The Son is Sanctity Vital, The Holy Ghoſt is Sanctity Vital*; but the Holy Ghoſt is Vital Sanctity only as an *Inſpiration-virtue*, which is next to be conſider'd.

CHAP. II.

Sect. 1. *The Holy Ghoſt is no Political kind of Perſon. The meaning of the Aſſertion.* 2. *The firſt Argument to prove it.* 3. *A ſecond Argument.* 4. *A third Argument.* 5. *A fourth Argument.* 6. *A fifth Argument.* 7. *A ſixth Argument.* 8. *A ſeventh Argument.* 9. *An eighth Argument.* 10. *An Argument from the Objections againſt his Perſonality.* 11. *Further Objections againſt his Perſonality anſwer'd.* 12. *More Objections againſt it, with an Anſwer to them.* Sect. 2. *Of the Eternity and Unoriginateneſs of the Holy Spirit.* 1. *Its Exiſtence cannot be prov'd to be orignated.* 2. *Indications of the falſity of it.* 3. *The ſilence of the Scripture concerning it.* 4. *The Account which the Scholaſtic Theology giveth of it.* 5. *If his Exiſtence is originated, it muſt be by Generation.* 6. *Neither Generation nor Creation is competible to the Holy Ghoſt.* 7. *An originated Exiſtence repugnant to the Holy Ghoſt.* 8. *His Eſſentiality to the Godhead.* 9. *His Idea as to his Eſſence.* Sect. 3. *Of Creaturizing the Holy Spirit.* 1. *The Holy Spirit is one of the Trinity.* 2. *The Holy Spirit is in God* 3. *Is of God-Agency and Efficiency.* 4. *Of Creature-tranſcendent Properties.* 5. *Differences between Creatures and the Holy Spirit.* 6. *Of his Inhabitation of the People of God.* 7. *Sinning againſt the Holy Ghoſt proveth him to be no Creature.* 8. *So doth the Crime of* Ananias. 9. *Great Abſurdity to ſuppoſe him a Creature.*

SECTION I.

What kind of Perſon the Holy Ghoſt is, that he is no Political kind of Perſon.

I. FRom the Subſtantiality and Perſonality of the Holy Spirit we may not preſently infer, that he is an Imperial Eſtate, the Lord, the King, the Creator, Governour, Lawgiver and Judge of the World, the Citizens of whoſe Kingdom we ought to be as his Subjects and Servants, to whom we owe all the Service due unto God and all the Duties of Godlineſs; for theſe things are alien from the Scriptural Notices of the Holy Ghoſt, claſh with his Idea and are incompetible to his kind of Perſon, who is *no political kind of Perſon*. Political kind of Perſons are ſuch as are or may be *the Citizens of a Polity* either the ruling or the ruled; ſuch are God, Chriſt, Angels (good and bad) and Mankind; and theſe only we mean, when we commonly ſpeak of Perſons. But the Holy Ghoſt (that neither is, nor can be the Citizen of a Polity either the Imperant or the Subject-party) is no political kind of Perſon, his Perſonality is of another kind, and if we will call him by a Name agreeable thereto, he may be denominated (as being The holy Inſpiration-virtue in the perſonal acceptation) *An Agent-virtual or Ghoſtly Agent-kind of Perſon:* Which Idea of his Perſonality may be illuſtrated from ſome Notices of the Holy Spirit in the Scholaſtick Theology. (e) *The Name Spirit is of a peculiar Notion, ſo as to ſignifie that Subſtance, which illaps'd and inſinuated into the Minds of Men infuſeth into them the knowledge of hidden things, chiefly of things to come; which therefore the Greeks call Inſpiration, the Latins Inſpiration and Afflation: to both which words the ſame origin of Breath or Spirit amongſt the Greeks anſwereth; as amongſt the Latins Flation and Spiration are of the ſame ſignification.* The Name of the Holy Spirit therefore (which ſignifieth Inſpiration) denoteth nothing of political quality, but repreſenteth the Holy Ghoſt as *a Non-political* and only *an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon.* The God *Apollo* amongſt the Heathen was a great Inſpirer, ſo is the true God, and both are political kind of Perſons; but the Spirit of God which he inſpireth, and whereby he inſpireth, is ſaid to be, (f) *the very Energy of God it ſelf, a ſubſtantive and ſubſiſtent Energy, a living Energy and Virtue,* (g) *as an Odor of the Subſtance of the Son living and operative, the natural and ſubſtantial Virtue of the Son, the Spirit of the Mouth of God, his Virtue, a Virtue proceeding from the Father and the Son, a Subſtantial Virtue.* By all which Names and Notices the Holy Ghoſt is repreſented not as a Political, but as only an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon. So if we conſider the Holy Spirit as it is Spiritual-vital (or Vital Sanctity) in it ſelf and to us, it is ſtiled in this Theology, (h) *A certain natural and living Energy, and as we may ſo ſay, Quality of the Deity.* (i) *Velut qualitas divinitatis Filii, qualitas ſubſtantiæ Patris,* (k) ἡ ἁγιαστικὴ δύναμις, *the Sanctificative Virtue*; and theſe Notices repreſent him as only an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon or Ghoſtly Agent; which Non-political kind of Perſon may be competently illuſtrated by the *Ariſtotelians Intellectus agens*, of which a late Writer ſaith, (l) *Averroes and the Rabbins* (ſome of them) *ſuppoſe the* Intellectus agens *to be called the Holy Ghoſt.* And *Gr. Naz.* ſaith of the Gentiles, (m) *that they had an Imagination touching the Holy Spirit, calling it* τὸν θύραθεν Νοῦν, *the Intellect that cometh from without*, which is ſuppoſed to be the *Intellectus agens*, that irradiateth the Phantaſms and educeth the paſſive Intellect *de potentia in actum.* Various conjectures have been made touching this *Intellectus agens*, ſome ſuppoſe it the Mundane Soul, (n) *Averroes* and *Maimonides* ſuppoſe it that *Ariſtotelic Intelligence*, whereby the laſt and loweſt Orb is moved. But whatever may be thought of it, it may reaſonably be thought the reſemblance (not of a Political, but) of a meerly *Agent-virtual kind of Perſon*. And ſuch a Mundane Soul will be, if we ſuppoſe it beyond a Plaſtic Nature (as being intellective) yet on this ſide an Imperial Eſtate (not ſuch as the Platoniſts and Stoicks Mundane Soul which is an Imperial Eſtate;) for this Mundane Soul is no Citizen or Political, but only an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon. We may conceive in our Mind a mighty Polity conſiſting of Men as the Subject-party and of a Divine Sovereign as the Imperial Eſtate of it, and that this Divine Sovereign by an Univerſal Spirit which he communicatively is as his Ghoſtly Agent connecteth, inſpireth, animateth and animatively governeth the Subject-party of this mighty Polity, that this Univerſal Spirit is of all Inſpiration-virtue, is Intellective and Spiritual-vital as an Inſpiration-virtue, but is no Citizen, (neither a Subject nor a Sovereign of the Polity) but is only an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon; and ſuch is the Holy Spirit. A Perſon he is *ſui generis*, but ſuch a Perſon, that cannot be a Citizen, that is perſonal only as an Holy Inſpiration-virtue, that is, *intellective, volitive, animative, energetical, ſpiritual-vital*, but ſo as is proper for an Holy Inſpiration-virtue, not ſo as is proper to a Political Perſon. *Intellective* he is of the matters of the wonderful Wiſdom of the Holy Government (ſearching the deep things of God,) but he is not ſo intellective, as to be that wonderful Wiſdom. *Volitive* he is and ſo *Holy-volitive*, that his Inſpirations are according to the Will of God, and he willeth them ſo to be; but he is not ſo holy-volitive, as to make the Decrees and Appointments of God. *Animative* he is, but not as a Political Perſon, who may be called *A ſelf-animative, that is not an Extra-animative* (or animative of others as a Ghoſtly Agent:) but the Holy Ghoſt is ſuch an *Extra-animative*, and is not properly *a Self-animative*. *Spiritual-vital* he is (formally as well as efficient-cauſally) but not ſo as to be an *Holy Spiritual Liver* (in the uſual ſenſe of the Phraſe) as every Holy Political Perſon is. An *intelligent free Agent* he is, but as an *Agent-virtual*, not as a political kind of Perſon. Let us ſuppoſe, that the Imperial Eſtate of the Papacy is like the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, that the Papal Empire is like the true Catholic Church, and that the Pope's Holineſs communicatively is a Spirit, which is his Inſpiration-virtue and Ghoſtly Agent, which pervadeth, connecteth, inſpireth and animateth the whole Papal Empire; that this Univerſal Spirit is fitly called *The Spirit of Popery*, and is like to the Spirit of Sanctity. Touching this Spirit of Popery common Underſtanding will pronounce, that if there is in it all Inſpiration-virtue, and if it is as a Soul to the Papal Empire, it muſt be a Subſtance and a Perſon *ſui generis*; but it cannot be thought a political kind of Perſon; and the ſame Judgment muſt be made of the Holy Spirit, for it is plainly demonſtrable by many Arguments, that he is no political kind of Perſon.

(e) *Habet enim ſpiritus vox peculiarem quandam notionem, ut eam ſubſtantiam ſignificet, quæ illapſa inſinuataque animis hominum occultarum iis rerum notitiam infundit, maximè futurarum: quam Græci propterea* ἐπίπνοιαν *Latini inſpirationem afflatumque nominant. cui utrique vocabulo eadem apud Græcos* τῆς πνοῆς *vel* τοῦ πνεύματος *origo reſpondet: ſicut apud Latinos flare & ſpirare eandem habent ſignificationem.* Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 8. S. 19.

(f) Ἐνέργεια *ipſa Dei,* ἐνέργεια οὐσιώδης καὶ ἐνυπόστατος, ἐνέργεια ζῶσα. *Idem T.* 1. *l.* 5. c. 9. *S.* 1, 2.

(g) *Inſtar jucundi odoris qui ex Filio halat, & afflatur. Nam ut odor è flore tanquam è principio manat ac diffunditur: ſic è Filio Spiritus oritur. Eſt hic velut odor quidam illius ſubſtantiæ, vivens & efficax. viva virtus eſt ac divina natura. Spiritus ſanctus oris Dei ſpiritus vocatur. virtus ipſius eſt ſpiritus ipſius.* φυσικὴ καὶ οὐσιώδης τοῦ υἱοῦ δύναμις. *Idem de Trin. l.* 7. c. 5. *S.* 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12. *Ex patre & filio procedens virtus.* Ibid. c. 8. S. 6. Δύναμις οὐσιώδης. *Ibid. c.* 10. *S.* 3.

(h) Ἐνέργειά τις φυσικὴ καὶ ζῶσα, καὶ ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω ποιότης τῆς θεότητος. *Ibid. c.* 5. *S.* 12.

(i) *Ibid. S.* 8.

(k) *Ibid. c.* 13. *S.* 21.

(l) *Averrhoes & Rabbini Intellectum abſtractum* (*idem hic cum agente*) *ſeu Neſchamah ſciſcunt vocari ſpiritum S. ut me docuit Joſephus de Voyſin. Jac.* Thomaz. diſſ. 14. S. 164.

(m) *Or.* 37.

(n) *Scalig. exerc.* 307. *S.* 18. *Maimon. Mor. Nev. par.* 2. *c.* 4.

II. The Holy Spirit hath *no Throne, no Exteriour Houſe or Temple, no Court, no Attendants, no Hoſt or Army, no Imperial Chariot, no Scepter, no Crown, no Tribunal*; therefore he is no Political Perſon: for if he is a political kind of Perſon, he muſt be a political kind of Regial or Imperial Perſon, as God and the Son of God is: but this he cannot be without any of the Badges and Enſigns of a Perſon of ſuch Quality, and which are uſually in Scripture attributed to God and the Son of God, to denote them Perſons of ſuch Quality and Condition. For,

(1) To God a Throne is attributed (o) in the Prophetic Viſions of him both in the Old and New Teſtament, (p) in Devotional Hymns and Laudatory Deſcriptions of God, (q) in Notices of Heaven, *Jeruſalem*, and the Temple, which are called the Throne of God, (r) the Name of God is he that ſitteth upon the Throne. So to the Son of God (s) a Throne is attributed both in the Old and New Teſtament. To Kings or Secular Rulers a Throne is uſually attributed, *Job* 36. 7. *Prov.* 20. 8. *Jer.* 17. 25. To Eccleſiaſtical Rulers alſo Thrones are attributed, *Luk.* 22. 30. *Apoc.* 4. 4. And to the Archangels Thrones are attributed, *Col.* 1. 16. If to all political kind of Perſons that are ruling Powers the Scripture attributeth a Throne, what can be the reaſon, why it never attributeth a Throne to the Holy Ghoſt? doubtleſs the reaſon is, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is not ſuch a Political Perſon and Ruling Power to which a Throne belongeth, but is only an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon.

(2.) To God the Scripture attributeth an Exteriour Dwelling-houſe (his Temple and Sanctuary) for ſuch is Heaven, and ſuch was the Judaical Tabernacle and Temple (an umbratile Repreſentation of Heaven) the Seat of his Imperial Majeſty, wherein he reſided as the place of his reſidence, 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. and 30. 27. *Pſal.* 2. 4. and 33. 14. and 123. 1. *Pſal.* 11. 4. *The Lord is in his holy Temple, the Lord's Throne is in Heaven.* The Throne is the Seat of Government, whence all Acts of Government are diſpens'd, thence is the iſſuing out Laws and Commands, hearing Suppliants, determining Cauſes, decreeing Rewards and Puniſhments. So it is from Heaven, that God iſſueth forth Laws and Commands, *Heb.* 12. 25. in and from Heaven he heareth Prayers, *Pſal.* 20. 6. therefore all our Prayers and Adorations muſt be directed thitherwards; for praying to and worſhipping God is an addreſſing to him as on his Throne, *Heb.* 4. 16. On this Throne the Son of God ſitteth, as the Scripture repreſenteth him, to whom alſo it attributeth the ſame Tabernacle and Sanctuary, the ſame Exteriour Dwelling-houſe with God, *Heb.* 8. 2. and 9. 11. But to the Holy Ghoſt the Scripture never attributeth any Exteriour Dwelling-houſe, Tabernacle, Temple or Sanctuary (his only Dwelling-houſe is the Souls and Bodies of the Regenerate) which is a manifeſt Indication, that he is no political kind of Perſon.

(3.) Heaven is the Court as well as the City of the great King, deſcrib'd by analogy to the Courts of the Eaſtern Princes, adumbrated by the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, where God kept Houſe (all things were in it requiſite to a ſumptuous Regial Houſe and Houſekeeping) which Houſekeeping in a Mundane Temple was ſymbolical

and

(o) 1 *King.* 22. 19. 2 *Chron.* 18. 18. *Iſa.* 6. 1. *and* 66. 1. *Ezek.* 1. 26. *and* 10. 1. *Apoc.* 1, 4. 3, 21. 4, 2—10. 5. 1, 6, 7, 11, 13. 6, 16. 7. 9, 10, 11, 15. 8, 3. 12, 5. 14, 3, 5. 16, 17. 19, 4, 5. 20, 4, 11. 21, 5. 22, 1, 3.

(p) *Pſal.* 9. 4, 7. *and* 11. 4. *and* 47. 8. *and* 79. 2. *and* 89. 14. *and* 93. 2. *and* 103. 19. *Lam.* 5. 19.

(q) *Matth.* 5. 31. *and* 23. 22. *Heb.* 4. 16. *and* 8. 1. *and* 12. 2. *Iſa.* 66. 1. *Jer.* 3. 17. *and* 14. 21. *and* 17. 12. *Ezek.* 43. 7.

(r) *Apoc.* 4. 9, 10. *and* 5. 1, 7, 13. *and* 6. 16. *and* 7. 10, 15. *and* 21. 5.

(s) *Pſal.* 45. 6. *Iſa.* 9. 7. *Matth.* 19. 28. *and* 25. 31. *Luk.* 1. 32. *Heb.* 1. 8. *and* 8. 1. *and* 12. 2. *Apoc.* 3. 21. *and* 22. 3.

and figurative of his Houſe-keeping in Heaven, where he liveth in magnificence like himſelf, is ſerv'd in State and Honour, his Entertainment is Royal and he is royally attended. *Matth.* 26. 29. *Dan.* 7. 10. So the Son of God is repreſented as keeping Houſe in Heaven, making Royal Entertainment and having Royal Attendance. *Luc.* 22. 30. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7. *Apoc.* 19. 14. But touching the Holy Ghoſt, who ever heard of his keeping Houſe or Court? Of his making Royal Entertainment in an exteriour Palace or of his having Royal Attendants? Therefore he is no Political kind of Prince, Potentate or Perſon.

(4.) The whole World of Creatures are as Hoſts and Armies unto God (he as a Lord General ordereth and governeth them, draweth them forth and muſtereth them, ſummoneth them to a Rendezvous and Embattels them, as there is occaſion, *Iſa.* 40. 26.) to Old *Iſrael* he was their Military Lord and King, *the God of their Armies, the Prince of their Hoſt, and their Hoſt was the Hoſt of the Lord* (he reſided amongſt them in a Tent or Tabernacle as their Military King, walk'd in the midſt of their Camp, went out with their Hoſt, fought their Battels, and when they went out to Battel, he went before them in the Ark) whence his uſual honourary Name is *the Lord of Hoſts.* The Name is not competible to the Son of God, yet the Son is a certain Military Lord and King, that hath his Hoſt or Army (*Apoc.* 19. 14. *The Armies of Heaven follow him*:) But ſo is not the Holy Spirit of God, which hath no Hoſt or Army. God and the Son of God may properly be ſaid, to wage War againſt their Enemies: But this cannot be ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt. Nor doth the Holy Ghoſt iſſue forth his Orders to the Inferiour Creatures (which are called a great Army and the Lord's Army, *Joel* 2. 11.) to fight his Battels againſt his Enemies, as God and the Son of God doth. Nor are wicked Angels and wicked Men (which belong to God's Hoſt) imploy'd by the Holy Ghoſt in his Wars as his Agents and Executioners: But ſo they are imploy'd by God and the Son of God. *Iſa.* 10. 5, 6. and 13. 4. *Ezek.* 30. 24. 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. They are (t) τεταγμένοι ἐπὶ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν πραγμάτων, *ſet over and imployed in ſad and punitive Works and Miniſteries*, but not by the Holy Ghoſt. Nor are the Holy Angels imploy'd by the Holy Ghoſt, to bring Meſſages, to guide and defend the Juſt, to oppoſe the Enemies of the Church and the malice of evil Spirits, to diſpenſe Benefits to, and to execute Judgments upon the World. They are God's Hoſts, his attendant Train, that are rul'd and manag'd by him, receive and execute his Commands (*per miniſtros more potentiſſimi Regis omnia facit*, ſaith *Bonaventure*) and they are Chriſt's Hoſts (as will appear at the laſt Day, *Jude* 14.) But the Holy Ghoſt ſendeth forth no Angels, hath no attendant Train of them, doth not do any of his Works by their Miniſtry, nor hath he any Angelical Hoſt or Army. All which Notices diſcriminative of the Holy Ghoſt from God and the Son of God plainly demonſtrateth, that he is no Political kind of Prince or Perſon.

1 Sam. 17. 45. Dan. 8. 10, 11. Joſh. 5. 14.

(5.) Unto God the Old Teſtament uſually attributeth a Seat between *the Cherubims*, which Seat was as his Regial Throne, and repreſented him as the great King, the Lord of Hoſts reſiding amongſt the Holy Angels his Guard and Attendants (on the Right-hand and on the left) which were repreſented by the Cherubims. The Cherubims are called *the Chariot of the Cherubims.* 1 Chron. 28. 18. And in *Ezekiel* they appear in the form of a Chariot with Wheels (whence that Viſion is called by the Jews *Mercavah*) and ſo the Pſalmiſt calleth the Holy Angels. *Pſal.* 68. 17. *The Chariot of God are twenty thouſand, even thouſands of Angels.* The words immediately following in the next Verſe the Apoſtle applieth to Chriſt's triumphant Aſcenſion (*when he aſcended on high, he led captivity captive.* Eph. 4. 8.) He ſuppoſeth therefore, that the Holy Angels are an Imperial Chariot unto Chriſt, as they are unto God (and that the Pſalmiſts words are meant of both) both the Imperial Perſon of the Father and the Son reſideth among them, ruleth and manageth them and imployeth them in the Works of his Providence. But to the Holy Ghoſt the Scripture never attributeth an Imperial Angelical Chariot or any thing of that Nature.

(6.) The Son of God is deſcrib'd with his *Bow*, with his *Sickle*, with his *Sword*, with his *Crown* and *Scepter*, with many *Crowns*, (Enſigns of his Regality, Spiritual Huſbandry, Judicial Severity, Military Prowefs aud Victoriouſneſs) with his Tribunal alſo or Judgment-Seat. *Rom.* 14. 10. And why is it, that no ſuch things as theſe are ever attributed to the Holy Spirit, but becauſe they are incompetible to him, as being no Political kind of Perſon or Potentate?

Apoc. 2. 12. and 6. 2 and 14. 14. and 19. 12.

III. Not any Authority proper to a Political Potentate, or any proper Act thereof is ever attributed in Scripture to the Holy Spirit. Not the Act or Authority of remitting and retaining Sins, of juſtifying and condemning, of bleſſing and blaſting us, of ſaving and deſtroying us, not the Law-giving Authority, not the Authority of ſitting in Judgment upon us and of diſtributing Rewards and Puniſhments. For whoever heard, that the Holy Ghoſt is Judge both of quick aud dead, that he will Crown the Righteous with Immortality and Sentence the Wicked to eternal Fire? To God we rightly attribute univerſal Dominion and Sovereignty (over Heaven, Earth and Hell,) the fulleſt height of Dominion and Sovereignty, all Creature-tranſcendent Dominion and Sovereignty, the Dominion of an univerſal Providence, and irreſiſtible All-diſpoſing Authority, a Monarchic Empire of commanding Power over all, and therefore Stile him *the moſt high God, the bleſſed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, the Lord of Hoſts, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, Omni-imperial or the Almighty* (in point of Right and of Might) *whoſe Kingdom is an everlaſting Kingdom and his Dominion endureth throughout all Ages.* But none of theſe Attributions are ever made in Scripture to the Spirit of God, and it would be an abſurdity claſhing with Piety, to ſay to the Holy Ghoſt, as *David* doth unto God. *Thine O Lord, is the Greatneſs, and the Power and the Glory, and the Victory and the Majeſty: For all that is in the Heaven and in the Earth is thine; thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as Head above all. Both Riches and Honour come of thee, and thou reigneſt over all, and in thine Hand is Power and Might, and in thine Hand it is to make Great, and to give Strength unto all.* So to the Son of God we rightly attribute an univerſal Lordſhip and Domination, which may juſtly be ſtiled Plenary, full Juriſdiction and free Empire (compriſing a right of diſpoſing of Affairs in

1 Chron. 29. 11, 12.

(t) *Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 378.*

in a ſupreme way of Regency, and of all Perſons by way of Precept and of Power, a Right of conſtituting Principalities and Powers *Dominium vitæ ac necis*, even as to Souls) whence he muſt be intituled *Lord of all*, *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*: But theſe Attributions of Political Potentacy are as incompetible to the Holy Spirit, as this other *the Imperial Head of the Church*. For Chriſt is Sovereign Lord both of the World and of the Church, and as he is Sovereign Lord of the Church, he is both an Head of *Government* and an Head of *Influence*: But the Holy Spirit is ſo far from being ſuch, that it is the Influence, which this Imperial Head deriveth upon the Body, and is therefore called *the Spirit of Chriſt*, becauſe he is the Owner, Donor and Diſpenſer of it. In his Kingdom and the Adminiſtration of his Government the Holy Spirit hath not the place and authority of a Political Potentate, nor doth any proper Act of ſuch a Potentate (in enacting Laws, protecting Subjects, exerciſing Judgment over them) but is only an Inſpiration-virtue and ghoſtly Agent.

A Divine obſerveth (*u*) *remittere peccata rarò & obſcurè ſp. ſancto attribuitur*, *the remitting Sins is rarely and obſcurely attributed to the Holy Spirit*. But this Obſervation is not well made; for he ought to have ſaid; that the remitting Sins is never attributed to the Holy Spirit, who throughout the Bible is never ſaid, to Forgive us our Sins. Yet ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church (*w*) pretend, to prove the Deity of the Holy Spirit by this Argument, *becauſe he forgiveth Sins*. To prove, that the Holy Spirit forgiveth Sins, they alledge, *Joh.* 20. 22, 23. *He breathed on them and ſaith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghoſt. Whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.* Which words prove, that the Apoſtles were qualified for the diſcharge of their Apoſtolic Office by receiving the Holy Ghoſt, and that by this their Apoſtolic Office they had a Power of remitting Sins: But of the Holy Ghoſts remitting Sins the Text ſaith nothing. Another Argument they uſe, to prove, that the Holy Ghoſt remitteth Sins; for Sins (ſay they) *are remitted in Baptiſm, wherein is the operation of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt.* But the Holy Scriptures allot to the Holy Ghoſt another operation in Baptiſm than that of remitting Sins. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Tit.* 3. 5. As Sins are not remitted by him; nor in his Name, ſo (which is of good Remark) Miracles are ſaid to be wrought in the Name of God and Chriſt, but not in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt.

(u) Baxter Meth. Theol. Par. 3. p. 349.

(w) Petav. de Trin. l. 1. c. 14. S. 20. & l. 2. c. 16. S. 4.

IV. The Holy Ghoſt is not any Political perſonal Relation (or Relative) unto God or Chriſt; therefore he is no Political kind of Perſon. The Greeks ſay of the Latin Church (*x*) that by ſuppoſing the Holy Ghoſt, to proceed from the Son, they make him the Nephew (or Grandſon) of the Father, which they account a groſs abſurdity. And they tell us of a certain Hereſie called υἱοπατρίας, which was therefore an Hereſie, becauſe it affirm'd, that the Son was the Father of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit was the Nephew of the Father. But other Hereticks are ſaid, thus to have argued againſt the Deity of the Holy Spirit. (*y*) *Si ſpiritus ſanctus creatus non eſt, aut frater eſt Dei patris, aut patruus eſt unigeniti Jeſu Chriſti; aut filius Chriſti eſt, aut nepos Dei patris, aut ipſe filius eſt Dei.* Every one of theſe Political perſonal Relations they accounted a groſs abſurdity, as the Catholicks alſo did, who ſaid of the Holy Spirit (*z*) οὐ γεννητὸν οὐ κτιστὸν, οὐ συναδελφὸν, οὐ πατραδελφὸν, οὐ προπάτορον, οὐκ ἔκγονον, *not generated, not created, not Brother, not Uncle, not Grandfather, not Nephew.* Unto God the Holy Spirit is not related either as Subject or Servant, or Son or Grandſon. Nor is he of ſuch *Sanctity*, of ſuch *Holy Office*, of ſuch *Practice of Piety* towards God, as he muſt neceſſarily be of, if he was a Political kind of Perſon. For if he is a Political kind of Perſon, he is an holy Political kind of Perſon belonging to God, and therefore is neceſſarily a Saint of God. Every Political Perſon that is in the State and Life of Sanctity, is neceſſarily a Saint of God (ſuch is the Son of God the King of Saints:) But the Holy Ghoſt is no Saint of God; therefore he is no Political kind of Perſon. God is his Proprietor (or Owner) he is Holy as ſet apart for God (for * *omne ſanctum eſt Deo ſanctum*;) if therefore he is a Political Perſon, he muſt be in ſome Office as to God, and ſuch an Office which is competible to a Political kind of Perſon; and conſequently he muſt be God's Prophet, or Prieſt, or King: But the Holy Ghoſt is none of theſe Offices (or officiary Dignities;) therefore he is no Political kind of Perſon. If he is ſuch a Perſon, he is a Political Prince or Potentate; and if he is ſuch a Prince and Potentate, he is God's Political Prince and Potentate: But this is a peculiarity of our Saviour's incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. God is his Proprietor and he belongeth unto God: And if he is a Political kind of Perſon, God muſt neceſſarily be unto him a God, as he is unto other holy Political kind of Perſons; and conſequently the Holy Ghoſt muſt be obliged to take him for his God and to make him his God by practiſing ſome Duties of Piety towards him, ſuch as Political Perſons practiſe: But of ſuch dutiful Piety ſome Judgment may be made from what a Scholaſtic Divine ſaith. (*a*) *Spiritus ſanctus nulli unquam ſupplicavit, neque precibus quidquam petiit. The Holy Ghoſt never made ſupplication to any, nor asked any thing by Prayers.* But another Author ſpeaketh without Book, when without any diſtinction or limitation of Senſe he ſaith of the Holy Ghoſt (*b*) *debitum amorem rependit, he repayeth the due Love to the Father and the Son, and therein is an imitable Pattern to us.*

(x) Petav. ibid. l. 7. c. 16. S. 3. & c. 2. S. 1.

(y) Ibid. c. 13. S.

(z) Ibid. c. 3. S. 3.

* Sanctitas illis rebus attribuitur, quæ in Deum ordinantur. Aquin. 1. Qu. 36. Art. 1.

(a) Petav. T. 4 l. 12. c. 8. S. 11.

(b) Idem de Trin. l. 8. c. 3. S. 11.

But as unto God, ſo unto Chriſt, the Holy Ghoſt is no Political perſonal Relation. For he is not one of Chriſt's Members, nor one of his Sheep, not his Lord, nor his Servant, not his Father, nor his Son, not his Brother or Couſin-German, or any ſuch Political perſonal Relation. A Divine ſaith (*c*) *the Holy Spirit is no part of Chriſt's Myſtical Body, but by its Graces doth produce and conſerve it.*

(c) Scrivener Body of Divin. p. 111.

V. The Holy Ghoſt is not any Political perſonal Relation (or Relative) unto us; he is no ſuch *Proprietor*, as he would neceſſarily be, if he was a Political kind of Perſon. For Chriſtians would be the People of the Holy Ghoſt, in the ſame Senſe that they are the People of God and Chriſt, and the Church would be his Church, in the ſame Notion that it is the Church of God and of Chriſt, if the Holy Ghoſt was a Political kind of Perſon. The Church would be his Vineyard and Inheritance, his Flock and his Kingdom; but to talk of the Church and People, the Vineyard and Inheritance,

tance, the Flock and the Kingdom of the Holy Ghoſt, is as great an Abſurdity, as a Neighbour Nation is guilty of, *that createth Knights of the Order of the Holy Ghoſt.* Chriſtians are Chriſt's Soldiers, the Miniſters of the Church are the Miniſters and Stewards of God and of Chriſt: But Religion knoweth no Soldiers, no Stewards, no Miniſters of the Holy Ghoſt (for Chriſt's Miniſters are called Miniſters, *not of the Letter, but of the Spirit*, only becauſe their Religion is the Diſpenſation of the Spirit, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6.) the Holy Ghoſt hath no Church nor People, no Vineyard nor Inheritance, no Flock nor Sheepfold, no City nor Kingdom, as a Political Proprietor and Prince.

The Church is join'd to the Holy Ghoſt by Covenant, and by ſuch a Covenant which is rightly called a Marriage-covenant, yet the Church is not his Spouſe, nor is the Holy Ghoſt *Sponſus Eccleſiæ*, as God and the Son of God is. God is ſaid, to *Betroth* the Church of *Iſrael*, and ſo Chriſtians by their ſolemn Covenant are eſpouſed and married unto Chriſt, and the Church becometh his Bride, his Spouſe or his Wife. But although the Church of Chriſtians are join'd to Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt by one and the ſame Marriage-covenant, yet Chriſtianity knoweth no ſuch thing as a Bride, Spouſe or Wife of the Holy Ghoſt. Therefore the Holy Ghoſt can be no Bridegroom nor Husband; he is neither Head nor Member, neither the Vine nor a Branch, neither the Husband nor a Member of the Spouſe. He is not the Maſter of our Family, nor the King of our Kingdom, he is not our Father, or our Shepherd, or our Guardian, or our Phyſician. In ſome Senſe he is our Patron (or Advocate) our Guide and Teacher, and may be fitly called our Sanctifier: But he is not any of theſe, as thoſe Names ſignifie certain Political perſonal Relations. Our Chriſtianity conſiſteth in owning Chriſt for our Sovereign Lord: But of our Lord the Holy Spirit there is not a Syllable in the Book of God. Wherefore as the ancient Writers of the Church dare not ſay (*d*) that the Holy Spirit is either *ingenitus* or *genitus* (begotten or unbegotten:) So thoſe in S. *Baſil*'s time were much in the right, who ſuppos'd, that the Holy Spirit was neither *Lord nor Servant.* They were much more in the right than S. *Baſil* himſelf (*e*) who pretendeth to prove, that the Holy Spirit is called *the Lord* in Scripture, yet his Allegations of Scripture are altogether Impertinent. (*f*) Without diſtinction or limitation of Senſe he attributeth to the Holy Spirit the Name of a Political Potentate and Relation; So the Nicene Creed (commonly ſo called) without any diſtinction or limitation of Senſe ſtileth the Holy Ghoſt *the Lord and Giver of Life*, which in the moſt obvious conſtruction of the words repreſenteth the Holy Ghoſt as a Political perſonal Potentate and Relation.

VI. The Holy Spirit is not any thing, nor doth any thing to us, nor is any thing done unto him, that conſtituteth him *a Political Potentate or a Political perſonal Relation.* For if we conſider, what the Holy Ghoſt is, he is not any thing more, or any thing leſs, or any thing elſe than *the Spirit of him that is of definitive Notion the Lord of the Creature.* He that is of definitive Notion *the Lord* of the Creature as ſuch is of the Godhead as a Political Potentate and a Political perſonal Relation: And his being of the Godhead as this Political Potentate and as this Political perſonal Relation is the ſame thing with his being of definitive Notion *he that is the Lord of the Creature.* But the Holy Spirit is not of the Godhead, ſo as to be of this definitive Notion; and therefore is not of the Godhead as this Political Potentate and this Political perſonal Relation *the Lord of the Creature.* The Holy Spirit is not of the Godhead otherwiſe than as the Spirit of God; nor is Lord of the Creature, otherwiſe than as the Spirit of him who is definitively *the Lord of the Creature*; which is to ſay, the Holy Spirit is not this Political Potentate, nor this Political perſonal Relation *the Lord of the Creature*, which is peculiar to him that is *the Lord* as diſtinct from *the Spirit of the Lord.* For to be only *the Spirit of the Lord* amounteth not to the being definitively *the Lord*, is plainly diſtinct from it and from being that Political Potentate and Political perſonal Relation. If we conſider what *the Holy Ghoſt doth*; it is manifeſt, that he cannot do any thing unto us, that conſtituteth him *our Father* (as he cannot be the Father of Chriſt as Man,) that God is *our Father* and Chriſt is *the Father of his Church*, but to be ſuch a Political Potentate and ſuch a Political perſonal Relation, is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. And conſequently, it is incompetible to him, to be any ſuch Political Potentate and Political perſonal Relation, which involveth in it the being *our Father*; and all ſuch operation which neceſſarily conſtituteth him *our Father* is falſly aſcrib'd to the Holy Ghoſt. Whence a Judgment may be made of this uſual Scheme of the Trinity and of the Operations of the divine Perſons. *All divine Operations* ad extrà *are aſcrib'd to them abſolutely, becauſe they are undivided in their Operation, acting by the ſame Wiſdom, Will and Power; ſo that every Perſon is Author of every Work of God, becauſe each Perſon is God. In this undivided Operation of the Divine Nature each Perſon doth the ſame Work in the order of their Subſiſtence; not one as the Inſtrument of the other, or imploy'd by the other, but as one common Principle or Authority, Wiſdom, Love and Power. As to the manner of Subſiſtence in the divine Eſſence there is a diſtinct Relation and Order between the Perſons, and hence there is no divine Work but is diſtinctly aſſign'd to each Perſon and eminently unto one. So it is in the Works of the old Creation and in the new, and in all particulars of them. Thus the Creation of the World is diſtinctly aſcrib'd to the Father as his Work.* Act. 4. 24. *To the Son as his.* Joh. 1. 3. *And alſo to the Holy Spirit.* Job 33. 4. *But by way of eminence to the Father, and abſolutely to God, who is Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. The Holy Ghoſt is the immediate Efficient of all divine external Operations.* In the Senſe of this Scheme a Council at *Rome* under Pope *Damaſus* decreed (*g*) *ſi quis negaverit, patrem omnia per filium incarnatum & ſpiritum ſanctum condidiſſe, hoc eſt viſibilia & inviſibilia; anathema ſit.* The Council meaneth, *that the Holy Ghoſt was conjunctly with the Father and the Son the Creator of all things viſible and inviſible, and they muſt be held accurſed, that believe not ſuch Maxims as theſe,* which muſt neceſſarily carry a ſtrange appearance in the Eyes of thoſe that underſtand the Goſpel-Theiſm. But as the Holy Spirit hath not done any thing, ſo neither is any thing done to him, that conſtituteth him a Political kind of Potentate or a Political perſonal Relation. For God hath not given to

Matth. 22. 2. *Joh.* 3. 29. 2 *Cor.* 11. 2. *Rom.* 7. 4. *Eph.* 5. 23…33. *Apoc.* 21. 9.

(d) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. *c.* 6. *S.* 3.

(e) *De Sp. Sanct. c.* 21.

(f) *Ibid. c.* 18.

(g) *Barn ad an.* 373. *n.* 12

his Spirit as to his Son *Dominion and Glory and a Kingdom.* The Holy Spirit is it ſelf a Gift (the ſupereminent Gift) but we never read in Scripture of any Gift given to the Holy Spirit, which is a plain Indication, that he is no Political kind of Perſon. But ſeeing that from Beneficence and Liberality Princes have their Name in Hebrew (נדיבים) and in the ancient Heroic times, as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, *(h)* ἀπ' εὐεργεσίας καθίςησαν τοὺς βασιλέας, *Men were made Kings becauſe of a precedent Beneficence*; if the Holy Ghoſt is Creator and Benefactor in equality with the Father and the Son, it ſeemeth but reaſonable, that he ſhould be King in equality.

VII. The Virtues of a Political Prince are not in the Holy Ghoſt as in a Political Prince; therefore he is no Political Prince or Perſon. As our Political Governours on Earth are certain Images and Repreſentatives of God, ſo the Divine Attributes of *Greatneſs* and *Goodneſs* (commonly ſo called) are the ſame with the Powers and Virtues of our Political Governours (ſave only that they tranſcend them in meaſure and the manner of having them;) for Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power are requiſite Qualifications in all Political Governours, and the great Virtues and Glories of a ſecular Prince are thoſe that *Claudian* attributeth to *Honorius*. —— *mitis precibus, pietatis abundans, pœnæ parcus erat.* Agreeably whereto God repreſenteth himſelf, *Exod.* 34. 6, 7. *The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-ſuffering, and abundant in goodneſs and truth, keeping mercy for thouſands, forgiving iniquity, tranſgreſſion and ſin, and that will by no means clear the guilty.* Such are the attributes of Goodneſs, that are in the holy happy Government, which God is; and the like amiable Virtues are known to be in Chriſt as in a Political Prince (for his Government is that of a Shepherd, of the Lamb of God, and of the *Son of Man*, of a contrary make and mold to that of Lions, Bears and Leopards, ſuch as the Eaſtern Monarchies were, *Dan.* 7.) But the Scripture never taketh Notice, that theſe amiable and beneficent Vertues are in the Holy Ghoſt as in a Political Prince, or that his adminiſtration of Government is an exerciſe of them; yet if they were ſo in him, the Scripture could not be ſilent concerning them, becauſe they are of greateſt concern to the Intereſt of a Government, the Honour and Service of it, and to our Duty and Benefit.

VIII. The Holy Ghoſt is an Holy Perſon, yet is not a Pattern of our Holineſs, as the Political holy Perſons are, *God, Chriſt and the Saints of God*; therefore he is not a Perſon *ejuſdem generis*, with the Political holy Perſons. The chief good of Man, his higheſt Excellency and Felicity, that which he ought to propoſe to himſelf as his ultimate end, and that which Religion ultimately deſigneth, is ὁμοίωσις θεῷ, *his Conformity and Aſſimilation to God*, to be God-like and Son of God-like in Grace and Glory, in Sanctity and Immortality. God and Chriſt are the Archetype, Model and Platform, according to which all the holy Virtuous are formed; for they are regenerated into the living Image of God now in Holineſs and Goodneſs, into his glorious Image at their Reſurrection, and are predeſtinated to be conformed to the Image of his Son. God and Chriſt are alſo the great Exemplar, whom all muſt ſtudiouſly imitate and reſemble, that belong to God and Godlineſs: And ſo they muſt ſtudiouſly imitate the Saints of God in that which maketh them Saints. But who ever heard, that the ultimate Deſign of Religion, and that which ought to be our ultimate Deſign, is Conformity and Aſſimilation to the Holy Ghoſt in Grace and Glory? That the holy Virtuous are renew'd and transform'd into the Image of the Holy Ghoſt now and at their Reſurrection? That we ought ſtudiouſly to imitate and reſemble the Holy Ghoſt, to put him on by Aſſimilation (as we put on Chriſt) to be Followers of the Holy Ghoſt as our Captain, or as the dear Children of God are Followers of God? Is the Holy Ghoſt ever propos'd to us as a Pattern and Exemplar of Humility, Self-denial, Contempt of the World, of Mercifulneſs, Benignity and walking in Love? No, nothing of this Nature is to be found in Chriſtianity or in the Scriptures, which every where inculcate our imitation of God, Chriſt and the Saints, but know nothing of our imitation of the Holy Ghoſt. Whence we make a Judgment of a Branch of the Scholaſtic Theology of elder Times, which ſtileth the Holy Ghoſt *(i)* εἰκὼν ἀληθὴς ϗ φυσικὴ θεοῦ ϗ χριςοῦ, *the true and natural Image of God and Chriſt*, μορφὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ, *the Form of the Son*, εἰκὼν ἀπαράλλακτος τοῦ υἱοῦ, *the Image of the Son in nothing differing*, πρόσωπον τοῦ υἱοῦ, *the Face or Countenance of the Son*, εἰκὼν ἀκεραιφνὴς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός, ὁμοίωσις δὲ φυσικὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, *the Son is the ſincere Image of the Father, but the natural reſemblance of the Son is his Spirit; the Son is called the Prototype* (or Archetype) *of the Holy Ghoſt, as the Father is of the Son.* All which uſual Maxims of the Scholaſtick Theology (and many more) are repugnant to this great Principle (which is as demonſtrable as any Propoſition in *Euclid*) *the Holy Ghoſt is no Political kind of Perſon.*

IX. The Holy Ghoſt never appeareth in the form of a Political kind of Perſon, as the other Divine Imperial Perſons do; therefore he is no Political kind of Perſon, as they are. For unleſs we will entertain a fond and irreligious Conceit of ſome Scholaſtick Theologers *(k)* that the three Men which appear'd to *Abraham* were the three Perſons of the Trinity, and that the two Angels which appear'd to *Lot*, were the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the Scripture ever maketh mention of any appearance of the Holy Ghoſt in the form of a Political Perſon. In the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on the day of *Pentecoſt* he made no viſible appearance but that of fiery cloven Tongues. His deſcent upon our Saviour at his Baptiſm is ſaid, to have been in *a bodily ſhape like a Dove*, but not in the form of a Political Perſon. In the Viſion of the Prophet *Daniel ch.* 7. 9, 13. The ancient of Days appeareth as an Imperial Majeſty and one like the Son of Man appeareth (both appear in the form of a Political kind of Perſon:) But there is no appearance of the Holy Ghoſt. In the Book of the Apocalypſe the Son of Man appeareth in a Viſion, *Ch.* 1. 13. God appeareth as an Imperial Majeſty ſitting on a Throne, *Ch.* 4. 2, 3. Seven Lamps of Fire appear before the Throne (which are the ſeven Spirits of God, *Ch.* 4. 5.) But there is no viſible appearance of the Holy Ghoſt. When the other Divine Perſons appear in the form of Political Perſons, the Holy Ghoſt appeareth not; and whenſoever he maketh a viſible appearance, is not in their form of a Political Perſon; which is a manifeſt Indication, that he is no ſuch kind of Perſon. And why are we ſaid, to be converted and turned to the other two Divine Perſons God and Chriſt (called the Lord) yet are never ſaid to be converted and turn'd to the Holy Ghoſt, but becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is not the Holy Sovereignty and Government ſtrictly ſo called, and therefore is no Political Prince or Potentate, and conſequently is no Political Perſon?

(h) *Polit. l.* 3. *c.* 14, 15.

(i) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. *c.* 7

(k) *Idem ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 2.

X. The truth of this Hypotheſis may be inferr'd from the Anti-Trinitarians Objections againſt the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt; for their Objections may be clearly aſſoiled by this Hypotheſis, but not without it. They argue (*l*) that the Holy Ghoſt is left unmentioned in many places of the New Teſtament, wherein the Father and the Son are mention'd, and wherein the Holy Ghoſt would not be left unmentioned, if he was a third Perſon diſtinct from the Father and the Son, there being the ſame reaſon in thoſe places for mentioning the Holy Ghoſt, if he is a Perſon, as for mentioning the other Perſons, and no reaſon to the contrary. But from our Hypotheſis it appeareth, that there is not *par ratio*, but there is a vaſt diſparity in the Caſe, *the Holy Ghoſt not being a Political Imperial Perſon of our Religion, as the other two Divine Perſons are.* Wherefore in all ſuch places of the New Teſtament which deſign to mention only *the Political Imperial Perſons of our Religion by themſelves*, or which deſign to mention only *the Political Perſons of our Religion both thoſe of the Subject and thoſe of the Imperial Party together*, in all ſuch places the Holy Ghoſt is omitted and unmention'd. Many places of the New Teſtament deſign, to mention only *the Political Imperial Perſons of our Religion by themſelves* (as without enumerating the Subject-party, ſo without proceeding to mention the Holy Ghoſt in Conſort with the Father and the Son) and this is done with great reaſon; for becauſe they are the only Political Imperial Perſons of our Religion and Polity, therefore it is fit, that oftentimes they ſhould be mention'd and celebrated by themſelves, and oftentimes it is not needful, or not proper, to mention the Holy Ghoſt in Conſort with them. In the Inſtitution of Baptiſm (which is for receiving the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, is the Sacrament of Regeneration by the Holy Ghoſt, and wherein we profeſs the Chriſtian Religion as receiv'd from the Apoſtles inſpir'd by the Holy Ghoſt) and upon ſome eſpecial occaſions alſo it was requiſite, that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould be mention'd in Conſort with the Father and the Son and as their Divine Ghoſtly Agent: As in the beginning of the Apocalypſe it was requiſite, that ſeven Arch-angels ſhould be mention'd in Conſort with God and Chriſt as their Providential Agents. But as in other places of the New Teſtament God and Chriſt are uſually mention'd without any Arch-angelical Agents: So ordinarily in the New Teſtament God and Chriſt are mention'd and celebrated without mentioning in Conſort with them their Divine ghoſtly Agent the Holy Ghoſt. Which would be an unreaſonble and an unaccountable Omiſſion, if the Holy Ghoſt is a Political Imperial Perſon of our Religion (as the Father and the Son is;) there would be a culpable defect in our Saviour's Saying, that the Chriſtian Religion is the knowledge of the only true God and the only true Meſſiah without mentioning the Holy Ghoſt. S. *Paul* could not rightly call it *the Myſtery of God and of the Father and of Chriſt:* Nor make this Deſcription of it; *to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt by whom are all things, and we by him*, without making any mention of the Holy Ghoſt. S. *John* could not rightly ſay, *our Fellowſhip* (Society) *is with the Father and with his Son Jeſus Chriſt; if that which ye have heard from the beginning, ſhall remain in you, ye alſo ſhall continue in the Son and in the Father* (Societively,) *he that abideth in the Doctrine of Chriſt, he hath both the Father and the Son*, without making any mention of the Holy Ghoſt as in Conſort with them. S. *John*'s Salutation could not rightly be of this form; *Grace be with you, Mercy and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of the Father*; S. *Paul*'s Salutations in the beginning of all his Epiſtles could not rightly be of this form; *Grace be unto you and Peace from God our Father and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; his Prayers could not rightly run in this form; *God himſelf and our Father, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt direct our way unto you; our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and God even our Father which hath loved us, comfort your Hearts*, without adjoining the Holy Ghoſt in Conſortſhip with God and Chriſt. Heaven this Apoſtle calleth *the Kingdom of Chriſt and of God*, but not of the Holy Ghoſt; calleth himſelf an Apoſtle *by the Commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is our Hope*; giveth Charge to *Timothy in the ſight of God who quickeneth all things and before Chriſt Jeſus; and before God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall judge the quick and the dead*; prayeth for Peace to the *Epheſians with Love and Faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; writeth to the Church of the *Theſſalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; prayeth, *that the Name of Chriſt may be glorify'd in them and they in him, according to the Grace of our God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and that the Lord would direct their Hearts into the Love of God and into the patient waiting for Chriſt*; deſcribeth their Converſion to be *a turning to ſerve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from Heaven*; and his preaching was *a teſtifying both to Jews and Greeks Repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; in all which paſſages of this Apoſtle (and ſeveral ſuch more) there is not any mention of the Holy Ghoſt in Conſortſhip with the other Divine Perſons. In like manner S. *Jude* writeth *to them that are ſanctified by God the Father and preſerved in Jeſus Chriſt*, and againſt them, *that deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; and S. *Peter* writeth to them, *that have obtain'd like precious Faith with us through the Righteouſneſs of God and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: Grace and Peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jeſus our Lord.* The holy Writer of the Apocalypſe had Heaven opened to him, but could not ſee the Bl. Trinity there (although the People and they that ſhould be wiſer than the Community of the People, talk confidently of ſeeing the Bl. Trinity in Heaven) he ſaw no Divine Perſons there *but God and the Lamb*, and accordingly the Creatures make their Doxology only *to him that ſitteth upon the Throne and to the Lamb*; the wicked call to the Rocks and Mountains, *to hide them from the*

Joh. 17. 3.
Col. 2. 2.
1 Cor. 8. 6.
1 Joh. 1. 3.
ch. 2. 24.
Eph. 2.
2 Joh. 3.
1 Theſſ. 3. 11
2 Theſſ. 2. 15.
Eph. 5. 5.
1 Tim. 1. 1.
ch. 6. 13.
2 Tim. 4. 1.
Eph. 6. 23.
2 Theſſ. 1. 1, 12. and ch. 3. 5.
1 Theſſ. 1. 9, 10.
Act. 20. 21.
Jude 1. 4.
2 Pet. 1. 1, 2.
Apoc. 5. 13. 6, 15. 14, 4.

(l) Crellius de uno Deo l. 1. S. 3. c. 3.

the Wrath of him that ſitteth on the Throne and
from the Wrath of the Lamb; the Saints are ſaid
20, 6. to be *the firſt fruits unto God and to the Lamb, to*
12, 17. *be Prieſts of God and of Chriſt*; to be thoſe *that*
14, 12. *keep the Commandments of God and the Faith of*
Jeſus, and have the Teſtimony of Jeſus; the Martyrs are ſaid, *to be beheaded for the witneſs of Je-*
20, 4. *ſus and for the word of God*; the Kingdoms of the
11, 15. World are ſaid to become *the Kingdoms of our*
Lord and of his Chriſt: And now is come Salvation
12, 10. *and Strength, and the Kingdom of our God and the*
21. 22, 23. *Power of his Chriſt*. Of the *New Jeruſalem* it is ſaid,
22. 1, 3. *The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Tem-*
ple of it; the Glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the Light thereof; a pure River of Water of Life proceeded out of the Throne of God and of the Lamb; and the Throne of God and of the Lamb ſhall be in it. Thus the Stream of the New Teſtament runneth, and this is the tenour of it; in the main current of it the Holy Ghoſt is not mention'd in conſortſhip with the Political Imperial Perſons of our Religion. But ſo great an omiſſion could not be in the New Teſtament, if the Holy Ghoſt is a Political Imperial Perſon.

Some places of the New Teſtament deſign, to mention *the Political Perſons of our Religion, both thoſe of the Subject and thoſe of the Imperial Party together, and theſe only*: And in ſuch places the Holy Ghoſt is not mention'd; as *Apoc.* 3. 5. *He that overcometh, I will confeſs his Name before my Father and before his Angels.* 1 Tim. 5. 21. *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect Angels.* Luk. 9. 26. *Whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me and my words, of him ſhall the Son of Man be aſhamed, when he ſhall come in his own Glory, and in his Father's, and of the Holy Angels.* Heb. 12. 22, 23. *Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the City of the living God the Heavenly Jeruſalem, and to an innumerable company of Angels, to the general Aſſembly and Church of the firſt-born which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the Spirits of juſt men made perfect: And to Jeſus the Mediator of the New Covenant.* (m) *Who can believe* (ſaith *Crellius*) *that in ſo prolix an enumeration of Perſons, who for their great excellency may be called Divine, the Holy Spirit could be omitted, if it is ſuch a Perſon as the Father or Chriſt?* It ought to be acknowledg'd, that the Holy Spirit is not ſuch a Perſon as the Father or Chriſt; for this is the only imaginable reaſon, why in ſo prolix an enumeration of Divine kind of Perſons the Holy Ghoſt is omitted: but this will not ſerve a *Socinian*'s purpoſe, that deſigneth abſolutely to deſtroy the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt. The Divine Author to the *Hebrews* propos'd to himſelf, to enumerate only the holy Political Perſons (Subject and Imperial) that make our Polity; and the Holy Spirit not being one of theſe therefore hath not a place in his illuſtrious Syſtem.

(m) *Quis credat in tam prolixa enumeratione perſonarum, quas ob præſtantiam ſummam divinas appellare licet, potuiſſe omitti ſpiritum ſanctum, ſi is ejuſmodi perſona divina eſſet, qualis Pater aut Chriſtus?*

XI. Againſt the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt many other Objections are made, which may be clearly aſſoil'd from our Hypotheſis.

Crell. ſupr. c. 1. & 4. (1.) An Objection is rais'd from this Text of the Apoſtle, *The things of God knoweth no Man but the Spirit of God*, 1 Cor. 2. 11. but of this Text of the Apoſtle we have before given an account. A like Objection is rais'd from the words of our Saviour, *Matth.* 11. 27. *No Man* (no Perſon) *knoweth the Son but the Father: neither knoweth any Man* (any Perſon) *the Father ſave the Son, and he to whomſoever the Son will reveal him.* This cannot be true (ſaith the Objector) if the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon and a Divine Perſon diſtinct from the Father and the Son; for if ſo, when our Saviour ſpake theſe words, there was a Perſon, that knew the Father beſides the Son, and there was a Perſon that knew the Son beſides the Father (and that without the Revelation of any) namely the Holy Ghoſt. But it is manifeſt, that in the words of our Saviour he confineth his Conſideration to the political kind of Perſons (ſuch only are Perſons commonly ſo called) ſuch as the Father and the Son, and Men and Angels are, but ſuch as the Holy Ghoſt is not, who therefore may be a Perſon *ſui generis*, and yet the words of our Saviour may be unexceptionably true.

(2.) A principal Objection againſt the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt is a ſuppos'd abſurd conſequence of it; for it inferreth (ſaith the Objector) *that the Holy Ghoſt is the Father of Chriſt, and that Chriſt is his Son; for Chriſt was generated by the Holy Ghoſt, and the Spirit of Holineſs was the proper and proximate cauſe of his filiation at his Reſurrection*, Rom. 1. 4. But this Objection is wholly invalidated by our Account of the Holy Ghoſt: for by the Holy Ghoſt whereby our Saviour was generated of the Bl. Virgin is moſt probably meant the Holy Ghoſt in the imperſonal acceptation: but if we ſuppoſe it, to be meant of the Holy Ghoſt in the perſonal acceptation as alſo *the Spirit of Holineſs* whereby he was rais'd, yet ſeeing the Holy Ghoſt in the perſonal acceptation is no political kind of Perſon, he can be no political perſonal Relation, neither Sovereign nor Subject, nor Father nor Son; and therefore he cannot be either the Father of Chriſt by generation or our Father by regeneration. In the Scholaſtick Theology indeed the Holy Ghoſt is a political kind of Perſon, and is ſtiled (n) *omnium qui in Chriſto renaſcuntur, parens ac genitor*; it maketh the Holy Ghoſt our Father by Spiritual Regeneration, and by parity of reaſon the Father of Chriſt by Generation. It ſuppoſeth alſo the Holy Ghoſt *naturæ conditor, the Creator of our Nature, and the Creator of Chriſt's Humane Nature*, which is a making the Holy Ghoſt both his Father and our Father; for our Creator, as ſuch, is (in a duely limited ſenſe) the Father of Mankind, *Mal.* 2. 10. *Luk.* 3. 38. *Act.* 17. 29. Theſe Conſequences are unavoidable otherwiſe than by ſuppoſing the Holy Ghoſt, to be a Perſon incapable of having Children, no political kind of Perſon, Relation, Potentate, Governour or Agent, but only a ghoſtly virtual Agent, which is in God and which God communicatively is, and which is his ghoſtly virtual Agent, which he inſpireth, and whereby he inſpireth into us and ingendreth in us the holy Light and Life, whereby we become God's Children. For the Holy Ghoſt in this Generation-work is not the Perſon of the Father, but is only the Holy Ghoſt (the ghoſtly virtual Agent of him who is the Father,) nor are we generated the living Images of the Holy Ghoſt, but of God; and from him we have our Parental Origin and Deſcent, not from the Holy Ghoſt otherwiſe than as his Agent and his Agency and Virtue. For the Illuſtration whereof let us ſuppoſe, that there is in Parental Providence, and that Parental Providence communicatively is, *ſuch a Spirit of the World*, which is an *intellectus agens* to Mankind and

Crell. ibid. c. 7.

(n) *Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 10. Digr. 5. c. 1.*

and alſo *vivificative* to the World of Mankind. It is manifeſt, that although *this Spirit of the World* is illuminative and vivificative to the World of Mankind, and conſequently a Light and Life is ingendred in them by it, yet this Spirit of the World is not the Father of Mankind, but Parental Providence is their generative Father by this his Spirit. And if it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the Holy Ghoſt (notwithſtanding his ſort of Perſonality) is our Father by Regeneration, much leſs can it be ſuppos'd, that he is the Father of Chriſt by Generation; for he is infinitely more the Son of God than Chriſtians are his Sons, and hath God for his generative Father at an infinitely higher rate than they.

Crell. ſupr. c. 6. (3.) It is objected, that by the Holy Ghoſt the Scripture meaneth *the Divine Virtue or Efficacy, the Energy or Power of God; for ſo the Holy Ghoſt is called in Scripture, and therein theſe Names are equipollent to the Holy Ghoſt,* Luk. 24. 49. *and* ch. 1. 35. 1 Cor. 2. 4, 5. Act. 10. 38. Matth. 12. 28. *compar'd with* Luk. 11. 10. Eph. 3. 7, 20. *Accordingly, thoſe Supernatural Gifts and Operations which proceed from that Divine Energy and Power, which we call Divine Inſpiration, holy People without any Revelation or further Inquiry impute to the Holy Ghoſt as the proximate cauſe of them; and when the holy Writers would ſignifie, that any one is divinely inſpir'd, they ſay, he is full of the Holy Ghoſt (or uſe the like Phraſe:) but if the Holy Ghoſt is not this Divine Virtue and Energy it ſelf, but a Perſon diſtinct from the Father and the Son, how could they be aſſur'd from the Nature of the thing, that Prophecy and all other the like Supernatural Gifts and Operations proceeded immediately from the Holy Ghoſt?* Much of Truth and Solidity there is in this Objection, which is really no Objection againſt our Hypotheſis, but is plainly a confirmation of it: For agreeably to this Objection we have defined the Holy Ghoſt, *The holy Inſpiration Virtue*; and how is it poſſible, but that the holy People and the holy Writers ſhould impute Prophecy and all other Gifts of Supernatural Inſpiration to *the holy Inſpiration-Virtue* either in the imperſonal or perſonal acceptation? In the imperſonal (or meerly real) acceptation the Holy Ghoſt is this *real Divine Virtue and Energy it ſelf* meerly ſuch. In the perſonal acceptation the Holy Ghoſt is *this real Divine Virtue and Energy it ſelf but not meerly ſuch*; which is all the difference, that is between theſe two Acceptations, the one of which cannot be ſuppos'd, wholly to exclude the other out of the Holy Scriptures. But becauſe *virtus divina* in the perſonal acceptation is the definitive Notion of the Holy Ghoſt in the perſonal acceptation, this ſpeaketh the Holy Ghoſt, to be no Political, but an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon, and therefore fitly called *Virtus Divina* or *Vis Enthea.*

Crell. ſupr. c. 6. n. 445, 450. XII. Other Objections are raiſed againſt the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt. (1.) From certain tropical Phraſes of Scripture: *for who will ſay, that any thing is marked or ſealed by a perſon, that any perſon is poured out upon Men, that they are baptiz'd with it, made to drink into it, anointed with it?* To ſay theſe things of a political kind of Perſon (that we are marked or ſealed with him, that he is poured forth, ſhed abroad, falleth on us, that we are baptiz'd with him, made to drink into him, and anointed with him) is indeed intolerable Language, as every ingenuous Mind muſt acknowledge. If we ſuppoſe this political kind of Perſon, King, Prieſt or Prophet, to be communicative of Gifts and Graces (as the Son of God is) yet to ſay of him, *I will pour him out upon all Fleſh, I will baptize you with him and with Fire; Believers are anointed with him, marked or ſealed with him* (intending theſe Sayings of him to be underſtood metonymically in reſpect of his Gifts and Graces) is as great ineptitude of Language as the *Socinians* Proſopopæia's touching the Holy Ghoſt. The Holy Ghoſt muſt be ſuch a thing, to which theſe Phraſes are applicable and accommodate, and therefore he cannot be a political kind of Perſon, but is definitively *The holy Inſpiration-virtue as an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon*; for to ſuch a kind of Perſon, to ſuch an holy Inſpiration-virtue perſonal theſe Phraſes are fitly applicable and accommodate. They are accommodate to his Nature and to his kind of Perſonality, as he is *Agent-virtual.* For as he is *Agent-virtual* (an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon) *He is poured out his Supernatural Gifts and Graces being poured out* (in pouring out theſe he is poured out) *and ſo we are baptized with him, made to drink into him, and anointed with him.* As let us ſuppoſe, *that the Spirit of the World is an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon and an Inſpiration-virtue of the Gift of Worldly Languages*; this Gift of Worldly Languages may fitly be ſaid, to be poured out, and God in pouring out this Gift of Languages poureth out this perſonal Inſpiration-virtue, *as it is Agent-virtual*; for he poureth out its Agency and Virtue, becauſe this Gift of Languages is that which is its Agency and Virtue. The other Scripture-phraſe of being *marked or ſealed* is alſo accommodate to the Nature of the Holy Ghoſt and the kind of its Perſonality: for Believers cannot be marked or ſealed with a political Perſon, becauſe ſuch a Perſon cannot be their interiour Endowment: but an Inſpiration-virtue that is no political Perſon, but only an Agent-virtual, may be their Interiour Endowment, and therefore they may be marked or ſealed with it. God ſetteth his mark of Property upon them (as it were) and owneth them for his, by giving them his Holy Spirit as their Interiour Endowment; and how eaſie is it, to conceive, that the Holy Spirit is the Interiour Endowment of all Regenerate Souls, and dwelleth in them as a Spiritual-vital Principle, which is not unſubſtantial, nor imperſonal, nor yet a political kind of Perſon, but its Perſonality is that of *a ghoſtly virtual Agent?* This being clearly intelligible and conceivable, we may infer from it, that the Holy Ghoſt (as an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon) might be the Interiour Endowment of thoſe Believers, that were inſpir'd with the Supernatural Gift of it, and they might fitly be ſaid, *to be marked or ſealed with the Holy Spirit.*

(2.) It is further argued; *that God is ſaid, to have given us of his Spirit, to give a meaſure of it, a double portion of it* (ſo much as is ſufficient for two, or the elder Brother's Portion, *Deut.* 21. 17.) *and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit are called* μερισμοὶ, *partitions or diſtributions of it; all which Phraſes argue, that the Holy Spirit may be divided into Parts and Portions, which is incompetible to a Perſon.* Some of theſe Phraſes indeed are incompetible to a Political Perſon, and but ſome of them (for we are rightly ſaid, to have ſomething of God and Chriſt in us) and ſo far the Objection may ſeem to have difficulty in it. But this difficulty will vaniſh, if we ſuppoſe the Holy Ghoſt *an holy Inſpiration-virtue as an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon.* For let us ſuppoſe *the Spirit of the World*, to be ſuch a Perſon, and *Ibid.*

there will be no difficulty in conceiving, that as it is *an Inſpiration-virtue and a virtual Agent*, it is capable of ſuch a Partition (notwithſtanding its Perſonality) that Men may be ſaid, to have more or leſs of the Spirit of the World in them: Nor is it otherwiſe with the Spirit that is of God.

(3.) To deſtroy his Perſonality, it is further objected, *That a Perſon cannot be given to many Perſons, much leſs to infinite, ſo as really to be and dwell in them; but ſo the Holy Ghoſt is given.* If we ſay, that the Holy Ghoſt is an Infinite Perſon, the Objector urgeth; *that if ſo, he needeth not be given unto Men, to be and to dwell in them; for he was always in them, and cannot but be ſo becauſe of his Infinity.* Thus the Anti-Trinitarians have their Fopperies of Philoſophy, as well as the Scholaſtick Theologers, who argue, (o) that *Miſſion* importeth the changing place, and therefore is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe God is every where. But as to all modes of exiſting, efficiencies, and reſiding in a place as his Houſe or Temple, God is not every where; and therefore the Holy Ghoſt may be an Infinite Perſon, yet may be given to innumerable Perſons, to be and dwell in them. In this Objection there is not ſo much ſtrength of reaſon as in the Argument of an ancient Writer (*Didymus*) who proveth the Deity of the Holy Spirit by this reaſon; becauſe to the Saints living in all parts of the World, *adeſt inhabitator ſpiritus ſanctus, the Holy Spirit is preſent as an Inhabitant having an unbounded Subſtance.*

SECTION II.

Of the Eternity and Unoriginateneſs of the Holy Spirit.

I. THE Divine Author to the Hebrews ſpeaketh of *the Eternal Spirit*, ch. 9. 14. and it appeareth from the conſtant ſenſe of Language in the New Teſtament, that by *the Spirit* in this place is meant the Holy Spirit (ſo the Vulg. Lat. readeth the place *per ſpiritum ſanctum*) and if inſtead of this Name *The Spirit* we ſubſtitute the definitive Notion thereof, which is *virtus divina*, thence it will appear, that the Spirit is denominated *Eternal*, as being from Eternity to Eternity. This the Scholaſtick Theology rightly acknowledgeth: but it ſuppoſeth the Exiſtence of the Holy Spirit from Eternity, to be originated by an Eternal *proceſſio divinarum perſonarum productiva, productive proceſſion of the Divine Perſons* (the Son and the Holy Ghoſt:) On the contrary, I ſuppoſe, that the Exiſtence of the Holy Spirit from Eternity is not originated by a *productive proceſſion*, but that (like the Divine Attributes) the Holy Spirit exiſteth from Eternity as *an unoriginated eſſentiality of the Godhead.* For the Scholaſtick Theology cannot prove its Maxim, nor ſhew by any good reaſon, that the Holy Spirit's Exiſtence from Eternity is originated (by a productive proceſſion) the only reaſons which it alledgeth being theſe of *Aquinas. As all Multitude ought to be reduc'd to one, ſo it ought to be deriv'd from one Principle.* (p) *The Philoſophers ſuppos'd but one Principle. To ſuppoſe two Innaſcibles* (underſtood in a large ſenſe, to ſignifie ſuch as do not proceed from another) *is to ſuppoſe two Gods and two Divine Natures. Whence* Hilary *ſaith in his Book of Synods, Seeing there is but one God, there cannot be two Innaſcibles. And for this reaſon chiefly, becauſe if there were two Innaſcibles, one of them would not be from another; and ſo they would not be diſtinguiſh'd by a relative oppoſition. They muſt be diſtinguiſh'd therefore by diverſity of Nature.* This Theology acknowledgeth, that the Holy Spirit is *ingenit* and *innaſcible* in the narrow ſenſe of the words, as they ſignifie *that which is not generated* (for it denieth, that the Holy Ghoſt is generated:) but it diſputeth, that the Holy Ghoſt is not in ſuch ſenſe ingenit and innaſcible, as not to have its Exiſtence from another: for if it was ſo ingenit and innaſcible, this Theology argueth, *there would be two Gods and two Divine Natures.* But this is no conſequence; for the unoriginated Exiſtence of the Holy Spirit from Eternity doth not at all claſh with the *Mono-theiſm* of God the Father, but on the contrary, it will appear preſently, that his Deity, and conſequently his ſole Deity cannot be without it. God and his Holy Spirit are not two Gods, nor two Divine Natures; they are but one Divine Eſſence and one Divine Sovereignty; and are no more two Principles or Heads of Beings, than Chriſt and his Holy Spirit are two Heads of the Church. The unoriginated Exiſtence of the Holy Spirit therefore doth not at all claſh with the due and rational deriving all *Multitude from Unity.* In this Scholaſtick Theology there is a Maxim, that (q) *in divinis omnia ſunt unum, ubi non obviat relationis oppoſitio: In the Trinity all things are one, where the relative oppoſition, which is caus'd by the origination of one perſon from another, doth not hinder.* But we have demonſtrated the falſity of this Maxim by proving, that the Holy Ghoſt is not a Perſon *ejuſdem generis* with the Father and the Son. God and his Holy Spirit therefore may be diſtinguiſh'd, without ſuppoſing the Holy Spirit, to have an originated Exiſtence from Eternity. Theſe Scholaſtic Reaſons for its originated Exiſtence being of no avail, it is requiſite, that ſome place of Scripture ſhould be produc'd, to prove it, if it muſt be believ'd as an Article of the Catholick Faith. But the Scholaſtick Theology proveth it not by any place of Scripture ſave only that celebrated one, which it inculcateth at a great rate, and at as great a rate miſunderſtandeth, *Joh.* 15. 26. *When the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father.*

II. In this Theology there are ſeveral ſuch Indications of the falſity of this originated Exiſtence of the Holy Ghoſt, as ſpeak it not *veriſimile, likely to be a Truth.* For, (1.) The Proceſſion productive of the Son hath a proper Name, and a very intelligible one, *It is called Generation*; but the Proceſſion productive of the Holy Ghoſt, (r) *non habet proprium nomen, hath not any proper Name*; from whence we may juſtly infer, that there is no ſuch thing; for Name and Nature are connex'd, as in this Saying of *Arnobius*, (s) *Attis nomine ſpoliaverat ſe viri*, Attis *bereav'd himſelf of the Name of a Man, when he bereav'd himſelf of the Nature of a Man*; and his being bereav'd of the Name of a Man importeth, that he was bereav'd of the Nature of a Man. So if the Proceſſion productive of the Holy Ghoſt is of no proper Name, it is of no proper Nature, and therefore is nothing. If it

Ibid c. 8. n. 439.

(o) Petav. de Trin. l. 8. c. 1. S. 4.

(q) Idem Ibid. Q. 36. Art. 2. Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 9. S. 6.

(r) Aquin. Supr. Qu. 36. Art. 1.

(s) Adv. Gent. l. 5. p. 160.

(p) *Philoſophi poſuerunt unum tantum principium. ponere duos innaſcibiles, eſt ponere duos Deos, & duas naturas divinas. unde Hilar. dicit in lib. de Synodis. Cum unus Deus ſit, duo innaſcibiles eſſe non poſſunt. Et hoc præcipue, quia ſi eſſent duo innaſcibiles, unus eorum non eſſet ab alio. Et ſic non diſtinguerentur oppoſitione relativa. oporteret igitur quod diſtinguerentur diverſitate naturæ.* 1. Con. Gent. c. 4. Summ. 1. par. Qu. 11. art. 3. & Qu. 33. art. 4. ad 4.

is of no proper Name, it is not ſignify'd in Scripture, nor is a reveal'd truth. And if it is ſo innominable, it is unknowable, and muſt be left as much in the dark, as S. *Bernard* found it, when he ſaid, (t) *Licet proceſſio ſpiritus ſancti obſcuriſſima ſit, & poſuerit tenebras latibulum ſuum.*

(2.) Relations in God are ſaid to be (u) *of ſo great Dignity, Nobility and Majeſty, that the moſt Sacred Myſtery of the Trinity is founded and ſubſiſteth meerly in the Relations of Origination, and by them the Divine Perſons are conſtituted and diſtinguiſh'd. The Foundations of theſe Divine Relations are the Proceſſions of the Divine Perſons:* as Generation is the Foundation of the Relation of Paternity and Filiation. The Relation of the Principle of this Proceſſion is called Paternity, the Relation of the Perſon *proceeding* is called Filiation. But is there any thing anſwerable to theſe Relations in the productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt? No, (w) *The Relations which are ſuppos'd to be according to this ſort of Proceſſion, have no Name:* (x) *but the Relation of the Principle of this Proceſſion is called Spiration: the Relation of the Perſon proceeding, Proceſſion: although theſe Names do not belong to the Relations, but to the Proceſſions or Originations.* But are theſe two Names or either of them the proper Name or Names of theſe Proceſſions or Originations? No, (y) *The Proceſſion which is not Generation, is without any ſpecial Name: but it may be called Spiration, becauſe it is the Proceſſion of the Spirit.* This Name Scholaſticks have given it, and it is left to them, to name it; which could not be, if either Name or Thing was found in the *Bible*. It is not ſo much as likely, that there is ſuch a perſonal productive Proceſſion, which cannot be called by any Name expreſſive of a perſonal productive Proceſſion, and which doth not found any *nominable* Relation; Nor is it likely, that one of the Divine Perſons is conſtituted and diſtinguiſh'd by ſuch an *innominable* Relation, which is nothing like a Relation, nothing like the Relations of Kindred, or the other Relations in the *Trinity*, *Paternity* and *Filiation*. (z) *Proceſſio & ſpiratio ſecundum proprietatem ſignificationis magis videntur ſignificare actus notionales, quàm relationes: Proceſſion and Spiration according to the propriety of their ſignification ſeem rather to ſignifie the Notional Acts* (ſo called) *than Relations.*

(3.) This Theology further obſerveth, (a) *In the Creatures there is not any communication of Nature by Spiration, or by any other proceſſion than Generation.* (b) *None ought to wonder, if no ſimilitude can be taken from Creatures and uſual things, which is fit, to illuſtrate the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; ſuch as we have in treating of the Production of the Son, which is properly called Generation: for that Proceſſion* (of the Holy Ghoſt) *is ſingular and agreeing only to the Divinity, whereby one Perſon both naturally and of the ſame Subſtance is ſo produc'd by two, as to be generated by neither of them.* This ſtrange productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt is ſo ſtupendiouſly exotick, that there is not any reſemblance of it in the whole Univerſe, much leſs in this lower World. But ſeeing Senſibles are the ***Imitamina*** of the Intelligibles, the things below of the things above, and there is an Analogy between Divine and Humane Affairs, this ſtupendious exotick Nature of the productive proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt is a great Indication, that there is no ſuch thing.

III. And this we may be well aſſur'd of, if we conſider, that the Holy Scriptures are wholly ſilent concerning it: nor would the Scholaſtick Theologers think otherwiſe, if it was not their humour, to diſtort the Holy Scriptures from a Chriſtian and Holy Popular to a School-metaphyſical and Philoſophic Senſe: for ſo our Saviour's words touching the Holy Spirit, *Joh.* 16. 13, 14. *He ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf; but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak; for he ſhall receive of mine;* are in the Scholaſtick Theology diſtorted, to ſignifie (c) *the productive Proceſſion and ſubſtantial Production of the Holy Spirit:* for this Theology diſputeth, (d) *One perſon is not ſaid, to receive, or hear, or learn of another, ſave only by a productive proceſſion from him, and being the thing which he receiveth: becauſe in God Science is the ſame with Eſſence.* Our Saviour is ſuppos'd to preach School-metaphyſicks inſtead of Goſpel; for (e) *when the Father is ſaid to ſpeak, and the Son to hear, the meaning is, that Subſtance is communicated from the Father to the Son, in which that thing is, which he ſpeaketh; which alſo muſt be affirmed touching the Holy Spirit:* (f) *as Generation expreſſeth the proceſſion of the Son from the Father according to Subſtance: ſo* πνεῦσις, *Spiration, ſignifieth the proper proceſſion of the Holy Spirit according to Subſtance: Our Saviour's breathing on his Diſciples therefore ſignifieth this Subſtantial Proceſſion of the Holy Spirit from the Divine Subſtance.* So the Name of *Living Water* which our Saviour giveth to the Holy Spirit, (g) is in this Theology ſuppos'd, to relate to the οὐσιώδης, *ſubſtantive* production of it, and in the ſame ſenſe it underſtandeth ἐκπορεύεσθαι, *to proceed:* πηγάζειν, *idem eſt quod* ἐκπορεύεσθαι, *hoc verò ſubſtantialem proceſſionem ſignificat:* *To pour out* (as out of a Fountain) *is the ſame with proceeding, which ſignifieth a Subſtantial Proceſſion.* At the ſame rate this Theology underſtandeth thoſe other Terms which it uſeth, προχεῖσθαι, προϊέναι, ἀναβλύζειν (to be poured out, to come forth, to burſt out) for theſe (h) *ſignifie a ſubſtantial Emanation, and ſuch a proceſſion, whereby a perſon receiveth Subſiſtence, which the Greek Theologers call Proceſſion.* (i) *So the* Ethiopians *inſtead of the word* Vazza *went forth or proceeded, and in the Preterperfect Tenſe, uſe the word* Saraz, *to bud or ſprout forth. Thus* Claudius *in his Confeſſion.*

> *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt, reviving Lord,* Zaſratz em Ab, *who proceeded or ſprung from the Father.*

Thus the Holy Scriptures are diſtorted and the words of our Saviour perverted (from the

---

(t) Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 2. Art. 4. S. 2.

(u) Ibid. Diſp. 3. in Proœm.

(w) *Relationes quæ ſecundum hujuſmodi proceſſionem accipiuntur, innominatæ ſunt.* Aquin. ſupr. Qu. 36. Art. 1.

(x) *Sed vocatur relatio principii hujus proceſſionis ſpiratio: relatio autem procedentis, proceſſio: quamvis hæc duo nomina ad ipſas proceſſiones vel origines pertineant & non ad relationes.* Ibid. Qu. 28. Art. 4.

(y) *Proceſſio quæ non eſt generatio, eſt ſine ſpeciali nomine: ſed poteſt nominari ſpiratio, quia eſt proceſſio ſpiritus.* Ibid. Qu. 27. Art. 4.

(z) *Ibid. Qu.* 36. *Art.* 1.

(a) *In creaturis communicatio naturæ non eſt niſi per generationem.* Ibid. Qu. 27. Art. 4. ad 3.

(b) *Mirum eſſe nemini debet, ſi nulla creatis & uſitatis ex rebus transferri ſimilitudo poteſt, quæ ad ſpiritus ſancti proceſſionem declarandam idonea ſit; cujuſmodi in Filii productione ſuppetit: quæ propriè generatio dicitur. Eſt enim ſingularis, ac ſoli Divinitati congruens illa proceſſio, qua ſic ab ambobus & naturaliter, & ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ perſona una producitur, ut ab neutra generetur.* Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 10. S. 4.

(c) Petav. ibid. c. 5. S. 4, 5. & c. 2. S. 6. & l. 3. c. 8.

(d) *Nihil vel accipere, vel audire, vel diſcere ab una perſona dici alteram, niſi ab eadem oriendo, & exiſtendo idipſum quod accipit: quoniam hoc eſt ſcire in Deo, quod eſſe.* Ibid.

(e) *Loqui patrem, vel audire Filium, eſt eam Filio ſubſtantiam communicari à Patre, in qua idipſum eſt quod loquitur. Quod etiam de ſpiritu ſancto fatendum eſt.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 8. S. 2.

(f) Ibid. l. 7. c. 5. S. 9, 11.

(g) Ibid. c. 4. S. 4.

(h) *Subſtantialem emanationem ſignificant, ac proceſſionem ejuſmodi, qua perſona ſubſiſtentiam accipit, quam* ἐκπόρευσιν *appellant Græci Theologi.* Ibid. S. 3.

(i) *Ludolph. Hiſt.* B. 3. c. 5. *Ed.* 1682.

Preſent to the Preterperfect Tenſe) and this is ἄιτιον τȢ ψεύδȢς, that which cauſeth our grand Miſtakes of the Holy Scriptures and of the Articles of our Faith, they have fallen into the Hands of Scholaſticks (Platonic and Ariſtotelian, of ancient and later times,) who will have them underſtood in their Scholaſtick Metaphyſical Senſe, which is both Unpopular and Unholy. Thus they interpret the Words of our Saviour touching the Miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt. *Joh.* 15. 26. *Whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father.* For the Holy Ghoſt's proceeding from the Father in reſpect of *ſubſtantive* Production into Exiſtence is nothing like any Popular or Holy-popular Affair: Nor is it pertinent to the matter, which our Saviour ſpeaketh of, which is only the (temporary) Miſſion and Communication of the Holy Ghoſt: Nor is it pertinent to our Saviour's Scope, which is to repreſent the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Truth and the Authentick Witneſs, becauſe he proceedeth from the Father: Nor could the Hearers of his Words underſtand them in the Scholaſtick Senſe; for the terms of *proceeding from the Father* are not amongſt Mankind expreſſive of an ȣ̓σιώδης, *ſubſtantive* Production into Exiſtence: Nor is his Speech touching a thing infinite Ages paſt; for he ſpeaketh in the Preſent Tenſe, and therefore ſo ſpeaketh, becauſe he ſpeaketh of a thing coming on and at hand. S. *Auſtin* himſelf (who uſually maketh Scholaſtick Interpretations, yet) ſometimes ſaith of the Holy Spirit ſpoken of in the Goſpel (k) *exiit, non quomodo natus, ſed quomodo datus, the Holy Spirit as given unto Men proceeded from the Father. Beza* upon the place ſaith; *it is certain, that our Saviour here doth not ſpeak of the Eſſence of the Spirit, but the Virtue and Efficacy of it in us, of which he maketh the Father the Origin. Such Teſtimonies as theſe therefore are not appoſitely cited either by the Greeks or againſt the Greeks, to prove the Eſſence of the Holy Spirit.* No Scripture informeth us, that there is any ſuch thing as a Scholaſtick productive Proceſſion of the Holy Spirit, yet the Greek and Latin Church (profoundly Scholaſticizing) for many Ages have been divided about it, and no body can tell, whence the Controverſie aroſe.

IV. The Scholaſtick Theology giveth not a tolerably good account of that productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt which it ſuppoſeth; the whole of it is an incongruous human Invention, that claſheth with ſound Reaſon. For,

(1.) This Theology ſuppoſeth, that there are in the Godhead *two Proceſſions productive of two Divine Perſons, which are equal and equally Divine.* But this cannot be known, unleſs by Divine Revelation it be made known (which it is not:) Nor is it reaſonable, to believe theſe Proceſſions from God of two Divine Perſons that are equal and equally Divine; for but one of them is celebrated as the ſupereminent Object of his Love, one of them is counted his יחיד *unus & unicè dilectus*, but one of them is his Heir of all things (*hæres ex aſſe*;) one of them is his *Iſaac*, whom he hath dealt with, as *Abraham* dealt with *Iſaac*, *Gen.* 25. 5, 6. *Unto Iſaac he gave all that he had.*

(2.) One of theſe two Divine Perſons is ſuppoſed to be produc'd by *Spiration*, which is purely a matter of Scholaſtick Invention and not of reaſonable Conception; for it is as reaſonable, to ſuppoſe *Inſpiration* in the Godhead as *Spiration*, nor did our Saviour's Spiration (his breathing on his Diſciples) ſignifie any thing but Inſpiration. And is it probable, that any Spiration (although it may be the Origin of Life) can be the Origin of a perſonal ſubſtantive Production? It would do well, if the Schoolmen would hold to their own Rule (l) *de divinis Philoſophari debemus per analogiam & ſimilitudinem ad res creatas, ſecluſis imperfectionibus* (touching divine things we ought to Philoſophize by Analogy and Similitude to created things, Imperfections being remov'd) for amongſt created things there is no perſonal ſubſtantive Production by Spiration.

(3.) Nor are perſonal ſubſtantive Productions like to meer Emanations, that are neither *Generation* nor *Spiration*, which are Similitudes that do not diſtinguiſh the Perſons and their Origination, but confound them. Such as theſe Similitudes. (m) *The Fountain of living Water is the Father: The River proceeding from the Fountain is the Son: The Water of the River is the Holy Spirit.* One ſaith (n) the Holy Spirit is a ſweet Odour of the Subſtance of the Son, *patrem roſam, filium florem, ſpiritum ſanctum odorem.* And the ſame Author ſaith, ὁ υἱὸς ὀσμή τις τῆς πατρῴας ȣ̓σίας, *the Son is as a certain Odour of the Father's Subſtance*, he is from the Father as ἐξ ἀνθέων εὐωδία, *a ſweet Odour from Flowers.* He ſaith alſo, *the Son is according to Nature begotten from the Father* ὡς ἐκ πυρὸς θερμότης, *as heat from fire*; and *Athenagoras* ſaith (o) ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, *the Spirit is from the Father as light from fire.* The ſame Author ſaith of the Logos υἱὸς τȢ πατρὸς ϗ ἀπόρροια, *he is the Son and Aporrhæa of the Father:* And he alſo ſaith (p) τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀπόρροιαν εἶναι φαμὲν τȢ θεȢ, *we ſay, that the Holy Spirit is an Aporrhæa of God.* Of theſe incongruous Imaginations (that confound two very diſtinct Perſons and their ſuppos'd diſtinct Originations) not God, but Man is the Author, Man Scholaſticizing the matters of God injudiciouſly and injuriouſly. For let us ſuppoſe, that the Son iſſueth from the Father by neceſſary Emanation (as things unſubſtantial and imperſonal may iſſue from one another) that his Sonſhip conſiſteth in being (q) ἀπόρροια τῆς τȢ πατρὸς ȣ̓σίας, (as *Theognoſtus* in *Athanaſius* calleth him) an *Emanatory Aporrhæa of the Father's Subſtance*; and that the Holy Spirit did emerge into Exiſtence as ἀπόρροια τȢ θεȢ, *an Emanatory Aporrhæa of God*; the conſequence is; the Holy Spirit will be moſt properly the Son, as being moſt properly *an Emanatory Aporrhæa.* For ſo the Spirit whence the Pagans had the Faculty of Divination, is called by their Theologers (r) πνεῦμα τὸ κατιὸν ϗ ἀπόρροια ἐκ τῆς ἐπȣρανίȣ δυνάμεως, *a Spirit deſcending and an Aporrhæa from the celeſtial Power.* The Holy Spirit therefore is not (in Conjunction with the Son) thus producible into Exiſtence, as will more clearly appear from the Schoolmens Diſputes.

(4.) For the Schoolmen Diſpute (s) that theſe Emanations muſt be ſuch, as are *true and proper Actions*, becauſe Generation is a true and proper Action, ſubſiſtent Perſons muſt be produc'd by a true and proper Action (or Actions,) and theſe Emanations cannot be immediately from the divine Eſſence without the Intervention of the divine Intellect and Will. For if they are not immediately from the divine Intellect and Will, no reaſon can be given, why

(k) V. Petav. ſupr. l. 7. c. 13. S. 19, 20.

(l) Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 2. Art. 3. S. 2.

(m) Πηγὴ ὕδατος ζῶντος ὁ πατήρ· Ποταμὸς ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς προερχόμενος ὁ υἱός· Ὕδωρ τȢ ποταμȢ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 4. S. 1.

(n) Ibid c. 5. S. 8.

(o) Legat. p. 27.

(p) Ibid. p. 10.

(q) Petav. ſupr. l. 5. c. 8. S. 13.

(r) Gale in Jambl. p. 235.

(s) Gonet. ſupr. Art. 2. S. 1. & Art. 3. S. 2.

the one productive Proceſſion precedeth the other; why the one is Generation and not the other; why the *Verbum* is but from one Perſon and the Holy Spirit from two; (*t*) and this is the only Reaſon, why there are but two productive Proceſſions in the Godhead, becauſe in an intellectual and divine Nature there are but two immanent Actions *Intellection* and *Volition.* (*u*) They argue, that theſe Proceſſions in the Godhead muſt neceſſarily be from *Immanent* (not tranſient) Operations; that one of them being called *Verbum* and *Sapientia Genita* is manifeſtly from the Operation of Intellect (as the generality of the Fathers ſuppoſe;) therefore the other being a different Proceſſion, is from the Operation of the Will (Volition which is Spiration;) agreeably whereto S. *Auſtin* and ſome other Fathers, have called the Holy Spirit *Amor, Love, Amor Patris & Filii, the mutual Love of the Father and the Son*; for Love is from the Will. The Father and the Son by their mutual Love (*w*) are ſuppos'd, to produce the Holy Spirit, *which is, Charitas ſubſtantialis & conſubſtantialis amborum, the ſubſtantial and conſubſtantial Love of both:* But not the *Eſſential* Love whereby they Love each other (for the divine Eſſence is not one Perſon but three) but the product and *terminus* of their mutual Love.

(5.) Becauſe of his Origination the Holy Ghoſt is called in this Theology (*x*) *the notional Love of the Father and the Son* (who are ſaid to Love by the Holy Spirit) *the Conjunction, Kiſs, Embracement, Undiſturbable Peace of the Father and the Son, the firm Connexion, inſeparable Love, individual Unity, indiſſoluble Bond of the Trinity.* Of all which Appellations and Expreſſions a good Senſe might be made, if the Holy Ghoſt was peculiarly the divine Affection of Love and Charity: But (although oftentimes of the words of this Theology no other Conſtruction can be made, but that they ſignifie in this ſenſe, yet) it cannot be pretended, that the Holy Ghoſt is more Love than *the Father is Love, and the Son is Love*, as Love ſignifieth the divine Affection of Love and Charity, which is the only Bond of Union and undiſturbable Peace. But this Theology deludeth it ſelf and us with Ambiguity of words, calling the Holy Ghoſt peculiarly Love only (*y*) as being *amor expreſſus, dilectionis terminus, expreſſed Love, the termination of it, and whoſe productive Proceſſion is from Will and Love*; which ſignifieth nothing to his being peculiarly *the divine Love and Charity*, which is the Bond of Union. But becauſe his productive Proceſſion is from Will and Love, *hence the Holy Ghoſt* (ſaith this Theology) *is by Perſonal Propriety, Donum Dei, the Gift of God, the Son is not the Gift although given by the Father* (and celebrated as the ſupereminent Gift of God in Scripture, whence this Theology is no derivative) *becauſe his productive Proceſſion is from Mind and Intelligence, not from Will and Love, as the Holy Ghoſts is.* (z) *Who therefore is called the Spirit, as being by his productive Proceſſion the ſweet breathing* (halitus & Spiratio) *of the Father and the Son.* Spiritus Spirantis alicujus eſt. *Spirit relateth to ſome one that Breaths*, whence the Holy Spirit hath its Name, ſaith this Theology. As if the holy People which in antient times impos'd and us'd this Name *the Spirit*, were acquainted with the Scholaſtick Metaphyſicks touching the Love-breathings of the Father and the Son.

(6.) The Reaſonings of this Theology whereby it explicateth *the productive Proceſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt have no Parallel. (*a*) Becauſe God was never ἄλογος, *without Reaſon*, hence this Theology inferreth, that the perſonal Logos muſt exiſt from Eternity: And becauſe God was never ἀθελής, *without Will or Volition*, hence it inferreth, that the Holy Ghoſt muſt exiſt from Eternity; *nam quid eſt aliud Charitas, quam voluntas* (as S. *Auſtin* ſaith) for what elſe is Love but Will? The Generation of the *Verbum* in this Theology is likened to the Generation of Accidents, not of Subſtances (*b*) yet this *Verbum* is ſuppoſed to be *Verbum ſubſiſtens*, λόγος οὐσιώδης, *a ſubſiſtent and ſubſtantial Verbum:* So the productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt is likened to the productive Proceſſion, not of any Subſtance, but of an Accident (Volition or Affection) yet it is called *Amor ſubſtantialis & conſubſtantialis*, the ſubſtantial and conſubſtantial Love. Of the *Verbum* this Theology thus interpreteth the Scripture. (*c*) *I came out of the Mouth of the moſt High: That is, out of the Intellect of the Father, which is as it were the Mouth of a Spiritual Subſtance.* And in like manner it ſaith of the Holy Spirit (*d*) *it is called the Spirit of the Mouth of God: By which Name the Son is called by the ancient Doctors.* (*e*) Theſe compare the Son to a Word or Speech that goeth out of our Mouth, and the Holy Spirit to the Breath or Spirit that accompanieth it. Whence they infer, that there is a Spirit of God, becauſe his Word muſt not be of worſe condition than ours, without Spirit. *Verbum ſine Spiritu non eſt, ut neque mens ſine Verbo.* The *Verbum* is not without Spirit, as the Mind is not without the *Verbum.* For by our Intellection which produceth a Mental-conceptional *Verbum*, or Notion (which is the Product-termination thereof) this Theology explicateth the Generation of the Son, and this it accounteth a very clear Explication (although the Generation of a Notion is nothing like the Generation of a divine Perſon:) But touching the productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Will or from Love this Theology maketh an unanſwerable Objection againſt its own Hypotheſis. For it ſuppoſeth (*f*) *that we cannot otherwiſe underſtand and declare the things divine than from our things.* With great Reaſon therefore a Schoolman thus argueth; (*g*) *in nobis nihil procedit per voluntatem: Ergo nec in divinis. In us there is no productive Proceſſion by the Will: Therefore it is ſo in the Godhead.* Others obſerve, (*h*) *that in the buſineſs of Intellection there are diſtinct Names, whereby the Intelligence it ſelf is diſcern'd from the Terminus and Product of it; for this is called* Logos *and* Verbum: *But in the Will and the Action thereof the Matter is more obſcure and undiſcernable.* Quoniam in creaturis actionis ejus terminus, quam θέλησιν Grecè nominant, Scholæ Volitionem,

(t) *Aquin.* 1. *Qu.* 27. *Art.* 5.

(u) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *Punct.* 3.

(w) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. *c.* 12.

(x) *Amor notionalis Patris & Filii, nexus, oſculum, amplexus, imperturbabilis pax Patris Filiique, gluten firmum, individuus amor, individua unitas, indiſſolubile vinculum Trinitatis.* Petav. Ibid. S. 5, & 8. *Pater & Filius diligunt ſe Spiritu Sancto.*

(y) *Ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 3. *S.* 6.

(z) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 10. *S.* 8. & *c.* 12. *S.* 7.

(a) *Ibid. c.* 12. *S.* 12.

(b) *Non huic ſed illi debet divina generatio aſſimilari.* Gonet. ſupr. Diſp. 2. Art. 3. S. [illegible]

(c) *Ego ex ore altiſſimi prodii: id eſt ex intellectu Patris, qui eſt veluti os ſpiritualis ſubſtantiæ.* Gonet. ibid. Diſp. 2. Art. 1. in Proœm.

(d) *Appellatus eſt Spiritus oris Dei: Os autem Patris ab antiquis Doctoribus nominatur Filius.* Petav. ſupr. l. 7. c. 5. S 9, 10.

(e) *Ibid. c.* 10. *S.* 1, 2. & *c.* 11. *S.* 8, 9.

(f) *Non aliunde quam* [illegible] *ex rebus divinas capere ac declarare poſſumus.* Petav. ſupr. l. 7 c. 12. S. 8.

(g) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 3.

(h) Petav. ſupr. l. 7. c. 12. [illegible] nem, ab ipſa ἐνεργείᾳ, & actione vix abjungitur. *Becauſe in Creatures the Terminus of Volition is ſcarce diſtinguiſhable from the Energy and Action it ſelf.* So far therefore the Scholaſtick Theology favoureth our Hypotheſis touching the Non-production of the Holy Ghoſt, it is really agreeable to ſome principal Maxims thereof (much more agreeable than the contrary Hypotheſis) and if violence is not done them, they plainly infer it; for there is no productive Proceſſion from Will. But ſeeing the Scholaſtick Theology will have it otherwiſe, let us ſuppoſe the productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from *Will*, which is the principal Faculty (not the Underſtanding) and from *Love*, which is a far higher Perfection than Knowledge, χρεῖττον λόγȣ ϗ ἐπιςήμης. *better than Reaſon and Knowledge.* The Holy Ghoſt being thus originated is much more nobly originated than the Son, whoſe productive Proceſſion is but from Intellect; and being appropriately *Love* or Charity, whereas the Son is but Reaſon and Knowledge; the Holy Ghoſt is neceſſarily far above the Son.

V. Scholaſtick Divines for many Ages have been extremely at a loſs, to aſſign a Difference between the eternal Generation of the Son and the eternal (productive) Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; and to ſhew a Reaſon, why the one is a Son and the other is no Son. (i) *We know that there is a difference between Generation and Proceſſion, but this manner of exiſting can neither be comprehended nor explain'd by us, but is only known to the Holy Trinity.* (k) *Proceſſion doth not ſignifie meer Egreſſion, but the ſubſtantial manner of exiſting, which cannot be apprehended by us.* The Maſter of the Sentences ſaith (l) *while we live here, we are not able to diſtinguiſh between the Generation of the Son and the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt.* So ſeveral other Schoolmen ſay. (m) *It is impoſſible, that this difference* (between Generation and Proceſſion) *ſhould be explicated in this Life by ſuch as we are, without ſome peculiar Revelation.* S. *Auſtin* ſaith (n) *How to diſtinguiſh between the Generation of the Son and the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, I know not, I cannot, I am not ſufficient. Who can ſay, what is the difference between being generated and proceeding?* So *Joh. Damaſcen* ſaith (o) *that there is a difference between Generation and Proceſſion, we have learned: But what that Mode of difference is, we have not learned.* To thoſe that ask'd, *if the Holy Spirit is from the Father, why is he not ſaid to be generated, or to be a Son?* (p) *Athanaſius* can give no other anſwer but only a reprehenſion for their *ſearching* (as he ſaith) *into the deep things of God, which no Man knoweth but the Spirit of God.* For the Reſolution of theſe great Queſtions S. *Baſil* can ſay nothing (q) *but the inconvenience of calling the Holy Spirit a Son, that the manner of his Exiſtence is ineffable*, and that he is from God ȣ̓γεννητῶς ὡς ὁ υἱὸς, ἀλλ' ὡς πνεῦμα ςόματος αὐτȣ̃, *not generatively as the Son, but as the Spirit of his Mouth.* He would have us not aſham'd, to confeſs our Ignorance touching the manner of the Holy Spirits Exiſtence (r) τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀῤῥήτως ἐκ τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃, *the Holy Spirit is from God inexplicably.* To ſearch therefore into this Myſtery, ſeemeth a great Folly, as being impoſſible, to be found out; and *Gr. Naz.* repreſenteth it as an Irreligious boldneſs being a ſearch into that which is hidden from us. (s) Τίς ȣ̃ν ἡ ἐκπόρευσις; *you will ſay, what is Proceſſion? Do you explain to me the Ingenitneſs of the Father, and I will explain to you the Generation of the Son and the Proceſſion of the Spirit,* ϗ παραπληκτίσομεν ἄμφω εἰς Θεȣ̃ μυςήρια παρακύπτοντες, *and ſo we will both be out of our Wits, looking into the Myſteries of God.*

But notwitſtanding this affrightment of danger the Scholaſtic Divines have look'd into this Myſtery, many of them have attempted an Explication of it, and have alledg'd many Reaſons, to ſhew, why the Holy Ghoſt is not a Son, or (which is the ſame thing) why his Proceſſion is not a Generation: But this they have done with mighty Diſagreement among themſelves, and with a Confutation of one another's Reaſons, which are ſo frivolous and unreaſonable and ſo devoid of probability, that no more than one of them is worthy to be taken into conſideration. This reaſon is that which *Aquinas* and his Followers give (t) *That the Verbum or Second Perſon having his productive Proceſſion from Intellect,* and therefore being like his Original as Intelligent, and like to the Object underſtood, (which is the Divine Eſſence) *hath a Similitude of Nature to his Original formally by Virtue of his Proceſſion, and therefore his Proceſſion is Generation* (omne generans generat ſibi ſimile) *and he is a Son: But the Holy Spirit having his productive Proceſſion from Will and Love* (wherein there is no Similitude of the Object belov'd, but only an Inclination thereto) *hath not a Similitude of Nature to his Original formally by Virtue of his Proceſſion, and therefore his Proceſſion is not Generation, nor is he a Son.* Intellectus eſt aſſimilativus, voluntas verò non eſt potentia aſſimilativa. *Intellection is ſo aſſimilative, that every mental conceptional Verbum is the Image and Similitude of the thing underſtood, and in the Godhead the Verbum* (produc'd by the Self-intellection of the firſt Perſon) *is by the Nature of his Origin and Proceſſion the Image and Similitude of the firſt Perſon that produceth him: But the Operation of the Will is not by ſuch aſſimilation to the beloved Object, it is not by a Similitude to it, but by a Motion and Impulſe unto it; and in the Godhead the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe Proceſſion is from the Will and by way of Love* (not by way of Similitude) *is not by this Nature of his Origin and Proceſſion the Image and Similitude of any, but is* Amor ſubſiſtens, *ſubſiſtent Love, which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if the Holy Spirit is not ſubſiſtent in the Divine Nature, or is not a Perſon like to the Verbum and Conſubſtantial: But that he is not this by his diſtinct productive Proceſſion, as it is an Operation of the Will and of Love, which tendeth not to expreſs the Similitude of any one, and therefore is not Generation* (as the productive Proceſſion of the Verbum is) *nor doth it conſtitute him a Son.* Such are the frivolous Philoſophic Subtilities and vain Speculations of this Scholaſtick Theology (much more agreeable to Phyſiology than Theology;) for that this Scholaſtick Speculation touching the Reaſon of the Non-generation and Sonſhip of the Holy Spirit is very vain and frivolous will appear from theſe following Remarks.

(i) *Quid inter generationem & proceſſionem diſcrimen ſit, compertum habemus: Modus autem exiſtentiæ à nobis neque comprehendi, nec verbis explicari poteſt, ſed ſoli duntaxat ſanctæ Trinitati cognitus eſt.* Elias Cret. in Gr. Naz. or. 23.

(k) *Proceſſio non ſimplicem egreſſionem ſignificat: Sed ſubſtantialem & naturalem quoque modum exiſtendi declarat, qui à nobis percipi nequit.* Idem in Or. 37.

(l) *Inter generationem Filii & proceſſionem ſpiritus ſancti, dum hic vivimus, diſtinguere non valemus.* 1. Diſt. 13.

(m) *Ap. Vaſqu. in* 1. *Par. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 113. *c.* 3. *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 4.

(n) *Diſtinguere inter illam generationem & hanc proceſſionem, neſcio, non valeo, non ſufficio.* C. Maximin. l. 3. c. 14. *Quid inter naſci & procedere interſit, explicare quis poteſt.* Ibid.

(o) L. 1. c. 9.

(p) Ep. ad Serap. p. 556. Com. & T. 2. p. 23.

(q) C. Eunom p. 121. de ſp. ſanct. c. 18.

(r) *Or. c. Sabell. p.* 609, 610.

(s) *Or.* 37. p. 597.

(t) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. c. 14. *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *Diſp.* 2. *Art.* 4. *S.* 4.

(1.) In this vain Speculation the main Queſtion is overlook'd, which ought to be clearly ſtated in order to a clear reſolution of it. For the main Queſtion is, *Whether the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon producible into Exiſtence?* And the Scholaſtick Theology before it determineth this Queſtion, ought clearly to Anſwer this Argument. *If the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon producible into Exiſtence, it muſt be by Generation: But the Holy Ghoſt is not producible into Exiſtence by Generation; therefore he is not a Perſon producible into Exiſtence.* This Theology taketh it for granted that the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon produc'd into Exiſtence, and that there is a productive Proceſſion of him in the Godhead, which is *petitio principii*, and a taking that for granted, which it cannot ſolidly prove.

(2.) In this vain Speculation two different Conſiderations of the Scholaſtick Proceſſion of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are ſo confounded, that the one of them maketh no appearance. For the Scholaſtick Proceſſion of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt ought in the firſt place, to be conſider'd in their more general Nature, wherein they agree, *as they are both Proceſſions of Divine Perſons:* And in the next place they ought to be conſider'd in their more Special Nature, wherein they differ, as the one of them is from Intellect, and the other from Will and Love. So the Scholaſtick Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt ought in the firſt place, to be conſider'd in its more general Nature, *as it is the productive Proceſſion of a Divine Perſon:* And in the ſecond place it ought to be conſider'd in its more Special Nature, *as it is the productive Proceſſion of a Divine Perſon from Will and Love.* The former of theſe Conſiderations maketh no appearance in this Speculation, which yet is of principal regard. For ſuppoſe, that the productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, as it is from Will and Love, is not a Generation, what doth this ſignifie, if his productive Proceſſion as it is the productive Proceſſion of a Divine Perſon is neceſſarily a Generation? That this is a Generation, is manifeſt from the Scholaſtick definition of Generation. (u) *Whatever of a live Similitude of Nature proceedeth from one alive, that is a conjunct Principle, neceſſarily proceedeth ſuch (not by accident, but) by Virtue of its very Production, and ſo cannot but be truly generated and be a Son.*

(3.) This vain Speculation acknowledgeth, that the definition of Generation agreeth to the productive Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt: But it maketh an addition thereto, ſuch an addition which is ambiguous and equivocal. (w) *The productive Proceſſion of the Holy Spirit is, according to the definition of Generation, an Origination into Similitude of Nature of one that liveth, from one which liveth, that is a conjunct Principle.* For the Holy Spirit is one that liveth, that is originated from one that liveth, and is a conjunct Principle, becauſe he is the *Terminus* of an immanent Action, and is intimately conjoin'd with his Principle or Original by an indentity of Nature. *He is like in Nature*, becauſe the Nature of the Father and the Son (the ſame Nature) is communicated to him by his productive Proceſſion, which therefore is a Generation, according to that known Maxim, *cui convenit definitio, ei convenit & definitum.* Not ſo, ſaith this Theology; for although the Holy Ghoſt hath a Similitude of Nature to his Original by his productive Proceſſion, yet not *formally by Virtue thereof*, and thence it is, that it is not a Generation. But theſe words *formally by Virtue of his productive Proceſſion* are ambiguous and equivocal. For they may be underſtood touching his productive Proceſſion both in its more *general* and in its more *ſpecial* Nature. If they are underſtood touching his productive Proceſſion in its more *ſpecial* Nature, this Theology diſputeth, that he hath not a Similitude of Nature to his Original *formally by Virtue of his productive Proceſſion*, which is the addition that it maketh to the definition of Generation. But if we underſtand theſe words touching his productive Proceſſion in its more *general* Nature, we may affirm, that the Holy Spirit hath a Similitude of Nature to his Original *formally by Virtue of his productive Proceſſion* (which therefore is a Generation) and this Theology hath nothing to ſay againſt it.

(4.) This vain Speculation implieth, that the productive Proceſſion of the Second Perſon is a Generation upon two accounts. For it is certainly a Generation in its more *general* Nature, as it is the productive Proceſſion of a Divine Perſon; and this Theology diſputeth, that it is a Generation in its more *ſpecial* Nature, as it is a productive Proceſſion from Intellect. In both theſe Conſiderations the productive Proceſſion of the Second Perſon muſt be thought a Generation, becauſe *he proceedeth into a Similitude of Nature* (in both theſe Conſiderations) *formally by Virtue of his productive Proceſſion* (or *quatenus talis proceſſio eſt*) and both theſe Reaſons, why his Production is Generation, have either the Scriptures or the Authority of the Fathers, to Countenance them: But the Reaſon which this Speculation aſſigneth, why the Production of the Holy Ghoſt is not Generation, hath neither Scripture, nor the Authority of the Fathers to Countenance it: But it is purely an Invention of the Modern Schoolmen, of which themſelves have ſo little Aſſurance, that one of them ſaith (x) *ſomething there is certainly in the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, that hindreth the adequate definition of Generation from agreeing to his Proceſſion, which agreeth to the Proceſſion of the ſecond Perſon: But what that is, God knoweth. To us it is enough, to know in general from the Faith, that certainly there is ſomething.*

(5.) This vain Speculation ſuppoſeth, not only that Intellect is more generative than Will and Love, but that Intellect alone is generative, and Will and Love are not generative. Whereas, not Intellection, but Will and Love is the Principle of Fecundity; not Intellection, but Will and Love is Inclination and Propenſion. Not Intellection, but Will and Deſire is properly the Principle of Action, and therefore of Generation. All the World knoweth, that Theory is barren, that it is Love (not Intellect) which is γενεσιουργὸς, *generative*, as Love was denominated by the Heathen; the better ſort of whom made Love and Deſire the Principle of the Generation of the Univerſe. And what is it, that maketh God and Men communicative

(u) *Quicquid procedit ſimile in Natura vivente, à vivente & à principio conjuncto, non poteſt non procedere tale (non ex accidenti, ſed) vi ipſius productionis, & ita non poteſt non verè generari, & eſſe filius.* Vaſqu. in 1 Par. T. 2. Diſp. 113. c. 6.

(w) *Hæc definitio origo viventis à vivente conjuncto in ſimilitudinem naturæ, convenit proceſſioni ſpiritus ſancti.* Gonct. ſupr. S. 1.

(x) *Aliquid omninò eſſe in proceſſione ſpiritus ſancti, quod reipſa obſtat, quo minus illius proceſſioni conveniat adæquata ratio generationis divinæ, quæ convenit proceſſioni divini verbi: Quid autem illud ſit Deus ſcit. Nobis ſatis eſt ex fide generatim ſcire, quod id omnino eſt aliquid.* Valentia T. 1. Diſp. 2. Q. 1. Punct. 4.

nicative but Love? What maketh Men incommunicative but want of Love? If there is a Correſpondence between Divine and Humane Affairs, this Propoſition of the Schoolmen muſt be infinitely falſe. (y) *The Intellect in the Godhead is the faculty of it ſelf primarily deſign'd to communicate Nature, but not the Will.*

(6.) This vain Speculation ſuppoſeth, that a Communication of the Divine Nature from the meer Intellection of it is generative, but the Communication of the Divine Nature from the love of it is not generative; for the mutual Love of the Father and the Son is ſaid to produce the Holy Spirit, but ſo that the Love of each of them to himſelf is alſo ſaid to produce it; (z) *as God underſtanding and contemplating himſelf produceth the Perſon of the Son* (or the *Verbum*:) *ſo loving and willing himſelf he produceth the Holy Spirit.* The Perſon thus originated from Love is of a more noble Origination, than he that is originated meerly from Intellect; therefore he cannot be leſs a Son, nor his Origination leſs a Generation. And God's communication of the Divine Nature from the love of it neceſſarily tendeth and is intended to produce a Perſon like to himſelf in Nature, who therefore (if produc'd) hath a ſimilitude of Nature *formally by virtue of his Production*, and conſequently his Production is (in the ſenſe of this Scholaſtick Speculation) a Generation.

(7.) This vain Speculation maketh the Holy Ghoſt far more God-like than the Son of God, and therefore much more his genuine Son, as being much more his reſembling Off-ſpring. For the Son of God is only the Scholaſtick *Verbum*; but God is *Love*, and the Holy Ghoſt (according to this Theology) is definitively and diſtinctively *Love*; therefore this Theology maketh the Holy Ghoſt far more God-like than the Son of God. The Scholaſtick Son of God is not in his uſual Scholaſtick Names ſuch a Divine and God-like thing, as the Scholaſtick Holy Ghoſt is: for what is *idea*, *ratio*, *proles mentis*, with the generation of it, *dictio*, *locutio*, *verbi productio* (and the like unholy Metaphyſical Crotchets) in compariſon of the Love that God is? The Love that God is, is the Divine Nature, and this Love is the Holy Spirit, (a) as S. *Auſtin* and the Schoolmen his Followers ſay; but an Abſtract Son of God that is but the product of Speculative Intellect, is of a lower Houſe than the Divine Nature.

(8.) This vain Speculation maketh the production of the Holy Ghoſt, to be much more a true and real Generation than the production of the Son: for Generation being a vital Production, the more vital a Production is, *cætera ſi ſint paria*, the more it is a true and real Generation. If we ſuppoſe two Productions, of which the one is ſingularly and eminently the vital Production, and the other is ſingularly and eminently the *notional* Production, it is manifeſt, that (*cæteris paribus*) the notional Production cannot pretend, to be ſo much a true and real Generation as the vital Production. Now, the Scholaſtick Production of the Holy Spirit being peculiarly the production of *Amor Subſtantialis* is ſingularly and eminently the Vital Production; and the Production of the Scholaſtick *Verbum* (the Abſtract Son) is ſingularly and eminently the notional Production: for the Scholaſtick Divines ancient and modern (b) affirm, *that the Divine Production is therefore a Generation truly and properly ſo called, becauſe thereby a word and notion of the Mind is produc'd into Exiſtence.*

(9.) As Generation is *an Origination into Similitude of Nature*, the Scholaſtick Production of the Holy Ghoſt is a much more true and real Generation than the Scholaſtick Production of the Son: for the Scholaſtick Son by his Production is properly the Image of God as intelligent; but the Scholaſtick Holy Ghoſt is properly the Image of God, *as God is Love*. And this *he is formally by virtue of his Production*: For as Chriſtians do not only love divinely, but they love that Love at a ſuper-eminent rate: ſo if God did produce the Holy Ghoſt out of love to his Divine Nature (as the Scholaſtick Theology ſuppoſeth) God did produce him out of love to the Love that he is; and conſequently (according to this Theology) *The Holy Ghoſt is Subſtantial Love produc'd from Love to the Love that God is.* He is therefore like produc'd from the love of like, and is the Image and Similitude of the Love that God is *formally by virtue of his Production and by the primary Intention thereof*; whence it appeareth, that the productive proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt is neceſſarily and unavoidably *Generation* and *Sonſhip*; therefore a productive Proceſſion is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. All pretending Explications of it are deluſory Vanities unconceivable and impoſſible.

VI. Neither *Generation* nor *Creation* is competible to the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt; therefore he is not producible into Exiſtence, but is *Unoriginate*. One perſon may be the production of another two ways: γεννητικῶς, *generatively*, and κτιστικῶς, *creatively*. If one perſon is the production of another in the natural way of production (of perſons) he is the production of that other *Generatively*: but if he is his Production otherwiſe than in the natural way, he is his Production *creatively*. So the Fathers diſtinguiſh *Generation* and *Creation* in the ſtrict acceptation. (c) *To make or create is a buſineſs of efficiency* (and is called by the Fathers Effection;) *but Generation is a buſineſs of Nature: by making or creating one is an opificer or a maker; by generating he is a Father.* (d) *That which is naturally generated of one, and not extrinſecally acquired, Nature counteth a Son, and this is the ſignification of the Name; for a Man maketh an Houſe, generateth a Son.* (e) *If one Man could make another Man two ways* (ſaith *Aquinas*) *namely by generation or ſome other way, as in an artificial way out of his own Fleſh, the one muſt be called a Son, not the other, though both alike in Subſtance.* Here are two ways of producing Perſons; the one is the way of Natural Production, which is the generative; the other is *alio modo* ſome other way, which is the *factive*, and there are but theſe two ways of producing Perſons. Let us ſuppoſe, that a God generateth a Son, and cauſeth another perſon to exiſt otherwiſe than by Generation. This perſon ſo cauſed to exiſt being not born of him, is therefore made by him; being his production otherwiſe than in the natural way of producing Perſons, he is therefore his Production *creatively*, as his Son is his Production *generatively*. As all Jews are either *the Native* or *the Factive* (which are the adventitious to the Native:) So all the perſonal productions of any one are either *the Native* or (the adventitious to the Native which is) *the Factive*. All his perſonal productions are either *natively* or *factively* originated from him; and there can be no medium between theſe two, as *Gr. Naz.* ſuppos'd, when he anſwer'd this Objection, which a certain Heretick is ſaid to have made. (f) *There is no medium in the Godhead between* ἀγέννητον & γέννητον, *unbegotten and begotten, the former whereof belongeth to the Father, the latter to the Son.* He anſwer'd, that there is a medium between theſe two, τὸ ἐκπορευτὸν, *that Proceſſion of which the Goſpel maketh mention, The Spirit which proceedeth from the Father.* The ſame anſwer *Gr. Naz.* would have made, if the Heretick had made this Objection; *There is no medium between Generation and Creation, the former whereof belongeth to the Son, the latter to Creatures*; for ſo the *Athanaſian* Creed ſaith, that the Holy Ghoſt is *neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.* But ſeeing all the Perſonal Productions of any one which are not the *Native*, are neceſſarily the adventitious to the Native and therefore the Factive: And ſeeing all his Perſonal Productions which are not in the way of natural Production (which is the Generative) are neceſſarily in the non-natural way of production (which is the Creative) therefore as to Perſonal Productions there can be no *medium* between γέννησις and ποίησις, *Generation and Effection or Creation.*

(y) *Intellectus in divinis eſt potentia per ſe primò deſtinata ad communicandam naturam, non autem voluntas.* Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 2. Art. 4. S. ult.

(z) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. c. 12. S. 14.

(a) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 8. c. 6. S. 9.

(b) *Divinam productionem ideo generationem eſſe propriè veréque dictum adſtruunt, quod per eam Verbum ac notio mentis exiſtit.* Petav. ibid. l 7. c. 14. S. 7.

(c) Τὸ μὲν ποιεῖν ἐνεργείας ἐστὶ, φύσεως δὲ τὸ γεννᾷν. S. *Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 184. Τῷ ποιεῖν δημιουργός τις ἐστι· τῷ δὲ γεννᾷν πατήρ. *Ibid.*

(d) Τὸ ἐκ τινὸς φύσει γεννώμενον, καὶ μὴ ἔξωθεν ἐπικτώμενον, υἱὸν οἶδεν ἡ φύσις, καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ ὀνόματός ἐστι τὸ σημαινόμενον. *S. Athanaſ. de Decret. Syn. Nic. p.* 408. *Com.* Καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος κτίζει μὲν οἰκίαν· γεννᾷ δὲ υἱόν. *Ibid. p.* 410.

(e) *Si duplici modo poſſet unus homo facere alterum hominem, ſcilicet per genituram aut alio modo, ſcilicet modo artificiali ex propria carne, ille diceretur filius, non iſte, licet uterque eſſet ſimilis in ſubſtantia.* Aquin. l. 4. c. Gent. c. 23.

(f) *Orat.* 37. p. 597.

VII. Production into Exiſtence therefore is repugnant to the Holy Spirit as he is no Son: for to ſuppoſe him to be of the Godhead and produc'd into Exiſtence, is to ſuppoſe him generated and to be a Son.

Production into Exiſtence is repugnant to the Holy Spirit, as he is *no Saint*; for if Vital Sanctity was communicated to him, he muſt be in ſome ſort ſanctify'd (caus'd to be Holy) and conſequently muſt be a Saint. But becauſe he is no Saint, therefore he is in God *unoriginately* without having Vital Sanctity communicated to him.

Production into Exiſtence is repugnant to the Holy Spirit, as he is ἡ ἁγιαστικὴ δύναμις, *the ſanctifying Virtue and Power*; for Vital Sanctity cannot be communicated to him without the ſanctifying Agency, Virtue and Power of God; whereas himſelf is that Sanctifying Agency, Virtue and Power.

So production into Exiſtence is repugnant to the definitive notion of the Holy Spirit, which is *virtus divina*; for this *virtus divina* which is the Holy Ghoſt, and which the Holy Ghoſt is, is not producible into Exiſtence by it ſelf or otherwiſe.

Production into Exiſtence is repugnant to the Name of *the Spirit of God*; for as the Spirit of a Man (to which the Apoſtle compareth the Spirit of God) is not producible into Exiſtence, unleſs Man is producible into Exiſtence: So the Spirit of God is not producible into Exiſtence, unleſs God is producible into Exiſtence.

Production into Exiſtence is repugnant to this other Name of the Holy Spirit *Donum* (the Gift) which ſeveral of the Fathers and Schoolmen that follow them, (g) account the peculiar perſonal Name of the Holy Spirit: from their Principles they can give no tolerably good reaſon, why it ought to be ſo accounted; but ſuch a reaſon may be given ſuppoſing the Holy Ghoſt's Exiſtence to be unoriginate: for if ſo, the Holy Ghoſt is *Donum cui nihil donatum eſt* (the Gift to whom nothing is given) which is his peculiar and perſonal property. But if Eſſence and Exiſtence is as much given to the Holy Ghoſt, as it is to the Son, *Donum* cannot reaſonably be thought his peculiar Name.

(g) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 8. c. 3.

VIII. The Holy Spirit is a grand Eſſentiality of *God Imperial* (the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial;) therefore his Exiſtence is *unoriginate and unproduc'd*. The ſenſe and force of this Argument will be eaſily intelligible, if we conſider our Lord Chriſt as *Chriſt Imperial* (the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial) who cannot be ſuch without this eſſentially neceſſary qualification, *fons omnis ſpiritus ſancti* (the fulneſs and fountain of the Holy Spirit) which therefore is a grand Eſſentiality of his Imperial Eſtate. He muſt be ſo qualify'd, as not only to be a *Politically Imperial*, but an *animatively vital Imperial Head*; not only *an Head of Government, but an Head of Influence*, from whom the Holy Spirit is deriv'd, and by whom it is communicated: (h) *For the Holy Scriptures ſay that the whole Church of God is the Body of Chriſt,* ὑπὸ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ψυχούμενον, *that is animated by the Son of God.* His Holy Spirit enliveneth and animateth the Body of his Univerſal Church conjoyning the Head and Members (*there is one Body and one Spirit*, Eph. 4. 4.) and as in our Body the Head is the nobleſt part, whoſe Office is to guide the Body, to impart Spirit, Life, Sence and Motion to it: So it is with Chriſt and the Church. And as in our Body a Nervous Juice deſcendeth from the Head upon the Members of the Body, whereby it is nouriſh'd (as to the nervous parts of it) a Nutriment is deriv'd upon it from the Head: So the Members of the Body of Chriſt have their Nutriment and Growth from him, *Col.* 2. 19. *From him the whole Body having Nouriſhment miniſtred increaſeth with the increaſe of God.* His Believers have all their holy vital Goods from his Holy Spirit, and thereby he diſpenſeth all ſupernatural Gifts and Graces. His Holy Spirit muſt be in the Comprehenſion of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, or elſe there can be no ſuch thing as ſaving Chriſtianity and Godlineſs. The Holy Spirit therefore is his grand eſſentially neceſſary Qualification, without it he cannot be qualify'd, to be Chriſt Imperial.

(h) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 309.

Theſe things appertain and muſt be apply'd not only to the Son of God, but (with ſome few limitations and abatements which are manifeſt) unto God the Father; for the Holy Spirit is his grand eſſentially neceſſary Qualification, without it he is not qualify'd, to be God Imperial. Now, it is not poſſible, but that God muſt be from Eternity qualify'd, to be God Imperial; and he muſt be from Eternity ſo qualify'd by that neceſſary Exiſtence, whereby himſelf doth exiſt; therefore the Holy Spirit muſt be in God from Eternity, and it muſt be in God from Eternity by that neceſſary Exiſtence, whereby himſelf doth exiſt without any production of the Holy Spirit into Exiſtence. *Num Deus unquam ſine Spiritu ſuo potuit eſſe*, could God ever be without his Spirit? (i) ſaith *Eugubinus.* He meaneth, that God could never be without his Spirit produc'd, as the Scholaſtick Theology

(i) De Per. Phil. l. c. 12.

gy ſuppoſeth. But he had ſpoken more agreeably to his profeſſion, if he had ſaid, that God can no more exiſt without the Spirit of God, than Man can exiſt without the Spirit of a Man, which exiſteth by the ſame Exiſtence, whereby the Man exiſteth without any production thereof conſequent to his Exiſtence. God exiſteth by meer neceſſary Exiſtence (antecedently to his production of any thing into Exiſtence;) in this God that exiſteth by meer neceſſary Exiſtence, no eternally and eſſentially neceſſary Qualification of the Godhead can be wanting; the Holy Spirit is ſuch an Eſſentiality of the Godhead (as all muſt grant, who will not abſurdly ſuppoſe, that God may αὐτουργεῖν ἅπαντα, *do all thoſe things immediately which are the operations of the Holy Ghoſt*;) therefore the Holy Ghoſt did from Eternity exiſt in God by meer neceſſary Exiſtence. That this may not be thought improbable, we will here conſider and repreſent a true and ſummary Idea of the Holy Spirit.

(k) Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 13. S. 14.

IX. The School-Divines ſay, (k) *In order of Nature*, prior eſt Dualitas quàm Trinitas, *a Duality of Perſons is before a Trinity.* And *Epiphanius* ſaith, (l) *In* Moſes *one ſingle perſon of the Godhead is chiefly notic'd: In the Prophets a Binary is preach'd at a great rate: in the Goſpel and the new Law a Trinity is manifeſted:* Conforming therefore our Sentiments to the Holy Scriptures, we ought not to proceed to a Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead, till we come to the New Teſtament and the Times thereof: but antecedently thereto we ought to contemplate only a Duality or Binary in the Godhead, which is repreſented in the Old Teſtament, and is there repreſented as in one Divine Eſſence (for there is no appearance of more than one Divine Eſſence throughout the Old Teſtament) and from the New Teſtament it appeareth, that this Duality or Binary is a Duality of Perſons: for ſuch is God and his Holy Spirit (which is that Binary of Perſons in the Godhead, which *Epiphanius* ſaith, is preach'd at a great rate in the Prophets) of which *Grotius* ſaith, (m) *Spiritus ille quo agitati ſunt prophetæ, non eſt aliquid creatum, & tamen diſtinguitur à mittente: That Spirit whereby the Prophets were moved, is not a created thing, yet is diſtinguiſh'd from the ſender of it.* This Duplicity therefore muſt be diſtinguiſh'd in one and the ſame Divine Eſſence, and it is diſtinguiſhable without any Abſurdity or Incongruity. For the one Divine Vital Eſſence is *The Vital Sanctity, which is the Communicative, and alſo the Vital Sanctity which is meerly the Conſtitutive.* That Vital Sanctity which is *meerly the Conſtitutive*, is that which is *meerly conſtitutive of the Political Imperial Perſon of God:* But the Holy Spirit is *that Vital Sanctity which God communicatively is.* For this is the Eſſence of the Holy Spirit (who is eſſential to the Godhead) *He is the Vital Sanctity the Communicative*, which is contradiſtinguiſh'd to *the meerly Conſtitutive:* as the Spirit which God is *meerly conſtitutively*, is contradiſtinguiſh'd to the Spirit which *God communicatively is.* Such is the Holy Spirit, of which God is communicative *ad extrà*, and who is Vital Sanctity only as *the Holy Inſpiration-virtue*, or as an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon, whoſe proper Function and Operation it is, to be *communicative* of what is in God as an Inſpiration-virtue, ſo that all ſupernatural Gifts and Graces are ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, *the Communication of the Holy Spirit*, 2 Cor. 13. 14. The Holy Spirit is a Perſon of the one Divine Sovereignty as well as a Perſon of the one Divine Vital Eſſence. As he is a Perſon of the one Divine Sovereignty (or Imperial Eſtate) there is no difficulty in his Idea, and therefore it needeth no illuſtration. But as he is a Perſon of the Vital Eſſence of God (which is Vital Sanctity) his Idea is not of ſo eaſie conception, as not to need illuſtration. And ſome illuſtration we may give it by conſidering the Perſon of our Lord Chriſt, in whom we muſt neceſſarily diſtinguiſh *Vital Sanctity*, which is *meerly the conſtitutive*, and *Vital Sanctity the communicative.* The former of theſe is the Vital Sanctity which is meerly conſtitutive of his Political Imperial Perſon; and as he is *fons omnis ſpiritus ſancti*, he is Vital Sanctity *the Communicative.* He muſt be this duplicity of Vital Sanctity, as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial: and ſo in God (the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial) in his one and the ſame numerical Divine Vital Eſſence there is the ſame duplicity of Vital Sanctity, which is the Eſſence of God, ſo as to bè the Eſſence of a Binary of Perſons in the Godhead, ſuch a Binary of Perſons as may and muſt be in the Godhead unproduc'd, namely, *The Eternal God* (the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial) and *the Eternal Spirit* his Holy Inſpiration-virtue, which is the Divine Vital Eſſence (the Vital Sanctity which is it) as it is *the communicative.*

(l) Apud Moyſem ſingularis divinitas præcipuè prædicata legitur: apud prophetas perſonarum binarius diligentius commendatur: Trinitas denique in Evangelio ac nova lege demonſtratur. Apud Petav. ibid. l. 2. c. 7. S. 1.

(m) De V. R. C. l. 5. c. 21.

This being the Nature and Notion of the Holy Spirit, our Hypotheſis doth not imply (as will be objected againſt it) that there are (n) δύο τὰ ἄναρχα, *two unprincipiates* in any culpable, abſurd or irreligious ſenſe: for although it aſſerteth the Holy Spirit, to be unprincipiate as to any production into Exiſtence, yet it ſuppoſeth him, to have his Exiſtence by and in the Exiſtence of God; and it is far from ſuppoſing him ſo *unprincipiate* as not to be the Spirit of of God, *his Agent-virtue* and meerly an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon. It aſſerteth, that God the Father is *the only unprincipiate*, yet ſo, as that his Spirit is (as to production into Exiſtence) unprincipiate: as genuine *Trinitarians* aſſert, that God the Father is the only God, but ſo as that his Son is God. If God the Father is the only God, this inferreth and implieth, that his Son is God: So if God the Father is the only unprincipiate, this inferreth and implieth, that his Spirit is unprincipiate. To ſay, that God the Father is unprincipiate, is to ſay, that the Holy Ghoſt is unprincipiate, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is unprincipiate as an Eſſentiality of his; and therefore it is a true Propoſition, to ſay, that God the Father only is *unprincipiate*, which is not prejudic'd by ſaying, that the Holy Ghoſt is unprincipiate. To ſay, that another Perſon of the Godhead is unprincipiate, ſo as that no prejudice is done to this Propoſition, *God the Father is the only Unprincipiate*, is moſt true: but to ſay, that God the Father only is unprincipiate, ſo as that no other Perſon of the Godhead is ſuch, is not true: for becauſe he is unprincipiate, and the only unprincipiate, therefore his Holy Spirit (as to production into Exiſtence) is unprincipiate. But the Scholaſtick Theology ſaith, (o) *to ſuppoſe that there are* duo Innaſcibiles in Trinitate, eſt hæreticum, *two Innaſcibles in the Trinity, is heretical:* for the Maxims of the Scholaſtick Theology will be thought the Catholick Faith, and to contradict them, muſt be counted Hereſie: whence *Melancthon* is counted

(n) Gr. Naz. or. 37. p. 596.

(o) Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 2. p. 153.

ed an Heretick for ſaying (as if the Divine Eſſence admitted a partition) (p) *Quando ſpiritus ſanctus mittitur, aliquid eſſentiæ divinæ mitti*: yet this is the ſenſe of the Fathers. (q) *He is a certain fruit of the Divine Eſſence, being in it and proceeding from it undividedly and inſeparately. The Holy Spirit cometh out of the Divine Nature and is in it naturally:* Which may beſt be underſtood from our Idea. *The Holy Spirit is the Divine Vital Eſſence, as it is the Communitative.*

Section III.

Of Creaturizing the Holy Spirit.

I. FRom the Idea of the Holy Spirit hitherto repreſented we are inabled, to make a Judgment touching his Deity, and what we ought to believe concerning it; which is, *That he is one of the Godhead* (the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial) *as an Inſpiration-virtue and Agent and as to his Inſpiration-virtue and Agency* (in the Senſe before explained) *but no further.* Sinful extremes on both hands ought to be avoided: On the one hand he ought not to be *creaturiz'd*, on the other hand he ought not to be extravagantly *deify'd*. He is ſinfully creaturiz'd by two ſorts of erroneous Conceits (of Ancient and Modern Times;) for ſome creaturize him denying his Perſonality, and others aſſerting it. Thoſe who diſpute, (r) that the Holy Spirit is not God, but meerly a Quality, a Virtue, Power or Efficacy flowing from God, do make him a Creature. Theſe creaturize him denying his Perſonality; but the *Arians* aſſerted his Perſonality, (s) yet made him a Creature. So did the *Semiarians* and *Macedonians* (called *Pneumatomachi*) and ſome that were no *Arians* as to the Son, yet as to the Holy Ghoſt ſymboliz'd with them and with *Valentinus*, and ſuppos'd the Holy Ghoſt, to be only an Angel, but greater than the reſt. *Origen* and *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* are charg'd with creaturizing the Holy Spirit, *Euſebius* is manifeſtly guilty of it, for having ſaid, that the Holy Ghoſt is neither God nor Son, he addeth, *that he is one of thoſe things, that were made by the Son, by whom all things were made.* Againſt all which erroneous and irreligious Conceits of creaturizing the Holy Spirit the form of Baptiſm and thoſe other places of the New Teſtament which reckon a Trinity (or Ternary) in the Holy Sovereignty of our Religion, are peremptory Allegations; for they plainly demonſtrate the Holy Ghoſt's Conſortſhip with God as one of the Godhead, ſo far as is competible to him, that is only the Holy Inſpiration-virtue and Agent, *Matth.* 28. 19. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *ch.* 12. 4, 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 13. 13. *Eph.* 3. 18. *ch.* 4. 5, 6. 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. Creatures are ſometimes conjoyn'd with God, as *Moſes*, *Samuel*, and the elect Angels, *Exod.* 14. 31. 1 *Sam.* 12. 18. 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. but Creatures are never conjoyn'd with God in an enumeration of the Perſons of an holy Sovereignty. Now, the reaſon why we are baptiz'd in the Name of the Father and the Son, is, becauſe they are the Perſons of our Holy Sovereignty; therefore the form of Baptiſm is an enumeration of the Perſons of our Holy Sovereignty. Of thoſe words prefatory to the Decalogue, *I am the Lord thy God*, *Abarbinel* ſaith, (t) *A King before he proceedeth, to make his Laws, ſettleth an acknowledgment of his Sovereignty*; ſo our Saviour in his Inſtitution of Baptiſm ſettleth an acknowledgment of the Chriſtians Sovereignty; therefore his form of Baptiſm is an enumeration of the Perſons of it. And is it imaginable, that a Creature ſhould have a place in ſuch an Enumeration of Perſons, and that the Subject-party and the Sovereignty ſhould be confounded by our Saviour? The Kingdom of God conſiſteth of two Parties: the one is the Subject or Creature-party, the other is the Imperial or Godhead-party. The Subject or Creature-party are the Saints meerly ſuch (for the Son of God is a Saint but not meerly ſuch) and to this Party the Ternary or Trinity (enumerated in the places before cited) is always contradivided; therefore that Ternary is the Supra-ſubject or Imperial Party (which is the Godhead-party) and the Holy Spirit being one of theſe is therefore one of the Godhead-party *as the Holy Spirit thereof.* The Body is the Creature-party, the Spirit that is no Member of the Body, but above the Body, is of the Creature-tranſcendent Party, *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. The Saints are the receivers of Supernatural Gifts, the Spirit (whoſe Gifts they are by an Univerſal Inſpiration-virtue) is of the Party that is above this recipient Party, and therefore is of the Creature-tranſcendent Party, 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 5, 6. As he by whom the Saints are juſtified, is of the Party that is above the Saints: ſo is he by whom they are ſanctified, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. So when the Apoſtle together with the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and the Love of God prayeth for the κοινωνία, *Communication* of the Holy Ghoſt, he manifeſtly repreſenteth the Holy Ghoſt as an univerſal Principle of Grace, of Creature-tranſcendent Condition, and of the Creature-tranſcendent Party; therefore the Ternary or Trinity before enumerated is an enumeration of the Perſons of the Godhead-party. They muſt be counted the Godhead-party; for by being baptized into their Name, we profeſs, to owe unto them our Faith and Obedience, and the other Duties of Religion due to the Imperial Party in Religion, to each one of them according to his Nature, State and Relation. (u) *is it not madneſs therefore, to ſay, that the Spirit is a Creature? for if he was a Creature,* ὐ συνετάσσετο τῇ τριάδι, *he had not been ranked in the Trinity, the whole of which is one God.* But in this Trinity there is a certain τάξις, *Order* or Subordination; for the Holy Spirit can be but (w) ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, *the third in order*, becauſe the Father and the Son are political imperial Divine Perſons, and therefore are ſtrictly the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, of which the Holy Ghoſt is only *the Inſpiration-virtue and Agent.*

II. *Athanaſius* inculcateth this Notice as of very great conſideration, (x) *that the Holy Spirit is* ἐν θεῷ, *in God.* He is in God as God is the Imperial Eſtate and the Imperial Head in Religion; for the Holy Spirit is Intrinſick and Eſſential to ſuch an Imperial Head; therefore the Holy Spirit is of the Imperial Party in Religion. The Holy Spirit is in God alſo, as God is a Nature or Eſſence; as ſome of the *Socinian* Writers have obſerv'd, with deſign to infer from thence, that the Holy Spirit is not a Perſon.

(p) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. *S.* 24.

(q) Καρπός τις ὥσπερ ἐστὶ τῆς θείας οὐσίας, ἐν αὐτῇ τε ὄν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀχωρίστως προερχόμενον. *S. Cyr. Theſaur.* p. 343. Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐξ αὐτῆς θείας φύσεως καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ φυσικῶς. *Ibid. p.* 340.

(r) *Crell. de uno Deo l.* 1 *S.* 3. *n.* 491.

(s) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *S.* 6. *c.* 11. *S.* 12. & *c.* 14.

(t) *Comparat ſe cum rege regionem aliquam ingrediente, quem ſervi ſui affantur: conſtitue nobis leges: reſpondet vero iis Non: ſed poſtquam imperium meum admiſeritis, tunc vobis ſtatuta præſcribam: ſi enim dominium meum non reciperetis, quomodo ſtatuta mea eſſent ſtabilia?* Apud Vorſt. de cap. Fid. p. 85, 86.

(u) S. Athan. Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 35 Com.

(w) [illegible]

(x) Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 565 C. Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 25. C ſon. (y) *It is manifeſt, that the Holy Spirit is not without God by Nature, but in God himſelf. For if it was not by Nature in God,* Paul *could not compare the Spirit of God with the Spirit of Man, which is by Nature in Man, as he doth in that place, where he ſaith: What Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of a Man which is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth no Man but the Spirit of God.* From which Text of the Apoſtle it appeareth, that the Holy Spirit is not without as to the Eſſence and Subſtance of God, as all created Nature is. For a Creature is (z) ἔξωθεν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐσίας, *without as to the Eſſence and Subſtance of God*; therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be a Creature. The Spirit of God is in him, as the Spirit of Man is in him, of Exiſtence unoriginated by any Act of his, and ſo as to be an Eſſentiality of the Godhead, which ſpeaketh him far remote from created Nature. So doth this Name *the Spirit*, which denoteth him, to be *the Inſpiration-virtue* of the Godhead, *that ſearcheth the deep things of God, which he revealeth*, and therefore is in God. And he not only is in God, but becauſe he penetrateth to the knowing *the deep things of God*, he is of Creature-tranſcendent Condition, (a) *divinæ enim ſolius eſt Poteſtatis arcana noviſſe, for it belongeth to Divine Potentacy only* (and to the Holy Spirit that is intimate therewith at a Creature-tranſcendent rate) *to know thoſe Recondites.* If his Name *the Spirit* ſpeaketh him, to be of the Godhead, his uſual Name *the Holy Spirit* muſt be ſuppos'd, much more to denote his Deity; for the attribute *Holy* importeth, that he is of the *God-eminence* and *Nobilitation.* (b) *Nos nihil precioſius invenimus, quo Deum prædicare poſſimus, niſi ut ſanctum appellemus.* In celebrating the Praiſes of God we can riſe to nothing higher than the attribute *Holy. He only is Holy*, and his being Holy denoteth his *God-eminence*; therefore the attribute Holy in the Name of the Holy Spirit denoteth his Creature-tranſcendence, and that he is of the God-eminence. His Unity and Identity with God is ſuch, that we cannot but ſuppoſe him, to be denominated Holy as being of the Godhead.

III. The Agency and Virtue of the Holy Spirit is *the God-agency and Virtue*, therefore if he is a Perſon, he is a Perſon of the Godhead. (c) *Operatio ſpiritus eſt operatio divina.* For ſo in Scripture theſe Names *the Spirit, the Holy Ghoſt, the Spirit of God* oftentimes plainly ſignifie *that which is the God-agency and Virtue, the Divine and Creature-tranſcendent.* So *the Spirit of God* and *the Spirit of the Lord* manifeſtly ſignifie in the Old Teſtament, as when *the Spirit of the Lord* is ſaid to come upon *Gideon, Jephtha, Sampſon,* upon *Saul, Azariah* and *Zechariah* (that propheſied) the Scripture meaneth, that *the God-agency and Virtue* came upon them. And of the ſame ſignification thoſe Names are uſually in the New Teſtament. For in *Matth.* 1. 18. *She was found with Child of the Holy Ghoſt*; in *Matth.* 1. 20. *That which is conceiv'd in her, is of the Holy Ghoſt*; The Holy Ghoſt ſignifieth, as it doth *Luc.* 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee* (the God-agency and Virtue) *and the Power of the higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee. Matth.* 3. 11. Our Saviour is ſaid, *to Baptize with the Holy Ghoſt*, whereby is meant, *vis divina, the God-agency and Virtue*, as Expoſitors (d) rightly underſtand the place. In many places the Holy Ghoſt (e) is conjoin'd with *Power* and is ſignified by the Name of Power (Divine) which ſpeaketh the Holy Ghoſt, to be no leſs than the God-agency and Virtue, which the Apoſtle ſometimes calleth *the Power of the Spirit of God*, ſometimes *the Power of God*, and ſometimes *the effectual working of his Power.* In this Senſe our Saviour is ſaid to caſt out Devils by *the Spirit of God*, and ſo the Power which is attributed to the Spirit of Holineſs in his Reſurrection (whereby he was declared to be the Son of God with Power, *Rom.* 1. 4.) is the God-agency, Virtue and Power. And as in his Reſurrection, ſo in ours, in quickning our mortal Bodies, *Rom.* 8. 11. in re-enlivening and renewing our Souls alſo the Spirit of God appeareth, to be of God agency, Virtue and Power. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. *Ye are manifeſtly declared, to be the Epiſtle of Chriſt, miniſtred by us, written not with Ink, but with the Spirit of the living God.* The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of *the living God*, becauſe the Chriſtian Religion is the Diſpenſation of the Spirit and of Life: Or as *Beza* ſaith, it denoteth (that which the Holy Spirit is) *virtutem Dei vivificam ad regenerandos animos, the vivific Power of God to regenerate Souls.* As he is the Spirit of vital Regeneration, this Divine Spirit appeareth, to be of Creature-tranſcendent Agency and Efficiency: But more viſibly he appeareth to be ſuch from the miraculous Works, which in the Apoſtle's time were wrought by *the Holy Ghoſt ſent down from Heaven and by the Power of the Spirit of God*; and from thoſe ſupernatural Gifts and Endowments which were given them, *Wiſdom, Tongues, Propheſie.* If the Holy Spirit is of the Creature-tranſcendent Agency, he cannot be a Creature.

IV. The ancient Writers of the Church inſiſt upon many Creature-tranſcendent Properties belonging to the Holy Spirit, and (though we build nothing upon their bare Authority, yet) ſuch is the truth and ſolidity of ſeveral of their Obſervations and Reaſonings, as cannot be conteſted.

As one inſiſteth, that the Holy Spirit is ἐν Θεῷ, *in God*: So another inſiſteth (f) that the Holy Spirit is ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *ex Deo*, not *ex Deo* as all things are, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ προελθόν, *but as proceeding out of God.* The Holy Spirit being the vital Eſſence of God as it is the Communicative, is both in God, and proceedeth out of God, ſo as no Creature doth. (g) *The Holy Spirit is one, as the Father is one, and the Son is one,* οὐ γὰρ ἓν τῶν πολλῶν ἐστι, *for he is not one of the many*, which are the Creatures. (h) *Whatever is made, is liable to change and turning:* Τὸ πνεῦμα οὔτε τροπῆς οὔτε μετασκευῆς ἐστὶ δεκτικόν, *the Spirit is not ſuſceptible of any turning or mutation; therefore is no Creature.* (i) *The Holy Spirit is inſeparably conjoin'd and ſo one with God, that it is no more* ἀλλότριος υἱοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, *alien from the Son and the Father than the Spirit of Man is from Man. Who then ſhall ſeparate and disjoin him?* (k) *Every Creature is of the Subject-ſervient Party and Condition:* Ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα δοῦλον, *but ſo is not the Holy Spirit.* (l) *It is* he that maketh Saints: Ἀνάγκη δὲ τὸ θεοῖς αἴτιον τοῦ θεοὺς εἶναι, θεῖον πνεῦμα καὶ θεὸν εἶναι, *but he that cauſeth Gods to be ſuch, muſt neceſſarily be a Divine Spirit and God.* There cannot be θεοποιὸς ἡ κτίσις, *a deifying Creature.* (m) *Every rational Creature ſometimes ſpeaketh of himſelf:*

(y) *Patet, quod non ſit extra Deum natura, ſed in ipſo Deo niſi enim natura Deo ineſſet, non potuiſſet Paulus Spiritum Dei cum Spiritu Hominis, qui Homini ineſt natura, conferre, idque eo loco, ubi ait: Quis hominum novit quæ ſunt hominis, niſi ſpiritus hominis qui eſt in homine: Ita quæ ſunt Dei nemo novit niſi ſpiritus Dei.* Catech. Racov. c. 6.

(z) Athan. Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 365.

(a) S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l. 2. c. 12. V. S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c. 19. in fine. c. Eunom. l. 2. p. 83.

(b) S. Ambroſ. ſupr. l. 3. c. 18.

(c) Ibid. l. 2. c. 11.

(d) Grot. Beza.

(e) Luc. 1. 17, 35. 4, 14. 11, 20. Matth. 12. 28. Act. 1. 8. and 10. 38. 1 Cor. 2. 4, 5. Eph. 3. 7, 16, 20. Rom. 15. 13, 19.

1 Pet 1. 12. Rom. 15. 19. 1 Cor. 12. 8, 9, 10.

(f) S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c. 18.

(g) Ibid.

(h) Idem c. Eunom. l. 5. p. 109.

(i) Ibid. p. 118, 120, 125.

(k) Ibid. p. 110. & 125.

(l) Ibid p. 140.

(m) Ibid. p. 137.

Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐχ οὕτως, *But it is not ſo with the Spirit ; for all his words are the words of God.* (*n*) *Every Creature is circumſcrib'd and bounded within certain limits:* Spiritus Sanctus non habet circumſcriptam Virtutem, *the Holy Spirit is of unbounded Virtue.* (*o*) Sempiternus eſt Spiritus, Creatura autem omnis in tempore eſt. *Every Creature's Exiſtence hath a beginning in time, but the Spirit is from Eternity.* (*p*) Sicut Pater Lumen, ita & Filius Lumen, & Spiritus Lumen eſt. *As the Father is Light, ſo the Son is Light, and the Spirit is Light.* (*q*) Sicut Pater Vita, & Filius Vita, & Spiritus Sanctus Vita. *As the Father is Life, ſo the Son is Life, and the Holy Spirit is Life.* (*r*) Sicut & Pater & Filius, ita & Spiritus Sanctus regenerat. *As the Father and the Son, ſo the Holy Spirit regenerateth.* In this and other the divineſt Works the Operation of theſe three is inſeparably conjoin'd. In our new Creation, as in our ſolemn Benedictions, the Holy Spirit is rank'd and conſorted with the Father and the Son. (*s*) Large Catalogues of the Creatures and of the Holy Angels are recited in Scripture, but the Holy Spirit is never rank'd amongſt them, as he would have been, if he is πνεῦμα διακονίας, *a Spirit of Miniſtry*, as the Angels are. (*t*) Τὸ μὴ μετέχον ζωῆς, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ μετεχόμενον, *that which doth not participate of Life* (as Creatures do) *but is it ſelf participated, what Cognation hath it with the things that are made?* (*u*) Ἐνεργεῖν δυνάμενῳ τὰ θεȣ̃, *being operative of the things proper to God, how can the Holy Spirit be a created Spirit?* Or how can τὸ ἐνεργὲς τȣ̃ θεȣ̃, *the God-agency and Virtue be in a Creature?* (*w*) Ἐπεὶ μὴ ἑτερόντι παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεργὲς αὐτȣ̃, *ſeeing the Virtue and Energy of it is not a thing different from it.* (*x*) Qui Spiritu Sancto plenus eſt, ſtatim univerſis donationibus Dei repletur. *He that is full of the Holy Ghoſt, is filled with all the Gifts of God, Wiſdom, Knowledge, Faith and the other Vertues. He therefore that filleth all capable Creatures, is not one of thoſe whom he filleth.*

(n) S. Ambroſ. de ſp. ſanct. l. 1. c. 7.
(o) Ibid. c. 8.
(p) Ibid. c. 16.
(q) Ibid. c. 18.
(r) Ibid. l. 2. c. 9.
(s) Athanaſ. Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 353.
(t) Ibid. p. 362.
(u) S. Cyr. de Trinit. Dial. p. 662.
(w) Ibid. p. 651.
(x) Didym. de ſp. ſanct. l. 1.

V. *Thus the Creature is differenc'd from the Spirit.* (*y*) *The Creature is of Subject-ſervient Condition: But the Spirit maketh Free. The Creature needeth Life: But the Spirit is Vivificative. The Creature needeth to be taught: But the Spirit teacheth. The Creature is ſanctified, but the Spirit ſanctifieth. Although you Name Angels, Arch-angels and all the ſupramundane Powers, they have their Holineſs by the Spirit.* (*z*) *But the Spirit it ſelf hath Holineſs by Nature not receiving it by Grace, but it is Nature and Eſſence unto him.* (*a*) Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὡς ἅγιος ὁ πατὴρ ϗ ἅγιος ὁ υἱὸς, *the Spirit is Holy, as the Father is Holy, and the Son is Holy.* (*b*) Οὐδὲν κτιςὸν κατ' ȣ̉σίαν ἅγιον. *No Creature is eſſentially Holy*, Grace and Holineſs (vital Sanctity) is in Creatures an accident: But of the Spirit of Grace and Holineſs vital Sanctity is the Eſſence.

(y) Ἡ μὲν κτίσις δȣλεύει· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλευθεροῖ· ἡ κτίσις ζωῆς προσδεής ἐςι· τὸ πνεῦμά ἐςι τὸ ζωοποιȣ̃ν. Ἡ κτίσις διδασκαλίας δεῖται· Τὸ πνεῦμά ἐςι τὸ διδάσκον. Ἡ κτίσις ἁγιάζεται· Τὸ πνεῦμά ἐςι τὸ ἁγιάζον. S. Baſil. Ep. 387.

(z) Αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα φυσικὴν ἔχει τὴν ἁγιότητα ȣ̉ κατὰ χάριν λαβὸν, ἀλλὰ συνȣσιωμένην αὐτῷ.

(a) Idem de ſp. ſanct. c. 19.
(b) Idem c. Eunom. l. 5. p. 110.

As the Grace and Holineſs which Creatures have, is an Adjunct of their Nature, ſo they have it by Sanctification from ſome other. (*c*) Ἑτέρωθεν ἐπεισήχθη, *it was introduc'd from elſewhere:* (*d*) But the Holy Spirit being κατ' ȣ̉σίαν ἅγιον, *Holy by his Eſſence*, ȣ̉ δεῖται τȣ̃ ἔξωθεν ἁγιασμȣ̃, *needeth not Sanctification from abroad* (*e*) *Having it* οἴκοθεν ϗ ȣ̉σιωδῶς, *of its own Nature and Eſſentially.* (*f*) Non eſt aliqua in Spiritu Sancto fortitudo, aut operatio Sanctificationis virtutiſque ab extraneo quodam. *In the Holy Spirit there is not any work of Sanctification and Virtue from any extraneous one.*

(c) Idem de ſp. ſanct. c. 19.
(d) Idem c. Eunom. l. 5. p. 110.
(e) S. Cyr. de Trin. p. 665.
(f) Didym. ſupr.

If Creatures are Sanctified, yet they do not Sanctifie (Communicate to others Grace and Holineſs;) But the Holy Spirit is not only incapable of Sanctification from another, but he is the Sanctifier of all that are Holy. (*g*) Οὐχ ἁγιαζόμενόν ἐςι, ἀλλ' ἁγιάζον, *he is not ſanctified, but ſanctifieth.* Whence he is excellently well intituled by S. *Athanaſius* (*h*) ἡ ἁγιαςικὴ ϗ φωτιςικὴ ζωὴ, *the Sanctificative and Illuminative Life.* And by the *Alexandrian Cyril* (*i*) ȣ̉σία ϗ φύσις ἁγιαςικὴ, *a Sanctificative Eſſence and Nature.*

(g) S. Baſil. de ſp. ſanct. c. 19.
(h) Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 351. Com.
(i) De Trin. p. 673.

Creatures that are Virtuous and Holy, cannot be duely called by the abſtract Names of Virtue and Perfection: But the ancient Writers ſay (*k*) that the Holy Spirit is αὐτὸ ἀλήθεια, αὐτὸ δικαιοσύνη, *Truth it ſelf, Righteouſneſs it ſelf, Life it ſelf, Love it ſelf.* But that theſe Names may be agreeable to the Holy Spirit, they ought to be underſtood with the addition of *Communicative*, and ſo underſtood they are very agreeable to the Holy Spirit, and ſhew the Creature-tranſcendency of it. For the Holy Spirit is the Communicative *Light, Life and Love, Truth* and *Grace* it ſelf.

(k) Petav. T. 1. l. 2. c. 6. S. 15. S. Baſil. de ſp. ſanct. c. 19.

No Creature can be *the Spirit of Adoption to us* in the Senſe of the Apoſtle. For it muſt be a Spirit that is in God, and more than a Servant, which is ſo well acquainted with the Secrets of God, as to be able, *to bear Witneſs with our Spirit, that we are God's Children, to ſhed abroad his Love in our Hearts*, to give us the Senſe of our Adoption and of his Paternal Love and Favour. Nor can any Creature be the Spirit of Adoption to us in the Senſe of the ancient Writers of the Church, who do not mean by the Spirit of Adoption what the Apoſtle meaneth. For they ſuppoſe (*l*) that the Holy Spirit is called *the Spirit of Adoption*, becauſe by Sanctification he maketh us the Sons of God (which are more than meer Creatures;) and it is irrational to ſuppoſe, that more than meer Creatures are made ſuch meerly by the Operation of a Creature.

(l) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 15. S. 5.

To be Born of God and of the Spirit (*m*) is the ſame thing. Therefore as the World and the Spirit of the World are ſo one, that to be Born of the World (as Philoſophers ſpeak) and of the Spirit of the World, is the ſame thing: So God and the Spirit of God are ſo one, that to be Born of God and of the Spirit of God, is the ſame thing. But no Creature can be ſo one with God; therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be a Creature. *It is that of himſelf, that of God or of the Godhead his Holy Spirit.*

(m) S. Cyr. Theſaur. p. 349, 350.

VI. The Holy Spirit appeareth, to be of the Godhead from his Inhabitation of the People of God. For it cannot be ſuppos'd (*n*) διὰ κτίσματος θεὸν ἡμῖν ἐνοικίζεσθαι, *that by a Creature God dwelleth in us.* Nor can it be ſuppos'd, that by a Creature's inhabiting our Souls *we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature.* Thus to inhabit the Soul, is peculiar to an Holy Spirit, that is Creature-tranſcendent. (*o*) *If an Angel or Arch-angel ſpeaketh or operateth in us, yet God or Chriſt doth not thereby dwell in us.* (*p*) *If the Spirit dwelleth in us and Chriſt by him*, δύναμις ἄρα αὐτȣ̃ τὸ πνεῦμα, *then the Spirit is his Virtue or Power* (which is an excellent Notice of the Holy Spirit) *and is no Creature.* (*q*) *He is in us and*

(n) S. Cyr. de Trin. p. 660. Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 15. S. 5.
(o) S. Cyr. Theſaur. p. 335.
(p) Ibid. p. 358.
(q) Ibid. p. 353. & de Trin. p. 637.

and dwelleth in us, τὴν τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃ πρᾶξίν τε ϗ ἐνέργειαν ἀποπληρȣ̃ν, *as no leſs than God and doing the Operation of God*. For if the Holy Spirit worketh in us, it is God that worketh in us. *Phil.* 2. 13. and if the Holy Spirit teacheth us, *we are taught of God*. 1 Theſſ. 4. 9. He dwelleth in us as no leſs than God (and therefore is the Inſpiration-virtue of the Godhead, ſo as to be one of the Godhead;) for his Inhabitation maketh us *a Temple*, which is the holy Habitation or Dwelling-houſe of God. *R. Alſchech* ſaith (r) that the People of *Iſrael* are called the Temple of God: Whether ſo or otherwiſe, doubtleſs the Church of Chriſtians and all the genuine Members thereof are called the Temple of God. And they are ſuch a Temple, as that Rabbi ſaith, is to be expected, *Templum:* רוחני & כותלים רוחניים *a Spiritual Temple and Spiritual Walls. Ye are built up a Spiritual Houſe.* 1 Pet. 2. 5. God hath now no material Temple, Regenerate Chriſtians are a Spiritual Temple and a Living Temple (not a Structure of dead Stones) which God inhabiteth in a Spiritual vital way, by his Spirit, which is Spiritual vital in it ſelf and to us. *Eph.* 2. 22. *You are builded together for an Habitation of God through the Spirit.* 1 Cor. 3. 16. *Know ye not, that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* Ver. 17. *The Temple of God is Holy, which Temple ye are.* 2 Cor. 6. 16. *What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? For ye are the Temple of the living God; as God hath ſaid I will dwell in them, and walk in them.* The Church of God is called his Temple by the Holy Writers, and it is manifeſt, in what Notion, in what Reſpect, and on what account they call it his Temple, namely, as being *habitaculum Dei, the holy Habitation of God by his Spirit.* (1.) Therefore it is not, nor is called a Temple, as being an Houſe or Habitation of the *Schecinah*, the Divine Majeſty as dwelling amongſt Men in the Jews Notion, which they call *Schecinah* he that dwelleth. (2) It is not, nor is called a Temple, as being an Houſe or Habitation of God's eſpecial Preſence in an exteriour Symbolical way (by external Symbols) but in a Spiritual-vital way. (3.) It is not, nor is called a Temple, as being a Regial Houſe or Habitation of God, wherein he dwelleth as an Imperial Eſtate of Religion unto Men (towards which they muſt perform their Adorations) as he ſometimes dwelt in the Judaical Tabernacle and Temple, and always dwelleth in Heaven. (4.) It is not called the Temple of God, his Temple, as being dedicated to his Honour, as that material Edifice *Solomon*'s Temple was. The holy Writers in calling the Church of God his Temple, have no regard to any Dedication of it ſave only this (which the Holineſs of it implieth) *it is rightfully ſet apart for God, to poſſeſs and inhabit, to uſe and enjoy.* It is thus conſecrated and ſo far dedicated. (5.) It is not called the Temple of God, his Temple, in this Senſe, as being his proper Goods (like a material inanimate Houſe) *or that which he poſſeſſeth by his own divine Right*; for the holy Writers in calling the Church of God his Temple have no regard to any right of Poſſeſſion ſave only this; *the Church is rightfully ſet apart, for him to poſſeſs and inhabit, and is actually poſſeſs'd and inhabited by him.* (6.) It is not called the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo as not to be the Temple of God *definitively* ſo: Nor is it called the Temple of God (definitively ſo) ſo as not to be the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, but incluſively and comprehenſively. 1 *Cor.* 6. 19. *Know ye not, that your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, which is in you, which ye have of God?* Chriſtians becauſe they are the Temple of God, are the Temple of the Holy Spirit. 1 *Cor.* 3. 16. *Know ye not, that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* The Spirit of God is that of himſelf (that of God or of the Godhead) *the Inſpiration-virtue of the Godhead and of the Church.* If the Church is the Temple (or Habitation) of the Spirit of God, it is neceſſarily the Temple (or Habitation) of God: And if it is the living Temple (or Habitation) of God, it is neceſſarily the Temple (or Habitation) of the Spirit of God. (7.) The Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit maketh us the Temple of God *definitively* ſo; and the Habitation of the Holy Spirit alſo is as ſuch a Temple, and his Temple, as the Apoſtle expreſly affirmeth touching our Body; therefore the Holy Spirit is no Creature, but is of the Godhead; for no (s) δȣλικὸν οἰκητήριον, *Creature-habitation* is a Temple. But ſay the Adverſaries of the Deity of the Holy Spirit (t) *if becauſe our Body is called the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, we will infer from thence his Deity, we muſt ſhew that our Body is ſo called the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, as that he is a Perſon, to whoſe Honour it is dedicated, and by whom our Body is poſſeſs'd by his own divine Right.* To which Objection I anſwer; that thus to Diſpute, is plainly to Diſpute againſt the expreſs words of the Apoſtle; and the Objection is of no force upon this account. Becauſe the Holy Writers in calling the Church the Temple of God, have no regard *to any Dedication of it to his Honour, or any Poſſeſſion of it by his own Divine Right* ſave only thus far; they conſider it as rightly ſet apart for him to Poſſeſs and inhabit, and that it is actually poſſeſs'd and inhabited by him. And becauſe our Body is rightfully ſet apart, for the Holy Ghoſt to poſſeſs and inhabit, and is actually poſſeſs'd and inhabited by him, therefore the holy Writers fitly call it his Temple, which inferreth his Deity or Creature-tranſcendence.

(r) L'Emper. cod. mid. in præfat. Grot. Not. in 1 Cor. 3 16.

(s) S. Baſil. de ſp. ſanct. c. 21.

(t) Crell. de uno Deo l. 1. S. 3. c. 1.

VII. Sinning againſt the Holy Ghoſt could not be ſo horrendous, as the Scripture repreſenteth it, if the Holy Ghoſt is a Creature. For there are two Inſtances, wherein it is repreſented as the unpardonable Sinning. The one is the Caſe of total Apoſtacy, the other is the Caſe of the Phariſees Blaſphemy, both which agree in one general Nature; for they are *a blaſphemous malicious infidelity, not only againſt Chriſt, but againſt the Holy Ghoſt and his Teſtimony to Chriſtianity by Miracles.* The total Apoſtates wholly revolted from the Chriſtian Religion and Profeſſion to downright Infidelity (Judaiſm or Paganiſm) and their Infidelity was Blaſphemous both againſt Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt. For (as when a Subject renounceth his Allegiance and taketh up Arms againſt his Sovereign) the total Apoſtates became downright Adverſaries to Chriſt, his Religion and Kingdom, *Heb.* 10. 27. and counted his Blood, *the Blood of the Covenant wherewith they are ſanctify'd an unholy thing*, no better than the Blood of a Villain and Malefactor. *Doing deſpight to the Spirit of Grace*, Heb. 10. 29. rejecting, depelling, extinguiſhing, contumeliouſly treating and uſing the Holy Spirit, and counting the miraculous Gifts of it (whereof they had been Partakers, *Heb.* 6. 4.) a Diabolical Deluſion. It was not without Spight and Maliciouſneſs that they were thus contumelious (for they ſinn'd at this horrible rate after they had been inlightned and had receiv'd the knowledge of the Truth) and therefore their Apoſtaſie was a Sin unpardonable, a Sin unto Death, not only deadly, but irrecoverably deadly to the Sinner. *Heb.* 8. 6. and 10. 26. 1 *Joh.* 5. 16. But as their contumely againſt Chriſt would not have been any thing near ſo atrocious as it was, if Chriſt had been ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, *but a Man or a Creature:* So the contumely of theſe Apoſtates againſt the Holy Ghoſt could not have been any thing near of ſo black a Character, as it was, if the Holy Ghoſt had been a Creature.

The ſame Inference muſt be made from the Phariſees Blaſphemy, which is commonly called *the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, and which from *Matth.* 12. 24 —— 33. appeareth to be of this Deſcription. *It is the blaſphemous malicious Infidelity of thoſe that are not unacquainted with the Holy Ghoſt, againſt his Teſtimony to Chriſt and Chriſtianity by Miracles.* But to make this Deſcription ſufficiently full and clear, it is requiſite to add, that our Saviour was *mentium inſpector* (as *Grotius* ſaith) and ſaw that the Phariſees (who were not unacquainted with the Holy Ghoſt) were ſo maliciouſly minded, as to be unconvincible of the truth of Chriſtianity and unconvertible thereto by that divine Atteſtation, which was given by the Holy Ghoſt in his Miracles. Men may reproach the Perſon of Chriſt without reflecting on the Holy Ghoſt or that Divine Power whereby his Miracles were wrought. They may Blaſpheme the Holy Ghoſt without committing the Sin unpardonable. For S. *Auſtin* obſerveth, that the Jews and Gentiles to whom the Goſpel was preach'd, did ordinarily Blaſpheme the Holy Ghoſt, yet were not further from Converſion and Salvation than the reſt of this evil World. But ſo to Blaſpheme the Holy Ghoſt, as the Phariſees did and with their maliciouſneſs of Mind, is according to our Saviour's Commination *the Sin unpardonable* both becauſe of its atrociouſneſs and incurableneſs. For there was no cure for the obſtinate malicious Infidelity of the Phariſees, either by internal Grace (which upon horrible Affronts is withdrawn) or by External Evidence; for they defeated the higheſt External Evidence, that God can give. And what can be more atrocious, than to make *that of God the Spirit of Holineſs, an unclean Spirit?* But if the Spirit of Holineſs is a Creature, it is not imaginable, that the Phariſees Blaſphemy againſt him ſhould be far more atrocious than Blaſphemy againſt the Son of Man, or than the more uſual ſort of Blaſphemy againſt God. What is a Creature, that Blaſphemy againſt him ſhould be the ſuperlative capital Crime?

VIII. The Hiſtory of *Ananias's* foul fact of Lying, *Act.* 5. 3, 4. is an illuſtrious Teſtimony of the Creature-tranſcendency of the Holy Ghoſt. For without ſtraining any thing, without wire-drawing the Story (to look another way than it naturally doth) without altering the Tranſlation (which is not capable of Emendation) it plainly containeth theſe three Propoſitions. (1.) That the Apoſtles were at an extraordinary rate endow'd with the Holy Ghoſt. For S. *Peter* thus reproveth *Ananias. Why hath Satan filled thine Heart, to lye to the Holy Ghoſt?* (u) That is, to go about to deceive *Apoſtolos ſpiritu ſancto inſtructos*, the Apoſtles that are furniſh'd with the Holy Ghoſt, guided by the Spirit, and to whom it revealeth what is needful for the Church? 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 8. *He that deſpiſeth, deſpiſeth not Man, but God, who hath alſo given unto us his Holy Spirit.* S. *Paul* therefore ſaith, *Rom.* 9. 1. *I ſay the truth in Chriſt, I Lye not, my Conſcience alſo bearing me Witneſs in the Holy Ghoſt.* In Chriſt and in the Holy Ghoſt are like Phraſes and of like Interpretation. The Apoſtle uſeth them by way of *Conteſtation*, to make ſacred his Atteſtation to what he ſaith. He ſpake the truth *in Chriſt* as in his ſight and cogniſance; and his own mind did bear him Witneſs *in the Holy Ghoſt*, as in his privity and conſciouſneſs to it and all the ſecrets of it. (w) *Tres veritatis teſtes in vocat: Chriſtum, conſcientiam ſuam, ſpiritum ſanctum, qui fallere aut falli nequit.* He appealeth to three Witneſſes of his ſpeaking Truth: Chriſt, his Conſcience and the Holy Ghoſt (that reſided on him and inſpir'd him) which can neither deceive nor be deceiv'd. If the Holy Ghoſt in like manner as Chriſt, is appealed to as a Divine Witneſs, this demonſtrateth both his Perſonality and Creature-tranſcendency. (2.) That *Ananias* in lying to the Apoſtles (Men inſpir'd) did not lye meerly unto Men, but to the Holy Ghoſt, and his lying to the Holy Ghoſt as ſuch was not *a lying unto Men*, or unto an Angel or any other Creature. *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart, to lye to the Holy Ghoſt?* Saith the Apoſtle. *Why haſt thou conceived this thing in thine Heart? Thou haſt not lyed unto Men.* He did not lye at all meerly unto Men, as his lying was unto the Holy Ghoſt, it was not at all a lying unto Men. Nor could it be as ſuch a lying to an Angel or any other Creature; for this was the great aggravation of it, which rais'd it to a far higher pitch than lying unto Men, *it was a lying to the Holy Ghoſt.* Therefore his lying to the Holy Ghoſt as ſuch was not a lying to an Angel or any Creature; for ſo it could not be rais'd to a far higher pitch than lying unto Men. *v.* 9. The Apoſtle ſaith to *Sapphira*; *how is it, that ye have agreed together, to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* This was their Crime, it was *a lying to the Holy Ghoſt*, which was *a tempting the Spirit of the Lord*; and this is a far greater Crime than lying unto and tempting a Creature. Therefore the Spirit of the Lord is not a Creature. (3.) That *Ananias's* lying to the Holy Ghoſt was as ſuch *a lying not unto Men, but unto God.* For this is the Charge, that the Apoſtle draweth up againſt him: *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart, to lye to the Holy Ghoſt?* —— *thou haſt not lyed unto Men, but unto God.* His lying to the Holy Ghoſt was as ſuch a lying unto God, not unto Men, which was the great Aggravation and Criminality of it. But if the Holy Ghoſt is a Creature, if this lying unto God muſt be interpreted from what the Apoſtle ſaith of God's Meſſengers, *he that deſpiſeth, deſpiſeth not Men, but God:* (1 Theſſ. 4. 8.) His lying unto God was but a ſlender and diminutive ſort of lying unto God. For it was but a *partial* and very *remote* ſort of lying unto God, and far from being that *highly aggravated ſort of lying unto God*, which lying to the Holy Ghoſt is, ſuppoſing him to be of the Godhead. Inſtead of *Ananias's* let us ſubſtitute an Apoſtate, that *doth deſpite* to the Holy Spirit; and inſtead of lying let us ſubſtitute *offering contumely.* Let us ſuppoſe this Holy Spirit, to be but an Angel, and that S. *Peter* thus ſpeaketh to this Apoſtate. *You offer contumely to the Holy Spirit, and in ſo doing you do not offer*

contumely

(u) *Grot.* & *piſcat. in loc.*

(w) *Pareus in loc.*

contumely *unto Men, but unto God:* how ſlender and diminutive would this Contumelionſneſs be, ſuppoſing the Holy Spirit to be but an Angel? how much more highly aggravated would it be, ſuppoſing the Holy Spirit's Creature-tranſcendence?

IX. Mr. *Selden* citeth a *Muhammedan* Author, who ſaith; *The Holy Ghoſt is no Creature, but hath a ſingular production proper to it ſelf: for it is not a Spirit after the manner of other Spirits, becauſe it is the Spirit of God. The Spirit of a Man is a Creature, but the Spirit of God is not.* Creaturizing the Holy Ghoſt claſheth with common underſtanding; for (according to that controverted place which I ſuppoſe to be genuine, *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt are one,* 1 Joh. 5.7.) the Spirit of God muſt not be disjoyned from God. (x) *How groſs an Ingeny are we of* καὶ πόῤῥω τοῦ πνεύματος, *and far from the Spirit, if we doubt of this, and need to be taught it?* And how groſs an abſurdity is it, to ſuppoſe, that thoſe things which were done to Chriſt himſelf by the Holy Ghoſt, were done by a Creature? that the Bl. Virgin was with Child by a Creature; that which was conceiv'd in her, was of a Creature; that in Chriſt's Generation a Creature came upon her and overſhadow'd her; that when Chriſt was full of the Holy Ghoſt, he was replete by or with a Creature; that when the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, a Creature was upon him; that when anointed with the Holy Ghoſt, he was anointed with a Creature; when he caſt out Devils by the Spirit of God, it was by a Creature; that when the Spirit was given to him without meaſure, nothing more than a Creature was given him; that when raiſed from the dead by the Spirit of Holineſs, it was by a Creature; and that when he offer'd himſelf without Spot to God by the Eternal Spirit, this Eternal Spirit was a Creature: Who ſeeth not, that all theſe Sayings of the New Teſtament (and many ſuch more) touching the Holy Ghoſt, muſt be underſtood touching a Creature-tranſcendent Virtue and Agency, and that otherwiſe they are not intelligible? (y) ἡ τοῦ παρακλήτου προσηγορία, *the Name of the Paraclete doth not a little conduce, to ſhew the Glory of the Holy Spirit;* for our Saviour promiſeth to his Diſciples another *Paraclete,* whereby is meant (z) ἄλλος ἐγώ, *another I.* And he muſt have very mean thoughts of his Saviour, who can ſuppoſe a Creature, to be ſuch another *Paraclete* as he was, like him in Worth and Dignity.

(x) Gr. Naz. or. 37. p. 611.

(y) S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l. 3. p. 81.

(z) Gr. Naz. or. 44. p. 713.

CHAP. III.

The Introduction touching extravagant Deifying the Holy Spirit. 1. *In making him God definitively ſo.* 2. *In making him the Imperial Eſtate of God.* 3. *In the Attribution of an extravagant Identity to the Divine Perſons.* 4. *In the Attribution of an extravagant Equality.* 5. *In the Scholaſtick Theology's Monarchy or Unity of Principle.* 6. *In making the Holy Spirit the moſt high God without a due limitation of Senſe.* 7. *In exempting him from all Superiour Authority.* 8. *In making him properly the Author of his Gifts, Graces and Benefits.* 9. *In making him the Honour-perſon of the Lord.* 10. *In ſuppoſing him a Political kind of Potentate in the Godhead.* 11. *In ſuppoſing him the Creator, Vivificator, Benefactor and Providential Governour of the World and the preſerver of all things.* 12. *In making incongruous and heterogeneous Attributions to him.* 13. *In making incongruous Attributions to him about Chriſt.*

Of the Scholaſtick Theology's extravagant Deifying the Holy Spirit.

Extravagant Deifyings of the Holy Spirit are Miſtake, Error and Folly, which muſt not be counted ſmall and inconſiderable, becauſe it is about (the great thing) the Godhead it ſelf, and conſequently the Religion of the Godhead. They are a great blemiſh to the Chriſtian Theology, a miſrepreſentation of the Chriſtian Religion in the main and ſummary of it (which is the Holy Trinity) a ſpoiling the Wiſdom and reaſonableneſs of it, an affront to the Reaſon of Mankind (upon whoſe belief they are impos'd as the Catholick Faith) a perverting the Holy Scriptures, a grand occaſion of the Infidelity of the World, and of the Schiſms and Hereſies which infeſt the Church, and (which ſeemeth to be the worſt of thoſe Evils that are in them) they are very injurious unto God, to his Divine Majeſty and Honour and the dues of his Godhead. Theſe Evils are owing to the Scholaſtick Theology, which introduc'd the extravagant deifyings of the Holy Spirit, and wherein they are to be found in great plenty (in one ſmall Book the third of S. *Ambroſe de Spiritu Sancto,* there is a competent number of them) as we will ſhew by producing numerous Inſtances of them.

I. In the Scholaſtick Theology the Holy Spirit is made God *definitively ſo,* which is an heinous Extravagance; for this is undeniably plain and certain, that God is not the definitive Name and Notion of the Son, but *the Son of God* (the Son of him who is God;) that God is not the definitive Name and Notion of the Holy Spirit, but *the Spirit of God* (the Spirit of him who is God) and conſequently *God* is peculiarly the definitive Name and Notion of God the Father. But although this is undeniably plain and certain, yet the Scholaſtick Theology ſo marvellouſly overlooketh it, that it accounteth the Scholaſtick Divine Eſſence together with the three Perſons, to be God definitively ſo; and likewiſe each one of the three Divine Perſons it accounteth God definitively ſo: but it doth not acknowledge, that it is peculiar to any one Perſon of the Godhead, to be God *definitively* ſo. Yet if *the Spirit of God* is rightly ſo denominated, God muſt be the definitive Name and Notion of one, to whom the Holy Spirit belongeth, and from whom by this Name *the Spirit of God* (the Spirit of him who is God) he is plainly diſtinguiſh'd. But inſtead of being duely diſtinguiſh'd this Theology maketh the Spirit of God, to be God definitively ſo; in the application of places of Scripture and the divine honourary

Names inſtead of God (definitively ſo) oftentimes it ſubſtituteth the Spirit of God; and it applieth places of Scripture and the divine honourary Names both to God (definitively ſo) and to the Spirit of God without making a due diſtinction between them. (*a*) *It is the Spirit* (ſaith this Theology) *which* Iſaiah *ſaw, when he ſaid, I ſaw the Lord ſitting on a Throne, high and lifted up, and his Train filled the Temple. Above it ſtood the Seraphims: each one had ſix Wings; with twain he covered his Face, and with twain he covered his Feet, and with twain he did flie. And one cried unto another, and ſaid, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hoſts, the whole Earth is full of his Glory.* The Holy Ghoſt never appear'd, was never ſeen in any Prophetick Viſion, yet the ancient Scholaſtick Divines (whom the modern follow) are of Opinion, that he was ſeen in this Viſion of *Iſaiah*, and (as they imagine) they prove from S. *Paul*, that the Holy Ghoſt as appearing in this Viſion ſpake thoſe words, which follow a little after it: *Go and tell this People, Hear ye indeed but underſtand not; and ſee ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the Heart of this People fat.* (*b*) Ergo idem eſt Dominus Sabaoth ac ſpiritus ſanctus: *therefore the Lord of Hoſts and the Holy Spirit is the ſame*, as *Gr. Nyſſen*, *Baſil*, *Idatius*, *Cerealis*, *Victor Utic.* the *Alexandrian Cyril* and *Proclus* argue, to prove the Deity of the Holy Spirit. S. *Paul* is ſuppos'd to ſay, (*c*) *Hunc Deum verum ac Dominum exercituum eſſe ſpiritum ſanctum, that this true God and Lord of Hoſts is the Holy Spirit. To God and the Lord of Hoſts the Seraphims cried three times, Holy, holy, holy, becauſe Holineſs by nature is ſeen in three Hypoſtaſes, which three Hypoſtaſes are one Lord of Hoſts, that was ſeen in this Viſion*, as S. *Baſil* ſuppoſeth. But the Lord of Hoſts according to the Senſe of Scripture is only God *definitively* ſo, and ſo is *the God of Iſrael:* Yet theſe words of *David*, 2 *Sam.* 23. 3. *Spiritus Domini loquutus eſt per me, & ſermo ejus per linguam meam, dixit Deus Iſrael, mihi loquutus eſt fortis Iſrael dominator hominum*, are thus interpreted; (*d*) *Quo loco annon manifeſtè Spiritum Domini vocat etiam Deum Iſraelis, fortem & dominatorem?* In which place doth not *David* manifeſtly call the Spirit of the Lord the God of *Iſrael*, ſtrong and dominator? The ſame Author thus argueth: It was the true God, that commanded *Moſes* to ſpeak to *Aaron*, not to come at all times into the Holy Place within the Vail, *Lev.* 16. 2. *Hunc autem qui ſic præcipit, fuiſſe ipſum ſpiritum ſanctum: But the Giver of this Commandment was the Holy Spirit himſelf.* Pſal. 95. *God ſpeaketh thus; Harden not your Heart, as in the day of temptation in the Wilderneſs:* Hunc verò Deum ſpiritum ſanctum fuiſſe, qui fuit in deſerto ſic tentatus: *But this God was the Holy Spirit, who was ſo tempted in the Deſart.* This Theology ſo aſſerteth (and endeavoureth to prove) the Deity of the Holy Spirit, as to aſſert, that he is God *definitively* ſo. (*e*) Thus *Athanaſius*, *Gr. Nyſſen*, *Paſchaſius* and others argue; *Deus Iſrael eſt is, The God of* Iſrael *is he, who promiſed a new Covenant*, Jer. 31. *but this was the promiſe of the Holy Spirit himſelf.*

II. According to this Theology the Holy Spirit not only is of the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, but is the Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God and God *abſolutely*, which none but one Perſon of the Godhead can be, as in the Papacy or a Secular Monarchy but one Perſon can be the Imperial Eſtate. Nor can the Holy Spirit abſolutely be this Imperial Eſtate, which is *Self-originate, the firſt Cauſe*, Αὐτοκέφαλος (its own Head) *abſolutely independent, omni-imperial*, and is not without a certain *poteſtas* over all (but which muſt be underſtood with due abatement of ſenſe, when it is apply'd to Perſons of the Godhead) as S. *Hilary* ſaith, (*f*) *Qui mittit, poteſtatem ſuam in eo quod mittit, oſtendit:* He that ſendeth, ſheweth his Authority in ſending. So this Theology ſaith, (*g*) *Sending denoteth in him that ſendeth Dignity or Authority.* The Father hath the Prerogative of Authority both in reſpect of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and conſequently it is his Prerogative to be the Imperial Eſtate of God. The Father alſo giveth his Son and Spirit: He that giveth, doth give that which is his own; therefore the Father is the Owner and Superiour Proprietor both of his own Son and of his own Spirit; which implieth a certain right and power of diſpoſing of them, and ſpeaketh it his Peculiarity, to be the Imperial Eſtate of God. One would think, it is as plain as any common Notion, that the Imperial Eſtate of God is in order of Nature antecedent to the productive proceſſion of thoſe Divine Perſons, which (in this Theology) are ſuppos'd, to have a productive Proceſſion from it, and that it cannot be communicated to them (ſo as to be it) unleſs the before-named Attributes (ſelf-originate the firſt Cauſe, αὐτοκέφαλος, abſolutely independent, abſolutely omni-imperial) can be communicated to them, which is ſelf-contradictious and impoſſible; therefore neither of the Divine Perſons that are ſuppos'd, to have a productive Proceſſion from it, muſt be counted and called God, ſo as to make either of them the Imperial Eſtate of God, but they muſt be ſo counted and called in a duely limited ſenſe. The Son muſt be counted and called God *as being of the Godhead as the Son of it* and no further. The Spirit muſt be counted and called God *as being of the Godhead as the Spirit of it* and no further. And by this acknowledgment of their Deity the Faith of the Trinity is ſufficiently acknowledg'd; for *all the Controverſie* (ſaith *Gr. Nyſſen*) *which thoſe that follow the Church have with the* Anomæans *is this;* (*h*) *whether we ought to ſuppoſe the Son and the Spirit, to be of created nature, according to the Saying of the Adverſaries, or of uncreated nature, as the Church hath believed.* The Church ought to believe, that the Holy Spirit is of the uncreated nature, and conſequently is one of the Godhead-party, and one of his Godhead, who alone is *definitively and abſolutely God* (the Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God) theſe Bounds ſhe may not tranſcend, nor deviate from this Rule of Faith, as her Scholaſtick Theology doth, that maketh the Holy Spirit, *The Lord of Hoſts, the God of* Iſrael, *God definitively and abſolutely, The Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God.* That doth not acknowledge ſuch an Imperial Eſtate of *Almighty God*, the Being which is peculiar to one Perſon, but its Trinity is *a threefold Imperial Eſtate of God in one Eſſential God*, (*i*) *unus Deus habens tres perſonas, one eſſential God having three Perſons*, each of which is the Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God, as the *Athanaſian* Creed ſaith; *The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all one. The Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghoſt Almighty, yet they are not three Almighties,*

(a) *S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l.* 3. *c.* 22.

(b) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *S.* 2.

(c) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. *S.* 24. *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 3. *p.* 81. & *l.* 5. *p.* 115.

(d) *Valentia ibid.*

(e) *Petav. ſupr. S.* 3.

(f) De Trin. *l.* 8.

(g) *Miſſio quidem in eo qui mittit* ἀξίωμα, *id eſt, dignitatem ſive auctoritatem ineſſe teſtatur.* Petav. de Trin. l. 8. c. 1. S. 8.

(h) Περὶ τοῦ δεῖν ἢ κτιστὸν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῶν ἐναντίων, ἢ τῆς ἀκτίστου φύσεως καθὼς ἡ ἐκκλησία πεπίστευκε. *Gr. Nyſſ. c. Eunom.* l. 1 p. 66.

(i) Pet de Tri 4. c. 4 43

ties, but one Almighty. The Senſe is (a very heinous miſrepreſentation of the Godhead and of the Trinity) that although they are not *three Almighties* as to Eſſence, yet each Perſon is the Imperial Perſon (or Imperial Eſtate) of *Almighty God*, and this is the only Imperial Eſtate of God which this Theology acknowledgeth; which alſo thus repreſenteth the Holy Spirit, and proveth, that he ought to be worſhipp'd. (*k*) *For he that is God and Lord of the Univerſe, is to be worſhipp'd by all; for ſo it is written, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

III. Such an Identity this Theology attributeth to the Divine Perſons, which is of this meaning, *that there is no difference of one from another as to the being God definitively and àbſolutely and the Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God.* (*l*) *The three Perſons in Eſſence, Potentacy, Goodneſs, Wiſdom, Will, Power, and in all other Attributes which are abſolute, not relative, are the ſame, they are one, that is, one and a moſt ſimple thing without any difference.* (*m*) *Whoſoever doth not affirm, that of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt there is one Deity, Power and Authority, Divinity, Virtue, one Glory, Domination, Empire, one Will and Verity, let him be accurſed.* An Identity or numerical Unity of Scholaſtick Eſſence, a ταὐτότης τῆς φύσεως vel οὐσίας, *ſameneſs of Nature or of Subſtance* (which the term ὁμοούσιος, *conſubſtantial*, is us'd to ſignifie) this Theology attributeth to the three Divine Perſons, and alſo an Identity of Imperial Eſtate; *for God is the Name of a Nature and an Imperial Eſtate.* (*n*) *We acknowledge one Deity, one Kingdom, one Potentacy, one Virtue, one Action, one Will, one Domination.* (*o*) *Becauſe they are God, there is one Deity, one Majeſty, of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt.* This is that Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity, which this Theology celebrateth, which are terms that admit of a very good and laudable Senſe, and ſo the Unity and Identity of the Divine Perſons may be underſtood in a good Senſe; but in this Theology it is of this meaning, that they do not differ one from another *as to the being God definitively and abſolutely and the Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God:* for did they ſo differ, one might be ſaid to differ from another *quà Deus eſt*, which is contrary to the Maxims of this Theology.

IV. The *Equality* which (not without ſelf-contradiction) this Theology attributeth to the Divine Perſons, is of this Senſe; *that they do not differ one from another as to the being God definitively and abſolutely, and the Imperial Eſtate of God Almighty.* For it is a grand Maxim in this Theology, that the Father is greater than the Son, *quà Pater eſt, non quà Deus eſt*, as he is the Father (in reſpect only of his perſonal relative Property) but not *as he is God* (in reſpect of any thing that belongeth to him as God) ſo the Father is not greater than the Son or the Holy Ghoſt, theſe Divine Perſons having the very ſame Deity; and this is ſaid, to be the meaning of the *Athanaſian* Creed; *In this Trinity none is afore or after other; none is greater or leſs than another:* Of the Father this Theology ſaith, (*p*) *A greater Dignity is attributed to him without inequality of Perfection. It is an Article of the Catholick Faith, from which none diſſenteth but an Arian and Heretick, that the Father is not greater than the Son in Nature or Eſſence, or is more perfect in any thing, but altogether equal, yea the ſame in all Attributes and Perfections ſo called in the Schools.* But amongſt theſe Attributes or Perfections ſo called in the Schools one is *Potentacy* and *Authority*; and this Theology ſaith, (*q*) *Deus naturæ nomen eſt & poteſtatis:* therefore the Father is greater than the Son *quâ Deus eſt* (as he is God) if he is greater in Potentacy and hath any Power or Authority over the Son, which this Scholaſtick Theology ſometimes acknowledgeth, and ſometimes denieth; (*r*) *Patri non eſt auctoritas.* So this Theology ſometimes acknowledgeth, that ſending and giving the Holy Spirit importeth Dignity and Authority in the *Sender* and *Giver*, and ſometimes denieth it. (*s*) *The Holy Spirit is called the Gift of the Father and the Son* (only) *upon this account, becauſe he proceedeth from them.* But giving is free, whereas this proceſſion of the Holy Spirit is ſuppos'd to be (*t*) *naturalis ac neceſſaria* (natural and neceſſary) which ſpeaketh it no Gift. But much of this ſort of giving there is in this Theology, which ſaith of the generation of the Son, that it accounteth natural and neceſſary, (*u*) *By generating the Father gave power to the Son. All things that he hath in his Subſtance he gave to him by generating, neither is the Son any thing elſe but only thoſe things that are given him by the Father. He begat him equal, becauſe he gave him nothing leſs than Equality.* A marvellous Equality of the Divine Perſons this Theology deriveth from the ſame Father (S. *Auſtin*) from whom theſe Maxims are derived; (*w*) for the Son is ſaid, to be equal to and of as much Perfection as the Father, and not only ſo, but to be equal unto, and of as much Perfection as the Father and the Holy Spirit together; and not only ſo, but to be equal unto and of as much Perfection as the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt together. So the Holy Spirit is ſaid, to be equal unto and of as much Perfection as the Father; and not only ſo, but to be equal unto and of as much Perfection as the Father and the Son together; and not only ſo, but to be equal unto and of as much Perfection as Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt together. Whether theſe marvellous Propoſitions are remote from good Senſe or not, a Judgment may be made by comparing them with the Idea of God and of the Holy Spirit.

V. In-

(k) *Qui enim Deus Univerſitatis & Dominus, utique ab omnibus adorandus eſt. ſic enim ſcriptum eſt: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis & ipſi ſoli ſervies.* S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l. 3. c. 19.

(l) *Perſonæ tres in eſſentia, poteſtate, bonitate, ſapientia, voluntate, potentia, ac cæteris quæ abſolutè, non relativè dicuntur, ſunt idem, unum ſunt, hoc eſt, una & ſimpliciſſima res, ſine ulla differentia.* Petav. ſupr. l. 7. c. 10. S. 11.

(m) *Si quis non dixerit Patris & Filii & Spiritus ſancti unam deitatem, poteſtatem, divinitatem, virtutem, unam gloriam, dominationem, imperium, unam voluntatem & veritatem, anathema ſit.* Ibid. l. 4. c. 13. S. 14. & 11.

(n) *Unam novimus deitatem, unum regnum, unam poteſtatem, unam virtutem, unam actionem, unam voluntatem, unam dominationem.* Ibid. c. 15. S. 4.

(o) *Quia unus Deus, una divinitas, una majeſtas eſt Patris Filii & Spiritus Sancti.* S. Ambr. de Sp. Sanct. l. 1. c. 14.

(p) *Majus ei ἀξίωμα tribuitur citra perfectionis inæqualitatem: Majorem non eſſe Patrem Filio naturâ vel eſſentiâ, vel perfectiorem re ullâ; ſed æqualem penitùs; imò eundem in iis omnibus, quæ attributa vulgò & perfectiones in ſcholis appellantur, Catholicæ eſt dogma Fidei, à quo nullus diſſentit niſi Arianus & Hæreticus.* Petav. ſupr. l. 7. c. 6. S. 8. & l. 8. c. 9. S. 15. & T. 4. l. 6. c. 13. S. 7.

(q) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 4. c. 14. *S.* 1.

(r) *Ibid. l.* 5 c. 5. *S.* 12.

(s) *Spiritus Sanctus donum Patris & Filii appellatur, quia ab utroque procedit.* Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 10. Digreſſ. 1. p. 618.

(t) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 7. c. 12. *S.* 15.

(u) *Gignendo dedit potentiam Pater Filio. Omnia quæ habet in ſubſtantia ſua, gignendo dedit ei. Neque quid aliud eſt Filius, exceptis his quæ ei dantur à Patre. Æqualem utique genuit, quoniam nihil minus dedit.* Petav. de Trin. l. 5. c. 9. S. 15.

(w) *Tanta eſt æqualitas in ea Trinitate, ut non ſolùm Pater non ſit major quàm Filius, quod attinet ad divinitatem: ſed nec Pater & Filius ſimul majus aliquid ſint quàm Spiritus Sanctus, aut ſingula quæque perſona, quælibet trium minus aliquid ſit quàm ipſa Trinitas. Tantus eſt ſolus Pater, vel ſolus Filius, vel ſolus Spiritus Sanctus, quantus eſt ſimul Pater, & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus.* Idem T. 1. l. 6. c. 7. S. 13.

V. Inſtead of the true *Monarchy of God the Father* (his being peculiarly God definitively and abſolutely and the Imperial Eſtate of God) this Theology ſubſtituteth the bare *Unity* or *Singularity* of a firſt Principle and calleth it *a Monarchy*. For to ſhew, that a Trinity of Perſons is conſiſtent with the Unity of God, this Theology aſſerteth a certain Monarchy, (x) *which word is not meant in the uſual Senſe, to denote the Empire or Domination of one* (as an Imperial Head) *but an Unity or Singularity of the Principle.* Sometimes by the Monarchy this Theology meaneth *the Divine Perſons which though three in number and different in their relative Properties, yet in Eſſence and Attributes are the ſame.* This is a *Trinity in Unity*, becauſe the ſame Deity is in all the Divine Perſons, and therefore is called the Monarchy. But by *the Monarchy* this Theology meaneth alſo, *quod totius divinitatis vel deitatis principium Pater eſt*, that the Father is the Principle of the whole Divinity or Deity. So that there is a Trinity in Unity both becauſe the very ſame Deity is in all the Divine Perſons, (y) and becauſe of the ſingularity of a firſt Principle. Touching which ſingularity of Principle theſe three things are obſervable. (1.) This Unity or Singularity of a firſt Principle is diſcours'd of in this Theology, as a cauſe or reaſon of the Unity of the Trinity in this reſpect, *the Trinity of Perſons are one in the Father* (who is called the ἕνωσις, or Unition of the Trinity;) and likewiſe to ſhew the cauſe or reaſon, why all the Divine Perſons have the ſame Nature or Eſſence; which is, becauſe the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are from one Principle; whereas otherwiſe they would have a different Eſſence, and there would be more Gods than one. (z) But this Reaſon this Theology (in the ſame Breath) acknowledgeth, to be no ſufficient Reaſon; for the origination of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt from one Principle inferreth no more than a Specifick (not a Numerical) Unity of Nature and Eſſence. (2.) This Unity or Singularity of a firſt Principle is called *a Monarchy*, yet this Theology ſaith, it is no Monarchy (in the proper uſual ſenſe) which is as much as to ſay, *that God is not the Imperial Eſtate of God* (not the Almighty God) antecedently to a Trinity. Agreeably whereto this Theology ſaith, (a) *That the Son ſending the Holy Spirit hath ſome Authority over him: but not of Dominion or Majority; therefore of origine.* (b) *That Authority or Dignity is nothing elſe but the Notion of a Principle or Origin.* (c) *Many Ancients have ſaid, the Father to be greater than the Son, even according to his Divinity; not by Eſſence or any Perfection, but by Authority, that is, by Origine.* In which three Paſſages of this Theology there are more than three ſelf-contradictions: for the Authority which is of conſideration in the Buſineſs of Miſſion (the ſending the Holy Ghoſt) is *poteſtas*, which in theſe Paſſages of Scholaſtick Theology is ſaid to be *no Perfection*, which is to ſay, it is no Nobilitation, no Eminence, Preeminence or Power, no Glory or Magnificence, no Honour or Dignity, yet it is called *Dignity. Authoritas Originis* is call'd Authority, yet it is made no Authority; for it is no Authority, if it is not *Authoritas Majoritatis vel Superioritatis.* It is made to be nothing more than *the Notion of a Principle or Origine*; whereas Authority neceſſarily reſulteth from being a Principle or Origine, as Paternal Authority reſulteth from Generation. The Father is ſaid to be *Major* than the Son *Authoritate*, but not *Authoritate Majoritatis.* (3.) This Unity or Singularity of a firſt Principle and Scholaſtick *Monarchy* is in ſome reſpect not ſo agreeable to true Religion, as that one firſt Principle and Monarchy that is in the Pagans Polytheiſm (which yet ſignified nothing conſiderable to the advantage of the Unity of God and the diſadvantage of their Polytheiſm;) for the Pagans one firſt Principle was βασιλεὺς, *an Imperial Eſtate or Monarchy* in the proper uſual ſenſe: whereas this Scholaſtick Monarchy is ſaid, to be nothing more than the Notion of a Principle or Origine, as being no Dignity or Authority in the proper uſual ſenſe: therefore it is rather a Phyſiological kind of firſt Principle than a Political or Monarchical; and although it is called *Deus Pater*, yet it is neither like a God or a Father; for a God is a Potentate, and a Father is a Father-King.

VI. The Scholaſtick Theology maketh the Holy Spirit *the moſt High God* (the Supreme God) without intending a due limitation of Senſe, ſo making him to be the Imperial Eſtate of God and God *definitively and abſolutely.* For this Theology underſtandeth thoſe Propoſitions *abſolutely* and without limitation of ſenſe, which ought to be underſtood relatively and with due limitation of ſenſe: as our Saviour being God only as the Son of God, this Saying of his *All that the Father hath are mine*, ought to be underſtood *relatively* and with this limitation of ſenſe, *that being God as the Son of God*, the ſelf-exiſtent and independent Sovereignty of the Father is as being ſuch and in ſuch ſenſe his. But we may not infer from thence, that *ſelf-exiſtence and ſelf-originate independence* are Attributes of the Son as well as of the Father, yet at this rate the Scholaſtick Theology underſtandeth our Saviour's Saying, to ſignifie, (d) *proprietates Patris omnes in eſſe Filio, that all the Attributes of the Father are alſo Attributes of the Son.* So this Theology argueth, that the Son and the Holy Ghoſt cannot be God without being ſo abſolutely perfect as the Father; (e) that to ſuppoſe any the leaſt Perfection in the Father, to be wanting in the Son, is inconſiſtent with his being the Son of God, and alſo with his being God. It is inconſiſtent with his being the Son of God (produc'd by true and proper Generation;) for there is no Perfection in God the Father, which is not his Divinity or Deity (his Eſſence) which muſt be communicated intire and unmutilated to the Son. And it is inconſiſtent with his being God, becauſe it implieth his being imperfect. (f) So in the Holy Ghoſt there muſt be all *τὰ κοινὰ τῷ πατρὶ ϗ τῷ υἱῷ, the things that are common to the Father and the Son*, and *τὰ προσόντα τῷ πατρὶ ὡς θεῷ, thoſe things that are*

(x) *Qua voce, non ut alias ſolet, unicus & ſingularis principatus, vel dominatus exprimitur, ſed principii unitas & ſingularitas.* Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 15. S. 10. & l. 7. c. 10. S. 11.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 4. c. 15. *S.* 9, 14.

(z) *Ibid.* S. 12.

(a) *Mittens aliquam authoritatem habet in miſſum: oportet igitur quod Filius mittens ſpiritum ſanctum, habeat aliquam authoritatem in illum: ſed non dominii vel majoritatis, ut patet: ergo originis.* Aquin. c. Gent. l. 4. c. 24.

(b) *Quam auctoritatem dignitatemve nihil aliud eſſe, quàm principii notionem & originis demonſtravimus.* Petav. ſupr. l. 8. c. 1. S. 8.

(c) *Veteres multi patrem etiam ſecundum divinitatem majorem eſſe Filio dixerunt; non eſſentia aut perfectione aliqua, ſed auctoritate, hoc eſt origine.* Ibid. l. 5. c. 5. S. 13.

(d) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 8. S. 15.

(e) *Nam ſi Filius verè Deus eſt, utpote ab vero Deo vera & propria generatione productus, veram in ſe divinitatem habeat oportet: non aliam utique, vel numero diverſam ab ea, qua Deus eſt Pater: quia plures eſſe nequeunt: ſed neque mancam ac defectam ulla ſui parte; vel proprietate ac perfectione minorem aliqua; quia nihil in Deo eſt, quod non totus ipſe Deus, ac divinitas ſit ipſa. Proinde nihil in patre eſt omnino præter paternitatem, quod non in Filio ſit, imo ipſe ſit Filius. Ac ſi vel minima in eorum aliquo perfectio eſſet, quæ abeſſet ab altero, propter quam minor vel non æqualis eſſet, ne Deus quidem eſſet, quia imperfectus eſſet.* Petav. ſupr. c. 9. S. 4.

(f) *Gr. Naz. or.* 24. p. 429. S. *Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 5. p. 109.

in the Father as God. (g) *I read in the Scripture, that there is one Name, that is, Authority, Majeſty and Power of thoſe three. There I read all things that are proper to the ſupreme Deity, attributed to the three Perſons together, and to every one of them ſingly.* What the Apoſtle ſaith of God (that in him we Live and Move and have our Being) this Theology applieth to the Holy Spirit (h) αὐτὸ κτ' φύσιν ὑπάρχον ὅσα ϗ Θεὸς, *he being according to Nature whatſoever God is.* (i) *Quomodo non Deus, qui omnia habet quæ Deus habet? How is he not God, who hath all that God hath?* The extravagance of theſe Argumentations appeareth from the true Idea of God (wherewith the Scholaſtick Theology is unacquainted) which is that of the Imperial or Kingdom-eſtate of God, in which there can be but one Perſon, that is *the imperial Perſon of God definitively and abſolutely*, but one that is *the firſt Being and a Being abſolutely perfect, but one that is abſolutely ſupreme and the moſt high.* That the Sayings of Divines which follow the Scholaſtick way, may not be injurious unto him, it is to be wiſh'd, that they had a prudent limitation, which they have not. (k) *We do aſſert, that the Holy Spirit is God, that moſt high God, moſt abſolutely and properly ſo.* (l) *We have a clear deſcription of the Bleſſed Spirit, that he is the moſt high and eternal God, of the ſame Nature, Attributes and Operations with the Father and the Son, as receiving the ſame Eſſence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both.* This Origin of the Holy Spirits Deity is not ſo certain as this other (m) τῇ πρὸς Θεὸν ἑνώσει τὸ πνεῦμα Θεὸς, *the Spirit is God by Union with God.* And he that is ſo God, is not the moſt high God otherwiſe than as one of his Godhead, who alone is abſolutely the moſt high God.

VII. The Scholaſtic Theology maketh a ſhew of acknowledging, that there is in God a ſuperiour Authority in reſpect of the Holy Spirit, and that the Miſſion and Donation thereof implieth ſo much: But this Theology ſo explaineth it ſelf, that this ſeemingly acknowledged Authority amounteth to nothing of Authority. It attributeth to the Holy Spirit (n) *ſummam auctoritatem, the ſupreme Authority*, without diſtinction or limitation of Senſe; and in like manner it affirmeth, that the three divine Perſons have (o) *not diſparity, not inequality, but unity of Potentacy, unity of Empire, unity and identity of Majeſty* (without diſparity or inequality) *one Deity, one Kingdom, one Domination.* For theſe Attributions to the three divine Perſons do not mean, that the Son of God and the Holy Spirit of God as being ſuch are of the one Imperial Eſtate of God the Father, and as ſuch have his one Deity, Domination and ſupreme Potentacy (which is ſound Theology:) But this Theology ſuppoſeth, that every one of the divine Perſons is *definitively and abſolutely God*; and therefore whatever belongeth to the Father as God, muſt alſo belong to the Son and the Holy Spirit (becauſe each of them is God in this ſame ſenſe with the Father) and conſequently they muſt be *abſolutely exempt from all ſuperiour Proprietors, Authorities and Powers.* This Theology alſo contemplateth the three divine Perſons as three Hypoſtaſes (Subſiſtences) in one Scholaſtic divine Eſſence, which although they differ in their perſonal Properties, and one in reſpect of his perſonal Property may be counted greater than another (the Father is Ingenit, the Son is begotten by him, the Spirit is neither Ingenit, nor begotten, but proceedeth) yet the Eſſential Deity or the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence with all the eſſential Attributes is equally in all the three Hypoſtaſes, which having one and the ſame eſſential Deity, divine Majeſty, ſupreme Potentacy and Domination in perfect Identity and Equality, and being every one of them ſo abſolutely perfect as the other, every one of them is neceſſarily the Eternal, Almighty, moſt high God and ſupreme Potentate abſolutely (without limitation of Senſe) and therefore is *the Imperial Eſtate of Almighty God*, exempt from all ſuperiour Authorities, Proprietors and Powers. So the Holy Spirit (who in reſpect of us *breatheth where he liſteth, and diſtributeth his Gifts as he will*) is repreſented in this Theology as (p) *a Self-diſpoſer of his own Liberty, unſubject to the Power of any, diſtributing all things by the Authority of his own Will. He is free and hath the Rights of Domination. Hath Authority above all of breathing where he willeth and inſpiring how he willeth. Hath the Effuſion of Charity at his own diſpoſal. Operateth not by Command, but according to his own Will, as being at his own diſpoſal, not a Servant under the Power of another. For he doth not obey as commanded, but as a Donour is the diſpoſer of his own Bounty. We read, that it ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us (as we read, that it pleaſed God) which ſpeaketh him to have the arbitrement of things by his own Authority. And how can it be otherwiſe with him, who ſpeaketh what he willeth, and commandeth what he pleaſeth?* Theſe Propoſitions are not without Exceſs and Extravagance (the Holy Spirit being the divine Agent of the abſolutely ſupreme Authority) nor is this other. (q) *The Spirit* παραχωρεῖ, *yieldeth or giveth place to the Father as not being Ingenit, to the Son as not being generated:* Τὰ δ' ἄλλα συμφυὲς ϗ σύνθρονον, ϗ ὁμόδοξον ϗ ὁμότιμον, *but as to all things elſe he is of the ſame Nature, of the ſame Potentacy, of the ſame Glory and Honour.* He is ſo (according to this Theology) becauſe (r) *vera Deitas in nullo eſſe aut minor aut major poteſt. True Deity can be in none leſſer or greater.* And for this reaſon; *nulla ratione verè eſt unum, quod aliqua eſt in æqualitate diverſum. That is not by any reaſon truly one, which is different by any inequality.* (s) *Neſcit unitas ordinem, gradum neſcit æqualitas. Unity knoweth no Order, Equality knoweth no Degree.* But if we will take things by the right handle, and conſider the Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt *relatively* and with due limitation of Senſe, it is not hard to diſcern, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are one God with the Father in due Equality and in due Inequality, as being his Son and his Spirit, of both which he is ſuperiour Proprietor. Yet S. *Baſil* ſaith of the Spirit (t) οὐ κτῆμα Θεοῦ οὐδὲ κτίσμα, *it is no Poſſeſſion of God, nor any Creature*: As if God the Father

(g) *Lego trium iſtorum unum eſſe nomen, id eſt, auctoritatem, majeſtatem & potentiam. Lego omnia quæ ſunt propria ſummæ divinitatis, tribus ſimul, & trium ſingulis attributa.* Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 11. S. 5.

(h) S. Cyr. de Trin. Dial. 7. p. 655.

(i) S. Amb. de ſp. ſanct. l. 3. c. 19.

(k) Dr. Barrow on the Creed Ser. 34. p. 497.

(l) Bp. Pearſon on the Creed Art 8. p. 645. ed. 1.

(m) S. Cyr. de Trin. Dial. 7. p. 648.

(n) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 16. S. 12.

(o) *Non diſparilitatem, non inæqualitatem, ſed unitatem poteſtatis, unitatem imperii, unitatem & ταυτότητα Majeſtatis, unam deitatem, unum regnum, unam dominationem.* S. Ambr. de ſp. ſanct. l. 1. c. 2, 14. l. 2. c. 1, 2, 12. l. 3. c. 6. 14, 21.

(p) *Suæ libertatis arbiter, non alienæ poteſtati ſubjectus aut juri, omnia pro authoritate propriæ voluntatis dividens. Liber eſt, habet jura dominatus. Spirandi ubi velit, & inſpirandi quomodo velit, habens ſuper omnia poteſtatem. Divinæ arbiter charitatis eſt. Non eſt dubium, quin ea quæ operatur pater, operetur & ſpiritus. Nec ex præcepto, ſicut qui corporaliter audit operatur: Sed ex voluntate, qui ſui eſt liber arbitrii, non alienæ famulus Poteſtatis. Non enim quaſi juſſus obtemperat, ſed quaſi largitor ſuæ moderator eſt largitatis. Sicut enim de Deo legitur, placuit Deo, ita etiam cùm dicitur, quia viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto, arbiter ſuæ exprimitur poteſtatis. Et quomodo non arbiter, qui ea quæ vult loquitur, quæ vult mandat?* S. Ambroſ. de ſp. ſanct. l. 1. c. 1, 3, 7, 10. & l. 2. c. 12.

(q) Gr. Naz. or. 26. p. 445.

(r) Petav. ſupr. l. 8. c. 9. S. 15.

(s) S. Ambroſ de ſp. ſanct. l. 3. c. 18.

(t) C. Eunom. l. 5. p. 117.

ther could be Proprietor and Poſſeſſor of none but Creatures. But ſometimes this Father may ſeem to exceed on the other hand. (u) Ὀυτι ἀυτὸς ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα. *He is not God, but the Spirit of God.*

VIII. The Scholaſtick Theology ſuppoſeth, that the Operations of the Holy Spirit *ad extrà*, his Gifts, Graces and Benefits, are his doings as properly the Author of them. For ſo he is intituled (w) *the Author of the Prophets.* And as to the Apoſtles (x) *not only the Operator of Grace, but the Author of their Command touching what was to be done about circumciſing the Gentiles.* (y) *The Author of our Spiritual Generation, whereby we are created according to God. We cannot keep the Benefit, if we exclude the Author; the Author cannot be without the Gift, nor the Gift without the Author. If the Author be vile, how can the Gifts be precious?* (z) *We cannot doubt, but that the Spirit is Creator, whom we know to be the Author of our Lord's Incarnation.* (a) *The Apoſtles and Prophets were deſignati* (ordinatively deſign'd) *to Propheſie and Evangelize by the Holy Spirit, as by the Father and the Son.* The Holy Spirit being (b) *of omnimodous Equality in reſpect of Nature, operating and ſpeaking.* The Holy Ghoſt ſaid, ſeparate me *Barnabas* and *Saul*, Act. 13. 2. The Spirit ſaid unto *Peter* touching the Meſſengers of *Cornelius*, *I have ſent them.* Act. 10. 20. In which miſtaken places (before conſider'd) the Scholaſtick Theology obſerveth, that (c) *ſpiritus ſanctus* αὐθεντικῶς, *& ut majeſtate ſuprema dignum eſt, loquitur. The Holy Spirit ſpeaketh with the Authority of a Sovereign and as becometh ſupreme Majeſty.* The Holy Spirit (d) as being perfectly co-ordinate with the Father and the Son in the ſame Scholaſtick devine Eſſence, of one and the ſame Potentacy, Majeſty, and Authority without Inequality, of one and the ſame Will, Counſel and Operation, is ſuppos'd, to be properly and equally with the other divine Perſons the Author of his Gifts, Graces, Benefits, and all his Operations *ad extrà.* Of which Branch of the Scholaſtick Theology we ſhall be able to make a Judgment from theſe following Obſervations.

Firſt, This Branch of the Scholaſtick Theology is an Errour of very bad Conſequence, yet is not very remote from the Truth. For as Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are the one holy Sovereignty or Government in our Religion: So they are the one holy Author of it and of the ſupernatural Gifts, Graces and Benefits that are in it. But as the Father and the Son are only the holy Government in the ſtrict Acceptation: So the Father and the Son are only the holy Author in the ſtrict Acceptation; and therefore the Apoſtle (repreſenting the Author of our Religion) taketh no Notice of the Holy Ghoſt, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt by whom are all things.* As the Holy Spirit is of the Party of the Government, and muſt be reckon'd with the Government, yet is not the Government in ſtrict Acceptation, but the Agent thereof: So the Holy Spirit is of the Author-party and muſt be reckon'd with the Author, yet is not the Author in ſtrict Acceptation, but his divine Agent. And to repreſent him otherwiſe, is a miſrepreſentation of the Chriſtian Theology of very bad Conſequence in the Devotional part of Religion.

Secondly, In proving this Branch of Scholaſtick Theology the ancient Scholaſtick Divines ſtrangely miſ-apply the Scripture, miſtake the Senſe of it, and their Premiſes are a contradiction to their Concluſion. For God is ſaid, to reveal his *Arcana* to us by his Spirit, to ſanctifie us by his Spirit, to ſtrengthen us by his Spirit, to renew us by the Holy Ghoſt, and to quicken our mortal Bodies by his Spirit; which Phraſeology of Scripture manifeſtly implieth, that the Operation of the Holy Spirit is not that of the Author ſtrictly and properly ſuch, but that of the Agent of the Author. Yet from ſuch Premiſes the ancient Scholaſtic Divines infer a contrary Concluſion, namely, that the Holy Spirit is the Author of thoſe Operations, Gifts, Graces and Benefits in Parity and Equality with the Father and the Son. (e) *It is not to be doubted, but that all things are of him* (as the Author) *by whom are all things. Regeneration therefore is the work of the Holy Spirit, who is the Author of the new Man created after the Image of God. God hath this, he raiſeth the dead. For as the Father raiſeth the dead and quickneth: So the Son quickneth whom he will. But the Spirit alſo raiſeth the dead, by whom God raiſeth them. Therefore the Spirit hath whatever God hath.* The Spirit ſpake in the Perſon of God, when he ſpake to S. *Peter* touching the Meſſengers of *Cornelius*, and his Speech was *imperium Dei Patris, the Command of God the Father*, Act. 10. 20. But from this place S. *Ambroſe* raiſeth this Argument, to prove the Deity of the Holy Spirit. (f) *Peter being ſent by the Spirit did not tarry for the Command of God the Father. He confeſs'd, that this was the Oracle of the Spirit himſelf, and that this was his Grace, ſaying, God gave them* (the Gentiles) *the like Gift, as he did unto us.* (g) *Therefore it is the Holy Spirit, who* (as the Author) *cleanſed us from that Gentile filth.* So becauſe God is ſaid, to ſanctifie us by his Spirit, hence S. *Baſil* inferreth (h) *it is the Spirit that maketh Saints to be Saints, and affordeth to them that ask God of him a divine Life*; which ſpeaketh him the Author of their Sanctification. The Spirit is ſuppos'd, to be the Author of his Benefits, as the Son is the Author of his Benefits. (i) *For as our Lord giveth Power to them that receive him, to become the Sons of God: So the Holy Spirit* πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐστὶ, *is the Spirit of Adoption.* Whereby this Father meaneth, that the Spirit adopteth us to be Sons.

Thirdly, In this Branch of Scholaſtic Theology the Cauſality of the Holy Spirit is miſtaken in ſeveral reſpects. For this Theology affirmeth, (k) *that there is one Counſel of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghoſt touching*

things

(u) *Hom.* 17. *de Bapt. p.* 511.

(w) *Author Prophetarum.* S. Ambr. de ſp. ſanct. l. 2. c. 12.

(x) *Non ſolum operator gratiæ, ſed etiam author imperatæ executionis.* Ibid.

(y) *Spiritalis generationis author, qua ſecundum Deum creamur. Non poteſt manere beneficium, cùm author excluditur; nec author ſine munere, nec ſine authore munus. Si author vilis, quomodo dona precioſa?* Ibid. c. 9.

(z) *Dubitare non poſſumus ſpiritum creatorem, quem dominicæ cognoſcimus incarnationis authorem.* Ibid. c. 5.

(a) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 1.

(b) Εἰσάπαν ἰσοφυὲς, ἰσουργοῦντε ϗ ἰσοεπές. *S. Cyr. de Trin. Dial.* 7. *p.* 657.

(c) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 16. *S.* 12.

(d) *S. Cyr. ſupr. p.* 659.

(e) *Non eſt dubium, quia per quem omnia, ex eo omnia. Sancti igitur ſpiritus opus eſt regeneratio, & novi hujus hominis qui creatur ad imaginem Dei, author eſt ſpiritus. Habet Deus quod ſuſcitat mortuos. Sicut enim pater ſuſcitat mortuos & vivificat: Sic & filius quos vult vivificat. Suſcitat autem etiam ſpiritus per quem Deus ſuſcitat. Habet igitur quod habet Deus* S. Ambr. de ſp. ſanct. l. 2. c. 10. & 9. & l. 3. c. 20.

(f) *Petrus miſſus ab ſpiritu, non expectavit imperium Dei patris.* Ibid. l. 2. c. 11.

(g) *Spiritus ergo ſanctus eſt, qui nos ab illa gentili colluvione mundavit.* Ibid.

(h) Αὐτό ἐστιν ὁ τοὺς ἁγίους ἁγίους ἐποίησε, ϗ τὴν θείαν ζωὴν παρέχει τοῖς αἰτοῦσι παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεόν. *C. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 135.

(i) *Ibid. l.* 3. *p.* 83.

(k) *Unum conſilium Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti de* *rebus præcognitis & ſtatutis.* S. *Ambroſ. ſupr.* l. 2. c. 2.

things fore-known and fore-determin'd. But the Scripture hath no acquaintance with ſuch Maxims as theſe, nor doth it ever inform us, *that the Holy Spirit worketh all things after the Counſel of his own Will.* The ordinative Cauſality, the Right and Authority of making Decrees (which are the prime Cauſes of things) the Scripture never attributeth to the Holy Spirit; and becauſe he is *ſent, given, ſhed abroad, poured forth* authoritatively by another Perſon, who alſo *anointeth* and *ſealeth* us with the Holy Spirit, therefore he can be no ſuch Author, no ſuch Arbiter, no ſuch αὐθέντης, *Self-ſovereign* as this Theology ſuppoſeth. And as the *ordinative* Cauſality doth not properly belong to him, which therefore cannot conſtitute him *the Author:* So if we conſider his *effective* Cauſality (in his Gifts, Graces, Benefits) it muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from that of the Author. For the Government in the ſtrict Acceptation (which is the Father and the Son) is the *actual Efficient* by the original effective Cauſality as the Author: The Holy Spirit is the actual Efficient by the mediate effective Cauſality of the Agent of the Author. 1 *Cor.* 12. 6. *It is the ſame God* (the Father) *which worketh all in all.* But this original effective Cauſality of God is by the mediate effective Cauſality of his Spirit. *Ezek.* 36. 27. *I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes.* 2 Cor. 1. 21, 22. *Now he which eſtabliſheth us with you in Chriſt, and hath anointed us, is God. Who hath alſo ſealed us, and given the earneſt of the Spirit in our Hearts.* As the Father, ſo the Son is the Author (by the original effective Cauſality) and the Cauſality of the Holy Spirit is that of an Agent (the ghoſtly virtual divine Agent) of this Author. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. *Ye are the Epiſtle of Chriſt written with the Spirit.* Joh. 16. 14. *He ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.*

Fourthly, This Branch of the Scholaſtick Theology therefore involveth in it manifold contradictions to the true Idea of the Holy Spirit, and ſome very great Abſurdities. For, (1.) To be the Perſon of the Author (the Efficient by the original Cauſality) in reſpect of theſe Gifts, Graces, Benefits and Operations *ad extrà*, is peculiar to the Government in the ſtrict Acceptation (which is the Government in theſe Affairs) which the Holy Spirit is not, but is the Inſpiration-virtue and Agent of the Government. (2.) To be the Perſon of the Author in reſpect of theſe Gifts, Graces, Benefits and Operations *ad extrà* is peculiar to the imperial Proprietor and Diſpoſer of the Holy Spirit and of his Operations *ad extrà*, who as an imperial Head influentially communicateth the Holy Spirit to the Body and the Members thereof; for the Holy Spirit cannot be a Self-owner and Self-diſpoſer as the imperial Head of a Body; and therefore this the original Cauſality is incompetible to him. (3.) To be the Perſon of the Author in reſpect of theſe Benefits (the efficient Cauſe of them by the original Cauſality) is peculiar to him, that is unto us the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity or of Chriſtianity Imperial (the Father and the Son;) for as we owe unto him the Duty-part of Religion, ſo theſe are the Benefit-part of Religion, and are ſuch things, which belong unto him, to do unto us, *as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity or Chriſtianity Imperial.* But the Holy Ghoſt is not, cannot be, the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity or Chriſtianity Imperial, but is characteriſtically and definitively the divine Agent and Miſſionary thereof. (4.) To be the Perſon of the Author in reſpect of theſe Gifts and Graces (the efficient Cauſe of them by original Cauſality) is peculiar to the King of the Holy Empire. For the original Cauſality of them is his Goodneſs, and the Holy Spirit with its Gifts, Graces, Benefits are his Royal Bounty, Largeſſes and Donatives: But to be the King of the Holy Empire, is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. (5.) To be the Perſon of the Author in reſpect of theſe Graces (the efficient Cauſe of them by the original Cauſality) is peculiar to him, that is of *Paternal Goodneſs*, from which the Graces of God's Children (and their being God's Children) iſſue. Which original Cauſality is neceſſarily peculiar to the Father and the Son (the Father of his Church) for the Holy Ghoſt cannot be of the *Paternal Goodneſs.* (6.) If the Holy Spirit is the Author of theſe Gifts, Graces, Benefits and Operations *ad extrà*, the Spirit of Propheſie was the Father of the Prophets. Which was not the ſenſe of him that ſaid to the People (that were ſurpriz'd to ſee *Saul* among the Prophets) *But who is their Father.* 1. Sam. 10. 12. The Holy Spirit, if he is properly the Author of theſe Operations, is properly our Father by our Spiritual Generation, and we are properly his Sons and Children; which is an abſurd Suppoſition of the ſuperlative Degree. He is alſo, if properly the Author of theſe Operations, properly the Father of Chriſt Jeſus by his natural Generation, and Chriſt was properly the Son and Child of the Holy Ghoſt, which is an abſurdity beyond a Parallel. Yet this monſtrous Suppoſition is manifeſtly implied in the Argumentations of ſome learn'd Divines of our own, who otherwiſe follow the Scholaſtic Theology, yet thus far they recede from it; they hold that Chriſt Jeſus was the Son of God as begotten by the Spirit of the Virgin *Mary.* (l) *And the reaſon is clear* (ſaith one) *becauſe that the Holy Ghoſt is God. For were he any Creature, and not God himſelf, who thus begat our Saviour of the Virgin, he muſt have been the Son of a Creature, not of God.* Which Argumentation implieth, that Chriſt was the Son of the Holy Ghoſt, by whom he was begotten of the Bl. Virgin, and therefore (the Holy Ghoſt being God) was the Son of God. The ſame Author thus proveth the Deity of the Holy Spirit. (m) *He by whoſe Operation Chriſt was conceiv'd in the Womb of the Virgin, was no created Perſon; for by virtue of that Conception he was called the Son of God; whereas if a Creature had been the cauſe of his Conception, he had been in that reſpect the Son of a Creature.* Chriſt is ſuppos'd, to be the Son of that non-created Perſon (the Holy Ghoſt) by whoſe Operation he was conceiv'd in the Womb of the Virgin. And this is the Senſe of another Divine, who thus proveth the Deity of the Holy Spirit. (n) *Our Lord as Man was conceiv'd by the Holy Ghoſt, and for that reaſon was the Son of God: The Holy Ghoſt (ſaid the Angel) ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall over-ſhadow thee; therefore that holy thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God; what conſequence were there of this, if the Holy Ghoſt is not God?* This is a great inſtance of extravagant deifying the Holy Ghoſt, *the making the Son of God his Son.* Which prodigious miſtake is a natural Fruit and Conſequence of this erroneous Idea of the Holy Spirit, that he is properly the Author of his Gifts, Graces,

(l) *Bp. Pearſon on the Creed Art.* 2. p. 210. *ed.* 1.

(m) *Ibid. Art.* 8. p. 630.

(n) *Dr. Barrow on the Creed. Ser.* 34. p. 498.

Benefits and Operations *ad extra*. For the Proof whereof the Scholaſtick Theology hath little to ſay but *the Spirit breatheth where he liſteth, and divideth to every Man as he will.* Which is to be underſtood with reſpect to us.

IX. The Holy Spirit is, and muſt be ſaid, to be *God and Lord* with due diſtinction and limitation of Senſe; for he is God as being one of the Divine Sovereignty (the Godhead) and he is ſo far *Lord*, he is one of that Imperial Eſtate. But he is not *Lord*, as that Name ſignifieth *the Honour-perſon of the Lord*, nor is he God as being *the Divine Sovereignty* in ſtrict Acceptation. The ancient *Pneumatomachi* had uſually this Objection in their Mouths. (*o*) Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐπεισάγεις ξένον θεὸν καὶ ἄγραφον, *whence do you bring in to us a ſtrange God and unwritten* (that is no where in Scripture called God or Lord) οὐδαμοῦ γέγραπται, *it is no where written, that the Spirit is God.* To which Objection this Anſwer is made in the Dialogues againſt the *Macedonians* in *Athanaſius*'s Works (*p*) δῶμεν ὅτι οὐ γέγραπται, *let us grant, that the Holy Spirit is not any where in Scripture called by the Name God.* This Anſwer is a Conceſſion, that the Holy Ghoſt is not by expreſs Nomination in Scripture called *God or Lord*; which is a true Anſwer, and that which ought to be made. But the other Adverſaries of the *Pneumatomachi* (Ancient and Modern) diſliking this Anſwer, have in their Diſputes for the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt alledged ſeveral places of Scripture, wherein they ſuppoſe the Holy Spirit, to be called by expreſs Nomination God and Lord. But theſe their Allegations of Scripture are ſuch palpable miſapplications of it and ſo manifeſtly impertinent to their purpoſe, that ſcarce any of them are worthy to be taken into conſideration; there are indeed but two places, that can be ſaid with any ſhew of probability, to call the Holy Spirit by expreſs Nomination God or Lord. And in the one of theſe there is no difficulty; for when the Apoſtle ſaith 2 *Cor.* 3. 17. *Now the Lord is that Spirit*, it is ſufficiently plain and evident, that his intention is not to ſay, *that Spirit is the Lord* (Jehovah) *with whom* Moſes *ſpake, when he took the Vail off*; *and is the Lord to whom the Jews ſhall turn, when the Vail covering their Minds is taken off* (as they that diſpute againſt the *Pneumatomachi* will have his words conſtrued and underſtood;) for that Spirit (the Holy Ghoſt) is not the Imperial Eſtate of a Religion, nor the Imperial Eſtate of a Religion contrary to that of the Jews, to whom the Jews ought to turn, and to whom they will turn at that time, when the Vail is taken away. Who is it, that is the Imperial Eſtate of this Religion, but the Lord Chriſt uſually called the Lord in the New Teſtament? But the Holy Ghoſt is never ſo called in any other place of the New Teſtament, nor are we ever ſaid, to be converted or to turn to the Holy Ghoſt, but only to God and Chriſt. Therefore *the Lord* of whom the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the precedent Verſe (the ſame with *the Lord* in the words under conſideration) is not the Holy Ghoſt, but the Lord Chriſt. *Nevertheleſs, when it ſhall turn to the Lord, the Vail ſhall be taken away. The Vail is done away in Chriſt* (ſaith the Apoſtle, *v.* 14.) therefore it is the Lord Chriſt that he ſpeaketh of in the Verſe precedent to the words under conſideration. The Hiſtory to which the Apoſtle referreth, ſaith; *when* Moſes *went in before the Lord, he took the Vail off.* (*q*) Τοῦτο δὲ τύπος ἦν, *this was a Type of what ſhould be in time to come*, and this Type the Apoſtle thus interpreteth. *When it ſhall turn to the Lord* (ſo called in the New Teſtament, as *Moſes* went in before the Lord ſo called in the Old Teſtament) *the Vail ſhall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit* (or is the Spirit) both as being in himſelf wholly Spiritual, Divine and Heavenly; and as being unto us that Spirit ſpoken of in the former part of the Chapter (which is the Spirit of the Goſpel-diſpenſation) *the Spirit of the living God* which he miniſtreth, whereby we become Spiritual, are freed from the Vail of Judaical Blindneſs and Carnality, and have liberty of Acceſs, to behold the Glory of the Lord with open Face, as *Moſes* went in before the Lord with the Vail taken off. *For where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all with open Face, beholding as in a Glaſs the Glory of the Lord, are changed into the ſame Image, from Glory to Glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.* v. 17, 18. What Lord is it, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of in theſe ſubſequent words but the Lord Chriſt? And is it not abſurd, to ſuppoſe, that by *the Lord* and *the Spirit of the Lord* the Apoſtle meaneth the ſame Perſon? Therefore when he ſaith, *the Lord is that Spirit* (or is the Spirit) it is Chriſt (not the Holy Ghoſt) that he calleth the Lord. So Expoſitors generally interpret his Senſe, *Cappellus*, *Druſius*, *Camero*, *Eraſmus*, *Menochius*, *Beza*, *Calixtus*, *Piſcator*, *Vorſtius*, *Hammond* aud *Grotius*.

The other place of Scripture which deſerveth conſideration, is S. *Peter*'s reprehenſion of *Ananias*, *Act*. 5. 3, 4. *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart, to lye to the Holy Ghoſt? Thou haſt not lyed unto Men, but unto God.* In this place there is an appearance of calling the Holy Ghoſt by expreſs Nomination *God*, and ſome difficulty there is in arriving at the genuin ſenſe of it, becauſe of the ambiguity of the Name God. Which may ſignifie the moſt high God in abſolutely the higheſt Senſe ſuch; in which Acceptation it is the Name of God the Father only: And it may ſignifie the moſt high God, not in abſolutely the higheſt Senſe ſuch, but in a lower and limited Senſe ſuch; in which Acceptation it is the Name of the Son, and may be, as aforeſaid, the Name of the Holy Ghoſt. But ſeeing S. *Peter* in his reprehenſion of *Ananias* is aggravating his Crime to the higheſt pitch, it cannot be ſuppoſed, that he meaneth, to repreſent it as only Lying to the moſt high God in a lower and limited Senſe ſuch: But his intention is, to charge him with Lying to the moſt high God in abſolutely the higheſt Senſe ſuch. So the Name God taken abſolutely uſually ſignifieth in Scripture, and in the Language of holy People. And ſo it always ſignifieth in Scripture, when it is ſo confronted and oppos'd to *Men*, as it is in S. *Peter*'s reprehenſion. *The fooliſhneſs of God is wiſer then Men.* 1 Cor. 1. 25. *Not as pleaſing Men but God*, 1 Theſſ. 2. 4. *Do I perſwade Men or God?* Gal. 1. 10. The Apoſtle therefore in charging *Ananias* with Lying unto God becauſe of his Lying to the Holy Ghoſt, doth not call the Holy Ghoſt God; for by this Name *God* he meaneth that Perſon of God, which the Holy Ghoſt is not: But he affirmeth, that *Ananias* in Lying to the Holy Ghoſt did Lye to that Perſon of God; not immediately to himſelf, but immediately to that of himſelf, aud to that which is one with himſelf, his Inſpiration-Virtue and Agency (real and perſonal) which in juſt computation

---

(o) *Gr. Naz. or.* 37. p. 593.

(p) *Dial.* 1. p. 234. *Com.*

Exod. 34. 34.

(q) *S. Chryſoſt.*

putation is the ſame thing, as to lie immediately to his Perſon. The Scholaſtick Theology therefore miſtaketh in ſuppoſing, that the Holy Ghoſt is by expreſs nomination called God or Lord in Scripture; and it is much more miſtaken in its multifarious Contradictions to the Cauſe and Reaſon, why the Scriptures are altogether ſilent in it. It muſt neceſſarily ſeem ſtrange and wonderful to any *Trinitarian*, that throughout the *Bible* the Holy Ghoſt ſhould never be called by expreſs nomination *God* or *Lord*; but when the Cauſe is underſtood, the Admiration will ceaſe. The holy Writers could not expreſly call him ſo without making an operoſe diſtinction and limitation of ſenſe, which there was no occaſion of making in their time. They could not call the Holy Ghoſt *God* or *Lord*, as thoſe Names ſignifie in the proper uſual ſenſe a Divine Imperial Perſon, ſuch a Divine Imperial Perſon that is a political kind of Perſon and Potentate; for ſuch a kind of Perſon the Holy Ghoſt is not, as we have plainly demonſtrated.

X. The Scholaſtick Theology therefore is extravagant in making the Holy Ghoſt *a political kind of Potentate in the Godhead*; which it doth many ways and to an high pitch of extravagance. For, (1.) As this Theology attributeth to the Holy Ghoſt one and the ſame Potentacy, Majeſty, Empire, Kingdom and Domination with the Father and the Son; ſo it ſuppoſeth him, to be a political kind of Perſon, Prince and Potentate, as the Father and the Son is. It attributeth, (r) *this regal Potentacy* (which belongeth to the Father and the Son) *to the Holy Ghoſt alſo.* (s) Τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα, *the regial Dignity paſſeth from the Father through the Son upon the Spirit.* (t) *The Spirit that hath the power of making free, hath the Lordly Dignity.* Touching the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe before cited concerning *the Lord is that Spirit* the *Alexandrian Cyril* ſaith, *The Apoſtle knew no difference of the Son and the Spirit, but calleth him* (u) *by the Name of Lord.* A Tract attributed to *Athanaſius* ſaith; *The Apoſtle contracteth* (w) *three Lordſhips into one Lordſhip. The Lord is the Name of the Father and the Son: and ſeeing there is one Name of the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit hath the ſame Name, becauſe the Holy Spirit cometh in the Name of the Son,* (x) ſaith S. *Ambroſe.* And to theſe three this Theology attributeth in perfect Identity and Equality, (y) *the Eternal Imperial Potentacy*; for as the Son is the Image of the Father, ſo the Spirit is ſaid to be the Image of the Son, and hath (z) *the ſelf-ſoveraign and deſpotick Authority*; (a) *being glorified with the Name of Lord and God,* (b) *and hath a Name above every Name.* The Holy Ghoſt therefore in the ſtyle of the Scholaſtick Theology is *the Lord the King*, as much as the Father and the Son is, (c) *Eadem ratione qua Pater dominus eſt, & Filius Deus eſt, ſic & ſpiritus ſanctus dominus nuncupatur.* But with *this Lord the King as ſuch* the Scripture hath no acquaintance.

(2.) The Scripture knoweth very well the Divine Empire *the Political Kingdom of God and of the Son of God*; but with the Political Kingdom of the Holy Ghoſt the Scripture hath no acquaintance, it is peculiar to the Scholaſtick Theology, which thus argueth with the Pneumatomachiſts. (d) *Seeing he* (the Holy Spirit) *hath taken us into his Kingdom by the adoption of Sacred Regeneration, do we deny unto him that which is his? He hath made us Heirs of the Supernal Generation, do we challenge the Inheritance, and refute the Author?* (e) *What can be more wild, than for any one to deny, that the Holy Spirit* (as a political kind of Potentate) *reigneth with Chriſt?* In the ſame ſenſe the Holy Spirit is ſaid to be, (f) *τῆς βασιλείας κοινωνός, a Conſort of the Kingdom.* And as Kings commonly ſo called or Political kind of Potentates, have Officers and Miniſters of their Kingdom, and ſuch hath God and the Son of God: So the Apoſtles are in this Theology ſuppos'd to be in the ſame ſenſe, (g) *Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti Miniſtri, the Miniſters of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.*

(3.) As the Scholaſtick Theology maketh the Holy Ghoſt King of a Political Kingdom as much as the Father and the Son; ſo it attributeth to the Holy Ghoſt a Regial Seat or Throne (wherewith the Scripture hath no acquaintance) as well as to the Father and to the Son: For by *Gr. Naz.* the Holy Ghoſt is intituled, (h) *σύνθρονος, ὁμόθρονος, a Conſeſſor on the ſame Throne with the Father and the Son.* So he is ſtiled by *Theodorus Studita*, (i) *τὸ πνεῦμα σύνθρονον, the Spirit the Conſeſſor on the ſame Throne with the Son.* Which Epithets of the Holy Spirit are of the ſame nature with that of the Paraphraſt *Nonnus*, who ſuppoſing the Holy Spirit to be a political kind of Perſon and Potentate, fondly calleth him *Χριστοῦ σύγγονον, the Kinſman of Chriſt.* In the Dialogues againſt the *Macedonians* in *Athanaſius*'s Works this Queſtion is ſtarted, (k) *ποῦ καθέζεται τὸ πνεῦμα; where ſitteth the Spirit?* and the Anſwer is *σὺν αὐτῷ τῷ Χριστῷ, with Chriſt himſelf. For if we* (as S. *Paul* ſaith) *are Conſeſſors with him, no doubt the Spirit is ſo; for it is by him, that we are Conſeſſors.* A Book attributed to *Athanaſius* ſaith, (l) *When thoſe three that were* Abraham's *Gueſts ſate down, the Holy Spirit ſate on the Left-hand, that place being appointed for him: for becauſe he ſaith to the Son, ſit thou on my Right-hand, thence we may underſtand, that he ſaid to his Spirit, ſit thou on my Left-hand.* S. *Ambroſe* argueth, (m) *That the Holy Spirit is* in ſede Dei, *in the Seat of God, becauſe he is that River of Living Water, which proceedeth out of the Throne of God and of the Lamb.* But this Water that proceedeth out of the Throne, doth it ſit upon the Throne? Becauſe the Holy Spirit is the Living Water that iſſueth out of the Throne, doth this prove, that he hath *conſortium regni cum Patre & Filio*, the Conſortſhip of the Kingdom with the Father and the Son, as a political kind of Potentate, as this Father affirmeth? But ſo in this Theology, (n) *We confeſs the Spirit, to be eſſentially in* (Political) *Dignity in the Seat of the true Godhead.*

(4.) The Scholaſtick Theology attributeth to the Holy Ghoſt acts and things peculiar to a Political kind of Perſon and Potentate; as to be the Proprietor of the *Iſraelites* Inheritance, to be their Political Sovereign, and as ſuch to condemn and puniſh the Rebels. (*o*) *God had promiſed reſt to the* Iſraelites, *that reſt the Spirit calleth his. God condemneth the People of the* Jews, *ſo that they could not come into the Land flowing with Milk and Honey: by the ſame Sentence the Spirit condemneth them, ſaying: If they ſhall enter into my reſt.* To ſit in Judgment at the laſt Day and to diſtribute the Rewards and Puniſhments of it, are Peculiarities of a political kind of Potentate, and if they belong to the Holy Ghoſt, they ſpeak him, (*p*) *Dominum Majeſtatis* (as this Theology ſtileth him,) and theſe according to the Maxims of this Theology are and muſt be attributed to the Holy Spirit: For as it ſaith of the three Divine Perſons, (*q*) that they have *unum regnum*, one Kingdom, ſo it ſaith, that they exerciſe *unum judicium*, one Judgment. (*r*) *If any one weigheth things accurately* (ſaith S. *Baſil*,) *he will find, that in the time of the expected appearance of the Lord from Heaven*, μὴ ἀσυντελὲς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὥς τινες οἴονται, ἀλλὰ συμπαρεστάναι, *the Holy Ghoſt will not be idle and do nothing, as ſome ſuppoſe, but will ſtand by him even in the Day of his manifeſtation, when the bleſſed and only Potentate ſhall judge the World in Righteouſneſs.* S. *Baſil* addeth, τῶν δικαίων ὁ στέφανος ἡ τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστι χάρις, *the Crown of the Juſt at the Day of Judgment is the Beneficence of the Holy Ghoſt.* If theſe words mean, that the Holy Ghoſt diſtributeth Rewards and Puniſhments at the laſt Day, they are agreeable to the ſenſe of a Tract *De Sp. Sancto* in S. *Cyprian*'s Works, wherein the Holy Ghoſt is intituled *Mundanæ judex & vindex perfidiæ*, the Judge and Avenger of the World's Perfidiouſneſs.

(r) *Hanc regalem quandam etiam ſancto ſpiritui poteſtatem.* S. Ambr. de Sp. Sanct. l. 2. c. 12.

(s) *Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 11. S. 13.*

(t) Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐλευθεροῦν δυνάμενον, δεσποτικὸν ἔχει τὸ ἀξίωμα. *S. Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 339.

(u) Τῷ τῆς κυριότητος ὀνόματι. *Ibid. p.* 339.

(w) Τρεῖς κυριότητας εἰς μίαν κυριότητα. *De Com. Eſſent. p.* 373. *Com.*

(x) *Supr. l.* 1. *c.* 14.

(y) *Imperiale jus æternæ poteſtatis.* Ibid. l. 2. c. 12.

(z) Αὐθεντικὴν καὶ δεσποτικὴν ἐξουσίαν. *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 3. *p.* 83.

(a) Τὸ τῷ κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ δοξαζόμενον ὀνόματι. *Ibid. l.* 5. *p.* 120.

(b) *S. Ambr. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 19.

(c) *Didym. de Sp. Sanct. p.* 226.

(d) *Cum ille* (Spiritus Sanctus) *nos in regnum ſuum per adoptionem ſacræ regenerationis aſſumpſerit, nos ei quod ſuum eſt, denegamus? Ille nos ſupernæ generationis fecit hæredes, nos hæreditatem vindicamus, refutamus authorem?* S. Ambroſ. ſupr. l. 2. c. 9.

(e) *Quid dementius quàm ut neget quiſquam Chriſto conregnare ſpiritum ſanctum?* Ibid. l. 3. c. 21.

(f) *S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c.* 20.

(g) *S. Amb. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 12.

(h) *Or.* 26. *p.* 445. & *Or.* 12. *p.* 204.

(i) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 18. *S.* 7.

(k) *Dial.* 1. *p.* 230. *Com.*

(l) *De Com. Eſſent. p.* 377. *Com.*

(m) *Supr. l.* 3. *c.* 21.

(n) Τοῖς τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεότητος θώκοις οὐσιωδῶς ἐμπρέπειν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸ πνεῦμα. *S. Cyr. de Trin. Dial.* 7. *p.* 633.

(5.) The Scholaſtick Theology ſuppoſeth the Holy Ghoſt as a Political kind of Potentate, to be by his own Authority the Author of our Spiritual Goods and Benefits; and not only of our Spiritual, but alſo of our Temporal Benefits: For in a forecited Book attributed to *Athanaſius*, theſe words in the Pſalmiſt are accounted the words of the Holy Ghoſt as our *Liberator*; (*s*) *Call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou ſhalt glorifie me.* Of our Spiritual Benefits the principal and moſt comprehenſive is the Pardon of our Sins, of which the Holy Ghoſt is ſuppos'd the Author and the Doer of it by his own Authority; for he is ſaid, (*t*) *to pardon them as being God and of the ſame Operation with the Father and the Son.* (*u*) *Deus ex eo cognoſcitur, quia peccata condonat*, hereby he is known to be God becauſe he pardoneth our Sins. (*w*) *The Spirit as God juſtifieth Sinners. The God of the Univerſe juſtifieth Sinners, as having authority to forgive Sins, but in equal rank the Holy Spirit alſo juſtifieth Sinners.* Spiritual and Eternal Life are our great and eminent Benefits, and of theſe the Holy Ghoſt is ſuppos'd to be the Author and the Doer or Donour of them by his own Authority, as this Name of his implieth, (*x*) ζωῆς κύριος, *the Lord of Life.* (*y*) *He gave to the Church* (αὐθεντικῶς, and as the Author) *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that Miracles, then Gifts of healing, Helps, Governments, diverſities of Tongues:* and ſo he is ſuppoſed to give Graces as a Divine Political Potentate and as the Author; for in ſuch ſenſe he is intituled, (*z*) *Dominus virtutum*, the Lord of the Virtues, *Creator noſter ſecundum gratiæ Sacramentum*, our Creator according to the Sacrament of Grace (our new Creator) the Author of our new Creation, that ſanctifieth as he juſtifieth, (*a*) τὸ ἐνεργοῦν τὰ πάντα ὡς θεὸς, *that operateth all things as God*, and is οὐσία ζῶσα ἁγιασμοῦ κυρία, *a living Eſſence the Domina of Sanctification.* So in this Theology the Holy Ghoſt as a Divine Political Potentate is ſaid, (*b*) *nos adoptare in Dei filios*, to adopt us into Divine Sonſhip; and it aſcribeth to the Holy Ghoſt ſuch a Government of the Church, which is peculiar to a political kind of Potentate. (*c*) *Gubernationem Eccleſiæ ex principali quadam poteſtate, ſicut Pater & Filius eam gubernant*, the Government of the Church by ſuch a certain princely kind of Potentacy as the Father and the Son govern it.

XI. The Scholaſtick Theology is extravagant in ſuppoſing, that the Holy Ghoſt is *the Creator, the Vivificator, the Benefactor and providential Governour of the World, and the Preſerver of all things.* For this is a principal Maxim in this Theology, (*d*) *The Father by the word* (or Logos) *in the Holy Spirit doeth all things.* In this ſenſe S. *Baſil* ſaith, (*e*) *the Word*, or Logos, *and the Spirit are the two Hands of God, whereby the Heavens were made: For by the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made* (which are ſaid to be the Work of his Hands) *and all the Hoſt of them by the Breath of his Mouth*, (which is ſuppos'd to ſignifie the Spirit.) *The Spirit is co-ordinate and conjunct with the living Word*, εἰς τὸ δημιουργεῖν, *in order to creating; for God createth not by corporeal Hands*, ἀλλ' ἐνεργείᾳ ζῶντος λόγου καὶ πνεύματος μεταδόσει ζωοποιοῦ, *but by the Energy of the living Word and the communication of the vivificative Spirit*, ἐκ πομπῇ καὶ μεταδόσει πνεύματος, *by the emiſſion and communication of the Spirit*, and the Son is ſaid to be the Donour of it, εἰς ὑπόστασιν καὶ μόρφωσιν κτίσεως, *for the ſubſiſting and forming the Creation.* The three Divine Perſons are ſuppos'd to be undivided in their Operation, and every Perſon to be Author of every Work: (*f*) *The Father is the procatartick Cauſe of the things that were made, the Son the demiurgick, the Spirit the teleiotick or perfective.* (*g*) *No Gift cometh to the Creature without the Holy Spirit.* (*h*) πᾶσα ἡ τελειότης, *all the Perfection that the Creatures have is by the Spirit*, ſaith the *Alexandrian Cyril*; who alſo calleth the Spirit, (*i*) τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ παντουργικὸν, *the Father's and the Son's Opificer of all things.* He is therefore our Creator, (*k*) *ſecundum carnem, creator totius, creator omnium, qui patri & filio co-operator eſt in omnibus* (our Creator after the Fleſh, Creator of the *Univerſe*, Creator of all things, that is in all things Co-operator with the Father and the Son) *how can we ſuppoſe, that the Subſtance of the Earth was without the operation of the Holy Spirit, without whoſe operation the Convexities of the Heaven do not ſubſiſt? for ſo it is written, Verbo Domini cœli firmati ſunt & ſpiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum.* If the Holy Ghoſt is the Creator, Vivificator and Conſervator of all things, he is neceſſarily their providential Governour; for Conſervation is a Branch of Governing Providence. Beſides, the three Divine Perſons are ſuppos'd to operate by the ſame individual Action, and the doing of one is the doing of every one, whence the Holy Spirit, (*l*) ἐνεργεῖ ὅσα θεός, *operateth whatſoever God operateth*, (*m*) whether it be ἡ ἡμετέρα πρόνοια,

---

(o) *Requiem Judæis promiſerat Deus, eam requiem ſpiritus ſuam dicit. condemnat Deus populum Judæorum, ut in terram fluentem lac & mel pervenire non poſſet: eadem ſententia condemnat & ſpiritus dicens: Si introibunt in requiem meam.* S. Ambr. ſupr. l. 3. c. 9.

(p) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c. ult.*

(q) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(r) *S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c.* 16.

(s) *De com. Eſſent. p.* 378. *Com.*

(t) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 5. *p* 113.

(u) *S. Amb. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 19.

(w) Ὡς θεὸς δικαιοῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας. δικαιοῖ τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς, ἅτε δὴ καὶ ἔχων ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, ἀλλ' ἐν ἴσῃ τάξει δικαιοῖ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. *S. Cyr. de Trin. Dial.* 7. *p.* 647, 667.

(x) *S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c.* 13.

(y) *Ibid. c.* 16.

(z) *S. Ambroſ. ſupr. l.* 3. *c* 23. *l.* 2. *c.* 8, 9.

(a) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 131. *de Sp. Sanct. c.* 18.

(b) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *Diſp.* 10. *p.* 638.

(c) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. *S.* 24.

(d) Ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ τὰ πάντα ποιεῖ. *Athanaſ. Ep. ad Serap. T.* 1. *p.* 366. *Com.*

(e) *C. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 110, 118, 119, 122, 123.

(f) *Idem de Sp. Sanct. c.* 16.

(g) *Ibid. c.* 24.

(h) *S. Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 344.

(i) *De Trin. Dial.* 6. *p.* 619.

(k) *S. Amb. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 8. & *c.* 5. & *l.* 3. *c.* 19.

(l) *Gr. Naz. or.* 37. *p.* 610.

(m) *Gr. Nyſſen. ad Ablab. p.* 454.

πρόνοια, the Providence of us, or whether it be ἡ τῶ παντὸς οἰκονομία, *the Adminiſtration of the Univerſe, the Operation of three is but one*; for as their Eſſence, Potentacy, Domination, ſo their Operation and Efficiency is one and the ſame. The Holy Ghoſt therefore is ſuppos'd, to be the great Benefactor of the World; for ſuch is the Creator and Providential Governour of it, and ſo a Tract *de Sp. Sancto* in S. *Cyprian*'s Works repreſenteth him. (*n*) *This Holy Spirit the Soul of all things living, infuſeth of his Bounty ſo abundantly into all things, that all Rationals and Irrationals have their Being of him according to their kind, and their Agency agreeable to their Nature in their order: not that he is a ſubſtantial Soul to every one, but that remaining ſingularly in himſelf, he is a magnificent diſtributor of his fulneſs, beſtoweth and divideth his Efficiencies to every one, and as the Sun heating all things ſubject, he nouriſheth all things, and without any diminution of himſelf of his inexhauſted abundance he beſtoweth and imparteth what is ſufficient to all.* Much of vain and ſinful Extravagance is without a Comment viſible in this Mundane Creatorſhip and other Scholaſtick Elogies of the Holy Spirit; and more of it will appear from theſe following Remarks concerning it.

(1.) This Mundane Creatorſhip and theſe other Scholaſtick Elogies of the Holy Spirit are wholly groundleſs and unſcriptural, there is not a Syllable of them in the *Bible* (which could not be wholly ſilent concerning them, if they were true Elogies of a Divine Perſon) but all the Proofs of them from Scripture are ſo many impertinent Allegations unbecoming the Character of thoſe that alledge them: For *we have prov'd*, ſaith *S. Ambroſe*, (*o*) *that the Spirit is Creator, becauſe it is written*, Spiritus divinus qui fecit me. *The Spirit hath the Divinity, becauſe it is written*, Spiritus divinus qui eſt in naribus meis. *The Spirit of God* which is in my Noſtrils is my Breath, and the Spirit of God which is ſaid to have made me, is his Breath (his Word of Command, which is repreſented as a Vocal Word) and both theſe are hugely remote from the Holy Ghoſt in the Chriſtian Religion. But as *Athanaſius* obſerveth of the *Pneumatomachiſts*, that (*p*) ἀκούοντες πνεῦμα, *hearing Spirit ſpoken of in Scripture, which is a Creature, they preſently imagin'd, that the Holy Spirit was ſaid to be a Creature*: So whenſoever the Scripture ſpeaketh of *a Spirit of God*, the Scholaſtick Theology imagineth, that it ſpeaketh of the Holy Spirit: Whence a Divine of our own following the common track (not agreeably to his Learning and Piety) thus proveth the Deity of the Holy Spirit. (*q*) *Moſt Divine Operations are aſcrib'd to the Holy Ghoſt: Such are, to create things and to make the World; for it was the Spirit which reſting upon the unſhapen Maſs did hatch the World: By his Spirit* (ſaith *Job*) *he hath garniſh'd the Heavens; and by the word of the Lord* (ſaith the Pſalmiſt) *were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them by the Breath of his Mouth (or by his Spirit.) To conſerve things: Thou ſendeſt forth thy Spirit, they are created, and thou reneweſt the Face of the Earth, ſaith the Pſalmiſt, ſpeaking about the continu'd production or conſervation of things; particularly, to produce Man both at firſt and continually: for the Soul of the Protoplaſt was deriv'd from the Spirit of God; and good* Elihu *profeſſeth of himſelf: The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me Life.* —— *In fine, there is no work either of Nature, or of Providence, or of Grace, ſo ſublime, or ſo difficult, which is not aſcrib'd to the Efficacy of the Holy Spirit; the which doth ſhew his Sovereign Authority, and his Almighty Power.* His Sovereign Authority and Almighty Power muſt be acknowledg'd, if it be underſtood *relatively* and with due limitation of ſenſe; but not in the ſenſe of the Scholaſtick Theology, which is ſo blind, that it affirmeth, (*r*) *Spiritus ſanctus, creator ac mundi opifex paſſim in Scripturis appellatur.* In Scripture the Holy Spirit is every where called Creator and Maker of the World.

(2.) This Mundane Creatorſhip and theſe other Scholaſtick Elogies of the Holy Ghoſt are agreeable to the perverſe Genius of the Scholaſtick Theology, which wretchedly confoundeth (doth not duely diſtinguiſh) the things of the Old and New Teſtament, and thoſe things which in the New Teſtament are ſpoken of the New Creation (the things of the Chriſtian Religion) it perverteth to the old Mundane Creation. So the Pſalmiſts words (Thou ſendeſt forth thy Spirit, they are created and thou reneweſt the Face of the Earth) are in this Theology interpreted to mean, (*s*) the miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt and the production of worldly things thereby; whereas the miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt is purely for the production of Supernatural Gifts, Graces and Benefits that are Spiritual Benedictions. But it is not ſtrange, that this Theology which confoundeth things Supernatural and Natural, the Holy Ghoſt with the Breath of our Noſtrils, ſhould confound Secular and Spiritual Benedictions, the things of the Old and of the New Teſtament. In the Old Teſtament the Pſalmiſt ſaith unto God, *the Heavens are the work of thine Hands*: but becauſe this Theology ſuppoſeth, (*t*) that the Heavens were created by the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, therefore thoſe words are interpreted, to ſignifie, that the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are the two Hands of God; and *Athanaſius* ſaith, that the Son or Logos is called by *David Manus* and *Dextra*, and that theſe words of the Pſalmiſt are meant of him, *Why withdraweſt thou thy Hand, even thy Right-hand? pluck it out of thy Boſom.* In the New Teſtament the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things.* And the *all* things which he ſpeaketh of are only the All things of the New Creation (or of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation of things;) for theſe only are by one Lord Jeſus Chriſt as Mediator; theſe only are the All things of us the Chriſtian Religioniſts as ſuch; and theſe only are the Apoſtle's All things, 2 *Cor.* 5. 18. *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himſelf by Jeſus Chriſt.* But the Scholaſtick Theology perverteth this illuſtrious Text to the old Mundane Creation, (*u*) ſuppoſing that all things in that Creation were by one Lord Jeſus Chriſt (as if he was then the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Mediator,) and thence it proceedeth to form its Maxim in this manner, (*w*) τί ἐστι Θεός; ἡ πάντων ἀρχή· *What is God? the beginning of all things according to the Apoſtle's ſaying, One God of whom are all things: for the Logos is from him* γεννητῶς, *generatively, and the Spirit* ἐκπορευτῶς, *proceſſionally, then the whole Creation is by the Logos in the Spirit* δημιουργικῶς, *demiurgically.*

(3.) This

(n) *His ſpiritus ſanctus omnium viventium anima, ita largitate ſua ſe omnibus abundanter infundit, ut habeant omnia rationabilia & irrationabilia ſecundum genus ſuum ex eo quod ſunt, & quod in ſuo ordine ſuæ naturæ competentia agunt: non quod ipſe ſit ſubſtantialis anima ſingulis, ſed in ſe ſingulariter manens, de plenitudine ſua diſtributor magnificus proprias efficientias ſingulis dividit & largitur; & quaſi ſol omnia calefaciens ſubjecta, omnia nutrit, & abſque ulla ſui diminutione integritatem ſuam de inexhauſta abundantia, quod ſatis eſt & ſufficit omnibus, commodat & impartit.*

(o) S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l. 3. c. 19.

(p) Ep. ad Serap. T. 1. p. 328. com.

(q) Dr. Barrow on the Creed, Ser. 34. p. 300.

(r) Genet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 10. p. 626.

(s) Petav. de Trin. l. 8. c. 2. S. 2.

(t) Idem T. 1. l. 5. c. 8. S. 8.

(u) Idem de Trin. l. 3. c. 11. S. 7. S. Athanaſ. de Syn. Nic. decr. p. 405. com.

(w) Idem de com. Eſſent. p. 390.

(3.) This Mundane Creatorſhip and theſe other Scholaſtick Elogies of the Holy Ghoſt are repugnant both to his Idea and the Idea of God (the Father) who as being *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, the Univerſal Creator and Benefactor, the Vivificator, Preſerver and Providential Governour of all things is as ſuch in a large ſenſe *a Father* in nine ſeveral reſpects. For he is a Father of the Univerſe (πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων) a Father of all living Creatures, a Father in reſpect of Mankind, a Father in reſpect of the Souls of Men, a Father in reſpect of the Poor and Afflicted, *Pſal.* 68. 5. a Father in reſpect of Kings, Potentates and High Ones above Men, *Pſal.* 82. 6. and 89. 6. a Father in reſpect of the Holy Angels, *Job* 1. 6. and 38. 7. a Father in reſpect of Holy Men, the Divine Family which he hath founded, *Eph.* 3. 14, 15. and a Father in reſpect of Chriſt as Man, *Luk.* 1. 35. If therefore the Holy Ghoſt is the Univerſal Creator and Benefactor, the Vivificator, Preſerver and Providential Governour of all things, he is as ſuch in nine ſeveral reſpects *God the Father*; which is a grand repugnance, both to the Idea of the Holy Ghoſt, and to his Idea whoſe propriety it is, to be *God the Father as the maker of Heaven and Earth.* Moreover, this Mundane Creatorſhip and theſe Scholaſtick Elogies of the Holy Ghoſt are repugnant to the eminent Branches of the Idea of the Holy Ghoſt; and if they are certainly true, this Branch of the Scholaſtick Theology is neceſſarily falſe. For although the Holy Spirit was with God at the time of his Creation, when the original Kingdom of God was made, and the Holy Souls that then were made had their Holineſs by the operation of the Holy Spirit, (x) ἁγιασμὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἄνευ πνεύματος, *for Sanctification is not without the Spirit*; yet the Holy Spirit did not thereby become *the King of Saints* or *the Imperial Head of the Church*, and therefore was not the Creator of Saints, as they are ſuch, nor is he our new Creator. Nor can he be the Creator and Providential Governour of the World, unleſs he is the Author of all the Benefits of Creation and of all the Bleſſings of Providence, and is the great Houſekeeper of the World, (who giveth Food to all Fleſh and whoſe Alms-houſe the World is) nor unleſs he is the Lord, the Lord of all Creatures (as a political kind of Potentate,) the Lord of Sabbaoth, the great Proprietor of the World and of the Church, παμβασιλεύς, reigning as the King of Kings, whoſe is the Monarchick Empire and Kingdom over all, who is the Sovereign Superintendent, Superviſor and Diſpoſer of all, having Heaven for his Throne and the Earth for his Footſtool. Nor can the Holy Ghoſt be the Creator and Providential Governour of the World, unleſs he is the Imperial Eſtate of Religion, and by the Light of Nature ſuch, the Lawgiver of the World, who by his Laws eſtabliſh'd by agreeable Rewards and Puniſhments obligeth and inſtituteth all his capable Creatures to Gratitude, Subjection and Service, and to do all the Duties of Religion towards him, having and exerciſing the power of pardoning and condemning, of ſaving and deſtroying, as being *God the Judge of all.* All which inſeparable and eſſential Attributes of the Creator of the World are incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt.

(4.) This Mundane Creatorſhip and theſe other Scholaſtick Elogies of the Holy Ghoſt are repugnant both to the Pagan and Chriſtian Theology, both to Natural and Supernatural Religion and Diſpenſations of things, as will appear by debating with the Scholaſtick Theology this Queſtion; Whether God as he is Parental Nature (or Providence) that pervadeth the World and is the true *Zeus* or Vivificator of the World (that vegetateth and animateth it) muſt be apprehended, conſider'd and notic'd as the Holy Ghoſt or as the Father only? He muſt be ſuppos'd, to be the Father only, and cannot be conſider'd otherwiſe without a repugnance to the Senſe of the Pagan Theology, which ordinarily ſtileth its Coſmical *Zeus* Ζεῦ πάτερ, *Jupiter*, which is *Jovis Pater* or *Juvans Pater*, *Dieſpiter* or Διὶ πάτερ, φίλος πατὴρ, *Friend-Father*, πατὴρ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς, *the Father of this Univerſe* (the great Father of Nature) πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, *Divumque hominumque Pater rex.* The Senſe of the Chriſtian Theology may be underſtood from S. *Paul*'s Comment upon the Popular Pagans *Coſmical Zeus*, *Act.* 17. 25, 28. wherein he acknowledgeth, that the true *Zeus* (Vivificator of the World) is the true God; that Mankind are his Off-ſpring as being his Vital Production and in many reſpects his reſembling Off-ſpring; that the Pagans in conſidering God as an Inviſible One that pervadeth the World and is a Mundane Parental Providence, were ſo far right in their Theology; and that this Providence (as being Parental) is a loving helpful Benefactor to Mankind. And becauſe he affirmeth, that this Mundane Parental Providence is the Father of Mankind, therefore he conſidereth this Creator and Vivificator of the World, not as the Holy Ghoſt, but as the Father only. This Animal-world is from God as he is Mundane Parental Providence: but the Holy Spirit cannot be underſtood, to be in God as he is ſuch, but only as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial: nor is the Life that we derive from the Holy Spirit (according to the Chriſtian Theology) Life Natural but Supernatural only. The Goods that belong to Mundane Nature and Common Providence are of Natural Diſpenſation: but the Goods that we have from the Holy Spirit, are only thoſe that are of ſupernatural Diſpenſation (the Goods of the Kingdom of God;) therefore it ought not to be ſuppos'd, that he is Vivificator and Benefactor to the World as to the Goods of Mundane Nature and Common Providence. Nor doth any Chriſtian give thanks to the Holy Spirit as his Benefactor for theſe common Goods (nor perhaps for any Goods:) nor are the Operations of common Providence, and the Creation of the Earth with its Animal-inhabitants of any affinity with this Divine Spirit: nor is the Scholaſtick Theology well conſiſtent with it ſelf in attributing Creation and Providence to the Holy Spirit. For it affirmeth, (y) that the three Divine Perſons produce the Creatures, as they are but one in Eſſence and the abſolute Attributes, not as they are manifold in Relation and differ in Property, whence they are but one ſingular Principle of created Beings, yet it aſſigneth them as diſtinct Operations in the production of the Creatures as in the Chriſtian Religion; and that Operation in the Creation which one allotteth to the Holy Ghoſt, another allotteth to the Son. One ſaith, the Operation of the Holy Spirit is *Teleiotick* (or Perfective) which in Rational Beings is Sanctification, (z) in Beings not Rational it is the adorning them; but this *Methodius* allotteth to the Son: *We affirm* (ſaith he) *that there are two effective Powers: one that by his meer Will produceth what he will make, and this is the Father: the other that adorneth and variegateth the*

things

(x) S. *Baſil. de Sp. Sanct.* c. 16.

(y) *Petav. de Trin.* l. 7. c. 10. S. 11.

(z) *Gonet. Clyp.* T. 3. *Diſp.* 10. p. 627.

things that are made. (a) *The Son is the Omnipotent and mighty hand of the Father, whereby he adorneth the matter, after he hath produc'd it out of nothing.* Such Speculations of this Theology touching the Creation are not to be commended for their Wiſdom and Sanctity.

XII. This mundane Creatorſhip and theſe other Scholaſtic Elogies of the Holy Ghoſt are an Inſtance of an Irreligious extravagance uſual in the Scholaſtic Theology, which is to make Attributions to the divine Perſons, that are incongruous, alien and heterogeneous, ſo depraving the Chriſtian Theology and ſpoiling the Divinity of it. For by the untoward Notions of this Theology the Divine Spirit is made, to look like Parental Nature, or the Spirit of Nature a Principle of mundane Phyſiology. (b) *Adam was formed by the Hand of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt.* *Lactantius* ſaith of Cod's creating Man (c) *having formed his Body he breath'd into him a Soul from the vital Fountain of his Spirit, which is ever flowing.* Which is an high ſtrain of Platoniſm, a making the Holy Spirit the Fountain of Souls, as the Platoniſts make the Soul of the World, which alſo they denominate the third Opificer. Theſe and other Philoſophers are in the Tract *de ſp. ſancto* in S. *Cyprian*'s Works commended for inveſtigating the Soul of the World, but their ſhort ſightedneſs is pitied, becauſe they proceeded no further, and did not believe, (d) *That the Spirit is the Lord and Creator and Vivificator and Nouriſher of all that are under him.* Of this Holy Spirit this Theology ſaith (e) *In him we Live and Move and have our Being. The Divine Spirit ſuſtaineth all things in Being.* (f) *God gave the Spirit to the Creation (as a Soul unto Man)* εἰς ζωογόνησιν, *for Zoogony, or that it might produce living Creatures.* (g) *For the Spirit of God is Vivificative to all living things, being it ſelf according to its Nature Life from the Life of the Father.* (h) *The Spirit vivificateth all things that live and proceedeth from the living Father by the Son. For that is true, which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, it is the Spirit that quickneth.* Thus the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament that ſpeak of the Chriſtian and Saint of God-kind of things are diſtorted to the things of Nature and common Philoſophy; for the Holy Spirit is ſuppos'd, to be the procreative and conſervative cauſe of the Life of all things, and in this ſenſe it is ſtiled (i) ζωὴ, *Life,* ζῶσα δύναμις, *a living Power.* (k) Τὸ ζωοποιοῦν ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ζωοποιεῖται, *the vivificative Holy Sprit by whom all living things have Life.* (l) *The vivificating Holy Spirit proceedeth indeed from the Father, but the Son affordeth it to the Creation.* At this rate this Scholaſtic Theology perverteth the Doctrine of the Trinity and the things of the New Teſtament (which are the Saint of God-kind of things) into things of another Nature, Kind and Quality. It affirmeth, that the Holy Spirit is (m) *the Maker or Doer of all things, and that by him they are created, vegetated, animated, and every thing that exiſteth is made.* (n) *That although he is barren* ad intrà *(not by any Vice of his Nature, but by an ineffable Secret) yet he is of greateſt Fecundity* ad extrà, imò & totius Fœcunditatis Author & Parens, *yea the Author and Parent of all Fecundity.* (o) *For by his infinite Virtue and Power he doth not only moderate and govern all things, but alſo by his vivific Breath he cheriſheth, conſerveth, fecundeth, moveth and vivificateth them.* And if this Philoſophic-paganizing the Holy Spirit is agreeable to his Nature, one of the moſt proper Hymns to the Holy Ghoſt is that of *Virgil,*

> *Hinc hominum pecudumque genus vitæque volantum*
> *Et quæ marmoreo fert monſtra ſub æquore pontus.*

If the Holy Ghoſt is the Creator, Vivificator and Providential Governour of the World, he may reaſonably be thought to have rain'd down the *Iſraelites* Manna, and to have written their Law in two Tables of Stone (as that forementio'd Tract in S. *Cyprian*'s Works affirmeth:) But then he muſt be ſuppos'd to write the Law of Nature in the Hearts of all Men, our natural Reaſon and Conſcience (with all the reſt of our Faculties) as alſo Rain from Heaven and fruitful Seaſons, muſt be counted *the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.* This Chriſtianity will not allow; nor will it allow us to ſuppoſe, that the Ethical and Political Virtues of the Heathen (which S. *Auſtin* often acknowledgeth, to be the Gifts of God) the ſingular Endowments of Princes (who are thought by *Plato*, to have a divine touch) the good Life of unregenerate Mankind (Aliens from the Spirit of Holineſs) are of his Vitality or Vivification. Much leſs may we ſay, that Mankind *Live and Move and have their Being in him*, which may in ſome ſenſe be ſaid of holy Mankind. As *Euſebius* calleth *Melito* (p) τὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευσάμενον, *he whoſe Converſation was in all things in the Holy Spirit.* The Holy Spirit is manifeſtly peculiar to the Church and People of God, and is a Saint of God-kind of thing (not an univerſal Principle of natural Life) whence *Origen*, who Philoſophic-paganizeth both the Father and the Son, yet Chriſtianizeth in his Idea of the Holy Spirit. (q) *Operatio virtutis Dei patris & filii indiſcretè ſuper omnem pertendit creaturam: Spiritus ſancti verò participationem à ſanctis tantummodo haberi invenimus.* The Operation of the Father (in giving Exiſtence) extendeth to every Creature, and the Operation of the Son (in giving Reaſon) extendeth to every rational Creature: But they only that are holy participate of the Holy Spirit.

XIII. In the Actions about Chriſt which the Scholaſtick Theology attributeth to the Holy Ghoſt it is extravagant; for upon account of theſe Actions it attributeth to the Holy Ghoſt ſuch a Superiority above Chriſt, which is not agreeable to Chriſtianity and the Truth. (r) The Holy Ghoſt, ſaith this Theology, is Superiour to Chriſt as Man; from whence it inferreth the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt; becauſe no Creature is Superiour to Chriſt as Man, none but God only; therefore the Holy Ghoſt is God.

(a) Ἔστι δὲ ὁ υἱὸς, ἡ παντοδύναμις καὶ κραταιὰ χεὶρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ᾗ μετὰ τὸ ποιῆσαι τὴν ὕλην ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων κατακοσμεῖ. *Phot. cod.* 234. *Col.* 938.

(b) *Epiphan. Her.* 46. *n.* 3.

(c) *Ficto corpore ſpiravit ei animam de vitali fonte ſpiritus ſui, qui eſt perennis.* Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 24.

(d) *Spiritum & Dominum & Creatorem & Vivificatorem & Nutritorem omnium quæ ſub ipſo ſunt.*

(e) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. p.* 34. *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 128.

(f) *Theoph. ad Autol. l.* 2. *p.* 92.

(g) Ζωογονεῖ γὰρ τὰ πάντα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα, ζωὴ καὶ αὐτὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχον ἐκ ζωῆς τοῦ πατρός. *S. Cyr. ſupr. l.* 2. *p.* 55.

(h) Ζωοποιεῖ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ πρόεισιν ἐκ ζῶντος πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ· ἀληθεύει γὰρ λέγων ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν. *S. Cyr. ſupr. l.* 1. *p.* 34.

(i) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 118.

(k) *S. Cyr. ſupr. l.* 4. *p.* 147.

(l) Πρόεισι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ ζωοποιοῦν ἅγιον πνεῦμα χορηγεῖται δὲ τῇ κτίσει δι' υἱοῦ. *Ibid.*

(m) *Effector omnium rerum, per eamque creari, vegetari, animari, effici denique quicquid uſpiam exiſtit.* Petav. T. 1. l. 5. c. 9. S. 1.

(n) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *Diſp.* 10. *p.* 627.

(o) *Ibid. p.* 633.

(p) *Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 5. *c.* 24.

(q) *Peri archon. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(r) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. *S.* 24.

(s) *Chriſt even as a Man is elevated in Dignity and Eminence above all Creatures (above every Name, far above all Principality, Authority and Power, as the Apoſtle teacheth us) yet is he in that reſpect Inferiour and giveth place to the Holy Spirit. For as ſuch he did receive his Nature from the Holy Spirit; that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghoſt, ſaith the Evangeliſt; and more Honour than the Houſe hath he that made it, ſaith the Apoſtle to the Hebrews.* (t) *The ſupernatural Body of Chriſt is of the Holy Ghoſt, but cannot be of him by Generation, for that which is born of the Fleſh is Fleſh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit: Therefore it is of him* ὡς κτίσμα ἀυτȣ̃, *as his Creature.* (u) *Si ex operatione & poteſtate ejus virgo concepit, quis neget ſpiritum creatorem?* If the Virgin conceiv'd by his Operation and Power, who can deny, that the Spirit is (in that reſpect) his Creator? (w) *Spiritus ſanctus qui creavit dominicæ incarnationis ſacramentum, quod ſuper omnes eſt creaturas, quomodo eſſe poteſt creatura?* The Holy Ghoſt who created the Myſtery of our Lord's Incarnation, which is above all Creatures, how can he be a Creature?

(x) *Chriſt was ſent by the Holy Spirit; the Lord God (ſaid the Prophet of him) and his Spirit hath Sent me. But the Apoſtle (ſaith he of himſelf,* Joh. 13. 16.) *is not greater than he that ſent him; the ſent is not greater, that is (by a* λιτότης *or* μείωσις, the figure of Diminution) *he is inferiour to the Sender.* (y) *As Chriſt ſent the Spirit, ſo the Spirit ſent the Son of God. For the Son of God ſaith: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, becauſe he hath anointed me: He hath ſent me to preach the Goſpel to the Poor. The Lord and his Spirit hath ſent me. Therefore both the Father and the Spirit ſent the Son. I am bold, to ſay, that he who was ſent by the Spirit, was given by the Spirit (gratia Trinitatis,* by the Grace of the Trinity.)

(*) *Chriſt was conſecrated and inaugurated into his Offices by the Holy Spirit: The Spirit of the Lord (foretold* Eſaias *of Chriſt, as the Evangeliſts interpret) is upon me, becauſe he hath anointed me: But without Controverſie the leſſer is bleſſed by the greater, ſaith the Apoſtle. Chriſt was by the Holy Ghoſt endowed with excellent Gifts abundantly and beyond meaſure; but it is more bleſſed to give than to receive is an Aphoriſm out of our Saviour's own Mouth. In fine our Lord did by Virtue of the Holy Spirit perform Miracles; by the eternal Spirit he offered himſelf to God; by the Spirit he was raiſed from the dead; which things are manifeſt Arguments, that the Holy Spirit doth excel Chriſt as Man.* (z) *He ſaid well, the Spirit of the Lord is above me, becauſe he ſpake as the Son of Man. For as the Son of Man he was both anointed and ſent to preach the Goſpel.*

(a) *The Father deliver'd the Son to Death, and the Son deliver'd himſelf. But as the Father deliver'd the Son, and the Son deliver'd himſelf, ſo know, that the Spirit alſo deliver'd him to death. For it is written: Then was Jeſus led by the Spirit into the Wilderneſs, to be tempted by the Devil. Therefore the Spirit out of Love to us deliver'd to Death the Son of God.* (b) *The Holy Spirit anointeth and ſendeth Chriſt, as appeareth from what he ſaith of himſelf from the Prophecy of* Iſaiah, *Chriſt is alſo predeſtinated by the Holy Spirit.*

To make a Judgment of theſe Scholaſtick Attributions to the Holy Ghoſt, we muſt diſtinguiſh his meer *Precellency* to Chriſt conſider'd as meer Man from *the Acts of his Superiority* to Chriſt ſo conſider'd. For there is not any ſuch thing as *the Acts of his Superiority* to Chriſt as Man, nor would the Scholaſtic Theology entertain ſuch a conceit, if it did not ſuppoſe, that the Holy Ghoſt is a Political kind of Perſon and Potentate, and that his Gifts, Graces, Benefits, Operations *ad extrà* are his Doings as properly the Author of them. But as this Idea of the Holy Ghoſt is a great miſtake, ſo theſe Attributions, *that the Holy Ghoſt bleſſed Chriſt, as the leſſer Perſon is bleſt by the greater; that Chriſt had his Endowments from him as a Beneficiary from a Benefactor; that out of love to us he deliver'd Chriſt to Death; and that Chriſt was predeſtinated by the Holy Ghoſt;* are manifeſtly very vain and falſe Imaginations. Of the ſame Nature is this other Attribution, *that Chriſt was the Miſſionary of the Holy Ghoſt*, which is founded upon a Text of the Prophet *Iſaiah*, that we have before rightly expounded. *Iſa.* 48. 16. And it is obſervable, that *Origen* hath cited this Text (upon which this extravagant Attribution is founded) and although he doth not make an exactly right Interpretation of it, yet he rejecteth the Scholaſtic Theology's Interpretation of it as falſe and erroneous. (c) Καὶ νῦν κύριος ἀπέστειλέ με καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἀυτȣ̃, *and now the Lord hath ſent me and his Spirit. The ſenſe of the words is doubtful* (ſaith *Origen*) *whether the Father and the Holy Spirit ſent Jeſus, or whether the Father ſent both Chriſt and the Holy Spirit:* Τὸ δεύτερόν ἐστιν ἀληθές, *the latter of theſe is true.* As for *the Firſt* of theſe extravagant Attributions to the Holy Ghoſt, *that Chriſt in ſome reſpect had his Nature from him as a Creature from his Creator*, it is the moſt extravagant of all the reſt. For if the Holy Ghoſt was the Creator of Chriſt as Man, he was the Father of Chriſt as Man (d) *which is ſo abſurd* (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) *that no faithful Ears are able to endure it.* But this abſurd Suppoſition of the Scholaſtic Theology touching the Holy Ghoſt's Creatorſhip of Chriſt's Body may be clearly confuted from the Scholaſtick Theology it ſelf. For this Theology acknowledgeth (e) *ſementivam ſpiritus efficaciam, that the Energy and Operation of the Holy Ghoſt in our Saviour's Conception was as that of Seed.* As in human Generation a Father by his Seed generateth an human vital Body in the Womb of the Mother: So God by the Holy Ghoſt did generate the ſupernatural Body of our Saviour in the Womb of the Bl. Virgin. In which Generation there is no contrariety to our Saviour's Sayings touching Regeneration (which the aforecited Fathers object;) for it is manifeſt, that thoſe Sayings of our Saviour muſt have this due limitation of Senſe. *Not that which is born of the Spirit, but that which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh, unleſs that which is born of the Spirit be withall born of the Fleſh. That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit, not Fleſh, unleſs it be ſo born of the Spirit, as withall to be born of the Fleſh.* Theſe Sayings of our Saviour therefore do not prove, that his ſupernatural Body was produc'd by Creation, not by

(s) Dr. Barrow on the Creed Ser. 34. p. 501.

(t) S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l. 5. p. 111.

(u) S. Ambroſ. de ſp. ſanct. l. 2. c. 5.

(w) Ibid. c. 8.

(x) Dr. Barrow ſupr.

(y) *Sicut Chriſtus ſpiritum miſit, ita & filium Dei ſpiritus miſit. Dicit enim filius Dei: Spiritus Domini ſuper me, propter quod unxit me. Evangelizare pauperibus miſit me. Miſit me Dominus & ſpiritus ejus. Ergo & pater filium miſit & ſpiritus.——— Datus eſt autem audeo dicere & ab ſpiritu, qui miſſus ab ſpiritu eſt.* S. Ambroſ. ſupr. l. 3. c. 1, 2.

(*) Dr. Barrow ſupr.

(z) *Benè ſuper me dixit, quia quaſi filius hominis loquebatur. Quaſi filius enim hominis & unctus & miſſus eſt ad Evangelium prædicandum.* S. Ambr. ſupr. l. 3. c. 1.

(a) *Pater tradidit filium, & filius ipſe ſe tradidit. Sed ſicut pater tradidit filium, & filius ipſe ſe tradidit, accipe quia & ſpiritus eum tradidit. Scriptum eſt enim: Tunc Jeſus ductus eſt in deſertum ab ſpiritu, ut tentaretur à diabolo. Ergo & ſpiritus diligens tradidit Dei filium* S. Ambr. ſupr. l. 1. c. 12.

(b) *Ungit quoque Chriſtum ſpiritus ſanctus, ac mittit, ut ex Iſaiæ oraculo de ſe ipſe confirmat. Prædeſtinatur item Chriſtus per ſpiritum ſanctum.* Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 16. S. 13.

(c) C. Celſ. l. 1. p. 35.

(d) Petav. T. 4. l. 7. c. 5. S. 1, 2, 5.

(e) Ibid. S. 3.

by Generation: But an acknowledg'd *ſementiva ſpiritus efficacia* plainly proveth, that it was produc'd γεννητικῶς, *generatively*, not κτιστικῶς, *creatively.* There is a miſtake therefore in the Fathers thus arguing for the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt (f) *Quomodo creatura dicitur, qui Domini Creator ex Maria comprobatur? How is he ſaid to be a Creature, who is prov'd to be the Creator of our Lord of* Mary?

(f) *S. Aug. Ser. 5. de Temp. in Natal. Dom. Ser. 2.*

CHAP. IV.

1. *The Rule of the Holy Ghoſt's Religious Honour and Worſhip.* Concluſ. 1. *That there is a due and agreeable Religious Honour and Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.* Concluſ. 2. *There is great miſtake and extravagance in the Scholaſtick Theology touching the Religious Honour and Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.* Concluſ. 3. *The main Body of Religious Honour and Worſhip incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt.* Concluſ. 4. *There is no ſuch thing as doing Service to the Holy Ghoſt, or Conſecrations to his Service, or his Servants, Saints, Prieſts, his God-Service or his Religion.* Concluſ. 5. *Great difference and inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory, and of Aſcriptions of Glory to the Holy Ghoſt.* Concluſ. 6. *The preſent Church ſymbolizeth with the ancient Church in the Scholaſtick Theology's Miſtakes touching the Religious Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Of the Religious Honour and Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.

I. FROM our Idea of the Holy Ghoſt this great Rule touching his Religious Honour and Worſhip is a natural Conſectary. *We ought to be Religious and to give the Religious Honour and Worſhip to the Holy Ghoſt as to the Spirit of the Lord, ſo far as is due and agreeable thereto: But not as being the Honour-perſon of the Lord* (the Holy Sovereignty and Government in the ſtrict Acceptation) *not ſo far as is peculiarly due and agreeable to him that is ſo.* Which is to ſay in other words. *We ought to be Religious and to give the Religious Honour and Worſhip to the Holy Ghoſt, ſo far as is due and agreeable to the Divine Spirit of the Imperial Eſtate of our Religion* (which is God and Chriſt,) *but not ſo far as is peculiarly due to the Imperial Eſtate of our Religion, the Holy Ghoſt being only the Inſpiration-virtue and Agency thereof real and perſonal.* The ſenſe and truth of this Propoſition will clearly and fully appear by expanding it into ſeveral Concluſions, which are Inferences from it and are virtually contain'd in the Bowels of it.

CONCLUSION I.

There is a due and agreeable Religious Honour and Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.

I. THIS appeareth from what Philoſophy noticeth, that every thing hath (g) ἰδίαν ἀξίαν, *its proper Dignity*, and accordingly muſt be eſtimated and treated. To the Holy Spirit therefore we owe our Sovereign Eſtimation and Affection, as being of Sovereign Excellency in himſelf, of Sovereign Worth and Importance unto us, the Sovereign Gift of God and Benefit of the Chriſtian Religion, the comprehenſion of all Spiritual vital Goods (the peerleſs, choice, ineſtimable Goods, without which Man is *non minor miſeriarum multitudo quàm criminum*, an equal abundance of Sins and Miſeries) and our Sovereign Good, that is the Knowledge, Life, Image and Enjoyment of God to us, a Kingdom of Righteouſneſs, Peace and Joy, and (h) πηγὴ ὂν τῆς ἀϊδίου ζωῆς, *being alſo the Fountain of Life Eternal.* Our great Intereſt therefore is, to have the Holy Spirit (his Preſence and Inhabitation, his Light and Life, his Animation and Guidance, his ghoſtly Might and Aid, his Graces and Comforts, and the high and happy Priviledges that belong to the holy ſpiritual Livers) which is of infinite indiſpenſable Neceſſity; earneſtly to deſire and pray for the Holy Spirit, to prepare our Souls (i) εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ θείου, *for the Reception of ſo divine a Gueſt*, not to ſlight or reſiſt his Motions, not to rebel againſt his Light, not to quench his Holy Inſpirations, not to abuſe his Gifts, not to Blaſpheme his Operations, not to defile his Temple, not to prefer the pleaſures of Sin before his Joys, not to be an annoyance to him, not to treat him contumeliouſly, not any way to provoke or diſpleaſe him, but to be infinitely thankful for all the ineſtimable Goods of Sanctity, Divinity and Bleſſedneſs, which he is, and bringeth with him, and not to loſe him at any rate. All which Religious Honour is plainly injoin'd Duty to the Holy Ghoſt.

(g) *M. Ant. l. 4. S. 32.*

(h) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l. 5. p. 139.*

(i) *Gale not. in Jambl. p. 234.*

II. The Attribute *Holy* in the Name of the Holy Spirit denoteth his Creature-tranſcendence, and that he is of the God-eminence and Nobilitation. His *Holy* Inſpiration ſignifieth *the God-inſpiration* (which is of that Eminence) his *Holy* Agency ſignifieth *the God agency* (which is of that eminence Creature-tranſcendent) his Name *the Holy Spirit* ſignifieth *the God-inſpiration-virtue* (which is of that eminence Creature-tranſcendent;) and if he is of that Eminency the Godhead as *the Inſpiration-virtue and Agent thereof*, he is neceſſarily of *the God* Honour and Worſhip (the Holy or Religious Honour and Worſhip) ſo far as is competible to one of his Quality and Condition *an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon, the Holy Inſpiration-virtue and Agent.* As God muſt be honour'd and ſo honour'd as to be Holied, becauſe he is Holy: So the Spirit of God becauſe he is Holy, muſt be honour'd, and ſo honour'd as to be Holied, ſo far as is agreeable to one of his Idea. Therefore he muſt be Holied in reverential acts of Thought and Mind, for this is agreeable to his Idea, this his Sanctity and Divinity of Perſon neceſſarily requireth; and this Religious Honour muſt not be counted nothing; for *Plato* as cited by *Card. Beſſarion* ſaith in his *Epinomis, the moſt ſuitable Worſhip of God is to think honourably of him.* Beſides, the Religious Honour that muſt be done to the Holy Ghoſt in reverential Acts of Mind and Thought, may be done in due devotional Expreſſions.

III. According to the Inſtitution of our Religion we Confederate with the Holy Ghoſt in Baptiſm as with a Perſon of our holy Sovereignty and Government. Our being Baptiz'd in his Name therefore is our Profeſſion of Faith touching his Exiſtence, Eminence, Sanctity and Divinity of Perſon, the verity of his Revelations and Atteſtations to our Religion, his holy Functions and Operations (in illuminating, ſanctifying, guiding, confirming, corroborating, enlivening and comforting God's People;) and thereby we profeſs and undertake an agreeable Obedience to him, and a due Subjection to his Conduct and Regency. And as by entring into the holy Covenant we take God for our God, and undertake, to make him our God (by a due Behaviour towards him:) So by confederating with th Holy Ghoſt we take him for our Holy Ghoſt in all his holy Offices and Operations (our Teacher, Leader, Sanctifier, Comforter, as is before explain'd) and engage our ſelves, to make him ſuch by a due Demeanour towards him through our whole Life. A late Critick diſcourſing of the Followers of *Socrates*, *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*, ſaith of them (*k*) *jurant in nomen magiſtrorum, eorumque ſpiritui quaſi conſecrantur. They Swear into the Name of their Maſters, and are as it were conſecrated to their Spirit.* So Chriſtians in their Baptiſm are ſworn into the Name of Chriſt, and are conſecrated to his Spirit. For a Dialogue againſt the *Macedonians* in *Athanaſius*'s Works obſerveth (*l*) *that the offering our Bodies as a living Sacrifice is beyond all other Sacrifice; that every Sacrifice is made to the Honour of God; that we have offer'd this Sacrifice to the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt in Baptiſm, not honouring the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt either in a different place or in a different manner.* In which diſcourſe there is thus much of truth; in Baptiſm we conſecrate our Body to the Holy Ghoſt, to be his Temple and holy Habitation, which is an eminent Branch of Divine Honour, and is a doing the Religious Honour and Worſhip to the Holy Ghoſt.

IV. According to the New Teſtament the Paſtor's Benediction of his People is to be precationary to the Holy Ghoſt; for ſuch is that of the Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion* (Communication) *of the Holy Ghoſt, be with you all.* Amen. Which Benediction plainly demonſtrateth both the Perſonality and Deity of the Holy Ghoſt; for if he is not both a Perſon and of the Godhead, it would be a great Abſurdity, to make a Benediction (ſuch as the Apoſtle's is) precationary to the Holy Ghoſt. His Benediction alſo plainly ſheweth, what kind of Perſon in the Godhead the Holy Ghoſt is. For the Apoſtle deſireth for the *Corinthians* the beſt and choiceſt things, that are in the comprehenſion of Chriſtianity Imperial; wherein Chriſt being the Sovereignty of ſuch Favour and Kindneſs which is *Grace* (and ſaving Grace) this the Apoſtle deſireth, that they may have; and God being to us in Chriſt *Love* ſuperlative and tranſcendent, this the Apoſtle deſireth, that they may have; and the Communication of the Holy Ghoſt from God together with his Communication of himſelf to us being the great Priviledge and Peculiarity of our Religion, this the Apoſtle deſireth, that they may have. But why doth he not deſire for them the Favour and Love of the Holy Ghoſt as well as of God and Chriſt? Why doth he deſire for them only the Communication of the Holy Ghoſt? The Reaſon is plainly this, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is not a Political kind of Perſon or Potentate, not the Holy Sovereignty of our Religion in the ſtrict Acceptation, but is only an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon, and the communicative Agent of our Holy Sovereignty and Government. But becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is one of our Holy Sovereignty, or one of that Trinity of Perſons that conſtitute it, to every one of which Perſons the Apoſtle in his Benediction maketh diſtinctly a ſort of application; therefore the Communication of the Holy Ghoſt which he mentioneth, muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie *actively* the Communication of the Holy Ghoſt in his Gifts, Graces and Comforts. And as the Maledictions or Curſings which are ordinary in the Mouths of wicked Men, are not meer Wiſhes, but more than ſo, yet they are not Prayers, but are *Precationary* and of Affinity with Prayers (whence they are called *Imprecations*:) So the Apoſtle's Benediction or Bleſſing is not a meer Wiſh (ſuch as that of S. *John*, *I wiſh that thou mayeſt Proſper*) but is more than a meer Wiſh, yet is not properly and formally a Prayer, but is of ſuch affinity with a Prayer, that it muſt be called *Precationary*, and a Benediction Precationary to the Holy Ghoſt. So far therefore the Religious Worſhip belongeth to the Holy Ghoſt; Chriſtians muſt make Benedictions Precationary to the Holy Ghoſt as in Conſortſhip with God and Chriſt and of the imperial Party in Religion. And this maketh the difference between Benedictions Precationary to God, Chriſt or the Holy Ghoſt, and thoſe that are Precationary to the Holy Angels. (*m*) *Operatio divina habet imperium, non habet miniſterium. It is a Miniſtery that we attribute to the Holy Angels, but not to the Lord, nor to the Spirit of the Lord.* It is uſual with Chriſtians to ſay, *the Lord be with you*; and almoſt as uſual to ſay, *the good Angel attend you*: But the one of theſe Benedictions is Precationary to the Party imperial (as ſuch,) the other is Precationary to the Angel as no more than Miniſterial, *an Angel of Miniſtery.* In the one therefore there is a giving the Religious or Divine Honour, in the other no more than a Religious reſpect or regard. So S. *John*'s Benediction, *Apoc.* 1. 4, 5. as it is Precationary to God and Chriſt, is a giving the Religious or Divine Honour; for it is a making them of the Party imperial: But as it is Precationary to the ſeven Archangels (a ſort of ſupernal Potentates, the great Miniſters of Providence, for whom S. *John* had a great regard) it is not a making them of the Party imperial in Religion, but only Grandees of the Party miniſterial, which is giving them only a Religious great reſpect. But if a Paſtor in a time of approaching Sufferings did make this Benediction to his People; *God keep you, Chriſt ſtrengthen you, the Holy Spirit of Light and Truth illuminate and guide you*; this Benediction as Precationary to the Holy Ghoſt muſt be ſuppos'd a giving to him the Religious or Divine Honour, becauſe it is a making him of the imperial Party in Religion. And of this Nature is the Apoſtle's Benediction to the *Corinthians*.

V. All this Religious Honour or Worſhip is manifeſtly agreeable to the Holy Ghoſt, nothing of it maketh any change of his Idea; for it doth make him to be *the Lord*, or any thing more or leſs, or any thing elſe than *the Spirit*

(k) *Beroald in Apul. Aſ. p.* 914.

(l) *Dial.* 1. *p.* 227. *Com.*

(m) *S. Ambroſ. de Sp. Sanct. l.* 2. *c.* 12.

of the Lord. (1.) That Sovereign Eſteem and Affection which belongeth to him, doth not belong to him as being our Sovereign Lord himſelf, but as being that of himſelf (that of his Godhead) his emiſſarious Divine Spirit, who is vital Sanctity in himſelf and to us, and the Sovereign good which our Sovereign Lord is communicatively to his People. So our Religious dutiful demeanour to the Holy Ghoſt doth not belong to him as being our Sovereign Lord, but as being according to his Idea his Divine Spirit. *Peter ſaid to the Wife of* Ananias; *how is it, that ye have agreed together, to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God. If we live in the Spirit, let us walk in the Spirit. As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God. Quench not the Spirit. Know ye not, that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? Know ye not, that your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, which is in you, which ye have of God?* We have the Spirit of God not as a Sovereign Lord from our Sovereign Lord, but as our Divine Sovereign Lord's Inſpiration-virtue, which ought to have our choiceſt Eſteem, Affection and Demeanour, as being his choiceſt Communication, and compriſing our (n) *τὰ πνευματικὰ, Spiritual Goods and Bleſſings*, according to that of our Saviour, *your heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him.* Luc. 11. 13. (2.) The Holy Spirit being of the Godhead (as the Inſpiration-virtue and Agent thereof) *is Holy as ſuch*; and this Sanctity and Divinity of his Perſon muſt be practically acknowleg'd; it requireth, that by reverential Acts of Thought and Mind he be Holied according to his Idea. But the ſo ſanctifying and deifying him is not a making him *the Lord*, as the Apoſtle doth not make him ſuch. 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 5, 6. *There are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirt. And there are differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord. And there are diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God, which worketh all in all.* Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all.* (3.) In Baptiſm we confederate with the Holy Ghoſt, profeſs the Chriſtian Faith concerning him, promiſe and undertake an Obedience to him, but not as to our Sovereign Lord, but his vicarious Agent. *For there is one Faith, one Baptiſm, one Lord*, and this one Lord is not the Holy Ghoſt. *Eph.* 4. 5. In Baptiſm we are conſecrated to his Spirit, but not ſo as to live to the Spirit, for *we live to the Lord*, Rom. 14. 8. but ſo as to live in the Spirit, to ſerve him in the Spirit, and to be of his Spirit. *For by one Spirit are we all Baptized into one Body.* 1 Cor. 12. 13. In Baptiſm we conſecrate our Body to the Holy Ghoſt, to be his Temple, but not as ſuppoſing him the Lord and Proprietor of the Temple. For *the Body is not for Fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the Body.* 1 Cor. 6. 13. (4.) The Apoſtle's Benediction although meerly Precationary is deifying to the Holy Ghoſt (it is a making him of the Godhead) but not ſo deifying, as to make him the Honour-perſon of the Lord, (from which he is plainly diſtinguiſh'd) but only the communicative Agent of the Godhead. As elſewhere the Apoſtle repreſenteth him as the illuminative Agent. For we do not behold the Glory of the Holy Spirit, but we behold *as in a Glaſs the Glory of the Lord* by his Holy Spirit as the illuminative Agent. 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. *We pray* (ſaith *Origen*) *that the light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God may ſhine in our Hearts.* (o) *the Spirit of God viſiting our imaginative Faculty and ſhewing us the things of God; for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.* Thus far a certain Religious Honour and Worſhip appeareth, to be agreeable to the Holy Ghoſt. To the Anti-Trinitarians therefore who make this Objection againſt his Perſonality and Deity (p) *that there is neither Precept nor Example in Scripture of Worſhipping the Holy Ghoſt*; we make this Anſwer. That it appeareth plainly from the Nature of the thing and the Notices of Holy Scripture, that ſuch a Religious Honour and Worſhip belongeth to the Holy Ghoſt, which is agreeable to one of his Idea. And ſo much of Religious Honour and Worſhip as we have mention'd, therefore belongeth to him, becauſe it is agreeable to his Idea.

Act. 5. 9. Eph. 4. 30. Gal. 5. 25. Rom. 8. 14. 1 Theſſ. 5. 19. 1 Cor. 3. 16, 17. and 6. 19.

Conclusion 2.

In the Scholaſtick Theology there is much of Miſtake and Extravagance touching the Religious Honour and Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.

I. FOR as the Adoration which it aſſerteth, is hugely extravagant, ſo the Grounds which it proceedeth upon (in aſſerting it) are great Miſtakes, and ſuch are alſo the Anſwers, which it maketh to the principal Objections of the Adverſaries. The Adverſaries made this Objection (q) *the Spirit is in us as a Gift from God: But the Gift is by no means to be honour'd with the ſame or equal Honour as the Giver.* To which Objection S. *Baſil* anſwereth. *The Spirit is indeed the Gift of God* ἀλλὰ δῶρον ζωῆς, *but the Gift of Life; for he ſaith, the Law of the Spirit of Life hath made me free*; καὶ δῶρον δυνάμεως, *and the Gift of Power; for he ſaith, ye ſhall receive Power, after that the Holy Ghoſt is come upon you.* But a Man of a meaner Underſtanding than S. *Baſil* might have diſcern'd the impertinence of this Anſwer, and that it is one thing, to Honour the Holy Ghoſt as our *Sovereign Good*, and another thing to Honour him as our *Sovereign Lord.* The Matter in Queſtion (as it ought to be ſtated) is not whether the Holy Ghoſt muſt have the Honour due to our Sovereign Good, but whether he muſt have the Honour and Worſhip peculiarly due to our *Sovereign Lord?* Which is the God-ſervice (or the Divine Service) the Service which is Religion, of which S. *Auſtin* ſaith. (r) *Hic eſt Dei cultus, hæc vera religio, hæc recta pietas, hæc Deo debita ſervitus. This is the Worſhip of God, this is right Religion, this is true Piety, this is due ſerving God or due ſervice to God.* Diſcourſing once with a Phyſician a follower of *Socinus*, I argu'd that Chriſt could be no leſs than God, becauſe we muſt Love him at the rate of God. To which he anſwer'd, that ſo we muſt Love our own Souls. But this Anſwer was an Impertinence; becauſe it is one thing, to Love our own Souls with our Sovereign Love as being our Sovereign concern, and another thing to Love Chriſt with our Sovereign Love *as ſerving our Lord with the Honour and Service of Religion*; for ſo we do not ſerve our own Souls, nor may we ſo ſerve any Perſon who is not our Lord. (s) *Gr. Naz.* bringeth in a *Pneumatomachiſt* thus arguing; *Who ever worſhipped the Spirit? Who of the Ancients,*

(n) S. Chryſ. in Matth. 7. 11.

(o) Ἐπιδημοῦντος ἡμῶν τῷ φανταστικῷ πνεύματος θεοῦ καὶ φαντάζοντος ἡμᾶς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπεὶ ὅσοι πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, ἔτι υἱοί εἰσι θεοῦ. *C. Celſ. l.* 4. *p.* 227.

(p) *Crell. de uno Deo l.* 1. *S.* 3. *c.* 2.

(q) S. *Baſil. de ſp. ſanct. c.* 24.

(r) *De C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 4.

(s) *Or.* 37. *p.* 599.

ents, who of the Moderns? Who ever pray'd to him? Where is it Written, that we ought to Worſhip him and Pray to him? To this uſual and great Objection this is the firſt Anſwer which this Father maketh. *It is the Spirit in whom we Worſhip and by whom we Pray.* (t) *To Worſhip or Pray in the Spirit, ſeemeth to me nothing elſe, but that the Spirit it ſelf offereth up Prayer and Worſhip to it ſelf.* In a Dialogue against the *Macedonians* in *Athanaſius*'s Works a *Pneumatomachiſt* maketh an Objection to this Senſe. (u) *We cannot draw nigh to do the Religious Worſhip but in the Spirit: If we muſt do the Religious Worſhip to the Spirit, by whom muſt we draw nigh to him? By another Spirit?* To this Objection the Anſwer that is made, is an Equivocation of Words. *As we muſt Worſhip in the Spirit, ſo we muſt Worſhip in Truth, and alſo Worſhip the Truth that is Chriſt.* But the truth of Worſhip wherein we muſt Worſhip (as our Saviour ſpeaketh) is not *together with the Father and the Son* προσκυνητὸν ϗ λατρευτόν, *to have the Religious Worſhip and the Divine Service*, as this ancient Author diſputeth, that the Spirit ought to have.

II. For inſtead of the genuin Chriſtian Trinity (in which there is but one Divine Perſon, that is abſolutely the imperial Eſtate of God) theſe ancient Scholaſtick Divines ſubſtituted the Scholaſtick Trinity, which is a threefold imperial Eſtate of Almighty God; and upon this Ground they allot to the Holy Ghoſt the Religious Worſhip and the Divine Service (ſimply ſo called) ſuppoſing, that the ſo ſerving him is *a ſerving the living and true God*, no leſs than ſerving the Father and the Son is. For this Trinity implieth, that not one of the Divine Perſons hath above the other (w) εἰς δόξαν ὑπερβολὴν, *a Tranſcendence as to Glory*, (x) that there is an ὁμότιμον τῆς ἀξίας ϗ τῆς θεότητος, *an equality of Dignity and Deity equally to be honour'd* in thoſe three; that there is μία σύνταξις, λατρεία, προσκύνησις, *one Co-ordination, one Divine Service and Worſhip*; that every one of the Divine Perſons is ὁμόθρονος, ὁμόδοξος, ὁμότιμος, *of the ſame Throne, of the ſame Honour and Glory*; and the Trinity is τῶν ἴσων ϗ ὁμοτίμων σύλληψις, *a comprehenſion of Equals and of thoſe that are equal in Honour*. So a Tract attributed to *Athanaſius* argueth; (y) ὅπου γὰρ ὁμότιμος ἡ ἀξία, ὁμότιμος ϗ ἡ προσκύνησις, *where there is equal Dignity, the Adoration muſt be equal.* The three Divine Perſons therefore (as a threefold imperial Eſtate of God Almighty) being of the ſame Deity, Majeſty, Potentacy, Domination and Glory are of the ſame Worſhip and God-ſervice. (z) *Ideo unitas honoris, quia unitas poteſtatis, therefore they muſt have the ſame Honour, becauſe they are of the ſame Potentacy*, and are equally and in the ſame ſenſe *God, the Lord, the Lord our God, the imperial Eſtate of Religion.* As the *Athanaſian* Creed ſaith; *the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all one: The Glory equal, the Majeſty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, ſuch is the Son, and ſuch is the Holy Ghoſt. The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghoſt is God* (in the ſenſe of this Theology) *the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, the Holy Ghoſt Lord.* Agreeably whereto the Church hath decreed and practiſeth. For the Nicene Creed (commonly ſo called) ſaith of the Holy Ghoſt; ***who with the Father and the Son is worſhipped and glorified.*** The ſenſe whereof may be underſtood from what S. *Baſil* ſaith of the Church. (a) *In it the Son is confeſs'd Conſubſtantial to the Father, and the Holy Spirit* ὁμοτίμως συναριθμεῖται τε ϗ συλλατρεύεται, *is with equality of Honour connumerated and Co-worſhipped.* To the Holy Ghoſt therefore the Scholaſtick Theology allotteth (b) τὰς παντοδαπὰς τιμὰς, *omnifarious Religious Honours* as much as to the Father and the Son. But if this is not a great Extravance, our Idea of the Holy Ghoſt muſt be one.

Conclusion 3.

The main Body of the Duties of Religious Honour and Worſhip is manifeſtly incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt.

THIS appeareth (1.) from the multitude of Divine Attributes that are incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. For it is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, to be made (by way of honouring) God definitively and abſolutely ſo, the Honour-perſon of the Lord the imperial Eſtate of Religion, the Almighty or moſt High God (without a due limitation of Senſe) abſolutely exempt from all ſuperiour Proprietors, Authorities and Powers, a Political kind of Potentate in the Godhead, a Political kind of Relation (as Father, Sovereign, Shepherd, imperial Head,) the Donour of our Goods and Bleſſings αὐθεντικῶς (as the Author by his own Authority) properly the Author of his Gifts, Graces, Benefits, Operations *ad extra*, the Proprietor of a People, Kingdom, Inheritance, of a Throne, external Houſe, Court, Attendants, Hoſts, a Crown or Tribunal, the Law-giver that ſaveth and deſtroyeth, the Judge of all, the Diſtributor of Rewards and Puniſhments, the Creator and Providential Governour of us and the Univerſe, the Exemplar and Pattern of our Holineſs, the great Benefactor to the World, of univerſal Dominion (the great Monarchic Empire) our new Creator, our Saviour-Lord and King, as God and Chriſt is. The main of the Honourary Attributes of Chriſt therefore are incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt; ſuch as *the Lord of all, the Lord of Glory, the Lord and Saviour, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, the Lord's anointed, the King of Righteouſneſs, the Prince of Life, the Prince of Peace, the everlaſting Father, the Captain of our Salvation, the Lord our Righteouſneſs, the Lion of the Tribe of* Judah, *the firſt and the laſt, the great Shepherd, the righteous Judge, the Donour of our Spiritual Goods and Bleſſings* (of the Holy Spirit) *and of the Crown of Life.* The main of our Honourary Attributions to God are manifeſtly incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. Such as, *the Lord is a great God and a great King above all Gods. Great and marvellous are thy Works Lord God Almighty, juſt and true are thy Ways, O thou King of Saints! Thy Righteouſneſs is like the great Mountains, thy Judgments are a great Deep, O Lord thou preſerveſt Man and Beaſt. The Lord reigneth, let the People tremble. Let them Praiſe thy great and terrible Name, for it is Holy, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty! The Lord's Throne is in Heaven, his Eyes behold, his Eye-lids try the Children of Men. Thy Kingdom is an everlaſting Kingdom, and thy Dominion endureth throughout all Generations. I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth. The Earth is the Lords and the fulneſs thereof, the World and they that dwell therein. The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, forgiving Iniquity, Tranſgreſſion*

(t) Τὸ ἐν πνεύματι προσκυνεῖν τῷ πνεύματι ἢ προσεύχεσθαι, οὐδὲν ἄλλο εἶναί μοι φαίνεται, ἢ αὐτὸ ἑαυτῷ τὴν εὐχὴν προσάγειν ϗ τὴν προσκύνησιν.

(u) Dial. 1. p. 225. com.

(w) S. Baſil de ſp. ſanct. c 19.

(x) Gr. Naz. or. 37. p. 599 or. 44. p. 712. or. 12. p. 204. or. 13. p. 211. or. 26. p. 445.

(y) De com. eſſent. p. 375.

(z) S. Amb. de ſp. ſanct. l. 2. c. 1.

(a) Ep. 61.

(b) Idem de ſp. ſanct. c. 22.

ſion and Sin. The main of our natural Relations to God and our dutiful honourary Acknowledgements of them are manifeſtly incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. As that we are his reſembling Off-ſpring (made after his Image) his Creatures, Beneficiaries, Dependents, Servants, Subjects, that ought to be the Subjects of his Kingdom. *The People of his Paſture and the Sheep of his Hand.* That we owe our All to him, and are not our own, but his intirely, *of whom are all things, through whom are all things, and to whom are all things: To whom be Glory for ever.* Amen.

(2.) The Jews Worſhip of Oblations and Sacrifices always was in the main of it incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt as not being *the Honour-perſon of the Lord, the Lord of the Creatures, the Lord God of a People* (the Lord their God) *and the Lord of their Goods and Evils.* And for the ſame reaſon the Chriſtian Worſhip of Evangelical Oblations and Sacrifices (which Anſwer to the Judaical and were typified by them) is in the main of it incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt. (c) *All the Judaical Sacrifices were made to God, either as to the Maker, Preſerver and Lord of all* (who is worthy of all Honour and Worſhip:) *Or as to the Donour of all Goods, to obtain them or return Thanks for them: Or as to him that hath the ſupreme Right of puniſhing and pardoning, to impetrate his Favour. Every Sacrifice was as an Oblation made to a King, either to impetrate his Favour, or to make a grateful return to him.* The Chriſtians Oblations and Sacrifices *are founded* upon the ſame Reaſons with the Judaical, and therefore in the main are not Oblations to the Holy Ghoſt, as the Apoſtle's words imply. *Rom.* 15. 16. *That the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt.* (d) The Apoſtle maketh himſelf a ſort of Prieſt, and his Oblation is the converted Gentiles, which is repreſented, not as an Oblation made to the Holy Ghoſt, but as ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt, that it may be acceptable to God. (e) *The univerſal Church is an univerſal Sacrifice offer'd by the great Prieſt* (Chriſt Jeſus) who offereth not this Sacrifice to the Holy Ghoſt, but unto God. Yet we duly Conſecrate our ſelves to the Holy Ghoſt; for the Conſecration of our ſelves unto God is incluſively a conſecrating our ſelves to the Holy Ghoſt as to the Spirit of God, to be his Habitation: But the abſolute Conſecration of our ſelves and all that is ours is (not to the Holy Ghoſt, but) unto God; and the Oblation of our ſelves finally is (not to the Holy Ghoſt, but) unto God: Nor are our Alms-givings a Sacrifice to the Holy Ghoſt, nor can we Conſecrate our Eſtates and Worldly Goods to him, unleſs he was our Sovereign Lord the King. (f) *Per munus erga regem honos & affectio oſtenditur.* A broken Heart is a great Goſpel-ſacrifice: But this Propitiatory kind of Sacrifice for Sin is not an Oblation to the Holy Ghoſt, to whom it doth not belong, to forgive Sin. *Prayer* (as it is the practice of ſeeking God) is put for the main of Piety and is an highly valuable Sacrifice: But it is an Addreſs to the Throne of Grace, a calling upon the Lord, not the Holy Ghoſt, who hath not a Throne, nor is he our Saviour-Lord, and it is incongruous to Pray to him for the Remiſſion of Sin, for the Holy Spirit and everlaſting Life. The ſame account muſt be given of the Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiving.

(3.) The Holy Euchariſt was look'd upon in the elder Times of Chriſtianity as the great Oblation and Sacrifice of the New Teſtament; and in thoſe times they were ſo ſenſible, that this great Oblation could not be made to the Holy Ghoſt, that the Third Council of *Carthage* made this their XXIII. Canon; *ut cùm ad altare aſſiſtitur, ſemper ad patrem dirigatur oratio, that Prayer at the Altar be always made to the Father.* This Sacrifice of the Holy Euchariſt is the great Sacrifice of the New Teſtament, not only becauſe it is the Commemoration of Chriſt's Sacrifice, but becauſe it is the Comprehenſion of our Chriſtian Sacrifices. For therein we offer the Sacrifice of *Prayer, of Thankſgiving and Praiſe* (*Sacrificium laudis,*) therein we offer the Sacrifice of *our ſelves* and alſo the Sacrifice of our *Worldly Goods* unto God for the Maintenance of his Service. For ſo the Chriſtians anciently brought part of their Goods, to furniſh the Lord's Table (they brought ſome of the Fruits of the Earth with them and offer'd them at the Lord's Table) and out of theſe Oblations Bread and Wine was taken for the Sacrament (ſo the Elements became God's Goods, his Viands, and the Feaſt was his, becauſe it was furniſh'd by conſecrated Goods) part of the Service therefore was called *the Offertory*, becauſe Chriſtians made an Oblation of a Portion of their Goods; and their Phraſe was τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν, *of thine own we give thee.* Which is ſuch an Oblation, as is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt.

(4.) It is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, to be made our *Fear and our Dread*, as the Lord our God muſt be made (becauſe of his imperial Greatneſs, governing Juſtice, and punitive Severity;) therefore the Scripture ſaith of the Diſciples, *Act.* 9. 31. *They walk'd in the fear of the Lord*, and (not in the fear of the Holy Ghoſt, but) *in the comfort of the Holy Ghoſt.*

It is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, to be made our *Hope* and our *Truſt*, as not being relatively our Saviour-Lord (as he muſt be, whoſe Confidents and Dependents we are) nor having made us any Promiſe, that he will be actually ſo. Holy People are often ſaid, to place their Hope and Affiance in God and Chriſt, but never are ſaid, to Hope or Truſt in the Holy Ghoſt.

It is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, to be the object of our *paſſive Obedience or Patience* (our contentedneſs with his allowance of external things and ſubmiſſion to his Corrections) as being no Providential kind of Lord and Governour.

It is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, to be the object of our ſtudious *imitation*; yet the main of Piety is *imitari quem colis, to imitate him whom you Worſhip.*

That the generality of Men ſhould make *Oaths* by him and *Vows* to him, is incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, as not being *mundanæ perfidiæ judex & vindex, the Judge and Avenger of the World's perfidiouſneſs.*

(c) *Judæorum omnia ſacrificia Deo facta fuerunt, vel ut omnium conditori ac Domino, vel ut omnium bonorum largitori, vel ut ſummum pœnæ ac veniæ jus habenti.* Outram de Sacrif. l. 1. c. 19. p. 226. & c. 10. p. 107, 108. *Deus in omni cultûs genere tanquam omnium Conditor ac Conſervator omniumque Dominus ſpectari debet.* Ibid. *Sacrificium omne Deo factum inſtar rei fuit Regi oblatæ. Quid ergo res Regi oblata? Sanè vel ad impetrandam gratiam ejus, vel ad gratiam ei referendam pertinet.* Ibid. c. 19. p. 224.

(d) *Ibid.* p. 221.

(e) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 6.

(f) *Iren. adv. Hær. l.* 4. *c.* 34.

Concluſion 4.

There is (regularly) *no ſuch thing as the God-ſervice* (the Divine Service) *of the Holy Ghoſt, or the doing him Service, or Conſecrations to his Service, or his Prieſts, Saints, Servants.*

FOR (1.) The Holy Ghoſt was not in Judaiſm, nor is he in Chriſtianity *the Imperial Eſtate of a Religion or God-ſervice.* God Imperial is his Religion Imperial; Chriſt Imperial is his Religion Imperial. But none ever heard of the Holy Ghoſt Imperial with his Religion Imperial. Men may be impious and they ought to be pious towards the Holy Ghoſt, but not as to an imperial Eſtate of Religion, or as to a Political-imperial divine Perſon, that is, *the Lord*; for neither Chriſtianity nor any other Religion knoweth any thing of the holy Offices of his Service; although S. *Ambroſe* ſaith (g) *that he* (the Holy Spirit) *hath the Subject-ſervices of the Juſt; for it is written,* Spiritui Deo ſervimus, *We ſerve God the Spirit.* (h) So in the time of S. *Ambroſe* and S. *Auſtin* that place in the Epiſtle to the *Philippians* was miſ-read in moſt of the vulgar Latin Bibles; *we are the Circumciſion, that Worſhip God in the Spirit*; and the former of theſe Fathers complaineth, that the Text in ſome Bibles was falſified by the *Arians*, becauſe in thoſe Books it was read, as we rightly read it at this day. In our Bibles there is no appearance of any ſuch thing as *ſerving the Spirit* (or doing the Divine Service ſimply ſo called to the Holy Ghoſt) either in the Old or New Teſtament. In Judaiſm a Temple was built, an Altar was erected, Sacrifices were appointed, and Sacrificing Prieſts were ſet apart for God and his Divine Service, but not for the Holy Ghoſt. The Prieſts were conſecrated to the holy Office and Dignity of miniſtring the Divine Service (to draw near and have acceſs unto God, to wait and attend upon him in his immediate Worſhip) which conſiſteth in making Oblations and Preſents unto God both under the Law and the Goſpel. (i) *Oblationes & illic, oblationes & hic: Sacrificia in populo, ſacrificia in eccleſia.* So Chriſtians are a ſacerdotal Generation (a Generation of Prieſts) that have the Dignity and Priviledge, the Office and Imployment, to attend and wait upon God in his immediate Worſhip, to have acceſs unto him and to miniſter to him the Divine Service, and to this high and holy Office and Imployment they are conſecrated and ſet apart, being ſeparated from the reſt of the World and from profane Uſes, to be holy unto God. The Prieſts *Motto* is *Holineſs to the Lord*, but not to the Holy Ghoſt. They are Prieſts unto God, but not to the Spirit of God. They are ſaid, to *miniſter to the Lord*, but not to the Holy Ghoſt; *to attend upon the Lord* (his Divine Service) not the Holy Ghoſt; *to draw nigh unto God and to have acceſs to him* (in the holy Worſhip) not to the Holy Ghoſt. And in Heaven theſe Prieſts to God and to Chriſt are ſaid, to be *before the Throne of God and to ſerve him day and night in his Temple:* But we read not of any heavenly Temple, that the Holy Ghoſt hath, nor of any Divine Service that is done him there. Nor is the miniſtring to him the Divine Service agreeable to the God-ſervice of Chriſt's People, which is not to, but through the Holy Spirit. *For by him we have an acceſs by one Spirit unto the Father.* Eph. 2. 18. The Chriſtians God-ſervice is not to the Majeſty of the Holy Ghoſt, but by the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt through a Mediator to the Majeſty of God.

(g) De ſp. ſanct. l. 3. c. 19. & l. 2. c. 16.
(h) Petav. de Trin. l 2. c. 13. S. 3.
(i) Iren. ſupr.
1 Pet. 2. 9. Apoc. 1. 6.
Exod. 15. 28.
Act. 13. 2.
1 Cor. 7. 35.
Heb. 7. 19.
Eph. 2. 18.
Apoc. 7. 15.

(2.) There is much of miſtake in S. *Auſtin's* uſual Argument for the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt. (k) *If we were commanded, to build a Temple unto him, ſuch as* Solomon *made, of Wood and Stones, certainly by making a Temple we ſhould be convicted of giving him the Divine Worſhip. How much more do we owe it to him, to whom we do not make a Temple, but are a Temple? If we ſhould be Sacrilegious by making a Temple to any Creature, how is not he the true God, to whom we do not make a Temple, but we our ſelves are a Temple?* This Argument ſuppoſeth, that the Divine Service and Worſhip is as much and more given to the Holy Ghoſt by our ſelves being his Temple, as by erecting to him a material Temple, ſuch as *Solomon's* was, or ſuch as the Gentiles erected to Creatures; which is a great miſtake. For if we were commanded, to erect a *Solomon*-like Temple to the Holy Ghoſt, it muſt be his Regial Seat and Habitation as a God in the uſual ſenſe (a Political-imperial Divine Perſon;) it muſt be dedicated to his Honour and Service as a God; appertaining to his Temple he muſt have his Feſtivals, Sacrifices, Altar, Sacrificing Prieſts as a God; he muſt dwell in his Temple as a σέϐασμα, *an object of Religion and God-ſervice*, and muſt be in it an imperial Eſtate of Religion unto Men (that muſt perform their Adorations to him as in his Temple,) and he muſt be the Lord and Proprietor of his Temple. But nothing of this Deifying, nothing of this God-ſervice is imply'd in our Chriſtian Hypotheſis, *that we are the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt*, but the contrary. For our Holy Ghoſt is not a Political-imperial Divine Perſon, nor are we dedicated to his Service, nor doth the *Apparatus* of a Temple-Service belong to him, nor doth he dwell in us as a σέϐασμα, or an imperial Eſtate of Religion unto Men (that muſt pay their Adorations to him as dwelling in us) nor is he the Lord and Proprietor of this Temple, as is plain from the Apoſtle's Text, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. *Know ye not, that your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?* —— *therefore glorifie God in your Body, and in your Spirit, which are God's.* The Apoſtle doth not ſay, glorifie the Holy Ghoſt: But glorifie God. Nor doth he ſay, that our Body and Spirit are the Holy Ghoſt's: But he ſaith, *they are God's.* It is God, to whom this Temple is primarily dedicated and conſecrated, and to the Holy Ghoſt only as he is the Spirit of God, who inhabiteth it as his *locum tenens*, and as his Inſpiration-virtue and Agent. It is in ſuch ſenſe conſecrated to the Holy Ghoſt, to be his Habitation, but is not conſecrated to his Honour and Service, nor is he the Lord and Proprietor of it; for theſe things are peculiar to the Lord. So though a certain agreeable Religious Honour or Worſhip belongeth to the Holy Ghoſt, yet not ſuch Religious Honour or Worſhip which is his Service, nor ſuch God-ſervice which is a doing him Service; for theſe things are peculiar to the Lord. S. *Auſtin's* Argument may be thus retorted;

the

(k) *Nam ſi templum ei facere, ſicut Salomon fecit, de lignis & lapidibus juberemur, utique faciendo templum latriam exhibere convinceremur. Quanto magis latriam debemus, cui non templum facimus, ſed ſumus? Si ſacrilegi eſſemus faciendo templum cuicunque Creaturæ, quomodo non eſt Deus verus, cui non templum facimus, ſed nos ipſi templum ſumus?* Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 16. S. 11.

The Holy Ghoſt hath no Temple but within us; therefore he is not the σέβασμα or Divine Majeſty, to which we muſt perform our God-ſervice.

(3.) Both under the Law and under the Goſpel there are many Conſecrations of Things and Perſons (Sacred Edifices, a Sacred Revenue, Sacred Times, Sacred Utenſils) made to the Service of the Lord: but no Conſecration of Perſons or of Things either under the Law or Goſpel was ever made to the Service of the Holy Ghoſt; therefore neither Law nor Goſpel knoweth any ſuch thing as doing Service to the Holy Ghoſt, or his God-ſervice (ſimply ſo called) which cannot be without a Conſecration of Things and Perſons thereto. Nor can it be without an Holy People, that are holy to the Holy Ghoſt (the People of his Holineſs) which Holy People muſt be the Saints of the Holy Ghoſt: but neither the Old nor New Teſtament knoweth any ſuch Saints; therefore they know not any ſuch thing as the Service (or God-ſervice ſimply ſo called) of the Holy Ghoſt, nor do we conſecrate our Eſtates and worldly Goods for the maintenance of his Service. Nothing is more uſual in Scripture than *the Lord's Servant* (the Servant of God and Chriſt) it is the Name of all pious Perſons and their Title of Honour. The Elogy and honourable Name of *Moſes* is *The Servant of the Lord.* So of *David*, *Pſal.* 36. in the Title of the Pſalm. All the Prophets are ennobled with this Title *his Servants the Prophets.* All the Apoſtles and all the Godly throughout the World are noted with this Elogy, *Apoc.* 19. 5. *Praiſe God all ye his Servants and all ye that fear him both ſmall and great.* The Son of God himſelf is noted with this honourable Title and Elogy, *Behold my Servant whom I have choſen*, Iſa. 42. 1. ſo are the Holy Angels and all the Inhabitants of Heaven, *Apoc.* 22. 3. And in the elder times of Chriſtianity it was the honourable Inſcription upon the Tombs and Monuments of Pious People. (*l*) Being dead they ſpake this uſual Language of pious People, *The Servant of God*, *The Servant of the Lord*, *the Servant of Chriſt* (which is S. *Paul*s Title of Honour:) but if the Holy Ghoſt hath in equality with God and Chriſt right to a Service, our Service, a Divine Service, if by divine appointment he ought to have ſuch Service, there ought to be alſo in Religion this Title of Honour *The Servant of the Holy Ghoſt*, and this ought to be the familiar Language of holy People: which yet is ſo alien from Religion and incongruous, that it is not us'd in the Church, and the Scriptures know nothing of it. Nothing is ſo much inſiſted on in Scripture as *ſerving the Lord* (ſerving him with our All and at any rate, ſerving him Night and Day) Religion and Piety conſiſteth in ſerving the Lord (in being his Servants in State and Practice;) and ſeeing the whole concern of the Scriptures is Religion and Piety, if this conſiſted in ſerving the Holy Ghoſt (no leſs than in ſerving the Lord, or as well as in ſerving the Lord) the Scriptures could not be totally ſilent concerning it.

Deut. 24. 5. Apoc. 10. 7. Jud. 1. 1.

(*l*) *In hoc tumulo jacet famulus Dei Gregorius.* *Paula clariſſima fœmina famula Chriſti.* Hoornbeeck Theol. Pract. T. 2. l. 5. c. 2. p. 180.

(4.) The Lord and the Servant are Relatives; therefore if the Spirit of the Lord is not properly the Perſon of the Lord, Chriſtians are not properly his Servants: their Service is due only to their Lord, and the only reaſon why they are bound to do him ſervice (or to be actually his Servants) is, becauſe he is their Lord; therefore they are not of right and by obligation properly his Servants, who is not properly the Lord, nor their Lord. Their Lord hath plenary right to command them and demand their Service (abundance of Duty and Service) they are not their own but his, to whom they muſt be affected as to their Divine Sovereign Lord, whom they muſt revere and love (love at the higheſt rate of Love) obey, imitate and truſt; to whom they muſt loyally adhere, living for him, dying for him, making it their End and Buſineſs, to live for his Service, and to promote his Intereſts (the Intereſts of his Kingdom;) who is alſo their Beneficent Lord and Patron, that alone can and will reward his Servants with Eternal Life. Chriſtians are they that ſay (in Faith and Profeſſion, in Life and Practice) that Jeſus Chriſt is *Lord*, their Sovereign Lord, not that the Holy Ghoſt is ſo; for we are not dedicated to his Service, or to live for his Service, and to promote the Intereſts of his Kingdom (who hath no Kingdom;) nor is he an Object of our Imitation and Truſt, nor the Donour of Life Eternal to any of his Servants. Chriſtians therefore muſt not look upon themſelves as properly his Servants, but in all reſpects the Spirit of the Lord muſt be treated *as the Spirit of the Lord*; for ſingly conſider'd and conſider'd in conſort with the other perſons of the Trinity he is no other *than the Spirit of the Lord.*

CONCLUSION 5.

It is certain, that there is great difference and inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory; as will appear by ſhewing, that Glory is the thing that God is, and that Religion conſiſteth in giving him a Reputation-kind of Glory.

I. ONE of the Jews Names of God is כבוד *The Glory*, and their Doctors obſerve, (*m*) that *the Glory of the Lord* in Scripture ſignifieth God himſelf; as when *Moſes* ſaith, *Lord ſhew me thy Glory*, God anſwereth, *No Man can ſee me and live*, Ezek. 3. 12. *Bleſſed be the Glory of the Lord*, Iſa. 3. 8. *To provoke the Eyes of his Glory*, Iſa. 60. 7. *I will glorifie the Houſe of my Glory*, Iſa. 63. 15. *Behold from the Habitation of thy Holineſs and of thy Glory*, 2 Cor. 3. 18. *We beholding as in a Glaſs the Glory of the Lord*, 2 Cor. 4. 6. *The Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God*, Eph. 1. 12. *To the praiſe of his Glory*, Jude 24. *The preſence of his Glory* (his glorious Preſence) 2 Pet. 1. 17. *There came a Voice from the excellent Glory* (the Glory which the Divine Majeſty is) 1 Pet. 4. 13. *When his Glory ſhall be revealed* (that is, the Glory which he is) *Apoc.* 15. 8. *The Temple was filled with Smoke from the Glory of the Lord* (that is, from God himſelf) *Heb.* 1. 3. Chriſt is ſaid to be *the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory and the expreſs Image of his Perſon:* (*n*) where the latter words are an expoſition of the former; Image expounding Brightneſs, and Perſon or Subſtance expounding Glory. The Names of God are *The God of Glory*, Act. 7. 2. *The King of Glory*, Pſal. 24. 8. *The Father of Glory*, Eph. 1. 17. that is, who is the Peerleſs Divine Majeſtatick Glory; for what is God but *the Glory of the incorruptible God?* Rom. 1. 24. And this is according to the general ſenſe of Mankind, who ſuppoſe, that God is of great affinity with Light, which is a pure unſtained Brightneſs and Glory.

(*m*) *Maimon. Mor. Nev.* par. 1. c. 64.

(*n*) *Mr. Mede* on *Luk.* 2. 13, 14.

Glory. The *Perſians* thought (o) Light to be the firſt God. (p) *Hermes* ſaid, that God had Light for his Body and Truth for his Soul. One of the Hebrew Doctors thinketh, that Light is the Garment of God (becauſe the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Thou covereſt thy ſelf with Light as with a Garment*;) and the Councils ſay, that the Son of God is *Light of Light*. *Lactantius* derideth the Heathen for lighting Candles in their Divine Service, as if God needed Light (q) whoſe Light and Brightneſs far tranſcendeth that of the Sun: whence in the *New Jeruſalem* there is no Sun, *for the Glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the Light thereof*, Apoc. 21.23. But if there is no difference of the Divine Perſons as to Glory, why is it not ſaid, that the Glory of the Holy Ghoſt did alſo lighten it as well as the Glory of God and of the Lamb? Common Reaſon will infer from hence, that the Holy Ghoſt is not the Divine Majeſtatick Glory, not the King of Glory as God is, not the Lord of Glory as the Lamb is, 1 *Cor*. 2. 8. The Scripture that aboundeth and ſuperaboundeth in mentioning the Glory of the Lord, that every where repreſenteth and deſcribeth him *as the Glory*, and noticeth to us, that Glory is the thing that the Lord is, yet never ſo much as once maketh mention *of the Glory of the Holy Ghoſt*; only in one place he is ſtiled *The Spirit of Glory and of God*; which doth not mean (as is before diſcours'd) that he is the *Shecinah* (or the Glory of God) but the Inſpiration-virtue thereof. And is it imaginable, that the Scripture could be ſo totally ſilent touching the Glory of the Holy Ghoſt, that it ſhould never mention *the Preſence of his Glory*, or *the Praiſe of his Glory*, or *the Eyes of his Glory*, or *the Glory of his Majeſty*, if there is no difference or inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory? If the Holy Ghoſt is a Political kind of Perſon, a Political Imperial Divine Perſon, and the Glory of a Divine Majeſty? which he cannot be otherwiſe than as the Inſpiration-virtue thereof.

(o) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 146.
(p) *Gale in Jambl. p.* 192.
(q) *L.* 6. *c.* 2.

II. Glory is the thing that God is in his Appearances; for always the Appearance that he exhibiteth of himſelf is a Glory (either the Glory of the Angels his Attendants, or an Emanation from him, or a Splendor which he createth, to ſhew his Magnificence, as *Maimonides* ſuppoſeth) as *Exod*. 24. 16. *The Glory of the Lord abode upon the Mount*. This Glory reſided upon the Ark between the Cherubims (who becauſe they attended upon this Divine Majeſtatick Preſence, are called the Cherubims of Glory, *Heb*. 9. 5.) whence *the Glory* is ſaid to reſide amongſt the Jews, *Rom*. 9. 4. And becauſe when the Ark was taken by the *Philiſtins*, this Glory was taken away, therefore the cry then was *Icabod, where is the Glory? the Glory is departed from Iſrael, for the Ark of God is taken: He delivered his Strength into Captivity, and his Glory into the Enemies Hand*. Of this Glory the Pſalmiſt muſt be underſtood to ſpeak, *Pſal*. 63. 2. *That I may ſee thy Power and thy Glory, ſo as I have ſometime ſeen thee in the Sanctuary*, 1 Chron. 16. 27. *Glory and Honour are in his Preſence*. Where his Preſence is the Glory is; and where he appeareth, there the Glory appeareth; as *the Glory of the Lord ſhone round about the Shepherds*, Luk. 2. 9. In Heaven therefore (where God exhibiteth the moſt illuſtrious appearance of himſelf) there muſt be a viſible Glory of the Divine Majeſty reſiding there (typify'd by the Glory that reſided in the Judaical Tabernacle and Temple) which S. *Stephen* ſaw with his bodily Eyes, and which the Holy Angels Behold, *Act*. 7. 55. *Matth*. 18. 10. A Divine of our own calleth it, (r) *A Divine Shecina, a peculiar viſible Glory of God ineffable and unimitable, which is of this great conſequence, that the Holy Saints and Angels receive Commands from thence as from the very Mouth of God, are recreated more by that wonderful Luſtre than we Mortals are by the Light of the Sun, and that it is an Oracle with whom they may conſult, and receive Anſwers of clear and indubitable Certitude*. As the Glory of God appeareth in Heaven, and hath appeared on Earth, ſo in Prophetick Viſion it hath uſually appear'd (*Ezekiel* eſpecially hath many Viſions, wherein the Glory of the Lord appeareth) and it will appear at the laſt day, when Chriſt ſhall come *in the Glory of his Father*. In like manner the Glory of the Son of God appeareth in Heaven, where he is *crowned with Glory* (rais'd to the fulleſt height of Glory) it hath appear'd on Earth (for *Paul* ſaw it in his way to *Damaſcus, a brightneſs above that of the Sun*, *Act*. 26. 13.) it hath appeared in Prophetick Viſion an amazing, overcoming Glory (*his Countenance was as the Sun ſhining in his ſtrength*, Apoc. 1. 16.) and it will appear at the laſt day, *when his Glory ſhall be revealed, and he ſhall ſit in his Glory*. But now let us turn our Eyes to the Holy Ghoſt, and we ſhall find him of a very diſſonant Character. For nothing of his Glory appeareth in Heaven, nor did he ever make an appearance upon Earth in Glory, nor was any Glory of his ever ſeen in Prophetick Viſion, nor will any Glory of his appear at the laſt day: for there is not a Syllable of this nature in all the Book of God. What then ſhall we ſay to theſe things? ſhall we ſay (as the Scholaſtick Theology repreſenteth the Trinity) *that there is no difference or inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory? that the Holy Ghoſt is a political kind of Perſon and Prince and the Glory of a Divine Majeſty?* Not an Angel in Scripture appeareth like himſelf, but the appearance of his Glory is deſcrib'd in Scripture, only touching the Holy Ghoſt the Scripture never taketh the leaſt notice of the appearance of his Glory.

1 *Sam*. 4. 21.
Pſal. 78. 61.
(r) Dr. H. More Myſt. of Godlin. B. 5. ch. 4.
1 Pet. 4. 13. Matth. 19. 28.

III. Glory is the thing that God is in his glorious and glorifying Excellencies (or Attributes) and the glorious beaming forth or manifeſtation of them is his Glory: So *the Heavens declare the Glory of God*; *the whole Earth is full of his Glory*. His appearances in the World, which are glorious, are his Glory, *Numb*. 14. 21. *As truly as I live, ſaith the Lord, all the Earth ſhall be filled with the Glory of the Lord*. His miraculous Works are his Glory, 1 *Chron*. 16. 24. *Declare his Glory among the Heathen, his marvellous Works among all Nations*. So his divine miraculous Power is his Divine Glory, *Joh*. 2. 11. *Theſe things did Jeſus in* Cana *of* Galilee, *and manifeſted forth his Glory*, the Glory of his Divinity (of Perſon) of which his divine miraculous Power was a Branch, *Joh*. 17. 22. *The Glory which thou gaveſt me* (the Divine Glory of doing Miracles) *I have given them*. Thus every where the Scripture reſoundeth with the Glory of God and the Son of God (like a Book of Divine Heraldry or Blazonry it imployeth it ſelf in diſplaying their Glory) but of the Glory of the Holy Ghoſt there is *altum ſilentium!* yea though it often ſpeaketh of the miraculous Power of the Spirit of God, yet this it doth not count the Glory of the Holy Ghoſt, but only the Glory of God or Chriſt: for the Apoſtle ſpeaking of Chriſt's being raiſed from the Dead by *the Spirit of Holineſs*, doth not ſay, that

Pſal. 19. 1.
Iſa. 6. 3.
Habak. 3. 3.

he was raiſed by the Glory of the Holy Ghoſt, but by *the Glory of the Father*, as *Lazarus* was raiſ'd by *the Glory of God*, Rom. 6. 4. Joh. 11. 40. What account can we give from the Principles of the Scholaſtick Theology of this marvellous Phænomenon or rather non-appearance of the Holy Ghoſt? hath the Scripture no regard to the diſplaying his Glory, yet muſt we ſuppoſe, that there is no difference of the Divine Perſons as to Glory, and that he is the Glory of a Divine Majeſty? The Majeſty of God is his Glory, and Man (being a Majeſtick Lord-like Animal) is the repreſentation of it, and is there- 1 Cor. 11. 7. fore ſaid to be *the Image and Glory of God* (he is the Glory of God repreſented:) but of the Holy Ghoſt there is no ſuch Image, no ſuch Glory.

IV. Glory is the thing that God is in his Conſtitutive Divine Vital Nature and Eſſence; for if this was not Glory, it could not conſtitute him the Divine Majeſtatick Glory. (s) *To that ſimple and unchangeable Eſſence Clarity is not one thing and Nature another: but Nature it ſelf is to him his Clarity, Clarity it ſelf is Nature*, ſaith *Gregor. M.* He ſuppoſeth, not without reaſon, that the *Beatifick Viſion* is a ſeeing the very Eſſence and Subſtance of God; for though the appearances of his Glory on Earth are of a lower nature, yet the Glory which the Holy Angels and glorify'd Saints behold in the Heavenly Manſions is no leſs than the glorious Eſſence of God. The common Opinion is, that this Glory is to be ſeen only by *Intellective Intuition*; but an Intellective Intuition we may have of a very diſtant Object, whereas *the Juſt ſhall ſee his Face*. If his Glory is External, it may be externally ſeen; and that it is external, appeareth from the nature of Vital Sanctity; which cannot be in us, or in the Holy Angels in perfection without being both an Internal and an External Glory; and we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that it is ſo in God; whoſe Vital Sanctity is called by the Holy Writers 1 Joh. 1. 5. *Light* (which is pure Luſtre) in his regenerate 2 Cor. 3. 18. Children it is called *Glory* (they are ſaid to be changed from *Glory to Glory*, from Internal to External Glory) and ſo Chriſt's fulneſs of Vital Sanctity is called *his Glory*, Joh. 1. 14. which Internal Glory of his was not without an External Glory, that was vailed for a time, but ſhew'd it ſelf in his Transfiguration, when his Divinity (the fulneſs of this Divine Glory that dwelt in him) beaming forth and diſplaying it ſelf, changed the Complection of his Face, and made it ſhine as the Sun, and ſhone forth through his Raiment alſo, and made it as white as the Light. Theſe things ought to be believ'd, becauſe they are creditably atteſted; his Apo- Joh. 1. 14. 2 Pet. 1. 16. ſtles *ſaw his Glory* and *were Eye-witneſſes of his Majeſty*. But of the Divine Majeſtatick Glory of the Holy Ghoſt who were ever Spectators? and where are the Eye-witneſſes? No Holy Writer pretendeth to ſo much as an Intellective Intuition of it, or ever repreſenteth it as an Object of the Beatifick Viſion. None ever ſtileth him *moſt high in the Glory of God the Father*, or deſcribeth him as a Citizen (Soveraign or Subject) of the Kingdom of Glory; yet ſuch he muſt be, if he is the ſame conſtitutive divine vital Nature and Eſſence with the Father and the Son, if there is no difference of the Divine Perſons as to Glory, if he is properly שכינתא *the Shecinah* (as *Rittangel* ſuppoſeth) or if (as the Scholaſtick Theology affirmeth) *all that the Father hath, the Son hath except the being ingenit; and all that the Son hath, the Spirit hath, except the being generated*, (t) τὰ δ' ἄλλα συμφυὲς ϗ σύνθρονον, ϗ ὁμόδοξον ϗ ὁμότιμον, *but as to all things elſe, of the ſame Nature, of the ſame Throne, of the ſame Honour and Glory*.

(s) *Neque enim illi ſimplici & incommutabili eſſentiæ aliud eſt claritas & aliud natura: ſed ipſa ei natura ſua claritas, ipſa claritas natura eſt.* Greg. M. Moral. l. 18. c. 28.

(t) *Gr. Naz. or.* 26. *p.* 445.

V. Glory is the thing that God is in his Kingdom-eſtate, his Plenary Dominion and Sovereignty over all; for the Kingdom-eſtate amongſt Men is the height of Mundane Glory (Refulgency and Illuſtriouſneſs) unſtained with Abjectneſs and Meanneſs, and the higheſt remove from exteriour Vileneſs and Sordidneſs. (u) *The greateſt Glory on Earth is that of a mighty King, when he appeareth in ſtate; his Robes glorious, his Attendants glorious, every thing about him order'd to be as glorious as may be* (Solomon *in all his Glory*, Matth. 6.) *There is, I grant, no proportion here* (finiti ad infinitum:) *But becauſe we are acquainted with no higher, it is the beſt reſemblance we have, whereby to take ſome ſcantling of the infinite Glory of our Heavenly King. And therefore the Scriptures fitted to our Capacity, ſpeak of it to us moſtly in that Key* (*The Lord is King and hath put on glorious Apparel*, Pſal. 93. *O Lord my God thou art become exceeding glorious: thou art cloathed with Majeſty and Honour*, Pſal. 104.) *But as I ſaid before, it holdeth no proportion.* —— *A Divine Infinite Incomprehenſible Glory belongeth to him as Supreme King of Kings, as his peculiar Prerogative, and the choiceſt Flower in his Crown.* Kings in Scripture are called *Glories*. The high Eſtate of 2 *Pet.* 2. 10. the Kingdom is called *the Glory of the Kingdom*. And the Throne of Mundane Princes is called *Dan.* 2. 37. *and* 7. 14. *and* 11. 20. 1 *Sam.* 2. 8. *the Throne of Glory*. Agreeably whereto the Aſcriptions of Glory to God in Scripture are principally Aſcriptions of Dominion and a Kingdom, of Empire and Power, *Pſal.* 145. 11, 12. *They ſhall ſpeak of the Glory of thy Kingdom and talk of thy Power. To make known to the Sons of Men his mighty Acts and the glorious Majeſty of his Kingdom*, Jude 25. *To the only wiſe God our Saviour, be Glory and Majeſty, Dominion and Power both now and ever.* Amen. So in the cloſe of our Lord's Prayer and in the Jews Benedictions the Aſcriptions of Glory to God are the *Glory of the Kingdom and the Throne of Glory*, which the New Teſtament aſcribeth alſo to the Son of God together *Apoc.* 5. 12, 13. with the Kingdom and Dominion over all the Power and Glory thereof. But not any one Branch of this Political-imperial Glory belongeth to the Holy Ghoſt, therefore the Holy Ghoſt is not the Divine Majeſtatick Glory *otherwiſe than as the Inſpiration-Virtue thereof*; therefore there is great difference and inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory.

(u) Biſhop *Sanderſon Ser. on Rom.* 15. 6.

VI. The thing that we have to do in Religion, is the giving unto God *a Reputation-kind of Glory* (by glorifying Apprehenſions, Affections and Demeanour, by ſpeaking forth his Glories and living to his Honour, Service and Glory;) which although it is but a Reputation kind of Glory, yet it is the great reality as being of the greateſt importance: for he is unto us the Imperial Eſtate of God, who if he is not religiouſly ſerv'd and glorify'd, is undeify'd, for (the Godhead being an Eſtate of Honour and Dignity and of ſuperiour Relation) *not to glorifie him as God* (as is due to God) not to give unto God his due Honour, is a denying him to be God, a making him no God, a deſpoiling him of his Godhead.

head. He muſt have the Honours and Glories that are due unto his Godhead, which are *ſingular, proper and incommunicable*, which himſelf cannot part with or communicate, nor can he allow them, to be alienated or communicated by us; for he cannot part with them any more than he can part with his Godhead, nor can he chuſe but exact and demand them. He muſt have the Glory of his Glories (the Glory that belongeth to him upon account of his Glories;) for not dutifully to acknowledge them, is to bereave him of them, and to put upon him the contrary Infamies and Contumelies: which diſhonour is the extreme Injuriousneſs of Impiety; as Piety conſiſteth in doing Honour unto him. And as all the Duty of Children to their Parents, of Subjects to their Sovereign, is compris'd in honouring them; ſo all the multifarious Duties of Piety towards God are but various modes of doing Honour and giving Glory unto him. The Bible therefore that is our infallible, full and ſufficient Inſtitution and Rule of Piety, is our infallible, full and ſufficient Inſtitution and Rule of giving Glory to God. And ſeeing we give Glory to God, not by way of *Communication*, but by way of *Aſcription*, the Bible muſt neceſſarily be an infallible, full and ſufficient Rule and Inſtitution of making *Aſcriptions* of Glory to God. But the Bible doth not make ſo much as one *Aſcription of Glory to the Holy Ghoſt* (or one Doxology unto him;) therefore Piety doth not at all conſiſt in making ſuch Aſcriptions of Glory as we call *Doxologies*, to the Holy Ghoſt; and conſequently the Holy Ghoſt is not a Divine Majeſty or Majeſtatick Glory (otherwiſe than as the Inſpiration-virtue thereof;) therefore there is great difference and inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory. Moreover, there are manifold Aſcriptions of Glory (before-mention'd) which are peculiar to God, and the Son of God, and incompetible to the Holy Ghoſt, which plainly ſhew, that the Holy Ghoſt is not a Divine Majeſty, and that there is great difference and inequality of the Divine Perſons as to Glory.

CONCLUSION 6.

The preſent Church ſymbolizeth with the ancient Church in the Scholaſtick Theology's Miſtakes touching the Religious Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt.

I. IT is too viſible, that the Church of God in her Publick Offices may not agree with God and his Holy Scriptures, and that the Church's Scholaſtick Trinitarians are diſſonant from the Scriptural and Chriſtian Trinitarians: for the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament and the Holy People that liv'd in their time, were Trinitarians, as well as thoſe that liv'd in after-ages; but not ſuch Trinitarians either in their Doctrine or their Worſhip: for after that the Scholaſtick Theology and Trinity was introduc'd into the Church (which was very early) it made a change in her Worſhip (by degrees) and this change for the worſe is ſtill continued unto this Day. For although we have the Maxim of *Socrates* in our Mouths, (w) *unumquemque Deum ſic coli oportere, quomodo ſe ipſe colendum eſſe præceperit* (every God is to be worſhipp'd according to his own appointment) although as Proteſtants we profeſs, that the Bible only is our Religion, and that the Holy Scriptures are the Rule of our Faith and Worſhip, a ſufficient and only ſure Rule (as being the only ſure Revelation of the Mind of God) yet we are not ſo careful as we ought to be, to conform our Belief to their Doctrine, our Lives to their Laws, or our Worſhip to the devotional part of Scripture. Of this Nature (according to our Idea of the Holy Ghoſt) there are many paſſages in our publick Liturgy, ſome of which with the Modeſty becoming a private Man I ought to propoſe, to be review'd and conſider'd by Learned and Holy Men, and more eſpecially by our Governours in Church and State. The firſt of theſe is the Collect upon the Feaſt of Trinity in the Communion-ſervice. *It is very meet, right and our bounden duty, that we ſhould at all times, and in all places give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Almighty Everlaſting God: who art one God, one Lord, not one only Perſon, but three Perſons in one Subſtance. For that which we believe of the Glory of the Father, the ſame we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, without any difference or inequality. Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the Company of Heaven, we laud and magnifie thy glorious Name, evermore praiſing thee and ſaying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hoſts, Heaven and Earth are full of thy Glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord moſt High.* If we ask, who this one God and one Lord is, that is thus celebrated *as the Almighty and moſt High God, the Lord God of Hoſts, the Creator of all things?* It muſt be anſwer'd, that it is not peculiarly God the Father (whoſe Name is commanded to be left out of this Hymn on the Feaſt of Trinity) but it is one eſſential God with three Perſons, who are all this one God and a threefold Imperial Eſtate of Almighty Everlaſting God, the Lord moſt High, the Lord God of Hoſts, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, without (as to Glory) any difference or inequality. This eſſential God with three Perſons is made *a Name* (which is a Perſon) and *one Lord*, which denoteth but one Perſon (yet the Hymn ſaith *not one only Perſon*) and as the Holy Ghoſt is made God *definitively* and the Sovereign Lord, ſo the Divine Service and the Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiving is communicated and offered to him without making any difference of the Divine Perſons: as in the ſame *Communion-Service* thus we exhort the People; *Above all things ye muſt give moſt humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt for the Redemption of the World by the Death and Paſſion of our Saviour Chriſt:* Which Exhortation plainly ſpeaketh the ſenſe of S. *Ambroſe*, that the Holy Ghoſt gave our Saviour to death, that he is the Author and Donour of all our Goſpel-bleſſings, and it implieth an Offering of the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt to him, as in the Church of *Rome* the Sacrifice of the Maſs is offer'd up to the whole Trinity; *Suſcipe ſancta Trinitas, unus Deus, hanc oblationem.*

II. That ſhort Hymn or Doxology to the Trinity called *Gloria Patri* was expreſs'd in the elder times of the Church, σὺν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, *with the Holy Spirit*. And S. *Baſil* affirmeth, that this form of Doxology (x) *was an uſage older than Humane Memory, and that it was in uſe in the Church ever ſince the Goſpel was preach'd.* To ſhew the Antiquity of it, he citeth the *Alexandrian Dionyſius*, who ſaith (in his ſecond Epiſtle to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*) that he followed the Form and Rule of the Elders before him in this Doxology, (y) *To God the Father and the Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt with the Holy Spirit*

be

(w) S. Aug. de Conſenſ. Evang. l. 1. c. 18.

(x) De Sp. Sanct. c. 29.

(y) Τῷ δὲ θεῷ ϗ πατρὶ ϗ υἱῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, δόξα ϗ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever. He citeth alſo *Clemens Romanus*, *Irenæus*, *Euſebius*, *Origen*, and ſaith, that the ſame form of Doxology was us'd in the Church of *Neocæſarea*, and was brought in by *Greg. Thaumaturgus*. He affirmeth, that *Firmilianus* and *Meletius* were of this mind, the Orientals alſo and thoſe of the Weſt almoſt from *Illyricum* to the end of the World. He citeth alſo *Africanus* the Hiſtorian, who in the *Fifth* Book of his *Chronicon* hath this Doxology. *We give thanks to him, who afforded to our Fathers the Saviour of all and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, ᾧ ἡ δόξα ϗ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη σὺν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *to whom be Glory and Magnificence with the Holy Spirit for ever.* But touching theſe Ancients cited by S. *Baſil* it muſt be acknowledg'd, that ſeveral of them are either not good Authorities or not for his Purpoſe. For the Sayings of *Clem. Romanus* and *Irenæus* which he hath cited, are not Doxologies, nor are thoſe of *Origen*; and *Euſebius* certainly was of Opinion, that the Holy Spirit is a Creature. As for the Alexandrian *Dionyſius*, S. *Baſil* himſelf ſaith (z) that he was παντοδαπὸς, *various and inconſiſtent with himſelf, ſometimes admitting conſubſtantial and ſometimes deſtroying it, and creaturizing the Holy Spirit.* And ſo he is dealt with by ſome learned Men (*a*) that ſometimes ſuſpect him of Hereſie, and ſometimes cite his Sayings as Oracles. So notwithſtanding the high Character that S. *Baſil* giveth of *Greg. Thaumaturgus*, yet he reporteth of him (*b*) that he called the Son κτίσμα, ποίημα, *Creature* and *Facture*, which maketh it very improbable, that he ſhould introduce into the Church of *Neocæſarea* the commonly reputed Orthodox Doxology. But beſides the incompetency of S. *Baſil*'s Authorities, there is another conſideration which very much blemiſheth his Diſcourſe touching the Antiquity of this Doxology; and that is an ancient uſage (as he calleth it) among the Chriſtian People, who when light in the Evening was brought in, were wont to ſay, αἰνοῦμεν πατέρα ϗ υἱὸν ϗ ἅγιον πνεῦμα θεοῦ, *we praiſe the Father and Son and the Holy Spirit of God.* If this blind ſuperſtitious Uſage was coeval with the Doxology uſed in Churches, as S. *Baſil* ſeemeth to think it (for he ſaith, none can tell who brought it in) neither of them could be of Apoſtolical Original and Antiquity. Nor doth S. *Ambroſe* think, that the Doxology uſed in Churches was of Apoſtolical Original; for he aſſigneth another Origin of it (*c*) *majores noſtri, our Anceſtors* (ſaith he) *did conjoin the Glory of Chriſt*, cum Spiritu, *with the Holy Ghoſt.* S. *Baſil* ſo far agreeth with S. *Ambroſe*, he is content (*d*) that his form of Doxology be reckon'd amongſt unwritten Traditions, and ſaith, our Fathers were the Authors of it.

They that inſtituted it, are the beſt Expoſitors of the Senſe of it: But the form of Words may be underſtood, to ſignifie in a twofold Senſe. Which that I may intelligibly illuſtrate, let us ſuppoſe, that the Spirit of Holineſs belongeth to the *Pope*'s Holineſs, and that I aſcribe Glory and Dominion *to his Holineſs with the Spirit of Holineſs, or to him with the Holy Spirit.* This Doxology may be underſtood in a twofold Senſe. For it may be underſtood, to mean, that I aſcribe Glory and Dominion to his Holy Spirit as to an Honour-perſon of Glory and Dominion as well as himſelf, and as much as himſelf. And it may be underſtood, to mean only, that I aſcribe Glory and Dominion to him conſider'd as in ſeparate and undivided from (or conjoin'd with) his Holy Spirit; that to this one complex Object himſelf as duly conſorted with his Holy Spirit I make my Doxology. In this latter ſenſe our being Baptiz'd in the Name of the Father and the Holy Ghoſt is an Aſcription of the Glory of the Godhead *to the Father with the Holy Ghoſt*; it is an Aſcription of it in Faith and in Fact, although not in expreſs form of Words: And that which muſt be done in Faith and in Fact, may be done in an expreſs devotional form of Words. But it is the former, not this latter ſenſe, that is the meaning of the Doxology expounded according to the ſenſe of the Church, the Scholaſtic Theology, the Fathers and them that inſtituted it. (*e*) *Our Anceſtors in their Doxology did therefore conjoin the Glory of Chriſt with the Holy Ghoſt, to ſignifie, that Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt* (are in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology) *of one Potentacy*, each one being equally the Lord, God, the Lord our God. The Doxology of *Gloria Patri* thus expounded is ſuch as I cannot juſtifie; it is not (as all our Religious Worſhip ought to be order'd) *to the Glory of God the Father*, but the contrary; it claſheth with the main of our Idea of the Holy Ghoſt, more eſpecially with this eminent Branch of it; that the Holy Ghoſt is neither a Perſon of external Glory, nor of Political Imperial-perſonal Glory (of Dominion and Glory and Kingdom) which is the Glory that our Hymns and Doxologies do and ought to expreſs. For ſo the Hymn of *Dinonyſius* (before cited) aſcribeth δόξαν ϗ κράτος, *Glory and Dominion* or Empire; and the Hymn of *Africanus* aſcribeth δόξαν ϗ μεγαλωσύνην, *Glory and Majeſty*, which denoteth Political Imperial Majeſty.

III. That form of *Gloria Patri* which is now us'd, and that other form which the (above cited) Fathers commend, are both of them ſo far amiſs, that it is much to be deſir'd, that a better and more ancient form of *Gloria Patri* was ſubſtituted in their ſtead. For it is certain, that the more ancient form of *Gloria Patri* is not that which was us'd by the Fathers of the Fourth Century (when the Church began to be hugely degenerate) but that which was us'd in the days of *Polycarp*, much nearer to the Apoſtles times. This form of *Gloria Patri* was thus expreſs'd by him at his Martyrdom. (*f*) *I praiſe thee, I bleſs thee, I glorifie thee, by the eternal High Prieſt Jeſus Chriſt thy beloved Son*, δι' οὗ σοὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ δόξα, *by whom Glory be to thee together with him in* (or through) *the Holy Spirit, now and for ever.* *J. Mart.* giving an account of the Religion of Chriſtians ſaith more than once (*g*) *we Worſhip the Father, Son and Prophetic Spirit; the Son in the ſecond place, and the Prophetic Spirit* ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, *in the third Rank or Order.* In calling the Holy Spirit *the Prophetic Spirit* he clearly expreſſeth our Idea of the Holy Ghoſt, which is *the Holy Inſpiration virtue and Agent*: But what Worſhip the Chriſtians of his time gave to this Prophetic Spirit, this Father doth not clearly expreſs. Yet from ſome Paſſages in him it ſeemeth to have been a conjoining the Holy Spirit with the other divine Perſons in a Doxology, which was ſo far a Worſhipping the Holy Ghoſt. For deſcribing the Chriſtians Celebration of the Euchariſt and the Preſident's conſecrating it he ſaith

(z) Ep.41. p.803.

(a) Petav. de Trin. l. 1. c. 14. S. 13. & l. 3. c. 7. S. 9.

(b) Ep.54.

(c) De ſp. Sanct. l. 2. c. 10.

(d) Supr. c. 27, 28.

(e) *Ideo ut unam patris & filii & ſpiritus ſancti majores noſtri dicerent poteſtatem, cum ſpiritu ſancto gloriam Chriſti eſſe memorabant.* S. Ambroſ. de ſp. ſanct. l. 2. c. 10.

Phil. 2. 11.

(f) Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 15.

(g) Apol. 2. p. 56, 60.

(h) *He ſendeth up laud and glory to the Father of all by the Name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* Again he ſaith, *in all our Oblations* (i) *we bleſs the Maker of all things by his Son Jeſus Chriſt and by the Holy Spirit.* The Holy Spirit is not the Mediator, as the Son is, yet this Father ſaith, they offer'd up their Praiſe to God, not only by the Son, but alſo by the Holy Spirit. Which ſeemeth to argue, that as they offer'd up their Praiſe to God through Chriſt Jeſus, ſo they offer'd it up alſo in *Polycarp*'s form of Doxology ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, *in* (or through) *the Holy Spirit.* Did our ſhort Hymn of *Gloria Patri* run in this form it would be expreſſive of the right Faith of the Trinity, purely Scriptural and agreeable to Chriſtianity, and ſo agreeable to the Doxologies of the holy Writers, that we ſhould delight to uſe it in Conjunction with them and them with it, and it would not (as that form of *Gloria Patri* which now we uſe, doth) exclude out of our Aſſemblies and God-ſervice theſe many heavenly Doxologies of the New Teſtament. *Who is the bleſſed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords; who only hath Immortality, dwelling in the light which no Man can approach unto, whom no Man hath ſeen nor can ſee: To whom be Honour and Power everlaſting.* Amen. *Now unto the King eternal, immortal, inviſible, the only wiſe God, be Honour and Glory, for ever and ever.* Amen. *To God only wiſe be Glory through Jeſus Chriſt for ever.* Amen. *Now unto God and our Father be Glory for ever and ever.* Amen. *According to the Will of God our Father, to whom be Glory for ever and ever.* Amen. *Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, unto him be Glory in the Church by Chriſt Jeſus throughout all ages, world without end.* Amen. *The God of all Grace who hath called us to his eternal Glory by Chriſt Jeſus, to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever.* Amen. *To the only wiſe God our Saviour be Glory and Majeſty, Dominion and Power, both now and ever.* Amen. *To our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, to him be Glory both now and for ever.* Amen. *Through Jeſus Chriſt, to whom be Glory for ever and ever.* Amen. *Unto him that loved us, and waſhed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father; to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever.* Amen. *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was and is, and is to come. Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain, to receive Power and Riches, and Wiſdom and Strength, and Honour and Glory and Bleſſing. Bleſſing and Honour, and Glory and Power be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* Amen.

1 Tim. 6. 15, 16.
1 Tim. 1. 17.
Rom. 16. 27.
Phil. 4. 20.
Gal. 1. 4, 5.
Eph. 3. 20 21.
1 Pet. 5. 10.
Jude 25
Heb. 13. 21.
Apoc. 1. 5, 6.
Apoc. 4 8. and 5. 12, 13.

IV. In the beginning of the *Litany* we make a proper ſolemn Prayer to the Holy Ghoſt (doing the Service of Religion unto him) and this Prayer is, *to have Mercy upon us miſerable Sinners*; which muſt ſignifie his forgiving our Sins, that doth not belong to him, nor doth it belong to him as a Political-imperial divine Potentate, to exerciſe Mercy or punitive Severity in ſaving or deſtroying miſerable Sinners. In the ſame place we pray again for the ſame thing *to the whole Trinity at once*; which it is marvellous, that we ſhould do, conſidering that in ſo doing we venture (in high and holy Things) a great way further, than we have any clear light to guide us; that we our ſelves confeſs, we do not underſtand the Scholaſtic Trinity, which we pray to; that we recede from our own Rule, which is to make the Bible our Religion; that this mode of praying claſheth with the main of our Idea of The Holy Ghoſt, and with the ſenſe of our firſt Reformers. (k) For *Luther* blotted theſe words out of his German Prayers, *Sancta Trinitas, unus Deus, miſerere nobis, Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us. Calvin* in one of his Epiſtles ſaith (l) *hæc precatio vulgò recepta, Sancta Trinitas, unus Deus, miſerere noſtri, non mihi placet, & omninò barbariem ſapit. This commonly receiv'd Prayer, Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us, pleaſeth not me, plainly it ſavoureth of rudeneſs.* He ſeemeth, to think it rudeneſs in Grammar; and there is reaſon, to think it ſo; for it is the making that a Name, which is no Name. For Prayer is *a calling upon the Name of God or the Lord* (as the Scripture defineth it, and as the People of Chriſt are they *that call upon this Name, Act. 9. 21.*) and the Name of God or the Name of the Lord ſignifieth the Perſon of God or the Perſon of the Lord (that Honour-perſon:) But the Perſon of God or the Perſon of the Lord is not the Trinity, nor is the Trinity the Perſon of God or of the Lord. Every Perſon of the Trinity is not upon the Throne, nor is every one of them our Saviour-Lord (and to whom ſhould we make our Prayers but to our Saviour-Lord only?) Nor is every one of them *God definitively*, or the Imperial Eſtate of God abſolutely, or the moſt high God without limitation of ſenſe, or the Honour-perſon of the Lord, or a Political imperial divine Potentate, or a Political kind of Relation, or the Proprietor of a People and Kingdom, or the Author of our Spiritual Goods and Bleſſings, or the Pattern of our Holineſs, or the Judge of All, or the Creator, Benefactor and Providential Governour of the Univerſe; if in our Aſcriptions of Glory and in our Prayers we make them ſuch, whether this muſt be counted rudeneſs, or be called by ſome other Name, is left to them, to determine, that are competent Judges in ſuch matters. But of the ſame Nature with our Prayer to the Trinity is this Form of Prayer to be uſ'd at Sea. *God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghoſt have mercy upon us, ſave us now and evermore.* Amen. In Benedictions precationary to the Holy Ghoſt we ought to mention only his proper Functions and Operations (which he performeth as the Inſpiration-virtue and Agent of the Lord, ſuch as *illuminating, ſanctifying, ſtrengthening*, and the like:) But in ſolemnizing Matrimony we make the Holy Ghoſt a Providential kind of Governour in this Benediction. *God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghoſt bleſs, preſerve and keep you.* In our Book of *Ordination* we have an Hymn, which in the Title of it maketh the Holy Ghoſt *the Creator*; throughout the Body of it (which is twofold) it maketh the Holy Ghoſt the Honour-perſon of the Lord; it is a proper formal Prayer to him not only for the Spiritual, but Temporal Bleſſings (external Peace and Safety,) in this ſtrain it prayeth to him for Bleſſings, *according to thy Promiſe Lord*; and the cloſe of it maketh Aſcriptions of Excellency, Laud and Praiſe to the Holy Ghoſt as to the Father and the Son without any difference or inequality. *Whoſo is wiſe, he will underſtand theſe things, prudent and he ſhall know them.*

CHAP.

(h) Αἶνον ϗ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τȣ̃ ὀνόματος τȣ̃ υἱȣ̃ ϗ τȣ̃ πνεύματος τȣ̃ ἁγίȣ ἀναπέμπει. *Ubi ſupr. p. 97.*

(i) Εὐλογȣ̃μεν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων διὰ τȣ̃ υἱȣ̃ αὐτȣ̃ Ἰησȣ̃ Χριςȣ̃, ϗ διὰ πνεύματος τȣ̃ ἁγίȣ. *Ibid. p. 98.*

(k) Valentia T. 1. Diſp. 2. Qu. 1. punct. 1 S. 7.

(l) Cancel. Diſ. de voc Trin. S. 44.

CHAP. V.

1. *An Idea of the Nature of the Holy Scriptures. That the Bible is the Holy Popular Book.* Sect. 1. *A diſtribution of Things and Perſons into Popular and Idiotically Philoſophical.* 1. *Of the Philoſophers Acroaticks and Exotericks.* 2. *Perſons and Things fitly denominated Idiotically Philoſophical.* Sect. 2. *Of the People in the narrower Acceptation.* 1. *The word* Populus *in one narrower Acceptation ſignifieth the common People contradiſtinguiſh'd to Philoſophers.* 2. *Of Philoſophers Contempt of them.* 3. *A due Vindication of the common People from many Conſiderations.* Sect. 3. *In our Idea the Scriptures are denominated Popular in the large ſignification; and that they muſt be ſo prov'd.* 1. *Becauſe they are the Book of Religion.* 2. *Becauſe they are the Book of the Chriſtian Religion.* 3. *Becauſe they are the Book of the Law.* 4. *Becauſe they are the Book of Life. Several Inferences from thence.* Sect. 4. *The Scriptures are Popular ſo as to be Holy-popular, and as ſuch oppoſite to Philoſophers and their Schools.* 1 *Becauſe the Holy People are the People.* 2. *The Holy People and their Paſtors make one Holy People.* 3. *The Church a Popular Syſtem.* 4. *The New* Iſrael *the New Holy-popular Syſtem, as the Old* Iſrael *was the Old Holy-popular Syſtem.* 5. *A Connexion between Holy and Popular.*

I. Although an Idea of the Son of God might reaſonably be expected, to be connex'd with the Idea of God and of his Holy Spirit, yet it is too ſoon, to proceed to ſuch an Idea, which muſt not be repreſented, till we come to the times of the New Teſtament. But this is a proper place for *an Idea of the Nature of the Holy Scriptures* (that are connex'd with the Holy Spirit that inſpir'd them) which will be a Rule, to fix and determine the Ambiguity of their Senſe, and therefore will prepare the way for a true Idea of the Son of God. For a principal thing that incumbreth his Idea, is an ambiguity of Senſe in ſeveral places of Scripture that relate to his Perſon. His Generation, his Incarnation, his Name *the Logos* (and ſome others) are commonly underſtood in a Scholaſtical and Philoſophical kind of Senſe, which is unpopular and unholy (of Kind and Quality Philoſophic-pagan:) But they may be underſtood in an *Holy-popular* kind of Senſe; and which of theſe is the true Interpretation, muſt be determin'd by an *Idea of the Nature of the Holy Scriptures.* If the Scriptures are a Scholaſtical and Philoſophical kind of Book (a Book of Scholaſtical and Philoſophical Matters) then a Scholaſtic Deity, a Scholaſtic Trinity, a Scholaſtic *Logos*, a Scholaſtic Generation and Incarnation of the *Logos*, are true and genuine Articles; then a late Pretenſion muſt take place, *Philoſophia Scripturæ interpres* (the Scripture muſt be interpreted by Philoſophy) then we muſt have recourſe to *Philo* and the Schools of the Philoſophic Pagans, to interpret to us the *Logos* of our Religion. But if the Holy Scriptures are no Scholaſtical or Philoſophical kind of Book, but of a quite alien Nature and Character, then theſe great Articles of Religion are miſunderſtood by Scholaſtic Divines (Ancient and Modern) and they ought, to change their Idea's, to conform them to the Holy Scriptures. Whoſe true Nature and Character is compriſed in theſe very few words, *the Bible is the Holy-popular Book* (of Kind and Quality ſuch) *a Book of the Holy-popular Matters* (the Popular-religious Matters) *not of Matters unpopular and unholy*; and conſequently *it is a Book of the Holy-popular Learning, not of the Unholy and Unpopular, the Scholaſtical and Philoſophical.*

SECTION I.

A diſtribution of Things and Perſons into Popular and Idiotically Philoſophical.

I. THIS Idea and Character of the Holy Scriptures implieth, that the *Popular* Philoſophy muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from that which is proper and peculiar to the Schools of Philoſophers, which may be called *the Philoſophy idiotically Philoſophical.* All Popular Syſtems and Communities conſiſt of a ſort of Men denominated by *Ariſtotle* οἱ πολιτικοὶ ϗ πρακτικοί, *Men of the Political and Practic kind of Life*, whoſe Character may be underſtood from a Diſcourſe of *Salmaſius* touching his *Acroaticks* and *Exotericks.* (m) *Andronicus in Agellius* (ſaith he) ſheweth the difference between *Ariſtotle*'s *Exotericks* and *Acroaticks.* “Which is not what the Paraphraſt of his *Ethicks* hath fondly told the “World, that his *Exotericks* were Diſcourſes, “which he deliver'd by word of Mouth, and “the other ſuch as he wrote: But they differ “from one another in Matter and Method of “handling, in reſpect of Auditors, and the “time alſo of their delivery. The one was de-“liver'd in the *Lyceum*, the other in the Even-“ing. At the one none but his Scholars might “be admitted, who were called ἀκροαταὶ pro-“perly (for ſo in *Suidas*, ἀκροατὴς ὁ μαθητὴς, an “Auditor ſtrictly ſo called is a Diſciple) whence “came the Name of ἀκροατικοὶ λόγοι, *the Acroa-*“*ticks.* But at the other all might be promiſ-“cuouſly preſent, the People as well as his “Scholars, they were free and open to any, e-“ven τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς, *to extraneous Perſons who* “*had not embrac'd his Diſcipline.* Thoſe were “οἰκειακοί, and Domeſticks, theſe Aliens and “thoſe that were without. To his Acroaticks “none were lightly admitted, only thoſe whoſe “natural Wit he had made trial of, together “with their induſtry in Study, and whether “they were furniſh'd with the Elements of “Learning. And as the Perſons were different, “ſo was the Matter and Argument of his Diſ-“courſes; for he did not Diſcourſe of the ſame “Matters before the rude and unskilful, nor “the young and newly initiated, and thoſe “that were great Proficients, but accommoda-“ted things to the capacity of his Hearers, “more eaſie things to the leſs intelligent. Be-“ſides, not only their capacity, but their re-“liſh

(m) *Not. in Epiſtet. p.* 228, 229.

“ liſh was regarded. He did not (its likely) open the ſecrets of his Philoſophy to Men of Buſineſs, neglecting what was proper for their purpoſe things *Moral* and *Political.* Therefore *Andronicus* ſaith, that the Exotericks concern'd Rhetorick and civil Buſineſs; but to the Students in Philoſophy and ſuch as affected the Knowledge and Contemplation of things Natural, and to ſuch as were his Diſciples, to theſe he opened thoſe *Arcana.* (n) *His Acroaticks treated of the more remote and ſubtil Philoſophy, of Phyſical Contemplations or Metaphyſical and Logical Diſquiſitions.* Himſelf ſaith in his Ethicks (o) *Theſe are variouſly treated of both in the Exoterical Diſcourſes and in thoſe that are according to Philoſophy.* “ Exoterical Diſcourſes are contradiſtinguiſh'd to thoſe that are according to Philoſophy; this latter being the Study of extraordinary, remote and recondite Wiſdom, the knowledge of things Natural and Divine and the Contemplation of them. And thoſe that imploy'd themſelves in theſe, were σοφοὶ and θεωρητικοί, *the wiſe and contemplative Men*, whoſe deſign and buſineſs of Life was Contemplation: But the *Practic* Life was another thing, in which they that imploy'd themſelves, were not called σοφοὶ, *wiſe Men*, but φρόνιμοι, *prudent Men*, as *Ariſtotle* ſaith in his *Politicks.* Hence alſo he putteth a diſtinction between the νοῦς θεωρητικὸς and πρακτικὸς, *the Speculative and Practic Mind*, and it is a Queſtion in him, (p) *Whether a Political and Practical Life be more eligible, or a Life ſequeſtred from external Buſineſs, ſuch as the Speculative Man's, who ſome ſay, is the only Philoſopher.* “ In his Exotericks therefore he diſcourſed of the things that appertain to the πρακτικὸς καὶ πολιτικὸς βίος, *the Practic and Political Life*: In the other of what appertain'd to the φιλόσοφος καὶ θεωρητικὸς, *the Philoſophic and Theoretic Life.* Hence Arts and Sciences were diſtributed according to his Auditors. *Rhetorick*, *Ethicks* and *Politicks* were called Exoterical Diſciplines (ſo *Plutarch* (q) *Ethicos & Politicos libros*, ἐξωτερικῶν, *nomine cenſet appellatos*, counteth the Books of Ethicks and Politicks Exotericks:) But *Logick*, *Metaphyſicks*, *Phyſiology*, *Acroatical.* Likewiſe in the manner of handling they were different from one another. For as his Exoterical Diſcourſes were accommodate to Popular uſe, ſo his way of diſcourſing in them was more Popular, more large and plain: In the other more curt and obſcure.

Here are two very different Families of Things and Perſons. The one are thoſe that live the Political and Practic, *the Popular-ſocial Life*, that conſtitute the Popular and Exoterical Syſtems and Societies, Cities, Commonwealths and Empires, to whom therefore all the great things of the World do belong, and are Homogeneous to their Character, *Popular and Exoterical* (ſuch as the Principality and the Prieſthood, the Matters of Religion and Government, of War and Peace, of Courts, Camps and auguſt Aſſemblies, of Laws, Honours and Inheritances, of Mechanic Arts and Works) and theſe are repreſented as unconcern'd in the *Acroaticks.* Not as if they were wholly alien from them (for what *Ariſtotle* ſaith of Rhetorick and Logick, is true of the other Diſciplines of the Circle (r) πάντες τρόπον τινὰ μετέχουσιν αὐτῶν, *all in ſome ſort and degree partake of them*:) But becauſe in great degree they are alien from them, and are aſymbolous to them and their Character. Yet theſe that have nothing Characteriſtical of a Philoſopher, are allow'd to have their Philoſophy (the Ethicks and Politicks) which therefore muſt be called *the Popular and Exoterical Philoſophy.* And conſequently we Chriſtians muſt allow them, to have their *Theology* or *Philoſophy*, which muſt be called *the Holy-popular Theology or Philoſophy* (ſuch is the Theology that belongeth to Chriſtians as Chriſtians and therefore to all Chriſtians) in contradiſtinction to the *Theologia Scholaſtica*, *Metaphyſica*, *Philoſophica*, which anſwereth to the Acroaticks of *Ariſtotle.* Theſe are repreſented as proper and peculiar to his School, to his οἰκειακοὶ, *Privado's or Domeſticks*, and they may be ſaid, to be peculiar to all the Schools of Philoſophers; for all of thoſe ſegregate Syſtems had ſomething like the *Acroaticks* (although ſeveral both of the *Italic* and *Ionic* ſucceſſion did diſcard the Acroaticks) and theſe their τὰ ἴδια, or peculiarities may be fitly called their τὰ ἰδιωτικὰ, (as ἴδιος and ἰδιωτικὸς is oppos'd to δημόσιος, *Popular-publick)* and therefore may be ſaid, to be idiotically Philoſophical, as being at leaſt in ſome reſpect and degree ſuch.

II. They may be called idiotically Philoſophical either in a Senſe of reproach and diſparagement, or without reproach and diſparagement. And the accommodateneſs of this Name to the Nature of the things will appear by conſidering, (1.) The deſcriptions of a Philoſopher in *Plato*, who in the Perſon of *Callicles* thus declaimeth againſt Philoſophy. “ Philoſophy is indeed, O *Socrates*, a very ornamental thing, if a Man converſeth with it moderately and in the time of his Youth; but it ſpoileth the Men, that are immoderately converſant in it. For though they be furniſh'd with a good Wit, yet if they Philoſophize long, they will inevitably become unskilful in all thoſe things wherein a good and excellent Man ſhould be expert. They are rendred *Ignaro's* as to the Laws of the City, and Diſcourſe, which is requiſite for private and publick Converſation, and as to all the pleaſures and purſuits of Mankind, and in ſhort as to the whole buſineſs of Manners. So that if they ſet themſelves about any private or publick Action, they become ridiculous, as Political Men are, when they intermeddle with Philoſophical Diſputations.—— But the beſt way is, to have ſomething of both: So much Philoſophy doth well, as may ſerve for Juvenile Erudition; for it is not unbecoming Youth to Philoſophize. But for a Man at Age to Philoſophize, is as incongruous, as for a Man to ſpeak and play like a Child; for Childiſh Imperfections in Speech and Sports are pleaſing in that Age, and more Man-like is offenſive: So in a young Man Philoſophy is decorous, but not to forſake thoſe Studies at Age, is ſervile and ignoble. For ſuch the Man will become, that ſhunneth the converſe of Men, and never meddleth with any thing that is great and generous. You neglect, O *Socrates*, what you ſhould take care of, and render your generous Soul puerile, not knowing how to ſpeak in publick Conſultations,

nor

(n) Ἀκροατικὰ *autem vocabantur, in quibus Philoſophia remotior ſubtiliorque agitabatur, quæque ad naturæ contemplationes diſceptationeſve dialecticas pertinebant.*

(o) Ἐπέσκεπται δὲ πολλοῖς περὶ αὐταῖς τρόποις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν.

(p) Πότερον ὁ πολιτικὸς καὶ πρακτικὸς βίος αἱρετὸς, ἢ μᾶλλον ὁ πάντων ἐκτὸς ἀπολελυμένος, οἷον θεωρητικός τις, ὃν μόνον τινές φασιν εἶναι φιλόσοφον.

(q) *Ibid. p.* 236.

(r) *Rhet. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

“ nor make a good choice for your ſelf, nor how to adviſe others; is it not a diſhonourable thing, that if any ſhould caſt you into Priſon and accuſe you as a Criminal, you would not know what to do, but ſweat and gape only, not able to ſay any thing for your ſelf? And if any wretched fellow be your accuſer, you muſt die, if he will have it ſo? and how is this Wiſdom, that maketh an ingenuous Man worſe than he was before, a Man that can neither help nor deliver himſelf or others out of any great dangers: but all he hath is expos'd to Spoil and Rapine, and he liveth diſhonourably in the City and every Man may abuſe him *impune*? away therefore with Arguments and mind Buſineſs, and imploy your ſelf in thoſe things, whence you may become wiſe indeed; leave thoſe Trifles and delirous Trinkets, which will leave you to an empty Houſe, and imitate them that acquire Riches and Glory and many other Goods. That this Oration of *Plato* may be no diſcredit to its Author *Agellius* diſtinguiſheth a twofold Philoſophy: *For* Plato *ſpeaketh not*, ſaith he, (s) *touching that Philoſophy which is the Diſcipline of all Virtues, and which excelleth in publick and private Offices, and virtuouſly adminiſtreth Cities and the Commonwealth* (which is the popular Philoſophy:) *but touching the frivolous and puerile ſtudy of Subtilties* (ſuch is the Scholaſtick Theology) *which conduceth nothing to Life, either to preſerve or regulate it.* In his *Theætetus Plato* maketh this Deſcription of his Philoſophic Theoriſts (which *Clemens* and *Theodoret* (t) count a Deſcription of the Chriſtian Life;) “ Even from their Youth they are ignorant of the way to the places of popular Conventions, to the place of Judicature or the Senate-houſe, or any other Common-Council of the City; as for the Laws and publick Decrees whether written or publiſh'd by word of Mouth, they neither ſee nor hear them. The Factions of the Sodalities, their Meetings, their Suppers and their Revels they do not ſo much as dream of: Whether good or evil hath been done in the City, or whether any be infam'd by his Anceſtors, they are more unacquainted with, than with the Sand of the Sea; yea ſuch a Man doth not know, that he knoweth them not, for he doth not abſent himſelf from them, to be taken notice of, but in reality his Body is only in the City, but his Mind accounting all theſe things little or nothing, reſteth no where, according to *Pindar*, but is meaſuring by Geometry the things below and the things above the Earth, and tranſcending the Heavens in her Aſtronomical Exerciſes: ſearching into the Univerſal Nature of all Beings, not condeſcending to any particular thing that is near at hand. And as *Thales* being intent upon the Stars and looking upwards fell into a Ditch, a certain *Thracian* Girl is ſaid, to have wittily ſcoff'd at him, that he endeavour'd, to ſee thoſe things that were in Heaven, and could not ſee thoſe things that were before his Eyes and at his Feet: the ſame jear may be put upon all that are converſant in Philoſophy; for indeed ſuch a Man is a ſtranger to his next Neighbour, not only as to what he doth, but he ſcarce knoweth, whether he be a Man or ſome other Animal. But what Man is, and what Action or Paſſion is agreeable to ſuch a Nature, this he is inquiſitive about, and induſtrious in the reſearch: Yet if ſuch a Man be forc'd to diſcourſe either privately or in publick about ſuch things that are at hand and before his Eyes, he moveth Laughter, not ony to *Thracians*, but to the reſt of the People, falling into Ditches and Heſitations becauſe of his unskilfulneſs in ſuch Affairs, and his great Ineptitude gaineth him the Reputation of a Fool. It can be no injurious Contumely, to call ſuch Philoſophy as this (in great degree) *Idiotically Philoſophical* and Unpopular in a ſenſe of Reproach.

(2.) The Myſtic-Metaphyſical (or Acroamatical) Theology of the Philoſphic Pagans. For the Philoſophers who had nothing to do with Religion more than other Men, would be always meddling with the Gods. (u) *Philoſophy and the Religion of the Gods are very diſtant things: the Profeſſors of Philoſophy by whom none cometh to the Gods, are another ſort of Men than the Prelates of Religion.* Religion is a popular Buſineſs, (not peculiar to the Schools of Philoſophers) yet the Philoſophers in their Schools buſied themſelves with multifarious Diſquiſitions about the Gods, and their Theology is called *The natural Theology* by *Varro*, (w) *yet he remov'd this Theology from the People, and ſhut it up within the Walls of the Philoſophers Schools.* There the Scholaſtick Theology may reign ſecurely, but it ought not to ſtep beyond thoſe Walls, to be a Theology or Religion for the People, to make Articles of Faith for them, to form their Creeds, and to compoſe their Liturgies; for theſe things (although they are done in the Chriſtian Church) the ancient Pagans were too wiſe to allow. Their Myſtic-Metaphyſical Theology and the Deities thereof was had in great admiration by its Privado's; but they never pretended, to introduce their Scholaſtick Deities into Religion. *Plato* was ſenſible, that his firſt Scholaſtick Deity was *ſo idiotically Philoſophical* and unpopular, (x) that he would not allow any mention of him to be made amongſt the Vulgar, leſt they ſhould make it a matter of deriſion, as being altogether remote from what is popular. When *Dionyſius* deſir'd, to be further inſtructed touching this Deity, *Plato* anſwer'd, *I muſt ſpeak to you enigmatically, that if the Writing ſuffereth any thing by Sea or Land, he that readeth it may not underſtand. Take heed, that theſe things fall not into the Hands of the* (ἀπαίδευτοι) *illiterate; for as I think,* οὐκ ἔστι τούτων πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς καταγελαστότερα ἀκούσματα, *there are not any things more ridiculous amongſt the Multitude than theſe things.*

(3.) The Philoſophic Pagan Aſceticks their Maxims and Inſtitutes of the *Philoſophic Life*, which was in great part nothing better than unpopular Humour, and therefore deſerveth the Name of ἰδιωτικὸς βίος *(an idiotical unpopular Life)* although that Name uſually ſignifieth, (y) the Vulgar Life contradiſtinct to the Philoſophic. Of the ſame Character is the Platoniſts *Intellectual Life*, and the Mighty (or rather Almighty) Goods of Virtue which the *Stoicks* aſſum'd to themſelves, (z) *calcatis popularibus bonis*, the popular Goods being diſcarded and trampled on. (a) *Amongſt the Jews* (ſaith *Joſephus*) *three ſorts of Men philoſophize* (have their ſeveral Dogme's and Inſtitutes) *the Phariſees, Sadducees, Eſſens.* The Phariſees

(s) *De illa Philoſophia quæ virtutum omnium diſciplina eſt, quæque in publicis ſimul & privatis officiis excellit, civitateſque & Rempublicam, ſi nihil prohibeat, conſtanter & fortiter & perite adminiſtrat: ſed de illa futili atque puerili meditatione argutiarum nihil ad vitam neque tuendam neque ordinandam promovente.*

(t) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 434. *Theodoret. Therapeut. Ser.* 12. *p.* 169.

(u) *Philoſophia & religio Deorum disjuncta ſunt, longeque diſcreta: ſiquidem alii ſunt profeſſores ſapientiæ, per quos utique ad deos non aditur: alii religionis antiſtites.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 3.

(w) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 6. *c.* 5.

(x) *Eugubin. de Per. Phil. l.* 5. *c.* 3.

(y) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 67. *vid. Lactant. l.* 3. *c.* 14.

(z) *Sen. Ep.* 31.

(a) *Selden. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

riſees are counted a Sect of Philoſophy, and they were a Generation of *idiotical unpopular Aſceticks*, (*b*) that look'd upon the *populus terræ* (the ordinary ſort of Jews as well as Gentiles, the Unlearned and Plebeians) as devoid of intellectual Endowments, whereby they might know the Law and attain to Wiſdom. In purſuit of their own profeſſion of ſuperabundant Sanctimony they ſhunn'd all converſe with the *Populus Terræ*, not touching them or ſuffering themſelves to be touch'd by them (walking on the ſides of the High-ways, leſt they ſhould be polluted with the touch of any Plebeians;) not eating or drinking with them; and their Maxims were, *The Garments of the Plebeians are a Calcation to the Phariſees* (that is, they polluted them as much as any thing that a Gonorrhaic had trod upon) *The People of the Earth are the Footſtool of the Phariſees.* The Laws of their Fraternity were, that no Man muſt receive any thing liquid from a Plebeian, nor be his Gueſt, nor give him entertainment in his own Garment; if ſuch an one had lodg'd in their Houſes a purgation was neceſſary.

(4.) The Application of the Scholaſtick *Acroaticks* to the Interpretation of Scripture; for ſuch Interpretations muſt be called *Idiotically Philoſophical and Unpopular.* (*c*) In *Abarbinel Maimonides* proveth, that *God alone is true or truth, and there is no other truth in any like his truth* (that is, nothing beſides truly is;) for though we ſay, that created things exiſt, yet the word Exiſtence is not univocal, but equivocal or analogical (not equally predicated) when attributed to God and created things: for they have *Potentia* mix'd with *Act*, Neceſſity with Contingence, and Exiſtence with Privation: but there is none of this in God, and therefore his Truth and theirs is not alike. And this he proveth from that Saying of the Prophet *Jeremiah*, *Dominus Deus veritas eſt*, Jer. 10. 10. The Prophet ſaith, *The Lord is the true God* (in oppoſition to Idols) and *Maimonides* interpreteth it to mean, that he is Metaphyſical Truth of Exiſtence. From the ſame Philoſophic Vanity theſe Hebrew Doctors will have the Scripture to mean, *Deut.* 4. 35. (there is none elſe beſides him) not that there is no other God, but that *nihil eſt in exiſtentia præter Deum*, as if the Scripture deſign'd, to teach the Jews Metaphyſicks. The *Tetragrammaton*, ſay they, *docet de exiſtentiæ neceſſitate* (teacheth neceſſary Exiſtence) and ſo the meaning is (there is none beſides him) *there is no Exiſtent of neceſſary Exiſtence, there is no true Exiſtent but he alone.* So the Men of this ſtrain interpret the Name of God *I am*, (*d*) ὡς τῶν μετ' αὐτὸν οὐκ ὄντων κατὰ τὸ εἶναι, *as ſignifying that other things which are after him do not exiſt in reality* (although they are Spiritual and Eternal things) *but they are only by Opinion ſuppos'd to exiſt:* τὸ δὲ ὂν τοῦ ἀϊδίου δηλωτικόν ἐστι, *this Name denoteth that which is every way Eternal,* (*e*) ſaith *Theodoret*. Accordingly *Theophylact* upon the words of our Saviour, *Before* Abraham *was, I am*, thus noteth, *The very word* I am *is* ἐπὶ θεοῦ κυριώτερα, *proper unto God as ſignifying that which perpetually and ever is. So his Father* in the Old Teſtament uſeth *I am*; *but touching* Abraham *he uſeth the word* τὸ γενέσθαι, *he being corruptible, for that which is made, is corrupted*; *but* I am *denoteth an incapability of all Corruption and a Divine Eternity.* Agreeably to this mode of Interpreting Scripture, *Clemens* expoundeth the Darkneſs, which *Moſes* entred into, where God was (*f*) to ſignifie τὰς ἀδύτους καὶ ἀειδεῖς περὶ τοῦ ὄντος ἐννοίας, *the arcane and informous Notions touching him that is:* For which Expoſition he giveth us this Philoſophic Reaſon, *God is not in Darkneſs, or in Place, but above Place and Time and every Creature-property.* But *Gr. Naz.* giveth another Philoſophic (or Unpopular) Account of the Darkneſs wherein God is; for *poſuit tenebras latibulum ſuum* he interpreteth to ſignifie, (*g*) τὸ σωματικὸν γνόφον, τὴν ἡμετέραν παχύτητα, *our Craſſitude, that Corporeal Darkneſs which is between God and us.* A like Interpretation is that of the ancient Scholaſticks of the Church, (*h*) who ſuppoſe, that the infinite Eſſence of the Father is the τόπος φυσικός, *natural place* of the infinite Eſſence of the Son, wherein he reſteth, and this is the meaning of the Evangeliſts popular Phraſe, *The Son is in the Boſom of the Father.* But all Such Interpretations of Scripture (wherewith the Scholaſtick Theology aboundeth) are of kind and quality Philoſophic-pagan, Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical, and ought to be denominated *idiotically Philoſophical and Unpopular.*

Section II.

Of the People in one narrower Acceptation.

I. THE Name *Populus* (the People) is of various Acceptations, for it is of a larger and ſtricter Acceptation, and ſometimes it is taken in a magnifying, ſometimes in a vilifying, and ſometimes in an indifferent Senſe. (*i*) *By nature all Mankind make but one People.* But the Community of Mankind being cantoniz'd into ſeveral Families, Cities, Kingdoms and Empires, every one of theſe ſeveral and diſtinct Societies are accounted a ſeveral and diſtinct People; for ſo we read of (*k*) *familiæ ejus populus, populus Romanus*, a Citizen is called *Popularis*, the Community is called in Scripture, *the Daughter of my People*, Diſeaſes common thereto are called *Morbi populares*, and the Pagans civil Theology is ſaid to belong (*l*) *ad urbes populoſque, to Cities and People.* The Imperial Lawyers contradiſtinguiſh *Nobiles & Populares*; but they ſay alſo, (*m*) *Populi appellatione non tantùm ignobiles, ſed & nobiles quoque comprehenduntur*, the Name of the People comprehendeth not only the Ignoble but the Noble alſo. *Populi appellatione univerſi cives ſignificantur.* *Homer* calleth *Agamemnon* ποιμένα λαῶν, *the Paſtor of the People*, in which Appellation the other Kings were contained. The Name *Populus* therefore is of ſtricter and larger Acceptation, and it is of the number of the τὰ μέσα, and doth ſometimes ſignifie לשבח *ad laudem*, and ſometimes לגנאי *ad contumeliam* (as the Jews diſtinguiſh the different Acceptations of the ſame word) and ſometimes in an indifferent Senſe without reſpect either to praiſe or diſparagement; as when it denoteth only τὸ πλῆθος, a multitude or great number. (*n*) So *ſtellarum populus*, and *civitas omnis in populum effuſa*, denoteth only the multitude of Stars and throng of Men. But it ſignifieth in the laudatory or magnifying Senſe, when *Scipio* in *Cicero* defineth *Rempublicam rem populi*, and defineth *populum, cœtum multitudinis juris conſenſu & utilitatis communione ſociatum.* A multitude of Men combin'd together by a Common Law (a comprehenſion of Rights and Dues) and common Utility are a People. Whence S. Auſtin inferreth, (*o*) *where Juſtice is not, and Right is not obſerv'd, there is no People, only a Multitude which deſerveth not the Name of a People.* The publick good is commonly called *ſalus populi*, and *populi cura.* And in the Greek Writers τὰ τοῦ δήμου πράγματα (the things

(b) Vorſt. in Maimon. de fund. leg. p. 71.

(c) De cap. Fid. ap. Vorſt. p. 95.

(d) Hæſchel. in Philon. opuſc. p. 239.

(e) Qu. in pentat. proœm.

(f) Strom. l. 2. p. m. 264.

(g) Or. 34. p. 544.

(h) Ap. D. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p. 285, 28-, 288. ed. an. 1703.

(i) The Anarchy of a limited or mixed Monarchy, p. 8.

(k) Tiraquell. de Nobil. p. 170.

(l) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 6. c. 8.

(m) Tiraquell. [illegible] p. 526, 527.

(n) [illegible] tan. in Macrob. p. 651, 652.

(o) De C. D. l. 19. 21. C[illegible] in Per[illegible] 319. La[illegible] Hart. l[illegible] c. 7.

things of the People) are the concerns of the Publick. For the Notion of a People or Popular Community is not confin'd to Democracies and popular Commonwealths; (p) *the People remaineth the ſame, though the form of Government altereth; as the* Roman *People was the ſame under Kings, Conſuls, Emperours.* With relation to the *Roman* People in general (Noble and Ignoble) S. *Auſtin* declaiming againſt the fabulous Theology ſaith, (q) *O religioſas aures populares, atque in his etiam Romanas!* Under the Name People he comprehendeth the more honourable ſort of Citizens, yet conſidering them as Irreligious, he uſeth the word in ſome ſort in a ſenſe of Infamy and Diſparagement. And ſo doth *Antiſthenes* in that known Saying of his, (r) *multos quidem eſſe populares Deos, unum tamen naturalem* (there are many popular Gods, yet but one natural;) for it is manifeſt, that by *the People* he underſtandeth the whole Multitude of more honourable and leſs honourable Citizens, that follow'd the receiv'd Polytheiſm of his time, yet he taketh the word People in a ſenſe of Diſparagement. But uſually when it ſignifieth in a ſenſe of Diſparagement, it denoteth the meaner ſort of Citizens (the Plebeians or common People) as in the *fourth of* Xenophon's *Memoirs touching* Socrates, ὁ δῆμος, *the People*, is uſed to ſignifie τοὺς πένητας τῶν πολιτῶν, *the poorer ſort of Citizens.* So *Arnobius* ſpeaketh of (s) *popularis vulgaritas* (the vulgar Populace) *populus plebeiæ multitudinis*, the People of the Plebeian Multitude.

> (t) *Præſtat divitem eſſe ac popularem, quàm nobilem & mendicum.*
>
> *It is better* (ſaith *Plautus*) *to be rich and popular* (Ignoble) *than Noble and a Beggar.*

But in Holy Scripture the word *Populus* is never us'd in a vilifying Senſe, unleſs when it ſignifieth the Heathen People; as *Hoſ.* 7. 8. Ephraim *hath mixed himſelf among the People* (the Holy People among the Prophane,) *Jer.* 10. 7. *The Cuſtoms of the People are vain.* So *Joel* 2. 17. *Zech.* 10. 9. Several times in Holy Scripture the word *Populus* is us'd in a magnifying Senſe; ſometimes ſignifying a Secular or Civil Popular Community or Republick; as *Iſa.* 7. 8. Ephraim *ſhall be broken, that it be not a People* (a Polity or Republick) *Jer.* 48. 42. Moab *ſhall be deſtroyed from being a People.* Sometimes ſignifying a Church or an Eccleſiaſtick Popular Community, which conſiſteth of the People of God, *Rom.* 10. 19. *I will provoke them to jealouſie by them that are no People* (no People as to God) *which in time paſt were not a People, but are now the People of God,* 1 Pet. 2. 10. Something of a magnifying Senſe the word *Populus* hath in it, as it is us'd by *Job*, ch. 12. 2. *No doubt but ye are the* (eximious) *People.*

From which various Acceptations of the word *Populus* it appeareth, that the Philoſophers and their Schools are comprehended under that Name in a large Acceptation: For they are of the Community of Mankind, the Greek Philoſophers were of the *Grecian* People in a large Acceptation (and counted themſelves Citizens) and their Philoſophy is called by *Clemens*, (u) τοῦ λαοῦ φιλοσοφία, *the Philoſophy of the* (Mundane) *People.* But it appeareth, alſo, that the Philoſophers and their Schools are contradivided to the People both in a larger and narrower Acceptation; for they are contradiſtinguiſh'd to the People, as the Name *Populus* comprehendeth both the Noble and Ignoble, the Body of the Citizens and of the Republick, that are no Philoſophers; for with reſpect to all theſe *Ethicks* and *Politicks* are denominated *The Popular Philoſophy* (which is oppos'd to Philoſophy ſtrictly ſo called) and a great Man calleth (w) *Moralities, Laws and the like, The Sciences popular.* The Philoſophers never were *a People*, their Philoſophy properly ſuch (x) *ab hominum cætu abhorret*, they are therefore contradiſtinguiſh'd to *People, Nations and the Community of Mankind*, that are no Philoſophers. But moſt uſually they are contradiſtinguiſh'd to the People in a narrower Acceptation, as the word *Populus* denoteth the common People or vulgar ſort (y) οἱ πολλοί, *the Plebeian People.* A Philoſopher is oppos'd to (z) ὁ πολὺς καὶ δημώδης ἄνθρωπος, *a Plebeian and Popular Man*; whence *Lactantius* ſaith of *Arceſilas* (the Sceptical Philoſopher) that he ought to have diſtinguiſh'd thoſe things which may be known, and thoſe things which cannot be known: (a) *Sed ſi id feciſſet, ipſe ſe in populum redegiſſet, but if he had done this, he had ſpoil'd his being a Philoſopher, and reduc'd himſelf to be one of the People.*

II. From the People (the vulgar ſort) the Philoſophers had ſo great an averſion, (b) that the Platoniſts for this reaſon (amongſt others) would not become Chriſtians, leaſt they ſhould be called by the ſame Name with the Vulgar, and thereby be commoniz'd and vulgariz'd. The Philoſophic Writers and others in conſort with them uſually reproach and vilifie the People, as if they were writing Satyrs againſt them. (c) *The whole Philoſophic Chorus is according to* Seneca *of the ſame Mind with* Epicurus, *who ſaid, that he never deſign'd to pleaſe the People; for my Maxims the People do not like, and what they like is alien from my Notices. The People are not to be pleas'd but by thoſe that are like themſelves, which are not the Virtuous.* (d) *The Vulgar have rude Minds,* (e) *a baſe Soul,* (f) *look upon all things with childiſh Minds, are pleas'd with Trifles,* (g) *but not with any thing that is moderate.* They are celebrated for their τὸ ἄκριτον, *injudiciouſneſs* (being tenacious of their abſurd Conceits, yet eaſily carry'd away with ſhews and appearances, admiring ſlight things, not diſcerning great and weighty things;) they are bad judges of every good thing, ſaid *Pythagoras*; and they are as bad at practice (ſome have ſtiled them *colluviem quandam omnis generis ſordibus inquinatam*) a Philoſopher compareth them (h) to our Animal Body, being fooliſh, multifarious, vehement in Anger, violent in Luſt, diſſolute in Pleaſure as the Body, and alike tranſported to Rage, of which the beſt Men that have ſerv'd them the beſt, have felt the ſad effects, and have had cauſe to complain of their ungrateful impious Minds. *Ingratos animos atque impia pectora vulgi.* *Lucret.* (i) *There is nothing more unintelligent and more inſolent than the popular Multitude, that neither know of themſelves, nor have learned what is well-doing, and that do things without Counſel impetuouſly,* χειμάῤῥῳ ποταμῷ ἴκελοι, *like a Torrent,* (k) ὁ δῆμος οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἀκούων οὔθ' ὁρῶν, *they have no Ears to hear, nor Eyes to ſee.* (l) *The People are a ſtrange Beaſt with*

(p) Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 2. c. 9.

(q) De C. D. l. 6. c. 5.

(r) Lactan. l. 1. c. 5.

(s) Adv. Gent. l. 3. p. 101, 102.

(t) Tiraquell. ſupr. p. 527.

(u) Strom. l. 6. p. m. 497.

(w) Lord Bacon Adv. of Learning B. 2. p. m. 192.

(x) Lactan. l. 3. c. 25.

(y) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 260.

(z) Porph. de Abſt. l. 1. S. 13.

(a) L. 3. c. 5.

(b) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 13. c. 16.

(c) *Epicurus Ep.* 29. *Nunquam volui populo placere. nam quæ ego ſcio, non probat populus; quæ probat populus, ego neſcio. Subjungit Seneca; idem hoc omnes tibi ex omni domo conclamabunt, Peripatetici, Academici, Stoici, Cynici. quis enim placere poteſt populo, cui placet virtus?* V. Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 97, 98. & p. 76, 364.

(d) *Vulgi rudes animi.* Ammian. l. 30.

(e) Βάναυσος ἡ ψυχή. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 34.

(f) *Animis puerilibus ſpectat omnia, oblectatur frivolis.* Lactant. l. 2. c. 3.

(g) *Cui nihil moderatum gratum eſſe ſolet.* Verulam. de ſap. vet. p. 101.

(h) *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 40.

(i) *Herodot. l. 3. p.* 196.

(k) *Sappho ap. Athen.*

(l) *Charroon. B.* 1. *c.* 5. *Non ego ventoſæ plebis ſuffragia venor.* Horat. *Nec quidquam ingenuum poteſt habere officina.* Cic. ap. Herald. in Arnob. p. 140.

many Heads, inconſtant and variable (mobile vulgus) *without ſtay like the Waves of the Sea; Confuſion maketh them deſire Order, and when they have it, they like it not. They are light to believe, without Judgment, Reaſon, Diſcretion.* Plebi non judicium non veritas. *Tacit. The common People are devoid of Judgment and of Truth, Envious and Malicious, Enemies to good Men, contemners of Virtue, mutinous, deſiring nothing but Novelties and Changes, Seditious, Enemies to Peace and Quietneſs, always muttering and murmuring againſt the State, very unthankful towards their Benefactors, caring neither for the publick good, nor common honeſty, but for their private good only. They have nothing but a Mouth, they ſpeak all things, but know nothing; they look upon all things, but ſee nothing; they never know how to hold a Meaſure, nor to keep to an honeſt Mediocrity. The People are a Savage Beaſt, all that they think, is Vanity; all that they ſay, is falſe and erroneous; that they reprove, is good; that they approve, is naught; that which they praiſe, is infamous; that which they do and undertake, is folly. The vulgar Multitude is the Mother of Ignorance, Injuſtice, Inconſtancy, Idolatry, Vanity, which never yet could be pleaſed. Their Motto is* vox Populi vox Dei, *the Voice of the People is the Voice of God: but we may ſay,* vox Populi vox Stultorum, *the Voice of the People is the Voice of Fools. Petrarch* ſaith the ſame in Latin, *Quicquid vulgus cogitat, vanum eſt: quicquid loquitur, falſum eſt: quicquid improbat, bonum eſt: quicquid approbat, malum eſt: quicquid prædicat, infame eſt: quicquid agit, ſtultum eſt:* (*m*) Philoſophers therefore great Orators and great Artiſts have ſuſpected, that they have done or ſpoken ill, when they have had the acclamation and applauſe of the Multitude; and with ſome it is a Rule of Wiſdom, always to ſuſpect whatever pleaſeth and is approved by the People. But a better Rule is that of *Pythagoras,* (*n*) *to do always what we judge to be well-doing deſpiſing the diſreputation and applauſe of the People.*

> Ου γὰρ πλῆθος ἔχει συνετὴν κρίσιν οὔτε δικαίαν.
>
> *For the Multitude hath not an intelligent or juſt Judgment.*

Whence *Jo. Philoponus* (*o*) ſuppoſeth in vulgar Men *nequaquam mentem ſed veſtigium mentis,* not a Mind, but only a footſtep of Mind.

III. Much of truth there is in this diſparaging Character of the common People: but it ought to be underſtood with many and great abatements, elſe right is not done them. For,

(1.) Of the Vices of the common People none are ſo great, as that deadly Pride, which inſpir'd a late ſwaggering Philoſopher, when he wrote thus of the Platoniſts, (*p*) *Though they could artificially conform their Behaviour to the more refined and gentile ſort of Men, yet as for that ſavage Beaſt the popular Rout, they valued no more, to pleaſe them, than to gratifie Wolves or Tigres, for really Folly is ſo moulded into the Conſtitution of the common and mechanical ſort of Men, that that Philoſopher muſt be well nigh as abſurd as they, who ſuppoſeth them capable of Wiſdom, when they have ſcarce Wit or Judgment enough, to think a thought that is not inept and ridiculous. So that 'tis not poſſible for any Man who aſpireth to Wiſdom, to condeſcend to any compliance with their baſe and abſurd Humours; and therefore theſe Sons of Wiſdom were as regardleſs of them as of Apes and Baboons.* So the Grandio's of the Church of *Rome* vilifie the common People (although they are the People of Chriſt) they will not allow them, to read the Scriptures for this genuine Pontifician reaſon; *becauſe they are the Beaſt that may not touch the Mount.* The like contumelious uſage they have from thoſe puffy Magnifico's the Jewiſh Rabbins; for they ſay, (*q*) *The People of the Earth never come within ſight of the King's Palace; none of the People of the Earth is* חסיד *one of the Chaſidim or Saints. The People of the Earth do not live. An illegitimate Diſciple of a Wiſe Man is greater than a Prieſt, that is of the People of the Earth. To ſit in the Congregation of the People of the Earth, is one thing, that is deſtructive of the life of Man. A Companion of the Wiſe is of this Character; he doth not go and lodge with a Plebeian, nor entertain him as a Gueſt; a Diſciple of the Wiſe muſt make no Contracts with him; and though he ſeemeth to be pious, yet the Wiſe muſt not have his dwelling near him.* Six things the Rabbins ſay of the People of the Earth: *They are incapable of being Witneſſes, or receiving a Depoſition; they intruſt them not with a Secret; if they have loſt any thing, they cry it not; they do not walk with them, nor make them Tutors or Guardians:* (*r*) They call them accurſed and their Wives an abomination, and diſſwade from the marriage of their Daughters, becauſe he is curſed that lieth with any Beaſt, which is to be underſtood of their Daughters; they ſhall not riſe to life, except it be for the ſake of ſome learned Man; as if they have given a great Portion to a Daughter of his in Marriage, or have taken pains for his Subſiſtence, that he may have leiſure to follow the ſtudy of the Law; for this will be imputed to them, as if they had adher'd to the Divine Majeſty. (*s*) It is by Science and Intellectual Virtue that a Man becometh a Man; before he is furniſh'd with Science, he is like the Brutes; but Science advanceth him to be actually a Man, that was ſo before *in potentiâ* only, and in reſpect of his Capacity. Of the Gentiles they ſay, *the* Iſraelites *defile a Tent; but the* Gentiles *do not defile it: For this is the Law,* when a Man dieth, *Numb.* 19. 14. *you are called a Man and are a Man, but the Nations of the World are not called a Man.* Such idiotical Conceits are eminently Rabbinical, but not peculiarly ſo. For the Greek Philoſophers (thoſe intellectual gay Gallants) vilifie the *Barbarians,* much what at the ſame rate, that the Rabbins vilifie the Gentiles. They are repreſented by *Plato* as Enemies by Nature, and *Ariſtotle* ſaith, (*t*) the Greeks are born, to rule over the Barbarians. Their City (*Athens*) was ſo tranſcendent in Wiſdom and Eloquence, that the Name of a *Grecian* (*u*) μηκέτι τοῦ γένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας τεκμήριον, *was no more the Name of a Nation, but of an accompliſh'd Mind,* and ſignify'd the partakers of their Learning and Diſcipline rather than the Natives of their Country. But the Golden Graſhopper in their Hair was a Badge of their Nobleneſs in reſpect of their Country, and ſignify'd, that they were no Inmates, but αὐτόχθονες, originated from themſelves and their own Land; and that not only Arts, Learning and Philoſophy, (*w*) but the whole Race of Mankind were their derivatives, though (it ſhould ſeem) their Kindred with the Barbarians was worn out. It were happy, if this their *Mercury* could be well kill'd, that ſuch as derive their Wiſdom from the Greek Philoſophers, might not ſwell with their puffy Vanity, nor ſmell ſo rank of their faſtuous Arrogance; (*x*) τί γὰρ μέγα, εἰ Γαλιλαίους δέκα μία χεὶρ Ἑλληνικὴ κατειργάσατο; *for is it a great matter, if a gentile refin'd Grecanic Hand hath killed ten Galileans of the popular Rout?* Such was the Bravado of a Grecanic Sophi; which ſheweth, that next to the Men

---

(m) Gat. ſupr. p. 125.

(n) Ibid. p. 332.

(o) Ap. Joh. Bapt. Criſp. Quin. 1. p. 311.

(p) Sa. Parker Cenſure of the Plat. Philoſ. p. 34.

(q) Maimon. Mor. Nev. par. 2. c. 51. Buxt. Lex. Talm. col. 1526. Not. in Coſri p. 191, 192. Druſ. de 3. Sect. l. 2. c. 3. & p. 83. Verſ. in Maim. de fund. Leg. p. 71. Pocock. Not. Miſc. p. 351, &c. p. 394, &c.

(r) Druſ. in Joh. 7. 49.

(s) Maimon. ſupr. par. 3. c. 54. Pocock. port. Moſ. p. 96. 283.

(t) Grot. Not. in Matth. 5. 43.

(u) Iſocrat. Panegyr. p. 108. ed. Wolf.

(w) Laert. in proœm.

(x) Julian ap. Gr. Naz. or. 3. p.

Men of Phariſaical Sacroſanctity the Glorioſo's of profane Grecanic Wiſdom and Erudition are the greateſt Idioticks in Nature. But it is ſome ſlur to their Grecanic Glory (what *Origen* obſerveth) that their *Apollo* (y) gave his Oracles, not by a wiſe Man, not by a Man, not by a choice Virgin, but by a vulgar Plebeian Woman; (z) and the Authors of their *Eleuſinian Sacra* (the moſt illuſtrious amongſt the Greeks) were poor Country Swains; *Triptolemus a Neat-herd, Dyſaules a Goat-herd, Eubulus a Swine-herd, Eumolpus a Sheep-herd.*

(2.) In the whole compute of things the Schools of Philoſphers are of a blacker Character than the common People, whoſe greateſt Vices are far ſhort of the Greek Philoſophers, *Scepticiſm* and *Atheiſm.* For the common People are not to be perſwaded out of their Sences, nor to disbelieve the plain Notices of their Underſtandings, nor to ſay ſuch abſurd, inhumane and irreligious things, as ſome Philoſophers have ſaid (for nothing is ſo abſurd, which ſome Philoſophers have not ſaid:) But as God is the Founder, Preſerver, and Providential Governour of their Popular Societies (*a*) *calumna Populi:* So they are for a God, a Providence and a Religion. But as God is no Founder of the Philoſophers Schools, nor is his Providence charg'd with their Conſervation and Government: So (*b*) *multi philoſophorum religiones ſuſtulerunt*, the Philoſophers have been the Authors of ſeveral Sects, Schemes and Forms of Atheiſm (the *Anaximandrian*, the *Democritical* or *Atomical*, the *Hylozoick* or *Stratonical*, the *Pſeudoſtoical* or *Coſmo-plaſtick* Atheiſm,) and they have not been leſs unpopular than irreligious. For *Epicurus* was ſo unpopular (*c*) *that he would not have us to bring up Children, nor meddle with the Commonwealth.* The better ſort of Philoſophers that were no Atheiſts (*d*) were generally ſpeaking not better in their Religion and Lives than the common People; and the worſer ſort of Philoſophers far tranſcended their pitch of Impiety.

(3.) Before *Thales* began his Philoſophizing, the Greeks had their Popular Wiſdom of Morality, Laws and Politicks, (*e*) *and their Civil-popular Wiſdom made them wiſer than Scholaſticks.* (*f*) *Thales* (as *Plutarch* ſaith in the beginning of the Life of *Solon*) raiſed Wiſdom above Practice into Speculation: *But the other ſix wiſe Men were denominated wiſe from Civil Virtue.* Theſe with their Wiſdom may juſtly be denominated *common Popular*; for they were no Philoſophers, and the great Men of thoſe times follow'd the ſame Imployments with the common People) Shepherdizing, Husbandry, Mechanicks) they did their buſineſs with their own Hands (as the common People do) and thereby they got their living. *Varro* ſaith (*g*) *De Antiquis illuſtriſſimus quiſque paſtor erat, every illuſtrious Perſon of the Ancients was a Shepherd.* (*h*) *Ulyſſes* follow'd the Imployment of a Carpenter, his Father that of Agriculture (from the *res ruſtica* many great Families had their Names, *Fabii, Piſones, Lentuli, Cicerones, Bubulci, Bupecii, Juvenci, Porcii, Scrofæ* and many more) one of the Grecian wiſe Men *Pittacus* King of *Mitylene* (*i*) did the buſineſs of a *Miller*, and thence the Women ſang, Ἄλει μύλα, ἄλει, *grind Mill, grind; for* Pittacus *King of Great* Mitylene *grindeth.* In theſe ancient times (*k*) every Artificer σοφὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, *was called Wiſe* (as having the Wiſdom which his Art is) and every Mechanic Art was called a Wiſdom, Wiſdom being us'd to ſignifie Skill as *Exod.* 28. 3. *The Wiſe in Heart*, ſignifieth the Skilful, and *the Spirit of Wiſdom* is *Spiritus Peritiæ*, the Spirit of Skill. *Sapientiâ gubernator torquet navem haud valentiâ.* By Wiſdom the Pilot guideth his Ship, not by ſtrength. Σοφία ἐςὶν ἡ ἡνιοχεία, *the driving a Cart is a Wiſdom.* In this large ſenſe Wiſdom is us'd by *Crates* the Philoſopher and by *Homer* ἔθει ἀρχαίῳ, *after the manner of the ancient times, wherein every Artificer's Art was called Wiſdom*, as *Euſtathius* ſaith. So *Phidias* and *Polycletus* are called Wiſe by *Ariſtotle* (a wiſe Stone-cutter, a wiſe Statuary;) and *Plato* uſeth Wiſdom in a threefold Senſe. In the moſt ſtrict Senſe ἀντὶ τῆς τῶν νοητῶν ἐπιςήμης, *to ſignifie the Science of the Intelligibles*; in a leſs ſtrict Senſe ἀντὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας, *to ſignifie Philoſophy*; in a common and large Senſe ἀντὶ τῆς ἐμπειρίας, *for Skill or Expertneſs.* The common and Mechanical ſort of People therefore are not without their Wiſdom and their Wiſe-men, which they had in the elder times of *Greece* (and before the Greek Philoſophy was born) when they had alſo (*l*) the Wiſdom of the ancient Poets, which is common-popular (*m*) and ſuited to the reliſh of the common People. (*n*) *The Poet is indeed the right Popular Philoſopher.*

(4.) Amongſt the common People of *Greece* there are remarkable and celebrated Inſtances of Wiſdom; for ſuch is that of (*o*) *Aglaus Pſofidius* one of the common People of *Arcadia* (*Arcadum pauperimus*) who was pronounc'd by the Oracle, to be happier than *Gyges*; for in his extreme old Age he had never ſtirr'd beyond the bounds of his little Field, & *minimâ cupidine minimum in vita mali expertus eſt*, and by deſiring little of the World he felt little of the Evils of the World. (*p*) *Anacharſis* came into *Greece*, with deſign to find Inſtances of Wiſdom, but could find none in *Athens:* Whereupon he determin'd, to take a view of the Country of *Greece*, to ſee, if he could find any dwelling of Wiſdom there; and he found what he look'd for in a little obſcure Town called *Chenes.* For there he found one *Myſon*, *who knew nothing but rightly to govern his Family, rightly to till the Ground, to keep conjugal Chaſtity, and to educate his Children ingenuouſly.* The Scythian Philoſopher was ſatisfied herewith, and thought that he needed not, to ſeek for verboſe Wiſdom having found the real Works of it in one, in whom he much admir'd τὴν ἀφθονίαν τῶν ἔργων ϗ τὴν φειδὼ τῶν λόγων, *the abundance of his Works and the paucity of his Words.* If ſuch Inſtances of Wiſdom are found amongſt the common People, their diſparaging Character is not without a mixture of injurious extravagance. And as in the imperial Law it is counted Criminal (and will bear an Action) to ſpeak evil of any whole Nation: So it is alike Criminal without limitation or exception to ſpeak evil of the common People. In ſome of whom there are more than common Faculties, wherein they tranſcend many of thoſe, that conceit themſelves wiſe, becauſe they can decline *Nouns* and *Verbs*, and know *Genus* and *Species* (as *Arnobius* ſpeaketh) and many of thoſe that think themſelves wiſer than others, becauſe they are greater than they in external Circumſtances. For as one ingeniouſly ſpeaketh (*q*) *in natural Wit and Sagacity many times the Groom exceedeth the young Gallant, who aſſigneth*

(y) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. p. 335.

(z) *Marſham. can. chr.* p. 259. *ed. Lipſ.*

(a) *Hot. ting. diſſ. de nom. Dei or.* p. 276.

(b) *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 3.

(c) *Epictet. diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 23.

(d) *Lactant. l.* 3. *c.* 15.

(e) *Barclay Icon. Anim.* p. 122, 123.

(f) *Quid tandem Thales poſt innumeros conatus ſuos & indefeſſa ſtudia, propter quæ & rempublicam & maximos magiſtratus abjecit? Quid, inquam, jugiter ſcrutando invenit, quod eſſet hujus illuſtris machinæ quam cernimus, condignum fundamentum? Audi quàm celebris ſit excogitatio, Aqua eſt principium univerſorum.* Reuchlin. de verb. mirif. p. 35.

(g) *De R. R. c.* 1.

(h) *Tiraquell. de Nobil.* p 491, 492, 512.

(i) *Gat. in Ant.* p 4, 5.

(k) *Idem c. Pſychen.* p. 150, &c.

(l) *Euſeb. pr. ev. l.* 10. *c.* 4.

(m) *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 29

(n) *Sir Phil. Sidney Def. of Poeſy.* p. 499.

(o) *Plin. l* 7. *c.* 46. *Valer. Max. l.* 7. *c.* 1.

(p) *M Tyr. diſſ.* 15.

(q) *Dr. H. More Immort. of the Soul. l.* 3. *c.* 17.

him to keep his Dogs and Horſes. So *Naaman*'s Servant was wiſer than his Maſter. And as there is in ſeveral of the common People more than common Faculties, ſo there is in all of them that Faculty, which is moſt eminently in the mind of Man, and which is an eminent Endowment of their Minds, namely, a natural *juris prudentia* or *ſcientia juſti & æqui*, a Science of what is Juſt and Equal.

(5.) If the common People would recriminate, they might draw as bad a Character of any other ſort of Men, as their Adverſaries have drawn of them. For although there are many particular Perſons, that are of more than vulgar worth, yet we know not any order of Men, that conſidering the whole of it, is much better than they, but they that tranſcend them in worldly Reſpects, uſually tranſcend them in Vice and Wickedneſs. *Joſephus* ſaith; they that ſided with the *Sadducees* were only the rich and high Ones, they that ſided with the *Phariſees* were all the common People (the *Plebeians*) or as it is in *Gorionides* דלת העם τὸ λεπτὸν τοῦ λαοῦ, *the meaner ſort of People.* And which of theſe were the better (the more virtuouſly and religiouſly diſpos'd) whether the rich and high ones of the World, that were for the *Sadducees*, or the meaner and lower ſort of the People, that ſided with the *Phariſees?* (r) The *Phariſees* were ſevere in their Lives, they held the Immortality of the Soul, Rewards and Puniſhments in the Life to come, and it was by the (ſeeming) goodneſs of their Life and Doctrine, that they gained their great Authority with the common People. But the *Sadducees* becauſe they deny'd theſe great Fundamentals of Religion and Virtue, were therefore acceptable to the rich and great, and therefore they were odious and intolerable to the common People. Which ſheweth, that the vulgar are otherwiſe affected towards Religion and Virtue than the ſenſual and high minded Bravo's of the World, and that *Lactantius* rightly attributeth to them (s) *a plain and uncorrupt Judgment of Things.* The Imperial Lawyers that call them *Ignoble*, and contradiſtinguiſh them to their *Nobiles*, repreſent the generality of their *Nobiles* (agreeably to *Juvenal*) as made up of nothing but Vice and Title. (t) *Thoſe of them that are alien from prodigious Vices* profectò rari ſunt, *are rare Birds upon Earth*; whence they ſay with *Macrobius* Rara Nobilitas, *Nobility indeed is a great Rarity.* For *Maimonides* rightly maketh this the Character of the vulgar Men (u) the delights of *Ceres* and *Bacchus* and *Venus* are their End and Scope. Some have diſcours'd (w) *that the Vices of the common People are to be aſcrib'd to the high ones of the World. For ſeeing all imitate them and deſire to reſemble them, the common People had never defiled themſelves with ſo great and nefarious Wickedneſs, if they had not been incited to immenſe Luxury and Luſt by the Example of the Nobility. The Luſts of the Citizens which the great Men by the meer Example of their Continence ought to reſtrain and keep under, they increaſe and vehemently inflame by their filthineſs of Life.* Omne itaque malum videtur à ſummis viris tanquam à fonte defluere. *All evil therefore ſeemeth as from a Fountain to flow from the great Men.* More eſpecially from evil Princes, who are ſo generally evil, that one had reaſon to ſay (x) *omnes bonos principes uni annulo facillimè inſcribi poſſe*, all good Princes may very eaſily be written in one Ring.

(6.) At the riſe of Chriſtianity almoſt all the well diſpos'd Perſons (as to the Kingdom of God) were of the vulgar ſort. For all the ſecular wiſe Men and Philoſophers, the rich and great, οἱ χαριέστεροι, *the polite gentile People of the World* were then (a very few only excepted) the Blaſphemers and Perſecutors. 1 *Cor.* 1. 26, 27, 28. *Jam.* 2. 5, 6. *Matth.* 5. 3. and 11. 5. and 19. 24. From our Saviour's Sayings, (ſuch as *the poor have the Goſpel preach'd to them*) *Celſus* took occaſion for this Raillery. (y) *The Man of* Nazareth ἀντινομοθετεῖ, *giveth contrary Laws to thoſe that the God of the Jews gave by* Moſes, *as that there is no acceſs to the Father for one that is Rich, or ſeeketh Dignity, or affecteth Wiſdom or Glory.* (z) *The Chriſtians ſay, let none that is Learn'd come, none that is Wiſe, none that is Prudent (theſe things are accounted evil) but if any one is unlearned, if any one is unintelligent, if any one is a fool, let him come with great aſſurance.* (a) *The Syſtem of Chriſtians drive away every one that is Wiſe*, and call μόνους ἀνοήτους ϗ τοὺς ἀνδραποδώδεις, *only thoſe that are fools and of ſervile Condition.* (b) *They are Jugglers, that avoid* τοὺς χαριεστέρους *the Polite ſort of People as not being eaſily deceiv'd, but they inſnare* τοὺς ἀγροικοτέρους, *the more Ruſtick ſort.* Much of Calumny there is in this Raillery: But in thoſe times the Conteſt was (and is indeed in all times) between two kinds of Glories and Excellencies: The Chriſtian, ſaving and divine kind of Excellencies on the one hand; the ſecular and mundane kind of Excellencies on the other hand. The Chriſtians had the ſaving and Saint of God-kind of Excellencies, but the illuſtrious Pagans had the ſecular and mundane kind of Glories and Excellencies (the ſecular Learning, Philoſophy, Riches, Honours and Power) which marvellouſly mould the Minds of Men and indiſpoſe them for the Kingdom of God. They were therefore the floweſt to embrace Chriſtianity, inſomuch that in the time of the Emperor *Arcadius* (c) when the Senate-Houſe was burnt upon the account of *Chryſoſtom* and the Statues of *Jupiter* and *Minerva* (which ſtood before the Door) were preſerved intire in the Rubbiſh, οἱ χαριέστεροι, *the more Polite ſort of Men* (who were yet Pagans) conceiv'd good Hopes of the City. And *Fraiulus* a great Man under *Arcadius* profeſs'd in that Emperour's hearing. (d) *That he worſhipped the Gods according to the Cuſtom of his Country, and would not ſuffer himſelf in this, to be made obſequious to the multitude.* The vulgar multitude, although they were (e) the forward furious Perſecutors of Chriſtianity (it was the Popular cry *the Chriſtians to the Lions*) yet were much more forward Embracers of it than the politer ſort; (f) ſo that for one *Sergius* that believ'd the Goſpel, there were *multi piſcatores, multi ſellularii*, multitudes of Fiſher-men and of ſordid Artificers. (g) *Eccleſia Chriſti non de Academia & Lyceo, ſed de vili plebicula congregata eſt.* The Church of Chriſt was not gathered from the *Academy* and *Lyceum*, but from the vile vulgar ſort of People. Not but that the Church from the riſe of it had Men that were learned in Exotick Learning. *Origen* ſaith of his time (h) *the Churches now have* ὀλίγους σοφούς, *ſome that are learned in Exotick Learning, but theſe in compariſon of the multitudes are but a few.* (i) *Arnobius* glorieth in *Orators, Grammarians, Rhetoricians, Lawyers, Phyſicians, Philoſophers*, coming into to the Faith, but not many. The generality of the Chriſtians were in thoſe elder times of the vulgar ſort, whence they were reproach'd by the Pagans —— ſometimes for their want of (ſecular) Learning, for the Names that they gave them were (k) *Plebeii, indocti, imperiti, impoliti, rudes, agreſtes, ſtudiorum rudes, literarum profani,* (l) *bebetes, ſtolidi, fatui, obtuſi, bruti. Plebeians*, unlearned, unſkilful, unpolite, rude, ruſtick, unpoliſh'd with Study and Learning, dull, ſtolid, fooliſh, blockiſh, brutiſh. (m) *Deſpuitis nos ut rudes* (ſaith *Arnobius*) you diſdain us as rude; (n) *turba imperita, illiterata frequentia*, an illiterate Rabble they were called by *Aſclepeiades*. And (becauſe a great number of them were Women) their Religion was called (o) *muliebris & annilis ſuperſtitio*, a Womaniſh and Old-wife Superſtition. *Celſus* ſaith of them (p) *they endeavour to perſwade and are able to perſwade* μόνους τοὺς ἠλιθίους ϗ ἀγεννεῖς ϗ ἀναισθήτους, ϗ ἀνδράποδα, καὶ γύναια, καὶ παιδάρια, *only the ſtolid, the ignoble, the ſenſleſs, ſlaves, Women and Boyes.* —— ſometimes for their ſordid Occupations and Trades; ſuch as the *Romans* and *Lacedæmonians* would not practiſe themſelves, but devolv'd them upon Slaves and Foreigners. When therefore they called the Chriſtians *expertes artium niſi ſordidarum* ſuch as knew no Arts but thoſe that were ſordid (ſuch as were below an ingenuous Man) this was to call them (q) *the dregs of the vulgar.* (r) *None that is wiſe or learned* (ſaid they) *is made a Diſciple to Jeſus,* ἀλλ' ἢ ναῦται καὶ τελῶναι πονηρότατοι, *but ſuch as Mariners or improbous Publicans,* (s) the Teachers of the Church are *Lanarii, Sutores, Fullones*, Wooll-ſellers, Shooe-makers, Fullers. Agreeably to which Paganical reproaches *Theodoret* ſaith; *the Fountain of Widſom would have Chriſtianiz'd the Learned and Unlearned,* (t) *and Coblers, and Weavers, and Blackſmiths, and Servants, and Beggars, and Plowmen, and Wood-keepers, and Women, and ſuch as are neceſſitated to live by their Hand-labour.* Such were the conſtitutive Members of the Church of Chriſt, and ſuch as theſe only had (ordinarily) his Converſe, when he was here on Earth. —— ſometimes for their *Poverty*. For *Pauperes* (u) was one of the reproachful Names which the Pagans gave the Chriſtians. (w) *Plerique pauperes dicimur* (ſaith the Apologiſt) *the moſt of us are called poor People.* And this ſeemeth to be *Origen*'s meaning, when he ſaith (x) *the unbelieving Jews call thoſe that believe in Chriſt Ebionæi, that is poor People.* The Chriſtians ſo called themſelves; for *Pius* I. Biſhop of *Rome* in an Epiſtle to *Juſtus Viennenſis* ſaith of his Clergy, *ſalutat te ſenatus pauperum*, the Senate of the Poor ſalute thee. And *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome* (y) in his Epiſtle to *Fabius* reckoneth up in his Church more than Fifteen Hundred Widows, impotent and poor People. The Chriſtians were not aſham'd of their Poverty, which they look'd upon as of Affinity with Sanctity; for which reaſon the *Arabians* are not aſham'd of the Poverty of their great Prophet *Muhammed* (z) they willingly acknowledge it. And the Hebrew Book *Coſri* obſerveth (a) that the Chriſtians do not glory in Kings, potent Hero's and the Rich, but in thoſe Men that follow'd Jeſus, who were exiles and obſcure. They glory of their Poverty and their vulgar Plebeian Quality (calling them (b) *ruſticanos & piſcatores noſtros*, our Ruſticks and Fiſhermen) and this their vulgar Quality is by them that write in defence of the Chriſtian Religion, alledg'd as an Argument of their virtuous Diſpoſition; which Argument would ſignifie nothing, if the vulgar ſort was univerſally ſo vile and bad, as their diſparaging Character ſpeaketh them. (c) *It is manifeſt, that rude and illiterate Men are for the moſt part candid, veracious and uncrafty; but they that by learning and experience are become more skilful, exceed others in craft and ſubtilty.* Poverty was look'd upon as of Affinity with Sanctity by that Council of *Carthage*, which made a Canon, that the poor and the aged of the Church ſhould be honoured above the reſt.

(r) *Joſeph. Antiq. l.* 18. *c.* 2.

(s) *Vulgus cui ſimplex incorruptumque judicium eſt.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 20.

(t) *Tiraquell. de Nobil.* p. 526.

(u) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. c. 8.

(w) *Oſor. de Nobil Civil. l.* 1. p. 286.

(x) *Ap. Grot. Not. in Matth.* 20. 25.

(y) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. p. 343.

(z) *Ibid. l.* 3. p. 137.

(a) *Ibid.* p. 121.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 6. p. 284.

(c) *Zoſim. Hiſt.* p. 328.

(d) Ὅτι σέβοιτο ϗ τιμῴη θεοὺς κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, ϗ οὐκ ἀνέξεται κατὰ τοῦτο τοῖς ἀπὸ πλήθους ἀκολουθῆσαι. *Ibid.* p. 321.

(e) *Nec ulli magis depoſtulatores Chriſtianorum quàm vulgus.* Tertull. Apol. c. 32, 50.

(f) *Grot. Not. in* 1 *Cor.* 1. 26.

(g) *S. Hieron. in l.* 3. *com. ad Galat. Proæm.*

(h) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. p. 285.

(i) *Adv Gent. l.* 2. p. 44. *Balduin. Proleg. in Min. Fel.*

(7.) In all the great and general concerns of Mankind the common People have the greateſt concern, and ought (ſo far as impartial Goodneſs and Juſtice alloweth) to be of greateſt regard, as being οἱ πολλοί, (the many) the far greateſt part of Mankind, and not only our Fellow-citizens and Fellow-members (to which all Fellow-members ought to be Auxiliaries) but the far greateſt part of the publick (of which every particular Man is a Member, a part of that whole;) their Good therefore is the great Good (*commune multitudinis bonum*) to which every Man ought to be faithfully ſubſervient with all his Gifts and Abilities, his Wiſdom and Power. (d) *Celſus thinketh it not fit to diſcourſe with them, that he calleth Ruſticks, impure, irrational, ſeditious: Whereas he ought as a lover of Mankind to help the Ruſticks. For Beneficence is not ſo narrow, as to be with-held from Brute-animals, much leſs from the more ruſtick ſort of Men. But our Creator hath made us communicative to all Men. We ought therefore to diſcourſe with the Ruſticks, and (according to our Power) make them more urbane; with the impure; and (ſo far as we can) make them more pure; with thoſe that act without Reaſon and have diſtemper'd Souls, that they may not act without Reaſon, nor be diſeaſed in Soul.* If they are incapable of any great Improvements of their Reaſon, if as *Clemens* ſometimes ſaith (e *the vulgar cannot be Philoſophous*, yet they are capable of that which is infinitely better, of divine Grace and Love, and if they can Love as they ought, they can be Holy and Happy (f) *Good Women had the firſt Fruits of the Apparition of our raiſed Saviour. For their forward Love and the Paſſion of their Religion made greater haſt, to entertain a Grace, and was a greater endearment of their Perſons to our Lord than a more ſober reſerved and leſs active Spirit.* (g) *It was a Saying of* Ægidius, *that an old and ſimple Woman, if ſhe loveth Jeſus, may be greater than Brother* Bonaventure. The common People are capable of the beſt and greateſt things, and their Saviour had the greateſt regard for the Soul-intereſts of (h) *that multitude of Mankind, whom he came to deliver from the Domination of evil Demons.* So in Matters of Civil Government the Welfare of the common People ought to be of greateſt regard, if impartial Goodneſs and Juſtice did not require, that a due difference be made between the more and leſs excellent and uſeful Citizens; otherwiſe without any needful limitation we might argue both touching their Secular and Soul-intereſts. *The good of two is twice as good as the good of one; the good of three is thrice as good as the good of one; the*

(k) *Min. Fel.* p. 123, 112, 32, 11.

(l) *Arnob. ſupr. l.* 1. p. 15.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 3. p. 109.

(n) *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 31.

(o) *Ibid.* p. 71.

(p) *Orig. ſupr. l.* 3. p. 137.

(q) *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 33.

(r) *Orig. Philoc.* p. 48.

(s) *Herald. in Arnob.* p. 139.

(t) Καὶ σκυτέας καὶ ὑφάντας, καὶ χαλκοτύπους, καὶ οἰκέτας, καὶ προσαίτας καὶ γηπόνους, καὶ ἀλσοκόμους, καὶ γυναῖκας, καὶ ἐκ χειρῶν βιοτεύειν ἠναγκασμένας. Θεραπ. *Ser.* 8. & 5.

(u) *Min. Fel.* p. 122.

(w) *Ibid.* p. 335.

(x) *C. Celſ. l.* 2. p. 56.

(y) *Euſeb. H. Eccl. l.* 6. c. 43.

(z) *Hotting. H. O. l.* 1. c. 4. p. 136. ed. 1.

(a) *P.* 69, 298.

(b) *S. Hieron. ſupr.*

(c) *Conſtat enim rudes & indoctos homines, fere candidos eſſe eoſdem, veraces & incallidos; qui verò doctrina & uſu rerum peritiores extiterint, vafriciè eos, verſutiaque præſtare.* Huet. Dem. Ev. prop. 9. c. 147. S. 4.

(d) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 410.

(e) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 408.

(f) *Bp. Taylor great Exempl.* p. 537. *ed. an.* 1667.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 68.

(h) *Iſta hominum multitudo, propter quos à dæmonum dominatu liberandos Chriſtus advenit.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 27.

good of many thouſands is many thouſand times as good as the good of one. The dignity of their Nature alſo, their Relation to God, their near Cognation to us, their needfulneſs and uſefulneſs to all other Ranks and Orders of Men and to our ſelves alſo (for it is not ingenuous, to throw Dirt upon them that make us clean and fine) rendreth the common People of great regard. And it ought to be a matter of great regard, not to make Diſcriminations of Perſons from worldly Reſpects, which are not agreeable to Chriſtianity. (*i*) *Chriſtianus nec in pauperem ſuperbit.* A Chriſtian is not proud no not toward a poor Man.

(8.) The common People Chriſtianiz'd although they may be little ſet by in the World, yet it is they that do Buſineſs. *Sergunt indocti & rapiunt Cœlum.* Their Holineſs is alſo their Unvileneſs, thereby they are of (*k*) τὸ θεῖον γένος, *the divine Nation* (a Name that *Origen* giveth the Jews) which is alſo intituled (*l*) ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος, *the true Sacerdotal Generation,* the Holy Nation, the Royal Prieſthood. 1 *Pet* 2. 9. Although in reſpect of Externals they are no better than ſuch as *Sidonius Apollinaris* calleth (*m*) *bubſequas ruſticanos, ſubulcoſque roncantes, ruſtick Cow-herds and ſnorting Swine-herds,* yet upon their Converſion to God and Piety they become ἐξαίρετοι, *the eximious Perſons* (the elect of God) the truly Excellent and Honourable, of the divine Family and the holy City; their deadly foulneſs and ſordidneſs is waſh'd away, and they are dignify'd and ennobled in State and Relation, in Life and Nature, in Spirit and Practice, and in their Underſtandings alſo. (*n*) *For every where the Matters of our Faith are known, not only by them who are Teachers in the Church, but even of Coblers, Smiths and Weavers, and all kind of Artificers, and of Women alſo which get their living by their Hands, yea Maid-ſervants and Waiting-women: Husbandmen alſo do very well know them, and Ditchers, and Neat-herds and Wood-ſetters.* Plato maketh God unknowable by the vulgar eſpecially: (*o*) But *Deum quilibet opifex Chriſtianus & invenit & oſtendit.* Every Chriſtian Mechanick hath found and ſheweth God. Of this divine Knowledge of Chriſtian Mechanicks learned Men have ſpoken ſuch great things, as may be of bad Conſequence in an Age, that aboundeth with extravagant Preachers; yet I will mention ſome of their Sayings, becauſe they illuſtrate the Holy Popular Nature of the Holy Scriptures. (*p*) *The Shreds and Clouts of Taylors and Coblers may have greater Knowledge perhaps and better Judgment of the Senſe of Scriptures, than the Scarlet Gowns of learneder Men than they.* (*q*) *More of true Wiſdom is often found in one mean Man, not taught by ſubtle* Scotus *but by a Divine Spirit, than in many formal Theologers turgid with their* Ariſtotle. Ruſticks may excell Scholaſticks, Plebeians ſurmount the Doctors in the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, which is a far greater ennoblement to the Mind than Exotick Learning. (*r*) And as *Socrates, Zamolxis, Epictetus* (one of which was originally but a Statuary, the other but Servants) were in ſome ſort ennobled by Philoſophy: So the Holy Scriptures do not find Men truly learn'd, rich, free and noble, but they make them ſuch, learn'd in their want of Exotick Learning, rich in Poverty, free in Servitude, and noble in their Ignobleneſs.

SECTION III.

The Holy Scriptures are Popular in the large Signification.

I. THE Holy Scriptures are *the Book of Religion* (not as appropriated to Schools of Philoſophy, or Theology, but) *as it is of univerſal Concernment.* They are therefore in our Idea denominated *Popular* in a large Senſe, not meerly with reſpect to the common People, but to the community of Mankind (to all the People) and conſequently to the common People as well as others. *They are the Book of Religion*; for although many think (*s*) that there are ſeveral Hiſtorical Narrations in Scripture (as Genealogies, the Names and Places of Families) which are of no utility; and the Rabbins have a Tradition, that ungodly *Manaſſes* ſitting with his light Companions made it his Buſineſs to Cavil at theſe Narrations; yet *Maimonides* diſputeth, that they are all uſeful, either to confirm ſome fundamental Article of Faith, or for the Correction and Emendation of ſome Immorality, that Iniquity and Violence may not Reign. The Holy Scriptures are Holy in the deſign of the whole of them, which is Sanctity, *that we Sin not.* (*t*) *Religio quæ nullam patitur impietatem,* Religion that can endure no Impiety. As they tranſcend ſecular Philoſophy, becauſe they teach Piety and true Religion: So they are diſſonant from Human Arts and Sciences, becauſe the only Learning and Science which they teach, is Religion. (*u*) *Non philoſophiam, non eloquentiam, non reliquas artes & diſciplinas mundo præclaras atque admirabiles: Unica hic eſt ars, noſſe & colere Deum.* They teach not Philoſophy, not Eloquence, nor the other Arts and Diſciplines, which are excellent and admirable in the Eye of the World: The only Art here is, to know and Worſhip God, which is the true Popular Philoſophy. (*w*) *Here is the only true Ethicks; for a good and honeſt Life cannot be formed otherwiſe than by loving thoſe things that ought to be loved, that is, God and our Neighbour.* The Holy Scriptures therefore are Popular in the ſame ſenſe that the Popular Philoſophy is ſo, which is Exoterical to the Schools, and is Popular with Reſpect to the univerſality of Mankind. (*x*) *Paucorum eſt, ut literati ſint, omnium ut boni.* All muſt not be Learn'd, but all muſt be Virtuous and Religious. It is indiſpenſably requir'd of every Soul of Man, and is the Wiſdom and Goodneſs, the End and Uſe of Man. *Rom.* 2. 8. *Mic.* 6. 8. *Job* 28. 28. Piety and Religion is ſo far of univerſal Concernment, that Human Society cannot tolerably well ſubſiſt without ſome Religion. It is ſo far of univerſal Concernment, the World of Mankind concern themſelves about it, and are at variance about Religion. And it is ſo far of univerſal Concernment, it is the proper work and buſineſs of Man, and (in reſpect of Virtue, Duty and Intereſt) is indiſpenſably the chief buſineſs of every Man. (*y*) Γεώργει φαμὲν, εἰ γεωργὸς εἶ. *Art thou a Plowman? Till the Ground*; for that is thine Office and Buſineſs. Art thou a Man? Know God and be Religious; for that is thine Office and thy

---

(i) *Tertul. Apol. c.* 46.

(k) *Orig. Philocal. p.* 11.

(l) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 344.

(m) *L.* 1. *Ep.* 6.

(n) *Theodoret.* Θεραπ. *Ser.* 5. *ſub. fin.*

(o) *Tertul. Apol. c.* 46.

(p) *Dr. Raynolds Confer. with Hart c.* 2. *Div.* 2. *p.* 63.

(q) *Non raro plus veræ germanæque ſapientiæ deprehendas in uno quopiam homuncione, juxta vulgi opinionem, idiota ſimplici ac ſemifatuo: Cujus mentem non ſubtilis (ut vocant) Scotus, ſed cœleſtis ille Chriſti docuit ſpiritus, quàm in multis Theologorum tragicis perſonis, ac terque quaterque magiſtris noſtris, Ariſtotele ſuo turgidis, magiſtralium definitionum, concluſionum & propoſitionum turba differtis.* Eraſm. Adag. ſilen. Alcibiad.

(r) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 207, 208.

(s) *Maim. Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. *c.* 50.

(t) *S. Hilar. c. Conſtant.*

(u) *Vir. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 14. *c.* 28.

(w) *Hic Ethica, quoniam vita bona & honeſta non aliunde formatur, quàm cùm ea quæ diligenda ſunt, diliguntur, hoc eſt, Deus & proximus.* S. Aug. Ep. 3.

(x) *Petrarch.*

(y) *Clem.* Προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 47.

thy general Calling. No Man can ſay, It is *alienum opus*, another Man's Buſineſs, that appertaineth not to me; for it is indiſpenſably the chief Buſineſs and Concernment of every one, that is of the Name of Man. The Book of Piety and true Religion therefore muſt be popular with reſpect to the univerſality of Mankind. And ſo the Holy Writers of it *were Debters both to the Greeks and Barbarians, to the Wiſe and to the Unwiſe.* They have written the Scriptures (z) *& plebi & peritis* (as one ſpeaketh) both to the Common People and to the Learned. So S. *Auſtin* ſaith of the Scripture, (*a*) *ad cor loquitur indoctorum atque doctorum*, it ſpeaketh to the Heart both of the Unlearned and the Learned. And ſo the Jews ſay, (*b*) *Lex doctis & imperitis data, proinde omnium captui accommodata eſt.* The Law is given both to the Learned and Unlearned, and therefore is adapted to the Capacity of all. If the Scriptures were Scholaſtical and Unpopular, they could not be virtuouſly and duely Popular.

II. The Holy Scriptures are the Book of *the Chriſtian Religion* (not as appropriated to Schools of Philoſophy or Theology, but) *as it is of univerſal concernment.* They are therefore in a large ſenſe *Popular* (not Scholaſtical and Unpopular) of the ſame Character with our Religion, which (as to the deſign of it) maketh no difference between High and Low, Rich and Poor, Learned and Unlearned, Jew and Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, Bond or Free, but is open and acceſſible to all, as the Air, the Earth and Sea, and the Lights of Heaven are. (*c*) *The Goſpel receiveth all Men, Noble and Ignoble, Rich and Poor, old and young Women; for every one that is ſaveable, is with God equal.* (*d*) *Let the Learned, the Wiſe, the Prudent come, whoſoever is willing: but nevertheleſs, let the Rude, the Unintelligent, the Unlearned and Fooliſh come. Theſe the Word calleth, to make them better, and thoſe alſo which much excel theſe; for Chriſt is the Saviour of all Men, eſpecially of them that believe, whether the Intelligent or leſs Intelligent; and he is with the Father the Propitiation for our Sins, and not for ours only, but for the Sins of the whole World.* (*e*) *The Word of God our Lord Jeſus Chriſt ſeeing he came to all, and gathering both the Learned and Unlearned alike, he gave the Precepts of Salvation to every Sex and every Age.* (*f*) *Not from this or that place only, but from every place out of all Nations the Goſpel vehemently inviteth Men, to come to the God of all, to make haſt, and with all readineſs of Mind to receive the offered Gift, both Greeks and Barbarians, Men, Women and Younglings, Poor and Rich, Wiſe and Unlearned, not deſpiſing to call even thoſe of the ſervile ſort. For the Parent of them having made one Subſtance and Nature of all, did agreeably vouchſafe unto all this one and equal Munificence, the Gift of the knowledge and friendſhip of himſelf, to all that will obey and readily receive the Grace. This Friendſhip with his Father the Word of Chriſt came, to Evangelize to the whole World; for God was reconciling himſelf to the World, not imputing their Treſpaſſes; and came and preached Peace to them that were afar off and to them that were nigh. Theſe things of old the inſpir'd Sons of the Hebrews predicted to the whole World: One of them proclaimeth, All the ends of the World ſhall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the Kindreds of the Nations ſhall worſhip before him.* The Church of the Jews was the Incloſure of one Nation; but the Chriſtian Church of right extendeth to all Nations, the Goſpel was commanded to be preach'd to Families, Cities, Nations univerſally (that all might be Chriſtianiz'd and ſaved) and the effect of it was (*g*) *the changing Nations, altering the Perſwaſions of People, the deſtroying the Cuſtoms of their Foreſathers, radicated Cuſtom, the tyranny of Pleaſure, the force of Wickedneſs, their Altars, their Temples, their Images, their Myſteries, their impure Feſtivals and Sacrifices. It withdrew them from Senſuality, and drew them to faſting; it withdrew them from the love of Riches, and drew them to Poverty; it withdrew them from Laſciviouſneſs, and drew them to Chaſtity; it withdrew them from Paſſion, and drew them to Meekneſs; it withdrew them from Envy, and drew them to Benevolence; it withdrew them from the broad way, and drew them to the ſtrait and narrow way.* (*h*) *Mechanic Idiots and Plowmen and ſuch as tended Cattle, were taught to philoſophize, they philoſophiz'd touching Immortality, the Reſurrection and the ineffable Goods.* Such is the Philoſophy of the Chriſtian Religion, not that of the Schools, of which *Plato* (whom *Syneſius* followeth) was ſo highly conceited, (*i*) that he doth not allow τῷ μὴ φιλοσοφήσαντι, *to any that is not of the Secular Philoſophic Learning, to aſcend into the Society of the Gods.* But in Chriſtianity things are quite otherwiſe; for the meaneſt of the Vulgar may be truly holy, and without any Secular Philoſophic Learning may be a Chriſtian Philoſopher. (*k*) *Whoſo leadeth a Life according to our Inſtitution, although it be a Barbarian, or a Greek, or a Servant, or an old Man, or a Boy, or a Woman, may philoſophize without Secular Learning.*

III. The Holy Scriptures are *the Book of the Law*, which ſpeaketh them in a large ſenſe *Popular* (not Scholaſtical and Unpopular;) for the Old Teſtament is the Law of the Jews, and the New Teſtament is the Chriſtian's Law. (*l*) The whole Old Teſtament is called by the Jews תורה, which ſignifieth *a Law, Doctrine or Inſtitution. The Pſalms are the Law and the Prophets are the Law* (ſay they;) and in this large Senſe they underſtand *the Law* (though more eſpecially they mean thereby the Pentateuch) when they make their magnificent Elogies of it: with them *the Law* and *the Word of the Lord* (their whole Scripture) are identical Expreſſions, as they are in the Prophet, *Iſa.* 2. 3. ſo in ſome of our Saviour's Sayings *the Law* ſignifieth the whole Old Teſtament; as *Joh.* 10. 34. *Is it not written in your Law* (the Book of Pſalms) *I ſaid, ye are Gods?* Joh. 15. 25. *This cometh to paſs, that the Word might be fulfilled, that is written in their Law* (in the Book of Pſalms) *they hated me without a cauſe.* So the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 14. 21. *In the Law* (in the Prophet *Iſa* 28. 11.) *it is written, with Men of other Tongues and other Lips will I ſpeak unto this People.* Theſe things Expoſitors have obſerv'd, who have alſo given this good reaſon, why the whole Old Teſtament is called The Law of the Jews, becauſe in ſome degree the whole of it was Law to their Belief and Practice. The Old Teſtament conſiſteth of very various parts; for part of it is *Doctrinal* (Doctrinal-preceptive) part of it is *Devotional*, part of it is *Hiſtorical*, part of it is *Prophetical*; and

Dr. H. op. vol. 584. Ep. 3.

Menaſſ. Iſr. Qu. Deuter. 35.

(c) *Evangelium omnes homi- recipit, nobiles & ignobiles, ites & pauperes, anus & a- leſcentulas, quando omnis apud m, qui ſalvari poteſt, æqua- eſt.* Elmenhorſt. in Min. l. p. 122.

(d) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 141.

(e) *Cùm Dei ſermo dominus ſter Jeſus Chriſtus omnibus ve- it, & colligens doctos pariter indoctos, omni ſexui atque æ- ti præcepta ſalutis edidit.* S. ypr. de orat. dom.

) *Euſeb. . Ev. l.* 1. 1.

(g) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *p.* 634, 635.

(h) *Ibid. p.* 590, 623.

(i) *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. p.* 135. *Niceph. in Syneſ. p.* 382.

(k) Ἔξεστι γὰρ τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς πολιτευομένῳ, καὶ ἄνευ γραμμάτων φιλοσοφεῖν, κἂν βάρβαρος ᾖ κἂν Ἕλλην, κἂν δοῦλος, κἂν γέρων, κἂν παιδίον, κἂν γυνή. *Clem. Str. l.* 4. *p. m.* 362.

(l) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 982. *Cartwr. Mellif. Hebr. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *Pool's Syn. in Joh.* 10. 34.

and every one of theſe parts of their Holy Scripture was in ſome degree Law to their Belief and Practice, although only the *Doctrinal* part was plenarily and eminently ſo. For ſo the Law of God often ſignifieth only the comprehenſion of his *Statutes* or *Judgments* (his Appointments) and the *Law* and the *Teſtimony* (what he hath teſtify'd of his Will) are ſynonymous Expreſſions, *Iſa.* 8. 20. So the *Doctrinal-preceptive* part of the New Teſtament is moſt properly and eminently the Chriſtians Law; but the whole New Teſtament is alſo (in greater or leſſer degree) the Chriſtians Law for the ſame reaſon, that the whole Old Teſtament is the Law of the Jews. So in Chriſtian Writers (*m*) *Lex nova*, *Teſtamentum novum*, are terms ſynonymous; and conſequently all the Books of the New Teſtament are as much the *New Law* as they are *the New Teſtament*, and as much as they are the Goſpel; for the Goſpel is the New Law, *Rom.* 3. 27. and 8. 2. *Gal.* 6. 2. As therefore all the Books of the Jews Sacred Code were the Jews Law; ſo all the Books of the Chriſtians Sacred Code (peculiarly ſuch) are the Chriſtians Law: and both theſe Sacred Codes are rightly called by *Origen* (*n*) νόμος τῆς γραφῆς, *the Law of Scripture*; for they are not a meer Directory, but they are the Canon, (*o*) *a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners that is of Divine Authority*, and therefore is no leſs than Law. Accordingly they are read to the People as Law, agreeably to what *Varro* ſaith, (*p*) *Leges quia lectæ & ad populum, quas obſervet*, *Laws are ſo called, becauſe they are read to the People, that they may obſerve them.* If the Holy Scriptures are Law, they muſt be in a large ſenſe Popular (not Scholaſtical and Unpopular) for Law is in a large ſenſe *Popular Science*. The Jews Law was Popular and Exoterical in reſpect of a great Community of People of all ſorts, and therefore of the ſame nature with that which is Popular and Exoterical in reſpect of the Community of Mankind. The Chriſtian Law is manifeſtly popular in reſpect of the Community of Mankind; for it is the *Univerſal Law*. The Chriſtian Religion is the Kingdom of God, of which all Mankind are of right and by obligation Subjects; they are indiſpenſably oblig'd, actually to become ſuch, if the Goſpel is publiſh'd to them. The Law of this Kingdom therefore (the Scriptures of the New Teſtament) muſt be in a large ſenſe Popular, not Scholaſtical and Unpopular.

IV. The Holy Scriptures are *the Book of the Law of Life* (and in ſuch Senſe *the Book of Life*) which is wholly *for the Life of the People*, and therefore is alien from Scholaſtick and Unpopular Notion, which is alien from Life. They are *Popular* in a large Senſe (not Scholaſtick and Unpopular) as are *Ethicks* and *Politicks*, and as is the Civil Law of every Commonwealth, which is a Law of Life. (*q*) *It is manifeſt, that Laws are made for the welfare of the Citizens, the ſafety of Civil Societies, and for the quiet and happy Life of Men.* The Imperial Lawyers ſay, that by the Law (*r*) *benè beatéque vivimus*, we live well and happily. The publick Felicity which the Law deſigneth, is called by *Proclus*, (*s*) *Civitatis vita*, the Life of the City. And *Democritus* ſaid of Polity and Government, that theſe are the things that afford (*t*) μεγάλα καλὰ εἰς τὸν βίον, *great Goods unto Life.* So the deſign of the Law of the Jews was, that they ſhould live well and happily; the preceptive part of it oblig'd them to the Duties of Life (*vitæ officia*) and to the obſervance of it a long and happy Life was promis'd, *Lev.* 18. 5. *Ye ſhall keep my Statutes and my Judgments; which if a Man do, he ſhall live in them.* The Son of *Sirach* therefore calleth it *the Law of Life* (Eccluſ. 17. 11.) and ſo the Jews account it; for they call the Wood, to which the Volumn of their Law is annex'd, (*u*) *Etſchajim*, the Wood of Life; and they ſuppoſe, that ſuch as touch it ſhall live the longer for it. To which groſs Superſtition they add this groſs Profaneneſs: (*w*) If a Gentile ſetteth upon an Iſraelite, and will compel him, to tranſgreſs one of the Precepts of the Law, or elſe he will kill him; then let him violate that Precept, and not ſuffer himſelf to be kill'd; *as it is ſaid of the Precepts, if a Man do them, let him live by them.* If they ſay to a Man, commit Idolatry, and you ſhall not be killed, let him commit it, and not offer himſelf to death; for the Law is, *he ſhall live in them, not let him die.* Amongſt the Jews (who are generally no great Friends to Martyrdom) there are diverſities of Opinion touching theſe Matters; ſome are more ſtrict, others are of great Latitude: Of which latter ſort *Maimonides* was one, not only in his Opinion, but in Practice; (*x*) for being in *Spain* and under ſome force, he profeſs'd the *Muhammedan* Religion, till he got an opportunity to remove himſelf into *Egypt*, and then he reſum'd his profeſſion of Judaiſm, which he had never relinquiſh'd in his Heart. But the Jews have as much reaſon, to fear Death from the Violation of their Law, as to hope for Life from the obſervance of it; for it ſetteth before them *Life* and *Death*, which are the premiant and penal Sanction of their Law agreeably to the Laws of other Commonwealths, which are not made, to inſtitute Mankind in ſubtil Sciences, but for civil Life. So the Jews Law was made, to be the Inſtrument of governing a People, *whoſe Buſineſs is Life*, by the hopes and fears of Life and Death, *Ezek.* 18. 19, 20. Nor was their Learning that of the Schools of Philoſophers, but *their Law*, from the Promiſes whereof and their obſervance of it they hop'd not only for a temporal, but an eternal happy Life. And they might have entertain'd ſuch hopes from the temporal Promiſes of it, if they had been ſuch, as the truly pious Men of the Old Teſtament-times were, who look'd upon the temporal Promiſes (wherewith the Old Teſtament aboundeth) not only as typical, but as ſymbolical, not only as prefiguring what would be promis'd in the New Teſtament-times, but as ſignifying thoſe Spiritual and Divine Felicities, which in all times (by virtue of the New Teſtament) were the Portion of the Righteous, *Heb.* 11. 16. But thoſe temporal Promiſes muſt be conſider'd as temporal Promiſes, and becauſe ſo conſider'd they are ſtill in force *ſo far as is needful*, therefore the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament in conjunction are *the Law of Life, Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal*, *and Godlineſs hath promiſe of the Life that now is, and of that which is to come*, 1 Tim. 4. 8. *She is a Tree of Life, her Fruit is Life, and in the path-way thereof there is no Death* (no deadly Calamity) *Pſal.* 34. 12. *Prov.* 3. 2, 18. and 12. 28. Some Branches of Piety more eſpecially have the Promiſe of this Life, as Obedience to Parents, *Eph.* 6. 2. (*y*) And the *Arabians* have a true Proverb (one of the Emperour *Ali's*) *Eleemoſyna vitam auget*, *Alms increaſe Life.*

The

(m) *Tertull. c. Jud. c.* 6. *S. Aug. de Sp. & lit. c.* 18.

(n) *Philocal. c.* 9.

(o) *Biſhop Taylor Duct. dub. B.* 2. *c.* 3. *r.* 14. *p.* 359, *&c.*

(p) *L.* 5.

(q) *Conſtat profectò ad ſalutem civium, civitatumque incolumitatem vitamque hominum & quietam & beatam conditas eſſe leges.* Cic. de Leg. l. 2.

(r) *Ferdin. ABDvenſ. or. pro jur. civ. p.* 11.

(s) *De An. & Dæm. p.* 235.

(t) *Plut. Non poſſe vivi ſuav. p.* 1100.

(u) Buxt. *Syn. Jud.* c. 22. p. 424

(w) Vor *in Maim. de fund. Leg.* p. *&c.* D *Voſſ. in Maimon. Idol.* c. S. 8. Sel *de Syned.* l. 3. p. 24

(x) P *Spec.* p. 357.

(y) L'E *per.* Sa *Kimch.* 229.

The Holy Scriptures are *the Law of Life*, as they are the Law of Piety and true Religion, and they are eminently ſo, as they are the Law of the Chriſtian Religion; for *Theologia vita eſt, non ſcientia:* The Chriſtian Theology is a Life, not lifeleſs Science. *Chriſtus magiſter eſt vitæ, non ſcholæ*, Chriſt is the Maſter of Life, not of School-learning. (z) *He is the Teacher of our Life making alive the People of his Believers. His Baptiſm is the vital Laver, the Death of Crimes, the Life of Virtues, and thereby we are animated into a new Life. He was given unto Men for Life, and ſent to make us alive. His Precepts are the Vital Commandments, Vital Remedies. We are reſtor'd to immortality by the vivification of his Blood.* By *Ignatius* as cited by *Athanaſius*, (*a*) Chriſt is intituled ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, *true Life* (to us) *in Death.* The Food that he is (*b*) *ſalutem largitur & vitam*, giveth Life and Salvation, and by the Bread that he is *miſeræ mortis vincuntur exitia, the deadly deſtruction of miſerable Death is vanquiſh'd.* He is Vital Food and his Benefits are *vitalia beneficia* (Vital Benefits) whence *Epiphanius* hath made this compariſon between *Eve* and the Bl. Virgin, (*c*) *as one is called the Mother of all living, ſo by the other* αὐτὴ ἡ ζωὴ τῷ κόσμῳ γεγέννηται, *Life it ſelf was brought into the World.* His Inſtitution is (*d*) *pulchrum vivendi genus*, an excellent and amiable ſort of living, his Followers ſay of themſelves *non eloquimur magna ſed vivimus*, we do not ſpeak but live great things; when aſſembled they call themſelves (*e*) *populum circumvitalem*, a vital ſort of People aſſembled about their Lord; every one of them is by his Profeſſion (*f*) *vitæ negotiator*, a Trafficker for Life; and the Life that he aſpireth after, and expecteth from his Saviour (the Guardian of the Tree of Life) will not be (*g*) *vita mortalis, ſed plenè certéque vitalis*, a mortal Life, but plenarily and certainly vital. From the Tenour of the Chriſtian Religion therefore and of the Old Teſtament the Holy Scriptures appear, to be of this Character, *The Law of Life, the Book of Life.* Whence we may infer,

(1.) The Motives of Religion are accommodate to Nature, *the natural Inclination of Mankind*, and are ſuited to work upon the deepeſt Principle thereof; for ſuch is *the love of Life*, and Religion according to their own Heart's deſire bringeth them Life. The Lawyers ſay, (*h*) *Life is the beginning and foundation of all Law* (Right and Due) *and therefore dearer and more belov'd than all things elſe. Whence it is not abſurd, that the Lives of Men ſhould be preferr'd before other things whatſoever. If the Fame of a Man is to be ſpared, much more his Life; and he is thought excuſable, that would have his Life ſav'd any how.* Some ſay that (*i*) τὸ εἶναι, or *being*, is πάντων ἐρώτων πρεσβύτατος καὶ μέγιστος, *the oldeſt and greateſt of all our Loves*: but by our Being they mean our Life; for (*k*) *vivere in viventibus eſt eſſe*, in living Beings to live is to be, Life is their Eſſence; for a dead Man is not a Man.

(2.) The great Excellency and Utility, Importance and Neceſſity that Religion is of (becauſe it is Life;) for all Things and Perſons have their worth and weight, their value and importance from Life. The Soul is ennobled, becauſe it is (*l*) *ſcintilla vitæ*, the Vital Subſtance, and *Jupiter* was highly ennobled and celebrated by the Heathen as being the Author of their Life, Livelyhood and the ſafety of their Lives.

> *Jupiter qui genus colis aliſque hominum, per quem*
> *vivimus*
> *Vitale ævum: quem penes ſpes, vitæque ſunt*
> *hominum omnium.*
>
> Plautus pænul. Act. 5. ſc. 3.

They worſhipp'd their Gods and Demons, becauſe they ſuppos'd, (*m*) that they receiv'd from them *the things needful for Life*; deify'd the things profitable and the perſons highly beneficial to Life, thoſe eſpecially that found out (*n*) τὰ πρὸς τὴν βιωτικὴν χρείαν, *the Neceſſaries for Life.* So *Ariſtæus* was deify'd, (*o*) as βιοσώος, *a ſaver of Life*, and many others as *præclarè de vita meriti*, having highly deſerv'd of Life. So Men and Families become Noble by thoſe Virtues, (*p*) which are *vitæ communi ſalutares*, beneficial to common Life; and *Pliny* (who was little better than an Atheiſt) hath a favourable Opinion of the belief of a Providence, becauſe it is of utility to Humane Life. *Deos agere curam rerum humanarum credi, ex uſu vitæ eſt.* (*q*) The Imperial Lawyers diſpute for precedence of the Phyſicians, but this Objection lieth againſt them, the Phyſicians Profeſſion and Buſineſs is to ſave Life. To which the others anſwer, that their Profeſſion and Buſineſs alſo is converſant about that which is in juſt computation *the Life of Men* (their Subſtance and Livelyhood which hath in Greek the ſame Names with Life βίος and βίοτος) whence it hath its Ennoblement. Life ennobleth Arts and Sciences; for that is valuable Learning (*r*) which is μάθημα βιωφελές, *Learning profitable for Life*; but that can be of no great value, which is like (*s*) Nobility that feedeth no body, or like the Hay (*t*) *which one gave* Socrates *to eat inſtead of Bread*, or which (as *Agellius* complaineth of the common Arts and Sciences) hath *nihil ſolidum ad rationem vitæ pertinens*, nothing ſolid pertaining to the Buſineſs of Life. So *Socrates* is celebrated for this Saying, *Cæleſtia nihil ad benè vivendum pertinere*, the deep Speculation of the Celeſtial Bodies is not of importance, as not being of importance to good Life. But therefore true Religion is of greateſt importance, becauſe it is *Life and Vitality, the Diſcipline of Life, the Law of Life, the Way of Life, the Settlement of Life, the State of Life, the Concern of it is Life* (ubi de religione, ibi de vita agitur) *it ſaveth from the deadly Evils, is a vivification of the Dead, raiſeth them to Life, and in the final iſſue of things crowneth them with Life and Immortality.* Life is the Way (the Life of Duty and Virtue) and Life is the End (Life which is the Benefit and Reward;) it inſtituteth Aliens to the Holy-virtuous Life, *the Life of God* and the Life of Bleſſedneſs, that far tranſcendeth Humane Life (which is (*u*) Life-no-life, lifeleſs Life) to which no Learning can inſtitute Men but only *the Book of Life*, that is alſo as the Element of Life, whereby alone Life is conſerv'd, as an Hebrew Doctor ſaith, (*w*) *The Sons of Men are compar'd to the Fiſhes of the Sea; for as Fiſhes brought upon the Land die preſently, ſo do Men, when they ſeparate themſelves from the Words and Precepts of the Law.*

(3.) Philoſophers and Theologers may be diſtributed into the *Vitaliſts* and the *Sophiſts*; for they are fitly called *the Sophiſts*, that ſubſtitute

---

(z) *Doctor vitæ noſtræ vivificans credentium populum. lavacrum vitale. mors criminum, vita virtutum. in novam vitam animati. Hominibus ad vitam datus. vivificandis nobis. mandata vitalia. remedia vitalia. Sanguinis ſui vivificatione.* S. Cypr. de op. & Eleemoſ. Ep. 73. Ep. 2. de Idol. van. & ad Demetr. Ep. 25. de Lapſis.

(a) *Lib. de Synod. p.* 510. *Com.*

(b) *Jul. Firmic. de err. prof. rel. p.* 36, 38.

(c) *Hær.* 78. *S.* 18.

(d) *Min. Fel. p.* 312.

(e) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 12. *c.* 14. *S.* 2.

(f) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 46.

(g) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 19. *c.* 17.

(h) *Vita eſt initium & fundamentum omnis juris, & proinde omnibus aliis charius & antiquius. unde non abſurdum eſt, animas hominum quibuſcunque rebus præferri. Et cujus famæ, ejus vitæ multò magis parcendum eſt. Sed & ignoſcitur ei, qui ſanguinem ſuum qualiter qualiter redemptum voluit.* Zouch. Elem. Juriſprudent par. 2. S. 2.

(i) *Plut. Non poſſe vivi ſuav. p.* 1104.

(k) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 4. *Art.* 7. *S.* 1.

(l) *Tertull. de An. c.* 23.

(m) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 399.

(n) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 22. *Min. Fel. p.* 162.

(o) *Huet. Dem. Ev. pr.* 4. *S.* 17.

(p) *Oſor. de Nobil. civ. l.* 1. *p.* 294.

(q) *Tiraquell. de Nobil. p.* 412, &c.

(r) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 10. *c.* 4.

(s) *Tiraq. ſupr. p* 41.

(t) *Plut. adv. Colot. p.* 1108.

(u) *Plut. de Conſ. ad Apol. p.* 120. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 12. *c.* 20.

(w) *R. Samuel ap. Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 94.

Notion and falſe Philoſophy inſtead of Life: Such as *Maimonides*, who (in conſort with ſeveral Platoniſts) deriveth the moral Evils of Men from their Terreſtrial Matter as ſuch; and this is one of his Maxims, (*x*) *The Sins and Vices of Men have their origin, not from the Form, but from the Matter*; (*y*) whereas it is not the Matter, but the Evil Life that is in the Matter, that is (in part) the origin of the Sins of Men. There is in Man a Vital Carnality and Wickedneſs, which can be no more a Privation, than the Diſeaſes of the Body are Privations; yet without any diſtinction or limitation of Senſe the Scholaſtick Theologers ſay, (*z*) *nulla vitiis ſubſtantia, nulla vita*, Vitioſities have no Subſtance, no Vitality. They ſay alſo, (*a*) *that our conjunction with God is by Apprehenſion and* (ſpeculative) *Intellection*; (*b*) *that the Life of God is pure Intellect, that is He, and He is that*; as *Ariſtotle* is known to ſay, (*c*) *that the Life of God and his Beatitude is Theoretical.* (*d*) It is uſually ſaid in the Schools of Philoſophers, *He that liveth according to Sence, liveth a brutal Life: He that ordereth his Life according to the practical Intellect, liveth an Humane Life; but he that liveth according to the Theoretick Intellect, liveth a Divine Life.* So the *Alexandrian Cyril* and *Julian* his Adverſary agree, (*e*) *that the Felicity of Men principally conſiſteth* ἐν θεωρίᾳ τῶν ὄντων, *in the contemplation of Beings.* So Knowledge and to be in perpetual contemplation, is with *Clemens* (*f*) τελειότατον ἀγαθῶν, *the moſt perfect Good*; his Gnoſtick doth not deſire it, becauſe he would be ſaved, but counteth Knowledge ſufficient, and referreth his all to it. *Origen* by the Bread of Life which the Saints ſhall eat in the World to come, underſtandeth (*g*) *the Bread of Wiſdom, the Knowledge of the Truth and of the Cauſes of Things*; and by the Water of Life which according to the Doctrine of Jeſus they ſhall drink in that World, he underſtandeth (*h*) ποταμοὺς τῶν θεωρημάτων, *Rivers of Theorems*; agreeably to the Hebrew Book *Coſri*, which by *the Sabbath of Reſt and the Angelical World* underſtandeth, (*i*) *the exercitation of the Intellect, a ceaſing from Bodily Works that the Intellect may be perfected.* So *Aquinas* ſuppoſeth, (*k*) that the Nature, Life and Beatitude of God conſiſteth in *Intellection*, and following *Ariſtotle* he placeth the Eſſence of our Beatitude in Contemplation, as ſome others place our future Beatitude (*l*) *in the knowledge of the Univerſality of Beings*; ſo making an Heaven not ſo agreeable to any as to *Ariſtotle's Intelligences* (*m*) that are wholly intent upon Contemplation (and circumvolving the Spheres) an Heaven much more fit for Sophiſts than for the Saints of God; for Knowledge and Contemplation (ſo called in Philoſophy) are no peculiarities of the Saints of God, nor their kind of Goods and Excellencies, but the mean and humane, the common and external kind of Goods, ſuperficial and dilute, comparatively of ſmall concernment (in order to a bleſſed Life) that make none truly good, holy and happy, nor recommend them to God, nor ſave them from being vile and miſerable; and theſe common Goods may be no Goods at all, but common Miſchiefs to our ſelves and to the World. *Porphyry* therefore hath a mean eſteem of (*n*) πᾶν μάθημα, μαθημάτων πλῆθος, τὰ ἔξωθεν μαθήματα, *all Learning, the multitude of Learnings, the the external Learnings* (as he calleth them) the Collection of them being inſufficient, to make the poſſeſſour of them happy; and not only ſo, but he reckoneth the Learning of his Platonic Intelligibles (the things that truly are) ineffectual, ἐὰν μὴ προσῇ ϗ ἡ κατ' αὐτὰ φυσίωσις ϗ ζωή, *if there be not a conformation of our Nature and Life to them*; for this he accounteth the final Good, τὸ ζῆν κατὰ νοῦν, *the Platonic Intellectual Life.* Becauſe he depreciateth Learning in compariſon of Life, he is ſo far a Vitaliſt; but becauſe the Life which he magnifieth, is the Myſtic-metaphyſical and Platonic-ſcholaſtical kind of Life, he is no genuine Vitaliſt (but in the main a Sophiſt) not knowing that which is Life as to God and the Soul, and which is our true Nobilitation, Perfection and Felicity.

(4.) The genuine Chriſtians are neceſſarily and peculiarly *the Holy Vitaliſts*; for their Religion is peculiarly vital, *the Religion of Vital Sanctity, of the Vital People, and which is their Vivification, the Law of the Spirit of Life.* (*o*) The Jews call the Chriſtians *Dead*, and themſelves they call אומת החיה *the People of Life*; but Spiritual Life is peculiarly the Chriſtians Character, their conſtitutive form and eſſence, and ſpecific difference, whereby they are diſtinguiſh'd from all other Religioniſts, who are devoid of the ſence and ſavour of Life, of an holy vital Nature, and holy vital Operations, (of real living Righteouſneſs) who proceed not beyond an outſide Civility, or dead Morality, or external Ceremony, or a Soul-leſs Piety and God-ſervice, that is but a dead external-formal Buſineſs. To theſe lifeleſs and ſuperficial, ſuch ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Religioniſts the Spiritual-vital kind of Religioniſts are contradiſtinguiſh'd; and ſuch are Chriſt's Religioniſts: for *if any Man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, he is none of his.* Living Chriſtianity is the only genuine and ſaving Chriſtianity: if there be no Life in us, there is no Life for us.

(5.) The Scriptures are manifeſtly *popular*, becauſe they never ſpeak of Life in the peculiar ſenſe of Scholaſticks and Metaphyſicians, but always ſymbolize with the People. Theſe that are called by *Ariſtotle* οἱ πρακτικοί, *the practic ſort of Men*, are alſo denominated οἱ βιωτικοί, *ſuch as are converſant about and intent upon* τὰ βιωτικά, *the things of Life and Livelyhood.* Their Imployment and Concern is not about Chips of Entity and jejune Theory, but ſavoury Vitality and the Goods of Life, which are called their οὐσία or *Subſtance*; with theſe *Vitaliſts* the Scriptures always ſymbolize, when they ſpeak of *Life*; they mean by it *real Vitality*, not meer Notion. This they never call Life, and therefore never ſpeak in the Senſe of the Schools of Chriſtendom, who call ſpeculative Intellection and meer Notion *Life*; nor in the Senſe of the Platonic Scholaſticks, who call Intellect and Intellection *the firſt and moſt perfect Life.* Theſe in words agree with the Scriptures, (*p*) θέμενοι τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν ἐν ζωῇ, *placing Happineſs in Life:* but their Senſe is extremely diſſonant from the Scriptures; for they mean by Life *the Platonic intellectual form of Life.* This cannot be the Senſe of the Scriptures (what they mean by Life) becauſe it is peculiarly Scholaſtical and Unpopular; therefore nothing that is Unpopular and peculiarly Scholaſtical can be the Senſe of the Scriptures.

SECTION IV.

The Holy Scriptures are Popular as being Holy-popular.

I. They are *Holy-popular*; for they are *Litera Eccleſiaſtica*, the Book of the Church or People of God and of the Matters of their Learning.

(x) *Mor. Nev. par.* 3. c. 8.

(y) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 14. *c.* 3.

(z) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 4. *S.* 7. & *c.* 5. *S.* 5.

(a) *Maimon. ſupr. par.* 3. *c.* 8. &c. 51.

(b) *Coſri, p.* 365.

(c) *Ethic. l.* 10. *c.* 8.

(d) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 3. *c.* 42.

(e) *L.* 3. *p.* 84. & *l.* 5. *p.* 171.

(f) *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 478. & *l.* 4. *p.* 385. & *l.* 1.

(g) Περὶ ἀρχ. *l.* 2. *c.* 12.

(h) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 289.

(i) *P.* 337.

(k) 1. *qu.* 18. *art.* 3. *qu.* 26. *art.* 2. 12*æ*. *qu.* 3. *art* 4, 5.

(l) *White Stat. mor. p.* 52.

(m) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 41.

(n) *De Abſt. l.* 1. *S.* 29.

(o) *Coſri, p.* 108.

(p) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 4. *c.* 3.

Learning. *Inter ſacras literas & profanas*, Between the Books of ſacred and profane Learning, there is this difference; the latter are τὰ ἔξω μαθήματα, *the Learnings without the Church:* But the ſacred Books are (*q*) *proprius Theſaurus*, the proper Treaſure of the People of God. *He ſheweth his word unto Jacob, his Statutes and his Judgments unto Iſrael, he hath not dealt ſo with any Nation.* Pſal. 147. 19, 20. *What advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there of Circumciſion? Much every way: Chiefly becauſe that unto them were committed the Oracles of God.* Rom. 3. 1, 2. The Jews therefore are called by the *Muhammedans* (*r*) *Populus Libri*, as having a Book given them from Heaven containing their Religion. And by the ſame Name they call the Chriſtians, becauſe we have (*s*) *Scripturam divinam, qua Chriſtiana eruditio continetur*, the Divine Scripture which containeth the Chriſtian Learning. The Chriſtian Learning is the Chriſtian-popular (the Holy-popular) the Jews ſacred Books are the Holy-popular Books (the Books of the Holy People;) the Old and New Teſtament therefore are Books of *the Holy-popular Matters, the Holy-popular Religious Matters and Learning, not of Matters and Learning peculiarly Scholaſtical, Unholy and Unpopular.* In ancient times they were called (*t*) *Scriptura Populorum*, the Scripture or Book of the People; which Name denoteth this their true Nature and Character, *they are Popular as being Holy-popular.*

II. For the holy People are the People as contradiſtinct to the Philoſophic Scholaſticks and their Schools. Their Holineſs doth not hinder them from being the People but only from being the profane People. It maketh them the People in a magnifying ſenſe (that were no People) and they are moſt properly λαός. (*u*) For λαὸς, *populus ſanctus, cæteri* ἔθνη, *unde* ἐθνικός. *The Name People is moſt apply'd to the Holy People, others are the Nations, from whoſe Greek Name the name Ethnic is deriv'd.* Uſually in the Councils and in Eccleſiaſtic Writers (as contradiſtinct to their Paſtors) they are called *Plebs* (*w*) *Divina plebs, plebs Dei, ſancta plebs gentium*, the Divine People, the People of God, the holy People of the Gentiles. (*x*) Nothing is more uſual in S. *Cyprian* (eſpecially in his Epiſtles) whoſe definitive Notion of a particular Church is *Plebs paſtori ſuo adunata*, a People united to their Paſtor. The Biſhops Chairs are (in the Life of *Fulgentius*) called *Plebium Cathedræ* (the Chairs of the People) and the Rule was (*y*) *Epiſcopus deligatur plebe præſente, de univerſæ fraternitatis ſuffragio.* Let a Biſhop be choſen in the preſence of the People, by the Suffrage of the whole Fraternity. The *Fraternity*, the *Brethren*, the *Faithful*, the *Saints* and *Chriſtians*, the *Flock*, the *Sheep*, are the uſual Names of this *Plebs Chriſti*; and it is not unuſual, to call them (*z*) τὸ πλῆθος, *the multitude*, and ſometimes they are called *beata congregatio.* Uſually they are called *Eccleſia*, taking the word in a narrow contradiviſive Senſe, as the *Kingdom* is taken, when it is contradiſtinguiſhed to the King; and as a Family is taken, when it is contradiſtinguiſh'd to the Maſter of it. *He that propheſieth, edifieth the Church*, ſaith the Apoſtle. Which words are thus interpreted by the Commentaries under S. *Ambroſe*'s Name.

(q) *Beza in Rom.* 3. 1.

(r) *Hot-ting. H. O.* p. 220, 221 ed. 1.

(s) S. *Aug. de C. D. l.* 9. c. 5.

(t) S. *Hieron. in Pſal* 85.

(u) *Grot. Not. in Gen.* 31. 13.

(w) *Lactant. l* 4. *c.* 26. *J. Firmic. de error. prof. rel. p.* 44. *S. Ambroſ. com. in Luc.* 8.

(x) *Plebs Dominica, plebs Chriſti. plebs obſequens præceptis dominicis, convocata plebe, plebe præſente, plebis majeſtas, ad eam plebem cui præpoſitus ordinatur, apud plebem univerſam, ſine conſenſu plebis meæ.* Ep. 3, 5. 10, 11, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 40, 55, 68, 69. de op. & Eleemos.

(y) *Idem Ep.* 67.

(z) *Clem. Rom. Ep. p* 69. *Ignat. Ep. p.* 33.

Omnem plebem ædificat, he edifieth all the People. Ordinations were made by Men of great account τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, *the whole Church conſenting*, (*a*) ſaith *Clemens Romanus.* So *Regimen Eccleſiæ* ſignifieth the Government of the People, and Biſhops are ſaid (*b*) *Gubernare ſibi ſubjectas Eccleſias*, to Govern the Churches that are under them. Theſe are called (*c*) *cuncta Eccleſia*, all the Church, the Presbyters are called *Eccleſiæ Corona*, the Crown of the Church, the Deacons are alſo called (*d*) ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ὑπηρέται, *Miniſters of the Church of God.* So in Scripture the People as contradiſtinct to the Paſtors are called *the Church of God.* 1 *Tim.* 3. 5. *Act.* 20. 28. Uſually and from ancient times they are called the *Laity*; which is a Name diſlik'd by many, for although in it ſelf it only ſignifieth the People, yet it is us'd in a ſenſe of Diſparagement. But ſo they are called by *Tertullian*, (*e*) in ſome ancient Paſſages recorded by *Euſebius* and in S. *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles. In thoſe Epiſtles and generally in Eccleſiaſtic Writers their uſual and agreeable Name is *Populus.* (*f*) From flagitious Prieſts *populus ſeparetur*, let the People be ſeparated. Ordinations of Prieſts muſt be made *ſub populi aſſiſtentis conſcientia*, under the Conſcience of the People aſſiſting, (*g*) *Sacerdotes populo præſunt*, Prieſts preſide over the People, the Biſhop is ſaid (*h*) *toti præeſſe populo*, to preſide over the whole People, the Preſident having finiſh'd his Prayers and Thankſgivings at the Euchariſt (*i*) πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαός, *all the People preſent ſaith* Amen.

III. As the common People with their Civil Magiſtrates are one Civil People: So the Holy People with their Paſtors are one Eccleſiaſtical People, and both alike are *the People* contradiſtinct to the Philoſophic Scholaſticks and their Schools. The Paſtors are of the number of the Holy People in the more large comprehenſive Acceptation, the Paſtors and the People together are one *populus Sanctus, populus Chriſtianus, populus Dei, populus Chriſti*, conſider'd as in Conjunction they are *the Faithful, the Saints, the Brethren, the Fraternity*, and ſo conſider'd they are intituled (*k*) *Grex Chriſti*, the Flock of Chriſt, (*l*) *credentium populus*, the People of Believers, that make up one Church of God both particular and univerſal. The Paſtors of a Church are one with it, and as ſuch are Popular-kind of Men, not Civil-popular, but analogous to Civil-popular, as *Origen* compareth (*m*) *the Church of God at* Corinth, *with the ſecular People of* Corinth, *the Church of God at* Alexandria *with the ſecular People of* Alexandria, *the Senate of the Church* of God (the Eccleſiaſtical Senate) *with the ſecular Senate that is in each City, and the Archon of the Church of every City, with the ſecular Archon of the People of it.* So *Clemens* (*n*) compareth to Magiſtrates and thoſe that are under them the Presbyters and Deacons of the Church; becauſe the one hath τὴν βελτιωτικὴν εἰκόνα, *a reſemblance of the ſuperiour Miniſtration*, the other τὴν ὑπηρετικήν, *a reſemblance of the inferiour and ſervient.* The Paſtors of the Church are Holy-popular in the ſame reſpects and for the ſame reaſons, that ſecular Magiſtrates are Civil-popular, both are remote from the Schools of the Philoſophers, nor did thoſe Schools furniſh the Church with Paſtors or her Paſtors with Learning at the riſe of Chriſtianity. *Hegeſippus* in *Euſebius* relateth (*o*) that ſome of our Saviour's Kindred were brought before *Domitian* upon ſuſpicion of Danger to the Government

(a) P. 57.

(b) *Concil. Antioch. c.* 10.

(c) *Clem. conſtit. l.* 2. *c.* 18, 28.

(d) *Ignat. Ep. p.* 48.

(c) *Blondell. de jur. Pleb p.* 25, 26, 29. *S. Cypr. Ep.* 68.

(f) *Idem Ep.* 68.

(g) *Blondell. ſupr. p.* 5.

(h) *Clem. conſt. l.* 2. *c.* 26.

(i) *J. Mart. Apol.* 2. *p.* 29.

(k) *S. Cypr. de zel. & Liv.*

(l) *Idem de op. & Eleemoſ.*

(m) *C. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 129.

(n) *Strom. l.* 7. *p. m.* 01.

(o) *H. E. l.* 3. *c.* 20.

ment becauſe of their Title to the Kingdom (being of King *David*'s Poſterity :) But they relating, that the ſmall Eſtate which they had, lay in certain Grounds, which themſelves tilled, getting their living by their Labour and ſhewing the callouſneſs of their Hands contracted thereby they were diſmiſſed with Contempt, and hereupon they were choſen ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, *to be Paſtors of the Churches.* Such were the Church's Paſtors in thoſe times, ſhe was furniſh'd with them from the Country or from Trades, yet theſe were not unfurniſh'd with requiſite Abilities; for they were ſuch as were ſignified ὑπὸ τȣ͂ πνεύματ☉-, *by the Spirit* (p) ſaith *Clemens* (the Holy Ghoſt made them Overſeers) and by Inſpiration they had extraordinary Gifts (in the Spring-time of the Church ſhowers of ſupernatural Gifts deſcended upon her) *he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers.* Theſe Paſtors and Teachers were Holy-popular kind of Men, who were great ſtrangers to the Philoſophers Schools and their Scholaſtic Literature; and not only ſo, but *Tertullian* ſaith (q) *doctrinam ſecularis literaturæ ut ſtultitiæ apud Deum deputatam aſpernamur. We deſpiſe the ſecular Learning as fooliſhneſs with God.* The Philoſophers were the chief Enemies of the Chriſtian Religion, upon which account moſt of the Chriſtians had an exceſſive Averſation from Philoſophy. Which errour ſuch learned Men as *Clemens* and *Origen* endeavour'd to correct, but they did it by running into a contrary extreme. Yet from *Clemens* it appeareth, that the Church in his time without having any thing to do with the Schools of Philoſophers, made her Paſtors out of the Members of her own Body, having eſpecial regard to thoſe, that were of the choiceſt Parts and Abilities. (r) *The Paſtor taketh care of every one of his Sheep, but his care is chiefly intent upon thoſe,* ὅσοι διαπρεπεῖς τὰς φύσεις, *that are of excellent Ingeny, and are of Abilities to be profitable to the People,* ἔτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ ἡγεμονικοὶ ϗ παιδευτικοὶ, *theſe are thoſe that are fit to make Paſtors and Teachers of.* Which words probably relate to *Alexandria,* where greater and more early care was taken than by others (as appeareth from the School there) to have able Paſtors and more Philoſophical Men. But (as appeareth from ſeveral monſtrous Barbarities which they perpetrated) they leaſt deſerved the Name of Holy People there.

IV. The Church is of the ſame Names with *the Civil-popular Syſtems,* and is *a Popular Syſtem,* as they are. The word *Popular* commonly ſignifieth *Civil-popular,* as in good Authors *civilis & popularis religio* are terms coincident; and in *Cicero.* (s) *Man's Nature is ſo fram'd, as to have ſomething innate in it as it were Civil and Popular, which the Greeks call Political.* In ſuch ſenſe the Church is not Popular, but is that which is analogous thereto. *The Holy-popular City, Kingdom and Commonwealth.* (t) *Our holy Authors by the command and help of God have propagated and govern'd that People, that Commonwealth, ſuch a Kingdom, where that would be Sacrilege, which to the Pagans was Religion.* (u) *In the Church, that is, in the People, which he hath vouchſafed to adopt to himſelf.* (w) *Let us wait for the coming of Chriſt, to vindicate the People of his Church.* The Church is denominated *Populus* as being in her general Nature *a Popular Syſtem* or Society, which the Name of a *Republick* alſo ſignifieth her to be; but with this Specific Difference, ſhe is *the Holy-popular Syſtem or Commonwealth.* A Kingdom ſhe is alſo in her general Nature, as being a great Body of People viſibly profeſſing in common Subjection to a common Sovereign Power lodg'd in a ſingle Perſon. And as Civil-popular Kingdoms conſiſt of leſſer particular Syſtems called *Corporations:* So doth the Catholick Church conſiſt of particular Churches, which are viſible Societies (of Paſtors and their Flocks) which anſwer to thoſe *Corporations* in the Civil-popular Kingdoms. In a Civil-popular Kingdom (ſuch as the Kingdom of *England*) all the chief Magiſtrates of the ſeveral Corporations are not one common Authority over the whole of it, ſo as to make it one Corporation (one Ariſtocratical Corporation) beſides the Kingdom: Nor may we ſuppoſe, that in the Catholic Church there is of Right one common Authority of Eccleſiaſtic Men-governours over the whole of it, *making it one viſible Corporation ſo govern'd;* for this is not only a groundleſs and Unchriſtian Conceit, but it alſo ſpoileth the Analogy between the Church and the Civil-popular Kingdoms.

The Name of *a City* is alſo an eximious Name of the Church, which ſpeaketh her *a Popular* (the Holy-popular) *Syſtem.* For a City is not a rude Multitude, a Chaos or unformed Maſs, a rout and herd of People (x) nor a concourſe of Thieves, Robbers and Cut-throats (*Rome* ceaſed to be a City, when Senate, Laws and Magiſtrates had no longer place in it) but *an ordinate and regular Syſtem* (y) σύςημα ἱδρυμένον κατὰ νόμον διοικȣ́μενον, *a ſettled Syſtem adminiſtred according to Law.* As a City the Church is a *Popular Syſtem.* (z) *From people living together Cities have their Name; therefore the Name fitly denoteth particular Churches in the ſeveral parts of the World, which make one Catholick Church, wherein all the faithful live in Concord.* As a City the Church conſiſteth of Free-men (infranchis'd and endeniz'd) that are not of ſervile Condition, but in a bleſſed State of Freedom. And as a City ſhe is an Incloſure (not a wide open Common) as a Town-Corporate or priviledg'd Place; none can be her Members, but they that are admitted, nor can any be admitted (but remain Strangers and Foreigners) ſave only they that confederate and enter into Covenant. But this is that which diſcriminateth her and maketh her of a different kind from all other Cities and Societies, her Citizens are made ſuch by confederating with God *as Holy new Covenanters,* whereby they are in the State of Society with God and God with them *as a God and a People.* Other Cities (civil Societies) may be very religious, but they are not Societies made and conſtituted ſuch by Religion. They are but common civil Societies made ſuch by a civil Government, civil People, civil Pacts and Laws: But it is Religion or Society with God (his being to us a God in Covenant and our being to him a People in federal Society) that maketh this Society, to be a Society. That Party the

Party

(p) *Ap Euſeb. H. E. l.* 3 *c.* 23.

Eph 4.11, 12.

(q) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 137, 138.

(r) *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 499.

(s) *Sic hominis natura generata eſt, ut habeat quiddam innatum quaſi civile atque populare, quod Græci* πολιτικὸν *vocant.* De Fin. 5.

(t) *Sancti auctores noſtri eum populum, eam rempublicam, tale regnum, imperante & adjuvante Deo, propagaverunt atque rexerunt, ubi ſacrilegium eſſet, quod iſtis* (paganis) *religio fuit.* S. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 13. c. 15.

(u) *In Eccleſia, id eſt, in populo quem ſibi adoptare dignatus eſt.* S. Ambroſ. com. in Epheſ. 3.

(w) *Chriſtum expectemus Eccleſiæ ſuæ populum vindicaturum.* S. Cypr. de bon. Patient.

(x) *V. Cicer. Paradox. quod omnes ſtulti inſan.*

(y) S. *Baſil. in Pſal.* 45. *p.* 269.

(z) *Quia civitates à conventibus populis appellantur, non immeritò civitatum nomine vocantur ſunt Fidei eccleſiæ deſignatæ, quæ in ſingulis mundi partibus deſignatæ, unam catholicam faciunt, in qua fideles omnes de Deo rectè ſentientes concorditer vivunt.* Gregor. M. in Job 24. l. 16. c. 25.

Government here is *the Holy Sovereignty*; that Party the People here is the Liege-people of God (as ſuch;) the Pact between Prince and People here is the Holy Covenant; the Laws here are the Laws of Holineſs; the State of Citizenſhip here is the State of Holineſs; and conſequently the People here are peculiarly the People of God, *the People of his Holineſs*. This City therefore is *the City of God* (the divine imperial City) *the Holy and Holy-popular kind of Syſtem*, an Alien in the World and of an Alien Nature from the World. (a) *For this celeſtial City in its Peregrination on Earth calleth to it ſelf Citizens out of all Nations, and in all Languages collecteth a Stranger-ſociety.* (b) But whether we call this Society *the City of God* or his *Houſhold* and *Family* (which is another Name of the Church) it is the ſame thing. (c) Our Anceſtors (ſaith *Seneca*) *domum noſtram puſillam rempublicam eſſe judicarunt*, accounted our Houſhold a little Commonwealth. A Family is a leſſer City, and a City is but a greater Family, and both are alike Popular Syſtems. Some think, that the word *Eccleſia* hath ſomething Popular in it more than other Terms of Language. (d) *The word Eccleſia* (Church) *hath ſomething in it, that is Popular and apt to conciliate the Minds of Men. For it doth not denote an eximious Aſſembly conſiſting of the chief Men, as a Senate doth; but a promiſcuous multitude of any ſort of Men, not rude and confus'd, yet ſuch as no Man is excluded from becauſe of the lowneſs of his Condition.*

(a) *Hæc cæleſtis civitas dum peregrinatur in terra, ex omnibus gentibus cives evocat, atque in omnibus linguis peregrinam colligit ſocietatem.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 19. c. 17.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 15. *c.* 19.

(c) *Sen. Ep.* 43.

(d) *Habet ἐκκλησία neſcio quid populare, & quod hominum mentes conciliare aptum natum eſt. Denotat enim non cœtum eximium & ex optimatibus conflatum, ut eſt ſenatus & βȣλὴ, ſed quorumvis hominum promiſcuam multitudinem, non inconditam, ſanè, atque confuſaneam, ſed talem tamen ut nullus ab ea ob conditionis humilitatem excludatur.* Theſ. ſalmur. Par. 3. p. 404.

V. The Old *Iſrael* was *the Old Holy popular Syſtem correſpondent to the Civil-popular Syſtems*; and the New *Iſrael* is *the New Holy-popular Syſtem correſpondent to the Old* Iſrael. For the Commonwealth of Old *Iſrael* was founded and conſtituted as the Civil-popular Societies are, ſave only that there was this great point of difference between them (which is alſo a great point of difference between the Commonwealth of *Iſrael* and the Chriſtian Church) they took God for their King and their God, and God took them for his People, yet their Commonwealth was not *the Kingdom of God*; (e) as ſeveral of the beſt learned of the Fathers have obſerv'd, *that the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven* is not ſo much as once named in the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament. They had a particular reaſon to examine the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament touching this Name; for they were concern'd in the Controverſie of *Pelagius* (f) who in the *Dioſpolitan* Synod in *Palæſtine* was accus'd for aſſerting *that the Kingdom of Heaven is promis'd in the Old Teſtament.* He by a ſlight Allegation made a ſhift, to ſatisfie that Synod; but theſe Fathers were not ſo eaſily ſatiſfied; they ſuppos'd, that there was a material Errour in his Aſſertion, and therefore they continu'd, to inculcate (g) *reading the Law, reading the Prophets, reading the Pſalms, I never heard of the Kingdom of Heaven but in the Goſpel.* Which implieth, that the Commonwealth of Old *Iſrael was not the Kingdom of God, nor was it conſtituted a Kingdom by his being King thereof.* As when the Jews ſaid *Joh.* 19. 15. *We have no King but Cæſar*, they had a King, but ſo as to have no ſuch King, that conſtituted them a Kingdom: In like manner before *Iſrael* had a King to Reign over them, *the Lord their God was their King* (1 *Sam.* 12. 12.) but then they had a King, ſo as to have no ſuch King, that conſtituted them a Kingdom. In this reſpect and ſo far their Conſtitution was diſſonant from the Civil-popular Syſtems, which upon taking a ſingle Perſon for their King, and his taking them for his People, immediately become a Kingdom and his Kingdom. But they were a great People, a Nation and Commonwealth, as the Civil-popular Syſtems are; agreeably to them they had their Civil Government and Laws, Judges, Senates, Aſſemblies of the People, Judgments and Executions, Wars and Armies, Cities and Villages, Tribes and Tribute, their Prieſthood, Oracles, Inſtitutes of Religion (in abundance) and in proceſs of time they had their King and Kingdom *like to all the Nations round about them*: But ſo as to be the Holy-popular Commonwealth (h) *gens illa, illa civitas, illa reſpublica, illi Iſraelitæ, quibus credita ſunt eloquia Dei*, that Nation, that City, that Republick, thoſe Iſraelites, to whom were committed the Oracles of God.

(e) *Voſſ. Reſp. ad. Judic. Ravenſp.* c. 23.

(f) *Idem Hiſt. Pel. l.* 2. *Par.* 2. *Theſ.* 10.

(g) S. *Chryſoſt. ap. Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 20.

Deut. 17. 15.

(h) S. *Aug. de C. D. l.* 18. *c* 41.

The New *Iſrael* is an *Holy-popular Syſtem* correſpondent to Old *Iſrael*, which was a Type thereof. Whence in the New Teſtament (eſpecially in the *Apocalypſe*) the Affairs of the Chriſtian Church are ſpoken of under the Names and with Alluſion to ſuch Things and Perſons, as did of old concern *Iſrael* and the People of the Jews. And becauſe their holy Commonwealth was a Type of our Divine Republick, and alſo becauſe the Church of the Gentiles was to be ſuccedaneous to the rejected Jews, hence the Oeconomy and Government of the Chriſtian Church was ſo order'd as to be correſpondent (not to the Temple and the Hierarchy of Prieſts and Levites which was Ceremonial, but) to the Civil Government of that People, *ſo far as the Nature of the Goſpel would permit*. Accordingly, the Chriſtian Church hath the Names of the Twelve Tribes put upon it. *Apoc.* 7. Our Saviour founded it by Twelve Apoſtles, which anſwer to the Twelve Patriarchs (whence Old *Iſrael* deſcended) and to the Twelve φυλάρχαι, Princes of the Tribes preſerved in *David*'s time. 1 *Chron.* 28. 1. Theſe are ſaid (i) to have been next in Dignity to the King, and in publick Aſſemblies to have ſate about his Throne in Twelve Thrones or Chairs. But theſe Twelve Princes of the Twelve Tribes did not as a common Authority govern the whole Twelve Tribes (each govern'd apart (k) in his own Circuit;) nor did this their Government conſtitute Old *Iſrael* one Body Politick. The Correſpondence therefore of the Tvvelve Apoſtles to theſe Twelve Princes of the Tribes is deſtructive of that Pretenſion, which it is alledg'd to prove (l) namely, that the Tvvelve Apoſtles (and conſequently their Succeſſors) were ſet over the whole Catholick Church, to Govern the whole of it as one common Eccleſiaſtic Authority, ſo conſtituting it one viſible Corporation and Body Politic by this one Political Regiment thereof. But the Chriſtian Church knovveth no ſuch Body Politic nor Political Regiment; it muſt be govern'd by Parts, as the Tribes of *Iſrael* were govern'd by their ſeveral Princes and by their ſeveral *Sanhedrin* (or Senates) in their ſeveral Cities, to which *Sanhedrin* the Government of the Chriſtian Churches vvas conform'd. As that Apoſtolical Perſon *Clemens Romanus* intimateth,

(i) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 19. 28.

(k) *Dr. Hamm. on Matth.* 19. 28.

(l) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 1. *c.* 15.

(m) P. 54. mateth, when he ſaith (*m*) that the Apoſtles in their Travels conſtituted the firſt fruits of their Converts Biſhops and Deacons, ϗ τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς, *and this was no novel Inſtitution*, ἐκ γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγέγραπτο περὶ ἐπισκόπων ϗ διακόνων, *for in ancient times the Scripture ſpeaketh of Biſhops and Deacons*, and preſently he citeth *Iſa.* 60. 17. *I will make thy Rulers* (as the word in the Original ſignifieth) *Peace, and thine Exactours Righteouſneſs.* He maketh Biſhops Analogous to the Judges of the Jevviſh Conſiſtories, and the Deacons to the שוטרים *Exactours* or Serjeants that attended them. It is not probable, that the Apoſtles (being Jevvs) in ſettling Church-government receded from the laudable Cuſtoms of their Fore-fathers, or from that Precept of the Law *Deut.* 16. 18. *Judges and Officers ſhalt thou make thee in all thy Gates*, that is, in all thy Cities. For hovv like to this is S. *Paul*'s Order to *Titus, to ordain them Elders in every City?* They have the ſame Name πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders*; the ſame Office to govern God's *Iſrael*; thoſe made a Senate, Bench or Conſiſtory, and ſo did theſe, which is often called in *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles συνέδριον, *the Church's Sanhedrin.* Thoſe ſate in an Half-round vvith an Head over them (the ἀρχισυνάγωγος, Head of the Conſiſtory or Synogogue:) So did theſe, the Biſhop ſitting in a Chair more elevated than the reſt becauſe of the eminency of his place. Thoſe were made Judges or Rulers by Impoſition of Hands, whereby the *Schecinah* vvas ſuppos'd to reſt upon them (vvhence they did not uſe Impoſition of Hands out of the Land of *Canaan*, to vvhich Country they ſuppos'd the Schecinah confin'd:) So *Timothy* receiv'd the Holy Ghoſt by the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. In Scripture we never read of more than one Church in one City, and conſequently in Scripture-times there vvas but one Eccleſiaſtical Senate in one City; which may ſeem ſtrange conſidering the multitude of Believers, that then vvere in ſome populous Cities; and it is not eaſie to imagine any valuable Reaſon of it ſave this only. (*n*) *With the Jews it was a general rule, not to have two Senates in one City, to avoid diſſenſion; for it is ſaid* לא תתגודדו *non facietis diverſos cœtus, ye ſhall not divide your ſelves into diverſe Aſſemblies.* Thus far the Church appeareth, to be an Holy-popular Syſtem correſpondent to Old *Iſrael* in her external Polity. But the Nature of Chriſtianity neceſſitateth in ſome reſpects a Non-correſpondence between the Church and the Commonvvealth of *Iſrael.* For they dwelling in one Land might be govern'd by one Supreme Court (their Sanhedrin of Seventy Elders,) but Chriſtians not ſo, becauſe the Goſpel vvas to diſpread it ſelf over the vvhole Earth. Our Saviour therefore only choſe Seventy Diſciples and ſent them forth to Preach, but did not appoint them to be a Court vvith Authority over all Chriſtians (as the great Sanhedrin of *Iſrael* had Authority over all that People) nor is any mention made of thoſe Seventy in after-times, as if our Saviour by the choice of them intended only to ſignifie that his Church ſhould ſucceed in the place of Old *Iſrael* with great Correſpondence, yet not without neceſſary difference in her Polity. For as it was not his intention, that his Catholick Church ſhould live in one Land, under one ſecular Prince, and have but one Altar and one Tribe of *Levi*, becauſe ſuch vvas the State of things in Old *Iſrael:* So neither did he deſign to ſubject her to *one common Authority of Eccleſiaſtic Men-governours over the whole Church*, ſo making her one viſible Political Body beſides the Body of Chriſt.

(n) Maimon. de Idol. c. 12. S. 13.

VI. The Church is *the Holy Catholick Church*, vvhich ſhe could not be, if ſhe vvas not an Holy-popular Syſtem. For ſuch a Connexion there is betvveen *Holy* and *Popular*, that whatever is Unpopular and peculiarly Scholaſtical is Unholy. Things muſt be diſtributed into the Holy-popular kind of things, and the oppoſite Unholy, Unpopular and Scholaſtic. As the Scholaſtic *Life of God* (which is Intellection) is not the Holy-popular Life of God, but of oppoſite kind thereto, and therefore the Unholy. The Spirituality of the Metaphyſical Rabbins and Philoſophers (which is Metaphyſical Incorporeity) is not the Holy-popular kind of Spirituality, but the Unpopular, Scholaſtic and Unholy. So neither of thoſe Myſtic metaphyſical Deities τὸ ἓν, *the Henotety*, τὸ ὄν, *the Entity*, is the Holy-popular kind of God, but of oppoſite kind, Unpopular, Scholaſtical and Unholy. The Unpopular and Scholaſtic *Logos* (which is a Notion of the Mind, or Natural Reaſon or a Platonic Idea) is Unholy and of oppoſite kind to the Holy-popular kind of Logos, vvhich is *the Word of Life.* The Unpopular Scholaſtic Generation of the Son of God (which is *Dictio interna*) is ſo Unpopular and Scholaſtic, that it is of oppoſite kind both to the common Popular Generation and to the Holy-popular Generation (vvhich is Regeneration) and therefore is in more Senſes than one of kind both Unpopular and Unholy. And who needeth to be told, that a Platonic mundane Soul is of oppoſite kind to the Holy Spirit? Holineſs is the God-kind or the Saint of God-kind of Excellency, Sanctity is the Saint of God-kind (the Holy-popular kind) of thing; therefore the things that are of oppoſite kind to the Holy-popular, are neceſſarily the Unholy. They are τὰ ἔξω, *the things without* and on this ſide the Specific Comprehenſion of Sanctity. To introduce them therefore into the Scriptural Theology, what is it, but (*o*) to bring to and uſe *ſtrange Fire at the Altar of the Lord?* For the Scriptures are Holy, and they are Holy as being Holy-popular, and therefore what is Scholaſtical, Unpopular and Unholy, is alien from, and oppoſite to their Nature and Character. They are the Holy Books 1 *Maccab.* 12. 9. τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, *the Holy Scriptures.* 2 Tim. 3. 15. αἱ γραφαὶ ἅγιαι, *the Holy Writings.* Rom. 1. 2. So the Jevvs call them (*p*) כתבי הקדש *the Writings of Sanctity*, ספרי הקדש *the Books of Sanctity*, or the Holy Books, and ſometimes they call them the Sanctuary of the Lord. They are Holy, as that ſignifieth *Sacred*, having an inviolableneſs as being ſegregate and remote from what is common. And they are Holy, becauſe of their uncommon kind of Excellency and Unvileneſs, which is Sanctity or Holineſs. Their Holineſs is pure and perfect without any mixture of Sin and Evil. They are Holy by their Special Relation to God (being his Oracles) Holy in Reſpect of their efficient Cauſe (as iſſuing from the Holy Inſpiration) Holy in reſpect of their Effect (ſanctifying us) Holy in reſpect of their End and Deſign, which is to make us Holy. Their manner of treating of things is the Holy; and the Matters which they contain and treat of, are the Holy things, which are no other but the Holy-popular kind of things; for all things that the Scripture calleth *Holy*, are the

(o) Verulam. de Sap. vet. p. 105.

(p) Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p. 102.

Holy-popular kind of things; ſuch as *the Holy God, the holy One, the holy Name, the holy Nation, the holy People, the holy Seed, the holy Fleſh, the holy Place, the holy Temple, the holy Houſe, the holy Habitation, the holy Mountain, holy Ground, holy Prieſthood, holy Garments, holy Convocation, holy Camp, holy Land, holy Oyle, holy Sabbath, holy Crown, holy Coat, holy Inſtruments, holy Veſſels, holy Ark, holy Gifts, holy Offerings, holy Oracle, holy Solemnity, holy City, holy* Jeruſalem, *holy Day, holy Water, holy Flock, holy Chambers, holy Covenant, holy Angels, holy Child, holy Commandment, holy Men, holy Women, holy Brethren, holy Calling, holy Apoſtles and Prophets, holy Spirit, holy Converſation*, and ſuch more. If all things that in Scripture are denominated Holy, are the *Holy-popular* kind of things, the Scriptures themſelves that are ſo denominated, muſt be (according to our Idea) *Holy-popular*; and if they were not of this Character *The Holy-popular Book*, they could not be the Scriptures of the Church of God, which is *the Holy People or the Holy-popular Syſtem*; and is thus defin'd by *Clemens*, (q) ὁ ἐκ νόμυ ϗ ἐξ ἐθνῶν εἰς τὴν μίαν πίστιν συναγόμενος λαός, *A People gather'd out of Jews and Gentiles into one Faith.* (r) *Eccleſia populus eſt Chriſtianus, the Church is the Chriſtian People.* (s) *Chriſtians are a Nation brought forth in one Day (ſuch was their* ἀθρόα γένεσις, *Generation by heaps)* and they are *the Holy Nation*, which ſpeaketh them *the Holy-popular Syſtem.*

(q) *Strom. l. 6. init.*

(r) *Eraſm. Adag. Silen. Alcib.*

(s) *Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8.* p. 405.

CHAP. VI.

1. *The Holy Scriptures are Popular in reſpect of their Nature and Character, which ſpeaketh them wholly and intirely Popular, not at all Scholaſtical and Unpopular.* 2. *They are Popular in reſpect of their Theology.* 3. *They are Popular in reſpect of their Learning, Science and Wiſdom.* 4. *They are Popular in reſpect of their Notices of God.* 5. *They are Popular in reſpect of their Notices of the Viſible World.* 6. *They are Popular in reſpect of the Authors of them.* 7. *They are Popular as being without Art, the Arts and Terms of the Secular Learning.* 8. *They are Popular in reſpect of their final Object.* 9. *They are Popular in reſpect of Unexactneſs.* 10. *They are Popular in reſpect of their Figurations of Speech.* 11. *They are Popular in reſpect of their End and Effect.*

I. THE Holy Scriptures in our Idea are denominated *Popular* without limitation or reſtriction; to ſignifie, that they are intirely and in all reſpects *Popular* (not at all Scholaſtical and Unpopular) as being in reſpect of their Nature and Character *the Holy Popular Book.* If in ſeveral parts of them they are Scholaſtical to the utmoſt height and extremity (as the Scholaſtick Theology ſuppoſeth) or if in any conſiderable part of them they are Scholaſtical and Unpopular and as ſuch *Unholy*, they muſt be counted but in part *The Holy Popular Book*, and in part of a contrary Nature and Character: Whereas he that writeth a Book of *Civil-popular Learning*, muſt not make it at all Scholaſtical and Unpopular (for that is contrary to its Nature and Idea) the whole of it muſt be ſo far homogeneous, as to be *Civil-popular*; and there is the ſame reaſon for *the Holy-popular Book* as for a *Civil-popular:* or, as if one ſhould propoſe, to write an *Hebrew-popular Book*, and ſhould treat therein of the Literature proper to the Grecian Philoſophic Schools, this would be as great an Abſurdity, as to treat of Geometry in a Book of Grammar, or of the Modes of Courtſhip in a Book *de re Ruſticâ*; and it is alike incongruous, for the Holy-popular Book of the Scriptures to treat of the Matters of unholy and unpopular Scholaſtick Learning and Theology. (t) *Why do we commix things ſo repugnant? the Terrene and Celeſtial, the Vileſt and the Chiefeſt, things Pagan and Chriſtian, Profane and Sacred, why do we jumble them together?* (u) *You mix the things of Scholaſtick Darkneſs with the luminous divine things.* (w) *What affinity hath* Athens *with* Jeruſalem? *the Academy with the Church? our Inſtitution is of the Porch* (or School) *of* Solomon: *let them ſee to it, that have produc'd a Stoical, Platonical and Dialectical* (Scholaſtical) *Chriſtianiſm.* The Holy Scriptures are not like him, that in a *Carnaval-time* went dreſs'd half in the *Spaniſh* and half in the *French* Faſhion: nor like the Statue and *Teleſm* in *Photius* (x) that is ſaid, to have carry'd in one Leg perpetual burning Fire, and in the other Leg conſtantly running Water. They that forbid the commixing and combining the heterogeneous things (the plowing with an Ox and an Aſs together, the wearing a Garment of divers ſorts, of Woollen and Linnen together, the ſowing our Vineyard with divers Seeds) muſt not be thought, to commix and combine with their Holy-popular kind of things the things Unpopular, Scholaſtical and Unholy, ſo making thoſe heterogeneous things of one piece; but they are wholly and in all reſpects *an uniform Book of the Holy-popular Learning*, and not any one place in the Bible is of *Scholaſtick Interpretation.*

The Logicians have preſcrib'd a good Rule for interpreting Scripture, which is (y) *carefully to conſider what Things, what Subject and Predicate are ſpoken of in the Propoſition, and to what Diſcipline that Subject and Predicate do belong; from which Diſcipline the nature of the thing may be underſtood, and to that Diſcipline the words of the Author muſt be accommodated.* Agreeably to which Rule, when we are to interpret an obſcure place of Scripture, we ought carefully to conſider, whether it ſpeaketh of matters Unholy, Unpopular and Scholaſtical, or of the Holy-popular kind of things? The words of it perhaps are ambiguous, and if taken alone may be underſtood either of the Holy-popular kind of things, or of Matters Scholaſtical, Unpopular and Unholy; but conſidering the Writer of them, thoſe to whom they are written, the Book wherein they are written, the Deſign of them, the Context, parallel places, the Tenour of the Scriptures, and above all *their true Nature and Character*, we may be aſſured, that the holy writer ſpeaketh not of the Matters *Scholaſtical*, but of the *Holy-popular kind of things.* So any Man may be reaſonably ſatisfy'd, that *the Logos, the Life, the Light* ſpoken of

(t) *Quid tam inter ſe pugnantia miſcemus? Quid terrena cæleſtibus, quid infima ſummis, quid Ethnica Chriſtianis, quid profana ſacris confundimus?* Eraſm. ubi ſupr.

(u) *Miſcetis tenebroſa lucentibus.* Jul. Firmic. de err. prof. rel. p. 19.

(w) *Quid Athenis & Hieroſolymis? Quid Academiæ & Eccleſiæ? Noſtra inſtitutio de porticu Salomonis. viderint qui Stoicum & Platonicum & Dialecticum Chriſtianiſmum protulerunt.* Tertull. de præſcript. c. 7.

(x) *Cod.* 80. *col.* 1082.

(y) *Keckerman. Log. l.* 2. *S.* 2. *c.* 1.

of in the Proem of S. *John*'s Goſpel are not meant of *Unholy*, *Scholaſtical*, *Philoſophical* and *Unpopular* Matters, but of the *Holy-popular* (the Chriſtian-popular) and Evangelical kind of things. If any one ſhould interpret *the Life* there ſpoken of, to be meant of the Platoniſts intellectual form of Life, this would be thought a Deliration: yet the *Logos* there ſpoken of, is at this Day interpreted, to be meant of the Platonic *Logos* (for *Philo*'s *Logos* is no other than the Platonic) and this is thought an Orthodox Interpretation: (z) *So we force into a Conſortſhip with the Matters of the Chriſtian Religion the Matters of the Heathen Writers, which are alien and further diſtant from it than Darkneſs from Light.*

(z) *Phot. cod.* 170. *col.* 382.

II. The Holy Scriptures are Popular in reſpect of their *Theology*, which is *The Science of Sanctity*, *The Holy-popular or Saint of God-kind of Theology*, that is of an oppoſite kind to the *Theologia Scholaſtica*, *Metaphyſica*, *Philoſophica*, which is Unpopular (appropriate to the Schools) and Unholy. This Theology is like the Tribe of *Dan* in the Confines of the Gentiles; for the Matters of the genuine Theology of the Holy Scriptures the Maſters of this Theology, (a) *ad philoſophicas ſententias adulteraverunt*, have adulterated into Illegitimate-philoſophical: So that the Scriptural Theology muſt be conſider'd as remaining in its proper Nature, and as in the Schools of Jews and Chriſtians it is made into a Metaphyſical kind of Theology. For the Scholaſtick Rabbins have turn'd their Judaical Theology into a Philoſophic kind of Theology, perverting the Senſe of their Law, to accommodate it to the Senſe of the Philoſophic Pagans (ſometimes the *Platonic* and ſometimes the *Peripatetic*, but) chiefly the *Peripatetic*, as is viſible in their Doctrine of God, of the Orbs, the Angels, the Intelligences, and of Prophecy, which they derive from the *Intellectus Agens*. The ſame change hath been made in the Chriſtian Theology both in the elder-times of the Church, when *Platoniſm* prevailed, and in her later times, when the Philoſophy of *Ariſtotle* was thought oracular, when the Hebrew Book *Coſri* was written, (b) *as amongſt the Chriſtians, ſo alſo amongſt the Arabians and ſome Jews, the Study of the Scholaſtick Philoſophy was chiefly in vogue to the neglecting and ſetting aſide the Scripture*. The Scripture is neceſſarily in great degree ſet aſide in this Scholaſtick Theology, (c) *Academiis & porticibus Atticis partam ſapientiam ructat*, it ſavoureth of an origination from the Grecanic Schools, and is either a *Platonic* or an *Ariſtotelian* Scholaſticiſm mix'd with Chriſtianity (like the Vintners mixtures with Wine) to the ſophiſticating and changing the nature of it, and ſo great is this change in the Theology of the *Ariſtotelian* Schools, that their Learning cannot reaſonably be called the Chriſtian Theology, being only an exotick (pretending) Science touching the matters of it. As if we ſhould ſuppoſe a ſort of Men, to have only a Scholaſtick kind of Learning touching the matters of the Stoical Philoſophy, (d) δογματίζοντες μετάτινων σοφισμάτων, *dogmatizing with certain Sophiſms concerning them*, this their Learning muſt not be counted the true Stoical Philoſophy: So for the ſame reaſon this Theology, which is neither the Science of Sanctity *inſtitutive* or *conſtitutive*, but is only a Scholaſticizing touching multifarious matters of our Inſtitution of Sanctity, muſt not be counted the true Chriſtian Theology, but as it is called by *Melancthon*, (e) *Prophana Scholaſtice*, a Profane or Exotick Scholaſticiſm touching the matters of it. It ſo mixeth Philoſophy with Theology, as (f) *μιαίνειν βεβήλοις τὰ θεῖα, to contaminate the things Divine with Profane* by making them of one piece, and ſubſtituting Scholaſtical kind of Notions inſtead of the Saint of God-kind of things. It deſpoileth the Chriſtian Theology of its native Simplicity and Purity, its enraviſhing Pulchritude and Pretioſity, its lively Energy and Efficacy upon the Soul (for this Scholaſticiſm is a jejune and ſteril Science) of its native θειασμὸς, *Sanctity and Divinity* (its Saint of God-kind of Excellency) and maketh it, to be of the meanneſs and baſeneſs of a common School-Philoſophy. And as one dialectic Sect of the Philoſophers (the *Megarenſes*) were called ἐριστικοὶ, *contentious:* So this Scholaſtick Theology is (g) *contentioſa ac ſubtilis*; for the matters of Sanctity it turneth into Sophiſtical Vanities and matters of School-diſputes, being like the Theology of the *Arabian* Scholaſticks *Ars diſputatoria*, an Art of diſputing *Logically*, *Metaphyſically and Scholaſtically*. It underſtandeth not Sanctity, nor is this the ſubject and chief ſcope of it; it knoweth not the Life of God, ſcarce taketh any notice of his Kingdom (which is the true Chriſtian Theology) it is far better at intricating and perplexing matters of Theology than explaining them; it filleth the Mind with vain Ratiocinations, and is it ſelf full of *difficiles nugæ*, frivolous, ſubtil, nice, difficult Queſtions, that are good for nothing (*vermiculate Queſtions*, (h) as one calleth them) and its Notions are as ſpurious as its Language is barbarous. A Science it is, but of Sophiſts, not of Saints; a Divinity it is, but ſuch as is not of the divine kind (whence *Morinus* having to do with ſome Scholaſtick Theologers (i) complain'd, that he had to do with *Metaphyſicians* rather than *Divines*) as alien from the Scriptures, as it is from the People, from whom nothing is more alien than the Scholaſticks Philoſophic Genius. The modes of Reaſoning and Diſcourſe, (k) *the more alien they are from the Genius of the Schools, the more pleaſing they are to the reſt of Mankind*, as a modern Author obſerveth: Yet the ſame Author ſaith; (l) *To Theology the exact knowledge of the Scholaſtick Philoſophy is prerequir'd; for this ſpeaketh the native Language of that.* Another of the ſame Communion ſaith of *Calvin*, (m) *I have ſaid in the Hiſtory of* Calviniſm, *and I ſay it again, that that Man having never entred the Schools of Divinity, underſtood nothing at all of that Sacred Science; which is a Key abſolutely neceſſary for unlocking the Sentiments and Sentences of the holy Fathers, that contain the Principles of true Theology, as they are to be found in a lovely order in the Maſter of the Sentences.* Thus things go in this World, Men of Learning ſee not what is as viſible as the Day, but applaud what they ought to explode with a Paſſage in *Epictetus*, (n) ἆρον ἐκεῖνα τὰ τῶν σχολαστικῶν καὶ τῶν μωρῶν, *away with thoſe matters of Scholaſticks and fond Men.*

III. The Holy Scriptures are *Popular* (as being Holy-popular) in reſpect of their *Learning*, *Knowledge and Wiſdom*, *that which they mention with approbation*, *that which they uſe and expreſs*, that

(a) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 47.

(b) *Sicut inter Chriſtianos, ita etiam inter Arabes & quoſdam etiam Judæos, philoſophiæ ſcholaſticæ ſtudium maximè viguit, neglectâ & poſt habitâ ſcripturâ.* Buxtorf. præfat.

(c) *Tertull. de Anim. init.*

(d) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 155.

(e) *Ap. Melch. Can. Loc. Theol. l.* 8. *c.* 1.

(f) *Philo opuſc. p.* 42.

(g) *Petav. T.* 1. *proleg. c.* 1.

(h) *Ld Bacon Advanc. of Learn. B.* 1. *p.* 38.

(i) *Vita Morini, p.* 75.

(k) *Quò à Scholarum genio alieniores, eò ſunt cæteris mortalibus acceptiores.* Ars cogitandi, par. 3. c. 13.

(l) *Ad Theologiam accurata Scholaſticæ Philoſophiæ notitia prærequiritur, cùm hæc illius linguam vernaculam loquatur.* Ibid. Diſſert. 2. p. 20.

(m) *Maimbourg Hiſt. Treat. of the found. of the Ch. of Rome, p.* 24.

(n) *D[illegible]* 3. *c.* 26. *p.* 358.

that which they commend and teach. For, (1.) although the Scripture mentioneth other parts of Learning as laudable, yet it never mentioneth the Metaphyſical Philoſophy (which was the Philoſophers Scholaſtical Theology) with good Approbation, nor without a damnatory Sentence, *Col.* 2. 8. *Beware leſt any Man ſpoil you through Philoſophy.* The Philoſophy which the Apoſtle condemneth, is the old Pythagoric and Platonic Metaphyſical or Scholaſtical Theology (which pretended to be θεοπαράδοτος, *a Divine Tradition*, and therefore the Apoſtle calleth it *a Philoſophy after the Tradition of Men*) which was the ground-work, upon which the Gnoſticks ran their deſcant in multiplying their imaginary Gods or *Æons*, and of the *Cabaliſts* Emanations; for upon this account the *Athenian* Philoſophers are ſeveral times call'd by *Tertullian*, (o) *The Patriarchs of Hereticks*, and *Plato condimentarius Hereticorum*, the Sauce-maker of the Hereticks. Agreeably whereto he expoundeth this place to the *Coloſſians.* (2.) The Scripture maketh uſe of and expreſſeth *Mathematical Learning*, *Mechanical Wiſdom*, and there are in it ſeveral Branches of Natural Philoſophy: but of theſe *Acroaticks* of the Philoſophers Platonic and Ariſtotelian *their Scholaſtick Philoſophy Logical-metaphyſical* (which was eminently their School-philoſophic Learning) there are not any footſteps to be found in all the Book of God: which is not the Book of God, as he is meerly *the firſt Cauſe*, *Ens Entium*, *or the Supreme Being*, but as he is the Sovereign of the Holy People; and therefore the inſpir'd Learning and Wiſdom of it is neceſſarily analogous to the *Civil-popular*, which is hugely alien and remote from the Scholaſtick Philoſophy (or Theology) *Logical-metaphyſical.* So the Bible is ſuch a Stranger to it, that there is not one word in that Sacred Volume, of which a Man may ſay, as *Cicero* doth of one, (p) *Non eſt vulgi verbum ſed Philoſophorum*, it is not a word of the Vulgar but of the Philoſophers. Not a Logical word (properly ſuch) is to be found in the Bible, nor any Metaphyſical Diſtinctions, Abſtractions, Quiddities, Formalities, Suppoſitalities, or any thing of like nature; for (q) *rem populi tractat*, it treateth of the concerns of the People; and the Philoſopher obſerveth, that the Logicians artificial things are (r) τοῖς ἰδιώταις φορτικὰ, *burdenſom to the People that are no Philoſophers.* The Holy Writers do not diſpute or diſcourſe of any Subject *logically, metaphyſically and ſcholaſtically*, but popularly. (3.) The Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 12. 8. *To one is given by the Spirit the word of Wiſdom; to another the word of Knowledge by the ſame Spirit.* He maketh a difference between *Wiſdom* and *Knowledge*; and probably in the Apoſtle's Notion of them in this place they differ *as the gift of ſpeaking with Tongues and the gift of the Interpretation of Tongues.* For the gift of *the Word of Wiſdom* ſeemeth to ſignifie the gift of ſpeaking an *arcane, myſterious and recondite Doctrine*; and *the gift of the Word of Knowledge* is the gift of doctrinally expounding and declaring ſuch a myſterious and recondite Word of Wiſdom. So γνῶσις, *Knowledge*, ſometimes in Scripture ſignifieth, (s) the skill of underſtanding and expounding the involved Myſteries of the Old Teſtament, and ſo a learned Expoſitor underſtandeth it, to ſignifie in this place *that ſort of Chriſtian Knowledge, which conſiſteth in explaining Parables or myſterious Expreſſions in Scripture.* So *Wiſdom* in this Apoſtle's Diſcourſes ſignifieth arcane and recondite Wiſdom, 1 *Cor.* 2. So *ſapientia veterum* (of which an excellent perſon hath written a little Book) ſignifieth *the Wiſdom of the Ancients as involved in Parables and Fables:* and ſo Wiſdom in *Solomon*'s Notion ſignifieth, *the words of the wiſe and their dark Sayings*, Prov. 1. 6. The word of Wiſdom therefore may reaſonably be underſtood, to ſignifie *Doctrine arcane and myſterious unexpounded:* but none of this myſterious Doctrine, becauſe it was expounded and underſtood in Chriſtian Aſſemblies, can be ſuppos'd, to be the Myſteries of Scholaſtick Theology; nor amongſt all the Languages which the Apoſtles ſpake, was there ſuch an one as the Language of the School-divinity. (4.) There is *a Wiſdom that we ſpeak among them that are perfect*, 1 Cor. 2. 6. as the Apoſtle ſaith; whereby he meaneth an higher, more perfect and difficult knowledge of the Matters of Chriſtianity, which in a lower degree were known by the Community of the Faithful. In this Senſe we may ſay with *Gr. Naz.* (t) τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων μυστηρίων, *many of our Myſteries* (or rather many things appertaining to our Myſteries) *are not to be carry'd forth or expos'd to thoſe that are without:* Nor is it fit to diſcourſe them to all that are within; (u) τὰ συνετὰ συνετοῖς λέγομεν, *we ſpeak the things of Underſtanding to them that are of Underſtanding.* Such a Wiſdom therefore which is the matters of our Holy-popular Theology underſtood in an higher degree (which maketh the difference between Divines and other Chriſtians) our Inſtitution acknowledgeth; but it knoweth not the Metaphyſical *Acroaticks* of the Schools of Philoſophers, nor their *Acroamatical* Theology with the Scholaſtick Deities thereof, nor an Arcane Theology like that of the *Egyptians* concealed from the Vulgar, nor any ἱερὰ γράμματα, or Sacred Letters, but the Holy Scriptures (which are open to all) nor any ſuch Arcane Tradition of matters of Faith as the *Pontificians* ſuppoſe, which is very like the Gnoſticks pretended Arcane Tradition of Knowledge: For they ſuppoſe, (w) *a Tradition of matters of Faith by the Apoſtles and their Succeſſours; that the more ſublime and remote from common apprehenſion theſe Myſteries were, the more they were hidden and kept in the Boſom as it were, and the more cautious and arcane was the Tradition of them; nor were they lightly committed to writing: or if that was unavoidable, it was done ſparingly and obſcurely, that without being helped by the Interpretation of the Learned none might be able clearly to underſtand them.* By ſuch an Arcane Tradition they pretend, to have receiv'd the ſublimeſt Articles of their Scholaſtick Theology, which their Doctors will have, not only to be a *Science*, but *Sapience*, according to (x) *Ariſtotle*'s definition thereof, which is not much for the credit of their Scholaſtick Theology; for according to *Ariſtotle* Sapience is converſant *about things of the ſublimeſt nature*, but ſuch as are ἄχρηστα, *of no uſe or benefit.* (5.) Science and Sapience, Knowledge and Wiſdom in a large and uſual Senſe are one and the ſame accompliſhment of the Underſtanding; for in the Holy Writers *Wiſdom* and *Underſtanding* (the good underſtanding of things) are terms ſynonymous, *Job* 28. 12. *Where ſhall Wiſdom be found? and where is the place of Underſtanding?* Prov. 4. 5. *Get Wiſdom, get Underſtanding.* But theſe Names are us'd both in a Vulgar Senſe and in a Senſe of Nobilitation (to denote what is of more than vulgar quality) in which latter Senſe Wiſdom is *the good underſtanding of things, ſo as to be a perſon of good Uunderſtanding, not one that lacketh Underſtanding.* In a vulgar Senſe all Men have a degree of that which is materially Wiſdom,

and

(o) De præſcr. c. 7. adv. Hermog. c. 8. de Anim. c. 3. & 23.

(p) Academ. Qu. l. 1.

(q) Perſ. Sat. 4.

(r) Epict. diſſ. l. 2. c. 12.

(s) Dr. Hamm. on 1 Pet. 3. 7. and on 1 Cor. 1. 5.

(t) Or. 42. p. 687.

(u) M. Tyr. diſſ. 6.

(w) Petav. de Trin. præf. c. 1. S. 5.

(x) Idem. l. 1. proleg. c. 8.

and are in ſome degree wiſe and intelligent. In ſome degree they have a good underſtanding of the true nature, worth, importance and uſe of things, are adviſ'd and conſiderate, provident for the future, ſuit Means to Ends, prefer Neceſſaries before Superfluities, diſcern their own good and chuſe it, and will not barter away their valuable Commodities for Trifles; of every one of which Particulars (and ſuch more) we muſt pronounce, *It is Wiſdom* (a point and part of it) the good underſtanding of things, the oppoſite to Folly and the being wiſe. But this Name *The Wiſe* ſignifieth thoſe Perſons of Quality *that are of good underſtanding, ſo as not to be thoſe that lack Underſtanding*; and Wiſdom is *that good underſtanding of things which conſtituteth them ſuch*. In which Senſe of Nobilitation *Wiſdom is too high for a Fool*, Prov. 24. 7. *Wiſdom is according to her Name, and ſhe is not manifeſt unto many*, Eccluſ. 6. 22. This is that which is *graduately* Wiſdom (beyond a mean and ſorry good underſtanding of things) and this Wiſdom true Piety is and the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Wiſdom, which is the Learning, Knowledge and Wiſdom, that the Holy Scriptures commend and teach.

IV. The Holy Scriptures are *Popular* (not Metaphyſical, Scholaſtical and Unpopular) in their Notices of God; for the Metaphyſical Rabbins obſerve, that the Scripture doth not ſpeak of God agreeably to their Scholaſtick Theology, whence they ſay, *Loquitur lex ſecundum linguam filiorum hominum*, The Law in what it ſaith of God is popular. (y) *It would not be allowable, to make mention of any affirmative Attributes of God* (ſaith *Maimonides*) *if they were not in the Law. The pronouncing of them was not allowable ſave only in reading the Scripture: but the Men of the great Synagogue (who were Prophets) order'd them in Prayers, and from that time the uſe of them in Prayers became lawful.* The Scripture aboundeth with affirmative Attributes of God, which ſort of Attributions this Scholaſtick Theology doth not approve; nor doth it allow him (as becometh the great King and the God of a People) in any tolerable Senſe, to be a God *hearing Prayer, merciful and gracious, long-ſuffering and abundant in goodneſs and truth, keeping Mercy for thouſands, forgiving Iniquity, Tranſgreſſion and Sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty*. For this Theology (z) ſo removeth all Paſſion and Mutation from God, as to remove from him all Virtue and Vital Sanctity, and all the Virtues of a Righteous Governour (juſt Love and Hatred, Favour and Wrath) and ſo aſſerteth his Simplicity (or uncompoundedneſs) as to remove from him all diverſity of Attributes (all plurality and multitude) ſo leaving him nothing but a bare naked Eſſence, which it affirmeth, to be utterly unknowable, ſo that God cannot be known (a) *none can apprehend what God is beſides himſelf.* But the Scripture (which is an inſtitution to the knowledge of God) is ſo far from ſymbolizing with this unpopular Theology, (*b*) *that it ſpeaketh of God* ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, *and although it doth not attribute to God any thing that the Vulgar count an Imperfection, yet ſuch things as Men (when they firſt begin to think of God) do imagine to belong to him, thoſe are attributed to him in Scripture.* (c) *And this was a commodious beginning for Children, Women, and the reſt of the common People* (ſaith *Maimonides*) *who cannot apprehend things according to their truth and reality*; (*d*) ἐδέοντο οἱ πολλοί, *the common People had need, that it ſhould be ſo*, ſaith *Origen*. The Scripture therefore is acknowledg'd by the greateſt Scholaſticks, to be popular in its Notices of God. Whence good Expoſitors decline the more Philoſophical Senſe of a place of Scripture that ſpeaketh of God, and prefer the more Popular. As when the Apoſtle ſaith, that *God is not far from every one of us*, a great Expoſitor will not have the words underſtood touching his Eſſential Preſence, but touching his Power and Providence. (*e*) *For* Paul *doth not call the* Athenians *to ſubtil Diſputations touching the Eſſential Preſence of God (of which amongſt the Philoſophers and Jews and Chriſtians there were different Opinions) but to thoſe things which were viſible from the things of the World.* A good Divine cautioneth us againſt ſuch Authors, (*f*) *who in their Expoſition of the Holy Scriptures have more of Secular Philoſophy, than is agreeable to the Simplicity of Chriſtianity.* But Secular Philoſophy is ſuch an Interpreter of Scripture, as is not only injurious to the Simplicity of Chriſtianity, but intirely deſtructive to it; for Chriſtianity is deſtroy'd, if the Kingdom of God is deſtroy'd, which the Scripture is ſo popular, as to attribute it unto God, and which ſome (pretending) Interpreters deſtroy by their Secular Philoſophy; (*g*) *That God is a Lord and King as Men are, or doth generate or love, none that would be wiſe above the Vulgar, will aſſert: whence it is manifeſt, that the Chriſtian People, who take theſe words, as at firſt appearance they ſound, are infinitely miſtaken, and ſo are all Interpreters, that herein ſymbolize with them.* According to the Scripture and common Senſe God is *a Lord and King*, as Men are, and is *a free Agent*; but according to the Philoſophy of the Schools the Action or Operation of God (more eſpecially the immanent) is abſolutely indiſtinct from his Subſtance, which implieth, that it is neceſſarily exiſtent from Eternity (and in this Senſe God is ſaid, to be a pure Act) and conſequently there can be no liberty of agency in God. So according to *Ariſtotle's Metaphyſicks* God is ἀκίνητος οὐσία ἧς ἡ οὐσία ἐνέργεια, *an immovable Subſtance, whoſe Eſſence is Act or Energy.* (*h*) *But I would ask them, that make God immoveable, if a Man hath Subſtance, an Houſe and Family: if the Servants contemning the Patience of their Lord invade and enjoy all his Goods, and have the honour of the Family: but the Lord is contemned by all, derided and relinquiſh'd: can he be wiſe, that doth not avenge ſuch Contumelies? If the Maſter of a Family hath his Children ſlain by his Servant, his Wife killed, his Houſe burned, and never inflicteth a ſevere Puniſhment upon ſuch a Servant; doth he deſerve, to be counted gentle and merciful, or inhumane and cruel?* Non eſt ergo virtutis in Deo, ad ea quæ injuſtè fiunt, non commoveri: *It is not Virtue in God therefore, not to be moved at unrighteous practices.* He is therefore in reſpect of his Sanctity and punitive Severity of Nature rightly repreſented in the Holy Scriptures, which are ſo far from being Metaphyſical in their Notices of God, and from treating of the Subject of Metaphyſicks, which is *Incorporeity*, that the word ἀσώματος, *incoporeal,*

(y) *Mor. Nev. par.* 1. c. 59. p. 101.

(z) *Ibid.* c. 54, 55.

(a) *Ibid.* c. 58.

(b) *Ibid.* c. 26.

(c) *Ibid.* c. 33.

(d) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 4. p. 210.

(e) *Neque enim ad ſubtiles diſputationes de præſentia eſſentiali Dei, de qua variæ fuere & Philoſophorum & Judæorum & Chriſtianorum ſententiæ, Athenienſes vocat Paulus, ſed ad ea quæ rebus ſentiebantur.* Grot. Not. in Act. 17. 27.

(f) *Qui plus adferunt de ſeculari philoſophia in expoſitione S. Scripturarum, quam ſimplicitati Chriſtianæ conducit.* Muſcul. ap. Hotting. Hexacm. p. 267.

(g) *Hominum ad inſtar Deum eſſe Dominum aut Regem, aut generare aut diligere, nullus qui ſupra vulgus ſapere volet, aſſeret. unde plebem Chriſtianam, quando paſſim hæc, ut vocabula prima fronte ſonant, accipiunt, toto conſtat errare cœlo, & omnes qui cum illa hac in parte faciunt interpretes.* Philoſoph. Script. interpr. p. 15, 124.

(h) Lactan. de Ira Dei, *l.* 1. c. 17.

corporeal is not to be found in the Bible (*i*) as *Origen* obſerveth. Our Saviour's words therefore *God is a Spirit*, are miſinterpreted touching the Philoſophic Spirituality.

(i) Περὶ ἀρχ. in proœm.

V. The Holy Scriptures are Popular (not Philoſophical) in reſpect of their Notices of the Syſtem *of the viſible World and the Creation thereof*. This is commonly acknowledg'd, and the thing is manifeſt, that the Scriptural Syſtem of the World is (*k*) *Popularis univerſi compages*, the Popular Syſtem. For (1.) Many of the Fathers, S. *Chryſoſtom*, *Severianus*, *Diodorus Tarſenſis*, *Theodorus Mopſueſtenus*, *the Author of the Queſtions and Anſwers*. In *J. Mart.* Works, *Lactantius*, *Procopius*, are of Opinion (*l*) *that the Heavens are not round or a Sphere, but only half a Sphere, of the figure of a Tent and Arch*. This Conceit they diſpute for with great vehemence and confidence, contemptuouſly exploding our Hypotheſis, that the Heavens are of a Spherical Figure (ποῦ εἰσὶν οἱ σφαιροειδῆ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶναι ἀποφαινόμενοι, *where are they that affirm, that Heaven is of a Spherical Figure?* Saith S. *Chryſoſtom*) and the Arguments that they alledge againſt it, are certain places of Scripture (of the Pſalmiſt, the Prophet *Iſaiah*, and the Epiſtle to the Hebrews) wherein Heaven is called a Tent or Tabernacle. And *Photius* acknowledgeth, that this Conceit of the Fathers is cognate to the Holy Scriptures. *Pſal.* 104. 2. *Who ſtretcheſt out the Heavens like a Curtain.* Iſa. 40. 22. *It is he that ſtretcheth out the Heavens as a Curtain, and ſpreadeth them out as a Tent to dwell in*, So 2 *Eſdr.* 16. 59. (2.) The Prophet conſidereth (*m*) *Cælum ut fornix, terram ut tabulatum mundani ædificii*, Heaven as the arched Roof, the Earth as the Floor of the mundane Edifice. Such was the generally receiv'd Notion of the Earth in ancient times amongſt Jews and Pagans, the old Geographers and Poets, that it was (not a Globe, but) of a plane Figure, which implieth, that there are no Antipodes. If we ſuppoſe it to be a Globe incompaſs'd about with the Heavens, this will infer *Antipodes*, which was not thought a tolerable Opinion in ancient times. (3.) The ſuppoſed Flat or Plane of the Earth was in ancient times ſuppos'd to be Circular, whence it had the Name of *Orbis* (*n*) as appeareth from *Cicero*. Agreeably whereto the Scripture ſpeaketh of *the Circle of the Earth*. Iſa. 40. 22. Which Circle was ſuppos'd to bound it, and to bound the Heavens alſo (which ſeem to touch the Earth) whence we uſually read in Scripture of *the ends of the Earth* (the Extremities) *the ends of the World, from one end of the Earth to the other, from one end of Heaven to the other, from the one ſide of the Heavens to the other, unto the utmoſt part of Heaven*. (*o*) *By the ends of Heaven and the ends of the Earth we underſtand the ſame thing*; for we ſuppoſe the ὁρίζων, or *finitor Circulus*, to be the common boundary of both, and conſequently that the Earth as a Plane of vaſt amplitude hath this for its utmoſt Circuit or Termination. Coincident with this Horizon was the great Ocean, that inviron'd the Plane of the Earth, as the Ancients ſuppoſed; whence in ſeveral of the Poets the Ocean is put for the Horizon, and in Scripture the word that is us'd for the ſetting of the Sun (*p*) importeth his going down into the Ocean, as he ſeemeth to do. (4.) Beſides theſe Waters of the Ocean that were ſuppos'd to inviron the Plane of the Earth, there was an Imagination amongſt the Ancients of an Abyſs of Waters under the Plane of the Earth. (*q*) For both ancient Heathen and Chriſtian Writers held *Hades* (an inhabited infernal Region) to be under the Earth. So *Job* 26. 5. *the Giants* are ſaid, to lament under the Waters; not thoſe of the Flood (*r*) ſaith a learned Man, but thoſe that are under the Earth. So *R. Eleaſar* interpreteth ſome other places of Scripture. (5.) The Sun is repreſented in Scripture as moving and (miraculouſly) ſtanding ſtill, as running a Race and *having his Circuit from one end of Heaven to the other*: But without expreſſing any thing of that part of his Circuit, that is under our Hemiſphere; which muſt be very ſtrange and ſurpriſing to them that conſider not the Popular Nature of the Holy Scriptures. And it is alike ſtrange and ſurpriſing, that in the Old Teſtament the Clouds are repreſented as high as Heaven; the Sun and Moon are plac'd in the Heaven where the Clouds are; and God himſelf is repreſented as having his Seat and Reſidence in the Sky and amongſt the Clouds, thereby to expreſs his Highneſs and Eminence. In celebrating *his Excellency on the Sky* the Holy Writers deſign to celebrate his Highneſs and Eminence (as if they ſhould ſtile him *celſi dominator poli*) yet they are not ſolicitous to raiſe it any higher than the Sky, this being ſuppos'd a very great height, the greateſt height of our Syſtem, and the greateſt height of the viſible World according to Popular Apprehenſion. (6.) As the Scriptures ſpeak of the viſible World according to Popular Apprehenſion, ſo *Moſes* deſcribeth the Creation of it. (*s*) *For the Scope of* Moſes *in his deſcription of the Creation was*, οὔτε φυσιολογῆσαι, οὔτε ἀστρονομῆσαι, *neither to do the part of a Phyſiologer, nor of an Aſtronomer* (ſaith *Joan. Philoponus*) *but to lead Men to the knowledge of God by the Creation of the World*. (*t*) *It was not his purpoſe* (ſaith the *Alex. Cyril*) φυσιολογεῖν ἰσχνῶς, *to Phyſiologize or Diſcourſe of the Nature of Things ſubtilly*. He is ſo far from it, that a Scholaſtic Divine hath laid down this Rule for interpreting the Moſaic Text of the Creation. (*u*) *Moſes hath accommodated his deſcription of natural and corporeal Things to the apprehenſion and genius of a rude and dull People*. (*w*) Two learned Phyſicians therefore (*Sennertus* and *Valleſius*) were extremely much miſtaken in betaking themſelves to the Study of the Scriptures for underſtanding Phyſiology and the Secrets of Nature. So a certain Author hath written a Book in Hebrew (*x*) *for acquiring the Arts by the Six Hundred Thirteen Precepts of the Law*. And *Salmanticenſis* as cited by *Druſius* (*y*) ſaith of the *Eſſens*, *Intendunt in ſapientiam Legis, è qua educunt ſapientias Phyſicas, ad intelligendum naturas ſtirpium & animalium*. They follow the Study of the Law, whence they extract the Learning of Phyſicks, to underſtand the Nature of Plants and Animals.

(k) Windet. de vit. funct. p. 267.

(l) Phot. cod. 223. col. 698. Petav. T. 3. de op. l. 1. c. 12.

(m) Gaſſend. Inſtit. Aſtr. l. 3. c. 10.

(n) De N. D. l. 2.

(o) Grot.

(p) Grot. Not. in Marc. 1. 32.

(q) Bp. Uſher Anſw. to the Chall. p. 375.

(r) Windet ſupr. S. 12

Pſal. 19. 5, 6.

(s) Phot. cod. 240. col. 991.

(t) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 2. p. 50.

(u) Petav. T. 3. de op. in proœm.

(w) Voet. Diſp. Par. 1. p. 680.

(x) Hotting. de jur. Hebr. p. 4.

(y) De 3. Sect. p. 234.

VI. The Holy Scriptures are Popular (as being Holy-popular) *in reſpect of the Authors of them*. For as our God is Popular (the God of the Holy People) our Chriſt is Popular (the King of the Holy People) our Holy Spirit is Popular (the Spirit of the Holy People:) So the Writers of the Holy Scripture are *Popular*, as being none of the *Metaphyſicians*, *Scholaſticks*, *Naturaliſts*, *none of the Philoſophic Life and Learning* (properly ſuch,) *none of any Philoſophic Sect, School or Family*, but aliens from *the Secular Philoſophy* and the Holy-popular kind of Men. (*z*) *Homer* is commended as τηρήσας τὰ τῶν ἡρώων πρόσωπα, *keeping a Decorum in the Perſons of his*

(z) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 355.

Hero's, and attributing to them what is agreeable; for it is an abſurdity in a Fable, to introduce an unlearned Perſon, that never heard a Philoſopher, ſpeaking Philoſophically. So it is abſurd, to ſuppoſe, that the Holy Writers have written Scholaſticiſm (*Platonic or Ariſtotelian*) that were none of the Philoſophic kind of Perſons, but the Holy-popular kind of Men. For

(1.) The Holy Writers conſider'd as *Jews* appear, to be none of the *Philoſophic*, but the *Holy-popular* kind of Men. Such was their Character as Jews, which were the Holy-popular Nation, but throughout all the times of their Commonwealth they never were a Philoſophic Nation, as ſeveral of the Pagan Nations were. What the Rabbins ſay of *Abraham*'s addictedneſs to Aſtronomy, and that God called him from it and *from all other natural dubious Science* (ſo they allegorically interpret *egredere forâs*, Gen. 15. 5.) is groundleſs and fabulous; and ſuch is *Clemens*'s Pretenſion (*a*) *that the Philoſophy of the Hebrews is far more ancient than any other Philoſophy, and that the Philoſophers Dogmata were ſtollen from them.* When *Moſes* wrote his Hiſtory of the Creation, they are ſaid to have been *a rude and dull People*, and it is not imaginable, whence they ſhould learn Philoſophy. Nor was that ſort of Learning *the Acroaticks of the Philoſophers Schools* ever conſiderably cultivated, or pretended to, amongſt that People. They never had any Schools of Philoſophy amongſt them (as the Pagan Nations had;) for the Schools or Colledges which they had before the time of their firſt Temple (*b*) were only Schools *of the Sons of the Prophets*, wherein they apply'd themſelves to Divine Studies, the ſtudy of the Law their ſacred Learning. Theſe Schools continu'd all the time of their firſt Temple; for במשנה 2 *King*. 22. 14. ſeemeth to be rightly rendred *the Colledge*, becauſe שנה ſignifieth to *Learn* or *Teach*, and משנה ſignifieth *Study*, and accordingly the word which we render *the Colledge* (*c*) is by the Chaldee Paraphraſt rendred *the Houſe of Learning*, and by *Kimchi the School*. But when the Jews were in their Babylonian Captivity probably they apply'd themſelves to the Learning of the Gentiles; for when they were mix'd amongſt them, they learn'd their Works, (*d*) and their Opinions alſo (as *Maimonides* ſaith;) and it is reaſonable, to believe, that to recommend themſelves to the Gentiles they would at ſuch a time apply themſelves to their Learning and Sciences, which is their way in their diſperſions, as *Abul-pharagius* ſaith of them. (*e*) *The Hebrews becauſe they were ſeparated from the reſt of the Nations, thought it unlawful, to cultivate Philoſophy, confining themſelves to the Wiſdom of their Law and Prophetic Traditions; and their Doctors were moſt expert in the Hiſtory of the Prophets and of the firſt Creation, which others receiv'd from them. But when after their diſperſion in ſeveral Regions they were mix'd with the Nations, the Minds of a few of them were excited, to acquire the ſpeculative Sciences, and the Intellectual Virtues, and ſome of them attained what they would of the various ſorts of Sciences.* As it is probable, that the Jews in their Babylonian captivity did not wholly neglect Philoſophy, ſo it is certain, that when the Arms of *Alexander* ſpread far and wide, they became acquainted with the Greek Philoſophy and imbib'd it: But it was not imbib'd by the generality of that People; if any of them imbib'd it in a great degree (as *Philo*) thereby they ceaſed to be genuine Jews; and the Learning and Diſcipline of that People in theſe latter times of their Commonwealth ſtill continu'd the ſame as before. (*f*) *Ebræorum veterum ſapientia in ſui Juriſprudentia poſita erat.* (*g*) *That the chief, if not the only knowledge, to which Men of Learning were bred among the People of God from the beginning, was that of the Law, and afterwards of the other Scriptures, the Name of Scribe is evidence enough; by which Name all that made Profeſſion of Book-learning among that People were called.* The generality of the more learned Jews in theſe latter times of their Commonwealth were not Philoſophic; and as for the Holy Writers, the generality of them appear, not to have been more Philoſophic than the generality of the Jews were; if any of them (as *Moſes* and *Solomon*) underſtood Philoſophy better, yet they were not the Men of that Learning and Diſcipline, but of another, *the Jews Religion and Law*; whence we may juſtly pronounce, that all the Holy Scriptures were written by the Holy-popular kind of Men.

(2.) The Holy Writers conſider'd as *the Prophets and Apoſtles* appear, to be none of the Philoſophic, but *the Holy-popular* kind of Men. For *the Prophets were the Teachers of the People by Inſpiration and Miſſion from God.* They were Teachers; for although the work of a Prophet did contain ſeveral other things, and Propheſying doth denote ſeveral other things, yet the principal part of the Prophets buſineſs was *Teaching.* Whence Prophets and Teachers are exegetical the one of the other. *Act.* 13. 1. 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. *Matth.* 7. 15. and *Ch.* 24. 34. Propheſying is put for expounding and declaring the Will of God. 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. and 14. 3. He that expoundeth another's Mind and Meaning is his Prophet. *Exod.* 7. 1. So an Interpreter of *Ariſtotle* (that expoundeth his Myſteries) is called by *Themiſtius* (*h*) *Ariſtotle*'s Prophet. So they that declared and interpreted the Worſhip of the Gods to private Men, are called in *Dionyſ. Halicarnaſs.* (*i*) Ἐξηγηταὶ ϗ προφῆται, *Declarers and Prophets.* Agreeably whereto they that ſmote our Saviour, ſaid to him, *Propheſie unto us, who is he that ſmote thee.* Matth. 26. 68. Our Saviour as a Prophet was *a Teacher ſent from God.* Joh. 3. 2. and ſuch was *Moſes*, whoſe Chair was the Chair of Doctrine as well as of Judgment. (*k*) Whence *Philo* ſaith; that they brought the Man, who gather'd Wood on the Sabbath, before *Moſes*, *and the multitude ſtood by him, to hear him.* The Prophets therefore (*l*) *were ſuch, as did not only predict future things by divine Inſpiration, but by teaching and reforming the People were Types of Chriſt the great Prophet. They were ſuch as exhorted Men to the obſervance of the Law, as the Book* Coſri *ſaith. And* R. Sol. Jarchi *ſaith; the word Prophet every where ſignifieth a Man that preacheth to the People and ſpeaketh words of Reproof to them.* The Prophets that God ſendeth, are ſent to the People, are the Teachers of true Religion (which is the People's buſineſs) and to them their uſual Applications and Addreſſes are made. *Iſa.* 6. 9. *Jer.* 16. 10. *Amos* 7. 15. *Mic.* 2. 11. The Office of the Prophets therefore was an Holy-popular imploy (they were Holy-popular kind of Men) accordingly *the vulgar*, as the Book *Coſri* ſaith (*m*) *do not believe the Philoſophers, as they do the Prophets.* The *Muhammedans* ſay (*n*) *a Nation is to a Prophet inſtead of Sons.* Agreeably whereto the Apoſtles (being Prophets) are called by *Tertullian* (*o*) *deſtinati nationibus magiſtri*, the deſigned Teachers of the Nations. S. *Paul* calleth himſelf *a Teacher of the*

Gen-

(a) *Strom. l.* 1. *p. m.* 234.

(b) *Vatabl. & Grot. in* 1 *Sam.* 10. 5.

(c) *Mr. Smith of Prophecy c.* 9.

(d) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 2. *c.* 11.

(e) *Hiſt. Dyn. p* 22, 23.

(f) *Marſham Can. Chron. p.* 225. *ed. Lipſ.*

(g) *Mr. Thorndike of Relig. Aſſemb. c.* 3.

(h) *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 215.

(i) *Antiq. Rom. l.* 2.

(k) *Mr. Thorndike ſupr. c.* 2.

(l) *Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p.* 569.

(m) *P.* 2[illegible]

(n) *Hotting. H. or. p.* 134 *ed.* 1.

(o) *De Præſcript. c.* 20.

Gentiles, and he is called by S. *Chryſoſtom* (p) ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης Ἀπόστολος, *the Apoſtle of the World*, ἡ γλῶττα τῆς οἰκουμένης, *the Tongue of the World.*

(3.) Although *Moſes* may be ſaid, to have been of Philoſophic Education (being learned in all the Wiſdom of the *Egyptians*) yet being rais'd to be a Prophet of God and the People, he became an Holy-popular kind of Man, that ought not to write as a Philoſopher, but as a Prophet of God to the People; and accordingly he hath made no uſe of his Philoſophy in his Writings. A great Expoſitor indeed ſaith (q) *certè Aſtrologiæ & Medicinæ peritia paſſim in ejus legibus apparet*, Skill in Aſtronomy and Phyſick appeareth in many places of his Laws. And we will acknowledge, that a meaſure of Skill in thoſe Sciences doth appear in his Laws, but no more than may juſtly be accounted *Popular*, the *Acroaticks* of thoſe Sciences are not to be found in the Laws of *Moſes*. He is ſo far from Philoſophical exactneſs in Aſtronomical matters (and he is not more Philoſophical in matters of Phyſick) that he left the People of *Iſrael* in difficulties inextricable touching their Feſtival times and in matters of Calculation. *Clavius* ſaith; God doth not tye his Church to the ſubtilties of Aſtronomical Calculations, but to the common judgment of Senſe. Which ſpeaketh the Holy-Scripture, not a Philoſophical, but a Popular Book. But *Clemens* will have the Law of *Moſes*, to be a Book of Philoſophy, and one part of it to be the Science of *Metaphyſicks*. (r) *The Moſaic Philoſophy* (ſaith he) *conſiſteth of four Parts. One is Hiſtorical: Another is, that which is properly called Nomothetical, which is touching Ethical Matters: A third is the Hierurgical* (about Sacrifices,) *which is* τῆς φυσικῆς θεωρίας, *a buſineſs of Phyſical Theory or Phyſiology: A fourth part is the Theological,* ἡ ἐποπτεία, *which is our being Inſpectors, of the Myſticks, of the truly great Myſteries, as* Plato *calleth them. But* Ariſtotle *calleth this part* Μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ, *Metaphyſicks.* As to thoſe that have their Eyes infected with an Icteriſm all objects ſeem yellow: So this Father's Mind was ſo viciated with Conceits of Philoſophy, that the moſt Popular-religious things imaginable ſeem'd to him Philoſophical. So a learned Man of our own (over-addicted to Cabaliſm and Platoniſm) will have the 90th *Pſalm* (which is aſcrib'd to *Moſes*) a Monument of the ancient Moſaical or Cabaliſtical Philoſophy. (s) Accordingly the firſt and ſecond Verſes of the Pſalm wherein God is ſtiled *our dwelling place* (that is, our Houſe of Defence) are perverted, to ſignifie, that God is the Cabaliſts מקום *the common place of all things*, that his Divine Eſſence is that increate ſpace, which receiveth, containeth and ſuſtaineth all things as their Seat and Place. The Pſalm from the *third* Verſe to the *twelfth* according to this Philoſophic and Cabaliſtic Interpretation concerneth the Lapſe of Souls into this evanid Terreſtrial State of Life. *Their State of ſilence* is ſuppos'd to be intimated in the third and fourth Verſes of the Pſalm; and the *fifth* Verſe is ſuppos'd to intimate the Platonic Inſemination of Souls called by *Plotinus* ἡ εἰς γένεσιν σπορὰ, *their Inſemination into Generation.* That which immediately followeth (they are as aſleep) is ſaid to be hugely Moſaical and Platonical; for *a deep ſleep fell upon* Adam, and the Platoniſts ſay, *that the Soul ſleepeth in this Body.* This Interpretation of a Pſalm is an Inſtance, that ſheweth, what a wild Interpreter of Scripture Philoſophy is; for *Moſes* did not compoſe his Pſalm as a Philoſopher (much leſs as a Myſtic-Metaphyſical, Cabaliſtic and Platonic Philoſopher) but as a Prophet of God and of the People; he compos'd it not for a School of Platoniſts, but for a Nation of Religious People; there is nothing in it, that ſoundeth towards Platonic Philoſophy; the whole of it is plainly expreſſive of Popular-religious matters, as all Expoſitors have hitherto ſuppos'd.

(4.) The Holy Writers conſider'd with reſpect to ſecular Learning appear, to be none of the Philoſophic, but the Holy-popular kind of Men. They are an Inſtance of the Rabbins folly, who require ſeveral great Qualifications in a Prophet; (t) for they ſay, *the Holy Spirit doth not reſt but upon a Man of Wiſdom, Fortitude, Riches*; and they diſlike this Opinion of the ignorant vulgar (that are wiſer than themſelves) *that God may chuſe Men whom he pleaſeth, and may ſend them, it matters not, whether they be wiſe and learned or unlearned, old or young; this only is requir'd; that they be virtuous and good.* But the Father of the Prophets, if he doth not find Men qualified with all requiſite Endowments, to be Prophets, can make them ſuch. So in the times of the Old Teſtament Ruſticks (as *David* and *Amos*) became Prophets. And in the times of the New Teſtament the great and eminent Prophets, although they were not illiterate at the rate of the pretended Prophet *Muhammed* (who is called by his followers the illiterate Prophet (u) becauſe he could neither write nor read) yet they were ſuch as are commonly called (w) ἄγροικοι, ἀμαθεῖς, ἀγράμματοι, ἀσύνετοι, ἰδιῶται, ἄγλωττοι, ἄσημοι, πένητες, εὐτελεῖς, *the ruſtick, unlearned, illiterate, unintelligent, ideots, uneloquent, obſcure, poor and of mean condition in the World.* The Jewiſh Rulers counted them *unlearned and ignorant Men.* Act. 4. 13. The Gentiles objected, that our Holy Books (x) *ab indoctis hominibus & rudibus ſcripta ſunt*, were written by unlearned and ruſtical Men. *Celſus* reflecteth upon (y) τὴν ἰδιωτείαν αὐτῶν, *their illiterateneſs*, and the Chriſtians make large acknowledgements of it. (z) *The Demagogues of our Polity are Publicans and Fiſhermen and Tent-makers.* They call the Holy Founders of our Religion (a) *Piſcatores, Opifices, Ruſticanos atque id genus imperitorum.* Fiſhermen, Mechanicks, Ruſticks, and the like illiterates. (b) Οἱ ἡμέτεροι ἁλιεῖς καὶ τελῶναι καὶ ὁ σκυτοτόμος, *our Fiſhermen and Publicans and Leather-cutter* (ſo S. *Paul* becauſe a Tent-maker was reproachfully called by the Pagans) our Laws they call ἡ τῶν ἁλιέων νομοθεσία, the Fiſhermen's Laws, οἱ σκυτοτομικοὶ νόμοι, the Leather-cutters Laws; and O*rigen* ſaith of them too much (and ſaith, it is written in the Goſpel) that they were ſuch as had not learned (c) τὰ πρῶτα γράμματα, *the firſt Rudiments of Learning.* But he doth not ſpeak extravagantly, when he argueth (d) that *Paul* the Tent-maker, *Peter* the Fiſherman, and *John* that left his Father's Nets, were not likely to have read *Plato*'s Epiſtles. *Piſcatoribus non dialecticis credimus* (ſaith S. *Ambroſe*) *we as Believers give credence to Fiſhermen, not to Logicians, or Metaphyſicians.* (e) *Not to Logicians, not to Rhetoricians, not to Grammarians, but to Ruſticks and Fiſhermen our Lord committed his Secrets.* Chriſtians have always thought it for the intereſt of their Religion, to repreſent the Apoſtolic Founders of it as deſtitute of the ſecular Learning and Philoſophy (and therefore as the Holy-popular kind of Men;) to ſhew (f) that their

Abilities

(p) In 1 Cor. 9. 2.

(q) Grot. Not. in Act. 7. 22.

(r) Strom. l. 1. p. m. 259, 260.

(s) Dr. H. More Scrip. Phil. T. 1. p. 170.

(t) Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p. 570, 572.

(u) Pocock. Spec. p. 156. 290.

(w) S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 2. in 1 Cor. & T. 6. p. 635.

(x) Arnob. l. 1. p. 34.

(y) Orig. l. 1. p. 48.

(z) Δημαγωγοὶ δὲ τῆς πολιτείας εἰσὶ ταύτης τελῶναι, καὶ ἁλιεῖς καὶ σκηνοποιοί. S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. p. 5.

(a) Arnob. l. 1. p. 30.

(b) Theodoret. Θεραπ. ſer. 5, & 9.

(c) C. Celſ. l. 1. p. 48.

(d) Ibid. l. 6. p. 279.

(e) Baron. ad an. 670. n. 3.

(f) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 1. p. 48. & l. 2. p. 135.

Abilities and Endowments, their marvellous perſwaſive preaching and the ſucceſs of it, were of God, not of Man; and that there is no appearance, no place for ſuſpicion, of human Sophiſtry and Contrivance in ſuch plain Holy-popular kind of Men. And what we have ſaid of theſe eminent Prophets of the New Teſtament, is in great degree applicable to the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, who are called by *Theophilus* (g) ἀγράμματοι ϗ ποιμένες ϗ ἰδιῶται, *Illiterates, Shepherds and Ideots amongſt the Hebrews.* The Apoſtate *Julian* alſo counteth the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, unfit to be Prophets (*h*) ὅτι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ψυχὴν οὐ παρέσχον ἀποκαθᾶραι τοῖς ἐγκυκλίοις μαθήμασι, *becauſe their Mind was not purged and poliſh'd by the Arts and Sciences of the Circle.*

VII. The Holy Scriptures therefore are Popular as being without Art, *the Arts and Terms of ſecular Learning and Philoſophy.* They Symbolize with their Holy Writers (the Effect reſembleth the Cauſe) that ſpeak and write *more ſuo*, in their own way and agreeably to their Character. (*i*) *A very few Fiſhermen not skilled in the Liberal Sciences, and as to their Learnings altogether impolite, not expert in Grammar, not armed with Logick, not tumid with Rhetorick, Chriſt ſent with the Nets of Faith to the Sea of this World, and ſo caught ſuch abundance of Fiſhes of all kinds, and ſo much the more wonderful as the more rare the Philoſophers themſelves.* (*k*) *They did not profeſs the Arts of Speech* (*l*) *bade adieu to the variegated compoſition of Words and the human Wiſdom* (*m*) and were οἱ ἰδιῶται ὡς πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν Ἑλληνικήν, *the illiterate as to the Greek Philoſophy.* Accordingly the Scriptures are written without *the art of Grammar*, and without any nice or accurate obſervance of the Rules of it. For the Criticks (*n*) have remark'd ſeveral places of Scripture (to which others may be added 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. *Eph.* 2. 2.) wherein the Conſtruction is πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον, *not with the Words, but with the Senſe*; which ſort of Conſtruction is a Deviation from the Rules of Grammar, and ſheweth, that the Holy Scripture is in its way of ſpeaking Popular. Some call this ſort of Conſtruction *a Solæciſm* (yet no vicious Solæciſm) whence they ſay, that the Holy Writers do ſometimes (*o*) *Solæcize with the vulgar*; and if they do ſo, they are the more Popular. They are alſo written without the *Art of Logick*, without the *Logical Definitions, Diſtributions, Argumentations and Method*; nor do they uſe the Logical or Diſputatory Terms, as the Hebrew Book *Coſri* (*p*) obſerveth of the Prophets. So the Apoſtle *Paul* maketh uſe of no Philoſophical Terms (*q*) *there are none ſuch to be found in his Epiſtles, but all his Writings are in the vulgar Speech.* The Scriptures are alſo written without the Art of Rhetorick; (*r*) *for all the Preachers of Truth, the Prophets and Apoſtles, were deſtitute* τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς εὐγλωττίας, *of the Grecanic Eloquence, their Writings are ſimple and deſtitute* τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς λαμπρότητος, *of the Grecanic brightning Ornaments.* I believ'd the Scriptures, ſaith *Tatianus* (*s*) both becauſe of τῶν λέξεων τὸ ἄτυφον, *the lowneſs of their Language*, ϗ τῶν εἰπόντων τὸ ἀνεπιτήδευτον, *and becauſe the ſpeakers were without artifice.* A great Expoſitor ſaith of our Saviour (*t*) *his Speech was every where clear and popular.* What our Saviour ſaith of not one jot of the Law paſſing away (*u*) *it is proverbial, as moſt of the things are in our Lord's Sermons, taken from common uſe.* (*w*) *In Chriſt's Sayings there are very many things taken from the common Speech of the vulgar or from the Precepts of the wiſe Men, but which for the moſt part be transferr'd from human to divine Things.* Of the Holy Writers Divines and Expoſitors ſay (*x*) *Lucas certè loquitur cum vulgo* (*y*) *Paulus cùm vulgo loquitur*, (*z*) *the Holy Spirit accommodateth his Speech to the cuſtomary ſpeaking of Men*, and in this ſenſe the Scripture is written (*Iſa.* 8. 1.) *Becheret Enoſh, with the Pen of Man*, (*a*) Πᾶν τὸ ἐν λόγοις κομψὸν ἀτιμάζουσα, *contemning all concinnity of Speech.* So of S. *John's* Compoſures a Critick ſaith (*b*) *nihil affectationis aut ex oratorum arte habent*, they have nothing of Affectation (of Wit or Eloquence) nothing of the Orator's Art. The Scriptures therefore are written agreeably to what *Plato* ſaith (*c*) *Art muſt not be look'd for in the greateſt things.* Their true Character may be underſtood, not only from the Notices of their Friends, but from the Obloquies of their Enemies; for the Pagans objected againſt them (*d*) *the common, ordinary, Plebeian, ſordid way of ſpeaking, Barbariſms, and Solæciſms*, and *Celſus* calleth them ἀγροίκους ἀπάτας, *ruſtick Deceits*; all which reproaches ſpeak them *Popular.* So the Objections which other Adverſaries have made againſt them (*e*) from their unuſual Method, ſeemingly incoherent Ratiocinations, various Repetitions, vulgar Phraſes, ſimplicity and nakedneſs of human Embelliſhments, have all of them their Origine from this Source, *they are the Holy-popular Book*, which is and ought to be without Art, *the Arts and Terms of ſecular Learning and Philoſophy.* From which Branch of their Idea we may infer,

(1.) One of their principal Virtues of Speech is *the Simplicity* thereof. As the Chriſtians Religion is to be admir'd and adher'd to, in the nakedneſs and ſimplicity thereof (which is its freedom from any Heterogeneous mixture, that ſophiſticateth and adulterateth the purity of it;) and as one of their principal Virtues is an Holy-virtuous Simplicity (which is their being without Guile, Artifice or Subtilty:) So amongſt other Virtues of Speech in the Holy Scriptures (*f*) their Nakedneſs and Simplicity is deſervedly admir'd (*g*) τὸ ἁπλοῦν ϗ εὐγενὲς τοῦ λόγου, *that ſimple and ingenuous way of ſpeaking*, a Simplicity alien from all Affectation that reigneth in them, (*h*) a Simplicity unacquainted with any Arts of Sophiſtry, which knoweth not how to contrive a Lye, and which cannot be diſprov'd by ſuch an Argument, as *Cicero* diſproveth ſome Sibylline Oracles; for he proveth them, not to be of Divine Inſpiration (*i*) becauſe there is human Art in them, the Art of an Acroſtick. There was no need of artificial Eloquence in the Teachers of true Religion,

---

(g) *Ad Autol. l.* 2. p. 112.

(h) *Fragm. Ep. T.* 1. p. 541.

(i) *Ineruditos liberalibus diſciplinis, & omninò, quantum ad illorum doctrinas attinet, impolitos, non peritos Grammatica, non armatos dialectica, non Rhetorica inflatos, piſcatores Chriſtus cum retibus fidei ad mare hujus ſeculi pauciſſimos miſit, atque ita ex omni genere tam multos piſces, & tanto mirabiliores quanto rariores etiam ipſos Philoſophos cepit.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 22. c. 5.

(k) *J. Mart. Paran.* p. 32.

(l) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. p. 372.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 6. p. 276.

(n) *In Luc.* 22. 20.

(o) *Beza digreſſ. in Act.* 10.

(p) P. 361.

(q) *Curcel. Diſſ. de voc. Trin. S.* 18.

(r) *Theodoret.* Θεραπ. *Ser.* 5, & 8.

(s) *Or. c. Græc. p.* 165.

(t) *Cujus ſermo ubique erat conſpicuus & popularis.* Grot. Not. in Matth. 26. 26.

(u) *Proverbiale eſt, qualia ſunt pleraque in Domini noſtri ſermonibus, de medio uſu ſumpta.* Idem in Matth. 5. 18.

(w) *Sed & in Chriſti dictis plurima ſunt, ex medio vulgi ſermone, aut ex ſapientum præceptis deſumpta, ſed quæ ipſe plerunque à rebus humanis ad divinas tranſtulit.* Idem Proleg. ad Stob. Florileg.

(x) *Lightfoot Hor. in Matth.* 3. 15.

(y) *Grot. Not. in Rom.* 7. 22.

(z) *Hyper. de rat. ſtud. Theol.* p. 137.

(a) *Gr. Naz. or.* 20. p. 323.

(b) *Heinſ. Ariſt. ſac.* p. 275.

(c) *Phot. cod.* 24. *col* 1239.

(d) *Simplicitatem communemque ſermonem,* κοινότητα ϗ ἁπλαίαν ϗ ἅπασι καθημαξευμένην τὴν λέξιν, *Barbariſmos & Solæciſmos.* Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 32. Arnob. l. 1. p. 35. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 7. p. 232. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 1. p. 17.

(e) V. Mr. *Boyle Style of the Script.*

(f) *Inter cæteras ſacrarum literarum* λεκτικὰς *virtutes ſimplicitatem ac* ἀφέλειαν *admira* Heinſ. ſupr.

(g) *Gr. Naz. or.* 21. p. 3

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. p. 135. *Arnob.* p. 3

(i) *De Div. l.* 2.

gion, no more than in Architects, Phyſicians, Mathematicians (whoſe Demonſtrations are obſcur'd and ſpoil'd by Eloquence) their Gold needed no gilding, (k) *quo imperitior ſermo hoc illuſtrior eſt, their Speech being without the paint and pomp and flouriſhes of* (artificial) *Eloquence is thereby the more illuſtrious.* (l) *Simplex ac nuda veritas, plain and naked truth* hath all the Excellency and Pretioſity of the truth to recommend it. Simplicity is moſt agreeable both to Divine and Humane Laws, (m) as the Lawyers ſay. And as they condemn over-much Subtilty in Law, ſo the Simplicity of the Holy Scriptures agreeth not with the very ſubtil Interpretations. (n) *Scholaſtici quidem argutè & ſubtiliter diſputant, nos verò piſcatoriam ſimplicitatem potiùs ſequemur.* The Scholaſticks diſpute acutely and ſubtilly, but *we will rather follow the Fiſhermens Simplicity.* Subtil Speculations twiſted with great Truths, are greatly to their prejudice; for they tempt Men, to reject thoſe ſubſtantial Verities becauſe of their ſubtil Appendages. And if thoſe ſubtil Speculations are very ſubtil Interpretations of Scripture, there is great reaſon, to ſay of them, as an Expoſitor doth upon *Matth.* 5. 29. (o) *In hunc locum multa congeruntur ſubtiliora, quàm ferat ſermonis popularitas:* Upon this place many more Subtilties are heap'd together than the popularity of the Language of Holy Scripture will bear.

(2.) The Style of the Scriptures is in great part ſuch, as the ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writers affirm it to be, who ſay of our Saviour, (p) he affecteth τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, *a low way of ſpeaking*, (q) the *Logos* of God πτωχοτέραις ταῖς λέξεσι διδάσκει, *uſeth in his teaching a meaner ſort of Speech*, he uſed (r) τὸ ταπεινὸν τῶν ῥημάτων, *a lowneſs of Language* (not a ſublime majeſtick Style;) and although *Longinus* ſuppoſeth, that *Moſes* uſeth a ſublime Style, when he introduceth God thus ſpeaking, *Let there be Light, and there was Light; let the Earth be, and it was ſo*; yet there are thoſe that affirm, (s) that *Moſes* in this Narration uſeth no other than a low Style, whence they infer, that *Longinus* never ſaw the Text of *Moſes*. But the meaning of *Longinus* ſeemeth to be, that *Moſes* uſeth a ſublime Style as introducing God ſpeaking in ſuch a Style; and doubtleſs thoſe words of God are in ſome reſpect of the ſublime Style being *imperatoria* (as *Tacitus* ſpeaketh) δεινότερον τὸ βραχὺ καὶ ἐπιτακτικόν, they are conciſe and have a grandeur and agreeableneſs to Imperial Majeſty. But touching our Saviour ancient Writers ſay, (t) ἀγροικότερον εἰπών, *he ſpake more homely*; and in the Scriptures in general they ſuppoſe, τὸ εὐτελὲς τῆς φράσεως, *a lowneſs of Speech*, ἐν ἰδιωτικῇ λέξει μεγάλα πεινοῶν, *compriſing great things in vulgar Language.* (u) *We ſpeak* νοῦν μὲν ἀληθῆ, λέξιν δὲ ἀμαθῆ, *things true in Senſe, but impolite in Language.* (w) *A great and ineffable Treaſure is brought us, not in ſplendid and tumid Speeches, but* ἁπλοῖ καὶ πεζοί, *ſimple, low and ordinary.* Such is the ancient Writers Character of the Scriptures; but in ſome modern Authors they are of a different Character. *Budæus* is of Opinion, (x) that there are more ſublime and efficacious Tropes in Scripture, than are to be found in the ancient Greek and Latin Writers. *Melancthon* was wont to ſay (as *Mollerus* reporteth) *that there is no Writing in the World more elegant than the Pſalter of* David. (y) *Mornay* (with whom ſeveral others agree) preferreth the Prophet *Iſaiah* before *Cicero*. *Beza* preferreth *Paul* before *Plato* in Grandiloquence, before *Demoſthenes* in δεινότης, before *Ariſtotle* and *Galen* in exact method of teaching. But S. *Chryſoſtom* (z) would not thank him for doing this honour to *Paul* in preferring the Eloquence of his Writings before *Plato*; which that Father counteth both an Extravagance and an Injury to the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion. Not that S. *Paul*'s Writings are deſtitute of Eloquence, for there is in them and the reſt of the Holy Books (although no Grecanic artificial Eloquence, yet) an inartificial Eloquence, ſuch as is the Language of Wiſdom and of thoſe Divine Affections and Paſſions, wherewith the Holy Scriptures abound. (a) *They that underſtand what they ſpeak, underſtand alſo, that they* (the Holy Writers) *ought not to have ſpoken otherwiſe: for as there is a ſeveral ſort of Eloquence which becometh the ſeveral Ages of Men, and that is not to be counted Eloquence, which is not agreeable to the Perſon that ſpeaketh: ſo there is a certain Eloquence, which is agreeable to Divine Men* (no other is agreeable) *and this is the Eloquence that they ſpeak, in which they did not follow the Precepts of Rhetorick, but their Eloquence follow'd their Wiſdom*, as S. *Auſtin* diſcourſeth; who will have the Holy Writers accounted Eloquent, yet ſaith of the Scripture, (b) *invitat omnes humili ſermone*, it inviteth all by a lowneſs of Speech. The low Style of the Scriptures is not ſo alien from Eloquence, but that there are eminent ſtrains of it (ſcarce to be parallell'd) in the Holy Writers; but it is ſo mean an Accompliſhment, (c) *and ſo little is the fruit of this Wiſdom of the Mouth*, that to conteſt for the Holy Writers preheminence in it beyond the Pagan Writers, and to inſiſt on it as the matter of their praiſe, is as if we ſhould commend *Sylla* as an excellent Singer, or *Appius Claudius* as an excellent Dancer. And to ſlight the Holy Scriptures as deſtitute of the Grecanic Eloquence, is the ſame Vanity, that the *Athenians* were guilty of, who when they wanted Money for the Publick, refus'd to take the kind proffer of one, who offer'd to furniſh them with it, becauſe in his Language he did not proffer it *ſatis Atticè & emendatè*, Attically and finely enough. (d) They have little concern for their great and only concern, that are for fineneſs of Words, Witticiſms and Elegancies in the New Teſtament, which is the Book of Life, of that Life which knoweth none of our Concinnity of Language, no Suavity of Attick Speech or Purity of Greciſm.

(3.) The Terms of Language in Scripture muſt not be underſtood in *the peculiarly Philoſophic Senſe*, but being the words of Popular-religious Men touching the Popular-religious Matters they are of Popular-religious Senſe and Interpretation. (e) An *Arabian* is ſaid to have come to the City *Dhafar* to the King of the *Hamyarenſes* ſitting on the Roof of his Palace, who courteouſly entertain'd the Man, and ſaid to him ثب *Theb*, that is, *ſit down.* The Man anſwer'd, *Know, O King, that I am ready to do whatever you command me:* And immediately leaping down from the Roof of the Palace, by his fall he brake the Members of his Body and ſo died. The King wonder'd at the madneſs of the Man, till his Domeſticks told him, that the word which he had uſed, in another dialect of the *Arabians* did not ſignifie *ſitting*, but rather

leaping

(k) Theodoret. Seearr. ser. 1. Min. Rel. p. 124.

(l) Lactant. l. 3. c. 1.

(m) *Simplicitas legibus amica. Nimia ſubtilitas in jure reprobatur.*

(n) Chemnit. loc. com. p. 12.

(o) Grot.

(p) S. Cyr. in Julian. p. 531.

(q) S. Athanaſ. de Incarn. verb. p. 76. Com.

(r) Phot. cod. 222. col. 622.

(s) Huet. Dem. Ev. pr. 4. c. 2. S. 53.

(t) Orig. c. Cel. p. 122, 371. 373. Philoc. c. 14.

(u) S. Baſil. Ep. 146.

(w) Theodoret. Therap. Ser. 9.

(x) De Aſſe l. 5. fol. 192.

(y) De ver. Rel. Chriſt. c. 25.

(z) Hom. 3. in 1 Cor.

(a) S. Aug de Doct. Chriſt. l. 4. c. 6.

(b) Ep. 3.

(c) Gr. Naz. or. 3. p. 79.

(d) *Verborum elegantiam in ſcriptis novi fœderis, aut veneres ſectari, ejus eſt, qui nihil aliud ſpectavit unquam, nihil in futurum ſpectat. qui de fine eorum quæ ad alia nos ducunt, nunquam cogitavit. nullam enim linguæ venuſtatem, nullam Attici ſermonis ſuavitatem, aut Græciſmi puritatem vita novit quæ promittitur.* Heinſ. proleg. in Ariſtarch. Sacr.

(e) Pocock. Not. miſc. p. 24.

leaping or *flying. Surely then* (ſaid he) *whoſo cometh to* Dhafar, *had need to learn* Hamyariſm. So they that come to the City of God (that inſtead of ſitting down with ſafety and ſatisfaction they may not miſtake and fall into Errors) had need to learn *Scripturiſm*, and what words ſignifie in the dialect thereof. For as the ſame word is of various ſignifications in various *Arabian* dialects; ſo there is great difference between the acceptation of a word in the *Scriptural Dialect* and the *Philoſophical*. For the Exotick Greek Writers are unacquainted with our Scriptural ſignifications of words and our *Formulæ* or modes of expreſſion: Such as (*f*) *God is a Spirit*, *to baptize with the Spirit*, *that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit*, *the Holy Spirit was not yet*, *miniſtring Spirits*, *the Spirits of the Juſt*, *the unclean Spirits*, *the Spirit, Soul and Body*, *to be in and after the Spirit*, *to walk after the Spirit*, *in the Spirit of Meekneſs*, *diſcerning of Spirits*: which Scriptural uſe of τὸ πνεῦμα (Spirit) is in very various ſignifications and very uſual, but is extraneous to the profane Greek Writers and not of their acquaintance. The ſame muſt be ſaid of *the Fleſh* (the oppoſite to the Spirit;) *the Will of the Fleſh*, *the Word was made Fleſh*, *of the Seed of* David *according to the Fleſh*, *in my Fleſh dwelleth no good*, *walking after the Fleſh*, *being in or after the Fleſh*, *the Wiſdom of the Fleſh*, *living after the Fleſh*, *warring after the Fleſh*, *the Works of the Fleſh*, *the Deſires of the Fleſh*, *no Fleſh ſhall be juſtified*, *the weakneſs of your Fleſh*, *in the Days of his Fleſh*; which Scriptural uſe of ἡ σὰρξ (the Fleſh) is in very various ſignifications and very uſual, but is extraneous to the profane Greek Writers and not of their acquaintance. And if the Greek Philoſophers were ſo great Strangers to our Scriptural Notions of *Fleſh* and *Spirit* (with many other of our Terms) is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that they were ſo well acquainted with our Scriptural ſignification of ὁ λόγος (the Word,) that we muſt fetch the Interpretation of this Goſpel-Logos from their Schools, whence we will not fetch the ſignification of ἡ σὰρξ and τὸ πνεῦμα? As they were great ſtrangers to the Holy Writers and to the Senſe of their Terms, ſo the Holy Writers were as great ſtrangers to them (the generality of them *nunquam philoſophum pictum viderunt*, as *Cicero* ſpeaketh;) therefore the Terms which the Holy Writers uſe (ſuch as ὁ λόγος) do not in their Writings ſignifie in the Senſe of the Philoſophers *Acroaticks*. When our Saviour ſpeaketh of thoſe, unto whom ὁ λόγος, *the word of God came*, this muſt not be underſtood of the Platoniſts fontal *Logos* (as ſome would have it:) nor muſt we ſuppoſe with *Jobius* in *Photius* (in a ſtrain of Philoſophic-paganizing the matters of the Chriſtian Theology) that this is a legitimate Deſcription of our Purity, (*g*) τὸ καθαρὸν τοῦ νοῦ ἀμιγὲς τῆς ὕλης, *a purity of the intellectual Mind unmix'd with Matter*; or that the deſign of Chriſt's coming was to reduce us back again πρὸς τὸ νοερὸν, *to intellectuality*. If *Caſtellio* was highly criminal (as himſelf acknowledgeth and bewaileth) becauſe *ex evangelio Ciceronem facit* (as *Maldonate* chargeth him,) are they leſs criminal, *qui ex Evangelio Platonem faciunt?* and there are thoſe, that *ex Evangelio Zenonem faciunt*. The Holy Writers of the New Teſtament (eſpecially S. *John*) ſpeak in Chriſtianiſm, but they are underſtood in Paganiſm; which is (according to an Expreſſion of *Maimonides*) as if one ſhould ſpeak in *Hebrew* and be underſtood in *Arabick*. Words are ſo ambiguous, (*h*) that ſometimes the ſame word is of one ſignification amongſt Grammarians, of another amongſt Philoſophers, of another amongſt Theologers, and of another amongſt the Lawyers; but common Reaſon ſuggeſteth Rules and Notices, whereby to fix and determine their ſignification: For Law-terms muſt be underſtood in the Senſe of Law, and the Terms of Art and Science muſt be underſtood according to the uſe of the Men of Art and Science. So Terms Evangelical muſt be underſtood in an Evangelical Senſe; as they are us'd by the Popular-religious Writers (that are no Scholaſticks, no Philoſophers, no Sons of Art and Science) they muſt be underſtood in a Popular Senſe; as the word στοιχεῖα, *the Elements*, 2 Pet. 3. 10. doth not ſignifie in Scripture in the Philoſophical Senſe, but it ſignifieth what the People call the Elements. So the Evangeliſts *Logos*, *the Light and Life*, that he is (as alſo his Creation) neceſſarily ſignifie in our Popular-religious (or the Evangelical) Senſe; a Scholaſtick *Logos* (Platonic or Ariſtotelian) is hugely diſſonant from the Evangeliſt's Character; *certè talis loquendi modus ejus genio non convenit*, (*i*) as one argueth concerning *Ariſtotle*. (*k*) *Paſtor ſibi convenientia loquitur*: ſo our Evangeliſts certainly ſpeak agreeably to themſelves. What a Philoſopher ſaith (in great degree untruly) of the *Ariſtotelians* and *Platoniſts* is moſt true of theſe Holy Writers, (*l*) they were ἐν δημοτικῇ λέξει καὶ διανοίᾳ εἰθισμένοι, *wont to expreſs things in the Popular Laguage and Senſe*. And their Writings are the more beauteous, (*m*) becauſe they are like a chaſt Matron, that hath no Paintings nor any gaudy aſcititious Ornaments of Art.

VIII. The Holy Scriptures are *Popular* in reſpect of their *final Object* as being duely accommodated to the Univerſality of the People of God of ſeveral Ranks (accommodated to their Apprehenſion and Genius) and for their uſe and benefit. For as they were written by thoſe that were of the People (their Teachers and Holy Popular kind of Men) ſo they are written for the People, and are directed to the People; their Doctrines are for the Inſtruction of the People; their Laws are for the dutiful Obedience of the People; their *Ethicks*, *Oeconomicks*, *Eccleſiaſticks*, *Politicks*, are a Directory to the People; their Ordinances are an Inſtitution of the People; their Devotional Parts and Forms are for the Devotion of the People of God; and the whole of them is for their Creation, Conſervation, Diſcipline, Edification and Salvation. In this Senſe they are *the Book of the People*, and they ſpeak themſelves to be of this Character: for the Style of the Moſaic Law is, *Hear, O Iſrael*, and what God ſpake to the Prophets in the Old Teſtament-times, they ſpake to the People. So the Laws of Chriſt in the New Teſtament-times are the Laws of his Church and People, and are intentionally the Laws of all People, *Matth.* 28. 20. So the Apoſtles direct their Epiſtles, not only to the Paſtors, but to all the Faithful; and if any of them are directed to the Paſtors only (as thoſe to *Timothy* and *Titus*) yet in the purport of them they referr to the Community of the People of God. The Holy Scriptures therefore are given to the People, and they are adapted to them, to whom they were given. They were preach'd to the People by the Holy Writers of them, that ſpake to the People in the Language of the People, (*n*) *& quod tunc præconiaverunt, poſtea per Dei voluntatem in ſcripturis nobis tradiderunt*, and what they then preach'd,

afterwards

(f) *Gataker. c. Phochen.* p. 55, 56.

(g) *Phot.* col. 508, 602.

(h) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. Ep. dedic.*

(i) *Salmaſ. Not. in Epiſt.* p. 218.

(k) *Grot. Not. in Amos* 2. 13.

(l) *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 22.

(m) [illegible] *de cognit. Dei* p. 145.

(n) *Iren. adv. Hær.* l. 3. c. 1.

afterwards by the Will of God they deliver'd to us in the Scriptures. One of theſe Preachers to the People was our Bleſſed Saviour, whoſe Diſcourſes are eminently Popular (both as to τὸ λεκτικὸν, *the words*, and τὸ συνοηματικὸν, *the Senſe*) being *Parabolical* (which was an uſual and familiar way of teaching in the Eaſtern parts) and his Parables are taken from things popular, known and ordinary; as from Beaſts or Trees, from a Shepherd tending his Flock, from an Husbandman ſowing Corn in his Field, from a Fiſher caſting his Net into the Sea, from a Woman putting Leaven into her Dough, or ſuch like things accommodate to the Apprehenſion and Genius of the People: *ſenſus eſt admodum popularis*, ſaith *Grotius*, (o) of a Saying of our Saviour that is not parabolical. *Antony* the Religious Monk ſaid, (p) *Deus per Filium ſuum propriis Eccleſias ditavit eloquiis*, God by his Son hath enrich'd his Churches with his own Oracles. They are intirely the Church's Book (to whom the written Oracles of God are committed) and therefore the Book of the People (the Holy People) to whom they are accommodated. This Branch of their Character may be illuſtrated from the Hebrew Doctors, from the Fathers, *Origen* eſpecially, and from the Senſe and Sayings of Modern Divines.

(1.) Some of the Hebrew Doctors talk, (q) that the ſeven Voices at the giving of the Law repreſent the ſo many Sciences comprehended in it; that there are five things, which are Impediments in matters of Learning, all which were intimated at the giving of the Law. For the Voice of the Trumpet ſignifieth *altitude of Conception* (that things to be known are of high Conception;) the Lightnings ſignifie the Infirmity and Inſtability of Humane Underſtanding; the Smoak (that filled the Mount) the innumerable Propoſitions that cloud every thing; the *Voices* a Mind not well diſpos'd through Arrogance and Pride; the thick Cloud ſignifieth the Domeſtick Burden, Wife and Children. At this rate theſe Metaphyſical and Profane Rabbins play with their Law, repreſenting it as a Book of all the Sciences, and of all Secular Learning and Philoſophy. But theſe extravagant Conceits agree not with theſe other Accounts of it. (r) *In the Law there is nothing clearly delivered touching another World, nothing touching Angels and other marvellous things, which might have been treated of; and that for this reaſon, as* Aben Ezra *ſaith; becauſe the Law is given to the Learned and Unlearned, and therefore is adapted to the Capacity of all.* (s) *Spiritual happineſs is not expreſly promis'd in the Law of* Moſes, *but only indicated by certain ſigns and coverings; and this is done, becauſe the Law is not only given to the Wiſe and Unlearned, but to the Univerſality of the People, which is a mixture of the Undiſcerning and the Intelligent. Wherefore in the common promulgation of it thoſe things only ought to be inſerted, which might be underſtood by all, and might move the Minds of all,* which are τὰ αἰσθητὰ, *the things ſenſible, whereas* τὰ νοητὰ, *the things intelligible avail only amongſt the Wiſe, but to the Judgement of the Vulgar they do not ſo much as ſeem credible. For this reaſon the Law propos'd expreſly things corporeal, conſpicuous and known to the Vulgar, but thoſe things that are only reach'd by the underſtanding under the covering of Signs.* If the Law is ſo ſcanty in its Notices of Spiritual Happineſs, and treateth not of the great recondite things, it is far from being a Book of Univerſal Learning; nor is a Life to come more accommodate to Philoſophers than the Vulgar, who in all Ages have been more prone to believe a Life to come than the Philoſophers; but the Law is rightly ſaid to be accommodated to *the Univerſality of the People of the Jews* of ſeveral Ranks and Conditions.

(2.) *Our Scriptures*, ſaith Origen, (t) *have reſpect to the multitude of the leſs intelligent, which the contrivers of the Grecanic Fables have not obſerv'd They afford to the more intelligent a Theology able to raiſe the Soul from the things that are here; nevertheleſs condeſcending to the mean Abilities of Plebeian Men, and not very intelligent Women, and of Servants and ſimply of all, that by Jeſus only have help to live better, together with thoſe dogmata concerning God, which they are capable of. The Embaſſadours of the Truth deſigning according to their power to profit many, and ſo far as is poſſible (out of love to Men) to bring to it every one whatſoever, not only the Ingenious, but the Unintelligent, and not only the Greeks but alſo the Barbarians (and it is great manſuetude to convert the moſt Wild, Ruſtick and Plebeians) it is manifeſt, that they ought to take care, that their Speech be of a Character commonly underſtood and uſeful, and ſuch as may draw every one to the hearing of it. But they that keep at a diſtance from Plebeians as of ſervile condition, and not fit to hear well compos'd Oratory, regarding only thoſe that are bred in the Arts of Learning, theſe have a very narrow communicative Virtue. Our Prophets and Jeſus and his Apoſtles took care, that their way of ſpeaking ſhould be ſuch, as not only containeth Truths, but is alſo efficacious to draw the Multitude; till being converted and brought in, every one receiveth according to his Capacity the things that are covertly ſpoken in ſeemingly mean Language. The polite and elaborate Language of* Plato (who did βοστρυχίζειν, trim his Writings till the eightieth Year of his Age) *and of ſuch as he hath profited but a few (if it hath profited:) but the meaner Speech of thoſe who have taught and written both efficaciouſly and accommodately to the Multitude, hath profited very many.* (u) *Let us ſuppoſe a Sanative Food ſtrengthening thoſe that eat it; and that ſome of it is ſo prepar'd and with ſuch Sauces, as that none of the Unlearned (the Ruſticks, thoſe that are bred in Cottages and the Poor) eat of it, but only the Rich and Delicate: otherſome of it not prepared according to the Palate of the finer People, but as the Poor, the Ruſticks and the Multitude have learn'd to eat, is eaten by Sholes of People. If by one preparation of this Food the finer People only are cured, none of the Multitude meddling with ſuch Meat, and by the other the Multitudes are cured, whom will Communicative Virtue direct us to take, to prepare this Sanative Food? thoſe that prepare it only for the Rich or Learned, or thoſe that prepare it for the Multitudes? ſuppoſing it to be equally Sanative, whether it be prepared the one way or the other. It is manifeſt, that according to Philanthropy and Communicative Virtue that Phyſician is better, as being more profitable to the Publick, that taketh care of the Health of the many, than he that taketh care of a few only.* (w) Malo me populus, *I had rather edifie the People with rudeneſs of words, than ſpeak nothing but pure Ciceronian without edfying them.*

(3.) The Popularity of the Scripture Language was very much diſguſted by the politer ſort of Pagans. (x) *For this is a principal cauſe, why amongſt the Wiſe and Learned and the the Princes of this World the Holy Scripture is not believ'd, becauſe the Prophets have ſpoken in a common and ſimple Speech*

as

(o) *Not. in Luk.* 12. 15.

(p) *Vita D. Antonii.*

(q) *Men. ben Iſr. Qu. in Exod.* p. 136, 138.

(r) *Idem Qu. in Deuter.* p. 235.

(s) *Joſ. Albo ap. Grot. Not. in Matt.* 5. 19.

(t) *C. Celſ. l.* 4. p. 198. *l.* 7. p. 360. *l.* 6. p. 275.

(u) *Ibid. l.* 7. p. 371, 372.

(w) *Dr. Crakanthorp Vigil. dormit.* p. 499.

(x) *Nam hæc in primis cauſa eſt, cur apud ſapientes & doctos & principes hujus ſeculi ſcriptura ſancta fide careat, quòd prophetæ communi ac ſimplici ſermone, ut ad populum, ſunt locuti.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 1.

as to the People. But their Speech ought to be Popular; for (y) *the Buſineſs of the Apoſtles and Prophets was for the moſt part with ruſtick and plebeian Men*, ſaith *Beza*. *Be not offended with the Simplicity and as it were vility of words in the Holy Scriptures, that were ſo order'd*, ut ruſticam concionem facilius inſtruerent, *that they might furniſh a plebeian Sermon*, (z) ſaith S. *Hierom*. They are called *Scriptura Populorum* (ſaith he) becauſe (*a*) *Scriptura Populis omnibus legitur, hoc eſt, ut omnes intelligant. Plato ſcripſit in Scriptura, ſed non ſcripſit Populis, ſed paucis; vix enim intelligunt tres homines: Principes Eccleſiæ verò, principes Chriſti non ſcripſerunt paucis, ſed univerſo populo.* The Scriptures are not like *Plato*'s Books written only to a few, they are written to the Univerſality of God's People, and are to be read to all, and underſtood by all. The Bible is of right the Book of the People (in Conjunction vvith their Paſtors) it is the Code of their Laws, the Charter of their Liberties, the Teſtament whereby they are inſtituted Heirs, and the Deed of their Inheritance. They have right to keep it (as being their Depoſitum) right to have it tranſlated into the vulgar Languages, right to read it in private and at Meals (as it vvas read by the Primitive Chriſtians) right to have it read and expounded in their publick Aſſemblies, of Right and by Obligation they are to converſe with the Scriptures Day and Night. And S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith (*b*) ὀ μόνον ἀνδράσι συνετοῖς, ἀλλὰ ϗ γυναιξὶ ϗ νέοις ἅπαντα εἰσὶ τὰ λεγόμενα δῆλα, *all things ſaid in the Goſpel are plain and open, not only to intelligent Men, but alſo to Women and thoſe that are Young.* But ſuch Sayings of the Fathers muſt be underſtood with ſeveral Reſtrictions and Limitations; for the Scriptures are not without their Difficulties and Obſcurities. But in reſpect of far the greateſt part of them they are open and manifeſt to all; in matters neceſſary to Salvation they are ſufficiently clear and perſpicuous; their Words and Terms in the whole of them are to be underſtood in the plain Popular Senſe; and the whole of them may be underſtood by the People (the People of God) remaining the People, without being inſtituted in the Philoſophers Acroaticks.

(4.) Agreeably whereto Divines ſay (*c*) *whatſoever Notion is offer'd upon any head of Divinity by any, who perhaps are of more exquiſite Learning and ſearch in ſome things than others are, if when they are ſufficiently declared, they are not apprehenſible by common ordinary People as well as themſelves, I do count them of little worth in the Chriſtian Religion. They were plain Men, who firſt preached the Goſpel; and they were plain Men, for whoſe ſake it was firſt preached and is written. When it is evident, that there muſt go more skill to the finding ſuch or ſuch things out, more Learning, ſubtil Diſtinction and Wit, than I believe any of the Apoſtles, if they were living, ever had, I cannot but think preſently, that none of Chriſt's Diſciples would have deliver'd this. The Goſpel was addreſs'd to Perſons of very ordinary Endowments, and therefore to be underſtood in its moſt obvious Senſe.* (*e*) *The Speech of Scripture is the vulgar, and conſiſteth of words commonly receiv'd and uſed: Whereas the Scholaſtic Terms are unknown to the People, and are underſtood only by thoſe that have ſtudied Philoſophy.* (*f*) *Holy Scripture being not penn'd by Maſters of human Art or Science, nor directed to Perſons of more than ordinary Capacities or Improvements, doth not intend to uſe words otherwiſe than in the moſt plain and ordinary manner.* Of theſe Sayings and of this Branch of our Idea of the Holy Scriptures theſe are the Conſequences. Although in the Scriptures there is Meat for ſtrong Men as well as Milk for Babes, yet they are accommodate to the Univerſality of the People, as the Laws of a Nation are, and there is nothing in them peculiar to that kind of Notionaliſts the Scholaſticks. The great Articles of our Faith, *the Generation* and *Incarnation* of our Saviour and the great Article of the *Trinity* are not (in the Main or of Kind) *Unpopular*, *Scholaſtic* and *Metaphyſical.* The *Generation* of our Saviour and his Name *the Logos* ſignifie in the plain ordinary Senſe. *The whole of the Chriſtian Faith is Popular.* This ſurely is as plain, as that two and three make five. For the Chriſtian Faith is the Chriſtian-popular (the Holy-popular) Faith, and therefore is *Popular*, as the Pagans in *Prudentius* call it.

> *Populare quiddam ſub colore gloriæ*
> *Illiterata credidit frequentia.*

IX. The Holy Scriptures are Popular in reſpect of *Unexactneſs*; for the Holy Writers ſpeak and write with *a Popular Unexactneſs*, Populariter non κατ' ἀκρίβειαν φιλοσοφικὴν, *Popularly not according to Philoſophical Exactneſs*; which ſheweth, that the Bible is a *Popular*, not a *Philoſophical* or *Scholaſtical* kind of Book. A Divine of our own ſpeaking of the *Tenth* Commandment ſaith. (*g*) *It is certain, the Holy Spirit doth affect Logical Diviſion or Rhetorical Partitions or Methods, but delivereth things groſly to a rude People, inculcating the ſame thing under divers forms of Speech.* Again he ſaith. (*h*) *The Scripture is not wont to ſpeak Logically, Preciſely or Scholaſtically, but Popularly and Familiarly.* So it ſpeaketh, when it ſpeaketh of the Syſtem of the viſible World; when it maketh a Conſtruction, not to the Words, but to the Senſe, and ſo it ſpeaketh of ſingular Perſons and a ſingular Animal in the Plural Number. *Matth.* 21. 2. and 26. 8. and 27. 44. *Luc.* 23. 36. *Joh.* 19. 29. *Heb.* 11. 33, 37. So ſome Interpreters expound *Gen.* 1. 6. (*i*) *In medio, non mathematico, ſed rudi minerva.* The midſt is not mathematically, but groſly ſo called. So 2 *Chron.* 4. 2. *He made a molten Sea of ten Cubits from brim to brim, round in compaſs, and five Cubits the height thereof, and a line of thirty Cubits did compaſs it round about.* The Diameter of this round molten Sea is ſaid to be ten Cubits, yet the Circumference is ſaid to be but thirty Cubits, which is not according to Mathematical Exactneſs. So 1 *Joh.* 3. 8. the Apoſtle ſaith; *the Devil ſinneth from the beginning.* Which is not to be be underſtood nicely and exactly; (*k*) for a little time doth not hinder, but that a thing may be ſaid to have been from the beginning. Of our Saviour's Words which call Muſtard-ſeed *the leaſt of all Seeds*, an Expoſitor ſaith, (*l*) *In ſuch Sayings we are wont to ſpeak* non Philoſophicè & ſubtiliter, ſed populariter, *not Philoſophically and Subtilly, but Popularly*, παχυμερέστερον, *groſly*, not ἀκριβῶς, *exactly.* So in Moral and Proverbial Sayings (which are to be underſtood as moſt likely to be true and for the moſt part true) the Scripture ſpeaketh in a mollify'd and qualify'd Senſe, according to the Latitude and eaſie Air of Popular Speech, and not according to rigorous Exactneſs. *Train up a Child in the way that he ſhall go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it.*

(y) *Beza Digreſſ. in Act.* 10.

(z) *Ep.* 103.

(a) *In Pſal.* 86.

(b) *In Joan. Hom.* 2. *p.* 561.

(c) *Mr. Humphrey's Paper of Redemption. p.* 25.

(g) Scrivener Body of Divin. p. 531.

(h) Ibid. p. 322.

(i) Poli Syn. in loc.

(k) Viv. in S Aug. de C. D. l. 11. c. 15.

(l) Maldonat in Matth 13. 32.

(c) *Scripturæ ſermo eſt vulgaris & conſtans ex vocibus communiter receptis & uſitatis: Cùm termini Scholaſtici populo ſint incogniti, & ab iis ſolùm intelligantur, qui philoſophiæ operam dederunt.* Curcell. Diſſ. de voc. Trin. S. 13.

(f) Dr. *Barrow on the Creed. Ser.* 4 *p.* 55.

it. *All Men ſhall ſee and fear, and ſhall do no more ſuch Wickedneſs. When thy Judgments are in the Earth, the Inhabitants of the World will learn Righteouſneſs. Who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is Good?* So the generality of Speech in Scripture is oftentimes to be limited to the matter ſpoken of; as when our Saviour ſaith to the Apoſtles, *The Spirit of Truth he will guide you into all Truth* (not all common or uſeleſs Truth, but ſuch as concerneth your Miniſtery:) *All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you*; yet he had many things to ſay to them, which then they could not bear. So *Gen.* 31. 29. *Laban* is charg'd *to ſpeak to* Jacob *neither good nor bad*, that is, touching *Jacob*'s return to him. The *Stoick* in *Stobæus* obſerveth this neceſſary and uſual limitation of the largeneſs of our Popular Speech. (m) *We ſay of a Piper or an Harper, he doth all well, yet ſubunderſtanding as to the matter of his piping and harping.* So when God ſaith in the Prophet *Jer.* 32. 40. *I will put my fear in their Hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me*; the Senſe is, their departure ſhall not be eaſie or uſual. And when the Scripture ſpeaketh of *Ahab*'s *ſending into all Nations*; *of giving to* Cyrus *all Kingdoms*; both of *Hezekiah* and *Joſiah*, *that there was none like him*; *that we ſhall be hated of all Men*; *that all are gone aſide and become filthy*; *that Chriſt ever taught in the Synagogue and Temple*; *that the Apoſtles were in the Temple continually*, *of giving Thanks in every thing*, *of praying continually, and rejoicing evermore*; this Phraſeology is of a mild Popular Senſe, and is not rigorouſly to be underſtood. Which ſort of miſunderſtanding Popular Speech was the Errour of the *Euchites*, the *Anthropomorphites* and of *Pelagius* (who ſuppos'd, that none Rich could be ſaved,) and is the Errour of *Tranſubſtantiation* and of the high-flown *Perfectioniſts*; (n) and ſeveral of the Jews Objections againſt Chriſtianity are rigorous Interpretations of the Popular Prophetic Phraſes of the Old Teſtament. This Popularity of Holy Scripture in reſpect of *Unexactneſs* is further remarkable in ſeveral great Inſtances of it, which we ought not to overlook. For

(1.) In an Objection which the Jews make againſt the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament, there are many Inſtances of their Popular Unexactneſs. S. *Hierom* in many of his Commentaries obſerveth, (o) *that in almoſt all the Teſtimonies which they cite from the Old Teſtament, the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles truſted to their Memory, and only explicating the Senſe they often chang'd the Words, ſometimes adding and ſometimes taking away words.* (p) Upon this account the Jews accuſe them of corrupting the Scriptures; to which the Chriſtians Anſwer; that the Writers of the New Teſtament were not ſolicitous about the words, but the Senſe they recite. Which is an Anſwer, that (although they reject, yet) the Jews have great Reaſon, to be ſatisfied with, ſeeing their own Writers have done the ſame thing. For the *Eighteenth Pſalm* as it is recited 2 *Sam.* 22. is obſerved, to differ from that which is in the Book of *Pſalms* in no leſs than nine and forty places; ſo little regard have the Holy Writers to a Critical or Philoſophical Exactneſs. So vain and frivolous is that Saying of the Rabbins; that there is not one Letter of Scripture, on which great Mountains of Learning do not depend; and ſo needleſs is the pains of ſome Criticks in reconciling the Old and New Teſtament, ſometimes accuſing the Copyiſts, ſometimes the Interpreters, and ſometimes they tell us, that either by Divine Inſpiration or having a better Copy the Apoſtles ſo cite Teſtimonies from the Prophets, as to correct the Faults (as if the Apoſtles were as great Criticks as themſevles;) and concerning the Septuagint they have recourſe to their *varia Lectiones*, as if they had read otherwiſe than we do. (q) Whereas thoſe ancient Interpreters did not render word for word, or confine themſelves to the words, but having regard to the Senſe, that they might expreſs it in their own way (oftentimes Paraphraſtically) they took liberty, to recede from the words, having as little regard to a nice Exactneſs as the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament. Who in citing the Old Teſtament (r) ſometimes follow the Septuagint differing from the Hebrew; ſometimes they follow the Hebrew Text waving the Septuagint; ſometimes their Citation agreeth with neither (as *Matth.* 2. 6.) ſometimes they forſake the Septuagint when the difference is but in Words, not in Senſe; to the end ſay ſome, that their indulgence to the Grecizing Jews and Gentiles in uſing the Greek Verſion receiv'd by them, might not be ſo interpreted, as if they counted it Authentick and not to be receded from: But the true reaſon is, the Holy Writers had no regard to a nice and needleſs Exactneſs. Of which the Evangeliſt S. *Matthew* is a great Inſtance, in whoſe Genealogy of our Saviour three Kings are left out; yet he accounted that imperfect Genealogy which he made uſe of and follow'd, to be ſufficiently perfect for his purpoſe (as it was) and therefore he concern'd not himſelf about a needleſs rigorous Exactneſs.

(2.) A ſpeaking of things in groſs by way of counting without deſcending to unneceſſary Exactneſs (which may be called a groſs Popular ſpeaking) is in *Gen.* 46. 15. *Theſe be the Sons of Leah, which ſhe bare unto Jacob in Padan-Aram* (where only ſix Sons was born) *with his Daughter Dinah: All the Souls of his Sons and Daughters were thirty and three.* So *Act.* 7. 14. (although not ſo many as ſeventy Perſons can reaſonably be thought, to have gone down into *Egypt*, yet) the Text ſaith; *Joſeph called his Father* Jacob *to him, and all his Kindred, threeſcore and fifteen Souls.* And the Text of *Moſes* ſaith *Gen.* 46. 27. *All the Souls of the Houſe of Jacob which came into Egypt, were threeſcore and ten.* So *Act.* 7. 6. *Gen.* 15. 13. (although the Children of *Iſrael* could not be in their Egyptian Thraldom above the one half of the ſpace of four hundred Years, yet) the Text ſaith, *that they ſhould be in Bondage and be evil intreated four hundred Years.* And *Exod.* 12. 40. the Text ſaith, *The ſojourning of the Children of Iſrael, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty Years.* In this groſs Popular way of ſpeaking things diſtinct are huddled up together (for brevity ſake) without deſcending to the Exactneſs of diſtinguiſhing them. As any one may be ſatisfied, that *Act.* 7. 16. S. *Stephen*'s meaning is, that their Fathers which were carried out of *Egypt*, were buried both in the Field, which *Abraham* bought for a Summ of Money of *Ephron* the Son of *Zohar*, and in the Field which *Jacob* bought of the Sons of *Hamor* the Father of *Sichem*: But in his conciſe Expreſſions theſe two diſtinct Paſſages of Old Teſtament-Hiſtory are ſo far from being diſtinctly mention'd, that they are intricated and in great degree confounded. The Rabbins have ſeveral axioms, which ſhew, that the Scriptures are not artificially written; for they ſay (*s*) אין

(m) Λέγομεν πάντ᾽ εὖ ποιεῖν, τὸν αὐλητὴν ἢ κιθαρῳδὸν συνακουομένου τοῦ ὅτι τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν αὔλησιν, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν κιθαρῳδίαν.

(n) Pocock on Hoſ. p. 21. *Hulſ. Theol. Jud.* p. 157.

(o) *In Galat.* 3. 10. *in Amos* 5. 25. *in Mich.* 5. 2. &c. *Epiſt.* 101.

(p) *Hotting. Theſaur. Phil.* p. 132.

(q) *Pocock Not. Miſc.* p. 45.

(r) *Lud. Capel. Crit. ſacr. l.* 3. *c.* 3. & *l.* 2. *c.* 1. *Hotting. ſupr.* p. 333.

(s) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 62. *Hotting. Theſ. Phil.* p. 232 *Menaſ. ben Iſ Qu. in Gen.* p. 45.

מוקדם ומאוחר בתורה *Non eſt prius & poſterius in lege*, there is no before and after in the Law. Which is to ſay, ὕςερον πρότερον, there is no ſuch exact Obſervation of Order, but that is ſet before, which ſhould come after. The Prophecy of *Jeremiah* is full of theſe Tranſpoſitions: But touching the Law the Jews ſay, this Axiom muſt be underſtood of ſeveral Sections of it, not of the ſame Section. They obſerve alſo in ſome places (t) מקרא מסורס *that the words of Scripture are inverted or tranſpos'd.* And the ſame is obſerv'd by S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyril.* As *Joh.* 8. 44. our Saviour ſpeaketh of the Devil, as if this was the cauſe, why he abode not in the Truth, becauſe there is no Truth in him: *Cùm potiùs ea ſit cauſa, ut in eo veritas non ſit, quòd in veritate non ſtetit.* Whereas this is rather the cauſe, why there is no Truth in him, becauſe he abode not in the Truth, as S. *Auſtin* diſcourſeth. This tranſpoſing the parts of an Oration is a Popular way of ſpeaking, which occurreth alſo *Joh.* 7. 4. the meaning whereof is; οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ εἶναι θέλων, ἐν κρυπτῷ τι ποιεῖ, *no Man that ſeeketh to be known openly, doth any thing in ſecret.*

(t) *Buxt. ſupr. col.* 1553. *Clav. Talm. p.* 193.

(3.) The Bible is ſo far from being a Scholaſtical or Philoſophical kind of Book, that a great part of it is imploy'd about matters of Chorography and Chronology, and about Genealogies, eſpecially the Genealogies of the Holy People, which ſpeak it a Popular and Holy-popular kind of Book. In theſe minute Matters in great degree extrinſecal to Religion it is far from affecting a nice Exactneſs, as is viſible, not only in the many diſagreements of Chronologers, the difficulties and improbalities wherewith their Accounts of Time are incumbred, but alſo from the Scriptural way of Chronologizing (in the Patriarchs, the Judges, the Kings and other Periods of time) which is by even Years, that muſt not be underſtood exactly, but with a *plùs minùs.* The Hebrew Doctors ſay (u) *major numerus devorat minorem*, which is to ſay, *the Scripture ſpeaketh in round Numbers.* Oftentimes the words of the Holy Writers touching theſe minute Matters are not to be underſtood, as if they ſpeak preciſely and poſitively, but becauſe they ſpeak with a Popular latitude and indifference, they are to be underſtood with this additional Explication, *ſpeaking only as to a paſſable account of things.* So S. *Paul*'s words muſt be underſtood *Act.* 13. 20, 21. *He gave unto them Judges about the ſpace of four hundred and fifty Years until* Samuel *the Prophet. And afterward they deſir'd a King: And God gave unto them* Saul *the Son of* Cis, *a Man of the Tribe of* Benjamin, *by the ſpace of forty Years.* So 1 *Cor.* 10. 8. *There fell in one day three and twenty thouſand.* So S. *Matthew*'s rounds of *fourteen Generations* are to be underſtood, which are reckon'd well enough ſpeaking only as to a paſſable account of things; and ſo are S. *Stephen's threeſcore and fifteen Souls.* Act. 7. 14. As the Holy Scriptures were not deſign'd, to teach us natural Philoſophy, ſo neither did the Holy Writers of them (except in ſome very few Inſtances) intend a nice defining of the matters of Chronology (not having ſo much as once defin'd the length of their Year, nor told us, whether it was Solar or Lunar) and therefore theſe miſtakes that are crept into the Bible in thoſe minute things of numbers, are unreaſonably made an Objection againſt their divine Original and Authority. For this Objection importeth only, that there are miſtakes in ſome parts of the Bible touching theſe minute things, not in the whole of it (for the miſtakes in ſome parts are rectified in others;) that the Jews and Chriſtians have not been ſo careful, as to keep their Holy Books from being vitiated by the Tranſcribers in theſe minute things: But as for the Holy Writers it cannot be ſhew'd, that they have committed any miſtake about them, they not intending nicely to define matters of Chronology, but their exceptionable Paſſages are to be underſtood with this additional Explication, *ſpeaking only as to a paſſable account of things*; ſo that their miſtakes which are ſuch as to Exactneſs of ſpeaking, are as to the ſenſe of the Speaker no miſtakes.

(u) *Men. ben Iſr. Qu. in Gen. p.* 129.

(4.) This account which we have given of the ſeeming Scriptural miſtakes in *Numbers*, is alſo applicable to the ſeeming Scriptural miſtakes in *Names*; for of theſe there are ſome Inſtances, but not many (difference in a few Letters not making different Names) the only conſiderable ones are *Act.* 7. 16. (where S. *Stephen* glanceth at once at two Hiſtorical Paſſages before-mention'd) and that of *Matth.* 27. 9. where the Evangeliſt nameth the Prophet *Jeremiah*, yet citeth a place of the Prophet *Zechariah*, of whom the Jews were wont to ſay, *that the Spirit of* Jeremiah *was in* Zechariah. Which Saying of the Jews implieth, that the Prophet *Zechariah* was accounted amongſt them (and probably called) another or a ſecond *Jeremiah.* In a Writer therefore that intendeth only a paſſable account of theſe minute things *Numbers* and *Names*, it is very allowable, to cite the words of the Prophet *Zechariah* (he being reputatively a Prophet *Jeremiah*) as the words of the Prophet *Jeremiah.* It is not reaſonable, to be more rigorous in our Dealings with the Prophets and Holy Writers, than the Criticks are in their Dealings with the Poets, of whom they ſay (w) *certè juvanda in plurimis potiùs vatum ſenſa, quàm exigenda omnia ad rigidam normam.* As the Poets ought not to be held rigorouſly to Rule in every thing, but rather in many things to be candidly help'd out: So the Holy Popular Writers in many things ought to be interpreted, not rigorouſly, but in a mollify'd and qualify'd Senſe, and agreeably to the largeneſs and unexactneſs of Popular Speech. But not ſo as to deny the plain ſenſe of Words, to deſtroy the common ſenſe of Language, to ſhut our Eyes againſt the Evidence of expreſs Words, to make a Noſe of Wax of the Scriptures, and to make them ſpeak (contrarily to their Character) unpopularly, as a late Scholaſtic Divine doth; who will not allow, that our Saviour was generated *the Son of God* by his Generation of the Bl. Virgin, although theſe are the plain expreſs Words of the Angel. *Luk.* 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee: Therefore alſo that Holy thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God.* (x) *For the Angel* (ſaith he) *muſt not be made to ſpeak according to Polite and Dialectical ſubtilty, but he muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak according to the common and popular cuſtom of Speech, wherein thoſe things are ſometimes alledg'd, as the cauſe of a thing, which are not the cauſe of it, but rather its effects and conſequents, or in ſome ſort connected with it.* It is vvell, that a Popular Unexactneſs is acknovvledg'd in Holy Scripture,

(w) *Pitan. ad Macrob. Saturn. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *inter omiſſa. p.* 693.

(x) *Neque enim ad limatam & dialecticam ſubtilitatem exigenda illius verba ſunt, ſed ad communem & popularem ſermonis conſuetudinem, in qua cauſſæ inſtar ea nonnunquam afferuntur, quæ non tam cauſſæ ſunt, quam effecta & conſequentia, aut quo modo cum re conjuncta.* Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 6. S. 2.

ture, that the Angel is ſuppos'd to ſpeak according to common and Popular Cuſtom: But if the Angel's words are of this Conſtruction, if he ſpeaketh according to the common Cuſtom of all People in ſpeaking of the Generation of a Son, our Saviour muſt be generated the Son of God by his Human-divine (or Temporal) Generation. This muſt be ſuppos'd, to be the Angel's Senſe, if the plain and common Senſe of words muſt not be deny'd, and if common Sence may be Judge in the Caſe.

X. The Holy Scriptures are *Popular* in reſpect of *their Figurations of Speech*; for in theſe they abound, in theſe they muſt be expounded as ſpeaking popularly, and theſe ſpeak them *a Popular-kind of Book.* Theſe ſo abound in Scripture, that a late learned Interpreter of Prophecies hath obſerv'd in them ſeveral ſuch *Schemes*, as Grammar and *Rhetorick* are not acquainted with (y) *Dioriſmus*, *Hylaſmus*, *Henopœia*, *Zoopœia*, *Iſraeliſmus*, *Antichroniſmus.* In all which Prophetic Schemes (as in all the uſual Tropes and Figures of Rhetorick) the Scripture muſt be expounded as ſpeaking popularly. For ſo it ſpeaketh in this *Dioriſm*, Apoc. 18. 6. *Double unto her double according to her works, fill to her double.* Which Popular Phraſeology doth not ſignifie, that ſhe ſhould be repay'd preciſely with as much more, as ſhe had injur'd others: But it only importeth, that ſhe ſhould be pay'd home for all her Injuſtice, and ſhould be punitively recompens'd amply and abundantly. So the Scripture ſpeaketh in an Holy-popular Phraſeology, vvhich importeth, that the Church ſhould be Pagano-Chriſtian (filled with Gentiles and over-run with Gentiliſm) in this *Hylaſmus*, Apoc. 11. 2. *The Court which is without the Temple leave out and meaſure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: And the Holy City ſhall they tread under foot forty and two Months.* So in *Daniel*'s *Henopœia* wherein four Horns denote four Succeſſions of Kings *Dan.* 8. 8. the Phraſe is Popular, the ſtrength of Beaſts offenſive and defenſive conſiſting in their Horns, and an Horn being a Popular Emblem of Povver. So this *Zoopœia* (which only importeth, that Blood requireth Vengeance) is a Popular Phraſeology. *Gen.* 4. 10. *The voice of thy Brother's Blood crieth unto me from the Ground.* *Iſraeliſmus* is a Scheme purely Holy-popular, and *Anti-chroniſmus* hath its Origine from an Oriental Popular way of reckoning time. *Lev.* 25. 8. In theſe Prophetick Schemes therefore the Popularity of the Scripture appeareth, and in ſome degree they illuſtrate it: But we vvill make a further Illuſtration of it by conſidering ſome other remarkable Popular Figurations of Speech in Scripture, and all of them ſuch, which ſeem not well reducible to our known Tropes and Schemes in Rhetorick; which will further ſhew, that not only the Art of *Logick*, but that of *Rhetorick* is capable of Improvement, and may be made more accommadate for expounding the Scriptures and treating of divine things.

FIGURATION I.

The Firſt remarkable mode of Popular-figurative Speech is ſpeaking in the Senſe of *ἰσοδυναμία*, *Equipollence or Equivalence*, which is of the ſame ſignification vvith the Name of an Eccleſiaſtical Diſpenſation called *perinde valere.* And ſo vve uſually expreſs an Equipollence; as this Saying of the Jews, כל דבר שאין אדם פהנה ממנו הרי הוא בחוקת אבוד אצלו we thus render. *Quicquid ſit è quo non capiat quis utilitatem, perinde illi eſt, ac ſi periiſſet.* Another Saying of theirs vve thus render. (z) *Quicunque utilitatem percipit ex hoc mundo abſque benedictione, perinde facit, ac ſi deprædaretur Deum.* In their impious Vovv called *Corban* they ſpake in the Senſe of *Equipollence*; for thereby any thing vvhereby a certain Perſon (a Parent or other) might be profited by them, (a) was ſuppos'd to be made as prohibited and unlawful, as for any one to convert a Gift conſecrated to God to his own uſe. It was made by their Vow (as they ſuppos'd) not properly and formally, but equipollently *Corban*, or a Gift conſecrated to God. *Mark* 7. 11. *It is Corban, that is to ſay a Gift, by whatſoever thou mighteſt be profited by me:* אשור קרבן *not leſs probited than to touch a Corban.* He that toucheth any thing trodden on by a Gonorrhaic, is polluted thereby, as the Jews ſuppoſe; and this Pollution and every Pollution Equipollent thereto they call *a Calcation*; in vvhich Senſe this their *Miſnical* Saying muſt be underſtood. (b) *The Garments of the Plebeians are a Calcation to the Phariſees, the Garments of the Phariſees are a Calcation to them that eat the Heave-offering* (Terumah) *the Garments of them that eat the Heave-offering are a Calcation to them that eat the ſacred Things, the Garments of them that eat the ſacred things are a Calcation in reſpect of the Water of Separation.* In this Miſnical Saying they ſpeak in the Senſe of Equipollence, and ſo they ſpeak (c) *touching that anointing which is after meat inſtead of waſhing*; for although this anointing is done vvith Ointment, yet they uſually call *it the ſecond waſhing and the ſecond waters.* So although they are nice and critical in obſerving their Traditions, (d) and require Water to vvaſh their Hands vvith before Meat, yet they account not only Snow, Hail, Rime-froſt, Ice, Salt vvhen melted to be fit for that uſe, but alſo the Liquors made of red Worms, the Fat of Fiſhes, the Juice of Fruits and Wine, eſpecially White-wine; for all theſe they account Water, and ſuppoſe, that in a caſe of neceſſity they may be uſed inſtead of it. They have debates amongſt themſelves (e) touching the meaning of this Law *an Eye for an Eye, and a Tooth for a Tooth*, whether it ought to be literally obſerv'd (as the *Bathuſæi* would have it) ſo that he vvho had his Eye or Tooth ſtruck out, might demand of the Judge, that he vvho did this Violence, ſhould alſo have his Eye or Tooth beaten out. And they alledge ſeveral Reaſons, which plainly ſhew, that this Law cannot always and in all caſes be literally obſerv'd. From vvhence they infer; that by an Eye and Tooth in the Puniſhment we are to underſtand a (Pecuniary) Recompence and Compenſation for an Eye or Tooth. But this Concluſion is more than their Premiſſes will infer; for they only infer, that in ſuch Caſes where the Lavv cannot be literally executed, there an Equipollent ought to be admitted, which (doubtleſs) is the Senſe of the Law. But although they are too forvvard, to admit of an Equipollent in the Interpretation of this Lavv, they are not forvvard enough, to admit of it in the Interpretation of another. (f) For if a Prieſt (ſay they) is drunk vvith Wine, he may not enter into the Sanctuary, his Service becometh profane, and himſelf becometh guilty of Death from the Hand of God. But vvhat if he be drunk vvith ſome other Liquor that is not Wine? Then (ſay they) he may not enter the Sanctuary, but if he doth enter it, and miniſtreth

(y) Dr. H. More Myſt. of Iniquity p. 213.

(z) Buxt. Lex. Talm. col. 623.

(a) Pocock Not. Miſc. p. 411, 414.

(b) Ibid. p. 394, 369.

(c) Heinſ. Ariſtarch. ſac. p. 452.

(d) Pocock ſupr. p. 358.

(e) Coſri p. 221, 222.

(f) Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex. 158.

miniſtreth Divine Service, his Service doth not become profane, nor doth he become guilty of Death; for theſe Evils do not accrue to him, unleſs he be drunk with Wine. But common Sence (if the Scripture did not) might inform theſe blind Guides (the drinking Rabbins) that it is equally criminal, to be drunk with Wine or other ſtrong Drink; and that (according to a Maxim of our Common Law) *non refert quid ex æquipollentibus fiat*.

Of Theories and Practices Equipollent it matters not which is choſen: So it is not material, that in citing the Old Teſtament the Writers of the New Teſtament ſhould keep to the Words of it; it is enough that their Citations are Equipollent to the cited places of the Old Teſtament. And if theſe Holy Writers content themſelves with Equipollents, this will go a great way in juſtifying the Opinion of (g) ſeveral reformed Divines (oppos'd in this point by thoſe of the Church of *Rome*) that the Holy Euchariſt in Caſes of unavoidable Neceſſity (as in Countries where our Bread and Wine is not to be had, and when ſome Perſons Swoon at the ſmell of Wine) may be duly celebrated by Supplemental Equipollents to Bread and Wine. So far are they from the rigour of the Greek Church, which holdeth, that there can be no valid Celebration of the Euchariſt with unleavened Bread, becauſe ſuch Bread is not true Bread, as the Patriarch *Hieremias* proveth; becauſe ἄρτος, (Bread) is deriv'd from αἴρω τῷ κουφίζω, *the raiſing which the Meal hath from Leaven only*. The ſame reform'd Divines are of Opinion, that Baptiſm in a Caſe of unavoidable Neceſſity may be adminiſtred by a Supplemental Equipollent to Water; that the Baptiſm was valid (as Pope *Zachary* determin'd) which an ignorant Prieſt adminiſtred, who Baptiz'd *In nomine Patria, & Filia, & Spiritus Sancta*; and that Baptiſm adminiſtred in the Name of Chriſt only is valid (as ſeveral of the Fathers and Schoolmen affirm) although no expreſs mention be made of the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, the Name of Chriſt including thoſe other divine Names, and being an Equipollent to the uſual Names of the Trinity. Our Baptiſm is indifferently called Baptiſm in the Name of Chriſt and in the Name of the Chriſtian Trinity, theſe being Equipollents: So the Miracle in the Book of *Joſhua* called *the Sun's ſtanding ſtill*, might be called the Earth's ſtanding ſtill theſe being Equipollents: But if the Scripture had called it the Earth's ſtanding ſtill, it had not been a Popular Book. In the ſame Book we have *a Metaphor of Equivalence* (which is a Senſe of Equipollence) complicated with a *Proſopopœia*; for becauſe the Stone which *Joſhua* had erected, was a Monument, Record and Teſtimony of the Covenant made between God and the People, was as much as a Witneſs, that had heard the making of it, and conſequently would as be ſuch a Witneſs againſt them (a Teſtimony againſt them) if they brake it; therefore he ſaith *Ch.* 24. 27. *Behold this ſtone ſhall be a witneſs unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which he ſpake unto us; it ſhall be therefore a witneſs unto you, leſt ye deny your God.* So becauſe the Wood and Stone which the King of *Babylon* uſed in building, got by a Rapine, required Vengeance; therefore the Prophet ſaith, *Habak.* 2. 11. *The ſtone ſhall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber ſhall anſwer it.* A Senſe of Equipollence complicated with a *Proſopopœia* we have again, 1 Cor. 15. 26, 54, 55. for the crowning us with Immortality is equipollently *the killing Death*, as the Apoſtle repreſenteth it. And there is the ſame Complication *Pſal.* 19. 3, 4. *There is no ſpeech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone forth through all the Earth, and their words to the end of the World.* The ſignificant Expreſſions of the Heavens are equivalent to a Voice and Words, as we are ſaid, to ſpeak by the Eyes, and the Rhetoricians ſay, there is Rhetorick in the Eye, the Motion and Poſture of the Body. The Son of *Sirach* ſpeaketh in a Senſe of Equivalence, *Ch.* 35. 1, 2, 3. *He that keepeth the law, bringeth offerings enough: He that taketh heed to the commandment, offereth a peace-offering. He that requiteth a good turn, offereth fine flour: And he that giveth alms, ſacrificeth praiſe. To depart from wickedneſs, is a thing pleaſing to the Lord: And to forſake unrighteouſneſs, is a propitiation.* So our Saviour ſpeaketh, *Mark* 3. 34, 35. *Behold my Mother and my Brethren. For whoſoever ſhall do the Will of God, the ſame is my Brother, and my Siſter and Mother.* Chriſt's Diſciples were no leſs to him than all thoſe Relations of Friendſhip: And when they publiſh'd the Goſpel, they did as much as *Preach it upon the Houſe-tops. Matth.* 10. 27.

(g) *Voſſii Theſes*, p. 447, &c. & p. 349, 375, 376. *Scrivener Body of Divin.* p. 205.

As to ſay to any Perſon, *why hath Satan filled thine Heart?* Is as much (Equipollent) as to ſay, he aboundeth with wicked Cogitations and Affections: So this Saying of *Moſes* to the People, *great Temptations thine Eyes have ſeen, Signs and great Miracles, yet the Lord hath not given you an Heart to perceive, and Eyes to ſee, and Ears to hear unto this day*; deſigneth to expreſs their great vicioſity, is equivalent to a downright charging them with graceleſneſs, ſtupidity, wicked blindneſs and obſtinacy, and is an Holy-popular way of expreſſing it. (h) The Proverb cited by *Heraclitus* ſaith of unintelligent Hearers, παρεόντας ἀπεῖναι, *that being preſent they are abſent*, they are no better than ſo (in a Senſe of Equipollence they are abſent;) and he ſaith of them, *they are like unto the Deaf*: But *Cicero* ſaith; *in his linguis quas non intelligimus, ſurdi profectò ſumus.* In a Senſe of Equipollence we are Deaf, as to the Tongues we do not underſtand. Such were the Jevvs in the time of *Moſes* and of our Saviour, *deaf Hearers*, like to ἅλας ἄναλον, *the Saltleſs Salt, the Shepherds no Shepherds, Circumciſion-leſs Circumciſion.* In which *Oxymora* there is the Senſe of Equipollence; for they are Shepherds no Shepherds, that have the name and place, but are no better (or worſe) than none. The Senſe of Equipollence is viſible alſo in 1 *Sam.* 15. 23. *Rebellion is as the Sin of Witchcraft* (it is Tantamount) *and Stubborneſs is as Iniquity and Idolatry.* In *Iſa.* 49. 16. *I have graven thee upon the Palms of my Hands.* In *Pro.* 3. 3. *Bind them about thy Neck, write them upon the Table of thine Heart.* In *Deut.* 6. 8, 9. *Thou ſhalt bind them for a Sign upon thine Hand, and they ſhall be as Frontlets between thine Eyes. And thou ſhalt write them upon the Poſts of thy Houſe, and on thy Gates.* In *Pro.* 8. 36. *All they that hate me, love Death* (for they do that which is equivalent to loving their own Deſtruction.) In *Pro.* 13. 24. *He that ſpareth his Rod, hateth his Son* (for he doth that which is in effect hating him, and which is equivalent thereto.) So in the Senſe of Equivalence our Saviour ſpeaketh *Joh.* 12. 45. *He that ſeeth me, ſeeth him that ſent me.* And when he teacheth Duties of perpetual Duration ſpeaking in Old Teſtament-language, *Matth.* 5. 23. and 23. 3. *Mark* 11. 17. *Luc.*

Deut. 29. 3, 4.

(h) Grot. Not. in Matth. 13. 13.

Mark 9. 50. Ezek. 34. 7, 8. Rom. 2. 25.

Luk. 16. 31. And when he forbiddeth ſaying *Raca*, meaning this or any equivalent term of Reproach (which ſort of words our Saviour meaneth by thoſe *idle words*, that we muſt give an account of, *Matth.* 12. 36.) And when he injoyneth us, to do what is equivalent to *the cutting off the right Hand, and plucking out the right Eye*, Matth. 5. 22, 29. Had *Origen* underſtood this Senſe of Equipollence, he would have ſeen an abſurdity, not in this literal Interpretation of our Saviour's Precept, (*i*) but in his own allegorical Interpretation of it. Had the Jews underſtood this Senſe of Equipollence, they would not have devis'd their *Phylacteries*, which are not more commanded by their Law *than the writing it on the Poſts of their Houſes and on their Gates.* If a late Critick had underſtood it, he would not have ſeverely chaſtis'd ancient Authors, (*k*) for applying theſe Attributes or Epithets unto God αὐτογένεθλος, αὐτολόχευτος, αὐτόγονος, αὐτοφυὴς, and others of like Nature (which denote his ſelf-exiſtence;) for all theſe are true and genuine Attributes of God, not in the ſtrict and rigorous way of ſpeaking, but underſtood in the Senſe of Equivalence; which is the Senſe of the Law, (*l*) *In maleficiis rati habitio mandato comparatur*, the ratifying evil deeds is equivalent to the commanding them.

In which Senſe many of our ordinary Sayings are to be underſtood. *Conſcientia mille teſtes. Hauſtus aquæ mihi nectar erit. Qui non vetat peccare, jubet. Qui ſuccurrere perituro poteſt, ſi non ſuccurrat, occidit.* Lactant. τῆλε φίλοι ναίοντες, ὐκ εἰσὶ φίλοι, *Friends living far off are not Friends*; once well done is twice done. (*m*) *Cùm via multa patet, nulla eſt. Qui alienum negat, tollit.* S. Aug. *Quod in veniſti & non reddidiſti, rapuiſti. Mihi ſolitudo & receſſus provincia eſt*, ſaith Cicero in an Epiſtle to *Atticus. Non intelligunt homines, quàm magnum vectigal ſit parſimonia.* Cic. (*n*) ὅρκος βέβαιός ἐστιν, ἂν νεύσω μόνον, *If I do but nod, it is a valid Oath.* The *Muhammedans* are told by their Prophet, (*o*) *That whoſoever of the Heirs of Paradiſe dieth, whether over or under Age, Tricenarius evadet*, he ſhall become thirty Years of Age, and ſhall never exceed that Age. (*p*) The Law appointeth the Books of Hereticks to be burned; a Canon appointeth them, to be brought in and laid up in the *Conſtantinopolitan* Patriarch's Palace: how ſhall this Law and Canon be reconciled? ταυτόν ἐστι (ſaith *Balſamon*) *it is the ſame thing; for both ways they are kept from being ſeen and read.* S. *Chryſoſtom* affirmeth, (*q*) that the Table and the Place which Chriſtians reſort to (as containing the ſame Spiritual Viands) is the ſame Table and the ſame upper Room, on and in which Chriſt with his own Diſciples did eat his laſt Supper, αὕτη ἐκείνη ἐστὶν ἡ τράπεζα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον ἔχει, *This is that Table, and that had nothing more than this.* As there are Metaphors of Equivalence, ſo in the Holy Euchariſt the Bread and Wine are not meer Symbols, Repreſentations and Similitudes of Chriſt's Body and Blood, but they are *Signs or Symbols of Equivalence*, the due communicating in them being (as to the communicating in the benefits of Chriſt's Sacrifice) equivalent to the eating and drinking Chriſt's Body and Blood in the proper literal Acceptation. They are therefore (as to the communicating in Chriſt crucify'd, who is the Food of Life to us as ſuch) an equivalent to the Real Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood, which being repreſented by them in ſuch Senſe of Equivalence, we are by the viſible Elements partakers of them, as much as we can be partakers of them to the intent and purpoſe of the Sacrament. In the Senſe of Equivalence Martyrdom is called *Baptiſm* by the ancient Writers of the Church, according to the words of *Gennadius de Martyrio*, (*r*) *ubi tota Baptiſmi ſacramenta complentur.* In the ſame Senſe they held it Murder, for any Woman by evil Arts to procure Abortion, to ſtifle the Embryo, to kill a Child in a manner before it be alive, it being much what the ſame thing, to hinder Life, and to take it away, to kill a Man or deſtroy what would be one. So in a Senſe of Equivalence and Equality the Birds in *Ariſtophanes* call themſelves Oracles, becauſe the Heathen conſulted them for Divination and ordering their Affairs.

Ἐσμὲν δ' ὑμεῖς Ἄμμων· Δελφοί· Δωδώνη· Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·

We are Ammon, Delphi, Dodona, Phæbus Apollo.

Voſſius (a great Rhetorician) conſidereth not this Senſe of Equivalence as it is ſuch, but meerly as it is Metaphorical. (*t*) In diſcourſing of the *Iſraelites* forgetting God (in their worſhipping the Calf) he followeth the Schoolmen, and diſtinguiſheth a twofold Obliviouſneſs; *the one when the Species of Memory are obliterated; the other when they are not recollected as they ought, ſo that a Man acteth contrary to what he would do, if they were duely recollected. So a Woman forgetteth her Husband and her Conjugal Covenant, when ſhe proſtituteth her ſelf to another Man: and a Man forgetteth God and his Divine Covenant, when following his fooliſh Cogitations he preſumeth to worſhip either another God, or God in a forbidden Symbol. This is not properly Oblivion, but* quaſi *Oblivion, becauſe a Man behaveth himſelf, as if he did forget: neverthele ſs in Scripture* κατὰ μεταφορὰν (metaphorically) *this is called forgetting God.* but this learned Author ought to have remembred, that he was treating of matters of legal conſideration (matters of Duty and Sin) and therefore in the firſt place he ought to have conſider'd and notic'd *the Sin of forgetting God* (the not duely minding and remembring him is the Sin of forgetting him) and to have diſtinguſh'd the Sin of forgetting God into the *proper* and *metaphorical* forgetting. The metaphorical forgetting is *properly the Sin of forgetting God*, although it is not the Sin of *proper forgetting God*; but it is equivalent thereto, and ought not, to be conſider'd meerly as a Metaphor, but as an Equivalent. Every Metaphor is not a Metaphorical Equivalent (as *homo homini Deus* is not a Metaphorical Equivalent) and this popular mode of ſpeaking in the Sence of Equivalence is of far larger extent than Metaphors, which therefore is not reducible to (or cannot be counted wholly the ſame with) that Trope. Nor ought we to count the Spiritual Idolatry meerly a Metaphorical Idolatry; for they that deify Senſitive Vanities in Eſteem and Affection, by ſo doing do unto them what is equivalent to the deifying them in the groſs devotional way; and they attribute to them, not meerly a Similitude to God, but an Equivalence. As *Euripides* ſaith, (*u*) *Riches are to Wiſe Men God.* And the reaſon of his ſo ſaying may be underſtood from the Verſes of *Menander*, (*w*) *if you have Riches*, εὔξαι τι βούλει, πάντα σοι γενήσεται, *pray for what you will, all ſhall be done to you.* The World's lovers count Riches, to be for their purpoſe equivalent unto God, and more than a *quaſi-God*, if *quaſi* is a term of abatement.

(i) Philocal. p. 14.

(k) Heinſ. Ariſtarch. c. 3. vid. Dr. Cudw. Intell. Syſt. p. 405, 406.

(l) Bp. Taylor. Duct. Dub. B. 4. c. 1. r. 2. p. 764.

(m) Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 121.

(n) Grot. Floril. Tit. 27. p. 121.

(o) Pocock. Not. Miſc. p. 302.

(p) Balſam. in can. 9. concil. 7.

(q) Hom. 82. in Matth. p. 514.

(r) De Eccleſ. Dogmat. c. 73.

(r) Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 290. Tertull. Apol. c. 9.

(t) De Idol. l. 1. c. 3.

(u) Voſſ. ibid. l. 6. c. 49.

(w) Ibid.

Figuration II.

A ſecond remarkable Mode of Popular Figurative Speech is ſpeaking in *the Computative Senſe*, which is imply'd in the Senſe of *Equipollence.* For Mankind make a juſt account and computation of things, and according thereto they ſpeak of them, and ſo do the Holy Scriptures, 1 *Cor.* 11. 5. *Every Woman that prayeth or propheſieth with her Head uncovered, diſhonoureth her Head; for that is even all one, as if ſhe were ſhaven.* Conſidering the uſe and end of Womens wearing their Hair at length, and alſo the uſe and end of their wearing the Veil, it appeareth, that in a due computation of things theſe are ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, *one and the ſame thing*, to be ſhaven and not to wear the Veil, *Deut.* 24. 6. *No Man ſhall take the neather or the upper Milſtone to pledge; for he taketh a Man's Life to pledge* (as taking that to pledge, without which the Man cannot live, and therefore in juſt computation of things his Life.) *Heb.* 11. 12. *There ſprang even of one and him as good as dead* (no better than dead) *ſo many as the Stars.* Rom. 4. 19. *He conſidered not his own Body now dead, when he was about an hundred Years old.* Gen. 20. 3. *God came to* Abimelech *in a Dream by Night, and ſaid to him, Behold* (unleſs thou makeſt Reſtitution) *thou art but a dead Man* (in the juſt computation of things.) The Jews ſay, (x) Moſes *our Maſter is not dead, but is aſcended, to ſerve in the high places: for though he died in reſpect of us, who were depriv'd of him, yet in reſpect of himſelf his departure was Life, becauſe of the degree to which he was advanced.* They that ſpeak thus of *Moſes* in the *Computative* Senſe, ought agreeably thereto to interpret the Scriptures. But *Maimonides* holdeth, that the Celeſtial Orbs are animate and intelligent, (y) and he proveth it from the words of the Pſalmiſt, *The Heavens declare the Glory of God.* He affirmeth alſo, (z) that the Reſurrection doth not belong to the Unjuſt; *for how can the Unjuſt live when they are dead, ſeeing they are dead while they live, as the wiſe Men ſay?* In a Computative Senſe (but not juſt) the Jews ſay, *A poor Man, a blind Man, and a childleſs Man pro mortuis habentur.* A juſt Computative Senſe is expreſs'd in that of S. *Auſtin*; *Omnia mandata facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit, ignoſcitur.* The Lawyers expreſs it when they ſay, that in ſome caſes *voluntas reputatur pro facto*, and that Man and Wife are one Perſon in Law. So in a juſt Account and Computation of things the Act of our Saviour's Diſciples was his Act, *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. *Servus non eſt perſona, ſed res. Ulpian* ſaith of a Minor, (a) *ſi in Biſſexto natus eſt, ſive priore, ſive poſteriore die, Celſus ſcripſit nihil referre; nam id biduum pro uno die habetur.* It matters not whether he is born the former or latter Day of the Biſſextile; for thoſe Days are accounted for one Day. Such a Computation of things muſt be in Humane Law; and ſo Philoſophy making a Computation of things ſtyleth a Friend ἄλλος ἐγὼ, *another I* (which is *Zeno*'s definition of a Friend) the things of Mortal Nature τὰ μὴ ὄντα, *the things that are not*, agreeably to the Wiſe Man, *Prov.* 23. 5. *Wilt thou ſet thine Eyes upon that which is not?* Mundane Vanities are alſo in juſt computation *Schemes, Dreams, Shews, Shadows, Graſs, Wind, Vapour*, σκύβαλα, as the Scripture ſtyleth them. It computeth, that *an Idol is nothing* (for *quà* an Idol it is but an Idoliz'd Vanity,) and that one is more than an hundred and fourſcore thouſand, 2 *Chron.* 36. 7, 8. *There be mo with us* than with him (as *Hezekiah* reckoneth in his War with *Sennacherib*:) *with him is an Arm of Fleſh, but with us is the Lord our God.* The Poet *Juvenal* is blamed for ſaying, that ſome would promiſe an *Hecatomb*, which was a Grecian Sacrifice, not a Roman. But one of his Commentators anſwereth on his behalf, (b) that he intendeth not the Property of the Sacrifice, but the Value, *what in a juſt account of things is an Hecatomb*: which is the Senſe of our Engliſh Proverb; *The beſt Way is the ſhorteſt Mile*; the Sence of theſe following Sayings of Equivalence, (c) *omnia habet, qui nihil concupiſcit*, (d) *repreſentat opes ſapientia, quas cuicunque ſupervacuas fecit, dedit*; and is the Senſe of *Scaliger's Oxymoron*; *Neſcire velle, quæ magiſter maximus te ſcire non vult, erudita eſt inſcitia*, to be willing, to be ignorant of thoſe things, which the great Maſter will not have thee to know, is Learned Ignorance. So although *perfect freedom* in the ſtrict and rigorous way of ſpeaking ſignifieth, to be ſubject to no Power or Authority (ἐλεύθερον τὸ ἄρχον αὐτοῦ, *he is free, that hath right to govern and diſpoſe of himſelf*, as the Platoniſts define Liberty) yet the Service of God is juſtly ſaid, to *be perfect freedom*; for ſuch it is in juſt Account and Computation. So of this Earthly Life good Authors ſay, (e) *it hath but the Name of Life, potiùs mors eſt*, becauſe it is ſuch a diminutive kind of Life, and ſo incumbred with Evils, that in the juſt account of things it is Death rather than Life. But as it ought not to be ſo denominated, nor ought the Service of God to be denominated *perfect freedom*, if theſe things were not ſuch as they are denominated in juſt account and computation: ſo there ought to be no ſuch Names and Notices in Chriſtianity as being *born again, born of God, being new Creatures, being alive unto God, paſſing from Death to Life, partaking of the Divine Nature*, if there be no Realities that are ſuch in the juſt account and computation of things. As Hell muſt be thought no leſs than Hell, and Heaven no leſs than Heaven; ſo a Chriſtian's Regeneration or his becoming a new Man according to Chriſtianity muſt be thought, to import no leſs than a new and holy vital Nature, elſe it cannot be in juſt account and computation of things a New and Divine Birth and Generation. To ſuppoſe, that theſe Expreſſions are meerly metaphorical and alluſive, and import no more than ſuch an exteriour change of Converſation, which is on this ſide Vital Sanctity, is to unchriſtianize Chriſtianity, to make it no ſaving Religion and the Language of it very little Senſe, for a meer metaphorical Senſe is comparatively a very little Senſe.

(x) *Porta Moſis.* p. 10.

(y) *Mor. Nev. par.* 2. c. 5.

(z) *Pocock. Not. Miſc.* p. 157.

(a) *In tit. de minor.* l. 3. *denique Sect.* 3.

(b) *Holiday*, p. 236.

(c) *Min. Fel.* p. 335.

(d) *Sen. Ep.* 17.

(e) *Plut. conſol. ad Apol.* p. 120. *S. Aug. de C. D.* l. 13. c. 20.

Figuration III.

In the *third* place we will remark *a Popular* (Figurative) *Mode* of ſpeaking in the *Reputative Senſe*; which is a ſpeaking of things, as they are *reputed*. Such is *Acceptilatio* in the Civil Law, (f) which is an imaginary payment of a Debt made by Interrogation and Anſwer. The Debtor ſaith, have you receiv'd what I owe you? The Creditor anſwereth, I have receiv'd it (or I count my ſelf to have receiv'd it) which Anſwer maketh the Debtor's Obligation null and void. *Euripides* calleth that Mind very wiſe, which reputeth it ſelf ſo;

—— οὐ γὰρ οὐδ' ἀζήμιον
Γνώμην μὲν εἶναι τοῖς σοφοῖς λίαν σοφόν.

It is a noxious thing, for wiſe Men, to be very wiſe.

(f) *Calvin. Lex. in voce Acceptil.*

The Poet *Ovid* ſaith, (*g*) *reus ille ferè eſt, de quo victoria lucro eſſe poteſt.* As a great perſon of our Nation ſaid, that his Eſtate made him a Traitor. *Seneca* ſaith of *Cato*'s Drunkenneſs; *facilius effeceris crimen honeſtum quàm turpem Catonem*; *you may ſooner cauſe the crime to be* (reputed) *honeſt, than* Cato *to be* (reputed) *a Criminal.* The Evangeliſt implicitly calleth our Saviour a Malefactor as being reputed ſuch, *Luk.* 23. 32. *There were two other Malefactors led with him to be put to death.* The Apoſtle to the *Galatians* ſaith, *ch.* 5. 4. *Chriſt is become of no effect to you, whoſoever of you are* (in your own Reputation) *juſtified by the Law.* Again he ſaith, *ch.* 4. 12. (but his words are miſ-rendred in our Tranſlation) *Brethren, I beſeech you, be as I; for I am as you* (friendly making no diſtinction of Perſons, as 1 *King.* 22. 4.) *Te have not injured me at all.* (*h*) *But had they not injur'd him? yes very much, in preferring the falſe Apoſtles before him, queſtioning his Doctrine, yea becoming his Enemies and that for telling them the truth; yet behold him profeſſing here, ye have not injured me at all, becauſe theſe wrongs were as no wrongs in his eſtimation, it was not his purpoſe to impute them.* To the inflated *Corinthians* the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 4. 10. *We are* (reputatively) *fools for Chriſt's ſake, but ye are* (reputatively) *wiſe in Chriſt.* 1 *King.* 1. 21. *Bathſheba* ſolliciteth *David*, to declare his Succeſſour, and her words run thus in the Hebrew, *Otherwiſe it ſhall come to paſs, when my Lord the King ſhall ſleep with his Fathers, that I and my Son* Solomon *ſhall be Sinners.* The Senſe is, that if *Adonijah* prevailed, ſhe and her Son *Solomon* ſhould be reputatively Criminals, or as our Tranſlation hath it, *ſhould be counted Offenders.* In this reputative Senſe the words of *Tertullian* ought to be underſtood, which otherwiſe are abſurd and irrational. (*i*) *Natus eſt Dei Filius: non pudet, quia pudendum eſt. Mortuus eſt Dei Filius: prorſus credibile eſt, quia ineptum eſt. & ſepultus reſurrexit: certum eſt, quia impoſſibile eſt.* The Son of God was born: we are not aſham'd to profeſs it, becauſe the World counteth it a thing to be aſham'd of (it is the more likely to be of God.) The Son of God died: it is altogether credible, becauſe in the Eyes of Infidels it is inept. Being buried he roſe again: it is certain, that it was done by Divine Power, becauſe Unbelievers repute it impoſſible.

FIGURATION IV.

A fourth Mode of Popular (Figurative) Speech which we will remark, is the ſpeaking in words expreſſive of the *real-formal Senſe*, but the meaning is, *a Popular-formal Senſe*, which is extrinſecal thereto. As *to juſtifie*, *to ſanctifie*, *to beatifie*, *to vilifie*, *to magnifie*, *to glorifie*, are words expreſſive of making Perſons *Righteous*, *Holy*, *Bleſſed*, *Vile*, *Great*, *Glorious* in the real-formal Senſe, yet are ordinarily uſed to ſignifie the making them ſuch only in *a Popular-formal* Senſe. So Evil Men make others *Offenders*, not only by tempting them to ſin (which is a making them Offenders in the Real-formal Senſe) but by cauſeleſly imputing Criminality to them, which ſeemeth to be the Prophet's Senſe, *Iſa.* 29. 21. *All that watch for Iniquity are cut off, that make a Man an offender for a word.* By judicial Sentence alſo *they juſtifie the Wicked for Reward, and* (in a Popular-formal Senſe) *take away the Righteouſneſs of the Righteous from him*, Iſa. 5. 23. So *Naboth*'s Righteouſneſs was taken away, and in a Popular-formal Senſe he was made an Offender (a Blaſphemer) 1 *King.* 21. 9. In ſuch Senſe we ſpeak, when we ſay of a Thief (or other Malefactor) *He is a Thief and I will make a Thief of him.* The meaning whereof is, that in Treatment and Uſage, in Plight and Garb, in Penal External State and Condition, Form and Appearance, he ſhall be made a Thief. So Chriſt was made a Malefactor for us. For ſpeaking in the Abſtract, as the Apoſtle doth, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *He was made Sin for us* in ſuch Senſe as belongeth to our *Sin-bearer* (our Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifice) to be made Sin for us, upon whom our Criminality is to be tranſferr'd and brought, and who is to bear it (the weight of it and what it amounteth to) in order to the taking it away. Speaking therefore in the *Concrete* he was made a Sinner for us in reſpect of Treatment and Uſage, Penal External State and Condition. The ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *Gal.* 3. 13. *He was made a Curſe for us*, as being made a Perſon of ſuch a Penal External Condition, which is accurſed, odious and abominable, therefore ſpeaking in the *Concrete*, he was made an accurſed Varlet for us (a vile *Devotum Caput*) *in a Popular-formal Senſe.* To which Senſe as contradiſtinct to the *Real-formal* Senſe we may reduce that Hebraiſm commonly ſo called, which putteth *Reals* for *Verbals*; (*k*) as the Doctors are ſaid, *to bind or looſe* thoſe things, which they only declare, to be bound or looſed, forbidden or permitted by the Law of God. (*l*) The Prieſt in the Hebrew Text is ſaid, to *cleanſe* and *pollute* a Perſon, when he only pronounceth him clean or unclean. (*m*) The Prophets are ſaid, *to root out, to pull down, to deſtroy, to kill, to caſt out, to build, to plant, to ſuſtain with Corn and Wine*, and to do thoſe things, which they only do by way of Prophecy: Which doing them in their Prophecy may be likened to the doing them in a Poem; for Poets are ſaid to do thoſe things, which they ſing of (or do) in their Poems; as in that of *Virgil* concerning *Silenus* (*n*).

> *Tum Phaetondiadas muſco circumdat amaræ*
> *Corticis; atque ſolo proceras erigit alnos.*

Upon which *Servius* noteth, (*o*) *It is a marvellous praiſe of ſinging* Silenus, *to repreſent him, not as ſinging of a thing made, but as making it by his ſinging.* He obſerveth alſo, that there is another like Paſſage in *Virgil.*

> ——— *Quis humum florentibus herbis*
> *Spargeret? aut viridi fontes induceret umbrâ?*

This reputed Hebraiſm therefore, *the putting Reals for Verbals*, is really no Hebraiſm, but a Popular Phraſeology common to all People, as ſeveral other reputed Hebraiſms are. For to put the Act for the Object is a reputed Hebraiſm, whereas it is uſual in Authors that are no Hebrews; as *Timorem tuum taxa*, eſtimate the thing thou feareſt: *lacrymæque ſequuntur vota*; our Tears follow our Enjoyments. (*p*) *Heinſius* deſervedly reprehendeth a Lawyer *Antonius Auguſtinus* for finding Hebraiſms in *Ulpian*, becauſe he ſpeaketh Elliptically; whereas the like forms of Speech are uſual in *Tacitus*, *Plautus*, *Homer*, and are common to all Tongues and Writers of all Ages.

FIGURATION V.

In the *fifth* place we will remark *a Popular* (figurative) mode of ſpeaking in *the raiſed* (or contra-diminutive) Senſe, which in our Language is uſually expreſs'd by theſe (and the like)

(g) *De Nuce.*

(h) Arrowſmith chain of princ. p. 221, 222.

(i) *De carne Chriſt.* c. 5.

(k) *Lightfoot Hor. in Matth.* 16. 19.

(l) *Lev.* 13. 6, 11, 20, &c.

(m) *Pool's Synopſ. in Jer.* 1. 10.

(n) *Eclog.* 6.

(o) *Mira eſt Canentis laus, ut quaſi non factam rem cantare, ſed ipſe eam cantando facere videatur.*

(p) *Ariſtarch. ſacr.* p. 225.

like) Terms; *indeed, to purpoſe, with a witneſs.* ἢ δεῖ χελώνης κρέα φαγεῖν, ἢ μὴ φαγεῖν, *you ought either to eat the Fleſh of a Snail to purpoſe, or not to eat it at all:* νῦν ἔγνω τὸν ἔρωτα, ſaith the Shepherd in *Theocritus*, when he had felt the Tyranny of Love: comparatively before he knew it not, but now he knew it indeed. So the Rhetoricians obſerve certain Inſtances of πλοκὴ (and they obſerve them only as Inſtances of that Figure) which ſpeak in this Senſe. As when Apples are ſcarce and dear, we ſay, Apples are Apples indeed; ſo the Poet meaneth, that *Corydon* was *Corydon* indeed.

Ex illo Corydon, Corydon eſt tempore nobis.

Prov. 14. 16. *A juſt Man falleth ſeven times, and riſeth up again; but the Wicked ſhall fall into Miſchief.* The falling of the Righteous (into Affliction) ſeveral times and riſing again is but falling in a diminutive Senſe; but the Wicked's *falling into Miſchief*, ſo as never to emerge out of Ruine, is *falling with a Witneſs.* In this raiſed Senſe the word *dead* ſignifieth in our Saviour's Argument againſt the *Sadducees*, Matth. 22. 32. *God is not the God of the Dead* (of thoſe that are utterly dead, loſt and gone;) and in this raiſed Senſe the word *true* ſignifieth in ſeveral places of the New Teſtament. For the true Light is, (q) *lux eximia, excellentiſſima*, the eximious ſuper-eminent Light, *Joh.* 1. 9. 1 *Joh.* 2. 8. And in ſuch Senſe Spiritual Goods are called *the true Riches*, Heaven *the true Tabernacle*, Chriſt *the true Vine, the true Bread from Heaven*, and his Fleſh *verè cibus*, which our Tranſlation rightly rendreth *My Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*, Joh. 6. 55. other Meat is Meat (the Food of Life) in a ſlender and diminutive Senſe; but the Meat that nouriſheth to Life Eternal, is Meat indeed: for that Life which knoweth no Death, is (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) ζωὴ ὄντως, *Life indeed*; but Life in calamitous circumſtances is βίος ἄβιος, *Life not Life* (Life in a diminutive Senſe) and ſuch is this Earthly Life, that tendeth to death and endeth in death. As Father and Mother muſt be dutifully loved, yet comparatively hated; (*r*) as the intermediate Days of the great Feſtivals amongſt the Jews (although ſimply ſacred, yet) are called חול *profane* in compariſon of the firſt and laſt days: as this Earthly Region although a κόσμος (ornamental thing) yet is a Land of *Cabul* in compariſon of the Heavenly Regions; and as (*s*) *hæc mortalitas umbra mortis eſt, vera mors eſt damnatio cum diabolo*, Bodily Death is but a Shadow in compariſon of the Second Death: So all Senſitive Goods and Evils muſt be accounted but diminutive Shews and Shadows (*omnia imaginaria in ſeculo, nihil veri, Tertullian.*) in compariſon of the Great, the Spiritual and Eternal Goods and Evils, which therefore are the only Goods and Evils indeed. So εὐγένεια, or *to be well-born* in worldly reſpects, is but a ſhew and ſhadow, but to be born of God, is to be well-born indeed.

XI. The Holy Scriptures are Popular (Holy-popular) in reſpect of their *End and Effect*, which is the Sanctity and Salvation of the People by the Religion and Government of Chriſt. For, (1.) of him the Scriptures affirm, that *he is given for a Covenant of the People, for a Light of the Gentiles, for a Witneſs of the People, a Leader and Commander of the People, that he ſhould ſhew Light to the People, that to him ſhall the gathering of the People be, that his Birth was Joy to all People, himſelf God's Salvation prepar'd before the Face of all People, that he ſuffered to ſanctifie the People, that he ſhould be for Salvation to the Ends of the Earth, deſtroy the Face of the Covering caſt over all People, and the Veil that is ſpread over all Nations, that the Iſles ſhould wait for his Law, that all Kings ſhould bow down before him, all Nations ſhould ſerve him, that he ſhould ſprinkle many Nations, that the Nations ſhould bleſs themſelves in him and in him they ſhould glory; that in his times many Nations ſhould be joyned to the Lord and be his People; that he ſhould have Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom, and all People, Nations and Languages ſhould ſerve and obey him.* Which Holy-popular deſign appeareth throughout his whole Undertaking, in all his Offices and the execution of them; for himſelf and his Apoſtles preach'd and wrought Miracles in the Commonwealth of the People, but not in the Schools of Philoſophers, nor in the Commonwealth of Learning, nor was it his deſign to erect *Rempublicam literariam* a Commonwealth of Learning, but *Rempublicam Sanctorum* that Commonwealth of Holy People the Church of God. Himſelf and his Religion was not only or chiefly deſign'd for the Ingenious and Subtil, for elevated Wits and refined Underſtandings, but more principally for the Vulgar, that are of mean Capacities and Endowments (yet the main Body of Mankind) to illuminate and ſanctifie them, to make them wiſe unto Salvation, and to conduct them in the way of Duty to their Eternal Happineſs. The ſanctifying and ſaving Efficacy of his Doctrine chiefly appear'd in effecting their Converſion, (*t*) *in changing* τοσοῦτον πλῆθος τῶν ἀλογωτάτων, *ſo vaſt a multitude of thoſe that had little Reaſon and were ſunk into Paſſions and vile Affections. The Vulgar Speech* (of the Scriptures) ὥσπερεὶ καὶ ἐπῳδαὶ, *as certain Incantations full of Power converting Multitudes by Troops from an intemperate to a well-compos'd Life, from Injuriouſneſs to Goodneſs, from Timidity to ſuch firmitude of Mind, as to deſpiſe Death for the cauſe of Piety: How ſhall we not juſtly admire the Power that is in it?* The miraculous Efficacy and Succeſs of it ſpeaketh both the Divinity and Deſign of its Author; his Deſign was upon the People (to make them the elect People of God) the End of his coming was to be King of a People, to erect an Univerſal Holy-popular Empire (the Holy Catholick Church) to put an end to Carnal Judaiſm, to aboliſh Idolatrous Gentiliſm, to introduce the new Religion of a Saviour-King to the World (an Inſtitution for ſanctifying and ſaving the People) whoſe Deſign, becauſe he is ſuch, muſt neceſſarily extend to Jews and Gentiles, to the Univerſality of Mankind, to all Nations, to all People, and to all the Popular Societies of Men. (*u*) His Apoſtles brought the Divine Doctrine to all Nations, Grecian and Barbarian, the Iſſue and Effect of it was, they perſwaded not only the *Romans* and thoſe that liv'd under their Government, but alſo the *Scythians* and *Sauromatians*, the *Indians*, *Ethiopians*, *Perſians*, *Seres*, *Hyrcanians*, *Bactrians*, *Britains*, *Cimbri*, *Germans*, and to ſpeak compendiouſly, all Nations and all kind of Men (innumerable of them) to receive the Laws of the crucify'd Jeſus. Thus the Kingdom of Chriſt was erected, the oppoſite to Satan's Kingdom; for Chriſt's Deſign is, that his Kingdom in this World may go down, and the Kingdom of God may be ſet up. As Satan's Deſign and Buſineſs is, to ſeduce Mankind from God and Holineſs, from Life and Salvation: ſo Chriſt's Deſign and Buſineſs is, to convert them from being Subjects of Satan's Kingdom, to be the Subjects and Citizens of God's Kingdom, to ſerve him in a Life of Holineſs and to be the Heirs of Salvation. Both theſe Kingdoms are alike Popular, but the one is Holy-popular, the other conſiſteth of the wicked World of Mankind; the deſign and buſineſs of Chriſtianity therefore is Holy-popular, as the buſineſs of Judaiſm was alſo but with the difference of Literal and Spiritual Judaiſm.

(q) *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 1. 9. & 6. 55.

(r) *Pocock. Not. Miſc.* p. 84, 85.

(s) *S. Aug. in Pſal.* 43.

Iſa 42, 6. 49, 8. 55, 4. *Gen.* 49. 10. *Act.* 26. 23. *Luk.* 2. 10, 31. *Heb.* 13. 12.

Iſa. 49, 6. 25, 7. *Pſal.* 72. 11, 17. *Iſa.* 52. 15. *Jer.* 4. 2. *Zech.* 2. 11. *Dan.* 7. 14.

(t) *Orig. c. Celſ.* l. 2. p. 110.

(u) *Theod- ret. Serm. Ser.* 5.

(2.) Nothing is more viſible in Chriſt's Religion than his deſign of an Holy-popular Empire; for this is the Tenour and Summary of it. (w) "The Chriſtian Creed, that Jeſus is the "Lord, that he is the Chriſt of God, that he died "for our Sins, that he roſe again from the "Dead. And there is no queſtion, but that he "that believeth this heartily, and confeſſeth it "conſtantly, and liveth accordingly, ſhall be "ſaved. We cannot be deceiv'd; it is ſo plainly, "ſo certainly affirmed in Scripture, that "there is no place left for Heſitation. For "this is his Precept, *that we believe in the Name* "*of his* (Imperial) *Son Jeſus Chriſt, and that we* "*love one another. Whoſoever ſhall confeſs, that* "*Jeſus is the* (Imperial) *Son of God, God dwelleth* "*in him and he in God. Whoſoever believeth*, "*that Jeſus is the Chriſt, is born of God.* "*Who is he, that overcometh the World, but he* "*that believeth, that Jeſus is the Son of God?* "It is obſervable, that when the Eunuch had "deſired Baptiſm, S. *Philip* told him, he might, "if he did believe this, and was, when he made "this Confeſſion; intimating that this is the "Chriſtians Faith which is the Foundation of "all his Hope and the Condition of his Baptiſm, "and therefore ſufficient for his Salvation. "For indeed this was the Summ of all "that *Philip* had preach'd; for it is ſaid of him, "that he preached things *concerning the Kingdom* "*of God and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.* And "this was the Summ of all that S. *Paul* had "preached in the Synagogues and Aſſemblies "of the People, this he diſputed for, this he "proved laboriouſly; that Jeſus is the Chriſt, "that he is the (Imperial) Son of God, that he "did, that he ought to ſuffer and riſe again "the third Day, and this was that new Doctrine, "for which the *Athenians* and other "Greeks wondred at him, and he became to "them a ſetter forth of ſtrange Gods, becauſe "he preached *Jeſus* and the Reſurrection. This "was it, into which the Jaylor and all his "Houſe were Baptiz'd; and this was it, which "was propounded to him as the only ſufficient "means of Salvation; *Believe in the Lord Jeſus,* "*and thou ſhalt be ſaved, and all thine Houſe.* "This thing was illuſtrated ſometimes with other "glorious things ſtill promoting the Faith "and Honour of Jeſus, as that he aſcended into "Heaven, and ſhall be Judge of the World. "But this was the whole Faith; τὰ περὶ τῆς "βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, "*the things which concerned the Kingdom of God* "*and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt was the large circumference* "*of the Chriſtian Faith.* (x) *P. Leo* ſaith, that the way is ſtrait and difficult, not only in reſpect of keeping the Commandments, but as the way of Belief, it being a matter of great labour and hazard, not to Err in Doctrine.

But S. *Hilary* ſaith (y) *God doth not call us to the Life of Bleſſedneſs by hard Queſtions, nor trouble us with abundance of Eloquence: The gaining Eternity is compendious and eaſie; to believe that God raiſed Jeſus from the dead, and to confeſs that he is Lord.* Gr. Naz. ſaith (z) *Thou needeſt not to aſcend into Heaven, to bring down Chriſt from thence; nor to deſcend into the deep, to bring up Chriſt from the dead, either curiouſly to ſearch into his firſt Nature, or his laſt Oeconomy. The Word is nigh thee, the Mind hath this treaſure and the Tongue, the one believing it, the other confeſſing it. What is more compendious than this Treaſure? What is more eaſie than this Benefit? Confeſs Jeſus Chriſt, and Believe, that he is raiſed from the Dead, and thou ſhalt be ſaved.* How well theſe Fathers diſcourſe conſiſtently with themſelves and their own Theology touching the Trinity, is not hard to diſcern: But aſſuredly they are right in affirming, that the Holy-virtuous believing this Holy-popular Article, that Jeſus is our Divine Sovereign Lord, is the Summary of the Chriſtians Faith, as being conſtitutive of his Kingdom, and as conſtituting them the Subjects and Citizens thereof, the Elect People of God and the Heirs of Salvation. This Holy-popular Article underſtood in an Holy-popular Senſe implieth and includeth the Belief of an Holy-popular Trinity, but not of a Scholaſtic Trinity, which may be counted (as Bp. *Gardiner* called Juſtification) *an Article of Learning*, but can be no Article of Holy-popular Religion. Articles that conſiſt of a vaſt abundance of Scholaſtic Terms and Notions immenſly Subtil, Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical, altogether Unholy and Unpopular, cannot be neceſſary (a) *ad fundandam domum Dei*, to found the Houſe of God (as *Abarbinel* ſpeaketh) which is an Holy-popular Commonwealth. And in this Senſe I would underſtand what *P. Lombard* ſaith (b) *fidei ſacramentum à Philoſophicis argumentis eſt liberum*, the Myſtery of Faith is free from Philoſophic Argumentations.

(3.) Not Scholaſtic Subtilty but Sanctity (the Holy-popular Buſineſs) is the End and Effect of the Holy Scriptures. For as they are not deſign'd, to teach Men Grammar, Rhetorick, Logick, Muſick, Arithmetick, Geometry, Aſtronomy, Medicine, Architecture, Navigation, or any of the Humane Sciences (for which we are ſufficiently furniſh'd in Nature:) So neither are they deſign'd to make us learned in the Scholaſtic Metaphyſicks. But what a Father ſaith of *Dialectica*, as it ſignifieth *Logick*, muſt be ſaid of it, as it ſignifieth Metaphyſicks. (c) *Non in Dialectica complacuit Deo, ſalvum facere populum ſuum*, God hath not plac'd the Salvation of his People in Metaphyſicks, but in being his People, his godly Believers, his faithful Subjects and Servants, his Regenerate Children and ſuch as have put on the new Man in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. The only great concern of Mankind is to be ſuch Holy People, the Saints of God, and it is their kind of Learning, which the Scripture teacheth, the Wiſdom of being Wiſe according to God (d) *For Faith is the Poſſeſſion* οὐ σοφῶν τῶν κατὰ κόσμον, ἀλλὰ τῶν κατὰ Θεόν, *not of the Wiſe according to the World, but according to God* (e) *Who by their Inquiry, their Learning and Exerciſe* (in the Holy Scripture) *reap this Fruit* τὸ γενέσθαι βασιλέας, *to be ſuch Kings as the Saints of God are.* (f) *As if one attendeth to* Iſchnomachus, *to be inſtituted by him, he will make him an Husbandman; if to* Lampis, *he will make him a Mariner; if to* Charidemus, *he will make him a Commander in War;*

(w) Bp. Taylor Duct. Dub. B. 2. c. 3. p. 388.

(x) Ser. 5. de Nativ.

(y) *Non per difficiles nos Deum ad beatam vitam quæſtiones vocat, nec multiplici eloquentiæ facundiæ genere ſolicitat. In abſoluto nobis ac facili eſt æternitas: Jeſum ſuſcitatum à mortuis per Deum credere, & ipſum eſſe Dominum confiteri.* De Trinit. l. 10.

(z) Orat. 26. p. 458

(a) Abarb. de cap. Fid. ap. Vorſt. p. 76

(b) L. 3. ſentent. diſt. 22.

(c) S. Ambroſ. de Fide l. 1. c. 3.

(d) Clem. pædag. l. 3. c. 11. p. m. 189.

(e) Idem Strom. l. 6. p. m. 496.

(f) Idem Strom. l. 7. p. m. 545.

if to Simon, *he will make him an Horſe-rider*; *if to* Perdix, *he will make him a Victualler*; *if to* Crobylus, *he will make him a Cook*; *if to* Archelaus, *he will make him a Dancer*; *if to* Homer, *he will make him a Poet*; *if to* Pyrrho, *he will make him a Contentioniſt*; *if to* Demoſthenes, *he will make him a Rhetorician*; *if to* Chryſippus, *he will make him a Logician*; *if to* Ariſtotle, *he will make him a Naturaliſt*; *if to* Plato, *he will make him a Philoſopher: So he that obeyeth the Lord and followeth his Word*, ἐκτελεῖται κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐν σαρκὶ περιπολῶν θεὸς, *is made according to the Image of his Maſter, a God converſing in Fleſh* (a Saint of God) *they do not therefore attain to this height, that do not follow the leading of God*: ἡγεῖται δὲ κατὰ τὰς θεοπνεύστους γραφὰς, *and he leadeth by the divinely inſpired Scriptures.* They lead to true Religion and Godlineſs, which in the whole of it is a Popular Buſineſs, and we are to conduct our ſelves in it by the ſame Rules of Prudence, whereby Men conduct themſelves in the ordinary Affairs of Life. They lead to ſuch Religion and Godlineſs, which the Father calleth (g) *noſtram ſimplicem pietatem*, which is Sanctity devoid of Scholaſtic Subtilty; for ſuch is the Chriſtian Learning. They lead from all Sin and Vice to all Holineſs and Virtue, and are like *Ptolomee*'s Library, which had this Inſcripttion ἰατρεῖον ψυχῆς, for they are the Church's *Phyſick-ſhop for the Soul.* But they are to lead the Church, the Church is not to lead them; and they lead from all Errour into all Truth, but it is only from ſuch Errour, which violateth Sanctity, and only into ſuch Truth, which the Church's (the Holy People's) Learning and Philoſophy compriſeth, which ſpeaketh them *the Holy-popular Book.*

Having thus repreſented their true Idea, it ought to be a Teſt, whereby to diſcern the true and genuin Interpretations of Scripture from the ſpurious and illegitimate; and the conſequences of it are, that the Holy Scriptures are not of Scholaſtical, but of a Popular-religious Interpretation (or to ſpeak as Friar *Bacon* doth, they ought to be interpreted (h) *laicaliter, non philoſophice*;) and that the great Articles of our Chriſtian Faith (which are undeniably Holy-popular Articles) are not of a Metaphyſical Unholy and Unpopular, but of an Holy-popular Senſe and Explication. The Popular-religious Senſe of Scripture is ſo mean a thing in the Eyes of *Philo*, that he frequently denieth the literal Senſe; as he will have *Jacob*'s paſſing over *Jordan* with his Staff, to mean (i) that ὁ ἀσκητὴς νοῦς, *the Mind in its Exerciſes paſſeth through the Paſſions and the Evils of our Mortal Nature by Wiſdom and Learning.* Ταπεινὸν γὰρ τὸ ἐνδέχεσθαι, ὅτι βακτηρίαν ἔχων ποταμὸν διέβαινε, *for it is a low thing, to ſuppoſe, that having a Staff he paſſed a River.* So the ancient Scholaſtic Divines of the Church when in the New Teſtament they read of God's giving things to his Son, they neglect the plain and Popular-religious Senſe (as if it was a low thing) and preſently turn all to Scholaſtic Metaphyſicks. (k) *Omne judicium dedit Filio, ſic intelligendum eſt, ut dare ſit idem, ac communicare generando.* His giving all Judgment to the Son muſt be interpreted, to mean, that he communicated it to him by eternal Generation. But ſuch Scholaſtic Interpretations are manifeſtly wild Diſtortions of the ſacred Text, and muſt be cenſured as ſpurious and illegitimate, becauſe they are rancidly Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical and claſh with our Idea of the Holy Scriptures. Some of theſe Scholaſtic Interpretations of the New Teſtament pretend to be Apoſtolical Traditions: But they that conſider, how much the World is abuſed with this Pretence, will not think it ſafe, to rely upon pretended unwritten Traditions. (l) *Traditive Interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: No Tradition but only of Scripture can derive it ſelf from the Fountain.* Nor can any pretended Traditive Interpretation be of ſuch certainty as our *Idea of the Nature of the Holy Scriptures* ſo clearly explained, ſo certainly demonſtrated. It is but reaſonable therefore (and the Intereſts of Religion require it) to relinquiſh the *Scholaſtical* and *Metaphyſical*, and to ſubſtitute in their ſtead *an Holy-popular God, an Holy-popular Son of God, an Holy-popular Spirit of God, an Holy-popular Trinity, an Holy-popular Logos, an Holy-popular Deity of the Meſſiah, and his Holy-popular Incarnation and new Creation*, whereby Religion was very much alter'd from what it was before in the more ancient times of the Scriptures. Whoſe account of Religion in thoſe ancient times ought to be premiſ'd to our Idea of the *Meſſiah* and his new Settlement of Religion.

(g) *S. Aug. de C. D. l. 12. c. 17.*

(h) *Selden Titles of Hon. pref.*

(i) Opuſc. p. 113.

(k) Petav. T. 4. l. 12. c. 16. S. 6.

(l) *Mr. Chillingworth of the Rel. of Proteſt. c. 6. n. 56.*

BOOK

BOOK V.

An Idea of the Saving Religions (true or pretended) in the ancient and later Times of the Scriptures. The Firſt of which is The Law of Nature.

CHAP. I.

The Introduction to an Idea of the Law of Nature. 1. *A definitive Notion of the Law of Nature, and the various Conſiderations of it.* 2. *A definitive Notion of Good.* 3. *Of ſome faulty definitions of Good, with fourteen Arguments againſt one faulty definition of Good and that Scheme of the Law of Nature which it implieth.* 4. *The Good which the Diſcipline of Morality treateth of, is the good Life and Practice, which is the Beauteous-beneficial.* 5. *This Definition illuſtrated.* 6. *To the Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice the Names of Praiſe and Commendation belong.* 7. *The Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice is Righteouſneſs.* 8. *The arbitrary Will of God is not the adequate rule and meaſure of Good and Evil.* 9. *Good and Evil are ſuch antecedently to any determination of the Divine Will.* 10. *The good Life and Practice is the jural Practice towards all the Objects of Practice.* 11. *The good Life and Practice is the Societive.* 12. *The Honourary Attributes of the Law of Nature.*

PELAGIUS diſtinguiſh'd *three ſeveral Religions* and ways to Salvation, that took place in three ſeveral ſucceſſive Intervals of time from the beginning of the World (m) *the times before the* (Moſaic) *Law, the times of the Law, and the times of Grace.* For he ſuppos'd, that Men were ſaved *per Naturam, per Legem, per Chriſtum,* in the times before the Lavv (from *Adam* to *Moſes*) he held, that Men were ſaved *by Nature.* In the times of the Moſaical Lavv (as he ſuppos'd) Men vvere ſaved by the Lavv. And now in the times of the Goſpel (as he ſuppos'd) they are ſaved by Chriſt and by Grace. But they that will rightly repreſent the Affairs of Religion, muſt conſider theſe three Religions, not meerly as ſucceeding one another in ſeveral diſtinct Intervals of time, but as in ſome degree Synchronizing and Co-exiſting in the ſame time from the firſt *Adam* to *Moſes* and ſo on to the ſecond *Adam.* For there was not only the Law of Nature in that Interval of time from *Adam* to *Moſes,* but there was ſomething of the Judaical Religion and of the Typical Inſtitutes of the Moſaic Law in thoſe times (and therefore ſomething of the Moſaic Law before the Law was given by *Moſes,* Rom. 5. 13.) there was alſo ſomething of the Religion of ſaving Grace in thoſe times and in the ſucceeding times of the Moſaic Law. Theſe three Religions therefore muſt be conſider'd as commencing and co-exiſting from the eldeſt times of the World, the Religion of Judaiſm and Chriſtianity being in ſome degree co-eval with *the Law of Nature.*

I. THE Law of Nature is of a competently clear definition, which is generally current amongſt them that have not put off Humane Nature; *it is a Moral Law, a Law of the great Morals, that is notic'd to all Men by the light of Nature.* The Jews divide the Precepts of their Law into (n) מושכלות ומקיבלות *intellectual and thoſe that are receiv'd by Tradition.* The former are ſuch Precepts, *de quibus hominis intellectus teſtatur, eaque explorat,* ſo that if they were not written, the Underſtanding of it ſelf would find them out, as the Precept of honouring Parents, againſt Homicide, Theft, falſe Witneſs, Rapine and ſuch more. Of theſe החקים השכליים *intellectual Statutes,* the Jews ſay (o) they are Principles Preparatory to the Divine Law, preceding it in Nature and Time, vvithout vvhich no Society of Men can ſubſiſt. So the Fathers of the Chriſtian Church ſay, (p) *Before the Law of* Moſes *written in Tables of Stone there was an unwritten Law, which was notic'd by the light of Nature. Before the Jews receiv'd the Law, all Nations and the whole World receiv'd the Law of Nature, that Law which is written in the Heart, extendeth to all Nations, and no Man is unacquainted with it. We have in our ſelves a certain natural diſcernment of the Good from the Evil. What is the Law of Nature? Our Conſcience hath given us plain notice of it, and hath made the knowledge of the things that are honeſt, and that are otherwiſe to be Self-taught.* The imperial Lawyers (that unwiſely extend the Law of Nature to irrational Animals, yet) when they will define it properly and accurately, they do it agreeably to the Senſe of the Fathers. (q) *The Law of Nature is the rule of right Agency, which Nature noticeth, and flweth from Natural Affection and Reaſon.* Divines and School-men define it to this Senſe. (r) *The Law of Nature is that which proceedeth from the Inſtitution of Nature it ſelf, and this is common to all.* The Learned Pagans define it (s) *Reaſon from the Nature of*

(m) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 3. *Par.* 2. *Theſ.* 10.

n) *Hot-ing. Theſ. Phil.* p. 346. *Po-ck Port. Moſ.* p. 223. 24.

(o) *Coſri* p. 113.

(p) *Ante legem Moyſi ſcriptam in tabulis lapideis legem fuiſſe non ſcriptam, quæ naturaliter intelligebatur.* Tertull. adv. Jud. c. 2. *Audiant Judæi, qui ſe ſolos legem accepiſſe Domini gloriantur; quòd univerſæ primùm gentes totuſque orbis Naturalem acceperit legem.* S. Hieron. in Iſai. c. 24. l. 8. *Iſta lex quæ in corde ſcribitur, omnes continet Nationes, & nullus eſt, qui hanc legem neſciat.* Idem T. 3. Ep. ad Algaſ. Qu. 8. Τὶ ἔχομεν παρ' ἑαυτοῖς κριτήριον φυσικὸν, δι' οὗ τὰ καλὰ τῶν πονηρῶν διακρίνομεν. Τί ποτέ ἐστι νόμος φυσικός; τὸ συνειδὸς ἡμῖν διήρθρωσε, καὶ αὐτοδίδακτον ἐποίησε τὴν γνῶσιν τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν οὐ τοιούτων. *V. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 3. *Par.* 3. *Theſ.* 10. *S. Chryſoſt. Hom.* 12. & 13. *ad Pop. Antioch.*

(q) *Jus naturale eſt Norma rectè agendi quam Natura tradit, & à naturali affectione & ratione profluit.* Zouch. Elem. Juriſ-prud. Par. 1. S. 3. Selden. de Jur. Nat. & G. l. 1. c. 8.

(r) *Jus naturale eſt illud, quod ex ipſius naturæ inſtitutione provenit, & hoc eſt omnibus commune.* Seld. Ibid. Sharrock. de Offic. c. 2. Suarez de Leg. l. 1. c. 3.

(s) *Ratio profecta à rerum*

things, which injoineth the things that ought to be done, and forbiddeth the contrary. By *Ariſtotle* it is called (t) κοινὸς νόμος, *the Law which is common to all,* φύσει κοινὸν δίκαιον ἢ ἄδικον, *that juſt and unjuſt which is by Nature and common to all.* The Law of Nature therefore is *a Law of the great Morals* (and the true Moral Philoſophy) *of Nature's Inſtitution*; ſo far it is rightly notic'd by all theſe definitive Notions of it. But to make a due Illuſtration of it without the uſual fault of a mutilate and defective Contemplation (which overlooketh ſome of the main and principal Notices of it) this great Law muſt be ſeveral ways diſtinguiſh'd. For it muſt be conſider'd *under a twofold Notion in a threefold Reſpect: In Reſpect of the Obligation, Promulgation and Obſervance of it.* Firſt, in reſpect of its *Obligation* it is of a twofold Notion; for the Law of Nature ſignifieth *what is in its own Nature Law* (to all intelligent Agents) and it is Law alſo to all intelligent created Agents by *an Authoritative Obligation.* But antecedently to this Obligation from a ſuperiour Authority, it is of an Obligatory Nature and muſt be conſider'd as *the comprehenſion of what is in it ſelf and in its own Nature matter of Law* (of Obligation;) for that this great Law is of this Nature and Notion, will appear (as from other conſiderations, ſo) from a due Explication of *the Good that* it requireth, and the *Evil* that it forbiddeth, which is of principal Conſideration.

II. *Theopompus* the Rhetorician found fault with *Plato* for defining every thing; for did no Man before you (ſaid he) pronounce the words *Good and Evil?* Or did we only ſound the Words without underſtanding the Senſe and Signification of them? To which Crimination a great Philoſopher anſwereth (u) although Mankind are by Nature furniſh'd with the Proleptick Notions (the true Notionalities) of Good and Evil, of Honeſt and Foul, Decorous and Indecorous, and ſo far there is no repugnance in their Sentiments; yet they are not of one mind about the Application of thoſe Names to the things (the true Realities) to which they belong, and this is the matter of their Diſagreement. There is no appearance indeed of any conſiderable Diſagreement amongſt the ancient Philoſophers touching the definitive Notion of Good: But ſuch a Diſagreement there is in the Schools of Chriſtendom; for the Metaphyſicians and learned Writers of Morality are not agreed about the Notion of *Bonum* (of which *Cicero* ſaith (w) I know not whence the word *Bonum* cometh) the principal Source of which Diſagreements is an unavoidable ambiguity of the word. For ſometimes it is us'd ironically (as the word *Chriſtian* amongſt the *Italians*;) becauſe Men are denominated *Good* upon account of their Innocence and Harmleſneſs, hence among the Heathen it became a Term of Reproach, and ſo us'd it importeth ſillineſs. O *bone, ne te fruſtrere. Horat. Sat.* 2. O *bone, num ignoras? Miſſa eſt à Cæſare laurus. Perſ. Sat.* 6. O *bone, id eſt, ô ineptum, ô funginum caput!* But except when the Name *Good* is thus us'd ironically, it always denoteth *what is to be lik'd and in ſome degree commended* (either really for ſufficient Cauſe and Reaſon, or in the Opinion of the Speaker;) for ſo it ſignifieth even when it is connex'd with Vices and Crimes. As vvhen vve ſay (x) *Bonus Latro, Bonus Sycophanta,* to ſignifie one that is *dextrous and expert* at Thieving and Sycophancy. Uſually Good ſingnifieth *Bonum utile* (as every Tree that is good for Food, *Gen.* 2. 9.) and as uſually it ſignifieth *bonum jucundum* (a joyous Day is a good Day, *Eſth.* 9. 22.) vvhence *Hetib* in Hebrew from *Tob* (Good) ſignifieth to Exhilerate. (y) A Philoſopher compareth Good to *Cæſar*'s Coin, agreeably whereto we ſpeak of *good Security,* and ſay a Bargain is good, a Tender is good (in reſpect of Law) and that a Grant vvhich is not good at firſt, cannot be made good *ex poſt facto.* What is valid or of avail in Law, is in ſuch reſpect and ſo far to be lik'd, it is currant (like *Cæſar*'s Coin) unexceptionable and unrefuſable. (z) *Some deny, that holding by Villenage maketh a Man a Villain, which many do at this day, and yet are good* (current and unexceptionable) *Freemen and no Villains.* When God performeth his Sayings, he is ſaid to make them good (what is to be allow'd of) *Numb.* 23. 19. And if a Proprietor is detrimented or damag'd in any thing, the Reſtitution or full Reparation of it is *a making it good* (what is to be allow'd of as to the not being detrimented or damag'd in reſpect of the Owner) *Exod.* 21. 14. and 22. 11, 14, 15. *Lev.* 24. 18. (a) When *Alexander* vvas dying, his Friends ask'd him, to vvhom he would leave the Kingdom? His Anſwer was, *Ei qui eſſet optimus* (ἀρίστῳ *vel* κρατίστῳ) *to the beſt Man* in reſpect of Military Fortitude (doubtleſs;) for in the Greek Writers ἀγαθὸς, ſignifieth *a Valiant Man,* and κακὸς, *a Coward,* becauſe they had Military Fortitude in higheſt Eſteem. Uſually things are denominated *Good* as to the ſize and meaſure of them (vvhich are of a ſize and meaſure that is to be lik'd) and Perſons with reſpect to their Rank and Degree in the World; in vvhich ſenſe vve ſay *a good while, a good way off, a good blow, good buſineſs* (which is *in medio* between great and mean) *a good Eſtate, a good Price, Men of good Note* (and of leſs Note) *of good Rank and Faſhion* (b) *fair Poſſeſſions,* (c) *good Towns,* (d) *a good Family.* Good therefore uſually ſignifieth with reſpect to Rank and Degree and honourary Reſpect; for in ſuch ſenſe Equals are denominated as *Good,* the beſt Man in the ſenſe of Nobility-learning ſignifieth him that is higheſt in Rank and Degree, that in an honourary Reſpect and Eſtimation is to be preferr'd (and in ſuch ſenſe is moſt to be lik'd) and the Superiours are ſtiled *the Betters:* So the ſuperiour in Strength and Power is in that reſpect the better Man. (e) *In Agonibus* (ſaith *Varro*) *herbam in modum Palmæ dat aliquis ei, cum quo contendere non cupit, & fatetur eſſe meliorem.* Amongſt the Lavvyers an honeſt Man *opponitur egeno* (who is not of Rank to be lik'd;) *boni & legales homines* are thoſe, that are to be lik'd and are unexceptionable in Law; *Wellborn* are thoſe that are of a Rank to be lik'd in reſpect of their Birth; the attribute of *good Man* in our Nation belongeth to thoſe, that are of ſuch a Rank which is to be lik'd, and to be had in a conſiderable degree of Eſteem and Reſpect (as we commonly eſtimate Things and Perſons:) But thoſe of the baſer ſort becauſe they are ſuch, are in *Euripides* and other Greek Authors uſually called κακοὶ and φαῦλοι, *the bad ſort.* So *Lucas Brugenſis* interpreteth the good and bad mention'd *Matth.* 22. 10. to ſignifie *honeſtos & ſordidos.* So the *Chalday* Oracles according to *Pletho*'s Interpetation call matter κακὴ ὕλη, *bad matter,* not becauſe it is the Fountain of

natura, ad rectè faciendum impellens, & à delicto avocans. Cic. de Leg. l. 2.

(t) *Rhet. l.* 1. *c.* 13.

(u) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 22. *& l.* 2. 11, 17.

(w) *De Fin. l.* 4.

(x) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 8. *S.* 6.

(y) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 3.

(z) *Lord Hollis Remains, p.* 71.

(a) *L'Emper. Not. in Jacchi. ad. p.* 211.

(b) *Selden Titles p.* 507.

(c) *Ibid. p.* 570.

(d) *Ibid. p.* 659, 667.

(e) *Ibid. p.* 28.

of Evil, but becauſe it is of the vile and infimous Rank and Condition. So *Epicurus*'s declination of Atoms is called by *Plutarch* σμικρὸν οὕτω πρᾶγμα ϗ φαῦλον, *ſo little, worthleſs, vile and bad a thing.* Somewhat near this uſe of the Name *Good* as it is expreſſive of Rank and Degree, is a peculiar uſe of it in our Engliſh Phraſeology, wherein things are ſaid to be *as good* (without any intention to ſay, that they are good) only to ſignifie, that one thing is little leſs than the other, not valuably or conſiderably deficient. For when we have near finiſh'd any piece of Work, we ſay, it is as good as finiſh'd; when any thing is well nigh gone, we ſay it is as good as loſt; and our Tranſlators ſay of *Abraham*, Heb. 11. 12. *Him as good as Dead*, to ſignifie, that he was little leſs than Dead.

The Metaphyſicians Maxim is of great Truth and Certainty; *omne Ens in quantum eſt Ens, eſt bonum.* Every Being as it is a Being is good; *for no Being is without Well-being.* A Being properly ſo called is that which hath a Species of Eſſence, and therefore is not without Aptitude for Exiſtence, having (f) *as its Nature is, a certain Perfection and form, whereby it is what it is.* And as a Being is that which is of ſome kind, ſo it is that which is neceſſarily of a certain Rank and Degree amongſt Beings, above nothing, and better than ſuch a ſomething, that is worſe than nothing, which is a Good or Well-being. Exiſtence may be ſo complicated, as to be (in ſeveral reſpects) worſe than Non-exiſtence; (g) *for we love Exiſtence as a Good, and therefore prefer not Being before an ill Being:* But Exiſtence is of it ſelf better than nothing and non-exiſtence, and muſt be counted *a Good.* To which the Schools add, that (h) *Bonum dicit rationem perfecti, Good as an Attribute of Ens denoteth that which is perfect*; every Being is without defect of its Eſſential Perfection, which is *Bonitas entitativa*, and this entitative Goodneſs is Well-being and *that which is to be lik'd*, as this Name *Good* always ſignifieth. Agreeably whereto ſome Schoolmen ſay, that *Bonum* and *Appetibile* are the ſame. But others of them make this Objection; (i) that an Object is not *Appetibile*, unleſs it can be deſir'd: But before it can be deſired, it muſt be underſtood to be good (which foundeth and cauſeth its appetibility) an Object therefore is not good, becauſe it is *Appetibile*, but on the contrary, it is *Appetibile*, becauſe it is good: (k) As *Plotinus* ſaith; *Good is neceſſarily* expetendum, *but it is not therefore good: But becauſe it is good, therefore it is* expetendum, *to be deſired.* But this Objection hath no force in it, ſave only what ariſeth from the Ambiguity of the word *Appetibile*, which may ſignifie *what can be deſir'd*, and it may ſignifie *what is worthy to be deſired*, Ἀξιέραστον, (as *Philo* ſpeaketh) in which latter Senſe (not in the former) *Appetibile* is the ſame with *Bonum*, as ſeveral judicious Philoſophers have diſcourſed. (l) *Good is that which is to be deſired, and that which is to be deſired is good. Evil is that which is to be eſchewed and hated.*

III. The Exiſtence of Good and Evil ſo far dependeth upon *a Preceptive Life*, that if there was no Perception of them, they would be of no more regard or conſideration, than if they were not at all. Whence *Lactantius* ſaith (m) *ut bonum ſit aliquid aut malum, ſenſus efficit.* But notwithſtanding this Connexion which Good hath with a perceptive Life, it ought not to be thus defin'd (a) *Good is that which is pleaſant to a perceptive Life conjunct with the Conſervation of the Percipient.* For the Nature and Notion of Good doth not conſiſt in being pleaſant, *but in being worthy to be pleas'd with.* This faulty definition of Good is not competible to the *Bonum Metaphyſicum*, nor to the *Bonum utile* as ſuch (which is uſually painful and afflictive,) nor can it pretend to be the definition of the good of *Duty and Virtue* as ſuch; for nothing can be the good of Duty and Virtue (which is good Practice) *meerly as pleaſant to a perceptive Life and conjunct with the Conſervation of the Percipient.* The Mountain muſt not be brought to *Muhammed*, but *Muhammed* muſt go to the Mountain. Intelligent Agents muſt not be told, that nothing is good, but as it is pleaſant to a perceptive Life and conjunct with their Conſervation: But they ſhould be told, that they ought to make the things that are good the matter of their Pleaſure, that there is ſufficient Cauſe and Reaſon, why they ſhould be pleas'd with them, and that upon this account they are good. If nothing is good, but as it is *pleaſant to a perceptive Life*, there can be no other good in the Univerſe but the good of Happineſs: Nor can the evil of Sin and Wickedneſs as ſuch be in the World, but only the evil of Infelicity. But ſuch definitive Notions of Good and Evil (which imply, that nothing is ſuch, but as it is felicitative or infelicitative) are mutilate and partial, and much too narrow, to be the definitions of Good and Evil in general; and there is the like exception againſt a celebrated definition of good, which ſome Schoolmen and others have excogitated; (b) *that convenience and inconvenience to ſome Body are the definitive Notions of Good and Evil. Good is that which is convenient to the Nature of a thing*, or (as ſome ſay) *quod Naturam reverà juvat, what is not hurtful, but really adjuvant to Nature.* A late Learned Writer of the Laws of Nature hath entertain'd this definitive Notion of *Good*, which is not only in its ſelf faulty and a miſtake, but it involveth in it many other Miſtakes, is a Fountain of Miſtakes in the Contemplation of the Law of Nature, and many ſuch Conſequences iſſue from it, which are very injurious thereunto. For

(1.) The Nature of Beings is manifeſtly a good Antecedent to what is *convenient* and *helpful*

(f) Κατὰ φύσιν ἑαυτοῦ τελειότητα ϗ εἶδος καθ' ὅ ἐστι τοῦτο ὅπερ ἐστί. *Simplic. in Epictet.* c. 33. p. 154.

(g) *Ibid.* c. 38. p. 224.

(h) *Aquin.* 1. *qu.* 5. *Art.* 1. & 3. *Vaſqu.* T. 1 *Qu* 5. *Art.* 1. *Diſp.* 23. c. 5, 6.

(i) *Vaſq. ibid.* c. 3. *Cajetan. in Aqu.* 1. *Par. Qu.* 5. *Art.* 1.

(k) Ἐφετὸν μὲν δεῖ τὸ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, οὐ μέν τι τῷ ἐφετὸν εἶναι ἀγαθὸν γίνεσθαι· ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι ἐφετὸν γίνεσθαι. *En.* 5. *l.* 7. c. 25.

(l) Ὅπου δὲ ὄρεξις τέτακται ϗ ἔκκλισις, εἴτε κατὰ φύσιν, εἴτε παρὰ φύσιν, ἐκεῖ τὸ ἀγαθὸν δοκεῖ ϗ τὸ κακόν. Ἀγαθὸν γὰρ τὸ ὀρεκτὸν, κακὸν δὲ τὸ φευκτὸν νομίζεται *Simplic. ſupr.* c. 72. p. 283. Τὸ γὰρ ἐφετὸν ἀγαθόν· ϗ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐφετόν. *Ibid.* c. 35. Τὸ δὲ κακὸν φευκτὸν ϗ μισητὸν, ὥσπερ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐφετὸν ϗ ἀσπαστόν. *Ibid.* c. 38. *Bonum profectò idem eſt atque expetendum. Ficin. in* 2. *Dial. Plat. de Rep. Illud verò per abſurdum Bonum eſſe aliquid quod non expetendum ſit: Aut expetendum quod non placens: Aut ſi id, non etiam diligendum: Ergo & probandum: Ita etiam laudabile.* Cic. de Fin. l. 3.

(m) *L.* 3. c. 19.

(a) *Bonum eſt quod vitæ alicui perceptivæ, vitæque hujus gradui, gratum, jucandum & congruum eſt, & cum conſervatione percipientis conjunctum.* Dr. H. More Ench. Eth. l. 1. c. 4.

(b) *Id bonum habeatur, quod eſt rei alicui conveniens & conſentaneum.—— quæ boni congruentia ad uſum quendam ac fructum ſive commodum refertur.* Petav. T. 1. l. 6. c. 1. S. 5. *Bonum nihil aliud eſt, quàm id quod eſt naturæ cujuſcunque rei conſentaneum, quod rem perficit.* Lud. Carbo Tract. de Leg. l. 2. Diſp. 2. *Bonum eſt, quod rei cujuſlibet, vel plurium facultates conſervat, vel inſuper ad auget & perficit. His enim effectibus ſe prodit peculiaris illa convenientia rei unius cum altera, quæ requiritur, ut huic Naturæ, præter alias, quicquam bonum eſſe dicatur. Bonum ideò fatemur dici, quod alteri convenit, adeòque relativè dici. Quodlibet ideo verè judicari bonum quia effectus ejus ſeu vis Naturam reverà juvat.* Dr. Cumberland de Leg. Natur. Diſſ. Phil. c. 3. S. 1, 2.

ful thereto, *conſervative* or *perfective* thereof. But if nothing is good ſave only as convenient to the Nature of Beings, their Nature (the Nature of Rational Beings) muſt not be ſuppos'd, to be good; and conſequently there can be no ſufficient reaſon for, or obligation to an Univerſal Love (which is a Summary of the Law of Nature;) for it is not poſſible, much leſs is it laudable, to love that which is not ſuppos'd to be good. The Notion of Good therefore muſt be ſo large and general (*c*) as to be competible to the Nature of Beings, eſpecially to the Nature of created Rationals (which is *bonum phyſicum*) and more eſpecially to the Nature of God, who muſt not be thought, to be good only (*d*) as convenient to himſelf and to us, as ſome ſuppoſe, (who yet ſtyle him *Ipſum bonum*, ȣ̓σία τȣ̃ ἀγαθȣ̃, *the Eſſence of Good*, which Names are incompetible to him, if he be good only *relative*:) but as being alſo both to himſelf and unto us *The Godhead*, that Good to which for its own ſake both himſelf and we muſt be convenient, which is a principal Branch of the Law of Nature.

(c) *Cauſæ conſtituentes, conſervantes & perficientes rerum hominúmve ea ſunt quæ nos dicimus bona.* Ibid.

(d) *Petav. ſupr. & ibid. c.* 2.

(2.) In our Elogies both of God and Creatures *Good* uſually ſignifieth in ſuch a Senſe, as cannot be expounded by *Convenient*. For we pronounce an Angel (upon account of all that he is) to be ſuperlatively *good* and *excellent*; in which Elogy ſuperlatively *good* and ſuperlatively *excellent* are terms ſynonymous, but ſuperlatively *good* and ſuperlatively *convenient* are not ſo. So when God is intituled *The ſupreme Good, The infinite and abſolutely perfect Good*. The Attribute Good in theſe Elogies denoteth his tranſcendent Excellency, and this tranſcendent Goodneſs the Schoolmen uſually mean, when they ſpeak of his Goodneſs. Speaking of his Goodneſs in their Senſe, The Godhead muſt be conſider'd as the Tranſcendent (Creature-tranſcendent) Good and Excellence (both in a real and perſonal acceptation) and as the ultimate and final Good and Excellence, of whom we muſt ſay, that *He is ſo good, that all things are for Him and to Him*, to be convenient unto him (as the Rights and Dues of the Godhead and as Religion and Godlineſs require) and in this Senſe he may be rightly ſtyled by *Plato* μέτρον πάντων, *the Meaſure of all things*. As all things, ſo himſelf muſt be convenient to his Godhead, (*e*) ȣ̓δὲν μὴ πρέπον ἑαυτῷ ὁ Θεὸς βȣ́λεται, ἀναιρετικὸν τυγχάνον τȣ̃ εἶναι αὐτὸν Θεόν· ἀδικεῖν ἐναντίον ἐστὶν αὐτȣ̃ τῇ Θεότητι· *God willeth nothing unbecoming himſelf; for it would deſtroy his being God: to do Unrighteouſneſs, is contrary to his Deity.* If we ſhould ſuppoſe (*per impoſſibile*) God to do any thing contrary and deſtructive to the Godhead, ſuch an Evil would not be meerly an inconvenience to himſelf (as ſelf) and to the Creatures, but it would be an horrendous Wickedneſs beſides; Evil therefore is not meerly an Inconvenience to himſelf (as ſelf) and to Creatures; therefore Good is not meerly a Convenience to theſe. Holy Souls are the admirers and lovers of the Godhead and adhere to it by their devotional eſteem and affection, not meerly as ſuppoſing it a Convenience to any, but much more upon account of its own Worth and Excellence, Pulchritude and Pretioſity. That Good which is meerly reſpective (which is good only as good and convenient to ſomething) cannot be abſolutely the ultimate and final Good; but ſuch is that Good which the Godhead is.

(e) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 247. *l.* 3. *p.* 154.

(3.) If nothing is good but reſpectively only (as convenient to Nature) there can be no other ultimate end of things but Self and a great Syſtem of Selves. (*f*) *Aggregatum ex omnibus rationalibus*, or (*g*) *the whole Univerſe, all Beings exiſtent.* Whatever is good meerly as convenient to ſomething, muſt be convenient to ſome or all of theſe; and it may be either *bonum naturale* or *bonum morale*. If it be *bonum naturale* that is convenient to all theſe, it is called *Commune Bonum, Bonum publicum, Felicitas publica* (in the largeſt Senſe) *the Univerſal Good*. If it be *Bonum morale* that is convenient to all theſe, it is called *Moral Virtue*, which Moral Good is procreant of the Natural Good, and is a means ſubſervient to the Common Good and Felicity. (*h*) *Moral Good is a kind of* bonum utile, *or Profitable Good, which doth effect Delectable Good* (or Felicity) *the End of all our Actions the Univerſal Good.* (*i*) Finis maximus eſt commune omnibus rationalibus agentibus bonum. Ideo virtus bonum eſt, quia actus humanos determinat ad effectus, qui boni publici naturalis partes ſunt. (*k*) *The common good of rational Beings is the greateſt and nobleſt End we can imagine or propoſe to our ſelves, as comprehending the Good and Happineſs of the whole Syſtem of Rational Beings, the collective Happineſs of the Deity as the Head of them, and that of all the individual perſons of Mankind exiſting together with us, as the conſtituent parts or members; and in which each Man's particular Good and Happineſs is included. All the Moral Duties we owe, either to God, our ſelves or others, are contained in, or may be reduc'd to this one Propoſition of our endeavouring the common Good of Rationals.* (*l*) *The general preſervation of Man's Natural Good is the ſole Root and Fountain of the Moral: the Univerſal Profit and Pleaſure, the publick Happineſs of Humane Life giveth being and denomination to every Virtue and Vice; and the true Rules and Directions to preſerve and ſecure that Happineſs make up the whole Volume, the Code and Pandect of the Law of Nature.* The Law of Nature (according to this Scheme of it) is an Inſtitution of meer publick ſelf-convenience as the End, and of meer publick ſelf-convenience as the Means. For the publick Happineſs (as ſuch) is nothing elſe but the common and publick Self-convenience, of which an Aggregate of Selves and every private ſelf in his publick Capacity is the ultimate End. Thoſe excellent Commonwealthsmen the Bees, that by innate Inſtinct are carry'd to endeavour the publick good (in which every one's particular good is included) cannot be ſuppos'd, to act for any better End than the common and publick Self-convenience. And as every one's private Happineſs (as ſuch) is nothing more than private Self-convenience; ſo the publick Happineſs (as ſuch) is nothing more than the common and publick Self-convenience: (*m*) *for Happineſs is the End of Humane Goods, but Man is the End of Happineſs; for we love our Happineſs for our own ſake.* What *Cicero* ſaith of Pleaſure, muſt be ſaid of Happineſs, (*n*) *We love it for the ſake of our ſelves, but do not love our ſelves for the ſake of it.* Wherefore according to this Scheme of the Law of Nature, which ſuppoſeth, that nothing is good but as convenient to Nature, there can be no other Ultimate End of things but natural ſelf, or an Aggregate of natural ſelves; nor can there be any other ultimate reaſon of things but private or publick Self-conveniency. And this would really be the ſtate of things in the Univerſe, if the whole Univerſe

(f) De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. c. 5. p.

(g) Eſſay in Moral. p. 18. 50.

(h) Ibid. p. 55, 57, and 14.

(i) De Leg. Nat. diſſ. c. 4. p. 176. & c. 5. p. 194.

(k) M. Tyrell of the Law of Nat. c. 3. p. 108, 110, 111.

(l) Dr. Bently Ser. on 1 Pet. 3. 15. p. 14, 15.

(m) *Felicitas eſt finis omnium bonorum humanorum, homo tamen eſt finis felicitatis: felicitatem enim propter nos ipſos diligimus, ut ipſâ perfruamur.* Buridan. Eth. p. 49.

(n) *Propter nos enim illam, non propter eam noſmet ipſos diligimus.* L. 5. de fin.

niverſe of Rationals were Self-exiſtents and Independents, that combin'd themſelves into Society meerly for their common Happineſs and for their own ſake: or if they were meer political Animals, that were ſo combin'd into Society by Nature. But in Sanctity Imperial (whereby a Judgment may be made of Civil Society) they are not thus combin'd into Society, but they are link'd together by an adamantine Law of right and due Agency, and by *this legal Neceſſity*, they muſt not be Wicked, but muſt be Holy-virtuous, *and are under infinite Obligations ſo to be.* They practiſe Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs for other ultimate Reaſons than Perſonal Self-reſpects or ſubſerviency to publick Self-convenience; and they eſchew Sin and Iniquity for other ultimate Reaſons, than meerly becauſe it is a publick Nuſance and Inconvenience. In the Kingdom of God Holineſs doth not exiſt meerly for the ſake of the Publick Happineſs, nor is the Holineſs of God a means to that end: but the Publick Happineſs exiſteth for his Holineſs and Godlineſs of Will.

(4.) This Scheme of the Law of Nature and its definitive Notion of Good becauſe it ſuppoſeth, that nothing is good but as convenient to Nature, that Virtue is of the rank of *Bonum utile*, (o) *and is no otherwiſe Virtue, but as it contributeth to this great End the common good of Rationals*, deſtroyeth the *Self-amiableneſs* and *Self-eligibleneſs* of Virtue and the *Self-odiouſneſs* of Sin and Wickedneſs. For it doth not, nor can acknowledge any other Pulchritude in Virtue than (p) the idoneouſneſs of it to this greateſt End *the common Happineſs of Rationals*; whereas abſtracting from all reſpect to Happineſs or Unhappineſs, publick or private, *turpe quia turpe eſt, non eſt faciendum*, (q) as *Cicero* uſually inſiſteth and inculcateth. Wickedneſs is not only to be eſchew'd as a publick Inconvenience, but for its own intrinſick Turpitude, as all the virtuous Philoſophers in conſort with Chriſtians agree, and that Sin as Sin is *infinitæ fugibilitatis.* (r) *Injuriam facere per ſe vitanda eſt, cujus turpitudo contra omnia præmia in ſcelus hortantia valet.* It hath been a Queſtion, whether Juſtice be for Society, or Society for Juſtice? do Men live in Society, meerly that they may live juſtly? or do they live juſtly, meerly that they may live in Society? Neither of theſe can be affirm'd with truth; but Men live in Society for Society-ſake (the innumerable Benefits of it) and they ought to live in Society (s) for Juſtice-ſake, which obligeth Children, to live in Society with their Parents, and Rationals to live in Society with God. Juſtice therefore is in part for its own * ſake, and in part for Society; and Society is partly for its own ſake, and partly for Juſtice-ſake. So Virtue is partly for Felicity, Holineſs for Happineſs: Felicity and Happineſs is partly for Virtue and Holineſs. For Virtue and Holineſs deſigneth and endeavoureth the Publick Happineſs, and conſiſteth in the faithful love of the whole and its Intereſt; but beſides this faithful Love there is in all Holy People a faithful eſteem and love of Righteouſneſs (and hatred of Sin and Iniquity) for its own ſake. They practiſe Righteouſneſs ultimately for Righteouſneſs-ſake (becauſe of its own Intrinſick Worth, Rectitude, Pulchritude and Pretioſity) *Matth.* 5. 10. (t) *ob eam unam cauſam, quia decet, quia rectum, quia honeſtum eſt*, for this ſole reaſon, becauſe it is right and juſt. So the Virtuous Philoſophers call that which is honeſt, (u) *Self-amiable, Self-laudable, Self-deſirable.* (w) Αὐτὸ δὲ αὐτὸ αἱρετὸν ὅτι τὸ δίκαιον, *that which is right and juſt, is eligible, becauſe it is ſuch.* There is more good in Juſtice than meerly a ſubſerviency to the publick Happineſs (and conſequently it is not good meerly as a Conveniency to Nature) elſe it is nothing better than a contrivance for living in Society and for publick convenience.

(5.) This Scheme of the Law of Nature and its definitive Notion of Good introduceth an Inſtitution of Morality of an illegitimate kind, which is not truly Moral, but meerly Politick and Prudential. For it ſuppoſeth, (x) *that all the Acts of all the Virtues are commanded meerly for the common convenience of Rationals; that the dictates of Prudence directing the Actions of Men to the publick good are the very Laws of Nature; that the Maker of the World muſt be ſuppos'd, to be endow'd with Prudence, in which there is a Volition of the beſt and greateſt End (the common good of all Rationals) and a proſecution of it by the moſt efficacious means, in which ſort of Acts* omnis religio & virtus continetur, *all Religion and Virtue is contain'd.* The Maker of the World is ſuppos'd from a Principle of Prudence, to will the greateſt End (the common Happineſs) and from the ſame Principle of Prudence alſo to contrive and injoyn the moſt effectual Means thereto, which are called *the Acts of Religion and Virtue*; and this his prudential Inſtitution of End and Means is this Scheme of the Law of Nature, which therefore is not a Virtuous (much leſs an Holy Virtuous) Inſtitution. For it is one thing, to inſtitute Men, to live well only as to a certain Intereſt, and another thing, to inſtitute them, to live well ſimply and abſolutely. A meer prudential Inſtitution of Morality careth neither for Virtue nor Vice, for living well nor living ill as ſuch and for their own ſake, nor any further than they ſubſerve or diſſerve the publick Convenience. As if one, that foundeth a Family, ſhould prudentially inſtitute the Members of it to demean themſelves humbly, that they may live in Peace, without caring either for Pride or Humility, but only for the common Peace. So this Inſtitution affirmeth, (y) *that the Laws of Nature and all the Virtues* nihil aliud ſunt, *are nothing elſe but means of obtaining the common good.* It ſuppoſeth, that Virtue is not good but only as effective of the common Felicity; and that Vice and Wickedneſs is not Evil but only as effective of the publick Infelicity, as will further appear preſently.

(6.) This Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its definition of Good) ſuppoſeth, (z) *that the common Good or Felicity is the whole Rule and Meaſure of Virtue*, as the adequate End is the rule and meaſure of the Means. It ſuppoſeth alſo, that there is no other rule and meaſure of endeavouring the common happineſs of Rationals but (a) *voluntas ad ultimum virium ſuarum determinata*, the Will determin'd (to this ſupreme End and Good) to the utmoſt of its Forces. (b) *The Eternal Happineſs of the whole Univerſe ought to have the greateſt ſtrength of Vo-*

(o) M. Tyr. red. ſupr. p. 191.

(p) De Leg. Nat. diſſ. in proleg. S. 16.

(q) De off. l. 3.

(r) Sen. de Beneſ. l. 4. c. 15.

(s) T. Sharrock de off. c. 2, n. 16.

* *Vi ſua & dignitate expetendum.* Cic. de fin. l. 3.

(t) Cic. de Fin. l. 2.

(u) *Bonum honeſtum per ſe laudabile, per ſe amabile, per ſe expetendum. Bonum honeſtum pulchritudine ſuâ ſpecieque laudabile.* Cic. de Fin. l. 2. *Forma honeſti, ſi oculis cerneretur, mirabiles amores, ut ait Plato, excitaret.* Idem de off. l. 1.

(w) *Jambl.* προτρεπ. c. 19.

(x) *Omnes actus ſingularum virtutum unicè propter Bonum commune imperari.* De Leg. Nat. diſſ. c. 8. p. 373. *Dictata prudentiæ actiones humanas ubi vis gentium ad bonum publicum (commune rationalium omnium) dirigentia ſunt ipſiſſimæ leges Naturæ.* Ibid. c. 5. p. 199. & vid. ibid. S. 19, 20. & c. 4. p. 176.

(y) *Ibid* c. 3. *p.* 166.

(z) *Commune bonum integer eſt & adæquatus finis.* Ibid. c. 5. p. 295. *Unus finis proponitur, qui omnibus communis ſit menſura boni & mali.* Ibid. p. 216.

(a) *Ibid.* c. 1. *p.* 7.

(b) *Eſſay of Moral.* p. 38, 64.

lition that can be, which is no leſs than Infinite. Both which Propoſitions claſh with this plain and certain Principle, *That Virtue is the Rule and Meaſure of endeavouring the common Happineſs of Rationals.* Which (including our own Happineſs) may be ſought meerly as an Intereſt and out of Intereſt from a Principle of natural and lawful Self-love and Self-concern (as the Political Animals ſeek the common Good) and common Reaſon dictateth this ſort of endeavouring the common Good. But the common Happineſs of Rationals muſt be ſought alſo from a Principle of *Duty and Virtue*, and conſequently it muſt not be ſought but in conſiſtence with Virtue, nor otherwiſe than Virtue requireth. No Man can be oblig'd, to ſeek his own or the publick Happineſs any otherwiſe or any further than as it is virtuous ſo to do, and as Holineſs and Godlineſs requireth. A Man may not violate Virtue and Holineſs, nor touch with Sin and Wickedneſs, no not for the Happineſs of the whole Univerſe. He may in ſome degree part with his own Happineſs (which is part of the publick Happineſs) and chuſe his own Unhappineſs (ſeveral Inconveniences of Life:) but no Man may chuſe his Sin and Wickedneſs in any degree, although himſelf only be the material Object of his Sin; ſo much greater and ſtricter are his Obligations in reſpect of Virtue and Holineſs than in reſpect of Happineſs. To chuſe Annihilation rather than Sin is certainly a laudable choice (as *Durandus* ſuppoſeth) and it is therefore laudable, becauſe it
Exod. 32. 32. is virtuous. When *Moſes* wiſheth his own Name, *to be blotted out of the Book of Life*; when S. *Paul*
Rom. 9. 3. ſaith, *I could wiſh that my ſelf were accurſed from Chriſt for my Brethren my Kinſmen according to the Fleſh*; theſe Holy Men in ſome degree wiſh their own Unhappineſs for the ſake of a more publick Happineſs; but their wiſhing it is not to be underſtood abſolutely, but with this reſtriction and limitation, ſo far as it is lawful and virtuous ſo to do. Virtue therefore is the Rule and Meaſure of endeavouring both our own and the publick Happineſs. God himſelf endeavoureth the publick Happineſs, yet cannot be ſaid, to endeavour it *ad ultimum virium*, but as it is Holineſs and Godlineſs ſo to do. We are oblig'd to endeavour his Glory (which is one Branch of the *Bonum publicum naturale:*) but ſuch a kind of endeavouring it, which is not true Holineſs and Godlineſs, is not acceptable, but criminal in his Eyes. We are oblig'd to endeavour the Happineſs of created Rationals, but ſo as to endeavour the Unhappineſs of the Apoſtate Angels and the ruine of their Kingdom. And if any Men be in the ſame ſtate of Reprobation with the Apoſtate Angels (by notoriouſly ſinning the Sin unto Death) we are not oblig'd to ſeek their Happineſs, 1 *Joh.* 5. 16. Holineſs and Godlineſs conſiſteth in endeavouring the Publick Happineſs, but as Holineſs and Godlineſs requireth.

(7.) According to its definition of Good this Scheme of the Law of Nature condemneth the Philoſophy of the Stoicks, (c) *becauſe they endeavouring to eſtabliſh the eximious goodneſs of Virtue and badneſs of Vice, quite take away the one only cauſe, why the one is good, the other bad: for therefore Virtue is good, becauſe it determineth the Actions of Men to Effects that are parts of the publick Felicity.* Agreeably whereto the beſt compendium of Ethicks is ſaid to be (d) *an Idea of true Felicity and the Cauſes of it.* In this Scheme of the Law of Nature nothing is counted good but *Happineſs*, other things only as effective of Happineſs: nothing is counted Evil but Infelicity, other things only as effective of Infelicity. Virtue therefore is degraded, to be of the ſame rank with Food, Sleep and Houſes, that are good and neceſſary, as ſubſervient to the common Happineſs of Mankind: which Happineſs is by modern Philoſophers generally ſuppos'd, (*e*) to conſiſt meerly in Pleaſure; and conſequently Virtue is ſuppoſed, to be good only as ſubſervient to Pleaſure (private and publick) the only Competition between Vice and Virtue muſt be touching the Pleaſure which they afford: And this muſt be the only fault of the Pleaſures of Sin, they are deficient in matter of Pleaſure, or claſh with greater Pleaſure (as a leſſer Good with a greater) no Vice or Villainy is to be diſcommended but only as oppoſite to Pleaſure (in itſelf or its effects) and if it was not oppoſite to Pleaſure, it would not be a Vice, nor at all to be diſcommended, as *Epicurus* ſaid of Luxury. Vice and Vicious Perſons would be as good as Virtue and Virtuous Perſons, if the Nature of the Univerſe of Beings could be ſo contriv'd, that the former might be as ſubſervient to Pleaſure as the latter. Accordingly the goodneſs of Virtue and of the Law of Nature is ſaid to be no otherwiſe nor any further unalterable than (*f*) *manente rerum naturâ tali, qualis nunc eſt*, ſo long as the nature of the things of the Univerſe and their opperative force remaineth unchang'd. (*g*) As the ſame ſubſerviency to Happineſs, ſo the ſame unalterableneſs is aſcrib'd to Virtue and to natural things (Victuals, Cloaths, Phyſick) which are ſaid to be *unalterably good, that is, tending to the preſervation and happineſs of Mankind.* The Immutability therefore of Virtue is not abſolute, nor is it of an immutable nature in and of it ſelf (as a Square and Cube) but the immutability which it hath, accrueth to it from the unchang'd Nature of the Univerſe of Beings, to whoſe Happineſs it is a means ſubſervient.

(8.) This Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its definitive Notion of Good) deriveth the Neceſſity of Virtue in Men meerly from (*h*) *Neceſſity of publick Good* (which neceſſarily requireth it) and from their being injyon'd it meerly in order thereto. Man muſt practiſe Univerſal Benevolence, Juſtice, Temperance, Chaſtity, only for this great end. (*i*) *All the particular moral Virtues are contained under this one Law of endeavouring the common good of Rational Beings, and are to be deduced from it as their only true ground and original.* (*k*) *All the parts of Univerſal Juſtice and Benevolence,* viz. *all the particular Virtues contained under them are only commanded in order to the common good.* (l) *Every Virtue hath ſome natural efficacy, to promote the common good of Rationals, and is no otherwiſe a Virtue but as it contributeth to this great End.* According to theſe Maxims the Virtues have nothing to recommend them, at leaſt nothing to neceſſitate their practice, but only their neceſſary ſerviceableneſs to *a common Self-convenience*, for which ſole reaſon the ſeveral Clans of Thieves and Robbers (*m*) ſtrictly practiſe Juſtice amongſt themſelves. As they practiſe it becauſe it is neceſſary to their common Good, and Injuſtice would be a grand inconvenience to their Syſtem of Rationals; So if Mankind in general practiſe Juſtice, meerly becauſe it is neceſſary to their common Good, and Injuſtice would be a grand inconvenience to their Syſtem of Rationals (although their Syſtem and the Good thereof is of a different Nature from that of Thieves, yet) is not their reſpect to Juſtice and Injuſtice both alike? But theſe Maxims have worſe and greater flaws in them; for they not only deſtroy the Self-amiableneſs of Virtue, and the Self-odiouſneſs of Vice, but their being φύσει, *by Nature*, not θέσει, *by Arbitrary Conſtitution.* For let us ſuppoſe, that antecedently to the Conſtitution of the Univerſe of Rationals there is one ſolitary Rational Exiſtent; this one ſolitary Rational (according to theſe Maxims) cannot practiſe any Virtue, nor is he in his ſolitary State capable either of Virtue or of Vice, which therefore are not φύσει, *in themſelves neceſſary.* Such they are not (according to theſe Maxims) after the Univerſe of Rationals is conſtituted; they are neceſſary meerly and only for the common Good of this conſtituted Univerſe and by his Will who conſtituting this Univerſe appointed them meerly and only for the common Good thereof. They are therefore as Arbitrary as the conſtituted Univerſe and as his Will and Appointment in conſtituting the Univerſe. But whatever is in it ſelf (its own Nature) ἐυπραξία, *the right and due Practice* is upon that account and *for it ſelf* (not meerly for publick Good) indiſpenſably neceſſary, upon that account it is commanded by God, upon that account it is *Virtue*, becauſe it is *Well-doing*, and not meerly becauſe it is a promoting the common Good. *To endeavour the common Good of Rational Beings*, is ſo far from being the Comprehenſion of all Virtue, that unleſs our endeavouring this common Good is of the Legitimate kind and duely qualified, it is not Virtue, but Vice and Crime. Such is all *Benevolence* and *Beneficence*, which is againſt Righteouſneſs. *Benefacere* in one Senſe (to Benefit others) is ſometimes repugnant to *Benefacere* in another Senſe (Well-doing) according to that of *Ennius* (*n*) *Benefacta malè locata malefacta arbitror.* All are not oblig'd to perpetual and univerſal Benevolence and Beneficence vvithout limitation: But all are oblig'd to *Righteouſneſs* without limitation; this therefore is Virtue and the rule of Virtue, which muſt rule and limit *our endeavouring the common Good of Rationals*, and vvhich God requireth, not only as an endeavouring the common Good, but as Righteouſneſs (*o*) *for he loveth Righteouſneſs as ſuch* (*p*) ἀπὸ τῆς ταύτης αἱ λοιπαὶ ἀρεταὶ ὑφίσανται, *from this* (which a Pythagorean calleth ματέρα τῶν αλλων ἀρετῶν, *the Mother of other Virtues*) *the reſt of the Virtues have their Origin.* Therefore *ſtudium communis Boni totius Syſtematis Rationalium* is but a Branch of *ſtudium benè vivendi.* So the Philoſophers ſuppos'd, who ſo diſcours'd of Virtue, as to make Men the Admirers and Lovers of it for its own ſake; and ſo Chriſtians are the Admirers and Lovers of the divine Image, *the Life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs.*

(c) *Quippe in cauti dum virtutis egregiam bonitatem, vitiorumque inſignem malitiam ſtabilire ſatagunt, unicam illam cauſam quare virtus bona eſt, vitiumque malum penitus tollunt. ideo enim virtus bonum eſt, quia actus humanos determinat ad effectus, qui Boni publici naturalis partes ſunt.* De Leg. Nat. diſſ. c. 5. p. 194.

(d) *Optimum certè compendium Ethicæ eſt veræ felicitatis ejuſque cauſarum Idea.* Ibid. p. 274.

(e) *Ibid.* c. 5. ſ. 12, 13. *Eſſay of Moral.* p. 55, 90. *Sharrock de off.* c. 1. n. 3. Dr. *H. More Enchir. Eth.* l. 1. c. 2. *Stearn Med. An.* l. 1. c. 13.

(f) *De Leg. Nat. diſſ.* c. 5. p. 231, 232.

(g) *Mr. Tyrrell ſupr.* p. 308. and p. 27. v. *Cic. de off.* l. 3. *ſub fin.*

(h) *Unicè propter nobiliſſimum hunc finem, unicè propter commune omnium Bonum à ſingulis promovendum. quia ad bonum univerſi ſtatum facit, ad communis Boni procurationem.* De Leg. Nat. diſſ. c. 5. p. 292. c. 8. p. 356, 357, 366.

(i) *Mr. Tyrrell ſupr.* p. c. 4. p. 154.

(k) *Ibid* p. 182, 183.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 191.

(9.) This Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its definition of Good) deriveth the Dominion and Sovereignty of God himſelf (*q*) meerly *from the neceſſity of publick Good, God did aſſume it to himſelf, becauſe the common Good did neceſſarily require it.* But if the Divine Dominion and Sovereignty over all Creatures is thus founded, it is not ſo well founded, as Humane Sovereignties; for theſe are founded upon neceſſity of publick Good, and alſo the Law of a Superiour Sovereign, from whom they derive their ruling Authority. But the Divine Dominion and Sovereignty is ſuppos'd to be founded meerly upon neceſſity of publick Good and the Dictate of the divine Mind concerning it. Which Dictate can give no Authority (unleſs one can give Authority to himſelf meerly by the Dictate of his ovvn Mind) nor can it pretend to be a Law (unleſs one can make a Law antecedently to his Sovereignty and Legiſlative Povver) nor are any oblig'd to be ſubject to this aſſumed Sovereignty (founded meerly upon neceſſity of publick Good) but by the great Law of endeavouring the publick Good, which therefore muſt be made antecedently to this Aſſumption of the Sovereignty, and conſequently it muſt be made by one that was no Sovereignty, no Legiſlative Power. To this aſſumed Dominion and Sovereignty (aſſumed meerly from neceſſity of common Good and in order thereto) he cannot claim our Subjection ſave only from neceſſity of common Good and in order thereto. But if this is the whole of his Dominion and Sovereignty, he is far from having the moſt ſupreme Dominion poſſible (which the Deity muſt have) nor hath he the ſupreme governing Power originally and eſſentially (as his eſſential Perfection, for he could not have it, if the common Good did not require it) it accrueth to him adventitiouſly, derivatively, mutuatitiouſly and accidentally; he is not ſole Owner of his own Dominion, nor is it Independent or Plenary: But all is the Publick's, the Publick is neceſſarily Supreme Lord of all; for whatever Dominion God hath, is from the Publick (from the neceſſity of publick Good) for the Publick, for the ſake of the Publick and the behoof thereof. But thus to derive his Dominion and Sovereignty from the neceſſity of publick Good, is to ſay, that he muſt be God meerly becauſe the publick Good requireth it; for his Dominion and Sovereignty is his Godhead.

(10) This Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its definition of Good) maketh God, his Dominion and Sovereignty *a ſubordinate and ſubſervient Means to the publick Good.* For it ſuppoſeth (*r*) all Rights and Dues to be deriv'd from the common Good (and to be Means ſubordinate and ſubſervient thereto) that the divine Dominion and Sovereignty is *in order to the common Good,* (*s*) and it is one of the *Media ad ejus proſecutionem neceſſaria,* Means neceſſary to the Proſecution of it. (*t*) The Means are ſubordinate and ſubſervient to the End; the End always excelleth the thing which is to the End; the End is deſired for it ſelf, the Means for the End, which are neceſſary, when the End cannot be had without them, not otherwiſe; they have their Goodneſs and Meaſure from it, and

---

(m) *Juſtitia ad rem gerendam neceſſaria eſt. Cujus tanta vis eſt, ut nec illi quidem qui maleficio & ſcelere paſcuntur, poſſint ſine ulla particula Juſtitiæ vivere.* Cic. de Off. l. 2.

(n) Cic. de Off. l. 2.

(o) Pſal. 11.

(p) M. Ant. l. 11. S. 10. Gat. in loc.

(q) *Ego certè nihil invenire poſſum, quod impediat, quo minùs hoc Dictamen Intellectûs Divini, neceſſe eſt ad Bonum commune, ut pleniſſima & ſuprema omnes creaturas gubernandi poteſtas à Deo aſſumatur ipſique reſervetur, plenam vim habeat Legis, ſolidumque adeo ſit Dominii divini fundamentum.—— cognitâ neceſſitate Dominii divini in ordine ad commune, quod ſummum eſt, Bonum, cognoſcitur Lex naturalis illud ei tribuens.* De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. c. 7. p. 343. & c. 9. p. 380, 381. vid. ibid. c. 7. p. 342, 344, 345. & c. 9. S. 1.

(r) *Ibid.* c. 7. S. 3, 6.

(s) *Ibid.* p. 344.

(t) *Aquin. paſſim. Ritchel Metaph. Par.* 2. c. 8. S. 2.

the

the Reaſon of them is taken from the End. (u) *The End hath a greater Sovereignty in all Actions than the Actor himſelf. He hath a Sovereignty and Rule over others, but the End hath a Rule over himſelf.* The common Good of Rationals therefore is highly dignified and ennobled, becauſe it is ſuppos'd, to be *the End:* But that is not all, it is ſuppos'd to be abſolutely the higheſt, beſt and greateſt amongſt *Ends.* (w) *Finis optimus maximuſque, ſummus Finis, ſuprema Lex, Bonum maximum, unicus Finis in quo proſequendo omnes conſentire poſſunt, Finis nobiliſſimus, integer & adæquatus Finis, Finis præcipuus, ſummum Bonum, Finis ille unicus naturâ ſuâ optimus & maximus, Finis major eſſe non poteſt.* (x) The great End and Rule of all our Actions, the nobleſt Object and higheſt End we can be ordain'd for. That theſe honourary Attributes of the common Good may be allowable, they muſt be applied to the common Good of the Kingdom of God (the Commonwealth of holy Rationals) to this common Good *in the plenary Senſe*, and this Name *the End* muſt be underſtood in a large Senſe. For God, his Divine Dominion and Sovereignty, is in reſpect of Will and Affection, Intention and Deſign for this common Good, and the common Good and Intereſt of his Kingdom is his Intereſt. In other reſpects alſo God is in Will and Intention for the common Good. But we muſt diſtinguiſh between a *made* and *unmade* Sovereignty, a *divine* and *human* Sovereignty. If the Sovereignty is an human Sovereignty made by the People, or made by God for the People, although it hath all the uſual Rights of Sovereignty, yet it is neceſſarily (in the ſtrict and proper Senſe) *a ſubordinate and ſubſervient Means to an End the common Good.* But things are quite otherwiſe, if the Sovereignty is unmade and maketh the People, and is infinitely better than they; for ſuch a Sovereignty is neceſſarily *unſubordinate*, and cannot be *the ſubordinate and ſubſervient Means to any End*, but is abſolutely, as without any *Efficient*, ſo without any *final* Cauſe. Whence a Judgment may be made, how far theſe honourary Attributes of the common Good intrench upon the Prerogatives of the God-head. For what pious Man vvill ſay, that the common Good is a Law and End above him, that his Goodneſs is but a means to it, that he is no further neceſſary than in order to it, not ſo good or great or excellent or honourable as the publick Good, nor ſo amiable, deſirable or delectable, nor are we to love him, or devote our ſelves to him, or to adhere to him ſo much as the common Good, in which we ought finally to acquieſce, and which muſt be deify'd and ſuper-deify'd?

(11.) In this Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its Notion of Good) but one half of the *common Good* is repreſented (as ſuch;) for by the common Good of Rationals it meaneth only their Happineſs, to which it ſubordinateth God and Virtue. Whereas the common Good of Rationals muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into *the good which is for them*, vvhich is their *Happineſs* (as ſuch;) and *into the good which they are for*, vvhich is their *Holineſs*, the good of Duty and Virtue. (y) *That which is abſolutely Good, is every way ſuperiour to us, and we ought always to be commanded by it, becauſe we are made under it: But that which is relatively good to us, may ſometime be commanded by us. Eternal Truth and Righteouſneſs are in themſelves perfectly and abſolutely good, and the more we conform our ſelves to them, the better we are.* If the God-head, if Virtue and Righteouſneſs vvere only relatively good as convenient and commodious to us, if they vvere meerly for us as their End, they muſt be look'd upon as things meerly ſubſervient to our Pleaſure, and muſt be eſteem'd and lov'd accordingly. But becauſe they are abſolutely and in themſelves Good, and a good (of kind) ſuperiour to us and our Pleaſure, therefore our Pleaſure ought to be accommodated unto them, all Rationals ſhould be pleas'd vvith them, and take the higheſt Complacence in them, eſteeming and loving them vvith the ſummity and top-flovver of their Minds and Affections both for their ovvn Sake (their ovvn Excellence) and for our ſake as being our true Excellency and Felicity. (z)*Virtutes & ſui cauſa expetimus ut præſtantes per ſe & honeſtas; & alterius, id eſt beatitudinis*, ſaith *Apuleius:* So the Pagans Philoſophize at a more virtuous rate than thoſe Chriſtian Divines that ſay (a) *there is ſome prime and chief Good, which a Man deſireth for it ſelf, and for it all other things, which good is the good of pleaſure or the delectable good. For this good only a Man enjoyeth: Of the good of Honeſty, Profit, Decor, there is in it ſelf no Enjoyment. Only the pleaſure which reſulteth from it or is conjoin'd with it a Man can enjoy. The evil contrary to this good can be nothing elſe but miſery or pain and that perpetual. For there is no Man who doth not hate that at the higheſt rate and all other things upon the account of it.* To this Diſcourſe of a Foreign Divine we will confront a better and more Religious Diſcourſe of a Divine of our own. (b) *Thoſe are ignorant of the Nature of Sin, that imagine any Evil greater than it or ſo great.* Cicero's *Saying in the firſt Book of his Tuſculan Queſtions hath without doubt not a litttle of Truth in it.* Ne malum quidem ullum cum turpitudinis malo comparandum. *There is no Evil comparable to that of Sin.* Hierocles *a ſober Philoſopher and very free from the high flown Humour and ranting Genius of the* Stoicks, *though he would allow that other things beſides Sin may be* χαλεπὰ ϗ δυσδιάθετα, *very grievous and difficult to be born, yet he would admit nothing beſides this, to be* ὄντως κακὸν, *truly Evil;* *and he giveth this Reaſon for it;* viz. *Becauſe that certain Circumſtances may make other things Good, that have the repute of Evils; but none can make this ſo. He ſaith, the word* καλῶς, (well) *can never be join'd with any Vice, but ſo it may with every thing beſides. As it is proper to ſay concerning ſuch or ſuch a Perſon,* νοσεῖ καλῶς, πένεται καλῶς, *he is well diſeas'd, he is well poor, that is, he is both theſe to good purpoſe, behaving himſelf well in his Sickneſs and Poverty as he ought to do: But it can never be ſaid,* ἀδικεῖ καλῶς, ἀκολασαίνει καλῶς, *he doth injury well or he is rightly and as becometh him intemperate.* The Averſation that Holy Souls have from Sin, is greater than their Averſation from Infelicity.

(12.) In this Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its Notion of Good) the due order of Reaſoning and the order of our Obligations is inverted. For antecedently to the Law of *endeavouring the common Good* there is an Obligation upon Mankind (and therefore a great Law) of conſcientious Subjection and Obedience to the Authority of the Law-giver. He would

(u) *Leſſius de perfect. div. p.* 77.

(w) *De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. Proleg. S.* 20, 23. & *p.* 4, 63, 236, 254, 291, 295, 373, 381.

(x) *Mr. Tyrrell. ſupr. p.* 128, 152, 153.

(y) *Mr. Smith Select Diſcourſ. p.* 159, 160.

(z) *Apul. de Philoſoph.*

(a) *Eſſe aliquod bonum primum at ſummum quod homo propter ſe appetit, & propter quod alia omnia expetit, illudque bonum eſſe bonum jucundum ſive delectabile. Solo enim delectabili bono fruitur homo: Boni honeſti, utilis, decori, nulla per ſe eſt fruitio. Voluptas ſola quæ ex iis reſultat aut iis conjuncta eſt, eſt id quo frui poteſt homo* ——— *contrarium huic bono malum non poteſt aliud quid eſſe quàm miſeria ſive dolor iſque perpetuus. Nemo enim homo eſt, qui illam non ſumme odit, & propter eum alia omnia.* Epiſcop. de lib. arbitr. c. 4.

(b) *Dr. Fowler Deſign of Chriſtian. Sect.* 2. *c.* 9. *Debemus potius velle mundum univerſum annihilari, quàm aliquid fieri contra voluntatem Dei. Anſelm.*

would not make this Law for them, if they were not antecedently under ſuch an Obligation, if he could not claim Subjection and Obedience from them; nor could he otherwiſe be called their *Rector* and *Legiſlator*, nor can they do the thing commanded becauſe it is commanded (which is Obedience) unleſs they acknowledge, that they owe Subjection and Obedience to the Law-giver. This therefore is the firſt Law of Nature. As all Governments in the firſt place take care, to eſtabliſh their Authority, and as a Man is bound to acknowledge Subjection to the King, before he is bound to obey the Law *of endeavouring the common Good of the Kingdom*: So Mankind are firſt oblig'd, to conſent, to be practically Subjects and Servants to God, and then as his Subjects and Servants, to endeavour the common Good. The Order of their Obligations is not to endeavour the common Good in the firſt place, and ſo to be pious and virtuous towards God, but to be pious and virtuous towards God, and ſo to endeavour the common Good; for if they endeavour the common Good, they are bound to do it from a Principle of Piety towards God, and the Law of Nature is not Religion, if it doth not oblige them to it. So in all our Actions inquiry muſt be made, whether they be right in reſpect of Matter, Manner, Object, Meaſure, Principle, End, Circumſtances, which ſort of inquiries would be frivolous and impertinent, if Virtue is not Virtue but meerly as it is an endeavour of the common Good; if all the Law was compriſed in this one Propoſition, *to endeavour the common Good*, if beſides this endeavour more of virtuous Agency was not required by the Law, and requir'd for its own ſake, as being *(c) per ſe, ſua vi, ſua natura, ſua ſponte laudabile*, in its own Nature laudable. Kings and great Governours are in the firſt place inſtituted, *to endeavour the common Good*: But the Law of Nature inſtituteth Men as Men. Who are not in the *firſt* place inſtituted, *to endeavour the common Good*, but in the *ſecond* place only, *as it is Well-doing, as it is Virtue, as it is Righteouſneſs, as it is the good Life*. For the Law of Nature inſtituteth Men, as all other Laws do, in the firſt place to be *the Well-doers, not the Evil doers* (as ſuch Men have Rewards promis'd and Puniſhments threatned in Laws) to be the *Righteous*, not the *Wicked* (as ſuch Men are juſtify'd or condemn'd in Law) ſo *Ethica eſt benè vivendi diſciplina*, the Diſcipline of living well as to Virtue and as to Felicity.

(13.) This Scheme of the Law of Nature (agreeably to its Notion of Good) ſeemeth to acknowledge no other Obligation of it *(d)* but meerly from the Sanction of it, which is Self-intereſt. The Law-giver is ſuppos'd *to indicate to Men, that the endeavouring the common Good* (or univerſal Benevolence) *is a neceſſary Means to their neceſſary End, which is their own Happineſs contained in the common Good; and that if they do not ſo act, this will be pernicious to themſelves. (e) Natural Rewards and Penalties, thoſe Motives of Obedience, are the proper Sanction, to make the Law Obligatory. For Obligation properly ſignifieth nothing but laying a neceſſity upon us, to act according to the direction of the Law.* But if this is the whole of the Law's Obligation (as ſeveral others ſeem *(f)* to ſuppoſe) the Tranſgreſſion of the Law is not *Unrighteouſneſs, Sin and Criminality*, but only *Imprudence* and *Infelicity*; for the Sanction of the Law importeth no other Evil. But the Lawyers have defin'd the Obligation of the Law *Juris vinculum* (the Bond of the Law) whereby they mean *the Jural reſtraint*, as in Greek Authors *to bind one* ſignifieth *(g) to reſtrain him*. Agreeably whereto *Heſichyus* muſt be underſtood, when he ſaith δεόμενος, νόμος, δεσμὸς, *one bound in Law, the Law is a Band or Bond*. The Jural Reſtraint or Band is *Non licet* (which is a reſtraint of unbounded Liberty of Agency) as the Hebrew word for binding אסר uſually ſignifieth in the Talmud, to *forbid* or *prohibit*, and the Participles or Nouns deduc'd from thence אסיר and איסור ſignifie very often a thing prohibited or unlawful. It is look'd upon as *Bound* and ſo called, becauſe there is upon it the Jural reſtraint *Non licet*. But becauſe a bare *Non licet* is not ſufficient, to inforce the Law, therefore the Sin and Puniſhment, the Precept and the Sanction both concur, to make the Jural reſtraint, which muſt be thus fully expreſſed *Non licet impunè. Every thing from which either Sin or Puniſhment cometh unto him that doth it,* נקרא אסר *is called Bound*, ſaith *Elias Levita*. As Sin and Iniquity in Scripture uſually ſignifieth the Puniſhment alſo, *(h)* ſo חיב ſignifieth one that is Bound (*obligatus*) as to the *Non licet*, and alſo one that is Bound as to the *Non impunè*, that is a Debtor of the Puniſhment. So in Greek ἐνοχὴ, ſignifieth *Obligation* and ἔνοχος, *one Bound* as to the *Non licet* (as by an Oath,) and they uſually relate alſo to the *Non impunè* and ſignifie Obligation or to be obnoxious to the Puniſhment. But although Sin and Puniſhment are cloſely connex'd, yet the Obligation of *Non licet* is diſtinct from the Obligation of *Non impunè*, as Sin and Puniſhment are of diſtinct conſideration: But a Man is Bound both when he cannot do a thing without Sin, and when he cannot do a thing without Puniſhment, and both theſe Obligations are in every Law, and both concur, to make the Obligation of it. But becauſe the Obligation of *Non licet* is antecedent to the Obligation of *Non impunè* (the Precept to the Sanction) and the Sin is made by the Law (the Law hath ſo much Obligation, as to make the Sin) before the Penalty is enacted; therefore the Law hath an Obligation antecedently to the Sanction of it. For every one is bound to eſchew what is Sin (not to do that which he cannot do without being a Sinner and Evil doer) becauſe none can have a Licence or Liberty to Sin, a Right to do what is Unrighteous, which is a Contradiction. To violate Righteouſneſs, is neceſſarily Sin and Unrighteouſneſs; therefore all are obliged to eſchew it antecedently to the Sanction of the Law. So the Law of Religion (which is ſuppos'd, to have its Name *à Religando*, which *Lucretius* calleth *Religionis nodus* *(i)* and *Lactantius vinculum pietatis quo obſtricti ſumus Deo*, the Bond of Piety whereby we are Bound unto God) cannot rationally be thought Obligatory meerly from the Sanction of it; for to violate the Holineſs of the Godhead, is neceſſarily Sin and Profaneneſs. No ingenuous Man looketh upon himſelf as oblig'd to be grateful to his Benefactors, to Love his Wife and Children, or to Love and Honour his God and Saviour meerly by the Sanction of Rewards and Puniſhments. Is there no Obligation upon Men from Right and Wrong, Due and Undue, Sanctity and Sin, Righteouſneſs and Wickedneſs, Honeſty and Diſhoneſty, Integrity and Guile, Worthineſs and Baſeneſs, Conſcience or Crime, Virtue or Villainy, but meerly from a prudent Regard to their own Happineſs? (k) *Prudens noſtræ fælicitatis cura ab alienæ, communis nempe omnium ſocietatis, ſtudio divelli nequit. A prudent care of our own Felicity is inſeparable from the care of the common Good*; and hence it is, that a prudent Man thinketh himſelf oblig'd to obey the great Law of endeavouring the common Good. But if this prudent Man ſhould be ſo imprudent, as to diſcard all care and regard of his own Felicity, would he be diſcharg'd by this imprudence from all his Bonds and Fetters of Obligation, and become looſe and unbound, to live as he liſteth? *Cicero* asketh the Men of Prudence (l) if they were ſecure from the Sanction of the Law (*impunitate propoſita*) whether they would be diſhoneſt or not? If they ſay, they would, *facinoroſos ſe eſſe fateantur* (let them confeſs themſelves flagitious :) if they ſay, they would not, *omnia turpia per ſe ipſa fugienda eſſe concedant*, let them acknowledge, that all things foul and filthy are to be eſchew'd becauſe they are ſuch. If a truly wiſe Man hath *Gyges*'s Ring, (m) *He thinketh not, that he hath more Licence to Sin, than if he had it not. We ought to be of this Perſwaſion, that if we could be hid from all the Gods and Men* (and therefore were ſecure from the Sanction of the Law) *yet nothing is to be done avariciouſly, unjuſtly, libidinouſly.* Every vulgar Man ſaith, *I am bound in Duty, in Juſtice, in Gratitude, in Conſcience* (conſciouſneſs of Duty and Sin) and the Schools ſay, that (n) *obligatio naturalis* (the Obligation of the Law of Nature) is *Nexus Conſcientiæ*, a Bond of Conſcience. No Man can be oblig'd out of regard to his own Happineſs, to chuſe, to be annihilated for the Welfare of others; yet few will deny, that this is Virtue and Duty, if the common Good did require it. Every Man is bound to make the publick Happineſs his chief End (as this Scheme of the Law of Nature ſuppoſeth) therefore he is Bound, to ſeek it otherwiſe than meerly for the ſake of his own Happineſs: Nor is it poſſible to deduce our conſcientious kind of Obligations meerly from that which is Heterogeneous, *A Politick and Prudential kind of regard to our own Happineſs.* But becauſe the Legiſlator annexeth this *bonum jucundum*, to his Law, and for the ſake of this Men chuſe Virtue and Obedience, hence ſome infer (o) that *bonum jucundum* hath the precedence of *bonum honeſtum*, which is an Argument that may be thus retorted upon the Makers of it. The Legiſlator annexeth to his Law the Sanction of *bonum jucundum* for the ſake of *bonum honeſtum*, which the Law injoineth; this therefore is the principal in the Eſtimation and Intention of the Law-giver. Whoſe Will if it be made known, is (without a Sanction) a Bond or Obligation upon us; for we owe Obedience thereto, and every one is bound to pay what he oweth.

(c) Cic. de Fin. l. 2.

(d) *Summa vis obligandi hæc eſt; legis Authorem legum ſuarum obſervationi bona, tranſgreſſioni mala, ſcilicet naturalia, adjunxiſſe, quorum proſpectu moventur homines actiones potiùs legibus conformes quàm abiis diſſentientes elicere.* De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. c. 5. p. 206. *Vinculis propriè non aſtringitur animus humanus.*—— *Ego itaque obligationem moralem ſic univerſaliter nec incommodè definiri poſſe arbitror; obligatio eſt actus Legiſlatoris quo actiones Legi ſuæ conformes eis quibus Lex fertur neceſſarias eſſe indicat. Actio autem Agenti rationali tum neceſſaria eſſe intelligitur, cùm certum eſt eam contineri in cauſis neceſſario requiſitis ad fælicitatem illam, quam naturaliter adeoque neceſſariò expetit.* Ibid. p. 240, & vid. p. 174. 241, 257. *Nec ſanè quicquam intelligere poſſum, quod animum humanum neceſſitate ullâ poſſit aſtringere (in quâ vim obligationis ponit definitio Juſtiniani) præter argumenta bonum aut malum ex actibus noſtris proventurum indicantia.* Ibid. c 5. S. 35. & vid. ibid. S. 2, 19 22, 25 42, 44. 46.

(e) *Dr. Parker Demonſtr. of the Law of Nat. p. 60.*

(f) *Vel Thuſ. Pufendorf. &c.*

(g) Dr. *Hamm. Power of the Keyes.* c. 4 S 6, 7, 21, 24.

(h) *Seld. de Jur. Nat. & Gent. l. 1. c. 4.*

(i) *L. 4. c.* 28.

(14.) The Law of Nature is certainly *a matter of Conſcience* not of meer human Policy and Prudence, and *a matter of Sanctity* not of meer Civil-religious Society, as it is made in this Scheme of it, which (agreeably to its Notion of Good) is a *Syſtem of human Policy and Prudence modelling the Univerſe of Rationals into a Civil* (Civil-religious) *Society by Conſent and Agreement in their Politicks for the common Happineſs of Civil Life.* The Univerſe of Rationals is in a very divided State, but they are modelled into one Society (p) in this Scheme, which is an Inſtitution to Civil-religious Society, into which the whole Univerſe of Rationals is ſuppos'd to be combin'd. Civil Society being Civil-religious is not without a ſacred Society; for all civil People have their Deity, their Religion, their Prieſts and their *Sacra*, which muſt be in this great Civil Society, that conſiſteth of the Under-rationals and of God the Head-rational (or the Head of Rational Beings) and which looketh like a God-Society, but is *no God-kind of Society.* Into this Society the Univerſe of Rationals is ſuppos'd to be combin'd, not by the Bands of Right and Due, but in the method of human Policy and Prudence by one common Intereſt (their common Happineſs) and by Conſent and Agreement in their Politicks. (q) *All Rational Beings or Agents are, and muſt be conſider'd together, as naturally and neceſſarily conſtituting one intellectual Syſtem or Society; becauſe they agree together, to proſecute one chief End* viz. *The good of the Univerſe or World, eſpecially of that intellectual Syſtem, by the fitteſt means applicable to that end; ſince whilſt they are truly Rational, they cannot differ in judging what is that beſt End, nor avoid chuſing the ſame neceſſary Means leading thereto.* (r) The Univerſe of Rationals is ſuppos'd, to be united (s) *in ordine ad unum finem*, in order to the common Good, which is the common End; for God in order to the common Good aſſumeth to himſelf the ſupreme governing Power, and the Under-rationals (t) for neceſſity of common Good do and muſt yield it unto him; by which agreement in Politicks they are related as *Rector* and *Subjects* in Society. Which Society being of no higher kind than Civil, the common Happineſs (that is the end of the Aſſociation) can be nothing more than *the Happineſs of Civil Life*; and conſequently *the univerſal Benevolence*, and the other Virtues which are in this Scheme of the Law of Nature, are no other than thoſe of *Ariſtotle*'s and *Cicero*'s Inſtitution. They muſt not be ſuppos'd (u) *utriuſque Tabulæ Legis divinæ Moſaicæ & Evangelicæ ſumma*, (w) *the Summ both of the Moral Law of Moſes and of the Goſpel of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*; which they are as far diſtant from, as the *ſecular* Happineſs is from the Spiritual, the Civil-ſocietive Virtue is from the Spiritual religious, and human prudential Policy is from the Inſtitution and Diſcipline of Sanctity, that is not pretended to by this Scheme of the Law of Nature. Which being not Satisfactory, we are neceſſitated, to recede from it, and to give a diſſonant Account of *the Law of Nature* and of the Good to which it inſtituteth.

IV. The

(k) De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. c. 2. S. 8.

(l) De Off. l. 3.

(m) *Nihil plus ſibi licere putat peccare, quàm ſi non haberet. Satis nobis perſuaſum eſſe debet, ſi omnes Deos hominesque celare poſſemus, nihil tamen avarè, nihil injuſtè, nihil libidinosè eſſe faciendum.* Ibid.

(n) *Leſſius de Juſt. & Jur. l. 2. c. 19. Suarez de Leg. l. 2. c. 9. S. 6.*

(o) *Epiſcop. de lib. Arbitr. c.* 4.

(p) *Patet veram Ethicam homines inſtituere ad ſocietatem longè ampliſſimam cum Deo hominibuſque ineundam & conſervandam.* De Leg. Nat. Diſ. c. 6. S. 2.

(q) Mr. Tyrell ſupr. pref.

(r) *Patet omnes primum Rationales tum per rectæ ubicunque ſit rationis conſenſionem neceſſariam, tum per eaſdem communis fælicitatis cauſas inter ſe uniri.* De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. c. 5. S. 30.

(s) *Ibid. c.* 1. *S.* 4.

(t) *Ibid. c.* 9. *S.* 1. *& Proleg. S.* 24.

(u) *Ibid. c.* 1. *S.* 10.

(w) Mr. Tyrell. ſupr. p. 24

IV. The good to which the Law of Nature and the Diſcipline of Morality inſtituteth, is *the good Life and Practice* (of which there are many Branches) the Notion whereof is compounded of two Notions *Beauteous-Beneficial:* as the Works of Nature are therefore ſaid to be good (well-done) becauſe the make of them is *the Beauteous-Beneficial.* (x) *For all the parts of the World are ſo conſtituted, that they could not be better either for Beauty or Uſefulneſs.* (y) *It is hard to ſay, whether the Beauty or Utility be the greater; there is ſo marvellous an accord between Uſefulneſs and Comelineſs in the Fabrick of Animals.* (z) *All the parts of an Humane Body are for neceſſary uſe and for beauty.* So in Building (a) *regard muſt be had both to the Beauty and Uſefulneſs of the Work.* The *Lacedæmonians* had regard for both theſe, when they pray'd for *pulchra cum bonis*, and the old Philoſophers had regard to both theſe in their definitive Notices of Goods and Evils. (b) *All the good things are thoſe that are profitable, conducive, beauteous, comely, cognate; but the Evils are the contrary, thoſe things that are hurtful, noxious, incommodious, alien, uncomely and foul.* So Perfections in general are *ornamenta & adjumenta* (ornamental and uſeful) agreeably whereto the good Morals muſt be defin'd *the Beauteous-Beneficial.* (c) *The* Grecians *moſt divinely* (ſaith Mr. Hooker) *have given to the active perfection of Men a Name expreſſing both Beauty and Goodneſs* (καλοκ'αγαθία) *becauſe Goodneſs in ordinary Speech is for the moſt part applied only to that which is beneficial; but we in the name of Goodneſs do here imply both.* Good therefore in Morality (the Good of Virtue) is of this definitive Notion, τὸ καλοκ'αγαθὸν, *the Beauteous-Beneficial Life and Practice.* (δ) *Ariſtoteles docet omnes virtutes* τῇ καλοκ'αγαθίᾳ, *comprehendi.*

What is beauteous is amiable, and is to be lik'd and lov'd, whence it is called τὸ καλὸν, which ſignifieth it both to be *beauteous* and to be *good.* In ether of theſe ſignifications the word may be underſtood in that known Verſe of *Theognis* (which ſpeaketh *Philo*'s Senſe, (d) Ἀξιέραστον μόνον τὸ καλόν ἐστι, *That only which is beauteous or good, is worthy of love*) * *That only which is beauteous or good, is to me amical.* What is beauteous all Men call good (whence *Maimonides* ſaith, (e) *de re pulchra vel deformi dicitur Bonum vel Malum*) agreeably to the uſual Etymology of κάλλος (Pulchritude) ἀπὸ τοῦ καλεῖν vel ἀπὸ τοῦ κηλεῖν καὶ θέλγειν, *from calling Men to it, or from winning or alluring their Affections.* To the ſame Senſe S. *Auſtin* diſcourſeth, *Quid eſt pulchrum? & quid eſt pulchritudo? Quid eſt quod nos allicit & conciliat rebus quas amamus? Niſi enim eſſet in eis decus & ſpecies, nullo modo nos ad ſe moverent: What meaneth Beauteous and what is Pulchritude? What is it that allureth us to the things we love? for unleſs there was in them decor and ſpecioſity, they would not move us at all.* The ſame Father ſuppoſeth and the Schoolmen from him, that the nature of good conſiſteth in this Ternary, (f) *in modo, in ſpecie, in ordine,* in Meaſure, in Specioſity, in Order; all which are certain Modes of Beauty. So *Plato* in his *Gorgias* ſaith; κόσμος τις ἐγγινόμενος ἐν ἑκάστῳ ὁ ἑκάστου οἰκεῖος, ἀγαθὸν παρέχει ἕκαστον, *A certain graceſulneſs in every Being which is proper thereto, maketh every Being good.* Accordingly Virtue whereby intelligent Agents are made good is (g) *a certain Pulchritude in the Mind and the Actions that iſſue from it:* (h) *for Virtue is a congruous and conſonant diſpoſition of the Soul from Reaſon about the whole Life.* (i) *The good of Honeſty* (bonum honeſtum) *is laudable by its Pulchritude, Form and Specioſity:* (k) *Wherein appeareth an Ornament and Graceſulneſs of Life, Temperance, Modeſty, a ſedation of Perturbations, and a due meaſure of things, which is that which is decorous.* (l) *How come we to underſtand what is Virtue? By ſeeing the order and decor that is in it.* (m) *Virtue is ſo graceful, that even bad Men approve of better things.* (n) *It is no ſmall matter, to obſerve Meaſure and Order in every thing, wherein that which is decorous appeareth.* (o) *This is a ſhort and true definition of Virtue, it is the due order of Love. That Love it ſelf whereby we rightly love what is to be lov'd, is to be ordinately lov'd, that there may be in us Virtue, whereby we live well.* (p) *What elſe is Juſtice when it is in us, or any Virtue whereby we live rightly and wiſely, but the Pulchritude of the Inward Man? according to this Pulchritude rather than according to the Body we are made after the Image of God. The true ſupreme Pulchritude is Righteouſneſs.* (q) *The things that are juſt we diſcern by an intelligible Species,* (r) *by a certain Form and Image in my Mind, and becauſe I ſee ſuch an Equity and Congruence of things, as muſt be in that Virtue; which if it be abſent (howſoever that be) I diſcern Injuſtice, becauſe I ſee that temperament of eximious Pulchritude and concinnity is wanting: nor do I underſtand Injuſtice ſo much from beating a Man, taking away his Money, or Reproaches or Rapine, or other the like Force and Injury (which ſurely are not Privations, and they may alſo be done juſtly, as if the Magiſtrate commandeth, or if they be done with a good Mind) as becauſe I diſcern that Decency and Concinnity of the faireſt Virtue to be wanting.* Of the eximious pulchritude of Juſtice *Ariſtotle* ſaith, (s) *Neither the Evening nor the Morning is ſo admirable.* Virtue is a ſplendor and luminouſneſs of practice, which is a Beauty of it: (t) *Virtus in omnium animos lumen ſuum*

(x) *Omnes mundi partes ita conſtitutæ ſunt, ut neque ad uſum meliores potuerint eſſe, nec ad ſpeciem pulchriores.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(y) *Difficile eſt expedire, utrum ſpecies an utilitas major ſit, adeò miro modo conſentit utilitas cum decore.* Lactant. de opif. c. 10. & 2.

(z) *Nihil in homine membrorum eſt, quod non & neceſſitatis cauſa ſit & decoris.* Min. Fel. p. 135.

(a) *Adhibenda dignitatis commoditatiſque diligentia.* Cic. de off. l. 1.

(b) Πάντα δὲ τ' ἀγαθὰ ὠφέλιμα εἶναι, καὶ χρηστὰ, καὶ συμφέροντα, καὶ λυσιτελῆ, καὶ σπουδαῖα, καὶ πρέποντα, καὶ καλὰ, καὶ οἰκεῖα· τὰ δὲ κακὰ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων, πάντα βλαβερὰ, καὶ δύσχρηστα, καὶ ἀσύμφορα, καὶ ἀλυσιτελῆ, καὶ φαῦλα, καὶ ἀνοικεῖα, καὶ ἀπρεπῆ, καὶ αἰσχρά. Stob. *Ecl. Eth. l.* 2. *p.* 166.

(c) Hooker Eccl. Polit. *l.* 1. *p. m.* 17.

(δ) Caſaub. Not. in Matth. 22. 49.

(d) *Claud. Dauſq. Not. in Baſil. Seleuc. or. p.* 325. *Petav. T.* 1 *l.* 6. *c.* 8.

* Ὅτι καλὸν φίλον ἐστί· τὸ δ' οὐ καλὸν, οὐ φίλον ἐστί·

(e) *Mor. Nev. par.* 1. *c.* 2.

(f) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 1. *Aquin.* 1. *Qu.* 5. *Art.* 5.

(g) *Quædam in animo & actionibus inde prodeuntibus pulchritudo.* J. Cirelli or. 1. de Honeſt. nat. p. 627.

(h) Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀρετὴ αὐτὴ διάθεσίς ἐστι ψυχῆς σύμφωνος ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου περὶ ὅλον τὸν βίον. *Clem. Pædag. l.* 1. *c* 13.

(i) *Bonum honeſtum eſt pulchritudine ſua ſpecieque laudabile.* Cic. de Fin. l 2.

(k) *In qua verecundia & quaſi quidam ornatus vitæ, temperantia & modeſtia, omniſque ſedatio perturbationum animi, & rerum modus cernitur; quod dici Latinè decorum poteſt, Græcè enim πρέπον dicitur.* Idem de off. l. 1.

(l) *Ex quo virtutem intelligimus? oſtendit illam nobis ordo ejus & decor.* Sen. Ep. 120.

(m) *Adeo gratioſa virtus eſt, ut inſitum ſit etiam malis probare meliora.* Idem de Benef. l. 4 c. 17.

(n) *Non mediocre eſt rebus ſingulis modum ſervare atque impartiri ordinem, in quo verè prælucet illud quod decorum dicitur.* S. Ambroſ. de off. l. 1. c. 45.

(o) *Definitio brevis & vera virtutis, ordo eſt amoris. Amor ipſe ordinatè amandus eſt, quo benè amatur quod amandum eſt, ut ſit in nobis virtus qua vivitur benè.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c 22.

(p) *Quid eſt aliud Juſtitia cùm in nobis eſt, vel quælibet virtus, quâ rectè ſapienterque vivitur, quàm interioris hominis pulchritudo? etiam ſecundum hanc pulchritudinem, magis quàm ſecundum corpus, facti ſumus ad imaginem Dei. ſumma & vera pulchritudo Juſtitia eſt.* S. Aug. in Pſal 44. Ep. 222. Petav. ſupr. l. 6. c. 8.

(q) *Juſta ſentimus per intelligibilem ſpeciem.* S. Aug. de C D. l. 11. c. 27.

(r) *Per formam quandam & imaginem in mente mea, quòd vidi æquitatem & congruentiam rerum, qualis debet in virtute illa, quæ ſi abſit, quocunque modo id fiat, Injuſtitiam intelligo, quoniam temperamentum illud magna pulchritudine concinnum abeſſe video: nec tam ex pulſatione hominis aut ereptione pecuniæ, aut conviciis, aut raptatione, vique alia ſimili & injuria Injuſtitiam intelligo, quæ certè privationes non ſunt, ſed juſtè etiam fieri poſſunt, ut ſi magiſtratus jubeat, vel bona mente fiant, quàm quòd cerno decentiam illam & concinnitatem abeſſe virtutis pulcherrimæ.* Vives in loc.

(s) Οὔθ' ἕσπερος, οὔθ' ἑῷος, οὕτω θαυμαστός. *Ariſt. Eth. l.* 5. *c.* 3.

(t) *Sen. de Benef. l.* 4. *c.* 17.

præmittit, etiam qui non ſequuntur illam vident: Virtue ſendeth its Light into the Minds of all, even they that are no followers of it yet ſee it. Virtue is an illuſtriouſneſs and honourableneſs (as well as amiableneſs) of practice, which is the Beauteouſneſs of it, whence it hath the Name of *Honeſtas.* (u) *Quid eſt Honeſtas, niſi quæ turpitudinem quaſi mortem fugiat? What is Honeſty or Virtue* (Anti-baſeneſs) *but the eſchewing Turpitude as Death?* Vice and Wickedneſs is that which is (w) *turpe, inhoneſtum, indecorum, pravum, flagitioſum, fœdum,* foul, diſhoneſt, indecorous, bad, flagitious, filthy: of definitive Notion it is *Turpitude* and *Deformity* of Practice, which the Philoſophers ſometimes (agreeably to the Scriptures) call *Crookedneſs* and *Obliquity.* For the evil Morals they call (x) *curvi mores,* σκολιὰ ϗ στρεβλὰ, *the crooked and perverſe Manners* oppoſite to κατορθώματα, *the right done Deeds:* (y) Φιλοτιμώμεθα ὖν φυγεῖν πᾶν σκολιὸν ἔργον ϗ στραγγαλιῶδες, *let us earneſtly endeavour to avoid every oblique, crooked and diſtorted practice.* The various Names which the Philoſophers (in conſort with the generality of Mankind) have given to the virtuous practice, denote the Regularity and Beauteouſneſs of it. Τὸ εὖ, *that which is well,* τὸ δέον, *that which ought to be,* τὸ πρέπον, *that which is decorous,* τὸ ἴσον, *that which is equal,* τὸ καλὸν, *that which is fair,* τὸ ἁρμόζον, *that which is fit, congruous, proportionate,* τὸ ὀρθὸν, *that which is right.* (z) *Eſt quiddam in omni virtute quod deceat;* there is a decency in all Virtue. The Hebrew word *Tob* to which ἀγαθὸν, in the Helleniſtical uſe anſwereth is obſerv'd by the Criticks, (a) to ſignifie *lætum, hilare* (joyous) and alſo *pulchrum formoſum,* beauteous; the Beauty of Virtue therefore ſpeaketh the Goodneſs of it.

V. And it is *the Good Life and Practice* upon the account of its *Beneficialneſs* and *Utility,* to which ſome have (erroneouſly) confin'd the Notion of Good. (b) *Good as good doth nothing elſe but profit,* ſaith *Clemens.* But without confining thereto the Notion of Good the Philoſophers obſerve, that (c) *Good in common acceptation is Profit.* Themſelves ſay, (d) *Good muſt be ſomething profitable.* (e) *Good is profitable.* They ſpeak agreeably to the common Senſe of Mankind; (f) *for all of us deſire profit,* and (as *Cicero* ſpeaketh) *are rapturouſly carry'd to it.* In their private Capacity Mankind are intent upon their private Utility, and in their publick Capacity they are intent upon their common Utility; for Laws are made (g) *pro utilitate hominum,* for the common Utility, which is the end of the Society. What is profitable and beneficial, uſeful and needful (although it be only wholſome, not ſightly nor toothſome) for ſufficient cauſe and reaſon ought to be lik'd: but (h) *that is not called Good, which is not profitable, which yieldeth no Fruit.* (i) *As there is no Light which doth not enlighten, ſo there is no Good which doth not profit.* A principal reaſon therefore why Things and Perſons are denominated *good* is their *Utility* and *Beneficialneſs.* (k) Ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν ὁ Θεός· ἀγαθὸς δὲ ὢν ἐυεργητικός· *God is good, and being good he cannot fail to be Beneficent.* (l) *Vir bonus eſt, qui prodeſt quibus poteſt, nocet nemini: He is a good Man, who profiteth whom he can, is hurtful to none.* It is an Article of the *Italians* Creed, (m) *Ogni adjuto è bon,* any thing that helpeth is good. So ſaid he, that called on the Devil, to be eas'd of his Gout, when calling upon God did not eaſe him. His Senſe ſeemeth to be in the Maxim, which yet hath thus much of truth in it; the things *helpful* and *ſalutary* are the things that are good, and thoſe that are *noxious, poyſonous, miſchievous* and *deadly* are the bad things: (n) *In the Head of a Polypus there is that which is bad* (hurtful) *and that which is* (wholſome) *good.* So Egypt affordeth (o) *many good* (ſalutary) *Medicines and many pernicious.* The good life and practice therefore is that which is *the helpful, the ſalutary and beneficial.* (p) *The nature of Virtue is to benefit and profit: the nature of Wickedneſs is to be miſchievous and to do hurt.* The ſeveral Branches of Vice and Wickedneſs are ſuch as the Orator calleth (q) *maleficia, pernicies, peſtes capitales;* they are that Life and Practice, which is the *noxious, poyſonous, miſchievous and maleficial ſimply and abſolutely.* In enormous Selfiſhneſs, Malevolence, Pride, Ambition, Fraud, Guile, Perfidiouſneſs, Envy, Avarice, Circumvention, Wraths, Enmities, Calumnies, Thefts, Cruelty, Homicide, Profaneneſs and contempt of God, and in all unjuſt and uncharitable Actions there is a deadly maleficent deformity, and all the foul voluptuous Senſualities are alſo pernicious and maleficial; ὑπερφυεῖ τινι ὡς μεγάλῃ βλάβῃ καὶ κακῷ θαυμασίῳ ὑπερβάλλουσα τ' ἄλλα ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς πονηρία· *By an incredibly great hurt and wonderful detriment* (ſaith *Plato* in his *Gorgias*) *the Evil of the Soul tranſcendeth other Evils.* The vicious life and practice is of definitive Notion *The foul and ill-favour'd maleficial,* as on the contrary, the virtuous life and practice is *The beauteous-beneficial.* All the Branches of it are *abſolutely* (every way and in all reſpects) *beneficial,* and not only of Utility but of indiſpenſable neceſſity to the Happineſs of every one and of All (to the common good;) ſome ſort of them is indiſpenſably neceſſary to Humane Society. Of *Juſtice, Cicero* ſaith there are two Fundamentals: (r) *Primum ut ne cui noceatur,* firſt not to hurt any; *deinde ut communi utilitati ſerviatur,* next that we ſerve the common Utility. *Purity* and *Charity* are in Religion inſeparably connex'd, and the Connection of them is a conjoyning *Beauty* with *Beneficialneſs,* Charity being univerſally beneficial; for (s) ὁ φιλῶν τὶ ὠφελεῖν αὐτὸ βὔλεται, *he that loveth any thing, willeth to profit or benefit it.* The Virtues are the more beauteous, becauſe they are beneficial; for *Beneficialneſs is ornamental and a Perfection;* to which purpoſe there are many good Sayings in *Plato;* for in his *Hippias major* he ſaith, (t) *That which is uſeful, as it is of uſe, and as to what it is of uſe, and when it is of uſe, we call Fair; but what is wholly unprofitable, we call Foul.* In his *fiſth de Rep.* he ſaith, (u) *It is excellently ſaid, That which is of Utility is fair, and that which is Noxious, is foul.* In his firſt *Alcibiades* he ſaith, (w) *The*

(u) *S. Ambroſ. de off. l.* 1. *c.* 45.

(w) *Cic. de Fin. l.* 3.

(x) *Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 204.

(y) *S. Baſil. Hom. in Pſal.* 22. *p.* 198.

(z) *Cic. de off. l.* 1.

(a) *Gat. c. Pſochen. p.* 139, 140.

(b) Τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν ᾗ ἀγαθόν ἐστιν, ὐδὲν ἄλλο ποιεῖ, ἢ ὅτι ὠφελεῖ. *Lipſ. Manud. l.* 2. *diſſ.* 22.

(c) Ἀγαθὸν δὲ κοινῶς μὲν τὸ ὄφελος. *Ibid.*

(d) Τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν χρησιμόν τι δεῖ εἶναι. *M. Ant. l.* 8. *S.* 10.

(e) Τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὠφέλιμον. *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 8.

(f) *Omnes enim expetimus utilitatem, ad eamque rapimur; nec facere aliter ullo modo poſſumus. nam quis eſt qui utilia fugiat? aut quis potiùs qui ea non ſtudioſiſſimè perſequatur?* Cic. de off. l. 3.

(g) *Digeſt. l.* 1. *Tit.* 3. *lex.* 25.

(h) *Nè Latinè quidem Bonum dicitur, niſi quod frugi ſit, à quo fructus aliquis percipitur.* Bucer. in Matth. 5. 6.

(i) Καθάπερ ὐκ ἔστι φῶς ὃ μὴ φωτίζει, ὐδὲ ἀγαθὸν ἐστιν, ὃ μὴ ὠφελεῖ. *Clem. pædag. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(k) *Nemeſ. de Nat. Hom. c.* 42.

(l) *Cic. de off. l.* 3.

(m) *Anſw. to Philan. Anglic. Append. p.* 13.

(n) Πυλύποδος κεφαλῇ ἔνι μὲν κακὸν ἐν δὲ ϗ ἐσθλόν.

(o) Φάρμακα πολλὰ μὲν ἐσθλὰ μεμιγμένα πολλὰ δὲ λυγρά. *Plutarch. de aud. Poet. p.* 15.

(p) Φύσει ἁ μὲν ἀρετὰ ἀγαθοποιὸς ϗ ὠφελητικά· ἁ δὲ κακία κακοποιὸς ϗ βλαπτικά. *Theag. Pythag.*

(q) *De off. l.* 3. & *de Seneå.*

(r) *De off. l.* 1.

(s) *Clem. pæd. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(t) Τὸ μὲν χρήσιμον, καὶ ᾗ χρήσιμον, καὶ πρὸς ὃ χρήσιμον, καὶ ὁ πότε χρήσιμον, καλὸν φαμὲν εἶναι· τὸ δὲ πάντη ἄχρηστον αἰσχρόν.

(u) Κάλλιστα δὴ τῦτο καὶ λέγεται καὶ λελέξεται, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ὠφέλιμον καλόν· τὸ δὲ βλαβερὸν αἰσχρόν.

(w) Τὰ μὲν δίκαια καλὰ

juſt

δὲ καλὰ ἀγαθά· τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ συμφέρει· τὰ δίκαια ἄρα συμφέροντά ἐστιν.

juſt things are the fair; the fair are the good; the good are the conducive and profitable; the juſt things therefore are the profitable. According to this Philoſopher the *Beneficialneſs* of the good Life may in a large acceptation of Beauty be called the *Beauteouſneſs* thereof; but in the ſtrict acceptation theſe are diſtinguiſh'd, as the Beauty of the Conval Lilly is diſtinguiſh'd from its Medicinal Virtue. Of the Beauteouſneſs of the good Life in the ſtrict acceptation, a Saying of this Philoſopher in his *Gorgias* muſt be underſtood, τάξει ἄρα τεταγμένον ϗ κεκοσμημένον ἐστὶν ἀρετὴ ἑκάστου, *to be ordinate and ſo adorn'd, is every one's Virtue.*

VI. If the *Beauteous-Beneficial* Life and Practice is *the good Life and Practice*, it is neceſſarily that Life and Practice, to which the Names of Praiſe and Commendation belong (for Good is a term of Praiſe and Commendation, and compriſeth the other Names of Praiſe and Commendation;) and to the contrary Life and Practice the Names of Odiouſneſs and Diſgrace, of Infamy and Diſpraiſe belong: with reſpect whereunto many Philoſophers have well defin'd *Virtue* and *Vice*: (x) *For what is diſpraiſable for it ſelf, is upon that account named Vice*, ſaith *Cicero.* (y) *The good of Honeſty is that which maketh them praiſe-worthy, that have this good worthy of praiſe.* (z) *Evil practice is every deſervedly infamous practice.* But the Operations of Virtue they call (a) *the laudable Operations.* To underſtand what is Virtue and what is Vice, a great Philoſopher preſcribeth a young Man this method: (b) *Conſider what ſort of Men it is, that you praiſe, when you are unbyaſs'd with any Affection: Is it the Juſt or the Unjuſt? The Juſt. Is it the Temperate or Intemperate? The Temperate. Is it the Continent or Incontinent? The Continent.* So what the Hebrew Doctors call (c) מדה טובה *good Quality or Property*, Interpreters render *laudable Virtue*, and the *Muhammedans* inquire, (d) *Whence is it, that Actions are accounted worthy of praiſe or diſpraiſe?* Virtue in the definitive Notion of it is *The laudable practice*, and thence it is, that all Mankind would be in ſome ſort reputed virtuous; (e) *for who is there that would not ſeem beneficent? that doth not deſire to be accounted Good in the midſt of all his atrocious Villainies and Injuries? that doth not put ſome colour of right upon thoſe things that he hath done moſt outrageouſly?*

As the good Life and Practice is the laudable, ſo it is *the excellent and felicitative*, which is another definitive Notion of it. For unleſs it is ſomething excellent and eximious, it is not *praiſe-worthy*; upon which account ordinary ſelf-regard for our own Happineſs is not Virtue. (f) *Quid enim magnifici eſt, ſe amare, ſibi parcere, ſibi acquirere?* To love one's ſelf, to ſpare one's ſelf, to get to one's ſelf, what is there eximious in ſo doing? The good Life and Practice which (as being the Beneficial) is *felicitative* unto Men and *unto God* (ſo far as he is capable of being benefited) is alſo our true and only felicitative Life. (g) Εὐτυχίαν ἄλλην ἀρετῆς ἡγῇ βελτίω; *think-eſt thou, that there is any Felicity better than Virtue? Plato* diſputeth in his firſt *Alcibiades*, οὐκ οἷόν τε, ἐὰν μή τις σώφρων ϗ ἀγαθὸς ᾖ, εὐδαίμονα εἶναι· *It is not poſſible, that any ſhould be happy, unleſs he be prudent and good.*

The good Life and Practice is alſo *The honourable* and *comfortable* (which is another definitive Notion of it) agreeably to the two grand Neceſſaries for Man; for Man muſt have an *honourable* and *comfortable* Being. A Dignity there is in Virtue (h) which is one ſort of Pulchritude, and which maketh it *honourable.* It exempteth its poſſeſſors from being *the vile Perſons* and doing the vile things, (i) ſaveth from the bad and ſad things, affordeth other-kins Comforts than the *fœda peccandi ſolatia*, there is in it an immenſity of what is good and comfortable and nothing that is not good and comfortable. Such Virtue which is Vital Sanctity is the divine and unvile kind of good and goodneſs, the comprehenſion of thoſe ſubſtantial vital Goods, that are ineffably comfortable.

The good Life and Practice that is *the well-doing* is alſo *the well-being* of Rationals and their true Perfection, (k) ἀκρότας ϗ τελειότας τᾶς ἀνθρώπω φύσιος, *the ſummity and perfection of Man's Nature*, as the Pythagoreans have ſtiled it. (l) As all Beings have their Perfection by their proper Virtue, which is their Nature rais'd to its Summity (ſharpneſs of Sight is the Virtue of the Eye and the Nature of the Eye rais'd to its Summity; quickneſs of hearing is the Virtue of the Ear and the Nature of the Ear rais'd to its Summity; Velocity is the Virtue of the Feet and their Nature rais'd to its Summity:) So the proper Virtue of Man is the Nature of Man rais'd to its Summity and chief Perfection.

The good Life and Practice muſt not be thought meerly a publick Self-convenience (that is neceſſary for Men only becauſe of the Neceſſity of their Affairs) but it may be defin'd *The doing what is ſimply and abſolutely convenient*, as Cicero ſaith, (m) *Sapientia eſt conveniens actio*, Wiſdom is a doing what is conveinent; (n) *recta & conſona*, the things that are right and conſonant. *Malum eſt ipſa inconvenientia*, Evil is inconvenience it ſelf, (o) ſaith S. *Auſtin.* (p) *As a Stage-player muſt have (not any, but) a certain Action, and a Dancer muſt have (not any, but) a certain Motion: So a Man muſt live (not any, but) a certain kind of Life, which we call Convenient and Conſentaneous.*

VII. The *Beauteous-Beneficial* Life and Practice conſider'd as *that which ought to be*, is *Righteouſneſs* (Uncriminality and Anti-wickedneſs) which is a threefold comprehenſion of Duty, *Duty as to God, to others and to our ſelves*; which threefold comprehenſion of Duty the Apoſtle's words are commonly thought to ſignifie, *Tit.* 2. 12. *We ſhould live Soberly, Righteouſly and Godly.* Piety or Religion (ſtrictly ſo called) is a Syſtem of *the Beauteous-Beneficial* Life and Practice towards God; Juſtice and Charity towards Men is a Syſtem of the *Beauteous-Beneficial* Practice towards others; and Sobriety is a Syſtem of *the Beauteous-Beneficial* Practice as to our ſelves. This whole Duty of Man and *Univerſal Righteouſneſs* is nothing elſe but the ſeveral Branches of the *Beau-*

teous-

(x) *Quod enim vituperabile eſt per ſeipſum, ideo ipſo vitium nominatum puto.* Cic. de Fin. l. 3.

(y) Λέγεσθαι δὲ τὸ καλὸν, τὸ ἐπαινετοὺς παρεχόμενον τοὺς ἔχοντας ἀγαθὸν ἐπαίνου ἄξιον. *Laert. in Zenon.*

(z) Κακοεργία ἐστὶ πᾶσα πρᾶξις ἄτιμος. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 12. c. 35.

(a) Τὰς ἐπαινετὰς ἐνεργείας. *Stob. Ecl. Eth. p.* 166.

(b) Ὅρα τίνας αὐτὸς ἐπαινεῖς ὅταν δίχα πάθους τινὰς ἐπαινῇς· πότερα τοὺς δικαίους, ἢ τοὺς ἀδίκους; τοὺς δικαίους. πότερον τοὺς σώφρονας, ἢ τοὺς ἀκολάστους; τοὺς σώφρονας. τοὺς ἐγκρατεῖς δ᾽ ἢ τοὺς ἀκρατεῖς; τοὺς ἐγκρατεῖς. *Epict. diſſ. l.* 3. c. 1.

(c) *Coſri*, p. 15.

(d) *Pocock. Spec.* p. 206.

(e) *Quis eſt, qui non beneficus videri velit? qui non inter ſcelera & injurias opinionem bonitatis affectet? qui non ipſis quæ impotentiſſimè fecit, ſpeciem aliquam induat recti?* Sen. de Benef. l. 4. c. 17.

(f) *Sen. ibid. c.* 14.

(g) *Himer. ap. Phot. cod.* 243. *col.* 1068.

(h) *Cic. de off. l.* 1. *de Fin. l.* 2.

(i) Ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαλλαγείσης εὔδιος ἡ ψυχὴ ϗ γαληνιῶσα γίνεται. *J. Mart. paræn.*

(k) *Euryph. Pythag.*

(l) *Metop. Pythag.*

(m) *De Fin. l.* 3.

(n) *Coſri*, p. 252.

(o) *De Mor. Manich. c.* 8.

(p) *Ut hiſtrioni actio, ſaltatori motus, non quivis, ſed certus quidam eſt datus: ſic vita agenda eſt certo genere quodam, non quolibet: quod genus conveniens, conſentaneumque dicimus.* Cic. de Fin. l. 3.

teous-Beneficial Life conſider'd as it is (q) τὰ δέοντα πράσσειν, *a doing what ought to be*, and muſt neceſſarily be in reſpect of *well-being*, *well-doing*, and *well-done*. It is Righteouſneſs therefore, and is conſider'd as ſuch by thoſe Chriſtian Writers, that ſay, (r) *omne virtutis officium eſt non peccare* (s) *ſine ſcelere ac ſine macula vivere.* The whole of Virtue is, *that we ſin not*, that we live without Wickedneſs and without Spot. So *to live honeſtly* in the Senſe of the Science of Sanctity (*Heb.* 13. 18.) is to live without vice or crime, which is the ſame with *Righteouſneſs* and with the *Beauteous-Beneficial life and practice*, which is the ſame with *the Good life and practice.* From which identity of notices it is not hard, to reſolve a celebrated Queſtion in Morality, touching *What is the rule and meaſure of Good and Evil, Juſt and Unjuſt.* For Righteouſneſs is the rule and meaſure of Practice, all intelligent Agents muſt be regulated by it (and what is repugnant to it, is neceſſarily Unrighteouſneſs, Sin and Iniquity:) but of Righteouſneſs there is not properly any rule or meaſure ſave only its own nature and notion, *which is the Beauteous-Beneficial life and practice conſider'd as that which ought to be* (t) ἁ γὰρ ἀρετὰ στάθμαν ἔχει τὸ δέον, καὶ ἐστὶ τῶ δέοντος ἕξις, *for Virtue hath a rule That which ought to be, and it is the habit of what ought to be.* This is the rule and meaſure, which Righteouſneſs is, and which may be called *The rule and meaſure of Righteouſneſs conſtitutively ſuch*: but beſides this there may be a rule and meaſure of Righteouſneſs *evidentially and declaratively ſuch.* The common opinion is (u) *that right reaſon is the rule and meaſure of Good and Evil.* Which may ſignifie, that the diſcernments and dictates of Reaſon are only *evidentially and declaratively* the rule and meaſure of good and evil, as ſenſe and reaſon are only *evidentially and declaratively* the rule and meaſure of what is true and falſe. But it may ſignify, that the diſcernments and dictates of Reaſon are *conſtitutively* the rule and meaſure of what is Good and Evil; as a poſitive Law is (in matters of poſitive Inſtitution) *conſtitutively* the rule and meaſure of Good and Evil. In this latter ſenſe the right diſcernments and dictates of Reaſon are not the rule and meaſure of Good and Evil, as they are not in ſuch ſenſe the rule and meaſure of good Air or good Medicines. As things are not true, ſo neither are they right and good, becauſe they are conformable to Reaſon: but Reaſon is therefore right and good, becauſe it is conformable to the things that are ſo. The Schools therefore have not form'd this their Definition aright (w) *That which is agreeable to a rational intelligent Nature as it is ſuch, is good; That which is diſſentaneous and diſagreeable from it, is evil.* For good is not to be accommodated to a rational Nature, but the rational Nature is to be accommodated unto Good, and its Reaſon is then right, *when it rightly diſcerneth between Good and Evil.* Some ſuppoſe, that *the happineſs of the ſyſtem of Rationals is the ſole end and meaſure of Good:* but this Opinion maketh Virtue, to be Policy rather than Virtue. A *Facultas* ἀγαθοειδὴς, *ſuper-intellectual Boniform Faculty* and the unintelligent Senſe reſiding therein, (x) is alſo made the rule and meaſure of Good and Evil: but this is a purely Platonic Crotchet (the Platonic Unity) not ſo good as Policy. The only rule and meaſure of the Good and the Evil is this definitive Notion *The Beauteous-Beneficial Practice* and the various means of diſcerning what is ſo, but the common Happineſs of the whole rightly underſtood may be counted *the meaſure* of it, as it is *Beneficial.*

(q) *Theag. Pythag.*

(r) *Lactan. l.* 6. *c.* 5.

(s) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 9.

(t) *Archyt. Pythag.*

(u) *Sen. Ep.* 66. *Ariſtot. Eth. Nicom. l.* 6. *c.* 1. *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *Annot. ad S.* 10 *Sharrock de off. c.* 2. *N.* 2. *Dr. H. More op. Phil. Vol.* 1. *p.* 588, 589.

(w) *Vaſqu. l.* 2. *Diſp.* 58. *c.* 2. *Coninck. de Moral. Diſp.* 3. *Dub.* 1. *p.* 31.

(x) *D. H. M. Ench. Eth. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

VIII. A Miſtake of greater importance than any of theſe (touching the rule and meaſure of Good and Evil) is that of *Szydlovius*; *that the arbitrarious Will of God is conſtitutively the adequate rule and meaſure of Good and Evil, Juſt and Unjuſt, and that nothing is Good or Evil, but becauſe it is commanded or forbidden.* With this nefarious *Dogma* a learned Writer but a blundering Contemplator of the Law of Nature ſo far ſymbolizeth, that he ſticketh not to affirm, (y) *Juſtum nihil eſt non conſtitutia lege, nothing is juſt or unjuſt of it ſelf, until ſome Law of God or Man doth ſupervene. God cannot do an unjuſt thing; becauſe whatſoever he willeth or doeth, is therefore juſt, becauſe he willeth and doeth it, his Will being the meaſure of Juſtice. It is but a weak diſtinction, to affirm, ſome things to be forbidden by God, becauſe they are unlawful, and ſome to be unlawful, becauſe they are forbidden. For this laſt part of the diſtinction taketh in all that is unlawful in the World, and therefore the other is a dead Member and may be lopp'd off.* So Occham *affirmeth againſt the common Sentence of the Schools (as his manner is)* nullus eſt actus malus niſi quatenus à Deo prohibitus eſt, & qui non poteſt fieri bonus ſi à Deo præcipiatur, & è converſo: *Every thing is good or bad according as it is commanded or forbidden by God and no otherwiſe.* Theſe Sayings are attended with a Self-contradiction, (z) *that it is eternally and indiſpenſably neceſſary, that we love God, and that he cannot command us to hate him:* And 'tis but reaſonable, that they ſhould contradict themſelves, that contradict common Senſe, and contemplate *Goodneſs* at the ſame rate of extravagance, that ſome others contemplate *Truth*, who affirm, (a) *that God indeed doth neceſſarily conceive thoſe Truths, which immediately relate to himſelf, his Nature, Eſſence and Attributes: He was never indifferent as to theſe; but as for all other Truths which are not God himſelf, theſe wholly depend upon the moſt free and arbitrary determination of his own Will, and are therefore only true, becauſe he appointed them to be ſo; and that there might, if God had ſo pleaſed, either have been none of theſe at all, or elſe quite different from what they now are.* If Truth is of ſo indeterminate a nature Good muſt be as arbitrarious as ſome ſay, (b) *that by the meer light of Nature without Divine Revelation it cannot be made appear, that there is any difference between Vice and Virtue, although we were aſſur'd, that there is a God. That nothing is juſt and good, but that only which he commandeth, and for no other reaſon but becauſe he doth ſo.* They that diſcourſe at this rate are either extremely deficient in their Reaſon or their Religion: either they underſtand not Theiſm or believe it not; for their Maxims are the grand Arcana of Atheiſm. *Protagoras* and thoſe of his Notion, as *Plato* ſaith in his *Theætetus*, (c) *will build upon this, and place the firmitude of their cauſe in it, that none of the things juſt and unjuſt, holy and unholy hath by Nature any Eſſence of its own.* The reſtraints of Virtue and Honeſty in *Plato*'s *Gorgias* are called by *Callicles*, τὰ καλλωπίσματα τὰ παρὰ φύσιν, *ſpecious things that are beſides Nature*, (d) which was the Senſe of the *Epicureans*, of the *Scepticks* and of *Ariſtippus* alſo (no better than an Atheiſt) who ſaid, *that nothing is juſt by nature but only* νόμῳ καὶ ἔθει, *by Law and Cuſtom.* Law is ſuppos'd, to make Juſtice, whereas without antecedent Juſtice, it is impoſſible, that there can be any made Law. For no Law can be made but by one that hath Right to be obey'd

(y) Bp. Taylor Duct. Dub. B. 2 c. 1. n. 4, 52, 53.

(z) Ibid. Rule 9. n. 12.

(a) Poiret. cogit. rationde Deo. l 3. c. 10. Des Cartes Ep. 37. par. 1.

(b) Cuper. Arcan. Atheism. l. 2. c. 10.

(c) Ἐν τοῖς δικαίοις καὶ ἀδίκοις καὶ ὁσίοις καὶ ἀνοσίοις ἐθέλουσιν ἰσχυρίζεσθαι, ὡς οὐκ φύσει αὐτῶν οὐδὲν οὐσίαν ἑαυτοῦ ἔχον.

(c) Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 7.

bey'd and to whom Obedience is due. Right and Due therefore (and conſequently juſt and unjuſt) is neceſſarily antecedent to any made Law. If nothing is unrighteous but by a made Law, Mankind muſt be conſider'd as perfectly at Liberty and unoblig'd antecedently to that Law; and if we ſuppoſe them, to be perfectly at Liberty and unoblig'd, then that Law could not oblige them; for no Command or Prohibition can oblige them to Obedience, that are Perſons perfectly at liberty and unoblig'd. Nor can they oblige themſelves by any Pacts or Covenants of their own making; for if there be nothing in its own Nature unjuſt, it cannot be in its own Nature an unjuſt thing, to break their own Pacts and Covenants, but they may unmake them, as faſt as they make them. And conſequently if we ſuppoſe them, to be once perfectly at liberty and unoblig'd, they muſt for ever continue ſo, if there be nothing unjuſt in its own Nature. If nothing is eſſentially and in its own Nature Unrighteous, there is nothing ſo bad which God may not do (lye and deny himſelf, condemn the Obedient and reward the Diſobedient) there is nothing ſo wicked which God may not Command (Atheiſm, Blaſphemy, Demonolatry, Fraud, Sodomy, Cruelty) a Syſtem of Moral Truths, Virtues and Duties might be made by Divine Appointment juſt contrary to thoſe that are now ſuch; and by arbitrary Will and Appointment all manner of Wickedneſs would be Righteouſneſs, Good would be Evil and Evil Good, and Irreligion would be Religion, (as *Occham* ſuppoſeth :) But if Religion and Virtue was thus deſtroy'd, God himſelf would be deſtroy'd; for ἄνευ ἀρετῆς θεὸς ὄνομα μόνον, *without Virtue God is but a Name.* If God is eſſentially Good and Holy, a good and holy Nature and Life is eſſential to God. If God is eſſentially of the good and holy kind (the God-kind) a good and holy kind of Nature is eſſential to God. Which good and holy kind of Nature and Life cannot be made ſuch by an arbitrary Determination of the Divine Will; therefore it is eſſentially ſuch (both as it is in God and as it is in the Children of God) and conſequently there is the good kind of Life and Practice, and the evil kind of Life and Practice, and theſe are not meer arbitrary Determinations of the Divine Will. The ſeveral Attributes of Benignity, Mercy, Juſtice, Veracity, Faithfulneſs (and ſuch more) as they are in God, are that which is eſſentially and in its own Nature Good; therefore they are ſo, as they are in Man.

If God by his free Appointment did not make this Propoſition to be a Truth, *a Being abſolutely perfect is neceſſarily Exiſtent*, it is a fond Imagination, to ſuppoſe, that by his free Appointment the like Self-evident Propoſitions are made Truths. ***Rationes rerum***, the abſtract Natures, Eſſences, Species and Ideas of things which are in intelligent Mind, are not firſt appointed and determin'd by the Divine Will, and then known by the Divine Underſtanding (for how ſhould the Divine Mind determine thoſe things, which it knoweth nothing of?) Nor are they of free and arbitrary Determination: But intelligent Mind neceſſarily formeth them (elſe there could be no Underſtanding things) and upon this account they are alſo neceſſary; *every thing poſſible is neceſſarily of a certain proper intelligible Eſſence, Nature and Notion.* For ſeeing it is the (intelligible) Eſſence of ſuch a thing, the thing is neceſſarily and immutably of that intelligible Nature and Notion. In theſe intelligible Natures and Eſſences the Mind clearly and diſtinctly perceiveth ſeveral *Eſſentialities*, (which becauſe they are Eſſentialities) are not only Truths, but neceſſary and immutable Truths, and therefore may juſtly be called *Æternæ Veritates*, Eternal Truths. As for Inſtance; the Mind clearly diſcerneth, that this is an Eſſentiality of the whole, *to be bigger than the part*; that this is an Eſſentiality of the Cauſe, *to be in order of Nature before the Effect*; that this is an Eſſentiality of a plain Triangle, *to have its three Angles equal to two right ones*; theſe are therefore *neceſſary, immutable and eternal Verities.* But whatever the Mind clearly perceiveth, to be repugnant to the Eſſentialities of things, that ſhe calleth *impoſſible* and *contradictious* (contradictiouſneſs is repugnant both to Reality and Conception) which determineth the extent of omnipotent Power; for it can do nothing contradictious and impoſſible. Thus much common Sence dictateth concerning God: But it doth not ſuppoſe, that the *Rationes Rerum, Rationes Veri & Boni*, are independent upon God. They are not to be conſider'd as meerly *the Eſſences of things*, or as meerly *the Reaſons of True and Good*; for they are *the meerly intelligible Eſſences of things, and the meerly intelligible Reaſons of True and Good*, which as ſuch and ſo far as they are ſuch, manifeſtly depend upon intelligent Mind, and therefore depend upon God; for there is no other intelligent Mind, but either *the Mind of God or created intelligent Mind*, which is deriv'd from his All-comprehending intelligent Mind. And ſeeing this World of Intelligibles are (more or leſs) neceſſarily form'd by every intelligent Mind, there is neceſſarily a difference between Vice and Virtue by the meer light of Nature.

IX. *Bonum Honeſtum* (or Virtue) is not a meer Name, but hath its proper Nature, which is a Specific Nature. This Specific Nature or Idea is in Intelligent Mind and is *the Beauteous-beneficial Practice*, which this Name *the Good* denoteth, as we have largely prov'd from the Signification of it. So that it is as certain, that this Name *the Good* (Bonum Honeſtum) denoteth this Specific Nature τὸ καλοκ'ἀγαθὸν, *the Beauteous-beneficial Practice*, as that this Name Man denoteth this Specific Nature *the Rational Animal*, or that *the Square* ſignifieth *the Quadrilateral-equilateral-rectangular Figure.* The Good therefore in Morality, as being that which is eſſentially and in its own Nature *the Beauteous-beneficial Practice*, is that which is eſſentially and in its own Nature *that which is the Right and Good*; and conſequently it is that which is *neceſſarily, immutably and eternally ſo.* *(e) Order, Meaſure, Comelineſs, Pulchritude, Elegance and convenience of Parts, which no Animal but Man diſcerneth, Reaſon transferreth to the Mind, and thinketh, that they ought to be obſerved there, and the obſervance of them is that which maketh* Bonum Honeſtum, *which is that which in its own Nature is laudable.* If therefore Beauty, Pulchritude, Order, Meaſure, Congruity, Proportion, are not wholly of arbitrarious Determination and Inſtitution, nor variable at Pleaſure, but of a fix'd determinate Nature; if in Pulchri-

(e) *Unum hoc Animal* (Homo) *ſentit quid ſit ordo, quid ſit quod deceat in factis dictiſque, qui modus. Itaque eorum ipſorum quæ aſpectu ſentiuntur, nullum alıud animal pulchritudinem, venuſtatem, convenientiam partium ſentit, quam ſimilitudinem, natura, ratioque ab oculis ad animum transferens, multò etiam magis pulchritudinem, conſtantiam, ordinem in conſiliis factiſque conſervandum putat caveque nè quid indecorè, effeminative faciat; tùm in omnibus & opinionibus & factis nè quid libidinosè aut faciat aut cogitet. Quibus ex rebus conflatur & efficitur id, quod quærimus honeſtum; quod etiamſi nobilitatum non ſit, tamen honeſtum ſit, quodque verè dicimus, etiamſi à nullo laude-*

tude of Body there muſt be a certain Figure, Order and Symmetry of Parts; if in a good and virtuous Soul there muſt be ſuch an orderly Subordination of Parts, as there is in a well-order'd City; hence it appeareth, that *the Good* in Morality is that which is eſſentially and in its own Nature ſuch, and is not a matter of arbitrary Determination. In ſeveral inſtances indeed Mankind are of different Sentiments touching what is graceful and handſom, regular and beauteous, (*f*) yet none can deny, that the natural Poſition and Situation of the parts of the Face is beauteous, and that a diſtortion of them is hideouſly ill-favour'd and of an horrid Aſpect. Such Viciofities and Deformities of the Body are an umbratile reſemblance of the Viciofities and Deformities of the Mind and Life. And as the gentiler ſort of People are extremely abhorrent from any Turpitude, Defilement and Deformity of their Body: So in the truly virtuous there is ſomething that is pure (*g*) ϗ ὐδ᾽ ὁπωσῦν ἀξιῶν ῥυπαίνεσθαι, *that will not endure at all to be defiled.* (*h*) *Nè capias, inquit continentia, unde non decet, nè comedas, ne bibas; ſuſtine, tolera, denique moriare potius quàm quicquam indecori committas.* Vice and Wickedneſs is an horrid Deformity, that the Virtuous will not touch with.

The Good in Morality as it is the *Beneficial* kind of Practice, is that which is *eſſentially and in its own Nature Good*, and is not of arbitrary Determination and Inſtitution. (*i*) *Charity, Peace, Brotherly Love, are good, not only becauſe God hath commanded them, or willed us to follow them: But God by his Law doth Will and Command us to follow after theſe things, becauſe they were always good, even before he willed or commanded us to follow them. The time will never be, wherein Innocency, Brotherly Love, Charity, Peace and Loving-kindneſs ſhall be as diſpleaſing to God as Murther, Hatred, Malice, Cruelty and Uncharitableneſs hitherto always have been. He cannot Enact a Law either to authorize theſe or the like Practices, or to prohibit the contrary Virtues.* If Men ſhould make ſuch a Law, it would be *a framing Miſchief by a Law.* Pſal. 94. 20. If a City maketh Laws and Statutes, which ſeem to them profitable and beneficial, yet really they may be miſchievous and pernicious (as *Plato* argueth againſt *Protagoras*;) for things are not profitable and hurtful meerly in our Conceit and Opinion, but they are really and in their own Nature ſuch, (*k*) and a Law cannot make things noxious and poiſonous, to be wholſome and ſalutary. *Theft, Adultery*, falſifying Wills and Teſtaments (Crimes forbidden by the Moral Law) can never be made innocent or ſalutary by any Votes or Statutes; for in their own Nature they are pernicious; as the contrary Virtue and the Good in Morality is in its own Nature *Beauteous-beneficial*, whence it is that which is in its own Nature laudable. (*l*) *For in its own Nature it is the Good, which no more conſiſteth in Opinion than Beatitude conſiſteth in it.* (*m*) *Nor doth the virtue of a Tree or of an Horſe conſiſt in Opinion, but in the Nature of the thing.* The virtue of *the Eye* or of *a Watch* is their *Beauteous-beneficial* Nature and Properties, which is their Goodneſs and Perfection, and their Aptitude for their End and Uſe, and no other Nature or Properties but the *Beauteous-beneficial* can conſtitute *a good Eye* or *a good Watch* (which therefore are indiſpenſably requiſite in the Eye and in a Watch:) So the Virtue of intelligent Agents is *the Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice*, which is their Goodneſs and Perfection, and their Aptitude for their End and Uſe, and no other Life and Practice can poſſibly conſtitute them good or good Agents, that is, *the Well-doers, not the Evil-doers.* Whence in the Nature and Reaſon of the thing it is indiſpenſably requiſite in all intelligent Agents, and is to them *matter of Law or Obligation.* For *Law or Obligation* (in a large but very proper Senſe) is nothing elſe but a *Non licet, or a Boundary to Licence.* As we have ſeen from *Ariſtotle* ὁ νόμος τὸ μέσον, *Meaſure is Law.* Ἡ τάξις νόμος, *Concinnity of Order is Law.* So *Plato* ſaith in his *Gorgias.* (*n*) *As the ordinate Diſpoſitions of the Body are called Health: So this Name Law and Legitimate belongeth to the ordinate Diſpoſitions and Ornaments of the Soul (whence Men become Legitimate and Decorous) which are Juſtice and Temperance.* The Rules of Muſick by which the meaſures of Singing and Playing are determin'd (*o*) were called by the Greeks Νόμοι, *Laws*, from thoſe Bounds which the Muſicians of old preſcrib'd for the tuning of Voices and Inſtruments, they obſerving in every *Nomus* τὴν οἰκείαν τάσιν, *its proper Intention.* Νόμοι προσηγορεύθησαν, ἐπειδὴ ὐκ ἐξῆν παραβῆναι καθ᾽ ἕκαστον νενομισμένον εἶδος τῆς τάσεως, *they were called Nomi* (Laws) *becauſe in every one of them it was not lawful to tranſgreſs the preſcrib'd ſort of Intention.* If the Old Muſicians had preſcrib'd no Rules of Muſick, yet there would be unavoidably Laws of Muſick in their own Nature ſuch, without the obſervation whereof there could be no Singing or Playing well: So in the Diſcipline of Morality, if no Law was made by a Superiour Authority, yet ſome Practices would be notic'd to the Mind *as Well-doing that cannot be left undone without heinous Criminality*; and others would be notic'd *as Evil-doing that cannot be done without heinous Criminality.* The things that ought to be done, muſt be done, for the not doing them is to be villainous, diſhoneſt, wicked and unrighteous; and for the ſame reaſon the things that ought not to be done, muſt not be done; and being thus notic'd to the Mind theſe Notices are neceſſarily *Laws* as being *Boundaries to Licenſe.* (*p*) *Would I write the Name of Dio, as I will? No: But I am taught, to Will, that it be written, as it ought. So in Muſical Matters and in all things, wherein there is Art and Science. Elſe it would not be material, to know a thing* (how to do it well) *if it be accommodated to every one's Will.* It would be to no purpoſe, to have or learn the Science of living well, if as ſome ſay, (*q*) *Jus eſt nihil aliud*

---

tur, laudabile eſſe natura. Cic. de Off. l. 1.

(f) *An corporis pravitates ſi erunt perinſignes, habebunt aliquid offenſionis, animi deformitas non habebit?* Idem de Leg. l. 1. *An eſt ullum majus malum turpitudine? Quæ ſi in formitate corporis habeat aliquid offenſionis, quanta illa depravatio & fœditas turpificati animi debet videri?* Idem de Off. l. 3.

(g) Plutarch. de prof. p. 85.

(h) V. Sharrock de Off. c. 2. N. 9.

(i) Dr. Jackson B 10. ch. 39. p. m. 3180.

(k) *Quod ſi populorum juſſis, ſi principium decretis, ſi ſententiis judicum jura conſtituerentur, jus eſſet latrocinari, jus adulterare, jus Teſtamenta falſa ſupponere, ſi hæc ſuffragiis aut ſcitis multitudinis probarentur. Quæ ſi tanta potentia ſtultorum ſententiis atque juſſis ut eorum ſuffragiis rerum natura vertatur, cur non ſanciunt, ut quæ mala pernicioſaque ſunt, habeantur pro bonis ac ſalutaribus?* Cic. de Leg. l. 1.

(l) *Quod laudabile bonum eſt, in ſe habeat quod laudetur, neceſſe eſt: Ipſum enim bonum non eſt in opinionibus, ſed in naturâ. Nam ni ita eſſet, beati quoque opinione eſſent, quo quid dici poteſt ſtultius?* Ibid.

(m) *Nec arboris nec equi virtus quæ dicitur (in quo abutimur nomine) in opinione ſita eſt, ſed in Naturâ.* Ibid.

(n) Ταῖς δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς τάξεσι ϗ κοσμήσεσι νόμιμόν τε ϗ νόμος (ὄνομα εἶναι,) ὅθεν καὶ νόμιμοι γίγνονται καὶ κόσμιοι. Ταῦτα δ᾽ ἐστι δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ σωφροσύνη.

(o) Plutarch. de muſic. p. 1132, 1133.

(p) Βούλομαι γράφειν ὡς θέλω τὸ Δίωνος ὄνομα; ὐ, ἀλλὰ διδάσκομαι θέλειν ὡς δεῖ γράφεσθαι. Τί ἐπὶ μυσικῶν; ὡσαύτως. Τί ἐν τῷ καθόλου, ὅπου τέχνη τις ἢ ἐπιστήμη ἐστί; ὡσαύτως. Εἰ δὲ μὴ, οὐδὲν ἦν ἄξιον τὸ ἐπίστασθαί τι, εἰ τοῖς ἑκάστου βουλήσεσι προσηρμόζετο. Epict. Diſſ. l. 1. c. 12.

(p) Reuchl. de verb. mirif. p. 17.

lud niſi quod homines volunt, Right is nothing elſe but what Men will. But Men do not aſſume to themſelves a Liberty, to write the Name of *Dio*, as they will; or to Sing and Play, as they pleaſe; in theſe things they learn to obſerve a certain Order and Meaſure, which is neceſſary, that what they do, may be well done (tolerably well done) which therefore is the Law of their Agency. So in Life and Practice a certain Order and Meaſure is indiſpenſably requiſite, that they may be Well-doers, which therefore is the Law of their Agency. Their Practice muſt be *the Good* in one Senſe, it muſt be *the Beauteous-beneficial*, or it cannot be *the Good* in the other Senſe, *that which is to be lik'd. Nec cuncta licere credimus.* Nothing is done, as it ought to be, unleſs it be well done, and a Mechanic Work is not well done, unleſs it is *Beauteous-beneficial*; the Works and Doings of Men therefore ought to be of that Character.

Juſtitia in ſuo cuique tribuendo. Cic. de Fin. l. 5. This Juſtice is ad alterum, and is called by Ariſtotle ἀλλότριον ἀγαθόν.

X. The Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice is *Righteouſneſs* not only in reſpect of the Agent (as being what he ought to do) but in reſpect of the Objects as being that which ought to be done to them, and a giving them what is their Right and Due, according to the uſual Notion of Juſtice, which is *Jus ſuum cuique tribuere*. This Life and Practice therefore may not unfitly be called *the Jural Life and Practice* (the Oppoſite to the injurious) which being a Debt unto all is therefore the good of Duty unto all, and ſuch Duty which is not of arbitrary Appointment, but is *natural and neceſſary Juſtice* (that which in its own Nature is Right and Due, Juſt and Good) the Rights and Dues of the Univerſe of Rationals being *Neceſſary, Immutable* and *Eternal*. For ſuch are the Rights and Dues of God, of the natural Relations of Parents and Children, and that the Rights and Dues of Mankind in general are ſuch, will appear by conſidering a Summary of the Philoſophers Diſcipline of Virtue. (r) Moral Philoſophy in the firſt place adjuſteth the Rates of things, allotting to all things that meaſure of Eſteem and Valuation which belongeth to them: And in the next place it taketh care, that the bent of the Soul about them (wherewith the Actions muſt Accord) be ordinate, proportionate and agreeable to the Dignity of the things. Whence the virtuous Life neceſſarily becometh *Beauteous* (for Order, Meaſure, Congruity, Proportion and Symmetry are Beauteous things, and the rectitude of the Soul in duely valuing and affecting the things Divine and Excellent and duely depreciating and diſaffecting the things that are vile, and of ſmall concern and conſideration, is alſo a nobleneſs of Nature, an excellency and pulchritude of the Soul) and thence the virtuous Man reapeth this ineſtimable *Utility* and *Benefit*, he eſcapeth thoſe inveiglements, whereby Men are drawn to the vile and villainous maleficial Practices. (s) *Ex vitioſis enim de rebus opinicnibus velut è corruptis fontibus maxima pars facinorum ſcatet.* For the vicious Opinions that Men have (of ſecular Honour, Riches and Pleaſure) are the Fountain of the greateſt part of flagitious Practices. With great Reaſon therefore Philoſophy inſiſteth and inculcateth (t) *to give every thing its Dignity, to act according to the Dignity of every thing, to uſe and treat and carry our ſelves towards every thing according to its dignity*; for every thing (u) *hath its proper Dignity and congruous Meaſure.* Which Precepts of Philoſophy touching things are chiefly and primarily applicable to Perſons, that are capable of right and wrong (otherwiſe than things are) of having Juſtice and Injuſtice done them, that are deeply affected with Wrongs and Injuries, and that reckon contumely and vilipendency in their Injuries the Quinteſſence and Soul of them. Towards Man therefore πράσσειν τὰ κατ' ἀξίαν, *do thoſe things that are according to his Dignity*, which is neceſſarily his right and due Valuation, and therefore ſuch a Valuation of him is neceſſarily his Right and Due. Accordingly he is ſo valued in the *Beauteous-beneficial Life*, which conſiſteth in obſerving an Equality between Man and Man, *another Man and one's ſelf*, without any inordinate partiality and crooked warping to our own ſide. If another Man muſt be rated according to his Dignity, he muſt be ſo rated compar'd *with Self*, and therefore muſt be of *Impartially-equal* conſideration and regard, and muſt have an *Impartially-equal* ſhare in the diſtribution of our Eſteem and Affection, and his equal Worthineſs thereof muſt be judg'd of without partiality (elſe he is not rated according to his Dignity compar'd with Self) and conſequently another Man muſt be ἄλλος αὐτὸς, *another Self*. He is ſuch in Conſtitution and Condition (for in the main one Man is the Live-image and Picture of another) and it is neceſſarily his Right and Due, to be ſuch in our internal and external Practice (our Regard, Eſteem, Will and Affection and external Actions;) theſe great Laws therefore, *whatſoever ye would that Men ſhould do to you, do ye even ſo to them, thou ſhalt love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf* (which are the Summary of Juſtice and Charity to our Neighbour) are in the Nature and Reaſon of the thing matter of *Duty* and *Juſtice*, of *Law* and *Obligation*. Such is the Gratitude of a Beneficiary towards his Benefactor (who hath merited it, and whoſe Right and Due it is) and in the Nature and Reaſon of the thing it is the Right and Due of a Righteous Perſon (and therefore matter of Law) to be juſtified, not condemn'd. To be free from any intended hurt, is neceſſarily the Right and Due of an innocent Perſon, and is in the Nature and Reaſon of the thing matter of Law. To hate him therefore and bear him Ill-will, to have any evil Paſſions againſt him, evil Thoughts of him, malignly to Cenſure him, proudly to deſpiſe him, to ſpeak againſt his Credit, to do him prejudice in Soul, Body, or his Poſſeſſions, is againſt his Right and Due, and is eſſentially and in its own Nature *Injury* and *Injuſtice*. And in general we muſt pronounce touching every Man, that whatever cannot be deny'd him without repugnance to *the Beauteous-beneficial Practice* (w) is neceſſarily his Right and Due. Whence Rights and Dues accrue unto Men by Contract, and the ſeveral ſorts of Contracts amongſt Men are ſo many Settlements of Rights and Dues, becauſe no Man may break Faith (or be faithleſs in his Dealings) which is a groſs Repugnance to *the Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice*. So an Alms is a ſort of Due to an honeſt poor Man (*Prov.* 3. 27.) for it cannot be deny'd him without plain Repugnance to *the Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice*. So if a Man denieth Neceſſaries to his own Soul and Body, if he doth not order them well, and keep them in Chaſtity and Temperance, if he proſtituteth, defileth, hurteth, diſeaſeth and deſtroyeth them, if he taketh not an ordinate care of his Welfare, of his Reputation and Maintenance in this Life and of his future Felicity, his Practice is a Repugnance to *the Beauteous-beneficial*, he denieth to himſelf what he may not deny to himſelf, and what cannot be deny'd to any one of Mankind without being injurious and unjuſt towards him.

(r) *Philoſophia moralis pars prima eſt, inſpectio ſuum cuique tribuens, & æſtimans quanto quidque dignum ſit, maximè utilis. Quid enim eſt tam neceſſarium, quàm pretia rebus imponere? Secunda de impetu: Tertia de actionibus. Primum enim eſt, ut quanti quidque ſit judices: Secundum, ut impetum ad illa capias ordinatum temperatumque: Tertium, ut inter impetum tuum actionemque conveniat, ut in omnibus iſtis tibi ipſi conſentias. Tunc enim vita ſibi concors eſt, ubi actio non deſtituit impetum, impetus ex dignitate rei concipitur, perinde remiſſus acriorve prout illa digna eſt peti.* Sen. Ep. 89. Gat. in Ant. p. 158.

(s) Eraſm. Inſtit. Principis. p. 152.

(t) Τὴν ἀξίαν ἑκάστῳ ἀποδιδόναι, πράσσειν τὰ κατ' ἀξίαν, χρῆσθαι ἑκάστῳ κατ' ἀξίαν. *Epict. Diſſ. l. 2. c. 23. M. Ant. l. 8. S. 29. l. 12. S. 1.*

(u) Ἰδίαν ἀξίαν ἔχει καὶ συμμετρίαν. *M. Ant. l. 4. S. 32. Gat. Not. p. 115.*

(w) *Grotius ſaith otherwiſe. De J. B. ac P. l. 2. c. 11. S. 3.*

(x) M. Ant. l 12. S. 24.

We ſhould do all things no otherwiſe (*x*) ἢ ὡς ἂν ἡ δίκη αὐτὴ ἐνήργησεν, *than as if Juſtice it ſelf did them*, Juſtice regardeth things as they are in themſelves without partial regard to this or that Perſon. If upon a true Judgment of things another appeareth, to deſerve my Love of Complacence, Praiſe and Honour, as much as my ſelf, Juſtice ſaith, he ought to have an equal ſhare and portion of it. If the Temporal and Eternal Concerns of another be equally valuable with mine own, I am not equally (or well) affected if they be not of *impartially-equal Regard* with me. So the good of two being twice as much as the good of one, and the good of ten being ten times as much as the good of one, is to be (ordinarily) ſo far preferr'd before the good of one. Juſtice ſaith, if an Owner leaveth his Ground uncultivated for many Years, it is fit, he ſhould loſe it; if any will not Work, neither ſhall he Eat: But what a Man getteth by his honeſt Labour and Induſtry, of Right and Due belongeth to him and is his *Property*. Such Dictates of Juſtice introduc'd *Dominion* and *Property* amongſt Men. For although there is much of irregularity and confuſion in Human Affairs, and *Vis* ordinarily prevaileth againſt *Jus*, yet it is not to be ſuppos'd, that Property was introduc'd amongſt Men (*y*) meerly by *Diviſion* of the Earth and by *Occupancy* (arbitrarious and fortuitous) or meerly (*z*) *by poſitive Law*: But upon Grounds and Reaſons of Juſtice. When a Diſh of Meat is brought to the Table, before it is cut up, it is common to all that ſit at the Table; but after it is cut up, and every Man hath taken his ſhare, then *quam quiſque occupavit partem*, what part one hath taken to himſelf, that is not common to the reſt, but is proper to him. But this Property is not meerly from Occupancy or Poſſeſſion, or Diviſion by conſent; it ariſeth from this Ground and Reaſon of Juſtice; *to every Man that hath not forfeited it, of Right and Due belongeth* (although not this or that particular ſhare, yet in general) *a ſhare of the Food which the Earth affordeth; and his occupancy or ſeizure of this or that particular piece of Food at the common Table is a particular determination and limitation of his general Right and an incloſure made thereby, which none may invade without leave.* This Similitude is eaſily applicable to the Original Partition of the Earth and the Accommodations thereof, and to the Introduction of Property; for antecedently thereto the Founder of the Earth had made a Donation of it to Mankind the leſſer and greater Syſtems of Mankind and particular Men alſo had their Rights and Dues; and when they divided the Earth by Occupancy (for ſo they divided it) this their Occupancy was an Incloſure made by a particular determination and limitation of their Right in general to ſome part of the Earth, and ſome of its Accommodations for their Place, Food and Raiment; nor can there be any ſuch Community of things, wherein every one muſt not have his peculiar Place and ſhare of Food and Raiment diſtinct and apart from all others. Natural and neceſſary Juſtice therefore in great degree introduced *Meum* and *Tuum* (Property of Goods) amongſt Men, and made them *Owners*, who (doubtleſs) have Right, to transfer their Rights and to alienate their Property by Donation or by Contract; upon which account (as well as by the Obligation of keeping Faith) Contracts become Settlements of the Rights and Dues of Men. Uſually they loſe and forfeit their Rights and Dues by a change of their Qualifications; for ſo Men forfeit their Eſtates and Lives into the Hands of Juſtice, the due objects of Favour become worthy objects of punitive Diſpleaſure; as on the contrary, he that is an apt and worthy object of punitive Severity to Day, may be a fit and due object of Clemency to Morrow. And who doth not applaud, love and honour ſuch *Beauteous-beneficial Practice?* (*a*) Nature conſtraineth us to love thoſe, in whom Liberality, Beneficence, Juſtice, Fidelity, and ſuch more Virtues appear; becauſe *Bonum honeſtum*, of it ſelf and for its own ſake is pleaſing, and by its Beauteouſneſs is moving and taking to the Minds of Men.

(y) Grot. ſupr. l. 2. c. 2.

(z) Seld. Mar. Clauſ. l. 1. c. 5.

(a) *Vehementer amor multi dinis commovetur ipſa fama & opinione liberalitatis, benefic tiæ, juſtitiæ, fidei, omniumque e rum virtutum, quæ pertinent manſuetudinem morum ac facil tatem. Etenim illud ipſum q decorum honeſtumque dicim quia per ſe nobis placet, anim que omnium natura & ſpecie commovet, maximéque quaſi p lucet ex iis quaſi commemor virtutibus, idcirco illos, in q bus eas virtutis eſſe remur, à natura ipſa diligere cogimur.* Cic. Off. l. 2.

XI. The Good in Morality that is *the Beauteous-beneficial Life and Practice*, and the *Jural Practice* is in Conjunction therewith *the living Societively.* (*b*) Τὸ δὲ εὖ ζῆν, ἐστὶ κοινωνικῶς ζῆν, *To live well* (the good Life) *is to live ſocietively.* The Obligation that is upon Rationals to *this ſocietive Life and Practice* as ſuch (to live in Society, and to live the good Life in Society, and to be of the ſocietive Diſpoſition and Practice) may ſeem to be of meer arbitrary Appointment, becauſe it muſt be deduc'd from the Creation of the Univerſe, which was Arbitrary. But notwithſtanding this Deduction of it, It muſt be denominated *a natural and neceſſary Obligation*; for although the Creation of the Univerſe was Arbitrary, yet ſuppoſing this Creation, the Creation *of Rationals for Society and of the parts for the whole* was not Arbitrary, but Neceſſary. In the Original Creation the Rationals that were made, were neceſſarily of Right and by Obligation God's Subjects and Servants, they were made to be his Societiſts, the Citizens of his Kingdom, *the parts of this whole*, and conſequently they were made for the whole, to conſtitute and conſerve it, and for the common Good thereof. Of this whole the Pagan Theologers miſtaken account of the Univerſe is an Image and Reſemblance. (*c*) They look'd upon the World as the common City of Gods and Men and every one as a part thereof, which naturally and neceſſarily inferreth, that we ought to prefer the common Utility before our own, as the Laws

(b) Plutarc. ad Colot. p. 1108.

(c) *Mundum cenſent regi mine Deorum, eumque eſſe qu communem urbem & civita hominum & deorum, & u quemque noſtrûm ejus mundi partem. Ex quo illud na conſequitur, ut communem uti tatem noſtræ ante ponamus. enim leges omnium ſalutem*

prefer

gulorum ſaluti anteponunt: Sic vir bonus & ſapiens & legibus parens, & civilis Officii non ignarus, utilitati omnium plus quàm unius alicujus aut ſuæ conſulit. Nec magis vituperandus eſt proditor patriæ, quàm communis utilitatis aut ſalutis deſertor propter ſuam utilitatem aut ſalutem. Cic. de Fin. l. 3.

prefer the Welfare of all before the Welfare of any one. So Holy Men live and lay down their Lives for the intereſt of the Kingdom of God, which is the truly noble and illuſtrious Whole, and the intereſt thereof is the truly noble common Good, to which all the Parts are to co-operate and be ſubſervient and for which they have their All, as Virtue obligeth them. If they were made, to be Parts of this Whole, and to promote the Commonweal thereof, they were neceſſarily made for *the Holy-ſocietive* (or the God-ſocietive) Life and Practice, which is neceſſarily *the Holy-ſocietive Love-practice*; for without the Love-practice they are neceſſarily *Unſocietive* and *Anti-ſocietive*, and their *Love-practice* in the Holy Society muſt be the Holy Societive-kind of Love, which is *the Divine Love*, that is the true *Beauteous-beneficial Practice*; for the Divine Love is *Divine Beauty* and *perfect Lovelineſs*. The Holy Societive Life and Practice is alſo neceſſarily *the Jural Practice* towards all in their Social Capacity, *the Holy-ſocietive Duty to God* (univerſal Piety without which there is no living in Society with him) *the Holy-ſocietive Duty to our Fellow-citizens*, *Fellow-ſubjects and Fellow-members* (that are our Societiſts in different Relations) and *the Holy-ſocietive Duty as to our ſelves*, who are Parts of the Whole, whence by prejudicing our own true Perfection and Felicity we are injurious to the Whole. To all which Holy-ſocietive Practice created Rationals are oblig'd not meerly by one ſolitary Obligation, but by innumerable neceſſary Obligations from the Nature and Reaſon of things conjoin'd with the neceſſary Conſtitution of the Univerſe. For how innumerable are their Obligations from thence, to be and live in the State of Society with God and his Liege-people as his Servants and Subjects? To Piety and all the Branches of univerſal Piety? How great and many Obligations have the Regenerate and Divine Family to Unity and Concord, to a ſpecial Love and Kindneſs towards their Fellow-citizens of the Holy Empire, that are Members of the ſame Myſtical Body, animated by the ſame Holy Spirit, born of the ſame heavenly Parentage, Children of the ſame heavenly Father, ſo nearly related to him, ſo highly belov'd by him, and that are Co-heirs of the ſame Inheritance? How many and how great Obligations are there upon every one of them, not to live only or chiefly for Self, but that their care and concern be for the Intereſt of the whole and for themſelves as parts of the whole? The Law of the Kingdom of God therefore muſt be conſider'd as *the Law of Nature*, that is not of meer arbitrary Appointment, but the whole of it is what is in its own Nature (ſuppoſing the Conſtitution of the Univerſe) *neceſſarily and immutably* matter of Law, Duty and Juſtice. We cannot doubt, but that it may be denominated ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe *the Law of Nature*.

There is great Analogy and Reſemblance between the *Human-ſocietive* and *the Holy-ſocietive* Practice; for although the World of Mankind is not properly a Polity, as the City of God is, yet they are the Aggregate of ſeveral Polities, Families, Cities and Kingdoms, every one of which is a little Image and Reſemblance of the City of God. (*d*) The Civil-ſocietive Goodneſs and Virtue requireth, that the parts of them be ſubſervient to the whole and Co-operate to the good thereof, elſe their Practice is not the Societive; nor is their Practice the Human-ſocietive (but deſtructive to Society) if it is not in ſome ſort *the Jural Practice* towards the Deity. (*e*) *For it is more poſſible for a City to ſubſiſt without a foundation, than that a Polity ſhould conſiſt, if the Opinion of the Gods be taken away. If you go about the Earth, you may find Cities without Walls, Letters, Kings, ſumptuous Houſes, without Riches, Money, Theaters and places of Exerciſes: But an atheous City, a City without a Temple, Prayers, Oaths, Vaticinations, Sacrifices for procuring Good and averting Evil none ever ſaw* (in the Civil World) *or will ſee*. The Human-ſocietive Practice is *the Jural Practice* towards * various ſpecial Relations, Sovereign and Subject, Parents and Children, Brethren, Husband and Wife, Maſter and Servant (the Nature of which Relations is neceſſarily a Law to thoſe that are Societiſts in ſuch Relations) and in general towards all that are Fellow-citizens. (*f*) For it fareth with the Body Politick as with the Body Natural. If one Member of the Body Natural hath this Conceit, that it ſhould be well by deſpoiling another Member and traducing the Welfare thereof to it ſelf, this would infer a diſſolution and deſtruction of the Body Natural: So if one Member of the Body Politick for his own intereſt and conveniency will deprive others of thoſe Accommodations, which of Right and Due belong to them, there can be no ſuch thing as Society and Fellow-Citizenſhip amongſt Men. In every Polity therefore the Jural Practice towards Fellow-citizens in general is indiſpenſably neceſſary, as being the only Societive Practice. Which Societive Practice is not to be confin'd to the particular Polities of Men (*g*) for there is no living the good Life without exerciſing towards Mankind in general *the Beauteous-beneficial Practice* (Innocence, Inoffenſiveneſs, univerſal Benevolence, Beneficence, Juſtice and Equity, Manſuetude and Peaceableneſs, Veracity, Fidelity, Candor and Humanity) nor without exerciſing towards them *the Jural Practice*; for every Man is a Citizen of this World, hath his Rights and Dues in reſpect of the Univerſe of Mankind, and till he hath made a Forfeiture, it is neceſſarily his Right and Due, to have a place upon Earth and a Portion of its Accommodations, and not to be prejudic'd by any in his Life, Liberty, or other ſecular Concerns. As every one that is a Citizen in a particular Polity, is neceſſarily a Citizen of this World, ſo every one that is a Societiſt in any particular Polity, is neceſſarily an human Societiſt; Mankind therefore are related to one another as Fellow-citizens (though not in the ſtrict Political Notion) and as Human Societiſts; whence they are oblig'd to make the Human-ſocietive Life and Practice towards

---

(e) *Plutarch adv. Colot.* p. 1125.

* *The Stoicks ſay,* τὸ καθῆκον ταῖς σχέσεσι παραμετρεῖται. *Duty is meaſured by Relations.*

(f) *Detrahere aliquid alteri, & hominem hominis incommodo ſuum augere commodum, magis eſt contra naturam quàm mors, quàm paupertas, quàm dolor, quàm cætera, quæ poſſunt aut corpori accidere, aut rebus externis. Nam principio tollit convictum humanum & ſocietatem. Si enim ſic erimus affecti, ut propter ſuum quiſque emolumentum ſpoliet aut violet alterum, diſrumpi neceſſe eſt eam, quæ maximè eſt ſecundum naturam, humani generis ſocietatem. Ut, ſi unumquodque membrum ſenſum hunc haberet, ut poſſe putaret ſe valere, ſi proximi membri valetudinem ad ſe traduxiſſet, debilitare & interire totum corpus neceſſe eſſet: Sic ſi unuſquiſque noſtrum rapiat ad ſe commoda aliorum, detrahatque quod cuique poſſit, emolumenti ſui gratia, ſocietas hominum & communitas evertatur neceſſe eſt.* Cic. de Off. l. 3.

(g) *Qui autem civium rationem dicunt eſſe habendam externorum negant; hi dirimunt communem humani generis ſocietatem: Qua ſublata beneficentia, liberalitas, bonitas, juſtitia funditus tollitur. Quæ qui tollunt, etiam adverſus Deos immortales impii judicandi ſunt; ab iis enim conſtitutam inter homines ſocietatem evertunt.* Ibid.

one another their Life and Practice. They are alſo one Kindred, one Family, one Tribe, one Nation of Mankind, a Collective of many of the ſame nature and the ſame kind, (h) *Natura nos cognatos edidit.* By which near alliance they are neceſſarily oblig'd to a ſuitable diſpoſition and practice; and not only ſo, but thereby they become one Whole or Univerſe, of which every particular Man and every particular Polity is a part. As every particular Country is a part of the World, which is every Man's Country: ſo every particular Man and every particular Nation is a part of this great Nation, a part of this Whole, and is for the Whole, to affect and promote the common weal and good of this Whole, but no further than it is conſiſtent with, and ſo as to ſubordinate it to the Intereſt of a far greater and better Whole.

XII. The Law of Nature (beſides that it is impos'd by a Superiour Authority) appeareth to be a comprehenſion of what is in its own Nature matter of Law (or Obligation;) whence theſe three honourary Attributes neceſſarily belong to it, *Immutability*, *Eternity*, *Univerſality*, which *Cicero* hath conjoyn'd: (*i*) *All Nations are at all times within the extent of one Law ſempiternal and immutable. J. Mart.* calleth the Matters of it, (*k*) *The Eternal and in their own nature Righteous Doings and Pieties.* And (*l*) *the things that are univerſally and in their own nature and eternally good*; which excellent words denote theſe three eminent Properties of the Law of Nature, *The Univerſality*, *The Eternity*, and *The Immutability* of it.

(1.) The Law of Nature being what is in its own nature matter of Law, the Attribute of *Immutability* belongeth to it, (*m*) *whence Philoſophers, Lawyers and Divines ſo often pronounce, that the Laws of Nature are immutable.* In oppoſition to which commonly receiv'd Maxim (*n*) ſome diſpute (or rather looſely declaim) *that the Law of Nature can be diſpens'd with by Divine Power.* But theſe will have (what none will allow them) *an altering the Caſe and a changing the Matter* to be a diſpenſing with the Law. They have alledg'd nothing, that looketh like an Argument ſave only theſe few Matrimonial Caſes, *The diſpenſing with Polygamy and permiſſion of Divorces in the Old Teſtament, and the diſpenſing with the Law againſt the inceſtuous marriage of Brother and Siſter in the beginning of the World.* But theſe Matrimonial Caſes are weak Allegations; for it is not certain, how far they are determined by the Law of Nature and how far they properly belong to poſitive Law. The Objector himſelf affirmeth, (*o*) *that the marriage of Brother and Siſter is unlawful only, becauſe forbidden by poſitive Law.* But the Lawyers ſay, (*p*) *Thoſe are inceſtuous Marriages which are prohibited by Nature.* And it is moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that all the Laws in Scripture againſt *Inceſt* are, not abſolutely, but in a degree and meaſure, greater or leſſer, Laws of Nature, or Branches of the Law of Nature, at leaſt the ſlenderer and remoter Branches thereof: Of which ſort is the Law againſt ſetting the younger before the firſt-born, *Gen.* 29. 26. and 48. 18. *Deut.* 21. 16, 17. which muſt be reputed in ſome ſort a Branch of the Law of Nature, and is called by ſome (*q*) *Jus naturale*, becauſe the doing otherwiſe ordinarily is in the nature of the thing an Incongruity; yet is not ſuch an Incongruity, but that it may be outweigh'd by a greater Good or Congruity, and in ſuch a caſe the Law is (not obligatory or) not Law. So the Law againſt the marriage of Brother and Siſter muſt be reputed in ſome ſort a Branch of the Law of Nature, becauſe the doing otherwiſe is ordinarily in the nature of the thing an Incongruity, yet is not ſuch an Incongruity, but that in the beginning of the World it was outweigh'd by a greater Good or Congruity (that all Mankind might iſſue from a common Parent) and among the Jews alſo it was outweigh'd by a greater Good or Congruity (as in caſe a Brother died without Child) and in ſuch a caſe the Law was (not obligatory or) not Law. (*r*) Learned Men are extremely at a loſs, to aſſign the cauſes and reaſons, why certain degrees of kindred were forbidden to marry; but I ſuppoſe, that a conſiderable number of reaſons may be aſſign'd. For probably in theſe Laws ſome regard was had to the inlarging Friendſhip in the World by Kindreds ariſing from Marriage, as S. *Auſtin* and *Plutarch* ſuppoſe. Probably ſome regard was had to the bettering the Breed of Mankind; for it is commonly obſerv'd, that without croſſing the ſtrein (as the Phraſe is) the breed of ſome Animals is not good. *Parents and Children* (the right aſcending and deſcending Line) *Mothers in Law and the Husband's Children*, *Uncles and Nieces*, *Aunts and Nephews*, cannot marry without ſome (greater or leſſer) violation of a certain Sanctity (greater or leſſer) which ſuperiour natural Relations have, and of a religious diſtance which it requireth, to be obſerv'd; for as the ancient Greeks call'd our Parents θεὺς (Gods) ſo they call'd our Parents Brethren θείυς (Divine) as *Simplicius* upon *Epictetus* obſerveth. And touching all the prohibited degrees of Kindred we may affirm, that for this reaſon they may not marry, becauſe in the nature of the thing there is an Incongruity (more or leſs) which is (more or leſs) diſcern'd by common reaſon (as may be proved by ſeveral Inſtances) and ſo far as there is ſuch an Incongruity, there is a turpitude and foulneſs (a filthy Incongruity) in the fact of uncovering Nakedneſs *upon the account of nearneſs of Fleſh or Relation.* But this Incongruity ceaſeth in the caſe of a greater Good and Congruity, whence there is no difficulty in the caſe of *Cain*'s marrying his Siſter. And as for the *Polygamy* and *Divorces* that were permitted in the times of the Old Teſtament, they were repugnant indeed to the primitive Inſtitution of Marriage in Paradiſe (to which our Saviour hath reduc'd us) but ſeem not to have been contrary to the Light of Nature or any Law which it revealeth: for it doth not reveal any thing of the creation of one Man and one Woman only in the beginning of the World, nor their Paradiſaical State, nor the eſtabliſhing the conjunction of Male and Female *in ſingulari conjugio* at the firſt. But from the permiſſion of Polygamy and Divorces there is great reaſon, to infer the imperfection of the Inſtitution of Piety in the Old Teſtament-times, and that the famous Anceſtors of old *Iſrael* who practis'd Polygamy (although in the main real and ſpiritual Religioniſts, yet) were in great degree ſymbolical and ſecular kind of Pietiſts; and that God for increaſing their Seed (*Abraham*'s Seed) diſpens'd with his own Inſtitution of Marriage: but no legitimate Inference can be made from thence, (*s*) that the Law of Nature can be diſpens'd with by Divine Power.

(h) *Sen. Ep.* 95.

(i) *Omnes gentes & omni tempore una Lex & ſempiterna & immutabilis continet.* Lactant. l. 6. c. 8.

(k) Τὰς αἰωνίυς ϗ φύσει δικαιοπϱαξίας ϗ ἐυσεϐείας. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 266.

(l) Τὰ καθόλυ καὶ φύσει καὶ αἰώνια καλά. *Ibid. p.* 263.

(m) *Selden. Mar. clauſ. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(n) *Bp. Taylor Duct. Dub. B.* 2. *c.* 1. *r.* 9. p. 200.

(o) *Ibid. c.* 2. *r.* 3. *n.* 24.

(p) *V. Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(q) *Malvend. in Deut.* 21. 16.

(r) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *S.* 12.

(s) *V. Suarez. de Leg. l.* 2. *c.* 13, 14, 15.

(2.) *The Eternal Law* is of various acceptation. The Pagan Theologers call *Themis* (t) *the Eternal Law*, whereby they mean *the Univerſal Law* preſcrib'd to the World and (unintelligent) *Nature*, which obſerveth a ſettled Law and Order. In the School of the Stoicks there is a twofold Eternal Law, (u) the one meerly *providential* (as when they ſay, *omnia æternæ legis imperio fieri*, all things are by Law, Fate or Providential Decree) the other *morally-preceptive*, (w) call'd by *Cicero ſempiterna Lex*, which is the eternal mind or right reaſon of *Jove* conſider'd as commanding ſome things to be done and prohibiting others. This twofold Eternal Law of the *Stoicks* conjoyn'd into one is *the Eternal Law* of the Schools (the Notices whereof they derive from S. *Auſtin*) for their Eternal Law is, (x) *ratio gubernativa totius Univerſi in mente divina exiſtens*, Reaſon exiſting in the Divine Mind conſider'd as gubernative of the whole Univerſe. The Stoicks look'd upon their morally perceptive Eternal Law as *the Law of Nature*, and therefore look'd upon the mind and right reaſon of *Jove* (commanding and forbidding) as the *primary* and *original* Law of Nature, the mind and right reaſon of Man commanding and forbidding (a derivative from the Eternal Mind of *Jove*) they look'd upon as the *ſecondary* and *derivative* Law of Nature. So *Cicero* agreeably to their Senſe ſaith, (y) *Lex nihil aliud eſt niſi recta & à numine Deorum tracta ratio, imperans honeſta, prohibenſque contraria.* Law is nothing elſe but right reaſon deriv'd from the Gods, commanding things honeſt and forbidding the contrary. So the Schools ſay, (z) *Lex naturalis eſt quædam participatio legis æternæ in rationali creatura.* The Law of Nature is a certain participation of the Law Eternal in a rational Creature. Right Reaſon is repreſented as the Law of Nature *conſtitutively*, and this Law is ſuppos'd to exiſt from Eternity: But as we do not acknowledge, that Right Reaſon is in ſuch ſenſe Law, ſo neither do we ſuppoſe, that the Law of Nature is in ſuch ſenſe denominated *the Eternal Law*: But it is ſo denominated in the ſame ſenſe, that neceſſary Propoſitions are denominated *Eternal Truths*. And they are ſo denominated, not to ſignifie, that ſuch Propoſitions exiſted from Eternity, and had a Truth from Eternity as ſo exiſting, or that the *veritas rei* (truth of the thing) which they expreſs, mentally or really exiſted from Eternity: But the Senſe is, that ſuppoſing thoſe Propoſitions to exiſt, which cannot but be Truths (neceſſary Truths) they are Truths of Eternal Neceſſity. They are *Eternal Truths*, not as being Truths which cannot but exiſt (as ſome ſay, that they neceſſarily exiſt in an Eternal Mind) but as being Truths which cannot but be Truths, there is an eternal neceſſity of their being Truths: and ſo the *Intelligible Eſſences* of things are Eternal; not becauſe they cannot but exiſt, but becauſe ſuppoſing them to be in Mind, they cannot but be the Intelligible Eſſences of things, ſo that the Eſſences of things are Eternal, as to the being the Eſſences of things. As theſe Verities, *Eternal Truths*, are of *eternal immutable* neceſſity, and there is an impoſſibility of their being otherwiſe: So the Laws of Nature are Eternal Laws, as being of eternal *immutable neceſſity*, and the matters of them are denominated τὰ αἰώνια καλά, to ſignifie, that it cannot be, but they muſt be the things that are the right, the juſt and the good. In ſuch Senſe they are Laws that had no beginning, *but always were* according to the Saying of *Antigone* in *Sophocles*, who having bury'd her Brother *Polynice* againſt the King's Edict, and being accus'd for doing it againſt the Laws, ſhe made anſwer, that although ſhe had offended againſt the Law of *Creon*, yet ſhe had committed no offence againſt the unwritten Law, which is not of late or yeſterday's ſtanding, but *always was*. (a) *Theſe are not matters of to day or yeſterday, but they ever live, and none knoweth their Date or from whence they came.*

(3.) A third honourary Attribute of the Law of Nature is *the Univerſality* of it; for in ſeveral reſpects and upon ſeveral accounts it muſt be denominated *The Univerſal Law*. In reſpect of the Univerſe of Mankind it is the *Law Univerſal*, (b) *the common Law written in the publick of all the World and in the natural Tables.* The Matters of it are called by the Greek writers, (c) κοινὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δίκαια, *the common Juſts of all Men*, and ſo the Lawyers ſay, (d) *All People that are govern'd by Laws, have a proper civil Law of their own and the common Law of all Men beſides.* So *Ariſtotle* ſaith, (e) *I diſtribute Law into that which is proper and that which is common; for there is that which all Men ſuppoſe a common Juſt and Unjuſt, which is by nature ſuch and is immutable.*

But the Law of Nature is not only univerſal in reſpect of the Univerſe of Mankind, but in reſpect of the vaſt Univerſe of created Rationals. Agreeably whereto *Empedocles* ſang of natural Juſtice: (f) *It is extended throughout the vaſt Ether and the infinite Regions of Light.* *Celſus* having ſaid from *Pindar*, *that Law is the King of all*; *Origen* anſwereth, that if he meaneth the Law of Cities, this is falſe; for all are not under the Rule of that Law: but Chriſtians acknowledge (g) a Law τῇ φύσει πάντων βασιλέα, *that is by nature King of all.* Accordingly one of *Ariſtotle*'s Interpreters ſaith, (h) *With the Gods of neceſſity there is that which is immutably juſt, ſo that there is that which is in its own nature juſt.* (i) *The true Law* (ſaith *Cicero*) *is right reaſon, congruous to nature, diffus'd into all, conſtant, ſempiternal, which calleth to duty by commanding, and by forbidding deterreth from villainy.* If right reaſon is the Law of Nature (as in ſome ſort it is) or if the Law of Nature (k) *is the force of the Intellect, whereby we diſcern thoſe things that are in themſelves good, from thoſe that are in themſelves evil*, (as Schoolmen ſay,) or if it is *Lex vera impreſſa mentibus*, a Law impreſs'd upon intelligent Minds (as the ancient Writers commonly ſay) It cannot be a Law wholly appropriate and peculiar to the Univerſe of Mankind, but is neceſſarily *the Law of the vaſt Univerſe of Men and Angels*. So in the School of the Stoicks the Law of Nature is, (l) *The Law of the Univerſe, one Law the common reaſon of all intelligent Beings, the Reaſon and Law*

(t) *Pighius de Dea Themide*, p. 39.

(u) *Lipſ. Phyſ. l.* 1. *diſſ.* 12.

(w) *De Leg. l.* 2. *Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(x) *Aquin.* 12æ. *Qu.* 91. *Art.* 1.

(y) *In Philipp.* 2.

(z) *Selden. ſupr.*

(a) Οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κἀχθὲς, ἀλλ' ἀεί ποτε Ζῇ ταῦτα. κ'οὐδεὶς οἶδεν ἐξ ὅτου φάνη. *Ariſtot. Rhet. l.* 1. *c.* 13, 15.

(b) *Lex communis in publico mundi & naturalibus Tabulis ſcripta.* Tertull. de coron. mil.

(c) *Selden. Mar. Clauſ. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(d) *Idem de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(e) Λέγω δὲ νόμον, τὸν μὲν ἴδιον τὸν δὲ κοινόν· κοινὸν δὲ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν· ἔστι γάρ ὃ μαντεύονταί τι πάντες φύσει, κοινὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἄδικον· καὶ οὐδέποτε μεταβάλλει· κατὰ φύσιν γάρ ἐστιν. *Rhet. l.* 1. *c.* 13, 15.

(f) ——διὰ τ' εὐρυμέδοντος Αἰθέρος ἠνεκέως τέταται, διά τ' ἀπλέτου αὐγῆς. *Ariſtot. ſupr.*

(g) *L.* 5. *p.* 258.

(h) Παρά γε τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνάγκη δίκαιον εἶναι ἀμετάβλητον, ὥστε εἶναί τι φυσικὸν δίκαιον. *Andronic. Rhod.*

(i) *Eſt quidem vera Lex, recta ratio, naturæ congruens, diffuſa in omnes, conſtans, ſempiterna, quæ vocet ad officium jubendo, vetando à fraude deterreat.* Cic. ap. Lactant. l. 6. c. 8.

(k) *Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

(l) *Lex univerſi Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 371. νόμος εἷς λόγος κοινὸς πάντων τῶν νοερῶν ζώων *M. Ant. l.* 7. *S.* 9. *& l.* 2. *S.* 16.

of the moſt ancient City and Polity. For they argue, (*m*) *That Reaſon which preſcribeth what is to be done, and not to be done, is common to us all; if that, then Law; if ſo, then are we Fellow-citizens, and the World is as a City.* So *Cicero* argueth, (*n*) *They that have Reaſon in common, have Right Reaſon in common, which is Law; therefore Men are thus conſociated with the Gods, they are of one common Law, and conſequently they are of the ſame City or Polity.* But ſuppoſing Right Reaſon to be Law, that all Rationals have ſomething of it, and conſequently they have ſomething of one Law, yet they have not one Law as Citizens and Societiſts that are of the ſame City; for Rationals are not Fellow-Citizens and of the ſame Society as Rationals, but as a ſpecial kind of Rationals (as the *Salts* that aſſociate are thoſe that are of a ſpecial kind) *Divine, Diabolical or Humane.*

The Law of Nature may be denominated *Univerſal* as being the Law of *Univerſal Righteouſneſs* (which requireth it;) for the obligation to obey poſitive Laws is of the Law of Nature, which is the ſame with *Univerſal Righteouſneſs, that which is in its own nature ſuch, conſider'd as that which ought to be done.* (*o*) *There is no difference between Right Reaſon and Reaſon of Juſtice.* The Stoicks ſay, (*p*) *Juſtice is the Science of thoſe things that are to be choſen and eſchew'd, and of the things indifferent.* (*q*) When the three parts of the Soul (the Iraſcible, the Concupiſcible and the Rational) harmonize and agree, and are as they ought to be, ſo that Reaſon ruleth, and the other obey and are regulated by it, this rectitude of the Soul the Platoniſts call *Juſtice.* If the ſeveral parts of the Soul do their proper work and office, this οἰκειοπραγία they call Juſtice. (*r*) *Juſtice is the ſummary comprehenſion of all Virtue.* The Law of Nature therefore conſider'd as the comprehenſion of what is in its own nature *matter of obligation and ought to be*, is neither more nor leſs than the comprehenſion of what is in its own nature *Righteouſneſs*, and is the ſame with the Divine Moral Law (the preceptive part of the Original Law) the *Tranſgreſſion* whereof is the definitive Notion of Sin and Unrighteouſneſs, 1 *Joh.* 3.4. But this muſt not be called the Law of Nature without a diſtinction and limitation of Senſe.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 4. *S.* 4.

(n) *Inter quos ratio, inter eoſdem etiam recta ratio communis eſt. Quæ cùm ſit Lex, Lege quoque conſociati homines cum Diis putandi ſumus. unde univerſus hic mundus una civitas communis Deorum atque hominum exiſtimanda.* De Leg. l. 1.

(o) Οὐδὲν διήνεγκε λόγος ὀρθὸς καὶ λόγος δικαιοσύνης. *Ant. l.* 11. *S.* 1

(p) Τὴν δὲ δικαιοσύνην ἐπιστήμην ὧν αἱρετέον καὶ εὐλαβητέον καὶ οὐδετέρων. *Laert.* *Zenon.*

(q) *Alcin. de Doctr. Pl.* c. 28. *Plotin. En. l.* 2. c. *Jambl. de Myſt. S.* 4. c. 5. *Porphyr. ſent. c.* 34.

(r) Ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶσ' ἀρετή 'στι.

CHAP. II.

1. *The Law of Nature defin'd with reſpect to the promulgation of it is The comprehenſion of our natural Notices of what is Law. Thoſe Notices diſtinguiſh'd.* Sect. 1. *Our Natural Notices of what is Law are from the notic'd Exiſtence of God.* Sect. 2. *From the nature of well and evil doing conjoyn'd with the natural Frame of the Mind. Several Objections againſt the ancient Account of the Law of Nature anſwer'd.* Sect. 3. *Our natural Notices of what is Law are from the Nature of things, from natural Inſtincts, and from the Senſe of Conſcience.* Sect. 4. *Of a twofold Notion of the Law of Nature in reſpect of the obſervation of it.*

I. THE divine Moral Law is thus far the Law of Nature, It is the comprehenſion of what is in its own nature matter of Law, and This is the Law that is notic'd by the Light of Nature; yet it may not be called The Law of Nature without diſtinction and limitation of Senſe. For the Law of Nature (according to its true and uſual definition) is this Moral Law *only as it is notic'd by natural Light*; ſo that the Law of Nature conſider'd with reſpect to the promulgation of it muſt be defin'd *The comprehenſion of our natural Notices of what is Law.* Theſe natural Notices are of two ſorts (ſo that the Law of Nature is of a twofold Notion as in reſpect of the *Obligation* of it, ſo in reſpect of the *promulgation* of it;) for ſome of them have only *The Verity of natural Notices*, others have not only *the Verity, but the Notoreity of natural Notices*, which therefore have a greater promulgation: but both are *Notitiæ Communis*, common natural Notices of Religion and Virtue *and of what is Law*, the Syſtem whereof is *the Law of Nature.* Nature is a term of multifarious ſignification, but the ambiguity of it (ſo far as is requiſite in this Argument of the Law of Nature) is taken away by *Tertullian*, who underſtandeth by it *Mundane Nature* (of which our Humane Nature is a part) *the conſtitution of Mundane Nature, or the natural Mundane Conſtitution of things* (with whatever falleth within that Comprehenſion) and he oppoſeth it to *Prophecy*, which is Supernatural Revelation. (*s*) *This whole revolving Orb of things atteſteth the Reſurrection of the Dead. Nature is thy firſt Miſtreſs of Diſcipline, which God premis'd, deſigning that Prophecy ſhould ſucceed, that ſo thou mighteſt more eaſily give credit to Prophecy being a Diſciple of Nature.* The Notices of what is Law, which are from the Inſtitution of this Mundane Nature, eſpecially of our own, are *the Laws of Nature*, which (in the *firſt place*) noticeth *the Being of God*, whoſe Exiſtence is Law.

(s) *Totus hic ordo revolubilis rerum teſtatio eſt reſurrectionis mortuorum.* —— *Præmiſit tibi* (Deus) *Naturam magiſtram ſubmiſſurus & prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiæ diſcipulus Naturæ.* De Reſurr. carn. c. 12.

Section I.

Our natural Notices of what is Law, are from the Exiſtence of God notic'd by Nature.

I. MUndane Nature (that comprehenſion of the Works of the Creation) clearly noticeth to Mankind the Exiſtence of God, which is written in this great Book or Volume of the World in Capital Letters, to be ſeen and read of all Men. *For the inviſible things of Him from the Creation of the World are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made, even his Eternal Power and Godhead,* Rom. 1. 20. *There is no Speech nor Language, where their Voice* (the Voice of the Heavens and the Heavenly Bodies) *is not heard: Their Line* (or loud Voice rather) *is gone out through all the Earth, and their words to the end of the World. Pſal.* 19. 3, 4. If we ask whence it is, and whoſe doing is it, that there is ſuch an admirable Syſtem, as our Eyes behold, with all the Excellencies and Conveniences, the Parts, Furniture, and Inhabitants thereof? In anſwer thereto univerſal Nature proclaimeth, the great God formed all things. Such is the Origination of things in Theiſm, wherewith Atheiſm thus far agreeth, they both ſuppoſe, *that a thing cannot be made by it ſelf* (for then it muſt be Exiſtent before it is Exiſtent) *that it is impoſſible, that all things ſhould be made*; *that if at any time there was nothing, there never could have been any thing* (for ſomething cannot come from nothing;) *that ſomething was from Eternity unmade, increate, ſelf-exiſtent, and abſolutely independent.* Thus far there is no diſagreement between the Atheiſts and the Theiſts (or Religioniſts;) the only matter in debate is, whether *this acknowledg'd Eternal ſomething* (which is *neceſſarily Increate, neceſſarily Exiſtent, and abſolutely Independent*) is ſuch an Eternal ſomething *as the Religioniſts God*, or whether it be only *the univerſal Matter or the Material World*, as the Atheiſts ſuppoſe? But becauſe this acknowledg'd Eternal Something is neceſſarily *Increate*, it muſt be ſuch a thing, to which it neceſſarily belongeth, to be of Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection: Nor could it neceſſarily belong to this Eternal ſomething, to be *Self-exiſtent*, but becauſe it neceſſarily belongeth to it, to be of Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection, which plainly ſpeaketh it to be the Religioniſts God. And the *abſolute Independence* which neceſſarily belongeth to it, is neceſſarily an Honour, Dignity and Nobilitation of Eſtate, the ſupreme Honour and Dignity, that is, *the Sovereignty of Eſtate*; which again ſpeaketh this Eternal ſomething, to be the Religioniſts God. To be abſolutely Independent, is to be of the Subject-tranſcendent Condition, which therefore is proper to the Imperial Eſtate of the Religioniſts God. Self-exiſtence and Exiſtence from Eternity is ſuch a Sublimity of Condition, which cannot in Congruity be attributed to any mean thing, but is peculiar to ſuch a ſomething, that is of higheſt Excellency. Neceſſary Exiſtence from Eternity is the greateſt Exiſtence, the greateſt perfection of Exiſtence, and peculiarly (the Religioniſts) God-exiſtence, in whoſe Idea alone *neceſſary Exiſtence* is compris'd; which therefore cannot belong to the vile imperfect Matter, which ſcarce exiſteth. That which neceſſarily exiſteth and from Eternity, is τὸ ἀεὶ ὂν, *that which always is*, not ſubject to Mutation, Generation and Corruption, as the Matter is, in which we have nothing of the Idea of *an Eternal ſomething*; but in the Religioniſts God there is the whole of that Idea. Reaſon can aſſign a Cauſe and Reaſon of his Self-exiſtence from Eternity, but not of the Matters or the material Worlds (t) *that have not in themſelves the Cauſe of their exiſting.*

In Theiſm the Univerſe of Rationals is well conſtituted and as it ought to be. The Conſtitution of it is *the Beauteous-beneficial* (as that of a Family, a City, a Kingdom or Empire;) for it conſiſteth of a Creature-tranſcendent Sovereignty and of the Subject-eſtates. But the Atheiſts *Head-leſs* and *Body-leſs* Univerſe is horribly amiſs, and it could not be ſo conſtituted by eternal immutable neceſſity; for what is by eternal immutable neceſſity, could never be otherwiſe, and therefore cannot be amiſs. Such a bad Conſtitution of the Univerſe (which is without Regularity, Order and Government) cannot be by Natural Neceſſity, and it is againſt Legal Neceſſity (it may not be) nor is it probable, to be, ſeeing all the known parts of the Univerſe of Rationals conſiſt of Polities, wherein there is a Regent and Subject-party. Without a Regent Party the material World alſo would be a Chaos, not a κόσμ☉, *beauteous mundane Syſtem continu'd in great order and regularity.* (u) Ἔϛιν ἓν ὁ διοικῶν, *therefore there is one that adminiſtreth it.*

II. The Origination of Things in Theiſm is in ſuch order, which is natural and poſſible: But Atheiſm inverteth it (beginning at the wrong end) and originateth things in ſuch an Order, which is unnatural and impoſſible. *(w) For in the things that are generated the Proceſs is not upwards, but downwards.* That an Univerſe of imperfect Beings ſhould iſſue from *a Being abſolutely perfect*, is no more unnatural or impoſſible, than that a Poet ſhould make a Verſe, or the Morning Son ſhould produce Vapours: But that an Univerſe of Beings of great Perfections (Vital and Intellectual, Natural and Moral) ſhould be produc'd meerly by the mundane Matter (which is of all things the moſt imperfect) is as unnatural and impoſſible, as that the Verſe ſhould make the Poet, or the Vapours ſhould produce the Morning-Sun. That Nonſence ſhould generate Sence, and the imperceptive ſtupidity of Matter ſhould produce perceptive Life, Cogitation, Reaſon and Underſtanding; that the aſcent of things ſhould be upwards from the Matter producing all the higher Orders of Beings of manifold Species and Ranks, of various kinds and degrees of Perfection (inanimate, animate, vegetative, Senſitive, Rational) that the greater plenty of Perfection ſhould be the Product of the greater Penury (as if the greater Summ ſhould be the Product of the leſſer) is in the Judgment of common Sence, plainly impoſſible. Alike impoſſible it is, that the matter of an Houſe ſhould without an Architect build it ſelf into an Houſe and repleniſh it with Inhabitants. And it is impoſſible, that any Beings, or that the material World ſhould be Self-exiſtent, that have not neceſſary Exiſtence included in their Nature.

The Atheiſts ſuppoſe, that the World was made, but ſome diſſenting Brethren amongſt them rather ſuppoſe, *that the Frame of the World was Self-exiſtent from Eternity*, and conſequently it was Self-moving from Eternity. But as it cannot be Self-exiſtent not having neceſſary Exiſtence included in its Nature, ſo for the ſame Reaſon Matter cannot be *Self-moving*, and to ſuppoſe, that Bodies can move themſelves, that reſt is incompetible to them, Motion Eſſential, that they mov'd one another infinitely from Eternity, are impoſſible ſuppoſitions and Contradictions to the Evidence of common Sence. So the Self-exiſtence of Mankind from Eternity is an impoſſible Suppoſition; for as no Rational Man or Men now in being can poſſibly be of this Opinion, that he or they are Self-exiſtent from Eternity: ſo it was in all the Generations, that are paſt. Nor could they be Exiſtent from Eternity, for let us ſuppoſe, the

---

(t) Μὴ ἔχοντα ἐν αὐτοῖς τὴν αἰτίαν τȣ̃ εἶναι. *Simplic. in Epict. c.* 38. *p.* 202.

(u) *Epict. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

(w) Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τοῖς γεννωμένοις, ὐκ ἔϛι πρὸς τὸ ἄνω ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ κάτω χωρεῖν. *Plotin. En.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 16.

Generations of Men that are paſt, to have been as infinite as we can imagine, yet we clearly and evidently diſcern, that all of them muſt neceſſarily begin to live (whence they muſt have a firſt moment of their Exiſtence) and therefore none of them could poſſibly Exiſt from Eternity. That our Earth, is of late Formation, appeareth from the late Invention of Letters and Arts, the known Plantation of moſt Countries, the gradual decreaſe of Mountains and gradual increaſe of Mankind.

III. If we ſuppoſe Matter and Motion, to have exiſted from Eternity (without a firſt Cauſe or Mover) yet as they could produce nothing higher than certain modes or accidents of Matter (not Mind or Reaſon) ſo neither could the Matter by the motion of its Particles fortuitouſly or mechanically form the viſible World. (x) *For if any one ſhould carry to* Scythia *ſuch a Sphere as* Poſidonius *made, that doth but repreſent the motion of the Planets, who amongſt thoſe Barbarians can doubt, but that ſuch a Sphere was made by Reaſon?* No Man is ſo mad as to think, that an artificial Sphere, an excellent Book or a magnificent Building were made by themſelves meerly by the Mechanical motion of their own Materials; yet what mean and contemptible pieces of Artifice are all artificial Spheres, Books and Buildings compar'd with the bright and vaſt Celeſtial Spheres, the immenſe and goodly Volume and ſtupendious Structure of the viſible World? The generality of Mankind therefore in all Ages have been convinc'd of the Exiſtence of a Deity (y) by beholding and contemplating the heavenly Bodies and the Structure of the viſible World, the parts whereof relate to certain Operations and Uſes, to which they are admirably fitted; and they relate to one another and are aptly combin'd into one harmonious habitable World, wherein *Artificialneſs* and *wiſe Deſign* is every where viſible, ſuch Artificialneſs and wiſe Diſpoſal, ſuch Order and Regularity, as the contemplative mind of Man can neither ſufficiently underſtand nor admire, and which plainly demonſtrateth, that things were not left to the blind agitation of the matter (which cannot model, diſtinguiſh, proportionate, nor do things in number weight and meaſure, nor do them ſo well as the greateſt Reaſon can do no better) but that there is a Maker of all things, who well underſtood what he had to do, is of immenſe Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power, and that the World is in all the Parts of it the Work of *a wonderful Providence.* Such is the ordinary Phænomenon of Gravity and the diſtant Poles of the *Æquator* and *Ecliptick* (repugnant to the Mechanick Laws) ſuch is the marvellous Light of the Sun and ſuch is our *Earth* (furniſh'd with two great Lights) that revolveth diurnally about its own Axis with ſuch equability and conſtancy of motion, that it never varieth one minute; that revolveth annually about the Sun with its Axis of a duely inclining Poſture, of a perpetual Paralleliſm to it ſelf, and is exactly confin'd within the Tropicks, hath its Surface cloath'd with Green, is a Terraqueous Globe, involv'd in a convenient Atmoſphere (z) furniſh'd with copious Stores of Water, with multifarious ſorts of *Minerals*, *Animals* (in all reſpects ſuited to their Element) *Vegetables* (of admirable Contexture and many of them of exquiſite Beauty) with all ſorts of Seeds or Seminal Principles (which are alſo propagated for continuance of the Species) as thoſe of Plants, which are made moſt elaborately, and are ſo fitted, that they are manifeſtly deſign'd for Vegetation. It is not probable, that any of theſe things had been, if there had been no higher cauſe of things than the rude Agitations of the Matter (which knoweth no Beauty or final Cauſe) no Reaſon can be aſſign'd, why any of them are but only from the final Cauſe (it is for *the Beſt*, that they ſhould be ſo) and from the Wiſdom of the Creator of all things, who deſigned for them End and Uſe. For who can doubt, but that Parental Nature which hath furniſh'd Animals with organical parts for the Reception, Maſtication, digeſtion and diſtribution of Food, hath alſo provided the Herbs and Graſs and Plants and their Fruit, to be their Food and Phyſick, and that they were made for this end and uſe? That the Feet were made for walking, the Hands for working, the Eyes for ſeeing, and that Light and Eyes were deſign'd for one another? (a) ***Who is it then, that hath ſuited and adapted this to that, and that to this?*** (b) That hath made the Fruits of the Earth for Animals, Animals for Man, as the Horſe for carrying him, the Ox for ploughing, the Dog for hunting and keeping Houſe?

IV. It muſt be an intelligent Cauſe (not the ſenſleſs Matter) that diverſify'd the Matter into ſuch innumerable Species of Beings as this World conſiſteth of (all which are of a regular Idea and have their Specific Natures and Properties) that inſtituted a beauteous Order and gradual Subordination of them (of Plants to Animals and Animals to Men) that adjuſted the growth of Animals, determin'd their Stature, gave them their Beauty and their uſefulneſs, their diſtinction into Male and Female (which are manifeſtly deſign'd the one for the other) endow'd them with their admirable Inſtincts, made ſome of them *Oviparous*, others *Viviparous*, ſome with ***Wings*** and others with *Fins*, of which differences amongſt Animals no mechanical Cauſe can be aſſign'd, but a Reaſon may be aſſign'd from the final Cauſe, which ſheweth, that they were not ſo made without Reaſon. Which alſo appeareth from the Fabrick of the Bodies of Animals, of the Formation and Organization whereof it is madneſs, to pretend to give a mechanical Account (why the Brains and Lungs, and Nerves and Membranes, the Veins and Arteries, the Bones, Joints and Ligaments, the *Valvulæ* and Fibres were ſo fram'd and ſituated) yet the wiſe contrivance that is in them filleth the Books of Phyſicians and Anatomiſts, who find in them nothing inept, nothing in vain, and the Artifice that is in them ſo amazingly exquiſite and elaborate, that all the Works of Human Art are but a bungle if compar'd with the Body of an Animal. That the rudely agitated Matter can form it ſelf into Clocks, Engines of War and Muſical Inſtruments, is much more credible, than that it can form it ſelf into the Bodies of Animals. And if one ſhould ſuppoſe, that the agitated Particles of ſenſeleſs Matter did of old of their own accord ſpin themſelves into Threads, that theſe Threads of themſelves did Weave themſelves into pieces of Cloth (of numerous kinds) that theſe pieces of Cloth did make themſelves into

---

(x) *Cic de N. D. l.* 2.

(y) *Plutarch. de placit. Phil. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *Sext. Empir. adv. Mathem. p.* 312.

(z) *Vid. S. Chryſoſt. T.* 7. *p.* 7, 9. *&c.*

(a) Τίς οὖν ὁ ἁρμόσας τοῦτο πρὸς ἐκεῖνο, κἀκεῖνο πρὸς τοῦτο; *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(b) *Fructus quos terra gignit animantium cauſa, animantes autem hominum, ut equum vehendi cauſa, arandi bovem, venandi & cuſtodiendi canem.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

Garments of Thouſands of regular ſhapes hugely different, and alſo into ſome Hundreds of the very ſame ſhape, and that when thoſe Garments were worn out, the Matter of its own accord made it ſelf into new ones exactly like the former (although it is much more than ten Thouſand to one, that it doth not twice hit upon the ſame Form) this would be a much more credible Hypotheſis than this Atheiſtick Hypotheſis touching the Origine of Animals; that the agitated Particles of Matter did of their own accord form themſelves at firſt into certain *Stamina* of the Parts of Animals, next into Organical Parts, and next into perfect Animals of numerous and hugely different kinds, and into a great number of individuals of the ſeveral kinds, which are propagated from one Generation to another, with as great regularity as the Body of an Animal is form'd. It conſiſteth of a vaſt variety of Parts and Organs, of exquiſite Size, Situation, Temper, Texture, Connexion, Diſtinction; every Animal is form'd with ſuch Organs as are ſuitable to it, its Organical Parts are admirably fitted for their ſeveral Functions, and thoſe Functions are ſuch as the Oeconomy of the whole requireth (Maſtication, Deglutition, Concoction, Fermentation, Chylification, Sanguification, Separation, Percolation, Reſpiration, Nutrition, Generation, local Motion, various Senſation (and other Functions of Life) the Parts of an Animal and their Functions conſtitute one orderly Oeconomy of the whole; therefore they were made by an intelligent Artiſt, who had the whole in his Mind and deſign'd the good thereof. The ſeveral parts of it are the wonders of his Divine Art; for ſuch is that eximious Organ the Eye, which is ſo commodiouſly ſeated and guarded, conſiſteth of ſuch a variety of Parts ſo admirably compoſ'd and put together, is of ſuch curioſity of Structure and ſo many Excellencies, and ſo admirably fitted for its Function and Office, that every one who will not ſhut the Eyes of his Mind, cannot fail to diſcern, that it was made by a Divine Artiſt for the uſe of Seeing. Such is the *rete mirabile* in the Brain, and the *plexus pampiniformis*, elſewhere; the Fabrick of the *aſpera Arteria*, which is cover'd with the *Epiglottis* and is ſmooth in that part, which toucheth the *Æſophagus*; the bending of the *Arteria Aorta* a little above the Heart, and the Fabrication of the *Valvulæ* of the Heart and of the Veins; the concurrent Organs for the Ampliation and Coarctation of the Breaſt in Reſpiration (c) *about which Motions the Mechanic Artifice of the Creator (which is plainly adapted to Mathematic Rules) we cannot ſufficiently admire.* And who can chuſe but admire that ſtrange Proviſion of Temporary Parts and of Nutriment, which provident Nature maketh for the *Fœtus* during the time of Geſtation? What we have ſaid of the Bodies of Animals is in great degree applicable to Plants (d) in which the Root, the Stalk, the Flower, the Seed, with their numerous conſtitutent Parts Lignous and Parenchymous (the Skin, cortical Body, Veſſels, Fibres, Covers, Pith, Radicle, Lobes and ſuch more) and even the Claſpers, Thorns, Hairs, Globulets, are admirably fitted for an uſe and purpoſe (ſome ſervice of the Plant) and are manifeſtly deſign'd thereto.

V. Atheiſm can give no Account of the Origination of Mankind; for thoſe Accounts which the old Atheiſtick Philoſophers gave of it, were as groſs Foolery as the Fictions of the Poets. Such is the Conceit of *Anaximander* (e) that the firſt Men were generated in the Bellies of Fiſhes, and were there nouriſh'd, till they were able to help themſelves, and then they were caſt upon the dry Land. Which portentous Conceit is as wiſe as that of *Epicurus* (f) that the Slime of the Earth being heated there grew out of it certain Wombs (or Bags) wherein the firſt Men (and other Animals) were form'd, for whoſe nouriſhment thoſe Wombs drew out of the Earth a milky Liquor, and theſe being excluded from their Wombs (the Earth ſtill affording them Milk) and Adult propagated their Kind. So *Democritus* ſuppoſ'd, that Men at firſt were generated out of Water and Slime (or Mud) or roſe out of the Earth by the motion of the Matter. But if *Mother* Earth thus produc'd Mankind at firſt, it is much, that of ſo long a time, there were never ſince any the like Productions (ſeeing Nature obſerveth fix'd and determinate Laws and is conſtant in obſerving them) and that now Mankind cannot be generated but by Propagation from their kind. As the King of *Siam* ask'd the *French* Miſſionaries (g) if the Sun in Europe was the ſame with theirs in the *Indies* (becauſe at the ſame time he appear'd different in thoſe two places:) So we muſt ask the *Epicureans*, if their Child-bearing Earth was the ſame with ours? For our Earth is as inept for Child-bearing, as Fiſhes are for ingendring Human Fleſh. She hath no Seminal Principles for Human Productions, nor any Faculty of conceiving with Child, and if any Nurſlings were committed to her care, ſhe muſt neceſſarily expoſe them, and could not educate them. If of old ſhe afforded Milk, yet ſhe could not thereby originate Mankind, unleſs ſhe could alſo contrive and form Human Bodies (wherein there are as many Miracles as Parts) nor would her Nutriment ſignifie any thing, unleſs ſhe could alſo furniſh them with all the marvellous Organs of Nutrition (of Deglutition and Concoction) their Tunicles, Muſcles, Glandules, ſeveral ſorts of Fibres, their ſhape and ſituation, their Dilatation and Contraction, opening and ſhutting, Faculties of Digeſtion, Retention, Expulſion, the Commixtures and Secretions that are made in them with the Cauſes of them, the Periſtaltick motion of the Inteſtines, their *Valvulæ* to hinder Regurgitation, their Convolution, Corrugation and Cells, their marvellous Intertexture (the Meſentery) and the Nett-work that covereth them, the Milky Veſſels with their Inſertion into the Inteſtines and their *Valvulæ*, wherein a ſuperlative Wiſdom of Parental Providence appeareth. Which hath alſo eſtabliſhed ſuch a courſe of Nature, that when a Woman hath brought forth a Child, her Breaſts ſhould be full of Milk.

> ——— ——— — (h) *quòd omnis*
> *Impetus in Mammas convertitur ille Alimenti.*

But from theſe Legends of the old Atheiſtick Philoſophers it appeareth, that the Philoſophy of Atheiſm is an Atheiſtick Credulity and Phantaſtry devoid of any colour of probability. (i) *But this is the Principal Wiſdom of our times: It is an eaſie matter to deny any*

(c) *Circa hos motus divini conditoris mechanicen ad regulas mathematicas planè adaptatam, ſatis admirari non poſſumus.* Dr. Willis Pharmac. Ration. Par. 2. S. 1. c. 1.

(d) Dr. *Grew Phil. Hiſt. of Plants*, B. 1. c. 1.

(e) *Plutarch. ſympoſ. l.* 8. *c.* 8.

(f) *Lucret. l.* 5. *Cenſorin. de die nat. c.* 4. *Lactant. l.* 7. *c.* 7.

(g) *Le Compte's Memoirs of China*, *p.* 487.

(h) *Lucret. l.* 5.

(i) *Sed hæc ſumma ſapientia noſtrorum temporum: Facile eſt* *thing, that thou mayeſt be counted wiſer than others*, as *Cardan* complaineth.

VI. The Soul of Man is of ſuch a Nature and Nobilitation, that it cannot be deriv'd from the Matter, whence it appeareth, that God is the Maker of it and of the World. For ſuch are the Faculties and Operations of the Mind and Soul of Man, *Vital Perception*, *Senſation*, *Cogitation*, *Imagination*, *Memory*, *ſpontaneous Motion*, *Self-conſciouſneſs and Self-reflexion*, *Intellection and the noble* Operations *of Reaſon*, *Liberty of Will and Agency*, (whereby in many reſpects and in great degree ſhe is ἄγαλμα θεοῦ, *a Statue or Image of the Deity*) that are plainly incompetible to that kind of Subſtance *Matter or Body* in general, to an organiz'd Human Body and to every Member thereof. No Effect can tranſcend the Perfection of its Cauſe: But theſe Faculties and Operations are certainly great Perfections, that far tranſcend the Matter with its Modifications. *Self-conſciouſneſs* and *Self-reflection* (which imply Self-penetration) is directly repugnant to the very Nature and Eſſence of the Matter, which is eſſentially *Self-impenetrable. Spontaneous Motion* (our immitting and directing the Animal Spirits into the Muſcles in order to local Motion, by an Act of Volition upon conſulting and deliberating within our ſelves touching Good and Evil) is an Act of *free Self-determining Agency*, whereas all the Motions of Matter (in reſpect of it ſelf) are purely neceſſary, and according to certain Laws of Motion. A Body cannot act but neceſſarily, as it is cauſed to act by ſome other; Atheiſm therefore that maketh Man nothing more than a corporeal Machine, bereaveth Mankind of that Liberty of Agency, whereby they are capable of deſerving Praiſe and Diſpraiſe, Rewards and Puniſhments, and thereby deſtroyeth Laws and Government. But Men may be certain, that they have within themſelves an intelligent Self-determining Mind and Soul, which cannot be deriv'd from the Dirt *the Brute-corporeal Matter*, which aſcertaineth the Being of God, and whereby themſelves are Men, that tranſcend the Brutes, to whoſe low Line and Level the Atheiſts degrade themſelves, and why ſhould they not be us'd like Dogs that will be no better than Dogs? Man is not like the Brutes, that have no higher cognitive Faculty than Sence and Imagination, and that look no further than the Phantaſms of Sence without at all Philoſophizing about them; his reaſoning Mind inquireth into the Nature and Cauſes of them, maketh a Judgment of them, and rectifieth the Errours of Sence; his Cogitations are not confin'd to the Objects of Sence, he ſearcheth into all recondite and myſterious Things, contemplateth things purely intelligible, reckoneth and numbreth (which the Brutes cannot) and the Natures and Eſſences of things that are univerſal and beyond Sence, are his Objects of Science. The Soul her ſelf exerteth *the Second Notions*, and becauſe a corporeal Subſtance can have no Perceptions, but only corporeal Impreſſes, therefore theſe *Noemata* of the Mind are a certain Demonſtration, that there is an incorporeal Subſtance in Man. Not only the *Logical* and *Mathematical* Terms, but our ordinary Terms of Language (as Relation, Difference, Good, Evil) have a certain Meaning and intelligible Notion, but no Phantaſm belonging to them. And as the Mind hath the Notion of many things, of which there can be no Phantaſm in Imagination: So there are many things corporeal, which ſhe clearly and diſtinctly underſtandeth, yet cannot clearly and diſtinctly imagine (as a *Chiliagonum* and the infinite diviſibility of quantity) and her Mathematical Ideas (as a plain Superficies, a round Globe) according to the exactneſs and accuracy of them are not to be found in external Matter. The Intelligent Mind withſtandeth the hurry of Paſſion, the inveiglements of Sence, the impoſture and tricks of Phancy; ſhe compareth the Phantaſms of Sence and Imagination, and judgeth of them, formeth Propoſitions, maketh Deductions, and cannot but form thoſe Propoſitions called *common Notions*, which ſhe knoweth to be *Eternal Verities* without any Information from Sence. Human Nature therefore is of an higher Species than the Senſitive; as bad as it is, yet there are many Inſtances in it of great Abilities for Theory and Practice, of admirable Endowments of Wiſdom and Virtue, of Invention and Judgment, of Underſtanding and Elocution, of Wit and Memory, of Policy and Prowess, of Arts and Sciences, whoſe Original is certainly from the Religioniſts Parental Nature. (k) *Artes innumerabiles repertæ ſunt docente Natura.*

VII. In Human Nature (degenerate) there are ſuch Moral and Religious Endowments, ſuch laudable Qualities and Properties, ſuch a kindly ſort of Inſtincts and Inclinations, that plainly ſpeak its divine Original and give Atteſtation to the Exiſtence of God. For who doth not approve and applaud Beneficence, Faithfulneſs and Juſtice? And who doth not vilifie and deteſt Maliciousneſs, Fraud and Injuſtice? A common Goodneſs of Nature, Humanity, Ingenuity, Generoſity, a natural Gratitude, Sociableneſs, Friendlineſs, a ſingular Affection towards near Relations, and civil Virtue, is common to Mankind in general, and was found in great plenty in the Heathen World. Atheiſm therefore is monſtrouſly unnatural, which together with the Exiſtence of God (Parental Nature) diſcardeth all good Nature, all Obligation to it, any Inſtitution of it by the Author of Nature, and any ſuch Inſtincts in Man's Nature. (l) *A Father is nothing, a Son is nothing* (Atheiſts make no account of natural Relation or Affection) *with them Affection to our Offſpring is not Natural.* (m) *You Epicureans ſuppoſe, that Men would not be benign and beneficent, if they were not weak* (if it was not meerly out of Self-intereſt, as fearing or needing others) *not acknowledging any natural Love or Affection.* Atheiſm therefore is deſtructive of common Goodneſs of Nature, which is manifeſtly implanted in Man by Parental Nature, whence the Ants have their Prudence, the Bees their Polity and Sexangular Cells, the Birds their curioſity in building their Neſts and care of their Young. There could have been no ſuch Goodneſs in Man's Nature, as now there is, if God was not the Author of Nature; nor would there be ſuch civil Virtues, as there are amongſt Men, if God was not the Maker and Providential Governour of Mankind, and if Man was not made by God Civil-ſocietive. In ſuch ſenſe *Cicero* may be underſtood, to ſay and to ſay well (n) *Mind*, *Faith*, *Virtue*, *Concord*,

---

negare quid vis, ut ſapiens habearis. Cardan. de rer. Var. l. 16. c. 92.

(k) Cic. de Leg. l. 1.

(l) Ὁ πατὴρ οὐδέν ἐστι, ὁ υἱὸς οὐδέν ἐστιν. Οἷς μὴ φυσική ἐστι πρὸς τὰ ἔκγονα φιλοστοργία. *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. c. 23. & l. 2. c. 20.

(m) *Ne homines quidem cenſetis, niſi imbecilli eſſent, futuros beneficos & benignos. Nulla eſt Caritas naturalis.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(n) *Si ineſt in homin*

Concord, whence could they come upon Earth but from above? The Wiſdom and Goodneſs of Parental Providence is ſeen in the uſefulneſs of thoſe Inſtincts of Nature call'd *The Paſſions* (which are implanted in Man and other Animals) for the Subſtantiality of Life conſiſteth in them, thereby Man hath a little Kingdom within himſelf (conſiſting of Subjects and Sovereign) the Paſſion of *Veneration* is requiſite in Government, *Anger* for the exerciſe of Fortitude, *Commiſeration* is for ſuccouring the Afflicted, *Fear* for avoiding Danger, and all the other Paſſions are of good uſe (which ſheweth, that Nature had a very wiſe and deſigning Author) and ſome of them (as the Paſſion of *Devotion*) are plain Indications, that Man was made for Religion. Mankind are by natural inſtinct (in ſome ſort) the devotional Suppliants of an inviſible ſuperiour Power, and have ſo ſtrong a propenſion to Religion, that they will rather worſhip Rivers, Trees and a Red Cloth, than live without a Religious Worſhip, of which the Deity alone is the due object. And as there would not have been ſuch a natural Appetite as Hunger, if there had been no Meat (for Nature doth nothing in vain:) So if there had not been a God, there would not have been in Man a natural propenſion to Religion. Mankind hath alſo *Natural Conſcience*, which is a conſciouſneſs of Duty and of Sin, of well and evil-doing with reſpect to an inviſible ſuperiour Power. *Metus Conſcientiæ* is one of their natural Paſſions, upon violating the Dictates of their Conſcience they have naturally a remorſe of Conſcience, and a preſage that ſome penal evil will befall them (from an inviſible ſuperiour Power) becauſe of the Evil which they have done; and upon well-doing according to their Conſcience they have naturally an hope and confidence of their ſafety and proſperity, and that doing well they ſhall fare well. (o) *Conſcience is the beſt Witneſs of a Deity.* (p) *God hath primordially endow'd the Soul with a Conſcience, which is the ſame in all Nations and People.* If any ſeem to themſelves, to have extinguiſh'd the Senſe of Conſcience, uſually they find the contrary, that they have only laid it to ſleep, and that when Troubles and Dangers come, it awaketh like a ſleeping Lion. Or if there be any that have totally extinguiſh'd it, theſe have manifeſtly extinguiſh'd the Light of Nature, and have done ſuch violence to their Minds, as is done to the Senſories of the Body by a violent Diſeaſe, whereby Senſation is deſtroy'd. *Natural Conſcience* implieth, that there is in Man the Faculty called *liberum arbitrium* (elſe it would be folly, for Men to be troubled for their evil-doings) and that there is a Law of Nature, a natural *Ethicks* and diſcipline of Morality, a well-doing and evil-doing, duty and ſin, antecedently to any Humane Inſtitution, which is a plain truth and plainly deſtructive to Atheiſm.

VIII. As the *Mundus Naturalis* is a well-made Syſtem, ſo is the *Mundus Humanus* as it conſiſteth of *Societies* (leſſer and greater Polities) that are beauteous and uſeful Structures. Theſe give an atteſtation to the Exiſtence of God; for none elſe can reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to be the Founder of them; and they ſhew, that Man is made and deſign'd for Society, whence the Exiſtence of God appeareth. The Atheiſts that diſcard the Exiſtence of God, diſcard therewith the natural Societiveneſs of Man, and not without great reaſon; for that God exiſteth and is the Maker of Man, is as evident, as that Man is made and deſign'd for Society. And it is evident, that Man is ſo made; for he is not only ſociable towards thoſe of his own kind by kindly natural Inſtinct and Inclination, as the Brutes are, but he is capable of proper Laws and Government, of minding the common good and of Arts needful for Humane Society. He hath the power of Speech, which would be in vain, if Man was not deſign'd to live in Society. His natural Paſſions of *Veneration*, *Glory*, *Shame*, manifeſtly relate to Society. So doth the thin Skin of his Face (through which his Cogitations and Paſſions make a diſcovery of themſelves) the ſmoothneſs of his Face (not cover'd with Hair as the Brutes) the pulchritude of his Countenance, the difference of Mens Countenances in vaſt variety (wereby they are known one from another) and the different Qualifications of Men, ſome being magnanimous, others of a ſofter temper, ſome being fitted for the Pen, others for the Plough, ſome to command, others to obey, that the welfare of the whole might be provided for, *by that which every Joynt ſupplieth.* Mankind are born in Families, conſtitute and live in Families, in which there is a conſtant cohabitation of both Sexes for their mutual help and comfort, for the propagation of their *Species*, and to take care of their Off-ſpring (which continueth weak and feeble much longer than that of Brutes, and therefore requireth a conſtant cohabitation and continued care of the Parents) theſe Family-Societies are plainly by the order and deſign of Nature, Mankind are manifeſtly deſign'd to live in Family-Societies (the firſt elementary Societies) which therefore derive their origin from Parental Providence, which alſo continueth the different Sexes of Animals (Male and Female) in due proportion throughout all Ages of the world. (ſ) *And becauſe Solitude is intolerable to every Man, even with an infinite abundance of Pleaſures, hence it is plain, that we are naturally deſign'd for a Conjunction and a Community.* Mankind are neceſſitated, to live in Society, in which there is no living without a *God* and *Providence*, *a Life to come* and *a Religion.* (q) For there can be no good of Virtue in Humane Life, if there be no Religion; nor any thing to reſtrain Men from any Heart-villainy, or any ſecret Villainy, or any Villainy that they can commit with ſafety and impunity in this World, nor from any Villainy ſave only ſo far as they want an opportunity to commit it. The Religion of an Oath muſt be out of doors. None can have the right of Authority and Sovereignty, nor can others be under a conſcientious obligation to Subjection and Obedience. Princes cannot be conſcientiouſly oblig'd, to keep Faith with their Neighbour-princes, or to govern their Subjects with Wiſdom and Juſtice, or to ſtand to the Pacts and Covenants which they make with them: nor can themſelves have any ſecurity from Aſſaſſination and Violence; *for Strength muſt be the Law of Juſtice.*

nere Mens, Fides, Virtus, Concordia, unde hæc in terras niſi à ſuperis defluere potuerunt? Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(o) *Conſcientia optima teſtis Divinitatis.* Tertull. de Teſtim. Anim.

(p) *Animæ à primordio Conſcientia Dei dos eſt, eadem nec alia & in Ægyptiis, & in Syris, & in Ponticis.* Idem c. Marcion. l. 1. c. 10.

(ſ) *Quodque nemo in ſolitudine vitam agere velit, ne cum infinita quidem voluptatum abundantia facilè intelligitur, nos ad conjunctionem congregationemque hominum & ad naturalem communitatem eſſe natos.* Cic. de Fin. l. 3.

(q) *Sine qua vita hominum ſtultitia, ſcelere, immanitate completur.* Lactant. de Ira, c. 8.

IX. The ancient Writers report (*r*) an univerſal conſent of Nations touching the Exiſtence of a Deity. Some modern Travellers ſay otherwiſe, and make an Exception of ſome barbarous unciviliz'd Nations at the Bay of *Soldania*, in *Braſil*, and the *Caribee* Iſlands, in *Newfoundland* and *New France*, the Natives whereof are ſaid to live without any acknowledgment of a God and Senſe of Religion. But although theſe Savages are ſo extremely degenerate into Bruitiſhneſs, that they ſcarce deſerve to be reckon'd amongſt Mankind, and if they live without Civil Government, they muſt be acknowledg'd hugely anomalous and diſſonant from the Nations, yet it is great raſhneſs and unadviſedneſs, to believe theſe Reports (*s*) of their total Irreligion. For ſome of theſe Reporters contradict themſelves (as *J. Lerius* manifeſtly doth) others of them are contradicted by other Travellers, that were better acquainted with theſe Savages and better underſtood their Sentiments. It is poſſible, that ſome perſons amongſt them may live in the total neglect of a God and a Religion; that thoſe who have little of Political Government (which they cannot be wholly without) have little Religion; and that the Univerſality of them make no great ſhew of any Religion: And this ſeemeth to be all the truth, that is in the Story. The Exiſtence of a Deity hath certainly the general conſent of Nations to recommend it, and is ſo evident, that the World of Mankind have always ſtood convicted of the truth of it; it may juſtly be reckon'd one of their common Notions, and becauſe it is the common Senſe of Mankind, it muſt be accounted true in the Judgment of common Senſe and according to the light of Nature. Had it been wholly an arbitrarious Fiction or Impoſture, it is not poſſible, that there could have been ſo univerſal an agreement both touching the Exiſtence of a Deity, and alſo the Properties and Attributes of a Deity, and that theſe Notices and Opinions ſhould not wear away and vaniſh (as Impoſtures do, that in proceſs of time are diſcover'd) but continue firm and immoveable throughout all Times and Ages. No Cauſe can reaſonably be aſſign'd of this ſo univerſal a Conſent but Nature, *Univerſal Mundane Nature and the Nature of Man.* (t) *Seeing this Opinon is not eſtabliſh'd by any Inſtitution, Cuſtom or Law, and among all without exception a firm conſent doth continue, it muſt neceſſarily be underſtood, that there are Gods, we having implanted or rather innate Notices of them; but that about which there is a conſent of all by nature, that muſt neceſſarily be true.* The belief of the Soul's Immortality and of a Life to come, which is the general Senſe of Mankind, and which inferreth the Exiſtence of a Deity, both iſſue from the ſame cauſe, and are the eminent Branches of Natural Religion, which is a Property of Man's Nature.

To theſe evident Notices of the Exiſtence of God from *Nature* we may annex *extraordinary and ſpecial Providences.* For although Providence is a ſomewhat lubricous Argument (the ways of governing Providence being various and myſterious) and although this ſort of Providences are no *ſenſible Miracles*, nor can ſo eaſily be diſtinguiſh'd as they from what is done by the meer agency of ſecond Cauſes; yet there are ſeveral Occurrences in Humane Affairs, that in fair and reaſonable conſtruction muſt be accounted *ſpecial Providences*, and carry the marks of a divine Hand. Such is the diſperſion of the Jews and their continuing a diſtinct People in their diſperſion (a thing that hath no parallel in Hiſtory) the portentous preſignifications (*u*) that have uſher'd in calamitous Wars, ſtrange deliverances of good Men and of Societies of good People, ſtrange diſcoveries of Plots and of Murders, remarkable Judgments that have befallen Perſecutors and Tyrants, and other wicked Grandees of the World; ſignal Anſwers of Prayer, and the decay and ruine of many great Families for their Injuſtice. (*w*) The ſudden riſe of the *Macedonian* and ruine of the *Perſian* Monarchy was plainly an Act of Divine Providence; the Heathen Poets and Hiſtorians with great reaſon aſcribe it to Fate, for *Darius* was manifeſtly blinded in his Conduct, when he fought with *Alexander.* (*x*) The greatneſs of the *Roman* Empire was decreed by Fate (ſaith *Machiavel*) and the ruine of it was by a Divine Fate, for the barbarous Northern Nations that devaſtated it, acknowledg'd, that their Invaſion of it was not of themſelves, *but they were divinely impell'd thereto.* The Juſtice of Providence is very viſible in thoſe Temporal Judgments, that have a conformity and reſemblance to the Sin, that is the cauſe of them. The iſſue of many Wars and Battels hath been determin'd by ſome ſpecial Providence. The Impunity of ſome Men outragiouſly wicked is not ſo great an Objection againſt Providence, but that ſome remarkable Inſtances of its Juſtice may reaſonably move an ingenuous Pagan, to make ſuch an acknowledgment, as *Manlius Torquatus* made, when finding *Annius* lying dead at the Foot of the Steps of the Temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus* (after an inſolent Speech which he had made againſt the *Romans*) he cried out, (*y*) *Eſt cæleſte Numen, es magne Jupiter: There is a God in Heaven, Thou art O mighty* Jove! *The Lord is known by the Judgment that he executeth*, as he is by Mundane Nature.

X. If the Exiſtence of God is naturally notic'd to Mankind, a Law of Religion and Virtue (which is the Law of Nature) is naturally notic'd unto them; for to be the Imperial Eſtate of God to us, is neceſſarily the Law of our *Subjection* and *Service* unto him, and of this Univerſal Righteouſneſs, that we ſin not againſt him. But this natural Notice of the Exiſtence of God and of a Law of Religion and Virtue is of a twofold Notion. For the Exiſtence of a Deity (Supreme Deity) in general, and a Law of Religion and Virtue in general hath *the Notoreity of a natural Notice to the World of Mankind:* And the Exiſtence of the true God with his Law of true Religion and Virtue *that hath not the Notoreity, hath the Verity of a natural Notice to the World of Mankind*; whence they are neceſſarily oblig'd to all that Religious Subjection and Service, Honour and Worſhip (Internal and External) which Sanctity and Piety is the comprehenſion of, and which is manifeſtly in its own nature Piety and God-ſervice, a virtuous and honourary congruity unto God. If he is notic'd to them as of right and due *the Imperial-eſtate of God to them*, they muſt neceſſarily have this Notice, that they are of right and by obligation his Subjects and Religioniſts, that are bound, to give unto him the rights and dues of his Godhead; which is a terrible Prohibition to them, not to live in Atheiſm (ſpeculative or practical)

(r) *Ariſtot. Met. l.* 12. *c.* 8. *Cic. de Leg. l.* 1. *de N. D. l.* 1. *Tuſc. l.* 1. *Sen. Ep.* 117. *Plutarch. adv. Colot. p.* 1125. *M. Tyr. diſſ.* 1.

(o) *Hoffman. umbr. in luce, p.* 49.

(t) *Cum enim non inſtituto aliquo aut more, aut lege, ſit opinio conſtituta, maneatque ad unum omnium firma conſenſio, intelligi neceſſe eſt eſſe Deos, quoniam inſitas eorum, vel potius innatas cognitiones habemus; de quo autem omnium natura conſentit, id verum eſſe neceſſe eſt.* Cic. de N. D. l. 1.

(u) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 5. c. 23.

(w) Dr. Jackson of the Div. Eſſ. and Attrib. par. 2. s. 2. c. 25.

(x) Ibid. c. 27.

(y) Liv. l. 8. c. 6.

practical) Profaneneſs, neglect, oblivion or contempt of God and his Service, not to alienate themſelves from Him, or be evil-doers towards Him, injurious, unthankful and unworthy, not to diſparage Him and make Him vile, not to put Diſgraces and Contumelies upon him, not to deny his Sovereignty and Attributes (by not making a virtuous and honourary acknowledgment of them) not to Paganize or Atheize the Deity or undeify Him (any way) nor to give his proper Honour to another, deifying Vilities and thereby blaſphemouſly reproaching God, which was a principal Crime of the Heathen World, which ſwarm'd with Idols and fictitious Deities, yet *knew God* (had the true God notic'd to them) Rom. 1 21. 19, 20, 18. τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *that which may be naturally known of God* was notic'd to them, *was manifeſt in them* (in their Minds) *for God had ſhew'd it unto them. His Truth* therefore (his practical Truth, namely, thoſe Notices and Inſtructions, Rules and Precepts which concern the Service of God) was not unknown to them, as the Apoſtle affirmeth. His Truth and their Duty could not but be notic'd, if the Exiſtence of the Imperial Eſtate of God was notic'd to them; knowing this they could not but know (in great degree) that juſt and agreeable worſhip and ſervice, which they ow'd unto Him, and that Man muſt be religious towards God. Not only *ſingly* but *in ſociety* Man muſt be religious towards God (the publick religious Worſhip in Aſſemblies and Societies of Men being highly honourary to God and beneficial to Man;) and ſeeing God is naturally notic'd unto all Men as a Sovereign Power over them, that ſuperintendeth their Affairs and Ways, is juſt in his Government, and will reward or puniſh them, as they are *well-doers* or *evil-doers* (ſo that they cannot be ignorant, that they muſt drink as they brew, and fare as they obſerve or violate the Truth which is notic'd unto them) it is manifeſt, that they are under the obligation of *Non licet impunè* not to be evil-doers but well-doers, and that a neceſſity of living the good life and of Univerſal Righteouſneſs is notic'd to all Men by the light of Nature, which noticeth the Exiſtence of God. The Heathen World that wallow'd in Impieties and Impurities, yet *knew the* Rom. 1. 32. *Judgment of God*, that Men ought not to be evil-doers, and *that they which do ſuch things* are evil-doers *and worthy of Death.* (z) *Verily there is a God, that heareth and ſeeth what we do, who will deal with every Man, as he is well or ill deſerving*, ſaith an Heathen Comedian.

(a) *Men and Angels are created with Reaſon, to know by whom they are made*, καὶ μετὰ νόμου τοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κρίνεσθαι, ἐὰν παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον πράττωσι, *and with a Law that they muſt be judged by him, if they do what is contrary to right reaſon.* (b) *All Men that behold the World and the ordinate motion in Heaven and the fix'd Stars, and the order of the Planets that are carry'd by a contrary motion, that diſcern the Temperature of the Air for the benefit of Animals and of Men chiefly, and the abundance of things that are made for Men*, εὐλαβείσθωσαν δυσαρεστόν τι ποιῆσαι τῷ δημιουργῷ τοῦ παντὸς καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν, *let them piouſly fear, to do any thing diſpleaſing to the Creator of all and of their Souls.* (c) *The Heavens teach all Men and Nations* διὰ τῆς ὄψεως, *by our ſeeing their Pulchritude, their Magnitude, their Height, their Situation, their Figure, their Permanency*, &c. διδασκόμενος διὰ τῆς ὄψεως προσκυνεῖς τὸν ποιήσαντα, *being taught by thine Eye-ſight thou worſhippeſt the maker of them.* That is the Natural Conſequence and the Law of Nature.

SECTION II.

The Law of Nature is notic'd to Mankind by the nature of well and evil-doing as underſtood by the Mind and diſcern'd by our natural Reaſon and Underſtanding.

I. AS every Man hath the Exiſtence of God externally notic'd unto him (the meaneſt Ruſtick who cannot but diſcern, that his Cow is made to give him Milk, her Paps to give ſuck, his Sheep to afford him Cloathing, hath God notic'd to him) and as the Mind of Man of it ſelf diſcerneth τὸ εὖ καὶ καλῶς, *the Well and Fit* that is in External Nature: in like manner what is *good* and *evil*, *right* and *wrong*, is (in good degree) notic'd to every Man, and the Mind of her ſelf diſcerneth what is the *Beauteous-Beneficial* and the *Foul-Maleficial* practice. (d) *Communis Intelligentia res nobis notas efficit*: common underſtanding noticeth theſe things to us. (e) *Men are ſelf-taught the knowledge of Virtue: we need not external teaching; for we have in our Nature the knowledge of it, without labour and toil, without going about and inquiring whether Temperance be good and profitable, with one Mind we all acknowledge it, and none maketh doubt of the Virtue: So we account Adultery evil, without labour or teaching we know the naughtineſs of the Sin. In theſe and the like computations of things all of us are ſelf-taught.* An Hebrew Doctor, *R. Aſar* ſaith, (f) the Chriſtians look upon this as the Summary of the Law of Nature, *Quod odioſum tibi eſt, proximo tuo nè feceris.* He ſpeaketh the Senſe of the ancient Chriſtian Writers, who often repreſent this Maxim as a Summary of the Law of Nature (although they are far from confining it thereto) and celebrate it for the ſelf-evident Juſtice thereof. *J. Mart.* looketh upon this as the Summary of Juſtice, (g) *He that loveth his Neighbour as himſelf, his volition of Goods to him will be the ſame as to himſelf.* (h) *Thou knoweſt the good which thou oughteſt to do to thy Neighbour* (ſaith S. *Baſil*) *that which thou would'ſt have another to do to thee. Thou knoweſt what is evil; that which thou would'ſt not have done to thee by another.* This knowledge of Good and Evil we have (ſaith he) from the ἀδίδακτος τῆς φύσεως νόμος, *untaught Law of Nature.* (i) *According to what is ſaid, they are a Law to themſelves* (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) *all the Sinners of the Earth are deſervedly counted Sinners; for there is none that doth an Injury to another, but he that would not have it done to himſelf; and in this he tranſgreſſeth the Law of Nature, which he cannot be ignorant of, becauſe he doth that which he will not ſuffer.* (k) *Art thou only a Man? doſt*

thou

(z) *Eſt profectò Deus, qui quæ nos gerimus auditque & videt Bene merenti benè pro fuerit, malè merenti par erit.* Plaut. in Captiv. Act. 2. Scen. 2.

(a) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 370.

(b) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. p. 411, 412.

(c) S. Chryſoſt. Ἀνδριαντ. 9.

(d) *Cic ap. Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. c. 7.

(e) Αὐτοδίδακτοι ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς γνῶσιν· οὐ δεόμεθα λόγων, οὐδὲ διδασκαλίας, ἔχομεν γὰρ ἐν τῇ φύσει τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐ χρεία πόνων, οὐδὲ καμάτων, ὥστε περιελθεῖν καὶ ζητῆσαι, εἰ καλὸν ἡ σωφροσύνη, καὶ χρήσιμον· ἀλλὰ κοινῇ γνώμῃ πάντες ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῦτο, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀμφιβάλλει περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς. οὕτω καὶ τὴν μοιχείαν κακὸν εἶναι νομίζομεν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα πόνων ἡμῖν δεῖ καὶ μαθήσεως, ὥστε γνῶναι τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ταύτης κακίαν, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις ψήφοις ἐσμὲν αὐτοδίδακτοι. *S. Chryſoſt. Hom.* 12. & 13. *ad Pop. Antioch.*

(f) *Hotting. Theſ. Phil.* p. 543.

(g) Ὁ τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπῶν, ὥσπερ αὐτῷ βούλεται ἀγαθὰ, κἀκείνῳ βουλήσεται. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 321.

(h) Οἶδας τί ποιήσεις τῷ πλησίον καλόν· ὃ σεαυτῷ βούλει παρ' ἑτέρου γίνεσθαι. οἶδας ὅτι ποτέ ἐστι τὸ κακόν· ὃ οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸς παθεῖν ἕλοιο παρ' ἑτέρου. *S. Baſil. Hexaem. Hom.* 9.

(i) *Secundum id quod ait, ipſi ſibi ſunt lex, non immeritò prævaricatores æſtimantur omnes peccatores terræ. Nullus enim eſt, qui faciat alteri injuriam, niſi qui ſibi fieri nolit. & in hoc tranſgreditur naturæ legem, quam non ſinitur ignorare, dum id quod facit non vult pati.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 118. Con. 25.

(k) *Apud ſe habet unde no*

thou not live in the ſociety of Mankind? every Man knoweth from himſelf what he ought to do to another. (*l*) *Inſtead of a written Law he hath Conſcience and Reaſon, which ſufficeth inſtead thereof*, as S. Chryſoſtom ſaith. (*m*) *The natural Law ſpeaketh in our Hearts, all the Goods are to be done and the Evils to be eſchew'd.* The Mind is of ſuch a frame, that ſhe naturally and rightly noticeth to all Men touching ſome things, that they are of ſuch a nature, that they cannot be done, and touching other things that they cannot be left undone, without the guilt and criminality of being Evil-doers, and that their being ſuch is contrary to the Mind of God, and ſubjecteth them to his punitive Diſpleaſure: as on the contrary, their being well-doers is according to the Mind of God, and intitleth them to his Favour and Rewards; *And the Syſtem of theſe natural Notices is the Law of Nature.* This definitive Notion of it is agreeable to the Senſe of the ancient Writers, whoſe Account of it I look upon as true and genuine in the main; and to make it appear ſuch, I will diſtinctly conſider the ſeveral Objections, which modern Writers have made againſt it.

II. One Objection againſt the ancient Writers account of the Law of Nature is, *that it ſuppoſeth the Legiſlative Power of Reaſon*, which is not to be ſuppos'd. (*n*) *Reaſon is not the Law or its Meaſure; neither can any Man be ſure, that any thing is a Law of Nature, becauſe it ſeems to him hugely reaſonable, neither if it be ſo indeed, is it therefore a Law. For Reaſon can demonſtrate, and it can perſwade, and invite, but not compel any thing but Aſſent, not Obedience, and therefore it is no Law.* Meer Reaſon is not Law, but Reaſon complicated with what is Law is neceſſarily Law, and ſuch is the Reaſon which the ancient Writers mean and ſpeak of, although they are not always careful, to repreſent it as ſuch, but often ſpeak of it, as if it was meer Reaſon. The Heathen generally look'd upon the Mind as a Demon or a God, and their rule was, (*o*) *to do all things, which the Demon willeth or injoyneth, which* Jupiter *hath appointed to preſide in every one, to be his Leader and Pædagogue, and to do nothing againſt my proper God and Demon*, which is the Mind, and the Mind ſo conſider'd is *Jupiter's* Vicegerent and is Legiſlative by his Authority: whence it might be called by ſome of them, (*p*) ὁ νομοθέτης νοῦς, *the Lawgiver-mind*. But moſt uſually the ancient Writers look upon the Law of Nature as a Law, that God hath put into our Nature and hath written in the Minds of Men. So S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, that when God formed Man (*q*) νόμον αὐτῷ φυσικὸν ἐγκατέθηκε, *he put into him a natural Law*: When Man was formed, the knowledge of the *facienda & fugienda* (ἡ γνῶσις τῶν πρακτέων) was implanted in him. So S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (*r*) *There is no Soul of Man that hath the uſe of Reaſon, in whoſe Conſcience God doth not ſpeak; for who but God writeth the natural Law in the Hearts of Men?* (*s*) *The true Law, not ingraven in Tables, nor cut in Braſs, but impreſs'd upon Minds.* In the ſame manner (*t*) *Philo* and the Pagan Theologers repreſent the Law of Nature (Right Reaſon) ſtiling it, *a Law immortal by an immortal Nature imprinted in an immortal Mind*, in contradiſtinction to mortal Laws that by this or that mortal are written on inanimate Papers or Pillars: (*u*) Sometime ſtiling it *Characters in the Mind:* (*w*) Sometimes *the unwritten Law.* But when Right Reaſon is thus intituled Law by the ancient Writers, they do not conſider it as *meer Reaſon* (which yet is fit to guide and govern) but they conſider it as complicated with what is Law. For as Right Reaſon noticeth what is *the well-doing and the evil-doing*, it is complicated with what is in its own nature matter of Law. And as it noticeth, that the *well-doing* and *the being well-doers* is according to the mind of God, and *the evil-doing* and the *being evil-doers* is againſt the mind of God, it is complicated with what is Law by a Superiour Authority. And that the Ancient Writers conſider Right Reaſon as thus complicated, appeareth from their ſtiling it, (*x*) κανόνα τὸν θεῖον, *the Divine Rule*, and from their ſaying, that (*y*) θεὸς ὁ νομοθέτης, *God is the Lawgiver here.* (*z*) *Unus eſt communis quaſi Magiſter & Imperator omnium Deus. Ille leges hujus Inventor, Diſceptator, Lator.* There is one common Maſter as it were and Commander of all, that is God. He is the Inventor, Examiner and Giver of this Law. The Laws of Nature muſt be conſider'd not as the Dictates of meer Right Reaſon but as the Dictates of *Conſcientious Right Reaſon.*

III. A ſecond Objection is made againſt the ancient Writers, that in their Account of the Law of Nature the proof of its Legiſlation from God is wanting. (*a*) *All Writers upon this Subject thought it ſufficient, to define the Law of Nature, to be only a dictate of Right Reaſon, without deducing its Authority from God as a Legiſlator: Or if they have ſuppos'd God the Author of it, as* Suarez *in his Book* de Legibus *and* Grotius *in his* de Jure Belli & Pacis *have done; yet they contented themſelves with ſuppoſing, that God had impreſs'd theſe Ideas upon Mens Souls, as ſo many innate Notions, which they call the Light of Nature.* (*b*) *This* Mr. Selden *hath ſuggeſted to the Moral Philoſophers, who are wont to conſider the Dictates of their Reaſon as Laws without ſufficient proof, either that they have the neceſſary form of Laws, or are eſtabliſh'd by God.* But this great Author himſelf hath ſhew'd, (*c*) that *a governing Providence juſt towards all* (remunerative or punitive) *as they are the Well-doers or the Evil-doers is notic'd and acknowledg'd in Chriſtianiſm, Judaiſm, Muhammediſm and Paganiſm.* Paganiſm aboundeth with Notices of it; and if this Principle is univerſally notic'd, and is generally entertain'd by the ancient Writers, it is impoſſible, that their Diſcipline of Morality ſhould be ſo defective, as not to ſhew, that the Dictates of Right Reaſon have at leaſt an equipollent Legiſlation from God and the form of Laws. Three things they are careful to obſerve and copiouſly diſcourſe. (1.) That the Mind is by God naturally furniſh'd

---

rit, quia quod ſibi non vult fieri, non debet facere alteri.—— Si non vis pati iſta, nunquid ſolus es homo? nonne in ſocietate vivis generis humani? Qui tecum factus eſt, ſocius tuus eſt. Ibid. in Pſal. 51. Enarr.

(l) Ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ νόμου τὸ συνειδὸς καὶ λογισμός. *S. Chryſoſt. in Ep. ad Rom.* λογ. ε.

(m) *Naturalis lex loquitur in cordibus noſtris, bona quæque facienda & vitanda mala.* S. Hieron. com. in Gal. 3. 2.

(n) *Ratio quatenus talis ſolùm & ſimplex ſuadet & demonſtrat, non jubet, aut ad officium, niſi ſuperioris eo qui jubetur, accedat ſimul auctoritas, obligat, neque enim imperare ſibi, neque ſe prohibere quiſquam poteſt.* Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l. 1. c. 7. Bp. Taylor. Duct. Dub. B. 2. c. 1. n. 30.

(o) Ποιεῖν ὅσα βούλεται ὁ δαίμων, ὃν ἑκάστῳ προστάτην καὶ ἡγεμόνα Ζεὺς ἔδωκεν· μηδὲν πράσσειν παρὰ τὸν ἐμὸν θεὸν καὶ δαίμονα. *M. Ant. l. 5. S. 10, 27. Gat. Not. p. 232. Hierocl. in aur. Carm. p. 118, 214. Grot. Not. in Rom. 2. 15.*

(p) *Hierocl. in aur. Car.* p. 209, 210.

(q) *Hom.* 12. & 13. *ad pop. Antioch.*

(r) *Nullam animam eſſe, quæ ratiocinari poſſit, in cujus conſcientia non loquatur Deus. Quis enim legem naturalem in cordibus hominum ſcribit, niſi Deus?* Suarez de Leg. l. 2. c. 5

(s) *Lex vera, non inſculpta tabulis, nec ære inciſa, ſed impreſſa mentibus.* S. Ambroſ. in Pſal. 104.

(t) *De boni Hom. Libert.*

(u) Χαρακτῆρας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ. *Epict. Diſſ. l. 4. c. 5.*

(w) Ὁ δὲ νοῦς καθάπερ ἐν πόλει νόμος, ἀλλὰ θεὸς μὲν ὁ νομοθέτης, ἄγραφος δὲ ὁ νόμος. *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 40.

(x) *Hierocl. ſupr.* p. 234.

(y) *M. Tyr. ſupr.*

(z) *Cic. apud Lactant. l. 6. c. 9. &* Selden. *ſupr. l. 1. c. 8.*

(a) *Mr. Tyrrell of the Law of Nat.* p. 372.

(b) *De Leg. Nat. Diſſ. proleg.* S. 5.

(c) *De J. Nat. & Gent. l. 1. c. 4.*

niſh'd with Notices of what is *the Well-doing* and *the Evil-doing*, the Summary whereof they call *the Natural Law* and uſually *right Reaſon* and the Dictates thereof. (d) *Who ſhall Rule the Prince that ruleth all? That which is the King of all, Mortals and Immortals* (as *Pindar* ſaith) *the Law, not an external Law written in Books or in Wood, but his own animative Reaſon.* Agreeably whereto the Vices of the Mind are ſaid to be (e) ἀποστροφαὶ καὶ ἀποτεύγματα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου, *Averſions and Errata from right Reaſon*, and in the Platonic Definitions Ἁμαρτία πρᾶξις παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λογισμόν, *Sin is a practice againſt right Reaſon.* The Philoſophers *Ethicks*, their account of what is Virtue and Vice, and of the Duty of Man (f) τί πρὸς θεοὺς ἐστὶ καθῆκον, τί πρὸς γονεῖς, τί πρὸς ἀδελφούς, τί πρὸς πατρίδα, τί πρὸς ξένους, *what his Duty is to the Gods, what to his Parents, what to his Brethren, what to his Country, what to Strangers*, was the Dictate of their Reaſon, and their Sayings ſhew what ſeem'd to them in its own Nature Good or Evil. But ſeveral of their Sayings are ſuch miſtakes, which ſhew that their Reaſon wanted a Rectification, that the particular Laws of Nature have not ſo full and perfect a Revelation and Legiſlation from God as the Laws of ſupernatural Revelation, and that (although Mankind by conſidering the Nature of any Practice may, and ordinarily do know whether it be a Branch of the Law of Nature, yet) Men need the aids of ſupernatural Revelation, to better their knowledge of the Law of Nature. But doubtleſs it is not the way to edifie them much in this Knowledge, to ſend them (g) to the Corn-fields (h) or to the wide World (which is ſaid to be as God's Statute-Book) to learn the Laws of Nature. Yet for the ſake of this method of Underſtanding the Law of Nature the ancient Accounts of it are diſcarded, and the Definition of it by (i) *many ſagacious accurate Schoolmen, Philoſophers, Lawyers and Divines*, is charg'd with falſhood. (2.) The ancient Writers and thoſe that Symbolize with them obſerve that the Laws of Nature are of *Self-obligation.* (k) *The Law of Nature is in its ſelf good and agreeable to the Idea of the divine Sanctity, ſo that if it had never had a Legiſlation, yet in true judgment it would ſeem to oblige. Whence Idolatry* (*for inſtance*) *is a Sin, not becauſe God would prohibit it, but becauſe it is Self-odious: So we Worſhip God, not only becauſe it is his Will, but becauſe he is our God: So we owe Obedience to God, not only becauſe he hath commanded it, ſo that if an Angel ſhould command, we ſhould owe the like Obedience, but becauſe we are his, by natural right oblig'd.* So the Schools ſay of Sins againſt the Law of Nature (l) *Prohibita ſunt quia mala, they are prohibited becauſe they are Evil.* There are ſome Affections and Practices (ſuch as Envy, Homicide, rejoicing in the Calamities of others) that are neceſſarily συνειλημμένα μετὰ τῆς φαυλότητος, *complicated with pravity*, (m) ſaith *Ariſtotle*, who ſuppoſeth, that Virtue (the Morals of it) ought to be practis'd διὰ τὸ καλὸν becauſe it is *bonum honeſtum.* So *Plato* (in ſeveral of his Dialogues) diſputeth, that Virtue and Vice are eſſentially and in their own Nature ſuch. The Pagan Moraliſts very well underſtood, that Vice is in it ſelf a criminal Evil and full of Penal Evils, that Virtue is the true Excellency and Felicity of Man, and that they were oblig'd to practiſe the Law of Nature as Men, (n) *and that by diſobeying it they loſt the Dignity of Men.* (3.) The ancient Writers obſerve and diſcourſe, that the Laws of Nature are of *Authoritative Obligation*, and therefore the Heathen practiſe them from a Principle of Religion.

(o) *For God Wills lawful Riches,*
but to get
By violence and rapine God doth
hate.
(p) *For evil Deeds the Gods do*
not affect,
But know Mens Works and Puniſhment inflict.

The Exiſtence of a juſt Providence notic'd to Mankind is an Injunction of the *Bonum Honeſtum* as pleaſing to God, and a Prohibition of the *malum turpe* as diſpleaſing to his Authoritative Will. From this Notice therefore the Dictates of right Reaſon have neceſſarily *the Form of Laws* and *a Legiſlation* from God agreeable to *Mic.* 6. 8. *He hath ſhewed thee, O Man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee?* For by the Dictates of right Reaſon he ſheweth unto Man *what is good*, and by the Notice of his juſt governing Providence he noticeth unto Man, that he requireth of him the doing of it. Whence the ancient Moraliſts ſay, that (q) λόγῳ ὀρθῷ πείθεσθαι καὶ θεῷ ταυτόν ἐστι, *to obey right Reaſon and to obey God is the ſame thing.* They do not content themſelves with ſuppoſing, that God hath impreſs'd the Law of Nature upon Men's Souls, but they deduce its Authority from his Authority; for they ſuppoſe, that this is a common Notion (r) *that the Will of God is juſt at the higheſt rate, that therefore what is foul and diſhoneſt and contrary to right Reaſon, cannot but be offenſive to him, and the contrary cannot but be pleaſing.* They obſerve alſo (s) *nos ad juſtitiam eſſe natos*, that we are deſign'd by the great Author of Nature to do what is Juſt; he therefore that doth what is unjuſt, is impious againſt God (as the Philoſophic Emperour ſaith) and to practice Juſtice, is of his *Appointment.* From the Notice whereof and of his juſt governing Providence the Laws of Nature have *the Form of Laws*, and they have alſo *the Sanction of Laws.* For as Men are the Well-doers or the Evil-doers his juſt governing Providence rewardeth and puniſheth both in this and the other Life, and this is common Notion. His Providence is called (t) *Nemeſis* ἀπὸ τῆς ἑκάστῳ διανεμήσεως, *from diſtributing to every one his due Portion.* In this Life (u) *Wars, Diſeaſes and Deaths* are Puniſhments inflicted for the Sins of Men; and in the Life to come *quod quiſque fecit patitur.* The Senſe of the Heathen Religioniſts is thus expreſs'd *in Plato's Gorgias.*

(d) Τίς οὖν ἄρξει τοῦ ἄρχοντος; ὁ νόμος, ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνητῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων (ὥς φησι Πίνδαρος) οὐκ ἐν βιβλίοις ἔξω γεγραμμένος, οὐδέ τισι ξύλοις, ἀλλ' ἔμψυχος ὢν ἑαυτῷ λόγος. *Plutarch. ad princip. indoct. p.* 780.

(e) *Hier. in aur. Car. p.* 105.

(f) *Epict. diss. l.* 2. *c.* 17.

(g) *Bp. Parker of the Law of Nat. p.* 19.

(h) *Mr. Baxter Reaſ. of the Chriſt. Rel. Par.* 1. *c.* 10.

(i) *Ibid.*

(k) *Lex naturalis eſt per ſe bona ac ideæ ſanctitatis divinæ conſentanea, adeò ut ſi vel maximè nunquam lata fuiſſet, tamen vero judicio videretur obligare, unde, non quia Deus voluit, exempli gratia, prohibere idololatriam, ſed quia per ſe digna odio, peccatum eſt: Sic adoramus Deum, non tantum quia ipſe voluit, ſed & quia Deus eſt noſter: Ita obedientiam debemus Deo, non ſolum quia Deus id juſſit, adeòque etiam angelo jubenti parem obedientiam deberemus, ſed quia res Dei ſumus conſequenter ex naturali jure obligati.* D. Dannh. ap. Bebel. de princip. Offic. Chriſt. p. 144.

(l) *Aquin.* 2da 2dæ *Qu.* 57 *Art.* 1.

(m) *Eth. l.* 2. *c.* 5. & *l.* 9. *c.* 8.

(n) *Cui qui non parebit, ipſe ſe fugiet, ac naturam hominis aſpernatus, hoc ipſo luet maximas pœnas.* Cic. ap. Lactant. l. 6. c. 8.

(o) *Nam Deus odit violentiam, legitimè parta*
Poſſidere vult omnes, non rapinam exercere. Eurip. Helena.

(p) Οὐ γὰρ σχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μάκαρες φιλέουσι
Ἀλλὰ δίκην τίνουσι καὶ ἴσασιν ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων.
Homer. vid. Grot. Dict. Poet. p. 122.

(q) *Hier. in aur. Car. p.* 170.

(r) *Quicquid contra rationem rectam fit, diſplicet Deo, & contrarium illi placet, quia cùm voluntas Dei ſit ſummè juſta, non poteſt illi non diſplicere quod turpe eſt, nec non placere honeſtum.* Suarez de Leg. l. 2. c. 6.

(s) *Cic. de Leg. l.* 1.

(t) *Lib. de Mund. c.* 7.

(u) ——— *acuitque metum mortalibus ægris. Si quando Lethum horrificum, morboſque Deûm Rex Molitur, meritas aut bello territat urbes.* Virgil. Æn. 12.

IV. A *Third* Objection againſt the Ancients account of the Law of Nature is *an uncertain Notice of* (Religion and Virtue) *the Morals of it*; for they ſuppoſe, that right Reaſon is that which noticeth to Mankind the virtuous Morals, and is the noticing Rule thereof. (x) But according to the *Pyrrhonians* and *Scepticks* there is no Truth in the reaſonings of Men. “ The Profeſſors of right Reaſon (the Philoſophers) were hugely diſſonant touching Good and Evil, and the great Principle of conducting Life (*ſummum bonum.*) what ſome account a Principle or Concluſion evidently true, others no leſs intelligent account extremely falſe. Some of them believ'd the worſt Crimes to be innocent, as *Theodorus* the Philoſopher allowed of Adultery, Theft, Sacriledge; *Plato* allow'd Adultery and Community of Wives, ſo did *Socrates* and *Cato*; *Zeno* and *Chryſippus* approv'd of Inceſt, and ſo did the *Perſians*. So that we may well ſay as *Socrates* in *Plato's Phædrus*; when we hear the *Name of Silver or Iron, all Men that ſpeak the ſame Language underſtand the ſame thing: But when we ſpeak of Juſt or Good, we are diſtracted into various apprehenſions, and differ from each other and from our ſelves.* Every Man maketh his Opinions to be Laws of Nature, if his Perſwaſion be ſtrong and violent. And ſome are Atheiſts that believe no God nor any thing that is diſhoneſt, which they can do in private or with impunity. Some have believ'd, that there is nothing in it ſelf Juſt, and only regarded what is profitable, ſo did *Carneades* and ſo did *Ariſtippus*. And it is not ſufficient to ſay, ſome Perſons are unreaſonable, becauſe we ſuppoſe them to ſpeak unnatural things; for we are not to reject an Opinion upon pretence it is unreaſonable, unleſs we firſt know ſome certain rule and meaſure of Reaſon. Now we cannot take our meaſures of Reaſon from Nature; or if we do, we cannot take the meaſures of Nature from Reaſon. *If we Judge of what is natural by its Conformity to right Reaſon, we cannot Judge of right Reaſon by its Conformity to what is natural.* Thus Reaſon is made uſe of againſt it ſelf, various Reaſons are alledg'd, to ſhew the uncertainty of the Notices of Reaſon in Moral matters. But as *Demodocus* ſaid of the *Mileſians* (y) *the Mileſians are no Fools, but they do the ſame things that Fools do*: So they that are not irrational, yet ſometimes argue at an unreaſonable rate. For the diſſent of *Pyrrhonians* and *Scepticks* doth it ſignifie any thing, to deſtroy the certainty of Reaſon? Or the diſſent of Atheiſts to deſtroy the certainty of the Exiſtence of God? The Name of *Theodorus* was not *the Philoſopher* (z) but Ἄθεος, *the Atheiſt*, and *Ariſtippus* was of no better Character. The Philoſophers were not the genuin Profeſſors of right Reaſon, but generally they were extravagant unpopular Humoriſts, that affected to maintain Paradoxes. *Heraclitus* held that contradictory Propoſitions are conſiſtent. *Zeno Eleates* held that motion is impoſſible, and *Anaxagoras* that Snow and Coal are of the ſame colour. If any one ſhould alledge theſe abſurd Paradoxes of the Philoſophers, to deſtroy or impair the certitude of Logick and external Sence, ſuch Allegations would not ſignifie any thing (ſuch uncertainties do not make an uncertainty;) and the Allegation of their abſurd Conceits touching Moral matters ſignifieth as little, to deſtroy or impair the evident certitude of the Notices of right Reaſon and the Morals of the Law of Nature. Of which we muſt affirm (1.) So great a certainty there is in the Law of Nature, that there is no invincible difficulty in the whole of it or the Science of it as there is in other Sciences, Metaphyſicks, Phyſiology, Mathematicks, in which there are invincible difficulties. But the Science of *univerſal Righteouſneſs* in its own Nature ſuch hath no ſuch invincible difficulty in it, as rendreth it impoſſible for Mankind, to arrive at an evident certainty touching the whole of it. For it muſt be ſuppos'd, that they that are oblig'd, to *fulfil all this Righteouſneſs*, may have an evident certainty touching what it is (as ſeveral Righteous men have had) that this *whole Duty of Man* is not ἀκατάληπτόν τι, *a thing incomprehenſible by Man*; for then it could not be *this whole Duty of Man* nor could it be fully taught or learned. But (a) ὅτι τῆς φύσεως, ὅτι τῆς μαθήσεως νόμος εἷς, *the Law of Nature and the* (Moral) *Law of Diſcipline is one Law.* (2.) So great a certainty there is in the Law of Nature, that none can innocently be groſly ignorant of or miſtake any of the Morals of it, but it is their Sin and their Crime; ſo the Polytheiſm, Idolatry, Unchaſtity, and bloody Spectacles, which were the Practice of the Heathen in their night of Ignorance, were their Sin and their Crime. By their Reaſon God had notic'd to the World of Mankind in general the knowledge of himſelf his *Truth* and their Duty (which is the Law of Nature) ſo far the Truth was not unknown to them: But they were not Upright and Faithful towards it (held the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs) whence they were invelop'd in atheous Ignorance, which was their deadly Sin and their Crime, and (no excuſable invincible Ignorance, but) an effect of their Unfaithfulneſs. Their Polytheiſm doth not prove, that Mankind have but uncertain Notices touching the Unity of the Godhead: Nor doth the Philoſophers allowing Adultery and Inceſt, prove that Mankind have but uncertain Notices of the Law of Nature. It is certain, they had better Notices, and if thoſe better Notices were not to them evidently certain, yet they would have been evidently certain, if they had been Faithful; ſo great a certainty there is in the Notices of the Law of Nature. Would it not have been evidently certain to *Carneades*, that there are things in themſelves juſt, if he had not been a Villain? To be a ſound Moraliſt (towards God and Man) is not a buſineſs of abſtruſe and ſubtil Speculation, but of Faithfulneſs and Integrity: Nor is it ſo requiſite, to be a Philoſopher, as to be honeſt and duly Conſcentious. (3.) So great a certainty there is in the Law of Nature, that there is a certain Rule of Right Reaſon (in Morality) which is the *Beauteous-beneficial* Practice. If the

---

(w) Ἦν νόμος ὅδε περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν μὲν δικαίως τὸν βίον διελθόντα καὶ ὁσίως, ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσῃ, εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπιόντα, οἰκεῖν ἐν πάσῃ εὐδαιμονίᾳ ἐκτὸς κακῶν. Τὸν δὲ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀθέως, εἰς τὸ τῆς τίσεώς τε καὶ δίκης δεσμωτήριον, ὃ δὴ τάρταρον καλοῦσιν, ἰέναι. *V. Jambl. Protrept. p.* 82. *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 2. *c.* 9 *Sharrock de Off. l.* 1. *N.* 7.

(w) *Concerning Men there was this Law under* Saturn, *which always was and yet is a Law among the Gods, that when any Man dieth, who hath led his Life juſtly and holily, he goeth to the Iſlands of the Bleſſed and liveth in all Happineſs free from Evils. But he that hath led his Life unjuſtly and atheouſly, he goeth to the Priſon of Puniſhment and Juſtice, which is called Tartarus.*

(x) *Seld. de J.Nat. & Gent. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *Bp. Taylor Duct. Dub. B.* 2. *c.* 1. *n.* 31. *&c.*

(y) *Ariſt. Eth. l.* 7. *c.* 9.

(z) *Vid. S. Parker de Deo Diſp.* 1. *S.* 8.

(a) *Clem. Str. l.* 1. *in fine.*

the Mind noticeth or dictateth what is the right Practice, this is neceſſarily right Reaſon; if therefore ſhe noticeth or dictateth touching *the Beauteous-beneficial* Practice, that this is to be done, and touching the Foul-maleficial kind of Practice, that this is not to be done, this is right Reaſon. And there is no more difficulty in diſcerning what is right Reaſon (in Morality) than there is diſcerning what is the *Beauteous-beneficial* and what is the *Foul-maleficial Practice*. Now, it is as evident and certain, that the Virtues commonly ſo called are *the Beauteous-beneficial* Practice, and the Vices commonly ſo called are the *Foul-maleficial* Practice, as it is evident and certain, that hating and hurting is not helping, that to be a Liar is not honourable, that *the Soldanian* Diet (of Guts and Garbage) is not cleanly, and that *Therſites* is not handſome. (4.) So great a certainty there is in the Law of Nature, that a great part of it is of unqueſtionable Evidence and Certainty with Mankind in general, and is aſcertain'd by *the conſent of Nations*; with reſpect whereunto the Lawyers define *the Law of Nature.* (*b*) *That which natural Reaſon hath ſettled among all Men. That which is alike obſerv'd amongſt all People or Nations. The natural Laws are thoſe, which are alike obſerv'd in all Nations.* (*c*) *The conſent of all Nations in every thing is to be reputed a Law of Nature,* ſaith *Cicero.* So *Ariſtotle* defineth the Law of Nature. (*d*) *That which hath every where the ſame force, as fire alike burneth both here and amongſt the* Perſians. The Law of Nature therefore is of a larger and narrower Acceptation; the one the more comprehenſive, the other the more famous. In the more comprehenſive Senſe it is that whole Syſtem of Law, which a juſt Providence requireth the obſervance of from all Mankind antecedently to ſupernatural Revelation, and which hath the Verity of natural Notice. But in the narrower and more famous Senſe it is only that part of the Law of Nature, which hath the Notoreity of natural Notice, the common acknowledgment of the World. But as Miracles are not a ſufficient Proof of the Divinity of a Doctrine, unleſs upon impartial Examination the Nature of it appeareth to be Divine: So the conſent of Mankind alone is not a ſufficient Proof touching any Morals, that they are Laws of Nature, unleſs upon impartial Examination they appear to be in their own Nature Good or Evil and therefore of themſelves Matter of Law. But if any Morals are receiv'd and acknowledg'd by the common conſent of Nations as Branches of the Law of Nature, and upon impartial Examination they appear to be in their own Nature Good or Evil (agreably to the general acknowledgment of Mankind) of ſuch Morals we have the greateſt aſſurance imaginable, that they are Branches of the Law of Nature. For they are ſo in the Judgment of common Sence, to Notoreity, and ſo as to be common (or general) Notions, and they muſt be groſly plain and evident Branches of the Law of Nature, that have the general acknowledgment of Mankind in this their atheous and degenerate Condition. This general agreement concerning them, their firm continuance throughout all Ages, the impoſſibility of eradicating them out of the Minds of Men, plainly demonſtrate, that they are not from any arbitrary Inſtitution of Men, but are natural Notions, that the Mind is of ſuch a Nature as to Notice them, and the Soul of Man is naturally diſpos'd to the belief of them. The conſent of Nations therefore both demonſtrateth the Exiſtence of the Law of Nature, and is in part a certain Notice of the Morals of it. It demonſtrateth the Exiſtence of the Law of Nature; for it appeareth from the conſent of Nations, that there is a juſt Providence, which requireth of all Men, that they be the Well-doers not the Evil-doers, and that a Syſtem of Morals which are in their own Nature Well-doing, are *naturally* and *convictively* even to the Notoreity of a general acknowledgment notic'd to Mankind. The certainty of noticing the Morals of the Law of Nature from this general conſent of Nations hath many Objections made againſt it: But they are made without a due clearneſs and conſiſtency of Diſcourſe, and without any conſiderable ſtrength of Reaſoning. For ſometimes it is ſaid (*e*) that *Juris naturalis corpus*, a Body of the Law of Nature is not to be look'd for from the conſent of Nations, which no Man will contradict. Sometimes it is ſaid, that the Hebrew Doctors do not unwiſely (*f*) to make no reckoning of the conſent of Nations *in Juris Naturalis deſignatione*, in the Deſignation of the Law of Nature, (*g*) *that the Law of Nations is no indication of the Law of Nature.* Which are Poſitions hugely extravagant maintain'd by Reaſons extremely inſignificant. For what if all Nations are not known? If ſome known Nations are Savages and in great degree live without Law? If in ſome other known Nations ſome of the groſſeſt Immoralities have been commonly practic'd and authoriz'd? What ſignifie theſe Exceptions to the invalidating this great certainty; *that the Exiſtence of a Law of Nature hath the conſent of Nations and the general acknowledgment of Mankind, as alſo ſeveral great Moralities, which is an Indication, that they are of the Law of Nature?* If a judicious Heathen Lawyer *Paulus* ſaith (*h*) that Theft is prohibited by the Law of Nature, if another of the ſame Character (*Ulpianus*) calleth it *naturâ turpe*, there are few but will look on theſe Sayings as conſiderable Indications, that the Prohibition of Theft is of the Law of Nature; how much more ought they to think ſo, if the generality of Mankind ſay ſo? The *Perſians* practis'd and authoriz'd an inceſtuous mixture with their own Mothers (μητρομιξια) and *Antiochus Soter* marry'd his Father's Wife: But theſe inceſtuous mixtures were againſt the general Senſe of Mankind, as we learn (*i*) not only from the Poets and from *Cicero*, but from a better Author 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. which ought to be look'd upon as an Indication, that they were againſt the Law of Nature. (*k*) *The Nations differ about their Superſtition, but what Nation is there, that doth not like and love manſuetude, benignity and a grateful Mind? And that doth not vilifie and hate the Proud, the Maleficial, the Cruel and Ungrateful?* (5.) In written Laws both Divine and Human there is ſuch uncertainty, that Men are of various Opinions touching their right Interpretation and touching what in the Senſe of thoſe Laws is Juſt and Good (according

Multum dare ſolemus præſumptioni omnium hominum. Sen. Ep. 117.

(b) *Id quod naturalis ratio inter omnes homines conſtituit. Quod apud omnes populos ſeu gentes peraquè cuſtoditur. Naturalia jura quæ apud gentes peraquè obſervantur.* Selden. de J. Nat. & Gent. l. 1. c. 6, 7, 8.

(c) *Omni autem in re conſenſio omnium gentium Lex naturæ putanda eſt.* Cic. Tuſc. 1. *Publica Lex hominum naturaque continet hoc fas* Perſ. Sat. 5.

(d) Τὸ πανταχοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχον δύναμιν, ὥσπερ τὸ πῦρ καὶ ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐν Πέρσαις καίει. *Selden. ſupr.*

(e) *Seld. ſupr. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(f) *Ibid.*

(g) *Bp. Taylor Duct. Dub. B.* 2. *c.* 1. *n.* 28.

(h) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *S.* 10.

(i) *Seld ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 11. *Bp. Taylor ſupr. n.* 23.

(k) *Quæ autem Natio non Comitatem, non benignitatem, non gratum animum & beneficii memorem diligit? Quæ ſuperbos, quæ maleficos, quæ crudeles, quæ ingratos non aſpernatur non odit?* Cic. de Leg. l. 1.

cording to the Saying of *Socrates* to *Phædrus*) and every one thinketh, that his own Opinion is Law; yet this uncertainty doth not hinder, but that there is an evidently certain Interpretation of theſe written Laws: So there is a diverſity of Opinions touching what is right Reaſon, Juſt and Good according to the Law of Nature, ſuch uncertainty there is in it; yet this doth not hinder, but that there is an evidently certain right Reaſon (in Moral Matters) well and evil Doing according to the Law of Nature. Touching which the differences of Mankind would not be very great, if they were duely conſcientious. (*l*) *Let no Man pretend, that through Ignorance he neglecteth Virtue, or becauſe he hath none to ſhew him the way*, ἀρκοῦντα γὰρ ἔχομεν διδάσκαλον τὸ συνειδός, *for we have Conſcience a ſufficient Teacher.*

(l) *S. Chryſoſt. ap. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 3. *Par* 3. *Theſ.* 10.

V. A *Fourth* Objection againſt the ancient Account of the Law of Nature is *the Suppoſition of innate Ideas, Notions and Principles* (ſuch natural impreſſions) *which it involveth.* (*m*) *The Divine Law which is naturally conjoin'd with the Soul, as a Torch or Luminary, crieth to her and admoniſheth her, to walk in the Kingly way without declining to the Right or Left, teaching that the Kingly way is, that which is according to right Reaſon.* The ancient Writers look upon the natural Law (*n*) as an innate Law (*Nata Lex* as *Cicero* calleth it) as a natural Inſcription and Impreſſion upon the Minds of all Men; and the Apoſtle manifeſtly favoureth this notion of it, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. For although he doth not ſay, that the Moral Law is written in the Heart of the Gentiles, yet he ſaith, *that the Law as to the work of it is written in their Hearts* (their inward Man) and that *they are a Law unto themſelves* as to the work of the Law, which is to indicate, direct, dictate, command and forbid, to judge, *Joh.* 7. 51. to criminate or accuſe, *Joh.* 5. 45. to convince and condemn, *Jam.* 2. 9. The Apoſtle affirmeth, that the Law in ſome ſort (as to the work of it) is written in the Heart of the Gentiles, and conſequently in ſome reſpect it is *the Law written in the Minds of Men*, as the ancient Moraliſts ſtile it. They ſuppoſe it to be written in the Soul as having τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν, *the leading part*, τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον, *right Reaſon*, τὸ συνειδὸς, *the Conſcience*, τὸ κριτήριον φυσικὸν, *that natural diſcernment whereby we diſtinguiſh the Goods from the Evils.* This is their Senſe (as appeareth from all their accounts of it) and this is all that they mean, when they ſpeak of a Law naturally written and impreſs'd upon the Soul (*o*) τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον φύσει ἐνόντα καὶ ἐγγεγραμμένον αὐτῇ, *that right Reaſon* (which is the Law of Nature) *is innate to the Soul and written or implanted in her.* They ſuppoſe, that it is *Innate* or *Natural* to the intelligent reaſoning Mind (which is νοῦς πρακτικὸς, *Practical*) to Underſtand and Reaſon rightly (in ſome degree at leaſt) touching the Matters of Morality, and conſequently to form thoſe *Notices* or *Dictates* which are the Law of Nature. In this Senſe they ſuppoſe it *Innate, a natural Inſcription or Impreſſion*, and in this Senſe we ought to aſſert *innate Ideas, Notions and Principles, that are not adventitious.* (*p*) For all Arts and Sciences had their Origin from Nature, all Mankind are by Nature (in ſome degree) *Logicians* and *Mathematicians*, in ſome degree they are born ſuch, and in the like degree they are born *Moraliſts* and *Religioniſts.* The deſign and buſineſs of Arts and Sciences is only (*q*) *to make up what is begun in Nature*; it is innate therefore to the Mind of Man, to form *Logical, Mathematical, Religious* and *Moral Ideas, Notions and Principles*, which are not adventitious *Notices* or *Evidences.* It is innate to a Child, to grow up to be a Man in Mind and Underſtanding as well as Stature of Body; and conſequently it is innate to him, to grow up to the underſtanding the common Notions, which is Eſſential to one that underſtandeth at the rate of a Man. As if it was innate to a Child, to grow up to be a *Coſmographer*, ſo that Coſmography would be to him no adventitious Notice or Evidence, but an innate Notion and Idea: In like manner it is innate to a Child, to be an Intellectualiſt, to become intelligent of the common Notions, to grow up to the underſtanding them at the rate of a Man, and they are to him no adventitious Notices or Evidences, but innate Notions and Principles. *Reaſoning* is certainly innate to the reaſoning Mind; and if the Mind is by Natural Conſtitution *Religious* as well as *Rational*, Religious Reaſoning muſt neceſſarily be innate to her. Her innate reaſoning implieth, that *the method* of reaſoning is innate to her, which is to form Ideas, to compare them, to make a Judgment of them, to make Deductions of Cauſes from Effects, of Effects from Cauſes, of Conſequents from Antecedents, and of Concluſions from evident Principles. In this method of Reaſoning the Mind findeth, that it is natural and innate to her (as Reaſoning) to form thoſe Propoſitions called the common Notions, to think of them and to think them true, that they are not in her as adventitious Notices and Evidences, but *they are as much innate to her, as it is innate to Man, to be actually a Rationaliſt and Religioniſt*, and therefore ſhe calleth them innate Notions and Principles. As ſhe hath an innate Power, ſo (being made both *Rational* and *Religious*) ſhe hath an innate Propenſion, to Notice and Dictate the common Notions, which are hereby diſtinguiſh'd from adventitious Notices and Evidences; *becauſe of this innate Propenſion they are* αὐτοδίδακτα, *Self-taught*, and ἀδίδακτον τῆς φύσεως δῶρον, *an untaught Gift of Nature*, nor can the Mind disbelieve them without doing violence to her ſelf. This innate Propenſion appeareth from the general conſent, that hath been amongſt Mankind (in good degree) touching the Laws of Nature. (*r*) For in all Times and Ages without any Philoſophical Diſquiſitions about them or any abſtruſe inquiries into the Cauſes and Reaſons of them Mankind had the knowledge of them. Which plainly ſheweth, that they deriv'd this their knowledge of them from one great univerſal Teacher (that teacheth the Huſbandman) and that they were notic'd and dictated to them from an innate Propenſion of their own Minds. The ſenſe and truth of innate Ideas and Principles may be inferr'd from the Saying of a late Philoſopher. (*s*) *A power of judging uncorruptly and of diſtinguiſhing true from falſe by Nature equal is innate in us all.* Of the common Notions that are Speculative we muſt affirm, that the Mind meerly by her innate Power of diſtinguiſhing between true and falſe hath (virtually at leaſt) the Notice of them and a diſcernment of the truth of them without needing any adventitious Notice or

(m) Νόμος δὲ θεῖος αὐτῇ ψυχῇ συνεζευγμένος κατὰ φύσιν, λαμπτὴρ καὶ φωστῆρος δίκην ἐπιφωνεῖ ἔνδοθεν ὑπηχῶν αὐτῇ καὶ λέγων, ὁδῷ βασιλικῇ πορεύσῃ, οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖς δεξιὰ, οὐδὲ ἀριστερά. Βασιλικὴν τὴν κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον πορείαν εἶναι διδάσκων. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(n) *Origen. in c.* 2. *Ep. ad Roman. & Philocal. c.* 9.

(o) *Hier. in aur. Car. p.* 106.

(p) *Downam. Com. in Rami Dialect. Proleg.*

(p) Τὸ προσλεῖπον τῆς φύσεως ἀναπληροῦν.

(r) *Mr. Lowde of the Nat. of Man. p.* 71.

(s) *Vim in corruptè judicandi & verum à falſo diſtinguendi naturâ æqualem omnibus nobis innatum eſſe.* Des Cart. de Methód. p. 1.

or Evidence. Of the common Notions that are Practical we muſt affirm, that the Mind meerly by her innate Power of diſtinguiſhing between well and evil Doing hath (virtually at leaſt) the Notice of them and a diſcernment of their Obligation without needing any adventitious Notice or Evidence. Theſe are therefore juſtly counted *Idea's*, *Notions and Principles* that are innate to us, not in every ſenſe, but ſo as is explain'd, and in ſuch ſenſe innate Ideas, Notions and Principles may and ought to be aſſerted againſt all Objections that are made againſt them.

(1.) Againſt innate Principles in general it is argu'd (t) *Infants and Ideots do not know them, therefore they are not imprinted on their Minds.* But how vaſtly remote and diſtant is this Argument from concerning innate Ideas and Principles in the genuin Senſe of aſſerting them? A like remote and diſtant from good Senſe is this other Argumentation. *If theſe ſuppos'd innate Principles were native Characters and Impreſſions, they would appear faireſt and cleareſt in Naturals, in Children, Ideots, Salvages and illiterate People being of all other the leaſt corrupted by cuſtom or borrowed Opinions.* For it is not imaginable, that the Principles of Science and of Law, and the Dictates of right Reaſon ſhould appear faireſt and cleareſt in them, that are almoſt totally devoid of Reaſon, nor do Infants know them, till they come to the uſe of Reaſon. But the Objector with an untoward confidence affirmeth; *it is utterly falſe, that the uſe of Reaſon aſſiſteth us in the knowledge of theſe Maxims, or that Children know or aſſent to theſe Maxims, as ſoon as they come to the uſe of Reaſon; ſome time after during a Man's Life they may be aſſented to, and ſo may all other knowable Truths.* All Mankind call theſe *Noemata* (the common Notions) the Dictates of right Reaſon, the uſe of Reaſon therefore aſſiſteth us in the knowledge of theſe Self-evident Maxims. Which are not of the condition of other knowable Truths (that may be known or not known by Mankind) but the Notice of the common Notions is Eſſential to ſuch Rationaliſts and Religioniſts as all Men are by Nature. And proportionably as common Reaſon diſplayeth it ſelf in Mankind in their growth from their Non-age, theſe common Notions are diſcover'd. To ſuch Children as begin to have the uſe of Reaſon they begin to be diſcover'd; and as they have the uſe of Reaſon in a greater degree, they are diſcover'd in a greater degree.

(2.) Againſt innate practical Principles it is argu'd; *that Thieves and High-way Men do not own Faith and Juſtice as Principles; the Principles of Morality therefore are not own'd by all Men* (have not univerſal conſent) *therefore they are not innate.* But they know not God, nor Man, nor the World, that do not know, that Thieves and High-way Men (many of which are educated in the Chriſtian Religion) do ordinarily own *Faith* and *Juſtice* as to the *Notice*, *Conviction* and *Dictate* of their own Minds, which they Sin againſt. It is argu'd alſo; *that there are no practical Principles wherein all Men agree (not any practical Truth that is univerſally receiv'd without doubt or queſtion) therefore none innate.* But if Mankind univerſally deſire their own *Felicity*, if they are univerſally *Societiſts* (Civil ſocietiſts) there is an univerſal agreement of Mankind in great practical Principles, and ſuch an agreement implieth and inferreth their agreement in a great number of practical Principles. But the Hypotheſis of innate Ideas and Principles doth not require, that there ſhould be any practical Truth univerſally receiv'd without doubt or queſtion by Mankind. It is enough to juſtifie that Aſſertion, if all Men have Notices and Dictates of practical Truth that are innate. And of theſe we muſt affirm, that as to be actually a Sinner, is innate to every Child of Man in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way, to be actually a Rationaliſt (a Logician, an Arithmetician) a Societiſt, is innate to every Child of Man in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way: So to be actually *a Juriſt*, *a Moraliſt*, *a Religioniſt* at leaſt as to the Notices and Dictates of his Mind, is innate to every Child of Man in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way.

(3.) It is argu'd; *that not one Moral Rule can be propos'd, whereof a Man may not juſtly demand a Reaſon, and therefore it is not Self-evident, as every innate Principle muſt needs be.* But may a Reaſon juſtly be demanded of the great Rules and Principles of Morality, which cannot be deny'd without a Contradiction? *The Good is not to be hated, but is that which is to be lik'd and choſen: The Evil is not to be lov'd, but is that which is to be diſlik'd and eſchew'd. The Beauteous-beneficial kind of Practice is the Good, the Foul-maleficial kind of Practice is the Evil. The Good is the Well-doing* (εὐπραξία,) *the Evil is the Evil-doing. The Well-doing is Righteouſneſs* (the right doing) *the Evil-doing is* (the wrong doing) *Unrighteouſneſs. To be an Evil-doer is Vice and Crime. That which cannot be done without Vice and Crime is not allowable, may not be done. None can have right to do the wrong* (that which is Unrighteouſneſs) *nor may do that which may not be done. It is neceſſarily Wickedneſs and foul Criminality, to be a Doer of Unrighteouſneſs. To be a foul Criminal and Malefactor, is not lawful, or tolerable, but puniſhable. Innocence, Purity, Order, Aptitude, Congruity and Proportion in our Practice, is Beauteous. The ſincere Benevolence is goodneſs of Will and Affection. To reverence the Elders, to keep Faith, to do to others as we would be done to, is the Beauteous-beneficial Practice. The deadly malign Nature and Practice is the Evil. The Brutiſh kind of Morals are the vile. Guile and Hypocriſie is Villainy. To do inimical kind of things to a Friend, to deſign evil to the Innocent, to condemn the Righteous, to be a Citizen no Citizen worſe than none, a diſſerving kind of Servant, are foul Maleficial things. Virtus eſt vitium fugere.* The great Rules of Morality are as Self-evident, as the Principles of the ſpeculative Sciences. *Luk.* 12. 57. *Why even of your ſelves judge ye not what is right.* (u) Οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι οἴκοθεν γινώσκομεν τὸ δέον *for we Men of our ſelves know what ought to be done.* It is argu'd further; *that a great variety of Opinions concerning Moral Rules is to be found amongſt Men, according to the different ſorts of Happineſs, which they propoſe to themſelves, which could not be, if the practical Principles were innate.* But the Premiſſes do not infer this Concluſion. For according to the different Happineſs which the Popular and the Philoſophic Pagans propos'd to themſelves, they had great diverſity of Opinion concerning ſeveral Moral Rules, yet the ſame innate Moral Rules were notic'd to both Parties and obſerv'd by both.

(4.) The Objector ſaith; *I cannot ſee, how any Men ſhould ever tranſgreſs the Moral Rules with confidence and ſerenity, were they innate and ſtamped upon their Minds. If any can be thought, to be*

(t) Mr. Locke of human Underſtand. B 1.

(v) Theophylact. in Matth. 7. 12.

naturally imprinted, none, I think, can have a fairer pretence to be innate than this, Parents preſerve and cheriſh your Children. But have there not been whole Nations, and thoſe of the moſt civiliz'd People, amongſt whom the expoſing their Children and leaving them in the Fields to periſh by want or wild Beaſts, hath been the Practice, as little condemned or ſcrupled as the begetting them? It was familiar and uncondemned Practice amongſt the Greeks and Romans, to expoſe without Pity or Remorſe their innocent Infants. But whether Moral Rules be *extrinſecally* imprinted upon the Mind (from a Book, a Teacher, or the Conſtitution of the World) or whether they be imprinted in the way of innate Principles, the Caſe is the ſame as to the poſſibility of tranſgreſſing them *with Confidence and Serenity*. If Men can with Confidence and Serenity tranſgreſs any Moral Rules that are imprinted upon their Minds, they may ſo tranſgreſs thoſe that are impreſs'd in the way of innate Principles. And nothing is more uſual than for Men, with Confidence and Serenity to tranſgreſs the Moral Rules imprinted upon their Minds; for ſo the Jews and Papiſts tranſgreſs this Commandment (imprinted on their Minds) *Thou ſhalt not kill*; and ſo the Proteſtants tranſgreſs theſe Moral Rules imprinted on their Minds *be not drunk with Wine, let there be no Diviſions among you.* There is no Sect of Religioniſts, that doth not violate ſome Moral Rules imprinted on their Minds with greater Confidence and Serenity than the *Greeks* and *Romans* expos'd their Children; for although the Objector hath ſome (*w*) to bear him company in his Exaggerations of their inhuman Practice, yet it is certain, there are ſeveral miſtakes in his account of it. For as the expoſing Children was condemned (*x*) amongſt the *Egyptians* (*y*) and the *Germans*, ſo amongſt the Greeks it was ſeverely prohibited and condemned by the Theban Law (z) ἐκθεῖναι παιδίον, *to expoſe a Child. Ælian* who was a *Roman* (although he wrote in Greek) ſaith of this *Theban Law* (which made the expoſing an Infant Capital) *it was a Law of the greateſt Rectitude and Philanthropy. Iſocrates* condemneth theſe Crimes in other Cities and vindicateth his own City from them (*a*) ἐκβολὰς ὧν ἐγέννησαν ϗ καταποντισμοὺς, *the ejecting and drowning their Children.* The Greeks and Romans were far from being totally devoid of natural Love and Tenderneſs to their Children (commonly called στοργή) uſually there was a mixture of Kindneſs and Tenderneſs in their expoſing their Infants (*b*) as there was alſo in their pawning and ſelling them. This very plainly appeareth in the Chriſtian Apologiſts ſevere reprehenſions of the Pagans for expoſing their Children, (*c*) which was not with deſign, to have them deſtroy'd but preſerv'd. They had this Law of Nature *Parents preſerve and cheriſh your Children,* not only imprinted upon their Minds *but upon their Bowels,* yet becauſe of Poverty and Want and to avoid the burden of them, they often kill'd ſome of their Children, (*d*) in ſo much that the Emperour *Conſtantine* to prevent the killing their ſupernumerary Children made a Law for their Relief. But thoſe Parents that were more Parental than to kill their Children, choſe rather to expoſe them (as the leſſer of two Evils) not with a deſign to have them deſtroy'd, but that ſome might ſhew pity on them, take them up and Educate them. There was therefore a mixture of Humanity and Piety (as *Lactantius* ſpeaketh) in the Pagans expoſing their Children; and doubtleſs it was from a Principle of Heathen Piety and great reſpect to their aged Parents (*e*) that ſome barbarous Nations kill'd them, when they grew very old (accounting it ignominious to be decrepit) and others ſacrific'd and ate them, accounting this the moſt honourable Entombment, to bury them in their own Bowels. (*f*) So the *Muhammedans* from a Principle of Heathen Piety and blind Devotion have a great Veneration for diſtracted Men and leud Miſcreants that have the garb of Aſceticks, and give them an univerſal Licenſe to do any thing, even to lie with their Wives, accounting the Children that they beget Holy. But conſidering theſe and the like inſtances of the Paradoxical Nature of the Worlds Piety our Objector ſhould not have ask'd (*g*) *where are thoſe innate Principles of Juſtice, Piety, Gratitude, Equity, Chaſtity?* But in all reaſon he ought to have ask'd, *where are they not?* For the Principles of Piety and Virtue in general we find all the World over, the World of Mankind are agreed in them, but it is with this difference, *what one Party of Men call Virtue and Piety, another Party calleth Vice and Impiety.* And with great Reaſon; for with unregenerate Mankind many Enormities have the repute of Virtues or at leaſt of ſinleſs Practices. Which is not for want of the innate practical Principles, (*h*) *but this is the cauſe of all Evils unto Men, they have not skill to accommodate and apply the common Notions* (τὰς προλήψεις τὰς κοινὰς ἐννοίας,) *to particular matters of Practice.* They know the true Notionalities of Good, Juſtice, Virtue and Piety, and that they ought to chuſe and practice them: But are ſadly unacquainted with what is really and materially ſo. Whence it is too poſſible, for a whole Nation to allow the tranſgreſſion of a practical Rule, which is imprinted on their Minds; for they may do it from a falſe Opinion of *Well-doing* or *Lawful doing*, as the Church of *Rome* alloweth (and more than alloweth) the tranſgreſſion of the ſecond Commandment. And they may do it from an Opinion of the neceſſity of Affairs and of greater Good, as the Church of *Rome* hath allow'd Stews, and the *Perſians* allowed the groſſeſt Inceſt from an extravagant Affectation of Magick.

Nam Magus ex matre & gnato naſcatur oportet.

Whence it is eaſie to make a Judgment of this remaining part of our Objector's Argument; *that no practical Rule which is any where univerſally or with publick Approbation or Allowance tranſgreſs'd, can be ſuppos'd innate. It is impoſſible to conceive that a whole Nation of Men ſhould all publickly reject and renounce what every one of them certainly and infallibly know to be a Law; for ſo they muſt, who have it naturally imprinted on their Minds.* From the neceſſity of Affairs and an Opinion of greater good the Greeks and Romans in ſome degree, and but in ſome degree tolerated the tranſgreſſion of this Law *Parents preſerve your Children:* But they were far from publickly rejecting and renouncing it, the tranſgreſſion of it was not uncondemned amongſt themſelves, and from themſelves it appeareth, that they had it deeply im-

printed

(w) *Paraphr. Apologet. Tertull.* p. 27. *ed. Pamel.*

(x) *Witſ. Ægyptiac. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

(y) *Lipſ. Not. in Tacit. Hiſt. l.* 5.

(z) *Ælian. var. Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 306.

(a) *Panathen. p. m.* 444.

(b) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 2. *c.* 5.

(c) *Natos ex ſe pueros aut ſtrangulant, aut ſi nimium pii fuerint, exponunt.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 9. *Falſa pietas cogit exponere. Etiamſi contingat ei quod voluit, ut alatur, addixit certè ſanguinem ſuum vel ad ſervitutem vel ad lupanar.* Idem l. 6. c. 20. *Filios exponitis ſuſcipiendos ab aliqua prætereunte miſericordiæ extraneæ.* Tertull. Apol. c. 9. *Domi natos alienæ miſericordiæ frequenter exponitis.* Min. Fel. p. 306.

(d) *Baron. ad ann.* 315. *n.* 5.

(e) *Sharrock. de Offic. c.* 3. *N.* 3.

(f) *Mr. Locke ſupr. c.* 3.

(g) *Ibid.*

(h) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 26.

printed in their Nature. (i) *Nature* (ſaith *Cicero*) *impelleth Men, to love thoſe that they have begotten, and ingendreth in them a ſpecial love to their Off-ſpring, and taketh care, to make proviſion for Wife and Children, which are counted dear, and ought to be taken care of.* There is nothing more that is worth conſidering in our Objector's Diſcourſes againſt innate practical Principles ſave only his demand of a Catalogue of them, which is like our Pontifician Adverſaries demand of a Catalogue of Fundamentals.

(5.) Our Objector diſputeth againſt *the innate Idea of God*, and therein ſome others of the Learned agree with him: but by this innate Idea they mean, (k) *An original Notion and Propoſition that God is, actually imprinted on us antecedently to all uſe of our Faculties. An anticipating Principle engraven upon our Souls before all exerciſe of Reaſon.* Such an original Notion and Propoſition needeth not to be confuted by any operoſe reaſonings; for it is a Notice of God by reaſon antecedent to all uſe of reaſon, which is Nonſenſe and a Contradiction. But a Prolepſis or Anticipation concerning God (as the Ancients ſpeak) rightly underſtood is only antecedent to the argumentative deductions of Reaſon, as other common Notions are; it is a natural and ſpontaneous exertion of Reaſon, (l) ἔμφυτος ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπίνοια, *an innate Notion to all Men*, whereby we mean, *that it is innate to the Mind of Man, to ſuggeſt and notice to him the Exiſtence of a Deity in general* (an inviſible ſovereign power over us, an Object of Religious Worſhip) *not without noticing to him the true God and his Service:* as it is alſo innate to the mind of man, to ſuggeſt and notice to him *a future ſtate of the Soul and Rewards and Puniſhments there*; both which are prime dictates and ſuggeſtions of the mind made rational and religious and prime Branches of Natural Religion. *So far the Soul of Man is naturally Chriſtian.* But againſt the innate Idea of God ſome incredible Stories of ſome Savage Nations that live in total Atheiſm, are objected; and it is objected alſo, that an innate Idea of God is not requiſite. (m) *A man by the right uſe of his natural Abilities may without any innate Principles attain the knowledge of a God and other things that concern him:* (n) *Without any ſuch primitive impreſſion we can eaſily attain to the knowledge of the Deity by the ſole uſe of our natural Reaſon.* It is poſſible, that without any original impreſſion Men by the ſole uſe of their Reaſon might diſcover, *that there is a God*, as Propoſitions in *Euclid* have been found out and diſcover'd: and it muſt be acknowledg'd, (o) *that they who made the diſcovery, had made a right uſe of their Reaſon:* but it muſt be acknowledg'd alſo, that an εὕρηκα had well become them upon ſo wonderful a diſcovery, and it is great pity, that amongſt the Inventors of uſeful things their Names are not recorded, who firſt made this important diſcovery, *that there is a God.* Men by the ſole uſe of their Reaſon may diſcover, that there is a God: but there is much of peradventure and hap-hazard, whether Mankind diſcover the Being of God or not. For we are told, that (p) *if Men do not make enquiry into the admirable Contrivances that are in the World, they may live long without any Notion of ſuch a Being.* It is more than probable therefore, that the generality of Mankind (who do not philoſophize) will be univerſally Atheiſts, as devoid of any Notion of God, as the Soul is ſuppos'd to be originally, by them that ſtyle her *Abraſa Tabula.* Without innate Principles or primitive Impreſſion it is poſſible, that Men may attain the knowledge of a God: but is it not alſo poſſible, that they may not? *that they may live long without any Notion of ſuch a Being?* In which tract of time they muſt neceſſarily have no Conſcience, nor any Law or *Work of the Law*, nor any *Thoughts accuſing or excuſing*; they muſt neceſſarily be Atheiſts without being Rebels, without the guilt of the Heathen, who when *they knew God, did not glorifie him as God, nor lik'd to retain God in their knowledge*, and they muſt neceſſarily be ungodly and unrighteous *without holding the truth in unrighteouſneſs.* It muſt be ſuppos'd, that God made them without making them Religioniſts; for as men cannot be ſaid, to be made Philoſophers, meerly becauſe by their natural Abilities they may become Philoſophers; ſo neither can they be ſaid, to be made Religioniſts, meerly becauſe by their natural Faculties they may become ſuch. Are they not born by nature Atheiſts, if they have no innate Idea of God, no primitive Impreſſion, *if they may live long without any Notion of ſuch a Being?* That Mankind may be by nature Religioniſts, innate Idea is requiſite, (q) ἐπίνοια ἀναγκαία καὶ ἔμφυτος ἐν παντὶ τῷ λογικῷ, γιγνομένη κατὰ φύσιν ἄνευ θνητοῦ διδασκάλου καὶ λόγου, *a neceſſary and innate Notion which is naturally in every Rational without an Humane Teacher or operoſe deductions of Reaſon.* This legitimate innate Idea of God is incumbred with no valuable Objections, but it is poſſible that thoſe Objections may be made againſt it, that are urg'd againſt an erroneous innate Idea of God and primitive Impreſſion, therefore we will briefly conſider them.

Firſt, It is argu'd, (r) *That ſuch an Impreſſion taketh away the commendableneſs and rewardableneſs of Faith by rendring the Belief of a God irreſiſtible and neceſſary.* But our legitimate innate Idea of God is not liable to this Objection; for although it is innate to the minds of all men, to notice to them the Exiſtence of God as a Principle of Natural Religion, yet they may be Atheiſts: but it will be very hard, if not impoſſible, to be thorough-pac'd Atheiſts; and ſo ſome wiſe men have thought, that the Fool who ſaith in his Heart there is no God, (s) *rather ſaith it by rote to himſelf, as that he would have, than that he can throughly believe it or be perſwaded of it.* The commendableneſs of *Faith* is not taken away in any ſuch caſe, where there is place for a virtuous diſpoſition: whence although the Apoſtle *Thomas* had the Evidence of Sence (which may ſeem to neceſſitate aſſent) for our Saviour's Reſurrection, yet his Faith was commendable and rewardable. In his caſe there was place for virtuous Diſpoſition; whence *the Watch* and from them the Chief Prieſts although they had the Evidence of Sence as well as he, yet being devoid of his virtuous diſpoſition continu'd in Unbelief, *Matth.* 28. 11. Evidence of Sence, Evidence plainly mathematical will not neceſſitate *Aſſent* in ſuch caſes, where a requiſite virtuous Diſpoſition is wanting, and a potent Intereſt and Inclination is againſt it.

Another Argument againſt an erroneous innate Idea of God is drawn from the Apoſtle's preaching to the *Athenians*, Act. 17. 27. *Of ſeeking the Lord, if happily they might feel after him and find him:* whence this Inference is made, (t) *That it requireth ſome Induſtry and Conſiderati-*

on,

(i) *Apparet à Naturâ ipſâ impelli, ut eos quos genuerimus, amemus.* Cic. de Fin. l. 1. *Ingeneratque in primis præcipuum quendam amorem in eos qui procreati ſunt. ſtudet parare ea quæ ſuppeditant ad cultum & ad victum, nec ſibi ſoli, ſed conjugi, liberis, cæteriſque quos caros habeat & tueri debeat.* Idem de off. l. 1.

(k) Dr. Bentley 3. Ser. againſt Atheiſm, p. 5, 6.

(l) Dion. Chryſoſt. orat. 12.

(m) Mr. Lock ſupr. c. 4.

(n) Dr. Bentley ſupr. p. 5.

(o) Mr. Lock ſupr.

(p) Ibid.

(q) Dion. Chryſoſt.

(r) Dr. Bentley ſupr. p. 5.

(s) Ld. Bacon Eſſay of Atheiſm.

(t) Dr. Bentley ſupr. p. 1, 6.

on, to find out the Being of God by the Light of Nature. This Inference concerneth our Hypotheſis; for (being part of a Diſpute againſt an innate Idea) this muſt be the Senſe of it; that *the finding out the Being of God by the Light of Nature is meerly by Induſtry and Conſideration excluſively of an Innate Idea.* But the Inference is no legitimate Inference from the Apoſtle's Text, whoſe ſcope is not to exhort the *Athenians*, to ſeek and find out the Being of God, nor did he preach to them as to Atheiſts or ſuch *Heteroclits*, that had not made the diſcovery, that there is a God, but as to Pagan Theiſts (who had Gods too many;) nor doth *ſeeking after the Lord and finding him* ſignifie the finding out this Propoſition, *that there is a God*, nor are all thoſe that have found out this Propoſition, ſuch as have found God in the Apoſtle's Senſe. But he conſidereth the *Athenians* as Aliens from the true God and from knowing him, he exhorteth them therefore, *to ſeek the Lord, to feel after him and find him*, which is, to unpaganize themſelves, to know him ſo, as to be his Religioniſts. To find the Being of God (the Exiſtence of a Deity) this needed not, (u) *a ſeeking the Lord with Meditation and Study*; their innate Notion of the Being of God and the obvious Phænomena of Nature made them a ſort of Theiſts: but to be in *Theiſm of Religion and Condition*, This was the thing which required a ſeeking the Lord with meditation and ſtudy, and becauſe they were without it, therefore they were Heathen Atheo-Theiſts. and the true God was to them a Stranger-Deity.

SECTION III.

The Law of Nature is notic'd to Mankind by the Nature of things, the Inſtincts of Nature, and the Senſe of Conſcience.

I. THE Stoicks define *officium* (duty) *actionem naturalibus conſtitutionibus convenientem*, a Practice agreeable to the Natural Conſtitutions. And when *Arnobius* asketh, (w) *Quænam eſt ratio naturalis aut in mundi conſtitutionibus lex ſcripta?* his words imply, *that the Law of Nature is that which is written in the Conſtitutions of the World.* So the Apoſtle ſuppoſeth, that Sodomy, Beſtiality and other Heathen Pollutions were Crimes againſt the Law of Nature, becauſe they were repugnant to the Order of Nature, to the manifeſt Inſtitution of the great Author of Nature and to the natural uſe of things, *Rom.* 1. 26, 27. *Men and Women chang'd the natural uſe into that which is againſt Nature.* The Heathen Idolatry was againſt the Nature of Creatures (that were deify'd by it) and upon this account alſo it was a Crime againſt the Law of Nature, it was repugnant and injurious to the Dignity of Man (made after God's Image) an hideous and vile debaſement of him, to fall down before Stocks and Stones with all manner of ſubmiſſion and lowly Adoration. A Friar in *China* as he was ſaying Maſs, chanc'd to throw down ſome of that Peoples Idols, whereupon they began to ruſh upon him with great vehemency. He begg'd their pardon for what he had done unwarily, but withall told them, that it was much more fit and reaſonable, for the Work to worſhip the Workman, than for the Workman to worſhip the Work that he had made. The People upon this Admonition left their Idols, telling him, that they never heard ſo much before. As Idolaters ſin againſt their own Dignity, *ſo he that committeth Fornication, ſinneth againſt his own Body* (and therefore againſt his own Dignity) proſtituting it and making it ſo abominably vile, as to make it the Member of an Harlot, 1 *Cor.* 6. 15, 16, 18. (x) *Apparet cauſam vetandi fuiſſe ipſam facti turpitudinem.* Scortation was manifeſtly forbidden becauſe of the turpitude which ſuch things have, when they are out of a certain Orbit, within which they ought to be confin'd, and without which they have a craſs and execrable foulneſs, and are criminal, ſhameful, diſgraceful Contaminations, repugnant to that graceful and ornamental Purity and Chaſtity, which is the Honour of the Body and of the Perſon, (1 *Theſſ.* 4. 4.) whence a great Lady in *Italy* was wont to ſay, *A Woman ſhould conceal the reſt of her Virtues, but in her Chaſtity ſhe ſhould glory.* (y) *Wiſe Men have judg'd, that the ſenſual pleaſure of the Taſt and Touch* (cibi & veneris) *is of all things the moſt foul and filthy.* The ſenſual exceſs of Drunkenneſs (like the Villainies of Uncleanneſs) is manifeſtly repugnant to the natural uſe of things, the Honour and Dignity of Man (indeed to common Civility, Gravity, Modeſty, Diſcretion) and to the dignifying Properties of the Humane Nature. For whereas Man is naturally a beauteous, noble and cleanly Animal, there is no Beaſt of the Field ſo beaſtly as a Drunkard, a moſt foul, naſty, noxious and miſhapen Animal, with ſtaring diſtorted Eyes, a fetid Breath, a ſtuttering bawling Tongue, leud Demeanour, and as *Chaucer* telleth him, (z) *thy Face is turned into a new array.* His trade is gorging, ſurcharging, diſgorging, and *ſhameful ſpewing is upon his glory.* (a) *For Men to meet together, to drink themſelves drunk, is more foul and diſhoneſt* (ſaith *Maimonides*) *than if Men ſhould meet together in an Houſe naked and in the Day-time, to do the Works of Nature.* The life of Senſualiſts is oppoſite to the regular frame and conſtitution of Man, which conſiſteth in the Sovereignty and Rule of his Intellectual Rational Nature and the Subjection of the Senſitive; for in them Animal Senſitive Nature is predominant and beareth the ſway, and the Head is, where the Heels ſhould be, (b) *Beaſts, Plants, the Sun, the Stars, are deſign'd for ſomething,* σὺ οὖν πρὸς τι, *what then art thou deſign'd for? for Senſual Pleaſure? Bethink thy ſelf, whether this be ſuitable to our Natural Sentiment.* A vicious Life is repugnant to the end and uſe of Man, to his true Excellency and proper Felicity, and to the agreeable Morals of Man. Whence (c) evil men are reproach'd ταῖς ἀλόγων προσηγορίαις, *with the Names of Brute-Animals*, they are λυκάνθρωποι, *Men-wolves, Dogs and Foxes*, like the *Minotaur*, that was in part a Man and in part a Beaſt. In reſpect of their Morals they are Brute-Animals and ſo far θηρία ἀνθρωπόμορφα, *Brutes in the ſhape of Men*, which are monſtroſities in nature. From the nature of things this great comprehenſive rule of practice is deduc'd by *Seneca*, (d) *omnia vitia contra Naturam pugnant: omnia debitum ordinem deſerunt.* All Vices are repugnant to Nature (the Nature of things) *all of them are inordinate.* Inordinate Self-love, Self-magnifying, Fear and Care, inordinate Anger and all *inordinate Affection* (Col. 3. 5.) *the Luſt of the Fleſh, the Luſt of the Eyes and the Pride of Life* (the Summary of all Wickedneſs) are vicious and criminal becauſe of their Inordinacy; for they are Nature grown Unnatural, Enormous, Diſproportionate, and like a Muſical Inſtrument out of Tune, agreeably to *Ariſtotle*'s excellent Compariſon.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 7.

(w) *Adv. Gent.* l. 1. p. 36.

(x) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 27.

(y) *Voluptas quæ nimia ex guſtu atque tactu eſt, ſicut ſapientes viri cenſuerunt, omnium rerum fœdiſſima eſt.* Macrob. Saturn. l. 2. c. 8.

(z) *The Man of Laws Tale.*

(a) *Maimon. Mor. Nev.* par. 3. c. 8.

(b) *M. Ant.* l. 8. c. 19.

(c) *S. Chryſoſt.* T. 5. p. 545. &c. & T. 3. p. 582.

(d) *Ep.* 122.

pariſon. (e) *An honeſt Man as ſuch is delighted with virtuous Practices, but is troubled at thoſe which proceed from Wickedneſs: As a Muſician is delighted with good Tunes, but is offended at what is diſ-harmonious.* All Men are offended at the violation of relative Duties, the reaſon of them is ſo plain and obvious.

Qui didicit Patriæ quid debeat & quid amicis
Quo ſit amore Parens, quo Frater amandus & hoſpes,
Quid ſit Conſcripti, quid Judicis officium, quæ
Partes in bellum miſſi ducis, ille profectò
Reddere perſonæ ſcit convenientia cuique.
Horat. de Art. Poet.

Groſs irreverence to a Prince, ingratitude to a Benefactor, injuring a Friend, are repugnances and incongruities to the Object (the *Perſians* proverbially ſay, *drink Wine, ſet the Pulpit and Church on fire, burn an Abdalla's Coat, be ſeen in an Idol's Temple, but wrong not your Friend*) and ſuch is the juſtifying the wicked, the befriending Sin, the profaning that which is Holy, all impiety towards God, the minding Private Intereſt and ſlighting the Publick, the taking care of the Body and neglecting the Soul, to which (in weight and worth) this World is not proportionate. (f) *Rerum naturæ aſſentior*, I aſſent to the Nature of Things, ſuch is the Law of Nature.

II. The Law of Nature is in ſome degree notic'd by *the kindly Inſtincts that are in Nature*, which is below Reaſon, Will and Choice. So Nature (in the narrow Senſe) uſually ſignifieth the natural (unintelligent) Agents Nature. (g) *For Nature is a thing neceſſitative and without free Will.* (h) *Man is in part carry'd according to Nature, in part he acteth according to Will and Choice.* (i) *The Ancients called the Paſſions natural and devoid of Reaſon.* In this notion of Nature cuſtom is ſaid to be a ſecond Nature or ἐπίκτητος φύσις, *an acquir'd Nature*, as *Galen* calleth it. (k) *What is Learned, is not of Nature, but of Will and Choice, which yet by cuſtom and the love of Sin is in ſome ſort turn'd into a Nature.* Of Nature in this Notion (Nature in the Univerſe) *Ariſtotle* ſaith, that although ſhe acteth not electively or intendingly, but fatally, and knoweth not what ſhe doth, yet ſhe doth nothing in vain, but all for Ends and Uſes. As Nature blindly operateth in the great World, ſo in Animals and in Man, in whoſe Animal-nature (as in Brute-animals) there are blind Inſtincts, which are not the Law of Nature, but are to be govern'd according to the Law of Nature, and ought to be in ſubjection to Reaſon (as Reaſon to God) which they uſually rebel againſt and dethrone. (l) *My Mind being right Nature violently carrieth me away.* The Animal Nature in Man is full of inordinate Concupiſcence, which is not ſo Nature, as not to be *vitium Naturæ*; for the Nature of Man is ſadly out of frame by it. Nor is it Nature as being natural to the Soul of Man; for it is extraneous and adventitious, and requireth a Purgation, which is ἀφαίρεσις ἀλλοτρίου παντός, *a taking away what is extraneous and unnatural.* Nor is it kindly and agreeable, and in ſuch ſenſe natural or con-natural to the Soul, (m) ἀλλὰ θεάσαι εἰ προσηνέστερον ἡ ὁσιότης, *but conſider, if Virtue and Sanctity be not more kindly and pleaſant.* Yet a Nature it is, as being the Animal-nature, and ſo far the Nature of Man, it is now (in a certain degree) his innate Conſtitution, and it is the Specific Nature of the carnal and mundane Family, whence the Apoſtle ſaith of inordinate Concupiſcence (the Luſt of the Fleſh, the Luſt of the Eyes, and the Pride of Life) *it is not of the Father, but is of the World.* 1 Joh. 2. 16. It is of the World, as it is lapſed and become this wicked World.

But if this Animal Nature be conſider'd as it is Nature, not *vitium Naturæ*, the kindly Inſtincts of it are Notices of the Law of Nature, and contradict the Atheiſts Politicks, that are founded upon Lyes and Slanders of Mankind (whereby it appeareth, how highly well they deſerve of Mankind) *that natural Relations are nothing, that there is nothing of Honeſty, Juſtice or Philanthropy in human Nature, no natural Charity or Friendlineſs, that Man is not ſociable by Nature* (as Brute-animals are, that have a ſort of Benevolence for thoſe of their own kind) but *omnis benevolentia oritur ex metu & imbecillitate*, all Benevolence is only from fear or feebleneſs. If theſe unnatural Abuſers of Nature and worſt of Impoſtors teach, *that nothing is juſt or unjuſt in the ſtate of Nature, every Man by Nature hath a right to every thing* (whatever his Appetite inclineth him to) *and whatſoever one doth to another, it is no injury*; ſo that a Son may lawfully kill his own Parents, and the Innocent may be tortur'd to all extremity; the innate Humanity and στοργή, that is in Mankind, the natural Paſſions of *Gratitude* and *Commiſeration* that are in human Nature, contradict theſe leud and nefarious *Dogmata*; and this other ill natur'd Maxim alſo, *that Man ſeeketh that which is good for himſelf as the only object of his Deſires*, is contradicted by Nature, (n) *Formicæ, Apes, Ciconiæ, aliorum cauſa quædam faciunt*, Ants, Bees, Storks, do ſome things for the ſake of others. (o) *The inclination to Goodneſs is imprinted deeply in the Nature of Man: Inſomuch that if it iſſue not towards Men, it will take unto other living Creatures; as is ſeen in the Turks, a cruel People, who nevertheleſs are kind to Beaſts, and give Alms to Dogs and Birds: Inſomuch as* Busbechius *reporteth, a Chriſtian Boy in* Conſtantinople *had like to have been ſtoned for gagging in waggiſhneſs a long billed Fowl.* Many Inſtincts of Nature inſtigate to what is manifeſtly a ſort of Goodneſs or Well-doing, and theſe are Indications, that the being devoid of them and the Practice which is contrary to them is *criminally unnatural.* Such is the Inſtinct to common *Modeſty* (p) called by the Atheiſts μωρία, *fooliſhneſs*, and the Inſtinct to *natural Affection*, Rom. 1. 31. Such is the Inſtinct of Nature to an ordinate regular *Self-love*, Deſire of our own Good, Self-conſervation, Well-being and Felicity, and an Averſion from the contrary. *Naturâ enim ſibi quiſque amicus eſt* (for every one by Nature is a Friend to himſelf) which was a common Saying in ancient times. *No Man ever hated his own Fleſh* (without being criminally unnatural) *but loveth and cheriſheth it.* Eph. 5. 29. Nature inſtigateth Mankind, to take care of themſelves and their Off-ſpring, ſo making a natural Society, Kindred and Friendſhip, and taking care

---

(c) Ὁ σπουδαῖος, ᾗ σπουδαῖος, ταῖς κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν πράξεσι χαίρει, ταῖς δ᾽ ἀπὸ κακίας δυσχεραίνει· καθάπερ ὁ μουσικὸς τοῖς καλοῖς μέλεσιν ἥδεται, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς φαύλοις λυπεῖται. *Eth. l. 9. c. 9.*

(f) *Sen. de vit. beat. c. 3.*

(g) Ἡ γὰρ φύσις ἀναγκαστικόν τι ἐστὶ καὶ ἀβούλητον χρῆμα. *Petav T. 4 l. 3. c. 4.*

(h) Πῇ μὲν φέρεται κατὰ φύσιν, πῇ δὲ κατὰ προαίρεσιν. *Euſeb. pr. ev. l. 6 c. 10.*

(i) *Perturbationes Animi antiqui naturales eſſe dicebant, & rationis expertes.* Cic. Academ. Qu. l. 1.

(k) *Quicquid diſcitur, non naturæ eſt, ſed ſtudii & propriæ voluntatis, quæ nimiâ conſuetudine & amore peccandi quodammodo in naturam convertitur.* S. Hieron. Com. in Jer. 13. 23.

(l) Γνώμην δ᾽ ἔχοντά μ᾽ ἡ φύσις βιάζεται. *Plutarch. de virtut. mor. p. 446.*

(m) *M. Ant. l. 5. S. 9.*

(n) *Cic. de Fin. l. 3.*

(o) *Lord Bacon Eſſay of Goodneſs.*

(p) *Epict. Diſſ. l. 2. c. 20.*

Ἀγαθὴ γὰρ ἡ φύσις διδάσκαλος. *Diodor ap. Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 2. c. 7. S. 4.*

of the conſervation of the Species, and to extinguiſh or control theſe Inſtincts, is κακούργημα, *maleficium*. In diſpoſing of their Eſtates Men rightly ſuppoſe themſelves oblig'd, to proportion their kindneſs to others to their degrees of nearneſs to themſelves, as the kindly Inſtincts of Nature incline them. (q) *There are various degrees of Society and Conjunction amongſt Mankind; and as every one is nearer, ſo ordinarily he is to have a greater ſhare of our Kindneſs with its Effects.* The Inſtincts of Nature to Religion and Society by ſhewing the deſign of the great Author of Nature are manifeſtly Notices of the Law of Nature.

III. The Law of Nature is notic'd by *the Sence of Conſcience*, the peaceful and joyous Sence of Innocence and Well-doing, and the dolorous torturous Sence of Guilt. Conſcience is certainly of this definitive Notion; *It is the Mind as conſcious of Duty and of Sin*, and ſo far it is the ſame with νοῦς πρακτικός, *the practical Mind.* For Conſcience denoteth that which is *conſcient* or *conſcious* in a Man as ſuch; it denoteth therefore the Mind as conſcious, and it muſt neceſſarily denote the Mind as *conſcious of Duty and of Sin*, becauſe nothing elſe in Law and Religion is matter of Conſcience. Thoſe Paſſions of the Mind as conſcious of Duty and Sin *Morſus Conſcientiæ*, *ſatisfactio ſive acquieſcentia in ſeipſo* (*quæ vocatur Tranquillitas & Quies Conſcientiæ*) *& pœnitentia*, are the Conſcience in Man; therefore the Conſcience is the Mind of Man as conſcious of Duty and of Sin. Of Conſcience ſo defin'd there are two Branches; the one *directive*, which reſpecteth Duty and Sin not yet done (which is *intelligentia practica* and the Schools *Syntereſis* or Syſtem of common practical Notions) the other is *reflexive*, which reſpecteth Duty and Sin already done; and from both theſe Branches of *Conſciouſneſs* (but chiefly from the latter) Conſcience hath its Name. For it is a vulgar miſtake, to confound *Conſcientiâ* with *Scientia* (or Knowledge) *in order to Action*, or to interpret it *cum alio Scientia*. In ancient Authors *Conſcientia* ſignifieth *Conſciouſneſs of our Doings*, ſometimes the Conſciouſneſs of others, but moſt uſually our own Conſciouſneſs. So *Tacitus* ſaith of *Nero*, that he fell in Love with *Acte* (r) *having taken two young Men into Conſciouſneſs of his doing*. So *Cicero* ſaith, that *Epicurus* Philoſophizeth in ſuch a manner, (s) *that there is nothing ſo foul, which he ſeemeth not willing to do for pleaſure-ſake, if Men be not conſcious thereof.* But moſt uſually *Conſcientia* in the ancient Writers ſignifieth our own *Conſciouſneſs* of our doings. As when *Cicero* ſaith, (t) *Every one's flagitious doing exagitateth him and affecteth him with madneſs: His evil Cogitations and Conſciouſneſs of Mind terrifie him.* (u) *The Conſciouſneſs of a well ſpent Life and the remembrance of many Well-doings is moſt pleaſant.* (w) *The Conſciouſneſs of a right Will is the greateſt Conſolation of incommodious Affairs.* (x) *In the very Conſciouſneſs of Well-doings there is fruit enough of our Labours.* The ſame Author ſomewhere ſaith (y) *I uſe not ſo much, to rejoice in any thing as the Conſciouſneſs of my Duties.* In theſe Sayings (and ſuch more) *Conſcientia* is rightly rendred Conſciouſneſs, as appeareth (z) from many parallel Sayings of the ancient Writers. From whoſe uſual Phraſeology it is manifeſt, that *Conſcience* hath its Name from Conſciouſneſs (the Mind's Conſciouſneſs of well and evil Doing) whence it muſt be defin'd *the Mind as conſcious of Duty and of Sin.* Agreeably to which Definition of *Conſcience* the uſual diſtributions of Conſcience may eaſily be underſtood and explain'd. For if the Mind as conſcious of Duty and Sin (directly and reflexively) is uncriminal, *this is the good Conſcience*: If it be criminal, *this is the evil Conſcience.* As conſcious of Duty and of Sin the Mind may be quiet or troubled: The one is a *quiet* the other a *troubled* Conſcience. If the Mind is tenderly conſcious of Duty and of Sin, this is a *tender Conſcience*: If ſenſleſs and not apt to check or to check but feebly, *this is a ſtupid Conſcience.* And what is an *erroneous*, *doubtful*, *ſcrupulous Conſcience*, but the Mind conſcious in general of Duty and of Sin, and erroneous, doubtful and ſcrupulous touching ſome particular matters of Practice? The Notion of Conſcience in the New Teſtament (where the Name occurreth no leſs than Thirty two times) is the Mind as conſcious of Duty and of Sin. When the holy Writers ſpeak of being *convicted* by our own Conſcience, of being *condemned* by it, of the *teſtimony of our Conſcience, and our Conſcience bearing Witneſs*, of *commending themſelves to every Man's Conſcience and being made manifeſt in their Conſciences*, and of *having no more Conſcience of Sins*, Conſcience ſignifieth as in profane Authors *the Conſciouſneſs of our Mind, the Mind as conſcious of Good and Evil.* To do any thing *for Conſcience-ſake*, *for Conſcience towards God*, is to do it as conſcious of *Duty to God and of Sin againſt him.* Rom. 13. 5. 1 Pet. 2. 19. Some ate things offer'd to an Idol with *Conſcience of the Idol*, as conſcious of Duty and Religious Worſhip to the Idol, 1 *Cor.* 8. 7. their being ſo conſcious of Duty and of Sin was their ſinful weakneſs, and therefore their Conſcience was weak, 1 *Cor.* 8. 7. and it was alſo defiled with ſad Criminality, the Practice of Idolatry. So the Mind of ungodly Infidels as ſuch is defiled, and their Conſcience is defiled by their deadly Criminality of Practice. *Tit.* 1. 15. Chriſtians were at liberty, to eat what was offer'd unto Idols, *asking no Queſtion for Conſcience-ſake* (asking no Queſtion upon account of their own Minds Conſciouſneſs of Good and Evil:) But they might not eat it under this Notion as Idols Meat in the apprehenſion of thoſe that made Conſcience of the Worſhip of Idols, but were bound to abſtain, becauſe of their Conſcience (their Conſciouſneſs of Good and Evil) for if they did in ſuch manner externally Symbolize with them, their Liberty would be *judged* (conſtrued and interpreted) by their Conſcience (their Conſciouſneſs of Duty and Sin) who made Conſcience of the Worſhip of Idols. How then could a Chriſtian think it a reaſonable thing, to Symbolize with them? Chriſtians have not only a Conſcience but *the good Conſcience*, which is ſometimes called *a Conſcience void of Offence*, ſometimes *a pure Conſcience*. And becauſe by Virtue of Chriſt's Sacrifice they are uncondemnably ſinleſs, guiltleſs and uncriminal as to the Mind, Soul and Conſcience, therefore they are ſaid to have *their Hearts ſprinkled from an evil Conſcience*, Heb. 10. 22. to have *their Conſcience purg'd from dead Works* (thoſe deadly Works that were deadly Criminalities and deadly Pollutions, *Heb.* 9. 14.) and Chriſt's Sacrifice is ſaid to make them *perfect as pertaining to the Conſcience*, Heb. 9. 9. For they are perfect as to the expiation of Sin, or are perfectly expiated by Chriſt's Sacrifice, being made by it uncondemnably ſinleſs, guiltleſs and uncriminal as to the Mind, Soul and Conſcience. In one place more of the New Teſtament mention is made of *Conſcience*, but it is of a ſuperlatively evil Conſcience; for the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *a Conſcience ſeared with an hot Iron.* 1 Tim. 4. 2. ſuch is the Conſcience of an habituated atrocious Criminal. The Phraſe may ſignifie (*a*) that his Conſcience is deeply maculated with the Marks of his Crimes (*Pectus inuſtæ deformant maculæ*;) it may ſignifie (*b*) that he is of a branded ſtigmatiz'd Conſcience, an infamous Villain; and the Phraſe may allude to ſear'd cauteriz'd Fleſh, and therefore may ſignifie (*c*) that he is become inſenſate as to his Conſcience, and is ſo far harden'd in his Villainy.

(q) *Optimè ſocietas hominum conjunctioque ſervabitur, ſi ut quiſque erit conjunctiſſimus, ita in eum benignitatis plurimum conferetur.* Cic. de Off. l. 1.

(r) *Aſſumptis in conſcientiam Othone & Claudio Senecione adoleſcentulis.* Annal. l. 13.

(s) *Ut hominum conſcientia remota, nihil tam turpe ſit, quod voluptatis cauſa non videatur eſſe facturus.* De Fin. l. 2.

(t) *Suam quenque ſcelus agitat, amantiâque afficit: Suæ malæ cogitationes conſcientiæque animi terrent.* Pro. Sext. Roſc.

(u) *Conſcientia benè actæ vitæ multorumque benefactorum recordatio jucundiſſima eſt.* Idem de Senect.

(w) *Conſcientia rectæ voluntatis maxima conſolatio eſt rerum incommodarum.* Idem l. 6. Ep. 4.

(x) *In ipſa conſcientia rectè factorum ſatis laborum fructus eſt.* Idem 5. Philip.

(y) *Nulla re tam lætari ſoleo, quàm officiorum meorum conſcientia.*

(z) *Magna profectò res eſt, ſi quis de Innocentiâ ſuâ ſibi conſcius eſt.* Sophocl. ap. Sharrock de Offic. c. 1. N. 11. *Conſcium eſſe ſibi in vitâ ſuâ Nullius Criminis, multum profectò voluptatis parit.* Antiphon. ibid. *Nihil eſt miſerius quàm animus hominis conſcius.* Plautus ap. Bp. Taylor Duct. Dub. B. 1. c. 1. r. 2. n. 9. *Oreſtes* being ask'd what troubled him? Maketh anſwer (in the Tragedy) ἡ σύνεσις, ὅτι σύνοιδα δεῖν' εἰργασμένος, *Conſcience, becauſe I am conſcious, that I have done atrocious things.* *Qui ſibimet alicujus rei eſt conſcius, ſit licet audaciſſimus, conſcientia illum maximè meticuloſum reddit.* Menander ap Sharrock ſupr. N. 10. *Conſcia mens ut cuique ſua eſt, ita concipit intra Pectora pro facto ſpemque metumque ſuo.* Ovid. ibid.

——*Tormentaque ſera Gehennæ*
Anticipat, patiturque ſuos mens
conſcia Manes. Auſon.

—————— *ſi quid*
Uſquam Juſtitiæ eſt, & mens
ſibi conſcia recti.
Virgil 1. Æn.

Joh 8. 38. *Wiſd.* 15. 13. *Tit.* 3. 11. 1 *Joh.* 3. 20. Rom. 2. 15. and 9. 1. 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. and 4. 2. and 5. 11. *Heb.* 10. 2.

1 *Cor.* 10. 25, 27, 28, 29.

IV. At this gigantick pitch of Wickedneſs they are arriv'd, that have overcome their checking and controlling Mind, that can commit groſs and flagrant Sins without reluctance or regret, remorſe or ſhame, and perpetrate notorious Wickedneſs with an Opinion of its generoſity, gallantry and bravery. (*d*) So the Philoſophers diſtinguiſh between ἀκρασία, *Incontinence*, and ἀκολασία, *Intemperance*: Ἡ μὲν ἀκρασία σώζει τὴν κρίσιν ὀρθὴν, *in Incontinence the Man keepeth his Judgment right, but is carried away by the appetite, that is too ſtrong for Reaſon.* But of ἀκολασία, (Intemperance) they ſay, αὕτη μὲν ἔχουσα καὶ πάθος φαῦλον καὶ λόγον, *it addeth a vicious judgment to a vicious appetite*, καὶ τὴν αἴσθησιν ἀποβάλλει τῶν ἁμαρτομένων, *and it deſtroyeth the Sence of the Sins.* The Man ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς συνεπινεύει ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, *from his whole Soul inclineth and conſenteth to his ſenſual Pleaſures*, and ſuch *commit Uncleanneſs with greedineſs.* Eph. 4. 19. How far Men may thus degenerate εἰς θηριωδίαν, *into Brutiſhneſs* (to be paſt feeling having the Mind obnubilated and the Conſcience deaded) is beſt known to them, that make the deſperate Experiment: But in ſome of the greateſt Monſters for Wickedneſs amongſt the Heathen, *Tiberius*, *Caligula*, *Nero*) the Sence of Conſcience was ſo far from being extinguiſh'd, that in the height of their greatneſs and in an affluence of Proſperity and ſenſual Pleaſures they found the Rebukes and Laſhes, the Anguiſh and Terrours of their own guilty Minds unavoidable. Whence the Hiſtorian obſerveth, that (*e*) *if the Minds of Tyrants be laid open, the Verberations and Laniations may be ſeen.* By the Vultur gnawing *Ixion*'s Liver the ancient Theologers meant (*f*) *the torments of an evil Conſcience.* By their *Erynnies*, *Eumenides*, *Furies* alſo the Heathen Theologers meant the horrours and terrours of a guilty Mind (*g*) *hæ ſunt impiis aſſiduæ domeſticæque Furiæ*, theſe are the conſtant and domeſtic Furies to the impious. Heathen Mankind felt in themſeves and found in others, that horrours of Conſcience attend horrid Practices, and that there is ſomething in Man, ὃ τὸ ἄδικον μὲν λωβᾶται, τὸ δὲ δίκαιον ὀνίνησιν, *which injuſtice ſenſibly hurteth, and which juſtice helpeth and delighteth*, as *Socrates* ſaith in *Plato*'s *Crito.* They found that certain groſs Sins did ſenſibly wound their Conſciences, which alſo wounded them, accuſing and reproaching them, convicting and condemning them (*h*) and ſcourging them with ſilent ſtrokes, diſquieting them with anguiſh and penſiveneſs, with doleful fears and ſad preſages; and this ſenſe of Guilt in their own Minds was a manifeſt Notice and Indication to them, to count thoſe Practices Wickedneſs, and to eſchew them as ſuch, which did claſh with the frame of their Minds, and brought ſo many and ſo great Evils of an evil Conſcience upon them. By internal Sence and Experience they found, they had a Conſcience *bearing them Witneſs*, acquitting and comforting, or accuſing and condemning them; they found a difference between Well-doing and Evil-doing in general, that ſome Practices were peaceful and pleaſant to their Minds (as harmonious and agreeable thereto) and that others they could not diſpence with; whereby the Duties of Honeſty and Juſtice were notic'd to them, to be Laws, inviolable, and they were warn'd of a future Judgment. They found, that Sin hath another face after the commiſſion of it, than it had before (*perfecto demum ſcelere magnitudo ejus intellecta eſt*, ſaith *Tacitus*) and that the only way to Peace, was not to Sin againſt their Conſcience. Erroneous Conſciences they had, yet not ſo erroneous, but that we may pronounce with *Origen* (*i*) *all Men have according to the common Notions a ſound anticipation touching the Moral Diſcipline.*

SECTION IV.

Of the twofold Obſervation of the Law of Nature.

I. AS in reſpect of its *Obligation* and *Promulgation*, ſo in reſpect of its *Obſervation* the Law of Nature is of a twofold Notion. For abating an additional Reſtriction which is in its definition (that limiteth it to the Notices of the light of Nature) the Law of Nature is intirely the ſame with the Divine Moral Law. And becauſe that additional Reſtriction reſpecteth only the Promulgation of it, therefore the Law of Nature conſider'd without reſpect to the Promulgation of it is abſolutely the ſame with the Divine Moral Law. Whence Divines ſay (*k*) *the Law of Nature is in reality the Moral Law, of which the Summary is compris'd in the Decalogue.*

Act. 23. 1. 24. 16. 1 Tim. 1. 5, 19, and 3. 9. Heb. 13. 18. 2 Tim. 1. 3. 1 Pet. 3. 16. 21.

(a) Grot.

(b) Dr. Hamm.

(c) Mr. Mede.

(d) Plutarch. de virt. mor. p 445, 446. Caſaubon. in Perſ. p. 249, 250.

(e) *Si recludantur Tyrannorum mentes, poſſe aſpici laniatus & ictus.* Vid. Grot. de V. R. C. l. 1. in fine. Iſ. Pontani Not. in Macrob. p. 675. Owen. Θεολ. παντοδ. l. 1. c. 5.

(f) *Tormenta malæ conſcientiæ obnoxia flagitio viſcera interiora rimantis & ipſa vitalia indefeſſa admiſſi ſceleris admonitione laniantis.* Macrob. in Som. Scip. l. 1. c. 10.

(g) *Cic. or. pro Sext. Roſc.*

(h) *Mala facinora conſcientia flagellari, & plurimum illi tormentorum eſſe, eò quòd perpetua illam ſolicitudo urget ac verberat.* Sen. Ep. 97.

(i) Πάντων ἐχόντων κατὰ τὰς κοινὰς ἐννοίας πρόληψιν ὑγιῆ περὶ τοῦ ἠθικοῦ τόπου. *C. Celſ. l. 1. p. 6.*

(k) *Eſt autem Lex naturæ reipſa Lex moralis cujus ſumma comprehenſa eſt in Decalogo.* Melancthon. Exam Theol. p. 360.

(l) *The Decalogue it ſelf is wont to be called the Law of Nature.* (m) *All the Precepts of the Decalogue belong to the Law of Nature except the Fourth touching the Sabbath.* The Schools ſay (n) *all the Moral Precepts of the old Law are of the Law of Nature.* They might have ſaid, that the Law of Nature is of the Divine Moral Law, but they choſe to ſpeak otherwiſe, and others of the learned ſpeak as they. (o) *Not only the Principles and Grounds of Spiritual and inward Obedience to God for God's ſake, but alſo the Precepts wherein it conſiſteth, are rather preſuppos'd by the Law than introduc'd by it; and therefore may well be ſaid, to be tranſlated out of the Law of Nature into* Moſes's *Law.* Some therefore call theſe Precepts of the Moſaic Law (p) *Tralatitia*, becauſe they ſuppoſe them to be tranſlated out of the Law of Nature. So the ancient Writers of the Church look upon the Moſaic Moral Law as the Law of Nature of a ſecond Edition. (q) *Was not the Law of Nature in the People of* Iſrael? *Plainly it was, for they were Men, and could not be without the Law of Nature, unleſs they could be without the Nature of Men. They were made therefore much more Sinners by the Divine Law, whereby the Law of Nature was reſtor'd, or augmented or confirmed.* (r) *This is the natural Law, which was partly reform'd by* Moſes, *and partly its Authority in reſtrainiug Vices was confirm'd*, ſaith the Author of the Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans* under S. *Ambroſe*'s Name. He ſuppoſeth, that the Law of Nature was by *Moſes* cleans'd from heterogeneous Mixtures, and that in ſuch Senſe reform'd it is the ſame with the Moſaic Moral Law, and conſequently it muſt be conſider'd (as the Moſaic Moral Law hath been conſider'd) both as it is of *Civil-religious* and as it is of *Spiritual-Religious* Obſervation. The one conſtituteth the *Civil-religious*, the other *the Spiritual-religious* People. The one is neceſſary in Civil-religious Society, the other is Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, which alone is available, to conſtitute Men Righteous as to their Soul-intereſts.

II. The Law of Nature (becauſe of this different Obſervance of it) is an Inſtitution of *Spiritual-Religious Virtue and Duty* in order to Mens *Soul-intereſts*, and alſo an Inſtitution of *Civil-religious Virtue and Duty* in order to their *Secular* and *Civil* Intereſts, as the Apoſtle conſidereth the Moſaic-moral Law. 1 *Tim.* 1. 9, 10. *The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawleſs and diſobedient, for the ungodly and for ſinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of Fathers and murderers of Mothers, for man-ſlayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themſelves with mankind, for men-ſtealers, for liars, for perjured perſons.* As a Philoſopher is far from ſuppoſing, that a virtuous Man's proper Inſtitution of Virtue is not made for a virtuous Man: So if the Apoſtle had conſider'd the Moral Law as the Law of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, he would not have ſaid, that *it is not made for a righteous Man*; for it is his proper Inſtitution of Righteouſneſs. *Rom.* 2. 13. and 8. 7. and 13. 8, 10. *Jam.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11. But as the Philoſophers ſay of the Civil Law of the Commonwealth (s) *it is not made for the good* (it is not needful to make ſuch Laws for them:) So the Apoſtle ſaith of the Civil-religious Law of the Jews, it is not made for a righteous Man, as needful to be made for him, but for the leud and flagitious, (t) that by Authority of Law they may be documented with the Civil-religious Morals, *reſtrain'd from violating them, or puniſh'd if they do violate them.* The Moſaic Moral Law as it was the Law of the Judaical Commonwealth (that Political Law) was an Inſtitution of Civil-religious Virtue and Duty and of Civil-religious Obſervation. Whence a young Man telleth our Saviour *Matth.* 19. 20. that he had always obſerv'd the Moral Precepts of the Law; and the favour which our Saviour had for him, ſheweth, that he ſpake nothing but truth; for as to the Civil-religious Obſervation of the Precepts of the Moral Law he was train'd up ſo virtuouſly, that he had kept them from his Youth. So the Apoſtle in his Judaical Religion *touching the Righteouſneſs which is in the Law* (the Law-religion of the Law-religioniſts) *was blameleſs.* Phil. 3. 6. (u) *The Righteouſneſs which is of or in the Law* (ſaith a Pontifician Theologer) *is thoſe Works which Men do without the Grace of Faith, being help'd only by the knowledge of the Law, and theſe Works do not juſtifie before God, but only before Men, who only conſider externals.* Which account of the Righteouſneſs that is in the Law, is in part true and in part falſe. For it is rightly ſaid, to be thoſe Works, which Men do without Grace and Faith meerly by the knowledge of the Law: But this Righteouſneſs may juſtifie before God as to ſecular and civil Intereſts. *Ezek.* 18. 5, 9, 20, 22, 26, 27. And it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the good Conſcience which S. *Paul* had in his Judaiſm, was nothing of his legal Righteouſneſs, which therefore was not meerly external as to the Mind and Soul, yet no better than a Civil-religious Obſervance of a Civil-religious Law. Such is the Law of Nature, as it is the Law of Civil Societiſts, (*Lex Attica vel Jus Civile Romanorum*) as it is *Jus Gentium* (the Law of Nations) and as it is the Law of mundane Citizens in general meerly in order to their Secular Intereſts. For the Civil Law of every Nation in great part conſiſteth of the Law of Nature, which Civil Law is a Civil-religious Inſtitution (an Inſtitution of Civil-religious Virtue and Duty and of Civil-religious Obſervation) and conſequently the Law of Nature whereof it conſiſteth, is of the ſame Character. Such a Civil-Religious Inſtitution as the Civil Lawyers Diſcipline, which is defined by themſelves (w) *the Notice both of Divine and Human things, the Science of Juſt and Unjuſt.* This the Fathers call a Wiſdom (x) that extendeth only *to the Utility of Temporal Life, the Honeſty of this Life, the civil way of*

(l) *Ipſe Decalogus Lex Naturæ vocari ſolet.* Zanch. op. T. 4. l. 1. p. 194.

(m) *Decalogi præcepta omnia ad Legem naturalem pertinent, excepto quarto de quiete Sabbathi.* Curcell. Synopſ. Eth. c. 6.

(n) *Omnia præcepta moralia veteris legis ſunt de lege naturæ.* Aquin. 12dæ Qu. 100. Art. 1.

(o) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 1. *c.* 12.

(p) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 17.

(q) *Nunquid lex iſta naturalis non erat in populo Iſrael? Erat planè, quoniam & ipſi homines erant. Sine lege autem naturali eſſent, ſi præter naturam humani generis eſſe potuiſſent. Multo magis ergo prævaricatores facti ſunt lege divina, qua naturalis illa, ſive inſtaurata, ſive aucta, ſive firmata eſt.* S. Aug. Enar. in Pſal. 178. Conc. 25.

(r) *Hac eſt lex naturalis quæ per Moyſen partim reformata, partim authoritas ejus firmata in vitiis cohibendis.* In Ep. ad Rom. c. 3.

(s) *Grot. Not. in loc. & in Matth.* 5. 17. *& in Gal.* 5. 2

(t) *De hoc uſu dicitur, Lex e poſita injuſtis.* Melanchth. Exam. Theol. p. 393. *Hæc coacta expreſsáque juſtitia neceſſaria e publicæ hominum communitati. Hoc officium (legis moralis) videtur Apoſtolus propriè attigiſſe quum tradit Legem non eſſe juſto poſitam.* Calvin. Inſtit. l. 2. c. 7. S. 10.

(u) *Juſtitia ex lege ſive in lege, ſunt illa opera quæ homines faciunt ſine gratiâ fidei, ſolâ cognitione legis adjuti, & hæc opera non juſtificant coram Deo, ſed ſolum coram hominibus, qui tantum externa conſiderant.* Bellarm. T. 4. l. 1. c. 19.

(w) *Juriſprudentia eſt divinarum atque humanarum rerum notitia, juſti atque injuſti ſcientia.* Inſtit. l. 1. Tit. 1.

(x) *Ad temporalis vitæ utilitatem, ad hanc vitam moremque civilem, ad præſentis vitæ honeſtatem, ad Societatis humanæ æquitatem, ad mores civi-*

Living, the equity of Humane Society, the good manners of Cities and concord of the People. (y) *Humane Life*, ſaith the Orator, *is deſtroy'd by Wickedneſs, but conſerv'd by Virtue.* This ſort of Religion and Virtue neceſſary for Humane Society and for Humane Civil Life the Humane Laws inſtitute and in conſort with them the Law of Nature, the Morals whereof *Joſephus* calleth, (z) *That which is common to all Men unto honeſty of Manners, and which alone is ſufficient to conſerve the life of Men.* As a Civil-religious Inſtitution and for the conſervation of Humane Life the Law of Nature had an agreeable obſervation amongſt the virtuous Popular Pagans; for their obſervation of it was (in their way of Religion) Civil-religious; which was (a) *Virtus civilis, non vera, ſed veriſimilis, ad veras virtutes, æternamque beatitudinem non profecit*, Civil Virtue, not the true, but a ſemblance thereof, wholly ineffectual to make the Soul truly holy and happy.

III. But the Law Natural and Moſaical is the Law (or Religion) of Soul-intereſts, *for ſo the doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified*, Rom. 2. 13. *The Commandment was ordained to Life*, Rom. 7. 10. (b) It promiſeth and affordeth Life to the Doers of it. (c) *When a young Man ask'd, Good Maſter, what ſhall I do, that I may inherit Eternal Life? Chriſt anſwer'd, If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments, which he reckoneth in their order. The Commandments of the Law therefore were ſuch, and that by the purpoſe and deſign of the Lawgiver, and this was it, which the Law profeſſedly looked at, to lead Men to Life Eternal and Salvation.* (d) *In like manner*, Luk. 10. *to a Lawyer that asked, What ſhall I do, to inherit Eternal Life? Chriſt anſwered, What is written in the Law, how readeſt thou? ſignifying plainly, that the Law was given as the way of obtaining Eternal Life.* The Moral Law therefore natural and moſaical is not meerly a Civil-religious Inſtitution, but an Inſtitution of Religion and Virtue in order to Life Eternal, which muſt be called, *The Law-religion touching Soul-intereſts.* Our Saviour in his Diſcourſe with the Lawyer expreſſeth the very terms (the condition and premiant part of the Sanction) of this Law-religion; for he having repeated to our Saviour the grand Precepts of the Moral Law touching the Love of God and of Man, our Saviour replyeth to him, *Hoc fac & vives, This do and thou ſhalt live.* (e) *This is ſuch a fulfilling the legal Covenant, that a Man by benefit thereof may obtain the inheritance of Eternal Life.* (f) *Lex dicit, redde quod debes. Hoc fac & vives. The Law ſaith, pay what you owe* (do what you ought) *This do and thou ſhalt live.* If the Moral Law (natural and moſaical) is a Settlement or Covenant of Life Eternal, it is neceſſarily alſo a Settlement of Condemnation and of Death Spiritual and Eternal. (g) *It is called the Law of Sin, not as if the Law it ſelf is Sin, but becauſe of the Sinners that it is impos'd upon; therefore it is alſo the Law of Death, becauſe the Wages of Sin is Death, the Sting of Death is Sin, and the ſtrength of Sin is the Law.* (h) *The Law of Death is the* (moral) *Law of* Moſes, *which the Apoſtle in another Epiſtle calleth the miniſtration of Death.* (i) *The Law is not Wrath, but it worketh Wrath, that is, puniſhment, to the Sinner, not pardoning, but vindicating.* (k) *For the Law doth not pardon Sins, but condemneth.* (l) *Chriſt hath redeemed us from the Curſe of the Law, which is ſettled upon Sinners.* If the Moral Law hath all theſe tragical effects, (and others of like nature) in the Senſe of the New Teſtament, if the deſign of a Saviour was to redeem Mankind from the multifarious Evils brought upon them by the Moral Law, it muſt be thought a Premiant and Penal Settlement of the Soul-intereſts of men. Nor is it poſſible, that it can be an *Holy Spiritual Law* (as the Apoſtle ſtileth it) unleſs the Sanction of it be the Settlement of the Spiritual and Soul-intereſts of men. From whence it followeth, that *Life* and *Death* as they are the Sanction of the Law, muſt be underſtood in a twofold Notion, the one *Civil-religious*, the other *Spiritual-religious*, the one of which is figurative of the other. As when the Apoſtle ſaith, *The Law is not of Faith, but the Man that doeth them ſhall live in them:* Life muſt ſignifie *Secular Proſperity* as premiant to *Civil-religious Obedience*; and Life Eternal as premiant to the *Spiritual-religious* fulfilling the Law. Gal 3. 12.

IV. If the Moral Law natural and moſaical is the Law (or Religion) of Soul-intereſts, it is neceſſarily in the preceptive part of it an Inſtitution of the *Spiritual-religious* Morals and of Spiritual-religious Obſervation, (m) *quod legi convenit utique Spiritali*, which belongeth to it, as it is *the holy Spiritual Law*, Rom. 7. 12, 14. Such a kind of Law requireth, that men be the holy Spiritual kind of Livers (not of the wicked, carnal and ſinning kind) and that they live the holy ſpiritual kind of Life, which is the Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs of the inward man and the ſpiritual-religious obſervance of the Law. (n) *We know, ſaith the Apoſtle, that the Law is ſpiritual, but I am carnal; whereby he ſheweth, that the Law cannot be fulfilled but by the Spiritual, who are not made ſuch but by Grace. To a Spiritual Law as every one is of greater affinity (growing in ſpiritual affection) ſo much the more he fulfilleth it.* (o) *If the Law is Spiritual, the Precepts of it are Spiritual, and the Works of it are Spiritual.* The Law is Spiritual both in reſpect of the Life and Practice, and in reſpect of the Virtue and Duty which it requireth; for it requireth the holy Spiritual Life and Practice, and the Spiritual-religious Virtue and Duty, which are the ſame thing, but with this difference; The holy ſpiritual Life and Practice is contradiſtinguiſh'd to carnality and wickedneſs of Life and Practice, but the Spiritual-religious Virtue and Duty is contradiſtinguiſh'd to the Civil-religious, which (if alone) is but a carnality of Religion and Virtue. Such was the Religion and Virtue of

---

tatum concordiamque populorum. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. par. 3. Theſ. 10, 11, 12. Lactant. l. 6. c. 6.

(y) *Iſocrat. Archid. p. m.* 212.

(z) Τὸ πρὸς καλοκαγαθίαν κοινὸν ἅπασι, ϗ μόνον ἱκανὸν διασώζειν τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον. V. *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 17.

(a) *Voſſ. ſupr. Theſ.* 8, & 11.

(b) *Vitam æternam facientibus repromittit.* S. Hieron. com. in loc. *Obedientibus proficit ad vitam.* S. Ambroſ. com. in loc.

(c) *Petav. Dogm. Th. T.* 1. l. 10. c. 24.

(d) *Suarez. de Leg. l.* 9. c. 3.

(e) *Davenant. de Juſtit. actual.* c. 47. *Le Blanc. Theſ.* p. 560.

(f) *Urſin. Catech. par.* 2. *Qu.* 19. p. 101.

(g) *Lex peccati dicitur, non quia lex ipſa peccatum eſt, ſed quia peccatoribus imponitur. ideò etiam lex mortis, quia ſtupendiam peccati mors, aculeus mortis peccatum, virtus autem peccati lex.* S. Aug. T. 4. l. 83. Qu. 66.

(h) *Lex mortis Moyſi lex eſt, quia mortificat peccatores. Nam & in alia Epiſtola inter cætera dicit de authoritate Legis: Si miniſtratio mortis formata in lapidibus fuit in gloria.* S. Ambroſ. Com. in. Rom. 8.

(i) *Non lex ira eſt, ſed iram operatur peccanti, id eſt pænam, dum non ignoſcit, ſed vindicat.* Idem Com. in c. 4.

(k) *Lex enim non donat peccata, ſed damnat.* S. Hieron. Com. in Rom. 4.

(l) *Redemit nos Chriſtus de maledicto legis, quod peccantibus conſtitutum eſt.* Idem l. 2. Com. in Ep. ad Gal. c. 3. 13.

(m) *S. Ambroſ. in Pſal.* 118. *Ser.* 19.

(n) *Scimus inquit Apoſtolus, quia lex ſpiritalis eſt, ego autem carnalis ſum. In quo ſatis oſtendit, non poſſe impleri legem niſi à ſpiritalibus, qui non ſiunt niſi per gratiam. Spiritali enim legi quanto fit quiſque ſimilior, id eſt, quanto magis & ipſe in ſpiritalem ſurgit affectum, tanto eam magis implet.* S. Aug. ad Simplic. l. 1. Qu. 1.

(o) *Si Lex ſpiritalis eſt, utique præcepta Legis ſunt ſpiritalia, & opera ejus ſpiritalia ſunt.* S. Ambroſ. in Pſal. 43. p. m. 564.

the Jews after the Letter, that ſerv'd in the oldneſs of the Letter, being totally devoid of the Holy Spiritual Life, and therefore they were under the Curſe of the Holy Spiritual Law, (*p*) *quia ſub maledicto ſunt omnes, qui ſub litera ſunt*, for all that are under the Letter, are under the Curſe. They are in their Carnality of Life and Practice, and in their Carnality of Religion and Virtue, and are a Family of virtuous People and of Religioniſts oppoſite to the Spiritual and Divine Family of Regenerate Religioniſts, in whom the Righteouſneſs which the Holy Spiritual Law requireth, is fulfilled (in the main although not in the rigor of it) *Rom.* 8. 4. and 13. 10. (*q*) Regenerate Chriſtians that *walk not after the Fleſh but after the Spirit* (live the Holy Spiritual Life) fulfill the Righteouſneſs of the Law; the Law is therefore the Inſtitution of the Spiritual-religious Duty and Virtue. (*r*) None are the doers of it and of the Righteouſneſs which it requireth, but they that belong to the New Teſtament, that have the Law not written in Tables, but in their Hearts by an intimate and faithful love of God and of Righteouſneſs, which is the Spiritual-religious obſervance of the Law. (*s*) To do the Commandments of the Moral Law from ſervile fear of puniſhment (which is to do them againſt one's Will) is not to be a well-doer. The Law is not obſerv'd but by the love of God and of Righteouſneſs and delight in things ſpiritually good, and (*t*) by that equitable Charity which doeth to all, as we our ſelves would be done to. And if the Life of Divine Charity is the only genuine obſervance of the Law, it is neceſſarily of Spiritual-religious obſervation. The Chriſtian Moral Law is of Spiritual-religious obſervation, and the Moſaic Moral Law is of the ſame nature; for our Saviour in his Sermon on the Mount (which is the Chriſtian Moral Law) is ſaid, to have *perfected* and *filled up* the Moſaic-moral Law upon this account, (*u*) becauſe what was obſcurely imply'd therein, our Saviour hath clearly and diſtinctly explicated. That part of his Moral Law wherein he ſeemeth to dilate, extend and fill up the Moſaic (uſing the Phraſe *But I ſay unto you*) is in the main nothing elſe but the Contents of the Moſaic Moral Law clearly unfolded *and ſo as to be changed into Chriſtianity*. And becauſe the Moſaic Moral Law is the ſame with the Law of Nature, hence ſome Divines ſay of our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount, (*w*) *Hæc Legis Epitome non eſt conſilium arbitrarium, ſed eſt Lex naturæ obſervatu neceſſaria*, This Epitome of the Law is not arbitrary Counſel, but is the Law of Nature of neceſſary obſervation. The Law of Nature therefore is of various acceptation; for the whole Divine Moral Law *without reſtriction to natural Light* (the whole Syſtem of that Moral Law of which there are Notices by the light of Nature) is ſometimes called *The Law of Nature.* And by confining it to the Notices of natural Light this large acceptation of it is made narrower; for it is not to be ſuppos'd, that the Light of Nature ſo fully and perfectly noticeth the Moral Law as the Moſaic Scripture. (*x*) *The Ten Commandments teach nothing new; but what was obliterated they admoniſh: that Juſtice laid aſleep in the Jews by the Law, as Fire by blowing, may rekindle.*

V. As the Summary of what the Law of Nature (or the Moral Law) requireth, is *The good Life* (well-doing or Univerſal Righteouſneſs:) ſo it appeareth, that the good Life muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into two kinds, *The Civil-religious and the Spiritual-religious.* The Civil-religious good life maketh ſuch a City, as is defined by *Ariſtotle*, (*y*) ἡ τοῦ εὖ ζῆν κοινωνία, *A Society of living well.* It maketh ſuch good People, as *Demoſthenes* ſpeaketh of. (*z*) *If all indeed fearing the Puniſhments that are in the Laws, abſtain from evil-doing; and if all deſirous of the Rewards allotted to well-doing, will do what they ought, what hindreth, but that the City may be moſt ample*, καὶ πάντας χρηστοὺς, καὶ μηδένα εἶναι πονηρὸν, *and that all be good and not one bad or improbous.* The good life of the virtuous Popular Pagans, (*a*) who boaſted of their living well, *and did by nature the things contained in the Law*, cannot be thought of a better Character than the Civil-religious. For of the Spiritual-religious kind of good life it muſt be ſaid, (*b*) *If we live well, we have been dead, and are riſen to life. He that is not yet dead, nor riſen to life, as yet liveth an evil life. And if he liveth an evil life, he doth not live, let him die, that he may not die.* Let him die to the purpoſe being *ſpiritually alive*, and not take up *with the bad kind of good life* (which continueth men in the ſtate of death;) for the Law of it is not only (*c*) *Lex factorum &* νόμος ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς, *a Law of external good Deeds and of a carnal Commandment*, but alſo νόμος πνευματικὸς, *a Spiritual Law:* Which diſtinct conſiderations of the Law are taken notice of by the Learned *Grotius*, who yet in moſt of his Annotations hath marvellouſly miſtaken and perverted the Theology of the Law.

(p) *S. Ambroſ. ibid.*

(q) *Lex data eſt, ut gratia quæreretur: Gratia data eſt. ut Lex impleretur. Neque enim ſuo vitio non implebatur Lex, ſed vitio prudentiæ carnis. quod vitium per legem demonſtrandum, per gratiam ſanandum fuit. ut juſtitia legis impleretur in nobis qui non ſecundum carnem ambulamus, ſed ſecundum ſpiritum.* S. Aug. de Spirit. & Lit. c. 19.

(r) *Ut hoc ſit pertinere ad Teſtamentum Novum, legem Dei habere, non in tabulis, ſed in cordibus ſcriptam; hoc eſt in intimo affectu juſtitiam legis amplecti, ubi fides per dilectionem operatur.* Idem ibid. c. 26.

(s) *Mandatum ſi fit timore pœnæ, non amore juſtitiæ, ſerviliter fit, non liberaliter, & ideo nec fit. non enim fructus eſt bonus, qui de charitatis radice non ſurgit.* Ibid. c. 14.

(t) *Præcepta legis per charitatem impleta ſunt, quæ per timorem non poterant.* Idem Qu. ſuper Exod. l. 2. Qu. 166. S. Ambroſ. Com. in Ep. ad Hebr. c. 10.

(u) *Petav. T. 1. l. 10. c. 24. S. 12. de Lege & Grat. l. 1. c. 7.*

(w) *Scultet. Exercit. Ev. c.* 20.

(x) *Decem ſermones in tabulis nihil novum docent; ſed quod obliteratum fuerat, admonent: ut juſtitia in illis ignium more, quaſi adflatu quodam legis, ſpiritu recaleſcat.* Novatian. de Cib. Jud. c. 2.

(y) *Polit. l.* 3. *c.* 9.

(z) In Lept.

(a) S. Aug. in *Pſal.* 31. *præfat.*

(b) *Si benè vivimus, mortui fuimus & reſurreximus. Qui autem nondum mortuus eſt, nec reſurrexit, malè adhuc vivit. Et ſi malè vivit, non vivit, moriatur nè moriatur.* S. Aug. de Tempore Ser. 142.

(c) Grot. de *J. B. & P. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The Introduction. Sect. 1. *The proper condition of the Men of Nature that belong to the Law, is the Life and State of lapſed ungodly Sinners, which is The natural and legal condition.* Sect. 2. *The Article of Original Sin ſignifieth, that Mankind are natively and originally Sinners, as being natively and originally in old* Adam *ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, as being ſuch to whom a Branch of the ſtate of Condemnation belongeth at preſent* (and therefore the Name and Reputation of Sinners) *as being of a vitiated Nature and in all the natural and legal condition in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent tendency that way.* Sect. 3. *Mankind that belong to Nature and to the Law, do not nor can attain Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs by Nature and by the Law.* Sect. 4. *Mankind that belong to Nature and to the Law, cannot attain to the ſtate of Righteouſneſs by the Law and the Works thereof, but all of them are in all the Evils of the Criminal and Penal State, the State of Condemnation.* Sect. 5. *The Law muſt be look'd upon as the Religion of Man's Unregeneracy, and as the Religion of the Religioniſts of Unregeneracy, and conſequently as the Religion of our Spiritual Servitude.*

FRom the Law as it is a ſettlement and diſpenſation of things, the Apoſtle and the ancient Writers of the Church (following the Apoſtle) deduce the many great Spiritual Evils, that are incumbent upon unchriſtianiz'd mankind; which cannot be ſuppos'd to iſſue from a Moſaic Law, that was peculiar to the Jews: but ſeeing an univerſal Effect muſt have an univerſal Cauſe, they muſt be deriv'd from the Law, *Original, Natural and Moſaical*, which are one univerſal Law. (d) *The Moral Law obligeth all Rational Creatures* (Angels and Men) *and appertaineth to Men of all times.* This therefore (the Law of the Univerſe of Rationals) is the great Univerſal Law; and the Pagan Theologers (who had ſome acquaintance with the Theology of the Law) conſider it as the Law of God's original Sovereignty and Government, when they ſtile the Precepts of it, (e) *νόμοι νόμων πρεσβύτεροι, Laws more ancient than any* (Humane) *Laws.* This moſt ancient of Laws conſider'd as a Settlement and Diſpenſation of things we have defin'd *The Religion of Law-juſtice*, agreeably to that difference which the Fathers make between Law and Goſpel. (f) *In the Law of Works there is the Juſtice of God commanding: but in the Law of Faith the Mercy of God helping.* The one is medicinal for the Maladies which come by the other. If the Law-juſtice had not been, the Law of helping Mercy had not been needful. As if there had been no Sin, there had been no Saviour: So there had been no Goſpel, if there had been no Law. Whence in great part thoſe Spiritual Evils (together with a mixture of Temporal Evils) muſt be deriv'd, which conſtitute *the natural and legal condition of Mankind*, of which we will repreſent ſeveral definitive Notices, to make it clearly intelligible, that the neceſſity of introducing *the Goſpel-ſettlement and Diſpenſation* may thence plainly appear.

(d) *Obligat Lex moralis omnes creaturas rationales & ad omnium temporum homines pertinet.* Melancton. exam. Theol. p. m. 371, 379.

(e) M. Tyr. diſſ. 40.

(f) *In lege factorum eſt Dei jubentis juſtitia: in lege autem fidei, ſubvenientis miſericordia.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 118. conc. 10.

SECTION I.

The proper Condition of the Men of Nature that belong to the Law, is The Life and State of lapſed ungodly Sinners, which is the natural and legal Condition.

I. NAture is a word of ſuch various Significations both in Sacred and Profane Authors, that one hath compos'd a little Book (a Manuſcript in the Library at *Vienna*) to ſhew (g) *ἡ φύσις ὁσαχῶς παρείληπται τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ, how many ways Nature is taken in Scripture.* But in Scripture the word is of no conſiderable difficulty ſave only in that celebrated place (which hath occaſion'd ſeveral Diſputes,) 1 *Cor.* 11. 14. *Doth not even Nature it ſelf teach you, that if a Man have long Hair, it is a ſhame unto him?* Nature in this place cannot ſignifie *Cuſtom*, the Allegation whereof is impertinent (as *Salmaſius* obſerveth) and the Apoſtle throughout his Diſcourſe manifeſtly argueth from the Nature of Men and Women. Maſculine and Feminine Nature together with the Diſcretion that is in Humane Nature, to diſcern them, teacheth different uſages touching Mens and Womens Hair and touching covering their Heads. Not as if theſe uſages amounted to Laws of Nature: but ſo far Nature teacheth them, as to be a ſufficient ground and reaſon of that civil cuſtom, which took place at *Corinth*, which was *for Men to be ſhaven and not to let their Hair grow at length as Womens* (*κομᾶν* is oppos'd to *κείρεσθαι*, *Grot. Not. in v.* 15.) *nor to have their Heads cover'd in the publick Aſſemblies; And for Women* (as not to be ſhaven, but to let their Hair grow at length, ſo) *to wear a Veil on their Head.* Which Veil the Apoſtle conſidereth, not meerly as a covering of their Face; but as a covering it for this purpoſe, *for Self-humiliation, Demiſſion and Subjection*, and therefore he calleth it, *v.* 10. *Power on their Head*, that is, a Badge of their Subjection. To this uſe of the Veil the Apoſtle hath reſpect, *v.* 15. *If a Woman have long Hair it is a glory to her*; for her Hair is given her *ἀντὶ περιβολαίου, inſtead of a Veil*, as the words ought to be rendred. For the Apoſtle cannot mean, that her Hair is given her *for a covering of her Face*; ſuch an ordinary uſe of the Hair is not imaginable, nor can it be the deſign of Nature, nor is the Hair ever us'd for ſuch a purpoſe unleſs (h) in ſome caſes of extraordinary Sorrow. But her Hair is given her to be *as a Veil* upon this account (which Expoſitors have overlook'd) becauſe it is given her, to be worn at length and unſhaven, and the wearing it ſo is for the ſame purpoſe as the Veil, *viz.* for *ſelf-humiliation*, demiſſion and ſubjection, whence a Woman's long Hair is called by *Tertullian*, (i) *Humilitatis ſuæ ſarcina.* So the *Nazarites* wore their Hair at length and unſhaven, (k) for Self-humiliation and Demiſſion; therefore Women are ſo to wear their Hair for the ſame purpoſe, as the Council of *Gangra* ſaith.

(l) If

(b) *Biſhop Pearſon vind. Ep. S. Ignat. par.* 2. c. 14. p. 196.

(h) Dr. *Lightfoot Hor. in v.* 15.

(i) De Coron. *Mil.* c. 14.

(k) Dr. *Lightfoot in v.* 14.

(*l*) *If any Woman for ſome exerciſe of ſuppoſed Piety ſhall poll her Hair, which God gave her to put her in mind of her Subjection, as being one that diſſolveth the Commandment of Subjection let her be Anathema.* Womens wearing their Hair at length and unſhaven being for the ſame purpoſe as their wearing the Veil, thoſe of them in the Church of *Corinth* that refus'd to wear the Veil, might as well chuſe to be ſhaven, as the Apoſtle argueth, *v.* 5, 6. *Every Woman that prayeth or propheſieth with her Head uncovered, diſhonoureth her Head* (that is, her ſelf, it is a ſhame to her, *v.* 6.) *for that is even all one as if ſhe were ſhaven. For if the Woman be not covered, let her alſo be ſhorn: but if it be a ſhame, for a Woman to be ſhorn or ſhaven, let her be covered.* From this Illuſtration of all the conſiderable Obſcurities in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe it appeareth, (*n*) that although ſeveral Nations have affected to wear very long Hair, yet this is no reaſon, why (in expounding the Apoſtle) we ſhould recede from the uſual Senſe of φύσις, *Nature*, whence Phyſiology hath its Name, and which uſually ſignifieth *Mundane Nature* (as is before obſerv'd) and alſo *Innate Inſtinct*, which is below underſtanding and choice. Some ſuppoſe, (*o*) *that Nature is an irrational force exciting Motions in Bodies.* The Brutes are ſaid, to practiſe the reſemblance of ſeveral Virtues *ſolà Naturà duce* meerly by the guidance of Nature, which is innate Inſtinct. (*p*) Sometimes Nature ſignifieth Nativity (agreeably to the Etymology of the word φύσις) and ſometimes Generation, (*q*) as in S. *James*'s Epiſtle γένεσις and φύσις are the ſame, and *Ocellus Lucanus* ſaith, (*r*) that below the Moon is the Region νείκους καὶ φύσεως, *of Contention and of Nature or Generation.* This is that which the old Philoſophers commonly mean by Nature, *ſublunary mundane Nature*, or geneſiurgick Nature. (*s*) Empedocles *us'd the word Nature for Generation.* (*t*) *Is there any genuine and perfect and eternal good among thoſe things which are inbred in us by Nature, which is in Generation?* Uſually Nature ſignifieth, (*u*) the conſtitutive nature of Beings (*ſingulis ſua eſt natura*) and in a large acceptation Nature ſignifieth vitiated and corrupted Nature. (*w*) *We uſe Nature in one ſenſe, when we properly call that the Nature of Man, in which he was firſt made inculpable; and in another ſenſe when we call that his Nature, in which we are now born degenerate.* Nature is uſually contradiſtinguiſh'd to Law, (*x*) and more uſually to Grace. But in any or all of theſe Acceptations Nature may be underſtood in the Name that we have given to the Law-religioniſts in ſtiling them *The Men of Nature:* whereby we mean *thoſe that in reſpect of ſaving Religion tranſcend not the line and level of common mundane humane Nature, that are totally graceleſs and unchriſtianiz'd.*

II. The Phraſe of *belonging to the Law* is of ambiguity, as thoſe other Phraſes are, which the Apoſtle uſeth, *in the Law*, *of the Law*, *under the Law*. For according to the Apoſtle's Senſe, *Rom.* 2. 12. *Thoſe that have ſinned in the Law*, are the Jews, the Intrinſicks of the Moſaic Inſtitution (as the Gentiles are thoſe that have ſinned without any written Law:) but the Phraſe may ſignifie more largely and generally; for all that are Intrinſicks to ſuch an Inſtitution of Religion, which is a written divine Law, may be ſaid, to be ἔννομοι or ἐν νόμῳ, *in the Law*, as a Father ſaith, (*y*) *in lege Spiritales & Judæi & Chriſtiani.* When the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of thoſe *that are of the Law*, in one place he meaneth thoſe, that are Jewiſh Religioniſts meerly ſuch, *ſo as to be Unbelievers*; as *Rom.* 4. 14. *If they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void.* But in another place when he ſpeaketh of thoſe *that are of the Law*, he meaneth, thoſe that are Jews ſo as to be Believers; as *Rom.* 4. 16. *Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace; to the end the Promiſe might be ſure to all the Seed, not to that only which is of the Law, but to that alſo which is of the Faith of* Abraham, *who is the Father of us all.* When he ſpeaketh of thoſe *that are under the Law*, ſometimes he meaneth thoſe that are under the rule and authoritative Diſcipline of the Moſaic Law, that look upon themſelves as under an obligation to the whole of it; as 1 *Cor.* 9. 20. *Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the Law as under the Law, that I might gain them that are under the Law.* Rom. 3. 19. *What things ſoever the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them that are under it.* But in other places he conſidereth the Law as a ſettlement and diſpenſation of things (which he confronteth and oppoſeth to the ſettlement and diſpenſation of Saving Grace, *Gal.* 5. 4.) and they that are under this Law-ſettlement and diſpenſation of things, to whom the matters of it do belong (and to whom the matters of the ſettlement and diſpenſation of Saving Grace do not belong) theſe he looketh upon *as thoſe that are under the Law*, and theſe are they whom I call *them that belong to the Law*. Gal. 5. 18. *If ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the Law* (but under another Settlement and diſpenſation of things:) Regenerate Chriſtians are thoſe that are under that ſettlement and œconomy of things, which is Saving Grace, not under the Law-ſettlement and œconomy of things. *Rom.* 6. 14. *Ye are not under the Law, but under Grace.* (*z*) *He ſpeaketh of the diſpenſation of Grace. The carnal Jews were under the Law. Man was left under the Law, if left to himſelf, without the aid of the internal gift of Divine Grace. He is under the Law, as being an improbous Sinner, that is not chang'd from the old Man, but is* in vetuſtate corruptionis, *in the oldneſs of his Corruption.* So the Apoſtle accounteth thoſe that belong to the Law *the carnal* and ſuch as are *in the Fleſh*, Rom. 8. 5, 6, 14. So *Iſhmael* born of the Bondwoman and according to the courſe of Nature only, ſignifieth thoſe that belong to the Law. Thoſe that are of the World (the Men of Nature) are thoſe that are of the Law, and thoſe that are of the Law, are thoſe that are of the World, τοῦ νόμου τῷ κόσμῳ συνᾴδοντος, *the Law thus harmonizing with the World, and the World with the Law*, as Philo ſpeaketh.

III. It may ſeem a Paradox, that the Gentiles ſhould be ſuch as belong to the Law, who are ſtiled ἄνομοι, *thoſe that are without Law*,

Rom. 2. 12.

(l) Ἔι τις γυναικῶν διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν ἀποκείροιτο τὰς κόμας, ἃς ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὑπόμνησιν τῆς ὑποταγῆς, ὡς ἀναλύουσα παράγγελμα τῆς ὑποταγῆς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Can. 17.

(n) *Sharrock de off. c.* 11.

(o) *Naturam eſſe vim quandam ſine ratione cientem motus in corporibus.* Cic. de N. D. l. 2. Lactant. l. 7. c. 3.

(p) *Petav. T.* 2. *l.* 4. *c.* 3. *& T.* 4. *l.* 3. *c* 8. *s.* 6.

(q) *Windet. de vit. funct. p.* 33. *Ed.* 3.

(r) *Cap.* 2.

(s) *Empedocles* ἀντὶ τῆς γενέσεως εἴρηκε τὴν φύσιν. *Plutarch. adv. Colot. p.* 1112.

(t) Τί γὰρ ἂν εἴη γνήσιον καὶ τέλειον, καὶ ἀΐδιον ἀγαθὸν τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως τῆς ἐν γενέσει εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐμφυομένων; *Jambl. de Myſt. S.* 10. *c.* 3.

(u) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 6. *c.* 8. *Coſri p.* 254.

(w) *Naturam aliter dicimus, cùm propriè loquimur naturam hominis, in qua primum in ſuo genere inculpabilis factus eſt: aliter iſtam in qua ex illius damnati pœna & mortales, & ignari, & carni ſubditi naſcimur.* S. Aug. de lib. Arbitr. l. 3. c. 19.

(x) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 10. *c.* 18. *s.* 6.

(y) S. Aug. de oper. Monachor. c. 11.

(z) *De diſpenſatione Gratia loquitur.* S. Aug. Ep. 19. *Sub lege carnales Judæi.* Idem de oper. Monach. ſupr. *Homo ſub lege relinquebatur, ſi ſibiipſi, ut- pote non adjutus interno dono di- vinæ gratiæ.* Cajetan. in loc. *Sub lege vivit in quantum quiſ- que peccator eſt: id eſt, in quan- tum à vetere homine non eſt mu- tatus.* S. Aug. Expoſ. Ep. ad Galat. c. 2. 19.

Rom. 2. 12. 1 *Cor.* 9. 21. They did not belong to the Judaical Law (with reſpect whereunto they are ſaid to be without Law) nor were they like the *Jews*, *Chriſtians* and *Muhammedans*, that have a Law, which is their *Religion*, *a Judaical, Chriſtian and Muhammedan Law*: But there is no ſuch thing as the *Pagan Law*, the Law of every particular Commonwealth was the the Pagans Law of Religion. But as part of the Univerſe of Rationals and as being (a) *a World of Sinners* they could not be without the Law of Nature; and being the graceleſs and unholy kind of Rationals they could not belong to any better Settlement or Diſpenſation of things than the Law (not to the Religion of Saving Grace;) therefore they were neceſſarily of Character *the Men of Nature that belong to the Law*. If they had been God's true and genuin kind of Religioniſts, they had been in the ſame Condition with thoſe Holy People of the *Ante-Moſaic* times, who obſerv'd the Law of Nature, ſo as to be in the State of Grace, to live the Life of Grace, and to belong to the Settlement and Diſpenſation of Grace (the initial Religion of Saving Grace:) But they were (in the main) of the ſame Family and Foot-mark with the carnal Jews, alike graceleſs, wicked and carnal kind of Rationals, alike graceleſs, wicked and carnal kind of Religioniſts. The civiler ſort of Pagans ſymboliz'd with the carnal Jews in this their *Naturaliſm* and *Legaliſm*, they pretended to good Life, recommended it and perſwaded others to it, but diſſwaded them from being Chriſtians. (b) *For there are many ſuch that in cuſtomary Speech are called good Men, and good Women, innocent, and as obſerving the Precepts in the Law, honouring their Parents, not committing Adultery, nor Homicide, nor Theft, nor falſe Witneſs againſt any, and as obſerving the other Precepts in the Law, which are no Chriſtians; and uſually theſe boaſt as the Jews, are we blind alſo? Such Men uſually perſwade others, to live well and not to be Chriſtians.* Such Religioniſts (whether Jews or Gentiles) muſt be denominated the Law-religioniſts, and ſuch as belong to that Settlement and Diſpenſation of things. The matters of it belong in common to graceleſs and unholy Jews and Gentiles. (c) *The Law condemned the World; for as* S. Paul *ſaith, God hath ſhut up all under Sin by it, and hath ſhew'd us to be Guilty of Puniſhments.* (d) *For all have ſinn'd and are under the Curſe.* (e) *But how is the Law the ſtrength of Sin? Becauſe without the Law Sin is weak, committed indeed, but not able to condemn.* Sin hath its damnatory Power (to bring Mankind into the State of Condemnation) by the Law. (f) *If the Law worketh wrath, and maketh Men Guilty of Tranſgreſſion, it is manifeſt, that they are ſubjected to the Curſe alſo. And they that are ſubjected to the Curſe and the Puniſhment, and guilty of the Tranſgreſſion, are not thoſe that are worthy to inherit, but worthy of the Portion of a Criminal and to be caſt out.* (g) *What the Apoſtle ſaith of the Jewiſh Law, may much more juſtly be ſaid of the Law of Nature, the Law of all Mankind: If Righteouſneſs is by the Law, Chriſt is dead in vain.* The Gentiles as well as the Jews pretended to Righteouſneſs by the Law, and were alike oppoſite to Chriſtianity; if the carnal Jews therefore were thoſe that belong'd to the Settlement and Diſpenſation of the Law, the ſame muſt be ſaid of the Gentiles. Accordingly the Apoſtle telleth the Chriſtianiz'd *Galatians* and *Romans* (who were Gentiles) that if they were Chriſtianiz'd, and becauſe they were Chriſtianiz'd, *they were not under the Law*. Which implieth, that antecedently to their Chriſtianity they belong'd to the Law-Settlement and Diſpenſation of things.

IV. Mankind therefore muſt be contemplated as the Men of Nature that belong to the Law, and it muſt be conſider'd what their Condition is *by Nature and by the Law*; and ſo conſidered (according to Chriſtianity) their Condition is no other (in reſpect of Life and of State) than that *of lapſed ungodly Sinners*, ſuch is their *natural* and *legal* Condition. (h) *Faith found thee a Sinner, if thou waſt juſtify'd by it. Chriſt deſcended for no other cauſe but the liberation of Sinners. Liberation is not competible but to one that is a Servant of Sin, nor can he be redeem'd, that is not by Sin a Captive. Every one is neceſſarily from* Adam *evil and carnal; if regenerate in Chriſt he will afterwards be Good and Spiritual: But none is Good, who was not at firſt bad. If thou art not impious, yet thou waſt ſometime ſuch; for none is made Juſt but of a Sinner.* Sinners the World of Mankind are by Nature and by the Law, ſo as not to be the *Righteous*, but all are the *Ungodly*, Rom. 5. 6. *The Unjuſt*, 1 Pet. 3. 18. *the Tranſgreſſors that are gone aſtray*, Iſa. 53. 6, 12. (i) Τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ γένους, *of the atheouſly dark Kind aud Family*, 1 Joh. 2. 8. of the evil ſinning Kind, and of this evil World. *Joh.* 8. 23. and 7. 7. *Gal.* 1. 4. So far from being without Sin, that they are without any true Saving Goodneſs. *Joh.* 5. 42. 1 *Joh.* 4. 7. At Chriſt's coming ſuch was the Condition of Mankind univerſally (a few only excepted who belong'd to the initial Religion of Saving Grace) both Jews and Gentiles. (k) *Omne hominum genus per naturæ diſſimulationem & deliquerat & rebellaverat adverſus Creatorem.* All (Heathen) Mankind by holding the naturally notic'd Truth in unRighteouſneſs had ſinn'd and rebell'd againſt the Creator. The Gentiles were (l) *Peccatores Terræ*, (the Sinners of the Earth) and the Jews (except before excepted) were alike nefarious Sinners as they. *Rom.* 3. 9. Of the *jetzer harang* evil Figment or Concupiſcence which is in Man an Hebrew Doctor ſaith (*m*) הוא שטן הוא יצר הרע הוא מלאך המות *It is the Devil, it is the evil Concupiſcence, it is the Angel of Death.* Agreeable whereto is a late pious Writer's tragical Character of Mankind, which yet underſtood with a due additional Qualification hath nothing of extravagance in it. (*n*) *Such is Man by his Nature, exceſſively arrogant, elated, intemperate, covetous, inſatiable, covetous of what is not his own, a ſupplanter, a liar, contentious, envious, revengeful, a man-ſlayer, blind, raſh, refractary, impious and prone to all wickedneſs; and to ſpeak compendiouſly, the Nature of Man as now corrupt is not very much different from the Nature of impure Devils.* Such Exaggerations of the evil Nature of Man ought to be underſtood with this additional Qualification, that there is in it a mixture of a ſort of Virtue and Religion. *Nemo malus omnino malus.* The Children of Wickedneſs in ſome degree depart from Iniquity, and will not perpetrate all manner of villainy. Many of them are memorable for laudable Practices of an extraordinary Character. (*o*) *Herod* the Great caus'd all his Golden and Silver Veſſels to be melted, to make Proviſion for the People in a time of Famine. That *Herod* who was eaten of Worms, *Act.* 12. 23. is ſaid to have been of a moſt mild Diſpoſition, Humane and Liberal, and ready to ſuccour ſuch as were in Adverſity, a moſt Religious obſerver of the Rites of his Country, and no day paſſed wherein he did not offer Sacrifice. *Alexander* the great (whoſe Vices equaliz'd his ſecular Grandeur) having conquer'd *Darius* (*p*) treated his Mother, Wife and Daughters with great humanity, and ſent them back untouch'd. Sitting on high by the Fire in a time of a great Snow he took notice of a very old *Macedonian* Soldier ſtupify'd by the Cold; and not computing the difference of Fortune but of Age, he came down from his Seat, and with his own Hands ſet that Body which was contracted by the cold in his own Seat, ſaying, that would be ſalutary to him, which amongſt the *Perſians* would have been Capital, to poſſeſs the King's Throne. Such generous doings make a fine ſhew, but it is not hard, to make a judgment of their Kind and Quality from the Character of the Perſons that did them; *for Thorns do not bring forth Grapes, nor do Men gather Figs of Thiſtles.* The carnal and mundane kind of Men (remaining ſuch) can be no better than the carnal and mundane kind of Virtuous Men and Religioniſts: Not God's kind of Virtuous People nor his kind of Religioniſts, but the World's kind of Virtuous People and Religioniſts, the Aliens from God and the true and ſaving Piety (their Hearts are alienated from it) the Rebel-kind of Sinners, living in mortal Sin, and therefore the Servants of Sin. To abandon Iniquity in ſome degree and to practice ſome ſort of Virtue and Piety, but not ſo far or to ſuch effect, as to be of the number of the truly Righteous and Holy, can be of no avail to Life eternal, but continueth Men (*q*) *ſub veteri damnatione*, under the old Condemnation, which the Moſaic Law brought upon the Jews and the Law of Nature upon the flagitious Heathen World. (*r*) *For if thoſe under this Law* (the Moſaic) *appear to be under the Curſe, becauſe of their not obſerving all things in it, is it not much more apparent, that all the Gentiles are under the Curſe, that Worſhip Idols and commit Uncleanneſs with Boyes, and perpetrate many other evil things?*

(a) *Quomodo poteſt ſine lege peccari cùm omnes ſimul ſubditi ſimus legi naturali?* S. Ambroſ. com. in Ep. ad Rom. c. 2.

(b) *Multi enim ſunt, qui ſecundum quandam vitæ hujus conſuetudinem dicuntur boni homines, boni viri, bonæ fœminæ, innocentes, & quaſi obſervantes ea quæ in Lege præcepta ſunt, deferentes honorem parentibus ſuis, non mœchantes, non homicidium perpetrantes, non furtum facientes, non falſum teſtimonium adverſus quenquam perhibentes, & cætera quæ lege mandata ſunt velut obſervantes, Chriſtiani non ſunt; & plerunque ſe jactant quomodo iſti, nunquid & nos Cæci ſumus? Quærunt plerunque tales homines etiam perſuadere hominibus, ut bene vivant, & Chriſtiani non ſint.* S. Aug. in Johan. Tr. 45.

(c) Ὁ μὲν νόμος κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον· συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος φησί· καὶ κολάσεως ἡμᾶς ἐνόχους ὄντας ἐδείκνυεν. *S. Cyr. in Johan. p.* 102.

(d) Πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν. *S. Chryſoſt.* in Galat. 3. 11.

(e) Πῶς δὲ ἁμαρτίας δύναμις ὁ νόμος; ὅτι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἀσθενὴς ἦν, πραττομένη μὲν, οὐ δυναμένη δὲ οὕτω καταδικάσαι. *Idem in* 1 *Cor.* 15. 56.

(f) Εἰ δὲ ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται καὶ παραβάσει ὑπευθύνους ποιεῖ, εὔδηλον ὅτι καὶ κατάρᾳ· οἱ δὲ κατάρᾳ καὶ τιμωρίᾳ καὶ παραβάσει ὄντες ὑπεύθυνοι, οὐ τοῦ κληρονομεῖν ἄξιοι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ δίκην διδόναι καὶ ἐκβάλλεσθαι. *Idem in Rom.* 4. 15.

(g) *Si hoc Apoſtolus dixit de Lege, quam accepit gens una Judæorum, quanto juſtiùs dicitur de Lege Naturæ, quam accepit univerſum genus humanum?* S. Aug. de Nat. & Grat. c. 2.

(h) *Peccatorem te Fides invenit, & ſi te fides data fecit juſtum peccatorem invenit, quem faceret juſtum.* S. Aug. Enar. Pſal. 31. præfat. *Chriſtus non alia ex cauſa deſcendit, quàm peccatorum liberandorum.* Tertull. de Idol. c. 5. *Nullus niſi qui peccati ſervus eſt, liber efficitur, nec redemptus dici poteſt, niſi qui verè per peccatum fuerit ante captivus, ſicut ſcriptum eſt, ſi vos filius liberaverit, verè liberi eritis.* Zoſim. ap. S. Aug. Ep. 157. *Unuſquiſque primò ſit neceſſe eſt ex Adam malus atque carnalis: Quòd ſi in Chriſto renaſcendo profecerit, poſtea erit bonus & ſpiritalis. Non quidem omnis homo malus erit bonus, nemo tamen erit bonus, qui non erat malus.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. 1. *Tu etiamſi non es impius, fuiſti tamen aliquando: Quia nemo fit juſtus niſi ex peccatore* Idem T. 10. Hom. 6.

(i) *Macar. Hom.* 30.

(k) *Tertull. c. Marcion. l.* 5. c. 5.

(l) *S. Hilar. in. Pſal.* 118.

Section II.

The Article of Original Sin ſignifieth, that Mankind are natively and originally Sinners, as being natively and originally in Old Adam *ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, as being ſuch to whom a Branch of the State of Condemnation belongeth at preſent* (and therefore the Name and Reputation of Sinners) *as being of a vitiated Nature and in all the natural and legal Condition in a degree of Inchoation and prevalent Tendency that way.*

I. THE Anti-pelagian Fathers have deſervedly called the Article of *original Sin*, (*s*) one of the *Fundamenta Fidei* (Fundamentals of Faith;) for if it is not one of the *Proximate* and *Primary*, yet at leaſt it is one of the remote and ſecondary Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Inſtitution. The *natural and legal Condition of Mankind* is manifeſtly one of the primary Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Inſtitution, and the Article of Original Sin is Fundamental to this primary Fundamental. For if it was not becauſe of Original Sin Mankind might have Righteouſneſs, Life and Salvation by Nature and by the Law; and if ſo, Chriſt would be of no neceſſity, they might do as well with his room as his company. (*t*) *If the Law could give Life, no doubt Righteouſneſs would be by the Law, nor would a Saviour be ſought, nor would Chriſt come, nor would he ſeek the loſt Sheep by his Blood.* They that heartily acknowledge Chriſtianity therefore, muſt befriend the Article of Original Sin; they are Adverſaries to their own Inſtitution, that diſpute againſt it and put ſlurs upon the Article, although ſome of them do not ſo properly diſpute againſt the Article, as againſt ſome of the Exceſſes and Extravagances that are affix'd to the Article, that blemiſh it and ſpoil the reaſonableneſs of it, of which there is a competent number. For (1.) the Article doth not imply, that *Adam*'s Sin is imputed to all his Poſterity, as if they themſelves had committed it. That *Adam* was deputed by God, to repreſent all Mankind, to keep or loſe Original Righteouſneſs for them, that he receiv'd it in his own Name and the Name of his Poſterity, and the Covenant was with all Mankind in him: Whereupon his Diſobedience is formally imputed to them as their Diſobedience, and his Tranſgreſſion ſo imputed to them is their Original Sin. (2.) The Article doth not imply, that all Mankind are (in reſpect of their Soul-intereſts) in the ſtate of Damnation, becauſe *Adam*'s Sin is imputed to them, as if they themſelves had committed it. This is one of the Exceſſes and Extravagances of S. *Auſtin* and the Anti-pelagian Fathers, *neminem naſci ex Adam* *niſi*

(m) *Menaſſ. ben Iſr. ap. Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 4. c. 2.

(n) *Ita eſt homo ſuâ naturâ, ſupra modum arrogans, elato animo, intemperans, avarus, inſatiabilis, alieni cupidus, ſupplantator, mendax, contentioſus, invidus, vindictæ cupidus, homicida, cæcus, præceps, præfractus, impius atque ad omne facinus natus; ut in ſummam contraham, hominis natura (corrupta videlicet ea quâ utimur) ab impurorum naturâ dæmonum parùm eſt abſimilis.* Jac. Acont. Stratagem. p. 17. *O quàm deteſtabilis res eſt hominis ingenium, ſi Deus ſuum ſubtrahat ſpiritum!* Ibid. p. 225.

(o) *Joſeph. Antiqu. l.* 15. c. 12. *& l.* 19. c. 7.

(p) *Plutarch. in Alex.*

(q) *Iren. adv. Hær. l.* 3. c. 20.

(r) Εἰ δὲ οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον τῶν ὑπὸ κατάραν φαίνονται εἶναι διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντα φυλάξαι, οὐχὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη φανήσονται ὑπὸ κατάραν ὄντα ϗ εἰδωλολατροῦντα, ϗ παιδοφθοροῦντα ϗ τὰ ἄλλα κακὰ ἐργαζόμενα. J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 322.

(s) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 2. *Par.* 1. p. 181.

(t) *Si lex poſſet vivificare, omninò ex lege eſſet juſtitia, nec quæreretur Salvator, nec veniret Chriſtus, nec ſanguine ſuo ovem perditam quæreret.* S. Aug. de verb. Apoſt. Ser. 13.

niſi vinculo delicti & damnationis obſtrictum. Whence Mankind is called by them *maſſa damnata, maſſa damnationis, maſſa perditionis.* (3.) It doth not imply, that the far greateſt part of Mankind are by the Offence of *Adam* ſubjected to the irrevocable Decree of Reprobation. That God look'd upon Mankind as lapſed into Sin by *Adam's* Tranſgreſſion and thereupon did predeſtinate the greateſt part of them to eternal Damnation, which is the *Sublapſarian* Doctrine. (4.) It doth not imply any thing touching the good or bad Eſtate of ſuch as die in their Infancy, about which there are many Speculations and Debates. Some ſuppoſing that all ſuch Infants (notwithſtanding Original Sin) are admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven; others, only the Children of the Faithful; others, only ſuch Infants as are elected; others, only ſuch as are baptiz'd; others, only ſuch as are baptized and communicated. Some have thought, that Original Sin meriteth nothing worſe than a middle place between Heaven and Hell, where Infants enjoy neither Happineſs nor Miſery. Others ſuppoſe, that in this middle place they enjoy Happineſs. Others exclude a middle place, and ſuppoſe, that all ſuch as die in Infancy, that are not admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven, go to Hell, and there ſuffer *pœna damni*, as ſome ſay; others ſuppoſe, that they ſuffer Hell-torments. Thus upon occaſion of Original Sin ſuch an Infant-Theology is brought into the Church, of which neither the Scripture nor ſound Reaſon knoweth any thing. (5) The Article doth not imply, that in our firſt Conception there is in us ſuch a vicious Nature, wherein there are formally all Diabolical Vices, and which conſtituteth Infants in their firſt Conception Infidels, Fornicators, Calumniators, Proud, Envious, Murderers, Haters of God. (6.) It doth not imply, that meer Infants are chargeable with any Sin, Fault or Crime otherwiſe than with due diſtinction and limitation of Senſe. For not being intelligent voluntary Agents they are not chargeable with any actual Sin, and conſequently they have not thereby contracted any habitual Sin. That which in others is Sin in habit and diſpoſition, is not in the ſame ſenſe Sin in them, if it is their Fate not their Choice. Let us ſuppoſe two Infants, the one born with an Holy Nature, the other without it; the former of theſe is a due Object of complacence and praiſe, the other of diſplicence and diſpraiſe. But the former of theſe is not an Object of *rectoral premiant complacence and commendation*, nor is the other an Object of *rectoral punitive diſplicence and blame*, if the one had no hand in acquiring, nor the other in loſing the holy Nature; for there is nothing of Duty in the one's having his diſpoſitive Goodneſs, nor any thing of undutifulneſs (fault or faileur of Duty) in the others diſpoſitive Badneſs.

Pelagius ſaid, Quo non eant ſcio, Quo eant neſcio.

II. The Article of Original Sin ſignifieth *our being natively and originally Sinners*, in a ſober ſenſe, which in general conſiſteth *in our being natively and originally in old* Adam *and in him ſubjected to the courſe of Nature.* (u) *Every Soul of Man till he be of a new Cenſus in Chriſt, is reckon'd to be in A*dam, *and is ſo long unclean.* (w) *As all Men by the firſt or carnal Generation belong to A*dam: *So all that come to Chriſt, come to Spiritual Regeneration.* Mankind muſt be conſider'd as natively belonging to the firſt *Adam* and of his Alliance (x) *omnes enim fuimus in illo uno*, for we all were in that one, and in him were ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, which was under a Suſpenſion during the Innocence and Paradiſaical Eſtate of our firſt Parents. But upon and for their Offence that Suſpenſion was taken off, whereby themſelves and their Poſterity were ſubjected to the courſe of Nature. The Sin of *Adam* ſo far introduc'd it, as to be meritoriouſly the *removens prohibens* thereof. In ſome degree therefore and in ſome ſenſe his Offence was imputed to his Poſterity; for not in a *formal* but a *meritorious* ſenſe of Imputation it was thus far imputed to his Poſterity; upon account of his Offence the Suſpenſion of the courſe of Nature was removed, whereupon his Poſterity were ſubjected thereto. Yet there is great Reaſon to ſuppoſe, that they were not ſubjected to the courſe of Nature meerly for his Offence: But thus far they were ſubjected to the courſe of Nature meerly for his Offence, the ſuſpenſion of the courſe of Nature was taken off meerly upon account of it. Upon the removal whereof the Life of Man became ſubject to Calamities, his Body to Diſeaſes and Death in the courſe of Nature, the internal Nature of Man became vitiated by inordinate Concupiſcence in the courſe of Nature, and Mankind became by and upon account of the Sin of *Adam* (ſo far as to remove the Obſtacle) *natively and originally Sinners.* In this ſummary and general account of Original Sin three Branches of it are compris'd.

III. The firſt Branch of Orignal Sin is, *Mankind are ſubjected to the Domination of bodily Death* (according to the courſe of Nature) *and are ſo far in the State of Condemnation by Adam's* Tranſgreſſion. So the Jews ſay, that Men die (y) *by an univerſal and common Law, which the Counſel of the Serpent introduc'd into the World.* So the Chaldee Paraphraſt ſaith (z) *by that Counſel of the Serpent all the Inhabitants of the Earth are made obnoxious to Death.* S. *Jarchi* rightly affirmeth, *in omnibus maledictionibus primi hominis omnes ejus generationes conveniunt.* In all the Maledictions of the firſt Man all his Generations agree. The Condemnation of *Adam* to die the bodily Death (according to the courſe of Nature) was the Condemnation of his Poſterity, as the Apoſtle ſaith. *The Judgment was by one to Condemnation. By one Man's Offence Death reign'd by one. By the Offence of one Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation.* Rom. 5. 15, 16, 18. (a) *The Apoſtle often repeateth this Phraſe by one, that when a Jew ſhall ask, how the World is ſaved by the Well-doing of one, that is, Chriſt; thou mighteſt be able to anſwer, how was the World condemned by one* Adam *ſinning?* (b) A*dam ſinning the World was condemn'd.* So S. *Chryſoſtom* diſcourſeth agreeably to the Apoſtle, and he often explaineth himſelf what he meaneth by this Condemnation. Γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἐκείνου πάντες θνητοί, *all Men were from him generated Mortal* or under a neceſſity of dying. So the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe touching the Penal Effect of the Sin of *Adam* is manifeſtly confin'd to bodily Death (*Death reign'd from* Adam *to* Moſes, *v.* 14.) But if he had ſuppos'd, that all Men are now originally, not only ſubjected to bodily Death, but dead as to Spirituals and Eternals meerly by *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, he would not have confin'd his Diſcourſe touching the Penal Effect of the Sin of *Adam* to bodily Death; nor could he extend it to any other Death, if his Diſcourſe muſt be of one piece with the Moſaic Hiſtory, which manifeſtly confineth the Puniſhment of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion to bodily Death. If he had not ſinn'd, he had not dy'd: But having ſinn'd he muſt die as a condemn'd Malefactor, and he muſt die as introducing the Settlement of Death according to the courſe of Nature. The making this Settlement depended upon his Diſobedience, and was procur'd by it, and all that belong to him, belong to this Settlement and are ſubjected to the Domination of (bodily) Death upon the account of Sin, which is *a Condemnation.* There is therefore a Correſpondence between the two *Adam*'s; for as Chriſt is the Founder of a State of Juſtification (Uncondemnation) and of Life to them that are of him, and the head of this Settlement: So the firſt *Adam* was the Founder of a State of Condemnation and of Death to them that are of him, and the head of the Settlement, 1 *Cor.* 15. 22.

(u) *Omnis Anima eo uſque in Adam cenſetur, donec in Chriſto recenſeatur: Tamdiu immunda donec recenſeatur.* Tertull. de An. c. 40.

(w) *Sicut omnes homines per primam, hoc eſt, per carnalem generationem, pertinent ad Adam: Sic omnes homines ad ſecundam, hoc eſt ſpiritualem veniunt, quicunque ad Chriſtum perveniunt.* S. Aug. Ep. 28.

(x) S. *Aug. de C. D. l.* 13. c. 14.

(y) *Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 4. c. 2.

(z) *L'Emper. in Iſa.* 53. p. 13, 17.

(a) Οὐκ ἀφίσταται τοῦ ἑνὸς, ἵν' ὅταν λέγῃ σοι Ἰουδαῖος, πῶς ἑνὸς κατορθώσαντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ οἰκουμένη ἐσώθη; δυνηθῇς αὐτῷ λέγειν, πῶς ἑνὸς παρακούσαντος τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἡ οἰκουμένη κατεκρίθη; *S. Chryſoſt. ap. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 1. *par.* 2. *p.* 164. 166.

(b) Παρακούσαντος τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἡ οἰκουμένη κατεκρίθη. *Idem in Rom.* 5. *Hom.* 10.

IV. A *Second* Branch of Original Sin is, *Mankind by* Adam's *Tranſgreſſion have the Name and Reputation of Sinners.* For *by one Man's Diſobedience many were made Sinners.* Rom. 5. 19. (c) *What is the meaning of Sinners here?* Τὸ ὑπεύθυνοι κολάσει, καὶ καταδεδικασμένοι θανάτῳ· ὅτι τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἀποθανόντος πάντες ἐγενόμεθα θνητοί. *The meaning of it is, obnoxious to Puniſhment and condemn'd to Death; that* Adam *dying we all became Mortal or ſubjected to a neceſſity of dying.* (d) The Jews ſay אין מיתה בלא חטא *without Sin there is no Death, nor Puniſhment without Crime.* If mankind are ſubjected to Death, they are ſubjected to the Puniſhment of Sin, and they that are rightly ſubjected to the Puniſhment of Sin, are ſo far Sinners, *of Name and Reputation the Sinners*, which is a blot in our Eſchucheon, that accrueth to all Mankind by *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſions. *Cato* hath well expreſs'd the Apoſtle's ſenſe (ẟ) *omne humanum genus quodque eſt, quodque erit, morte damnatum eſt*, all Mankind, both that which now is, and that which ſhall be, is condemn'd by Death. They are Sinners therefore; for Sinners are they, to whom Condemnation and Death belongeth. As they to whom Impunity belongeth, are the Innocent and the Righteous: So they to whom the evil Penal belongeth, are upon that account the Sinners. If therefore Condemnation, the State of Condemnation (one Branch of it ſubjection to bodily Death) belongeth to Mankind natively and originally by and upon account of the Sin of *Adam*, this Inference is unavoidable, that by and upon account of the Sin of *Adam* Mankind are natively and originally *the Sinners*, ſuch as are of Name and Reputation *the Sinners.* They that are *made Sinners* (ſubjected to Condemnation and Puniſhment) have the Name and Reputation of Sinners put upon them: Therefore if they are rightly *made Sinners*, the Name and Reputation of Sinners of right belongeth unto them. Some have obſerv'd, that (e) *in the Hebrew Tongue, whoſe Phraſes the Apoſtles (writing in Greek) imitate, they are called by the Name of Sinners, who are treated and dealt with as Sinners.* But they that made this Obſervation, ought to have made another. For they ought to have made a difference between thoſe that are wrongfully made Sinners (as thoſe that are made Offenders for a word, *Iſa.* 29. 21.) and thoſe that are rightfully made ſuch; for theſe are not only *Quaſi-ſinners*, but to them the Name and Reputation of Sinners juſtly appertaineth. It juſtly appertaineth to the Deſcendents of old *Adam*, that are his blemiſh'd Relatives, and for his Sin juſtly under Condemnation to bodily Death. They might be in a State of Affliction without being Sinners: But to ſuppoſe them juſtly under Condemnation, in the State of Puniſhment and of Death, and yet not to ſuppoſe them Sinners, is, as if we ſhould ſuppoſe them, to be juſtly in the State of Slaves, yet not of the Name and Reputation of Slaves.

(c) S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. 5. Hom. 10.

(c) *Hoornbeek ſupr.*

(ẟ) *Sen. Ep.* 71.

By one Man's Diſobedience therefore many were made Sinners: As by the Obedience of one many are made Righteous. Rom. 5. 19. As they that are of Chriſt are by him in the State of the Righteous (he founded for us the State of the Righteous) and therefore the Name and Reputation of the Righteous belongeth unto them: So they that are of *Adam* are by him in the State of Sinners (he founded for them a State of Sinners) and therefore the Name and Reputation of Sinners belongeth unto them. The Caſe of *Adam*'s Poſterity may be illuſtrated from the *corruption of Blood* (a Branch of our *Engliſh* Law;) for a Man may be ſo foul a Criminal, that the Judgment or Attainder againſt him may ſpoil and corrupt, not only his Perſon, but his Blood (his Family) his Children are debarr'd from inheriting his Eſtate (which is forfeited) himſelf and his Children loſe their Dignity, and if they were Noble, they are degraded and made ignoble, and they are ſo deeply blemiſh'd and ſtain'd, that they cannot be reſtor'd by any ordinary method, nor by any thing leſs than an Act of Parliament. So when the Ground was curſed for the Sin of Man, when *Adam* was ejected out of Paradiſe, doom'd to a toilſome Life and a certain Death, theſe Penal Evils were Hereditary to his Poſterity and were entail'd upon his Children (ſo far the Sin of *Adam* was imputed to his Poſterity) they were debarr'd from the Tree of Life and from inheriting his Immortality (which was forfeited) the loſs of Innocence and the Paradiſaical State was a great Degradation, and they were ſo deeply ſtain'd and blemiſh'd, that they could not be reſtor'd but by a new Settlement of Things. In great degree therefore there is an Analogy between the corruption of Blood in Human Law and the Caſe of *Adam*'s Poſterity. But to make the former throughout Parallel with the latter, let us ſuppoſe, that a Man's Crime is ſo foul, as not only to ſubject him to Death, but deeply to vitiate alſo the Frame of his Nature, and that the corruption of his Blood is ſo great, that the Children which he begetteth derive his vitiated Nature from him, and are by his Attainder not only diſinherited, degraded and ſtain'd: but are alſo natively and originally by and upon account of his Crime juſtly under Condemnation to ſuffer Death. No Rational Man will ſtick to affirm, that the Children of ſuch a Criminal are natively and originally a Brood and Generation of Criminals; therefore Mankind that are natively and originally in old *Adam*, that derive his vitiated nature from him, and are natively and originally by and upon account of his crime juſtly under condemnation, to ſuffer Calamity, Diſeaſes and Death, are *natively and originally Sinners.*

(e) *In linguâ Hebraicâ, cujus phraſes Apoſtoli Grecè ſcribendo ſæpè imitantur, peccatorum nomen iis tribuitur, qui tanquam peccatores tractantur.* Curcel Inſtit. l. 3. c. 16.

V. The *vitiated Nature of* Adam *and his Poſterity* (which is the *third Branch* of Original Sin) ought in congruity to be concomitant with their penal ſtate of Death. For if they loſe the rectitude of their Nature, it would be incongruous, that they ſhould not be ſubjected to the penal ſtate of Death; and it would be incongruous, that they ſhould be ſubjected to a ſettlement of their penal ſtate of Death, if they did retain the perfect rectitude of their Nature, and were ſo far wholly innocuous. Therefore *(f)* μετὰ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ὁ τῶν παθῶν ἐπεισῆλθεν ὄχλος, *together with Death there entred a throng and multitude of Affections and Paſſions*, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom*, *(g)* πολὺς παθῶν ἑσμὸς, *a large ſwarm of tumultuous Paſſions*, and thence it is *(h)* ὅτι ῥέπει ἡ φύσις ἐπὶ τὸ πταίειν, *that Nature inclineth to falling*; ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe he ſuppoſeth, that Mankind are natively and originally Sinners in nature and practice. The ſuſpenſion being taken off inordinate Concupiſcence took place in Humane Nature (in the courſe of nature) in conjunction and complication with bodily death. So the Hebrew Doctors ſay, (i) that the evil Figment was not in Man from his creation, but is from the old Serpent, that ſeduc'd our firſt Parents; and the Introduction of it into Humane Nature they conjoyn and complicate with the Introduction of Death. But if we ſhould ſuppoſe, that *Adam*'s Poſterity are lapſed under puniſhment ſo far as to be ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, without being lapſed into Sin ſo far as to be ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, we ſuppoſe them lapſed-not lapſed, ſubjected to the courſe of Nature-not ſubjected to the courſe of Nature, and every one will be ready to argue with the Anti-pelagian Fathers, *(k) Why are little Children afflicted, if they are altogether ſinleſs?* It would be incongruous, to conſider them as a part of lapſed Mankind, that are lapſed under the puniſhment of Sin according to the courſe of Nature, yet are not lapſed into Sin (of Nature and Practice) according to the courſe of Nature. *(l)* The Jews fancy, that four Men dy'd without any ſin of their own, *Benjamin* the Son of *Jacob*, *Amram* the Father of *Moſes*, *Jeſſe* the Father of *David*, and *Chiliab David*'s Son. If all Mankind were ſuch, as the Jews fancy theſe four men to have been, if they had no Sin of their own, if there was no lapſe of Mankind into Sin in Nature and Practice, it would be extremely harſh and incongruous, that they ſhould conflict with innumerable Calamities during their life-time and at length with the pains of Death. *(m) In truth the heavy Yoke that is upon the Sons of* Adam, *from the day that they go out of their Mother's Womb, would be by no means juſt.* The Apoſtle therefore repreſenteth Mankind as by and upon account of the offence of one man lapſed under the domination of Death, and in conjunction therewith lapſed alſo into ſin of nature and practice. *By one man ſin entred into the World and death by ſin; and ſo death paſſed upon all men,* ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, *through whom or for that all ſinned* (from the beginning of the World) *Rom.* 5. 12. Death and Sin entred, not ſingly and ſolitarily, but Death by the means of Sin and conjunct and complicate with it; and ſo Death paſſed upon all Men regularly, juſtly and in great congruity, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, *for that all ſinned.* In reſpect of the Hypotheſis of Original Sin it is not material, how ἐφ' ᾧ is rendred; whether with the Ancients generally *in quo* (in whom) or as ſome would have it *per quem* (by whom) or as others would have it *quatenus, eò quod* (in as much as for that;) which latter rendring I prefer before the other, becauſe it is moſt expreſſive of this Branch of the Hypotheſis of Original Sin, *Death paſſed upon all men, for that all ſinned.* Not as if their perſonal Sin was the ſole meritorious procuring cauſe of their Death (which is expreſly contrary to the Scripture:) but this is the cauſe or reaſon, why Death paſſed upon all Men regularly, juſtly and agreeably. Sin and Death were complicated in their entrance, and ſo they continu'd; *for Sin continu'd in the World till the Law, and ſo did Death; for it reigned from* Adam *to* Moſes, *before and until the Law, over them that did not ſin againſt the Law* (notwithſtanding that ſin is not imputed, when there is no Law) *nor after the ſimilitude of* Adam's *tranſgreſſion*, v. 14, 15. The continuance of Sin in the World appeareth from the continuance of the reign of Death, the lapſe of Mankind into Sin appeareth from their lapſe under the reign of Death; for Death could not reign over them, if they were ſinleſs and had not loſt their Innocency.

(f) S. Chryſoſt. ap. Voſſ. ſupr.

(g) Idem in Ep. ad Rom. Hom. 11.

(h) Idem T. 1. p. 710.

(i) Helvic. proteu angel. S. 13, 15, 16 vid. P. Fag. in Gen. 2. ult.

(k) *Propter quid ergo affliguntur parvuli, ſi nullum habeant omninò peccatum? Quâ juſtitiâ parvulus ſubjicitur peccati ſtipendio, ſi nulla eſt in eo peccati pollutio?* Voſſ. Hiſt. pel. l. 2. par. 1. Theſ. 3.

(l) Hoornbeek c. Jud. l. 4. c. 2.

(m) *Profectò grave jugum ſuper filios Adam, à die exitus de ventre matris eorum, nullo modo juſtum eſſet.* S. Aug. ap. Voſſ. ſupr.

1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. *Ecclaſ.* 25. 24.

VI. Theſe three Branches of Original Sin are the ſumm total of it, as it is derivable from the ſin and fall of *Adam*. For no place of Scripture deriveth from it the loſs of Original Righteouſneſs. S. *Chryſoſtom* deriveth from it Original Sin (of which he giveth a better account than any other of the ancient Writers) but taketh not any notice of our loſs or privation of this endowment *Original Righteouſneſs.* On the contrary, *(n) Eraſmus*, *Stapulenſis* and others are of Opinion, that this is S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Senſe, *that by the Sin of* Adam *our Bodies are become mortal, but our Souls have ſuffer'd no damage by it.* *Voſſius* indeed thinketh, that they are miſtaken; becauſe S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *that a ſwarm of Paſſions entred together with Mortality:* but this reaſon is it ſelf a miſtake. For the diſorderly Affections, Paſſions and Appetites that are in Man, according to the Scripture-notion of them belong to the Body (are called *the Fleſh, the Affections and Luſts thereof, the Deeds of the Body, the Earthly Members*) and according to ſevere Philoſophy they are *the Life of the Body* and belong to our terreſtrial animal nature. According to S. *Chryſoſtom* therefore and the Scriptures none of the Evils of Original Sin are derivable from the Sin of *Adam* but only the criminal and penal Evils of our Animal Nature; therefore our Terreſtrial-animal Idea of our firſt Parents is a genuine and legitimate Idea. For if all the Branches of Original Sin deriveable from them are only ſuch as belong to our Terreſtrial-animal Nature, either in their Innocency they were not partakers of the Divine Nature, or their Poſterity had no concern in it. Some think, *(o) It is all one, whether we ſay, that Original Sin is Concupiſcence, or that it is the want of Original Righteouſneſs with Concupiſcence.* But this alſo is a great miſtake; for Original Righteouſneſs (in the Senſe of the Schools) is the Life of God in the Soul of Man and the proper Life of the up-

(n) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel.* l. 2. par 1. *Theſ.* 6. p. 165.

(o) *Mr. Thorndike Ep. B.* 2. c. 20.

per Soul; whereas the Animal-vital Nature is the ſeat and ſubject of Concupiſcence. This may reaſonably be deriv'd from our firſt Parents: but we muſt have a Faith big enough to remove Mountains, if we can believe it poſſible for our firſt Parents, by carnal generation to beſtow upon the Souls of their Poſterity the Life Divine (which is not born of the Fleſh) or by their lapſe to bereave the Souls of all Men of their proper Life, and (without any fault or fact of theirs) to ſink them into Spiritual Death, which is an Ocean of deadly Evils. To give a full account of Original Sin therefore, the lapſe of Souls muſt be conjoyn'd with the Terreſtrial-animal lapſe of our firſt Parents, from whom we derive our Animal-vital Nature.

VII. The Animal-vital Nature (ſolitary and ſeparate from the Holy-vital) beginneth its reign and domination with the life of man, whence he is *natively* and *originally* of a *ſinning* nature, (*p*) of *the ſinning kind* (τὸ ἁμαρτωλὸν γένος) and in a degree of inchoation and prevalent tendency that way (as is before diſcours'd) of *a Nature full of Sins*. For the Animal-vital Nature is in the courſe of Nature productive of all ſorts of Sins, *the luſt of the Fleſh, the luſt of the Eyes, and the pride of Life*, (and as ſuch it is *the Body of Sin and of Death, the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, indwelling Sin, the Law of Sin, the Law in the Members, the Earthly Members, the old Leaven.*) *The Fleſh* is parturient of Sin and Wickedneſs naturally, ſpontaneouſly (as the Fountain powreth out Water) *unceſſantly, deceitfully, violently and impetuouſly:* (*q*) *ad vitia nos naturæ noſtræ propellit inſtinctus*, the Inſtinct of our Nature impelleth us to Vices. Which Original Pravity the Scripture ſignifieth in its Character of Man (ſinful Fleſh) *Rom.* 8. 3. of the World of Mankind, 1 *Joh.* 5. 19. of the univerſal depravation of Men, *Pſal.* 14. and 53. Of the Men of the Ante-diluvian times, *Gen.* 8. 21. Of the Heart of Man, *Numb.* 15. 39. *Eccleſ.* 11. 9. Of the Jews and Gentiles (of which neither Barrel was better Herring) *Rom.* 3. 9. Of the Humane Birth, *Joh.* 3. 6. Of Unregenerate Mankind, *Rom.* 8. 8, 9. *Eph.* 2. 1. Of their Deſcent and Pedigree, which is *from beneath*, Joh. 8. 23. So according to *Philo* (*r*) the Scripture calleth the Sons of *Adam* τοὺς γῆς υἱοὺς, *the Sons of the Earth.* Their original Sinnerſhip is ſo apparent, that even *Celſus* (the foul Philoſopher) ſaith, (*s*) πέφυκε τὸ ἀνθρώπινον φῦλον ἁμαρτάνειν, *Mankind are by nature inclin'd to ſin.* Agreeable whereto is (*t*) the *Arabians* Proverb (which in their Language is elegant and rhythmical) *Man is called the Son of defect or diminution.* That which the Apoſtle calleth the Fleſh is called by *Ariſtotle* τι πεφυκὸς ἀντιβαῖνον τῷ λόγῳ, *ſomewhat innate to us which oppoſeth Reaſon.* The Hebrew Doctors uſually diſcourſe of the original pravity of man's nature, and their Senſe is, (*u*) that there is Concupiſcence in Man deriv'd from the Crime and Contagion of our firſt Parents, which he followeth from his Birth and which hath deprav'd the Faculties of his Soul; that Concupiſcence is innate to the Heart of Man, and Sin is in ſome ſort natural to Man. An old and fooliſh King ſpoken of *Eccl.* 4. 13. is by one of their Commentaries interpreted of the *jetzer harang*, Evil Figment. But why do they call it a King? becauſe all the Members obey it, ſaith this Commentary. In the *Talmud* the Emperour *Antoninus* inquireth of *R. Jehuda Hakkadoſh* touching the Evil Figment, *From what time doth Concupiſcence bear rule over a Man? from the moment of his intire Formation or from his Nativity?* the Anſwer is, *from his Formation.* In our Saviour's time the Jews had a notion of *being born in Sin*, as appeareth from the Phariſees reproach of the blind Man, *Joh.* 9. 34. *Thou waſt altogether born in Sins*; which reproach may juſtly be thought an hyperbolical expreſſion, but the Hyperbole doth not lie in ſaying, *that he was born in Sins*, but in ſaying, that *he was altogether born in Sins*; whereby the Phariſees meant, that as to his whole nature he was nothing but Sins, that nothing but Sins were in him, not a ſpark of Sanctity or Goodneſs. This reproach is ſo atrocious, and ſo quite out of the Road, that it is not imaginable, whence the Phariſees had it, or how they came by it, if this was not a well-known Notion among the Jews at that time, *that Mankind are born in Sins.* (*w*) *The only remedy for Mankind is, to be born again; and doth it not thence appear, into what depth of evil the nature of all Mankind is plung'd?*

Section III.

Mankind that belong to Nature and to the Law do not nor can attain Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs by Nature and the Law.

I. THE great want of Mankind is the want of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, which appeareth in the contrariety between them and the Law. For the holy ſpiritual Law requireth the holy ſpiritual Life (in ſinleſs perfection) the ſpirituality of it ſpeaketh the eximious ſanctity of it, which is its great excellency. (*x*) *For the Apoſtle ſtiling the Law ſpiritual, ſignifieth it to be the teacher of Virtue and the adverſary of Wickedneſs; for this is to be ſpiritual, to withdraw from all Sins.* (*y*) *The Law is ſpiritual, becauſe it commandeth the things that are ſpiritual, the hard Works of the Spirit forbidding Sins.* The Law of Univerſal Righteouſneſs muſt be ſpiritual; but Mankind that belong to Nature and to the Law, that are ſubjected to the courſe of nature under the reign of the Fleſh and Sin, are of an oppoſite Character; for they are of kind and quality *the Carnal*, Rom. 7. 14. (*z*) *The Apoſtle calleth him Carnal, that hath not yet attain'd Spiritual Grace.* Spiritual Grace is not attainable by Nature or by the Law (as the Name ſheweth;) but Spiritual Grace only ſaveth from carnality of mind and life, and nothing elſe is Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs (for whatever Righteouſneſs is on this ſide it, is but (*a*) *mundana juſtitia, a mundane kind of Righteouſneſs*) Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs therefore is not attainable by Nature or by the Law. Righteouſneſs to a world of lapſed Sinners is a Foreign Commodity and not of their own growth. The Sons of *Adam* are the Sons of Carnality and Wickedneſs, graceleſs rebel Sinners, *unſubjected to the holy ſpiritual Law*, Rom. 8. 7. in Mind and Affection, Diſpoſition and Practice of an alien inimical, atheous carnal and mundane kind, moulded and tempered according to the Fleſh, lapſed under (*b*) τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου (the Spirit of the World) having a Mind replete with Errors

(the

(p) *Macar. Hom.* 5.

(q) *S. Hilar. in Pſal.* 1.

(r) Περὶ φυτουργίας.

(s) *Grot. Not. in Luk.* 2. 22.

(t) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. p.* 334. *Ed.* 1.

(u) *Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 4. *c.* 2. *vid. Buxtorf. Lex breve Rabbin. p* 869. *Hulſ. Theol. Jud. l.* 1. *par.* 2. *p.* 461, 462. *Helvic. proteuangel. S.* 15, 16. *L'Emper. in Abar. in Iſa.* 30. *p.* 13.

(w) *Cùm ſine ſacramento regenerationis æternam mortem nemo poſſit evadere, nonne ex ipſius remedii ſingularitate apertiſſime patet, in quàm profundum malum totius humani generis natura demerſa ſit?* Proſper. adv. Caſſian. c. 19.

(x) Πνευματικὸν γὰρ εἰπὼν, διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς δείκνυσιν ὄντα, καὶ κακίας πολέμιον· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ πνευματικὸν, τὸ πάντων ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπάγειν. *S. Chryſoſt. in Ep. ad Rom. Hom.* 13.

(y) *Lex ſpiritualis eſt, quia ſpiritualia mandat, ardua præcipit opera ſpiritus, prohibens peccata.* Sedulius in cap. 7. ad Rom.

(z) *Theodoret. & Theophylact. in loc.*

(a) S. *Ambroſ. com. in Rom.* 6.

(b) *Macar. Hom.* 2.

(the Errors of an ungodly Mind) a Nature full of reigning Concupiſcences (which are not umbratile things, but vital and ſubſtantial, inbred and radicated Carnality and Wickedneſs) it's a great thing therefore to them, (that are ſo far from Righteouſneſs) to attain Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. Their entrance into the holy Life compriſeth matters of ſublime excellency, of great difficulty and oppoſition and incumbred with many Impediments; it importeth the illumination of a benighted Soul, the ingendring a new life in the Soul, the over-maſtering thoſe maſterly Luſts and vile Affections which reign over Mankind, a change of Nature, (c) which is *παγχάλεπον, extremely difficult*, a change of kind (the turning a wicked carnal kind of Man into an holy ſpiritual kind of Man) ſuch a change as is ~~in the Phraſe~~ of the Ancients *à Tartaro ad Tarteſſum migrare*, a migration from an infernal Region to the Region of Holineſs and Happineſs. The attainment of Righteouſneſs therefore is not meerly from *the Will of Man*, Joh. 1. 13. Nor can Mankind by Nature (their natural Abilities, Diſcipline or Religion) *make themſelves free* from their deadly reigning carnality of Mind and Life, *Joh.* 8. 34, 36.

Nor can they be ſav'd from it by the Law, which is not a Religion accommodate for the ſanctifying and ſaving Sinners. It affordeth them no further aſſiſtance towards the attaining Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs than a bare rule of Righteouſneſs; (d) *for the Law being Spiritual did only ſhew Sin* (as a rule of Righteouſneſs) *but did not kill Sin.* (e) *The Law condemneth the wicked deed, but doth not take away the Wickedneſs. The Law could ſtop the Mouth of all, but could not change the Mind.* (f) *What did the Law deſign? to make Man righteous, but it could not.* (g) *Not to the Servants of Righteouſneſs but to the Servants of Sin, to unjuſt Men God gave a juſt Law, which was of efficacy to ſhew their Sins, but not to take them away.* The Law could not give Life, therefore not Spiritual Life, *Gal.* 3. 21. As to the Souls of lapſed Mankind the beſt of the Law is dead, the worſt of it is deadly. It maketh no living impreſſion or inſcription of it ſelf upon them, but they that belong to this Settlement and Diſpenſation of things, continue in their oldneſs and carnality of Mind and inward Life and Nature, and under the dominion of Sin.

II. Neither Jew nor Gentile could attain Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs by the Law, but Sin liv'd and reign'd under the Law, and in ſome ſort by the Law; for it was to them in ſome ſort *the Law of Sin and of Death*, Rom. 8. 2. *For when we were in the Fleſh, the motions of Sin were by the Law.—— What ſhall we ſay then? is the Law Sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known Sin but by the Law; for I had not known Luſt, except the Law had ſaid, Thou ſhalt not covet. But Sin taking occaſion by the Commandment, wrought in me all manner of Concupiſcence. For without the Law Sin was dead. For I was alive without the Law once; but when the Commandment came, Sin revived and I died. And the Commandment which was ordained to Life, I found to be unto Death. For Sin taking occaſion by the Commandment, deceived me, and by it ſlew me. Wherefore the Law is holy, and the Commandment holy, and juſt and good: Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But Sin that it might appear Sin, working Death in me by that which is good; that Sin by the Commandment might become exceeding ſinful*, Rom. 7. 5.— 13. This Perioche of Scripture I have tranſcrib'd, with deſign to make a due explication of it; for Learned Men and converſant in the Scriptures have not fully reach'd the Apoſtle's Senſe in it. If we ask, how Sin *took occaſion by the Commandment, to work in Men all manner of Concupiſcence, to deceive them and to work death in them?* The worſt account is that which is given by **Grotius** and thoſe that follow him, (h) who impute it to the impunity that is in this Precept, *Thou ſhalt not covet*; for becauſe it was not fortify'd with a Penalty, thence (ſay they) *Men were ſeduced to give way to Concupiſcence, and to turn the Precept that was given for Life to their Death.* But this Expoſition contradicteth the minacious nature of the Moſaic Law, *Heb.* 12. 18. and the uſeful deſign of it, which was (as the Fathers rightly ſuppoſe) by its ſtrictneſs, minaciouſneſs and terrour, to convict Men of their ſin and miſery, to humble them, to prepare them for and put them upon ſeeking Divine Grace. (i) *Litera eſt minax quæ convincat prævaricatores.* Several other Precepts of the Decalogue as well as this, *Thou ſhalt not covet*, are not fortify'd with a Penalty, yet the Law is minacious, and therefore ingendreth *the Spirit of Bondage*, which according to S. *Auſtin* is the fear of Damnation; *Sub quo timore anima laborat, quando concupiſcentiam malam non vicerit*, under which fear the Soul laboureth, when ſhe doth not overcome her evil Concupiſcence. Whence is it elſe that we read in the Apoſtle, O *wretched Man that I am, who ſhall deliver me from the Body of this Death?* If this Precept of internal Purity *Non concupiſces*, was thought a matter of Impunity, what reaſon could there be for ſuch *ταλανισμοὶ*, tragical Exclamations? It is not imaginable, that a Man convicted of the ſinfulneſs of his Concupiſcence by this precept *Non concupiſces*, ſhould give indulgence to it, becauſe the Precept was not fortify'd by a Penalty annexed (for the conviction of a Sin implieth a conviction of incurring Divine Wrath upon the wilful committing it:) but if there might be ſuch a Man, this is not the Man whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, who was not ſeduc'd into a favourable opinion of Concupiſcence (becauſe no Penalty was annex'd to the Precept) *but what he diſſallow'd and hated that he did, and was miſerably captivated thereto.* This bad Expoſition pretendeth not to give any account of the main point in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe, namely, *how the motions of Sins are by the Law:* but the Author of it addeth a Participle to the Apoſtle's words, and maketh this the Senſe of them, *the motions of Sins were by the Law φαινόμενα aut γνωριζόμενα, apparent or made known:* which ſenſe is incongruous to the Apoſtle's buſineſs (which was to ſhew the Judaical Believers their happy freedom from the Law) and if this rate of expounding may be admitted (the adding Participles which are not manifeſtly imply'd) the Scriptures may be made a Noſe of Wax. But if the Apoſtle had not ſaid ſomething of the Law, which might ſeem opprobrious and injurious to it, why doth he betake himſelf preſently to the vindicating the Law, the making an Apology, and the anſwering an Objection,

---

(c) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 3. p. 151.

(d) *Spiritualis enim cùm lex eſſet, manifeſtavit tantummodo peccatum, non autem interemit.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 20.

(e) *Lex factum damnat non aufert malitiam.* S. Ambroſ. de fug. Sec. c. 7. *Lex os omnium potuit obſtruere, non potuit mentem convertere.* Ibid. c. 3.

(f) Τί γὰρ ἐβούλετο ὁ νόμος; δίκαιον ποιῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἴσχυσεν. *S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. Hom.* 17.

(g) *Non juſtitiæ ſervientibus ſed peccato, juſtam ſcilicet legem injuſtis hominibus dedit Deus, ad demonſtranda peccata eorum, non auferenda. non enim aufert peccatum.* S. Aug. præfat. Expoſ. Ep. ad Gal.

(h) *Grot. Not. in Rom.* 7. 8. *Mr. Thorndike Ep. B* 2. c. 31, 32. *Dr. Hamm. Paraphr. v.* 8, 11.

(i) *S. Aug. in Pſal.* 7

jection, *as if he had made the Law the cauſe of Sin?* v. 7.

Some ſuppoſe, (*k*) that Sin is excited by the Law through that Inclination, which is in Mankind to the Evil forbidden by the Law (*nitimur in vetitum*) from their natural love of liberty and impatience of reſtraint; whence the Damm which the Law ſetteth for repreſſing the courſe of Sin, doth but provoke the Stream or Current, to ſwell higher and greater, and to overburſt all obſtacles. So the Sin of Parriſide did not become rife amongſt the *Romans*, and the like unnatural Sin towards Children or Infants did not become rife at *Paris*, till a Law was made againſt it. (*l*) So *Seneca* ſaith, *Homicidæ cum lege cæperunt, & illis facinus pœna monſtravit.* The like account *Tacitus* and *Lampridius* give of the ſpreading of *Uſury* and *Sodomy*. And this mode of irritating or exciting Sin muſt be acknowledg'd ſo conſiderable, that it may reaſonably be admitted as part of the Apoſtle's Senſe; but it is not ſo uſual or general, as that it may reaſonably be thought the principal thing, that the Apoſtle meaneth, when he ſaith, *the motions of Sins were by the Law.* They that inſiſt upon this mode of exciting Sin, have taken notice of another, which is more conſiderable, namely, *that in a negative Precept there is a propoſal of ſuch things that are evil.* By the Law's inefficacious Documents of *Non-concupiſcence* there was excited in the Minds of the carnal Jews a Phantaſm or Imagination of tempting Objects (as of Money, Goods, a fine Houſe, a Neighbour's Wife) by which Phantaſm of tempting Objects an Appetite after them is excited in the Sons of Carnality, the motions and ſuggeſtions of Sin are raiſed, and *ſo the motions of Sin are* (occaſionally) *by the Law*, and ſo far it raiſeth up an evil Spirit, which it cannot conjure down. This ſeemeth to be an unexceptionable explication of the Apoſtle's Senſe, that *the Law is like ineffectual Phyſick, that ſtirreth the bad Humours, but doth not purge them out.* The Law did (ſeveral ways) excite indwelling Sin and put it into motion, but could not ſubdue and mortifie it; for the Law could not prevail, the Fleſh could not be ſubject, *Rom.* 8. 3, 7. Sin was enlivened and ſuſcitated by the Law, and the motions of it being *occaſionally* by the Law, the Apoſtle ſaith, *Sin taking occaſion by the Commandment wrought in me all manner of Concupiſcence; when the Commandment came, Sin revived; Sin taking occaſion by the Commandment* (did operate in me, and being excited) *deceived me* (Sin prevaileth and reigneth by deceiving Men) *without the Law ſin was dead* (dormant and comparatively dead) *I was alive without the Law once* (when without the Law Sin was dead, then was I alive, free from that deadly dying which was afterwards my condition:) but when the Law came and Sin was enlivened, *I died* by deadly ſinning againſt it, which is a deadly kind of dying. *And the Commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death; for by it Sin ſlew me* (or killed me) making me a deadly Sinner againſt it. The Law therefore is *ex accidenti*; the Law of Sin and of Death to ſuch as are in the natural and legal Condition; yet the Law is wholly inculpable, juſt and good, and all theſe Evils have their origin from indwelling Sin, *which worketh death to me by that which is good* (ſaith the Apoſtle) to this effect and event, *Sin thereby appeareth Sin* in its own colours (Ἀντινομία, a perfect repugnance to the Holy Law) and becometh *ſuperlatively ſinful* by the Law or Commandment that was given againſt it, *v.* 13. In the following part of the Chapter the Apoſtle perſonateth a Man, that is by the Law under great conviction of mind touching his evil practice, yet by the power and prevalency of indwelling Sin is impell'd and hurry'd thereto (as all men are in the natural and legal condition) whence he would have us, to make this Inference, *that Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs is not to be attain'd by the Law*; for it is not the cure of Sin. By the prevalency of Sin *ipſa remedia* (the Documents of the Law touching Non-concupiſcences) *convertuntur invulnera.*

(k) Dr. *Jackſon Comment.* B. 10. S. 1. ch. 9. S. *Aug. de Sp. & lit.* c. 4.

(l) Grot. *Not in Rom.* 7. 8.

III. The preſent Jews (the great admirers of and adherents to the Law) are an inſtance of the ineffectualneſs of the Law for the cure of Sin. For notwithſtanding their (*m*) Ιουδαϊκὸν φυσημα, *Judaical elation*, they are manifeſtly under the dominion of Sin and Urighteouſneſs, in deadly Carnality and Wickedneſs, utter aliens from and deadly Enemies to Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. They ſuppoſe, that by means of the Law the Divinity inhabiteth amongſt the *Iſraelites*, that they are the Holy Nation, the only Elect People of God and his dear *Iſrael*; they glory in their Sanctity, and ſometimes have ſuch high thoughts of it, (*n*) that in reſpect of ſinleſneſs they compare themſelves with the Genii in Heaven; not a few of them (*o*) have been called Saints in a Senſe of Eminence, and every one of their Synagogues is called *Synagoga Sancta*, yet S. *Chryſoſtom* hath made this heavy Judgment of their Caſe, (*p*) *that the unclean Spirits inhabit both their Synagogues and their Souls.* They are the great wonder of the World for their blindneſs and unintelligentneſs in Divine Matters, their monſtrous Imaginations, Portentous Fictions, Legends and Romances, for their bruitiſh Stolidity, groundleſs and ſenſeleſs Fancies and Fables in expounding the Scripture (turning the Word of God into Fables) for their reaſoning (*q*) without reaſon, and for their immenſity of ſuperſtitious Obſervations and Traditions (in which they repoſe great Confidence) prodigiouſly wild and abſurd.

(m) S. Cyr. c. *Jul.* l. 3. p. 107.

(n) Buxt. *Syn. Jud.* c. 21. p. 420. ed. *An.* 1614.

(o) Hotting. *Diſſ.* 2. p. 54, 78.

(p) T. 6. p. 373.

(q) L'Emper. *not. in Jacchiad.* p. 200.

Of old it was obſerv'd, (*r*) *That all the things of the preſent Jews are Fables and Trifles, for they have not the light of the knowledge of the Scriptures. Their moſt holy Talmud* (as they call it, and which their Doctors call *the joy of their Heart and the health of their Bones*) is the outer Darkneſs into which they are caſt. *Quicquid abſurdum quidquid fabuloſum animo fingi poſſit, illic invenias.* But this their Oral Law they equalize to their written Law; prefer the ſtudy of it before the ſtudy of their written Law, they ſuppoſe their wiſe men to excell the Prophets, and it is an ordinary rule with them, *Attend to the words of the Scribes more than to the words of the Law.* The eſteem that they have for their Oral Law, ſuppoſing it Divine and Infallible, is hugely ſubſervient to the Pride of their Rabbins that deliver the Oracles of it, and who will be counted nothing leſs than infallible Doctors, all muſt believe what they ſay, and ſay *Amen* to it (although they teach, that the Right-hand is the Left) for *reverentia magiſtri ſicut reverentia Cœli*, to rebell aginſt them is as Rebellion againſt God.

(r) *Orig. ap. Herald. in Arnob.* p. 134. *Simon. Hiſt. Crit.* l. 3. c. 6. *Paget Arrow ag. the Brown.* p. 369, 449. *Buxt. Syn.* c. 1. *de Abbrev.* p. 193, & *Vorſt. in Maim. & Abrab.* p. 4, 77. *Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. Leg.* 222. & 67. & p. 136.

The arrogance of theſe turgid inflated Rabbins is prodigious (*s*) for they are not only called of Men *Rabbi*, *Rabbi*, but their uſual attribute is כ״ם *Gloria Doctoris noſtri Domini*, *Domini N.* Some of them have ſeated themſelves Cheek by Jole with Princes, and they ſuppoſe, that at eating their Paſchal Lamb all the Iſraelites are inoyn'd, to behave themſelves *like Kings and Princes of the Earth*, and that this is the deſign of the Laws touching the manner of eating it. The beſt ſort of Sanctity which the beſt of theſe Doctors is acquainted with, is *intelligibilium apprehenſio*, ſpeculative Science, and he that hath reach'd this attainment, is ſaid to be for himſelf and his own end. But the end and uſe which the reſt of Mankind are for, is, *to be ſervient to the Man of Science*, his Food or Phyſick, or to bear him company. Whence *Ben Zoma* (the Phænix of his Age) ſtanding upon the Mount of the Holy Houſe, when he ſaw the Iſraelites aſcend, ſaid, *bleſſed be he that hath created all theſe to be ſervient to me.* (*t*) Themſelves theſe grand Magnifico's look upon as above Men, but the Gentiles with them are not of the Rank of Men. Themſelves they account the Lords and the Chriſtians the Slaves, and the great thing they dream of, is to be the Lords of the World and to have the Chriſtians their Footſtool, and this they pray for with the moſt bitter Execrations. From an unhumbled pride they deſpiſe the Chriſtians Saviour, ſuppoſe themſelves the only People, that can and do obſerve all the Commandments and fulfil the whole Law: But the Chriſtians and other People (yet allowing a future Reward to their Proſelytes of the Gate) they look upon as miſerable, accurſed, rejectaneous Miſcreants, an abomination to God and deſtined only to Damnation. The Modern Jews are all *Phariſees* (except the *Karraim* whom they infinitely deteſt as Hereticks) and they are of the ſame Foot-mark with their Predeceſſors.

As they have not the light of the Knowledge of the Scriptures (which they horribly profane (*u*) in their familiar Letters to one another) ſo from the many blaſphemous Stories that they tell of God, it appeareth, that they are without the light of the knowledge of God and devoid of a Sence of Religion. They have not an ordinary ſeriouſneſs in treating of Divine Matters, in their Devotion there is nothing of Devotion, their Praying is trifling. They that know them well, have given this account of their Piety. *In their Religious Worſhip there is nothing but Hypocriſie and Falſity. In the univerſality of the People of the Jews there is nothing obſervable in their Converſation or any thing they do, but an horrendous induration and obſtinacy. They talk of Faith and good Works, but neither will nor can underſtand them.*

Many of their illegitimate Notices and Conceits ſpeak their utter unacquaintedneſs with Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, and that they are aliens from it and from knowing it. Their Notices of Sin are Profane and Philoſophic-pagan; (*w*) for they derive it from *the terrene Matter*, which they count impure. *Man cannot be perfect* (ſaith one of theſe Doctors) *becauſe of the Matter which maketh him Sin.* Another of them ſaith of the Body, *Sin is by the corporeal Matter of it, and becauſe it is compounded of Earth.* Agreeably whereto *Men. ben Iſ.* expoundeth this Saying touching the Prophet, *Jer.* 1. 5. *Before thou cameſt forth out of the Womb I ſanctified thee.* That is (ſaith this Rabbi) *I made the temperament of thy Body prone to Virtue and Sanctity, as Philoſophers ſay, the temper of the Mind followeth the temperament of the Body.* No better a Sanctification than this do the Jews acknowledge; (*x*) *for to do away their Pollution, is not a work of the Holy Ghoſt, whom by way of deriſion they call the Chriſtians Sanctifier, but it is a work of Purgatory, wherein all the Relicks of Uncleanneſs, which Repentance had left uncleans'd, are to be done away.* The beſt of theſe Doctors thus interpreteth *Truth* and *Peace* in the Prophet. (*y*) *Truth ſignifieth the Intellectual and Peace the Moral Virtues (whereby Peace is made in the World) which are acquired by repeated Actions.* The Jews acknowledge no other Moral Virtue than the Human-moral, which is that of *Ariſtotle*, that is acquired by (z) cuſtomary Practice and conſiſteth in Mediocrity.

By multitudes of their Maxims and leud Conceits (which ſpeak their Religion a groſs and vile Superſtition) they make Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs altogether needleſs. So extravagant is their φιλαυτία, *Love to themſelves and their own Nation*, that it is with them a generally receiv'd Maxim. (*a*) *Every Iſraelite hath a Portion in the World to come. If a Jew hath but done one good Work, he ſhall not fail at the long run to have the reward of eternal Life. He that dwelleth within the Land of* Iſrael, *is abſolv'd from all Iniquity. He that walketh but four Cubits in it, is certainly a Son of the World to come. Whoſoever diligently obſerveth the Commandment touching the Zizith or Pendants, doth as much as if he obſerv'd the whole Law. Whoſoever hath the Phylacteries affix'd to his Head or Arm, the Zizith to his Veſtment, and the Schedule called* Mezuzah *to his door, he is ſafe from Sin; for theſe are great Memorials and the Angels deliver him from Sin.* Some of the Rabbins are of Opinion, that the obſervance of all the Precepts of the Law is needful for healing the Soul and acquiring Perfection: But others ſuppoſe, that it is ſufficient for Salvation, if one be perform'd. As if they carry'd the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven at their Girdle, they ſay, *whoſoever learneth the Talmudic Traditions ought to be perſwaded, that he ſhall be a Son of Life eternal.* About the Pollution of Garments, Meats, Drinks, Veſſels, which are with them נופי תורה *the ſubſtantials of the Law*, their Traditions and Subtilties are innumerable.

There is no appearance, that any of them are any thing better than *Worldings*, *mundane Religioniſts and ſuch as belong to the Jeruſalem which is from beneath.* The worſer ſort of them (*b*) are very much addicted to *Thievery* (which their Rabbins allow not) they are notorious for their unrighteous oppreſſive Uſury, and their diſhoneſty in Traffick, and they allow their Women to deceive and circumvent whom they can. In their Feaſt of

(s) *Buxt. de Abrev. p.* 98, *&c. Lightfoot Hor. in Luc.* 14. 8. *Hotting. de jur p.* 23, 25, 28, 29. *Maimon.* 8. *cap. Com. in Pirke aboth præmiſſ. c.* 5. *Mor. Nev. Par.* 3. *c.* 8.

(t) *Buxt. Syn. p.* 309, 360, 371. *&* *in fine præfat. Hulſ. Theol. Jud. l.* 1. *p.* 125.

(u) *Heinſ. Proleg. ad Ariſtarch. Buxt. ſupr. p.* 36, 181, 417, 475. *In opinioſo ipſorum cultu præter hypocriſin & falſitatem nihil eſt. In populo Judæorum toto præter horrendam indurationem & obſtinationem in converſatione & actione ejus quacunque nihil obſervare queas. Quid fides operáve bona ſint, intelligere neque volunt neque poſſunt.* Ibid. p. 1, 2, 38. *Nullibi minus intentionis eſt, quàm in ipſorum precibus.* Buxt. de Abbrev. p. 180, 181.

(w) *Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 4. *c.* 1, 2.

(x) *L'Addiſon of the Jews*, *p.* 33.

(y) *Maim.* 8. *cap. com. ſuo in Pirke Ab. præmiſſ. c.* 4.

(z) *Ariſt. Eth. l.* 2. *c.*

(a) *Hulſ ſupr. p.* 19, 31, 172. *Hoornbeek ſupr. p.* 432. *& l.* 7. *c* 3. *Paget ſupr. p.* 290, 298. *Lightfoot Hor. in Mar. p.* 61. *& in Luc.* 13. 23. *Abrah. ap. Vorſt. de cap. Fid. p.* 51, 52, 104, 109. *Coſri p.* 97. *Mr. Smith Select. Diſc. p.* 302, 303. *Buxt. Syn. c.* 4. *p.* 137. *de Abbrev. p.* 203. *Pocock Not. Miſc. p.* 352. *Clav. Talm. p.* 9.

(b) *Buxt. Syn. c.* 1. *p* 23. *c.* 3. *in fine. c.* 21. *p.* 416. *Hoornbeek ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 4, 7. *Hotting. de jur. Lex.* 121. *p.* 155. *Selden de J. N. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 10. *Lightfoot Hor. in Marc.* 16. 15. *& Luc.* 3. 5. *P. Fag. in Exod.* 23. 1. *Cartwright Melliſic. Hebr. c.* 8.

Reconciliation all the Vows, Oaths, Promiſes and Covenants which they have violated, are fully pardon'd, and the Sin of them is quite annihilated, as they ſuppoſe, becauſe then Covenant-breakers as well as Covenant-keepers have right in one Holy Communion to pray to, and to praiſe God together; whence as of Old, ſo at this day their Oaths are not to be truſted. Profane Swearing by the Creatures is one of their reigning Sins, which ſome of their Rabbins ſeverely Condemn and others Extenuate. They require a ſincerity in their Proſelytes of Juſtice, but their own ſincerity amounteth to ſo little, that they allow themſelves in ſeveral Caſes and Circumſtances, to violate moſt of the Laws of their Religion, to ſave their bodily Life. They reſolve Caſes of Conſcience like mundane Lawyers. Their mundane Genius appeareth in their uſual Elogies of their Rabbins, that they are Wiſe and Rich, and Riches are with them a requiſite Qualification for the Spirit of Prophecy, the Reward of Virtue and a Mark of God's Favour. Chiefly their mundane Genius appeareth in their Cauſe of their rejecting the true Meſſiah, they deſire no other than a mundane Meſſiah, that may deliver them from their worldly Captivity and Calamity. They have no Sence at all of their Spiritual Thraldom and Captivity, nor any better Sentiments than thoſe of the Spirit of the World.

One eminent Branch of their Character is *groſs ſenſuality*. (*c*) For their quarrel againſt Chriſtianity is not ſo much upon account of the ſenſual Lives of pretending Chriſtians; becauſe themſelves ſuppoſe, that under the Law and eſpecially under the Meſſiah a voluptuous Kingdom and Religion is promis'd them abounding with Riches and ſenſitive Delights. They have ſeveral commendable Inſtitutes on behalf of Chaſtity, but they have ſuch an *Ethice Cubicularia*, as no chaſt Ears can endure. Before the Sabbath they eat Leeks, to impower them for Commerce with their Wives in honour of the Sabbath. For in this manner they make the Sabbath a delight (*Sabbatum deliciarum*) by indulging themſelves all manner of ſenſitive Delight and Pleaſure, and believe, that by ſo doing they ſhall have Liberty, Riches, Lands and Inheritances. On the Sabbath they have three Feaſts, and much what at the ſame rate they obſerve the *New Moon* and they keep the Feaſt of the Dedication of the Temple *vorando, belluando, ludendo* (by gluttonizing and playing) the Feaſt of the Paſſover they celebrate by drinking till Midnight, and at the Feaſt of *Purim* they think it neceſſary to be drunken, till they cannot diſtinguiſh betwixt *Arur Haman* (curſed be *Haman*) and *Baruch Mordecai*, bleſſed be *Mordecai*. They revel in this Feſtival at a greater rate than the Gentiles in their *Bacchanalia*. When a Male Child is born, the Men meet together and drink till they cannot ſee, they drink and forget their Captivity. (*d*) *Living to the Belly, gaping after the things that are preſent, of the ſame diſpoſition with Swine and Goats, one thing only they know, to fill the Belly and to be drunk.* Their Practice is agreeable to their Theory; (*e*) *for all the good things* (ſaith *Maimonides*) *that the Prophets propheſied of for* Iſrael, *they were nothing elſe but things for the Body, which* Iſrael *ſhall enjoy in the days of the King Meſſias, in the time that he ſhall turn the Kingdom to* Iſrael. But a groſs Senſualiſt is called by this Rabbi *mera materia in mari* τῆς ὕλης, *natans*.

Another principal part of their Character is their murderous and bloody Temper. (*f*) A Gentile (although a Proſelyte of the Gate) they do not account their Neighbour. They account it unlawful, to ſhew Mercy to any of the Gentiles. If a Jew ſeeth a Gentile periſhing or drown'd in Water, he may not help him; if he ſeeth him next door to Death, he may not deliver him. If any of the Gentiles tranſgreſs a Precept which belongeth to them, their Puniſhment is no leſs than Death, *admonitio eorum eſt mors eorum*, ſay the Rabbins. They ſuppoſe themſelves bound to hate, abominate and deſtroy ſuch as they account Hereticks in the Faith (by deſtroying the impious I deſtroy the Thorns out of the Vineyard, ſaith a Rabbi) accordingly this Prayer is uſually in their Mouths, *Let all Hereticks ſuddenly periſh.* Apoſtates (ſuch as are converted from Judaiſm) they cauſe to fall into a Pit, but do not help them out (as themſelves ſay;) in one of their Prayers they pray for their eternal Perdition, this Prayer they recite daily, and call it *Precationem Hæreticorum*; for it is a Prayer againſt Apoſtates, Hereticks, and the Jews Enemies, and againſt all theſe they pray in this direful curſing Form, *eradicate them, beat them down, deſtroy them, ſubdue them.* It is no Sin with them, to kill a Chriſtian; Chriſtians they account Gentiles, Hereticks, the Enemies of God and their Enemies, and againſt them they pray, that God will pour out his Wrath on them, perſecute them, deſtroy them from under Heaven, excite his burning Vengeance againſt them; and their Hope is, that all theſe Edomites ſhall periſh and be rooted out of the World. And becauſe the Chriſtians have the Domination, they have this Prayer againſt them in their Liturgy; *Let all the elated ſpeedily periſh, and let them all be cut off, and quickly bring them down in our days.* Upon certain pieces of Fleſh (the hinder parts of Animals) which they ſell to Chriſtians, uſually they pour a Malediction, that the *Goi* (Gentile) which buyeth and eateth them, may eat his Death. An immenſe maliciousneſs they have againſt the Chriſtian Religion, and touching the Chriſtian Meſſiah they have ſuch lying Stories, ſuch villainous Reproaches, and uſe ſuch blaſphemous Execrations, as are too horrible to be related. Their voice is the ſame that it was of old (*g*) Σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον, *Crucifie him, Crucifie him.*

IV. The Jews are manifeſtly aliens from Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, and there is no appearance, that the reſt of Mankind which belong to the Law, are much better than they. (*h*) The *Samaritans* are properly called *Judæo-Samaritani*, and may paſs for a Mongrel-ſort of Jews, whom they ſeem to exceed in Phariſaical blindneſs and arrogance. The *Muhammedans* are not leſs blind and ſuperſtitious and zealous in their Superſtition than the Jews, not leſs abſurd in their Conceits, fabulous in their Tales, wild in their

---

(c) *Epiſcop. Inſtit.* p. 438. *Buxt. Syn.* c. 2. p. 80. c. 5. p. 160. c. 8. p. 227. c. 10. p. 258, 267. c. 13. p. 333. c. 17. p 374. c. 23. & 24. *de Abbrev.* p. 208. *Hoornbeek ſupr.* l. 7. c. 5.

(d) *S. Chryſoſt.* T. 6. p. 370.

(e) *Paget ſupr.* p. 410 *Maimon.* 8. *cap. com. in Pirke aboth præmiſſ.* c. 5.

(f) *Lightfoot Hor. in Luc.* 10. 29. *Maimon de Idol.* c. 10. *Hotting. de jur. Lex.* 28, 34, 54. *Abarb. ap. Vorſt. de cap. Fid.* p. 8. *Maimon. ibid. de Fund. Leg.* p. 85. *Heinſ. Ariſtarch.* p. 475. *Pool's Synopſ. in Matth.* 5. 43. *L'Emper. Not. in Abarb. Com. in Iſa.* 30. p. 148, 150. & p. 158. *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 1201, 2442. *Syn Jud.* c. 3. p. 115. c. 5. p. 165, 170, 171, 176. c. 9. p. 235. c. 13. p 333, &c. c. 16. p. 360. c. 19. p. 395. c. 22. p. 472. *Coſri* p. 241.

Ἐν σφαγαῖς καὶ φόνοις ἀναστρέφοντες. *S. Chryſoſt.* T. 6. p. 373.

(g) *S. Chryſoſt.* T. 6. p. 371.

(h) *Hotting. Exercit. Ant. Mor.* S. 16, &c. *L'Emper. Not. in Benjamin.* p. 170. *Druſ. de 3. Sect.* l. 3. c. 10, 11, 14, 17.

their impoſſible Stories than the Jews; like them they curſe in their Prayers, and will have all of their Belief ſav'd at the long run though never ſo wicked. But they are much leſs abhorrent from groſs Idolatry than the Jews are. (*i*) For they have a number of Saints, that are for ſeveral Uſes (ſome to help in War, others in Peregrination, others in Child-birth and the like) whom they invoke and venerate. The Jews tranſcend them in their Notices of God and of the World to come, in their care againſt incentives to the Luſt of Uncleanneſs, and their Religion was of Divine Inſtitution: They on the other hand in ſome reſpects tranſcend the Jews (being not ſo malicious againſt Chriſt, not ſo addicted to drunkenneſs, nor diſhoneſt in Traffick as the Jews) but both are *alienated from the Life of God* (as the Gentiles were) and under the Dominion of Sin and Unrighteouſneſs. For *Muhammediſm* is not an Inſtitution of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, but of ſottiſh rituality and vile Externalneſs, of brutiſh fury and leud Uncleanneſs, of Hatred, Revenge, War and Murder, not fairly inſtructing and inſtituting Men to the Wiſdom of the Juſt (*k*) but killing them that receive it not, according to that grand Precept of its Founder, *occidite homines, quouſque omnes Mauri fiant*, kill Men, till all become Muhammedans. The beſt of it is like *Jus Hebræorum*, a Civil-religious Inſtitution (*l*) according to which in the Muhammedan Empire Juſtice is adminiſtred to the People. The great Men of the *Muhammedans* Hierarchy and the great Doctors of their Law are Lawyers, Judges and Juſtices to the People; they have no Church but their Commonwealth; and the beſt Precepts of their Religion as ſuch are but Inſtitutes of Civil-religious Virtue. In their Religion therefore (the beſt Precepts of it) there is nothing at all of the Life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs: Nor is it poſſible, that there ſhould be any, ſeeing it was inſtituted by an heatheniſhly ignorant and impure Varlet, that knew not the Life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. But as the Jews promiſe themſelves Salvation upon account of their Civil-religious Virtue, ſo do the *Muhammedans*. In that Juſtice and Charity which by their Law they are bound to practice (amongſt themſelves) they very much reſemble the carnal Jews (as alſo in the high Conceit of themſelves and their own Religion) and their hatred and contempt of the Chriſtians is like the Jews hatred and contempt of the Gentiles. They have their Alms, Pilgrimages and Prayers, their Martyrs, Miracles and Reliques in common with other Religions: But their Saints are ſuch, as all other Religions are aſham'd of, *Beaſtialiſts, Fools and Madmen. Maimonides* therefore hath given their true Character (*m*) *thoſe ſtolid fooliſh Arabians* השטופים בזמה *immers'd in Wickedneſs.* Such is the State of Mankind in their Naturaliſm and Legaliſm of Condition.

V. This Poſition may ſeem liable to the *Pelagians* Objection touching the perfect fulfilling the Law of God in this Life (in the rigour of it;) for they argu'd (*n*) that if this be impoſſible, then God commandeth that which is impoſſible, which is contrary to the Nature of a Law according to that known Saying, *ad impoſſibile neminem obligari*. If Mankind therefore which belong to the Law, cannot attain Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs by it, how can they be oblig'd by the Law, to be truly Righteous and Holy, which *is to them* impoſſible? But it muſt be conſider'd, whether a Law is impoſſible by or without the Subjects fault, and whether we ſuppoſe it abſolutely, or only in a certain limited Senſe impoſſible. (1.) If the attaining Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs was now abſolutely or phyſically impoſſible to Mankind, their Caſe would be like thoſe in *Italy* (*o*) whom they called *Murcos*, who cut off their Thumbs, to diſable themſelves from being Soldiers; for whatever impoſſibility there now is of attaining Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, Mankind have contracted it by their own fault. (2.) It is not to be ſuppos'd, that their attaining Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs by the Law is abſolutely or phyſically impoſſible. But as we ſuppoſe it only *morally* impoſſible, that any meer Man ſhould in this Life perfectly keep the Law in the rigour of it (this is to be reckon'd amongſt things that are ſo impoſſible, that they are τὰ μὴ συμβαίνοντα. *ſo difficult that they do not come to paſs*:) So we ſuppoſe it only *morally* impoſſibe, that any who belong to Nature and to the Law, ſhould ſo far keep the Law, as to be truly Righteous and Holy; and that this Moral Impoſſibility is a *Moral* Impotency, being the pravity of their Will, Affection and Diſpoſition, which doth not excuſe them from fault and blame, but conſtituteth them culpable, criminal and condemnable. They are of the Evil kind, the Evil affected and addicted, and that which maketh them ſuch is their Evil Mind, Will and Choice, they ought to be otherwiſe, and might be otherwiſe, if they were willing as they ought; but this their badneſs of willing diſpoſitive and actual (of which there is great ſtore in Mankind's Naturaliſm and Legaliſm of Condition) is their Criminality, although their willing otherwiſe as they ought, is *morally impoſſible* and therefore their *moral impotency*. Men may be oblig'd by a juſt Law, to what is morally impoſſible (elſe Chriſtians could not be oblig'd to pray without diſtraction and wandring thoughts) therefore Men may be oblig'd by a juſt Law to what is morally impoſſible *as being their moral impotency*; for this is nothing more than what is morally impoſſible. If Men might not be oblig'd by a juſt Law to what is morally impoſſible becauſe of their moral impotency (or *non-potency*) the more prevalent and predominant, radicated and confirm'd their enmity and diſaffection to Righteouſneſs is, and their propenſion to Wickedneſs, the more they would be diſobliged from the Law of Righteouſneſs, and ſo they would fare the better for being worſe; whereas the greater and the more confirm'd their Will is to Wickedneſs, the more odious they are, the more wicked, criminal and puniſhable. (3.) Suppoſe it abſolutely impoſſible for Men to attain Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs in their Naturaliſm and Legaliſm of Condition, yet as it was not impoſſible for the Gentiles, to emerge out of their Gentiliſm, ſo it is not impoſſible for Mankind to emerge out of their Naturaliſm and Legaliſm of Condition. If they cannot have Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs by *Nature* and by the *Law*, yet they may be faithful to Righteouſneſs according to their Light and Strength, and may ſeek to God and his Divine Saving Grace, the Religion and Diſpenſation whereof is coeval with the Fall of Man. They have no cauſe therefore to complain of hard unrighteous uſage, becauſe Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs is not attainable by the Law, ſeeing

(i) Hotting. Hiſt. or. l. 2. c. 5. p. 392. &c Ed. 1. Selden Titles p. 658. ed. 3.

(k) Coſri p. 13.

(l) Sutliv. Turcopapiſm. c. 6.

(m) Pocock. Spec. p. 293.

(n) Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 5. Par. 1. Theſ. 6, 7. Plutarch. de Stoic. repugn. p. 1037.

(o) Voſſ. ibid. l. 2. Par. 3. Theſ. 2.

ing another diſpenſation of things is provided for them, whereby it may be attained. (p) *Malè utitur lege, qui non ſe ſubdit Deo pia humilitate, ut per gratiam poſſit Lex impleri.*

(p) *S. Aug. ad Simplic. l.* 1. *Qu.* 1.

Section IV.

Mankind that belong to Nature and to the Law, cannot attain the State of Righteouſneſs by the Law and the Works thereof: But all of them are in all the Evils of the Criminal and Penal State, the State of Condemnation.

I. To be *a Free-man*, ſignifieth in a twofold Sence, the one the Sence of *Moral* Learning, the other the Sence of *Nobility* Learning. For it ſignifieth, to be a *Free-man* in Life and Practice (liberal and bountiful) and to be in State *a Free-man* (to have the Rights and Priviledges and good Eſtate of a Free-man) not a Bond-ſlave. So Men are ſaid to be *Noble* as to matter of Life and Practice (in oppoſition to a baſe Diſpoſition and Practice) and uſually to *be Noble*, ſignifieth to be in State *Noble*, to have ſuch Honours, Rights and Priviledges, whereby ſecular Grandees are ennobled. So in Theology, to be *Righteous*, is to be ſuch in Life and Practice, as uſually the Phraſe ſignifieth; and uſually it ſignifieth alſo, *to be in State the Righteous*, ſuch to whom the Reputation, Rights and Priviledges of the Righteous belong. Theſe are two ſorts of Righteouſneſs, the one of *Life and Practice*, the other of *State and Condition*: The one *Inherent*, the other *Adherent*: The one may be called *the Righteouſneſs of Sanctification*, the other of *Juſtification*. Which conſiſteth in *being in State and Condition the Righteous as to God*: that is, in being *in reſpect of honourary Reputation, Rights and Priviledges the Righteous*. Or it conſiſteth *in being in juſt Reputation the uncriminal, uncondemnable, rewardable Perſons*. For as the *Sinners* are thoſe, *that are of Reputation the Criminals, to whom the Evil Penal* (or Condemnation) *belongeth*: So the *Righteous* are thoſe, *that are of Reputation the Non-criminals, to whom there is no Condemnation*. Rom. 8. 1. This Righteouſneſs of Perſons is the ſame with their *Juſtifiedneſs*, and is uſually expreſs'd in Scripture by their being *juſtified* or made the Righteous. *Rom.* 8. 30, 33. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. Sometimes it is expreſſed by *not imputing Sin to a Perſon*, which is the making him in Reputation no (deadly) Sinner. *Rom.* 4. 8. *Not numbring him with the Tranſgreſſors.* Iſa. 53. 12. The ungodly Sinners are under the ſtain of Sin (an adherent Pollution and blot in their Eſcucheon) and are in Reputation *turpes perſonæ*, Perſons infamous and foully blemiſh'd: But when Sin is not imputed, they are no more *the blemiſh'd, the maculated*, or of any foul criminal Name (whatever foul Facts they have done) *not the Unrighteous, nor Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor Effeminate, nor Abuſers of themſelves with Mankind, nor Thieves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Revilers, nor Extortioners*, not nefarious and flagitious Varlets, nor muſt they be treated and us'd as ſuch. In the *Non-imputation* of Sin the *Remiſſion* of Sin conſiſteth, which is the great concern of Mankind; for the State of Remiſſion of Sins (according to Chriſtianity) is the State of all their Honours and of all their Comforts. They that are in it, are of Reputation not the ungodly Sinners (the Criminals) but *the Righteous*, which is an honourary Reputation, and implieth the being unſtain'd, dignified and ennobled. He that is reputed one of the Righteous, is (q) ὁ καλλωπιζόμενος, *one that is honour'd and unſordified in eſtimation.* (r) *Gloria uniuſcujuſque juſtitia eſt.* Righteouſneſs is Honour, Glory and Illuſtriouſneſs: As Criminality and Condemnation is Infamy and Diſgrace. A foul ſtain it is and a blackning the Criminal Perſons: But if any of theſe foul Criminals attain to Righteouſneſs, (*ſanctorum juſtitia*) he is *waſh'd, cleans'd, whitened, brightned*, his filthy Garments are taken away, and he is (as it were) array'd *in fine Linnen*, a Symbol of *the Righteouſneſs of the Saints*, becauſe of its cleanneſs, brightneſs and reſplendency. *Zech.* 3. 4. *Apoc.* 19. 8. To have Righteouſneſs therefore, is to have Religious Nobleneſs and Excellency, the ſeveral Branches of Righteouſneſs are ſo many Branches of Religious Nobleneſs and Excellency; for the inherent Righteouſneſs of the Saints of God is a Brightneſs and Reſplendence, the Reputation of the Righteous is a Brightneſs and Reſplendence, the State of the Righteous is an high and excellent, a noble, bleſſed and divine Condition, enrich'd with vaſt and vaſtly numerous Rights and Priviledges, which are a Brightneſs and Reſplendence of Eſtate. According to Chriſtianity the Righteous are in the State of Amity and Peace with God, *the reconciled, the accepted, the elect of God*, that are adopted into his divine and heavenly Family, the Citizens of his Kingdom and of the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, the Collegues and Intercommoners with the Holy Angels. God is their Father, of a fatherly diſpoſition and behaviour, and will do all Paternal Offices towards them; they have right to his Preſence and Society, to his Holy Spirit and its Guidance, his Holy Angels and their Guardianſhip, to his Proviſion and Protection, to the audience of their Prayers, the reſpectful treatment of their Perſons, and to all Bleſſings conſequent upon the divine Friendſhip. Therefore their Eſtate is an impregnable and glorious Eſtate, becauſe they have an Almighty Friend, the fruit of whoſe Friendſhip is all manner of Bleſſedneſs, all that is conducive unto Bleſſedneſs, all needful Bleſſings (thoſe of time as well as thoſe of Eternity) they are ſo happy, that every Wind bloweth them Happineſs, nothing ſhall ruin them, nothing ſhall really hurt them (not the moſt dangerous things of the World, *Rom.* 8. 38, 39.) they may dwell quiet from fear of Evil, Death to them is not deadly, the Law cannot condemn them, the Grave cannot hold them, their Enemies may kill them, but cannot hurt them (as *Socrates* ſaid of his Enemies) they overcome them, when they ſeem to be overcome, finally they ſhall be victorious over all the Enemies of their Salvation, and ſhall never periſh, never be forſaken, never be left Fatherleſs and Friendleſs. They are priviledg'd Perſons exempt from Spiritual Beggary and Slavery, from the Dominion of Sin and Satan (and all their ghoſtly Enemies) from the divine Wrath, and from Condemnation and all the deadly Penal Evils. They are the Heirs of God, the Heirs of his Promiſes, the Heirs of his Inheritance, and have right to a full deliverance from all Evils and the enjoyment of all Good, ſo immenſe and boundleſs are the Felicities of the Righteous.

(q) S. *Chryſoſt. in Rom.* λογ. κ.

(r) *Greg. M. in Job l.* 14. *c.* 19.

Rom. 5. 10. *Eph.* 1. 6. *Col.* 3. 12.

Apoc 2. 11.

II. From theſe definitive Notices of the State of Righteouſneſs (or Juſtifiedneſs) it appeareth to be no other than the State of Grace, Life and Salvation (which is oppoſite to the Criminal and Penal State) and this will further appear by conſidering, that in Scripture *Righteouſneſs* (the State of Righteouſneſs) is confronted and oppos'd to *Condemnation* (the State of Condemnation) 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. And not only ſo, but in the Phraſeology of Holy Scripture *Righteouſneſs* and *Salvation* are frequently terms Synonymous, as to be *juſtified* (made the Righteous) and to be *ſaved*, are uſually in the New Teſtament identical Expreſſions. *Eph.* 2. 5. *By Grace ye are ſaved.* Rom. 11. 11. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in thine heart, that God raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* As *the juſtified* and *the ſaved* (οἱ σωζόμενοι,) are in the ſtile of the New Teſtament ſynomous Expreſſions, ſo are *Righteouſneſs* and *Salvation* in many places of the Old Teſtament, as one Learned Man hath obſerv'd, (s) *that Righteouſneſs in the Old Teſtament often ſignifieth Felicity and Proſperity.* But it is not Felicity and Proſperity in general, that is called *Righteouſneſs* in the Old Teſtament: But the ſecular Felicity and Proſperity of the literal *Iſrael*, whoſe ſecular Infelicity and Miſery was *their Criminal and Penal State*, and whoſe ſecular Felicity and Proſperity was their *Juſtifiedneſs* or Righteouſneſs; for their being reputed and treated as Criminals, and their being reputed and treated as the Righteous (the Righteous Nation) was in reſpect of ſecular Felicity and Infelicity. Secular Felicity and Proſperity, *their Salvation* is called *their Righteouſneſs*, as it was, and becauſe it was *their Juſtifiedneſs*, as appeareth from the Prophet. *Iſa.* 45. 24. *Surely ſhall one ſay, in the Lord have I Righteouſneſs and Strength.* Righteouſneſs here certainly ſignifieth *Salvation*, Felicity and Proſperity, which is called *Righteouſneſs*, as it was, and becauſe it was *Iſrael*'s Juſtifiedneſs, as is plain from the following words; *In the Lord ſhall all the houſe of Iſrael be juſtified and ſhall glory.* Jer. 23. 6. *In his days Judah ſhall be ſaved, and Iſrael ſhall dwell ſafely: And this is his Name, whereby he ſhall be called, the Lord our Righteouſneſs.* The Prophet foretelleth a time when *Judah* and *Iſrael* ſhall have Salvation, and that Jehovah will then be their Righteouſneſs (they ſhall have Righteouſneſs from him) this Righteouſneſs is Juſtifiedneſs, which is the ſame with *Salvation*; therefore *Iſrael*'s Salvation is called Righteouſneſs, as it was, and becauſe it was their *Juſtifiedneſs*. Sometimes Righteouſneſs ought to be expounded by Salvation. As *Iſa.* 54. 17. *This is the heritage of the Servants of the Lord, and their Righteouſneſs is of me, ſaith the Lord.* Pſal. 24. 5. *He ſhall receive the bleſſing from the Lord, and Righteouſneſs from the God of his Salvation.* In theſe following Texts *Righteouſneſs* and *Salvation* (or Felicity and Proſperity) are palpably Terms ſynonymous. *Iſa.* 61. 10. *I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my Soul ſhall be joyful in my God, for he hath clothed me with the Garments of Salvation, he hath cover'd me with the Robe of Righteouſneſs.* Iſa. 62. 1, 2. *For Zion's ſake I will not hold my Peace, and for Jeruſalem's ſake I will not reſt, until the Righteouſneſs thereof go forth as brightneſs, and the Salvation thereof as a Lamp that burneth. And the Gentiles ſhall ſee thy Righteouſneſs, and all Kings thy Glory.* Iſa. 61. 11. *The Lord will cauſe Righteouſneſs and Praiſe, to ſpring forth before all Nations.* Iſa. 48. 18. *O that thou hadſt hearkened to my Commandments: Then had thy Peace been as a River, and thy Righteouſneſs as the Waves of the Sea.* The Juſtify'dneſs and Savedneſs of his People, their liberation from Penal Evils, Miſcreancy and Miſery, their brightneſs and reſplendency of external Condition conſider'd as it was their *Juſtifiedneſs*, this God calleth their *Righteouſneſs*; and who can doubt, but that our Saviour is called *the Sun of Righteouſneſs*, to ſignifie, that he is the Sun of Salvation? *Mal.* 4. 2.

III. In theſe definitive Notices of Righteouſneſs *the being in State and Condition the Righteous* is underſtood, not with reſpect to Men, but to God, with whom *Abraham* (upon his believing divinely) obtain'd *the State and Condition of the Righteous* Abraham, and therefore the Scripture ſaith *Rom.* 4. 3. *Abraham believed God, and* (t) *it was counted to him for Righteouſneſs.* So Chriſt's Believers by their Faith gain this ineſtimable Benefit, they have with God the Reputation of the Righteous, and this the Apoſtle meaneth, when he ſaith, that *God imputeth Righteouſneſs to them, Faith is counted to them, is imputed to them for Righteouſneſs, as it was reckon'd to Abraham for Righteouſneſs.* Rom. 4. 5, 6, 9, 22, 23, 24. For to ſay, that Sin is imputed to any one, is the ſame, as to ſay, that he is counted a Sinner; to ſay, that Adultery is imputed to any one, and to ſay, that he is counted an Adulterer, are identical Expreſſions: So this Expreſſion *Righteouſneſs is imputed to Believers*, muſt ſignifie, that they are counted the Righteous; as is plain alſo from the meaning of the word *imputed* (u) *ſignificat enim aſcribi, attribui*, for it ſignifieth to be aſcrib'd, attributed. The meaning of this Phraſe interpreteth thoſe other, which the Apoſtle uſeth, which are certainly of the ſame ſenſe. For as if we ſay of *Hannah*'s tacit moving her Lips, it was imputed to her for Drunkenneſs, we mean theſe two things: That ſhe was reputed drunken, and this was upon account of her tacit moving her Lips. So when the Apoſtle ſaith of *Abraham* and of Chriſt's Believers, that their Faith is *counted, reckon'd, imputed to them for Righteouſneſs*, his meaning is, that they are reputed the Righteous upon account of their Faith. But the Phraſe of *imputing Righteouſneſs* may be underſtood in a twofold Senſe: Either in the Senſe of the Religion of Soul-intereſts, and with reſpect to Soul-concerns; or in the Senſe of literal Judaiſm (which was a Civil-religious and typical Inſtitution of Sanctity) and in reſpect of ſecular Intereſts. For the Pſalmiſt ſaith of *Phinehas* and his Fact of Zeal, *that was counted unto him for Righteouſneſs unto all Generations for evermore.* *Pſal.* 106. 31. It was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs, for he gain'd thereby the Reputation of *the Righteous Phinehas* (as *Abraham* by his Faith gain'd the reputation of the Righteous *Abraham*:) But this *Phinehas* did not gain in the ſenſe of the Religion of Soul-intereſts, or with reſpect to Soul-concerns, but only in the ſenſe of literal Judaiſm and to the purpoſe of gaining an everlaſting Jewiſh Prieſthood.

IV. The learned *Grotius* miſtaketh the Senſe of theſe Phraſes of Scripture, and thence it is,

(s) *Ea ſignificatio ſubinde in V. T. occurrit, ut* צדקה *pro felicitate & proſperitate accipiatur.* L'Emper. Not. in Moſis Kimchi ὁδοιπορ. p. 229.

(t) *Habitus fuit pro juſto à Deo.* Vatabl. *Fides ejus à Deo acceptata eſt, ut Scil. propter eam juſtitiam ei largiretur, ipſumque juſtum atque amicum ſuum reputaret.* Menoch. *Fides dicitur imputari pro juſtitia, quod credenti juſtitia fuerit gratis imputata, ſeu quod credens ex gratia fuerit juſtus reputatus.* Pareus.

(u) *Cajetan. ad Rom.* 4. 3.

that he doth not acknowledge this great Article of Chriſtianity *the State of Righteouſneſs*. If any Action is ſaid to be *counted*, *reckon'd* or *imputed for Righteouſneſs*, (w) the Phraſe ſignifieth only (according to this Interpreter) *that it is counted an eminently Righteous or laudable Action*. When the Apoſtle argueth, *to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs*; the Senſe is according to this Interpreter; (x) *illa fides ei plurimum prodeſt, quippe à Deo magni æſtimata*, that Faith very much profiteth him, as being highly eſteem'd by God. This looſe and careleſs Interpretation of Scripture is extremely culpable; for it is extremely mutilate and partial, and doth not reach the fulneſs of Senſe, that is in this Phraſe *imputing Righteouſneſs*. When God imputeth Righteouſneſs to Divine Believers as ſuch, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that he accounteth their Faith laudable and eximious (and ſuch it is:) But if the Apoſtle had ſaid, *that God imputeth ingenuity to Bondſlaves*, when they become Divine Believers, would any one ſuppoſe, that this is all the meaning of it; *he accounteth their Faith laudable and eximious?* The imputing Righteouſneſs to Divine Believers upon their Faith can ſignifie nothing leſs than a reputing them the Righteous, who were before reputed ungodly Sinners and the Servants of Sin. It can ſignifie nothing leſs than a change of their State from Servitude to Freedom, from Death to Life, from Condemnation to Righteouſneſs; and that by Faith they paſs out of one of theſe oppoſite Eſtates into the other (y) anſwerably to the Old *Iſraelites* paſſing out of *Egypt* into *Canaan*. Meerly to account their Faith eminently righteous or laudable, is an imputing Righteouſneſs to their Action only, not to their Perſons: But the Apoſtle diſcourſeth of imputing Righteouſneſs to the Perſons of Divine Believers. And ſeeing it is the ſubſtance of Chriſtianity, which he diſputeth for, and his words manifeſtly contain in them the ſummary and ſubſtance of Chriſtianity, when he ſaith, *that an ungodly Sinner becoming a Divine Believer his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs* (plainly expreſſing both the Benefit-part and the Duty-part of the New Covenant) how diſingenuous is it, to ſlight and ſhuffle off the richneſs and fulneſs of his Words with theſe general Terms, *that Faith very much profiteth him as being highly eſteem'd by God?* Some of the Learned follow *Grotius* in his careleſs Miſtakes; for they ſay (z) *that* λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *is nothing elſe, but to be approved as a good Man, or a doer of what is Righteous and Good, and that becauſe he doeth what is Good and Righteous*. But this is ſo far from being the whole Senſe of the Apoſtle's Phraſe, that it muſt not be thought any part of it. For there is a great want of propriety of Expreſſion in this Propoſition, and if the Expreſſion be made proper, the Senſe will not be at all the Apoſtle's Senſe. There is a great want of Propriety in the Expreſſion; for a Perſon is not ſaid λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, but a Thing to a Perſon. And what is the Thing that (according to Chriſtianity) muſt be ſuppos'd, λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *to be imputed unto Righteouſneſs?* Is it the *being a good Man, a doer of what is Good and Righteous* antecedently to Chriſtianity? If not, then all Men muſt be initiated into Saving Chriſtianity, that they may be truly *good Men, or doers of what is Good and Righteous*. And they cannot enter into Saving Chriſtianity, but unavoidably Righteouſneſs muſt be imputed to them; therefore that which initiateth them into Saving Chriſtianity (which is their being Divine Believers or their Faith) muſt be the thing that is imputed to them for Righteouſneſs, as the Apoſtle argueth. Righteouſneſs therefore in the Religion of Soul-intereſts is not to be obtain'd, as *Phinehas* obtain'd it in literal Judaiſm meerly by his doing *a Work of Righteouſneſs*, and meerly by *Judicial Sentence* approving him *as a good Man, or a doer of what is Good and Righteous*. But this is the Senſe of the *Grotian* Interpretation, which explodeth any ſuch Imputation, of Righteouſneſs, which is *a Creative-making men Righteous*, and alloweth no other but that which is by Judicial Sentence. For to impute Righteouſneſs according to this Interpreter, is nothing elſe, but for God (exerciſing his Judgment) highly to approve of, praiſe and commend Men as in their Faith and Practice doing (a) that which is egregiouſly laudable, hugely Good and Righteous. It muſt be acknowledg'd, that if God praiſeth or commendeth any as Doers of that which is Good and Righteous, this is a ſort of imputing Righteouſneſs unto them (for Well-doing is Righteouſneſs:) But this may be done without the Goſpel. This is not the Goſwel-way of making ungodly Sinners the Righteous. This looketh like a buſineſs of human Merit, meerly to exerciſe a Judicial Sentence, and to deal with Men according to that Judicial Sentence, this is Law-religion, not the Religion of Sovereign and Saving Grace. There is nothing extraordinary in this, nothing out of the road of human Affairs, *to praiſe them that do well*, or to praiſe the Virtue of Faith (b) as *Philo* hath done. But as Faith in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſes doth not ſignifie any ſort of Faith, as Righteouſneſs in his Diſcourſes doth not ſignifie any ſort of Righteouſneſs (nor doth it ſignifie *Praiſe* either in Human Authors or the Holy Writers:) So *the imputing Righteouſneſs* in his Diſcourſes doth not ſignifie any ſort of imputing Righteouſneſs, but ſuch an imputing Righteouſneſs which is *the Gift of Righteouſneſs* and a creative Act. *Rom.* 5. 17. If there be no ſuch Imputation of Righteouſneſs, which is a Creative-making Sinners the Righteous, there can be no new Creation, or Conſtitution of Rights and Dues, no new Creation of Men (for they muſt be new created as to their State as well as their Nature) nor is it poſſible, that Chriſtian Believers as ſuch ſhould have Right, Title and Priviledge to be the Righteous, and have all the Rights and Priviledges of the Righteous, or that condemn'd ungodly Sinners ſhould be the Righteous by becoming Chriſtian Believers, but by a new Creation and Settlement of things, whereby the Reputation and Rights and Priviledges of the Righteous are to them *given*, *granted*, *reckoned and imputed*. God by Chriſt hath (notwithſtanding the Law) made, founded and provided for Believing Sinners the State of the Righteous (or the State of Righteouſneſs) they have it, as *Abraham* had it, by the free Gift of his Sovereign Grace. *Rom.* 5. 15,--21. *Iſa.* 53. 11. *Rom.* 3. 24. 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Gal.* 2. 21. *Apoc.* 1. 5, 6. The making the new Covenant or Settlement of Rights and Dues (by the

---

(w) Not. in Rom. 4. 3, 22.

(x) Not. in v. 5.

(y) V. Grot. Not. in Joh. 5. 24. & in 1 Cor. 5. 7.

(z) Dr. H. More Myſt. of Godlineſs. B. 8. c. 5.

(a) *Fidem cenſeri à Deo rem egregiè bonam.* Proleg. in Ep. ad Rom. *Fidem Abrahami à Deo pro re magna acceptam eſſe.* Not. in Rom. 4. 22. *Per animi probitatem, quæ partim in Fide conſiſtit, partim ex Fide naſcitur, aliturque, hæredem eſſe mundi.* Not. in v. 13. *Idem eſt juſtitiam imputari per Fidem quod Fidem imputari in juſtitiam. Significat enim aſcribi alicui laudem fidei nomine, nam & laus dicitur juſtitia per μετωνυμίαν.* Not. in v. 11.

(b) Vid. Not. in Rom. 4. 3.

Obedience and Sufferings of Chriſt) was a creative-making Believing Sinners the Righteous, and this Righteouſneſs they have by Gift and by Grace, *Matth.* 26. 28. *Joh.* 1. 12. *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. *Gal.* 3. 21, 26. *Eph.* 2. 6, 8. and 3. 9. *Heb.* 11. 7. 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. When an Ungodly Sinner becometh a Chriſtian Believer, he paſſeth out of the ſtate of Sin, of Wrath, and of Death, into the ſtate of Righteouſneſs and of Life, which is a creative-making Believing Sinners the Righteous, *Joh.* 5. 24. *Rom.* 1. 17. and 8. 1. and 10. 10. *Gal.* 5. 5. 2 *Cor.* 5. 17, 18. *Tit.* 3. 5, 7. 1 *Joh.* 3. 14. A creating Believing Sinners into the ſtate of Saints can be nothing elſe but a creating them into the ſtate of the Righteous; and the Apoſtle is expreſs, that this creative-making them the Righteous is *the imputing to them Righteouſneſs*. And if in Chriſtianity there is ſuch an imputing Righteouſneſs, which is a creative-making Believing Sinners the Righteous, then there is (in Chriſtianity) another-kins imputing Righteouſneſs than the *meer judicial-ſentential*, which is only an approving and praiſing the goodneſs of Mens Faith and Practice. The vanity of *Grotius*'s Interpretation is further diſcernible from hence; (c) Himſelf and thoſe that follow him, make the imputing Righteouſneſs a quite different thing from *Juſtification*. To confute which Conceit nothing more is needful, than to read the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe, and to appeal to common Senſe. (d) *To him that conſidereth the drift and force of* S. Paul*'s Diſcourſe, it will clearly appear, that Juſtification, imputing Righteouſneſs, not imputing Sin and remiſſion of Sin, are the ſame thing; otherwiſe the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe would not ſignifie or conclude any thing; imputing Faith for Righteouſneſs is the ſame with Juſtifying by Faith.*

V. The way of attaining *Righteouſneſs* (the being in ſtate and condition the Righteous as to God) is a principal thing, that Chriſtianity debateth with its Adverſaries *the Law-religioniſts* of all ſorts, *Judaical*, *Pagan*, *Muhammedan*, which are a ſort of *Pagano-Judaical* Religioniſts. Theſe all agree (although in many reſpects they diſagree) that the way of attaining Righteouſneſs and Salvation is by the Law (the Law-religion of the Law-religioniſts) and that in the Senſe of the Religion of Soul-intereſts *they are juſt before God by being the Law-religioniſts and ſo doing the Works thereof*. The Sentiments of the Jews are, (1.) They muſt not only be *Talkers* but *Doers*, (e) אנשי מעשה *Men of Deeds* or good Works, of which ſome of their Elogies are Hyperbolical and Extravagant (ſuch were the Philoſophic Pagans Elogies of Virtue) ſuch is this Saying of *R. Jacob*, (f) *Better is one Hour ſpent in Repentance and Good Works in this World than the whole Life of the World to come.* Another of their Doctors ſaith laudably, (g) *He whoſe Wiſdom exceedeth his Works, is like a Tree, whoſe Branches are more than the Roots, which a Wind coming overturneth by the Roots. But he whoſe Works exceed his Wiſdom, is like a Tree, whoſe Branches are fewer than the Roots, and if all the Winds in the World come and blow upon it, they move it not.* Which is a Saying like our Saviour's touching the effect of Chriſtian Practice, that it maketh a Solidity and Firmitude in the Chriſtian Profeſſion, *Matth.* 7. 24, 25. The Rabbins talk like great practitioners, (h) נאים דברים מפי עשיהם *words are beauteous out of the mouth of them that do them.* (i) *He that keepeth one Commandment, getteth one Advocate to plead for him; and he that committeth one Tranſgreſſion, getteth one Accuſer. Repentance and Good Works are Bucklers againſt the Divine Wrath.* Anciently (and a like cuſtom they have at this day) when an Iſraelite or Proſelyte was circumcis'd, the by-ſtanders amongſt the Jews made this Acclamation, (k) *As thou haſt introduc'd him into the Covenant, ſo introduce us into the Law, and into Protection and into Good Works.* (2.) By Good Works the Jews underſtand, (l) all obſervances of their Law (and conſequently their obſervances of the Moral Law are part of their Good Works) מעשים תוריים רבים *manifold legal Works.* By the practice of theſe Good Works (as they ſuppoſe) they make themſelves good (as to inherent Virtue, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs,) for they ſay, (m) *Hominem effingi ſecundum opera ſua, a Man is formed* (made good or bad) *according to his Works.* (n) *God hath not created Man perfect, but it is in his power, to perfect the form of his Soul by rightly ordering his Works.* (o) Actionibus perfici animam ut bona reddatur, *The Soul is perfected and made good by practice.* They ſuppoſe therefore, that the Precepts of their Law were multiply'd to ſo vaſt a number, becauſe God would have his choſen People adorn'd with all manner of Virtue, and that the immenſe multitude of the Moſaic Inſtitutes was deſign'd for this end, (p) to purifie *Iſrael*, and to make them of great Righteouſneſs; for by obſerving their legal and ritual Inſtitutes of Purity they pretend, (q) to obtain Internal Purity. The Pagans ſo far ſymbolize with the Jews, their Ethical Virtue, (r) ἐξ ἔθους περιγίνεται, *is acquired by cuſtomary practice.* (3.) The Jews ſuppoſe, that by their legal good Works they are in the ſtate and condition of the Righteous as to God, and have with him the *Reputation*, *Impunity* and *Reward* of the Righteous in reſpect of Soul-intereſts. For their Law ſaith, *Deut.* 6. 24. *It ſhall be our Righteouſneſs, if we obſerve to do all theſe Commandments before the Lord our God.* And thus they underſtand it; (s) *It ſhall be our Righteouſneſs, whereby we ſhall be juſt, to inherit the World to come.* (t) *The Crowns which the Juſt wear in the life to come, are ſuch as they have got* על ידי תורה ומעשים טובים *by the ſtudy of the Law and their good Works.* The Summary of the Jews Religion is (u) to learn and to labour in the Law ſo they become juſt and gain a Reward both in this and the other World. But they ſuppoſe, (w) that a Man may be eſteem'd by God *tzaddik* or juſt as to another, and yet may be called by him *raſha* or unjuſt as to this World (as determining to puniſh him in this World:) and he may be reputed *raſha* or impious as to the other World (obnoxious to Condemnation) and yet may be reputed *tzaddik* or juſt as to this World. In great conformity to the Jews Hypotheſis, that they were juſt by obſerving the Law, the Pagans Principle was, what *Socrates* diſcourſeth with *Hippias*, (x) *The Law of the City teacheth what to do and what to eſchew, and that which is according to Law is juſt. He that doeth thoſe things that are juſt, is not he juſt? and he that doeth thoſe things that are unjuſt, is not he unjuſt? The Man conformable to the Law therefore he is juſt, and he that tranſgreſſeth the Law, he is unjuſt.* To every one that hath liv'd juſtly the Pagans promiſe, (y) that after Death he ſhall live with the Gods. So *Plato* ſaith in his *Phædrus*, ὃς μὲν ἂν δικαίως διάγῃ, *He that leadeth his*

(c) *Aliud eſt cum dicitur homo juſtificari per fidem.* Proleg in Ep. ad Rom.

(d) Dr. Barrow on the Creed, Ser. 5. p. 78, 79.

(e) Lightfoot Hor. in Luk. 15. 7.

(f) *Pirke Aboth* c. 23.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 4, 5, 18.

(h) *Ibid.* Tayler. in Præfat.

(i) *Ibid.* p. 21.

(k) *Selden. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 2. c. 2.

(l) *Coſri* p. 70, 121.

(m) *Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex* 21. p. 30.

(n) *Ibid. Lex* 2. p. 11.

(o) *Ibid. Lex* 213. p. 315.

(p) *Pirke Aboth.*

(q) *Pocock. Not. Miſc.* p. 352.

(r) *Ariſt. Eth. l.* 2. c. 1.

(s) *Hornbeek c. Jud. l.* 6. c. 2.

(t) *Pocock. Not. Miſc.* p. 215.

(u) *Pirke Ab.* p. 11.

(w) *Buxt. Syn.* c. 18.

(x) Τὸ νόμιμον δίκαιον εἶναι. οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν τὰ δίκαια πράττων, δίκαιος, ὁ δὲ τὰ ἄδικα ἄδικος; ὁ μὲν ἄρα νόμιμος δίκαιός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ἄδικος. Απομνημ. 4.

(y) *Eugub. de Per. Phil. l.* 8. c. 3.

life juſtly, is partaker of the better lot and portion; but he that liveth unjuſtly, of the worſer. In his Apologue of *Er* (in his tenth *de Rep.*) *Er* reporteth, that the Soul when ſhe goeth from hence, goeth to a certain divine kind of place, where there are two wide gapings of the Earth beneath and of the Heaven above over againſt them, that between theſe the Judges ſit, and that in paſſing Judgment τοὺς μὲν δικαίους κελεύειν πορεύεσθαι τὴν εἰς δεξιάν τε ϗ ἄνω, *they bid the juſt go on the Right-hand and upwards, but the unjuſt to go on the Left-hand and downwards.* In his *Gorgias* he thus diſcourſeth; (z) *This ſeemeth to me the ſcope, looking at which we ought to guide our life, referring all things private and publick thereto, that he who deſireth to be happy, practiſe Juſtice and Temperance, not ſuffering his Appetites to be unreſtrained, and ſeeking to fulfill them (which is an infinite evil) and live like a lawleſs Robber; for ſuch an one cannot be amical to another Man, nor unto God; for he cannot be ſocietive.* The *Muhammedan* Prophet is ſaid, (*a*) to promiſe a future reward to all that believe in God and a Day of Judgment, *and do that which is juſt.* (4.) The Jews ſuppoſe, that all things in this and a future life are diſtributed and befall Men *according to their merits, their good or evil works.* This is one of their principal Articles of Faith; for they ſay, (*b*) *Fundamentum legis, Fideique omnino caput eſt, omnia quæ hominibus eveniunt, pro ſuis cujuſque factis ac meritis divinâ providentiâ evenire.* (*c*) *R. Joſeph Albo* buildeth the Jewiſh Faith upon this Foundation (it is one of his three Foundations in his *Sepher Ikkarim*) *the eternal reward of good works and the eternal puniſhment of evil works.* And upon this ground the Jews reject Chriſtianity; for if a Man by integrity of life, keeping the Commandments of God and his good works can merit Eternal Life, as by his impiety and evil works he is obnoxious to Eternal Puniſhment, to what purpoſe is the Paſſion of the Meſſiah? They doubt not to merit Eternal Life by keeping the Commandments and by their good works (*d*) they make a Garment of the Precepts (a Garment of Righteouſneſs) their good works they call *Juſtitiæ*, their Righteouſneſs (as their *Gemara Babylonica* ſaith, (*e*) *Every Man hath his Righteouſneſſes and his Tranſgreſſions*) we are commanded (*f*) to lend to a poor Man (ſay they) לזכותינו *that it may be Righteouſneſs to us.* Their Righteouſneſſes are their Merits; for Righteouſneſs and Merit (*g*) are amongſt the Jews terms ſynonymous, the ſame word זכות ſignifieth both, and oftentimes both in conjunction, whence it is often rendred, (*h*) *juſtitiæ meritum*, the merit of Righteouſneſs. In this Maxim the Pagan Religioniſts agree with the Judaical, that the diſtribution of things is according to the merits of Men, and this was the generally receiv'd Opinion amongſt all Nations, as one ſaith of the *Chineſe*, (*i*) *Pro meritis actæ vitæ ſuæ cuique præmia & ſupplicia, ex communi omnium gentium opinione conſtituunt*, Accordin to the common Opinion of all Nations they allot Rewards and Puniſhments to every one according to the merits of his paſt life. (*k*) *For the Gods diſtribute to all what is according to their merit.* (*l*) Τὰς πρὸς ἀξίαν ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι, *the Soul receiveth a Retribution of thoſe things that were done in the time of life according to her merit.* (5.) The Jews Religion is not only their Good Works but their *Faith*; for a Faith they have, but ſuch a Faith which is at beſt *a Work of the Law*; and by this their Faith in conjunction with their Good Works they ſuppoſe themſelves to be made juſt. (*m*) *Filii Iſraelis ſunt juſti per fidem ac legem ſuam.* The Sons of *Iſrael* are juſt by their *Faith* (the Faith of the Law-religioniſts) *and by their Law.* They call their Religion, (*n*) *fœdus Legis & Fidei*, the Covenant of the Law and Faith, and they ſuppoſe, that thoſe words of the Prophet *The Juſt ſhall live by Faith*, are a Summary of their Religion. So the Pagan Religioniſts have (not only the Platonick Faith, nor only the Virtue of Fidelity, which was deify'd in Paganiſm, but) the Faith of Pagan Religioniſts; for although they never agreed upon a Creed or Form of Doctrine, yet they called their Religion their Faith, as the Jews do. *Together with Divination we ought not to take away Providence and the Deity, but to ſeek ſolutions of thoſe things, that ſeem contrary thereto*, ſaith *Plutarch*, (*o*) τὴν δὲ εὐσεβῆ ϗ πάτριον μὴ προΐεσθαι πίστιν, *but not to caſt away the pious Faith, which we have from our Anceſtors*; (*p*) τὴν πίστιν ἣν οἱ πλεῖστοι περὶ θεῶν ἔχουσι, *the Faith which the moſt have touching the Gods. Plato* in his *Gorgias* having diſcourſed of the different ſtate of Men in a future life ſubjoyneth, (*q*) ταῦτ' ἐστὶν, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, ἃ ἐγὼ ἀκηκοὼς πιστεύω ἀληθῆ εἶναι, *Theſe are the things*, O Callicles, *which being reported to me, I believe to be true*; for theſe were Articles of his Faith as a Pagan Religioniſt. (6.) The Jews have in their Religion a ſort of *Grace* and *Mercy*, whence they expect a ſort of remiſſion of Sins. For they ſay, (*r*) *there are thirteen Properties in God, and but one is vindictive.* The followers of *R. Hillel* have this maxim, (*s*) *The Lord of Mercy inclineth to Mercy.* (*t*) *R. Albo* (of great eſteem among the Jews) maketh a diſtinction between rewarding and puniſhing, לפי שורת הדין *according to the rule of Judgment*, and על צד החסד *by the way of Mercy.* If God dealeth with Men rigorouſly according to the rule of Judgment, then the Puniſhment due to evil Works is Eternal, and the Reward due to good Works is only Temporal. But if God dealeth with Men according to the way of his Mercy this order is inverted; for the puniſhment of an evil Work which before the Throne of Judgment was Eternal, before the Throne of Grace becometh Temporal; and the Reward which before the Throne of Judgment was only Temporal, before the Throne of Grace becometh Eternal. The *Muhammedans* magnifie the Mercy of God at an higher rate than the Jews (much of their Devotion conſiſteth in praiſing the Mercy of God) and their Prophet ſaith, (*u*) *There is no Man, whom his Works will ſave.* To him that replieth, *what not you?* his Anſwer is, *Not I my ſelf muſt be ſaved otherwiſe than by the Mercy of God.* The Heathen had a Notion of a πρόνοια ἱλάσιμος, *placable Providence*, one of *Jupiter*'s Titles was ἀφέσιος, *Remiſſor*, and their Prayers and Sacrifices ſhew, what opinion they had of the Mercy of their Deities and of their need of it.

VI. In this Scheme of the Law-religioniſts way of attaining Righteouſneſs the great things in Religion are culpably made arbitrary and unſettled. For whereas Societies are held together by the Bonds of right and due, the Law of every Polity is a publick Settlement of the Rights and Dues of the Members of it, every Polity is neceſſarily founded upon a Settlement of Rights and Dues, and conſequently the Kingdom of God is neceſſarily founded upon a Settlement, wereby the Rights and Dues of Men and Angels are determin'd; theſe Law-religioniſts ſuppoſe, that the Rights and Dues of Men are (in great degree) unſettled and undetermin'd, are left to God's arbitrary Will and Pleaſure, and to arbitrary Grace and Mercy. The *Muhammedans* ſay, (w) *Thoſe that believe well, and do well ſhall have Eternal Beatitude; thoſe that believe amiſs and live ill, ſhall have Eternal Puniſhments; but thoſe that believe well, yet live ill*, of theſe they ſay, *ipſi ſunt in arbitrio Dei, who either puniſheth them or ſheweth them Mercy, as he will.* (x) The Jews ſuppoſe, that as a Man meriteth *Eternal Condemnation by his Evil Works, ſo he meriteth Eternal Life by his Good Works, and that he hath ſufficient Free-will and Ability to both:* But after all their fierce Diſputations for this their Dogma touching the merit and demerit of the Works of Men (which in the conſequence of it would ſpoil their Maxim that every *Iſraelite* hath a Portion in the World to come) they do not ſuppoſe a ſettlement of their Rights and Dues as to their Spiritual and Eternal Intereſts; but the main of a Man's Intereſt (his Reward for his good Works and his Puniſhment for his evil Works in the main of it) is unſettled and undetermined, and dependeth upon an arbitrary aſcending the Throne of Judgment or of Grace. No wonder therefore, if the Jews are hugely uncertain of Salvation, (y) if they reckon the certitude of it amongſt the ſeven things that are hidden from Men, and recite with applauſe the Story of their *R. Johanan* the Son of *Zacay*, who being ſick and viſited by his Diſciples began to weep, and being ask'd the cauſe of it, anſwer'd; *If I was to go before a King whom I had offended, I ſhould hope, that he might be appeas'd by words or corrupted by money: but now I am to go before him who is a King above all Kings, whom I can neither appeaſe by words, nor corrupt by gifts, nor do I know, whether I ſhall be carry'd to Paradiſe, or thrown down to Hell, and this is the cauſe of my weeping. If a Man of ſuch Piety and Wiſdom could not certainly promiſe to himſelf Paradiſe, who* (as the Jews argue) *can be certain, that it ſhall be his Portion?*

(z) Οὗτος ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ ὁ σκοπὸς εἶναι πρὸς ὃν βλέποντα δεῖ ζῆν· ϗ πάντα εἰς τοῦτο τὰ αὑτοῦ συντείνοντα ϗ τὰ τῆς πόλεως, ὅπως δικαιοσύνη παρέσται ϗ σωφροσύνη τῷ μακαρίῳ μέλλοντι ἔσεσθαι, οὕτω πράττειν· οὐκ ἐπιθυμίας ἐῶντα ἀκολάστους εἶναι, ϗ ταύτας ἐπιχειροῦντα πληροῦν, ἀνήνυτον κακόν, λῃστοῦ βίον ζῶντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἂν ἄλλῳ ἀνθρώπῳ προσφιλὴς ἂν εἴη ὁ τοιοῦτος, οὔτε θεῷ. κοινωνεῖν γὰρ ἀδύνατος.

(a) *Selden. de J. Nat. & G. l. 6. c. 12.*

(b) *Pocock. Not. Miſc. p. 178. Outram. de Sacrif. l. 1. c. 12. S. 6.*

(c) *Buxt. Syn. p. 18, 19, 23.*

(d) *L'Emper. Not. in Abarb. com. in Iſa. 30. p. 16.*

(e) *Hoornbeek ſupr. l. 6. c. 2.*

(f) *Hotting. de Jur. Lex 66.*

(g) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col. 668.*

(h) *Hottin. de Jur. Lex 25. p. 36. L'Emper. Not. in Jacchiad. p. 177.*

(i) *Maffeius Indic. l. 6. p. 257.*

(k) Πᾶσι γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι (Θεοὶ) τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν διανέμουσι. *Procl. in Tim. p. 328.*

(l) *Hierocl. in aur. car. p. 125, 138.*

(m) *Abar. ben. ap. Vorſt. de cap. Fid. p. 114.*

(n) *Hotting. de Jur. Lex 17. p. 27. & Lex 25. p. 36.*

(o) *De Pyth. orac. p. 402.*

(p) *Non poſſe viv. Suav. p. 1101.*

(q) *V. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 12. c. 6. Jambl. de vit. Pythag. p. 130, 131, 136.*

(r) *Grot. Not. in Exod. 34. 7.*

(s) *Pocock. ſupr. p. 173.*

(t) *Ibid. p. 171. Huls. Theol. Jud. par. 1. l. 1. p. 17, &c.*

(u) *Pocock. ſupr. p.* [illegible]

The Law-religioniſts cannot tolerably define, who are the Righteous and the Wicked, the Juſt and the Unjuſt; this with them is arbitrary and unſettled. In *Plato's Phædo* there are three ſorts of Men, that are to be judged: (z) *Thoſe that have liv'd well and holily, thoſe that have liv'd otherwiſe, and thoſe that have liv'd a middle ſort of life.* Agreeably whereto the Jews diſtinguiſh three ſorts of Men, that are to be judg'd, (a) *Tzaddikim* the juſt, *Reſhaim the wicked*, *Benoniim the intermediate.* He whoſe Righteouſneſs (Good Works) preponderate his Sins, is *tzaddik*, juſt. He whoſe Sins preponderate his Righteouſneſs, is *raſha*, bad or wicked. The middle ſort are thoſe, whoſe good and evil deeds equally ballance one another. Of the *reſhaim* (wicked) ſome are much worſe than others, for ſome have no merits at all, and theſe they call *reſhaim gemurim*, the perfectly wicked. Of the *tzaddikim* ſome are of an higher Claſſis than others; for ſome are ſaid to have no Sins, that are worthy, to be put in the Balance againſt their Merits, and theſe they call *tzaddikim gemurim*, the perfectly Righteous. But in this mode of diſtinguiſhing the Righteous and the Wicked, (b) *a Man by one good work may bring himſelf* Lecaph zacuth, *into the ſtate of Righteouſneſs, and by one Tranſgreſſion he may bring himſelf* Lecaph chobah *into the ſtate of Guiltineſs and be curſed for ever.* The weight of a Grain of a good or evil work will turn the Scale, and make one of the Wicked to be one of the Righteous, or one of the Righteous to be one of the Wicked. And if they are of the ſame Kind and Family, if both are the Doers of Righteouſneſs and both are the Doers of Wickedneſs, if they are only diſtinguſhed by the ſlender degree of a good or evil work, and there is very little difference between them in this life, it is abſurd, to make a vaſtly great difference between them in the life to come. Yet thus *Lactantius* diſcourſeth like a Law-religioniſt; (c) *That the good works of Men will be weighed with their evil, and as the one outweigheth the other, they will be juſtified or condemned.* This will infer a middle order (as the Jews ſuppoſe) between the Righteous and the Wicked; which is as abſurd, as if a King ſhould introduce a middle order between his loyal and diſloyal Subjects: or as if a Father ſhould ſuppoſe in his Family a middle order between his dutiful and undutiful Children.

In the Law-religioniſts Scheme the cure of Sin is in great degree uncertain and arbitrarious. Some of their Friends conſtitute a Religion of theſe five Articles, (d) called *Catholick Verities.* 1. *That there is a Supreme Deity.* 2. *That the Deity ought to be worſhipped.* 3. *That the beſt worſhip of the Deity is Virtue conjoyn'd with Piety.* 4. *That Men ſhould repent.* 5. *That there is a Reward and Puniſhment after this life.* In this Scheme meer Repentance is repreſented as a ſufficient cure for Sin; but this is far from being a *Catholick Verity*; for the Religion both of the Jews and of the World of the Gentiles was a Religion of Sacrifices for the expiation of Sin. The Jews who are of opinion, that they cannot enter into Heaven, unleſs their Sins be expiated, are concern'd, to bethink themſelves, how to get clear of them, and they have thought of various methods fond, arbitrarious, inſufficient, and at beſt of very uncertain avail. For they ſuppoſe, (e) that *Death, Afflictions, Repentance and Good Works* are Expiations of Sin. Every Year they obſerve *the Day of Expiation* and ſeven penitential Days before it, whereon they do penance (as alſo in the Month preceding it) and are intent upon expiating their Sins by *Abſtinences, Lotions, Flagellations, Alms, Penitential Prayers, and Pſalms, throwing their Sins into a River*, and (in ſome places) by putting their Sins upon a Cock, which they kill and give up in exchange for themſelves. If notwithſtanding theſe methods (which yet are thought ſo available, that on the day of Epiation the Jews fancy themſelves whiter than Snow) they are not ſufficiently purg'd from their Sins in this life, they have taken care for the plenary expiation of them, and that ſatisfaction be made for them by ſuffering puniſhments in the life to come. (f) *Deus prius ob delicta caſtigat*, God firſt chaſtiſeth them for their Sins, *and having ſo purg'd them, giveth to every one of them an intire reward for his Works. Thoſe of the intermediate order will be puniſh'd for ſome time, but afterwards being made pure and immaculate;*

(w) Windet de vit. funct. p. 203. ed. 3.

(x) Hulſ. ſupr.

(y) Hoornbeek. Jud. l. 5. c. 2. p. 442, 444.

(z) Οἱ καλῶς ϗ ὁσίως βιώσαντες, ϗ οἱ μή. ϗ οἱ μὲν ἂν δόξωσι μέσως βεβιωκέναι. *Marſham can. chr. p.* 283.

(a) *Hoornbeek ſupr. p.* 427.

(b) *Paget ſupr. p.* 436.

(c) *Judicabuntur qui Deum ſcierunt, & facinora eorum, id eſt mala opera cum bonis collata ponderabuntur, ut ſi plura & gravia fuerint bona juſtificentur ad vitam beatam: ſi autem mala ſuperaverint, condemnentur ad pœnam.* Lact. l. 7. c. 20.

(d) *De Veritat. p.* 76. *de Rel. Gent. p.* 49.

(e) *Hoornbeek ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 2. *Buxt. Syn. c.* 18. *Lev. Moden. Hiſt. par.* 3. *c.* 5, 6.

(f) *Menaſſ. ben Iſr. de Reſurr. l.* 2. *c.* 18, 8.

late, will be receiv'd into the order of the Good. So *Plato* in his *Phædo* ſaith of thoſe, that have not liv'd well, yet are *ſanable*; though they have committed great Crimes and muſt fall into *Tartarus*, yet having ſtay'd there a Year ἐκβάλλει, τὸ κῦμα, *the ſurge caſteth them out.* Of the intermediate order he ſaith (g) *they ſuffer Puniſhment in the other World for the Injuſtices they have done, and being thereby purg'd they are freed and abſolv'd, and then they receive the Reward of their Beneficences, every one according to his Merit.* (h) There is great Conformity between the Jews and Pagans in the methods of obtaining Forgiveneſs of Sins and getting clear of them by Faſting, Alms, Lotions, Flagellations and other Rites of Pennance.

(g) Καθαιρόμενοι τῶν τε ἀδικημάτων διδόντες δίκας ἀπολύονται, εἴ τίς τι ἠδίκησε, τῶν τε εὐεργεσιῶν τιμὰς φέρονται, κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἕκαστος.

(h) *Purchas Pilgr. Par.* 1. *B.* 9. *c.* 11. *S.* 2.

VII. In the Law-religioniſts Scheme there is great Self-inconſiſtency. For the Mercy and Grace which they have introduc'd into their Religion, is in great degree deſtructive to their Merit of good Works, which are ſuppos'd in ſtrictneſs to Merit nothing more than *a temporal Reward*, the Eternal is ſaid to be of meer Grace. Which is deſtructive of their great Principle, (i) *that Man by his good Works can merit Salvation as by his evil Works eternal Condemnation.* And it is deſtructive to meer Grace; for all antecedent Merit is deſtructive to meer Grace. And it contradicteth alſo their *Satisfactions for Sin* (for they ſuppoſe (k) that Men muſt make Satisfaction for their Sins by Pennance or Puniſhments in this or another Life, before they can enjoy the Reward of their good Works) which Satiſfactions that they make for their Sins, are neceſſarily commenſurate with the Merits of their good Works and of equal avail. For to take away a temporal or eternal Puniſhment by a Satisfaction, is as great a thing, as by a good Work to Merit a temporal or eternal Reward. If their good Works therefore in ſtrictneſs merit nothing more than a temporal Reward, their Satisfactions in ſtrictneſs can take away nothing more than a temporal Puniſhment (like the Satisfactions in the Church of *Rome*) whereas they pretend, to ſatisfie for the eternal Puniſhment of their Sins. But ſuch Satisfactions which in ſtrictneſs are only condign Compenſations for temporal Puniſhments of Sin, is it not groſly abſurd, that they ſhould be counted Satisfactions for the eternal Puniſhments? The making Satisfaction for a Sin is (l) a redeeming and buying off the Puniſhment of it. The Forgiveneſs of Sin therefore cannot be of meer Grace to him that maketh Satisfaction for it. And if the Law-religioniſts have not the Forgiveneſs of their Sins (in reſpect of the eternal Puniſhment of them) of meer Grace, they cannot have the eternal Reward of meer Grace; for to be deliver'd from the eternal Puniſhment, is one half of the eternal Reward. For this reaſon they have introduced Grace into their Religion in contradiction to the Nature of Grace; as alſo becauſe the Grace which they have introduc'd muſt be according to their Hypotheſis ſaving Grace (for they have the eternal Reward from it) which yet cannot be ſaving Grace. For it is nothing elſe but that abundance of Grace and Mercy, which is in their Law, as it is their Political Law and Civil-religious Inſtitution, which is nothing more than that Grace and Mercy, which is in that common Providence, that governeth Mankind. All ſorts of Religioniſts have in their Religion a *Faith* and *Repentance*, a *Grace* and *Mercy* of the Deity and a (ſuppos'd) *Remiſſion of Sins.* And ſuch as their Faith and Repentance is, ſuch is their Grace and Mercy, and ſuch is their Remiſſion of Sins. By a Civil-religious Faith and Repentance Mankind may obtain from the Grace and Mercy of common Providence a Remiſſion of Sins as to ſecular Intereſts, as of Old the *Ninevites* did, and as God promiſeth by the Prophet, *Jer.* 18. 7, 8. and as a *Perſian* Heathen King (*Firutz* or *Perozes*) did, of whom *Schickard* relateth (m) that in his time, which was about the time of the Council of *Chalcedon*, there happen'd a mighty Drought in *Perſia*, ſo that it rain'd not for ſeven Years; and when the Kings Granaries were utterly exhauſted, and there was no hope of further Supplies, he called his People out into the open Fields, and there in a moſt humble manner he beſought the great God Lord of Heaven and Earth, to ſend them Rain, and gave not over praying, till a plentiful ſhower fell upon them.

(i) *Hulſ. ſupr. p.* 16.

(k) *Hoornbeck ſupr.*

(l) *Bellarm. de pœnitent. l.* 4. *c.* 8.

(m) *Tarich p.* 130.

VIII. The Law-religioniſts Righteouſneſs as to State and Condition can be of no better Character than their Righteouſneſs of Life and Practice; therefore they cannot attain the State of Righteouſneſs (as to Soul-intereſts) by the Law. The Rabbinical Righteouſneſs of Life and Practice may be underſtood from *Maimonides*'s method of curing Vice and acquiring Virtue, (n) which is the ſame that we uſe in reducing the Body to an equal temperament by contraries. So (ſaith he) to a parſimonious Man we muſt not immediately preſcribe *Liberality*, but the practice of Prodigality, till he hath got rid of the Vice of Parſimony, and then preſcribe to him the practice of Liberality. The Rabbinical Virtue is nothing better than *Ariſtotle*'s *Mediocrity* (not Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs) which is to be obtain'd, not by eſchewing, but by chuſing and practiſing both the extremes (ſometimes the one ſometimes the other) both which extremes are Sin and Vice, and conſequently the practice of Sin and Vice is (according to our Hebrew Doctor) lawful and laudable, and the only method of acquiring Virtue. They that are ſo groſly unintelligent in matters of Vice and Virtue, Sin and Sanctity, Wickedneſs and Righteouſneſs, is it any wonder, that they ſhould conceit (o) *that the Law may be eaſily kept*, (p) *that the ultimate perfection of the Soul is attainable by it*, that themſelves are the Righteous (the perfectly Righteous) or that they ſhould magnifie their own Futilities at the ſame rate with the ſtolid *Arabians* (q) *qui unicam tantum de libro Dei legit literam, meretur bonum retributionis*, he that readeth but one Letter in the Alcoran meriteth the Good of Retribution? The Law-religioniſts Righteouſneſs of Life and Practice (their Repentance and good Works) is no better than the Civil-religious, to which the Jews (r) agreeably to the Pagans promiſe the Happineſs of the World to come. As the *Japoneſe* (s) promiſe certain happy places to them that obſerve their Laws, ſo ſoon as they depart this Life. They that have this Civil-religious Righteouſneſs of Life and Practice, have neceſſarily therewith a Righteouſneſs as to State and Condition; for they are Righteous *in ſecular-legal*

(n) 8 *Cap. com. ſuo in Pirke Aboth præmiſſ.*

(o) *Mor. Nev. Par.* 2. *c.* 39

(p) *Abarbin. ap. Vorſt. de cap. Fid. p.* 49.

(q) *Hotting. H. O. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *p.* 314. *ed.* 1.

(r) *Omnibus qui patriam conſervarint, adjuverint, auxerint, certum eſſe in cœlo definitum locum.* Macrob. in Somn. Scip. l. 1. c. 8. *Et ſi vitam reſtrictius egerint, aulam ſibi ejus patere.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 2. p. 86.

(s) *Poſſevin. Biblioth. l.* 10. *c.* 2.

lar-legal account and reputation and as to ſecular intereſts, according to *Ezek.* 18. 9. *He that hath walked in my ſtatutes, and hath kept my judgments to deal truly; he is juſt, he ſhall ſurely live, ſaith the Lord God.* This Righteouſneſs of State and Condition (or of Juſtification) which muſt be called *a Secular-legal Righteouſneſs* (becauſe it conſiſteth in being Juſt in Secular-legal account and reputation and as to Secular-intereſts) is that which the Apoſtle calleth *his own Righteouſneſs which is of the Law.* Phil. 3. 9. For his Righteouſneſs *which is of the Law*, ſignifieth *contradiviſively*, that which is ſo of the Law, as not to be of the Goſpel, as thoſe *that are of the Law*, are thoſe that are ſo of the Law, as not to be of the Goſpel. *Rom.* 4. 14. *His own Righteouſneſs* ſignifieth contradiviſively that which is ſo his own Righteouſneſs, as not to be God's in his ſupernatural and ſuperlegal diſpenſation of Things. His own Righteouſneſs is manifeſtly the ſame with the Jews *own Righteouſneſs*, which they ſought to eſtabliſh in oppoſition to the Righteouſneſs of God. *Rom.* 10. 3. The Righteouſneſs of God is that Goſpel-ſtate of Righteouſneſs, which God in Chriſt hath provided for us Sinners. This is *his Righteouſneſs* declared in the Goſpel, *Rom.* 3. 25. the Righteouſneſs of God whereby we are made the Righteous. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *The Righteouſneſs which is of Faith.* Rom. 10. 6. *the Righteouſneſs of God which is revealed from Faith to Faith.* Rom. 1. 17. *The Righteouſneſs of God witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets and now manifeſted.* Rom. 3. 21. *His Righteouſneſs* which is ſuch a diſpenſation wherein *he is Juſt and the Juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus.* Rom. 3. 26. *The Righteouſneſs of God which is by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt unto all.* Rom. 3. 22. *That which is through the Faith of Chriſt, the Righteouſneſs which is of God by Faith.* Phil. 3. 9. To this Righteouſneſs of God the Apoſtle oppoſeth *his own Righteouſneſs which is of the Law*, which manifeſtly ſignifieth *the Law-religioniſts Righteouſneſs* (that which the Rabbins ſpeak of, when they ſay, *Filii Iſraelis ſunt juſti per Legem ſuam*) whoſe Converſion the Apoſtle endeavoureth, from whoſe ſort of Righteouſneſs he was converted, which was a ſort of Righteouſneſs that he had antecedently to Chriſtianity, was the great obſtacle to the entertaining it, which ought to be counted Dung, and the vilifying whereof is pertinent to his buſineſs. Upon all which accounts *his own Righteouſneſs which is of the Law*, neceſſarily ſignifieth the Righteouſneſs of his State of Judaiſm (the Judaical-legal Righteouſneſs of State and Condition, a Secular-legal Righteouſneſs oppoſite to that of the Kingdom of God) and cannot ſignifie *the Chriſtian inherent Righteouſneſs which the Law requireth*, (*t*) as ſome unchriſtianly and inexcuſably miſtake.

IX. The Law-religioniſts content themſelves with ſuch a Pardon of the Acts of Sin, that is on this ſide the State of Remiſſion of Sins (the State of Righteouſneſs;) therefore they attain not the State of Righteouſneſs (as to Soul-intereſts) by the Law and the Works thereof. In the Old Teſtament there are numerous Inſtances of pardoning Sin in reſpect only of (ſecular Intereſts) temporal Puniſhment. *Amos* 7. 2, 3. *Jer.* 5. 1. *Pſal.* 85. 1, 2, 3. Sometimes the People of *Iſrael* had their Sins pardon'd in the main (not wholly) in ſome degree they were not pardon'd, yet they are ſaid to be pardon'd. *Pſal.* 78. 38. *Numb.* 14. 20, 23, 29. God pardon'd and puniſh'd both at once, when he did not deſtroy the People of *Iſrael* by a πανωλεθρία, (threatned *Numb.* 14. 12.) yet debarr'd the provokers from ſeeing the Land of *Canaan.* At the ſame rate he pardon'd *David*, who yet in ſome degree was not pardon'd; for divers ways he ſuffer'd Puniſhment for his Sin in the matter of *Uriah* (to his dying day) which yet was pardon'd. 2 *Sam.* 12. 13. So the Sins of *Menaſſah* were in ſome reſpect and degree pardon'd and not pardon'd. 2 *Chron.* 33. 13. 2 *King.* 24. 34. That pardon of Sin which the Jews obtain'd by their Sacrifices was a Pardon not a Pardon. For their Sacrifies did not cleanſe from all ſort of Sin nor could they cleanſe and expiate the guilt of Sin as to Mens Soul-eſtate, but as to their Soul-condition they remain'd ſtill in the State of Sinners; yet their Sacrifices made atonement for them and thereby their Sins were forgiven them. *Lev.* 5. 17. *Deut.* 21. 8. When *Hezekiah* recover'd from Sickneſs (the Puniſhment of his Sin) God is ſaid, to have *caſt his Sins behind his back.* *Iſa.* 38. 17. So in the New Teſtament this is the ordinary Preface to our Saviour's Cures, *Son thy Sins are forgiven thee.* Of which the Senſe is, *thy Sins are ſo far forgiven, thou art releas'd from a temporal Puniſhment of them.* When our Saviour took pains and wearied himſelf in healing bodily Sickneſſes, thoſe Sickneſſes are conſider'd as the Puniſhment of our Sins, and the taking them away as a ſort of taking away our Sins, and therefore the Evangeliſt ſaith, *Matth.* 8. 17. *He healed all that were ſick, that it might be fulfilled, which was ſpoken by Eſaias the Prophet, himſelf took our infirmities and bare our ſickneſſes.*

In reſpect of Soul-intereſts there is in the New Teſtament a certain limited ſort of Remiſſion of Sins; for our Saviour's Prayer and that of S. *Stephen* and S. *Paul* for their Perſecutors, that they might *be forgiven and their Sin might not be laid to their Charge*, are to be underſtood with this Limitation and Qualification *ſo far as may be.* God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf, providing for us and tendring to us the Remiſſion of our Sins, which was a certain limited *not imputing our Treſpaſſes*, and ſo far as it was a non-imputing our Treſpaſſes, it was a forgiving our Sins antecedently to any Faith or Repentance of ours. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. But all theſe limited ſorts of Remiſſion of Sins are on this ſide the State of Remiſſion of Sins as actually poſſeſs'd and enjoy'd, whereby they that were no People, become the People of God, and have God for their God, ungodly Sinners have the State, Relation, Rights and Priviledges of the Saints of God, Aliens and Enemies are naturaliz'd, endeniz'd, infranchis'd, reconciled Enemies are receiv'd into Favour with God and become the Objects of his ſpecial Saving Love, Bondſlaves are manumis'd and are in the State of Freedom, ungodly Sinners are clear'd of the ſtain of Sin, diſcharg'd of the Puniſhment (poſitive and privative) and are in the State of Righteouſneſs and of Bleſſedneſs. Such is the State of Remiſſion of Sins, which is provided for the World of ungodly Sinners in the Saving Religion of Chriſtianity: But the Law-religioniſts content themſelves with ſuch a Pardon of the acts of Sin, which is on this ſide the State of Remiſſion of Sins, and which if they could obtain, would be extremely inſufficient. For let us ſuppoſe, that a Man for ſome great Crime is rightly condemned by his Prince, to live in perpetual ſlavery to him as his Lord, and that this Slave during his Servitude committeth ſeveral Faults, which his Lord pardoneth, yet

Luk 23. 34. *Act.* 7. 60. 2 *Tim.* 4. 16.

1 *Pet.* 2. 10. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Eph* 2. 16, 17, 19. *Rom.* 5. 5, 10, 11. *and ch.* 8. 38. *Joh.* 8. 36. *Tit.* 3. 5, 7. *Act.* 2 38.

(t) Dr. *Owen of Juſtif. c.* 18. *Confer.* πνευματ. *l.* 4. *c.* 7. *p.* 322, 467.

doth not ſo far pardon him, but that he ſtill detaineth him in Servitude; this Pardon is like *that leſſer and narrower Remiſſion of Sins*, which the Law-religioniſts promiſe themſelves, which is on this ſide the State of Remiſſion of Sins. But if in Proceſs of time this great Lord out of generous Kindneſs manumiſeth this his Slave (rightly condemned to perpetual ſlavery for his Criminality,) if he ſo far pardoneth him, as to make him a perfectly Free-man, this Pardon is like *that great and ample Remiſſion of Sins*, which Chriſtianity affordeth. If the Law-religioniſts therefore could obtain that Pardon of Sins which they promiſe themſelves, yet they would ſtill remain in the *Criminal* and *Penal* State, unleſs they made a Tranſition out of it into the oppoſite State of Remiſſion of Sins according to Chriſtianity. And as an Alien in our Nation that committeth certain Crimes againſt the Government and is pardon'd for them, yet unleſs he be naturaliz'd and endeniz'd, is incapable of any inheritance in *England*: So the Law-religioniſts notwithſtanding their Pardon (if they could obtain it) yet are incapable of any Inheritance in the Kingdom of God. Great things they ſay of Repentance, and great things (u) a learned Muhammedan ſaith of a Death-bed Repentance, which uſually is of little avail: Nor is the Law-religioniſts Repentance leſs inſufficient than their Pardon. For a Sovereign granteth not a Pardon to rebellious Subjects, but upon Condition of returning to their Subjection and Allegiance in his Kingdom, their Repentance muſt amount to this return, elſe it is no available Repentance: Nor can it reaſonably be ſuppos'd, that God granteth any Pardon to Rebel-ſinners (in reſpect of their Soul-intereſts) but upon Condition of returning to their Subjection and Allegiance in the Kingdom of God, which is a Kingdom, that the Law-religioniſts acknowledge not, and therefore pretend not to be Subjects therein. That can be no available Repentance, which is not a turning to God, who is neceſſarily the imperial Eſtate of his Kingdom; and what ſignifieth the Repentance of an ungodly Man, who ſtill continueth an unholy and ungodly kind of Man? No Repentance therefore can be of avail (in reſpect of Soul-intereſts) but that wherein there is a change of the Man (a change of kind from a wicked to an holy kind of Man) who is not chang'd by thoſe bodily auſterities of Penance, which the Law-religioniſts have invented. They are deſign'd (as in the Church of *Rome*) to be a proper ſatisfaction to Divine Juſtice, a compenſation by way of equivalence for the Puniſhment, which their Sins deſerve (which is not a little injurious to God) thereby *juſtitiæ reſtauratur æqualitas* (as 'tis ſuppos'd) they quit ſcores with God and owe him nothing.

X. This is the common Condition of Mankind (antecedently to any thing of Chriſtianity) *they are in the Criminal and Penal State of the Law*, and ſuch they continue, ſo long as they belong to the Law; therefore the Law-religioniſts cannot attain the State of Righteouſneſs by the Law and the Works thereof. Not having gain'd the Pearl of Price (the Life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs) all their Goodneſs in their Unregeneracy is but a bad and vile kind of Goodneſs, their Religious Practice but a dead, ſuperficial, and exteriour-formal kind of Buſineſs, notwithſtanding their Pennances, Aſceticiſms, Civilities, Human Moralities, Phantaſtry, Rituality, although they are virtuous Men and Religioniſts of the carnal and mundane kind (as the Apoſtle was in his Judaiſm *Phil.* 3.) yet they remain deadly Criminals (in their deadly criminal Life) and therefore in their deadly Penal State. The Law not being Vital or Vivificative to its Religioniſts is to degenerate Mankind at the beſt but *Law-form* (an external Rule) and as ſuch it is *dead*: But it is alſo to degenerate Mankind *Form of Law*, and as ſuch at the worſt it is *deadly*; for (in ſome ſort) they are made deadly Sinners by it and are under its deadly Sentence, and are therefore in the State of Sin and of Death by it. (w) *For the Letter of the Law which teacheth not to Sin, if the vivificative Spirit be wanting, killeth.* Mankind in their Unregeneracy (devoid of the Spiritual Life) are deadly Tranſgreſſors of the Holy Spiritual Law, which hath the form of Law, and is the Settlement of premiant and penal Life and Death as due in Law-juſtice. (x) *Quid meruit peccator? interroget juſtitiam, inveniet pœnam.* What hath a deadly Sinner deſerved? Let him ask Law-juſtice, and he will find Puniſhment. The Law-Religion is ſo far from being the Religion or Settlement of the State of Remiſſion of Sins and of Righteouſneſs to degenerate Mankind (in reſpect of Soul-intereſts) that on the contrary it is to them the proper Law or Religion of the Criminal and Penal State, as the Apoſtle diſcourſeth, *Rom.* 3. 19, 20. *Now we know, that what things ſoever the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them who are under the Law: That every mouth might be ſtopped, and all the World may become guilty before God. Therefore by the Deeds of the Law there ſhall no Fleſh be juſtified in his ſight: For by the Law is the knowledge of Sin.* Rom. 4. 15. *Becauſe the Law worketh Wrath: For where no Law is, there is no Tranſgreſſion.* What the Old Teſtament ſaith in its Tragical exaggerations of the Wickedneſs of Mankind, is meant of the Law-religioniſts (them who are under the Law) which ſpeaketh them a Generation of ungodly Sinners (who ought to ſtop their Mouths as to Self-juſtifying, and to acknowledge themſelves what they really are, Criminals and ſubject to Condemnation;) therefore by being the Law-religioniſts and doing the Deeds of the Law *no Fleſh ſhall be juſtified.* This is one of the Apoſtle's Arguments againſt being juſtified (being in the State of Righteouſneſs as to God) by the Law. To this Argument he ſubjoineth another. *By the Deeds of the Law there ſhall no Fleſh be juſtified in his ſight; for by the Law is the knowledge of Sin.* In which Argument there is an Ellipſis; for the Senſe of it is, *By the Law is the Knowledge of Sin, ſo as to be deadly Sinners by tranſgreſſing it.* Mankind are criminaliz'd and unjuſtified by the Law (they have their Guilt and Criminality by it;) *for where no Law is, there is no Tranſgreſſion.* (y) *The Law of it ſelf, ſeparate from Grace, only maketh Men guilty, which is the Condition of all that are under it.* The World by the Law is a World of deadly Sinners, and conſequently is ſubjected to *Divine Wrath* by it, as the

---

(u) *Dico, quiſquis moritur pœnitendo eum facti, talem fruiturum dei favore & ejus gloria, quamvis commiſerit tot peccata, quot ſunt arenæ in mari & ſtellæ in cælo.* Ap. Selden. de Synedr. l. 1. c. 12. p. 487.

(w) *Quoniam litera Legis quæ docet non eſſe peccandum, ſi ſpiritus vivificans deſit, occidit.* S. Aug. de Sp. & lit. c. 5.

(x) S. Aug. *in Joan. Tr.* 3. *de cap.* 1.

(y) *Ubi enim Lex non eſt, nec prævaricatio: Et ideo per ſeipſam cùm ſola litera eſt, ſine ſpiritu, id eſt, lex ſine gratia, tantummodo reos facit.* S. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 15. c. 8. *Omnes homines ſub lege conſtitutos reos facit Lex.* Idem in Joan. Tr. 3. de cap. 1.

Apoſtle argueth. (z) *For when a Man knoweth Sin, if Grace helpeth not, that he may avoid it, no doubt the Law worketh Wrath.* The Law therefore is the proper Law or Religion, not of ſaving, but of making deadly Sinners. There is no expiation of Sin for them (as to Soul-intereſts) no Settlement of the State of Remiſſion of Sins, no diſpenſation of ſanctifying Grace for them in the Law-religion; they can have no liberation from their deadly Evils, no right to the Favour of God, nor the Immunities and Priviledges of his elect People by it: But they are depriv'd of all thoſe felicitative Immunities and Priviledges, of the Favour of God, of the State of Righteouſneſs, Reconciliation and Salvation by it, and are ſubjected to the contrary Penalties and to Divine Wrath. For being deadly Sinners they are neceſſarily condemned to die for Sin. *Rom.* 7. 24. and 8. 6. *Heb.* 6. 1. *Joh.* 5. 24. 1 *Joh.* 3. 14. The Jews ſay (*a*) *great is the Law, which giveth Life to them that do it both in this World and the World to come.* In this World this Sect of mundane Religioniſts taketh care, to have enough of Life: But in the World to come they will find no Life by their Law; for *ex accidenti*, and through the Wickedneſs of Mankind they are excluded from Life by it. (*b*) *Non eſt data lex, quæ poſſet vivificare, ſed condemnare.*

(z) *Quando cognoſcit homo peccatum, ſi non adjuvat gratia, ut cognitum caveatur, ſine dubio lex iram operatur.* Idem de Gr. & lib. Arbitr. c. 10.

(a) *Pirke Aboth. p.* 11.

(b) *S. Ambroſ. com. Gal.* 3.

XI. It is the Counſel and purpoſe of God, that Men ſhould not attain the State of Righteouſneſs *as Law-religioniſts by their Righteouſneſs and their Merits*; He hath choſen and appointed another method of attaining it oppoſite to the Law-religion, the Law of Works, *the Works of the Law*, the Law-religioniſts way of attaining it. Theſe two ways the Apoſtle uſually confronteth and oppoſeth in the Diſputes which he manageth on behalf of Chriſtianity, wherein his Senſe touching *the Works of the Law* (which hath been very much miſtaken) will be clearly intelligible, if we conſider, (1.) The Apoſtle's Diſpute is againſt the *Law-religion* and the *Law-religioniſts* and their way of attaining the State of Righteouſneſs and Salvation, which was by their doing the Works of the Law as Law-religioniſts. The Faith of Chriſtian Believers may be called a Work (*the Work of God*, Joh. 6. 29.) but cannot be called a Work of the Law: Nor can thoſe Divine Graces and Duties which are included in it, be called *Works* or *Works of the Law* in the Apoſtle's Notion, although the Divine Moral Law requireth them; for they are not *Works* or *Works of the Law* in the Apoſtle's Notion, *but as they are the Law-religioniſts Works their Righteouſneſſes and their Merits.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they appertain to the Law or Religion of Works. *Rom.* 3. 27. *Where is boaſting then? It is excluded. By what Law? Of Works? Nay: But by the Law of Faith.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they are the legal working way oppoſite to Faith. *Gal.* 3. 12. *The Law is not of Faith, but the Man that doeth them, ſhall live in them.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they are the legal working way in order to attaining the State of Righteouſneſs. *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. *Iſrael which follow'd after the Law of Righteouſneſs* (the Benefit-part of it) *hath not attain'd to the Law of Righteouſneſs* (the Benefit-part of ſuch a Law.) *Wherefore? Becauſe they ſought it not by Faith*, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμȣ, *but as* (to be attain'd) *by the Works of the Law.* Rom. 4. 5. *To him that worketh not* (as a Law-religioniſt) *but believeth on him that juſtifieth the Ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they are the legal way of working in order to the being juſtified by the Law. *Gal.* 3. 11. *That no Man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God is evident.* Gal. 5. 4. *Chriſt is become of no Effect unto you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law.* Gal. 3. 18. *If the inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of promiſe.* Gal. 2. 21. *If Righteouſneſs come by the Law, then Chriſt is dead in Vain.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law expreſly, as they are the Works of the Law-religioniſts. *Gal.* 3. 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law* (the Law-religioniſts) *are under the Curſe.* Rom. 4. 14. *If they which are of the Law, be Heirs, Faith is made void.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they are the Works of the Law-religioniſts, that are in their Unregeneracy. *Rom.* 4. 1, 2. *What ſhall we ſay then, that Abraham our Father as pertaining to the Fleſh hath found? For if Abraham was juſtified by Works*, &c. He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they are a Religion oppoſite to the Goſpel. *Gal.* 3. 2. *Received ye the Spirit by the Works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith?* Rom. 3. 20, 21. *By the Deeds of the Law there ſhall no Fleſh be juſtified. But now the Righteouſneſs of God without the Law is manifeſted.* He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they are a Religion deſtructive to the Goſpel, that maketh Faith and the Promiſe void, Chriſt of no Effect and Dead in vain. *Gal.* 5. 4 He diſputeth againſt the Works of the Law, as they were the Religion of the *unbelieving Jews*, Rom. 10. 5, 6. and he meaneth by Works and the Works of the Law, that which the Jews meant, which are the Adverſaries, that he diſputeth againſt. Whence it is manifeſt, that this is the Apoſtle's Notion of them, *they are the Law-religious Practices of the Law-religioniſts, or they are the Works which the Law requireth, as they are the Law-religion of the Law-religioniſts their Righteouſneſſes and Merits.* They muſt be blinded with Prejudice, that ſee not ſo clear an Evidence, (*c*) that will have the Works of Chriſtianity and Regeneracy, to be the Works of the Law in the Apoſtle's Notion, who had no occaſion to diſpute againſt ſuch Works, which ought to be recommended and inforc'd with all imaginable vigor, and which there can be no good Reaſon or Deſign to diſpute againſt; for it is no good deſign, to imbroil the Church with frivolous Subtilties and miſchievous Diſputes about Juſtification.

(c) *Dr. Owen of Juſtific. c.* 14.

(2.) *Works* and the *Works of the Law* in the Apoſtle's Notion involve in them *an incongruous Phariſaical Merit*; therefore his Senſe is, that God would not have Men to attain the State of Righteouſneſs as Law-religioniſts *by their Righteouſneſſes and their Merits* in the boaſtful Self-exalting way. *Rom.* 3. 27. *Where is boaſting then? It is excluded. By what Law? Of Works? Nay.* Chap. 4. 2. *If Abraham were juſtified by Works, he hath whereof to Glory, but not before God.* Chap. 4. 4. *Now to him that worketh, is the Reward not reckon'd of Grace, but of Debt.* Chap. 4. 16. *Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace.* Rom. 11. 6. *If by Grace, then it is no more of Works: Otherwiſe Grace is no more Grace. But if it be of Works, then it is no more of Grace: Otherwiſe Work is no more Work.* 1 Cor. 1. 30, 31. *Of him are ye in Chriſt Jeſus, who of God is* *made unto us Wiſdom, and Righteouſneſs, and Sanctification, and Redemption. That according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.* Eph. 2. 8, 9. *By Grace are ye ſaved through Faith. Not of Works, leſt any Man ſhould boaſt.* 2 Tim. 1. 9. *Who hath ſaved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our Works, but according to his own Purpoſe and Grace, which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before the World began.* Tit. 3. 5, 7. *Not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration: that being juſtified by his Grace, we might be made Heirs.* Rom. 3. 24. Chriſtian Believers *through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus are juſtified freely by his Grace* without the Humane Merits. *Merit* is a term of great ambiguity (that muſt be variouſly diſtinguiſh'd) it ſignifieth both *the debitorious* and *indebitorious* kind of worthineſs (called by the Schools merit of Condignity and of Congruity) both the legitimate kind of worthineſs and the illegitimate *Bravo's* kind of worthineſs. *Perſonæ miſerabiles & favorabiles* (ſo called in Law) deſerve compaſſion and favour, grateful perſons deſerve to have kindneſſes done them, and an honeſt poor Man is worthy of the Charity of Almſgiving, as being a fit object thereof. So worthy Communicants are thoſe that are duely qualify'd and meet to be partakers of the Holy Communion. Every due object of our eſteem and affections deſerveth them (there are thoſe of whom our Saviour ſaith, they are not worthy of him, *Matth.* 10. 37.) and ſo doth the due object of Reward and Puniſhment. But this *Merit* which only importeth a congruity of the Object, is not Merit in the ſtrict acceptation, the ſenſe of *Condignity*, nor ſo as *to deſerve a benefit debitoriouſly as due debt of Law-juſtice in the juſt poiſe and value of Things and Perſons.* In ſuch Senſe of Merit a Benefactor meriteth Gratitude, and ſuch merit there is in commutative Juſtice; for the Labourer that hath earned his Wages, is in this Senſe of Merit worthy of them; And he that buyeth Lands or Goods meriteth them (in this ſtrict acceptation of Merit) if he payeth a price for them, that in the juſt poiſe and eſtimation of things is equivalent thereto. In diſtributive Juſtice amongſt Men obedient Subjects merit (in this Senſe of Merit) that they be advantageouſly differenc'd from the diſobedient; and amongſt pious People of ancient time the Houſe of God at *Jeruſalem* was a *meritorious* impulſive cauſe of their ſpecial kindneſs for that City. So Virtue is not only a congruous object of our eſteem and love, but meriteth it in the ſtrict acceptation, and Vice meriteth Deteſtation. Of the illegitimate *Bravo's* kind of merit the Cynical Philoſopher *Diogenes* is an inſtance; who ſuppos'd himſelf an eximious worthy, a perſon highly meritorious, and that what was given him, was no more than he deſerv'd not leſs than debitoriouſly, which was *arrogance* and *ſelf-aſſuming*. When one beſtow'd ſomething upon him, and one prais'd the Giver, Ἐμὲ δ᾽ οὐκ ἐπαινεῖτε τὸν ἄξιον λαβεῖν, *don't you praiſe me*, ſaid he, *that am worthy to receive it? (d) A certain generous Champion of the Ancients having for a long time well exercis'd his Body to Fortitude, went to the Olympicks, and looking upon the Statue of the* Piſæan Jove *thus ſaid; If all things be rightly and as they ought prepared by me for the Combat,* O Jupiter (φέρων δικαίως) *paſſing Sentence juſtly give the Victory to me.* This Bravo ſeemeth to have thought, that the value of his Perſon and his Merits ſhould in all reaſon and juſtice ſo far avail with *Jupiter*, as for the ſake of them to give him the Victory. But this the Bravo's merit or pretenſion to merit, as alſo the debitorious merit are repugnant to Chriſtianity, wherein God exerciſeth Sovereign Grace, ſo as to exerciſe Juſtice in beſtowing the Reward of Eternal Life, *Rom.* 6. 23. 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. 1 *Pet.* 1. 13. *Jude* 21. *Luk.* 14. 14. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 6. 2 *Tim.* 4. 7, 8. *Heb.* 10. 35. *ch.* 11. 26. 2 *Joh.* 8. If the Faithful have Eternal Life from God exerciſing Sovereign Grace, Mercy and Bounty, ſo as to exerciſe Juſtice, (e) it cannot be due debt in juſtice to their Merits; for if it was, they might and would have it from God as exerciſing meer Juſtice. But ſeeing they have the Reward from Sovereign Grace, Mercy and Bounty, which they ſtand in need of, therefore they are the *unworthy*. And ſeeing they have it from Sovereign Grace, Mercy and Bounty exerciſing Juſtice, therefore they are the *worthy*, *Matth.* 10. 37. *Luk.* 20. 35. *ch.* 21. 36. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 5. *Apoc.* 3. 4. *ch.* 17. 14. *Col.* 1. 12. *(f) Chriſt will raiſe the Bodies of all Men,* ϗ τῶν μὲν ἀξίων ἐνδύσει ἀφθαρσίαν, *and will cloath the worthy with Immortality*: Retributions will be made κατ᾽ ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἑκάστου, *as every one's deeds are worthy*. They that ſhall be rewarded with Eternal Life therefore, are *the Unworthy Worthies* (ſuch are the Goſpel-worthies) In God's account they are worthy, but ſo that in their own account they are and ought to be the unworthy. They have merits and do merit and are rewardable Objects, and therefore are worthy; (g) *Nullane ſunt merita juſtorum? ſunt plane quia juſti ſunt.* But theſe their well-deſervings are not meriting *debitoriouſly*, they are a legitimate kind of worthineſs, not *the illegitimate Bravo's* merit, and in the whole computation of things they have reaſon and are greatly oblig'd, to count themſelves the unworthy. And if this is the caſe of the Righteous, it would be infinitely incongruous, that deadly Sinners ſhould as Law-religioniſts by their Righteouſneſs and their Merits have the ſtate of the Righteous; whence they are manifeſtly incapable of attaining it. (h) They will make ſatisfaction for their own Sins and (like unhumbled Bravo's) will merit for themſelves, and without being beholden to a Saviour will purchaſe Eternal Life at their own coſt and charges; and they pretend, (i) *that by their good works they are made good and worthy of Life Eternal.*

Pſal. 122. 9.

(d) Clem. Str. l. 7. p. m. 523.

(e) V. S. Aug. de Civ. & lib. arbit. c. 8.

(f) J. Mart. Apol. 2. p. 87. & p. 80, 82.

(g) S. Aug. Ep. 105.

(h) Bax. Syn. c. 1. p. 18.

(i) Hetting. de jur. Lex 20. p. 32.

(3.) In the Apoſtle's Diſputes Works have the ſame connection with the Law, that Faith hath with Grace; and as *the Believers* are the Religioniſts of Grace, ſo *the Workers* are the Religioniſts of the Law. Works therefore and the Works of the Law which are the Works of theſe Religioniſts *the Workers*, manifeſtly ſignifie *the Law-religioniſts Works*, whoſe way of attaining Righteouſneſs was contrary to God's way, which is the humble way, the free and noble way, the way of Sovereign Grace, the endearing and obliging way: But in the Law-religioniſts way of attaining Righteouſneſs ſovereign Grace is vilify'd; for they have their Righteouſneſſes and their Merits without any diſpenſation of ſupernatural and ſuperlegal Grace; and if they attain Righteouſneſs by the Law, they muſt have it as a matter of *Law-juſtice* by having done the Works of the Law. *If it be of Works, it is not of Grace.* (k) *For Redemption by the Blood of Chriſt would be vilify'd, and the prerogative of humane works would not yield*

(k) *Vileſceret enim redemptio ſanguinis Chriſti, nec miſericordiæ Dei humanorum operum prærogativa ſuccumberet, ſi juſtitia* *to Divine Mercy, if the juſtification which is by Grace, was due to antecedent merits, ſo as not to be the gift of a Benefactor, but the reward of a Worker.* In the Law-religioniſts way of attaining Righteouſneſs there is nothing but what is graceleſs, flat and inſipid, harſh and legal, nothing endearing and obliging. (l) *But who is ſo outragiouſly mad, as not to give unſpeakable thanks to the Mercy of his Saviour? They that are ſav'd by Grace, are not called the Veſſels of their Merits, but the Veſſels of Mercy.* (m) *To the merits of an Impietiſt not Grace but Puniſhment is due.* (n) *We had no antecedent merits to recommend us, but demerits whence Damnation was due to us.* (o) *The Sons of the Promiſe are Sons of Beneficence. This is Grace which is gratuitous, and is not gain'd by the merits of a Worker but the mercy of a Donour.* (p) *Thou art made immortal, thou art made free, thou art made a Son, thou art made juſt, thou art made a Brother, thou art made a Coheir, thou reigneſt together and art glorify'd together, all things are given thee by Grace.* This is the free and noble way of juſtifying Sinners; but is there any thing truly great, noble and eximious in the Law-religioniſts way, who pretend, to make themſelves juſt by their own (graceleſs) Righteouſneſſes and Merits and labouring in their Law? for it is no great thing, to repute them Juſt and reward them as Righteous, who have made themſelves ſuch. Their way of attaining Righteouſneſs (as it is haughty, ſo) it naturally ingendreth and cheriſheth an unholy elation of Mind. They will be meritoriouſly rewardable perſons by their works in their unregeneracy, and are prone to think, that their legal doings make them ſuch Magnifico's in God's Eyes, as they are in their own. For one of them ſaith, (q) *If a Man with alacrity practiſeth the Precepts and Good Works and addicteth himſelf to the Law, thence he ſhall become clean and free from all Sin, all Uncleanneſs, purg'd from all Improbity and Crime; and if he ſo doeth, by degrees he will be clean before God, innocent and of pure Hands; and if he be ſo clean, he will at length come to ſuch a pitch, as to be accounted holy and great before his Creator.* (r) It is uſual with ſome of them amongſt the Talmudiſts, to boaſt of their perfection, and that never in their whole life they perpetrated any Enormities. Which is a great thing with them, whoſe Religion is the Religion of Works, and who will be in themſelves the Righteous, not in another: Whereas Chriſtian Believers have the ſtate of Righteouſneſs as being in Chriſt: (s) *Ecce Agnus Dei, qui tollit peccata mundi. Et ideo nemo glorietur in operibus, quia nemo factis ſuis juſtificatur, ſed qui juſtus eſt, donatum habet.* Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the Sins of the World. And therefore let no Man glory in Works, for no Man is juſtify'd by them, but he that is one of the Righteous hath it by gift.

XII. It appeareth, that Mankind which belong to Nature and to the Law, cannot attain the ſtate of Righteouſneſs by the Law and the Works thereof, but are in the *criminal* and *penal* ſtate. Which Propoſition ought to be conſider'd not only with reſpect to every Man's eternal welfare, but that a good account may be given of the Chriſtian Religion, and that it may be well defended againſt the Jews in thoſe main parts of it, *The Sacrifice of the Meſſiah and the Juſtification of Sinners.* Of theſe great things this rational account may be given. (1.) God is peculiarly and definitively, *The Soul-Sovereignty and Government* (in contradiſtinction to Civil Sovereignties and Governments) what God is to the Souls of Men, He is in his Soul-Sovereignty and Government, which Soul-Sovereignty and Government is the ſame thing with his Religion conſider'd as his Soul-Sovereignty and Government and as to Soul-Intereſts, and this Religion is the ſame thing with the Settlement of his Kingdom, Sovereignty and Government. (t) The Law-religioniſts (the *Jews* and *Muhammedans*) will have ſuch a God and Religion, as they like and fancy, which is agreeable to their Genius and is for their turn, and acteth as fondly and arbitrariouſly as they pleaſe. For ſo the Jews agreeably to the fondneſs which they have for their own Nation, fancy (u) that they ſhall be cited before the Throne of Grace (whence they ſhall have the Eternal Reward) but other Nations before the Throne of Judment, (w) and Religion is no leſs an arbitrary unſettled buſineſs amongſt the *Muhammedans.* Not conſidering, that Religion (as to Soul-intereſts) is a Settlement of Rights and Dues, and of God's Soul-Sovereignty and Government, and that his exerciſe of Saving Grace and Mercy muſt be in and by a Saving Religion. If God therefore is ſaving to the Souls of Men, his Religion muſt be ſaving, his Soul-Sovereignty and Government muſt be ſaving, and the Settlement of his Kingdom muſt be Soul-ſaving. (2.) To a world of ungodly Sinners his original Soul-Sovereignty and Government, his original Religion (the original Law) the ſettlement of his original Kingdom, Sovereignty and Government is not ſaving but the contrary. To ſuppoſe, that the Law-religion (or natural Religion) is ſaving to a world of Sinners, is a contradiction. What they are by Nature and by the Law ſpeaketh them in a loſt condition, and their caſe is ſo far irremediable, that if God ſhould iſſue out an Act of Pardon for all the Acts of their Sins (ſuppoſing that he may do it) yet this Medicine would be far from being proportionate to their Maladies. Their whole ſtate muſt be chang'd, the ſtate of remiſſion of Sins or of Righteouſneſs according to Chriſtianity muſt be founded and made for them (ſo that they who were Aliens and Enemies may become Citizens of the Kingdom of God, and have the State, Relation, Rights and Priviledges of the Saints of God) a new and ſaving Religion, a new ſettlement of the Kingdom of God, and and conſequently a new Kingdom of God muſt be made, and the Sovereignty and Government thereof (which was the Law-Sovereignty and Government) muſt become new. (x) Τοῦτο μέγα ὄντως ϗ θαυμαστὸν, *This is great indeed and wonderful.* (3.) We may conceive it poſſible, that theſe great things may be effected by this method. God may raiſe up a Divine Perſon, to be a Divine Mediatory Saviour King to the World of Sin-

---

catio quæ fit per gratiam, meritis præcedentibus deberetur, ut non manus largientis, ſed merces eſſet operantis. Script. de vocat. Gent. l. 1. c. 5.

(l) *Quis verò uſque adeò dementiſſimè inſaniat, ut non agat ineffabiles gratias miſericordiæ liberantis? Qui per gratiam liberantur, non vaſa meritorum ſuorum, ſed vaſa miſericordiæ nominantur.* S. Aug. de Nat. & Gr. 5.

(m) *Meritis impii non gratia, ſed pœna debetur.* S. Aug. Ep. 105.

(n) *Nihil præceſſerat in meritis noſtris, niſi unde damnari deberemus.* Idem in Pſal. 18.

(o) *Filii promiſſionis filii ſunt beneficii. Hæc eſt gratia quæ gratis datur, non meritis operantis, ſed miſeratione donantis.* Idem Ep. 120. c. 19.

(p) Γέγονας ἀθάνατος, γέγονας ἐλεύθερος, γέγονας υἱὸς, γέγονας δίκαιος, γέγονας ἀδελφὸς, γέγονας συγκληρονόμος, συμβασιλεύεις, συνδοξάζῃ, πάντα σοι κεχάρισται. *S. Chryſoſt. in Epheſ. λογ. α.*

(q) *Ap. Hulſ. Theol. Jud. par.* 1. *p.* 4.

(r) *Lightfoot Hor. in Luk.* 15. 7.

(s) *S. Ambroſ.*

(t) *Ita ſcribunt, credunt, ſentiunt de Deo, deque regimine ejuſdem Judæi excæcati, conſtituentes eum judicem ſuper peccatis ipſorum talem, qualem eum ipſi habere optarent.* Buxt. Syn. c. 18. p.m. 384.

(u) *Hulſ. ſupr. p.* 19.

(w) *Pocock. ſpec. p.* 252. *Hotting. Hiſt. or. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 365. *ed.* 1.

(x) *S. Chryſoſt. in Epheſ. λογ. γ.*

Sinners, God may (with his own conſent) appoint him, to be *the King of believing Sinners* in order to his being *King of believing Saints*, and proceeding and dealing with this King of believing Sinners according to Law-juſtice (as the Government of Law-juſtice muſt deal with him) may put upon him whatever is requiſite for him, to do and ſuffer, that he may be the King of believing Saints. Which being accompliſh'd God may conſtitute this Divine Perſon in Sovereignty and actual Government the King of believing Saints, and Law-juſtice hath nothing to ſay againſt it. By this method a ſaving Religion may be made for the World of Sinners, a new ſettlement of Rights and Dues may be made for the Kingdom of God, and the Sovereignty and Government thereof may become new. But that theſe great things could be done without Chriſt (or as ſome Learned Men ſuppoſe, that God might have contriv'd a way, to ſave the World of Sinners without the undertaking of Chriſt) is beyond any rational conception. Nor ought we to think, that God had ſo little value for his own Son (of infinite precioſity) as without the greateſt neceſſity to give him up to Agonies ineffable, to Dolours inſupportable, to the extremity of Torments.

SECTION V.

The Law muſt be conſider'd as the Religion of Man's Unregeneracy, and of the Religioniſts of Unregeneracy, and conſequently as the Religion of our Spiritual Servitude.

I. THE Law (both as it is the Political Law of the Jews literally underſtood and as it is the original Religion of Soul-intereſts, the ſettlement of the Divine Moral Law) is thus oppos'd to the Goſpel; the one is the Religion of Regeneracy to all that belong to it, and the other of Unregeneracy. The Law affordeth not the Goods of Regeneracy, nor ſaveth from the Evils of Unregeneracy: but on the contrary, the Evils of Unregeneracy and a privation of the Goods of Regeneracy accrue to Mankind by the Law. As the Law ſignifieth the Political Law of the Carnal Jews, it is thus oppos'd to the Goſpel. (y) *The Old Teſtament appertaineth to the Old Man, whence Man muſt neceſſarily begin; but the New to the New Man, to which Man ought to paſs from his Oldneſs. The whole Old Law is in this diſtinguiſhed from the New, that juſtifieth not, this juſtifieth. That is called the Old Teſtament, becauſe it knoweth not the renewing Men: but ours is called the New, becauſe it reneweth. There is in it the newneſs of the Spirit, which cureth the new Man of the Vicioſity of his Oldneſs (the badneſs of the Old Man) which was far from being cur'd by the commanding and threatning Letter.* The Old Teſtament (a Civil-religious Inſtitution) *had a Righteouſneſs, but terrene, carnal Promiſes the Figures of things Spiritual*, and (in its Ceremonial Inſtitutes) *was the oldneſs of the Carnal Law and a Servile Yoke.* As the Law is the Divine Moral Law and the Settlement thereof, it is thus differenced from the Goſpel. (z) *The Law doth not abſolve from Sins, but ſheweth Sins. The Law is not Sin, the Commandment is to life, the Law is holy, and the Commandment holy, and juſt and good: yet becauſe Good it ſelf is killing to the diſobedient Soul, when the Grace of God helpeth not, the Law became the miniſtration of Death in the Old Teſtament, becauſe of the killing Letter, and Grace in the New Teſtament is the miniſtration of Life, becauſe of the quickning Spirit. The Law and Grace muſt be diſtinguiſh'd. The one requireth performance, the other helpeth to perform. The one maketh the hearers of Righteouſneſs, the other the doers of Righteouſneſs. The Law ſhew'd the Diſeaſe, but did not take it away. That was the Holy-ſpiritual Law, this* (the Goſpel) *is the Law of the Spirit.* The Law as it is the Holy Spiritual Law is not a ſettlement either of the ſtate of remiſſion of Sins upon us, or of renewing Grace to us: Sin is not taken away by it, either the *condemning* or the *commanding* power of Sin. Sin reigneth, ſo long as the Law reigneth, and both theſe in conjunction naturally ingender that *ſervile fear*, which is the Spirit of the Law-religioniſts, and which ſpeaketh them the unregenerate kind of Religioniſts. (a) *Hæc eſt breviſſima & apertiſſima differentia duorum Teſtamentorum, timor & amor: illud ad veterem, hoc ad novum hominem pertinet.* This is the ſhorteſt and plaineſt difference of the two Teſtaments, Fear and Love: that appertaineth to the Old, this to the New Man. The whole of this difference between the Law and the Goſpel ſheweth what Mankind are in their natural and legal condition. (b) *Una quædam maſſa peccati, ſupplicium debens divinæ ſummæque juſtitiæ:* One maſs of Sin, Debtors of Puniſhment to the Divine and Supreme Juſtice. If they apply themſelves to the Law-religion for the cure of their great Evils, inſtead of *Bread* it will give them *a Stone*, inſtead of *a Fiſh* it will give them *a Serpent*; for as a Law it maketh them guilty Criminals, and ſhutteth them up under Condemnation, which are the grand Evils of their Unregeneracy connex'd with their Spiritual Servitude under the Law.

II. *Tell me, ye that deſire to be under the Law, do ye not hear the Law? for it is written, that* Abraham *had two Sons; the one by a Bondmaid, the other by a Free Woman. But he who was of the Bond-woman, was born after the Fleſh: but he who was of the Free Woman, was by promiſe. Which things are an Allegory; for theſe are the two Covenants; the one from the* Mount Sinai, *which gendreth to Bondage, which is* Agar. *For this* Agar *is* Mount Sinai *in* Arabia, *and anſwereth to* Jeruſalem *which now is, and is in bondage with her Children. But* Jeruſalem *which is above is free, which is the Mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 21, — 26. The Apoſtle here confronteth two Covenants (ſettlements and diſpenſations of things) the

---

(y) *Teſtamentum vetus pertinet ad veterem hominem, à quo neceſſe eſt hominem incipere: Novum autem ad hominem novum, quo debet homo ex vetuſtate tranſire.* S. Aug. contr. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 3. c. 4. *Lex ipſa vetus tota in hoc diſtinguitur à nova, quod illa non juſtificat, hæc juſtificat. illud dicitur vetus Teſtamentum, quia ad veterem hominem pertinet, nec renovare novit: noſtrum dicitur novum, quia renovat.* Bellarm. de effect. ſacram. l. 2. c. 16. *Propter veteris hominis noxam quæ per literam jubentem & minantem minimè ſanabatur, dicitur illud teſtamentum vetus: hoc autem novum, propter novitatem ſpiritus, quæ hominem novum ſanat à vitio vetuſtatis.* S. Aug. de Sp. & lit. c. 20. *Juſtitiam habebat quidem, ſed terrenam.* Quæſt. ex utroque mixtim pars 2 inter opera S. Aug. T. 4. *In figuris rerum ſpiritalium habens promiſſa carnalia, propter quod vetus dicitur Teſtamentum.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 25. *Vetuſtas carnalis legis, jugumq ſervile.* Idem de Sp. & Li c. 21.

(z) *Non ſolvit Lex à peccatis, ſed oſtendit peccata.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 129. *Ecce quemadmodum lex non eſt peccatum, & mandatum in vitam, & lex ſancta & mandatum ſanctum, & juſtum & bonum: Et tamen quia de ipſo bono interficitur inobediens anima, ubi Dei non adjuvat gratia, miniſtratio mortis facta eſt lex in veteri teſtamento propter occidentem literam, & miniſtratio vitæ facta eſt gratia in novo teſtamento propter vivificantem ſpiritum.* Idem T. 6. contr. adverſ. Leg. & Prophet. l. 2. c. 7. *Diſtinguenda eſt lex & gratia. Lex jubere novit, gratia juvare.* Idem Ep. 95. *Lex auditores juſtitiæ facit, gratia factores.* Idem contr. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 3. c. 2. *Jubebat non ſanabat: languorem oſtendebat, non auferebat.* Idem in Joan. Tr. 3. de cap. 1. Ἐκεῖνος μὲν πνευματικὸς, ὅυτος δὲ νόμος πνεύματος. *S. Chryſoſt.* in Rom. λογ. ιγ.

(a) S. Aug. T. 6. c. Adimant. c. 17.

(b) S. Aug. ad Simplic. l. 1. Qu. 2.

Old and the New, the one adumbrated and typify'd by *Agar* the Bondwoman, the other by *Sarab* the Free-woman. *Agar* was by Nation an *Egyptian*, by ſtate and condition a Bondmaid, that was only given to *Abraham* as a Concubine, and had neither Dower nor Power as a true Wife, but liv'd in his Family as a Bondwoman, and when ſhe had done her work, was turn'd out of Doors. By this *Agar* the Law-religion was adumbrated and typify'd, but the New Covenant (the Goſpel-religion) was typify'd by *Sarab* the Free-woman; for ſhe was free-born, liv'd free a Matron or a Lady, and had the right of Dower and of Power. Theſe two Mothers ſhadow'd forth the two Covenants, the one from *Mount Sinai* which gendreth to Bondage (as *Agar* was originally of *Egypt* the Houſe of Bondage and was of condition a Bondwoman) the other from *Mount Sion*. But theſe two Mothers did not only adumbrate and typifie two Covenants, but two Churches alſo; for *Agar* anſwereth to *Jeruſalem* which now is (the literal *Jeruſalem*) the Church of the Carnal Jews *that is in Bondage with her Children*. *Sarab* anſwereth to the Church of Spiritual Jews *the* Jeruſalem *which is above that is the Mother of all true Chriſtians*, and is in the ſtate of Freedom, and ſo are all her Children. As theſe two Mothers (*Agar* and *Sarab*) were of contrary condition, ſo were their two Sons (according to that ſaying in Law, *partus ſequitur ventrem*;) for the Son of the one was *Iſhmael*, a Bondman, as his Mother was a Bondwoman: the Son of the other was *Iſaac* a Free-man, as his Mother was a Free-woman. Thus the Law and the Goſpel are contrary, the Carnal and the Spiritual Church; the one is a Bondwoman the other is a Freewoman. And the Sons of the Law and of the Goſpel, the Sons of the Carnal and Spiritual Church they ſymbolize with their Mothers; for the Sons of the Law (the Law-religioniſts) the Sons of the Jewiſh Church are as *Iſhmael*, who, though in ſome ſort a Son, yet was not a genuine Son, had not the right of a Son (and therefore no right to the Inheritance) but was a Baſtard-bond-child, becauſe he came from a Woman, who had not the ſtate of a Woman and the right of a Wife, but was a Bondmaid and a Concubine only. On the other hand, the Sons of the Goſpel and the Spiritual Heavenly Church are as *Iſaac*, who was a true Son and had the right of a Son, becauſe he came from a Mother, who had the ſtate of a Woman, and the right of a Wife, and being a legitimate Son he had right to the Inheritance. This was the difference between theſe two Mothers and their Sons on the Mother's ſide; and there was a difference between them alſo on the Father's ſide; for though they had one Father, yet they iſſu'd from different generative Powers. *Iſhmael* was begotten by *Abraham*'s natural power and ſtrength of generation, as alſo from *Agar*'s natural force of conception, and therefore he is ſaid, *to be born after the Fleſh*, there was nothing ſupernatural in his Birth. But *Abraham* begat *Iſaac* by a ſupernatural power and ſtrength of generation from God, as alſo from *Sarab*'s ſupernatural virtue of conception. In like manner, they that are of the Law (the Carnal Jews) they are of the natural Birth only, but *Abraham*'s Carnal Seed and the Carnal Religioniſts: On the other hand, the true Chriſtians are of the Spiritual and Supernatural Birth, born of God; theſe therefore are the genuine Sons and Heirs of God, the other are but Baſtards and Bondmen, that have no right to inherit. (c) *In Hiſmael ſunt omnes qui carnaliter colunt Deum, ad ipſos enim & vetus Teſtamentum pertinet.* The carnal kind of Religioniſts are of *Iſhmael*, thoſe that belong to the Law, and (upon ſeveral accounts) are in Spiritual Servitude. For the Jews ſubjection to the load and luggage of the Moſaic Rites was a Servitude. And they were the *Serviliſts*, not the *Filialiſts* in Religion, becauſe the temper of thoſe baſe-born Legaliſts was the baſe and ſervile.

V. 29.

(c) S. Aug. in Pſal. 119.

(d) *They that under the Law externally comply with the Precepts of it from a cupidity of obtaining or fear of loſing a worldly Felicity, theſe belong to the Old Teſtament, which gendereth to Servitude; for carnal fear and cupidity maketh them Slaves.* The Sons of Carnality becauſe of their mundane genius and graceleſs diſpoſition could be no better than vile Serviliſts in Religion. But this is not the worſt Branch of their Servitude.

(d) *Verùm hæc planè magna diſtantia eſt, quòd faciunt iſta ſub lege poſiti, quos litera occidit, terrenam felicitatem vel cupiditate adipiſcendi vel timore amittendi. Hi ad vetus pertinent Teſtamentum, quod in ſervitutem generat, quia facit eos carnalis timor & cupiditas ſervos.* S. Aug. contr. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 3. c. 4.

(e) *For they were under the Law, not under Grace; and therefore were under the domination of Sin, from which a Man hath not Liberation by the Law, but by Grace.* The common condition of all Mankind therefore in their Unregeneracy, is to be under the domination of Sin.

(e) *Sub lege enim erant non ſub gratia; & ideo eis dominabatur peccatum, à quo non fit homo liber lege, ſed gratia.* Idem de grat. & lib. arbitr. c. 12.

III. Agreeably to which Fundamental of Chriſtianity S. *Paul*'s Diſcourſe in his ſeventh Chapter to the *Romans* ought to be underſtood; for it is not to be ſuppos'd, that he deſigneth to contradict, but to eſtabliſh and illuſtrate the Principles of his own Religion. Accordingly he affirmeth of himſelf as a Law-religioniſt, and of all other Law-religioniſts, that they belong *to the Letter*, that they are *in the Fleſh*, that they are under *the domination of Sin*, that the Law was weak through the Fleſh, that a liberation from the Servitude of Sin is peculiarly the benefit that cometh by Chriſt, and is the happy eſtate of every regenerate Chriſtian, *Rom.* 8. 1.---4. For God in Chriſt hath *condemned Sin in the Fleſh* (ſentenc'd it to death) and every Regenerate Chriſtian belongeth to *the Law of the Spirit of Life that hath made him free, the Righteouſneſs of the Law is fulfilled in him, and he walketh not after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit.* If with this Character of a Goſpel-religioniſt we compare the Character of that kind of Religioniſt, whom the Apoſtle perſonateth and deſcribeth in the controverted part of this ſeventh Chapter, they will appear, to be as contrary, as Law and Goſpel, as Fleſh and Spirit, as Sin and Righteouſneſs, as Miſery and Happineſs, as Thraldom and Freedom. For that Religioniſt whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, is a Law-religioniſt (or he ſpeaketh of himſelf conſider'd as a Law-religioniſt) in whom *Sin is enlivened by the Law, worketh in him all manner of Concupiſcence, maketh him a deadly Sinner taking occaſion by the Commandment, a miſerable Man, that approveth of the Law of Righteouſneſs, yet is captivated to Sin and Wickedneſs, and therefore crieth out for a liberation*, which is a Law-religioniſt's right uſe of the Law. (f) *Utilitas legis eſt, ut hominem de ſua infirmitate convictum, gratiæ medicinam quæ in Chriſto eſt implorare compellat.* That Religioniſt whom the Apoſtle perſonateth is *carnal*,

Rom. 7. 6.
Rom. 7. 5.
Rom. 6. 14.
Rom. 7. 8, 9, 11, 01, 22, 23, 24. 14.
(f) S. *Aug.* Ep. 200.

ſold under Sin, ſpeaketh the Language of the unregenerate Law-religioniſts (*g*) both Jews and Gentiles. *Sciebam ut eſſe me deceret, facere non quibam miſer*, ſaith a young Man in *Plautus*. So *Phædrias* in the Comedy, & *prudens, ſciens, vivuſque pereo*. There are many the like Sayings in the Writings of the Popular Pagans which are obſerv'd and diſcours'd of (*h*) by the Philoſophers and others.

The Philoſophers diſtinguiſh two parts in the Soul of Man, *the inferiour and ſuperiour*. The one is common to the Brutes and falleth within the comprehenſion of ſenſitive Nature, which they call (*i*) τὸ παθητικὸν, *the Paſſive*, (the ſeat of the bodily Appetites, Affections and Paſſions) the other is τὸ λογικὸν, *the rational Nature*; and between theſe two as contrary operative Principles there is uſually a conflict and combat. Διπλῆ γάρ ἐστι μαχομένη φύσις εἰς ἓν κεκραμένη, *for two Natures conflicting one with the other are conjoin'd*, the ſenſitive Appetite (the Appetite to ſenſitive Good) reſiſting and withſtanding the Rational Nature, as it diſcerneth and dictateth the good of Honeſty. In this conflict the ſenſitive Nature uſually prevaileth (by its deceit and impetuous violence) not only againſt mens Reſolutions to the contrary in their ſober mood, but againſt the preſent light and dictates of their Mind (*k*) ἐκ βίας ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἳ προσελθοῦσαι ἄγουσι ϗ ἕλκουσι, *by the force of their Cupidities, which carry and drag them* (*l*) ταῖς παθητικαῖς ὁλκαῖς ὥσπερ τισὶ μολυβδίσιν, *by the pathetick Tractions as by Weights of Lead*, (*m*) καθάπερ ὑπό τινος ἀπειθοῦς ἵππου, as by a certain unruly Horſe (*fertur Equis auriga*) *they are carry'd to perpetrate Sin.* (*n*) The Mind is τυραννουμένη, *tyrannically lorded over by the brutal affections* (which are uſually in motion and commotion) τῶν ἀλόγων παθῶν κατεχόντων αὐτὴν, ϗ περισπώντων ϗ τὰ ἑαυτοῖς ὀρεκτὰ πράττειν ἀναγκαζόντων, *the irrational Paſſions poſſeſſing it and diſtracting it and* (in ſome ſort) *compelling it, to do the things that are to them deſirable.* (*o*) Πᾶν γὰρ πάθος βιαστικόν ἐστιν, *for every Paſſion hath a certain compulſory force in it* (*p*) ἐκκρούει τοὺς λογισμοὺς, *it dethroneth or expelleth Reaſonings*. Whence Mankind are ſaid by their brutal Affections (both iraſcible and concupiſcible) βιάζεσθαι, ἀναγκάζεσθαι, *to be* (in great degree) *forc'd and neceſſitated* to do Evil. But this neceſſity of doing Evil groweth upon them, if their evil Practices become cuſtomary; for thereby the bent and byaſs of their Nature more ſtrongly and habitually ſtandeth that way, and it becometh an extreme difficulty, to leave their evil Practices, and to withſtand their Concupiſcences that hurry and impel them thereto. (*q*) *Imbecillis eſt primò omnis affectus deinde ipſe ſe concitat, & vires dum procedit, parat.* All the vicious Affections which abound in Man's Nature, if they have not at firſt, by cuſtomary Practice will grow to have a compulſory force, and they that are under ſuch a compulſory force, cannot be Freemen, but are neceſſarily Slaves. For in the uſual Notion *Liber eſt, qui vivit ut vult*, and according to the definition in *Plato*'s Works ἐλεύθερον τὸ ἄρχον αὑτοῦ, *that is Free, which governeth, ordereth and diſpoſeth of it ſelf*: But he that is conſtrained againſt his own mind and liking, to act *ad nutum alterius*, is a Slave.

IV. Whence the Religioniſt whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, proveth himſelf, to be a Slave of Sin. V. 15. *For that which I do, I allow not: For what I would, that do I not, but what I hate, that do I.* This Argument implieth, that in a Law-religioniſt there is a διπλόη, *duplicity of Nature*; a Mind Rational and Religious, which approveth the Law of Righteouſneſs (*if I then do that which I would not, I conſent unto the Law, that it is Good*) V. 15. and an inferiour ſenſitive Nature full of evil Concupiſcences, which hath the Rule and Maſtery of the Man, and is Lord of his Practice. *v.* 17. *Now then it is no more I that do it, but Sin that dwelleth in me.* Becauſe the Man is not at his own diſpoſe, therefore he argueth, *it is no more I that do it* (as being αὐτεξούσιος, *at mine* own diſpoſe, and as doing it αὐτομάτως, *of mine own accord* without being impell'd and compell'd thereto:) But *indwelling Sin doeth it, as being Lord and Maſter of me and my Practice*; therefore I am a Slave. And this further appeareth from what I find in my ſelf a Nature contrariant and contra-nitent to Good. *v.* 18. *For I know, that in me* (*that is in my Fleſh*) *dwelleth no good thing* (the Fleſh is full of evil Concupiſcence) the ſenſe of which words is exactly expreſs'd by *Ariſtotle*. Φαίνεται δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς ϗ ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸν λόγον πεφυκὸς, ὃ μάχεται τε ϗ ἀντιτείνει τῷ λόγῳ, *it appeareth, that in Men beſides Reaſon there is ſomewhat elſe innate, which reſiſteth and is contra-nitent to Reaſon.* Which contrariant Nature is of prevalent Power; *for to Will is preſent with me* (to have a Mind (*r*) and Velleity to good) *but how to perform that which is good I find not.* (I am forcibly carry'd off by it from the good which I like, and by the ὁρμὴ of it impell'd to the evil which I diſlike and condemn) *for the good that I would I do not: But the evil which I would not, that I do* (*v.* 19.) from whence it appeareth, that I am in Servitude. If Sin reigneth, it is in the State of a King, which is a State of prowefs and victorious Power, and for this reaſon it is called *a Law and the Law in the Members*, becauſe in unregenerate Mankind it ruleth and commandeth, as a Law doth. From which Notion of a Law this Law-religioniſt whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, argueth, that he is in Servitude, *v.* 21. *I find then a Law* (that which ruleth and commandeth me) *that when I would do good, evil is preſent with me.* His Servitude alſo appeareth from the Notion of *Captivity*. For Captivity is Servitude, into which Men are forcibly carry'd by their Conquerours in War. If this Religioniſt therefore whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, findeth in himſelf *two Natures at War one with another*, if he findeth, that the Divine Law is the Law of the Mind, which therefore harmonizeth, liketh and is pleas'd with the Divine Law (*I delight in the Law of God after the inward Man*, v. 22.) and if he findeth alſo another Law *in his Members* (in the Fleſh) *warring againſt the Law of his Mind*, prevailing, conquering and *bringing him into captivity to the Law of Sin which is in his Members*, (v. 23.) he is neceſſarily in Servitude under the Reign and Domination of Sin. Which in unregenerate Mankind (that are in the Chains and Fetters of their Corruptions) prevaileth againſt Prudence, Diſcretion and common Reaſon (which is born down and ſilenc'd by it) againſt the Sence of common Honeſty and Juſtice, againſt their Knowledge, Convictions, Velleities, Reſolutions, againſt the Light of the Law and the Sence of Conſcience, and hurrieth them to the moſt outragious Enormities.

(g) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. col.* 2303.

(h) *Alcin. de Doct. Plat. c.* 24. *Hierocl. in aur. Car. p.* 7. *Plutarch. de virt. mor. p.* 446. *Salmaſ. in Epictet. p* 55, 56. *Grot. Not. in Rom.* 7. 15. *Oſor. de Nobil. Chriſt. l.* 1. *p.* 413. *Simplic. in Epict. c.* 10, 11.

(i) *Alcin. ſupr. Galen. l.* 5. *de Dogm. Hippocr. & Plat. Julian. Orat. in Sol.*

(k) *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 1. *c.* 9. & *En.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 17.

(l) *Hierocl. ſupr. p.* 77.

(m) *Salmaſ. ſupr.*

(n) *Simplic. ſupr. c.* 10, 11, 60.

(o) *Salmaſ. ſupr.*

(p) *Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 224, 299, 375.

(q) *Sen. Ep.* 116.

(r) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 3 *Par.* 3. *Theſ.* 7.

ties. (s) *If any conſidereth the innate Motion of the Fleſh to the moſt abſurd Paſſions* (he will acknowledge that) *good dwelleth not in us; for it compelleth the Mind of Man, to will and chuſe inconſiderately, to do what is not lawful, and that which is free it dareth to ſubject to the yoke of Servitude, equally to the Captives. Its intolerable reſiſtence and contranitence the moſt wiſe* Paul *ſheweth, when he ſaith; for I delight in the Law of God after the inward Man: But I ſee another Law warring againſt the Law of my Mind and bringing me into Captivity to the Law of Sin.* The Law-religioniſt whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, having thus demonſtrated his own Servitude of Condition, maketh a tragical Exclamation of it, and crieth out for a Liberator, *v.* 24. *O wretched Man that I am, who ſhall deliver me from the body of this death?* To which the Apoſtle ſpeaking as a Chriſtian Theologer maketh Anſwer, *I thank God through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* Which is to ſay, *a Liberator we have, thanks be to God, even Chriſt Jeſus.* Having thus pointed at Man's Liberation, he ſubjoineth an Epilogue to his Diſcourſe of Man's Servitude, and maketh this ſummary Recapitulation of it, *v.* 25. *So then with the Mind I my ſelf ſerve the Law of God; but with the fleſh the Law of Sin.* That is, with the Mind which is I my ſelf (αὐτὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος) I am a Religioniſt of the Law, conſenting to it and being pleas'd with it: But with the Fleſh as carrying me Captive I ſerve the Law of Sin. This is my Servitude of Condition, *who am ſold under Sin,* (t) as the Children of the firſt *Adam* are ſaid to be *venundati ſub peccato.* That Religioniſt therefore whom the Apoſtle perſonateth, and deſcribeth, is an unregenerate Law-religioniſt (u) as the moſt and beſt of the ancient Writers of the Church have expounded the Apoſtle, and ſo the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe is expounded (w) in the late *Theſes Salmurienſes.* The Scope of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe inferreth the truth of this Expoſition; for he is ſhewing the Judaical Believers their happy Freedom from the Law, *Rom.* 7. 1--4. It is pertinent therefore to his deſign, to ſhew the miſerable State of Servitude, which a Law-religioniſt is in: But to ſhew, that a regenerate Chriſtian is ſadly incumbred with Sin and in a miſerable plight, is contrary to his Deſign and Scope.

V. Servitude to indwelling Sin is always *addictitious* (the Servants of Sin addict themſelves, to fulfill τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκός, *the Wills of the Fleſh,* and yield themſelves to obey and gratifie its promptings, ſuggeſtions and inclinations) but this *addictitious Servitude* is ſometimes *the affectively addictitious,* ſometimes *the affectively captivating,* and ſometimes *the compulſorily captivating.* (x) They that hate Piety and love the atheous kind of Life, their Vices and the Pleaſures of them, that are Proud and Worldly, Drunkards and Whoremongers, and they love to be ſo, and would be ſo (that are like the Slave in *Exodus,* who loveth his Maſter and will not go out free) their ſervitude to Sin, becauſe it is lik'd and affected, is *affectively addictitious.* And if their vicious Appetites, Affections and Inclinations are ſtrong and vehement, it is *affectively captivating.* (y) Which is one conſequent of Mens immerſing themſelves in ſenſual Delights and Pleaſures, the Inclinations in their Nature towards them by cuſtom become rampant, ſtrong and vehement, radicated, confirm'd and ſettled; and as the practice of their Vices becometh eaſie and pleaſant to them, ſo to be reſtrain'd from them, is a mighty pain; and they are ſo rapturouſly carry'd away with them, that they cannot live without them, nor wean themſelves from them, although they know, that they will ſhortly be their ruin. If habituated Drunkards have not their fill of Drink, they find themſelves intolerably off the Hooks, and they are ſo marvellouſly captivated and carry'd away with the love of their Vice, that *à ſe impetrare non poſſunt,* they cannot find in their Heart to bid adieu to their brave Delight, their royal Repaſt, nor to forbear their Vice, reſiſt it, or uſe means againſt it, but their Voice is that in *Jotham*'s Parable, *non poſſum relinquere vinum meum,* it is their All, their Paradiſe and their Heaven. How madly are they tranſported with the love of Drink, that will drink out their Eyes with a *valeat lumen amicum, Eyes if you will not drink, you are no Eyes for me?* But there is a ſervitude to Sin, which is compulſorily captivating. Not as if any Man could be compell'd to Sin wholly againſt his Will; for (as one ſaith) *what is Evil? It is that which no Man committeth againſt his Will.* But actual Sin is from a twofold Original: The Luſt of Man ſuggeſting, tempting, inclining, irritating, impelling, and the Will of Man conſenting. If the Will conſenteth not, the Sin cannot be done: But uſually the Luſts of Men are of ſuch Power and Prevalency, that they find themſelves under a ſort of force and urgent neceſſity to gratifie them notwithſtanding their Velleities to the contrary (the Fleſh will have no nay) and this compulſory ſort of Servitude was the State of that Religioniſt, whom S. *Paul* perſonateth and deſcribeth. The voice of the *Incontinent* (ſo called by the Philoſophers) is, *fugienda petimus, ſed mei non ſum potens.* I underſtand the Evils that I am about to commit, but my Paſſion or Appetite overcometh my Reaſon, which obſcurely diſcerneth what ought to be done, and feebly conflicteth for it.

VI. Servitude to Sin is good Senſe, but ſuch is not an ignoble Freedom, an unſervile Servitude. Yet ſuch there are amongſt the *affectively addictitious* to the ſervitude of Sin, that (like the Turks) ſtrive who ſhall be the greateſt Slaves, that affect to be Gallants in Wickedneſs, and count a doleful *ſlavery* their *bravery.* For a doleful ſlavery it is, to ſerve thoſe vicious Appetites and Affections, that are *mad* Maſters, and fill the Souls and Lives of Men with Madneſs; that are the *baſeſt* of Maſters and put their Servants upon doing the vileſt things (as Slaves were put to the vileſt and moſt painful Drudgeries) that over-work their Slaves to the conſuming the health and ſtrength of their Bodies and the vigour of their Minds in their Service, and take as little care of them (z) as the Law-courts amongſt the Jews took of their Slaves (their Maſters exacted of them all their Work with all ſeverity, but what became of them, whether they periſh'd by Cold or Famine, their Law-courts regarded not;) Men cannot gratifie them when they would, their Luſts and Paſſions frequently meet with croſſes and diſappointments (and then they fill them with torture and diſquiet) but if they ſhould have all manner of accommodations and opportunities, to gratifie them, yet they could never ſatisfie them, the more they gratifie them, they rage the more, and become more violent and tempeſtuous. *They enlarge their deſire as Hell, and are as Death and cannot be ſatisfied.* Hab. 2. 5. They raiſe troubleſome and painful Agitations in the Soul; where they govern (deſtructive to good Order and Government) they are *morbi animi*, and make a vitiated Nature, every vicious Affection is a loathſome, defiling and diſturbing Diſeaſe, a troubleſom and painful Diſtemper (Pride is as a Tympany, Luſt is like a Fever, Avarice is as a Dropſie, Envy is like a Conſumption, and in all the hating hurting Paſſions there is Anguiſh and Inquietude) to ſerve them therefore, is to ſerve very troubleſome uneaſie Maſters. And they are a *multitude* of Maſters, like many Tyrants in one City, which cauſe broils and tumults, στασιάζουσι, *they raiſe Sedition*, a Civil War, and make a jarring tumultuous Kingdom in all Men, in whom they bear ſway, by their thwarting one another (the ſpending Vices of Pride and Voluptuouſneſs, commanding one thing and Covetouſneſs the contrary) they that ſerve them, ſerve many Maſters, that cannot be all pleas'd at once; and they muſt ſerve them againſt their Judgment and Conſcience, which is an abominable Servitude. (*a*) *For a Free-man is one, with whom nothing hath ſo much ſway as his own Judgment.* If the Slaves of Sin do not gratifie their Luſts and Paſſions, they will torment them; and if they do gratifie them, their Conſcience will torment them, they wound it and it woundeth them again, and whippeth and laſheth them (as the Roman Lords did *in terga & cervices ſævire*, imprint Marks and Characters upon the Backs of their Slaves by their ſevere beating them) uſually they are haunted with *ſerviles trepidationes* (as *Arnobius* ſpeaketh) ſlaviſh Fears, Horrours and Preſages, and filled with Shame and Anguiſh, which is a doleful Servitutude. (*b*) *Non eſt omnis metus ſervitus?* A doleful Servitude it is, to live under an evil Conſcience that *occultum flagellum*, ſecret Whip wherewith the Slaves of Sin are chaſtis'd (and which maketh them of all Slaves the moſt miſerable) to be troubled with intemperate Longings and unruly Deſires after unwholeſome and loathſome things (like Women troubled with the *Pica*) to be led away with divers Luſts and perpetually tantaliz'd by them; to be ridden by the Witch (as *Plato* ſpeaketh of the Soul (*c*) γοητευομένη ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος, *bewitch'd by the Body*) to be inchanted and captivated by fleſhly Vanities, wherein they promiſe themſelves a Paradiſe, but find a Purgatory. Their ſenſual Exceſſes are every way *Abaddons* and *Apollyons*, their Pleaſures are not the valuable and deſirable Pleaſures (but the phantaſtic fooleries and gulleries of a Moment and a γλυκύπικρος ἡδονὴ, *bitter-ſweet Pleaſure*) they ſlight that great Intereſt which they ſhould ſerve, and ſerve that which they ſhould ſubdue, and the reward which they muſt have for their Service at the long run, is to be put to Death. *Rom.* 6. 16.

(s) Ἐι γὰρ δή τις ἕλοιτο λεπτῶς καταθρεῖν τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἔμφυτον κίνημα, τὸ πρός γε ῥώμη τῶν παθῶν ἐκπτώτατα, ἐκ εἰκῆ ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ ἀγαθόν. Καταβιβάζεται γὰρ τὸν νοῦν ἀνθρώπινον ἐπί γε τὸ δεῖν καὶ τοῦτο ἀκατασκέπτως ἐλέσθαι δρᾶν ἃ μὴ θέμις. καὶ τοῖς δορυκτήτοις ἐν ἴσῳ δουλείας ὑπάγειν ζυγῷ, κατατολμᾷ τὸν ἐλεύθερον. Ἀφόρητον δὲ τὴν ἀντίστασιν καὶ Παῦλος ὁ πάνσοφος ἀποφαίνει λέγων, συνήδομαι, &c. S Cyr. c. *Jul.* l. 3. p. 91.

——*ſi poſſem, ſanior eſſem.*
Sed trahit invitam nova vis: aliudque Cupido
Mens aliud ſuadet.
Ovid 7. Met.

(t) Fulgent. de incarn. & Gr. Chriſt. c. 13. S. Ambroſ. com. in Rom. 7.

(u) Voſſ. hiſt. l. 2. Par. 1. p. 142.

(w) Par. 2. Theſ. de ſpirit. ſervitut.

(x) *Vitia noſtra quia amamus defendimus.* Sen. Ep 117.

(y) *Pars hominum vitiis gaudet conſtanter & urget propoſitum.* Horat. Ser. l. 2. Sat. 7. *Voluptatibus ſe mergunt, quibus in conſuetudinem adductis carere non poſſunt: Et ob hoc miſerrimi ſunt, quod eo proveniunt, ut illis quæ ſupervacua fuerant, facta ſint neceſſaria; ſerviunt itaque voluptatibus, non fruuntur: Et mala ſua, quod malorum ultimum eſt, amant.* Sen. Ep. 39.

(z) Selden. de *J. Nat.* & G. l. 6. c. 8.

VII. As bad a Service as Servitude to Sin is, yet (*d*) *every Soul of Man hath fallen under the common Enemies malign yoke of Servitude, and having loſt the liberty, which ſhe received from her Creator, ſhe was carry'd into captivity by Sin.* Such is the State of Mankind antecedently to their Liberation: And beſides this their Servitude to *inherent* Sin they are in a State of *adherent* Servitude to Sin, which is analogous to *civil* Servitude. For Mankind under the Domination of Sin are as Slaves in a Commonwealth, that are look'd upon as *Aliens*, no *Citizens*, as vile infamous Miſcreants, filthy and ſordid Varlets, that have no Rights, are Owners of no Eſtate, and are reputed in Law as dead Men. Till they have obtain'd their Freedom, *they are not Fellow-citizens with the Saints, or of the Houſhold of God, but are Strangers and Foreigners.* And as the Talmudiſts ſay (*e*) *Servi & ancillæ non inclamant, neque Abba Pater, neneque Imma Mater*: So Mankind in their Servitude under Sin are not of the divine Kindred and Alliance, they have no right to the Favour of God, to claim Kindred with him, to have Acceſs to him, to have him for their Father; no right in the Family, nor right to the Inheritance, nor can they be Freeholders or Owners of a bleſſed Eſtate in the Kingdom of God. The Immunities, Rights and Priviledges of his Saints and Servants (which are the happy Eſtate of Spiritual Freedom) belong not to the Servants of Sin. A Civil-religious Citizenſhip, Sonſhip and Inheritance is competible to this mundane Family: But they are ſo far from enjoying the Spiritual-religious Priviledges, Liberties and Immunities of the Regenerate and Divine Family, that they are ſubjected to all the contrary Penalties (which is their Servitude;) for they are not exempted and priviledg'd from the Reputation of Criminals, from the Divine Wrath, the Domination of Satan and of Death, but theſe Penal Evils are ſettled upon them, and they are ſubjected to Condemnation, to Impriſonment, to Puniſhment eternal, which is a far worſe Thraldom and Servitude of Condition, than to be ſubjected to the Whip and the Croſs, and ſuch like baſe and hard Puniſhments of common Slaves.

(a) *Cic. Paradox.*

(b) *Cic. ibid.*

(c) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 27.

(d) Πᾶσα ἀνθρωπίνη ψυχὴ ὑπέκυψεν τῷ πονηρῷ τῆς δουλείας ζυγῷ τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων ἐχθροῦ, καὶ τὴν παρὰ τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀφαιρεθεῖσα, αἰχμάλωτος ἤχθη διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. *S. Baſil. Hom. in Pſal.* 48. *p.* 279.

Eph. 2. 19.

(e) Lud. de Dieu in *Rom.* 8. 15.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Sect. 1. *Of the Nature and Origin of the Religion of Saving Grace, which is here conſidered as Initial. Of the Notion of Grace. Of the Divine Predeſtination. How much of certainty there is in the Perſonal Predeſtination. Why this Religion is called the Religion of Saving Grace. An Idea of it and of Juſtification.* Sect. 2. *Of God's Believers, the Nature and Nobleneſs of their juſtifying Faith, and the eminent Ingredients thereof.* Sect. 3. *Of the Religion of Holy Men of the Old Teſtament-times and how far they were Chriſtians.* Sect. 4. *Of the Ante-moſaical Inſtitutions of Religion, Adamical, Noachical, Abrahamical.* Sect. 5. *Of the Moſaical Inſtitution as Civil-religious, as the Divine Moral Law, as the Doctrine of true Religion and Righteouſneſs, and as a Prophetic-typical Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. Of the Types of it, the Political-hiſtorical, the Promiſſory, the Perſonal-hiſtorical, the Characteriſtical and the Ceremonial.*

SECTION I.

Of the Nature and Origin of the Religion of Saving Grace, which is here conſidered as initially introduc'd.

I. THE Law of Nature had from the beginning of the World and antecedently to the times of Chriſtianity theſe two Concomitants, *the initial Religion of Saving Grace* and *the Religion* of *initial or conſummate Judaiſm*, which we will conjoin in conſideration, beginning with *the initial Religion of Saving Grace*. Grace that is the Name of the Chriſtian Religion, is a term of common Language and of ambiguous Sence. Primarily it ſignifieth Amiableneſs, Gracefulneſs, Ornamentalneſs. As *Jam.* 1. 11. *The grace of the faſhion of it periſheth.* So *Prov.* 1. 9. and 3. 22. and 4. 9. and 22. 11. *Pſal.* 45. 3. Hence the graceful quality of Gratitude is called Grace. (*f*) *Gratiam habemus animo & voluntate.* And hence the Divine Virtues that are of Kind beyond common Nature and the oppoſites to Sin and Vice, are uſually amongſt Chriſtians called *Grace* and *Graces*. Theſe are Divine Grace but far from being the whole of that *Divine Grace*, which the diſtinctive Name of the Chriſtian Religion denoteth. The ſenſe whereof may be thus illuſtrated.

(1.) In a large and lax acceptation *Grace* is the ſame with Favour and Kindneſs; for this (with the effect of it) is uſually called Grace, (*g*) as when one is ſaid *habere gratiam regis*, to have the King's Favour. *God gave Joſeph Grace in the ſight of the keeper of the Priſon*, ſo it is in the Hebrew, *Gen.* 39. 21. But in our Tranſlation it is, *God gave him Favour in the ſight of the keeper of the Priſon.* The wiſe Man's ſaying, *God giveth Grace to the lowly*, Interpreters thus expound. (*h*) *He giveth him favour amongſt Men and maketh them gracious to him.* Grace is the ſame with Favour, Kindneſs (Benevolence) in thoſe uſual Scripture-phraſes of *finding Grace*, *obtaining Grace*, *giving Grace* in the Eyes of others; in Holy Mens Prayers that God would be *Gracious*, and in their thankful Acknowledgments, that God hath dealt Graciouſly with them. In profane Writers Grace is of the ſame Notion. (*i*) *Law and Juſtice we are born to uſe towards Men only* (ſaith *Plutarch*) εὐεργεσίας δὲ ϗ χάριτας, *but Beneficences and Graces we muſt exerciſe even towards Brute Animals. Epicurus* by denying Providence is ſaid (*k*) to bereave the Deity of all Grace. Of a rigorous Law-courſe that excludeth Favour and Kindneſs. *Cicero* ſaith (*l*) *it excludeth Grace.* (*m*) The Kindneſs which a Benefactor beginneth, and a Beneficiary returneth, is called Grace. To them that ask, what is the Principle of the Creation (the Cauſe of making the World?) The anſwer is in (*n*) *Philo*'s Language, ὅτι ἀγαθότης ϗ χάρις τȣ͂ θεȣ͂, *the Goodneſs and Grace of God.* That Exclamation in the Prophet *Zechariah*, *Grace, Grace unto it*, is thus expounded by *Vatablus*, *multus favor Dei & hominum.*

(2.) In a narrower Acceptation *gratuitous* Favour and Kindneſs only (that which is Free and not due Debt) is Grace. (*o*) Χάρις, *Grace*, is by *Ariſtotle* reckon'd amongſt the Paſſions of the Mind (as Mercy is alſo, to which Grace is near of Kin) and according to this Philoſopher it denoteth *ſuch Favour towards an indigent Perſon, as to do him a kindneſs, to gratifie him.* He ſeemeth by *Grace* to underſtand gratuitous and free Favour (that is not due Debt) agreeably to the Apoſtle, who counteth a Benefit that is Debt repugnant to Grace. *Rom.* 4. 4. So far therefore as the Human Merits imply *Debt*, ſo far they imply a repugnance to Grace; and ſo far Grace is Favour and Kindneſs unmerited and to the undeſerving. As it is Favour and Kindneſs, it is oppoſite to Wrath; and as it is Free and Gratuitous, it is oppoſite to what is *Law-juſtice*; for what is matter of Law and Juſtice is Debt, not Grace. In a Kingdom ſuch Benefits as a Man hath by the Grace of the Sovereign, he hath not originally by Law-juſtice, and ſuch Grace of the Sovereign reſembleth Divine Grace. (*p*) *Hoc eſt enim proprium numinum, liberales venias & conceſſiones habere gratuitas.* An Act of Pardon is ſo eximious an Act of Grace, that a Father appropriateth the Name to it, (*q*) *Grace is not done, but where offence is.* The Fathers ſo far follow the Apoſtle, they look upon *Grace as eſſentially Gratuitous*, and therefore ſay (*r*) *that which is Debt is not Grace; for Grace is given, Debt is pay'd, Grace therefore is given to the unworthy.* But although thus far they follow the Apoſtle, yet ſome-

(f) *Martin. Lex. in voce Gratia.*

(g) *J. Driedo de Grat. & lib. arb. l. 1. c. 2.*

(h) *Dabit gratiam*, i. e. *illis apud homines gratiam conciliet. Efficiet ut homines eis faveant atque benefaciant: Seu reddet eos gratioſos. Sic accipitur iſta phraſis.* Exod. 3. 21. & 11. 3. & 12. 36. *Hinc* מצא חן *invenit gratiam*, Exod. 33. 12. *Et* נשא חן *gratiam tulit.* Eſth. 2. 15, 17. *Et* נתן חן *dedit gratiam*, Exod. 3. 21. & 12. 36. *Et* חן *gratia pro exiſtimatione*, Eccl. 9. 11. *Sic &* χάρις, Luc. 2. 52. *Et* κεχαριτωμένη *gratioſiſſimè habita.* Luc. 1. 28. Mercer. & Piſcat. in loc. Gatak. Cinn. c. 8.

(i) *Plutarch. in Caton. Major.*

(k) *Diis immortalibus opem & gratiam ſuſtulit. Si maximè talis eſt Deus, ut nullâ gratiâ nullâ hominum caritate teneatur, valeat.* Cic. de N. D. l. 1.

(l) *Via juris eſt quibuſdam in rebus, ut nihil ſit loci gratiæ.* Cic. Ep. l. 1. ad Qu. fratr. Ep. 2.

(m) *Beneficus eſt qui gratiam cœperit, debitor qui retulerit.* S. Ambroſ. in Luc. 6.

(n) *Philo de Alleg. l.* 2.

(o) *Voſſ. Inſtit. or. l.* 2. *c.* 9.

(p) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 7. *p.* 216.

(q) *Nec gratia enim fit niſi offenſæ.* Tertull. c. Marcion. l. 5. c. 5.

(r) *Si debitum eſt, gratia non eſt: Gratia quippe donatur, debitum redditur. Gratia ergo donatur indignis.* S. Aug. ap. Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. Par. 2. Antitheſ. 12.

times they ſpeak diſſonantly from his ſenſe of *Grace*, and ſymbolize with *Philo* in aſſigning the cauſe of the Creation. For S. *Hierom* ſaith, (*s*) *It was of the Grace of God, that Man was created.* S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (*t*) *Let us mind the Grace of God, not only that whereby he made us, but that whereby he re-made us.* S. *Auſtin* and the *African* Fathers alledge a reaſon, to juſtifie this account of the cauſe of the Creation, (*u*) *it may well be called Grace, becauſe it was gratuitous goodneſs, without the merits of any antecedent works.* But thus to argue, is to alledge a Scriptural reaſon for ſpeaking diſſonantly from the Holy Scriptures (for theſe Fathers rightly affirm againſt *Pelagius*, that the benefit of Creation is never called *Grace* either in the Old or New Teſtament) and it is to alledge an Apoſtolical reaſon for receding from the Apoſtle's Senſe. For common parental Nature and Providence (whence Man hath his Creation) is not *Grace* in the Apoſtle's Senſe.

(3.) In the ſtricteſt acceptation no other gratuitous Favour but ſuch as tranſcendeth the road and courſe of Nature (as well as Law) is *Grace*. (*c*) *Surmounting the line and level of Nature it belongeth to the Supernaturals, and theſe are the things that Grace denoteth.* So it ſignifieth in the Greek Fathers; as *Severianus* ſaith of the Euchariſt, that it doth χάριτι σώζειν ϗ ὐ φύσει, *ſave by Grace and not by Nature:* as our Liturgy ſaith of Baptiſm; *being by nature born in Sin and the Children of Wrath, we are hereby made the Children of Grace. Grant to this Child that thing which by nature he cannot have.* (*s*) The *Pelagians* were put to their ſhifts, when the Fathers clearly prov'd, that the Scripture doth not ſpeak *touching any natural Grace, but that which ſurmounteth the powers of nature:* ſuch as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaketh of, when he ſaith of Manna, ἤργει ἡ φύσις ϗ εἰργάζετο ἡ χάρις, *Nature was inactive, Grace operated.* The Grace of the New Teſtament (the Grace of Chriſt, the Grace of the Holy Spirit, the Grace of Regeneration or of the Chriſtian Sacraments involveth in it the Notion of Supernatural, as being (*t*) *that Grace whereby we are Chriſtians, of which the Evangeliſt ſaith, Grace and Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt. For that Grace which S.* Paul *commendeth, is not any Grace, whereby we are made Men or Rationals, but that whereby we are regenerate in Chriſt.* (*u*) The Schoolmen therefore, although they take Grace in ſo large an acceptation, that with them the benefits of Creation and Conſervation are ſaid to be of Grace, yet they ſay, *That Grace in the moſt proper acceptation ſignifieth thoſe Gifts and Benefits exhibited to us by Chriſt, that are beyond all that is owing to Nature.* They underſtand by Grace *donum gratuitum ſupernaturale*, a gratuitous ſupernatural Benefit, which they count Grace *in the more ſpecial acceptation properly Theological.* Grace in this acceptation they diſtribute into *Gratia gratum faciens*, whereby they mean *the Grace of Sanctification*; and *Gratia gratis data*, whereby they mean *the Gifts for Edification*, which are uſually contradiſtinguiſh'd to Saving Grace. But Saving Grace muſt not be confin'd to the Grace of Sanctification. The Goſpel-religion is the Religion of Grace (the Grace of God, the Word of his Grace, the Covenant of Grace, are the uſual Names of it) which *Grace* of it muſt be conſider'd, not only as contradiſtinct to Rigour, Severity and Wrath, to due Debt, and to Law-juſtice, and as involving in it the Notion of *Supernatural*, but as involving in it alſo the Notion of *Saving*; for the Grace of it is (*w*) *Salvans gratia*, Saving Grace, *Eph.* 2. 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 9. This therefore is the true Name of the Goſpel or the Chriſtian Religion, *The Religion of Saving Grace.* It is the Saving Grace of the Sovereign with the Effects of it. A Religion τεθηλυῖα χάριτι, *rich and flowring with Grace* (as *J. Mart.* ſpeaketh) which ſpeaketh it of ineffable Pulchritude and Precioſity. *Quid enim gratiæ nomine gratius? quid pulchrius? quid ſuavius?* The Name of the Chriſtian Religion is *as an Ointment poured forth.*

II. Grace is not only oppos'd to Nature, as *Supernatural* is oppos'd to *Natural*, but as θέσις, *poſitive Inſtitution*, is oppos'd to φύσις, *Nature*. For the ineſtimable benefits of the Chriſtian Religion that iſſue from Grace, iſſue alſo from poſitive Inſtitution. They iſſue from Grace, *Rom.* 4. 16. and 5. 17, 20, 21. *Eph.* 1. 7. and 2. 5. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 16. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Tit.* 3. 7. They iſſue alſo from poſitive Inſtitution, from *the ſole Will of God, his Purpoſe, Good Pleaſure and the Counſel of his Will*, Luk. 12. 32. Eph. 1. 5, 9, 11. Jam. 1. 18. The Notion of Grace therefore in the Senſe of the New Teſtament implieth in it *poſitive Inſtitution*; which ſheweth, that the Origin of this Religion of Saving Grace is from the *Divine Predeſtination* (the fore-deſignation of God) the Object or Matter whereof muſt be conſider'd both as *real* and as *perſonal*. The real Object of the Divine Predeſtination is the Chriſtian Religion, *as it is the Religion of Saving Grace.* For God foreſeeing the lapſe of Men and Angels was pleaſed from everlaſting (before the World or before Time) *to predeſtinate and foredeſign this Religion of Saving Grace, with deſign to chriſtianize and ſave Mankind.* This account we have from the Holy Scriptures of the *Divine Predeſtination*, which made no noiſe in the Church till the times of *Pelagius*, and in thoſe times (when it was hotly agitated) and ever ſince thoſe times it is *a perſonal Predeſtination*, that the Thoughts and Diſcourſes of Men have been buſied about, and little regard hath been had to the real Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion. But this Predeſtination is of high regard with the Holy Writers, their devout Minds contemplate the Predeſtination of the Saviour of the World, and derive the origin of his Saving Religion and of the mighty Priviledges and Felicities which his People enjoy, from the Divine Predeſtination. For of the Saviour of the World they affirm, 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. *Who verily was fore-ordain'd before the Foundation of the World. Apoc.* 13. 8. Saints and Chriſtians *were before the Foundation of the World written in the Book of Life of the Lamb ſlain*; which ſpeaketh them his Subjects and him the Imperial Head of them that are predeſtinated to Life Eternal. God in his Preſcience and Predeſtination eximiouſly *loved him before the Foundation of the World*, Joh. 17. 24.

(s) *Homo à principio conditionis ſuæ Deo utitur adjutore, cùm illius ſit gratia, quod creatus eſt.* T. 3. Ep. 139.

(t) *Attendamus gratiam Dei, non ſolum qua fecit nos, verum etiam qua refecit.* In Pſal. 144.

(u) *Meritò iſta gratia dici poteſt, quia non præcedentium aliquorum operum meritis, ſed gratuita Dei bonitate donata eſt.* S. Aug. Ep. 95.

(r) *Naturæ captum ac modum ſuperans, ad ea pertinet quæ ſupra naturam ſunt, & ſupernaturalia vocantur. Atque hæc propriè gratiæ vocabulo continentur.* Petav. T. 1. l. 10. c. 18. S. 5, 6.

(s) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 3. par. 2. Theſ.* 1. 5, 6.

(t) *Ea gratia qua Chriſtiani ſumus. Hæc nempe eſt gratia, de qua per omnem locum loquuti ſunt Apoſtolici viri, commendantes gratiam Chriſti, de qua Joannis primo, Gratia & veritas per Jeſum Chriſtum facta eſt. Neque enim Paulus talem gratiam commendat, qua creati ſumus, ut homines eſſemus, aut rationales, induſtrioſi in rebus hujus ſeculi, ſed illam qua renati ſumus in Chriſto exuentes veterem hominem.* J. Driedo de Gr. & lib. arb. l. 1. c. 2.

(u) *Vaſqu. in* 12æ. *T.* 2. *Diſp.* 185. *c.* 1. *Aquin.* 12æ. *Qu.* 111. *Art.* 1. *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 9. *Tr.* 7. *p.* 366. *Gr. de Valent. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 8. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1.

(w) S. Bernard. l. de Gr. & lib. arbitr.

17. 24. predeſtinated him to the Heavenly Kingdom-eſtate, *the Glory which he had with God before the World was*, Joh. 17. 5. and his Paſſion was by the Divine Predeſtination, *the determinate counſel and foreknowledge of God*, Act. 2. 23. and *ch.* 4. 28. The Jews ſay, (*x*) *The Name of the Meſſiah was prepar'd before the Sun*, and *that the World was created for the Meſſiah.* They ſuppoſe therefore, that the Meſſiah was predeſtinated before the World was. So the preaching of the Goſpel is call'd, *the Commandment of the everlaſting God*, Rom. 16. 26. to ſignifie, that it is no novel invention, but had its origin from the Counſel of his Will, and his Sovereign good pleaſure from everlaſting, and is *a Myſtery that from the beginning of the World was hid in God*, Eph. 3. 9. *Hid from Ages and Generations*, Col. 1. 26. Χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένον, *kept ſecret in the times of the Ages of the World*, Rom. 16. 25. and is nothing leſs than πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων, *the purpoſe before all Ages, which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord*, Eph. 3. 11. *who hath ſaved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our Works, but according to his own Purpoſe and Grace, which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus*, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, *before the times of the Ages of the World*, 2 Tim. 1. 9. The truly Divine Predeſtination therefore was not a dark plot for the ruine of the ſinful World, but a contrivance and deſign of Sovereign Grace for their recovery; which conſider'd them under no better a Character than as altogether undeſerving and ill deſerving, yet purpos'd and deſign'd for them from everlaſting the Religion of Saving Grace, and in ſuch ſenſe (*y*) *prædeſtinatio eſt gratiæ præparatio*, as a Father defineth it. If the Divine Predeſtination is rightly ſaid, to be the preparation of Grace, it muſt be thought the preparation of Glory, and the everlaſting Kingdom may be ſaid, to have been prepar'd for Chriſt's People before the Foundation of the World: but this is not our Saviour's Senſe, nor the Phraſe that he uſeth, when he ſpeaketh of the preparation of it, *Matth.* 25. 34. For he doth not ſay, that it was prepar'd for them *before*, but *from*, the Foundation of the World. Which words manifeſtly relate to the Creation, and ſignifie, that in the Creation and Fabrication of the Univerſe a Kingdom was prepar'd, to be inherited and inhabited by the Children and Heirs of of God. But this predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion was (incluſively and comprehenſively) a Predeſtination of the everlaſting Kingdom and conſequently of Life Eternal to Chriſt's People. Accordingly, we become Chriſtians *in hope of Eternal Life, which God that cannot lie promiſed* (ἐπηγγείλατο, *hath made a promiſe of*) πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, *before the times of the Ages of the World*, or before the World began. *But hath in due time manifeſted his Word through preaching*, Tit. 1. 2, 3. In which words of the Apoſtle the word ἐπηγγείλατο, *hath made a promiſe of*, is of a twofold meaning and acceptation. In one ſenſe (the uſual ſenſe of Speech) God did not make a promiſe of Eternal Life before the World began; for then no word was ſpoken, nor was there any exiſtent, to whom a promiſe could be made. Yet then in his predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion God made Eternal Life *his Promiſe*, the great and eminent promiſe of his Goſpel, and in ſuch ſenſe made a promiſe of it. He then promis'd it, ſo as to make it the great *promittendum*, and now in due time *he hath manifeſted his word of promiſe.* By the predeſtination of his Goſpel he hath predeſtinated Chriſt's Believers to be *the People of God holy and beloved, the Children of God and the Heirs of his Inheritance.* Whence the Apoſtle ſaith; *He hath choſen us in him before the Foundation of the World: having predeſtinated us unto the adoption of Children by Jeſus Chriſt, in whom we have obtained an Inheritance, being predeſtinated according to the purpoſe of him, who worketh all things after the counſel of his own Will.* They are therefore *elect according to the foreknowledge of God* (his Predeſtination or Predetermination) a choſen Generation.

(x) Grot. Not. in Joh. 17. 5. & in Heb. 1. 2.

(y) S. Aug. de Prædeſtin. Sanct. c. 10.

Eph. 1. 4, 5, 11.

1 Pet. 1. 2.

III. Much of a perſonal Predeſtination therefore is compris'd in the real Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion. For by virtue thereof the faithful in Chriſt Jeſus are predeſtinated to their Immunities and Priviledges (their Juſtification, Adoption and right to the Inheritance) and are in the ſtate of Salvation and Election (they are the elect or choſen People of God) Hypocrites and Unbelievers are predeſtinated to be depriv'd of thoſe Immunities and Priviledges, and to be ſubjected to the contrary Penalties, and are in the ſtate of Condemnation and Reprobation, that ſtate of Reprobation which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Know ye not your own ſelves, how that Chriſt Jeſus is in you, except ye be Reprobates?* The conditionate predeſtination of ſome Perſons in particular to Eternal Happineſs, and of others to Eternal Miſery, is nothing elſe but the predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion complicated with the Divine Preſcience. Such is the Predeſtination which our Saviour ſpeaketh of according to S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Fxpoſition of his words: *Come ye bleſſed Children of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the World.* (*z*) *For before you were born, becauſe I knew, that you would be ſuch, theſe things were prepared for you by me.* (*a*) *Thoſe whom he foreknew, that they would be devout to him, thoſe he elected to receive the promis'd rewards.* If the predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion is a Decree, to beſtow Eternal Happineſs upon all true Chriſtians (as ſuch) and if the Divine Preſcience diſcerneth, that certain particular Perſons in ſucceſſive Generations will become true Chriſtians, the Divine Underſtanding muſt neceſſarily diſcern, that by the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion Eternal Happineſs is ſufficiently decreed to thoſe particular Perſons: therefore it cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, that any ſpecial or particular Decree is made, to beſtow Eternal Happineſs upon thoſe particular perſons as foreſeen true Chriſtians; but it muſt be ſuppos'd, that their conditionate predeſtination or election to Eternal Happineſs is only the predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion complicated with the Divine Preſcience. Of the ſame nature is the conditionate predeſtination of ſome particular perſons to the ſtate of Righteouſneſs, Adoption, Election (the ſaving Priviledges of the Chriſtian Religion) and the conditionate predeſtination of others to the contrary condition and to Eternal Miſery. From whence it followeth, that this conditionate predeſtination of particular perſons (which is ſaid to be the only predeſtination of particular perſons (*b*) acknowledg'd by the ancient Writers of the Church before S. *Auſtin*'s time) ought not to be deny'd and exploded; and that it is not liable to thoſe Objections, which ſome have rais'd againſt it, (*c*) *that it taketh away Humane Liberty and introduceth Fatal Neceſſity* (that none can paſs out of the number of thoſe that are to be damned, into

(z) S. Chryſoſt. in Gen. Hom. 51.

(a) S. Ambroſ. Com. in Rom. 8.

(b) Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 6. Theſ. 16.

(c) Curcell. Inſtit. l. 6. c. 7.

the number of thoſe that are to be ſaved, or the contrary;) for the conditionate predeſtination of particular perſons is nothing elſe but the predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion complicated with the Divine Preſcience.

But beſides this Real Predeſtination and the Perſonal Predeſtination which it compriſeth, we muſt contemplate the *Perſonal Predeſtination* ſtrictly ſo called, which is a Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion, and which differeth as much from the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion, as the giving Men unto Chriſt differeth from the giving Chriſt unto Men. For as the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion implyeth a deſign of chriſtianizing and ſaving Mankind: ſo it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that in proſecution of this deſign *many are abſolutely predeſtinated to the Chriſtian Religion*, or (which is the ſame thing) *that ſuch aids of Grace are abſolutely predeſtinated unto many, to chriſtianize them truly and ſavingly, as God foreſaw would be effectual.* The Divine Predeſtination thus ſtated hath nothing in it of contrariety to thoſe grand Maxims of Chriſtianity, which were counted indiſputable in the eldertimes of the Church, (*d*) *that God will have all Men to be ſaved* (ſo far as is fit for him to will it) *and that Chriſt gave himſelf a ranſom for all.* But to theſe grand Maxims there is a grand Repugnance in S. *Auſtin*'s Hypotheſis of Predeſtination, as it is repreſented in his own Writings. For he ſuppoſeth, (*e*) that by the fall of *Adam* Mankind are become a Maſs of Perdition, which God foreſeeing from everlaſting out of meer Mercy ſegregated ſome out of that Maſs, whom he determin'd to ſave, and to afford them ſuch aids of Grace, as ſhould effectually ſave them, leaving all the reſt in the Maſs of Perdition. *Theſe he calleth the Reprobates and the former the Elect.* His Hypotheſis as to the main of it did prevail in the Church becauſe of his great Authority: but his great followers in the Pelagian Controverſie mitigated the harſhneſs of it (acknowledging without tergiverſation or any perverſe mincing the matter the general good-will of God to Mankind, and that Chriſt's Blood was the redemption of the whole World) thus they repreſent his Hypotheſis otherwiſe than it ſeemeth to be repreſented in his own Writings, *that God deſigning to ſave fallen Mankind,* (*f*) *abſolutely predeſtinated ſome to Eternal Life, contenting himſelf to bear a general good will to the reſt of Mankind, and to make ſuch neceſſary proviſion of Grace for them, that they might be ſaved, if they would, yet theſe univerſally periſh through their own fault.* All that have a due reſpect for the many venerable and holy Perſons, that have entertain'd this Hypotheſis, will be eaſily perſuaded, that it is an Hypotheſis, which hath ſomething of conſiderable truth in it. And it will appear to be ſuch, if we conſider, that there are four Branches of the Divine Predeſtination, that are of great certainty and firmitude.

(d) *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 7. *par.* 1. *Theſ.* 2. *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 10. *c.* 4, 5. & *T.*4. *l.* 13. *c.* 1, &c.

(e) *Ibid. c.* 5.

(f) *Ibid. c.* 13.

IV. This firſt Branch of Divine Predeſtination is of great certainty; *it is abſolutely predetermin'd* (or predeſtinated) *that Chriſt ſhould have a Church*, as *Marcellus* ſaith, (*g*) τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν πάλαι προωρίσατο ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός, *Almighty God predeſtinated the Church of Old.* The Predictions in Scripture touching the Seed of *Abraham* according to the Fleſh do not only declare the Divine Preſcience, but they are an abſolute Decree and Determination, that he ſhould have a numerous Progeny according to the Fleſh. There was therefore an abſolute Decree and Determination, that he ſhould be the Father of many Nations, and have a numerous Progeny according to the Spirit, and *that in his Seed all the Nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed*, that Chriſt's coming ſhould not be fruſtaneous, but *that he ſhould ſee of the travel of his Soul and be ſatisfied*; *that a Seed ſhould ſerve him*; *that the utmoſt ends of the Earth ſhould be given him for his Poſſeſſion*; *that he ſhould have dominion from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the Ends of the Earth*; *that the Rod of his Strength ſhould be ſent out of* Sion, *and he ſhould rule in the midſt of his Enemies*, *that Dominion and Glory and a Kingdom ſhould be given him, and that all People, Nations and Languages ſhould ſerve him.* If theſe Divine Predictions are *a declaring the Decree*, Pſal. 2. 7. the Exiſtence of the Chriſtian Church is abſolutely decreed and determined and in ſuch ſenſe predeſtinated. (*h*) And if a Divine Fate muſt be acknowledg'd in the erection of Mundane Empires and Monarchies, ſhall not a Divine Fate (or Decree) be ſuppos'd in the erection of the Chriſtian Empire, which is ſaid *to be ſet up by the God of Heaven?* Dan. 2. 44. (*i*) *certainly thoſe Chriſtians eſpecially of the firſt times becauſe of the ſudden and eximious Energy of the Spirit may be ſaid, to have been* (*as it were*) *drawn by force, which* Origen *alſo affirmeth of ſome of his own time. Beſides that eminent Inſtance of S.* Paul *ſome other Inſtances may be given from the Martyrology; as of two Mimicks, the one under* Dioclesian, *the other under* Julian, *who imitating the Chriſtian Myſteries by way of mockery, were on a ſudden chang'd and profeſs'd themſelves Chriſtians.* The miraculous Converſions that were in the primitive times, the miraculous Gifts that the Church was then filled with, the irreſiſtible Wiſdom and Power of Speech and invincible Fortitude which the Planters of Chriſtianity were then furniſh'd with, the mighty difficulties which Chriſtianity grappled with and vanquiſh'd at its firſt riſing, the marvellous ſucceſs of the Goſpel and the means of effecting it, are a manifeſt demonſtration, that it was the Decree of Heaven, that the Chriſtian Empire ſhould be erected notwithſtanding all Oppoſition. Nor can it reaſonably be doubted, but that the conſervation, propagation and continuance of the Chriſtian Church is abſolutely decreed; *for the Gates of Hades ſhall not prevail againſt it.* And what rational Man can believe, that God did predeſtinate his Son, to be the great Shepherd, the heavenly Bridegroom, the holy imperial Head, yet did not predeſtinate him any Sheep, not any Flock, not any Spouſe, not any Body, not a Church which *is his fulneſs* (as conſtituting him whole and intire in his relative and political Capacity)? *Eph.* 1. 23. This abſolute Predeſtination of the Church (which neceſſarily conſiſteth of true Chriſtians) plainly inferreth the abſolute Predeſtination of ſome perſons in ſome parts of the World to true and ſaving Chriſtianity, which is commonly called *Predeſtination to Grace.*

(g) *Ibid. l.* 11. *c.* 13.

(h) Dr. *Jackſon of the Divine Eſſ. and Attr. par.* 2. *c.* 25.

(i) *Certè illi, præcipuè primorum temporum Chriſtiani, ob vim ſubitam atque eximiam Spiritus dici poſſunt quaſi vi pertracti: quod & de quibuſdam ſui ævi affirmat Origenes. Exempla, præter illud Pauli nobile, dari poſſunt ex Martyrologio nonnulla, ut de Mimis duobus qui, cum Chriſtiana myſteria per ludibrium imitarentur, ſub Diocletiano alter, alter verò ſub Juliano, ſubitò mutati ac Chriſtianos ſe profeſſi ſunt.* Grot. Not. in Luk. 14. 23.

V. This ſecond Branch of Divine Predeſtination is of great certainty, *The abſolute Predeſtination of the Gentiles to the Chriſtian Religion and to be the genuine People or Church of God.* For the Predeſtination which the Apoſtle hath reſpect to in his *Ninth* to the *Romans*, is not meerly the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion (as many learned Men ſuppoſe) but is alſo the Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion. As appeareth,

(1.) From the Types which he alledgeth, to ſhew, that God had not caſt off *Abraham's* Seed (having promis'd to be a God to him and his Seed) *for they are not all* Iſrael *that are of* Iſrael*: Neither becauſe they are the Seed of* Abraham, *are they all Children: But in* Iſaac *ſhall thy Seed be called. That is, they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promiſe are counted for the Seed. For this is the word of Promiſe, at this time will I come, and* Sara *ſhall have a Son.* The Queſtion which the Apoſtle debateth with the Jews is, who are the Holy Seed, the *Iſrael* of God? Is it thoſe that are of Natural, or thoſe that are of Supernatural Generation? This Queſtion is eaſily reſolv'd from the Type; for *Iſhmael* who was of Natural Generation was rejected, and God would have *Iſaac*, who was of Supernatural Generation, to be the only Seed. Therefore thoſe in the Antitype that are of Supernatural Generation, are the Seed and the only Seed *according to the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion*, which confineth the Seed of God to regenerate Chriſtians, and rejecteth the carnal Jews that are the Seed of *Abraham* by natural Generation. But the word of Promiſe which the Apoſtle citeth, expreſſeth alſo a Divine Predeſtination and purpoſe of raiſing up that Seed of *Abraham* of Supernatural Generation, which was the Type; therefore it implieth a Divine Predeſtination and purpoſe of raiſing up that Seed of *Abraham* of Supernatural Generation, which is the Anti-type; *which is the Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion.*

Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8, 9.

(2.) From a Second Type which the Apoſtle alledgeth. *And not only this, but when* Rebecca *alſo had conceiv'd by one, even by our Father* Iſaac *(for the Children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand, not of works, but of him that calleth) it was ſaid unto her, the elder ſhall ſerve the younger. As it is written,* Jacob *have I loved, but* Eſau *have I hated.* A great Myſtery there is (as *Philo* obſerveth) in the diſcrimination of theſe Twins (*Jacob* and *Eſau*) that were not differenc'd in their Geniture (*Rebecca* conceiv'd by one) nor could they be differenced by any Works that they did in the Womb; yet at that time while they were in the Womb, the Divine Oracle pronounc'd, that the Elder ſhould be of vile, the Younger of eximious condition, the Younger was the favourite, the Elder was comparatively and typically hated. Which diſcrimination of them muſt be wholly attributed to *the purpoſe of God according to Election* (free choice and diſpoſal) and it was made with deſign, that *the purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand* (declaratively) as it is a purpoſe touching the Priviledges of the State of Salvation, that they ſhall be, *not of works, but of him that calleth*, that is, (*k*) who doth Men the free Favour to bring them by way of calling to the Priviledges of the State of Salvation, which he hath freely provided for them. *He that calleth, is he, who doth Men the free Favour, to provide for them the Priviledges of the State of Salvation in the Chriſtian Religion, and doth them the free Favour alſo, to bring them by way of calling unto the Chriſtian Religion.* If the diſcrimination of *Jacob* and *Eſau* was made with deſign, that the purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand (declaratively) *not of works, but of him that calleth*, then it was made with deſign, to typifie that Rejection of the Elder Family of Religioniſts, and that choice of the Younger Family of Religioniſts, which is involv'd both *in the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion, and in the Predeſtination of perſons to the Chriſtian Religion.* For in the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion there is a Rejection of the unbelieving Jews (notwithſtanding their Works) and a choice of the believing Gentiles. And the Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion is a Predeſtination or purpoſe, effectually to call and convert the Gentiles (together with a remnant of the Jews) to be truly Chriſtian Believers, the main body of the Jews being hardned in their Infidelity. To this Predeſtination (and not only to the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion) the Apoſtle hath reſpect, when he aſſerteth, that the Priviledges of the State of Salvation are *of him that calleth*, and when he ſtileth the Chriſtians *the called* (v. 24.) he meaneth to aſſert, that God was at liberty (*l*) *to receive Gentiles as well as Jews, nay to call Gentiles and reject the Jews.*

V. 10, 11, 12, 13.

(3.) From the Apoſtle's Argumentation, *v.* 14, 15. If God doth ſo (call the Gentiles and reject the Jews) *ſhall we ſay, that there is Unrighteouſneſs with God? God forbid. For he ſaith to* Moſes, *I will have Mercy, on whom I will have Mercy; and I will have Compaſſion, on whom I will have Compaſſion.* Unaccountably to Man God is at liberty to make a diſcrimination of Perſons, to ſhew Mercy to ſome, and to deny it to others; which ſhewing Mercy (in the Apoſtle's ſenſe) relateth not only to the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion, but to the Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion, as ſome (that are no Friends to an extravagant Predeſtination) do acknowlege, who diſtinguiſh between the *ordinary* and *extraordinary* Mercy of God; and of this they ſay (*m*) *hereby God calleth and impelleth to Repentance Men that are immers'd in their Sins by ſome ſingular way; which ſort of Mercy was ſhew'd unto* Paul. *To this ſort of Mercy thoſe words of God have reſpect, I will have Mercy, on whom I will have Mercy.* Such (in part) is the Apoſtle's ſenſe of this Moſaic Maxim, as appeareth from the Sequel of his Diſcourſe, wherein *ſhewing Mercy* to ſome is confronted and oppos'd to the *hardning* others. And in the Verſe next following the Apoſtle inferreth from his Moſaic Maxim, that the Buſineſs in hand (which is the obtaining the Priviledges of Salvation) *is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth*, ſo that he muſt have it (for then the Jew muſt neceſſarily have it:) *But it is of God that ſheweth Mercy*, on whom he will ſhew Mercy, whence the Gentiles have it, on whom God ſheweth Mercy (both in making the Chriſtian Religion and in bringing them to the Chriſtian Religion) and the Jews have it not, with whom God dealeth otherwiſe than in the way of ſhewing Mercy. *V.* 16, 17, 18. *So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth Mercy. For the Scripture ſaith unto* Pharaoh, *even for this ſame purpoſe have I raiſed thee up, that I might ſhew my Power in thee, and that my Name might be declared throughout all the Earth. Therefore hath he Mercy, on whom he will have Mercy, and whom he will, he hardneth.* To what purpoſe is this diſcourſe of *hardning*, if the Apoſtle hath not reſpect to converting Grace?

(k) See Dr. Hammond Not. on Matth. 20. 16.

(l) Dr. Ham. Paraphr. on v. 13.

(m) Crell. de Deo & ejus Attr. c. 20. col. 308.

If this is not (in part) that ſhewing Mercy which he meaneth? (n) *Emollit quos vult ob cauſas ſibi cognitas.* (o) So the *obtaining Mercy*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. ſignifieth an obtaining both the prevenient and ſubſequent Mercy, both the Mercy of being pardon'd upon Converſion, and the Mercy of being converted, whereas God blindeth and hardneth many others in their Sins. God hardned *Pharaoh*, as the Apoſtle proveth from Scripture, yet not from any Text that expreſly ſaith ſo, but from this general account of him; *that God rais'd him for this purpoſe, to ſhew his Power in him*, according to the Hiſtory of *Pharaoh*, to which the Apoſtle referreth, and to whom the Jews were a Parallel. The ſenſe of the Apoſtle touching the hardning of *Pharaoh* (and conſequently of the Jews) muſt be expounded from the Hiſtory, in which there is not the leaſt Indication, that *Pharaoh* was created, to be a Veſſel of Wrath. But in the Text which the Apoſtle citeth, *Exod.* 9. 16. the Hebrew word is העמדתיך, which ſignifieth (p) *I have made thee to ſtand, conſtituted or ſet thee.* Agreeably whereto the word ἐξήγειρα, which the Apoſtle uſeth, hath been rendred by ſeveral Learned Men (q) κατέστησα, *poſui te*; and ἐγείρειν τρόπαιον, is rendred by the Lexicographers, *ſtatuere trophæum.* So that the ſenſe of the Text is, *I have conſtituted, ſet thee, or ſet thee up* (as a Mark or Butt of the Arrows of the Almighty) *for this purpoſe that I might ſhew my Power in thee. Pharaoh* becauſe of his enormous Wickedneſs was conſtituted (that is, appointed) to be an Example of Divine Severity.

(4.) From the ſaucy rejoinder which the Apoſtle mentioneth, *v.* 19. *Thou wilt ſay unto me, why doth he yet find fault? For who hath reſiſted his Will?* The ſenſe of which reply is thus well expounded. (r) *Si Deus non vult ſanare niſi per fidem, & fidem nobis non dat, cur nos accuſamur?* If God will not ſave but by Faith, and doth not give us Faith, why is the Fault charg'd upon us? The Apoſtle's ſenſe alſo clearly appeareth in his Anſwer hereto, *V.* 20, 21. *Shall the thing form'd ſay to him that form'd it, why haſt thou made me thus? Hath not the Potter power over the Clay, of the ſame lump to make one Veſſel unto Honour and another unto Diſhonour?* (s) *God may make a Veſſel to both theſe uſes partly in a general way, and partly in a ſpecial way. In a general way, by preſcribing ſuch a mode of Religion as pleaſeth him, which whoſo followeth, ſhall obtain the Reward, and who ſo followeth it not, ſhall incur the Puniſhment. In a ſpecial way God may do it; for of ſeveral that have equally deſerved Puniſhment, God may have Mercy upon one as he pleaſeth, and may harden and puniſh another.* God in his new Creation of the ſame Maſs (degenerate Humane Nature) may make one Veſſel unto honour and another unto diſhonour by his predeſtinating and preſcribing the Chriſtian Religion, whereby they that embrace Chriſtianity are made Veſſels unto Honour, and they that reject Chriſtianity are made Veſſels unto Diſhonour. And God may convert one Sinner to the Chriſtian Religion, and harden another (no greater a Sinner than the other) in his Infidelity; and ſo of the ſame Maſs may make one Veſſel unto Honour and another unto Diſhonour. Hence a Synod forbiddeth (t) *force and violence to be done to any, to conſtrain them to embrace the Chriſtian Faith; becauſe God hath Mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardneth.*

(5.) When the Apoſtle writ his *Ninth* to the *Romans*, the Jews (as to the main of them) were none of God's People, the Gentiles had the Priviledges of God's People. The Jews were hardned in their Infidelity, the Gentiles were effectually called and converted to Chriſtianity. The Jews were in this wretched Condition notwithſtanding their carnal Deſcent and Works of the Law; the Gentiles were in this happy Condition notwithſtanding their former Idolatries and alienation from God, according to thoſe Prophecies which the Apoſtle citeth, and applieth to his own purpoſe, *V.* 25, 26. *I will call them my People, which were not my People, and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it ſhall come to paſs, that in the place where it was ſaid unto them, ye are not my People, there ſhall they be called the Children of the living God.* Theſe Prophecies and ſuch more (*the Children of the deſolate ſhall be more than of the married Wife*) do not plainly expreſs the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion, but they plainly predict the effectual calling of the Gentiles to the Religion and happy Condition of Chriſtians, and conſequently they expreſs very plainly a Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion. The Apoſtle's Diſcourſe ſo clearly relateth to the calling and converſion of the Gentiles, that ſome of no ſmall inſight into matters of Theology ſay of it (u) the *Apoſtle purpoſely writeth of only Vocation to the Goſpel and the Faith and Grace of Chriſt: Election to Glory hath no place in the diſputation, ſave only conſequentially and by accident.* They that thus underſtand the Apoſtle, are far from ſuppoſing, that his Diſcourſe relateth to no other Predeſtination but that of the Chriſtian Religion.

VI. The abſolute Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion inferreth the certainty of a *Third* Branch of the Divine Predeſtinaon; *that ſome are abſolutely predeſtinated to be Chriſt's Sheep, and are ſuch as are given him by the Father.* Our Saviour uſually calleth his People *thoſe whom the Father hath given him*; which Phraſe is in his Mouth an Expreſſion of Duty, Gratitude and Dependence, and is a due honouring God; for it is an acknowledgment, that he hath all his People by his Father's Gift. As the Apoſtle introduceth him thus Saying, *Heb.* 2. 13. *I and the Children which God hath given me.* As God actually giveth Children to Men to the World's end in the courſe of Nature and of Providence, and hath Decreed ſo to give them: So God actually giveth a People to Chriſt to the World's end in the Oeconomy of Grace, and hath Decreed ſo to give them. But becauſe thoſe whom God hath thus Decreed, to give unto Chriſt, are uſually imbu'd with a Preparatory Diſpoſition, before they are actually given to him; it is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh *three Degrees*, in which Men may be ſaid to be given to Chriſt. For they are given to him in the degree of *actual Donation*, in the degree of *Preparatory Diſpoſition only*, and *in Decreto only*. For as the Grace which is only predeſtinated to us, is ſaid *to be given us*, 2 Tim. 1. 9. So they that are only predeſtinated to the Chriſtian Religion, muſt be ſaid, *to be given to Chriſt*. So the Heathen were ſometime given for his Inheritance *in Decreto* only. Thoſe that are given to him in *Preparatory Diſpoſition*, are (antecedently to their

(n) *Grot. Not. in v.* 18.

(o) *Idem Not. in Luc.* 23. 34.

(p) *See Ainſworth in loc.*

(q) *See Pool's Synopſ. in loc.*

(r) *Grot. Not. in loc.*

(s) *Crell. ſupr. c.* 23. *col.* 175, 176.

(t) *Præcipit ſancta ſynodus, nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre; cui enim vult Deus miſeretur, & quem vult indurat.* Concil. Tolet. 4.

(u) *De ſolâ vocatione ad Evangelium, Chriſtique fidem & gratiam propoſitum eſt Apoſtolo ſcribere. Electio verò ad gloriam nonniſi conſequenter & ex accidenti locum habet in illa diſputatione.* Petav. T. 1. l. 10. c. 1.

their Converſion) called *his People*, Act. 18. 10. And our Saviour acquainteth us, that there are in the World, thoſe that are *his Sheep*, that know his Voice, when they hear it and will follow him, and that the Jews did not Believe, becauſe they were not his Sheep. *Joh.* 10. 4, 26. Theſe Sheep muſt be ſuppos'd, to be thoſe (*w*) that are ἔυθετοι εἰς βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *fit, prepared or diſpoſed for the Kingdom of God.* Of whom the Evangeliſt ſpeaketh, *Act.* 13. 48. Καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, *and as many as were* rectè poſiti, *rightly diſpoſed or in a good poſture to eternal Life believ'd.* The word τεταγμένοι, properly ſignifieth *ordinated*, and ſometimes it cannot be otherwiſe rendred, as when *Plotinus* ſaith, (*x*) τοὺς δὲ κατ' ἄλλους δαίμονας τεταγμένους *thoſe that are ordinated* (rank'd, diſpos'd of, put into a good Poſture) *according to other Demons.* Moſt uſually the word ſignifieth in a Military Notion, as the Soldiers in their Ranks are called by *Ælian* τεταγμένοι, *ordinated, rightly ſet in a good Poſture.* The Evangeliſt therefore by thoſe that were *ordinated* to the Chriſtian Religion's Life eternal, may be underſtood, to mean *thoſe that were in a good Poſture thereto* (rectè poſiti) *their Minds and Diſpoſitions ſtanding right that way.* They that are thus well diſpos'd to Life eternal (as it is tendred in the Chriſtian Religion) are People ſo well minded and ſo well given, that they will come to Chriſt; and they are thoſe, to whom it is given of God, that they will come to Chriſt. *For no Man can come unto me* (ſaith our Saviour) *except it be given unto him of my Father.* Joh. 6. 65. They are ſuch as are given unto Chriſt therefore in *Preparatory Diſpoſition*, and of theſe our Saviour's words are neceſſarily meant, *Joh.* 6. 37. *All that the Father giveth me, ſhall* (or will) *come to me.* Of thoſe that are given to Chriſt in the degree of *actual* Donation our Saviour ſpeaketh. *Joh.* 17. 2, 6, 9. *I have manifeſted thy Name unto the Men which thou gaveſt me out of the World: Thine they were and thou gaveſt them me, and they have kept thy word. I pray not for the World, but for them which thou haſt given me. As thou haſt given him Power over all fleſh, that he ſhould give eternal Life to as many as thou haſt given him.* God imparted to our Saviour univerſal Dominion and Sovereignty, for this end, that he might be a Saviour finally and plenarily to as many as came unto him and were his Believers, while he was here on Earth, and by parity of Reaſon to as many as become his Believers in ſucceeding Ages. *For this is the Father's will which hath ſent me, that of all which he hath given me, I ſhould loſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up again at the laſt day.* Joh. 6. 39.

(w) *Grot. & Hammond. Not. in Joh.* 5. 37.

(x) *En.* 3. *l.* 5. *c.* 7.

VII. This *Fourth* Branch of Divine Predeſtination is of great certainty, *that Chriſt's People are in ſeveral reſpects the predeſtinated People.* For the Apoſtle to comfort the Chriſtians in his time under the heavy Preſſures and Afflictions which they endur'd upon account of their Religion, calleth them by ſeveral Names, which denote them, to be the People predeſtinated by God, and conſequently ſuch as God would own and take care of. (1.) They are *the called according to purpoſe*, Rom. 8. 28. whereby he doth not mean *thoſe that are called according to their good and ſincere purpoſe of Mind*; for this is to ſtile them ſuch as are called, not according to God's purpoſe but their own. This Expoſition is not tolerable Senſe, and is extremely alien from the Apoſtle's Senſe and Phraſe, who uſually in his Epiſtles deriveth the Chriſtians calling, and the Priviledges of the State of Salvation to which they are called, from the Divine Predeſtination, the Will and Counſel, the Grace and Purpoſe of God from everlaſting. His deſign in this place is to repreſent God as the Patron of the Chriſtians and of their Religion; therefore the Chriſtians ought to be repreſented *as the called according to* (his) *purpoſe*, and with theſe words the words following have an argumentative Connexion (which ſheweth the Senſe of them) having mention'd *the called according to purpoſe*, he addeth immediately *for whom he did foreknow*, (*y*) *ubi* προορισμὸν, *indicat idem eſſe ac* πρόθεσιν, which is an Indication, that Predeſtination and Purpoſe is the ſame. The purpoſe of God from everlaſting was, to raiſe up a Generation of true Chriſtians, which are the ſame with *the effectually called*, and theſe are *the called according to purpoſe.* (2.) They are thoſe whom God *did foreknow*, Rom. 8. 29. (*z*) πρόγνωσις & προορισμὸς, *Fore-knowledge and Predeſtination* are us'd in Scripture as Terms ſynonymous. When the Apoſtle therefore calleth Chriſt's People thoſe whom God *did foreknow*, his intention is to ſtile them the *predeſtinated* People, that are not meerly predeſtinated to exiſt, but to be *the elect People of God*; for ſo an Apoſtle ſtileth them *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father* (his Predetermination or Predeſtination) 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. So our Apoſtle ſaith of a remnant of the Jews, who were Chriſtian Believers, *Rom.* 11. 2. *God hath not caſt away his people which he foreknew.* (*a*) *Hoc quod ait, præſcivit, non rectè intelligitur, niſi prædeſtinavit.* Their being *foreknown* denoteth they that were predeſtinated, and that God foreknew Chriſt's People, ſo as to love them (with his ſpecial ſaving Love and Favour) and to acknowledge them for his People. (3.) They are *the predeſtinated to be of Chriſt-like condition*, and conſequently to bear the Croſs. *Rom.* 8. 29. *For whom he did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate, to be conformed to the Image of his Son.* This is one Branch of their Predeſtination (they are predeſtinated to Sufferings:) But it is marvellous, that any ſhould ſuppoſe, that they are look'd upon by the Apoſtle as *the predeſtinated*, only becauſe they are predeſtinated to Sufferings, and that God is ſaid, to call thoſe whom he predeſtinated, *only becauſe he called them to Sufferings.* This is not the Notion of *calling* them in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe, and of their being *called* according to his Purpoſe or Predeſtination: Nor is this the Notion of *calling* them that is uſual in the New Teſtament, or that calling them which is an eminent Branch of the Chriſtian Theology. What meaneth this turning out of the great Road of the New Teſtament into a little By-path, but that Men deſign to ſerve an Hypotheſis at any rate, Right or Wrong? Chriſt's People are called by God, to be Chriſt's People in purſuance of his Purpoſe or Predeſtination of ſaving them. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. They are *called to the Fellowſhip of his Son*, and thereby they become the Elect of God. 1 *Cor.* 1. 9. 2 *Pet.* 1. 10. *Rom.* 8. 31. Of theſe things the Apoſtle manifeſtly diſcourſeth, and not of their being called to Sufferings only. (4.) By the Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion they are predeſtinated to the State of Grace and of Glory. *Rom.* 8. 30. *Moreover, whom he did predeſtinate, them he alſo called: And whom he called, them he alſo juſtify'd: And whom he juſtify'd, them he alſo glorify'd.* So the Apoſtle deſcribeth

(y) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 9. *c.* 1. *S.* 4.

(z) *Grot. Not. in Act.* 2. 23. 1 *Pet.* 1. 2.

(a) *S. Aug. de dono perſeverant. c.* 18.

ſcribeth the Oeconomy of their Salvation like a Golden Chain conſiſting of ſeveral Links, the firſt Link being their Predeſtination like *Homer*'s Chain faſtned to *Jupiter*'s Seat. He diſcourſeth of the immenſe Kindneſs of God to the People of Chriſt, and of their immenſe Safety and Felicity upon account of it. He orderly enumerateth their immenſe Felicities, and having ſtiled them no leſs than three times *the predeſtinated People*, he ſubjoineth, that in purſuance of their Predeſtination they are *the called, juſtified, glorified*. Their Predeſtination which he ſpeaketh of, is not meerly *their Predeſtination to Sufferings*, but their Predeſtination ſimply and without addition ſo called, whereby they become Chriſt's People, and the ſuperlative Felicities and Priviledges of the State of Salvation accrue to them as Chriſt's People. Thus much of certainty therefore there is in S. *Auſtin*'s Hypotheſis of Predeſtination (as it is meliorated by his Followers) there is a Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion and a Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion. But we may not imitate them in calling theſe *the Elect* antecedently to their Faith; for we have no good Authority ſo to do. Nor is it certain, that there is an *abſolutum ſalvandi decretum*, that theſe are abſolutely and infallibly predeſtinated to Salvation, ſo that none of them ſhall totally and finally fall away, as S. *Auſtin* and his followers maintain. For without ſuppoſing any ſuch abſolute Decree of ſaving any men's Perſons or individual Natures as ſuch, it may be juſtly affirm'd of Chriſt's People in general, that they are *a People predeſtinated, called, juſtified, and ſuch as ſhall be glorified*. It ought not to be ſuppos'd, that the individual Natures of Men as ſuch without their Qualifications are conſtitutive either of the Elect of God or of Reprobates. S. *Auſtin* and his Followers ſpeak without Book, when they make an ill-natur'd diſtribution of Mankind into *Elect* and *Reprobate* meerly from God's abſolute Decree, becauſe they ſuppoſe, that God abſolutely predeſtinateth ſome to Salvation, and doth not vouchſafe the ſame Favour unto others. His great Followers make a great ſhew of great kindneſs to the Reprobates (as they call them) they ſuppoſe, that a proviſion of ſufficient Grace is made for them, that they may be ſaved, if they will: But if they are Reprobates, and all of them infallibly periſh, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that this Grace ſufficient to ſave Mankind, hath conſtantly and univerſally no better effect, than to aggravate their Condemnation, and that no Grace is ſaving to any Man without an abſolute Decree of ſaving him. They have ſo ſtated matters therefore in the Divine Decree, that as to the far greater part of Mankind not the leaſt good Effect and Benefit can be expected from the univerſal love of God towards them, their univerſal Redemption by Chriſt, and the ſufficient Grace that is afforded them, to what purpoſe then is all this waſt? Their Hypotheſis of the Divine Predeſtination is not without its Extravagances: But their Theorems were Sober and Modeſt, if compar'd with thoſe that were introduc'd into the Church in after-times, and which have prevail'd both in the Church of *Rome* and the reform'd Churches to a prodigious pitch of Extravagance, extremely injurious to Piety and the Souls of Men, and moſt reproachful to God and to the Chriſtian Religion. Which knoweth nothing certain touching this whole buſineſs of Divine Predeſtination, but that there is a Predeſtination of the Chriſtian Religion and a Predeſtination of Perſons to the Chriſtian Religion, which muſt not be thought inconſiſtent with a general love of God to Mankind, nor any fond unrighteous partiality (b) the Schools ſay, *pertinet ad perfectionem Univerſi.*

VIII. The Religion of *Saving Grace* (predeſtinated from everlaſting) is denominated *Saving*, to ſignifie, that it is *the Religion of making Sinners the Righteous in State and Condition, in Life and Practice.* The Names of it are (c) *Salvation, the Salvation of God, the Power of God unto Salvation, the Goſpel of our Salvation, the Grace of God that bringeth Salvation, ſo great Salvation, the common Salvation, the Doctrine of it is the word of Salvation, neither is there Salvation in any other.* (d) All that have duly entertain'd it, are ſtiled οἱ σωζόμενοι, *thoſe that are ſaved*, which implieth, that by their Religion they are in the State of Salvation. It is the Religion therefore of the State of Salvation (thereby Sinners paſs out of the State of Condemnation into the State of Salvation) which is the ſame thing with the State of the Righteous (for the State of Condemnation is the State of Sinners, and the State of Salvation is the State of the Righteous) upon this account therefore this Religion is the Saving Religion, becauſe it is to Sinners the State and Life of the Righteous. The Apoſtle argueth, that the Goſpel is *the Power of God unto Salvation, becauſe therein is the Righteouſneſs of God* (the State of Righteouſneſs of God's providing) *is reveal'd from Faith to Faith* (to Believers ſucceſſively) and he uſeth *Righteouſneſs* and *Salvation* as terms exegetical one of another. *Rom.* 10. 10. *With the heart Man believeth unto righteouſneſs, and with the mouth confeſſion is made unto Salvation.* As our Saviour ſaith, *he that believeth ſhall be ſaved*: So the Apoſtle ſaith (to the ſame Sence) *he that believeth ſhall be juſtified.* As the State of Salvation is the oppoſite to the State of Condemnation: So is the State of Righteouſneſs. 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. *If the miniſtration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the miniſtration of righteouſneſs exceed in glory.* The State of Righteouſneſs and of Salvation are one and the ſame State, the terms of Righteouſneſs and Salvation are ſynonymous, not only in ſeveral places of the Old, but of the New Teſtament. Baptiſm therefore ſaveth the Chriſtian Belivers, becauſe therein they are made the Righteous in State and Condition, in Nature and Practice. *They are waſhed, they are ſanctified, they are juſtified in the Name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God.* 1 Cor. 6. 11. *He ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt. That being juſtified by his Grace, we ſhould be made Heirs.* Tit. 3. 5, 7. (e) *We coming as to the beginnings of another Life, and being entred into the Paths of true Piety are juſtified not without the Favour of Chriſt. For by him the Father is Propitious to us. Now the Law-giver juſtifying us and freeing us from all Crime, and remitting to us the Puniſhment due to our Sins, and alſo inviſibly ſanctifying us by the Holy Spirit, and himſelf reforming us in a way known to himſelf into the newneſs of a temperate and duely*

1 Pet. 3. 21.

(b) Durand. l. 1. diſt. 4. Qu. 2.

(c) Act. 4. 12. and 13. 26. and 16. 17. and 28. 28. Rom. 1. 16. and 11. 11. Eph. 1. 13. Tit. 2. 11. Jude 3.

(d) Act. 2. 47. 1 Cor. 1. 18. 2 Cor. 2. 15. 2 Tim. 1. 9. Tit. 3. 5. Eph. 2. 5.

(c) Ὡς δὲ εἰς ἀρχὰς ἑτέρας ἥκοντες ζωῆς καὶ ταῖς τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας τρίβοις ἐμβεβηκότες, Χριστοῦ κατανεύοντος δικαιούμεθα. Δι' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἵλεως ὁ πατήρ. Δικαιοῦντος δὲ τοῦ νομοθέτου καὶ ἁπάσης ἡμᾶς ἀπαλλάττοντος γραφῆς, καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ ταῖς παραβάσεσιν ἀνιέντος δίκης, καὶ προσέτι νοητῶς ἁγιάζοντος διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ ἀναμορφοῦντος ἡμᾶς καθ' ὃν οἶδε τρόπον αὐτὸς εἰς καινότητα ζωῆς σωφρονός τε καὶ ἐπιεικοῦς τίς ὁ κατακρίνων ἔτι, ἢ καὶ ποῖος ἐν ἡμῖν ἔσται ῥύπος, οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιμι φράσαι. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 7. p. 248, 249.

moderate life, I cannot ſay, who there is yet to condemn us, or what filth will be in us. Such is the holy and happy condition of Regenerate Chriſtians, they are in ſtate and condition, in life and practice the Righteous, which is the ſtate of Salvation, the ſtate of Grace and of Life, the uncriminal, unpenal and uncondemnable State; they are ſav'd from the Domination of their deadly ghoſtly Enemies, from their deadly criminal and penal Evils, are in the ſtate of Favour and Alliance with God and of Citizenſhip in his Kingdom, and have a preſent right to the future poſſeſſion of perfect Bleſſedneſs, *which is all our Salvation and ſhould be all our deſire*, 2 Sam. 23. 5.

IX. The Religion of Saving Grace therefore is *the Religion of being juſtified by Grace and by Faith* (the Faith of God's Believers and Religioniſts that are not the Men of Nature who belong to the Law) *by Grace on God's part and by Faith on our part:* the one is *the duty-part*, the other is *the benefit-part* of this Saving Religion, and both have the Name of *Saving Grace*. Such is the Idea of this Saving Religion in S. *Paul's* Epiſtles, from whom the true Idea of it ought to be learned; for he alone of all the Holy Writers hath debated the neceſſity of Chriſtianity, and deduc'd it from its true grounds, whence the true nature and ſpecifick difference of it may beſt be underſtood. And although the term of *Juſtification* which he ordinarily uſeth, may ſeem obſcure and ambiguous (which accordingly hath occaſion'd many unhappy diſputes in the Church) yet when a Man is arriv'd at a certain notion of the matter, to which the Apoſtle applieth it, it plainly appeareth, that no other term could be ſo expreſſive of his Senſe, none ſo proper and accommodate for his purpoſe. For ſeeing the Chriſtian Religion is therefore the ſaving Religion, becauſe it is the Religion of making Sinners the Righteous, therefore to ſignifie, that it is *the ſaving Religion*, no Name can be ſo proper, as to call it *the Religion of juſtifying Sinners*, that is, of making them the Righteous. So the word ſignifieth in our Engliſh Tongue, and if we will allow ſuch a Latin word as *Juſtificare*, it muſt properly ſignifie *Juſtum facere* (as *Sanctificare* is *Sanctum facere*) the Greek word δικαιόω is of this ſignification, and the Hebrew word *Hitzdik* is commonly uſed in this Senſe throughout the Old Teſtament. No reaſonable doubt can be made therefore touching the meaning of the word *Juſtifying* in S. *Paul's* Epiſtles, it plainly ſignifieth, *to make Sinners the Righteous.*

But things and perſons may be ſaid to be juſtify'd (made Righteous or uncriminaliz'd) in various ſenſes, reſpects and degrees. The Hebrew Doctors ſay of one that perſuadeth many to Righteouſneſs, (f) *Juſtificat multos.* They ſay alſo, (g) *Juſtifica ſtateras exacte, Exquiſite juſtifica pondera*, make the Ballances and the Weights exactly juſt and faultleſs. *Celſus* thus ſcoffeth at Chriſtianity, (h) *after a long Age God hath bethought himſelf*, δικαιῶσαι τὸν ἀνθρώπων βίον, *to juſtifie* (make Righteous) *the life of Men.* Thus to juſtifie Things or Perſons, is to make them Righteous *intrinſecally:* but in the moſt uſual ſenſe the juſtifying Things or Perſons denoteth only the making them Righteous *extrinſecally, mentally, verbally, ſententially, or in treatment and uſage, demonſtratively* (by ſhewing their Righteouſneſs) or *creatively* by granting them the ſtate and condition of the Righteous. He that is Righteous in his own conceit, *mentally* juſtifieth himſelf. He that defendeth and vindicateth a Criminal, and the Judge that pronounceth Sentence in his favour, juſtifieth him *verbally* and *ſententially*. In *treatment* and *uſage* our Saviour was made a Sinner, and ſo a Criminal may be made Righteous, but God will not ſo juſtifie the Wicked, *Exod.* 23. 7. *Mentally, ſententially* and *in treatment* and *uſage* Judges ought, to juſtifie the Righteous, not the Wicked, *Deut.* 25. 1. *Prov.* 17. 15. So Wiſdom is juſtified of her Children, *Matth.* 11. 19. So the Publicans juſtify'd God, *Luk.* 7. 29. So a Man full of talk ſhall not be juſtified, *Job* 11. 2. So the Publican was juſtified rather than the Phariſee, *Luk.* 7. 29. So the doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified, *Rom.* 2. 13. and in ſuch Senſe *By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified*, Matth. 12. 37. The Apoſtle knew nothing by himſelf, but was not thereby authentickly juſtified without being *ſententially* juſtified by God, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. Our Saviour's Righteouſneſs was manifeſted and demonſtrated by the Spirit, whereby he was raiſed from the dead, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. whence he is ſaid to be (demonſtratively) juſtified by the Spirit, as the words ſhould be rendred, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. In ſuch ſenſe the Pſalmiſt ſaith of God, *Pſal.* 51. 4. *that thou mighteſt be juſtified* (manifeſted to be really Righteous) *when thou ſpeakeſt.* So he that undertaketh, to juſtifie what any Man ſaith or doth, undertaketh to demonſtrate (to make it appear) to be lawful and juſt. This Phraſe *Juſtifica teipſum* is called by *Buxtorf*, (i) *a proverbial ſpeech, whereby a Man is taught, firſt to free himſelf from blame, before he blameth others.* He that reproveth another, ought to manifeſt, that he is free from ſuch Criminality as rendreth him an unfit reprover, and in this ſenſe ought to juſtifie himſelf. Near of kin to this ſenſe is the Phariſees juſtifying themſelves (making themſelves Righteous) in ſhew and appearance before Men, *Luk.* 10. 29. and 16. 15. and *Jeruſalem* is ſaid to juſtifie *Samaria*, becauſe by her greater Wickedneſs ſhe made *Samaria* in compariſon appear juſt, *Ezek.* 16. 51. So Sinners may juſtifie themſelves before Men, but how is it poſſible, that God ſhould juſtifie them?

X. It is poſſible, that God may juſtifie them *intrinſecally*, by effectually perſuading them to Righteouſneſs, and by infuſing into their Natures Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. And it is poſſible, that God may juſtifie them *extrinſecally* in various Senſes; for he may account and judge and pronounce them the Righteous, and ſo juſtifie them *mentally* and *ſententially*. He may juſtifie them alſo in treatment and uſage and *demonſtratively* by manifeſting them, to be the Righteous. But it is impoſſible, that God ſhould do any of theſe *extrinſecally* juſtifying Acts towards them, or that he ſhould *intrinſecally* juſtifie them availably to their Juſtification without granting unto them the ſtate of Righteouſneſs, ſo making them the Righteous in ſtate and condition. For the making Ungodly Sinners the Righteous is a making them the Saints of God; and the being Saints is like the being Jews; for as all Jews, that are not *Jews native*, muſt be *Jews factive:* ſo all Saints that are not *Saints native*, muſt be *Saints factive*. As none can be *Jews factive*, unleſs the ſtate and condition of Jews be granted unto them: ſo none can be *Saints factive*, unleſs God granteth unto them the ſtate and condition of Saints. And as if the ſtate and condition of Jews is granted unto any, this Act is a creative-making

(f) *Buxt. Lex. Talm.* col. 667.

(g) *Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex.* 223.

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 4. p. 165.

(i) *Inſtit. Ep. Hebr.* p. 203.

them Jews (in ſuch ſenſe as Conſuls, Magiſtrates, Commanders in Armies (*k*) are ſaid to be created in *Cicero*, *Cæſar*, and *Livy:*) So if God actually granteth unto any the ſtate and condition of Saints (or of his Children) this Act is a creative-making them Saints (or his Children ;) therefore if God actually granteth unto any the ſtate of the Righteous, this Act is a creative-making them the Righteous. Without this creative-making them the Righteous they cannot be juſtify'd by God, and by this creative-making them the Righteous they are juſtify'd by God ; therefore this creative-making them the Righteous muſt be conſider'd as their *Juſtification.* The juſtification of Ungodly Sinners muſt be conſider'd, not meerly as *a judicial-ſentential Act*, but as a *Creative-Act*, as an Act of Grace giving and granting to them the ſtate of the Righteous, which is S. *Paul*'s Notion of *Juſtification.*

(k) *Voſſ. Theſ. p.* 2. *S. Aug. c. adverſar. leg. & prophet. l.* 1. *ſub fin.*

It hath been thought, that *juſtifying* is a *judicial* or *forenſical* word, and muſt be underſtood in *a Forenſic* or Law-ſenſe (to ſignifie aſſoiling from guilt, accounting and declaring juſt) whence the juſtification of Sinners hath been conſider'd meerly as *a judicial-ſentential Act*, God is ſaid, to juſtifie as a Judge, and a Sentence of God as a Judge is made the *Genus* of Juſtification (He is ſuppos'd in Judgment to acquit Sinners from Guilt and Puniſhment, and to account them the Righteous) whereas in the firſt Inſtant the Juſtification of Sinners ought to be conſider'd as *a Creative Act* making them the Righteous in ſtate and condition. Upon their becoming Chriſtian Believers the ſtate of Saints (or of the Righteous) accrueth to them by the grant and donation of God in his new Settlement. The New Teſtament (or Covenant) is the Grant and Donation of the ſtate of remiſſion of Sins (the ſtate of Righteouſneſs) to Chriſtian Believers, *Matth.* 26. 28. *Mark* 16. 16. *Heb.* 8. 12. 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. They have their Juſtification (their being juſtify'd or in the ſtate of the Righteous) from the Blood of Chriſt (*mors enim ejus juſtificatio peccatoris,* Rom. 5. 9.) therefore they have it from the New Teſtament in his Blood, *Matth.* 26. 28. By raiſing Chriſt from the dead God did abſolve him from the Sentence of Death and ſolemnly diſcharge him from his Peoples Sins (that accru'd to him and were laid upon him) and by ſo doing did ſolemnly and formally acquit and diſcharge his People from their Sins. By this Act of God therefore (of which the Blood of Chriſt was the procuring cauſe) they have the ſtate of remiſſion of Sins (or of Righteouſneſs) and conſequently they have their Juſtification by his Reſurrection, *Rom.* 4. 25. and 8. 33, 34. His Reſurrection was not only the pattern, but the cauſe of our *Spiritual riſing* ; for God by raiſing him from the dead did grant unto his People the ſtate of remiſſion of Sins, which was a granting to them the ſtate of Life and Salvation, a raiſed condition, a ſtate of Heavenly Citizenſhip. Whence they are ſaid, *to be quickened* (made alive) *together with Chriſt*, Eph. 2. 5. Col. 2. 13. *To be raiſed up together and made to ſit together in heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus*, Eph. 2. 6. All his People are riſen with him, and in a raiſed condition with him, *Col.* 2. 12. and *ch.* 3. 1. of all which ſublime Phraſes no Senſe can be made but by ſuppoſing, that Chriſtian Believers have the ſtate of the Righteous given and granted unto them by the Act of God in raiſing Chriſt from the dead. How elſe is the Reſurrection of Chriſt the new Creation, but becauſe it was a making the Goſpel the new Settlement and Conſtitution of things, whereby Sinners becoming Believers are in the ſtate of the Righteous, which is their Juſtification? Which the Apoſtle calleth *the Gift of Righteouſneſs, the Gift by Grace, the Free Gift*, to ſhew, how we come by it. Which plainly demonſtrateth, that the Goſpel (the Benefit-part of it) is the Gift of the ſtate of Righteouſneſs, which is the Juſtification of Sinners, *Rom.* 5. 19. *As by one Man's diſobedience many were made Sinners ; ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made Righteous,* δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται, *ſhall be conſtituted Righteous.* The Phraſe denoteth, that Chriſt's People are in the ſtate of Righteouſneſs, and this ſtate they are in by the ſettlement of Grace, which Chriſt introduc'd by his Obedience, as Mankind originally are in the ſtate of Sinners by that ſettlement of Nature, which *Adam* introduc'd by his Diſobedience.

S. Ambroſ. Com. in Gal. 2.

Rom. 5. 15, 16, 17.

XI. But the Juſtification of Sinners is not meerly a *Creative-act*, *a judicial-ſentential Act* is complicated with the *Creative-act.* For Sinners becoming ſincere Believers are the Righteous in Life and Practice (according to the Goſpel) and are judged by God ſo to be, and this *Judicial-ſentential Act* is a Branch of their Juſtification, which is not meerly a granting to them the ſtate of the Righteous, but an approving them and accounting them the Righteous. For as unregenerate Mankind could not be in the ſtate and condition of Sinners, if they were not ſuch in reſpect of Diſpoſition and Practice: So Chriſtian Believers, if they were not in reſpect of Diſpoſition and Practice the Righteous, they could not be in ſtate and condition the Righteous. Nor can God make a falſe Judgment of Things or Perſons, He cannot repute them the Righteous, that are really the Unrighteous ; if therefore by Grace he maketh any Sinners the Righteous in ſtate and condition, they muſt neceſſarily be the Righteous in diſpoſition and practice (in the degree of ſincere beginners) elſe with God they could not be juſtify'd. None but they that are ſo qualify'd, perform the condition of the Covenant of Grace, which is the Duty-part of the Goſpel ; and none but they can have any claim to the Benefit-part of it, which is the ſtate of Righteouſneſs. For none are truly Chriſtian Believers, but they that are Godly Believers (that are the Righteous indeed in diſpoſition and practice according to the Nature of things and the inſtitution of the New Covenant) whoſe Faith is the Divine Grace of Faith (and their believing the Saint of God-kind of believing) which is virtually and radically all Godlineſs ; for to be a truly Chriſtian Believer, is to be chriſtianiz'd in Sentiment and Perſuaſion, in Diſpoſition and Practice. His Juſtification therefore may be illuſtrated by this Similitude. Let us ſuppoſe, that an Alien and an Enemy is by the King admitted to be a Citizen upon condition and ſuppoſition, that he becometh a faithful Citizen, and that this tranſaction is his Juſtification. If it be asked, how this Man becometh ſo juſtify'd, as to have the ſtate and condition of a Citizen? It muſt be anſwered, by the meer Grace of the King and by his creative Act. But if it be ask'd, how he cometh to be ſo juſtify'd, as to be counted by the King an upright and faithful Citizen? It muſt be anſwered by being indeed ſuch an one. Let us ſuppoſe, that a Noble Man marrieth a Poor Woman upon condition and ſuppoſition, that ſhe becometh a faithful loyal Wife to him, that this Marriage is her Juſtification, and that this Noble-man cannot be deceiv'd in his Judgment of things and perſons. If now this Queſtion be ask'd, how this poor Woman cometh to be ſo ennobled in her ſtate and condition? It muſt be anſwered, by the meer Grace and Favour of the Noble-man, who hath juſtify'd her freely by his Grace and by his creative Act. But if the Queſtion be ask'd, how this poor Woman cometh to be ſo juſtify'd, as to be counted faithful and loyal? this muſt be the Anſwer, *by being ſo indeed.* As ſhe is ennobled in her ſtate and condition, ſhe is juſtify'd by a creative Act: as ſhe is counted faithful and loyal, ſhe is juſtify'd by a mental-ſentential Act. And becauſe theſe Acts are inſeparably connex'd in her Marriage, which is ſuppos'd her Juſtification, thence it is manifeſt, that they are not two Juſtifications, but one Juſtification. The poor Woman cannot be juſtify'd by the creative Act, unleſs ſhe be juſtify'd by the judicial-ſentential Act; and ſhe cannot be juſtify'd by the judicial-ſentential Act otherwiſe than by being a faithful loyal Wife; therefore ſhe cannot be juſtified but by being a Wife indeed in diſpoſition and practice. This Similitude is eaſily apply'd to the Juſtification of truly Chriſtian Believers, who are all of them the truly Righteous in diſpoſition and practice. And by this unexceptionable method of ſtating things the Doctrine of S. *Paul* and S. *James* touching Juſtification is clearly reconcileable (for every genuine Chriſtian Believer is at leaſt an initial Doer of Righteouſneſs) and there is no need of diſtinguiſhing a firſt and ſecond Juſtification, as will be diſcours'd preſently.

SECTION II.

Of God's Believers the Nature and Nobleneſs of their Juſtifying Faith.

I. THE Faith which juſtifieth, is that which conſtituteth God's Believers (the Godly Believers) in contradiſtinction to the Men of Nature that belong to the Law. The Law-religioniſts have their Faith as well as their Works: but as their Good-works do not ſave them from being the Evil-doers, their Righteouſneſs doth not ſave them from being the Unrighteous, ſo their Faith doth not ſave them from being the Unbelievers. Such they are in the Eye of the Holy Writers; and becauſe they are in the criminal and penal ſtate, ſo long as they are the Men of Nature that belong to the Law, there can be no other way of attaining Righteouſneſs, but to become God's Believers, ſo as to belong to his œconomy of things, which is above Nature and above the Law. The Chriſtian Religion is ſuch a Divine Oeconomy, and accordingly it directeth Men in this way to attain Righteouſneſs *by being God's Believers* ſo counted and called in Chriſtianity. *By the Faith of God*, Rom. 3. 3. *Faith towards God*, Heb. 6. 1. *Faith to God-ward*, 1 Theſſ. 1. 8. *The Faith of God's Elect*, Tit. 1. 1. *and by believing in God*, Act. 16. 34. Chriſt's Religioniſts are ſuch as by him do believe in God, 1 Pet. 1. 21. *He that heareth my word and believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life*, Joh. 5. 24. *I through the Law am dead to the Law, that I might live unto God* as his Religioniſt, *Gal.* 2. 20. As God is the prime Author of the Chriſtian Religion (which is called the Goſpel of God, the Grace of God, the Power and Wiſdom of God, the Word of God, the Commandment of God, the Record of God, the Salvation of God, and the Righteouſneſs which it tendreth to a World of Sinners is the Righteouſneſs of God) ſo the Chriſtian Believers and Religioniſts are thoſe that God owneth for his Believers and Religioniſts, and all thoſe that God owneth for his Believers and Religioniſts, are in Chriſtianity look'd upon and conſider'd as initially at leaſt the Chriſtian Believers and Religioniſts. The Chriſtian Believers in this large Senſe are the ſame with God's Believers, to whom the juſtifying and ſaving Faith is peculiar, and with reſpect to whom it may be beſt notic'd as to ſome general definitive Notices of it. For it is of definitive Notion, *That believing, that whole buſineſs of believing, all ſuch believing, which conſtituteth God's Believers* (the whole buſineſs of believing as God's Believers) ſo that the Eſſence and Summary of Faith conſiſteth *in being God's Believers*, not in all reſpects, but *in reſpect of believing.* If we know who are God's Believers, we cannot but know, what Faith is; for by *Faith* the Scripture meaneth *God's Believers believing* (ſuch believing which is their practice of believing as ſuch) and which ſignifieth *the due* (the Dutiful and Virtuous) *believing God and the Matters of God*; as the contempt of the World ſignifieth the due contempt of it, and the loving God and our Brother ſignifieth the virtuous and dutiful loving Him. *Quod non recte fit, fieri non dicitur.* As he that doth not duely receive Chriſt, in the main rejecteth him and his Goſpel: ſo they that do not duely believe the Matters of God (in the main) muſt not be thought God's Believers. Who are not the meer Hiſtorical kind of Believers (ſuch the Devils themſelves are) nor the ſlight ſuperficial Believers of Divine Matters (that believe them only as currant Notions in their Countrey) nor the cuſtomary and traditional kind of Believers (whoſe Faith is but an Infidel kind of Faith and as to ſaving Faith they are Infidels:) but they are God's kind of Believers and *the Men of Faith*, whoſe ſtate and condition is ennobled by Faith, ſo are their Minds and Lives, and in their kind of believing there is a Divine Nobleneſs and Spiritual Excellency, as will appear by conſidering the eminent Ingredients and Properties of it.

II. The Faith of God's Believers is of ſo noble a nature, *that it is a due ſymbolizing and conſorting with God in our Sentiments and Perſwaſion.* For as the Name of Chriſt's Believers denoteth, that they believe according to Chriſt Jeſus and his Inſtitution of Religion, both in reſpect of the matter of their belief and the kind and quality of their believing, and that in theſe reſpects they Chriſtianize in their Sentiments and Perſwaſion: ſo the Name of God's Believers denoteth, that they believe according to God and his Inſtitution of Religion and Sanctity (either more perfect or imperfect) both in reſpect of the matter of their belief and the kind and quality of their believing, and that in theſe reſpects they duely Theize (Symbolize with God) in their Sentiments and Perſwaſion. They could not be the Divine Family of Believers, *of whom the World is not worthy*, Heb. 11. 38. nor could their believing be of excellency and precioſity *the Faith of God's Elect*, Tit. 1. 1. *the precious Faith*, 2 Pet. 1. 1. if it was not of kind and quality a Divine Sentiment and Perſwaſion, homogeneous and of kin to God. From his Diſcipline and Inſtitution the genuine Believers of the Verity and Excellency of Chriſt and

Chriſtianity derive this their Sentiment and Perſwaſion; it is *his Gift*, *of his revealing*, *they are taught it by him*, *have heard and learn'd it from him*, *and are drawn to it* (effectually inclin'd and diſpos'd to it) *by God*. In reſpect of this their Sentiment and Perſwaſion they are initially regenerate and born of God; *for whoſoever believeth that Jeſus is the Chriſt*, *is born of God*, 1 Joh. 5. 1. *As many as received him*, *were born*, *not of Blood*, *nor of the Will of the Fleſh*, *nor of the Will of Man*, *but of God*, Joh. 1. 12, 13. The diſcernment and acknowledgment of the Divine Excellency (*l*) that is in Chriſt and Chriſtianity, are not the Graceleſs Godleſs kind of things, which are to be had from Nature and Humane Inſtitution, they are the God-kind of things, that are beyond the meer natural Man's ken (he knoweth not what kind of things they are) and they are repugnant to his blind and carnal Conceits and to his carnal Genius and Humour. *They that are after the Fleſh judge after the Fleſh*, Joh. 8. 15. the Sentiments of the Mundane Crew are according to the Spirit of the World, 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. But the Sentiments of true Believers are according to God and his Word and the Holy Spirit; which ſpeaketh them the genuine Theiſts, as thoſe are Platoniſts, that ſymbolize with *Plato* in their Sentiments. They are ὁμόνοοι, and ſymbolize with God in their Sentiments touching what is truly excellent, choice and precious, and what is vile, what is truth and what is falſhood, what is ſubſtance and what is ſhadow, what is happineſs and what is miſery, what are the true goods and the true evils, what is ſanctity and what is ſin, (and touching the immenſe good of the one and evil of the other) they are of the ſame Mind with God touching Nature and Grace, their Way and their End, the concerns of this and another Life, Earth and Heaven, Riches and Poverty, the Divine Excellency that is in bearing the Croſs (which they account their triumphal Chariot) the invaluableneſs of all external things (that are *extra gratiam & gloriam*) the vaſt diſparity between the momentaneous and momentous things, the things of the World and the matters of the Kingdom of God and of the Soul. They are not ſway'd by Mundane Excellencies and Proſperities, (*m*) which are on the Pagans ſide, they duely diſcern and acknowledge the tranſcendent Excellency and Precioſity of a deeply humbled and crucify'd Saviour ſtript of all Mundane Excellencies and to Worldly Minds not valuable or deſirable; *the form of God and the Glory of the only begotten Son of God* they diſcern and acknowledge under the form of a Servant, the Ignominy of a reputed Malefactor, and what the World calleth Villainy and naileth to a Croſs they diſcern and believe, to be the Life of God in Fleſh. (*n*) *Of Riches*, *Splendor*, *Health*, *Eloquence*, *I reap'd this only fruit* (ſaith Gr. *Naz.*) τὸ παριδεῖν καὶ ἐσχηκέναι ὧν Χριστὸν προετίμησα, *that I contemn'd them*, *and had ſome things*, *before which I preferr'd Chriſt*. So *Paulinus* forſook his great Eſtate, his great Dignity and his Poetry alſo, when he became one of Chriſt's Believers.

Divine Believers not only ſymbolize with God in the *goodneſs* but in the *greatneſs* of their Sentiment, *which is an high and raiſed ſenſe of God and of divine things:* Which ſort of ſymbolizing with God is ſo eminent a Branch of their Faith (or believing) that ſome will have it the definitive Notion thereof (they ſhould have called it an eminent Ingredient thereof) for thus they define Faith: (*o*) *Eſt exiſtimatio magnifice ſentiens de Dei potentia, juſtitia & bonitate, & ſi quid promiſerit, in eo præſtando conſtantia.* It is an high Senſe (affective Opinion) and confidence concerning the Power, Juſtice and Goodneſs of God, and that whatſoever he hath promis'd, he will certainly perform. This was the Faith of *Abraham*, *who againſt hope*, *believed in hope*, *was ſtrong in Faith giving Glory to God*, *and being fully perſwaded*, *that what he had promiſed*, *he was able alſo to perform*, Rom. 4. 18,---22. *Abraham*'s Faith manifeſtly conſiſted in correſponding and conſorting in his Sentiment and Perſwaſion with the Attributes of God and his tranſcendent agency (which is beyond Man and Second Cauſes, beyond the Road and Courſe of Nature and of Law) by this Faith *Sarah conceiv'd and bare a Son*, and by this Faith other Believers in the Old Teſtament-times perform'd their Heroic and Miraculous Atchievements (paſſed through the Red Sea, threw down the Walls of *Jericho*, ſubdued Kingdoms, wrought Righteouſneſs, ſtopp'd the Mouths of Lions, quenched the violence of Fire, eſcap'd the Edge of the Sword, out of weakneſs were made ſtrong, waxed valiant in Fight, turned to flight the Armies of the Aliens) ſo the doing miraculous Works our Saviour promiſeth to Faith (to Faith that is the great wonder-worker) and before he wrought his miraculous cures on morbid People, he requir'd, that they ſhould believe his Divine Power and Authority, and having wrought them he attributed them to their Faith. So *Heraclitus* was wont to ſay, (*p*) τῶν θείων τὰ πολλὰ δι' ἀπιστίαν μὴ γινώσκεσθαι, that is, according to *Plutarch*'s Interpretation, *The greateſt of the Gods miraculous Works are not known unto Men becauſe of their Unbelief*, which *Plutarch* calleth ἀσθένειαν ἀπιστίας, *the Evil or Weakneſs of Unbelief*. Humane Weakneſs and Wickedneſs are complicated together in Unbelief, and (in oppoſition thereto) there is a ſuperlative goodneſs and greatneſs in the Faith of God's Believers. Whence S. *Chryſoſtom* had reaſon to ſay, that believing is ὑψηλῆς καὶ μεγαλοφυοῦς ψυχῆς, *of a ſublime and great Soul*, and that Unbelievers are ταλαίπωροι καὶ μικρόψυχοι καὶ ἀσθενεῖς, *miſerable*, *little-ſoul'd and weak*. Virtuouſly and dutifully to truſt in God and in nothing leſs than God (not in our ſelves, in Man or in the World) to be his Confidents and Dependents (the Men of God as to our Truſts and Confidences) to have this generous truſt concerning God, that it ſhall be always well with his faithful Clients, that Adverſaries ſhall be to them as no Adverſaries, that they ſhall never be left forlorn, hopeleſs and helpleſs, that there is but one thing requiſite to compleat our ſafety (from the ruinous Evils at leaſt) to have ſuch an Almighty Patron; all ſuch religious truſting in God, which is an eminent Branch of Faith, is manifeſtly in the Nature and Nobleneſs of it *Theizing*, a conſorting with God and nothing leſs than God in our Sentiments, Perſwaſions and Confidences. Whence Believers are fitly intituled, (*q*) *Homines Dei*, *the Men of God*. They are ſuch in renouncing *their own Righteouſneſs which is of the Law*, in thankfully accepting the Righteouſneſs *which is of God in Chriſt*, and in the value which they put on his ineſtimable Sacrifice and great Propitiation.

III. The Nature and Nobleneſs of the Faith of God's Believers appeareth from *a ſecond* eminent Ingredient of it; for *it ſurmounteth all Difficulties and Impediments*, which is a great ennoblement of it. As in Humane Sciences and Theories,

Eph. 2. 8.
Phil. 1. 29.
Matth. 16. 17.
Joh. 6. 44, 45.

(l) Vid. Grot. Not. in Joh. 6. 44.

(m) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 6. p. 205.

(n) Gr. Naz. or. 1. p. 32.

(o) Grot. Proleg. in Ep. ad Rom.

Heb. 11. 29, 30, &c.

Mark 16. 17, 18. and ch. 11. 23, 24.
Matth. 9. 22.
Mark 10. 52.
Luk. 7. 50.

(p) Caſaubon of Enthuſ. p. 221.

(q) S. Cyp. ad Demetr. & de mortal.

Theories, ſo in the Chriſtian Faith and the main Articles of it there are difficulties (that incumber them.) The difficulty of underſtanding the Origin of things (as the Origin of the Soul of Man) the difficulty of underſtanding the Nature of things (as of incorporeal Subſtance) the *modus* of things (as how there can be a proper Creation and Reſurrection of the Body) the Cauſe and Reaſon of things (as of Chriſt's Sacrifice and of his coming ſo late) the difficulty of reconciling things (as S. *Matthew*'s and S. *Luke*'s account of Chriſt's Genealogy) the difficulty of our narrow Minds conceiving great things (as how one Being can animadvert and order all things at once) the ſeeming abſurdity and contradictiouſneſs of ſome Narratives in Scripture (as the beginning of *Geneſis*) the ſeeming contradictiouſneſs and commonly ſuppos'd unintelligibleneſs of ſome great Myſteries (as the Chriſtian Trinity, the Union of God and Man in one Perſon) the ſeeming and ſurpriſing improbability of ſome things (as the Fall of Angels from Heaven, the mean appearance of the Meſſiah, the numeroſity of the damned) the utter remoteneſs of other things from human acquaintance (as the Chriſtian Regeneration) the liableneſs of the Scriptures, of Chriſtianity, and of Providence alſo to various Objections (which Infidelity muſtereth up) together with the Sects and Scandals of the Chriſtian Church; all theſe difficulties incumber the believing the Chriſtian Faith. But the grand Impediment to Faith is together with *the Temptations of the World* (which are great Adverſaries to Faith and all Piety) *the Ungodly-mindedneſs of Men*, according to that of our Saviour to the Jews, *Joh.* 8. 47. *He that is of God* (Godly-minded) *heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, becauſe ye are not of God.* If Chriſt had been born and liv'd in ſecular Grandeur, Riches and Glory, the whole Nation of the Jews would have believed on him, becauſe they were the World's admirers and lovers. The true cauſe of their Unbelief therefore was their Ungodly-mindedneſs, *Joh.* 10. 26. They were not ſo qualified, as the Sheep of Chriſt are, with Humility, poverty of Spirit, innocence of Mind, the temper of little Children, a diſregard to the World's Glories and Senſualities. They deteſted ſuch a Meſſiah, and counted it a diſgrace to be his Followers, who was oppoſite to all the World's Wickedneſs, and alien from all that the World magnifieth, whoſe Life and Spirit ſeemeth not at all ſublime and generous (and is repugnant to the high Spirit of the World) who not only bare the Croſs himſelf, but bringeth it upon all his Followers (whereas they were for their worldly Intereſts and Advantages and their mundane Religion) his unlikeneſs and manifold contrariety to them and to what they lik'd and affected, begat their vehement diſlike and diſaffection, as himſelf ſaith, *Joh.* 7. 7. *The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth, becauſe I teſtifie of it, that the works thereof are evil.* Agreebly whereto *Plato* ſaith in his *Gorgias*, τῷ αὐτῶν γὰρ ἤθει λεγομένων τῶν λόγων, ἕκαστοι χαίρουσι· τῷ δὲ ἀλλοτρίῳ ἄχθονται, *all are pleas'd with thoſe Diſcourſes that are agreeable to their own manners, but diſturb'd with thoſe that are different from them.* Ungodly mindedneſs diſpoſeth Men to diſguſt Divine Truth (as being many ways troubleſome and offenſive to them, diſgracing them, condemning them, making them to condemn themſelves, as being contrary to their vicious Affections, againſt what they are for, and what they like and affect;) it ſtrongly diſpoſeth them alſo to perſecute the Holy Life (againſt which there is in the evil Life and in evil Men a deadly Antipathy, as being every way contrariant to them, to their Inclinations and Intereſts, their party and mundane Felicity;) ſo many corruptions of the Mind as are in Men, ſo many Branches as there are of Ungodly mindedneſs (blindneſs, prejudice, inapprehenſiveneſs of Divine Things, careleſneſs and unconcernedneſs about them, perverſeneſs of Mind, hardneſs of Heart, averſation from Piety, Puſillanimity, carnal Zeal, various Branches of Pride, Covetouſneſs, Voluptuouſneſs, innumerable vicious Affections) ſo many Springs and Fountains there are of Unbelief, and ſo many latent Cauſes there are in Men diſpoſing them thereunto. The Faith of a Chriſtian Believer therefore is a truly noble Faith, who by the ſtrength of Rational and Divine Motives, a virtuous Diſpoſition and the aſſiſtance of Divine Grace, vanquiſheth ſo great a Proneneſs, as in Man's Nature to Infidelity, overcometh ſo great Difficulties, ſo many and great Impediments and Temptations, as incumber the Chriſtian Faith.

So the Faith of God's Believers in the times of the Old Teſtament was *a godly noble Faith*; for upon God's bare word they believ'd the things unſeen *beyond and againſt the preſent appearances in Nature and to human Senſe, human Probabilities and Poſſibilities, human Reaſonings and Conceits, human Affections and Intereſts, human Confidences and Reliances.* Men are too prone to judge of things according to the preſent appearances, and hardly believe, that they will be otherwiſe than at preſent they feel and find. In health and proſperity they are prone to think, that *they ſhall never be moved, they ſhall never ſit as a Widow, who ſhall bring them down to the Ground?* They are fearleſs Contemners of Temporal, much more of the Eternal Dangers, and make a puff at the ſtupendious Changes that are coming upon the World, becauſe there is no appearance of any ſuch things, but *all things continue as they were*, 2 Pet. 3. 3. The World joggeth on in a ſettled courſe, the Sun Riſing and Setting, the Moon increaſing and decreaſing, the Sea ebbing and flowing, the Earth producing its Fruits in their Seaſon, and who is not prone to this Infidel-conceit, that this orderly ſettled courſe of things will continue for ever? Men are not prone to believe Futurities, that like the plenty in *Samaria* tranſcend the Road of Nature, and are beyond all human probability and poſſibility. How few are there, that ſeriouſly believe, that the time is coming, when this Sun ſhall be turned into Darkneſs and this Moon into Blood (and ſhall for ever withdraw their ſhining) when this broad and wide Sea ſhall become a fiery Lake, and this now flouriſhing World with all its mighty Structures ſhall be ſack'd and ruin'd, and become a *Sodom* of deſolation? So the jolly World in *Noah*'s days diſbeliev'd his Preachment of a Deluge, no ſuch thing being humanly probable or poſſible, and perhaps they thought him in jeſt, not in earneſt, as *Lot* ſeemed to his Sons-in-Law, and therefore they undauntedly follow'd their ſenſualizing trade. *Matth.* 24. 38. It was not humanly probable or poſſible, that Chriſt crucified ſhould be raiſed to be the King of Glory; nor is it more probable, that Chriſtians in Beaſts Skins ſhould be

Pſal. 30. 6. *Iſa.* 47 8. *Obad.* 3.

2 *King.* 7. 2.

Gen. 19. 14.

clothed with Robes of Immortality: But God's Believers in their Faith tranſcend human Probabilities and Poſſibilities, as *Abraham* did, *that conſider'd not his own Body now dead, neither yet the deadneſs of Sara's Womb. He ſtagger'd not at the promiſe of God through Unbelief.* Rom. 4. 19, 20. (r) *Not to ſteal, not to kill,* τῶν τυχόντων ἐστὶ, *theſe may be done by vulgar Souls: But to believe, that God can do things impoſſible,* μεγαλοφυοῦς τινὸς δεῖται ψυχῆς καὶ σφόδρα περὶ αὐτὸν διακειμένης, *this requireth an extraordinary Soul and an hugely pious Diſpoſition towards him.* God's Believers ſurmount *human Sence* alſo (not looking at the things that are ſeen) they account not the matters of Sence the great Realities, nor the Goods and Evils of Sence the only, or the great Goods and Evils; nor do they count things glorious or vile, that appear ſo to human Sence; the great things of their Faith are ſuch, as the natural Man never ſaw or felt the like (they fall not within the Horizon of Sence or of his Experience) and therefore he is prone, to think them Fictions and meer Imaginations. As a poor Man of our Nation would not believe that there is any ſuch Summ as a Thouſand Pound, but that rich Men only talk'd of ſuch a thing, to excite poor Men to induſtry; and why was this, but becauſe he was a poor Man, and no ſuch Summ fell within the compaſs of his Sence and Experience? In the Faith there is nothing that contradicteth rightly circumſtantiated Sence or ſound Reaſon: But (s) τοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους ὑπερβῆναι ἐχρῆν λογισμοὺς, *Faith muſt tranſcend human Conceits and Reaſonings,* ſuch as that of the Scribes and Phariſees, *Luk.* 5. 21. the reaſoning of the Politicians, that the wiſeſt courſe is to be of the King's Religion; the reaſoning of the Philoſophers (that the Reſurrection of the Body is but another ſleep) the reaſoning of the Jews and Heathens, that it is abſurd to believe a crucified Man to be God, that the Son of God ought to have appear'd like the Sun in the Firmament, and that the Chriſtians were mad in ſuffering Martyrdom. *Hath not God made fooliſh the Wiſdom of this World?* Worldy Religioniſts have a Faith, which is *an human Affection and a regard to the human Intereſts,* they have a reſpect for their Country, the Laws and Faſhions of it, for their Anceſtors and their Education, and for the (Human) Authority of the great and learned, *have any of the Phariſees believed on him?* Joh. 7. 48. (t) Carnal Chriſtians have ſuch an honourable reſpect for Chriſt, as the Jews and Heathens had for their deceas'd Worthies (Men of Fame) their Benefactors and Saviours, and (in the main) are Unbelievers as well as they; for God's Believers act from diviner Principles, and are ſway'd by higher Motives and Intereſts. They that in the times of the Old Teſtament forſook their Fathers Houſe and their Country in queſt of an Heavenly, and confeſſed, *that they were Pilgrims and Strangers on the Earth,* ſurmounted *the human Affections and Intereſts* (which are uſually the great Impediments to Faith, as well as the origin of a counterfeit kind of Faith;) and the Believers in thoſe times alſo *ſurmounted the human Confidences and Reliances,* Gold, Wealth, the Arm of Fleſh, ſecular Policy and Prudence, Military Puiſſance and Preparations, the multitude of Mountains that ſurrounded their Cities and were a defence to them. There is therefore a Sublimity and Tranſcendency in the Faith of God's Believers, their believing is the practice of believing divinely, an honourable and noble Practice, which is a doing to God the greateſt Honour and Credit (and therefore he doth the greateſt Honour and Credit to Faith) and it is alſo at the greateſt rate honourary and ennobling to themſelves. But Infidel Conceits and Diſtruſts are baſe and vile; how baſe is it to diſcredit God, to blemiſh his unſtain'd Veracity and Faithfulneſs (*Numb.* 20. 12.) to disbelieve him, to ſuſpect him, to think him ſo poor a Patron, that we dare not venture our All in his Service? There is an immenſity of baſeneſs in being an Infidel.

(r) S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. λογ. η.

(s) Idem in Hebr. λογ. κϛ.

1 Cor. 1. 20.

(t) Dr. Jackſon of Juſtif. Faith. ch. 13, 14.

Job 21. 34. Pro. 3. 5. and 10. 15. Pſal. 33. 16. and 44. 6. and 52. 7. and 118. 9, 10. Iſa. 10. 13. Jer. 17. 5. Habak. 1. 16.

IV. The nature and nobleneſs of the Faith of God's Believers appeareth from a *Third* eminent Ingredient of it; *they ſo believe the matters of God as to give them their due preheminence in goodneſs and importance.* For their Faith conſiſteth not in believing meerly their Verity and Reality, but alſo their tranſcendent Worth and Concernment (which is a right judgment touching the Rate and Value of things) that *their preſent Sufferings are not worthy to be compar'd with their future Glory, nor the things that are ſeen with the things that are not ſeen, nor their earthly All with the Kingdom,* nor all the natural Man's gainful admir'd things *with the Excellency of the Knowledge of Chriſt.* When *Moſes* by Faith fear'd not the Wrath of a King *as ſeeing him who is inviſible,* he believ'd an immenſe diſproportion between a ſecular Grandee and the great God; and when he choſe rather to ſuffer Affliction, than to enjoy the Pleaſures of Sin, he believ'd that was the far better part which he choſe, and this was his Faith. (u) *Even to rebuke or reproach for Chriſt's ſake be aſſented as good to him, yea better than all the treaſures of* Egypt. The price of the World's Felicities is fallen very low in the Eyes of Divine Believers; for they believe the Account, which true Religion giveth of them, and their Faith in the Nature of it is *a believing and thinking divinely* (which is a right and godly perſwaſion) *of the worth and importance of Goods and Evils, Viſible and Inviſible, Preſent and Future, of Man and of this Life, and of the human Goods and Excellencies, of the World, its Wants and Plenty, its Pleaſure and Pain, its Honour and Ignominy, of Afflictions, of Death and Judgment, of God and Religion, of Chriſt and his Kingdom, of Sin and Holineſs, of the Soul, of Life eternal and the ſecond Death.* They that Believe and think divinely of the Worth and Importance of the Kingdom of God, prize it at the higheſt rate of prizing, and ſubject all things thereunto; they count it an infinitely valuable and deſireable Condition, abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary, to be his Saints and Servants, and that nothing elſe is greatly valuable or deſireable; they reckon the Goods of the Kingdom the true ineſtimable Goods and the only true Goods, that muſt be gain'd at any rate; that Hardſhips and Afflictions are light and Loſſes are Gain for the Kingdom God's Sake; that his Favour is infinitely of more worth and advantage than all the World (which is as nothing in compariſon) that *his loving kindneſs is better than Life* (for which Life it ſelf is to be forſaken) and that *a day in his Courts is better than a thouſand elſewhere.* They ſet up God in that Sovereignty of eſteem and regard, which belongeth unto him, and as they do not diſcredit the truth of God in his Promiſes, ſo they do not baſely diſcredit him in their value and compute of things, by vilifying and undervaluing the infinite Good that he is in himſelf and

Rom 8. 18. 2 Cor. 4. 18. Math. 13. 46. Phil. 3. 8.

(u) Dr. Jackſon ſupr. c. 7. p. 59.

and to his People, or by undervaluing his kind of Goods and Excellencies. They believe, that there is no compariſon, no proportion between gaining the World and ſaving the Soul, nor between the common mundane Goods and Excellencies and the ſaving Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies; that this World is a Region of Vanity and Sin, Snares and Calamities (enough to denominate it an evil World and a World of Evils) and accordingly they depreciate it, vilifie it, nullifie it; they believe † that Sin is no underling Evil, Holineſs no underling Good; that Life eternal immenſly tranſcendeth this Life, and that Death eternal is an unfathomable Evil, both for weight and duration (the fulneſs and extremity of all Evil, as Life eternal is the fulneſs of all Good) ſo that in their reckoning of things the matters of God's Kingdom, their Sanctity and their Salvation have *the duly paramount, the incomparably Peerleſs and Sovereign eſteem.* (w) *Cùm omnia quæcunque Deus non ſunt, præ Deo putent vilia & contemnenda, ſeipſos quoque inter cætera quæ Deus non ſunt, habent deſpicatui.* Time was, when they ſet ſo highly by themſelves, that a diſparagement done to them was as a piece of Sacriledge, when they counted mundane Applauſe and a Preferment an Heaven upon Earth; thought it a ſuperlative Felicity, to flow in Wealth, to live in ſecular Splendor and Gallantry, and were dreadfully afraid of Poverty, Diſgrace and the Croſs; when they idoliz'd the gay and ſpecious things of the World and counted the Pleaſures of Sin better than an Holy Life: But when they become Divine Believers, their Bill of Rates is chang'd, they count themſelves leſs than the leaſt of God's Mercies, they believe a Conformity to Chriſt Crucify'd is their Nobilitation and Perfection, that all worldly Glory is Pageantry and Phantaſtry, all ſenſitive Delights are Dreams and Gulleries, the Pleaſures of Sin are *mortiferæ ſuavitates* (deadly Sweets, as *Lactantius* calleth them) the World's Gallantry and Honour is a puff and flaſh of Vanity, its Treaſure is gaud and trifle, its Furniture is not ſubſtantial Realities, but certain *Phænomena*, its Greatneſſes are light and little things, its Enjoyments are Bitter-ſweets (vexatious delectables) its Riches are as Cyphers in their Arithmetick (things very vain and unprofitable) an human Body they account a vile Body, and all the Concerns of this Life they reckon not worth any more than a mean concern and regard, that there is no very valuable Felicity but the Heavenly, which they ſhall fully enjoy, when they obtain their heavenly Bodies and arrive at the heavenly State of Life; and this their believing and judging of things ſo divinely, is their *Holy Perſwaſion and their Faith.* The view that they have of the great unſeen things, that are now exiſtent, and of the unſeen Rewards and Puniſhments which are to come (which far over-ballance all this World's Enjoyments and Sufferings) preſented to their Minds by Faith, maketh them ſeriouſly minded, daſheth out of countenance the World's Temptations, ſheweth them Reaſon to ſet light by it, Reaſon to be contented in a mean Station and a low Condition (when others are highly elevated) Reaſon to be ſeriouſly and ſtrictly Religious, Religious at any rate, to hope for a joyous and happy Iſſue, Reaſon to have no dealings with Sin upon any terms, *and to reſiſt even unto Blood ſtriving againſt it.*

They are of this Belief (x) that there is no compariſon between the evil of ſuffering and of ſinning againſt God. *Clemens* ſpeaketh the Sence of a Divine Believer. (y) *He contemneth all the Gold that is upon the Earth, and under the Earth, and the Kingdom of the World from one end of the Ocean to the other* (not accounting theſe mundane things the valuable conſiderable things, but *nihileitates*, as *Tertullian* calleth them) *ſo to adhere to the alone Service of God.* A wide difference therefore Faith maketh between a Worldly Man and a Divine Believer; for what the one counteth all, the other counteth as nothing. What the one maketh an Idol of, the other calleth *Nehuſhtan.* What the one calleth Home, the other calleth a ſtrange Land. What the one counteth gallantry, the other counteth baſeneſs; what the one magnifieth, the other vilifieth and trampleth on what he adoreth. *Unuſquiſque ut affectus eſt, ita judicat.* The one maketh light of Sin and Sanctity, which with the other infinitely preponderate and weigh down all. *Heaven is with them no leſs than Heaven, and Hell is no leſs than Hell.* The one maketh light of God and the things of his Kingdom and magnifieth the (ſorry ſordid) mundane things, the other maketh light of the World and magnifieth the great eternal things. The one maketh light of God's Favour and Frowns, the other maketh light of the World's Favour and Frowns; and it is not hard to ſay, on which part the nobleneſs lieth. For Virtue (as *Lactantius* inculcateth) conſiſteth in contemning thoſe things, that are the Portion of the wicked. To be a Divine Believer (z) *is the work of a great and heavenly Mind* (the Mind becometh ſuch by Faith) *that is no longer inveigled with our things*, as *Philo* ſaith of truſting to God alone. (a) *Abraham* (ſaith a Father) *following God becauſe of the generoſity of his Faith became a Friend of God.* *Diogenes* being ask'd, who were the nobleſt of Men? Made anſwer (b) *the contemners of Riches, Glory, Pleaſure, Life, that conquer alſo the contrary things, Poverty, Diſgrace, Labour and Death.*

V. The nature and nobleneſs of the Faith of God's Believers appeareth from a *Fourth* eminent Ingredient of it; *they are Believers, his Believers, ſo as to be the true and faithful*, which is their uſual Name in Scripture. So in the ancient Writers of the Church they are ſtiled (c) *Fideles* (contradiſtinguiſh'd to the *Catechumeni*) and ſo Sovereign Princes call their Liege-people (d) *ſuos Fideles.* The Name uſually occurreth in **Feudal** Law and Cuſtoms, which are of Affinity with the matters of Religion; for the Kingdom of God is of Affinity (as with other Kingdoms and Governments, ſo) with *Feudal* Kingdoms and Governments. *Feudum, Fief or* **Fee**, properly denoteth ſuch Lands and Tenements (e) that are given to a Man and his Heirs by a ſuperiour Lord as a Benefit (*prædium beneficiarium*) for which he oweth the Lord Fealty and Service, and he is ſaid, to hold them in *Fee.* He is the *Client* and the *Feudatary*, his Benefactor is his Patron and Lord-protector; and to each other they owe the Affection and are to do the Offices of Patron and Client. The Feudatary hath an Inveſtiture or Introduction into the Poſſeſſion of the Fee upon his taking an Oath of Fealty and Homage, wherein he ſweareth, to be true and faithful to his Lord and Patron; and in making Homage (which is *Fides clientularis*) the words are, *Here venio in tuum hominium & fidem, & homo tuus fio*; and they that by doing Fealty and Homage to a ſuperiour Lord become his Men (*f*) are in Feudal Law called *Fideles*, and till they openly prevaricate, are look'd upon as *Fideles homines.* Theſe Feudal Tenures ſeem to have been begun by *Seſoſtris* or his Father in *Egypt*; (*g*) for *Seſoſtris* granted to his Soldiers, *Feuda militaria à vectigalibus immunia & jure hæreditario tenenda:* But the *Goths* and *Vandals* introduc'd them into theſe parts of *Europe*, where they took ſuch place, that formerly in our Nation all the Subjects by Feudal Tenures held their Lands of the King, who was their Liege-Lord, and they were his Liege-Men and *Fideles.* (*h*) *For all with us that have Fee, hold* per fidem & fiduciam, *that is, by Fealty.* In the ſame manner the Subjects and Citizens of the Kingdom of God (in this World) have and hold their Spiritual Eſtates, and have an Inveſtiture in the Sacraments of the Chriſtian Religion, and conſequently they muſt be look'd upon as his *Fideles* in the Notion of Feudal Law. But not only in Feudal Law, but in other Governments alſo where Feudal Law hath no place, (*i*) the Subjects becauſe of their Allegiance to the King (their Sovereign Leige-Lord) are look'd upon as his *Fideles* and *Liege*-people. And for the ſame reaſon God's Believers and Liege-people (the Subjects and Citizens of his Kingdom) are called and counted *Fideles*, his *Fideles*; for they are denominated *the Faithful* (partly at leaſt) upon account of their *Faithfulneſs.* Their Faith therefore conſiſteth in *believing God and the matters of God, ſo as to be the true and ſincere, the loyal and faithful*, and it muſt neceſſarily involve and comprehend in it *the Moral Virtue of Faithfulneſs.* For to be unfaithful and perfidious, *Children wherein there is no Faith*, is a grand inconſiſtency with Faith and incompetible to the Faithful. (*k*) *Quid facit in domo Fidei perfidum Pectus?* As the Eſſence and Being of the King's *Fideles* (as ſuch) conſiſteth in being true and faithful: So doth the Eſſence and Being of Chriſt's *Fideles.* Counterfeit Money (that is but a ſhew and ſemblance of Money) is not Money, and counterfeit Helmets (that are but a falſe and fallacious appearance) are not Helmets. To be a Friend and to be a true Friend, is but the ſame thing: So to be a Believer (one of Chriſt's Friends) is nothing leſs than to be a true Believer. And as the Eſſence of a true Friend conſiſteth in being true and faithful: So doth the Eſſence of a true Believer; for this is that which conſtituteth and diſtinguiſheth a true Believer as contradiſtinct to an Hypocrite or Cheat-religioniſt. Faith without faithfulneſs (unfaithful and faithleſs Faith) is the counterfeit of true Faith, oppoſite to the Nature and Eſſence of it, as counterfeit Humility is to the true Humility. No other Faith *is God's Believers believing*, no other Faith can conſtitute God's Believers, but that which conſtituteth his Liege-people, who cannot be conſtituted ſuch but by their Faithfulneſs. (*l*) Faith muſt be conſider'd as *the buſineſs of being God's Believers.* To believe, that Jeſus is *the Chriſt*, that he is *the Son of God*, that he is *the Lord* (which is the Chriſtians juſtifying and ſaving Faith, *Joh.* 20. 31. 1 *Joh.* 5. 5. *Rom.* 10. 9. *Phil.* 2. 11.) is ſo to believe theſe things of him, *as to be his Believers*, who are his faithful People, and are conſtituted ſuch by their Faith, which is incluſively and comprehenſively their Faithfulneſs. To *believe on his Name* is (in the ſenſe of Scripture) duly to believe on his Name, which is duly to receive him, and duly to receive him, is to receive him as our Divine Sovereign Liege-Lord and Saviour-King. *Luk.* 2. 11. *Joh.* 1. 12. and 4. 42. therefore to believe on his Name, is to become his faithful People, which is of the Nature and Eſſence of the Chriſtians Faith. Their Faith is *Faith unfeigned*, 1 Tim. 1. 5. *a believing in the Heart.* Rom. 10. 9. *A believing with all the Heart.* Act. 8. 37. *And with a true Heart.* Heb. 10. 22. The Jews ſay of their *Cabala* (which is their Faith objectively underſtood) *it profiteth not, unleſs it be receiv'd with a good Heart:* Nor will the Chriſtian Faith objectively underſtood profit any, if they receive it not *into an honeſt and good Heart*, Luk. 8. 15.

---

† *V. S. Chryſoſt.* Ἀνδριαντ. i. p. 492. & l. 5. λογ. 3. ſub. fin.

(w) *Viv. Not. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 9. c. 22.*

(x) *Quas non oportet mortes præ eligere, quod non ſupplicium potiùs ferre, imò in quam profundam inferni abyſſum non intrare, quàm contra conſcientiam atteſtari?* Zuinglius Ep. 3.

(y) Χρυσὸν μὲν πάντα τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ὑπὸ γῆν καὶ βασιλείαν τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἐπὶ πέρατα ὠκεανοῦ ὑπερορῶν, ὡς μόνης τῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἀντέχεσθαι θεραπείας. *Strom. l. 7. p. m.* 536.

(z) Μεγάλης καὶ ὀλυμπίου διανοίας ἔργον ἐστι, πρὸς οὐδενὸς οὐκέτι δελεαζομένης τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν. *Philo. Quis rer. div. hær. p.* 335. *Ed. Gr. Paris.*

(a) *Abraham propter generoſitatem fidei ſequens, amicus factus eſt Dei.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 27.

(b) Οἱ καταφρονοῦντες πλούτου, δόξης, ἡδονῆς, ζωῆς, τῶν δὲ ἐναντίων ὑπεράνω ὄντες, πενίας, ἀδοξίας, πόνου, θανάτου. *Tiraquell. de Nobil. p.* 46.

(c) *Tertull. de præſcript. c.* 41. *de exhort caſtit. c.* 4.

(d) *Seld. Titles p.* 569. *Ed.* 3.

(e) *Cowell Interpret. in voce Fee & Homage.*

Faith juſtifieth Men, becauſe they are conſtituted God's Believers by it, but they muſt be ſincere Believers, whom God approveth of and juſtifieth. *Act.* 15. 8. It is a marvellous Irreligionizing the Chriſtian Religion, to ſuppoſe, that Men are juſtified by Faith only *without any conſideration of their Sincerity and Faithfulneſs.* For as that is not Faith indeed, which doth not involve in the Nature and Eſſence of it Sincerity and Faithfulneſs: So it is impoſſible, but that in God's Juſtification of Men the Sincere muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the Hypocrites, and conſequently they muſt be juſtified as the Sincere. To whom is it that God doth not impute Iniquity, but to thoſe (only) *in whoſe Spirit there is no guile?* Pſal. 32. 2. Men become Chriſt's People by Faith, but their Faith muſt be the Chriſtian Believers Faith (or Believing) which is not meerly an interiour Aſſent to the Verities of the Chriſtian Religion, but this Faith muſt be profeſs'd in Baptiſm, and therefore muſt be not meerly Faith, but Faith profeſs'd. *Rom.* 10. 9, 10. And the Covenanting on our part which is in Baptiſm, is alſo the Chriſtian Believers Faith (or Believing;) for their believing on Chriſt is a believing on him, ſo as to be his *Fideles*, which is of the Nature and Eſſence of their (Faith or) believing as it is ſuch. They have their Juſtification by the new Covenant, the Benefits whereof they cannot poſſibly be Partakers of otherwiſe than by entring into this Holy Covenant (by being faithful new Covenanters;) if therefore they are juſtified by (Faith or) Believing, this Chriſtian Covenanting *the ſtipulation of a good Conſcience towards God* (whereby they are ſaved, 1 Pet. 3. 22.) muſt be their Faith as being of the Nature and Eſſence of their Chriſtian Believing as it is ſuch. The buſineſs of their believing on Chriſt is their faithful *Conſent* (as well as *Aſſent*) whereby they *are joined unto the Lord*, 1 Cor. 6. 17. *eſpouſed to him*, 2 Cor. 11. 2. *give themſelves unto the Lord*, 2 Cor. 8. 5. are brought into the Bond of his Covenant, *Ezek.* 20. 32. and become his Liege-people, *Heb.* 8. 10. For none but his *Fæderati* (the People of the Holy League and Covenant) are his Liege-people,

(f) Calvin. Lex. in voce Fideles.

(g) Marſham Can. Chr. p. m. 391.

(h) Cowell in voce Fealty.

(i) Calvin. ſupr.

(k) S. Cypr. de op. & Eleem.

(l) Moſe manni Et mologiam habet à verbo Ala ma, quod ſe dedit, obtemperavit ac Fidelis fa ctus e, denotat. Hotting. H. O. p. 3 ed. 1.

People, none but they are in the State of Society with him and his People, and none but they are his Allies; for the *French* rightly call the new Covenant the new *Alliance*. Their ſubjection to the Goſpel of Chriſt (and conſequently their ſubjection to Chriſt himſelf) 2 *Cor.* 9. 13. their coming to Chriſt as to their Celeſtial Sovereign, *Joh.* 6. 35. their taking upon them his Yoke, or their faithful undertaking Chriſtianity, *Matth.* 11. 29. their forſaking all things ſo far as they come in compariſon and ſtand in competition with Chriſt and ſaving Chriſtianity, *Luk.* 14. 26, 33. are included in their believing. Which therefore involveth and includeth their abandoning and caſhiering all things on this ſide the Kingdom of God (this Life and all its Accommodations) ſo far as not to make them the matters of their great Affection and Concern (m) ἀπροσπαθῶς βιῶν, *to live without inordinate Affection*; their abandoning all worldly Hopes and Deſires (for the Hope that is laid up for them in Heaven) to make an heavenly Intereſt the care and buſineſs of their Life (I have relinquiſh'd all worldly Deſires, ἐφ' ᾧ Χριστῷ συνεταξάμην, *ever ſince I made my Covenant with Chriſt*, ſaith *Gr. Naz.*) their chuſing the good part (the Holy Life) though it bringeth a Croſs with it, and diſcarding the Pleaſures of Sin and the Vanities of the World, and their becoming the faithful Friends to God and Holineſs and the faithful Enemies to Sin and Wickedneſs. *Salvian* therefore had Reaſon to ſay (n) *cùm hoc ſit hominis Chriſtiani fides, fideliter Chriſti mandata ſervare.* So *Gaudentius Brixianus* ſaith, *fidem Dei ſervat, qui mandati ejus jura non violat. Was not* Abraham *found faithful in Temptation, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs?* 1 Macab. 2. 52. True Believers are faithful to their Principles of Faith, and their Elections and Affections, their Care and Endeavour are agreeable to what they believe touching the immenſe diſproportion (in Worth and Importance) between God and Men, the World and the Soul, Earth and Heaven, things Temporal and Eternal, and touching the abſolute indiſpenſable neceſſity of ſecuring their Sanctity and Salvation. As one of their great Principles of Faith is the tranſcendent Excellency and Concernment of Chriſt and Chriſtianity above all human Goods and Excellencies and all worldly Intereſts: So in Will and Affection, in Care and Endeavour they ſerve him (as his faithful Friends and Adherents) not in the underling unfaithful way, but with their beſt and their all and at any rate, never denying him, nor being traiterouſly undutiful to him, nor taking part with his Enemies, befriending his Intereſt and Service, relieving him in his Members, conforming themſelves to his Precepts and Pattern, and adhering to him to the Death. And this their Faithfulneſs is of the Nature and Eſſence of their Faith, as it is their Faith (of which Temptations are the Trial, 1 *Pet.* 1. 7.) and it is alſo *the great ennoblement of their Faith.* For what is it, that commendeth and ennobleth a Servant, a Steward, a Soldier, a Wife, a Friend, a Subject, but their unſtained Loyalty and Faithfulneſs? There is no greater nobleneſs of Diſpoſition and Practice than unblemiſh'd Faithfulneſs, which *Plato* calleth the greateſt of Virtues, and is the Eſſence and ſummary of Virtue. 1 *Pet.* 2. 22. *Apoc.* 14. 5. Nor is there any greater baſeneſs and villainy of Diſpoſition and Practice than Unfaithfulneſs (*Pſal.* 5. 9.) which is the Eſſence and ſummary of Wickedneſs. The *Romans* built Temples to Faith (Fidelity) and were taught by *Numa* to Swear by it; for he ſuppos'd Unfaithfulneſs ruinous to Society, (o) τὸν δὲ πιστὸν εἰς φιλίαν ἐνάρμοστον, *but a faithful Man to be fit for Friendſhip.* A faithful Man (whom the Jews call *bar Samcha, filius baſis, filius ſuſtentaculi*, one whoſe Fidelity you may build upon) is according to the Poet *Theognis* more precious than Gold and Silver. Πιστὸς ἀνὴρ χρυσοῦ τε ϗ ἀργύρου ἀντερύσασθαι Ἄξιος.

(m) Clem. Str. l. 4. p. 351.

(n) Petav. T. 4. l. 9. c. 3.

(o) Procl. Plat. Theol. l. 1. c. 25. p. 62. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 12. c. 2. Clem. Str. l. 2. p. 270.

VI. The nature and nobleneſs of the Faith of God's Believers appeareth from a *Fifth* eminent Ingredient of it; *they believe Divine Matters ſo affectively and effectually, as to practice divinely.* For they love and live divinely, becauſe they believe divinely. Their Faith is of this Nature (although this is no adequate definition of it) *it is the Subſtance of things hoped for, the Evidence of things not ſeen.* Heb. 11. 1. (p) *The great unſeen things ſeem to have no Subſiſtence, but Faith giveth them a Subſiſtence.* (q) *And it ſheweth thoſe things as Subſiſtent, which are yet to come to paſs.* (r) *In ſome ſort it maketh them to be and to be preſent. A certain undoubted perſwaſion* (ſaith the Chriſtian *Proclus*) *maketh that which is abſent in time, to be to our Cogitation as preſent, and the things that are expected and look'd for* σχεδὸν ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγει, *it almoſt ſetteth before our Eyes.* Faith therefore maketh abſent things as preſent, things remote as nigh at hand; it realizeth things that do not appear to have any Subſiſtence, and maketh evident the things unſeen, as if we ſaw them with our bodily Eyes. And this view of the great unſeen things preſented to Believers Minds by Faith maketh (in great degree) the ſame impreſſion upon their Souls, which the ſight of them would make, and exciteth in them thoſe Affections, which would be excited, if they ſaw them with their Eyes. They have ſuch a reverential regard for the Divine Majeſty, *as if they ſaw him that is inviſible.* An unſeen Heaven enkindleth their Deſires, exciteth their Endeavours, animateth them in their Labours and Sufferings ſo potently and vigorouſly, as if they had look'd into Heaven, and had ſeen the inexpreſſible Glories and Felicities that are there. The glorious and terrible Phænomena of the day of Judgment awaken them now, as all Men will be awakened by them, when they ſee them. The *Conflagration of the Earth* and *an unſeen Hell*, influence their Minds, affect their Souls, govern their Lives, and they concern themſelves to eſcape the *fiery Indignation* (that will devour the Adverſary) as if the flames were now enkindling about their Ears. As their Faith is built upon ſolid Grounds, ſo they have ſolid Apprehenſions and a ſound Belief of the great inviſible things, and are deeply and ſolidly affected with them. They are lively and ſolidly perſwaded of their reality and importance, as if they were matters of Sence; and they have an operative force upon them, as if they ſaw them and look'd on them (for their Faith is a kind of (s) Eye-ſight and Fore-ſight, and the true θεῖον ὄμμα, *Divine Eye*:) But vulgar Minds are not better'd by thoſe ſlight Notices and that ſuperficial Belief, which they have of the great unſeen things. God and his adorable Attributes are as light things with

(p) Ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται. S. Chryſoſt.

(q) Καὶ δείκνυσιν ὡς ὑφεστῶτα τὰ μηδέπω γεγενημένα. Theodoret.

(r) Εἶναι αὐτὰ ϗ παρεῖναι τρόπον τινὰ παρασκευάζουσα. Oecumen.

Heb. 11. 27.

(s) V. S. Chryſoſt. T. 5. λογ. 3.

them as the Aerial Meteors, they toſs his Name in their Mouths at pleaſure, his preſence doth not awe them from perpetrating Wickedneſs (not ſo much as the preſence of a Child) they ſlight his Service, and fear not to provoke his Sovereign Juſtice and Power. Heaven maketh no more impreſſion upon their Minds, than if it was a Fairy Iſland or Land of *Utopia*, that hath no exiſtence. Hell is to theſe ſuperficial Believers but as a Poetick Fable, and hath not ſo much power and prevalency with them, as a Mawkin hath with the Crows, that frighteth them from the Corn. For all the Horrours of Eternity do not reſtrain their ravenous Luſts, nor damp their extravagant Mirth, nor make them ſeriouſly concern'd for their future State: but their All is to make their preſent Markets, and they live, as if there was nothing to come hereafter.

(t) *Claudian. l. 2. in Eutrop.*

(t) *Sed quàm cœcus ineſt vitiis amor? omne futurum*
Deſpicitur, ſuadentque brevem præſentia fructum.

As this World is a World of unholy Unbelievers, ſo that part of it which is called Chriſtian muſt be look'd upon as (in great degree) immers'd in Infidelity; for Hypocrites are not in the Faith, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. they are a ſort of Unbelievers, *Matth.* 24. 51. compar'd with *Luk.* 12. 46. their cuſtomary, ſlight and dead opinionative Belief ſaveth them not from the Sin, and Vices, and Diſeaſes of Infidelity, nor from the ſtate of Infidels, nor do they believe the holy Faith, or believe in Chriſt, any otherwiſe than ſo as in the main to deny him, and to be worſe than Infidels, which is not Faith, but want of Faith. To believe, that God is, and yet to be audacious ungodly Sinners, and to live without God in the World; to believe, that the Soul is of more concernment than all the World, yet to be little concerned what becometh of the Soul; to believe the Heavenly Realities, yet to neglect them and purſue Worldly Vanities; to believe, that there is an Hell for the Ungodly, and that Sin will make them caſt-aways, yet not to caſt away their Sins; to believe the Chriſtian Religion, and that it conſiſteth in *living ſoberly, righteouſly and godly*, yet like the (u) ancient *Aſcrogodytæ* to introduce the *Bacchanalia* into the Church; to pretend to a Religion, the only ſaving Religion, yet to deſtroy the Eſſence, Buſineſs and deſign of it; to believe a great Day of Accounts, yet to make no recknoning of it; to believe, that they muſt be happy or miſerable for ever, as they live here, and yet to be regardleſs how they live, to be careful for a Moment and careleſs for Eternity: This is a monſtrouſly wild and abſurd, not a reaſonable and religious kind of believing, *not God's Believers believing*. Their Faith is the archical and radical part of their Holineſs, as the Philoſophers *Decreta* or *Dogmata* (w) were archical and radical to their inſtitution of Virtue) it repreſenth to their Minds the nature, neceſſity and reaſons of Holineſs, the mighty motives and obligations, helps and aſſiſtances thereto, and becauſe of their lively Faith they live the life of Faith, *Gal.* 2. 20. Their Faith is cauſal and productive of all Holineſs of Soul and of Life, *purifieth their inward Man*, produceth Love (an appreciative and affectionate love to him in whom they believe) *Charity is from a pure Heart and Faith unfeigned*. By Faith they ſucceſsfully manage their holy warfare againſt Sin and Temptations, 1 *Tim.* 6. 12. reſiſt the Devil and repell his fiery Darts, 1 *Pet.* 5. 9. *Eph.* 6. 16. *And this is the victory that overcometh the World, even our Faith*, 1 Joh. 5. 4. As Infidelity is the Root and Source of all Sin and Wickedneſs and want of Godlineſs: So the Faith of God's Believers is the Source and Origin of all Piety and Divine Virtue, 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. *Act.* 26. 18. They believe that the Fruit of Holineſs is the Favour of God and Life Eternal, and that the neglect of it is the forfeiture of all their ineſtimable Goods, and they believe it ſo effectually, that they willingly undergo any labour, hardſhip or ſufferings in an holy courſe of life, and they will be holy, (x) μετὰ πολλοῦ δρόμου καὶ ἀγῶνος, *though it coſteth them a great conflict, ſtriving and agony*. They believe, that Sin is now deadly, and will iſſue in the ſecond Death, and they believe it ſo effectually, that their great care is to kill that which is killing to the life of God and to the Soul, they *flee from Sin as from the Face of a Serpent* (Eccluſ. 21. 2.) and will rather venture into the Fire than venture upon ſinning againſt God. They believe the ſecond coming of Chriſt, and believe it ſo effectually, that they are dreſſing their Lamps with Oyl, to meet the Heavenly Bridegroom, *Matth.* 25. 7. They believe the World to be ſo vain and vile as it is, and that they have no very valuable poſſeſſions or accommodations of life on this ſide Heaven; and they believe it ſo effectually, that their Souls are alienated from the World, and they are heavenly affected and addicted, *Phil.* 3. 20. By Faith Heaven becometh the Object of their Eſteem, Love and Deſire, and they ſojourn here on Earth as in a ſtrange Country. Faith baniſheth their puſillanimous Fears, withereth this World's Gayeties in their Eyes, vanquiſheth Adverſities, inſpireth them with Fortitude and Magnanimity, and maketh them ſtrong and invincible in their Piety, able to do and bear and ſuffer all things. By Faith (the Comforts and Supports which it affordeth) the hardeſt and nobleſt duties of Godlineſs become eaſie to them, they run the Chriſtian Race with patience, it putteth fervour into their Prayers and vigour into their Piety, and by Faith they live and die in peace and joyous hopes, *Rom.* 15. 13. *Heb.* 6. 12. and 10. 37. Faith is the Leader in an holy Converſation (*Heb.* 13. 7.) and the holy motions and operations of a Divine Believer (all his good works) are from Faith, as the motion of a Watch is from the Spring, (y) *operatur quia credit*, he worketh, becauſe he believeth. By Faith he doeth the greateſt and ſuffereth the heavieſt things. (z) *Laus eſt fidei, fiducia futurorum mundi adverſa tolerare:* This is a noble Faith, from a perſwaſion of things to come to bear the World's Adverſities. (a) The Primitive Chriſtians and the Saints of the Old Teſtament (their Heroical Virtues) are great Inſtances of the noble iſſues and productions of Faith; whence *Daniel* could not be frighted from his Devotions by a Lion's Den, and the three Hebrew Youths his Companions were (b) *in fide fortes, in captivitate victores*, ſtrong in Faith, victorious in Captivity. The doings of the Men of Faith are ſo highly noble and excellent, that *Clemens* muſt be impeach'd as guilty of a groſs extravagance in making God's Believers undergraduates to his Phantaſtick Gnoſtick. (c) *Every practice of a Gnoſtick is well-doing in perfection; but the practice of one that is meerly a Believer may be ſaid to be of a middle rank, as not being freed from imperfecti-*

(u) *Baron. ad an.* 373. *n.* 34.

(w) *Lipſ. Manud. l.* 2. *diſſ.* 12.

Act. 15. 9.
1 *Pet.* 1. 22.
Gal. 5. 6.
1 *Pet.* 1. 7.
1 *Joh.* 4. 10, 19.

(x) *Max. Hom.*

(y) *S. Cypr. de op. & eleem.*

(z) *Idem de Zel. & Liv.*

(a) *Idem ad Demetr.*

(b) *Idem de orat. domin.*

(c) Καὶ πᾶσα πρᾶξις, γνωστικοῦ μὲν κατόρθωμα· τοῦ δὲ ἁπλῶς πιστοῦ, μέση πρᾶξις λέγοιτ᾽ ἂν, μηδέπω κατὰ λόγον ἐπιτελουμένη, μηδὲ μὴν κατ᾽ ἐπίστασιν κατορθουμένη. παντὸς δὲ ἔμπαλιν τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ, ἁμαρτητική. *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 48

on by Reaſon, nor rais'd to perfection by Science: on the other hand, the practice of every Pagan is ſinful.

VII. It appeareth from this account of Juſtifying Faith (of which it is very difficult to repreſent a juſt Idea) that it muſt not be counted the Aggregate of all Divine Graces (although it virtually containeth them) but a diſtinct particular Virtue. And if it muſt be ſo conſider'd, it is reaſonable to ask the reaſon of its peculiar juſtifying Virtue, why Men are juſtify'd by Faith rather than by any other Divine Virtue? Many reaſons of this difference are plain and obvious; for it is Faith peculiarly that ſymbolizeth with God, that maketh the alliance which his Divine People have to him, that conſtituteth them a Divine People in Mind and Life, that is archical and radical to all Godlineſs, and it is by the Religion of Saving Grace (ſupernatural and ſuperlegal Grace) that Men muſt be juſtify'd; *for which reaſons they muſt have their Juſtification as God's Believers.* Upon their becoming ſuch and as ſuch they are juſtify'd by *a creative Act as to the having the ſtate of the Righteous*, which is S. *Paul*'s Notion of Juſtification. But they that are thus juſtified by *a creative Act as to the having the ſtate of the Righteous*, are juſtified alſo by *a judicial-ſentential Act as to the being counted the really Righteous in diſpoſition and practice* (God judgeth them that are the ſincere Believers the really Righteous in diſpoſition and practice) and this is S. *James*'s notion of Juſtification. Theſe two Apoſtles do not ſpeak of the ſame kind of *Faith*; for the one ſpeaketh of the Saving, the other of the Hiſtorical kind of Faith. Nor do they ſpeak of the ſame kind of *Works*; for the one ſpeaketh of the Law-religioniſts Works, and the other ſpeaketh of the Works of Faith. But both of them ſpeak of one and the ſame Juſtification conſider'd under two different Notions: For S. *James* ſpeaketh of it, as it is *the judging and counting a Man one of the really Righteous in diſpoſition and practice*; and how can he be ſo juſtified by God, as to be judged and counted one of the really Righteous in diſpoſition and practice (a Doer of Righteouſneſs) but by his Works? *For he that doeth Righteouſneſs is Righteous*, 1 Joh. 3. 7. God's Believers may be conſider'd meerly as they are God's Believers. So S. *Paul* conſidereth them: and they may be conſider'd, as they are God's Believers in their Works and Doings, and ſo S. *James* conſidereth them. For *Abraham* was God's Believer *in offering up his only Son*, Jam. 2. 21. Rahab *was God's Believer*, and as ſuch preſerved the Spies, *Jam.* 2. 25. Both were great works of Faith, both were eminently God's Believers in their doings. And both they and all others that are God's Believers, are ſo juſtify'd by God, *as to be judged and counted the Righteous in diſpoſition and practice, becauſe they are God's Believers in their doings, which is their Juſtification by Works.* All that become God's Believers neceſſarily become God's Believers in their (internal and external Converſation) Works and Doings. (*d*) Ψεύδεται τὸν θεὸν, ὃς οὐ πιστεύει τῷ θεῷ· οὐ πιστεύει δὲ, ὁ μὴ ποιῶν ἃ ἐνετείλατο· *He falſifieth God, who doth not believe God; and he doth not believe him, who doeth not the things that he hath commanded.* (*e*) *Fidei noſtræ veritatem in vitæ noſtræ conſideratione debemus agnoſcere.* The truth of our Faith appeareth from the conſideration of our Life. They that are God's Believers indeed, are God's Believers in their Works and Doings. As God's Believers they are ſo juſtify'd, as to have the ſtate of Righteouſneſs given them, as S. *Paul* affirmeth; as God's Believers in their Works and Doings they are ſo juſtify'd, as to be judged and counted the Righteous in diſpoſition and practice, as S. *James* affirmeth. And thus it appeareth, that there is no diſagreement between theſe two Apoſtles.

SECTION III.

Of the Religion of the Holy Men of the Old Teſtament-times, and how far they were Chriſtians.

I. THE Hypotheſis of *Pelagius* that in the times of the Old Teſtament Men were ſaved by *Nature* and by the *Law*, (*f*) is well refuted by the Anti-pelagian Fathers; whence ſome modern Writers of Inſtitutions of Theology appear, to have committed a foul miſtake, in conſidering the Ancient Times of the Old Teſtament, which are called the Times of Natural Religion, *as in ſuch Senſe the Times of Natural Religion, that the Chriſtian Religion was not in thoſe Times.* For this World never ſaw any Church of God, or any Saints of God that were made ſuch meerly by Natural Religion. Ever ſince there hath been a Church on Earth, there hath been a Religion of Saving Grace. The ancient Saints conſtituted the Church, and ſo ſoon as any Saints were in the World, the Church was in the World, (*g*) *Ex quo vocantur Sancti Eccleſia eſt in terrâ*: but to ſuppoſe, that there were real Saints in this degenerate World without the Religion of Saving Grace is a contradiction. This Religion therefore (although it had not a plenary Introduction till our Saviour's coming, yet) had an initial Introduction in the Old Teſtament-times, and throughout thoſe times (from the beginning of the World) there was *The initial Religion of Saving Grace, An initial Chriſtianiſm*, which was the Religion of Holy Men in the Old Teſtament-times, who may be called Chriſtians but not without ſeveral Limitations.

Firſt, They were ſo far Chriſtians, *their Religion was that Religion of Saving Grace, which was in the times of Judaiſm.* For not only in the times of the Moſaic Law, but all along from the beginning of the World throughout the times of the Old Teſtament the Religion of Saving Grace was complicated with *ritual* and *typical Judaiſm*, elſe it had not been *initially*, but *plenarily* introduc'd in the Old Teſtament-times; elſe the Old Teſtament had not been one continu'd Prophecy (in Types as well as Words) of our Lord Chriſt and his Religion; elſe there would not be always a due difference between the Old and New Teſtament, nor would the New Teſtament be always involv'd in the Old; nor is this queſtionable without queſtioning the Scriptures Hiſtorical account of ancient times. For as Circumciſion was *not of* Moſes, *but of the Fathers*; ſo the Judaical Sacrifices and Oblations, were not of *Moſes*, but of *Cain* and *Abel*. And if theſe Typical Judaical Rites (with ſome other) were introduc'd from the beginning of the World, ſhall it not be thought, that Typical and Ritual Judaiſm was introduc'd ſo early as well as Chriſtianity? and ſhould not the times of the Law of Nature commonly ſo called, be ſtil'd the times of *Initial Judaiſm?* There is therefore a great miſtake in the more ancient Writers of the Primitive Church, who (diſputing againſt Judaiſm and Judaizers) aſſert, that in the eldeſt times of the World, (*h*) ὁ Ἰουδαϊσμὸς οὐκ ἦν, *Judaiſm was*

(d) *Clem. Str. l.* 4. *p. m.* 358.

(e) *Greg. M. Hom.* 29. *in Evang.*

(f) *Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l.* 3. *par.* 2. *Antith.* 10.

(g) *S. Aug.*

Joh. 7. 22. *Gen.* 4. 3, 4.

(h) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 6.

was not (i) that they liv'd and were Religious according to the Goſpel of Chriſt, Χριστιανικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἰουδαϊκῶς, *Chriſtianly but not Judaically.* So in the Epiſtles of *Ignatius* the *Magneſians* are exhorted, to live according to *Chriſtianiſm*, not according to *Judaiſm* for this reaſon; οἱ γὰρ θειότατοι προφῆται, *for the moſt Divine Prophets liv'd according to Chriſt Jeſus, for which cauſe they were perſecuted.* As if the Prophets did not live according to the Rites of Judaiſm, as if they rejected God's Inſtitutes of Religion, which were of obligatory force in their time; for ſo *Ignatius* addeth, μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, *they ceas'd to obſerve the Sabbath.* *J. Mart.* ſaith of *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Lot*, *Melchizedek*, (k) *All the forenamed juſt Men pleaſed God without obſerving the Sabbath, and ſo did* Abraham *after them, and all his Children until* Moſes. And thus he argueth againſt the Jews: (l) *If before* Abraham *there was no need of Circumciſion, nor any need of obſerving the Sabbath and of Feaſts and Oblations before* Moſes, *neither is there now.* (m) *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* call *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Melchizedek*, each one of theſe *incircumciſum nec ſabbatizantem*, but they do not forget with *J. Mart.* that the Judaical Oblations were of far greater ſtanding than *Moſes*, as old as the beginning of the World. But theſe *Epiphanius* forgetteth; for ſpeaking of the times before the Flood he ſaith, (n) *Judaiſm then was not, nor other Hereſie, but as I may ſo ſpeak, the Faith which now is, this being from the beginning in the Holy Catholick Church of God, and again revealed in after-times.* *Euſebius* without any exception or limitation reporteth of *Melchiſedek*, that he was the Prieſt of the moſt high God, yet not circumcis'd, nor anointed, nor did he know what the Sabbath is, (o) *nor was he at all acquainted with any of thoſe Rites, which after theſe were injoyned the whole Jewiſh Nation: but on the contrary he liv'd according to Chriſt's Goſpel.* Of *Noah* he ſaith, (p) *He was not acquainted with any of the Judaical Rites, nor with Circumciſion of the Body, nor any other of the Inſtitutes of* Moſes. Who could imagine, that Men of Learning ſhould thus contradict the Scriptures (in plain matters of fact) and themſelves alſo? For within a few Pages *Euſebius* betaketh himſelf, to aſſign the reaſons, why we do not offer Sacrifices to God ὁμοίως τοῖς παλαιοῖς, *as thoſe Ancients did, that were ſo highly beloved of God.* The Religion of Judaical Sacrifices (and the differencing clean from unclean Animals, *Gen.* 7. 2.) was their Religion, which is a demonſtration, that their Religion was (initial) ritual Judaiſm, and that theſe are extremely falſe and injudicious Conceits, (q) *that all who from the beginning of Mankind are famous for Juſtice and Religion, as* Moſes *the great Servant of God and* Abraham *before him and his Sons, and ſo many righteous Men and Prophets as were afterwards, ſaw the Divine Logos with the pure Eyes of their Mind, and knew him, and gave him due worſhip as to the Son of God.* (r) *That out of great love to Mankind the Divine Logos ſometimes by Viſions of Angels appear'd to his Subjects, ſometimes by himſelf (as being the ſalutary power of God) in the form of a Man he appear'd to one and another of the ancient beloved Men of God.* (s) *that before the Law of* Moſes *there were* νομίματε ἄλλα καὶ ἐντολαὶ Χριστοῦ, δι' ὧν ἐδικαιώθησαν, *other Laws and Commandments of Chriſt, whereby the Ancients were juſtify'd, the New Teſtament being no other than that way of Piety and pious Converſation, which was more ancient than the times of* Moſes, *which was hidden as it were from Men, when the Law of* Moſes *was introduc'd, but was reviv'd and reſtor'd by the Diſcipline of our Saviour.*

This Scheme of Theology affirmeth, that God hath not only in theſe laſt Days ſpoken unto us by his Son, but that in the firſt and eldeſt times the Son of God appear'd, and gave his Law, Religion and Teſtament to the Fathers, who obſerv'd it and liv'd according to it, and did not only as Prophets ſee Chriſt's Day, but they ſaw him with their Eyes, convers'd and were acquainted with him, and therefore had no reaſon, to long for his coming in the Fleſh, nor had the Pagans any reaſon, to demand the cauſe of his coming ſo late, for according to this Hypotheſis he came very early, and long before the time of his coming which the Scripture ſpeaketh of (and conſequently his coming in the Fleſh was his ſecond coming) nor could the end of his coming (in Fleſh) be a new Creation of what was not before, but a reviving and reſtoring of what had been long before, but had ſuffer'd a great interruption. Accordingly this is ſaid to be our Saviour's Language, (t) *I recall all Men to the pious and godly life of the Men, that were of old time beloved of God*, without excepting their Polygamy and Sacrifices, which ſurely are not ſuch a way of Life and Religion, as is according to Chriſt's Goſpel. If the Ancients before the Law had the New Teſtament, as we have, how are the Imperfections of their Life and Religion excuſable from the Imperfection of their Inſtitution? how is it, that without us they could not be made perfect? how was the Goſpel a Secret from the beginning of the World, and but then made manifeſt, when *Paul* preach'd it? *Rom.* 16. 25, 26. That Chriſtianity in the Senſe of the Fathers is more ancient than Judaiſm, is a celebrated Aſſertion, (u) which ſome blindly follow, but it is not to the honour of their Underſtanding. For it maketh the Antitype to be before the Type, the thing propheſied of, to be before the Prophecy, and this is the plain Senſe of it, *The times of Chriſtianity are the ancient times and the times of Judaiſm are the later times, Chriſtianity is the Old Teſtament and Judaiſm the New; The New Teſtament is the Old and the Old Teſtament is the New*, which is more than one Contradiction. *You muſt not think* (ſaith *Euſebius*) *that the Teſtament of the Men beloved of God that were before* Moſes, *is called the Old Teſtament: but that which was given by* Moſes *himſelf to the Jewiſh Nation.* But if the Religion of theſe Ancients was, not the Law of *Moſes* or any part of it, but only the New Teſtament, the New Teſtament ought to have the Name of the Old Teſtament, and one part and the more ancient part of the Old Teſtament-times muſt not be counted ſuch, but the times of the New Teſtament. The New Teſtament in the Old Teſtament-times muſt be ſuppos'd, not to have been *veiled*, but *revealed*; thoſe muſt be counted the times of Chriſtianity, when no Law for Chriſtianity was made or publiſh'd; and the Inſtitution of Chriſtianity muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been in the

(i) *Idem Dem. Ev. l.* 1 *c.* 6.

(k) *Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 236.

(l) Εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἦν χρεία περιτομῆς, οὐδὲ πρὸ Μωϋσέως τοῦ σαββατισμοῦ καὶ ἑορτῶν καὶ προσφορῶν, οὐδὲ νῦν. *Ibid. p.* 241.

(m) *Adv. Hær. l.* 4. *c.* 30. *adv. Jud. c.* 2, 4.

(n) Οὐκ Ἰουδαϊσμός, οὐχ αἱρέσις τις ἑτέρα, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἡ νῦν πίστις, ἐν τῇ ἄρτι ἁγίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὖσα, καὶ ὕστερον πάλιν ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα. *Panar. l.* 1. *T.* 1. *n.* 5.

(o) Οὐ δ' ὅλως τι τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα τῷ παντὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνει διὰ Μωσέως παρηγγελμένων ἐποιοῦντα· ἄντικρυς δὲ κατὰ τὸ Χριστοῦ εὐαγγέλιον βιοῦντα. *Dem. Ev. ſupr.*

(p) Οὐδὲν γοῦν οὗτος τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἐθῶν ἐπιστάμενος, οὔτε ἐν περιτομῇ σώματος, οὔτε ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ὑπὸ Μωσέως διατεταγμένοις. *Ibid.*

(q) *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(r) *Ibid.*

(s) *Dem. Ev. ſupr.*

(t) Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν παλαιῶν θεοφιλῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐσεβῆ καὶ θεοφιλῆ βίον ἀνακαλοῦμαι τοὺς πάντας. *Euſeb. ibid.*

(u) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 1. *c.* 12. *B.* 2. *c.* 19.

proper ſtate of the Inſtitution of Chriſtianity, the Religion of Chriſtianity in the proper ſtate of the Religion of Chriſtianity, before it was plenarily introduc'd by our Saviour. The Law of *Moſes* is ſuppos'd to have been not a continuation of the Chriſtianity of the Old Teſtament-times, but a grand Interruption thereof; and after God had manifeſted the New Teſtament in the more ancient times of the Old Teſtament, he is ſuppos'd, to have eclips'd it by the Moſaic Law; which are abſurd Suppoſitions. And it is alike abſurd, to ſuppoſe, that the Holy Men and Prophets who liv'd in the times of the Moſaic Law, were not the ſame ſort of Chriſtians with thoſe Ancients, that liv'd before the times of the Law, whoſe Religion was not meer Chriſtianity, but Chriſtianity as involv'd in Judaiſm; and conſequently, as they are ſaid to have been (*w*) *in reality Chriſtians although not in Name*, ſo it ought to be ſaid, that they were Jews in reality although not in Name; for they were Spiritual Jews (as Chriſtians are) and in reſpect of external Rites they were Judaical Religioniſts. It is not abſolutely certain, that they obſerv'd the *Judaical Sabbath*: But moſt are of Opinion, that the Patriarchs before and after the Flood did obſerve every Seventh Day as a day ſet apart for God's Service, and think it reaſonable, that God ſhould ſet apart that day (for his Worſhip and to continue the Memory of his Creation) and that if God had not ſet apart that day, Men of themſelves would have agreed to ſet apart ſuch a day. Which Opinion is countenanced by ſeveral places of Scripture, *Gen.* 2. 3. and 8. 16. *Exod.* 16. 23, 25, 26. But a late learned Aſſerter of this Opinion doth not think (*x*) that the Patriarchs kept ſuch a Reſt on the Seventh Day as God injoin'd the *Iſraelites*; *for* (as he ſuppoſeth) *that was proper to them for a peculiar Reaſon, becauſe they had been Slaves in* Egypt. Whereas the principal Reaſon of the Judaical Sabbatic Reſt was not their Slavery in *Egypt*, but *God's reſting the Seventh Day from all his Works*. And if the Patriarchs did Sabbatize (of which there is no reaſon to doubt) ſhall it not be thought, that they Sabbatiz'd *Judaically*, ſeeing they Sacrific'd *Judaically*?

II. *They kept the Law of Nature in the State of Grace* (as regenerate Chriſtians do) *but ſo as to have the Prophetic Inſtitution of their time. Tertullian* diſcourſeth (*y*) *that before the Law of* Moſes *written in Tables of Stone, there was an unwritten Law, which was naturally underſtood, and was kept by the Fathers. For whence was* Noah *found Juſt, if the Juſtice of the Law of Nature was not before him? Whence was* Abraham *reputed the Friend of God* (that is Righteous) *if not from the Equity and Juſtice of the Law of Nature?* (*z*) *By the Law of Nature* (ſaith S. *Hierom*) *which ſpeaketh in our Hearts, that all Good muſt be done, and all Evil muſt be eſchew'd, we have reported* Abraham, Moſes, *and the reſt of the Saints, to have been made Righteous.* The Patriarchs were (*a*) *adorn'd with a Life that is according to Nature, by right Reaſonings they were adorn'd with the Virtue of Religion, by natural Reaſonings and unwritten Laws ſteering the right courſe of Virtue they paſs'd beyond fleſhly Pleaſures into an every way wiſe and religious Life.* Thus far the ancient Writers Elogies of the Law of Nature are allowable: But they are not ſo, when they proceed, to ſay, that (*b*) *Abel, not having learn'd of any, nor heard of any Law touching Firſt-fruits, of himſelf and being taught by his own Conſcience, offer'd that Sacrifice.* (*c*) *The Law of Nature which God implanteth without teaching the Underſtanding or Knowledge of the Creator, called them* (Cain *and* Abel) *to offer Sacrifice to God; for all good things are inſeminated and implanted by Nature.* But (as will hereafter appear) the Sacrifices and Oblations of the Ancients are not probably deriv'd from Nature or the Law of Nature. Although the Scripture doth not report to us any general Laws or Precepts given to Mankind before the Flood ſave only the Law of Nature, yet it appeareth from the Scripture, that the Religion of the Church or People of God from the beginning of the World had always in it ſomething that was of poſitive Inſtitution; and that the Holy Men of the eldeſt Times of the Old Teſtament were Prophets of God, and conſequently they had ſupernatural Revelations. *Noah* and *Abraham* (mention'd by *Tertullian* and *S. Jerom* as meer Obſervers of the Law of Nature) were Prophets of God. *Reſtore the Man his Wife, for he is a Prophet.* Gen. 20. 7. The Pſalmiſt calleth the Patriarchs Prophets. *Pſal.* 150. 15. *Touch not mine anointed and do my Prophets no harm.* 'Αποκάλυψις 'Ενώχ, *the Revelation of* Enoch ſheweth, that he hath been accounted a Prophet, and the Apoſtle affirmeth, that he was a Prophet indeed. *Jude* 14. *Euſebius* that aſcribeth the Virtues of the Patriarchs (before and after the Flood) to Natural Reaſon and the Law of Nature, yet uſually diſcourſeth, that they had the extraordinary appearances of God and converſe with him (*d*) and that they were φίλοι Θεȣ̃ ϗ προφῆται, *the Friends of God and Prophets.* S. *Cyril* that ſaith of *Abel*, he was called by the Law of Nature to offer Sacrifice (*e*) diſcourſeth, that *Abel* (the Righteous *Abel* and a Shepherd) was a Type and Fore-runner of Chriſt (the Juſt one and the great Shepherd) which implieth, that he was a Prophet. Our Saviour reckoneth him in the Catalogue and Succeſſion of Prophets. *Matth.* 23. 34,--- 37. And according to (*f*) *Origen* (*g*) and *Tertullian*, *Adam* was a Prophet. All that have written of theſe ancient times have obſerv'd (*h*) *the appearances* of God (by Angels) *were then frequent.* An ancient Writer ſaith (*i*) *when I conſider the Fathers of the Old Teſtament, I find in Scripture, that many of them ſaw God.* They had ſuch an appearance of God to them, and ſuch converſe with him, as conſtituteth Prophets, and therefore muſt not be look'd upon meerly as Holy Men, but as extraordinary Miniſters of Religion in their time. Much leſs muſt they be look'd upon as meer Obſervers of the Law of Nature; for although this in the eldeſt times was the only general Law, yet the Religion of thoſe times was in part the Religion of Prophets as ſuch, and conſquently was of poſitive Inſtitution; and this part of it was *Chriſtiano-judaical*, which muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the Law of Nature. The Law of Nature alſo muſt be conſider'd, as it is meerly the Law of Nature, and as it is from (ſupernatural Revelation) Prophetick Inſpiration. *Job* ſaith *Ch.* 23. 11, 12. *My foot hath held his ſteps, his way have I kept, and not declined, neither have I gone back from the Commandment of his Lips; I have eſteemed the words of his Mouth more than my neceſſary Food.* Which words ſome will have (*k*) to be meant of the Law of Nature, as it is meerly the Law of Nature, which is extremely abſurd. They are neceſſarily meant of ſome Law or Doctrine that is God's word by his Prophets, of which number

---

(w) *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(x) *Bp. Patrick on Gen.* 2. 3.

(y) *Adv. Jud. c.* 2.

(z) *S. Hieron. Com. in Gal.* 3.

(a) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 6, 7, 8.

(b) *S. Chryſoſt.* 'Ανδριάντ. 12.

(c) *S. Cyr. in Joann. p.* 561.

(d) *Pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 5, 7. *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 4. *Dem. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(e) *In Joan. p.* 562. *Glaphyr. in Gen. l.* 1. *p.* 19.

(f) *Hom.* 2. *in Cant.*

(g) *De Anim. c.* 11.

(h) *Epiſcop. Inſt. l.* 1. *c.* 10.

(i) *Greg. M in Job l.* 18. *c.* 37.

(k) *Seld. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

Job himſelf was one. And of the ſame Notion is that Divine Character of *Abraham*'s Piety. *Gen.* 18. 19. *I know him, that he will command his Children and his houſhold after him, and they ſhall keep the way of the Lord.* Such Prophetick Doctrine the Church and People of God were never unfurniſh'd with, of this they were the Believers, and thereby they were in the State of Grace. Their obſervance therefore of the Law of Nature was of the ſame kind with that of regenerate Chriſtians, the Spiritual-religious (*l*) οἱ πνευματικῶς αὐτὸν ἐκτελοῦντες ϗ τῆς χάριτος μετέχοντες, *they are ſuch as partake of Grace and ſpiritually fulfil the Law.*

III. They were therefore *God's Believers* as Chriſtians are, and obtain'd the State of Righteouſneſs by Faith (in the Chriſtian way) but ſo that their Faith muſt be denominated *the Iſraelitical Theiſm of God's Believers.* They were God's Believers both as to the matter and kind of their Faith, their works were the works and doings of Faith, and they did the Heroic Deeds of the Men of Faith. *Noah* became a Preacher of Righteouſneſs in an Age of profligate Wickedneſs againſt the Humour and Faſhion of the World (not regarding what Sufferings he might incur thereby;) by Faith *Abraham* forſook his Country and his own Bowels, and ſacrific'd his only Son; and by Faith *Moſes* forſook the Honour and Grandeur of a Court with its appendent Opulency and Pleaſure, and choſe the Lot of God's People, Poverty, Reproach, Slavery and a Brick-kiln. The Reproach which he choſe (the Reproach of God's People) was the ſame thing then, which the Reproach of Chriſt is now, and therefore the Apoſtle calleth it by that Name. *Heb.* 11. 26. *Eſteeming the reproach of Chriſt greater riches then the treaſures in Egypt.* Great and Heroic things theſe Ancients did by Faith, which is the Duty-part of Religion, and thereby they obtain'd the Benefit-part of it, the State of Righteouſneſs. For ſuch was God's way of juſtifying Men from the beginning of the World. *Hab.* 2. 4. *The Juſt ſhall live by his Faith.* That is, by that Faith whereby he is Juſt, he ſhall have Life and Happineſs. So *Noah* obtain'd the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith, and therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *he became an Heir of the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith*; for in his Language and in the Hebrew way of ſpeaking, to be an Heir and a Poſſeſſor, are identical Expreſſions. There is a great appearance of Chriſtianity therefore in the Religion of theſe ancient Divine Believers, which yet muſt not be denominated *the Goſpel Theiſm* which is of the New Teſtament, but *the Iſraelitical Theiſm* which is of the Old Teſtament, and accordingly their Faith muſt be denominated the Iſraelitical Theiſm *of God's Believers.* Which Name involveth in it a threefold Notice of their Faith.

(1.) They were Believers (godly noble Believers) *as to God and his Word* (in their time) *and the Matters of Theiſm.* Infidelity as to God and his Word and the Matters of Theiſm is diſtinguiſhable from Infidelity as to Chriſt and Chriſtianity. Of this Nature was the Unbelief of *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Numb.* 20. 12. *Becauſe ye believed me not, to ſanctifie me in the Eyes of the Children of Iſrael.* And that of the Children of *Iſrael*, Pſal. 106. 25. *They believed not his word, nor hearkned to the voice of the Lord.* And ſuch was the Infidelity of the Old World that derided *Noah*'s Preachment of Righteouſneſs, *Matth.* 24. 38. To this Infidelity the Faith of God's Believers in the Old Teſtament-times ought to be confronted and oppos'd. For *their Belief and Perſwaſion was according to God and his Word againſt the preſent appearances in Nature and to human Sence, againſt all human Probabilities and Poſſibilities, againſt human Reaſonings and Conceits, againſt human Affections and Intereſts, human Confidences and Reliances*; and this their Godly noble ſymbolizing with God in their Sentiment and Perſwaſion (their going beyond Nature, human Sence and Appearances, human Probabilities, Inclinations and Intereſts ſo as to Conſort with God) was the Faith that made them Godly noble in their Spirits, Practices and Atchievements, the Faith that recommended them to God, and whereby they were juſtified, and which renowneth them in Holy Scripture and to all Ages. Such was the Faith of *Abraham who believ'd God that quickneth the dead.* Rom. 4. 17, 22. Such was the Faith of *Noah*, who *being warned of God prepar'd an Ark.* Heb. 11. 7. Such was the Faith of *Rahab* the Harlot, who believed in the God of *Iſrael* (ſhe believ'd the Promiſes that God had made to his People *Iſrael*, and reſolv'd thereupon to become one of them, and to embrace the Iſraelitical Theiſm) *whence ſhe receiv'd the Spies in Peace and preſerv'd them*, and by this Faith ſhe was juſtified, *Jam.* 2. 25. *Heb.* 11. 31. So thoſe of the noble Army of Martyrs *endured tortures not accepting deliverance* by the Faith of a better Reſurrection, and this was their ſaving Faith. *Heb.* 11. 35. At the ſame rate the Apoſtle deſcribeth the juſtifying and ſaving Faith of all the reſt of the Divine Believers in his Catalogue, *Heb.* 11. Neither he in this Catalogue nor any other place of Scripture ever mentioneth their Faith touching the Meſſiah as their juſtifying Faith, either as the whole of it or as any conſtitutive Ingredient thereof. Which is the more ſtrange, becauſe the ancient Writers of the Church inſiſt upon their Faith touching the Meſſiah (which they ſometimes over-amplifie) as the whole of their juſtifying Faith obſcuring and overlooking the nobleneſs of their Faith as to God and his Word and the Matters of Theiſm. (*m*) *One Faith juſtifieth the Saints of all times, and to the ſame hope of the faithful all that belongeth, which by the Mediator of God and Man Chriſt Jeſus, either we confeſs to be done, or our Fathers wiſh'd to be done.* (*n*) *The ancients were healed* (or ſaved) *by the ſame Faith that we are, the Faith of the Mediator of God and Man the Man Chriſt Jeſus, the Faith of his Blood, the Faith of his Croſs, the Faith of his Death and Reſurrection.* (*o*) *They liv'd by one and the ſame Faith whereby we live, believing the Incarnation, Paſſion and Reſurrection of Chriſt to come, which we believe to be paſt.* That the Ancients diſtinctly underſtood and believ'd the Oeconomy of our Salvation by Chriſt and the ſeveral Articles thereof, his Incarnation, Paſſion, Reſurrection (and the very time of his riſing, as S. *Auſtin* ſuppoſeth, *Ep.* 89.) is not credible. Nor is that Story credible, which the Apoſtolic *Clemens* mentioneth, (*p*) *They hanged a ſcarlet Thread*

(l) *Macar. Hom.* 37.

Heb. 11. 7.

(m) *Una Fides juſtificat univerſorum temporum ſanctos, & ad eandem ſpem fidelium pertinet quicquid per mediatorem Dei & hominum Jeſum Chriſtum, vel nos confitemur factum, vel patres noſtri adoptavere faciendum.* Leo. M. Ser. 14. de Paſſion.

(n) *Ea fides ſanavit antiquos, quæ ſanat & nos, id eſt, mediatoris Dei & hominum hominis Jeſu Chriſti, fides ſanguinis ejus, fides crucis ejus, fides mortis & reſurrectionis ejus.* S. Aug. de Nat. & Gr. c. 44.

(o) *Ex fide qua nos vivimus, una eademque vixerunt, incarnationem, paſſionem, reſurrectionemque Chriſti credentes futuram, quam nos credimus factam.* Idem contr. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 3. c. 4. & vid. contr. Pelag. & Celeſt. l. 2. c. 24. & Ep. 89.

(p) Ep. ad Corinth p. 17.

Thread by the Wall of Rahab's *Houſe, thereby ſignifying, that by the Blood of the Lord there ſhould be Redemption to all that believe and hope in God.* But,

(2.) They were *Chriſt's Prophetick Believers*, the Meſſiah and his coming to be a Saviour-king being a principal Article of the Iſraelitical Theiſm of God's Believers. (q) *Hæc fuit omnium prima Cabala*, this was the true ancient Cabala amongſt the People of God in the Old Teſtament-times. It was a Branch of their Faith alſo as they were Prophets, *Matth.* 13. 17. *Joh.* 8. 56. (r) *Viderunt Prophetæ aliquid magni in noſtra ſera tempora reſervari; ſed quale id eſſet, non potuerunt pervidere.* The Prophets ſaw, that ſome great thing was reſerv'd to our late times, but what it was they could not throughly diſcern. But by the Spirit of Chriſt which was in them, they underſtood and believ'd, that Salvation was to come by Chriſt, and diligently ſearch'd and inquir'd into it. 1 *Pet.* 1. 10, 11. The Patriarchs ſaw the heavenly Promiſes (as well as their earthly) *afar off*, becauſe they looked upon them as a Branch of their promis'd Salvation by Chriſt. *Heb.* 11. 13, 39, 40. *David in Spirit* (by the Spirit of Prophecy) calleth Chriſt his Lord (owneth him for his Lord) and therefore was nothing leſs than one of Chriſt's (Prophetick) Religioniſts. All the ancient Prophets, and Patriarchs were his Types, Fore-runners, Expectants, and as Divine Religioniſts near of Kin to him, and therefore muſt be denominated *his Prophetick Believers, Religioniſts and Relatives.* But they did not underſtand (and therefore could not explicitly believe his Oeconomy of our Salvation at the rate of Chriſtians: Nor were they Believers of his Doctrine (or Revelation) as Chriſtians are: Nor were they (as Chriſtians are now) the federal Believers and Religioniſts of his Government. *They were of the Faith of Chriſt initially introduc'd*, and ſo far as it was introduc'd in their time. (s) *Many Prophets and Righteous Men foreſeeing by the Spirit his coming prayed to come to that time, when they might ſee their Lord face to face.* (t) *The Prophets obſcurely, darkly and tenuiouſly in ſome ſort ſaw and manifeſted the coming of Chriſt.* Νεφέλαι γὰρ οἱ προφῆται, *for there is a cloudineſs in the Prophets*, and although ſome of them probably had clearer Revelations of Chriſt than others, yet neither they nor others from them had any thing more than a Prophetick Inſtitution to the Faith of Chriſt, which could amount to nothing more than an initial Introduction of it. It was not then in the ſtate of *Evolution* but of *Involution*, as being involv'd in the Theiſm of the Old Teſtament. Nor was it then the direct immediate way to Righteouſneſs and Salvation, but by way of σύγκλωσις καὶ ἐπιπλοκή, *Intertexture and Implication*, as being involv'd and comprehended in the Faith of God's Believers in the Old Teſtament-times. So the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* (in his Catalogue of Divine Believers) looketh upon it, and therefore doth not openly inſiſt upon it, as it was not to be openly inſiſted on in the Old Teſtament-times. (u) *Prophetæ licet occultius tamen Dominum prænunciabant.* But the Apoſtle not only reckoneth theſe Ancients as one Race and Succeſſion of Believers with Chriſt's People of the New Teſtament-times; but he affirmeth, *that theſe all having obtained a good report through Faith, received not the Promiſe: God having provided ſome better thing for us, that they without us ſhould not be made perfect.* Heb. 11. 39, 40. In which words the Apoſtle looketh upon the promiſed heavenly Felicity as a Branch of the promiſed Salvation by Chriſt. This Salvation the ancient Saints could not receive as actually done and accompliſh'd in their time, and conſequently they could not ſo receive that eminent Branch of it the promiſed heavenly Felicity: But God hath provided this better thing for us, to have the promis'd Redemption and Salvation by Chriſt actually done and exhibited in our time; the conſequent whereof is this, the ancient Saints otherwiſe than in Conjunction with us cannot attain the Perfection and Conſummation of their Happineſs, which is an heavenly Immortality. If this be the Apoſtle's Senſe (and no other is probable) this place was not impertinently alledg'd (w) by the ancient Writers of the Church, to prove, that the ancient Saints did not enter into Heaven ſtrictly ſo called before our Saviour's Aſcenſion.

(3.) *The Unity of their Faith with Chriſt's Believers of the New Teſtament* is ſuch as the Iſraelitical Theiſm importeth. For as to God and his Word and the Matters of Theiſm the Chriſtian Believers Sentiment agreeth with theſe ancient Saints; and as to Chriſt and Chriſtianity they were Prophetick Believers and more than meer Prophetick Believers. For Hiſtory is the reverſe of Prophecy, and conſequently a meer Prophetick Faith is but an Hiſtorical kind of Faith, and is meerly an Act of the intelligent Mind, which may be in the Devils themſelves. Prophecy is a ſupernatural Gift, but not a ſupernatural Grace or Virtue. It recommendeth no Man to God or Chriſt. 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. *Matth.* 7. 22. Nor could a meer Prophetick Faith touching the Meſſiah to come incumber the Ancients with any Severities, Difficulties and Hardſhips, or make them Holy and Godlike; and therefore it could not be of any great Virtue or Value. But their Prophetick Faith was animated by an *affectus pius credendi* (whence it became ſaving Faith, a Divine Grace and Virtue) and therefore conſtituted them *Chriſt's Believers* and ſo far Chriſtians. (x) *Although occultly yet then they were Chriſtians.* But with this difference (y) *what was to them foretold, is told to us. What was then veiled is now revealed.* Such is their Unity of Faith with ours. (z) *The Fathers who believ'd, that Chriſt ſhould come, are in the Society of the Faith with them, who have believed, that he is come. By which ſameneſs of Faith they are conjoined.* (a) *Our Head is Chriſt, and we are the Body of that Head. Are we alone ſo, and not thoſe alſo that were before us? All the Juſt that were from the beginning of the World have Chriſt their Head. For they believ'd his future coming, whom we now believe to be come; and as we are, ſo they were, healed by the Faith of him: that he might be the Head of whole* Jeruſalem, counting together *all the faithful from the*

(q) Reuchlin. de Art. Cab. l. 1. fol. 9.

(r) Grot. Not in 1 Pet. 1. 10.

Pſal. 110. 1.

(s) *Prophetæ & juſti multi præſcientes per ſpiritum adventum ejus, oraverunt in illud tempus venire, in quo facie ad faciem viderent Dominum ſuum.* Iren adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 24.

(t) Οἱ προφῆται ἀμυδρῶς πως καὶ σκοτεινῶς καὶ λεπτῶς πως τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔβλεπον καὶ ἐδήλουν. *S. Athan. Dict. & Interpr. parab. Qu.* 85.

(u) S. Aug. in Pſal. 104.

(w) *Montacut. Appar.* 1. *S.* 116, 165.

(x) *Etiamſi latenter jam tamen Chriſtiani.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 104.

(y) *Illis futura prænunciabatur, quæ jam facta à nobis annunciatur. Et tempore veteris teſtamenti velabatur, quæ tempore novi teſtamenti revelatur.* Idem Ep. 89.

(z) *Eadem fides utroſque conjungit, & eos qui venturum eſſe, & eos qui eum veniſſe crediderunt. In ejus ſunt fidei ſocietate nobiſcum & illi patres.* Idem in Joan. Tr. 45.

(a) *Caput noſtrum Chriſtus eſt: Corpus capitis illius nos ſumus. Nunquid ſoli nos, & non etiam illi qui fuerunt ante nos? Omnes qui ab initio ſeculi fuerunt juſti caput Chriſtum habent. Illum enim venturum eſſe crediderunt, quem nos veniſſe jam credimus, & in ejus fide & ipſi ſanati ſunt, in cujus & nos: Ut eſſet & ipſe totius caput Hieruſalem, omnibus connumeratis fidelibus ab initio uſque in finem, adjunctis etiam legionibus & exercitibus angelorum, ut fiat illa una civitas ſub uno rege.* Idem in Pſal. 36. Conc. 3.

beginning to the end, adjoining alſo the Legions and Hoſts of Angels, that ſo there may be one City under one King. (b) *We ſay, that the ancient and Catholic Church is one and alone in Subſtance and Notion, in Origin and Excellence, by the Will of one God and by one Lord collecting them that are ordain'd, whom God predeſtinated (having known before the Foundation of the World that they would become Righteous) into the Unity of one Faith according to their proper Teſtaments, or rather according to one Teſtament in ſeveral times.* As if the two Teſtaments were but one, in ſome inſtances the Chriſtian Believers Faith is of identity with theſe ancient Believers Faith. Both are heavenly Believers, and Chriſtians ſay of the things that are here, as theſe ancient Saints are ſuppos'd to ſay (c) πάντα ξένα καὶ ἀλλότρια, *all things are ſtrange and alien.* In ſome inſtances the Chriſtian Believers Faith is a lively reſemblance of theſe ancient Believers Faith. For (d) τῇ ὁμοιότητι τῆς πίστεως, *by a like Faith unto* Abraham *we come into the Adoption of* Abraham. *For it is alike incredible amongſt Men, to raiſe one from the dead, as for Children to be generated* ἐκ νενεκρωμένων πρεσβυτῶν, *from dead aged People: But Chriſt being preach'd to us that he was crucify'd and dead, and raiſed again, this we believe, which is* ὁ τύπος τῆς ἐκείνου πίστεως, *a likeneſs of the Faith of* Abraham.

IV. They were truly Righteous and Holy and genuin Religioniſts as regenerate Chriſtians are, yet not only Judaiz'd in their Rites, *but were in other reſpects the Judaical kind of Pietiſts.* (e) Quis ignorat ſub altera diſpenſatione Dei, omnes retrò ſanctos ejuſdem fuiſſe meriti, cujus nunc Chriſtiani ſunt? *Who doth not know, that under the other diſpenſation of God all the ancient Saints were of the ſame Merit with Chriſtians?* They were the true Saints of God, and their Religion was not only the Religion of the true God, but that Religion of the true God, whereby Men become the true Saints of God. They were *of the Church of the firſt-born which are written in Heaven*, not Aliens or thoſe that are without (not the profane and mundane People, nor the mundane Theiſts, ſuch as the Heathen and the carnal *Iſrael* were) but thoſe that are within as to the Chriſtian Church and Religion, and therefore are neceſſarily his People, who is the Head of the Church, which is of this definitive Notion (f) *This City of God is as it were a certain Land and Legion of the ſanctify'd.* (g) *The ſame Church brought forth* Abel *and* Enoch *and* Noah *and* Abraham, Moſes *and the Prophets and our Apoſtles and Martyrs and all good Chriſtians. They were born indeed in different times, but are all contained in the Society of one People, and are the Citizens of the ſame City.* (h) *The Catholic Church was in Holy* Abel *and in* Noah *and in* Abraham *and the reſt till the coming of our Lord and Saviour.* They were one genuine People and Church of God, one Generation of the Righteous with regenerate Chriſtians, that are of their Race and Succeſſion.

They were Holy in Life and Practice, and (although the Sanctity of moſt of them hath a dark ſide of bleiniſh as well as a bright ſide) are propos'd to Chriſtians as Patterns of Holineſs. (i) *They that Sail on the great Sea, Steer their Courſe looking at certain Stars: But the Church's Sea-faring Men, not looking at certain Stars,* ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας τείνοντες, *but directing the Eye of their Mind to the Fathers, and in the deſire of their Souls following their Steps, Sail to the ſame Port of the Kingdom.* —— *The beſt Teacher of Patience is the Life of bleſſed* Job, *of tolerance of Injuries that of* Moſes, *of Mildneſs that of* David, *of Faſting and Prayer that of* Daniel, *of Chaſtity that of* Joſeph. (k) *That three Hebrew Youths in the midſt of the Babylonian Furnace remain'd untouch'd by the fire, is not to me ſo ſtrange and wonderful, as that this juſt Man having fallen into a worſe than Babylonian Furnace, the laſciviouſneſs of an Egyptian Woman, yet remain'd untouch'd, and having kept the Garments of his Chaſtity pure, ſo came forth.* (l) *The Fathers were Righteous Men having the Virtue of the Decalogue written in their Hearts and Souls, as loving God that made them, and abſtaining from Injuſtice towards their Neighbour.*

They were genuin Religioniſts (m) *veraces Dei cultores*, the true Worſhippers of God as regenerate Chriſtians are. For *Cain* and *Abel* were two oppoſite kind of Religioniſts, the one the *Carnal*, the other the *Spiritual* kind of Religioniſt; which was the Reaſon, why *God had reſpect unto* Abel *and to his offering.* Gen. 4. 4. It is not certain, in what way God teſtify'd his acceptance of *Abel*'s Sacrifice; it might be by granting his Requeſt, or by an Angel's Voice, as God teſtify'd his acceptance of *Abraham*'s Sacrifice and of *Cornelius*'s Alms and Prayers. But the Jews and the ancient Writers of the Church think, that Fire came from Heaven, which burnt up his Sacrifice. And this account is hugely probable; both becauſe (n) it is God's uſual way in Scripture, to ſend Fire from Heaven, to burn the Sacrifice to Aſhes, thereby teſtifying his acceptance of it and of him that offereth it; and alſo becauſe the Hebrew Verb דשן which ſignifieth, *to turn into Aſhes*, is us'd to ſignifie *receiving* or *accepting*. Pſal. 20. 3. *The Lord accept* (in the Hebrew *turn into Aſhes*) *thy burnt Sacrifice.* This account of God's teſtifying his acceptance of *Abel*'s Sacrifice is much more probable than this of a late learn'd Expoſitor (o) *that it was done by a ſtream of Light from the Schecinah, as* Homer *repreſenteth* Jupiter *lightning or ſending forth flaſhes of Lightning upon his Pagan Sacrificers.* For (beſides that it doth not appear, that *Abel*'s Sacrifice was offer'd to any Schecinah) *this lightning or ſending forth flaſhes of Lightning upon the Sacrificers* is not a Scriptural, but a purely Paganical Rite peculiar to the Pagan Deities, that by lightning and thundring about the Sacrifices conciliated to themſelves a great veneration from their Worſhippers. But of theſe Deities neither *Cain* nor *Abel* were the Worſhippers, both worſhipp'd the true God, but with this difference, the one was a Carnal Worſhipper, as the Carnal Jews were, the other was a Spiritual Worſhipper, as regenerate Chriſtians are. (*p*) *Cain*'s perſecution of *Abel* prefigured the carnal Jews perſecution of Chriſt and Chriſtians, and from this *Epocha* Perſecution beareth date, which hath its origin from Men of no worſe a Character than Religioniſts. For it is not meer Irreligioniſts, that are the great Perſecutors, but the Carnal and Mundane Family of Religioniſts perſecuteth the Spiritual and Divine Family, Cain *will kill* Abel *to the World's end*, as *Luther* ſaith. * From *Abel* the Church in Pilgrimage runneth on *inter perſecutiones mundi & conſolationes Dei*. In theſe (*Cain* and *Abel*) the two oppoſite Cities began the World and the Church.

(b) Κατά τε οὖν ὑπόστασιν, κατά τε ἐπίνοιαν, κατά τε ἀρχὴν, κατά τε ἐξοχὴν, μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις ἑνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ βουλήματι, δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ κυρίου, συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους οὓς προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. *Clem. Str. l. 7. p. m.* 549.

(c) *S. Chryſoſt. in Hebr. Hom.* 24.

(d) *Idem in Epheſ. Hom.* 4. p. 782.

(e) *S. Hieron. adv. Jovin. l. 2. c.* 3.

(f) Αὕτη δὴ οὖν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ πόλις γῆ τις ὥσπερ ἐστὶ καὶ χώρα τῶν ἡγιασμένων. *S. Cyr. in Mich. p.* 438.

(g) *Quæ autem peperit Abel & Enoc & Noe & Abraham, ipſa peperit & Moyſen & Prophetas tempore poſteriores ante adventum Domini: Et quæ iſtos ipſa & Apoſtolos & Martyres noſtros & omnes bonos Chriſtianos. Omnes enim diverſis quidem temporibus apparuerunt, ſed ſocietate unius populi continentur & ejuſdem civitatis cives ſunt.* S. Aug. de Bapt. c. Donat. l. 1. c. 16.

(h) *In ſancto Abel Eccleſia Catholica fuit, & in Noe & in Abraham & in reliquis uſque ad adventum Domini Salvatoris.* Idem de Temp. Ser. 217.

(i) S. Chryſoſt. T. 5. λογ. ρα. p. 655.

(k) Idem in Gen. λογ. μδ. p. 365.

(l) *Juſti autem patres virtutem Decalogi conſcriptam habentes in cordibus & animabus ſuis, diligentes ſcilicet Deum qui fecit eos, & abſtinentes erga proximum ab injuſtitia,* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 30.

(m) S. Aug. Ep. 157.

(n) Lev. 9. 24. Judg. 6. 21. 1 King. 18. 38. 1 Chron. 21. 26. 2 Chron. 7. 1.

(o) Bp. Patrick Gen. 4. 4.

But although the ancient Saints were ſuch as a Father calleth, (*q*) Ἰσραηλιτικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν, πνευματικὸν, *the true Spiritual Iſrael*, yet their Inſtitution of Sanctity was but *initial Spiritual Judaiſm*, as the Inſtitution of thoſe of them that liv'd before the Moſaic Law, was but *initial literal Judaiſm*. Thoſe of them that liv'd in the time of the Moſaic Law, were *the Holy Land kind of Pietiſts*, ſuch in a leſſer degree were the Patriarchs *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, and in all reaſon the more ancient Saints their Predeceſſors muſt be thought no other than ſuch as they, whoſe Virtue, Duty and Felicity, was ſuch as ought to be in the Old Teſtament-times, but was in ſeveral reſpects ſo peculiar to thoſe times, that to imitate it, is ſuch ſinful Judaizing, as ſome of the Eaſtern Churches are guilty of (*r*) that religiouſly abſtain from eating unclean Animals. The Holy Land kind of Pietiſts in the time of the Law were themſelves and their Virtue of the martial genius agreeably to the Apoſtles deſcription of them, *Heb.* 11. 32, 33, 34. which martial or military kind of Virtue (that was and ought to be in theſe Judaical Pietiſts) brancheth it ſelf into that *martial zelotick Spirit*, *that curſing Spirit*, *that Spirit of revenge* which breatheth in the Old Teſtament (in Holy Men and Prophets) and which are ſo many Branches of that *Elias-like* Spirit, which our Saviour rebuketh, *Luk.* 9. 55. Elias *zeal'd a Zeal for the Law*, he had a martial kind of fiery zeal for eradicating and deſtroying Idolaters (ſuch as *Phinehas* alſo had, and ſuch as the *Iſraelites* were bound to have, when they invaded the Land of *Canaan*) and this Warlike kind of Zeal was in thoſe times his Virtue and his Righteouſneſs. Notwithſtanding our non-imitation of it therefore he muſt be allow'd to be, what an eloquent Father ſtileth him, (*s*) *that Prophet*, *that Earthly Angel*, *that Heavenly Man*, *that went on the Earth but ſway'd the things of Heaven*, *that tricubital Man*, *that reach'd on high in his goings*, *and that flew to the very Summities of Heaven*, *the diſpenſer of the Waters*, *whoſe Tongue was a Treaſure of the Waters and the Key of the Heavens.* The ancient Saints were the Judaical Pietiſts, as they were Polygamiſts; for ſuch were that ſort of Pietiſts in all times, and thereby they are diſtinguiſh'd from the Chriſtian. If we conſider them as the Holy Land kind of Pietiſts, this account may be given of their Polygamy; that the Land of *Canaan* with the Secular Felicity thereof being ſettled or intended to be ſettled upon *Abraham*'s Seed, it was requiſite, that the Judaical Pietiſts ſhould not be abridg'd of Polygamy, which the oriental parts are not a little fond of unto this Day. As the ancient Saints were Judaical Pietiſts in reſpect of their typical and ſymbolical Sanctity (they were converſant in Types and Shadows) So living under the Old Teſtament-diſpenſation of things (which is ſparing in Spirituals and aboundeth with Secular Promiſes and Bleſſings) ſuch a ſtrain of Secularity as diſtinguiſheth them from Chriſtians, pervadeth their Piety in the Old Teſtament.

V. They had the Lot and Portion of Chriſtians in this World, which is Affliction and Sufferings for Righteouſneſs ſake (ſo far they were Chriſtians) but ſo as far to tranſcend them in Temporal Promiſes. The Righteous were then promis'd the largeſt Secular Felicities, but it was never intended, that they ſhould enjoy them without a mixture of the Croſs. (*t*) *If when we undertake the matters of Spiritual Life and Practice, we foreſee, that we ſhall be ſecur'd from hardſhip and ſufferings, we cannot be thought to do any great thing, having ſuch a ſecurity: but hence it is, that the doers of thoſe virtuous things are chiefly to be admir'd, becauſe they decline them not*, ϗ κινδύνους ϗ ζημίας, ϗ θανάτους ϗ μυρία κακὰ προορώμενοι, *foreſeeing dangers, and loſſes, and deaths, and innumerable evils, nor are deterr'd from them by the fears of ſlaughter. Thou therefore when thou art about to do any of thoſe things that are according to God*, πολλοὺς προόρα κινδύνους, πολλὰς ζημίας, πολλοὺς θανάτους, *foreſee many dangers, many loſſes, many deaths, and think it not ſtrange, nor be troubled, if theſe things befall thee:* (*u*) *For thus God hath inſtituted all the Saints by afflictions, ſtraits and diſtreſſes.* (*w*) *The Combatant doth not gain his Crowns, nor the Souldier his Trophies, nor the Shipmaſter his Port, nor the Husbandman his full Floor, by Sleep, Sloth and deliciating. Now and of old ever ſince there were Men, a Life afflictive and of Labours and full of innumerable hard things, hath been the lot of all that were or are Friends of God.* The firſt of them was not only afflicted, but perſecuted, and is juſtly ſtiled, (*x*) τὸ ἀρνίον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the Lamb of Chriſt*; for he died a Martyr for true Religion. (*y*) *The Sufferings of the Church began from the Blood of* Abel, who was ſucceeded by the Prophets, that wore the Badge of the Chriſtian Family according to our Saviour's Parallel, *ſo perſecuted they the Prophets which were before you.* Theſe were in their Lives oppoſite to the Guize and Humour of the World, and ſharp reprovers of the prevailing Sins of the times wherein they liv'd (as became the Miniſters of true Religion) whence they were hated, malign'd, abus'd and murder'd (*z*) by that evil World which they oppos'd. Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers perſecuted? *Act.* 7. 52. (*a*) *Noah* therefore a Man of Righteouſneſs, a preacher of Righteouſneſs, living in an Age of the moſt outragious Wickedneſs, in a Wilderneſs of barbarous Senſualiſts and Savages, conteſting the whole World of the Ungodly alone and unaſſiſted with any Companion, and for a much longer time than any other Prophet, conflicting with two Deluges (of Wickedneſs and of Waters) could not but ſuffer Hardſhips innumerable. *Abraham* by Divine Command wandred from his Home and Country into the wide World (he knew not whither) was exercis'd with ſevere trials (the Jews reckon nine of his tentations) liv'd a travelling life all his days, ſojourning as a Stranger (having no fix'd dwelling-place) which was alſo the caſe of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, *Heb.* 11. 9. *Jacob* ſpent a conſiderable part of his life in toilſome Servitude (in the

---

(p) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 15. c. 7.

* Ibid. l. 18. c. 51. & l. 15. c. 1.

(q) J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 228.

(r) Brerewood Enquir. of Armen.

1 Maccab. 2. 58.

(s) Τὸν προφήτην ἐκεῖνον, τὸν ἐπίγειον ἄγγελον, ϗ ἐπουράνιον ἄνθρωπον, τὸν χαμαὶ βαδίζοντα ϗ τὰ οὐράνια ἡνιοχοῦντα, τὸν τρίπηχυν ἄνθρωπον ϗ ὑψηλοβατοῦντα, ϗ εἰς αὐτὰς ἀναπτασθέντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς ἀψῖδας, τὸν τῶν ὑδάτων ταμίαν, οὗ ἡ γλῶττα θησαυρὸς ἐγένετο τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ κλεὶς τῶν οὐρανῶν. S. Chryſoſt. T. 8. p. 20.

(t) S. Chryſoſt. Ἀνδριαντ. p. 459.

(u) Idem in 2 Cor. Hom. 27.

(w) Idem T. 5. λογ. ογ. p. 522.

(x) Idem. T. 6. λογ. 1. p. 107.

(y) Greg. M super Ezech. l. 2. Hom. 15.

(z) 1 King. 19. 10. 2 Chron. 16. 10.

(a) Vid. S. Chryſoſt. T. 6. λογ. 1. p. 108, &c. & in Gen. λογ. κγ. p. 166.

Day the Drought conſum'd him and the Froſt by Night, and the Sleep departed from his Eyes) and upon a review of the whole of it (which was a ſucceſſion of troubles, he found, that he had reaſon to ſay, *Few and evil have been the Days of my Pilgrimage*, Gen. 47. 9. *Moſes* after his Court-education was forc'd to become a Fugitive (to flee for his life) to tent Sheep for his living, forty Years being expir'd he undertook the care of a much more troubleſome Flock, was imploy'd in conducting through a vaſt howling Wilderneſs a frantick untoward People, that made him weary of his Life by their monſtrous Sins and ſeditious Murmurs and the Plagues which their Impieties procured; and after all his immenſe Pains and tedious Travels he was deny'd entrance into *Canaan*. *Job* was a Prodigy of Affliction and of Patience. *David's* Afflictions and Perſecutions for Righteouſneſs ſake (for he was made the Drunkard's Song) are deſcrib'd by himſelf in an accent ſo tragical, as ſpeaketh them ſuperlative; (*b*) πάντα γὰρ μῦθον καὶ τραγῳδίαν πᾶσαν ἐνίκησε τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τούτου πάθη, *for the Sufferings of this King ſurmount all Fable and all Tragedy.* Such was the courſe of things even in the Old Teſtament-times, which were not without a zealous and faithful love to God and true Religion; for in the caſe of the three Hebrew Youths, (*c*) πῦρ ἐκράτει πυρὸς, τὸ πνευματικὸν τοῦ φυσικοῦ, *one Fire prevailed over another, the Spiritual over the Natural.* Nor were the Faithful in thoſe times without their fiery trial eſpecially the *Maccabees*, that were expos'd to the utmoſt outrages of a barbarous Perſecution, to which the Apoſtle hath reſpect in his tragical account of the Sufferings of God's Believers, *Heb.* 11. 35,----38. (*d*) *and is there any thing more glorious?* τί τὸ ἰσάμιλλον εἰς φαιδρότητα τῶν ἐξ ἀρετῶν; *is there any ſo mighty an illuſtriouſneſs of Virtue?* Such are the Church's Glories, that are made illuſtrious by their Sufferings.

VI. They belong'd to the New Teſtament, which is the Chriſtian Religion, but ſo that they belong'd alſo to that Religion (the Judaical Religion) which was the Religion of the Old Teſtament-times. They are therefore of Character Chriſtiano-Judaical, and ſo far theſe ancient Saints were Chriſtians, *They were made Saints by the Grace of Chriſt.* For the New Teſtament (although not properly made till the death of the Teſtator, yet) being made in the purpoſe of God, provided and promis'd by God, the Church having an Inſtitution to the Religion of it from the beginning, and the matters of it being prefigured in the Religion of the Times of the Old Teſtament, things in thoſe times were initially diſpens'd according to it. Converting Grace was diſpens'd, to bring Men to perform the Condition of it (as was requiſite in thoſe times,) and to all that ſo perform'd the Condition of it the ineſtimable Benefits of it did belong, *and they were the Children of the Promiſe and of Grace.* Proviſion was then made by the Grace of the New Teſtament, that God's Believers ſhould be in the ſtate of Righteouſneſs,(*e*) *quia nec fides ſine gratia, nec gratia ſine fide*, Juſtifying Faith and the Grace of the New Teſtament are inſeparable. All the Church of the Regenerate (of ancient and later times) belongeth to the New Teſtament. (*f*) *Novum Teſtamentum quo renovatur homo ad novam hæreditatem*, that is the New Teſtament, whereby we are renew'd to a new Inheritance. All the truly holy and ſpiritual kind of Men and Religioniſts from the beginning of the World did belong to the New Teſtament. (*g*) *To ſuch Men and Religioniſts that are no better than Animal the Old Teſtament belongeth, to ſuch as are Spiritual the New Teſtament belongeth. As in the Inſtitutions of the Old Teſtament there were ſome ſpiritual livers, ſuch as belong'd to the New Teſtament that was then veiled: ſo now that the New Teſtament is revealed, in the Inſtitutions of it the moſt live Animal and carnal.* All that were of old in the ſtate of Grace neceſſarily belong'd to the Religion of Saving Grace, which was provided for them and diſpens'd unto them. (*h*) *For God's care of Humane Concerns is not a new conſult, nor a late mercy: but from the Creation he appointed one and the ſame cauſe of Salvation to all. The Grace of God, whereby the Univerſality of the Saints was always juſtify'd, had an increaſe, not a beginning at Chriſt's birth. And this great Myſtery of Godlineſs, which hath now filled the whole World, was ſo potent even in the ſignifications of it, that they gain'd no leſs, who believ'd it, when it was only promis'd, than they that have receiv'd it, now it is actually given.* Great reaſon there is therefore, that Chriſt ſhould own the ancient Saints for his; for they were not only the Religioniſts of his Perſon and his kind of Religioniſts, but they were Saints of his making, as he is the maker of the New Teſtament, whereby *he hath aboliſh'd Death, and brought Life and Immortality to light*, 2 Tim. 1. 10. The Pagans underſtood and hop'd for Life and Immortality in their Religion, and ſo did the Jews in their Religion, *Joh.* 5. 39. Yet the Apoſtle had reaſon to ſay, that Chriſt *hath aboliſhed Death, and brought Life and Immortality to light:* becauſe there is no other available ſettlement or promiſe of Life and Immortality but only the New Teſtament. The promiſe of Life in the original Law or in any other Religion is unto us of no avail; without a redemption-liberation by Chriſt Mankind had remain'd in the ſtate of death everlaſtingly. But by the New Teſtament which he hath made (and by no other Religion) *Life is to purpoſe brought to light*, it is the available ſettlement of Life and Immortality. All the Heirs of Life therefore belong to the New Teſtament. And ſuch were thoſe ancient Saints, who ſaw through the Veil of Earthly Promiſes and faithfully embrac'd the Heavenly; (*i*) *they adminiſtred the Old Teſtament, but were the Heirs of the New Teſtament.* As *Abraham* from his Faith in God's promiſe, that his Poſterity ſhould have the Land of *Canaan*, left his own Country, to live as a Stanger in it; and while he was doing this, he liv'd as a Pilgrim in this World from Faith in God's promiſe, that thereby he ſhould obtain a better World.

VII. It appeareth, that the Religion of the ancient Saints was *an initial Chriſtianiſm* and that they were *Chriſt's Believers and Religioniſts, ſo far as the being God's Believers and Religioniſts doth import, which was the way to Righteouſneſs and Salvation in their time.* Their Caſe and Character therefore doth not ſuit with the Opinion of S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Epiphanius*, *that the acknowledgment*

(b) *S. Chryſoſt. ſupr.* λογ. ια. p. 129.

(c) *Idem T.* 5. εἰς τοὺς Μακκαβ. λογ. 6. p. 639.

(d) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 189.

(e) *Hypognoſt. ſcrip. l.* 3. *c.* 14.

(f) *S. Aug. in Pſal.* 88. *Con.* 1.

(g) *Ad animales pertinet vetus teſtamentum, ad ſpiritales novum ſicut in ſacramentis veteris teſtamenti vivebant quidam ſpiritales, ad novum ſcilicet teſtamentum quod tunc occultabatur pertinentes: ſic & nunc in ſacramento novi teſtamenti, quod jam revelatum eſt, plerique vivunt animales.* Idem de Bapt. c. Donat. l. 1. c. 15.

(h) *Non enim novo conſilio Deus rebus humanis, nec ſera miſeratione conſuluit: ſed à conſtitutione unam eandemque omnibus cauſam ſalutis inſtituit. Gratia autem Dei, qua ſemper eſt Univerſitas juſtificata ſanctorum, aucta eſt Chriſto naſcente, non capta. Et hoc magnæ pietatis ſacramentum, quo totus jam mundus impletus eſt, tam potens etiam in ſuis ſignificationibus fuit, ut non minus adepti ſint, qui in illud credidere promiſſum, quam qui ſuſcipere donatum.* Leo M. Ser. 3. de Nativ.

(i) S. Aug. *Ep.* 120. c. 2. & contr. 2. *Ep. Pelag. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

ment and ſervice of Chriſt was not required before his coming; it was ſufficient, to relinquiſh the worſhip of Idols, and to acknowledge one only God the Creator. For theſe ancient Saints were God's Believers according to the Iſraelitical Theiſm, wherein a prophetick Faith touching the Meſſiah was involv'd and comprehended. But on behalf of this Opinion (of S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Epiphanius*) it may be argued, that if there were in the World any ſuch genuine Theiſts as theſe ancient Saints, which yet were wholly unacquainted with the knowledge and faith of Chriſt's Perſon, ſuch genuine Theiſts could not fail of Salvation. The Religion of ſuch genuine Theiſts might be called, *The more imperfect initial Chriſtianiſm*, and the Religion of the Saints of the Old Teſtament might be called for diſtinction ſake *The more perfect initial Chriſtianiſm.* Both being God's Believers and Religioniſts (truly Godly Believers and Religioniſts) the genuine People and worſhippers of God, and truly Righteous and Holy, they muſt neceſſarily be ſuch as belong to the Religion and Diſpenſation of Saving Grace, which is the New Teſtament; their Religion muſt be initial Chriſtianiſm and themſelves Heirs of Salvation. (k) *Thoſe only will have the bleſſed life to come, that have receiv'd the Religion according to Jeſus, and Piety towards the Creator of all things ſincere and pure and unmix'd as to any thing created.* To Chriſtians plenarily ſuch *Origen* confineth Salvation in the New Teſtament-times; and by parity of reaſon it muſt be confin'd to Chriſtians at leaſt initially ſuch in all Times and Ages. But ſeeing none that are truly godly Believers and Religioniſts, can be reaſonably ſuppos'd, to miſs of Salvation, therefore all that are of that Character, muſt be counted at leaſt initially Chriſtians. (l) S. *Auſtin* excludeth all from Salvation, to whom Chriſt is not revealed, and therefore confineth it to thoſe that have the knowledge and faith of Chriſt's perſon; yet himſelf ſaith, (m) *ubicunque timetur Deus & laudatur, ibi eſt Eccleſia Chriſti*, whereſoever God is feared and praiſed, there is the Church of Chriſt. It may ſeem therefore, that if there were any ſuch genuine Theiſts, that are truly godly Believers and Religioniſts, although they had no acquaintance with the knowledge and faith of Chriſt's perſon, yet theſe muſt be reputed initially Chriſtians, *ſuch as come to God believing that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him.* Heb. 11. 6. *Such as in every Nation fearing God and working Righteouſneſs are accepted with him.* Act. 10. 34. But it is moſt reaſonable and agreeable to the Scriptures to ſuppoſe, that there never were, nor ever will be any ſuch genuine Theiſts (the σεϐόμενοι that imperfectly belong'd to the Jewiſh Church, were not ſuch Theiſts;) that ſince the Fall there is no ſaving Theiſm on this ſide the Iſraelitical Theiſm (that involv'd the Faith of Chriſt:) that if the Gentiles had not alienated themſelves from God, but duely ſought after him, He would have been to them a God, but no otherwiſe than he was to his ancient People, and their Theiſm ſhould have been the ſame with the Iſraelitical Theiſm. So that although *the acknowledgment and ſervice of Chriſt* ſhould not have been formally and explicitly requir'd of the Gentiles before his coming, yet the acknowledgment of Chriſt ſhould have been comprehended in their *Theiſm*, as it was in God's ancient Peoples. But the Gentile World alienating themſelves from God at a prodigious rate, it was an Act of great ſeverity in God, to ſuffer them for many Ages, to wander in the darkeſt Night and to wallow in the fouleſt Mire; and an Act of great goodneſs in God, to raiſe up and preſerve a Church on Earth and a ſaving Religion, which was introduc'd from the beginning of the World, and is continu'd unto this Day. For it appeareth from the Character of the ancient Saints, that the Chriſtian Religion (together with Judaiſm) had an initial introduction from the moſt ancient Old Teſtament-times; and it appeareth alſo from the Religion that was introduc'd in theſe remarkable Succeſſions of Old Teſtament-time, the time of *Adam*, *Noah*, *Abraham* and *Moſes*, in which four Succeſſions of time *Irenæus* thinketh, (n) *quatuor data ſunt teſtamenta*, four Teſtaments were given.

Section IV.

Of the Ante-Moſaical Inſtitutions Adamical, Noachical, Abrahamical.

I. In the Adamical Inſtitution (beſides the illuſtrious Types of *Adam* and his Paradiſe and the doom of the Serpent, which are a great Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion) the origin of *Sacrifices* muſt be conſider'd, which in all reaſon ought to be deriv'd from divine poſitive Inſtitution, not from Nature, not from Humane Arbitrary Inſtitution, nor as ſome derive them, (o) *from rude ſimple Antiquity.* S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, The offering Sacrifices was (p) *when as yet there were no Letters, nor any written Law, nor any Prophets, nor any Judges, there was only* Adam *with his Children.* If theſe things were ſo, Sacrifice muſt be of Humane Origination; but if things are quite otherwiſe, if Sacrifice had its origin in a Family of Prophets (no leſs than Prophets) ordinary Reaſon will derive it from divine poſitive Inſtitution. There is great reaſon, to think *Abel* one of the Rank and Succeſſion of Prophets. *Adam* was not a Prophet, as that name ſignifieth an extraordinary Agent or Miſſionary ſent from God, or an inſpir'd Teacher of Mankind; but he ſpake ſomething prophetical, had an extraordinary intercourſe with God and the appearance of Angels as well as the Prophets, and the *Bath Col* which he had in Paradiſe, is one degree of Prophecy. In reſpect of Supernatural Revelation therefore he was no leſs than a Prophet. And if either himſelf or *Abel* introduc'd the rite of Sacrifice (and there is no probability, that *Cain* introduc'd it) it was introduc'd by one of ſuch a Character, as is not wont to inſtitute things in God's ſervice without underſtanding the Mind of God. It hath the faireſt pretenſion imaginable to Divine Inſtitution, being introduc'd and continu'd in after-times by the eminent Saints and Prophets of God, (q) *that were pious in their life and near to God, and had their Souls illuminated by the D*[illegible] *Spirit. This I do not think a fortuitous buſineſs, or of humane motion, but of Divine Suggeſtion and Cogitation.* The rite of Sacrifice was not only continu'd by Prophets, but was publickly inacted by God in his written Law to the Jews; which is an Indication, that it was originally of his appointment. For let us ſuppoſe, that *Cain* and *Chanock* his Son were Prophets of the God *Jupiter Hammon*, that theſe Pagan Prophets introduc'd *the ſacred veſtal Fire*, and that a long time after this God *Jupiter Hammon* publiſh'd by his Servant *Numa* a Pandect of his Laws (containing univerſal Paganiſm) wherein he publickly inacted *the ſacred veſtal Fire*. No Man that conſidereth this antecedence and conſequence of things, that the *Veſtal Fire* was at firſt introduc'd by the Prophets of *Jupiter Hammon*, and afterwards this God publickly own'd it, and inacted it in his written Law, would make any doubt touching the origin of it; he would ſuppoſe, that this Heathen God firſt appointed it, and that his Prophets underſtood his Mind; for the ſame reaſon the rite of Sacrifice muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been originally, not meerly of Humane Suggeſtion, but of Divine Inſtitution. In Nature there is not any Suggeſtion, to offer Animals in Sacrifice to God: but S. *Auſtin* mentioneth a Saying of *Socrates* as a Suggeſtion of Natural Reaſon, (r) *unumquemque Deum ſic coli oportere, quomodo ſe ipſe colendum eſſe præceperit*, every God muſt be worſhipp'd according to his own appointment. Following the Suggeſtion of Nature therefore *Adam* and his Children muſt have abſtain'd from ſacrificing without a Divine Inſtitution; nor is it likely, that upon their own Heads they would venture upon inventing a Religious Worſhip, and ſuch a Religious Worſhip, which the Church of *Rome* maintaineth, to be of all other Worſhip moſt peculiar and appropriate to God. Nature would rather have ſuggeſted to them that of *Plato* in his *Epinomis*, οὐ δυνατὸν εἰδέναι τῇ θνητῇ τῶν τοιούτων πέρι, *it is not poſſible for our mortal nature, to know any thing about theſe matters*. (s) The Heathen therefore buſied themſelves in Divination, to know the Mind of their Gods touching their Worſhip. Neither *Cain* nor *Abel* could have had any tolerable aſſurance, that their Sacrifices and Oblations were an acceptable ſervice, if they had had no notice of the Mind of God concerning them: nor could the offering Sacrifice concern *Abel* as one of God's Believers (and therefore he could not offer it by Faith as he did, *Heb.* 11. 4.) nor was there any ground for Faith in the caſe, if there was no Divine Inſtitution concerning it. When *Abel* had offered his Sacrifice, Mankind had abundant aſſurance, that God approv'd this mode of Religious Worſhip, which Approbation was equivalent to an Inſtitution. From his great approbation of *Abel*'s Sacrifice it appear'd, to be his Will, that this mode of Worſhip ſhould be inſtituted in thoſe times; and if it was his Will, that it ſhould be inſtituted, how could it be unreveal'd to his Prophets? *Amos* 3. 7. It is granted, (t) that in theſe eldeſt times they did offer Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifices. (u) *They judg'd it needful for the expiation of the Sins of Men, to offer to the donour of their Life and Soul their welfare's price of Redemption.* They offer'd Propitiatory Sacrifices, with reſpect thereto God pardon'd the Sins of Me[illegible]is they knew and underſtood: but it is impo[illegible]e, that they could know this, that God would accept the Life of the Sacrifice inſtead of the Sinners, or that holy Men ſhould have any ſuch conceit in their Heads, if they had no notice of the Mind of God, no revelation from him about it. Beſides, the Divine Wiſdom determin'd, that the Old Teſtament ſhould be a continu'd Prophecy of the New, and that in the Old Teſtament-times Men ſhould have by Types and Shadows an Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. This was deſign'd in the Moſaic Inſtitution, and there is the ſame reaſon, that it ſhould be deſign'd from the beginning; and that it was deſign'd from the beginning, is manifeſt from thoſe Types and Shadows that were inſtituted in the time of Man's Innocency. In thoſe Branches of the Adamical Inſtitution an adumbration of the Meſſiah was deſign'd; and if the Meſſiah muſt be typify'd and adumbrated from the beginning of the World, his ineſtimable Sacrifice muſt be typify'd, and conſequently the rite of Sacrifice muſt be inſtituted from the beginning, to typifie and adumbrate his Sacrifice.

(k) Ἡ μέλλουσα μακαρία ζωὴ μόνοις ἔσαι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν θρησκεύσασιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸν εὐσέβειαν εἰλικρινῆ καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ ἄμικτον πρὸς ὁτιποτοῦν γενητὸν παραδεξαμένοις. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 160.

(l) De C. D. l. 18. c. 47. c. Pelag. & Celeſt. l. 2. c. 24.

(m) In Pſ. 21. Expoſ. 2.

(n) *Adv. Hær. p. m.* 287.

(o) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 3. *diſſ.* 2. *c.* 4.

(p) Ὄτε οὔπω γράμματα, ὄτε οὔπω νόμος, ὅτε οὔπω προφῆται, καὶ δικασταὶ, ἀλλὰ μόνος ὁ Ἀδὰμ μετὰ τῶν παίδων ἦν. Ἀνδριαντ. 12. *p.* 543. Οὐ γραμμάτων ὄντων, οὐ προφητῶν, οὐ νόμου γραπτοῦ ἐνηχοῦντος. *T.* 7. *p.* 13.

(q) Ἅτε τὸν τρόπον εὐσεβεῖς, καὶ θεῷ προσῳκειωμένοι, θείῳ τε πνεύματι τὰς ψυχὰς πεφωτισμένοι. Τοῦτο δὲ τὸν λογισμὸν ἡγοῦμαι εἶναι οὐ τὸν τυχόντα, οὐδ' ἀνθρωπίνως κεκινημένον, κατὰ θείαν δὲ ἐπίνοιαν ὑποβεβλημένον. *Euſeb. Dem. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 10.

They that are otherwiſe minded, do not deny, that the Moſaic Sacrifices were Types and Adumbrations of Chriſt's Sacrifice: (w) but they will not acknowledge, that the Patriarchal Sacrifices were ſuch, becauſe (ſay they) ſome Emphatick Circumſtances of the Moſaic were wanting in the Patriarchal Sacrifices. But this is a little Artifice to evade the force of an Argument. As if one ſhould argue, the Moſaic Sabbath was a Type of the Chriſtians Sabbatiſm, but it doth not thence follow, that the Patriarchal Sabbath (*Gen.* 2. 3.) was ſo, becauſe an Emphatick Circumſtance which was in the Moſaic Sabbath, was wanting in the Patriarchal Sabbath. The Moſaic Propitiatory Sacrifices were Types of Chriſt's Sacrifice as ſuch, and becauſe they were Propitiatory Sacrifices; from whence it followeth, that the Patriarchal Sacrifices becauſe they were Propitiatory Sacrifices, were alſo Types of Chriſt's Sacrifice. And if they were Types of Chriſt's Sacrifice, they were unqueſtionably of Divine Inſtitution, and a Branch of the Patriarch's Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. The Religion of the moſt ancient Saints of the Old Teſtament was an initial Chriſtianiſm. The Inſtitutes of their Religion therefore were (according to the mode of the Old Teſtament) the Inſtitutes of this their initial Chriſtianiſm. Of theſe Inſtitutes the rite of Sacrifice in the eldeſt times of the World was the principal; therefore it was a Rite of Divine Inſtitution introductory to the Religion of Chriſtianity. (x) They that aſſert the humane arbitrary Inſtitution of Sacrifice, have nothing to ſay (that is of weight) on behalf of their Hypotheſis ſave only the ſilence of *Moſes* touching the origin of Sacrifice (but he is not ſilent touching the frequent intercourſe Men had with God, when Sacrifices began, from which intercourſe they had their Inſtitutes of Religion) and the words of the Prophet to the Jews, *Jer.* 7. 21, 22. *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, the God of Iſrael, put your Burnt-offerings upon your Sacrifices and eat Fleſh. For I ſpake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the Land of* Egypt, *concerning Burnt-offerings or Sacrifices.* From thence they argue, that in the beginning of the World God did not give Men any command touching Sacrifices; for if he had done ſo, this could not at all have abated the Jews high Opinion of thoſe Rites, to tell them, *I gave no command touching Sacrifices to your Fathers, when I brought them out of the Land of* Egypt. For was not a Command in the beginning of the World of as great account as a Command given to their Fathers, when they came out of *Egypt*? But how little force there is in this Argumentation, will appear by conſidering, that the Prophets words plainly reſpect *the groſs materiality of Sacrifice* (the giving God Fleſh) which God never had regard to, neither in the beginning of the World, nor when the *Iſraelites* came out of *Egypt*; and this he declareth to the Jews, to abate their high Opinion of thoſe Ritualities. They might not eat of their Burnt-offerings as of their other Sacrifices, yet God ſaith, *put your Burnt-offerings upon your Sacrifices and eat Fleſh*. Which words with due Reſtriction and Limitation muſt be thus underſtood; *ſo far as concerneth the groſs materiality of Sacrifice, you may feed your Corps with the Burnt-offerings as well as other Sacrifices, take and devour all.* When the *Iſraelites* came out of *Egypt*, they ask'd leave of *Pharaoh*, to go and Sacrifice to their God, he gave them a written Law touching Sacrifices, yet neither in the beginning of the World, nor when the *Iſraelites* came out of *Egypt*, did God give any command touching Sacrifices, *as having any regard at all to the groſs materiality of Sacrifice*. Therefore he telleth the Jews, that when their Fathers came out of *Egypt*, he did not ſpeak unto them, nor command them touching Sacrifices, that is, *touching thoſe groſs material Rites as ſuch*; for they were not acceptable to God but as inſtances of dutiful Obedience and conjoin'd therewith, as it immediately followeth in the Prophet, *V.* 23. *But this thing commanded I them, ſaying, obey my voice, and I will be your God.* From this place of the Prophet thus clearly explain'd and which might be explain'd (y) from many other places of Scripture, it is impoſſible to draw any inference to the prejudice of the Divine Inſtitution of Sacrifice: But on the contrary, hence ariſeth a mighty Argument for the Divine Inſtitution of Sacrifice. For if Sacrifices were not acceptable to God but as inſtances of dutiful Obedience (and conjoin'd therewith) then the Sacrifice of *Abel* which was ſo highly acceptable to God, was an inſtance of his dutiful Obedience to the Divine Inſtitution of Sacrifice.

(r) *De Conſenſ. Evang. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(s) *Jambl. de vit. Pythag. c.* 28. *p.* 129.

(t) *Spencer. ſupr.*

(u) Δεῖν εἰς ἀποκάθαρσιν τῶν θνητῶν πλημμελημάτων, λύτρον τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας τῆς καὶ ζωῆς καὶ ψυχῆς χορηγῷ προσφέρεσθαι ἡγοῦντο. *Euſeb. ſupr.*

(w) *Spencer. ſupr.*

(x) *Vid. Spencer. ſupr. Outr. de Sacrific. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

II. The *Adamical* Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion was ſo far and to ſuch effect propagated, *the Moſaic Hiſtory mentioneth a Succeſſion of Holy Men, who were of this Inſtitution in the Ante-diluvian times.* More of them might be Holy Men than the Scripture particularly remarketh for their Holineſs (as *Enos*, *Mahaleel*, *Jared*) and ſome of them being certainly Prophets, who probably had their Hearers and Followers, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that theſe were imbodied into Religious Societies, and held their Aſſemblies for publick Religious Worſhip, which is thought, to be the meaning of the ſacred Hiſtorians Character of the days of *Enos*, Gen. 4. 26. *Then began Men to call on the Name of the Lord.* But this Expoſition of the Text (that publick worſhipping of God began in the days of *Enos*) wanteth probability. For God was publickly worſhipp'd by *Cain* and *Abel*, their Sacrifices were Rites of publick Worſhip, and how could either of them be truly Religious, if he took not care that his Family (ſuch as he had) ſhould join with him in Religious Worſhip? Many of the Hebrew Writers (with whom ſome of the learned Writers of the Chriſtian Church join) will have the Text to ſpeak of the riſe of Idolatry, and thus they render the words of it; *tunc profanatum eſt invocando nomen Domini*, then was there Profanation by invoking the Name of the Lord. But this Expoſition is incongruous. (z) For *Moſes* is not ſpeaking of the Family of impious *Cain*, but of the Religious Family of *Seth*; and the Hebrew words will not bear this rendring. For although the word *Huchal* ſignifieth Profanation as well as Beginning, yet it doth not ſignifie Profanation, when the Prepoſition *le* immediately followeth in the next word, and the next word is לקרא which may not be rendred by invoking. Others therefore diſallowing both theſe Expoſitions (and ſome others which are ſo improbable, that they need not a confutation) approve the marginal Tranſlation of our Bible, *then began Men to call themſelves by the Name of the Lord* (to call themſelves the Servants or Worſhippers of the Lord in diſtinction from the *Canites* and profane Perſons;) which Tranſlation of the words would have been unexceptionable, if our Tranſlators in their marginal Verſion had not inſerted this word *themſelves*, which is not in the Hebrew. The Hebrew words are אז הוחל לקרא בשם יהוה which are thus exactly rendred into Engliſh. *Then it was begun, to call by the Name of the Lord.* The ſenſe of this Verſion is imperfect, but the way to make it compleat and full, is not to inſert this word *themſelves*, but *things* and *perſons*. *Moſes* is treating about the origin of things, and agreeably to his purpoſe he telleth us, that in the days of *Enos* this Religious Cuſtom and Uſage was begun, *to call Things and Perſons by the Name of the Lord.* As the *People of God*, the *Servants of God*, the *Men of God*, the *Church of God*, the *Angels of God*, the *Houſe of God* (and the like) which is the Scriptural and Religious way of ſpeaking. If this be the ſenſe of the place (which is moſt probable) it importeth the making a Diſcrimination between the Holy and Profane, the Introduction of this way of ſpeaking in the days of *Enos* recommendeth the Piety that was in thoſe times in the Family of *Seth*; and it importeth, that the then People of God deſired, to be known as ſuch, and to diſcriminate themſelves from the World of the Ungodly, as the Apoſtle ſtileth the Ante-diluvian Age.

III. In this Age *Noah* liv'd, whoſe Inſtitution was *an initial Judaiſm*, which is a Religion that was gradually introduc'd, as *Maimonides* repreſenteth it. (a) *Six of the Precepts of the Sons of* Noah *were given to* Adam, *to* Noah *a Seventh was added, and ſo things ſtood through the whole World till the time of* Abraham. *Over and above theſe* Abraham *receiv'd the Precept of Circumciſion, and inſtituted Morning Prayers,* Iſaac *ſet apart the Tenths, and added Afternoon Prayer. An addition was made by* Jacob *touching not eating the Nerve of Oblivion and of Evening Prayers: And in* Egypt *more and other Precepts were given to* Abraham, *until* Moſes *our Maſter came, and by him the Law was conſummated.* The Seven Precepts of the Sons of *Noah*, (the Firſt touching *ſtrange Worſhip* or renouncing idolatrous Worſhip; the Second touching *the malediction of the Name of God* or of Blaſphemy; the Third touching *ſhedding of Blood* or againſt Homicide; the Fourth touching *diſcloſing Nakedneſs* or ſetting bounds to Luſt and Marriage; the Fifth touching *Theft and Rapine*; the Sixth touching *Magiſtrates* and Civil Government; the Seventh touching *not eating the Member of a living Animal*) are Six of them certain Precepts which the Jews have collected out of their own Law with the addition of a Seventh

(y) 1 *Sam.* 15. 22. *Pſal.* 50. 8,--13. *Prov.* 21. 3, 27. *Iſa.* 1. 11, 13. and *ch.* 65. 3. *Jer.* 6.20. *Hoſ.* 6. 6.

(z) *Bp. Patrick in loc. Dionyſ. Voſſ. in Maimon. de Idol. c.* 1.

(a) *Ap. Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 7. c. 1. *Coſri p.* 42.

Precept out of their own Imagination. For that theſe Precepts were given either to *Adam* or to *Noah* in a way of ſupernatural Revelation, as the Jews ſuppoſe (*b*) is a groundleſs Conceit, of which the Scripture ſaith nothing, and *Joſephus* knoweth nothing, but it is purely a Rabbinical and Talmudical Tradition (groundleſs and fabulous) and accordingly *Jeſephus Albo* ſpeaking of theſe Precepts ſaith, he ſpeaketh of them *according to the Tradition of our Rabbins.* Six of them are Precepts of the Law of Nature, as it is a Civil-religious Inſtitution (and as ſuch they were given to *Adam* and to *Noah*) accordingly the Jews account them (*c*) certain Rules of Juſtice neceſſary for human Life, compel Men to undertake the obſervance of them, put to Death ſuch as know them not, and ſuch as refuſe to take upon them the obſervance of them; ſo making them a Civil-religious Inſtitution. But they alſo ſuppoſe that the obſervance of them conſtituteth Men חסידי אומות *the pious of the Gentiles*; of theſe they require an interiour ſort of Religious Worſhip, they acquaint them with higher Puniſhments than thoſe of their Law-courts, and they alſo allow them a part in the World to come: But how little the Piety which they require amounteth to, and how undiſcerning theſe Night-birds are in matters of Piety, may appear from this nefarious Licence which the ancient Talmudiſts allow. (*d*) *When one of the Sons of* Noah *is forc'd to the Tranſgreſſion of a Precept, that bindeth him, that very Tranſgreſſion is lawful to him, although it be Idolatry, that he is forc'd to. For to ſuch the Sanctification of the Name of God is not injoined.*

As the Jews diſtinguiſh themſelves from the Sons of *Noah*, ſo in *Noah*'s Inſtitution their Precepts of the Sons of *Noah* are diſtinct from the ritual Inſtitutes of Judaiſm. Of which (beſides the Rite of Sacrifice) the firſt is God's Command touching the making a difference between clean and unclean Animals. *Gen.* 7. 2. *Of every clean Beaſt thou ſhalt take to thee by ſevens, the Male and his Female: And of Beaſts that are not clean by two, the Male and his Female.* It is not probable, that this difference betwen Animals in the days of *Noah* had any relation to Mens Food; both becauſe Animals were not eaten before the Flood, and becauſe after the Flood God granted Licenſe to *Noah* and his Sons, to eat Animals without making any difference between the Clean and Unclean. It muſt be ſuppos'd therefore, that in the days of *Noah*, thoſe were counted Clean Animals, which were allow'd to be offer'd to God in Sacrifice, and thoſe were counted Unclean, which might not be offer'd in Sacrifice, as we read, *Gen.* 8. 20. *Noah builded an Altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean Beaſt, and of every clean Fowl, and offer'd burnt Offerings on the Altar.* This difference between Animals is (in all probability) as old as the Rite of Sacrifice, was a Branch of the Diſcipline of Sacrifice, and deriv'd from the ſame Original. For ſeeing God did own and appoint it in the days of *Noah*, and afterwards did imbody it in the *Moſaic* Law, it is utterly unreaſonable, to ſuppoſe it of human arbitrary Inſtitution. It is ſo apparently of Divine Inſtitution, that it proveth the Divine Inſtitution of Sacrifice. And it muſt be look'd upon as a Branch of Judaiſm, in which as plenarily introduc'd the difference between clean and unclean Animals had relation both to Food and Sacrifice, but not ſo in *Judaiſm* initially introduc'd. Another Branch of Judaiſm (manifeſtly ſuch) appeareth, to have been introduc'd in the days of *Noah*, which is the prohibition of eating Blood. *Gen.* 9. 3, 4. *Every moving thing that liveth, ſhall be meat for you: But fleſh with the life thereof, which is the Blood thereof, ſhall you not eat.* (*e*) The *Arabians* are obſerv'd, to be Ferine and Sanguinary in their Diſpoſition, which ſome of their Phyſicians look upon as (in ſome degree) an effect of their Diet; for they ſuppoſe, that the Diſpoſition and Temperament of Men is agreeable to their Diet; whence they commend the Fleſh of Sheep for Food, but the Fleſh of Camels and of Lions (as they ſay) maketh Men of hurtful Qualities. Something of this Philoſophy may be in this Preſcript of Diet to the Sons of *Noah*; for the deſign of it is to inure them to Humanity, and to alienate them from the ferity and barbarity of the Ante-diluvian times. God having granted them a Licenſe to eat the Fleſh of Animals, maketh an exception from that general Grant, *they may not eat the Fleſh with the Blood*; and the Prohibition expreſſeth the reaſon of it, *the Blood thereof is the Life thereof*, which upon that account they may not eat. The thing intended therefore in this Prohibition is *the not eating the Blood*, as the Iſraelites in the Moſaic Law are prohibited to eat any manner of Blood upon this account; *for the Life of the Fleſh is in the Blood.* Lev. 17. 11. If any of them therefore did hunt or catch any Beaſt or Fowl that may be eaten, he muſt pour out the Blood thereof and cover it with Duſt, *becauſe it is the Life of all Fleſh.* V. 13, 14. And the reaſon of the Law is again repeated. V. 14. The *Iſraelites* as well as *Noah* and his Sons, are prohibited to eat the Fleſh of Animals with the Blood; they are prohibited it for the very ſame reaſon; the mind and intention of the Law-giver therefore in both theſe Prohibitions is the very ſame, namely, *the not eating the vital Blood*, and ſo *Joſephus* underſtandeth the Precept to the Sons of *Noah*. The Moſaic Law granteth the ſame Licence, to eat Fleſh, and maketh the very ſame exception from that general Grant, which this Precept to the Sons of *Noah* doth, *Deut.* 12. 15, 16. The Scripture therefore is its own Interpreter, and ſufficiently expoundeth this Precept to the Sons of *Noah*, that it prohibiteth the Sin, which the Iſraelitiſh Army committed, 1 *Sam.* 14. 32. And is it not marvellous, that Men of Learning can be unſatisfied with ſo eaſie, ſo natural, ſo ſcriptural an Interpretation of the Precept, and prefer before it the Rabbins Interpretation, who underſtand it to be (their Seventh Precept of the Sons of *Noah*) a Prohibition to eat the Member or Fleſh of a live-Animal, while the Blood is palpitating in it? Which is purely a Rabbinical Crotchet, not at all pointed at in the Precept, and which ſuppoſeth the whole deſign of the Precept to be (*f*) to prohibit ſuch a nauſeous barbarous Ferity, as the Scripture knoweth nothing of, which few Men can find in their Heart to practiſe, and which was never practis'd in theſe parts of the World ſave only in the *Bacchanalia* and ſome other few and rare inſtances. The Precept therefore ought to be look'd upon as a Branch of *Judaiſm* initially introduc'd. And if Judaiſm was initially introduc'd in the days of *Noah*, his Inſtitution muſt be thought *initial Judaiſm*; his Rite of Sacrifice muſt be thought a Branch of initial Judaiſm; and conſequently it muſt be thought

---

(b) *Hoornbeek ſupr. Spencer. Diſſert. in Act.* 15. 20. *c.* 2.

(c) *Seld. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 3. *Cunæus de Rep. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

(d) *Seld. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 11.

Gen. 9. 3.

(e) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 87, 88.

(f) *V. Curc. de Eſu ſanguin. c.* 4.

of Divine Inſtitution, typical and adumbrative of Chriſt's Sacrifice (as the Sacrifices in Judaiſm were) and he muſt be ſuppos'd, to have been thereby inſtituted to the Chriſtian Religion, as Men were inſtituted thereto in the times of the Judaical Commonwealth. And if *Noah*'s Inſtitution was an initial Judaiſm, the Inſtitution of *Abel* and of *Enoch* muſt be thought ſuch. Judaiſm therefore was initially introduced, and conſequently Men were inſtituted to the Chriſtian Religion, from the beginning of the World.

IV. The Water in *Noah*'s Deluge ſeemeth hugely remote from the matters of the Chriſtian Religion, yet according to the Apoſtle they are of the near Affinity of Type and Antitype, and he findeth a lively correſpondence between them. *In the Ark few, that is, eight Souls were ſaved by Water. The like Figure whereunto* (in the Greek it is, the Antitype whereto) *Baptiſm doth alſo now ſave us.* 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21. The Waters of the Deluge as they overwhelmed and drowned the World, are far from anſwering to the Chriſtian Baptiſm; nor doth the Apoſtle compare it to the overwhelming Deluge as ſuch: But this is the Compariſon that he maketh. Our being ſaved by Water (the Chriſtian Baptiſm) now in the times of the Goſpel, anſwereth by way of Antitype to *Noah*'s and his Family's being ſaved by Water. (*g*) *They that believe not the Goſpel, are like them that believed not in the days of* Noah. *They that believe and are ſav'd by Baptiſm, are like them that were ſaved in the Ark by Water.* (*h*) *The Myſtery of the Men that are ſaved* (of us Chriſtians that are ſaved by Baptiſm) *was in the Deluge.* (*i*) *So that we Chriſtians are often called the Ark of* Noah, *which alone have eſcap'd the deluge or drowning of the whole World.* Noah and his Family were ſaved, by Water they were ſav'd from the overwhelming Deluge (as it was ſuch) this was the Type; and conſequently the Water (not as an overwhelming Deluge, but) as Salutary and Salvifick this was the Type. The correſpondence therefore conſiſteth in our being ſaved by Water now, and their being ſaved by Water in old time. As Water was Salvifick to *Noah* and his Family (bearing up the Ark and carrying it on high) they were ſaved by it from being drowned in the Deluge: So we are ſaved by Water now from being drown'd in the Deluge of the World's Wickedneſs and by the Deluge of Divine Vengeance that will flow in upon it. (*k*) Τὸν ἐπηρτημένον τῷ κόσμῳ διαδράσκομεν ὄλεθρον, *we eſcape the Perdition that is impendent upon the World.* The matters of the Chriſtian Religion were typify'd and prefigur'd in *Noah*'s Deluge, and this all Chriſtians aſſert; it ſeemeth ſtrangely incongruous therefore, that any of them ſhould deny that they were typify'd and prefigur'd by his Sacrifice (*l*) which was Propitiatory (*m*) and *Joſephus* accounteth it ſuch.

Noah was perfect (unſtain'd with any heinous Vice and Crime) *in his Generation* (the moſt corrupt and vicious imaginable) *Gen.* 6. 9. His genuine Righteouſneſs of Life approv'd and commended by God, *Gen.* 7. 1. and his *walking* with God, *Gen.* 6. 9. ſpeak him to have been a true Saint of God and one of God's Believers (whom Chriſtianity accounteth ſuch) antecedently to his Faith touching the Deluge and the preparing his Ark. *Heb.* 11. 7. It cannot be ſuppos'd therefore, that by his Faith touching the Deluge he firſt obtain'd Righteouſneſs with God: But it muſt be ſuppos'd (the like is obſervable touching *Abraham*) that having obtain'd it before, he then obtain'd it more eminently and at an higher rate by being ſo eminently one of God's Believers throughout his whole Carriage in the matter of the Deluge. For as before, ſo at that time more eſpecially there is great reaſon to admire his ſuperlative Virtue, (*n*) *how he was able, to deſpiſe and carry himſelf above ſo great a multitude of People deriding, inſulting, mocking and taunting.* This Holy Man in ſeveral reſpects practis'd (*o*) *the things that Chriſt coming afterwards taught.* In ſuch ſenſe his Religion was the Chriſtian initially introduc'd.

V. In the ſame Senſe the Religion of the Patriarch *Abraham* was the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd; and it was alſo the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd, as it was (Ritual) Judaiſm initially introduc'd. In great part his Inſtitution was *a plain Inſtitution* to an eximious Faith and Piety (which gain'd him thoſe Spiritual Honours and Advantages, which theſe afford unto Chriſtians;) for the purpoſe of God then was, to raiſe up and ſelect to himſelf the Church of *Iſrael* (both of the Literal and Spirltual *Iſrael*) of which *Abraham* muſt be the Father. And if he muſt be the Father of the People of God, he muſt be a great illuſtrious Hero, and grand Senior for Faith and Piety, and ſuch as the Jews call *Abraham* (*p*) עמוד של עולם *Columna mundi, the Pillar of the World*, whereby they intend, to denote his eminency for Righteouſneſs, according to that Maxim of theirs *juſtus eſt fundamentum ſeculi.* So in the Prophet (as many underſtand him) *Abraham* is ſtiled *the Righteous Man from the Eaſt*, the illuſtrious and famous Man for Righteouſneſs. *Iſa.* 41. 2. The Apoſtle ſtileth him *the Father of the Faithful*, which is a great honourary Attribute. For the Jews ſay of the word Abba (Father) it is לשון כבוד *a word of Honour* and importeth venerable Dignity; whence the Rich Man in the Parable uſeth this Compellation *Father Abraham*, Luk. 16. 24. The Jews alſo conceiv'd of *Abraham*, that he hath a parental place and dignity in Paradiſe, and thoſe who are there may lye in his Boſom, which they ſuppoſed the deſirable place of Reſt and Repoſe and delicious Entertainment. Whence our Saviour (in compliance with their Notion) ſaith of *Lazarus*, *He was carried by the Angels into Abraham's Boſom.* Luk. 16. 22. Howſoever theſe things are in the Life to come, *Abraham* hath the venerable Dignity of a Father amongſt the Faithfull in this Life, and for this Reaſon; becauſe in all Families and Kindreds the Grand Senior is look'd upon as the Father, and the Juniors that reſemble him, are counted the Sons and Children. As in the Family of Martial Perſons *Mars* (the Grand Senior) is counted the Father, and Martial Men (the Juniors that reſemble him) are called υἱοὶ

Ἄρεως,

(g) *Illa quippe res geſta forma fuerat futurorum, ut ii qui modo non credunt Evangelio, dum in omnibus gentibus ædificatur Eccleſia, illis intelligantur eſſe ſimiles, qui tunc non crediderunt, cùm fabricaretur arca. Illi autem qui crediderunt, & per Baptiſmum ſalvi fiunt, illis comparentur, qui tunc in eadem arca ſalvi facti ſunt per aquam.* S. Aug. Ep. 99.

(h) Τὸ μυστήριον τῶν σωζομένων ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ γέγονεν. *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 367.

(i) Ὥστε δὲ καὶ τὴν Νῶε κιβωτὸν πολλάκις ὀνομασθῆναι, μόνην διαφυγοῦσαν τὴν τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἐπίκλυσιν. *Gr. Naz. Or.* 12. *p.* 196.

(k) *S. Cyr. Glaphyr. in Gen. p.* 35.

(l) *Seld. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

(m) *Antiqu. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(n) Πῶς ἴσχυσε τοσούτου δήμου καταγελῶντος, ἐπεμβαίνοντος, χλευάζοντος, κωμῳδοῦντος, ὑπεριδεῖν καὶ ἀνώτερος γενέσθαι. *S. Chryſoſt. in Gen.* λογ. κγ.

(o) Ἅπερ ὁ Χριστὸς ὕστερον παραγενόμενος ἐδίδασκε. *Ibid.*

(p) *Maim. de Idol. c.* 1.

Rom. 4. 11, 16.

Ἄρεως, *Sons of Mars.* So Phyſicians are the Sons of *Æſculapius.* So *Abraham* is the Grand Senior in the Family of God's Believers, and they are (q) Ἀβρααμιαῖοι, *Abrahamitæ*, (r) τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν πίστιν ὄντες, *being the Children of* Abraham *becauſe of their like Faith.* God called him (as *J. Mart.* diſcourſeth) *bidding him go out of the Land wherein he dwelt; and us all he hath called by that voice, and we are gone out of that Converſation wherein we liv'd,* κτ̀ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων, *at the common rate of other Inhabitants of the Earth living wickedly; and with* Abraham *we ſhall inherit the Holy Land, and receive the Inheritance to eternal Ages, being the Children of* Abraham *by a like Faith. For as he believ'd the voice of God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs: in the ſame manner we alſo believing the voice of God, which was preached to us by the Prophets, and is again ſpoken to us by the Apoſtles of Chriſt,* μέχρι τοῦ ἀποθνήσκειν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπηλαξάμεθα, *have ronounc'd all things in the World even to the Death.* His Heavenly Call and prompt Obedience thereto (which was one Branch of his Inſtitution) ſpeaketh him a Chriſtian kind of Religioniſt; for Chriſtians renounce the World and come out of it, duly forſake their earthly All, and are commanded, as *Abraham* was, (s) *to prefer things unſeen before thoſe that appear, and things to come before thoſe in hand*, which is the Faith of God's Believers, the Dictate and Life of Faith. His Faith was a believing hard and great things and almoſt incredible. And an hard and great thing it was to forſake all that was dear to Fleſh and Blood (his Country, Kindred and Father's Houſe) to be abſolutely reſign'd to God's conduct and diſpoſal, to budge at no hardſhips, and to expoſe himſelf to all the incommodations of an Exile and a Pilgrimage. So ſtrong was his Faith and ſo faithful was his Obedience, as that in one of the hardeſt trials imaginable and moſt againſt Nature (the ſacrificing his only Son) nothing in Nature could prevail againſt it (*t*) τὴν φύσιν ῥίπτει, ϗ φιλοθεΐαν ἀσπάζεται, *he caſteth away Nature and embraceth Love and Obedience to God.* Theſe things were hugely Divine and Chriſtian, and ſuch was his Devotion, his interceſſion for *Sodom*, his care of his Family and Poſterity, his Hoſpitality, his peaceable Temper, *Gen.* 13. his generous Friendſhip, *Gen.* 14. the main of his Practice, and that great rule of his Practice, *walk before me and be thou perfect.* His State and Condition was as high and divine, as Chriſtianity affordeth (that height of Honour and Happineſs to be called the Friend of God) which he obtain'd as a divine Believer of the matters of his Inſtitution. In the Promiſſory part whereof one Branch is ſo highly Evangelical and Chriſtian, that the Apoſtle ſaith, *the Goſpel was before preach'd unto Abraham.* Gal. 3. 8. It was foreſignify'd to him by this Prophetick Promiſe, *In thee ſhall all Nations be bleſſed:* Or as it is elſewhere *Gen.* 22. 18. *In thy Seed ſhall all Nations of the Earth be bleſſed.* The bleſſed Seed of *Abraham* is of a twofold Notion, *That which maketh bleſſed and that which is made bleſſed.* Of his bleſſed Seed in this latter Notion the Apoſtle ſaith; *They which be of Faith are bleſſed with faithful Abraham.* Gal. 3. 9. Of his bleſſed Seed in the former Notion the Apoſtle ſaith, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his Seed were the Promiſes made. He ſaith not, and to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy Seed, which is Chriſt.* Which Apoſtolic Argumentation muſt be explained and juſtify'd by conſidering, that τὰ σπέρματα, *Seeds* in the Plurality of number, and τὸ σπέρμα, *Seed* in the Plurality of Notion are identical. It is not ſaid, *that the Promiſes were made to Abraham* ϗ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, *and to Seeds*, that is, ϗ τῷ σπέρματι, *and to Seed in the Plurality of Notion.* To *Abraham and his Seed* the Promiſes are ſaid to be made: But (ſpeaking of the Promiſe of making bleſſed) it is not ſaid *to his Seed* in the Plurality of Number or of Notion *as of many*; but *to his Seed* in the Singular Number and Notion, *as of one, that is, Chriſt.* The Promiſe made to *Abraham*'s Seed of *making bleſſed*, muſt be meant and underſtood in the Singular Number and Notion (as of one;) for it is a Prophetick Promiſe of ſuch a Seed, in whom all Nations (Jews and Gentiles) ſhould obtain Bleſſedneſs.

VI. The Abrahamical Inſtitution was in part (Ritual) *Judaiſm initially* introduc'd; and as ſuch it was a typical Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. So the earthly *Canaan* promiſed to *Abraham* and his Seed (after the Fleſh) was a Type of that heavenly *Canaan* and better Country, to which *Abraham* and the Patriarchs travell'd in their Pilgrimage. A vaſtly numerous poſterity (according to the Letter) God promiſed to *Abraham*, which he alſo promis'd to take for his Select peculiar People (and to be related to them as their God, *Gen.* 17. 7.) But this Carnal Seed of *Abraham* were a Type of the True and Spiritual; (*u*) *for Chriſtians are the Nation, that God of old promiſed to* Abraham, *ſtyling him the Father of many Nations.* So *Iſaac* upon the Altar was a Type of Chriſt's Sacrifice and Circumciſion (a principal Rite of Judaiſm) was a Type (*w*) *ad ſignificandam regenerationem quæ fit in Chriſto*, to ſignifie the Regeneration which we have in Chriſt. Chriſtianity therefore contradiſtinguiſheth two kinds of Circumciſion in the perſonal acceptation (as Circumciſion ſignifieth the Perſon circumciſed) *we are the Circumciſion, which worſhip God in the Spirit*, the true and ſpiritual, not the literal and carnal Circumciſion. *Phil.* 3. 3. And as Circumciſion ſignifieth in the real acceptation, Chriſtianity contradiſtinguiſheth the Literal and Spiritual (Spiritual-vital) Circumciſion, the Circumiſion in Type and in Truth. (*x*) Οἱ τύποι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἦσαν, ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. *The Types were in the Law, but the Truth is in the Goſpel.* (*y*) Ἡ μὲν περιτομὴ σημεῖον ἦν, τὸ δὲ λουτρὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας τὸ σημαινόμενον, *Circumciſion was the Sign, but the Laver of Regeneration was the thing ſignified.* From the Analogy between theſe two kinds of Circumciſion (for there muſt be an Analogy and Correſpondence between the Type and the Antitype) we may infer, *that the literal and ritual Circumciſion was of a ſanctificative Nature and Notion, thereby that which ſignifieth the vicioſity and foulneſs of Man's Nature was taken away.* The Chriſtian Circumciſion (or Regeneration) is a taking away the vicioſity and foulneſs of Man's Nature *in the Heart and in the Spirit*, Rom. 2. 29. and in ſubſtantial Truth and Reality (a putting off the whole Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, *Col.* 2. 11.) The ritual Circumciſion was a Type and Adumbration of this Spiritual Circumciſion; therefore it was of a ſanctificative Nature and Notion.

And this appeareth from the conſtant Language of Scripture, in which *to Circumciſe any thing*, is always of a ſanctificative Notion, and denoteth *a taking away the vicioſity and foulneſs of*

it,

(q) *Epiphan. adv. Hær. l.* 1. c. 1.

(r) *J. Mart. Dial. cum. Tryph.* p. 347.

(s) Τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα τῶν φαινομένων προτιμᾷν, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα τῶν ἐν χερσὶν ὄντων. *S. Chryſoſt.* in *Gen.* λογ. λα.

(t) *Idem T.* 5. *p.* 654.

(u) *J. Mart. Dial cum Tryph. p.* 347.

(w) *S. Aug. c. Jul. l.* 6. *c.* 7.

(x) *Epiphan. l.* 1. *Hær.* 8.

(y) *S. Athanaſ. de Sab. & Circumciſ.*

it, and things and perſons are ſaid to be uncircumcis'd, to ſignifie, *that their vicioſity and foulneſs is untaken away*. For this is the meaning of *uncircumcis'd Lips*, *uncircumcis'd Ears*, *uncircumcis'd Hearts*, *uncircumcis'd in Heart and Ears*, Exod. 6. 12. Jer. 6. 10. Lev. 26. 41. Act. 7. 51. So the *uncircumcis'd* and the *unclean* are terms ſynonymous. *Iſa.* 52. 1. 1 *Sam.* 17. 26. *Ezek.* 44. 7. The Fruit of Trees is ſaid to be (z) *as uncircumcis'd*, to denote the impurity of it, that it may not be eaten, *Lev.* 19. 23. The uncircumcis'd Perſons in *Ezek.* 28. 10. and 31. 18. are in the Chaldee wicked and ſinners. The Jews look'd upon all Perſons as unclean and not to be convers'd with, till they were circumcis'd, *Act.* 10. 15. and 11. 3. *Jacob*'s Sons pretended that they could not give their Siſter to one of the uncircumcis'd, becauſe of the Pollution of that People. And the Apoſtle deſcribeth us Gentiles as *dead in Sins and the Uncircumciſion of our Fleſh*, which is our vicioſity and foulneſs of Nature and Practice. *Col.* 2. 13. (*a*) Circumciſion metaphorically denoteth *the purging from Vices* (as Circumciſe the Fore-skin of your Heart, Circumciſe your ſelves to the Lord, *Deut.* 10. 16. *Jer.* 4. 4.) and *Gnorlah* or the Fleſh of our Fore-skin denoteth *all vicioſity* and is ſometimes rendred *Uncleanneſs*. Agreeably whereto *R. Menahem* ſaith (*b*) *the Fore-skin ſignifieth the ſtrength of Uncleanneſs*. *Gerundenſis* ſaith (*c*) *in a perfect human Body nothing is ſuperfluous except the Gnorlah*. But we are not ſo much to conſider what the *Gnorlah* is, as what it denoteth and ſignifieth. (*d*) *A wild Olive-tree is good in Nature, but it ſignifieth that which is Evil : So do Wolves and Foxes, a Sow wallowing in the Mire and a Dog return'd to his Vomit : The Gnorlah as it is a Particle of an human Body, is good by Nature, but it ſignifieth that which is evil by a Figure. The Fore-skin is not Sin, but it ſignifieth Sin, and chiefly original Sin, becauſe the Origin of them that are born is by that very Member.* The Rite of Circumciſion was of a ſanctificative Nature and Notion, becauſe it was an amption of that which ſignifieth Sin and chiefly original Sin. Which the *Gnorlah* fitly ſignifieth, both becauſe it is a Native and Original to us, and becauſe it adhereth to the Member of Propagation, as original Sin adhereth to the Propagation of our ſinful Fleſh. And this is one true and great Reaſon, why God deſigning to imprint a Mark and Character upon his People, would not have it imprinted upon any other part of the Body, but only that which ſerveth for the Propagation of Mankind. Some ſay that (*e*) *Circumciſion ſignified nothing elſe but the putting off that vicioſity and foulneſs, which adhereth to us from Generation.* Agreeably whereto a Philoſophic Pagan ſpeaketh of (*f*) *the Circumciſion of the things cognate to Generation.* The Jews ſay, that Circumciſion was ordained (*g*) to break the force of that Uncleanneſs, which the Old Serpent introduc'd (agreeable whereto is their Cuſtom, when they cut off the Fore-skin of a Child, they throw it into a Veſſel filled with Duſt which is hard by, and this they do, to ſignifie that they give it for Meat to the Old Serpent, who muſt eat Duſt:) They alſo tell us, that in the Days of the Meſſiah God will Circumciſe their Heart and in thoſe days the *evil Figment* will ceaſe, and their Hearts ſhall cleave unto the Lord their God according to *Deut.* 30. 6. (*h*) The Cabaliſts ſay, *all evil Concupiſcence will be eradicated in the days of the Meſſiah.* So far they agree with Chriſtianity; and agreeably to their Sence it is moſt reaſonable and Chriſtian, to ſay, that Circumciſion was deſign'd to ſignifie the cutting and putting off that foulneſs and vicioſity of Nature which is in Man's Unregeneracy. *Col.* 2. 11.

VII. The Rite of Circumciſion (beſides that it was of a ſanctificative Nature and Notion) was a *federal marking the Holy People that were the Holy Seed.* For God gave to *Abraham the Covenant of Circumciſion* (a Covenant the confederating Rite whereof was Circumciſion) *Act.* 7. 8. The Iſraelites therefore were circumcis'd, to enter them into the Abrahamical Covenant, and in Sign and Token thereof, *Gen.* 17. 11. So the Hebrew Doctors commonly ſay, (*i*) *By three things did* Iſrael *enter into the Covenant, by Circumciſion and Baptiſm and Sacrifice.* And as in ancient times their way was, to ratifie and eſtabliſh their Leagues and Covenants by Blood (their ſacred ſolemn Leagues and Covenants were eſtabliſh'd by Blood:) So the Blood that cometh forth in circumciſing a Perſon the Jews call דם ברית *the Blood of the Covenant.* A Child on the day of his Circumciſion was called חתן *Sponſus*, becauſe he was then (as it were) betrothed and eſpouſed to God; and ſeveral learned Men think, that *Zipporah* uſing the ſolemn words of Circumciſion ſaid to her Child, when ſhe circumcis'd him חתן דמים *Sponſus ſanguinum tu es.* But there is no probability, that theſe words were ſpoken to the Child, or that they were the ſolemn words of Circumciſion; they carry an air of Feminine Paſſion, and it is moſt probable, that *Zipporah* upon making her Child a חתן or *Sponſus* by Circumciſion, took occaſion to call her Husband *Sponſus Sanguinis* becauſe of the Circumciſion. A bloody Rite Circumciſion muſt be, that it may be federal; whence the Jews ſay, that if one that becometh a Proſelyte to their Religion, was before circumcis'd according to the Cuſtom of ſome Heathen Nations, yet it was neceſſary that the דם ברית *Blood of the Covenant* be let out of the Scar of his former Circumciſion. Such Proſelytes that by Circumciſion were initiated into the Abrahamical Covenant (*k*) *had the Name of Jews*, were of the ſame Condition (in the main) with the Jews Native; and as they by Circumciſion became Judaical Religioniſts (undertaking the obſervance of the Moſaic Law, *Act.* 15. 15. *Gal.* 5. 3.) So thoſe that relinquiſh'd the Jews Religion, us'd certain Artifices (*l*) *whereby they became uncircumcis'd*, obliterating their Circumciſion, which was ſuppos'd, to conſtitute, denominate and diſtinguiſh *Jews*, and to be the Bond and Badge of their Judaiſm. By Circumciſion they were in a State of diſtinction and ſeparation from all other People (as profane) ſelected and ſegregated from them, and appropriated to God, as the conſecrated Holy People. *Lev.* 20. 24, 26. (*m*) *R. Levi Barcinonenſis after he hath told us of I know not what perfection of Body and Soul, which is either ſignified or conferr'd by the Jewiſh Circumciſion, addeth this as his laſt and ſtrongeſt Reaſon, that God for ever bleſſed hereby diſtinguiſheth his ſelect People from o-*

(z) *Ainſworth on Gen.* 17. 11.

(a) *Sicut purgatio à vitiis per* μεταφορὰν *vocatur circumciſio, ita ſtatus vitioſus* ἀκροβυστία, *quo nomine Hebræi appellant omne id quod amputandum eſt. Quare* ערלה *quod* ἀκροβυστίαν *ſign. Lev.* 19. 23. *Vertitur* ἀκαθαρσία. Grot. Not. in Col. 2. 13.

(b) *Ainſworth ſupr.*

(c) *Munſter on Gen.* 17. 11.

(d) *S. Aug. c. Jul. l.* 6. *c.* 7.

(e) Ἡ γὰρ περιτομὴ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐδήλου ἢ τὴν τῆς γενέσεως ἀπέκδυσιν. *S. Athanaſ. ſupr.*

(f) Εἰ ἐκ παιδὸς εὐθὺς κοπτόμενον περιεκόπτη τὰς τῆς γενέσεως ξυγγενείας. *Jambl.* προτρεπ. *p.* 100.

(g) *Hoornbeek c. Jud. p.* 354.

(h) *Helvic. proteuang. n.* 35.

(i) *Seld. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

Exod. 4. 25.

(k) *Seld. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 4.

(l) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. Col.* 1275.

(m) *Le Clerk on Gen. Diſſ.* 7.

thers, by ſetting a mark on their Bodies. Hence the Rite of Circumciſion was omitted all the time that the *Iſraelites* were in the Wilderneſs; for they were then ſufficiently ſeparated from other People by being alone in the Wilderneſs.

God would have them mark'd by Circumciſion as being his peculiar People; as all Families and Tribes of Men have their Badges and Cogniſances, whereby they diſtinguiſh themſelves from others. Such are the Coats of Arms which are now in uſe in the *European* parts. (*n*) The *Spartans* had the picture of a Lance impreſs'd upon their Bodies, the *Pelopidæ* had a whitiſh Shoulder like Ivory, whereby they were known and diſtinguiſh'd from others. Servants and Souldiers in the elder times had a mark in their Foreheads, Hands or Arms, whereby they were diſcriminated, and were known to whom they belong'd. Several Families had Badges of their Noble Deſcent: (*o*) *A radiatum Caput* was an enſign of thoſe deſcended from *Phœbus*, a Lion's Skin of thoſe deſcended from *Hercules.* (*p*) The worſhippers of *Bacchus* were mark'd with the enſign of an Ivy-leaf (to ſignifie what they were) and they that were initiated into the Heathen Myſteries were mark'd with certain dots burnt in their Fleſh called σφραγῖνδες, whence they were ſaid to be *conſignati & σφραγιδωτὲς, conſign'd and ſealed.* The Heathen burnt certain marks in their Children's Bodies, whereby they were conſecrated to their Idols. In like manner God would have his Religioniſts marked by Circumciſion as their diſtinctive Badge and Cogniſance, which ſhew'd, whoſe they were, and whereby they were known and joyned to one another without the mixture of any other. Nor were they only marked by Circumciſion as the Holy People, but as *the Holy Seed* (the Seed of *Abraham*) touching whom God covenanted to be to them a God, and that they ſhould be to him a People: which was one reaſon, why God would have his mark and character imprinted upon that part, which ſerveth for the propagation of Mankind, becauſe his great regard was to the Holy Seed; their mark of Circumciſion denoted the People of the God of *Abraham*, to be the Holy Seed, upon which account (as alſo becauſe it was a mark of the Holy People) it was a very honourary Badge, and the Jews gloried in it as the Character of their Illuſtrious Deſcent and Genealogical Sanctity. One ſort of it was at a great rate honourary, as appeareth from *Joſ.* 5. 9. *The Lord ſaid unto* Joſhua, *This day have I rolled away the reproach of* Egypt *from off you: therefore the Name of the place is called* Gilgal *unto this day. Joſhua*'s Circumciſion was not a meer Circumciſion (ſuch a Circumciſion the *Iſraelites* had in *Egypt*) but ſuch a Circumciſion which initiated the Children of *Iſrael* into their Canaan-condition, and therefore to be an Holy Nation and Commonwealth, which was a taking away the Reproach of their being *Egyptian* Slaves. But the uſual Circumciſion of the Jews was very honourary upon this further account; as Merchants and others ſet their Property upon their Goods, ſo God would have his mark of Property ſet upon his Religioniſts in the Old Teſtament by Circumciſion (and in the New Teſtament by the Holy Spirit called by S. *Auſtin Egregius character*, and Regenerate Chriſtians are ſaid to be ſealed with it, *Eph.* 1. 13.) thereby owning them for his. To *Abraham* Circumciſion is ſaid to be *a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith*, Rom. 4. 11. becauſe God's taking him and his Seed into covenant by Circumciſion, and the making him Heir of the Promiſes of it by that ſolemn Rite, did ſolemnly aſſure and aſcertain him, that he had Righteouſneſs and Acceptance with God by that Faith, which he had and exercis'd in his uncircumciſed condition. For *obſignare* is (*q*) *ſigno appoſito declarare*, to ſeal a thing is by a ſolemn mark to atteſt to it. The common uſe of ſealing is, ſolemnly and publickly to ſignifie our owning any thing. Circumciſion therefore was a Seal to *Abraham* and his Poſterity, as being a ſolemn teſtification, that God (by ſetting his mark upon them) own'd them for his People in Covenant. The Federal Nature of this bloody Rite is the reaſon of that bloody Sanction of it, *Gen.* 17. 14. *The uncircumciſed Man-Child, whoſe Fleſh of his Foreskin is not circumciſed, that Soul ſhall be cut off from his People, he hath broken my Covenant.* (*r*) Many mitigate or alleviate the Senſe of this *Cereth* or Exciſion, and will have it ſignifie ſomething leſs than the puniſhment of Death. But there is no reaſon, that the phraſe ſhould be otherwiſe underſtood in this place, than as it uſually ſignifieth in the Books of *Moſes*, which is the Puniſhment of Death by the Hand of God or of the Magiſtrate. And there is greater reaſon, that it ſhould be ſo underſtood in this place than in any other; for it muſt be ſuppos'd, that a capital puniſhment is allotted to a capital crime. And the crime of an uncircumciſed Man-Child that wilfully and contemptuouſly neglecteth to be circumcis'd (of ſuch the Text muſt be underſtood) can be no leſs than capital, as the Text repreſenteth it. For a deſtroying the Covenant of God is like the deſtroying Allegiance, which is a deſtroying the Sovereignty.

(n) *Grot. Not. in Rom.* 8. 16. *Hamm. on Apoc.* 13. 17.

(o) *Selden Titles*, p. 120, 125.

(p) *Herald. in Arnob.* p. 129, 130.

The Jews conceit, that they have a different ſort of Souls from other People. V. Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. Lex. 2. p. 10.

(q) *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 3. 33.

(r) *Selden de Synedr. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *Hotting. de Jur. Hebr. Lex* 227.

VIII. The *Egyptians* us'd a ſort of Circumciſion as well as the Seed of *Abraham*; and it is not eaſie to ſay, whether this Rite was originally *Abrahamical* or *Egyptian*, (*s*) as *Herodotus*, *Diodorus* and *Celſus* affirm. It ſeemeth not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that God in the *Abrahamical* Inſtitution of Circumciſion had regard to any paganical obſervance of it (the *Abrahamical* Circumciſion is founded upon its own Reaſons:) nor on the other hand is it probable, that Circumciſion was (immediately or mediately) propagated from the *Jews* to the *Egyptians*, but it was an humourſom Rite of their Paganical Purity, as *Herodotus* ſaith, (*t*) the *Egyptians* us'd it καθαρειότητος ἕνεκεν, *for cleanlineſs ſake.* They had too great a contempt and hatred of the Jews, to entertain any Rite which they underſtood to be theirs; they were tenacious of their own Cuſtoms and would not entertain any other; and they were ſo idiotical, that they would not have converſe or correſpondence with Strangers, ſhunning all exotick uſages. They are ſaid, to have adminiſtred their Circumciſion to Perſons at the age of fourteen, to Women alſo, it was not amongſt them a National Rite, (*u*) as appeareth from *Joſephus* againſt *Apion*, and *Epiphanius* ſeemeth to ſay, that it was peculiar to their Prieſts. The Rite of Circumciſion was in uſe (*w*) not only amongſt the *Egyptians*, *Colchians*, *Ethiopians*, *Arabians*, *Homerites*, *Troglodytes*, *Nigrites* and other Heathen Nations of our Continent, but amongſt the *Americans*, who cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to have deriv'd their Rite of Circumciſion (immediately or mediately) from the Jews. (*x*) *Circumciduntur Mexicani Infantes, Jucatanenſes & alii:* (*y*) *what is admirable, in* Coluacane, *as alſo in* Jacatan, Uraba *and* Dariena *there are many circumcis'd.* The Circumciſion therefore which was in uſe in ſeveral

(s) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(t) *L.* 2. *c.* 37.

(u) *L.* 2.

(w) *Ludolph. Hiſt. of Ethiop. B.* 3. *c.* 1.

(x) *Huet. Dem. Ev. prop.* 4. *c.* 7.

(y) *Le Blanc Travails, par.* 3. *c.* 2.

Heathen Nations, ſeemeth to have been ſuch as their Baptiſm was, originally nothing elſe but a Rite of Paganical Purity. And as the Baptiſm which the Pagans us'd in their initiations into their Myſteries, was a different kind of thing from the Chriſtian Baptiſm, and therefore was not Baptiſm, but by equivocation of words: ſo the Circumciſion which the *Egyptians* and other Heathen Nations (in ſome degree) us'd, was not Circumciſion but by equivocation of words; for it was a different kind of thing from the Federal Circumciſion of the Seed of *Abraham*. Upon which account (as alſo becauſe Circumciſion was not a National Rite amongſt the *Egyptians* and other Heathen Nations) thoſe Nations are juſtly counted uncircumcis'd Nations: as the Chriſtian Church counteth the Pagan Nations unbaptiz'd, notwithſtanding the Baptiſms which they us'd in their Myſteries. So we read in the Prophet, *Jer.* 25. 26. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will puniſh all them that are circumcis'd with the uncircumcis'd.* Egypt *and* Judah *and* Edom, *and the Children of* Ammon *and* Moab, *and all that are in the utmoſt corners, that dwell in the Wilderneſs: for all theſe Nations are uncircumciſed, and all the Houſe of* Iſrael *are uncircumciſed in the Heart.* Egypt and the other Heathen Nations here enumerated are not counted circumciſed Nations (ſo to underſtand the Prophet is to contradict common ſenſe) but they are counted the Nations *uncircumciſed in Fleſh*, and are conſorted with the Houſe of *Iſrael*, that were uncircumciſed in the Heart. Notwithſtanding therefore that ſort of Circumciſion which was in uſe among the Heathen Nations, yet they ought to be reckon'd the uncircumciſed Nations: which may reaſonably incline us to think, that a ſort of Circumciſion might be in uſe amongſt the *Philiſtins* notwithſtanding that uſual Character of them in the Bible *uncircumciſed Philiſtins.* At leaſt it cannot be inferr'd from this their Character, that a Rite of Circumciſion never was in uſe amongſt them; for at the time when they were ſo characteriz'd, they might have left off all uſe of it; as *Grotius* thinketh, (z) that in the time of the Prophet *Jeremiah*, the *Idumeans* and *Arabians* had left off all uſe of it. Upon which account (and ſeveral others) there is an uncertainty and infirmity in this Argument. (a) The *Philiſtim* were not circumciſed; the *Philiſtim* in the more ancient times came from the *Caſluchim* (the *Colchians*, *Gen.* 10. 14.) therefore in the more ancient times Circumciſion was not in uſe amongſt the *Colchians*; for if it had been in uſe amongſt them, they would have propagated it to the *Philiſtim*. And if it was not in uſe amongſt the *Colchians* in the more ancient times, it was not in uſe amongſt the *Egyptians* (in thoſe times) of whom the *Colchians* were a Colony.

Section V.

Of the Moſaical Inſtitution.

I. THE *Moſaic Inſtitution* muſt be conſider'd as it is no more nor better than *the Law-religioniſts Religion*, and as it is (like the *Ante-moſaical Inſtitutions*) *the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd.* So far as it is on this ſide the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd, it may be ſeparate from the Goſpel, and is but *the Law-religioniſts Religion*, which is oppos'd to the Religion of Chriſtianity. And ſo the Moſaic Inſtitution muſt be oppos'd, as it is *the Moſaical Covenant, as it is a Civil-religious Inſtitution, and as it is the Settlement of the Holy Spiritual Law.* For although the Covenant of Grace was hidden and veiled in and under the Moſaical Covenant, and in the times of the Moſaic Covenant (or Teſtament) there was an adminiſtration or diſpenſation of the Covenant of Grace, ſo that in ſome ſenſe (incluſively and comprehenſively) the Moſaic Inſtitution may be ſaid, to have been the Covenant of Grace, yet if we inquire, what is that *Covenant*, which is ſtrictly and properly *the Moſaic Covenant*, it muſt be anſwer'd, *The Covenant of Grace is not that Covenant*, but another and an oppoſite kind of Covenant, which muſt be duely diſtinguiſh'd from it, not confounded. The Covenant of Grace is commonly ſuppos'd, to have been made with *Adam* immediately after his Fall (as the Covenant of Works is ſaid, to have been made with *Adam* in Innocency) afterwards to have been repeated to *Abraham* (and ſome ſay, it was made with *Noah*) and at length to have become *Fœdus gratiæ Moſaicum*, the Moſaic Covenant of Grace. The Moſaic Covenant is ſuppos'd to have been *a Covenant of Grace*, *The Covenant of Grace of the firſt Edition, Adminiſtration and Diſpenſation*, *The old Covenant of Grace*, ſo making the old and new Covenant, not two Covenants of oppoſite kind and quality, but two oppoſite Adminiſtrations of one and the ſame Covenant of Grace, which is diſtinguiſh'd into the old and new Covenant of Grace. But thus to make the Old and New Covenant, the Moſaic Covenant and the Covenant of Grace, *the ſame in ſubſtance:* This making the Moſaic Covenant the Covenant of Grace, ſo as not duely to diſtinguiſh them, not to make them two oppoſite kind of Covenants, is a great miſtake in Theology, and a contradiction to the New Teſtament. In which Grace ſignifieth *Saving Grace*, the ſettlement and diſpenſation whereof is always oppos'd to the Moſaic Law or Covenant, *Joh.* 1. 17. *The Law was given by* Moſes, *but Grace and Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt*, (b) χάριν ϗ ἀλήθειαν ἀντιθεὶς τῷ νόμῳ, *oppoſing Grace and Truth to the Law*, Rom. 6. 14. *Ye are not under the Law, but under Grace.* Gal. 5. 4. *Chriſt is become of no effect unto you, whoſoever of you are juſtify'd by the* (Moſaic) *Law, ye are fallen from Grace.* Gal. 2. 21. *I do not fruſtrate the Grace of God: for if Righteouſneſs come by the* (Moſaic) *Law, Chriſt is dead in vain.* The Moſaic Law therefore in the Senſe of the New Teſtament is ſo Law, as not to be ſaving Grace, it affordeth Men no ſaving Benefits (which the Religion of Saving Grace affordeth;) for it is not *the miniſtration of Righteouſneſs*, 2 Cor. 3. 9. No Man is juſtify'd by the Law of *Moſes*, *Act.* 13. 39. *Gal.* 3. 10, 11. Nor is there any attaining the Life of Righteouſneſs (or of Sanctification) by it: (c) οὐ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἐκόμισε Μωϋσῆς ἀλλὰ γράμματα, *for* Moſes *did not bring to us the Spirit* (by his Covenant) *but Letters, Stones and External Scripts only*, 2 Cor. 3. 6, 7. A liberation from ſervitude under Sin is not attainable by the Law (that Covenant and Diſpenſation of things) *Rom.* 6. 14. and *ch.* 7. 5. *Gal.* 4. 23, 24. Nor a regeneration into the Holy Life, *Rom.* 8. 2. Nor is it the Religion of making Sinners the Righteous in ſtate and condition, in life and practice, *Rom.* 3. 20. and *ch.* 5. 20. Nor is the Inheritance (of Life Eternal) by the Law, *Gal.* 3. 18, 21. Nor is it the Religion of being juſtify'd by Faith and by Grace; *for the Law is not of Faith; but the Man that doeth them, ſhall live in them*, Gal. 3. 12. Moſes *deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs which is of the Law*, that

(z) *Not. in Jer.* 9. 26.

(a) *Witſii Ægypt. l.* 3. *c.* 6.

(b) *S. Chryſoſt. in loc.*

(c) *Idem in 2 Cor.* λογ. ς.

that the Man which doeth theſe things, ſhall live by them, Rom. 10. 5. The Moſaic Law or Covenant doth not juſtifie and ſave Men, as they are God's Believers according to Chriſtianity, and by their Faith; but the proceedings of it are Law-proceedings (ſo as not to be the proceedings of Supra-legal Grace) the tenour of it runneth in form of Law, and according to it the way to obtain Life and Happineſs, is not the Faith of God's Believers (according to Chriſtianity) but *the doing the Works of the Law*. The Moſaic Law or Covenant therefore is *the Covenant of Works* an oppoſite kind of Law to the Chriſtian, *Rom.* 3. 21. The Law or Covenant of Grace and of Works are two Covenants ſpecifically diſtinct and oppoſite; for the unbelieving Jews way of obtaining Righteouſneſs (which is the Covenant of Works) and the Chriſtians way of obtaining Righteouſneſs (which is the Covenant of Grace) are two Religions ſpecifically diſtinct and oppoſite, *Rom.* 9. 30, 32. If we aſk, which of theſe two oppoſite kind of Covenants is the Moſaic Covenant? the Apoſtle anſwereth, *It is the Covenant of Works*. So the new Law, Covenant or Teſtament, and the old Law, Covenant or Teſtament are ſpecifically diſtinct and oppoſite; for the one is the unbelieving Jews Religion, the other is the Chriſtians. The New Law, Covenant or Teſtament is the Religion of our Newneſs and Regeneracy; all that belong to it, are made by it the new kind of Men and the new kind of Religioniſts; and it is a new creation or conſtitution of things, whereby all old things (proper to our Unregeneracy) are done away, and all things that are introduc'd, are of a new nature and excellency, *Rom.* 7. 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. *Apoc.* 21. 5. It is ſpecifically therefore diſtinct from and oppoſite to the old Law, Covenant or Teſtament. And if we aſk, which of theſe two Covenants or Teſtaments is the Moſaic? The Apoſtle anſwereth, *It is the old, the firſt Covenant and Teſtament*, of which *Moſes* was the Mediator, *Heb.* 8. 7, 13. and *ch.* 9. 18, 19, 20.

As *Hagar* muſt not be ſaid to be *Sarah*, nor *Iſhmael Iſaac*, nor Bondage Freedom, nor Fleſh Spirit, nor Shadow Subſtance, nor Condemnation Juſtification; ſo the Moſaic Law or Covenant muſt not be ſaid, to be the Covenant of Grace, but an oppoſite kind of Covenant, as the Prophet oppoſeth *the new Covenant* to that which was made with the Houſe of *Iſrael*, when they came out of *Egypt, which Covenant they brake, Jer.* 31. 31, 32. The Moſaic or Judaical Covenant is the Covenant that God made with *Iſrael in Horeb*, Deut. 5. 2. whence we read of *the words of the Covenant*, Exod. 34. 28. *the Tables of the Covenant*, Deut. 9. 11. and the *Ark of the Covenant*, Deut. 10. 8. If the Covenant that God made with old *Iſrael* in *Horeb* was the ſame with the Covenant of Grace, then it was the Covenant *of writing his Law in their Hearts*: but this (ſaith the Prophet) is another Covenant, and it muſt be another kind of Covenant; for a dead external Covenant which is but a writing in Tables of Stone (and therefore eaſily broken) is not of the ſame kind with an interiour vital and vivificative Covenant, that writeth the Divine Laws in the Heart, and is the Spirit that giveth Life, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. But the Jews diſpute, (*d*) that this new Covenant (which writeth the Divine Laws in the Heart) is no other than that which was given on Mount *Sinai*. To ſuppoſe therefore the Covenant of Grace, to be the ſame with the Moſaic Covenant, is one of the Jews Errors, and a principal Branch of their Infidelity. Chriſtian Divines that diſpute againſt them maintain, that the New Covenant is not (*e*) *redintegratio fœderis carnalis & legalis* (*quod volunt Judæi*) *ſed aliud naturâ & ſpecie differens fœdus*, a reſtoring the carnal and legal Covenant, but another Covenant different in nature and in kind. The Moſaic Covenant is neceſſarily that carnal legal Covenant, and therefore is not the ſame with the Chriſtians Covenant of Grace. To call it the old Covenant of Grace, is contradictory to the nature and notion of the Covenant of Grace, which is eſſentially the new and everlaſting Covenant, and that which extendeth to all Nations: (*f*) ὁ δὲ ἐν Χωρὴβ, παλαιὸς ἤδη νόμος, καὶ ὑμῶν μόνον, *But the Covenant in* Horeb *is now the old Law, and is yours only*, ſaith *J. Mart.* to *Trypho*.

II. The Moſaic Inſtitution muſt be conſider'd as a *Civil Religious Inſtitution* (whereby the Seed of *Abraham* vaſtly multiply'd was inſtituted into a Commonwealth:) The Moſaic Law was a Political or Civil-religious Law (rightly diſtributed into Moral, Ceremonial, Judicial) and the Moſaic Covenant was *a Civil-religious Pact or Covenant* between God and the People of *Iſrael*, whom God inſtituted into ſuch a Commonwealth, as was a Theocracy, in purſuance of his Covenant made with *Abraham*, to be a God to him and his Seed, and to give them the Land of *Canaan* for their Inheritance. If this Inheritance is the Heavenly Inheritance, then the *Abrahamical Covenant* may be called *A Covenant of Grace for Eternal Life and Salvation*. But Divines in their Diſputes with the Jews have given it another Name, and rightly call it, (*g*) *fœdus illud carnale cum Abrahamo initum cujus ſacramentum erat circumciſio*, that carnal Covenant made with *Abraham* whoſe Sacrament was Circumciſion, which they contradiſtinguiſh to *the Covenant of Grace made in Chriſt*. A carnal Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Carnal Seed was the only Covenant between God and *Abraham*, that was made by an expreſs mutual confederating. For as to the Covenant of Saving Grace there was no expreſs mutual confederating between God and *Abraham*, nor in all the times of the Old Teſtament. Abſolute promiſes were made to *Abraham*, that are called God's Covenant: but an abſolute promiſe is only *fœdus* μονόπλευρον, *a Covenant of one Party*, not a mutual confederative Covenant. As to ſuch Covenant-making the Covenant of Grace was not made with *Adam*, or with *Noah*, or with *Abraham*, or with any other in the Old Teſtament-times, nor could it be ſo made, till it was made as to its conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence, which was not till the Death and Sacrifice of the Meſſiah, whoſe Bloodſhed was the making the New Teſtament or Covenant, *Matth.* 26. 28. *Heb.* 9. 16. When our Saviour was here on Earth (by the miniſtry of others) he baptized many Diſciples, but as a Prophet and Doctor only, and ſo far only he then *confirm'd the Covenant with many*, Dan. 9. 27. But ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church are of opinion, (*h*) that this Baptiſm of his antecedent to his Paſſion and Reſurrection did not confer the remiſſion of Sins and the Holy Spirit: whereby they mean (doubtleſs) that it was not in the proper plenary ſenſe an entring into the new Covenant, and therefore the benefits of it were not conferr'd by it: or at moſt it conferr'd thoſe benefits of the Covenant but in a degree proportionate to Mens entring into it. And if this was the caſe of our Saviour's own Baptiſm, it cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, that by the car-

nal

(d) *Hulſ. Theol. Jud. par.* 1. *l.* 1. *p.* 148.

(e) *Ibid. p.* 75.

(f) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 228.

(g) *Hulſ. ſupr. p.* 145.

Luk. 1. 72, 73. *Act.* 3. 25. *Gal.* 3. 15, 17.

(h) *Ap. Maldonat. in Joh.* 3. 22.

nal Rite of Circumciſion *Abraham*'s carnal Seed confederated with God in the Covenant of Grace. It entred them into a gracious Covenant; for ſuch was the Covenant of Circumciſion, that God gave unto *Abraham:* But every gracious Promiſe or Covenant (although it relateth to the Meſſiah) muſt not be counted the Covenant of Grace, which was a ſecret in the Old Teſtament-times. But by a carnal Covenant and the Promiſes of ſecular Honours and Advantages *Abraham* was inſtituted to the Knowledge and Belief of thoſe ſpiritual and heavenly Honours and Advantages that are the premiant part of the Covenant of Grace (which God had provided) and which proceeding according to it God diſpens'd to him and to all Divine Believers in the Old Teſtament-times. And of the ſame Nature is the premiant and promiſſory part of the Moſaic Civil-religious Law (being a Donation of the Land of *Canaan* and the Felicities thereof to the carnal Seed of *Abraham* typically and figuratively) yet the Holy Writers are ſo far from ſuppoſing it, to be upon this account the ſame with the Covenant of Grace, that they oppoſe theſe two Covenants, looking upon the one as earthly and ſecular, the other as ſpiritual and heavenly in its Promiſes. For the one promiſeth all ſpiritual and eternal Benefits, the other (in the Letter of it) promiſeth nothing more than ſecular Bleſſings and Proſperities (for theſe Old *Iſrael* covenanted with God and God with them) as appeareth all along in the treating of this Covenant. *Exod.* 23. 25, 26. *Levit.* 26. 3, 4. *Deut.* 6. 17, 24. and *Ch.* 7. 12, 13. and *Ch.* 28.

Our Saviour's Prieſthood therefore, his Covenant and his Mediatorſhip far tranſcendeth the Moſaic. *Heb.* 8. 6. *He hath obtained a more excellent Miniſtery, by how much he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was eſtabliſh'd upon better Promiſes.* The better Promiſes are not thoſe of the Moſaic Covenant, but of that which Chriſt hath mediated for us. For the Moſaic Covenant was extremely faulty and defective, elſe it had not been abrogated, and a new one had not been made. *Heb.* 8. 7. *There is verily a diſanulling of the Commandment going before, for the weakneſs and unprofitableneſs thereof. For the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did.* Heb. 7. 18, 19. The Law (Civil-religious) was an impotent ineffectual Inſtitution to the purpoſe of juſtifying, ſanctifying and ſaving Men, *it made nothing ſo perfect*, but that the Subſtance of the thing was wanting, as remarkably appeareth in its Expiations of Sin, which did not make the Worſhippers perfect, ſo as not to need another kind of expiatory Sacrifice and Expiation. *Heb.* 9. 9. In preſcribing expiatory Sacrifices this Religious Inſtitution (*i*) reckoneth Perjury with the legal Defilements, and ceremonial Offences, and preſcribeth the ſame Expiation for the moſt monſtrous Immoralities and for Trifles. Which plainly argueth, that the expiatory Sacrifices of it were thoſe of a Civil-religious Inſtitution (*k*) and that they expiated Sin only in reſpect of Temporal Puniſhment. If the Moſaic Covenant in the Letter of it had not been meerly a Civil-religious Inſtitution, the Goſpel could not have been *the bringing in a better Hope:* Nor could the Apoſtle have ſaid, *that Chriſt is the Mediator of the New Teſtament, that by means of Death for the Redemption of the Tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt Teſtament, they which are called might receive the Promiſe of eternal Inheritance.* Heb. 9. 15. Chriſt died for our Liberation from thoſe Tranſgreſſions that prevail'd under the firſt Teſtament, that they which are called might be Heirs of Life eternal by the new Teſtament. None were made Heirs of Life eternal therefore by the Moſaic Teſtament: Nor had the Moſaic Covenant an expreſs Sanction by ſuch Penalties as the Covenant of Grace threatneth. For when the Apoſtle ſaith, *Heb.* 10. 28, 29. *He that deſpiſed Moſes Law, died without Mercy, under two or three Witneſſes. Of how much ſorer puniſhment, ſuppoſe ye, ſhall he be thought worthy, who hath troden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing?* He confronteth and oppoſeth Chriſt to *Moſes*, his Covenant to the Moſaic Covenant; and looketh upon that Temporal Death which it threatneth, as Typical of the penal Sanction of the New Covenant, as the reſt which the Moſaic Covenant promis'd, was Typical of the reſt, which the Covenant of Grace promiſeth. *Heb.* 4. Chriſtianity every where proclaimeth the Typical Nature of the Moſaic Covenant; which ſheweth, that the Matters of it in the Letter of it are only things Civil-religious, Secular and Temporal, that typifie and adumbrate things Spiritual and Eternal. So far the Covenant of Grace is different from the Moſaic Covenant, *which was a Figure for the time then preſent. Heb.* 9. 9. (*l*) Τὰ μὲν Ἰουδαϊκὰ πάντα τύποι ἦν. *All the Judaical things were Types.* (*m*) Befell them τυπικῶς, *typically.* (*n*) *Omnia hæc in figura veniebant illis.* 1 Cor. 10, 11.

(i) *Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex* 121, 124. *Outram. de Sacrif. l.* 1. *c.* 12, 13.

(k) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 1. *c.* 41.

(l) *S. Chryſoſt. in Joh. Hom.* νδ.

(m) *Orig. Philocal. p.* 10.

(n) *Iren. adv. Hær: l.* 4. *c.* 28.

III. The Moſaic Law is not an expreſs Covenant with *Iſrael* touching the future Rewards and Puniſhments. This the Schoolmen in conſort with ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church affirm. (*o*) *God would have the ſecond Death hidden and a ſecret* (as to the inſiſting upon it in the Old Teſtament) *the Letter of the Goſpel and of the Law are different, becauſe the Promiſes are different: there things Terrene, here things Celeſtial are promis'd. Between the Law and the Goſpel there is this difference: There the Kingdom of* Canaan *and the Promiſes of things Temporal are contained; here Life eternal and the Kingdom of Heaven is promiſed.* The Hebrew Doctors that believe ſome ſuch thing as a Reſurrection (*p*) yet know not what to make of it, and they ſay (*q*) *that in the Scripture in the Prophets there is not ſo clear and frequent mention of the Promiſes of eternal Life, as in the Writings of our wiſe Men.* They make the excellency of their Religion, to conſiſt, not in a Promiſe of Immortality, but in a conjunction with the Divine Majeſty, whereby they are above being hurt by Death. And thus they argue againſt the *Karraites*, that do not admit of their Oral Law, nor the Traditions and Sayings of their Rabbins. (*s*) *Let them ſhew us, whence they are bound, to make Prayers unto God; and whence is it, that they believe a Meeting-place of all living* (Paradiſe and Hell) *Reward and Puniſhment after death?* If the Law had been a Covenant with the *Iſraelites* touching ſpiritual and eternal Life and Death, it could not have been ſo ſparing as it is in the great Precepts which concern an holy Life (the Hebrew Doctors are at a loſs (*t*) to find in their Law a Precept againſt Drunkenneſs) nor in the great Articles of Religion, ſome of which the Rabbins cannot find in it, or deduce from it (*u*) but by their Faculty of deducing *quidlibet ex quolibet*. Such are

(o) *Vid. Voſſ. Reſp. ad jud. Ravenſperg. c.* 23.

(p) *Pocock. Not. Miſc. p.* 88.

(q) *Coſri p* 71, 187. 63.

(s) *Ibid. p.* 203.

(t) *Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex* 252.

(u) *L'Emper. Not. in Jacchiad. p.* 200, 201. *Abrav. ap. Vorſt. de cap. Fid. p.* 71, 103.

their Proofs of Hell-torments, Proofs of nothing but their own Folly. And although it is an Article of their Faith, that the Reſurrection of the Dead is contained in their Law, yet the moſt of the Proofs which they bring for it are confuted by themſelves, and they are ſo manifeſtly weak, as gave occaſion to the *Samaritans*, to brag of an Advantage, which they had above the Jews, that in their Pentateuch eternal Life and the Reſurrection are clearly recorded, which are not ſo in the Jewiſh. (*w*) Themſelves acknowledge (although they are hugely concern'd for the Reputation of their Law) that there is no mention of the Article of the Reſurrection in their Law גלוי ובביאור *openly and expreſly*, but only by obſcure Indication. *Abarbenel* counteth the Article of the Reſurrection and another Life, to be of the number of סתרי תורה *the hidden things of the Law*. Our Saviour proveth the Reſurrection out of the Law, but not by any thing clear and expreſs, but by ſuch an Inference, as no meer Man could have made, nor doth he make his Inference from any Promiſe of the Moſaic Covenant to its Obſervers. In the Law, the Prophets, the *Hagiographa*, no place ſeemeth ſo clear a Proof of the Reſurrection, as that of the Prophet *Daniel*, ch. 12. 2. *Many of them that ſleep in the Duſt of the Earth ſhall awake*. And this the generality of the Jews account a valid Proof. If it is ſo, yet it is no Promiſe of the Moſaic Covenant to its Obſervers; but ſeveral good Interpreters are otherwiſe minded, (*x*) they expound this Paſſage of the Prophet, to be meant of the Liberation of the Jews from the Miſeries that befel them in the Perſecution of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. A like account they give (*y*) of that Paſſage in the Book of *Job*, which ſome of the Hebrew Doctors refer to the Reſurrection, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he ſhall ſtand at the latter day upon the Earth*. But *R. Saadiah Gaon* alledgeth this Argument. (*z*) We have found *Moſes* our Maſter the principal Perſon amongſt juſt Men, and the Worſhippers of God, to have received none of thoſe things, which make up a Reward in this World mention'd in a Section of the Law, *Lev.* 26. Nor did *Moſes* ſo much as enter into the Land of *Canaan*. But if there is no Reward of juſt Men beſides thoſe that are enumerated in that Section of the Law, the greateſt ſhare of them ought to have been given to *Moſes*. And if this Retribution in this World was all, he was no fit Perſon, to make others Partakers of it, who enjoy'd none of it himſelf. This he calleth הטענה גדולה *the great Argument*; and a great Argument it is indeed, that the Portion of *Moſes* and the truly pious Jews was an inviſible recompence of reward, that they expected it and were entitled to it though not by the Moſaical Law or Covenant, which induc'd none to undertake the obſervance of it by a Promiſe of eternal Life and a better Reſurrection made to the obſervance of it, although the undertaking and obſervance of it was to thoſe whom it concern'd a Condition of Life eternal. Which is a ſufficient Anſwer to an Objection, which a learned Man maketh (*a*) that if the Law did not Covenant for Life eternal, there could be no ſufficient reaſon, why any ſhould embrace and undertake it. For as the Heathen World and *Balaam* the Soothſayer (whoſe Saying, *Let me die the death of the Righteous* is one of the cleareſt intimations of a future Happineſs in all the Pentateuch) ſo the ancient People of God were not without the Notice of future Rewards and Puniſhments; there was alſo amongſt the ancient People of God a *Cabala* of the Reſurrection, as appeareth from the Intimations of it and Alluſions to it in the Old Teſtament. Let us ſuppoſe now, that to a People furniſh'd with theſe Notices a meerly Civil-religious Law is promulgated by God and impos'd upon them by his Command. Although this Law is meerly a Civil-religious Law for a Nation (ſuch as our *Engliſh* Nation) yet ſeeing it is impos'd upon them by Divine Command, they muſt neceſſarily look upon Obedience to it and the faithful Obſervance of it as a condition of obtaining the Favour of God and Life eternal, although no ſuch Retribution is promis'd in this Civil-religious Law. (*b*) Some think, that the Promiſe of ſuch a Retribution was by God's intention included in this general Promiſe, *I will be to thee a God*. If this be granted, yet it is very remote from an expreſs Covenant with *Iſrael* touching the future Rewards and Puniſhments. Such general Terms may include and involve in them the being a God to his genuin People according to a different Covenant from the Moſaical; and this importeth nothing more than that the Goſpel was veiled under the Law. *Matth.* 22. 31, 32. 2 *Cor.* 6. 16, 17. and 7. 1. *Heb.* 11. 16. *Apoc.* 21. 3, 7.

IV. The Moſaic Law is oppos'd to the Covenant of Grace, not only as it is a Civil-religious Law (which it is plainly and expreſly) but as it is *the Settlement of the Holy Spiritual Law* (the Original Law and Settlement of Soul-intereſts) which is covertly contained in it and ſignified by it. (*c*) *For this great and admirable Law compriſeth* πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην, *all Righteouſneſs*, and therefore is of Spiritual-religious obſervance. In the preceptive part this Divine Moral Law is the rule of Righteouſneſs: But if it was meerly ſuch, it could not have the whole Nature of a Law, it muſt be a Settlement of Rights and Dues and have a Sanction of Reward and Puniſhment, and therefore muſt be a premiant and penal Law. The penal Sanction of the Law is viſible in the Apoſtle's account of it, *that it worketh Wrath, is the Law of Death, the ſtrength of Sin, the miniſtration of Condemnation*. And touching the premiant Sanction of *this Spiritual-religious Law* it muſt be ſaid (*d*) *God gave unto us a Law and Holy Commandments*, ἃς πᾶς ὁ ποιήσας δύναται σωθῆναι, *which every one that doeth, may be ſaved*. But ſome ſuppoſe, that the premiant or promiſſory Sanction of the Law is ceaſed *ceſſante conditionis poſſibilitate* (becauſe the poſſibility of the Condition is ceaſed) *ceſſante ſubditi capacitate*, becauſe the capacity of the Subject is ceaſed. *It is unworthy of God, to ſay, that he doth ever ſince the Fall tell the World, if you are not fallen, nor ſinners, you ſhall be juſtify'd; or on condition, that you be ſuch as never did Sin, you ſhall live. This* (ſay they) *were to condemn us ironically. Therefore the promiſſory covenanting part of the Law* (the Promiſe and the Condition) *is ceaſed. It is no Promiſe nor Covenant of God.* To which I anſwer, that the Original Law is not indeed ſuch a Covenant as requireth a mutual Stipulation, nor did it ever perhaps require expreſs Covenanting (although ſome are prone to think (*e*) that the Angels at their Creation were required to enter into an expreſs Covenant of Subjection, Allegiance and Fealty:) But that

it

Hotting. Diſſ. de Reſur. p. 10. *Pocock. ſupr. p.* 98. *Lightfoot Hor. in Joh.* 4. 15. *Men. ben Iſr. de Reſur. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *Coch. c.* 11. *n.* 2, 3. 9.

(w) *Pocock ſupr. p.* 99.

(x) *Hulſ. Theol. Jud. Par.* 1. *p.* 572.

(y) *Huet. Dem. Ev. prop.* 7. *S.* 13.

(z) *Pocock ſupr.*

(a) *Pocock.*

(b) *Epiſcop. Inſtit. l.* 3. *S.* 4. *c.* 1.

(c) *Theophil. ad Autol. l.* 3. *p.* 127.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 2. *p.* 104.

(e) *Mr. Lawſon Theopolit. B.* 1. *c.* 10.

it always was ever ſince the Creation, and ever will be *a Settlement*, *Conſtitution*, *premiant or promiſſory Law* (and in ſuch ſenſe a Covenant) will appear by conſidering the neceſſary indiſpenſable Obligation of the Condition, and the neceſſary eternal truth of the Promiſe. For the hardeſt condition of this Original Law that can reaſonably be imagin'd, is *only ſinleſs Obedience*, to which all Rationals are neceſſarily and indiſpenſably oblig'd; for to ſuppoſe, that they may Sin, is a contradiction. And as the Condition is of neceſſary indiſpenſable Obligation, ſo the Promiſe is a neceſſary eternal Verity. For it always was, and ever will be true, that he who performeth unſinning Obedience *δύναται σωθῆναι, may be ſaved*, yea ſhall be ſav'd. The premiant or promiſſory part of the Law therefore is not ceaſed, nor ever can ceaſe, although it is ceaſed as to any availableneſs to our Benefit; upon which account it would be a thing unreaſonable and unworthy of God, to make this Original Law a mutual confederative Covenant with fallen Mankind. This is not that mutual confederative Moſaic Covenant, the propoſal whereof was made by *Moſes* to the Children of *Iſrael*, *but this is covertly contain'd in and ſignify'd by the Moſaic-civil-religious Law*. As the Apoſtle interpreteth *Moſes*, Rom. 10. 5. *Moſes deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs which is of the Law, that the Man which doeth thoſe things, ſhall live by them.* In the firſt and literal Senſe of the Law *Vivere* and the legal promiſe of Life denoteth the enjoyment of Life in this World, which repreſenteth and covertly ſignifieth Life eternal and the legal Promiſe thereof. In the Moſaic Law therefore Life eternal and the legal Promiſe thereof is repreſented and covertly ſignified, elſe the Allegation of the Text of *Moſes* would be impertinent to the Apoſtle's buſineſs; for he is diſcourſing, not of Secular, but of Soul-intereſts. Righteouſneſs alſo (a term which the Apoſtle uſeth) denoteth Salvation in the Apoſtle's Senſe. Who in another place alledgeth this ſame Moſaic Text, Gal 3. 12. *The Law is not of Faith: but the Man that doeth them, ſhall live in them.* He had before proved, that *as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curſe.* This he proveth from the Tenour of the Moſaic Law (the Letter of it) wherein the Tenour of the Original Law of Soul-intereſts is repreſented and covertly ſignified. As therefore the legal, ſpiritual and eternal Malediction is repreſented and covertly ſignified in one Text of the Law: So the legal, ſpiritual and eternal Benediction is repreſented and covertly ſignified in this other Text of the Moſaic Law, *the Man that doeth them ſhall live in them.* The ſame Apoſtle ſaith of the Commandment of the Moſaic Law conſidered as Spiritual-religious, *it was ordained to Life*, which muſt ſignifie Life Spiritual and Eternal. *Rom.* 7. 10. The Commandment of the Moſaic Law therefore as it is in the Law, was ordained to Life eternal, and the keeping it as the Law requireth, intituleth to Life eternal by the Law; therefore ſome ſort of legal Promiſe of Life eternal is in the Moſaical Law; and conſequently the legal Promiſe of Life eternal is covertly ſignified in it. Agreeably to the Apoſtle our Saviour interpreteth the Moſaic Law; for to him that ask'd him, *What good thing ſhall I do, that I may have eternal Life?* Our Saviour anſwer'd, *Matth.* 19. *If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments.* The other reply'd, *all theſe things have I kept from my Youth.* From whence it is apparent, that our Saviour ſhap'd his Anſwer to this young Religioniſt according to his own Religion. For as keeping the Commandments is really *conditio ſine qua non* of entring into Life, ſo it was the ſenſe of this ſtrict Judaical Pietiſt's Religion. And if in his Religion a condition was requir'd in order to the entring into Life, there was in his Religion a Promiſe of entring into Life upon Condition, ſuch a Condition as the Apoſtle citeth from the Law, *The Man that doeth them, ſhall live in them.* This appeareth alſo from our Saviour's Diſcourſe with a capricious Lawyer, *Luk.* 10. 25. who to try his Law-skill (tempting him, ſaith the Text) ask'd him, *Maſter, what ſhall I do to inherit eternal Life?* Our Saviour asketh him again, what the Law requir'd? And he rehearſing the great Commandments (of the love of God and of Man) our Saviour replieth, *Thou haſt anſwer'd right: this do and thou ſhalt live.* Which words of our Saviour are not meant as a ſufficient directory to Life and Salvation, but as a ſufficient Anſwer to a capricious Queſtioniſt in matters of Law-skill. They rightly repreſent therefore the ſenſe of the Law; and conſequently they infer, that a Righteouſneſs of Life and Practice is requir'd by the Law in order to Life eternal (which is the love of God and of Man) and that the Law (in ſome ſort) promiſeth Life eternal to the Righteouſneſs which it requireth. Both Jews and Gentiles look'd for Immortality and eternal Life, the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life are the great Principles of Natural Religion, and could not be wholly wanting in the Moſaic Law, if the Preceptive part of the Holy Spiritual Law was imbodied in it. They are therefore covertly imbodied in the Moſaic Law, and ſo as to conſtitute Law-religion, which is oppoſite to the Religion of Saving Grace.

Gal. 3. 19. *Wherefore then ſerveth the Law? It was added becauſe of tranſgreſſions. To reſtrain Men from Wickedneſs and to convict them of their Tranſgreſſions.* Petav. T. 1. L. 10. c. 25.

V. 10.

V. But it muſt be acknowledg'd, that in Notices of the Soul's Immortality, the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life, and in Arguments drawn from thence to ingage Men to virtuous Practice, the Pagan Theology tranſcendeth the Moſaic Law and the Prophets; which muſt neceſſarily be matter of admiration to them, that conſider not the Cauſes and Reaſons of it. One principal Reaſon why the Moſaic Inſtitution is ſo ſparing in Notices of future Rewards and Puniſhments, is, becauſe it was to be *a Civil-religious Inſtitution*, ſuch an one as was oppoſite to the Gentiles Idolatry and alſo Typical of the Chriſtian Religion. Another Reaſon was, becauſe the Moſaic Law could not be an expreſs Covenant touching the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life. For the Original Law touching Soul-intereſts could not be a mutual confederative Covenant with fallen Mankind. And the Moſaic Law could not be plainly and expreſly *the New Covenant* antecedently to the times of Chriſtianity. It could not be therefore an expreſs Covenant touching the future Rewards and Puniſhments, which in this Oeconomy and Diſpenſation of things, and conſequently throughout the whole Old Teſtament, *are but obſcurely taken notice of.* Which Character of the Books of the Old Teſtament implieth, that they are of a very different Nature from the Books of the New Teſtament, that they ought to be duely diſtinguiſh'd from them, and not confounded with them, as is too uſually done both by Ancient and Modern Writers. When the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh of Hell (*f*) the Hebrew Doctors underſtand thereby the Hell of the damned (whereas Hell is of no ſuch ſignification in the Old Teſtament) and Chriſtian Divines have ſymboliz'd with them in their Folly, whence a mighty pother has been rais'd in the Church about *Chriſt's deſcent into Hell.* (*g*) Some have ſaid, that Chriſt deſcended thither, that all ſuch as confeſs'd him there, might be ſaved: But *Philaſtrius* ſaith, this is contrary to that of the Prophet *David*, *in Inferno quis confitebitur tibi?* (*h*) *J. Mart.* accuſeth the Jews of diſmembring the Prophet *Jeremiah*, and taking out of him a place, which ſpake of Chriſt's Deſcent *to thoſe of* Iſrael *which were dead, that he might Evangelize to them his Salvation*, whereas no ſuch Language as this could ever be in the Old Teſtament. When the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *The juſt ſhall inherit the Earth* (*i*) *Origen* expoundeth this Saying, to be meant *of* Plato's *pure Earth in a pure Heaven*, whereby he meaneth the heavenly Beatitude, which the Pſalmiſt doth not mean by the Earth, nor can the Earth in the literal Senſe ſignifie it. (*k*) S. *Auſtin* confuteth ſome that were ſo unwiſe, as to interpret God's breathing into *Adam* the Breath of Life from Chriſt's breathing upon his Diſciples (*l*) yet ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church underſtand this breathing the Breath of Life into *Adam*, to ſignifie the breathing into him the Holy Spirit. So the Image of God wherein the Terreſtrial *Adam* was created, we commonly ſuppoſe, to be the Divine Vital Image of *Wiſdom, Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs*, which is not the Old Teſtament-notion of the Image of God. So by *the Sons of God that ſaw the Daughters of Men*, Gen. 6. 2. *Moſes* is thought to mean Pious Men (of the Family of *Seth*:) But this is not the Old Teſtament-notion of the Sons of God. Such Interpretations of the Old Teſtament are as incongruous, as *Tertullian*'s Phancy (*m*) *that the Light which was produc'd* in the Moſaic *Coſmopœia, was Chriſt the true Light, that enlightneth every Man coming into the World.* (*n*) So the appearances of God in the Old Teſtament are ſuppos'd, to be Chriſt the Son of God, although we have many plain Notices in Scripture, that they were Angels. And in expreſs contradiction to Scripture Chriſt is ſuppos'd alſo, to have been the Legiſlator that gave the Moſaic Law upon Mount *Sinai*. So one of the Reliques of Holy *Rome* is ſaid to be (*o*) *the Tables of Stone with the Ten Commandments that our Lord* (Chriſt) *gave to* Moyſes *on Mount* Sinai. But the foul-mouth'd *Celſus* may be allow'd to throw Dirt upon ſo abſurd a Story. (*p*) *How could he be a Legiſlator by* Moſes *for the getting of Riches and Power and filling the Earth, the ſlaughtering Enemies without ſparing the young, and killing them univerſally?* In the Book of *Pſalms* we read, *have I not hated them that hate thee, O Lord?* And perhaps ſuch old Teſtament Language was not unapplicable to the Apoſtate *Julian*: But the *Alexandrian Cyril* citeth it (*q*) as the Saying of the Prophet *David* to Chriſt, who muſt not be thought a Teacher of the antiquated Zelotick Piety and *Elias*-like Spirit. The putting Hereticks and Idolaters to Death ſome of the Chriſtian Church plead for, and would put in Practice, if it was in their Power (agreeably to that Conceit that Chriſt was the Legiſlator of the Moſaic Law) although it is plainly (*r*) a Branch of the antiquated Zelotick Piety. *Pope Adrian* endeavour'd to perſwade the Princes of *Germany*, to cut off *Luther*, becauſe God caſt *Corah* and his Company down to Hell, and commanded, that thoſe who would not obey the Prieſt, ſhould be put to Death. (*s*) All the Power and Juriſdiction that was granted to the High Prieſt in the Old Teſtament, is ſaid to be promis'd to the Pope in the New Teſtament. (*t*) And the Pontificians defend their Incenſe, their Holy Water, their Chriſm, their Conſecration of Altars, and the uſe of Lights in time of Divine Service with other Ritualities by the Moſaic Law: (*u*) As the *Muhammedans* defend the Thefts, Devaſtations and Rapines of their Prophet by the Example of *Joſhua*.

VI. But in *the Law and the Prophets* the Piety, Virtue and Righteouſneſs (of Life and Practice) of Saints and Prophets in the Old Teſtament-times (who were God's Believers and initially Chriſtians) is contain'd. Their Inſtitution of Piety, Morality and Righteouſneſs (Spiritual-religious) is in this Moſac Inſtitution; which therefore in reſpect of theſe Contents of it ſo conſider'd was the Chriſtian Religion (the matters of it) initially introduc'd in thoſe Old Teſtament-times. *Moſes* and the Prophets were the Holy Men of thoſe times and the Doctors, Teachers and Miniſters of true Religion and Righteouſneſs (which Chriſtianity counteth ſuch) for ſuch our Saviour accounteth them. *Luk.* 16. 29. *They have Moſes and the Prophets.* Matth. 5. 12. *So perſecuted they the Prophets which were before you.* Matth. 7. 12. *Whatſoever ye would that Men ſhould do to you, do ye even ſo to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.* Our Saviour recommendeth his Precept as being a Summary of that Equity and Righteouſneſs (as to what concerneth the ſecond Table) which was taught by *Moſes* and the Prophets, who were, and were accounted the Divine Teachers of Duty and true Virtue and the Law thereof. And whoſe Doctrine is a Syſtem of what is Moral and Spiritual-religious Law (the Preceptive part of it) as our Saviour intimateth alſo, *Matth.* 22. 40. *On theſe two Commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.* It is a great recommendation of theſe two Commandments, that the whole Doctrine of Godlineſs and Righteouſneſs as taught by *Moſes* and the Prophets is but theſe two Commandments expanded. By their Inſtructions, Precepts, Exhortations, Reproofs (and Devotions alſo) *Moſes* and the Prophets taught the Spiritual-religious Law, and that Spiritual-religious truth of Piety which is the due obſervance thereof, and which is manifeſtly requir'd by thoſe two great Commandments of the Law (touching the love of God and of Man) which are a Summary and Abridgment of the ancient Rule of Duty and Virtue, of Religion and ſubſtantial Righteouſneſs. For *Moſes* and the Prophets (in the main) taught the ſame Life of Righteouſneſs, that conſtituteth regenerate Chriſtians, to whom the Law is a Rule of Life. *Jam.* 2. 8, 10. *Gal.* 5. 13, 14. *Eph.* 6. 2. who muſt have it fulfilled in them and by them, *Rom.* 8. 4. and 13. 8, 9. and ſo fulfilled it is Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. It is old Spiritual-religious Law as written only outwardly in Tables of Stone, and it is new Spiritual-religious Law as written

(f) *Ap. Petav. T.* 4. *Par.* 2. *l.* 13. *c.* 15.

(g) *Ibid. c.* 18. *c.* 10.

(h) *Ibid.*

(i) *C. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 351.

(k) *De C. D. l.* 13. *c.* 24.

(l) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 8. *c.* 5. & 7.

(m) *Adv. Prax. c.* 12.

(n) *Tertul. Paradox.* 19.

(o) *The Romiſh Horſleach. p.* 59.

(p) Πῶς ἐκεῖνος διὰ Μωϋσέως νομοθετεῖ πλȣτεῖν, ϗ δυναστεύειν, ϗ καταπιμπλάναι τὴν γῆν, ϗ καταφονεύειν τȣ̀ς πολεμίȣς ἡβηδὸν, ϗ παγγενεὶ κτείνειν. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 343.

(q) *C. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 2.

(r) *Eſto idololatras in Theocratiâ Judaicâ capite plexos: at minimè hinc conficitur, quod voluit Pamelius, hæreticos ex Cypriani ſententia in republicâ Chriſtianâ morte plectendos.* Ep. Fell in Cypr. p. 173.

(s) *Anſw. to Philan. Angl. p.* 120.

(t) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. Proleg. c.* 3. *S.* 2.

(u) *Hotting. Hiſt. Or. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *p.* 47. *Ed.* 1.

written inwardly on the fleſhly Tables of the Heart, *Heb.* 8. 10. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. *Moſes* and the Prophets were inſtituted themſelves and their Doctrine was an Inſtitution of others (an effectual Inſtitution of God's Believers in the Old Teſtament-times) to that Spiritual-religious truth of Piety, which is the Chriſtian's Life of Righteouſneſs; this Moſaic Inſtitution therefore was an initial Introduction of the Chriſtian Religion. The many Injunctions in the Old Teſtament *to fear God, and depart from Evil, to hate the Evil and love the Good, to have clean Hands and a pure Heart, to keep the Heart with all diligence, to do juſtly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God, to Judgment, Mercy, Faith and the love of God* (magnalia legis, *or weightier matters of the Law*) are Branches of this Moſaic Inſtitution; and ſuch are the many Sermons of the Prophets, wherein they ſharply rebuke the Jews Superſtition and Hypocriſie in over-placing their Religion and Righteouſneſs in Sacrifices and Ceremonial Inſtitutes, with deſign to bring them to the Spiritual-religious practice of the ſubſtantial Duties of Religion. The Book of *Proverbs* (of ſage Sentences and Aphoriſms) is an illuſtrious Inſtitution to Piety, and ſuch is the Book of *Pſalms*, of which S. *Baſil* giveth this high Elogy, (*w*) *all things appertaining to Divinity are treaſur'd up in the Book of* Pſalms, ὥσπερ ἐν μεγάλῳ τινὶ ϗ κοινῷ ταμιείῳ, *as in a certain great and common Repoſitory*. From the Pſalmiſt's high Elogies of the Moſaic Law and his conſtant imploying his Meditation therein, it appeareth, that this Old Teſtament Moral Law as it is Spiritual-religious (an authoritative Doctrine inſtituting to holy ſpiritual living and the various duties thereof) is of ſuch ſuperlative excellency, (*x*) that *J. Mart.* ought not to find fault, if this honourary Attribute be given to it, *The Law of the Lord is perfect*. For it was perfect as being *right and without Iniquity*, (which is the Pſalmiſt's ſenſe, *Pſal.* 19. 7.) and it was perfect as not being *culpably defective*; for it had all the perfection which ſuch an Inſtitution ought to have, and was an Inſtitution to the perfect way of living without Vice or Crime, (*y*) ſo far as was requiſite in thoſe times, reclaiming from all Vice and Crime, or as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh, *converting the Soul*. But if it had been ſo perfect, as that nothing could be added to it, *Swearing*, *Curſing*, *Revenge*, ſome *Uncharitableneſs*, *Unmercifulneſs*, *Untruth* (beſides Polygamy) had not been ſo uſual as they were with Holy People in the Old Teſtament-times; which Imperfections are not excuſable but from the Imperfection of their Inſtitution. If it had been ſo perfect, as that nothing could be added to it *as to the inſtituting us*, there could have been no place for a new Law and Lawgiver, *a new Commandment*; nor could the new Law be a clearer Revelation, (*z*) a Diſpenſation of more abundant Grace and Aſſiſtance, and more full of Love and Goodneſs than the Moſaic Inſtitution, nor could it require of us another Spirit; nor could the ſtate of God's People be more Son-like leſs Servile, more Heavenly and leſs Secular and Earthly in the times of the New than in thoſe of the Old Teſtament. In thoſe times holy Men were inſtituted to ſuch a goodneſs of Diſpoſition and Practice, as was in the main an holy ſpiritual Life, but ſo as not to be forbidden many things, which are hugely alien from that goodneſs of Diſpoſition and Practice, which is in Chriſt's Inſtitution. The great Law of the due and ordinate love of God and Man is a Moſaic Law; but all the Contents of it (all things that are imply'd in it) were far from being clearly and diſtinctly explicated in the Moſaic Inſtitution. It injoyned a true and ſaving goodneſs of Diſpoſition and Practice, but this injoyned Goodneſs (this due and ordinate love of God and of Man) as the Jews were inſtituted to it, is not to be extended any further than the Moralities in the Law and the Prophets reach (*Matth.* 22. 40.) which are very much ſhort of that vaſtly extenſive goodneſs of Diſpoſition and Practice, which the Chriſtian Inſtitution requireth, to conſtitute a more divine and child of Godlike, gracious and benign, ſpiritual and heavenly ſort of Religioniſts. *Irenæus* obſerveth, that there is a due agreement complicated with a due difference between the Moral Precepts of the Old and New Teſtament. (*a*) *The Precepts of perfect life being the ſame in both Teſtaments, demonſtrate the ſame God of both, who commanded* (indeed) *particular Precepts ſuitable to both, but the more eminent and chief without which Salvation cannot be had* (in any times) *are the ſame in both*. The Moſaic Inſtitution in the Old Teſtament was ſuitable to the time and that ſtate of things, which then was; and in the New Teſtament there are particular Precepts ſuited to theſe times and that ſtate of things which now is, which are peculiar to the New Teſtament. If the Moral Diſcipline of the Old Teſtament had not been in the ſtrein and tenour of it much more mundane than is agreeable to the New Teſtament, the Jews had not ſo much abominated their Meſſiah becauſe of his mean appearance and afflicted ſtate.

Math. 23. 23. Luk. 11. 42.

(w) Hom. in Pſal. 1. p. 127.

Pſal. 19. and Pſal. 119.

(x) Dial cum Tryph. p. 251.

(y) Huet. Dem. Ev. prop. 9. c. 107.

(z) V. Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 1. c. 1. in fine.

(a) *Conſummatæ vitæ præcepta in utroque Teſtamento cùm ſint eadem, eundem oſtenderunt Deum, qui particularia quidem præcepta apta utriſque præcepit, ſed eminentiora & ſumma, ſine quibus ſalvari non poteſt, in utroque eadem ſuaſit.* Adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 12.

VII. But although the Moral Diſcipline of the Old Teſtament was the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd, yet the common Opinion is, (*b*) that thoſe Moral Precepts do not oblige Chriſtians, as they are delivered by *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, but only as they are the Law of Nature, and as they are reinforc'd and confirm'd by Chriſt's Authority. The reaſon of this Opinion is, becauſe *Moſes* was not ſent or authoriz'd, to be our Lawgiver (to deliver a Law to any but the Jews) all his Laws are one Body of Political Laws (of which the Decalogue is a part) peculiarly given to one People or Political Body (the Hebrews,) which in the making and promulgation of them were not directed to, or deſign'd for, any other People, and therefore could not bind them. How much of force there is in this great Argument, will appear by diſtinguiſhing between Spiritual-religious and Civil-religious (or Political) Law; and between inſtituting the Jews as Men (to the Virtues and Duties that belong to them as ſuch) and as Judaical Men. If God ſhould inact and promulgate an authoritative Inſtitution of Judaical Judges, in terms directed to them only; this would be in part an Inſtitution of them as Judaical Judges, and in part it would be an Inſtitution of them as Judges, to the Virtues and Duties that belong to them as ſuch. So when God inacted and promulgated an authoritative Inſtitution of Judaical Men, in terms directed to them only, this was in part an Inſtitution of them as Judaical Men, and in part it was an Inſtitution of them as Men, to the Virtues and Duties that belong'd to them as ſuch. And as if God ſhould promulgate an Inſtitution of Judaical Judges, every Judge that cometh to the knowledge of it, would have the preceptive Will of God notic'd to him

(b) Suarez de Leg. l. 9. c. 11. Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 1. c. 1.

therein, touching his Duty as a Judge (for what God requireth of one Judge as ſuch, he requireth of all:) So in the Inſtitution of Judaical Men which God promulgated, every Man that came to the knowledge of it, had therein the preceptive Will of God notic'd to him touching his Duty as a Man; for what God requireth of one Man as ſuch, he requireth of all Men. So in a Divine Inſtitution of Judaical Fathers, Children, Kings, Maſters, Neighbours, Religious Worſhippers and People of God, the preceptive Will of God is notic'd touching all that are theſe Relations; for *à quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia.* From whence it appeareth, that the preceptive part of the Old Teſtament is far from being abrogated, that the Moſaic Inſtitution to Piety is far from being ſo narrow and reſtrained, as to concern only the Jews (or Iſraelites;) for the Nature and Notion of it ſheweth it, to be vaſtly extenſive in its uſe and authority. It inſtituteth Judaical Men as Men, to the Virtue and Duty which concerneth them as Men; *to fear God and keep his Commandments, which is the whole duty of Man. Unto you, O Men, do I call, and my Voice is to the Sons of Men. He hath ſhewed thee, O Man, what is good. Unto Man he ſaid, Behold the fear of the Lord, that is Wiſdom, and to depart from evil is Underſtanding. Come ye Children, hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What Man is he that deſireth Life, and loveth many Days, that he may ſee good. Keep thy Tongue from evil, and thy Lips from ſpeaking guile.* God in delivering the Moral Precepts of the Moſaical Inſtitution doth as good as ſay to the Jews, *Theſe are Virtues and Duties that belong to you as Men, theſe things I require of you and command you, as you are Men*; whereby he plainly ſignifieth, that he requireth them of all Men, virtually and equivalently he thereby commandeth them unto all Men; thus far therefore the Moral Precepts of the Old Teſtament are of a preceptive nature unto all Men that come to the knowledge of them. In publiſhing theſe Precepts *Moſes* and the Prophets did publiſh what was Divine Law and Commandment to the Jews *primarily, directly, formally* and *expreſly* by their Legiſlation; and ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe they are not Divine Law and Commandment unto us: but thereby the Mind and Will of God concerning us is made known and declared equivalently to ſuch a *primary, direct, formal* and *expreſs* Legiſlation (as if it was made unto us) and as deliver'd by *Moſes* and the Prophets they have *virtually* ſuch a Legiſlation to us; and ſo far *Moſes* and the Prophets are Promulgers of Law unto us, both as we are Men, and as we are the People of God. For the Virtues and Duties that did belong to the Jews as Men, did belong to them alſo as they were the People of God, and belong unto us for the ſame reaſon, and for greater reaſon, as having greater obligation to Sanctity and Goodneſs than they. Thoſe Moſaic Precepts which are Holy Spiritual Law, are manifeſtly Univerſal Law.

Eccl. 12. 13.
Prov. 8. 4.
Mic. 6. 8.
Job 28. 28.
Pſal 34. 11, 12, 13.

It is a poor buſineſs, to allow God's Word in the Old Teſtament, to be a true Expoſition of *the Law of Nature*; for ſuch is every Orthodox Lecture of a Moral Philoſopher. The Law and the Prophets are deſtroy'd *materially*, if their Doctrine is deſtroy'd; and *formally*, if their Authority is deſtroy'd. If they are to us of no preceptive Authority, if they do not bind us at all *ratione miniſterii*, they are *formally* deſtroy'd, and are not unto us the Law and the Prophets. (*c*) *The whole Law of Piety, Sanctity, Humanity, Verity, Chaſtity, Juſtice, Mercy, Benevolence, doth remain*, ſaith *Tertullian.* But it cannot be ſaid, to remain, if its obligatory Nature and Authority as a Law deliver'd by *Moſes* and the Prophets is totally deſtroy'd. The Apoſtle conſidereth God as Legiſlator of the Moſaic Moral Law, ſaying, *Do not commit Adultery, Do not kill, Thou ſhalt love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf.* This Moral Law as publiſh'd in the Scripture of the Old Teſtament the Apoſtle looketh upon as Law unto Chriſtians; for he urgeth it upon them, as that which is unto them Law upon the account of its promulgation as Law in the Scripture of the Old Teſtament. *He that ſaid, Do not commit adultery, ſaid alſo Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a tranſgreſſor of the Law.* S. *Paul* looketh upon Chriſtian Children as bound to honour their Parents, not only by the Law of Nature, and the Law of Chriſt, but by the preceptive Authority of God's Commandment in the Moſaic Inſtitution, *Eph.* 6. 2, 3. *Honour thy Father and Mother (which is the firſt Commandment with promiſe) that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayeſt live long on the Earth.* The Apoſtle looketh upon the premiant temporal Promiſes annex'd to the Precepts of the Moſaic-moral Law as not wholly ceas'd, but continuing in force in ſuch a Senſe as is agreeable to the ſtate of Chriſtians; therefore thoſe Moſaic-moral Precepts to which they are annex'd are as ſuch of preceptive Authority unto Chriſtians. They are bound to the Duties of a Spiritual-religious Life by a threefold Cord, *Eccl.* 4. 12. the Law natural, the Moſaic-moral and the Chriſtian-moral Law; which Obligations are not deſtructive of each other, but accumulative.

Jam. 2. 8,—11.

VIII. The Moſaic Inſtitution is both *the Doctrine of true Religion and Righteouſneſs and alſo a Prophetic and Typical Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion.* Upon theſe, two accounts ſocially conſider'd and becauſe of the latter of them ~~is~~ ſingly conſider'd, *It was the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd.* Under theſe two Notions (as the Doctrine of true Religion and Righteouſneſs and in conjunction therewith a Prophetic and Typical Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion) it is conſider'd by the ancient Writers of the Church and by our Saviour alſo. Of the Jews an ancient Writer ſaith, (*d*) *The Law was to them both a Diſcipline of Life and a Prophecy of things to come.* (*e*) It conſiſteth of two ſorts of Precepts, *præcepta vitæ agendæ*, the Precepts of a Life that is to be liv'd; *& præcepta vitæ ſignificandæ*, and the Precepts of a Life that is to be ſignify'd. (*f*) *To a Jew that asketh me, why I hold in my Hand the Old Teſtament, whoſe Precepts I do not obſerve? I make anſwer, that Chriſtians obſerve the Precepts of the Life that is to be liv'd out of thoſe very Books* (as deliver'd there, acknowledging their preceptive Authority:) *but the Precepts of the Life to be ſignify'd, were then rightly obſerv'd, when thoſe things were foretold, which are now reveal'd.* Our Saviour conſidereth the Moſaic Inſtitution under theſe two Notions, *Matth.* 5. 17. *Think not, that I am come to deſtroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to deſtroy, but to fulfill.* The Law and the Prophets were the ancient authoritative

(c) *Manet lex tota pietatis, ſanctitatis, humanitatis, veritatis, caſtitatis, juſtitiæ, miſericordiæ, benevolentiæ, pudicitiæ.* Tertull. de pudicit. c. 6.

(d) *Lex & diſciplina erat i lis & prophetia futurorum.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 28.

(e) *S. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 6.*

(f) *Judæo dicente mihi, cur tenes vetus Teſtamentum, cujus præcepta non ſervas? Reſpondi, ſervari à Chriſtianis etiam ex ipſis libris præcepta vitæ agendæ, præcepta verò vitæ ſignificandæ tunc rectè obſervata, cùm prænunciabantur iſta, quæ nunc revelata ſunt.* Ibid.

thoritative Teachers of true Religion and Righteouſneſs, and are ſo conſider'd by our Saviour in delivering his Law of Righteouſneſs. As they were ſuch, he came not to do any thing, that may be juſtly called a deſtroying them in any reſpect; not to deſtroy their preceptive Authority, nor to cancel Mens obligation to obſerve their Precepts of true Godlineſs and Righteouſneſs, nor to thwart their End and Deſign, which was to make Men really Righteous. And that our Saviour conſidereth the Law and the Prophets under this Notion (as the ancient Teachers of true Religion and Righteouſneſs towards God and Man) appeareth from the words that he ſubjoyneth, *v.* 19. *Whoſoever therefore ſhall break one of theſe leaſt Cammandments, and ſhall teach Men ſo, he ſhall be counted the leaſt* (he ſhall be the leaſt ſet by, and conſequently ſhall be of no account) *in the Kingdom of Heaven.* But our Saviour conſidereth the Moſaic Inſtitution under a ſecond Notion, *as prophetic and typical of the Chriſtian Religion*; for thus *Clemens* expoundeth his words (and undoubtedly this Senſe is included in them) *I am not come to deſtroy, but to fulfill:* (g) τὰς κατὰ νόμον προφητείας ἐπιτελῶς γενέσθαι κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν, *the Prophecies of the Law were perfectly fulfilled in his coming.* And that this is our Saviour's Senſe, appeareth from the words immediately following, *v.* 18. *Verily, I ſay unto you, till Heaven and Earth paſs, one jot or one tittle ſhall in no wiſe paſs from the Law, till all be fulfilled.* Every thing predicted in the Old Teſtament which is here called the Law (and which comprehendeth the Law ſtrictly ſo called and the Prophets) muſt infallibly be fulfilled, and cannot poſſibly fail of a due completion. And conſequently the main of thoſe Predictions (relating to the Meſſiah and his Religion) muſt have their due completion in Chriſt, as our Saviour often diſcours'd to his Diſciples, *that all things muſt be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of* Moſes *and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms concerning me*, Luk. 24. 25, 26, 27, 44, 45. ch. 18. 31. ch. 22. 37. Joh. 5. 39, 45, 46, 47. Agreeably to our Saviour's Diſcourſes, the Apoſtles in their Diſcourſes, Diſputations and Sermons uſually alledge and inſiſt upon (*h*) the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, to demonſtrate the Truth and Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion. *Mightily convincing the Jews ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was the Chriſt: reaſoning out of the Scriptures, perſwading them concerning Jeſus both out of the Law of* Moſes *and out of the Prophets; for to him give all the Prophets witneſs*, Joh. 1. 45. Act. 3. 18, 22, 24. ch. 10. 43. ch. 13. 47. ch. 15. 11. ch. 17. 2, 3. ch. 18. 28. ch. 26. 22, 23. ch. 28. 23. Rom. 16. 26. 1 Cor. 15. 3. 1 Pet. 1. 10, 11. The ancient Scriptures *are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation*, becauſe they teach the Faith of Chriſt (which was intimated in the Converſe between our Saviour and *Moſes* and *Elias* upon the Mount,) 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. The founders of our Religion look upon the Chriſtian Church as founded upon the Prophets (*Eph.* 2. 20.) and upon *a more ſure word of prophecy* (more ſure than that it can be a cunningly deviſed Fable) *to which we do well to take heed as unto a Light that ſhineth in a dark place*, which is a place not well illuminated, and ſuch are we, till it be day-time with us, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. The ſhining Light that is in the ancient Scriptures, implieth, that there are in them (conſidering the time) illuſtrious Notices of the Chriſtian Religion; and becauſe they are *a more ſure word of prophecy*, thoſe illuſtrious Notices are alſo illuſtrious and uncontroulable atteſtations to the Truth and Divinity thereof. For the Chriſtian Religion being amply foretold by ancient Prophecy, and plainly correſponding thereto, there can be nothing of fiction or fallacy in the caſe, (*i*) whence *Origen* rightly calleth the Prophets Predictions, ἰσχυροτάτην ἀπόδειξιν, *the ſtrongeſt demonſtration.* The Prophets and Evangeliſts, the Prediction and the Hiſtory, exactly agree; and the Evangeliſts are curious in obſerving the accompliſhment of ancient Prophecy in the paſſages of our Saviour's Life and Paſſion, to which they uſually ſubjoyn, *This was done, that the Scripture might be fulfilled.* Thoſe ancient Scriptures acquaint every one that will look into them, with the Idea of a certain ſuper-eminent Perſonage, whom God had deſign'd to ſend into the World, known amongſt God's People by the Name of *Meſſiah the Prince*; they predict the time of his coming, and amply characterize and deſcribe him, his Country, Tribe, Family, the place and manner of his Birth, the quality of the Perſon that he ſhould be born of, his external ſtate and condition, his high and holy Offices, Qualities, Endowments, Deportments, his great Performances and Succeſſes, his tragical Sufferings and the ineſtimable Benefits conſequent thereupon, his kind of Death and Burial, his Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, Seſſion at the Right Hand of God and everlaſting Prieſthood, the Nature of his Religion and Kingdom and the Extent of it; by all which deſcriptive and characteriſtick Notices of the Meſſiah recorded in ancient Prophecy, the Moſaic Inſtitution appeareth to be, unto them that live in the times of the New Teſtament, an ample Prophetick Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. For the Meſſiah is therefore ſo illuſtriouſly characteriz'd in ancient Prophecy, that he might be certainly known and diſtinguiſh'd from other perſons, when he appear'd in the World. *But the Goſpel had not its firſt riſe from his appearance:* (k) *it was radically in the Books of the Prophets, but budded forth in the preaching of the Apoſtles.* Whence S. *Paul* (that it might not be counted a meer novel thing) ſaith, *That God had promiſed it before by his Prophets in the Holy Scripture*, Rom. 1. 2. It was amply foreſignify'd by *Moſes* and the Prophets, and the many prophetick and promiſſory Notices of it that were in thoſe ancient times ſhew, that in ſuch a degree as was competible to them that liv'd in thoſe times, the Moſaic Inſtitution was a Prophetic Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. Having *Moſes* and the Prophets they had *the lively Oracles of God*; for the Prophetic Oracles inſtituted them to the Religion of Saving Grace, which is *Life Eternal* to its Religioniſts.

IX. *Moſes* and the Prophets are not meerly a Prophetic but a Typical Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion. (*l*) *The way of prophecying in the Old Teſtament is both by Words and by Types.* (*m*) In ſeveral of the ancient Prophecies touching the Meſſiah there is nothing of the Veil or Coverture of a Type: Nor is there any prefigurative Type in *Iſaiah*'s illuſtrious Prophecy of Chriſt's ſuffering: Nor is there in the Contexture of the Prophecy any occaſion to ſpeak of the Meſſiah under the Coverture of a Type. But the Prophet having repreſented the Jews Captivity under the Chaldeans (which

(g) Strom. l. 3. p. m. 325.

(h) V. S. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 12. c. 45.

(i) Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop. 7. S. 5.

(k) Ἀλλ' ἐῤῥιζώθη μὲν ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις τῶν προφητῶν, ἐβλάστησε δὲ ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι τῶν ἀποστόλων. S. *Chryſoſt.* T. 6. p. 641.

Act. 7. 38. *Rom.* 3. 2.

(l) *Scimus ut vocibus, ita & rebus prophetatum.* Tertull. Τὰ μὲν διὰ ῥημάτων, τὰ δὲ διὰ τύπων. S. *Chryſoſt. Grot. Not. in Matth.* 1. 22.

(m) Gen. 3. 15. *and* 49. 10. *Pſal.* 110. 1. *Dan.* 7. 13 *and ch.* 9. 26. *Hagg.* 2. 7, 9. *Zech.* 12. 10. *and ch.* 9. 9. *Malach.* 3. 1.

(which was their Humiliation) and their Liberation from it, which was their Exaltation, a Type of their Spiritual Redemption and Liberation, and which the Prophets uſually connect and complicate with their Prophecies of the Meſſiah, he had great reaſon and occaſion without any Veil or Coverture to repreſent the Meſſiah and his Humiliation and Exaltation (which were of affinity with the things he had been ſpeaking of) and accordingly he maketh theſe great things his Theme, *Iſa.* 52. 13, 14. *Behold my Servant ſhall proſper, he ſhall be exalted and extolled and be very high. As many were aſtoniſhed at thee (his Viſage was ſo marred more than any Man and his Form more than the Sons of Men) ſo ſhall he ſprinkle many Nations, the Kings ſhall ſhut their Mouths at him.* Which Prediction of the Meſſiah's Exaltation is follow'd in the Prophet with a large pathetical deſcription of his Humiliation and Sufferings, ſuch a deſcription which in the main Strokes of it is unapplicable to any Type, *Iſa.* 53. But the greater number of Prophecies touching the Meſſiah are complicated with Types, and the general way of Inſtitution (to the Chriſtian Religion) in the Old Teſtament is by Types. (*n*) *By things typical inſtituting to the things that are true, by Temporal to Eternal, by Carnal to Spiritual, by Earthly to Heavenly.* (*o*) Στοιχειωτὴς ὁ νόμος, *The Law is a certain elementary Teacher, that ſoweth in us (as it were) by Enigms and Shadows the knowledge of the Myſtery of Chriſt.* By this elementary (which is alſo a cryptick) way of teaching the Jews were inſtituted, agreeably to the ancient learned Nations whoſe way of Inſtitution was by Hieroglyphicks, Symbols, Emblems, Fables, Allegories and Parables, that at once hide and veil, and yet (in ſome degree) reveal the truth of things. (*p*) *For all that have Theologiz'd, both Barbarians and Greeks, have in this way of Doctrine deliver'd the truth of things, by Enigms and Symbols, Allegories and Metaphors, and certain ſuch ways.* As this way of Inſtitution was agreeable to the Genius of ancient times, ſo it was adapted to the Old Teſtament; for Sciagraphy ought to precede Zoography, nor could the matters of Chriſtianity (till the fulneſs of time was come) exiſt in this World out of the Involutions and Shadows of literal Judaiſm. Whence the City of God in thoſe ancient times, (*q*) *non in lumine, ſed in umbra concurrit*, paſſed along, not in the Light, but in the Shade. Such was the ſtate of the Church under the Moſaic Inſtitution, which is a vaſt congloremation of Types, that may be conſider'd as of theſe ſeveral kinds. *The Political-hiſtorical, the Promiſſory, the Perſonal-hiſtorical, the Characteriſtical and the Ceremonial*; with all which ſorts of Types the Prophecies of the Meſſiah are complicated.

X. The *Political-hiſtorical Types* are ſuch as belong to the Hiſtory of the Polity of old Iſrael (the Body of that People;) for old Iſrael and their holy Commonwealth was a Type and Figure of the new and Chriſtian Iſrael; their redemption from the Egyptian Thraldom, their paſſing out of *Egypt* into *Canaan*, their paſſing through the Red Sea, their conduct through the Wilderneſs, their Brazen Serpent, their Manna and the Rock that follow'd them, the giving of their Law from Mount *Sinai*, their Mount *Sion* and *Jeruſalem*, their Canaan-condition and Theocracy, their Prophets, Prieſts and Kings, their Wars and Victories, their adoption and ſeparation from the World, their liberation from the *Babylonian* Captivity, their new Political World (Polity or Republick) that ſucceeded it, called *new Heavens and a new Earth*, were all of them myſterious Types of the Chriſtian Meſſiah and of the Chriſtian Church and Religion. (*r*) *The Hebrews Commonwealth was in ſome ſort ſacrated, to be a foreſignifying Type of the City of God to be gather'd out of all Nations.* The Hebrew Nation was deputed to foreſignifie Chriſt: (*s*) *The whole Adminiſtration of which Republick ſhould be a Prophecy of the King that was to come, and to build the Celeſtial City out of all Nations.* With theſe illuſtrious political Types the Prophecies of the Meſſiah are uſually complicated, whence his ſtate of things is in thoſe Prophecies of Typical Repreſentation and Deſcription. For they uſually repreſent him as *the King of the Jews, the King of* Iſrael *ſitting on the Throne of* David *his Father, having Mount* Sion *for his Regial Seat, reigning over the Houſe of* Jacob, *feeding them as their Shepherd and Saviour-King, and eſtabliſhing his Kingdom with Judgment and Juſtice*; *as a Sovereign Friend to the Righteous in his Government, an Iron-rod to the Wicked, a deſtroyer of Idolatry, a protector of the Poor, an hugely peaceable Prince, under whoſe Government the Engines of War ſhould be broken, and the ferine Animals become tame and placid*, Pſal. 2. 6. and 72, 4, 7, 12. Iſa. 2. 4. and 9. 6. and 11. 4, 6. Jer. 33. 15, 16. Ezek. 34. 33. and 37. 24. Mic. 5. 2. Zech. 9. 9, 10. and 13. 2. Luk. 1. 33, 34. In his Days *a new Covenant is made with* Iſrael *and* Judah, Judah *is ſaved and* Jeruſalem *dwelleth ſafely, the Daughter of* Sion *hath the firſt dominion, the Mountain of the Lord's Houſe is exalted above the Hills, and all Nations flow unto it*; *his Dominion is from Sea to Sea, and from the River to the end of the Earth*; and he is ſaid, *to ſet up an Enſign, to aſſemble the Nations, the outcaſts of* Iſrael *and the diſperſed of* Judah, *and to gather them from the four Corners of the Earth*, Jer. 31. 31. and 33. 16. Mic. 4. 1, 2, 8. Pſal. 72. 8. Iſa. 2. 2. and 11. 11, 12. Zech. 9. 10. If theſe Prophetick Deſcriptions of the Meſſiah be underſtood according to the literal ſound of them, we have ſuch a kind of Meſſiah and ſuch an Idea of the Meſſiah, which is in great degree coincident with the Meſſiah, that the Jews fancy, and call *Ben David* (a mundane kind of Saviour-king to the Jews) and ſuch an Idea of the Meſſiah is a typical kind of Repreſentation and Deſcription of the true Meſſiah. For theſe Prophetick Deſcriptions import (according to their genuine meaning) that the Throne of the Meſſiah is the Antitype to the Throne of *David*, that he ſhall be King of the new and Chriſtian *Iſrael* and *Judah*, the myſtical *Sion* and *Jeruſalem*; yet they import alſo, that the Meſſiah with his eximious Benefits was primarily intended for, and ſhould (in ſome degree) be primarily entertain'd by the literal *Iſrael* and *Judah*. And according to the Apoſtle's method of interpreting Prophecies they import alſo, that the Meſſiah with his eximious Benefits ſhall be entertain'd by the literal *Iſrael* and *Judah*, initially and very imperfectly at firſt, and in proceſs of time more plenarily and generally, *Rom.* 9. 27. and 11. 26. In theſe Prophecies therefore there is a complication of

---

(n) *Per ea quæ erant ſecunda ad prima advocans, hoc eſt per typica ad vera, & per temporalia ad æterna, & per carnalia ad ſpiritualia, & per terrena ad cæleſtia.* Iren. l. 4. c. 28.

(o) *S. Cyr. de Adorat. l.* 2. *p.* 78.

(p) *Clem. Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 405, 406.

(q) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 18. *c.* 1.

Iſa. 65. 17.

(r) *In Hebræa gente, erat ipſa quodammodo ſacrata Reſpublica in prophetationem & prænunciationem civitatis Dei ex omnibus gentibus congreganda.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 32.

(s) *Cui prophetando venturo, gens una deputata eſt, cujus Reipublicæ tota adminiſtratio prophetia eſſet illius Regis venturi, & civitatem cæleſtem ex omnibus gentibus condituri.* Idem de conſenſ. Evang. l. 1. c. 11.

of the Literal and Spiritual *Iſrael*, as there is alſo in one Prophets Prediction of the vaſt numeroſity of *Iſrael* (meaning the Spiritual *Iſrael*, which in part conſiſted of the Literal *Iſrael*) *Hoſ.* 1. 10. *The number of the Children of Iſraal ſhall be as the Sand of the Sea, which cannot be meaſured nor numbred; and it ſhall come to paſs, that in the place where it was ſaid unto them, ye are not my People, there ſhall it be ſaid unto them, ye are the Sons of the living God.* In this Prophecy there would be nothing of difficulty, if the Prophet did not obſcure it by ſubjoining immediately, *V.* 11. *Then ſhall the Children of Judah and the Children of Iſrael be gathered together, and appoint themſelves one head, and they ſhall come up out of the Land.* This part of the Prophecy had manifeſtly a Literal-typical Completion in the reduction of the Jews (in conſort with ſome of the Ten Tribes) from the Babylonian Captivity under the conduct of *Zorobabel*, Jer. 30. 18---21. and *ch.* 33. 22, 26. *Ezek.* 37. 16. and conſequently a meer myſtical Interpretation of it cannot be genuin and legitimate. It muſt be conſidered therefore as a complex Prophecy (that compriſeth both Type and Antitype;) the Prophet predicteth, that at ſuch time, when the Children of *Iſrael* are to begin, to multiply into a vaſt numeroſity, this Prediction ſhall be fulfilled, firſt in the Type and afterwards in the Antitype, when the Converts to the Meſſiah emerge out of their Spiritual Captivity. So this Prophecy of *Iſaiah* hath a twofold Completion (one in the Type, the other in the Antitype) *a Virgin ſhall conceive and bear a Son.* So there are two Completions of the Prophecy of *Amos*, wherein he predicteth the Kingdom of the Meſſiah and the calling of the Gentiles into it under this Type, the raiſing up the Regial Houſe of *David* to its former magnificence and domination. *Amos* 9. 11, 12. *In that day will I raiſe up the Tabernacle of David that is fallen, and cloſe up the Breaches thereof, and I will raiſe up his Ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old. That they may poſſeſs the remnant of Edom and of all the Heathen upon whom my Name is called, ſaith the Lord that doth this.* In Prophecies therefore relating to the Meſſiah his State of things is predicted, by predicting Types and Typical Repreſentations thereof, as appeareth from the Political Types.

XI. The *promiſſory Types* are the promiſſory part of the Moſaic Inſtitution, which is earthly Felicities figurative of the heavenly Promiſes of the Chriſtian Religion. (t) *The Old Teſtament hath terrene Promiſes, a terrene Jeruſalem, a terrene Paleſtine, a terrene Kingdom, a terrene Salvation, the Subjugation of Enemies, abundance of Children, plenty of Corn and Wine; which are ſpiritually underſtood, as the earthly Jeruſalem was a ſhadow of the heavenly. And this is the Myſtery of the Old Teſtament, which was underſtood by them that were Intelligennt and Spiritual.* For even *Maimonides* ſaith of the Land of *Canaan* (u) it ſignifieth ארץ החיים *the Land of the Living which is the World to come.* And if the carnal Jews that are mainly intent upon the earthly Felicities, yet underſtand better things, no doubt Holy Men that liv'd in the Old Teſtament-times ſaw through the Veil of earthly Promiſes, although they were ſo far from declaring the better Promiſes, that the Prophecies of the Meſſiah are uſually complicated with the earthly Promiſes (which are a Typical Repreſentation of his felicitative State of things, and the Prophecies of them uſually are Complex) ſuch as external Peace and Solace, Safety and Liberty, Riches, Honour, Power and Dominion, Victory over Enemies, Proſperity and Plenty of accommodations of Life. *Pſal.* 72. 7, 16. *In his days ſhall the righteous flouriſh, and abundance of peace ſo long as the Moon endureth. There ſhall be an handful of Corn in the Earth, upon the top of the Mountains; the fruit thereof ſhall ſhake like Lebanon, and they of the City ſhall flouriſh like Graſs of the Earth.* Malach. 4. 2, 3. *Unto you that fear my Name, ſhall the Sun of Righteouſneſs ariſe with healing in his Wings; and ye ſhall go forth and grow up as Calves at the Stall. And ye ſhall tread down the wicked; for they ſhall be Aſhes under the Soles of your Feet.* Ezek. 34. 24,--29. *I the Lord will be their God, and my Servant David a Prince among them. And I will make with them a Covenant of Peace, and will cauſe the evil Beaſts to ceaſe out of the Land: and they ſhall dwell ſafely in the Wilderneſs and ſleep in the Woods. And I will make them and the places round about my Hill a Bleſſing: and I will cauſe the ſhower to come down in his ſeaſon: there ſhall be ſhowers of Bleſſing. And the Tree of the Field ſhall yield her Fruit, and the Earth ſhall yield her Increaſe, and they ſhall be ſafe in their Land, and ſhall know that I am the Lord, when I have broken the bands of their yoke, and deliver'd them out of the hand of thoſe that ſerved themſelves of them. And they ſhall no more be a prey to the Heathen, neither ſhall the Beaſts of the Land devour them; but they ſhall dwell ſafely, and none ſhall make them afraid. And I will raiſe up for them a plant of renown (my Servant David ſhall feed them and he ſhall be their Shepherd, V.* 23) *and they ſhall be no more conſumed with hunger in the Land, neither bear the ſhame of the Heathen any more.* Iſa. 49. 8, 9, 10. *I will give thee for a Covenant of the People, to eſtabliſh the Earth, to cauſe to inherit the deſolate Heritages. That thou mayeſt ſay to the Priſoners, go forth; to them that are in darkneſs, ſhew your ſelves: they ſhall feed in the ways, and their paſtures ſhall be in all high places, they ſhall not hunger nor thirſt, neither ſhall the Heat nor Sun ſmite them: for he that hath Mercy on them ſhall lead them, even by the Springs of Water ſhall be guide them.* Iſa. 45. 13, 14. *I have raiſed him up in Righteouſneſs, and I will direct all his ways: he ſhall build my City, and he ſhall let go my Captives, not for price nor reward, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts. Thus ſaith the Lord, the labour of Egypt and merchandiſe of Æthiopia and of the Sebeans, men of ſtature ſhall come over unto thee, and they ſhall be thine, they ſhall come after thee, in chains they ſhall come over.* Pſal. 45. 16. *Inſtead of thy Fathers ſhall be thy Children, whom thou mayeſt make Princes in all the Earth.* Hagg. 2. 9. *In this place will I give peace*, which in the ſtile of the Old Teſtament ſignifieth *omnia fauſta & proſpera*, all Proſperity.

XII. The Perſonal-hiſtorical Types belong to the Hiſtory of particular Perſons, and have therein (more or leſs) an Hiſtorical Verity and Completion. Such were *Adam* and *Eve*, their Paradiſe and Tree of Life, *Abel*, *Noah* and the Waters of his Deluge, *Melchiſedec*, *Iſaac*, *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, *Samſon*, *David*, *Solomon*, *Iſaiah*, *Jonah*, *Zorobabel*,

---

(t) *Vetus Teſtamentum promiſſiones habet terrenas, terrenam Hieruſalem, terrenam Palæſtinam, Regnum terrenum, Salutem terrenam, hoſtium ſubjugationem, abundantiam filiorum, fecunditatem frugum; omnia iſta promiſſiones ſunt terrenæ. In figura ſpiritaliter intelliguntur, quomodo Hieruſalem terrena umbra erat regni cœleſtis, & regnum terrenum umbra erat regni angelorum.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 119. *Et hoc eſt Sacramentum veteris Teſtamenti, ubi occultum erat novum: Quod illic promiſſa & dona terrena ſunt intelligentibus & tunc ſpiritalibus, quamvis nondum in manifeſtatione prædicantibus, & quæ illis temporalibus rebus ſignificaretur æternitas, & in quibus Dei donis eſſet vera felicitas.* Idem de C. D. l. 4. c. 33

(u) *L'Emper. Not. in Jacchiad. p.* 188. *& in Cod. Midd. p.* 133.

robabel, *Eliakim*, *Cyrus*, *Iſaac* and *Iſhmael*, *Jacob* and *Eſau*, *Hagar* and *Sarah*, (w) *ô res geſtas, ſed prophetice geſtas!* Prophecies that are complicated with theſe Hiſtorical kind of Types are complex Prophecies, which in the next immediate Senſe are meant of the Type, but in a more remote retir'd Senſe are meant of the Antitype, wherein they have their perfect Completion; for in the Type they have but an initial imperfect Completion. (x) The Seventy firſt *Pſalm* (with us the Seventy ſecond) is according to the Title of it in the next immediate Senſe meant of King *Solomon*: But the Predictions there (touching the vaſt amplitude and endleſs duration of his Empire in Righteouſneſs, Peace and Proſperity, as alſo touching his noble Acts) were accompliſh- in *Solomon* in a very ſlender degree and meaſure, as in *an imperfect ſhadow*, which in the Lord Meſſiah have their more perfect Accompliſhment. In the ſame manner the *Forty fifth* and *Eighty ninth* Pſalm are meant of *Solomon*, as alſo that Prophetick Promiſe by *Nathan*, *I will be his Father and he ſhall be my Son.* 2 Sam. 7. 14. So the Second *Pſalm* is meant of *David* as (imperfectly) a Type of Chriſt, and this Prophetick Promiſe to *Abraham* was a Promiſe of the Meſſiah, *In Iſaac ſhall thy Seed be called.* Gen. 21, 12. Several Hiſtorical Paſſages in the Book of *Pſalms* are in the New Teſtament interpreted, to be meant of the Meſſiah (as *the Zeal of thine Houſe hath eaten me up*; *the Stone which the Builders refus'd, is become the head Stone in the Corner*) in which Hiſtorical Paſſages the Pſalmiſt was deſign'd to repreſent the Meſſiah, as the Virgin-propheteſs in Isa. 7. 14. *Iſaiah*'s time, in bearing a Son and calling him *Immanuel*, was deſign'd to repreſent and foreſignifie his Nativity. With theſe Hiſtorical kind of Types the Prophecies of the Meſſiah are uſually complicated, eſpecially with that eminent Hiſtorical Type *Zorobabel*, under whoſe conduct the Jews were reduc'd from their Babylonian Captivity, which was a Type and Pledge of their ſpiritual Redemption and Liberation by the Meſſiah. For the moſt part the Prophets were ſuch as liv'd about the time of the Babylonian Captivity, the Jews deliverance from it is a principal Subject of their Prophecies (which they exaggerate to the Skies by their lofty Schemes of Speech) in expounding their Prophecies (y) it muſt be look'd upon as preludious to, and Typical of that Liberation which is by Chriſt. For a voice crying in the Wilderneſs preceded both, *Iſa.* 40. 3. and the voice crying in the Wilderneſs that preceded the former, was preludious and typical to that voice crying in the Wilderneſs, which preceded the latter, *Matth.* 3. 3. The Prophet comforting *Zion*'s Mourners by the glad Tydings of a Liberation from the Babylonian Captivity, was preludious and typical to the great Evangelical Prophet preaching the Goſpel to the Poor, and deliverance to the Captives, *Iſa.* 61. 1--4. *Luk.* 4. 18. The raiſing up the Tabernacle of *David* in *Zorobabel* at the Reſtauration from the Babylonian Captivity was preludious and typical to the magnificent raiſing it up in the Kingdom of the Meſſiah, *Amos* 9. 11. This method of expounding Prophecies (by a correſpondence between the matters of the Old and New Teſtament, between the Old and New *Iſrael*, between Literal and Myſtical, Type and Antitype) is certainly Genuin and Legitimate, but may be carry'd on further than it will fairly go; whence the learned *Grotius* hath made very foul work with many Prophecies. On the other hand they that recede over-far from his method, come near him in the number and greatneſs of his Miſcarriages; they deſtroy the plain ſenſe of Words and Language, they fear not expreſly to contradict the ſacred Text, to gratifie their own Prejudices; they deſtroy the contexture and coherence of Prophecies and render them untelligible; they confound the Type and the Antitype, and make the Old Teſtament, not to be the New Teſtament involv'd, but reveal'd. To theſe it will ſeem little leſs than Blaſphemy, to affirm, that *Zorobabel* is in the ſtile of the Prophets called *the Branch* and *my Servant* David, yet there is nothing in the Bible more expreſs and palpable, as will appear to any that can read Engliſh with unprejudic'd Eyes.

The days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will bring Jer. 30.
again the captivity of my people Iſrael and Judah, 3, 8, 9,
and I will cauſe them to return to the land that I 10.
gave to their fathers, and they ſhall poſſeſs it. Strangers ſhall no more ſerve themſelves of him, but they ſhall ſerve the Lord their God and David their King, whom I will raiſe up unto them. Therefore fear thou not, O my ſervant Jacob, for lo, I will ſave thee from afar, and thy ſeed from the land of their captivity, and Jacob ſhall return and be in reſt and quiet, and none ſhall make him afraid. Behold, the Jer. 23.
days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will raiſe unto 5, 7, 8.
David a righteous Branch; in his days Judah ſhall be ſaved, and Iſrael ſhall dwell ſafely: they ſhall no more ſay, the Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Iſrael out of the land of Egypt: but the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the ſeed of the houſe of Iſrael out of the North-country, and from all countries whither I had driven them, and they ſhall dwell in their own land. In thoſe days and at that time will I cauſe the branch of Righteouſneſs to grow up unto David; for David ſhall never want a man to ſit upon the throne of the houſe of Iſrael: Neither ſhall the Prieſts and Levites want a man before me, to offer burnt-offerings. Behold, I Jer. 33.
will take the children of Iſrael from among the Hea- 15, 17, 18.
then whither they be gone, and will gather them on Ezek. 37.
every ſide, and bring them into their own land. 21, 24, 25.
And David my ſervant ſhall be King over them; they ſhall have one ſhepherd, and they ſhall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my ſervant, wherein your fathers have dwelt, and they ſhall dwell therein, even they and their children and their childrens children for ever, and my ſervant David (one of the Houſe of *David*) *ſhall be their Prince for ever. I* Ezek. 34.
will ſeek out my ſheep and will deliver them out of 12, 13, 22,
all places, where they have been ſcattered in the 23, 29.
cloudy and dark day. And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them into their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Iſrael by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I will ſave my flock and they ſhall be no more a prey, and I will judge between the fat cattel and the lean cattel. And will ſet up one ſhepherd over them, and he ſhall feed them, even my ſervant David. I the Lord will be their God, and my ſervant David a Prince

---

(w) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 16. c 37.

(x) *Hic eſt mos ſcripturæ ſanctæ, ut futurorum veritatem præmittat in typis, junta illud quod de Domino ſalvatore in ſeptuageſimo primo pſalmo dicitur, qui prænotatur Salomonis, & omnia quæ de eo dicuntur, Salomoni non valent convenire. Nec enim permanſit ille cum ſole, & ante Lunam generationis generationum, neque dominatus eſt à mari uſque ad mare, & à flumine uſque ad terminos orbis terrarum, nec omnes gentes ſervierunt ei, neque ante ſolem permanſit nomen ejus, nec benedictæ ſunt in ipſo omnes tribus terræ, neque omnes gentes magnificaverunt eum. Ex parte autem, & quaſi in umbra & imagine veritatis in Salomone præmiſſa ſunt, ut in Domino ſalvatore perfectius implerentur.* S. Hieron. Com. in Dan. 11. 12.

(y) *Quia reditus ille ac reſtitutio populi quoddam fuit regni Chriſti præludium, ideo ſemper incipere convenit à tempore illo quoties vaticinantur Prophetæ de nova Eccleſia.* Calvin. prælect. in Jer. 3. 17, 18.

among them. I will raiſe up for them a plant of renown, and they ſhall be no more conſumed with hunger in the land, neither bear the ſhame of the heathen any more. I will raiſe up the tabernacle of David Amos 9. 11, 14. Zech. 3. 8. *that is fallen, and I will bring again the captivity of my people. Hear now, O Joſhua the high prieſt: behold I will bring forth my ſervant the branch. For behold the ſtone that I have laid before Joſhua: upon one ſtone ſhall be ſeven eyes. They* Zech. 4. 10. *ſhall rejoice and ſee the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel with thoſe ſeven, they are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth.* Zech. 6. 12-15. *Behold the man whoſe name is the branch, and he ſhall grow up out of his place, and he ſhall build the temple of the Lord: even he ſhall build the temple of the Lord, and he ſhall bear the glory, and ſhall ſit and rule upon his Throne, and he ſhall be a Prieſt upon his throne, and the counſel of peace ſhall be between them both. And the crowns ſhall be to Helem, and to Tobijah, and to Jedaiah, and to Hen the ſon of Zepheniah, for a memorial in the temple of the Lord. And they that are far off ſhall come and build in the temple of the Lord.* If we cannot underſtand plain Engliſh, it is a vanity, to pretend to underſtand Prophecies. If the ſenſe of Language is intelligible, that Branch of the Regial Houſe of *David* which was Governour of the Jews at the time of their return from their Captivity is ſtiled in the Prophets *a Righteous branch, a branch of righteouſneſs raiſed up unto* David, *my ſervant* David, David *their King, their Prince and their Shepherd, a plant of renown.* In him the fallen Houſe of *David* was (preludiouſly) raiſed up, and therefore he was a Branch raiſed up unto *David.* He was the Builder of the ſecond Temple, that like an Architect held in his hand the Plummet or Plumb-line (the Globular part whereof, which was a Stone, had ſeven Eyes engraven upon it;) therefore in the Prophet *Zechary* he is meant by this Name *My Servant The Branch.* Accordingly, upon the engraving the ſeven Eyes upon the Globular part of *Zerrubbabel*'s Plumb-line, the Text ſaith, *I will remove the iniquity of that Land in one day. In that day ſhall ye call every Man his Neighbour under the Vine and under the Fig-tree.* This was done at the time, when God brought forth his Servant *The Branch.* Zech. 3. 8, 9, 10. Difficulties and Objections are raiſ'd againſt this ſound and ſure Interpretation of Prophecy, but they that make them (againſt plain and expreſs Texts of Scripture) might better imploy themſelves in Salving them: Nor is it any great difficulty to anſwer theſe Objections. *That* Zorobabel *was not a King, nor did his Government continue for ever, nor had the Jews ſuch Peace and Safety under it, as the Prophecies mention, nor did they poſſeſs their Land or enjoy their Sanctuary for ever.* For every one knoweth how variouſly this Phraſe *for ever* is us'd in the Old Teſtament, and theſe words of the Prophecy *My Servant* David *ſhall be their Prince for ever,* may relate both to the Type and Antitype. *Zorobabel* was a King, and the Jews enjoy'd Peace and Safety under his Government in the ſame degree, that he was a Type of the true *Branch* and *David,* which was very imperfectly, and in the uſual manner of umbratile Types. (z) Grot. Not. in Deut. 17. 9. & cap. 33. 5. There are ſubordinate Kings (z) and unſubordinate Kings in Reality, that are not Kings in Name. And doubtleſs in reſpect of Kingſhip *Zorobabel* is a parallel for *Moſes,* who was not uſually ſtiled King, yet in the ſtile of a Prophetick compoſure he is ſaid to be *King in* Jeſhurun. With great aſſurance therefore we may pronounce, that the ancient Prophecies in great part ought to be interpreted by a correſpondence between Literal and Myſtical (Type and Antitype) that a conſiderable number of Prophecies relating to the Meſſiah are of this Interpretation, and conſequently have a twofold Completion, and ſome of them have a threefold Completion, as that in *Hoſ.* 3. 4, 5. *The Children of Iſrael ſhall abide many days without a King and without a Prince, and without a Sacrifice, and without an Image, and without an Ephod, and without Teraphim. Afterward ſhall the Children of Iſrael return, and ſeek the Lord their God, and David their King, and ſhall fear the Lord and his Goodneſs in the latter days.* For in ſome degree the Children of *Iſrael* did ſeek *David* their King (one of the Houſe of *David* and a typical *David*) when they were commix'd with the Jews in their Reſtauration from the Captivity, and had a great inſtance of God's Goodneſs to them in their ſecular Concerns. In ſome degree they did ſeek *David* their King, when any of them (ſince the times of Chriſtianity) were converted to the Faith of Chriſt. And (according to the Apoſtle's method of interpreting Prophecies) we are yet to expect, that they will be more ſignally and generally converted unto the true *David* their King.

XIII. Some Perſons that in ſome degree are Hiſtorical Types, are in great part Types, not *Hiſtorically,* but only *Characteriſtically* and *Deſcriptively,* which may be called *Characteriſtical* Types. For the underſtanding of which let us ſuppoſe the *Paſchal Lamb,* to have been a Perſon Rational and Prophetical, and that ſpeaking in the Perſon of his Character he thus deſcrib'd his Condition. " I am a perfect unble-
" miſh'd Lamb ſet apart on the Tenth Day of
" the Month *Niſan,* put to a cruentous Death
" on the Fourteenth Day between the two E-
" venings; I am ſacrific'd, my Fleſh is roſted,
" my Blood is ſprinkled, and I am the Lord's Paſ-
" ſover. They pierce my Hands and my Feet
" (although a Bone of me is not broken) Dogs
" have compaſs'd me, the aſſembly of the wick-
" ed have encloſ'd me, they look and ſtare up-
" on me. All they that ſee me, laugh me to
" ſcorn; they ſhoot out the Lip, they ſhake
" the Head ſaying, he truſted on the Lord that
" he would deliver him; let him deliver him,
" if he will have him. They gave me Gall to
" eat, and in my thirſt they gave me Vinegar
" to drink. They part my Garments among
" them, and caſt lots upon my Veſture. I am a
" Worm and no Man, a reproach of Men and
" deſpiſed of the People, and thou haſt brought
" me into the Duſt of Death. But thou wilt
" not leave my Soul in Hell; neither wilt thou
" ſuffer thine Holy One to ſee Corruption. If the Paſchal Lamb had made this deſcription of his Condition, there would have been nothing of incongruity in it; for all this he might juſtly have ſaid ſpeaking *characteriſtically* and in the Perſon of his Character (the Paſcal Lamb:) But in one part of the deſcription he would have ſpoken in the perſon both of the Typical and Antitypical Paſchal Lamb; and in the other part of it he would have ſpoken only in the perſon of the Antitypical Paſchal Lamb. In the matters of the one part of the deſcription he would have been an Hiſtorical Type; and in the matters of the other part of it he would have been only a Characteriſtical Type of the Antitypical Paſchal Lamb. So in ſeveral paſſages of the Book of *Pſalms* (which have no

place in the Hiſtory of the Pſalmiſt) the Typical and Prophetical *David* is only a Characteriſtical Type of the Antitypical *David.* The Second *Pſalm* ſpeaketh of *David* as a Type of Chriſt; *David* therein ſpeaketh characteriſtically and in the Perſon of his Character (which is *David* the Lord's anointed;) in one part of it he is an Hiſtorical Type of Chriſt, ſpeaketh both of the Perſon of the Typical and Antitypical *David*; but in the other part of it the words are ſpoken of him as a Type of Chriſt only *characteriſtically* and *deſcriptively* (a Type under which is exhibited the ſole characteriſm and deſcription of the Antitype) they are meant only of the Antitypical *David.* So in thoſe *Pſalms*, Pſal. 45. and 72. which deſcribe the condition of King *Solomon* as a Type of the Meſſiah, *Solomon* is in ſome degree an Hiſtorical Type, but in great part he is only a Characteriſtical Type of the Antitypical Son of *David.* Such a Type of Chriſt he was, as the literal *Jeruſalem* was of the New and Chriſtian *Jeruſalem*; for under the Type of the literal *Jeruſalem* the Prophet *Iſaiah* maketh a large Prophetick deſcription of the Holineſs and Peace, of the amplitude and glory of the Chriſtian Church, *Iſa.* 60. In which Prophetick deſcription the literal *Jeruſalem* is in ſome degree an *Hiſtorical*, but in great part only a *Characteriſtical* Type of the New and Chriſtian *Jeruſalem.* Such a Type of Chriſt is *Zorobabel* in the Prophecies, and ſuch a Type of Chriſt is the Prophet *Iſaiah ch.* 49. where he ſpeaketh of himſelf characteriſtically and in the Perſon of his Character (which is the Evangelical Prophet) and in the deſcription of his Condition he is in part an Hiſtorical Type (and ſo far ſpeaketh both in the Perſon of the Type and the Antitype) but in great part he is only a Characteriſtical Type of the great Evangelical Prophet, and ſo far ſpeaketh only in the Perſon of the Antitype. *Liſten, O Iſles, unto me, and hearken ye People from far, the Lord hath called me from the Womb, from the Bowels of my Mother hath he made mention of my Name. And he hath made my Mouth like a ſharp Sword, in the ſhadow of his Hand hath he hid me, and made me a poliſh'd Shaft, in his Quiver hath he hid me. And ſaid unto me, thou art my Servant, O Iſrael, in whom I will be glorified. Then I ſaid, I have laboured in vain, I have ſpent my ſtrength for nought and in vain, yet ſurely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God. And now, ſaith the Lord, that formed me from the Womb, to be his Servant to bring Jacob again to him, tho' Iſrael be not gathered, yet ſhall I be glorious in the Eyes of the Lord, and my God ſhall be my ſtrength. And he ſaid, it is a light thing, that thou ſhouldeſt be my Servant to raiſe up the Tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael: I will alſo give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayeſt be my Salvation unto the end of the Earth. Thus ſaith the Lord the Redeemer of Iſrael, and his Holy One, to him whom Man deſpiſeth, to him whom the Nation abhorreth, to a Servant of Rulers, Kings ſhall ſee and ariſe, Princes alſo ſhall worſhip.* In the *Forty ſecond* Chapter of this Prophet throughout the whole of it and the whole Contexture of the Prophecy there is not any Indication of a prefigurative Type of the Meſſiah; conſider'd therefore ſingly and alone it would be reaſonable, to affirm, that there is not in it any ſuch prefigurative Type. But becauſe it is of the very ſame Nature and Compoſure with this other (in the *Forty ninth* Chapter) it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that there is the ſame prefigurative Type in it, not meerly Hiſtorical, but *Characteriſtical. Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine Elect in whom my Soul delighteth. I have put my Spirit upon him, he ſhall bring forth Judgment to the Gentiles. He ſhall not cry nor lift up, nor cauſe his voice to be heard in the Streets. A bruiſed Reed ſhall be not break: and the ſmoking Flax ſhall be not quench: he ſhall bring forth Judgment unto truth. He ſhall not fail, nor be diſcourag'd, till he have ſet Judgment in the Earth: and the Iſles ſhall wait for his Law.* It would be reaſonable alſo, to ſuppoſe, that *Hezekiah* (a Branch of the Regial Houſe of *David*) is in ſome eminent Prophecies of this Evangelical Prophet ſuch a Type, as *Zorobabel* is in other Prophecies, if this great Objection did not lie againſt it; that *Hezekiah* was Nine or Ten Years Old, when his Father *Ahaz* began to Reign, and conſequently was born a conſiderable time before theſe Prophecies. *Iſa.* 9. 6, 7. *For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government ſhall be upon his ſhoulder: and his Name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, The mighty God, The everlaſting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increaſe of his Government and Peace there ſhall be no end, upon the Throne of David and upon his Kingdom to order it, and to eſtabliſh it with Judgment and Juſtice from henceforth even for ever: the Zeal of the Lord of Hoſts will perform this.* Iſa. 11. 1. *And there ſhall come forth a Rod out of the Stem of Jeſſe, and a Branch ſhall grow out of his Roots. And the Spirit of the Lord ſhall reſt upon him, the Spirit of Wiſdom and Underſtanding, the Spirit of Counſel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge and of the Fear of the Lord. The Wolf alſo ſhall dwell with the Lamb.* As *Hezekiah*'s age and time of Life agreeth not to theſe Predictions, ſo the ſublime Attributes of the Perſon predicted in one of them ſeem not applicable to any meer Child of Man. But on the other hand it muſt be conſider'd; that theſe Predictions were utter'd upon occaſion of the King of *Aſſyria*'s afflicting the Jews and their deliverance from him; that this is a Subject of his Prophecy in his *Eighth*, *Ninth*, *Tenth* and *Eleventh* Chapters; that the Coherence and Contexture of his Prophecy is quite ſpoiled and the ſenſe of it is utterly unintelligible, unleſs we ſuppoſe, that in theſe Predictions *Hezekiah* is comprized as a preludious Type of the Meſſiah. It ſeemeth therefore but reaſonable and neceſſary, to ſuppoſe theſe Predictions to compriſe both that which is *in part* and that which is *perfect.* The ſublime honourary Attributes that are in them, are *in part* competible to *Hezekiah.* And notwithſtanding his age and time of Life, yet (being but a Child) it may be truly and congruouſly predicted of him, that in part *he ſhall come forth of the Stem of Jeſſe, and ſhall grow out of his Roots.* And as being ſuch an one it may be ſaid of him *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given.*

XIV. The *Ceremonial Types* (famouſly known) belong to the Moſaic Ceremonial Law, which the Hebrew Doctors ſuppoſe, to conſiſt of Symbols; for one of them ſaith (a) *All things in the Law, the Prophets and the Hagiographa* רומזים אל החכמה *have reſpect to a recondite Wiſdom. Abarbinel* ſaith (b) *the Tabernacle and the other things were principally intended to be* כספר חכמה עליונה *as a Book of higher Wiſdom.* And another Hebrew Doctor ſaith, *The Tabernacle and its Veſſels now they are deſtroy'd, bring this utility to a pious Man, he embraceth that which they indicate* והחכמה הרמוזה בהם *and the Wiſdom intended*

(a) Dr. Caſtel. Ep Lex. Heptaglott. Præmiſ. Huet. Dem. Ev. pr. 7. S. 1.

(l) L'Emper. Not. in Jacch ad. p. 1[illegible]. & Cod. Mid. p. 132, 133.

tended in them. R. Alſchech affirmeth, *that the Temple of the Meſſiah will be Spiritual*; which is an acknowledgment, that the Inſtitutes of the Moſaic Ceremonial Law are not only Symbols, but Types. They were Symbols of things Celeſtial, *Shadows, Examples and Patterns of Heaven and heavenly things*, as the Apoſtle ſtileth them. They were Hiſtorical and Commemorative Symbols; for the *Egyptian* Servitude and the *Iſraelites* Liberation from thence, and their wandring in the Wilderneſs were ſymbolically repreſented and commemorated in their Feaſt of Paſſover and of Tabernacles. Many of their Inſtitutes were Ethical kind of Symbols and of moral ſignification; for ſuch were their Circumciſion, their Waſhings, their Incenſe and Salt, their diſcarding Leaven, their offering unblemiſh'd Sacrifices, their abſtinence from unclean Animals, their pollution by the Dead. (c) A dead Body in the Moſaic Inſtitution is a Symbol of the bodily cadaverous kind of things, from which they muſt be more eſpecially withdrawn, that are eſpecially devoted to God and his Service, and which are to all that are not duely alienated from them, a deadly defilement.

But the Moſaic Ritual Inſtitutes were not only Symbols, (*d*) they were Types alſo (Symbols inſtituted and intended by God, to prefigure things to come) as the Apoſtle ſtileth them *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, a ſhadow of things to come*, Col. 2. 17. If he had meerly ſtiled them *a Shadow*, his meaning might have been, as a late Learned Writer will have it, (*e*) not that they had the relation of a Type to things to come, but that they were only umbratile evanid Inſtitutes compar'd with things to come. But ſeeing the Apoſtle ſtileth the Judaical Inſtitutes (for of thoſe he ſpeaketh) *a ſhadow of things to come*, he manifeſtly attributeth to them the Nature and definitive Notion of a Type, and withall diſparageth them as umbratile and evanid compar'd with the things to come. *They ſtood only in Meats and Drinks and divers Waſhings and carnal Ordinances*, Heb. 9. 10. *The Law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things* (the things themſelves in their likeneſs) *Heb.* 10. 1. When the Apoſtle ſaith, The Law had a ſhadow of good things to come, his words are certainly of this meaning, that the Judaical Inſtitutes were Types; therefore his words are of the ſame meaning, when he ſaith of the ſame things the ſame words, *They were a ſhadow of things to come.* (*f*) *The Apoſtle* (ſaith Origen) *in few words ſheweth the meaning of the whole* (Ceremonial) *Law, when he ſaith, Let no Man judge you in Meat or in Drink, or in reſpect of an Holy Day, or of the New Mooon, or of the Sabbath Days: which are a ſhadow of things to come.* The Ceremonial Law therefore muſt be conſider'd as introductory to the Chriſtian Religion, and a typical Inſtitution thereto: but it muſt be conſider'd alſo as *remedying of Idolatry*, which is one of the great Ends of this Ritual Law; and ſome ſay, (*g*) it is *finis primarius* (the primary end of it) and that the adumbrating and typifying the Chriſtian Religion is but the ſecondary end of it, and that the Moſaic Evangelical Types were inſtituted only *obiter & ex intentione quâdam ſecundariâ*, by the by and from a certain ſecondary intendment. Which is an Hypotheſis that tendeth to make as foul work with the Ceremonial Law, as ſome have made with the Prophecies, and cannot rationally be entertain'd by any but a Jew, who preferreth Judaiſm before Chriſtianity. For the meer remedying groſs Heathen Idolatry, amounteth to nothing more than Literal Judaiſm, which cannot be the primary end of God in the Moſaic Inſtitution. As the Ceremonial Law was remedying of Idolatry, it was but Civil-religious and ſalutary to the Secular Eſtate: but as it was introductory to the Chriſtian Religion, it was Spiritual-religious and ſaving to the Souls of Men. Ritual Judaiſm was initially introduc'd from the beginning of the World, not primarily for its own ſake, nor as remedying of groſs Idolatry, but chiefly for the ſake of the Chriſtian Religion; therefore Ritual Judaiſm plenarily introduc'd (or the Moſaic Ceremonial Law) was primarily inſtituted for the ſake of the Chriſtian Religion. All Chriſtians look upon the Inſtitutes of Judaiſm as ſubſerving the Chriſtian Religion. (*h*) *For the legal worſhip by Figures and Types is of a ſervient condition to the Evangelical Doctrines, ſhewing in it ſelf an obſcure pulchritude of truth.* In this reſpect (as in other) the Law was to the Jews *a pedagogue unto Chriſt* (Gal. 3. 24.) who was the End of it in more Senſes than one (*Rom.* 10. 4.) a far greater End, and an End which God deſign'd (from Eternal Ages) at a far higher rate than the meer remedying groſs Idolatry. The principal End of the Ritual Law and the Prophets is the ſame, and they are of like (general) nature. (*i*) *Omnia illa præcepta carnali populo impoſita futuram diſciplinam ſpiritalis populi prophetabant.* All thoſe Precepts impos'd upon a Carnal People were *Prophetical* of the future Diſcipline of a Spiritual People. The Ceremonial Law was a Prophecy of the Chriſtian Religion; and as the Miniſtry of the Prophets and their Predictions were for various Ends, but their chief End was the Meſſiah: So the Ceremonial Law was for other Ends, but the chief and primary End of it was the Chriſtian Religion, which far tranſcendeth all other Ends imaginable. For it was in order to the introducing the Chriſtian Religion, that the carnal Seed of *Abraham* was choſen to be God's People; and were inſtituted into a literal and typical *Iſrael*; old *Iſrael* (the Judaical Commonwealth and Religion) were not primarily inſtituted for their own ſake, but with reſpect to the Meſſiah, the Chriſtian Church and Religion. The Moſaic Ritual Inſtitutes therefore refer to the Chriſtian Religion, not only as they were typical Inſtitutes, but as they were Remedies againſt Idolatry. For as ſuch they were ſubordinate and ſubſervient to the weal of the Iſraelitical Polity, which Polity was inſtituted in ſubordination and ſubſerviency to the deſign of introducing the Chriſtian Religion. Let us conſider them as Inſtitutes of the Jewiſh Church, and the End of them ſo conſider'd was, that God and his People might live in Society for the Ends of Society: But this Society was typical, the Jews holy Commonwealth was a grand Type of the Chriſtian Church and Religion, was deſign'd for the Introduction of it, and conſequently it was not of primary Intention and Deſign, nor were the Inſtitutes intended for the common good of it (as ſuch) of primary Intention and Deſign, but mediately and remotely at leaſt they were ſubordinate to the Introduction of Chriſtianity. So the Moſaic

(c) *Lex tum pontifici maximo, tum Nazaræo præſcripta erat, nè quantumvis proximorum exequiis intereſſent. Nam corpus animi caſſum ut Philo explicat ſignificat res eas omnes quæ corporales ſunt, & ad animum nihil pertinent. Ab harum rerum cura abſtrahere ſe debent, qui Deo inſerviunt.* Grot. Not. in Matth. 8. 22.

(d) *V. Outram de Sacrif. c. l.* 1. c. 18.

(e) *Spencer de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. c. 11. *S.* 2.

(f) *Origen. Philocal. p.* 10.

(g) *Dr. Spencer. ſupr. S.* 4.

(h) Ἡ γὰρ διὰ νόμου λατρεία, διὰ σχημάτων οὖσα καὶ τύπων δουλεύει τρόπον τινὰ τοῖς Εὐαγγελικοῖς παιδεύμασιν, ἀμυδρὸν τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ κάλλος ἐφ' ἑαυτῇ δεικνῦσα. *S. Cyr. Glaphyr. in Gen. l.* 3. *p.* 79.

(i) *S. Aug. c. Adimant.* c. 15.

Judicial Law was ſubordinate to the Introduction of the Chriſtian Religion; and if it had been typical of the matters of Chriſtianity, it would have been both *remotely* and *proximately* ſubordinated to the Introduction of the Chriſtian Religion; *remotely* as being an Inſtitution ſubordinate to the weal publick (which was ſubordinate to the deſign of introducing Chriſtianity;) and *proximately*, as being typical and adumbrative of the matters of the Chriſtian Religion. And this muſt have been the primary end of the *Judicial Law* (to introduce Chriſtianity, as a typical Inſtitution thereunto) becauſe the Introduction of Chriſtianity is the primary and general End of the Iſraelitical Polity, and a more primary End than the civil publick weal, which is ſubordinate to the Introduction of Chriſtianity. The ſame judgment muſt be made touching the primary End of the Moſaic Ceremonial Law; for it was neceſſary, that the Carnal Seed of *Abraham* ſhould have a Religion conſiſting of abundance of Ceremonies remedying of Idolatry, but this was in order to the making them a Literal *Iſrael*; and the making them a Literal *Iſrael* was ſubordinate to the deſign of introducing the Chriſtian Religion, which was the primary and general deſign of God in the inſtitution of the Hebrew Commonwealth and Religion, a more primary and principal deſign than the meer making a Literal *Iſrael* by remedies againſt Idolatry. Therefore the Inſtitution of ſuch Ceremonies as were typical of the Chriſtian Religion, was a Branch of the primary deſign of God.

Agreeably whereto the Schools ſay, (k) *Caeremonialia eſſe figuralia primò & perſe, quia ſunt principaliter inſtituta ad aliquid praeſignandum:* which Maxim of the Schools is not nicely to be extended to all the little Ceremonials (many of which were not prefigurative Types:) but the Ceremonial Law in the main of it was typical. For the main of the Jews inſtituted Religion conſiſted in Sacrifice, their Sacred Perſons, Places, Times, and many of their Sacred Ritualities, were chiefly inſtituted for Sacrifice, of which there were ſeveral kinds, (*l*) but all of them are juſtly reputed Types of Chriſt's Sacrifice. Some of them were more eſpecially and eminently ſuch, (*m*) as the Paſchal Lamb (the *Iſraelites* Paſſover) the Red Heifer, all thoſe ſacrific'd Animals whoſe Bodies were burnt without the Camp and their Blood was brought into the Sanctuary by the High Prieſt for Sin, *Heb.* 9. 7, 8. *Into the ſecond Tabernacle went the High Prieſt alone once every Year not without Blood, which he offered for himſelf and for the Errors of the People. The Holy Ghoſt this ſignifying, that the way into the Holieſt of all was not yet made manifeſt, while as the firſt Tabernacle was yet ſtanding*, v. 9, 10, 11. The Apoſtle goeth on making a compariſon between the Jews High Prieſt and our High Prieſt; between the Blood of Bulls and Goats that were ſlain on the Day of Expiation, and the Blood of Chriſt; between the Earthly Holy of Holies and the Heavenly; and the High Prieſts entring into the Earthly Holy of Holies with the Blood of his Sacrifices, this he compareth with our Saviour's entring into Heaven by his own Blood, thoſe legal things being Types and Adumbrations of the Evangelical. The Aaronical High Prieſt with his ſumptuous Veſtments (rich beyond all Parallel) his Oracle of *Urim*, his peculiar office of making Expiation, his ſole entring into the moſt Holy Place with the Blood of his Sacrifices, his ſprinkling it and burning Incenſe there, and his preſenting himſelf before God, was a marvellous expreſs and lively typical reſemblance of our Immortal High Prieſt and of his Sacrifice. So was the Scape-goat and the Propitiatory (or Mercy-ſeat) the Tabernacle (or Temple) was both a Type of the Chriſtian Church and of the Godhead tabernacling in our Fleſh in the Perſon of the Meſſiah. The Jews Circumciſion was (not only a Symbol, but) a Type of the Chriſtian Regeneration; the purgation of a Leprous Perſon typify'd the Chriſtian Expiation of Sin; and the Ritual Sanctity and Ritual Religious Worſhip of the Moſaic Inſtitution was a Type of that real Sanctity and real Religious Worſhip which is in the Chriſtian Inſtitution. (*n*) *Interpretatur Apoſtolus Sabbatum ad Hebraeos, cùm dicit, Remanet igitur Sabbatiſmus populo Dei.* As the Writers of the New Teſtament interpret the Jewiſh Sabbath by the Chriſtian Reſt which it typify'd; ſo they interpret Incenſe by the Prayers of Saints, *Apoc.* 5. 8. the Jewiſh Sacrifices by Spiritual Sacrifices, by the Sacrifice of our Bodies, by good Works, and by the Fruit of our Lips, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Rom.* 12. 1. *Heb.* 13. 15, 16. and in like manner they interpret the Jewiſh Prieſts, when they ſtyle Chriſtians an Holy Prieſthood, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. Agreeably to which Interpretation of the Ceremonial Law the Prophecies of the Meſſiah muſt be interpreted; for they are complicated with theſe Ceremonial Types, *Mal.* 3. 3, 4. *He ſhall ſit as a refiner and purifier of Silver: and he ſhall purifie the Sons of* Levi, *and purge them as Gold and Silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an Offering in Righteouſneſs. Then ſhall the Offering of* Judah *and* Jeruſalem *be pleaſant unto the Lord, as in the Days of Old.* Mal. 1. 11. *From the riſing of the Sun even unto the going down of the ſame my Name ſhall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incenſe ſhall be offered unto my Name and a pure Offering.* Iſa. 19. 19, 21. *In that Day there ſhall be an Altar to the Lord in the midſt of the Land of* Egypt, *and a Pillar at the Border thereof to the Lord. And the Lord ſhall be known to* Egypt, *and the* Egyptians *ſhall know the Lord in that Day, and ſhall do Sacrifice and Oblation.* Chriſtians that miniſter the Divine Service, are in ancient Prophecy ſignify'd by the Sons of *Levi*; Incenſe and a pure Meat-offering, Sacrifice and Oblation (wherein the Judaical Worſhip conſiſted) denote the Chriſtians Religious Worſhip, but under a Veil of the Moſaic Inſtitution, which was a Type of it, as *Noah*'s Water typify'd the Chriſtian Baptiſm. So the *Iſraelites* being baptiz'd in the Cloud and in the Sea unto *Moſes* conducting them out of the literal *Egypt* through the Wilderneſs into the literal *Canaan*, was a Type of our being baptized into Chriſt conducting us out of the Spiritual *Egypt* through the Wilderneſs of this inhoſpitable World into the Heavenly *Canaan*. And the drowning the *Egyptians* in the Sea typify'd the drowning our Sins in Baptiſm. (*o*) *There the* Egyptians *were ſuffocated, here the old Man of Sins is buried.* 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3.

CHAP.

(k) *Aquin. ap. Suarez. de Leg. l.* 9. *c.* 3. *n.* 10.

(l) *Outram. de Sacrif. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(m) *Bochar. de Animal. par.* 1. *l* 2. *c.* 50. *Huet. Dem. Ev. pr.* 9. *p.* 136. & 170.

(n) *S. Aug. c. Adimant.* c. 16.

(o) Ἐκεῖ Αἰγύπτιοι ἀπεπνίγοντο, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων κατορύττεται. *S. Chryſ. T.* 5. λόγ. ν. *p.* 348.

CHAP. V.

1. Of the Chriſtian Religion as it is the new Settlement of Saving Grace. Of ſeveral Settlements, a Teſtament, a Covenant and a Law. 2. Of a Teſtament. 3. Of a Covenant. 4. Of a Law. How honourary theſe Names are. 5. Of the Covenant as the Foundation of God. 6. Of the excellency of Chriſtianity as a preceptive Law. 7. Of Antiquity and Newneſs. 8. Of Chriſt's Seniority to Abraham. *9. Of Newneſs as a principal Attribute of the Chriſtian Religion and why it is called New. 10. Of a Chriſtian Religioniſt as a new Covenanter. 11. Of the many differences between the new Settlement of Religion and the old Settlement of the Law-religion. 12. Of Regeneration in Judaiſm, Paganiſm and Profane Authors. 13. Of Regeneration real and as to State and Condition. 14. Of the entrance into Chriſtianity. 15. Of the Chriſtian Method of bringing Men to good Life. 16. Chriſtianity deſigneth a change of Man's Nature. 17. Of the Life of Grace as it is a Nature. 18. Of the Life of Grace as it is The Divine Nature.*

I. TO make a due Illuſtration of the Chriſtian Religion it muſt be conſider'd under four definitive Names and Notions (which it hath in the Holy Scriptures) *The new Settlement of Saving Grace*, *The new Kingdom of God*, *The great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, *The new Creation*. We have conſider'd this Religion, as it was provided and promis'd in the Old Teſtament-times: But as it was properly made into *a Settlement of Saving Grace*, it belongeth to the conſideration of the New Teſtament-times, and commenc'd from the making the New Teſtament, by which Name our Religion is commonly called and the Books alſo that contain it. For ſo we (following the Latin Chriſtians) tranſlate the Greek Name of our Religion ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, *Novum Teſtamentum* (the New Teſtament:) but the Greek Name is beſt render'd *The new Settlement*. For διαθήκη properly ſignifieth *a Diſpoſal*, *an Ordination*, *a Conſtitution*, *a Settlement of things*. And ſo doth the Hebrew word ברית which anſwereth to it; for it is deriv'd from ברא which ſignifieth, to *make*, *ordain* or *conſtitute*. The Chriſtian Religion therefore, which in the ſpecial nature of it is Saving Grace, in the general nature of it is *a Settlement of things that God hath made*. And ſuch a Settlement it is, that hath the Name and Nature of *a Teſtament*, *a Covenant* and *a Law*; which ſeveral ſorts of Settlements the Name of our Religion, (*p*) Διαθήκη ſignifieth. It ſignifieth *a Teſtament*, and accordingly the Chriſtian Religion is ſometimes called a Teſtament. For the Greek word which the Apoſtle uſeth, may not be otherwiſe render'd, *Heb.* 9. 16. *Where a Teſtament is, there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the death of the Teſtator.* Sometimes the Greek Name of the Chriſtian Religion muſt be render'd (not a Teſtament, but) *a Covenant*. For ſo it neceſſarily ſignifieth, when the Apoſtle oppoſeth it to that which the *Iſraelites* brake (for it is not proper to ſpeak of breaking a Teſtament;) the *Iſraelites* brake *the old Covenant*, and conſequently the Chriſtian Religion, which ſtandeth oppos'd thereto, muſt be called *The new Covenant*, as our Tranſlation ſtileth it, *Heb.* 8. 8, 10, 13. And becauſe the Chriſtian Religion is a ſettlement of things, that is, *of authoritative Obligation* and alſo *a ſettlement of Rights and Dues*, it is neceſſarily *a Law*, *The Law of Chriſt*, *The Law of Faith*, *The Law of Liberty*, *The Law of the one Lawgiver*, *The Law of the Spirit of Life*, Gal. 6.2. Rom. 3.27. and 8.2. Jam. 2. 12. and 4.12. Theſe ſeveral ſorts of Settlements, although they have their proper diſtinctions from each other, yet all of them agree in one general Nature (they are all Settlements) and in other reſpects they are of ſo great affinity, that it is not ſtrange, that they are all called by one common Name (διαθήκη) or that one Settlement (the Chriſtian Religion) hath the Name and Nature of them all. For *a Law* and *a Teſtament* are of ſuch affinity, that the *Civilians* ſay, *Voluntas Teſtatoris pro lege habetur*, The Will of the Teſtator is accounted as Law; and hence came the uſe of the Latin word *legare*, to bequeath. A *Law* and a *Covenant* are ſo near of kin, that a mutual Covenant is a Law to the Parties contracting, and the terms of a Contract are called *the Laws* of it, the publick Law in a Commonwealth is call'd by *Ariſtotle* and *Demoſthenes* συνθήκη τις, *a certain Agreement or Compact of the People*, and in a Law the nature of a Covenant is involv'd becauſe it promiſeth a Reward. Laws alſo and publick Leagues and Covenants agree in having Sanction (which is *à Sanguine*) for publick Leagues and Covenants had anciently a Sanction by the Blood of a Sacrifice, and Laws have their Sanction from the penal part of them, which conſecrateth the Blood of the Tranſgreſſor to the Law. Teſtaments alſo ſo far agree with Laws and public Covenants, they have an eſtabliſhment by the death of the Teſtator. But the principal thing remarkable touching theſe ſeveral ſorts of Settlements is their creating *Rights and Dues*, *Claims and Titles*. All of them are Settlements of Rights and Dues. For Rights and Dues accrew to a Legatary by a Teſtament, to a Covenantee by a Covenant, and by the Law of every Polity the Rights and Dues of Men are ſettled and determin'd.

II. A *Teſtament* and *an Heir* are of like Explication. For in the ſtrict Notion of the Law-courts an Heir is one (*q*) that hath right to ſucceed in the room of a perſon deceas'd (whence they ſay, *nemo eſt hæres viventis*) and by *Inheritance* they underſtand the Patrimony or whole Rights of a Perſon deceas'd together with the Right of ſucceeding thereto. At which rate of defining things neither Chriſt nor Chriſtians can be the Heirs of God, nor can they have any Inheritance from him of right thereunto. Nor can God make *a Teſtament*, if nothing can be a Teſtament, (*r*) but (in the Civilians Notion) *ſuch a diſpoſal of things as one will have to be valid after his death*, whence it is commonly called (as *Quintilian* defineth it) *the Will of the Dead*. In which ſtrict Law-ſenſe the Old Teſtament could not be a Teſtament (for God could not die, yet a Teſtament it was, and muſt be ſo called in a large popular ſenſe. For if one will be a great Benefactor to others, and as ſuch doth make and publiſh an irrevocable Settlement of his Eſtate,

giving

(p) *Grot. Proleg. in Evang. S. Matth.*

(q) *Vinn. Com. in Inſtit. l. 2. Tit. 2. Corvin. de Verb ſignif. Lex.* 24.

(r) *Vinn. ibid. Tit.* 10.

giving them the right of Heirs, beſtowing on them the right of Inheritance, and deviſing his Goods to them, which they muſt receive after a certain time; by ſo doing (although he dieth not) he maketh his Will and Teſtament. This Act and Deed of his is his Settlement, ſo as to be his Teſtament; for although Legacies belong not to the Eſſence of a Teſtament, yet the giving to others the right of Heirs and of Inheritance; is ſo much the Eſſence of a Teſtament, that a Teſtament is defin'd by ſome Civilians (s) *hæredis inſtitutio*, the inſtituting an Heir. When therefore God made a diſpoſal of his Eſtate to *Abraham* and his Seed, making them the Heirs of God, *Gen.* 15. 18. *Rom.* 4. 13. when he made this diſpoſal of it irrevocable (certain Beaſts and Birds being ſlain, and the Beaſts being divided in the midſt, and the Pieces laid one againſt another, a burning Lamp paſſed between the Pieces, *Gen.* 15.) this ſolemn Act and Deed of God was a making and confirming his Abrahamical Teſtament. To this Teſtament complicated with the Moſaical the Apoſtle alloweth the Name of a Teſtament; for he calleth it *The firſt Teſtament*, Heb. 9. 18. It cannot be his meaning therefore, that in every Teſtament, *V.* 16. in any acceptation ſuch, *there muſt of neceſſity be the Death of the Teſtator:* but that where a Teſtament is ſimply ſo called and without limitation of Senſe, *there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the Death of the Teſtator*. And this is ſo requiſite in Teſtaments, that even *the firſt Teſtament* (which was but a Teſtament with limitation of Senſe) *was not dedicated without Blood*, without ſomething of Death and of Blood. Teſtaments therefore (according to this Apoſtle) in this agree with Covenants and with Laws, they are made and eſtabliſh'd by Death and by Blood, and this he diſcourſeth, to ſhew the neceſſity of Chriſt's death for making and eſtabliſhing the New Teſtament. *For this cauſe he was the Mediator of it, that by means of death* (for the making the Teſtament) *they which are called might receive the pro- V.* 15. *miſe of Eternal Inheritance.* Chriſt in the New Teſtament is not of the Party of the Legataries, but of the Teſtator-party, *Luk.* 22. 29. But this is not the Apoſtle's buſineſs, to ſhew, that in making and confirming the New Teſtament there muſt be a Death of the Teſtator (which is a general miſtake:) but his buſineſs is, to ſhew, that Chriſt as Mediator by means of death made and confirm'd the Teſtament, and this was neceſſary, becauſe a Teſtament muſt be made and confirm'd by Death and by Blood. *Whereupon neither the firſt Teſtament was dedicated without Blood.* A Teſtament is a noble deed of Settlement, becauſe it inſtituteth Heirs. The Chriſtian Settlement muſt be of this noble Nature, *that they which are called might receive the promiſe of Eternal Inheritance.* It muſt be made therefore and confirm'd *by means of Death.* If by the death of the Teſtator (as Humane Teſtaments are) it is a Teſtament ſimply ſo called: If otherwiſe, it is a Teſtament that is ſuch with limitation of Senſe. But it may be and is a mixture and complication of both theſe ſorts of Teſtaments. For in good degree it is made and confirm'd by the death of the Teſtator (it is Chriſt's Teſtament) and in part it is a Teſtament, that is only ſuch with limitation of Senſe; for it is God's Teſtament, who cannot die in his own perſon. Yet there is great analogy between this Divine Teſtament and Humane Teſtaments: For the Goſpel is *teſtatio mentis*, whence (as *Juſtinian* ſaith) a Teſtament hath its Name. And it is ſufficiently teſtify'd, to be the Will of God by the moſt creditable Witneſſes that ever were, as Humane Teſtaments (according to the Civil Law) 1 *Joh.* 5. 8. *Apoc.* 3. 14. muſt be witneſs'd by divers well-qualify'd and teſtable perſons. And as Humane Wills and Teſtaments are confirm'd by Death, and in ſome ſort made by it (for they are made irrevocable and made the Will of the Dead by it:) So this Divine Teſtament was made and confirm'd by the Death of Chriſt, who is the Lord the Son, and in this Divine Teſtament is *Hæres ex aſſe*, Heir of the whole Patrimony or Inheritance (which he is to diſtribute to the younger Children) and is Executor of this Divine Teſtament, who is to ſee, that all the Legacies therein bequeath'd be diſcharg'd, and the Goods deviſ'd muſt be receiv'd from his Hands. But Chriſt's Believers are inſtituted alſo by this Teſtament, to be the Sons and Heirs of God (having right to poſſeſs their Father's Eſtate) and they are the Legataries, to whom all the ineſtimable ſaving Benefits of the Goſpel are bequeath'd (God maketh to them a Grant and Donation of them) and here is no place for a *Querela inoſſicioſi Teſtamenti*, complaint of an inoſticious Teſtament, wherein there is unjuſt Partiality. Humane Teſtamens are regiſtred and enrolled (for which purpoſe there are publick Scribes and Notaries:) So this Divine Teſtament is now regiſtred and enrolled in Scripture (by Divine Scribes) but for ſome time it was like a nuncupative Will and Teſtament.

(s) *Calvin. Lex. in voce Teſtamentum. Vinn. ſupr.*

III. The *Covenant* of God ſometimes ſignifieth meerly *his promiſſory Settlement of things*, and ſometimes ſuch a promiſſory Settlement of things, which is in the nature of it *a mutual Covenant.* His meerly promiſſory Settlement of *Day and Night, of not drowning the World any more, of the Affairs of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob, *of the Houſe of* David, *of* Phinehas's *everlaſting Prieſthood*, is called his *Covenant*, and ſo are his ancient Promiſes concerning the Meſſiah. *Jer.* 33. 20. *Gen.* 9. 9. *Exod.* 2. 24. *Pſal.* 89. 28. *Numb.* 25. 12, 13. *Luk.* 1. 72. *Act.* 3. 25. *Gal.* 3. 15, 17. In theſe Promiſes God took upon himſelf an Obligation or binding Ingagement to others, whence they are called his Covenant, and ſo the word Covenant muſt be interpreted his promiſſory Settlement, 2 *Chron.* 13. 5. *Ought ye not to know, that the Lord God of* Iſrael *gave the Kingdom over* Iſrael *to* David *for ever, even to him and to his Sons by a Covenant of Salt?* Numb. 18. 19. *All the Heave-offerings of the holy things, which the Children of* Iſrael *offer unto the Lord, have I given thee* (Aaron) *and thy Sons and thy Daughters with thee, by a Statute for ever: it is a Covenant of Salt for ever.* A Statute, Appointment, Conſtitution or Settlement of things which was of a promiſſory Nature, is called God's Covenant, and his *Covenant of Salt*, becauſe Salt was uſual in making Covenants and making them firm. So *Lev.* 24. 8. *Aaron* is appointed to ſet in order the Shew-bread before the Lord continually *by an everlaſting Covenant.* Nehem. 13. 29. *They have defiled the Prieſthood and the Covenant of the Prieſthood and of the Levites.* But God's Covenant in the Senſe of Eminence (both the Moſaic and the Chriſtian) although it may be conſider'd *abſtractedly from actual mutual covenanting*; yet it cannot be conſider'd abſtractedly from the Precept and Condition, the Duty and Obligation of *actual mutual covenanting*; for ſo far it is eſſentially *a mutual Covenant and Contract between God and Man.* His Covenant is the ſame with his Inſtitution of Religion, and is a comprehenſion of Precepts and Penalties as well as of Promiſes;

and his Teſtament is not only an Inſtitution of Heirs but of Piety. Such was the Old Teſtament of Moſaic Miniſtery, whoſe Precepts were ingraven in Stones; and ſuch is the New Teſtament of the Apoſtolic Miniſtery, which writeth its Precepts in the Heart. Such was the Covenant from Mount *Sinai* which gendreth to Bondage; and ſuch is the Covenant from Mount *Sion*, which ſetteth free from the Servitude of Sin. Both theſe Covenants are a Conſtitution and Settlement of things of God's making and ordaining. And as the Moſaic Covenant is a Settlement of the Benefit-part of the Covenant upon the *Iſraelites* upon Condition of their performing the Duty-part of it: So the Chriſtian Covenant is upon Condition of performing the Duty-part of it, a Settlement of the Benefit-part of it upon all Mankind. The Preachers of Chriſtianity tender unto Mankind the Chriſtian Covenant with all the ineſtimable Benefits of it and the infinite Obligations that are upon them, to enter into it and live accordingly, and manage a Treaty with them, to bring them into the Bond of this Covenant, as *Moſes* managed a Treaty with the *Iſraelites*, to bring them into the Bond of his Covenant, *Deut*. 29. 12, 13. *Act*. 2. 38. and *Ch*. 22. 16. 2 *Cor*. 5. 19, 20. As God taketh a binding Ingagement upon himſelf, to be unto them a God: So he requireth, that they take a binding Ingagement upon themſelves, to be unto him a People, *Iſa*. 44. 5. *Hoſ*. 2. 23. *Zech*. 13. 9. *Pſal*. 119. 106. 2 *Cor*. 8. 5. and 11. 2. *Gal*. 3. 27. *Col*. 3. 9, 10. Their Converſion to Chriſtianity and their becoming God's People conſiſteth in becoming his mutual Covenanters and Confederates, *Ezek*. 16. 8. So Prince and People Confederate with each other, and by becoming *the Men of his Confederacy* they become his Liege-people. *Obad*. 7. *Deut*. 26. 17, 18. *Ezek*. 16. 8.

IV. *The Law* is a Name that properly belongeth to the Settlement of the Law-religion (and denoteth the whole Body of it) the Chriſtian Conſtitution and Settlement of Matters of Religion (conſiſting of Doctrines, Precepts, Promiſes, Conditions, Penalties) is called by the Holy Writers *The Goſpel*, which they uſually oppoſe to the Law. But as Divinity is oppoſed to Philoſophy, yet is a Philoſophy *ſui generis*; and the Chriſtian Life is oppos'd to Morality, yet is a Morality *ſui generis* (Divine Morality:) So the Goſpel which is oppos'd to the Law, is yet a Chriſtian and Goſpel-kind of Law. It is Law, as it is an Inſtitution, which all the World, to whom it is promulg'd, are bound to entertain and obey (ſo far it is Law to the World;) and it is an Inſtitution, Doctrine and Diſcipline, which is Law to our Faith and Practice. Such a Law of Doctrine, Diſcipline and Inſtitution the Hebrew word תורה properly ſignifieth, and ſuch a Law the Prophets mean, when they call the Evangelical Doctrine Law. *Iſa*. 2. 3. *Mic*. 4. 2. *Out of Zion ſhall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jeruſalem*. Iſa. 51. 4. *A Law ſhall proceed from me, and I will make my Judgment to reſt for a light of the People*. Iſa. 42. 4. *The Iſles ſhall wait for his Law*. His Leſſons are virtually his Laws, his Instructions are his Edicts (who is Lord of our Faith and Practice) and his teachings are his Commands. But the Prophets alſo repreſent him as a Sovereign Lord and Law-giver (reigning over the Houſe of *Jacob*, having the Government upon his Shoulder) exerciſing his Legiſlative Authority and Power. *Iſa*. 33. 22. *The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King, he will ſave us*. If Chriſt is our Sovereign Lord and King, Maſter and Governour, it is incumbent upon him, to make and publiſh his Laws (Government principally conſiſteth in Legiſlation) it belongeth to him, to give Commandments, to thoſe that are of Right and by Obligation his Subjects and Servants, and upon them it is incumbent, to obey his Laws and keep his Commandments. Religion is matter of Law and Obligation (bounden Duty and Service to God) and ſuch is the Chriſtians Religion. If Duty and Obligation is incumbent upon them, they are under a Law (every Man's Duty is matter of Law to him, and Sin is the Tranſgreſſion of the Law, becauſe it is the violating Duty and Obligation;) if Chriſt hath impoſed Duty upon them, they are neceſſarily under his Law. The Subjects and Citizens of his Kingdom have the Rights and Priviledges of Subjects and Citizens, and are bound to do the Duties of Subjects and Citizens by the Settlement of their Polity, (which ſettleth the Rights and Dues of Men as to Salvation and Damnation, and) which is the Law of it. Without a Settlement of Rights and Dues (what ſhall be due from us and what ſhall be due to us) there can be no Polity, no City of God, nor can Chriſt have a Kingdom without a fundamental Law. The Chriſtian Religion therefore is rightly called by the Jews (t) *Lex Chriſtianorum*, the Chriſtians Law.

Each one of theſe Names *a Teſtament*, *a Covenant* and *a Law* are alike honourary to the Chriſtian Religion. For as *a Teſtament* is a noble Settlement, ſo is *a Law* (the Lawyers ſay, *Lex eſt Sanctio Sancta*) and ſo is *a Covenant*. For *a Covenant of the People* is the Settlement and grand Charter of their Liberty and Immunity; which is ſo eminently the Nature of thoſe Covenants, upon which Polities are founded, that in the Prophets *a Covenant of the People*, ſignifieth *The inſtrument of their Liberty and Immunity*. Iſa. 42. 6, 7. *I will give thee for a Covenant of the People, for a light to the Gentiles. To open the blind Eyes, to bring out the Priſoners from the Priſon, and them that ſit in darkneſs out of the Priſon-houſe*. Ch. 49. 8, 9. *I will preſerve thee and give thee for a Covenant of the People, to eſtabliſh the Earth, to cauſe to inherit the deſolate Heritages; that thou mayeſt ſay to the Priſoners go forth; to them that are in darkneſs ſhew your ſelves*. But although theſe Names of the Chriſtian Religion are alike Honourary to it, and expreſſive of the Nature of it, yet not without this diverſity of Notion. The Name *Teſtament* peculiarly repreſenteth the Chriſtian Settlement as a diſpoſal of the Eſtate of God, and (as to Spirituals) of his whole Eſtate. For a Will is a Deed, which giveth away all (all that is deviſable) Men by their Wills and Teſtaments give away their whole Eſtate to their Heirs and Legataries. So by this Divine Settlement Chriſt's Believers have Right and Priviledge to be the Sons and Heirs of God, and to them he giveth and deviſeth his whole Eſtate of Bleſſedneſs, *to inherit all things as joint-heirs with Chriſt*. Apoc. 21. 7. Rom. 8. 17. The Apoſtle ſaith of God, *Eph*. 2. 6. *He hath raiſed us up together, and made us ſit together in heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus*. God in raiſing Chriſt granted unto him the ſtate of Life, and in granting it unto him he gave and granted unto Chriſt's People the ſtate of Life (which they now enjoy in Chriſt) ſo that they were all put

(t) *Buxt. Lex. Talm. Col.* 587.

into a raiſed Condition together with Chriſt. Which raiſed Condition (the State of Life and Salvation) is the Condition of being Free Citizens of Heaven (of having their Names written there) *and of having a right to ſit in the heavenly places.* They are therefore ſaid, to ſit in them, becauſe they have *jus ad rem*, a preſent Right to the future Poſſeſſion of the heavenly Places, and in the ſame Senſe they are ſaid, to have *obtained an Inheritance*, Eph. 1. 11. They are Heirs by this Divine Settlement, as it is a Teſtament; and as it is a Law and Covenant, it is the Charter of their Rights, Immunities and Priviledges, whereby they are exempted from the deadly Evils, and the Domination of their deadly ghoſtly Enemies. And ſo large is their Charter, that *all things are theirs*, 1 Cor. 3. 21. All things that are incident to them in this World, are ſo far theirs, as to be ſubſervient to their Welfare.

V. In an Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion *the Covenant* muſt be laid as the Foundation (which is of principal Weight and Importance) the Apoſtle therefore with great reaſon calleth it by that Name. 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *The foundation of God ſtandeth ſure, having this Seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his. And let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity.* But Learned Men are not agreed touching the meaning of the word, which is here rendred Foundation. For ſome ſay, it cannot ſo ſignifie in this place, becauſe a Seal doth not agree to a Foundation, to which Men do not uſe to affix a Seal. In anſwer whereto ſome ſay, that the word which is rendred *a Seal*, may be rendred an Inſcription, and that anciently there were Inſcriptions upon Foundation-ſtones (for good Luck ſake) as in our times Sentences are written or ingraven upon Rings. And ſo the Senſe of the Apoſtles words will run thus; *The foundation of God ſtandeth ſure, having this Inſcription, the Lord knoweth them that are his.* But to this Anſwer ſome reply, that although the word σφραγὶς, which is here rendred a Seal, may ſignifie an Inſcription, yet it only ſignifieth ſuch an Inſcription, which is upon a Seal, and which hath no relation to a Foundation. They are therefore of Opinion, that the word here rendred *a Foundation*, ought not to be ſo rendred in this place, but that it ought to be rendred *a Covenant or Contract, a Bond or Bill Obligatory*, whereby two Parties mutually oblige themſelves to each other. So the Hebrew word עיקר ſignifieth amongſt the Rabbins, not only a Root or a Foundation, but an inſtrument of Contract, a Bond or Bill Obligatory. And becauſe the Greek word which is here rendred Foundation, anſwereth to that Hebrew word, therefore they ſuppoſe, the Apoſtle here uſeth it in an anſwereable and agreeable Signification, and that it ought to be rendred, *not the Foundation of God, but his Covenant or his Inſtrument of Contract.* And this ſignification of the word (as they obſerve) agreeth mighty well with what followeth concerning the Seal affix'd to it, which is very ſuitable to a Contract or mutual Obligation, but not to a Foundation. The Apoſtle mentioneth a Seal, which is uſually affixed to Contracts and Covenants, and in ancient times thoſe Seals had an Inſcription on both ſides agreeable to the Condition of the Perſons contracting: So the Apoſtle mentioneth a Seal, that hath an Inſcription on both ſides agreeable both to God and to us. On God's part it hath this Inſcription, *The Lord knoweth them that are his:* And on our part of it hath this Inſcription, *let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity.* They are of Opinion therefore, that theſe words contain the terms of the Covenant between God and us. Here is God's part of the Covenant, *The Lord knoweth them that are his*, he will own them and ſave them. And here is that of the Covenant, which is on our part, *Let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity.* This Expoſition of the Apoſtle's words is doubtleſs the true meaning of them: But there is no Reaſon why there ſhould be any Diſpute touching the ſignification of the word here rendred *Foundation*; becauſe both ſignifications of it are hugely agreeable to the meaning of the place, and hugely conſiſtent with each other. They ought not to be ſeparated and oppos'd, but conjoin'd; the Apoſtle's ſenſe includeth and comprehendeth both of them. For his words plainly relate both *to a Foundation that ſtandeth ſure, and to a Contract which is ſealed.* The one of theſe is the bare ſignification of the word, the other is the thing ſignified (the one is the verbal, the other is the real ſignification) the one is the immediate, the other is the remoter Senſe. If we ask, what the Greek word θεμέλιος, here uſed by the Apoſtle ſignifieth? It muſt be anſwer'd *a Foundation*, which is not only the ordinary ſignification of it, but it never ſignifieth otherwiſe. Our Tranſlators therefore have rightly rendred the word: But we muſt not content our ſelves with the bare Notion of the word; we muſt inquire, what is the thing or reality, to which the Name and Notion of a Foundation belongeth? And the Anſwer muſt be, *It is God's Covenant or Contract*, and this the Apoſtle calleth *The Foundation of God*, for this really is the Foundation of God. So that his Senſe is, *The Foundation of the Lord*, that is, *his Covenant*, ſtandeth ſure, having a Seal with an Inſcription upon it. That which is the Foundation of God ſtandeth ſure; the Covenant of God is that which is his Foundation; and this Covenant or Contract hath a Seal affix'd to it with this Inſcription upon it containing the terms of the Covenant on God's part and ours; *The Lord knoweth them that are his; and let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity.* This aſſuredly is the Apoſtle's Senſe and the full meaning of his words.

The Covenant of God is the Foundation of all Claims and Titles to the ſaving Goods and Bleſſings, and of all reaſonable and religious Hopes and Expectations; for God doth not adminiſter the Affairs of Religion arbitrariouſly, but agreeably to the Tenour of his Covenant, which is the Settlement of his Soul-Sovereignty and Government, and of the Rights and Dues of Men as to their Soul-intereſts. He is immenſly merciful in making this Divine Settlement of Grace and Mercy, in diſpenſing things according to it, and in bringing Men to perform the Terms and Conditions of it. But it muſt not be ſuppos'd, that he can be mercifully ſaving to the Souls of Men otherwiſe than in his Soul Sovereignty and Government, in this Divine Settlement thereof the Settlement of Saving Grace and Mercy, and according to the Tenour thereof; nor otherwiſe than as the holy kind of Imperial Eſtate of Saving Grace and Mercy, according to his kind of Saving Mercy, according to the Nature of Saving Mercy, according to the Religion and Government of Saving Mercy, and the neceſſary Terms and Conditions thereof. His Saving Mercy is a merciful method of ſaving Men from their Sins: But if Men would be ſaved from the Puniſhment without being ſaved from their Sins, God neither hath nor can have any ſuch Saving Mercy. *If Children then Heirs:* οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ πάντες ἔςωσάν μοι ἀποκληρονόμοι, (which are *Gr. Naz.* words in his Laſt Will and Teſtament, but ſpeak the Senſe of God's Will and Teſtament) *but let all the reſt be to me no Heirs, but diſinherited Perſons.* They that are no Children of God, but (in the main) Aliens and Enemies muſt not hope, to inherit his Eſtate of Bleſſedneſs. For his Covenant is מוסד מוסד *fundamentum fundatum*, a Foundation ſurely founded, and ſuch is Faith and Hope that is founded upon it: But Hope not founded upon the Covenant of God, but groſly repugnant to the Tenour of it, is fond Credulity, blind Self-deceiving, irreligious Preſumption, diſhoneſt Lying and Impoſture, that will be ruinous in the Iſſue; for they will not ſtrive, to enter in at the ſtrait Gate, that Hope to go to Heaven in the broad Way; nor will they change their Condition, that conceit themſelves in good Eſtate already (*u*) *as* Plotinus *ſaith, what doth he deſire to receive, who is well already?* They may be the Sons of God and Heirs of Salvation, if they will accept ſo Divine a Condition and live accordingly: But carnal Security will not ſecure them, groundleſs hopes of Salvation will not ſave them. *(w) Vain Hopes are big, but empty in the iſſue.*

VI. The Chriſtian Religion as *a Law is*, what Heathen Mankind (in general) ardently wiſh'd for, and that which they call (*x*) ῥοδόκολπον εὐνομίαν, *the Conſtitution of good Laws that hath a Roſie-boſom*, to which they allot two Siſters *Juſtice and Peace.* (*y*) By the Juſtice and Tranquillity of *Numa*'s Government, not only the Roman People were mitigated and became placid, but their melioration of Temper diſpread it ſelf (like a ſanative Air) to the Neighbour-people, and they alſo did διψᾶν τὴν εὐνομίαν, *thirſt after a good Conſtitution of Laws.* Good Laws and Government are a Branch of *the deſire of all Nations*, Mankind generally have a Senſe of their Excellency and Neceſſity; the Chriſtian Religion therefore (which is the true εὐνομία, *Conſtitution of good Laws*) is ſuited to their own Hearts deſire. For as a Law it directeth and obligeth to the Life of Bleſſedneſs, and is a Legiſlative Inſtitution to the Eſtate of Bleſſedneſs and the Inheritance of Bleſſedneſs, which is πρῶτον ὀρεκτὸν, ἔσχατον ὀρεκτῶν, *the firſt and laſt of deſirables.* The Goſpel is (the word of Salvation) *the Legiſlative Will and Word of God* touching the way of Salvation, which bringeth Life and Salvation to Men, and is as needful and deſireable as Life and Salvation it ſelf. It is a Legiſlative Inſtitution of their Sanctity, that are natively ungodly Sinners, an Inſtitution of the genuine Saints and Servants of God, of their divine Graces and Virtues, of their holy Duties and good Works, of their Services and their Rewards, of their preſent State of Salvation and their future eternal Salvation. None were more renown'd among the Heathen than their Lawgivers (*Numa, Solon, Lycurgus, Zaleucus, Charondas*) whoſe Laws were only the Laws of Civil Government and the Rules of Civil Life (which Humane Life cannot be without:) But Chriſt's Religion is the Law of his Soul-ſovereignty and Government, of loyal Affection and dutiful Subjection thereto; the Law of his Service and Society, of his Holy Life and ways, of living ſpiritually and eternally, and of diſpenſing the ſpiritual and eternal Goods and Evils. The knowing and obeying his Law is Chriſtianity and Godlineſs (the Eſſence of it and the whole of it) which is *the whole of Man*, of his Intereſt and Concern, of his Duty and Virtue, of his true Excellency and Felicity (his Holineſs and Happineſs) which bringeth him all the valuable, needful and deſireable Gains and Advantages, all the true Goods (the Goods which muſt not be loſt) ſuperlative and immenſe. The Law of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs is the true *dux vitæ & magiſtra officiorum*, (which is *Chryſippus*'s Notion of a Law) it guideth in the perfect way (where there is nothing of Sin and Folly, nor any thing to cauſe Sorrow) in the right and ſtraight, the ſafe and the pure Paths (that ſhine as the Light) and into all amiable and virtuous Living in all Circumſtances and Conditions. It preſcribeth (as to our ſelves) all true excellency of Diſpoſition and Practice, all the beauteous-beneficial Duties and Virtues towards Men, and the moſt eximious Piety towards God, which is μακάρων ὁδός, *the way of the bleſſed Livers*, as the Oracle calleth Piety. To this Law all the Pſalmiſts Elogies of the Divine Law of right do belong, and that honourary Name which the Jews give to their Law כלי חמדה *a Veſſel of Deſires.*

VII. The Chriſtian Religion is not only God's Teſtament, his Covenant and his Law, but his *New Teſtament, his New Covenant and his New Law.* Which hath been (ever ſince the riſe of it) a principal Objection againſt it and a principal Reaſon of that courſe uſage, which it hath met with in the World. For *Galerius* perſecuted the Chriſtians (z) becauſe they forſook the ancient Religion, *the Religion of their own Parents. Suetonius* in the Life of *Nero* ſaith, *the Chriſtians were puniſh'd; A ſort of Men of a new and maleficient Superſtition.* To this *Nero* had regard in his Perſecutions, as appeareth from an Inſcription (*a*) which in Memory of him was found in *Spain*, wherein he is ſaid to have purg'd the Province of Robbers, and of thoſe that obtruded a new Superſtition upon Mankind. So the Pagans uſually reproach'd Chriſtianity as *new Doctrine*, Act. 17. 19. *a new Superſtition, the new Religion*, that was but of Yeſterday, deſtitute of antiquity, and the adverſary to the ancient Religion. (*b*) *You uſually object to us* (ſaith *Arnobius*) *that our Religion is novel.* So *Lucian* reproacheth Chriſt *as the great Man crucified in Palæſtine who introduc'd the new Religion.* S. *Paul* was counted *(c) the inventor of new Laws alien from Nature. (d) The Chriſtians introduce among us* (ſaid the Pagans) *a new and ſtrange Religion.* —— (*e*) *ſeris novellum commenti genus.* Although there are ſome that affect innovation (*f*) and deſpiſe antiquity (like the *Epicureans*, who boaſted, that they walked in an untrodden Path, and trod not in the Foot-ſteps of the Philoſophers

---

Is. 28. 16.

(u) Ὡς πλωτῖνός φησι· τί ζητήσαι λαβεῖν εὖ ἔχων. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 8. p. 280.

(w) Κενεῶν δ' ἐλπίδων χαῦνον τέλος. Pindar. Nem. Od. 8.

(x) Stob. Ecl. Phyſ. l. 1. c. 9.

(y) Plutarch. in Num.

(z) *Euſeb. E. H. l. 8. c. 17.*

(a) *Ob provinciam latronibus & his qui novam generi humano ſuperſtitionem inculcabant, purgatum.*

(b) *Nobis objectare conſueſtis novellam eſſe religionem noſtram.* Elmenh. in Arnob. p. 19. & in Min. Fel. p. 43.

(c) Τῶν καινῶν καὶ ἀλλοτρίων τῆς φύσεως νόμων εὑρετής. *Vita S. Thecl. p.* 239.

(d) Ξένην τινὰ καὶ καινὴν εἰσάγουσιν ἡμῖν θρησκείαν. *Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 5. *c.* 1.

(e) *Prudent. in agon. Fructuos.*

(f) *H. Stephan. Apol pro Herod. initio. Phot. Cod.* 243. *Col.* 1083.

Philoſophers that were before them) yet the generality of Men have a great (if not an extravagant) regard for Antiquity, they glory in it and are govern'd by it. In Humane Societies thoſe of the Elder Age are thought fitteſt to Govern, and their Elder Age carrieth with it a Venerableneſs and Authority, whence the Names that properly ſignifie Elder Age, are become Names of Authority, and ſignifie thoſe of greater Rank, that bear Rule over others. (g) As πρεσβύτεροι, *Elder*, *Senior* (the Jewiſh Sanherdrim were called *Seniores*, and *Abraham*'s chief Servant the Elder of his Houſe) the Arabick *Sheich* or *Cheque* and our Engliſh *Ealderman.* In ſecular Nobility-Learning Antiquity ennobleth Nobility it ſelf (*h*) for recent Nobility is not counted plenary Nobility, *novus homo*, importeth an ignobleneſs and diſparagement, there muſt be a competent Antiquity of riches and ſplendour of Family, to conſtitute plenary Nobility. In the account of Holy Scripture Ancientry is honourable; for the Ancient is the honourable, *Iſa.* 9. 15. and with honourable reſpect the Scripture ſpeaketh of *ancient things*, 1 Chron. 4. 22. *ancient People*, Iſa. 44. 7. *an ancient Nation*, Jer. 5. 15. *ancient Land-marks*, Pro. 22. 28. *an ancient River*, Judg. 5. 21. *ancient Paths*, Jer. 18. 15. *ancient Mountains*, Deut. 33. 15. *ancient Kings*, Iſa. 19. 11. *ancient Men*, Lev. 19. 32. Amongſt the Sons of the ſame Father the eldeſt is counted moſt worthy and honourable; divers Nations have contended for Antiquity, and the *Arcadians* would be before the Moon, ſo highly did they affect Seniority and Antiquity. Both Jews and Chriſtians have been ſeveral times put upon it, to prove the Antiquity of their Religion and Records; and becauſe *Moſes* appeareth, to have been the moſt ancient Law-giver, this hath gain'd him no ſmall Honour and Authority. Cuſtoms gain Credit and Authority by their Antiquity, the more ancient they are, the more inviolable. By their Antiquity they gain in the minds of Men a Sanctity and Authority, and ſeem (as *Quintilian* ſaith of the Salian Verſes) *longo conſecrata tempore*, *ſacrated by length of time.* Men are diſpos'd to reverence thoſe things, that have ſtood the ſhock of Ages, which have an Affinity with *the ancient of Days*, and a Priority, Precedence, Paternity or Father-hood, of which Juniors muſt be obſervant. (*i*) *For ancient Doctrines as by an hoary Ancientry having a Reverendneſs, in ſome ſort command Ingenuity to aſſent.* Antiquity therefore is (in ſome degree) honourary, according to that of *Ariſtotle* (*k*) τιμιώτατον μὲν γὰρ τὸ πρεσβύτατον, *that which is moſt ancient is moſt honourable.* The old Paths ought to have been of great regard with the Jews, *Jer.* 6. 16. they are reproached for ſacrificing *to new Gods whom their Fathers knew not.* Deut. 32. 17. Judg. 5. 8. and in a controverted Caſe our Saviour appealeth to true Antiquity (*ævi melioris conſuetudo*) *from the beginning it was not ſo.* Matth. 19. 8.

Antiquity is Honourary, but complicated with badneſs it is a diſparagement, and the attribute of Antiquity complicated with an Idea of badneſs (although not expreſly) uſually ſignifieth in a Senſe of diſparagement. (*l*) So ἀρχαῖος, (*old*) ſignifieth *inept* and *fooliſh.* (*m*) *Clemens* compareth the Sophiſts unto τὰ παλαιὰ ὑποδήματα, *old Shooes.* The *oldneſs of the Letter* is not commendable. *Rom.* 7. 6. *Nor are things which decay and wax old and are ready to vanquiſh away.* Heb. 8. 13. When our Saviour ſaith, *Matth.* 5. *Ye have heard, that it was ſaid by them of old times*, he intendeth to diſparage Antiquity becauſe of its imperfection; and the Heathen Writers call the ancient times τὸ μυθικὸν, *the fabulous age.* (*n*) *You* (Pagans) *ſay, that our things are more ancient and therefore moſt true and creditable. As if Antiquity was not the teeming Mother of Errour.* (*o*) παλαιὰ δὲ ἡ πλάνη· καινὸν δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια φαίνεται. *Becauſe Errour is old, Truth ſeemeth to be new.* Errour is the worſe for being old, and ſo are all Evils, an old Leproſie *Lev.* 13. 11. the old hatred, *Ezek.* 25. 15. to be old in Adulteries, *Ezek.* 23. 43. the old Serpent and the old Man. But if an evil Man be reform'd and meliorated, he becometh a new Man in an honourary Senſe, and his *newneſs* is his excellency, as the Philoſophic Emperour ſuppoſeth in his Precept. (*p*) Ἀνανέου σεαυτὸν, *renew thy ſelf or make thy ſelf new.* A new Song is ſo called in a Senſe of excellency, *Pſal.* 40. 3. *Apoc.* 14. 3. the new Edition of a Book is the beſt Edition, a new Garment tranſcendeth an old one, and old Trees bring forth but little Fruit ſmall and ſour, and at length ceaſe bearing, till they be good for nothing but fewel for the Fire. Things that are not otherwiſe bad become ſuch by being old (*Vetuſtas oleo tædium affert*) many and great are the imperfections of old Age, and to be old in reſpect of theſe imperfections, is not an excellency but a diſparagement. Antiquity therefore is Honourary, if not combin'd with badneſs, and newneſs is a diſparagement, if goodneſs and excellency doth not accompany it, and recommend it. But things and perſons may be either of an honourable or a diſhonourable Antiquity: And they may be of an honourable as well as a diſhonourable newneſs. The Taunts therefore of the Pontificians that call us *Novelliſts*, *New Goſpellers*, *New Reformers* (and think to ſilence us with *deſinat inceſſere novitas vetuſtatem*) are of no regard; for our Reformation was nothing elſe but a dutiful and virtuous Ἀνανέωσις, *making our ſelves new.* Themſelves will have new things (*q*) if received by the Church, had in Honour and Veneration, as much as if they were ancient: But we condemn their exotick Novelties. (*r*) *Nos nova omnia quæ Chriſtus non docuit, jure damnamus, quia fidelibus via Chriſtus eſt.* For the ſame reaſon we condemn their blind and ſtupid adherence to bad Antiquity (ſaying with *Ignatius* (*s*) ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖα ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός, *Chriſt Jeſus is to me all Antiquity*) wherein they ſymbolize with the Pagans, who thought it an impiety to queſtion Antiquity, whoſe beſt plea for the Inſtitutes of their Religion was their great Antiquity, (*t*) the Tradition of their Anceſtors and a great Conceit which they had of their Anceſtors Wiſdom, ſuppoſing with *Plato*, that οἱ παλαιοὶ κρείττονες καὶ ἐγγυτέρω τῶν θεῶν οἰκοῦντες, *the Ancients were better and nearer the Gods than we.* The Jews have (*u*) a like Conceit of the Wiſdom of their Fathers (or wiſe Men) and are not leſs zealous for the Religion and Traditions of their Fore-fathers. *Gal.* 1. 14. So that Chriſtianity at its firſt planting had this great difficulty to grapple with, an extravagant regard for Antiquity both in Jews and Pagans. The Martyr *Antipas* being carried before the Prefect, he would have perſwaded him (*w*) ὅτι τὰ πρεσβύτερα τιμιώτερα ἦν, *that the old Religion of Gentiliſm* was

(g) *Seld. Titles* p. 36, 502.

(h) *Tiraquell. de Nobil.* c. 19.

(i) Δυσωπητικὰ γάρ πως τὰ παλαιὰ τῶν δογμάτων, οἱονεὶ πολιᾷ τινι τῇ ἀρχαιότητι τὸ αἰδέσιμον ἔχοντα. *S. Baſil. de ſp. ſanct.* c. 29.

(k) *Metaph. l.* 15. c. 3.

(l) *H. Stephan. ſupr.*

(m) *Str. l.* 1. p. *m.* 205.

(n) *Antiquiora, inquitis, noſtra ſunt, ac per hoc fidei & veritatis pleniſſima. Quaſi vero errorum non antiquitas pleniſſima mater ſit.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 34.

(o) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. p. m. 4.

(p) *M. Ant.* l. 4. S. 4

(q) *Baron. ad an.* 363. n. 104.

(r) *S. Ambroſ. de Virgin.* l. 3.

(s) *Ep. ad Philadelph.*

(t) *Lactant.* l. 2. c. 7. & 5. c.

(u) *Hornbeek c. Jud. Proleg. S.* 3.

(w) *Dr. Ham. in Apoc.* 2.

was more venerable than Chriſtianity, which began but of late. The Pagan Prieſthood were for preſerving their Rites, (x) ὥσπερ ἱερὰ ἄσυλα, *ſacred and inviolate*, and recommended τὸ ἀμετάπτωτον, a conſtancy and unchangeableneſs in their Religion: of which the *Roman* Senate was a great inſtance, (y) of whom not a Man would be perſwaded by an Oration of *Theodoſius* (which he made a little before his death) to relinquiſh their ancient Rites, which they had retain'd from the beginning of their City, and which are called by *Zoſimus*, (z) τὰ ἐξ αἰῶνος πάτρια, *their Country-rites without a beginning*. (a) Both by the Greek and Roman Laws it was death κινεῖν τὰ ἀκίνητα, *to move theſe immoveables*, and to introduce any new Religion.

(x) *Jambl. de Myſt. S.* 7. c. 5.
(y) *Baron. ad an.* 395. n. 24.
(z) P. 324.
(a) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 4. c. 1. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. p. 189.

VIII. But the Chriſtian Religion muſt have ſuch a Name (b) as the *Athenians* gave to the thirtieth Day of the Month (on which Day the Moon was both old and new) which they call'd Ἔνη ϗ νέα, *old and new*. For this Religion was ordained before the World, in reſpect of an initial Introduction of it and Inſtitution to it, it is coeval with the World, for the holy Men of the eldeſt times were of this Religion. Upon which account our Saviour hath a Seniority and Ancientry before *Abraham* (the grand Senior of the Faithful) and before all the Saints of the Old Teſtament-times, *Joh.* 8. 56, 57, 58. *Your Father* Abraham *rejoyced to ſee my Day: and he ſaw it and was glad. Then ſaid the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty Years old, and haſt thou ſeen* Abraham? *Jeſus ſaid unto them, Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Before* Abraham *was, I am.* The carnal Jews had a great honour for *Abraham*, and our Saviour telleth them, that *Abraham* had a great honour for him, and *rejoyced to ſee his Day*. This the Jews underſtood as an affirmation, that *Abraham* had ſeen him and he had ſeen *Abraham*, and that they were Contemporaries; which the Jews could not but think extravagantly ſtrange and impoſſible. But our Saviour not content, to amuſe them with ſuch a ſtrange Propoſition, addeth another, which in the ſound of it ſeem'd more ſtrange and impoſſible; for he telleth them (with a repeated aſſeveration) *before* Abraham *was*, *I am*. If by theſe words he had meant to ſignifie his Exiſtence from Eternity, he would have ſaid, *before* Abraham *was*, *I was*, not *I am*. His ſaying *I am*, certainly meaneth *I am* as being the Meſſiah; for this is the meaning of *I am* (ſo it is in the Original) in theſe following Diſcourſes of our Saviour, *Joh.* 4. 26. *ch.* 8. 24, 28. *ch.* 13. 19. This was agreeable to our Saviour's Buſineſs (which was to be known and owned as the Meſſiah) to ſpeak of his being the Meſſiah, and accordingly he ſpeaketh of *his Exiſtence in his Day*, which is to ſpeak of his being the Meſſiah. He cannot mean therefore his Exiſtence from Eternity: nor can he mean (as the followers of *Socinus* interpret his words) *I am the Meſſiah before* Abraham *be or be made* (the Father of many Nations;) for *Abraham* is manifeſtly conſider'd in this Diſcourſe as a grand Senior in reſpect of Time, and the Contexture of it ſheweth, that our Saviour's Intention is, to aſſert his own Seniority and Ancientry; and conſequently the Greek words cannot fairly be rendred otherwiſe than they are in our Tranſlation, *Before* Abraham *was*. The Learned *Grotius* interpreteth the words to mean, that Chriſt was before *Abraham by Divine Conſtitution or Appointment*, againſt which Interpretation *Placæus* hath made ſeveral Objections, the principal of which would ſignifie nothing, if *Grotius* had thus clearly and fully expreſs'd his Senſe; *In the order and ſucceſſion of things in the Divine Conſtitution before* Abraham *was*, *I am*. In the Divine Conſtitution of things the Meſſiah is firſt, before all and ſenior unto all; *Abraham* and his Affairs were in order to the Meſſiah, and conſequently our Saviour might juſtly ſay, *In the Divine Conſtitution I am* Abraham's *Predeceſſor*. But it muſt be acknowledg'd, that our Saviour is not ſpeaking only of his Exiſtence in the Divine Conſtitution, but of *his real Exiſtence in his Day*; and his words muſt be underſtood to ſignifie, *Before* Abraham *was*, *I am in real Exiſtence in my Day*. Which cannot be true, if it be underſtood touching the Order and Succeſſion of time: but is moſt true, if it be underſtood touching the Order and Succeſſion of things. For the real Exiſtence of the Meſſiah in his Day (as maker of the New Teſtament) is the antecedent and procuring cauſe of all ſaving Benefits (which the ancient Saints had) and the Conſideration whereupon they are granted. As to the Order and Succeſſion of things therefore his real Exiſtence in his Day is before *Abraham* was *Abraham*, before he was juſtify'd, before he became the Father of the Faithful, or was made the Father of many Nations. And conſequently our Saviour might juſtly affirm, *Before* Abraham *was as* Abraham, *I am in my Day*. As if *Will.* the Conquerour of an hundred Slaves ſhould make an hundred Free-men in conſideration of a great payment, which Queen *Elizabeth* ſhould make in her Day; it is manifeſt, that Queen *Elizabeth* might juſtly ſay, *Before thoſe Free-men were*, *I am in my Day*, as being the antecedent cauſe of their Freedom. As Chriſt was *Abraham*'s Senior and Anteceſſor, ſo *John* the Baptiſt owneth him for his Senior and Anteceſſor, *Joh.* 1. 15. *He that cometh after me*, ἔμπροσθέν μȣ γέγονεν, *was before me*, ὅτι πρῶτός μȣ ἦν, *for he was my pre-eminent*. Our Saviour came after *John* the Baptiſt in one ſenſe, but not in another; was his follower in one ſenſe, but not in another. (c) He did not lacky after *John* as his Junior, but was before him and his Senior in the order of Divine Deſtination, as being his pre-eminent in worth and dignity, deſign and deſerved regard, and in the buſineſs of the Baptiſts miſſion and coming. His Senſe is, *He that cometh after me*, was ὁ ἐρχόμενος (He that cometh) *before me*; for in this buſineſs of my miſſion and coming He was my pre-eminent: which implieth, that *he that cometh after me*, *is mightier* (or greater) *than I*, as the Baptiſt ſaith in the other Evangeliſts, *Matth.* 3. 11. *Mark* 1. 7. *Luk.* 3. 16. In order of time the Baptiſt came before Chriſt, but in the order of things he was after him; for in this œconomy of things *John* was not the primary perſon or of primary deſign, but as he ſaith, Chriſt was πρῶτός μȣ, *I was inferiour and ſubſervient to him in my miſſion and coming, and am in my Miniſtry and Quality an Undergratuate unto him.* (d) According to which Expoſition of the Text the laſt words of it (ὅτι πρῶτός μȣ ἦν) do not expreſs the cauſe or reaſon of the thing before aſſerted (our Saviour's prelation before *John*) but they are only an explanatory cauſe or reaſon of the foregoing Aſſertion and obſcure Saying (ἔμπροσθέν μȣ γέγονεν, *was before me*:) as if the Baptiſt had ſpoken thus; *I ſay, he was before me, becauſe in this divine œconomy of things he was my pre-eminent.* In ſuch ſenſe Chriſtianity is of Seniority and Ancientry to all things in the World.

(b) *Leo Allat. de menſur. temp.* c. 12. p. 147.
Muhammed ſaid, *Fui ego propheta, cùm Adamus adhuc inter aquam & lutum eſſet.* Pocock. ſpec. p. 158.
(c) *Vid. Petav, T.* 4. *par.* 1. *p.* 570.
(d) *Vid. Heinſ. Ariſtarch. ſac.* p. 282, 300, &c.

IX. Yet *Newneſs* is a principal Attribute of the Chriſtian Religion and of the things that are of kind and quality Chriſtian. For the Chriſtian Religion diſtinguiſheth things into *Old* and

New, confronteth and oppoſeth the old things (as diſſonant and heterogeneous) to the New and Chriſtian. The Chriſtian Birth is the *New Birth*, the Chriſtian Life is the *New Life*, the Chriſtian Man is the *New Man* (of new kind and quality) the Chriſtian Church is *a New Man* (as being the Church of Regenerate Chriſtians) her care muſt be, to purge out the *Old Leaven* (that ſowreth and defileth) and to be a *New Lump*. The Chriſtian *Iſrael* is the *New Iſrael* and the Chriſtian *Jeruſalem the New Jeruſalem*, the Chriſtian Doctrine is *New Doctrine*, the Chriſtian Name is *a New Name*, the Chriſtian Inſtitutions are compar'd to *New Cloath* and *New Wine* (that would not fadge with the Old) the Chriſtian God-ſervice is *in newneſs of Spirit*, the Chriſtian way of addreſſing and approaching to God is *a new and living way*, the great Chriſtian Commandment is *a New Commandment*, the Chriſtian Creation is *the New Creation*, and the Chriſtian Teſtament or Covenant is the *New Teſtament or Covenant*. (e) *Chriſtianiſm is neither Helleniſm nor Judaiſm*, ἀλλά τις καινὴ ϰ̀ ἀληθὴς θεοσοφία, *but a certain new and true Theoſophy, and the Name ſheweth its newneſs*. The Emperour *Conſtantine* called it, (f) *νέαν παιδείαν, the new Diſcipline*. Chriſtians call themſelves and their Religion, (g) καινὸν γένος ϰ̀ ἐπιτήδευμα, *a new Generation and Inſtitute*. The newneſs of it appeareth in the Title, which our Holy Books carry in the Front of them ἡ καινὴ Διαθήκη, *The New Teſtament, Law or Covenant*. Of which Name of the Chriſtian Religion there are various Reaſons. For, (1.) It denoteth, that the Chriſtian Religion is *a Settlement or Conſtitution of things but* * *newly made and publiſh'd*, ſince the fullneſs of time pre-ordain'd of God was accompliſh'd. Agreeably whereto *Celſus* (truly enough but maliciouſly) calleth Chriſt τὸν ἔναγχος φανέντα, *He that appear'd but of late time*. The *laſt times* are a Phraſe, which the Scripture uſeth, to denote the Times of Chriſtianity, as ſome ſuppoſe: but more probably it denoteth, the laſt Times of the Judaical Commonwealth, which are co-incident with the Times of the Meſſiah, *Act*. 2. 17. *Heb*. 1. 2. Until the laſt times the Judaical Settlement of things continu'd in force, and ſo long the New Settlement was not made, *Col*. 2. 14. *Heb*. 8. 13. The New Teſtament is (h) τελευταῖος νόμος, *the laſt Law of God*. (2.) The Name denoteth, that it is *a Settlement of a new Nature and of oppoſite kind and quality to the Old Settlement of things*. For the Settlement of Saving Grace and the Settlement of the Law-religion, The Covenant from Mount *Sion* and the Covenant from Mount *Sinai*, are of oppoſite kind and quality. (i) Moſes *delivered a Law in Mount* Sinai, *which is called The Old Teſtament, becauſe it hath Earthly Promiſes: and by Jeſus Chriſt a New Teſtament was to come, in which the Kingdom of Heaven ſhould be promiſed*. (3.) The new Settlement is ſo denominated, *becauſe it is the Settlement of new matters*. The matters which Publick Settlements are converſant about, are the matters of this Divine Settlement, but they are new matters of *Dominion* and *Property*, of *Society* and *Government*, of *Sovereignty* and *Subjection*, of *Loyalty* and *Virtue*, and the matters of a new kind of Life and Learning, Warfare and Confederacy, Freedom and Nobility, Citizenſhip and Inheritance: (k) καινῶς τουτέστι ξένως, *that which is new, is ſtrange and unuſual. Thou bringeſt certain ſtrange things to our Ears*, Act. 17. 20. (l) *God made a new Teſtament; for the matters of the Jews and Greeks are old; but we of a third kind that worſhip newly are Chriſtians*. The matters peculiarly Chriſtian ſo far as they are peculiarly Chriſtian, are new: but many matters of this Inſtitution are not new, ſave only as they are made the matters of Chriſtian Inſtitution. For the Notices and Laws of Nature and the laudable Moralities of Jews and Heathens are parts of the Chriſtian Inſtitution, and muſt not only be obſerv'd by Chriſtians, but they muſt Chriſtianize in the obſervance of them; and this Chriſtianizing in the obſervance of them is a new matter. *To do good and to communicate*, is no new matter, but ſo to communicate, as to chriſtianize in doing it, is a new matter. (4.) The Chriſtian Settlement is called *The new Settlement*, to ſignifie, that it is *of new and unuſual goodneſs and excellency*. For ſo in good Authors (m) things are denominated *New*, ſometimes to ſignifie, that they are of an *unuſual greatneſs* (as *Servius* upon *Virgil* ſeveral times expoundeth *novus* by *magnus*:) ſometimes they are denominated *New*, to ſignifie, that they are of an unuſual goodneſs and excellency. *Pollio & ipſe facit nova carmina*, Pollio maketh new Verſes, that is, eximious mirandous Verſes, which are of an unuſual goodneſs and excellency. (n) *Novum dicitur, quod ob excellentiam habet admirationem*, That is called New, which is had in admiration for its unuſual goodneſs and excellency. In ſuch ſenſe the Scripture ſpeaketh of *new Heavens and a new Earth, the new* Jeruſalem, *and a new Name, which no Man knoweth, ſaving he that receiveth it*. It is a Name therefore of new, unuſual and unheard-of Excellency. So the *new Song*, Apoc. 14. 3. *None could learn, but they which were redeemed from the Earth*. It is a Song therefore of new and unheard-of Excellency. So that immortal Joy which is the Wine of the Kingdom, our Saviour calleth *New Wine*, Matth. 26. 29. to ſignifie, that it is of new and unheard-of Excellency. The New Teſtament is of this nature, whence *Gr. Naz.* calleth it, (o) τὴν μεγάλην διαθήκην, *the great Teſtament*. For the Promiſes of God in this New Teſtament (ſaith his Commentator *Elias Cret.*) *exceed all that Ear can hear, or Mind can conceive*. (5.) The Chriſtian Settlement is called *The New*, to ſignifie, that it is *always New*, as always retaining the freſhneſs of its Beauty and Vigour, without any thing of oldneſs in a ſenſe of diſparagement. *Arnobius*, to wipe off the reproach of Novelty from Chriſtianity, telleth the Heathen, (p) *quandoque & ipſa vetus fiet*, in proceſs of time it will become old, *as the Heathen Religion was once new, and was now become old*. It muſt be acknowledg'd, that this new Religion in proceſs of time becometh of long ſtanding in the World and in ſuch ſenſe old; but becauſe it will be always new to Mankind (who are not born Chriſtians) becauſe it will never be antiquated, and becauſe it will always retain the Virtues and Excellencies of Newneſs, therefore it will always continue the New Religion; as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith of the Church, (q) οὐδέποτε γηρᾷ, ἀεὶ δὲ ἀκμάζει, *it never waxeth old, but is always in vigour*, or like an Houſe, that without any ſullying or decay always continueth a new Houſe, according to that in the Book of *Job*, *Gloria mea nova erat mecum, my Glory was new or freſh in me*. (r) *Novo non aliud ſuccedit*, No Teſtament ſucceedeth the New Teſtament: but (s) *ideò vetus Teſtamentum vocatur, quia per novum aboletur*, therefore the Old Teſtament is ſo called, becauſe it is antiquated by the New.

---

1 Pet. 2. 2. Rom. 6. 4. Eph. 4. 24. and 2. 15. 1 Cor. 5. 3. Gal. 6. 16. Apoc. 3. 12. Mar. 1. 27. Apoc. 2. 17. Matth. 9. 16, 17. Rom. 7. 6. Heb. 10. 20. Joh. 13. 34. 1 Joh. 2. 8. 2 Cor. 5. 17. Matth. 26. 28. Heb. 8. 13. and 9. 15. and 12. 14.

(e) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 1. c. 5.

(f) Dr. Ham. pract. cat. B. 2. S. 3.

(g) J. Mart. Ep. ad Diognet. p. 492.

* S. Aug. c. duas Epiſt. Pelag. l. 3. c. 4.

(h) J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 228.

(i) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 18. c. 11.

(k) S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. Hom. πϛ.

(l) Νέαν ἡμῖν διέθετο διαθήκην· τὰ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων ϰ̀ Ἰουδαίων παλαιά· ὑμεῖς δὲ, οἱ καινῶς αὐτὸν τρίτῳ γένει σεβόμενοι, Χριστιανοί. Clem. Strom. l. 6. p. m. 458.

(m) Martin. Lex. in voce Novus.

(n) Cameron in Mat. 26. 29.

(o) Or. 4. p. 124.

(p) L. 2. p. 93.

(q) T. 5. p. 93.

(r) S. Hier. Com. in Eſai. c. 54.

(s) S. Aug. in Pſal. 104.

X. The Name of the Chriſtian Religion (ἡ καινὴ Διαθήκη) implieth, that to be a Chriſtian Religioniſt, is to be a Religioniſt of the new Covenant *an holy new Covenanter.* As the Jews were the Holy People, in the ſtate of Society with God as their God, and they became ſuch by being the People of *the holy Covenant*, Dan. 11. 28, 30. So the Religion of Chriſtians is their Covenant, and they become Chriſtians by being Parties in it, (t) καθομολογήσαντες ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, *profeſſing themſelves to God, that they will no more live to themſelves, but to him that died for them.* His Name is *Sponſus Eccleſiæ*, which importeth, that the Church is joyned to him by a Marriage-covenant. Nor are any called by his Name, but they that profeſs, (u) *that Chriſt* is their Lord, which is their common Faith, Profeſſion and Covenant, *Rom.* 10. 9. *ch.* 14. 9. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *ch.* 8. 6. *ch.* 12. 3. 2 *Cor.* 4. 5. *Eph.* 4. 5. *Phil.* 2. 11. If Chriſt was meerly a publiſher of Doctrines, it might be ſufficient, to believe his Sayings; if he was meerly a Expiator of Sin, it might be ſufficient, to rely upon his great Propitiation; but ſeeing He is eſſentially and eminently an Eſtate of Sovereignty and Government, therefore to be one of his Relatives and Religioniſts, neceſſarily importeth ſuch a due acknowledgment of his Sovereignty as that of the Prophet, *Iſa.* 44. 5. *One ſhall ſay, I am the Lord's, and another ſhall call himſelf by the Name of* Jacob, *and another ſhall ſubſcribe with his Hand unto the Lord, and ſurname himſelf by the Name of* Iſrael. So we Chriſtians (w) ὥσπερ ἔγγραφον ὁμολογίαν κατεθέμεθα, *have made a Bond or written Contract as it were, to be dead unto Sin and the World and live unto Righteouſneſs:* (x) οἱ Χριστοῦ Χριστιανοί, *Chriſtians are thoſe that are Chriſt's People* (in contradiſtinction to Aliens) his Citizens and Societiſts; they are to him in the ſtate and relation of Servants to a Lord, Diſciples to the Maſter of their Inſtitution, Clients to a Patron, Subjects to a Sovereign; into which ſtate and relation they cannot enter but by their expreſs Conſent and ſolemn Baptiſmal Covenant, wherein they undertake (y) *in Society with Chriſt and in conformity to him, to be crucify'd, to die, to be buried, to be planted, raiſed.* By way of Covenant and Profeſſion they become *dead unto Sin* (utterly parted from it, never to live in it, nor to ſuffer it to live in them any more) ſo that the ſinning life is gone with Chriſtians by their utter renouncing it, undertaking, promiſing, profeſſing to eſchew and mortifie it, 1 *Pet.* 4. 1. *For as much then as Chriſt hath ſuffered for us in the Fleſh, arm your ſelves with the ſame mind; for he that hath ſuffered in the Fleſh, hath ceaſed from Sin.* Chriſt became dead (ſuffered in the Fleſh) and thereby was freed from the puniſhment of Sin: So Chriſtians muſt be ſuch as are become dead (ſuch as have ſuffered in the Fleſh) and thereby ceaſe from the life of Sin; for he that is become dead (hath ſuffered in the Fleſh) hath ceaſed from Sin. To be a Chriſtian, is a matter of covenanting, God covenanteth for the Benefit-part of the new Covenant, and Man covenanteth for the Duty-part, the ſummary whereof is to ceaſe from the life and practice of Sin, and from the Vices and Vanities of the World, and never to look back to them any more. Agreeably to the *Pythagoreans* Precept, (z) *Having gone into the Temple turn not back; whereby they ſignifie, that he who betaketh himſelf to God, ſhould not be double-minded, nor adhering to humane things.* But the Chriſtians Covenant is alſo of great affinity with the *Roman* Souldiers military Oath, (a) *that ſwear to follow their Leaders, whitherſoever they led them. Cæſaris milites patrem & matrem ejurabant & omnem proximum:* They renounc'd Father and Mother and every one that was next to them, *Luk.* 14. 26, 27, 33.

XI. That there are differences between the *Old Settlement* of the Law-religion (meaning thereby both the Political Law of the Jews and the Settlement of the Holy Spiritual Law) and *the New Settlement* of the Goſpel, is viſible from the Names of them: but how great and manifold theſe differences are, and wherein they conſiſt, is not ſo viſible. Theſe differences have been glanc'd at in ſeveral foregoing Diſcourſes: but becauſe they are of great importance and greatly illuſtrate the new and marvellous goodneſs and excellency of the Chriſtian Religion (according to its Name ἡ καινὴ Διαθήκη) we will here repreſent a ſummary account of them at one view.

(1.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppoſite in reſpect of their Religioniſts. For the Chriſtian Religioniſts are an oppoſite kind of Religioniſts to the Law-religioniſts. (b) *Our hope is not by the Law.* Gal. 2. 20. *I through the Law am dead to the Law* (parted from it, ſo as not to be a Law-religioniſt) *that I might live unto God*, as one of his kind of Religioniſts. The Law-religioniſts ought to be divorced from it and married to another, their Religion ought to be of kind and quality Chriſtian, *Rom.* 7. 4. *My Brethren, ye are become dead to the Law by the Body of Chriſt, that ye ſhould be married to another even to him who is raiſed from the dead, that we ſhould bring forth fruit unto God.* Expoſitors (to clear the meaning of this place) ſollicitouſly inquire, in what ſenſe Chriſtians are freed from the Dominion of the Law? (c) They have excogitated various Senſes, but have generally overlook'd the Apoſtle's Senſe. For his deſign is, to alienate the Jews from the Law-religion, and to confirm them in Chriſtianity. They were ſometimes the Law-religioniſts, and then the Law-religion was their Husband. *Now a Woman which hath an Husband, is bound by the Law to her Husband, ſo long as he liveth: but if the Husband be dead, ſhe is looſed from the Law of her Husband. If while her Husband liveth, ſhe be married to another Man, ſhe ſhall be called an Adultereſs: but if her Husband be dead, ſhe is free from the Law; ſo that ſhe is no Adultereſs, though ſhe be married to another Man*, Rom. 7. 2, 3. The Jews therefore who ſometime had the Law for their Husband, were yet at liberty to be married unto Chriſt, becauſe the Law (their firſt Husband) was in this ſenſe dead by the Body of Chriſt, *It had loſt its power of obliging them to be its Religioniſts.* God's new Settlement of things was made by the death of Chriſt, whence both Jews and Gentiles are obliged, to become his Religioniſts, and not to live any longer to the Law as its Religioniſts. So far the Law is dead, and they are dead to the Law. If the Chriſtian Settlement ought to take place, the other is neceſſarily out of date, *Heb.* 7. 12, 18. *ch.* 8. 13. *Eph.* 2. 15. *Col.* 2. 14. *Gal.* 3. 19, 25. *ch.* 6. 15.

(2.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppos'd in reſpect of *Excellency, Perfection and Duration.* (d) *Quamvis vetera priora ſint tempore, nova tamen anteponenda ſint dignitate.* So the Holy Writers diſcourſe, that the Moſaic (Ritual) Law was but an adumbration of the Divine and Heavenly things of the New Teſtament, *that the New is the better Covenant, that the Commandment going before is diſanull'd for the weakneſs and unprofitableneſs thereof, that the Law was delivered by Angels, but the Goſpel by the Son of God* (and it is but reaſonable (f) to ſuppoſe, that the new Law is tranſcendently excellent, ſeeing the perſon imploy'd to deliver it, is tranſcendently excellent) that the Law was to the Jews *a pedagogue unto Chriſt*, that his Sacrifice maketh *Reconciliation for Iniquity*, his Teſtament *bringeth in everlaſting Righteouſneſs, is the everlaſting Covenant, and if that which was done away was glorious, that which remaineth excelleth in glory*, 2 Cor. 3. 10, 11.

(t) S. Baſil. de Bapt. l. 1. p. 652.

(u) *Qui Chriſtianus dicitur, Chriſtum ſe habere Dominum profitetur.* De vit. Chriſtian. lib. inter oper. S. Aug. T. 9.

(w) S. Baſil. ſupr. p. 670.

(x) Clem. ſtr. l. 1. p. m. 258.

(y) Συνεσταυρῶσθαι τῷ Χριστῷ, συντεθνηκέναι, συντετάφθαι, συμπεφυτεῦσθαι, συνεγηγέρθαι. S. Baſil. ſupr. p. 662.

(z) Εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀπερχόμενος μὴ ἐπιστρέφου· ἐνδεικνύμενοι, ὅτι τὸν εἰς Θεὸν ὁρμηθέντα οὐ χρὴ διγνώμονά τι ἔχειν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀντεχόμενον. Simplic. in Epict. Ench. c. 74.

(a) Herald. in Arnob. p. 65, 131. Elmenhorſt in Arnob. p. 61.

(b) J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 228.

(c) V. Suarez de Leg. l. 9. c. 13.

(d) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 20. c. 4.

(3.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppoſite in their *Promiſes*; for in the Law-religion there is either no Promiſe, or no available Promiſe of Life Eternal or of any Spiritual Benefit; and there is a meaſurable oppoſition in their Doctrine and Precepts. For the Doctrine concerning Chriſt and Salvation by him is oppoſite to the Law-religioniſts Religion, which (as preceptive) is *not of Faith*, that is uſually oppos'd to the Law-religion. (g) *Non Lex Eccleſiam congregavit, ſed Fides Chriſti*, The Church of God was not gather'd by the Law, but by the *Faith of Chriſt* (on which ſhe is founded) which is not old but new Law. The great Commandment whereof is not any part of the Law-religion (*This is his Commandment, that we ſhould believe on the Name of his Son Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 Joh. 3. 23.) Nor is there any Commandment in the Law touching *the New Society Love as ſuch* (which is the Chriſtian kind of Love and the Love of Chriſtians as Chriſtians) it is contradiſtinguiſh'd to the Commandment of Charity in the old Law, *Joh.* 13. 34.

(4.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppos'd as *Law* and *Grace*; for the Law-religion is ſo Law, as not to be Saving Grace, and the Goſpel is the Law (the Settlement and Diſpenſation) of Saving Grace. The one is the Settlement of what is matter of Law-juſtice, the other is (h) *Grace juſtifying the Ungodly and freeing thoſe polluted by Sins from all Criminality*. They are not meerly pardon'd, but dignify'd and preferr'd to an high and honourable eſtate of alliance with God (far beyond what any merits of Man can pretend to) not only without any antecedent merits, but againſt their demerits. His Sovereign Grace and Kindneſs was the ſupreme cauſe, that mov'd him to make this Divine Settlement, and in the ſeveral Branches of it tranſcendent and exuberant Grace appeareth (as in forgiving all Treſpaſſes, receiving returning Prodigals with the greateſt expreſſions of Endearment, predeſtinating us to the adoption of Children, not ſparing his own Son, but giving him to death for us all, and giving us with him all things) *the Glory of his Grace, the Riches of his Grace, the exceeding Riches of his Grace* (Grace to a Pleonaſm and the height of miracle) *the abundance of Grace*, and not only the *abundance*, but *ſuperabundance*. For the Law entred, and Sin abounded: but when Sin had abounded, Grace over-abounded (abounded above the abounding of Sin) by a vaſt overflowing abolition of it, *Rom.* 5. 20. In the Law-religion there is an unpleaſing harſhneſs and rigour: but the Religion of Chriſtianity is the Goſpel (good tydings that ought to be receiv'd with joy) *the Goſpel of the Grace of God*, the Law of Kindneſs that is not to be called *The Law* but with ſome term of abatement (as the Law of Grace, the Law of Liberty) it is not a Code and Pandect of Impoſitions (a Bundle of harſh and rigorous Precepts) it bindeth no heavy Burdens grievous to be born, *it breaketh not the bruiſed Reed, nor quencheth the ſmoaking Flax:* but it is riches to the poor in Spirit, eaſe and refreſhment to the weary and heavy laden, a Balſam for the wounded Soul, a Magazine and Store-houſe of Conſolation for the penſive and afflicted. It doth not imperiouſly and minaciouſly command, but graciouſly invite, beſeech and perſwade Men, the Life and Spirit of it is a gracious Benignity, an Heavenly Sweetneſs and Graciouſneſs breatheth in the Style and Language of it, and the Terms of it are Terms of Sovereign Grace.

(5.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppos'd as *the Law of Works and the Law of Faith*, Rom. 3. 27. (i) *What is the Law of Faith? to be ſaved by Grace.* Works are thus far diſcarded in the Chriſtian Religion, in ſettling the ſtate of Righteouſneſs upon Men it hath no regard to any of their Works (whether better or worſe) antecedent to the Faith of Chriſt. Whether they have been of civil Converſation and laudable Humane Morals, or ſmooth external Religioniſts (as the carnal Jews were) or lewd and diſſolute Drunkards and Whoremongers (as the Sinners of the Gentiles were) none of theſe differences in their Morals create any difference in their method of obtaining Righteouſneſs; for all muſt obtain it in the ſame way and on the ſame terms; all muſt begin the world anew, and if they have any Heathen Virtues or Judaical Prerogatives and Law-religious practices, they muſt relinquiſh them, ſo as to become Chriſt's Believers, for whom the ſtate of Righteouſneſs and Salvation is provided in the Chriſtian Settlement by the Grace of God in Chriſt. But this is not the method of obtaining Righteouſneſs in the Law-religion. (k) *Lex merita examinat, Gratia fidem quærit.* The Law examineth Humane Merits (whether we have done the Works of the Law) the Religion of Grace inquireth, whether we are Chriſt's Believers or not?

(6.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppos'd as *Life and Death, Juſtification and Condemnation*; for the one is the Settlement of Death and Condemnation, the other of Righteouſneſs and of Life. (l) *Eſt in lege juſtitia, ſed non per legem juſtitia*: Righteouſneſs is in the Law, but cometh not by the Law. It is ſo far from affording Righteouſneſs to its Religioniſts, that by accident through their Carnality (not through any fault in the Law) it affordeth them their criminal and penal Evils. For Sin occaſionally operateth in them by the Law, it convinceth them of Sin, when they commit it, it maketh their Sin to be Sin (for if they had no Law, they could have no Sin) maketh them guilty and condemneth them for their ungodly ſinning againſt it, and ſo all the World is become guilty, in the ſtate of Condemnation and under the Divine Wrath. (m) *The Law is the accuſer of Sin, the miniſtration of Condemnation, whereby God hath ſhut up all in Sin, that he might have Mercy upon all.* The Law of Nature (natural Religion) is of this Nature; for thereby much of the truth of God and of their Duty is notic'd to Mankind, but they are improbous

(f) *Suarez de Leg. l.* 10. *c.* 8.

(g) *S. Ambroſ.*

(h) Χάρις δικαιοῦσα τὸν ἀσεβῆ καὶ παντὸς αἰτιάματος ἀπαλλάττουσα τοὺς ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις μεμολυσμένους. *S. Cyr. in Eſai. l.* 3. *T.* 6. *p.* 759, 916.

Eph. 1. 6, 7. *ch.* 2. 7. *Rom.* 5. 17.

(i) Τίς ὁ τῆς πίστεως νόμος; διὰ χάριτος σώζεσθαι. *S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. λογ.* 3. *p.* 47.

(k) *S. Ambroſ. in Pſ.* 43.

(l) *Idem Com in Luk. l.* 5. *p. m.* 52.

(m) Ὁ νόμος, ὁ τῆς ἁμαρτίας κατήγορος, ἡ τῆς κατακρίσεως διακονία, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα συνέκλεισεν εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. *S. Cyr. Glaph. in Deuter. p.* 430.

improbous Sinners againſt it (living in Ungodlineſs and Unrighteouſneſs) whence the Apoſtle perſwadeth all Men to become Chriſtians, and to enter into that State of Righteouſneſs, which God in Chriſt had provided for them, becauſe they were under Condemnation and Divine Wrath by ſinning againſt natural Religion.

(7.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppoſed as *The Letter and the Spirit*; for the Law-religion is the diſpenſation of the Letter and the Goſpel is the diſpenſation of the Spirit. (*n*) *The New Teſtament differeth from the Old, becauſe by the New the Law of God is written in the Heart of the faithful, which by the Old was written in Tables.* The Old Covenant therefore was meerly a diſpenſation of the Letter of the Divine Law (an external diſpenſation) but the New Covenant affordeth its Religioniſts vital Sanctity (the Law written in the Heart) which ſpeaketh it a diſpenſation of the Spirit and of ſanctifying Grace. Which Specific difference of the two Covenants equally concerneth the Law of Nature and the Moſaic Moral Law; for the Law of Nature being written only in the notional Mind, is (as it were) written only in external Tables. So that the Law-religion is no accommodate Religion for ſaving lapſed Sinners; for becauſe it affordeth no ſpiritual Life to its Religioniſts, it maketh them not truly Holy and Righteous, and not being ſuch they are ſubjected to Death and Condemnation by it, becauſe of their ungodly ſinning againſt it. It is weak and impotent, unable to prevail againſt the reigning of Sin; and becauſe it is meerly an external dead diſpenſation of the Letter, all the Law-religioniſts (Nature's Religioniſts) are the dead-formal Religioniſts (their Piety is dead, cadaverous, unholy and illegitimate) whereas the Religioniſts of the New Covenant are the true vital kind of Religioniſts. (*o*) Δικαιοῖ ἐν χάριτι ϗ ἁγιάζει τοὺς πεπιστευκότας, *by Grace it juſtifieth and ſanctifieth thoſe that have believed*, and planteth the Holy Life (not in the Surface only but) in the inmoſt Conſtitution of their Souls. Whence this Covenant is not eaſily broken, for this living Principle is a laſting Principle, *Jer.* 31. 32.

(8.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppoſed as *Bondage and Freedom*; for the one is the Religion of our Spiritual Servitude, Thraldom and Bondage, the other of our Spiritual Freedom. *Joh.* 8. 34, 35, 36. *Gal.* 4. 24, 25, 26. The Jews ſay (*p*) *The bleſſed God redeem'd us from Servitude, and we were made Free* (בני חורין filii ingenuorum vel nobilium) *and worthy of the Kingdom and the Majeſty.* At this day they ſwell with the Conceit of that mighty Honour and Happineſs, to which they were advanc'd by their liberation from the Egyptian Bondage; in their Paſchal Solemnity they phancy themſelves Princes (that have been Bond-ſlaves, but by Redemption are in a State of Freedom) they behave themſelves as Kings or Sons of Kings, aſſume Grandeur to themſelves, feaſt like Princes (eating Roaſt-meat) drink themſelves drunk, and are ſo highly elevated in their Cups, that (conceiting themſelves Princes) they glory over the Chriſtians as Slaves. Without ſymbolizing with them in their delirous extravagances Chriſtians may learn from them, that their Spiritual Freedom is their Ennoblement and their Happineſs (oppoſite to the baſeneſs and miſery of their Spiritual Servitude) that antecedently to their Redemption they are in the myſtical *Egypt*, that this their Redemption implieth, that Chriſt's Believers have a State of Freedom provided for them and ſettled upon them in his New Teſtament, and that becoming ſuch they ceaſe to be of vile and ſervile Condition (in reſpect of Spirituals) and paſs out of the State of Bond-ſlaves into a noble and happy Condition of Freedom, which compriſeth all Spiritual Immunities, Rights and Priviledges, and anſwereth to the *Canaan*-condition of Old *Iſrael*. (*q*) *Being juſtified we paſs into the true Freedom. When upon believing an Idolater was juſtified, that is, when he ſhook off his former ignobleneſs contracted by Sin, then he appear'd ſplendid and noble and of unſervile Condition.* The juſtifying Sinners is manumiſing them, unſervilizing and unſlaving them, thereby they are unſordify'd and ennobled, and are no more of ſervile quality and condition (improbous Villains and vile Miſcreants) but the Elect of God, his Sons and Heirs (which is the higheſt remove from Servitude) the Free Citizens of his Kingdom, Freeholders and Owners of a bleſſed Eſtate in it, and they are in reality, what Old *Iſrael* was in Type *a Royal Prieſthood.* Their Juſtification is of ſuch Affinity with their Freedom, that ſometimes δικαιῶσθαι, (to be juſtified) ſignifieth to be freed, yet not without reſpect to the Chriſtian Juſtification. *Act.* 13. 39. *By him all that believe are juſtified* (freed) *from all things, from which ye could not be juſtified by the Law of Moſes.* Rom. 6. 7. *He that is dead* δεδικαίωται, *is juſtified* (freed) *from Sin.* As he that is literally dead, ſo he that is dead according to Chriſtianity, *ſerveth Sin no more.* His ſtate of *Sanctification* is a ſtate of Freedom (from under his Egyptian Task-maſters, the reign of indwelling Sin) and the Spirit of the adopted Sons of God is a Child of God-kind of Spirit, which begetteth in them a ſenſe of God's Paternal Relation and Diſpoſition towards them, and a Child of God-kind of Diſpoſition and Behaviour towards God again. And they move in the Holy Paths from Judgment and Choice and from an unforc'd Inclination and Propenſion towards them; upon all which accounts they are not baſe *Serviliſts*, but *Filialiſts* in Religion. (*r*) *We Chriſtians ſay, that what the Jews* (the Law-religioniſts) *do out of fear, we do out of love. That they are Slaves, we are Sons; that they are conſtrain'd to good, we ſpontaneouſly embrace and practiſe it.*

(9.) Theſe Settlements of Religion are oppos'd as the *Fleſh* and the *Spirit*, *Unregeneracy* and *Regeneracy*, Gal. 3. 3. *ch.* 4. 23. Rom. 7. 5, 6. For the Law-religioniſts are in the ſtate of Unregeneracy and their Religion is to them the ſtate of Unregeneracy: The genuine Chriſtian Religioniſts are in the ſtate of Regeneracy, and their Religion is to them the ſtate of Regeneracy. The one the Apoſtle calleth *the Fleſh*, the other he calleth *the Spirit.* For *the Fleſh* denoteth Unregeneracy, as it ſignifieth *Carnality of Religion* (Carnal Judaiſm the oppoſite to Spiritual Judaiſm) *If any other Man thinketh, that he hath whereof he might truſt in the Fleſh, I more. Circumciſed the eighth day, of the ſtock of Iſrael.* Phil. 3. 3, 4. *What ſhall we ſay then, that Abraham our Father as pertaining to the Fleſh hath found?*

(n) *Diſtat à vetere Teſtamentum novum, eò quòd per novum ſcribitur Lex Dei in corde fidelium, quæ per vetus in tabulis ſcripta eſt.* S. Aug. de Sp. & Lit. c. 28 Rom. 2. 29. *and* 7. 6. *and* 8. 2, 9. 2 Cor. 3. 6, 8. Gal. 3. 14. *ch.* 5. 18. Jer. 31. 33. Heb. 8. 10.

(o) *S. Cyr. Glaphyr. in Deuter. p.* 428.

(p) *Hotting. de jur. Hebr. Lex* 13, 14, 19, 20. *Buxtorf. Synag. c.* 13.

(q) Δικαιούμενοι πρὸς ἐλευθερίαν τὴν ἀληθῆ διαβαίνομεν. Ὅτε πιστεύσας ἐδικαιώθη, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν, ὅτε τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δυσγένειαν ἀπεσείσατο, τότε πέφηνε λαμπρὸς ϗ εὐγενὴς ϗ ἐλεύθερος. *S. Cyr. in Joan. l.* 5. *p.* 537.

(r) *Dicimus quod Judæi propter metum faciunt, id nos facere propter charitatem. Illos ſervos eſſe, nos filios: illos cogi ad bonum, nos bonum ſponte ſuſcipere.* S. Hieron. Com. in Galat. c. 3.

Rom. 4. 1. (s) *Carnem dicens circumciſionem ſignificavit*, by *the Fleſh* the Apoſtle meaneth (a Rite of carnal Judaiſm) Circumciſion. The Fleſh denoteth Unregeneracy, as it ſignifieth *vital Carnality*. Rom. 8. 8. *They that are in the Fleſh, cannot pleaſe God.* Theſe are (t) *in ſtatu carnali*, they are the carnal kind of Men and the carnal kind of Religioniſts, and ſuch are the Law's Religioniſts. For the Apoſtle calleth (u) *ſtatum ſub lege* (the ſtate of Man under the Law) *ſtatum carnalem*, the ſtate of Carnality. The Family of Nature's and the Law's Religioniſts therefore are thoſe that are in the Fleſh; the genuine Chriſtian Family are thoſe that are in the Spirit. The new Settlement of Chriſtianity is the Religion of our Newneſs or Regeneracy. (w) *For this is the difference between the Law and the Goſpel, the Goſpel bringeth with it*, *gratiam regenerationis*, regenerating Grace. (x) *Chriſt is the Mediator of the New Teſtament*, καινῆς δὲ φημὶ τῆς εἰς καινότητα ζωῆς ἁγίας ἀναμορφοῦσης τὸν ἄνθρωπον, *I ſay of the new, which reformeth a Man into the newneſs of an Holy Life.* This the Chriſtian Religion affordeth, this it ſtrictly requireth, the ſtreſs of Man's Salvation it layeth upon his Regeneration (which in the Chriſtian Notion was never requir'd in any other Philoſophy or Inſtitution) all the Regenerate and none but they belong to the Chriſtian Settlement, the being a genuine Chriſtian conſiſteth in Regeneracy, and none that are totally Unregenerate, can duly like or affect Chriſtianity. Upon all which accounts the Chriſtian Religion is peculiarly the Religion and Inſtitution of Man's Regeneration.

XII. But the term Regeneration and many little Reſemblances of the Chriſtian Regeneration may be found in Judaiſm, Paganiſm, and in profane Authors. (y) For the Jews look'd upon their Proſelytes of Juſtice (whom they Baptiz'd) as new-born, as Infants newly come into the World; whence they ſuppos'd, that all their former Kindred ceas'd (their Father, Mother, Children, Brothers and Siſters were ſuch no more) together with their former Gentiliſm they were ſuppos'd, to put off all their former Kindred either by Conſanguinity or Affinity (Blood or Marriage) ſo that none of their former Kindred could inherit their Eſtate when they dy'd. Nor did they only put off their former Kindred, but their Country alſo; and the Jews were of Opinion, that at that Moment, when one of theſe Proſelytes ceas'd to be a Gentile, and became a Jew, a Soul from Heaven entred into his Body, his former Soul removing or vaniſhing away. And as the Jews had a ſort of Regeneration amongſt them, ſo of the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries and an Initiation thereinto it muſt be ſaid (z) *Hæc eſt nationum* παλιγγενεσία, this is the Gentiles Regeneration. They that were initiated into theſe Myſteries (after many Purgations and Expiations and five Years Preparatory Trial) relinquiſh'd that wild kind of Life which they liv'd before, and took up another form and way of living, and bound themſelves thereto (to an eximious Piety towards their Gods, and great Humanity, to exceed others, to eſchew Sins and live a better Life than other Men) whence theſe Myſteries were called *principia vitæ*, which Name ſpeaketh them a Regeneration. So certain Traditions concerning *Bacchus* are called by *Plutarch* (a) μῦθος εἰς τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν, *a Fable for Regeneration*, which he interpreteth *the caſtigation and ſubduing of the brutal and inordinate part.* A naſty Ceremony the Gentiles in latter times had called *Tauropolia*, which they alſo called Regeneration. (b) A Perſon ſate in a Pit under Ground (or the like place) which was cover'd with Boards, and then they ſacrific'd a Bull or Ram upon the top of the Pit, and his Blood dropt through the Boards upon the Perſon, and beſprinkled and bedaub'd him, and this Perſon was look'd upon as hereby conſecrated and regenerated, and was ſaid to be *Taurobolio Criobolioque in æternum renatus.* (c) *They are ting'd at certain ſacred times* (ſaith *Tertullian* of the Gentiles) *idque in regenerationem & impunitatem perjuriorum*, and that for Regeneration and impunity of their Perjuries. Many Regenerations are attributed to *Pythagoras*; for his Tranſmigration of Souls was called Regeneration; and amongſt the Greeks when thoſe that had been long abſent and were thought dead unexpectedly return'd Home, (d) they were look'd upon as *ex orco reduces* and δευτερογενεῖς, *born a ſecond time.* If when the funeral Rites had been perform'd for a Man as for one dead, and he came to life again, or if a Man had been ſaid to be dead in a far Country or in the Wars, and came Home again, ſuch an one was ſaid, to be born again. Amongſt the Philoſophers παλιγγενεσία, (Regeneration) ſignifieth the Reproduction, Renaſcence and Reviviſcence of things (e) τὴν φθορὰν ἐπανάγειν εἰς τὴν γένεσιν, *to reduce that which is corrupted into Generation.* The *Stoicks* thought, that the World would be deſtroy'd and reproduc'd, and this Reproduction of it is called by them (f) παλιγγενεσία τῶν ὅλων, *the Regeneration of the Univerſe.* So the Reſurrection of the Body (being our Reproduction and Reviviſcence) is called by the Fathers *Regeneration* agreeably to the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 1. 5. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Phyſicians uſe the term Regeneration; for if any Fleſh be loſt from any part of the Body the Reſtauration of it they call the Regeneration of it. (g) And *Cicero* calleth his Reſtauration to his Country and his Honours his παλιγγενεσία, *Regeneration.* They that are delivered from the danger of Death, let them look upon themſelves as *renati* born again (ſaith *Jul. Firmicus*;) becauſe they have a new Life (as it were) they are in ſome ſort born again. So any ſolemn day of eximious Joy and Gladneſs was called by the Ancients *Natalis*, a Birth-day; and *Hegio in Plautus* ſaith, *Dii immortales, iterum natus videor.* I ſeem to be born again (to have a new Life) becauſe he heard that his captive Son was come Home. Amongſt the Lawyers there is a ſort of Regeneration, which is of great Remark. (h) For if a Bond-ſlave amongſt the Romans was totally manumis'd and unenſlav'd (*plenâ donatus ingenuitate*) if he was ſo fully ſet at Liberty that he became a Roman Citizen, and was as fully Free, as if he had been Free-born, this the Law calleth *the Regeneration of him*, and he is ſaid to be Regenerate, becauſe he is made Free-born and hath the Birth-right given him; whereas he was a Slave before, he was now (as it were) new Born, becauſe he was as one Free-born, which the Law calleth *regenerationis jus.* In exotick Learning therefore ſuch Notices there are of Regeneration, which conſiderably illuſtrate the Regeneration that is in Chriſt's Religion, and which is ſo much the ſame thing with (Saving) Chriſtianity, that it may juſtly be counted but another Name of it.

XIII. For

(s) *S. Ambroſ. in loc.*

(t) *Cajetan. in loc.*

(u) *Idem in Rom.* 7. 5.

(w) *Calvin. in Jer.* 31. 33.

(x) *S. Cyr. in Eſai.* p. 542.

(y) *Seld. de J. Nat. & G. l.* 2. c. 2. *Marſham. Can. Chr.* p. 199. *Ed. Lipſ.*

(z) *Herald. in Arnob.* p. 84.

(a) *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 3.

(b) *Seld. de Synedr. l.* 3. c. 13. *Van. Dale Orac.* p. 162, 175.

(c) *Tertull. de Bapt.* c. 5.

(d) *Marſham. ſupr.*

(e) *Procl. in Tim.* p. 313. *Eugubin. de Per. Phil.* p. 234.

(f) *Gat. in Ant.* p. 385.

(g) *Liber. de S. Amore Ep. Theol.* p. 307, 308.

(h) *Seld. ſupr Calvin. Lex. in voce Natali*

XIII. For Regeneration denoteth and compriſeth both Regeneration of *State* and of *Nature*, both the Chriſtian State and the Chriſtian Life. If the *waſhing of Regeneration*, Tit. 3. 5. denoteth and compriſeth the Remiſſion of Sins (as it certainly doth and none can doubt of it that conſult *Act.* 22. 16.) then the State of Remiſſion of Sins and conſequently the State of *Adoption* and *Divine Citizenſhip* ought to be called in Theology *Regeneration of State*, as *reſtitutio natalium* (the ennobling a Slave with plenary ingenuity) is called by the Imperial Lawyers Regeneration. If the new Eſtate of things under Chriſt (i) is called the Regeneration, *Matth.* 19. 28. ſhall not that new Eſtate of Rights and Relations, which the Slaves of Sin becoming Divine Believers enter upon at their admiſſion into the Kingdom of God be look'd upon as part of their Regeneration? The Ancients thought ſo, as appeareth from their Phraſeology (k) *cùm ille nos in regnum ſuum per adoptionem ſacræ regenerationis aſſumpſerit.* Seeing he hath taken us into his Kingdom by the Adoption of ſacred Regeneration. His Kingdom is conſtituted by Regeneration of State (as well as Nature) for therein conſiſteth his manumiſing and infranchiſing Slaves, his naturalizing and endenizing Aliens, his making them Citizens and Sons of his divine and heavenly Family, and nigh that were far off. S. *Auſtin* ſaith of the predeſtinated (l) *regenerationis adoptione naſcuntur ex Deo.* By the Adoption of Regeneration they are Born of God. The Grace of Adoption is conferr'd upon a Chriſtian in his ſecond Nativity, and it muſt be conſider'd as a principal part of his Regeneration, becauſe it is a principal part of his ſecond Nativity; for it is his (m) *adoptiva nobilitas*, ennoblement of State and Condition. His Regeneration is nothing leſs than a paſſing out of one oppoſite State into another, out of the State of ſpiritual Servitude and Condemnation (the natural and legal Condition) into the State of Grace and Salvation, *a paſſing from Death to Life*, whence the word *Reſurrection* (n) ſometimes ſignifieth Regeneration. In Heathen Language it may be called *à Tartaro ad Tarteſſum migratio* (a paſſing out of the worſt into the beſt Eſtate;) and what *Pindar* ſaith of the Gods, is applicable to all regenerate Souls (o) *they have eſcaped the big-ſounding current of the Waters of* Acheron. Upon account of which happy change of State they may juſtly be look'd upon as a Son that *was dead and is alive again*, as *ex orco reduces* and δευτερογενεῖς, *born a ſecond time.*

With this Regeneration of State (which is relative) a real Regeneration of Life and Nature is complicated, in reſpect whereof there is great Analogy and Correſpondence between natural and ſpiritual Generation, the firſt Birth and the new Birth. For Generation is definitively (p) *a Production* of that which hath Life (every *Fœtus* is a living Creature;) and in like manner (q) *the Generation from above and from God is Life.* All that produce a thing from Non-exiſtence into Exiſtence are ſaid ποιεῖν *to make or effect*, (r) *but one that produceth his Productions with Life is a Father.* There is a Father (who begetteth into Life) both in the firſt and the ſecond Birth; and the Sons of the new Birth as well as thoſe of the natural Birth, have a Mother alſo. For they are *Sion*'s Children, who travaileth to bring forth Children unto God. *Lam.* 4. 2. *Iſa.* 66. 8. *Apoc.* 12. 1. *Jeruſalem which is above, is the Mother of them all.* Gal. 4. 26. (s) *Fathers are the cauſes of living Beings and project Seed with Life.* A Child is begotten by the vigour of the Seed of his Father, which is a vital Principle, and thereby he is alive and hath a vital Nature: So the regenerate Children of God are begotten by *the vital Seed of God in them* (by an holy vital Principle) and have an holy vital Nature (the holy Love-nature) which is abhorrent from all filthineſs, and deadly repugnant and inimical to all Wickedneſs. *Whoſoever is born of God his Seed remaineth in him, and he cannot Sin* (it is intolerably frightful and painful to him, wounding and deadly to his inward Life and Nature) *becauſe he is born of God.* 1 Joh. 3. 9. They are born of *the Seed of the Word*, but ſo as to be born of God by his Spirit, *which giveth Life* and reneweth them into his living Image, ſo that he is their Father and they are his Children, not meerly by Similitude and Imitation, but by ſupernatural Generation (t) *as the Children of this World that are generated and generate others* διὰ τὴν γένεσιν υἱοὶ ὄντες, *are Sons and Children becauſe of their Generation.* But becauſe they are regenerated into the Image of God, this their Generation from him is a cauſe and reaſon of their reſembling him (in all Purity and Sanctity, Grace and Goodneſs) the holy Life which is planted in them is a Child-like reſemblance of God, which conſtituteth them his living Images, as Children amongſt Men naturally reſemble their Parents, by whom they were generated. The forming the Divine Image in the Soul is analogous to the forming and ſhaping the *Fœtus* in the Womb in natural Generation (*Gal.* 4. 19.) and as by our natural Birth we are brought into the World, and born of a certain Stock and Family, but are not born without pangs and throws: So by the new Birth regenerate Chriſtians are born into a better World (the Kingdom of God) are born of the Divine Family, but (u) μετὰ τὸν λόγον τῶν τραυμάτων, *not till after the Divine Word hath wounded the Soul and cauſed compunction there.* Natural Generation is a Propagation of the Species (unleſs the Generation is equivocal) and the ſpiritual Generation is thus far a Propagation of the Species, the new Birth is the Saint of God-kind of Birth, the Holy God begetteth the Holy Kind, that are the Off-ſpring of the King of Saints as he is ſuch, and are Holy by Birth and by Kind. They are God-like (and therefore King-like) the Divine Image is the ennoblement of their Mind and Life, and they derive from their Birth and Parentage which is the truly noble (w) *vigore cœleſti ſublime pectus*, a breaſt ſublime by celeſtial vigour, a Mind too high for theſe low things, and too Holy to wallow in the defilements of Senſuality. (x) *For we, that having rejected our terrene Nativity are re-created and renew'd in Spirit* (or by the Spirit) *do not now live to the World, but to God.* The Chriſtian Life together with the Chriſtian State is compriſed in Regeneration, and it compriſeth alſo the Sanctification of the Body as well as that of the

---

(i) V. Grot. Not. in loc.

(k) S. Ambroſ. de Sp. ſanct. l. 2. c. 9.

(l) Tract. in Joban. 42.

(m) Leo M. Ser. 6. de Nativ. c. 3.

(n) Hotting. Diſſ. de Reſurr. p. 4.

(o) Βαρυβόαν πορθμὸν πεφευγότες Ἀχέροντοι. *Ap. Plutarch. de ſuperſtit. p.* 167.

(p) *Productio viventis à vivente ſimilis producenti in ſubſtantia & natura.* Luc. Holſten. Diſſ. 2. in loca quædam Con. Nic.

(q) Ζωὴ δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἄνωθεν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γέννησις. *Macar. Hom.* 30.

(r) Ὡς δὲ μετὰ ζωῆς παράγων ἀπεργάζει πατήρ. *Procl. in Tim. p.* 91.

(s) Ζώων εἰσὶν οἱ πατέρες αἴτιοι καὶ ζώντων τινῶν καὶ προετικοὶ σπερμάτων μετὰ ζωῆς. *Procl. Ibid.*

Jam. 1. 18. 1 *Pet.* 1. 23.

(t) *Clem. Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 338.

(u) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 281.

(w) *S. Cypr. Ep.* 8.

(x) *Nam qui expoſita nativitate terrena, ſpiritu recreati & renati ſumus, non jam mundo ſed Deo vivimus.* S. Cypr. ad Demetr.

Soul. (y) *The Body alſo* (having the Sanctity of a Temple) *is ſanctified, in which ſuch a Soul dwelleth.* (z) *The Spirit being ſanctified the Body muſt neceſſarily be Holy, which the ſanctified Spirit uſeth.*

Gal. 4. 27. Eph. 4. 24. XIV. The entrance into Chriſtianity and Godlineſs is Regeneration, which is *a putting on the new Man in the new Covenant and the new Birth.* It denoteth and compriſeth both the Fact of Man and the Grace of God. As it is a putting on the new Man in the new Covenant (and a putting off the old Man) it is the Fact of Man, *Col.* 3. 9, 10. as it is a putting on the new Man in the new Birth, it is the Grace of God. *Tit.* 3. 5. The Habits or Qualities of a Perſon the Scripture looketh upon as his Veſtment or Garment, and what any Perſon adjoineth to himſelf (as it were) in the Phraſe of the Orientals he is ſaid to be cloathed with and to put it on. So the *Samaritans* ſay of him, that doth not rightly obſerve the Sabbath (a) *non induit Sabbathum*, he doth not put on the Sabbath. One that is Religious is called by the *Syrians Indutus Deo*; a Follower of Chriſt is called *Indutus Chriſto, Indutus Meſſia.* So when the Spirit of God came upon *Zechariah*, becauſe it was adjoined to him, he is ſaid *to be cloathed with it.* 2 Chron. 24. 20. And the Hebrew Book *Coſri* ſaith of the Prophets (b) *induuntur ſpiritu ſancto*, they are cloathed with the Holy Spirit. Agreeably to which oriental Phraſe Chriſtians ſpeak (c) *Chriſti nomen induere.* In their Baptiſm they are ſaid, to *put on Chriſt*, and to put *on the new Man*, which is the ſame thing; for the new Man ſignifieth *that Perſon of Quality*, as the Apoſtle's words imply, *Gal.* 2. 20 *I am crucified with Chriſt: nevertheleſs I live*; *yet not I*; or as our former Engliſh Tranſlation hath it, *not I any more.* It is not I that now live, that Perſon of Qualities and Properties, nor that kind of Man (that Man of Carnality and Judaiſm) which was before; not the old Man which is *homo carnalis homo terrenus*, (d) *hominis terreni vetuſtas* (the carnal earthly Man) for I have put off the old kind of Liver and the old kind of Religioniſt, and *it is not I that now live* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *but Chriſt* (that Perſon of Quality, the new and Chriſtian kind of Man) *liveth in me.* Chriſt is the new Man in himſelf. *Et Deus & renovatus homo miſcetur in unum.* And unto us he is the new Man. (e) *He became the origine of another kind, that which is regenerated by him by Water and by Faith.* (f) *He is the Image and Character of God, by whom all that partake of him are made the Images of God.* In the deſign of his coming he is unto us the new Man. (g) *He would become the Son of Man, that he might make us the Sons of God. God was born of Man, that Men might be born of God. Chriſt redeem'd us and made us his Members* (h) *that in him alſo we might be Chriſt's.* (i) *Chriſt would be what Man is, that Man might be what Chriſt is.* (k) *Chriſt came to make the Mind new, the Soul new, and new Eyes, new Ears, a new ſpiritual Tongue, and to ſpeak ſummarily, to make his Believers new Men.* So that a genuine Chriſtian is (l) *a new Man transformed by the Spirit of God.* So by the ancient Writers of the Church a μετάπλασις, μεταστοιχείωσις, μεταποίησις, *Change and Transformation of the Soul* is attributed to Baptiſm, and they have ſtiled it φωτισμὸς, *Illumination*, θάνατος ἁμαρτίας, *the death of Sin*, ψυχῆς κάθαρσις, *the purgation of the Soul, ſacramentum ſanctificationis* (the Sacrament of Sanctification) *lavacrum vitale* (the vital Laver) *The ſecond Nativity, The ſalutary Nativity* (m) *nativitas Chriſtianorum in Baptiſmo eſt*, the Chriſtians Nativity is in Baptiſm. Which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if the external Rite of Baptiſm was the whole or the main of the Chriſtian Regeneration: But Regeneration is the buſineſs of Baptiſm, of which the new Covenant is the Subſtance. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. By faithful entring into the new Covenant a Chriſtian by way of Covenant and Profeſſion putteth on (n) τὸν ἐπουράνιον ϗ καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅς ἐστι χριστός, *the heavenly and new Man, which is Chriſt*; and upon his performing this Duty-part of the new Covenant (and in conjunction therewith) this Benefit-part of the Covenant accrueth to him in Baptiſm, *The renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.* But the external Rite of Baptiſm devoid of theſe is only an Image of Regeneration; and they that think otherwiſe, are like the *Trojans* (o) *that held the Image of* Helena *as her ſelf.* (p) *They are all but Images* (without Subſtance) *that Men have.* Notwithſtanding the external Rite of Baptiſm the generality of pretending Chriſtians are in the main too viſibly in their Unregeneracy, if a Father hath rightly defin'd Regeneration, (q) *By a ſpiritual Nativity to be made truly and indeed the Children of God.* (r) *What doth it profit any, that he is baptized, if he is not juſtified* (ſanctified?) He that is not in the Spirit (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) which is the State of Regeneracy, muſt not pretend, to be born of the Spirit: Nor can the ſign be of avail to him without the thing ſignified. (s) When in a time of great Mortality many betook themſelves to Baptiſm for fear of Death, an Angel is ſaid to have appear'd to *Peter* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and to have given him this Reprimand, *Quamdiu huc mittis marſupia iſta inania? How long wilt thou continue to ſend hither thoſe empty Bags that have nothing in them?* Such there are many Baptized, yet devoid of all Divine Grace, and though waſh'd in that ſacred Laver yet not cleanſed from their filthineſs.

It appeareth from the entrance into Chriſtianity, that it may be defin'd *The Inſtitution and Diſcipline of the new Man* (the Man of Regeneracy) that the Kingdom of Chriſtianity is the Region and Specific comprehenſion of Regeneracy, and that all things properly Chriſtian and all the Chriſtian kind of things are the things of Regeneracy. By divine Appointment *all old things* (the things of Unregeneracy) *are paſt away, all things are become new.* 2 Cor. 5. 17. Nothing now is to take place, but what is of Kind and Quality *new, divine and Spiritual*, the matters of Regeneracy. Such is the *Benefit-part* and the *Duty-part* of Chriſtianity; ſuch is the Chriſtian

---

(y) Ἁγιάζεται δὲ ϗ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ᾧ οἰκεῖ. *Clem. Str.* 6. *p. m.* 464.

(z) *Fieri non poteſt, ut ſanctificato ſpiritu, non ſit ſanctum etiam corpus, quo ſanctificatus utitur ſpiritus.* S. Aug. de bono viduit.

(a) *Hotting. Diſſ. de Reſur. p.* 27.

(b) P. 372.

(c) *S. Cypr. de Zel. & Liv.*

(d) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 13. *c.* 16.

(e) Ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονεν τοῦ ἀναγεννηθέντος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δι' ὕδατος ϗ πίστεως. *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 367.

(f) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 5.

(g) *Hominis filius eſſe voluit, ut nos Dei filios faceret. Quare filius Dei factus eſt homo, niſi ut homines faceret filios Dei? Deus natus eſt ex homine, ut ex Deo homines naſcerentur.* Ibid. T. 4. l. 2. c. 7, 8. & l. 12. c. 12.

(h) *Ut in illo & nos Chriſti eſſemus.* S. Aug.

(i) *Quod homo eſt, eſſe Chriſtus voluit, ut homo poſſit eſſe quod Chriſtus eſt.* S. Cypr. de Idol. van.

(k) Καινὸν νοῦν, ϗ καινὴν ψυχὴν, ϗ καινοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καινὰ ὦτα, καινὴν γλῶτταν πνευματικὴν, ϗ ἁπαξαπλῶς καινοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ ἦλθεν ἀπεργάσασθαι. *Macar. Hom.* 44.

(l) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 52.

(m) S. Cypr. Ep. 2, 7, 74.

(n) *Macar. Hom.* 42.

(o) Οἱ τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης εἴδωλον ἔχοντες ὡς αὐτήν. *Pho. Cod.* 247. *Col.* 1251.

(p) Πάντα εἴδωλά ἐστι τῷ ἀνδρί. *Ibid. Col.* 1270.

(q) *Nativitate ſpiritali vere Dei filios fieri.* S. Cypr. de op. & Eleemos.

(r) *Quid cuiquam prodeſt, quod baptizatur, ſi non juſtificatur? Quiſquis cupit pœnas evadere ſempiternas, non ſolùm baptizetur, verùm etiam juſtificetur.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 21. c. 27. & c. 16.

(s) *Baron. ad an.* 310. *n.* 13.

Covenant, the Chriſtian Birth, the Chriſtian State, the Chriſtian Life, the Chriſtian Family and Kindred (ἀδελφοῖ ἡ γέννησις ἡ διὰ πνεῦμα, (t) *Regeneration maketh Brethren*) the Chriſtian's Virtues (the Fruits of the Holy Spirit, *Gal.* 5. 22.) his Religious Worſhip and God-ſervice, *Phil.* 3. 3. his Righteouſneſs, Peace and Joy, which are the proper Goods of the Kingdom, *Rom.* 14. 17. Such are the Honours and Nobilitations, the vaſt Immunities, Rights and Priviledges, that are in Chriſtianity, the Chriſtian Riches and hidden Treaſures, the Chriſtian Manna and living Waters, the Chriſtian Citizenſhip, Freedom, Warfare, Sabbath, Prieſthood, (u) Temple, Sacrifices and Images. (w) *The Chriſtians World is another, their Table is other, their Garments are other, their Fruition is other, their Society and Communion is other, and ſo is their Sentiment; therefore they tranſcend all Men.* The Goſpel is (x) *a form of living from our Reſurrection.*

XV. In bringing Men to the good life this is the peculiar method of Chriſtianity, *It beginneth with renewing their Souls into it.* (y) For the Jews know no other method of acquiring Virtue but by cuſtomary practice. The Philoſophic Pagans were unacquainted with any ſuch thing as the Chriſtian Regeneration, although they ſpeak of a vertuous change in a Man. (z) *Shew us a change made in thy Mind the leading part of thy Soul.* (a) *Thou ſhalt be another Man and enter into another Life,* (b) *being chang'd from a Belluine into a Divine Life.* But they that aſpire after a Divine Life, ought to bethink themſelves in the firſt place of *entring into Life,* that they may be (c) אומה החיה *a People of Life* (as the Jews falſly call themſelves) *ſpiritually alive to do the Functions and Operations of Spiritual Life.* Dead Seeds (as Naturaliſts ſay) are not prolifick. And it is a Canon, (d) *ex infectâ radice fructus non producitur*, good Fruit is not produc'd from a corrupt Root. So the Jews have an univerſal Canon, as they call it, (e) *Quicquid promanat ab immundo immundum eſt.* If they may not eat of an unclean Beaſt, they may not eat of the Fat of it; and they may not eat the Egg of an Owl, becauſe the Owl is an unclean Creature. Unſanctify'd Mankind therefore whoſe Vicioſity and Foulneſs is not taken away by Spiritual Circumciſion, *offer no pure Oblations*, Mal. 3. 3. nor do any holy kind of good Works, *Eph.* 2. 10. but (unleſs it be in order to their cleanſing) *every work of their Hands and that which they offer is unclean*, Hagg. 2. 14. The counterfeit *Dionyſius* defineth Regeneration, (f) *the making us Divine. We cannot know Divine Things without it* (ſaith he) *nor do Divine Works, unleſs we be Divine: as we muſt firſt be Men, before we do the things of Men; for as every thing is, ſo it acteth.* δεῖ πρῶτον ὑπάρξαι εἰς τὸ εἶναι, καὶ τότε ἐνεργῆσαι, *a thing muſt firſt be* (ſaith *Maximus* the Scholiaſt) *and then operate:* ἀκολουθεῖ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρξει τὸ κατ᾽ αὐτὴν ἐνεργεῖν, *the operation according to nature followeth the being according to nature.* In the regular order of things therefore the Chriſtians Inſtitution to a good Life ought to begin with θεογενεσία, *the Divine Generation* (as the counterfeit *Dionyſius* calleth Regeneration) whereby they are *enlightned, inclin'd and inabled* to live the truly good Life, and have the Virtues which conſtitute it (in ſome degree) wrought in their Souls. Which method of Inſtitution is neceſſary in a Religion of Saving Grace, if the genuine and ſaving Virtue is in them only, (g) *qui de ſpiritu Dei virtutes habent, that have their Virtues from the Spirit of God.* If (h) *the Law cannot be fulfilled by any but by them that are Spiritual, who are not made ſuch but by Grace.* And it is neceſſary in an Inſtitution of *Holy Vitaliſts*, which the Chriſtian Religion is as its peculiar Excellency.

(i) *Every one is originated from one dead, before and by his Sins: and being cut off from the Root of his former Life now by the Word of God and the Sacrament of Baptiſm the vital Waters he liveth again.* (k) *We have reflouriſh'd in Chriſt unto newneſs of Life, and the time of his coming is as a Spiritual Spring, that maketh the Nature of Man* ἐνανθῆ καὶ ἔγκαρπον, *florid and fruitful.* Chriſtianity therefore tranſcendeth all Humane Inſtitutions to Virtue, becauſe it affordeth *a new Birth*, which is the production of a new Life in Men, whereby they become by genius and temper Holy-virtuous, as ſome are *ſtirpe & ingenio bellicoſi*, warlike by innate diſpoſition. Their new Life is (l) *an holy Diſpoſition, a juſt Diſpoſition.* (n) *That which is occult within a Man, that is the Life* (Men live as it impelleth them) *that is the Man*, it ſwayeth and governeth them. A Regenerate Soul therefore without any exteriour conſtraint or compulſion liveth a godly life, having an interiour ſtable and permanent diſpoſition to all the Duties thereof, which he performeth with great eaſe and facility, with great freedom and alacrity, with delight and complacency (becauſe agreeable to his innate Inclination and Diſpoſition) and with livelineſs, vigour and ſtrength; for the Spirit of Life from God is entred into him. (o) *Nunc alia mentem vis agit, major Deus.* (p) *The* Tartars (ſaith a late Writer) *muſt be born again, before they can be brought to the neatneſs of the* Chineſes, *which requireth a long application to it, before they can practice it.* But if they could be born again things alien and extremely difficult might become eaſie and agreeable.

XVI. Regeneration is deſign'd to change Man's Nature by introducing a New and Child of God-kind of Nature. Whence it is defin'd, (q) *generare filios Deo*, to generate Children to God, (r) τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως νεουργία, *the new making Man's Nature*, (s) ἡ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον μεταποίησις, *a change or tranſmutation into that which is Divine.* Our Saviour according to his undertaking (t) ἀνακαινίζει καὶ ἀνορθοῖ τὴν φύσιν, *reneweth and reſtoreth Nature.* So the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts ſay, (u) *In the Days of the Meſſiah Mankind will be cured of the biting of the Serpent* (whereby Humane Nature was impoyſon'd with Pravity) which implieth, that his deſign is to alter Man's Nature, and (as the Prophets repreſent it) to change Wolves into Sheep, poyſonous Animals into innocuous and ſalutary, Thorns of the Wilderneſs into Plants of Paradiſe, Senſualiſts into Saints, the wicked ſinning kind into the holy kind, which is a great change of Nature. (w) *By the Word the Apoſtles chang'd the dead into living, Sinners into Righteous, the Blind into Seeing, profligating*

(t) S. Baſil. Hom. in Lacizis p. 537.

(u) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 8. p. 389, 390, &c.

(w) Χριστιανῶν γὰρ κόσμος ἕτερός ἐστι, καὶ ἄλλη τράπεζα, καὶ ἄλλα ἐνδύματα, καὶ ἄλλη ἀπόλαυσις, καὶ ἄλλη κοινωνία, καὶ ἄλλο φρόνησις· διὸ καὶ κρείττους πάντων ἀνθρώπων τυγχάνουσι. Macar. Hom. 5.

(x) Τοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως βίου προδιατύπωσις. S. Baſil. de Sp. Sanct. c. 15.

(y) Hottin. de Jur. Hebr. Lex 20, 40, 213.

(z) Δεῖξόν τινα ἡμῖν μεταβολὴν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ τοῦ σεαυτοῦ. Epict. diſſ. l. 3. c. 21.

(a) Ἔσῃ ἕτερος, καὶ εἰς βίον εἰσελεύσῃ ἕτερον. M. Ant. l. 10. S. 8.

(b) Μεταβαλὼν εἰς θεῖον ἐκ θηριώδους βίον. Plutarch. de profect. virt. p. 75.

(c) Coſri, p. 108.

(d) Tiraquell. de Nobil. p. 106.

(e) Hottin. Jur. Lex 159.

(f) Eccleſ. Hierarch. c. 2.

(g) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 5. c. 19.

(h) Idem ad ſimplic. l. 1. Qu. 1.

(i) *Oritur ex mortuo quiſque antea peccatis aridus: & ab anterioris vitæ radice deciſus, nunc eloquio Dei & ſacramento baptiſmi aquis vitalibus reviviſcit.* S. Hilar. in Pſal. 135.

(k) Ἀνεθάλομεν ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸς καινότητα ζωῆς. S. Cyr. Glaphyr. in Exod. p. 314.

(l) Διάθεσις ὁσία, διάθεσις δικαία. M. Ant l. 6. S. 30. & l. 5. S. 34. Gat. Not. p. 382. 284.

(n) Τὸ ἔνδον ἐγκεκρυμμένον, ἐκεῖνο ζωή, ἐκεῖνο ἄνθρωπος. M. Ant. ibid.

(o) Paulin. ap. Baron. ad an. 394. n. 84.

(p) Palafox, p. 562.

(q) S. Cypr. Ep. 74.

(r) Theodor. ad Pſ. 29.

(s) Gr. Nyſſen.

(t) S. Chryſoſt. ap. Phot. cod. 277. col. 1555.

(u) Helvic. protevang. par. S. 26, 35.

(w) S. Chryſoſt. T. 6. p. 627.

τὰ νοσήματα τ̃ φύσεως, *the Diſeaſes of Nature and the Vicioſity of the Soul.* A Man is not healed, if his Nature is not healed; he is graceleſs and wicked, or truly Virtuous and Holy, as he is in his inward Nature; and as he is in his inward Nature, ſuch will his Practice be. For both ſalutary and poyſonous Plants bring forth Fruit after their kind, *Thorns do not bring forth Grapes, nor do Men gather Figs of Thiſtles.* The Evil that is done in the World is firſt in the Evil Nature of Man, and floweth from that Fountain of bitter Waters. *A good Man out of the good Treaſure of his Heart bringeth forth good things, and an evil Man out of the evil Treaſure of his Heart bringeth forth evil things. Out of the Heart proceed evil thoughts, Murders, Adulteries, Fornications, Thefts, Falſe-witneſs, Blaſphemies.* To change an evil Man therefore, and to make him truly good and holy (which he cannot be ſo long as Vital Carnality and Wickedneſs liveth and reigneth in him, and is his animative Nature) there muſt be a change of his inward Nature. As no Man can be of the Humane Kind and Family, unleſs he is of the Humane Nature: ſo none can be of the Holy and Divine Kind and Family, unleſs he is of the Divine Nature. The Divine Nature is the Holineſs and Happineſs, the only Sanctity and Felicity of the Soul, her proper Life and Light, her Purity and Tranquillity, her Freedom and Reſt and a Divine Kingdom; the cure of all her deadly Evils, of all her vile and loathſome polluting Vices (which are the Fountain of unſpeakable pain and trouble) the true *vita beata*, her preſent Bleſſedneſs, and her qualification for the future Bleſſedneſs; for they muſt be Godlike in Nature and Practice, that live with God for ever. The Priviledge which the Pope hath granted to the Church of S. *Sebaſtian* at *Rome*, certainly belongeth to the Divine Nature. *In that Church there is to be got true Remiſſion of Sins, Brightneſs and Life everlaſting, Joy and Gladneſs without end.* What is it that maketh the Children of God, the Elect of God, the Saints of God but the Divine Nature? What is it that maketh the Peace of God, the Reſt of God, the City of God, the Heaven of God, but the Divine Nature? What is it that conſtituteth the Chriſt of God, the Spirit of God, the ever-bleſſed God himſelf, but the Divine Nature eſſentially and in infinite fulneſs? The deſign of Chriſtianity is not any common mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies (to make us rich, and learned, and great in the World) but to make us *partakers of the Divine Nature*, which is Man's aſſimulation to God and the Saint of God-kind of Good and Excellency, 2 *Pet.* 4. 4.

*Matth.*12. 35.

*Matth.*15. 19.

Quæ gloria eſt ſimilem Deo fieri? S. Cypr. de Bono patient.

XVII. The Life of Grace (into which Souls are regenerate) muſt be conſider'd *as a Nature.* Such it is, as Nature ſignifieth *The Specific Nature of Beings*, that conſtituteth, diſtinguiſheth and denominateth them, which is defin'd by *Boethius*, *cujuſlibet ſubſtantiæ ſpecificata proprietas*, the ſpecific Propriety of every Subſtance. All Species of Beings have their ſeveral Specific Natures (which are common to the whole kind) and one of theſe Specific Natures is the Life of Grace, which is *The Child of God-kind of Nature.* It is a Nature alſo, as the word ſignifieth, *An Innate Diſpoſition and Conſtitution*, which is commonly called Nature. As ſome Plants are ſaid to be *wild by Nature*, and for ſuch to be grafted into a good Olive-tree is *contrary to nature*, Rom. 11. 24. (x) *Singulis ſua eſt natura*, All things have their proper Conſtitution, which is a Nature, and the courſe of things which is according to it, is according to the courſe of Nature. Vulturs are of a ravening, Monkeys of a luſtful, Tygers of a fierce and ſavage, Vipers of a venenate Nature; for ſuch is their conſtitutive Nature, *their innate Qualities and Properties. Tiberius* the Emperour had ſuch Eyes, that he could ſee in the dark time of the Night, and this innate Property of his is called (y) by *Pliny* Nature; and the Philoſopher *Stilpo*'s vicious Inclination to Wine and Women is called in *Cicero* his *Vicious Nature*, which he is ſaid, to have ſo ſubdu'd, that none ever ſaw him Drunk, or diſcern'd any Footſteps of Luſt in him. But the Life of Grace is *a Nature* in another and ſtrict acceptation; as Nature ſignifieth ſuch a Nature (or comprehenſion of innate Qualities and Properties) which is meerly *vital* and *animative*, and is found in natural Agents, that do not act by Choice and Deliberation but by inſtinct. In ſuch a Nature there are Sympathies and Antipathies, that prevent Reaſon and Deliberation. Such a Nature is animative *principium motus intrinſecum* (as Nature is commonly defin'd) a live Impetus and innate Propenſion that is ſelf-moving without being externally driven and impell'd, as the Heart moveth, dilateth and contracteth it ſelf, and poureth out Blood throughout the whole Body, and as a Serpent hiſſeth and ſtingeth. Such a Nature is a Principle of free motion and action (for a natural motion is free and unforc'd, not violent, as a Fountain poureth out Water with a free current) it acteth with delight and pleaſure what is connatural and agreeable to it, as Men eat and drink and do the Functions of Natural Life; and their Nature is a fix'd and permanent principle of action; for to change Nature is (z) παγχαλεπὸν, *extremely difficult*, ſuch a Nature is the Life of Grace in regenerate Souls (at leaſt it comprehendeth and includeth ſuch a Nature;) for as Bees and Ants are taught of God, to do after their kind, in like manner his regenerate Children are taught to love one another, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 9. (*a*) αὐτοδιδάκτῳ τῇ φύσει, by natural inſtinct they are carry'd to the Duties of Godlineſs, to hate Sin and Wickedneſs, to love God and Holineſs, to do good and to communicate; the bent and byaſs of their Nature ſtandeth that way. They have a Nature that carrieth them to be heavenly-minded and to contemn the World, Sin is painful and intolerable to them, as being contrary to their new and divine kind of live-nature, which hath an horrour againſt it, and riſeth againſt it, as a Lamb hath a dread of the Wolf by nature (natural Antipathy:) but they have a Sympathy with what is good and holy, *ſavour the things that are of God*, and diſcern an enraviſhing Amiableneſs, and feel a tranſporting pleaſure in all the ways of Goodneſs, Purity and Righteouſneſs, which are to them connatural and agreeable. They walk in the ways of God from a free and genuine propenſion, and to them *his Commandments are not grievous*, (*b*) οὐδενὶ γὰρ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἐπίπονον, *for what is according to nature is not uneaſie and laborious to any, as it is not laborious to the Fire to burn.* As the Fleſh is an inward vital nature ſpontaneouſly parturient of Sin and Wickedneſs, and the ungodly are carry'd on in the ways of Wickedneſs by a *live-impetus* and propenſion (*the Spirit of Whoredom is in them*:) So the Life of Grace in the Regenerate is an inward vital Nature, which ſetteth them in motion towards God and Piety, and inclin- them to all holy virtuous Practices, which they perform,

(x) *Coſri*, p. 254, 255.

(y) *L.* 11. c. 37.

(z) *Celſus* ap. *Orig. l.* 3. p. 152.

(a) *Philo* περὶ ιωδ[illegible], p. 164. ed. Gr. Pariſ.

(b) *Proc.* Plat. Theol. l. 1. c. 15.

perform, (*c*) *naturaliter & connato ingenio*, naturally and by an innate genius, as a great Naturaliſt ſpeaketh. A Chriſtian's Regeneration, eſpecially if he is arriv'd at a confirm'd ſtate maketh him Χριστιανὸν βαθέα, *one that is more than Skin-deep a Chriſtian*, (*d*) δικαιοσύνῃ βεβαμμένον εἰς βάθος, *not only ſlightly ting'd, but deeply imbu'd with Righteouſneſs*, or dy'd in grain with it. (*e*) *If any one hath an habit of good* (ſaith Gr. *Naz.*) *and he be throughly imbu'd with it, it is harder for him to fall to Vice, than at firſt to become Good, becauſe Good in him confirm'd by Time and Reaſon* φύσις καθίσταται, *is become a Nature.* Such is the new Nature in confirm'd regenerate Chriſtians, a throughly permanent Principle, that maketh Holineſs the Life and Breath, the Pulſe and Conſtitution of their Soul, the Soul of their Soul, and as near to them as they are to themſelves. Their new Nature by degrees worketh out Corruption, as according to *Hypocrates*, (*f*) *Nature is a cure for Diſeaſes* and worketh out what is againſt it. And as the ſeveral Species of Animals are by their inſtinctive Nature fitted for their proper work and uſe: So by their holy vital Nature regenerate Chriſtians are qualify'd for their holy work and uſe, according to the Stoicks definition of Virtue, which is, (*g*) *to be naturally adapted or well qualify'd for our proper work.* With great reaſon therefore Chriſtianity beginneth its Inſtitution to a Life of Holineſs and good Works with Regeneration and a change of Nature. (*h*) For Men will not uſually betake themſelves to an Imploy to which their Nature is not adapted, (*i*) τῆς φύσιος ἀντιπρηττούσης κενεὰ πάντα, *if Nature be repugnant, all is in vain.*

XVIII. The Life of Grace in regenerate Souls muſt not only be conſider'd as a Nature, but as *the divine kind of Nature*, which is contradiſtinct to *common Nature, common good Nature and the evil or diabolical Nature.* For ſuch was the efficacy of Chriſtianity at the riſe of it, (*k*) ἀπὸ δαιμόνων ἀγγέλους τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰργάσατο, *Men that were Devils it made them Angels.* Theſe were of the Diabolical Kind and Family by their Diabolical Nature, which was ſo their Nature, as to be only the Vicioſity and Corruption of their Nature, in the ſtrict notion of Philoſophy, that conſidereth the Natures of things as antecedent to their Vicioſity and Corruption, and rightly affirmeth, (*l*) *that every Nature is good, that every Vice is hurtful to Nature* (as the Vicioſity of the Eye hurteth the Nature of the Eye) *whereby it is contrary to Nature.* As Nature is rightly conſider'd antecedently to its Vicioſity and Corruption, ſo it muſt be conſider'd antecedently to Saving Grace, and ſo conſider'd it is *common unholy Nature*, to which *the Divine Nature* is oppos'd as tranſcendent thereto; for it is of another and higher kind than Humane Nature, as the Divine Birth and Family far tranſcend the Humane Birth and Family, and there is no compariſon between the common Humane Goods and Excellencies (Wit, Parts, Mundane Riches and Power) and the divine kind of Goods and Excellencies. Theſe we ſhould diſtinguiſh as the precious from the vile, (*m*) *and venerate theſe as being the divine things, but depreciate thoſe and account them contemptible as being the humane things.* Amongſt the meer Humane Goods a principal one is the common kind of *Good Nature*, whereby in the uſual Senſe is meant *That which is good as to natural Diſpoſition and Temper.* So it ſignifieth in *Plato*: (*n*) *It is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the better Natures are in thoſe that are of the Noble Families.* Good Nature in this uſual acceptation is not a little valuable and deſirable (Humane Nature if devoid of it, would be as bad as the Atheiſts repreſent it, unregenerate Mankind would be θηρία ἀνθρωπόμορφα, *ferine Animals* in the ſhape of Men, Foxes and Fire-brands, Cut-throats and Cannibals, as wild Boars and ravening Bears to one another, and the Earth would be no better than a Wilderneſs of wild Beaſts) it deſerveth commendation, but not without a mixture of great diſparagement. For it is no better than common Nature, a bad and vile kind of thing, that is uſually found in wicked Men, is not at all Religious or Conſcientious, is on this ſide true Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs, conſtituteth none truly good, nor good in God's account, nor of a good nature and diſpoſition towards God and Holineſs, nor of a good nature and diſpoſition in the main; for Men that are well-natur'd and of good humour towards one another, yet are Rebel-ſinners againſt God, *and have not the love of God in them.* But good Nature is an ambiguous expreſſion, and if it be underſtood to ſignifie in a large acceptation *good Diſpoſition and Temper*, in ſuch Senſe the Divine Nature is *Good Nature*, the truly Good Nature (and alone ſuch) as being the holy kind of Good Nature. For,

(1.) The Divine Nature (the Saint of God-kind of Good-nature) is *the Divine kind of Love*, the holy Love Nature and Practice, which is neceſſarily the true goodneſs of Nature and Practice, and the ſame with vital Grace and Holineſs. Vital Sanctity is nothing elſe but the holy Love (Divine Charity which is the Nature of God and of his Children) as Vital Carnality and Wickedneſs is nothing elſe but the inordinate carnal ſelf-love, 1 *Cor.* 13. *Gal.* 5. 6. 1 *Joh.* 3. 23. *ch.* 4. 7, 16. (2.) In the Divine Nature there is no want of Goodneſs, but whatever is true goodneſs of Nature is in the Divine Nature. Innocence, Self-denial, Humility, Meekneſs, Manſuetude, Benignity, Magnanimity, Juſtice, Mercy, Liberality, Fidelity, a patient Spirit, a ſympathizing with the Goods and Evils of others (making them as our own) a loving Enemies, forbearing and forgiving others, a ſeeking the good of others and not any carnal ſelfiſh Intereſt of our own; all which Branches of true goodneſs of Nature (and what is repugnant thereto is wretchedly baſe and evil Nature) are illuſtrious and ſhining (*o*) in the Divine Nature, and this ſinleſs Love cannot live but in *Temperance* and *Chaſtity.* The Divine Nature is the truly and eximiouſly benevolent Nature, that ardently deſireth, to do good to all (and hurt to none) is concern'd for their weal and wo, maketh Men have the ſame cares and fears, the ſame deſires ſorrows and joys for others as for themſelves, exerteth it ſelf in all Acts and Offices of ardent and affectionate Benevolence, maketh the glorious Angels willingly to wait upon us, brought down the Son of God from Heaven, to help us in our Needs, and to ſave us from our Evils, made him become Poor to make us Rich, to undergo Agonies for our Eaſe, Chains for our Liberty, Stripes for our Healing, Buffeting and Mockeries for our Honour, Wounds for our Cure, and Death

for

(c) *Harvey de Generat.* p. 145.

(d) *Caſaub. in Perſ.* p. 224. *Gat. in Ant.* p. 55.

(e) *Gr. Naz.* or. 13.

(f) Νόσων φύσιες ἰητροί.

(g) Εὖ πεφυκέναι πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον ἔργον. *Laert. in Zenon.*

(h) *Gr. Naz. Ep.* 63.

(i) *Hippocrat.*

(k) S. *Chryſoſt. T.* 6. p. 348.

(l) S. *Aug. de C. D. l.* 12. c. 1.

(n) Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς θεῖα ἀποσεμνύνειν, τὰ δ' ὡς ἀνθρώπινα ἡγεῖσθαι εὐκαταφρόνητα. *Jambl. de Myſt. S.* 1. *c.* 21.

(n) Εἰκὸς ἀμείνους γίγνεσθαι φύσεις ἐν γενναίοις γένεσι. *Ap. Tiraquell. de Nobil. p.* 138.

(o) 1 *Tim.* 6. 1. *Luk.* 6. 32. *Joh.* 1. 14. *Gal.* 6. 10. *Heb.* 13. 16. *Matth.* 5. 44. *Job* 31. 29. *Eph.* 4. 2.

for our Life (like a magnanimous and wondrous lover of Souls) ſuch amazing goodneſs of Nature there is in the Divine Nature. Rom. 13. 10. The Divine Love is the ſumm of the Divine Law, and therefore is univerſal Righteouſneſs and the ſumm of all true Goodneſs. (p) *Charity begun is Righteouſneſs begun, Charity perfected is Righteouſneſs perfected.* (3.) In the Divine Nature there is no mixture of Evil Nature (it is perfectly oppoſite to the foul and hurtful Vices of Man's Nature) no vile villainous Selfiſhneſs (the Principle of all Wickedneſs) no envying the good 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5. Gal. 5. 22. Eph. 4. 32. 1 Cor. 10. 32. Rom. 15. 2. 1 Cor. 13. 4. of others (but a rejoycing in their Honour and Proſperity) no Malignity or ſpiteful Miſchievouſneſs, no Haughtineſs, Inſolence or Arrogance, no vaunting or fleſhly Gloriation, no malign Cenſoriouſneſs nor contempt of our Brother, no Unmercifulneſs or Hard-heartedneſs (all that partake of it are Men of Bowels) no crooked Partiality or Injuſtice, no wronging or defrauding any, nor doth it allow the cauſeleſs offending diſcontenting and diſquieting any, it ſeeketh not the Sorrow and Moleſtation of others, but their Happineſs and their Joy, maketh us accommodate our ſelves to their good, beareth Injuries and Indignities, and is not apt to inkindle into Flames. No Nigardlineſs or baſe Penurioùſneſs, or churliſh Strait-heartedneſs is in the Divine Nature; no unſeemly Harſhneſs, Roughneſs or Sourneſs, no diſtaſtful bitterneſs of Spirit (but on the contrary, a gracious ſweetneſs of Temper) nothing of Frowardneſs or bad Humour, no Surlineſs or Imperiouſneſs (but condeſcending Goodneſs) no ſqueezing and grinding others, no want of kindneſs is in the Divine Nature, but theſe harſh and 1 Cor. 13. 4. hurtful Vices as are alien from it, as the Waters of *Marah* are from the Waters of Life. It ba- 1 Pet. 2. 1. 1 Cor. 13 5. niſheth *Frauds, Guiles, Hypocriſies, Evil-ſpeakings,* and is ſo far from *working ill to its Neighbour* that it *thinketh no Evil.* If it took place in the World, it would be a cure for Evil Nature and the multifarious Evils that iſſue from it (a *Panacæa* and *Catholicon*) for Debates, Envyings, Wraths, Strifes, Backbitings, Whiſperings, Swellings, Feuds, Brawlings, Seditions, Schiſms, Wars and deſolations of Countries, killing and deſtroying by Sea and Land, contention for Honour and Preferment, deceit in Traffick, unchriſtian Law-ſuits, Cruelty, Treachery, Perfidiouſneſs, Robbery, Bribery, Oppreſſion and Perſecution. That is the true and genuine good Nature, which is diametrically oppoſite to the God-hating and Man-hating and hurting Nature; and ſuch is the Divine Nature. (4.) The Divine Nature is *the pure goodneſs of Nature* (like pure refin'd Gold) a Rom. 12. 9. Jude 23. Apoc. 2. 2. Benignity that is Vital Purity and Sanctity, a cleanneſs, brightneſs and luminouſneſs of inward Life and Nature, pure and refin'd from all mixture of Vileneſs and Villainy (Light wherein there is no Darkneſs at all) the immaculate and unvile kind of Love and Goodneſs, that is abhorrent from all Filthineſs, will endure no Turpitude or Defilement, nor any thing bordering upon it (not Wantonneſs in Dreſſes and Attire, in Geſture and Motion, not the Eye of Adultery, not any Impurity by Meats or Drinks or any defiling Senſuality, not any ſordid Selfiſhneſs, nor any droſſy polluting love of the World) that hath an horrour and averſation againſt all Sin and Wickedneſs, baniſheth it from all Lines of Communication, and cannot endure the ſight, company and preſence of it. All Animals are affected and addicted according to their kind. Can a Swine be cleanly or a Lion cowardly? it is contrary to their kind: ſo is ſinning againſt God to a regenerate Child of God. It is contra-natural againſt his holy Vital Nature, which abhorreth, reſiſteth and oppoſeth it, and hath a deadly enmity and antipathy againſt it, (r) *having got to himſelf ſomething that is pure, and which will not endure to be defiled.* He cannot ſin (do any heinous ſin) he cannot endure it nor diſpenſe with ſinning againſt God. (5.) The Di- 1 Joh. 3. 9. vine Nature is the beauteous and lovely Nature. For as Sin and Wickedneſs is a foulneſs, uglineſs and horridneſs of Nature and Practice: So the Divine Nature as it is in God is the Divine Beauty, and as it is in holy Souls it is the Pulchritude of the Soul and the Beauty of Holineſs, wherein there is nothing of unlovely diſpoſition, nothing that is inimical and injurious, nothing but what is ſalutary, innocuous and beneficent, nothing of deformity, nothing to diſfigure or diſcolour, it is Purity without Defilement and Lovelineſs without any Odiouſneſs. *Thou art all fair my Love, and there is no ſpot in thee.* Nothing is ſo lovely as Love is, (s) which according to the Poet is the moſt beauteous of all the Gods. All Men think a Friend amiable, and it is the Divine Love-nature that maketh them the Friends of God and of Men: but Pride, Envy, Malevolence make them Fiends not Friends. (6.) The Divine Nature is *the peaceable Nature* (the Mother and Nurſe of Peace) as Peace ſignifieth freedom from Variance and Diſſention (for Love is ἑνωτικὸν, *Unitive*, and Amity is Peace) as Peace ſignifieth freedom from diſturbance of Mind (for to dwell in Purity, is to dwell in Peace) as Peace ſignifieth freedom from all Trouble and Infelicity (for it is *Life* and *Peace*, Rom. 8. 6.) as Peace ſignifieth the Virtue and Duty of *Peaceableneſs*; for it is *firſt pure then peaceable*, Jam. 3. 17. The Diſcipline of the Divine Nature is (t) εἰρηνικὴ διδασκαλία, *the pacifick Diſcipline*, the Peace-making Religion, a Vein of Peace runneth through the whole of it, the Pulſe, the Breath, the Voice of it is Peace. *When the Paſtour of the Church entreth, preſently he pronounceth* εἰρήνη πᾶσιν, *Peace be with you all.* (u) *When he preacheth, his beginning is, Peace be with you all; when he bleſſeth the People, his Bleſſing is, Peace be with you all; when he injoyneth the Chriſtian Salutation, it is with this clauſe, Peace be with you all; when the Chriſtian Sacrifice was conſecrated, this form was uſed, Peace be with you all; and again at intervening times, Grace and Peace be with you.* (7.) The Divine Good Nature is ineffably *joyous* and *comfortable*, not only to the poſſeſſours of it, but to others, whoſe Peace and true Joy and Comfort it promoteth (not their Grievance and Calamity;) for in ſuch Senſe the Rom. 14. 17. Apoſtle ſaith of the Kingdom of God, *It is Righteouſneſs, Peace and Joy.* Charity will not needleſly diſpleaſe, grieve and afflict any, but is to others in its nature and effects like the benign light and influence of the Sun joyous and comfortable. (w) *It cauſeth a marvellous gentleneſs and reſtriction of Manners, and Philanthropy and Benignity and Manſuetude.* It ſuppreſſeth cauſleſs Jealouſies and Suſpicions, beareth with Infirmities, extinguiſheth thoſe furious Paſſions, that are the Incendiaries of the World, and thoſe hurtful Luſts that are the Plagues and Calamities of the Life of Man. It tameth and ſoftneth and ſweetneth Man's Nature, is compaſſionate, courteous, tender hearted, beateth Swords into Plough-ſhares, yet breaketh not (but cheriſheth and ſtrengtheneth) the bruiſed Reed, healeth the broken hearted, comforteth the feeble minded, ſupporteth the weak, and like *Cicero*'s excellent Man taketh a courſe (*x*) *qui conſolari poſſit afflictos*, whereby to comfort the afflicted. The Divine Nature forbiddeth vain Sorrows and Diſcontents as well as vain and ſinful Pleaſures, maketh it unlawful for us to be miſerable, and requireth us to live a Life of the higheſt and divineſt Joy. So divine a felicitative Nature (to our ſelves and others) is certainly the true and genuine kind of good Nature. (8.) The Divine Nature is the *moſt noble Nature and of the moſt noble Goodneſs* poſſible or conceivable. For as no Creature can be worſe than the Devil, nor any Nature worſe than the Diabolical: So no Being can be better than God, nor any Nature more excellent than the Divine Nature, nor any Goodneſs more noble than the Divine Love and Charity. Nothing is ſo high, nothing ſo deep, nothing ſo large, nothing ſo noble, nothing ſo free and generous, nothing ſo couragious and valiant, nothing ſo ſtrong and invincible, nothing ſo Heroical (in doing and ſuffering for the Welfare of others) as the Divine Love. As it ſent down Chriſt from Heaven (the nobleſt Lover that ever was, whoſe Hiſtory is embelliſh'd with all the Wonders of amazing Love and Goodneſs) ſo it ſent his Apoſtles to wander about the World, and to undergo the greateſt Labours and Sufferings in it for the Converſion and Salvation of Men, without propoſing any worldly advantage to themſelves. And Charity obligeth all Chriſtians to be good to their Brethren at an unparallel'd rate, not only to part with their Eſtates for them, but (in conformity to their Maſter) to lay down their lives for them. (*y*) *Amor vaſtat lineam*, Love exceedeth bounds (as the Hebrews ſay) and ſo the Divine Love exceedeth the ordinary bounds of Love. The World is acquainted with no ſuch good Nature as the eximious Love and Goodneſs of the Divine Nature. The admirers therefore of good Nature ſhould not content themſelves with a counterfeit ſhew and reſemblance thereof, but ought in Congruity, to become the faithful Admirers and Lovers of the Divine Nature, which appeareth, to be the true and genuine good Nature. Nor may the proud and ignorant and cenſorious Pretenders to Chriſtianity father their ill Nature upon a Religion of the divine good Nature.

(p) *Charitas inchoata inchoata juſtitia eſt, charitas perfecta perfecta juſtitia eſt.* S. Aug. de Nat. & Gr. c. 70.

(r) Καθαρεύοντι κηλῖδος ἑαυτῷ, ϗ ὐδ' ὁπωσῦν ἀξιῶν ἐμπαίνεσθαι. *Plutarch. de profect. virt. p.* 85.

(s) *Theoph. ad Autol.* p. 84.

(t) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 2. p. 79.

(u) Ὅταν ὁμιλῇ, εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν εὐλογῇ, εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν ἀσπάζεσθαι κελεύῃ, εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν ἡ θυσία τελεσθῇ, εἰρήνη πᾶσι· ϗ μεταξὺ πάλιν, χάρις ὑμῖν ϗ εἰρήνη. S. Chryſoſt. in Coloſſ. λογ. γ.

(w) Ἐμποιεῖ δὲ θαυμαστήν τινα πρᾳότητα, ϗ καταστολὴν τὸ ἦθος, ϗ φιλανθρωπίαν, ϗ χρηστότητα ϗ ἡμερότητα. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 53.

(x) *De Leg. l.* 1. *ſub fin.*

(y) *Buxt. Inſtit. Ep. Hebr. p.* 270.

CHAP. VI.

1. Of the various Significations of the Kingdom of God. 2. Of the Kingdom of Chriſtianity under ſeveral Conſiderations. 3. Of a mundane Kingdom as oppoſite to the Kingdom of God. 4. Of ſymbolizing with the Jews touching a mundane Kingdom of the Meſſiah. 5. Of the Kingdom of Darkneſs as oppoſite to the Kingdom of God. 6. Of the Kingdom of God in the Senſe of the New Teſtament as oppoſite to a threefold Kingdom of God. 7. What the making the new Kingdom of God compriſeth. 8. Inferences from the making the new Kingdom of God. 9. The Kingdom of God is propounded to our purchaſe.

I. THE Chriſtian Religion which hath been conſider'd as it is *The Settlement of Saving Grace*, muſt be alſo conſider'd, as it is *The Kingdom of God*, or *The Kingdom of Heaven*, which is an uſual Name of it in the New Teſtament. For as Heaven is a known Name of God amongſt the Jews and in Scripture: (*z*) So *the Kingdom of God* and *the Kingdom of Heaven* is in the New Teſtament the ſame Name. The Kingdom of Heaven (*regnum cœlorum*) frequently occurreth in the Jewiſh Writers (they often ſpeak of taking upon them *jugum regni cœlorum*) and ſome think, that by the Kingdom of Heaven they mean *the internal Love and Fear of God*; ſome others (as *Grotius* and *Selden*) are of Opinion, that our Saviour in the New Teſtament followeth their Phraſeology, and that they mean by the Kingdom of Heaven התורה *their Law*. But theſe are great miſtakes; for by taking upon them *jugum regni cœlorum* (the Yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven) the Jewiſh Writers plainly mean *receptionem imperii divini*, the reception of the divine imperial Authority (as *Abarbinel* ſpeaketh;) and they diſtinguiſh between *jugum regni cœlorum* (the Yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven) and *jugum precepti*, the Yoke of the Precept (of particular Precepts) of which their Law conſiſteth. In our Saviour's Diſcourſes and the reſt of the New Teſtament all the ſignifications of the Kingdom of Heaven (or the Kingdom of God) are extremely alien and remote from the Jewiſh Law, wherein the Kingdom of Heaven is not ſo much as once named (*a*) as the Fathers obſerve. In the New Teſtament it is of various ſignifications, but thoſe various ſignifications are not ſuch, or ſo many, as is commonly thought; they are not more, nor any other than the various ſignifications of the word *Kingdom* in common Language, when we ſpeak of a mundane Kingdom. For in ordinary Language *The Kingdom* ſignifieth in a threefold Senſe, *The Region or Territory, the reigning Eſtate, and the Polity.* So the Kingdom of Heaven (or the Kingdom of God) ſometimes ſignifieth Heaven locally underſtood (called by *Plato* ὁ τῶν κακῶν καθαρὸς τόπος, *the place free from all Evils*) the celeſtial Paradiſe, the better Country, *the Region of Immortality and Beatitude*; as the Kingdom of *Perſia* ſometimes ſignifieth the Country and Territory ſo called. *Matth.* 5. 10, 20. *ch.* 7. 21. *ch.* 8. 11. *Marc.* 9. 47. *ch.* 14. 25. *Luc.* 13. 28. *ch.* 14. 15. *ch.* 18. 24, 25. *Act.* 14. 22. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. *ch.* 15. 50. *Gal.* 5. 21. *Eph.* 5. 5. 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 12. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 5. But as in Scripture and common Language *The Kingdom* often ſignifieth *The reigning Eſtate* (the Kingdom-eſtate:) So the Kingdom of God often ſignifieth *his reigning or eſtate of reigning*: As we are told of

(z) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 3. 2. *Lightf. Hor. in loc. &* in *Joh.* 3. 3.

(a) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 5. 20.

a certain Aſtrological Book in great Vogue amongſt the *Perſians* (b) called *regnum Dei* (the Kingdom of God) which ſignifieth his Eſtate of reigning in the Sovereign adminiſtration of things. In our Saviour's Diſcourſes the Kingdom of God ſeveral times ſignifieth *his reigning in the powerful and puiſſant deſtroying his Enemies.* Matth. 16. 28. *There be ſome ſtanding here, which ſhall not taſte of death, till they ſee the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom.* Marc. 9. 1. *There be ſome of them that ſtand here, which ſhall not taſte of death, till they have ſeen the Kingdom of God come with Power.* Luc. 21. 31. *When ye ſee theſe things come to paſs, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand.* The Kingdom of God ſignifieth in the ſame Notion as in theſe Diſcourſes (which relate to the deſtruction of the Temple and of *Jeruſalem*) when the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of Chriſt's final coming to Judgment. *2 Tim.* 4. 1. *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his Kingdom.* So *Apoc.* 12. 10. *Now is come Salvation and Strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the Power of his Chriſt.* A Third Signification there is of the Kingdom of God (or the Kingdom of Heaven;) for moſt uſually in the New Teſtament it ſignifieth *That Holy Polity which God and Chriſt is of as the Regent Party thereof*; which is the Kingdom of God and his People, the City of God and his Saints, the Holy Empire, *Sanctorum Reſpublica*, the Kingdom of Chriſtianity and Sanctity. Which muſt be conſider'd under a twofold Notion: As it is *The Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity and Sanctity* (which is diſtinguiſhable into the Kingdom of Grace and of Glory) and as it is *The viſible Chriſtian Church.* As it is the viſible Chriſtian Church, it is compar'd to a Knot of wiſe and fooliſh Virgins, a Field of Wheat and Tares, a Net repleniſh'd with good and bad Fiſh, a Family of Servants ſome good and faithful, others wicked and ſlothful, and οἱ πλῆκται, *the ſtrikers* that beat their Fellow-ſervants and eat and drink with the drunken. As it is the Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity and Sanctity, the comprehenſion of the ineſtimable Goods thereof (the State, Life, Inheritance and Society of real Saints of God) the Apoſtle ſaith of the conſtitutive Eſſence of it, *It is Righteouſneſs and Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt.* Our Saviour compareth it to *a treaſure hid in a Field and a goodly Pearl*; which is not to be purchas'd but by duly parting with our earthly All. He allotteth it and confineth it to thoſe only that are of a diſpoſition ſuitable and agreeable thereto (little Children and the poor in Spirit) telleth a Scribe, that he was not far from it, injoineth all Men to ſeek it and the Righteouſneſs that is in it in the firſt place, recommendeth an holy Violence in the taking of it, and this Notion of the Kingdom muſt expound a Petition in our Lord's Prayer *Thy Kingdom come.* But the Kingdom of God cometh not with Obſervation (it is not of ſuch a Nature, as to come in an exteriour ſolemn and pompous manner) *neither ſhall they ſay, lo here, or lo there: for lo the Kingdom of God* (the due erecting of it which he requireth) *is within you.* Luc. 17. 20, 21. Some of our Saviour's Diſcourſes touching the Kingdom of God are beſt interpreted by ſeparating the two diſtinct Notions of it: But as thoſe two diſtinct Notions are in the Nature of the thing conjoin'd and complicated (for the Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity and the viſible Chriſtian Church are really conjoin'd and complicated:) So ſeveral of our Saviour's Diſcourſes are beſt underſtood by conjoining and complicating them in our conſideration, and ſo the Kingdom of God muſt be expounded to ſignifie (in general) *the Kingdom of Chriſtianity*, which is both the viſible Church and the Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity. In reſpect of both theſe Notions of the Kingdom (conjunct) with a quick and mighty Progreſs it diſpread it ſelf over the World, whence it is compar'd to a Grain of *Muſtard-Seed*, that is of a mighty growth, and to Leaven that quickly leaveneth the whole lump. *Matth.* 13. 31, 32. The Scribes and Phariſees ſhut up *the Kingdom of Heaven* (the Kingdom of Chriſtianity) *againſt Men.* Matth. 23. 13. Our Saviour gave to his Apoſtles *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* (of the Kingdom of Chriſtianity) *Matth.* 16. 19. and the Affairs of it he compareth to a certain King, which would take account of his Servants, one of which would not forgive his Fellow-ſervant. *Matth.* 18. 23. When he ſaith, *Joh.* 3. 5. *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God* (the Kingdom of Chriſtianity) his Senſe is; that none can enter into the viſible Church, but he that is born of Water, and none can enter into the Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity, but he that is born of the Spirit.

(b) *Huet. Dem. Ev. prop.* 4. *c.* 5.

*Matth.*13. 30, 48. *ch.* 25. 1, 14.

Rom. 14. 17.
*Matth.*13. 44, 45, 46.
Matth. 5. 3. *and* 18. 3.
Marc. 12. 34.
Matth. 6. 33. *ch.* 11, 12.

II. In many places of the New Teſtament *The Kingdom of God* (or the Kingdom of Heaven) muſt be expounded by *The Kingdom of Chriſtianity under ſeveral conſiderations.* As when *Paul* is ſaid, *to have diſputed and perſwaded the things concerning the Kingdom of God*, to have *preach'd the Kingdom of God*, and to have *teſtified of the Kingdom of God*; the Senſe is, that he taught and preach'd the Kingdom (or Religion) of Chriſtianity as being the Kingdom of God. So our Saviour *preach'd the Kingdom of God*, and ſent out his Diſciples to preach it; and he told them, *Unto you it is given to know the Myſtery of the Kingdom of God*, which is the Myſtery of the Kingdom (or Religion) of Chriſtianity as being the Kingdom of God. To the Jewiſh Builders he ſaith, *The Kingdom of God* (which is the Kingdom of Chriſtianity) *ſhall be taken from you.* The Kingdom of God is the Kingdom of God and his People; therefore a taking away the Kingdom of God from them is a diſcarding them from being his People. The Kingdom of Chriſtianity is the Kingdom of God, as it is *the Goſpel-kingdom*; whence we read of *ſhewing the glad Tydings of the Kingdom of God*, *of preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom of God.* When our Saviour ſaith, *If I with the Finger of God caſt out Devils, no doubt the Kingdom of God is come upon you*; the Senſe is, his Kingdom of Chriſtianity is come upon you, as to his ſupernatural Means of erecting it. His Kingdom of Chriſtianity as to his way of adminiſtring the Affairs of it, is *not in Word but in Power.* So the Apoſtle's Text muſt be expounded; and when our Saviour ſaith of *John the Baptiſt*, *he that is leaſt in the Kingdom of God is greater than he*: the Kingdom of God is generally expounded, to ſignifie his Kingdom of Chriſtianity, the meaneſt Chriſtian being in ſeveral reſpects ſuperiour to *John the Baptiſt.* The meaneſt genuine Chriſtian is a Member of the Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity, wherein the ſpurious illegitimate Chriſtians have no Memberſhip; and in this Senſe the words of our Saviour are moſt probably to be underſtood. *Matth.* 5. 19 *Whoſoever ſhall break one of theſe leaſt Commandments, and ſhall teach*

Act. 19. 8. *ch.* 20. 25. *ch.* 28. 23, 31.
Luc. 4. 43. *ch.* 9. 2.
Marc. 4. 11.

Matth. 21. 43.

Luc. 8. 1. *ch.* 11. 20.
Marc. 1. 14.

1 *Cor.* 4. 20.

Luc. 7. 28.

Men ſo, he ſhall be called the leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven (they muſt not be owned for Chriſtians, that are licentious in their Principles and Practices:) *But whoſoever ſhall do and teach them, the ſame ſhall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven*, he ſhall be no under Graduate in Chriſtianity. Some few places there are of the New Teſtament, which yet remain to be conſider'd, in the expounding of which ſome affix to the Kingdom of God (or the Kingdom of Heaven) a ſingular Interpretation. (*c*) For they are of Opinion, that the Kingdom of Heaven mentioned in *John* the Baptiſt and our Saviour's preaching, and urg'd by them as a mighty motive to Repentance, ſignifieth *the fatal deſtruction of the Jews*. And it may be ſuppos'd, that the fatal deſtruction of the Jews is intimated in thoſe places, but it is not ſignified ſave only conſequentially by the Kingdom of Heaven mentioned by *John* the Baptiſt and our Saviour. *Matth.* 3. 2. *ch.* 4. 17. *Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* Marc. 1. 15. *The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand: Repent ye, and believe the Goſpel.* Our Saviour ſaith, *The time is fulfilled*; therefore the Kingdom of God which he ſpeaketh of, is the Kingdom of Chriſtianity. And there is no reaſon, to ſuppoſe, that the Kingdom of Heaven in *John* the Baptiſt's and our Saviour's preaching ſignifieth otherwiſe than in the Apoſtle's preaching to the Cities, who were commanded to ſhake off the Duſt of their Feet againſt the Unbelieving and Impenitent, ſaying, *Be ye ſure of this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you*, Luc. 10. 11. So *John* the Baptiſt and our Saviour inculcate the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven as a mighty Motive to Repentance, becauſe it would be ruinous to the Impenitent and Unbelieving Jews, and not only in reſpect of their ſpiritual, but ſecular Concerns. For if they remain'd unconverted, the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven would be to them an horrendous aggravation of Sin and Puniſhment, and would iſſue in a tremendous temporal deſtruction of their Nation.

III. From a careful ſurvey of the New Teſtament it appeareth, that uſually *The Kingdom of God* ſignifieth, that Holy Polity *his Kingdom of Chriſtianity and Sanctity*, which ſtandeth oppos'd and muſt be contradiſtinguiſh'd *to the humane mundane Kingdoms, the Kingdom of Darkneſs and to a threefold Kingdom of God.* (*d*) *All the things of this Kingdom being ſpiritual and heavenly, it is rightly called Cæleſtial and the Kingdom of Heaven.* The Name of this Republick (the Kingdom of Heaven) denoteth it, to be originally and of Kind and Quality a ſpiritual, divine and heavenly Republick, of kind different from and tranſcendent to the humane and mundane kind of Kingdoms. For ſuch it is in reſpect of the Sovereign of it (who was not of this World, when he was in the World) and in reſpect of the genuine Subjects of it (regenerate Chriſtians called out of the World) whoſe State and Condition is divine and heavenly, as alſo their Life and Laws. All the genuine Citizens of this Divine Kingdom are Citizens of Heaven (*peregrini deorſum, Cives ſurſum*) the ſtate of Sanctity which they are in, is a lower Room of Heaven (*e*) εἰκὼν δὲ τῆς οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας, ἡ ἐπίγειος, *and the Church on Earth is an Image of the Church in Heaven.* Not ſuch an Image of the heavenly Kingdom as a mundane Kingdom is, which only containeth certain umbratile Reſemblances of the heavenly Kingdom, that are of another kind: But ſuch an Image of Heaven as an Holy Man is of God, whoſe Holineſs is a Child-like reſemblance of God: So Grace is (as the Schools ſay) *ætas infantilis gloriæ*, Glory in its infancy and inchoation. As the Kingdom of Glory therefore, ſo the Kingdom of Grace, is immenſly diſtant from the terrene and mundane Kingdoms, wherein there is nothing higher and better than the humane and mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies; for the Kingdom of God and his Saints according to Chriſtianity is neceſſarily the Kingdom of the Saint of God-kind of things according to Chriſtianity, (*f*) *wherein there is no lineament of the World or of any mundane Promiſe* (ſave only of Food and Raiment) *it ſetteth forth nothing but what is worthy of Heaven, and nothing elſe it offereth to its Religioniſts.* The Kingdom of Chriſtianity is not a Kingdom of mundane Riches, but of divine Graces; a Kingdom without any Military Forts or Caſtles to fortifie it, without any Armies or Navies to defend it, without any worldly Wealth to ſupport it, without any external Splendor and Magnificence to adorn it. Mundane Wealth and Pomp abound in mundane Kingdoms, but this Kingdom is *regnum crucis* (whence it ſometimes ſeem'd forlorn and deſolate in the Eye of the World) the Honours, Riches, Immunities and Priviledges of it are the ſpiritual, divine and heavenly, and ſuch is the Peace of it, the War that it manageth, and the Fortitude that it exerciſeth. (*g*) *The Fortitude of the Gentiles is from mundane Cupidity, but the Fortitude of Chriſtians is from divine Charity, which is the Virtue of this City of God, a Virtue that none vanquiſheth, the Fire of it no Waves of the World, no Floods of Temptation extinguiſh.* A mundane Kingdom is an external Domination over the Bodies and Eſtates of Men, and the main concern of Civil Government is for their ſecular Weal and Proſperity; its Rewards and Puniſhments are meerly ſecular, and it is managed by external Force and Coaction: But this Kingdom is a Soul-ſovereignty (a Sovereignty over the Territory of the Soul) which demandeth the Soul-honour and Service, is for the Holineſs and Happineſs of Souls, beſtoweth the Soul-goods and inflicteth the Soul-evils, its Rewards and Puniſhments are the Spiritual and Eternal; it pretendeth not to any ſecular Proſperities, nor any ſecular Power, nor any coercive force over the Bodies and Eſtates of Men, is not a Government adminiſtred by external force and the power of the Sword, nor was it planted or propagated by the Arm of Fleſh: But it began in the form of a Servant and the ignominy of the Croſs, without the power or learning of the World to countenance it (whence it ſeem'd fooliſh in the Eye of the World) and in its Virtue, Genius and Spirit was not a little unlike the World, nor a little diſlik'd by the World.

The Civil Government in mundane Kingdoms is in a Lordly way (*h*) *not ſuch as that of a Wife,*

nor

(c) *Dr. Hamm. on Matth.* 3.

(d) *Ut omnia hujus regni ſpiritalia & cæleſtia ſunt, jure cæleſte & cælorum regnum appellatur.* Bucer. Enarrat. in Mat. 3. 7.

(e) *Clem. Str. l.* 4. p. 384.

(f) *In quâ nullum vel mundi vel mundani promiſſi occurrit lineamentum, nil niſi cælo dignum ea pandit, atque cultoribus ſuis offert.* Vorſt. Not. in Maimon. de fundam. leg. p. 139.

(g) *Fortitudinem gentilium mundana cupiditas, fortitudinem autem Chriſtianorum Dei Charitas facit.* S. Aug. contr. poſt. reſp. Julian. l. 1. c. 81. *Qui vult intelligere virtutem hujus civitatis, intelligat vim charitatis. Ipſa eſt virtus quam nemo vincit. Hujus ignem nulli fluctus ſeculi, nulla flumina tentationis extinguunt.* Idem in Pſal. 47.

(h) Οὐ πιςτὸς οἷος ὁ τῆς γυναικὸς, οὐδὲ πιςτὸς οἷος *nor as that of Servants, but much more formidable; for we ſee every where ſharp Swords, Executioners, Pains, Baſtiles, Puniſhments.* But the Government in the Kingdom of Chriſtianity is the holy happy Government, Government without any Miſgovernment, and wherein there is nothing of harſhneſs and arrogance (that of a Shepherd over his Sheep, of an Husband over his Spouſe) the Government of the Lamb of God and of the *Son of Man*, which denoteth the Humanity and Benignity, the Manſuetude and Graciouſneſs of his Government. In his Kingdom thoſe that have the greater places in it, muſt not be like the ſecular Grandees in their Temper and Behaviour, nor muſt they be like them in external State and Condition (for State, Splendor and Riches accrue to ſecular Grandees by their great Places:) But they that have the greater Places and Offices in Chriſt's Kingdom, muſt be as the Servants of all in virtuous Temper and Behaviour, and in their external State and Condition they muſt have nothing of Secular-like State and Greatneſs (that gratifieth worldly Pride) by their great Places, only greater Service, Miniſtery, Hardſhip and ſecular Inconveniences will accrue to them in this World. *Matth.* 25. 20---28. *Te know, that the Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe dominion over them, and they that are great exerciſe authority upon them. But it ſhall not be ſo among you: But whoſoever will be great among you, let him be your Miniſter. And whoſoever will be chief among you, let him be your Servant. Even as the Son of Man came not to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter.* (Not to aſſume to himſelf or enjoy State and Greatneſs in this World.) *Luk.* 22. 26. *He that is greateſt among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth ſerve. For whether is greater, he that ſitteth at meat or he that ſerveth? Is not he that ſitteth at meat? But I am among you as he that ſerveth.* Not any place in Chriſt's Kingdom is a place of ſecular-like State and Greatneſs. (*i*) *When the Apoſtle ſaith, he that deſireth the Office of a Biſhop, deſireth a good Work, his intent is, to explain, what Epiſcopacy is, which ſignifieth the taking care and overſight of others, and is the Name of a Work and Labour, not of an Honour.* (*k*) *He that deſireth the Office of a Biſhop, deſireth a good Work; a Work, not a Dignity; Labour, not ſenſitive Delight and Pleaſure; a Work whereby he may decreaſe in Humility, not ſwell with Sublimity.* Chriſt hath not annex'd any thing of ſecular-like State and Greatneſs to the chief Places and Offices in his Kingdom, and it is againſt his mind, that any thing of that Nature (which is incongruous and extravagant) ſhould be annex'd thereto by others. *Non his delectatur Chriſtus, quæ miratur mundus.* The World's Pomps and Vanities are out of faſhion in Chriſt's Kingdom. The World is for Preferment, and Chriſt is for a virtuous Self-abaſement. The World is for (*l*) πλουσιακὴ διαγωγή, *the rich and opulent way of living*, and to be λαμπρόβιοι, *great and ſplendid* (in Houſe and Garb, Port and Proviſion) and Chriſt is for a Croſs and the meanneſs of Service. He was not one of the World's Grandees or gay Gallants, he neither affected nor enjoy'd its ſplendid Gauds and Braveries of high living (nor is it Chriſt-like Virtue to affect them, or a Chriſt-like Condition to enjoy them:) His reigning Condition was not of this World, and that which is meant of his reigning Eſtate and Condition, is fitly applicable to his Polity, *My Kingdom is not of this World*, Joh. 18. 36. If the Temperament and Conſtitution of it was not alien from the World, it could not be of Kind and Quality Chriſt's Kingdom.

IV. Yet in the Chriſtian Church in great part and from ancient time the mundane Spirit hath prevail'd and reign'd to the height of wonder and aſtoniſhment (ſymbolizing with the carnal Jews, their ſecular Meſſiah and his mundane Kingdom;) and ſo far as it hath prevailed and reign'd, the Church hath not been of Kind and Quality Chriſtian, but a mundane Republick. Such a Kingdom of Chriſt which is a Kingdom of mundane Pomp and Felicity, and ſhould continue a Thouſand Years after the Reſurrection, the ancient Chiliaſts dream'd of; and ſuch a Kingdom of Chriſt the Church of *Rome* is, that is no Chiliaſt, nor dreameth of a Thouſand Years ſecular Felicity after the Reſurrection; for ſhe more than dreameth of a worldly kind of Kingdom and Monarchy, a Polity of ſecular State and Grandeur maintain'd by worldly Craft, the power of the Sword and a barbarous Inquiſition; a Kingdom of mundane Eccleſiaſtic Bravery, of Ambition and ſecular Preheminence, of all imaginable mundane Pomp, her pretended Vicar of Chriſt (who hath his Kingdom in this World though Chriſt had not) preſiding *in excelſo Eccleſiæ militantis throno ſuper gentes & regna conſtitutus* (as he ſaith in his Bulls) diſpoſing of the Crowns and Kingdoms of the World, beſtowing the Titles of mundane Honour and Dignity, and treading on the Necks of Kings. At this day the Patriarch of *Alexandria* giveth himſelf the Title of τῆς οἰκουμένης κριτής, *Judge of the World*, and he of *Conſtantinople* will be *Oecumenical Patriach*. Τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου, is an expreſſion of *Balſamon* upon the Ninth Canon of the Second Council of *Nice*: Nor is it only to Patriarchs that ſuch ſuperlative Magnificence is attributed, but (*m*) the Dignity of every Biſhop is ſaid to be equal to the Imperatorial, and in ſacred places to be preferr'd before it. (*n*) *Euſebius* the Empreſs ſent for *Leontius* Biſhop of *Tripolis* to come to her. He made anſwer, that if ſhe would have him to come to her, the Reverence due to Biſhops muſt be preſerv'd. When I enter, you muſt come down from your ſublime Throne, and reverently come to meet me, and put your Head under my Hands, to receive my Benediction. Then I muſt ſit, you muſt modeſtly ſtand and not ſit, till I give you a ſign (ſo the Biſhops at the Council of *Nice* beckned to *Conſtantine*, to ſit down) if you like theſe Conditions, I will come; if otherwiſe, you can do nothing for me, that will countervail the neglect of the Honour due unto Biſhops and the violation of the divine Inſtitute of the Prieſthood. By C. *Borrhomeus* and his *Milan* Council Biſhops are forbidden to ſtand, when Princes ſit, even for ſaying Grace at Meat, or otherwiſe to depreſs and abject themſelves to Princes. By theſe Inſtitutes of the Prieſthood the Princes became humble, but the Biſhops (profeſſing the Diſcipline of Humility) became enormouſly proud (not ſo humble and ſober as thoſe Rabbins,

---

ὁ τῶν δούλων, ἀλλὰ πολλῷ φοβερώτερος. Ξίφη γάρ ἐστιν ἰδεῖν ἠκονημένα πανταχοῦ, δημίους, κολάσεις, βασανιστήρια, τιμωρίας. *S. Chryſoſt.* T. 5. p. 13.

Dan. 7. 13.

(i) *Qui Epiſcopatum deſiderat bonum opus deſiderat. Exponere voluit Apoſtolus, quid ſit Epiſcopatus: quia nomen eſt operis, non honoris.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 19. c. 19.

(k) *Si quis Epiſcopatum deſiderat, bonum opus deſiderat; opus non dignitatem; laborem non delicias; opus per quod humilitate decreſcat, non intumeſcat faſtigio.* S. Hieron. ap. Grot. Not. in Matth. 20, 22.

(l) *M. Ant. l.* 1. *S.* 3.

(m) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 14. c. 12.

(n) *Baron. ad an.* 325. *n.* 16.

bins, who ſay (*o*) we do not expect great Revenues and Riches, to be carry'd in Chariots, and to drink Wine with various ſorts of Muſick, in the Kingdom of our Meſſiah) as appeareth from the ancient complaints (*p*) of their tyrannical Domination, their ἐξουσίας κοσμικῶς τῦφος, *fumoſus ſeculi typhus*, puffy Grandeur and Magnificence of the World, (*q*) their φιλονεικίαι ϗ φιλαρχίαι, outragious Contentions and Ambitions, (*r*) their λύσσα φιλαρχίας, *madneſs of Ambition*, ὑπὲρ θρόνων ἔρις, *Contention for their Thrones*, for the extent of their Dioceſes, for Preheminence and Grandeur (who ſhould be greateſt) the bloody Conteſts that were at their Elections, their furious and bloody Contentions and Perſecutions for their Opinions, their lordly Superiority over the Presbyters, and their diſcarding them from the Government of the Church (who are really their Collegues) their depriving the Church of due Paſtoral Government (for want of which ὑλομανεῖ, *it is as a Wilderneſs or as the Field of the Sluggard*) and adminiſtring their kind of Church-government, which in the main of it is not the Chriſtiano-paſtoral kind of Government and Diſcipline (that is now loſt out of the Church) but a mundane and ſecular kind of rule and way of procedure in Government, which ſignifieth nothing to the promoting Saving Chriſtianity and the real Holineſs of the Church. What a marvellouſly mundane Spirit of pride prevailed in the Guides of the Church, when many Canons were made for preſerving the Grandeur of Biſhops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs, and that leſſer Cities ſhould have no Biſhops, *ne vileſcat nomen Epiſcopi?* When in the Council of *Chalcedon* the Phraſe was, *that Biſhops taught Men by the Magnificence of their Footſteps?* The Government of the Church ought to carry the Marks and Signatures of the Divinity and Sanctity of our Religion and its due alienation from the World (as a Chriſtians Habit according to S. *Baſil* ſhould lively expreſs the meekneſs and humility of his Mind:) But they that have modell'd Eccleſiaſtical Government, have proceeded by other Rules, they have deſignedly made it conformable to the World. (*s*) *As all mundane Power is differenc'd by theſe degrees of Dignities, firſt there is the Emperour, then the Cæſars, then Kings, Dukes and Counts and Tribunes, ſo Eccleſiaſtical Dignity is found to be ordinated by the Holy Fathers.* But thus to conform the Church to the World is *humanam Eccleſiam facere*, to make the Church Humane (which ſeem'd to S. *Cyprian* a Crime of a ſtrange Nature) and to deſtroy her Divine Nature and Excellency. Which is ſo entirely deſtroy'd in the Church of *Rome*, that there is great cauſe to complain (*t*) *It is no more a Church, but a certain human Republick. To be a Biſhop, is no more a Service and Miniſtery, but a mundane Honour and Dignity.* If the Guides of the Church be of this Character, their Inſtitutes of Religion will be mundane in the deſign of them (mainly for the Honour and Profit of the Prieſthood) by their Artifices they will make the Church a Kingdom of mundane Riches and ſecular Pomp, they will accommodate Religion to their own Genius, and dreſs up their Godſervice with a phantaſtick Bravery of pompous Ceremony, which is as alien from the Spouſe of Chriſt, as the ſecular Gauds are from Chriſtian Women. (*u*) *Mulierem ornari ſeculariter non oportare*, a Chriſtian Woman ought not to be adorn'd with ſecular Bravery. So to maintain Chriſtianity by the Methods deſtructive to the lives of Men, as worldly Kingdoms muſt be upheld and maintain'd, is at a great rate mundane and unchriſtian. (*w*) *Abſit ut igni humano vindicetur divina ſecta.* Far be it from us, that the Divine Sect be vindicated by Humane Fire. Our Saviour argueth, *If my Kingdom were of this World, then would my Servants fight.* And the Argument may be thus inverted; if his pretended Servants be a furious fighting Generation, their Kingdom is of this World; for they are Aliens from Chriſtianity. Such were the Monks of ancient times, a Zealotick Generation of Warriours (like the Jewiſh Zealots) and ſuch were their nominal Chriſtians at *Alexandria* (*x*) who murder'd that excellent Mathematician *Hypatia* the Daughter of *Theon*, tore her to pieces and burn'd her Members. (*y*) On the Sacrament-day they kill'd *Proterius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* in the Baptiſtery (by the inſtigation of *Timotheus* his Corrival) his dead Body torn in pieces they drew through the City, afterwards burn'd it (throwing the Aſhes into the Air) and ſo barbarous was their rage, that they tore in pieces his Bowels and ate them. Pretending Chriſtians (more like the Fiends of Hell than the Citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven) by their fierce and furious Contentions, Seditions and Tumults, Slaughters, Perſecutions and bloody Wars have made the viſible Church called the Kingdom of Heaven, to reſemble that mundane City, to which Heaven ſtandeth oppos'd in Philoſophy as well as Chriſtianity. For ſo Philoſophy confronteth two Cities the Terreſtrial and Celeſtial (ſuppos'd to be repreſented in *Vulcan*'s Shield) and thus deſcribeth the Terreſtrial. (*z*) *In this there are Wars, Seditions, Rapines, Fightings, Cryings, Wailings and Lamentations.*

V. The Kingdom of God that in the New Teſtament is oppos'd to the mundane humane Kingdoms, is much more eminently oppos'd to Satan's Kingdom. For the Summary of Chriſtianity is compris'd in the knowledge of the two oppoſite Religions, *the Law and the Religion of Saving Grace, the two oppoſite Lives of Fleſh and Spirit* (vital Carnality and vital Sanctity) *the two oppoſite Eſtates of Life and Death, the two oppoſite Kingdoms, the Kingdom of God and of Satan.* (*a*) *For there are two Nations and two Kingdoms, the one of Chriſt, the other of Satan: Of which it might be ſaid, Nation ſhall riſe againſt Nation, and Kingdom againſt Kingdom: and this doth not ceaſe to be ſo from the time that it was ſaid, Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* Then God began, to ſet up his Kingdom, which was the raiſing up Kingdom againſt Kingdom, a Kingdom that both in the nature and deſign of it is oppoſite to Satan's Kingdom, the one being the Kingdom of Darkneſs (of the darkneſs of Ignorance, Sin and Miſery) the other the Kingdom of Light (the light of Saving Knowledge, Grace and Comfort;) for Chriſt both in himſelf and to us is Light. (*b*) *We* (regenerate Chriſtians) *are in Chriſt, that is, in the true Sun and the true Day. When is he without* Light,

(o) *Vorſt. Not. in Abravan. de cap. Fid.* p. 63, 60.

(p) *Grot. de Imp. ſum. poteſt.* p. 360.

(q) *Gr. Naz. Ep.* 55.

(r) *Idem Carm. de vit. ſua* p. p. 25.

(s) *Sicut omnis mundana poteſtas his gradibus dignitatum à ſe invicem diſtat, id eſt, ut primus ſit Auguſtus vel Imperator, deinde Cæſares, deinde Reges, Duces & Comites atque Tribuni, ita & Eccleſiaſtica dignitas ordinata à ſanctis Patribus invenitur.* Selden Titles of Hon. p. 232. Ed. 3.

(t) *Spalat. de profect. ſuâ.*

(u) *S. Cypr. Teſtim. ad Quirin. l.* 3. *n.* 36.

(w) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 37.

(x) *Socrat. Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 15.

(y) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 16.

(z) Ἐν δὲ τῇ, πόλεμοι καὶ στάσεις, ϗ ἁρπαγαὶ ϗ μάχαι, ϗ ὀλολυγαὶ, ϗ οἰμωγαὶ, ϗ γόοι. *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 27.

(a) *Duæ quippe gentes ſunt, & duo regna, unum ſcilicet Chriſti, alterum Diaboli: de quibus dici potuit; Exurget gens contra gentem, & regnum ſuper regnum: quod non deſinit fieri, ex quo dictum eſt; Agite pœnitentiam, appropinquavit enim regnum cœlorum.* S. Aug. Ep. 80.

(b) *In Chriſto, hoc eſt, in ſole & die vero ſumus. Quando ſine lumine eſt, cui lumen in corde eſt? Aut quando ſol ei & dies non eſt, cui ſol & dies Chriſtus*

Light, that hath Light in his Heart? or when is the Sun and the Day wanting to him, to whom Chriſt is both Sun and Day? We that are in Chriſt, that is, always in the Light, let us not ceaſe from Prayer even in the Night-time. In the ſtate of Chriſtian Regeneracy *the Darkneſs is paſt and the true Light now ſhineth* (1 Joh. 2. 8.) which ſtate of Regeneracy is the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Light. If thou haſt entred into it, (c) *the Darkneſs is departed from thy inward Man; the Night that was there is diſſipated; the caliginouſneſs is done away; the Splendor of the Day hath enligtned thy Senſes; thou haſt begun to be a Man of Light; for Chriſt is Light and the Day.* (d) *He is Light, we without him are Darkneſs. Recede from him, thou wilt remain in thy Darkneſs: Come to him, thou wilt have Light, but not thine own. For ye were ſometimes Darkneſs, ſaith the Apoſtle to the Faithful, that were ſometimes Infidels. Ye were ſometimes Darkneſs; but now Light in the Lord. If Light in the Lord, they were Darkneſs without the Lord.* (e) *All the Saints are Lights, but through believing they are illuminated by him, from whom if one departeth, he will be darkned. But when he ſaith, that every one who believeth in me, may not remain in Darkneſs, It is plain from his words, that he found all in Darkneſs.* All Mankind therefore in their Unregeneracy (Jews as well as Gentiles) are called *Darkneſs* by the Evangeliſt, *Joh.* 1. 5. *The Light ſhined in Darkneſs, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not.* (f) *Mundus enim Tenebræ:* The World is that which is fitly ſignify'd by Darkneſs; for the Life of all unregenerate Mankind is (g) ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ σκότους, *the Life of Darkneſs* (the Darkneſs of reigning Carnality and Wickedneſs:) but the Gentiles more eſpecially and eminently were invelop'd in Darkneſs, and with reſpect to them more eſpecially the Apoſtle confronteth and oppoſeth the Kingdom of Darkneſs to the Kingdom of God, *Col.* 1. 13. *Who hath delivered us from the power of Darkneſs and tranſlated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son.* Chriſtianity is (as *Jamblichus* ſaith of Philoſophy) ἡμεροειδὴς, *like unto the Day*, Heatheniſm is *of the Night* and *of Darkneſs* in matters of Religion, whence the Apoſtle to the Gentiles was ſent, *to turn them from Darkneſs to Light and from the power of Satan unto God.* Chriſt's deſign was againſt Satan as having a Kingdom in the World (which is the Kingdom of Darkneſs) he reign'd, and Sin and the Law reign'd over the World of benighted Mankind: but theſe Chriſt deſpoil'd of their Regnancy by his Paſſion, whence he is ſaid to *have ſpoiled Principalities and Powers*, Col. 2. 15. which Divine Victory was follow'd by a triumph over them; for *having aſcended he led captivity captive, and made ſhew of them openly* (in the Apoſtles caſting out Devils and in their ſucceſsful preaching whereby Demonolatry fell) θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ, *there was a triumphing over them in him.* His Kingdom was ſet up in oppoſition to Satan's Kingdom, and between theſe two Kingdoms there is the greateſt Hoſtility and Contrariety imaginable. If therefore in a Polity which calleth it ſelf Chriſt's Kingdom and the Catholick Church, there is no ſuch contrariety, if inſtead thereof it groſly ſymbolizeth with Satan's Kingdom in the main and principal Properties of it, if it be *a Kingdom of the Darkneſs of Ignorance, a Kingdom of horrid Superſtition and Idolatry, a Kingdom of Luciferian Pride, a Kingdom of Uncleanneſs* (as Satan is the unclean Spirit) *a Kingdom of Worldlineſs* (as Satan is the Prince of this World) *a Kingdom of Lyes* (as Satan is a Lyar, whoſe lying is ſelf-originated, his own kind of thing, and the Father of the Fact and Family) *a Kingdom of barbarous Perſecution, Homicide and Murder* (as Satan was a Murderer from the beginning) *a Kingdom of Profaneneſs and of all outragious Wickedneſs* (as Satan and his Angels are πνεύματα πονηρίας, Spirits of Wickedneſs) ſuch a pretended Kingdom of Chriſt is neceſſarily a grand Myſtery of Iniquity as being at leaſt in great degree Satan's Kingdom.

VI. The Kingdom of God in the Senſe of the New Teſtament (beſides that it is oppos'd to the Humane Mundane Kingdoms and to the Kingdoms of Darkneſs) is oppos'd to a threefold Kingdom of God. For the whole Univerſe is his Poſſeſſion and Dominion, is govern'd by his Providence and ſubjected to his irreſiſtible authoritative Power: but it is not the Holy Polity, which is his Kingdom. His Univerſal Dominion and Sovereignty over the Creatures the Scripture uſually calleth *his Kingdom:* but this Kingdom is *extrinſick and extra-ſocietive*, whereas in his Church and Kingdom God is an intrinſick imperial Head and Sovereignty. Such he was in ſome degree in the Church of old *Iſrael*, which was a *Theocracy*; yet the Church of old *Iſrael* was not that Holy Polity, which is his Kingdom: but this Kingdom is (in the ſecond place) oppos'd to *his Kingdom over old* Iſrael. In *Solomon*'s time (h) the Theocracy was in great degree diminiſhed, yet *Solomon* is ſaid *to ſit upon the Throne of the Kingdom of the Lord over* Iſrael. And in the laſt times of the Judaical Polity God is called *the King of Iſrael*, and *Jeruſalem* the City of the great King. The Jews ſeem to think, that their Theocracy in ſome degree ſtill continueth; for thus they continue to pray; *Let thy Kingdom reign over us for ever.* God did reign over them peculiarly (they were in Covenant and the ſtate of Society with God as a People with their God, in the eldeſt times of their Commonwealth he made Laws for them peculiarly, govern'd them by his Oracles, appointed their Magiſtrates, receiv'd their Tribute, fought their Battels, dwelt amongſt them and walk'd in the midſt of their Camp:) but *this Kingdom of God over* Iſrael did not make them a Kingdom much leſs the Kingdom of God. For till the time of the Judges was expir'd, and their Kings were conſtituted, there was no ſuch thing as *the Kingdom of* Iſrael. Before that time they might be called *a Kingdom of Prieſts*, Exod. 19. 6. but a Kingdom there doth not ſignifie politically (that Species of Polity contradiſtinct to a Commonwealth) it ſignifieth only a Regial Sacerdotal Syſtem (*regale ſacerdotium*) in reſpect of the *Iſraelites* Nobilitation of Eſtate; that obeying God they ſhould be ſuch as are of regial, ſublime, unſervile condition. But as they were not a Kingdom, till their Kings were conſtituted notwithſtanding their Theocracy; ſo if their Kings had been remov'd, they would have been a Commonwealth, not a Kingdom, although the

Theocracy

---

eſt? Qui autem in Chriſto, hoc eſt, in lumine ſemper ſumus, nec noctibus ab oratione ceſſemus. S. Cypr. de orat. domin. ſub fin.

(c) *Receſſerunt de pectore tuo tenebræ, nox inde diſcuſſa eſt, caligo deterſa eſt, illuminavit ſenſus tuos ſplendor diei, homo lucis eſſe cœpiſti, quia lux & dies Chriſtus eſt.* Idem de Zel. & Liv.

(d) *Ille lumen, nos ſine illo tenebræ. Si receſſeris, in tuis tenebris remanebis: Si acceſſeris, non de tuo lucebis. Fuiſtis enim aliquando tenebræ, ait Apoſtolus fidelibus ex infidelibus. Fuiſtis aliquando tenebræ: nunc autem lux in Domino. Si ergo lux in Domino, tenebræ ſine Domino.* S. Aug. de Temp. Ser. 256.

(e) *Lumina ſunt omnes ſancti, ſed credendo ab eo illuminantur, à quo ſi quis receſſerit, tenebrabitur. Cùm autem dicit, ut omnis qui credit in me, in tenebris non maneat; ſatis manifeſtat, omnes ſe in tenebris inveniſſe.* Idem in Joann. Tr. 54.

(f) *Idem ibid. Tr.* 3.

(g) *Macar. Hom.* 1.

Act. 26. 18.

Eph. 4. 8.

Joh. 8. 44.

(h) *Spencer. Diſſ. de Theocr. Jud.* c. 4. *ſ.* 2.

1 *Chron.* 28. 5.

Zeph. 3. 15.

Matth. 5. 15.

Theocracy remain'd, and God continu'd, to be their King. For God was their King but in a certain ſenſe and degree, he did never take upon him, to be abſolutely the Eſtate of their Civil-ſovereignty (or Civil-political King) ſo to conſtitute them a Kingdom. (*i*) Diſcourſes therefore of their Theocracy muſt be underſtood with limitation of ſenſe, for God was ſo their King (Civil-political) as not to be their King; they ſo elected him to be their King, as not to elect him for their King; and ſo took an Oath of Allegiance to him, as not to take an Oath of Allegiance to him. For they entred into Covenant with him as a People with the Lord their God, and this was the only Oath of Allegiance, which they took; which is a plain intimation, that although God did in many reſpects exerciſe a Regial Civil Government over them, yet he was not properly and plenarily their (Civil-political) King, that conſtituted them properly and plenarily a Monarchy and a Kingdom. But as if the Pope ſhould in many reſpects exerciſe a Regial Civil Government over the Commonwealth of *Venice*, yet without conſtituting them properly and plenarily a Monarchy and a Kingdom; ſuch was the caſe of old *Iſrael*, before their Theocracy was diminiſh'd by conſtituting their King. A *third Kingdom of God* to which his Kingdom in the ſenſe of the New Teſtament is oppos'd, is his *Original Kingdom*; for the New Teſtament-kingdom of God is of late creation, and muſt be called, *The new Kingdom of God*, as Tertullian ſtileth it. (*k*) *We ought chiefly to inquire, whether a new Lawgiver is not to be expected, and the Heir of a new Teſtament, a Prieſt of new Sacrifices, and a purger by a new Circumciſion, and the obſerver of an Eternal Sabbath: who cometh to reſtrain the Old Law and to make a New Teſtament, to offer new Sacrifices, and to repreſs the old Ceremonies, and the old Circumciſion with its Sabbath, and to publiſh a new Kingdom not ſubject to Corruption.* As the new Teſtament is the new Law of God, ſo the Kingdom of the new Teſtament is the new Kingdom of God, which cannot be oppos'd to an old Iſraelitical Kingdom of God; for there was no ſuch Kingdom. Although ſome ſay, (*l*) that the Hebrews being deliver'd out of *Egypt* transferr'd their own right upon God, and ſo he became their King (or *ſumma poteſtas*) and had a Kingdom *ex vi pacti*, by their Election and Covenant. And theſe ſuppoſe, that (*m*) *by Religion the Kingdom of God is conſtituted, ſo that Religion is almoſt nothing elſe but the Conſtitution of the Kingdom of God.* But it ought to be conſider'd, that not every Religion, nor every Religion of the true God conſtituteth the Kingdom of God, but only ſuch a Religion which is Sanctity as to the Soul-intereſts, which conſtituteth the genuine Saints of God (the Citizens of Heaven and the Heirs of Salvation;) for in the ſame Senſe that Chriſt is the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial, God is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial. If the Theocracy had conſtituted old *Iſrael* a Kingdom, that Kingdom would have been a Polity *of different kind and quality from the Kingdom of God*; for it would have been but an earthly and mundane kind of Kingdom, a Polity of kind and quality Civil-religious (in reſpect of its Laws, Virtue, Sanctity, Rewards and Puniſhments;) whereas the Kingdom of God is the *Kingdom of Heaven*, of a Spiritual, Divine and Heavenly Nature, and of kind and quality the Spiritual Religious Polity (elſe it could not be the oppoſite both to the Kingdom of Darkneſs and the Humane Mundane Kingdoms) *The genuine Saint of God-kind of Kingdom.* No other Polity can be the Kingdom of God (which is the Kingdom of God and his Saints in truth ſuch) but the Kingdom of real and ſaving Sanctity, which is peculiar to the genuine Saints of God; whereas old *Iſrael* were the Saints of God, the holy People, and the holy Commonwealth, but in the ſame ſenſe as they were Jews, not thoſe that are in truth ſuch but in Type, and their Religion, Polity and Theocracy was but a typical adumbration of the Kingdom of God.

VII. The new Kingdom of God is made by making *the new Settlement and Diſpenſation of things* (which maketh it to be the new Kingdom of God:) but the making this new Settlement is not meerly the making a new Law, it compriſeth the making *a new Lord, a new Law, and the general Peace*; upon all which accounts it is the making a new Kingdom of God. The making *a new Lord* was the making *a new Mediatory Saviour-King in his Kingdom-eſtate*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, *Act.* 2. 36. *Let all the Houſe of* Iſrael *know aſſuredly, that God hath made that ſame Jeſus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Chriſt.* Act. 5. 31. *Him hath God exalted with his Right-hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour.* He was originally deſign'd, to be a Saviour-prince (to Mankind and to his People) the whole of his Mediation or Inter-agency here on Earth was deſign'd, to render him ſuch a Saviour-prince: but he was only ſuch a Prince *in fieri*, till he was raiſed to the eſtate of the Divine Sovereignty and became a Saviour-King in reigning Eſtate. When he was raiſed to this magnificent and creature-tranſcendent Eſtate of Sovereignty (which he could not poſſeſs without his Father's donation or collation) he was made plenarily in State and Condition (inaugurated and inthron'd) the Saviour-Prince, Meſſiah the King (the King of God's People) or *The Chriſt*, which ſignifieth *the Lord's Anointed that is anointed to be the Lord, the* (Mediatory) *Divine Sovereign Lord.* His Eſtate of Sovereign Lordſhip and Dominion was *inherited, merited, imparted.* For he was *the Heir*, *Matth.* 21. 38. *ch.* 22. 2. as in Humane Governments the eldeſt Son is Heir of the Crown (of the Imperial Dignity:) So the Son of God was Heir apparent of the Supreme Sovereignty (of the Heavenly Royal Dignity) the Rights and the whole Eſtate of God. With this his juſt Title the Will of his Father did concur, *who appointed him Heir of all things*, Heb. 1. 2. which may ſignifie *inheritor or poſſeſſor of all things*; and it may ſignifie *Lord of all things*; for the word *Heir* in ancient times ſignify'd Lord. (*n*) *Hæres apud antiquos pro Domino ponebant*, ſaith *Feſtus*. He might have claim'd the Heavenly Sovereignty by right of Inheritance, but he ſo far diveſted

---

(i) *Deum regem politicum fuiſſe, regis politici locum in gente Iſraelitica tenuiſſe, regis officio functum fuiſſe, Deum gentis totius regem eſſe, Regis aut Imperatoris civilis nomen & officium gerere, Deum in regem ſuum junctis ſuffragiis elegit populus, ab iiſdem eligi in Imperatorem, Deus ad munus regium electus erat, Deum in Regem & Imperatorem ſuum eligente populo, Regum & ſubditorum ritu mutuo fœdere & promiſſione ſibi invicem aſtringebantur, poſtquam Iſraelitæ Deum ad officium Regium elegiſſent, Deus jure regio uſus, Legibus politicis Remp. munivit, Tabernaculum tanquàm mobile palatium parari voluit, ut inter ſubditos Ejus habitaret; Deus regis politici nomen & officium ſumere non dedignatus eſt.* D. Spencer. ſupr. c. 1. S. 2. & c. 2. & c. 4. S. 1. & c. 5. S. 1.

(k) *Et quidem in primis quærendum, an expectetur novæ legis lator, & novi Teſtamenti hæres, & novorum ſacrificiorum ſacerdos, & novæ circumciſionis purgator, & æterni ſabbati cultor: qui legem veterem compeſcat & novum Teſtamentum ſtatuat, nova ſacrificia offerat, & ceremonias antiquas reprimat, & circumciſionem veterem cum ſuo ſibi ſabbato compeſcat, & novum regnum, quod non corrumpatur, adnunciet.* Adv. Judæos, c. 6.

(l) *Spinoza Theologopol.* c. 17.

(m) *Per religionem conſtituitur regnum Dei, nihilque ferè adeo ſit religio, quàm regni Dei conſtitutio.* Ibid.

(n) *Vinnius Com in Inſtit. p.*411.

diveſted himſelf of this claim for our ſakes, that he choſe to have the Heavenly Sovereignty as a Mediatory Sovereign Lord rather than as meer Lord the Son, and upon another ſcore than as meer Heir, namely, as a reward of his Obedience and Sufferings for our Redemption; whereby he not only merited for us, but he merited us (to have us for his Subjects and Servants) and highly merited at our Hands, that we ſhould own him for our Sovereign Lord; and he alſo merited at the Hands of God his high advancement to the Heavenly Sovereignty, which was the juſt reward of his Humiliation. *For to this end Chriſt both died and roſe and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*, Rom. 14. 9. The end of his dying and riſing again was, that he might be in the ſtate and place of Lord of all (which is the Heavenly Sovereignty or the Imperial Eſtate of God) and exerciſe Lordſhip and Dominion over all. By his dying he merited it, and he became poſſeſs'd of it by his riſing again, *When the Lord ſaid unto my Lord, ſit thou at my right hand, gave him a Name, which is above every Name, gave all things into his Hand, committed all Judgment unto the Son, gave him power over all Fleſh, and all power in Heaven and Earth; gave him to be head over all things to the Church, ſubjected unto him the World to come, Angels, Principalities and Powers, crown'd him with Glory and Honour, and put all things under his Feet.* As he is poſſeſs'd of the Heavenly and Divine Sovereignty, ſo all the Prerogatives of a Divine King, all the Branches of Sovereign Dominion and Power appertain to him (power to inact and abrogate Laws, to remit and retain Sins, power of Life and Death;) and becauſe he is rightfully poſſeſs'd of the Divine Sovereignty, all Potentates are Underlings to him, all Creatures are ſubjected to his diſpoſal (ſo far as is needful for the Intereſts of his Kingdom) and all capable Creatures are (remotely at leaſt) his Liege-ſubjects. So many of them as duely own him for their Sovereign Lord, conſtitute his Church and Kingdom (the new Kingdom of God) wherein he exerciſeth all Kingly Power, doth all Kingly Offices, and enjoyeth the Homage and Service due to a Divine King. His Government of his Kingdom is that of a Divine King; for it is not meerly in a political, but alſo in a ſpiritual way; his genuine Subjects are govern'd by his Laws (by his Officers alſo) and by his Holy Spirit; he reigneth over them and reigneth in them, his Throne is ſet up in their Hearts, as having the Supremacy in their inward Man, the Subjection and Service of their Souls, and they ſerve him with all their Heart and Soul.

The Meſſiah was deſign'd to have a Kingdom upon his great Undertaking; and his great Undertaking was, to make *the new Law or Settlement for the new Kingdom of God*, that thereby it might be a Kingdom of the Saints of God, although it muſt neceſſarily conſiſt of lapſed miſerable Sinners. Accordingly by this new Law (or Settlement) ungodly Sinners (in their original ſtate ſuch) become the Saints of God in State and Condition, in Life and Practice. Becoming Chriſt's People they have the State and Condition of the Saints of God, that is provided for them, ſettled upon them, *the State of Remiſſion of Sins and of Righteouſneſs, of Reconcilement and Favour with God, of Adoption and Heavenly Citizenſhip.* God is ſo free to them, as to make them free Citizens of the Supernal City; ſo kind to them as to make them his neareſt Kindred; and ſo fatherly unto them, as to make them his Sons and Heirs. But the Citizens of this Divine Polity muſt be the Saints of God in Life and Practice (as well as in State and Condition) in order whereto our Saviour hath made this new Law *an Inſtitution of Chriſtian Sanctity of Life*, compriſing the Doctrines and Precepts of it (with Admonitions, Reproofs, Exhortations and Examples adjoyned) propoſing the faireſt Patterns of it, enforcing it with the mightieſt Motives and Inducements, furniſhing the greateſt helps and aſſiſtances thereto, and not only externally teaching it (like Humane Inſtitutions of Virtue) but vitally begetting it in the Souls of his Religioniſts; for his Religion is an Inſtitution of *Sanctification* as well as of *Sanctity*. The entrance into Chriſtianity is by Sanctification and an initial Sanctity (denying all Ungodlineſs and Worldly Luſts) and the Eſſence of Chriſtianity perſonal conſiſteth therein; for none are genuine Chriſtians but *the ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus.* 1 Cor. 1. 2. In his Inſtitution Sin and Wickedneſs is of the blackeſt Character, Holineſs hath the higheſt Elogies, immenſe Felicities are promis'd to the one, and as immenſe Penalties are denounc'd againſt the other; his deſign in his Inſtitution and in his whole Undertaking is for Holineſs and againſt Sin and Wickedneſs. Nor is it only a ſlender degree of Holineſs, which his Inſtitution deſigneth and requireth, but the exacteſt and moſt elevated pitch of Sanctity, *to keep a clear and pure Conſcience, to keep the Heart pure* (that nothing of an evil Tincture be there) *not to defile our Garments, to keep our ſelves unſpotted from the World* (any Worldly Luſts) *and that the wicked one touch us not, to purifie our ſelves as our Lord is pure, to give diligence, to be found of him in peace without ſpot and blameleſs, to perfect Holineſs, to be holy and unblameable and unreprovable in his ſight*, that there be no Blot in our Eſcutcheon and none may juſtly ſay, black is our Eye. His deſign is, to make us God-like in Holineſs and Happineſs; agreeably to which deſign the *minimum quod ſic* of a true Chriſtian, is faithfully to endeavour all immaculate Sanctity of Soul and Life, to be no committer of Sin, not to live in any known Sin (the habitual practice of any) not to do any act of deliberate heinous Sin, but (as being faithful to God and Holineſs, to God and his Duty) to live the holy ſinleſs Life in the utmoſt ſtrictneſs and purity thereof. (o) *For as we do not admire the Creator only in the Heavens, the Earth, the Sun, the Ocean, Elephants and Camels, but in minute Animals:* ità mens Chriſto dedita æquè & in majoribus & in minoribus intenta eſt, *ſo a mind piouſly affected and addicted to Chriſt is ſolicitous in leſſer matters of Duty and Sin as well as in greater.* But the new Law of our Saviour is not to be conſider'd only as an Inſtitution of Sanctity for particular Chriſtians as ſuch, but as combin'd in Societies, eſpecially as Members of the Univerſal Church and of particular Churches. For by the Chriſtian Sacraments they become συνωμόται, *Men of a Confederacy* (they confederate not with Chriſt only but with his Liege-people) they are oblig'd to aſſociate and aſſemble for the Chriſtian Religious Worſhip (the matters whereof with the kind and quality of it are preſcrib'd in this new Law) under the preſidency of Spiritual Guides and Paſtours, who have their Office appointed by our Saviour, and are oblig'd and authoriz'd to exerciſe an holy Diſcipline for the Sanctity of theſe Chriſtian Societies, which the Holy Nation (the Communion of Saints) muſt conſiſt of, and which muſt

be

(o) S. Hieron. Ep.

be holy in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Life.

The making *this new Kingdom of God* compriſeth the making *the general Peace*, whereby the Church above is now *one Family*, *one City and one Kingdom* with the Church below, and both are *one new Kingdom of God*. Our Saviour's Mediation for Pacification principally relateth unto God, his principal Buſineſs was, to mediate and negotiate a Peace with God, to procure for us the State of Remiſſion of Sins (the Donation and Settlement thereof) to make this Peace, to purchaſe this Peace (procuring it by a price) and to publiſh this Peace. The making whereof implieth a certain reconciliation and recollection of the Angels in Heaven and Mankind on Earth into one Body, and healing in great degree the divided State of the Univerſe, which was alſo part of his Deſign and Buſineſs. *Eph.* 1. 10. *That in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times he might gather together in one all things in Chriſt, both which are in Heaven and which are on Earth, even in him.* The Angels in Heaven and Chriſtians on Earth are now under one Imperial Head (*p*) collected and combin'd into one illuſtrious Syſtem and Republick *The new Kingdom of God*. So the Jews and Gentiles are collected into one Body (the new Kingdom of God) and therefore are reconciled to one another being both reconciled to God by the Croſs. *Eph.* 2. 16. But the Holy Angels cannot be ſuppos'd, to have needed a reconcilement, as the Jews and Gentiles did; for they were not in the State of Variance and Hoſtility with God; yet the Apoſtle ſaith, *Col.* 1. 20. *And having made peace by the Blood of his Croſs, by him to reconcile all things unto himſelf, by him I ſay, whether they be things in Earth or things in Heaven.* To aſſoil the difficulty that is in this place (which ſpeaketh of reconciling the Holy Angels) it muſt be conſider'd, that the great effect of the Blood of the Croſs is our Peace and Reconciliation with God, the conſequent whereof was the Exaltation of the Meſſiah, to be the Imperial Head of the Church conſiſting of Chriſtians below and the Holy Angels above. The Holy Angels are Citizens of the Kingdom of God, but of no other ſave only the new Kingdom of God, the Settlement whereof is the new Law of our Peace and Reconciliation, which maketh the new Kingdom of God. And becauſe it is ſuch, the Holy Angels are not Citizens of it, nor have they a Being or ſtanding in it by the old Settlement of the Kingdom of God, nor are we made Citizens with the Holy Angels by that Settlement (which may be called their Settlement) or by coming into their Kingdom of God: But they are made Fellow-citizens with us by our Settlement of Peace and Reconciliation, and by coming into our Kingdom of God. The new Conſtitution and Settlement of the Kingdom of God hath this advantage above the old, it is deſign'd and accommodate for the reconciling all things to himſelf (things in Earth and things in Heaven) *which is a bringing them into the deſign'd and propos'd State of Agreement with himſelf, which is to live as his Liege-people in one Syſtem.* This Reconciliation God effecteth as the great Reconciler and Peace-maker of the Univerſe, this Reconciliation the univerſal good requireth, and therefore all have need of it (even the Holy Angels who are not capable of Reconciliation in every ſuch ſenſe as Sinners are) and this Reconciliation the Apoſtle meaneth in this place. For (as ſeveral Interpreters have obſerv'd) it is a parallel place to *Eph.* 1. 10. (*q*) *For that which the Apoſtle here calleth reconciling, writing to the* Epheſians *and treating of the ſame decree of God, he calleth recapitulating, recollecting, gathering together into one.* As Jews and Gentiles were by Chriſt reconciled to God, and reconciled to one another, to live as his Liege-people in one Body: So Angels and Men were thus far reconciled to God and to one another, *they were brought into the deſigned and propoſed State of Agreement with himſelf, which is to live as his Liege-people in one Polity and Catholic Church, one new Kingdom of God.* Men were at a greater rate reconciled to God, but thus far the Angels are reconciled to God in common with Men, and ſo far *Homer*'s Wiſh is accompliſh'd, *that diſcord might periſh from amongſt the Gods and Men.*

Ὡς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο.

VIII. The making the new Kingdom of God is not a barren Theory, it affordeth ſome valuable Concluſions, that naturally iſſue from it. For (1.) It inferreth, that there is no ſuch thing as one way to Salvation by Nature another by Grace; one way to Salvation by the Law another by the Goſpel; an Heathen way and a Chriſtian way to Salvation, and that Men may be ſav'd in any Religion: But as there is one only God, ſo there is but one Kingdom of God, *which is the one only Religion of Salvation.* There is no State of Righteouſneſs, but to be a Subject and Citizen of the Kingdom of God: Nor is there any other way, to be one of the People of God; for they that are totally Extrinſicks to it, are neceſſarily Aliens, and as far diſtant and remote from God, as they are from his City and Kingdom. The Kingdom of Darkneſs and of Light ſhare the Univerſe of Rationals between them; not to be a Citizen of the Kingdom of God, is to be a Subject of the oppoſite Kingdom, which is not conſiſtent with a State of Salvation. The making the new Kingdom of God implieth, that Salvation is not to be attain'd by the Law-religion, and if not by the Law-religion, much leſs by *a Lye-religion*, that in the main ſubſtance of it is an abominable Lye, which maketh Ungodlineſs a Religion, *deadly Impiety a Saving Religion.* Salvation it ſelf cannot ſave Men without true Sanctity (of Soul and Life) which is not to be found out of the Kingdom of God, the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial. (2.) It inferreth, that the Souls of Men are in a lapſed Condition; for it ſheweth, that Mankind are now no *Natives* of the Kingdom of God, that all the Citizens of it in this World are *factively* ſuch, that in their now Original State are Foreigners not Citizens. But ſuch they were not in their firſt Native State, they were made, to be and live in the State (of Religion) of Society and Citizenſhip with God, to live the Life of knowing him, loving and enjoying him, which is their Holineſs and their Happineſs. They are now therefore in the State of lapſed Revolters from God; and if they were not ſuch, there would have been no need, that a new Kingdom of God ſhould be made, that they might be in the State of Society and Citizenſhip with God. (*r*) *The Holy Scripture* (ſaith *Origen*) *will not call any of thoſe things that are evil* κτῆμα θεοῦ, *the Poſſeſſion of God: But evil Men are called* ἄνθρωποι ἁμαρτίας, υἱοὶ λοιμοί, ἢ υἱοὶ ἀδικίας, *the Men of Sin, Sons that are Peſtilences, or Sons of Unrighteouſneſs.* Of the Supernals it muſt

---

(p) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 5.

(q) *Quod enim hic ait* ἀποκαταλλάξαι, *ad Ep.* 1. *Ubi de eodem decreto patris agit, vocat* ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι. *Grot. & Zanch. in loc.*

(r) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 394.

be ſaid (s) φαύλȣς μὲν ὄντας ȣ̓ θεμιτὸν εἰς συγγένειαν συνάπτειν, *with them it is not lawful to reckon our ſelves joyned in Affinity, if we are wicked.* But ſuch are all Men, before they are made Righteous, in their now original Condition they are of the wicked and mundane Kind and Party, Aliens from the State and Life of Sanctity (which maketh the City and Kingdom of God) they are now therefore natively Aliens from God and from his Kingdom. As Founder and providential Governour of this lower World he maketh none the Subjects and Citizens of that Holy Polity which is his Kingdom. None are *actually* ſuch, but they that are entred into federal Society with God as his Subjects and Citizens, and multitudes of theſe are none of his Subjects in the ſenſe of Alliance (nor without a nullifying abatement and limitation of ſenſe) they are but ſuch *Fideles* which deny the Faith, ſuch Believers that are worſe than Infidels, and like *Cateline* and *Cethegus* at *Rome* are *Cives non Cives*, Citizens no Citizens. (3.) It inferreth, that the State of Mankind muſt be chang'd as well as their Nature (t) *Strangers and Foreigners* muſt be made *Fellow-citizens with the Saints and of the Kingdom of God*; by which happy change in their Condition *they are brought unto God* (in State and Condition) *made nigh, that were ſometime far off*; and made *Free*, that were ſometime (*mancipia peccati & diaboli*) vile infamous Slaves. *Job.* 8. 36. *If the Son ſhall make you free, ye ſhall be free indeed.* The carnal Jews were the Servants of Sin and ſtood in need to have their Freedom given them by Chriſt, as a Bond-ſlave in a Family hath need to have his Freedom given him by the Son. For a Bondſlave in a Family is not of its Kindred, but is as an extraneous Perſon and a Foreigner, that hath no right of Inheritance, nor any right or intereſt in the Family, but ſtayeth in it only *durante Domini bene placito*, during the Pleaſure of his Lord, who may ſell him, turn him out of the Houſe or diſpoſe of him at his Pleaſure. *The Servant abideth not in the Houſe for ever: but the Son abideth ever*, as being Lord of the Family. As in humane Families it belongeth to him, to make his *Liberti* or *Liberati* (freed Men) ſo they that are called to the State of Chriſtianity, *are the Lord's Freemen.* 1 Cor. 7. 22. They are Deniſons and Free Citizens of God's Kingdom, and as *Cicero* ſaith, *omnibus municipibus duas eſſe patrias, unam naturæ, alteram juris*, all that are taken into the number of the Roman Citizens, have two Countries, the one *Natural* the other *Jural*: So all that become the Citizens of God's Kingdom have a Jural Country beſides their Natural; for Heaven is jurally their Country, where they have the right of Commerce now, and they will be called to Offices and Honours there. (4.) It inferreth, that the prime leading Duty of Mankind in the Chriſtian Religion is, to become Subjects and Citizens of the Kingdom of God. As in an humane City and Kingdom Men are firſt made Citizens in State and Relation, and then they obſerve the Laws of it; they firſt confederate with a Prince and take him for their Sovereign, and then they yield him Obedience (ſo humane Societies are conſtituted;) and as an Husband and Wife firſt enter into that conjugal Relation, and then they perform conjugal Duties; one Man taketh another for his Maſter, and then ſerveth him; a Soldier is firſt liſted, and then he liveth the Life and doth the Work of a Soldier: So in the Chriſtian Religion the firſt Duty of Man to God is, to become a Subject of his Kingdom in State and Relation (ſo to take him for his God) to confederate with Chriſt, to own him for his Sovereign Lord, and then to obſerve his Laws. *Col.* 2. 6. *As ye have receiv'd Chriſt Jeſus the Lord, ſo walk ye in him.* As in Schollars Studies, ſo in the Duties of Piety a Priority of Order is to be obſerv'd; Subjection in State is the prime fundamental Duty, that muſt precede Subjection and Service in Fact. Firſt be in Chriſt, then live godly in Chriſt Jeſus; ſeek thoſe things that are above, but firſt be riſen with Chriſt; do the things which he ſaith, but firſt call him Lord and acknowledge his Sovereignty. They that duly practiſe Religion, muſt be in the State of Religion, as the People of a ſtrange God are in the State of Society with their God. That they may be God's Servants, they ought to be conſecrated to his Service; and they ought to be cleans'd and purg'd, to be fit, to have dealings with an Holy God. *Heb.* 10. 22. *Let us draw near with a true Heart in full aſſurance of Faith, having our Hearts ſprinkled from an evil Conſcience, and our Bodies waſhed with our pure Water.* Sincere Believers (of a true Heart) are devoid of any preſent heinous Sinfulneſs and Criminality; and by the Blood and Sacrifie of Chriſt they are cleans'd from a Conſcience ſinful, guilty and criminal by their heinous Sins lying upon it. *Their Conſcience is purged from dead* (deadly) *Works, to ſerve the living and true God.* Heb. 9. 14. They are cleans'd from a Conſcience ſinful, guilty and criminal by deadly Sins, and conſequently are freed from the deadly condition of being deadly Sinners, that ſo they may be in the ſinleſs condition of the Saints and Servants of God and have the Saint of God-kind of good Conſcience. By duly entring therefore into the new Kingdom of God they are qualified for his Society and Service, and they enter into the State and Relation of his Saints and Servants, which muſt be the Law of their Life and Practice. For every one is obliged (u) to act the part of the perſon that he is rightfully ſuſtaineth, and his State is the Law of his diſpoſition and Practice. So the Children and Saints of God are obliged to be ſuch in Life and Practice, becauſe they are ſuch in State and Condition. And as all the Ten Commandments are virtually and radically contain'd in the Firſt Commandment of taking God for our God (as *Luther* ſaith:) So to become a Subject of the Kingdom of God, virtually and radically compriſeth all Obedience, the whole Duty-part of Religion, which intitleth to the Benefit-part of it. In reſpect of both theſe (both as it is the Summary of the Duty-part and the Benefit-part of Chriſtianity) S. *Baſil* ſaith of Baptiſm (which is the initiating or entrance-Duty into the Kingdom of God) ἀρχή μοι ζωῆς τὸ βάπτισμα, *Baptiſm is to me the beginning of Life.*

IX. The Kingdom of God (as it is the Kingdom of Saving Chriſtianity) is not only propounded to our acceptance, but to our purchaſe and acquiſition, *to be ſought in the firſt place, to be taken with an holy violence, and to be purchaſed by parting with our earthly all.* And not without great reaſon; for one *Adrianus* (as ſome ſay) an Officer under *Maximianus* the Tyrant beholding the Fortitude of the Chriſtian Martyrs (in undergoing their Torments) was very inquiſitive to know, what was the cauſe of it? And one of them thus anſwer'd him. *Eye hath not ſeen, Ear hath not heard, nor hath it ever entred*

(s) Plotin. En. 2. l. 9. c. 18.

(t) Eph. 2. 13, 19. 1 Pet. 3. 18.

(u) Gat Ant. p. 438.

Matth 33. ch 15. ch. 44, 4

tred into the Heart of Man to conceive, what God hath prepared for them that love him. Such are the Goods of the Kingdom of God above, of which the Kingdom of Grace below is an Inchoation. (w) Tertull. (w) *Bonorum quorundam (ſicut & malorum) intolerabilis eſt magnitudo*, ſome Goods (as well as ſome Evils) are intolerably great. They are immenſe and immeaſurable, and of kind and quality tranſcendent to all that Man is acquainted with. No Time can Bound them, no Cogitation can Fathom them, no Arithmetick can Number them, no Geometry can Meaſure them, no Rhetorick can Declare them, no Words can reach the ſize or ſuit the Dimenſions of them. Who can ſay, what this amounteth to, to be a Son and Heir of God, Co-heir with Chriſt, a Citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven? Theſe are matter for Extaſies, fervour and flames of Affection; and to exerciſe Violence (which in other Caſes is extravagance and indiſcretion) in taking the Kingdom, is but neceſſary Wiſdom and Virtue. (x) S. Hieron. (x) *Niſi vim feceris, regnum cœlorum non capies.* There is no entring into the State of Saving Chriſtianity by cold and careleſs Endeavours, without an agoniſtical ſtriving (ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν, ſaith our Saviour) there Luk. 13. 34. 2 Cor. 7. 11. ch. 8. 16. Heb. 2. 1. Eccl. 9. 10. muſt be an earneſt and *vehement deſire, an earneſt care and taking heed*, an earneſt breaking with Sin (to the cutting off the Right-hand and plucking out the Right-eye) a vehement hating Sin and Wickedneſs (not enduring to ſee or hear it or to have any dealings with it) an oppoſing it with all our Might and a reſiſting it even unto Blood (all ſinful Thoughts, Motions and Inclinations) an earneſt bridling our Appetites, Luſts and Paſſions (a doing violence to our ſelves) a violent ſtruggling with unruly Luſts and violent Temptations, *a ſtriving for the Maſtery* and Victory (as when Men wreſtle or fight with an Enemy, that ſeeketh their Life, or ſtretch their Sinews to run a Race) an earneſt praying, and an earneſt fleeing from the Baits of Sin (as when *Joſeph* left his Garment with his Miſtreſs and ran away) a reſolute undertaking the Duties of Godlineſs though never ſo hazardous, coſtly, diſgraceful and fleſh-diſpleaſing 1 Tim. 6. 12. Phil. 3. 14. (whatever we loſe or ſuffer) *a laying hold on eternal Life* (which is a violent taking it) *a reaching forth unto thoſe things which are before* (as the Race-horſes ſtretch themſelves) *a preſſing toward the Mark. Eluctamur per obſtantia*, we muſt violently break through all Obſtacles and Difficulties, like that young Man, who deſigning (according to the Religion of his times) to retire from the World and betake himſelf to a ſevere Life, and his Relations being extremely importunate with him, to diſſwade him from it, he threw them all off with this violent Reſolution, *volo ſervare animam meam*, I am reſolv'd to ſave my Soul. It is not reaſonable, to be earneſt and violent about trivial Matters (which is beyond the ſize and proportion of them) but the Kingdom of God is the one thing neceſſary, the Goods of it are of infinite precioſity, worth and importance, and muſt be gain'd, or we are loſt, and therefore muſt be gain'd at any rate (whatever they coſt us;) they challenge the beſt of our Affections, the prime and chief of our Care (all things elſe being as nothing in compariſon) they ought to be deſir'd as much as any thing can be deſir'd, and ſought as much as any thing can be ſought, the utmoſt labour and diligence is not too much for them, nor are the beſt of our endeavours more than needeth, to gain and ſecure them. For the things tranſcendently excellent muſt be hardly come by, to make them cheap and eaſie to be had, is to make them vile, to depreciate and diſparage them. They are nefariouſly vilify'd, if they are not tranſcendently valu'd, if they are not in our Minds as they are in themſelves, of the Sovereign peerleſs eſtimation; and we are *the carnally minded*, if we make them not the Goods of the Throne, placing all things elſe at the Footſtool, abandoning them as to any inordinate Eſtimation, Affection and Adherence, which alienateth the Soul from Piety and from the Goods of the Kingdom. Theſe muſt be taken with all the Hardſhips and Incumbrances that accompany them as inſeparably, as the ſhadow doth the Body (as the Lawyers ſay *omne commodum ſuo cum onere pertranſire*) one of the principal of which Incumbrances is *an actual parting with all things for them, when Tribulation or Perſecution ariſeth.* Theſe Difficulties are not to be vanquiſh'd but by a virtuous Violence; without it there is no doing or ſuffering the great things which Chriſtianity requireth. As *Cicero* ſaith; *ſine ardore quodam mentis nihil fit egregium*, without a certain ardour of Mind nothing eximious can be done.

CHAP. VII.

1. Of the Notion of Greatneſs, which is an attribute of the Myſtery of Godlineſs. 2. Of the Greatneſs of Things and Perſons. 3. Of the uſual diſtribution of Nobility. 4. Of the Greatneſs of God. 5. Of Greatneſs as attributed to the Myſtery of Godlineſs. 6. Of the Pagans Popular-myſtic-religious Inſtitutions. 7. Of their Deities. 8. The Chriſtian Religion is a Popular-religious Myſtery. 9. Trinitarians ought to be of the Holy-popular, not the Scholaſtic kind. Of the Inconſiſtency of Scholaſtic Trinitarians. 10. The Reaſons why the Chriſtian Religion is called a Myſtery. 11. The Name Myſtery implieth a great Obligation upon profeſſing Chriſtians to great Sanctity. 12. The Name Myſtery implieth, that Chriſtianity is of a mean outſide. 13. The Name Myſtery inplieth, that the Chriſtian Religion is reaſonably Myſterious. 14. The Name Myſtery implieth, that the Chriſtian Religion is a Knowledge and Wiſdom, and of the excellency of the Knowledge of Chriſt. 15. The Name Myſtery implieth, that the Chriſtian Religion is duly intelligible, and of the many ways whereby the Scholoſtic Theology may be deſtructive to the due Intelligibleneſs thereof. 16. The Name Myſtery implieth, that the Matters of Chriſtianity are extraordinary mirandous things.

1. THE Chriſtian Religion that hath been conſider'd as *The new Settlement of Saving Grace* and as *The new Kingdom of God*, is of another Name *The great Myſtery of Godlineſs*; of which illuſtrious Name one part is the attribute of *Greatneſs*, which ought to be taken into conſideration,

ſideration, becauſe ſcarce any one hath attempted a definition of it (or to ſay what it is) and they that attempt it, will find it of greater difficulty than at firſt ſight is imaginable. It is commonly ſaid (y) *Magnum & parvum non dicitur niſi cum reſpectu. The different bounds of Great and Little cannot be determin'd but by their References. The leaſt Body that is, is not little in reſpect of the ſeveral little parts, whereinto it may be divided. No part can be ſaid Great in reſpect of the whole whence it is taken. Of the largeſt Country in Europe we may ſay,* Quota pars terrarum? *Little* England *is a competent ſtile for our native Country compar'd with* France, Spain *or* Germany. *And yet* Armorica *with reference to* England *is truly inſtiled* Little Britain. *Within the leſs of theſe two Provinces, it would be matter of no long ſearch, to find huge Mole-hills and ſuch petty Hills as cannot deſerve the name of Mountains.* (z) *There is no right nor left, nor upper hand in Nature; every thing is little or every thing is great, as it is diverſly compared.* (a) *Whatever is eminent among its Neighbours, is there great, where it is eminent. For greatneſs hath no certain meaſure, compariſon either elevateth or depreſſeth it. The Ship which is great in the River, is little in the Sea: The Rudder which to one Ship is great, is to another ſmall. Thou art now in thy Province great, although thou thinkeſt meanly of thy ſelf.* But this uſual Maxim (that nothing is great or little but as it is compar'd) is manifeſtly falſe, unleſs it be limited to finite Beings. For God who is infinite and unlimited in Preſence, Duration and in all Perfection, cannot be ſmall or little howſoever compar'd, but is neceſſarily great without any Relation or Compariſon. Wherefore the Ideas of *great* and *little* are not neceſſarily ſuch as the Ideas of *like* and *unlike*, *equal* and *unequal*, which are neceſſarily *relative* and *comparative* Ideas. But the greatneſs of finite Beings is different from the greatneſs of God in a threefold reſpect. For all finite Beings are great but to a certain degree and meaſure; they are great but in ſome reſpect (as a Prince of great Authority is of ſmall natural ſtrength) and the greateſt of them may be outvy'd and tranſcended, and therefore may be comparatively ſmall; all which imperfections are incompetible to God. Which yet doth not hinder *Plato*'s Notion of *Greatneſs* (in his *Hippias major*) from being alike applicable both to God and the Creatures. (b) *All great things are great by ſurmounting* (or exceeding;) *for hereby they are conſtituted great. And although they are not ſeen, yet if they ſurmount, they are neceſſarily great.* Which Notion of Greatneſs confuteth an ill natur'd Dogmatiſt, who cannot deny, that God the Father is greater than God the Son, yet falleth foul upon *Calvin* for attributing to God the Father an ὑπεροχὴ, (ſurmounting) in reſpect of the Son. And by this only Argument he pretendeth, to refute *Calvin* (c) *intereſt inter* τὸ μεῖζον *&* τὸ ὑπερέχον, *ut indicat Chryſoſtomus*, there is a difference between being greater and ſurmounting, as *Chryſoſtom* intimateth. But *Plato* (who is at leaſt as good Authority as *Chryſoſtom* for ſettling the Notion of Greatneſs and the ſignification of a Greek word) is ſo far from acknowledging any ſuch difference, that he maketh the Nature and Notion of the one, to conſiſt in the other, τὸ μεῖζον, *that which is greater is therefore ſuch, becauſe it is* τὸ ὑπερέχον, *that which ſurmounteth.* So all things that are relatively and comparatively great, are therefore ſuch, becauſe they ſurmount; for their ſurmounting is their *amplitude* (they are of ſuch amplitude, that they ſurmount) which is their greatneſs.

II. Things and Perſons are denominated great in manifold Reſpects and in diſhonourary as well as honourary Reſpects: But they are not *greatned* (really or reputatively) by being great in any thing that is diſhonourary. Sometimes things are ſaid, to be great in reſpect of their difficulty (wherein there is an amplitude) as the magnanimous Man is ſaid, to perform hard and great things. *Magnum eſt in Rep. tueri perſonam principis.* It is a great thing, to expreſs and maintain the Perſon of the Prince in every thing. S. *Cyprian*'s Phraſe is (d) *glorioſè & granditer operati ſunt*, they did what was glorious and grand. Such are the Atchievements that are of great Difficulty and Coſt, of great Virtue and Excellency. Sometimes things are donominated great with reſpect to their weight and importance; for that is (e) *grande officium*, and a great Commandment, which is of great importance, and great ſtreſs is laid upon it. With reſpect to their weight, worth and value the things of this Life are called *the ſmalleſt matters*, and the promiſes of the Goſpel are ſtiled *exceeding great Promiſes*, as being Promiſes of the true and great Goods, unfathomable and ineſtimable. With reſpect to our Eſtimation Philoſophy ſaith (f) *Animo magno nil magnum*, to one of great Mindedneſs none of the external things are of great conſideration; and with reſpect to Mens conſideration and regard *Eaſter-week* was called *Hebdomada magna*, as the Jews Preparation for the Paſſover is called an high Day. What is in Mens account of great conſideration and regard is commonly called a great matter; what is of ſmall conſideration and regard a ſmall matter; what is of no conſideration or regard is called nothing or no matter. (g) *Magna & excedentia ſolitum ac vulgarem modum*, thoſe are great things that exceed the vulgar and ordinary meaſure. Such is *the great Day* (in reſpect of the Occurrences of it) ſuch are the great Works of God (the Works of Creature-tranſcendent Agency) the Miracles of Prophets, *Act.* 6. 8. 2 *King*. 8. 4. And oftentimes in Scripture *a great thing* ſignifieth an extraordinary mirandous thing. 2 *King*. 8. 13. *Eccl.* 9. 13. 1 *Cor*. 9. 11. 2 *Cor*. 11. 15. So the Philoſopher having compar'd the ſlaughter of Men and the deſtruction of Cities to the death of Sheep and the burning of Swallow-neſts, asketh (h) τί μέγα ἔχει ταῦτα, *what is there great in theſe things?* (i) *Aaron's making the Calf is in our Eyes a very great thing, becauſe in moſt Nations Images are not now worſhipp'd: But at that time it was counted a light thing, becauſe all Nations then made Images to Worſhip them.* In this Notion evil things which are diſhonourary may be denominated great things, and by being diſhonourary they may be ſo far great, as to be extraordinary mirandous things, but ſo as withall to be extremely diſparag'd, to be ignoble and baſe, vile and villainous things, which is not to be truly greatned, but to be leſſen'd more than greatned. 2 *King*. 8. 13. *Is thy Servant a Dog, that he ſhould do this great thing?* Joel. 2. 20. *His ill ſavour ſhall come up, becauſe he hath done great things*, but ſo as to

(y) Dr. *Jackſon* B. 11. ch. 35. initio.

(z) Cowley.

(a) *Quicquid inter vicina eminet, magnum eſt illic, ubi eminet. Nam magnitudo non habet certum modum: Comparatio illam aut tollit aut deprimit. Navis quæ in flumine magna eſt, in mari parvula eſt: Gubernaculum quod navi alteri magnum, alteri exiguum eſt. Tu nunc in provincia, licet contemnas ipſe te, magnus es.* Sen. Ep. 43.

(b) Πάντα τὰ μεγάλα ἐςὶ μεγάλα τῷ ὑπερέχοντι· τέτῳ γὸ πάντα μεγάλα ἐςι, κἂν μὴ φαίνηται, ὑπερέχη δὲ ἀνάγκη ἀυτοῖς μεγάλοις εἶναι.

(c) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *S.* 12. *& l.* 5. *c.* 4. *S.* 13.

(d) *P.* 55. *Ed. Oxon.*

(e) *Tertull.*

1 *Cor*. 6. 2. 2 *Pet*. 1. 4.

(f) *Sen. Ep.* 8.

(g) *Idem de conſt. ſap. c.* 7.

(h) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 28.

(i) *Coſri p.* 58.

to be evil things, the worſe for being great.

Men may be great in manifold reſpects; in corporeal dimenſions (as other bodily things are) and in their mental Abilities and Virtues. (k) *Think not, that Hereſies could be made by ſome little Souls. They were not made but by ſome great Men, ſuch great Men that were no leſs evil Men than they were great. The Mountains ſignifie certain great but bad Souls.* Some Souls as being of an Amplitude in reſpect of their Faculties and Comprehenſion are denominated *great* Souls, and others becauſe they are diminutive in reſpect of their Faculties, ſee but a little way, and look but at a few things, are denominated *little narrow* Souls. So Minds and Souls are diſtinguiſh'd into great and little in reſpect of their Bounty and Strenuity, by the Virtue of *Magnanimity* and Vice of *Puſillanimity*. To be heroically minded, is ſublime and great Mindedneſs (that ſurmounteth and is of an honourary amplitude) as the Poet ſaith: (*l*)

(k) *Non putetis, quia potuerunt fieri hæreſes per aliquas parvas animas. Non fecerunt hæreſes niſi magni homines, ſed quantum magni, tantum mali homines. Montes ſignificant magnas quaſdam animas, ſed malas.* S. Aug. Enarr. in Pſal. 124.

(l) *Ovid. de Triſt. l.* 3. *Eleg.* 5.

Quo quiſque eſt major, magis eſt placabilis iræ.
Et faciles motus mens generoſa capit.

In Fame and Reputation Men may be great: (*m*) *Cicuta Socratem magnum fecit*, the Hemlock made *Socrates great*. In the Old Teſtament Men are uſually ſaid to be great in reſpect of Riches and Worldly Poſſeſſions; ſo *Iſaac waxed very great* and *Barzillai was a very great Man: Abner* was a great Man both as the Chieftain of a great Hoſt (a Prince) and as being great in Military Conduct, Valour and Atchievements, 2 *Sam.* 3. 38. The *Perſian* Magi were in their own Country great in Authority and were had in great Honour, whence they are ſtiled (*n*) μέγα ϗ σεβάσμιον γένος, *a great and venerable kind of Men.* As by Superiority of Relation, by Seniority, by Primogeniture, one Man may be greater than another, and to be a Son, is greater than to be a Servant, becauſe more unſubject: So in Cities and Kingdoms the more unſubject Eſtates as ſuch are intituled *the great Men.* Theſe have their officiary and honourary Dignities of ſeveral Ranks (which are called *Dignities*, becauſe Men are dignify'd by them) and they may be called their Eminences and Sublimities, their Honours and Nobilitations, their Greatneſſes and Magnificences as to worldly Eſtate and Condition: which are nothing elſe but their more unſubject and unabject Eſtates as to the World (for as to the World they are unmean and unabject, not ignoble, and therefore unplebeian) whereby they ſurmount thoſe of the more ſubject, mean and underling Eſtate. In many reſpects theſe μεγιστᾶνες, or *Magnates* (the Grands) are great in the World; for they move in an Orb of Secular Rule and Prefecture, are great in Worldly Poſſeſſions, in the valuation of the Commonwealth, in regard and honour with the People, in Enſigns of their Honour, in Rank and Precedence, in Titles and Attributes (whence ſome have called them the Men of Bulk and Title) in Attendance, port and ſplendid Circumſtances (they live great) in Parentage and Deſcent, in Prerogatives, Rights and Priviledges (called by the Lawyers *Dominium Nobilium*) and this whole is their Mundane Illuſtriouſneſs and Nobleneſs, Greatneſs and Magnificence. The great Men of the World that are celebrated by that Name and Attribute were ſuch in many reſpects; as *Alexander* the Great, *Antiochus* the Great, *Pompey* the Great, *Herod* the Great, *Charles* the Great, and now we have *Lewis* the Great.

(m) *Sen. Ep.* 13.

Gen. 26. 13. 2 Sam. 19. 32.

(n) *Porph. de Abſt. l.* 4. *S.* 16.

A great Man (as alſo a great Family) is great as being of eminency above the generality of Men in ſome reſpect, but not in reſpect of any thing that is diſhonorary. It is not to be ſuppos'd, that there are (*o*) *tàm vitiis quàm virtutibus Nobiles*, Nobles by Vices as well as by Virtues. For this is not the ennobling but the ignobling Nobleneſs, to be *nobile ſcelus, nobile ſcortum:* nor is this the greatning, but a leſſening greatneſs, to be of eminency above the generality of Men, in reſpect of Vice and Wickedneſs. *Degenerant homines vitiis fiuntque minores.* A late Philoſopher ſaith of his *minima corporalia*, they are *infinitæ exilitatis*, which ſpeaketh them greatly little. Holy Men ſay, *omnia præter Chriſtum ingenti laborant parvitate*, all things beſides Chriſt are hugely little. There is therefore an huge and great Littleneſs: but this is not the greatning Greatneſs: nor is this the greatning Greatneſs, to be a great Infidel, a great Rebel againſt God; for this is to be greatly vile and baſe by Vice and Wickedneſs. The great ones of the World that are wicked, are infinitely more leſſen'd by their Wickedneſs, than they are greatned by all their Mundane Magnificence. So a great Fame that is αἰσχρὸν κλέος, or infamous (ſuch as the Founder of the Sect of the *Jacobites* (*p*) is ſaid to have) is not the greatning Greatneſs, which is, (*q*) αὔξησίς τις ϗ ἄδρυνσις ἐπὶ προσλήψει τινὸς ἀγαθοῦ, *a certain incraſſing and aggrandizing by the acceſſion of ſome good.*

(o) *Ritſchel. Metaph. par.* 1. *c.* 8. *n.* 27.

(p) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 17. *S.* 6.

(q) *Simplic. in Epict. c.* 11. *Jambl. de vit. Pythag. p.* 50.

III. Greatneſs is of the ſame diſtribution with Nobility, which is uſually diſtributed into the *Civil*, the *Eccleſiaſtical*, the *Philoſophical* and the *Celeſtial.* (1.) The Civil-mundane Greatneſs is that which taketh place in Civil Societies, and which in ſome degree is neceſſary to their Subſiſtence, Order and Government; it is an encouragement to civil Virtues and great Actions, and they that enjoy it (as *Seneca* ſpeaketh) *Hoc habent magnificum & ingens*, have this great and magnificent power or priviledge, they may do a great deal of good having a large Sphere of Ability and Influence: otherwiſe theſe great things of the World are extremely little, no conſiderable good is to be found in them, but *Vanity*, *Fallacy* and *Enmity* to the Holy Life muſt be written upon the Forehead of them. They are deadly to the (*r*) admirers and lovers of them, to all that are not duely out of love with them, that affect Mundane Greatneſs (ſo as not to be duely diſaffected thereto) which hath no ſuch conformity to the State and Life of Chriſt (who preferr'd a Croſs before a Throne here) nor to the State and Life of Chriſtians (the Diſciples of Humility and of the Croſs, the Aliens from the World) as may invite and ingage their Affections; nor is it ſuitable to the ſad and ſinful ſtate of Man in this World, to affect to be a Mundane Bravo, and to entertain Ideas of his Secular Grandeur. Wiſdom and Virtue conſiſteth in low and undervaluing thoughts of it, and in alienating the Soul from it. (*s*) Μηδὲν μέγα φαντάζου, *account nothing great but to be virtuous* (be ſo diſſonant from *Marius*, who never regarded to be a good Man, if he was but a great Man, as *Plutarch* relateth) all things elſe are νεκρὰ ϗ καπνός, *cadaverous things and Smoke.* (2.) It was God's Inſtitution, that in the Church of the Jews (which was Mundane and Typical) there ſhould be an Eccleſiaſtical Mundane Greatneſs (for ſuch was the Honour of *Aaron*, and beſides all the Prieſts were Noble:)

(r) *Solos ſe homines eſſe arbitrantur, cæteros fœnum eſſe oportere.* Voſſ de Nobil. de Idol. l. 3. c. 53. v. Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 18. c. 23.

(t) *M. Ant. l.* 12. *S.* 32, 33.

but in the Chriſtian Church our Saviour hath forbidden, not all Eccleſiaſtical Greatneſs, but an *Eccleſiaſtical Mundane Greatneſs*, Matth. 20. 25, 26. His Church muſt conſiſt of the Rulers and the Ruled, ſome of his Diſciples muſt be in place and office great, and therefore great Church-men, but according to Chriſt's Inſtitution, they muſt be in place and office *great* and *chief* only *Chriſtian-miniſterially and ſerviently*, not *Mundane-imperially*; for thus the Church is different from the World. They have not *imperium*, the Imperial kind of rule over Chriſtians (ſuch as ruling Potentates have) and therefore muſt be ſaid, to have *an authoritative miniſterial rule*, as only having and exerciſing a Chriſtian Miniſtry (as Stewards in a Family) and as being *great* and *chief* in being greatly and chiefly ſerviceable to the Salvation of all. They have not this *Greatneſs* and *Chieftainſhip* as an *Honour*, but only Greatneſs and Chieftainſhip of *Miniſtry* and *Service*; for thus alſo the Church is different from the World. A *Magiſtrature* is a Greatneſs and Chieftainſhip as an Honour: (t) *τιμὰς λέγομεν τὰς ἀρχὰς, we call Magiſtratures Honours.* Such therefore as are priviledg'd from publick Service (ſaith the Law) may not on that account refuſe Magiſtracy, (u) *magiſtratus non munus ſed honos.* But in Chriſt's Church they that are great and chief in place and office, have not (by his Inſtitution) any greatneſs or chieftainſhip as an Honour, but only the great and chief Miniſtry and Service; and in this Senſe it may be ſaid, (w) *Honours had their riſe with Gentiliſm, there they ought to be bury'd, and may not live in the Church.*

(3.) That great mindedneſs which is in Secular Philoſophy (a ſpecies of Mundane Greatneſs) at a great rate contemneth the Civil-mundane Greatneſs. *Socrates* perſuaded *Alcibiades*, that notwithſtanding his illuſtrious Birth, (x) there was no difference between him and a Porter. The Stoicks Wiſe Man is with them the only Noble Man, a Man of their generous Virtue is uſually intituled *Vir magnus*, they eſtimate the Greatneſs and Nobleneſs of Men by the Mind only, (y) *Animus facit nobilem.* (z) The Cynicks utterly contemn'd Riches, Glory and Nobility (commonly ſo called) and the Poet agreeably to their ſenſe taketh away from *Alexander* the Name of *Great* and beſtoweth it upon *Diogenes*. *Senſit Alexander teſtâ cum vidit in illâ Magnum habitatorem.* —— The Platoniſts do not at ſo great a rate boaſt of their Philoſophical Greatneſs and contemn the Civil-mundane Nobleneſs (*Plato* is ſaid, (a) to have worn a Golden Ear-ring in token of his Nobility) but their Philoſophy valueth no Nobility (*b*) in compariſon of the ennoblement of the Mind, profeſſeth a great vilipendency of the Body and of all Bodily Excellencies, reckoneth ten thouſand Acres of Land, *πάνυ σμικρὰ, very little things* (no wondrous great Eſtate) and counteth them ridiculous, that celebrate their Parentage, and think, that one is Noble, becauſe he hath ſeven Grandfathers, that have liv'd in Riches and Affluence; for ſuch ſee but a very little way, elſe (looking at the Univerſe) they would reckon, that they have Progenitors innumerable, of which ſome were rich, ſome poor, ſome were Kings, ſome were Slaves. (4.) The *Celeſtial Greatneſs* belongeth to the Science of Sanctity, which (c) *judgeth Men Slaves or Noble by their Manners. The only freedom with God is not to be a Servant of Sin. To ſhine with Virtues, is with God the height of Nobility. I only regard* (ſaith Gr. Naz.) *ἢ δίκαιος ἢ κακὸς, whether thou be Righteous or Wicked. The Clay is equally the origin of us all, we have all the like Skins, all one Duſt, the Off-ſpring of one Potter.* (d) *Omnes pari ſorte naſcimur, ſolâ virtute diſtinguimur.* Philoſophy and Religion agree, that Virtue maketh truly Noble: but Philoſophy is a ſtranger to true Piety, which Religion accounteth the only true Virtue and Nobility. (*e*) *So* Flavianus *accounted Piety the only Nobility.* Philoſophy and Religion agree, that all Men are in ſome ſort born Noble; (*f*) *omnes ſi ad primam originem revocentur, à Diis ſunt* (all are the Off-ſpring of God:) but Philoſophy is a ſtranger to the new Birth, which Chriſtians account the only noble Birth. (*g*) *For none of the Saints ever celebrated their Birth-day, but their new Birth-day.* Philoſophy and Religion agree, that the true Ennoblement of a Man is, to be a Son of God: but Philoſophy ſuppoſeth, (*h*) that every Man hath the Honour and Nobilitation of a Son of God by nature, whereas Religion ſuppoſeth Men vile in their Naturaliſm and Unregeneracy, that none are Sons of God but by regenerative Grace, (*i*) *fiuntque filii Dei, de paupertate divites, de humilitate ſublimes*, ſo they are made the Sons of God, from Poverty Rich, from Meanneſs Sublime. By Chriſtianity vile infamous Sinners become of high eſteem with God, of the illuſtrious divine Family, of truly noble Extraction, of ſacred royal Condition, of a truly noble Country, and the Heirs of ſuch a Patrimony, of Immunities and Priviledges, of Office and Imployment, of Enjoyments and Atchievements truly great and honourable, of the honourable and truly noble Qualities and Virtues, of honourable Attendance (that of Angels) and notwithſtanding the Contumelies they meet with in the World, their Memory will be honourable, and they ſhall live nobly and honourably now and for ever. Their Sanctity is their true Nobility, the ennoblement of their State and Relation, and of their Nature and Practice. For (*k*) *magni & excelſi animi eſt, deſpicere & calcare mortalia*, to deſpiſe and trample on the things of Mortality, is the property of a great and ſublime Soul. (*l*) *If a Chriſtian Philoſopher be ignobly born as to the Statue and the Clay (if Clay can very much differ from Clay) he will confront to it the Spiritual Nobility, according to which every one formeth himſelf, to the worſe, or to the better: but that other which is by Humane Propagation or Writing he ſetteth aſide as counterfeit and nothing worth. For there are three kinds of Nobility: One is that which is originated from above, whereby we are all alike noble, as being made after the Image of God. The other is that which cometh by the Fleſh; and I do not know, that any one is noble by this, which conſiſteth of Corruption. A third is that which is notic'd by Vice and Virtue, of which we partake leſs or more, as we retain the Divine Image or deſtroy it. He that is indeed wiſe and a Philoſopher, will love this Nobility; for as for the fourth kind of Nobility, which is by Parchment and Letters Patents, I will then think it worth the mentioning, when I entertain Beauty in Paint, and revere an Ape, that is bid, to be a Lion.* In this ſtrain Philoſophers and the Fathers vilifie that Mundane Nobility, which vulgar Conceit magnifieth; which yet muſt be acknowledg'd to be a ſort (the meaneſt ſort) of Nobility; for the Scriptures acknowledge it, ſpeak of it with reſpect, and frequently

(t) *Ariſtot. Polit. l.* 3. *c.* 10.

(u) C. 12. *H. de muner. & honor.*

(w) *Honores cum gentilitate ortos eſſe, ibi ſepeliri debere, in Eccleſia vivere nefas eſt.* Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 8. c. 17.

(x) *Idem in l.* 14. *c.* 8.

(y) *Sen. Ep.* 44. *de Beneſ. l.* 3. *c.* 28.

(z) *Tiraqu. de Nobil. p.* 192.

(a) *Abul Pharag. Hiſt. Dynaſt. p.* 58.

(b) *Boeth. de Conſol. Phil. p.* 128. *Jambl.* Προτρεπτ. p. 87. *vid. Epict. Diſſ. l.* 3. *c.* 14.

(c) *Servum & nobilem de moribus pronunciat. Sola apud Deum libertas eſt, non ſervire peccatis. Summa apud Deum nobilitas eſt, clarum eſſe virtutibus.* Ap. Tiraquell. ſupr. p. 54, 58.

(d) *Min. Fel. p.* 343. *Lactant. l.* 5. *c.* 15.

(e) *Theodor. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 4. *c.* 25.

(f) *Sen. Ep.* 44.

(g) *Origen. Hom.* 8. *in Levit.*

(h) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(i) *S. Ambroſ. Ep.* 33.

(k) *Lactan. l.* 6. *c.* 12.

(l) *Gr. Naz. or.* 28. *p.* 480.

ly mention many Ranks of it. (*l*) Philoſophers alſo acknowledge it and ſo do the Fathers, that yet diſparage it at a great rate. So the Martyr *Romanus* (*m*) contemn'd his Mundane, and valu'd no other but his Chriſtian Nobility.

(l) *Voſſ. Inſtit. or. l.* 2. *c.* 14. 8. *Tiraquell. ſupr. c.* 21. *La- ant. de Mort. perſec. p.* 41. *An- t. in Min. Fel. p.* 343.

(m) —*abſit ut me nobilem, anguis parentum præſtet, aut ex curiæ. Generoſa Chriſti ſecta bilitat viros.*

IV. Greatneſs is attributed to God upon account of his Holineſs of Name (for He is magnificent in Holineſs, *Exod.* 15. 11.) it may be attributed to Him upon account of his Goodneſs (as being the great and only Benefactor, to whom all are related as Dependents and Beneficiaries) upon account alſo of his *Eternity*, *All-ſufficiency*, *Immutability*, *Immortality*, *Immenſity* (or Omnipreſence) and his *Incomprehenſibleneſs* by our Underſtandings, *Job* 36. 26. *Behold, God is great and we know him not: neither can the number of his Tears be ſearched out. Ch.* 11. 7, 8. In our Inveſtigation of God the Object is of the vaſteſt dimenſions, *that which is as high as Heaven, deeper than Hell, that which is longer than the Earth and broader than the Sea*; ſuch is the Divine Greatneſs, which is *unſearchable*, Pſal. 145. 3. Agreeably whereto an Apocryphal Book deſcribeth the vaſt *Expanſum* of the corporeal Univerſe. O Iſrael, *how great is the Houſe of God, and how large is the place of his Poſſeſſion? Great and hath none end, high and unmeaſurable.* But chiefly Greatneſs is attributed to God upon account of his Imperial Eſtate, as being The Creature-tranſcendent Potentate. For thus the Orator diſtinguiſheth *Cæſar's Greatneſs* and *Goodneſs*. (*m*) *They that dare ſpeak before thee, know not thy Greatneſs; they that dare not, know not thy Goodneſs. Servius* noteth, (*n*) *every God ſeemeth great to his Devotioniſt, although* Jupiter *alone is great*, as being alone the Imperial Eſtate amongſt the Heathen Gods. Anſwerably to which Heathen Notion the Scripture muſt be underſtood, when it ſaith of the true God, *Great is our God above all Gods. I know, that the Lord is great, and that our God is above all Gods. I know, that the Lord is greater than all Gods. The Lord your God is a God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God. The Lord is a great God, and a great King above all Gods. Thou Lord art high above all the Earth, thou art exalted far above all Gods.* All thoſe honourary Names which denote his tranſcendent Imperial Eſtate (ſuch as *The moſt high, the Lord of Hoſts, the great King, All-imperial*) and all the Scriptural Attributions of Majeſty and Dominion, denote his Greatneſs; and with reſpect to his Imperial Eſtate King *David* ſaith, 1 *Chron.* 29. 11, 12. *Thine, O Lord, is the Greatneſs, and the Power, and the Glory, and the Victory, and the Majeſty; thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as Head above all. Both Riches and Honour come of thee, and thou reigneſt over all, and in thine Hand is power and might, and in thine Hand it is, to make great.* Greatneſs is primarily attributed to God, to denote him the Creature-tranſcendent Potentate: but his being ſuch importeth his Creature-tranſcendence in *Wiſdom, Power and Operation*, which are ſo many Branches of his Greatneſs, *Pſal.* 147. 5. *Great is our Lord and of great power, his Underſtanding is infinite.* 1 Joh. 3. 20. *God is greater than our Heart* (in reſpect of Science) *and knoweth all things.* Jer. 32. 19. *Great in Counſel and mighty in Work.* Nahum 1. 3. *Slow to Anger and great in Power.* So *Cicero* ſaith, (*o*) that *Jupiter* was called *optimus propter beneficia, maximus propter vim*, the beſt becauſe of his Benefits, the greateſt becauſe of his (executive) Power. Such is the Power and Agency of *the great God who formed all things*, as ſpeaketh his Greatneſs, for it is no leſs than Miraculous and Creature-tranſcendent, and this Creature-tranſcendent Power is infinitely and unboundedly in Him. But his Creature-tranſcendence implieth alſo ſome other Attributes of Compariſon (his paramount and peerleſs Singularity and the comparative nothingneſs of Creatures) upon account of which the Scripture attributeth *Greatneſs* unto God, 2 *Sam.* 7. 22. *Wherefore thou art great, O Lord God, and there is none like thee, neither is there any God beſide thee.* Iſa. 40. 15, 17. *All Nations before him are as nothing, as a drop of a Bucket, and as the ſmall duſt of a Ballance.*

Baruch 3. 24, 25.

(m) *Qui audent dicere, magnitudinem tuam ignorant, qui non audent, humanitatem.*

(n) *Omnem Deum videri cultori ſuo magnum, tametſi ſolus Jupiter magnus ſit.* Gale in Jambl. p. 222.

2 Chron. 2. 5. 1 Chron. 16. 25. Exod. 18. 11. Deut. 10. 17. Pſal. 95. 3. and 97. 9.

(o) *De N. D. l.* 2.

His *Greatneſs* may be further underſtood by conſidering his *Glory*, which muſt be conſider'd *as in Himſelf and coming from Himſelf, And as in us and coming from us.* For the Glory that He is and manifeſtation thereof is that which is called *his Glory*; as *Maimonides* obſerveth, (*p*) the Shecinah is called his Glory and the Divine Eſſence (which compriſeth his Eſſential Excellency and Perfection) is alſo called his Glory, *Exod.* 23. 18, 20. So *Greg. M.* ſaith; *Non aliud claritas, aliud natura*, the Nature and the Glory is the ſame thing. Accordingly we read of *The God, the King, the Lord, the Father of Glory, the excellent Glory, the preſence of his Glory, the Glory of the incorruptible God, the Glory of his Majeſty, the Habitation of his Holineſs and his Glory, the Brightneſs of his Glory, the Cherubims of Glory, of provoking the Eyes of his Glory, of the Houſe of his Glory, of the knowledge of the Glory of God, that we ſhould be to the praiſe of his Glory, the Glory of God did lighten it, bleſſed be the Glory of the Lord, Glory and Honour are in his preſence, the Throne of Glory, my People have chang'd their Glory* (their God) *the Heavens declare the Glory of God, Chriſt was raiſed from the dead by the Glory of the Father* (the Glory of his Power) *the whole Earth is full of his Glory* (the Glory which his glorious Perfections and Operations are) *the riches of his Glory* (his glorious Virtue and Power) *declare his Glory among the Heathen, his marvellous Works among all Nations.* His Glory muſt alſo be conſider'd *as in us, and coming from us.* And ſo Man is ſaid, to be *the Glory of God*, as being the Glory of God repreſented (a Repreſentation of the Majeſty of God) as the Image of God in regenerate Souls is the vital Glory of God repreſented. *His Glory as coming from us* is a Reputation-kind of Glory (ſuch a giving unto God the glory of his Glories) *which is the due honouring and glorifying God in our Souls and by our Tongues and Lives:* Which right and due of the Godhead *that he muſt be honour'd and glorify'd by us, magnify'd and prais'd, made aſcriptively and in reputation great*, is his Greatneſs jurally underſtood. For becauſe of his Greatneſs he ought to be ador'd: *Humilitas amplitudinem venerari debet*; Meanneſs ought to venerate Greatneſs. His Greatneſs is an *Awfulneſs* (He is intituled *great and dreadful*, Dan. 9. 4.) whence he ought to be feared. (*q*) *The true praiſing and celebrating Him is the apprehending* (and ſpeaking forth) *his Greatneſs.* So the Philoſopher praiſeth God; (*r*) *μέγας ὁ Θεός, great is God that gave us theſe Inſtruments, whereby we till the Earth; great is God, that gave us Hands, a Throat, a Ventricle, to grow by inſenſible degrees, to breath when we ſleep, a power to underſtand theſe*

(p) *Mor. Nev. par* 1. *c.* 64.

1 Cor. 11. 7.

(q) *Maimon. ſupr.*

(r) *Epictet. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 16.

things and to uſe them aright. So the Pſalmiſt praiſeth God, *Pſal.* 145. 3,—6. *Great is the Lord and greatly to be praiſed, and his Greatneſs is unſearchable. One Generation ſhall praiſe thy Works to another, and ſhall declare thy mighty Acts. I will ſpeak of the glorious Honour of thy Majeſty and of thy wondrous Works. And Men ſhall ſpeak of the might of thy terrible Acts: and I will declare thy Greatneſs.* Becauſe of his greatneſs God muſt not be meanly and diminutively thought of, priz'd and praiſed, but at the higheſt rate tranſcendently and incomparably, agreeably to the only Creature-tranſcendent Potentate, *whoſe Name alone is excellent and whoſe Praiſe is above the Earth and Heaven.* Whence the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Praiſe him according to his excellent greatneſs.*

V. Greatneſs that is an Attribute of God, is alſo an Attribute of *the Myſtery of Godlineſs*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *Great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs: God was manifeſt in the Fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preach'd unto the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up into Glory.* The words are, *Evangelii encomium & compendium*, an Elogy and Summary of the Chriſtian Verity. The Attribute *Great* therefore which is part of this Elogy, ſignifieth as a μεγαλυσμὸς, and muſt be underſtood in a laudatory ſenſe, as it ſignifieth in the Religion and Myſteries of the Gentiles, wherein there is frequent mention of (s) *magni Dii, magni Dea*, μεγάλαι Θεαὶ, *magna Juno* (great Gods and Goddeſſes) and *great is* Diana *of the* Epheſians, *Act.* 19. 28. It is not only with reſpect to our Underſtanding, that the Myſtery of Godlineſs is denominated *great*, as if it was deſign'd only to ſignifie, that it is greatly myſterious and recondite; for ſuch is the Myſtery of Iniquity, and ſuch were the trifles of the Gentiles Myſteries. But a Myſtery truly great (*t*) μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, μυστικόν ἐστι, is not only greatly myſterious, but the myſterious things of it are *great things*, and (great things ſo as to be good) truly great things. So the Hiſtory of *Adam* and *Eve* is *a great Myſtery*, Eph. 5. 32. not only as being greatly myſterious, but (*u*) ὅτι μέγα τι ϗ θαυμαστὸν ᾔνιξατο, *becauſe it ſignify'd that which is great and wonderful.* So the Myſtery of Godlineſs is a Syſtem, not only of the moſt myſterious things, but of things truly great and wonderful, which are alſo of greateſt weight and worth, excellency and importance, the great things of God and of ſaving Religion, which therefore ought to be greatly heeded and regarded, greatly eſteem'd and magnify'd, and becauſe of the Deity that is in them, they ought to be entertain'd with great veneration. (*w*) *For they are great things indeed and beyond expreſſion, which God hath ſhew'd to us.* Other Magnitudes are comparatively little (as the great things of the World, *Jer.* 44. 5.) theſe are in juſt eſtimation great, that are as high as the Deity, as vaſt as Immenſity, as boundleſs as Eternity, that ſwell beyond all Dimenſions, *Eph.* 3. 18. which therefore ought to gravitate upon the Mind, and to attract the Eyes and Hearts of all Men, as *Moſes* turn'd aſide, to ſee *a certain great ſight*, Exod. 3. 3. (*x*) *For it is a great thing indeed, and wondrous, and full of aſtoniſhment, that our Fleſh ſhould ſit above, and be ador'd by Angels and Archangels, Seraphim and Cherubim.* No Religion pretendeth to ſuch great things as the Chriſtian; for they are not ſorry mean things, which the Adverſaries of it have objected againſt it, (*y*) *that the Son of God ought to have appear'd as the Sun, which ſheweth it ſelf by its own light,* (*z*) *that it is a fabulous buſineſs,* ὑὸν τε ἔχειν τ̃ Θεὸν ϗ δὴ ϗ πεπονθέναι, *both for God to have a Son, and that he hath ſuffered,* (*a*) *how could we think, Jeſus to be a God, that was compounded of a mortal Body?* (*b*) *It is not to be believ'd, that God would expoſe his Son to the death of the Croſs,* (*c*) *Quale cor habetis, qui Deum colitis crucifixum?* Of late in *China* the Heathen were at their old cant: (*d*) *What kind of Law is that of yours, which holdeth forth for a God a Man who was executed as a Malefactor?* If Chriſtianity pretendeth to ſuch things as theſe, it muſt be acknowledg'd, that it pretendeth to great things beyond all parallel; *ſo great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs*, that it ſeem'd incredible in the Eyes of Unbelievers, who ſuffer'd themſelves, to be impos'd upon by fallacious external ſhews and appearances; whereas they might have learn'd from *Heraclitus* ſitting in his Cottage *Etiam hic Dii ſunt.*

VI. The Apoſtle denominating Chriſt's Religion *The Myſtery of Godlineſs* alludeth (as is generally ſuppos'd) to the Heathens Popular-religious Myſteries, The *Iſiac*, *Mithraic*, *Eleaſinian*, *Samothracian* and ſuch more. Theſe have ſo great a correſpondence to the Myſtery of Godlineſs, that the Apoſtle may reaſonably be thought to allude to them, and to oppoſe them to the Myſtery of Chriſtianity. For Men were not natively Intrinſicks of theſe Myſtick-religious Inſtitutions, but became ſuch by an Initiation as they are not born Chriſtians, but are made ſuch by being initiated into Chriſtianity. As they are initiated into Chriſtianity by Baptiſm, ſo the Gentiles, (*e*) *ſacris quibuſdam per lavacrum initiantur*, are initiated into ſome of their *Sacra* by Waſhing. (*f*) *Ilyſſus* a River of *Attica* was made uſe of in this Rite, there a luſtration was wont to be made in the leſſer *Eleuſinian* Myſteries, by which they paſs'd into the greater. Καθαρμὸς was a principal part of theſe Religions (uſually a very operoſe and tedious one, a Shop of Purgations) whereby they acknowledg'd the Impurity of Mankind in their now natural ſtate. They ſuppos'd alſo (in conſort with Chriſtianity) that thoſe who were not initiated, were in the ſtate of Profaneneſs; for with them (*g*) βέβηλοι ϗ μηδέπω κεκαθαρμένοι, *the Profane and the Unpurg'd were the ſame.* Chriſtianity initiateth Men by teaching them a certain Doctrine of Fundamentals: So the leſſer *Eleuſinian* Myſteries had (*h*) διδασκαλίας τινὰ ὑπόθεσιν, *a certain Foundation of Doctrine* (to prepare them for things to come after) but in the greater Myſteries Men were learners no more. They were ſuppos'd to be Converts to God, Piety, Humanity, and good Life, from their evil Opinions and evil Life, upon account of which Converſion (anſwerably to the Chriſtian Baptiſm) they had their Luſtration, (*i*) *as thoſe that did what they ought, relinquiſh their atheous Opinion, and turn to the true Tradition.* (*k*) They relinquiſh'd the wild kind of Life which they liv'd before, and when they were initiated into theſe Myſteries, thought themſelves bound to eximious good life, to eſchew Sins and to exceed other Men. They were a Generation of Pagan Saintiſts, and their Inſtitution a Myſtery of Pagan Sanctity and Godlineſs; for upon their Initiation they were ſaid εἰς εὐσέβειαν ἥκειν, *to come into Godlineſs*, their Myſteries were inſtituted ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ ϗ ἐπανορθώσει τοῦ βίου, *for Diſcipline and amendment of Life*, they were called τελεταί, as bringing Men to perfection of Life, and *Cicero* ſaith of them. (*l*) *Athens ſeemeth to me, to have produc'd and introduc'd into human Life many eximious and divine things, but nothing better than thoſe Myſteries* (the Eleuſinian) *by which from a wild and ferine Life we are poliſh'd and mitigated to Humanity; and which as they are called* Initia, *ſo we have known them indeed the beginnings of Life.* (*m*) *This is the Gentiles Regeneration.* But in the Mithraic Sacra Water was not us'd, inſtead thereof Honey was poured upon the Hands of the initiated, with a Charge (*n*) καθαρὰς ἔχειν τὰς χεῖρας ἀπὸ παντὸς λυπηροῦ ϗ βλαπτικοῦ ϗ μυσαροῦ, *from all that is Evil, Miſchievous and Flagitious.*

(s) *Gothofred. Exercit. in loc.*

(t) *Epictet. Diſſ. p.* 307

(u) *S. Chryſoſt. in Epheſ. Hom.* 20.

(w) Ὄντως γὰρ μεγάλα ἀνεκδιήγητα τὰ παρὰ Θεοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπιδεδειγμένα. *Idem in* 1 *Tim. Hom.* 7.

(x) Καὶ γὰρ ὄντως μέγα ϗ θαυμαστὸν ϗ ἐκπλήξεως γέμον. *Idem in Hebr. Hom.* 5.

(y) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 78.

(z) *Clem. Str. l.* 1. *p. m.* 229.

(a) *Orig. Philocal. p.* 49.

(b) *Tertull. c. Jud. c.* 10.

(c) *S. Aug. de Verb. Apoſt. ſer.* 8.

(d) *Semedo par.* 2. *c.* 3.

(e) *Tertull. de Baptiſm. c.* 5.

(f) *Marſh. can. Chron. p.* 201. *Ed. Lipſ.*

(g) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 8. *Herald. in Arnob. p.* 87.

(h) *Clem. Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 424.

(i) Ὡς δέον τὴν ἄθεον ἀποθεμένους δόξαν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ τρέπεσθαι παράδοσιν. *Clem. ibid. l.* 7. *p. m.* 513.

(k) *Gothofred. ſupr. col.* 3775, 3789.

The *Eleuſinian* Rites were not only the beginning of Life, but (*o*) *expiatio cædis* an Expiation of Guilt (like the Chriſtian Baptiſm) the Eleuſinian Luſtration was a Preparation to the Sacra (as the Chriſtian Baptiſm is;) and as Baptiſm is called by the ancient Writers φωτισμός, *Illumination*: (*p*) *So by the Eleuſinian Luſtrations Souls were ſuppos'd to be purg'd from the Contagion of things Mortal, and to be qualified for the Contemplation of divine things.* As by entring into Chriſtianity and Godlineſs Men become near unto God, his Domeſticks, Societiſts and Citizens: So theſe Religious Myſtic Inſtitutions of the Pagans were for God-ſociety, the Intrinſicks of them were look'd upon as God-ſocietiſts, that had more eſpecially the Preſence, Converſe and Society of their Gods, and were made nigh unto them. As *Apuleius* ſpeaking of his Initiation ſaith (*q*) *Deos Inferos & Deos ſuperos acceſſi coram & adoravi de proximo*, I came into the Preſence of the Infernal and Supernal Gods and moſt nearly ador'd them. The Intrinſicks of theſe Paganical Inſtitutions were ſuppos'd, to be in the State of Holineſs and Happineſs, of Sanctity and Beatitude, as Chriſtian Believers really are. (*r*) *Initiati credebantur Deos habere in periculis præſentiſſimos, & ipſos fieri Sanctiores & Juſtiores.* The initiated into the Samothracian Myſteries were ſuppos'd, to have the Gods moſt nigh unto them in Dangers, and themſelves were ſuppos'd to be made more Holy and Juſt, upon account of which mighty advantages many great Men of ancient times deſir'd to be initiated into theſe Myſteries; and the like advantages were ſuppos'd to accrue from the *Eleuſinian*. From thoſe Myſteries ſaith *Cicero* (*s*) *We have not only the benefit of living joyouſly, but of dying with better Hope.* It was thought, that the Myſticks of this Inſtitution were abſolved from their Sins after Death, that they liv'd with thoſe Gods whoſe Religioniſts they were, and that they were more honourable and happy than others in the other World. By *Sophocles* theſe Myſteries are repreſented (anſwerably to Chriſtianity) as Saving to Mankind. (*t*)

In Hades they have Life, theſe
Sacra that have ſeen,
With others all is bad, theſe are
the happy Men.

They that ſaw theſe *Sacra*, are ſaid to have ſeen (*u*) πολλὰ μυστικὰ θεάματα, *many arcane Sights*, the appearances of the Gods; to which the Apoſtle may reaſonably be thought to allude, when he ſaith, *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh.*

VII. His alluſion to the *Popular-pagan Myſteries*, not to the *Philoſophic*, is of great remark, both for the right underſtanding the Deities of theſe Pagan Religious Myſteries and for right underſtanding the Chriſtian Religion and the Deity thereof. For it ſheweth, that the *Demiurgus* in the Eleuſinian Myſteries was the Popular Pagan *Jupiter*, not the Platoniſts Νοῦς, or Logos (*w*) as ſome ſuppoſe. For this Platonic Deity is not a Popular Pagan Deity (a Deity of the Pagans Religion and Laws) but is an arcane Philoſophic Deity, and therefore could not be the *Demiurgus* in the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries, which are far more ancient than the humour of Philoſophizing amongſt the Greeks. Much of Nature (probably) there was in theſe Myſteries, becauſe the ſupreme Deity of the Popular Pagans was univerſal mundane animated Nature: But the Platoniſts Logos is tranſcendent thereto, and therefore tranſcendent to the *Eleuſinian* Inſtitution, which if it was a Traduction from *Egypt*, yet it was nothing more than a Popular-pagan Traduction (of which Nature there were many Traductions from *Egypt*:) But according to *Homer*, the Founders of this Inſtitution that learn'd the Myſteries of it from the Goddeſs *Ceres*, were poor Country-Swains, far from being acquainted with the Platoniſts Acroamatical Logos. The Men that manag'd theſe Myſteries, were not train'd up in the Schools of Philoſophers (*x*) but the *Hierophantes*, *Daduchus*, *Hierocéryx*, and *Ceryx*, were Men choſen by the Athenian People out of the number of the Athenian People; the Deities therefore of their Inſtitution (and conſequently their Demiurgus) were not the Philoſophic-pagan. The Deities of the *Samothracian* Myſteries according (*y*) to the Scholiaſt on *Apollonius* and *Artemidorus* were the ſame with the *Eleuſinian*, at leaſt they were of the ſame Character Popular-pagan. For (*z*) according to *Servius*, *Macrobius* and *Varro* they were *Dii Penates* (*a*) they were certainly *Dii Patrii*, the Country-gods (the Deities of their Religion and Laws) the *Romans* had them (not from the Philoſophic, but) from the Popular Pagans. (*b*) For they had them from the *Albani*, thoſe had them from the *Trojans* (that fled out of their Country) and by King *Dardanus* they were brought from *Samothrace* into *Phrygia*. And as thoſe *Phrygian* Deities *Cybele* and *Attis*, ſo theſe *Samothracian* Deities were called (*c*) *Dii magni*, the Prieſts alſo of theſe *Samothracian* Deities and the Prieſts of *Cybele* (*d*) were called by the ſame Name, which ſpeaketh a great Affinity between theſe *Samothracian* Deities and the Mother of the Gods. (*e*) To the Deities of theſe *Samothracian* Myſteries *Orpheus* (who was initiated into them) pray'd in a Tempeſt for a Calm (as the Popular Pagans pray'd to their Deities) theſe Myſteries were for the uſe and benefit of the Popular Pagans, and all the great Men of ancient times, of whom we read (*f*) that they were initiated into them, were Popular Pagans (unleſs *Orpheus* may be counted a Philoſophic Pagan) *Jaſon*, *Caſtor & Pollux*, *Hercules & Orpheus*, *Cadmus*, *Ulyſſes*, *Agamemnon*, *Tarquinius Demarathi Corinthi fil. and* Philip *the Father of* Alexander. We will ſuppoſe, that theſe *Samothracian* Deities were (*g*) three in number, and the ſame with that Ternary of Deities in the Capitol at *Rome*, *Jupiter*, *Minerva* and *Juno*:

(l) *Nam mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenæ peperiſſe, atque in vitam hominum attuliſſe, tum nihil melius illis myſteriis, quibus ex agreſti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem, & mitigati ſumus; initiaque ut appellantur, ita re vera principia vitæ cognovimus.*

(m) *Herald. in Arnob.* p. 84.

(n) *Porph. de Antro*, p. 260.

(o) *Marſham ſupr.* p. 264.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 266.

(q) *Metamorph. l.* 2. *prope fin. v. Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 5. c. 39.

(r) *Marſham. ſupr.* p. 126.

(s) *Non ſolum cum lætitia vivendi rationem accepimus, ſed etiam cum ſpe meliore moriendi.* Marſham. Ibid. p. 266. Gothofred. ſupr. col. 3789.

(t) ——ὡς τρισόλβιοι
Κεῖνοι βροτῶν, οἳ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη.
Μόλωσ' ἐς ᾅδου· τοῖς δὲ γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ.
Ζῆν ἐστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακά.

(u) *Marſh.* p. 267.

(w) *Idem* p. 262.

(x) *Ibid.* p. 261.

(y) *Bochart. Canaan l.* 1. c. 12. & 39.

(z) *Elmenhorſt. in Arnob.* p. 125.

(a) *Macrob. Sat. l.* 3. c. 4.

(b) *Voſſ. de Idol.* 8. c. 12.

(c) *Pignor.* p. 9, 24.

(d) *Arnob. c. Gent. l.* 3. p. 124.

(e) *Voſſ. de Idol.* 9. l. c. 35.

(f) *Marſham. ſupr.* p. 125.

(g) *Tertull. de Spectac.* c. 8.

But is it reaſonable, to infer from thence (h) with ſome learned Men, that the *Samothracian* Deities were the three Divine Hypoſtaſes of *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, and that they were originally an Hebrew Tradition touching the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt? So ſome ſuppoſe (i) that the old *Germans* worſhipp'd one and the true eternal God in Trinity under the Names and Deities of the *Sun*, *Moon and Fire*, and that by *Caſtor* and *Pollux* was meant the *Logos* and the *Holy Ghoſt*. Which are as likely Conceits as theſe other, the *Samothracian* and *Capitoline* Deities were the Trinity, *Jupiter* being God the Father, *Minerva* the Logos, and *Juno* the Holy Ghoſt. For it is certain, that the Capitoline *Jupiter* was no other than the Popular Pagan *Jupiter*, *Minerva* is a Parallel for the Pontificians Virgin-Goddeſs, but not for the Logos, and is there any thing like the Holy Ghoſt in *Juno*? But becauſe theſe *Samothracian* Deities are called by an Hebrew Name *Cabiri* (the mighty Gods) for this only Reaſon ſome learned Men are prone to think theſe Deities of the Pagan Polytheiſm an Hebrew Tradition of the Trinity. But this is a weak Surmiſe; for there is a Traduction and Derivation of Hebrew Words and Names into the Language of Pagan Nations, although the things which thoſe Pagan Nations ſignified by thoſe Names were not deriv'd from the Hebrews. As *Adonis* is an Hebrew Name, yet the Perſon ſignified by that Name is no Tradition from the Hebrews. So in the War between *Lucullus* and *Mithridates* there is mention (k) of the City of the *Cabiri* (l) certain Mountains in *Phrygia* were called *Cabiri*, and the Prieſts of *Cybele* were called *Cabiri*, yet theſe things were no Traditions from the Hebrews. But thus far we ought to acknowledge an Hebrew Original of theſe *Samothracian* Deities, that had the Name of *Cabri* or *Divi potes* (m) probably they were originally *Phœnician* Deities worſhipped at *Berytus*, whence their Name *Cabiri* was propagated to *Samothracia*. Agreeably to this their Origin a certain Cave (called *Zerynthus*) was ſacred unto them, wherein Dogs were ſacrific'd to *Hecate*; and like other Phænician Deities (n) they requir'd humane Sacrifices, which ſpeaketh them not divine Hypoſtaſes but Diabolical.

VIII. For the right underſtanding the Chriſtian Religion it is of great uſe, to obſerve, that the Apoſtle in ſtiling it *The Myſtery of Godlineſs* alludeth to the Popular Pagan Myſteries. For if in this Deſcription of the Chriſtian Religion he had alluded to the Myſtical and Acroamatical Theology of the Philoſophic Pagans, this would have inferr'd, that the Chriſtian Religion is a Myſtery of *Scholaſtical* and *Metaphyſical* Theology: But ſeeing that in ſtiling the Chriſtian Religion a Myſtery he hath no reſpect at all to the Myſteries of the Philoſophic Pagans, not to their Myſtic-metaphyſical and Scholaſtic Theology (which is unpopular and unholy) not to any thing of that Nature, but only to the Religious Myſteries of the Popular Pagans, this plainly inferreth, that the Chriſtian Religion is no Myſtery of Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical Learning, but that this is the true Nature and Notion of it, *it is a Popular-religious* (or Holy-popular) *kind of Myſtery*. Excepting only the difference between true and falſe Religion it is of the ſame Nature with the Popular Pagans Religious Myſteries; for it is the Chriſtians Science of Sanctity and Saint of God-kind of Learning, which concerneth them and is their Buſineſs, as they are the Holy People (whereas Scholaſtic and Unpopular kind of Learning concerneth them not as Chriſtians, but is Exotick and Exoterical) the comprehenſion of (o) τὰ παραδιδόμενα μυστήρια τῆς κατ' Ἰησοῦν θεοσεβείας, *the delivered Myſteries* (or myſterious things) *of Godlineſs according to Jeſus*. A Philoſophy it is, but no other Philoſophy than ſuch as is the Diſcipline of Sanctity and Piety, which is a Popular-religious Philoſophy. Such is Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, and ſuch therefore is *the Myſtery of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs*. And ſuch is *the Truth which is after Godlineſs* (the Truth which is the true and Saving Religion) for this kind of Truth is the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Philoſophy (p) τοῦ λαοῦ φιλοσοφία, *the Philoſophy of the People* (as Chriſtianity is fitly ſtiled) the Truth of which the Church (that is, *Populus Chriſtianus*) is *the Pillar and Fulciment*, which ſhe ſuſtaineth, exhibiteth, and propoſeth to the World. 1 *Tim*. 3. 15. The Names of this Myſtery ſpeak it the Holy Popular kind of Myſtery; for they plainly ſignifie *the Chriſtian* and *the Evangelical* kind of Myſtery (q) *The Myſtery of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, the Myſtery of the Goſpel, the Myſtery of Chriſt* (the Myſtery of his being Chriſt and our being Chriſtians) *the Myſtery of God and of the Father and of Chriſt, the Myſtery of Faith and of his Will, the Myſtery of the knowledge of Chriſt, the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, this Myſtery among the Gentiles which is Chriſt in you the hope of Glory.* The Chriſtian Religion in the Deſign of it is Popular; for the End and Buſineſs of it is *the Salvation of all People*. Luk. 2. 10. The great Author of it founded it from this Principle, *Amor erga populum*, (Love to his People) and it muſt be ſaid of him, as S. *Hierom* ſaith of the Jewiſh High Prieſt, *Quicquid agebat, quicquid loquebatur, doctrina erat populi*, whatever he did and ſpake was inſtructive to the People. He taught no Unpopular kind of Learning, nor did he teach in the Schools of it. His Apoſtles were Teachers of the People, their buſineſs was, to gather and to feed the Flock of God's People (r) *inſtituting Women and Children and the multitude of the common People to a godly Life*. Which is analogous to the Buſineſs of Civil Life; for Holy People manage themſelves in Religion by the ſame Rules of Prudence, whereby Men ordinarily manage human Affairs; whence it appeareth, that Religion is an Holy Popular Buſineſs. And ſuch are the Myſteries which conſtitute the Chriſtian Religion as parts of it; they are plainly Holy-popular-kind of Myſteries. For ſuch is the Myſtery of *two oppoſite Religions of Law and Saving Grace, two oppoſite Kingdoms of Darkneſs and Light, two oppoſite Potentates a Saviour-king and an Abaddon, two oppoſite Creations old and new, two oppoſite Eſtates of Regeneracy and Unregeneracy, Juſtification and Condemnation, two oppoſite Lives of Sin and Sanctity, of the old and new Man, the Myſtery of the new Jeruſalem, of the hidden Manna, of the Holy Euchariſt, the Myſtery of Chriſt and his Church and their Union, the Myſtery of their Rejection of the Jews and of calling the Gentiles, the Myſtery of a Reſurrection to Life and Death eternal.* All which Evangelical Myſteries are extremely remote from and oppoſite unto the *Unpopular and Scholaſtic* kind of Myſteries. If therefore the Chriſtian Religion is of one piece, if it is not (as *Methodius* calleth *Origen*) *a Centaur*, if it doth not

---

(h) *Intell. Syſt.* p. 450. *Voſſ. ſupr.* l. 8. c. 12. *H. Mori op.* T. 2. p. 587, &c.

(i) *Voſſ. Ibid.* l 1. c. 37, 38.

(k) *Phot. cod.* 224. *Col.* 741.

(l) *Voſſ. de Idol.* l. 2. c. 53.

(m) *Bochart. ſupr.* c. 12.

(n) *Voſſ. ſupr.* l. 1. c. 35.

(o) *Orig. c Celſ.* l. 3. p. 148.

Tit. 1. 1.

(p) *Clem. Str.* l. 6. p. m. 497.

(q) *Eph.* 3. 4. and 6. 19. *Matth.* 13. 11. *Mark* 4. 11. 1 *Cor.* 2. 7. and 4. 1. *Col.* 1. 26, 27. and 2. 2. 1 *Tim.* 3. 9.

(r) Γύναια καὶ παῖδας, καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀγελαίων πλῆθος ἐπὶ τὸν εὐσεβῆ βίον χειραγωγοῦντες. *Euſeb. pr. Ev.* l. 1. c. 5.

(s) *Miſcere tenebroſa lucentibus*, combine things together as Heterogeneous as Light and Darkneſs, we may ſafely pronounce, that not any part of the Chriſtian Religion is an *Unpopular Scholaſtic* kind of Myſtery.

IX. The genuine Trinitarians therefore muſt be *The Holy-popular* (or the Chriſtian) not *the Scholaſtic* kind of Trinitarians, elſe the Chriſtian Religion will be in the main and principal Articles of it and in the Summary of it not an *Holy-popular* but an *Unpopular* and *Unholy kind* of Myſtery. For the Scholaſtic Theology to initiate us into the Myſtery of the Trinity (*t*) beginneth with the Philoſophy of *Ens* and the Metaphyſical Definition thereof (which yet is not capable of a perfect Definition) and then it proceedeth to the diviſion of *Ens* into *Subſtance* and *Accident*, defining the latter *a Being inherent in another as in a Subject ſupporting it*, and the former it defineth *a Being not inhering in another*. But beſides *Subſtance* and *Accident* (which yet are an adequate Diviſion of real Beings) there is *a Mode of Being*, which is not a meer Nothing, nor *Ens rationis*, nor being added to a Being doth it make any addition to it of another Being, or degree of Being, but it is an *Affection* or *Habitude* of a Being, *whereby it is determin'd to ſome particular State or Condition*. From theſe Appendages of Being reſulteth the difference called *Modal*; and from this Branch of the Philoſophy of *Ens* the Scholaſtick Theology proceedeth, to define and diſtinguiſh *Eſſence*, *Exiſtence*, *Nature*, *Subſiſtence* and *Perſonality*. As *Ens* or Being may be defin'd *That which is*, ſo *Eſſence* may be defined *That by which a thing is what it is*. *Exiſtence* is *that Mode or Affection of Being, by which a thing* (if it hath any cauſe) *ſtandeth actually produc'd out of the Power of its Cauſes*. *Subſiſtence is a Mode of Being by which a thing exiſteth by it ſelf without exiſting in another either as a part in the whole, or as an Adjunct in the Subject*. *Exiſtence* and *Subſiſtence* really differ; for one and the ſame undivided Exiſtence, as well as one and ſame *Eſſence*, belongeth to all the three Divine Perſons equally, whereas yet every Perſon hath his own proper diſtinct *Subſiſtence*. To whatſoever Being or Nature this Mode of *Subſiſtence* belongeth, that is a *ſuppoſitum*, as being a thing which by no means exiſteth in any other, but as a Baſis or Foundation ſupporteth ſuch Things or Beings as exiſt in it; whence it is named ὑφιϛάμενον. And the conſequence of this is, that as Subſiſtence maketh a thing a *Suppoſitum*, ſo *Suppoſitality* maketh it incommunicable; ſince that which is incapable of exiſting in another, muſt alſo hinder it from being communicated to another. And another conſequence of the ſame is; that every *Suppoſitum* or Being thus ſubſiſting by it ſelf, is *a compleat Being*, that is, ſuch an one, which is not made for the Completion of any other; for whatſoever is ſo, muſt naturally exiſt in it, as a part doth in the whole, or at leaſt be originally deſign'd ſo to do. Hence it is eaſie, to give an account what *a Perſon* is; for *Suppoſitum* is *ſubſtantia ſingularis completa per ſe ſubſiſtens*, and a Perſon is *Suppoſitum rationale*. The *Ratio intellectiva* being added to *Suppoſitum* maketh it a Perſon, which is *a further Perfection of Suppoſitality, and the utmoſt Perfection of Subſiſtence*. Which Subſiſtence or Suppoſitality added to Nature maketh a Compoſition in created finite Perſons, but not in the uncreated and infinite; for in them the divine Nature and the perſonal Subſiſtence coaleſce into one by an incomprehenſible ineffable kind of Union and Conjunction. Of this difference between Perſons created and uncreated this Theology pretendeth not to give any Account.

But having acquainted us with theſe Logical and Metaphyſical Terms and Notions it proceedeth, to teach us, *that there is one and but one Self-exiſting, infinite, eternal Being, Nature or Subſtance*, which we call God. And that this infinite, eternal Self-exiſting Being, Nature or Subſtance, exiſteth in and is common to *three diſtinct Perſons, Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt*. Of which the Son eternally iſſueth from the Father by way of *Generation*, and the Holy Ghoſt jointly from both by way of *Spiration*; which three Divine Perſons ſuperadd to this Divine Nature or Deity *three different Modes of Subſiſtence*, founding ſo many different *Relations*, each of them belonging to each Perſon in a peculiar uncommunicable manner; ſo that by Virtue thereof each Perſon reſpectively differeth and ſtandeth diſtinguiſh'd from the other two: And yet by reaſon of one and the ſame *numerical Divine Nature* or Godhead equally exiſting in and common to all the three Perſons, they are all but one and the ſame God. They are conſtituted three Perſons by three different Modes of Subſiſtence, which alſo as *Properties* diſtinguiſh the Perſons from each other, and as *Relations* cauſe them to be referred to one another; and as *objective Conceptions* they are called *Notiones*, but as ſuch they are four in number, *Paternity*, *Filiation*, *Spiration* and *Proceſſion*, all of them importing Relation. To expreſs therefore the diſtinction and difference of the divine Perſons theſe following Terms are uſed; *Perſonæ Subſiſtentiæ*, *modi Subſiſtendi*, *Proprietates*, *Relationes*, *Notiones ſeu Notionalia*. To expreſs their Unity and Agreement in one and the ſame Nature theſe Terms are uſed, ὁμȣσιότης, *Conſubſtantiality*, μία ȣ̓σία, *one Eſſence*, ’Εμπεριχώρησις, *Circumminceſſion* or mutual In-being. This is the beſt account, which the Scholaſtic Theology giveth of the Trinity, and is generally receiv'd by School-Divines (yet not without contradicting this Account in ſome Inſtances) whence it is manifeſt, that this Theology's account of the Trinity is nothing better than a Syſtem of common Logicks and Metaphyſicks, of Kind and Quality it is *Unholy* and *Unpopular*, and conſequently it maketh the Myſtery of the Trinity of a contrary Nature and Character to *the Myſtery of Godlineſs*. Many School-divines ſuppoſe, that there is an Impreſſion of the Trinity upon created things in Nature, an Image of it in the natural Faculties of the Soul of Man; by which Hypotheſis it is made a Myſtery on this ſide the Myſtery of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs.

Upon which account there is too much Reaſon to ſay (as a great Prelate of our Nation many Years agone is reported to have ſaid) *there hath not been a greater Plague to the Chriſtian Religion then School-divinity*. Proteſtant Divines in great numbers have thus declaim'd againſt the School-divinity, not conſidering, that this was their own Theology, and that retaining the Scholaſtic Trinity, the Scholaſtic Logos and the Scholaſtic Incarnation, they retain'd the main Subſtance of School-divinity, and the prime Articles of it. It fareth therefore with the School-divinity as with Aſtrology at *Rome*, which (as *Tacitus* ſaith) was always prohibited, yet always retain'd: So the Scholaſtic Theology is always declaim'd againſt, and yet the main of it is always retain'd. But there is this

prejudice

(s) *Jul. Firmic. de error.* p. 19.

(t) *Animadverſions upon Dr. Sherlock* c. 2. and 8.

prejudice againſt the prime Articles of it, That its *Trinity*, *Logos* and *Incarnation*, is not of the Chriſtian (the Holy-popular) kind, but is manifeſtly of Kind and Quality Unpopular and Scholaſtical, which is not tolerably intelligible by any, but thoſe that have learned a Syſtem of School-Logicks and Metaphyſicks (u) *Few can have any diſcernment of it, none but thoſe that are ſomewhat learned in Philoſophy.* And there is a further prejudice againſt the prime Articles of it; The *Trinity*, the *Logos*, the *Incarnation*, if they are of Kind and Quality Scholaſtic Myſteries, they are of Scholaſtic Explication. But they are ſo far from being of Scholaſtic Explication, that the Scholaſtic Theology after all its Subtilties of Notion, Speculation and Diſtinction, pronounceth them at a great rate *Unintelligible* and *Inexplicable*. Such a Theology is not accommodate either for the Schools or for the Church. Not for the Schools (although it is Scholaſtical;) for it intricateth what it undertaketh to Explicate. Not for the Church; for it ſpoileth *the plain Man's Path-way to Heaven.*

X. To define a Myſtery with reſpect to the *Scholaſtick* rather than to the *Popular* kind of Myſteries, is moſt accommodate to the purpoſe of brangling Schoolmen, but not to the Nature and Intereſts of Chriſtianity, which knoweth not Scholaſticiſm, nor hath any deſign, to recommend Metaphyſical Speculations to the World under the Name of Myſteries; for in the Nature and definitive Notion of it, it is an Holy-popular Inſtitution, and as ſuch is *a Myſtery*. A Myſtery therefore muſt not be defin'd *a revealed Truth that tranſcendeth and ſurpaſſeth all human Comprehenſion* (which is neither the Pagan nor the Chriſtian Notion of a Myſtery, no adequate Notion of a Myſtery in general, nor of a Religious Myſtery in general, nor of a truly Religious Myſtery:) But a Myſtery muſt be defin'd agreeably to the Nature of the Popular-religious Myſteries and to the Senſe of the People, who call a thing *a Myſtery* (w) to ſignifie, *that it is of an abſtruſe, arcane and recondite Nature.* In the Book of *Daniel* and the *Apocrypha* (the Book of *Tobit*, *Judeth*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and the Second of *Macchabees*) the Secrets of Men are called *Myſteries*, agreeably whereunto in the New Teſtament the Secrets of God as ſuch are called *Myſteries*, and not becauſe they ſurpaſs all human Comprehenſion. Myſteries there are many, that tranſcend all human Comprehenſion, and they are therefore Myſteries (as being myſterious and recondite) becauſe they tranſcend all human Comprehenſion. But upon other accounts and in other reſpects things may be of an arcane and recondite Nature, and theſe are *Myſteries*, although they tranſcend not all human Comprehenſion. Such Myſteries there are in an ordinary Senſe, and ſuch Myſteries there are in a magnifying laudatory Senſe, which are called Myſteries, to denote, that they are arcane and recondite, ſo as to be of ſupravulgar Excellency, choice *Arcana*. Common Myſteries, as *Myſteries of State, Trade, Art and Philoſophy*. Myſteries of Religion (reputatively ſuch) as the Myſteries of the Gentiles, whoſe Language was (x) *Religionis ſcereta perdidici*, I have throughly learn'd the Myſteries of Religion. So the *Seven Stars* and the *Seven Golden Candleſticks* are a Myſtery. *Apoc.* 1. 20. *Babylon* is a Myſtery. *Apoc.* 17. 5. And ſuch is the calling of the Gentiles, the Rejection of the Jews and their future Converſion. *Rom.* 11. 25. The Name Myſtery here ſignifieth (y) *That which was unknown and arcane, and which is mighty ſtrange and wonderful, as the Apoſtle ſaith elſewhere; behold I ſhew you a Myſtery, we ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.* Which change of an earthly into an heavenly Body is of as eaſie apprehenſion as the Phænomena of Nature, and doth not more than they ſurpaſs all humane Comprehenſion. So the *Myſtery of the Will of God* which is made known, is not incomprehenſible ſince it is made known, as *the Prophetick Myſtery of God when it is finiſh'd*, is not likely to ſurpaſs all humane Comprehenſion. The Writers of the Church indeed call the Chriſtian Religion a Myſtery with reſpect to their Scholaſtick Myſteries, which are ſuppos'd, to ſurpaſs humane Comprehenſion: But they are of no Authority, if they come in Competition with the Holy Writers of Scripture, nor are they of ſuch narrow Minds, as to confine the Name Myſtery to the Scholaſtic Myſteries: For they ordinarily call the Sacraments Myſteries, and the Wane of the Moon is called (z) *magnum myſterium* (a great Myſtery) as being of arcane Signification and denoting the Diſſolution of all things. This therefore is no eſſential Ingredient of a Myſtery of true Religion, to ſurpaſs all human Comprehenſion: Nor is the Chriſtian Religion called a Myſtery (by the Holy Writers) meerly or primarily upon this account. But

(1.) The Chriſtian Religion is called *a Myſtery* as being *a Secret* (a moſt ancient Secret, not known, nor poſſible to be known) *till revealed*, and of a Nature *hugely Alien* from what is uſual and from our natural Notices. In this Senſe the Goſpel-Oeconomy of things is ſtiled *The Revelation of the Myſtery, which was kept ſecret ſince the World began, the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery, even the hidden Wiſdom, which God ordained before the World; the Myſtery of Chriſt, which in other ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men, as it is now revealed; the Myſtery which from the beginning of the World hath been hid in God; the Myſtery which hath been hid from Ages and Generations, but now is made manifeſt.* The Goſpel is a free determination of the Wiſdom and Will of God, which is purely of ſupernatural Revelation, nor could any Wit or Reaſon of Man ever have dream'd of any ſuch things as the Matters of Chriſtianity (a) οὕτω ξένα ϗ ἀλλότρια, *ſo ſtrange and alien*, (b) ξένα τινὰ ϗ παράδοξα ϗ ὑπὲρ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς πράγματα, *certain ſtrange things and remote from our Conceits, and beyond the Heavens.*

(2.) The Chriſtian Religion is called *a Myſtery* as being in great degree *not vulgarly known ſince it is revealed.* For God hath made fooliſh the Wiſdom of this World (their multijugous Erudition and Prudence) in appointing a way to Salvation extremely diſſonant from their apprehenſion, which they cannot like or reliſh, and which is hid from Rabbinical Grandees and Philoſophic Gallants and revealed to Babes, hid from Princes and revealed to Peaſants, hid from Phariſees and revealed to Publicans, to rightly prepared Souls, *Matth.* 13. 11. to the Saints that are duely initiated, *Col.* 1. 26. to the Holy Apoſtles and Prophets, *Eph.* 3. 5. but not to the worldy States-men and Politicians, 1 *Cor.* 2. 8. not to many wiſe Men after the Fleſh. 1 *Cor.* 1. 23, 26. *Matth.* 11. 25. The Heathen Myſteries were concealed from thoſe that were not duly prepared and initiated, nor is it otherwiſe with this great Myſtery *the Kingdom of God*

(u) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 3. *S.* 1.

(w) *See Pool's Synopſ. on Rom.* 11. 25. *and on Eph.* 1. 9.

(x) *Jul. Firmic. de error. p.* 36.

(y) Τὸ ἀγνοούμενον ϗ ἀπόῤῥητον, ϗ πολὺ μὲν τὸ θαῦμα, πολὺ δὲ παράδοξον ἔχον. *S. Chryſoſt. in Rom.* λόγ. ιθ.

Eph. 1. 9. *Apoc.* 10. 7.

(z) *S. Ambroſ. Hexaem. l.* 4. *c.* 8.

Rom. 16. 25. 1 *Cor.* 2. 7. *Eph.* 3. 4, 5, 9. *Col.* 1. 26.

(a) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 408.

(b) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 3. *p.* 762.

God. For although Chriſtianity muſt be publiſh'd upon the Houſe tops (whereas the Heathen Myſteries muſt not be told abroad) yet being ſo publiſh'd it is like *Ariſtotle's Acroamaticks*, publiſh'd not publiſh'd, or like a Bee incloſ'd in Gumm, *& lucet & latet*, it ſhineth and yet is arcane and recondite. For as to the matters of Sanctity and Saving Religion Mankind in their Graceleſſneſs and Wickedneſs are marvellouſly undiſcerning, and indiſpos'd to diſcern them, and theſe are (penally) hid from the Eyes of the unmeet and unworthy. *For many are in high place and in renown: but Myſteries are revealed unto the Meek*, Ecclus. 3. 19. To the one *it is given to know the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven*, but to the other *it is not given*, Matth. 13. 11. Chriſtianity is alſo not only or chiefly a Myſtery of Notion, but of Life, and of the Goods and Enjoyments of a myſterious recondite Life (the choice *arcanum* thereof) which none knoweth, but they that have it. No natural Man hath any Imagination or Conceit of it, but as *a Treaſure hid in a Field* it is extremely remote from vulgar Notice and Apprehenſion.

Matth. 13. 44.

(3.) The Chriſtian Religion is called a Myſtery *as being in part hid from the knowledge of the Chriſtians*; and in part and in ſeveral reſpects *it is to them incomprehenſible.* The greateſt proficients in Chriſtianity pretend not, to be like the Pagan ἐπόπται (to be Learners no more) *to underſtand all Myſteries and all Knowledge. They know but in part*, their Underſtandings cannot graſp the greatneſs and vaſtneſs of all things, that are in their Religion, and they have but glimpſes of the great things to come. They cannot reach the cauſes and reaſons of all things that are in it, which they contemplate with great admiration, *Rom.* 11. 33. They are at a loſs ſometimes, to give a clear account of the *Modus* of things (which is in all caſes difficult) and they pretend not clearly and fully to aſſoil all difficulties that incumber Religion; as how the Divine Preſcience of all future Events can conſiſt with the liberty of the Will of Man and the Contingency of his Actions. And as the Chriſtian Religion is in part and in ſome reſpect incomprehenſible and unfathomable by Chriſtians: ſo they attain the knowledge of it by degrees, whence the Apoſtle conſidereth ſome Myſteries as (in part at leaſt) hidden from the knowledge of the Chriſtians, *Rom.* 11. 25. *I would not, that ye ſhould be ignorant of this Myſtery.* 1 Cor. 15. 51. *Behold, I ſhew you a Myſtery.* Col. 2. 2. *Grow unto all riches of the full aſſurance of underſtanding, to the acknowledgment of the Myſtery of God, and of the Father, and of Chriſt.* As the holy Writers therefore, when they ſpeak of *Myſtery Babylon* and the *Myſtery of Iniquity*, conſider thoſe things as concealed from the knowledge of Men: as our Saviour, when he expoundeth to S. *John* the Myſtery of *the ſeven Stars and the ſeven Golden Candleſticks*, conſidereth this Myſtery as a thing hidden from his knowledge, and therefore expoundeth it unto him, *Apoc.* 1. 20. and as the Apoſtle conſidereth the Chriſtian Religion as concealed from the knowledge of Men, when he ſtileth it *the Wiſdom in a Myſtery, the hidden Wiſdom, which none of the Princes of the World knew*: ſo he conſidereth ſome Myſteries as (in part at leaſt) hidden from the knowledge of the Chriſtians.

(4.) The Chriſtian Religion is called *a Myſtery* as being in the Introduction of it, *The grand Myſtery of Providence.* For as a principal thing that Providence concerneth it ſelf about in this World, is the raiſing up new Empires and Monarchies: ſo the Introduction of the Chriſtian Religion was the erecting a new Divine Empire and Monarchy. And as (c) the Counſels of Princes and Affairs of State (*Ragioni di ſtato*) *when they are purpoſely carried on in a Cloud of Secrecy, that the Reaſons and Ends of the Actions may be hidden from the Eyes of Men, are therefore called the Myſtery of State*: ſo in the ſeemingly mean and obſcure Birth and Life and tragical Sufferings of the Son of God there was this grand deſign, the new founding and making the Kingdom of God; and the carrying it on and accompliſhing it by ſeemingly weak and ignoble means with wonderful ſecrecy (concealedly and myſteriouſly) was the greateſt Myſtery of State that ever was. To this account of the Name *Myſtery* the Apoſtle (doubtleſs) hath reſpect, when he ſaith, *Great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God was manifeſt in the Fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit*: (d) τουτέςιν ἡ οἰκονομία ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, *hereby is meant the œconomy that was for us.*

(c) *Biſhop Sanderſon Ser. on* 1 *Tim.* 3. 16.

(d) *S.Chryſoſt. in loc.*

XI. The Name *Myſtery* implieth a great obligation upon profeſſing Chriſtians to great Sanctity of Life; for to this their Initiation into the Chriſtian Myſtery obligeth them at a ſuperlative rate, and they are monſtrouſly inconſiſtent with their Inſtitution, if they have not actually relinquiſh'd *the wild kind of Life and begun a new life*; *if they live not a better life than others in the practice of eximious Piety and Humanity.* They muſt look upon themſelves (correſpondently to the Pagan Myſticks) as a *Populus alius*, a People ſeparated and diſcriminated from the World, that muſt not live according to the ſinful guiſe and faſhion of it, nor immerſe themſelves in the Pollutions of it, but obſerve a form and way of living different from it, contrary to the Rules and Maxims, the Vices and Vanities of it, muſt be unlike the World of Ungodly Sinners, and in their Spirit and their Lives muſt tranſcend the vulgar and common level: (e) τὸ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκλάμψαν ἔθνος, *the Nation illuſtrious and reſplendent every where in the World*, is the Character of the Chriſtians and their Churches, *(f) whoſe way of living is contrary to the Superſtitious, Intemperate and unjuſt, and which compar'd with the common Societies of Men are as Lights in the World.* Such they were in the better times of Chriſtianity, and ſuch they are oblig'd to be in all times by their Inſtitution *as the God-ſocietiſts*, whoſe way of living muſt be the God-ſociety way of living (not the Mundane and Profane) that muſt not live as aliens from God and Piety. They are *the conſecrated People*, ſelect and appropriated to God (and therefore ſacred) ſet apart to be a People for his uſe and ſervice, and it is Sacriledge added to Perfidiouſneſs and Diſloyalty, for them to be nefarious Children of Diſobedience, to vulgarize and profane themſelves, to pollute an holy Prieſthood and that Soul and Body which is conſecrated unto God. They are *Dei Secta*, God's Sect of Religioniſts, the Intrinſicks of his Inſtitution, which is an Inſtitution of far higher Sanctity than any other, and therefore no ſmall meaſure of it can be anſwerable to their Religion and Obligation, but they muſt be eximiouſly holy, as the Pagan Myſticks pretended to be, who counted Sanctity their Nobilitation and Perfection, their Honour and their Glory, and the Profane and Polluted they ſhut out from their Communion. So amongſt the Philoſophers Sanctity was thought their Excellency (*Vir Sanctus* was one of their honourary Titles) and their

(c) *Gr.Naz. or.* 3. *p.*63.

(f) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 128.

Philoſophy was an Inſtitution of (illegitimate) Sanctity. So amongſt the Jews and Phariſees their eximious Sanctity was their Glory, as it is alſo amongſt the *Turks*, who uſually reproach the *Chriſtians* and the *Perſians* as polluted. But in degenerate Chriſtendom Sanctity is ſunk in its Reputation, few in compariſon pretend to any Sanctity, much leſs aſpire after an eximious Sanctity; the generality are openly a foul and improbous, a leud and flagitious Generation, that pour their Hatred, Contempt and Contumelies upon Sanctity of Life. Inſomuch that the grand impediment that detaineth Men from it, is the diſhonourable uſage that attendeth it; it would ſpoil their Faſhion and leſſen their Figure in the Nations that are called Chriſtian; for to be truly Holy, is not the way to gain their Eſteem and Applauſe, but rather to be Vile in their Eyes.

XII. The Name *Myſtery* implieth, that Chriſtianity is of a mean outſide; for it would not be a Myſtery, if its Internal Greatneſs was not complicated with External Meanneſs; if *magnalia Dei*, the great things of God were not *ignobilia Mundi*, of mean appearance in the Eye of the World. In the holy Founder of it there was a Saint of God-kind of Myſtery; for *in humilitate latuit majeſtas*, his Majeſty divine was vailed by a mean outſide appearance, whence he was *deſpiſed and rejected of Men*. They could not believe, that one ſo meanly born and bred, ſo homely attended, that liv'd in mean Circumſtances, without any worldly Splendor, and deſtitute of all Humane Excellencies, was the Son of God and the Saviour of the World. *They were offended in him*, ſtumbled at theſe things, ſo as to contemn and diſguſt the Chriſtian kind of Chriſt. And this himſelf foreſaw, that it would be the great ſtumbling-block, and therefore when he had wrought many Miracles, to ſhew that he was the Meſſiah, he addeth, *Matth.* 11. 6. *Bleſſed is he, whoſoever ſhall not be offended in me.* He knew, that his mean appearance in the World would be a more prevalent Argument againſt him, than all his Miracles were for him, that one ſo abject and ignoble in worldly reſpects ſhould be the promis'd Meſſiah, this would ſeem a greater Prodigy than curing the Blind and the Lame and raiſing the Dead. Nothing ſeem'd ſo incredible to the Jews (and many of the Gentiles) as that the Meſſiah ſhould be externally a mean abject Perſon: but in Myſteries (*g*) ἕτερα ὁρῶμεν, ἕτερα πιστεύομεν, *we ſee one thing and believe another, whence touching theſe things I and an Unbeliever are differently affected.* For an Unbeliever diſcerneth no Form nor Comelineſs in him, in whom a Divine Believer diſcerneth the Glory of the only begotten Son of God. So the Treaſures of Nature are hid under Ground, the excellent things are not the outſide things, nor things of vulgar notice and appearance (but the vile vulgar things which have nothing within, are the overly things, that make a gaudy ſhew, whereby the World's admirers are impos'd upon;) ſo Chriſt's Religion is a Myſtery of the ſame nature with his Divine Perſon. (*h*) *For the Philoſophy of Chriſt is of this nature; nothing is more mean in the outſide, nothing is more divine in the inſide.* Chriſtianity bringeth us Honour and Riches, Treaſures and Pleaſures and fine Raiment, but all in a Myſtery, without any thing taking and glorious in the outſide. (*i*) οὐκ ἔστιν ἓν τὸ τυχὸν ὁ χριστιανισμός· τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστιν, *Chriſtianiſm therefore is not a vulgar thing; for this is a great Myſtery*, Joh. 4. 32. *I have Meat to eat, that ye know not of.*

Matth. 13. 57.

XIII. The Name Myſtery implieth, that the Chriſtian Religion is reaſonably *myſterious, abſtruſe* and *obſcure* to the Underſtanding. For it muſt be ſuch, ſo far as there is cauſe and reaſon for it; and there is great reaſon, that it ſhould be ſuch in a competent meaſure, whether we conſider Reaſons of *natural* or of *legal* neceſſity. For there is a natural neceſſity, that it ſhould be abſtruſe and obſcure to the Underſtandings of Men becauſe of their natural Imperfection and moral Indiſpoſition; and becauſe of the vaſtneſs, depth and difficulty of the things themſelves which it revealeth. In ſeveral Inſtances it ſo ſparingly revealeth them, that they ſtill remain abſtruſe, intricate and complicated with knotty difficulties. And ſo the knowledge of things in general is involv'd, lieth deep and remote, and it is not a ſlight ſuperficial glance, that will penetrate to the underſtanding them. If no part of common Learning (which is the knowledge of various things beyond vulgar notice) is attainable without aſſiduous ſtudy and exerciſe, it muſt be ſuppos'd, (*k*) τὸ μὴ σαφὲς τὸ σοφόν, *that what is wiſe, is not manifeſt and obvious*, nor attainable (ordinarily) but by ſerious ſtudy and meditation, by conſidering, weighing and carefully obſerving things, by ſearching and diving deep and going to the bottom of them. δυσθήρατος ἐστι σοφία, *Wiſdom is hardly inveſtigated*, and ſo (*l*) *Clemens* interpreteth that of the Prophet, *Iſa.* 45. 3. *I will give unto thee the hidden Treaſures of Darkneſs; for the Treaſure of God, the never-failing Riches is Wiſdom hardly to be attained.* So things excellent (by a legal neceſſity) ought to be hardly come by, they are the more valued, becauſe they are hardly come by, and to make them cheap, is to make them vile. (*m*) *That which is got by labour is valued at a great rate, but lightly come, lightly go.* Virtue therefore muſt be of difficult acquiſition (whereas Vice is eaſie) and the Treaſures of Wiſdom muſt be *the hidden Riches of ſecret places*; they that enjoy them, muſt *ſeek them as Silver and ſearch for them as for hid Treaſures.* They muſt be vailed with obſcurity, both to excite and reward Induſtry; for Induſtry would want its reward, if all things were alike plain to the Careleſs and the Induſtrious. And the Reward of Induſtry is that which exciteth Induſtry, which is alſo excited by the abſtruſeneſs of the matters of Wiſdom. For the generality of Men have an earneſt deſire, to underſtand Myſteries and Secrets, they are willing to ſweat for them, and have a great deal of pleaſure in finding them. And as Virgins ought to be vailed (whence they have the Name of עלמה) and their being vailed exciteth Men's deſire of ſeeing their Faces; ſo the reconditeneſs of the matters of Wiſdom exciteth their deſires of acquaintance with them.

> *Καὶ πλέον ἱμείρουσι καλυπτομένοιο προσώπου. Nonnus.*

Religion and the holy Records thereof ought to be ſo temper'd, that (as it is ſaid of *Homer*'s Writings) *read them over never ſo often ſomething always appeareth new.* A competent obſcurity is requiſite in them, to keep holy things at a due diſtance

(g) *S. Chryſoſt. in* 1 *Cor. Hom.* 7.

(h) *Habet hoc utique Philoſophia Chriſti, nihil primo aſpectu contemptius, nihil in receſſu divinius.* Maffeius Indic. l. 12 p. 497. *Chriſti ſapientia ſtultitia eſt apud mundum.* Herman. Hamelman. de Trad. Apoſt. p. 26.

(i) *Macar. Hom.* 27.

(k) *Niceph. in Syneſ.* p. 356.

(l) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 406.

(m) Τὸ πόνῳ κτηθὲν περισπούδαστον· ὃ δὲ ῥᾳδίως λαμβάνεται, καὶ ῥᾳδίως ἀποβάλλεται. *Phot. cod.* 222. *col.* 629. *Gr. Naz. or.* 34. *p.* 544.

diſtance from the Wicked, to keep the Faithful in due dependence upon God (*ut difficultas intellectus gratiam Dei quæreret*, Greg. M.) and to keep off Contempt and conciliate Veneration. For which reaſon the *Pythagoreans* (*n*) wrapp'd up their Wiſdom in Symbols. And the Popular Pagans conciliated Veneration to their fooliſh and filthy Myſteries by *Secrecy* and *Silence*, by making them *opertanea ſacra*, ἀπόῤῥητα σύμβολα, ἱερὰ ἄῤῥητα, τελετὰς μυστικὰς, κρύφια μυστήρια, *tacita ſacra*, arcane, hidden *ſacra*, under covert and not to be divulg'd. So a diſcreet reſervedneſs is found to conciliate reſpect amongſt Men, who are apt to ſlight and contemn what is of obvious notice. And Darkneſs is ſaid, to increaſe Devotion, whence the Heathen made their Temples dark, and ſhady Groves were the places, wherein they worſhipp'd their Gods. The Night alſo, the Fountains and the Groves were the Objects of their Religious Veneration becauſe of their ſhadineſs and ſolemnneſs (they worſhipp'd *lucos & ſilentia*, ſaith *Pliny*) a Cave alſo ſhaded with Leaves (*o*) was in great veneration amongſt them. A Shadineſs and Abſtruſeneſs therefore is requiſite, to make Religion venerable, and conſequently there ought to be a competent obſcurity in the Chriſtian Religion and the holy Records thereof.

Which reaſonable Obſcurity is a great reaſon for *Modeſty* and *Moderation*. Not for ſottiſh Superſtition, or believing with an implicit Faith, or following the Herd, but for Modeſty and Self-ſuſpicion in ſearching into and treating of Divine Matters (not too boldly and raſhly rejecting every thing that is diſſonant from our private Reaſon) both becauſe they are Divine Matters, which require a becoming Modeſty (for we ſhould never be more modeſt than when we deal with the Buſineſs of the Gods, ſaith *Ariſtotle*) and becauſe theſe Divine Matters are incumbred with Obſcurity, and great is the imperfection of Humane Underſtanding. Chriſtians alſo that are of different Apprehenſions in matters of Religion, ought to exerciſe great *Moderation*, and not fall into Parties, Sects, Seditions, Bloody Wars, Perſecutions, malign cenſuring and reviling one another; for ſuch is the weakneſs and corruption of Mankind, their diſproportion of Parts, their different Education, Temper and Inclination, and the matters of their Religion are (in ſeveral Inſtances) ſhaded with ſuch Obſcurity, that diverſity of Opinions is unavoidable, not only amongſt profeſſing, but ſincere Chriſtians, that are ſound in the Faith. Unbelievers alſo have great reaſon, to be moderate in their cenſures of the profeſſors of Chriſtianity, and have no reaſon to be ſcandaliz'd at the diverſities of Opinion amongſt them; for they are a natural conſequence of the obſcure Theories of their Religion, (*p*) there are the like diverſities of Opinion in all Religions, and amongſt the Lawyers and Naturaliſts, Phyſicians and Philoſophers, that are converſant about Nature's Myſteries, which are far from being ſo myſterious and profound as ſome Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. Diviſions in the Church that always were, and always were great Scandals, occaſion'd this Saying of old time, ***I would be a Chriſtian*** (ſed neſcio cui parti adhæream) ***but know not what Party to be of.*** But it muſt be thought the Language of Folly and Profaneneſs. As they that will not take Phyſick, till all Phyſicians are agreed, muſt die of their Diſeaſes; ſo they that will not be Religious, till all Religioniſts are agreed, muſt die in their Profaneneſs.

XIV. The Name *Myſtery* implieth, that the Chriſtian Religion is not ſo obſcure, but that it is *a Knowledge, Science and Wiſdom, The excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt.* For that it may be a Religious Myſtery (a Divine Myſtery revealed) it muſt be a matter arcane and abſtruſe, ſo as to be the knowledge thereof. Accordingly it is defined *The knowledge of the Myſtery of Chriſt, of the Son of God, of the Truth, the knowledge of God, the Savour of the good knowledge of God made maniſeſt* (by his Miſſionaries) *in every place, the light of the knowledge of the Glory of God in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt*; which is in plain Engliſh, *The knowledge of God in Chriſt*, as our Saviour defineth it, when he ſaith, *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee the only true God and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* He is made unto us of God *Wiſdom* objectively; his Religion as it is the knowledge of him, is the Chriſtians *Wiſdom* and *Philoſophy*; they contemplate *the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery*, which is the œconomy of Chriſt for our Salvation, and the marvellous Tranſactions of God about him, whence he is called *The Wiſdom of God*. The Chriſtian Religion therefore is a Wiſdom *objective* and *ſubjective*, *inſtitutive* and *conſtitutive*; and as the Science of Aſtronomy is the comprehenſion of what is to be known of the Stars: So the Religion of Chriſtianity conſiſteth in knowing Chriſt as we ought, which is *Scientia Scientiarum*, a Science of tranſcendent Excellency (*Phil.* 3. 8.) *A knowledge that muſt be known, and which is infinitely worth the knowing.* For the matters of this divine kind of Learning are not like the things of the World, that are meer ſhews and fallacious appearances, which although they look gay and goodly at a diſtance, yet when we come to the handling them, they are no better than a Feather and a Shadow: but the matters of Saving Chriſtianity having their Glory and Excellency on the inſide, by acquaintance with them we find them of infinite worth and precioſity, and the more we are acquainted with them, the more we prize and admire them. *Hæc & nos riſimus aliquando.* Time was when we thought them ſilly, frivolous and ridiculous, σκύβαλα, *worthleſs and refuſe*: but finding in them a Treaſure in compariſon whereof all worldly Riches are but riff raff ſtuff; an enraviſhing Pleaſure in compariſon whereof all Mundane Delights are dull and inſipid; a Glory that turneth all Earthly Glory into Darkneſs and Deformity; and a Wiſom in compariſon whereof all ſecular Learning is but a ſounding Braſs and a tinkling Cymbal, we have great reaſon (with the Apoſtle) to attribute a τὸ ὑπερέχον, *tranſcendent excellence to the knowledge of the Son of God.* This Attribute belongeth to the Chriſtian Learning. Which is,

(1.) A vaſt comprehenſion of Divine Knowledge, that conſtituteth (*q*) τοὺς φιλοσόφους τοῦ Θεοῦ, *God's Philoſophers*, (*r*) *ſeeing therefore the Logos himſelf hath come to us from Heaven, it ſeemeth to me, we ſhould not go to Humane Diſcipline, buſying our ſelves to go to* Athens, *and the reſt of* Greece *or* Ionia. *The Maſter now inſtituteth all, and by the Word* (or Logos) *the Univerſe is now made* Athens *and* Greece. (2.) The tranſcendent excellency of *Wiſdom* and *Knowledge*, which is the primary Good and the Fountain of Goods (as Ignorance and Folly is the Evil of Evils and the Fountain of Evils) the great Ornament and Accompliſhment

(n) Lil. Gyrald. de Pythag. Symbol. Clem. Str. l. 5. p. m. 405.

(o) Sen. Ep. 41.

(p) Clem. Str. l. 7. p. m. 541. Orig c. Celſ. l. 3. p. 118.

Joh. 17. 3. 1 Cor. 1. 24, 30. ch. 2. 7. 2 Cor. 2. 14. ch. 4. 6. Eph. 3. 4. ch. 4. 13. Col. 1. 10. Heb. 10. 26.

(q) Clem. Str. l. 6. p. 481.

(r) Διό μοι δοκεῖ, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἧκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς οὐρανόθεν ὁ λόγος, ἡμᾶς ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρωπίνην ἰέναι μὴ χρῆναι διδασκαλίαν ἔτι, Ἀθήνας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ Ἰωνίαν πολυπραγμονοῦντας. πάντα νῦν ὁ διδάσκαλος κατηχεῖ καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἤδη Ἀθῆναι καὶ Ἑλλὰς γέγονεν τῷ λόγῳ. *Idem* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 51.

ment of Man, which maketh him amiable and uſeful, valuable and honourable (as Ignorance and Folly maketh him ſapleſs and uſeleſs and is his great blemiſh and Reproach) is the proper Riches of the Mind, her immortal and invaluable Treaſure and Pleaſure, her Beauty and Brightneſs, her Light and Guide, her good government and management of things, the cure for her Evils, her ſafety and rectitude in Judgment and Practice. (3.) All *the Wiſdom* which true Piety is, which is a vaſt comprehenſion of what is matter of Wiſdom. For to diſcern the true nature, worth and uſe of things, to eſtimate them aright, not to be deluded by ſhews and appearances, to be well adviſed and underſtand what we do, to chuſe a right end and ſuit the means thereto, to be intent upon our true Good, and to make our chief and only Intereſt our chief and only Buſineſs, to have a care of the main, to be provident and foreſeeing, wary and circumſpect, to be ſober minded and not carry'd away with extravagant Fancies, Appetites and Paſſions, to do our work and act our part well, to walk in the ſafe Paths, to prefer neceſſaries before unneceſſaries, to endure a little inconvenience to avoid a far greater, not to loſe an Hog for an half penny worth of Tarr, not to barter away a precious Commodity for a Trifle, not to doat upon fantaſtick nothings, nor to buy them at too dear a rate, not to ſell our All for nothing, our Salvation for an old Song, nor to run into the horrours of Eternity for a moments foolery and gullery, but to make the wiſe choice and the wiſe bargain: All this Wiſdom (and ſuch more) true Piety is. (4.) The tranſcendent kind of *Knowledge*. For to know the Son of God as we ought (duely Chriſtianizing) is the Saving or Saint of God-kind of Knowledge, the diſcriminative Excellency whereby the Divine Family is diſtinguiſh'd from the Unholy Atheous Family. It is with Knowledge as with the Waters, there are upper and nether Springs of it; for common Science is from beneath, and a graceleſs kind of thing: but (s) *Fleſh and Blood* revealeth not the knowledge of the Son of God, which is ſo of God, as not to be of Man (or of the Humane Kind and Family) as *Grotius* thus well expoundeth a Saying of our Saviour. (t) *No Man can acknowledge the Heavenly Excellency that is in me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him.* Into this divine kind of knowledge Souls are renewed, the Children of Light have it by Divine Illumination; for to them (u) φῶς ὁ κύριος ϗ γνῶσις ἡ ἀληθὴς, *our Lord is light and the true knowledge:* which is of invaluable Excellency; for (w) *he is happy* (according to *Empedocles*) *that poſſeſſeth the Riches of a Divine Mind.* (5.) The *knowledge* of the tranſcendent kind of Goods and Excellencies: for ſuch are the Chriſtian and Divine, the Saving and Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies (the Goods of the Kingdom) which are of ineffable Pulchritude and Precioſity, and *the whole of Man*. For Man hath no other great concern, but to be a Saint of God, and without being ſuch he is viler than the vileſt Leper and the vileſt Animal notwithſtanding all his common and external Goods and Excellencies. All things on this ſide the Goods of Saving Chriſtianity are ſorry vulgar kind of things, and are good to be deſpiſed; as one ask'd another, *What Nobility was good for?* the other anſwer'd, *It is good to be deſpiſed, as Wealth is.* What are Riches to Righteouſneſs? Wealth to the Pearl of price? the Sciences to Sanctity? and what is all that the World counteth great and excellent, Wit, Learning, Parts, Power, Honours, Riches, Philoſophy and Humane Virtue in compariſon of *the excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt?* The Gleanings of the Grapes of this *Ephraim* are better than the Vintage of *Abiezer. Chriſtus & Cœlum non patitur hyperbolen.* Who doth not value a little Diamond above a Mountain of common Stone and Rubbiſh? ſo ſaith *Ariſtotle*, (x) *to know a little of the things divine and excellent, if we can reach it, is more delicious, than to know all things that we converſe with.* (6.) The knowledge of the *tranſcendent* things in worth, weight and importance; for ſuch are the matters of the Kingdom of God and of the Soul, of ſpiritual and eternal living and dying.

Fundamenta quibus nixatur vita ſaluſque.

That is not Wiſdom, which provideth not for Eternity, nor is Eternity to be provided for otherwiſe than by the Chriſtian Wiſdom. By other knowledge Men may gain a Name in the World, but it muſt be by the knowledge of the Son of God that their Names are written in Heaven: which if they neglect, they are no better proficients in Wiſdom than *Antonius* was, of whom *Cicero* ſaith, that he gave his Maſter a great reward, *to teach him, to be never the wiſer.* (7.) The knowledge that is infinitely *profitable* and *beneficial* (and therefore infinitely needful) as being illuminative and ſanative to the Soul, an Antidote againſt all her Vices, a Cure for all her deadly Diſeaſes, a Medicine for all her Maladies, that affordeth her eaſe and relief in all her Fears and Sorrows, Peace and Contentment in all Adverſities and Afflictions, giveth her a joyous foretaſt of her Eternal Joys, transformeth and changeth the Soul into the likeneſs of the things known, informeth and regulateth her, to behave her ſelf aright in all Conditions and Relations, maketh her wiſe to Salvation, directeth her to ſteer her courſe aright to the Haven where ſhe would be; and by this knowledge ſhe overcometh the World, eſcapeth the Inveiglements of it, and the Snares of Sin and Death everlaſting. There are not ſuch noble Theories of Knowledge any where to be found as in the Chriſtian Religion; and (which is their Excellency) they are not Scholaſtick Theories of barren Speculation, but (y) μάθημα θεῖον ϗ βιωφελὲς τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ γνῶσις, *the knowledge of the Truth is a Divine Diſcipline profitable to Life.* It bringeth the Remiſſion of all Sins, the Favour of God, the Honour and Happineſs of his Saints, all the Benefits, Promiſes, Priviledges and Immunities of his Covenant and Kingdom, and is not only a Tree of Knowledge, but the Tree of Life. *For we have all things that pertain unto Life and Godlineſs, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to Glory and Virtue.* 2 Pet. 1. 3. This only I found the true and profitable Philoſophy, ſaith *J. Martyr.* (8.) The Godly People's kind of *myſterious knowledge*, which is *ſavoury* and *ſubſtantial*, *certain* and *ſatisfactory*. (z) Μυστικὸν ἐστὶν, οὐχ ὡς ἔτυχεν, *It is myſterious, not what is vulgar and obvious.* For Chriſt is the things of regeneracy in himſelf and to us, Chriſtianity is the Science and Diſcipline of *the new Man, the new Life* and the *new ſtate of Life*, which are Secrets, of which Nature diſcerneth nothing, and to the meer natural Man they are hugely unimaginable and unaccountable. But becauſe the knowledge of Chriſt is the Godly Peoples kind of myſterious knowledge (not a Scholaſtick or Philoſophick kind of Myſtery, but that which Godlineſs is, and which is Godlineſs) therefore all that are capable of Divine

(s) V. Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 8. c. 23.

(t) Not. in Joh. 6.44.

(u) Clem. Str. l. 6. initio.

(w) Ibid. l. 5. in fin.

(x) De par. Anim. l. 1. c. 5.

(y) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 5. p. 182.

(z) Epict. Diſſ. l. 3. c. 21.

Illumination and of underſtanding the matters of Sanctity and Salvation, are capable of underſtanding the Chriſtian Myſtery, the Contemplation whereof is ineffably pleaſant and delightful (a kind of beatific Viſion) and the more enraviſhingly delightful, becauſe it is a Myſtery. For (a) *theſaurum inveniſſe gratuitum eſt.* He that findeth hidden Treaſure, is affected with an extraordinary Joy, (b) as *Pythagoras* and *Archimedes* were tranſported and enraviſh'd by their Mathematical Inventions, which yet were meerly entertainment for the Theoretic Mind, whereas the Chriſtian Learning is converſant about the Objects of Divine Affection, whence the knowledge of them is *ſavoury* and *ſubſtantial* (an ἡδυπάθεια) which filleth the Soul with ineffable Complacence and Delight. And having this *oracular Learning*, which is (not a glimmering imperfect Notice, not a fallible Conjecture, nor ſlippery Ratiocination, but) a Divine Revelation conjunct with Life and Experience, therein ſhe acquieſceth and ſetteth up her reſt. (9.) All the *tranſcendent Excellency of being a Chriſtian.* For Chriſtians as ſuch have no other Learning, pretend to no other but the knowledge of Chriſt. And as Piety is the Buſineſs of knowing God as we ought: So Chriſtian Piety (the Eſſence of it and the Summary of it) is *the learning and knowing Chriſt as we ought*, ſo to learn Chriſt, as to be really Chriſtianiz'd (to be of the Chriſtian Birth, of the Chriſtian Life, of the Chriſtian State, of the Chriſtian Family) to unlearn all Ungodlineſs, to be his Holy new Creatures, to Conſort and Symbolize with him (as his genuine Followers) and to be aſſimilated to him in Diſpoſition and Practice. As the learning Philoſophy and Aſtronomy is the ſame thing, as to be a Philoſopher and an Aſtronomer: So the learning and knowing Chriſt as we ought, is the ſame thing as to be a Chriſtian, which is matter of immenſe and boundleſs Excellency and Felicity. (c) Ἡμῖν καὶ μέγα πρᾶγμα καὶ ὄνομα, *to us it is a great thing and a great Name, to be and be called Chriſtians.*

XV. The Name *Myſtery* therefore implieth, that the Chriſtian Religion is *duly intelligible, and is not unintelligible inconſiſtently with the Science of Chriſtianity and Sanctity.* As a Religious Myſtery it muſt be an arcane *matter of knowledge, and therefore knowable and intelligible* (apt and agreeable to be underſtood;) and it muſt be ſuch an arcane matter of Knowledge, that muſt be taught, learn'd and believ'd, and therefore muſt be intelligible. A principal Benefit that true Religion affordeth, is *Knowledge* and good *Underſtanding*; all Irreligion is want of Underſtanding; to be Religious, is Wiſdom and Underſtanding; the buſineſs of Religion is a matter of good Underſtanding, and the honourary Names of it are *Wiſdom*, *Knowledge* and *Underſtanding*. This being the great Excellency and recommendation of Religion no greater Injury can be done to the Chriſtian Religion, than to make it in whole or in part ſuch an *Unintelligible* and *Super-intelligible* as the Platoniſts firſt Principle, or as the *Myſticks* Inſtitution of the Church of *Rome*, or as the Talk of thoſe who decry Reaſon as a low thing, and ſpeak ſo ſublimely (ſuch unintelligible Non-ſenſe) that no Man can frame a Notion or Conception of their Talk, nor do themſelves underſtand what they ſay. 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. If Chriſtianity was in whole or in part ſuch a Nonſenſical or Myſtic-platonical *Super-intelligible*, it would be unintelligible in a diſgraceful Senſe, which loathſome *Unintelligibleneſs* can be no attribute of ſo Divine a Religion. It is certain therefore, that Chriſtianity in the whole of it is of an intelligible Nature, *an intelligible Theory* of rational Apprehenſion and Conception. But it is one thing, to ſay, that the whole of it is of an intelligible Nature, and another thing to ſay, that the whole of it is intelligible by us in this imperfect State. In every Science and in thoſe mean things *Time* and *Motion*, *a Spike of Graſs*, *a Bubble of Water*, there is ἀκατάληπτόν τι, *ſomething that our Underſtandings cannot reach*, and which perplexeth and baffleth them. To pretend therefore to an adequate comprehenſive Knowledge of all things in the Chriſtian Religion, would be a deliration, a vanity like that of *R. Samuel*, who is noted for this arrogant Saying (d) *Notæ mihi ſunt viæ cæli, ſicut ſemitæ Nabardeæ.* But notwithſtanding this acknowledg'd Unintelligibleneſs in the Chriſtian Religion it muſt be ſaid, that the Scholaſtic Theology is culpably deſtructive to *the due Intelligibleneſs thereof, and maketh it unintelligible inconſiſtently with the Science of Chriſtianity and Sanctity.* As will appear from ſome inſtances that ſhall here be produc'd, and as will further appear from many Objections, that will be hereafter produc'd againſt this Theology. For,

(1.) This Theology is deſtructive of the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion *by extravagant Harangues touching the Unintelligibleneſs of its Articles and Myſteries.* In the elder times of the Church (as is before diſcours'd) there was a Scholaſtic Theology, which tranſcrib'd the Platoniſts Myſtic-metaphyſical Conceits touching their Super-intelligible Henotety, that took a pride and pleaſure in teaching, not the knowledge of God, but *Ignorance* and *Neſcience* of God, and made Myſtic-metaphyſical Riddles of God. Agreeably whereto the Myſtery of the Trinity is called by ancient Writers (e) ἄῤῥητος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀκατανόητος, ἀπερίληπτος, ὑπερούσιος, ὑπέρθεος, ὑπὲρ νοῦν ϗ ὑπὲρ λόγον, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπίνους λογισμοὺς ϗ ὑπὲρ ἔρευνσιν, *Unſayable, Unconceivable, Unintelligible, Incomprehenſible, Super-ſubſtance, Super-God, Supermind, Super-reaſon, above humane Ratiocination and Scrutiny. Athanaſius* ſaith (*f*) *theſe things that are delivered by Faith, are not to be perceiv'd by humane Wiſdom, but by the hearing of Faith. For what Speech can worthily interpret thoſe things that are above created Nature, or what Hearing can at all underſtand* ἃ μὴ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώποις μήτε ἀκούειν μήτε λαλεῖν, *thoſe things which Men may neither hear nor ſpeak?* Such things S. *Paul* heard in his Rapture into the Third Heaven, and if the Chriſtian Trinity had been one of theſe grand Secrets, he muſt have ſaid of it, as ſome do (*g*) *credamus & taceamus, teneamus & non inquiramus*, let us believe it and keep ſilence, hold it, not inquire into it. It muſt be an Acroamatical Deity, to whom Secrecy and Silence belongeth, and a Myſtery (that like the *Muhammedan* Religion) refuſeth inquiry, if it is the Scholaſtic Trinity. (*h*) Τὰ γὰρ ὑπὲρ νοῦν ϗ σύνεσιν τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν, *for thoſe things that are above Mind and our Underſtanding, are to be venerated by Faith only and admit not any curioſity. I am initiated and have believed, but why do I not learn the Nature of him whom I Worſhip?* Ἄπαγε τοῖς ὑπὲρ νοῦν ϗ λόγον τὴν ἄκαιρον ἐπιφέρων ζήτησιν, *away with unmannerly inquiry touching things above Mind and Reaſon.* Such were the thoughts of elder times

---

(a) S. Hilar.

(b) Plutarch. c. Epicur. p. 1094.

(c) Gr. Naz.

(d) Cosri p. 319.

(e) Animadverſ. upon Dr. Sherlock p. 237.

(f) Τὰ πίστει παραδοθέντα ταῦτα, οὐκ ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ σοφίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκοῇ πίστεως διανοεῖσθαι πρέπει. T. 1. Ep. ad Serap. p. 357, 358. Com.

(g) Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l. 11. c. 24.

(h) S. Cyr. Paſch. Hom. 8. p. 103. & Hom. 12. p. 169.

touching an inquiry into the knowledge of Divine Myſteries, which in our own time we are ſo far from promoting and improving, that ſeveral of the Learned make it their buſineſs, totally to ſufflaminate and ſtifle it. For the extravagant Author of *Chriſtianity not myſterious*, is thus confuted. *(i) Though we may be ſaid, to have Ideas of God and divine Things, yet they are not immediate or proper ones, but are Conceptions that we frame of them from the things of this World by Analogy and Similitude. So that all the Ideas we at preſent have of the things of another World are no other than a ſort of Types and Figures of things, the real Nature of which is totally obſcur'd from us, and we have no more Notion of them, than a blind Man hath of Light. We may turn and wind all theſe Ideas we have into Ten Thouſand different ſhapes, and yet never make up any likeneſs or ſimilitude of the real Nature of thoſe Objects of another World.* But thus to confute an Adverſary, is really to confute and contradict one's ſelf; for if our Ideas of divine things are form'd by *Analogy* and *Similitude*, we have otherkins Notices of them than a blind Man hath of Light, and without any turning or winding our Ideas are *a Likeneſs and Similitude* of the real Nature of the Objects of another World. Τὰ αἰσθητὰ τῶν νοητῶν μιμήματα.

(i) *Anſwer to Chriſtianity not Myſter.* p. 31, 32, 40, 41, 43.

To make Chriſtianity as myſterious, as the Scholaſtic Theology would have it, this Hypotheſis (touching our Ideas) proceedeth to ſay *(k) that we have no Notion at all of the myſterious things of the Goſpel, as they are in themſelves. After they are revealed, they are totally obſcur'd both from our Sences and our Reaſon, as to the real Nature and Properties of them as they are in themſelves. As to the internal Eſſence and real Properties of theſe divine things reveal'd to us from Heaven, we are wholly ignorant of them. We have no Ideas, no Conception of the real Nature and Properties of them, know nothing of them.* An attempt therefore to explain them is cenſur'd *(l) as the greateſt Folly, becauſe it is impoſſible; and as the greateſt Boldneſs, becauſe it is ſearching into what is hidden from us, and a talking of what we have no Idea. That part of the Chriſtian Myſtery which is intelligible and plain, was ever ſo; and that part which is myſterious (notwithſtanding all vain endeavours) will ever be ſo, till we come to another World.* Thus as Controverſies, ſo Myſteries multiply upon us every Day. This way of defending the Scholaſtic Myſteries (inſtead of explaining Myſteries) createth the greateſt Myſteries. For theſe are the greateſt Myſteries of all other; the Chriſtian Religion is the knowledge of the Truth, but doth not give us to underſtand the Truth of divine things (which is totally obſcur'd from us) we have only a ſort of Types and Figures of them. It giveth us, to underſtand the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but without giving us to underſtand any thing of their real Nature and Properties; and therefore giveth us ſo to underſtand them, as to be in the main wholly ignorant of them. It copiouſly deſcribeth things of an intelligible and conceivable Nature in the moſt plain intelligible words (as for inſtance, the Kingdom of Heaven) but we can have no Conception of its real Nature and Properties, which yet our Saviour expected from his Diſciples, when he ask'd them, *Have ye underſtood all theſe things?* By the expounded Parables and Similitudes of the Goſpel (which open the Eye of the Underſtanding) we underſtand nothing of the real Nature and Properties of divine things, nor did the Prophets and Apoſtles underſtand any thing of them, as they are in themſelves by their Apocalyptick Viſions and Repreſentations of them. Divine and humane things, the things of this and of another World, are of one general Nature (ſuch is an earthly and an heavenly King and Kingdom) but we cannot ſo much as underſtand the general Nature of the things of the other World, *that cannot at all underſtand their real Nature and Properties.* We are not capable of underſtanding the Remiſſion of Sins (or Juſtification) Adoption, Sanctification, Redemption, the new Covenant, the new Creation, the divine Nature, or any other Goſpel-myſteries, at all, as they are in themſelves; and if the Apoſtle ſpendeth a Chapter in deſcribing the real Nature and Properties of a Reſurrection-body, yet we are incapable of forming any Conception of them, as they are in themſelves. There are methods of inveſtigating the true Ideas of things, that are hidden from us, but not of theſe divine things, which muſt be unknown till another World, their real Nature being totally obſcur'd from us in the Chriſtian Religion, which therefore can have no deſign of enriching us with Divine Wiſdom and Knowledge. That Wiſdom which it is in it ſelf, we are not capable of underſtanding, nor is it unto us a comprehenſion of the true Ideas of things, and therefore to us it is no Wiſdom. As it is in us (conſtitutively) it is the Light of intellectual Knowledge, and yet we are in the dark; for the real Nature of divine things is totally obſcur'd from us. It is the Knowledge of the Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies, which cannot be known by us; for unleſs they be known as to their Kind and Quality (their real Nature and Properties) they are not known. It is the Divine Science, *the Spiritual Man's Science of divine things*, yet the Spiritual Man is of the ſame Character with the Natural Man, *He cannot know them.* It is a knowing the divine things, ſo as not to be in the main Alien from them and from knowing them, yet every one muſt neceſſarily be ſo far Alien from knowing them, till he cometh to another World. It is a knowing the divine things (not by remote Notices, but) by acquaintance with the things themſelves, which yet cannot be known as they are in themſelves. Although Heaven cometh down into us, and is begun in us, yet the real Nature of the things of the other World is totally obſcured from us. Although God cometh down from Heaven, and converſeth with us in humane Fleſh (ſo that he that hath ſeen him hath ſeen the Father) yet in this World the real Nature and Properties of God are not to be known, no not by his own Kind and Family. They know God, ſo as to know him who is God, who and what he is, that is God (and therefore the Characteriſtick Notices of him) they know God, as he is the Saint of God-kind of God, and the Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies in himſelf and to us, yet as to his real Nature and Properties God is not to be known. His real Nature and Properties being totally obſcur'd in their Religion, it is properly the ignorance and neſcience of God, yet it deſigneth, to give us an underſtanding, to know God, it is fam'd for its excellent noticing God (in all reſpects) and it calleth it ſelf by this venerable Name *The Knowledge of God*. Theſe are great Myſteries, which have more of Folly and irreligious Boldneſs in them, then there is in truly Zealous and laborious Attempts, to explain thoſe Myſteries, which the Scholaſtic Theology repreſenteth and

celebrateth

(k) *Ibid.* p. 56, 113, 116, 124.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 55.

celebrateth as unintelligible. Which yet is not ſo bad a Theology, as always to harp upon this harſh String *the Unintelligibleneſs of God*; oftentimes it magnifieth above all things, and as the root of all Goods (m) τῆς θεωρίας τὸ χρῆμα, *the Buſineſs of contemplating and knowing God*, and pretendeth unto (n) *the certain Knowledge, the ſubtil and accurate Theory of him.*

(2.) The Scholaſtick Theology is deſtructive of the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion by attributing to it *ſuch Unintelligibleneſs, which deſtroyeth its being a Science.* Every Science is in the main by us clearly intelligible (otherwiſe it cannot be a Science;) if therefore the Chriſtian Theology is both a Science and a Myſtery, it muſt be ſuch a Myſtery, which is in the main clearly intelligible. But ſuch a Myſtery it cannot be, if ſome Scholaſtic Divines rightly define a Myſtery (o) *It is a Truth, of which we know ſomething at preſent, though very imperfectly: But are ignorant of a great deal more belonging to it.* If the Myſtery of Godlineſs is of this Nature, it cannot be a Science; much leſs can it be a Science, if the real Nature of the divine things that are in it, *is totally obſcur'd from us, and we have no more Notion of them than a blind Man hath of Light.* If our Light it ſelf is Darkneſs, how great is that Darkneſs? If in the main we are unacquainted with the Myſtery of Godlineſs, how great is our Ungodlineſs? And what becometh of the Nobleneſs of the Chriſtian Theology and the tranſcendent Excellency of it above other Sciences, if in the main it is unintelligible? A Debate there is indeed amongſt the Scholaſtic Divines, whether the Chriſtian Theology be properly a Science or not? The Thomiſts maintain (p) that is is properly a Science, but not perfect in this imperfect State. Others will have it called a Science in the ſtrict Senſe of *Ariſtotle*, but ſome of them ſay (q) it is a Science of another Nature than *Ariſtotle* was acquainted with; and others ſay (r) it is a more perfect Habit than a Science. Notwithſtanding therefore this Debate amongſt the Schoolmen (which is no better than a Logomachy) the Chriſtian Theology and Religion in its general Nature muſt be look'd upon as a Science, and in its Specific Nature it is *The Knowledge of God as he is the Sanctity Imperial*, and in like manner it is *The Knowledge of Chriſt as he is the Chriſtianity Imperial.* He muſt be conſider'd as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial, and he is ſuch, not ſingly and ſolitarily, but as a Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity, in Conjunction with God the Father and the Holy Ghoſt; and conſequently the Knowledge of Chriſt as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial, is the ſame thing with the knowledge of the Chriſtian Trinity (which is the Imperial Eſtate in Chriſtianity Imperial) and that not only *virtually* and *implicitly*, but as being it *identically* and in *reality* the ſame thing with it, the acknowledgement of Chriſt (as the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial) being nothing leſs, nothing elſe than the acknowledgment of the Chriſtian Trinity, which is the Eſſence and Summary of the Chriſtian Faith, as Divines generally ſuppoſe, and as appeareth from the form of Baptiſm (s) and from what ſome Criticks have diſcours'd concerning it. The Chriſtian Theology therefore is of definitive Notion *The Science of the Holy Trinity* (which is the Chriſtian Creed;) from whence it followeth, that the Chriſtian Trinity is not in the main by us unintelligible, as the Scholaſtic Theology hath made it. And this will further appear, if we compare the Chriſtian Trinity with *Trigonometry* in Mathematicks; for as if we ſuppoſe *Trigonometry*, to be in the main unintelligible, there can be no ſuch Science as *Geometry* or *Aſtronomy*: So if the Chriſtian Trinity is in the main unintelligible, there can be no ſuch Science as the Chriſtian Theology. In the Exiſtence of God from *Eternity* there is a great difficulty (becauſe it involveth an *Infinitum*) yet this Eternity is not in the main unintelligible (for we have a clear Notion of neceſſary Exiſtence and of Duration without a beginning,) but if we ſuppoſe it ſo to be, yet this is only a little exteriour Branch of natural Theology, which (like the Angle of Contact in Geometry that doth not ſpoil the Intelligibleneſs of the Science) doth not hinder Theology from being a clear intelligible Science. But if (the Chriſtian Trinity) the Summary of the Chriſtian Faith is in the main unintelligible, the Chriſtian Theology cannot be thought a clear intelligible Science. God may require of us the belief of that which is by us incomprehenſible in a twofold Senſe: For he may require of us the belief of that, which we cannot have a clear and ſatisfactory Notion of; and he may require of us the belief of that, of which we can have no adequate comprehenſive Knowledge: But it cannot be ſuppoſed, that the Subject of his Science (which we have by his Divine Revelation) is in the main by us unintelligible. Such an *Incomprehenſible* is inconſiſtent with his Divine Science, and *Clemens* thinketh it inconſiſtent with the Divine Goodneſs. (t) *The Gnoſtick* (the wiſe Man) *of whom I ſpeak, comprehendeth thoſe things, that ſeem to others incomprehenſible; believing that nothing is incomprehenſible to the Son of God, and therefore nothing is untaught by him; for he that ſuffer'd out of love to us, could with-hold nothing that maketh for the teaching of Knowledge.*

(3.) The Scholaſtic Theology is deſtructive of the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion *by making the great Articles of it unintelligible to all that are not School-philoſophers*, (u) others cannot have any diſcernment of them. Whereas the great Articles of Chriſtianity are intelligible by all, that underſtand Politicks, Morality, Nobility-learning, Imperial and Subject-eſtates, Government and Laws (which all are naturally adapted to underſtand) if withall they have an holy diſcernment of the Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies. But theſe great Articles as they are repreſented in the Scholaſtical Theology, are not tolerably intelligible by any, that are unacquainted with the Terms and Notions of the School-Doctors, who are (ſurely) much fitter Perſons, to initiate Men into theſe kind of Myſteries than Fiſhermen and Tent-makers. They muſt have the Honour of being the only *Myſtagogi*, to inſtitute us into ſuch high Myſteries, which are unintelligible without their Terms and Notions, and are as unintelligible *with them* as *without them*. For although they pretend (w) to a light in their Theology, *which irradiateth and manifeſteth things*, yet really they obſcure them by their heterogeneous Notions and Subtilties, and *Darkneſs is upon the face of their Deep*. They ſay of their

Theology

(m) S. Cyr. c. *Jul.* l. 5. p. 157, 158.

(n) Περὶ αὐτοῦ γνῶσις ἀπλανὴς, καὶ θεωρία ἰσχνὴ καὶ ἀπεξεσμένη. *Ibid.*

(o) *Animadverſ. on Dr. Sherlock.* p. 4.

(p) *Gonet. T.* 1. *Diſp. Proem. Art.* 1.

(q) *Petav. T.* 1. *Proleg. c.* 8.

(r) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 1. *Punct.* 3.

(s) *Voſſ. de Symbol. Diſſ.* 1. *n.* 29. *Eraſm. ad Cenſ. Pariſ. Tit.* 11.

(t) Ὁ γνωστικὸς δὲ ἐκεῖνος περὶ οὗ λέγω, τὰ δοκοῦντα ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸς καταλαμβάνει· Πιστεύσας ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀκατάληπτον τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ· Ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἀδίδακτον. Ὁ γὰρ δι' ἀγάπην τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς παθὼν, οὐδὲν ἂν ὑποστείλαιτο εἰς διδασκαλίαν τῆς γνώσεως. *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 458.

(u) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c* 3. *S.* 1.

(w) *Gonet. ſupr. Art.* 11.

(x) *Ibid.*

Theology (x) *obſcuriſſima fidei myſteria explicat, (divinæ naturæ relationes & attributa, auguſtiſſimæ Triadis miranda, & Incarnationis ſecreta aperit :)* But we find them far better at making than explaining Myſteries, and that after all their brangling Altercations and diſputative Rencounters their Myſteries are as far from being duly explained as at the firſt. He that will take the pains to Conſult theſe obſcure Oracles, to obtain an Explication of Myſteries, it will fare with him, as if he ſhould take pains to climb up an high Hill, in hope to touch the Stars at the top of it, and when he cometh thither, he findeth himſelf as far from touching them as before.

(4.) The Scholaſtic Theology is deſtructive of the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion *by ſpoiling the Intelligibleneſs of Holy Scripture and the reaſonableneſs and congruity of the Chriſtian Religion.* For both the Old and New Teſtament are perverted to an Alien ſenſe by Scholaſtic Interpretations, and in great degree Chriſt is not objectively *the Wiſdom of God* in this Theology. For was it wiſe and reaſonable, that our Saviour ſhould make Prayers to himſelf? Make Satisfaction to himſelf? Take great Care of his Soul, when his Soul was not himſelf? It is highly reaſonable, that the Creator of Man ſhould take care of the Redemption and Recovery of the fallen Man by a Mediator : But that this Creator of Man and the offended Party ſhould himſelf become the Mediator, is a monſtrous incongruity. A mighty aptitudinal reaſonableneſs and congruity there is in oppoſing the Son of God (according to his true Idea) as the Second *Adam* to the Firſt *Adam* and to the Prince of the Kingdom of Darkneſs: But there is no ſuch aptitude, reaſonableneſs and congruity in oppoſing one that is the eternal Almighty God to old *Adam* and the old Serpent. It is highly reaſonable and congruous, that our Saviour-king ſhould be God's High Prieſt; God muſt be the Object of his Miniſtration ; to God he muſt make Oblation and offer a Propitiatory Sacrifice for his People ; and on their behalf he muſt deal with God as their Patron and Advocate ; which ſacerdotal Officiary Dignity is hugely agreeable to the Son of God according to his genuine Idea, but not to ſuch a Son of God as cannot have God for his God or his Imperial Head. In our Redemption there is a duly equal regard to the Glory of God and the Salvation of Men; and ſo in our Saviour's Oeconomy God had a duly equal regard to the advancement of his Son and to our Welfare; which ſort of Oeconomy is hugely agreeable to the Son of God according to his genuine Idea, but not to ſuch a Son of God, that was incapable of any advancement (y) οὐδὲ αὔξησιν ζητεῖ τελειότατος ὤν, *nor doth he deſire any increaſe being moſt perfect.* But hath the Apoſtle reſpect to ſuch a Son, when he ſaith; *Though he were a Son, yet learned he Obedience, by the things which he ſuffer'd : and being made perfect he became the Author of eternal Salvation.* And with what Congruity can it be ſaid of ſuch a Son, *he was made Perfect through Sufferings?* In the Scholaſtic Theology our Saviour's Oeconomy is made to conſiſt of a multitude of Incongruities (many of which will be remark'd hereafter) which ſpoil the Wiſdom and Reaſonableneſs of the Chriſtian Religion.

(y) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 280. *Heb.* 2. 10. *and* 5. 8, 9.

(5.) The Scholaſtic Theology is deſtructive to the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion by introducing into it ſuch Dogmata that are Contradictions (as unintelligible as a Triangular Square ;) for ſuch is *Tranſubſtantiation*, the moſt Sacroſanct Dogma of the Church of *Rome*, and the Myſtery of all her Myſteries, which yet is deſtructive of the certainty both of Sence and Reaſon, involveth in it numerous Contradictions, and is ſo prodigious an abſurdity, as is not to be parallel'd in any Religion. The Romaniſts are ſenſible of its repugnance to their Faculties, and therefore in one of their Manuals this is part of a Prayer at Holy Maſs (z) *herein I renounce my Sence and all Man's Underſtanding.* It may ſeem immodeſt, to ſay, that in the Scholaſtic Doctrine of the Trinity there are Contradictions, and I am loath, to ſay it : But it is manifeſt, that this Maxim, *Quæ ſunt eadem uni tertio, ſunt eadem inter ſe*, cannot be deny'd without a Contradiction. Yet the Scholaſtic Theology ſaith, (a) *the three Properties* (Relations or Perſons) *in divinis, are not really diſtinguiſh'd from the Eſſence, but are one and the very ſame thing with it, yet they really differ from one another ; which in this Myſtery is ſingular and wonderful. For infinite and created things this Maxim holdeth* ; Quæ ſunt eadem uni tertio ſecundum rem, ſunt eadem inter ſe ſecundum rem : *But not in God an infinite Being.* Our Minds indeed are diſproportionate to things infinite ; we are ſo far from adequately comprehending them, that we cannot ſo far comprehend infinite *number, magnitude, littleneſs*, as to have clear and ſatisfactory Apprehenſions of them. Whence we meet with ſeveral ſurprizing difficulties in Geometry (which have their riſe from the infinite diviſibility of Quantity :) But thoſe ſurprizing difficulties involve in them the conſideration of an *Infinitum :* Whereas in the real diſtinction of the divine Perſons from one another and their Identity with the Eſſence (although that Eſſence is infinite) no ſuch conſideration of an *Infinitum* is involv'd ; and therefore the difference between finite and infinite is not pertinently alledg'd, to invalidate the truth of this Maxim *in Divinis, Quæ ſunt eadem uni tertio ſecundum rem, ſunt eadem inter ſe ſecundum rem.* But we will ſuppoſe, that in this Scholaſtic Doctrine of the Trinity and in thoſe ſuprizing difficulties in Geometry there is the ſame conſideration of an *Infinitum*, yet there is manifeſtly this difference between theſe two Caſes. In thoſe ſurprizing difficulties (the Doctrine of *Aſymptotes, incommenſurable Lines* and ſuch more) we plainly diſcern, that there is no ſufficient ground for the Charge of a Contradicton, which cannot be ſaid of this Scholaſtic Doctrine of the Trinity.

(z) *A Man of devout Prayers fit for all Perſons and Occaſions at Gant.* 1670.

(a) *Proprietates (vel Relationes) cum eſſentia ipſa una ſunt eademque res, etſi invicem re ipſa diſcrepant ; quod in hoc myſterio ſingulare eſt ac mirable.* Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 10. S. 5. & l. 3. c. 9. S. 14. Vaſqu. T. 2. Diſp. 122. c. 2. in 1. Thom.

(6.) The Scholaſtic Theology is deſtructive to the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion, by introducing into it ſuch Dogmata, which we plainly diſcern, not to be of an *intelligible Nature*, but to be above Reaſon in the ſame Senſe with the Myſtic-platonic firſt Principle. In Theology, Geometry and natural Philoſophy there are ſome things (b) that may be called things above Reaſon, not in the Myſtic-platonic Senſe, but becauſe at a peculiar rate they ſurpaſs our Underſtanding, and are ſo far *above Reaſon*, that ſome of them are too *immenſe* for our Underſtanding, others are by us *inexplicable*, and others of them ſeem to be *inconſiſtent* with the Body of other Truths. Such are *the divine Preſcience, compoſitio continui, Time,*

(b) *Mr. Boyle of things above Reaſon.*

Motion, the Rota Ariſtotelica, the Angle of Contact, and the manner of the Soul's moving the Body. But although theſe Heteroclites (and ſome others of like nature) do at a ſtrange rate perplex and poſe our Underſtanding, and are in great degree to us unintelligible, yet any Man that attentively conſidereth them, may plainly diſcern, that they are of an intelligible nature; and he may as plainly diſcern, that this intelligible nature is wanting in ſeveral of thoſe Objects, which the Scholaſtic Theology propoſeth to our Underſtanding. (*c*) *That there is one* (Scholaſtical) *Divine Nature or Eſſence common unto three Perſons incomprehenſibly united and ineffably diſtinguiſhed, united in eſſential Attributes, diſtinguiſhed by peculiar Idioms and Relations; all equally united in every Divine Perfection, each different from other in order and manner of Subſiſtence; that there is a mutual inexiſtence of one in all, and all in one, a communication without any deprivation or diminution in the Communication; an eternal Generation and an eternal Proceſſion without Precedence or Succeſſion, without proper cauſality or dependence; a Father imparting his own and the Son receiving his Father's Life, and a Spirit iſſuing from both without any diviſion or multiplication of Eſſence: theſe are Notions which may well puzzle our Reaſon in conceiving how they agree —— upon which we ſhould meditate, not with hope to comprehend, but with diſpoſition to admire, veiling our Faces in the Preſence, and proſtrating our Reaſon at the Feet, of Wiſdom ſo far tranſcending us.* (*d*) *By one Subſtance many do underſtand a numerical or individual unity of Subſtance; and by three Perſons they underſtand three diſtinct Subſiſtences in that Eſſence. It is not pretended by theſe, that we can give a diſtinct Idea of Perſon or Subſiſtence, only they hold, it importeth a real diverſity in one from another, and even ſuch a diverſity from the ſubſtance of the Deity it ſelf, that ſome things belong to the Perſon that do not belong to the Subſtance; for the Subſtance neither begetteth, nor is begotten; neither breaths nor proceedeth. This carrieth in it ſomewhat that is not agreeable to our Notions, nor like any thing that we can apprehend.* Thoſe ſeverals in theſe Schemes of the Scholaſtick Trinity (which muſt be underſtood Scholaſtically, and as things are underſtood and ſtated in the Scholaſtick Theology) *which are not like any thing that we can apprehend*, may reaſonably be counted *ſuper-intelligibles* of the ſame nature with the Platonic firſt Principle, they are not the Objects of any Conception or Intellection (Humane, Angelical or Divine) *ſuper-eminent genus intelligibile.* This Theology (*e*) *regionem intelligentiæ excedit*, tranſcendeth the Region of Intelligence.

(c) Dr. Barrow, a Def. of the B. Trinity on Col. 3. 2.

(d) Biſhop Burnet on the Articles, p. 37.

(e) S. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 2.

XVI. The Name *Myſtery* (which is the laſt thing remarkable concerning it) implieth, *that the matters of the Chriſtian Religion are extraordinary mirandous things.* For a Myſtery is τὸ ἀπόῤῥητον ϗ θαυμάσιον, *that which is arcane and wonderful.* Agreeably whereto the Apoſtle ſaith, *Behold, ye deſpiſers, and wonder and periſh: for I work a work in your Days, a work which you ſhall in no wiſe believe, though a Man declare it unto you.* The Text ſpeaketh not meerly of the Excæcation and Reprobation of the Jews, but both of their Sin and their Puniſhment (to ſignifie both theſe the Apoſtle accommodateth the words of an ancient Prophet:) their Puniſhment was, *wonder and periſh:* but their Sin was their Incredulity, they believ'd not the wonderful work of God, which the Apoſtle declared unto them, which was God's raiſing up our Meſſiah, which ſeem'd to the Jews ſo ſtrange and wonderful, that they thought it incredible. The ſame Prophet, that foretelleth their Incredulity, ſaith of the Meſſiah, *Iſa.* 9. 6. *His Name ſhall be called* (he ſhall be) *wonderful.* So the conjunction of his two Natures is called by S. *Auſtin, admirabilis mixtura* (a wonderful mixture of God and Man) his appearance in the World and in a mean and contemptible guize is wonderful to the height of Miracle; and in reſpect of his miraculous Conception and Birth, his deſcent from Heaven, his Unction, agency of Miracles, his typical and prophetic Atteſtations, his Wiſdom and Sanctity, his Pulchritude and Precioſity, his officiary Dignities, his new Creation and Religion, his Paſſion and Reſurrection, his Excellencies and Benefits, his Humiliation and Exaltation, he is the great wonder of Heaven and Earth. *His Love to us was wonderful*, they are wonderful things that he hath done for us, *his Teſtimonies are wonderful* (as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh) in his Religion there is a marvellous pleonaſm of Grace (that ſuper-aboundeth) the Immunities and Priviledges, the Dignities, Safeties and Felicities which he hath provided for his People, are ſuperlative to the height of wonder and aſtoniſhment (1 *Cor.* 3. 21. 23.) his Inheritance overpowereth (*f*) τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν διανοίας τὸ μέτριον, *the mediocrity of our Mind*, and is above all that we are able to ask or think. Nor is the Sanctity, to which he calleth his People diſproportionate to their Felicity; for they are called *to Glory and Virtue*, and from a benighted condition *into marvellous Light.* Of their heroic paſſive Virtue we have (*g*) *ſuch and ſo great Precepts and Examples, that the greatneſs of them maketh Infidels call in queſtion the truth of our Profeſſion, but with us they are a ground and foundation of Faith.* The matters of our Faith are things of Creature-tranſcendent agency, miraculous and wonderful, (*h*) παράδοξα οὐ μὴν παράλογα, *things ſtrange and wonderful, but not abſurd or irrational.*

Act. 13. 41.

(f) S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 8. p. 279.

1 Pet. 2. 9.

2 Pet. 1. 3.

(g) *Talia tantaque documenta quorum magnitudo penes nationes detractio fidei eſt, penes nos verò ratio & ſtructio.* Tertull.

(h) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 4. c. 1.

CHAP. VIII.

1. The Chriſtian Religion is call'd, The Myſtery of Godlineſs, to ſignify that it is the Diſcipline of Univerſal Holineſs and Godlineſs in all reſpects. 2. All things requiſite in the Diſcipline of Univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs are in the Chriſtian Religion. 3. Inferences from this account of the Chriſtian Religion. 4. Of a great Excellency of this great Myſtery, the Tranſcendence of its Godlineſs. This illuſtrated and proved from certain deſcriptive Notices of it. 5. It is illuſtrated and proved from the general Nature of the Chriſtian Religion. 6. It is illuſtrated and proved from the State of Regeneracy. 7. It is illuſtrated and proved from the Chriſtians good Life. 8. It is illuſtrated and proved from the tranſcendent bad Entertainment which Chriſtianity met with in the World. 9. It is illuſtrated and proved from the Sentiment and Behaviour of the Chriſtians in their Sufferings. 10. It is illuſtrated and proved from the Virtue and Godlineſs requir'd by our Saviour in his Sermon on the Mount.

1. EVery one of the Popular Pagans religious Myſteries, to which the Apoſtle alludeth, was *a Pagan Myſtery of Godlineſs*; for it was a Myſtery, ſo as to be an Inſtitution of Pagan Holineſs and Godlineſs. Anſwerably whereto the Chriſtian Religion is a Myſtery, ſo as to be the Diſcipline and Inſtitution of real univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs, and therefore it is denominated *The Myſtery of Godlineſs*. So Chriſtianiſm conſider'd as *conſtitutive* is defin'd by ſome, (i) *the acknowledgment of Godlineſs leading to Life Eternal*. Conſider'd as *inſtitutive* it is denominated, (k) *the Divine and Godly Diſcipline*, which is its true and honourary Character. But to be a Myſtery, would be ſmall honour to it, if it was not the Myſtery of Godlineſs: nor would its being *the Truth* be any great honour to it, if it was *not the Truth which is after Godlineſs*, Tit. 1. 1. *The Doctrine which is according to Godlineſs*, 1 Tim. 6. 3. To be the Truth in any Caſe (although there are many inſignificant Truths) is a degree of ennoblement (for Truth recommendeth things, gaineth them reſpect and credit, whereas Falſhood, Error and a Lye is their diſparagement and reproach:) To be a more than *vulgar* and *ordinary* ſort of Truth, is an higher degree of Ennoblement (which ſort of Truth the Pagans magnify'd, building an Altar to Truth, (l) ſuppoſing Souls to be fed in the Field of Truth, that the greateſt of the Gods *Oromaſdes* is in his Body like unto Light, and in his Soul like unto Truth (as the *Perſians* ſuppos'd) that nothing is more delicious to the Mind of Man than the Light of Truth, intituling Truth *the Daughter of* Jove (as *Pindar*) a Queen and the beginning of Virtue, a Fellow-citizen of the Gods, the greateſt of the Gods, ſo great a gift that God can give no greater to Men, a divine thing and the beginning of all Goods to the Gods and Men:) But to be *the nobleſt kind of Truth*, is the far greateſt Ennoblement, (m) *Veritas ſine quâ Vanitas* (the Verity without which all things are Vanity) *the one truth whereby holy Souls are illuminated*, which is the true Daughter of God (Light as He is, pure and uncorrupt, of unſtained Beauty and enraviſhing Pulchritude) and as vital Food to the Soul, without which ſhe droopeth and languiſheth in a famiſh'd condition, but which ſhe taſteth with a delicious reliſh, and whereby ſhe reviveth, hath her new Life, Strength and Vigour, her growth and improvement in the Holy Life. Such is the Truth which Godlineſs is in the conſtitutive parts of it (its *Credenda* and *Agenda*, or as it is πίστις καθαρὰ καὶ ὀρθὸς βίος, *the holy Faith and the holy Life*) that are the ſame with the conſtitutive parts of the Chriſtian Religion, which therefore in this reſpect is *the Diſcipline of univerſal Holineſs and Godlineſs*. And ſuch it is in many other reſpects. For,

(1.) In *the entrance of it* it initiateth into univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs (the turning from all Sin and Wickedneſs to the faithful ſerving God in a Life of Holineſs) whence the entrance into Saving Chriſtianity is not without both *laborious* and *afflictive* difficulty, which muſt attend the change of our nature and our whole courſe, and which the Philoſophers found at an extravagant rate in the change of their courſe of Life. (n) For when *Sextius* the *Roman* had abandon'd his Dignities for Philoſophy, at firſt he found ſo much trouble in it, that for meer vexation of Mind he had like to have thrown himſelf into the Sea. So *Diogenes* at his firſt embracing his ſtrict Philoſophic Life, when he ſaw the *Athenians* revelling, banquetting and making merry, and reflected upon that courſe of Life which he had undertaken, how diſconſolate and troubleſome it was, began to repent himſelf, that he had become a Philoſopher, and was ready to relapſe to the common way of living. All excellent things at firſt are difficult and unpleaſant, and ſuch is the beginning of Godlineſs (which is the Godly Man's kind of Virtue) Habits are not eaſily chang'd, there is no death (nor dying to Sin) without ſome pain. (o) *A Man becometh not a Chriſtian* ἀκαμάτως, *without labour*. There is difficulty therefore in the Chriſtian Initiation, becauſe it is an entrance into Godlineſs, anſwerable to the Gentiles Initiation into the *Eleuſinian* Myſteries, (p) *Aditum prius cruciant*, they make the entrance difficult and full of trouble. So the entrance into Godlineſs and the emerging from under the domination of Sin is by a bleeding Repentance (which doth not leave Men in their Sins and in their Blood) by Sorrows and conflicts with ghoſtly Enemies and violent Temptations, by breaking through many Difficulties and Impediments (from within and without) by breaking with Sin entirely and for ever and duely parting with this whole World, by rectifying crooked Nature, ſubduing unruly Luſts and Paſſions, by ſerious Devotion, Care and Circumſpection, a religious ſtrictneſs and ſeverity of Life, and a diligent purſuing Holineſs notwithſtanding all Inclinations and Reluctances of the Fleſh, and all ſollicitations and provocations to the contrary.

(2.) In the *Eſſence* of it, It is the Diſcipline of univerſal Holineſs and Godlineſs. (q) *Learn and obſerve the Evangelical Converſation, the exact government of the Eyes, the bridling the Tongue, the ſubjugating*

(i) Ἐπίγνωσις εὐσεβείας εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιαν ὁδηγοῦσα. *Phavorin.*

(k) Ἔνθεος καὶ εὐσεβὴς παιδεία. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(l) *Plotin. En.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 4. *Gothofred. Exercit. in* 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Veritatis luce menti hominis nihil dulcius.* Cic. Acad. 2. Θυγάτηρ Διός, *Pindar.*

(m) *S. Aug. in Pſal.* 11. & *T.* 9. *Soliloq. c.* 13. *Pabulum animæ incredibili quadam jucunditate perfuſum.* Lactant. l. 5. c. 1.

(n) *Plut. de profect. p.* 77.

(o) *Macar. Hom.* 27.

(p) *V. Herald. in Arnob. p.* 130.

(q) Μάθε, διδάχθητι εὐαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν, ὀφθαλμῶν ἀκρίβειαν, γλώσσης ἐγκράτειαν, σώματος δουλαγωγίαν, φρόνημα ταπεινὸν, ἐννοίας καθαρότητα, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμόν. ἀγγαρευόμενος προσίθει, ἀποστερύμενος μὴ δικάζε, μισύμενος ἀγάπα, διωκόμενος ἀνέχε, βλασφημύμενος παρακάλει. νεκρώθηλι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, συσαυρώθηλι τῷ Χριςῷ, ὅλην τὴν ἀγάπην μετάθες ὅπὶ τ̃ κύριον ἀλλὰ χαλεπὰ ταῦτα· τί ἢ τῶν ἀγαθῶν εὔκολον; Τίς καθεύδων τρόπαιον ἔςησε; τίς τρυφῶν κ̀ καταυλύμενος τοῖς τ̃ καρτερίας ςεφάνοις κατεκοσμήθη; ὐδεὶς μὴ δραμὼν ἀνείλετο τὸ βραβεῖον. πόνοι γεννῶσι δόξαν, ἱδρῶτες προξενῦσι ςεφάνυς. *S. Baſil. Hom.* 13. p. 484.

jugating the Body, the lowly Sentiment, the purity of Thought, the extinction of Anger. If any compell thee to go a Mile, add thereto; if any defraud thee, make not uſe of a Court of Judicature; being hated, love; being perſecuted, ſuffer it; being reviled, intreat. Be dead to ſin, be crucify'd with Chriſt, transfer thy whole love upon the Lord. But theſe are difficult things you will ſay. And what is there of Mundane Goods that is eaſie? Who is there that ſleeping ever rais'd a Trophee? Who ever deliciating and making merry was adorn'd with the Crowns of Tolerance? None but he that runneth getteth the Prize. Labours produce Glory, Pains uſher in Crowns. Through many Tribulations we muſt enter into the Kingdom, but theſe Tribulations the Felicity of the Kingdom of Heaven ſucceedeth, whereas the labours of Sins the pain and ſadneſs of Hell ſucceedeth. Such a (r) διδασκαλεῖον τ̃ θείας ἀρετῆς, *School of Divine Virtue* is Chriſtianity inſtitutive in the Eſſence of it; and Chriſtianity conſtitutive conſiſteth in being (s) ςρατιώτης Χριςῦ, ἀθλητὴς ἐυσεβείας, *a Soldier of Chriſt, a Champion or Wreſtler of Godlineſs.* He that pretendeth, to be a Chriſtian, pretendeth, to be a Diſciple of the Diſcipline of univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs, to learn and follow it; and if in the main he doth not learn and follow it, he is in the main an Alien. (t) *Si & aliud jam non Chriſtianus.* (u) *They that live not as Chriſt hath taught,* γνωριζέσθωσαν μὴ ὄντες Χριςιανοὶ, *let them be known, to be no Chriſtians* (no Diſciples) *although with their Tongues they profeſs his Doctrine.*

(r) J. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 42.
(s) S. Baſil. ſupr.
(t) Tertull. Apol. c. 44.
(u) J. Mart. Apol. 2. p. 63.

(3.) It is the Diſcipline of univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs in the ſubject-matter of it, which is all Godlineſs (the comprehenſion of it and of what belongeth to it) nothing that is not ſo. For in this reſpect it tranſcendeth all Humane Inſtitutions of Virtue and all falſe Religions, there is no allay or embaſing mixture of Wickedneſs and Ungodlineſs in Chriſt's Religion.

Quicquid tam ſancta condidit manus, cœlum eſt.

Nor doth it inſtitute Men, to place their Religion in notional knowledge, in empty profeſſion, in diſputative Opinions (and mighty Animoſities about them) in things of little value, frigid humane Inſtitutes, little Singularities of Sects and Parties, enthuſiaſtick heights and heats of Fancy and Paſſion, Humane Morality, Superficial Formalities and outſide Obſervances, but the one thing that it inſiſteth upon, and concerneth it ſelf about, is, (w) γεωργεῖν τὴν ἐυσέβειαν, *to plow and ſow and till Godlineſs.*

(w) Gr. Naz.

(4.) It is the Diſcipline of Univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs in the *efficacy* and *effect of it*, that which was eminently conſpicuous in the firſt times of Chriſtianity, when all over the World (x) *Chriſtian Churches were planted conſiſting of thoſe that were converted* ἀπὸ μυρίων ὅσων κακῶν, *from Evils innumerable, from Uncleanneſſes, Injuſtices, Intemperance, Superſtition, contempt of God and a colluvies of Wickedneſs.* Philoſophy was of little avail for the due reforming the Souls and Lives of Men, one *Phædon* and *Polemo* were reclaim'd by it from a luxurious Life, who yet remain'd Heathen Ungodly Sinners, as they were before. And ſuch would the Philoſophers have been, if they had liv'd according to their own Precepts; whereas for the moſt part (y) *cum eorum vita mirabiliter pugnat oratio*, their Doctrine and their Life were marvellouſly repugnant. But Chriſt's Religion is productive of the Godlineſs which it teacheth, at the riſe of it thouſands at once were converted by it from a bad Religion and an evil Life and chang'd into other kind of Men. (z) *Since Chriſt appear'd amongſt Men, they began to forſake the worſhip of Idols, the Oracles ceaſed, the Poets, Gods and Heroes began to be contemned, Magick became out of requeſt, Mankind were ſet free from the Domination of Demons, multitudes of Societies of Men are perſuaded to deſpiſe things temporal and look at the things eternal, the Fornicators become Chaſt, the Man-killers wear Swords no more, the Timerous become Manly, the barbarous Nations lay aſide their Inhumanity, become pacifick, have forſaken their Country-Gods, abandon'd their ferine and barbarous Cuſtoms, and when they hear the Doctrine of Chriſt, turn from War to Agriculture, from Swords to Prayers; the Greeks and Barbarians are no more in War and Hoſtility, but they that are diſcipled to Chriſt, maintain a virtuous Warfare againſt the Devil, that they may be chaſt in their Youth, patient in Trials, hardy in Labours, bear Revilings and Defraudations, and (which is marvellous) they deſpiſe Death and become Martyrs of Chriſt.* His Apoſtles *with great power* (a) *changed the Dead into Living, Sinners into the Juſt, the Blind into Seeing.* His Religion maketh Men alive unto God, ſetteth them free from thoſe fleſhly Luſts, that bear ſway over the reſt of Mankind, maketh them holy at the very Heart, whence they naturally abhor that which is evil, and affect that which is good, the love of God is the inmoſt conſtitution of their Soul, their care and their courſe is to ſerve him, and out of dutiful regard to him, to practiſe univerſal Righteouſneſs and to ſin no more.

(x) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 1. p. 21, 53. l. 3. p. 128.
(y) Cic. Tuſc. 2.
(z) Athanaſ. de Incarn. Verb. T. 1. p. 73. Com. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 1. c. 4.

(a) Μετετίθεσαν νεκρὺς εἰς ζῶντας, ἁμαρτωλὺς εἰς δικαίυς, πηρὺς εἰς βλέποντας. *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *p.* 627.

(5.) It is the Diſcipline of Univerſal Holineſs and Godlineſs in *the End, Deſign and Buſineſs of it*, which is to ſave ungodly Sinners from all Ungodlineſs and Wickedneſs (the Sin of it and the puniſhment of it) and to make them truly Holy and Godly *initially, progreſſively, conſummately* and in perfection. Throughout the Goſpel of God the Voice of Godlineſs is heard, injoyning, inculcating, admoniſhing, exhorting, *to repent and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out, to awake out of ſleep and ariſe from the dead, to caſt off the Works of Darkneſs, deny all Ungodlineſs and Worldly Luſts, lay apart all filthineſs and ſuperfluity of naughtineſs, depart from all Iniquity, to cleanſe, purifie, mortifie, crucifie, to abhor that wich is evil, to be dead unto Sin, and to live unto God, not to be conformed to this World, to ſow to the Spirit, to abſtain from fleſhly Luſts, to reſiſt the Devil, to be the doers of Righteouſneſs, to do and ſuffer the Will of God, to be obedient and to pleaſe God, to have a good Conſcience, to walk in the light and honeſtly as in the Day, to ſhine as Lights in the World, to walk in all good Works, not to defile our Garments, to glorifie God in Body and Spirit, to purſue Holineſs and to be holy in all manner of Converſation, to live godly in Chriſt Jeſus and to be his faithful followers, to grow and thrive in the holy life, to be vigilant, zealous, diligent, fervent in Godlineſs, and to perfect Holineſs in the fear of God.* The end of publiſhing his Goſpel to the Gentiles was, *to open their Eyes, to turn them from Darkneſs to Light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveneſs of Sins and inheritance among them which are ſanctified.* So God will have his Goſpel and Chri-

Act. 26. 18.

ſtian Churches every where in the World (b) ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστροφῆς καὶ διορθώσεως, *for the converſion and reformation of Men.* So Chriſt came into the World, *to ſave ungodly Sinners* (to ſave them from being ungodly Sinners in ſtate and in fact) Godlineſs is the Subject-matter of his Sermons and occaſional Diſcourſes, his holy Life was deſign'd to be a perfect pattern of Holineſs and Godlineſs, the End of his conditional Promiſes and the threatnings of his holy Law, and of his Sacramental Initiations is Godlineſs, which was alſo deſign'd in his Paſſion and Crucifixion. For his death was deſign'd, to be the pattern of ours and the cauſe of ours, that we ſhould die to Sin, as he died for Sin. And who will not kill the Sin that killed his Saviour? and forſake Sin that was ſo exemplarily puniſh'd in the Son of God? who will not anſwer prodigious love with love again, or refuſe to be his Servant, that hath over-bought him, and paid for him more than he was worth? who can find in his Heart, to fruſtrate the End of Chriſt's Sufferings (to make his Blood to be ſpilt in vain) or crucifie the Son of God again? Gal. 1. 4. Luk. 1. 74. 1 Pet. 2. 24. Tit. 2. 14. *He gave himſelf for our Sins, that he might deliver us from this preſent evil World* (by calling us out of the World and ſaving us from the Sins and Puniſhments thereof) that we being no longer under the Domination of our Ghoſtly Enemies *might ſerve him in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs*; *that we being dead to Sin might live to Righteouſneſs, therefore he bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree*; and *that he might redeem us from all Iniquity* (as being no longer unregenerate Sinners under the condemning and the commanding power of Sin) *and purifie unto himſelf a peculiar People.* Eph. 5. 25, 26, 27. *He gave himſelf for his Church, that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it, and might preſent it to himſelf a glorious Church*; that there might be no blemiſh in his Spouſe, not any Freckle in her Face, or any Mole in her Body, not any Defilement or Deformity. His *Reſurrection* and *Aſcenſion* alſo were deſign'd to promote Godlineſs; for all that will be his Religioniſts, are thereby oblig'd in ſociety with him and conformity to him, to riſe to newneſs of Life, and to dwell in Heaven in Mind and Affection; ſo that Godlineſs is deſign'd throughout the whole of our Saviour's œconomy. The *Grace* of God alſo in the Goſpel-œconomy is deſign'd to excite Gratitude, and is a mighty obligation to an holy Life. And the End of a Chriſtian's calling is Godlineſs, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 7. All things in Chriſtianity conſpire in a ſubſerviency to this great End and Deſign, to promote Godlineſs.

II. In the Chriſtian Religion there are all things requiſite, to conſtitute it the Diſcipline of Univerſal Holineſs and Godlineſs. In ſuch an Inſtitution (becauſe of the degenerate ſtate of Mankind) there muſt be,

(1.) *An Expiation of Sin.* For the ſtate of Holineſs and Godlineſs is the ſtate of Remiſſion of Sins and of Society with God, with whom according to the Senſe and Inſtitutes both of Jews and Gentiles no Communion is to be had by Sinners, nor is his Favour to be obtain'd without *a purgation, luſtration and expiation* of their Guilt and Defilement. Heb. 9. 22. Lev. 16. 30. and ch. 12. 7. Amongſt the Jews *almoſt all things were purged with Blood*, thereby they were made clean from their Sins, that they might be the holy People and the holy Worſhippers. The Gentiles Expiatory Sacrifices were called, (c) ἁγνιστικὰ & καθαρτικὰ, *cleanſing and purgative*, and by theſe Luſtrations they ſuppos'd themſelves (d) to gain the Society and Benevolence of their Gods. Agreeably whereto an Expiation is provided for Chriſtian Believers, in their Religion, a *purgation* from all their foul Criminality, *a Laver for Sin and for Uncleanneſs* (the King's Bath of Chriſt's Blood, as ſome call it) an Expiatory Sacrifice that hath *made an end of Sin*, Dan. 9. 24. ſo that nothing more remaineth to be done for the expiation of it: Whereas the Legal Sacrifices could not cleanſe from Sin at all *as to the Soul-eſtate*, nor as to Externals ſave only for a time. For *every Prieſt ſtandeth daily miniſtring and offering oftentimes the ſame Sacrifices* Heb. 10. 11. (they were frequently to be repeated) therefore they did not make a full and final Expiation of Sin as to Externals. Whence the Apoſtle inferreth, that *they can never take away Sins.* Heb. 10. 1, 2, 3, 4. Spiritually they can never take them away at all; and as to Externals they cannot take them quite away, nor make the Religioniſt *perfect*, for the Expiation of Sin by the Legal Sacrifices being hugely defective, the Religioniſt could not be perfect (but muſt be lamentably defective) as to the buſineſs of having his Sins expiated. *Thoſe Sacrifices which were offered Year by Year continually, could not make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceaſed to be offered? becauſe that the Worſhippers once purged ſhould have had no more Conſcience of Sins* (in the legal way of ſucceſſional ſinning and ſucceſſionally expiating Sin.) *But in thoſe Sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of Sins every Year. For it is not poſſible, that the Blood of Bulls and Goats ſhould take away Sins.* But by Chriſt's Sacrifice his Believers are cleanſed from Sin as to their Soul-eſtate, from the guilt of deadly Sins, from the puniſhment of thoſe deadly Sins, from the ſenſe of that guilt, from the fear of that puniſhment, and he hath made a full and perfect Expiation of the Sins of his People, his Sacrifice cleanſeth them throughout all Times and Ages (needeth not to be reiterated, nor do they need any other Expiatory Sacrifice) they are in the uncondemnably ſinleſs eſtate, and are not in any reſpect defective (but are perfect) as to the buſineſs of having their Sins expiated. *For by one Offering he hath for ever perfected* Heb. 10. 14. (as to the Expiation of Sin) *them that are ſanctified*, or made Saints.

(2.) In the Diſcipline of univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs there muſt be *the perfect rule of Righteouſneſs*; which may be denominated *Perfect* in various Senſes, and in various Degrees: But in this place by *the perfect rule of Righteouſneſs*; I mean, *a rule of Righteouſneſs, that is perfect, ſo far as is requiſite, to inſtitute us to true and perfect Righteouſneſs and Holineſs.* Such a perfect rule of Righteouſneſs is not to be found in the Philoſophy of the Gentiles, nor in the Law of Nature, nor in the original Law of God, nor in the Inſtitution of *Moſes* and the Prophets, nor in any Inſtitution ſave only in the Chriſtian Religion, which therefore is peculiarly of this Excellency, *It is not in any reſpect partially and defectively, but in all reſpects plenarily the Diſcipline of Sanctity and Godlineſs.* Such a Rule it is (as to all religious Faith and Practice) as ſome have defin'd (e) *a Rule is not capable of addition or diminution.* But of the Law of Righteouſneſs as it was delivered by *Moſes* and the Prophets, the Fathers ſay (f) *that Chriſt doth, adimplere* (ἀναπληροῦν) *extendere*

(b) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 3. p. 128.

(c) Grot. de Satisf. c. 10.

(d) Jambl. de Myſt. l. 1. c. 13.

(e) Ὁ κανὼν οὔτε πρόσθεσιν, οὔτε ἀφαίρεσιν δέχεται. S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 12. in 3. Philip.

(f) V. S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. p. 107, 110, 111. Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 1. c. 2. S. 6. Dr. Ham. Pract. Cat. l. 2. S. 3. Mal. in Mat. 5. 21. Bp. Tayl. Duct. Dub. B. 2. c. 2. r. 4. Suar. de Leg. l. 10. c. 2. n. 15.

extendere, dilatare, ampliare, ſupplere quod minus habet, perficere, augere, fill up, extend, dilate, enlarge it, ſupply what was deficient, perfect, increaſe it; and in ſuch Senſe they underſtand the words of our Saviour, *I am not come to deſtroy* (the Law or the Prophets) *but to fulfil.* So our Saviour's giving of Laws is called πλήρωσις, ἐπίτασις, τελείωσις, *a filling up, extending, perfecting* the Moſaic Moral Precepts; as *the prohibition of Anger, of an unchaſt Look, of ſwearing and the Commandment of loving Enemies*, are a Completion and Perfection of the prohibition of Murder, Adultery, Perjury, and of the Commandment of loving our Neighbour. So in reſpect of all other Laws this is μειζόνων ἐντολῶν καιρός, *a ſeaſon of greater Precepts than were before*; we have καινὰ ϗ νέα παραγγέλματα καὶ φιλοσοφώτερα, *new Commandments and of an higher Philoſophy. The Law of Chriſt* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *is the neceſſary Supplements to the Diſcipline of the Creator.* All which Sayings of the Ancients touching the imperfection of the Diſcipline of the Old Teſtament are unexceptionably true, if they be underſtood *reſpectively to the inſtituting us*; if the imperfection of it be ſo interpreted and to this Senſe: *That notwithſtanding the holy ſpiritual Law that is in it, yet it is far from being ſo perfect, as is requiſite, to inſtitute us to true and perfect Righteouſneſs and Holineſs.* For the Letter of the Law doth ſufficiently inſtitute Men to the Civil-religious, but not to the Spiritual-religious obſervance of it; nor is it ſufficient, to inſtitute Men to the Spiritual-religious obſervance of the Law as ſuch, but they muſt be inſtituted to the Spiritual-religious obſervance of it, as the Spiritual-religious obſervance of it is the Religion of Saving Grace. Nor is it ſufficient to inſtitute Men only to that Spiritual-religious obſervance of it, which was the Religion of Saving Grace in the Old Teſtament-times, but they muſt be inſtituted to that Spiritual-religious obſervance of it, which is the Religion of Saving Grace in the New Teſtament-times. And thus our Saviour (g) τὰ τῦ νόμυ προςάγματα πρὸς τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν μετερρύθμιζε, *hath transform'd and chang'd the Precepts of the Law into an Evangelical Inſtitution of Life*, which is a new Religion, and as to the inſtituting us a new Law (a Law of Chriſt-like Sanctity and Benignity) which inſtituteth us to ſuch high and holy Duties and degrees of Duty, as no Diſcipline of the Old Teſtament doth inſtitute us to, ſo far as is needful for our Sanctity and Salvation. For ſo it doth not inſtitute us unto any of thoſe high and holy Duties and Virtues, which our Saviour requireth in his Sermon on the Mount, *nor to become Citizens of the new Kingdom of God, to abandon the Kingdom of Darkneſs, to be faithful new Covenanters, to paſs from Death to Life, to be regenerate into vital Sanctity, to live the life of Faith, Hope and Charity, to godly Sorrow, to Mortification, Self-denial, bearing the Croſs, to be crucified to the World, to love Chriſtians as Chriſtians* (a Branch of duly extenſive Love to our Neighbour which Chriſt only teacheth) *to lay down our Life for the Brethren, to manage the holy Warfare, to avoid Scandal, to bear with the Infirmities of the weak, to do every thing in the Name of Chriſt, to glory in his Croſs, to wait for him from Heaven, to pray for the Holy Spirit and to bring forth the Fruits of it, and to be the holy Worſhippers of the New Teſtament*; whereas the Old Teſtament is in great part an Inſtitution of a luggage of external Ritualities, which is one of its great Imperfections. (h) Ἐν τῇ καινῇ νόμοι μυρίοι ϗ περὶ πολλῶν μειζόνων πραγμάτων, *in the New Teſtament there are innumerable Laws and touching many higher and greater matters then in the Law.* The Chriſtian way of good Practice therefore is *the perfect way*, as perfect is oppos'd to *the culpably deficient* (in ſome reſpect ſuch) and therefore it is the perfect, becauſe it is not the culpably deficient. For that is accounted perfect (i) *cui nihil deeſt.* So in Scripture Perfect is oppos'd to that which is lacking and deficient. *Jam.* 1. 14. 1 *Theſſ.* 3. 10. 1 *Job.* 4. 18. *Perfectum* is oppos'd to that which is *ex parte.* 1 Cor. 13. 10. So when a young Man ſaith, *What lack I yet?* Our Saviour anſwereth, *If thou wilt be perfect* (not lack any thing neceſſary to Life eternal) *Matth.* 19. 20, 21. ſo perfect is oppos'd to that which is culpably deficient, when our Saviour requireth of his Diſciples τὶ περισσὸν, *that which is more than others do*; others love thoſe that love them, but his Diſciples muſt love and do good to Enemies; the former is the culpably deficient way, the latter is the *perfect* way of good Practice. *Be ye perfect* (of the Chriſtian way of good Practice) *even as your Father which is in Heaven, is perfect.* Matth. 5. 48. So in *J. Mart.* (k) τέλειον γενέσθαι, *to be made perfect*, ſignifieth, to be made a Chriſtian, the Chriſtians way of good Practice being the high and perfect way, as their Religion (in this and every other Senſe of the word Perfect) is the perfect rule of Righteouſneſs.

(3.) In the Diſcipline of univerſal Sanctity and Godlineſs there muſt be *duly perfect Notices of what is Virtue and Godlineſs, of the Objects which it is converſant about, and of all things requiſite thereto.* For the general and generally ruinous Diſeaſe of Mankind is the criminal blindneſs of their Mind in miſtaking *Vice* for *Virtue, ſinful* for *lawful* and *laudable, Superſtition* for true *Religion*, the *ſhews* and *appearances* of things for the *Truths* and *Realities*, and the ſemblance of *Righteouſneſs* for the true *Righteouſneſs* and Holineſs. In Errour and in Evil there are ſome glimmerings and appearances of Good (elſe they would not be choſen or deſired) and ſo folly is entertained, becauſe it carrieth *a ſhew of Wiſdom.* Col. 2. 22. (l) *As the way of Wiſdom hath ſomething like to Folly: So this hath ſomething like to Wiſdom; and as it hath manifeſt Vices, ſo it hath ſomething like to Virtue, a certain ſemblance and ſhew of Righteouſneſs.* To contemn Religion and the Fear of God (ἐκ φαυλισμὸς τῶν θείων, as *Joſephus* calleth it) carrieth a ſhew of Wit and Gallantry (whence many are tempted to Atheiſm;) Chriſtian Patience and Magnanimity (in loving and forgiving Enemies, bearing Injuries and turning the other Cheek to the ſmiter) carrieth a ſhew of Puſillanimity; a Laodicean lukewarmneſs and neutrality carrieth a ſhew of Prudence and Moderation; in ſhew and appearance there is weakneſs and ignominy in Chriſt's Croſs, his Perſon is contemptible Humanity, his Life is meanneſs of Spirit, his Sacraments are mean Elements, his Goſpel is the fooliſhneſs of preaching, his mortify'd Followers are the forlorn and miſerable, the mundane Bravo's (in their ruff and gallantry) are the only happy Men. And as the Heathen took the Sun for the great God, becauſe he appeareth in mighty Splendor and Bravery: So for the ſame Reaſon Mankind are the World's Admirers and Lovers. By ſhews of a worldly Happineſs

(g *Jobius ap. Phot. Cod.* 222. *Col.* 584.

(h) S Chry- ſit.

(i) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 7. *S.* 1. *perfectio linguæ noſtræ ſanctæ requirit, ut in illa nihil deſideretur. Coſri* p. 426.

(k) *Grot. Not. in loc.*

(l) *Sicut via ſapientiæ habet aliquid ſimile ſtultitiæ: ita hæc habet aliquid ſimile ſapientiæ; & ut habet vitia manifeſta, ſic habet aliquid quod ſimile eſſe videatur virtuti, imaginem quandam ſpeciemque juſtitiæ.* Lactant. l. 6. c. 7.

(which is but Gullery and Impoſture) by ſhews of Sanctimony (fallacious Specioſities) they are deceiv'd to their Prejudice; for (*m*) *the origine of all their Tragedies is their following* τὸ φαινόμενον, *the ſhews and appearnces of things* (*n*) *and therefore the principal buſineſs of a Philoſopher* (a wiſe Man) is δοκιμάζειν τὰς φαντασίας, *to examine ſhews and appearances* (*as people examine Money to diſcern what is genuine from counterfeit*) ἔσω βλέπειν, *to look within them*, ἀπογυμνῦν τὰ ἀξιοπιςὰ τὰ πράγματα, *to ſtrip naked the things that ſeem to deſerve great reſpect*; for (*o*) as the King of *Egypt* cheated the Philoſopher with a counterfeit Pomegranate (made of Wax) ſo Mankind cheat themſelves (as *Paul* did in his Unregeneracy) with an illegitimate kind of Virtue, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs. (*p*) *Umbra eſt & imago juſtitiæ, quam illi juſtitiam putaverunt.* Humility doth not ſignifie the ſame thing to a Chriſtian and to a creeping Phariſee (*q*) that placeth his great Humility in not lifting up his Foot clearly from the Ground in his going. Chriſtians ſay (*r*) *as any Man is holier and fuller of holy deſire, ſo much he is the greater weeper in Prayer:* (*s*) But from the Virtue of a Stoick and a Pythagorean nothing is more Alien, than to be a Mourner. (*t*) If the People that get their livelyhood by their Labour, did leave off their Calling, to learn of a Philoſopher τί ποτέ ἐςι τὸ δίκαιον, *what is juſt and unjuſt*, ſuch People would die and periſh by Famine, before they could learn it: *But it is not thus with us Chriſtians, Chriſt hath taught us, what is Juſtice* (*and every other Virtue*) ἐν βραχέσι καὶ σαφέσι ῥήμασιν, *in ſhort and clear Expreſſions.* Himſelf is the only accompliſh'd Teacher of the Science of Sanctity, that throughly inſtituteth his Religioniſts, *to diſcern the things that differ and to approve the things that are excellent*, furniſheth them with duly perfect Notices of Vice and Virtue, Sin and Sanctity, of God and his Service, of Satan and his Kingdom (the inviſible Objects that Virtue is converſant about) of their Diſeaſes and their Cure, their Way, their Work and their End (things requiſite to be known in Order and Virtue to Godlineſs) and of the final iſſue of Godlineſs and Ungodlineſs.

(4.) In the Diſcipline of univerſal Sanctity, Righteouſneſs and Godlineſs, there muſt be *the mightieſt Motives and inducements to Godlineſs*; ſuch as may reaſonably prevail with all Men, to chuſe it, purſue and practiſe it at any rate (notwithſtanding all its Incumbrances and Impediments) to part with all things that come in Competition with it, their Eaſe and their Pleaſures, their ſenſitive Paradiſe and their ſecular Glories, for the Cares and Labours, and Sorrows and Sufferings (a Fleſh-diſpleaſing courſe of Life) which it requireth, accounting all things Vanity but *Sanctity* and *Piety*. So the *Stoicks* inſtitute Men to Virtue by ingendring in them an high and rapturous Eſtimation of it and Affection for it. (*u*) *Hujus quadam ſuperſtitione teneantur: hanc ament: cum hac vivere velint, ſine hac nolint.* If their Virtue had been *Godlineſs*, their method of Inſtitution and their rapturous Elogies of Virtue had been Rational and Religious; for Holineſs and Godlineſs is *the choice Saint of God-kind of Good*, that differeth *toto genere* from other Goods (the ſorry, common and external kind of Goods) is *the only Good* in compariſon and the only Good *that maketh Men good*, the *Good* that cannot be bad, but is neceſſarily and univerſally Good as to God and Men and their own Souls (whereas the common Goods may be common Miſchiefs to themſelves and to the World) *the Good* without which nothing elſe will be eventually good to them (all will be Snare and Sin and Ruin) *the abſolutely neceſſary Good* (without which there is no Being, no deſireable, no tolerable Being) *the Good that turneth all things into Good*, that maketh Loſſes Gains, Croſſes Comforts, and Diſgrace Glorious (it turneth all things into Gold) *the Good* that vanquiſheth the deadly Enemies and the World's Evils (maketh the Poſſeſſors of it Conquerors at a ſublimer rate than any worldly Conquerours) *the Good* that ſaveth from all the deadly Evils and the real Evils, and ſetteth Men beyond the Power of being hurt (for all things co-operate for their Good and Welfare) *the pure ſinleſs Good*, wherein there is nothing of vileneſs or villainy, of turpitude or deformity, of foul ſenſuality or ſelfiſh baſeneſs or crooked partiality (but the whole of it is irreprehenſibly amiable, pure and clean, ennobling and felicitative to the Soul) *the Good* that is perfectly oppoſite to the criminal Evil of Sin and Wickedneſs (which is the true Evil, the direful atrocious Evil, the only Evil in compariſon, and the All of Evil in it ſelf and the effects of it, the Evil that maketh the evil Ones, and the World the evil World, that is the true infamy, beggary and ſlavery, that polluteth and undoeth the Soul, and maketh her poor and miſerable, and wretched, blind and naked, and in the Nature, demerit and penal Effects of it is an infinite Evil) *the Good* that ſaveth from all the criminal and penal Evils (and from the momentary Labours, Sorrows and Sufferings which it requireth) *the Good* that is the prime fundamental Good, to which all ſpiritual and eternal premiant Goods are conſequent and all promiſed temporal Goods, (1 *Tim.* 4. 8.) *the Good* which if it took place would be the ſource of immenſe Goods to the publick, and the cure of its Evils, would make holy and happy Societies, holy and happy Times (a golden Age in the World) *the Good* that entitleth to the whole Eſtate of God and the immenſe Felicities of his People, to an inviolable Bleſſedneſs here and hereafter (as there is an Hell for the Ungodly, who are depriv'd of theſe unfathomable Goods and ſubjected to the contrary Evils) *the Good* in the comprehenſion whereof is that vaſt variety of Goods, which are the true and Divine-kind of Goods, the true Learning, Light and Life, Health and Pulchritude, Eaſe and Reſt, Safety and Liberty, Peace and Friendſhip, Nobility and Honour, Treaſure and Pleaſure (the ſolid and ſubſtantial Goods of which ſenſitive Goods are but ſhadows) *the Good* whoſe affluence and variety of Goods are ſuch as know no want of Good nor any diſparaging Properties (for the Riches that are here, are the Goods of the Kingdom, the Honour that is here, is Alliance with God, a divine Nature and a Name written in Heaven, the Pleaſures are the holy Vital, the Pure and unmix'd, the ſolid everlaſting Comforts) *the Good* which is not an underling and undergraduate, but the Sovereign and Peerleſs, the boundleſs and immeaſurable, the ultimate and final Good (as being the Good of Conformity to and Communion with God) which all things muſt be ſubſervient to, and which muſt ſet them their Bounds and Meaſures. And who is

not

(m) *Epict. Diſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 28. & *vid c.* 7.

(n) *Ibid. c.* 20. *M. Ant. l.* 6. *S.* 3, 13.

(o) *Laert. in vit. Sphæri.*

(p) *Lactant. l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(q) *Buxt. Lex.Talm. col.* 1852.

(r) *Qnanto quiſque eſt ſanctior & deſiderii ſancti plenior, tanto eſt ejus in orando fletus uberior.* S. Aug. de C. D. l. 20. c. 17.

(s) *Stearn Medel. An. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *Jambl. de vit. Pythag. c.* 32. *p.* 191.

(t) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 2. *p.* 5.

Omne virtutis officium eſt non peccare. Lactant. l. 6. *c.* 5.

(u) *Sen. Ep.* 95.

not awaken'd, who is not enraviſh'd, who is not inflam'd with ardent Deſires after Sanctity and Godlineſs at the thoughts of ſuch tranſcendent things as theſe? It appeareth therefore from this one Conſideration *the Excellency and Importance of Godlineſs* (beſides which there are many more of like Nature) that Chriſtianity is not wanting in mighty Motives and Inducements to Godlineſs.

(5.) In the Diſcipline of univerſal Sanctity, Righteouſneſs and Godlineſs *there muſt be mighty helps and aſſiſtances thereto.* For the moſt perfect rule of Righteouſneſs back'd with the mightieſt moving Reaſons what will it ſignifie to them that want ability to underſtand, embrace and practiſe it? The ancient Writers and Counſels argue (*w*) the Scripture is expreſs, that none
(w) Voſſ. Hiſt. Pel. l. 4. Par. 1. Anti Theſ. 1. become Chriſtian Believers meerly by natural free Will, but by the Gift of God and by Grace (whereby their Minds are raiſed to apprehend and diſpoſed to embrace Chriſtianity) which in ſome may be only *ſufficient*, but is *effectual* in them that are duly prepar'd by *preventing* Grace. *Joh.* 6. 37. *Act.* 13. 48. Agreeably whereto *Plato* (in his *Meno*) looketh upon Virtue as θεῖόν τι κτῆμα, *a thing that cometh from the Gods*, and ſuppoſeth, that Men are made Virtuous by Inſpiration. One of his School ſaith (*x*) *that the*
(x) M. Tyr. Diſſ. 22. *inclination and manuduction of Souls to the better things needeth* ξυναγωνιςοῦ θεοῦ ϗ ξυλλήπτορος, *a God concertator and coadjutor.* For it is an eaſie thing, to talk virtuouſly, but (ſave only to them that have made progreſs in Virtue) it is not eaſie to
(y) Iren. adv. Her. l. 3. c. 19. live ſo. (*y*) *As the dry Earth doth not bring forth Fruit, unleſs it receiveth Rain: So we being at firſt dry Wood ſhould never fructifie life without the ſupernal voluntary Rain.* The Law-religion therefore is weak and impotent; for it diſpenſeth no ſpiritual Aids, or ghoſtly Strength, no ſupernatural Life, Virtue or Efficacy: But in the Religion of Saving Grace Supernatural Grace is diſpens'd, to make Chriſtian Believers, and ſanctifying Grace is diſpens'd, to make thoſe Chriſtian Believers Holy and Spiritual kind of Men, that are inabled and inclin'd to do thoſe holy things, which the unſanctified are altogether indiſpos'd to, and unfit to meddle with. And as *Hippocrates* ſaith, νούσων φύσιες ἰητροί, *Nature is the Phyſician that cureth Diſeaſes:* So the Introduction of any Grace into the Soul is a cure of the
(z) S. Chryſoſt. in Hebr. p. 493. contrary Vice (*z*) divine Affections quench ſinful Affections, the new Nature conflicteth with indwelling Sin in regenerate Believers (as Nature with a Diſeaſe) and by degrees expelleth it. They have the Holy Spirit, that illuminateth their Mind, to diſcern the ſupernatural kind of Truths and the true Countenance of things, (that they be not deceiv'd) in his Light they ſee the odiouſneſs of Sin, the vanity and fallacy of the World, and the dangerous By-paths which they eſcape, and by his conduct and animation they are led and guided in the Paths of Purity, Peace and Righteouſneſs; are filled with an holy Ardor and Alacrity, an holy Reſolution, Conſtancy, Fortitude, Patience, Magnanimity (whereby they contemn Death and Dangers from Men) are reſtrain'd from Errour, Vice and Wickedneſs, ſupported and comforted in their holy Courſe, in their Doubts, Difficulties and Diſtreſſes, are aſſiſted (by his Auxiliary Grace) to reſiſt and vanquiſh Temptations, and to ſubdue their Corruptions, nor is there any ſtrong-hold of Satan, which they are not able to pull down, or any ſpiritual Enemy which they are not able to conquer, or any holy Duty which they are not inabled to peform by this Principle of might and ghoſtly ſtrength. They have an Unction from the Holy One, who is a Magazine and Storehouſe of Grace, whoſe Office it is, to be a liberal diſpenſer of Grace and Holineſs to his Church, the Members of his Body derive Life, nutriment and growth from this their Head, he is a merciful High Prieſt, apt to ſuccour them when they are tempted, and they are commanded never to diſtruſt his aid, which is ingag'd for their aſſiſtance. Prayer openeth the Treaſury of Heaven, where they have an Advocate that taketh care of their Affairs with God, and that their Wants be ſupplied; who is their faithful Patron in all Exigences, and who reſtraineth Satan and defendeth them from his Aſſaults. They have his divine Example, to inſtruct, conduct and ingage them, the help of continual Inſtruction and Exhortation, the Holy Sacraments that preach to their Eyes, the Communion of Saints, and the Miniſtry and Guardianſhip of the Holy Angels. They have alſo the Love of God ſhed abroad in their Hearts (as that ſignifieth both his Love to them and their Love to him) and Love keepeth the Commandments, maketh every Burden light and every bitter thing ſweet. Such are the Helps of Grace which Chriſtians have towards Godlineſs.

III. The Nature and Character of their Religion inferreth, that all Doctrines repugnant to Piety (any Branch of it) are repugnant to Chriſtianity; that it is infinitely abſurd, to do any Wickedneſs, to promote Chriſtianity (as it is infinitely abſurd, to perpetrate Villainy, to promote Honeſty;) that God is hugely intent upon the buſineſs of Godlineſs; for Chriſtianity is the Voice of God calling Men (*a*) *from Uncleanneſs* (a) S. Chryſoſt. in 1 Cor. p. 287, 289.
to Chaſtity, from the Love of this Life to ſuffer Deaths, from Drunkenneſs to Faſting, from Laughter to Tears and Compunction, and to the greateſt exactneſs in all things. Filthineſs and fooliſh talking and jeſting let it not proceed out of your Mouth. God hath ſo diſpoſed matters, as if he intended, that there ſhould not be left a Relique of Ungodlineſs. All Men ſhould be intent upon Godlineſs as their chief buſineſs (*b*) ἔργον δὲ ἡ θεοσέβεια, *making* (b) Conſt. Apoſtol. 2. 61.
it more than a By-work, ſubordinating all things to it, and accounting them Good or Evil as they are Helps to it or hindrances from it. The Profeſſors of Chriſtianity ſhould be infinitely careful by their holy Lives to repreſent their Religion as the Diſcipline of Sanctity and Godlineſs, to recommend it and the holy Author of it as Good and Excellent (for ſuch that Religion will be thought, that maketh Men Good and Excellent:) But by their ungodly Lives their Religion will be miſrepreſented as a bad Religon (or at leaſt as ineffectual to ſave Men from Ungodlineſs) the holy Author of it will be repreſented as Unholy, if his profeſs'd Followers be wicked; Chriſtianity will become deſpicable and odious, and a *Muhammedan* will be tempted to ſay, *Ecce quales ſunt qui Chriſtum colunt?* The Lives of multitudes of Chriſtians marvellouſly contradict the Nature and Character of their Religion; for they are Aliens from the Life of God much what at the old Heathen rate: many do not pretend to Godlineſs, and many that pretend to it defame it by their ſcandalous Vices. They will be called Chriſtians, yet are no ſuch kind of Men. They pretend to Chriſt's Religion (which conſiſteth in being Holy and Religious according to Chriſt's Inſtitution) but deny and deſtroy his Religion,

the deſign and buſineſs of it (which is perfectly oppoſite and deſtructive to all Sin and Ungodlineſs) they deſtroy his Sovereignty Government and Kingdom, his Laws, his Life and his Service, practically deny him to be their Sovevereign Lord, and are only ſo far his Subjects and Servants, his Partiſans and Adherents, as to defile his Church, to ſcandalize Chriſtianity, to harden the World in Infidelity and Ungodlineſs, and to bring upon their Saviour (who knew no Sin) this heavy reproach uſual in *Salvian's* time, *ſi Chriſtus ſancta docuiſſet Chriſtiani ſanctè vixiſſent.* Not Jews nor Heathens can do ſo much injury to Chriſtianity, as wicked Chriſtians do, who therefore are the worſt of Enemies to the Croſs of Chriſt, and deſerve an *Anathema Maranatha.* 1 Cor. 16. 22.

From the Nature and Character of the Chriſtian Religion all Men ſhould learn, wherein to place their *Happineſs*, which is the ineſtimable Benefit, that God intended them, when he introduc'd *the Myſtery of Godlineſs.* Their great Concern (their Duty and their Intereſt) is to be happy and to eſcape the being miſerable, which conſiſteth in being ſaved from their Ungodlineſs and the penal Effects thereof. In Holineſs and Godlineſs they have a liberation and exemption from being miſerable, and the enjoyment of their true Happineſs, *the State of Bleſſedneſs, the Life of Bleſſedneſs, the Inheritance of Bleſſedneſs and the Society of the Bleſſed.* But Sin always was and always will be miſerable; Man cannot be more vile and miſerable than Sin and Hell and the Wrath of God will make him. *All Religioniſts* ſhould learn alſo from the Nature and Character of Chriſtianity, *not to miſplace their Religion*, which is then miſplac'd, when it is not duly plac'd in the Subſtantials of Godlineſs. The *Samaritans* are at this day a Sect ſtrict and devout in their way, and thus they magnifie their Sanctity above the Jews. *We do not kindle a fire on the Sabbath, we do not go out of the Doors, we do not ſleep with any Woman on the Sabbath day at night, but the Jews do all this.* Aliens from Godlineſs uſually place their Religion in ſome Trinkets (as in exteriour Formalities and ritual Obſervances) that are on this ſide Godlineſs, and ſubſtitute a Changeling inſtead of the living Child. It is not unuſual, to make downright Ungodlineſs a Religion, as a Branch of the *Donatiſts* Religion was a taking away their own and others Lives. (c) *Fiunt miſeris & religioſa delicta.* One of the great Diſeaſes of the Chriſtian Church is *the over-valuing things of little value and undervaluing the great Subſtantials of Godlineſs.* The ſeveral Parties of Chriſtians have their peculiar Opinions, Rites, Modes of Government and Worſhip, and theſe little Peculiarities that make the diſcrimination, are the great things with them; by theſe they value themſelves, theſe they make the Teſt and Standard of Godlineſs; the Zealots for theſe muſt be counted Pious, and others muſt be branded with ignominious Names; for theſe they become like Fiends and Furies to one another, cenſuring, vilifying, declaiming againſt one another with great (and ſometimes Perſecutive) Heat and Animoſity; theſe they are mighty buſie and talkative about, and their great Concern is, to make Men Proſelytes to themſelves and their Party rather than to Chriſt and an Holy Life. For in this mighty Ardour the love of Godlineſs groweth cold; and as in a Fever when the kindly natural heat decayeth, and a contra-natural heat enkindleth, bodily ſtrength decayeth and languiſheth: So when our fervour is placed upon any thing but the great imports of Godlineſs, Piety decayeth and languiſheth, and inſtead of loving and living the Holy Life (in all the ways of Purity, Goodneſs and Righteouſneſs) we become *earthly, ſenſual and deviliſh.* The conſequence of theſe Evils in the Church is Atheiſm, and Infidelity in the World; for when they that have ~~that~~ little Devotion, ſee ſuch wild work amongſt Religioniſts, they are prone to think, that Religion is nothing better than Humour and Frenzy.

(c) S. Cypr. p. 6. Ed. Pamel.

From the Nature and Character of the Chriſtian Religion it appeareth, that Ungodlineſs is the Adverſary to it (hath an antipathy againſt it) and is the root of Infidelity. They that are well diſpos'd towards Godlineſs are prepar'd for the due reception of Chriſtianity, and are thoſe that (in ſome degree) *are of God and hear God's word:* But in Ungodlineſs there is a manifold *remote* and a great *proximate* ill diſpoſition towards Godlineſs and conſequently to the due receiving the Chriſtian Religion. For Ungodlineſs maketh Men blind, erroneous and fooliſh, full of atheous and carnal Conceits in matters of Religion, their Happineſs and Salvation (and uſually of a blind and carnal Zeal that will bear down all that oppoſeth it) very unteachable in their Underſtandings, befool'd and deceiv'd in their Opinion and Judgment, unperſwadable in their Wills (bent upon their Sin and Ruin) ſenſleſs, ſtupid and benum'd in their Mind and Affections, careleſs, regardleſs and inconſiderate of the great things of Faith and their own great Concerns (of which they make little reckoning having other Fiſh to fry) all which are impediments and remote ill diſpoſitions to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs. And the great *Proximate* ill diſpoſition is *diſlike* and *diſaffection*; for unlikeneſs cannot but diſlike; *contraria pugnant*, contraries agree as Fire and Water, Light and Darkneſs. The Chriſtians Diſcipline of Godlineſs is utterly contrary and repugnant to all Vice and Wickedneſs, whence they that are addicted to any Vice (remaining ſuch) cannot like it, will be loath to believe it, and unwilling that ſuch a Doctrine ſhould be true, which is a very frowning and threatning Truth, which maketh them vile and diſgraceth them, criminateth, condemneth and diſquieteth them, ſheweth them the truth of their Caſe, and would make them condemn themſelves, bereave them of their vain Hopes and Imaginations, their falſe Opinions and Valuations of themſelves (put them out of conceit with themſelves) which is of a ſtinging and pungent Nature (as Light is to ſore Eyes) croſſeth and thwarteth their corrupt Affections, is againſt what they are for (like and affect) againſt their ſecular Intereſt, their ſuppos'd felicitative Life and Enjoyments, diſturbeth their Repoſe, maketh Men diſſenters from them and contrary kind of Men, who by non-compliance with them (d) teſtifie againſt them, and condemn them, ſhew a diſlike of them and their ways and an abhorrence of their Practices, put an uneaſie reſtraint upon them, check and controul them, diſgrace and diſparage them, by the light of an Holy Life make the deformity of their Deeds of darkneſs appear, and many ways are offenſive unto them. In Ungdodlineſs there is a Genius and Diſpoſition averſe from and deadly inimical to Godlineſs, ſuch as the Philoſophic Pagans found inimical to their Virtue. (e) *The Name of a Philoſopher is a grievous and troubleſom hearing to the vulgar,*

Joh. 8. 47.

(d) S. Cypr. Ep. 2. Lact. l. 5. c. 9. Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 381.

(e) M. Tyr. Diſſ. 29.

the rich is a grievous Spectacle to the poor, the temperate to the intemperate, and the eminently valiant to the cowardly, ὐ γὰρ ἀνέχονται αἱ πονηρίαι τὰς ἀρετὰς, *for Wickedneſſes cannot endure the Virtues.* Wiſd. 2. 15. *He is grievous unto us even to behold: For his Life is not like other Mens, his ways are of another Faſhion.* Many could not ſee without trouble (*f*) τὺς τῦ φιλοσόφυ σχῆμα ἔχοντας, *thoſe that had the Garb of a Philoſopher. If we deſpiſe external things and have no power in the World, and refuſe to flatter them that are in power* (*g*) *they revile us and beat us, and pour contumelies upon us, and take away our Goods, and make us remove our Quarters, and ſometimes they kill us.* (*h*) *And many being vanquiſhed by Deriſions, Subſannations and Reproaches, have deſerted their Order, and returned to the former cuſtomary way of living.* So many have been detained from ſerious embracing Chriſtianity by the ignominy and diſgrace that attended it, and becauſe it would darken their worldly Glory, ſpoil their Garb and Faſhion in the Eye of the World, and like a damp put out the Candle of their Joy. The puſillanimous are fearful of the frowns and evil Words of Men, and much more of their Blows; they think it a terrible thing, to live a mortifying kind of Life, and to walk in a troubleſome afflictive way, and are ſtumbled at the hard and great things, which Chriſtianity requireth of them and will bring upon them (the Croſs, the whole Body of Afflictions) they have not Fortitude, to undertake Chriſtianity (a dangerous as well as a laborious Buſineſs) a worldly Heart ſuggeſteth, that a worldly Life and Happineſs is beſt, whence the Vice of *Worldlineſs* (an inordinate reſpect to ſome worldly Intereſt) uſually detaineth Men in Infidelity, and is the grand Adverſary to Saving Faith. But none is more ſo than the vice of *Pride*, which the Chriſtian Religion is in the main of it levell'd againſt, and to which it is ſo entirely repugnant, that it is but agreeable to the nature of things, if the Children of Pride have an antipathy againſt it. They are not apt to learn, or to correct their Errours, are more prone to queſtion the truth of God, then to confeſs their Ignorance and Incapacity. The ſenſual and high-minded are too lofty for a lowly Saviour (as the Phariſees and Philoſophic Bravo's were:) It is not to be expected, that the gay Gallants of the World ſhould (in any great number) ſeriouſly embrace a Religion of deep Humility, that cometh to ſtrip them of their gayety and ſpruceneſs, to pluck their Plumes and lower their Top-ſail: nor are the admirers and lovers of the World qualify'd for the due reception of a Religion, that diſgraceth thoſe Vilities, diſparageth their Poſſeſſors and layeth their Honour in the Duſt, uſually the Chriſtian Religion ſeemeth contemptible and ſilly to thoſe high-flown Men of Senſe (as they ſuppoſe themſelves) that are proud of their Wit and Parts, nor is it rightly valu'd by any, that are (*i*) *nondum ſalubriter proſtrati*, in their unhumbled ſtate and unacquainted with thoſe humbling Duties, whereby Sinners are initiated into *the Myſtery of Godlineſs.*

(f) Dion. Pruſ. or. 72.

(g) Καὶ λοιδορῦσι, ϗ τύπτυ-
σι, ϗ παντοίως ὑβρίζυσιν ἡμᾶς,
ϗ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀφαιρῦνται, ϗ
μεταλύυσι, ϗ τὸ τελευταῖον,
λόϊς ϗ φονεύυσιν.

(h) Καὶ δὴ πολλοὶ τοῖς γέλωσι, ϗ τοῖς μώκοις, ϗ τοῖς ὀνειδισμοῖς ἡττηθέντες, ἔλιπον τὴν τάξιν, ϗ πρὸς τὰ πρότερον ἤθη ἐπέστρεψαν. Simplic. in Epict. p. 21, 124.

Quomodo ſunt verè juſti quibus vilis eſt humilitas veri juſti? S. Aug. c. Jul. l. 4. c. 3.

(i) S. Aug. confeſſ. l. 4. c. 1.

IV. The Nature and Character of the Chriſtian Religion inferreth, that it is *the only efficacious Diſcipline of Godlineſs*, that to call Chriſtianity *the moſt effectual Religion to promote Godlineſs*, as ſuppoſing that other Religions are *effectual for the purpoſe of Godlineſs* (though not ſo effectual) is not to commend it, but to reproach it. (*k*) *For the Croſs of Chriſt is made void, if we ſay, that by any other way beſides his Religion Men may attain Righteouſneſs* (Godlineſs) *and Life eternal.* To ſuppoſe, that by ſome other Religion beſides Chriſtianity Men are ſaved from their Sins and Ungodlineſs, emerge from under the Dominion of Sin and need not a Saving Converſion to Chriſtiainity and Godlineſs, is a grand inconſiſtence with Chriſtianity. (*l*) *We were ſailing* (ſaith a late Traveller) *in the Arabick Sea in company of many Merchants of ſeveral Nations and Religions, there aroſe a diſpute touching the diverſity of Religions, one holding (as our Deiſts and Atheiſts this Day do) that all Religions were indifferent and ſufficient, and that all Perſons acknowledging a God ſhould infallibly be ſaved: miſcalling the Chriſtians and blaming them for having good Opinions of themſelves and bad of others. To whom a Chriſtian diſcreetly and learnedly replied, ſhewing the Purity of our Religion, and that a Chriſtian dying in mortal Sin ſhould be damned as well as Turk or Infidel.* Upon this account the Chriſtian Religion only can be ſuppos'd to ſave Men from their Ungodlineſs, becauſe no other Religion can be ſuppos'd, to ſave them from being deadly Sinners; and for this Reaſon it is the peculiar *Excellency* and *Tranſcendence* of this Religion, to be *the Diſcipline of Godlineſs.* Which *Tranſcendence* of the Chriſtian Religion implieth the *Tranſcendence of its Godlineſs*, and that this muſt be counted an attribute of the Myſtery of Godlineſs, *its Godlineſs is tranſcendent to all other reputed Religion and Virtue.* Which great Attribute of this great Myſtery (hugely honourary to the Chriſtian Religion and of great Concern to the Souls and Salvation of its Profeſſors) we will duly illuſtrate and prove from ſeveral Heads of Argument taking our riſe from theſe following deſcriptive Notices of it.

(k) *Evacuatur crux Chriſti, ſi aliquo modo præter illius ſacramentum ad juſtitiam vitamque æternam perveniri poſſe dicatur.* S. Aug. de Nat. & Gr. c. 7.

(l) *Le Blanc's Travailes Par. 1. c. 9.*

(1.) The Chriſtians Godlineſs is that which conſtituteth the Saints of God, and therefore is no leſs than *Sanctity of Virtue*; and it is of *Tranſcendence Divine* (Supra-humane) as ſurmounting unregenerate Humanity: But all other reputed Virtue and Religion is no more than unregenerate and graceleſs Humanity. *Are ye not carnal and walk as Men?* ſaith the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. (*m*) So *ſecundum hominem & ſecundum Deum vivere* (to live according to Man and according to God) are oppoſed. *Ambulare ſecundum hominem & eſſe carnalem* (to walk according to Man and to be of the Carnal kind of Life and Practice) are Identical. The Carnal kind of Men are ſuch in matter of Vice (in following the worſer part of unregenerate Humane Nature) and they are ſuch in matter of Virtue (in following the better part of unregenerate Humane Nature) they are ſuch notwithſtanding a ſort of Virtue and Religion which they have, otherwiſe the Apoſtle would not have blam'd the *Corinthians* for *walking as Men*, but becauſe they did not walk as Men in following the better part of unregenerate Humane Nature. Whereas their Crime was, *they walked as Men* (the bad and carnal kind of Men, that are no Saints or Holy Men) they walk'd not according to God and the Chriſtian Godlineſs. (*n*) *What would he have them to do, to whom he upbraided, that they were Men? Would ye*

(m) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 14. c. 4.

(n) *Quid eos volebat facere, quibus exprobabat, quia homines erant? vultis noſſe, quid eos facere volebat? Audite in Pſalmo:*

know, what he would have them to do? Hear in the Pſalms; I have ſaid ye are Gods and all of you Sons of the Higheſt. To this therefore God calleth us, that we be not Men. Not meer Men, but (o) ἄνθρωποι Θεοῦ, *Men of God* (the divine kind of Men) γένος ἅγιον καὶ κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως, *the holy Nation, partakers of the Divine Natature,* υἱοί τε καὶ Θεοί, *Sons of Gods and Gods* (a Race of high ones above the Sons of Men;) for Chriſt put on a created Body, (p) ἵν᾽ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀνακαινισθῆναι καὶ θεοποιηθῆναι δυνηθῶμεν, *that we might be in him renew'd and deify'd,* as the Fathers ſpeak without any thing of extravagance in their Senſe. There is a want of Judgment and Piety therefore in many of our Modern Elogies of the Chriſtian Religion and Vindications of Morality, as in this following. (q) *Chriſt Jeſus taught Morality,* viz. *the way of living like Men, and the fifth Chapter of* Matthew *is an excellent Lecture of this kind.* To live like Men is a general ambiguous expreſſion, and to make it of a determinate ſignification, it muſt be underſtood, to ſignifie either in a ſenſe of diſparagement; *To live like thoſe that are of kind and quality and pitch of excellency Men, ſo as to live as meer Men:* or in a ſenſe of excellency; *To live like thoſe that are of kind and quality and pitch of excellency Men, ſo as to live as more than meer Men.* If in the former ſenſe our Saviour hath taught us, *to live like Men,* he was a Teacher of Morality at the ſame rate with *Homer,* of whom *Cicero* complaineth, (r) He maketh the Gods to live like Men, whereas he ought to make them live like the Gods. So our Saviour is ſuppos'd, to teach Chriſtians, to live like Men, whereas his buſineſs was, to teach Men, to live like Chriſtians. Things more vulgar and accommodate to the humane ſize have the Name of Man call'd upon them in Scripture: but they are things great and extraordinary, that have the Name of God call'd upon them, *Job* 1. 6. *Pſal.* 65. 9. and 104. 16. *Iſa.* 8. 1. *Gal.* 1. 7, 11. To live like Men therefore is far from being expreſſive of the Chriſtian Godlineſs, *which is a living according to God,* and to ſink it into ſuch a Morality, is *a debaſing and vulgarizing the divinity of the Chriſtian Religion.* Whoſe holy Laws are Chriſtianity, which cannot be of one piece with the Moralities of Jews and Heathens, and therefore muſt not be called Morality (meerly ſuch) but the Divine or Chriſtian kind of Morality, which ought to be contradiſtinguiſh'd to the meer Humane Morality. And what can be more apparent than that our Saviour's *Beatitudes* (bleſſed are the poor in Spirit, bleſſed are they that mourn) are not Rules of meer Morality teaching to live like Men, but are Rules initiative into the Chriſtian Sanctity, which is the Life of the Regenerate Children of God? So the following Precepts (Ye are the Salt of the Earth, the Light of the World, let your Light ſhine before Men, that they may glorifie your Father which is in Heaven) are not Precepts of Morality injoyning nothing more than to live like meer Men: nor is the original Law of God (whoſe Precepts are in ſome ſort written upon our Hearts) meerly a Law of ſuch Morality; for it is the Holy Spiritual Law, that obligeth to the Holy Spiritual Life, which is the Morality of the holy kind of Men as ſuch, which conſtituteth Saints and Holy Angels. (s) *So when God introduc'd Chriſtianity, he made a ſtupendious change of things beyond all thought, from Devils made Men Angels and introduc'd a Converſation worthy of Heaven,* (t) τῆς ἀγγελικῆς πολιτείας τὴν εὐταξίαν, *the lovely order of an Angelical Converſation; for ſuch a Life he hath introduc'd, ſuch Laws he hath made, ſuch a Converſation he hath appointed, that ſuch as apply themſelves to theſe* ἀγγέλους εὐθέως γίνεσθαι καὶ ὁμοίους θεῷ, *preſently become Angels and like unto God (ſo far as is competible to us) although they are no better than the worſt of Men.* (u) *A Spiritual Man is not any longer in the Fleſh,* ἄγγελος ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη γενόμενος, *from thenceforth he is become an Angel and an aſcendent towards Heaven.* So our Religion was anciently called, (w) ἡ ἀγγελικὴ καὶ οὐράνιος πολιτεία, *the Angelical and Heavenly Converſation. Origen* calleth his Friend *Ambroſius,* (x) *a Man of God, a Man in Chriſt,* and ſaith of him, *that he contended to be Spiritual,* nec amplius homo, *and to be no more a Man.*

Ego dixi, dii eſtis, & filii excelſi omnes. Ad hoc ergo vocat nos Deus, ne ſimus homines. S. Aug. in Joann. Tr. 1.

(o) *S. Athan. de Syn. Nic. decr.* p. 411. *Ep. ad Adelph.* p. 332. *or.* 2. c. *Arian.* p. 166. *Com.*

(p) *Idem or.* 3. c. *Arian.* p. 223.

(q) *Glanvil. way to happin.* p. 113, 114.

(r) *Tuſc. l.* 1.

(s) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. p. 348.

(t) Idem T. 2. p. 602.

(u) Idem T. 3 p. 107.

(w) Vit. Thecl. p. 233, 234.

(x) Spencer. Not. in Orig. p. 2.

(2.) The Philoſophic Pagans have *a Divine Virtue,* which they diſtinguiſh from the Humane. (y) *The Humane Virtue is that which maketh a good Man;* but the Theoretic is θεία ἀρετή, *Divine Virtue,* whereby the Platoniſts pretended, to be deify'd. (z) They would be firſt Men and then Gods. And they pretended not only to a Theoretic Divine Virtue, but (a) to live the life of the Gods in Humane Bodies, (b) *not any Humane, but a Divine Life.* They were not content to live (c) *the life of a good Man, which is the political or ethical Virtue: but this muſt be diſmiſs'd and another muſt be choſen, that of the Gods: for our aſſimilation muſt be to theſe, not to good Men.* The Stoicks pretended to more than to fulfil, (d) τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαγγελίαν, *the profeſſion of a Man* (to live like Men) their aim and aſpire was, *of Men to become Gods.* Of the *Ethicks* of *Ariſtotle* the ſublimer Philoſophers ſay, (e) μικρόν τι καὶ ταπεινὸν καὶ δημῶδες περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς φρονοῦσι, *they are of a mean and low and plebeious Sentiment touching Virtue.* Yet this vulgar Moraliſt (*Ariſtotle*) diſtinguiſheth Virtue into (f) *the Humane and Heroical,* which he accounteth *Divine Virtue.* He ſuppoſeth alſo, (g) *that the Intellect in Man is a divine thing, and that the Life according to it* (to live in Contemplation) is βίος θεῖος πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον, *a Divine Life in compariſon of the Humane Life.* So *Clemens* will have his *Gnoſtick* or Man of knowledge (h) ἰσάγγελος, *equal or like to the Angels in this Life.* In theſe Philoſophic Pagan Sublimities there is viſibly a rampant and delirous Extravagance, from which none of them is excuſable: but *Celſus* thinketh, (i) that the Chriſtians borrowed their diſtinction of Wiſdom into *Divine* and *Humane* from the Pagan Theologers, who uſually diſtinguiſh things (k) *into Divine and Humane, the Precious and the Vile,* and in this their diſtinction of Wiſdom and Virtue there is no extravagance. The Jews ſuppoſe, (l) that there is amongſt them a degree of Intellectuality and Sanctity that is above Men, and which they call the angelical degree; whether this pretenſion be ſober or extravagant, there is nothing of Extravagance in the diſtribution which they make of Mankind into אדם טבעי *the natural Man, as the Idolatrous Gentiles,* and אדם אלהי *the Divine Man as the* (true) *Iſraelites.* Theſe are really (m) τὸ θεῖον γένος, *the Divine Generation, Divine Men, adorn'd with the Divine Similitude,* alone are counted worthy, τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν, *of the Divine Goods* (which the Philoſophers appropriate to the highly Virtuous) and are

(y) Hierocl. in aur. Car. p. 5, 6, 218.

(z) Πρῶτον ἀνθρώπους γενέσθαι τοὺς ἐσομένους Θεοὺς δεῖ. *Phot. cod.* 242. *col.* 1065.

(a) *Eſſentque in corporibus humanis vitam imitati Deorum.* Cic. Tuſc. l. 1.

(b) Οὐκ ἀνθρώπινόν τινα βίον, ἀλλὰ τὸν θεῖον. *Stob. Ecl. Phyſ.* p. 204.

(c) Τὸν ἀνθρώπου βίον τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. *Plotin. En.* 1. l. 2. c. 6.

(d) Epict. diſſ. l. 2. c. 9. & 19.

(e) Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 15. c. 4.

(f) Eth. ad Nic. l. 7. c. 1.

(g) Ibid. l. 10. c. 7.

(h) Str. l. 7. p. m. 526, 538.

(i) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 283.

(k) Jambl. de Myſt. S. 1. c. 21.

(l) Coſri,

21, & 63.

(m) Hierocl. ſupr. p. 45, 118, 125, 230, 278.

are of the θεῖος χορὸς, *the Divine Chorus*; for their Names are written in Heaven. (n) Chriſtians are *the Divine People, the Divine Sect, the Sect of God, the Diſciples of God* (as the ancient Writers call them) their Inſtitution is ἀγωγὴ ἡ θεία, *the Divine Inſtitution*, not ἀνθρώπινον μάθημα, ἀλλὰ θεία διδασκαλία, *any Humane but a Divine Diſcipline*, (o) their Life is ἡ ἔνθεος καὶ οὐράνιος ζωὴ, *the Divine and Heavenly Life*, ἡ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πολιτεία, *the Converſation in Heaven brought down on Earth*, they emulate the Life *of Angels*, τὴν ἐπουράνιον μελετῶντες πολιτείαν, *meditating the Life which is in Heaven*, their Chriſtian Converſation and the Judaical differ from each other ὅσον ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, *as much as the Converſation of Angels and of Men*, they are a Temple far tranſcending the Judaical, the living Temple, the Houſe and holy Habitation of God, which he inhabiteth in a living way, they being ὑπὸ θείου πνεύματος ἀγόμενοι, *animated by a Divine Spirit*, and they muſt eſchew what is alien τῆς θείας φύσεως, *from a Divine Nature*. They are of the Heavenly Royal Family, Deſcent and Parentage, and conſequently of the Heavenly Royal Qualities and Properties; the Divine Genius and Indoles is peculiar to their Family, they are born of God in reſpect of their Virtue (which therefore is of kind and quality divine) ſuch the Pagans thought more than meer Men (they counted them *ſemidei*) that were ἐκ διὸς γεγονότες, *generated by* Jupiter; and if like generateth like, their Virtue and Godlineſs muſt be the true Nobleneſs and God-likeneſs. (p) *And therein God taketh no little complacence*, cùm quis ſic ſpiritaliter naſcitur, ut in actibus ejus & laudibus divina generoſitas prædicetur, *when any one is ſo ſpiritually born, as that the Divine Generoſity is notic'd in his practices and praiſes.* (q) Ὁ θεῖος λόγος, *the Divine Word* (whence Chriſtians have their Inſtitution) produceth πράξεις θείας, *Divine Practices.* (r) *Converſabatur Deus, ut homo divinè agere doceretur*, God was converſant amongſt Men, that Man might be taught, to practiſe divinely. But all other Virtue which is not the Chriſtian, is but that *of the Will of Man*, of kind and quality the Humane. *Inter Ethnicam Philoſophiam & Chriſtianam tantum intereſt, quantum à divino ſpiritu humanum abeſt ingenium.*

(3.) The Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs is *the Chriſt-like*; for it is a derivative and deſcendent from Chriſt, a participation of his fulneſs (δικαιοσύνη ὤν, μετέχεται ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων, *being Righteouſneſs it ſelf, they that become Righteous, participate of him*) who is the ſampler, Pattern and original of Sanctity, the Head on whom the precious Oyl was pour'd, that runneth down to the Skirts of his Garments, and who is filled with all Virtue, that he might be a publick Bank and Treaſury thereof. His Virtue is of another kind than that which is found in unregenerate Humanity, and (which ſpeaketh a great tranſcendence thereof) it conſtituteth Men *Chriſtos*, as the Fathers ſay; whereby they mean a race of juniour and ſervient Chriſts. (s) *The Scripture calleth thoſe Chriſts, that live according to Chriſt.* (t) *He maketh us his Members, that in him we alſo might be Chriſts.* (u) *The true Chriſt is one, who by the participation of himſelf maketh many Chriſts.* God hath made an external delineation of our Religion in the perſon of Chriſt, he is the Archetype, according to which all are formed, that are Chriſtianiz'd, (w) who partake of his threefold honourary Office (ſo far they are Chriſt-like) and are dead, crucify'd, raiſed in ſociety with him and conformity to him. Their being Chriſtians conſiſteth in affinity and conformity to Chriſt (as Platonizing conſiſteth in affinity to *Plato*) in ſymbolizing with him in his Genius and Diſpoſition, his Life and Spirit, to which the Humane and Mundane kind of Virtue is hugely alien and diſagreeing, ſo alien, that it diſcerneth not his kind of Virtue and Excellency; for he is to the World *the Myſtery of Godlineſs*. The World hath no acquaintance with that new Life, which is the Life of Chriſt, *Fleſh and Blood* revealeth not his Excellencies, (which are not diſcern'd without a Ray of ſupernatural Light) therefore *the World knew him not*, 1 Joh. 3. 1. (x) *For the Myſtery of Chriſtianiſm is alien from this World.* (y) *The Wiſdom of God is ſo vailed, that the Treaſures of it are hid there, where the World hath affix'd the Title of Fooliſhneſs.* For ſo *Celſus* a great admirer of the Pagan Virtue, can find nothing in Chriſt of that Virtue, Generoſity and Bravery, which he admireth. Our Saviour's Speeches (that *do ſpirare divinitatem*) are with him (z) πάροιστρα, *fanatical*; the unſpotted mirrour of all Divine Perfection therefore was in his Account no better (a) than (as he calleth *Mary Magdalene*) πάροιστρος, *a Fanatick*. So *Julian* calleth the Saints of God, (b) *flagitious, abominable, miſerable, abject, and nothing worth*; yet a mighty Pagan Virtuoſo this Apoſtate was, and a great friend to Political Juſtice, as the Devil himſelf (in ſome ſort) is in ſeveral of his Oracles. (c) For in the War againſt *Pyrrhus* the *Romans* wanting Money made a Prayer to *Juno*, and the Goddeſs is ſaid, to have made anſwer, *ſi integra inter arma juſtitia eſſet, pecuniam non defuturam*, that Money ſhould not be wanting, if in their War Juſtice was not violated. Accordingly they were furniſh'd with it, and this was the occaſion of worſhipping *Juno Moneta*.

(4.) The Chriſtians Godlineſs is beyond all things, that are on this ſide (Godlineſs) *the being truly Holy and Godly*. *Epicurus* is ſaid, (d) *humanum fuiſſe* (to have been Humane) whence he was called *a good Man* becauſe of his good Nature, which is no better goodneſs than ſuch as may be found in a Brute, in an Atheiſt, and in the Witch of *Endor*, who was in ſuch ſenſe a good Woman, but ſo as to be a Witch. (e) *For this Woman though a* Pythoneſs, *yet was of a very good nature and benign, which* Joſephus *taketh notice of, and extolleth her mightily for it.* Many are good Men in ſuch a ſenſe as *Guicciardine* calleth Pope *Clement* a good Pope, for he addeth; *I mean not goodneſs Apoſtolical; for in theſe days he was eſteem'd a good Pope, that did not exceed the wickedneſs of the worſt of Men.* (f) Amongſt the Pagans Men were counted good becauſe of their Political Virtue (becauſe they were good as to Civil Society) they honour'd Parents, did not perpetrate Adultery, Homicide, Theft, Falſe Witneſs, which was counted good Life, and the Pagans that ſo lived, ſuppos'd themſelves to live well, and boaſted of their Works of Righteouſneſs, (g) *I give to the Poor, I rob no body, nor covet the Wife of another, nor kill, nor cheat any, reſtore*

(n) *Lact. l. 4. c. 26. & l. 6. c. 23. Tertull. Apol. c. 37, 39. Clem. Protr. p. m. 52. Pædag. l. 1. c. 7. & l. 3. c. 11. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 3. p. 129.*

(o) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l. 1. c. 3. Petav. T. 4. l. 7. c. 11. S. 4. Clem. Pæd. l. 1. c. 12. & l. 3. c. 7. S. Chryſoſt. in Act. p. 669. Orig. ſupr. l. 7. p. 367.*

(p) *S. Cypr. de Zelo & Liv.*

(q) *J. Mart. Paræn. p. 40.*

(r) *Tertull. c. Marcion. l. 2. c. 27.*

(s) Χριστοὺς οἶδε καλεῖν ἡ γραφὴ, τοὺς ζῶντας κατὰ Χριστόν. *Gr. Naz. orat. 21. p. 378.*

(t) *Faciens nos membra ſua, ut in illo & nos Chriſti eſſemus.* S. Aug. 2. Enar. in Pſal. 26

(u) *Chriſtus verus unus eſt, qui participatione ſui multos facit Chriſtos.* Pamphil. Apol. inter op. S. Hieron. T. 9.

(w) *Grot. de Imp. ſum. Pot. c. 2. n. 5.*

(x) Τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ ξένον ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. *Macar. Hom. 27.*

(y) *Apparet illic ſapientiam eſſe quærendam, ubi ſtultitiæ titulus apparet.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 2. *Dei ſapientia mundi eſt inſania.*

(z) *Orig. c. Celſ. p. 338.*

(a) *Ibid. l. 2. p. 96.*

(b) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 8. p. 252.*

(c) *Putean. pecun. ratio, c. 1.*

(d) *Cic. de Fin. l. 2.*

(e) *Sadduciſm. Triumphat. p. 47.*

(f) *S. Aug. in Joan. Tr. 45.*

(g) *Idem in Pſal. 31.*

what without witneſs is committed to my truſt. As bad as this evil World is, yet all in ſome ſort and degree do and live well and (almoſt) all are ſo far Religious. (*h*) *In ipſa impietate vitæ ſuæ faciunt aliqua legis*, in their impiety of Life they do ſome things of the Law. No evil Man is altogether naught, not *Herod* the Great, who (as *Joſephus* relateth) cauſ'd all his Veſſels of Gold and Silver to be melted for the relief of the Poor in a time of Famine. Memorable inſtances of the Humane and Mundane kind of Morality or Virtue abound in Paganiſm. When *Mount Ætna* vomited forth his Flames, two young men in *Sicily* took their Parents on their Backs, and carry'd them through the Flames unhurt; for which dutiful fact the Name of *Pii* was given them, by that Name they are remembred to Poſterity, and the place of their burial is called *Campus piorum*. That great and ancient Nation of the *Chineſe* is eminent for the duty of honouring Parents, (*i*) their Books are full of Moral Sentences and good Counſels, they have their Commandments which have a correſpondence to our Decalogue (as not to kill, not to ſteal, not to lie, to honour Father and Mother) and their Laws are founded upon the five Cardinal Virtues held in great veneration amongſt them, *Piety*, *Juſtice*, *Policy*, *Prudence* and *Fidelity*. The Jews alſo abound with good Moralities (as appeareth from *Buxtorf*'s *Florilegium Hebraicum*) and there is great abundance of excellent Moral Sentences and good Counſels amongſt the *Muhammedans*, who thus magnifie their Law and their Lives: (*k*) *We his People* (the People of *Muhammed*) *as much excell all other People in Knowledge and Manners, as the Law of his Sect excelleth all other.* Thus not only Philoſophers, Phariſees and Aſceticks (that pretend to be extraordinary Saintiſts) but all this wicked World of Mankind are in ſome ſort and degree good Men, have good Life and are virtuous and Religious, which is one part of their Character: but their plenary Character hath both a dark and a bright ſide; for the moral good that is amongſt the generality of Mankind, is quite overpoyſed and obſcur'd, (*l*) *immenſo malorum cumulo*, by an immenſe heap of moral Evils. They are only ſo far good, as yet to be ſtark naught; have good Life only ſo far as yet to be dead in Sin and deadly nefarious Miſcreants; they are only ſo far Religious, as yet to be the damnably wicked Kind and Party; and are only ſo far wiſe and virtuous, as yet to be (*m*) *fatui*, *ſtulti*, *flagitiis immerſi* (Fools immers'd over Head and Ears in Vice and Wickedneſs) as *Maimonides* rightly characteriſeth the *Arabians* notwithſtanding their Moralities and Virtues. Their Virtue doth not ſave them from being the damnably vicious and flagitious, their Godlineſs doth not ſave them from being the Wicked and Ungodly. In that little Virtue which they practiſe, they are not the Godly-virtuous, and therefore are not the righteous doers of Righteouſneſs. So in carnal pretending Chriſtians there is a believing on Chriſt and a loving him, which is not the Godly-virtuous (and therefore not the Chriſtian) kind of believing on him and loving him, but is a vile and graceleſs kind of thing (that may be called the Humane and Mundane kind of believing on him and loving him) not that which the Diſcipline of Godlineſs requireth, not the Chriſtians Virtue and Religion; for nothing can be ſuch, that doth not conſtitute Men the Godly-virtuous, and therefore nothing can be ſuch, that is on this ſide *Saving Grace and Holineſs* (the Saint of God-kind of Virtue) as the Chriſtians Virtue is commonly called.

V. The tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs appeareth from the general nature of the Chriſtian Religion, which is of tranſcendent Excellency and conſiſteth of things ſuperlative and tranſcendent. S. *Paul* is obſerv'd, to delight in ſtrange magnifying expreſſions and compoſitions of words, heaping Expreſſion upon Expreſſion (as if he could never ſpeak high enough of Chriſt and the matters of Chriſtianity) ſuch as ὑπεράνω, *Eph.* 4. 10. ὑπερύψωσε, *Phil.* 2. 9. ὑπερπλεόνασε, 1 *Tim.* 1. 14. πολὺ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον, *Phil.* 1. 23. καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν, 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ, *Eph.* 3. 20. *Unſearchable Riches*, Eph. 3. 8. *Breadth, and length, and depth, and height*, Eph. 3. 18. *The love of Chriſt which paſſeth all knowledge*, Eph. 3. 19. *Chriſt is all and in all*, Col. 3. 11. His Excellency (reſplendent in his Divine Names and Attributes) is ſuperlative and tranſcendent; for (as the *Muhammedans* ſay of their Alcoran) *it tranſcendeth all Creatures.* In him (his Perſon and Religion) are all the Goods and Excellencies of the tranſcendent kind, better Learning, Life and Liberty, Riches, Honours and Comforts than the World is acquainted with (the unbounded Abyſs, the height and fulneſs of them) the worſt of Chriſt (even his Reproach) is better than the World (the beſt of the World) the Treaſures in *Egypt*, *Heb.* 11. 26. The knowledge of him is ſuperlative and tranſcendent, incomparably paramount to all other knowledge and to all other things, to all Judaical Excellencies and Advantages, the natural and legal Man's Religion and Virtue, all Mundane Goods and Excellencies, which are rejectaneous ſtuff, (*n*) τῇ πρὸς Χριστὸν συγκρίσει, *in compariſon of Chriſt and Saving Chriſtianity*, and muſt be counted loſs, if they hinder from this gain, *Phil.* 3. 8. The Eſtimation and Affection that is due to him is ſuperlative and tranſcendent. For all things muſt be depreciated and forſaken, and muſt be look'd upon as forſaken things in compariſon of, and ſo far as they come in competition with, him and the Goods of his Kingdom; which muſt ſtand ſingular, peerleſs and tranſcendent in our Eſteem and Affection, and muſt have the Height and Sovereignty of it. All things muſt be devoted to him, nothing muſt be alienated from him, he muſt be ſerv'd with our All and at any rate; for ſo Chriſtians love Chriſt to the death, and rejoyce to die for him, (*o*) as *J. Mart.* often repeateth. *Many have worſhipp'd the Sun, yet none have ſuffer'd death for the Faith of the Sun: but Men of all ſorts ſuffer all things for the Name of Jeſus. For his word of Truth and Wiſdom is* πυρωδέστερος καὶ φωτεινότερος, *more ardent and more lucid by much than the Solar Virtues.* His love to his People and his ſufferings upon their account together with the effects of them are ſuperlative and tranſcendent. For nothing is ſo celebrated amongſt Chriſtians as Chriſt crucify'd (the Author of their Salvation and the Object of their Admiration) the royal and moſt heroick Lover that ever was, who died for us, when we were in the height of our Rebellion, died as the Prince of Criminals a Death ſupaſſing all Dolours, died as our Sin-bearer and *waſh'd us from our Sins in his own Blood*, Apoc. 1. 5. His Love and his Blood, his ſolemn and dreadful paſſion of Sorrows, Ignominies and Agonies (which was a Love-Tragedy) is not to be thought on without Paſſion, and his Croſs hath an amazing Myſtery in it; for

(h) *Idem de Sp. & Lit. c.* 28.

(i) *Semedo par.* 1. *c.* 29.

(k) *Hottin. Diſſ. p.* 74.

(l) *Maffeius Indic. p.* 532.

(m) *Pocock Spec. p.* 9.

(n) *S. Chryſoſt. in Phil. Hom.* 11.

(o) *P.* 78, 337, 342, 349, 350.

for (p) τὸν θάνατον εἰς ζωὴν ἀνεσταύρωσεν, *he crucified Death into Life.* His whole Oeconomy of *Humiliation* and *Exaltation* is ſuperlative and tranſcendent. For Power, Majeſty and immenſe Riches were hid under an appearance of weakneſs, meanneſs and extreme Poverty. God ſo order'd Chriſt, as to be alien from the World, and quite of another Mould; he ſpeaketh not like one of us, he liveth not like one of us, his Sentiments are not as ours, *his ways are of another Faſhion.* He was (duly) oppoſite to all that the World is and is pleas'd with (as Holineſs is oppoſite to Sin, Humility to Pride, Spiritual to Carnal, divine Mourning to Revelling and Jollity) and he is a Meſſiah for none but Sinners, for Miſcreants and Varlets; for no Man can embrace Chriſt, but thereby he owneth himſelf a condemned Criminal and Malefactor. (q) *Chriſt was ſent a Legate to a Whore, a Thief and a Publican.* His Hiſtory is full of miraculous Atteſtations to his Divinity, but in worldly reſpects he was (r) ἄδοξος, ἄτιμος, ἐξουθενημένος, *inglorious, abject, annihilated,* the Lord of Glory was ſtript of all mundane Glory to the height of Prodigy and Aſtoniſhment, *his viſage was marred more than any Man, and his form more than the Sons of Men.* And alike tranſcendent was his Exaltation ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, *over above all the Heavens,* Eph. 4. 10. His divine Virtues of *Humility, Patience* and *Self-denial* are ſuperlative and tranſcendent. For there is a Conſtellation of Miracles of Humility in his voluntary Humiliation, in changing the form of God for the form of a Servant, Riches for extreme Poverty, Glory for Meanneſs and Diſgrace, Heaven for this gloomy Region of Sin and Miſery; and not only diveſting himſelf of all his external heavenly Glory, but of all the gay and ſpecious things of this World, chuſing a Croſs in it before a Throne, and to be fetter'd in an Iron-chain, ſtript and whipt from Pillar to Poſt, gibbeted and hanged on a Tree, and expoſed as a Spectacle of reproach to Men and Angels. O *miracula! ô prodigia!* (s) *What revilings of Reproach did he patiently bear? What mockeries of Contumelies did he tolerate? He the innocent and juſt one is reckon'd amongſt the flagitious, and the word of God is led to be a Victim without opening his Mouth. When the Sun hid his Head, the Day was benighted, and the Earth was moved, he is not moved, that Patience might have its plenary and perfect Conſummation in Chriſt.* He ſtuck at nothing, not Contumelies, not Poverty, no depth of abaſement and of ſufferings for the Welfare and Salvation of others, ſo intirely did he deny himſelf his private Pleaſure and Emolument. The *Love of God* in ſending his Son (the moſt free and ſelf-moving, the moſt undeſerv'd and ill deſerv'd, the moſt pure and unſelf-intereſted, the moſt ardent and beneficent, the moſt condeſcending, coſtly and expenſive Love that ever was) is ſuperlative and tranſcendent. *He ſpared not his own Son,* but wrote his Love to us in Characters of his own Blood. 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. *Herein was Love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and ſent his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins.* To cut off his own Right-hand (as it were) to part with the Apple of his own Eye, to abandon ſo divine a Perſon as his own Son (ſo near and dear to God) to unſpeakable Labours, unparallelled Sufferings, inſupportable Torments, and to bring them upon him for us Rebels and Traitors, this ſpeaketh the immenſity of his Love to us, raiſeth it to the higheſt pitch, and maketh it ſtupendious and amazing. So the Goſpel-diſpenſation of things is ſuperlative and tranſcendent, and is celebrated by the Holy Writers both for the tranſcendent *Grace* of it and *Glory* of it. *Eph.* 16. 2 *Cor.* 3. 9, 10.

The Chriſtian Religion appeareth, to conſiſt of things Superlative and Tranſcendent, and conſequently if it is of one piece, it's *Virtue* and *Godlineſs* muſt be ſomething that is Superlative and Tranſcendent (ſuch as divine *Illumination, Sanctification, the Faith of God's Elect, the Holy Spiritual Life, the Spiritual-religious Worſhip, the imitation of Chriſt, the Divine Charity,* which are of Tranſcendent kind and degree) whence a Judgment may be made of ſome modern Elogies of the Chriſtian Religion. (t) One counteth good Nature *the prime intendment* of the Chriſtian Religion, and commendeth the bleſſed Jeſus *for the ſweetneſs and obligingneſs of his Converſation.* Another commendeth the Chriſtian Religion *as every way well calculated for the Peace and Order of the World,* and calleth it *the beſt natur'd Inſtitution in the World.* A Third ſaith, *The Chriſtian Religion is adapted to the true Temper of Humane Nature, the Reaſons and Underſtandings of Mankind, and is ſuch as any wiſe and prudent Man would have pitch'd upon.* Which modern Elogies of the Chriſtian Religion may be underſtood in no ill Senſe, but the true meaning of them ſeemeth to be this very ill Senſe; they make the vile and vulgar things of the World, *common good Nature, civil Virtue and Societiveneſs, the regulating Humane Nature according to common Prudence* (the humane and mundane Morality and living like Men) to be the Virtue and Godlineſs of the Chriſtian Religion. Which is a vulgarizing the Divinity of it, a commonizing and profaning the Sanctity of it, and a degrading the Tranſcendency of it to the common level. He that ſaith (u) *A true and lively Divine Charity is the only School-miſtreſs of Life,* teacheth me Saving Chriſtianity: But he that teacheth me only to be *good natur'd, civilly obliging, and to keep Humane Nature in due Temper according to common Prudence,* teacheth me nothing of Chriſtian and Divine Virtue. There are the ſame Names of Virtues and Vices in Chriſtianity, common Humanity, Judaiſm and Paganiſm: But the things ſignified by thoſe Names are of different kind; as that Divine Faith whereby Chriſtian Believers are juſtified (and ſanctified) is of a different kind from any thing, that in graceleſs unregenerate Humanity is called Faith. So the Chriſtians Divine Charity (the Love that God is, which is the Life of God and of Regenerate Souls) is of a different kind from any thing, that the virtuous Pagans call *Charity.* (w) They pretend to a *Benevolentia Univerſalis* (βούλεσθαι πᾶσι τ' ἀγαθά, *to have good Will to all*) yet murder'd by Thouſands thoſe innocent Chriſtians, for whom the Divine Charity would have oblig'd them to die. The main buſineſs of Chriſtianity is tranſcendent to what unholy Mankind count Well-doing and Virtue, *viz.* To eſtimate aright Chriſt crucified, to take up his Croſs, to crucifie the Fleſh with the Affections and Luſts, to croſs the grain of ſenſitive Nature, to be ſanctified in Body, Soul and Spirit, to exterminate all κακοήθεια, *malignity of Nature,* to ſhake off every evil Habit and eſchew every

(p) Clem. Alex. Strom. p. m. 53.

(q) Phot. Cod. 277. Col. 1556.

(r) J. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 336, 350.

(s) *Quæ conviciorum probra patienter audita? quæ contumeliarum tolerata ludibria? Ille innocens, ille juſtus inter facinoroſos deputatur, & Dei Sermo ad victimam tacens ducitur.* S. Cypr. de Bono patient.

(t) *Cenſure of the Platonic Philoſ.* p. 27.

(u) *Unica magiſtra divina quædam charitas, vera & viva charitas.* Acont.

(w) Simplic. in Epict. p. 141.

tempting Bait, to Watch and Pray, that we enter not into Temptation, not to be defiled or ſinfully diſturb'd, but to live in Purity and joyous Peace, to make God and Heaven All and the World as nothing, to imploy all our Talents in his Service, to prefer his Honour and Intereſt before all things, to imitate his Divine Nature and Practice, and to be God-like in all Purity and Sanctity, in all Grace and Goodneſs.

VI. The Tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs appeareth from *their Regenerate State and Condition*; for it is the Virtue and Godlineſs thereof, and can be no lower than their State and Condition, which is magnificent and tranſcendent. (x) *All of them are the Children of Light, the Children of the Promiſe, the Children of* Abraham, *the Children of* God, *the choſen Nation, the Royal Prieſthood, the true Iſraelites, fore-known and predeſtinated to the Kingdom of God, who hath called them, not only of the Jews, but alſo of the Gentiles.* S. *Paul* had great Reaſon, to ſay, we have receiv'd abundance of Grace, (y) *For we have not only received from Grace ſo much as is needful for the taking away Sin, but much more. For thereby we were freed from Puniſhment, and have put off all Wickedneſs, and were regenerated from above, and are riſen again the old Man being buried, and were redeem'd, and were ſanctified, and brought into Sonſhip and juſtified, and made the Brethren of the only Begotten, and conſtituted Co-heirs, and of the ſame Body with him, and our Initiation is into his Fleſh, and as the Body hath Union with the Head, ſuch is our Union with him.* If a Man is Chriſtianiz'd, this is (z) *a return to Sonſhip, a liberty to call God his Father, to be a conſort of the Grace of Chriſt, to be called a Child of Light, to be a partaker of eternal Glory, and to ſay all at once, it is to be in all plenitude of Benediction in this World, and of the Goods that are laid up for us in the Promiſes in the World to come. Julian* asketh, what good *Jeſus* was the Author of to his Kindred? And the Anſwer is (a) *He was made Man, that we might be his Kindred; and what is there on Earth comparably ſo magnificent as this? We are made partakers of the Divine Nature, are filled with the Holy Spirit, gain by him Spiritual Cognation with God, he hath made himſelf our Brother, we are called the Sons of God who is over all.* To be ſo highly dignify'd and ennobled, as to be *the Children of Light, the Children of* Abraham, *the true Iſraelites, the Children of God, the choſen Generation, the Royal Prieſthood, the Brethren of Chriſt and his Co-heirs, the Members of his Body, Bone of his Bone and Fleſh of his Fleſh, to be juſtified, ſanctified, regenerated, entitled to all the Promiſes and to an heavenly Glory*, is a Condition at a great rate tranſcendent to unregenerate Humanity; which tranſcendent Condition none can be in without the Virtue and Godlineſs that conſtituteth it; nor can any Virtue or Godlineſs conſtitute it, which is not tranſcendent to Humane Nature in its lapſed State. Their Law of Life alſo (or Diſcipline of Virtue) that are in ſo tranſcendent a Condition, muſt neceſſarily be of a tranſcendent Strain. And their tranſcendent Condition it ſelf is ſuch a Law of Life; for the State and Condition that any Man is rightfully in, is a Law of Life to him. The Sons of God are neceſſarily oblig'd to live agreeably to their Deſcent and Parentage, their Kind and Family, their Rank and Relation, their high Condition and their Hopes.

The entrance into this tranſcendent Condition ſheweth the tranſcendence of its Virtue, which is not uſually acquir'd but by ſuch a method, as is competently well deſcrib'd by the Council of *Trent*. (b) "By the hearing of Faith, "by underſtanding themſelves to be ungodly "Sinners, by the fear of Divine Juſtice, by "conſidering the Mercy of God in Chriſt, by "loving God initially, by hating their Sins, "and by receiving the Grace of God, Sinners "come to a ſanctification and renovation of the "inward Man, whence a Man of Unrighteous "is made Righteous, and of an Enemy a Friend, "that he may be an Heir according to the "Hope of eternal Life. (c) *Chriſtianus Gerſon* a Jew converted to Chriſtianity and baptiz'd in *Germany* in the Year 1600. continu'd in great anxiety of Mind Fourteen Weeks together, inſomuch that he could not reliſh either Meat or Drink, nor take any quiet Sleep. In the Progreſs of a Sinners Converſion to Godlineſs ſuch difficulties and conflicts uſually occurr, that ſpeak it a ſort of Virtue, hugely diſtant from, and tranſcendent to, ordinary moral Virtue, which is ſo remote from it, that it may indiſpoſe Men to the Acquiſition of it. (d) *For Men never much affrighted with the danger, wherein all by Nature ſtand, nor inflam'd with the Love of a better Country than they enjoy, cannot addreſs themſelves to any reſolute or ſpeedy departure out of the Territories of civil Moralities, within which if Satan hold us, he maketh full reckoning of us as of his civil or natural Subjects.* (e) *Nemo capeſſit nova, niſi quem pænituit priorum.* Therefore to the way of removing out of Satans Territories into the Territories of Godlineſs (which is a great remove) the civil Moralities may by accident be a great Impediment. For the way is a duly humbling Repentance. The high and brave Spirit of Man muſt be broken; he muſt be poor, that he may be rich; empty, that he may be filled; have nothing, to poſſeſs all things; be loſt, that he may be found; be condemned, that he may be pardon'd; be blind, that he may ſee; be a fool, that he may be wiſe; and die, that he may be made alive.

VII. The Tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs appeareth from *their good* Life, which is not ſuch good Life, that is competible to deadly Sinners (remaining ſuch) nor doth it conſiſt of (f) thoſe *opera moralia*, or good Works that a Man may perform without Grace, as ſome School-men ſay (who contradiſtinguiſh thoſe *opera moralia*, to their *opera meritoria*) nor is it only ſuch good Life, to which we are inſtituted by common *Ethicks* (which yet are called *Ars benè vivendi, benè vivendi Diſciplina*, the

Art

(x) *Omnes filii lucis filii promiſſionis, filii Abrahæ, filii Dei, genus electum, regale ſacerdotium, veri Iſraelitæ, præcogniti, & præordinati in regnum Dei, qui eos vocavit non ſolum ex Judæis, ſed etiam ex Gentibus.* Author. de vocat. Gentium. l. 1. c. 6.

(y) Οὐ γὰρ ὅσον ἐχρῄζομεν εἰς τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀναίρεσιν, τοσοῦτον ἐλάβομεν μόνον ἐκ τῆς χάριτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῷ πλέον. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ κολάσεως ἀπηλλάγημεν καὶ κακίαν ἀπεδυσάμεθα πᾶσαν, καὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν ἄνωθεν, καὶ ἀνέστημεν τοῦ παλαιοῦ ταφέντος ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἀπελυτρώθημεν καὶ ἡγιάσθημεν, καὶ εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἤχθημεν, καὶ ἐδικαιώθημεν, καὶ ἐγενόμεθα ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, καὶ συγκληρονόμοι καὶ σύσσωμοι αὐτοῦ καθέστημεν, καὶ εἰς τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ τελοῦμεν, καὶ ὥσπερ σῶμα κεφαλῇ οὕτως ἡνώμεθα. *S. Chryſoſt. in Rom. Hom.* 10.

(z) Ἡ εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἐπάνοδος· ἡ παῤῥησία τοῦ καλεῖν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα τὸν Θεόν. Κοινωνὸν γενέσθαι τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· τέκνον φωτὸς χρηματίζειν· δόξης αἰδίου μετέχειν. Καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς ἐν παντὶ πληρώματι εὐλογίας γενέσθαι ἔν τε αἰῶνι τούτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι τῶν ἐν ἐπαγγελίαις ἀποκειμένων ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν. *S. Baſil. de ſp. ſanct. c.* 15.

(a) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. *p.* 214.

(b) *Ap. Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 10. *c.* 27. *S.* 12.

(c) *Henrich. de ver. Chriſt. rel. p.* 369.

(d) *Dr. Jackſon origin of Unbelief. S.* 1. *ch.* 5.

(e) *Apulejus de Deo Socrat.*

(f) *Durand. l.* 2. *diſt.* 28. *Qu.* 2.

Art or Diſcipline of living Well) but it is a Tranſcendent to what unregenerate Humanity calleth good Life. For

(1.) The Chriſtians good Life is no lower than *their new Life* (and the Divine Virtues thereof;) for they ſuppoſe, that the Life which is antecedent thereto, is a deadly evil Life and *an abiding in Death.* Whence they call their good Life (g) τὸν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως βίον, *the Life which they have and live from their Reſurrection.* Their good Life therefore is no lower than *the Righteouſneſs of the Kingdom of God.* Rom. 14. 17. no lower than the Life which they have and live in the Divine Spirit, whereby they are inabled to do thoſe things, which the natural Man cannot turn his Hand to, to bear thoſe Sufferings which meer Man cannot undergo, to practiſe Virtues that are againſt the Hair and grievous to Nature (to love Enemies, forgive Injuries, acknowledge our Faults when juſtly reprov'd, and to expoſe our ſelves to reproach, ignominy and torments for the Glory of God (h) is a Goodneſs that is of the Holy Spirit) whence ſome have thus defin'd the Holy Spirit, *It is that whereby we are made more than Men.* The Chriſtians Virtues therefore are of Tranſcendence Divine, if they *live in the Spirit, the fruit whereof is Love, Joy, Peace, Long-ſuffering, Gentleneſs, Goodneſs, Faith, Meekneſs, Temperance.* Their good Life is no lower than *their Life of Faith*, which is the ſummary of their Godlineſs, according to what the Hebrew Doctors ſay. (i) *Six hundred and thirteen Precepts were given to* Moſes, *but the Pſalmiſt hath reduced them to eleven; the Prophet* Iſaiah *cometh, and hath reduced them unto ſix; the Prophet* Micah *cometh and hath reduc'd them to three; the Prophet* Iſaiah *again hath reduced them to two; but the Prophet* Habakkuk *cometh, and hath reduced them all to one: the Juſt ſhall live by his Faith.* There is no living unto God according to his Inſtitution of Sanctity without being God's Believers (without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe him) nor can their Life of Godlineſs be a lower Life than that which is implied in their Character *the Life of Faith.* They live in the exerciſe of it (the practiſe of Believing divinely) they practiſe univerſal Righteouſneſs by it (whence they are divinely Juſt, Merciful, Chaſt, Temperate, rejoicing in Hope, patient in Tribulation) they do the great things of the Men of Faith, repelling Temptations, conquering fleſhly Allurements, ſubduing ſenſitive Appetites, deſpiſing the World and curing their worldly Mind and Life. (k) Ἡ πίστις μετεωρίζει τὴν ψυχὴν, *Faith raiſeth the Soul to an high and elevated Life.* And ſuch is the Chriſtians *holy and heavenly Life*, nor is their good Life of a lower order than *vita ſanctorum* (the Life of thoſe that are of the Saint of God-kind and Family) the Morals of it are *mores ſanctitatis* (whence it muſt be called Sanctity of Virtue) and a principal Law of it is ἁγιοπρεπῶς πολιτεύεσθαι, *to live as becometh Saints.* Whom ſome have compar'd to Heaven (l) *becauſe they ſhine with ſo many Virtues, as Heaven doth with Stars: Our Lord ſaying; ye are the Light of the World, ſhine like Luminaries in the World.* The Tranſcendence of their Condition as the Lights of the World ſpeaketh the Tranſcendence of their good Life, an eminent Branch whereof is their heavenly mindedneſs. For their Religion inſtituteth them, to be heavenly in their eſtimation of things, Election, Affections and Converſation, to make account, that they have no very valuable Home, or Country, Eſtate or Treaſure on this ſide Heaven; to make it the buſineſs of their Life to ſeek and ſecure the heavenly Felicity, to carry it above the World, and (m) to count nothing here their own, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἑτέρωθι, *but to live elſewhere, and to deſpiſe the preſent things* ὡς οὐκ ὄντα, *as things that are not*, to be Strangers (n) *as to the Inheritances that are here, mindful only of their own things, but counting all things that are here Alien.* The Chriſtian Life could not be the Holy Life, if it was not the heavenly Life (for none can be the godly affected and addicted and God's Adherents, that are the worldly affected and addicted and the World's Adherents) nor could it be *the Life of Faith*, if it was not the Life of *Divine Charity*, which is connex'd with Faith, as the heat of the Fire is with the light of it, and which (in various Senſes and for various Reaſons) may be called univerſal Divine Virtue and Godlineſs. For it keepeth all the Commandments, all Well-doings not qualify'd with it are but ill kind of doings (whence the Schools may be allow'd to call it the form of all the Virtues) and in the ſame Senſe that all Wickedneſs is (Selfiſhneſs or) *the Self-love Practice*, all the true goodneſs of Practice (to be godly and divinely ſelf-denying, lowly minded, innocent, uninvidious, patient, benign, beneficent, pure and peaceable, juſt and merciful) is *the godly Love-practice.* The (genuine) Chriſtians therefore out-live all the World, becauſe they out-love all the World, their holy and divine kind of Love is (o) *Chriſtiani nominis theſaurus* (the Treaſure of the Chriſtian Name) the ſummary of their Myſtery of Godlineſs, *they dwell in Love and dwell in God and God in them.* 1 Joh. 4. 16. Their good Life therefore is no lower order of Virtue than the Love that God is (as the Father of the divine Family) which is the true greatneſs and goodneſs, lovelineſs without any odiouſneſs, nobleneſs without any vileneſs.

(2.) Throughout univerſal Paganiſm there is no ſuch thing as a duly ſerious concern for the Salvation of the Soul, which muſt be chiefly taken care of, or it will be loſt (*Ficinus* in his Proem before the Books of *Plato* exhorteth to the reading of them, becauſe there young Men may learn *inter jocandum præcepta morum*, the Precepts of Life and Manners that are delivered joaking:) But the Chriſtians good Life is a ſuperlative and tranſcendent *care of the Soul.* Such as *Maximilian* King of *Bohemia* (afterwards Emperour) expreſſed in his Anſwer to the Pope, (who perſwaded him to be a good Catholick with the promiſe of many inviting Honours and Emoluments) *I thank your Holineſs, but my Soul's health is dearer unto me than all things in the World.* In Paganiſm there are generous Sayings (p) that no Gains ſhould allure Men, nor Torments affright them, to do any vile thing (q) *rebus omnibus dignitatem anteponunt* (r) yet there are not in it any Martyrs of Piety. But the Chriſtians good Life is a tranſcendent regard for *Sin* and for *Holineſs* as ſuch, they are not of the graceleſs ſinning kind, nor can they diſpenſe with ſinning againſt God at any rate, but their voice is that of the *Bohemian* Proteſtants in their Perſecution. *Omnia acceptamus, ſive famem, ſive funem, ſive rogum, potius quam ut peccemus in Deum.* We embrace every thing, whether

(g) S. Baſil. de. ſp. ſanct. c. 15. *Homo animalis ſpiritum non habens.* 1 Cor. 2. 14.

(h) Acont. Stratagem. p. 222. ed. An. 1554.

Gal. 5. 22, 23, 25.

(i) Hotting. de jur. Hebr. p. 3, 4.

(k) S. Chryſoſt. T. 5. or. 55.

1 Pet. 4. 6.

(l) *Quia quot cœlum ſtellis, tot ſancti virtutibus eluceſcunt: dicente Domino; vos eſtis lux mundi, lucete ſicut luminaria in mundo.* P. Chryſol. Ser. 120.

(m) Gr. Naz. or. 3. p. 94.

(n) Τῶν τῇδε κληρονομημάτων, μόνων τῶν ἰδίων μεμνημένοι, τὰ δὲ ἐνταῦθα πάντα ἀλλότρια ἡγούμενοι. *Clem. Str. l. 7. p. 536.*

(o) Tertull. de patient.

(p) Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 107.

(q) Cic. de off. l. 3.

(r) S. Chryſoſt. in 1 Cor. p. 264.

whether Hunger or Halter or Fire, rather than (wittingly and willingly) to Sin againſt God. So the Chriſtian Martyrs fear'd not Death, but to Sin againſt God. They adher'd to Righteouſneſs at the rate of theſe following Verſes. (*s*)

Ἴτω μὲν πῦρ, ἴτω δὲ φάσγανον, τέμνε
Κάταιθε σάρκας, ἐμπλήσθητί μου πίνων
Κέλαινον αἷμα. Πρόσθε γὰρ κάτω γαίης
Ιασιν ἄστρα, γῆ δ᾽ ἄνεισ᾽ ἐς οὐρανὸν,
Πρὶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ σοι θῶπ᾽ ἀπαντῆσαι λόγον.

Let Fire burn my Fleſh, and Sword my Body cut,
And with my deareſt Blood thy raging Paſſion glut,
The Stars ſhall ſooner fall and Earth to Heaven go,
Than any lying word out of my Mouth ſhall flow.

The Chriſtians good Life is a tranſcendent regard for *God and his Service, his Favour and Diſpleaſure, his Rewards and Puniſhments* (which may well turn this World's gay Specioſities into a *nigrum nihil*, and make the noiſie things that are here without ſence or ſound) they make light of Afflictions in compariſon of what God will inflict, Hell is with them no leſs than Hell and Heaven no leſs than Heaven. (*t*) *If there was no Hell, yet an heavenly Glory being propos'd to us, ſo that we may have a Kingdom and be glorified with the Son of God, it ought to be lamented with Thouſands of Tears, that Men ſhould deprive themſelves of ſuch tranſcendent Goods as theſe. If I was to be cut in pieces, if I was to die Ten Thouſand Deaths, if I ſhould part with Ten Thouſand Souls and as many Bodies every day, yet all this I ought to ſuffer for ſuch a Glory. But ſeeing Hell is at hand, the never dying Worm, the Fire unquenchable and the gnaſhing of Teeth, how is it that we do not open our Eyes, but continue fatning our Bodies and neglecting our Souls?* Godlineſs of Mind and Life conſiſteth in a Sovereign and tranſcendent Regard for theſe great inviſible things (the ungodly minded are therefore ſuch, becauſe they are otherwiſe minded, the great things have not their Sovereign Concern and Care, Eſtimation and Affection, but are with them of underling Regard) to which the things that are ſeen are immenſly diſproportionate. Agreeably to which immenſe diſproportion our Saviour initiateth Men into Godlineſs calling them to Self-denial; for Self-denial is a denying *totum me*, all that I am in the World. (*u*) *Let therefore every Man examine his own Heart, whether he can ſay of his deareſt Pledges, all theſe have I counted Dung for Chriſt's ſake.* Of a like tranſcendent ſtrain with their Self-denial, is *the Activa* and *Paſſive* Virtue to which Chriſtians are inſtituted. Which is nothing leſs then (*w*) τὸ σφοδρὸν τῆς χάριτος, *a vehemence of Grace*, and the holy fervour of Love, which doth not move drowſily or remiſly, nor is it cold and indifferent, but its Motions are live-ardent, it runneth and flieth, and is an holy kind of Zeal in the Service of God (for *qui non zelat non amat*;) nothing leſs than the management of an holy War offenſive and defenſive (of infinite neceſſity and greateſt hazard, wherein if they are vanquiſh'd, all is loſt) an agoniſtical *ſtriving, wreſtling, running, fighting* for Victory and Immortality, for their Innocence and Sanctity and for the Life of the Soul (*quotidiè de vita dimicamus*, S. *Cypr.*) nothing leſs than *praying continually, earneſt taking heed*, aſſiduous diligence, *all diligence*, a making Godlineſs their buſineſs, which requireth *the whole Man and the whole Soul*, and muſt be their care of all cares (for it is not a little care or pains, that will do a great deal of Work or any great Work, no excellent thing can be ſo done or gained, and none miſcarry but by their negligence;) nothing leſs than a purſuing Holineſs, abounding in every good Work, thriving in the holy Life, growing to be perfect Men, working out their Salvation, *preſſing toward the Mark* (as the Race-horſes ſtretch themſelves vehemently toward the end of their Race) *for the Prize of the high calling of God*. Phil. 3. 14. The Sublimity of their *paſſive Virtue* is above the viſible Heavens. (*x*) *For Heaven, Day and Night doth not ſo glorifie God as an holy Soul. As he that beholdeth the Pulchritude of Heaven ſaith, Glory be to thee, O God, what a Work haſt thou created? So doth he that beholdeth the Virtue of a Man and much more. For who is not ſtruck with admiration, when one that is a Man of the common Nature, and converſant in the midſt of Men, is as an adamant in the midſt of ſwarms of Sufferings? When being in the midſt of Fire and Swords and wild Beaſts, he is ſtronger than an adamant, and vanquiſheth all things for the Profeſſion of Godlineſs? When being reviled, he bleſſeth; being evil ſpoken of he praiſeth; when being injur'd he prayeth for the injurious; when he doth good to them, that lie in wait to do him a miſchief and make War upon him. For theſe and ſuch things as theſe do more glorifie God than the viſible Heavens.*

(3.) The Chriſtians good Life is a tranſcendent goodneſs and meekneſs towards Men. For it is not to be ſuppos'd, (*y*) that the intemperate Zealotick Practices of ſome in the elder times of the Church (in pulling down the Heathen Temples, trampling on their Altar, rudely treating the Preſident) the fierce Digladiations and Contentions, Slaughters and Perſecutions that for a long time prevailed in the Church, the Chriſtians thundring out Anathema's againſt one another upon every trifling matter of difference, and their being bloody Furiſts and Gladioliſts in many ages, are reconcileable with the goodneſs and gentleneſs of the Chriſtian Life. (*z*) *The Name of Jeſus* ἐμποιεῖ θαυμασίαν τινὰ πρᾳότητα, *ingendreth a certain wonderful meekneſs, and modeſty, and philanthropy, and goodneſs, and gentleneſs.* (*a*) *They that were more ferine than Wolves having receiv'd the Goſpel* προβάτων ἡμερώτεροι γεγόνασι, *became more gentle than Sheep.* (*b*) *This is the ſimplicity that is to be ſeen in the Church, this is the Charity* which ought to *be had, that the love of the Brotherhood imitate the Doves, that their manſuetude and lenity equalize that of Lambs and Sheep. How incongruous in a Chriſtian Breaſt is the ferity of Wolves, the rage of Dogs, the deadly poiſon of Serpents and bloody ſavageneſs of wild Beaſts?* (*d*) *We ſhould remember, what Name Chriſt giveth his People, by what Title he calleth his Flock: He calleth them Sheep, that the Chriſtian ſimplicity may equalize that of Sheep: He calleth them Lambs, that the ſimplicity of the Mind may imitate their innocent Nature.* (e) *We diſcern one another by the Mark of Innocence and Modeſty.* In our places of Aſſembly (*f*) *nothing is heard, but that which maketh Humane, Meek, Modeſt, Chaſt, communicative of the*

(s) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(t) *S. Chryſoſt. in Johan. p.* 891.

(u) *Mr. Hales Ser. on Matth.* 26. 75.

(w) *S. Chryſoſt.*

(x) S. Chryſoſt. in 1 Cor. Hom. 18. p. 355.

(y) *Baron. ad an.* 307. n. 17. *& ad an.* 308. n. 91. *Herald. in Min. Fel.* p. 77.

(z) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. p. 53.

(a) S. *Chryſoſt. T.* 6. p. 623.

(b) *Hæc eſt in Eccleſia noſcenda ſimplicitas, hæc charitas obtinenda, ut columbas dilectio fraternitatis imitetur, ut manſuetudo & lenitas agnis & ovibus coæquetur. Quid facit in pectore Chriſtiano luporum feritas? & canum rabies? & venenum lethale ſerpentum? & cruenta ſævitia beſtiarum?* S. *Cypr. de Unit. Eccleſ.*

(d) *Meminiſſe debemus quo vocabulo plebem ſuam Chriſtus appellet, quo titulo gregem ſuum nuncupet: Oves nominat, ut innocentia Chriſtiana ovibus æquetur: Agnos vocat, ut agnorum naturam ſimplicem ſimplicitas mentis imitetur.* Idem de Zel. & Liv.

(e) *Nos innocentiæ ac modeſtiæ ſigno facile dignoſcimus.*

(f) *Aliud auditur nihil, niſi quod humanos faciat, niſi quod mites, verecundos, pudicos, caſtos, familiaris communicatores rei, & cum omnibus conſolida*

Goods of this Life, and conjoyned with all by the firmeſt Bonds of Kindred. (g) *We that are commanded, to love Enemies, whom have we to hate? We that being hurt may not return like for like, whom can we hurt?* Malè velle male facere, male dicere, male cogitare de quoquam ex æquo vetamur. *We are the ſame to the Emperours and to our Neighbours, and are equally forbidden, to will, do, ſpeak, think evil of any.* Theſe are great things, but we ſhall hear far greater things than theſe. (h) Amongſt the Pagans Sheep and Lambs were Names of Reproach and denoted Stolidity, Meekneſs was of an ill Name amongſt them, οἱ πρᾶοι, the Men of meek and mild temper were thought none of the wiſeſt: but our Saviour pronounceth the meek bleſſed, (i) *againſt the general and commonly known Opinion of men.* And he not only advanceth Meekneſs to a Beatitude, but he advanceth it to an extraordinary Sublimity. *Chriſt hath taught a new ſort of Manſuetude* (which muſt be underſtood with a due limitation) *the great King of Heaven* (ſaith *Iſidore Peluſiota*) *came down from above, to deliver to the World the Laws of an Heavenly Converſation, which he hath propoſed in a way of conflict and ſtriving quite contrary to the Order of the Olympick Games. There he that fighteth and getteth the Victory receiveth the Crown, here he that is ſtricken and beaten and beareth it patiently, hath the honour and applauſe. There he that returneth blow for blow is celebrated: here he that turneth the other Cheek, is celebrated in the Theatre of Angels. The Victory is meaſur'd not by Revenge, but by a wiſe and generous Patience. This is the new Law of Crowns, this is the new way of Conflict and Contention.* (k) Chriſtians do not hate, but pity their Perſecutors, lament for their Sin and future Miſery, and would not have them puniſh'd (which is φιλανθρωπίας τὸ μέγεθος, *the greatneſs of Philanthropy*) they pray for their Enemies and love thoſe that hate them, bleſs thoſe that curſe them, (l) being reviled they bleſs, being perſecuted they ſuffer it, being defamed they intreat, (m) and they are taught by their ἥμερος ϗ φιλάνθρωπος νομοθεσία, *Law of Gentleneſs and Philanthropy,* not to reſiſt their Enemies and Perſecutors; which ſuperlative manſuetude muſt not be counted common good Nature, (n) *that ſoftneſs and goodneſs of temper which are naturally implanted by the Creator in the Rational Nature*; for the Chriſtians learn'd it only from their Lawgiver. (o) *Chriſtians* (ſaith *Origen*) *have ſuch Laws of manſuetude, that they may be kill'd as Sheep.* (p) *In their Apparel and Diet and the reſt of their Life they ſhew* θαυμαστὴν ϗ ὁμολογουμένως παράδοξον, *the marvellous and confeſſedly ſtrange nature of their inſtitution of Life; they dwell in their own Countries, but as Strangers, they partake of all things as Citizens, and they ſuffer all things as Strangers; every ſtrange Land is to them a Country, and their own Country is to them a ſtrange Land. They marry as all do, and beget Children, but do not (as others) expoſe their Children. They uſe a common Table not-common* (not polluted) *they are in the Fleſh, but do not live according to the Fleſh. They have their Manſion on Earth, but their Converſation in Heaven. They obey Humane Laws, but by their own Lives they tranſcend the Laws.* Ἀγαπῶσι πάντας ϗ ὑπὸ πάντων διώκονται, *they love all men and are perſecuted by all men. They are unknown by the World, yet condemned by the World. They are put to death, yet quickened unto life. They are poor, yet make many rich. They are ſtript of all things, yet abound with all things. They are diſgrac'd and in their diſgraces they are glorious. They are infam'd, yet juſtified, they are reviled, yet bleſs; they are contumeliouſly treated, but treat others with great reſpect; they do good, but are puniſh'd as evil men; being puniſh'd they rejoyce, as being* (in death) *made alive. The Jews war againſt them as Aliens, and by the Greeks they are perſecuted: but they that hate them, cannot ſhew cauſe why they are inimical to them.*

VIII. The tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs appeareth from the tranſcendent *bad Entertainment*, which it met with in the World at the riſe of it; which plainly argueth, that it is of kind and quality (the Saint of God-kind of Excellency, or) *Sanctity of Virtue and of Tranſcendence Divine.* The Tragical Scene of Hatred and Perſecution that was raiſed in the World at the riſe of it, demonſtrateth the truth of this Character of it. For,

(1.) The Adverſary to Chriſt and Chriſtians (their Religion and Virtue) was *the World*, which ſometimes ſignifieth only *the multitude of Mankind* (ſo we call a vaſt multitude *a World of People*:) but uſually it ſignifieth the multitude of Mankind, ſo as to connote their kind and quality, which is the Mundane and Ungodly, and ſo the World ſignifieth *the multitude of Mankind, that are* Cives hujus Mundi (in S. *Auſtin*'s Senſe) the World's partiſans and adherents againſt God and Godlineſs, *Joh.* 17. 16. *They are not of the World, even as I am not of the World.* Joh. 15. 19. *If ye were of the World, the World would love his own: but becauſe ye are not of the World, but I have choſen you out of the World, therefore the World hateth you.* The Mundane Genius (the Spirit of the World whereby all ungodly Mankind are animated) had a deadly averſation from the Chriſt of God (the God-kind of Chriſt) his Sanctity and Divinity of Life and Spirit. In him no ſuch accompliſhments were reſplendent, which are taking to Mankind in their Mundane Naturaliſm (ſuch as Secular Philoſophy, Wit, Eloquence, Power and Pomp, Mundane Gallantry) his Accompliſhments were of another kind, ſuch as were alien from the World, and as repugnant to the World as Righteouſneſs to Unrighteouſneſs (deep Humility, Lamb-like Meekneſs, Divine Graciouſneſs and Benignity, Self-reſigning, Soul-melting Love, the enraviſhing Excellencies, Endearments and Precioſities of a crucify'd Saviour;) and as *Quintilian* counteth it a proficiency in Oratory, to be like *Cicero*: ſo it muſt be counted ſomething of Sanctity and Saving Grace, to like and reliſh the Life and Genius of the Chriſt of God. It is not reaſonable therefore, to ſuppoſe, that *the Chriſtian Religion is ſo ſuitable to the unregenerate man's Reaſon* (to the Reaſons and Underſtandings of Mankind) *that it is ſuch, as any wiſe and prudent man would have pitch'd upon*; for the worldly wiſe and prudent notwithſtanding their unregenerate Reaſon want their Eye-ſight, are Aliens from the true knowledge of God and Chriſt, have no diſcernment of his Excellency (which is a tranſcendent to unregenerate Humanity) their Reaſon, Wiſdom and Prudence doth not tranſcend the Mundane Genius, to which Chriſt is a Stone of ſtumbling and Rock of offence, and which at the riſe of Chriſtianity did not only (q) *abuſe him by maledictions of words, but*

germanitatis neceſſitudine copulatos. Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 4. p. 152.

(g) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 37.

(h) *Herald. in Arnob.* p. 152.

(i) *Ibid.* p. 94.

(k) *J. Mart.* p. 56, 91, 363. *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 5. p. 548.

(l) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 5. p. 273.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 2. p. 79.

(n) Τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ϗ τὸ εὐσταθὲς, ἐσπαρμένα φυσικῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τῇ λογικῇ φύσει. *Ibid. l.* 7. p. 363.

(o) *Ibid. l.* 8. p. 115.

(p) *J. Mart. Ep. ad Diognet.* p. 496.

Multum profeciſſe cui placuit Cicero.

(q) *Verborum maledictionibus Chriſtum ſcindere, verum etiam bello gravi atque omnibus perſequi telorum effuſionibus & ruinis.* Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 1. p. 41.

rais'd a War againſt him and perſecuted him by the ruining effuſions of Darts. He that is born after the Fleſh, perſecuteth him that is born after the Spirit. (r) *The Chriſtians Religion and Virtue was a Stranger of heavenly deſcent introduc'd into the World of unregenerate Mankind, that were Aliens from it and Enemies to it* becauſe it is the Virtue and Godlineſs of Regeneracy, and not that which is of the old Houſe.

(2.) The World was outragiouſly the Adverſary of Chriſt and Chriſtians (their Virtue and Religion) which was ſo far from gaining them the Honour and Favour of the World, or ſaving them from the ignominy and hatred of it, that it expos'd them thereto at the moſt ſuperlative rate. For the Goſpel (*s*) and other Books of Learning are full of the Jews horrible Reproaches and malicious Calumnies of Chriſt, whom the Gentiles imitated, (*t*) in their Commentaries of the Acts of *Pilate* and our Saviour (full of Blaſphemies and Contumelies of Chriſt) which were taught in the Schools, and the Boys had them daily in their Mouths. So *Lucian*'s Name for our Saviour ὁ ἀνασκολοπιζόμενος, is the ſame with the Jews תלוי (*u*) the Jews and Pagans agree in imputing his Divine Miracles to Art Magick, and agree alſo, to have any one rather than Chriſt. *Not this man but* Barabbas, ſaith the Jew. (*w*) *Let* Jonas *be conſecrated a God rather than Jeſus*, ſaith the Pagan. His Name made his Followers infamous and odious throughout the World, which was filled with hatred againſt the Chriſtian Name (*odium erga nomen Chriſtianum*, *oditur in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum, nominis eſt prælium*) whence the Chriſtians that were not chargeable with any (immoral) Crimes, yet were hated, perſecuted and put to death for their Name. If any confeſs'd himſelf a Chriſtian, he was condemned to die without any further Tryal; which the Chriſtians thought very hard meaſure: but the Pagans could not endure the Name Chriſtian (*noſtri nominis inhorreſcitis mentione*, ſaith *Arnobius*) and their Name denoted their Sect of Religion, which the Pagans abominated at a far greater rate than any immoral Crimes, and thought it a comprehenſion of all Crimes. (*x*) *Omnia complectitur ſcelera Chriſtianum eſſe. Chriſtianum hominum omnium ſcelerum reum, deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturæ totius inimicum exiſtimas.* The Chriſtians as ſuch were thought guilty of all Crimes, the Enemies of the Gods, the Emperours, of the Laws and Cuſtoms (or good Manners) and of univerſal Nature, *hoſtes humani generis* (the Enemies of Mankind) who if not chargeable with any other Injuſtice, yet as being Chriſtians and perſwading others to be ſuch (*y*) did τ̃ βίον ἀδικεῖν, *do a great deal of hurt to Life.* The World of Mankind therefore hated them as Chriſtians, hated them to the death, hated them ſo outragiouſly, (*z*) that if a Son turned Chriſtian, the Father would diſinherit him; if a Servant turned Chriſtian, the Maſter would impriſon him; and the Husband had rather his Wife ſhould be a Whore than a Chriſtian. *Tanti non eſt bonum, quanti eſt odium Chriſtianorum.* The emendation of a Servant, Wife or Son cannot counterballance the hatred of the Chriſtians. (*a*) No Extremities or Puniſhment were thought beyond their demerit (pulling out the Eyes and breaking the Legs were towards them counted gentle puniſhments) they were treated with the utmoſt height of Rage, Barbarity and Cruelty, with all varieties of puniſhment which the Wit of Man could excogitate, (*b*) and *Ulpian* the Lawyer (an excellent Lawyer and of great Humane Virtue) is known to have made a Collection of the ſeveral Edicts which the Emperours put out againſt the Chriſtians, to ſhew, by what ways and methods they ought to be puniſh'd and deſtroy'd. Which prodigiouſly ſtrange Phænomena could not have been in the World, if Chriſtianity had not been of this tranſcendence, *The great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, from which unregenerate Mankind were Aliens, and to which they were deadly inimical.

(3.) The World was a contemptuous reproachful Adverſary to Chriſt and Chriſtians, their Religion and Virtue, which ſpeaketh the tranſcendence of it; for they did not diſcern and reliſh that Saint of God-kind of Excellency, that is in Chriſt crucify'd, in bearing his Croſs, in his Religion and Virtue and Divine Family, *that were crucified to the World and the World was crucified unto them.* As Friendſhip, ſo Alienation (which is to be dead or crucify'd as to any livelineſs of Affection and Appetite) is mutual, and ſuch an Alienation there was between the Chriſtians and the World: the World was to them an Alien and they were the ſame to the World, 1 *Joh.* 3. 1. *The World knoweth us not.* They were counted *alieni* by the Jews, (*c*) and *extraneous* by the Pagans, (*d*) with whom it was matter of the greateſt ſcorn and deriſion, to worſhip a crucify'd Man put to death as a Malefactor. (*e*) They contemn'd the Chriſtians as far below them, who had all the Mundane Glories and Proſperities on their ſide (the liberal Arts, greatneſs of Empire and the great Men of the World) they reproach'd them (*f*) for their meanneſs and poverty in the World, which diſpos'd Men to Chriſtianity, and therefore it diſpos'd them to Chriſtianity, becauſe Chriſtianity is the Saint of God-kind of Virtue; and for the ſame reaſon Mundane Bravery indiſpos'd Men to Chriſtianity, and *not many wiſe Men after the Fleſh, not many mighty, not many noble were called.* In our own times the Princes in the *Eaſt-Indies* are ſaid to be (*g*) *jealous of our Religion, becauſe the Chriſtians adore one God great above the reſt, that will not ſuffer any others, diſdaining to communicate himſelf to any; and that ſetteth a greater eſteem and value upon innocent, poor and ſimple People than upon the rich Kings and Princes. This is their ordinary diſcourſe.* In all times the Mundane Bravo's have a great averſation from the Chriſtians Sanctity and Virtue (which is oppoſite and deſtructive to their being Mundane Bravo's, would eclipſe their Brightneſs and pull down the Pillars of their Glory) nor would the Philoſophic Bravo's be Chriſtians for this reaſon, (*h*) *Chriſtus humilis eſt, vos ſuperbi.* Some think it no way probable, that ſo great a Philoſopher and ſo wiſe a Man as *Plutarch* ſhould believe the Superſtition and Fopperies of Paganiſm: but they that read the beginning of his Life of *Marcellus* will be of another mind. Great and immenſe was the fooliſhneſs of the wiſeſt of the Pagans in divine matters, an effect whereof was their reproaching Chriſtianity as a *womaniſh Superſtition, a peſtilent Superſtition,* (*i*) *Fooliſhneſs* and *Madneſs.* Παραφρονεῖς, *thou art delirous,* (*k*) ſaith *Trypho* to *J. Martyr.* (*l*) *Epictetus* objecteth to the *Galileans* ſuffering Martyrdom, μανία, *madneſs, dementiam exiſtimant,* they count it madneſs, (*m*) ſaith *Tertullian, that we prefer obſtinacy rather than ſafety.* So *Amentia* (madneſs) is the Name (*n*) that the juniour *Pliny* giveth to the Chriſtian Religion, which therefore cannot be ſuppos'd, to be highly ſuitable to the Reaſons and Underſtandings of unregenerate Mankind, but is neceſſarily to them a veiled Myſtery becauſe of its Saint of God-kind of Excellency, from which they are Aliens. Yet in a conſiderable degree they have a diſcernment of what is juſt and unjuſt, good and evil, and conſequently of a good and bad life. Whence ſome ſay, (o) *A good Converſation will indeed command Eſteem, irreſiſtibly extort reſpect from all men.—— Yea it will procure reſpect even from the worſt of men; for it is a miſtake, to think, that bad men really do or can deſpiſe true Goodneſs. In truth however they may pretend, or make a ſhew, to ſlight and ſcorn it, however in words they may flout and revile it, yet in their Hearts they cannot but admire and reverence it. Although their Will may be ſo far perverted, as to ſet them againſt it, yet their reaſon cannot be ſo far deſtroy'd (or natural Light ſo quench'd in them) as to diſapprove it. They do but vilely diſſemble and bely their Conſcience, when they make, as if they did condemn or contemn it.* But this Diſcourſe needeth great limitation; for the Sentiments and Opinions of Men touching the goodneſs of things and perſons are hugely diſſonant, and what one approveth and eſteemeth, another condemneth and contemneth. The ancient Pagans that agreed in Paganiſm, yet were hugely diſſonant in their Notions of what is *true Goodneſs* and *a good Converſation.* The Jews, Chriſtians, Pagans and *Muhammedans* are in a conſiderable degree agreed touching what is *true Goodneſs* and *a good Converſation*, but their difference is greater than their agreement. The World did not *in their Hearts admire and reverence true Goodneſs*, when they treated the Son of God with the utmoſt of their hatred and contempt: nor did a good Converſation in thoſe times *always command eſteem and irreſiſtibly extort reſpect from all men*, when Chriſtianity *cum odio ſui cæpit*, was hated to the death, ſo ſoon as it was born into the World, when it was thought a Religion fit for none but the Rabble (*ſervi & ancillæ*) when the Jews and Pagans (*p*) raged againſt the Chriſtians worſe than againſt any other Enemies, raged againſt them both alive and dead, raged againſt them for true goodneſs, (*q*) counted them [illegible], thought it Piety and Juſtice to deſtroy them, and poured the utmoſt ſcorn and contempt upon them, (*r*) *pereuntibus addita ludibria.* It is too poſſible, that Mankind in their Infidelity, Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs may *condemn* and *contemn* that which is true Goodneſs at as high a rate as *Paul* perſecuted it; and if Chriſtendom is full ſtock'd with ſuch Cattel, *Infidels as to ſaving Faith and the Sons of Carnality and Wickedneſs*, true Goodneſs may have much what the ſame treatment in degenerate Chriſtendom as in the old Heathen World. It had ſo in *Salvian*'s days, when true Goodneſs was ſo *condemn'd* and *contemn'd*, that none could be in eſteem and credit, none could be ſafe, unleſs he was an evil-doer. (*s*) The World called Chriſtian in great part conſiſteth of Impietiſts, who inſult over Chriſtians that live piouſly. They that contemn mundane things, and will not drink with the drunken, how are they inſulted over by them that count their Wickedneſs Gallantry and Bravery? Thus it was in S. *Auſtin*'s days, nor is there any great emendation in the ſtate of the Chriſtian World unto this day. For try it who will, and he will find, that the ſtrictneſs and purity of the Chriſtian Life will not conciliate him eſteem and credit, but rather diminiſh his eſteem, and ſpoil his garb and faſhion in the Eyes of the generality of men. It will make him many ways offenſive to them, bring upon him their jealous and ſcornful Eyes, and under foul Names and Notions they will hate, condemn and reproach his Sanctity of Life. But on the other hand a good Converſation hath a mighty force and aptitude, to command eſteem and extort reſpect from all men, and often produceth in ſome men ſuch an effect; no bad men really do or can deſpiſe all true Goodneſs, they cannot but in their Hearts reverence and admire that which is convictively to them true Goodneſs and by the Light of Nature ſuch; none of them can inwardly condemn or contemn true Goodneſs and a good Converſation as ſuch; ſo far it is true, *that bad men do not really nor can deſpiſe true Goodneſs.*

(r) *Scit ſe peregrinam in terris agere, inter extraneos facile inimicos invenire.* Tertull. Apol. c. 1.

(s) *Buxt. Synag. Jud.* p. 165, 176. *ed. an.* 1614. *de Abbrev.* p. 10, 87, 88. *Lex. Talm. col.* 1459.

(t) *Baron. ad an.* 311. *n.* 47, 49.

(u) *Elmen. in Arnob.* p. 40.

(w) *Orig. c. Celſ l.* 7. p. 370. *Tertull. Apol. c.* 1, 2, 3. *J. Mart.* p. 55. *Arnob.* p. 19.

(x) *Annot. in Zoſim.* p. 340. *Elmenh. in Arnob.* p. 4. *Annot. in Min. Fel.* p. 105.

(y) *Clem. Str. p. m.* 368.

(z) *Tertull. c. nation. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(a) *Baron. ad an.* 311. *S.* 2.

(b) *Panciroll. rer. mem. l.* 1. p. 275.

(c) *Tertull. Apol. c.* 31.

(d) *Elmen. in Arnob.* p. 31.

(e) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 6. & 7.

(f) *Min. Fel.* p. 102.

(g) *Le Blanc. Travails, pa.* 1. c. 22.

(h) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. c. 2

(i) *Lactan. l.* 5. c. 1

(k) *P.* 258.

(l) Diſſ. l. 4. c. 7.

(m) *Apol.* c. 27.

(n) *Voſſ. in Plin. Ep.* p. 27. *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 1 c. 27.

(o) Dr. *Barrow*, Ser. 2. on Rom. 12. 17.

'Ουδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι διαειδὲν νόημα· ἀλλ' ὃ σὺ θαυμάζεις, τῷ δ' ἑτέροισι γέλως. Denique non omnes eadem mirantur amantque. *Horat.*

(p) *Lactan.* l. 5. c. 9, 11.

(q) *Herald.* in *Arnob.* p. 56.

(r) *Tacit. Annal.* 15.

(4.) The Chriſtians Godlineſs was at the riſe of it connex'd with the Croſs (of Perſecution and Tribulation) which is one of its great Singularities. For all manner of Vice and all other Sects of Virtue and Religion had much more tolerable quarter in the World than the Chriſtian; there is no ſtanding allotment of the Croſs to any other Sect of Virtue and Religion, nor is there any other Inſtitution of taking up and bearing the Croſs. (*t*) *Epicurus* flouriſh'd at *Athens*, and his Sect of Philoſophers flouriſh'd as much as any other (if not more) in the *Roman* Empire, which put to death ſholes of Chriſtians for reputed Atheiſm. (*u*) They that equaliz'd the Philoſophers and the Chriſtians for teaching Virtue, would not have them equaliz'd *as to licence and impunity of Diſcipline.* (*w*) *Simon Magus* by his boaſtful pretenſions rais'd a Sect of *Simonians*, and no Perſecution was rais'd againſt them as againſt the Chriſtians. (*x*) In the Jews War the Impoſtor *Barchocebas* commanded τιμωρίας δεινὰς, *grievous Puniſhments* to be inflicted upon the Chriſtians only, if they did not deny Jeſus Chriſt and blaſpheme him. Some ſmall matters the Philoſophers ſuffer'd by their unpopular Life (*Socrates* and *Pythagoras* ſuffer'd death, but the actors of thoſe Inhumanities afterwards repented of them and repair'd their Honour) the Jews ſuffer'd much, a great Perſecution, from the madneſs of *Antiochus Epiphanes* (wherein there were ſome Martyrs of kin to the Chriſtian:) but their Religion was far from being like the Chriſtian, *The Inſtitution of a Religion of the Croſs.* For Chriſtians muſt have ſociety with and conformity to Chriſt in his Sufferings (in his Ignominy, in his Agony, in his Wounds, in his Thorns, in his Conflicts, Victories and Triumphs, his Croſs and his Crown) ſeeing he far'd hardly to extremity, they muſt not expect to be cocker'd and to go to Heaven on an eaſie Feather-bed. His Kingdom (his reigning proſperous Condition) was not here, he did not live high in Affluence and Pleaſure, in Pomp and Splendor, nor had the Favour and Applauſe of Men. To flow in Wealth, to ſhine in Secular Luſtre, to ſwim in ſenſitive Delights, to be the Sons of Pleaſure, the Darlings of Fortune, and the World's Minions, this is not *to be as he was in this World.* Which yet is one tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue, (*y*) and as as the holy Writers frequently, plainly and expreſly affirm, *hereunto they are appointed*,

(t) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 18 *c.*4. *Cic. de Fin. l.*1. & 2.

(u) *Tertull. Apol. c.*46.

(w) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 282.

(x) *J. Mart. Apol.* 2. *p.* 72.

(y) *See Dr. Hamm. of Taking up the Croſs.*

(s) *Totus mundus Chriſtianus eſt & totus mundus impius. Per totum enim mundum impii, & per totum mundum pii: illi illos non cognoſcunt. Quomodo putamus quia non cognoſcunt? Inſultant benè viventibus. Unuſquiſque veſtrum qui jam piè vivit, qui contemnit ſecularia, qui non vult ire ad ſpectacula, qui non vult ſe inebriare, qui iſta facere noluerit, quomodo ei inſultatur ab his qui faciunt? Nunquid inſultaretur ei ſi agnoſceretur?* S. Aug. Expoſ. in Ep. 1. Joan. Tr. 4.

appointed, the Righteous are not ſaved but by endurances and hardſhips in their way, theſe are (more or leſs) the Lot of all that will live Godly, and of every Son of the Divine Family, they are needful for our welfare (that we may be try'd and exercis'd, approv'd and improv'd, and may have our Smart here and the Beſt to come) and in the natural courſe of things they are unavoidable in this evil World. (z) *Civitas Dei mundi hujus dilectoribus odioſa eſt*, the City of God and his Saints is odious to the Lovers of the World (whence the Lot and Badge of the true Church muſt be the Croſs) *the Truth is ſharp and pungent hated by the ſenſual and voluptuous* (qui vitam ſuam mortiferis voluptatibus dedunt) *therefore they that follow it, muſt brook many injuries, ſuſtain many hardſhips and troubles.* (a) *No one that chuſeth* πυκτεύειν, *to combat by cuffing, expecteth to be crowned without Wounds.* The ancient Writers therefore ſuppoſe (though ſome in our time teach otherwiſe) that no times are ſo favourable as wholly to exempt a Chriſtian from any degree of bearing the Croſs, (b) that it is an error to think otherwiſe, and that he is not initiated into Saving Chriſtianity, that knoweth not the Croſs. (c) *The Juſt cannot live here without Perſecution. But how is this, when the Church hath Peace? Becauſe they live amongſt the Evil, they ſuffer Perſecution.* Quare? Quia omnes mali perſequuntur bonos. *The reaſon is, becauſe all evil men perſecute the good.* The holy Vitaliſts and the Sons of Carnality are vitally diſſonant and repugnant and of a contrary kind, whence the latter have againſt the former a vital and deadly enmity and antipathy (ſuch as is between the Wolf and the Lamb, the Dolphin and the Crocodile) which is a principal Fountain of the Chriſtians Perſecutions, and ſpeaketh their Virtue no leſs tranſcendent than that of the holy Vitaliſts, which is the Life of God.

IX. In the Chriſtians Sufferings there was *a great appearance of the tranſcendence of their Virtue and Godlineſs to great and happy effects.* (d) *For contrarily to the Senſe of the Jews, who counted a quiet and placid death a dying upon the Mouth of the Lord, the Chriſtians counted a violent and bloody death the moſt bleſſed and deſirable.* They were not like the Philoſophers, who ſuppos'd, (e) that External Calamities and Adverſities οὐ πάνυ πολὺ, *do not very much befall good men*; for their Religion allotted them (beſides common Afflictions and Adverſities) the Croſs of Perſecution and Tribulation, which they accounted a ſtate of the greateſt perfection of Virtue in this World, the ſtate of their greateſt Honour and Ennoblement (nothing ſo ennobled and adorn'd *Paphnutius* at the Council of *Nice* as the loſs of his Eye for Chriſt's ſake, *Conſtantine* took notice of that Eye and kiſs'd it) the ſtate of their Military Glory and Victory, their magnificent and royal, their advantageous and felicitative, their joyous and triumphant Condition: for *they rejoyced inaſmuch as they were partakers of Chriſt's Sufferings*, and gloried in his Croſs; accounting loſſes their gain, if they were for his intereſt; hardſhips their pleaſure, if for his ſervice; ignominy their honour, if for his name-ſake; and to undergo pains and diſgraces for him, their felicity and their glory. When they were reproachfully called by the Heathen *Sarmentitii* and *Semaxii* (becauſe they were burned as upon a Croſs) *Tertullian* anſwereth on their behalf, *Hic eſt habitus victoriæ noſtræ, hæc palmata veſtis, tali curru triumphamus:* They counted the Croſs the Habit of their Victory and Triumph, their triumphal Chariot, they kiſs'd their Chains, calling them πνευματικὰς μαργαρίτας, *Spiritual Jewels*, as *Ignatius* called his; (f) *they deſpiſed this preſent Life, trampled on Torments and Puniſhments, contemned Death*, and accounted their Death, (g) *not their Deſtruction but their Coronation.* And how extremely alien from Humane Nature, how much above Nature were theſe Divine Sentiments? Such was alſo,

(1.) Their promptitude and alacrity in entertaining their Sufferings; (h) *for they rejoyced more at their being condemn'd, than if they had been abſolv'd.* Chriſtianus etiam damnatus gratias agit: *A Chriſtian when condemned giveth thanks to Men* for condemning him; *and he giveth thanks to God* (as *Polycarp* did) for having a part in the number of Martyrs and of the Cup of Chriſt. When the Martyrs at *Thebais* ſuffered under *Diocleſian*, (i) *we ſaw* (ſaith *Euſebius*) θαυμασιωτάτην ὁρμὴν θείαν τε προθυμίαν, *a moſt wonderful vehemency and divine forwardneſs of Chriſt's Believers. For ſo ſoon as Sentence was pronounced upon the firſt of them, others leap'd to the Tribunal of the Judge, confeſſing themſelves Chriſtians, without regard as to dangers and multifarious torments, without fear as to the free profeſſion of Piety towards God; entertaining the laſt Sentence of death* μετά τε χαρᾶς καὶ γέλωτος καὶ εὐφροσύνης, *with joy and laughter and chearfulneſs, ſo that they ſang Hymns and Thankſgivings unto God until the expiring of their laſt Breath.* Some in thoſe times of Perſecution, (k) were caſt into Priſon, ſome were driven from their Country, others had their Goods taken away; ſome were ſlain and had their Limbs cut off, ſome were delivered to the Fire, others were drowned, they ſuſtained all manner of Puniſhments, and which was δυνάμεως ὑπερβολὴ, *a tranſcendence of power in him that could effect it, they that ſuffered theſe things, were not only not deſpondent, nor only not afflicted in mind,* ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔχαιρον, ἐσκίρτων, ἐπήδων, *but they alſo rejoyced, leaped and danced.* (l) *We undergo the extremities of Puniſhment* καὶ θανατούμενοι χαίρομεν, *and being put to death, we rejoyce.* (m) *Fire and Sword and wild Beaſts and Ungulæ tearing the Fleſh are rather delight unto us than terrour.* Chriſtians ſlight theſe uſual Bugbears of Humane Nature, (n) παίζουσι πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἐπίπονα, *make ſport with all the hardſhips of this Life.* (o) *If God* (ſaith Origen) *will have us conflict and combat again for Piety, let our antagoniſts come, and we will ſay to them, I can do all things through him that enableth me, Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.* What the Philoſopher ſaith of his wiſe man is moſt true of a Chriſtian, (p) *He is an Artiſt at taming Evils; Pain, Penury, Ignominy, Priſon and Exile, and all other horrendous things, when they are come to him, are tame and gentle.* Not only gentle and innocuous, but tranſportingly joyous; for *Julian* ſaid of the Chriſtians, (q) *that they would fly to Martyrdom as Bees to their Hive. They trampled on Live-coals as Dirt, look'd upon Seas and Waves as Meadows, and ran to the Sword as to a Diadem and a Crown.* They throng'd in great multitudes offering themſelves to Martyrdom, (r) and ſought it more in thoſe times, than others ſought for Biſhopricks in after-times. (s) They ſtrove with one another, who ſhould be the Martyr. They wearied their Perſecutors, ſo many offer'd themſelves to Martyrdom, that they knew not what to do with them; (*t*) their Adverſaries called them *Deſperati*, and the Preſident *Arrius Antoninus* (ſeeing a multitude that offer'd themſelves to Martyrdom) cried; O *miſerable People, if you would die, you have Precipices or Ropes, whereby to diſpatch your ſelves*. Something of exceſs there was in their Zeal for Martyrdom, which yet (in the main) was Divine, as was alſo their more regular Charity to their Perſecutors, whom they look'd upon (*u*) *as co-operating to their end and ſcope, accounting them* ἀποκρισιαρίους τῆς δεσποτικῆς οἰκονομίας, *Under-agents of the Lord's Oeconomy.*

(z) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 5. *c.* 16. *Lactant. l.* 4. *c.* 26.

(a) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *p.* 459.

(b) *Erras, mi frater, erras ſi putas unquam Chriſtianum perſecutionem non pati.* S. Hieron. ad Heliodor. *Nunquam deeſt tribulatio perſecutionis, ſi nunquam deſit obſervantia pietatis.* S. Leo Ser. 9. de Quadr. *Fidenter dico, quia minus piè vivis, ſi minus perſecutionem pertuleris.* Greg. M. Ep. 27. l. 6. *Si non pateris pro Chriſto ullam tribulationem, vide nè nondum cœperis in Chriſto piè vivere.* S. Aug. in Pſal. 55. *Si putas te non habere tribulationes, nondum cœpiſti eſſe Chriſtianus.* Ibid.

(c) *Append. de Diverſ. Ser.* 16. *inter op. S. Aug. T.* 10.

(d) *Fellin. S. Cypr. Ep.* 13.

(e) *Hierocl. in aur. Car. p.* 105.

(f) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *p.* 337.

(g) *S. Cypr. Ep.* 82.

(h) *Tertull. ad Scap. c.* 1, 2. *Apol. c.* 46.

(i) *Euſeb. H. Eccl. l.* 8. *c.* 9.

(k) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. *p.* 636.

(l) *J. Mart. p.* 265.

(m) *Gr. Naz. or.* 20. *p.* 350.

(n) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 109.

(o) *Ibid. l.* 8. *p.* 424.

(p) *Sen. Ep.* 85.

(q) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 5. *p.* 533.

(r) *Sulp. Sev. Hiſt. l.* 2. *p.* 143.

(s) *Baron. ad an.* 309. *n.* 21.

(2.) Their Patience and Fortitude in bearing their Sufferings (together with the Conſolations which they found in them) which were (*w*) παλαίσματα ὑπὲρ τὴν θνητὴν φύσιν, *wreſtlings above mortal Nature.* (*x*) *In all theſe, the Fire, and Iron, and Nailings that they endur'd, the wild Beaſts and depths of the Sea, the cuttings off of their Members and burnings, the piercings and effoſſions of their Eyes and the mutilations of their whole Body, the Famine, the Mines, the Bonds, they ſhew'd their patience for Piety, and for the love and deſire of their King they counted all theſe* ἡδονῆς πάσης γλυκίονα, *more ſweet than any Pleaſure.* (*y*) *The Sword, the Croſs and wild Beaſts, Chains and Fire and all other Torments could not make them depart from their Profeſſion.* They openly proclaim'd it in the midſt of their Torments (*z*) *lacerati & cruenti vociferamur, Deum colimus per Chriſtum*, tortur'd and torn and all in Blood we proclaim, we Worſhip God by Chriſt. (*a*) *With us Boys and Young Women by an inſpir'd Patience paſſive of Grief and Pain, contemn Croſſes, Torments, wild Beaſts, and all the terrible Bugbears of Puniſhments.* Their Patience they have rightly called inſpired; (*b*) for it was Religious, joyouſly thankful to God, freed them from turbulent Reſentments of impatience, *was in the Eyes of the People and of Provinces and their Torturers themſelves* (*c*) maximum miraculum (one of the greateſt Miracles) *an happy and invincible Patience that vanquiſh'd all Cruelty, and bare* (execrabiles corporum lacerationes ſine ullo gemitu) *the torturous Lacerations of their Bodies without whimpering.* A Patience of ſo high and holy a Character muſt be thought of Kind and Quality tranſcendent to the Popular and Philoſophic Pagans Patience, amongſt whom there are memorable inſtances of Patience and Fortitude. Such as *Anaxarchus, Epictetus, Zeno Eleates*, an Athenian Harlot, and of late (*d*) a *Chineſe* defy'd and vanquiſh'd all extremities of Torture, rather than he would betray a Conſpiracy againſt Tyranny and for the good of his Country. But amongſt the Pagans the Military Fortitude was the great Virtue, the name Virtue primarily ſignifieth it, Meekneſs was therefore of an ill Name amongſt them, amongſt the ancient Greeks *a bad Man* ſignify'd a Coward, *a good Man* a Valiant Man, to die in Battel was thought the moſt glorious Death (and they that ſo died were counted the bleſſed in the World to come) Virtue with them was that which they counted *Laudable*, and they thought nothing more laudable than a mundane Gallantry and Bravery of Spirit, which was their Fortitude and Patience. But the Chriſtians Military Fortitude is of the ſame Nature with *the Armour of God*, and therefore is Sanctity of Virtue and of Tranſcendence Divine, from which the Philoſophers Fortitude and Patience is remote and diſtant, as their αὐτοχειρία, *Self-murder* is from the Chriſtians Martyrdom. (*e*) *Tales ſtulta Philoſophia habeat Martyres.* The Chriſtian Martyrs had divine Aſſiſtance and ineffable Conſolations in their Sufferings, whence their Virtue appeareth to be Sanctity of Virtue and of Tranſcendence Divine. The Apoſtles and other Martyrs (*f*) *conflicted with Fire and Iron and wild Beaſts and Tyrants, with preſent Evils and threatned Evils,* ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις σώμασιν, ἢ ἀσώματοι, *as not in their own, but in other Bodies, yea as without Bodies. Pamphilus* the Martyr Philoſophiz'd in the midſt of his Torments (*g*) *as one without Fleſh and without a Body, not ſeeming to have any Sence of his Pains.* (*h*) *How many of ours have not only born without wailing the burning of their Right-hand* (as *Mutius Scævola* did) *but the burning of their whole Body?* So the cruel Martyrdom of *Marcus Arethuſius* was to him (*i*) as πομπὴ οὐ συμφορά, *a ſhew not a calamity.*

(3.) In the Chriſtians Sufferings the divine tranſcendence of their Virtue appear'd *to great and happy Effects.* For in her times of Perſecution the Church grew in extent and amplitude (*k*) *a great Acceſſion was made of new Converts, who by beholding the Sufferings of others, and ſeeing torrents of Blood from them, were not made more averſe from the Faith, but more forward to embrace it, more bold and fervid.* The greatneſs of the Chriſtians Sufferings in conſort with their Heroic paſſive Virtue (*l*) *illecebra erat ſectæ*, drew them to Chriſtianity. For they were awakened thereby and excited to inquire into it, and having inquired into it, were ſo taken with it, that they deſir'd to die for it. The greatneſs of the Chriſtians Sufferings was (*m*) a great Vindication of their Innocency (for it was againſt common ſenſe, to ſuppoſe, that they were voluptuous or intemperate, who were ſo forward to Sacrifice their Eſtates and Lives) and the People ſeeing multitudes of ſuch, whoſe Patience was invincible in the midſt of their various Torments (*n*) they were prone to think that it was not a vain thing for which ſo many (of all Sorts, Ages and Sexes) laid down their Lives (but that there was Truth at the bottom of it) and that their invincible Patience was ſomething more than Humane. The Divinity of their Virtue was ſo conſpicuous in their Sufferings, that it convinc'd Men, that their Religion was of divine Original, and they were a principal cauſe of its true Proſperity. For it is not with the Chriſtian Church as with the Kingdoms of the World, that cannot ſubſiſt without ſecular Peace and Proſperity; nor is the Chriſtian Religion like other Religions, that thrive beſt in times of worldy Proſperity under the ſhadow of ſecular Authority: But Chriſtians have a Peace and Proſperity independent upon the World, Perſecution was their time of Honour and Proſperity, they were raiſed up, when they were caſt down, their Graces ſhone the brighteſt in the dark Night of their Suffering, and then their Religion was in the moſt thriving and flouriſhing Condition. (*o*) In Perſecutions and Afflictions συνελεξάμεθα δόξαν ϗ δύναμιν, *we gathered Glory and Power, which we loſt, when we came*

(t) *Min. Fel.* p. 71. *Tertul. ad Scap.* c. 4.

(u) *Macar. Hom.* 37.

(w) *S. Chryſoſt.* T. 6. p. 337.

(x) *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl.* l. 8. c. 14. & *de laud. Conſt.* c. 7. p. 622.

(y) *J. Mart.* p. 337.

(z) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 21.

(a) *Pueri & mulierculæ noſtræ cruces & tormenta feras & omnes ſuppliciorum terriculas inſpirata patientiâ doloris illudunt.* Min. Fel. p. 339.

(b) *S. Cypr. ad Demetr.*

(c) *Lactant.* l. 6 c. 17.

(d) *Palafox.* p. 372.

(e) *S. Hieron.*

(f) *Gr. Naz. or.* 3. p. 76.

(g) Ἄσαρκος ὥσπερ ϗ ἀσώματος, οὐδ' ἐπαΐειν δοκῶν τῶν ἀλγηδόνων. *Euſeb. H. Eccl.* p. 338.

(h) *Quot ex noſtris non dextram ſolum, ſed totum corpus uri, cremari, ſine ullis ejulatibus pertulerunt?* Min. Fel. p. 339.

(i) *Gr. Naz. or.* 3. p. 89.

(k) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 6. p. 636.

(l) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 50.

(m) *J. Mart.* p. 50.

(n) *Lactant.* l. 5. c. 13. *Min. Fel.* p. 340.

(o) *Gr. Naz. or.* 3. p. 62.

to *enjoy worldly Proſperity.* (p) *The Heathen Emperours never more contributed to our Well-being, than when they commanded Chriſtians to be beaten, baniſh'd and put to Death.* In her times of Perſecution the Chriſtian Church was highly Chriſtian, *ſub tyrannis aurea* (like Gold tried and purified in the Fire:) But when thoſe times were blown over and the Church enjoy'd the World, ſhe became (by degrees) like the World, a Crew of Worldly People, or a θηριοτροφεῖον, *a Nurſery of Brutiſts,* as ſhe is at this day.

X. The tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs appeareth from our Saviour's *Sermon on the Mount*, which Name of his Diſcipline (a Sermon on the Mount) is ſuppos'd, to denote and ſignifie, that it is a Diſcipline of *Sublimity*, *Celſitude* and *Tranſcendence.* (q) *If we ask what the Mount ſignifieth, it is rightly underſtood to ſignifie greater Precepts of Righteouſneſs, for they were the leſſer that were given to the Jews.* A City ſet on an Hill is (r) *a City founded upon eximious and great Righteouſneſs, which the Mount ſignifieth, on which our Lord diſcourſeth.* So Mount *Sion* in the Prophets ſignifieth the Church (s) τὸ μέγα καὶ νοητὸν ὄρος, *a great and ſpiritual Mountain* (t) *for there is nothing flat and mean in her, nor any abject Doctrines, but whatever is great and ſublime, namely, the true knowledge of God, and the illuſtrious manifeſtation of the Myſteries of our Saviour.* The Church is called a Mountain, to ſignifie (u) *the elevatedneſs of her Dogmata*, and alſo becauſe (w) *the Life of them that are juſtified in Chriſt and ſanctified by the Spirit is raiſed on high.* Which Allegorical Expoſition of a Mountain is the true and genuine Expoſition of our Saviour's Sermon upon the Mount. For

(1.) Our Saviour inſtituteth to the Virtue and Righteouſneſs of *Chriſtianity* and *Regeneracy* (which is Sanctity of Virtue) the Virtue and Righteouſneſs which he teacheth, is no other *than the Life of them that are juſtified in Chriſt and ſanctified by the Spirit.* For the Goſpel is (x) *the draught of that form of Life, which we are to live from our Reſurrection.* So our Saviour (ſaith *S. Baſil*) preparing us for this Life, propoſeth (y) *the whole Evangelical Converſation, injoining, to be devoid of Anger, to bear Evils, to be pure from the love of Pleaſures, and from the love of Money.* (z) *In Chriſt Jeſus neither Circumciſion availeth any thing, nor Uncircumciſion, but a new Creature. For what is done to us externally in the Body, is of no great Merit, but that is highly to be regarded, which is done in the Mind. For to deſpiſe this preſent World, not to love tranſitory things, to be humble at the Heart towards God and Man, to bear Contumelies patiently, to repel Malicioufneſs from the Heart, to diſtribute to the Needy that which is our own, not to deſire that which is other Mens, to love a Friend in God, to love Enemies for God, to mourn for the Affliction of a Neighbour, not to rejoice at the Death of an Enemy: This is the new Creature, which the Doctor of the Gentiles elſewhere requireth, ſaying: If any Man be in Chriſt, he is a new Creature, old things are paſt away, behold, all things are become new. For it belongeth to the old Man, to affect this preſent World, to have a Concupiſcence of the tranſitory things, to lift up the Mind in pride, not to have patience, to be malicious and revengeful towards our Neighbour, not to give of our own to the Indigent, to deſire that which is anothers for increaſing and multiplying, to love none purely for God, to return inimicalneſs to Enemies, to rejoice in the affliction of our Neighbour. All theſe things are of the old Man, they are things that we derive from the root of Corruption. But he that now overcometh theſe, and according to our Lord's Precepts changeth his mind into Benignity, of him it is rightly ſaid, that old things are paſt away, behold, all things are become new. Then they are made new in our Minds, when the Vices of the old Man paſs away.* The Virtue and Righteouſneſs which our Lord's Precepts require (according to theſe ancient Writers) is that which is conſtitutive of the new Creature, of the State and Life of Regeneracy, which therefore as ſuch are Chriſtianity of Virtue and Righteouſneſs. And our Lord's Precepts muſt be obſerv'd from a Principle of Faith in him and Love and Obedience to him, upon which account alſo the obſervance of them is Chriſtianity of Virtue and Righteouſneſs. And ſo far as they are Chriſtianity of Virtue and Righteouſneſs, (which cannot be introduc'd without new New Laws and Duties) they are neceſſarily new Laws, new Commandments and new Duties. They muſt therefore be denominated (a) ἡ καινὴ πολιτεία, *the new Converſation* (b) *the Law of the new People called to an eternal Inheritance* (novus populus ad æternam hæreditatem vocatus) *perfectus vitæ Chriſtianæ modus* (the perfect Law of the Chriſtian Life) the new and Chriſtian Law of Life (c) ὡς ὁ καινὸς νομοθέτης ἐκέλευσεν, *as the new Law-giver hath commanded.*

(2.) Our Saviour therefore inſtituteth to Virtue and Righteouſneſs which is high and tranſcendent both in *kind* and *degree.* For as it is the Virtue and Righteouſneſs conſtitutive of *the new Man of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs*, and the ſame with *the fruit of the Spirit which is in all Goodneſs, and Righteouſneſs and Truth*, it is neceſſarily (the Saint of God-kind of Virtue) high and tranſcendent in the kind of it. And it is high and tranſcendent in the degree of it; (d) *for he that loveth an Enemy proceedeth to an higher degree of Benignity, than he that only loveth thoſe*

(p) *Nunquam nobis amplius contulerunt* (Gentiles) *quàm cùm verberari Chriſtianos atque proſcribi ac necari juberent.* S. Ambroſ. Ep. c. Symmach. p. 563.

(q) *Si quæritur, quid ſignificet Mons, benè intelligitur ſignificare majora præcepta juſtitiæ, quia minora erant, quæ Judæis data ſunt.* S. Aug. de Ser. Dom. in Monte. l. 1. c. 1.

(r) *Civitas fundata ſuper inſignem magnamque juſtitiam, quam ſignificat ipſe mons, in quo diſputat Dominus.* Ibid. c. 6.

(s) *S. Cyr. in Eſai. l. 2. T. 3. p. 281.*

(t) Χθαμαλὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τῶν πεπατημένων δογμάτων, ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τι μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν. *Ibid.*

(u) Τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ δογμάτων, τὸ ἐπηρμένον. *Ibid. l. 2. T. 1. p. 201.*

(w) Ἀνῴκισται καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ βίος τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ δεδικαιωμένων καὶ ἡγιασμένων ἐν πνεύματι. *Idem Com. in Mich. p. 424.*

(x) Τοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως βίου προδιατύπωσις. *S. Baſil. de ſp. ſanct. c. 15.*

(y) Τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν πᾶσαν πολιτείαν, τὸ ἀόργητον, τὸ ἀνεξίκακον, τὸ φιληδονίας ἀῤῥύπωτον, τὸ ἀφιλάργυρον τοῦ τρόπου νομοθετῶν. *Ibid.*

(z) *In Chriſto Jeſu neque circumciſio aliquid valet neque præputium, ſed nova creatura. Non enim magni eſt meriti ſi quid foris erga nos agatur in corpore ſed magnopere penſandum eſt, quid agatur in mente. Nam præſentem mundum deſpicere, tranſitoria non amare, mentem medullitus in humilitate Deo & proximo ſternere, contra illatas contumelias patientiam ſervare, & cuſtodita patientia dolorem malitiæ à corde repellere, egenis propria tribuere, aliena minimè ambire, amicos in Deo diligere, propter Deum & eos qui inimici ſunt, amare, de afflictione proximi lugere, de morte ejus qui inimicus eſt, non exultare: Hæc eſt nova creatura quam magiſter gentium apud alios diſcipulos vigilanti oculo requirens, dicit: Si quis igitur in Chriſto nova creatura, vetera tranſierunt: Ecce facta ſunt omnia nova. Ad veterem quippe hominem pertinet, præſentem mundum quærere: Tranſitoria ex concupiſcentia amare: Mentem in ſuperbiam erigere: Patientiam non habere: Ex dolore malitiæ de proximi læſione cogitare: Sua indigentibus non dare: Atque ad multiplicandum aliena quærere: Nullum purè propter Deum diligere: Inimicitias inimicis reddere: De afflictione proximi gaudere: Cuncta hæc vetuſti ſunt hominis: Quæ videlicet de radice trahimus corruptionis, ſed qui jam iſta exuperat, & ad præcepta dominica mentem in benignitatem commutat, de hoc rectè dicitur. Quia vetuſta tranſierunt, ecce facta ſunt omnia nova. Tunc ergo in noſtris mentibus nova fiunt, cùm a nobis vetuſti hominis vitia tranſeunt.* Greg. M. ſupr. Ezech. l. 1. Hom. 10.

(a) S. Chryſoſt. in Matth. p. 93.

(b) S. Aug. ſupr. l. 2. c. 5. & l. 1. c. 1.

(c) J. Mart. p. 236.

(d) S. Aug. ſupr. l. 1. c. 9, 21.

that love him: and he that is not angry without a cauſe, proceedeth to an higher degree, than he that only abſtaineth from killing. But he that only loveth thoſe that love him, will perfect his Benignity (ſo that it will be the perfect way of good Practice) *if he carrieth it on to the love of an Enemy. And he that only abſtaineth from killing* (perficietur) *will be of the perfect way of good Practice, if he proceedeth, not to be angry without a cauſe.* (e) *Innocence is perfectly known to us that are taught of God as being revealed by a perfect Maſter, and faithfully obſerv'd by us as being commanded by an incontemptible inſpector. Not killing how can it be more fully commanded than by teaching, that we may not be ſo much as angry? Adultery how can it be more perfectly prohibited than by reſtraining us from the ſolitary Concupiſcence of the Eye? To unteach Evil doing what can be greater Diſcipline than to interdict evil ſpeaking? Againſt the permiſſion of Injury what can be more inſtructive, than not to ſuffer any retaliation thereof?* Chriſt's way of eſchewing the ſeveral Sins and Vices is not the *mutilate* and *partial* way, which is a *lower* and *leſſer kind* and *degree* of eſchewing them: But the *plenary* and *perfect* way, which is the *ſuperlative* and *higheſt kind* and *degree* of eſchewing them. Such is the Spiritual-religious Virtue and Righteouſneſs, which is oppos'd to the Civil-religious Virtue and Righteouſneſs, that is on this ſide the Kingdom of God, and doth not ſave Men from being the wicked and unrighteous. For where *Heart-murder* and *Heart-adultery* liveth and reigneth, there may be *not-killing* and *not-committing* Adultery as to external Fact, and conſequently a Civil-religious Virtue and Righteouſneſs, which is a ſpurious and illegitimate kind of Virtue and Righteouſneſs. Such is the carnal Man's and carnal Religioniſt's kind of Virtue and Righteouſneſs, to which the Regenerate Chriſtians Virtue and Righteouſneſs is oppos'd as of Kind and Quality *the genuine and legitimate*, and as of *tranſcendent kind and degree*. The carnal kind of Men and Religioniſts Practiſe *the retaliating inimicalneſs, an Eye for an Eye, and a Tooth for a Tooth* (the Sin of Revenge:) But the Regenerate Chriſtians Virtue and Righteouſneſs is not to Practiſe *the retaliating inimicalneſs* (not ſo to reſiſt the evil Man, as the Chriſtian Law forbiddeth) although the *Non-practice* of it giveth advantage to the evil Man, to double his Injury, *to ſmite us on both Cheeks, to take away both Coat and Cloak, and to compel us to travel two Miles.* Matth. 5. 39, 40, 41. Such is the ſublimity and tranſcendence of the Chriſtian Philoſophy, whence our Saviour's Commandments are ſaid to be (f) μεγάλα ϗ ἐπίπονα ϗ ὑψηλά, *great and laborious and high*, τὰ μακρὰ σκάμματα διέτεινε, *he hath made great Stages of Virtue, he inſtituted* ὑψηλὴν τὴν πολιτείαν, *an high Converſation*, πολιτείαν ἀγγελικήν, *an Angelical Converſation, making Earth Heaven, commanding ſuch things, which aſſimilated thoſe that were converſant in them to the incorporeal Powers, made Men Angels*, τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης σχεδὸν ἐξοικίζων φύσεως, *almoſt diſlodging them of Humane Nature.* (g) *He hath ſet us upon the very top or pinnacle of Virtue, leading us to the very height and ſummity of Philoſophy, by degrees he conducteth us to the very top of Heaven.* And theſe Sublimities of Chriſtian Philoſophy are not meer good Advice and Counſel, which may be neglected with ſafety and impunity (h) *but if they be not done*, ϗ γέενναν ἠπείλησε, *he hath threatned Hell, and that otherwiſe there is no entring into the Kingdom of Heaven. And he that entreth not into the Kingdom of Heaven, ſhall fall into Hell undoubtedly.* Hell is the Portion of none but the Ungodly, our Saviour's Sublimities of Philoſophy therefore are nothing more than an Inſtitution to the Chriſtians Godlineſs, which is God-likeneſs (according to Chriſtianity) as the ſtile of our Saviour's Sermon importeth. For he urgeth his Diſciples to the Practice of his ſublime Diſcipline by this Reaſon, that they may be *the Children of God, the Children of the Higheſt, the Children of their Father which is in Heaven, and Perfect as their Father which is in Heaven is Perfect.* The Children of God by Regeneration muſt be alſo his genuine Children by reſemblance and imitation of his Holineſs and Goodneſs, which is the Chriſtians Godlineſs and the Tranſcendence thereof. In the Doctrine of Chriſt therefore there is (i) τὸ ὑπερέχον πρὸς εὐζωΐαν, a *tranſcendent Excellency as to* (truly) *good Life.*

(3.) The Chriſtians Virtue and Righteouſneſs (requir'd by our Saviour's Sermon) is tranſcendent to the Virtue and Righteouſneſs of other Religioniſts in the kind of it and the degree of it. Their Righteouſneſs cannot be the Righteouſneſs of Chriſtians, unleſs it *exceedeth the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees* (that were of higheſt Reputation amongſt the Jews for Piety and Sanctity) as our Saviour ſaith. Whereby he ſignifieth, that they muſt be (k) *meliores optimis*, better than the beſt of mundane Religioniſts, and higher than the higheſt of the Law-religioniſts. Who in the Eyes of Men ſeem'd to be high and mighty Saintiſts, but were deadly ungodly Sinners (devoid of the Life of Sanctity) whoſe Righteouſneſs did not entitle them to the Kingdom of Heaven, nor was it Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, but of Kind and Quality ſpurious and illegitimate, the whole of it was either external to the Soul, or at leaſt external to the Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs of the Soul. The Righteouſneſs which they practis'd (no better than literal Judaiſm) was complicated with the fouleſt Wickedneſs; and the Righteouſneſs which they taught (being blind and undiſcerning of Good and Evil) was of the ſame Character. The Righteouſneſs therefore of theſe formal Doctors, dead Ritualiſts and out-ſide Saintiſts may be called *Juſtitia minor*, to ſignifie, that it is a Righteouſneſs leſſer than the Righteouſneſs of the truly Righteous. (l) *The leſſer Righteouſneſs is the Righteouſneſs of the Phariſees, the greater Righteouſneſs is the Righteouſneſs of the Chriſtians. The Righteouſneſs of the Phariſees is not to kill: The Righteouſneſs of thoſe that ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, is, not to be angry without a cauſe. The leſſer Righteouſneſs is not to commit bodily Adultery: The greater Righteouſneſs is that of the Kingdom of God, not to commit Adultery in the Heart.* (m) *The greateſt part of the Precepts* (of our Saviour) *concern inward Virtues; as the love of Enemies, reſervedneſs in judging, being looſen'd from the Goods*

of

(c) *Innocentiam à Deo edocti, & perfectè eam novimus, ut à perfecto magiſtro revelatum, & fideliter cuſtodimus, ut ab incontemptibili diſpectore mandatam. Quid plenius dicere, non occides, an docere, nè iraſcaris quidem? Quid perfectius, prohibere adulterium, an etiam ab oculorum ſolitaria concupiſcentia arcere? Quid eruditius de maleficio, an & de maleloquio interdicere? Quid inſtructius injuriam non permittere, an nec vicem injuriæ ſumere?* Tertull. Apol. c. 45.

(f) S. Chryſoſt. T. 8. p. 73.

(g) Εἰς αὐτὴν ἡμᾶς τὴν κορυφὴν ἔστησε τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἄνω τὴν ἀκροτάτην τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀνάγων τὴν κορυφήν, κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς αὐτὰς ἡμᾶς ἀνάγει τῶν οὐρανῶν τὰς ἁψῖδας. *Idem in Matth.* p 129, 131.

(h) *Idem* T. 3. p. 91, 92.

Matth. 5. 9. 45, 48. *Luc.* 6. 35.

(i) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 1. c. 4.

(k) *Bucer. in Matth.* 5. 20.

(l) *Minor juſtitia juſtitia phariſæorum, major juſtitia juſtitia Chriſtianorum. Juſtitia phariſæorum eſt, ut non occidant: juſtitia eorum qui intraturi ſunt in regnum cœlorum, ut non iraſcantur ſine cauſa. Juſtitia minor eſt, non mœchari corporum conjunctione: Juſtitia verò major eſt regni Dei, non mœchari corde.* S. Aug. ſupr. c. 9. & 12.

(m) *Moral Eſſays by Meſſieurs du Port Royal.* p. 165, 166.

of the World, renouncing Humane Satisfactions, vigilance in Prayer, the humility and ſimplicity of Children. It is here that he placeth the Juſtice ſurpaſſing the Juſtice of the Phariſees, without which none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. If by the inward Virtues we underſtand thoſe real vital ſubſtantial Virtues, it is moſt true, that in theſe our Saviour chiefly placeth *the Juſtice ſurpaſſing the Juſtice of the Phariſees*, in whom there was nothing more than certain umbratil ſemblances of the inward Virtues; for even their love to God was only an out-ſide formal Buſineſs, that reach'd no further than the Surface of the Soul. But in reſpect of external Practice alſo Chriſtians muſt (in ſeveral reſpects) eſchew the Phariſees legal Practices, and deny themſelves their legal Allowances. (n) *Do we not walk in newneſs of Life and perfect Righteouſneſs above the Scribes and Phariſees, if we obſerve what our Lord ſaith? It was ſaid to them of old time an Eye for an Eye, and a Tooth for a Tooth. But I ſay unto you, that ye reſiſt not Evil: But whoſoever ſhall ſmite thee on thy right Cheek, turn to him the other alſo. And if any Man will Sue thee at the Law, and take away thy Coat, let him have thy Cloak alſo. —— how is he not dead to the Law, that doth not vindicate what was taken away, and liveth to Chriſt, that proceedeth to add the Cloak alſo?* Chriſtianity conſiſteth in being *dead to the Law* (parted from it ſo as not to live to it any more as one of its Religioniſts) and in living to Chriſt as one of his Religioniſts, who by a new Law hath preſcrib'd a new Practice diſſonant from that of the legal Doctors (the Scribes) and the Judaical Saintiſts.

The Pagan Saintiſts cannot reaſonably be thought of a better Character than the Judaical. Many Sayings there are in Paganiſm (touching Innocence, Juſtice, Patience, Beneficence) agreeable to the Precepts of Chriſtianity. Whence ſome infer, *that there are no Evangelical Precepts of Chriſtian Practice, which were not before taught by the Philoſophers.* So *Celſus* pretendeth (o) *that the Chriſtians Ethicks are common to them with other Philoſophers,* ὡς ȣ σεμνόν τι ϗ καινὸν μάθημα, *ſo that there is nothing more than ordinary, nothing new in Chriſt's Diſcipline.* If this was ſo, it would abate very much of the neceſſity of Chriſt's coming and of his honourary Names (the Light of the World and Light of Men and Light of the Gentiles, the only Doctor and Maſter, the Way, the Truth and the Life;) for the World was before ſufficiently furniſh'd and illuminated with *Ethicks* from the Schools of Philoſophy. *Non negamus Philoſophos juxta noſtra ſenſiſſe.* We acknowledge, that the Philoſophers have ſaid things agreeable to our Diſcipline, but this Agreement is complicated with greater diſagreement. For there is nothing of true Piety in their Diſcipline. (p) *Philoſophy did not know the Religious Worſhip that is according to God.* Whence they may juſtly be ſaid, to be Aliens from the total of our Diſcipline, which is thus rightly repreſented. (q) This is the Chriſtians Maxim, *All the Wiſdom of Man conſiſteth in this one thing, in knowing and ſerving God.* Philoſophy did not unteach them Heathen Impiety, nor cure Polytheiſm and Idolatry but increaſe them (increaſing the number of the Gods) nor did it ſave them from being *Self-magnifico*'s, or teach Mankind to be truly Good and Holy; for as the Popular Pagans Notion of a good Man was *one that was worthy of* Cere's *ſacred Torch*, ſo the Philoſopher thus characterizeth a good Man. (r) *Who can deny, that* Ulyſſes *was a good Man, that was minded by* Jupiter, *belov'd by* Minerva, *guided by* Mercury? (s) *Athenæ nihil commune habent cum Hieroſolymis quoad virtutes Theologicas.* The Philoſophers have nothing in common with the Chriſtians as to the Theological Virtues (which are peculiar to God's People) without which the other Virtues are neceſſarily of Kind and Quality illegitimate, how much ſoever they may ſeem to reſemble the Chriſtian.

(4.) The Moſaic Law muſt be conſider'd both as it was *the Law of the Law-religioniſts Virtue and Righteouſneſs* (that of the Scribes and Phariſees) and as it was an Inſtitution to the true Righteouſneſs and Holineſs of Saints and Prophets in the Old Teſtament-times; and of the Moſaic Law thus conſider'd we muſt affirm, that our Saviour's Sermon is an Inſtitution to an higher Virtue and Righteouſneſs than the Moſaic Law. (t) ȣ τὰ αὐτὰ κεῖται τοῖς παλαιοῖς ϗ ἡμῖν σκάμματα, *We and the Ancients have not the ſame Stages of Virtue propos'd to us.* God and Nature proceed to perfection gradually from lower to higher Degrees. The Law and the Prophets (the ancient Teachers of Righteouſneſs) were but as the Morning Star to make way for *the Sun of Righteouſneſs*, and it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the Morning Star ſhineth as bright as the Sun. From an Hebrew Doctor *R. Hiskiah* ſome have cited this Saying. (u) *The Law which thou at preſent learneſt, ſhall be vanity compar'd with the Law, which is to be delivered in the days of the Meſſiah.* Agreeably whereto Chriſtians give this account of their Law and Life. (w) *With us it is a Crime, not only to be evil, but to come within a little of being ſo; Chaſtity is ſo ſtudied, as to reſtrain the Eye; the Man-killing Hand is removed to ſuch a diſtance, as that Anger is repreſs'd; Perjury is ſo atrocious and ſuperlatively nefarious, as that Swearing is to us only* ἀπώματος *matter of Abjuration; many of us never had Riches, many were glad, that they had them only for this Reaſon, that they might deſpiſe theſe many things,* τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν ἀντὶ παντὸς πλȣτȣ φιλοσοφȣντες, *chuſing to have nothing inſtead of all Riches, abandoning the Belly (as an harſh and loathſome Miſtreſs and the Mother of all Evils) to the craſs generality. To theſe there is one Law of Virtue, not to be overcome by ſo much as any ſmall Vices, that are over-look'd by others; others puniſh the ends of Sin, we puniſh even the beginnings of it, reſtraining it at a far off as a flowing Evil hardly to be ſtopp'd. But tell me, where and with what Men there is a Law, for them that are reviled, to bleſs; them that are defam'd, to intreat; them that are perſecuted, to give way; them that are ſtript of their Garments, to become more naked; them that are curſed, to pray for them that curſe them; and in a word* χρηστότητι νικᾶν θρασύτητα, *by goodneſs to overcome boldneſs, and to make the injurious better by our patience in Sufferings?* (x) Chriſtians that live in the times of the Goſpel (which tranſcend the times of the old Teſtament in Light and Knowledge, in Grace and Aſſiſtance, in Love and Kindneſs, in Immunities and Priviledges) μείζονα ἐπιδείκνυσθαι δεῖ τὴν ἀρετὴν, *ought to ſhew a greater Virtue and more eminent Sanctity*; a more eminent Heavenly-mindedneſs, as having a Religion of the better Promiſes; a more eminent Purity, as having the pure immortal Joys more clearly reveal'd; a more eminent Patience, as being better accquainted with the Diſcipline

(n) *S. Baſil. de Bapt. l.* 1. *p.* 654.

Gal. 2. 19.

(o) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 6.

(p) Οὐ γὰρ τὴν κατὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἔγνω θρησκείαν ἡ φιλοσοφία. *Clem. Str. l.* 6. *p. m.* 486.

(q) *Omnis ſapientia hominis in hoc uno eſt, ut Deum cognoſcat & colat: hoc noſtrum dogma, hæc ſententia eſt.* Lactant. l. 3. c. 30.

(r) *Max. Tyr. diſſ.* 22.

(s) *Alſted. Encyclop. Syſt. Eth. l. c.* 1.

(t) *S. Chryſoſt. T.* 3. *p.* 91.

(u) *Raymund. pugn. Fid. p.* 608.

(w) *Gr. Naz. or.* 3. *p.* 108.

(x) *V. Grot. de J. B. ac P. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *S.* 17. *& c.* 2. *S.* 6. *cum Annot. S. Chryſoſt. in Gen. p.* 182. *& T.* 6. *p.* 717.

Diſcipline of the Croſs; a more eminent Humility, as being the Followers of Chriſt the great Maſter of Humility; a more eminent Charity and Benignity towards all Men ſince the kindneſs and love of God towards Man hath appear'd; and a more eminent Charity in loving Chriſtians as Chriſtians and laying down their Lives for the Brethren, touching which Holy People in the Old Teſtament-times had no Commandment. And if Chriſtians are neceſſarily oblig'd to greater Goodneſs and Holineſs than they, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that by our Saviour and his Apoſtles Chriſtians are inſtituted to that greater Goodneſs and Holineſs in the New Teſtament; and that ſince the coming of Chriſt πολλῷ στενωτέρα γέγονεν ἡ ὁδὸς, *the way of Piety is made much more narrow.* In the Old Teſtament-times the Jews in their Moſaic Inſtitution had large Permiſſions, *Poligamy*, *Divorce*, ſome *Revenge* (the avenger of Blood, an Eye for an Eye) *Curſing*, *not duely neceſſitated Swearing* (and ſome others) which Permiſſions that to the Jews were neceſſary, very much abated the Perfection of Holy Mens Inſtitution to Spiritual-religious Righteouſneſs (which was complicated with their Civil-religious) and it was neceſſary, that our Saviour ſhould expreſly reſtrain them. They were commanded not to hate their Brother-ſocietiſt (Jew or Proſelyte) not to bear him a grudge, and by a general Precept they were bound not to avenge, *Lev.* 19. 17, 18. If ſuch an one was their Enemy, they were commanded to do him common kindneſſes, *Exod.* 23. 4, 5. *Deut.* 22. 1,—4. But the ſeven Nations in *Paleſtine* they were commanded (yet not without ſome limitation) *utterly to deſtroy, and ſhew no mercy to them*, Deut. 7. 2. Exod. 34. 12. With the *Amalekites* they were bound, to have an irreconcileable War, *Exod.* 17. 16. *Deut.* 25. 19. Againſt the *Ammonites* and *Moabites* the Law denounceth this ſevere Sentence (which yet is not to be underſtood without ſome mollifying limitation) *Thou ſhalt not ſeek their Peace nor their Proſperity all thy Days for ever.*, Deut 23. 6. Thus far the Jews Civil-religious Inſtitution oblig'd them to have and to hate Enemies (which our Saviour forbiddeth) and to revenge themſelves upon thoſe Nations that had injur'd them. But this is not all the hatred of Enemies, to which they were inſtituted by their Political Law; for the Aliens that oppos'd them are repreſented in it as God's Enemies, they are taught to hate them and to fight againſt them as ſuch Enemies, and to rejoyce and triumph in their deſtruction. God was (in ſome ſort) their Political King and alſo their Military King or Lord General, he fought their Battels for them, and their Battels againſt the Aliens were the Lord's Battels. The greateſt Actions in thoſe Old Teſtament-times were the ſaving them out of the Hands of their Temporal Enemies, and the executing ſevere Judgments upon Offenders, to uphold the Worſhip and Government of their King and their God and to aſſert his Law (for God being their King they that oppos'd his Government were dealt with as Rebels and Traytors in a Commonwealth) and a curſing, fighting, killing Military Spirit was their Judaical Legal Spirit. But in the New Teſtament (as we have no literal *Canaan*, nor literal Judaiſm, ſo) we have no Heathen Nations to fight againſt but our Heatheniſh Nature; the Lord's Battels that we are to fight, are againſt Sin and Temptations; God doth not now raiſe up Saviours, to deliver us out of the Hands of Temporal Enemies, nor is he the God of our Armies; the Valour that we are to exerciſe, is that of bearing the Croſs (not of fighting in the high places of the Field;) the Weapons of our Warfare as Chriſtians are not Carnal, but Spiritual (as our Warfare is;) God now delighteth in other Names and Titles than in the Old Teſtament-times, the Son of God is come with the Law of Kindneſs in his Mouth; and as the appearances of God are now changed, from dreadful and terrible to inexpreſſibly kind and benign: ſo his Behaviour to his Enemies is now chang'd (from killing them to die for them) Chriſtians are come from the Mount of Curſing, from a Condemning, Conſuming, Deſtroying Diſpenſation to a diſpenſation of inexpreſſible Grace and Love: All which ſhould ſweeten their Diſpoſition, and fill them with Love and Goodneſs to Mankind. And if their God is the God of all Grace, if their Saviour is full of Grace, if their Law is the Law of Grace, and their Life is the Life of Grace, it cannot be otherwiſe, but they muſt have far more gracious Laws and Precepts given them now, to regulate their Behaviour, than were given in the Moſaic Inſtitution, and there muſt be a Spirit peculiar to the Goſpel-times oppoſite to the Judaical Old Teſtament-ſpirit.

The Judaical Old Teſtament-ſpirit ſeemeth to breath in a great part of the Prayers and Devotions of the Book of Pſalms, which ſeem to be ſuch, as the *Jews* and *Muhammedans* uſually make, Prayers of Imprecation or Execration (curſing Prayers) that are not reconcileable to Chriſtian Piety. To ſalve this difficulty, (*y*) ſome would have the Tranſlation changed, and to run not in the Senſe of the Imperative Mood, but of the Future Tenſe; for they obſerve, that in the Hebrew the words are in the Future Tenſe, not *let them be confounded*, but *they ſhall be confounded*, not *let them be turned back*, but *they ſhall be turned back*, Pſal. 35. 4. But this ſolution of the difficulty is of no value, as appeareth from the conſent of Interpreters, who render the Pſalmiſts words, not in the ſenſe of the Future Tenſe, but of the Imperative Mood, and in many places the Hebrew words cannot otherwiſe be rendred; for they are not of the Future Tenſe, but of the Imperative Mood, as *Pſal.* 59. 13. כלה *Conſume them in wrath.* Pſal. 69. 24. שפך *pour out thine Indignation upon them.* The many places of this ſort of Prayers wherein the Hebrew is of the Imperative Mood, demonſtrate, that thoſe other places wherein the Hebrew is of the Future Tenſe, are of the ſame Senſe, and conſequently the Tranſlation ought not to be changed. Nor is is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, (*z*) *that it is Chriſt himſelf* that ſpeaketh the hundred and ninth Pſalm (that Pſalm of dreadful Execrations;) for this is to ſuppoſe him, to ſpeak extremely diſſonant Language from his Evangely. It is a better way, to mitigate the harſhneſs of this ſort of Prayers, to ſuppoſe them *non vota ſed vaticinia*, not properly Prayers, but Prophetic Predictions and Comminations with approbation (Comminations of a due event in a way of Prayer) as when the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Set thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan ſtand at his right hand*, the meaning is, *It will be ſo, and it ought to be ſo*, ſo it is fit and righteous, that it ſhould be *add Iniquity to their Iniquity*, is as much as to ſay, ſo it will be, and ſo it ought to be. But there are many places in the Book of Pſams, that are not capable

(y) *Dr. Ham. Pref. to his Paraphr. on the Pſalms.*

(z) *Idem ibid.*

pable of this μαλακτικὸν, this cannot be thought the full meaning of them, but they are manifeſtly and properly Prayers, Prayers of Imprecation againſt God's, the Church's and the Pſalmiſt's Enemies, as *Pſal.* 59, 69. 83, 109. This ſort of Prayers therefore muſt be thought the Proprieties of the Land of *Canaan*'s Pietiſts, and imputed to their Judaical Old Teſtament-ſpirit. From the ſame Spirit iſſu'd *Curſe ye Meroz*, the Prophet *Eliſha*'s curſing the Children that reviled him, his Maſters calling for Fire from Heaven, the Prophet *Jeremy*'s Prayers for Vengeance againſt his Perſecutors, and the Prayer of dying *Zechariah*, *The Lord look upon it and require it.* Old Iſrael's Pietiſts (truly ſuch) were ſpiritually Religious, as Chriſtians are, and in ſeveral Inſtances they remarkably chriſtianiz'd in their Practice, (*a*) as *Moſes* in praying for his Enemies, *David* in bearing *Shimei*'s Curſes patiently: but in many Inſtances their Practices accounted laudable or not criminal becauſe agreeable to their Civil-religious Inſtitution (wherewith their Spiritual-religious Inſtitution was complicated) are not juſtifiable in Chriſtianity; as *Jael*'s trepanning and deſtroying *Siſera*, the harſh uſage of the Children of *Ammon* by *David* a very Holy Man of the Moſaic Inſtitution. But the Moſaic Inſtitution is not in our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount conſider'd as an Inſtitution of the true Righteouſneſs and Holineſs of the Saints and Prophets of the Old Teſtament-times; It is manifeſtly conſider'd by him in the other Notion, *as the Law of the Law-religioniſts Virtue and Righteouſneſs*, ſuch as the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees was. That our Saviour in his Sermon hath reſpect to the Law (not meerly to the Gloſſes of the Scribes and Phariſees) is apparent from his citing the very words of it, when he ſaith, *It was ſaid by them of old time.* By the Law the Law-religioniſts had their Virtue and Righteouſneſs, which in the whole of it was not better than that of the Jews Civil-religious Law, whence the Chriſtians ſtick not to affirm, that they tranſcend the Righteouſneſs of the Law. (*b*) *Our newneſs of Life is it not tranſcendently conſpicuous, not only in compariſon of the Greeks and of Worldly Men, but alſo in compariſon of thoſe that have ſuperlatively the Righteouſneſs of the Law? Seeing we do not deſire any addition, nor covet more, as worldly men do, and not only ſo, but we do not affect the things that we have, and which are our own. We ſtudy to do good to the Indigent above the Law; for we do not only do good to our Neighbour, but extend it unto Enemies and to the Evil, doing good according to the Commandment of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is to be merciful, as our Heavenly Father is merciful,* ϗ πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον δικαιοσύνης τὴν περισσείαν φυλάσσειν ὁμοίως διδασκόμεθα· *And in like manner we are taught to obſerve a tranſcendence of all the Righteouſneſs of the Law*, and conſequently of all the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees.

(5.) As the Law of Nature is variouſly underſtood, ſo our Saviour's Inſtitution of Virtue and Righteouſneſs (in his Sermon on the Mount) muſt be ſaid, to tranſcend, or not to tranſcend the Law of Nature. Some ſay, that *ſetting aſide the poſitive Precepts of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, Chriſt commanded no new Duty, but all was Duty before that is now.* Others thus expreſs their Opinion more cautiouſly; *that matters of Faith and the Sacraments only excepted, there is nothing in the whole Goſpel, which is not* juris naturalis. Many are of this Mind, but ſome of the beſt learned ſay, (*c*) *they ſee no reaſon for this Opinion*: which yet is manifeſtly founded upon theſe Reaſons; *The Law Natural is the ſame with the Divine Moral Law, is alſo the comprehenſion of what is in its own Nature matter of Law* (of which Nature the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity are except the two Sacraments) *and it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that our Saviour's buſineſs in his Sermon on the Mount is to make Duties of poſitive Inſtitution.* Which Reaſons would be of great force, if the Natural Law might be conſider'd as fully and perfectly *a Law without being duely notic'd*: but without being ſuch it is not *plenarily Law*; the Natural Law therefore muſt be defined, *The comprehenſion of what is in its own nature matter of Law, ſo far as it is notic'd to Mankind by Natural Light.* Which definition of the Law of Nature inferreth, that this Propoſition, *All the* Agenda *of Chriſtianity are* juris naturalis, *the Sacraments only excepted*, is either wanting in good Senſe or devoid of Truth. For if by the two Sacraments we underſtand the whole of Chriſtianity (which is virtually compris'd in them) the Propoſition is wanting in good Senſe. But if the Propoſition meaneth by the two Sacraments ſtrictly thoſe two poſitive inſtituted Rites only diſtinct from all the other *Agenda* of Chriſtianity, which are ſuppos'd, to be of the Natural Law, it is at a great rate devoid of Truth. For Natural Light is far from noticing all the *Agenda* of Piety, the Holy Life and the Saint of God-kind of Virtue. All thoſe Chriſtian Duties that have Chriſt for their Object, or Chriſtians (as ſuch) or the Church of Chriſt, or the new Kingdom of God, or the Kingdom of Darkneſs, are ſo far new Duties; and ſuch are all thoſe Chriſtian Duties, that ſuppoſe the ſtate of Chriſtianity (the entring into it or being in it) the Immunities and Priviledges of it, the communication of the Holy Spirit and our Regeneration by it. Natural Light furniſheth no Notices of the two oppoſite Kingdoms of Light and Darkneſs, the two oppoſite ſtates of Life and Death, the two oppoſite kind of Lives the Carnal and the Holy Spiritual, the two oppoſite Families the Mundane-born and the Heaven-born, the two oppoſite Religions of Law and Saving Grace, the two oppoſite kinds of Religioniſts the Carnal and the Spiritual; and therefore cannot be thought to notice the great *Agenda* that ſuppoſe them. The Carnal Jews that had the Law of Nature of a better Edition than the Gentiles, yet were Aliens from the knowledge of the Spiritual Freedom, the Spiritual Food (the Object of Spiritual Hunger and Thirſt) the Spiritual Circumciſion and from the very knowledge of the Spiritual-religious obſervance of the Law. They knew not by their Natural and Legal Light the true and genuine kind of Virtue, Piety, Humility, Purity, Temperance, Juſtice, Charity: So Heathen Mankind took up with their bad kind of Virtue, and (*d*) *Plato* allotteth a future Felicity in the beſt place to them that have exercis'd τὴν δημοτικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν ἀρετήν, *the Popular and Civil Virtue.* The Duties of Religion that are notic'd by the Light of Nature, may not be notic'd by it as to the Due and Chriſtian-kind of them. To pray to God and to worſhip him, may be notic'd by Natural Light without the notice, that (according to Chriſtianity) we ought to worſhip him in Spirit and Truth, and to pray, that his

Kingdom

(a) *Grot. de V. R. C. l. 5. S. 6.*

Judg. 4. 18.

2 *Sam.* 12. 31.

(b) *S. Baſil. de Bapt. l. 1. p. 654.*

(c) *Grot. de J. B. ac P. l. 1. c. 2. S. 6.*

(d) *Alcin. de doctr. Plat. c.*

Kingdom may come. What is Virtue and Righteouſneſs, is in good degree notic'd to Mankind by Natural Light, yet ſo imperfectly, that all unregenerate Mankind are blind and benighted, and every one that becometh a Convert to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, becometh a new kind of Man, of a new Nature and a new Spirit, of new Affections, Volitions and Deſigns, entreth into a new Covenant, a new Kingdom and Family, becometh a Member of a new and heavenly Society, hath a new Father, a new Country, a new Inheritance, a new Lord, a new Law, a new Work and Buſineſs, liveth a new Life, and his Duties are (in a limited Senſe) *new Duties* in reſpect of the Light of Unregenerate Nature, which knoweth them not, which counteth them mean and pedantic or fooliſhneſs and madneſs. (*e*) *When any one beginneth to live unto God, to deſpiſe the World, to bear his Injuries without willing to revenge them, not to deſire Riches, nor ſeek a terrene Felicity, to contemn all things, and highly to ſet up in his thoughts the Lord only, and to adhere to the way of Chriſt, the Pagans ſay, he is mad.* It ſeemeth as abſurd to the natural Man's Reaſon, as it is diſtaſtful and abominable to his Genius, *to rejoyce in Loſſes, to make Reproaches our Glory,* (*f*) *Lowneſs our Height, Meanneſs our Greatneſs, our Riches to have nothing, to return no Evil to any, but to requite their greateſt Injuries with good-will and good offices, to eſteem them that ſlight us, and to love them that hate us.* What the Philoſophers (the Pagan Saintiſts) have diſcours'd of theſe matters, appeareth not to have been from any conſcientious regard to the Light of Nature, but from Unpopular Humour. (*g*) *Sacred Theology is grounded only upon the Word and Oracles of God, and not upon the Light of Nature. This holdeth not only in thoſe Points of Faith which concern the great Myſteries of the Deity, of the Creation, and of the Redemption, but likewiſe thoſe which concern the Law Moral truly interpreted; love your Enemies, do good to them that hate you, be like your Heavenly Father, that ſuffereth his Rain to fall upon the juſt and unjuſt. To this it ought to be applied,* Nec vox hominem ſonat, *It is a Voice beyond the Light of Nature.*

(e) *Cùm cœperit Deo quiſpiam vivere, mundum contemnere, injurias ſuas nolle ulciſci, nolle hîc divitias, non hîc quærere felicitatem terrenam, contemnere omnia, Dominum ſolum cogitare, viam Chriſti non deſerere, à paganis dicitur inſanus.* Annot. in Min. Fel. p. 79.

(f) *Luk.* 14. 11. *Matth.* 20. 27. 2*Cor.* 6. 10.

(g) *Lord Bacon Advanc. of Learn.* p. m. 317.

Chriſtianity as it is *Lex remedians*, is neceſſarily a new Law, that injoyneth *new Duties*, Duties that are new in this Senſe, *they are not requir'd by the Original Law of Soul-intereſts, nor are they Branches of our original Sanctity of Life.* Which original Law of Soul-intereſts with due diſtinction and limitation of Senſe may be called *the Law of Nature*; for the Law of Nature ſo far as it is the Divine Moral Law and is of Spiritual-religious obſervance, is the Holy Spiritual Law, or the Original Law of Soul-intereſts, which was the perfect rule of Righteouſneſs in the original ſtate of the Univerſe (requiring all Duty, forbidding all Sin, allowing no degree of Sin, nor any failure of Duty and Virtue, but requiring the Spiritual-religious Virtue and Righteouſneſs in abſolute ſinleſs Perfection) for Sin was therefore Sin, becauſe it was a tranſgreſſion of the Divine Law (the Rule of Practice) a deviation from this ſtraight Rule. So in Chriſtianity this Divine Law is ſuppos'd by the Apoſtle, to require that Spiritual-religious Virtue and Righteouſneſs, which conſtituteth Regenerate Chriſtians, and it cannot be ſuppos'd, to require this Virtue and Righteouſneſs imperfectly, but in abſolute ſinleſs Perfection. It is not imaginable therefore, that our Saviour doth inſtitute to an higher Virtue and Righteouſneſs than the Divine Moral Law, in ſuch Senſe he commandeth no *new Duty*, nor doth our recover'd Sanctity tranſcend our original Sanctity, and conſequently the Law of Grace doth not tranſcend the Law of Nature ſo underſtood and explained. Yet Chriſtians muſt ſay, (*h*) τὸ κ̓τ' φύσιν βιῶν ἀπίστω πεπιστευκότος ἐϛὶν, *to live according to Nature, is to be a vile Unbeliever.* Natura eſt prima omnium diſciplina, *Nature* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *is the firſt Schoolmiſtreſs of all:* but the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity are the Virtues and Duties of Regeneracy, which therefore are of an higher Diſcipline than the Law and Light of Nature; they are higher than any Civil-religious obſervance of the Law of Nature, and than any Spiritual-religious obſervance of it which the Light of Nature ſheweth. As they are the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity they are an addition of new Duty both to Men and Angels (for the Holy Angels being Chriſtianiz'd have an addition made to their Duty by our Saviour's coming) and they ariſe from new cauſes of Duty or degrees of Duty, as *glorying in the Croſs* manifeſtly doth, *laying down our Lives for the Brethren, and loving Enemies with a Love conformable to the Love of God in Chriſt unto us, when we were Enemies.* But theſe additions of Duty and of cauſes of Duty are not Superiorities and Tranſcendencies above that Spiritual-religious Virtue and Righteouſneſs which the Divine Moral Law requireth (and which conſtituteth the Saints of God) they are only *novi modi exercendi*, new modes of exerciſing that Divine Charity, which is the Summary of Sanctity, of the Divine Moral Law and of the Myſtery of Godlineſs. The prime Article whereof *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh* yet remaineth to be diſcours'd of; but of this great Article and of the *fourth* Name of the Chriſtian Religion *The new Creation* we will give an account in the following Book.

(h) *J. Mart. Ep. ad Zen.*

BOOK

BOOK VI.

An Idea of the Lord the Son, his Incarnation and new Creation.

CHAP. I.

1. The true Idea of the Son of God of a middle Nature between two extremes; the one the Doctrine of Arius *and* Socinus *that creaturizeth the Son of God, the other the Scolaſtic-Theology of the Church, that introduceth an Abſtract Son of God. 2. The firſt ſort of Arguments to prove the Truth of our Idea (which alſo clearly illuſtrateth it) is from this Name The Son of God, which denoteth an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation. 3. This Honour and Dignity is deſtroy'd by the Hypotheſis of an Abſtract Son of God. 4. In the New Teſtament it is never attributed to an Abſtract Son. 5. Amongſt Holy People it always ſignifieth the Perſon of the* Meſſiah. *6. The Son of God and the Humane Nature are inſeparable. 7. The Idea of the true Son of God belongeth to popular Nobility-Learning. 8. The true Son of God is an holy-popular-kind of Son. 9. The Abſtract Son of God is of no Religion. 10. The Abſtract Son of God is no Ingredient of the Chriſtian Trinity.*

I. THE Chriſtian Religioniſts are thoſe that believe on the Name of the Son of God (in the Senſe of the New Teſtament) whereby they are diſcriminated from the World of Unbelievers, *Jews, Heathens* and *Muhammedans,* who either do not acknowledge any one to be the Son of God (in the Senſe of Chriſtianity) or they do not acknowledge him to be ſo, that is ſo called in the New Teſtament and in the Chriſtian Religion. (i) The *Muhammedans* accuſe the Chriſtians of falſifying the Word of God unto *Iſa* (Jeſus) in the ſecond Pſalm; that inſtead of *Thou art my Prophet, I have educated thee,* they have ſubſtituted, *Thou art my Son, I have begotten thee.* Such is the tranſcendency of God in the Conceit of theſe Infidels, that they ſuppoſe it a thing far below him to have a Son; they are great *Unitarians* (Zealots for the Unity of God) their Religion (k) doth not acknowledge any Son of God, to be join'd with him in Religious Worſhip; and thoſe that ſo join a Son of God they call *Aſſociantes,* by which Name they uſually call the Chriſtians, ſuppoſing them in ſo doing guilty of an unpardonable Crime. And by the ſame Name *Muhammed* called thoſe old *Arabians* that worſhipp'd Angels as the Sons and Daughters of God, whoſe Idolatrous Worſhip he aboliſh'd. The Pagans in their Philoſophy and Religion had Sons of God more than a few. The Indian *Brachmans* ſuppos'd, that God had ſeveral Sons, to one of which they attributed the Creation of the World. (l) For *Porphyry* from *Bardiſanes* telleth of an huge Statue of theirs, half of a Maſculine and half of a Feminine Form, on whoſe Arms the ſeveral Parts of the World were ingraven, which Statue (as the *Brachmans* reported) God gave to his Son when he created the World, that he might uſe it as an Exemplar. So the *Platoniſts* attribute the Creation of the World to their *Logos,* called by *Philo* πρωτόγονος υἱὸς Θεοῦ, *the primogenit Son of God,* and by *Porphyry* πατρικὸς νοῦς, *the paternal Mind or Intellect.* (m) *Hunc autem Chriſtum eſſe non credis* (ſaith St. *Auſtin* to *Porphyry*) this paternal Intellect and primogenit Son a *Platoniſt* doth not believe to be Chriſt. Our Chriſt is indeed as vaſtly diſſonant from a Platonic Son of God, as Chriſtianity is from Paganiſm, as *Celſus* obſerveth touching another Platonic Son of God. *Whence it is* (ſaith he) *that theſe Chriſtians call their Jeſus the Son of God, I now declare.* (n) *The Men of ancient times called this World as made by God his Child and Youngling. And is there not a mighty ſimilitude between this and the Chriſtians Son of God?* St. *Auſtin* therefore and *Lactantius* who alledge a Diſcourſe in the *Aſclepian* Dialogue, touching this paganical Son of God (the viſible World) as a Teſtimony in confirmation of Chriſtianity, have committed a very great miſtake. And a miſtake there is in the Aſſertion of a learned Man of our own, (o) *that according to the Senſe of the ancient Jews, the Son of God ſpoken of Pſalm 2. was the Eternal Son of God of the ſame Subſtance with the Father.* For altho' it is apparent, that at the riſe of Chriſtianity, and in the times before it, the *Jews* did call the Meſſiah the Son of God, yet there is no appearance that they look'd upon him as the Eternal Son of God. Of the Senſe of the *Jews* ſince the times of Chriſtianity, *Origen* giveth this account. (p) *A Jew doth not acknowledge, that any Prophet hath predicted the coming of the Son of God. That which they ſay is, that the Chriſt of God ſhall come. They often ask us, and* (when they diſpute with us) *preſently ask us touching the Son of God, as ſuppoſing that there is no ſuch Perſon, nor that any ſuch is propheſy'd of.* But in this account of the Senſe of the *Jews* there is ſomething of miſtake; for the *Hebrew* Doctors which ſince the times of Chriſtianity expound the ſecond Pſalm touching the Meſſiah, (q) do call him the Son of God: but they do not ſuppoſe him the Son of God, ſo as to be of the Godhead (which is the Chriſtian Senſe) but in a metaphorical and large Senſe, and ſuch a Senſe which is competible to a meer Man. *Athanaſius* therefore thus excuſeth the Apoſtles, becauſe in the beginning of their preaching the Goſpel they ſeem'd only to ſpeak of the Humane Nature of Chriſt. (r) *They had a reaſonable cauſe for ſo doing, becauſe the Jews of thoſe times being themſelves in Error, and drawing the Heathen into the ſame Error,* ἐνόμιζον τὸν χριστὸν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ ἔρχεσθαι, καθ' ὁμοιότητα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἄλλων γενομένων τέκνων, οὔτε δὲ Θεὸν αὐτὸν, *they ſuppoſed the Meſſiah to come of the Seed of* David, *only a meer Man, like*

(i) Hotting. Theſ. Phil. p. 164.

(k) Idem Hiſt. or. l. 1. c. 7. p. 157. l. 2. c. 2. p. 221. ed. 1.

(l) De ſtyge p. 283.

(m) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 10. c. 28.

(n) Ἄνδρες παλαιοὶ τόνδε τὸν κόσμον ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ γενόμενον, παῖδά τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤϊθεον προσεῖπον. Πάνυ γοῦν ὅμοιος οὗτός τε κἀκεῖνος παῖς Θεοῦ. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 308. Intel. Syſt. p. 540, 330.

(o) Pocock. Not. Miſc. p. 307, &c.

(p) Ἰουδαῖος δὲ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαι, ὅτι προφήτης τις εἶπεν ἥξειν Θεοῦ υἱόν. ὃ γὰρ λέγουσιν, ἐστὶν, ὅτι ἥξει ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ πολλάκις γε ζητοῦσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐθέως περὶ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς οὐδενὸς ὄντος τοιούτου, οὐδὲ προφητευθέντος. C. Celſ. l. 1. p. 38.

(q) Hoornbeck c. Jud. l. 5. c. 1. Lightfoot Hor. in Matt. 27. 54.

(r) De ſent. Dionyſ. p. 432. Com.

others of David's *Poſterity, not believing him to be God.* The *Jews* Maxim is (s) *Quod Deus non habeat ſocium aut ſecundum in Deitate*; they do not acknowledge, either that Jeſus is the true Meſſiah, or that the true Meſſiah is the Son of God, as that Name importeth his Deity, both which are fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Theology, alike certain, but not alike eaſily intelligible; for the multifarious Conteſts in the Chriſtian Church touching the Perſon of the Meſſiah (which hath been the Subject of more and more virulent Debates than any other branch of Religion) ſhew how infinitely perplex'd and obſcure this Article is, *The Deity of the Meſſiah.*

The true meaning of the Article (as I ſuppoſe) is of a middle nature between two Extremes: The Doctrine of *Arius* and *Socinus* on the one hand, which creaturizeth the Son of God; and the Scholaſtic Theology of the Church on the other hand, which by the Son of God underſtandeth *an Abſtract Son of God of Eternal Generation.* In oppoſition to both theſe Extremes, and to avoid the great Evils that on both hands incumber this great Article, we will ſhew that this great Name *The Son of God*, is one of the ἀξιώματα *Titles and Attributes of Honour and Dignity*, and that it importeth nothing leſs than the Deity of that determinate individual Perſon, to whom it belongeth. And touching that determinate individual Perſon to whom it belongeth, we will ſhew, that it is only the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, and not any Abſtract Son of God. By *an Abſtract Son of God* I mean the Scholaſtic *Verbum* or the Platonic *Logos*, or any other the like Hypoſtaſis. *A ſuppoſed Son of God conſidered in the State of Separation and Abſtraction from being the complex Perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* (t) *Either the ſolitary Scholaſtic Verbum or the Scholaſtic Verbum incarnate is called The only begotten Son of God.* This ſolitary Scholaſtic *Verbum* is fitly denominated an Abſtract Son of God, that is ſeparated and abſtracted from being the Perſon of Chriſt. For (u) *perſona Chriſti mixtura eſt Dei & hominis, perſona ex duabus naturis compoſita, Deus & Homo, nec ſine verâ Divinitate Humanitas, nec ſine verâ Humanitate Divinitas.* And if the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus is eſſentially *God-Man*, no ſuppoſed Son of God that is not *God-Man*, can be the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. If he is in the ſtate of ſeparation and abſtraction from being Man, he is neceſſarily in the ſtate of ſeparation and abſtraction from being the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. It is no contradiction, to ſay, that the Scholaſtic *Verbum* or Platonic *Logos* is the Son of God; but it is a contradiction, to ſay, that ſuch an abſtract Son of God (being ſuch) is the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. (w) Our uſual Theology will not allow us to ſay, that Chriſt Jeſus was aſſum'd into Unity of Perſon with the Son of God, becauſe the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus is eſſentially the complex both of the Divine and Humane Nature, upon which account it alſo affirmeth (x) *Nondum erat Chriſtus, ante quam noſtri habitus ſimilitudine Homo eſſet inventus.* Chriſt was not antecedently to his being Man, (y) *Chriſt both Name and Thing doth not any way agree* τῷ λόγῳ γυμνῷ, *to the naked Logos* (not having Humane Nature conjoin'd) ſaith the *Alexandrian Cyril.* And according to *Athanaſius* incarnatione ipſa Chriſtus factus eſt, *he became Chriſt by his Incarnation*; good Authors ſometimes have unwarily ſpoken otherwiſe, but this (ſaith *Petavius*) *unicè eſt Chriſtiana profeſſio* is the only Chriſtian Profeſſion. The Chriſtian Profeſſion knoweth no Abſtract Chriſt Jeſus, yet the Scholaſtic Theology of the Chriſtian Church (from the elder times of it) hath introduc'd into the Chriſtian Theology an Abſtract Son of God, that (being ſuch) cannot be the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, who is the only Son of God, and ſuch a Son of God, that is not Creature but Creature-tranſcendent.

II. The firſt ſort of Arguments to prove the truth of this our Idea (which will alſo clearly explicate and illuſtrate it) we will deduce from this Name, *The Son of God*, which certainly ſignifieth *an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation.* For it is ſelf-evident, that to be the Son of God importeth Honour, Dignity and Nobilitation of Perſon; that the Scripture Theology by the Name of The Son of God intendeth to ennoble the Perſon ſo called, as Humane Authors intend to ennoble Men by the Names δῖος, *Divine*, διογενὴς, *God-begotten*, διοτρεφὴς, *a Nurſling of God, deorum filii, ſati ſanguine Divûm, è ſtirpe Deorum*, Sons of the Gods, Θεοειδεῖς, Θεοείκελοι, ἰσόθεοι, *God-like*, Θεῷ τὸ εἶδος ὅμοιος, *Os humeroſque Deo ſimilis.*

—— —— οὐδὲ ἐῴκει
Ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο.

So *Priam* ſaid of *Hector*.

—— —— *he ſeem'd to me*
No Son of Mortal Man, but of a God to be.

But this Name, *The Son of God*, in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament, is not only a term of Honour and Ennoblement (as a Son of God is in profane Authors:) but in our Religion (which is the Kingdom of God) it is the name of a certain Honour, Dignity and eſtate of Nobilitation, ſuch as Nobility-learning treateth of. For ſo in all Kingdoms and Empires to be be Son and Heir of the Government, is a particular diſtinct Honour, Dignity and eſtate of Nobilitation (almoſt the ſupreme Dignity) and the Writers of Nobility-learning treat of it as one of the Titles of Honour, (z) *In* Codinus *the Heir apparent is expreſs'd generally by the Emperour's Son, or* ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ βασιλέως, *and the Deſpotes are mention'd by themſelves as of an inferiour Dignity.* The Son of the King therefore (or the Emperor's Son) is a Title of Honour, that denoteth a Dignity Superiour to the other Dignities (next to the Supreme) the Dignity of the Heir apparent or *of the King's primogenit Son*, as the Heir apparent hath been called (a) in our own Nation and (b) in *France* alſo before the Title of *le Daulphin* was in uſe, *Filius regis primogenitus* therefore is in ſenſe the ſame with the Title *of the Prince* (which is the uſual Name of the Son and Heir apparent) who is ſometimes ſtiled, not only the Son of the King, but *the Son of the Kingdom*; for ſo one of our *Engliſh* Hiſtorians (c) ſtileth *Henry the Eighth.* His Father had other Sons, but he was not only the Son of the King but the Son of the Kingdom; not only the Son of his Father's Nature but of his Regial or Imperial Eſtate (and conſequently of the Kingdom, as that name ſignifieth the Kingdom Eſtate) who therefore ought to be called *The Regial* or *Imperial* Son of the King. And he ought the rather to be ſo called, becauſe he is not only the deſigned Succeſſor in the Imperial Dignity in time to come, but he is at preſent in great degree partaker thereof, (d) *For the Prince in our Law is reputed as the ſame Perſon with the King, and ſo declared by a Statute of* Hen. 8. Coruſcat enim princeps

(Jay

(s) *Abarben. ap. Vorſt. de cap. fid. p.* 27, 33.

(t) *Filius Dei unigenitus dicitur, aut Verbum ſolum, aut Verbum incarnatum. Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 16. *c.* 5. *S.* 9.

(u) *Idem ibid. l.*3. *c.* 9. *S.* 15. *c.* 16. *S.* 2. *l.*4. *c.*9. *S.* 12. *l.*5. *c.*3. *S.*6. *l.*11. *c.* 8. *S.*12. & *l.* 4. *c.* 14. *S.* 10. *de Trin. l.* 3. *c.*11. *S.*14.

(w) *Idem T.*4. *l.* 6. *c.* 9. *S.* 17.

(x) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.*15. *S.* 12.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 11. *c.* 8, 9. *S.*1. *vid. S. Cyr. de rect. Fid. p.* 54.

(z) *Selden Titles p.* 232. *Ed.*3.

(a) *Ibid. p.* 498.

(b) *ibid. p.* 397.

(c) *Sir Fr. Bacon Hiſt. of Henry* 8.

(d) *The preſent State of* Eng. 1. *par. p.*104, 105.

(*ſay our Lawyers*) radiis Regis Patris ſui, & cenſetur una perſona cum ipſo. *And the Civilians ſay, the King's eldeſt Son may be ſtiled a King.* But mine Author addeth, *The Prince in Nature is a diſtinct Perſon from the King, ſo in Law alſo in ſome Caſes he is a Subject.* In former times (*e*) the Prince in our Nation had the Attribute of *Atheling* or *Ætheling*, to denote him in a ſenſe of Eminence *Nobilis ortu*, *generoſus*, *ἐυγενὴς*, *or one born of him that is Noble*; and an ancient Poet of ours ſtyling him *Edgar Atheling*, looketh upon him as King by kind.

(e) Seldon ſupr. p. 498, 499.

Wo ſo were next King by kunde me cluped Atheling,
Thervore me cluped him ſo, vor by kunde he was
(*King.*

(*f*) *Galba* at his deſignation of *L. Piſo* for his Succeſſor in the *Roman* Empire ſaid, that he placed him (by the Example of *Octavian*) *in proximo ſibi faſtigio*, in the next Sublimity to himſelf. In after-times and for a long time the Heir apparent or Succeſſor deſign'd in the *Roman* Empire was called *Cæſar*, had the Attribute of *Nobiliſſimus*, certain *Imperatoria Inſignia* (Imperial-Enſigns or Ornaments) were allow'd him, his Dignity is ſometimes ſtyl'd *Imperium* and *Cæſarianum Imperium*; *ad Imperii ſocietatem adſciſcere* and *ad Imperium aſſumere*, or τοῦ βασιλικοῦ κοινωνὸν ἀποφαίνειν κλήσει *were Phraſes to make a* Cæſar (there being another kind of taking a Partner to the Empire by making another Emperour;) *neither was it meerly titulary and of expectation, but join'd with an eminency of Power, and for the moſt part ſuch, as wanted only a fulneſs of Equality with the Emperor's.* A like Eminency of Honour was conjoyn'd with this Eminency of Power; (*g*) for the Emperor *Theodoſius* was angry with a Biſhop, becauſe he did not Honour the Emperor's Son with the like Honour as himſelf. Of later times the Heir or Succeſſor apparent is not ſtyled *Cæſar*, but *Rex Romanorum*, which is a great Name, but touching the greatneſs of his Power the Imperial Lawyers are not agreed, yet thus far they are agreed, they all ſuppoſe him to be of Supra-ſubject (or Subject-tranſcendent) Condition. (*h*) *There is alſo a frequent Opinion among them, that* Filius Regis Rex vocari debet, quamvis regnum non habeat; *and that he is* Rex quoad nomen & dignitatem, *but not* quoad juriſdictionem, adminiſtrationem, vel alia ſimilia, quæ reſpiciunt Dominium. But ſo much of Dominion neceſſarily belongeth to the Son and Heir of the King, as belongeth to the firſt-born Son and Heir of a Family (*i*) who is not only ſtyled *Herus ac Dominus*, but *Dominus rerum paternarum*; and the Lawyers ſay of ſuch, *erant vivente quoque Patre quodammodo Domini.*

(f) Ibid. p. 225, 227.

(g) Sozomen Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 6.

(h) Selden ſupr. p. 27.

(i) Grot. Not. in Joh. 8. 35. Owen in Heb. 1. 2. Calv. Lex. in Voce Dominium.

From theſe Notices of Humane Affairs it is apparent, that the Son of God is of definitive notion an Honour, Dignity and eſtate of Nobilitation, and that his Name and Idea belongeth not to *Platonic* and *Ariſtotelick* Metaphyſicks or to Scholaſtick Theology (as both Catholicks and Hereticks have ſuppoſed) but to Nobility-learning. The Bible throughout the whole of it ſuppoſeth, that there is an analogy between Divine and Humane Affairs, and ſo do all Expoſitors; for they explicate the one by the other. Our Saviour's Idea muſt be underſtood by that of *a King's Son*, Matt. 22. 2. that of a Son in a Family, *John* 8. 35. that of a Son and Heir, *Matt.* 21. 37, 38. *Rom.* 8. 17. *Heb.* 1. 2. that of a *Filius unigenitus & primogenitus*, John 1. 14, 18. Rom. 8. 29. Col. 1. 15, 18. Heb. 7. 6. The Son of God is of definitive notion *Filius Regis unigenitus & primogenitus* in the Kingdom of God; and therefore is of definitive notion ſuch an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation *in divinis*, as the *Filius Regis primogenitus* is in an Humane Kingdom. God is an Honour, Dignity and eſtate of Nobilitation, whoſe Name and Idea belongeth to Nobility-learning; and the ſame Judgment muſt neceſſarily be made of the Name and Idea of the Son of God. As from the nature and propriety of his Generation, and Sonſhip, the Fathers rightly argue (*k*) that the Son is not ſelf-exiſtent, nor a Creature, and that he is of the ſame Nature with the Father: So from the nature and propriety of his imperial Generation and Sonſhip (becauſe he is the Son and Heir of the great Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead) we ought to argue, that he is this Honour, Dignity and eſtate of Nobilitation, *the Imperial Son of God, a Divine Imperial Perſon, a Prince Creature-tranſcendent, a filial Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent, a Chriſtian and Saint of God-kind of Son of God ſo as to be the Lord the Son, the Imperial Saint of God-kind of Son, the holy Empire's Imperial Son, the height of all Honour, Nobilitation and Excellence competible to a Son.* Let us conceive in our Mind that God is *The Imperial Eſtate-tranſcendent to all Creatures, Men and Angels* (ſo as to be the God-kind of Soveraignty) this Idea implieth and inferreth, *that the Imperial Son of God is ſuperiour and tranſcendent to all Creatures, Men and Angels; that it is Sanctity, Divinity and Deity of Perſon, to be the Imperial Son of God; that he is one of and in the Godhead* (the Soveraignty;) *that amongſt the Saints and Sons of God he is the Lord the Son, in State and Nature no leſs than God the Son; and that he is* Deus natus & genitus *in the ſame ſenſe that a King's primogenit Son is* Rex natus & genitus, which is the Pſalmiſt's Senſe of the King's Son, *Pſalm* 72. 1. *Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteouſneſs unto the King's Son.* For the King's Son ſignifieth *Rex natus & genitus*, as the Son of God ſignifieth *his Imperial Son*; which an ignorant Friar in *France* well diſcern'd, when he compared the *French* King to God the Father, and called our bleſſed Lord *the* Daulphin *of Heaven.* The Holy Ghoſt calleth him The Imperial Son, ſtyling him *The Prince of the King's of the Earth*; ſo do the Magi, calling him *He that is born King of the* Jews (which is the ſame with *Rex natus & genitus*;) *The only begotten Son of God* is the ſame with the Imperial Son, and ſo is the Meſſiah or *Chriſt the Lord.* Divines implicitly call him *The Imperial Son*, when they call our Saviour (*l*) *The only Son of our ſupreme Sovereign and the Heir apparent to the Kingdom of Heaven*, (*m*) *The Son of God the Heir of Eternal Majeſty*, (*n*) τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγαθῶν οὐσιωδῶς κληρονόμον, *eſſentially the Heir of the Father's Goods*, (*o*) μόνος κληρονόμος ὡς υἱὸς, *the only Heir as a Son.* Agreeably to the Apoſtle *Heb.* 1. 2. the Council of *Frankford* calleth the Son (*p*) *filium & heredem univerſorum*, the Son and Heir of all things. Here therefore we may ſafely fix our Foot (the Ground being firm under us) with great aſſurance we may pronounce, that this is the true Idea of the Son of God *The Imperial Son, The Imperial Svint of God-kind of Son*, or *The Holy Empire's Imperial Son*, and that this is the ſenſe of *Clemens Romanus*, who p. 36. of his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* calleth our Saviour τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, *The Scepter of the magnificence of God*, which is the ſame Name with *The Imperial Son* that is an Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation Creature-tranſcendent. For in

(k) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 10.

(l) Downam Chriſt. Warf. par. 2. p. 331.

(m) Dr. Barrow Ser. on Joh. 1. 14.

(n) S. Cyr. in Joann. p. 170.

(o) Idem Theſaur. p. 226.

(p) Petav. T. 4. l. 7. c. 1. S. 7.

the Kingdom of God the Creature-party and the Subject-party are one and the very ſame; if therefore the Son of God is natively and eſſentially a Lord and Prince Subject-tranſcendent, he is natively and eſſentially a Lord and Prince Creature-tranſcendent, which is a demonſtration of Chriſt's Divinity againſt the Doctrine of *Arius* and *Socinus*. But the true Idea of the Son of God is alike oppoſite to the Scholaſtic Hypotheſis of an Abſtract Son of God (whereby the plain and certain definitive notices of the Son of God are contradicted and overthrown) which therefore as we paſs along we will modeſtly confront and oppoſe to the true and genuine Son of God, that is, Chriſt Jeſus, *The Child of God, The Son of God, The Imperial Son of God, The Imperial Saint of God-kind of Son* (neither more nor leſs than ſo) who is *The God-ſon of God of kind and degree ſuch* (no Creature-ſon) *and in ſuch ſenſe God the Son.*

III. The Honour and Dignity of ſuch a Son is deſtroy'd by the Hypotheſis of a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son. For as there can be no ſuch Honour and Dignity amongſt Men as *the Imperial Son and Heir of the King*, if the plenary Kingdom-eſtate be ſubſtituted inſtead of it, if the Son of the King be eſſentially and plenarily from his nativity King as well as the Father: ſo the Honour and Dignity of the Imperial Son and Heir of God is deſtroy'd, if we ſubſtitute the Eſtate of the Godhead inſtead of it, if the Son of God is eſſentially and plenarily from eternity God Almighty (omni-imperial) as well as the Father. It cannot be ſaid of ſuch a Son, that he is neither higher nor lower than the Imperial Son and Heir, that he is natively no more than the Prince, the Son of the King that is the Son of the Kingdom, nor may he be called the Heir apparent of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Heir of eternal Majeſty; for he is ſuppoſed to have been begotten immediately and from Eternity into the actual and plenary poſſeſſion of the Kingdom-eſtate. (q) *Seeing the Father is believed to be All-imperial and Eternal, the Son is demonſtrated to be conſempiternal, and to differ in nothing from the Father; for he was God of God, All-imperial of the All Imperial, Coeternal of the Eternal, not after in time, not inferiour in potentacy, not unlike in glory, not divided in Eſſence.* This is not the Idea of an imperial Son and Heir, but of one that is eſſentially and plenarily, natively and neceſſarily an Emperour from a Emperour, and ſo the Son is ſuppoſed to be *de Deo Deus.* (r) *The Father is God by Nature, Omni-imperial, Creator, Lord, King, Incorruptible, Immortal, Life, having no beginning of Exiſtence, nor produc'd from not being into being; and the Son is all theſe without any diverſity.* This Idea of an Abſtract Son of God utterly ſpoileth the analogy between Divine and Humane Affairs, deſtroyeth the Notion of a Son and Heir, and yet it is not unuſual with the ancient Writers, to compare the Son of God to a Son and Heir, to ſuch a Son and Heir as cannot have the plenary Poſſeſſion of the Kingdom-eſtate but by the after-conceſſion, aſſumption or tradition of the Father. Thus *Tertullian* diſputeth againſt *Sabellianiſm.* (s) *The nature and notion of a Monarchy doth not hinder, but that the Monarch may have a Son, and* (ſi particeps ejus adſumatur & Filius) *if his Son be aſſumed into the Government and becometh a Partner in it, it doth not follow, that the Monarchy is divided and ceaſeth to be a Monarchy. Lactantius* compareth the Son of God to the Son and Heir of a Family, to whom the Father granteth the Rule and Government. (t) *If one hath a Son whom he ſingularly loveth, who yet is in the Houſe and Hand of his Father, altho' he granteth unto his Son the Name and Power of Lord, yet in the eye of the Law the Family is but one and the Maſter one,* (u) Athenagoras (ſaith *Eugubinus*) *to illuſtrate Divine Affairs from Humane, hath brought a very fine ſimilitude. The* Roman *Emperour begat a Son, afterwards took him into Conſortſhip of the Empire, and declared him* Auguſtus. *The World venerated both theſe as one Emperor. The Son venerated the Father, not the Father the Son; but the Father ſo lov'd the Son, that he gave unto him whatever himſelf was. He had generated him, then declar'd him Emperor, made a tradition of the Imperial power of the World to him, commanded all to obey him, the Honour that was done to him be accounted as done to himſelf, and ſo declared; nor was there any thing which the Son had not by Tradition from him.* Black is ſcarce more unlike to white than an Imperial Son rais'd to the Government by the after-aſſumption and tradition of the Father is unlike to a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son (who hath nothing by donation from the Father but only by generation, and who is generated plenary King or Emperour) yet this is the fine ſimilitude of *Athenagoras*, who alſo (to compleat his unlike ſimilitude) ought to have proceeded, to ſhew, that three political Imperial Perſons in the *Roman* Government were venerated as one Emperor, and that this Ternary was a reſemblance of the Trinity.

IV. If Chriſtians ſpeak of the Son of God, their Religion obligeth them to underſtand by that Name the Perſon ſo called in the New Teſtament, which is no other than the Perſon of the Chriſtian Meſſiah. For throughout the whole New Teſtament (w) this name the Son of God never ſignifieth an Abſtract Son of God, is never applied to any ſuch Hypoſtaſis, but only to the complex Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. Mar. 1. 1. *The Goſpel of Chriſt the Son of God.* Luke 1. 35. *That holy thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God.* Matt. 16. 16. *Peter anſwered and ſaid, Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God.* John 6. 69. *We believe and are ſure, that thou art that Chriſt the Son of the living God.* John 1. 49. *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael.* John 11. 27. *Martha ſaith unto him, yea Lord I believe, that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World.* Acts 8. 37. *The Eunuch anſwered*

(q) *Cùm enim Deus & omnipotens & æternus creditur pater, conſempiternus eidem Filius demonſtratur, in nullo à patre differens; quia de Deo Deus, de omnipotente omnipotens, de æterno natus eſt Coæternus: non poſterior tempore, non inferior poteſtate, non diſſimilis gloria, non diviſus eſſentia. S.* Leo *ap.* Petav. *de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 6. *S.* 11.

(r) Ὁ πατὴρ Θεὸς κατὰ φύσιν, παντοκράτωρ, δημιουργὸς, κύριος, βασιλεὺς, ἄφθαρτος, ἀθάνατος, ζωὴ, ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι μὴ ἔχων, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρενεχθείς· ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀπαραλλάκτως. *S. Cyr. ap. Petav. ibid. l.*2. *c.* 11. *S.*2.

(s) *Adv. Prax. c.* 3.

(t) *Cùm quis habet filium, quem unicè diligit, qui tamen ſit in domo & manu Patris, licet ei nomen Domini poteſtatemque concedat, Civili tamen jure & domus una & unus Dominus nominatur.* l. 4 c. 29.

(u) *Attulit pulcherrimum, quoad licet ex mortalibus noſſe immortalia,* Athenagoras *exemplum, in Oratione ad duos Imperatores, Patrem & Filium. Pater erat* Antoninus Pius, *erat ei filius* Auguſtus; *genitus ab eo & declaratus* Auguſtus, *Imperatorque totius Orbis. Omnis terra gentes omnes venerabantur utrumque ut unum Imperatorem. Quidquid jubebat filius factum erat: quidquid item pater, fiebat extemplo: procedebat filius, vererabantur, adorabant omnes, idque cupido & volente Patre: ſimiliter procedebat Imperator Verus, omnes venerabantur, etiam filius. Filius venerabatur patrem, non pater filium, ſed tanta charitate filium diligebat pater, ut illi ſua delitiæ eſſent, ſua voluptas & gaudium, ut dederit ei quidquid ipſe eſſet. Genuerat eum, tum Imperatorem declaraverat, totius orbis poteſtatem tradiderat, omnes illi parere jubebat: quidquid honoris impenderetur filio ſibi collatum prædicabat, præ ſe ferebat: nihil erat reliquum quod filio non tradidiſſet.* Eugub. de per. Phil. l. 2. c. 8.

(w) *Vid. Crell. de uno Deo l.* 1. *S.* 2. *n.* 316.

ſwer'd and ſaid, I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God. Acts 9. 20. *Paul preached Chriſt, that he is the Son of God.* 1 Joh. 5. 5. *Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth, that Jeſus is the Son of God?* 1 Joh. 4. 15. *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs, that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God*; yet this in ſome ſort the unclean Spirits confeſs *Matt.* 8. 29. *What have we to do with thee, Jeſus thou Son of God?* They that were in the Ship with him did acknowledge it after his ceaſing the Wind, *Matt.* 14. 23. *They came and worſhipped him, ſaying, of a truth thou art the Son of God.* The Devil in his temptation was willing to ſuppoſe it, *Matt.* 4. 3, 6. *If thou be the Son of God, command that theſe Stones be made Bread.* The Centurion (an Heathen Soldier) did acknowledge it, *Matt.* 27. 54. *Mar.* 15. 39. and the ſenſe of his Words may be underſtood by comparing the Evangeliſts: For in ſome of them his Words are, *Truly* Lu. 23. 47. *this Man was the Son of God*; but in S. *Luke* his Words are, *Certainly this was a righteous Man.* Altho' he might not know the meaning of this Name *The Son of God* either in the ſenſe of *Jews* or Chriſtians, yet ſeeing the manner of our Saviour's Death and the Miracles that attended it, and knowing that he ſuffered Death for pretending to be the Son of God, he juſtify'd our Saviour, that he was no Impoſtor, and pronounc'd that he was *a juſt Man* in his pretenſion, or (which is the ſame thing) that he was, as he pretended to be, *The Son of God*: With Chriſtians this is the main point. For they are 1 *Joh.* 5. 10, 13. *Gal.* 2. 20. *Eph.* 4. 13. Chriſtians, becauſe *they believe on the Son of God, they live by the Faith of the Son of God*, their Religion is *the knowledge of the Son of God.* Their prime fundamental Article as Chriſtians, their choice and noble characteriſtic and diſtinctive Article, of principal importance, vaſt comprehenſion, the Eſſence and Summary of their Faith, is this Abridgment of Chriſt's Evangely, *John* 20. 31. *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his Name.* To this Article it is, that the Witneſſes of Chriſtianity atteſt, that we Chriſtians *Heb.* 4. 14. *Joh.* 1. 34. *Mat.* 3. 17. *Mar.* 14. 61. peculiarly *have a great High Prieſt that is paſſed into the Heavens, Jeſus the Son of God.* John *bare record, that this is the Son of God.* God the Father bare record by a Voice from Heaven, *This is my beloved Son.* The Son of God died to atteſt this great Article; for the High Prieſt ask'd him, *Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the bleſſed? And Jeſus ſaid, I am.* Chriſtians confeſs their Faith in the ſame Terms, and this language ſo pervadeth the New Teſtament, that it muſt be acknowledged, that *Servetus* made a true obſervation, when he ſaid, *Nullum locum ex tota ſcriptura poſſe dari, ubi Chriſtus abſolute ſine reſpectu ad humanam naturam nominetur Filius Dei*; which rude Expreſſions mean, *that throughout the whole Bible the Name of the Son of God is not attributed to an Abſtract Son.*

V. In thoſe times when the New Teſtament was written, this Name *The Son of God* was amongſt both *Jews* and Chriſtians an honourary Name ſignificative of the Perſon of the Meſſiah; ſo that in thoſe times both among *Jews* and Chriſtians to be the Perſon of the Son of God, was as ſuch to be the Perſon of the Meſſiah, and to be the Perſon of the Meſſiah, was as ſuch to be the Perſon of the Son of God. And the reaſon hereof is apparent; for to be *the Imperial Son of God*, is as ſuch to be the Perſon of *Meſſiah the Prince*; and to be the Perſon of *Meſſiah the Prince*, is as ſuch to be the Imperial Son of God. This Name therefore, The Son of God, never did amongſt Holy People in thoſe times ſignify any Abſtract Son of God, never was apply'd to any ſuch Hypoſtaſis, nor was any ſuch Hypoſtaſis (any ſuch Abſtract Eſſence as a Platonic *Mens* or a Scholaſtic *Verbum*) ever thought of in thoſe times amongſt Holy People; for altho' there might be amongſt the *Jews* in thoſe times ſome ſuch Philoſophic-Paganizers as *Philo*, yet their Romantick Platonic Scholaſticiſm was nothing to the People, nothing to the Holy People (that were altogether Aliens from it) their notion of the Perſon of Chriſt was the Son of God, and their notion of the Son of God was the Perſon of Chriſt, and they knew no other: Of this we have great aſſurance both from the whole New Teſtament, and from thoſe Expoſitors of it, that are the beſt learned in matters of *Jewiſh* Learning (x) υἱὸς ὑψίςȣ κληθήσεται, *id eſt, Meſſias vocabitur. Nam Meſſias & Filius Dei convertuntur.* He ſhall be called the Son of the Higheſt, that is, he ſhall be called the Meſſias (the Lord Meſſias;) *for the Meſſias and the Son of God are terms convertible*, Joh. 9. 35. *Doſt thou believe on the Son of God?* The Senſe is (y) *Doſt thou plase thy truſt on the Meſſias, as all the Jews profeſs themſelves to do? The Son of God was the uſual cognomen of the Meſſiah.* (z) *Theſe names Chriſt and the Son of God are Names that are uſed one inſtead of the other.* The Perſon of Chriſt therefore is the Son of God, but no otherwiſe than as the Perſon of Chriſt, he hath no other Deity, no other Sonſhip unto God (and conſequently there is no Abſtract Son:) but as the Perſon of Chriſt he is upon ſeveral accounts the Son of God, *Pſal.* 2. 6. and 89. 26, 27. *Joh.* 10. 36. *Act.* 13. 33. *Heb.* 1. 3, 4, 5.

VI. The Son of God and the Humane Nature are now inſeparable, whence a reaſonable Man will infer, that the Humane Nature is one of his Eſſentialities, and that an Abſtract Son of God never was, becauſe ſuch a Son never will, never can be (a) *à fine rerum contemplemur initia, ſemper enim ſimilis eſt finis initiis.* From the end of things we may learn their beginnings, that the Humane Nature was from the beginning inſeparable from the Son of God, and one of his Eſſentialities; for he can never ceaſe to be the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. But an Abſtract Son of God is ſuppoſed to have exiſted from Eternity without being the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus; from whence it followeth, that he is not eſſentially ſuch, and that he may exiſt to Eternity (compleat in his Hypoſtaſis and Deity) and yet may ceaſe to be the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. (b) *Natura hominis aſſumpta nihil ad eſſentiam perſonæ Verbi attinet*, the aſſumed Humane Nature is not at all eſſential to the Perſon of the *Verbum*, *it is but adventitious and as an Accident to a Subſtance.* The Scholaſtic *Verbum* therefore that aſſumed *noſtrum hominem nempe Jeſum Chriſtum* (c) as *Athanaſius* ſaith, may diſcard and annihilate this *Athanaſian Chriſtum Jeſum*, and yet this Abſtract Son will remain untouch'd and intire; which diſſolution of the Perſon of the Meſſias (ſuppoſing an Abſtract Son) is not in the Nature of the thing impoſſible, unreaſonable or incommodious: and the Philoſopher *Amelius* ſuppoſeth, that this

(x) *Lightfoot Hor. in Luk.* 1. 32.

(y) *Fiduciam tuam collocas in Meſſiam, quod omnes Judæi facere ſe profitentur. Filius Dei cognomen erat uſitatum Meſſiæ.* Grot. Not. in Joh. 9. 35.

(z) *Appellationes Chriſti & Filii Dei inter ſe permutantur.* Limborch. Amica Collat. cum erudit. Jud. c. 9. p. 218.

(a) *Origen* περὶ ἀρχ. *l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(b) *Petav.* T. 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 15. *S.* 14.

(c) *Ibid. l.* 11. *c.* 8. *S.* 12.

is the ſenſe of St. *John*'s Goſpel; *that the Logos* (or Platonic Mens) *hath the Rank and Dignity of a principle, that by him all things were made, and what was made in him was life,* (d) *then did he ſlide into Bodies, and having put on Fleſh did appear a Man, at the ſame time ſhewing the Majeſty of his Nature; and after a diſſolution of his compages he was deify'd again and became a* (naked) *Deity again as at firſt, before he deſcended into Body and Fleſh and Man.* Before we appeal to this Philoſopher (as learned Men do) touching the ſenſe of the Proem of S. *John*'s Goſpel, we ought to be better ſatisfied touching his faculty of interpreting Scripture, who pretendeth to find in it a diſſolution of Chriſt's Divinity from his Humanity, (e) which is an Opinion falſly imputed to *Origen*, but was really the Opinion of *Marcellus Ancyranus*, who ſuppoſed, that after the Day of Judgment the Humanity of Chriſt ſhould be quite diſcarded and annihilated. Agreeably whereto both the Fathers and Modern Divines Diſcourſe (f) that the (Abſtract) Son of God to appear unto Men, and to have dealings with them in the Old Teſtament times, did often aſſume an Angelical Nature, which he preſently diſmiſs'd. And who can read theſe Diſcourſes without ſuſpecting, that at the long-run he may deal in the ſame manner with his Humane Nature? It will be ſaid, that the Caſe is different, that the Angelical Nature was not in perſonal Union with him, as the Humane Nature is, that in his Incarnation the two Natures were joyn'd ἀδιαιρέτως, *undividedly*, ἀχωρίστως, *inſeparably*, as the Councils ſay, (g) and Divines ſay, *Quod ſemel accepit, nunquam dimiſit.* But theſe Allegations are far from being ſatisfactory to them that inquire into the Cauſes of Things. For if the Humane Nature is altogether preter-eſſential and adventitious to the Son of God, it may be ſafely diſcarded; and if it was but aſſum'd for an Oeconomy, is it not reaſonable that it ſhould be laid aſide, when that Oeconomy is over? The Humane Nature therefore muſt be ſuppoſed eſſential to the Son of God, and hereafter it will be proved ſo to be.

VII. The true Son of God is not a Scholaſtical and unpopular, but a *popular kind of Son*, that belongeth to popular Nobility-Learning, is ſuited to the Affairs, Underſtandings and Affections of the People (mankind in general) who are concern'd, to be the Religioniſts of the Son of God. And he is neceſſarily *a popular Imperial kind of Son*, to whom the People owe their Subjection and Obedience, and therefore is *the Chriſtian Imperial Son*, which is the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. But the Abſtract Son of God is altogether unpopular, and belongeth only to Platonic or Ariſtotelic Metaphyſicks. For thus the eternal *Logos* (Word or Son of God) is defin'd by the Maſters of this Scholaſtick Theology. (h) *Id ipſum quod apud Græcos vox iſta* (Logos) *ſignificat, notio & ἔννοια.* The very thing which the Greek Word *Logos* ſignifieth, *A Notion or Conception of the Mind*, which is ſuppoſed to be generated from Eternity by the eternal Father. If the Apoſtles had gone about the World and alarm'd all Mankind under pain of damnation, to believe in ſuch a *mental conceptional Word* or Metaphyſical Son of God, as this Scholaſtic Theology repreſenteth to us, what an extravagant preachment had Chriſtianity been? Not but that this mental-conceptional Word and Metaphyſical Son is a great reality; for the *Alexandrian Cyril* ſaith, (i) ἔστι τοίνυν ἐξ ΟΝΤΟΣ Ο ΩΝ, καὶ ὄνομα τοῦτο προσφυέστατον αὐτῷ, *He is ex Ente Ens* (the Metaphyſical *Ens* from the Metaphyſical *Ens*) *and this is his moſt agreeable Name.* So *J. Mart.* in divers places (k) maketh the following Words to be the Words of the *Logos* or Abſtract Son of God, ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, *I am Ens* (or he that is) *the God of Abraham.* Entity is ſuppoſed to be the moſt agreeable notice of this Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God, as the Platonic Logos is of definitive Notion τὸ ὄν, *the Metaphyſical Ens.* True Chriſtians may through miſtake have a great Zeal for this Scholaſtic Theology, which pretendeth to do great Honour to their Saviour: but their Zeal will be cool'd, if they conſider, that this eternal Scholaſtic Son of God is an Abſtract from the Perſon of their Saviour, an Idea peculiar to Scholaſticiſm, and nothing better than a branch of Metaphyſical *Ontology*, neither ſuited to their Underſtandings nor to their Holy Affections. And they ought the more to alienate themſelves from this Scholaſtic Abſtract Son, becauſe in the Primitive times this imaginary Son undermin'd and in great degree deſtroy'd the true and popular-imperial Son of God. For *Origen* ſaith of his Platonic Logos or Abſtract Son of God (l) ὅπερ ἦν ὁ κυρίως υἱὸς Θεοῦ, *This was the Son of God properly ſo called.* But is not God always called in the New Teſtament *the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt?* And is it not the Perſon of Chriſt, that as ſuch is always called *The Son of God and the Son of the Bleſſed? Origen* proceedeth to ſay of his Platonic Logos (m) *that the Son of God ſaid in Jeſus, I am the way and the truth and the life.* But was it alſo this ſuppoſed Son of God, that ſaid in Jeſus *Not my Will be done?* With *Origen* the Man Chriſt Jeſus was of little value, the object of his Eſteem was his Platonic Logos or Abſtract Son, whom he ſuppoſeth to be in the Man Chriſt Jeſus, ὁ βλεπόμενος ἄνθρωπος, *the Man that was ſeen*, as he ſtyleth him. But Eccleſiaſtic Writers (who yet ſuppoſe an Abſtract Son) diſlike this *Origenic* Language. They obſerve (n) that God ſaid of the complex Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, *This is my Son*, but did not ſay, *In hoc eſt Filius meus.* And that our Saviour to ſhew the Son of God to him that had been blind, did not point at τὸν ἔσω κεκρυμμένον, *an internally hidden Son of God*, but told him, This is the Son of God, which thou haſt ſeen, and that talketh with thee, which are no contemptible Arguments againſt the Hypotheſis of an Abſtract Son.

VIII. The Abſtract Son of God as being of a kind and quality Metaphyſical and Scholaſtical is both *unpopular* and *unholy.* For that Abſtract Son of God which we meet with in the beſt learned of the Fathers, is no other than the Platonic *Mens or Logos*, which is a *Philoſophic-pagan* kind of Son; who as he is of Kind and Quality Pagan, is profane and unholy; and as he is of Kind and Quality Philoſophic (Scholaſtical and Metaphyſical) is both *unpopular* and *unholy.* Such a Son of God (an abſtract Platonic Metaphyſical *Ens*) is quite alien from Religion and Sanctity (which is the holy-popular Buſineſs) and is meerly a buſineſs of Platonic mundane Metaphyſicks. The *Verbum* or *Logos* of the School-Divines is of the ſame Character; for the Maſters of this Theology ſay of it (o) *Hoc ipſum diſ-*

(d) Εἶτα εἰς τὰ σώματα πίπτειν, καὶ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον φαντάζεσθαι ἄνθρωπον, μετὰ τοῦ τηνικαῦτα δεικνύειν τῆς φύσεως τὸ μεγαλεῖον. Ἀμέλει καὶ ἀναλυθέντα πάλιν ἀποθεῶσθαι καὶ Θεὸν εἶναι, οἷος ἦν πρὸ τοῦ εἰς τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατενεχθῆναι. *S. Cyr. C. Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 283.

(e) *Petav. ſup. l.* 12. *c.* 8.

(f) *Mr. Thornd. Epil. B.* 2. *c.* 13. *Dr. Teniſon of Idol. p.* 318.

(g) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 16. *S.* 11, 14. & *l.* 12. *c.* 18. *S.* 2.

(h) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 16. *c.* 1. *S.* 8.

(i) *C. Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 266.

(k) *P.* 95, 96, 28

(l) *C. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 52.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 2. *p.* 62.

(n) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 7. *c.* 1. *S.* 6, & *l.* 8. *c.* 12. *S.* 20.

(o) *Idem de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 3. *S.* 1.

diſcernere pauci poſſunt, nec niſi Philoſophia paululum eruditi. And is this a Son of God, that muſt be preach'd and propounded to the Faith of all Mankind, although incapable of underſtanding the Metaphyſicks of an Abſtract Son of God, which the *Alexandrian Cyril* calleth (*p*) τὰ ἰσχνὰ καὶ ἀπόρρητα τῶν θεωρημάτων, *the ſubtilties and recondites of the Theorems?* More than ordinary Scholaſtic ſubtilty is requiſite, to form a Notion or Idea of an Abſtract Son of God: but they that believe ſuch a Son, muſt have a Notion of what he is (elſe he is to them a *Non Ens*, not ſo much as *an Ens rationis)* and this is the Notion of him moſt in vogue amongſt Scholaſtic Divines (*q*) *Fetus eſt mentis intelligentiæque quod producitur, ac verbum mentis, It is the Product and Child of Mind and Intellection, and the Word of the Mind.* Such an Abſtract kind of Son is manifeſtly both *unpopular* and *unholy:* but the true Son of God is neceſſarily and demonſtratively an *holy popular* kind of Son. For he is a Saint of God-kind of Son, and a Saint of God-kind of imperial Son (elſe he is not the Son of God in the ſenſe of the ſcience of Sanctity) therefore he is the Chriſtian and Chriſtian-imperial kind of Son (elſe he is not the Son of God in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity) therefore he is no other than the Perſon of the Chriſtian Meſſiah. He is the Iſſue of paternal Sanctity, one of the divine Family of the Saints and Sons of God (ſo as to be Lord of the Family) he is neceſſarily the Son and Heir of the Kingdom of God (which is the Kingdom of Saints and Sons, the holy-popular Family and Empire) he is neceſſarily the Prince and King of Saints; therefore he is neceſſarily *The moſt holy*, *The holy one of God*, which is the ſcriptural Definition of the Perſon of the Meſſiah. The Son of God is neceſſarily the God-kind of Son, the God-kind of imperial Son; therefore he is neceſſarily the holy-popular kind of imperial Son, the King of God's People; and what is the Definition of the Perſon of the Meſſiah but (the King of the Jews, the King of Iſrael) the King of God's People? It is not imaginable therefore, that there ſhould be any ſuch Son of God as a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son: nor ought we that are the holy People, to conteſt for ſuch a Son of God, which is altogether alien from the God-kind (the holy and Saint of God-kind) of things not of kin to the Chriſtian-ſaving Son of God (of kind and quality a Godleſs Son of God) to us altogether heterogeneous, foreign and exotick. Nor are we concern'd to regard any ſuch Abſtract Son, that is not the Perſon of Chriſt our only Saviour.

IX. The Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God is a perſon of no Religion *objectively* or *ſubjectively*; which ſheweth, that there never was any ſuch Son of God. For neither the Light of Nature nor of Scripture enjoineth any religious Worſhip or God-Service of an Abſtract Son of God. The Platonic *Mens* or *Logos* is an Heathen Deity, but peculiar to the Schools of Philoſophers and metaphyſical Theamatiſts: It was no Deity of the Pagans religious Worſhip, nor was ſuch a Deity known in their Religion. In the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament there are numerous and illuſtrious Types and Predictions of King *Meſſiah*, whom all Nations are concern'd to ſerve and obey: but of the God-Service of an Abſtract Son of God there is *nec vola nec veſtigium* in all the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament. And is it poſſible, that this ſuppoſed Son of God ſhould have the Government of the World, and (*r*) a Kingdom-eſtate of Sovereignty and Rule throughout the Old Teſtament-times; and that no body ſhould be concern'd, to be his Subject or Servant, ſo as to do him the religious Homage and Service? It is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Holy Spirit exiſted in thoſe times, when no religious Worſhip was done to him, none was demanded for him: But the Caſe is different; for the Holy Spirit is not *majeſtas imperii* a divine imperial Head (an Eſtate of Kingdom and Empire) as the Son of God neceſſarily is, and the Abſtract Son of God is ſuppoſed to have been all along the Old Teſtament-times. Yet in the Scriptures of thoſe Times there is not ſo much as any mention of ſuch a Son of God, nor any Precept, Hiſtory, or Example of his God-Service and Worſhip: But *The Son* in the Old Teſtament ſignifieth, as in the New Teſtament, *The complex Perſon of the Meſſiah.* Throughout the whole New Teſtament, not any Son of God but only the complex Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, is propounded to us, to be believ'd in, lov'd, obey'd, and invocated. The Chriſtian Witneſſes do not atteſt the Exiſtence of any Abſtract Son of God. No Man becometh a Chriſtian Religioniſt (nor of any other Religion) by believing in an Abſtract Son of God. The *Platoniſts* Belief of ſuch a Son neither made them Chriſtian nor Heathen Religioniſts; which is a plain Indication, that this Scholaſtic Son is of no concern at all in Religion, but is only a buſineſs of Scholaſtic Metaphyſicks; and that the Schools may keep their Trinity to themſelves (both the *Platonic* of *T'agathon*, *Nous*, *Pſyche*, and the *Ariſtotelic* of *Mens*, *Notitia*, *Amor)* Religioniſts have no concern in it.

The Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God is a Perſon of no Religion *ſubjectively*, whereby he is oppoſite to the true Son of God, the moſt vertuous and pious, and the moſt dutiful Son to a Father that ever was or can be. His Piety was celebrated by the *Arians*, thereby to befriend their own *Dogma*; and one of them did it at ſuch a rate, as to make it a matter of Raillery. For when *Eudoxius* had gain'd the See of *Conſtantinople*, and was ſeated in the Throne of it, the firſt Sentence that he pronounc'd, was (*s*) ὁ πατὴρ ἀσεβὴς· ὁ υἱὸς εὐσεβὴς, *the Father is impious, the Son is pious.* And when a Tumult aroſe upon it, *Be not troubled* (ſaid he) *at what I have ſpoken; for the Father is* ἀσεβὴς *impious* (not pious) *becauſe he worſhippeth none: but the Son is pious, becauſe he worſhippeth the Father. Which Apology ceas'd the Tumult, but excited a loud Laughter.* At this ludicrous rate a pretended Chriſtian Prelate celebrated the Piety of the Son of God, ſo as to betray his own Impiety; from which alſo his *Dogma* is not excuſable, becauſe it ſinketh God's only Son below the Dignity of the Son of God. A Crime which *Euſebius* is guilty of, when he deſcribeth the Son of God as (*t*) τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς καθοσιωμένος τιμῇ, *devoted* (in the *Arian* ſenſe) *to the Worſhip of the Father.* But this is ſomewhat a nice Point, and it is eaſie to fall into Miſtake on both hands, as will appear by conſidering the different Opinions of the Fathers touching this Queſtion, (*u*) *Whether Chriſt was properly a Servant to his Father?* Some of them affirm it, and others deny it: Both Parties are miſtaken, and yet both ſay true. For he was a Servant to his Father, yet ſo as to be *the imperial Son of God*, and therefore ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe he was a Servant; and ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe he was not a Servant. *Iſa.* 49. 6. and 52. 13. and 53. 11. *Zech.* 3. 8. *Matt.* 12. 18. *Heb.*

(p) c. *Jul.* l. 8. p. 270.

(q) *Petav.* de Trin. l. 2. c. 11. §. 7.

(r) *Petav.* T. 4. l. 12. c. 18. S. 1.

(s) *Socrat.* *Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 43.

(t) *Valeſ.* *Annot.* in *Euſeb.*

(u) *Petav.* T. 4. l. 7. c. 7, 8, 9.

Heb. 1. 7, 14. and 3. 5, 6. It cannot be ſuppoſ'd, that the Son of God is oblig'd to practiſe all the ſame Duties of Piety to his Father in a ſtate of *Exaltation* as in a ſtate of *Humiliation*; but from Duty of Piety to his Father he can never be diſcharg'd: and although we may not ſubject him to the Father in the *Arian* Notion (as a Creature ſubordinate and heterouſian) yet on the other hand it is incompetible to his eſſential condition of Sonſhip, to be equaliz'd with God at ſo extravagant a rate, as the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, which aſſerteth, (*w*) *That God was not to him a God, as he was God* (the Abſtract Son) *nor was he obedient to God the Father, nor inferiour as God* (as the Abſtract Son) *but only as Man*; (*x*) *Patri non eſt auctoritas, the Father hath no Authority over him, nor greater Dignity or Excellency:* (*y*) *In the Trinity there is* ἄκρα ἰσότης, *equality to the heighth, nothing is prepos'd and ſub-pos'd.* In *Gerſon*'s days, (z) as *Eraſmus* relateth, a Divine was compell'd to make a publick Recantation, for ſaying that *God the Father was the Cauſe of the Son and Spirit.* A virtuous Son will imitate a divine Father; it is his Duty and Character: but we are told (*a*) that this Saying ὁ υἱὸς τὸν πατέρα μιμεῖται (the Son imitateth the Father) is *hæretica locutio, quæ in Arianis damnata*, an heretical Speech which was condemn'd in the *Arians.* What then doth our Saviour mean, when he ſaith *John* 5. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do: for whatſoever things he doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe?* To look on what the Father doeth, and to do likewiſe, plainly ſignifieth an Imitation of him: No, ſaith *Cæſarius* (*b*) *when the Son formed* Adam *and* Eve, *he did not look upon another Man and Woman made by the Father*; ἀλλ' αὐθέντης ὑπάρχων δημιουργὸς καὶ αὐτεξούσιος, τῶν ὅλων θεὸς, *but being a ſelf-authoritative* Demiurgus, *and ſelf-imperial, and God of the Univerſe, he was ſufficient to make all things.* Such an Abſtract Son of God can be of no Religion (ſubjectively) nor can ſuch irreligious Attributions to him be excus'd from being Blaſphemy againſt God. The only Apology that can be made for the Authors of them is, to ſay, that ſeveral of them contradict themſelves, and ſometimes ſpeak better things. For in this Scholaſtic Theology God with reſpect to the Abſtract Son is ſaid to have (*c*) the paternal ἀξίωμα *dignity and a paternal Authority* (*d*) *to be the Cauſe and Author of the Son*, and he is ſaid to be *Patri ſubjectus ut auctori* ſubject to the *Father* as the Author of him, yet not in the *Arian* ſenſe. But in another Mood theſe Scholaſtic Divines will not have him ſuppos'd (*e*) *ſubject to the Father as he is God* (or the Abſtract Son) *in any ſenſe*, ſo extremely ſelf-contradictious are the Maſters of this Theology to themſelves: And beſides many great Contradictions ariſe in it from the ſeveral diſagreeing Parties of it (Platonic, Ariſtotelic, ancient and modern of both ſorts) yet all of them muſt agree in ſuppoſing, that the Abſtract Son cannot be of any Piety or Religion. For the Platonic Logos is not ſuppos'd to practice any Duties of Piety towards *T' Agathon* (although he looketh thitherward) and the Ariſtotelian Scholiaſticks agree, that the Abſtract Son in the Trinity is not of any diſtinct Underſtanding, Will, and Power of Action from the other divine Perſons; which implieth, that he cannot be of any diſtinct Practice or practical Virtue. And ſome (*f*) modern Ariſtotelian Scholiaſticks do not allow him to be a Perſon in the vulgar ſenſe, as if Metaphyſicks and Theology differ'd from the vulgar in their Notion of a Perſon. Yet one that is of Underſtanding, Will, and Affection, is neceſſarily a Perſon in the vulgar familiar ſenſe, which is the ſenſe of the Scriptures.

X. The Scholiaſtic Abſtract Son of God doth not as ſuch conſtitute any other than a Philoſophic Pagan-kind of Trinity, it doth not conſtitute the Chriſtian Trinity (as the true and genuine Son of God doth;) for that is not the Chriſtian Trinity, wherein the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus is wanting. The Chriſtian Trinity is the ſummary of the Chriſtian Faith, and the moſt ancient Chriſtian Creed. It is characteriſtical, and diſtinctive of our Profeſſion; the Belief and Profeſſion of it conſtituteth us Chriſtian Believers and Religioniſts. The Son in this Trinity is the complex Perſon of Chriſt; God is conſidered in it under this formal Notion as *the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* The Holy Ghoſt is conſider'd in it as the Chriſtian Paraclete and the Spirit of Chriſt. And ſuch a Trinity is of kind and quality Chriſtian: But if we remove out of the Chriſtian Trinity the complex Perſon of Chriſt, ſubſtituting in his ſtead a ſcholaſtic Abſtract Son of God, and ſuppoſe the other Perſons of the Trinity to be homogeneous; we ſhall then have ſuch a Trinity, wherein there is nothing of Chriſtianity, which is not characteriſtic or diſtinctive of our Profeſſion, nor doth the Belief of it make a Chriſtian. A Trinity of Archical Hypoſtaſes and demiurgic Principles, like thoſe of the Platonic Triad, that are αἱ ἀρχαὶ τῶν ὄντων καὶ τῶν ὅλων αἰτίαι, *the archical and active Principles of the Univerſe of Beings*, which is of kind and quality no better than Philoſophic-pagan, which properly belongeth to the Schools of Philoſophers and Metaphyſicians, not properly to the Faith of God's Believers; nor is it the Myſtery of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs. Such a Trinity is that in *Greg. Thaumat.* Confeſſion of Faith, which he is ſaid to have received by Revelation from the Bleſſed Virgin and S. *John*, and which was preſerv'd and taught in his Church a long time after. (*g*) *There is nothing created or ſervient in the Trinity, nor any thing ſuperinductitious, as if it did not exiſt before, but was afterwards brought in.* If the Son in our Trinity is the Scholaſtic Abſtract Son, if the complex Perſon of Chriſt is not ſuperinductitious into it, it is not the Chriſtian Trinity.

CHAP.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 9. *c.* 6. *S.* 2. & *c.* 9. *S.* 3.

(x) *Idem de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 5. *S.* 12. & *c.* 4. *S.* 13.

(y) *Photius col.* 604, 605. 1542.

(z) *Ep.* 682

(a) *Heinſ. Ariſtarch. c.* 21.

(b) *Dial.* 3. *ad Inter.* 30.

(c) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 5.

(e) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 7. *S.* 6. & *de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 3. *S.* 14.

(f) *Mr. Nye Doctr. of the Trin. p.* 53. 154.

(g) Οὔτε κτιστόν τι, ἢ δοῦλον ἐν τῇ τριάδι, οὔτε ἐπείσακτον, ὡς πρότερον μὲν οὐχ ὑπάρχον, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπεισελθόν. Dr. *Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p.* 151, 152. *Ed. an.* 1703.

CHAP. II.

1. A ſecond ſort of Arguments to prove the truth of our Idea from the Birth-nobilitation of our Saviour. 2. His Birth-nobilitation, his true Generation and Nativity, is that which is related in Scripture. 3. This is ſupplanted and deſtroy'd by an unſcriptural Generation and Nativity. 4. His Birth-nobilitation true Generation and Nativity is Popular. 5. It is Holy-popular. 6. His Birth-nobilitation from his Holy-popular Generation. 7. His Birth-nobilitation is deſtroy'd by the Scholaſtic Incarnation.

I. A Second ſort of Arguments to prove the Truth of our Idea, we will deduce from *the Birth-nobilitation of the Son of God*; for his Name ſpeaketh him of *Birth-nobilitation* and of the higheſt poſſible or conceivable (*h*) *as being one that ſprang from the ſupernal root naturally conſerving in himſelf his paternal Nobility. S. Hilary* calleth his Divinity (*i*) *naturam generoſitatis*, which denoteth his native Nobleneſs, and that native Nobleneſs is the Birth-nobilitation of a Divine kind of Imperial Son of God, who therefore hath εὐγενείας τὸ ἄκρον, *the fulleſt height of Birth-nobilitation*. From the Exiſtence of a ſupreme God the Heathens inferr'd (k) *that there are native generated Gods, which derive their origin from the princely Fountain of things*. If theſe Heathen Gods had been really the Sons of God, (*l*) *if* Faunus *and* Picus *had been of the Divine Race, Family and Potentacy*, (divini generis & poteſtatis) *if they are the Regal or Royal Progeny, and deſcendents from the Head of all Principality* (ſi ſint progenies regia & principali oriuntur è capite) *Arnobius* would have attributed to them (ab rerum capite deſcendentium honeſtamenta natalium) *a Birth-illuſtriouſneſs and Nobilitation, as deriving their Deſcent and Pedigree from the Imperial Head of all*. So in the Greek and Latin Poets the Deſcendents from Kings are (*m*) repreſented as highly Noble and Illuſtrious; (ſo amongſt the *Iſraelites* 2 King. 9. 34.) Kings themſelves, and other eminent Perſons are counted natively and by kind noble at a great rate, as being Deſcendents from *Jove* the ſupreme King. Antiquity called Kings the Sons of *Jove*, Ἐκ Διὸς βασιλῆες. *Heſiod.* —— *Mi genus ab Jove ſummo*, ſaith *Æneas* in *Virgil*, who often repeateth *Nate Dea*, becauſe the Deſcendents from the Gods were reputed Noble, as θεῖος ſignifyeth both Divine and Noble. So the *Chineſe* ennoble their Emperour (*n*) by ſtyling him *Thienzu, Son of Heaven*: Kings have their chief ennoblement from their Relation to God and Heaven, and Cognation to them alſo (to be Son-in-Law to a King, 1 *Sam.* 18. 18.) is an ennoblement of Condition. But to be the Son and Heir of the King and of the Crown-Dignity (*o*) a *novus Conſtantinus*, is the great Eſtate of Nobilitation (becauſe in the main Subject-tranſcendent;) and ſometimes ſuch a Phyſiognomy, ſuch great Endowments, Heroic Qualities and Atchievements accompany theſe great Eſtates of Nobilitation, that the Poets ſay, *Credo equidem (nec vana fides) genus eſſe deorum.* Agreeably to this uſual Senſe of Language our Saviour's Name is expreſſive of his high Birth-nobilitation in general, and it affordeth alſo theſe four particular Notices thereof. (1.) His name denoteth, that he is *natively* of *Regial* and *Imperial* Conditon; for ſuch he is as the Son of God (who is the great King) and ſuch he is as the Son of *David*; of which Name *Clemens* miſtakingly ſaith, (*p*) *that many called our Saviour the Son of* David, *but few knew him to be the Son of God*. For the *Jews* in our Saviour's time did call the Meſſiah the Son of God, and *the Son of David* is a Periphraſis of the Meſſiah, it is one of his Names and a name of great Nobilitation. Chriſt in the Book of the *Apocalypſe* (wherein he is repreſented in all his Royal Habiliments, with all his Royal Power and Majeſty and Royal Titles) is intituled *The Lion of the Tribe of* Judah, *The Root of David*, Apoc. 5. 5. He is the Lion of the Tribe of *Judah* as being the warlike victorious Prince of the warlike victorious Tribe; And the Root of *David* by a Metonymy denoteth him a Branch ſpringing from that Root (the Branch and Offspring of *David*, Apoc. 22. 16.) which ſpeaketh him *the Stem of Royalty, Splendor and Proweſs* (the Regial Son) who according to the Prediction of the ſecond Pſalm hath Right to the Kingdoms of the Earth. Agreeably whereto he intituleth himſelf *The bright Morning Star*, Apoc. 22. 16. to ſignify, that he is the magnificent Imperial Eſtate riſing in the Eaſt; as the King of *Babylon* for the ſame reaſon is intituled *Lucifer Son of the Morning*, Iſa. 14. 12. And in this political Senſe (in all reaſon) the Morning-Star muſt be underſtood in our Saviour's Promiſe, *Apoc.* 2. 28. as the Context ſheweth. *He that overcometh and keepeth my Works unto the end, to him will I give Power over the Nations; and he ſhall Rule them with a Rod of Iron (as the Veſſels of a Potter ſhall they be broken to pieces) even as I received of my Father. And I will give him the Morning-Star.* The meaning of the Promiſe is, that he who overcometh ſhall be in Conſort with Chriſt *a Phoſphorus and Son of the Morning*, (in ſuch ſenſe he ſhall have the Morning-Star) having the brightneſs of Rule and Empire: Rule and Empire is that which our Saviour was born to. (2.) His Name denoteth, that he is natively *of Divine, Regial and Imperial Condition*, by Birth a Divine Imperial Lord, Prince and Potentate. His Birth-nobilitation may be illuſtrated from the Sons and Heirs in Families (for the Heir is Lord of all, *Gal.* 4. 1.) but the chief illuſtration of it is from the *Hebrew* Tongue, which denoteth the Qualities that Perſons are of by ſtyling them the Sons thereof (as the Sons of Wiſdom, the Sons of Darkneſs) or the Sons of thoſe that are of thoſe Qualities; as *the Sons of the Wiſe, the Sons of the Mighty*. So in other Languages, the Sons of *Mars*, the Sons of *Æſculapius*; and in *Martinius*'s *Bellum Tartaricum* we read of the great River of *Kiang*, which is ſaid to be ſo vaſt, *that it is worthy to be called the Son of the Sea*. In which Denominations our intent is to ſignify a reſemblance between the Progeny and the Parent, and that the Progeny are Deſcendents from the Parents, ſo as to be of the Quality which we mention. For this Name *The Sons of Nobles* ſignifieth the Deſcendents from Nobles, ſo as to be *the Nobles the Sons*. This Name *The Sons of the Mighty* (or the Sons of the Gods) ſignifieth the Deſcendents (from the Gods ſo as to be the Gods the Sons, or) the

(h) Ὁ τ̃ ἄνωθεν ῥίζης ἐκπεφυκὼς τ̃ πατρῴαν ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ φυσικῶς ἀποσώζων εὐφυΐαν, *S. Cyr. in Johan.* p. 161.

(i) *In Pſal.* 2.

(k) *Arnob. adv. Gent.* l. 1. p. 16.

(l) *Ibid.* l. 5. p. 156. & l. 3. p. 101. & l. 2. p. 76.

(m) *Tiraquelle de Nobil.* p. 25, 182, 539.

(n) *Semedo Hiſt. of Chin. par.* 1. c. 22.

(o) *Selden Titles*, p. 51.

(p) *Strom.* l. 6. p. m. 490.

Eccleſ. 10. 17.

Pſal. 29. 1. *and* 89. 6.

Deſcendents from the Mighty ſo as to be *the Mighty the Sons*. This Name *The Sons of Men* ſignifieth the Deſcendents from Men, ſo as to be *the Men the Sons*, Mic. 5. 7. and this Name *The King's Son* ſignifieth the Deſcendent from the King, ſo as to be *the King the Son*, Pſalm 72. 1. So the Son of the Stranger is the Stranger the Son. The Sons of the Prophets are the Prophets the Sons. Agreeably whereto this Name The Son of God (which importeth the fulleſt height of Birth-nobilitation) in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament muſt by perfect Analogy be underſtood, to denote and ſignify *The Lord the Son*, or *God the Son*; and ſuch is the Imperial Son of God (contradiſtinct to the Creature-Party) the Creature-tranſcendent Lord the Son. Mr. *Selden* ſaith, that as this Name The Son of Man amongſt the *Jews* ſignifieth Man: ſo by this Name *The Son of God* they ought to underſtand the true God himſelf. *(q)* But this great Hebrician very much miſtaketh his Analogy; (*Filius Dei* can never ſignify *ipſum verum Deum*) he ought to have made his Compariſon thus; as *Filius hominis* amongſt the *Hebrews* ſignifieth *Man the Son*, ſo *Filius Dei* ſignifieth *God the Son*. And is not this manifeſtly the reaſon, why the *Muhammedans* will not allow our Saviour to be called *The Son of God*, becauſe in Oriental Language this Name denoteth and ſignifieth God the Son? So our Saviour's profeſſing himſelf The Son of God was underſtood by the *Jews* to ſignifie (according to their *Hebrew* way of Expreſſion) that he was God the Son; for they charged him with Blaſphemy, and that *he made himſelf God and equal with God*, becauſe he ſaid, *I am the Son of God*, Joh. 5. 18. and 10. 33, 36. Our Saviour did in this their Senſe profeſs himſelf the Son of God, *Mar.* 14. 62. and this they look'd upon as an horrendous Crime, and accuſed him as *reus affectatæ divinitatis*, for which cauſe they put him to Death. *Joh.* 19. 7. *We have a Law and by our Law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf* (no leſs than God the Son) *the Son of God*. He is ſo the Lord's anointed, as to be *the Lord anointed*; and he is ſo *the Word of God*, as to be *God the Word*. For ſo his Name importeth *Apoc.* 19. 19. where Chriſt is repreſented as the great Evangelical Warriour, a mighty Hero, Commander and Conqueror (riding on a white Horſe, attended by the Armies of Heaven on white Horſes, having Eyes as a Flame of Fire, on his Head many Crowns, cloathed in Purple, ſmiting the Nations with a Sword, ruling them with a Rod of Iron, and having on his Thigh and Veſture this name written King of Kings and Lord of Lords) and in this Viſion of his Divine Majeſty and Glory, Prowess and Puiſſance, his Name is ſaid to be called *The Word of God*. Throughout the Viſion Chriſt is repreſented as a Divine Imperial Potentate; therefore his Name in this Viſion *The Word of God* muſt be ſuppoſed to be of this meaning *God the Word*, as he is expreſly ſtyl'd *John* 1. 1. And if this Name *The Word of God* is of this meaning *God the Word*, in all reaſon this Name *The Son of God* muſt be ſuppoſed, to be of this meaning *God the Son*. He is ſo *The Word of God*, as to be *God the Word*; and by parity of Reaſon he is ſo *The Son of God* as to be *God the Son*, which (rightly underſtood) is the ſame Name with *Deus natus & genitus*, and this Name muſt be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe with *Rex natus & genitus*, which ſignifieth the Imperial Son, who is *King the Son*; in which ſenſe an ancient Writer might truly ſay of God (r) ὡς βασιλεὺς υἱὸν βασιλέα ἔπεμψεν, *as a King he ſent the Son-King*. The Son-King may ſignify the Regial Son meerly ſuch, and it may ſignifie the Regial Son in actual and plenary poſſeſſion of the Kingdom-eſtate; and of the ſame variety of acceptation is this Name *God the Son*, or *the Lord the Son*. Of this Name our bleſſed Saviour was the firſt Day of his Nativity, which an Angel thus proclaim'd, *Luk.* 2. 11. *Unto you is born this Day in the City of* David *a Saviour, which is Chriſt the Lord*. If I had underſtood Chriſtianity ſo well as now I do, and had heard theſe Words of the Angel, I ſhould have thus argu'd with myſelf touching Chriſt's Divinity: *To be the Saviour-prince and the Lord Meſſiah in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity is a Divine Imperial Condition; therefore the Child that is now born, is by Birth-nobilitation of Divine Imperial Rank and Party; for otherwiſe he would be immenſly inept for, and immenſly remote and diſtant from the Divine Imperial Condition of the Saviour-King and the Lord Meſſiah.* This deduction being plain and obvious, as well as undoubtedly certain, it is marvellous that the followers of *Socinus* (who are very converſant in the Scriptures) ſhould miſs of it. But a principal Reaſon is, they are ſtrangers to Nobility-learning (as their Writings ſhew) which is the cauſe of their mean and dull and pedantick Notions in matters of Theology. What generous Mind would not argue with *Clemens* (s) τίς δ' ἂν τοῦδε εὐγενέστερος, ᾧ μόνος πατὴρ ὁ Θεός; *who can be of greater Birth-nobilitation than he who had God for his generative Father and God only?* (3.) His Name denoteth, that *he is one of the Divine-kind of Birth, ſo as to be natively of Divine Imperial Condition; that he is natively one of the Divine Family of the Saints and Sons of God, ſo as to be Lord of the Family, the Lord the Son, the Creature-tranſcendent Lord the Son.* He can be no other than natively a Saint who is ſuch a Son, that is natively the King of Saints. If he is natively *the holy Child Jeſus*, he muſt be natively an holy Child, and therefore a Child of God. He that is natively the Son of God according to Chriſtianity, is natively a Son of God according to Chriſtianity; and therefore he is natively a Saint of God-kind of regial Son, natively the regial Son contradiſtinct to the Creature-party of Saints and regenerate Sons of God, but ſo as to be one of their Divine Family, *that are Children of God, and therefore Heirs of God and Joint-Heirs with Chriſt, who is the firſt-born among many brethren. For both he that ſanctifieth, and they that are ſanctified, are all of one; for which cauſe he is not aſhamed to call them Brethren. A Son he is over his own Houſe*, ſo that himſelf is one of that Divine Houſhold, as he ſaith to *Mary Magdalene*. *Go to my Brethren and ſay unto them, I aſcend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.* (4.) His Name is of a meaning extremely diſſonant from the Appellation of *Adam*, of whom in a Genealogy the Evangeliſt ſaith, *who was the Son of God*. A learned Expoſitor will not allow (*t*) that the Evangeliſt calleth *Adam* the Son of God, accounting it incongruous and nothing to his purpoſe; but we will ſuppoſe him to be ſo called, as being ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe the Son of God, his natural Life was immediately from him, and ſo his Appellation muſt be underſtood *Phyſiologically*, to ſignfy only, that that Phyſiological kind of Origination and Derivation which is in mundane Nature, in the caſe of *Adam* was immediately from God. For *Adam* is not called the Son of God with any reſpect to Religion, nor to denote any Religious Nobilitation, no nor any Nobilitation at all. His Appellation doth not ſo much as denote that he was born of God, as the meaneſt Regenerate Chriſtian is; and if he had been ſo born, yet his Sonſhip to God would not have raiſed him higher than the δουλικὴ φύσις, *the ſubject and ſervient Nature and Condition*, whereas the ſecond *Adam* is no lower than the δεσποτικὴ or βασιλὶς φύσις, *the dominant, regial and imperial Nature and Condition.* Such was his Birth-nobilitation in his *Bethlehemitical* Nativity, as the holy Text plainly and uncontrolably ſignifieth *Luke* 2. 11. *Unto you is born this Day Chriſt the Lord.* Whence it is manifeſt, that our Saviour in his *Bethlehemitical* Nativity was of this Birth-nobilitation; he was born *the King of the* Jews, *Chriſt the Lord, the Lord Chriſt*, which is the ſame Name with the *Lord the Son* and *the Son of God*. Other Texts alſo alike plain and uncontrolable aſſure us, that our Saviour by his Humane-divine Generation and in and by his *Bethlehemitical* Nativity was of this Birth-nobilitation, he was born *the Son of God*. Luk. 1. 31, 32. *Thou ſhalt conceive in thy Womb and bring forth a Son, and ſhalt call his Name Jeſus. He ſhall be great and ſhall be called* (that is, he ſhall be) *the Son of the Higheſt.* Luk. 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee: and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee: therefore alſo that holy thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called* (ſhall be) *the Son of God.* Theſe Texts ſpeak as plainly as the Tongue of Man can ſpeak touching the Birth-nobilitation of our Saviour (they need no Interpreter but an unprejudic'd Mind) whence it is much, that Men of Learning ſhould *pro* and *con* Diſcourſe ſo blindly as they do, touching the Humane-Divine Generation and Birth-nobilitation of their Saviour. *Epiſcopius* ſaith, (u) *This Eminency (to be formed by the Power of God in the Womb) is proper to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, to which the like never was, nor ever will be.* I reply (ſaith a learned Man) *that is not true. For what? The Fleſh of Chriſt was conceived and formed in the Womb of the Virgin by Divine Power and Virtue without a Father. And was not the firſt Man formed by the Hands of God himſelf without Father and Mother? Is he not therefore expreſly called the Son of God?* Luke 3. 38. *In this therefore that Eminency of Chriſt Jeſus doth not conſiſt, whence he is called the only or only begotten Son. Yea according to this reaſon, the firſt Adam will be in ſome ſort ſuperiour to the ſecond; for this was made by God without Father only, that was made without Father and Mother.* Thus the Humane-Divine Generation of our Saviour and his Birth-nobilitation is diſparag'd and degraded below a comparative triviality (the forming the terreſtrial *Adam*) againſt the plain nature of things, againſt the plain uncontrolable ſenſe of Scripture, and againſt the ſenſe of thoſe many miraculous Phænomena that attended our Saviour's Generation and Nativity, and loudly proclaim it to be the greateſt thing that ever was, namely the Embaſſy of an Archangel, the miraculous birth of the Baptiſt, the Propheſies of Holy People, their many Divine Hymns of Praiſe, the Angel's publication of tydings of great Joy to all People, the celebration of the Angelical Hoſt, the appearance of the Glory of the Lord and of a new Star in Heaven. What mean all theſe great things, if our Saviour's Generation and Nativity was nothing but the forming in the Womb and bringing forth the Body of a Man, that ſo a great Perſon (the Abſtract Son) might become mean, an infirm Man. If an humane King had generated of the Bleſſed Virgin his primogenit Son, this primogenit Son by virtue of this Generation would have been *an Humane Imperial Son.* By parity of Reaſon therefore, If the Divine King doth generate of the Bleſſed Virgin his primogenit Son, this primogenit Son by virtue of this Generation is neceſſarily *The Divine Imperial Son*, and conſequently *The Lord the Son.* If this is not demonſtrative reaſoning, there is no ſuch thing as demonſtration. But becauſe the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth (w) that our Saviour's Humane-Divine Generation and conſequent Nativity was (not his Birth-nobilitation, but) his *Humiliation*, that thereby he was only born the Son of Man, and that his Birth-nobilitation as the Son of God is the Nativity of an Abſtract Son, we will therefore confront theſe Generations and Nativities by deducing certain Inferences from the Account which we have given of our Saviour's Birth-nobilitation.

(q) *Bar Enoſh filius hominis millies in Ebræorum Commentariis pro homine occurrit: ita Filius Dei etiam in eorum ore pro ipſo vero Deo.* De J. Nat. & Gent. l. 2. c. 12.

(r) J. Mar. E. ad Diognet. p. 498.

(s) Strom. l. 1. p. m. 269.

Rom. 8. 17, 29. Heb. 2. 11. and 3. 6. Joh. 20. 17.

Luk. 3. 38.

(t) Lightfoot Hor. in Luk. 3. 23.

II. The Birth-nobilitation of the Son of God truly ſuch and his true Generation and Nativity is plainly related in Holy Scripture: but the Scholaſtic Generation and Nativity of an Abſtract Son of God is not ſo much as mention'd in Holy Scripture; for of an Abſtract Son and of the twofold or threefold Nativity which the Scholaſtic Theology attributeth to the Son of God, there is not one Syllable in all the Book of God. Some of the ancient Scholaſtic Divines (as *Athanaſius*) are ſaid (x) *to attribute a threefold Nativity to the Son. The firſt is that whereby the Logos was from the Father and with the Father from Eternity, as being the Coeternal Progeny of the Eternal paternal Mind. This only is the true and properly called Nativity of the* Logos, *as he is the Logos of God and God. Becauſe of this Nativity he is called the only begotten, as* Athanaſius *ſuppoſeth, who alſo ſuppoſeth, that only upon account of it the Son is of or from the Father, that is, deriv'd his Origine from him. Another Nativity is that condeſcenſion of the Logos, which is his going forth from the Father to the creating the Univerſe; with reſpect whereto he is called the Firſt-born of every Creature, as* Athanaſius *ſuppoſeth. His third Nativity was, when this Divine Perſon went forth from the Boſom and Glory of the Father into the Womb of the moſt Holy Virgin, and ſo the Word was made Fleſh and he was born Man.* But moſt uſually the Scholaſtic Theology doth not attribute to the Son theſe three Nativities, but two of them only; deriving the complex Perſon of our Saviour from two ſeveral Generations and Nativities, the one productive of him as God (the Son) the other as Creature only and as Man. And theſe two Generations and Nativities we are injoyn'd to believe as a principal Article of Faith, both *Catholicks* and *Arians* thunder out Anathema's againſt all that do not acknowledge it. The Senſe of the Catholicks is, (y) *According to the Catholick Faith and the Declarations of Scripture it is certain, that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath two Nativities, one of his Father without time, the other of his Mother without knowing Man; and that he hath two ſeveral Natures from theſe two Nativities, that of God, as he is begotten of the Father without time; and that of Man, as he is born of his Mother. In the firſt ſpiritual Nativity he had no Mother, in the ſecond carnal Nativity no Father. The Word was ſingle according to his Divine, Paternal and Sempiternal Generation, but became double* (or complex) *by his Maternal, Temporal and Corporeal Generation.* But if we inquire of Scholaſtic Divines, In what part of the Bible are theſe two Generations and Nativities diſtinguiſh'd? In what place of Scripture are they mention'd? Where are they attributed to the Son of God? And touching the firſt of them (the Generation and Nativity of an Abſtract Son of God) what Holy Writer hath aſſerted it, or made any mention of it? They have no places of Scripture to produce, but ſuch as a wiſe Man would be aſhamed to alledge. And for my own part I am infinitely aſham'd, to read the Fathers of the Chriſtian Church building an Article of Faith upon moſt intoleraby inept Applications of places of Scripture: Such as *Ante Luciferum genui te. Eructavit Cormeum Sermonem optimum. Dominus condidit me initium viarum. Ante omnes colles generavit me.* (z) *Priuſquam te formarem in utero, novi te. Beatus qui erat, antequam naſceretur.* One Evangeliſt is thought to aſſert this Article, when he ſaith, *The Word was made* (or became) *Fleſh.* But doth this Evangeliſt ever diſtinguiſh theſe two Generations and Nativities? Doth he ever make the leaſt mention of the Generation and Nativity of an Abſtract Son? And is there no way for the Word to become Fleſh but by a Generation and Nativity? Shall we then (being deſtitute of expreſs places of Scripture) build this Article upon Humane Argumentations? That is a very lubricous Foundation, and all our Arguments will not ſignify ſo much as this one Prejudice againſt them; *If it had been an Article of Faith, it would have been expreſly mention'd in Scripture.* Or ſhall we ſymbolize with the Church of *Rome*, and build this Article upon Eccleſiaſtical Tradition, whereby alone the Scholaſtic Trinity can be proved? That is a more lubricous foundation than Humane Argumentation. If the Fathers and Councils had only propoſed and recommended this Article as an Hypotheſis, whereby the certain Articles of the Chriſtian Faith (the Trinity, the Deity and Incarnation of the Meſſiah) may be explain'd, this had been becoming Fathers of the Chriſtian Church. But to make Articles of Faith of our own Heads, to inſert them into Creeds, to hereticate and damn all that do not acknowledge them, is unchriſtian overdoing at a great rate, irreconcileable with Wiſdom, Juſtice and Charity, extremely injurious to the Underſtandings of Men, to the Rights of Chriſtians, and moſt of all to the Religion of Chriſtianity.

(u) *Hæc* ἐξοχὴ (*nempe quâ Dei virtute in utero formatus erat*) *propria eſt Jeſu Chriſto homini, cui nulla alia aut ſimilis fuit aut erit unquam. Regero, illud verum non eſſe. Quid enim? Caro Chriſti divinâ potentiâ ac virtute ſine patre in utero virginis concepta ac formata fuit. Annon primus homo ſine patre & matre Dei ipſius manibus formatus fuit? Annon idcirco Dei filius diſertè dicitur?* Luk 3. 38. *Non ergo in hoc ſita eſt* ἐξοχὴ *illa Jeſu Chriſti, quâ Filius unicus ſive unigenitus appellatur: Imo hâc ratione primus Adam ſecundo quadammodo ſuperior erit; cùm ille à Deo ſine patre & matre, hic ſine patre tantum factus fuerit.* Dr. Bull c. Zuicker. p 37.

(w) Petav. T. 4. l. 7. c. 6. S. 4.

(x) *Athanaſius triplicem Filio nativitatem manifeſtè tribuit. Prima eſt, qua ut,* ὁ λόγος *ab æterno ex patre & apud patrem extitit, utpote æternæ mentis paternæ coæterna progenies. Hæc ſola eſt* τοῦ λόγου *quâ Dei* λόγος *& Deus eſt, vera ac propriè dicta nativitas. Ob hanc nativitatem* τοῦ μονογενοῦς *in ſcripturis dici ipſum cenſuit Athanaſius: qui & eo ſolo nomine exiſtimavit Filium eſſe* ἐκ πατρὸς, *hoc eſt, ex patre initium & originem ſubſiſtentiæ ſuæ traxiſſe. Altera nativitas conſiſtit in illa* συγκαταβάσει, *quâ* ὁ λόγος *ex Deo patre exivit ad creationem Univerſi. Hujus reſpectu dici illum in ſcripturis omnis creaturæ primogenitum ſtatuit Athanaſius. Ex hac nativitate nihil acceſſit divinæ perſonæ* τοῦ λόγου· *utpote quæ, ut dicit, fuit potiùs ipſius demiſſio & Condeſcenſio. Tertia demum ejus nativitas cum eadem divina perſona è ſinu & gloria paterna exivit, ſeque intulit in uterum ſacratiſſimæ virginis, itaque verbum caro factum eſt, ſive natus eſt homo.* Dr. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p 232. Ed. an. 1703.

III. The true Birth-nobilitation of the Son of God and his Scriptural Generation and Nativity is almoſt totally ſupplanted and deſtroy'd by the unſcriptural Generation and Nativity of an Abſtract Son. For the Scholaſtic Divines have their Minds ſo prepoſſeſs'd and taken up with their Metaphyſical (or rather Hyper-Metaphyſical) Speculations of an Abſtract Son, and his unſcriptural Generation (which they voluminouſly and vehemently conteſt about) that ſome of them look ſo diſdainfully upon the Scriptural Generation and Nativity, that they will ſcarce allow it the Name of a Generation. (a) *There is a twofold Generation of him, the one into Divinity and Filiety, Recondite, Divine, and which may be underſtood by Faith: the other is to come into Fleſh, and to carry Fleſh. The former of theſe is the only Generation, a manifeſtation of Power from God: the latter is rather a taking Fleſh, not a Generation.* Ordinarily they give it the name of a Generation; but when they come to explain themſelves, they plainly tell us, that they do not mean by it any ſuch thing as a Generation. For they ſay (b) *One may become a proper natural Son two ways: the one by natural and formal Generation, whereby the Nature and Eſſence is communicated; the other is by a Subſtantive unition into the ſame Perſon.* (c) *The proceſſion of the Humane Nature of Chriſt is not by Generation, nor is it communicated from the Father, nor is Chriſt as Man generated by God, nor hath he the natural ſimilitude or image of God, which the Condition of a Son requireth. But being joined with the Word by a natural Conjunction, it hath by that unition the Divinity communicated to it, and the propriety of it or of the Word, which is Filiety. Conſider'd as Man therefore he is the natural and properly ſo called Son of God, not by Generation but Unition.* But was not the Bleſſed Virgin *with* Child (impregnated) by God or by the Holy Ghoſt? That which was conceived (*d*) or rather begotten in her, was it not of the Holy Ghoſt? In the Conception of our Saviour the Bleſſed Virgin was a Mother, and was not God a Father? Therefore this Conception was a Divine Generation. So three of the Evangeliſts certainly thought it, that look'd upon Chriſt Jeſus as the Son of God properly ſo called, yet knew nothing *of the eternal Generation of the Son*, as S. *Jerom* thinketh, and the thing is manifeſt from their Writings. So the Angel, *Luke* 1. 35. plainly affirmeth, that our Saviour is the Son of God becauſe of his miraculous Conception, and that this miraculous Conception was a Divine Generation, as it muſt be, if according to our (right) tranſlation it was the cauſe of our Lord's Sonſhip; for (as *Vaſquez* ſaith) *ratio filii propriè accepti & ratio geniti eadem eſt.* If it was not a generation, how abſurd is it to ſtyle the Bleſſed Virgin Θεοτόκος, *the Mother of God?* And how abſurdly do we talk of our Saviour's being begotten of a Virgin and born of a Woman, of his being of the Seed of *David*, of celebrating his Birth and Nativity, and of labouring for ſpiritual Regeneration conformable to his natural Generation? The Scholaſtic Theologers expreſly contradict the Scriptures, when they ſay (e) *that the Man aſſum'd out of* Mary (ſuch is their Language) *was not begotten by the Holy Ghoſt but created.* They expreſly contradict themſelves (which is no rarity with theſe Maſters) in denying his Conception to be a Generation; for ſometimes thus they argue, (f) *Seeing one and the ſame Chriſt is both God and Man, he muſt neceſſarily receive his being both by true Generation: therefore both as God and as Man he was truly generated.* In ſome degree they contradict their own Doctrine of the Incarnation; for they ſay (g) that the Holy Ghoſt deſcended upon the Bleſſed Virgin, repleniſh'd her Womb with a genital Vertue, framed our Saviour's Body, and conjoin'd it with the Logos; and by this Unition, not by Generation, Chriſt Jeſus as Man became the proper natural Son of God. They attribute the Incarnation therefore to the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt rather than to the Logos (as ſometimes they do, to avoid the force of ſcriptural Arguments:) but uſually they ſuppoſe it to be principally the Act of the Logos, and account it chiefly his Aſſumption of the humane Nature into perſonal Union with himſelf, ſo joyning the humane Nature with God. This Unition they ſubſtitute inſtead of Generation, ſuppoſing (what they cannot prove) that in the miraculous Conception the Communication of the divine Nature and Eſſence, and the Production of ſuch a Son who is the divine Image and Similitude, are both wanting.

(y) Petav. T. 4. l. 3. c. 6. & c. 7. S. 3. & c. 12. S. 8.

(z) *Lactan.* l. 4. c. 8.

(a) *Duplex generatio ejus: Una quidem in divinitatem & filietatem, occulta, divina, & quæ fide intelligatur: Alia autem in carnem venire, & ferre carnem. Illa quidem ſola generatio à Deo potentiæ manifeſtatio: Iſta autem acceptio magis carnis, non generatio.* Mar. Victorin. ap. Petav. de Trin. l. 1. c. 5. S. 8.

(b) Petav. T. 4. l. 16. c. 5. S. 9.

(c) *Humana Chriſti natura non illa quidem generatione procedit, vel communicatur à patre: neque Chriſtus qua homo eſt, Gignitur à Deo: neque Dei ſimilitudinem naturalem aut imaginem habet, quod filii conditio poſtulat, verùm naturali copulatione cum Verbo conjuncta, eadem unitione communicatam ſibi divinitatem obtinet, ac divinitatis modum, ſive proprietatem, quâ Verbum conſtat, quæ filietas dicitur. Ideò propriè dictus & naturalis eſt Dei Filius, non Generatione, ſed unitione, quatenus ut eſt homo ſpectatur.* Petav. ibid. l. 7. c. 5. S. 5. Vaſq. T. 1. in 3 par. Diſp. 89. c. 14. Gonet. Clyp. T. 12. Diſp. 23. Art. 2.

(d) *See Dr. Pearſon on this Art. his only Son* initio.

(e) Ap. Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 7. S. 18.

(f) *Cùm unus idemque Chriſtus ſit Deus & homo, neceſſe eſt, ut vera generatione utrumq; ut eſſet, acceperit. Verè igitur & quà Deus eſt, & quà homo eſt genitus.* Petv. T. 4. l. 5. c. 14. S. 9.

(g) *Id. de Trin. l. 3. c. 5. S. 5.*

IV. The Birth-nobilitation of the Son of God (truly ſuch) and conſequently his true Generation and Nativity, is *popular* (that which the People or the generality of Mankind mean by thoſe Names:) but the ſcholaſtic Generation of an Abſtract Son is altogether *ſcholaſtical* and *unpopular.* For becauſe the *Logos* (or Word) in the Evangeliſt is the ſame with the Son of God, and becauſe *ſaying* is the ſame thing with producing *a Word*, hence the ſcholaſtic Divines infer, that the generating the Abſtract Son of God is nothing elſe but an internal ſaying or mental conceiving. (h) *Generatio iſta nihil eſt aliud quàm locutio quædam ac dictio.* That Generation is nothing elſe but a (mental conceiving) certain internal ſaying and ſpeaking. (i) *Verbum enim ex mente ſuo quodammodo gignitur.* For a Word is in ſome ſort generated by or from the Mind. So *Clemens* (k) ſaith of the Abſtract Son of God, Λόγος υἱὸς νȣ̃ γνήσιος, *The Logos is the genuin Son of Mind.* And S. *Baſil* ſaith, that he hath the Name of *Logos* to ſhew, ὅτι ἐκ τȣ̃ νȣ̃ προῆλθε, *that his Proceſſion is by and from Mind and Intellect.* So according to S. *Auſtin*, *Quia verbum ideò filius.* The Son is therefore the Son, becauſe he is the mental conceptional Word. (l) As in us *Verbum mentis* (a Notion of the Mind) hath its origin from our Intelligence, and our Notion or Idea (*verbum mentis*) repreſenteth the Object (is the expreſs image and ſimilitude thereof) and conſequently if our Mind is the Object of her own Cogitation, her *Verbum mentis* is the Image of her ſelf: So God, who is ſaid to be Mind by knowing and contemplating himſelf, is ſuppos'd to generate his Notion or Idea, his *Verbum mentis*, (or mental conceptional Word) which *Verbum mentis* is ſuppos'd to be the Abſtract Son of God that is of eternal Generation. Such an Hypotheſis hath prevail'd in the Church for many Ages: but to me it ſeemeth marvellous to a Prodigy, that ever ſuch a Crotchet (which profaneth our Religion, and not only rendreth it unintelligible, but ridiculous) ſhould enter into any ſober Man's head. And it ſeemeth more marvellous, that in a learned Age, and at this time of the day (m) Men of excellent Learning and Underſtanding ſhould obtrude it upon, or at leaſt recommend it to the Church of God. (n) *Ita prorſus ſenſiſſe veteres pleroſque conſtat.* It is maniſeſt, that the Ancients for the moſt part were of this Opinion: *For they ſuppos'd that the Logos of God the Father was ſo called, not chiefly with reſpect to the external Speech of a Man, but to the interiour Notion and Conception of the Mind of Man, which is called by Philoſophers the mental conceptional Word* (ſed ad interiorem humani animi ἔννοιαν & notionem, quæ à philoſophis verbum mentis nominatur) *and that as that interiour Word neceſſarily floweth from the Mind of Man and co-exiſteth with it: ſo from God the Father, who is an eternal Mind, his mental-conceptional Word was neceſſarily generated, and is coeternal with him. And as a Man when he thinketh, findeth as it were another Perſon ſpeaking with him: ſo in God his mental conceptional Word is really another and a diſtinct Perſon from him.* Athenagoras *with moſt of the Ancients thought, that that divine Perſon which we call* the Logos and Son of God *was in an ineffable and altogether incomprehenſible manner from Eternity generated by the Mind and Cogitation of God the Father.* Et multa ſunt quæ ſuadent, hoc myſterium ab ipſis Apoſtolis traditum fuiſſe. *And there are many things which incline to believe, that this Myſtery was a Tradition from the Apoſtles themſelves.* But they that can diſcern good ſenſe, and that rightly reliſh the Excellency and Nobleneſs of Chriſtianity, will as ſoon believe all the Tales of the Legendaries, and the childiſh unwritten Traditions of the Church of *Rome*, as this Myſtery, that the ever bleſſed Son of God is a childiſh ſcholaſtic Crotchet; and that this Whim is a Tradition from the Apoſtles (who were no Scholaſticks) which confeſſeth, deſcribeth, and repreſenteth it ſelf as nothing better than ἔννοια *& notio quæ à Philoſophis verbum mentis nominatur*, that is, an idiotically philoſophical and unpopular Conceit. A meer Notion of ſpeculative Mind is by Scholaſticks counted a *ſubſtantive, living, and wiſe Child, a Son, a Son and Heir, the moſt virtuous Son, the Heir of a vaſt Eſtate, a Perſon, the moſt noble and holy Perſon, a Perſon of Religion and of the Godhead, the eternal almighty God; the meer Cogitation of cogitative Mind is counted a Perſon diſtinct from the cogitative Mind: Meer thinking is counted generating*; begetting a Child and Son, and ſuch a Son who is born of God (*Nil tam abſurdum eſt, quod non aliquis dixerit philoſophorum*;) and they that can underſtand Generation no better, have reaſon to ſay with the R. R. Expoſitor of our Articles, *What begetting ſignifieth, it is not poſſible for us to underſtand.* But we know very well what the generality of Mankind mean by begetting a Child, and by the Generation and Nativity of a Son. We know that the Scripture uſeth words in their ſenſe (and therefore ſpeaketh intelligibly) and we are ſure, that the true Son of God is not appropriate to Scholaſticks, but is accommodate to the People and their Concerns. We affirm therefore, that he is of no Affinity *with a notion of the Mind called by Philoſophers Verbum mentis* (which will be farther conſider'd

(h) Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 10. S. 6.

(i) Grot. de V. R. C. l. 6. c. 9.

(k) Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 14. S. 3, 4, 5.

(l) *Ibid. l. 3. c. 10. S. 2. l. 5. c. 8. S. 7. l. 6. c. 2.*

(m) *Dr. Bull, Mr. Nye.*

(n) *Dr. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p.* 206.

hereafter) but he muſt be denominated a popular kind of Son, of a popular Birth-nobilitation, Generation, and Nativity.

V. The Birth-nobilitation of the Son of God, and his true Generation and Nativity, is of kind and quality *holy-popular:* but the Generation and Nativity of the Abſtract Son of God is both *unholy* and *unpopular*; for it is not a buſineſs of *Sanctity*, but of *School Philoſophy*. That *generatio ex Deo* which is the reality of Regeneration, muſt be called *The holy and divine kind of Generation* (Generation being a vital Production, and this being the holy and divine kind of vital Production) whereby alone a Man becometh a Saint of God-kind of Son, a Son of God in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament (by being born and begotten of God in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament;) whence it appeareth, that the true Son of God cannot be of the ſcholaſtic kind of Generation and Nativity (but is neceſſarily of another kind of Generation and Nativity:) nor can an Abſtract ſcholaſtic Son (as being of a ſcholaſtic kind of Generation and Nativity) be the true Son of God. He is not a Son of the holy and divine kind of Generation (it is incompetible to him) and not being born of God in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament, he is not a Son of God in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament. Which is too apparent from the Accounts which the ancient Writers have given of his Generation, that are of ſuch a nature, as plainly demonſtrateth, that they did not receive their Notices from thoſe divine Teachers the holy Apoſtles, but that they are a fruit of their own miſunderſtanding Underſtanding. Some of them are not only of an unholy exotic nature, but are ſo rude and unlearned, that they are as remote from School-philoſophy as from Sanctity. For ſo (o) *Lactantius* conſidering the Abſtract Son of God under the Notion of *Sermo* and *Verbum*, he obſerveth, that in our Speech the Spirit of our Noſtrils is complicated with the Word of our Mouth, and therefore he ſuppoſeth, that God generated his Son *prolatione vocis ac ſpiritus*; and that he produc'd the Angels ſilently, but that the Son (whom he ſtileth *Vocalis ſpiritus) cum voce ac ſono ex ore Dei proceſſit*. This is a Notion ſuperlatively wild for a Chriſtian Apologiſt: but this was the Mode of the Chriſtian Apologiſts; inſtead of recommending to Men an holy Meſſiah and his divine Religion, to puzzle them with an Abſtract Son of God and his unholy Generation. So *Tertullian* ſhewing, that the Stoicks attribute the Formation of all things to a *Logos*, *Sermo*, *& Ratio artifex*, which they counted a Spirit, he ſubjoineth, *(p) To that Speech, Reaſon and Virtue, whereby we have ſaid, that God formed all things, we attribute the proper ſubſtance of a Spirit, which hath Speech to pronounce, Reaſon to diſpoſe, and Virtue to perfect things. This* (Sermo) *we have learn'd to have had a prolation by God, and that his Generation was by prolation.* (q) *God before the Conſtitution of the Univerſe was ſilently cogitating with himſelf and making an orderly diſpoſal of things; he had within himſelf and in his very Reaſon his* Sermo, *whereby the Univerſe of things was cogitated and ordered, and made in the Mind* (or as to the Reaſon) *of God. This cogitative Virtue and this diſpoſal of things in divine reaſon is called Wiſdom in Scripture* (Prov. 8.) *wherein the ſeveral Reaſons* (or Ideas) *of things were contained; for in Wiſdom by Cogitation and Diſpoſal God made all things, which Wiſdom* (the ſame with *Sermo) was not ſelf-originated, but ſo ſoon as it began to be agitated in the Reaſon of God for the diſpoſing of the Creation-works, then it had its Nativity and Making. So ſoon as he diſcern'd it neceſſary for the Creation-works, he preſently made it, and generated it in himſelf, according to that of* Solomon, *The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways towards his Works. Thus things were made* quantum in Dei ſenſu *as to their being made in the reaſon of God: but when God would give them their real Subſtances and Species, in the firſt place he brought forth the* Sermo, *that by him all things might be made.* Tunc igitur etiam ipſe Sermo ſpeciem & ornatum ſuum ſumit, ſonum & vocem, cùm dicit Deus fiat Lux. Hæc eſt nativitas perfecta Sermonis. *Then it was therefore that the* Sermo *had his Species and Adornation, his Sound and his Voice, when God ſaid, Let there be Light. This is the perfect Nativity of the* Sermo, *when he proceedeth from God, and by proceeding from him is generated and made his Son. Firſt, the* Sermo *is cogitatively made in the Name of Wiſdom; the Lord created me the beginning of his ways. Then he is generated effectively; when he prepared the Heavens, I was there.*

This is the Summary of *Tertullian*'s ſcholaſtic Speculation touching a twofold Generation of the Logos antecedent to the Creation (the one an imperfect, the other a perfect Generation and Nativity) which is diſſonant from that of ſome other Fathers (that will be cited preſently;) for they do not attribute any Nativity or Generation to the Logos antecedent to his Prolation, which was the beginning of the Creation. But this with *Tertullian* is the ſecond or perfect Nativity of the *Sermo*, when he had *his ſpecies and adornation, ſound and voice.* *(r) O rare ſpecies of the* Sermo, *O eximious adornation! But ſo this great man in the moſt auguſt myſtery of all other, was pleas'd with toying and following Nugacities.* Such is the *Epicriſis* which a learned ſcholaſtic Divine ſubjoineth to *Tertullian*'s Account of his ſcholaſtic abſtract Logos. And it had been happy if ſo far as is juſt, and as Chriſtianity oblig'd him, he had paſs'd the ſame Cenſure upon the whole of that ſcholaſtic Theology, wherewith his learned Book is repleniſh'd. I may not preſume to cenſure venerable Names, but I may propoſe ſome Interrogatories to learned and holy Men, and may be allow'd to ask them what they think touching the ſcholaſticizing theſe divine matters (which we have under conſideration) whether it is not *an unholy toying and trifling and following Nugacities?* What elſe is the *Dictio interna* both of ancient and modern times *(æternæ mentis coæterna progenies?)* What elſe is (s) *ἐξερευξάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὅλων eructavit verbum ante hæc univerſa?* What elſe are theſe miſerably perverted Places of Scripture, *Sermone ejus cœli confirmati ſunt, & ſpiritu oris ejus omnes vires eorum; Deus condidit me initium viarum in opera ſua, ante omnes colles generavit me, Ante Luciferum genui te?* What elſe is the Prolation of the *Sermo* at the beginning of the Creation, his Generation by Prolation, the Application of this famous Text thereto, *Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te*, and this unchriſtianiz'd Maxim (t) *Deus in principio fecit ſibi Filium*, God in the beginning of the Creation (by

(o) *L.* 4. *c.* 8.

(p) *Nos etiam ſermoni atque rationi itemq; virtuti per quæ omnia molitum Deum ediximus, propriam ſubſtantiam ſpiritum inſcribimus, cui & ſermo inſit pronuncianti, & ratio adſit diſponenti, & virtus præſit perficienti. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus & prolatione generatum.* Apol. c. 21.

(q) *Adv. Prax. c.* 5, 6, 7. *& v. adv. Hermog. c.* 18. 20.

(r) *Egregiam verò ſermonis ſpeciem, ornatum egregium! ſed ita nimirum viſum eſt viro magno, in auguſtiſſimo omnium myſterio quaſi ludere & nugas ſectari.* Dr. Bull ſupr. p. 241.

(s) *Tertull. ſupr.*

(t) *Ibid. & c. Marcion. l.* 2. *c.* 27.

(by the prolation of Speech) made to himſelf a Son? Of what other Character are theſe ancient Conceits touching an Abſtract *Logos* or *Sermo* and his *Generation* (u) *God having within him his internal Sermo, he generated him before the univerſe of Beings* (w) *when God would make thoſe things, which he had conſulted about, he generated the Sermo* (or Logos) *prolatitious, the firſt begotten of the whole Creation.* (x) *The Voice of God* (in *Adam*'s Paradiſe) *what is it elſe but the Sermo, who is alſo his Son?* What better can be thought of the account which *Athenagoras* giveth of the Abſtract Logos and his Generation? (y) *God from the beginning being an eternal Mind had the Logos in himſelf, being eternally Logical* (rational) *the Son of God is the Logos of God, which is the exemplar Cauſe and formative Energy of the Creation by prolation or iſſuing forth from the Father* (which iſſuing forth was the beginning of the Creation, he iſſued forth, to be the exemplar Cauſe and formative Energy, to ſeparate the craſs from the tenuious parts of the Matter) *ſo being the firſt thing generated by God.* So *Tatianus* calleth the Abſtract Son or Logos (z) ἔργον, πρωτότοκον τοῦ πατρὸς, *the primogenit Work of the Father, by which all things were made.* It is not eaſy to acquit ſuch Epithets of unholy nugacity, and is there not ſomething of it in this account, which *Tatianus* hath given of the Abſtract Logos of God? (a) *With him by his rational Virtue the Logos did ſubſiſt: but by the will of his ſingleneſs the Logos iſſued forth*; which iſſuing forth of the Abſtract Logos (at the beginning of the Creation) is the only Generation that theſe Fathers attribute to him; for they do not make *Tertullian*'s diſtinction of a twofold Generation and Nativity of the *Sermo*. Nor doth *J. Mart.* who intituleth the Abſtract Logos (b) πρῶτον γέννημα, *the firſt thing generated by God*, τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶν ὅλων κτισμάτων, *the primogenit Son of the Univerſe of Creatures*, and ſaith of him ὅτι ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ Θεὸς γεγέννηκε δύναμίν τινα ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικήν, *that firſt before all Creatures God generated out of himſelf a certain rational Power*, πρὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων, *abſolutely before all Creatures.* The Expreſſions ſound, as if the Logos was ſuppoſed to be generated only in the beginning of the Creation; but however that be, is there nothing of unholy nugacity in this Father's Deſcription of the Logos? Nor in his comparing the Production of the Logos (not to the Production of an internal Word of the Mind, as Scholaſtic Divines uſually do, but) to the Production of external Speech, thus expreſſing his Senſe (c) λόγον γάρ τινα προβάλλοντες λόγον γεννῶμεν, *we producing* (or pronouncing) *a Word generate a Word?* So *Tatianus* (who was his Scholar and ſpeaketh his Senſe) diſputeth, *that the Logos iſſuing from the Power of the Father did not leave him Alogos*, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ λαλῶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούετε, *for I my ſelf ſpeak and you hear, yet by the tranſition of Speech I am not* κενὸς λόγου *devoid of Logos.* Here is no ſuch thing as the generation of a Son (for the pronouncing a Word is no ſuch thing) nothing that looketh like Apoſtolical Tradition, or that ſavoureth of the ſanctity and divine Excellency of the Chriſtian Religion, which muſt neceſſarily ſuffer unſpeakable detriment in thoſe ancient times, when its Apologiſts inſtead of acquainting Men with the Chriſtian ſaving Son of God, made it their buſineſs to repreſent to them School-philoſophic Trifles. We may be allowed to aſk, if *Athanaſius*'s account of the generation of an Abſtract Son and Logos muſt not be thought of that number? (d) *If he is not the Word he is not the Son; for that which is out of the Father is the Son. And what is that which is out* (or forth) *of the Father, but a Word proceeding out of the Heart, and begotten out of the Womb?*

VI. *To be born Holy, of the Holy-kind, ſo as to be of the Holy Imperial degree, is the great Birth-nobilitation, which one that is born the Son of God cannot be without*; therefore the Scholaſtic Abſtract Son or *Sermo* is not one that is born the Son of God. For the Son of God being called *The Word*, the Scholaſtic Divines have defin'd him by that Name underſtood according to their School-Philoſophy. (e) *So that by the Son of God is underſtood the Word of the Father, which is, the ſame thing to the Father, as an internal Word of the Mind is to the Mind of Man.* An external Prolatitious Word is produc'd in time (whence it is moſt probable, that *J. Mart.* ſuppoſed his Logos to be produc'd in time) this Abſtract Logos therefore is defin'd *an internal mental Word* or Conception, (f) *the Progeny of the paternal Mind itſelf, born from it, remaining in it, and ſo intimately united to it, that it may be called the very Nous or Mind of the Father.* This Account of the Logos giveth us occaſion to propoſe another Interrogatory to Learned and Holy Men, Whether *Tertullian* hath not a great deal of Company in following unholy Nugacities? For they that give this account of the Logos, ſtrangely miſtake popular-religious Language touching popular-religious Matters, forget the Learning of Chriſtians and of the Scriptures, and by inſtituting us into the Learning of their Scholaſtic-metaphyſicks, ſubſtituted inſtead of truly Divine-learning, they inſtitute us to be Sophiſts not the Saints of God. Nor is their Logos of any better Character; for he is definitively nothing better than *Nous* the Progeny of *Nous* (ſpeculative Mind;) and therefore if he can be a Perſon, he can be no better than a Sophiſt an Alien from God and the Saints of God. He is *The Word*; and is he not therefore definitively *(The Word of God) The Holy Word; The God-kind of Word?* No, he is not of any ſuch Nobilitation, but is definitively a Word only (g) according to *S. Auſtin* (who ſpeaketh the too uſual Senſe of the Greek and Latin Fathers) *Quid eſt dico? Verbum profero. What is ſaying? The producing a Word.* He is *a Thought*; but if ſo, one would think, that he ſhould be definitively a noble-Thought, or a good and holy-Thought; but neither is this Nobilitation any ingredient of his definition, he is only the mental Production of a Thought. And if he is only a mental Production, his Production is not Generation

(for

(u) Ἔχων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις σπλάγχνοις ἐγέννησεν αὐτὸν πρὸ τῶν ὅλων. *Theophil. ad Autol.* p. 88.

(w) Ὁπότε δὲ ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἐβουλεύσατο, τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικὸν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως. *Ibid.* p. 100.

(x) Φωνὴ δὲ τί ἄλλο ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅς ἐστι καὶ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. *Ibid.*

(y) Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς νοῦς ἀΐδιος ὢν εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν· ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ, ἰδέα καὶ ἐνεργεία εἶναι προελθὼν, πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρί. P. 10.

(z) P. 145.

(a) Διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπέστησε. Θελήματι δὲ τῆς ἁπλότητος αὐτοῦ προπηδᾷ λόγος. *Ibid.*

(b) *Apol.* 2. p. 66. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 267, 284, 356, 357, 359.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 284.

(d) Καὶ εἰ μὴ λόγος, οὐδὲ υἱός· τὸ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς υἱός ἐστι. τί δὲ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, εἰ μὴ ὁ λόγος, ὁ ἐκ καρδίας προελθὼν, καὶ ἐκ γαστρὸς γεννηθείς. *Ap. Dr. Bull* p. 208.

(e) *Ita ut Filius Dei intelligatur*, ὁ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, *Verbum patris, quod nempe ſe habeat ad patrem, ut ad mentem humanam Verbum ejus interius.* Dr. Bull, p. 203.

(f) *Ipſius paternæ mentis progenies, ex ipſa nata, in eâque ipſâ manens, tam intimè ipſi unita, ut planè* ὁ νοῦς *ipſa mens patris appellari poſſit.* Ibid.

(g) *In Pſ* 44.

(for that is a vital Production) not an Holy vital Generation, not the holy kind of Generation; therefore he is not *one that is born the Son of God.* The Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God is not of ſo high a kind of Birth, and therefore is not by much of ſuch Birth-nobilitation as the meaneſt Regenerate Chriſtian, that is one of the Divine Family, which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *Eph.* 3. 15. *of whom* (God the Father) *the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is named.* (h) *The* Jews *count it a magnificent thing, that they can derive their Pedegree from* Judah, Reuben *and other Sons of* Jacob; *but we Regenerate Chriſtians reckon our Deſcent from God the Father.* So part of *S.Paul*'s Judaical Glories, *Phil.* 3. 5. was his being *of the Stock of Iſrael, of the Tribe of Benjamin* (not deſcended from the Handmaids as many of *Jacob*'s Children were) *an Hebrew of the Hebrews*; which denoteth the great antiquity of his Race, and that both his Parents were of *Abraham*'s Race, neither of them Aliens. The *Jews* were (*i*) τετυφωμένοι διὰ τὸ γένος, *puffed up becauſe of their Stock and Family:* but Regenerate Chriſtians reckon upon no Birth-nobilitation ſave only their Regeneration, nor upon any Family but the Divine Family, from the Father whereof (as he is ſuch) they derive their Deſcent and Pedigree, not as Men, but as Saints and Holy People the Sons of God. (*k*) *If any Man had bad Parents and yet is virtuous* (ſaith the Apoſtate *Julian*) τοῦτον δὲ νομιστέον πατέρα τὸν Δία καὶ φυτουργὸν, Jove *muſt be ſuppoſed to be his Father and the Founder of his Family, and he muſt be denominated* εὐγενὴς, *nobly born.* Such is the Birth-nobilitation of true Chriſtians, they are born of God and Heaven-born, and therefore nobly-born (for even Gold is reputed noble, (*l*) becauſe it is of a bright, fiery and radiant Colour, *tanquam Cælo derivatum*) and as they are Heaven-born, ſo together with the Inhabitants of Heaven they conſtitute one Family and Empire of Saints and Holy People, that are all of the ſame Birth-nobilitation, called by the counterfeit *Dionyſius* and his Scholiaſt ἡ Θεία Γένεσις, Θεογενεσία, *the Divine kind of Generation,* which is (*m*) τὸ ὑψηλὸν καὶ εὐγενὲς, *ſublime and real Birth-nobleneſs*, whereby Chriſtians become ſpiritual *Jews*, (*n*) which is τῆς ψυχῆς εὐγένεια, *the Birth-nobilitation of the Soul.* This Divine kind of Generation is the Son of God-kind of Generation, and therefore the true Son of God is neceſſarily of this Generation and Nativity and of the Birth-nobilitation which it importeth. So our Creed repreſenteth him as in his Humane-divine Generation born and begotten of God (in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity) born of the Holy Ghoſt (which importeth Sanctity) and therefore a Sanctity-kind of Son, not only as to the Body, but as to the Soul much more, according to that of *P. Chryſologus* (*o*) *Quod in ea natum eſt, de ſpiritu Sancto eſt, & quod de ſpiritu Sancto natum eſt, Spiritus eſt.* That which is born in her (the Bleſſed Virgin) *is of the Holy Ghoſt, and that which is born of the Holy Spirit is* (vital Sanctity or) *Spirit.* (*p*) *Nos etſi efficimur, non tamen ſancti naſcimur: Ille autem ſolus veraciter Sanctus natus eſt.* This difference there is between Chriſt and us; we are made Holy but are not born Holy: he alone is born truly Holy.

But if this is all the difference between Chriſt and us (his Generation and our Regeneration) as a Regenerate Chriſtian, although born of God, is yet no more than a Man (an Holy Man:) So Chriſt muſt be repreſented as no more than *Ille homo à ſpiritu Sancto conceptus, & natus ex B. Virgine*, That Man conceiv'd by the Holy Ghoſt and born of the Bleſſed Virgin. But they that thus deadly miſrepreſent him, ought to conſider, that *it is* one thing for an Imperial Eſtate of Religion and Sanctity, *to generate his mean Sons as to Religion and Sanctity, that are of the ſubject and ſervient Sanctity*; and another thing *to generate a Son to Sanctity Imperial, who is a filial Imperial Eſtate as to Religion and Sanctity and a Perſon of Sanctity Imperial.* When the Angel ſpeaketh to the Bleſſed Virgin of *that Holy thing which ſhould be born of her*, Luk. 1. 35. He muſt be underſtood to call her Child *The holy one of God*, Mar. 1. 24. Dan. 9. 25. Act. 2. 27. which Name denoteth him to be *Sanctus Sanctorum*, and therefore *a Saint of God-kind of Son, and a Saint of God-kind of Imperial Son or the Lord the Son.* Of this Birth-nobilitation our Saviour was as then generated and begotten of God, as the Angel's Words plainly ſignifie. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee, therefore alſo that Holy thing which ſhall be born of thee.* —— The Angel ſaith further, that the Child as then begotten of God ſhould be *The Son of God, The Son of the Higheſt.* And ſeeing his Words muſt be underſtood as μεγαλυσμοί, and in the ſenſe of Nobility-learning, they neceſſarily import, that this Holy Child was by Birth-nobilitation *that Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation* which theſe Names (The Son of God, The Son of the Higheſt) ſignify; and conſequently they import, that he was by Birth-nobilitation *The Regial or Imperial Son of God.* And that he was of this Birth-nobilitation, is manifeſt, becauſe he was born (by his *Bethlehemitical* Birth-nobilitation) *The Lord, Chriſt the Lord, Meſſiah the Prince, the King of Iſrael, The filial Imperial Eſtate of the Holy Empire.* And becauſe he was born to it, and was by birth no leſs than Son and Heir of the Kingdom of God, the Angel ſaith *Luk.* 1. 32, 33. *The Lord ſhall give unto him the Throne of his Father David* (the Antitype of it) *and he ſhall reign over the Houſe of* Jacob *for ever.* Theſe things being infinitely plain and certain, this Dogma of the Followers of *Socinus* as they underſtand it, *Chriſtum non natura, ſed Dei beneficio Deum eſſe* (that Chriſt is not God by Nature, but only by God's conferring ſuch a Dignity upon him) appeareth to be infinitely criminal. (*q*) And ſuch is the miſtake of *Maldonate* (which they glibly ſwallow) that *purus homo*, a meer Man might have been generated as our Saviour was: Which groſs Miſtake had it's Origine from his groſs Ignorance in Scripture Nobility-learning; for he doth not ſo much as know, that God muſt be contemplated as an Imperial Eſtate. Let us ſuppoſe the Papacy to be an immortal Imperial Eſtate, and that we hear *Roman* Catholicks talk of *the Son of the Papacy*, What reaſonable Man would not have this Idea of him, *That he is a* Roman *Catholick kind of Son*, but not a mean Son of the Subject ſervient Party, but by *Birth-nobilitation The Imperial Son*, one whom the *Roman* Catholicks count of this high Birth-nobilitation *The Son of their Holy Lord's Imperial Honour and Dignity, The Lord the Son?* Such is the Son of God, as S. *Auſtin* well deſcribeth him. (*r*) *It was requiſite that he ſhould baptize, who is the only Son of God, not an adopted Son. The only Son hath the Power, the adopted Sons the Miniſtry and Service.*

(h) *Magnificum putant Hebræi, quod genus ſuum referre poſſunt ad Judam, Reubenem & alios Jacobi filius; at nos Deo patre cenſemur.* Grot. Not. in loc.

(i) *J. Mar. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 229.

(k) *Seld. de Synedr. l.* 3. *c.* 9. *S.* 6.

(l) *Putear. pecun. ratio c.* 4.

(m) *S. Chryſoſt. in Joan Hom.* 10.

(n) *Orig. Philocal. l.* 16.

(o) *Ap. Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 18. *in fine.*

(p) *Maldonat. in Luk.* 1. 35.

(q) *Crell. de uno Deo l.* 1. *S.* 2. *c.* 295.

(r) *Oportebat ut ille baptizaret, qui eſt Filius Dei unicus non adoptatus. Adoptati Filii, Miniſtri ſunt Unici. Unicus habet poteſtatem, adoptati miniſterium.* Tr. 7. in Joan.

VII. The Scriptural Birth-nobilitation of our Saviour is deſtroy'd by that *Incarnation* of an Abſtract Son of God, which the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth. For his Scriptural Birth-nobilitation is his conjunct *Humane-divine Generation and Nativity*, which this Theology divideth into two ſeparate Generations and Nativities, one of which is infinitely remote and diſtant from his Scriptural Generation and Nativity, and this infinitely remote Generation and Nativity this Theology maketh to be his only Birth-nobilitation. For that Generation and Nativity is only his Birth-nobilitation, whereby he hath the Divinity (or Deity) of his Perſon, not that whereby he hath only the Humanity and Servility of his Perſon; but according to this Theology he hath the Divinity (or Deity) of his Perſon only from a Generation and Nativity infinitely antecedent to his conjunct Humane-divine Generation and Nativity, and thereby he hath only the Humanity and Servility of his Perſon. So this Theology underſtandeth that uſual Maxim, *Qui Deus eſt de patre, idem homo eſt de matre* (he that is God from his Father is Man from his Mother) which would be a very good Maxim, if it was underſtood of the conjunct Humane-divine Generation of our Saviour, and in all reaſon it ought to be ſo underſtood. For the Scholaſtic Theologers ſay of Chriſt (s) *Conſubſtantialis eſt Deo Patri & matri* (he is Conſubſtantial to God his Father and to his Mother) ſuch he is, and ſuch he ought to be, and accordingly his Scriptural Generation is a conjunct Humane-divine Generation. In which Generation the Bleſſed Virgin perform'd all the parts of a Mother, and God performed all the parts of a Father. And if God in this Generation perform'd all the parts of a Father, then the Holy Child had his Sonſhip unto God and his Birth-nobilitation of the Son of God by this conjunct Humane-divine Generation, as the Scripture expreſly declareth. This reaſoning the unprejudic'd will be apt to think ſufficiently Demonſtrative; but we ought to conſider further, that the Scholaſtic Divines find themſelves under a neceſſity of denying either the Temporal or Eternal Generation of our Saviour. For if he had his Divine Nature communicated to him from Eternity, he could not have it by a Temporal Generation; and conſequently that Temporal Generation ſo called could not be his Generation, nor could he have the Birth-nobilitation of his Perſon by it; it muſt be nothing more than (t) *an Oeconomy of Deſcent and Demiſſion, an Aſſumption, an Unition, an Inhumanation, an Incarnation, an Incorporation, an Exinanition, and a taking upon him the form of a Servant*, which is extremely oppoſite to his Birth-nobilitation.

Accordingly in this Theology theſe are the diſcriptive Notices of our Saviour's conjunct Humane-divine Generation. (u) *His Birth ſeemeth to be the greateſt and ſtrangeſt Paſſion of all, involving the loweſt Submiſſion and the deepeſt Suffering. —— For him to deſcend from Heaven the Region of Light and Bliſs into this gloomy and ſad World, for him in a manner to diveſt himſelf of Celeſtial Majeſty and to aſſume the Form of a Servant; for him to be incloſed in a Womb and to come out wailing thence; to ſuck at a Breaſt for Life, to be carried in Arms!* (w) In this ſtrain with great variety of Expreſſion the Scholaſtic Divines repreſent our Saviour's Humane-divine Generation and Nativity. If they had inſiſted upon the Poverty and Meanneſs of his Nativity in Worldly reſpects, their diſcriptive Notices of his Birth would have been an eminent branch of the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion: but to repreſent an Abſtract Son of God as undergoing a Generation for us (a Deſcent εἰς γένεσιν) to make his Generation and Nativity (in the whole of it) the moſt ſtupendious Self-humiliation and Self-abaſement, is plainly deſtructive to the Scriptural Birth-nobilitation of our Saviour. It involveth alſo a ſcurvy Reflection upon the Man Chriſt Jeſus, which appeareth in this Diſcourſe of an ancient Writer. (x) *This is the legitimate Son of God, who is of God himſelf, who aſſuming to himſelf that Holy Thing, and annexing to himſelf the Son of Man, by that connexion and permixtion maketh him the Son of God, which naturally he was not; ſo that this Name the Son of God is chiefly in the Spirit of the Lord which deſcended and came* (ut principalitas nominis filius Dei in ſpiritu ſit Domini, qui deſcendit & venit) *the Conſequence of that Name is in the Son of God and of Man, conſequentially this Son of Man is made the Son of God, but principally he is not ſo.* Although Chriſt as Man was manifeſtly begotten of God, yet according to this Author he was not as Man the legitimate Son of God, nor naturally and directly ſuch, but only conſequentially, as being united to an Abſtract Son of God. Agreeably to which Conceit he maketh a fond Interpretation of the Angel's Words (*therefore alſo that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God*) which is juſtly cenſur'd (y) and confuted by *Maldonate*. (z) In this Scholaſtic Theology there is a little Diſpute touching the Ennoblement of our Saviour's Humane Nature, whether we may not ſay, that it was deified by his Incarnation, and that Man was made God (as we may ſay, that God was made Man:) but this Diſpute we will overlook as not concerning the matter in hand. For we are not making inquiry touching the Ennoblement of his Humane Nature, but touching the Birth-nobilitation of his Perſon, as he is the Perſon of the Son of God.

(s) *Petav. T.4. l.3. p.243.*

(t) *Ibid. l.2. c.1.*

(u) *Dr. Barrow Ser. on Luk.* 2. 10.

(w) Dei *Filius pro noſtra ſalute hominis factus eſt Filius. Novem menſibus in utero ut naſcatur, expectat; faſtidia ſuſtinet cruentus egreditur, pannis involvitur, blanditiis delinitur, & ille pugillo mundum includens præſepis continetur anguſtiis.* Petav. ſupr. l. 5. c. 14. S. 10. *Chriſtus exinanitur in eo quod naſcitur, formam ſervi accipiendo.* Novatian. de Trin. c. 17.

(x) *Novatian. de Trin.* c. 19.

(y) *In Luk.* 1. 35.

(z) *Petav. T.4. l.4. c.9. & l.10. c.1.*

CHAP. III.

1. *A third ſort of Arguments to prove the truth of our Idea, deduc'd from our Saviour's generative Proprieties, which are thoſe of a proper natural Generation. The firſt generative Propriety.* 2. *The ſecond generative Propriety.* 3. *The third generative Propriety.* 4. *The fourth Generative Propriety.* 5. *The fifth generative Propriety.* 6. *The ſixth generative Propriety.* 7. *Miſtakes of the Scholaſtic Theology oppoſite to his proper natural Generation. The firſt Miſtake.* 8. *A ſecond Miſtake.* 9. *A third Miſtake.* 10. *A fourth Miſtake.* 11. *A fifth Miſtake.* 12. *A ſixth Miſtake.* 13. *A ſeventh Miſtake.* 14. *An eighth Miſtake.*

I. A Fourth ſort of Arguments to prove the truth of our Idea of the Son of God, we will deduce from *his generative Proprieties,* which conſtitute him *truly and naturally in the proper and plenary ſenſe The generated Son of God, and God in ſuch ſenſe his generative Father; ſo that this Generation, Filiation and Paternity, is the true and natural, the proper and the plenary.* The truth of theſe generative Properties is abundantly atteſted both by the Nature of things and the Teſtimony of Holy Scripture: but we will not content our ſelves barely to prove the truth of them, we will diſtinctly explicate thoſe ſeveral Divine Truths, which they involve, contain and imply, which are ſo many branches of the true Idea of the Son of God, and of this great Article *The Divinity of the Meſſiah.* The firſt of theſe *generative Proprieties* is, that he is *a God-kind or Saint of God-kind of Son.* For the proper natural Generation is a propagation of the Species, Children and Parents are ὁμογενεῖς, of the ſame ſpecific Nature, Men and other Animals generate their Kind, *homo ex homine, bos ex bove.* So all the Regenerate Children of God are of the God-kind, and the Son of God is neceſſarily ſo (as being begotten and born of God) and therefore as to his conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence, his true Idea muſt be underſtood by analogy to the Creature-Sons and Saints of God. For notwithſtanding the immenſe diſtance between him and them, yet the Son of God is neceſſarily a Son of God and a Saint of God, (as being an Holy one of God) of the God-kind or the Saint of God-kind (of that ſpecific Comprehenſion) of the Holy and Divine Kind and Family. And if he is neceſſarily of this Family as the *Son of it,* he is neceſſarily a ſort of Brother to all the holy Members of it, not as being the incarnate Son of God, but as being *The Son of God.* (*a*) The Scholaſtic Theology will by no means allow, that he was our Brother, or had any Brethren till his Incarnation. But it is not his being Incarnate that conſtituteth us his Brethren, but our being the Sons of God; and although he had never been Incarnate, yet ſuppoſing both himſelf and us, to have been always the Sons of God, we had been always his Brethren. For God is neceſſarily the Father of all his Saints and Sons, they have all one common Father, and conſequently they are Brethren, and in ſome ſort his Brethren, who muſt be number'd with the Sons of God as ſuch, though not with the Creature-Sons of God as ſuch. He muſt not be number'd with the Creature-Sons of God as ſuch, ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe he hath no Brethren: He muſt be number'd with the Sons of God as ſuch, ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe he hath many Brethren, *Matt.* 25. 40. This the ancient Writers of the Church plainly enough expreſs, when they ſay, *The Son of God became what we were, that we might become what he was.* (*b*) *He was made Man that he might make Men the Sons of God, regenerate them in Spirit, and might have adopted Brethren.*

II. A ſecond generative propriety of the Son of God is, *that the Divine Nature is communicated to him.* (*c*) For in proper natural Generation the ſame Nature (not a different) is communicated, deriv'd and propagated from Father to Son, and the Son is a Natural Fruit of the Father, as in the Goſpel (ſaith *Gr. Nyſſen*) *the Generation of Vipers* (the Sons of Vipers) *are Serpents not Sheep.* A Father uſually is not properly and naturally *generative,* nor is a Son truly and according to Nature a Son, unleſs he is of the ſame Logically ſpecific Nature with the Father, and the one be deriv'd from the other. A Son is not genuin but degenerate, if he is not of the ſame morally ſpecific Nature with the Father; the Birth is unnatural, as if a Lionneſs ſhould yean a Goat, or an Eagle bring forth a Sparrow. All vital Beings propagate their Kind (Brutes, Men, Devils,) ſo Chriſt propagateth the Chriſtian Kind, and God muſt be ſaid to propagate his Kind; for the Holy and Divine kind (in reſpect of Life and Practice) are of his Kind and Quality, and that vital Sanctity which is generated in his Children is the Holy and Divine kind of vital Nature, and the Divine Nature communicated to them. (*d*) *It is a participation of the Divine Nature, and according to this acceptation of Nature we are ſaid to be Regenerated into Sons of God.* In ſuch ſenſe the ſaying of *S. Hilary* muſt be underſtood, which is commonly underſtood in an ill ſenſe, and reckon'd one of his Errors (*e*) *We are the Sons of God, not only by Adoption, but Nature.* Chriſtians therefore in their Regeneration being made partakers of the Divine Nature, ſymbolize with Chriſt in his Humane-divine Generation. (*f*) *We are new born by the ſame Spirit by which Chriſt was born.* So *S. Auſtin* ſpeaking of Chriſt and a Chriſtian ſaith (*g*) *This is reborn by the very ſame Spirit, whereby he was born.* That ſpecific Nature which is conſtitutive, diſtinctive and denominative of a Son of God as ſuch, is neceſſarily the conſtitutive Nature of the Son of God. Agreeably whereunto *Origen* calleth Virtue (*h*) ὑιὸν Θεȣ̃ ὑπὸ τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃ γεγεννημένην, *The Son of God as being generated by God.* It is generated by God in and for the generation of his Sons, and neceſſarily conſtituteth both Chriſt and Chriſtians the Sons of God, but with great and many Differences. For that which in us is Regeneration, is in Chriſt Generation. To us it is adventitious (a Non-eſſenti-

ality)

(a) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *S.* 2. *T.* 4. *l.* 6 *c.* 6. *S.* 4. & *l.* 11. *c.* 9 *S.* 9. *S. Aug. de Fid.* & *Symb. c.* 4.

(b) *Factus eſt homo ut homines faceret filios Dei, ut regeneraret in ſpiritu, ut fratres haberet adoptatos.* Petav. T. 4. l. 2 c. 8. S. 2, 3.

(c) *Idem. de Trin. l.* 2. c. 10. *S.* 9. & *l.* 5. c. 7. *S.* 6, 7.

(d) *Eſt participatio divinæ naturæ & ſecundum acceptionem hujuſmodi naturæ dicimur regenerari in filios Dei.* Aquin. 12 Qu. 110. Art. 3.

(e) *Remarks relating to the ſtate of the Church of the 1ſt Cen. p.* 474.

(f) *Ex eodem ſpiritu renati ſumus, ex quo natus eſt Chriſtus.* Fulgent. de incarn. & grat. c. 20.

(g) *De ipſo ſpiritu & hic renatus, de quo eſt ille natus.* De prædeſt. ſanct. c. 15.

(h) *C. Cel. l.* 5. *p.* 258.

ality) to be the Sons of God, and ſo far divine Vertue is to us adventitious (non-eſſential:) but to the Perſon of Chriſt it is eſſential, to be a Son of God, and Divine Vertue is to him an eſſentiality, upon which account we muſt affirm, that in his Humane-divine Generation there was a communication of *the Divine Nature and Eſſence* (and alſo the production of ſuch a Son who is the divine Image and Similitude) although Scholaſtic Divines affirm the contrary.

III. A third generative Propriety is *Similitude of Nature*, whereby the Son is the live Image of the Father, as *Adam begat a Son in his own likeneſs, after his Image*, Gen. 5. 3. In proper natural Generation the Son is (i) *viventis vivens imago, & ex patre natus non habet naturæ diverſitatem*, a live-Image of one that hath life, and being born of him is without diverſity of Nature. The ſameneſs of Nature between Father and Son (according to *S. Auſtin*'s Interpretation) the Fathers and Councils ſignify by the Term ὁμοούσιος, *Conſubſtantial or Co-eſſential.* (k) *The Arians call us Homoouſians, becauſe in oppoſition to their Error we defend the Father and the Son, to be in the language of the* Greeks *Homoouſious*, id eſt unius ejuſdemque ſubſtantiæ, vel ut expreſſiùs dicamus Eſſentiæ (quæ οὐσία Græcè appellatur) quod planius dicitur unius ejuſdemque Naturæ, *that is, of one and the ſame Subſtance, or to ſpeak more clearly, Eſſence (which is called in Greek Uſia) which is more plainly thus expreſſed, of one and the ſame Nature.* Of this identity of Nature (or Conſubſtantiality) between Father and Son the generation of Animals and the propagation of Mankind is a viſible inſtance; for the Son of a Man is of the ſame Eſſence and Humane Nature with the Father, which implieth his ſimilitude of Nature, and that he is the live Image and Effigies of his Father. Theſe Phyſiological Notices are applicable to the generation of the Son of God, and the Fathers in their Scholaſtic Theology have apply'd them thereto: but touching their method of applying them, I muſt propoſe it to be conſider'd by all Learned and Holy Men, whether it is not moſt extremely irregular? For they never inquire, what *God of proper kind is, nor what is his ſpecific Determination, nor wherein the Image and Similitude of God* (according to Chriſtianity) *conſiſteth:* but according to the Scholaſtic way of contemplating God (by way of Eſſence and Attributes) they conceive in their Minds the Attributes of the Godhead (Eternity, univerſal Potentacy, Omniſcience, Omnipotence and ſuch more) and theſe they affix to a ſecond Perſon, whom they call the Son of God, (l) and having ſo done, they pronounce him the full and perfect Image and Similitude of God. But if we ſhould hear the Courtiers ſay, the King hath begotten a Son, that is his perfect Image and Similitude, what Interpretation ſhould we make of this Saying? Should we ſuppoſe that this is the primary ſenſe of it, that this generated Son is the perfect Image and Similitude of the King in reſpect of Government, the Powers and Prerogatives thereof? So to interpret it is not the regular Method of underſtanding the Image and Similitude of the King (it is a beginning at the wrong end:) and alike irregular is the Scholaſtic Theology in underſtanding the Image and Similitude of God. For this is plainly the due Order and Method of proceeding. A Man generateth the Mankind of Sons, which as ſuch are his Image and Similitude; and God generateth the God-kind of Sons, which as ſuch are his Image and Similitude. A Man generateth Sons, which reſemble him as to his Mankind of Excellence, Perfection and Nobilitation; and God generateth Sons which reſemble him as to his God-kind of Excellence, Perfection and Nobilitation. The Divine Nature (the conſtitutive vital Nature of the Sons of God and their Eſſence as ſuch) is the God-kind of Image and Similitude of God, and conſtituteth the Poſſeſſors of it his live-Images (m) according to the Chriſtian Religion. And (ſeeing the Image of God in Glory is but Grace conſummate) there is not any Image of God that is conſtitutive of a Saint and Son of God but this alone. (n) *And what a glory is it, to be God-like* (as Saints and Sons of God?) *If the divine Similitude appeareth and ſhineth in our Actions?* The Philoſophers ſo far agree with the Chriſtian Religion, they place the Image and Similitude of God in Sanctity and Virtue according to that of *Plato*, *There is nothing on Earth ſo like to God as the Soul of a juſt Man.* (o) ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ, *Similitude to God conſiſteth in being Holy and Juſt with Prudence. A temperate Man is to God a Friend*, ὅμοιος γὰρ, *for he is like unto him.* In his *Fourth of Laws*, he ſaith, *What practice is acceptable and ſuitable to God? one, even that which the old Saying implyeth*, ὅτι τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον φίλον ἂν εἴη, *like is ever a Friend to like.* Theſe plain and certain Notices which both Philoſophy and Religion furniſheth, were not unknown to the Fathers of the Chriſtian Church, but they are far from having made a due uſe of them in forming their Idea of the Son of God. For the Son of God is neceſſarily a Saint and Son of God, and therefore muſt become ſuch by his Generation into vital Sanctity (the living Image of God;) and as *Clemens* ſaith ſpeaking of Chriſtians, (p) ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ χριστοῦ γίνεσθε, χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ, *ye are imitators of Chriſt and Chriſt of God.* Chriſtians by their Regeneration are the living Images of Chriſt, and the Perſon of Chriſt is by his Generation the live Image of God, which he is in ſuch a manner and meaſure, that he muſt be ſtyl'd in an holy religious Senſe (as will appear preſently) ὁμοούσιος καὶ ὁμοφυὴς, *Co-eſſential and of the ſame Nature with God.* Regenerate Chriſtians cannot be ſo called without great abatement, diſtinction and limitation of Senſe; Chriſt muſt be ſo ſtyled ſimply and without addition. But by theſe Terms (ὁμοούσιος καὶ ὁμοφυὴς) the Scholaſtick Divines mean, that the whole Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence and Attributes were communicated to him in his Generation, we ſuppoſe that thoſe Attributes were not plenarily communicated to him till his Exaltation to the Throne, and that then they were ſo Communicated; ſo that in the whole of it *this Generation, Filiation and Paternity is the true and natural, the proper and the plenary.*

IV. A fourth generative Propriety of the Son of God is, *that his Production was not by making or creating* (that exteriour way of Production) *but that he was of or from the vital Eſſence or Subſtance of the Genitor by an interiour way of Production.* The Terms *of making, creating, generating* (q) are ſometimes ſynonymous (ſuch an ambiguity there is in theſe Words) παιδοποιεῖν, *creare liberos* ſignify the Generation or Procreation of Children, and we read of *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, that he wrote a Book περὶ κτίσεως καὶ γενέσεως χριστοῦ, *touching the Creation and Generation*

(i) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 11. & l. 5. c. 8.

(k) Contr. Sermones Arian.

(l) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 11.

(m) *Matt.* 5. 45. *Eph.* 4. 24. *Col.* 3. 10. *Pet.* 1 16. 1 *Joh.* 4. 7, 8.

(n) *Quæ gloria eſt ſimilem Deo fieri? Si ſimilitudo divina manifeſtetur & luceat in actibus noſtris?* S. Cypr. de bono patient.

(o) Petav. T. 3. de Op. 6. dier. l. 2. c. 4. S. 10.

(p) *Strom.* l. 2. p. m. 307.

(q) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 1. & 10, S. 13. Thorndike Epil. B. 2. c. 17.

tion of Chriſt. But although in a large ſenſe (as they ſignify any Production) theſe Terms are ſynonymous, yet they are of a ſtricter Notion, and are ordinarily diſtinguiſh'd, as *Irenæus* ſaith (r) *differentia eſt inter natum & factum*, there is a difference between being born and being made, of which difference we have this account in the Scholaſtic Theology. (s) *A Man is ſaid to make an Houſe, but to beget a Son; Effection or Creation is* ἔξωθεν, *exteriourly, Generation is* ἔσωθεν, *interiourly; the Production is in an interiour way in Generation and of the Subſtance of the Genitor, but that which is made or created by him is not ſo, but is only an external Work.* In which account of the difference between *Generation* and *Effection* (or Creation) there is manifeſtly a culpable defect; for the Word *Vital* is wanting, which the Nature of the thing requireth, and without which this difference between *generating* and *making* is not intelligible. For in the Scholaſtic Theology Generation is defin'd (*) *origo viventis à vivente*, agreeably whereto (t) the Philoſophers have differenc'd *generating* from *making*. Generation is a vital Production both in reſpect of the Cauſe, the Product and the way of producing it; whence it is manifeſt, that the Son of God is of the vital Eſſence of God (whence his Nature is deriv'd) which vital Eſſence is vital Sanctity. His Generation therefore may be illuſtrated from the Generation (or Regeneration) of the Creature-ſons of God, who are (in ſome degree) erroneouſly called by Scholaſtic Divines (u) *factæ non natæ genitæque imagines, ideoque naturam ipſam Dei &* οὐσίαν, *non participant*, made, not born and generated Images (of God) and therefore they do not participate of the very Nature and Eſſence of God. Elſewhere they tell us (w) *that the created Nature of Men and Angels is a certain participation of the Divinity*; and if their Nature may be ſo called, their holy Nature muſt be called a participation of the very Nature of God. And although they are nothing more than Creature-ſons, yet in ſome reſpect they are born and begotten of God, and thereby become *his born and generated Images.* But the Scholaſtic Divines are willing, to decline theſe plain religious Notices when they treat of the Trinity (as not agreeing with their Philoſophy concerning it) whence the *Alexandrian Cyril*, although at other times he ſpeaketh the Scripture Language, and calleth the Regeneration of God's Children (x) *Generation*, yet in his Dialogues of the Trinity he ſaith, *when we are adopted we receive Grace* (y) ἐν γεννήσεως τάξει, *inſtead of a Generation.*

V. A fifth generative Propriety of the Son of God is, *that his Generation is agreeable to that definition of Generation uſual in the Schools,* (z) *Origo viventis à vivente per principium conjunctum.* It is the origination of what is vital from that which is vital by a conjunct Principle, whereby they mean a ſeminal vital Principle, which they ſuppoſe to be requiſite in all natural Generations, and ſo far they are ſound Philoſophers. But like the old Philoſophers they ſuppoſe alſo, that the Seed is the Matter out of which (in part) the body of the *Fœtus* is formed. Agreeably whereto (a) *Smalcius* (a Follower of *Socinus*) ſuppoſeth, that our Saviour's Body was not formed meerly out of the Subſtance of the Bleſſed Virgin, but that God on his part created ſome Matter in her Womb, which he added to her Subſtance and conjoyn'd with it, to conſtitute the Body of our Saviour, and ſo a true Man was generated, otherwiſe (as he conceiteth) this Man had not been properly the Son of God from his Conception and Nativity: But theſe are great Miſtakes in Philoſophy. For Modern Naturaliſts are ſatisfied, that the Seed of the Male giveth neither Matter nor Form to the *Fœtus* it ſelf; but like the Flint and Steel only ſetteth the Tinder on Fire as Dr. *Harvey* expreſſeth it. The ſeminal vital Principle of our Saviour's Generation was in the Womb of the Bleſſed Virgin (ſuch Seminal vital Principles are the Eggs not long ſince diſcover'd to be in Womens Wombs) but it had not exerted its Seminal vital Virtue, nor had a *Fœtus* been formed if ſhe had not been impregnated from above. Thus our Saviour's Generation as to his Humane Nature appeareth, to be agreeable to the uſual definition of Generation: nor is it otherwiſe with his Generation as to his Divine Nature. For although a material Seminal vital Principle cannot be ſuppoſed in ſpiritual vital Generation, yet there is ſomething analogous thereto in the Generation of God's Children. For they are begotten into Life by a principle of Life, and have a principle of Life ſpiritual as well as of Life natural. Their holy vital Virtues and Practices are from a vital Principle, which muſt be called an holy vital Nature conſtitutive of their *Species.* And becauſe this Holy vital Nature is the Seminal vital Principle in their new birth (analogous to the Spermatic vital Principle of our bodily Life) the Apoſtle calleth it their Seed. 1 *Joh.* 3. 9. *Whoſoever is born of God doth not commit Sin; for his Seed remaineth in him and he cannot Sin, becauſe he is born of God.* If there is a Seminal vital Principle in the Generation of God's Children as they are born of God, a *principium conjunctum* cannot be wanting in the Generation of the Son of God.

VI. A ſixth generative Propriety of the Son of God is, *that he is natively the holy Empire's Imperial Son, and therefore the holy Imperial Lord the Son* (which is Imperial Sanctity, a Divinity or Deity of Perſon) *and therefore no Creature or Creature-ſon.* So in Humane Kingdoms Like generateth Like, both in Kind and Degree; Subjects beget Subjects, and the Imperial Eſtate generateth the Imperial Son, and this is true natural and orderly Generation, Filiation and Paternity. Nor is it otherwiſe in the Kingdom of God, wherein God is *The Holy Imperial Lord,* and if he is a Father, he is *The Holy Imperial Lord the Father,* and conſequently his Son and Heir is of this Idea; he is natively *according to the natural Order* of Generation *The holy Imperial Lord the Son.* This Idea and generative Propriety is plainly ſignified by his Name *The Son of God*; for when the Pſalmiſt ſaith *kiſs the Son, oſculo homagii,* what can he mean by the Son (in the myſtical Senſe) but *The holy Imperial Lord the Son?* Throughout the new Teſtament (not only in ſome but in all places of it) this Name the Son of God manifeſtly ſo ſignifieth. For the Devil underſtood it to ſo ſignify, when in his Temptation, as he repreſenteth to our Saviour his nearneſs to God (who therefore would have an eſpecial care of his ſafety) ſo he alſo repreſenteth to him his Power over Nature and over all Creatures, which the Imperial Son of God muſt neceſſarily have. *If thou be the Son of God command that theſe Stones be made Bread.* When the *Eunuch* ſaith, *I believe, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God,* what can be his meaning but that he believed, that Jeſus Chriſt *is the Divine Im-*

(r) *L.* 4. *c.* 29.

(s) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *l.* 5 *c.* 4. *S.* 8. & *c* 7. *S.* 1, 2.

(*) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 14. *S* 1.

(t) *Procl. in Tim. p.* 91, 92.

(u) *Petav. supr. l.* 6. *c.* 5. *S.* 7.

(w) *Ibid. c.* 11. *S.* 2.

(x) *Com. in Eſai. p.* 608.

(y) *Dial.* 2. *p.* 439.

(z) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 8. *S.* 8. *l.* 7. *c.* 14. *S.* 1.

(a) *V. Bp. Pearſon on the Creed p.* 337. *Ed.* 1.

perial Lord the Son, and therefore he would be his Subject and Religioniſt? So when the Apoſtles preach'd Chriſt, *that he is the Son of God* (to induce Men to be his Subjects and Religioniſts) this muſt neceſſarily be their meaning, *that he is the divine imperial Lord the Son*, which layeth a neceſſity upon Mankind to become his Subjects and Religioniſts. So this Name ſignifieth in all thoſe places, wherein it is ſynonymous with the Name Chriſt or Meſſiah; And ſo it ſignifieth in that of our Saviour, *If the Son* (the Lord of the Family the holy Empire) *ſhall make you free, ye ſhall be free indeed.* Sometimes the Son is not only diſtinguiſh'd from Men and Angels, nor only repreſented as of an higher Order than they, but of a contradiſtinct Party, they being of the Subject Party (*Moſes* but a Heb. 1. 14. and 3. 5. Servant, the Angels but miniſtring Spirits) but he is of the imperial eſtate (or Sovereignty) as the imperial Son and Heir, *Heb.* 1. 2. to whom it belongeth to ſit on the imperial Throne, and on the right-hand of the Majeſty on high. *Heb.* 1. 3, 8. His name the Son, ſignifieth him to be of imperial quality and condition in contradiſtinction to the ſervient Party of holy Men and holy Angels. *For to which of the Angels ſaid he* Heb. 1. 5, 8, 13. *at any time, Thou art my Son? I will be to him a Father, and he ſhall be to me a Son? To which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, ſit on my right-hand?* or *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever?* He is now fully poſſeſs'd of the ſupreme Soveraignty (as the Son) an eſtate of properly divine and creature-tranſcendent Sublimities, the imperial eſtate of the God-head (*b*) τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βασιλείαν βασιλεύει ὁ υἱὸς, *The Son reigneth in the ſame Kingdom-eſtate with the Father.* Which tranſcendent imperial condition he hath *obtained by inheritance*, Heb. 1. 4. therefore he is natively the imperial Son the Lord the Son: which is to ſay, that he is natively a Perſon of Sanctity imperial, that it is Divinity and Deity of Perſon to be the Son of God (that Divinity and Deity of Perſon which the name importeth) and conſequently, *The Son of God is no Creature nor Creature ſon, but the divine Lord the Son, or the divine imperial Lord the Son, which is the Meſſiah.*

The Schools rightly affirm (*c*) *Nulla poteſt dari creatura, quæ naturaliter ſit filia Dei*, There cannot be a Creature, which hath naturally Filiation to God: For a Creature as ſuch can be no more than a Creature, and therefore it cannot belong to the nature or eſſence of it, to be a Saint or a Son of God. But it is otherwiſe with one whoſe Definition is *The Son of God*; whoſe Eſſence it is, to be *The Son of God*, and who is this *ſpecies individua*, the Son of God: who is *his* Son, ſo as to be *the Lord the Son*, is born of him (or begotten by him) ſo as to be *the Lord the Son*, and therefore is *the only Son, the only begotten Son of God.* The Multitude of Sons that are of the ſubject and ſervient Party, do not hinder, but that the divine imperial Son is the only Son in a threefold ſenſe, *as being alone the Son, as being alone a Son, as being a Son that is the only one of God.* He alone muſt be conjoined with the Father as *the Son.* He alone is *a Son*, ſo as not to be of the remote and diſtant and ſervient Party: And he alone is *a Son* in the proper plenary ſenſe (as having plenarily the Proprieties of Generation and Filiation;) for Creature-ſons are but mutilately and partially, in ſome reſpect and degree Sons (Sons not Sons, generated not generated) they have a Generation from God, yet ſo as to be of *factive* not *generative* Original, and ſo as to be no higher than Sons of the Creature-party. (*d*) *We are many Sons, but this Son is not ſuch as we. For this is both a true and proper Son, by original, not by adoption: by reality, not nominality: by nativity, not creation.* He is alſo the only or only begotten Son, as being a Son, that is the only one of God (the one Son his well-beloved, *Mark* 12. 6.) ſuch as the Hebrews call יחיד which ſignifieth *unus & unicus ejus & unigena* (*e*) but the Septuagint render it not amiſs ἀγαπητὸς, *beloved*, both becauſe an only Son is highly beloved, and becauſe a Son that ſtandeth ſingular and alone in the Father's Eſteem and Affection is ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe an only (or only begotten) Son. Such an only Son was *Iſaac* to *Abraham*, *Solomon* to *David*, Gen. 22. 2. Prov. 4. 3. and ſuch an only Son is the imperial Son of God, who ſtandeth ſingular and alone in his Father's Eſtimate, and ought to ſtand ſo in ours, as being of infinite Excellency, Precioſity, and Importance. His high Excellency and Dignity, together with his near and dear relation to God, the Apoſtle expreſſeth by ſtiling him *his Son*: but (as if this was not enough) he ſometimes ſpeaketh more emphatically, and ſtileth him *his own Son*, which ſignifieth (as *his own blood*) *his* Rom. 8. 3, 32. *divine Son*, who is ſingularly and uncommonly, peculiarly and appropriately, properly and plenarily, in the neareſt degree of Relation and Alliance his Son, and is not in any degree alien and foreign, as he would be, if he was a Creature, not a divine Perſon. *Foul is the Error and Impiety therefore* of degrading the Son of God into a Creature; and great is the Incongruity of ſuppoſing God to generate a Creature (or one that is but a Man) by true and proper and natural Generation; for by ſuch a Generation the Son of God muſt be from him, as the Scholaſtic Theology rightly affirmeth. But this Theology is in this point (in great degree) inconſiſtent with it ſelf, and (in ſeveral reſpects) muſt be confronted and oppos'd to a true and proper and natural Generation.

VII. For the ſcholaſtic Theology miſtaketh in its Paralleliſm of the Generation of the Son of God, and the Conſequence which it draweth from it. (*f*) *A Man begetteth a Man, and God begetteth God. For what is it to be generated, but to be born of another into a ſimilitude of Nature? He that is begotten muſt have a Nature communicated to him from him that begetteth, and therein muſt be like unto him, not leſſer, not inferiour, as to the nature, eſſence or ſubſtance, as we ſee in the Propagation of Men and all Animals. The Son therefore cannot be generated leſſer or inferiour than the Father as to the divine eſſence and nature, and thoſe things which belong to the eſſence* (or which belong to the Father as he is God) *but being* ὁμοούσιος, *conſubſtantial or coeſſential* (of the ſame ſubſtance) *with the Father, he hath the ſame eternity, immortality, wiſdom, verity, bonity, immenſity, omnipotency* (with ſuch more Attributes) *by his Generation, and the very ſame Deity or Divinity. For there is not any thing at all in the Father, which is not communicated to the Son* (in the Generation of him) *ſave only his Paternity; and if any the leaſt Perfection which is in the one, was wanting in the other, he would not be God becauſe imperfect. Wherefore* (*g*) *the Son is born full from full, and*

(b) S. Athanaſ. Orat. 2. in Arian.

(c) Gonet. Clyp. T. 1. Tr. 2. Diſp. 1. S. 2. p. 532.

(d) *Multi nos filii Dei, ſed non talis hic filius eſt. Hic enim & verus & proprius eſt filius, origine, non adoptione: veritate, non nuncupatione: nativitate, non creatione.* S. Hilar. de Trin. l. 3.

(e) Grot. N. t. in Joh. 1. 14.

(f) *Homo hominem generat, & Deus Deum. Quid enim aliud eſt generari, quàm naſci ex altero in ſimilitudinem naturæ?* Petav. de Trin. l. 5. c. 8. S. 2. l. 3. c. 3. S. 3, 13. l. 4. c. 5. S. 13. c. 16. S. 12. l. 5. c. 9. S. 4.

(g) *Plenus è pleno natus eſt Filius, & perfectus à perfecto, totus ex toto, perfectus in Deitate.* Ib. l. 5. c. 6, 7, 8, 9.

perfect from perfect, whole from whole, perfect in Deity. Thus the Catholic Fathers argue in their Diſpute againſt the *Arians*, (a Diſpute vitiated by an unholy Scholaſticiſm on both ſides) who ſuppos'd the Son not to be of the ſame Subſtance with the Father, but of an inferiour created Subſtance of another kind. They grounded themſelves upon this Maxim (their Faith was founded upon it) that *abating the imperfection which is in humane Generation, there is the ſame true, proper, genuine and natural Generation, Paternity and Filiation* in divinis *which is amongſt Men, and that as a Man generateth a Man, ſo God generateth God*. From whence they inferr'd, *that the Son of God is generated in ſuch equality with the Father, that he is generated abſolutely perfect*. But in this Argumentation (although they proceed upon a ſound Principle) they are miſtaken in their Paralleliſm; for the Generation of the Son of God is not parallel to an Animal's meerly generating an Animal, nor to a Man's generating a meer Man. It may be compar'd thereto, but this is not the due and Scriptural Paralleliſm; for it is a Father's generating the Son and Heir of his Family, and a King's generating the Son and Heir of his Kingdom, that is the Parallel of the Generation of the Son of God. From whence it followeth, that the Catholic Fathers are miſtaken in their Conſequence and in this their Doctrine of the Trinity, that all that belongeth to the Father as God (and therefore his Kingdom and Godhead-eſtate) is actually and plenarily communicated to the Son in his Generation, and in this ſenſe he is ſaid to be *de Deo Deus*, God of God *(h)* ἀΐδιος, ἀθάνατος, δυνατὸς, φῶς, βασιλεὺς, παντοκράτωρ, θεὸς, κύριος, κτίστης καὶ ποιητής, *All that the Father is, eternal, immortal, potent, light, King, All-imperial, God, Lord, Creator and Maker*. But is not the Generation of ſuch a Son extremely diſſonant from a Father's begetting the Son and Heir of his Family (who doth not beget him at firſt and immediately into the actual and plenary Poſſeſſion of his Inheritance) and from the proper natural regial Generation of a Son? Is it reaſonable, that the Catholic Fathers ſhould take and leave at pleaſure the proper natural Generation? So far as it agreeth with their ſcholaſtic Theories, ſo far they entertain it: but if it claſheth with them, they abandon it. For ſo a Synod telleth us *(i) Solius divinitatis eſt, inæqualem filium non habere. It is otherwiſe in all other Generations and Filiations, only in the Deity the Son is generated, without an inequality to the Father*. What now is become of the proper natural Generation *in divinis?* This is not to weigh by our own Weights, and to mete by our own Meaſures. The Fathers argue, that the Son muſt be generated *perfect in Deity*, becauſe he is the *expreſs, natural, and generated Image of the Father*; as if a King could not have a Son, that is his expreſs natural and generated Image, without communicating to him actually and plenarily in his Generation the Kingdom-eſtate. S. *Athanaſius* argueth *(k)* that Chriſt was not anointed to be made King, ἦν γὰρ ἀϊδίως βασιλεύων, *for he was King and reigned from Eternity:* But he ought to have argued contrariwiſe; becauſe it is certain, he was anointed to be made King, therefore he was not ſuch a King before to which an Unction is incompetible: Not ſuch a King as *Euſebius* aſſerteth, *(l) That only begotten Logos of God coreigneth with his Father from infinite Ages to infinite Ages.*

VIII. The Scholaſtic Theology that erroneouſly diſtinguiſheth two Generations (before mentioned) erroneouſly confoundeth two diſtinct Generations, the *natural* Generation of a King with the *political*, which maketh the Generation of the Son hugely unlike to proper natural Generation and to popular Affairs. For is there any thing more obvious in humane Affairs, than that Kings and Potentates have a twofold Generation and Nativity, a *natural* as Men, and a *political* as Kings? They are the Sons of God as Kings *(m)* and are generated by him as ſuch. *Pſal.* 89. 26, 27. *He ſhall cry unto me, Thou art my Father. Alſo I will make him my firſt-born higher than the Kings of the earth.* Each King of the Earth is look'd on as a Son of God; and ſo *David* Pſal. 2. as a King exalted by God is ſtiled his Son, and the time of his Inauguration, or taking Poſſeſſion of the Throne, is called the day of God's begetting him. So the Roman Emperours generally had two *Natales* or Birth-days kept, *Natalis Imperatoris* and *Imperii*; the firſt to commemorate his coming into the World, the ſecond his Advancement to the Imperial Dignity: and this is the true and proper regial Generation and Filiation. If therefore the Son of God is rais'd to the actual and plenary Poſſeſſion of the divine Sovereignty by the true and proper regial Generation and Filiation, it muſt be by a twofold Generation and Nativity, touching both which the holy Writers are not ſilent: but theſe holy-popular Notices belong to another ſort of Learning and Theology than that which the Fathers and Councils follow in their Doctrine of the Trinity. For they ſuppoſe, that the Son had the whole Deity communicated to him from Eternity, yet had but one Generation (that of the Subſtance of the Father) and in that one Generation nothing was communicated to him (as indeed by that Generation nothing more could be communicated to him) but only the conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence of God (whereby he is conſubſtantial with the Father:) as a Man hath but one Generation as a Man, and in that one Generation nothing more is communicated to him than the conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence of a Man. But if the Son of God was plenarily God from Eternity, that great Imperial Eſtate the Godhead-Eſtate muſt have been communicated to him from eternal Ages, and that Communication muſt have been a Generation as well as the Communication of the conſtitutive nature and eſſence of God; for it is one thing to generate a Man, another thing to generate a King.

IX. The Generation of the Son of God in the Scholaſtic Theology, is nothing like the *proper natural Generation of the vital Subſtance of the Father*. For it is but the Generation of a Notion by a Notion, and is any thing more unſubſtantial and umbratile? *(n) The Scholaſtic Theology affirmeth, that the divine Generation is therefore a Generation truly and properly ſo called, becauſe thereby a word and notion of the Mind exiſteth. (o) A word of the Mind which is produc'd by Intellection.* So S. *Auſtin* proveth, that the Son is equal to the Father from the manner of his Generation. *(p) As ſaying himſelf* (underſtanding himſelf) *the Father generated a*

(h) Petav. ſupr l. 2. c. 11. S. 5.

(i) Ibid. l. 5. c. 9. S. 7.

(k) Or. 2. adv. Arian. p. 171. Com.

(l) Ὁ μένγε τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενὴς λόγος, τῷ αὐτοῦ πατρὶ συμβασιλεύων ἐξ ἀνάρχων αἰώνων εἰς ἀπείρους καὶ ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας. *Or. de Laud. Conſtant.* pag. 607.

(m) V. Dr. *Hamm.* on *Pſal.* 2. *N. t. f.* Petav de *Trin. l.* 3. c. 6. S. 7.

(n) *Divinam productionem ideo generationem eſſe propriè vereque dictam adſtruit, quod per eum verbum ac notio mentis exiſtit.* Petav. de Trin. l. 7. c. 14. S. 7.

(o) *Verbum mentis quod cognitione producitur.* Ibid. l. 5. c. 8. S. 7.

(p) *Tanquam ſeipſum dicens pater genuit verbum ſibi æquale per omnia. Non enim ſeipſum integrè perfecteque dixiſſet, ſi aliquid minus aut amplius eſſet in ejus verbo, quàm in ipſo.*

Word equal to himſelf in all things. For he had not ſaid himſelf perfectly and intirely if there was any thing more or leſs in his Word than in himſelf. But if we ſhould ſuppoſe with *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, (and others of the Ancients) that the Abſtract Son was generated by external ſaying (Pronunciation) this would not be thought the proper natural Generation of the vital Subſtance of the Father; and it is not imaginable, that a Generation by internal ſaying is a more ſubſtantial or a more proper and natural Generation than that other by external ſaying. Yet with the ſcholaſtic Divines this Generation by internal ſaying is (*q*) *the moſt formal Generation* (*r*) *the primary and archetypal Generation, of which humane Generation is but the ſimilitude and imitation.* So that the Son of God (*s*) *quia verbum ideo filius, is therefore the Son, becauſe he is the Word of the Mind.* But it would be very difficult, for theſe ſcholaſtic Divines to perſwade the generality of Mankind, that the moſt proper Child of a Man is a Notion, the Child of his Mind, and the moſt proper way of begetting Children is by thinking, and that the moſt primary, proper and archetypal way of conceiving a Son is conceiving in the Mind, and that conceiving a Son in the Womb is but the ſimilitudinary and metaphorical (*t*) Some have compar'd the eternal Generation of the Son of God to *Minerva*'s being born of *Jupiter*'s Brain: but is this brain-conception and generation the proper natural generation of a Child of the Subſtance of the Father? S. *Auſtin* ſaith (*u*) *Mens parens eſt notitiæ ſuæ* (the Mind is the Parent of her own Notice) but his Phraſe is metaphorical. Sometimes theſe Theologers ſay (*w*) *Hæc notitia velut partus quidam eſt, quæ idcirco gigni dicitur*, This Notice is as a certain Child, which therefore is ſaid to be generated. (*x*) *Productio verbi creati eſt quædam intelligibilis generatio*, the Production of a created mental *Verbum* is a certain intelligible Generation. From which metaphorical Phraſeology it appeareth, that themſelves look upon the mental kind of Generation in created Beings as the improper and metaphorical. In conſiſtence with themſelves therefore and their own Rule (which is (*y*) to philoſophize *de divinis* by Analogy and Similitude to created Beings ſecluding Imperfections) they ought to ſuppoſe that the mental kind of Generation *in divinis* is the improper and metaphorical. Accordingly, they ſuppoſe, that in two divine Perſons the Generation of the Child of the Mind or *Verbum mentis* (*z*) is improper, and metaphorical: but in the Father they will have this Generation (of the Son of the Mind or *Verbum mentis*) to be the primary proper Generation. They are not tolerably conſiſtent with themſelves; for to prove the Propriety of the Son's Generation, they in conſort with the Fathers alledge *ex utero ante Luciferum genui te*, and they ſay (*a*) that the Phraſe *ex utero* is uſed to ſignify, that the Son is generated of the Subſtance of the Father (Quod enim hoc modo naſcitur, id ex generantis oritur ſubſtantia) *for that which is this way generated, is of the Subſtance of the Parent.* They ſay alſo (from *Athanaſius*) that by the Womb is ſignified, τὸ ἴδιον καὶ γνήσιον, *that he is a proper and genuine Son.* And they alſo affirm, (*b*) *Non creatum, factumve, ſed eo productum modo, quo filii propagantur à patribus, Dei eſſe filium*, that the Son of God was not created or made, but was produc'd in that manner, that Sons are propagated from their Fathers. They ſuppoſe therefore, that the Propriety of Generation conſiſteth in being the fruit of the Womb (not of the Mind) that the Conception in the Womb is the proper and ſubſtantial Conception, the Conception in the Mind is but the umbratile and metaphorical. So the terms of conceiving, and begetting, and being born, in common uſe and primary ſignification, relate to the Womb, and not to the mental-conceptional Generation of the Schools. The way of propagating Children both divine and humane is not in the notional way, thus therefore the Son of God was not generated.

X. The ſcholaſtic Theology can give no good Anſwer to that Objection which S. *Hilary* relateth, (*c*) *There are many wiſe men of the World, whoſe wiſdom is fooliſhneſs with God, who when they hear God of God, true of true, perfect of perfect, and that one was born of one, contradict us as preaching impoſſible things; for they ſay,* Naſci nihil potuit ab uno, quia omnis nativitas eſt ex duobus, *there could be no birth of one alone, for every Nativity is of two*; as in *Ariſtotle*, Male and Female are called φύσεως ἀρχαί, *the Principles* (or beginnings) *of Generation.* The ſame Father reporteth, (*d*) *The envy of the Jews, the hatred of the Gentiles, the fury of the Hereticks, is chiefly excited againſt us upon this account, becauſe we confeſs the Son in the Father by virtue of eternal Generation.* This is no great credit to the Article, to be the cauſe of infinite Miſchiefs to the Church of God, and to the Souls of Men; which yet muſt be born with, if it was really an Article of the Chriſtian Faith; and it would become us to anſwer Objections as S. *Hilary* doth, *The Wiſdom of this World is fooliſhneſs with God.* But ſeeing the revealed Word of God knoweth no ſuch Article, and it is at beſt but an Hypotheſis, whereby the Chriſtian Faith may be explained, it becometh wiſe Men to conſider, whether it be well done, to affix to their Religion ſuch an Article which ſpoileth the Recommendableneſs of it. The Aſſerters of it ought to provide ſound Anſwers to plain and ſound Reaſonings. Such Anſwers which are creditable to their Religion, and do not diſhonour it by ſcholaſtic Futilities, as *Syneſius* doth in his firſt Hymn, where he ſuppoſeth, that the Father brought forth the Son ὑπερουσίοις λοχείαις, *by a ſuperſubſtantial Child-birth*, which ſoundeth not like the Generation of the Son of the Subſtance of the Father. The Jeſuits are provided of another Anſwer; for ſome of them made a Creed, of which this was one Branch, (*e*) *I believe in two Gods, of which one is both Father and Mother of the Son metaphorically in eternal Generation.* With this Branch of the Jeſuit's Creed it may not be amiſs to conjoin a Branch of the *Armenians* Creed touching the Son of God. (*f*) *As none knoweth his Eternity, ſo none can conceive his Being or Eſſence; for as he was Jeſus Chriſt from all eternity, ſo he is to day, and ſhall be for ever.* Jeſus Chriſt was not born without a Father and a Mother; if therefore he was Jeſus Chriſt from all Eternity, one God (agreeably to the Jeſuits Creed) was both Father and Mother in the eternal Generation. So the ſcholaſtick Theology teacheth (*g*) that the Male is the principal in Generation, and therefore God is called the Father (becauſe he is the origin of the eternal Genera-

(q) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *Diſp.* 2. *p.* 168.

(r) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 7. *S.* 8, 9.

(s) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 14.

(t) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 8. *c.* 12. *Gonet. ſupr. p* 463.

(u) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 7. *c.* 13. *S.* 24.

(w) *Ibid.*

(x) *Gonet. ſupr. p.* 88.

(y) *Ibid. p* 84.

(z) *Valent. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. *p.* 583.

(a) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 5 *c.* 7. *S.* 2, 4.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 10. *S.* 1.

(c) *De Trin. l.* 2.

(d) *Neque vel invidia Judæorum, vel odium Gentilium vel furor hereticorum, aliis potius adverſus nos cauſis eſt excitatus, quàm quod æternitatis virtute nomen filii confitemur in patre.* De Concil. Arim. p. 29.

(e) *Credo in duos Deos, quorum unus filii pater & mater eſt metaphoricè in generatione æterna.* Hoornbeck Theol. pract. T. 2. in Præfat.

(f) *Rycaut preſ. ſtate of the Armenian Ch. p.* 413.

(g) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 9. *S.* 15.

Generation, yet not without having ſomething of the Name and Propriety of a Mother; for he is ſaid *ex utero genuiſſe.* But it is a Maxim in this Theology, that the eternal Generation was *without a Mother.* Yet here we have ſomething of a Mother of God *in divinis*, where there can be no Impregnation, nor any ſeminal Principle, nor the Formation of any *Fœtus* but Idea's, nor the Production of any Son but *a Word of the Mind*, which is nothing like what Mothers call the Son of their Womb. But what are theſe ſcholaſtic Vanities (repugnant to the nature of things in Generation, and to the common ſenſe of Mankind concerning it) to a proper natural Generation?

XI. As in the *Arian*, ſo in the *Platonic* Scholaſticiſm, the Abſtract Son of God pretendeth not to a proper natural Generation. For although the *Platoniſts* ſay, that this ſecond God was generated by the firſt God or *T'Agathon*, yet by this Generation they mean only an *Emanation*; and therefore this ſecond God is ſtiled (*h*) αὐτοπάτωρ καὶ αὐτόγονος, *a ſelf-parent and ſelf-begotten*, becauſe they ſuppoſe, that in a proper ſenſe he was not generated, οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνου κινουμένου πρὸς γένεσιν τοῦ τούτου ἡ πρόοδος γέγονεν, *for this God did not proceed from that firſt God as any way moved towards the Generation of him* (for if there was any Motion, he would not be the ſecond God, but the third) *but he muſt neceſſarily proceed from that Firſt as remaining quieſcent and immovable*, οὐ προσνεύσαντος οὐδὲ βουληθέντος, οὐδὲ ὅλως κινηθέντος, *not ſo much as actively conſenting thereto, nor at all willing it, or any way moved thereunto.* Becauſe of this manner of his proceeding from the firſt God (by natural and neceſſary Emanation) he is ſaid to proceed αὐτογόνως, *ſelf-begottenly.* (*i*) The *Platoniſts* ſay of him ἑαυτὸν ἐξέλαμψε, *of himſelf he ſhone forth*, and he is ſtiled in an Oracle

> Αὐτοπάτωρ, ἀπάτωρ τε, πατὴρ, υἱὸς αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ
> Αὐτοφυής, ἀδίδακτος, ἀμήτωρ. ———
>
> *Self-father, without Father, Father and Son of himſelf,*
> *Self-born, untaught, without a Mother.* ———

With this Platonic Language none of the Chriſtian Name ſymbolize ſo much as *Calvin* and his Followers, who ſuppoſe the Son of God to be αὐτόθεος, *God from himſelf:* but they are condemned by the ſcholaſtic Theology of the Chriſtian Church, which in condemning them condemneth this Platonic Language and this abſurd Tenent, that the ſame Perſon is both his own Father and Son. But it is a Vanity, to condemn the Language of the *Platoniſts*, and yet to retain their ſenſe, or not to alter it to much better purpoſe than the School-Divines have done. For ſome of them ſuppoſe, (*k*) that the Son is from the Father only by way of Reſultance and Emanation, in ſuch a manner as the Properties of things have their Origin from the Eſſence (without any true and proper Action) and it is but reaſonable that theſe ſhould retain the Platonic Language, that the Son is from the Father αὐτογόνως, *ſelf-generatively.* Others of them ſuppoſe, that the Son is from the Father as a natural and neceſſary Emanation, by a natural and neceſſary Action (*l*) as Light is from the Sun and Heat from the Fire, which ſo ſoon as they exiſt, diffuſe their Light and Heat, and (having no Intellection or Preconception of what they do, nor Volition) always operate to the utmoſt of their power. But if God is the Father of his Son by proper natural Generation, they are related as Father and Son, and have the Rights and Dues of Father and Son in the ſenſe of Law and Morality; and conſequently it is the Father's doing (in the ſenſe of Law and Morality) that the Son doth exiſt, elſe he is not his Father in the ſenſe of Law and Morality, nor did he (in ſuch ſenſe) generate him, nor is he related to him as a Son, nor doth he owe unto him the Dues from a Son, nor may claim the Rights of a Son. And if it muſt be the Father's doing (in the ſenſe of Law and Morality) that the Son doth exiſt, or elſe he is not the Father, a natural and neceſſary Emanation by a natural and neceſſary Action cannot conſtitute any one a Father; for ſuch a Production is not imputable to him, nor can it be counted his doing in the ſenſe of Law and Morality. As if from a Man faſt aſleep ſuch a Child ſhould proceed, that is a natural and neceſſary Emanation by a natural and neceſſary Action, he would not be the Father of it (in the ſenſe of Law and Morality) and the caſe would be the ſame, if ſuch a Child ſhould ſo proceed from him when awake, if when awake he was as little concern'd in the Production of it as if he was faſt aſleep. He would be no more the Father of ſuch a Child (in the ſenſe of Law and Morality) than of a Platonic Son, that is from him αὐτογόνως, *ſelf-begottenly.* But ſome School-Divines ſometimes proceed a ſtep farther, and are willing to ſuppoſe (*m*) that the Father in ſome ſort willeth the Production of the Son (antecedently to his Production) and that the Son is of the Father *per neceſſariam ac naturalem electionem* by a neceſſary and natural Election, or (to raiſe no Diſpute about a Word) *by a neceſſary and natural Volition excluſive of all Deliberation.* But neither is this Production of a Son properly the Father's doing, and becauſe it is wholly unavoidable and indeliberate, without Counſel, End or Deſign, and in this Production no ſuch thing is intended, as that the Father (ſo called) ſhall have the poſſeſſion, uſe and diſpoſal of the Son, therefore the Son (ſo called) is *ſui juris* at liberty and his own diſpoſe, and the Father (ſo called) is not a certain ſuperiour Owner and Proprietor of him. But ſuch is every Father in proper natural Generation, wherein it is intended (at leaſt by God in nature) that the Father ſhall have a poſſeſſion, uſe and diſpoſal of the Son; and if God be the Owner of any thing (one would think) he muſt be the Owner of his own Son, and accordingly the Apoſtle ſaith, *that Chriſt is God's*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 23. The Son of God had his Production from a Charity tranſcendent to what belongeth to Creature-objects, yet ſo as to be produc'd for God; for if Chriſt was not God's, he could not be the Son and Heir of God; and he could not be God's, if in his Production he was not at all *for him and to him.* And ſeeing there is holy end and deſign in his Production, it could not be from a meer natural and neceſſary volition (ſuch as the volition or appetite of good in general which is in all Men) but muſt be from an holy virtuous Will (*n*) as the moſt ancient Writers of the Church ſuppos'd (although their Sentiment in this Point hath ſince been counted Hereſie) agreeably to what we ſee amongſt Men; for good Men beget Children by natural Inclination and Operation conjunct with an holy virtuous Will, which never excludeth Deliberation. If we ſuppoſe therefore, that the Generation of the Son of God is from ſuch a natural and neceſſary volition, which is but a ſort of natural neceſſity, ſo that naturally it cannot

but

(h) Dr. *Cudw. Intell. Syſt.* p. 574.

(i) *Gale in Jambl.* p. 299, 300.

(k) *V. Gonet. Clyp. T.* 4. p. 53.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 51. *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. c. 11. S. 11.

(m) *Petav. ibid. l.* 6. c. 8. S. 2[illegible].

(n) *Ibid. S.* 2.

but always be; if we ſuppoſe him to be from the Father as a natural and neceſſary *Aporrhœa*, or as Heat from the Fire (*o*) only ſuppoſing a natural and neceſſary volition to be in the Fire; we ſuppoſe ſuch a generation,* which is hugely diſſonant from the proper natural generation, and from the holy-virtuous volition and agency, which is too irrational and unholy to be competible unto God. And becauſe ſuch a Son of God ſo produc'd without end or deſign, cannot be his (in reſpect of Ownerſhip) as a Son is the Father's, therein he reſembleth the Platonic Son, of whom his Father (ſo called) cannot be the Owner, as a Father is of his Son, nor can ſuch a Son owe to his nominal Father any filial Duty.

XII. By the proper natural generation of a Son all that incommunicable Perfection which Paternity implieth, is preſerved intire, which by the ſcholaſtic generation of the Son (of God) is deſtroy'd. For although in ſeveral Sayings that occur in this Theology, the due difference between Father and Son may ſeem to be preſerv'd intire, yet theſe Sayings are contradicted by others, and if we conſider the Maxims of it (whereby we ought to make a judgment of it) they will appear to be ſuch, as manifeſtly deſtroy that incommunicable Perfection which Paternity implieth. For Paternity in the imperial eſtate of the Godhead implieth *Self-exiſtence, abſolute Self-perfection, and Self-fullneſs, abſolute Supremacy, Liberty and Independence, Ownerſhip abſolutely univerſal, peerleſs Supereminence, abſolutely the fulleſt height of Dominion and Power, and to be abſolutely the firſt Cauſe and the laſt End*; All which Perfections muſt be conſider'd as Peculiarities of the Father, incommunicable to the Son (without deſtroying his Sonſhip) and as ſuch they are Nobilitation and Perfection. That manner of having the Perfections of vital Sanctity (and other divine Perfections) which is peculiar to God the Father, and which his Paternity implieth, is Nobilitation and Perfection, and ſuch is alſo the Father's fecundity or generative and prolific Virtue, whereby he is generative of the Son (*p*) as ſome of the ancient Writers diſcourſe. But that which is chiefly remarkable touching the Peculiarities of God the Father, and which clearly illuſtrateth the Unity of God according to the Chriſtian Religion (although it plainly teacheth a Trinity in the Godhead) is that peculiar notion wherein God the Father is God. For it is he only whoſe *definitive Name, Notion and Idea is God* (the imperial eſtate of God or of the Godhead) which is to be God *abſolutely and definitively*. For although the Son is God, yet this is not his definitive Name, Notion and Idea, but *The Son of God*. Although the holy Spirit is God, yet this is not his definitive Name, Notion and Idea, but *The Spirit of God*. Only the Father is He, whoſe definitive Name, Notion and Idea is God, as (in ſome degree) appeareth from ſome good obſervations, which even Scholaſtick Divines have made. (*q*) *In the Scriptures when the Name God is put abſolutely, at large, and without reſtriction, or the addition of any Perſonal Propriety, it ſignifieth the Father. As when the Apoſtle writeth: though there be many that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things*, 1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. *Theodorus Abucara* obſerveth alſo, *that the Son and the Spirit are related to the Father, as the Father is not related to them. For the Son is the Son of God and the Word of God, and the Spirit is the Spirit of God, the Finger of God.* Τȣ̃ πατρὸς λέγονται, οὐχ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶν, *They are ſaid to be the Father's, the Father is not ſaid to be theirs.* They are ſaid to be his, as a certain Superiour owner's, (who accordingly ſendeth them) but ſo the Father is not theirs. The Son is God, but as a Perſon of the Trinity, (upon that account) The Father is God in Nature, antecedently to a Trinity. The Son is God, as being the Son of ſuch a Father (the Son of God:) but the Father is not God as being the Father of ſuch a Son, but in nature antecedently to any actual Paternity. All which Peculiarities of God the Father (imply'd in his Paternity) a proper natural Generation muſt neceſſarily preſerve intire and inviolate: but inſtead of preſerving them, the ſcholaſtic Theology in its Maxims plainly ſubverteth and deſtroyeth them. For in this Theology (*r*) *potentia generativa* is no branch of Omnipotency (*s*) The Paternity is counted no Perfection, *but only a perſonal propriety, a relation and a notion, all perfection is in the eſſence (and what belongeth thereto) which is common to all the three Perſons.* Whence every one of them is ſaid to be *no leſs than the whole Trinity; the Son is no leſs than the Father and the Son together, and the Holy Spirit is the whole that himſelf the Father and the Son is*; which cannot be thought very pious Miſtakes. (*t*) So *Innaſcibility* or Self-exiſtence (and conſequently Independence) is in this Theology accounted no Perfection, but only a Notion of the Father, of whom *Cerealis* ſaith, *Patri non eſt auctoritas, quia voluntas nulla eſt. Pater enim nec volens, nec nolens genuit, ſed natura.* The Father hath no Authority over the Son, becauſe he did not generate him by Will. For he did not generate him either willing or nilling, but by Nature. It is a principal Maxim in this Theology (*u*) *That the Son in his Generation had the whole intire Deity communicated to him by the Father; not any the leaſt Perfection was in the Father, which was not communicated to the Son; all things were communicated* (quæ patri quâ eſt Deus competunt) *which belong to the Father as he is God.* Agreeably to which fundamental Maxim (not to be thought on without amazement) ſome ſay (*w*) that in the Trinity of Perſons there is no order (without which the divine relations cannot be) no priority of dignity, one is not before or after another, nor is Numeration to be admitted here, that of *firſt, ſecond, third.*

XIII. To make a proper natural Generation no Generation, is a great Incongruity in the ſcholaſtic Theology, which aſſerteth a Production of diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead without any ſuch diſtinctneſs of eſſence, which is neceſſary to conſtitute diſtinct Perſons. The Fathers argue, *As a Man generateth a Man, ſo God generateth God.* This in their ſenſe is a bad Argument, and if they were Pagan Theologers they would proceed to argue with as good reaſon; *As one Man generateth another Man, ſo one God generateth another God.* But Chriſtian Divines underſtand, that the Suppoſition of more Gods than one is both impoſſible and irreligious. Whence their ſcholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, that there is but one infinite and abſolutely perfect uncreated Spirit, Mind and Eſſence, called God. That the Generation of the Son and the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt cannot be the Production of more than one ſcholaſtic individual

---

(o) *Ibid.* S. 12.

(p) *Ibid. l.* 5. c. 6. S. 9.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 4. c. 15. S. 14.

(r) *Gonet.* Clyp. T. 5. p. 107.

(s) *Petav.* ſup. *l.* 10. c. 3. S. 1. 4. & *l.* 6. c. 7. S. 12, 14, 15.

(t) *Ibid.* *l.* 5. c. 1. S. 19. & c. 5. S. 12.

(u) *Ibid.* *l.* 3. c. 3. S. 3. *l.* 4. c. 16. S. 12. *l.* 5. c. 9. S. 4. *l.* 2. c. 11. S. 5.

(w) *Idem* T. 1. *l.* 2. c. 8. S. 11, 20, 21.

divine Eſſence and Attributes; for this would be a making more Gods than one. The Son therefore by his Generation is not ſuppos'd to have any individual Eſſence or Subſtance diſtinct from the Father, but only the ſame diſtinctly, ſo as to be a different *mode of Subſiſtence or relative Property*. And in this ſenſe the Son is ſuppos'd to be ὁμοούσιος (conſubſtantial or coeſſential with the Father) as having the ſame ſcholaſtic individual divine Eſſence or Subſtance with the Father, the communication whereof is ſaid to be his Generation. The intellectual nature of the three divine Perſons (their Underſtanding, Will and Power of Action) is ſuppos'd to be numerically one and the ſame, and abſolutely indiſtinct as that of one Man or one Angel. And this the Hypotheſis of *a ſcholaſtic proper natural Generation* implieth; which therefore inferreth this conſequence, that there can be no Production of a diſtinct Perſon or Perſons *in divinis*, and therefore no ſuch thing as Generation (which is the Production of a diſtinct Perſon) can be there. This will clearly appear by conſidering (1.) The ſcholaſtic Divines are not ſo unwiſe, as not to underſtand what they ſay, yet they univerſally acknowledge, that theſe myſterious things which they ſay touching the Perſons of the divine Eſſence (ſeveral Perſons that are of one and the ſame ſingular ſcholaſtic Eſſence without any diſtinctneſs of Eſſence) are to us *unconceivable*, that our Minds cannot reach them or form an Idea and Conception of them, but they are (x) *extrà intelligentiæ conceptionem* (beyond the conception of Intelligence) that their Myſtery of the Trinity is ὑπὲρ νοῦν, ὑπὲρ λόγον, above Underſtanding and Reaſon, ſo as to be unintelligible (which neither Men nor Angels can underſtand) *fideique non perſcrutantis ſed recipientis*, which is not a matter of human ſearch, but to be receiv'd by a Faith-ſubmiſſion. This is no ſmall blemiſh to their commonly received Maxims touching the divine Perſons, *They plainly claſh with our Faculties and with the nature of things*, and (ſo far as we can judge from the nature of things) are impoſſible as well as unintelligible. The Generation of the Abſtract Son of God is ſaid, not to be the Production of any Eſſence (or Subſtance) into Exiſtence, it is only the communicating (or giving) the ſcholaſtick divine Eſſence, ſo that the ſcholaſtic individual Subſtance and Attributes of one individual Perſon, without any Diminution, Diviſion, Multiplication, or Diſtinction of Eſſence, is communicated, and becometh the ſcholaſtic individual Subſtance and Attributes of another individual Perſon alſo; which is not any poſſible Communication: Nor is it poſſible, that any intelligent Mind ſhould have any Notion or Conception of it, but it is as a Word without ſenſe or ſignification. (2.) According to Logick it is peculiar to the ſecond Subſtances *(genus* and *ſpecies)* to be *common* and *communicable*, *Subſtantia prima* (the firſt or ſingular Subſtance) *in plures non communicatur*. (y) This Maxim the ancient ſcholaſtic Divines of the Church found in common Logick: but that they might introduce a ſcholaſtic Trinity, they were neceſſitated to diſcard it, and other plain Dictates of Reaſon. For the Eſſence of an individual Man muſt be conſider'd as it is ſpecific, and as ſuch it is common and communicable: It muſt be conſider'd alſo as it is individual, and as ſuch it is proper, uncommon, and incommunicable. To ſuppoſe therefore an individual Eſſence to be ſcholaſtically common and communicable, is a Contradiction to the Nature and Notion of its Individuality. And thence it is, that the Mind cannot conceive of *ſeveral things having the ſame ſingular ſcholaſtic Eſſence without any diſtinctneſs of Eſſence*. (3.) *Curcellæus* argueth, (z) *That every thing is its own Nature and Eſſence. Every thing is conſtituted what it is, and diſtinguiſh'd from others by its proper Nature and Eſſence. If therefore the divine Perſons have not every one his proper Nature, but that which is numerically one common to all three, they are not three Perſons, but no more than one, which I cannot ſalve from being a Contradiction.* The Followers of *Socinus* argue, *A Perſon is an intelligent Being; therefore three Perſons muſt be three intelligent Beings.* To this Argument the Anſwer is, (a) *If it meaneth that there is no Perſon where there is no intelligent Nature to make it a Perſon, ſo we grant it. If it meaneth, that a Perſon implieth an intelligent Being ſeparated and divided from other Individuals of the ſame kind, as it is among Men, ſo we deny it as to the Perſons of the Trinity.* But in theſe great Argumentations Fairneſs and Clearneſs ſhould be uſed, which is wanting in this Anſwer. For the ſcholaſtic Hypotheſis of the Trinity doth not only deny a ſeparate divided Nature to the ſeveral Perſons of the Trinity: (b) but *a diſtinct individual Nature* (Eſſence or Subſtance) without which there can be no ſuch diſtinct Perſons as the Father and the Son are. (c) *Juriſconſulti perſonam appellare ſolent ipſam individuam hominis ſubſtantiam*, The individual Subſtance of an individual Perſon is that which the Lawyers (in conſort with common ſenſe) call the Perſon. For this is that which conſtituteth, denominateth, and diſtinguiſheth the individual Perſon as ſuch, is the individual Perſon identically (as the individual Subſtance of an Animal is that Animal identically) and can be neither larger nor narrower than the individual Perſon. If therefore the diſtinct individual Subſtance which conſtituteth the diſtinct individual Perſon as ſuch, doth not exiſt, the diſtinct individual Perſon cannot exiſt; and conſequently the Father cannot be ſuppos'd to generate a Son, that is a diſtinct individual Perſon, if nothing of a diſtinct individual Subſtance be generated, nor is ſuch a Generation any thing like a proper natural Generation. (4.) It is one thing to conſtitute an individual Perſon as ſuch, and another thing to conſtitute him ſuch a Perſon, *a Perſon of certain modes and relations*, *a Father or a Son*, *a firſt or a ſecond Perſon*. An individual mode or a relative property may conſtitute him *ſuch a Perſon*; but becauſe it can do no more, it cannot conſtitute him an individual Perſon as ſuch, although we conjoin with it the divine Eſſence, which is ſuppos'd to be common; for this Eſſence is not ſuppos'd to conſtitute an individual Perſon as ſuch. The being an individual Perſon is in order of Nature antecedent to the being a *firſt* or *ſecond* individual Perſon, and therefore an individual Perſon as ſuch cannot be conſtituted by thoſe modalities. So the being an individual Perſon as ſuch (which alone is capable of the relations of Father and Son, terminateth and ſuſtaineth them) is in order of Nature antecedent to the being (d) a paternal or a filial individual Perſon, and therefore cannot be conſtituted by thoſe relative Properties, but the diſtinct Perſons of the Father and the Son muſt be conſtituted by a Diſtinctneſs of Subſtance. If we ſhould ſuppoſe two Modes of Subſiſtence, or two relative Properties in the conſtitutive individual Eſſence of an

(x) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 13. *S.* 4.

(y) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 6. *c.* 1. *S.* 3.

(z) *De Ver. Trin. n.* 55.

(a) Biſhop Stilling-fleet of the Trin. p. 75, 76.

(b) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 13. *S.* 14.

(c) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 4. *S.* 2.

(d) *V. Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 7. *c.* 4. *S.* 6.

Abſtract Intelligence, it would not thereby become two individual Perſons, but only one Perſon of two diſtinct Capacities. (5.) As one ſeeing Eye can conſtitute but one Oculiſt, ſo one Intellect can conſtitute but one Intellectualiſt; therefore three Intellualiſts (or Intelligents) cannot be conſtituted but by three intellectual Natures, without which the Trinity of the Godhead cannot be Perſons either in a vulgar familiar ſenſe, or in any artificial metaphyſical ſenſe; for if they are three diſtinct Perſons, they are neceſſarily three diſtinct Intellectualiſts and intellectual Natures, which in all ſuch Caſes wherein the Notion of a *Suppoſitum* is not needful to be conſider'd is the ſame thing as to be *three diſtinct Perſons*. To ſuppoſe them *Perſons*, not in a vulgar familiar Senſe, but only in an artificial metaphyſical Senſe (of our own deviſing) is a groundleſs Diſtinction, that doth not ſignify any thing, if in both Senſes three diſtinct Perſons muſt be ſuppoſed three diſtinct Intellectualiſts; and it doth not amend, but farther deprave the Scholaſtic Theology. For it maketh the Trinity not to be a Trinity of Perſons according to the Senſe of Mankind, nor according to the Senſe of the Scriptures, nor a popular-religious Myſtery, but only a Ternary of School-Philoſophy Trifles, a Trinity for Sophiſts, and not for Saints and holy People. So this Scholaſtic Account of the three divine Perſons, that they are nothing but *original Mind knowing it ſelf and loving it ſelf*, (Mens, Notitia, Amor) is no more a Trinity of Perſons than the Carteſian *Tres modi cogitandi*, which is but a Toy-Trinity (that may ſerve the Schools to play with) a Trinity of Cyphers, not of divine Perſons, of Religion and Sanctity. *Acts* are Perſons, *Modalities* are Perſonalities, at the ſame rate that *thinking* is generating, and ſuch a Trinity of Perſons there is in any one Perſon, Man or Angel.

XIV. The Scholaſtic Theology underſtandeth theſe Names *Deus natus*, *Deus genitus*, *Deus de Deo natus*, in a ſenſe inconſiſtent *with any Generation, with proper natural Generation, and with the divine kind of Generation.* For it underſtandeth the Word *Deus* in theſe Names, to ſignify God *definitively* and *abſolutely*, whence it argueth, that the whole intire Deity muſt neceſſarily be communicated to the Son in his Generation, and that he muſt be abſolutely perfect (becauſe he is God) which is to underſtand theſe Names in a ſenſe inconſiſtent with any Generation, which is wholly incompetible to *a Being abſolutely perfect*, of which *Innaſcibility* and *Self-exiſtence* are eſſential Attributes. It underſtandeth theſe Names in a ſenſe inconſiſtent with *proper natural Generation*; as if one ſhould underſtand this Name *Rex natus & genitus*, as it is the Name of the King's primogenit Son, to ſignify, *that he is born perfect in Regality, that the whole intire Regality is communicated to him in his Generation*, This would be an underſtanding the Name in a Senſe inconſiſtent with *proper regial generation*. As *Rex natus & genitus*, ſo *Deus natus & genitus*, is the Honourary Title of our Saviour, and both theſe honourary Titles ſignify his Birth-nobilitation. They ſignify alſo in what Notion (with what Limitation and Diſtinction of Senſe) our Saviour is King and God. For as he is *Rex* not ſimply and without addition, but as *Rex natus & genitus*, (as the regial Son of the King:) in like manner he is *Deus*, not as *Deus* ſimply and without addition, but as *Deus natus & genitus*, that is, as the Imperial Son of God. He is not God in an extravagant Scholaſtic Senſe, but he is God as the Son, and as is competible to the Son. He is God as the Son and Heir of the Godhead, (much like to an Heir in Common-Law-ſenſe) and he is God as the Son, (or as being the Son) of and in the Chriſtian Godhead, which conſiſteth of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. He is God, (*e*) εἴσω τε πως ἐςὶ τῶν τῆς θεότητος ὅρων, *and is as it were within the Boundary of the Godhead*, not Creature, no leſs than God, God ſo as to be of the Godhead, of the Godhead-party, (contradiſtinct to the Creature-party) and for theſe Reaſons ought to be ſtiled God the Son, to ſignify his Creature-tranſcendence, and that he is no Creature-ſon. Creature-ſons have an holy and divine kind of Generation from God, and ſo hath the Creature-tranſcendent Son; but they are begotten and born of God only ſo far as to be Saints; he hath a divine Generation ſo far as to be King of Saints, and therefore is *Deus de Deo natus* God born or begotten of God. Agreeably to this divine Generation of a Son wherewith Chriſtianity is well acquainted, our Saviour's being *Deus de Deo natus* muſt be interpreted, from which the Scholaſtic kind of generating a Son is altogether alien. And its miſunderſtanding theſe Names muſt be counted a πρῶτον ψεῦδος, one of its grand fundamental Miſtakes, which is the Origine of innumerable other.

CHAP. IV.

1. *A fourth ſort of Arguments to prove the Truth of our Idea of the Son of God from the Proprieties of his Sanctity. The firſt Propriety.* 2. *The ſecond Propriety.* 3. *The third Propriety.* 4. *The fourth Propriety.* 5. *The fifth Propriety.* 6. *The ſixth Propriety.* 7. *The ſeventh Propriety.* 8. *The eighth Propriety, with a ſummary Idea of the Chriſtian Trinity.* 9. *The Diſſonances of the Scholaſtic Theology. The firſt Diſſonance.* 10. *The ſecond Diſſonance.* 11. *The third Diſſonance.* 12. *The fourth Diſſonance.* 13. *The fifth Diſſonance.* 14. *A Conſectary from it.*

1. A Fourth ſort of Arguments to prove the Truth of our Idea of the Son of God, we will deduce from *the Proprieties of his Sanctity*, the Conſideration whereof ſheweth, that his Idea belongeth not to Metaphyſicks or the Scholaſtic Theology, but to the Science of Sanctity, to which the Idea of God, and of a Saint or genuin Son of God neceſſarily belongeth. He is the Son of God according to Chriſtianity, which is the Science of Sanctity; therefore his Idea belongeth thereunto. And becauſe his Idea belongeth to Nobility-learning, it muſt neceſſarily belong to the Science of Sanctity, which is the Scripture-Nobility-Learning. Every Idea of the Son of God therefore that is form'd in Metaphyſicks and the Scholaſtic Theology, is of Kind and Quality ſpurious and illegitimate. For it cannot be his Idea, (*f*) *Qui Sanctitas eſt & Communicatio*

(e) S. Cyr. in Johan. p. 229.

(f) Didym. de Spir. Sanct. l. 1.

catio Patris, who is Sanctity and the Communication of the Father. From his Sanctity it appeareth, that he is a Saint of God-kind of Son of God, and from the Proprieties thereof it appeareth, that he is a Saint of God-kind of Son of God, ſo as to be (in a legitimate ſenſe) God the Son, not a Creature-ſon. *Lactantius* ſuppoſeth, that (g) *having perform'd his Magiſtery and the Legation of God, becauſe of that Virtue which he both taught and practiſed, he might be and deſerv'd to be accounted God by all Nations.*

But there is not ſo much Reaſon to account him God becauſe of that Sanctity which he taught, as becauſe of that Sanctity which he is. For (in the *firſt* place) it muſt be ſaid ſimply and without any Limitation of Senſe, *Sanctity is that which he is as his proper kind of thing, Good and Excellency*, which cannot be ſaid of any Creature-ſon, Man or Angel. For Sanctity is not *Gabriel's* or *Raphael's* kind of thing as ſuch, nor the *Petrian* and *Paulian* kind of thing as ſuch, theſe muſt be conſider'd as other kind of Perſons than Sons and Saints of God, as they are Perſons of ſuch Names, they are but common angelical and human kind of Perſons, and therefore we cannot ſay of any one of them ſimply without Limitation of Senſe, *Sanctity is that which he is as his kind of thing.* Nor can any one of them ſay, *I quà I* am that Perſon of Quality a Saint or Son of God, I am ſuch *ex propriâ naturâ & eſſentiâ ſpecificâ*, by my proper ſpecific Nature and Eſſence. An Angel-Perſon or a Man-Perſon is not as ſuch that Perſon of Quality a Saint or Son of God. An Angel is the Angelical Nature, and the Angelical Nature is an Angel; a Man is the Human Nature, and the Human Nature is a Man, but the Divine Nature is not the Conſtitutive of their Species, they are not it as ſuch, it is not they; nor is Man or Angel *ex propriâ ſpecie perſonæ*, a Saint or Son of God; for this is not his proper kind of Perſon. If Men or Angels are the Saints and Sons of God, they are rightly counted more than meer Men or Angels, and are called by the Fathers (h) *Dii adoptati ac Filii*, adopted Gods and Sons. But the Son of God is no ſuch adopted Son, nor can be conſider'd as a meer Angelical or Human kind of Perſon, but he muſt be conſider'd as a God-kind (a Divine-vital-kind) of Perſon. If we may ſay of any Creature-ſon, (Man or Angel) as he is a Saint or Son of God, Sanctity is that which he is as his kind of thing, yet this we cannot ſay of him ſimply, without Limitation of Senſe; but ſo we muſt ſay of the Son of God, *Sanctity is that which he is as his kind of thing or reality*; for as it is the God-kind of thing, ſo it is the Son of God-kind of thing. Sanctity is that which he of proper kind is (as being of proper kind that Perſon of Quality a Son of God) it is his ſpecific Nature, as it is God the Father's, which plainly demonſtrateth that he is no Creature-ſon; for he is of proper Kind and Species a Perſon, not of the common Angelical or Human Species, but of the God-kind and Species, and therefore not any thing leſs, not any thing elſe than of proper Kind and Species a Perſon of the Creature-tranſcendent Kind and Species. This ſpeaketh him the Divine Kind of Lord the Son, (or of proper Kind God the Son); for as he muſt be Man that of proper Kind and Species is a Perſon of the Man-kind and Species, ſo he muſt be God (not leſs than God) that of proper Kind and Species is a Perſon of the God-kind and Species. If St. *Paul* was a Man, ſo as to be of proper Kind and Species a Perſon of the God-kind and Species, he could not be a Man without being God, and therefore he would be both God and Man in one Perſon, which is the Perſon of our Saviour, who is neceſſarily a God-kind of Perſon, ſuch a God-kind of Perſon, who is *the Lord the Son.* His being Man doth not hinder him from being God (of proper Kind and Species a Perſon of the God-kind and Species:) nor doth his being God hinder him from being Man, but it hindreth him from being of proper Kind and Species a Perſon of the common Human Species, becauſe he is not a Perſon without being of proper Kind and Species a Perſon of the God-kind and Species, or without being God. His Human Nature, if it was alone, might conſtitute a Perſon, but it could not conſtitute his Perſon. His Human Nature therefore cannot ſubſiſt as his Human Nature, (the Human Nature of his Perſon) but in Conjunction with his Divine Nature, ſo conſtituting the Perſon of *Deus-Homo*, or *Homo-Deus*; for which Reaſon he cannot be conſider'd as a meer Human-kind of Perſon, but muſt be conſider'd as a God-kind of Perſon, (a God-vital kind of Perſon) as being *Deus natus ac genitus*, or *The Imperial Saint of God-kind of Son, The holy Empires Imperial Son.*

II. Nothing but Sanctity is that which he is as *his kind of thing, good and excellency.* His genuin Idea is beſt underſtood from the Matters of Chriſtian Sanctity, (the Learning of it, the Life of it, the State of it, the Settlement, Inſtitution, Law and Diſcipline of it, the Kingdom and Government of Sanctity Imperial) for theſe are the All that he is (as his kind of things) in himſelf and to us. His Honour and Nobility is no other than Sanctity, his Riches are only thoſe of the Kingdom of Sanctity, and the only Benefit that cometh by him, is to be a Saint of God. His Goods and Excellencies are of an oppoſite kind to the common, human and mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies (ſecular Learning and Policy, Wit and Eloquence, Splendor and Gallantry, Riches and Power, and in due degree they are oppoſite to mundane Virtue and Religion) thoſe are the Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies, which ennoble the Excellency of *the knowledge of Chriſt*, ſuch as none diſcern and reliſh, like and love, but they that are touch'd from above and imbu'd with a divine Sentiment, *Matth.* 16. 17. *Joh.* 1. 13. If he had been a ſecular and mundane kind of Meſſiah, he muſt have brought us ſecular and mundane kind of Goods and Excellencies, but with theſe the World was ſufficiently furniſh'd before his coming, it needed only the true and choice and ſaving Goods and Excellencies, and theſe only are to be found in him. Not any thing that might ſignally recommend him to the natural Man's Eſteem, not any thing that he doateth upon and glorieth in, not any thing taking and plauſible to him appear'd in Chriſt when he was in the World, but only ſpiritual and divine kind of Excellencies ſtript naked (as it were) of the mundane Goods and Excellencies. (i) *Inops, nudus, humili loco natus, ſine oſtentatione humanæ ſapientiæ, ſimili coborte hominum comitatus*, Indigent, naked, born in a mean place, without Oſtentation of Human Wiſdom, attended by a Train of Men of the like Character, ſuch was the Appearance of the Son of God in the World, which ſheweth that he is unto us no other Goods and Excellencies but only the God-kind of Goods and

(g) *Magiſterio ac Dei legatione perfunctus, ob eam ipſam virtutem quam ſimul & docuit & fecit ab omnibus gentibus & meruit & potuit Deus credi.* l. 4. c. 16.

(h) *Ap. Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. c. 10. *S.* 10.

(i) *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 7. c. 21.

and Excellencies, nor is he any other in himſelf (as his kind of Goods and Excellencies) which ſpeaketh his Sanctity and Divinity of Perſon, that he is of proper Kind and Species a Perſon of the God-kind and Species.

III. As Sanctity is the All that he is, ſo (in the ſenſe of Perfection and Indeficiency, without any Abatement or Diminution) he is *the All of Sanctity.* And this he is as the Son of God the Father, whoſe Godhead is in the State of Derivation, ſo that in Conjunction with God the Son is vital Sanctity in the infinite fulneſs thereof, and ſo all Sanctity is in him, which the Apoſtle's Words muſt neceſſarily import, when he attributeth to him an immenſe fulneſs, *Col.* 1. 19. *It pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.* Col. 2. 9. *In him dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily.* Eph. 1. 23. *The Church is his Body, the fulneſs of him that filleth all in all.* As he is a Saint of God-kind of Son, vital Sanctity is his conſtitutive Nature, of which a Creature-ſon can have only a certain meaſure, and he that hath only a meaſure of it is no more than a Creature-ſon. But as the Council of *Frankford* rightly determineth (*k*) *Chriſtus naturâ unctus, nos per gratiam, quia in illo plene fuit divinitas,* Chriſt was anointed by Nature, we by Grace, becauſe the Divinity was in him in fulneſs. So the Schoolmen and the Fathers agree, *that he is not anointed by ſome Participation of Sanctity,* Sed ipſamet Sanctitate per eſſentiam, quæ eſt Divinitas, *but by eſſential Sanctity it ſelf, which is the Divinity.* (*l*) Per gratiam unionis fit communicatio totius divinitatis & totius ſanctitatis divinæ, *By the grace of Union a Communication is made of the whole Divinity, and the whole divine Sanctity.* A modern Scholaſtic aſſerteth (*m*) an immenſe and infinite Plenitude of Grace and Sanctity in the Human Nature of Chriſt, and rightly deriveth it, not only from his Unction to be the Meſſiah, (although it muſt be derived from thence alſo) but from his Human-divine Generation, as *Caſſian* doth. (*n*) *He is the Son of God, becauſe begotten and conceived by the Divinity. And if he is the Son of God, he is certainly God. And if he is God, the Grace of God is not wanting in him. All Grace therefore is in him, all Virtue, all Power, all Divinity. In his Conception all divine Virtue, all fulneſs of Divinity came into him. Whence he had his Origin thence he had the Perfection of all Divinity.* So the Evangeliſt attributeth to the only begotten Son of God as ſuch the fulneſs of Grace, *Joh.* 1. 14. which fulneſs of Grace cannot be meant of ſuch a narrow meaſurable fulneſs as denominateth holy Men and Women *full of Grace:* but it muſt be underſtood of ſuch a fulneſs as beareth a proportion to the fulneſs of God the Father; for the Evangeliſt ſaith, *We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace.* All the Grace and Holineſs that we have is but a ſomething of that fulneſs which he is; for *of his fulneſs have all we received, and grace for grace.* His fulneſs denoteth, according to *Origen,* (*o*) τὴν ἀκρὴν μετοχὴν τῆς θεότητος, *The higheſt and fulleſt Participation of the Godhead,* who alſo ſtyleth the Abſtract-ſon ἡ περιεκτικὴ πασῶν ἀρετῶν ἀρετὴ, *A Virtue that compriſeth all Virtues.* And *Clemens* ſaith, (*p*) *All the Powers of the Holy Spirit collected into one, concur to one thing, to be the Perfection of the Son.* (*q*) *We ſaw the Glory* (as St. *Chryſoſt.* paraphraſeth the Evangeliſt) *not of a Prophet, nor of an Angel, nor of an Archangel, nor of the Powers above, nor of any other created Nature, but of the Lord himſelf, of the King himſelf, the genuin only begotten Son, the Lord of all himſelf,* whoſe fulneſs is called by this Father ἄβυσσος ἄφατος καὶ πέλαγος ἄπειρος, *a bottomleſs Abyſs and boundleſs Sea.* His fulneſs is abſolutely undiminiſhable and inexhauſtible, how much ſoever of it is communicated it is not leſſen'd or impair'd thereby, (as if we light Thouſands of Lamps at a Fire, the Fire is not thereby impair'd or diminiſh'd) which ſpeaketh his fulneſs abſolutely immenſe and immeaſurable. So ſome (ſpeaking with reſpect to Chriſt's Prerogative) have ſaid of the Bl. Virgin, (*r*) *Singulis ſe gratia eſt largita per partes; Mariæ verò ſimul ſe totam dedit gratiæ plenitudo.* To every one of the Saints Grace was given by Parts or Portions, but to *Mary* the whole Plenitude of Grace was given at once. He that was born of her is the Plenitude of Grace and Holineſs, which in Church-Writers is ſometimes called (*s*) *Plenitudo Divinitatis,* the fulneſs of the Divinity. The Divinity (vital Sanctity) is communicated to him as much and as far as it can be communicated, and conſequently in the immenſe and boundleſs fulneſs of it, without which he could not be qualify'd to be the Origin of the Creature-ſons of God. They are as leſſer Stars, or rather as Planets, that ſhine by a borrowed Light: He is as the Sun, ſuppoſing the Sun to be the Fulneſs as well as the Fountain of Light. But this fulneſs muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into *Native* and *Dative.* That which we clearly diſcern to have been given him in the conferring on him the Officiary Dignity of the Meſſiah muſt be called *Dative,* but what is otherwiſe muſt be counted his *Native* fulneſs, as *natively* appertaining to the Excellency of his Perſon. And this being an immenſe fulneſs of vital Sanctity demonſtrateth that he is no Creature-ſon, but is of the Godhead.

IV. Vital Sanctity (in the immenſe fulneſs of it) is his Eſſence, which alſo demonſtrateth that he is no Creature-ſon. For Sanctity is not eſſential to Men or Angels, or any Creature. It is eſſential to them as they are Saints, but it is not eſſential to any of them to be Saints. It is their Nature and Eſſence as they are holy Men and holy Angels, but it is not their Nature and Eſſence ſimply and without addition. It is not they, they are not it, but only have it (a ſomething of it) and may exiſt without it; for they are good and holy (*t*) κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς καὶ ἐξ ἐπιγεννήματος, *preter-eſſentially and adventitiouſly.* Agreeably to which Imperfection of Creatures the *Arians* having called their Abſtract-ſon of God κτίσμα, *a Creature,* they ſuppos'd (a Party of them at leaſt) that he was *mutable and defectible.* In Oppoſition to which monſtrous Conceit the Catholic Fathers (*u*) attribute even to Chriſt Jeſus (who is Man) Ἀναμαρτησία, (Impeccancy) in this ſenſe, *That he was beyond all Poſſibility of ſinning.* Which Propriety of his Sanctity will be readily acknowledg'd by all that have honourable Thoughts of their Saviour, and therefore to them it is a Demonſtration of his Creature-tranſcendency; for every Creature is neceſſarily in its own Nature *peccable, mutable, defectible.* But to the Divine Imperial Son of God the Divine Nature in immenſe fulneſs is Eſſence, which Divine Eſſence is to his Perſon perfect Holineſs; for it is a Contradiction to ſuppoſe him deficient

(k) Gonet. Clyp. T. 12. p. 5, 7. Petav. T. 4. l. 11. c. 7. Vaſq. in 3. par. Th. T. 1. Diſp. 41. c. 3.

(l) Gonet. ibid. Diſp. 20. Art. 1.

(m) Petav. ſupr. c. 5. S. 2, 7. & c. 6. S. 6.

(n) *Dei filius quia & à Divinitate genitus & à Divinitate conceptus. Si autem Dei filius, ergo indubitanter Deus. Si autem Deus, ergo gratia Dei non carens.——Omnis ergo in eo gratia, omnis virtus, omnis potentia, omnis divinitas.——Omnis in ipſa ſtatim hominis conceptione Dei virtus, omnis divinitatis venit plenitudo. Inde enim illi omnis divinitatis perfectio, unde & origo.* Petav. ibid. c. 9. S. 8.

(o) Grot. Not. in Joh. 1. 16. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 258.

(p) Πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ πνεύματος συλλήβδην μὲν ἕν τι πρᾶγμα γενόμεναι, συντελοῦσιν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ τὸν υἱόν. *Str. l.* 4. *p. m.* 391.

(q) In Johan. Hom. 12. & 14.

(r) P. Chryſol. Ser. 143.

(s) Grot. Not. in Col. 1. 19. Petav. T. 4. l. 8. c. 12. S. 17.

(t) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 305.

(u) Petav. T. 4. l. 11. c. 10.

in Holineſs, whoſe Eſſence is Holineſs in infinite fulneſs, and without Deficiency. As God is holy in ſinleſs Perfection by Nature, becauſe the Divine Nature (vital Sanctity) is his Nature, ſo is the Son of God; whence the ancient Writers ſay (w) that he was φύσει κακίας ἀλλότριος, *by Nature alien from all Sin and Wickedneſs,* φυσικὴ δικαιοσύνη, *natural Righteouſneſs,* John Baptiſt, ἔργον ἦν δικαιοσύνης, *was the Work of Righteouſneſs,* Ἰησοῦς δὲ φύσει, *but Jeſus was by Nature, Gratia ipſa fuit illi homini naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum admittere poteſt. Sinleſs Holineſs was in him as Heat in the Fire or Cold in the Snow, which cannot be otherwiſe affected.* (x) *Aliter de igne, aliter de ferro calidi nomen accipimus, quia ignis per ſe calet.* Grace and Holineſs is in Chriſt as Heat is in the Fire, not as it is in Iron. Yet this Similitude the ancient Writers make uſe of to good purpoſe. For to ſignify that Chriſt's Human Nature was altogether holy they compare it to a red hot Iron and a live burning Coal, which is not hot meerly by the quantity of Heat, but by the Subſtance of Fire receiv'd into it and pervading it. They illuſtrate it alſo by ſuppoſing the Region of the Air to be a Region of Fire, and a Globe of Iron to be plac'd in this Region of Fire, which thereby becometh altogether fiery, yet retaining the Nature of Iron; ſo the Human Nature of Chriſt by its Union with the Divine (yet retaining the eſſential Properties of Human Nature) becometh holy and divine.

(w) *Ibid.* c. 7, & 10, & 12.

(x) *Macrob. in ſom. ſcip. l.* 2. *c.* 15.

V. His unbounded fulneſs of vital Sanctity is in him with reſpect to us *primarily* and *originally.* (y) *For this Son of God far tranſcendeth every one that becauſe of his Virtue is called a Son of God, for he is as it were the Origin and Fountain of ſuch. He is ſet as it were the Root and the firſt Fruit of thoſe that are reformed to newneſs of Life in Spirit.* He is the new Man in himſelf, and in his Religion and Diſpenſation of Things he is the new Man unto us; nor is the new Man of Grace and Holineſs to be gained otherwiſe than by his Religion, who is conſtituted the publick Bank and Treaſury of Grace and Holineſs, (whence the indigent World may be ſupply'd) the Head and Principle of new Mankind, (as the firſt *Adam* was of the old) the Head of the Church of the Regenerate, who *have an Unction from the Holy One,* that was himſelf (like *Aaron*) anointed with the precious Oil, and *datively* filled, that he might fill all things, *Eph.* 4. 10. Some object, that if Chriſt was God by Nature, it was ſuperfluous and needleſs for God to give unto him the Holy Spirit; and probably ſome will make this like Objection. If Chriſt was *natively* the unbounded fulneſs of Grace and Holineſs, it was ſuperfluous and needleſs to make him *datively* ſuch. But it muſt be conſider'd that he ought to be the immenſe fulneſs of Grace and Holineſs both becauſe of his Nature and his Place. He muſt be natively the immenſe fulneſs of vital Sanctity as being a Perſon of this high Worth and Excellency, *the only begotten Son of God.* And he muſt be *datively* the immenſe fulneſs of the Spirit of Holineſs as being by Officiary Dignity God's Meſſiah; *for him hath God the Father ſealed* (appointed him to be the Meſſiah and Saviour of the World) *Joh.* 6. 27. He muſt be authoriz'd and every way furniſh'd by God, and ſuch an Oeconomy muſt be us'd towards him as is fit to be us'd towards a Perſon of ſuch a place, and conſequently he muſt caſt out Devils and be rais'd from the Dead as God's Meſſiah by the Spirit of God.

(y) Οὗτος δὲ πολλῷ καὶ μακρῷ διαφέρει παντὸς τοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν χρηματίζοντος υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅστις ὡσπερεὶ πηγῆς καὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν τοιούτων τυγχάνει. *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 1. *p.* 44. ῥίζα δὲ ὥσπερ καὶ ἀπαρχὴ τιθέμενος τῶν εἰς καινότητα ζωῆς ἀναμορφουμένων ἐν πνεύματι. *S. Cyr. Alex. T.* 5. *p.* 691.

VI. He is vital Sanctity it ſelf, (the things themſelves which vital Sanctity is) which ſpeaketh him to be no Creature-ſon. In the ancient Writers of the Church the Son of God is called by many abſtract Names, (z) αὐτοσοφία, αὐτολόγος, αὐτοδύναμις, αὐτοφῶς, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοαρετὴ, αὐτοαγιασμὸς, αὐτοζωὴ, αὐτοπηγὴ, αὐτορίζα, *Wiſdom it ſelf, Logos it ſelf, Power it ſelf, Light it ſelf, Truth it ſelf, Righteouſneſs it ſelf, Virtue it ſelf, Sanctification it ſelf, Life it ſelf, The Fountain it ſelf, the Root it ſelf.* By theſe Names (the moſt of which are proper and accommodate to the true Son of God) the Scholaſtic Theology intendeth to ſignify that the Son of God is theſe Forms and Attributes in infinite Perfection, and is not meerly a Participation of a Portion of them, and that they are not in him by way of Quality and Habit, but they are his Eſſentialities; and this is all that it meaneth by theſe Abſtract Names, which it applieth to the Abſtract Son of God. But as in the Application of theſe Names I pretend not to follow the Scholaſtic Theology, ſo I cannot altogether ſymbolize with it in the Interpretation of them. For the New-Teſtament's Names of the Meſſiah ought to be interpreted as Names of the New-Teſtament and of the Chriſtian Religion, which is the Religion of Regeneracy. If the Apoſtle ſaith that *God is Love,* this muſt be underſtood of *the Love* that vital Sanctity is, and which is in Regeneracy; and this divine kind of Love God is, not only in *infinite Perfection* and *eſſentially,* but as (his ſpecific Nature and Difference) that which he is as his kind of thing, Good and Excellency. So if Chriſt is called *The Light,* (or αὐτοφῶς, Light it ſelf) this muſt be underſtood of the Light which vital Sanctity is, and which is in Regeneracy, as S. *Cyprian* ſpeaketh, (a) *in Chriſto, hoc eſt in Lumine,* (in Chriſt, that is, in the Light) and this Light is that which he is as his kind of thing, Good and Excellency, eſſentially and in infinite Perfection in himſelf, and he is it unto us alſo, which ſpeaketh him the new Creator, no Creature-ſon, for ſuch a Son cannot be the Light which we are in, as we *are light in the Lord,* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) no Creature can be *the Light of Life,* as he is, or the ſaving Truth and Wiſdom, with reſpect whereunto he may be denominated αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοσοφία, *Truth it ſelf, Wiſdom it ſelf.* So with reſpect to the Virtue and Righteouſneſs which is in Regeneracy it is rightly ſaid, (b) *Ipſe Virtus & Juſtitia eſt,* and he is juſtly denominated (c) *Innocentia ipſa & ipſa Juſtitia,* αὐτοαρετὴ, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, for the Life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs is that which he is as his kind of Good and Excellency, and in infinite Fulneſs and Perfection it is his Eſſence, whence it muſt be ſaid of this Holy of Holies, (d) *Sanctuarium Sanctuariorum ipſe Meſſias.* This ſort of Attributes are great Attributions, as incompetible to a Creature-ſon as the Mathematical Dimenſions are to a Point.

(z) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 309. S. Chryſoſt. in Joh. Hom. 14. Petav. de Trin. l. 6. c. 11. S. 1. & T. 1. l. 2. c. 6. S. 9. &c.

(a) De orat. Dom in fin.

(b) Lact. l. 4. c. 16.

(c) S. Cypr. de Bon. patient.

(d) v. Grot. Not. in Joh. 2. 19.

VII. His vital Sanctity is the (interior and exterior) Deiformity of the Divine Imperial Lord the Son, which is Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity, and ſpeaketh him to be no Creature-ſon. Such a Son of God as he is ſuch an Image of God he is, (for the Son is the Image of the Father) and ſuch is his Deiformity. He may be a natural Image of God, if he is no more than the Perſon of a Man; he may be a ſupernatural Image and Reſemblance of God, if he is no more than an holy Man or a glorified Saint; but according to his Idea he is the Creature-tranſcendent Son of the Creature-tranſcendent Imperial Eſtate, and therefore the Creature-tranſcendent Image of God, of the Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity, which is his Imperial Perſonal (interior and exterior) Deiformity in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New-Teſtament. For this is that which the holy Writers of the New-Teſtament mean when they ſtile our Saviour *The Image of God*, *The Image of the inviſible God*, *The expreſs Image of his Perſon*. (2 Cor. 4. 4. Col. 1. 15. Heb. 1. 3.) In which μεγαλυσμοὶ, or magnifying Expreſſions, they do not celebrate an Abſtract Scholaſtic Son of God, but it is manifeſtly the Perſon of our Saviour Chriſt which they celebrate; and that which they celebrate is his proper Honour and Nobilitation, which is his *Divinity of Perſon*, (or Creature-tranſcendence;) and their Senſe is, that he is the Image of God as the Lord the Son, and therefore peculiarly, appropriately, and in ſuch ſenſe which is incommunicable to any Creature. The Creature-ſons that are in reſpect of vital Sanctity (which is both Grace and Glory) the Sons and live Images of God, are no more than Creature-ſons, the ſubject, ſervient, undergraduate, mutilate and partial, and comparatively the mean, the remote, diſtant and heterogeneous Sons and Images of God, whoſe vital Sanctity is no more than the *particular*, *finite*, *and narrow bounded*; but the Son of God is (as we have ſeen) this vital Sanctity as his kind of Good and Excellency, and in infinite Fulneſs and Perfection it is his Eſſence, ſo as to be in this reſpect God, not Creature, and ſo as to be in this reſpect of definitive Notion *God the Image*, (which is the ſame Name with God the Son) and therefore in this ſenſe and reſpect *God of God*, *Light of Light*, *very God of very God*, or as the ancient Writers ſometimes ſpeak, (e) *Divinitas genita*, the generated Divinity. But it muſt be remembred that the ancient Writers look upon every Creature-ſon or Saint of God as a Divinity; and it muſt be acknowledg'd that vital Sanctity is of kind a Creature-tranſcendent Good, Excellency and Deiformity; ſo that every Creature-ſon or Saint of God is ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe of Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity, and is of the ſame Divine Family with *the only begotten Son of God*, who yet in reſpect of vital Sanctity (or this Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity) is vaſtly different from the Creature-ſons. For they are not of proper Kind and Species Perſons of the God-kind and Species as he is, and therefore as to Kind they are but mutilately and partially (not in the plenary ſenſe) Perſons of vital Sanctity (or the Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity) and they are far from being Perſons of it in his degree (who is of it in God-graduality;) ſo that becauſe of vital Sanctity which he is *eſſentially and in infinite fulneſs* he alone of all the Sons of God is of Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity both as to kind and degree in the plenary ſenſe. Creature-ſons are as to kind of the Creature-tranſcendent Deiformity, but becauſe they are only preter-eſſentially and adventitiouſly ſo, their being ſo is but that which is of the Creature-kind, not that which is of the God-kind, as the Son of God's is, who becauſe of his peculiar vital Sanctity in reſpect of Kind and Degree muſt be denominated αὐτὸ τῆς θεότητος εἶδος, *the very Form or Species of the Divinity*, as *Athanaſius* calleth the Abſtract Son of God; or as he is called in that Expoſition of the Faith attributed to *Gr. Thaumaturgus*, χαρακτὴρ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς θεότητος, *The Character and Image of the Divinity*. When the holy Writers ſo denominate him, they conſider him in his Imperial Eſtate of Exaltation, wherein he is moſt illuſtriouſly *the Image of the inviſible God*, and wherein he may be moſt clearly diſcern'd to be (as the Image *derivatively* from God, but conjunctly and undividedly with God) of one and the ſame Idea with God, *viz. The Sanctity imperial*, *The Sanctity vital*, *The Sanctity imperial-perſonal*, for Chriſtianity imperial is Sanctity imperial, and Chriſtianity vital is Sanctity vital. So that God is not only in himſelf, but in and to his Son *the Sanctity imperial*, *vital*, *imperial-perſonal*, not only *ſelf-originately*, but *derivatively* ſo.

VIII. The vital Sanctity which the Son of God is, *is that of the one individual divine vital Eſſence*, (which is to him an undivided Derivative) *whereby he is one of the Trinity of divine Perſons of one Eſſence*. As the divine Perſons of the Chriſtian Trinity are neceſſarily the Perſons of one Sovereignty, for there can be but one divine Sovereignty, ſo for the ſame Reaſon they are neceſſarily the Perſons of *one divine vital Eſſence*. That there may be three Perſons of one divine Sovereignty is of eaſy Apprehenſion, (needeth no Illuſtration) and that the Son of God is one of theſe is plain from his Idea, (for he is the divine imperial Son;) but that there can be more Perſons than one of one divine Eſſence is not of eaſy Apprehenſion, the Suppoſal of it is the principal Difficulty that incumbreth the Doctrine of the Trinity, which is not to be voided either in the *Ariſtotelian* Scholaſtic way, by ſuppoſing them to be only certain Scholaſtic *Modes* or *Relations* of one common ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence; nor in the *Platonic* Scholaſtic way by multiplying the ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence. But waving theſe Scholaſtic Hypotheſes, we will here briefly repreſent a clear intelligible Account of this abſtruſe Theory by theſe following Steps and Gradations.

(1.) By the divine Eſſence we mean *The one Eſſence of one God the Father*, which may ſignify either in the ſtricter or in the larger Notion and Comprehenſion. In the ſtricter and narrower Notion and Comprehenſion the divine Eſſence of God the Father is only that which is ſo his Eſſence, as not to be the Eſſence of the Son. But in the larger Notion and Comprehenſion the divine Eſſence of God the Father compriſeth that divine Eſſence which the Son is. For the divine Eſſence of the Son is the divine Eſſence of God the Father, but ſo as to be the divine Eſſence of the Son. He belongeth to God the Father, he is his Son, and a Perſon of his Godhead, of his one Sovereignty, and of his one divine Eſſence, the fulneſs whereof is πλήρωμα τοῦ πατρὸς, *the fulneſs of the Father*. If there was in the Godhead a divine Eſſence which is not the Eſſence of God the Father, there muſt be two or more divine Eſſences there, and the one divine Eſſence of one God would be wanting there.

2. The one divine Eſſence muſt be conſider'd as *it is the divine vital Eſſence*, as is ſelf-evident, and the ſcholaſtic Theology uſually harpeth upon this ſtring (f) *That in Life which the Son is ſaid to have from the Father, there is the ſignification of Nature and Eſſence. By Life in the only begotten which is generated by the*

(e) Petav. de Trin. l. 6. c. 6. S. 20. & T. 4. l. 11. c 12. S. 11.

(f) *Sicut Pater habet vitam in ſemetipſo, ita & Filio dedit vitam habere in ſemetipſo. In vita naturæ & eſſentiæ ſignificatio eſt.* S. Athanaſ. ap. Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 6. S. 10. *Vita in*

Father, Eſſence is underſtood. That which is Life in both is ſignified by Eſſence; and Life which is generated from Life, is Eſſence which is born from Eſſence. So in the counterfeit *Dionyſius*, ὄντως & ζώντως, the communication of Eſſence and *Life* (g) is the ſame thing. The Generation of the Son being a vital Production, the divine Eſſence muſt be conſidered as the divine vital Eſſence.

(3.) The one divine vital Eſſence is *vital Sanctity* (which is the God-kind and Saint of God-kind of vital Eſſence) as the ſcholaſtic Theology ſaith (h) *Divinitas ipſa ſanctitas eſt, The Divinity is Sanctity it ſelf.* The one divine vital Eſſence is vital Sanctity, becauſe it is *The God-kind of vital Nature and Eſſence*, and therefore is a ſpecific vital Nature and Eſſence, yet ſo as to be an exiſtent individual Nature and Eſſence, as other ſpecific vital Natures and Eſſences are. It is communicable as well as other ſpecific vital Natures and Eſſences; for it is in ſome degree communicated to all the Creature-Sons of God. But it is not in this reſpect communicable as they, it cannot intirely exiſt in ſeveral Individuals intirely divided and ſeparated: nor is it communicable to any Creature, ſo as to conciliate to him *the imperial Creature-tranſcendency*, which is the Deity.

(4.) The imperial Son of God (The imperial Saint of God-kind of Son) is neceſſarily a Perſon of *the imperial Creature-tranſcendency* (of the Sanctity, Divinity and Godhead) and of *vital Sanctity* eſſentially and in infinite Fullneſs. It muſt be communicated to him, as much as it can be communicated, and ſo it is commonly ſaid, that God in the Generation of his Son did communicate his divine Eſſence: but this cannot be done by the Production of a new divine vital Eſſence (as in the Generation of a Child there is a Production of a new humane vital Eſſence;) therefore as he is neceſſarily εἴσω τῶν τῆς θεότητος ὅρων, *within the boundaries of the Godhead*, ſo he muſt neceſſarily exiſt in and of *the one divine vital Eſſence* as a Perſon of it, he muſt belong to this Eſſence, it muſt belong to him. Not as if any individual Eſſence could be ſcholaſtically communicated, but in reſpect of the vital Sanctity which it is derivatively, the one individual divine vital Eſſence became by his Generation the Eſſence of the Son of God. In ſuch ſenſe it became common or was communicated in this divine Generation, in which therefore much more was done than a meer Sanctification of our Saviour's humane Nature; for *the fullneſs of the Godhead dwelleth in him bodily* (ſubſtantially, *non umbratiliter*) of which Words no good ſenſe can be made without ſuppoſing, that *the one individual divine vital Eſſence*, in reſpect of the vital Sanctity which it is, became by his Generation his Eſſence and Subſtance. If his Perſon is conſtituted by no other Subſtance but meerly the humane, he is no more than a Man, he is not *Deus natus & genitus*, or God the Son; And he muſt be more than *the Son*, if we ſuppoſe him a Perſon of this divine vital Eſſence at ſuch an extravagant rate of plenary Communication, that he no more deriveth from the Father.

(5.) The Son is eſſentially and neceſſarily *A Derivative:* The Godhead therefore muſt be in the ſtate of Derivation (of deriving and being derived) and the divine vital Eſſence muſt be ſo, elſe no Son can be in it. The vital Sanctity therefore which this divine vital Eſſence is, muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into that which *it is primitively*, and that which it is *derivatively*; for the vital Sanctity which the Son is, muſt be denominated *The Derivative.* Upon his Generation the vital Sanctity which this divine vital Eſſence is, became thus diſtinguiſh'd, or became *twofold:* That which is *The Primitive* (the fullneſs of it) and that which is *The Derivative.* This divine vital Eſſence as it is *The primitive vital Sanctity*, is the Father (his divine vital Eſſence in the ſtrict Notion and Comprehenſion:) but *The vital Sanctity* which this divine vital Eſſence is, as it is *the Derivative* (the fullneſs of it) is the Son, *his divine vital Eſſence.* This one individual divine Eſſence therefore is of this twofold Notion or Conſideration; *It is the divine vital Eſſence of the Father*, and it is alſo *the divine vital Eſſence of the Son.* Whence it is very plain, *that one individual divine vital Eſſence is the Eſſence of two Perſons:* of the one as it is *The vital Sanctity the Primitive*, of the other as it is *The Derivative* from the inexhauſtible Fountain of it. Becauſe the Son is The vital Sanctity *The Derivative*, therefore ſpeaking with reſpect thereto he is fitly called by thoſe Names of Derivation which the Fathers and Councils have given to the Abſtract Son of God, *Light of Light, Life from Life, Sapience from Sapience, God of God.* The Image is the Derivative from the Exemplar (the Son from the Father) ſo is the Image of the inviſible God. *(i)* χαρακτηρίζει τὸ γένος, *he beareth the character of his Deſcent and Parentage*, and is ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης *the eradiation of the Glory* (or the eradiated Glory of God) the brightneſs and glory of God as effulgent and deriv'd. *Heb.* 1.3. ſuch is his vital Sanctity, ſuch is his imperial-perſonal Deiformity or Similitude to God, *It is the brightneſs of his glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon.* (k) *The latter words expound the former, Image expounding Brightneſs, and Perſon or Subſtance expounding glory.* The deriv'd brightneſs of his Perſon or of his Glory is this divine Image or the vital Sanctity which he is. And as the Father is *The vital Sanctity*, both *the meerly conſtitutive* and *the communicative*, ſo is the imperial Son, but with the difference of *The Primitive* and *The Derivative.* Which Derivative muſt be conſider'd as derivative from God, and as derivative to us, who receive of Chriſt's Fullneſs.

(6.) The vital Sanctity which the Son is (the derivative and the live-image of the Father) is the divine vital Eſſence of the Father, in the large Notion and Comprehenſion, ſo that in ſuch ſenſe the Father doth not part with it out of his own Eſſence. (It is his own Life and Nature, his own vital Sanctity *in divinis.)* It is not parted or divided from the Exemplar (the primitive vital Sanctity which the Father is) It is not parted or divided from the one-individual divine vital Eſſence of the Father (it is *undividedly* that one individual divine vital Eſſence, and that one individual divine vital Eſſence is it *undividedly*) ſo that the vital Sanctity, which the Son is, muſt be ſaid to be imparted without parting with it, and it muſt be denominated *The undivided Derivative, the undivided plenary Derivative.* In humane Generation the ſame (ſpecific) Nature is communicated and deriv'd from Father to Son, ſo as that an entirely ſeparated and divided individual Eſſence is produced: but it is otherwiſe in the Generation of the Son of God; for the vital Sanctity which he is, is imparted by God the Father without

parting

---

unigenito quæ ex Patre generata eſt, eſſentia intellecta. —— *Quod in utroque vita eſt, id in utroque ſignificatur eſſentia; & vita quæ generatur ex vita, id eſt, eſſentia quæ de eſſentia naſcitur, dum non diſſimilis naſcitur, ſcilicet quia vita ex vita eſt.* S. Hilar. ap. Petav. ibid. l. 6. c. 10. S. 1.

(g) *Ibid. l. 6. c.* 11. *S.* 9.

(h) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 11. *c.* 12. *S.* 11.

(i) *Epiph. Hær.* 76.

(k) *Mr. Mede on Luke* 2. 13, 14.

parting it from his one individual divine vital Eſſence, and the Son is ὁμοούσιος, *co-eſſential with the Father*, not extra-eſſential. This undivided Derivation of the Son from the Father, the ancient Fathers (to help our Conception of it) have compar'd to *Light iſſuing from Fire, Splendour from Light, Vapour from the Water, the River-water from the Fountain, the Beam from the Sun.* Which Similitudes may ſomewhat illuſtrate the undivided Derivation of the Son from the Father (or rather the undivided Derivation of the vital Sanctity which the Son is) which may alſo be illuſtrated from the Image of the Face in the Looking-glaſs; for the Image in the Glaſs is an undivided Derivative from the Face. So in the Godhead, in reſpect of vital Sanctity, the Communication is *plenary* and *undivided.*

(7.) But becauſe it may well be thought, that theſe little Similitudes are far from clearly explicating a great and abſtruſe Theory, we will illuſtrate it by this following ſimilitude. Let us ſuppoſe the Sun to be the imperial Lord of Heaven, and inſtead of one of thoſe Heroes which the Heathen deify'd in the Sun, let us ſubſtitute a ſolar imperial Son, who is eſſentially of ſolar Light (of imperial Soli-formity) which ſolar Light we will ſuppoſe to be *one individual luminous vital Eſſence.* The whole of this one individual luminous vital Eſſence is the Father's Eſſence in the large Notion and Comprehenſion, but in the ſtrict Notion and Comprehenſion it is his Eſſence only, as it is *his luminous Vitality* peculiarly ſuch, not the imperial Son's. The imperial Son (if he doth exiſt) muſt neceſſarily exiſt in and of this *one individual luminous vital Eſſence* as a Perſon of it, he muſt belong to this Eſſence, it muſt belong to him; for his Generation cannot be the Production of a new ſolar vital Eſſence. This one individual luminous vital Eſſence therefore muſt be communicated to him, which cannot be ſuppos'd to be a ſcholaſtic Communication, but a Communication only in reſpect of *the luminous Vitality* which it is, in reſpect of which luminous Vitality this one individual luminous vital Eſſence becometh the Eſſence of the imperial Son by his Generation. For upon his Generation *The luminous Vitality* which this luminous vital Eſſence is, becometh twofold: that which it is primitively, and *that which it is derivatively.* This luminous vital Eſſence as it is *The primitive luminous Vitality* is the imperial Father (his luminous vital Eſſence in the ſtrict Notion and Comprehenſion:) but *the luminous Vitality*, which this luminous vital Eſſence is, as it is *the derivative luminous Vitality*, is the imperial Son, *his luminous vital Eſſence.* This one individual luminous vital Eſſence therefore is of this twofold Notion or Conſideration: *It is the luminous vital Eſſence of the Father*, and it is alſo *the luminous vital Eſſence of the Son.* Whence it is very plain, that one individual luminous vital Eſſence is the Eſſence of two Perſons: of the one as it is the luminous Vitality *The primitive*, of the other as it is the luminous Vitality *The derivative*, of which the Sun is an inexhauſtible Fountain to his Son. As it is the former, it is *the luminous vital Eſſence of the Father* (in the ſtrict Notion) *and the Exemplar:* As it is the latter, it is *the luminous vital Eſſence of the Son and the Image.* The luminous Vitality which the Son is (the Derivative) and the luminous Vitality which the Father is in the ſtrict Notion (the Primitive) are *undivided*; they are undivided the one from the other; they are undivided from the one individual luminous vital Eſſence (without any Section, Partition or Diviſion from it) both are the luminous vital Eſſence of the Father in the large Notion and Comprehenſion; which ſpeaketh the luminous Vitality that the Son is (the Derivative) to be imparted without parting with it (the undividedly Derivative) and it ſpeaketh the Son to be ὁμοούσιος *co-eſſential* with the Father.

(8.) That we may not overlook the Idea of the Holy Ghoſt (who may be undividedly deriv'd from the Father to the Son, or imparted without parting it from his own Eſſence, as is of eaſie conception and needeth no illuſtration) let us ſuppoſe that this imperial Lord the Son is the origin and neceſſarily the imperial Head of *a luminous vital Empire*, and therefore muſt be in the large Comprehenſion of his Eſſence, not only *The luminous Vitality the meerly conſtitutive* (of his Perſon) but alſo *The luminous Vitality which is The Communicative.* So that there is *a third ſolar imperial Perſon*, and *The one individual luminous vital Eſſence* muſt be conſider'd both as it is *The luminous Vitality the meerly conſtitutive*, and as it is *The luminous Vitality the Communicative.* It is The luminous Vitality *the meerly Conſtitutive*, as it is *The luminous Vitality of the Father* (in the ſtrict Notion) and as it is *The luminous Vitality of the Son* (in the ſtrict Notion) contradiſtinguiſh'd and confronted to *the luminous Vitality* which the Holy Ghoſt is. But the luminous Vitality which the Sun (the Father) is, muſt be two ways confronted: for as it is *The Primitive* it muſt be confronted to the *Derivative:* and as it is *The meerly Conſtitutive*, it muſt be confronted to *The Communicative.* So the luminous Vitality which the imperial Son is, muſt be two ways confronted: for as it is *The Derivative*, it muſt be confronted to *the Primitive*, and as it is The meerly *Conſtitutive*, it muſt be confronted to the *Communicative.* This ſecond ſolar imperial Perſon muſt be alſo ſuppos'd to be (conjunctly and undividedly with the Father and ſubordinately to him) The imperial Head and Origin of the luminous vital Empire, whence the third ſolar imperial Perſon, which anſwereth to the Holy Ghoſt (who is the vital Sanctity, as it is *The Communicative*) muſt neceſſarily be deriv'd to the ſecond from the Father. Theſe things are eaſily applicable to the Chriſtian Trinity, if inſtead of *luminous Vitality* we ſubſtitute *vital Sanctity*; and underſtand *the meerly Conſtitutive* to belong to the Father and the Son as the conſtitutive nature of each, but the *communicative* to belong to them as to their place.

(9.) Vital Sanctity *in divinis* is not to be ſuppos'd a meer Accident, Quality or Habit, but *Eſſentiality*, it is Eſſence or Subſtance as it is *vital* and *vital* Sanctity. Accordingly our Saviour's Perſon is conſtituted, not meerly by an humane vital Subſtance, but *by the one individual divine vital Eſſence*, as it is *the meerly conſtitutive vital Sanctity the Derivative*, whence he is eſſentially God as well as Man, and his Perſon became ſo conſtituted by his *generatio ex Deo*, yet not meerly by his divine Generation, but by his *human-divine generation.* For vital Sanctity doth not conſtitute a Perſon, but as it is combin'd with an intellectual Nature, of it ſelf and alone it is not a Perſon; whence the Hypotheſis of an Abſtract Son of God, his Eternal Generation and the Scholaſtic Incarnation muſt neceſſarily be diſcarded by them that will not otherwiſe than agreeably to ſound Reaſon, Religion and the nature of things maintain the Divinity of our Saviour's Perſon, which is a Theory that in our Account of it is of ſo intelligible a Notion and of ſo rational a Conſiſtence, that no clearer Explication can be given of any Theory in Philoſophy or Theology, which is enough to put to ſilence the Anti-Trinitarians Arguings from Reaſon againſt it. And if the Debate muſt be determin'd by the Holy Scriptures, it is not hard to diſcern who will have the better Cauſe of it. For it is not imaginable that throughout the New-Teſtament the Son ſhould be joyned with the Father as his Colleague and Conſort, if he was not of one Eſſence and Sovereignty, of one Honour, Majeſty and Divinity with the Father. When he ſaith, *what things ſoever the Father doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe; I and my Father are one; I am in the Father and the Father in me; He that hath ſeen me hath ſeen the Father; My Father worketh and I work; All that the Father hath are mine.* He ſpeaketh not the Language of Creatures (of holy Men and Prophets) he repreſenteth himſelf as bordering ſo near upon the Father as no Creature can do, and of ſuch Approximation as only a divine Perſon can be of. He would have ſpoken of himſelf in a much more homely Style if he had been a Creature-ſon, and would have taken care that Men ſhould not miſtake him for God; whereas on the contrary he uſually ſpeaketh of himſelf in ſuch a Style that no unprejudic'd Interpreter of his Words can ſuppoſe that they mean any thing leſs than to repreſent him as (*l*) *Deum in homine quodammodo incluſum*, (God in ſome ſort inclos'd in Man) as the Scholaſtick Theology rightly affirmeth. But theſe Matters relating to his Sanctity are in this Theology (in ſeveral reſpects) repreſented very differently from our Account of them, and we will briefly confront and compare ſome of theſe diſſonant Accounts.

IX. In the Scholaſtic Theology the Unity of the Son's Eſſence and Sovereignty with the Father's is uſually notic'd in Words that agree with our Account, but the Senſe of them, which ought to be of Kind and Quality Divine and Chriſtian, is (for the moſt part) an unchriſtian Scholaſticiſm. Such is that Maxim of St. *Athanaſius*, (*m*) τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θεότητος ἐστὶ τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ, *The fulneſs of the Father's Divinity is the Eſſence of the Son.* The fulneſs of the Father's Divinity is ſuppos'd to exiſt in the Son according to that of St. *Auſtin*, (*n*) *Altho' the divinity dwelleth in the Saints, yet not all the fulneſs of the divinity, as in Chriſt the Head.* But the fulneſs of the Father's Divinity is not only ſuppos'd to exiſt in the Son, but to be his Eſſence by a plenary Communication of the divine Eſſence, which plenary Communication of it is ſuppos'd to be undivided, for the Son is ſaid to be (*o*) τὸ ἴδιον τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας γέννημα ἀδιαίρετον, *the proper undivided Off-ſpring of the Father's Eſſence.* This Theology declaimeth againſt any *Section, Partition, Diviſion*, (τομὴ ἢ διαίρεσις) of the divine Eſſence, as that which introduceth a Plurality of Gods. It attributeth to the ſeveral divine Perſons an Unity of Sovereignty, (δυναστείαν μίαν κυριότητα μίαν, βασιλείαν μίαν, *one Potentacy, one Domination, one Kingdom or Regality*) and in like manner it attributeth to them, μίαν οὐσίαν, τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα, μίαν θεότητος φύσιν, *one Eſſence, the ſame common Eſſence, one nature of the Divinity.* If theſe and the like Notices of the Unity and Undividedneſs of the divine Eſſence and Perſons be underſtood agreeably to the Sanctity and Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion, they are truly Divine and Chriſtian; but in the Scholaſtic Theology they are underſtood as Maxims of Ontology or Metaphyſical Theology, (which is the Theology that hath prevail'd in the Church) and the Senſe of them is (for the moſt part) an unchriſtian Scholaſticiſm. For the ſeveral ſorts of Triads (or Trinities) which this Theology affordeth appertain to ſome ſort of Scholaſticiſm; and all that have attempted to explain the Trinity in an unuſual Method, and yet have not departed from this kind of Theology, have only ſubſtituted a Trinity of one ſort of Scholaſticiſm inſtead of another. The Divine Sovereignty in this Theology doth not ſignify *the Sanctity Imperial*, but the Sovereignty of univerſal governing Providence; and it turneth the Chriſtian Trinity into a Deity of univerſal governing Providence (conſider'd as ſuch) which is hugely unchriſtian and unholy. In like manner the divine Nature or Eſſence in this Theology (uſually) doth not ſignify *the Sanctity vital*, but the ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes, the fulneſs whereof is that which it (uſually) meaneth by *the fulneſs of the Father's Divinity*, which is ſuppos'd to be in the Son. The *Nicene* ὁμοούσιος, (conſubſtantial or co-eſſential) in this Theology chiefly ſignifieth, that the ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence with its Attributes is common to the Son with the Father, which implieth the Son's Equality with the Father, as the Son of a Man is a Man and of the Eſſence of a Man equally with his Father. It ſignifieth alſo, that the Abſtract-Son is no created Subſtance, nor an extrinſick *Heterouſian* in reſpect of God the Father, as the ſecond Archical Hypoſtaſis in Platoniſm (a ſubordinate Deity) is in reſpect of the firſt God, (*p*) and that the Abſtract-Son is indiviſible from the Father as a Plant from the Root, which is conſubſtantial thereto. And conſidering the moſt uſual and currant Senſe of the Fathers it is reaſonable to believe, that the Word was at firſt intended to ſignify that the Subſtance, Nature and Eſſence of the Abſtract-Son is more than *ſpecifically*, that it is *numerically* one and the ſame with the Father's. This Conſubſtantiality being apply'd to the Father and the Son, not upon account of the Chriſtian Divine Nature, but upon account of the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence and Attributes, it became a Metaphyſical and Scholaſtical kind of Term, upon which account it gave Scandal and troubled pious Minds, (as we find in the Account of thoſe Times when it was introduc'd) to the *Arians* it ſeem'd to imply vaſt Abſurdities, and it met with ſo violent an Oppoſition from them, that upon account of this one ſingle Term *Homoouſios* the Chriſtian Church was filled with virulent Cenſures and Reproaches, Diſputings, Fightings, Tumults, Schiſms, Slaughters, Baniſhments, Perſecutions and Outrages innumerable. All which infamous Diſaſters had been avoided, if the Term had been apply'd to the Father and the Son only upon account of the Chriſtian Divinity of the Son, his *Sanctity vital and imperial.*

X. Although the Scholaſtic Theology moſt uſually and generally doth not ſuppoſe that the divine Perſons are *ſeveral infinite Minds and Spirits*, (ſeveral Individuals in one ſpecific Nature as Men are) yet the beſt Learned of the moſt Ancient Fathers did hold, that the Father and the Abſtract Son were two diſtinct infinite Spirits, (or Scholaſtic Eſſences) and conſequently they

(l) *Method. ap. D. Bull p.* 167.

(m) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 16. *S.* 10, 12. & *l.* 5. *c.* 9. *S.* 3.

(n) *In ſanctis quamvis divinitas habitet, non tamen ſicut in capite quod eſt Chriſtus, omnis plenitudo divinitatis.*

(o) *S. Athanaſ. de ſyn. Nic. decret. p.* 420, 421 *Com. Petav. ſupr.* & *l.* 4. *c.* 13. *S.* 8, 14, 18.

(p) *S. Athanaſ. ſupr.*

they attributed not a ſingular and numerical, but a ſpecific Unity of Nature to the divine Perſons. But at and after the *Nicene* Council the generality of Learned Men in the Chriſtian Church ſeem to have quite abandon'd this (portentous) Conceit; for thus *Gr. Naz.* expreſſeth their Senſe, (q) τὸ μὲν ἓν τῇ ὀυσίᾳ γινώσκοντες, τὰ δὲ τρία ταῖς ὑποστάσεσιν, *We acknowledge God one as to Eſſence, but three as to Perſons.* Before the meaning of the Term *Hypoſtaſis* was ſettled there was a Diſſenſion amongſt the Catholicks, (r) one Party affirm'd that there is but one Hypoſtaſis, (meaning thereby one divine Eſſence) another Party affirm'd that there are three *Hypoſtaſes*, (meaning thereby three divine Perſons;) but ſo ſoon as they well underſtood one anothers meaning their Quarrel was at an end, becauſe they all agreed in this Principle, and this was the Senſe of them all, *one Eſſence and three Perſons.* (s) Gr. *Nyſſen* and ſome others of the ancient Writers would not have three Men called *three Men*, but one Man, becauſe their common Eſſence is but one, (they are but one in Eſſence;) and they thus diſcourſe with deſign to ſhew, that the divine Perſons are not three Gods, but only one God; which Diſcourſe of theirs hath a twofold Aſpect, for on the one hand they ſeem to ſuppoſe that the divine Perſons are ſeveral Individuals in one ſpecific Eſſence, as three Men are; but on the other hand it is plain that (although they miſtake in their Philoſophy) they would have a numerical Unity of Nature attributed to the divine Perſons, becauſe they would have ſuch an Unity of Nature attributed to them which anſwereth to that of *one Man.* The ancient Scholaſtic Theology therefore of their Times, as well as the modern, ſeemeth to have diſcarded a ſpecific divine Nature, which to do is in ſome ſenſe one of its Virtues, and in another ſenſe it is one of its Vices. For to diſcard ſuch a ſpecific divine Nature, of which the divine Perſons are ſo many Individuals, is one of its Virtues; but univerſally to diſcard a ſpecific divine Nature, and to overlook the God-kind of vital Nature, (which muſt be called a ſpecific divine Nature) is a principal Vice of this Theology, which maketh it (in great degree) an unchriſtian Scholaſticiſm. The undivided Communication of this divine Eſſence (the God-kind of vital Nature) is clearly intelligible, and is of Kind and Quality Chriſtian; but the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth that this Eſſence *an infinite Mind and Spirit* as ſuch is communicated ſo as to produce a Perſon whoſe Eſſence is an infinite Mind and Spirit, yet no ſuch Eſſence, nor any Reality is produc'd, which is a moſt unintelligible and (according to natural Light) impoſſible Communication; nor is it poſſible that meerly three Modes or Relations conjoyn'd with one Scholaſtic Eſſence ſhould conſtitute three divine Perſons. The *Platonic* Party of Scholaſtic Trinitarians therefore object againſt the *Ariſtotelian*, that theirs is a phantaſtic Trinity of meerly nominal Perſons, that it is not a thing in Nature, nor falleth under Human Conception. But on the other hand the *Ariſtotelian* Party of Scholaſtic Trinitarians object againſt the *Platonic*, that their Trinity of *three diſtinct infinite Minds and Spirits*, (each of which is ſuppos'd to have the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence whole and entire) is downright Tritheiſm. A Plurality of Scholaſtic divine Eſſences is like a Plurality of divine Sovereignties, neceſſarily a Plurality of Gods. The Notion of God according to natural Light is *one infinite eternal Mind or Spirit*; but three ſuch infinite Spirits cannot be one numerical infinite eternal Mind or Spirit, nor can one numerical infinite Mind or Spirit be three diſtinct infinite eternal Minds or Spirits. They are neceſſarily three Gods; for three Gods muſt be defin'd by three ſuch infinite Beings. They are three individual Scholaſtic divine Eſſences, as three Men are three individual human Eſſences, each of them is ſuppos'd to be his proper peculiar Eſſence or Subſtance, which is his ſingular individual Eſſence or Subſtance; therefore they are (not one individual, but) three individual Eſſences or Subſtances in one common ſpecific Nature, as Men are; and according to this Hypotheſis Gods may be multiplied like unto Men. Thus the divided Parties of Scholaſtic Trinitarians ſtrenuouſly argue againſt each other; whence it appeareth that both their Scholaſtic Trinities are great Miſtakes, that they ought to be diſcarded, and that ſuch a Trinity that is not Scholaſtic ought to be ſubſtituted in their ſtead. Such a Trinity that can ſolve and anſwer theſe Objections of Infidels. (t) *Bodinus denieth that God can produce God, becauſe an infinite Being cannot flow from an infinite Being.* With the Jews (that are great Scholaſticks) it is a Maxim (u) *That God cannot make any one ſuch as he is.* Nor is it poſſible that from one infinite Mind and Spirit two infinite Minds and Spirits ſhould emane, that are twice as much as he is, or that theſe ſhould have neceſſary Exiſtence; yet according to the ancient Writers (before cited) that call the Abſtract Son of God an infinite Spirit of God, the Trinity muſt be *three infinite Minds and Spirits.*

XI. The meaneſt Chriſtian clearly underſtandeth wherein the Image of God in a Son of God doth conſiſt, the New-Teſtament plainly declaring that it conſiſteth in our being inwardly regenerated in our Souls, (in having the living Image of God planted there) and in being outwardly regenerated into the glorious Image of God by being clothed with immortal Bodies. From which plain Notices of the Science of Sanctity it is not hard to give an account of the Image of God in the only begotten Son of God, which according to Chriſtianity muſt conſiſt in his imperial-perſonal *Deiformity*, ſuch Deiformity which is his interior Sanctity and his divine and heavenly Sovereignty. But theſe plain Notices of the Chriſtian Theology are of ſmall regard in the Scholaſtic Theology, it hath excogitated very diſſonant Accounts of the Image of God in the Son of God, ſuch as Chriſtianity knoweth nothing of, and which ingendred not only the fierce Altercations about ὁμοούσιος, *conſubſtantial*, but the like eager Conteſts about ὁμοιούσιος (of like Subſtance, Nature and Eſſence) which Term the favourers of *Arianiſm* endeavour'd to ſubſtitute inſtead of the Nicene *Homoouſios.* If this Term had been expounded to ſignify in a truly Divine and Chriſtian Senſe only, there could not have been any Conteſts about it amongſt Chriſtians; for all of them did acknowledge that the Son is the Image of the Father, (elſe he is not the Son) and therefore of like Nature and Eſſence in the Senſe of the Science of Sanctity. But in thoſe elder Times when theſe unchriſtian Conteſts began, a Scholaſtick Theology was ſubſtituted inſtead of the genuine Chriſtian Theology, the Term *Homoiouſios* was underſtood

(q) *Or.* 32. p. 520.

(r) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 4. c. 14. *S.* 10.

(s) *Ibid.* c. 9. *S.* 5. *&c.*

(t) *Bodinus negat Deum efficere poſſe Deum, quia infinitum ab infinito fluere nequit.* Poſſevin; Jo. Bodin. libr. cautio.

(u) *Quòd Deus non poſſit facere aliquem ſui ſimilem.* Hotting diſſ. de Attribut. p. 325;

derſtood to ſignify in an unholy ſcholaſtic Senſe, and thence it was that the ſeveral Parties of Chriſtians were at variance about it; and not only the ſeveral Parties of Chriſtians were at variance about it, (*w*) but the ſame Fathers were at variance with themſelves, ſometimes diſliking it and ſharply diſputing againſt it, and ſometimes approving it and diſputing for it, which is an Inconſiſtence in the ancient Scholaſtick Theology. An Inconſiſtence there is alſo in the modern Scholaſtick Theology touching the infinite fulneſs of Grace and Sanctity in the Human Nature of Chriſt. For on the one hand it affirmeth (*x*) *that this Grace and Sanctity is without meaſure, and what is without meaſure is infinite; that it is an unmeaſurable fulneſs of habitual Holineſs, ſuch as wonderfully exceedeth the joynt and cumulated Holineſs of all, either Saints or Angels; that Chriſt's Grace is not only Plenty, but Immenſity, there being no end or bottom of his Riches; in him were not only ſome Treaſures, but all the Treaſures; and as* S. Hierom *ſaith on* Iſa. XI *deſcendit ſuper eum fons omnis Domini, the whole entire Fountain of Holineſs deſcended upon him.* Yet on the other hand this Theology argueth, *that the Grace of Chriſt is a Creature,* (a created Quality) *inherent in his Soul, which is a Creature alſo, and therefore it muſt neceſſarily be finite, not all-fulneſs, unleſs we ſpeak ſecundum quid, and improperly,* (as ſome ſay) which is to make the Apoſtle ſpeak improperly, when he ſaith of Chriſt, *It pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell, Col.* 1. 19. The Scholaſtick Theology ought to reconcile theſe ſeeming contradictory Propoſitions, (which may be done) but it is better at making than reconciling Inconſiſtences touching Chriſt's fulneſs, of which *Origin* ſpeaketh like a Chriſtian Divine, (*y*) *Our Saviour doth not participate of righteouſneſs, but being righteouſneſs is participated by the Juſt.*

XII. The Scholaſtic Hypotheſis touching the abſolute Unity and Identity of the divine Eſſence in the divine Perſons is diſſonant from Chriſtianity. For the meaneſt Chriſtian may underſtand that God muſt be conſider'd as he is *a Parental Providence,* and as he is *the Sanctity Imperial.* His divine Eſſence muſt be conſider'd as it is *vital* and *vivificative* to the World of living Creatures, (as being the true Zeus) and it muſt be conſider'd as it is *the divine vital kind of Eſſence,* (the Sanctity vital) which is the God-kind or Saint of God-kind of vital Eſſence. But this different Conſideration of the divine Eſſence is not (according to Chriſtianity) competible to the divine Eſſence of the Son of God, (who is meerly the holy Imperial Son) nor is it competible to the divine Eſſence of the Holy Ghoſt, (who is meerly the Spirit of Holineſs;) the Scholaſtic Theology therefore in its Hypotheſis of the abſolute Unity and Identity of the divine Eſſence in the divine Perſons (which ought to be limited to Sanctity vital as it is ſuch) is guilty of an unchriſtian Miſtake. A like Miſtake the uſual Scholaſtick Theology committeth in that *περιχώρησις, Circumince*ſ*ſion, mutual Inexiſtence or in-being, immeation or pervading,* which it attributeth to the divine Perſons, and of which it interpreteth our Saviour's Words, *I am in the Father and the Father in me.* For ſeeing the ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence is abſolutely and numerically one and the ſame in all the three divine Perſons, the Senſe of this Theology is, it attributeth to the divine Perſons *mutual-inexiſtence or in-being, mutual immeation or pervading,* although in reſpect of their Nature and Eſſence there can be no ſuch thing as *mutual-inexiſtence or in-being, mutual immeation or pervading.* (*z*) For as if their Perſons were not diſtinct, one of them could not be ſaid to be in the other, *Sed ambo unus & idem*; ſo if their Nature or Eſſence is not at all diſtinct, one of them cannot be ſaid to be in the other in reſpect of his Nature or Eſſence; and conſequently there can be no ſuch thing as their mutual *in-being, immeation or pervading,* according to the ſcholaſtic Theology. But there is a Chriſtian kind of *Perichoreſis,* or mutual in-being of the divine Perſons; for that fulneſs of vital Sanctity which the Son hath and is, he hath it and is it in the Father, and the Father is it in and to the Son. Which Chriſtian kind of *Perichoreſis* is hugely remote and diſtant from a ſuppoſed *Perichoreſis* of ſeveral Perſons that are of one and the ſame ſingular ſcholaſtick Eſſence.

This grand Difficulty in the Scholaſtick Trinity (ſeveral Perſons of one and the ſame ſingular ſcholaſtic Eſſence) the Scholaſtic Theology pretendeth not to aſſoil, but only to palliate and excuſe from the inſuperable Difficulties that are in ſome other Theories, and ſome other Articles of Religion. But it ought to be conſider'd, that the Chriſtian Trinity is more than a particular Article of the Chriſtian Religion, *It is the initiating Creed of it, the Center of it, the main Body of the Chriſtian Faith, the Foundation of Foundations,* (as the Jews call the Exiſtence of God) other fundamental Articles and the very Frame of the Chriſtian Religion being founded upon it. The inſuperable Difficulties which ſome Branches of Religion that are ſaid to be above our Comprehenſion, (as the Article of God's Eternity) ſeem to involve, are comparatively ſmall Matters and very tolerable, and thoſe Branches of Religion have natural Light to ſupport the Belief of them; but the Evils which this great Article (as it is repreſented in the Scholaſtick Theology) hath done to Chriſtianity are not very tolerable, and the Article it ſelf is purely from ſupernatural Revelation, and is a divine Inſtitution for the Salvation of the World. And can it be ſuppos'd that this Article (ſo great and good, of ſo wiſe an Inſtitution and ſo peculiar a Character) is neceſſarily of ſuch a nature, that the Poſſibility of it is not reconcileable to the unprejudic'd Reaſon of Mankind? that it muſt neceſſarily be the choke-pear of Chriſtianity, and the grand Stumbling-block of Faith, that occaſioneth (in great degree) the World's Infidelity? that it cannot be vindicated from the Objections of Infidels, nor be fit to be debated any where but in the Schools, and there it is repreſented as unconceivable and unintelligible at the moſt ſuperlative rate? that it muſt neceſſarily make Chriſtianity (in great part) a Religion fit for Sophiſts, but not for Saints, intrigue it with Philoſophic Subtilties and Difficulties innumerable, ſophiſticate the Plainneſs and Simplicity of it, adulterate the Purity of it, profane the Sanctity of it, ſpoil the Reaſonableneſs and Recommendableneſs of it, and occaſion a Shole of Scholaſtic Hereſies (with all the Evils that accompany them) touching the Perſon of Chriſt? (*a*) *It is not only in the Work of Virtue and the Obſervance of the Commandments, but alſo in the Path of Faith, that the way is ſtrait and hard which leadeth to Life; it is a Matter of great Labour*

and

(w) *Petav de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 6.

(x) *Gonet. clyp. T.* 12. *Diſp.* 13. *Art.* 1 *S.* 1. *Davenant in Col.* 1. 19. *Jeanes of the fulneſs of Chriſt, p.* 235, 236, 243, 246, 247. *Ed.* 1.

(y) Ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν οὐ μετέχει μὲν δικαιοσύνης, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ὢν μετέχεται ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων. *c. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 320.

(z) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 4. *c.* 16. *S.* 5.

(a) *Non in ſolo opere virtutis, aut in ſola obſervantia mandatorum; ſed etiam intramite fidei anguſta & ardua via eſt, quæ ducit ad vitam: & magni laboris eſt magnique diſcriminis, inter dubias imperitorum opiniones & veriſimiles falſitates per unam*

and great danger to walk ſmoothly on in the one Path of ſound Doctrine, between the dubious Opinions of the unskilful and the Falſities that carry a ſhew of Truth; and the Snares of Error every where oppoſing themſelves, to eſcape all danger of Deception. In the great Myſteries of Faith, as they are repreſented in the Scholaſtic Theology, it is not eaſy to eſcape dangerous Miſtakes; yet ſometimes this Theology ſaith, *In abſoluto & facili eſt æternitas*, The Condition of Salvation is compendious and eaſy both in reſpect of Obedience and of Faith. The Articles whereof would not be ſuch inſuperable Difficulties as they are, if they were underſtood agreeably to the Nature of that Religion of which they are the Articles. They ought to be underſtood and explicated agreeably to *the Myſtery of Godlineſs*, which is a Myſtery of Grace and Sanctity, not of School-Philoſophy. And accordingly the Trinity muſt be ſuppos'd, not to be a Trinity of Perſons of one ſingular ſcholaſtic Eſſence, but of *one individual divine vital Eſſence*, which is vital Sanctity; ſo that each divine Perſon muſt be diſtinctly notic'd as to the vital Sanctity that he diſtinctly is. *The Father is the Sanctity vital, as it is the Primitive*; The Son is *the Sanctity vital, as it is the Derivative* (the undividedly Derivative) *The Holy Ghoſt* (that appertaineth both to the Sanctity vital the Primitive, and to the Sanctity vital the Derivative) is diſtinctly *The Sanctity vital as it is the Communicative.*

XIII. The Scholaſtic Theology cannot aſſoil this Difficulty (which incumbreth the Doctrine of the Trinity) *That ſeveral Perſons are God, and yet there is but one God.* For it cannot aſſoil this Difficulty but by another which it doth not pretend to aſſoil. It ſuppoſeth that every one of the divine Perſons is God by having the whole ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence, and that this ſingular divine Eſſence exiſteth in them all and is common to them all, whereby they become one God; and thus it ſalveth one Difficulty by another which it doth not pretend to aſſoil. This is one Evil, and another is connex'd therewith. For this one ſingular ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence this Theology calleth *one eſſential God*, and it thus diſtinguiſheth a twofold meaning of the Name God. (*b*) *There is one certain thing which is in reality Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, the three Perſons together* (This is God) *and every one of them ſingly is God, as* (habens divinitatem) *having the Deity or Divinity. The Name God is ambiguous, and ſometimes ſignifieth the Nature and Divinity common to the three Perſons, or the three Perſons together with the ſame Eſſence: and ſometimes it ſignifieth ſome one Perſon of the three.* Having thus diſtinguiſh'd the ſeveral (ſuppoſed) Significations of the Name God this Theology thus aſſoileth the Difficulty which is under Conſideration. (*c*) Res illa una Deus eſt, *That one thing is God which is in ſome reſpect one and in ſome reſpect three; one Subſtance* (or Eſſence) *and in Perſons three.* By this Method of aſſoiling the Difficulty we have ſuch an one God which is *no God*, and ſuch an one God as is in *Pagan Polytheiſm*, but *the Scriptural Unity of God* and his *uncauſed Godhead* is overlooked and deſtroyed. For the Name God in the proper (not metaphorical) Acceptation is certainly *a Title of Honour*, and a Name of Perſonal Nobilitation, one God therefore or The one God is neceſſarily a divine Perſon; and to ſuppoſe that to be The one God which is not a Perſon of God-Nobilitation is a Contradiction. A Scholaſtic *meer eſſential one God*, therefore (*una quædam res, res illa una*) ſubſtituted inſtead of *a Perſonal God*, is really no God at all, nor are the Scriptures acquainted with any ſuch Deity. Nor are they acquainted with ſuch an one God which is in this Theology, and is alſo in *the Pagan Polytheiſm*. For as the Pagan Theiſts were Monarchiſts, and deriv'd their many Gods from one Supreme Deity and Principle of all things, ſo the Scholaſtic Theology deriveth all Beings and the other divine Perſons from God the Father; (*d*) *Ab hoc Deo, & quà principium eſt ἀγέννητον, uno etiam ac ſolo*, (from this God, and as he is the ingenit Principle, the one and only.) The Scholaſtic Theology attributeth to God the Father what the Pagan Polytheiſts attributed to their Supream Deity; for it ſuppoſeth him to be ſo far *the one and only God as he is of himſelf God*; but it looketh upon him as nothing more than *hic Deus*, This Perſon of God, (*e*) *Hic Deus qui eſt Pater*, (one of the Perſons that have the Deity) and is far from acknowledging his *Mono-Theiſm* (ſimply and without addition) *that he is the one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God, and as ſuch the one only God, beſides whom there is no other.* This *Mono-Theiſm* of God the Father, *which is the true Unity of God, the true Anti-polytheiſm*, which the Scripture aſſerteth and celebrateth (as will be hereafter diſcours'd) is deſtroyed by this Scholaſtic Theology and its Trinity, which alſo thus far deſtroyeth *his uncauſed Godhead*; it denieth him to be God in order of Nature antecedently to any Cauſation. For the Generation of the Son and the Spiration of the Holy Ghoſt muſt be accounted ſome ſort of *Cauſation*, and is ſo called in the Scholaſtic Theology, which alſo ſuppoſeth that *the Father is the Fountain of the Divinity, that the Son of God is a Perſon generated by God, and that the Holy Ghoſt is from the Father and the Son by Spiration.* If this generated Son as ſuch is the Son of God, if the Holy Ghoſt by this Spiration is the Spirit of God, common Senſe will argue that the Father did exiſt as God in order of Nature antecedently to this Cauſation, Generation and Spiration, and therefore in order of Nature antecedently to his being a Father and antecedently to a Trinity. And if he did ſo exiſt, *then he did exiſt as the one only God from Eternity, doth ſo exiſt to Eternity, is not without great Impiety called by Scholaſticks Hic Deus, A meer eſſential or imperſonal God is not the one only God, nor is this ſcholaſtic Maxim* (underſtood as it is in the Scholaſtic Theology) *excuſable from foul Error*, Quælibet perſona eſt tota eſſentia divina, id eſt, unus ille verus Deus, extrà quem non eſt alius, *Every Perſon is the whole divine Eſſence, that is, the one true God, beſides whom there is no other.*

XIV. Theſe things the Scholaſtic Theology muſt admit, if it did admit this Principle, *that God did exiſt in order of Nature antecedently to a Trinity.* This Theology therefore denieth this ſelf-evident Principle, (and therefore denieth him to be God in order of Nature antecedently to any Cauſation) in its principal Maxims it affirmeth the contrary. But this Affirmation is ſo grand an Abſurdity, that alone it is ſufficient to ſpoil its Explication of the Trinity. For this is the Senſe of this Theology, *that God is a Father in order of Nature antecedently to his being a Perſon*, and therefore antecedently to his Exiſtence. *Generation and Filiation, Spiration and Pro-*

ſanæ doctrinæ ſemitam inoffenſis greſſibus ambulare; & cùm undique ſe laquei erroris opponunt, omne periculum deceptionis evadere. S. Leo Ser. 5. de Nativ.

(b) *Una quædam res eſt, quæ veraciter eſt Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, tres ſimul perſonæ, ac ſingulatim quælibet earundem.* Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 9. S. 7, 10. *Nomen Deus ancipitem habet uſum, atque interdum communem tribus naturam & divinitatem ſignificat, aut tres ſimul perſonas cum eâdem eſſentiâ: interdum verò perſonam aliquam de tribus.* Ibid. c. 11. S. 5. & l. 4. c. 3. S. 9.

(c) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 9. S. 14.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 2. S. 4.

(e) *Ibid. l.* 5. c. 4. S. 10.

ceſſion, (ſaith this Theology) *conſtitute three Perſons in the eternal Godhead. To produce and to proceed (whether by Generation or Spiration) is that which maketh or conſtituteth a Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead.* By producing therefore and by Generation the Father is made and conſtituted a Perſon, and conſequently his being a Father (by Generation and Production) is in order of Nature antecedent to his being a Perſon. The ſame Concluſion iſſueth from other grand Maxims of this Theology. *For it ſtateth the Perſonalities of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt upon three modes of Subſiſtence,* (τρόποι ὑπάρξεως) *of one and the ſame Eſſence, which is thereby diſtinguiſh'd into three Perſons. Which Modes of Subſiſtence are relative Subſiſtences, or ſubſiſting Relations*; *ſo that every divine Perſon is formally conſtituted what he is*, relatione perſonali, perſona divina eſt Hypoſtaſis & tamen relatio, relatione plurificatur perſona in divinis. *All the abſolute and eſſential Attributes are perfectly the ſame in the divine Perſons, which are conſtituted and diſtinguiſh'd by their relative Properties.* The divine Perſon of God the Father therefore is conſtituted a Perſon, and is diſtinguiſh'd from the other divine Perſons by his Relation of Paternity, which is neceſſarily founded upon his generating the Son, and conſequently this Generation and his Paternity are in order of Nature antecedent to his being a Perſon. (*f*) The Schoolmen are aware of this Difficulty, and attempt to aſſoil it, but *Vaſquez* is gravell'd with it, and others that pretend to aſſoil it had as good ſay nothing, as nothing to purpoſe. For they cannot anſwer their own Objections, their Diſtinctions are not reconcileable to common Senſe, nor are they excogitated for any other End, but to palliate this groſſeſt of Abſurdities, *Paternitas conſtituit Patrem in eſſe perſonæ*, (*g*) *proprietas ipſa Patris, non ut in creatis evenit, ad hypoſtaſin accedit jam exiſtentem, ſive perſonam*; *ſed eam ipſam conſtituit.* It is not with God as it is with Creatures, he is conſtituted a Perſon by his Paternity. Such is their Maxim, yet they talk at the greateſt rate for proper Generation *in divinis.*

(f) Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 11. Art. 3.

(g) Petav. de Trin. l. 5. c. 4. S. 10.

CHAP. V.

A fifth ſort of Arguments to prove the Truth of our Idea, from plain Attributions of Deity to our Saviour in holy Scripture: The firſt ſort of theſe Attributions. 2. *A ſecond ſort of them.* 3. *A third ſort of them.* 4. *A fourth ſort of them.* 5. *A fifth ſort of them.* 6. *A ſixth ſort of them.* 7. *A ſeventh ſort of them.* 8. *An eighth ſort of them.* 9. *The Scholaſtick Theology miſtaketh in alledging the Old-Teſtament.* 10. *Particularly in alledging the Prophets.* 11. *It miſtaketh in alledging the New-Teſtament.* 12. *A principal Fault of this Theology.* 13. *It cannot anſwer the Anti-Trinitarians Scripture-Arguments from the Unity of God.* 14. *Nor a ſecond ſort of their Scripture-Arguments.* 15. *Nor a third ſort of their Scripture-Arguments.* 16. *Nor a fourth Claſſis of their Scripture-Arguments.* 17. *Nor a fifth Claſſis of them.* 18. *Nor the Jews Objections.*

1. A Fifth ſort of Arguments to prove the Truth of our Idea of the Son of God we will deduce *from the many plain Attributions of Deity to him in holy Scripture. Socinus* and his Followers have ſtated their Controverſy touching the Divinity of Chriſt upon the Terms of *Deus ſummus*, which is an ambiguous Expreſſion. For by denying him to be *Deus ſummus*, they mean to deny *his being a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead*, and to make him a *Creature*, as they call him; and this we ſuppoſe to be a bordering upon Infidelity and meer natural Religion, a vilifying the Son of God, a deſtroying the Nobleneſs of Chriſtianity, and therefore both *Hereſy* and *Pedantry*. But if by denying him to be *Deus ſummus* they did only mean that he is not *Deus ſummus* in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology, we ought ſo far to conſort with their Hypotheſis; for nothing is more contrary to his Idea than to ſuppoſe him (in the Senſe of that Theology) *the Almighty eternal God.* As it is on the one hand a moſt unchriſtian Extravagance to deny his proper Deity (this being his Eſſence and Definition, to be *Deus natus & genitus*) *to make him a Creature ſuch as is a minor Deity, or a meer holy Man deiſy'd*; ſo on the other hand it is an irreligious Extravagance to aſſert, *that all the Names and Operations and Attributes of God are in full and plain Words* (in Scripture) *given to Chriſt.* The Scripture uſeth great Temper and Sobriety in its many plain Attributions of Deity to our Saviour, and touching all of them in general it is obſervable that they are no other than ſuch as belong to him, as he is *The holy imperial Lord the Son.*

The *firſt* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is this Name *The Lord* with its illuſtrious Adjuncts *The Lord of all, The one Lord, The Lord of Glory, Lord of Lords and King of Kings.* Which illuſtrious Adjuncts ſignify this one thing, and nothing more, that he is *the holy imperial Lord the Son actually poſſeſs'd of his imperial Eſtate* (to which a Right and Title was antecedent;) for the holy imperial Lord actually poſſeſs'd of his Imperial Eſtate, (which is the divine Sovereignty) is neceſſarily and plenarily *Lord of all, The one Lord, The Lord of Glory, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.* From which high and holy Sovereignty a Judgment may be made touching his true Idea; for that divine imperial Eſtate which he now poſſeſſeth did belong to him as his Eſtate; but it could not belong to any ſave only a Perſon of this Quality and Character, *The holy imperial Lord the Son*; this therefore is his true Idea. He was natively the Perſon of *Chriſt the Lord*, which is to ſay, that he was natively *The holy imperial Lord*, and therefore (the divine Prince and Potentate) the holy imperial Lord the Son. If he had been a Creature-ſon it would have been an infinite Incongruity to raiſe him to the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, the ſame Throne, Sovereignty, Majeſty and Glory with God, (allowing only the difference between Father and Son) the ſame univerſal and plenary Dominion, the ſame Soul-Sovereignty, the fulleſt Height of Honour and Power, of Illuſtriouſneſs and Beatitude. His high and holy Imperial Eſtate of ſupreme Lordſhip and Dominion always belong'd to him, was always deſign'd for him, though not actually conferr'd upon him till his Reſurrection.

Acts 10. 36. 1 Cor. 2. 8. and 8. 6. Apoc. 17. 14.

rection. But as Chriſtians in reſpect of their heavenly Inheritance have *jus ad rem* before they have *jus in re*, ſo it was with the Son of God in reſpect of his heavenly Sovereignty; for in the days of his Fleſh he had Right and Title to it, and therefore was no Creature-Son, but (as a Chriſtian muſt be ſaid to be a Citizen of Heaven, though not in actual Poſſeſſion of that State and Place) a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead. If he was a Creature-Son, he muſt be of the *ſervient* and *ſubject*-party, which is oppoſite to his Name *The Lord*, that always and eſſentially belong'd to him, and denoteth him to be eſſentially of the Godhead-party. In the Language of the holy People this Name *The Lord* always ſignifieth the Creature-tranſcendent Lord (to whom all Creatures, Men and Angels, of right are ſubject) The Son of God therefore as ſuch is of the Godhead-party, becauſe as ſuch he is *The Lord*. In the Language of the holy People (who are Citizens and the Subjects of the holy Empire) this Name *The Lord* ſignifieth *The holy imperial Lord* (their divine ſoveraign Lord) this therefore is his true Idea. There can be but one Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent, which is the one ſupreme Godhead: The Son of God is neceſſarily a Perſon of this one Creature-tranſcendent Kingdom-eſtate; therefore he is neceſſarily a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead, and his true Idea muſt repreſent him as no leſs than ſo. In the New Teſtament *The Lord* is the uſual Name of the Son of God, as in the Old Teſtament it ſignifieth the true God: the true God is *The Lord* in Sanctity and Religion, becauſe he is the imperial eſtate of Sanctity; therefore the Son of God muſt be a Perſon of that imperial eſtate, or elſe in Sanctity and Religion he cannot be *The Lord*.

II. A *ſecond* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is this Name *the Lord*, as it is the Interpretation of the Name *Jehovah*; whence ſome learned Men infer, that Chriſt is *The Jehovah*. Which Aſſertion muſt be underſtood to be meant ſtrictly and without limitation of ſenſe. But in ſuch ſenſe it is not true or poſſible; for *Jehovah* is the proper diſtinctive Name of *the one Perſon of God definitively ſuch*, and therefore of a divine Perſon diſtinct from the Perſon of Chriſt; and it is not poſſible, that in the ſtrict ſenſe one divine Perſon can be another. But the holy Writers in ſeveral Places ſpeak of Chriſt indiſtinctly from *Jehovah, as being in certain Caſes and Conditions not diſcriminated from him, of the ſame Condition with him, and ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe Jehovah, the ſame with Jehovah.* Thus *in aſcending up on high and leading Captivity captive* Chriſt is the ſame with *Jehovah* (of the ſame Condition with *Jehovah*) and what is ſaid of *Jehovah* in the Old Teſtament, is apply'd to Chriſt in the New Teſtament. *Pſal.* 68. 18. *Eph.* 4. 8. In being *pierc'd and looked on* Chriſt is the ſame *Apoc.* 1. 7. with Jehovah. *Zech.* 12. 10. *Joh.* 19. 37. In being of right *to be worſhipped by all the Gods* (the holy Angels) Chriſt is the ſame with *Jehovah. Pſal.* 97. 7. *Heb.* 1. 6. So in the right of having *every knee bowed to him.* Iſa. 45. 23. Rom. 14. 11. In ſome places the holy Writers ſpeak of *Jehovah indiviſively and complicately* with Chriſt, as being in ſome caſes ſo conjunct and undivided, that they are not diſcriminated ſave only *immediatione ſuppoſiti* (by the immediateneſs of Chriſt's Perſon) ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe he is *Jehovah*, or the ſame with *Jehovah*. What the Prophet *Joel* ſaith *Chap.* 2. 32. *Whoſoever ſhall call on the Name of the Lord* (Jehovah) *ſhall be delivered*, Rom. 10. 13. the Apoſtle applieth to Chriſt the Lord, but not to Chriſt alone, but to *Jehovah* indiviſively and complicately with Chriſt; for he ſpeaketh of *calling upon the Name of the Lord* according to Chriſtianity, the ſeveral Texts which he citeth, are meant of the *Jehovah* of the Old Teſtament, and ſo are thoſe words of his, *The ſame Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* What the Prophet *Iſaiah* ſaith Chap. 40. 3. *The voice of one that crieth in the Wilderneſs, prepare ye the way of the Lord* (Jehovah) is thus apply'd in the ſaying of *Zechariah* to *John the Baptiſt* Luk. 1. 76. *Thou Child ſhalt be called the Prophet of the higheſt; for thou ſhalt go before the face of the Lord* (or *Jehovah* as it is in the Prophet *Iſaiah*) to prepare his ways. What the Prophet ſaith of *Jehovah* is by *Zechariah* applied to Chriſt, but not to Chriſt alone, nor to him in the firſt place, but to the Jews *Jehovah indiviſively and complicately* with Chriſt; for by *the Higheſt* is meant the Jews *Jehovah*, whoſe Prophet *John Baptiſt* was, and who *went before his face, to prepare his ways*, although not immediately as appearing in his own Perſon. Hence it is, that the Words of the Prophet *Malachi*, differently repreſented in the Prophecy and in the Evangeliſt, are in ſenſe the ſame. In his Prophecy they run thus; *I ſend my Meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare my way before me.* *Mal.* 3. 1. In the Evangeliſt they are thus repreſented; *I ſend my Meſſenger before thy face, which ſhall prepare thy way before thee.* *Matth.* 11. 10. In the Prophecy they are the Words of God touching ſending a Meſſenger before his own face: In the Evangeliſt they are the Words of God touching ſending a Meſſenger before the face of his Son, which in Scripture are look'd upon as the ſame thing. In the ſame place Chriſt is again complicated with *Jehovah*. Mal. 3. 1. *The Lord whom ye ſeek, ſhall ſuddenly come to his Temple, even the Meſſenger of the Covenant.* For the Jew's *Jehovah* was the Lord of his Temple, and he came into his Temple, though not in his own Perſon, yet in *the Meſſenger of the Covenant*'s coming into it, which was an Equipollent or the ſame thing. And by the Divinity of his Perſon he filled that ſecond Temple *with glory* at the ſame rate, as if himſelf had appeared therein in his own Perſon, and thereby made *the glory of the latter houſe greater than the glory of the former*; which is the only tolerable ſenſe that can be made of the Prophecy. *Hagg.* 2. 7, 9. And as the Meſſiah may be ſaid to be the *Jehovah coming into his Temple*, or the *Jehovah aſcending on high, and leading captivity captive*, but not in his own Perſon: ſo he may be ſaid to be the *Jehovah our Righteouſneſs*, but not in his own Perſon, according to that of the Apoſtle (whence it is manifeſt, that he is not *Jehovah* or God our Righteouſneſs in his own Perſon) 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *He is made unto us of God Righteouſneſs.* This is the higheſt ſenſe wherein the Meſſiah can be ſaid to be *Jehovah our Righteouſneſs*: but he may be ſaid to be ſo in ſome other lower ſenſes analogically to *Zorobabel*, of whom the Prophecy is literally meant. Jer. 23. 6. *In his days Judah ſhall be ſaved, and Iſrael ſhall dwell ſafely: and this is his Name whereby he ſhall be called, The Lord* (Jehovah) *our Righteouſneſs.* The Words are part of a Prophecy touching the Return of the Jews from the *Babylonian* Captivity wherein their God (Jehovah) was Righteouſneſs and Salvation (in reſpect of ſecular Intereſts) to the literal *Iſrael* and *Judah*. And this Righteouſneſs and Salvation in the literal ſenſe of the Prophecy was a type of the ſpiritual *Iſrael*'s Righteouſneſs and Salvation (as to Soul-Intereſts) of which Chriſt is the procuring cauſe, and which God hath provided for them in Chriſt. Which genuine Expoſition of the Prophecy is far from inferring that Chriſt is ſtrictly the *Jehovah :* nor doth this Saying of ſome Hebrew Doctors ſignifie any thing to the Proof of it (h) *that God calleth the Meſſiah by his own name, and his name is Jehovah*; for ſo he calleth *Zorobabel* (i) and often an Angel : Nor do thoſe Hebrew Doctors count the Meſſiah the *Jehovah*, we diſcard therefore this extravagant conceit, that Chriſt is ſtrictly *the Jehovah :* but we will inſer from the numerous cited places of Scripture, that he is ſo much undiſcriminated from Jehovah and the ſame with him, that he can be no leſs than a Perſon of his God-head (one with him in divine-vital Eſſence and Sovereignty) no Creature-Son.

(h) *Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed, Art.* 2 *p.* 208. *Ed.* 1.

(i) *Bil.bra veritat. p.* 190, 335.

III. The *third* ſort of plain Attributions is this Name *God attributed to Chriſt*, which we do not ſuppoſe to mean, that Chriſt is *the Perſon of God* (the imperial Perſon of God) *abſolutely and definitively ſo*; but that he is God ſo as to be a Perſon of *the one ſupreme Godhead* (that imperial Creature-tranſcendence or God-eminence) *as the imperial Son in it and of it*, and therefore God in a ſenſe directly oppoſite to this moſt unchriſtian Aſſertion of the Anti-Trinitarians (k. *Chriſtum perſonam ſupremæ divinitatis non eſſe*, that Chriſt is not a Perſon of the ſupreme Godhead, but only *an holy Man conſtituted an extrinſick minor Deity*, ſo introducing (if they worſhip Chriſt) *Man-worſhip, Creature-worſhip, and a Plurality of Gods.* The feeble Anſwers which they make to thoſe Places of Scripture, wherein Chriſt is called God, ſhew, that they are far better at proving, than at anſwering the Proofs that are alledg'd againſt them. It argueth a great want of Ingenuity, that they do not (without making Demurs and ſeeking Tricks and Evaſions) freely and ingenuouſly acknowledge the Deity of their Saviour notwithſtanding theſe expreſs Teſtimonies of Scripture. *Joh.* 1. 1. *The Word was God.* Joh. 20. 28. *My Lord and my God, ſaid* Thomas *to our Saviour.* 1 Tim. 3. 16. *God was manifeſted in the fleſh.* 1 Joh. 3. 16. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, becauſe he laid down his life for us* (in the Perſon of his Son, which was equivalent to the laying it down in his own Perſon.) *Act.* 20. 28. *God hath purchaſed the Church with his own blood.* In which place I do not ſuppoſe, that Chriſt is called God, but his Blood is called the Blood of God *as being divine Blood*, as the Lamb of God ſignifieth *the divine Lamb.* To him the Apoſtle attributeth *the Throne of*
Heb. 8. 1. *God* (כסי הכבוד *the Throne of Glory* ſo called by the Jews) which therefore doth belong to him, but is ſo far from belonging to any that is not God, that it is utterly incommunicable to any Creature, who can rightfully ſit on the Throne of God, without being truly God ? He cannot be the Meſſiah, that is not the imperial Son; And he that is the imperial Son, is neceſſarily one of the imperial Eſtate (that is, of the Godhead) which is a perfect Demonſtration of the Deity of our Saviour, to whom therefore, as to one of the Godhead, the Apoſtle attributeth the
Heb. 1. 8. Throne : *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever* Which words are part of a Prophecy, that muſt have a completion in a far ſublimer ſenſe in the New Teſtament than in the Old; as muſt alſo thoſe other Words of a Prophecy *Matth.* 1. 23. *They ſhall call his Name Emanuel, which is God with us.* Of the ſame nature is that ſublime Prophecy (which no honeſt Interpreter of Scripture can deny to be ultimately meant of our Saviour) *Iſa.* 9. 6. *His name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, The mighty God.* In the Style of the Jews *The bleſſed* ſignifieth God. The Apoſtle therefore could not more expreſly and fully atteſt the Deity of Chriſt, than by ſaying of him, Rom. 9. 5. *Who is over all God bleſſed for ever.* Which yet is no more than his uſual Name *The Son of God* importeth; for it is *Divinity* or *Deity* of Perſon, to be the (imperial) Son of God.

(k) *Crellius de uno Deo l.* 1. *S.* 2. *c.* 4.

IV. A *fourth* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is *The divine* Attributes of an *omni-imperial* Authority, an *omnipotent executive Power*, an *Omniſcience* and *Omnipreſence*, which in Scripture are expreſly aſcrib'd to our Saviour, and which belong to him, as he is *the holy imperial Lord the Son.* For his Idea is the meaſure of his divine Attributes; all ſuch divine Attributes belong to him, which neceſſarily belong to the Holy imperial Lord the Son (both upon account of the Dignity of his Perſon, and upon account of his officiary Dignity and Government.) No other divine Attributes do belong to him, but ſuch as belong *to the Holy imperial Lord the Son as ſuch.* As ſuch he muſt have *an omni-imperial Authority* with reſpect to the holy imperial Concerns (the Concerns of his Church and Kingdom;) his Sovereignty is the Church-Sovereignty, and that it may be ſo, it muſt be in this ſenſe an univerſal Sovereignty; All capable Creatures muſt owe Subjection to him, muſt be of Right and by Obligation the Subjects of his holy Empire, and all things muſt be ſubjected to his Diſpoſal. He is not a governing Lord and King of the World, but all capable Creatures ought to be the Subjects of his ſpiritual Kingdom (in ſuch ſenſe he is King of Kings and Lord of Lords;) and as the Pope pretendeth to all temporal Power *indirectè & in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, ſo Chriſt hath Right to diſpoſe of all things, as the Concerns of his holy Empire do require. Agreeably to his *Omni-imperial Authority* his Power is omnipotent in order to the Concerns of his holy Empire, *adminiſtring the Government of it, hearing Prayers, pardoning Sins, giving Grace, ſending the Holy Spirit, judging the World, killing and making alive, raiſing the dead, diſtributing the final Rewards and Puniſhments, and crowning his People with life immortal.* The Apoſtle giveth illuſtrious Atteſtations to his Omnipotency with reſpect to the holy Empire, *Coloſ.* 1. 17. *By him all things conſiſt.* Hebr. 1. 3. *Upholding all things by the word of his power.* His Agency is that which is peculiar to the Godhead, and an imitation of his Father's Creature-tranſcendent Agency. *What things ſoever the Father doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe. As the Father raiſeth up the dead, and quickneth them : even ſo the Son quickneth whom he will*, Joh. 5. 19, 21. His *Omniſcience* (which he hath *derivatively, conjunctly*, and *undividedly* with God) is a principal branch of his (Deity or) imperial Creature-tranſcendence; Without it he could not be Meſſiah the King, the imperial Son in his imperial Eſtate, he could not be qualify'd for his Religion, officiary Dignity and Government. For the Patron-Saints of the Pontificians without an *Omniſcience* are incapable of Invocation. Without it Chriſt could not be King of the Univerſal Church (eſpecially as to the Soul-ſovereignty of it) or Judge of the World. He could not judge *the Secrets of Men* if he did not *ſearch the Heart and Reins*, which is a Peculiarity of the Godhead. *Apoc.* 2. 23. His Diſciples obſerv'd, that he knew *what was in Man, the ſecret thoughts of Men.* Joh. 2. 25. Matth. 9. 4. They attribute to him an Omniſcience. *Joh.* 16. 30. *We are ſure that thou knoweſt all things.* Joh. 21. 17. *Lord, thou knoweſt all things.* But if we ſpeak of our Saviour in the days of his Fleſh, it muſt not be ſaid in rigorous exactneſs, but with a mollifying reſtriction (πῆ in ſome ſort) *that he knew all things*, † as appeareth from his own words touching his Neſcience of the laſt day. *Mar.* 13. 32. For it is manifeſt, that although many Attempts have been made, to expound them otherwiſe; yet no tolerable Expoſition can be made of them, ſave only that of *Grotius*, who interpreteth them to mean, that as our Saviour in his minority *encreaſed in Wiſdom*, ſo he arrived not at the fullneſs of Knowledge till after his Reſurrection. *Sicut poſt reſurrectionem accepit omnem poteſtatem, itâ & omnem ſcientiam.* As after his Reſurrection he received all Power, ſo all Knowledge. Agreeably whereto the Apocalypſe is ſaid to be given him by God. *Apoc.* 1. 1. In *actu primo* therefore and radically Chriſt had in him ſuch Powers, which might not be fully exercis'd in this lower State, *till he was made perfect*. Heb. 5. 9. His Attribute of *Omnipreſence* appeareth in *his dwelling in the Souls of his People, his being with their Spirit, his coming in to them and ſupping with them, his being with them to the end of the World*, and *wherever two or three are gathered together in his Name.* If Chriſt was a Creature-Son unfurniſh'd with, and incapable of theſe divine Attributes and Perfections, Chriſtianity would be a Religion of the greateſt Nonſenſe imaginable; for the prime Article of it is, that Chriſt preſideth in the imperial Eſtate and Government of a vaſt holy Univerſe, and yet he muſt be ſuppos'd utterly incapable thereof, and of Abilities to manage it.

† *The ſealed Book was not underſtood by the Lamb till it was opened by him Apoc.* 5. 5.

Joh. 14. 23. 2 *Tim.* 4. 22. *Apoc.* 3. 20. *Matth* 18. 20. *and* 28. 20.

V. A *fifth* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is *The religious Worſhip and Service of Piety* (which is incommunicable to any Creature;) for Chriſtians are alike God's Religioniſts and Chriſt's Religioniſts, not only becauſe they are of his Inſtitution, but becauſe he is (in conſort with God) the Object of their God-honour and Service. *They honour the Son as they honour the Father, are alike God's Believers and Chriſt's Believers, their Saviour is their ſoveraign Hope and Truſt*, they ſerve him with that Eſteem, Devotedneſs and Adherence, that Fullneſs of Affection, thoſe Intentions and Deſigns, which are the (deifying) ſoveraign Honour and Service of their Souls. This ſuperlative Affection which by way of Homage we owe unto Chriſt, proveth his Deity; A Chriſtian ſerveth none but God with that devotional Eſteem and Affection wherewith he ſerveth his Lord Chriſt, which muſt be no leſs than ſupreme and ſoveraign (allowing only the Difference which Father and Son importeth) peerleſs and incommunicable beyond all competition, a depreciating all things in compariſon, a counting nothing too much for him, nothing too dear for him, a ſerving him with our All and at any rate, living for him, dying for him, 2 *Cor.* 5. 15. No Man therefore can be a Chriſtian without making Chriſt in devotional Eſteem, Affection and Service, *his Chriſtian imperial Lord and his God as God the Son* according to Chriſtianity. *Job.* 20. 28. It is doubtful whether they be Semi-Chriſtians, that at this rate minorate the Adoration due unto Chriſt (k) *Non eadem, neque æqualis, ſed quodammodo ſimilis eſt illi, quæ Deo debetur.* It is not the ſame, nor equal, but in ſome ſort it is like to that which is due to God. Although they are not ſo bad, yet becauſe they are hugely diſſonant from the Sentiment of Chriſtians, muſt they not be thought of the ſame Family and Foot-mark with *Aſterius* the *Cappadocian* Sophiſt, who (if *Athanaſius* doth not wrong him) wrote a Book (l) *in quo locuſtam & erucam cum Chriſto comparat, immo Chriſto anteponit*, wherein he compareth the Locuſt and Palmer-worm with Chriſt, yea and preferreth them before him? How far the genuin Chriſtians are from minorating the Adoration of their Saviour, and making him an Underling in their religious Worſhip, appeareth from their Character; for they are ſuch as own Chriſt Jeſus for their divine ſovereign Lord and *call upon his name*, Act. 9. 21. 1 Cor. 1. 2. the name of that Lord who is not to be heard of but by the Preaching of the Goſpel, *Rom.* 10. 14. to whom they are bound to *bow the Knee* (paying him the religious Worſhip) *Phil.* 2. 10. whom they conjoin with God in their Doxologies and laudatory Aſcriptions, *Apoc.* 5. 13. and 7. 10. to whom their Doxologies are the ſame that they make unto God, 1 *Pet.* 4. 11. 2 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Heb.* 13. 21. *Rom.* 9. 5. *Apoc.* 1. 5, 6. *and* 5. 13. *and* 7. 10. As the holy Angels alſo (in conſort with all Creatures) pay unto him the ſame Adorations with God, and reſound together the Praiſes of God and of the Lamb. *Heb.* 1. 6. *Apoc.* 5. 11, 12, 13. our Saviour is repreſented as a Perſon conjoin'd with God in the ſupreme Godhead, and Chriſtians conſider him as ſuch in their religious Worſhip without making any minorating or diſparaging Difference or Separation. They are repreſented as conjunct and undivided, and as ſitting on the ſame Throne (not only in the Doxologies, but) in the Deſcription of the New Jeruſalem; for *the Throne of God and of the Lamb* are ſaid to be in it. *Apoc.* 22. 3. It is not hard, to diſcern what ſort of Perſon this divine name *The Lamb* and his Throne ſignifieth and characterizeth, that they denote *the holy imperial Lord the Son*, who as ſuch is the Object of the higheſt Acts of religious Worſhip in Baptiſm and the Holy Euchariſt, in Doxologies and Prayer. For St. *John* prayeth to him, *Apoc.* 22. 20. St. *Paul* prayeth to him, as Chriſtians pray unto God, 2 *Cor.* 12. 8. The Protomartyr did put up his Prayers to him, and they are the ſame that the Prince of Martyrs did put up to his Father upon the Croſs, *Act.* 7. 59, 60. In the precationary Benedictions of the holy Writers (which are a ſort of Addreſſes to him for the greateſt Bleſſings) uſually he is conjoined with God, 1 *Theſ.* 3. 11, 12. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 16, 17. So S. *Paul* uſually beginneth his Epiſtles and ſometimes cloſeth them, *Eph.* 6. 23. 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. Oftentimes his Benedictions run in this form, *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you, or be with your Spirit, Gal.* 6. 18. *Phil.* 4. 23. 2 *Theſ.* 3. 18. ſo *Apoc.* 22. 21.

Joh. 5. 22, 23. *and* 14. 1. 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. *Eph.* 1. 12. *Matt.* 10. 37. 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. *Phil.* 1. 21. 1 *Pet.* 2. 7.

(k) *Enjedin. explicat. loc. &c.* p. 388.

(l) *Baron. ad an.* 325. *n.* 101.

He that is rightfully the Object of all this religious Worſhip (the divine Honours) in the Chriſtian Church, cannot be ſuppos'd to be unqualified for it; ſuch religious Worſhip is an Aſcription to him of the Creature-tranſcendent Knowledge, Preſence, Power, Dominion and Sovereignty (and therefore of nothing leſs than the Godhead) which our Saviour rightfully both inherited and merited, *Rom.* 14. 8, 9. *Apoc.* 5. 9, 12. compar'd with *Apoc.* 4.12. Whence a learned ſcholaſtic Divine of our own argueth with great reaſon (*m*) *He that by juſt Title hath acquir'd a divine Empire over Men and the divine Honours, is neceſſarily God* (as the imperial Son:) *But the Son by juſt Title and moſt deſerved Right hath acquir'd the divine Empire and Honours; which inferreth the Concluſion.* The ſame (*n*) Author hath ſo well explain'd the Difference between the Adoration done to Angels in the Times of the Old Teſtament and the Worſhip that we rightfully do to our Saviour in the Times of the New Teſtament, as that it is a clear Proof of his Deity of Perſon. For thoſe Adorations which the Patriarchs did to an Angel, were only to an Angel viſible and preſent: but we pay religious Worſhip to our Saviour in Heaven the inviſible World. The Adoration done to an Angel in thoſe times was done to the Angel only by Accident (not *quâ talis*, but only as repreſenting and ſuſtaining the Perſon of God) it was done to God *per ſe*: but Chriſt is propos'd an Object of our Adoration *per ſe. Apoc.* 5. 12. An Angel was worſhipp'd only during the time that he appeared on Earth and ſuſtained the Perſon of God, when he laid aſide that Perſon, he was to be no more worſhipp'd: but Chriſt is perpetually and to eternity an Object of religious Worſhip. *Rom.* 9. 5. *Heb.* 13. 21. 1 *Pet.* 4. 11. and 5. 11. 2 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Apoc.* 1. 5, 6. and 5. 12, 13. Having thus eſtabliſh'd the divine Worſhip of Chriſt, let us conſider on the other hand, what divine Worſhip was given to him by the believing Jews, when he was here on Earth. If they that believ'd him to be the Son of God, had ſuppos'd him to be the eternal almighty God, certainly they would have been affected towards him as to the Appearance of the eternal almighty God, they would have been ſtounded and amaz'd at his Appearance amongſt them, as much as *Peter* and *John* were at the Voice of God on the holy Mount. When he appear'd amongſt them, they would have fallen on their Faces, they would have made him the Object of their daily ſolemn Devotions, and of their Temple-Service (or at leaſt they would have deſir'd, that he might be made ſuch:) but they did nothing of this; therefore by the Son of God they did not underſtand the eternal almighty God, nor any thing more or leſs, or any thing elſe than *the imperial Son.* As ſuch our Saviour requireth the divine Honours to be done to him, *Joh.* 5. 21, 22, 23.

VI. A *ſixth* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is *the Form of God*, Phil. 2. 6. Touching the meaning whereof we need not be very ſollicitous; for the Form of God is manifeſtly the ſame with *Deiformity*, and Deiformity muſt be underſtood, as it ſignifieth in the Chriſtian Theology, wherein Chriſtians inwardly in their Souls and outwardly in their Bodies, regenerated into the divine image, are uſually denominated θεοειδεῖς, *Deiformes*, and this is their Deiformity. And ſuch was the Deiformity of the Son of God (agreeable to that of the other Sons of God) but not without great difference. For other Sons of God have their Deiformity by Regeneration, Chriſt had his Deiformity by Nature and Generation. Other Sons of God are but Creature-Sons, and their Deiformity is no higher: but Chriſt's was a divine imperial-perſonal *Deiformity*; for he was God the image of God. And as a Man (made after the image of God) hath both the internal and external form of a Man (both the rational Soul and alſo the external Pulchritude and Majeſty of a Man:) ſo in the Son of God, before his voluntary ſelf-humbling, there was both the interiour form of God, and alſo the exteriour Glory, Pulchritude, Illuſtriouſneſs, Magnificence and Majeſty of God. The interiour form of God he never parted with, but the exteriour form of his divine royal Perſon he parted with and laid aſide, when he voluntarily became cloathed with humane Fleſh, Weakneſs and Meanneſs. As the Sun (ſaith S. *Ambroſe*) *when he is cover'd with a cloud, his clarity and brightneſs is not deſtroyed, but it is ſuppreſs'd.* So was the Glory of the Son of God, when he became the Son of Man, and ſo far he parted with it. Extrinſecally he put off his Glory, and it was all obſcur'd and ecclips'd, as the Sparklings of a Jewel are, when it is hid in its casket. The divine Glory of his royal Perſon was overſhadow'd with a Vail, ecclips'd and darkned with a cloud of Fleſh called *the Vail of his Fleſh, Heb.* 10. 20. For as by the Vail the arcane things of the Holy of Holies were hid from the eyes of Men: ſo by Chriſt's Fleſh his divine imperial perſonal Deiformity was vail'd and hid from Men's bodily eyes, and the Son of God appeared under that mean external guiſe which the Apoſtle calleth *the Form of a Servant*, Phil. 2. 7. which Phraſe muſt be expounded agreeably to that other *the Form of God* (and cannot tolerably be expounded otherwiſe;) for as that ſignifieth *Deiformity*, ſo the Form of a Servant denoteth the *Servi-formity*, the vile, abject, ignoble, and ſervile condition in worldly reſpects. The Apoſtle addeth, that *he was made* (or became) *in the likeneſs of Men*, that is, without his Deiformity; laying aſide his Deiformity, he became in the Likeneſs of us Men (that are without all external Deiformity) of our bodily nature (as to the general Infirmities thereof) which is frail, infirm, paſſible, mortal. The Apoſtle uſeth another Expreſſion of the ſame import with the likeneſs of Men (ver. 8.) he *was found in faſhion* (external guiſe) *as a Man* (diveſted of his Deiformity) which he might have been, although he had liv'd as a mighty Prince and illuſtrious Potentate amongſt Men: but the Apoſtle muſt be underſtood to mean, that *he became in the likeneſs of Men, and was found in faſhion as a Man*, ſo as not to tranſcend *Servi-formity* amongſt Men in worldly reſpects. He emptied himſelf therefore (*o*) *ſe vilem & imbecillum hominem faciendo*, by making himſelf a mean and infirm Man. From which Account of his ſtupendious Exinanition and Humiliation it appeareth, that in the days of his Fleſh (before he was conſtituted Lord and Chriſt in his imperial eſtate) *he was God*, as having been antecedently to his making himſelf in the likeneſs of Men *in divine imperial-perſonal Deiformity.* But ſuch was his Humility, that he duely neglected and declin'd *his being as God* (or his being equal with God) ȣ̓κ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, *he counted it not a prey or a matter of rampant deſire and ſeizure*, he did not aſſume it or take it upon him. This Senſe is the natural Signification of the Words, this Senſe the Contexture of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe requireth, this Senſe repreſenteth our Saviour as extremely alien from the ambitious mundane Spirit (that counteth nothing unlawful for Dominion) and the Luciferian Spirit of the

---

(m) *Quiſquis juſto titulo divinum in homines imperium ac divinos honores acquiſivit, ut is Deus ſit, neceſſe eſt: At qui Filius juſto titulo ac meritiſſimo jure divinum in homines imperium acquiſivit & Ergo.* Dr. Bull c. Zuicker, p. 40.

(n) *Ibid.* p. 32.

(o) *Petav.* T. 4. *l.* 3. c. 11. *S.* 1.

the Prince of Darkneſs, who was tranſported with the rampant Deſire of a Godhead (ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, *he counted it a matter of rampant Deſire and Seizure*) whereas our Saviour duely declin'd his being equal to God (or his being as God) and therefore muſt be ſaid not to have aſſum'd it, or taken it upon him. But *though he was rich* (both as being Heir of the whole Eſtate of God, and as being in divine imperial-perſonal Deiformity) *yet for our ſakes he became poor*, 2 Cor. 8. 9.

VII. A *ſeventh* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is the Form of Apoſtolical Benediction, 2 *Cor.* 13. 14. (*The Grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all*) and more eſpecially the Form of Baptiſm preſcrib'd by our Saviour, (*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*) which is a plain Teſtimony, that according to the Chriſtian Inſtitution the Son is a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead, and not only ſo, but that there are three Perſons of the one ſupreme Godhead, as the Chriſtian Church hath always underſtood the Words. For Baptiſm is the Chriſtians federal Rite, and is like that Oath of Allegiance which Aliens take when they are naturaliz'd and endeniz'd. As they by an Oath of Allegiance confederate with the Sovereignty in an Earthly Kingdom, ſo they that are baptiz'd confederate with the holy Sovereignty, which is in the Comprehenſion of Chriſtianity and the Kingdom of God. This Holy Trinity (or Ternary) therefore muſt neceſſarily be the one holy and divine Sovereignty, wherewith they confederate Allegiance. They that are baptized in the Name of Chriſt are admitted into the State and Relation of Subjects unto him, and own him for their King and Sovereign; he is therefore a Perſon of the holy Sovereignty, and ſo is his holy Spirit, (which is the Inſpiration-virtue of the holy Government) unleſs it can be ſuppoſed that we confederate with any thing that is not a Perſon. The Chriſtian Baptiſm conſiſteth of *a Duty-part* and *a Benefit-part*. As it conſiſteth of *a Duty-part*, to be baptized in the Name of this holy Trinity, importeth a being baptized into the Faith and Profeſſion of an holy Chriſtian Trinity (Baptiſm is adminiſtred *in confeſſione & Auctoris & Unigeniti & Doni*, ſaith S. *Hilary*) accordingly the moſt ancient Chriſtian Creed was this Form of Baptiſm and no more. Chriſtian Believers therefore muſt be ſuch as believe an holy Chriſtian Trinity, and muſt be *Chriſtian Trinitarians* (not ſuch as diſown the Name) and there is not any tolerable Trinity conceivable or imaginable, ſave only three Perſons of one ſupreme Godhead; for a Trinity that conſiſteth of *one God and two Creatures*, neither Wit nor Grace will count a tolerable Trinity. A Trinity is the Eſſence and Summary of the Chriſtian Religion; to diſpute away therefore the commonly receiv'd Trinity, without ſubſtituting a better in its ſtead, is a deſtroying the Chriſtian Religion. According to the Chriſtian Religion all that are meerly of the *Miniſterial* Party, (Apoſtles and Evangeliſts as well as others) are baptized into the Faith of an holy Trinity (formally or equivalently) this holy Trinity is contradiſtinguiſh'd to all that are of the meer Miniſterial and Subject-Party, each one of this Holy Trinity is conjoyn'd and aſſociated with the other, (though not without any Note of Diſtinction or Superiority, yet) as of one holy imperial Party and Dignity; every Chriſtian muſt be one of the Father's Believers as being the divine Author of his Religion and the Object of his Faith; he muſt be one of the Son's Believers as being the divine Author of his Religion and the Object of his Faith; he muſt be one of the Holy Ghoſt's Believers as being the divine Agent of the Author of his Religion and an Object of his Faith, (which is a thing incompetible to any Creature;) upon all which accounts it is evident that each one of this holy Trinity is of the holy imperial Party and Dignity, which is the Godhead in the Chriſtian Religion. A Chriſtian is alſo bound to exerciſe that religious Reverence, Subjection and Obedience towards each one of this holy Trinity which is peculiar to God only; and in Baptiſm he is dedicated to each one of this Holy Trinity agreeably to his Oeconomy, as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh. If we conſider Baptiſm with reſpect to the Benefit-part of it, it is manifeſt that a Chriſtian hath the Benefits of his Regeneration from this whole Holy Trinity, as from thoſe that are of the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate. For the State of Remiſſion of Sins, of divine Sonſhip and ſanctifying Grace are conferr'd upon a Believer in his Baptiſm not *Miniſterially*, but *Imperially*, by this holy Trinity. Church-Officers are the Miniſterial Party, but this Holy Trinity are the one holy imperial Party in conferring theſe divine Benefits, *Tit.* 3. 5, 6. *According to his Mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, which he ſhed on us abundantly thro' Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour.* It belongeth to the Creature-Party to be regenerated and ſanctified; but authoritatively to confer the State of Remiſſion of Sins, and executively to ſanctify Souls, are Peculiarities of the imperial Party in Sanctity and Religion.

VIII. An *eighth* ſort of theſe plain Attributions is that Apocalyptick Name of our Saviour *Alpha* and *Omega*, which is a Name of God in the Old-Teſtament, and a Prophetick kind of Name. For it denoteth (as is before diſcours'd) his God-like governing, ordering and carrying on Affairs from firſt to laſt, from the beginning to the end, that is, his actual and jural Management of Affairs in the ſupreme way of Regency from firſt to laſt. And therefore it denoteth him to be the divine or *ſupreme Potentate*, unſubject, independent, unaccountable, uncontrollable, αὐτοκράτωρ, *Self-Sovereign*, παντοκράτωρ, *actually and jurally the Commander and Diſpoſer of all things.* So in the Prophet God often ſaith of himſelf, *I am the Firſt and I am the Laſt*, thereby intending to ſay, *I am He, or I am God.* Agreeably to this Name of God in the Old-Teſtament, (which relateth to the Affairs of Old Iſrael) our Saviour ſaith of himſelf (with relation to the Affairs of the New Iſrael) in the Book of the Apocalypſe, *ch.* 1. 11. *I am Alpha and Omega, the firſt and the laſt.* v. 17. *I am the firſt and the laſt*, *ch.* 2. 8. *Theſe things ſaith the Firſt and the Laſt, which was dead and is alive*, *ch.* 22. 13. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the firſt and the laſt.* The actual and jural Management and carrying on of Affairs (the Affairs of Old Iſrael in the Old-Teſtament-Times) in the ſupreme way of Regency from firſt to laſt this Name in the Old-Teſtament aſcribeth unto God; therefore the actual and jural Management and carrying on of Affairs (the Affairs of the New Iſrael in the New-Teſtament-Times) in the ſupreme way of Regency from firſt to laſt this Name in the New-Teſtament aſcribeth unto Chriſt. In the Old-Teſtament it is an Aſcription

Iſa. 41. 4. *and* 44. 6. *and* 48. 12.

tion of the Godhead unto God, a ſtyling him the ſupreme Potentate and Lord of Affairs; therefore in the New-Teſtament it is an Aſcription of the Godhead unto Chriſt, a ſtyling him the ſupreme Potentate and Lord of Affairs (only with that Abatement which the Name of the Son of God importeth.) In the Old-Teſtament the meaning of it is, *I am he, or I am God,* (the God of the Old-Teſtament;) therefore in the New-Teſtament the meaning of it is, *I am he, or I am God,* (the God of the New-Teſtament.) Theſe Deductions and Conſequences are clear and firm, and prove that our Saviour is a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead. But the Scholaſtick Theology inferreth from this Name (*I am Alpha and Omega*) that Chriſt is the Supreme Eternal God, not duly conſidering the Analogy between the Old and New Teſtament, not conſidering that this Name is a Prophetick kind of Name, (which is a Reſtriction and Limitation of it, and ſheweth in what reſpect both God and Chriſt is the firſt and the laſt) not conſidering that this Name is given to our Saviour not as he is the ſupreme Eternal God, but as he is (after his Reſurrection) raiſed to the Poſſeſſion of the Divine Sovereignty, as is apparent from *Apoc.* 2. 8. *Theſe things ſaith the Firſt and the Laſt, which was dead and is alive.* Many the like Miſinterpretations of Scripture, that give great Scandal and Advantage to the Anti-Trinitarians, are obſervable in the Scholaſtic Theology, (although the Arguments whereby it proveth the Deity of Chriſt are in great part firm and good) which Weakneſs of many of its Proofs complicated with the Weakneſs of its Anſwers to the contrary Allegations we will remark and confront to our Account of the plain Attributions of Deity to our Saviour in holy Scripture.

IX. This Theology miſtaketh in its Allegations of the Old-Teſtament to prove the Deity of Chriſt and the Trinity of the Chriſtian Religion, which cannot ſeem ſtrange to them who have look'd into the Writings of the Fathers, with whom it is uſual and cuſtomary to alledge the Words of God in the *Pentateuch*, the *Pſalms* and the *Prophets*, as ſpoken by the Son of God. *Athanaſius* ſaith (*p*) *as often as any of the Old Prophets ſay,* ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου, *The Word of the Lord came to me, this is meant of the Son of God.* And is it ſtrange that they who miſinterpret the Scriptures at this rate ſhould miſtake the Appearances of Angels in the Old-Teſtament-Times for Appearances of the Son of God? That they ſhould miſtake in their Idea of the Trinity? And in their Allegation of Proofs of it from the Old-Teſtament? wherein there are no better Proofs of it than thoſe celebrated Words of the Pſalmiſt, (which cannot be thought by any, ſave only by a Mind blinded with Prejudice, to mean a Trinity) *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them by the Breath of his Mouth.* So the Name *Elohim* in the beginning of *Geneſis* (being of the Plural Number) hath been thought to imply a Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead, (*q*) which idle Conceit is now exploded. And there is no more Firmitude in this other celebrated place, *Let us make Man after our Image.* Or in this other, *Gen.* 3. 22. *Behold the Man is become as one of us.* Or in this Phraſe of *Moſes*, Gen. 19. 24. *The Lord rained upon Sodom Brimſtone and Fire from the Lord out of Heaven.* (*r*) For it is uſual in Hebrew to put the Noun for the Pronoun, and to change the Perſon from the firſt to the third. The Phraſe is parallel to this other, *Dixit Dominus adſcende ad Dominum,* ſuch the Phraſe is *Dan.* 9. 17. and *Zech.* 3. 2. (where the Phraſe is, *The Lord ſaid, The Lord rebuke thee*) the Apoſtle hath taught us plainly enough to expound (not of Chriſt, but) of the Angel of God's Name and Preſence, *Jude* 7. The Elogy of Wiſdom in the Book of *Proverbs, ch.* 8. is by the Fathers generally expounded to be meant of the Son of God, which ancient Conceit is ſtill retained by ſome, but others (that are no Anti-Trinitarians) reject and explode it. (*s*) Moſt of the Fathers interpret it to be meant of the Son incarnate, others expound it of the Abſtract *Logos*, or Son of God; but it cannot be meant of both theſe, which is an Argument that it is meant of neither. *Solomon*'s Wiſdom was not a Deity, or σίβασμα, *an Object of religious Worſhip* in the Old-Teſtament-Times, it is no higher than *Scientia rerum agendarum*, the Wiſdom of Creation, Providence, Diſcipline, pious Ethicks and Politicks, which is on this ſide Chriſt and Chriſtianity, *Matth.* 12. 42. His Wiſdom is of no higher kind than meer inſtructive Wiſdom, but Chriſt is the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery, 1 *Cor.* 2. 7. His Wiſdom had prepared her Banquet in his Time, (*Prov.* 9. 1.) but Chriſt's was not prepared till the Times of the Goſpel, *Matth.* 22. 2. His Wiſdom is a Woman and a Queen Regent, and therefore the Daughter, not the Son of God. His Wiſdom (being a Woman) is only an allegorical and fictitious Perſon, that cry'd and lifted up her Voice in his Time, and loudly proclaim'd and publiſh'd her Documents; but ſo did not the Son of God. Wiſdom was *Solomon*'s Miſtreſs and School-miſtreſs, as Philoſophy (the ſame with Wiſdom) was the Miſtreſs and School-Miſtreſs of the Heathen Sages, which they extol at the ſame rate that *Solomon* doth Wiſdom, (*t*) attributing the ſame things to it, repreſenting it as a Woman, ſtyling it the Miſtreſs of Life and Manners, the School-Miſtreſs of Virtue, the Foundreſs of Human Society, the Inventreſs of Laws, (with ſuch more honourary Attributes) as *Solomon* ſaith of his Wiſdom, *By me Kings reign and Princes decree Juſtice.* (*u*) *Hence many very learned Men* (ſaith *S. Auſtin*) *interpret* Solomon's *Wiſdom to be meant of that Wiſdom which he had receiv'd to govern the People.* His Wiſdom is obſerv'd to be nothing elſe (*w*) but the Property of Wiſdom, (the Oppoſite to Fooliſhneſs) as it belongeth indifferently either to God or Man, and to be the ſame with *Knowledge, Underſtanding, Inſtruction, Diſcretion,* (which are with *Solomon* Terms ſynonymous) and what elſe can that Wiſdom be which *findeth out the Knowledge of witty Inventions?* Prov. 8. 12. (*x*) The Apocryphal Book of *Wiſdom* and the Son of *Sirach* ſymbolize with *Solomon* in their Elogy of Wiſdom, (conſidering it both as demiurgic and operative of the Works of God, and as diſciplinary and inſtructive to Men, repreſenting it as enraviſhingly beauteous, *Solomon*'s Miſtreſs or deſired Spouſe, as kind to Man and the faireſt Iſſue of God, and of the greateſt Ancientry;) but there is no Probability that they mean by *Wiſdom* any thing more than an Endowment of the Mind, or the *Moſaic Law*, which is that which the Son of *Sirach* meaneth by it.

X. The Viſion of *Iſaiah* the Prophet *ch.* 6. hath been ſuppos'd to be a Viſion of the Son of God, and this Reaſon is alledg'd to countenance this

(p) *De Synod. p.* 714. *Com.*

Pſal. 33. 6.

(q) *Voſſ. Etymol. in voce Deus. Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 3.

(r) *V. Druſ. Revet. Pocock. Grot. in Hoſ.* 1. 7.

(s) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 1.

(t) *Cic. Tuſc.* 2&5.

(u) *Multi quidem doctiſſimi viri hoc ex perſona illius ſapientiæ dictum aſſerunt, quam Salomon ad judicandum regendumque populum accceperat.* Ap. Petav. ſupr. c. 1. S. 10.

(w) *Mr Nye Doct. of the Trin. p.* 129 133.

(x) *Wiſd.* 7, 8, 9. *Ecclus.* 1. *and* 24.

this Conceit, the Evangeliſt having cited a Verſe of that Chapter and ſome other Words of that Prophet, ſubjoyneth, *Joh.* 12. 41. *Theſe things ſaid Eſaias, when he ſaw his Glory,* (Chriſt's Glory) *and ſpake of him.* But the Glory of *the Lord of Hoſts* (a Name incompetible to Chriſt) is that which *Iſaiah* ſaw, that Glory which the Jews call the *Schecinah*, that Glory which dwelt in their Temple, his Glory who is celebrated by the τρισάγιον, *holy, holy, holy,* (*Apoc.* 4. 8.) whoſe Glory filleth the whole Earth, who ſitteth upon the Throne, ſo as thereby to be diſtinguiſh'd from Chriſt the Lamb, *Apoc.* 5. 11. And it is certain that the Prophetic Judicial Sentence cited by the Evangeliſt from the Prophet *Iſaiah*, (*Make the Heart of this People fat, and make their Ears heavy, and ſhut their Eyes, Iſa.* 6. 10.) had a Completion in that Prophet's Time, whence *Calvin* upon the place ſaith, *Evangeliſta extendit ad Evangelium quod jam uſu venerat ſub lege*, what had come to paſs under the Law the Evangeliſt extendeth to the Goſpel. And the Reaſon is, in this Evangelical Prophet's Viſions the Affairs of the Goſpel-Times were complicated with thoſe things that came to paſs in his own Time. He ſaw the Jews Excæcation and Obduration in his own Time, and therewith he foreſaw the Jews Excæcation and Obduration in the Goſpel-Times, (this latter complicated with the former) ſo he ſaw the Glory of God, and therewith he foreſaw the Glory of Chriſt (this latter complicated with the former) he had a Previſion of Chriſt and his Glory, (*y*) as *Abraham* ſaw Chriſt's day, ſaith *Grotius*.

(y) *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 12. 41.

An unprejudic'd Mind ſurveying the Old-Teſtament from the beginning to the end will not find in it (otherwiſe than in its illuſtrious Prophecies of a Meſſiah to come) any Indication of the Trinity nor of the Deity of an Abſtract Son of God, which is at leaſt a very probable Argument that his Generation and Exiſtence from Eternity is a Miſtake. It hath been thought that his Generation from Eternity may be prov'd from ſome of the illuſtrious Prophecies of the Old-Teſtament touching a Meſſiah to come, particularly from the *ſecond Pſalm*, whence no ſuch thing can be proved but by expounding it in Contradiction to the Text. But the Prophet *Micah* ſaith, *ch.* 5. 2. *Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, tho' thou be little among the Thouſands of Judah, yet out of thee ſhall he come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Iſrael: his goings forth are from of old, à diebus ſeculi.* Some Obſcurity there is in the laſt Clauſe of this Prophecy (which is not well rendred in our Tranſlation;) but thus much is plain and univerſally acknowledg'd, it ſpeaketh not of an Abſtract Son of God, but of the Imperial Perſon of the Meſſiah promis'd to the Jews, and as to his Nativity it mentioneth only that at *Bethlehem*. This Imperial Perſon is ennobled in the Prophecy by the Ancientry of his *Origines* or *goings forth*, which may be ſpoken of in a twofold Senſe, either in the ſenſe of denoting his Age, or in the ſenſe of deriving his Pedigree. To ſay of the Meſſiah, that *his goings forth are of old, à diebus ſeculi*, in the ſenſe of denoting his Age, is an intituling him *The Ancient of days*, which is a Title competible to the Father, but not to the Son, not to the Lamb of God and the holy Child Jeſus. This therefore cannot be the Senſe of the Prophecy, but it muſt be underſtood to ſpeak of the Antiquity of *the Origines* or *goings forth* of the Meſſiah in the ſenſe of deriving his Pedigree; and ſo to ſay that his *Origines* or *goings forth* are of old, *à diebus ſeculi*, is to conſider him as a Branch or Stem of ancient Royalty, and to ſay of him, his *Origines* or *goings forth*, in reſpect of Imperial Family, are of old, *à diebus ſeculi*. Agreeably to which Senſe (*z*) the Jews expound this Text of the Prophet, (underſtanding it to mean, that the Meſſiah is of the anciently illuſtrious Davidical Family, that was reigning ſeveral Hundred Years) and they are but ſlender Objections that are made againſt this Expoſition. But *Calvin* maketh another Expoſition of this Clauſe of the Prophecy touching *the Meſſias's goings forth of old*, he ſuppoſeth it to be meant of his divine Predeſtination, which is a very probable Expoſition, although it is objected that the ſame thing may be ſaid of us, that we are predeſtinated from Eternity. For this Objection may as well be made againſt the Apoſtle ſaying, that *Chriſt was fore-ordained before the Foundation of the World*, as againſt *Calvin*'s Expoſition. There is great difference between Chriſt's Predeſtination and ours, for he was infinitely of more Regard in the divine Decree than any other Perſon, he was predeſtinated as a Perſon of the higheſt Honour, Excellency and Importance; and therefore his Predeſtination was ſupereminently honourary, as both Jews and Chriſtians account it, when they ſay of him, *that he was fore-ordained before the Foundation of the World, Ante ſolem præparatum eſt nomen Meſſiæ.* It ought therefore to be mentioned for his Honour, that the goings forth of this divine imperial Potentate in reſpect of the divine Predeſtination are of old, *à diebus ſeculi.* But there is a third Expoſition that is the moſt probable, (*a*) which interpreteth his *goings forth* to ſignify *the goings forth of his regial or governing Family from Bethlehem*, theſe were *from of old, à diebus ſeculi.* There is no Reaſon to doubt of the Certainty of this Interpretation.

(z) *Hoorn-beck* l. *Jud. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *p.* 229.

(a) *Bibliä veritat. p.* 341.

XI. The Scholaſtic Theology is not without Miſtakes and Exceſſes in its Allegations and Interpretations of the New-Teſtament to prove the Deity of Chriſt. For although the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are God *contradiviſively*, and are *the only Lord God, the true God, the great God, the moſt high God, the Almighty God, which is, and which was, and which is to come*, as Perſons of his Godhead, *indiviſively* and as appertaining to him that is ſo; yet ſeeing no divine Perſon can be the imperial Perſon of God, or God *abſolutely* and *definitively*, but the Father only, (as will be diſcours'd hereafter) and he alone is ſimply and without addition, without diſtinction and limitation of Senſe, *The only Lord God, the true God, the great God, the moſt high God, the Almighty God*, (which is, and which was, and which is to come) therefore it muſt be ſuppos'd that theſe honourary Names put abſolutely in Scripture are meant of God the Father only, and are his Peculiarities. *S. Hilary* argueth, (*b*) *that Chriſt is not God, if he is not the true God; as that is not Fire and Water, which is not true Fire and Water.* But this pious Father ought to have conſider'd that we muſt diſtinguiſh before we define, and that it is one thing to ſay that Chriſt is or is not the true God, and another thing to ſay in what ſenſe he is or is not the true God. The true God is Life Eternal to us in Chriſt Jeſus, ſo that being in Chriſt Jeſus we are in the true God and have Eternal Life. And this is plainly the Apoſtle's Senſe, 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, in his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God and Eternal Life.* The true God and the true Meſſiah are diſtinguiſh'd, but ſo, that

(b) *Ap. Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 9. *S.* 7.

that they are one Imperial Party in the ſaving Religion of Chriſtianity. And in like manner *The only Lord God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* are diſtinguiſh'd, yet are ſo intimately and intirely conjoyn'd in Religion, that a denying the one is a denying the other alſo. Whence the Apoſtle ſaith of the Gnoſticks, *denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Jude* 7. So the *great* God mention'd by St. *Paul*, (*looking for that bleſſed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*) *Tit.* 2. 13. ought in all Reaſon to be interpreted agreeably to the Style of Scripture, which by that Name doth not mean our bleſſed Saviour, *Prov.* 26. 10. *Job* 36. 26. 2 *Sam.* 7. 22. 2 *Chron.* 2. 5. *Pſal.* 48. 1. The Scholaſtic Theology interpreting theſe Names to be meant of our Saviour muſt be charg'd with Miſtakes, Exceſſes, and an over-ſtretching the String, which Miſtakes are very viſible in the like Interpretation which this Theology maketh of thoſe other Names *The moſt high*, (Luc. 1. 76.) *the Lord which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty*, Apoc. 1. 4, 8. compar'd with *Apoc.* 4. 8. and *Apoc.* 5. 13.

In this Theology Chriſt is ſuppos'd to have been the God of Old *Iſrael*, which is infinitely contrary to his Idea, to the Tenour of Chriſtianity, the Stream of the Scripture-Theology, to many Notices of the God of *Iſrael* which the Scripture furniſheth, and to that Diſtinction which the New-Teſtament maketh between the God of *Iſrael* and Chriſt our Saviour, *Act.* 3. 13. *The God of Abraham, and of Iſaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his Son Jeſus*, Act. 5. 30. *The God of our Fathers raiſed up Jeſus*, Act. 22. 14. *The God of our Fathers hath choſen thee, that thou ſhouldeſt know his Will and ſee that juſt one.* It is ſcarce imaginable that any one who readeth theſe places of Scripture ſhould ſuppoſe that it was the Son of God who ſaid to *Moſes*, Exod. 3. 6. *I am the God of thy Father, the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, the God of Jacob.* (c) Yet this *S. Baſil*, *S. Ambroſe*, and others of the Fathers ſuppoſe. Chriſt is ſuppos'd to have been *Dux & Dominus*, the Lord and Leader of the old rebellious *Iſraelites* in their March through the Wilderneſs, to countenance which Conceit St. *Paul*'s Text is alledg'd, 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. *Neither let us tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted, and were deſtroyed of Serpents.* But it is the way of the Holy Writers of the New-Teſtament to ſpeak of the Old-Teſtament Affairs in New-Teſtament Language. As becauſe the Reproach of God's People is now the Reproach of Chriſt, therefore the Apoſtle ſaith of *Moſes*, Heb. 11. 26. *Eſteeming the Reproach of Chriſt* (the Reproach of God's People which is now the Reproach of Chriſt) *greater Riches than the Treaſures in Egypt.* So the Prophetick Spirit is now the Spirit of Chriſt, and accordingly the Apoſtle ſaith of the Prophets of the Old-Teſtament, Pet. 1. 11. *ſearching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Chriſt which was in them did ſignify*; and this is alledg'd as a Proof of the Exiſtence and Deity of our Saviour in the Times of the Old-Teſtament.

Our Saviour prayeth, *Joh.* 17. 5. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf*, † *with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* This divine Prayer is ſuppos'd to ſignify our Saviour's Generation and Deity from Eternity, (*d*) becauſe the Expreſſion is not the Glory which was given to me, but which I had with thee. *Habere eſt verbum poſſeſſivum atque actum & fruitionem præſentem deſignat.* They that interpret the Words to ſignify the Glory which he had only *in decreto*, cannot confirm their Interpretation by any Example in Scripture; but on the contrary, (1.) If we ſay that *Lazarus* had his good things with God before he actually receiv'd them, that ſo St. *Paul* had his Crown of Righteouſneſs, and ſo the *Meſſiah* had his Kingdom, who will deny that this is an agreeable and ſcriptural way of ſpeaking? The Jews ſay that ſeven things were (intentionally) made before the World, *The Garden of Eden, The Law, The Juſt, The Iſraelites, The Throne of Glory, Jeruſalem, and the Meſſiah the Son of David.* Agreeably to this their Senſe the Jews may ſay, *They had a Meſſiah with God before the World was*, and this is an agreeable and ſcriptural way of ſpeaking. To be *given* to us and to *have* are Terms equivalent; for what is *given* to us in ſome ſort we *have*; ſo Chriſtians *have an Houſe from Heaven*, although they have it not in *preſent actual Poſſeſſion and Fruition*, 2 Cor. 5. 1. and ſuppoſing them to have been before the Creation predeſtinated to Glory, may we not ſay of them, *They had a celeſtial glorious Houſe with God before the World was?* ſo it muſt be ſaid of the Meſſiah before he was actually glorified, *He had with God a ſupereminent Glory*, (an Heavenly Kingdom-Eſtate) *before the World was.* (2.) Our Saviour thus interpreteth his own Phraſeology, and withal expoundeth to us what Glory it is that he meaneth in this his divine Prayer, *v.* 24. *Father, I will that they alſo whom thou haſt given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my Glory which thou haſt given me; for thou lovedſt me before the Foundation of the World.* This Expreſſion, *The Glory which thou haſt given me, for thou lovedſt me before the Foundation of the World*, and this other Expreſſion, *The Glory which I had with thee before the World was*, are equipollent Expreſſions, they are the ſame Words, (or equivalent) ſignifying the very ſame thing. Our Saviour by thus ſaying, *Thou lovedſt me before the Foundation of the World, ſo as to give me a ſupereminent heavenly Glory*, plainly telleth us what he meaneth by *the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* And withal he plainly telleth us what Glory it is that he meaneth and ſpeaketh of, *viz. the Glory of the Perſon of Chriſt glorified*, the Glory which he would have his Diſciples to ſee and behold, (the Glory of his ſuffering Humanity, his premiant Glory) this is *the Glory which God had given him (in decreto) out of ſuperlative Love to him before the Foundation of the World*, or *the Glory which he had with God before the World was.* So St. *Auſtin*, (though a great Scholaſtic Divine) rightly interpreteth theſe Words of our Saviour, *Glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* (*e*) *Do that in the World which was with thee before the World, Do that in its time which thou determinedſt before all Times. As then in Predeſtination, ſo now in Performance.* (3.) In this divine Prayer our Saviour ſpeaketh in the Style of the New-Teſtament, throughout the whole of which (in all other places) the Glory of an Abſtract Son of God is never called Chriſt's Glory; this therefore is not the Glory ſpoken of in this Prayer. In ſome ſort our Saviour was in Glory antecedently to his Humiliation, for he was in *the Form of God*: yet this in the Style of the New-Teſtament is never called *his Glory*, as being only previous to that which was eminently and ultimately his Glory, *Luc.* 24. 26. *Ought not Chriſt to have ſuffered theſe things, and*

(c) *S. Baſil c. Eunom. l.* 2. *p.* 56. *S. Ambroſ. de Fide l.* 2. *c.* 5.

† *Vid. Coſri p.* 254. *Ed. Buxt.*

(d) Dr *Bull.*

(e) *Fac in mundo quod apud te jam fuerat ante mundum: fac in ſuo tempore quod ante omnia tempora ſtatuiſti. Sicut tunc in prædeſtinatione, ita & nunc perfectione.* Tr. in Joan. 105. vid. Grot. Not. in loc.

to enter into his Glory? This Glory (the Glory of the Meſſias's Heavenly Kingdom-Eſtate) is *the Joy that was ſet before him*, this Glory was his *Crown* and his *Apotheoſis*, whereby he *was made perfect*; and this is the Glory (as appeareth from the Style of the New-Teſtament) which his Diſciples underſtood him to mean when he ſpeaketh of *the Glory which he had with God before the World was*. If our Saviour ſpake thoſe Words agreeably to the Senſe of his Diſciples, and agreeably to his own Senſe in other parts of this divine Prayer, then they are not meant of *any ſuch Glory as an Abſtract Son poſſeſs'd from Eternal Ages*. This was not the Glory of Chriſt glorified, of which thoſe Words are meant. Nor could the Scholaſtic *Logos* ever be without the Glory of his Scholaſtic Deity, and therefore could not pray to be reſtored to it.

A Learned Divine argueth with great Aſſurance (*f*) that Chriſt is the only Son of God from all Eternity, becauſe *Heb.* 7. 3. *Melchiſedech is repreſented without beginning or end of days, that ſo he might be a Type or Shadow of the Son of God. But how far a Type of this Son of God? only in this, as he was without beginning of days or end of life.* But this is arbitrariouſly ſpoken, and is a Reflexion upon the Apoſtle, (as if he mention'd *Melchiſedech*'s being without Father or Mother or Pedigree to no purpoſe) and it is as credible that *Melchiſedech* was a Type of the Son of God in being without Father or Mother or Pedigree, as in being (in this learned Man's Senſe) without beginning of Days or end of Life. The Apoſtle ſaith of him, *made like unto the Son of God, he abideth a Prieſt continually. Melchiſedech* is introduc'd to repreſent Chriſt as *an immortal Prieſt*; not as a meer Perſon, but as a Prieſt, an immortal Prieſt, and not as a Prieſt that is ſo from Eternity to Eternity; nor doth any Man believe that our Saviour's Prieſthood had no beginning of Days. But the Apoſtle's Senſe is, that the Succeſſional Levitical Prieſthood was by Deſcent, the Pedigree of the Prieſts both by the Father's and Mother's ſide was exactly preſerv'd, they had their Predeceſſors and Succeſſors, and ſo in their Prieſthood there was *a Succeſſion of the beginning of Days and end of Life*. But *Melchiſedech*'s Order of Prieſthood is no ſuch Succeſſional Prieſthood; he is repreſented *without Father*, *without Mother*, *without Pedigree*, *having neither beginning of Days nor end of Life*, which ſheweth that in his Order of Prieſthood *there is no Succeſſion of the beginning of Days or end of Life*, (as there is in the Mortal, Temporary, Succeſſional Levitical Prieſthood;) and in this Unſucceſſional Nature of his Prieſthood *Melchiſedech* (who abideth a Prieſt continually) is made like to the Son of God, whoſe *Prieſthood is unchangeable, immortal and unſucceſſional*, without a Succeſſion of the beginning of Days or end of Life.

XII. The principal Fault of the Scholaſtic Theology is a diſtorting the Holy Scriptures from *a popular-religious* to a School-philoſophic Senſe. As our Saviour's Words, *I came forth from the Father*, (which the meaneſt Chriſtian can underſtand) are thus interpreted in this Theology. (*g*) *I ſhone forth out of his Subſtance. For the Abſtract Son ſhone forth in a manner tranſcending all Underſtanding and Expreſſion.* When our Saviour ſaith, that the Father hath given him any thing, according to this Theology (*h*) *this is the meaning, that the Father generated him; not that after he was exiſtent, the Father gave him ſomething which he had not.* (*i*) *He gave to him by generating, not in the way of beſtowing.* If our Saviour ſaith (ſpeaking of his Doctrine) *I have not ſpoken of my ſelf*, (being the Scholaſtic *Verbum*) this is his meaning, (*k*) *I am not begotten or born of my ſelf. For if the Word of the Father ſpeaketh, he ſpeaketh himſelf, becauſe he is the Word of the Father.* The Father is ſaid to ſpeak to the Son and to give him Commandment, which are eaſily intelligible Expreſſions, and of an ordinary Senſe; but in this Theology (*l*) *the Commandment of the Father is no other but the* (Subſtantive) *Word of the Father.* So that when our Saviour ſaith of the Father, *He gave me Commandment*, the meaning is, *He generated the* (Subſtantive) *Verbum that I am.* To give him Commandment is, (*m*) *Verbum producere, to produce the Scholaſtic Word, who is the Subſtantive Will and Commandment of the Father.* The Son is ſaid to hear, and the meaning is (ſaith this Theology) *that Subſtance is communicated to the Son from the Father*, in qua id ipſum eſt, quod loquitur, *in which that very thing is which he ſpeaketh.* If the Father is ſaid to ſhew the Son (who is ſuppos'd to be a metaphyſical kind of Son) any thing that is to be done, this Theology underſtandeth it to mean, (*n*) *rerum formas atque ideas communicare gignendo*, the Communication of the Forms and Ideas of things by generating him. (*o*) *To learn the Son, is to generate him learned and knowing, and to give all Judgment to the Son, is to generate him the Judge.* So theſe Expreſſions of our Saviour, *I am in the Father and the Father in me, I and the Father are one, he that hath ſeen me hath ſeen the Father*, (*p*) are in this Theology interpreted to ſignify its *Conſubſtantiality* and *Circumınceſſion*, (ὁμοούσιον & περιχώρησις,) of the ſcholaſtic kind. And ſo the Words of our Saviour, *Joh.* 16. 15. *All things that the Father hath are mine*, (which are beſt interpreted by thoſe of the Apoſtle, *whom he hath appointed Heir of all things*, Heb. 1. 2.) are by this Theology diſtorted to a School-philoſophic Senſe, and at this rate it interpreteth the New-Teſtament and the Evangeliſt's *Logos*. A *Logos* which is in the Mind of an Artificer, and is meerly an Ideal Exemplar of his Works, is a popular Buſineſs; but this is not the *Logos* which is (*q*) *Et exemplar & Ars divina, juxta quam Deus Pater cuncta molitus eſt*, (both the exemplar and divine Art, according to which God the Father made all things) this is a ſecond infinite Mind, which is ſuppos'd to be the Ideal Exemplar *Logos*, (the Mundane-Syſtem *Logos*) the Artificer of the firſt Artificer and his Art, which is of no Affinity with popular or religious Matters, (and is of as little Affinity with Reaſon) but is purely a Buſineſs of Platonic myſtic-metaphyſical Ontology, an idiotically philoſophical and unpopular Conceit. So the infinite ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence of the Father (*r*) is by the ancient Scholaſticks ſuppos'd to be τόπος φυσικός, *the natural place* of the infinite ſcholaſtic divine Eſſence of the Son, wherein he reſteth, who is inſeparate from him, and between whom there is an

ἐμπεριχώρησις

(f) Dr. Jackſon B. 7. S. 3. c. 26. So S. Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom. 4. p. 574.

(g) *Ex ſubſtantia ejus effulſi. Effulſit enim modo quodam qui intelligentiam omnem ſuperat, & quem oratione nemo poteſt aſſequi.* Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 8. S. 2.

(h) *Vult intelligi, quod eum genuerit Pater; non ut tanquam jam exiſtenti & non habenti dederit aliquid.* S. Aug. de Trin. l. 1. c. 12.

(i) *Dedit generando, non largiendo.* V. Petav. ſupr. l. 2. c. 4. S. 7, 8.

(k) *Ego non ex me natus ſum. Si enim verbum Patris loquitur, ſeipſum loquitur, quia ipſe eſt verbum Patris.* S. Aug. ſupr.

(l) *Non aliud eſt mandatum Patris, aliud verbum Patris.* Idem ibid.

(m) *Petav. ſupr. l. 6. c. 4. S. 5. & l. 3. c. 8. S. 2.*

(n) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 4. S. 6.*

(o) *Docere Filium eſt doctum & ſcientem genuiſſe, & judicium dare Filio, eſt judicem ipſum gignere.* Petav. ibid. l. 8. c. 1. S. 10.

(p) *Ibid. l. 4. c. 5. S. 12.*

(q) *Dr Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p. 203. Ed. an. 1703.*

(r) *Ibid. p.* 285, 287. 288.

ἐμπεριχώρησις, (Circuminceſſion) and this idiotically philoſophical and unpopular Conceit is ſuppos'd to be the Interpretation of the Evangeliſt's popular Phraſe, *The Son is in the Boſom of the Father*, as we have before remark'd.

XIII. As the *Anti-Trinitarians* can never anſwer the Scriptural Arguments, whereby the ſcholaſtic Theology proveth the Articles of the Trinity and the Deity of the Meſſiah: So the ſcholaſtic Theology can never anſwer the Anti-Trinitarians contrary Allegations from Scripture. Both Parties are good at proving their own Hypotheſis, but neither Party can tolerably anſwer (to ſay nothing of Arguments from reaſon) the Scriptural Arguments of their Adverſaries. Which is a plain Indication, that both Parties are miſtaken, that they have divided the Truth between them, and that another Account of thoſe great Articles, diſſonant from both, ought to be introduc'd. For although the ſcholaſtic Theology that hath been long in poſſeſſion is of venerable Antiquity, and back'd with all manner of Church-Authority, will think ſcorn to be impeach'd of Errour by any private Man; yet it will appear to any impartial Conſiderer of things, that its great Articles as they are ſcholaſticiz'd, are a multiply'd Contradiction to thoſe many places of Scripture *touching the Unity of God*, which are alledg'd againſt them by the Anti-Trinitarians. Such as theſe following. *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* 1 Cor. 8. 6. *To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt by whom are all things.* Eph. 4. 6. *One God and Father of all.* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.* Rom. 16. 27. *To God only wiſe be glory through Jeſus Chriſt.* Act. 3. 13. *The God of our Fathers hath glorify'd his Son Jeſus.* From theſe places and many more (that will be cited hereafter) it is apparent, that the one God beſides whom there is no other, is a Perſon, as the Apoſtle repreſenteth him, *We know, that there is no other God but one.* And to ſhew who it is that is this one God, he preſently ſubjoineth, *To us there is but one God the Father.* 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 6. But in the ſcholaſtic Theology *The one God* is not a Perſon, but an Eſſence trine in Perſons, which is one Contradiction to the Scripture-Theology. The one perſonal God is repreſented in Scripture as in order of nature exiſtent antecedently to the Son and to a Trinity: but according to the ſcholaſtic Theology Generation conſtituteth him a Perſon; which is another Contradiction to the Scripture-Theology. The Scripture-Theology repreſenteth to us in the firſt place one perſonal God with all his Attributes, Rights, Dues and Decrees, and after this Theology touching the one perſonal God it repreſenteth to us a Trinity: but the ſcholaſtic Theology in the firſt place repreſenteth to us a Trinity in Unity, which is a third Contradiction to the Scripture-Theology. It is apparent from theſe Places of Scripture, that but one divine Perſon (the Father) is the Perſon of God and of definitive Name and Notion God: but according to the ſcholaſtic Theology every one of the divine Perſons is ſuch, every one of them is without Diſtinction or Limitation of Senſe counted and denominated *The one God, The true and the great God, the one ſupreme eternal almighty God*, which is a *fourth* Contradiction to the Scripture-Theology.

To evade the argumentative force of ſome of theſe places of Scripture, we are told (*s*) that to ſuch Younglings in Chriſtianity as the *Corinthians* were, the Trinity was a dangerous point, therefore the Apoſtle propoſeth to them God the Father as the only God of the Chriſtians, concealing the other divine Perſons as they are Perſons of the Trinity, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. But as this could not be very honeſtly done, ſo the Apoſtle did not do it; for elſewhere he expreſly mentioneth to them the other divine Perſons of the Trinity, and yet when he mentioneth them, he expreſly mentioneth God the Father as the only God, 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 5, 6. And if the Trinity is ſuch a dangerous point to Younglings in Chriſtianity, whence is it, that our Saviour inſtituted it, to be the initiating Creed of his Believers? For another reaſon the Apoſtle is ſaid to propoſe God the Father as the only God, to aſſert *μοναρχίαν the ſingularity of the Principle, and that he is the fountain of the Divinity and of Entity.* But this ſcholaſtic Maxim doth not aſſert the Scriptural Unity of God, it reacheth no farther than Paganiſm (for the Pagan Polytheiſts aſſerted this Monarchy, they deriv'd their Deities and all Beings from one firſt Principle and ſupreme Deity;) this Maxim therefore cannot be the whole of the Apoſtles Maxim (touching the Unity of God; and conſequently when they intitle the Father *the only God, the only wiſe God, the only Lord God*, it is an enormous wreſting their Words, thus to interpret them (*t*) *He only is God, is only Wiſe, is only Lord of himſelf*; for this is to ſuppoſe, that Chriſtianity teacheth but the ſame thing with Paganiſm touching the Unity of God. If therefore the holy Writers frequently aſſert, that God the Father (repreſented as diſtinct from the Son) is the one only God, this muſt not be underſtood to mean nothing more than that he is *the firſt and higheſt Principle*, the κορυφὴ and ſummity of all (for thus things are ſtated in the Pagan Theopolity:) but it muſt be underſtood to mean, what the Article of the Unity of God importeth in the Scripture-Theology, which is *this Scriptural Anti-Polytheiſm, that God the Father is the one and ſole Perſon of the Almighty God, and that as ſuch he is the one God, beſides whom there is no other.* This Scriptural Antipolytheiſm or Unity of God, the Bible from the beginning to the end of it loudly proclaimeth, and ſo far as the ſcholaſtic Theology infringeth this great fundamental Article, it is inexcuſably impious, and ought to be abandon'd by all the Lovers of God and Piety. We ought therefore to deteſt and abandon its Diſtortion of our Saviour's Words *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* In which plain Words our Saviour ſaith nothing touching (the Unity of God) but what the whole Bible proclaimeth, *That God the Father is the only true God, beſides whom there is no other.* Yet this ſcholaſtic Theology ſometimes will have the Words conſtrued thus; *This is life eternal, to know thee, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent, to be the only true God.* Sometimes it diſputeth (*u*) that the excluſive Word *only* belongeth not to the *Subject*, but to the *Predicate* of the Propoſition. And ſometimes it will have the Words ſignifie, *Pater eſt habens ſolam veram deitatem*, the Father hath the only true Deity. Which Conſtruction of the Words maketh him a true Deity in conſort with others, but not τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν, *the only true God*, as our Saviour ſtyleth him. At the ſame rate this Theology diſtorteth *the God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob*, (*w*) which it will have to ſignify the whole Trinity.

(s) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *S.* 6, 8

(t) *Ibid. c.* 2. *S.* 11.

(u) *Ibid. c.* 1. *S.* 2.

(w) *Ibid. c.* 2. *S.* 18.

nity. They that can at this rate diſtort the Holy Scriptures are Armour of Proof againſt all Scripture-Arguments, they muſt be left (as incapable of Conviction) to their own Prejudices: but they muſt not be thought to have anſwer'd their Adverſaries Arguments becauſe they have ſaid ſomething to them, which is *computatively* nothing, or worſe than nothing. They muſt make a new Bible before they can extinguiſh the Light wherewith this great Principle ſhineth, *The Unity of God is the Mono-Theiſm of God the Father*. This Principle (without ſeeking Artifices and Evaſions) ought to be freely and ingenuouſly granted to the *Unitarians*; but when they have gain'd it, all that they have gain'd by it againſt the Chriſtian Trinity they may put in their Eye, as will hereafter appear.

XIV. The *Anti-Trinitarians* object that God is *the Head of Chriſt, and is alſo his God*, (1 Cor. 11. 3. Matth. 27. 46. Joh. 20. 17. Eph. 1. 17. Heb. 1. 9. Apoc. 3. 12. Micah 5. 4.) which are things incompetible to the Son of God in the Scholaſtic Theology. To which Argument this Theology anſwereth, (*x*) that God is the Head of Chriſt according to his divine Nature, but is *not his God*, ſave only according to his human Nature. Which Anſwer is a ſelf-contradiction. For if God is the Head of Chriſt according to his divine Nature, he is neceſſarily his *Godhead*, (and conſequently his God) according to his divine Nature. God is to Chriſt a God and an Head, (an Imperial Head) as an Imperial Father is an Head to his Imperial Son, (who yet is of the ſame Imperial Eſtate with himſelf) his human-divine Perſon therefore is ſuch an Imperial Head which hath an Head, and is God ſo as to have a God, as the Author to the *Hebrews* ſaith of him, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*. And yet he alſo ſaith of him, *God even thy God hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladneſs*. The Son of God is neceſſarily the Son of the Imperial Eſtate of God, therefore the Imperial Eſtate of God is to him the Imperial Eſtate of God (as to the Imperial Son) and conſequently God is unto him a God. There can be therefore no ſuch thing as a Son of God which hath not God for his God, and conſequently there can be no ſuch thing as the Abſtract Son of God in the Scholaſtic Trinity, of whom the Scholaſticks ſay, (*y*) *The Eternal Father is called the God of Chriſt, not as Chriſt is God and the Verbum, but as he is Man*. In this Theology the Scriptural *Mono-Theiſm* doth not belong to God the Father, and therefore he cannot be the God of the ſecond Perſon in the Scholaſtic Trinity, which Trinity muſt fall if this great Principle ſtandeth firm, *that God the Father is neceſſarily the God of the true Son of God*, as he is intituled by our Saviour, *My God and my Father*, and in the Tenour of the New-Teſtament *his God and Father*, which two Names are not only fitly conjoyn'd, but inſeparably connex'd. For as Chriſt (the Father of his Church) cannot be a Father to any Perſon without being his Lord, this being his eſſential Dignity, to be the Lord of all that are his; ſo God cannot be a Father to any Perſon without being his God, this being his eſſential Dignity, to be a God (the Imperial Eſtate of a God) to all his Children and to all that are his. The Son of God therefore muſt have him for his Father, ſo as to have him for his God; *to have him for his, is to have him for his God*, and it is impoſſible that in reſpect of his own Son (or in any other reſpect) he ſhould be no God, as he muſt be, if he is his Father, and yet is not his God. If he is his Father, he is *his divine imperial Father*, and therefore is neceſſarily his God. Accordingly our Saviour by his Practice of Piety towards him through his whole Life practically made him his God. For his not ſeeking his own Glory, but God's Honour and Intereſt above all things, that God might be glorified in him and by him; his not ſeeking or doing his own Will, but the Will of the Father which ſent him; his religious Obedience to God, his keeping his Commandments, his doing always thoſe things that pleaſe him, and the entire reſigning his Will to the Will of God, was a practical making him his God. And ſuch was (*z*) his εὐλάβεια, *Pious Fear and Obſervance towards God*, or his religious Caution (as ſome render it) in declining at the greateſt rate every thing that was contrary to the Will of God. The many Prayers alſo which our Saviour put up unto him that was able to ſave him from Death, (ſometime with ſtrong Crying and Tears) were a practical making God his God. It will be ſaid that he practis'd all this Piety towards God only as Man; but there is a different Notion of it in the Apoſtle, who ſuppoſeth our Saviour to have practis'd it *as a Son*, and a Son he was, not only as Man, but according to his divine Nature, therefore according to his divine Nature *God was his God*. If we ſuppoſe the contrary, that according to his Divinity God was not his God, then according to his Divinity he did not owe Duty to God, and if ſo, then according to his Divinity he was not *a Son* in the Senſe of Law and Morality, and according to proper natural Generation. If he was God, ſo as not to have a God according to his Divinity, then God the Father could be his God but very *diminutively*, and ſo as rather not to be his God. He was therefore no more than forſaken of his God, *that was rather not his God*, when he cry'd out, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* He did but go to his God, *that was rather not his God*, when he ſaid to his Diſciples, *I aſcend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God*. And becauſe if he is the Abſtract Son he cannot ſay my God (in the Religioniſts Senſe) if he is the Abſtract Son incarnate he cannot ſay my God but very diminutively, therefore (according to this Theology) it is not eaſy to ſay how the loſs of *my God* could be ſinking and overwhelming to our Saviour.

XV. The Anti-Trinitarians object the Apoſtle's Text, 1 *Cor.* 3. 33. *Ye are Chriſt's and Chriſt is God's.* Whence they irreligiouſly infer, that Chriſt is not a Perſon of the ſupreme Godhead; but they ought to make this religious Inference from it, that God is ſuch a ſuperior Owner and Proprietor of Chriſt according to his divine Nature as a Father is of a Son, is more than mutilately and diminutively his God, and it was not meerly his Nature as Man that in the Days of his Fleſh rever'd the Divinity in the Father, (*a*) as the Scholaſtic Theology affirmeth. Chriſt is not ſaid to be his own, (as we are not our own) but God the Father's, from whom the holy Writers derive his All, and to him they refer it. For all things in the Oeconomy of our Religion they derive from *one God the Father, of whom are all things*, (as being the prime Original and ſupreme Cauſe) *and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things*, as being the mediatory Cauſe of all things, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *God by him hath created all things*,

(x) *Ibid.* c. 4. *S.* 12, 13.

Heb. 1. 8, 9.

(y) *Pater æternus Chriſti Deus appellatur, non quà ille Deus ac verbum eſt, ſed ut eſt homo.* Petav. T. 4. l. 9. c. 6. S. 2.

Matth. 26. 39. *Joh.* 5. 30. *and* 6. 30. *and* 8. 29, 50. *and* 12. 28. *and* 13. 31. *and* 14. 31. *and* 15. 10. *and* 17. 4. *Phil.* 2. 8. *Heb.* 5. 8.

(z) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *S.* 8.

Heb. 5. 8.

(a) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *S.* 8.

Eph. 3. 9. *God by him hath reconciled all things*, Col. 1. 20. *God by him hath given us the Victory*, 1 Cor. 15. 57. *God by him hath given us the Holy Spirit*, Tit. 3. 7. *God by him will judge the Secrets of Men*, Rom. 2. 16. *God by him wrought Miracles, Signs and Wonders*, Act. 2. 22. *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himſelf by Jeſus Chriſt*, 2 Cor. 5. 18. *Of God he is made unto us Wiſdom and Righteouſneſs and Sanctification and Redemption*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. *Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be made an High-prieſt*, (as *Aaron* made not himſelf ſuch, but was called of God) *but he that ſaid unto him, Thou art my Son*, Heb. 5. 5. *I have ſet my King upon my holy Hill of Sion. I will declare the Decree, The Lord hath ſaid unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I ſhall give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance*, Pſal. 2. 5, 6, 7. So the Prophet *Daniel* hath a Viſion, wherein the Son of Man is repreſented as coming to the Ancient of Days, *and there was given him Dominion and Glory and a Kingdom, Dan.* 7. 13. As the regial Son hath his Kingdom by the Appointment and Donation of his Eternal Father, ſo himſelf was *the choſen one of God*, Luk. 23. 35. *The holy One of God*, Mar. 1. 24. *The Lamb of God*, Joh. 1. 29. *The Gift of God*, Joh. 4. 10. *The Bread of God*, Joh. 6. 33. *The Salvation of God*, Luk. 3. 6 *The Chriſt of God*, Luk. 9. 20. *God ſanctified him and ſent him into the World*, Joh. 10. 36. *God the Father ſealed him*, Joh. 6. 27. *God anointed him with the Holy Ghoſt and with Power*, Act. 10. 38. *God gave the Spirit without meaſure unto him*, Joh. 3. 34. *God gave him to the World and to Death for us all*, Joh. 3. 16. Rom. 8. 32. *and God appointed him Heir of all things*, Heb. 1. 2. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand*, Joh. 3. 35. *God hath put all things under his Feet*, 1 Cor. 15. 27. *God gave him the Throne of his Father David*, Luk. 1. 32. *God glorified his Son Jeſus*, Act. 3. 13. *God ſet him at his own Right Hand*, Eph. 1. 20. *God made him both Lord and Chriſt, a Prince and a Saviour*, Act. 2. 36. and 5. 31. *God hath highly exalted him, given him a Name above every Name, and every Tongue muſt confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord to the glory of God the Father*, Phil 2. 11. *God raiſed him up from the Dead, and gave him glory, that our Faith and Hope might be in God*, 1 Pet. 1. 21. So the Scripture uſually repreſenteth the miraculous Reſurrection of our Saviour as God's doing, (the Operation of his tranſcendent Power) but in ſome places our Saviour repreſenteth it as done by himſelf, *Joh.* 2. 19. *Deſtroy this Temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up*, Joh. 10. 17, 18. *I lay down my Life, that I might take it again. No Man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my ſelf: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This Commandment have I received of my Father.* In theſe places our Saviour conſidereth himſelf as *God's Meſſiah*, and ſpeaketh not *excluſively*, but *incluſively* and *comprehenſively* of the Preſence, Power and Agency of his Father, that thereby he would raiſe up his Temple and could reaſſume his Life. For ſo theſe places muſt be interpreted, that they may be conſiſtent with the Stream and Tenour of the New-Teſtament, which affirmeth our Saviour's Reſurrection to have been done(b) by the Agency of God the Father, of whom our Saviour (conſidering himſelf as God's Meſſiah) uſually ſpeaketh agreeably to the holy Writers of the New-Teſtament, deriving his All from him, attributing and referring his All to him. So that none who will open unprejudic'd Eyes to read the New-Teſtament can ſuppoſe (as the Scholaſtic Theology doth) that in the main God was not his God nor his ſuperior Proprietor or Owner; but that in the main (as to his Divinity) he was only his own God, and at that rate *a Self-owner, a Self-ſovereign.*

The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do. The Father loveth the Son, and ſheweth him all things that himſelf doeth: and he will ſhew him greater Works than theſe, that ye may marvel. I can of mine own ſelf do nothing: as I hear I judge, and my Judgment is juſt, becauſe I ſeek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father which hath ſent me. My Doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me. If any Man will do his Will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine whether it be of God or whether I ſpeak of my ſelf. He that ſpeaketh of himſelf ſeeketh his own glory: but he that ſeeketh his glory that ſent him, the ſame is true and no unrighteouſneſs is in him. When ye have lift up the Son of Man then ſhall ye know that I do nothing of my ſelf, but as my Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe things. I have not ſpoken of my ſelf, but the Father which ſent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I ſhould ſay and what I ſhould ſpeak. And I know that his Commandment is Life everlaſting: whatſoever I ſpeak therefore, even as the Father ſaid unto me, ſo I ſpeak. The Word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's which ſent me. The Father which dwelleth in me he doeth the Works. He that believeth on me believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me. I ſeek not mine own glory, there is one that ſeeketh and judgeth. If I honour myſelf, my Honour is nothing; it is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye ſay, that he is your God. I am come in my Father's Name. The Works that I do in my Father's Name, they bear witneſs of me. To ſit on my Right Hand and on my Left is not mine to give, but it ſhall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father. All things are delivered to me of my Father. All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth. The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment unto the Son. As the Father hath Life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son to have Life in himſelf, and hath given him Authority to execute Judgment. The living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father. All that the Father giveth me ſhall come to me. Thou haſt given him Power over all Fleſh, that he ſhould give Eternal Life to as many as thou haſt given him. I have manifeſted thy Name unto the Men which thou gaveſt me out of the World: thine they were and thou gaveſt them me. Now they have known that all things whatſoever thou haſt given me are of thee. And the glory which thou gaveſt me I have given them. Father, I will that they alſo whom thou haſt given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou haſt given me. He that overcometh to him will I give Power over the Nations, even as I received of my Father. When he cometh into the World (as the great Miſſionary of God) *he ſaith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldeſt not, but a Body haſt thou prepared me: In Burnt-offering and Sacrifices for Sin thou haſt had no Pleaſure: Then ſaid I, lo, I come,* (*in the Volume of the Book it is written of me*) *to do thy Will, O God. Not my Will but thine be done. I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter. When the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you from the Father*, Joh. 11. 41. *Becauſe of the People that ſtand by I ſaid it, that they may believe that thou haſt ſent me.* (c) Ut inde me à te miſſum colligant, quòd videant omnia à me ad tuam laudem referri, nihil me mihi vindicare.

Joh. 5. 19, 20, 30. *and* 7. 16, 17, 18.

Joh. 8. 28. *and* 12. 49, 50. *and* 14 10, 24. *and* 12. 44.

Joh. 8. 50, 54. *and* 5. 43. *and* 10. 25. *Matth.* 20. 23. *and* 11. 27. *and* 28. 18.

Joh. 5. 22, 26, 27. *and* 6. 57, 37. *and* 17. 2, 6, 7, 22, 24.

Apoc. 2. 26, 27.

Heb. 10. 5, 6, 7.

Luk. 22. 42.

Joh. 14. 16. *and* 15. 26.

XVI. The *Arians* objected, that to God the Son, who is King coeternal, coeſſential and coequal

(b) *Act.* 2. 24, 30, 32. *and* 3. 15, 26. *and* 4. 10. *and* 5. 30. *and* 10. 40. *and* 13. 33 *and* 17. 31. *Rom.* 4. 24. *and* 8. 11. *and* 10. 9. 1 *Cor.* 6. 14 *and* 15. 15. 2 *Cor.* 4. 14. *and* 13. 4. *Gal.* 1. 1. *Eph.* 1. 19, 20. *and* 25. *Col.* 2. 12, 13. *Heb.* 13. 20.

(c) *Grot. Not. in loc.*

equal with the Father in the Scholaſtic Senſe, the Text of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 15. 24, 28. is altogether incompetible, for he cannot be ſuppos'd *to deliver up the Kingdom to God the Father, and ſo to become ſubject unto him.* To which the ancient Scholaſtic Theology anſwereth, (*d*) that Chriſt will preſent to his Father the Multitude of the Elect at the laſt day, and this is *delivering up the Kingdom to him*; and then Chriſt's Members will be perfectly ſubject unto God, and *ſo the Son will be ſubject unto him.* But theſe Anſwers are wild Miſinterpretations of the Apoſtle, who is not ſpeaking of any ſuch things as theſe, but of *putting down all Rule and all Authority and Power.* Some therefore (as *Camero*) diſtinguiſh a twofold Kingdom of Chriſt, the one *the Eſſential*, (which belongeth to him as the ſecond Perſon in the ſcholaſtic Trinity, and which cannot be depos'd) the other the *vicarious* and *mediatory*, (which was given to him) and this is ſuppos'd to ceaſe, and then the Son will be otherwiſe ſubject to the Father than he is now, but in what reſpect they do not intelligibly expreſs. Nor is it intelligible that retaining the eſſential Kingdom the Abdication of the mediatory Kingdom can make the Son more but leſs ſubject than now, (the mediatory Kingdom being ſome ſort of Subjection;) or that the Son by the Abdication of the mediatory Kingdom can become ſubject to the Father without becoming ſubject to himſelf, if he retaineth the eſſential Kingdom; or that God can be *all in all* without Chriſt's being *all in all*, if he retaineth the eſſential Kingdom. It is to no purpoſe (in this Matter) to diſtinguiſh ſeveral Conſiderations of the Son (as God and as Man) for his Perſon is but one, and if his Perſon retaineth the eſſential Kingdom, he retaineth the moſt unſubject Condition that the ſcholaſtic Theology can attribute to him, (the Condition of the Supream Eternal Almighty God) and therefore cannot be ſaid to become ſubject by the Abdication of the mediatory Kingdom. The Apoſtle alſo conſidereth our Saviour in his higheſt Capacity, as appeareth from the Emphaſis in his Words, yet ſaith of him, *then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him that put all things under him:* Nor would it be to the Apoſtle's Purpoſe, (which is to ſhew, that there will be no governing Eſtate but God only) to ſay that the Son will abdicate the mediatory Kingdom and yet retain the eſſential Kingdom. Theſe are mighty Difficulties, inſuperable by the ſcholaſtic Theology; but the Text is not of inſuperable difficulty. For altho' the Imperial Son of God will always continue ſuch, and he is not to be compar'd to a General in War, that giveth up his Commiſſion when the War is ended, (as the *Unitarians* ſuppoſe) yet at the end of things he will ceaſe to be a governing Imperial Eſtate. Imperial Chriſtianity will then ceaſe, and conſequently Chriſt will ceaſe to be the governing Imperial Eſtate of it, and nothing but Sanctity Imperial will remain. But the Imperial Son of God can never be of the Subject-Creature-Party, nor doth the Apoſtle ſuppoſe that he will be otherwiſe ſubject to God than as the regal Son of a King is ſubject to his alone reigning Father. The regal Son in ſuch Circumſtances is not a governing Imperial Eſtate, yet in ſome ſort reigneth (in the Senſe of Government) in his Father's reigning, but without the Adminiſtration of the Government. So Chriſt's Adminiſtration of the Government will ceaſe at the laſt day, and this Senſe of the place ſeemeth to be agreeable (*e*) to *Pet. Martyr*'s Expoſition of it. From which genuin Expoſition of it we may infer, that there is no ſuch Son of God (or God the Son) as the ſecond Perſon in the ſcholaſtic Trinity that neceſſarily retaineth the eſſential Kingdom.

The Exaltation of Chriſt is by the Holy Writers ſet forth in an high Strain and in rapturous lofty Expreſſions; but the ſcholaſtic Theology maketh nothing of it. (*f*) *No new Perfection or new Glory or Beatitude or any part of it did accrue to Chriſt by his Aſcenſion, only a change of external place was made by it. It is abſurd to ſay that God the Word was after his Incarnation promoted to greater glory than he had before. Hippolytus* ſaith, (*g*) *The Name above every Name,* οὐ δόσις ὡς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν οὐκ ἐνόντων αὐτῷ φυσικῶς, *was not a gift of that which he had not naturally in the beginning: but rather a return to that which he had eſſentially and in the beginning.* Thus the celebrated Exaltation of our Saviour is in this Theology (in the Compute of the whole) made nothing, and not only ſo, but it is made leſs than nothing, and not an *Exaltation*, but a *Degradation.* For to allot the mediatory Kingdom (ſuppos'd to be the only given Kingdom) to ſuch a divine Perſon, who was fully poſſeſs'd of the eſſential Kingdom, is a Degradation, the mediatory Kingdom being manifeſtly below the eſſential Kingdom, as all Men will acknowledge, ſave only ſuch (and it is ſtrange that there ſhould be any ſuch) who ſuppoſe the Mediatorſhip to be above the Authority of God. The Anti-Trinitarians argue, If the Son of God is the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity, and was always fully poſſeſs'd of the eſſential Kingdom, his plenary Right of reigning could not be given him at a certain time (as the New-Teſtament affirmeth) for he always had it; nor could God give him at that certain time the plenary Poſſeſſion of the divine Sovereignty, for he was always fully poſſeſs'd of it. A mediatory Kingdom, as it is meerly the officiary Dignity of Mediation, might be given him, but this could not be the Exaltation of his Perſon. He might be *declaratively* exalted, but this is not the Exaltation which the New-Teſtament celebrateth, which is *the making him both Lord and King, the inveſting him with all Power in Heaven and Earth, the raiſing him above all Principality and Power and Might and Dominion,* (Angels, Authorities and Powers being made ſubject unto him) *the giving him the Throne and the Name above every Name.* That the divine imperial Son of God in the ſenſe of the holy-popular Theology ſhould be thus exalted (as a Reward of his Obedience and Sufferings) is hugely agreeable and eaſily intelligible; but to attribute this Exaltation to the ſecond Perſon of the ſcholaſtic Trinity, who is always and eſſentially the Supreme Almighty God in plenary Poſſeſſion of the high and holy imperial Eſtate, is hugely incongruous and unintelligible. If we ſuppoſe him to be incarnate (in the ſcholaſtic ſenſe) yet an Exaltation is not properly competible to his Perſon (who cannot be made greater or better than he is) at leaſt it is competible to him only in reſpect of the Human Nature, and therefore but very mutilately and diminutively; and in reſpect of his whole Perſon it is an Exaltation, that is no Exaltation, (a Reward that is no Reward) and much more no Exaltation than an Exaltation, becauſe it is incompetible to his divine Nature. Which divine Nature is ſo far from being capable of an Exaltation, that (in conſort with and undi-

---

(d) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 3. S. 15. & l. 3. c. 5. S. 1, 2.

(e) Loc. Com. Claſſ. 2. c. 17. ſ. 14.

(f) *Chriſto per ſuam Aſcenſionem nulla nova acceſſit perfectio vel gloria nova vel beatitudo, aut pars ejus duntaxat loci extrinſeci mutatio facta eſt.* Biel in Feſt. Aſſumpt. B. Mariæ Ser. 4. *Deum Verbum poſt Incarnationem ad majorem quàm ante gloriam fuiſſe provectum, abſurdam eſt dictu.* Petav. T. 4. l. 15. c. 4. S. 2.

(g) *Ap. D. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p.* 103. *Ed. an.* 1703.

undividedly from the Father and the Holy Ghoſt) it is ſuppos'd to give all things, and conſequently the Exaltation to the Human Nature. But this Hypotheſis cannot be true, for beſides that the Scriptures repreſent our Saviour's Exaltation and Glorification as peculiarly the Act of God the Father, (*Joh.* 17. 5.) it is not tolerable to ſay, *that the Son of God committed all Judgment to the Son of God, made him Lord and King, and gave him a Name above every Name.* Satisfactory Anſwers to theſe Arguments are not to be expected from the ſcholaſtic Theology, for what can be expected from ſuch a Theology, which groſly miſtaketh and miſinterpreteth the plaineſt places in the Bible? Is there any thing more plain than that of the Apoſtle, *Let all the Houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly that God hath made that ſame Jeſus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Chriſt? Act.* 2. 36. This the *Arians* objected, and the ſcholaſtic Theology anſwereth, that it is meant of the Incarnation. (h) Pet. de Trin. l. 2. c. 3. S. 3. (*h*) *This is the only true ſenſe of the place, the Human Nature being aſſum'd into the Conſortſhip of the divine Subſtance, thereby he is ſaid to be made both Chriſt and Lord.* But what will this Theology ſay to that of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 1. 6. *When he bringeth in the firſt begotten into the World he ſaith, And let all the Angels of God worſhip him.* A divine Edict was publiſh'd at that time enjoyning the holy Angels to worſhip the Son of God. But if he was always poſſeſs'd of the eſſential Kingdom, at that time they could not but know him to be their ancient Lord and Sovereign. But (when he was brought into the World) they did not know him to be ſuch (as appeareth from the divine Edict enjoyning them to worſhip him, which had been ſuperfluous, if they had known him to be their ancient Lord and Sovereign;) therefore he was not always poſſeſs'd of the eſſential Kingdom.

XVII. The *Arians* objected, that none knew of the laſt day, *not the Angels, neither the Son, but the Father.* Marc. 13. 32. To this the ſcholaſtic Theology anſwereth; that our Saviour's words are of this meaning, *He would not declare it,* or *as his Father's Legate and Ambaſſadour he was not to declare it* (but was prohibited) *it was not revealed to him, that he might reveal it to others.* The moſt ſay, *He knew of it as God, but was neſcient of it only as Man.* Which is to ſay, that *the Father* doth not ſignifie the Father only, but two other Perſons; and that the Son doth not ſignifie the Son properly ſuch; for Chriſt as Man is not properly the Son according to this Theology. *Joh.* 10. 29. our Saviour ſaith, *My Father which gave them me, is greater than all.* Joh. 14. 28. *If ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, becauſe I ſaid, I go unto my Father; for my Father is greater than I.* Our Saviour affirmeth, that his going to the Father would ſignifie very much to the bettering his condition, for this reaſon, *becauſe my Father is greater than I.* In the Interpretation of which words, (that were very much inſiſted on by the *Arians*) the ſcholaſtic Theology is not conſiſtent with it ſelf. (i) Petav. ſupr. l. 2. c. 2. (*i*) For ſometimes it will have the words to be ſpoken of our Saviour only according to his humane nature; and if ſo, the Father is not greater than Chriſt according to his divine nature, which yet the more ancient ſcholaſtic Theology affirmeth. It underſtandeth theſe words to be ſpoken of our Saviour according to his divine nature, and acknowledgeth the Father to be greater than Chriſt κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον, *as being the principle and fountain of the divinity.* But this ſenſe is impertinent to our Saviour's Scope; for it doth not ſhew, that his going to the Father will ſignifie any thing (much leſs very much) to the bettering his condition. Nor may we limit the ſenſe of his Words to his humane nature; for it is a poor buſineſs to ſay of God, *My Father is greater than I as Man* (the compariſon is between Perſon and Perſon ſimply and without addition) and according to this Interpretation in how ſlender a degree is our Saviour's Affirmation true (My Father is greater than I) and how little would his going to the Father ſignifie to the bettering his Condition? Sound Reaſon there is in theſe Argumentations of the Anti-Trinitarians againſt the ſcholaſtic Theology: but there is neither ſound Reaſon nor true Religion in the Inference which they draw from our Saviour's words, namely, *that Chriſt is a minor Deity heterouſian to the Godhead.* For our Saviour's compariſon is between a divine imperial Father and his divine imperial Son not yet poſſeſs'd of his divine imperial eſtate.

The Diſcourſe between our Saviour and a Young-man *Matt.* 19. 17. is a Diſcourſe between two great Religioniſts, whereof the one checketh the other for his Language (not well-becoming a great Religioniſt) in ſtyling him *good Maſter. Why calleſt thou me good* (ſaith our Saviour) *there is none good but one, that is God.* This Text the *Arians* objected againſt the ſcholaſtic Trinity, and it is of ſome force upon this account, becauſe it proveth God the Father's *Mono theiſm.* For our Saviour appropriateth Goodneſs unto God (the Father) conformably to thoſe other Texts (which the *Arians* alſo objected) *God only wiſe,* Rom. 16. 27. *who only hath immortality,* 1 *Tim.* 6. 16. In theſe Texts our Saviour is manifeſtly diſtinguiſh'd from *the one only wiſe and good and immortal God* (to whom he is related as the only begotten Son) and therefore the ſcholaſtic Theology which interpreteth theſe Attributes to be in theſe Texts Attributions to the whole Trinity, manifeſtly diſtorteth the holy Scriptures. As on the other Hand the Anti-Trinitarians do not reaſon from Scripture in their unchriſtian degrading our Saviour below a Perſon of the ſupreme Godhead. For let us only ſuppoſe, that the holy Spirit is a Perſon of the ſupreme God-head as the Agent of that imperial eſtate; may not this holy Spirit ſay of God the Father, *God only is wiſe, God only is good, God only hath immortality,* without excluding himſelf from being a Perſon of the ſupreme Godhead? Theſe Attributions directly and primarily are the peculiar Attributions of God the Father, to whom *Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Immortality* ſupereminently belongeth. But this Peculiarity and Supereminence doth not at all claſh with the Wiſdom, Goodneſs, and Immortality of the other divine Perſons, but inferreth it. For becauſe *God only is wiſe, good, and hath immortality,* therefore his imperial Son and his holy Spirit muſt have Wiſdom, Goodneſs, and Immortality, as being Perſons of his Godhead; and they muſt have ſuch Wiſdom, Goodneſs, and Immortality, as belongeth to ſuch Perſons of his Godhead.

The *Anti-Trinitarians* object, that the ſecond Perſon in the ſcholaſtic Trinity cannot be ſuch a Legate or Miſſionary of God as our Saviour was. For that Abſtract Son of God cannot come down from Heaven, nor remove from Place to Place, and therefore cannot be ſent by him into the World. And if he is under no Authority, as many ſuppoſe (being the eternal almighty God) he cannot be authoritatively ſent by God, nor come in his Name, nor receive his Commandments and obſerve him. If he is the eternal almighty God, he ought to be counted ſuch, and therefore ought to repreſent himſelf as ſuch: but if he be ſuch a Miſſionary of God as our Saviour was, he muſt repreſent himſelf as of a very diſſonant Character from himſelf, he muſt ſay of himſelf things utterly incompetible to ſuch a perſon and inconſiſtent with Truth. For being abſolutely omnipotent and able of himſelf to do all things, yet ſpeaking as the Father's Miſſionary (and therefore according to his divine Nature) he muſt ſay, *I can of my ſelf do nothing.* Being abſolutely Omnipotent from Eternity yet ſpeaking as the Father's Miſſionary (and therefore according to his divine Nature) he muſt ſay, *All Power is* (in time) *given unto me. The Father hath* (in time) *given to the Son, to have Life in himſelf.* Being abſolutely *Omniſcient* from Eternity yet ſpeaking as the Father's Miſſionary he muſt ſay, *As my Father hath taught me* (in time) *I ſpeak theſe things. As I hear I judge. The Father which ſent me he gave me a Commandment, what I ſhould ſay, and what I ſhould ſpeak.* And the holy Writers muſt ſay of him, *Apoc.* 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt which God* (in time) *gave unto him.* Being the Almighty Eternal God yet ſpeaking as the Father's Miſſionary he muſt ſay, *If I honour my ſelf my Honour is nothing. I am not come in mine own Name,* (by mine own Authority) *The Words that I ſpeak unto you I ſpeak not of my ſelf. My Doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me.* In the Preſence of his Father that ſent him he muſt place all his Safety. *He that ſent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone: for I do always thoſe things that pleaſe him.* And although the whole Trinity of Perſons are of one individual ſcholaſtic Eſſence, Will, Power, Energy and Operation, yet (ſpeaking as the Father's Miſſionary and according to his divine Nature) he muſt ſay, *I came down from Heaven not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me I ſeek not mine own Glory, there is one that ſeeketh and judgeth.* All our Saviour's Diſcourſes are hugely agreeable to a divine Imperial Son of the Chriſtian and holy-popular Kind, but not to ſuch a Deity of Perſon that is in himſelf the Eternal Almighty God. It ſeemeth incongruous and too mean for him not to attribute any thing to himſelf, to place all his Safety in the Preſence of his Father that ſent him, from his Conſortſhip to derive the Infallibility of his Judgment, (*If I judge, my Judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that ſent me*) and from his Miſſion to derive the Validity of his Teſtimony, *Joh.* 8. 14. *Though I bear record of my ſelf, yet my record is true: for I know whence I came and whither I go.* St. Paul ſpeaketh not congruouſly of ſuch a Deity of Perſon, 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. *he liveth by the power of God.* In his Reſurrection he ought to be repreſented as his own Father and his own Son, and his Divinity ought to be repreſented as ſaying to his Humanity *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.*

To this Heap of the Anti-Trinitarians Arguments we will annex theſe two other. They argue, that if Chriſt was the Eternal Almighty God it was needleſs and ſuperfluous to give the Holy Spirit unto him. To which the Scholaſtic Theology anſwereth, *that the divine Perſons cannot act ſeparately* ad extrà, *what the Father doth that the Son doth, and that the Holy Ghoſt doth by one individual Act. The divine Word acteth by and in Conjunction with the Holy Spirit, and thereby he ſanctifieth his own Human Nature.* Thus the Son of God (ſanctifying his own Human Nature, and conſequently being his own regenerate Child) is again made to be his own Father and his own Son. The Anti-Trinitarians argue, that if the Devil had known Chriſt to be the Eternal Almighty God (and he muſt know it as well as the holy People) he would not have been ſo prodigiouſly fooliſh as to attempt his Seduction, and to ſollicit him to ſo vile a thing as to fall down and worſhip him. To which Argument the Scholaſtic Theology anſwereth, *that the Devil underſtood not the Myſtery of the Incarnation.* He did not therefore underſtand this Name *The Son of God* in the Notion of the Scholaſtic Theology. The holy People therefore muſt not be ſuppos'd ſo to have underſtood it, unleſs we will ſuppoſe them to have been better Schoolmen than the grand Maſter of Subtilties. Doubtleſs our Saviour was expos'd to the Devil's Temptation, *as the Prince of the Holy Empire,* to encounter and to vanquiſh the Prince of Darkneſs.

XVIII. Againſt the Trinity and the Deity of the Meſſiah as they are repreſented in the Scholaſtic Theology, the Jews make Objections as well as the Anti-Trinitarians of the Chriſtian Profeſſion. And as their Objections in ſeveral Inſtances are the ſame, ſo the Scholaſtic Theology anſwereth them both alike. For the Jews object (*k*) the Prieſt is he that offereth Sacrifice, God doth not offer Sacrifice, but Sacrifice is offer'd unto him; therefore it is abſurd to ſuppoſe our Meſſiah (the Prieſt) to be God in the ſenſe of the ſcholaſtic Theology. To which ſolid Objection the ſcholaſtic Theology anſwereth, *that Chriſt doth not offer Sacrifice as God, but as Mediator and as Man.* This Anſwer diſtinguiſheth two Capacities of the ſame Perſon in reſpect of himſelf, in the one he is the Creditor, in the other the Debtor. And as this both Debtor and Creditor in reſpect of himſelf payeth himſelf, at the ſame rate the ſcholaſtic Theology maketh Chriſt Mediator, as will be hereafter diſcours'd. The Jews alſo object, if our Meſſiah was God (in the ſenſe of the ſcholaſtic Theology) how could all Power in Heaven and Earth (in time) be given him who was always fully poſſeſs'd of it? what need was there that it ſhould be given him? is he not God as well as the Father, and hath he not the ſame Power over all Nations? But why then doth the Father ſay unto him, *Aſk of me and I ſhall give thee the Nations and the utmoſt ends of the Earth for thine Inheritance? were not the Nations his Poſſeſſion antecedently to this Poſtulation?* To which Objection the ſcholaſtic Theology anſwereth, (l) *that he hath an eſſential power over all things equal with the Father, but as the Mediator and as Man becauſe of a ſingular Office and Oeconomy he hath a delegated Power from the Father. Not as if the Power of the Son was of different greatneſs,* (*now or then greater or leſſer*) *but there is a difference in the Diſpenſation of it, as he is God and as he is conſtituted Mediator by the Father.* The Jews are not ſatisfy'd with this Anſwer to their Objection, and Chriſtians have much leſs Reaſon to be ſatisfy'd with it, as being a Contradiction to a great and the divineſt part of the New-Teſtament. For to allot an Office of delegated Power to one that was of eſſential Power equal to the Father, was an Humiliation, not a Glorification. And if the Perſon of our Saviour had (in time) no Augmentation of Power conferr'd upon him, all the magnificent Deſcriptions of his Exaltation in the New-Teſtament (that amount to nothing) what are they but meer Smoke and Vapour? The Jews object further, that

Joh. 8. 16.

(k) *Hoornbeck c. jud. l.* 5. *c.* 1. *p.* 367.

(l) *Ibid p.* 363. *Buxt. ſyn. jud. p.* 588. *Ed. an.* 1614.

that if our Meſſiah was God (in the ſcholaſtic ſenſe) he could not be impotent, nor need Aid and Help. If the Son is the ſame (ſcholaſtic) divine Eſſence with the Father, the one will have no need of the other. How then can the Father ſay to the Son, *Sit thou at my Right Hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footſtool?* To this Objection the ſcholaſtic Theology anſwereth, (m) *that one Perſon of the Deity needeth not another. But the Meſſiah is ſaid to be exalted and ſeated at the Right Hand of God, not as God, but as Man and Mediator.* In which Anſwer there is nothing of ſound Theology. For if one Perſon of the Deity needeth not another, what meaneth our Saviour's Prayers with ſtrong Cries and Tears? And if he is ſeated at the Right Hand of God, not as God; but as Man, this inferreth, that as not God he ſitteth upon the Throne of God (the Throne of Glory) which is a Contradiction. Thus every way unſatisfactory are the Anſwers which the ſcholaſtic Theology maketh to the Jews Objections againſt the Deity of the Meſſiah; and the Anſwer which it maketh to their Objection againſt the Trinity is of the ſame Character. For the Jews (as alſo the *Muhammedans*) object againſt the ſcholaſtic Trinity, that it is impoſſible. And the ſcholaſtic Theology thus far agreeth with the Objectors, (n) *Trinitatis myſterium,* ἀνεξερεύνητον, *omninò eſt,* The Myſtery of the Trinity is altogether paſt finding out, *and is not a matter of human ſearch, but to be receiv'd by Faith-ſubmiſſion.* The Weakneſs of theſe Anſwers to the Objections of Infidels (againſt the principal Articles of the Chriſtian Faith) is eaſily underſtood, but can never ſufficiently be lamented.

(m) *Hoorn-beek ſupr* p. 365, 367

(n) *Hulſ. Theol. Jud. par.* 1. *l.* 1. p. 94.

CHAP. VI.

1. A ſixth ſort of Argument for the Truth of our Idea of the Son of God is the true Idea of the Meſſiah. His Idea ſummarily repreſented, and the firſt Branch thereof. 2. *A ſecond Branch of his Idea.* 3. *A third Branch of it.* 4. *A fourth Branch of his Idea.* 5. *A fifth Branch of it.* 6. *A ſixth Branch of his Idea.* 7. *A ſeventh Branch of it.* 8. *An eighth Branch of his Idea.* 9. *A ninth Branch of it.* 10. *A tenth Branch of his Idea.* 11. *A Conſectary from our Idea of the Meſſiah.*

1. THE Truth of our Idea of the Son of God may be proved and illuſtrated from *a ſixth* ſort of Argument, which is the Idea of the *Meſſiah*, whoſe Idea is in great degree co-incident with our Idea of the Son of God, and muſt be thus ſummarily repreſented.

> *The Chriſt or the Meſſiah as ſuch is the Lord's anointed to this officiary Dignity,*
> *The mediatory Saviour-King of the Holy Empire.*

By this Name *The Chriſt* or the *Meſſiah* the ancient Jews that liv'd before our Saviour's Time called an illuſtrious Perſon predicted and promiſed to their Nation as a Saviour-Prince. Under this Name and Notion they expected him, although the Name occurreth but once in the Old Teſtament, *Dan.* 9. 25. *From the going forth of the Commandment unto the Meſſiah the Prince.* The Jews might have called him by ſeveral other Names (*Shiloh, Emmanuel, The Branch, Menahem*) but they made choice of this Name *The Meſſiah*, a Name that denoteth *his officiary Dignity*, which will be well underſtood by diſtinctly conſidering the ſeveral Ingredients of his Idea.

His Idea (in the firſt place) repreſenteth him as *The Anointed*, according to the Signification of his Name; for *The Meſſiah* in Hebrew and *The Chriſt* in Greek ſignifyeth *The Anointed*. The Reaſon of which Name is a Cuſtom which the Jews had to ſet apart and conſecrate Perſons that were deſign'd for an eminent and extraordinary Employment, by anointing them; and in the ſame manner things inanimate were made ſacred. For *Moſes took the anointing Oil, and anointed the Tabernacle and all that was therein, and ſanctified them, and anointed the Altar and all the Veſſels, both the Laver and his foot to ſanctify them*, *Lev.* 8. 10, 11. Long before the Time of *Moſes Jacob poured Oil upon the top of a Pillar* to conſecrate it; and in like manner the Heathen Nations poured Oil upon Stones (Bætulia) and pay'd their religious Adorations to them. And as the Heathen Nations ſuppos'd that a divine Virtue reſided in their anointed Stones, ſo the Jews by anointing Perſons deſign'd for eminent and extraordinary Employments denoted and ſignified a plenteous Effuſion of Gifts and Abilities upon them, to qualify them for their great Employments. Which plenteous Effuſion of Gifts was more than meerly adumbrated in the Unction of ſome of their Kings; for *Saul* had a regial Spirit conferr'd upon him, and the Spirit of the Lord came upon *David* immediately after his regial Unction, 1 *Sam.* 16. 13, 14. The Cuſtom of anointing Kings was ſo uſual in Ancient Times, that in *Jotham's* Parable to anoint a King ſignifieth to elect and conſtitute him ſuch. *The Trees went forth to anoint a King over them.* They addreſs'd themſelves to the Bramble, *and the Bramble ſaid unto the Trees, If in truth ye anoint me King over you, then come and put your truſt in my Shadow.* (o) In ſome Greek Copies alſo that which in our Tranſlation runneth thus; They went to make *Abimelech* King, is thus rendred; *They went* (χρίσαι) *to anoint Abimelech King.* In Ancient Times therefore, when Kings and other extraordinary Perſons were ſolemnly anointed, there were many *Chriſts* (anointed Perſons or Sons of Oil) but one is ſupereminently ſuch, and to him the Name is appropriated. Yet at the time of his appearing and long before the Jews had loſt their *Unction*; for themſelves tell us, that the Unction which they us'd in anointing their Kings and High-Prieſts was hid in the Days of *Joſiah*, but it will be found again when the Meſſiah cometh, that he may be anointed with it and the Kings and Prieſts in his Days. But becauſe they had loſt their Unction before our Saviour's Time, it cannot be ſuppos'd that he was anointed with material Oil, yet he muſt be known and conſider'd as *The Anointed*.

Gen. 28, 18.

Jud. 9.

(o) *Selden Titles* p. 107. *Ed.* 3.

II. His Idea repreſenteth him as *The Lord's Anointed* agreeably to his Name *The Lord's Chriſt*, *The Chriſt of God*, Pſal. 2. 2. *The Kings of the Earth ſet themſelves againſt the Lord and againſt his Anointed*, Act. 4. 26, 27. *The Rulers were gathered together againſt the Lord and againſt his Chriſt. For of a truth againſt thy holy Child Jeſus, whom*

Luk. 2. 26. *and* 9. 2

thou haſt anointed, the Gentiles and the People of Iſrael were gathered together. He was therefore *the King elect*, for his Name, *The Lord's Anointed*, importeth that he was of God's electing, that God ſegregated him and ſingled him out from all others, and pitch'd upon him to be the Perſon that ſhould do the greateſt piece of Service, and bear the greateſt officiary Dignity that ever was. And that he was of God's preferring and dignifying, who appointed him his high Office and Dignity (far above all others) and being ſo diſcriminated and eſpecially dignified by him, and nearly related to him, he was ἐξαίρετος, *choice and eximious in God's Eſteem*, (the great Favourite) and ſo ſeparated from all others by way of Eminency, in which ſenſe he was *The choſen of God*, Luk. 23. 35. Matth. 12. 18. 1 Pet. 2. 4. His Name importeth alſo, that as he is of God's electing and preferring, and infinitely choice, and of Precioſity in his Eyes, ſo he is of God's patronizing, who will not fail to own him and ſtand by him, *Pſal.* 89. 20, 21. *I have found David my Servant, with my holy Oil have I anointed him, with whom my hand ſhall be eſtabliſhed: mine Arm alſo ſhall ſtrengthen him.* God will be a mighty Patron to his anointed King, and will defend and maintain him (in the Execution of his Office) and therefore ſaith of him, *Behold my Servant, whom I uphold*, (defend and maintain) *Iſa.* 42. 1. *The Lord at his Right Hand*, (as his παραστάτης, or Aſſiſtant) *will ſtrike through Kings in the day of his Wrath*, (will utterly deſtroy the Enemies of his Kingdom and Government, though never ſo potent) *Pſal.* 110. 5, 6. But when his Diſciples in their Prayer to God ſtyled him *Thy holy Child Jeſus whom thou haſt anointed*, their meaning was, *whom thou haſt authoriz'd and commiſſion'd.* Act. 4. 27. His Name importeth that he was authoriz'd and ordain'd by God to his ſacred Office and Dignity, had his Miſſion and Commiſſion from him, (was authoriz'd and commiſſion'd to do all the Offices of the Saviour Prince) he came to us in his Father's Name, and was commiſſion'd ſo to do, and had his Mandate from above, *Joh.* 8. 42. *I came not of my ſelf, but he ſent me, Joh.* 10. 36. *The Father ſanctified him*, (ſelected, ſet him apart and appointed him for his ſaving Office and Employ) and ſo ſent him into the World, and gave miraculous Atteſtations to him. *For him hath God the Father ſealed*, (Joh. 6. 27.) God hath authoriz'd and commiſſionated him as it were under his broad Seal, (his Miracles were as it were the broad Seal of Heaven) thereby giving him both Authority and Credence, as Ambaſſadors have both their Authority and Credence from the King's Seal. The Kings of *Iſrael*, as being the Lord's Anointed, were no common and vulgar, but very ſacred, venerable and inviolable Perſons, (although they were anointed only to an inferior and petty Regality;) our Saviour's Name therefore (the Lord's Anointed) importeth the mighty Sacredneſs of his Perſon, whom God hath ſupereminently ſet apart for himſelf, and who is anointed to the fulleſt height of Honour and Dignity. *The anointed One of God is neceſſarily the holy One of God*, as Holineſs denoteth unvulgarneſs and unvileneſs of Perſon, *Marc.* 1. 24. He was alſo *the Lord's Anointed* anſwerably to that divine Influx which in Ancient Times was (ſometimes) appointed to reſide upon God's Anointed (to inable and qualify them to diſcharge that Office and Dignity to which they were anointed;) for to qualify him for his high and holy Function *he was anointed with the Holy Ghoſt and with Power*, Act. 10. 38. When he entred upon his Office and Miniſtry *the Spirit of God deſcended upon him*, Matth. 3. 16. and he deſcended in the Power of the Spirit into *Galilee*, thus noticing himſelf in the Synagogues. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, becauſe he hath anointed me to preach the Goſpel to the Poor*, Luk. 4. 14, 18. His Unction by the Holy Ghoſt therefore was at his Baptiſm, (*p*) but the ſcholaſtic Theology will have our Saviour to have been anointed with the Holy Ghoſt in the Womb of the Bl. Virgin, when the divine Nature by the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt was conjoyned with the Human Nature, of which ſort of Unction (ſo called) it muſt be ſaid, that it is nothing like an anointing; yet from hence this Theology deriveth the Name of Chriſt. Not conſidering that this Name *The Chriſt* chiefly denoteth an officiary Dignity, and that to be *anointed* in a large ſenſe ſignifieth to be appointed and conſtituted. Whence our Saviour's Inauguration into his Heavenly Regality is called his Unction, *Heb.* 1. 9. and King *Cyrus* being a ſort of Saviour-Prince raiſed, ordained and conſtituted by an eſpecial Providence, is called by God *mine anointed*, Iſa. 45. 1. *He is my Shepherd, and ſhall perform all my Pleaſure*, Iſa. 44. 28.

III. The Idea of the Meſſiah repreſenteth him *as anointed to be the Lord* (A divine imperial Perſon, A Creature-tranſcendent Lord, Prince and Potentate) *The King of the holy Empire.* In his Perſon theſe three honourary Attributes concur; He was *The Lord's anointed, he was The Lord anointed, and He was anointed to be the Lord.* He was *The Lord's anointed* as being the Perſon whom God anointed. He was *The Lord anointed*, as being *His holy Child Jeſus*, who was natively *The Lord*, Luk. 2. 11. And he was anointed to be *The Lord*, as being inveſted with the officiary Dignity of the divine imperial Lord the King of the holy Empire, which is ſignify'd by his Name *Meſſiah*. (*q*) *Chriſt is not a proper name, but a name of Potentacy and Kingdom. For ſo the Jews called their Kings. As amongſt the Romans the putting on the Purple is an Enſign of the regial dignity aſſumed: ſo with them the Unction of the ſacred Ointment conferr'd the regial name and power. For this reaſon we call him Chriſt, that is, Anointed, who is called in Hebrew Meſſias. Which Name ſignifieth him to be a King, not of an earthly, but of an heavenly and ſempiternal Kingdom.* (*r*) In the Evangeliſts the name of King and of Meſſiah is confounded. *Notum illud Judæorum* משיח לשון שררה *poteſtatem denotare unctionem, & Meſſiæ nomen poteſtatis eſſe.* The Jews are known to ſay, *That Unction denoteth Authority and Power, and that Meſſiah is a name of Potentacy.* So the Jews uſually ſtile him *Rex Meſſias*, and the Chaldee Paraphraſts commonly call him מלכא משיחא *the King Meſſiah.* This was the Jews Notion of him, when they thus accus'd him, *Luk.* 23. 2. *We found this Fellow perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give Tribute to Cæſar, ſaying that he himſelf is Chriſt a King.* He was adjudg'd to ſuffer Death for this reaſon, becauſe he affirm'd that he was Chriſt a King, which was counted Treaſon againſt *Cæſar.* In the Hiſtory of his Paſſion to be the Chriſt, *Matth.* 26. 68. to be a King, *Luk.* 23. 2. to be the King of Iſrael, *Matt.* 27. 42. or the King of the Jews *Mar.* 15. 18. are terms of the ſame Signification. *Herod* ſet him

(p) *Petav.* T. 4. *l.* 11. c. 8, 9.

(q) *Chriſtus non proprium nomen eſt, ſed nuncupatio poteſtatis & regni. Sic enim Judæi reges ſuos appellabant.* —— *Sicut nunc Romanis indumentum purpuræ inſigne eſt regiæ dignitatis aſſumptæ: ſic illis unctio ſacri unguenti nomen ac poteſtatem regiam conferebat.* —— *ob hanc rationem nos eum Chriſtum nuncupamus, id eſt, unctum, qui Hebraicè Meſſias dicitur.* —— *quo nomine rex ſignificatur: non quod ille regnum hoc terrenum fuerit adeptus, ſed quod cœleſte ac ſempiternum.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 7.

(r) *Heinſ. Ariſt. ſac.* p. 392.

him out as a mock King, ſo did the Souldiers and *Pilate* (Joh. 19. 14.) who alſo in his Examination inſiſted upon his Kingſhip: and this was the ſenſe of the Inſcription upon the Croſs, *that our Saviour ſuffer'd Death for affirming himſelf to be the Chriſt, or the King of the Jews. Art thou a King then?* ſaid *Pilate. Jeſus anſwer'd, Thou ſay'ſt that I am a King,* Joh. 18. 37. Under this Notion he is predicted in the Book of Pſalms: *Yet have I ſet my King upon my holy hill of Sion, Pſal.* 2. 6. and 72. 1. Under this Notion he is uſually predicted in the Prophets, as *a King that ſhall come, a King that ſhall reign, as Meſſiah the Prince, the Prince of Peace, as a Ruler, and as ſitting upon the Throne of David.* So his Inauguration into his heavenly Eſtate of Kingſhip is called *The making him Chriſt* (which was done gradually, in the degree of Inchoation, before it was done in the degree of Perfection) *Act.* 2. 36. His Name therefore primarily ſignifieth and denoteth him to be *a King*, and ſuch a King as his Idea repreſenteth him, namely (A divine imperial Perſon) *The King of the holy Empire*, who is The Lord the King. For Chriſt is of definitive Notion *The King of the Iſrael of God* (the King of the Jews) *the King of Sion.* Becauſe *David* was King of the holy People (the literal Iſrael) therefore Chriſt is ſaid to ſucceed him in the Throne, and to be inthron'd on the Hill of *Sion*, which was the Seat of *David*'s Throne and Kingdom. *Luk.* 1. 32. *Pſal.* 2. 6. He is therefore the King of the holy People (the Church and People of God) of the holy Commonwealth (the Commonwealth of Saints) and the Title which was falſly attributed to a Muhammedan *Chaliph* is the true Definition of the true Meſſiah (s) *Emir Elmumunin Rex credentium, The Prince, Lord or Emperour of the true Believers.* His Dominion is univerſal and unlimited, but ſo as to be King of the Church only in the ſenſe of Alliance and Society. *Epheſ.* 1. 21. *God hath put all things under his feet, and given him to be the head over all things to the Church.* Over his univerſal Church he reigneth as the regent Party of a Polity, enjoying and exerciſing all Kingly Prerogatives, Powers, and Adminiſtrations; therein his Sovereignty is acknowledg'd, his holy Laws and happy Government take place, and he enjoyeth the Honours, Homage, and Service due to a divine King. His Church is his Kingdom, the Comprehenſion of his Liege-people, whom he protecteth from Enemies, whoſe Wants he provideth for, and whom he ſupporteth in their Troubles; eſtabliſhing Peace in their Borders, reſtraining, ſuppreſſing, and deſtroying all Adverſaries to this his Kingdom and his People's Welfare: exerciſing Judgment over them, diſtributing the greateſt Rewards to the loyal and faithful, and inflicting upon others the ſevereſt Puniſhments. But as for the reſt of the World they are in one ſenſe Chriſt's Subjects, and in another ſenſe they are not his Subjects (not actually his Citizens and Societiſts) they are in the ſtate of open declared Enemies to his Crown and Dignity.

IV. All his Offices are compris'd in his *Regality*, and in his being *The Lord's Anointed.* (t) Some ſuppoſe him to have had the Right of ſucceeding *David* in the temporal Kingdom, and to have had alſo the *Aaronical* Prieſthood, which are groundleſs Conceits, extremely alien from the Chriſtian Religion. But as in general He is *the King*, it belongeth to him (according to the ſenſe of ancient Writers and the uſage of ancient Times) to have the *Prieſthood* alſo. For *Melchizedec* (an illuſtrious Type of Chriſt) was both King and Prieſt (u) and the Kings of ſeveral Heathen Nations were Prieſts alſo. *Servius* (upon that of *Virgil, Rex Anius, Rex idem hominum, Phœbique ſacerdos*) ſaith, *Majorum hæc erat conſuetudo, ut Rex eſſet etiam ſacerdos & Pontifex; unde hodie etiam Imperatores Pontifices dicimus.* The Roman Emperours had the great Pontificate (till *Gratian* relinquiſh'd it) agreeably to the Cuſtom of ancient Times, that the King ſhould be Prieſt and Pontifex. So a Pythagorean will have every King to be a Prieſt, and for this reaſon, (w) *Becauſe it is fit, that the beſt ſhould have his Worſhip perform'd by the beſt, and by the chief Ruler amongſt Men, he being chief Ruler of all.* The great Affinity between the Regality and the Prieſthood, appeareth from the Appellation both of Jews and Chriſtians, that are intituled *Kings* and *Prieſts*, Exod. 19. 6. *Apoc.* 1. 6. and from the Hebrew word *Cohen*, which ſignifieth both *Prince* and *Prieſt.* So Man the *Prince* of this lower World ſhould underſtand that (x) *ritu ſibi vivendum ſacerdotis*, he ſhould live as a Prieſt. Both Princes and Prieſts wore White, which was both the ſacerdotal and royal Apparel, *Eſther* 8. 15. The Houſe wherein the High-prieſt liv'd was called *Regia* (as *Servius* obſerveth) and the Jews High-prieſt had his Crown, as Kings have, *Exod.* 29. 6. *Moſes*, who was King in *Jeſurun*, exercis'd the Prieſthood in part, in ſprinkling Blood and ratifying the Covenant, *Exod.* 24. 6, 7, 8. And in the nature of them theſe two Offices are ſo near of kin, that there is great reaſon that they ſhould be united in one Perſon. For the King being as ſuch God's Repreſentative to the People, acting and ruling in his name and ſtead, it is hugely agreeable, that he ſhould be the People's Repreſentative unto God, and act in their name and ſtead: So our Saviour ſuffer'd Death both as God's Repreſentative unto us, and as our Repreſentative unto God. But the Regal Office is not only of great Affinity and Connexion with the Sacerdotal, but alſo with the Prophetic Office. For the famous Men of ancient times (*Noah, Abraham, Iſaac*, and *Jacob*) ruled their Families as *Kings*, ſacrific'd as *Prieſts*, and were Teachers as *Prophets.* The Rabbins ſpeak of *Methuſala*'s, *Sem*'s, *Eber*'s *Domus judicii* (Houſe of Judgment) which ſome ſuppoſe to have been Courts of Judicature, (y) others rather ſuppoſe them Schools of Doctrine; probably they were both theſe, as the Jewiſh Synagogues were. *Maimonides* ſaith of them, *Omnes fuerunt Prophetæ & docebant homines ad morem Concionatorum, Doctorum & Præceptorum.* They were all Prophets, and taught Men as Preachers and Teachers. So *Bede* ſaith of King *Oſwald* (z) *Rex ſuis Ducibus ac Miniſtris interpres verbi extitit cœleſtis*, The King was to his Captains and Servants an Interpreter of the heavenly Word. Such a Prophet *Conſtantine* the Great was. But ſome Heathen Nations would have their King's Prophets in an higher ſenſe, if we believe *Friar-William de Rubruiquis* (who travell'd the Aſiatick parts about the Year 1253, and) who giveth this account of the name *Can* the name of the Prince in thoſe Parts. (a) *Can nomen dignitatis, quod idem eſt qui Divinator. Omnes Divinatores vocant Can. Unde principes dicuntur Can, quia penes eos ſpectat regimen populi per Divinationem.* This Friar was deceiv'd (no doubt) touching the Meaning of the Title *Can*, but not touching the Faculty

Zech. 9. 9. Jer. 23. 5. Dan. 9. 25. Iſa. 9. 6, 7. Mic. 5. 2.

(s) Selden Titles, p. 72, 73. Ed. 3.

(t) Petav. T. 4. l. 12. c. 15.

(u) Biſhop Taylor Duct. Dub. B. 3. c. 3. R. 4. n. 16.

(w) Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ ἄριστον ὑπὸ τῶ ἀρίστω τιμᾶσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἁγεμονεῦον ὑπὸ τῶ ἁγεμονεύοντος. Diotog. de regno.

(x) Macrob. in Som. Scip. l. 1. c. 14.

(y) Marſham Can. Chr. p. 183. Ed. Lipſ. Maimon. Mor. Nev. par. 2. c. 35.

(z) Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 2.

(a) Selden Titles p. 67.

culty of Divination requiſite in Princes, as a better Author aſſureth us. (*b*) *To Principality and the publick Adminiſtration of Affairs Prophecy was anciently ſo conjoined, that we may ſay of Kings and Princes, It was as well their Office to divine, as to give Laws.*

(b) *Olim principatui & publicæ adminiſtrationi prophetiam adeo conjunctam intelligimus, ut affirmare liceat, Regibus & Principibus, tam jura dare, quam etiam divinare, munus fuiſſe.* Fortun. Scac. Myrothec. P. 1. p. 36.

In the Hiſtory of Heathen Princes as it is related in the Bible (*c*) there are ſeveral Inſtances of their Divination by Dreams; and touching Divination in general *Joſeph* ſaith to his Brethren, *Wot ye not, that ſuch a Man as I* (a great Man) *can certainly divine?* Gen. 44. 15. The ancient Egyptians (as *Plato* reporteth in his *Politicus*) choſe their Kings from amongſt their Prieſts, whoſe Learning (in part) was Divination. And their *Triſmegiſt* (as *Ficinus* ſaith) had that name given him, becauſe he was *the greateſt King, the greateſt Prieſt, and the greateſt Philoſopher*; which two latter Branches of his Character comprehend the Learning of Divination. (*d*) *Philo* requireth four things in a conſummate and perfect Prince: *The Kingdom* (the Authority of reigning) *the faculty of preſcribing Laws, the Prieſthood, and Prophecy*, that he may be acquainted with the Mind of God.

(c) *Grot. Not. in Job.* 11. 51.

(d) Περὶ βίε Μωσ. l. 3. p. 464. Ed. Gr. Pariſ.

All the Offices of the Lord Meſſiah are compriſ'd (as in his Regality, ſo) in his being *The Lord's Anointed.* For in ancient times, amongſt God's People (as is commonly known) three ſorts of Perſons, all of them Types of the Meſſiah and his Forerunners, were anointed to their Function and Office, *Prophets, Prieſts, and Kings.* Whence it appeareth, that theſe Offices belong to the Meſſiah (the Antitype prefigured by theſe) as he is God's Anointed. The Prophets are ſtiled God's Anointed *Pſal.* 105. 15. *Touch not mine Anointed, and do my Prophets* (the Patriarchs) *no harm.* The Prophets might be ſtiled God's Anointed, although they were not anointed with material Oil; and it doth not appear from Scripture that they were ſo anointed. The inferiour Prieſts amongſt the Jews were not anointed, ſave only at firſt the Sons of *Aaron* (as the Jews ſay agreeably to the Scriptures) *whoſe anointing was an everlaſting Prieſthood throughout their Generations*, ſo that their Succeſſors needed not any other, *Exod.* 40. 15. But every High-prieſt the Succeſſour of *Aaron* was to be anointed; whence in the Jews common Language *The Anointed* ſignifieth the High-prieſt. And ſo in Scripture *the Prieſt that is anointed* ſignifieth the High-prieſt, *Lev.* 4. 3. The LXX render it, ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος, *the High-prieſt that is anointed.* A third Office that Men were anointed to amongſt God's People, was the Regal: but the Hebrew Doctors ſay (*e*) that thoſe who came to the Kingdom by Succeſſion in a legal courſe of Right, were not perſonally anointed: it was thought ſufficient, that their Anceſtors were anointed. But thoſe that came to the Kingdom in an extraordinary way by God's ſpecial Election and Appointment (as *Saul, David*, and *Jehu*) theſe were anointed; or if there was a Diſpute and Controverſie touching the right of ſucceeding in the Kingdom (as in *Solomon*'s caſe) then the King was inveſted with the Royal Dignity by anointing. From which account of anointing Perſons to three Offices or Functions it appeareth, that God's anointed (the Lord's Chriſt typify'd by theſe three ſorts of anointed Perſons) muſt be as ſuch a Perſon that is ordained to, and inveſted with theſe three Offices; *He muſt be the great and eminent Prophet, Prieſt and King.* So at *Rome* there is a τρισμέγιστος a (pretended) High-prieſt of the Chriſtian Religion, The oracular Prophet, and the Sovereign of an Eccleſiaſtic Empire. So in the *Muhammedan*'s Religion *The Chaliph* is The High-prieſt, The Vicar-general of their great Prophet, and the Emperour of the *Saracens.*

(e) Selden. de Succeſſ. l. 2. c. 9.

V. The Idea of the Lord Meſſiah repreſenteth him as anointed, to be *The Saviour-King* agreeably to his Name *Jeſus*, which ſpeaketh him the Saviour-King to his People, and conſequently to the World of Sinners. His name *The Chriſt* is not his proper perſonal name, but the name of *his officiary Dignity* (and therefore his Appellative:) but his name *Jeſus* is both his proper perſonal name and the name of his officiary Dignity; for he is The Saviour *ex officio*, and not meerly The Saviour, but *The Saviour-Prince*, as being of Princely royal Dignity. The Apoſtle conjoineth both theſe Attributes *Act.* 5. 31. *Him hath God exalted with his right-hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour*, which is ἓν διὰ δυοῖν and denoteth *a Saviour-Prince.* So *Act.* 3. 15. *The Prince of life* (Life and Salvation being ſynonymous) denoteth *The Saviour-Prince.* According to the cuſtom of ancient times when Kings and Princes were their Captains, a Prince and a Captain are ſynonymous. *The Captain of our Salvation* Heb. 2. 10. therefore is the Prince of it, or our Saviour-Prince. So the illuſtrious Types of Chriſt in the Old Teſtament were Saviour-Princes of the literal, as Chriſt is of the ſpiritual Iſrael. With which Difference between literal and ſpiritual, Chriſt is repreſented as *David*'s Son and Succeſſor in his Kingdom and Government, and in his Wars, Proweſs and Puiſſance. For the Kingdom and Government of right belonged to the Houſe of *David*, which was in ſuch high eſteem amongſt the Jews, that even after their Diſperſion and Baniſhment, and when *Jeruſalem* was burn'd, they would choſe no Patriarchs but thoſe that were of the Houſe of *David.* The Son of *David* was to ſucceed him in his Kingdom and Government over the Iſrael of God; he was alſo to ſucceed him in his Wars and victorious Puiſſance. And therefore he inculcateth and inſiſteth upon his Deſcent from *David* in his waging War againſt Satan's Kingdom, and his ſubduing the Princes of the Earth to the Sceptre of his Goſpel. *Apoc.* 22. 16. *I am the root of David.* As if he ſhould ſay, Do not wonder that I conquer Kings and the great ones of the earth, and vanquiſh oppoſite Powers, *facio rem avitam*; I do but what my Anceſtors have done before me; you may be confident, that the Root of *David* (the Kingly branch ſpringing from his Root, 1 *Macc.* 1. 10.) will prevail maugre all oppoſition. This Root of *David* is the Shepherd of Iſrael as *David* was, and a Bethlemite Shepherd (as *David* alſo was) he was born a kind of Bethlemite Shepherd amongſt the Cattel, his Birth being alſo firſt made known and publiſh'd amongſt the Shepherds. And becauſe the Family of *David* was at that time mean, obſcure, and wither'd, as a Root in dry ground, he is repreſented by the Prophet *as a Root out of a dry ground* (a Branch ſpringing from a Root in dry ground, *Iſa.* 53. 2.) but that obſcure wither'd Family then put forth a royal Stem, a princely Branch, that ſhould be a Saviour (and therefore a Saviour-Prince) according to that of the Angel, who publiſh'd his Birth to the Shepherds. *Luk.* 2. 11. *Unto you is born this day in the City of* David *a Saviour which is Chriſt the Lord.* At his Birth God ſo far viſited and redeemed his People, Luk. 1.69. that *In the houſe of his ſervant David he raiſed up for them an horn of Salvation*, which (the Horn being an Emblem of Power, and eſpecially of Regal Power) denoteth a mighty Saviour-King. Such a Shepherd of Iſrael his name *The Son of David* ſignified amongſt the Jews, A Saviour-King of God's People and of his People, which is the greateſt Excellency and Ennoblement of a King. For (*f*) *Nullum ornamentum principis faſtigio dignius, pulchriusq; eſt, quàm illa corona, ob cives ſervatos.* It belongeth to a mundane King, to be a Saviour-Prince to his People in reſpect of their ſecular Intereſts and from temporal Calamities (which is his greateſt Honour:) and in like manner The King of the ſpiritual Iſrael (The Son of *David*) muſt be the Saviour-Prince in reſpect of Spirituals and Eternals. Which appeareth alſo from this other name of his *The Son* Iſa. 43. 3. and 44. 6. and 45. 15. *of God.* For God is intituled *The God of Iſrael, The Saviour, The holy one of Iſrael thy Saviour, the King of Iſrael, and his Redeemer.* Which divine Attributes import, that it is a Divine and God-like thing to be the Saviour of Men, as it was accounted by the Heathen (*g*) who intituled *Jupiter* the Saviour, built the Temples and Altars Σωτῆρος Διὸς *of Jupiter the Saviour*, and the third Cup at their Feaſts was that Σωτῆρος Διὸς *of Jupiter the Saviour.* The other Gods alſo were ſtiled Σωτῆρες, *Saviours*, and the *Thuſſians* in an Inſcription upon their publick Coin intituled *Hercules, The Saviour of the Thuſſians.* Thoſe Men alſo that were accounted their magnificent Helpers, and whom they would honour at a great rate, they ſtiled their Saviours. As one of the *Ptolemies* was called *Soter* (Saviour) *Antigonus* was called by the *Athenians* firſt Benefactor and afterwards *Soter*, *Demetrius* alſo and *Antiochus* had the name of *Soter* given them. The Name is divine, and the Application of it to our Saviour ſpeaketh him a divine imperial Perſon, elſe he would be but a ſorry Saviour, not a Saviour in the plenary ſenſe, not a Conſort with God in peculiarly deſerving ſo divine a name. *I, even I am the Lord, and beſide me there is no Saviour.* Iſa. 43. 11.

VI. The Idea of the Lord Meſſiah repreſenteth him *as anointed to be the mediatory Saviour-* 1 Tim. 1. 1. Tit. 2. 10. and 3. 4. 2 Pet. 1. 1. Jude 25. 1 Tim. 2. 5. *King* agreeably to the Stile of the New Teſtament, wherein God the Father (in conſort with Chriſt) is called our Saviour, and is repreſented as ſaving us by his Son, whom he hath ſent to be *the Saviour of the World.* The Father therefore muſt be conſidered as *The ſupreme Saviour-King*, and The Son muſt be conſidered as *The mediatory Saviour-King*, agreeably to his uſual name *The Mediator between God and Men. A Mediator is not of one, but God is one*, Gal. 3. 20. The Apoſtle is diſcourſing, that we muſt have Juſtification or Righteouſneſs with God without any conſideration of the Works of the Law. And he proveth it from hence, becauſe *Abraham* had his Bleſſedneſs not in the Law-way, but by the free and gratuitous Promiſe of God. He had it not in the Law-way, but without any Law-Treaty; for the Moſaic Law was a Law-Treaty between God and the People of Iſrael by means of a Mediator. But God is only one Party, who (not by the Law-Treaty, but) by his own free Gift and Promiſe gave *Abraham* the Inheritance; and where there is but one Party, there can be no Mediator. Chriſt is the Mediator therefore, as being a Μεσίτης *medioxumous or middle Perſon that interveneth between two Parties*; and ſuch a Mediator he is in manifold reſpects. (1.) Chriſt is the Mediator in reſpect of his *conſtitutive nature*, which is both the divine and humane, and his Perſon is an humane-divine Perſon. If he was otherwiſe conſtituted (if he did not ἀμφοτέροις κοινωνεῖν, as S. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaketh) he could not be conſtituted as a middle Perſon between the two parties God and Men. As Man therefore is *in confinio utriuſque mundi* (in the middle between two Worlds) in reſpect of his Body he is of the nature of Brute-Animals, and in reſpect of his Soul he is of the nature of Angels, he is of kin to both, and is both in conjunction: ſo Chriſt the Mediator muſt be of kin both to God and Man, and muſt be both in conjunction. (2.) He is the Mediator in reſpect of his Place; for his Poſition or Standing is that of a middle Perſon. *The head* (imperial head) *of every Man is Chriſt, and the head of Chriſt is God*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. and 3. 23. *ye are Chriſt's, and Chriſt is God's.* He is God's Repreſentative, ſuſtaining his Perſon, and hath his Authority and Power; over us therefore his Authority is the divine: but he received it from God, his Sovereignty and Dominion, therefore is the *mediatory* or that of a middle Perſon. He deriveth from God, ſo far he is dependent: but we depend upon him intirely, and of his Fullneſs we receive. God is to him the fountain and original of Life, and he is to us the fountain and original of Life. *As the Father hath life in* Joh. 5. 26. *himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son, to have life in himſelf.* He is therefore the mediatory Original of Life. (3.) He is the Mediator in reſpect of his whole Buſineſs, Function and Agency. For the whole of it, and all that he hath to do, is a Mediation or Inter-agency, and all his Offices are Offices thereof. As a Prophet he is an *Internuntius* and Interpreter receiving his heavenly Doctrine from God, imparting it unto us, and giving the higheſt Atteſtations to the truth of it. *He that ſent me is true, and I ſpeak to the World the things that I have heard of him*, Joh. 8. 26. *No man hath ſeen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the boſom of the Father* (intimately acquainted with his Mind and Will) *he hath declared him*, Joh. 1. 18. His Prieſtly Office is an Office of Mediation and Inter-agency. For the Prieſts in ancient times did officiate with God for ſinful Men in order to the reconciling God to them, and to obtain for them his Mercy, Favours, and Bleſſings. They offered Sacrifice to God for the People, and in virtue thereof interceded with God on their behalf; and their offering Sacrifice was it ſelf an imploring God's Mercy for ſinful Men, a beſeeching God to accept it as a ranſom for them, and in conſideration thereof to releaſe them from their Sins. So our Saviour *made his ſoul an offering for ſin, bare the Sins of many, and made Interceſſion for the Tranſgreſſors*, Iſa. 53. 12. As a Prieſt alſo he hath ſtated and ſet himſelf in the Preſence of God, to patronize our Cauſe with God; and therefore his Prieſtly Office is an Office of Mediation. Such alſo is his Kingly Office and Dignity; for he reigneth by an imparted Authority (as ſecular Princes do) God hath committed the adminiſtration of all things into his hand, and adminiſtreth the Government by him, in giving Laws, in pardoning ſome and puniſhing others, in defending his People, and ſubduing his Enemies, in raiſing the dead and judging the World, in keeping his Sheep, and deſtroying the Goats and Wolves; in all theſe regal acts he is an Inter-agent between God and us. (4.) He is the Mediator as acting on behalf of both Parties, dealing with Men on behalf of God, and with God on behalf of Men. (*h*) *Advocatus idem*

(f) Sen.

(g) Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed, Art. 2. Reuchlin. de Art. Cab. l. 2. fol. 30.

(h) Pet T. 4. c. 8. S.

idem eſt quod & Mediator, (an Advocate is the ſame with a Mediator) ſaith *Paulinus*. But Chriſt's Advocateſhip is not commenſurate with his Mediatorſhip. He is an Advocate only in reſpect of his Prieſtly Office; but in all his Offices he is a Mediator. He is an Advocate only as he advocateth and intercedeth for us, dealeth with God on our behalf; but he is a Mediator both as he dealeth with Man for God, and as he dealeth with God for Man, reconciling God unto Man, and Man unto God, obtaining the Favour of God for us, and declaring God's Will to us, and converting us unto God So *Moſes* as a Mediator between God and the People of *Iſrael* dealt between both, and manag'd the Concerns of both; on behalf of God he taught and ruled the People, and on behalf of the People he impetrated the Favour and Protection of God. So Chriſt as Mediator muſt act for both Parties, he muſt be a divine Teacher and Lawgiver to us, muſt have and exerciſe the Adminiſtration of Government, and be a beneficent Ruler of his People, and muſt ſubdue his and their Enemies, and he muſt deal with us to reduce us to our Duty and Allegiance unto God. As God's Vicegerent he muſt act for him and deal with us; but he muſt alſo act for us and deal with God, to induce him to be propitious and gracious to us, and to procure for us all things needful for our Salvation. As he is the great Prophet and King, the Object of his Mediation and Miniſtration is Men, he is to take care of *Res Dei*, the Concerns of God with Men; but as he is our Prieſt the Object of his Mediation and Miniſtration is God, he is to take care of our Concerns with God, and to deal with him on our behalf For a Prieſt is to miniſter unto God, (his Office and Miniſtration looketh towards God) and to deal with God on behalf of Men. One may be a Prophet, a King and Ruler unto Men, but if he be a Prieſt it muſt be unto God as the Object of his Miniſtration. Which yet muſt be underſtood with ſome Limitation. For Men are the Object of one Branch of the Prieſt's Office, who as he is to bleſs God on the People's behalf (as a Prieſt) *Gen.* 14. 20 *Nehem.* 8. 6. ſo he is to bleſs the People in the Name of God, *Numb.* 6. 23. 1 *Chron.* 23. 13. The High-Prieſt alſo by *Urim* revealed the Will of God to the People, *Numb.* 27. 21. (5.) *Moſes* was the Mediator, (an Inter-meſſenger and Inter-agent) in the old Moſaical Treaty and Covenant, for by him God declared his Will to the People of *Iſrael*, and they being inform'd of it by him did comply, and by him contract with God to be his People, and ſo the Covenant was made by his Mediation. But Chriſt is the Mediator of an higher Covenant, (the new Covenant) and is alſo an higher kind of Mediator. For he is not only ſuch an Inter-agent in the Covenant as *Moſes* was, but he is the Mediator in procuring the New Covenant, and alſo the Mediator in executing and performing it. In conſideration of his Sacrifice and Merit God hath given and granted to us the New Covenant, with all the ineſtimable Benefits thereof. *Our Sins are* 1 *Joh.* 2. 12. *forgiven us for his Names ſake.* For his ſake God hath made a Grant and Donation of the State of Remiſſion of Sins to his Believers, *Eph* 4. 32. They are receiv'd into Favour, becauſe they belong to him who is the great Favourite, *Eph.* 1. 6. They *are juſtified in his Name*, (upon his account) and are *made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, (have the Reputation and State of the Righteous in him, by him and for him) 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. 2 *Cor.* 5. 18. His Blood as an Expiatory Sacrifice was the Blood of the New Covenant, and was the procuring Cauſe of it, as being the procuring Cauſe of the Benefit of Remiſſion of Sins, which is the Summary of the Benefits of the New Covenant, *Matth.* 26. 28. He is alſo the Mediator in executing and performing the New Covenant, for by his derivative and imparted Authority he pardoneth Sins according to the Terms of it, ſendeth the Holy Spirit, reneweth and ſanctifieth Souls, governeth his People, ſubdueth their Enemies, and raiſeth them to the Heavenly Bleſſedneſs. He beſtoweth upon them all the Legacies that God hath bequeath'd to them in his Laſt Will and Teſtament, and is a middle Perſon between the Teſtator and the Legataries, and by means of him God's Will and Teſtament hath its final Effect and Execution. A Mediator therefore is of a larger Notion than an Advocate, for Chriſt cannot be called *The Advocate* of the New Covenant, but is *The Mediator* thereof. (6.) He is the Mediator in making Peace between God and Man. For this is commonly the Uſe of a Mediator, he is *medius ad componendam cauſam*, (in the middle to compoſe the Matter in debate) to reconcile diſagreeing Parties, and to bring them to Concord and good Agreement. So one of the principal Ends of Chriſt's Mediation is Pacification and Reconcilement, that we might be delivered from being under the Wrath of God, and might be in the State of Remiſſion of Sins) State of Amity, Peace and Reconcilement with God, *Iſa* 53. 8. *Luk.* 2. 14. *Act.* 10. 36, 43. *Eph.* 2. 16, 17. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. This is that Peace which the ancient Prophets foretell (*i*) ſhould come by Chriſt, namely the Peace of Remiſſion of Sins and Reconciliation with God, *In this place will I give Peace*, Hagg. 2. 9. *He ſhall ſpeak Peace unto the Heathen*, Zech. 9. 10. *Peace to him that is afar off and to him that is near, ſaith the Lord, and I will heal him*, Iſa. 57. 19. *I will make with them a Covenant of Peace*, Ezek. 34. 25. Which Covenant of Peace literally underſtood concern'd the ſecular Proſperity of the Jews (reſtored from the *Babylonian* Captivity;) but in an higher ſenſe it ſignifieth the New Covenant of Grace and Peace, whereby Sinners that were in the State of Hoſtility enjoy the State of Amity and Peace with God, and *the Goſpel of Peace*, which is the Religion of our Reconcilement, of the Favour of God towards us, and the glad Tydings thereof, for nothing ſoundeth ſo high in it as Grace and Peace. This Peace in the firſt place Chriſt negociated with God, but he alſo negociateth it with us, in ſending his Heralds about the World to offer Peace, to treat of a Peace, and to call Men to be at Peace with God. By his Interpoſition alſo and *by the Blood of his Croſs* Peace was made between the holy Angels above and ſinful Mankind on Earth, (for now the holy Angels are one Family with Chriſtians, whereas before they were in a divided hoſtile State;) Jews and Gentiles alſo are by his Mediation reconciled to one another (becauſe both to God) whereas before there was a mighty Diſtance, and mighty Feuds and Antipathies between them, *Col.* 1. 20. *Eph.* 2. 14. (7.) Chriſt is the Mediator as being *The way to the Father*, which ſpeaketh him a middle Perſon between two Parties, for the Way is between us and the End. *I am the Way, no Man cometh unto the Father but by me*, ſaith our Saviour. *Joh.* 14: 6. No Man can be one of God's Citizens, Societiſts and Familiſts (of the heavenly Communion of Saints) but by Chriſt Jeſus; nor can he by any other way come unto God in Devotion, have acceſs to him, and a favourable Reception of his Perſon and his Prayers. *Through him we have ac-*

ceſs

(*i*) Mr *Mede* on *Luk.* 2. 13, 14.

ceſs by one Spirit unto the Father, Eph. 2. 18. There can be no Acceſs unto God, no good Correſpondence or friendly Dealings with him, unleſs we have Amity and Reconcilement with him; by him alone therefore we have Acceſs unto God, by whom we have Reconcilement. The way to the Holy of Holies, (the Reſidence of God) is *through the Vail of Chriſt's Fleſh*, which is *a new way* (of late diſcovery) and *a living way*, (becauſe he ever liveth to make Interceſſion for us) and this is the Chriſtian way of drawing nigh unto God, *Heb.* 10. 19--22. (8.) Chriſt is the Mediator as being *The mediate cauſe of all things in the* 1 Cor. 8. 6. *Chriſtian Religion.* For *there is one God the Father,* 2 Cor. 5. 18. *of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things. All things are of God by Jeſus Chriſt.* Chriſtians themſelves and all things that belong to Chriſtians as ſuch are thus originated, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. *Act.* 2. 33. Their ſaving Benefits are *by him* as the procuring Cauſe, and (derivatively from God, communicatively to us) they muſt paſs through his Hands. Not as through a meer Channel that receiveth them and conveyeth them, for he is ſo the mediate Cauſe of all things as to be *a Soveraign Diſpoſer and Diſpenſer of them, and Lord of Affairs,* which ſpeaketh him to be ſuch a Mediator as muſt be intituled *The mediatory Sovereign, or The Royal and Imperial Mediator.* He is not the Mediator between Men and the Godhead abſolutely, (but between Men and God that is definitively and abſolutely ſuch;) for himſelf The Mediator is in and of the Sovereignty *The Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead.* A vaſt Diſparity and Diſſimilitude there is therefore between the Chriſtian Mediator and thoſe Paganical Mediators the Demons or *Dii medioxumi*, which are not fitly compar'd to Chriſt, but in many reſpects reſemble the holy Angels in our Religion. *They are below the divine Order, they are Extrinſicks to the Godhead, they are but the ſervient and miniſterial Mediators.* Chriſt is the Imperial Mediator, intrinſick to the Godhead, and of the divine Sovereignty.

VII. The Saviour-King of believing Sinners muſt be as a Prieſt *An oblational and interceſſional Mediator.* A Prieſt amongſt Men is one that is conſecrated to the holy Office and Dignity, to miniſter the divine Service, ſo to deal with God on the behalf of Men, to be their Patron or Advocate. The Jewiſh Prieſts were ſolemnly conſecrated to the holy Office and Dignity, *Exod.* 28. 41. and 29. 44. Their holy Office and Dignity was to miniſter the divine Service, to attend and wait upon God in his immediate Worſhip, *Exod.* 28. 1. 1 *Chron.* 23. 13. 2 *Chron.* 13. 10. *Ezek.* 44. 15. *Joel* 2. 17. *Gen.* 14. 8. which was an high Office and Dignity (to miniſter unto God in his Houſe and Sanctuary) and of great Concern to Mankind. For a Prieſt (one that is ſuch in a publick Capacity) is appointed to miniſter unto God on the behalf of others, to deal with God on behalf of the People, and to be their Patron and Advocate, *Heb.* 5. 1. *A Prieſt is ordained for Men,* (for the Good and Benefit of Men) *in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins.* The Buſineſs of the divine Service and Worſhip was to make Oblations and Preſents unto God. The Prieſts therefore in the Time of the Law were to make Preſents and to offer Sacrifices to God on behalf of the People, and for the Expiation of their Sins. Agreeably whereto Chriſt muſt be ſo far a Prieſt on Earth as to offer upon the Croſs an expiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of his People. For although he was not a Prieſt after the Order of *Aaron*, yet the Sacrifices of the *Aaronical* Prieſthood referr'd to Chriſt, and muſt have their Completion in him. Nor was there ever a Religion in the World, ſince Sin came into it, without an expiatory Sacrifice, whereby the Guilt of it was clear'd and cleans'd and taken away. *Chriſt therefore was once offered, to bear the Sins of many, and to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himſelf*, Heb. 9. 26, 28. When he was ſent into the World he was made the Saviour-King of believing Sinners, (which was his officiary Dignity) and he could not be ſuch in reality but by making for them a ſaving Religion, he muſt be the Founder of the State of Life and Salvation, and of the New Covenant, and procure for them the State of Remiſſion of Sins by his expiatory Sacrifice. Which having offer'd, he became our Prieſtly Patron and Interceſſor with God for ever, and his being ſuch is his *everlaſting Prieſthood.* Heb. 9. 14. When he aſcended into Heaven *he offer'd himſelf without ſpot to God* as ſacrific'd and ſlain, and ſo he continueth for ever to preſent himſelf unto God. As the Blood of thoſe Sacrifices that were burnt without the Camp was by the High-Prieſt carry'd into the moſt holy place and preſented there, and ſprinkled before the Propitiatory, (*Heb.* 13. 11.) ſo Chriſt having ſuffer'd without the Gate of *Jeruſalem* carry'd his expiatory and propitiatory Sacrifice into Heaven, there to preſent it before God, and ſet it before him in his Preſence. On the Day of Expiation the Sacrifice was ſlain and offer'd without the Sanctuary, but the High-Prieſt with the Blood of it enter'd into the Holy of Holies, (*Heb.* 9. 7, 12.) ſo Chriſt enter'd into Heaven by his own Blood, and appeareth continually in the Preſence of God as our Victim, which is a continual Interceſſion for us, and a more powerful Sollicitation of the Favour of God for us than any Words can be. But beſides this Prieſtly way of befriending his People, (the ſtating and ſetting himſelf in the Preſence of God continually, who is nearly related to us and ſacrific'd for us) he repreſenteth and ſignifieth unto God his Will and Deſire touching their Good, (which is a powerful Impetration, *Joh.* 14. 16.) commending their Cauſe unto God, procuring his Favour for them, all things needful for their Salvation, and (in general) taking care of their Concerns with God, that things go well with them for ever, *Heb.* 7. 25. He is a Mediator therefore in his Prieſtly Office more eſpecially and eminently than in either of his other Offices, according to *Gr. Naz.* Definition of the Prieſthood (k) Μεσιτεία θεοῦ ϗ ἀνθρώπων, *A Mediatorſhip between God and Men.* (k) Orat. 1. p. 37.

To this high and holy Function of Prieſthood our Saviour could not be conſecrated antecedently to his expiatory Sacrifice, becauſe he muſt be conſecrated, not meerly to be an High-Prieſt, but an everlaſting High-Prieſt. His Conſecration therefore is really the ſame thing with his Exaltation to the Throne, (his Perfection and Conſummation) for his heavenly Prieſthood is of the ſame nature with that of Chriſtians, Βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, 1 Pet. 2. 9. *A Royal Prieſthood.* God hath given him Power to adminiſter all things, but ſo as is according to the Will of God; in Conjunction with God and in Dependence upon God he is to exerciſe his Regal Authority and Power; therefore his officiary Dignity muſt not be meerly a Regality, but a Prieſthood muſt be complicated with it, which ſpeaketh it a Church-Sovereignty. And as Heaven is both a Court and a Temple, ſo the officiary Dignity of the mediatory Saviour-King of the Holy Empire muſt be a *Sacerdotal Regality*, or a *Royal Prieſthood.* Thus the other Offices of our Saviour are complicated with his Regality, (the primary of them) are ennobled by it, and muſt have magnifying Denominations from it. For he muſt be conſider'd both as *the Royal Prieſt and Prophet*. In his State of Humiliation, altho' he could not then enter upon his Kingdom-Eſtate, (*l*) nor his Plenitude of Authority and Power, yet in that low Eſtate he was not without regial Dignity and Authority. And therefore in the diſcharge of his Prophetick Office he muſt be conſider'd as King; the Religion which this great Doctor taught was his Law, his Leſſons were his Legiſlation, his Inſtructions were his Edicts, and his Teachings were his Commands.

VIII. The Idea of the Lord Meſſiah implieth, that as actually ſuch he is (in ſeveral reſpects) *The Son of God*, and this his Sonſhip is a Divinity or Deity of Perſon. For if God conſtituteth him (more or leſs) actually the King of the Holy Empire, he is politically and by his Place, and alſo datively and factively The divine imperial Son, which is the ſenſe of our Saviour in his Diſcourſe to the Jews, *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. *Jeſus anſwered them, Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid, ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: ſay ye of him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* As the Jewiſh Judges and Rulers that were commiſſion'd by God, and a ſort of his Vicegerents and Repreſentatives, are called in Scripture *The Gods*, and *The Sons of God*, as being conſtituted politically and by their Place ſuch, ſo he whom God hath ſelected, and (in leſſer or greater degree) conſtituted *actually The Saviour-King of the Holy Empire*, is neceſſarily *The imperial Son of God*, as being politically and by his Place ſuch. Our Saviour would be known and acknowledg'd as the Meſſiah, (which is the great Article of Chriſtianity;) he argueth therefore, that as actually ſuch and upon that account he was The Son of God. From whence we learn what our Saviour meant by this Name *The Son of God*, namely, *Not the Eternal, but the Imperial Son of God*. This he was, as he was actually The Meſſiah, and his being ſo doth not at all claſh with his being *natively The Son of God*, but it is a Conſequent thereof. For he that is natively the Imperial Son of God, muſt be conſtituted in proceſs of Time *politically and in Place ſuch*. Our Saviour was conſtituted ſuch *when he was ſanctified and ſent into the World*: but he was then conſtituted ſuch only imperfectly, or initially, and in a leſſer degree. For he was not conſtituted plenarily Meſſiah the King (or The Chriſt) till his Reſurrection from the Dead, which anſwereth to the *Political* Generation of Kings, and was his *Natalis Imperii*, the Birth-day of his Empire, for thereby he was generated into his Heavenly Kingdom-Eſtate, and conſtituted actually and plenarily, politically and in place *The divine imperial Son*. He was a Son of God upon the ſame account that the Saints of God are, who being regenerated by him into the heavenly State of Life, (the State of Immortality and Beatitude) thereby become the Sons of God, as being Sons of the Reſurrection, *Luk.* 20. 36. *Rom.* 8. 23. But our Saviour's Reſurrection was of a far higher nature than that of the Saints in general, for he was raiſed to the divine imperial Eſtate of the imperial Son of God, and thereby was made in imperial Eſtate and Condition, (and therefore plenarily) both Lord and Chriſt the King, *Act.* 13. 32, 33. *We declare unto you glad Tydings, how that the Promiſe which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us their Children, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again; as it is alſo written in the ſecond Pſalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* Heb. 1. 5. *Unto which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, Heb. 5. 5. *Chriſt glorified not himſelf, to be made an High-Prieſt, but he that ſaid unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee.* If any thing can be plain and evident in the Bible, this is plain and evident, that the Scripture by this Name The Son of God doth not mean any ſuch thing as a ſcholaſtic Abſtract Son of Eternal Generation, but *The divine imperial Son* (The Meſſiah) who came forth from the Grave as from the Womb, and was generated by God (in his Reſurrection) not only into the Life of Immortality, but into his immortal ſacerdotal Regality; not only into the heavenly State of Life as the Saints are, but as a Prince and King into the imperial heavenly State of Life, upon both which accounts (in conjunction) *he is his firſt-born and firſt begotten from the Dead*, Col. 1. 18. Apoc. 1. 5. As it is ſaid of *David* in the literal ſenſe and of the *Meſſiah* in the myſtical ſenſe, *Pſal.* 89. 26, 27. *He ſhall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my Salvation. Alſo I will make him my firſt-born, higher than the Kings of the Earth.* If the Regality of mundane Kings is a Sonſhip unto God, the Regality of the Meſſiah is much more ſo. Agreeably whereto the Apoſtle's Text muſt be expounded, *Rom.* 1. 3, 4. *Concerning his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, which was made of the Seed of David according to the Fleſh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* (*m*) The Greek Interpreters agree with our Tranſlation in rendring the Participle ὁρισθεὶς, *declared*, or demonſtrated; but they have not ſhew'd that the Word is of this Signification. The Latin Interpreters render it *deſign'd* or predeſtinated, as if the Apoſtle was ſpeaking of ſomething future and to be done; whereas he is ſpeaking of a thing already done, and done with Power; for Power is not ſeen in things to be done, but in that which is done and effected. In this Text of the Apoſtle therefore the Word ὁρισθεὶς ought not to be rendred either *declared* or *predeſtinated*, but it may be rendred *defined*, (which is the uſual and proper Signification of it) if by *defining* we underſtand (agreeably to the Signification of ὁρισμος in Greek Writers) not the meer verbal and notional, but the real defining, the Act and Deed of defining, which is *conſtituting*. Our Saviour was ὁρισθεὶς, *defined or conſtituted The Son of God, and this was done with Power, by the Reſurrection from the Dead*, when he was made both Lord and King fully poſſeſs'd of his divine imperial Eſtate, or heavenly Regality, which is a Sonſhip unto God and his being plenarily *The divine imperial Son*. In the Interpretation of this place of Scripture the generality of Interpreters (ancient and modern) thus far agree, they ſuppoſe that this is the Apoſtle's ſenſe, *Our Saviour became the Son of God by his Reſurrection*. (*n*) But ſome of the Scholaſticks diſlike this Interpretation, and have ſubſtituted another inſtead of it. But that which they have ſubſtituted is moſt intricate, incongruous, incoherent and diſtorted, and contrary to the plain ſenſe of the Apoſtle's Words.

IX. The Idea of the Lord Meſſiah implieth, that he muſt be conſider'd both in his *primary* and his *officiary* Capacity, both which are deifying to him and Creature-tranſcendency. His *primary* Capacity is that which is antecedent to his actual Meſſias-ſhip, (which was not till the Father ſanctified

(l) *Grot. Not. in Matth.* 9. 6.

(m) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 11. *c.* 13. & *T.* 2. *l.* 3. *c.* 3. *S.* 9, 10.

(n) *Petavium.*

ctified him and ſent him into the World) which actual Meſſias-ſhip was his Sonſhip unto God; but antecedently to this officiary Dignity in his native primary Capacity he was the imperial Son of God. For in this primary Capacity he was that Honour, Dignity and Eſtate of Nobilitation *The Imperial Son of God*, which is ſupraſubject or Creature-tranſcendent. And his actual Meſſias-ſhip or officiary Dignity is alſo deifying to him, and cannot in Congruity be leſs than Creature-tranſcendency. As he is actually The Meſſiah, *Creature-tranſcendence of Authority, Power, Knowledge, Preſence and the Spirit without meaſure belongeth to him, he is The Chriſtianity imperial, Chriſt the Power of God and the Wiſdom of God, The Way, the Truth and the Life, The Eternal Life, The Manna and Bread that came down from Heaven and giveth Life to the World, The Horn of Salvation, The Saviour of the World, The Lamb of God that taketh away the Sins of it, and who of God is made unto us Wiſdom and Righteouſneſs, Sanctification and Redemption, The true Paſſover, The true Vine, The Logos and High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion, The Author and Finiſher of our Faith, The Captain of our Salvation, The one Shepherd, The chief Shepherd, The great Shepherd of the Sheep, The Deſire of all Nations, The Sun of Righteouſneſs, The true Melchizedek King of Salem, The Fountain opened for Judah and Jeruſalem, The Rock, The Foundation, The Conſolation of Iſrael, The Reſurrection, The Alpha and Omega, The Lord of the Vineyard, The Lord of all, The Lord of Glory.* All which Attributes (and ſuch more) that belong to him as he is actually The Meſſiah, are deifying to him and Creature-tranſcendency, which Creature-tranſcendency the holy Writers attribute to him in their Deſcriptions of his Reſurrection, wherein they ſet forth his *Apotheoſis*. Eph. 1. 19--22. *That ye may know what is the exceeding greatneſs of his Power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty Power, which he wrought in Chriſt, when he raiſed him from the Dead, and ſet him at his own Right Hand in the heavenly places. Far above all Principality and Power and Might and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but alſo in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his Feet.* To raiſe a dead Man to Life is peculiarly an Act of divine Power, to raiſe him to Life immortal is a greater Act of divine Power; but Chriſt's Reſurrection was a much more ſtupendious Act of divine Power, for it was a raiſing him to the ſupreme Sovereignty, the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, (to which all Potentates are Underlings) to poſſeſs the Place and State of God, to ſuſtain the Perſon, Port and Majeſty of God, to carry the honourary Name and Stile of God, to be reſpected and reverenc'd, magnify'd and ador'd as God far above all created Sublimities whatſoever. But this ſtupendious deifying Reſurrection was nothing more than a conſtituting him *The Son of God*, from whence it appeareth that The Son of God in the Stile of the New-Teſtament ſignifieth *one of the Godhead, as the Son*, who was made of the Seed of *David according to the Fleſh*, (which denoteth infirm Humanity) *and defined* (or conſtituted) *the Son of God with Power according to the Spirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* To the Seed of *David* the Apoſtle confronteth the Son of God, to infirm Humanity he confronteth Divinity of Power, and to the Fleſh he confronteth the Spirit of Holineſs. Which Spirit of Holineſs is not ſo the Spirit of God as not to be his Spirit; and in like manner the Power of God (or that Divinity of Power) *whereby he liveth*, (2 Cor. 13. 4.) is not ſo the Power of God as not to be his Divinity of Power. Such is his Divinity, Deity or Creature-tranſcendence of Perſon, which (as appeareth from all theſe ſcriptural Notices of it) *conſiſteth in his being the imperial Son of God in his primary and officiary Capacity.*

X. The Idea of the Lord Meſſiah implieth, *that in him all Fulneſs dwelleth*, according to that of the Apoſtle, *It pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.* The fulneſs which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of is from the Will and Appointment of God, and belongeth to Chriſt, as he is the Head of the Church, (as the Context ſheweth and Divines have obſerv'd) and becauſe to be the Head of the Church and to be the Meſſiah is the ſame thing, therefore *all fulneſs* belongeth to him by his officiary Dignity (as he is the Meſſiah) which All-fulneſs is manifeſtly deifying to him and Creature-tranſcendency. His fulneſs is of the things divine, to which alone the Name of fulneſs belongeth; for (*o*) *Plenitudo propriè niſi divinis rebus ſuperniſque non convenit*, Fulneſs cannot properly be attributed ſave only to the divine and ſupernal things. In him there are *unſearchable Riches*, (Eph. 3. 8.) all the true and ſaving Goods and all plenty and fulneſs of them, (which are his Wealth and Riches) all fulneſs as to our ſpiritual Wants (whatever indigent Souls can want or deſire, and whatever is needful to our true Happineſs and Perfection) with reſpect whereunto a devout Chriſtian ſaith, (*p*) ὁ χριστὸς τὰ πάντα τῷ πιστεύοντι, *Chriſt is all things to a true Believer.* The common Proverb that *Money is regnant, Money governeth all, Money is All in All*, was thus religiouſly alter'd by *Charles* the Great, *Chriſt is regnant, Chriſt governeth all, Chriſt is All in All.* His Religion is the fulneſs of ſaving Truth and Knowledge, Wiſdom and Philoſophy, *Col.* 2. 3. A full and final Expiation of Sin is in it, *Heb.* 10. 14. And as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial, (Meſſiah the King in his Imperial Eſtate) he is to his Believers all the Benefits of the Religion of ſaving Grace (which he hath mediated for them) a full Diſcharge from all their Sins, a plenary Liberation from all their criminal and penal Evils, their ſpiritual Miſeries and Calamities, their deadly ghoſtly Enemies, and by him they have a full Donation of all the choice ineſtimable Goods of the Kingdom (of which they are Citizens, and have the Immunities, Rights and Priviledges of Citizens) nothing leſs than the whole Eſtate of God, (the Honours and Felicities of God's Children) and whatever *all the fulneſs of God* may ſignify, *Eph.* 3. 19. For *God hath bleſſed them with* (the Plenitude of) *all ſpiritual Bleſſings in heavenly good things in Chriſt*, Eph. 1. 3.

The fullneſs of all Excellency, Perfection, and Nobilitation, both as to kind and degree, is ſo and in ſuch ſenſe in him, that none of it can be ſaid to be wanting in him, nor can he be ſaid to be wanting in it. As he is the imperial eſtate of Chriſtianity imperial, he is the univerſal cauſe and origin of Sanctity, the immenſe fullneſs of vital Sanctity is in him, the fullneſs of the holy Spirit (the gifts and graces of it) He is raiſed to the fulleſt height of Glory and Beatitude, of Honour, Authority, Dominion, Knowledge, and miraculous Power (that which in a large ſenſe muſt be called *the fulleſt height* of all theſe) every branch of which Excellency and Perfection is deifying to him and Creature-tranſcendence. Which divine Tranſcendence of his appeareth alſo from that other illuſtrious account of our Saviour's Fullneſs, which the Apoſtle giveth to the

Col. 1. 19.

(o) *Macrob. in ſom. ſcip. l.* 1. c. 5.

(p) *Ap. Gat. Not. in Ant.* p. 352.

Col. 2. 9. the *Coloſſians, In him dwelleth all the fullneſs of the Godhead bodily.* Which account of Chriſt's Fullneſs was of great force to retain the *Coloſſians* in their Adherence to the Chriſtian Religion (againſt mundane Philoſophy, humane Traditions, and Jewiſh Rites, to which they were tempted by Seducers) and in all reaſon it ſhould ingender in all Men an high Eſtimation of Chriſtianity. For if all the fullneſs of the Godhead is communicated unto Chriſt (and otherwiſe it cannot dwell in him) all the Fullneſs of Sanctity and divine Perfection muſt neceſſarily be in him and his Religion. The Apoſtle therefore ſubjoineth, v. 10. *And ye are complete* (or filled) *in him, which is the head of all principality and power.* Chriſt that in his imperial eſtate is the head of all Principality and Power, is alſo the imperial eſtate of Chriſtianity imperial, and the Apoſtle conſidereth him as ſuch (throughout this Diſcourſe to the *Coloſſians)* he conſidereth Chriſt as connoting his Religion, ſo that his Elogies of the Perſon of Chriſt are Elogies of his Religion, and he ſo ſetteth forth the tranſcendence of Chriſt's Perſon, as withall to ſet forth the tranſcendence of his Religion, and of the ſtate of his Religioniſts. But common ſence will not allow the Followers of *Socinus* to ſuppoſe, that the Perſon of Chriſt is meerly his Doctrine, and that all the fullneſs of the Godhead ſignifieth only the Will of God fully revealed in his Doctrine, which is a groſs diſtortion of holy Scripture, and at this rate of interpreting, the fullneſs of the Scriptures may be dwindled away into emptineſs, and the body into a ſhadow. *The Godhead in the fullneſs of what it is in it ſelf and to us, dwelleth in Chriſt and is communicated to him, and it dwelleth in him ſubſtantially,* according to the Apoſtle; *At this rate we have God in Chriſt and in the Chriſtian Religion, not meerly* umbratiliter *as in the Judaical Temple and the Jewiſh Rites of Religion, which were a ſhadow of things to come, but the body is of Chriſt,* Col. 2. 17. Some expound the word σωματικῶς *bodily* to ſignifie ὑποστατικῶς *perſonally* (ſuppoſing the Apoſtle to ſpeak of the ſcholaſtic hypoſtatical union) but this Expoſition cannot be legitimate. For neither can the word σωματικῶς ſo ſignifie, nor doth the Apoſtle teach the *Coloſſians* ſcholaſtic Theology, nor is it agreeable to that Theology, to ſay, that the Son of God dwelleth perſonally in Chriſt (it is *Neſtorianiſm)* nor doth this Expoſition include the Father's and the Holy Ghoſt's dwelling in Chriſt, nor doth it ſet forth the excellency of the Chriſtian Religion. (*q*) Some have obſerv'd, that this magnificent Deſcription of our Saviour's fullneſs is by the Apoſtle oppos'd to the *Gnoſticks fullneſs of the Godhead,* which they deviſ'd, to ſubvert the Chriſtian Faith by a counterfeit imitation of the Chriſtians fullneſs of the Godhead, which is the Trinity. And this Obſervation would be of good remark, if it could be ſhew'd, that the Trinity is in the Scriptures and in our Religion counted and called *The fullneſs of the Godhead:* but becauſe this can never be ſhew'd, this Obſervation muſt remain uncertain. But from the view that we have taken of our Saviour's fullneſs it appeareth, how well he is qualify'd for his officiary Dignity (to adminiſter Government without Miſgovernment, to be a faithful Lover and beneficent Ruler of his Liege-people, their Shepherd, and their ſovereign Friend and Patron, to be all ſuperiour comfortable Relations and all manner of ſaving goods to them, to afford them ſalutary relief and aid, and to receive their departing Souls) all the branches whereof ſpeak his Deity or Creature-tranſcendence. Which more eſpecially appeareth in his giving and giving to the Holy Spirit. *Joh.* 16. 14, 15. *He ſhall glorifie me: for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore ſaid I, that he ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.*

(q) Mr. Thorndike Epil. B. 2. c. 12. and 15.

XI. The Idea of the Meſſiah proveth, that this officiary dignity *The Meſſiaſhip* is incompetible to *a Creature-Son* (every Branch of it ſpeaking Creature-tranſcendence, a Creature being altogether unmeet for it and unworthy of it, nor will Religion allow it to be imparted to any Creature; he that condemneth the World for deifying Creatures, will not himſelf do the ſame thing;) and this Idea proveth alſo, that the Meſſiaſhip is incompetible to *the ſecond Perſon of the ſcholaſtic Trinity,* who was King and reigning from Eternity, and therefore was not anointed to be made King, as *Athanaſius* affirmeth. Many other grand Incongruities this Hypotheſis involveth (which are the known received Doctrines of the ſcholaſtic Theology and uſually occur in it) that claſh with the Idea of the Meſſiah. For the Meſſiah is a Perſon ſent by God (the Father) hath his Miſſion and Commiſſion from him, and the Scripture knoweth of no other Miſſion of the Meſſiah: but according to this Theology (*r*) the Meſſiah as Man was ſent by the Holy Spirit and by himſelf as God (becauſe the Will and Operation of the Trinity is one and undivided) it maketh therefore the great Apoſtle of our Profeſſion his own Apoſtle. According to this Theology, the Miſſion of the Son of God as God is his Incarnation, it denieth, that a local Miſſion (a moving from place to place) is competible to him as God; yet of his Miſſion as God it interpreteth thoſe words of our Saviour, which muſt be underſtood of a local Miſſion. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the World, and go to the Father,* Joh. 16. 28. Thoſe words of God to our Saviour *This is my beloved Son* (*s*) are according to this Theology the Operation of the whole Trinity, yet it acknowledgeth, that they agree and belong to God the Father only (*t*) *Non enim eſt Filius ſui ipſius vel ſpiritus ſancti Filius,* for the Son is not the Son of himſelf, or the Son of the Holy Spirit. So the Scripture and ſo this Theology teacheth, but its uſual Maxims are of another ſtrain. For ſometimes it affirmeth, that Chriſt is his own Creature. (*u*) *Factor virginis factus eſt in virgine factura ſua* (*w*) *God the Word formed a perfect Man, which he united to himſelf.* (*x*) Sometimes it affirmeth, *That God the Word did overſhadow the bleſſed Virgin and impregnate her.* (*y*) *Many of the Ancients interpret the Power of the Higheſt, which overſhadowed the Bleſſed Virgin, to ſignifie God the Word* (and ſome of them repreſent him (*z*) as making uſe of Oratory to the Bleſſed Virgin, perſwading and intreating her to be his Mother) agreeably whereto *Clemens* ſaith (*a*) *The Logos iſſuing forth is demiurgic, and when he becometh fleſh, to make himſelf viſible, he generateth himſelf.* If God the Word (ſo called in this Theology) overſhadow'd and impregnated the Bleſſed Virgin, and generated himſelf, he muſt neceſſarily be his own Father and his

A Creature muſt have no more than is fit for a Creature to have.

(r) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. c 4. S. 4. & *l.* 8. c. 1. *per tot.*

(s) *Ibid.* & *l.* 4. c. 15. S. 7.

(t) *Ibid. l.* 8. c. 1. S. 14.

(u) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 7. c. 6. S. 5.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 19. S. 2.

(x) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 6. S. 9.

(y) *Complures Antiquorum, virtutem altiſſimi ad verbum Deiq; filium referunt, quem Dei virtutem Apoſtolus nominat. Hic igitur obumbraſſe virginem dicitur, hoc eſt, in eam quodammodo deſcendiſſe, & inexplicabili virtute ac potentia in ejus caſtiſſimis viſceribus domum ac Templum ædificaſſe ſibi, hoc eſt, formaſſe corpus, ac ſe hominem feciſſe.* Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 6. S. 4.

(z) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 14. *c.* 9. *S.* 5.

(a) Προελθὼν δὲ ὁ λόγος δημιουργίας αἴτιος, ἔπειτα καὶ ἑαυτὸν γεννᾷ, ὅτ' ἂν ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γένηται, ἵνα καὶ θεαθῇ. *Strom. l.* 5 *p. m.* 403.

his own Son (*b*) which yet is a great contradiction both in Nature and Morality. But the ſcholaſtic Theology proceedeth farther in making him his own Father and Son. For ſometimes it affirmeth (*c*) *illam creaturam quam virgo concepit & peperit, tota Trinitas fecit*, The whole Trinity made that Creature which the Virgin conceived and brought forth. Sometimes it affirmeth, that Chriſt as Man (*d*) *non magis Dei patris, quàm ſuimet ipſius ac totius Trinitatis filius eſt*, is no more the Son of God the Father than of himſelf and the whole Trinity. So in this Theology he is made a Son of the Reſurrection to himſelf and to the Holy Spirit. (*e*) *Reſuſcitat Chriſtus ſemetipſum ſecundum carnem, cum patre & ſpiritu ſancto.* As this Theology maketh Chriſt to be his own Father and Son: ſo it alſo maketh him to be *Lord* and *Servant* to himſelf. For it ſuppoſeth him to be unto himſelf Creator and Creature, which is to be Lord and Servant to himſelf. And of our Saviour's Prayers it giveth this account (*f*) *Sibi patris filio ſupplicat filius matris*, Chriſt as Man is a Suppliant to himſelf as God. He is Lord and Servant to himſelf therefore, which yet this Theology accounteth Nonſenſe (*g*) *becauſe every one that is a Servant, is the Servant of another.* As this Theology ſuppoſeth the Meſſiah to be ſent by himſelf (making him his own Meſſiah:) ſo it teacheth (*h*) *that he anointed himſelf, that the Unction of his Humanity is his Divinity, and that he anointed himſelf with the Holy Spirit: but the Father is ſaid to anoint him, becauſe the Father doth it by the Son.* According to this Theology (*i*) *as God he gave the Holy Spirit to himſelf as Man*, ipſe eſt enim qui dat, ipſe eſt qui accipit, *for he himſelf is both the Giver and Receiver.* At this rate ſometimes it underſtandeth thoſe words of our Saviour, *I ſanctifie my ſelf.* (*k*) *I that am the Word of the Father, I my ſelf give the Spirit to my ſelf as Man, and by it ſanctifie my ſelf.* In this Theology ſuch Maxims as theſe uſually occur (*l*) *Chriſt was to himſelf the fountain and donor of Grace,* (*m*) *anointed his own Temple and ſanctified it, as he doth a Creature by the Holy Spirit,* (*n*) *receiv'd the Spirit as Man, gave it to himſelf as God. The holy Spirit from Chriſt deſcended upon Chriſt, from his Deity upon his humane Nature.* Such are the incredible and intolerable Incongruities of this Theology (as alien from the Scripture as they are from good ſence and the nature of things) from which we cannot be freed but by relinquiſhing the ſcholaſtic Explication of the Trinity and of the Deity of the Meſſiah, which involveth and inferreth theſe and many more ſuch Incongruities. Of which a principal one is that ſtrange Mediation and Prieſthood, which this Theology attributeth to our Saviour.

For every one that is a Prieſt, is neceſſarily the Prieſt of another; and every one that is a Mediator, muſt be a Mediator in reſpect of others: but according to this Theology (*o*) Chriſt is the Mediator between Sinners and himſelf (as being a Perſon of the Trinity) the Object of his Mediation and Prieſthood is himſelf, and his Sacrifice of Satisfaction and Reconciliation he offereth to himſelf, and reconcileth us to the whole Trinity. So his Interceſſion in Heaven is ſaid to be (*p*) *the cry of his blood* in conſpectu ſanctæ Trinitatis, *in the ſight of the holy Trinity.* (*q*) Apud divinitatem ſummæ Trinitatis humani generis oblata ſanctificat, peccata expiat, vota commendat. *With the Godhead of the ſupreme Trinity he ſanctifieth the Oblations of Mankind, expiateth their Sins, commendeth their Prayers.* The Mediation of our Saviour cannot conſiſt with the ſcholaſtic Trinity upon this account, becauſe it proveth, that God is our Saviour's God, according to his divine nature. For God is neceſſarily *the God* of the Perſon of the Mediator, which is the humane divine Perſon of our Saviour, as the Scholaſtic Theology acknowledgeth. But in this Theology he is ſuppos'd (*r*) to mediate only according to the humane nature, or to be ſo the Mediator, that the mediatory Operations (like thoſe of eating and drinking) are peculiarly the Operations of the humane nature. *The mediatory Function*, Deo congruit per hominem & in homine ſalutem noſtram adminiſtranti, *belongeth and agreeth to the Perſon of God adminiſtring the matters of our Salvation in and by the humane nature.* But whatever uſe there may be of the humane nature in his Mediatorſhip, yet ſeeing it is the Perſon of God (the Son) that ſuſtaineth this officiary Dignity and diſchargeth the Functions thereof, it is manifeſt that God is the God of this divine Perſon, not only according to his humane Nature, but as *ſuſtaining and adminiſtring this officiary Dignity*; for as ſuch he is the Perſon of the Mediator. But as if the humane nature only was the Perſon of the Mediator, this Theology (at a marvellous rate of Incongruity) ſaith (*s*) *Chriſtus idem quaſi altiſſimus donat, quaſi homo precatur*, The ſame Chriſt as Man prayeth, as God granteth his own Prayers, which is to ſay, that he prayeth to himſelf as his own God. *Chriſt is the Mediator between the holy Trinity and the Sons of Adam. Chriſt as Man is the Mediator between himſelf and ſinful Men.* To countenance theſe Paradoxes, Chriſt is compar'd to the Soul of Man, which conſiſteth of a ſuperiour and inferiour, an imperant and ſubject-part. But neither the Soul of Man, nor the Perſon of Chriſt (who ſubſiſteth only in the Perſon of the Son of God) conſiſteth of two Perſons, one the ſuperiour, the other the inferiour, one the God, the other the Mediator and Interceſſor. The Son of God may be conſidered as performing the Actions of his Mediation according to the Human Nature only, but the Human Nature (according to this Theology) is not a Perſon, nor is the Perſon of the Mediator more than one, who cannot be a Mediator between himſelf and others, *for he cannot be a middle Perſon between himſelf and others.* Nor is he the Mediator between the Holy Ghoſt and Mankind, for there is no ſuch Mediator, but he is *the Mediator between God and Men*, and what that meaneth the Apoſtle expoundeth, 1 *Joh.* 2. 1. *We have an Advocate with the Father.* But the ſcholaſtic Doctrine of the Trinity implieth, that a Mediator is needful in reſpect of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt as well as in reſpect of the Father; and according to this Theology none can be a Mediator in reſpect of one divine Perſon without being ſuch in reſpect of the whole Trinity of Perſons, becauſe of their numerical oneneſs of Intellect, Will, Motion, Action and Operation *ad extra.* The Will of revealing himſelf and of being reconciled to Mankind by a Mediator is neceſſarily the common Act of the whole three Perſons; from whence it followeth, that Chriſt muſt be a Mediator in reſpect of himſelf, which is impoſſible. So Chriſt (according to this Theology) muſt neceſſarily have *a Prieſt* if God the Father hath one, and the Prieſt is himſelf. To ſalve which intolerable Incongruities, the ſcholaſtic Theology hath nothing to ſay;

only

(b) *Tertul. adv. Prax. c.* 9.

(c) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 7. *c.* 6. *S.* 4.

(d) *Ibid. c.* 5. *S.* 5.

(c) *Ibid. c.* 6. *S.* 9.

(f) *Ibid. c.* 4. *S.* 4.

(g) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 9. *S.* 16, 17.

(h) *Ibid. l.* 11. *c.* 7. *S.* 6, 8.

(i) *Ibid. c.* 6. *S.* 5.

(k) *Ego qui patris ſum Verbum, ipſe mihi homini facto ſpiritum tribuo, & meipſum factum hominem in illo ſanctifico.* Ib. S. 4.

(l) *Ibid. c.* 5. *S.* 8.

(m) *Ibid. c.* 6. *S.* 4. & *c.* 7. *S.* 3. & *c.* 8 *S.* 6.

(n) *Ibid. c.* 6. *S.* 4. & *de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 7.

(o) *Idem de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 8. & *c.* 5. *S.* 5. *Davenant. in Col.* 1. 20.

(p) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 12. *c.* 8. *S.* 8.

(q) *Ibid. c.* 11. *S.* 6.

(r) *Idem de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 5. &c. & *c.* 3. *S.* 17.

(s) *Ibid. c.* 2. *S.* 8, 9.

only the force of theſe unanſwerable Objections of the Anti-Trinitarians it endeavoureth to abate by aſſerting this groſs Falſhood, (*t*) *that the Scriptures deſcribe Chriſt the Prieſt and Mediator only with reſpect to his Miſſion by the Father, not as having the Function of making Satisfaction and Reconciliation*(which reſpecteth the whole three Perſons equally offended by Mankind) *and thence it is that they ſay nothing of Chriſt's being a Prieſt and a Mediator between himſelf or the Holy Ghoſt and Mankind.* This indeed is purely ſcholaſtic, (that is, unſcriptural) Theology; but ſeeing the divine Perſon of Chriſt with reſpect to God (the Father) hath the holy Dignity and Office of Prieſthood (offereth Sacrifice, officiateth in the heavenly Sanctuary and dealeth with God on our behalf) this demonſtrateth that God is his God, as he is a divine Perſon ſuſtaining and adminiſtring this officiary Dignity, notwithſtanding this Pretenſion of the ſcholaſtic Theology, *that he mediateth only according to his Human Nature.* But who can believe this unreaſonable Dogma? For his being by officiary Dignity the Imperial Lord the Son is his being the Mediator; and all the Acts that belong to him as ſuch belong to his Mediatorſhip. And it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that in gathering and governing his Church, in knowing his People, (their Hearts, their Virtues and Vices, and their Needs) in ſanctifying their Souls and raiſing them at the laſt day he acteth only according to his Human Nature.

(t) *Ibid. c.5. S.5.*

CHAP. VII.

1. The great Objections againſt our Idea of the Lord the Son which are anſwer'd by various Conſiderations. 2. The Eternal Generation not Scriptural. 3. No good account of it in the ſcholaſtic Theology. 4. Reaſons drawn from the divine Perfections do not infer it. 5. It claſheth with the divine Perfections. 6. No Tradition of the Church for it. 7. We clearly diſcern that God may have an Imperial Son generated in time. 8. Of the ſcholaſtic Theologies Notion of a Creature. 9. Of neceſſary and contingent Exiſtence. 10. Of ſelf-originate and cauſed Exiſtence. 11. Of a new God. 12. Reflections on a Book newly publiſh'd.

I. HAving thus far illuſtrated and proved by Arguments the Truth of our Idea of the Son of God, it is time to take into Conſideration an obvious Objection that will be made againſt it. For every one will be ready to charge it with Impiety and Abſurdity, becauſe it denieth his Eternal Generation, which will be thought conſequentially a denial of his Deity and a creaturizing the Son of God. For it is commonly ſuppos'd that this is the definitive Notion of a Creature, *That which from an antecedent Non-exiſtence is brought forth into Being* (by ſome other Cauſe) or *That which after it once was not, is brought into Being.* It is commonly ſuppoſed alſo, *that whatever Being is neceſſarily exiſtent,* (and therefore undeſtroyable) is *divine Being: but all Being meerly contingent* (dependent upon Will and Pleaſure) *is created Being*; and that the *Non-eternal Generation of the Son cannot conſiſt with the divine Perfections, eſpecially not with God's Immutability.* Eternity alſo is an eſſential Attribute of God, (*u*) *Quis enim alius Dei cenſus quàm æternitas?* ſaith *Tertullian.* Nothing is ſo characteriſtical of the divine Nature, (ſaith *Iſidore Peluſiota*) as to be eternal. If the Son of God therefore is God, he muſt be generated from Eternity. Accordingly the *Arians* and other *Anti-Trinitarians* call Chriſt *a Creature* for this Reaſon, becauſe as they ſuppoſe, *Erat quando non erat:* So the Jews ſtile the Meſſias, (*w*) the moſt excellent of all Creatures. But the ancient Chriſtian Church that held the Deity of Chriſt aſſerted alſo his Generation from Eternity, as *Origen* ſaith, (*x*) *We do not worſhip a new God,* τὸν ὐ πρότερον ὄντα θεὸν, ὐδὲ γνωσθέντα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *that was not a God before, nor known unto Men.* And he telleth *Celſus,* (*y*) *We do not ſupervenerate,* τὸν ἔναγχός γε φανέντα, ὡς πρότερον ὐκ ὄντα, *one that hath lately appear'd, as if before he was not, for we believe that the Eſſence of Truth was before the time of Chriſt's appearing.* (*z*) *We are not commanded to receive* πρόσφατόν τινα θεὸν, *any recent God.* The Catholicks thought it for their Honour to profeſs (*a*) *Neque novitium neque recentem colimus Deum.* And for this Reaſon the Empreſs *Placilla* was extremely averſe from *Arianiſm,* becauſe ſhe had learned *that there is no new or recent God. Neſtorius* is of no Authority amongſt Catholicks, but if that great Rant of his which was meant againſt the Catholicks had been meant againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus* or *Photinus* (who deny'd our Saviour's Exiſtence before he was born of the Bl. Virgin) they would have concurr'd with him in it; *Non ſe bimeſtrem ac trimeſtrem Deum nominare poſſe.* Theſe are the great Objections which incumber our Idea of the Son of God, and which may bring upon it the Charge of Hereſy, of *Ebioniſm, Samoſatenianiſm, Photinianiſm, Socinianiſm.* But if our Idea is the Truth of God, it is pity that it ſhould be daſh'd out of Countenance by terrible Names. We will therefore aſſert and vindicate the Truth of it againſt theſe great Objections; and that we may fairly aſſoil all the Difficulties which it involveth, to what hath been already diſcours'd againſt the Eternal Generation we will add theſe following Conſiderations.

II. It is of great Conſideration that the Eternal Generation is never mention'd in the holy Scriptures, but they are totally ſilent concerning it. So that it muſt not be counted a ſcriptural Truth, much leſs an Article of Faith, either in it ſelf a diſtinct Article, or a Branch of that great Article *The Deity of the Meſſiah.* St. *Hilary* (ſpeaking of the unintelligibleneſs of the Eternal Generation) ſaith (*b*) *The Archangels know it not, the Angels have not heard it, the Ages hold it not, the Prophet hath not diſcern'd it, the Apoſtle hath ask'd no Queſtion about it, the Son himſelf hath not publiſh'd it*; therefore nothing of it is reveal'd. It is not pretended that it can be proved from Scripture in a direct or expreſs way, but only deductively and conſequentially. Several places of Scripture are alledg'd to prove our Saviour's præexiſtence before he was born of the Bl. Virgin; that præexiſtence (not of his Soul, which we do not concern our ſelves about in this Debate, but of his Perſon) is proved to be the

(u) *Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 9. S. 5. & l. 5. c. 9. S. 10.*

(w) *Coſri p. 254.*

(x) *C. Celſ. l. 5. p. 257.*

(y) *Ibid. l. 8. p. 386.*

(z) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l. 5. p. 134.*

(a) *Baron. ad an. 385. n. 34. & ad an. 372. n. 78.*

(b) *Archangeli neſciunt, Angeli non audierunt, ſecula non tenent, Propheta non ſenſit, Apoſtolus non interrogavit, filius ipſe non edidit.*

præexiſtence of a divine Perſon, which inferreth his Exiſtence from Eternity, and that inferreth his Eternal Generation, which cannot be proved from Scripture otherwiſe than by this deductive and conſequential way of Probation. But is there any other Article of Faith, or any other Matter of Fact neceſſary to be believed, which cannot otherwiſe be proved but only by this Method of going about, this deductive and conſequential way of Probation? If the holy Writers had thought this Eternal Generation an Article of Faith neceſſary to Salvation, certainly they would have made ſome mention of it in their Writings, at leaſt they would have told us (in writing the Hiſtory of the Son of God) that God generated a Son from Eternity, who was again generated in time, they would have given ſome hiſtorical account of an Abſtract Son of God (to whom an Eternal Generation belongeth) they would have made ſome notifying Deſcription of him, of which his Eternal Nativity muſt have been a principal Ingredient. They that inſiſt ſo much upon *being born and begotten of God*, could they forget ſo much as once to mention the tranſcendent divine Nativity of the Eternal Son of God? But ſuppoſe that they thought it prudent not to give any hiſtorical account of this Nativity, yet ſeeing their Buſineſs is *Chriſtology*, ſeeing they delight in ſtrange magnifying Expreſſions concerning Chriſt, making ſtrange Compoſitions of Words, and heaping Expreſſion upon Expreſſion, (as if they could never ſpeak high enough) ſeeing they abound with vaſt numbers of ennobling Attributes of the Son of God, whence is it that in all their Writings they never ſo much as once ſtile him by this tranſcendent ennobling Attribute *The Eternal Son of God?* Were they leſs ſtudious of his Honour than we are, who ordinarily celebrate and ennoble him by his Eternal Sonſhip? They that have ſtiled The Holy Spirit *The Eternal Spirit*, why is it that they have never ſtiled The Son *The Eternal Son?* They that have ſhewed various Reaſons why he is the Son of God, (his Generation of the Bl. Virgin, his Meſſias-ſhip, his Reſurrection) whence is it that they have never alledg'd this Reaſon, *becauſe he was generated by the Father from Eternity?* Theſe things are ſtupendiouſly unaccountable, (if our Saviour's Eternal Generation is a Truth, and much more if it is an Article of Faith) and the Conſideration of them ſhould incline us to believe, that thoſe places of Scripture which are uſually cited to prove his Exiſtence from Eternity, are meant of him as he is *The Evangelical Imperial Son*, not as he is The Eternal Son. So we have expounded *his preaching to the Spirits in Priſon*, *John Baptiſt*'s Saying concerning him *He was before me*, our Saviour's Saying touching his Exiſtence (in his day) before *Abraham*, and his Prayer concerning *the Glory that he had with God before the World was*, his going forth *from the Days of Eternity*, his likeneſs to *Melchizedeck*, and his Title of *Alpha* and *Omega*. And in like manner we ſhall expound *his coming down from Heaven*, *his being in the form of God*, his being *The Eternal Life*, *The firſt-born of every Creature*, *The Word which was in the beginning*, *by which all things and the Worlds were made*, *and the Beings in Heaven and Earth were created*. From an impartial Survey of all places of Scripture that are alledg'd in this Argument it will appear, that our Saviour's Eternal Generation cannot rightly be inferr'd from any part of the Bible, although his native Divinity or Deity of Perſon is beyond all Contradiction.

III. The Scholaſtic Theology is ſo far from giving a good account of the Eternal Generation, that its account thereof is not tolerably conſiſtent with it ſelf. For St. *Hilary* ſaith, that the Generation of the Son is from the Love of God, (c) *Omne quod Deus eſt per Charitatem impartiens*, (imparting by Charity all that God is:) but this *Aquinas* expreſly contradicteth. (d) *Chriſt is called* (ſaith he) *the Son of the Love of God as being ſuperabundantly beloved by him*, (non quod dilectio ſit principium generationis Filii) *not becauſe Love is the Principle of the Generation of the Son*. *Aquinas* and the Schoolmen generally diſpute, that the Generation of the Son is not from any antecedent Will of God: but a principal ſcholaſtic Divine contradicteth them and aſſerteth, (e) *antecedente voluntate Pater vult Filium ejuſque productionem*, The Father willeth the Son and his Production by an antecedent Will. Thus he contradicteth the Divines of his own School; but he as plainly contradicteth himſelf. For ſometimes he thinketh it beſt to aſſert, (f) *neque volentem neque nolentem Patrem genuiſſe Filium*, that the Father generated the Son neither willing nor nilling; that Creation is θελήσεως ἔργον, *the Work of the Will*, but the Generation of the Son is φύσεως ἔργον, *a Work of Nature*, (ut non per actionem ullam voluntatis genitus eſſe dicatur) *that he may not be ſaid to be generated by any Act of the Will*, either free or neceſſary. When he aſſerteth, that the Generation of the Son is from an antecedent Will of God, he meaneth *a natural and neceſſary Volition*, (ſuch as is in all Men towards Good in general:) but this Aſſertion of his is contradictory and deſtructive to this principal Maxim of his Theology, *The Father is conſtituted a Perſon by the Generation of the Son*. For (the Will being the rational Appetite) if he is not a Perſon antecedently to the Generation of the Son, he cannot will antecedently to his Generation. Nor can he generate the Son for any Reaſons moving his Will thereunto, Reaſons of Goodneſs and Charity, of Felicity and Society, (prudential and virtuous Reaſons) which are the Reaſons that many ſcholaſtic Divines alledge to prove the neceſſity of an Eternal Generation of the Son. (g) “God that took delight “in producing the World (otherwiſe he had not “produc'd it) could not but take more delight in “producing God out of himſelf than the World “out of nothing, (for the one is infinitely a “more excellent Production than the other, and “more deſirable;) therefore it is credible that “God firſt produc'd God out of himſelf, (out of “his own Nature) and afterwards the World. “Again, God taketh pleaſure in producing Crea-“tures like himſelf, and the more any Creature “is like himſelf the more he is pleaſed with it; “therefore he is moſt highly pleaſed in produ-‘cing ſome one like himſelf in Nature and Sub-“ſtance. And becauſe it is neceſſary that Com-“placence and Joy ſhould be in God in the high-“eſt degree, therefore it is neceſſary that God “ſhould have ſome one produced of his own Na-“ture like himſelf in the higheſt meaſure. More-“over, God taketh pleaſure in Society, (other-“wiſe he had not produc'd the World out of no-“thing) there cannot be a fulneſs of Joy *in ſummè ſolitario*; but if God taketh pleaſure in the “Society of another produc'd out of nothing, he “will incomparably take more pleaſure in the “Society of one produc'd out of his own Nature “and Subſtance. From the like Reaſons ſome School-Divines infer, that there muſt be a plurality of Perſons in the Godhead, (h) becauſe fulneſs of Goodneſs (which is communicative without Malignity or Invidiouſneſs, and giveth all that

(c) *Ap. Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 8. *S.* 4, 12.

(d) *Par.* 1. *Qu.* 41. *Art.* 2.

(e) *Petav. ſupr. S.* 20.

(f) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *S.* 9, 10.

(g) *Raymund. de ſabunde Theol. nat. p.* 65, *&c.*

(h) *Ric. Victorin ap. Petav. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 8. *S.* 13.

that God is) requireth it. And fulneſs of Happineſs requireth, that ſeveral Perſons be there, which enjoy the ſame good, love one another at the higheſt rate, and live in mutual Communion. And fulneſs of love requireth, that ſuch an one be there, whom God may and ought to love as himſelf. So ſome others argue (*i*) that God muſt live the moſt perfect and happy Life, which cannot be in meer ſolitude, and therefore muſt produce a Son (qui paternarum perfectionum æternus eſt teſtis congratulator atque hæres) ***who is an Eternal Witneſs, Congratulator and Heir of his Father's Perfections.*** Theſe are the Reaſons of generating the Son from Eternity.

But if the Son was generated from Eternity for theſe Reaſons, then we muſt ſay, that God produc'd his Son from Eternity, becauſe for certain Reaſons he thought it neceſſary; which Reaſons are Prudential and Virtuous Reaſons, and therefore we muſt ſuppoſe him to have been produc'd from Eternity, from *Wiſdom, Counſel and Will, for End and Deſign.* But this ſuppoſition is a downright Contradiction to the Scholaſtic Trinity, and the Eternal Generation, which (as the *Alex. Cyril* argueth) cannot be (*k*) τῆς κρίσεως καὶ βουλήσεως ἔργον, *a work of judgment and of will* (as the Creation is) becauſe it is Eternal. The Creation of the World (in the Scholaſtic Theology) is in this reſpect oppos'd to the Generation of the Son, he was not generated, becauſe God thought it neceſſary for certain Reaſons (moving his Will thereunto) to ſuppoſe him generated for End and Deſign (for motive Reaſons) is Contradictory to his Deity in the Scholaſtic Theology, which implyeth, that he is the ultimate End of all things as perfectly and plenarily, as God the Father is. His *neceſſary Exiſtence* alſo is deſtroy'd by this ſuppoſition, He was produc'd from Eternity for certain Reaſons moving the Will of God thereunto: Nor could the Father be conſtituted a Perſon by generating the Son, if ſuch Reaſons were antecedent to his Generation. The Son therefore (in this Theology) is ſuppos'd to proceed from the Father as heat from the Fire, the light from the Sun, and ſplendor from Light (which are ſimilitudes that the Ancient Writers frequently make uſe of) *naturally, neceſſarily,* and *eſſentially.* The Father is ſuppos'd, to generate the Son (*l*) οὐσιωδῶς, *eſſentially,* φύσει, *by nature* (in *quantum eſt* and as a natural Agent) not βουλήσει, *by Will*; and this Generation this Theology ſuppoſeth to be φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη *operationem,* a Natural and Eſſential Operation. (*m*) *How can he be generated by the Will and Counſel of the Father, who is the Will and Counſel of the Father? The Father doth not exiſt by Will, nor againſt Will, and the ſame muſt be ſaid of the Son.* Such are the Maxims of the Ancient Writers; they affirm, that the Generation of the Son, is not from the Will of God (*principiative* as the Principle of it) this they ſay: But they alſo ſay the contrary and are inconſiſtent with themſelves and their own Maxims. (*n*) *God having power concurring with his Will generated one worthy of himſelf.* Such are their ſayings, and how ſhall we reconcile ſuch Sayings with their own Maxims? *Petavius* thinketh, that when they ſay the Generation of the Son is from Will, they mean by Will nothing more than ***the natural and neceſſary Volition*** (before mentioned) which doth not hinder his Generation from being meerly Natural and Neceſſary, and thus he would ſave them from ſelf-contradiction. But he is much miſtaken in his method of reconciling them; for the Fathers cannot be ſuppos'd to mean *by Will* nothing more than the natural and neceſſary Volition, as will appear by theſe four Arguments. (1.) The Fathers ſay (*o*) the Son was generated *ex charitate,* which is a Divine kind of Love, and a Divine Virtue, of a very different Nature from the natural and neceſſary Volition. (2.) The Fathers derive the Generation of the Son from *Wiſdom* as well as *Will*; by Will therefore they cannot mean only the natural and neceſſary Volition. (*p*) *Sola ſapientia Pater genuit Filium,* ſaith S. *Auſtin,* or an Author under his Name. S. *Auſtin* in his undoubted Writings ſtyleth the Son (*q*) *Sapientia de Sapientia,* and ſo others of the Ancients ſtyle him σοφία ἐκ σοφίας, *Wiſdom from Wiſdom.* And this is not all (*r*) but they praiſe the *Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs of God* in the Generation of his Son. (3.) The natural and neceſſary Volition is not *Goodneſs,* nor is any thing that iſſueth from it properly a Gift (no more than the Fire is the Donour of Heat or the Sun of Light:) but theſe Ancient Writers aſcribe all that the Son is and hath to the *Goodneſs* and *Gift* of the Father. (*s*) ***Nil ex invidia retinens, plenuſque datorum.*** (*t*) ***Thou didſt beget him before all Ages by Will, Power and Goodneſs.*** (4.) The natural and neceſſary Volition is not ſuch a Volition, to which God is moved by Prudential and Virtuous Reaſons: but to this ſort of Volition the Ancient Writers aſcribe the Eternal Generation of the Son. For to this ſenſe S. *Baſil* and others argue. (*u*) *It is beſt and moſt becoming God, to be a Father and to generate a Son; and ſeeing he is neither wanting in the Knowledge of what is beſt, nor in Will to do it, nor in Power to accompliſh it, how could it be otherwiſe, but that he generated his Son from Eternity? If he did not ſo generate him, either it was becauſe he could not, or becauſe he would not: neither of which can be ſuppos'd; for it is abſurd, to ſuppoſe, that God did not always Will* (the Son) *the Good of Goods.* The Generation of the Son in this Argument is deriv'd, not from the natural and neceſſary Volition, which is a ſort of natural Neceſſity, but the *virtuous Volition* (the Volition of what is ſimply and abſolutely beſt) which is free from natural Neceſſity, and from which all Chriſtians derive the Creation of the World. Accordingly, *Eunomius* (S. *Baſil's* Adverſary) objected againſt this Argument, that it inferr'd as well the Creation of the World from Eternity, as the Generation of the Son from Eternity. But at the ſame rate the Fathers argue for the *Conſubſtantiality of the Son, and his equality with the Father,* as for his Eternal Generation. *If the Father did not generate a Son equal to himſelf, either it was becauſe he could not or he would not. If he would not, he was invidious; if he could not, he was impotent. To ſuppoſe him not able to generate a Conſubſtantial Son, is to impeach him of Imbecillity; and to ſuppoſe him not willing, is to ſuppoſe him* μὴ μᾶλλον ἐθελῆσαι τὸ κάλλιον, *not to will rather that which is the better and more excellent.* Such a Volition is not the natural and neceſſary Volition, nor are theſe Argumentations agreeable to the Maxims of the Fathers touching the Natural, Neceſſary and Eternal Generation of the Son; Nor is the Allegation of Virtuous and Prudential Reaſons to any purpoſe in a matter of Eternal Neceſſity. If the Son

(i) *Dr. H. More Script. phil. T.* 1. *p.* 764, *&c.*

(k) *Theſaur. p.* 59. *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 3 *c.*5. *S.*6. *Athanaſ. c. Arian. or.* 2. *p.* 157. *Com.*

(l) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 4. *S.* 10. *l.* 6. *c.* 8. *S.* 14. &c.

(m) *S. Cyril. ſupr. p.* 54.

(n) Ὁ δὲ θεὸς σύνδρομον ἔχων τῇ βουλήσει τὴν δύναμιν ἐγέννησεν ἄξιον ἑαυτοῦ. *Petav. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 8. S. 11.

(o) *Petav. ibid. S.* 4. & 12.

(p) *Ibid. S.* 16.

(q) *Ibid. c.* 10. *S.* 1, 2.

(r) *S. Chryſoſt. in Ep. ad Philip. p.* 42.

(s) *Petav. ſupr. c.* 8. *S.* 12.

(t) *Ipſum ante omnia ſecula genuiſti voluntate & potentia & bonitate.* Petav. ibid. S. 26. & vid. S. 24.

(u) *Ibid. S.* 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12.

Son be generated by Eternal Neceſſity, his Equality and Conſubſtantiality with the Father doth not at all depend upon the Determinations of of the Divine Will, but theſe things are antecedently thereto immovably fix'd by Eternal Neceſſity.

IV. There is as little reaſon for the Eternal Generation, as there is proof of Scripture. For ſuppoſing it poſſible, which it is not (for there can be no ſuch Son of God, that is not a Saint of God) yet why it ſhould actually be, no good reaſon can be given either from the *efficient* or the *final* Cauſe. Not from the *final* Cauſe; for according to *Gr. Nyſſen*'s compariſon, ſuppoſe the Fire, to have a natural and neceſſary Volition, and to generate heat *ad ultimum virium*, but not from any final Cauſe or Reaſon moving the Fire thereunto, ſuch is the Nature of the Eternal Generation. Which cannot be from any reaſon moving the Will of God thereunto, nor from any Volition but the natural and neceſſary. Whence this Argumentation of the Ancients appeareth, to be an impertinence; *If God did not generate his Son from Eternity, either it was becauſe he would not, or becauſe he could not*; for this Eternal Generation of his Son is neceſſarily antecedent to all his determinations of Will and all the Reaſons thereof. But the Exiſtence of God is neceſſarily Antecedent to the Generation of his Son, and God is according to his Idea *abſolutely perfect*, and conſequently the infinite Eternal Beatitude. And if infinite Eternal Beatitude is neceſſarily antecedent to Generation and Sonſhip in the Godhead, it is upon that account unreaſonable, to argue, that Generation and Sonſhip muſt be in the Godhead from Eternity, that Society may be there, without which there can be no perfect Beatitude; as ſome of the Heathen thus argu'd againſt the Unity of God (w) *ſi Deus unus eſt, quæ eſſe beata ſolitudo queat?* The Son's Deity and neceſſary Exiſtence (according to the Scholaſtic Theology) imply, that no reaſons of his Eternal Generation can be given from the *final* Cauſe: Nor will the efficient Cauſe afford any, unleſs certain Sayings of the Ancients may be counted (as themſelves accounted them) *Reaſons drawn from the Divine Perfections.* (x) As all things that are perfect generate ſomething, ſo that which was always perfect generated from Eternity, and it was moſt becoming him ſo to do. His Nature is of it ſelf γεννητική, *generative* (y) and as Men are Fathers οὐκ ἐκ βουλήσεως ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς, *not from Will but Naturally* (which is a miſtake) ſo it is with God. (z) The Son is *æternæ lucis æternus ſplendor.* The Light was from Eternity, therefore the ἀπαύγασμα, *Effulgency of it was from Eternity.* Ὄντος ἀεὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὢν ἔστι καὶ ἀϊδίως καὶ τὸ τούτου ἀπαύγασμα, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. *The Father exiſting from Eternity, from Eternity alſo his Splendor Exiſteth, which is his Verbum or Logos.* If he was not in the Father from Eternity (who is the Logos, Wiſdom and Virtue of the Father) *Logos*, and *Wiſdom* and *Virtue* would be wanting in the Father, he would be ἄλογος & ἄσοφος, which is moſt abſurd to ſuppoſe. He cannot be actually wiſe and intelligent *ſine expreſſa notione ac Verbo*, without an expreſs Notion which is the (Scholaſtic) Word. *Origen* argueth (a) that the (Platonic) Eſſence of Truth was before the time of Chriſt's appearing. To affirm, that ſometime he was not, is to ſay, that ſometime Truth was not, Wiſdom was not, Life was not. If any one ſaith, that ſometime he was not, and afterwards was produc'd, I will aſk ſuch an one, why he was not produc'd before? To which interrogatory of *Origen* a Chriſtian Trinitarian will make anſwer, that a Perſon who is eſſentially θεάνθρωπος cannot Exiſt without the human Nature. The *Alexandrian Cyril* argueth (b) If God did not generate his Son from Eternity, he could never generate him, Generation being *ex Subſtantia*, and therefore a Generation on this ſide Eternity would be a Mutation in his Subſtance. Some others argue (c) *A Perſon cannot begin to exiſt of and in the divine Eſſence it ſelf, which was not before, conſiſtently with the immutability of the Divine Nature. But it is the common Notion of all Men, that God is immutable. If therefore the Son is the true and genuin Son of God the Father, that is, originated of the Subſtance of the Father, and ſubſiſting in him, he is neceſſarily, as by nature equal to the Father, ſo coeval and co-eternal.* This Argument ſuppoſeth, that a true and genuin Son of God muſt neceſſarily be generated as the Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God is ſuppos'd to be generated of and in the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence or Subſtance (ſuch a Son cannot be generated *de novo* without a Mutation in the Divine Subſtance:) but a true and genuin Son of God may be generated otherwiſe, and much more accommodately to thoſe ſimilitudes which the Ancient Writers uſe. (d) *As we ſee, that if one taketh of the corporeal Fire which we uſe, inlightning a light of light, he doth not cauſe any Paſſion or Section in it, but it remaineth the ſame: ſuch incomprehenſibly is the Generation of Chriſt of the Father from Eternity. We ſee other fires kindled from fire, it not being at all diminſh'd, but remaining the ſame, whence many fires may be kindled. The Subſtance of the Son is not found from without, nor ſuperinduc'd from non-exiſtents, but generated of the Subſtance of the Father, as the Eradiation of light, as the Vapor of Water; for neither is that Eradiation, nor that Vapor, the Water it ſelf, nor the Sun it ſelf, nor alien and exotick, but an Aporrhœa of the Paternal Subſtance, which ſuffereth no Diviſion. As the Sun remaining the ſame is not diminiſh'd by his poured forth rayes: So the Subſtance of the Father ſuſtain'd no alteration having an Image of it ſelf the Son.* At this rate of generating a Son as a Candle is lighted by a Candle, or as Fire is kindled from Fire, without making any Mutation in it, a Son may be *de novo*, generated in the Godhead without making any Mutation in the Divine Subſtance. *For the divine vital Eſſence* (without any Mutation of Subſtance) *may become his Eſſence in reſpect of its Vital Sanctity, as it is the Derivative*; ſo it is the Holy Ghoſt's Eſſence in reſpect of its Vital Sanctity as it is the *Communicative.* The Son ſo generated is *Coeſſential* with the Father without the Eternal Generation, which is an Anſwer to this other Argument of the Metaphyſical Scholaſticks (e) τὸ ὁμοούσιον, *the Son's being conſubſtantial*, inferreth his τὸ συναΐδιον, *being coeternal.* Their reaſon

(w) *Lactant. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(x) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 9. *S.* 7, 8.

(y) *S. Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 57.

(z) *Ap. D. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p.* 199, 207, 197. *ed. an.* 1703.

(a) *C. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 386. *Periarch. l.* 1. *c.* 2. & *l.* 4.

(b) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *S.* 11. & *T.* 2. *l.* 5. *c.* 4. *S.* 9.

(c) *Non poteſt perſona aliqua ex & in ipſa divina eſſentia incipere exiſtere, quæ prius non fuit, ſalvâ divinæ naturæ immutabilitate. Atqui immutabilem eſſe Deum, eſt* κοινὴ *omnium hominum* ἔννοια. *Itaque ſi Filius ſit verus & genuinus Dei Patris Filius, hoc eſt, ex ſubſtantia Patris ortum habens & in ipſo ſubſiſtens, neceſſe eſt, Patri ſuo ut naturâ æqualis, ita Coævus & Coæternus ſit.* Dr. Bull ſupr. Sect. 4. c. 2. n. 4.

(d) Ὥσπερ οὖν ἐννοοῦμεν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν ὑλικοῦ πυρὸς λάβη τις, καὶ πάθος ἢ τομὴν οὐ ποιεῖ, ἐν τῷ ἀναλάμψαι φῶς ἐκ [illegible]ός, ἀλλὰ μένει τοῦτο· [illegible] ταλήπτως ἐξ αἰ[illegible] τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ πατρὸς [illegible] 199. *Ex igne ignes* alios acc[illegible]demus, *illo nihil* diminut[illegible] eodem *manente,* unde multi accendi *poſſunt ignes.* ibid. p. 358 Οὐκ ἔξωθέν τις ἐστιν ἐφευρεθεῖσα ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐσία, οὐδὲ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ἐπεισήχθη, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας ἔφυ, ὡς τοῦ φωτὸς ἀπαύγασμα, ὡς ὕδατος ἀτμὶς· οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, οὔτε ἡ ἀτμὶς αὐτὸ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστιν, ἢ αὐτὸς ὁ ἥλιος· οὔτε ἀλλότριον, ἀλλὰ ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, οὐ μερισμὸν ὑπομεινάσης τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας. ὡς γὰρ μένων ὁ ἥλιος ὁ αὐτὸς οὐ μειοῦται ταῖς ἐκχεομέναις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ αὐγαῖς· οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἀλλοίωσιν ὑπέμεινεν, εἰκόνα ἑαυτῆς ἔχουσα υἱόν. *ibid. p.* 135.

(e) *Ibid. p.* 173.

reaſon is τὸ δὲ ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ ἐπιγενητὸν οὐκ ἔστι, *that which is Conſubſtantial to the Father, is not Adventitious in time.* But one of their principal Arguments is taken from (*f*) the name *Father* (which is ſuppos'd to be a more excellent and honourary Name than the Name God, becauſe it is more excellent and honourary to God, to be the Father of his Son than the God of Creatures.) *God was the Father from Eternity* (ſay they) *therefore he generated a Son, and had a Son from Eternity.* So ſome have argu'd, that *God could not be Creator, Lord and King* from Eternity, unleſs there were Creatures, Servants and Subjects from Eternity. But this is meerly from the Ambiguity of Words, to create Difficulties (which are before conſider'd;) for as God was The Creator, Lord and King from Eternity in one ſenſe, not in another (in a duly limited ſenſe) ſo he was *The Father* from Eternity. From which uſual Name of God in the New Teſtament the Ancient Writers ſhould not have inferr'd the Eternal Generation, and that our Bleſſed Saviour is the Eternal Son: But they ought to have inferr'd from it, that he is *The Evangelical Imperial Son* (as the Apoſtle ſtyleth God *The Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*;) for Divines uſually ſay of this Name *The Father, vox hæc Evangelii eſt, vox hæc Evangelium eſt*, This is the Word of the Goſpel, and is The Goſpel.

V. The Eternal Generation, and The Eternal Trinity are far from being more agreeable to the divine Perfections than the Non-eternal. For they imply (*g*) *ſecundum eſſentiam eſſe Patrem, & ſecundum eſſentiam eſſe Filium*, (that the Father and Son are Eſſential to the Godhead) that the Son is an eſſential Conſtitutive of the Godhead (*res illa una quæ veraciter eſt Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus*) that without the Generation of the Son the Father could not be ſuch a Subſtance and Perſon, nor a Perſon in General, and that (*h*) *de ratione hujus Entis unius & primi eſt, ut in illo contineantur duæ illæ perſonæ Filius & Spiritus Sanctus.* It is of the Nature and Notion of this one and firſt Being, that thoſe two Perſons the Son and the holy Spirit be contained in it. But if The Son is an Eſſential Conſtitutive of the Godhead, he cannot Exiſt by Generation, but muſt Exiſt meerly and immediately by that *Neceſſary Exiſtence*, whereby God Exiſteth, and therefore can be no Son. For God Exiſteth by meer Neceſſary Exiſtence (in order of Nature antecedently to any Generation;) In this God that Exiſteth by meer Neceſſary Exiſtence, no eſſential Conſtitutive of God (or the Godhead) can be wanting; therefore Nothing generated (no Son) can be an eſſential Conſtitutive of the Godhead. If the Son is an eſſential Conſtitutive of God, thoſe ſimilitudes which the Ancient Writers have us'd, are not accomodate, to illuſtrate his Generation, namely (*i*) the Emanation of Heat from the Fire and of Light from the Sun. *Nec ſine ſole ſuo lux, nec ſine luce ſuâ Sol. Hieron. Vida.* For theſe Emanations of Light and Heat are but exteriour Communications, and are far more accommodate, to illuſtrate The neceſſary Emanation of the World from God (according to ſome Philoſophic-pagans) than the Eternal Generation of the Son, who is ſuppos'd, to be an eternally eſſential Conſtitutive of God. But no Being can be ſuppos'd to generate any eſſential Conſtitutive of it; therefore God cannot be ſuppos'd to generate ſuch a Son. His Eternal Generation bereaveth the Divine Majeſty of all Liberty of Agency, of all poſſible deliberation concerning it, of all Exerciſe of Wiſdom and Goodneſs in his divineſt Production, and ſome great Schoolmen ſay (*k*) *that God could not know his Son under the notion of poſſible or future*, which bereaveth him of all preconception of Mind and intelligent Agency in this Eternal Generation. If the Eternal Son iſſueth from the Eternal Father naturally, neceſſarily and eſſentially, it cannot be in the Senſe of Law and Morality his doing, that the Son doth Exiſt, (it is not imputable to him) he is not the Father, the Son is not to him a Son in the Senſe of Law and Morality, he oweth him nothing, no filial Affection or Duty, is not at all for him or to him, nor is he the ſuperiour Proprietor and Owner of him, nor hath right to the Poſſeſſion, uſe and diſpoſal of him (as is before diſcours'd) but ſuch a Son is neceſſarily *ſui juris*, as being not at all oblig'd to ſuch a Father. Accordingly the Scholaſtic Theology ſaith (*l*) *in Filium quem naturâ & neceſſariò produxit, Deus jus habet nullum.* God hath no right over his Son, whom he produc'd by nature and neceſſarily. (*m*) *As he was God, he was neither obedient, nor diſobedient, as the Fathers ſpeak. For theſe things are peculiar to them, that are of a ſecond Order and Subjects.* (*n*) *The Eternal Father is called The God of Chriſt, not as Chriſt is God and the Word, but as he is Man. Wherefore it was not as God, that he was obedient to his Father and did his Will, but as Man.* Theſe are marvellous Maxims touching the Son of God (repugnant to the Nature of Paternity and Sonſhip, and horribly repugnant to God and Piety) but they are not more marvellous than the ſelf-contradictions of this Theology, which uſually diſcourſeth, *that all things that the Son hath were given him by the Father, and given him by generating him,* (*o*) *and that he gave him his Being.* Yet it affirmeth, that his Generation was contrary to the Nature and Notion of a Gift, and that he was produc'd by a Natural Neceſſity. Which is ſuch a Principle of Generation, as is incompetible to any intelligent free Agent, as this Eternal Generation is incompetible to a Perſon. For God is ſaid (*p*) always to generate his Son from Eternity to Eternity, becauſe there can be no Mutation in God (*intra Deum*) becauſe the Son is produc'd by Intellection (which is from Eternity to Eternity) and becauſe God is a pure Act (*ſemper Actuoſus*) therefore this Generation is ſuppos'd to be a never-ceaſing Generation. Which is not a proper Natural Generation; It is a Generation that is always *in fieri*; It belongeth only to thoſe things that are always *in fieri*, that have not together and at once a total Perfect Eſſence, as Motion and Time; It doth not allow the Son a Conſiſtent, but only a Tranſient kind of Subſtance, (*q*) that is always *in fieri* from Eternity to Eternity. (*r*) It cannot be ſuppos'd, that that which was generated from Eternity, and yet is generated to this Day, and will be generated to Eternity, is a Perſon, who receiveth his Perfect Eſſence in a ſhort Time, and hath the whole of it at once. So *hodie* (this Day have I begotten thee) denoteth, that the Son is generated in one certain ſpace of time. And it is not ſenſe, to ſpeak of making that which is

(f) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 4. *S.* 5, 6. *& c.* 9. *S.* 9.

(g) *Petav ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 4. *S.* 10. *& l.* 6. *c.* 8. *S.* 7.

(h) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 1. *S.* 22.

(i) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 9. *S.* 5. *& l.* 1. *c.* 10. *S.* 5. *S. Cyr Theſaur. p.* 31, 36, &c.

(k) *Vaſqu. in Thom.* 1. *Par. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 160. *c.* 3.

(l) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 5. *c.* 5. *S.* 12.

(m) *Si quidem quâ Deus nec obediens, nec inobediens fuit, ut Patres loquuntur. Hæc enim eorum propria ſunt, qui ſecundi ordinis ſunt & ſubjecti.* Petav. T. 4. l. 9. c. 6. S 2.

(n) *Pater æternus Chriſti Deus appellatur, non quâ ille Deus ac verbum eſt, ſed ut homo. Quare non ut Deus Patri ac Deo ſuo Chriſtus obtemperavit, ejuſve voluntatem executus eſt, ſed ut homo.* ibid.

(o) *Quidquid Deus Pater Deo Filio dedit: ita enim dedit Filio Pater, ſine quibus Filius eſſe non poſſet, ſicut ei dedit ut eſſet.* Idem de Trin. l. 3. c. 4. S. 9. & l. 5. c. 5. S. 13.

(p) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 10. *S.* 5, 6.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 9. *S.* 13.

(r) *Curcell. Diſſ. de voc. Trin. n.* 67.

made, or of generating that which perfectly exiſteth and is perfectly produc'd by Generation. But this is none of the worſt Incongruities in the Scholaſtic Theology, nor is this never-ceaſing Generation held by all that hold the Eternal Generation. But all that hold the Eternal Generation muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe the Son not to be meerly an Object of the Eternal Predeſtination (as he is repreſented in holy Scripture) but to be *A principal Agent in his and our Eternal Predeſtination*, (s) which yet is never attributed to him in Scripture, (as *Maldonate* hath obſerv'd) and it is a great Argument againſt the Eternal Generation.

(s) *Maldonat. in Matth.* 20. 23.

VI. As there is no Scripture or ſound Reaſon for the Eternal Generation, ſo the Chriſtian Church hath *no Tradition* of it. It may be juſtly ſaid, that (in conſort with Scripture and ſound Reaſon) ſhe hath a Tradition of the Divinity or Deity of the Lord Meſſiah; for this hath been always expreſly acknowledg'd in the Chriſtian Church, and counted the great Eſſential of the Chriſtian Religion, the Belief whereof is neceſſary to Salvation. Thoſe that did not believe it (as the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*) were not accounted Chriſtians, and if any ſuch aroſe in the Church which deny'd it (as *Theodotus Byzantinus*, *Artemon* or *Artemas*, *P. Samoſatenus*) their Doctrine was counted mortiferous Hereſy, themſelves were counted Hereticks, and they fell under the Cenſures of the Church. Between the *Catholicks* and the *Arians* the Matter in Controverſy was the Deity of Chriſt, (wherewith *Conſubſtantialiſm* is intimately connex'd) this was the principal Queſtion (The ςάσις or ζήτημα) all others were but *incidental*, and the ſeveral Branches of Arianiſm were therefore counted Hereſy, becauſe they were thought a denying the Deity of Chriſt. In the Council of *Aquileia* the *Arian* Biſhops were put to this Teſt, (t) whether they would acknowledge Chriſt *verum Deum?* but they would only acknowledge him *verum Filium*, and would not be prevail'd with to proceed ſo far as to acknowledge him *verum Deum*. (u) *Perfecta Fides eſt Deum de Deo credere*, The perfect Faith (ſaith St. *Jerom*) is to believe him to be God of God. This Article (either well or ill underſtood) all Chriſtians from the riſe of Chriſtianity have thought a fundamental Article of their Religion, and have agreed in the Belief and Profeſſion of it. But touching the Eternal Generation theſe three things are obſervable.

(t) *Baron. ad an.* 381. *n.* 67.

(u) *Idem ad an.* 359. *n.* 38.

(1.) It is certain that the Primitive Chriſtians were not taught it, much leſs were they taught it as an Article of their Faith. If the Primitive Chriſtians had been taught it, if they had known the Eternal Generation, the moſt ancient Fathers could not have made ſuch marvellous blundering Work as they have done about the Generation of the *Logos* of God. Therefore we muſt ſay of them as St. *Jerom* doth of three of the Evangeliſts, *They knew not the Eternal Generation*. The Fathers before cited *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus*, *Tatianus*, (with whom *J. Mart. Tertullian* and *Lactantius* ſymbolize) knew ſo little of the Eternal Generation, that they never ſay, *The Son or Logos was generated from Eternity*, but this is their ſenſe, that the Generation of the Son is the ſame thing with the Prolation of the *Sermo* (or *Logos*) which Prolation was not till there was occaſion for him (to be an Archical Principle of the Univerſe of Beings) and then only (not before) he had his Prolation or Generation, and by his προέλευσις, *proceeding from the Father* at the beginning of the Creation became (w) πρῶτον γέννημα, *the firſt thing generated by the Father*. Some have thought that the beginning of *Geneſis* is thus in the Hebrew, *In principio Deus fecit ſibi Filium*. (x) *Tertullian* is not of Opinion that this is the Senſe of the Hebrew, but this is his Senſe and Notion touching the Generation of the Son, *In principio Deus fecit ſibi Filium*, In the beginning of the Creation God made to himſelf a Son, who thence is ſtiled by him *Primogenitus ut ante omnia genitus*. Theſe Fathers knew ſo little of the Eternal Generation, that they derive the Prolation or Generation of their Abſtract *Logos* from the free Will of God, as *J. Mart.* doth, and his Scholar *Tatianus* and the reſt of theſe Fathers are manifeſtly of the ſame Sentiment. (y) He is God and Son, κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἐκείνου, *according to his Will or Counſel*, and was generated δυνάμει καὶ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, *by his Power, Will or Counſel*. Some ſay that theſe Expreſſions mean only, that the Father did not generate the Son *againſt his Will*; but this is a trifling Evaſion. For they plainly mean, that God did not generate the Son by the natural and neceſſary Volition. As is manifeſt from the general Senſe of theſe Fathers, (the *Logos* iſſu'd forth θελήματι τῆς ἁπλότητος αὐτοῦ, *by the Will of his Singleneſs*, ſaith *Tatianus*;) they derive the Creation and the Prolation of the *Logos* from one and the ſame Volition, which cannot be the natural and neceſſary Volition. (z) *Ut primum Deus voluit, ipſum primum protulit Sermonem, ut per ipſum fierent Univerſa.* So ſoon as God would create all things, he firſt brought forth the *Sermo*, that by him all things might be made. In all reaſon *J. Mart.* muſt be underſtood to ſpeak of one and the ſame kind of Will when he ſaith, that the *Logos* hath many Names, both becauſe (a) he miniſtreth τῷ πατρικῷ βουλήματι (*to the Will of the Father*) καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς θελήσει γεγεννῆσθαι, *and becauſe he was generated by the Will of the Father*. He imputeth the whole Oeconomy of the *Logos* to the Will of God, and there is no Probability that in the ſame Contexture of Words he taketh the Will of God in a very different ſenſe when he ſaith, (b) ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ θεὸν ὄντα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄγγελον ἐκ τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ. (Sometimes he ſaith, τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ) ὃν καὶ ἄνθρωπον γεννηθῆναι διὰ τῆς παρθένου βεβούληται. *He is God and the Son of God according to the Will of God, and his Angel becauſe he miniſtreth to his Will, touching whom alſo his Will was that he ſhould be generated Man by a Virgin.* Theſe Fathers knew ſo little of the Eternal Generation, that ſometimes implicitly, and ſometimes expreſly they deny it. *J. Mart.* and *Tatianus* implicitly deny it, when (in the places formerly cited) they compare the Generation of the *Logos* (not to the Production of an internal Word of the Mind, but) to the Production of external Speech, and ſuch is the Senſe of the other Fathers, who count nothing the Generation of the *Sermo*, (or at leaſt nothing his perfect Generation and Nativity) but Prolation. (c) *This Sermo had his Prolation by God and his Generation by Prolation*, which is oppoſite to his neceſſary Exiſtence and eternal Generation. Sometimes they expreſly deny the Eternal Generation. (d) For *Tertullian* ſometimes expreſly denieth, *that God was always a Father, and that the Logos in God was without a beginning. Lactantius* ſaith of God, (e) *Cùm præter ipſum nihil adhuc eſſet, produxit ſimilem ſui ſpiritum, qui eſſet viribus Dei Patris præditus. When there was as yet nothing but himſelf, he produc'd a Spirit like himſelf, having the En-*

(w) *Athenag.* p. 10.

(x) *Adv. Prax.* c. 5, 6.

(y) *J. Mart. Dial.* p. 357, 358.

(z) *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 6. *vid. Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 8. *S.* 2.

(a) *Dial.* p. 284.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 350, 35

(c) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 21.

(e) *l.* 2. *c.* 5.

(d) *Quia & Pater Deus eſt, & judex Deus eſt; non tamen ideo Pater & Judex ſemper, quia Deus ſemper. Nam nec Pater eſſe potuit ante Filium, nec Judex ante delictum. Fuit autem tempus, cùm & delictum & Filius non fuit, quod judicem & qui Patrem Dominum faceret.* C. Hermogen. c. 3. *Si intra Dominum quod ex ipſo & in ipſo fuit, ſine initio non fuit, ſophia ſcilicet ipſius, exinde nata & condita.*

dowments

ex quo in ſenſu Dei ad opera mundi diſponenda cæpit agitari: multo magis non capit ſine initio quicquam fuiſſe, quod extra Dominum fuerit. Ibid. c. 18.

dowments of God his Father, and this was done *in principio*, in the beginning of things. *Lactantius* is plain and expreſs againſt the Eternal Generation, but that is not the only thing which is remarkable in his Words, for his Abſtract *Logos*, (an infinite Spirit) muſt interpret the *Logos* of *Tatianus*. (*f*) *The Logos iſſuing forth* ἔργον πρωτότοκον τοῦ πνεύματος γίνεται, *this was that primogenit Work the Spirit.* Λόγος ὁ ἐπουράνιος πνεῦμα γεγονὼς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός. And the *Logos* alſo of *Theophilus*. (*g*) Οὗτος ὢν πνεῦμα θεοῦ, *this being the Spirit of God.* Whence it is manifeſt (as is before obſerv'd) that by many of the Ancients the Trinity was thought *three infinite Minds or Spirits.* But touching theſe Fathers that are under Conſideration we muſt make this further Remark, that they knew ſo little of the Eternal Generation, that altho' they ſuppoſe a *Logos* always inexiſtent in God, yet they ſuppoſe it inexiſtent without that which they call Generation or Production, without any thing that they call Generation, or as *Tertullian* ſaith, without a perfect Nativity, Generation or Production. (*h*) *God having within him his internal Sermo*, ἐγέννησε αὐτὸν πρὸ τῶν ὅλων, *generated* (or produc'd) *him before the Univerſe of Beings.* The Origin of this ſtrange Conceit of theſe Fathers is very viſible, for they look'd upon the *Logos* of God to be like our external Speech, which is not generated or produc'd but by Prolation (or Pronunciation:) ſo the *Sermo* had his Prolation by God, and his Generation or Production by Prolation, (as *Tertullian* ſaith) which Prolation was not till the beginning of the Creation. Whence it is eaſy to make a Judgment of this Pretenſion of a learned Man, (*i*) *That in the very Times of the Apoſtles the eternal and divine Majeſty of the Son was celebrated by the Faithful even in their publick Liturgy.* A Judgment may be alſo made touching the Senſe of *J. Mart.* when he ſaith, that the *Logos* did præ-exiſt πρὸ αἰώνων, *before the Ages*, (or the Worlds;) for either his meaning is, that the *Logos* antecedently to his Generation was always in God, or that the generated *Logos* did exiſt πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, (before all Creatures) as himſelf ſpeaketh in conſort with theſe other Fathers. Of the ſame Sentiment with theſe Fathers, (but more eſpecially with *Tertullian*) touching the Eternal Generation is that ancient Writer of the Trinity ſuppoſed to be *Novatianus*, who ſaith of God. (*k*) *Of whom when it was his Will, The Sermo was born his Son. When the Father would have it ſo, he that was in the Father proceeded from the Father.* (*l*) *He proceedeth from the Father* (at the Creation) *and by proceeding from him was made his Son*, ſaith *Tertullian.* It is much that theſe Ancients did not conſider, that not every ſort of Inexiſtence in the Father, nor every ſort of proceeding from him, conſtituteth a Son; and that a natural, eſſential, eternal and perfect Generation muſt be acknowledg'd, or elſe an eternal Son is not acknowledg'd.

(f) P. 145.

(g) P. 88.

(h) Theophil. ibid.

(i) *Ipſis Apoſtolorum temporibus æterna ac divina Filii majeſtas à fidelibus etiam in publica Liturgia celebrabatur.* Dr. Bull ſupr. p. 189.

(k) *Ex quo quando ipſe voluit, Sermo Filius natus eſt. Hic ergo, quando Pater voluit, proceſſit ex Patre, & qui in Patre fuit proceſſit ex Patre.* cap. 31.

(l) *Ex Deo procedit, de quo procedendo Filius factus eſt.* Tertull. adv. prax. c. 6, 7.

(2.) The Primitive Chriſtians that acknowledg'd the Trinity and the Deity of the Meſſiah, differ'd in their way of underſtanding thoſe Articles, ſome underſtanding them in the Chriſtian and holy-popular way, others in a ſcholaſtic way, and theſe Scholaſticks very much differ'd from one another. The firſt Epiſtle of *Clemens Romanus* is in the whole of it holy-popular, the Theology of it is meer Chriſtianity undefiled with any mixture of Scholaſticiſm, (which is hugely alien from the Simplicity of Chriſtianity) whence *Photius* hath taken occaſion to reflect upon the Author of it as neglecting the more ſublime and God-becoming Appellations of our Saviour. The Remains that we have of *Polycarp* are of the ſame Character, whence (with great reaſon) we may infer, that both theſe holy Men and a great part of the Chriſtians of their Time were Chriſtian and holy-popular Trinitarians, ſuch as knew no other Trinity but the Chriſtian, nor any other Son of God ſave only (the Lamb) the Perſon of the Lord Jeſus. But the Epiſtles of *Ignatius* (thoſe of the beſt Edition) are of a very different Character, for there are in them ſeveral very groſs Strokes of the ſcholaſtic Theology, which are complicated with ſomething of a ſelf-contradiction. For the firſt Epiſtle (*m*) ſtileth our Saviour (moſt Apoſtolically) υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ, *The Son of God according to the Will and Power of God*, which Will and Power (if we underſtand thoſe Words in the uſual ſenſe) can have no place in the Eternal Generation. Yet in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians* (*n*) The Chriſt of God is ſtiled αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀΐδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, *his eternal Verbum or Sermo not iſſuing forth from Silence.* Agreeably whereto we muſt interpret this other Paſſage in that Epiſtle touching Chriſt, (*o*) ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη, *who before all Worlds was with the Father, and in the end was made manifeſt.* The Epiſtle to *Polycarp* ſtileth him (*p*) τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν, τὸν ἄχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατὸν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητὸν, *the ſuper-temporal, the intemporal, the inviſible, the for us viſible, the intangible, the impaſſible, the for us paſſible.* We are oblig'd to interpret theſe Epithets in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology, and ſo interpreted they have a ſtrong ſavour of Metaphyſicks, not at all agreeable to the Sanctity and Simplicity of Chriſtianity, which is a ſhrewd Indication that there is ſome foul dealing in theſe Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, which thoſe Scholaſtic Divines muſt acknowledg, who ſuppoſe that in the Times of *J. Mart. Athenagoras* (and thoſe other Fathers abovementioned) the Trinity was not clearly underſtood. For if the Scholaſtic Trinity was not clearly underſtood in thoſe Times, whence is it that it is ſo clearly underſtood and repreſented in the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*? In his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* this Paſſage ſpeaketh the Author an exact Scholaſtic Divine; (*q*) Εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικὸς, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεὸς, *there is one Phyſician carnal and ſpiritual, generate and ingenerate, being God in fleſh.* So the Scholaſtic Theology contradiſtinguiſheth in Chriſt, (*r*) ἀγέννητον οὐσίαν τῇ γεννητῇ, *the ingenerate Subſtance to the generate.* Which ingenerate Subſtance may moſt probably be underſtood to ſignify that infinite Spirit which many of the Ancients ſuppoſe to be the Abſtract Son, and an ingenerate Subſtance in Chriſt ſo underſtood is no laudable Theology. But we are not concern'd to diſpute the Authentickneſs of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles. It muſt be acknowledg'd that the Scholaſtic Theology was very early introduc'd into the Church, and was more early entertain'd in ſome parts of it than in others. It may be ſuppos'd therefore that the true *Ignatius* was a very early Scholaſtic Theologer, altho' others his Contemporaries were of another Character. The Scholaſtic Theologers of the Chriſtian Church in thoſe early Times did follow very different ſorts of ſcholaſtic Theology. For *Athenagoras* and many others in

(m) P. 2.

(n) P. 34.

(o) P. 33.

(p) P. 12.

(q) P. 21.

(r) Baſil. Seleuc. Hom. 25. p. 142.

in their Idea of the *Logos* ſymbolize moſt with the *Stoicks* univerſal *Logos* (their Coſmical Zeus) to which *Tertullian* (*s*) ſuppoſeth the Chriſtians *Logos* to be near of kin. The Alexandrian *Clemens* and *Origen* in forming their Idea of the Abſtract Son or *Logos* manifeſtly follow the Platonic Metaphyſicks. But of thoſe that in their Idea of the Trinity and the *Logos* ſymbolize moſt with the *Ariſtotelian* Metaphyſicks (as the generally received ſcholaſtic Theology ſince the Council of *Nice* doth) there are no Inſtances (that I know of) in thoſe early Times.

(3.) The *Arians* Dogma *Erat quando non erat*, was not Hereſy or criminal Error, ſave only as it was a Branch of their denying the Deity of Chriſt. The *Catholicks* underſtood it to be ſuch, and the *Arians* themſelves ſo underſtood it; for upon account of it they creaturiz'd the Son of God in their Language, calling him *ποίημα & κτίσμα, a thing made and a Creature.* But St. *Auſtin* reporteth (*t*) that the *Arians* of later Times, (he meaneth the *Semiarians*) relinquiſh'd that Principle of *Arius*, *Erat quando non erat*, and their Tenent was, *non extémpore cœpiſſe Filium Dei*, that the Son of God had not a Temporary beginning. Theſe *Semiarians* were of two ſorts, for ſome of them did not ſuppoſe that the Son of God was generated from Eternity, altho' they held that he had not a temporary beginning; for their Opinion was, that Time began from the Creation of the World and the Revolution of the Heavens. But another ſort of them held that the Son of God had no temporary beginning in another ſenſe; for their Opinion was, that he was generated from Eternity; yet theſe were accounted *Arians*, becauſe they held not the Son ὁμοούσιον, *of the ſame Subſtance*, but ὁμοιούσιον, *of like Subſtance* with the Father. If theſe were *Arians* or *Semiarians*, it is manifeſt that *Erat quando non erat* was not an eſſential Principle of Arianiſm, nor was it the principal Point of it, for that was *Anticonſubſtantialiſm*, which by the Council of *Nice* was made the Teſt of Arianiſm. That Council indeed condemn'd the Principle of *Arius*, *Erat quando non erat*, but the principal Matter of Conteſt between the *Catholicks* and the *Arians* was the Term *Conſubſtantial*, which being eſtabliſh'd by that Council (in Contradiction to *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*) and eſteemed *Arx & Propugnaculum Catholici dogmatis*, the conteſting Parties quarrelled infinitely and committed infinite Outrages againſt one another about that one Word. The Catholicks were reproach'd by the Name of *Homooŭſiani*, the principal Pique of their Adverſaries was againſt *Homooŭſios*, and their main Endeavour was to ſuppreſs and deſtroy it, (this the Catholicks complain'd of (*u*) as the greateſt Injury) and it is manifeſt that the thing deſign'd by the Emperor *Conſtantius* was, that the Words *Uſia* and *Homooŭſios* might be aboliſh'd as unſcriptural and exotick Words, that were paſt Mens underſtanding, ſavour'd of a dialectical Subtilty, and occaſion'd abundance of Contention in the Church. This was the State of things in the Times of the *Arian* Controverſy, the whole Hiſtory whereof is ſo full of ignorant and carnal Paſſion, ſo rancidly unſavory and unchriſtian, that I will not dwell upon ſo nauſeous a Subject any further than to obſerve, that altho' my Hypotheſis ſymbolizeth with the greateſt part of the *Arians* in denying the Eternal Generation, yet it ſymbolizeth much more with the Catholicks, becauſe it acknowledgeth *Conſubſtantialiſm* both in the genuin intended ſenſe of the Word, and alſo the Chriſtian kind thereof. (*w*) *Conſubſtantial ſignifieth this one thing in the Son, that his Eſſence or Subſtance is one and the ſame with that of the Father.*

VII. The Scholaſtic Eternal Generation is unconceivable and unintelligible at the moſt ſuperlative rate; but we clearly diſcern and underſtand that God may have *an Imperial Son* (who is God) without the Eternal Generation, upon which account this latter Hypotheſis is infinitely to be preferr'd before the former. For the Scholaſtic Divines (ſpeaking of the Eternal Generation) complain, *It is not poſſible for us to know what begetting ſignifieth.* (*x*) *It is impoſſible to know the Secret of the Eternal Generation of the Verbum, how it was, why it was, or what it was.* (*y*) *If any one ſhall ask, how is the Son produc'd by the Father? we ſay to him touching that Prolation, or Generation, or Nuncupation, or Adapertion, or by whatever Name it may be called, his Generation being undeclarable none knoweth it.* The uſual Anthem ſaith,

Quid ſit gigni, quid proceſſus
Me neſcire ſum profeſſus.

The *Arians* ſpeak almoſt the ſame things (*z*) touching the Unintelligibleneſs of the Generation of their Abſtract Son (which is on this ſide Eternity) as if Men deſign'd to recommend the Chriſtian Religion by repreſenting it as impoſſible and unintelligible. We cannot underſtand that God hath a Son generated from Eternity, and that he ſubmitted to be generated again in time; but we can clearly underſtand the Fallacy of this Argument (in the ſcholaſtic Theology) *If the Son is God, all the Properties which are eſſential to God muſt belong to him, and conſequently neceſſary and eternal Exiſtence muſt belong to him, which inferreth his Eternal Generation.* For this Argument is manifeſtly a Paralogiſm, becauſe of the Ambiguity of the Name God. If by this Name we underſtand God *definitively and abſolutely ſo*, neither the Son nor the Holy Ghoſt is God. But if by this Name we underſtand *a Perſon of the Godhead*, ſo the Son is God. But then this Propoſition is enormouſly falſe; *If the Son is God as a Perſon of the Godhead, all the Properties and Perfections which are eſſential to God definitively and abſolutely ſuch* (as Self-exiſtence, neceſſary Exiſtence, Exiſtence from Eternity) *muſt belong to him.* In reſpect of neceſſary Exiſtence there is great difference between *the being God definitively and abſolutely ſuch, and the being a Perſon of the Godhead.* For God definitively and abſolutely ſuch exiſteth by meer neceſſary Exiſtence; but the Son in the Godhead cannot exiſt otherwiſe than by Generation. God definitively and abſolutely ſuch exiſteth by a neceſſary Exiſtence, which is his own Attribute; but no other Perſon of the Godhead can ſo exiſt; but if he neceſſarily exiſteth, it muſt be either as neceſſarily appertaining to God (definitively and abſolutely ſuch) or as neceſſarily and eternally generated by God (definitively and abſolutely ſuch) ſo that his neceſſary Exiſtence is not upon his own account, nor is it his own Attribute, but he neceſſarily exiſteth becauſe of God definitively and abſolutely ſuch. If God (definitively and abſolutely ſuch) doth generate by a neceſſarily exiſtent and eternal Generation, the Son upon that account doth neceſſarily exiſt; but it cannot be ſaid that he neceſſarily exiſteth, becauſe neceſſa-

ry

(s) *Apolog.* c. 21.

(t) *V. Petav. de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *S.* 5. *Baron. ad an.* 357. *n.* 9. *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 6. *S.* 3.

(u) *Baron. ad an.* 362. *n.* 231.

(w) Ὁμοούσιος *id unum in Filio ſignificat, unam & eandem eſſentiam, ſive ſubſtantiam, illius eſſe, quæ Patris ſit.* Petav ſupr. l. 4. c. 5. S. 9.

(x) Petav. de Trin. l. 5. c. 6. S. 3, 4.

(y) *Si quis nobis dixerit, quomodo Filius prolatus à Patre eſt? dicimus ei, quia prolationem iſtam, ſive generationem, ſive nuncupationem, ſive adapertionem, aut quomodolibet quis nomine vocaverit, generationem ejus inenarrabilem exiſtentem nemo novit.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 2. c. 48.

(z) Baron. *ad an.* 318. *n.* 52.

ry Exiſtence is an eſſential Attribute contain'd in his Idea, which is that of *a Being abſolutely perfect*. The Son of God therefore cannot have neceſſary Exiſtence as his own Attribute, nor can he have it by a neceſſarily exiſtent and eternal Generation, unleſs neceſſary Exiſtence is not only an eſſential Attribute of the Divine Majeſty, but of the Divine Generation alſo. But this it manifeſtly is not. And it is alike evident, that Exiſtence from Eternity cannot belong to the Son as his own Attribute, unleſs neceſſary Exiſtence doth belong to him as his own Attribute, theſe being in ſeveral Expreſſions the very ſame thing.

But God (the Father) is neceſſarily exiſtent, and is neceſſarily the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, and the true Generation of the Son of God is, *This Imperial Eſtate's generating his Divine Imperial Son*. And as an Human Imperial Eſtate, ſo this Divine Imperial Eſtate may in time generate its Imperial Son; there is nothing of Impoſſibility, nothing of Incongruity in it, nothing of Difficulty in conceiving it. From whence it followeth, that an eternal Generation is not eſſential to *Deus natus & genitus*: For this Son of God (the Imperial Son) is neceſſarily an Imperial Perſon, a Divine Imperial Perſon, and therefore of the Godhead. This Argument needeth no Illuſtration to render it intelligible; but that the Argumentative Force of it may be more fully underſtood, we will briefly illuſtrate it *from the Divine Family and Kingdom of God, from the Idea of God and the Meſſias-ſhip*. The true Son of God is neceſſarily one of the Divine Family of the Sons and Saints of God (ſuch an one the Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God, ſuppoſed to be generated from Eternity, cannot be;) but he is ſo one of this Divine Family, as to be *The Imperial Head thereof*, and therefore is neceſſarily one of the Godhead, and juſtly denominated, *The Lord the Son*, and *God the Son*, whenſoever he is generated. The true Son of God is the Son and Heir of the Kingdom of God (which the Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God, ſuppoſed to be generated from Eternity, cannot be;) and he that is the Son and Heir of the Kingdom of God, although not generated from Eternity, is neceſſarily the Imperial Son, is of the Imperial Party, or Sovereignty, in the Kingdom of God (in Religion and Sanctity;) which is to ſay, That he is the Lord the Son, and God the Son, as certainly *The Divine Lamb is*, Apoc. 5. 12. The true Son of God is one of his Idea ſpecific-gradual; As one of his kind, He is vital Sanctity; as one of his Degree, He is vital Sanctity in infinite Fulneſs. And he that is of this Idea, is neceſſarily Creature-tranſcendent, and of the Godhead, whenſoever he is generated. He is alſo, by his Meſſias-ſhip, *The Saviour-King of the Holy Empire*, is, by Officiary Dignity of the Sovereignty and of the Godhead, as the Son of it; and therefore is, by Officiary Dignity, *The Lord the Son, and God the Son*. And as to his being, by Officiary Dignity, God the Son, neceſſary Exiſtence and an eternal Generation is not requiſite, ſo a neceſſarily exiſtent and an eternal Generation is not requiſite to his being natively ſuch. His being the Perſon of the Meſſiah (and in ſuch Senſe the Son of God) both in his *Primary* and his *Officiary* Capacity, involveth in it ſo much of Sanctity, Deity and Divinity of Perſon, that we need not to be beholden to Scholaſticks and their Metaphyſicks in our aſſerting his Godhead, and maintaining the Lamb of God as ſuch in his Divine Dominion and Throne. But on the contrary, if theſe plain and popular Argumentations are firm and ſolid (as certainly they are) then we have plainly demonſtrated the Falſity of this Scholaſtic and Metaphyſical Argumentation, *If Chriſt is not of eternal, and neceſſarily exiſtent Generation, he is but a Creature*.

VIII. A Creature ought to be thus defin'd; *That which is of the made and created Party, ſtrictly ſuch* (which is the Subject and Servient) *not of the Creator-Party*. With this Definition the Fathers exactly agree in this their Notion of a Creature, (u) *They are not leſs to be blamed that count the Son of God a made Thing, the Scriptures attributing to him an agreeable Generation, not a Formation or Making. Neither is one the Father of thoſe of which he is the Maker, if Father is properly underſtood, he that generateth. Nor is the Father a Maker, if only the Opificer is called the Maker.* This definitive Notion of a Creature, although ſufficiently accurate, yet is not ſo clear and perſpicuous, but that it may need to be illuſtrated and proved by theſe following Notices thereof.

(1.) The School-men (although in the Beginning of their voluminous Theology they have many little Altercations touching God and the Creatures, yet) have not taken care to ſettle the definitive Notion of a Creature; only from their uſual Expreſſions it appeareth, that they mean by it *created Nature, that which was made to exiſt*. Scholaſtic Divines, in Conſort with the Fathers, ſay, (a) *It is the proper Notion of Creatures*, τὸ μὴ εἶναι πρὶν γενέσθαι ϗ τὸ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑφίστασθαι, *not to be till they be made, from non-exiſtent to be made exiſtent, to begin to exiſt, and to be produced out of nothing*. Something there is of the true Definition of a Creature in theſe Notices, but not without the uſual Fault of Scholaſticks, who, in contemplating Matters of Theology, do not carry on their Thoughts far enough, but take up with their Metaphyſical Notices that firſt occur, and ſtopping in the Half-way, arrive not at the true Idea's of Divine Things. For this uſual and currant Definition of a Creature, *That which from antecedent Non-exiſtence is brought into Being*, is rather a vain and groundleſs Imagination, than the true Notion of a Creature. It is a Definition made without Reaſon and Judgment, as if we never look'd into Divine or Human Affairs. It is deny'd by a great Party of the School-men themſelves, who ſuppoſe, that the Creatures might be produced from Eternity. (b) One Party of them is of Opinion, That the World, as to all the Parts of it, and as to all Creatures, might have been produced from Eternity. Another Party of them is of Opinion, That the World as to no Part of it, nor as to any Creature, might have been produced from Eternity. A Third part of them chuſeth the middle way, and they are of Opinion, That the World, as to ſome Parts only, and only as to ſome Creatures, might have been produced from Eternity. Creatures therefore, (according to ſeveral Parties of the School-men) may be Creatures without their Beginning their Exiſtence, and although they were never Non-Exiſtents, whether they were ſtrictly made, or were of the created Party from Eternity, or made ſuch in time, this maketh no Difference or Variation as to their being Creatures: So our Saviour's Generation from Eternity ſignifieth nothing more as to his Deity, than his Generation in time. That conſiſteth in Being the Son of God as the Imperial Son. If he was of the made and created Party (ſtrictly ſuch) from Eternity, he was a Creature, although he exiſted from Eternity. And if he was *Deus natus ac genitus*, it is all one as to the Dignity and Eminence of his Perſon, whether he was generated from Eternity, or in time. But if Scholaſticks may define a Creature for us, the Non-attribution of an eternal Generation to Chriſt, and the *Arians erat quando non erat*, is neceſſarily the making him a Creature; and accordingly the *Arians* and *Socinians* have called Chriſt a Creature. And it muſt be acknowledged, that they have ſo ſtated Things, that according thereto, this is no *Miſnomer* of their Saviour.

(u) Οὐ μεῖον δ' ἂν καταμέμφοιτο ϗ τοὺς ποίημα τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι δοξάζοντας ϗ γεγονέναι τὸν κύριον, ὥσπερ ἕν τι τῶν ὄντως γενομένων νομίζοντας, τῶν θείων λόγων γέννησιν αὐτῷ τὴν ἁρμόττουσαν ϗ πρέπουσαν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πλάσιν τινὰ ϗ ποίησιν προσμαρτυρούντων. *Dion. Rom. ap. D. Bull Def. Fid. Nic.* p. 141. Οὔτε πατὴρ ἐστὶν ὢν ποιητής, εἰ κυρίως ὁ γεννήσας πατὴρ ἀκούοιτο· οὔτε ποιητὴς ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μόνος ὁ χειροτέχνης ποιητὴς λέγοιτο. *Dion. Alex. Ibid.* p. 150.

(a) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 6. *de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *S* 3.

(b) *Valen. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 3. *Qu.* 3. *Punct.* 2. *Vaſq. in Th.* 1 *Par. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 177. *Scheibler. Metaph. l.* 2. *c* 2. *Tit.* 17. *Art.* 2. *Punct.* 6.

(2.) The Terms *Made* and *Created* are ambiguous, ſometimes they ſignifie in a ſtrict, and ſometimes in a large Acceptation: (c) For as the Creatures are made, ſo in the ancient Writers of the Church, *Efficiens*, *fecit*, *factus eſt*, are frequently apply'd to the Generation of the Son, they underſtanding theſe Words in a large Senſe and as they ſignifie, to cauſe to exiſt. So *Sæbadius* ſaith of the Son (d) *Non ſine Subſtantia conſtitit, quod de tanta ſubſtantia fecit.* That was not without Subſtance, which he made of ſuch a Subſtance. *Novatianus* ſaith of God, (e) *Secundam Perſonam efficiens*, making the Second Perſon of the Godhead that proceeded from him. *Tertullian* ſaith, (f) *De quo procedendo Filius Dei factus eſt*, By proceeding from whom he was made the Son of God. So we have ſeen, that according to *Tatianus*, the *Logos* that iſſued forth before all Creatures, was ἔργον πρωτότοκον, *the primogenit Work of the Father*. So the ancient Writers uſually apply to the Generation of the Abſtract Son, that of *Solomon*, *Dominus condidit me initium viarum*. (g) Wiſdom ſaith, *She was created before the Works of God*, which they apply to the Generation and Production of the Son, but without deſigning to repreſent the Son as a Creature. For they uſe κτιστὸς, *created*, in ſo large a Senſe, as to ſignifie γεννητὸς, *generated*; whereas, in the ſtrict Acceptation, *created* and *generated* are oppoſed. (h) *Creata, id eſt facta, non genita.* One that is produced into Being therefore may be of Two ſorts: κτιστὸς, *one that is of the made and created Party* ſtrictly ſuch; γεννητὸς, *one that is generated*, but is not of the made and created Party ſtrictly ſuch. One may be from God, κτιστικῶς, *creatively*, *not generatively*: Or, γεννητικῶς, *generatively*, not *creatively*.

(3.) According to the Scholaſtic Theology, Two Perſons of the Godhead agree with the Creatures in this Generical Notion, *They are cauſed by God to exiſt.* For God the Father is (i) ſometimes ſaid to be the Cauſe of the Son, and both the Father and the Son are ſaid to be the Cauſe of the Holy Ghoſt. Which Agreement with the Creatures doth not hinder them from being of the Godhead, and the Creator-party, which is the oppoſite Party to the Creatures. And they are thus differenced from them, according to the ancient Writers (before cited.) They are of the βασιλὶς or δεσποτικὴ, Regial or Imperial Party, the Creatures are of the δουλικὴ, *ſubject and ſervient Party.* (k) κτίσμα & θεὸς, God and Creature are oppoſed, as δοῦλος & δεσπότης, *Servant and Lord.* (l) Πᾶν δὲ κτίσμα δοῦλον τοῦ κτίστου, *Every Creature is ſervient and ſubject to the Creator.* So the Expoſition of Faith in *J. Martyr*'s Works ſaith. *Every thing that exiſteth is either created or increated Nature,* (m) *That which is increated is dominant and free from all Neceſſity: But that which is created*, is of ſervient Condition, and under the Commands *of its Lord.* So the *Alex. Cyril* ſaith of Chriſt and Creatures, (n) *that he is Lord and God, they are of ſubject-ſervient Condition, and Creatures.* Their Rank, Order and Claſſis is the low and underling, they are under Authority, (bound to Homage and Service) the ſubordinate and ſubſervient Beings (ſubſervient to an higher End than themſelves) the Beneficiaries and Dependents *as the ſubject-ſervient Party.* And as in all Monarchic Governments, the ſubject and ſervient Party are the many (*the Monarchy is but one:*) So the ſubject-ſervient Party, that are under the Creature tranſcendent Monarchy, are the many, and of manifold Species, Compeers and Co-equals, Fellow-Subjects and Servants, in all Reſpects particular, limited and finite Beings, having but a Meaſure of Excellency and Perfection (Perfection mix'd with Imperfection, Light with Shadow, Weakneſs with Strength, and diſparaging Properties with their Glory;) and if they have any Divine kind of Good and Excellency, they have it not eſſentially, nor in infinite Perfection, nor is it their kind of Good and Excellency. Not any of them is related to us as the Sovereign Lord of all, our entire Benefactor and ſupreme Good; they are ſcanty and defective Goods in themſelves, and to us (Shallowneſs and Emptineſs is in the beſt of them) and they are nothing in Compariſon of God. Their Name ſpeaketh them not of the *Creator-Party*, but oppoſite thereto; whence the Scholoſtic Theology calleth a Creature, (o) *Opus aliquod externum & extrà Deum editum* (extra Divinitatis terminos) *an Extrinſick to the Godhead.* (p) *Creatæ res à divinitate alienæ*, Created Things are alien from the Divinity, ſaith this Theology.

(4.) From the true Definition of a Creature (thus illuſtrated and proved) the uſual and current Notion of a Creature (*that which from an antecedent Non exiſtence is brought into Being*) appeareth to be falſe and illegitimate: And this uſual Argumentation, whereby it is proved, *What once did not exiſt, can never come to exiſt without being made*, appeareth to be a Paralogiſm, becauſe of the Ambiguity of the Word *Made.* A Perſon that once did not exiſt, can never come to exiſt, *without being made to exiſt* (or cauſed to exiſt;) in ſuch Senſe the Propoſition is true, but nothing to the Purpoſe. But if the Senſe of it is, That a Perſon which once did not exiſt, can never come to exiſt without being *one of the made and created Party, ſtrictly ſuch*, the Propoſition is to the Purpoſe, but not true; for he that once did not exiſt, may come to exiſt by being generated, (without being ſtrictly made) γεννητικῶς, *generatively*, not κτιστικῶς, *creatively.* The Difference between theſe Two ways of Production (proper natural Generation and Creation) the Fathers well explain, (q) by comparing Creation to the Building an Houſe or Ship, which is an external Way and Work of Production, and alſo an artificial Fabrication. By which way of Production we

will

(c) *Certè veteres Theologi ac præcipuè ii, qui ante Concilii Nicæni tempora ſcripſerunt, per vocabulum* κτίζειν *non ſolum creationem intellexerunt, quæ ex nihilo fit, ſed omnem generaliter productionem, tam quæ ab æterno eſſet, quàm illam quæ in tempore. Ad eundem modum omninò exponendus eſt locus, quem ex Petri Apocryphis citat Clemens*, l. 6. p. 644. εἷς γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς, ὃς ἀρχὴν τῶν ἁπάντων ἐποίησεν, μηνύων τὸν πρωτόγονον υἱόν. *Unus enim eſt revera Deus, qui fecit principia Univerſorum, ſignificans primogenitum Filium ſcilicet Græcis itidem uſurpatum eſt,* ποιεῖν τέκνα *facere liberos pro liberos generare: & ita ſeipſum interpretatur Auctor ejus dicti continuò ſubjungens:* μηνύων τὸν πρωτόγονον υἱόν, *ſignificans primogenitum Filium. Valeſ. Not. ad Euſeb.* p. 8. πρωτόκτιστον σοφίαν, *Clem. Str.* 5. p. 591. *Vocem* κτιστὸς *in eo Clementis loco idem ſignificare, quod* γεννητός· *quemadmodum etiam latinè creare dicitur pro gignere. D. Bull ſupr.* p. 90.

(d) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 6. *S.* 10.

(e) *c.* 31.

(f) *Adv. Prax. c.* 7.

(g) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 1.

(h) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 11. *c.* 10. *v. Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *in fine.*

(i) *Petav. Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 5. *S.* 8, 9, 10.

(k) *S. Athanaſ. Or.* 3. *c. Arian.* p. 204. *Com.*

(l) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 4. p. 55.

(m) Ἡ μὲν ἄκτιστος δεσποτικὴ καὶ πάσης ἀνάγκης ἐλευθέρα· ἡ δὲ κτιστὴ, δουλικὴ καὶ νόμοις δεσποτικοῖς ἑπομένη. p. 374.

(n) Τὸν μὲν κύριον εἶναι καὶ θεὸν, τὰ δὲ δοῦλά τε καὶ ποιήματα. *Theſaur. p.* 55.

(o) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *in fin.*

(p) *Ibid. c.* 6. *in fin.*

(q) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 4. *S.* 7, 8 & *c.* 7. *S.* 2.

will ſuppoſe a great Lord to make and create a Family of Servants, and we will ſuppoſe this ſame great Lord to generate one Imperial Son, which Family thus conſtituted conſiſteth of *a made and created Party* ſtrictly ſuch, that are the ſervient-ſubject-Party, and it conſiſteth of an *Imperial Creator-Party*, the Father and the Son; for of this Party the Imperial Son is. We may carry on this Compariſon further, and ſuppoſe with *Origen* (in his firſt Book of Principles) both the Son and the Creatures to have been from Eternity, but with this difference, he ſuppoſeth the Creatures the Subject-Party, and the Son to be of the Godhead-Party. So of the regial Son of the Kingdom of God we may uſe the Words of the *Alexandrian Cyril* with due Limitation of Senſe. (r) *The Son is God, although the Father is God, and in like manner, the Father being King the Son is alſo King.* The Son of God is God as the regial Son of a King is King. The regial Son of a King is exempted from being one of the Subject-ſervient Party, and that which exempteth him is his regial Sonſhip; ſo that which exempteth the Imperial Son of the Bl. and only Potentate from being one of the Creature-Party, (the Subject-ſervient Party) is his divine imperial Sonſhip. If Non-exiſtence from Eternity, or to be brought into Being from antecedent Non-exiſtence, is inconſiſtent with his imperial Sonſhip, (as it manifeſtly is not) he muſt be ſuppos'd to be generated from Eternity; but nothing can deſtroy his Divinity, (Creature-tranſcendency) of Perſon, but what is deſtructive of his imperial Sonſhip. It is this alone that maketh the difference between God the Son and the Creatures, not Exiſtence from Eternity, not neceſſary Exiſtence in the ſcholaſtic Senſe. And this may be plainly demonſtrated againſt the ſcholaſtic Theology. For this Theology cannot with any Reaſon deny, that the divine imperial Son of God may be one that is generated but in time, nor will it deny that this imperial Son would be ſuch if he was generated from Eternity. Now this imperial Son generated but in time is neceſſarily the ſame Perſon that he would be if he was generated from Eternity, and conſequently he is alike *Deus natus ac genitus*, for this ſame Perſon cannot be ſuppos'd to be *Deus natus ac genitus* and not *Deus natus ac genitus*, but a Creature. If a Perſon that is *natively* of the Subject-ſervient Party,(and therefore but a Creature) is by Idolatry *factively* exempted from being of the Subject-ſervient Party, he is deify'd and made no Creature, but a Creature-tranſcendent; ſo a Perſon may be *natively* of ſuch Nobilitation and Perfection, of ſuch high Original and Quality, as to be totally exempted from being of the Subject ſervient Party; and he that is *natively* ſo exempted is natively no Creature, but a Creature-tranſcendent, *Deus natus ac genitus*.

IX. It is certain that there are ſeveral ſorts and degrees of *neceſſary* and *contingent Exiſtence*, and that one ſort of *contingent Exiſtence* is incompetible to any Creature. It is a wild miſtake in Metaphyſicks therefore thus to diſcriminate God and Creature; *whatever Being is neceſſarily exiſtent* (and therefore undeſtroyable) *is divine Being; but all Being meerly contingent* (dependent upon Will and Pleaſure) *is created Being.* For neither is all neceſſarily exiſtent Being which we can conceive of *divine Being*, nor is all contingent Being *created Being*. Neceſſary Exiſtence is an Attribute which we do not find abſolutely belonging to the Idea of any thing ſave only *a Being abſolutely perfect*; and if this is the Idea of the Son of God, he muſt be *ſelf-originate* and *innaſcible* (or ingenit) which is contradictory to his Sonſhip. The ſcholaſtic Theology therefore doth not attribute to the Son of God this neceſſary Exiſtence which belongeth unto God, and which is divine Being; but only ſuch a neceſſary Exiſtence which is *cauſed* and *derivative* (from a neceſſarily exiſtent Cauſation or Generation) which ſort of neceſſary Exiſtence is competible to a World of Creatures, as the Platoniſts ſuppos'd, (and as we may conceive) and which is oppoſite to that neceſſary Exiſtence which is divine Being. The neceſſary Exiſtence therefore which the Metaphyſicians treat of muſt be diſtinguiſh'd into the *ſelf-originate* and the *cauſed* or *derivative*, and into the independent and dependent.

But neceſſary Exiſtence in general is of far larger Conſideration than the Metaphyſicians Science; for their *neceſſary Exiſtence* may be called *the natural*, to which *the legal* neceſſary Exiſtence muſt be contradiſtinguiſh'd. Their neceſſary Exiſtence may be called *the abſolute*, to which we muſt contradiſtinguiſh *the reſpective* neceſſary Exiſtence, which hath reſpect to well and ill Being or Doing, to Good and Evil, to Life and Love, to Holineſs and Happineſs, to Sin and Miſery. In reſpect of the Holineſs and Happineſs of Souls, and of the Univerſe, the Exiſtence of the Son of God is The *unum neceſſarium*, (the Neceſſary of all Neceſſaries) and this reſpective Neceſſity of his Exiſtence is truly *divine Being*, and a grand Ennoblement of his divine Perſonage; for there is a (reſpective) Neceſſity that he ſhould exiſt, and ſuch a Neceſſity which is tranſcendent to the neceſſary Exiſtence of all Creatures. The Exiſtence of the World of Creatures is at a great rate neceſſary, and ſuppoſing the Goodneſs of God they cannot but exiſt in time; yet becauſe their Exiſtence is not ſo neceſſary as that they muſt always exiſt, (in great degree they admit of a may be and may not be) therefore their Exiſtence muſt be called *the contingent* Exiſtence; but this Contingence is complicated with Neceſſity, and is not ſo a Contingent, but that it is alſo a neceſſary Exiſtence.

That Exiſtence may be neceſſary in one ſenſe which in another ſenſe is contingent, and ſpeaking of neceſſary Exiſtence in the ſame ſenſe, the Exiſtence of a Being may be neceſſary in one degree and not in another. So our Saviour's Exiſtence (which is cauſed and derivative) is not ſo far neceſſary as that he muſt exiſt from Eternity by a neceſſarily exiſtent Generation, yet thus far it is neceſſary, he is exempt from the Creatures Mutableneſs and Defectibleneſs, from Good, and from their Deſtroyableneſs and Annihilableneſs. (s) *As the Father by Nature is holy, the Son by Nature is holy, ſo the Spirit is by Nature holy. In the three Hypoſtaſes we contemplate Sanctity according to Nature*, which is oppos'd to thoſe to whom ἐκ μετουσίας ὑπάρχει ἁγιάζεσθαι, *Sanctification is by Participation.* As Iron plac'd in the Fire is ignite, but doth not ceaſe to be Iron, nor is it all Fire. To them Sanctity is ἐπιγεννηματικὴ καὶ ἔξωθεν προσγεγεννημένη, *adventitious and brought to them from without.* But it is with the Son as St. *Baſil* ſaith of the Holy Spirit, τῷ μὲν φύσις ἡ ἁγιωσύνη, *Sanctity is to him Nature*, and therefore he is not μεταπτώτης φύσεως, *of a Nature that can fall or be changed.* Nor is he ſubject to *Deſtroyableneſs* or *Annihilableneſs* as the Creatures are,

(r) Ἀλλ᾽ ἔστι θεὸς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς, καί τοι τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντος θεοῦ, βασιλέως τε ὄντος ὁμοίως τοῦ πατρὸς, βασιλεύς ἐστι καὶ ὁ υἱός. *Theſaur.* p. 34.

(s) Ὥσπερ φύσει ἅγιος ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ φύσει ἅγιος ὁ υἱὸς, οὕτω φύσει ἅγιον τὸ πνεῦμα. —— ἐν τρισὶ ταῖς ὑποστάσεσιν ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμὸς θεωρεῖται. *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. p.* 83.

are, for he is not of the Subject-ſervient Condition as they, but is thus differenc'd from them, *He cannot but be the Lord* (of ſo unſubject a Condition, and ſo Divine an Eſſence, as that Name importeth;) for this is his *Birth-Nobilitation*, is Divine Being, and cannot but be neceſſary and never-failing Exiſtence to him. It may be conſider'd alſo, that he is of the Godhead-party, in Reality and due Perſonality one with the Father, his own Life *in Divinis*, and one that cannot but be infinitely dear to him, the Heir of his Empire, Sovereignty, Omnipotency, to whom his whole Eſtate belongeth by Merit and Inheritance, the great Owner, Proprietor and Lord of Affairs, and who, *as the Lord*, is (t) ζωὴ κατὰ φύσιν, *Life according to his Nature*, Life infinite and eternal. But although ſuppoſing him to be generated by proper natural Generation, he cannot but be *the Lord*, which is neceſſary Exiſtence, yet his being ſo generated is contingent Exiſtence. Whence it appeareth, that there is a contingent Exiſtence, which is incompetible to any Creature.

But although the Generation of the Son muſt be counted contingent Exiſtence, yet it is not contingent Exiſtence, as the Production of Creatures is, that are of exterior artificial Fabrication, and which are the proper Dependents on Will and Pleaſure, and the Effects thereof. If a Man buildeth an Houſe, it is proper to ſay to him, *By thy Will* (or for thy Pleaſure) this Houſe was erected. But if this Man generateth Children, it is not proper to ſay to him, *By thy Will* (or for thy Pleaſure) theſe Children are produced; becauſe the Procreation of Children (altho' it muſt be called contingent, and they are not generated by holy Men without Underſtanding and virtuous Will) is much of natural Operation, and rather of natural Operation than a Dependent on, and an Effect of Will and Pleaſure. Speaking comparatively, it muſt be ſaid (u) οὐκ ἐκ βουλήσεως, ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς, *Not to be of Will, but Naturally*. So touching the Imperial Son of God (although his Procreation muſt be called contingent, and he was not generated by his Father without Underſtanding and holy virtuous Will) it is not proper to ſay unto God, *By thy Will* (or for thy Pleaſure) *he is and was produced*. But touching the Creatures that are of exterior Fabrication (becauſe they are the proper Dependents on Will and Pleaſure, and the Effects thereof) it is proper to ſay unto God, *By thy Will* (or for thy Pleaſure) *they are and were created*, Apoc. 4. 11.

X. It is certain, that God and Creature are better differenced and diſtinguiſhed by *ſelf-originate* and *cauſed* Exiſtence, than by *neceſſary* and *contingent* Exiſtence. For the Name of a Creature denoteth *a cauſed Exiſtence*, but it doth not denote *a contingent Exiſtence*. A cauſed Exiſtence is eſſential to a Creature, as all Men acknowledge: But all Men do not acknowledge, that a contingent Exiſtence is eſſential to a Creature. All *ſelf-originate* Exiſtence is *neceſſary* Exiſtence, but all (ſuppos'd) neceſſary Exiſtence is not *ſelf-originate*. Upon all which Accounts it is manifeſt, that God and Creature are far better differenced and diſtinguiſhed by *ſelf-originate* and *cauſed* Exiſtence, than by *neceſſary* and *contingent* Exiſtence. If the Objection therefore (which we have under Conſideration) rightly argueth touching *neceſſary* and *contingent* Exiſtence, we may argue in the ſame manner (and with much more Reaſon) touching *ſelf-originate* and *cauſed* Exiſtence. The Objection ſaith, *Whatever Being is neceſſarily exiſtent is Divine Being; but all Being meerly contingent* (dependent upon Will and Pleaſure) *is created Being*. If this be ſound Arguing, then we may argue in this manner; *Whatever Being is ſelf-originate is Divine Being; but all Being meerly cauſed and derivative* (dependent upon another) *is created Being*. But if we thus argue, we deſtroy the Trinity, and the Scholaſtic Theology concerning it; we entirely deſtroy the Exiſtence of the Son of God, unleſs we will ſay with *Calvin*, that he is αὐτόθεος, (God of himſelf) which is a ſelf-contradictious and irreligious Conceit ſoundly confuted (w) both by the *Socinian* Writers,(x) and by the Scholaſtic Divines. The Scholaſtic Attribution of *neceſſary* Exiſtence to the Son of God, is alike incongruous as the Attribution of *ſelf-originate* Exiſtence; it is deſtructive of the Nature and Notion both of Father and Son, of Divine, as well as Human Generation, and indeed of the Nature and Agency of an Intelligent Being (who acteth not meerly by Neceſſity of Nature without Underſtanding and Will;) nor is neceſſary Exiſtence of any Affinity with the Contemplation of a Son, or of any derivative and cauſed Being, to whom it cannot appertain. The Honour proper to a Son is not neceſſary Exiſtence, but his εὐγένεια, or *Birth-Nobilitation*. If Chriſt Jeſus is natively the Imperial Son of God, whether the Scholaſtic neceſſary Exiſtence belongeth to him or not, *He is natively and neceſſarily the Lord the Son*.

XI. A late and recent Original of the Son of God, is ſuppoſed to introduce a *new God*; which is an Objection, that ariſeth meerly from an Equivocation of Words. For a *new God*, in the Criminal Senſe, is *Another God, and a new Eſtate of the Deity*. Such a new God, (which is another God than the one true eternal God) the Scripture criminateth and condemneth, *Deut.* 32. 17. *Judg.* 5. 8. and the Firſt Commandment forbiddeth, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me*. Such a new God, which is *another God, and a new Eſtate of the Deity*, Chriſtianity pretendeth not to introduce; but all Chriſtians ſay, *There is a new Lord, and a new Law*; and ſo far, and in ſuch Senſe only their Religion introduceth a *new God*. That it introduceth a *new Lord* (the Son) no Man can doubt, that readeth the New Teſtament, and the Hiſtory of Chriſt: For he became the Son of God, or *the Lord the Son*, by his Generation and Nativity in *Judea*, by his Meſſias-ſhip, by his Reſurrection and conſequent Exaltation (when he was made both Lord and King) all which are new and recent Things. He is therefore a new and recent (Imperial) *Son of God*, and conſequently a *new and recent Lord the Son*, and in ſuch Senſe a *new and recent God the Son*. If we have a new and recent Imperial Son of God (a new and recent Meſſiah;) if we have a new Sovereign Lord of all, who is the Son, we have neceſſarily a *new and recent God the Son*, as that Name is the ſame with a *new and recent Lord the Son*. Either our Saviour's Ἀποθέωσις, and all the Scriptural Deſcriptions of his Exaltation to the Throne of God, and the Divine Sovereignty ſignifie nothing, or they import thus much That we have a new and recent *God the Son*. It is the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus as ſuch, which is the Second Perſon of our Trinity, which is God the Son; and therefore we have a new recent God the Son; and ſuch is the Filial Imperial Eſtate of the new Kingdom of God. Theſe things being infinitely plain and certain, 'tis much that

Pla-

(t) *S. Cyr. Theſaur. Par.* 1. p. 108.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 57.

(w) *Crell. de uno Deo*, *l.* 1. *S.* 2. c. 2.

(x) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. c. 11.

Placilla the Empreſs ſhould be taught without any Diſtinction or Limitation of Senſe, *That there is no new or recent God*; that the Catholicks ſhould think it their Honour to profeſs rudely, and without making any Diſtinction or Limitation of Senſe, *We do not worſhip any new or recent God* (which may ſignifie, that they deny'd the Religion of Chriſtianity;) and that ſuch a Man as St. *Baſil*, without diſtinguiſhing at all the Ambiguity of Words, and limiting their Senſe, ſhould thus raſhly and crudely object againſt *Eunomius*, *We are not commanded to receive any recent God.* So *Gr. Nyſſen* argueth, (*y*) *God commandeth us by the Prophet*, μηδ᾽ἕνα πρόσφατον θεὸν, θεὸν εἶναι νομίζειν, μηδὲ προσκυνεῖν ἀλλοτρίῳ θεῷ, *that we ſhould not ſuppoſe any new God, to be God, nor worſhip any ſtrange God. But it is manifeſt, that is new and recent, which is not from Eternity; as on the contrary, that is called eternal, which is not recent. He therefore that doth not acknowledge*, τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν, *The Unigenit God, to be of the Father from Eternity, doth not deny him to be new and recent; for what is not eternal is certainly recent, and whatever is recent, is not God, as the Scripture ſaith*, ὅτι οὐκ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ θεὸς πρόσφατος, *There ſhall be in thee no new or recent God. Therefore he that ſaith*, Erat quando non erat, *denieth his Deity.* At this rate theſe Fathers miſname their Saviour, ſtyling him, *The Unigenit God*, whom the Scripture calleth, *The only begotten Son of God.* At this rate they confound Things that differ, *God and the Son of God.* At this rate they miſinterpret Scripture, applying what it ſaith of ſuch *a new God, which is another God, and a new Eſtate of the Deity*, to a new and recent Son of God. At this rate they deceive themſelves by the Ambiguity of Words, not diſtinguiſhing between *a new God the Son*, and a new God in another Senſe and Acceptation. At this rate they prove the eternal Generation of our Saviour, *without it he muſt be ſuppos'd a new and recent God.* But there is nothing of force in theſe Argumentations; for without exiſting from Eternity, our Saviour may be God in one Senſe (as a Perſon of the Godhead) though not in another. Chriſt ought to be conſider'd as the Imperial Son of the Imperial Eſtate of God, his Nativity ought to be conſider'd as Analogical to that of an Earthly Prince, whom all Men conſider as *a new and recent Lord of all.* So the Scripture repreſenteth our Saviour, and accordingly we ought to honour him; for he is our Lord and our God (the Son) as he is the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, *not as he is an Abſtract Son of God of eternal Generation.* Which is an Hypotheſis that doth not at all vindicate the Honour of our Religion from the Reproaches of Infidels; for whether our Saviour was generated from Eternity or not, we muſt acknowledge him τὸν ἐναγχός γε φανέντα, *him that hath lately appeared* (as *Celſus* calleth him;) and to ſay with *Origen*, *We do not worſhip a new God, that was not a God before, nor known unto Men*, is not ſo much to vindicate the Honour of our Religion, as to falſifie it. For the Son of God is not made known by the Creation, natural Light diſcovereth nothing of him, or of his Religion, nor can it be ſhew'd, that he had any Imperial Government, or was worſhipped in the Old Teſtament-times, (*z*) as the ancient Writers pretend. The true Son of God is not made known, but by the new and recent Religion of Chriſtianity. To the World he always was, and always will be what *Licinius* ſtyled him, (*a*) *Deus peregrinus*, (which I will tranſlate *a new and recent God*;) and ſo an (*b*) *Hebrew* Doctor ſtyleth him. As for *Origen*'s Platonic *Eſſence of Truth*, it is not the Son of God, nor do Chriſtians underſtand or worſhip it, nor was it in ancient times known unto Men, ſave only to Platonic Metaphyſicians, who ſuppoſed it's eternal Generation, (*c*) and from whoſe School St. *Auſtin* learned the eternal Generation, which a Divine of our own boldly aſſerteth, to be the only Generation of the Son of God.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *ſ.* 6.

(z) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 134.

(a) *Baron. ad an.* 317 *n.* 5.

(b) *Jacchiad. in Dan. p.* 247.

(c) *Curcell. p.* 823.

XII. For in a Book newly publiſh'd (written in an high Strain of Scholaſticiſm) this is the Title of a Chapter (*d*) *Chriſt is called the Son of God only on account of his eternal Generation.* Which ſheweth, that the imaginary eternal Generation hath deſtroy'd the true Scriptural Generation of the Son of God, the Generation of an imaginary Abſtract Son, hath deſtroy'd the Generation of the True Son; the Scholaſtic Divines find themſelves neceſſitated to deny either his eternal or temporal Generation; and which of theſe is the better Choice, is not hard to determine. For what is there in this eternal Generation, that ſhould make us fond of it? Is it at all conceivable or intelligible, rational or religious towards God, a wiſe and learned, or an unlearned Conceit? How much of Learning there is in this Scholaſtic Theology, appeareth from this learned Divine's uſual Expreſſions. (*e*) *It doth not become ſuch ignorant Creatures as we are, to concern our ſelves about Philoſophical Myſteries, eſpecially the Myſteries of the Divine Nature, when every thing is a Myſtery to us.* (*f*) *How an infinite Being filleth all Places with his Preſence, or how this Being which filleth all Places, can be ſaid locally to aſcend or deſcend, and to confine his Preſence to any one Place, or how an infinite Being can perſonally unite a finite Creature to himſelf, ſo as to be perfect God and perfect Man in one Perſon; theſe are all great Myſteries to me.* (*g*) *What a Perſonal Union is, for my part I cannot tell.* (*h*) *I freely acknowledge, that I underſtand nothing of the Philoſophy of the Incarnation.* At this rate we are Proficients in the Knowledge of Chriſt, at this rate we promote Learning and Theology. The true Chriſt *is made unto us of God Wiſdom*, in his Religion are *all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledge*: But the Scholaſtic Theology hath made Chriſt (including Tranſubſtantiation) an unintelligible Riddle beyond all Parallel; it hath bereft us of our Underſtanding, intricated, perplex'd, diſorder'd, diſgraced our Religion, turn'd it into a profane Scholaſtic Myſtery, and introduced an *Egyptian* Darkneſs upon the main Articles thereof. For is there any thing more unintelligible, than *Three diſtinct Perſons* (in Divinis) *without any proper Nature, to conſtitute them diſtinct Perſons? Their real Diſtinction from one another, and their Identity with the Eſſence? Individual Perſons, conſtituted ſuch by thoſe Modalities, that are neceſſarily conſequent upon their being Individual Perſons? A Perſon conſtituted ſuch by his Paternity, a Father in order of Nature antecedently to his being a Perſon? Two eternal Perſons in the Godhead, conſtituted ſuch by their Relation, who yet muſt be Perſons antecedently to their Relation? A Son that is eſſential to the Godhead, and yet is generated by the Godhead? A Son produced by Wiſdom, and by Will, and yet by natural Neceſſity and from Eternity? A Son whoſe Generation is the Father's Doing* (in the Senſe of Law and Morality) *and yet is a natural and neceſſary Emanation from the Father? A Son of God, that is not a Saint of God? A Son that is generated the Heir of a Kingdom, and yet is at firſt and immediately generated into the*

(d) *Scripture-Proofs of our Saviour's Divinity, by* Dr. Sherlock, *ch.* 5.

(e) P. 184.

(f) P. 229.

(g) P. 255.

(h) P. 251.

actual plenary Poſſeſſion of it? A Son of proper natural Generation, yet generated meerly by thinking? A Son that is but a Notion, yet is generated of the Subſtance of the Father? A Son that can be no more than the Son, yet is no leſs than the Father and the Son together? A Son who as God, is the Son of God, and yet his Father is not his God, as he is God? A Mediator and a Prieſt that is the Object of his own Mediation and Prieſthood? And a Son that is his own both Father and Son? Such is the Son of this eternal Generation; which is a Principle altogether Unſcriptural and Anti-ſcriptural (as being unpopular and unholy, oppoſite to the Character of the holy Scriptures) extremely injurious to God, and to the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus (our only Saviour) which involveth in it all the Evils of the Scholaſtic Theology, hath been in great degreee the Origin of the Evils which the Chriſtian Religion in ancient and modern times hath ſuffer'd, and which will eternally obſtruct the Propagation of of it, and the Peace of the Chriſtian Church. Yet with this Learned Divine, this Generation is the grand Fundamental of Faith and Salvation, and ſo darling a Principle, that he oppoſeth the Senſe of other learned Scholaſtic Divines, and will not admit, that Chriſt is called, *The Son of God, on any other account but only his eternal Generation.* Our Saviour therefore, his Evangeliſts and Apoſtles uſing this Name, *The Son of God*, muſt intend, to teach us and the *Jews* the eternal Generation. But how is it then, that throughout the New Teſtament not the leaſt mention is made of ſuch a Thing? That Three Evangeliſts are obſerved to have been ignorant of it, and the Fourth ſaith as little of it as they? And how is it that this Name, *The Son of God*, is throughout the Bible never apply'd to an Abſtract Son (to whom, according to this Scholaſtic Hypotheſis, it primarily belongeth?) That throughout the New Teſtament it is only apply'd to the complex Perſon of the Meſſiah; ſo that all Learned Men have obſerv'd, that *The Son of God* and the *Meſſiah* are terms convertible? Thoſe Evangeliſts, that are obſerv'd to be ignorant of the eternal Generation, call Chriſt, *The Son of God*, ſo did his Diſciples in the time of their Rudeneſs and Ignorance, ſo did the People upon his ceaſing the Wind, ſo did the Centurion, ſo did the unclean Spirit; and our Saviour himſelf conjoineth theſe Names, *His God, and his Father:* But God cannot be his God, as he is of the Eternal Generation; therefore he doth not upon that account call him Father, but counteth himſelf the Son of God on ſome other account than the Eternal Generation. No, ſaith this Divine, He is not ſo called, either upon account of his *miraculous Conception*, or *his Advancement into his Kingdom* (his Meſſias-ſhip) or *his Reſurrection.*

(1.) Not becauſe of his miraculous Conception; for the Angel's Meſſage to the Bleſſed Virgin, *Luke* 1. 35. ſignifieth, That ſhe ſhould conceive by a Divine Power, becauſe one that is the Son of God is to be born of her; not that therefore the Child which ſhould be born of her ſhould be called, The Son of God, becauſe ſhe ſhould conceive by a Divine Power. But that this Interpretation is a groſs Diſtortion of the Sacred Text is manifeſt from this Argument. The Bleſſed Virgin's Conception was certainly a Generation (for ſhe was overſhadow'd, impregnated, begot with Child, and conceiv'd in her Womb.) In this Generation God was the Father, (for it was he that overſhadow'd, impregnated, begot her with Child;) therefore the Child begotten in this Generation, was, as ſuch, The Child of this Father, *The Child and Son of God.* This the Words of the Angel ſignifie (for they are deſign'd to ſignifie the Nature of this Generation;) they do not ſay, *Thou ſhalt conceive by Divine Power, becauſe one that is great, that is holy, that is the Son of God and the Son of the Higheſt is to be born of thee:* But they ſay (ſpeaking *de futuro*) *Thou ſhalt conceive by Divine Power a Son, that ſhall be great, ſhall be called, The Son of the Higheſt, ſhall poſſeſs the Throne of* David, *The holy Thing that ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called, The Son of God*, Luk. 1. 32. 35. (*i*) It is objected, that *Chriſt often calleth himſelf, The Son of God, and ſpeaketh of God as his Father, but never mentioneth his miraculous Birth* (as if he did mention his eternal Generation) *which was a great Secret in thoſe Days* (as if it was a greater Secret than the eternal Generation:) But this Objection is therefore a trifling Argumentation, becauſe our Saviour's miraculous Conception and Birth is ſufficiently proved, to be a Cauſe and Reaſon of his Sonſhip, from the plain and copious Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts, wherein the eternal Generation maketh not the leaſt Appearance. (*k*) It is further objected, that our Saviour, with reſpect to his Birth, is ſo far from calling himſelf the Son of God, that he always calleth himſelf, *The Son of Man.* But this Objection is one of the Miſtakes of the Scholaſtic Theology (which perverteth almoſt every thing;) for our Saviour calleth himſelf the Son of Man with reſpect to his State of voluntary Humiliation, which (as alſo his coming down from Heaven) will be hereafter diſcourſed of. This Author hath another Objection, but it is only againſt his Brethren, thoſe Scholaſtic Divines, who ſuppoſe our Saviour to be called, The Son of God, not only upon account of his eternal Generation, but alſo upon account of his miraculous Conception. (*l*) Theſe he Hereticateth (in ſome ſort) as ſymbolizing with the ancient Scholaſtic Hereſie of *Neſtorius.* Such hath been the bleſſed Fruit of the Scholaſtic Theology, it hath occaſion'd a Shole of ancient and modern Scholaſtic Hereſies (with the horrible Evils that accompany them) touching the Perſon of Chriſt; it hath made the Faith of a Chriſtian a matter of extreme Subtilty and Scholaſticiſm; a meer honeſt-minded Chriſtian, not Technologically furniſh'd, cannot avoid the Crime of Hereſie (for the Scholaſtic Theology will be called the Catholick Faith:) No Man can be an Intelligent and Orthodox Believer, but a Sophiſt, and one that hath been train'd up in the Schools. But if thoſe Scholaſtic Divines muſt be Hereticks, that differ from our Author in their Account of our Saviour's Sonſhip, they may rejoyce in having good Company. (*m*) *The Dort-Interpreters thus expound* Luk. 1. 35. *It is not here ſaid, that Chriſt ſhould be the Son of God, becauſe conceived by the Holy Ghoſt; for ſo he ſhould be the Son of the Holy Ghoſt. But becauſe his Conception by the Holy Ghoſt is a Demonſtration, that the eternal Son of God aſſumed true human Nature of the Fleſh and Blood of* Mary *by the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt,*

(i) *P.* 15

170.

(k) *P.* 170.

(l) *P.* 15

(m) *Dordraceni Interpretes ſic exponunt.* Luc. 1. 35. *Hic non dicitur, Chriſtum Dei Filium fore, quia ex Spiritu S. conceptus eſt; quia ſic eſſet Filius Spiritus S. Sed quia conceptio ex Spiritu S. certa Demonſtratio eſt, quod æternus Dei Filius veram humanam naturam ex carne & ſanguine Mariæ, per operationem Spiritus S. in unitatem ſuæ perſonæ aſſumpſit. Sed contra.* Rodolphus *Gualterus, Hieronymus Zanchius, Joannes Maldonatus in Apologia Confeſſionis Remonſtrantium citate, aliique, exiſtimant hic dici Jeſum fore Dei Filium, quia ex*

into

Spiritu S. conceptus eſt, & alterum novorum iſtorum interpretum conſequentiam ignorant. Curcell. Diſſ. de voc. Trin. n. 24.

into the Unity of his Perſon. But on the contrary, Gualter, Zanchy, Maldonate, cited in the Apology of the Remonſtrants Confeſſion, and others alſo, are of opinion, that it is here ſaid, that Jeſus ſhall be the Son of God, becauſe conceiv'd by the Holy Ghoſt, and they underſtand not the imaginary Conſequence of thoſe new Interpreters. But if according to the Scripture and theſe Interpreters our Saviour is called The Son of God becauſe of his miraculous Conception, the ſcholaſtic eternal Generation muſt be out of Doors. For thus far our Author according to that Principle rightly reaſoneth. (*n*) *Son is the Name of a Perſon; and though there are two Natures in Chriſt, he is but one Perſon, and the eternal Word is that Perſon, and therefore that Son of God, who was born of the Virgin. To ſay, that the human Nature of Chriſt, which was miraculouſly formed in the Womb of the Virgin, is upon account of that miraculous Conception called The Son of God, is to make a Perſon of it, and to divide Chriſt into two Perſons, which is Neſtorianiſm. And to ſay, that the eternal Word and Son of God which was made Fleſh and was incarnate in the Womb of the Virgin, ~~is~~ therefore called The Son of God, is to ſay, that the eternal Son of God is therefore called The Son of God, becauſe he was made Man.*

(n) P. 168.

(2.) *Another Pretence* (as our Author calleth it) *for Chriſt's being called The Son of God without any reſpect to his eternal Generation, is that high Dignity and Authority God beſtowed on him, that he ſhould be the King of Iſrael, which they ſay is that account which Chriſt himſelf giveth*, Joh. 10. 34, 35, 36. *Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid, ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: ſay ye of him, whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt; becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* To this illuſtrious and uncontrollable Text our learned Author's Anſwer is *a ſelf-confutation*, a Contradiction to the Tenour of the Scriptures, the Senſe of all learned Men, and the plaineſt Truth in the World. *It is manifeſt* (ſaith he) *our Saviour doth not in this Anſwer to the Jews give the Reaſon why he calleth himſelf the Son of God, but why he is not guilty of Blaſphemy in calling himſelf the Son of God; for this was his Accuſation, and to this he anſwereth, and theſe are two very different things.* But they muſt ſee double that can ſee theſe to be two very different things. For if our Saviour ſaith, *It is not Blaſphemy for him to be called the Son of God*, this muſt be his meaning, *that he may be juſtly and uncriminally called the Son of God.* And this he proveth *à majore*; for if the Men of Dignity and Authority amongſt the Jews are in Scripture called Gods (or Sons of God) then he might juſtly be called *The* (imperial) *Son of God*, whom God had ſelected and conſecrated to another-kins Dignity and Authority than they, *viz. The Meſſias-ſhip*, which importeth *divine imperial Sonſhip unto God.* For according to the Tenour of the Scriptures Regality is Sonſhip unto God, *Pſal.* 89. 26, 27. *He ſhall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, Alſo I will make him my firſt-born, higher than the Kings of the Earth.* To which other places are agreeable, *Pſal.* 2. 7, 12. *Heb.* 1. 5, 9. 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. 1 *Chron.* 22. 10. If Regality is Sonſhip unto God, (who is the great King) then to be actually *Meſſiah the King*, (the divine King) is to be politically and by his Place *The divine regial Son of God.* Which is a Demonſtration that theſe two Names *Meſſiah* and *The Son of God* are in ſenſe the ſame; that our Saviour is called The Son of God (not with reſpect to the Eternal Generation, but) as being the Meſſiah; that this is the meaning of our Saviour's Diſcourſe with the Jews, and the account which himſelf giveth of his being the Son of God, *Joh.* 10. 34, 35, 36. This is further demonſtrable from *Heb.* 1. 5. *I will be to him a Father, and he ſhall be to me a Son.* For this Text ſpeaketh wholly *de futuro*, and can have no reſpect to the Eternal Generation, (that muſt be paſt more than Millions of Ages) which therefore demonſtrateth that Chriſt is in this place called *The Son*, not as being The Eternal Son, but as being (The Meſſiah) The regial or imperial Son. The Meſſiah and *the King of Iſrael*, (or the King of the Jews) are the ſame Name, all learned Men in the Scriptures have obſerv'd it, and underſtood the ſenſe of it; but our learned Author ſeeth not what is written in his Bible in Capital Letters; for thus he diſcourſeth. (*o*) *Some conclude, that to be the Son of God ſignifieth no more than to be the Chriſt, the Meſſias, the King of Iſrael. But the true Reaſon of this is on the other ſide, that the Chriſt and the King of Iſrael is the Son of God. For the Kingdom of Iſrael was a Theocracy, God himſelf was their King, and therefore the true Meſſias, the true King of Iſrael muſt be the Son of God, becauſe it is the Kingdom of God, which he always adminiſtred by his own eternal Word and eternal Son. Chriſt is not called the Son of God becauſe he is the King of Iſrael, but is therefore the King of Iſrael becauſe he is the Son of God.* To ſuppoſe that the Literal and Carnal Iſrael was *the Kingdom of God*, which is a Polity, and ſuch an one which is contrary to the Carnal Iſrael, is a great Miſtake; nor is *this Name*, as it ſignifieth a Polity, or the Kingdom of Heaven, or the Kingdom of the Meſſiah, to be found in all the Old Teſtament, as the Fathers have obſerv'd. To ſuppoſe therefore that God adminiſtred the Kingdom of Old Iſrael by his own eternal Word and Son, is not better than *pure Romance*; nor is there any Memoir of his Government, Worſhip, or Exiſtence, in all the Times of the Old Teſtament, or in any genuin Memoir of Judaiſm: Nor is the Suppoſition of his Legiſlation and Government in thoſe Times reconcileable with the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. and 2. 2, 3. But whatever the Holy Writers may ſay, we ſeem reſolved to go on in the beaten Track, which we do with great Steddineſs, ſave only when it happeneth to be the right way, for then we are apt to turn aſide into by-Paths, as this Author doth. Who conſidereth God as King of the Literal and Carnal Iſrael, and argueth, that for this Cauſe and Reaſon the Meſſias, *the true King of Iſrael*, muſt be the Son of God. But no other Man would have conſidered the Meſſias as *the true King of Iſrael*, (as *Saul* or *Solomon* was) but as *the King of the Spiritual and true Iſrael*; nor becauſe God was the King of the Carnal Iſrael can this be the Cauſe and Reaſon why the King of the Spiritual Iſrael muſt be the Son of God. For what an Argumentation is this, *à baculo ad angulum*, Chriſt the King of the Spiritual Iſrael muſt be the Son of God, becauſe God is King of the Carnal Iſrael, who are (falſly called) his Kingdom? But this is true Reaſoning; The true Kingdom of God is the Holy Empire, (typify'd by the Carnal Iſrael) of this the Meſſiah as ſuch is the King, and therefore is the Imperial Son of God; ſo that to be the Meſſiah and to be the Imperial Son of God is the ſame thing. Who ſeeth not this the plaineſt Truth in the World? Chriſt therefore is called the Son of God becauſe he is the King of Iſrael, as the Learned have ſuppos'd.

(o) P. 177, 178.

(3.) *Another account of Chriſt's being called the Son of God without any reſpect to his eternal Generation, is his Reſurrection from the Dead*, Act. 13. 32, 33. *We declare unto you glad Tydings, how that the Promiſe made unto the Fathers God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us their Children, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again; as it is alſo written in the ſecond Pſalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* To this illuſtrious Text, (which is as bright as the Day) our Scholaſtic Divine maketh a threefold feeble Anſwer, in which there is a marvellous want of good Underſtanding in Matters of Theology, but no want of Affection to the *good old Cauſe* of the Scholaſtic Theology. His firſt Anſwer is ſome little Exceptions put in againſt this plain Evidence, that *this day have I begotten thee*, relateth to the Reſurrection. He ſaith, *it is not plain to him, that this day ſignifieth the day of the Reſurrection*, (ſome cannot ſee, that *this day* ſignifieth *this day*; as in our Saviour's Diſcourſe concerning his ſeeing *Abraham* Scholaſtic Divines cannot ſee, that *his day* ſignifieth *his day*) *there is no Intimation of the Reſurrection in this ſecond Pſalm*, (yet this Text is in it and this other, I have ſet my King upon my holy Hill of Zion) *the Author to the Hebrews applieth this very Text to the Prieſthood of Chriſt, ſo that God as much begot him when he made him a Prieſt as when he raiſed him from the Dead.* What a marvellous Inſtance is this of a want of good Underſtanding, not to know that Chriſt's Reſurrection is the ſame thing with his being raiſed to his Heavenly Sacerdotal Dignity? The *ſecond* Anſwer which our Author maketh, is an Endeavour to diſtort the Text to a contrary Senſe. For he ſaith, *This day have I begotten thee doth not ſignify any Temporal Act, but an Eternal Generation.* But how ſhall this ſtrange Interpretation be proved true? He ſaith, *It is very plain from that Preference the Apoſtle giveth to Chriſt above Angels for this very Reaſon*, Heb. 1. 5. *Unto which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? for if we expound this of the Reſurrection of the Dead, what Preference did this give him above Angels?* This learned Author doth not read the Scriptures with ſuch Eyes as other Men do. He readeth *the Eternal Generation* where we read *the Reſurrection.* And we rightly read ſo, for is there any thing more plain, than that the Apoſtle in this place to the Hebrews ſpeaketh of our Saviour's *Imperial Sonſhip plenarily ſuch*, and his being raiſ'd thereto, which was his Generation? But our Author beſides the Apoſtle citeth the Catholick Fathers for his interpreting σήμερον, *(this day)* of the Eternal Generation; and this he ought not to have omitted, if he deſigneth to make thoſe Ancients our Standard, and to allow us no Improvements in Theology, but only to bear him Company in ſinging over again the old nonſenſical Cant of *hodiè æternitatis.* But at length (in the third place) he is content to ſuppoſe (p) *that this day have I begotten thee referreth to the Reſurrection:* but then he ſaith, *It is certain this did not make him the Son of God, for he owneth himſelf the Son of God before he died and roſe again.* Which Argumentation ſpeaketh a marvellous want of underſtanding our Saviour's Sonſhip, which is *an Imperial-perſonal Sonſhip*, the Perfection whereof he was to arrive at gradually, whence we often read in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* of his *being made perfect.* Our Author argueth alſo, that God's raiſing Chriſt could not be the *begetting* him, nor the Reaſon of his being called his Son, becauſe his Reſurrection is in certain Sayings of our Saviour attributed to himſelf. But of thoſe Sayings of our Saviour an account is given in our foregoing Diſcourſes, and of this Saying of St. *Paul* alſo, *Rom.* 1. 4. *who was declared to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* This and thoſe other Texts that we have vindicated from Corruption, (with others of like nature) are an illuſtrious Conſtellation of Scriptures, that bear a refulgent Teſtimony againſt *the Scholaſtic Eternal Generation.* (q) *For an Eternal Son needeth nothing more to make him a Son.*

(p) P. 161.

(q) Ibid. p. 172.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Of the prime Article of the Myſtery of Godlineſs, of which the Deity of our Lord is a part.* 2. *The Article of the Incarnation is another part of it.* 3. *Some places of Scripture illuſtrated that concern it.* 4. *Of the Word made Fleſh.* 5. *Of the Scholaſtick and the Chriſtian Trinitarians agreement touching this Article.* Sect. 1. *Their Firſt Diſagreement touching this Article, with a certain Rule of fixing and determining the Senſe of the New Teſtament.* Sect. 2. *Their Second Diſagreement. The Incarnation conjoin'd with the manifeſtation of our Saviour.* Sect. 3. *The Third Diſagreement touching a Binary of Generations.* Sect. 4. *The Fourth Diſagreement. The Scholaſtic Incarnation more than an Incarnation.* Sect. 5. *The Fifth Diſagreement. The Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation compar'd.* Sect. 6. *The Sixth Diſagreement. Scholaſtic Objections againſt the Scholaſtic Incarnation.* Sect. 7. *The Seventh Diſagreement. Of* Suppoſitum *and* Perſona. Sect. 8. *The Eighth Diſagreement. Of the hurt done to Religion by the Scholaſtic Incarnation.* Sect. 9. *The Ninth Diſagreement. Of Scholaſtic Abſurdities.*

I. OF the Chriſtian Religion which we have conſider'd and celebrated as *The great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, this is the prime Article *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*. (1 Tim. 3. 16.) Of which great Article there are three Branches (expreſs'd or involv'd in the Words of it) *the Deity of our Lord's Perſon, his Incarnation and the manner or kind of it*. For in this and the following Articles of the Myſtery of Godlineſs the Apoſtle's deſign manifeſtly is, to repreſent the Chriſtian Religion as great, magnificent and myſterious (accordingly he ſtileth it the great Myſtery of Godlineſs) and ſo the *Socinian* Interpreters obſerve, that his Diſcourſe is deſign'd, to conciliate Authority to the Chriſtian Doctrine and for the commendation of it. And what can make the Chriſtian Religion ſo great, magnificent and myſterious, as to ſtile it a marvellous *Theophania*, and to repreſent the Author of it as *God manifeſt in the Fleſh*? But in the *Socinians* Interpretation of this illuſtrious Text there is nothing great, magnificent and myſterious; for they ſuppoſe, that this is the whole ſenſe of it, that the Chriſtian Doctrine was manifeſted by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, infirm and abject Men in worldy Reſpects, and therefore called *Fleſh*. This is one of their Interpretations, wherein they ſhut the Name of God out of the Text: But they are content to follow the common reading, and to admit the Name of God into the Text; but ſo reading it, they interpret the Name of God, to ſignifie, not Chriſt, but God (the Father) who is ſaid to be manifeſted in the Fleſh (as they ſuppoſe) becauſe his myſterious Will was revealed by (infirm and mean Men in worldly Reſpects) Chriſt and his Apoſtles. This their ſecond Interpretation is in Senſe the ſame with the former, and is alike devoid of good Senſe. For is it tolerable good Senſe, to ſay, that the Goſpel or God was manifeſted in the Fleſh, becauſe the Goſpel or the Will and Counſel of God was revealed by infirm Men? No Author ſpeaketh at this rate; much leſs may we ſuppoſe *S. Paul* ſo to ſpeak, who throughout his Epiſtles upon all Occaſions diſplayeth Chriſt's Glory and Magnificence at the moſt ſuperlative rate. Therefore by *God manifeſt in the Fleſh* he muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean him that is *God-man* (connoting his Religion) and by the great Myſtery of Godlineſs he muſt be ſuppos'd to mean τὸ χριστȣ̃ μυστήριον, *the Myſtery of Chriſt*. The following Articles of the Myſtery of Godlineſs plainly determine the Apoſtle's Senſe, and demonſtrate, that he ſpeaketh of the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus *as manifeſt in the Fleſh*. For who is it, that *was juſtified* (proved to be no Impoſtor) *by the Spirit, that was ſeen of Angels* (and ador'd by them) *that was preach'd unto the Gentiles and believ'd on in the World*, but Chriſt Jeſus? And as Ἀνάληψις τȣ̃ Μωσέως, ſignifieth *the Aſſumption of* Moſes, ſo ἀναλήφθη ἐν δόξῃ, what can it ſignifie but our Saviour's glorious Aſſumption? The Words cannot ſignifie the Exaltation of the Goſpel (or the making it famous) and therefore it is a vanity, to argue from the Order of them, that they do ſo ſignifie. It is much more reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtle in recounting theſe Articles of the Myſtery of Godlineſs intended, to connex our Saviour's wonderful Entertainment in this and the other World. And ſo the Senſe of them is, that he had a wonderful Reception in this World as well as a marvellous glorious Aſſumption in the other. And being thus fairly expounded the Apoſtle's Words have nothing diſorderly in them; nothing that claſheth with the common reading, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, nothing but what proveth, that this is the true reading. Which further appeareth from the conſent of all thoſe ancient Greek Copies that the Greek Fathers uſed, and from the conſent af all Greek Copies, as *Beza* affirmeth. So great a demonſtration of the Truth of the common reading cannot reaſonably be ſhaken by the Allegation of a Paſſage in the Council of *Nice*, or a Story of *Liberatus* the Deacon touching *Macedonius* (that he was depos'd for corrupting this place) nor by an Allegation of *the vulgar Latin*, the *Syriac*, *Arabic*, *S. Ambroſe*, a *Clermont* Copy and a Paſſage in *Hincmarus* touching a *Neſtorian*'s putting Θεὸς into the Text. As if the *Neſtorians* would corrupt the Text to their own Prejudice, or could corrupt the Copies which the Greek Fathers us'd before the times of *Neſtorianiſm*. The *Clermont* Copy (from ſeveral conſiderations) appeareth, to be of little regard. The *Arabic* hath been thought to leave out the Name God, but that is a miſtake. The vulgar *Latin* and the *Syriac* that leave out the word *God*, were anciently thought, not to leave it out in Senſe; for they were underſtood, to ſpeak of our Saviour's Incarnation. *Sacramentum myſterii Dei, quod eſt Chriſtus in carne*, ſaith *S. Ambroſe*. So (*r*) *S. Jerom* (*s*) *Leo* (*t*) *S. Hilary* (*u*) *Fulgentius* underſtand the vulgar Latin, to ſpeak of our Saviour's Incarnation. *Great is the Myſtery of Truth, that he appeared in Humane Fleſh*, ſaith the *Æthiopick*, which leaveth out the Name God, but not to the prejudice of our Saviour's

(r) *In loc.*
(s) *Ep.*29. *ad Fl.*
(t) *De Trin. l.*11.
(u) *Ad Thra. c.*

(3.) *Another account of Chriſt's being called the Son of God without any reſpect to his eternal Generation, is his Reſurrection from the Dead*, Act. 13. 32, 33. *We declare unto you glad Tydings, how that the Promiſe made unto the Fathers God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us their Children, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again; as it is alſo written in the ſecond Pſalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* To this illuſtrious Text, (which is as bright as the Day) our Scholaſtic Divine maketh a threefold feeble Anſwer, in which there is a marvellous want of good Underſtanding in Matters of Theology, but no want of Affection to the *good old Cauſe* of the Scholaſtic Theology. His firſt Anſwer is ſome little Exceptions put in againſt this plain Evidence, that *this day have I begotten thee*, relateth to the Reſurrection. He ſaith, *it is not plain to him, that this day ſignifieth the day of the Reſurrection*, (ſome cannot ſee, that *this day* ſignifieth *this day*; as in our Saviour's Diſcourſe concerning his ſeeing *Abraham* Scholaſtic Divines cannot ſee, that *his day* ſignifieth *his day*) *there is no Intimation of the Reſurrection in this ſecond Pſalm*, (yet this Text is in it and this other, I have ſet my King upon my holy Hill of Zion) *the Author to the Hebrews applieth this very Text to the Prieſthood of Chriſt, ſo that God as much begot him when he made him a Prieſt as when he raiſed him from the Dead.* What a marvellous Inſtance is this of a want of good Underſtanding, not to know that Chriſt's Reſurrection is the ſame thing with his being raiſed to his Heavenly Sacerdotal Dignity? The *ſecond* Anſwer which our Author maketh, is an Endeavour to diſtort the Text to a contrary Senſe. For he ſaith, *This day have I begotten thee doth not ſignify any Temporal Act, but an Eternal Generation.* But how ſhall this ſtrange Interpretation be proved true? He ſaith, *It is very plain from that Preference the Apoſtle giveth to Chriſt above Angels for this very Reaſon*, Heb. 1. 5. *Unto which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? for if we expound this of the Reſurrection of the Dead, what Preference did this give him above Angels?* This learned Author doth not read the Scriptures with ſuch Eyes as other Men do. He readeth *the Eternal Generation* where we read *the Reſurrection*. And we rightly read ſo, for is there any thing more plain, than that the Apoſtle in this place to the Hebrews ſpeaketh of our Saviour's *Imperial Sonſhip plenarily ſuch*, and his being rais'd thereto, which was his Generation? But our Author beſides the Apoſtle citeth the Catholick Fathers for his interpreting σήμερον, *(this day)* of the Eternal Generation; and this he ought not to have omitted, if he deſigneth to make thoſe Ancients our Standard, and to allow us no Improvements in Theology, but only to bear him Company in ſinging over again the old nonſenſical Cant of *hodiè æternitatis*. But at length (in the third place) he is content to ſuppoſe (*p*) *that this day have I begotten thee referreth to the Reſurrection:* but then he ſaith, *It is certain this did not make him the Son of God, for he owneth himſelf the Son of God before he died and roſe again.* Which Argumentation ſpeaketh a marvellous want of underſtanding our Saviour's Sonſhip, which is *an Imperial-perſonal Sonſhip*, the Perfection whereof he was to arrive at gradually, whence we often read in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* of his *being made perfect*. Our Author argueth alſo, that God's raiſing Chriſt could not be the *begetting* him, nor the Reaſon of his being called his Son, becauſe his Reſurrection is in certain Sayings of our Saviour attributed to himſelf. But of thoſe Sayings of our Saviour an account is given in our foregoing Diſcourſes, and of this Saying of St. *Paul* alſo, *Rom.* 1. 4. *who was declared to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* This and thoſe other Texts that we have vindicated from Corruption, (with others of like nature) are an illuſtrious Conſtellation of Scriptures, that bear a refulgent Teſtimony againſt *the Scholaſtic Eternal Generation.* (*q*) *For an Eternal Son needeth nothing more to make him a Son.*

(p) P. 171.

1 *Tim.* 3. 16.

(q) Ibid. p. 172.

CHAP. VIII.

1. Of the prime Article of the Myſtery of Godlineſs, of which the Deity of our Lord is a part. 2. The Article of the Incarnation is another part of it. 3. Some places of Scripture illuſtrated that concern it. 4. Of the Word made Fleſh. 5. Of the Scholaſtick and the Chriſtian Trinitarians agreement touching this Article. Sect. 1. *Their Firſt Diſagreement touching this Article, with a certain Rule of fixing and determining the Senſe of the New Teſtament.* Sect. 2. *Their Second Diſagreement. The Incarnation conjoin'd with the manifeſtation of our Saviour.* Sect. 3. *The Third Diſagreement touching a Binary of Generations.* Sect. 4. *The Fourth Diſagreement. The Scholaſtic Incarnation more than an Incarnation.* Sect. 5. *The Fifth Diſagreement. The Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation compar'd.* Sect. 6. *The Sixth Diſagreement. Scholaſtic Objections againſt the Scholaſtic Incarnation.* Sect. 7. *The Seventh Diſagreement. Of* Suppoſitum *and* Perſona. Sect. 8. *The Eighth Diſagreement. Of the hurt done to Religion by the Scholaſtic Incarnation.* Sect. 9. *The Ninth Diſagreement. Of Scholaſtic Abſurdities.*

I. OF the Chriſtian Religion which we have conſider'd and celebrated as *The great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, this is the prime Article *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Of which great Article there are three Branches (expreſs'd or involv'd in the Words of it) *the Deity of our Lord's Perſon, his Incarnation and the manner or kind of it*. For in this and the following Articles of the Myſtery of Godlineſs the Apoſtle's deſign manifeſtly is, to repreſent the Chriſtian Religion as great, magnificent and myſterious (accordingly he ſtileth it the great Myſtery of Godlineſs) and ſo the *Socinian* Interpreters obſerve, that his Diſcourſe is deſign'd, to conciliate Authority to the Chriſtian Doctrine and for the commendation of it. And what can make the Chriſtian Religion ſo great, magnificent and myſterious, as to ſtile it a marvellous *Theophania*, and to repreſent the Author of it as *God manifeſt in the Fleſh?* But in the *Socinians* Interpretation of this illuſtrious Text there is nothing great, magnificent and myſterious; for they ſuppoſe, that this is the whole ſenſe of it, that the Chriſtian Doctrine was manifeſted by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, infirm and abject Men in worldy Reſpects, and therefore called *Fleſh*. This is one of their Interpretations, wherein they ſhut the Name of God out of the Text: But they are content to follow the common reading, and to admit the Name of God into the Text; but ſo reading it, they interpret the Name of God, to ſignifie, not Chriſt, but God (the Father) who is ſaid to be manifeſted in the Fleſh (as they ſuppoſe) becauſe his myſterious Will was revealed by (infirm and mean Men in worldly Reſpects) Chriſt and his Apoſtles. This their ſecond Interpretation is in Senſe the ſame with the former, and is alike devoid of good Senſe. For is it tolerable good Senſe, to ſay, that the Goſpel or God was manifeſted in the Fleſh, becauſe the Goſpel or the Will and Counſel of God was revealed by infirm Men? No Author ſpeaketh at this rate; much leſs may we ſuppoſe *S. Paul* ſo to ſpeak, who throughout his Epiſtles upon all Occaſions diſplayeth Chriſt's Glory and Magnificence at the moſt ſuperlative rate. Therefore by *God manifeſt in the Fleſh* he muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean him that is *God-man* (connoting his Religion) and by the great Myſtery of Godlineſs he muſt be ſuppos'd to mean τὸ Χριστοῦ μυστήριον, *the Myſtery of Chriſt*. The following Articles of the Myſtery of Godlineſs plainly determine the Apoſtle's Senſe, and demonſtrate, that he ſpeaketh of the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus *as manifeſt in the Fleſh*. For who is it, that *was juſtified* (proved to be no Impoſtor) *by the Spirit, that was ſeen of Angels* (and ador'd by them) *that was preach'd unto the Gentiles and believ'd on in the World*, but Chriſt Jeſus? And as Ἀνάληψις τοῦ Μωσέως, ſignifieth *the Aſſumption of* Moſes, ſo ἀναλήφθη ἐν δόξῃ, what can it ſignifie but our Saviour's glorious Aſſumption? The Words cannot ſignifie the Exaltation of the Goſpel (or the making it famous) and therefore it is a vanity, to argue from the Order of them, that they do ſo ſignifie. It is much more reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtle in recounting theſe Articles of the Myſtery of Godlineſs intended, to connex our Saviour's wonderful Entertainment in this and the other World. And ſo the Senſe of them is, that he had a wonderful Reception in this World as well as a marvellous glorious Aſſumption in the other. And being thus fairly expounded the Apoſtle's Words have nothing diſorderly in them; nothing that claſheth with the common reading, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, nothing but what proveth, that this is the true reading. Which further appeareth from the conſent of all thoſe ancient Greek Copies that the Greek Fathers uſed, and from the conſent af all Greek Copies, as *Beza* affirmeth. So great a demonſtration of the Truth of the common reading cannot reaſonably be ſhaken by the Allegation of a Paſſage in the Council of *Nice*, or a Story of *Liberatus* the Deacon touching *Macedonius* (that he was depos'd for corrupting this place) nor by an Allegation of *the vulgar Latin*, the *Syriac, Arabic, S. Ambroſe*, a *Clermont* Copy and a Paſſage in *Hincmarus* touching a *Neſtorian*'s putting Θεὸς into the Text. As if the *Neſtorians* would corrupt the Text to their own Prejudice, or could corrupt the Copies which the Greek Fathers us'd before the times of *Neſtorianiſm*. The *Clermont* Copy (from ſeveral conſiderations) appeareth, to be of little regard. The *Arabic* hath been thought to leave out the Name God, but that is a miſtake. The vulgar *Latin* and the *Syriac* that leave out the word *God*, were anciently thought, not to leave it out in Senſe; for they were underſtood, to ſpeak of our Saviour's Incarnation. *Sacramentum myſterii Dei, quod eſt Chriſtus in carne*, ſaith S. *Ambroſe*. So (r) *S. Jerom* (s) *Leo* (t) *S. Hilary* (u) *Fulgentius* underſtand the vulgar Latin, to ſpeak of our Saviour's Incarnation. *Great is the Myſtery of Truth, that he appeared in Humane Fleſh*, ſaith the *Æthiopick*, which leaveth out the Name God, but not to the prejudice of our Saviour's

(r) *In loc.*
(s) *Ep.* 29. *ad Fl.*
(t) *De Trin. l.* 11.
(u) *Ad Thra. c.*

Deity (of Perſon) or his Incarnation. And the ſame may be ſaid of the *Syriac* Verſion.

II. The Incarnation of our Saviour properly underſtood (which the Socinian Theology admitteth not) appeareth, to be well founded. For the Apoſtles prime Article of the Myſtery of Godlineſs can ſignifie nothing leſs, nothing elſe than his ἐνσωμάτωσις, *Incorporation*, ἔνσαρκος παρουσία, *preſence in Fleſh*, ἡ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπιδημία, *coming in Fleſh* (*w*) which are Names by which the Fathers uſually expreſs his Incarnation. But the Truth of this commonly receiv'd Article doth not rely upon one ſingle Text only; for it hath been always (*x*) one of the Articles of the Religion of Chriſtians (*we do not play the Fool, O Greeks, nor tell Nugacities, when we tell you, that God hath been in the form of Man*, ſaith *Tatianus*) and there is a conjunct Conſtellation of illuſtrious Texts of the New Teſtament, that aſſert and ſupport it. For according to the Apoſtle, *Phil*. 2. 6, 7, 8. Chriſt was *in the form of God*, and was not then *in the form of a Servant, nor in the likeneſs of Men, nor in faſhion as a Man:* But afterwards he became ſuch (by an exinanition) which could not be but by an ἐνανθρώπησις, *Inhumanation*, οἰκονομία ἐνανθρωπήσεως, *Oeconomy of Inhumanation*, which is one of the Names, whereby Eccleſiaſtical Writers ſignifie the Incarnation of our Saviour. So *he that was rich, yet for our ſakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich*. 2 Cor. 8. 9. So the Son of God *being the brightneſs of his Glory and the expreſs image of his Perſon* (as being a divine imperial Perſon) yet *becauſe the Children are partakers of Fleſh and Blood* (of a frail, infirm mortal Nature, ſubject to many Sufferings) *he alſo himſelf likewiſe took part of the ſame* voluntarily and by his own choice. *Heb*. 2. 14. This he did with deſign, to ſuffer Death, *that ſo by Death he might deſtroy him that had the power of Death, and deliver them who were ſubjected thereto*; which were frail mortal Men (ſuch as the Seed of *Abraham* or the Hebrews to whom the Apoſtle wrote) not Angels. Ὀυ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ

V. 16. ἐπιλαμβάνεται, *for verily he taketh not hold of Angels, but of the Seed of* Abraham *he taketh hold*. So our Tranſlators render the words in the Margin, much better than they have render'd them in the Text. For as they are rendred in the Text, they make the Apoſtle, to ſay that explicitly, which he ſaith only implicitly (for he doth not in theſe words explicitly teach our Saviour's Incarnation, nor ſay expreſly, *that he took not on him the Nature of Angels, but he took on him the Seed of* Abraham:) But he implicitly teacheth our Saviour's Incarnation. For in ſaying, *he taketh not hold of Angels, but of the Seed of* Abraham *he taketh hold* (ſo as to help and ſuccour them) the Apoſtle ſaith implicitly, *that he took not the Nature of Angels* (as having no deſign to ſuccour them) but that of the Seed of *Abraham*, whom he deſign'd to ſuccour.

V. 17. *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his Brethren* in their infirm mortal Nature (ſubject to Afflictions) in their afflicted Condition.

(w) Petav. T. 4. l. 2. c. 1.

(x) Ὀυ μωραίνομεν, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, οὐδὲ λήρους ἀπαγγέλλομεν, θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ γεγονέναι, καταγγέλλοντες. *Tatian.*

III. In this Divine Author to the Hebrews there is another Paſſage, which is commonly thought, to expreſs our Saviour's Incarnation. *Heb*. 10. 4, 5, 6, 7. *For it is not poſſible, that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats ſhould take away Sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the World, he ſaith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldeſt not, but a Body haſt thou prepared me* (or thou haſt fitted me, ſaith the Margin.) *In Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices for Sin thou haſt had no pleaſure. Then ſaid I, lo, I come, to do thy Will, O God*. In this Paſſage (which is deſign'd to ſhew, that God hath rejected the legal Sacrifices becauſe of their great Imperfection and Infirmity, and hath choſen the one Offering of Chriſt; and that Chriſtians are expiated or ſanctified through the Offering of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all *V*. 10.) The Divine Author citeth the words of the Pſalmiſt, which he ſuppoſeth, to be ſpoken by Chriſt at his coming into the World: But he citeth them not according to the Hebrew; for according to the Hebrew they are thus tranſlated. *Sacrifice and Offering thou didſt not deſire, mine Ears haſt thou opened, or bored*. Exod. 21. 6. But this opening or boring the Ear is in the general Nature of it a preparing the Body for Service and Obedience, and therefore reſpecting only the general Nature of it the Pſalmiſt's Words may be thus rendred σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, *a Body haſt thou prepared me* (or fitted me) ſo far the Divine Author hath rendred the Pſalmiſt's Words according to the Hebrew. Some Learned Men are of Opinion, that he hath rendred the Pſalmiſt's Words according to the Septuagint, and that anciently the Septuagint's Tranſlation was as it is now. (*y*) Others are of Opinion, that he hath not rendred the Pſalmiſt's Words according to the Septuagint, and that anciently the Septuagint's Tranſlation ran thus; ὠτία κατηρτίζω μοι. *thou haſt prepared or perfected to me Ears*. According to this latter Opinion the Septuagints Verſion of the Pſalmiſts Words is an Interpretation of the Hebrew underſtood in a ſtrict Notion, and ſuch as the Divine Author doth not cite it. According to the former Opinion the Septuagint's Verſion of the Pſalmiſts words is an Interpretation of the Hebrew underſtood only in a large general Notion (the opening or boring the Ear being conſider'd as only a preparing the Body for Service and Obedience) and as ſuch the Divine Author doth cite it. He citeth this Interpretation (or ſort of Interpretation) of the Hebrew, which muſt be conſider'd both as the Speech of *David*, and (according to this Divine Author) as the Speech of Chriſt. As it is the Speech of *David*, it is of this Senſe; *mine Ears haſt thou opened, that I might yield Obedience; for that is it, which thou requireſt*. As it is the Speech of Chriſt, it is of this meaning; *a Body haſt thou prepared me, that I might be obedient unto death; for that is it, which thou requireſt*. If our Saviour ſhould ſpeak theſe Words before his entrance into the Body, they would then be expreſſive of his Incarnation: But he may be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak them after his entrance into the Body as congruouſly as before it; and therefore we cannot pronounce touching this Paſſage of the Author to the Hebrews, that it is certainly expreſſive of his Incarnation. The Words of another Divine Author are more certainly expreſſive of it. 1 *Joh*. 4. 2, 3. *Every Spirit that confeſſeth, that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is of God: And every Spirit that confeſſeth not, that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is not of God*. For theſe words are plainly levell'd againſt the ancient Δοκηταὶ, and *Phantaſiaſtæ* (who were Gnoſticks;) and ſeeing their Hereſie conſiſted in aſſerting only a fictitious and phantaſtick Incarnation of our Saviour, therefore the Words of this Apoſtle in

(y) Grot. Not. in Heb. 10. 5. Dr. Ham. on Pſal. 40. Not. d.

oppoſition to them muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean and aſſert the real Incarnation of our Saviour (z) *who was truly born, did truly eat and drink, truly ſuffer'd perſecution under* Pontius Pilate, *was truly crucified and was dead, celeſtials, terreſtrials, and ſub-terreſtrials beholding him.* (a) *What is ſo direfully pernicious, as that the Truth of the Incarnation of Chriſt being deny'd, to deſire to deſtroy all hope of the Salvation of Men?* Our Saviour's days of Miniſtery were *the days of his Fleſh*, he was then real Humane Fleſh, and he was ſuch conſequently upon *his having been with God* and receiving his Doctrine from him, his being ſent from God, his coming down from Heaven, his coming forth from the Father and coming into the World; therefore his Incarnation is implicitly (yet clearly enough) atteſted by all thoſe innumerable places of the divineſt Evangeliſt, which ſpeak of our Saviour's having been with God and receiving his Doctrine from him, of his being ſent from God, of his coming down from Heaven, and of his coming forth from the Father and coming into the World.

IV. But in one place more eſpecially the Divine Evangeliſt concerneth himſelf moſt expreſly to atteſt the Article of our Saviour's Incarnation. *Joh.* 1. 14. *The Word was made Fleſh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only Begotten of the Father) full of Grace and Truth.* The Evangeliſt had before told us, that *the Word was with God and was God*, and then (in his State of imperial perſonal Deiformity) he was not Fleſh. But now he telleth us ϗ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, which words muſt ſignifie, that he was made or became Fleſh (which he was not in the State before mentioned) and therefore ἐγένετο, here doth not ſignifie *Fuit*, as the Followers of *Socinus* would have it, but *was made* or *became*; for he that in the pre-exiſtent State was not Fleſh, could not now be ſuch without being made or becoming ſuch, and muſt be ſaid, to *be made* or *become* ſuch. The Verb ἐγένετο, therefore is perverted from its genuine Signification in this place by the *Socinian* Interpreters, who alſo moſt enormouſly pervert the ſignification of the Noun Subſtantive σὰρξ, (Fleſh) when they ſuppoſe it to ſignifie Meanneſs and Infirmity. For in proper Grammatical ſignification Fleſh doth not ſignifie Meanneſs and Infirmity, but that ſubſtance ſo called, which is mean and infirm. *All Fleſh is Graſs*, Meanneſs and Infirmity are its Properties. But as the Name of *Graſs* or *Corn* ſignifieth that which is the Nature and Subſtance of Graſs or Corn: So (in the firſt inſtant) Fleſh ſignifieth that which is the Nature and Subſtance of Fleſh (for Fleſh is a Subſtance, not an Accident) and therefore is true real Fleſh. For *quod non eſt verè aurum, non eſt aurum*, and that which is not true real Fleſh, is not Fleſh. Our Divine Evangeliſt therefore (as we have ſeen) concerneth himſelf to aſſert againſt the Δοκηταὶ & φαντασιασταὶ, that Jeſus Chriſt is come in true real Fleſh; and accordingly his Senſe muſt be underſtood in the beginning of his Goſpel, *that the Divine* (Divine Imperial) *Word was made or became the real Subſtance of Fleſh.* From whence it followeth *that Chriſt ſuffered for us in the Fleſh, was put to Death in the Fleſh, aboliſh'd in his Fleſh the enmity, reconciled us in the Body of his Fleſh through death*, and that God ſent his Son (not in the likeneſs of Fleſh, but) *in the likeneſs of ſinful Fleſh.* If we ask therefore what kind of Fleſh it was that the Divine Word became (for all Fleſh is not the ſame Fleſh: But there is one kind of Fleſh of Men, another Fleſh of Beaſts, another of Fiſhes, another of Birds) the anſwer is, It was true real Humane Fleſh with all its eſſential Ingredients, natural Appetites, Affections and Paſſions, which was alike viſible and tangible as ours, alike needed and received Suſtenance, was alike tender and ſenſible, infirm, paſſible and mortal; and he was made like unto us in all things Sin only excepted. (b) *That the Word might raiſe us to Divine Majeſty, he ſhew'd himſelf in our weak Humane Nature. God was manifeſt in the Fleſh. For Fleſh conſignifieth Infirmity and Meanneſs of State. To which alſo the Name of the Son of Man referreth.*

There is not any Sentence of Holy Scripture, that is and hath been celebrated at an higher rate in the Church than this one, *Verbum Caro factum eſt.* (c) The Devotioniſts will not read or pronounce it without Genuflexion and Adoration, looking upon it as *humanæ ſalutis ſumma*, the ſummary of Man's Salvation. The Eccleſiaſtic Legendaries celebrate it (*d*) for a mighty ſuppoſed Efficacy that is in it, to make the Devils tremble, to cure Demoniacks, to drive away the Devil and to make him flie; of which mighty Efficacy they tell ſeveral inſtances. The Polemical Divines celebrate it (*e*) as the great *Effatum* or Propoſition (quo uno tota de Incarnatione rectè ſentiendi ac loquendi regula & Diſciplina continetur) *wherein the whole Rule and Diſcipline both of thinking and ſpeaking aright touching the Incarnation is contain'd.* It muſt be ſuppos'd therefore, not only to notice the miraculous Fact of our Saviour's Incarnation, but *the kind or manner of it*, which is alſo illuſtriouſly notic'd by that Apoſtolical Maxim *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, as will appear in the ſequel of this Diſcourſe.

V. For we muſt now proceed to conſider, that there are two oppoſite Explications of the Incarnation (and conſequently two oppoſite kinds of Incarnation) the one is *the Scholaſtic Trinitarian Incarnation*, the other is our own, which we muſt call *the Chriſtian Trinitarian Incarnation.* For according to the Chriſtian Trinitarian's Hypotheſis the Incarnation of the Son of God is *The* σάρκωσις *of his Humane Divine Perſon upon his undertaking the Meſſias-ſhip in Heaven.* By the Conſummation of his generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity he was with God in his State of Imperial-perſonal Deiformity; but upon the commencing of his miſſive Oeconomy (his undertaking the Meſſias-ſhip) he neceſſarily laid aſide his Imperial-perſonal Deiformity, and became Humane Fleſh, taking upon him (*f*) *abjectam illam ac imbecillam hominis naturam ac conditionem*, that *abject and weak Nature and Condition of Man* (Humane Fleſh) which was ſo far an ἐνανθρώπησις, *Inhumanation*, or becoming Man. But according to the Scholaſtick Trinitarians the Incarnation of the Son of God is *his becoming Man by a temporal Generation, ſo aſſuming Humane Nature into the Unity of his Perſon by a real Conjunction and Union thereof to his Divine Nature in a manner*

(z) Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. p. 51.

(a) *Quid tam exitiabile, quàm negata veritate incarnationis Chriſti, omnem ſpem ſalutis humane velle diſſolvere?* Leo Ep. o. ad Fl.

(b) *Ut* Λόγος *nos homines ad divinam majeſtatem eveheret, ipſe in imbecilla hac noſtra humana natura ſe oſtendit.* Paulus 1 Tim. 3. 16. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. *Nam* σὰρξ *infirmitatem & humilem ſtatum conſignificat.* Sic Pſal. 56. 4. & 78. 39. & alibi. Confer. Phil. 2. 6. 2 Cor. 8. 9. *Eodem ſpectat nomen Filii hominis.* Grot. Not. in Joh. 1. 14.

(c) *Stephan. Paris Verbum caro factum eſt fol.* 39.

(d) *Lud. de Sax. vit. J. Chriſt. c.* 18.

(e) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 9. *c.* 8. *s.* 6.

(f) *Beza in Phil.* 2. 7.

incomprehenſible and ineffable. (g) Carnem fieri ſive incarnari, nihil aliud eſt quàm gigni, hoc eſt, ſecunda generatione hominem fieri, *to be made Fleſh or incarnated, is nothing elſe but to be generated, that is, by a ſecond Generation to be made Man.* This Scholaſtic Incarnation in ſeveral reſpects and in great degree agreeth with the Chriſtian Trinitarian Incarnation: But this Agreement between them is complicated with many Differences and Diſagreements, and therefore they muſt be called diſſonant Accounts of of it. But theſe diſſonant Accounts of the Incarnation agree touching the general Nature of it, that it was ἡ ἔνσαρκος οἰκονομία, *the Oeconomy of the Son of God in Fleſh*, οἰκονομία, contradiſtinct to θεολογία, it being a συγκατάβασις, *demiſſion of himſelf from the height of Majeſty to our Meanneſs.* His Exinanition, πρόσληψις τῆς σαρκός, *his taking on him the indument of Fleſh*; for ſo he is ſaid by the Fathers ἐνδύσασθαι τὴν σάρκα, *to have put on Humane Fleſh*, but ſo that it was more than an indument. Theſe diſſonant Accounts of the Incarnation of the Son of God agree alſo touching the eminency of his Character, that his appearance in Fleſh was no leſs than a θεοφάνεια, according to that of S. *Auſtin*, *Deus, quid glorioſius? Caro, quid vilius? Deus in Carne quid mirabilius?* Theſe diſſonant Accounts of his Incarnation agree alſo touching the Truth and Reality of his Human Fleſh (h) whereas according to the Maxims of all Hereticks in the time of *Irenæus* he was (ſine carne & impaſſibilis) *without fleſh and impaſſible.* But the Chriſtians believ'd, that ἀληθῶς ἀνέλαβε σῶμα, ὁ λόγος γὰρ σὰρξ ἐγένετο, *he really aſſumed an Humane Body, for the Word was made Fleſh.* Theſe diſſonant Accounts agree alſo touching his intire unmutilated Humanity (i) *One Chriſt from the time of his Incarnation conſiſteth of the Divinity, the Fleſh and the Soul.* Theſe diſſonanant Accounts therefore agree touching the duplicity of his Character, that he was θεάνθρωπος, his one Perſon being both God and Man, both diſcard a *Neſtorian* duplicity of Perſons in Chriſt, and an *Eutychian* confuſion of the two Natures (Divine and Humane) and thoſe fooliſh impious Conceits, which are or have been touching the converting and changing *the Divinity into Fleſh, or the Fleſh into the Divinity.* The Word is ſaid to be made Fleſh, not to expreſs any ſuch abſurd Converſion or Mutation, but to ſignifie an agreeable Incarnation of a Divine Perſon, which conſiſteth in taking on him Humane Fleſh, ſo as to take it into the Unity of his Perſon (k) τὸ σεσαρκῶσθαι γὰρ, ἡνῶσθαι ἐστι σαρκί, *for to be incarnated, is to be united unto Fleſh.* Theſe diſſonant Accounts therefore agree, that in the Son of God incarnate there is an Unition of the Divine and Humane Nature, that theſe Natures are united ἀσυγχύτως, *without Confuſion*, ἀτρέπτως, *without Converſion* or Tranſmutation of the one into the other, ἀδιαιρέτως, *without Diviſion* (as not conſtituting two Perſons) ἀχωρίστως, *without Separation for ever.* They agree alſo, that although the Humane Nature is intire and perfect in the Son of God incarnate, yet he ſubſiſteth not in the Quality of an Humane but a Divine Perſon; that as *the Word was made Fleſh*, ſo the Fleſh was made the Word, and that the Properties of God are rightly attributed to him that is Man, and the Properties of Man are rightly attributed to him that is God, which ſort of Predication is called *the mutual communication of Properties.* Laſtly, Theſe diſſonant Accounts agree touching the final Cauſe and Reaſon of the Incarnation of the Son of God, which was to be *a Saviour-king to the World of Sinners.* Great and many are the Agreements between theſe diſſonant Accounts of our Saviour's Incarnation, which yet are very diſſonant Accounts of it, and which of them is the beſt and trueſt Hypotheſis, will appear by remarking the Diſagreements that are between them and making a Judgment of them.

SECTION I.

The Firſt Diſagreement.

I. THESE diſſonant Accounts diſagree in their Interpretation of the Apoſtle's Text (whence much of their Diſſonance touching the Incarnation appeareth) *Phil.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. *Let this mind be in you, which was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus; who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himſelf of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeneſs of Men. And being found in faſhion as a Man, he humbled himſelf and became obedient unto Death.* The Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, that this deiform ſelf-humbling Perſon ſpoken of by the Apoſtle is the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity (the Abſtract Logos) whoſe marvellous Humiliation was the Scholaſtic Incarnation: But the Apoſtle's Speech is touching the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, and an Abſtract Logos is not the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, nor is this Name competible thereto; therefore this deiform ſelf-humbling Perſon whom the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, is not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. Of this Opinion are (l) S. *Ambroſe*, *Eraſmus*, *Vorſtius*, *Piſcator*, *Luther* and the *Lutheran* Divines generally, ſo *Grotius* alſo (m) and a Divine of our own interpret the Apoſtle. He exhorteth Chriſtians to a Conformity to Chriſt Jeſus, who is their Pattern and great Exemplar, and this is uſual in the New Teſtament: But an Abſtract Logos is not the great Exemplar of Chriſtians, nor are they ever throughout the New Teſtament exhorted to be conformable thereto. This they are not exhorted to, in that place which ſome alledge, 2 *Cor.* 8. 9. (where Chriſt is ſaid to have been rich, yet for our ſakes he became poor:) But *Chriſt's richneſs* and his (exterior) *Deiformity* are the ſame thing, and the one is no more meant of an Abſtract Logos than the other. The Apoſtle exhorteth Chriſtians, to be like minded, as Chriſt Jeſus was, which Phraſe is not agreeable to an Abſtract Logos (n) φρονεῖν, *is not rightly us'd but touching a Man.* And as an Abſtract Logos is no Chriſtian Pattern, ſo he can be no Pattern of Humility (as the Apoſtle repreſenteth Chriſt Jeſus) for wiſe Men not without Reaſon make doubt, whether the Virtue of Humility be competible to the eternal Almighty God, whoſe Being is a certain Eſtate of Honour and Dignity, and if he is not duly honour'd and glorified, he is undeify'd. Piety is the buſineſs of giving him Honour and Glory, and Sin is therefore exceeding ſinful, becauſe it is a bereaving him of his Honour and Glory, a pouring contempt and contumely upon him. He muſt have the Glory of all his Excellencies and Perfections, and the proper Honour and Glory which is due unto his Godhead, he cannot part with or communicate. His Honour and Glory muſt be higheſt in our eſteem and deſires, himſelf deſigneth it as the ultimate end of all things, *Eph.* 1. 6, 12. He could not be God, if he did ſuffer his Name to be polluted, or not deſign, that it ſhould be declared throughout all the Earth, and that all the Earth ſhould be filled with his Glory. It cannot be therefore, it may not be, that the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity *ſhould empty himſelf and make himſelf of no Reputation*, or be a pattern of Humility, as the Chriſt of God is. (o) *Humilis veni, humilitatem docere veni, magiſter humilitatis veni*, ſaith Chriſt our Lord. He is the great Maſter of Humility, and the ſtupendious Inſtance thereof in laying aſide his (exteriour) Deiformity and *taking upon him the form of a Servant*, which is eaſily intelligible, if underſtood of the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt. (p) *But it hath rack'd many Mens minds to conceive, how an Exinanition of himſelf* (an Humiliation) *can belong to the eternal and immutable God by becoming Man.* His Exinanition is as hard to conceive either pious or poſſible, as (q) τὸν μέγαν Θεὸν δουλεύσειν, ἢ νοσήσειν, ἢ τεθνήξεσθαι, *that the great God ſhall undergo Servitude, or be ſick, or ſhall die*, which *Origen* accounteth things impoſſible. The Humiliation and Exinanition which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, neceſſarily belong to that Humane-divine Perſon, to whom *the obedience unto death and the exaltation* which he ſpeaketh of, do belong. And to whom do theſe belong but only to the complex Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus? They are incompetible to an Abſtract *Logos*, nor can *this Mind* (which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of) be ſaid, to have been *in Chriſt Jeſus*; for the Abſtract *Logos* was not Chriſt Jeſus, nor in Chriſt Jeſus, but only (according to the Scholaſtic Theology) had a mind to become Chriſt Jeſus. We may therefore confute the Scholaſtic Interpretation of this place (which is an Hiſtory of Chriſt) by this following Argument, which is plainly demonſtrative, and of which we muſt ſay, that all the Scholaſtic Divines in Chriſtendom cannot fairly anſwer it.

(g) Petav. T. 4. l. 6. c. 7. S. 4.

(h) Ibid. l. 4. c. 2. S. 7.

(i) *Unus ab Incarnationis tempore Chriſtus ex divinitate, carne & anima conſtat.* Petav. Ibid. S. 8.

(k) Ibid. S. 9.

(l) Vorſt. in loc.

(m) Mr. Thorndic Epil. B. c. 14. in fine.

(n) Vorſt. in loc.

> That which was in the Abſtract *Logos* conſider'd in the Hiſtory as it was ſuch, cannot be ſaid in the Hiſtory, to have been in Chriſt Jeſus:
>
> But *the Mind* which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, is that which was in the Abſtract *Logos* conſider'd in the Hiſtory as it was ſuch (according to the Scholaſtic Interpretation) *Ergo.*
>
> According to the Scholaſtic Interpretation, it ought have been ſaid, *Let that Mind be in you, which was not in Chriſt Jeſus.*

From this Argument plainly demonſtrative we infer, that the voluntary Humiliation of our Saviour (which was an Inhumanation) is by the Apoſtle attributed, not to an Abſtract *Logos* (or the Second Perſon in the Scholaſtic Trinity) but to his *Humane-divine Perſon*. And that antecedently to his voluntary Humiliation and Inhumanation his Humane-divine Perſon was in *the Form of God*. This is the Doctrine of the New Teſtament touching our Saviour, thus far the Senſe of it is fix'd and determin'd; and this Doctrine of it we will call *one demonſtrated Rule for its Interpretation.*

II. According to the Scholaſticks Interpretation *To be in the form of God*, ſignifieth, to be (r) *in eſſentiâ*, in the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence. (s) *As the Abſtract Son of God having aſſum'd our Nature did ſubſiſt in the real Eſſence of a Man and of a Servant: So antecedently thereto de did ſubſiſt in the* (Scholaſtic) *Eſſence and real Being of God.* So the Abſtract Son of God is repreſented in the Scholaſtic Trinity, and ſo the Apoſtle's words are diſtorted to a School-philoſophic Senſe, which is quite alien from their ſignification. For the form of God neceſſarily ſignifieth *Deiformity*: but the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence is neither the interiour nor exteriour Deiformity celebrated in Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament, nor do the holy Writers, when they ſpeak of being *formed*, *conformed*, *transformed*, mean any ſuch thing as a Scholaſtic Eſſence; this therefore cannot be the meaning of *the form of God*. But as the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* contemplateth the Son of God as in his Divine Vital Eſſence *the brightneſs of his Father's Glory*, and in his Imperial Eſtate (in conſort with God) *upholding all things by the word of his power:* So the Apoſtle to the *Philippians* contemplateth Chriſt as in Nature and State an Imperial Deiform Perſon, which was hugely remote from and oppoſite to his being *in the form of a Servant and in the likeneſs of Men.*

His taking upon him the form of a Servant is in the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppos'd, to ſignifie *The Abſtract Son's aſſuming the Humane Nature*, or as ſome ſay, *a created Nature* (which is the ſame thing) and the words ſo interpreted expreſs the Scholaſtic Incarnation, *that he was made Man*. But it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the Apoſtle's words are of any ſuch ſignification. For if this had been the Apoſtle's Senſe, he would have ſaid, that he took upon him *the form of a Man*; for he knew very well, that there is great difference between *a Man* and *a Servant*. If he had ſaid, that Chriſt took upon him the form of *a Lord*, it had not been hard to underſtand his Senſe; and it is not more difficult, to underſtand his Senſe, when he ſaith, *that Chriſt took upon him the form of a Servant*; for as the dominant eſtate and condition conſtituteth a Lord, ſo the ſervient and ſervile eſtate and condition conſtituteth a Servant. If Chriſt had in all reſpects taken upon him the form of a Servant, he muſt have abdicated his being *the Lord:* but he took it upon him only ſo far and in ſuch ſeveral reſpects, as ſtill to continue (in the main) *The Lord*; as the Heir while a Child in ſeveral reſpects differeth nothing from a Servant, and yet he is Lord of all. So Chriſt the Lord took upon him the form of a Servant, which the Apoſtle oppoſeth to his imperial perſonal Deiformity. This in ſome degree and ſeveral reſpects he relinquiſh'd, when he took upon him the form of a Servant; and conſequently, when he reſum'd his imperial perſonal Deiformity, he relinquiſh'd the form of a Servant, which he had aſſum'd. It is the greateſt of extravagancies, to ſuppoſe, that in his preſent ſtate of Exaltation he ſtill retaineth the form of a Servant: but the Humane Nature or a Created Nature he ſtill retaineth and will retain for ever; therefore his *taking upon him the form of a Servant* doth not ſignifie his aſſuming the Humane Nature or the Scholaſtic Incarnation.

III. Our Saviour's *being made in the likeneſs of Men* is ſuppos'd, to ſignifie *a ſubſtantial ſimilitude, that he had the Philoſophic Eſſence of a Man, was true Man*, and ὁμοούσιος, *conſubſtantial unto us*; as on the contrary, the *Marcionites* and *Manichees* inferr'd from theſe words, that Chriſt was not truly a Man, but κατὰ δόκησιν ϗ φαντασίαν, had

(o) S. Aug. Tr. 25. in Joan.

(p) Dr. More Myſt. of Godlin. B. 1. c. 8.

(q) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 341.

(r) Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 11. S. 5.

(s) Idem T. l. 7. c. 8.

Heb. 1. 3.

only the likeneſs of a Man. They perverted the words to an impious Senſe, and the Scholaſtic Theology perverteth them from their genuine Senſe. For ſuppoſe, I ſhould tell my Reader, *that Chriſt is now come down from Heaven, and having exteriourly laid aſide his Deiformity is made in the likeneſs of Men.* Every one would underſtand, that the ſenſe and intendment of this Story is not to ſay, that Chriſt is truly and ſubſtantially Man, but that he is made in *the likeneſs of Men* in this reſpect, as being now exteriourly without his Deiformity, and ſubjected to the Frailties of Humane Bodies, as we Men are, that are without (exteriour) Deiformity. So the Apoſtle muſt be underſtood; for he is not aſſerting the truth of our Saviour's Humanity, nor are his words accommodate thereto: but he is deſcribing our Saviour's deep Humiliation and Exinanition, which conſiſted in this; *he exteriourly laid aſide his Deiformity, and was made* (or became) *in the likeneſs of Men, and was found in Scheme, Faſhion* (external make or habit) *as a Man*, being exteriourly without his Deiformity, and ſubjected to the Bodily Infirmities, as we Men are, that are exteriourly deſtitute of Deiformity. The terms which the Apoſtle uſeth, lively deſcribe a deep Humiliation of our Saviour, but not the Scholaſtic Incarnation; for σχῆμα can ſignifie nothing more than *external guiſe*, and to ſay, that *Chriſt was found in external guiſe as a Man, and that he became in the likeneſs of Men*, is this an accommodate and ſufficient way of expreſſing *his aſſumption of the ſubſtantial verity of the Humane Nature and the Philoſpophic Eſſence of Man?* At firſt ſight the terms ὁμοίωμα, *likeneſs*, and σχῆμα, *faſhion*, ſeem to favour the ancient *Phantaſiaſtæ*, of themſelves they are terms of abatement and diminution, or rather of oppoſition to the ſubſtantial verity of the Humane Nature. And although it appeareth, that the Apoſtle doth not uſe them to any ſuch purpoſe, yet that is becauſe he is deſcribing another ſort of Humiliation than the Scholaſtic Incarnation, of which they are far from being ſufficiently expreſſive. Why then did the Apoſtle chuſe, to make uſe of ſuch terms as theſe inſtead of others, that are properly, plainly and fully expreſſive of the Scholaſtic Incarnation? it could not be to ill purpoſe, and was it to no purpoſe? Doth not his uſe of them plainly argue, that he is deſcribing ſuch an Humiliation, which is not an aſſuming the Humane Nature at the rate of the Scholaſtic Incarnation, but in a far leſſer degree? Our Saviour ſtill retaineth the real Philoſophic Eſſence of Man: but *the form of a Servant, the being made in the likeneſs of Men* (that are without Deiformity) *and the being found in faſhion as a Man*, were remov'd, when our Saviour was raiſed to his Deiformity; therefore thoſe expreſſions do not ſignifie the Philoſophic Eſſence of Man; and conſequently *the Form of God* doth not ſignifie the Philoſophic (or Scholaſtic) Eſſence of God. Some ſay, that theſe words of the Apoſtle *he was made in the likeneſs of Men*, are a moſt exact and critical form of Speech, to ſignifie, that though Chriſt was true and real Man, he was not meer Man, but a more Divine Perſon united to Humane Nature. But if we ſhould ſay of the Sacramental Elements, *they are made in the likeneſs of Bread and Wine*, would this be a moſt exact and critical form of Speech, to ſignifie, that though they are true and real Bread and Wine, they are not meer Bread and Wine, but a more Divine Subſtance united to the Material Elements?

We have now interpreted this illuſtrious Text againſt the Scholaſtic Theology (as before we interpreted it againſt the Anti-Trinitarians:) but we may not diſmiſs it without conſidering thoſe many Expoſitors, who rightly ſuppoſe, that it is the complex Perſon of Chriſt, who is here ſaid, to have *been in the form of God:* but they are of Opinion, that he was ſo in the days of his Meſſias-ſhip here on Earth, and that this was then his Humiliation; *he did not oſtentate his being in the form of God*, but in great degree concealed it, *took upon him the form of a Servant, became in the likeneſs of Men, and was found in faſhion as a Man.* This Interpretation taketh no notice of our Saviour's *being in the form of God* antecedently to his Meſſias-ſhip on Earth, and therefore it is confuted by thoſe innumerable Texts, which ſpeak of his *being with God, of his miſſion from being with God, of his coming down from Heaven, and ſo coming into the World in his Meſſias-ſhip*; for certainly he was *in the form of God*, when he was with God in his Heavenly Kingdom. This Interpretation alſo doth not attribute to the Son of God his exteriour Deiformity in the Senſe of the New Teſtament (which the form of God neceſſarily ſignifieth) it contradicteth the Scriptural Explication of the form of God (*the brightneſs of his Glory*, Heb. 1. 2.) it maketh the Exteriour Deiformity competible to this Earthly State of Life (repugnantly to the Scripture and the nature of things;) it minorateth *the form of God* at a great rate, which it ought to magnifie, and at the ſame rate it minorateth the ſtupendious Humiliation of the Son of God (for if it was only a receding from that Sublimity, which he might have aſſum'd to himſelf on Earth, it was no ſtupendious Humiliation:) And according to this Interpretation we muſt thus abſurdly deſcribe the proceſs of our Saviour's Humiliation; *Being in the form of God, yet being a Man on Earth, he was made in the likeneſs of Men, and was found in faſhion as a Man.*

IV. With this illuſtrious Text we will combine another (above-mention'd) that ſpeaketh the ſame Senſe, and giveth the ſame account of our Saviour's Incarnation, 2 *Cor.* 8. 9. *Ye know the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; that though he was rich, yet for your ſakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.* All Trinitarians (Fathers, Councils, Schoolmen, Divines) agree, that this Text muſt be underſtood of the Incarnation, nor can it be tolerably interpreted otherwiſe. And ſuppoſing it to be meant of the Incarnation, the Apoſtle plainly affirmeth, that it was not an Abſtract *Logos* (or the ſecond Perſon in the Scholaſtic Trinity) but the Perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt that was incarnate. The Incarnation alſo is ſaid to be *the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; and it is well known, that amongſt Chriſtians *The Grace of Chriſt* ſignifieth, not the Grace of any Abſtract *Logos* or *Verbum*, but the Grace of the Mediatory Sovereign in the Chriſtian Religion. And in conſort with the Text to the *Philippians* it is the Chriſtians Pattern and Exemplar that is here repreſented as the Perſon that was incarnate: which is not an Abſtract *Logos*, but the Perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Archetype, according to which they muſt be formed, and to whom they muſt be conformed. They are not his Servants, nor of his Kind and Cognation, nor have they learned Chriſt, nor do they really own him, love, eſteem and admire him, if they are not his followers in his Sanctity and in his Sufferings. Their being Chriſtians conſiſteth in ſymbolizing with him (as the being Platoniſts conſiſteth in ſymbolizing with *Plato)* their Honour, Excellency and Perfection conſiſteth in their aſſimilation and conformity to him, who is the mirrour of all Chriſtian and Divine Perfection, a Pattern in abſolute Perfection and of the whole of a Chriſtian (of his dying, riſing, reigning) a Pattern of all Divine Graces and Duties accommodate to all Perſons, their Captain and Leader, their Prince and Sovereign (to whoſe Garb and Demeanour Subjects uſually conform themſelves) rais'd up, ordained and appointed by God, to be (as S. *Cyprian* ſpeaketh) *Doctor vitæ noſtræ & Dux religionis* (and accordingly his whole Life *diſciplina morum fuit*) and to whom they are deſign'd, to be conform'd, that what he is by Nature, they might be by Grace. Great and many are their Obligations, to be Chriſt-like in Mind and Life, in Nature and Practice (his Example is the Law of their Religion) but they are not oblig'd, to have any ſuch regard for an Abſtract *Logos* or *Verbum*; no ſuch Metaphyſical Idea is their Shepherd and Captain (whom they muſt follow) their Lord and Maſter (from whom they muſt not be diſagreeable and diſſentaneous;) No ſuch Scholaſtic *Verbum mentis* or Platonic Idea is a Perſon rais'd up by God, to be the Pattern of their Mind and Life, nor are they predeſtinated to a conformity thereto. If this Metaphyſical Being was the Pattern of our Mind and Life, a principal Branch of our conformity thereto muſt be a Branch of Platoniſm, (*t*) which is to make our Mind a *mundus intellectualis*, that ſo it may reſemble this Abſtract *Logos* or *Verbum*, (*u*) *in which as in a moſt pure Glaſs the Species of all things ſhine, the form and exemplar of all producibles, according to which the ſupreme Opificer and Architect (as a terrene Artificer by impreſſed Art) operateth all things.* If we ſuppoſe this Abſtract *Logos* or *Verbum* to become incarnate, and ſuppoſe this Incarnation to be his Humiliation, yet this Incarnation and Humiliation cannot be the *Fact* or *Grace* of Chriſt Jeſus; for Chriſt Jeſus (according to the Scholaſtic Theology) did not exiſt antecendently to this Incarnation, but emerg'd into Exiſtence by it, and was an effect and product thereof. With what tolerable congruity and propriety can it be ſaid, *that the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus was rich and became poor*, becauſe an Abſtract *Logos* by laying aſide his Riches and becoming Poor (which is impoſſible) produc'd into exiſtence Chriſt Jeſus? And whereas the Scholaſtic Divines account our Saviour's *Nazaretic* Conception and *Bethlehemitical* Nativity one principal part of Chriſt's Humiliation, we muſt ask them, from what part of the Bible they have learn'd this their Dogma? And how it is poſſible, that the Conception and Nativity of Chriſt, whereby his Perſon was produc'd into Exiſtence, ſhould be his voluntary act of Humiliation? for ſo his Perſon muſt be exiſtent and operative before it was exiſtent. If we will allow the Apoſtle, to ſpeak properly, congruouſly, intelligibly, and as an honeſt meaning Man would ſpeak, we muſt ſuppoſe him, to conſider the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus (that complex Perſon) as a Divine Prince and Imperial Perſon, that by his generative œconomy was rich and in Deiformity (according to our demonſtrated rule of interpreting the New Teſtament) but by his miſſive œconomy, his marvellous voluntary Humiliation and wondrous ſelf-denying ſelf-humbling Incarnation became poor, not tranſcending Servi-formity, diveſting himſelf of his Heavenly Glory and of all outward things that are great in the World, leaving Heaven for Earth, Riches for Poverty, Glory for Meanneſs and Diſgrace.

(t) Ficin. in Plotin. En. 1. *l.* 2. c. 4.

(u) *In quo velut in ſpeculo mundiſſimo rerum omnium ſpecies relucent, producibilium omnium forma & exemplar, juxta quod ſummus ille rerum omnium opifex & Architector induſtrius velut terrenus quidam artifex ex impreſſa arte, univerſa operatur.* Stephan. Paris Verbum caro factum eſt. fol. 11.

Section II.

The Second Diſagreement.

I. These diſſonant Accounts agree in conjoyning our Saviour's *Incarnation* and *Manifeſtation*, but they differ about his *Manifeſtation* and conſequently about the time of his *Incarnation. God was manifeſted in the Fleſh* (ſaith the Apoſtle) and this was his Incarnation, which therefore was connex'd with his Manifeſtation. Accordingly the Incarnation is called by the Fathers, (*w*) φανέρωσις, ἐπιφάνεια, θεοφάνεια, which ſpeaketh it connex'd with our Saviour's Manifeſtation, and that it is really one and the ſame thing with it, 1 *Joh.* 1. 2. *The Life was manifeſted*, nempe in aſſumpta carne, ſay Expoſitors. *That Eternal Life which was with the Father, was manifeſted unto us*, per incarnationem, ſay they. (*x*) *Apparuit nobis viſibiliter per corpus aſſumptum.* So when this Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Joh.* 3. 5. *Ye know, that he was manifeſted*, Expoſitors make this expoſitory addition, *in aſſumpta carne*. This therefore ought to be counted a ſelf-evident maxim amongſt Chriſtians, *the manifeſtation of the Word of Life* (the Son of God) *was by his aſſumed Fleſh, by his Incarnation, ſo that his Incarnation was his Manifeſtation*, the ſame *with his manifeſtation in the Fleſh*. The Apoſtle ſaith, *The Life* (the word of Life) *was manifeſted*, and his Senſe is (*y*) *manifeſtata eſt ipſa vita in carne*; therefore he ſpeaketh of the Incarnation, and this is his definitive Notion of it, *Manifeſtatio vitæ* (verbi vitæ) *in carne.* Throughout the contexture of his Diſcourſe it is viſible, that he ſpeaketh of *the manifeſtation of the Word of Life in the Fleſh:* For he ſaith, *That which we have heard.* (*z*) *Joannes iſte, cæteri quoque Apoſtoli cum Chriſto in terris converſantes, audierunt hoc verbum, non in Deitatis ſuæ natura, ſed in humanitate aſſumpta.* The Apoſtle ſaith, *That which we have ſeen*, (*a*) *vidimus oculis noſtris corporalibus per aſſumptam naturam, ſi quidem verbum hoc caro factum, inter Apoſtolos viſibiliter habitavit, & converſatum eſt* The Apoſtle further ſaith, *Our Hands have handled the Word of Life.* (*b*) *Hoc Verbum incarnatum Apoſtoli tractaverunt, quia ſenſibiliter ipſum tetigerunt, palpaverunt & oſculati ſunt.* The ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *The Life was manifeſted.* (*c*) *Hæc Vita per naturam quam aſſumpſit humanam manifeſtavit ſeipſam, docendo, miracula faciendo, ſuos diſcipulos per totum mundum ad prædicandum mittendo. De qua ſcriptum habetur, vita erat lux hominum, & lux in tenebris lucet.* The Apoſtle further ſaith, *That Eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifeſted unto us.* (*d*) *Viſibiliter per corpus aſſumptum.* (*e*) *Antequam Verbum incarnaretur, æterna vita tàm animæ quàm corporis erat apud Patrem, non erat communicata hominibus: incarnato autem Verbo manifeſtata eſt nobis per Chriſtum.* It was ſo manifeſted, that the Apoſtles ſaw with their Eyes and their Hands handled the Word of Life. (*f*) *Et quis eſt, qui manibus tractet verbum, niſi quia verbum caro factum eſt, & habitavit in nobis?* The Word of Life was not more viſible

(w) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 2. c. 1.

(x) *Dion. Carthuſ. in loc.*

(y) *S. Aug. in loc.*

(z) *Dion. Carthuſ. in loc.*

(a) *Idem ibid.*

(b) *Idem ibid.*

(c) *Idem ibid.*

(d) *Idem ibid.*

(e) *Cajetan. in l. c.*

(f) *S. Aug. in loc.*

and palpable to the Apoſtle, then this is viſible and palpable in his Diſcourſe, that he conſidereth in it the Word of Life as manifeſt in the Fleſh, and that this is to conſider him as incarnate; that he conſidereth him in his ſtate of manifeſtation in the Fleſh, and that this is to conſider him in his ſtate of Incarnation, and to conſider him in his ſtate of Incarnation, is to conſider him in this ſtate of Manifeſtation; therefore his Incarnation was not in time antecedent to his Manifeſtation. His *Nazaretical* Generation or *Bethlehemitical* Nativity was not his Incarnation, but his Incarnation began, when his publick Miniſtry began; for at that time he became by officiary dignity *The Word of Life*; was ſent down from Heaven (where he was in his ſtate of Deiformity) and was manifeſted in Humane Fleſh. Are we ſo dull, as not to underſtand the time of his *Manifeſtation*, *who verily was fore-ordained before the Foundation of the World, but was manifeſt in theſe laſt times for us?* Expoſitors ſay *In carne*, and they ſay true: but could he be manifeſted before the time, *that he was made manifeſt unto* Iſrael? (g) *before he was ſent into the World, came into the World, and came a Light into the World?* Till this time there were no Apoſtles, to hear, ſee and handle the Word of Life: nor was there any Word of Life by officiary dignity ſuch, that might be heard, ſeen and handled; nor could Eternal Life be manifeſted till this time. Therefore the manifeſtation of *the Word of Life*, and conſequently his manifeſtation in the Fleſh or his Incarnation, could not be before this time.

II. An acceſſion of clearneſs and certitude will accrue to theſe Reaſonings, if we turn our Eyes from the beginning of S. *John*'s firſt Epiſtle to the beginning of his Goſpel. For if the Senſe of any part of the Bible may be thought clear and certain, this muſt be thought a clear and certain Principle, that S. *John* in the beginning of his Goſpel overlooketh our Saviour's Generation, and beginneth it with his miſſive œconomy, as that ſignifieth his Miniſtry, and his officiary Dignity, whereby he is *The Word of Light and Life*. This is ſo bright a Principle, that ſome glimmerings of it cannot but ſhine into the Eyes of every careful and unprejudic'd Reader of the Goſpel; and accordingly a late ingenious Writer of *the Harmony* of the Evangeliſts ſaith, (h) *S.* John's *Preface about the Divinity of the* Logos *is an Introduction to our Saviour's Miniſtry, at which he beginneth his Goſpel.* Let us ſuppoſe therefore, that he beginneth his Goſpel at our Saviour's Miniſtry, and the conſequence will be this, (i) *Filium carnem ſumpſiſſe ad œconomiam implendam*, The Son of God took on him Humane Fleſh, to fulfill his œconomy. And the time when he entred upon his Miniſtry or œconomy, this was the time of his Incarnation. For ſeeing the Evangeliſt wholly overlooketh our Saviour's Generation, therefore his celebrated Hiſtorical Maxim *Verbum caro factum eſt*, cannot belong to our Saviour's generative œconomy, but it neceſſarily ſynchronizeth and is connex'd with his entrance upon his Miniſtry or his miſſive œconomy (as the Word of Light and Life) at which this Evangeliſt beginneth his Hiſtory. And that this is his Senſe, will plainly appear, if we take a view of the whole of his celebrated Hiſtorical Maxim and of the ſeveral parts of it. If we read the whole of it (*The Word was made Fleſh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, full of Grace and Truth*) and ask at what time all this was done? The anſwer muſt be this; It was done at the time of our Saviour's Miniſtry (or his œconomy in the Fleſh) and not before; for before that time he did not dwell amongſt the Apoſtles, nor did they ſee his Divine Glory, or the fulneſs of Grace and Truth which is in Chriſt and the Chriſtian Religion. To take a view and make a right Judgment of the ſeveral parts of this celebrated Hiſtorical Maxim, we muſt reflect upon that Account, which a Popiſh Biſhop (expounding his Text *Verbum caro factum eſt*) hath given of the Benefits of Chriſt incarnate. (k) *Coming in Fleſh he gave unto Fleſh Life and Light, Life by the participation of Grace, and Light by the knowledge of the Truth.* This Account of the benefits of Chriſt incarnate is (doubtleſs) the true Expoſition of thoſe Names and Titles, which the Evangeliſt hath given to our Saviour, *the Light and Life*, which denote and ſignifie The Word (which he mentioneth) to be *The Word of Light and Life Evangelical.* Of this Word of Light and Life the Evangeliſt ſaith, *He became Fleſh*, and when he became Fleſh, he was by officiary dignity and imploy *The Word of Light and Life* Evangelical; therefore his Miniſtry began, ſo ſoon as he became Fleſh, and conſequently his Incarnation and Miniſtry ſynchronize. When he became Fleſh The Word of Light and Life was manifeſted, which was not manifeſted, till his Miniſtry commenced; therefore his Incarnation and his Miniſtry ſynchronize. So ſoon as he became Fleſh, he did appear in the World, and he did appear as the Word of Light and Life Evangelical (for ſo the Evangeliſt repreſenteth his appearance;) therefore his Miniſtry and Incarnation ſynchronize. When the Evangeliſt had ſaid, that *the Word was made Fleſh*, he immediately ſubjoyneth, *and dwelt among us*, (l) which words are a more plenary explication of his Incarnation. So ſoon therefore as he became Fleſh, he dwelt amongſt the Apoſtles (as the following words ſhew, *And we ſaw his Glory:*) but he did not dwell amongſt the Apoſtles till the time of his Miniſtry; therefore his Miniſtry and his Incarnation ſynchronize. Theſe three things (according to the Evangeliſt) are immediately connex and conſequent, *The Word became Fleſh, dwelt among the Apoſtles, and they ſaw his Glory* (there could not be the interval of many Years between the Word's becoming Fleſh and the Apoſtles ſeeing his Glory, as the Scholaſtic Incarnation ſuppoſeth:) but his Glory they did not ſee till the time of his Miniſtry; therefore his Miniſtry and his Incarnation ſynchronize. If he had dwelt among them, long before the time of his Miniſtry, they muſt have ſeen Divine Glories in him long before that time: but the only Divine Glory which the Evangeliſt mentioneth them to have ſeen in the Son of God, was that which they ſaw in the time of his Miniſtry, when they ſaw him *full of Grace and Truth* as Author of the Chriſtian Religion, which is the Religion of Saving Grace and Truth. Laſtly; As for the Soul to be in Fleſh, and to be in her Miniſtry, (m) is according to the *Chaldee* Oracles the ſame thing: ſo for the Son of God to become Fleſh and to be in his Miniſtry, is according to our Evangeliſt the very ſame thing.

Secti-

(g) See Dr. *Hamm.* on *Joh.* 1. *Not. a. Grot. Not. in Joh.* 1. 9.

(h) *Mr. Whiſton*, p. 201.

(i) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 10. *S.* 12.

(k) *In carne adveniens carnem vita & luce donavit, vitam quidem gratiæ participatione, lucem vero veritatis notitia.* Stephan. Paris. fol. 22.

(l) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* [illegible] c. 10. *S.* [illegible]

(m) *P.* 66.

SECTION III.

The Third Diſagreement.

I. THE Scholaſtic Incarnation ſuppoſeth that Binary of Generations, which this Theology diſtinguiſheth, and (ſo marvellouſly are things of an oppoſite Nature confounded) is the ſame thing with the Scholaſtic Temporal Generation of the Son of God. For this is the Hypotheſis that hath prevailed in the Church, which impoſeth her Scholaſtic Explications as Articles of the Catholic Faith (*n*) *that the only begotten Son of God was again generated of a Virgin, and that for us he ſuſtain'd a Generation. The Word who was incomplex according to his divine, paternal and ſempiternal Generation, became Complex according to his maternal and temporal and corporeal Generation.* (*o*) By the ancient Writers the Abſtract Son of God (called by them the Spirit and Ray of God) is ſaid, to have choſen an Holy Virgin, into whoſe Womb he might inſinuate himſelf, to come down from Heaven, to deſcend and ſlide into this Holy Virgin, and to be made Fleſh in her Womb. So when *Neſtorius* was boaſtfully preaching his Crotchets touching the Son of God, one of the People in the Aſſembly to reprove his Impudence (which he could not bear) proclaim'd with a loud voice (*p*) *The Word that was before all Worlds, did undergo a ſecond Generation according to the Fleſh.* Such are the Maxims of ancient times touching the Incarnation, which (ſo far as they are Scholaſtic Maxims touching the Incarnation) have nothing elſe to recommend them, but that they are the Maxims of ancient times; for they are altogether Alien from the Holy Scriptures. Which if ſome had as diligently inquir'd into, as they have read the Fathers, they would not have pronounc'd with a mighty Confidence (*q*) *a twofold Nativity or Generation of Chriſt is expreſly declared in the ſacred Books: One whereby he is born of the Father before the World; the other whereby he is procreated from his Mother the Virgin and the Family of* David. Of this Binary of Generations there is no Footſtep in the ſacred Books, it is an Humane Conceit not founded upon Scripture, not conſiſtent with it ſelf, but (as many other of the Scholaſtic Maxims) it is Self-ruinous. For in our Saviour's Temporal Generation (if it was his Generation) there muſt be a generative Father as well as a Mother; and in the Original of it, the Kind and Quality and Product thereof it muſt be Humane-divine: But theſe Propoſitions are ruinous to the Scholaſtic Theology, which therefore calleth this Generation *the maternal and corporeal Generation* in contradiſtinction to the *divine* and *paternal* Generation (*r*) *neque Chriſtus quâ homo eſt, gignitur à Deo.* But how then is the Incarnation a Generation, a ſecond Generation? Sometimes the Scholaſtic Divines ſay (*s*) *humana Chriſti natura non illa quidem generatione procedit* (the Humane Nature of Chriſt is not generated) but anon they tell us (*t*) *verè genita eſt eadem natura hominis ex virgine* (that ſame Humane Nature was truly generated of the Virgin) and Chriſt was (*u*) γεγεννημένος ἀληθῶς, *truly generated of a Virgin*, as *Ignatius* ſaith. Some of them will not allow us to ſay, that (*w*) Chriſt is Maſter and Servant to himſelf, or that the Word was Lord of the Man whom he aſſum'd: But others of them diſpute (*x*) *that Chriſt according to his Humane Nature is Servant to himſelf as God, that as Man he properly obey'd and perform'd Religious Worſhip to his own Perſon as exiſting in the Divine Nature.* (*y*) They agree, that he had the Holy Spirit from himſelf, ὅτι παρ' ἑτέρου οὐ δέεται λαβεῖν, *that there was no need for him, to receive from another.* And uſually they ſay, (*z*) that he created himſelf as Man, applying hereto the words of *Solomon*, *Wiſdom hath built her an Houſe*, whereby they mean, that *ſibi domicilium ex Virginali corpore fabricavit*, he made to himſelf an Houſe out of the Virginal Body. Whenceſoever this ancient Conceit was deriv'd, it is certain, it was not deriv'd from the Holy Bible, which knoweth no ſuch incongruous Maxims as theſe, *ipſe conditoris templum, ipſe conditor templi: Ipſe auctor operis, ipſe opus auctoris.* He was the Temple and the Builder of it: The Work and the Author of it. This Workmanſhip and Building was (as the Scholaſtic Theology calleth it) *a Generation*, and therefore Chriſt's building his own Houſe, implieth, that he was his own Father, according to that of S. *Hilary* (*a*) *ſibi ipſi origo naſcendi eſt.* So in this Theology it is a generally received Maxim (*b*) *tota Trinitas incarnationem operata eſt*, the Incarnation was the Work of the whole Trinity. The Incarnation which was a Generation (as this Theology calleth it) and wherein there muſt be a generative Father, is ſaid to be the Work of the whole Trinity; which implieth, that the whole Trinity is the Father of Chriſt as Man, and that he is the Son of it, which involveth a Syſtem of Abſurdities.

II. The Scholaſtic Theology miſunderſtandeth theſe following Texts of Scripture, which it ſuppoſeth, to ſpeak of the Incarnation. *Rom.* 1. 3. *Concerning his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, which was made of the Seed of David according to the Fleſh.* Rom. 9. 4, 5. *Who are Iſraelites, whoſe are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came.* Theſe places manifeſtly ſpeak of our Saviour's Birth-nobilitation (yet ſo as to complicate it with Humane Infirmity, ſignify'd by the word Fleſh;) for to be of the Regial Family and Royal Stem of *David*, of *Iſrael* and of the Fathers, was part of his Birth-nobilitation. They cannot therefore be interpreted of his wondrous Self-denying, and Self-humbling Incarnation without confounding things of an oppoſite Nature. But there is another Text of the Apoſtle uſually expounded touching the Incarnation which is not altogether impertinent thereto. *Gal.* 4. 4. *But when the fulneſs of time was come, God ſent forth his Son made of a Woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law.* This Text is of different conſideration; for one part of it concerneth *the miſſive*, and the other concerneth the *generative* Oeconomy of our Saviour. As our Saviour *came forth from God*, (Joh. 8. 42.) ſo the Apoſtle ſaith, that God ſent forth his Son *nempe è cœlo* (as ſeveral Expoſitors ſay) which Miſſion of our Saviour is the ſame thing with his Incarnation. This Son of God whom he ſent forth, could not be his Son but by a generative Oeconomy;

(n) Petav. T. 4. l. 5. c. 14. S. 8. & l. 3. c. 12. S. 8.

(o) *Iſte Dei radius delapſus in Virginem quandam & in utero ejus caro figuratus fuit.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 7 S. 1. *Deſcendens de cœlo ſanctus ille ſpiritus Dei, ſanctam virginem cujus utero ſe inſinuaret, elegit. Dei ſpiritus deſcendit in Vulvam.* Ibid. l. 5. c. 15. S. 4.

(p) *Verbum quod erat ante ſecula, ſecundam ſubiiſſe generationem ſecundum carnem.* Ibid. l. 6. c. 5. S. 8.

(q) *Nativitas, ſive generatio, duplex Chriſti in Sacris libris disertè prodita eſt, una quâ de patre ante ſecula natus eſt, altera quâ de matre virgine, deque Davidis ſtirpe procreatus eſt.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 8. S 6.

(r) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 5. *S.* 5.

(s) *Ibid.*

(t) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 6. *S.* 5.

(u) *Ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 8. *S.* 1.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 9. *S.* 16, 17.

(x) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 11. *Diſp.* 4. *p.* 180, 188.

(y) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 6. *p.* 594. & *l.* 8. *c.* 12. *S.* 18. & *l.* 7. *c.* 3. *S.* 4.

(z) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 10. *S.* 2, 11, 12.

(a) *Ibid. l.* 8. *c.* 9. *S.* 2.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 9. *S.* 17. & *c.* 5. *S.* 14.

conomy; this therefore the Apoſtle conſidereth, when he giveth him theſe deſcriptive Attributes *made of a Woman and made under the Law*. In four Manuſcripts as *Beza* ſaith, the Greek word is *γεννώμενος*, which ſignifieth our Saviour, to have been begotten or born of a Woman; and in the ſame ſenſe he is ſaid to *have been made of a Woman*; for the word *made* (c) is often us'd in a large Senſe, to ſignifie any Production, and is ſynonymous with *begotten*. Theſe attributes *made of a Woman and made under the Law*, the Apoſtle giveth to the Son of God, to ſignifie, that he ſymboliz'd with us originally as being *of this natural and this legal Condition*. And becauſe his words ſignifie natural and legal Condition (our natural and legal Condition and the Son of God's ſymbolizing with us in it) therefore they cannot ſignifie the Incarnation. For the Incarnation is a compound of what is *Supra-legal, Super-natural and Sub-natural*, what is above Nature and Law, and below Nature. *As to be in the form of God and to become in the likeneſs of Men not tranſcending Servi-formity; to be rich at the rate of God, and to become poor; to be with God, and to be God and to become Fleſh.*

The Scholaſtic Incarnation is more eſpecially injurious to this celebrated Text of the Evangeliſt *The Word was made Fleſh*. For although the Evangeliſt manifeſtly beginneth his Hiſtory with our Saviour's Miniſtry and wholly over-looketh his Generation, yet the Scholaſtic Theology will have this part of the beginning of his Hiſtory to be meant of his Generation, ſo contradicting the Nature and Character of the beginning of his Hiſtory, and deſtroying the neceſſary Order and Concinnity thereof. For if after the Evangeliſt hath related many things touching our Saviour's Miniſtry, *that his Light ſhined in Darkneſs, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not; that John Baptiſt was ſent to bear Witneſs of him; that he was in the World and came unto his own, who received him not*; if after all theſe Hiſtorical Relations touching our Saviour's Miniſtry he ſhould relate *his maternal and corporeal Generation and Birth* (by ſaying the Word was made Fleſh) this would not be the writing an Hiſtory but a *Cento*; not a writing our Saviour's Hiſtory, but only a relating certain Paſſages thereof ſo incoherently and diſorderly, as to put the Head of this Hiſtory in the Heel's place. A tolerable unexactneſs in obſerving Order is not to be criminated in Hiſtorians or in our Evangeliſt; and of the Nature (according to our Interpretation) is this Hiſtorical Paſſage *The Word was made Fleſh*; for theſe words are well and orderly enough ſubjoin'd to thoſe Hiſtorical Relations of our Saviour's Miniſtry that went before, becauſe the Incarnation belongeth to our Saviour's Miniſtry and is immediately connex'd with the matter in hand. But if we ſuppoſe them to be meant of his maternal and corporeal Generation, they are widely remote and diſtant from the matter in hand; and they are much what as incongruouſly and diſorderly plac'd, as if after his Relation of our Saviour's appearing to his Diſciples and breathing on them (after his Reſurrection) his Diſcourſe with *Thomas* about believing on him and with *Peter* about loving him, this Evangeliſt ſhould ſubjoin theſe words, *and he was born of the Bl. Virgin.*

SECTION IV.

The Fourth Diſagreement.

I. THE Scholaſtic Incarnation is more than meerly an Incarnation, which is an Argument, that it is a Miſtake. (*d*) For thereby this Theology meaneth, that the Abſtract Son of God was made Man. And if we ask, what it meaneth by being made Man? The anſwer is, he aſſum'd Humane Nature, which is Humane Fleſh endow'd with an intelligent Soul (perfect Man) and this is the Scholaſtic Idea of the Incarnation. This Theology therefore keepeth not to the Language of Scripture, but taketh the boldneſs to depart from it. For the Scripture ſaith, *the Word was made Fleſh, did partake of Fleſh and Blood, take hold of the Seed of* Abraham, *took on him the form of a Servant, was made in the likeneſs of Men, and became poor*, but never ſaith, that *he was made Man*. This ſort of Language maketh a great noiſe in the Scholaſtic Theology, but the Scripture is altogether a ſtranger to it; which is an Indication, that this Theology hath departed as much from the Senſe as from the Phraſe and Language of the Holy Writers, and that the Incarnation of the Son of God was an Inhumanation in reſpect of the Fleſh only (or bodily part of Man) and conſequently *the Word* that was made Fleſh, was not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of *the Word* (*e*) *Homo Cæleſtis*, as Chriſt is called by *P. Chryſologus*.

II. The Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, that the Abſtract Son of God in his Incarnation aſſumed an Humane Soul, whereas there is not a Syllable of ſuch Language in Scripture, which only ſaith, *the Word was made Fleſh*. This was obſerv'd by many in ancient times, whence ſome inferr'd, that Chriſt had no Human Soul, but that the *Logos* ſupply'd the place of an Humane Soul (*f*) which is ſaid, to have been the Conceit of the *Arians*. The *Apollinarians* ſuppos'd, that our Saviour had an animative Soul, yet had not that eminent part of an Humane Soul the Νοῦς or Mind, but that the Logos ſupply'd the place of it. And the reaſon of this their Conceit was, *Verbum caro factum eſt*, which implieth, that in his Incarnation our Saviour did not aſſume an *Humane Soul*. (g) *Origen* was of opinion, that the Humane Soul of our Saviour was united to the Logos in his præ-exiſtent State (antecedently to our Saviour's Birth) he did not therefore ſuppoſe, that in his Incarnation he aſſumed an Humane Soul. In favour of this Opinion of *Origen* a Philoſopher and Divine of our own thus argueth. (*h*) *Hence perhaps it is ſeaſonable, to put us in mind of the Reaſon, why in the Incarnation of the Meſſias no mention is made of the Soul, as* Joh. 1. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh; as if the naked Logos was united with Fleſh, no Soul intervening. But the Reaſon is, becauſe the*

(c) *Petav. de Trin. l. 6. c. 6. S.* 10.

Joh. 1. 5.-14.

(d) *Etenim Deus Dei Filius tempore conſtituto, aſſimulata interim majeſtate, ab æthereа ſede profectus in prædeſtinatæ virginis templo ſibimet caſtrametatur, quibus latenter infunditur, in hominem gignitur.* Petav. T. 4. l. 3. c. 7. S. 6. *Qui enim ſine matre in cælis aterne genitus, ipſe in terris ſine patre in utero virginis homo de ſpiritu ſancto creatus eſt.* Ibid. S. 10. *Verbum caro factum, id eſt, homo.* Ibid. l. 4. c. 12. S. 7. *Perfectum hominem ex anima rationali & corpore aſſumpſiſſe.* Ibid. l. 5. c. 11. S. 2. *Quid eſt humanitatis natura, niſi caro intelligente anima prædita?* Ibid. l. 4. c. 8. S 9.

(e) *Ibid. l.* 14. *c.* 5. *S.* 10.

(f) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 11. *S.* 1 & 12. *S.* 2.

(g) *Ibid. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *S.* 5.

(h) *Atque hinc forte an opportunè moneri poſſumus, cur in incarnatione Meſſiæ nulla animæ facta ſit mentio, ut* Johan. 1. 14. *& Logos caro factus eſt, quaſi nudus Logos cum Carne unitus eſſet, nullâ animâ interveniente. Sed ratio eſt, quia unio animæ Meſſiæ cum Logo infinitis ferè ante ſeculis facta intelligitur.* Dr. H. More op. Philoſ. Vol. 1. p. 582.

Union of the Soul of the Meſſias with the Logos is underſtood to have been done almoſt infinite Ages before.

III. The Scholaſtic Divines themſelves in noticing the Incarnation of our Saviour often omit the Soul and his Aſſumption thereof. For the Word by his Incarnation, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, *dwelt among us*, as our Tranſlation hath it. *Joh.* 1. 14. But ſome Criticks ſay (i) ἐσκήνωσεν, *idem eſt quod corpus aſſumpſit* Σκῆνος, *idem quod* σῶμα, *apud Heſych. & Democritum nec non*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. They that thus Criticize touching the word ἐσκήνωσεν, notice the Incarnation meerly by the Aſſumption of an Humane Body (called by the Pythagoreans Σκᾶνος,) and ſuppoſe, that the Incarnation is only an Incorporation. So *Macarius* noticeth the Incarnation (k) θεὸς ἐσωματοποίησεν ἑαυτὸν ϗ ἐσμίκρυνεν αὐτὸν, *God imbodied himſelf and leſſen'd himſelf.* 1 Tim. 3. 16. *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh* (that is) *incorpore humano*, ſaith *Piſcator.* So the Incarnation is called by S. *Hilary* (l) *corporatio*, which word is alſo us'd by *Tertullian.* Agreeably whereto our Saviour is called by S. *Ambroſe* (m) *biformis geminæque naturæ, conſors divinitatis & corporis*, Biform and of a double Nature, namely of the Divinity and the Body. *Greg. M.* thus expoundeth theſe words of the Angel to the Bl. Virgin, *The power of the Higheſt ſhall over-ſhadow thee* (n) *id eſt corpus in te humanitatis accipiet incorporeum lumen divinitatis*, the incorporeal Light of Divinity ſhall take *in thee a Body of Humanity.* Many notices of the Incarnation of like Nature there are in the ancient Writers of the Church, but none of ſo great remark as that which in the Acts of the Council of *Epheſus* is taken from the Council of *Nice*, which thus noticeth the Perſon of Chriſt (o) *una perſona compoſita ex divinitate cæleſti & humana carne.* One Perſon compounded of a celeſtial Divinity and of Humane fleſh.

IV. The Scholaſtic Divines themſelves have obſerv'd, that the term Incarnation is not expreſſive of their Inhumanation or becoming Man. For *Cajetan* and other Schoolmen ſay (p) by Scholaſtic cuſtom of Speech the term Incarnation ſignifieth the Aſſumption of intire Humane Nature by *the Word:* But by Impoſition, Inſtitution and in its own Nature the term Incarnation ſignifieth only, *that the Divine Word put on Fleſh.* The Evangeliſts Maxim therefore *the Word was made Fleſh*, although by Scholaſtic cuſtom it ſignifieth, *that intire Humane Nature was aſſumed by the Word*, yet the words of it by their Impoſition, Inſtitution and in their own Nature ſignifie no more, *but that the Divine Word put on Fleſh.* Fleſh ſometimes in Scripture ſignifieth Man (the whole Man) as *Rom.* 3. 20. *By the Deeds of the Law ſhall no Fleſh be juſtified.* Pſal. 56. 4. *I will not fear what Fleſh can do unto me.* Sometimes Fleſh ſignifieth only the bodily part of Man. *Matth.* 26. 41. *The Spirit is willing, but the Fleſh is weak.* Act. 2. 31. *Neither his Fleſh did ſee corruption.* So in Eccleſiaſtical Writers (q) *there is one Perſon of the Word, the rational Soul and the Fleſh.* (r) *As every one of us conſiſteth of Fleſh and a Soul: So Chriſt from the time of his Incarnation conſiſteth of the Divinity, of Fleſh and a Soul.* Fleſh being thus of an ambiguous ſignification, ſometimes ſignifying the whole Man (Synecdochically) and ſometimes only the bodily part of Man; the Queſtion is, in which of theſe ſignifications is it us'd in the Scriptural Doctrine of the Incarnation? For the Reſolution of which Doubt we will lay down theſe two following Rules. *Rule* 1. When Fleſh ſignifieth *Man* (the whole Man) the terms are identical and ſynonymous, and one of them may be put inſtead of the other; but when one of them cannot be put inſtead of the other, then Fleſh doth not ſignifie *Man*, but only the bodily part of Man. When the Apoſtle ſaith, *By the Deeds of the Law ſhall no Fleſh be juſtify'd*, we may put Man inſtead of Fleſh, and ſay, his Senſe is, *By the Deeds of the Law ſhall no Man be juſtify'd.* But when the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, we cannot put Man inſtead of Fleſh, nor ſay thus, *God was manifeſted in Man:* We can only ſay, God was manifeſted in Humane Fleſh. 1 *Joh.* 4. 2, 3. Another Apoſtle ſaith, *Jeſus Chriſt is come* ἐν σαρκὶ, *in Fleſh or in the Fleſh:* But we cannot put Man inſtead of Fleſh, and ſay, his Senſe is, *Jeſus Chriſt is come in Man.* In the Scriptural Doctrine of the Incarnation therefore Fleſh doth not ſignifie Man, but only the bodily part of Man. And conſequently the Evangeliſt's Hiſtorical Maxim *the Word was made Fleſh*, doth not ſignifie (in the ſenſe of the Scholaſtic Theology) *the Word was made Man. Rule* 2. When Fleſh ſignifieth only that which is manifeſt, exterior and viſible, it doth not ſignifie Man, but only the bodily part of Man. And thus it ſignifieth in this Scriptural Doctrine of the Incarnation, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh.* For to be manifeſted in that which is not manifeſt, exterior and viſible, is ſo to be manifeſted, as not to be manifeſted. The Apoſtle's Senſe may be very much illuſtrated from this following Paſſage of the Alexandrian *Cyril.* (s) *The Divinity is not tangible, but the Logos became tangible as by his own Fleſh. Inviſible he was by Nature, but was viſible* (or manifeſt) *by the Body.* The Word that was with God (1 *Joh.* 1. 1.) became audible, viſible, tangible, and was manifeſted in and by the Fleſh, as that ſignifieth only the bodily part of Man. So it ſignifieth in thoſe places of Scripture, wherein we read of *the Body of his Fleſh, the vail of his Fleſh, the days of his Fleſh*, and that he was *put to death in the Fleſh.*

V. The Scholaſtic Birth-humiliation of the Son of God is wholly Unſcriptural and Antiſcriptural, ſuch therefore is his *being made Man* in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology. For his being made Man in the Senſe of this Theology is his Birth-humiliation, which it accounteth a principal part of his Humiliation. (t) *What manner of humbling was this, that* Conditor ſolis, *ſhould be* Conditus ſub ſole, *ſhould be an Embrio, a little piece of unfaſhioned Fleſh; that* Verbum longum *ſhould be* Verbum abbreviatum (*as* Bernard *upon the Nativity;*) *that he who filleth Heaven and Earth with his Preſence, whom the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain, ſhould be himſelf as it were ſo narrow'd and curtail'd, as for nine Months ſpace to be ſhut up and included* intra virginei ventris anguſtias, *within ſo narrow a circuit as the Womb of the Virgin* Mary; *that he who was begotten of his Father before all time, ſhould be made of a Woman in the fulneſs of time; that* Verbum *ſhould be* Infans; *the ancient of days but a Child of a day old; that* Sydera regens *ſhould be* Ubera lambens; *that he who meted out Heaven with a Span, ſhould himſelf be a Child but of a Span long; that*

(i) *Pool's Syn. in Job.* 1.14.

(k) *Hom.* 4.

(l) *Valentia T.* 1. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 1. *Punct.* 1.

(m) *De Incar.* c. 4.

(n) *Lib.* 18. *Moral.* c. 12.

(o) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *S.* 5.

(p) *Valentia ſupr.*

(q) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 12. *c.* 19. *S.* 7, 8.

(r) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 2. *S.* 8. & *S.* 3. & *Ibid. c.* 12. *S.* 5.

(s) Καίτοι τὸ θεῖον ἐστιν ἀναφὲς, ἀλλὰ γέγονεν ἁπτὸς ὁ λόγος ὡς διὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς, ἀόρατος κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' ἦν ἐμφανὴς διὰ σώματος. *T.* 5. *p.* 57. *adv. Neſtor. l.* 3.

(t) *Mr. Jeanes mixture of Scholaſt. Div with Pract. p.* 93. *Ed.* 1.

Verbum *ſhould be* Mutum, *the eternal Word without a Word, not able to utter a Word or Syllable; that* Tonans *ſhould be* Vagiens *the great Thunderer of Heaven an Infant crying in a Manger!* This is a wonderful Humiliation indeed, and being ſo prodigiouſly ſtrange, it is wonderful, that the Scripture hath not moſt expreſly taken notice of it, (if it was true) and decypher'd it in as lively colours as the Scholaſtic Divines have done. But ſeeing the Scripture is totally ſilent concerning it, and on the contrary always repreſenteth our Saviour's Conception and Nativity as his Birth-nobilitation, therefore the Scripture doth not underſtand by them his Incarnation or being made Man in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology.

VI. The Soul of the Son of God was in part his *true ſubſtantial Self,* and therefore could not be a thing aſſumptitious by, and adventitious to, his Perſon. All wiſe Men ſay (u) *The Soul of Man is himſelf, not the external and viſible Figure of Man; the Soul is the true Man* (the Perſon) *Man is a Soul carrying a Carcaſe, we take care of the welfare of our Souls, that is, of our ſelves, I* (my true ſubſtantial Self) *am diſtinct from the Body.* So our Saviour ſuppoſeth, that the Soul of Man is his true ſubſtantial Self (that which truly and ſubſtantially is his Perſon) when he ſaith *Matth.* 10. 28. *Fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul.* Matth. 16. 26. *What is a Man profited, if he ſhall gain the whole World and loſe his own Soul?* In S. *Luk. ch.* 9. 25. the words are, *What is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world and loſe himſelf?* The Soul is himſelf, and accordingly the Syriack rendreth theſe words in S. *Luke, If he gain the whole World and loſe his Soul.* Luk. 23. 43. *Jeſus ſaid unto him* (the penitent Thief) *verily, I ſay unto thee, to day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* His Soul only could be that day in Paradiſe, yet he is ſaid to be there that day, his Soul being his true ſubſtantial Self. Such is the Soul of every Man, and ſuch was our Bl. Saviour's Soul. For as it was his true ſubſtantial Self, that S. *Stephen* commended into the Hands of Chriſt ſaying, *Lord Jeſus receive my Spirit.* Act. 7. 59. So it was his true ſubſtantial Self in part which Chriſt commended into the Hands of his Father, *Luk.* 23. 46. *Father into thy Hands I commend my Spirit.* His Soul ſignifieth his true and inmoſt, his ſubſtantial and central Self, *Job.* 12. 27. *Now is my Soul troubled.* Matth. 26. 38. *My Soul is exceeding ſorrowful even unto Death.* The Son of God (as good Men do) look'd upon his Soul as his Eſſence and as Himſelf. He was not two Perſons (the one as God the other as Man) but one only Perſon, and this one only Perſon counteth his Soul his Eſſence and Himſelf as all good Men do (ſo plainly, that it is not poſſible otherwiſe to expound his words;) therefore his Soul was not to his Perſon as an *Accident* to a *Subſtance,* meerly a *preter-eſſential, adventitious* and *aſſumed* thing, but he was and is eſſentially *God-man,* and conſequently, there never was any ſuch thing as an *Abſtract Logos* (or Abſtract Son of God) that by a Scholaſtic Incarnation aſſum'd an Humane Soul. As our Saviour accounted his Soul his true ſubſtantial Self, ſo doth *S. Ambroſe,* when conſidering him in that interval of time that was between his Paſſion and Reſurrection, he ſaith of him (w) *ipſe inter mortuos liber.* His meaning is (x) *when without Fleſh and denudated of that Body which he had aſſumed, he that was Life it ſelf deſcended to the Region of the Enemies.* Thus himſelf was free among the dead and his Soul was himſelf. It was not therefore an Abſtract Logos or *Verbum* that became Fleſh (or was incarnate) the Incarnation was not the Scholaſtic Inhumanation or being made Man: But it was the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah that became Fleſh, as thoſe words of the great Evangeliſt moſt naturally ſignifie, that *Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh.* 1 Joh. 4. 2, 3.

SECTION V.

The Fifth Diſagreement.

I. THE Shoclaſtic Incarnation like the Scholaſtic Trinity is eminently, not a Myſtery of Religion and Sanctity, but a myſterious Riddle of School-philoſophy, which is an evident Argument, that it is a miſtake. When matter of Sanctity as ſuch maketh any thing myſterious, it muſt be called a Myſtery of Sanctity: But if there be much of Matter of Philoſophy in it, which is ſtrangely myſterious and enigmatical, this may juſtly denominate it a myſterious Riddle of Philoſophy. And as the Scholaſtic *Tranſubſtantiation* is eminently, not a Myſtery of Sanctity, but a myſterious Riddle of Philoſophy, the Scholaſtic Theology having chang'd the Myſtery of the Holy Eucharist into a Syſtem of unholy, unpopular, unintelligible Conceits: So this Theology hath chang'd the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity, of our Saviour's Perſon and Incarnation from being Myſteries of Sanctity, to be myſterious Riddles of School-philoſophy eminently ſuch. For at a great rate this Theology magnifieth the enigmatical Philoſophy of the Trinity, and at the ſame rate it magnifieth the enigmatical Philoſophy of the Incarnation. Of the Trinity it obſerveth (y) that *S. Baſil* calleth it *ænigma novum* (which ſpeaketh it a Syſtem of enigmatical Philoſophy) that *Gr. Nyſſen* calleth it *ænigma à communi ſenſu abhorrens,* and that Pope *Hormiſdas* ſaith of it *ſecretum Trinitatis nec ulla viſibilium nec inviſibilium creaturarum potuit inveſtigare natura.* So the Incarnation is called by the Alexandrian *Cyril, ænigma ſacratiſſimum, quod nulla mens creata poteſt intelligere.* (z) *Wonderful and beyond Mind and Speech* (Conception and Expreſſion) *is the manner of the Incarnation.* This Wiſdom conſiſteth (a) ἐν ἀποῤῥήτοις τισὶ βαθέσι τε ϗ ἀκαταληψίαις, *in certain recondite ineffable depths and incomprehenſibles.*

II. The Union of the two Natures in Chriſt is according to this Theology alike myſteriouſly Philoſophical, as the Union of the three Perſons in the (Scholaſtic) Trinity. (b) *The Trinity of Perſons are but one Subſtance or Eſſence; and the three Subſtances or Eſſences in Chriſt* (whereof two are intelligent) *are but one Perſon.* The Union of theſe three Subſtances into one Perſon is commonly called incomprehenſible and ineffable. *For Chriſt's Divine Nature is united to his*

(u) *Mens cujuſque eſt quiſque, non ea figura quæ digito demonſtrari poteſt.* Cic. Ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος. *Plotin. En.* 4. *l.* 7. *c.* 1. *Verum hominem ipſam animam eſſe teſtatur.* Macrob. in Som. Scip. l. 2. c 12. *Anima revera ipſa eſt homo.* Coſri. Νȣ̃ς κυρίως ϗ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπός ἐςι. *Philo.* Ψυχάριον εἶ βαςάζον νεκρόν. *Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 155, 382. *Quid ſumus homines niſi animæ corporibus illigatæ? Audetis ridere nos, quod animarum noſtrarum provideamus ſaluti, id eſt, nobis ipſis: Quid enim ſumus homines, niſi animæ corporibus clauſæ?* Arnob. adv. Gent. ἄλλος εἰμι τȣ̃ νεκρȣ̃. *Epictet. diſſ. l.* 4. *c.* 7.

(w) De Incarn. c. 5.

(x) Euſeb. Dem. Ev. *l.* 8. *p.* 134.

(y) Gonet. Clyp. T. iv. Diſp. 2. p. 60, 61.

(z) Παράδοξος δὲ ϗ ὑπὲρ νȣ̃ν ϗ λόγον τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίας ὁ τρόπος. S. Cyr. c. *Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 280.

(a) *Idem adv. Neſtor. l.* 2. *T.* 6. *p.* 61.

(b) *Bernard. l.* 5. *de conſid. ad. Eugen.* c. 8.

his Humane Nature (ſaith a Scholaſtic Divine) *in ſuch a manner, as no mortal can comprehend. It is not in Man to define* (ſaith *Alexander* of *Hales*) *what manner of Communication this is, whereby the Humane Nature is communicated to The Word.* (c) *Curiouſly to ſearch into the manner of the Incarnation, or of the Unition of the Word with the terrene Fleſh, is not without detriment* (ſaith the *Alexandr. Cyril*) τὸ γὰρ ὑπὲρ νοῦν καὶ λόγον βασάνου κρεῖττον ἀεὶ, *for that which is above Mind and Speech, is beyond diſquiſition. The Deity and Humanity did concur ineffably, and ſo as none can underſtand or expreſs, to conſtitute ſome one thing*; ſo ſaith *Gr. Nyſſen.* And *Hippolytus* (with whom *Theodoret* agreeth) ſaith of this Unition; *It is altogether inapprehenſible by the knowledge of any Creature.*

(c) *V. Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 1. *ſ.* 1.

III. The Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation are alike grand Innovations in Philoſophy (as the Scholaſtic Theology affirmeth) alike repugnant to the ancient Maxims thereof; and ſo far theſe far better Articles ſymbolize with the prodigious Dogma of *Tranſubſtantiation.* For as by accident through the Folly and Vicioſity of Men the Chriſtian Religion hath ingendred Tranſubſtantiation: in like manner it hath introduc'd a Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation. And as the Scholaſtic Theology hath diſcarded or diſtorted all the Principles of the Philoſophic Arts and Sciences, to ſerve the Intereſt of Tranſubſtantiation: ſo it hath dealt with the ancient Maxims of Philoſophy, to ſerve the Intereſt of a Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation. For upon this account in two Points (*d*) the Scholaſtic Theology contradicteth the ancient Philoſophy. For the ancient Philoſophy ſuppoſeth, that a ſingular Nature or Subſtance is not common to more or communicable: but the Scholaſtic Theology affirmeth, that one and the ſame numerical Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence (although it is ſingular and individual) is common and communicated to the three Divine Perſons of the Trinity. The ancient Philoſophy ſuppoſeth, that every ſingular individual Nature (ſuch as the Nature of a Man) is *ſubſiſtent by its ſelf* (or hath its proper ſubſiſtence) not in and by another: but the Scholaſtic Theology affirmeth, that the Humane Nature in Chriſt is *not ſubſiſtent by it ſelf*, but in and by the *Logos* or *Verbum.* And thus this Theology ſerveth the Intereſt of its Trinity and Incarnation (having made them myſterious Riddles of Philoſophy) by diſcarding and contradicting the Senſe and Maxims of the ancient Philoſophy, which are far to be preferr'd before the Maxims of the Scholaſtic Theology; both becauſe they are the dictates of plain and clear Reaſon, and becauſe they are the dictates of impartial and unbiaſs'd Reaſon, not excogitated to ſerve a Turn and an Intereſt, as the Maxims of the Scholaſtic Theology manifeſtly are. Its Articles of Faith are certain new Maxims of Philoſophy repugnant to the ancient; if therefore God had deſign'd thoſe Articles to be Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, doubtleſs (at the riſe of Chriſtianity) he would have introduc'd into the World a new Philoſophy, to make them intelligible and credible.

(d) *Cùm in Ariſtotelia philoſophia & apud humanæ ſapientiæ auctores omnis* οὐσία *vel* φύσις, *hoc eſt, ſubſtantia quælibet ac natura ſingularis, ſe tota differat ab alia natura vel ſubſtantia ſingulari, & ſit* ἰδιοσύστατος, *quod eſt per ſe ſubſiſtens, & ab alterius cujuſlibet conſortio & copulatione divulſa: duo quædam ab illis diverſa Chriſtiana ſapientia didicit totidem exprimariis religionis noſtræ myſteriis, Trinitatis & Incarnationis: alterum, non omnem naturam particularem incommunicabilem eſſe; quod ex priore dogmate ſumus edocti. Nam divina Natura cùm ſit una & ſimplex, & eatenus individua, perſonis tribus eadem numero communis eſt. alterum; non omnem individuam naturam eſſe* ἰδιοσύστατον, *hoc eſt per ſe & non in altero, vel alterius ope conſiſtentem & cohærentem: quod ex Incarnationis myſterio percepimus: in quo humana natura & ſi ſingularis & una numero ſit, non tamen per ſe ſubſiſtit. Utrumque veteribus philoſophis ignotum propterea fuit, quod nulla humana ratio eò pertingere potuit: nec aliter iſtud quàm fide ac divina ſignificatione capere.* Petav. T. 4. l. 6. c. 1. S. 3.

IV. The Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation are alike unintelligible by any but the Sons of Art and School-philoſophy; yet theſe by their Superlative Subtilties and Intrigues of Diſtinction have intricated theſe Articles rather than made them intelligible. (*e*) *Porphyry* contendeth, that there is a ſort of Gods, which at certain times are changed into Men, but he doth not ſuppoſe, that they are chang'd into Men by the Scholaſtic kind of Incarnation or Inhumanation. (*f*) *The Heathen Gods made themſelves viſible by putting on Bodies and forming themſelves into the ſhape of Men.* (*g*) *Jupiter* is ſaid by *Julian*, to have generated amongſt the Intelligibles *Æſculapius* out of himſelf, who made a progreſs from Heaven upon Earth (where he became conſpicuous by the fecund Life of the Sun) and appeard ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ, *in the form of Man about* Epidaurus, whence he diſpread his ſalutary power over the whole Earth. If *Æſculapius* and other Heathen Deities were ſuppoſed to come and live in terrene Humane Bodies, and to animate them (as Humane Souls do) yet there is no great difficulty in the Notion of this their Inhumanation, the conception of it is not very puzzling to an ordinary Underſtanding, it is nothing like the Scholaſtic Inhumanation, which is, (*h*) *poſt SS. Trinitatis myſterium maximè admirabile*, moſt wonderful of all things next to the Sacroſanct Myſtery of the Trinity, as *Cajetan* ſaith. (*i*) *Such as are unexerciſed in Metaphyſical Speculations, that have not ſo much as conſidered the Union of their own Soul with their Body, nor once heard of diſtinction real and formal, and other ſettled Notions requiſite for the more expreſs apprehenſion of ſuch high points as the conjunction of the Divinity and Humanity in Chriſt and the Triunity of the Godhead, the beſt Inſtruction that can be given to them is, that they would make that up in humble Adoration that they want in Knowledge.* They muſt be well exercis'd in Metaphyſical Speculations, that have any tolerable inſight into the Myſtery of the Scholaſtic Incarnation (which conſiſteth in underſtanding Being, modes of Being, individual Subſtance, Hypoſtaſis or *ſuppoſitum*, *perſona*, Hypoſtatical Union, *Unum per ſe*, Incommunicability, the difference between Exiſtence and Subſiſtence, and between being perfect in Eſſence and Exiſtence) and when they have travell'd a long Journey in Metaphyſical Speculations touching this Myſtery, they will find themſelves not at all wiſer than they were at their firſt ſetting out, and that their Maſters *darken Counſel by words without knowledge*, that they talk of things whereof they have no Notion, and that at the long run they muſt acquieſce in that of the Ancients, *Generationem ejus quis enarrabit?* (*k*) Which according to S. *Leo* referreth not only to the Eternal, but alſo to the Temporal Generation of Chriſt God-man. (*l*) *Ipſa Jeſu in carne apparitio & ineffabilis eſt ſermone omni, & omni ignota intelligentiæ.* The Scholaſtic Theology hath ſo marvellouſly intricated the Article of the Incarnation, that there have been more Scholaſtic Diſputes about it than any other Article.

(e) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 287.

(f) *Dii falſi ſe aſpectabiles reddebant — inducntes ſe corporibus, ut ait Serv.* ἑαυτοὺς εἰδοποιοῦντες εἰς ἀνθρώπους. *Gothofr. exercit.* 2. *in* 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *p.* 3379.

(g) *S. Cyr. ſupr.*

(h) *Valentia T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 1. *punct.* 2.

(i) *Dr. H. More Myſt. of Godl. B.* 9. *c.* 3.

(k) *Valentia ſupr.*

(l) *Idem ibid.*

V. The Trinity and Incarnation of the Scholaſtic Theology are alike deſcrib'd in it, in Terms and Phraſes enigmatical, and not only enigmatical but unintelligible. For the Metaphyſical and Scholaſtic Genius delighteth, to make Riddles of the Trinity, whence we have, (*m*) *numerabilis Unitas, & in Unitate ac cum Unitate conſiſtens numeri conditio* (a numerable Unite, number in Uniteneſs and conſiſtent with Uniteneſs) and the Trinity is called by the counterfeit *Dionyſius*, (*n*) τριὰς ὑπερούσιος ϗ ὑπέρθεος, *the Triad Super-eſſential and Super-God*. And in like manner the Incarnation is thus deſcrib'd; (*o*) *God being ſuper-ſubſtantial and tranſcendent to all ſuper-ſubſtantiality, being minded to deſcend unto Subſtance, was ſuper-ſubſtantially ſubſtantiated.* At this rate ſome that are well exercis'd in Metaphyſical Speculations, treat of Divine Matters: others in deſcribing the Incarnation uſe terms more modeſt, but not leſs unintelligible; for thus they deſcribe the Hypoſtatical Union. (*p*) *This Union to the Divine Perſon and Nature addeth nothing but a Relation, but it maketh a change in the Humane Nature, which is by this means elevated to the higheſt perfection: for it is made a* quaſi *proper adjunct of the Divine Perſon by whom it is aſſumed: a* quaſi *part of the ſame whole God-man, of which the Divine Nature is another* quaſi *part: and as to ſubſiſtence a* quaſi *effect ſingularly ſuſtained by the Divine Nature: and alſo a* quaſi *ſubject which the Divine Nature ſingularly inhabiteth.* This is an uſual mode of Theologizing (touching the Incarnation) of which it is obſervable, (1.) That it is not conſiſtent with it ſelf. For if the Divine and Humane Nature in Chriſt are but *quaſi* parts, the whole (θεάνθρωπος) can be but a *quaſi* whole. And if the Humane Nature as to ſubſiſtence is but a *quaſi* Effect, the Cauſe can be but a *quaſi* Cauſe. (2.) By this mode of Theologizing we do not in Theology contemplate things, but only *quaſi* things. As if in Mathematicks we ſhould contemplate only a *quaſi* Triangle or a *quaſi* Cube; in Metaphyſicks only a *quaſi Ens*, *quaſi Eſſentia*; in Phyſicks only *quaſi* Matter and Form; in Logicks only *quaſi* Cauſe and Effect; which would be a deſtroying all the Sciences (by deſtroying the Objects of them;) for in Science we are to contemplate things, not *quaſi* things. (3.) This mode of ſpeaking doth not ſignifie what things really are, but what really they are not ſave only in pretenſion or reſemblance. It may be rightly us'd therefore touching things, of which there are or may be meer pretenſions or reſemblances (as Chriſt may be rightly called a *quaſi* Sinner:) but that there is or can be a *quaſi* part and a *quaſi* whole, or that one's true ſubſtantial ſelf can be a *quaſi* adjunct of his Perſon, is not intelligible. (4.) This mode of ſpeaking is one mode of making Riddles, ſuch as that of the Greeks a little alter'd, (*q*) A *quaſi* Man (an Eunuch) ſaw a *quaſi* Bird (a Bat) ſit on a *quaſi* Tree (Giant-Fennel) and threw (a Pumice-ſtone) a *quaſi* Stone at it.

VI. The Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation are alike incapable of an Illuſtration by ſimilitude or compariſon. For of the Trinity the Scholaſtic Theology ſaith, (*r*) *There is nothing like it to be found in any kind of things. The Order of things natural and the Capacity of the Humane Mind it tranſcendeth at the greateſt rate.* (*s*) *Jerom* of *Prague* was accus'd in the Council of *Conſtance*, to have cauſed a Shield or Eſcutcheon to be painted in repreſentation of the three Perſons in Trinity, comparing them therein to Water, Snow and Ice; and this fact of his he defended with this pretence, that God had ſtamped in natural matters ſome countenance of ſupernatural Myſteries. But doubtleſs he was not happier in his compariſon than others have been, that have made Compariſons of the Trinity without any conſiderable ſimilitude, and likened it to things extremely unlike: nor have they been happier in their attempts, by Compariſons to illuſtrate the Scholaſtic Incarnation. (*t*) *For we cannot produce any thing like this Myſtery, no ſimilitude can reach it.* But ſome have thought, that the dependence of Chriſt's Humanity upon the Perſon of the Word may be reſembled to the ſupportance of an *Accident in its Subject*: but then we muſt abſtract (ſay they) the Subject muſt be conſider'd as *not potential* in reſpect of the Accident (as not being to be formed and in ſome ſort perfected by it) and the Accident muſt not be conſider'd as inherent, that is, it muſt not be conſider'd as an Accident. So repugnant is this Myſtery to all things in Nature and natural Science, that the poſſibility of it (*u*) is not clearly intelligible by Natural Light.

SECTION VI.

The Sixth Diſagreement.

AGainſt the Scholaſtic Incarnation ſeveral Objections are made in the Scholaſtic Theology, which have ſo much weight in them, that they plainly ſhew it, to be a miſtake. For the School-Divines have the Arguments of Hereticks to anſwer (which is a main part of their Buſineſs;) among themſelves they are ill agreed and love to bandy and diſpute Party againſt Party; and of themſelves they are prone to ſtart Difficulties, to find themſelves work (to tye Knots and unlooſe them;) whence they generally incumber their Theories with numerous Objections, and ſo it fareth with their Theory of the Incarnation.

I. A principal Objection is from the Compoſition of Chriſt's Perſon. (*w*) *For the Humane Nature belongeth to the Eſſence of Chriſt's Perſon: but it doth not belong to the Eſſence of the* (Scholaſtic) Verbum; *therefore the Perſon of Chriſt and the Perſon of the* Verbum *is not the ſame Perſon. If we ſuppoſe alſo, that after the Incarnation the Humane Nature did belong to the Eſſence of the Perſon of Chriſt, which before this Incarnation did not belong to the Eſſence of the Perſon of the Word, from thence it followeth, that after this Incarnation the Perſon of the Word was chang'd and extinguiſh'd and a Perſon of a different Eſſence ſucceeded inſtead of it; for as an Unite added unto, or taken from Number, maketh another Number: ſo an eſſential part being added or taken away, the Eſſence is* chang'd

(m) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 2. c. 8. *S.* 21.

(n) *Myſt. Theol. c.* 1.

(o) Ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερούσιος ὢν, ϗ ὑπερουσιότητος ἁπάσης ὑπερανεστηκὼς, εἰς οὐσίαν ἐλθεῖν βουληθεὶς, ὑπερουσίως οὐσιώθη. *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 8. *c.* 12. *S.* 22.

(p) *Unio hæc perſonæ & naturæ divinæ nihil addit niſi relationem, in humana verò natura facit commutationem, dum elevatur hoc pacto ad ſummam perfectionem: fit enim quaſi adjunctum proprium divinæ perſonæ, à quâ aſſumitur: quaſi membrum ejuſdem integri* θεανθρώπου, *cujus divina natura eſt quaſi pars altera: & quoad ſubſiſtentiam quaſi effectum ſingulariter à divina natura ſuſtentatum: ac etiam quaſi ſubjectum, in quo divina natura ſingulariter habitat.* Ameſ. medul. Theol. l. 1. c. 18.

(q) *Athen. Dipnoſ. l.* 10. *Plato de Rep. l.* 5.

(r) *Nec ei quod ſimile ſit, in nullo rerum genere inveſtigari poteſt.* Petav. de Trin. l. 14. c. 13. S. 4. *Myſterium maximum cujus ſimile in rerum natura non datur. Ordinem rerum naturalium & captum mentis humanæ longiſſimè excedit.* Henichius.

(s) *Fuller's Lives, p.* 26.

(t) *Verbi incarnati rationem nulla poteſt undecunque capta ſimilitudo conſequi.* Petav. ſupr. l. 3. c. 16. S. 11. *Neque enim poſſumus aliquid huic myſterio ſimile proferre, quod per omnia quadret.* Valentia T. 4. Diſp. 1. Qu. 1. punct. 2.

(u) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 11. *Diſp.* 2. *Art.* 2.

(w) Pete T. 4. l. c. 16. S. 14.

chang'd and deſtroy'd. To this great Objection the only Anſwer (that looketh like an Anſwer) which the Scholaſtic Theology can make, is altogether impertinent. For it anſwereth, that the Humane Nature doth not belong to the Eſſence of the Perſon of the Word, but is only *accidens & adventitium.* Whereas the Objection argueth, that the Humane Nature belongeth to the Eſſence of the Perſon of Chriſt, and therefore neceſſarily belongeth to the Eſſence of the Perſon of the Word. That the Humane Nature belongeth to the Eſſence of the Perſon of Chriſt, is manifeſt from his Idea, and is abundantly acknowledg'd and conſtantly aſſerted by this ſelf-contradicting Scholaſtic Theology, which ſaith, (*x*) *The Name Chriſt ſignifieth not either God or Man alone, but properly ſignifieth both God and Man. The Perſon of Chriſt is both God and Man,* as S. Auſtin *ſaith, It is a mixture of God and Man. Chriſt is two according to his Natures.* (*y*) *Chriſt is one Perſon of a twofold Subſtance* (as every Man is a Perſon of a Rational Soul and Humane Fleſh) *for he is God and Man.* (*z*) *Chriſt is one Hypoſtaſis or Perſon of the Trinity having two Natures, the Divine and Humane.* Amongſt Chriſtians (that are Trinitarians) no doubt can be made, but that the Humane Nature belongeth to the Eſſence of the Perſon of Chriſt. From whence it followeth, that the Perſon incarnated was the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, and there can be no Abſtract *Logos*. For if the Humane Nature belongeth to the Eſſence of the Perſon of Chriſt, and doth not belong to the Eſſence of the Perſon of the *Logos*, the Perſon of Chriſt and the Perſon of the *Logos* cannot be the ſame Perſon, as the Objection argueth.

(x) *Chriſti vocabulum propriè utrumque ſignificat, Deum ſimul & hominem.* Petav. T. 4. l. 11. c. 8. S. 12. *Mixtura eſt Dei & hominis.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 16. S. 2. *Duo eſſe Chriſtum ſecundum naturas.* Ibid. c. 9. S. 15.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 11. *S.* 10.

(z) *Ibid. l.* 5. c. 3. *S.* 6.

A further and greater Objection againſt the Scholaſtic Incarnation ariſeth from the Compoſition of Chriſt's Perſon, which is ſuppos'd to conſiſt of two intellectual Natures, the one the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence, the other his Humane Soul, which are not ſuppos'd, to be united into one third Nature, but ſo as to conſtitute one Perſon; whereas if one Intellect, Reaſon and Will neceſſarily conſtituteth one Perſon, two Intellects and two Wills muſt neceſſarily conſtitute two Perſons. To avoid this Conſequence, one of theſe intellectual Natures (that is a Perſon) is ſaid, to aſſume the other *ad ſuam ſubſiſtentiam* (to its Subſiſtence) affording it a *Termination, Complement, Perſonality* (one intellectual Nature communicateth its Subſiſtence to the other, that hath Exiſtence, but wanteth Subſiſtence) and herein the Incarnation is ſuppos'd, to conſiſt; which therefore is bad Theology and worſe Philoſophy, as will hereafter appear.

II. Another Objection againſt its Incarnation this Theology raiſeth from the component parts of Chriſt s Perſon (*a*) who is *perſona compoſita*, compounded of the Godhead and the Manhood, that are the parts of Chriſt, of which and in which he ſubſiſteth. (*b*) So *Maximus* the Martyr ſaith, *That Chriſt is in his two Natures as the whole in the parts, and that the parts of Chriſt are the Deity and Humanity. J. Damaſcen.* calleth each of them ἓν τῶν μερῶν, *one of the parts. Leontius* ſaith, *We often denominate the whole from a part, and call a part by the name of the whole, when we call the Word the Son of Man,* and by ſuch more Names. And a modern Scholaſtic Theologer ſaith; *Chriſt is ſaid, to have ſuffered and have been dead, and to have exiſted from Eternity ſimply and without addition* (nec additur quâ ſui parte aut naturâ id illi conveniat) *nor do we add according to what part of him or what Nature it agreeth to him.* In the Incarnation the Manhood is neceſſarily a part, and conſequently the Godhead muſt be a part (the part of a *Compoſitum*:) but to be a part, is to be imperfect, which is incompetible to the Godhead. To this Objection this Theology maketh an Anſwer, wherein theſe ſeverals are obſervable. (1.) It affirmeth, (*c*) "That the Compoſition which is "in Chriſt (as all agree) doth not conſiſt of "Parts properly ſo called. Every Part properly ſo called is ſomething that is imperfect, "as being oppoſite to the Whole (which is in a "manner the ſame with perfect) and by a certain habitude it relateth to another Part, "wherewith by its Nature and ingenit Propenſion it requireth to be joyned; and by the "ſame Nature and Condition it reſpecteth the "Whole, and (by a kind of natural Appetite) "it would be in the Whole and conſtitute the "Whole. This therefore is a Part properly ſo "called, which is produced by God, not for it "ſelf, nor to ſubſiſt by it ſelf and alone, but "that in compoſition with ſome other thing "it might make a third, *a deſigned Whole*; for "the nature of things is from the Will of God. "From whence it followeth, that the Soul of a "Man, although it liveth when he is dead, yet "is not perfect, but muſt be counted a Part, "becauſe it is created by God, that it might "be the form of an Humane Body, and being "conjoyned with it might be component of the "whole Man. But ſuppoſe, that the Name of a Part properly ſo called, be limited and confined to that which is *a proper part and natively ſuch*, yet that which is not ſuch a part may be *in juſt account and denomination a part and factively ſuch.* As ſuppoſe, that the Heathen God *Æſculapius* ſhould aſſume Humane Nature into the Unity of his Perſon, ſo making a complex Perſon and Phyſician; the Manhood in this complex Perſon would neceſſarily be one part and the Godhead would be another, as being (factively) a comcomponent and conſtituent part of this complex Perſon. And the Godhead that was before an intire complete Perſon and God, would by this Incarnation be minorated into but a part of a Perſon and of a God, and of ſuch an one who is in part a Man. Which Minorations of the Godhead are incompetible to the true Godhead. And it is alſo repugnant to a Perſon, to be but a part of a Perſon, and conſequently but a part of an *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum*. Moreover, Chriſt's Humanity is neceſſarily one conſtituent part of his Perſon, and his Divinity is the other, which therefore cannot be the Scholaſtic *Logos*, that is antecedently to his Humanity *of it ſelf complete and abſolute, and is neither conſtituted by the preſence of it, nor diminiſh'd by the abſence of it.* (2.) This Theology affirmeth (*d*) touching the Compoſition of Chriſt's Perſon (called by the Fathers διπλοῦς, *biformis*, and of whom *Gr. Naz.* ſaith, ἓν ἐκ τῶν δύο γενέσθαι, *that he was made one of two*) that it is not like the other *that are uſual in the nature of things*; for here is no Compoſition of Parts properly ſo called, as in thoſe other; in other Compoſitions the Whole exiſteth not before the Parts are united, whereas Chriſt was from Eternity; in other Compoſitions the *Compoſitum* is not called by the Names of the ſeveral Parts, whereas Chriſt is called God and Man.

This

(a) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 15.

(b) *Ibid. S.* 2. *& l.* 4. c. 16. *S.* 2, 3, 9.

(c) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 15. *S.* 4.

(d) *Ibid. S.* 9. *& c.* 15. *S.* 9.

This Compoſition therefore is *ſui ac proprii generis*, of a kind proper and peculiar to it ſelf. But in all reaſon this Theology ought to diſtinguiſh in Chriſt (at leaſt) a twofold Compoſition: The one is of his Humane Nature, which is compounded of Soul and Body, and is ſuch a Compoſition, which is uſual in the Nature of things. And ſeeing this Compoſition is agreeable to the Nature of things, it ought to be look'd upon as an Indication, that the other Compoſition of his Divinity and Humanity is not ſo great an Heteroclit, as that there is nothing like it in Nature or Grace. (3.) This Theology acknowledgeth in Chriſt *(e)* not an *interiour*, but only an *exteriour* Compoſition; not ſuch as that of Matter and Form (which is an interiour Compoſition) but ſuch as is like that of *Subſtance* and *Accident*, whence nothing accrueth to the ſubject but that which is *quodammodo externum non intimum* (in ſome ſort external not intimious; for the Conjunction or Unition of the Manhood and Godhead is only *(in ſubſiſtendi proprietate) in ſubſiſting*, the Manhood being aſſum'd *(ad ſubſiſtendi communionem) to Communion of ſubſiſting*. This exteriour Compoſition is the only Compoſition, which this Theology acknowledgeth, which yet (Self-contradictiouſly) talketh of *the Humanity being wholly inſerted into the Divinity, of immixing the whole Natures, of their mutual inexplicable Immeation and Unition, and that the Union between God and Man is cloſer than that of Soul and Body.* (4.) By this exteriour Compoſition this Theology deſigneth to ſalve the abſolute Simplicity (uncompoundedneſs) of the Godhead notwithſtanding its Compoſition with the Humane Nature, which is ſaid to be *(f) accidentis inſtar ad perſonam Verbi*, as it were an accident to the Perſon of the Word *(g) Humanitas velut appendicis & accidentis inſtar eſt ad ſubſtantiam*, the Humanity (to the Perſon of the Word) is as an Appendix and an Accident to a Subſtance. Yet this Manhood doth not inhere, as an Accident doth; nor doth it affect the Godhead, as a Form (or Accident) doth the Subject-matter; nor (as the Schools ſpeak) doth any *eſſe accidentarium*, or Additament of Perfection accrue to the Godhead from it (which accrueth from Accidents to their Subject-ſubſtance;) and whereas the Godhead is incapable of a Compoſition of Subſtance and Accident (as being deſtructive to its Simplicity) a Compoſition of the Manhood with the Godhead is not incompetible thereto. In a juſt Computation of things therefore the Manhood is not by far ſo much as an *Accident* to the Perſon of *the Word*, but is hugely ſhort of it. Yet this contemptible Manhood leſs than an Accident is no leſs than our Saviour's intellectual Nature (which cannot be his Nature, unleſs it be conſtitutive of him) and nothing leſs than *his very Soul*, as much to him as the precious immortal Soul of a Man is to the Man, which is ſomewhat better than all *Accidents*, and is not to be degraded into an *Appendix or Hang-by*, as this Theology calleth the Humanity of Chriſt.

(c) *Ibid.* c 15. *S.* 10, 11.

(f) *Ibid c.* 15. *S.* 11. & *l.* 16. c. 5. *S.* 3.

(g) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *S.* 6.

III. Another Objection (againſt the Incarnation) this Theology raiſeth from the *immutability of God*; for the Word by the Incarnation ſeemeth to be chang'd in the intrinſic Conſtitution of his Perſon, becoming thereby *aliud* (if not *alius*) he that was meerly θεὸς becometh θεάνθρωπος, *perſona ſimplex* is chang'd to *perſona compoſita*, he that was but one intellectual Nature, is chang'd to be of two intellectual Natures, from purely incorporeal to corporeal, and in ſome reſpect to be animative of an Humane Body, and from being impaſſible he is chang'd, to be paſſible and mortal. *(h) It importeth a real and intrinſecal Mutation, for God to be made Man, and to take into his perſonal being our Nature.* To this objected Difficulty the School-doctors anſwer, *That the Word is not the Subject of the Humanity by receiving it intrinſecally, nor is potentially receptive thereof, but only affordeth it a Termination and Subſiſtence; and therefore is not chang'd intrinſecally by the Acceſſion of it and Union with it.* But if *Subject* and *Adjunct* are rightly defin'd by Logicians, the Word (in the Scholaſtic Incarnation) is neceſſarily the Subject and the Humane Nature the Adjunct of it. And becauſe the intellectual Nature of the Word muſt be intrinſic to his intellectual Nature (his Humane intellectual Nature to his Divine) therefore the Word muſt be the Subject of the Humane Nature *by receiving it intrinſecally*, which is an intrinſic Mutation and Alteration. There is a περιχώρησις of theſe two Natures, ſay the Fathers, whereby they mean *(i) a mutual Inexiſtence and Commeation*, which they illuſtrate by a Globe of Iron plac'd in the Air all-fiery, and by a drop of Vinegar poured into the Sea; both which (the Globe of Iron and the Vinegar) are intrinſecally receiv'd into the Air and into the Sea: The Humane Nature therefore was receiv'd by the Divine intrinſecally, and the Ancients ſay, *the Humane Nature was deify'd, (k) the whole of which the Divinity in ſome ſort transform'd into it ſelf, and being conjoined and wholly inſerted into it* (the Divinity) *ſo far as was poſſible, made it like unto it ſelf. The Perichoreſis immixing the whole Natures, and inſerting the one into the other. The Divine Nature once having made an Immeation through the Fleſh, gave to it an inexplicable Immeation into it ſelf, which is called Unition.* Which Immeation and Unition of the Divine Nature and the Fleſh muſt be an intrinſic Mutation of them both, as the Souls Immeation of the Body and their Unition is an intrinſic Mutation both of Soul and Body. And it muſt be accounted ſuch, becauſe this Union between the Divine and Humane Nature can be no leſs intrinſic than a vital Union. For the Scholaſtic Theology affirmeth *(u) that the Union between God and Man is far greater than between Soul and Fleſh.* It diſputeth *(w)* that the perſonal Union of the two Natures is (next to the Union of the Perſons in the Trinity) the greateſt and cloſeſt Union. If therefore the Humane Nature is an Adjunct of the Divine Nature, it is receiv'd by it at a great rate intrinſecally, which cannot be without an intrinſic Mutation of it.

(h) Gonet. *T.* 11. *Diſp.* 2. *Art.* 1. *S.* 3. *Valentia T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 1. *Punct.* 2. *Jeanes mixture of Scholaſt. Divin. with Pract. p.* 82. *ed.* 1.

(i) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 14. *S.* 3, 5.

(k) *Quippe quam totam in ſeſe quodammodo transformavit divinitas, & ſibi concertam ac penitus inſitam, quàm potuit fieri ſimillimam effecit.* Περιχώρησις *totas in ſe naturas immiſcens & inſerens. Divina natura cum per carnem ſemel immeavit, dedit etiam carni inexplicabilem in ſeipſam immeationem, quam unitionem vocant.* Idem Ibid. S. 7, 9, 12.

(u) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 13. *S.* 14.

(w) *Valentia T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 2. *Punct.* 6.

IV. A further Objection is in this Theology rais'd (againſt its Incarnation) *from the conſequent Incarnatian of the other Divine Perſons.* For this was the Aſſertion of a certain Clerk in *Anſelm (x) either the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt muſt be ſaid to be three Gods, or if theſe three are one God, it muſt ſaid, that the Father and the Holy Ghoſt were incarnate, if the Son was incarnate. For if the Deity of theſe three is one, and this was united to the Humanity, the three Perſons muſt be united thereto; the Deity being the Eſſence common to the three*

(x) *Vaſq. in* 3. *Par. Th. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 23. *c.* 1.

three Perſons, if this was united to the Humanity, it could not be, but that every Perſon muſt be united thereto. This Clerk could not ſuppoſe the ſame numerical Scholaſtic Divine Subſtance, to be incarnate and not incarnate: Or that it was incarnate, yet two Perſons indiſtinct from it (the Divine Nature and a Divine Perſon being *una ſimpliciſſima res*) were not incarnate. Agreeably to his Argument the Schoolmen introduce this Objection againſt their own Theology. (y) *That which belongeth to the Divine Nature, is common to all the Divine Perſons: But the Divine Nature aſſum'd the Humane Nature and was incarnate; therefore all the three Perſons.* In anſwering this Objection the School-doctors are divided in their Opinion. (z) For *Durandus* (with whom ſome others ſymbolize in great degree) is of Opinion, that in the Incarnation there were two Unions: The firſt and chief is of the Humane Nature and the Divine, whereby he ſuppoſeth the dependence of the Humane Nature to be primarily terminated, and not by the perſonal Propriety of *the Word.* The other is of the Humane Nature and *the Perſonality of the Word,* whereby he ſuppoſeth the Aſſumption (or Incarnation) to have been completed, and that this is the Reaſon, why *the Word* only is incarnate, not the Father or the Holy Ghoſt. But the generality of the School-doctors accuſe this Opinion of *Durandus,* that it inferreth the Incarnation of all the Divine Perſons, and therefore they reject it, and their Opinion is an inverſion of it. For they ſuppoſe, that the Union of the Humane Nature was primarily and immediately by and in the perſonal Propriety of *the Word,* and ſecondarily with the Divine Eſſence that he is. Which Divine Eſſence (howſoever modify'd and determin'd by the perſonal Propriety of *the Word*) is no other than the one Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence common to the three Divine Perſons This one Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence therefore was incarnate, and conſequently the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence of the Father was incarnate (though not as his Eſſence) and the ſame muſt be ſaid of the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence of the Holy Ghoſt. And in this Senſe ſome School-doctors ſay (a) *res quæ eſt pater* (id quod eſt pater) *incarnata dicitur, nempe eſſentia divina.* The thing that is the Father, namely the Scholaſtic Eſſence of his Perſon, was incarnate. And if the Scholaſtic Eſſence of his Perſon was incarnate, it is not poſſible, but that himſelf muſt be incarnate. (b) *For nothing is ſo intimious to a thing, ſo inward and next to it as its Eſſence. And the Eſſence of a Perſon is not his perſonal Propriety (which in the Divine Perſons is a Relation) but his Nature it ſelf.* Moreover, the perſonal Propriety of the Father and the Scholaſtic Eſſence of his Perſon are *una ſimpliciſſima res,* there is no diſtinction between them *ex parte rei*; therefore the Incarnation of the Scholaſtic Eſſence of his Perſon implieth the Incarnation of his perſonal Propriety. And thus it appeareth, that the Article of the Incarnation in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology implieth and inferreth the Incarnation of the whole Trinity.

V. Some marvellous incredible Incongruities ſeemingly ſuch (c) the Scholaſtic Theology obſerveth in its own Scheme of the Incarnation; whence a Judgment may be made touching the true account of it. For in our Hypotheſis touching the Incarnation there is nothing that carrieth the face of an incredible Incongruity. That God by proper natural Generation did of a pure Virgin beget a Son, his imperial Son (and therefore Creature-tranſcendent) a Perſon of the imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, an imperial Head of the Holy Empire, eſſentially an Humane-divine Perſon (according to his Generation) and of an Eſſence that is Humane-divine, this hath nothing in it of incredible Incongruity (ſeemingly ſuch) but the whole of it is according to the natural and agreeable order of things. Nor is there any thing of Incongruity in ſuppoſing, that this Divine Prince was *in the form of God,* but to fulfil an Oeconomy (diveſting himſelf of his exteriour Deiformity by a wondrous Humiliation) he became *real Humane Fleſh.* For this change of his exteriour Subſtance (his true σάρκωσις, or Incarnation) is of as eaſie Conception as his Transfiguration into Glory on the Holy Mount, and his diveſting himſelf of that Glory and returning to his former meanneſs of Humanity. Nor is there any thing of Incongruity in this, that *Origen* accounteth a marvellous ſeeming Incongruity, *that the very Logos of the Father, the Wiſdom of God it ſelf, ſo great a Power of the Divine Majeſty, muſt be ſuppos'd within the Circumſcription of a Man that appear'd in* Judea; for theſe great things are imply'd in his Idea, as he is *the Divine imperial Son.* But this Father had much more reaſon, to account this common Hypotheſis a marvellous ſeeming Incongruity, *that the very Wiſdom of God* (the Abſtract Logos) *entred the Privy Parts of a Woman, was born a little Infant and cried like other crying Children.* This he deſervedly accounteth a marvellous ſeeming Incongruity; and conſequently it is a marvellous ſeeming Incongruity, that the Abſtract Logos ſhould ſuſtain a Generation for us, and that without any neceſſity or reaſon imaginable. For if he wanted an Humane Body, therein to fulfill an Oeconomy, he might have aſſum'd one without a Generation, and then we might have ſaid, as the Ancients ſpeak (d) *Verbum Dei humano ſe miſcuit corpori,* the Logos of God commix'd himſelf with an Humane Body. But this the Scholaſtic Theology (e) ſuppoſeth to have been done by a Generation (*Deus conceptus eſt in utero ſanctiſſimæ matris & genitus, non tamen quà Deus eſt, ſed ut homo*;) for by a marvellous ſeeming Incongruity this Theology ever and anon calleth it a Generation, and yet ever and anon denieth it to have been a Generation. By a like Incongruity it ſuppoſeth one intellectual Nature, to have aſſumed another, which intellectual aſſuming Nature was a Divine Perſon (the Abſtract eternal Logos) and not meerly a Divine Nature, which ſome chuſe to ſubſtitute inſtead of a Divine Perſon.

(f) *I believe in his only Son Jeſus Chriſt, in whom beſides Humane Nature there is alſo a Divine, which was not only exiſtent before his Nativity of the Virgin* Mary, *but from Eternity.*

SECTION VII.

The Seventh Diſagreement.

I. IN the Scholaſtic Incarnation there are ſeveral Difficulties complicated with great Abſurdities touching *Exiſtence, Subſiſtence, Hypoſtaſis* and *Perſona,* not only as they concern the Divinity, but as they concern the Humanity of Chriſt. For amongſt the School-doctors it is a Controverſie (warmly debated) whether *the Humanity of Chriſt be a proper Exiſtent* (or hath its proper Exiſtence) or whether it exiſteth only by the Exiſtence of the Word (having no Exiſtence of its own) which is a Queſtion, that cannot but be out of all Queſtion with all Men, that have not their Underſtandings deprav'd by the vain Speculations of Scholaſticiſm. For if the Humanity of Chriſt hath not its proper Exiſtence (g) it muſt be reputed *a non-exiſtent, non-ens, non-extra cauſas productum, nihil in natura rerum.* Thus the Humane Nature (the principal part whereof is the great Reality and Subſtantiality) is dwindled into a Non-entity, and *who will ſet his Eyes upon that which is not?* But how abſurd ſoever this Conceit is (that the Humane Nature with all its Properties and Perfections is not a proper Exiſtent) it ſerveth to intricate and perplex the Scholaſtic Incarnation. (h) For ſome think the Humane Nature's proper Exiſtence incompoſſible with the Hypoſtatical Union, inconſiſtent with the Bl. Virgin's being the Mother of God, or but ſcarce conſiſtent with the ſubſtantial Union of the two Natures.

(y) *Valentia T. 4. Diſp. 1. Qu. 3. Punct. 1.*

(z) *Idem ibid. & Vasq. ſupr. Diſp. 26 & 28. Petav. T. 4. l. 2. c. 4. & l. 4. c. 8. & l. 5. c. 1. & l. 8. c. 8. S. 15.*

(a) *Valentia ſupr.*

(b) *Petav. T. 4. l. 8. c. 10. S. 15.*

(c) *Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν. l. 2. c. 6.*

(d) *Jul. Firm. de error. prof. rel. p. 51.*

(e) *Petav. T. 4. l. 16. c. 4. S. 7.*

(f) *Credo in filium ejus unigenitum Jeſum Chriſtum, in quo præter naturam humanam eſt etiam divina, quæ non tantum ante nativitatem ejus ex Maria Virgine, ſed etiam ab æterno extitit.* Curcel. Diſſ. de Voc. Trin. n. 4.

Exiſtence and *Subſiſtence* are nicely diſtinguiſhed in the Modern Scholaſtic Theology: But touching the Scholaſtic Theology of the Church in general it muſt be ſaid, that there is in it a vaſt confuſion and ambiguity in the uſe of theſe terms οὐσία, φύσις, ὑπόστασις, *Eſſence*, *Nature*, *Suppoſitum*, *Perſon*, *Subſtance*, *Subſiſtence*, *Exiſtence*. (i) *Exiſtence* and *Subſiſtence* amongſt the ancient Scholaſtic Divines of the Church are uſed as concrete Names; for this is the Faith which they profeſs touching the Trinity *unam eſſe ſubſtantiam, ſubſiſtentias tres*, that there is one Subſtance (or Eſſence) three Subſiſtences, whereby they mean Perſons, and ſo they define a Perſon *incommunicabilis exiſtentia*, an incommunicable Exiſtence. But amongſt the School-divines of later times *Exiſtence* and *Subſiſtence* ſignifie as *Aſtract* Names; and ſo *Exiſtence* is the mode of Being commonly known by that Name (and better known by that Name alone than by a Definition;) and of Subſtance *Aquinas* ſaith (k) *As it exiſteth by it ſelf and not in another, it is called Subſiſtence: For we ſay, thoſe things ſubſiſt, which exiſt in themſelves not in another.* This mode of Exiſtence which is *perſeity* of Exiſtence, is ſignified by *Subſiſtentia*, which (as *Aquinas* ſaith) anſwereth to the Greek *Hypoſtaſis.* The Name *Subſiſtence* therefore is in this Theology ſometimes of a larger and ſometimes of a ſtricter Acceptation. It is of a larger ſignification, when it ſignifieth only that *perſeity* of Exiſtence, which conſtituteth *Subſtance* in contradiſtinction to *Accidents*, whoſe Eſſence is, to be inherent in another as in a Subject ſupporting them, without which they cannot exiſt or ſupport themſelves. But Subſtance is a thing not ſo inhering in another, not ſubjected in it, nor ſo ſupported by it, but *exiſting by it ſelf.* And this is one of the Significations of *Hypoſtaſis* Subſiſtence (l) *it ſignifieth* (quod per ſeſe extat, quales ſunt primæ & individuæ ſubſtantiæ) *that which exiſteth by it ſelf, ſuch as are the firſt and ſingular Subſtances, excluding Accidents which are not called Hypoſtaſes or Subſiſtences.* So the Alexandrian *Dionyſius* taketh Hypoſtaſis for *Subſtance by it ſelf exiſtent, ſuch as is called by Philoſophers the Firſt,* ſingular or individual Subſtance. But in this Theology *Subſiſtence* ſignifieth in a narrower Acceptation; moſt uſually it ſignifieth that mode or *perſeity* of Exiſtence, which conſtituteth a Scholaſtic *Suppoſitum.*

II. For this is one of the Ambiguities of this Theology; oftentimes it telleth us (m) that what the Greeks call *Hypoſtaſis* is with us *Subſtantia* (n) it largely diſcourſeth, that according to the primary Signification of Words the Greek Hypoſtaſis is in Latin *Subſtantia*, and alſo (o) that the Latin *Subſiſtentia* is the ſame with the Greek Hypoſtaſis, and Hypoſtaſis is the ſame with *Suppoſitum* (p) and that Scholaſticks mean by Subſiſtence *that mode, whereby a thing produced into Being ſo exiſteth, as to be by it ſelf, and not inherent in another* (as Accidents;) it ſo defineth *Suppoſitum*, as if it meant the firſt or ſingular Subſtance without any diſtinction or limitation of Senſe (q) *Suppoſitum nihil aliud eſt quàm natura ſingularis per ſe Subſiſtens*, and at the ſame rate it uſually defineth a Perſon which is *Suppoſitum rationale* (r) *perſona eſt rationalis naturæ individua ſubſtantia*, as if *a rational individual Subſtance* was the definition of a Perſon, and an individual Subſtance was the definition of a *Suppoſitum.* Such an appearance of things there is in this Theology, but in the interiours of it they are of another Aſpect; for there we find, that a ſingular or individual Subſtance in the ordinary Senſe is not ſufficient, to conſtitute a Scholaſtic *Suppoſitum*; and that the *perſeity* of Exiſtence conſtitutive of a *Suppoſitum* is of another Notion than that which is conſtitutive of a Subſtance. For a *Suppoſitum is a ſingular Subſtance, that is a thing of that Subſiſtence by it ſelf, which is an intire Subſiſtence of its own*, and therefore of ſuch a mode of Exiſtence, which is a ſeparate proper Exiſtence, oppoſite to exiſting in another either as a part in the whole, or as an Adjunct in the Subject, oppoſite to the being properly a Component part or an incomplete Being (made for the Completion of another) oppoſite to the being terminated and ſuſtained by another (s) and becauſe it is a ſingular Subſtance it is not *notionally* communicable (common to more) as Univerſals are; nor is it really communicable as exiſting in another, or as part is communicated to part (with which it is conjoined, to make one whole that is *unum per ſe*) or otherwiſe inconſiſtently with the condition of a complete and ſeparately exiſtent Subſtance; for it is of an intire Subſiſtence of its own. Whence it is definitively denominated ἰδιοσύστατον, *that which is of ſole, ſeparate, intire Conſiſtence*, ἰδιοπεριόριστον, *that which is of its own Termination and Circumſcription*, ἰδιοϋπόστατον, *that which hath its proper intire Subſiſtence.*

III. Hypoſtaſis in the Scholaſtic Incarnation is of a Senſe peculiarly Scholaſtical, alien from the Scriptural and the many popular ſignifications of it. In the New Teſtament three times in our Tranſlation it is rendred *Confidence*, but ſometimes it is rendred *Subſtance*, and ſo *Kircher* in his Concordance no leſs than eight times rendreth it *Subſtance*, which ſeemeth to be the genuine Verſion of it, *Heb.* 11. 1. *Faith is the Subſtance of things hoped for*; for as to us the future Hopes of Believers have a Reality, Solidity and Subſtance by Faith, which is the Nature and eminent Property thereof. Agreeably to which Senſe (t) *S. Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius* and ſeveral others interpret the place. In another place of this Divine Author ὑπόστασις, is rendred *Subſtance* by the vulg. Latin (u) and ſeveral of the ancient Writers. *Heb.* 1. 3. *Who being the brightneſs of his Glory and the expreſs Image of his Subſtance.* So thoſe ancient Writers render it, nor is our Tranſlation, which rendreth it Perſon, diſſonant in Senſe from their Verſion, if by Perſon we underſtand his perſonal Subſtance (or Eſſence) or his Perſon as to his Subſtance (or Eſſence) meaning his Divine vital Eſſence. But in ſtating and repreſenting the Article of the Trinity ὑπόστασις, as it ſignifieth *Eſſence, Nature* and *Subſtance*, muſt be carefully diſtinguiſh'd from ὑπόστασις, as it ſignifieth *Perſon*, as the Church found neceſſary by ſad Experience (w) when great Troubles aroſe in the Eaſtern Parts meerly from the Ambiguity of the term *Hypoſtaſis*, when the Catholicks at *Antioch* made a Schiſm amongſt themſelves, one Party (that of *Meletius*) confeſſing three Hypoſtaſes, the other Party (that of *Paulinus*) denying three Hypoſtaſes; and when the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches were at great variance upon this account; the Greeks aſſerted three Hypoſtaſes and one Eſſence, the Latins aſſerted one Hypoſtaſis and three Perſons. Hypoſtaſis in the Article of the Trinity hath been us'd to ſignifie Nature or Eſſence, but in the Article of the Incarnation it is us'd only to ſignifie a Perſon or a *Suppoſitum*, that is conſtituted ſuch by *Subſiſtence* (which is different from *Exiſtence* as being narrower than it, and as being τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, *a mode of Exiſtence*) and as it ſignifieth a *Suppoſitum*, it is of a ſenſe peculiarly Scholaſtical.

(g) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 6.

(h) *Vaſq: in* 3. *Par. Th. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 71. *c.* 1. *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 11. *Diſp.* 8. *Art.* 2.

(i) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 3. *S.* 6. *&c.*

(k) *Secundum quod per ſe exiſtit & non in alio vocatur ſubſiſtentia. Illa enim ſubſiſtere dicimus, quæ non in alio ſed in ſe exiſtunt.* 1a Qu. 29. Art. 2.

(l) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *S.* 5. *& c.* 3. *S.* 6. *& c.* 1. *S.* 13.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *& c.* 2. *S.* 9.

(n) *Vaſq. in Th.* 1. *Par. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 124. *c.* 5

(o) *Idem in* 3. *Par. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 32. *c.* 1.

(p) *Petav. ſupr.*

(q) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 8. *c.* 2. *S.* 1.

(r) *Idem de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 9.

(s) *Ibid. c.* 8. *& T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 5. *S.* 5.

(t) *Idem de Trin.* 4. *c.* 2. *S.* 7.

Perſon (according to this Theology) compriſeth (x) the common Nature or Eſſence (Generical and Specific) and conſequently thoſe *Properties*, which are called φυσικὰ ἰδιώματα, *the natural and eſſential Properties*, which are common to the whole Species and to all the individuals thereof. The actual Exiſtence alſo of this Nature or Eſſence, whence it defineth an Hypoſtaſis (*naturam communem in individuo aliquo reipſa & actu exiſtentem*) *the common Nature actually exiſting in ſome individual.* A Complexion alſo or Conglobation of ὑποστατικὰ ἰδιώματα, *hypoſtatical or perſonal Properties*, Accidents and Qualities, which are individuating, and whereby one individual is diſcern'd and diſtinguiſh'd from another. Alſo the hypoſtatical Property (ὑποστατικὸν ἰδίωμα,) eminently ſuch, which is that mode of Exiſtence, whereby a particular Subſtance *per ſe ſubſiſtit*, or hath an intire Subſiſtence of its own, whereby it is not only individual in the ordinary Senſe, but ſo individual as to be *incommunicable.* And ſo this Theology (which ſuppoſeth, that *a Perſon* together with thoſe other Requiſites compriſeth *an intellectual Nature*, as all acknowledge) underſtandeth that uſual definition of a Perſon before-mention'd, *Eſt rationalis naturæ individua ſubſtantia*, it is an individual (incommunicable) Subſtance of a rational Nature. Thus the Scholaſtic Theology in its Notices of *Exiſtence, Subſiſtence, Suppoſitum, Hypoſtaſis* and *Perſona* (as they concern the Incarnation) appeareth to be operoſe and full of difficulties; but that is not all; for this Theology complicateth them alſo with no ſmall Abſurdities, ſuch as theſe following.

IV. This Theology is not content with ſuch an *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum*, which is agreeable to Nature and natural Science, but introduceth ſuch a Notion thereof which is agreeable to its ſupernatural Myſteries, but is alien from Nature and natural Science, and againſt the Senſe of Philoſophy. For Philoſophy doth not acknowledge the Scholaſtic *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum*, that is different from and ſuperadditional unto *a ſingular or individual Nature and Subſtance* (which is a complete Subſtance;) this being purely a product of the Scholaſticiſm of Chriſtendom, meerly excogitated to ſerve the Hypotheſis of its Trinity and Incarnation, and therefore they that know not thoſe Hypotheſes, cannot ſo much as dream of the Scholaſtic *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum.* (y) *Ariſtotle was utterly ignorant of Suppoſitum or Hypoſtaſis, as it is uſed in the Schools, and as it differeth from Nature or Subſtance. Ariſtotle*'s Nature or Subſtance doth not conſtitute a Scholaſtic *Suppoſitum*; for *Deus præciſè*, or the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence is not a Scholaſtic *Suppoſitum*. The Scholaſtic *Subſiſtence* or *Suppoſitality* (according to the Schools) may be ſeparated from *Ariſtotle*'s Nature or Subſtance, which being ſeparated, the Nature or Subſtance (although remaining ſuch) is not a Scholaſtic *Suppoſitum*, which therefore containeth a Superadditional to *Ariſtotle*'s Nature or Subſtance, and accordingly Scholaſtic Divines Diſpute amongſt themſelves, what it is, that *Suppoſitum* ſuperaddeth to Nature or Subſtance? (z) *Ariſtotle* and the reſt of the Philoſophers they explode, and accuſe them, to be the Fountain of Hereſies, of the *Sabellians* (that held but one Divine Perſon, becauſe there is but one Divine Eſſence or Subſtance) of the *Arians* and the *Tritheites*, that held three Eſſences as well as three Perſons. (a) *This is that which to the Hereticks is the cauſe of Error, they ſuppoſe, that Nature and Hypoſtaſis are the ſame. For this is their Opinion, that if any Nature be perfect, nothing more is requiſite to make it an Hypoſtaſis, or, if it be of the rational kind, a Perſon. Which Opinion is chiefly taken from the Philoſophy of* Ariſtotle. *According to the Greek Philoſophy they call Natures Hypoſtaſes and Perſons; and do not ſay three Hypoſtaſes in the Holy Trinity, leſt they ſeem to affirm three Natures: Nor two Natures in Chriſt, leſt they ſeem to confeſs two Hypoſtaſes and Perſons in him.* So far they were erroneous indeed (if they did not acknowledge three Hypoſtaſes in the Holy Trinity and two Natures in Chriſt:) But if by *a perfect Nature* they meant *an individual Subſtance perfect in Eſſence and a complete Subſtance* (not made for the Completion of any other) they were not erroneous, but truly Orthodox in ſuppoſing, that ſuch a Nature is an Hypoſtaſis or Perſon, and in theſe Philoſophical Points they followed far better Leaders (the ancient Philoſophers) than the Scholaſtic Divines. But is it not a grand abſurdity, to ſuppoſe, that Chriſtianity conſiſteth in Philoſophical Points, ſuch as introduce a grand alteration in natural Science, ſuch as quite tranſcend it and the Schools of ſecular Learning in Metaphyſical Subtilty, and ſuch as all natural Science is againſt? Chriſtianity maketh no alteration in the Rights of Men to the Goods of this World, their Powers and Privileges in Civil Societies: Nor doth it make any alteration in the natural Sciences, but preſerveth

(u) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 6.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 4.

(x) *Ibid. c.* 7, 8. & *T.* 4. *l.* 2. *S.* 12. & *l.* 3. *c.* 14. *S.* 2 & *l.* 5. *c.* 7. *S.* 8. & *l.* 6. *c.* 1. *S.* 7.

(y) *Suppoſitum vel Hypoſtaſin, quatenus uſurpatur in Scholis, & ut ab natura vel ſubſtantia differt, funditus ignoravit Ariſtoteles.* Ibid. l. 8. c. 2. S. 2.

(z) *Idem de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *S.* 4.

(a) *Hoc eſt quod hæreticis errorem objicit, quod idem eſſe naturam & hypoſtaſim arbitrantur. Sic enim perſuaſum habebant: Naturam omnem perfectam & ſuis abſolutam numeris, nihil deſiderare amplius, quo minus hypoſtaſis, & ſi quidem è genere ſit rationalium, perſona cenſeatur. Quod ex Ariſtotelis præſertim Philoſophia ſumptum eſſe demonſtravimus.* T. Petav. 4. l. 5. c. 7. S. 1.

veth theſe things, as it found them. *Hypoſtaſis*, *Suppoſitum*, *Perſona*, are firſt found in Nature, and therefore the Idea of them muſt neceſſarily belong to Naturaliſts and natural Science. But the Scholaſtic Theology (with reſpect to its Trinity and Incarnation) formeth ſuch an Idea of them, as can never enter into any meer Naturaliſt's Head. (*b*) *Without the Myſtery of the Incarnation the Philoſophers perhaps could not arrive at the diſtinction of Nature and Suppoſitum. No Humane Reaſon could reach thither.* But is it credible, that no Philoſophy, no Humane Reaſon could underſtand, how Hypoſtaſes or Perſons are to be defin'd and diſtinguiſh'd? Water, Wood, Stone, Metals, Minerals are Hypoſtaſes, and is it the Priviledge of School-divines (that are no Naturaliſts) to define and determine, whether theſe be Hypoſtaſes, and whether Men and Women are Perſons or not?

V. This Theology formeth the Idea of *Hypoſtaſis*, *Suppoſitum*, *Perſona*, with ſo great irregularity, as plainly proveth it erroneous and illegitimate. For it is not conſiſtent with it ſelf in defining *Hypoſtaſis*. (*c*) *From the ſenſe of the Ancients one may define Hypoſtaſis the common Nature actually and indeed exiſting in ſome individual.* But if Scholaſtic Divines would ſtand to this definition, they muſt ſuppoſe Chriſt's Humane Nature to be no Adjunct, but in conſort with the Divine *a Suppoſitum*. There is an irregular Ambiguity in an irregular repetition of *Perſeity* in their Definitions. For (*d*) *ſubſtantia eſt res per ſe ſubſiſtens*, ſo Subſtance is defin'd: And *Suppoſitum* (which muſt be conſidered as different from Subſtance;) is thus defin'd (*e*) *individua ſubſtantia per ſe ſubſiſtens*. A *Suppoſitum* is conſtituted ſuch by Subſiſtence; and if we aſk, what is *Subſiſtence*? Their Anſwer is (*f*) *per ſe eſſe*, which is definitive of Subſtance, and is irregularly repeated in the Definition of *Suppoſitum* and of the Subſiſtence, which is ſuppos'd to conſtitute it. Regular Definitions are ſhort and perſpicuous: But generally the Sholaſtic Divines Definitions of a *Suppoſitum* are irregularly long and irregularly obſcure; nor can they be otherwiſe, if they be ſuch, as themſelves account accurate. Which is a manifeſt Indication, that their Scholaſtic Myſteries put them unavoidably upon unfair Dealing, elſe they would not make ſuch irregular Definitions as theſe are. (*g*) *Suppoſitum eſt ſubſtantia ſingularis, completa & incommunicabilis.* (*h*) *Eſt individua ſubſtantia per ſemetipſum exiſtens* (vel Subſiſtens) *& propria terminatione circumſcripta.* A *Suppoſitum* muſt not be defin'd meerly an individual Subſtance complete, but the term *incommunicable* muſt be added, elſe the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence will be a *Suppoſitum* and a *Perſon*. And a *Suppoſitum* muſt not be defin'd meerly an *individual Subſtance or Nature complete*, but the terms *per ſe ſubſiſtens*, ἰδιοπεριόριστος, (or the like) muſt be added, elſe the Humane Nature of Chriſt will be much more than an *Adjunct* or *Accident*. And thus the Scholaſtick Divines accommodate their Definitions of a *Suppoſitum*, to agree with their own Prejudices (their Trinity and Incarnation) whereas they ought to judge of the Truth of them by the regular and genuine Definition of a *Suppoſitum*, which muſt conſiſt of a generical Nature and a ſpecific difference. The generical Nature (as all agree) is *an individual Eſſence, Nature or Subſtance*. The term *complete* added hereto is manifeſtly the ſpecific difference. For by an *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum* is not meant, that which is ſo incomplete, that it only belongeth to a *Suppoſitum*, or that which is naturally deſign'd for the Completion of a *Suppoſitum*, but if ſeveral things concur, that is the *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum*, which is not naturally a part and incomplete, not naturally deſign'd for the Completion of any other, but things concur to the Completion of it. Which is a complete Eſſence, Nature or Subſtance, (*i*) hath an intire Subſiſtance of its own, whoſe ſuppoſitality importeth an eminency of Subſiſtence, and the utmoſt perfection of Exiſtence in things unintelligent. All the Properties and Attributes that School-Divines deſcribe it by, ſpeak it *complete*, and in all their Definitions of it the term *complete* is one part of the ſpecific difference. But they ought to make it the whole of the ſpecific difference; for their copulative Definitions of a *Suppoſitum* are irregular and illegitimate; the term *complete* virtually compriſeth all the differencing Properties, which are rightly aſcrib'd to a *Suppoſitum*, is the ſummary of them all, and is radical to them all. For therefore the *Hypoſtaſis* or *Suppoſitum* doth *per ſe ſubſiſtere*, is notionally and really incommunicable, becauſe it is a complete Subſtance, not made for the Completion of any other. And if this is the genuine Definition of it *ſingularis ſubſtantia completa*, the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence (or *Deus preciſè apprehenſus*) is neceſſarily a *Suppoſitum* and a Perſon, but ſuch is not the Divine Nature in Chriſt; and conſequently the Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation conſiſteth not with the genuine Definition of a *Suppoſitum*.

VI. The Scholaſtic Theology both aſſerteth and denieth *Chriſt's Human Nature, to be a Suppoſitum, and both irregularly.* The School-doctors are of various Opinions touching what *Suppoſitum* (or Hypoſtaſis) addeth unto Nature: (*k*) But the generality of them agree, that the Complement added to a Nature whereby it is conſtituted a *Suppoſitum*, is (ſomewhat poſitive) that mode of *Exiſtence* commonly called *modus per ſe exiſtendi*, upon account whereof the Exiſtence of a Nature is called *Subſiſtence*, whereby a Nature or Subſtance is conſtituted a complete Subſtance (*l*) which is a *Suppoſitum*. But ſuch is not Chriſt's Humane Nature, ſuch are not the Parts of Humane Nature, that upon this account and for this only reaſon are incomplete Subſtances, becauſe they are properly and naturally Parts, they are naturally deſign'd, to be Parts of one Whole, and have an habitude thereto, and to each other as Parts, that require to be conjoyn'd for the Compoſition thereof. (*m*) *In compoſitionem totius imperfecta veniunt tanquam ipſius partes.* But if they were not Parts properly ſo called, if each of them was properly and naturally (*n*) *totum aliquid & integrum*

quod

(b) *Myſterio Incarnationis dimiſſo. Philoſophi fortaſſe non potuiſſent devenire ad diſtinctionem naturæ & ſuppoſiti.* Scheibler. Met. l. 2. c. 2. Art. 5. Punct. 5. *Nulla humana ratio eò pertingere potuit.* Petav. T. 4. l. 6. c. 1. S. 3.

(c) *Licebit hypoſtaſim ex antiquorum ſenſu definire, naturam communem in individuo aliquo reipſa & actu exiſtentm.* Ibid. l. 6. c. 1. S. 7.

(d) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 3. S. 9.*

(e) *Ibid. l. 3. c. 12. S. 2. & l. 8. c. 2. S. 1.*

(f) *Vaſq. in Th. 3. Par. T. 1. Diſp. 32. c. 4.*

(g) *Scheibl. ſupr. 2. Punct. 2.*

(h) *Petav. ſupr. l. 3. c. 12. S. 2.*

(i) *Hypoſtaſis ſignificat ſubſtantiam particularem, non quocunque modo, ſed prout eſt in ſuo complemento.* Aquin. 3. Qu. 2. Art. 3.

(k) *Vaſq. in Th. 3. Par. T. 1. Diſp. 31.*

(l) *Completam habet eſſentiam, non ſolùm quia numeris omnibus ſuis, hoc eſt, gradibus ſive partibus eſſentiam conſtituentibus abſolvitur: ſed etiam quia caret habitudine partis ad totum, neque ex naturæ ſuæ conditione poſtulat, ut cum altero in compoſitionem totius cujuſpiam propriè dicti ac naturam veniat: quo uno rationis particeps anima ab hypoſtaſis & perſonæ proprietate ſecernitur. Tum verò perfectum ſubſiſtendi modum obtinet, qui eam ab alterius cujuſcunque nexu & conſortio vindicat.* Petav. T. 4. l. 5. c. S. 9.

(m) *Ibid. l. 3. c. 9. S. 4.*

(n) *Ibid. l. 5. c. 5. S. 5.*

quod ἰδιοσύστατον *Græci nominant*, each of them would have an intire Subſiſtance of its own, and would be a complete Subſtance or a *Suppoſitum*. Humane Nature therefore unleſs it can be a Part properly and naturally ſuch, muſt neceſſarily be a complete Subſtance, (*o*) not only in reſpect of Eſſence, but alſo in reſpect of its mode of Exiſtence. But according to this Theology (*p*) Humane Nature cannot be properly and naturally a part (*nec humana ipſa natura eſt imperfecta, neque pars eſſe poteſt naturæ alterius*) therefore according to this Theology Chriſt's Humane Nature is a *Suppoſitum* and a *Perſon*. As that mode of Exiſtence *Subſiſtence* incapacitateth any Subſtance, to be a Part properly ſo called: So whatever Subſtance is incapable of being a Part properly ſo called, for that reaſon hath that mode of Exiſtence. That which cannot exiſt but as *a complete Subſtance* (not made for the completion of any other) cannot exiſt but as an Hypoſtaſis. And ſuch is Chriſt's Humane Nature, as the Scholaſtic Theology implieth, which as irregularly denieth what it irregularly aſſerteth; for it ſuppoſeth Chriſt's Humane Nature, to be adjoyn'd and apply'd to a Divine Perſon, that it may ſubſiſt.

VII. The Scholaſtic Theology (touching the Incarnation) maketh Chriſt's Humane Nature *no Subſtance*. For that which is a Subſtance, and is not a part properly ſo called, muſt be an Hypoſtaſis, *ſubſtantia ſingularis completa*, not made for the completion of any other. That *perſeity* of Exiſtence which conſtituteth a Subſtance, wanteth nothing, to make it that *perſeity* of Exiſtence, which conſtituteth a *Suppoſitum*, but only this Negation, *The not being a part properly ſo called*. Such is Chriſt's Humane Nature according to this Theology, which alſo denieth it to be an Hypoſtaſis, and therefore implicitly denieth it, to be a Subſtance. And not only implicitly, but more expreſly this Theology denieth the Humane Nature of Chriſt, to be a Subſtance. For a Subſtance that ſubſiſteth muſt ſubſiſt by it ſelf as a Subſtance and by being ſuch: But according to this Theology Chriſt's Humane Nature doth not ſubſiſt by it ſelf as a Subſtance and by being ſuch; it giveth a very different account of the Subſiſtence thereof, (*q*) *that it doth ſubſiſt, although not by its own but another's* ὑποστατικὸν ἰδίωμα, *hypoſtatic Propriety, that it could ſubſiſt by its own Propriety, if being left to it ſelf it exiſted ſeparately; that this one thing conſtituteth it a Subſtance* (proprio poſſe modo ſubſiſtere) *that it can ſubſiſt by its proper mode: but really and actually to ſubſiſt by its proper efficacy and mode, this is not eſſential to a Subſtance, as the actual uſe of Reaſon is not eſſential to a rational Animal.* But there is the ſame reaſon for *Subſtance* as for the other Predicaments (of Quantity and ſuch more;) for a Subſtance can no more have its ſubſiſtence by the Subſtance of another, than a Body can have Quantity by the Dimenſions of another. As a Body would be without Quantity, if it was not for its own Dimenſions: So a Subſtance would be without Subſiſtence, if it did not ſubſiſt by it ſelf as a Subſtance. To ſay, *that it could ſubſiſt, if being left to it ſelf it exiſted ſeparately*, is to ſay, that it is but potentially, not really and actually a Subſtance, as Infants are but potentially and aptitudinally, not actually rational. This is the utmoſt of Subſtantiality, which this Theology attributeth to the Humane Nature of Chriſt; (*r*) it is ἐνυπόστατος, as ſubſiſting in the *Logos*, and ſubſiſting by the Subſiſtence thereof; it is ἀνυπόστατος, as being no Hypoſtaſis; and it is thus far ἀνούσιος, *unſubſtantial*, it wanteth (*proprio ſubſtantiæ modo ac velut forma*) *the proper mode of Subſtance and as it were the form thereof.* Yet Subſtance it is, if the Scholaſticks rightly define Subſtance. (*s*) *The firſt Subſtance is defined, That which is of aptitude, to ſubſiſt by it ſelf and not in another.* Thus the true Nature and Notion of things is perverted, to comply with the Scholaſticiſm of the Incarnation, which alloweth this reaſoning; The Humane Nature is a Subſtance; if therefore it exiſteth, it exiſteth as a Subſtance: but it cannot allow this reaſoning; The Humane Nature is a Subſtance; if therefore it ſubſiſteth, it ſubſiſteth as a Subſtance; for it muſt ſubſiſt by the ſubſiſtence of the *Logos*; elſe it will be an *Hypoſtaſis* and an Humane Perſon. But there is no fear of ſuch a Conſequence, if the Abſtract *Logos* and Subſiſtence therein be remov'd from our Saviour's Eſſence; which is *The divine vital Eſſence* (as it is Vital Sanctity the derivative) wherewith the Humane Nature is eſſentially in Union and Conjunction. This complex Eſſence is an Hypoſtaſis and a Perſon, and ſo is the Humane Nature, but not otherwiſe than as in Union and Conjunction with the Divine (ſo far it is an Hypoſtaſis and a Perſon;) the Humane Nature alſo ſubſiſteth and ſubſiſteth as a Subſtance but not otherwiſe than as in Union and Conjunction with the Divine, whence our Saviour is neceſſarily *an Humane-divine Perſon*. Thus natural and eaſie are things (if taken by the right Handle) which the Scholaſtic Theology hath infinitely perplex'd and intricated.

VIII. For this Theology (touching the Incarnation) ſuppoſeth, that the Hypoſtaſis of the *Logos* became the Hypoſtaſis of the Humane Nature, (*t*) *aſſuming the Maſs of Humane Nature* (Fleſh animated by an intelligent Soul) *he cauſed it to ſubſiſt in his Hypoſtaſis* αὐτὸς γενόμενος τῇ σαρκὶ ὑπόστασις, *himſelf becoming an Hypoſtaſis to the Fleſh*, αὐτὸς γέγονεν ὑπόστασις τῷ προσλήμματι, *himſelf became an Hypoſtaſis to that which he aſſumed.* So *Jo. Damaſcen. Euthymius* and the reſt of the Scholaſtic Divines deſcribe the Incarnation; *that the* Logos *is an Hypoſtaſis to which the Humane Nature belongeth, that the Humane Nature did not exiſt otherwiſe than in and by the* Logos (*as ſubſiſting in it* (*which terminated and ſuſtain'd it by his Hypoſtatic Propriety, not ſuffering it to have any other Hypoſtatic Propriety adjoyn'd to it but his Divine Hypoſtatic Propriety* (that mode and propriety of ſubſiſting) *wherewith it was modify'd and determin'd; and the Perſonality of the* Logos (in a certain Senſe) *became alſo the Perſonality of the Humane Nature*, ut eadem eſt perſona hominis & albi, *as the perſon of* Peter *and of candid* Peter *is one and the ſame.* How clear ſoever the Conceptions may be, that School-divines have of theſe enigmatical matters, to others they will ſeem unconceivable, incredible, impoſſible. And the truth of them ought to be ſupported by clear Divine Revelation (which they are clearly deſtitute of, but) which ſupport they need at at a greater rate than the Humane Nature needeth to be ſupported by the Scholaſtic-Divine. For this Scholaſtic Suſtentation of the Maſs of Humane Nature (as it is called) is wholly needleſs thereto; which being the firſt Subſtance it can *per ſe ſubſiſtere*, as the Schola-

---

(o) *Ibid. c.* 8. *S.* 7.

(p) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 9. *S.* 4.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 8. *S.* 4.

(r) *Ibid. S.* 1, 3, 4.

(s) *Subſtantia prima definitur, quæ ad hoc apta eſt, ut per ſe, & non in alio ſubſiſtat.* Ibid. l. 7. c. 6. S. 10.

(t) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *S.* 12. *& T.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 13. *S.* 3.

ſtic Theology acknowledgeth. This Suſtentation of the Humane Nature therefore is in great degree a deſtroying the Subſtantiality of it (making it but an Accident) and it is an unnatural violence done to the Humane Nature; for the Scholaſtic *Logos* will not ſuffer it, to have its own Subſiſtence, (u) *that which belongeth to it and that which it would have, if it was not hindred by a Divine Power.* The Fleſh which is a Body (according to this Theology) ſubſiſteth by the ſubſiſtence of a Spirit, a bodily Shadow ſubſiſteth by the ſubſiſtence of a Divine Eternal Subſtance, one ſpecifically diſtinct Nature or Subſtance ſubſiſteth by the ſubſiſtence of another (as if we ſhould ſuppoſe a Plant to ſubſiſt by the ſubſiſtence of an Animal;) one Spirit is ſuppoſed to ſubſiſt by the ſubſiſtence of another without a ſubſiſtence of its own, which is as incongruous and impoſſible, as for one Body to be ſolid by the ſolidity of another without a ſolidity of its own. The Hypoſtatical Union is ſaid to be (w) *in ſola ſubſiſtendi proprietate* (only in the propriety of ſubſiſting) and what can it ſignifie to the ſubſiſtence of the Humane Nature (x) to communicate to it this Hypoſtatic Propriety, which is but a relation *filietas divina?* This muſt be thought the Hypoſtatic or Perſonal Propriety of the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity, whereby he becometh *a Subſiſtence, Hypoſtaſis and a Perſon,* although it is manifeſt to common ſenſe, that an individual Perſon is in order of Nature antecedent to a Paternal or Filial Perſon. (y) *The Propriety of a Son as it agreeth to Men, is in order of Nature poſteriour to the Origin and Generation, whereby a Man exiſteth. For we conceive of* Socrates *as produc'd by his Father* Sophroniſcus, *before we ſay, he is his Son.*

IX. The Scholaſtic Theology (touching the Incarnation) denieth, that the Humane Nature in Chriſt is a conſtitutive of his Perſon. (z) *If there be an acceſſion of ſome other Nature to the Divine, that is not at all connatural, but accident and adventitious; which neither conſtituteth the Suppoſitum (that is of it ſelf already complete and abſolute;) nor by being taken away diminiſheth or changeth it.* The Perſon of Chriſt is definitively (according to this Theology) and therefore eſſentially a complex Perſon of two Natures (Divine and Humane) it conſiſteth of theſe two Natures, and yet one of theſe two Natures muſt not be ſuppos'd to conſtitute it, nor muſt it be called a conſtitutive part. His Perſon is *perſona compoſita* (as this Theology copiouſly aſſerteth and proveth) it is compounded and therefore conſtituted of theſe two Natures, yet the Humane Nature muſt not be ſuppos'd to conſtitute it. But it is not unuſual with this Theology, to acknowledge, that the Humane Nature in a large acceptation and the ſenſe of *Ariſtotle* is a part of Chriſt: (a) *Ut ea partes vocentur, in quas dividitur, aut ex quibus conſtat id quod totum appellatur.* (b) So the ancient Writers call his Divinity and Humanity parts (in a large ſenſe) ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται τὸ ὅλον, Chriſt is called *a Totum* (uſually) *and this whole is conſtituted by them or conſiſteth of them;* the Humane Nature therefore is a conſtitutive part of Chriſt's *Suppoſitum.* It is his Subſtance, (c) and he hath from it not meerly a being Humane, but his *being Man* (which is not *an eſſe accidentarium, ſed naturale ac ſubſtantivum;*) and his Soul is not as an *Accident* or an Adjunct, but belongeth to his conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence; which demonſtrateth, that there can be no ſuch thing as the Scholaſtic Incarnation, or an Abſtract *Logos,* that wanteth an eſſential part of Chriſt's Perſon.

X. The Scholaſtic Theology (touching the Incarnation) ſpoileth the Conſtitution of Chriſt's Perſon, which muſt be of apteſt compoſure and greateſt concinnity. For ſeeing all the Creation-works of God (even the meaneſt Inſects) have in them a wonderful artifice and curioſity of Contrivance, it is not poſſible, that the Conſtitution of Chriſt's Perſon (the nobleſt of God's Productions) ſhould be meerly a rude tying and adjoyning of Man's Nature to a God, *inſtar accidentis & appendicis ad ſubſtantiam,* as an accident and an hang-by to a ſubſtance. But it hath far'd with the Scholaſtic Theology, as if a rude Country-man hearing of a *Zoophyton* or *Plant-animal,* ſhould form an Idea thereof by tying together and adjoyning to one another a Plant and an Animal (whereas he ought to have compounded together the Properties of a Plant and an Animal;) for ſuch an Idea the Scholaſtic Theology hath formed of θεάνθρωπος, *God-man.* Who according to his true Idea is of the Humane Nature and Species, but ſo as to be of the Saint and Son of God-kind, and ſo as to be in this kind of this high Rank and Graduality, *The Imperial Son,* and therefore *An Humane-divine Perſon* or *God-man;* for ſuch is *The Imperial Saint of God-kind of Son.*

SECTION VIII.

The Eighth Diſagreement.

I. THE Scholaſtic Theology touching the Incarnation doth not befriend Chriſtianity (and therefore is not likely to be one of the Truths of it) but is very prejudicial to the Intereſt of Religion. In great degree it is unintelligible and incredible, maketh Chriſtianity ſuch, and is a mighty Stumbling-block to Unbelievers. They that believe it, find their Faith puzzled by it and their Underſtanding nonpluſt. (d) *Nam de natura & ſuppoſito prout eſt in perſonis divinis, ex lumine rationis ferè nihil dici poteſt,* for touching a Nature and Suppoſitum as they are in Divine Perſons, almoſt nothing can be ſaid from the Light of Reaſon. It is a great reproach and diſhonour to the Religion of Chriſtians, that profeſs the knowledge of Chriſt (the Center of their Religion, the Author and Object of it) yet do not tolerably underſtand him; they know not what to make of his Perſon, Divinity, Incarnation, the Ideas which the Scholaſticks of the Primitive Church had of him were multifarious unholy Nugacities and inexcuſably ignorant Conceits, with theſe the Church hath been filled from the early days of it and with the fierceſt digladiations about them, as if the Chriſt of God was of the ſame Character that the Stoick gave of us Men, εἰς παραδοξίαν ἐφύμεν, *we are born to be a Paradox.* The principal Hereſies and Schiſms (almoſt all of them) thoſe of the largeſt diſpread, the longeſt continuance, the greateſt miſchief to Chriſtianity and the Church, have been rais'd upon the Article of the Incarnation, and were Hereſies touching the Natures and Perſon of Chriſt. Many of them were Scholaſtic kind of Hereſies, the more principal

(u) *Ibid. T.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 15. *S.* 6.

(w) *Ibid. S.* 11.

(x) *Ibid. c.* 14 *S.* 3.

(y) *Scire attinet, filii proprietatem, quatenus hominibus convenit, natura eſſe poſteriorem origine, ac generatione, qua homo exiſtit. Prius enim Socratem à patre Sophroniſco productum intelligimus, quàm ejus dicamus eſſe filium.* Ibid. l. 7. c. 4. S. 6.

(z) *Quod ſi alterius cujuſpiam quam divinæ ad illam naturæ fiat acceſſio, ea minimè connaturalis eſt, ſed accidens & adventitia; quæ nec ſuppoſitum conſtituat, quod ex ſeſe jam completum eſt & abſolutum; nec decedendo minuat aut immutet.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 16. S. 14.

(a) *Idem de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *S.* 12.

(b) *Vaſqu. in Tō.* 3. *par. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 16. *c.* 4.

(c) *Petav. T.* 4 *l.* 16. *c.* 5. *S.* 3.

(d) *Scheibler. Met. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *Art.* 5. *punct.* 1.

cipal and eminent were ſuch, they were a Scholaſticiſm levell'd againſt the Scholaſticiſm of the Church, and rais'd up in oppoſition to it; and thus far they had their origin from it, *they had never been, if the Scholaſtic Incarnation had not been.* One of theſe eminent Scholaſtic kind of Hereſies was that of *Neſtorius*, which is ſaid to be of vaſt diſpread in the Eaſtern Parts unto this Day. But the deepeſt Wound was given to the Church by the Hereſie of *Eutyches* (another eminent Scholaſtic kind of Hereſie) which branched it ſelf into numerous Parties (not without Prodigies of Sedition and Bloodſhed) the *Acephali*, *οἱ Διακρινόμενοι*, *Heſitantes*, *Corrupticolæ*, *Incorrupticolæ* (Aphthardocites) *Theopaſchites*, *Tritheites*, *Angelitæ*, *Agnoetæ*. The *Monothelites* alſo (amongſt whom were the greateſt Perſons in the Church) muſt be reckon'd amongſt the Scholaſtic Hereſies and a Branch of the *Eutychian*. For although every Orthodox Chriſtian muſt be in ſome ſenſe a *Monothelite* (an oppoſer of two Intellects and Intellections, two rational Wills and Volitions in Chriſt) yet the ancient *Monothelites* commix'd Truth with ſuch abſurd Conceits, as may juſtly be reckon'd Scholaſtic Hereſie. Amongſt theſe Scholaſtic Hereſies that in ſome ſort had their origin from the Scholaſtic Incarnation, we may alſo reckon the Hereſie of *Felix* and *Elipandus*, who affirm'd, that Chriſt as Man, was not the *natural* but the *adopted* Son of God. Into which Opinion they were manifeſtly led by the Scholaſtic Theology (which yet condemn'd them) which affirmeth, *that Chriſt as Man is not the natural Son of God by Generation.* Yet it alſo affirmeth (ſelf-contradictingly) that the Son of God (e) *took Humane Nature and true Fleſh of the Virgin* (vera generatione) *by true Generation.* From the Scholaſtic Generation we muſt in great degree derive the origin (not only of the Scholaſtic Hereſies that have infeſted the Church, but) of the *Muhammedan* Religion, that *lerna malorum* and deadly Steam of the bottomleſs Pit, which in great part hath diſpread it ſelf through the Earth and Air. (f) *For when* Muhammed *ſaw, that Men were weary of the Diſſenſions of the Chriſtian Religion* (chiefly about the Perſon and Natures of Chriſt) *he deviſ'd his new Religion.*

II. The Scholaſtic Theology (none of the leaſt of the Church's Evils) muſt be counted a Production of the Scholaſtic Incarnation (as being in ſome reſpect ſuch) which hath alſo produc'd an alteration in the natural Sciences (that are new modell'd into a compliance with it) whereby the true Notices of things, and Teſts of diſcrimination between Truth and Falſhood are loſt, and by this Artifice innumerable Impoſtures may be introduc'd into Religion, and ſucceſsfully obtruded upon Mankind; which is *a ſpoiling us by vain Philoſophy, not* Philoſophia Theologiæ ancillans. The Scholaſtic Incarnation ſpoileth alſo the Wiſdom and reaſonableneſs of the œconomy of the Chriſtian Religion (wherein the Wiſdom of God ought to ſhine moſt illuſtriouſly) making the Son of God to be Father and Son, Creator and Creature, Lord and Servant, Prieſt and Mediator to himſelf. And it muſt be counted very injurious and diſhonourable to God by ſuppoſing the Eternal Almighty God, *the great God that formed all things*, to have become Man, to have put on our Rags, to have been lodg'd in a dark Womb, to have cried like an Infant, to have done thoſe Actions which are proper to our Humane Imperfections (and are common to us with Brutes) and to have ſuffered thoſe Evils which our frail Mortality is ſubject to. Nor is this Hypotheſis of the Incarnation leſs Injurious to our great and only Saviour the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. For it implieth, that it was an Abſtract *Logos* (Platonic or Ariſtotelian) not the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, who being the only Son and Heir of God and the Son of his Love, was *ſanctified and ſealed by him and ſent into the World* (not without requiſite Instructions and Credentials) whom he gave to the World, to Labours, and Dolours, and Agonies, and Torments (that we might live through him) whom he appointed our Mediator and High Prieſt, the Founder of the Holy Empire and the Saviour-King thereof (and ſent him into the World on that Errand) giving him by degrees all Power and all Judgment, and to be *the Head over all things to the Church.* This Hypotheſis of the Incarnation implieth, that it was an Abſtract *Logos*, not the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, who was the ſuperlative lover of our Souls, that out of love to us took upon him, to be our Redeemer and our Saviour, our Exemplar and our Sin-bearer; *that came into the World to ſave Sinners* and to adminiſter all the matters of our Salvation; that took upon him, to become poor, though he was rich, diveſted himſelf of the form of God and took upon him the form of a Servant, emptied and abaſed himſelf (to the depth of a ſtupendious Humiliation) left Heaven for Earth, Glory for Meanneſs and Diſgrace, offered himſelf to Mortality, Infirmity, Servility, to be God's Meſſiah and our Saviour-prince, and came down from Heaven *not to do his own Will, but the will of him that ſent him.* All theſe things were done by an Abſtract *Logos*, none of theſe things were done by the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, as this Hypotheſis implieth, and accordingly theſe matters are repreſented in the currant Scholaſtic Theology of Chriſtendom (both of elder and latter times;) ſo much this Scholaſtic Incarnation doth, and ſo far it goeth in bereaving the Lord Jeſus of the Eſteem and Affections of his People and of his rightful honourary Attributions.

But this is not all; for to the *Logos* that was Abſtract, but is now ſuppos'd to be hypoſtatically united to our Saviour's Humanity, *inſhrined and intempled therein*, to this God or Eternal Deity thus incarnated Chriſtians are taught by this Scholaſtic Theology to do the Divine Honours; Chriſt as Man (g) is called *Homo dominicus*, *θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος*, *The God-carrying Man*, and his Humanity is called *The Temple, Houſe and Habitation of this Deity* (the Eternal *Logos*) *his Inſtrument, Veſtment, Indument, Sponſa.* Our Saviour that only ſpeaketh of the Temple of his Body, did not ſuppoſe his whole Humanity the Temple of his Godhead: but in this Theology he is of this Idea; whence he is compar'd (h) *to a vaſt Globe made all of ſolid Gold ſaving one very ſmall Section of Silver* (his Humanity) *ſo that the Eternal Godhead outſhineth every thing in this Object of Devotion.* To this therefore Chriſtians are taught to direct their Devotions and Devotional Affections. But they are concern'd to conſider, whether in ſo directing their Devotions they do not look upon Chriſt Jeſus as nothing more than an adventitious *Adjunct*, *Accident* and *Appendix*, having the ſame Notion of him, which *Athanaſius* hath, when he ſaith,

(*i*) *The*

(e) Petav. T. 4. l. 5. c. 14. S. 4.

(f) *Mahomet Arabs & Iſmaelita homo ambitioſus, aſtutus, & ad totius mundi perniciem natus, cùm homines videret pertæſos diſſidiorum Chriſtianæ religionis, novum dogma commentus eſt.* Melanth. Exam. Theol. p.m. 238.

(g) Petav. T. 4. l. 7. c. 10, 11, 12, 13.

(h) Dr. H. More Myſt. of Godl. B. 9. c. 2.

(i) *The Son of God in the conſummation of Ages deſcending from the Boſom of the Father of an immaculate Virgin*, τὸν ἡμέτερον ἀνείληφεν ἄνθρωπον Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, *aſſum'd our Man Chriſt Jeſus. Having aſſumed Fleſh, he was called Jeſus* καλεῖται καὶ ἄνθρωπος, *as alſo Man.* Is this the mode of glorifying Chriſt Jeſus, to make him as ſuch no Perſon, no Divine Perſon, no Son of God, but meerly *an appendant Humanity and our Man?* But at this rate (according to this Theology) Chriſt Jeſus muſt be depriv'd of Glory, and Chriſtians muſt give Glory and do Divine Honours to the Scholaſtic Eternal *Logos*, to whom they owe no Duty, nor are ever commanded to perform any.

III. The Scholaſtic Theology touching the Incarnation is at a ſuperlative rate injurious to the choiceſt Article of Chriſtianity, which is *Chriſt's Paſſion.* For according to the conſtant tenour of it, (k) *The Son is both impaſſible and paſſible: impaſſible* (juxta quod Logos) *as he is the* Logos; *but paſſible* (ut caro factus eſt) *as he is made Fleſh:* impaſſibilis divinitate, paſſibilis carne. *According to that Nature which he hath in common with the Father, he is increate, inviſible, uncircumſcrib'd, immutable, impaſſible, incorruptible, the maker of all things: but according to our Nature and that of his Fleſh he is create; paſſible, circumſcrib'd, comprehenſible.* (l) *As Man is in his Soul immortal, mortal in Fleſh: ſo Chriſt was in his Divinity impaſſible, paſſible in Fleſh.* All agree, that the Godhead is ἀπαθὴς, *impaſſible*, and ſo *Athanaſius* attributeth (m) *to the Fleſh, Paſſion, to the Divinity* τὸ ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἄτρεπτον, *impaſſibility and immutability.* So the ancient and modern Scholaſtic Divines diſtinguiſh the Proprieties of theſe ſeveral Natures. (n) *He was not troubled according to his Divinity, but his Soul was troubled, he was troubled according to his aſſumption of Humane Frailty, and becauſe he aſſum'd a Soul, he aſſum'd the Paſſions of it. To ſuffer, to be wounded and to die, are proper to the Humane Nature, incompetible to the Dinine Nature.* They diſtinguiſh a duplicity of Chriſt's Operations, which they attribute to his duplicity of Natures. (o) His Miracles they attribute to his Divinity, *as he is of the Father and God,* ἐνεργεῖ τὰ θαύματα, *he worketh Miracles:* but Hunger, Thirſt, Wearineſs, Sleep, Fear, Grief, Anxiety, Tears, and the ſuffering Pain and Death, they attribute to the imbecillity of his Humane Nature, who aſſum'd Humane Fleſh with the proper Paſſions thereof; *as he is of the Virgin and Man,* τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὸ πάθος ὑπέμεινε, *he underwent the Croſs and Paſſion.* (p) *He that was impaſſible ſuffered by that paſſible Nature, which he aſſumed, and he that could not die, died.* Theſe Sayings muſt be underſtood in the ſenſe of the Scholaſtic Theology, and ſo underſtood their meaning is; *that the Son of God was a Perſonal Eternal Deity* (the Logos) *who in his own Nature could not ſuffer any thing, but only in an aſſum'd Humane Nature.*

IV. The Scholaſtic Incarnation therefore implieth, that Chriſt's Paſſion muſt be conſider'd as *his Paſſion no Paſſion*, and himſelf as *a Sufferer no Sufferer*, as *Athanaſius* ſaith, (q) αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ πάσχων καὶ μὴ πάσχων, *he was a ſufferer and no ſufferer; he ſuffer'd becauſe his own Body ſuffer'd: but he did not ſuffer* ὅτι τῇ φύσει Θεὸς ὢν ὁ λόγος ἀπαθής ἐστι, *becauſe being by nature God the Word he is impaſſible.* So S. *Ambroſe* ſaith of Chriſt, *Idem patiebatur & non patiebatur.* And *Fulgentius* ſtileth him, *inviolabilis in vulnere, impaſſibilis in paſſione*, invulnerable in his Wounds, impaſſible in his Paſſion. So the Synod of *Toledo* ſaith of him, *ipſe impaſſibilis patiens*, in his Suffering he was impaſſible. *Vigilius* an *African* Biſhop diſcourſeth, that God and the Fleſh did not in Chriſt ſuffer alike. (r) *We ſay, that the Word did bear the Injuries of the Paſſion, yet did not feel the Paſſions: But becauſe his Fleſh not only bare them, but felt them and they were ſuperiour to it, therefore we rightly ſay, that our Lord was ſenſibly affected with them in his Fleſh without any ſenſe or mutation of his Divinity. The Humane Nature therefore* (as *Petavius* ſaith) *had a ſenſe of Grief and Pain, which the Divinity had not.* (s) *The Soul although it dieth not with the Body, yet ſuffereth with the Body and is affected by it: but from the aſſumed Nature in Chriſt nothing of Infirmity redoundeth into the Aſſumer.* (t) *As Man he underwent his Paſſion, as God he continu'd above Paſſion.* This is the ſenſe of that Theology which hath prevailed in the Church touching our Saviour's ſufferings; *The reality of them was confined to his Humanity, did not reach his perſonal Deity, which is of an impaſſible nature, utterly remote and exempt from all Paſſion, was not hurt at all, nor wounded, nor touch'd by our Saviour's ſufferings, had no ſenſe nor feeling of them.* But if his Divinity was thus totally exempt from Sufferings, how is it, that this Perſonal Divinity is ſaid, to have born them? Can any one be ſaid, to bear thoſe Sufferings, of which he hath no (afflictive) Senſe or Perception? To this the Scholaſtic Theology anſwereth, (u) *That this is done by way of imputation, and by that mode of ſpeaking called the Communication of Properties. God the Word* (ſaith S. *Cyril*) *of himſelf and by the condition of his proper ſubſtance, is exempt from all ſuffering and temporary Affliction: But becauſe he ſo aſſumed human Nature and conjoyned it with himſelf, as to become one and the ſame with it, and to have it appropriated to himſelf and his own, therefore whatever befalleth it, he imputeth to himſelf, God himſelf is ſaid to have ſuffered it, and it is ſaid, to have befallen him.* (w) Ἐλογίσθη δὲ τὸ πάθος εἰς τὴν θεότητα, καίτοιγε τῆς θεότητος ἀπαθοῦς οὔσης. Ὅτι οὕτως εὐδόκησεν ἐλθὼν ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀπαθὴς Θεὸς λόγος. *The Paſſion is imputed to the Deity, although the Deity is impaſſible. For ſo the holy* Logos *the impaſſible God coming amongſt us would have it to be, which is ſuch a thing, as if one cloathed with a Garment defiled with Blood ſprinkled on it, which cometh not at the Body of him that is cloathed with it:* λογίζεται δὲ ὁ σπίλος, *yet the Spot that is from Blood is imputed to him, that is cloathed with this Garment*, ſaith *Epiphanius.* Thus according to the Scholaſtic Incarnation Chriſt's Paſſion is *a Paſſion no Paſſion, himſelf a Sufferer no Sufferer.*

V. According to the Scholaſtic Incarnation *Chriſt's Paſſion is not to be counted a great and dreadful Paſſion, it is nothing ſo much a Paſſion as*

(i) *T.* 1. *p.* 394, 397. *Com.*

(k) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *S.* 4. & *l.* 7. *c.* 4. *S.* 9. & *l* 4. *c.* 16. *S.* 8.

(l) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 4. *S.* 9.

(m) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 13 *S.* 7.

(n) *Ut homo dubitat, ut homo turbatur: non turbatur ejus virtus, non turbatur ejus divinitas, ſed turbatur anima, turbatur ſecundum humanæ fragilitatis aſſumptionem, & ideo quia ſuſcepit animam, ſuſcepit & animæ paſſiones.* Ibid. l. 8. c. 9. S. 3. *Propria ſunt humanæ naturæ pati, vulnerari, mori. Natura divina non vulneratur, non moritur.* Melanth Exam. Theol. p. 309. 310.

(o) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 8. *c.* 7, 8, 9.

(p) *Paſſus eſt impaſſibilis per paſſibilem quem ſuſcepit, & immortalis mortuus eſt.* Ibid. l. 4. c. 15. S. 16.

(q) *Petav. ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 16. *S.* 4.

(r) *Verbum Dei dicimus paſſionis injurias pertuliſſe, non tamen paſſionem ſenſiſſe. Sed quia Caro ejus non ſolùm pertulit ſed & ſenſit & ceſſit, meritò ac jure dicimus, Dominum his omnibus paſſionum conditionibus ſenſibiliter affectum in carne ſua, ſine ſenſu vel mutatione divinitatis ſuæ. Ergo humana natura ſenſum habuit doloris & paſſionis, quem divinitas non cepit.* Ibid. l. 8. c. 9. S. 9.

(s) *Anima etiamſi non moritur cum corpore, tamen compatitur, ſeu afficitur à corpore: ſed ab aſſumpta natura in Chriſto nihil redundat infirmitatis in aſſumentem.* Melanth. ſupr. p. 270.

(t) Ὡς ἄνθρωπος τὸ πάθος ὑπέμεινεν· ὡς Θεὸς κρείττων πάθους μεμένηκε. *Petav. ſupr. l.* 4. *c.* 16. *S.* 9.

(u) Ibid T. 4. l. 6. c. 17. p. 599.

(w) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 13. *S.* 6.

no Paſſion, himſelf was nothing ſo much a Sufferer as no Sufferer. This conſequence is clearly deducible from the Tenor of the Scholaſtic Theology, which we have cited already, and which we ought to read over again, to conſider (not what it expreſſeth, but) what it implieth and inferreth. For we do not blame the Scholaſtic Theology for exempting the Deity from Suffering, but our Diſpute is againſt this Theology's Incarnation of *a Scholaſtic abſtract Logos, a perſonal eternal God.* For it is manifeſt, that according to this Scholaſtic Incarnation this following Judgment muſt be made of our Saviour's Paſſion. (1.) *It is not credible, to be a deſigned Paſſion.* For as it is incredible, and impoſſible, that God ſhould ſend into the World, to ſuffer Afflictions, ſuch an immortal Soul, which is utterly incapable of any afflictive Senſe or Perception: So it is alike incredible and impoſſible, that God ſhould ſend into the World, to ſuffer Pains and Dolours, *ſuch a God the Logos*, that is utterly incapable of ſuffering and feeling any. That God may ſend into the World, to ſuffer Pains and Dolours, ſuch *a Logos* that aſſuming Humane Nature is capable of ſuffering them in it, this is as poſſible, and credible, as that God may ſend into the World, to ſuffer Afflictions, ſuch an immortal Soul that aſſuming an Humane Body is capable of ſuffering Afflictions in it. But the Scholaſtic eternal God the Logos is of a contrary Character; whence *Gelaſius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine* ſaith of Chriſt (x) *He was bound, he was wounded, he was crucify'd, he was rudely handled, he bare ſtripes and the marks of them and the ſcar of the Spear. All theſe things that Body which was brought forth by* Mary *endur'd: But that which was generated by the Father before the Worlds* (the Scholaſtic eternal God the Logos) *no one could hurt.* So blind are theſe Scholaſticks, they think, they do Honour to their Saviour, when they do the greateſt diſparagement to his Perſon and Paſſion, and falſifie his Religion. For whereas Chriſtianity aſſureth us, that God gave and ſent his Son, to ſuffer Loads of Pain and Grief for us, they tell us (contradicting all this) that God ſent us ſuch an Abſtract Son, that neither out of Humane Nature, nor in Humane Nature was capable of ſuffering any thing. Such is the Wiſdom of the Scholaſtic Theology, that calleth it ſelf the Catholick Faith. (2.) *It was not a Paſſion in his Eſſence or Subſtance.* For according to the Scholaſtic Theology and Incarnation our Saviour's Humanity is not his Eſſence, but only an Adjunct, Appendix and as an Accident. It ſuppoſeth (y) *humanam naturam quaſi appendicis & acceſſionis inſtar ad divinam adhæreſcere*, that Chriſt's Humane Nature adhereth to his Divine as an Appendix and an Acceſſion. If therefore in our Saviour's Sufferings nothing did endure Sufferings but his Humanity, it muſt be ſuppos'd (according to this Theology) that nothing did endure Sufferings but only an Appendix and an Acceſſion to his Eſſence. (3.) *It was not a Paſſion in his true ſubſtantial Self or Perſon.* (z) Chriſt did not diſcourſe to us of enduring Sufferings, ſaith *S. Chryſoſtom*, himſelf being out of Danger and exempt from Dolour: But himſelf underwent Agonies and Dolours, to be (as the Scripture propoſeth him) a Pattern unto us of virtuous enduring Sufferings. But the Scholaſtic Theology and Incarnation maketh Chriſt no tolerable accommodate Pattern unto us of virtuous enduring Sufferings. For if we ſuffer our true ſubſtantial Self ſuffereth, which in Chriſt's Sufferings (according to this Theology) ſuffer'd nothing, but was wholly exempt and free from Sufferings, and only that which was ſomething of him endur'd Sufferings. (a) *He that ſuffer'd in the Fleſh* (ſaith *Fulgentius*) *was no other than he, that in the true Paſſion of the Fleſh continu'd altogether impaſſible.* In his Paſſion he ſuffer'd nothing in his true ſubſtantial Self (according to this Theology;) for his Hang-by cannot be ſuppos'd his true ſubſtantial Self. (4.) It was a Paſſion only in *his exteriour Superficials* (not in his intrinſic Centrals;) for according to the Scholaſtic Theology and Incarnation his Humanity (as we have ſeen before) is *the Temple, Houſe and Habitation* of this perſonal Deity (the Scholaſtic eternal Logos) *his Inſtrument, Veſtment, Indument.* (b) *The Similitude of a Garment is deſign'd to ſignifie the immutability of the Divinity in Chriſt, that whatever of Paſſion and vility in Life and Death God took upon him, he is believed, to have taken and receiv'd it as it were extrinſecally, in that Man which he carried, as in a Garment; but that it did not reach to his Subſtance.* (c) *Who was it therefore, that was ſeen to hang on the Tree, who was it that was Dead? The Man whom he had put on and carried with himſelf.* (5.) The blaſphemous *Celſus* ſaith (d) *what generous thing did Jeſus as a God, deſpiſing Men and deriding, and ſporting at that which befell him?* As he would have thought it generoſity in our Saviour, thus to have behav'd himſelf in his Paſſion: So Scholaſtic Divines think it generous, to ſay (as *Athanaſius* doth) of the Paſſions of our Saviour's Humane Nature (e) οὐχ ἥπτοντο κατὰ τὴν θεότητα αὐτοῦ, *they did not touch him according to his Divinity or Godhead.* But ſuch Sayings according to the Scholaſtic Theology and Incarnation imply and infer, that his Paſſion was not in his *Eſſence or Subſtance, nor in his true ſubſtantial Self or Perſon, nor in his intrinſic Centrals, but only his exteriour Superficials.* The Scholaſtic God the Logos therefore may be repreſented as a Deity ſitting in his Temple ſafe and untouch'd by any external Storms and Diſaſters: Or as the Mind and Soul of a Stoical or Sceptical Philoſopher, who (as he pretendeth) is ſo internally fortified againſt all acerbities of Pain and Grief, that they cannot paſs the Porch of his Soul. And now it is eaſie, to make a Judgment, what the Paſſion of our Saviour (dreadful to the height of wonder and aſtoniſhment, and beyond the ſize and dimenſion of our Conceptions and Expreſſions) amounteth to according to the Scholaſtic Theology and Incarnation. All Men therefore are concern'd to conſider, whether they will diſcard the Scholaſtic Theology Trinity and Incarnation: Or whether they will hold to ſuch a Theology and Incarnation, which unavoidably in the conſequence of it at an horrible rate

(x) *Vinctus eſt, vulneratus eſt, crucifixus eſt, attrectatus eſt, vibices geſtavit, lanceæ cicatricem admiſit, hæc omnia corpus ex Maria editum ſuſtinuit, quod autem ante ſecula ex patre genitum eſt, ei nocere nemo potuit.* Petav. T. 4 l. 8. c. 8. S. 10.

(y) *Ibid. l. 7. c. 13. S. 7.*

(z) *Chryſoſt. in Johan. Hom.* 67.

(a) *Nec alius in carne paſſus eſt niſi ille, qui in vera carnis paſſione impaſſibilis omninò permanſit.* Petav. ſupr. l. 8. c. 9. S. 8.

(b) *Divinitatis immutabilitas in Chriſto ſimilitudine veſtis exprimitur; dum quicquid perpeſſionis ac vilitatis in vita, obituque ſuſcepit, quaſi extrinſecus, eo quem geſtabat homine ceu veſtimento, excepiſſe Deus creditur; non autem ad ipſius pertinuiſſe ſubſtantiam.* Petav. ibid. l. 7. c. 13. S. 6.

(c) *Quis eſt ergo viſus in patibulo pendere, quis mortuus eſt? Homo quem induerat, & ſecum ipſe portabat.* Ibid. l. 3. c. 7. S. 3.

(d) Τί δὲ καὶ γενναῖον ἔδρασεν οἷον θεὸς, καταφρονῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαγελῶν καὶ παίζων τὸ συμβαῖνον ὁ Ἰησοῦς; *Orig. c. Celſ. l. 2. p.* 80.

(e) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 8. *c.* 8. *S.* 5.

nullifieth and vilifieth the Paſſion of their Saviour. But of his dreadful Paſſion there is no diminution, nothing of diſparagement in our Hypotheſis touching his Perſon and Incarnation. It ſuppoſeth him, to be eſſentially God-man or an Humane-divine Perſon, ſo far eſſentially adapted to a deſign'd Paſſion, and fully adapted to it by diveſting himſelf of his Deiformity and becoming Humane Fleſh. It ſuppoſeth his Paſſion to have been in his Eſſence (ſuch was his Holy and Divine Soul) in his true ſubſtantial Self and the intrinſic Centrals of his Perſon.

VI. The Scholaſtic Incarnation is injurious to this eminent benefit of Chriſt's Paſſion, *Heb.* 2. 18. *For in that he himſelf hath ſuffered being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted.* He knows how to ſupport and ſuccour us under Infirmities, becauſe he himſelf hath born them, and he is diſpoſed to do it. *V.* 17. *He was made like unto his Brethren in all things, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Prieſt.* Becauſe he was like unto us in our Infirmities and Diſtreſſes, he is rarely well qualified for our purpoſe; as they that have known the want of Bread and Water, and what it is, to have ungracious Children, are apt to pity others that want Bread and Water, or have untoward Children. So the Son of God is diſpoſed, to Compaſſionate, Relieve and Succour us. Are we afflicted with Hunger? He knoweth what it is, to be pinch'd with it? Are we tormented with Thirſt? He cried out upon the Croſs *I Thirſt*. Are we ſurrounded with Sorrow? The Son of God knoweth what it is, to bear a Load of it. Are we rack'd and gibbeted? So was his Body upon the Croſs. Are we tortur'd? In the days of his Fleſh he felt the Nails and Spear. But if in the days of his Fleſh he was no greater a Sufferer, than as the Scholaſtic Incarnation implieth (a Sufferer as no Sufferer) what can his Sufferings ſignifie, to qualifie and diſpoſe him, to ſuccour us in our Sufferings? Beſides, if his Humane Nature ſuffer'd deeply, yet this can ſignifie nothing to our advantage, unleſs either this Humane Nature hath the power of adminiſtring our Affairs, or doth incline that Nature, which hath the power of adminiſtring them, to compaſſionate and relieve us. But according to the Scholaſtic Theology the Humane Nature hath not the power of adminiſtring our Affairs according to its Propenſions and Pleaſure (it ſelf being under the power of the Scholaſtic Divine Nature:) Nor can it incline the Scholaſtic Divine Nature (which is ſuppos'd to have the power of adminiſtring our Affairs) to compaſſionate and ſuccour us, no more than the fearfulneſs of the Humane Nature can incline the Scholaſtic Divine Nature unto fearfulneſs.

Non ignara mali, &c.

VII. Throughout our Saviour's Paſſion there is not any appearance of the Scholaſtic God the Logos (the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity) but the contrary, whence the Scholaſtic Theology appeareth to have miſtaken the Incarnation. It aſſerteth in our Saviour two intellectual Natures and two rational Wills, yet throughout the whole Tranſaction of our Saviour's Paſſion it can find no appearance of any more than one intellectual Nature and one rational Will. It aſſerteth, that the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity was incarnate in our Saviour, yet it acknowledgeth, that throughout the whole Tragedy of his Sufferings nothing of him is diſcernible; but as a Divine of our own repreſenteth the Senſe of it (f) *the Faculties of the Divine Nature were totally ſuſpended upon ſuch Occaſions, and he proceeded in them not in any degree as God, but intirely as a meer and real Man.* The Scholaſtic Divinity in our Saviour therefore (according to this Theology) was wholly exempted both from ſuffering any thing and from doing any thing in his Paſſion; whence an ordinary underſtanding will infer, that really no ſuch perſonal Deity was incarnate in our ſuffering Saviour. For if he had been there, then was the time (if ever) of exerting his Virtues and Operations, when our Saviour was in the deepeſt plunge, ingaged in the greateſt conflict, and was to bear the heavieſt load of Preſſures (too heavy for any *Atlas* to bear) which made him ſink and faint under them. But becauſe there is no appearance of ſuch an Agent in our Saviour's Paſſion, and becauſe his Behaviour in it is thought incongruous to the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity, therefore all his Devotion and Reſignation at his Paſſion, his Humility and Lamb-like Meekneſs, his invincible Patience and Divine Charity (with all other Divine Graces and Duties reſplendent in it) the Scholaſtic Theology imputeth to *his meer Humane Will.* And is it not a great injury and diſparagement to his Divine Paſſion, to write upon it this Inſcription, *Hic Deus fecit nihil*, here Man did all? For howſoever this Language may be interpreted, it is not honourable (but diſgraceful) to our Saviour's Paſſion; nor is it tolerably proper. For his Divine Graces and Duties (thoſe Divine Excellencies and Accompliſhments) proceeded from a Divine Principle, and he proceeded in them upon a Principle Divine (elſe they could not be Divine Graces and Duties;) *theſe are the things that are of God*, the Saint of God and Son of God-kind of things, and are therefore peculiarly the things of his Divinity of Nature and Perſon (not of his Humanity) and the things of his Deity; for he hath no other Divinity or Deity but his being *The Son of God.* To ſuppoſe, that his Miracles in external matters are peculiarly the things of his Divinity (or Deity) and muſt be attributed thereto as ſuch; and that his Miracles of Grace, his Divine Virtues and Duties, are the things of his Humanity peculiarly, and muſt be attributed thereto as ſuch, is to ſet up the natural Man's kind of things above the things of Kind and Quality Divine. *S. Chryſoſtom* ſaith of our Saviour's Divine Prayer before his Paſſion, *It was not the Prayer of his Divinity, but of his aſſumed Nature; for God doth not pray.* But in that Prayer our Saviour calleth God his *Father*, and in ſo ſtiling him, we cannot reaſonably ſuppoſe, that he ſpake and pray'd meerly as Man, but as the Son of God. His Paſſion could not have been *Satisfactory* and *Meritorious*, nor the Son of God's kind of Paſſion, if it had not been replete with the Divine kind of Excellencies and Precioſities (Paſſive, Self-reſigning, Soul-melting Obedience and Love;) in theſe the Divinity of his Nature illuſtriouſly ſhone, and conſequently the Operations of it were far from being ſuſpended.

But his reluctance to Sufferings, his being diſmay'd and diſturb'd in Spirit, theſe proceeded from *a Principle purely Humane* (the imbecility of Humane Nature) and theſe demonſtrate, that our Saviour was liable to ſuch a State of Deſertion and of Frowns, ſuch a withdrawing of the

(f) Dr. Stanhope Ser. on Luk. 22. 42. p. 248.

the Divinity in reſpect of Comfort, as is not reconcileable with his being the ſecond Perſon in the Scholaſtic Trinity. Nor with this Notion which a Divine of our own hath of the Incarnation. * *This is the true Notion of a God Incarnate, The God liveth and acteth in Human Nature, is the principle of all its actions and motions, and doth all that becometh a God in the Nature of Man.* Several Scholaſticks have not been able, to think with Patience, of theſe Phenomena of his dreadful Paſſion. (g) *Our Saviour in the Hiſtory of his Paſſion is ſaid to have been ſore amazed, vehemently ſorrowful and very heavy, which many have thought unworthy the Perſon of the Son of God.* Origen *conceiteth, that Chriſt was not ſo vehemently ſorrowful, but only began to be ſorrowful. The Hiſtory of the bloody Sweat and the Angel ſtrengthening him ſome have expung'd out of S.* Luke. *Theophylact endeavoureth to elude thoſe Deſcriptions by inſerting as it were.* Epiphanius *expoundeth the Angel's ſtrengthning him to this Senſe, as if the Angel had ſaid to Chriſt, Thine is the Power and Fortitude. Many others alſo will not have the Cup which Chriſt prayed might paſs from him, to be meant of his Paſſion, but of the deſtruction of* Jeruſalem *and of the Jews.* If our Saviour was the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity incarnate, he could no more be deſtitute of Divine Omnipotent Aſſiſtance, than he could be deſtitute of vital Sanctity. And conſequently an Angel ſtrengthning him is according to that Hypotheſis a moſt unaccountable Phænomenon. It is poſſible, that Chriſt might then be deſtitute of the aſſiſting and comforting influences of the Holy Spirit: But ſuppoſing the Scholaſtic Incarnation he could no more be deſtitute of the Virtues and Influences of the Scholaſtic Logos, than he could be deſtitute of himſelf; for this Scholaſtic Logos is ſuppos'd to be himſelf, his Humane Nature being only an Appendix. Yet *Grotius* ſaith, * *Chriſtus deſtitutus Divinitatis in ſe habitantis virtute, humanaque natura relictus, ac proinde minor factus angelis, opus habuit angelorum ſolatio.* Chriſt being deſtitute of the Power of the Divinity that dwelt in him and left to Humane Nature, and therefore made lower than the Angels, needed their Support and Comfort.

* *Dr. Sherlock Scripture Proofs. p.* 211.

(g) *Multi fuerunt, quibus viſum fuit, indignum eſſe perſona filii Dei, tanta conſternatione conflictari, ſicut in hiſtoria paſſionis deſcribitur vocabulis* ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, ἀδημονεῖν, περίλυπος. *Origines philoſophatur, non contriſtatum Chriſtum, ſed cœpiſſe contriſtari. Quidam totam hiſtoriam de ſudore ſanguineo & Angelo confortante ex Luca expunxerunt. Theophylactus deſcriptiones illas per particulam* ὡσεὶ *conatur eludere. Epiphanius confortationem Angeli exponit, quaſi Angelus dixerit Chriſto, tua eſt potentia & fortitudo. Multi etiam alii calicem quem Chriſtus à ſe transferri petit, nolunt intelligi de paſſione Chriſti, ſed de perditione Judæorum, everſione Hieroſolymorum.* Chemnit. de 2. in Chriſt. natur. p. 16. vid. Lactant. l. 4. c. 30.

* *Not. in Luc.* 22. 43.

VIII. If the Scholaſtic Incarnation had not been, there had been no *Theopaſchites*, all of them were Scholaſtic *Theopaſchites.* (h) Some of them held, that the whole Trinity ſuffer'd, and theſe were diſtinguiſh'd from the *Patripaſſions*, who held, that only the Father ſuffer'd. Others of them held only, that the Divinity of the Logos was nailed to the Croſs and laid in a Grave. (i) The Hereſie of the *Apthardocites* (Incorrupticolæ) who held, that Chriſt's Body was not in this Life obnoxious to Corruption and Death, to ſenſe of Pain, ſinleſs Affections and Paſſions, had manifeſtly its Origin from the Scholaſtic Incarnation; for it is but the common Opinion touching the impaſſibility of Chriſt's Scholaſtic Divinity enlarged and amplified and extended to his Body. *S. Hilary* entertain'd this horribly bad Conceit (making our Saviour's Paſſion no Paſſion;) for he affirmeth our Saviour, to have been beaten, wounded, bound, hanged on high without any ſenſe of Pain. He was really free from all Pain (ſaith he) *quia Deus eſt*, whence it is manifeſt, that the Scholaſtic Incarnation was the Origin of his foul miſtake. From the ſame Origin we muſt derive this groſs Conceit of *Felix* the *Spaniſh* Biſhop. (k) *It ought not to be ſaid, that God the Son of God the Father ſuffered or was crucified, but the Man aſſumed by him; grounding himſelf upon this Example. Not* Iſaac *who was led by his Father to be ſacrificed, was ſarcificed, but a Ram was ſacrificed for him: as if in* Iſaac *the Son of God was figur'd, and in the Ram the Son of Man.*

(h) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 16. *S.* 8 & *c.* 17. *S.* 7, 8.

(i) *Ibid. c.* 15. *S.* 11, 14. & *c.* 7. *S.* 3. *Daille use of the Fathers B.* 2. *p.* 79, 80.

(k) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 1. *in fine.*

SECTION IX.

The Ninth Diſagreement.

I. THE Scholaſtic Incarnation is combin'd with multifarious abſurd Conceits that reflect a Diſparagement upon it, and (in ſome degree) confute it. Such as this marvellous Abſurdity wherein all the Scholaſtic Divines agree (*l*) that as to the Faculty of aſſuming Humane Nature there is no difference amongſt the Divine Perſons; the Father and the Holy Ghoſt as well as the Son might Hypoſtatically aſſume Humane Nature and become incarnate, whence it is uſual with them, to make large Diſcourſes, to ſhew, that it was more convenient, that the Son in the Scholaſtic Trinity ſhould be incarnate rather than either of the other Divine Perſons. Not underſtanding or not conſidering, that a Man cannot be the Holy Spirit, nor can the Holy Spirit be a Political Perſon as Man is. Nor is it poſſible, that God the Father ſhould be a Son (incarnate and born of a Virgin) or that he ſhould be out of his Imperial Eſtate (as the Son was, when he was a Man on Earth) nor is the Imperfection which the being a Man implieth, competible unto God *definitively* and *abſolutely* ſo, whoſe Being is *being unvile in abſolute Perfection.* And becauſe it is plainly demonſtrable, that an Incarnation is incompetible to the other Divine Perſons, from thence it followeth, that an Incarnation would be incompetible to God the Son, if he was meerly a Divine Perſon; and that a certain Incarnation is competible unto him peculiarly for this Reaſon, *Becauſe he is eſſentially an Humane-divine Perſon.* Againſt which Combination of God and Man in one Perſon the Followers of *Socinus* argue (*m*) *That God and Man are ſuch Oppoſites as are called Diſparata, which cannot be truly affirmed of one and the ſame Subject, much leſs of one another, becauſe they involve a Tacit contradiction. For God and Man differ as Man and not Man, Animal and not Animal; therefore God and Man cannot be ſimply and abſolutely affirmed of Chriſt.* But we do not combine God and Man thus extravagantly or without due limitation of Senſe, nor in any other Senſe than the New Teſtament every where combineth *the Son of God and the Son of Man*, which is the ſame thing as the combining God and Man.

(l) *Valentia T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 3. *Punct.* 2.

(m) *Crell. de uno Deo. l.* 2. *S.* 2. *c.* 7.

The Scholaſtic Incarnation is link'd and combin'd with this ſecond Scholaſtic Conceit; *That all the Divine Perſons may at the ſame time aſſume and be Hypoſtatically united with one and the ſame Humane Nature.* And with another Scholaſtic Conceit near of Kin to it; *That one*

Divine Perſon may aſſume and be Hypoſtaſtically united with ſeveral Human Natures. The generality of the School-Doctors *(n)* admit theſe Conceits and diſpute for them, only *Scotus* (with ſome very few others) is a Diſſenter as to this Propoſition; *That all the Divine Perſons may at once aſſume and be Hypoſtatically united with one and the ſame individual Humane Nature:* But the other Grandees of his Faculty pretend to aſſoil all his Objections, and all other difficult Queſtions and Objections, which incumber theſe ſtrange Propoſitions. If we ſuppoſe one and the ſame individual Humane Nature, to be at once aſſumed and Hypoſtatically united by all the Divine Perſons, it is a queſtion, by what Name theſe Perſons muſt be called, and whether they muſt be counted one Man or more? Some ſay, they muſt be counted but one Man, others count them three Men, and others will have them counted neither one nor three. If they muſt be counted but one Man (as *Aquinas* and his Followers ſay) ſeeing every one of the Divine Perſons communicateth to this one Man his perſonal Propriety, this one Man muſt neceſſarily be *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt*, which is ſuch a Trinity in Unity, as every one but a School-man will count a Prodigy. So if one Divine Perſon doth at once aſſume and hypoſtatically unite two individual Humane Natures, *Aquinas* and his Followers ſay, this Perſon muſt be counted but one Man, not two Men. For as their Scholaſticiſm hath compounded the Perſon of Chriſt of two intellectual Natures, ſo it compoundeth one Man of two individual Humane Natures, as if an individual Humane Nature was not a Man. But ſuppoſe (ſay ſome Objectors) that a Divine Perſon ſhould aſſume an Humane Nature, and at the ſame time aſſume the Nature of a Lion, would he be but one Animal? To this theſe School-doctors anſwer affirmatively; and that this one Animal may belong both to the Species of a Man and the Species of a Lion. With theſe vain and profane Crotchets the Scholaſticks entertain themſelves, and theſe they derive from that Fountain their Scholaſtic Incarnation of Chriſt; for they are Children of that Parent. And ſeeing the Children reſemble the Parent, the Scholaſtic Incarnation of Chriſt muſt not be thought of a very good Character; for theſe its derivatives are of a very bad one.

II. This Scholaſtic Incarnation is combin'd with this *Fourth* Scholaſtic Conceit, *That by a Divine Perſon any ſubſtantial Nature* (complete) *may be aſſum'd into Unity of Perſon or Hypoſtaſis, although it be an unreaſonable and ſenſleſs Nature.* *(o)* This the generality of the School-doctors aſſert with great aſſurance (proving the Truth of it from Chriſt's Body, which when it was dead and inanimate, was hypoſtatically ſuſtain'd by the Logos:) But ſome of them aſſert it with much greater Modeſty than others. For *Cajetan* ſaith, Although God without any Diſparagement to his Majeſty may be united to the vileſt Creatures, yet we ſhould abſtain from a particular mention of them, becauſe of our Infirmity, and that we may not be offenſive to pious Ears. For pious Ears will ſcarce endure to hear, what ſome of theſe School-doctors are not afraid to ſpeak, *viz.* That theſe Propoſitions are poſſible, *Deus eſt Lapis, Deus eſt Aſinus, Deus eſt Homo damnatus, Deus eſt Diabolus.* Such kind of Propoſitions that are dreadful Contumelies of the Holy God, are the genuine Iſſue and Progeny of the Scholaſtic Incarnation, they are inſeparable from it (as to their poſſibility) and are implicitly contained in it; and ſhould not the Cauſe be taken away, if the Effects of it are ſo bad, nothing better than horrendous Blaſphemies againſt God? But ſay the School-doctors *(p) it cannot be proved, to be poſitively indecent and unbecoming God, to aſſume an irrational Nature,* & naturam irrationalem in concreto de ipſo prædicari, illumque belluam, equum aut ſuem denominari, *and to be denominated a Beaſt, an Horſe, or a Sow.* To call God a Beaſt, an Horſe or a Sow, is with theſe impure Sophiſters no reproach to the Divine Majeſty; and that we may underſtand from what Fountain they derive this their impure Scholaſtic Atheology they tell us *(q) that God in aſſuming Man, in ſome ſort aſſumed* the Nature of Angels, Animals, Plants, Stones and things inanimate; and as by the Aſſumption of Humane Nature there is ſuch a Communication of Properties between God and Man, that by reaſon thereof God is ſaid to be *Homo & riſibilis:* So it is no indecency, *quòd aſſumptâ naturâ equi diceretur equus & hinnibilis.*

This Scholaſtic Incarnation the School-doctors (in the *Fifth* place) have combin'd with fooliſh and abſurd Queſtions and Aſſertions touching the Aſſumption of imperfect Natures and their Hypoſtatical Union with God; which ſpeaketh them extremely vain in their Imaginations, and therefore their Scholaſtic Incarnation of Chriſt looketh as of Kin to their Scholaſtic Vanities. One of theſe fooliſh and abſurd Queſtions which they debate (for they are of different Minds) and touching which they bandy their Arguments *pro* and *con* is *(r) whether* Materia prima *without a ſubſtantial Form may be aſſumed to the Divine Subſiſtence?* Another Queſtion which theſe ſubtil Doctors gravely debate, is touching the Aſſumption of Accidents. For although they do not doubt, but that Accidents inhering in their Subſtance may be aſſumed by God: Yet it is with them a Queſtion of difficulty, whether Accidents may be immediately (without their Subject) aſſum'd to the Perſonality and Subſiſtence Divine? Some affirm it, others deny it, and others tread in a middle Path. Theſe ſay, that no Accident can be aſſumed, to ſubſiſt by the Divine Subſiſtence, but may be aſſumed to exiſt by the Divine Exiſtence. And as Accidents may be ſupernaturally ſeparated from their Subject, and have a certain mode of exiſting *per ſe* (as appeareth in the quantity of the Bread in the Euchariſt:) So *ſubſtantial material Forms* may be ſupernaturally ſeparated from the Matter, and have a certain mode of ſubſiſting (given them by God) and therefore they may be aſſumed by and hypoſtatically united unto God, becauſe the Divine Subſiſtence may ſupply that mode of ſubſiſting, which they were capable of receiving from God. The ſeparate Soul of Man tranſcendeth theſe ſubſtantial material Forms, and therefore they make no doubt, but that a Divine Perſon may aſſume a rational Soul ſeparate from the Body by deſtroying its proper Subſiſtence and ſubſtituting inſtead of it the Divine Subſiſtence. Or God may create a rational Soul and hinder its proper Subſiſtence from reſulting from it, that the Divine Perſonality may be ſubſtituted inſtead of it. Touching integral parts (as the Hand, the Head, the Arm) theſe grave Scholaſticks diſcourſe, that ſo long as they continue united to the whole *Compoſitum*, they cannot be aſſumed to the Divine Subſiſtence, unleſs the *Compoſitum* be aſſumed: but if they be divided from the whole, thereby they acquire a proper Subſiſtence and Exiſtence (diſtinct from that which they had, when they were united to the whole) and having a Subſiſtence of their own, they may be immediately aſſumed by God (although the whole *Compoſitum* be not aſſumed) and may ſubſiſt by the Divine Subſiſtence.

(n) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 1. *Vaſq. in Th.* 3. *Par. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 29. *Valentia T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 3. *Punct.* 3, 4. *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 11. *Diſp.* 8. *Art.* 4, 5.

(o) *Vaſq. ſupr. Diſp.* 30. *Valentia ſupr. Qu.* 4. *Punct.* 1. *Gonet. ſupr. Diſp.* 9. *Art.* 1.

(p) Gonet.

(q) *In homine omnes gradus Univerſi quodammodo continentur; intelligit enim cum Angelis, vivit cum plantis, ſentit cum Animalibus, & exiſtit cum lapidibus & aliis inanimatis: Unde aſſumpto homine quodammodo totum Univerſum aſſumitur.* Idem.

(r) *Idem ibid. Art.* 2. & 3.

III. The Scholaſtic Incarnation is (in the *ſixth* place) combin'd with (s) a multitude of vain Speculations, Queſtions and Altercations touching *the matter, manner and order of the Aſſumption*, and is complicated with a Debate touching the Blood and Humours, (t) whether the Divine *Verbum ſo aſſumed an Humane Body, as that theſe were hypoſtatically aſſumed?* It is paſt doubt with theſe Maſters, *that the Fleſh and Bones and all the organical and integral parts of the Body* were aſſumed to the Subſiſtence of the Divine *Verbum*: the only difficulty is, touching *the Blood and other Humours, the Vital and Animal Spirits, Tears, Sweat, Spittle* (and other Excrements) *touching the Teeth alſo the Hair and Nails.* Of the Blood they have different Opinions; for ſome ſay, that no Blood was aſſumed by the *Verbum*. Others ſay, that all the Blood that was in Chriſt (while he was in a Mortal Body) did ſubſiſt by the Subſiſtence of the Divine Word. And others diſtinguiſh Blood into *nutrimental* and *natural*, which latter (as they ſuppoſe) was aſſumed by the Word, but not the former. The natural Blood (as they ſay) appertaineth to the ſubſtantial Integrity of Humane Nature and an Humane Body (whence there will be Blood in the Reſurrection-bodies) this therefore by the Divine Word was aſſumed to his Subſiſtence. And not only the Blood which was in Chriſt's Body when living, but alſo that which remained ſeparated from his Body *in triduo mortis*, was hypoſtatically united to the Divine Word. For although this was once a matter of great diſpute *inter fratres Minores & Prædicatores*, yet now the Schools are ſo confident of the truth of it, that they count the contrary Opinion little better than Hereſie. They are confident alſo, that there are ſeveral parcels of Chriſt's Blood, which he left behind him here on Earth (kept as ſacred Relicks for the conſolation of the Faithful:) but they do not ſuppoſe, that theſe retain the Hypoſtatical Union, notwithſtanding that celebrated Maxim *Quod ſemel aſſumpſit nunquam dimiſit.* Yet ſome few of them are otherwiſe minded; they are alſo divided in their Opinion touching the Nails and Hair, which the moſt of them ſuppoſe, to have been hypoſtatically united to the *Verbum*. The Teeth alſo (they ſay) were perſonally united to the Divine Word, but not Tears, Sweat, Spittle and other Superfluities and Excrements of an Humane Body. But becauſe Blood appertaineth to the Verity and Integrity of Humane Nature, and was therefore aſſumed by the Divine Word: So for the ſame reaſon Phlegm, Choler and Melancholy had the ſame aſſumption. And conſequently, if the Blood ſhed by Chriſt in his Paſſion was reaſſumed by him in his Reſurrection, and carried to Heaven with him (ſave only ſome parcels of it kept as Relicks) as the School-Doctors ſuppoſe, Phlegm, Choler and Melancholy muſt have the ſame reaſſumption. Such is the Wiſdom of the Schools of Chriſtendom in their Doctrine of the Incarnation.

IV. This Scholaſtic Incarnation is combin'd alſo with a diſagreeing Account of *the Grace of Chriſt's Perſon*, which in the Scholaſtic Theology is diſtinguiſh'd into (u) *The Grace of Union or the Subſtantial, The Grace habitual or of Unction, The Grace of the Head influxive upon others.* But ſome of the School-Doctors ſay, (w) That this Grace of the Head is not to be counted a diſtinct Grace from the other two; for by theſe Chriſt is qualify'd, to be an Head of Influence unto others, according to that of the Apoſtle, *of his fulneſs have all we received.* But becauſe in his fulneſs the holy Spirit which Chriſt communicateth, is comprehended, it ſeemeth reaſonable, that *the Grace of the Head* ſhould be diſtinguiſh'd from the Grace of Union and habitual Grace. There is more reaſon, to call in queſtion this diſtinction of his Grace into *that of Union* and *the habitual*; for this ſeeming twofold Grace of Chriſt may reaſonably be thought one and the ſame Grace under ſeveral Conſiderations; *His Eſſence which is Vital Sanctity being both the Grace of Eſſential Union to his Humane Nature and alſo Eſſential-habitual Grace to it.* The Fathers look upon Chriſt's Divinity as the Unction of his Humanity, whereby he was ſanctify'd. (x) Χρίσις δὲ ἡ θεότης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, *The Divinity is the Unction of the Humanity. God anointed the Humanity with the Divinity* (ſaith Gr. Naz.) *for this is the Unction of the Humanity. Not anointing him by Energy or Operation, as others are anointed;* παρουσίᾳ δὲ ὅλου τοῦ χρίοντος, *but by the preſence of the whole of that which anointeth.* They ſuppoſe Chriſt's Humane Nature by its conjunction with the Divine Nature, (y) θεωθῆναι, θεοποιεῖσθαι, τεθεῶσθαι, *to be deify'd* (in ſome ſort) *and to be made Divine.* They know not any ſuch thing as an habitual Grace in Chriſt diſtinct from the Grace of Union. This is purely an Opinion of Modern Scholaſtic Divines, and ſeveral of theſe that are School-Doctors (z) diſcourſe very heſitantly and dubiouſly touching this diſtinct habitual Grace, and ſay, it is not certain, that it is of Faith. But it is certain, that by the Grace of Union his Humane Nature was ſanctified, as both the Fathers and the School-Doctors agree. (a) They call the Saints *Chriſts* (anointed,) but they make theſe differences between them and Chriſt. *He is not anointed by ſome participation of Sanctity,* ſed ipſamet ſanctitate per eſſentiam quæ eſt divinitas, *but by Eſſential Sanctity it ſelf which is the Divinity.* To the Saints the Divinity is Sanctity and Unction only *cauſaliter* (it cauſeth that Sanctity and Grace whereby they are formally anointed and ſancti-

(s) *An natura humana manens in propria perſona aſſumi potuerit? An natura humana in Chriſto habeat inclinationem & appetitum ad proprium ſuppoſitum? An verè & propriè dici poſſit, perſona divina aſſumpſit hominem? Utrum Filius Dei debuerit aſſumere humanam naturam abſtractam ab omnibus individuis? Utrum Filius Dei naturam humanam aſſumere debuerit in omnibus individuis? Utrum conveniens fuerit, quòd Filius Dei humanam naturam aſſumeret ex ſtirpe Adæ? Utrum Dei Filius debuerit aſſumere verum corpus? Utrum Dei Filius aſſumere debuerit corpus terrenum, ſcilicet carnem & ſanguinem? Utrum Filius Dei aſſumpſerit animam? Utrum Filius Dei aſſumere debuerit Intellectum? Utrum Filius Dei aſſumpſerit carnem mediante anima? Utrum Filius Dei aſſumpſerit animam mediante ſpiritu, ſeu mente? Utrum anima à Dei filio priùs fuerit aſſumpta quàm caro? Utrum caro Chriſti prius fuerit à verbo aſſumpta, quàm anima unita? Utrum tota natura mediis partibus ipſius aſſumpta fuerit, an contra partes media tota natura? Utrum humana natura ſit aſſumpta mediante gratia? An gratia habitualis fuerit medium aut diſpoſitio ad unionem hypoſtaticam?* Vaſqu. in Th. 3. par. T. 1. Diſp. 33, &c.

(t) *Gonet. ſupr. Art.* 7.

(u) *Gratia unionis vel ſubſtantialis, gratia habitualis vel unctionis, gratia capitis influxiva in alios.* Gonet. ſupr. T. 12. p. 3.

(w) *Valentia, T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 8. *punct.* 1.

(x) *Ibid.* c. 8. S. 1, 8. *Vaſq. in Th.* 3. *par. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 41.

(y) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 11. *c.* 7. *S.* 7. *& c.* 12. *s.* 7.

(z) *Vaſqu. ſupr. Valentia, T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 7. *punct.* 1.

(a) *Vaſqu. ibid. c.* 3. *n.* 19. *Gonet. ſupr. p.* 7.

ſanctified;) but to Chriſt's Humanity the Divinity is (*unctio & ſanctitas formalis*) *the formal Unction and Sanctity.* To his Humanity alſo Sanctity is οὐσιώδης, *eſſential or ſubſtantive*, not appertaining to it by accident and ſeparably, as it appertaineth to the Saints. For which reaſon (*b*) ſome Scholaſtic Divines would not have it counted the habitual Grace, but derive it from the Grace of Union, that ſo it may be more intimate, natural, eſſential and ſubſtantive. The School-Doctors alſo repreſent it as intimate and ſubſtantive, when they argue, that the Humanity of Chriſt is ſanctified as a red hot Iron or a live-burning Coal is made fiery (by the ſubſtance of Fire receiv'd into it and pervading it;) and ſeveral of them content themſelves to ſay, that the Divinity is (*forma ſanctificans*) *the ſanctifying form.* But others of them more nicely inquire, what is meant by this Divinity that ſanctifieth? And theſe ſay, (*c*) *that the Divinity as diſtinct from the Perſonality of the* Verbum, or the Divine Nature which by means of that Perſonality is united with the Humane Nature, *formally ſanctifieth the Humanity.* But againſt this Account the Authors of it object, that if this Divinity is formally the Vital Sanctity of the Humanity, it muſt be a Radical and Phyſical Principle of a ſupernatural Life and the vital actions thereof; it muſt be united to the Humanity (*ut forma phyſica*) *as a phyſically informing form*; whereas ſuch a phyſical information ſpeaketh an Imperfection repugnant to the Divine Nature. Which is moſt true, if by the Divine Nature we underſtand a Divine Perſon, who cannot be a phyſically informing form. Nor is it imaginable, that the Divine Nature can be the Divine Nature of the Humanity, if it is not immediately united thereto. Which ſheweth, that the Divinity which is formally Sanctity to the Humanity, is not a Divine Perſon, but only a Divine Nature, that is like *a phyſically informing form.* And becauſe in Chriſt there is but one Divine Nature (not ſuch an habitual Grace and ſuch a Grace of Union that are two diſtinct Divine Natures) upon this account chiefly the diſtinct habitual Grace ought to be rejected.

V. The Scholaſtic Incarnation is combin'd with a diſagreeing account of the perfection and dimenſions of the Grace of Chriſt's Perſon. For the Scholaſticks of later times having imagin'd an habitual Grace in Chriſt different from the Grace of Union, agreeably to this fundamental miſtake reſolve theſe following Queſtions. *Whether the fulneſs of Grace was in Chriſt? Whether it was the higheſt poſſible? Whether it was infinite? Whether it could be increas'd?* Theſe Inquiries are touching the Dimenſions of their imaginary *habitual Grace*, not of *the Grace of Union*; for this (with the Fathers) they count abſolutely immenſe and infinite: but the habitual Grace of Chriſt (*d*) this they generally account *finite and ſuch as may be augmented by God's abſolute Power, not the higheſt poſſible ſave only according to God's ordinary Power, nor the fulneſs of Grace ſave only in a certain limited Senſe.* Inconſiſtently with themſelves therefore they introduce into the Soul of Chriſt an habitual Grace; for as their habitual Grace, ſo their Grace of Union is ſuppos'd to be in the Soul of Chriſt, which is anointed and formally ſanctified by it, and is made holy by it in ſuch manner as a live burning Coal is made fiery. According to their Theology therefore it muſt be ſaid, that the Grace which is in the Soul of Chriſt, is at once finite, and not finite, the higheſt poſſible, and not the higheſt poſſible, that which may be augmented, and that which cannot be augmented, a fulneſs of Grace which is not abſolutely full, but hath ſtint and limitation, and yet knoweth no limitation. So they interpret this place of Scripture *God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him*, to be meant not only *of the Grace of Union*, but of the habitual Grace, which therefore muſt be boundleſs and immeaſurable, yet this is the Grace which they ſay, hath ſtint and meaſure. Yet they ſay of it alſo, that it tranſcendeth all the Grace of all the Saints and of all the Angels taken all together; therefore it tranſcendeth all Grace that hath Bounds and Limits, and muſt be infinite and unlimited. And becauſe it tranſcendeth all the Grace of all the Saints and Angles taken all together, therefore it is Creature-tranſcendent, and conſequently it is deifying to Chriſt and to his Soul. Yet the Scholaſticks ſay of it, (*e*) *The Grace of Chriſt is a created quality inherent in his Soul, which is a Creature too; therefore it muſt neceſſarily be finite.* So *Aquinas* argueth, (*f*) *Habitual Grace is in the Soul of Chriſt as in the Subject of it: but the Soul of Chriſt is a Creature, and of a finite Capacity; the Grace therefore, which exceedeth not the Subject of it, cannot be infinite.* Yet this grand Scholaſtic himſelf ſaith of the Humanity of Chriſt, (*g*) *omne quod pertinet ad perfectionem gratiæ collatum ei fuit.* So the Apoſtle ſaith of Chriſt in reſpect of his Manhood (as all Men underſtand it) *It pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.* In which magnifying Character the Apoſtle muſt be ſuppoſed, to mean, that all fulneſs of Grace dwelleth in the Humanity of Chriſt without limitation or reſtriction; for to ſuppoſe, that it dwelleth in Chriſt's Manhood only *in ſome ſort, in a certain Senſe,* ſecundum quid, *and improperly*, ſo to limit his ſenſe (as ſome Scholaſtic Divines do) is to do manifeſt violence to his words, that cannot be made more general and emphatical than they are. The deſign of them is manifeſtly, to attribute to Chriſt Creature-tranſcendence; for Creatures can have but ſome fulneſs and abundance, it is proper to God only, to be *All*, to ſay unto him *All my Springs are in thee*, and to have *all fulneſs.* The Apoſtle therefore attributeth to the Manhood of Chriſt ſuch a fulneſs of Grace which is *Creature-tranſcendent*, which is proper to *the only begotten Son* (whoſe fulneſs is incompetible to any Creature) ſuch a fulneſs as belongeth to him, who hath (not a Portion of the Holy Spirit, but) the Holy Spirit without Bound or Meaſure; and ſuch a fulneſs which is peculiar to him, that hath *all the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling in him*; and how is it poſſible, that his fulneſs can be leſs than abſolutely boundleſs and immeaſurable? This is the fulneſs which the holy Writers celebrate in Chriſt; they know not any ſuch limited fulneſs of habitual Grace, which the Modern Scholaſticks have introduc'd, of which they ſay, (*h*) *all that the habitual Grace of Chriſt importeth, is communicable to a meer Creature. The habitual Grace is only a certain diminute and imperfect participation of the Divine Nature and of Sanctity.* And this limited Grace they ſuppoſe, to be one and the ſame Grace with *gratia capitis*, the Grace which is in Chriſt as Head of the Church, who as ſuch *filleth all in all*; whoſe Riches are not only Plenty, but Immenſity; whoſe Fulneſs is that of a Spring and Fountain indeficient and inexhauſtible, of a publick Treaſury and Storehouſe,

(b) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 11. *c.* 12. *S.* 11.

(c) Gonet. *ſupr. T.* 12. *Diſp.* 11. *Art.* 2.

(d) *Vaſqu. ſupr. Diſp.* 45, 46, 47. *Valentia, ſupr. punct.* 2. *Gonet. ſupr. Diſp.* 13

(e) Davenant. in *Col.* 1. 19. *Jeanes of Chriſt's fulneſs, p.* 235. *ed.* 1.

(f) 3. *Qu.* 7. *Art.* 11.

(g) Gonet. *ubi ſupr. Art.* 3. *S.* 2.

(h) Gonet. *ibid. Diſp.* 14. *Art.* 1. *S.* 1. [illegible] & *Diſp.* [illegible] *Art.* 1. *S.* [illegible] houſe, of an univerſal cauſe and principle of Grace (ſuch is the King of Saints) which therefore muſt neceſſarily be in him in infinite fulneſs. No partial finite meaſures of Grace can be ſufficient for univerſal endleſs Communications. One that hath but a finite Eſtate cannot be always on the liberal ſpending Hand, as Chriſt is, who hath promis'd to all his followers plenty and exundancy of the Water of Life, *Joh.* 7. 38. The fulleſt plenitude of Life poſſible and conceivable muſt neceſſarily be in him, who is *the Reſurrection and the Life.* And this the School-Doctors acknowledge; for although they limit their *habitual Grace*, yet they ſuppoſe, that *by the Grace of Union a communication is made of the whole Divinity and the whole Divine Sanctity.* (i) *All Grace was poured upon that Temple* (the Manhood of Chriſt) *we indeed have received of his fulneſs, but that Temple received intirely the whole of Grace.* The Vital Sanctity of this Humane Soul is his Divine Vital Eſſence, which is Grace and Holineſs in infinite fulneſs.

VI. The Scholaſtic Incarnation is combin'd with abſur'd Conceits touching the origin of *Chriſt's habitual Grace, his Filiation and Predeſtination.* For touching the origin of his habitual Grace the School-Doctors affirm, (k) *That Chriſt had the plenitude of it, not ſucceſſively and by parts* (as we) *but had the whole abundance of it in the firſt inſtant of his conception (wherein his bleſſed Soul was created) ſo that he never made any growth in ſanctifying Grace: And that he had this plenitude of habitual Grace at that time by the diſpoſition of his free Will and by an act of Divine Charity, as the Holy Angels had their habitual Grace by an act of Divine Charity, which they put forth in the firſt inſtant of their Creation.* Theſe are marvellous Conceits; that the Holy Angels by Free-will prepared themſelves for habitual Grace, and before they had it, put forth an Act of Charity; that an Infant in the firſt moment of his Conception exercis'd Free-will, diſpos'd himſelf for habitual Grace and burned with Divine Charity. But ſo theſe Scholaſticks ſuppoſe, (l) that Chriſt in the firſt moment of his Conception freely and out of Charity made an Oblation of himſelf (and thereby merited) and thus they interpret the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. 5.

Touching the Filiation of Chriſt theſe Scholaſticks affirm, that (*m*) *gratia habitualis non conſtituit Chriſtum ſpiritualiter genitum*, habitual Grace doth not conſtitute Chriſt ſpiritually begotten. If it did conſtitute him ſpiritually begotten, it muſt conſtitute him the Son of God, and conſequently his Temporal Generation muſt be his Birth-nobilitation, which is deſtructive to the Scholaſtic Incarnation. Yet this habitual Grace is that Divine Nature, into which the Children of God are regenerated, whoſe Regeneration is a Divine Generation, their habitual Grace conſtituteth them ſpiritually begotten; therefore the Schools that ſuppoſe it, to be in Chriſt, ought to ſuppoſe, that it conſtituteth Chriſt ſpiritually begotten. They muſt ſuppoſe him, to be born of the Spirit; for ſuch is every one that hath habitual Grace in him; and he that is born of the Spirit, is (doubtleſs) ſpiritually begotten.

The Predeſtination of Chriſt according to the Scriptures hath nothing of difficulty in it: but Scholaſticiſm will create difficulties, if it findeth none. For receding far and wide from the ſenſe of the Scriptures it ſuppoſeth, (*n*) *that Chriſt as Man* (ſubſiſting in Humane Nature) *was predeſtinated to be the natural Son of God* (by Union) and that this is primarily and principally the Predeſtination of Chriſt. And this is the Predeſtination (that the Scriptures know nothing of, but) which S. *Auſtin* mightily inſiſteth upon, making it an Example and Specimen of *the Predeſtination of the Saints* by Grace (without Merits;) for he ſuppoſeth (as other Scholaſticks do) that Chriſt as Man was not the natural Son of God by Generation, but became ſuch by Union and by Grace, and was predeſtinated thereto by Grace. (*o*) *We are made Saints by Grace without Merits, as that Man aſſumed into perſon by the Eternal Word became the only begotten Son of God without Merits.* Of this Unition of the Man to the Eternal *Logos* and his predeſtination thereto, S. *Auſtin* interpreteth the Apoſtle's words, which belong to a matter extremely remote and diſtant, *Rom.* 1. 3, 4. (*p*) *Jeſus was predeſtinated, that he who was to be the Son of* David *according to the Fleſh, might yet be in virtue the Son of God* (*q*) *by an hypoſtatical union of the Humanity with the Word.* But againſt this unſcriptural Predeſtination of Chriſt the Scholaſticks themſelves make this Objection, which they can never clearly anſwer; If Chriſt as Man is predeſtinated to natural Sonſhip unto God, it is the Perſon of Chriſt, that is ſo predeſtinated: but the Perſon of Chriſt cannot be ſo predeſtinated, becauſe natural Sonſhip unto God is included in the Perſon of Chriſt, which neceſſarily conſiſteth of the natural Son of God and the Humanity in Hypoſtatical Union.

VII. The Scholaſtic Incarnation is combin'd with many Abſurdities and ſome remarkable Verities touching *the Science of the Soul of Chriſt.* His Science (or Knowledge) the School-Doctors diſtribute into *Create* and *Increate*; and his Create Science they diſtribute into three ſorts: *Scientia beata, infuſa, acquiſita*, His beatific, infuſed and acquired Knowledge. In which diſtributions of our Saviour's Knowledge and the Account which they give of them there are ſome remarkable Verities. For,

(1.) They rightly attribute to the Perſon of Chriſt a Creature-tranſcendency of Knowledge. To his Perſon belongeth an *increate* Knowledge, as that ſignifieth Creature-tranſcendent. For if he is a Creature-tranſcendent Lord, Prince and Potentate. He muſt be Creature-tranſcendent in reſpect of the *ſcire, velle, poſſe.* To be the Imperial Son of God, is Creature-tranſcendency (or God-eminency) of Perſon, Knowledge and Power. And this Creature-tranſcendency of Knowledge the Diſciples attribute to our Saviour, *Joh.* 16. 30. and 21. 17. our Saviour attributeth it to himſelf, ſtiling himſelf καρδιογνώστης, *he that ſearcheth the Reins and Hearts*, Apoc. 2. 23. It is one thing, to know the Secrets of the Hearts of Men by a prophetic kind of Divine Revelation, which is competible to a Creature (for God may ſo reveal them to whom he pleaſeth;) another thing to know them by Divine Intuition, which is an incommunicable

Prerogative

(i) Πᾶσα ἡ χάρις ἐξεχύθη εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἐκεῖνον· ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἐλάβομεν· ὁ δὲ ναὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁλόκληρον τὴν χάριν ἔλαβε. S. Chryſoſt. T. 1. p. 633.

(k) Gonet. ſupr. Diſp. 13. Art. 2. S. 4. 5. & Diſp. 12. Art. 1. S. 3.

(l) Ibid. Diſp. 21. Art. 1. S. 4.

(m) Ibid. Diſp. 12. Art. 1. S. 2.

(n) Ibid.

(o) *Reſpondeatur quæſo: Ille homo ut à verbo patris coæterno in unitatem perſonæ aſſumptus, Filius Dei unigenitus eſſet, unde hoc meruit? Ea gratia fit ab initio fidei ſuæ homo quicunque Chriſtianus, qua gratia homo ille ab initio ſuo factus eſt Chriſtus.* De Prædeſt. Sanct. l. 1. c. 15.

(p) *Prædeſtinatus ergo Jeſus, ut qui futurus erat ſecundum carnem filius David, eſſet tamen in virtute filius Dei.*

(q) Valentia, T. 4. Diſp. 1. Qu. 23 punct. 2.

Prerogative and Peculiarity of a Divine and Creature-tranſcendent Perſon.

(2.) They rightly attribute a Creature-tranſcendency of Knowledge to the Soul of Chriſt. Some of them ſay, (r) *The Soul of our Lord had all Wiſdom, Divine and Humane, all Knowledge of the things that were, and are, and ſhall be, not by Nature, not by Grace,* ſed propter unionem perſonalem, *but becauſe of the Perſonal or Hypoſtatical Union.* Some of them derive the Knowledge which the Soul of Chriſt hath from the Hypoſtatical Union in ſo high a manner, as the reſt account a pitch of extravagance. For *Hugo de S. Victore* ſaith, (s) *that the Soul of Chriſt is wiſe,* ipſamet ſapientia increata Dei, communicata per unionem hypoſtaticam, *by the very increate Wiſdom of God communicated by the Hypoſtatical Union.* But there is nothing of reputed Extravagance in thoſe great things, which they affirm touching the *Beatifick Science,* which they attribute to the Soul of Chriſt, of which they ſay, (t) *That Chriſt by that knowledge clearly knew all things, that God knew by the Science of Viſion (as it is called) that is, all things that actually are, were or ſhall be. The Soul of Chriſt knoweth in the Word all things that exiſt in time preſent, paſt or to come.* The Knowledge of the Soul of Chriſt being create may ſeem to be finite, yet theſe Doctors ſay, *The Soul of Chriſt in the Word knoweth infinite things, as the Cogitations of the Bleſſed and of the Damned through all Eternity.* Thus far they extend the Beatifick Science of the Soul of Chriſt: but they ſay alſo, (u) *Chriſt by an infuſed Science knew all natural Objects, all Singulars, preſent, paſt and to come.* (w) *By this Science he knew all things that belong to Humane Sciences, and all things made known to Men by Revelation; but did not know the Divine Eſſence it ſelf by this Science.* (x) Aquinas *affirmeth, that Chriſt by this infuſed Science knew all things beſides the Divine Eſſence. The Soul of Chriſt therefore by an infuſed Science knew the ſecret Cogitations of the Hearts of Men and future Contingents. The infuſed knowledge of the Secrets of Men it ought to have, he being Lord and Judge of all.* (y) *The Catholic Faith againſt Hereticks teacheth, that Chriſt knew all Futurities, and that there was in him no Ignorance at all.* (z) *It belongeth to the Perfection of the Soul of Chriſt, that he not only know all things, but alſo with every poſſible manner and kind of knowledge.* Upon which account the School-Doctors have introduc'd theſe three modes and kinds of Knowledge, *The beatifick, infuſed and acquiſite,* all which they attribute to the Soul of Chriſt, thus far extending its Knowledge, and making only this following limitation of it. (a) *They ſuppoſe, that in the Divine Eſſence all things are beheld as in a Looking-glaſs, and that every one of the Bleſſed doth in* Verbo *know all things that belong to him; and becauſe to Chriſt and his Dignity all things in ſome ſort belong, thence they infer, that the Soul of Chriſt did always in God know and ſee all things paſt and future, all things ſaid, done or thought. Yet they do not think, that the Soul of Chriſt is ſimply omniſcient, becauſe it doth not comprehend the Divine Eſſence (for that which is finite, cannot comprehend that which is infinite)* non comprehendit eſſentiam divinam, nec omnia Deo poſſibilia novit, *it doth not comprehend the Divine Eſſence, nor know all things that are poſſible to God.* But notwithſtanding theſe Limitations and Reſtrictions which they make of the Science of the Soul of Chriſt, it is manifeſt, that the School-Doctors attribute thereto much of Creature-tranſcendency of Knowledge, and that they are not of the ſame Opinion with thoſe that ſay, (b) *the knowledge of the Humane Soul of Chriſt is neceſſarily limited to the Capacity of a Creature.* Nor is there any reaſon, that we ſhould be of this Opinion: for although the Soul of Chriſt is of it ſelf finite, yet it is eſſentially united with that which is infinite; and his Soul is of the ſame nature and denomination with his Perſon, and therefore muſt be called *eſſentially Humane-divine.* To this Humane-divine Soul the miraculous or creature-tranſcendent *Wiſdom, Knowledge or Science* belongeth, as alſo the miraculous or creature-tranſcendent *Vigour, Efficacy* or *operative Power.* Nor can we criminally miſtake in attributing thereto *Allfulneſs* of both (the miraculous or creature-tranſcendent Knowledge and Power) if we take care, not to contradict the Holy Scriptures, nor to injure the Honour of God the Father. For whoſe Honour the School-Doctors expreſs a regard, when they argue, that he that made him Lord and Judge of all, and gave him all authoritative Power, giveth him all Wiſdom requiſite for the management thereof (*Iſa.* 11. 2.) and the knowledge of all things that ought to come within his cogniſance. But their laudable Argumentations touching the Science of the Soul of Chriſt are not ſo many as their Abſurdities and Extravagancies, which are ſuch as theſe following.

(1.) They affirm, that the Soul of Chriſt from the firſt inſtant of his conception had the Beatifick Viſion (ſaw the Divine Eſſence) and was a *comprehenſor* from that time.

(2.) They ſuppoſe therefore, that from that time he had the ſupreme Beatitude (as to his Soul) and conſequently they make his dreadful Paſſion to be no dreadful Paſſion; for he could not be in the higheſt joy and delectation and the deepeſt ſorrow at the ſame time. Yet ſome of them ſay, (c) *Simul in eadem Chriſti anima reperiebatur gaudium comprehenſoris & triſtitia viatoris.*

(3.) They ſuppoſe, that the Soul of Chriſt ſeeth in the Divine Eſſence or *in Verbo* as in a Glaſs (d) all things paſt, preſent and to come, all things that God knoweth, ſay ſome; all things that concern his Glory, ſay others; all things poſſible, not any thing future, ſay others; not all things poſſible, but all things future, ſay others; and ſome ſay, that he ſeeth *in Verbo* all things that God knoweth, not actually, but habitually. All which Scholaſticiſm touching his ſeeing things in the Divine Eſſence is pure Phantaſtry and Extravagance.

(4.) As they ſuppoſe Chriſt from the inſtant of his Conception, to have been abſolutely and perfectly full of *Grace,* ſo they ſuppoſe him from the ſame time, to have been abſolutely and perfectly full of *Truth;* that (e) when he was an Infant in reſpect of the natural uſe of Reaſon, he was perfectly wiſe as to his *ſcientia beata & infuſa,*

(r) *Gonet. ſupr. Diſp.* 17. *Art.* 1. *S.* 3. *Art.* 4. *S.* 1.

(s) *Vaſqu. T.* 1. *in* 3. *par. Diſp.* 50. *c.* 1.

(t) *Chriſtum per iſtam ſcientiam clarè cognoviſſe omnia, quæcunque Deus cognovit ſcientiâ, ut vocant viſionis, id eſt, quæcunque actu ſunt, fuerunt aut erunt. Anima Chriſti in verbo cognoſcit omnia exiſtentia ſecundum quodcunque tempus. Anima Chriſti in verbo infinita cognoſcit.* Valentia T. 4. Diſp. 10. Qu. 10. punct. 2. Gonet. ſupr. Diſp. 16. Art. 3. S. 1.

(u) *Chriſtus per ſcientiam infuſam omnia objecta naturalia cognovit, omnia ſingularia, præſentia, præterita & futura.* Ibid. Diſp. 17. Art. 2. S. 1.

(w) *Aquin.* 3. *par. Qu.* 11. *Art.* 1.

(x) *Aſſerit S. Doctor Chriſtum cognoviſſe per ſcientiam infuſam omnia præter Dei eſſentiam. Anima Chriſti igitur per ſcientiam infuſam occultas cordium cogitationes & futura contingentia cognovit.* Gonet. ſupr. Art. 4. S. 1.

(y) *Chriſtum cognoviſſe omnia futura, nec ullam in eo fuiſſe ignorantiam, fides Catholica contra hæreticos docet.* Vaſq. ſupr. Diſp. 51. c. 2.

(z) *Ad perfectionem animæ Chriſti pertinet, quod non ſolum omnia cognoſcat, ſed etiam omni modo & genere cognitionis poſſibili.* Gonet. ſupr. Diſp. 17. Art. 5. S. 2.

(a) *Le Blanc. Theſ. Poſthum.* 4.

(b) *Mr. Thorndike Epi. B.* 2. c. 17.

(c) *Gonet. ſupr. Diſp.* 21. *Art.* 1. *S.* 3.

(d) *Vaſqu. ſupr. Diſp.* 50. *c.* 2.

(e) *Valentia, T.* 4. *Diſp.* 1. *Qu.* 9. *punct.* 2. *Bellarm. T.* 1. *de Chriſto, l.* 4. *c.* 2.

infuſa, although he wanted his *Scientia acquiſita*. And with this Limitation they ſuppoſe, that as he made no Proficiency in ſanctifying Grace, ſo he made none in Wiſdom, nor learned any thing afterwards which he did not know before, contrary to the Evangeliſt. *Luk.* 2. 40, 52.

(5.) If a Scholar ſhould be Born with a natural Faculty of reading and underſtanding Hebrew in the Bible, and we ſhould tell him, that this is not enough, he muſt underſtand Hebrew by Inſpiration; and not only ſo, but he muſt alſo learn and underſtand it by his Induſtry; every one would count us extremely abſurd and impertinent. Yet this our abſurd impertinency is a Parallel to what the School-doctors ſay of the Soul of Chriſt; for they ſuppoſe him, to know (from the inſtant of his Conception) the ſame knowable Objects *in Verbo* by his beatific Science; and (this being not enough) *extra Verbum* alſo by an infuſed Science; and not only ſo, but (theſe modes of Science being not ſufficient) by his *Scientia acquiſita*.

(6.) They ſuppoſe Chriſt (*f*) to have been a great Naturaliſt, of an excellent natural Wit, wherein he excelled all Men (even *Adam* himſelf) and that he acquired the Natural and Humane Sciences by his own Acts (as a great Party of them ſay) and ought ſo to do, *ne intellectus agens maneret in eo otioſus*, that his agent Intellect might not be idle and unimploy'd.

(7.) They will not allow, that Chriſt did learn any thing from the Angels, or had any Conſolation from them. At the beginning of his Paſſion God began to hide his Face from him, (and therefore Comfort was withdrawn, becauſe God was withdrawn) then he began to take upon him the Perſon and Diſpoſition of a punitive Judge to his own Son, and Chriſt had the apprehenſion and ſenſe of it, the weight whereof he felt ſo heavy, as made him ready to ſink under it, and it rais'd his Griefs and Fears to ſuch a pitch, that he needed *the Conſolation of an Angel*. No, ſaith a School-doctor (*g*) *Angelus nullam Chriſto adhibuit conſolationem*, the Angel gave no Conſolation to Chriſt, the meaning of *his ſtrengthning him is*, that the Angel attributed ſtrength unto him, congratulated his Fortitude, and (although in his Agony he was almoſt overwhelmed with Griefs and Fears, yet) prais'd and extoll'd his ſtoutneſs and greatneſs of Mind. So the plaineſt words of Scripture muſt be perverted and made to ſignifie nothing, when they are againſt prejudicate Conceits. Some of old blotted this Text out of their Bible (becauſe they ſuppos'd it to befriend Arianiſm) and the School-men might as well expunge it, as interpret it by a downright contradicting it. But at a like rate other Texts are interpreted, that are inconſiſtent with their Scholaſtic Incarnation, which is neceſſarily of the ſame Nature with their Scholaſtic Theology, touching which any Man may be rationally ſatisfied, that it is not true or legitimate.

(f) *Gonet. ſupr. Diſp.* 18. *Art.* 2. *S.* 1. & 2.

(g) *Vaſq. ſupr. Diſp.* 56. *c.* 2.

CHAP. IX.

1. *Of the Chriſtian Religion as it is the new Creation. Chriſt's Attribute of* Creator *proveth his Divinity of Perſon.* 2. *According to the Scholaſtic Theology he is the Deity of the old Creation, and a common univerſal Providence.* 3. *The Deity alſo of the Old Teſtament.* 4. *A Recapitulation of Arguments againſt it.* 5. *Some are from the Light and Law of Nature which are inſiſted upon.* 6. *More from the ſilence of the Old Teſtament.* 7. *From the Benefits we have by Chriſt and the Duty we owe to him.* 8. *From the New Teſtament's Nominations and Deſcriptions of the Deity of the old Creation, and from the Heathen Idolatry.* 9. *From the Idea of the Son, the Holy Ghoſt, and of the Trinity.* 10. *From the evident Senſe of many places of the New Teſtament.* 11. *From evident Reaſons for ſuppoſing the Creation attributed to our Saviour, to be meant of the new Creation.* 12. *From the Attributes connex'd by the Apoſtle with Chriſt's Creatorſhip.* 13. *From ſeveral other Indications in the Apoſtle's Divine Panegyrick to the* Coloſſians. 14. *Objections anſwer'd.* 15. *Of the Firſt Chapter to the* Hebrews *and the Creatorſhip there mention'd.*

I. IF the Chriſtian Religion is rightly denominated *The new Creation*, there muſt be in it *a creating things and perſons, a new creating them*; and Chriſt Jeſus the Author and Founder of this new Religion muſt be *a Creator, a new Creator*. Which Name manifeſtly ſpeaketh his *Creature-tranſcendency* (which is his Divinity or Deity of Perſon) that he is Lord of the Creature, of the Creator's not the Creature's Party, and conſequently he is (natively and by officiary Dignity) a Perſon of the Godhead, no Creature-ſon. So the Fathers uſually argue (with great ſtrength of Reaſon) that he cannot be a Creature, who is the Creator, and their Argument is as applicable to the new as to the old Creation. (*h*) *For the Maker of all things is not a Creature and a thing made, but the Work is renew'd in the Maker, according to that Saying of* Paul; *we are his Workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus.* (*i*) *How can that which is created create? Or how is the Creator created?* (*k*) *If the Son be Creator as the Father, he is not a Creature; and if all things are made by him, he is not of the number of the things that are made.* (*l*) *He is not* τῶν πάντων εἷς, *one of all that is the Maker of all and is not number'd with them.* (*m*) If he is ἕν τι τῶν γεγονότων, *one of the things that were made, how is it true, that all things were made by him?* (*n*) *Whence it is manifeſt, that he was not made, by whom all things were made. And if he was not made, he is not a Creature.* (*o*) *Quis hunc induxit errorem, ut eum qui creavit omnia, qui fecit omnia, diceret creaturam?* (*p*) Creation is θεότητος δηλωτικὸν, *demonſtrative of Deity* (thereby God proveth his Deity in the Old Teſtament) *let us not confound the Creator and the Creature.* He is ſaid to be πρωτότοκος, *the firſt Begotten*, not πρωτόκτιστος, *the firſt Created*,

(h) Οὐ γὰρ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ἁπάντων κτίσμα καὶ ποίημά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ποίημα ἐν τῷ ποιητῇ ἀνανεοῦται κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου· αὐτοῦ ἐσμὲν ποίημα κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. *S. Athanaſ. de human. nat. ſuſcept. p.* 467. *Com.*

(i) Πῶς δύναται τὸ κτιζόμενον κτίζειν; ἢ πῶς ὁ κτίζων κτίζεται; *Idem ad Afric. p.* 720.

(k) Ἐι δὲ κτιστὴς ὢν ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐκέτι κτίσμα· καὶ εἰ δι' αὐτοῦ κτίζεται τὰ πάντα, οὐκ ἔστι τῶν κτιζομένων. *Idem ad Serap. T.* 2. *p.* 23.

(l) *S. Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 169.

(m) *Gr. Nyſſen. c. Eunom. l.* 1. *p.* 131.

(n) *S. Aug. de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(o) *S. Ambroſ. de Fide l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(p) *S. Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom.* 4. *in Coloſſ Hom.* 3.

therefore he was not created. So all thoſe Fathers ſuppoſe, who do not expreſly acknowledge his eternal Generation (*Athenagoras*, *J. Mart.* *Theophilus*, *Tatianus*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*;) for theſe agree, that the Son was produc'd πρὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων, *abſolutely before all Creatures*, and therefore they ſuppoſe him to be no Creature. (q) *By the Lord Chriſt all things were created; his Proper Name therefore is the Creator, not Creature; for common ſenſe will not allow, that the Creator is a Creature, becauſe Creation is by the Creator.* The Son therefore muſt be (r) ἐντὸς ὅρων τῆς δεσποζούσης οὐσίας, *within and not without the Boundaries of the dominant Eſſence*, τὸ δουλικὸν ἀναβεβηκὼς μέτρον, *tranſcending the Boundary of the Subject-ſervient Party*. Thus the Fathers argue againſt thoſe that did σπείρειν ἐλαττώματα, *diſſeminate minorations of Chriſt*, creaturizing (which is vilifying) the Son of God, and they have both clearneſs of Argument and the Sentiments of Piety on their ſide. They have alſo obſerv'd, that the imperfections and diſparaging Properties of Creatures are incompetible to the Son of God. (s) For Creatures are many and various, but the Son is not one of the many, ἀλλ᾽ εἷς ἐστιν ὡς πατὴρ, *but he is one as the Father*. He is alſo an univerſal imperial Head: But all Creatures (as the Sun and Moon, Angels and Men) have their diſtinct places to which they are confin'd. Creatures are but particular Goods and are for particular Uſes, they are not univerſal All-ſufficient Goods, as the Son of God is. They need Help and Salvation themſelves, ſo as that not any of them is capable of being the univerſal Saviour. He is not deſtroyable or annihilable as they, nor are they omnipotent and immutable as he is; for it is poſſible, that any Creature *may lye*, but ſo cannot God or the Son of God. To beſtow Sanctification and Vivification, is alſo incompetible to any of the Creatures; for it belongeth to them, to receive it, not to beſtow it. They are Sons of God by Grace, but one is the Son of God φύσει ϗ ἀληθείᾳ, *by Nature and in Truth*.

II. The Attribute *Creator* putteth out of all Queſtion our Saviour's Deity: But it is a great Queſtion, of what Creation he is the Deity? All Chriſtians agree, that a new Creation is ſpoken of in the New Teſtament (which muſt be called peculiarly the Evangelical or New Teſtament-creation) that this new Creation is in the New Teſtament attributed to our Lord Chriſt (and muſt be called the Chriſtian Creation) and that it cannot be attributed to an Abſtract Son of God. But the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, that beſides this new Creation the old Creation is attributed to the Son of God in the New Teſtament, and that this creative Son is the ſecond Perſon in the Scholaſtick Trinity an Abſtract Son of God. With this Creatorſhip this Theology complicateth *a governing univerſal Providence*, and not without Cauſe. For this World (the Region of Animals) was founded by Parental Providence, wherewith governing Providence is neceſſarily conjoin'd. If therefore the Son of God created this Region of Animals, he is neceſſarily both a parental and a governing Providence to the World, as the Scholaſtic Theology aſſerteth. (t) *We ſee, that every thing is done with the greateſt reaſon in the making of all things, even the meaneſt and moſt abject, the Bodies of little Animals (Gnats, Fleas, Cimici) their propagation, increaſe, nouriſhment, number, and whatever ſeemeth unworthy the Majeſty of God, to take notice of particularly. Whence it is manifeſt, that that Reaſon which is the Logos, that is, the Word, or eternal Reaſon, and the Son of God, doth not only take care to fabricate them with ſo great Artifice, but hath as much care to cheriſh and preſerve them.* Origen ſaith, *The Logos by which all things were made, is not a Body, becauſe he pervadeth the Univerſe of things, that all things may be done with Reaſon, not as to Man only, but thoſe that are accounted the leaſt things, and which are govern'd by Nature.* Theſe have no Reaſon, yet act as if they had Reaſon, the Cauſe whereof is, ſaith Origen (u) ὁ πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς πάντων βασιλεὺς, *the moſt ancient Son of God, who being the King of all Creatures, made irrational Nature, affording thoſe the help of Inſtincts, to whom he did not vouchſafe to give Reaſon.* To the ſame Cauſe he imputeth the Conſtitution of Civil Society and Government, of Empires and Commonwealths, of the Laws and various Arts wherewith they are furniſh'd, and the Logos is by him intituled (w) ὁ διοικῶν τὰ ὅλα λόγος, *the Logos that adminiſtreth the Univerſe of things.* *Clemens* calleth the Nature of the Son (x) *The moſt Perfect, the moſt Holy, the moſt Dominant, the moſt Imperant, the moſt Regial and moſt Beneficent, which is next to the alone Almighty, and is the greateſt Eminence*, ἣ τὰ πάντα διατάσσεται κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς, ϗ τὸ πᾶν ἄριστα οἰακίζει, ἀκαμάτῳ ϗ ἀτρύτῳ δυνάμει πάντα ἐργαζομένη, *which ordereth all things according to the Will of the Father, and governeth the Univerſe in the beſt manner, doing all things by an indefatigable and immenſe Power. This is he* (ſaith *Clemens*) *That giveth Philoſophy to the Greeks by the lower Angels, taketh care of all, and (to ſpeak compendiouſly)* πᾶσα ὠφέλεια βιωτικὴ, κατὰ μὲν τὸν ἀνωτάτω λόγον, ἀπὸ τοῦ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ, τοῦ παντὸς ἐξηγουμένου πατρὸς, δι᾽ υἱοῦ ἐπιτελεῖται, *Every utility for the Life of Man, according to the higheſt Reaſon, from the Almighty God, the Father that preſideth over all, is perfected* (or perform'd) *by the Son.* Of the Logos *Theophilus* ſaith, (y) οὗτος λέγεται ἀρχὴ, ὅτι ἄρχει, ϗ κυριεύει πάντων τῶν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ δεδημιουργημένων, *He is called* Arche, *becauſe he ruleth and is dominant over all things that are made by him.* (z) *God made uſe of his Counſel and Artifice in making the World* (*ſaith* Lactantius) *and when he began the Fabrication of it* (illum primum & maximum Filium præfecit operi univerſo) *he ſet that his firſt and greateſt Son over the Univerſe that he made.* Omni diſpoſitioni ſuæ voluntatique præfecit, *he appointed him to preſide over his whole Ordination and Diſpoſition of things*, (a) ſaith *Tertullian*. (b) *We affirm* (ſaith the Alexandrian *Cyril*) *that the living and effective and ſubſiſtent Logos of God is the Maker of all Things that be produc'd into Exiſtence*, ζῶά τε χερσαῖα, νηκτὰ ϗ ἔνυδρα, *both the Land-animals and thoſe that ſwim and the Water-animals*, δι᾽ οὗ ϗ ἐν ᾧ καθεξουσιάζει ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὅλων, *by whom and in whom God ruleth over the Univerſe of Things.* The Abſtract Logos in the Scholaſtic

---

(q) *Per Dominum Chriſtum creata omnia ſunt, & idcircò ei proprium nomen, ut creator ſit. Quid operis nomen opifici imponimus? Humanæ intelligentiæ ſenſus hæc reſpuit, ut creator creatura ſit, quia creatio per creatorem eſt.* S. Hilar. de Trin. l. 12.

(r) *S. Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 301.

(s) *S. Athanaſ. ad Serap. T.* 2. *p.* 23. *& T.* 1. *p.* 362. *ad African. p.* 722. *Or.* 2. *c. Arian. p.* 150. *& Or.* 3. *p.* 207, 240, 265. *Com.*

(t) *Videmus ſumma ratione omnia eſſe facta, etiam tenuiſſima quæque & abjectiſſima, ut ſunt culicum, cimicum, pulicumque corpuſcula, eorumque propagationes, incrementa, nutricatus numerum, & quidquid eſt, quod ſciri à Deo ac regi ſigillatim, majeſtate illius indignum videtur. Ex quo evidens eſt, rationem illam quæ eſt* ὁ λόγος, *id eſt, Verbum ſive Ratio ſempiterna, Deique ſoboles, ad illa non modo tanto artificio fabricanda: Sed etiam non minore induſtria fovenda, tuendaque deſcendere.* ——— *Verbum, per quod omnia facta ſunt, corpus non eſſe, dicit Origines, quod Verbum univerſa pervadit: Ut ratione omnia fiant, non hominetenus, ſed uſque ad ea quæ minima videntur, & à natura gubernantur.* Petav. T. 1. l. 8. c. 4. S. 13.

(u) C. Celſ. l. 4. p. 217.

(w) Ibid. l. 8. p. 399.

(x) Str. l. 7. p. 504, 505. & l. 6. p. 498.

(y) Ad Autol. l. 2. p. 88.

(z) Lactant. l. 2. c. 9.

(a) C. Marcion. l. 2. c. 27.

(b) C. Jul. l. 7. p. 241. & l. 8. p. 268.

Theology is ſuppos'd (*c*) *providere rebus omnibus & mundum adminiſtrare.*

III. Accordingly he is ſtiled by *Euſebius* (without Arianizing) οὗτος ἡ καθόλου πρόνοια, κηδεμὼν οὗτος καὶ διορθωτὴς τοῦ παντὸς, *This is the Providence whereby all things are govern'd, this is the Curator and Rectifier of the Univerſe.* Who alſo thus expatiateth in his Praiſes. (*d*) "As being "the Power of God and the Wiſdom of God "he iſſueth from the paternal Deity and Regality, an excellent Off-ſpring of an excellent "Father, the common Saviour of all, permeateth and irrigateth all things, and diffuſing "unto all of Reaſon, Wiſdom and Light and "all Goods from his own fulneſs, he not only "irrigateth thoſe things that are near, but "thoſe alſo that are far diſtant, whether they "be in Earth or Sea or any other Region in "Nature. To all which he appointeth (as is "moſt juſt) Limits and Regions and Laws and "Lots ἐξουσίᾳ βασιλικῇ by his Kingly Power diſtributing and affording to every one what "is convenient. To ſome ὑπερκοσμίους ἁψῖδας, *the "ſupramundane Arches*, to others the Habitation of Heaven, to others the Etherial Manſions, to others the Air, and to others the Earth. "And again, tranſlating them from thence into other places, making a right Judgment of "the Life of every one, and recompenſing their "Manners. Taking care of the Livelyhood "and Food, not only of Rationals, but of Irrationals, that are for the uſe of the Rationals. "Affording to ſome only a mortal temporary Life, to others an immortal, doing all "things as the Logos of God, being preſent to "all and pervading all things by his rational "Power. This is the common Cultivator of "all things, by whom the Subſtance of all "things germinateth and flouriſheth, being irrigated by the Showers that are from him "continually, and is adorn'd with a new vigour and elegant Beauty Having the Reins "in his Hand εὐθεῖα περαίνει, *he carrieth on all "things in a ſtraight courſe according to the paternal Will, ſteering the great Ship of the whole "World.* Such an excellent Artificer the only "begotten Son the God over all as an excellent Father having generated an excellent "Fruit, gave this greateſt Good unto this "World, as a Soul to an inanimate Body, infuſing his own Logos (or Reaſon) into the "irrational Nature of Bodies, illuſtrating and "animating the Subſtance that was without "Form and Species, without Soul and Figure, "by the Divine Power of the Logos whom we "ought to conſider and contemplate as a conſtant indweller in the Matter and the Elements of Bodies, giving to all things vitality "and fecundity; but himſelf is an intellectual Light and Son of the ineffable Light. Such is the common univerſal Providence which (not the Holy Scriptures but) the Scholaſtic Theology attributeth to the Abſtract Son or Logos, which is alſo ſuppos'd (as a Deity of the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs) more eſpecially to have preſided over, and taken care of the Church in the times of the Old Teſtament, to have ſpoken by the Prophets, and God is ſuppos'd, by his Miniſtery to have ſpoken to the Fathers of the Old Teſtament (*e*) and theſe Matters are ſuppos'd to belong to the rule of Faith. Many are of Opinion, that the Logos gave the Moſaic Law to the Children of *Iſrael*, that he conducted them through the Wilderneſs to their promiſed Land, deliver'd the Jews from the Babylonian Captivity, and that God by him adminiſtred the Kingdom of Old *Iſrael*, that the Logos was the God of *Iſrael*, or (as ſome will have it) that the Soul of the Meſſiah conjoin'd with the eternal Logos was the God of *Iſrael*. *Clemens* thus argueth. (*f*) *If all things were made by him, and without him nothing was made, Prophecy and the Law were made by him.*

This Creatorſhip and univerſal Providence is ſuppos'd to belong to Chriſt upon account of his Divine Nature, whence by a Communication of Properties it is commonly ſaid, that Chriſt created all things in the old Creation, as S. *Hilary* before cited ſaith, *per Dominum Chriſtum creata ſunt omnia.* (*g*) *Chriſt is the eternal Virtue of God by which he made the things that were not*, ſaith another. So ancient Writers ſay, (*h*) *that Chriſt was* πρὸ αἰώνων ὡς λόγος, *before all things as being the Logos, and that he always dealt with Men (with the Patriarchs and Prophets) in the Name of God the Father.* Agreeably to which Scholaſtic mode of ſpeaking an ancient Saxon Prefacer thus readeth the Fourth Commandment (*i*) *for in Six Days Chriſt made the Heaven and Earth.* (*k*) The Senate and People of *Rome* in a late Inſcription in the Capitol give notice, that that place was once dedicated to *Jove*, but they had made it ſacred to the true God, to Jeſus Chriſt the Author of all good Things. A certain Writer of our own relateth (*l*) *a certain Puritan ſeeing me a young Scholar wear horned Shooes, accoſted me in theſe Words: Why do'ſt thou make thy Foot longer than Jeſus Chriſt hath made it? To whom I preſently anſwer'd in theſe Words; Why doſt thou make thy Hair ſhorter than Jeſus Chriſt hath made it?* Thus in ordinary Diſcourſe Men have learn'd to ſpeak the Language of the Scholaſtic Theology, which attributeth to Chriſt all the Names, Titles and Attributes, that are ſuppos'd to belong to the Abſtract Logos or Son of God. Chriſt is (according to this Theology) *ars patris* (the fabricatory Art of God) *idea & exemplar rerum fabricandarum* (the Idea and Exemplar of the things to be made) δημιουργικὸς λόγος, (the Demiurgic Reaſon) ἰδέα καὶ ἐνέργεια, (the Idea and formative Energy of univerſal Nature) *every Man's natural Reaſon is a Participation of Chriſt, every one naturally is in Chriſt, and in Chriſt he liveth and moveth and hath his Being.*

IV. To diſprove this Scholaſtic old Creatorſhip and common univerſal Providence attributed to Chriſt, the ſame Arguments are available, which have been us'd to diſprove the mundane Creatorſhip and common univerſal Providence attributed to the Holy Ghoſt For (1.) Chriſt according to his Divine Nature is the proper Subject of the Science of Sanctity, Chriſtianity and Regeneracy: But in this Scheme of Theology Chriſt according to his Divine Nature is of ſuch Kind and Quality, that he is the proper Subject of the common Sciences of Metaphyſicks, Phyſiology, Natural Theology, Pagan Theology; for there is nothing better than Paganiſm (what is agreeable to the mundane Syſtem-Theiſts) in this Scheme of Theology. And as ſome have turn'd the Holy Ghoſt into a mundane Soul, ſo communizing and profaning the Sanctity and Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion (by communizing and profaning the Matters of its Sanctity and Divinity:) In this Scheme of Theology Chriſt according to his Divine Nature is turn'd into *a*

Coſmical

(c) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 8. *c.* 11. *S.*8.

(d) *Or de laud. Conſtant. p.* 639, 640.

(e) *Tertull. de præſcript. c.* 13.

(f) *Strom. l* 6. *p.m.* 487.

(g) *S. Ambroſ. in Rom.* 1. 20.

(h) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 11. 8. *S.* 33.

(i) *Cited by D. Teniſon of Idol. p.* 335.

(k) *Ibid. p.* 61.

(l) *Scrivener Body of Divin. p.* 540.

Coſmical Zeus (that which is no better than parental Nature and common Providence) or into a Platonic mundane Logos (mundane-Syſtem Logos) which is an enormous Philoſophic-paganizing the Matters of the Chriſtian Theology. Inſtead of the Matters of Regeneracy and Saving Grace this Theology ſubſtituteth the things of Unregeneracy, common Nature and Philoſophic-paganiſm, which do not belong to Chriſt as Chriſt, nor are they his kind of things; for at beſt they are no better than the Platoniſts exotick Philoſophy touching their Scholaſtic creative Logos, and from their School the ancient Scholaſticks of the Church deriv'd them. For the creative Logos of (*m*) *Clemens*, (*n*) *Origen* (*o*) and *Euſebius* is the very ſame with the Platoniſts demiurgic Logos, which alſo was ſuppos'd, to be an univerſal Providence: (*p*) ἄγεται δ᾽ ὑφ᾽ ἡνιόχῳ θεῷ λόγῳ τὸ πᾶν, *the Univerſe is not Self-mov'd, nor by Chance, or irrational Nature, but by the governing Logos of God*, which is called by *Philo* (*q*) ὁ συνέχων καὶ διοικῶν λόγος τὸ σύμπαν, *the Logos that containeth and adminiſtreth the whole.* And as *Platoniſm* hath thus much of *Arianiſm* eſſential to it, the Platonic Logos is *a ſecond God*: So *Clemens* repreſenteth the Logos (*r*) as *a Nature next to the Almighty and the ſame with the Platonic Logos.* (*s*) *Origen* calleth him δεύτερον θεὸν, *the ſecond God*, (*t*) and ſo doth *Euſebius*. His Elogy of the Logos is in great degree tranſcrib'd from the Platoniſts, he ſpeaketh their Language (ὑπερκοσμίους ἀψῖδας, εὐθεῖα περαίνει) and *Valeſius* obſerveth touching the ancient Divines of the Church (*u*) *Patris quidem quietem ac beatitudinem propriam eſſe aiebant, filii verò operationem*, (they ſuppoſe *quietude* and *beatitude* proper to the Father, Operation to the Son) which is an eminent ſtroke of Platoniſm. Such is alſo this Paſſage of a late Preacher ſpeaking of Chriſt (*w*) *This Angel is deſcrib'd by the wiſe Man, She is the Emanation of the Power of God, a pure influence flowing from the Power of the Almighty, from whom as from a living Fountain all Forms flow, who is the great Preſident of the Univerſe; for the Emanation of this Angel is that which the Platoniſts call the Soul of the World.* The main Eſſentialities of the Platonic Logos are ſtill retain'd by the Scholaſtic Theology of later times (which hath diſcarded ſome of the properties and attributes of the Platonic Logos; for theſe are ſtill definitive Notices of the Scholaſtic creative Logos, *It is the Region of the Exemplar Ideas of all mundane things, and the demiurgic Art of God.* (2.) This Theology uſually diſtorteth the New Teſtament from ſignifying what is *Evangely*, to ſignifie what is *School-philoſophy*. As if Chriſt is intituled *the Logos of God*, this Theology underſtandeth by that Name a School-philoſophical Logos (*x*) that is the ſubſtantial Intellection of God, wherein the λόγοι, Reaſons or Ideas of all things are comprehended. If the Goſpel ſtileth him *Chriſt the Wiſdom of God and the Power of God*, this Theology will have theſe Attributes to ſignifie (*y*) *That he is the demiurgic Art and ſubſtantive Energy of God, whereby all things are made and done.* But thus to interpret the Goſpel, is not to interpret it as the Goſpel, but μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἄλλο γένος, to make it of a quite diſſonant Nature, and to ſpeak of quite diſſonant kind of things from the Evangelical. Yet at this rate the Goſpel muſt be interpreted, if this be the Senſe of the Holy Writers of it, *that Chriſt is the Deity of the old Creation.* (3.) God the Father as being (in the old Creation) the univerſal Creator and Benefactor, the Vivificator, Preſerver and providential Governour of all things, is *as ſuch* in a large Senſe *a Father* in Nine ſeveral Reſpects, as is ſhew'd in our Idea of the Holy Ghoſt. If therefore the Son of God is (in the old Creation) the univerſal Creator and Benefactor, the Vivificator, Preſerver and providential Governour of all things, he is in no leſs than Nine ſeveral Reſpects *God the Father*, which is a grand Repugnance to the Idea of the Son, and to his Idea whoſe Propriety it is to be *God the Father as the Maker of Heaven and Earth*, the Parent of the Univerſe. (4.) According to the Popular-pagan Theology (with which the Chriſtian in this point agreeth) God as he is parental Nature or Providence, that pervadeth the World, and is the true *Zeus* or Vivificator of the World (that vegetateth and animateth it) muſt be apprehended, conſider'd and notic'd, not as the Son, but as the Father only. For the Popular Pagans did not look upon their Coſmical Zeus as a Son, but as Ζευπάτωρ, *Jupiter-Father*, the great Father of Nature, πατὴρ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς, *the Father of this Univerſe, the Father of Gods and Men.* And the Apoſtle thus far agreeth with this Theology, *Act.* 17. 25, 28. he acknowledgeth, that the true *Zeus* (Creator and Vivificator of the World) is the true God, that he is the Father of Mankind, and that in conſidering God as one inviſible that pervadeth the World, and is a mundane parental Providence, the Popular Pagans were ſo far right in their Theology. He conſidereth therefore this mundane parental Providence, that is the Creator and Vivificator of the World, not as the Son, but as the Father only.

V. If the Son of God was the Deity of the old Creation (in ſuch Senſe God that made the World) the Sun, Moon and Stars muſt be the Preachers of him to the Pagans (as ſome would have them to be) he muſt be a Deity of natural Light and Religion (as God is) *and the inviſible things of him from the Creation of the World muſt be clearly ſeen.* For God the Son in the Scholaſtic Trinity is a Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate; if therefore in the old Creation he created the Univerſe of Beings, he created them, that they might be his Subjects and Servants, or as a Scholaſtic Divine diſcourſeth (*z*) *That they might be ſubſervient to his Glory as manifeſting his Divine Power and Goodneſs infinite. From Eternity Chriſt hath and fully poſſeſſeth infinite Glory: But by creating the World he manifeſted this his Glory to us, and oblig'd all Creatures to the Duty of glorifying him. Chriſt therefore in the Creation of things intended this his Glory.* Theſe are but reaſonable and neceſſary Conſequences of Chriſt's creating all things (in the old Creation) the Creatures were intended for his Service and to glorifie him; and that intelligent Creatures may be plenarily oblig'd to ſerve and glorifie him, his Exiſtence, Power and Goodneſs muſt be manifeſted by the Creation. And ſo *Athanaſius* pretendeth (*a*) that the Son of God is known by his Works. And another ancient Writer ſaith (*b*) *æterna virtus Dei Chriſtus eſt, per quem inſtituit quæ non erant, & manent in eo, cujus ſi dudum perſona agnita non eſt, opera tamen manifeſta ſunt.* But this is not S. *Paul*'s mode of

Theo-

(z) *Ut inſervirent gloriæ ejus, quatenus manifeſtant divinam ejus potentiam & bonitatem infinitam. Habet Chriſtus & plenè poſſidet gloriam infinitam ab æterno: Sed creando mundum manifeſtavit hanc ſuam gloriam nobis, & obligavit omnes creaturas ad hoc officium ſui glorificandi.* ——— *Chriſtus igitur in creatione rerum intendebat hanc ſuam gloriam.* Davenant. in Col. 1. 16.

(m) *Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 436.

(n) *C Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 308.

(o) *Pr. Ev. l.* 11. *c.* 8.

(p) *Ibid. c.* 7.

(q) *De vit. Moſ. l.* 3.

(r) *Str. l.* 5. *p.* 436, & *l.* 7. *p.* 504.

(s) *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 258. & *l.* 6. *p.* 318.

(t) *Petav. T.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 11.

(u) *Annot. in Euſeb. p.* 282.

(w) *Dr. Gell Ser. on Deut.* 32 8, 9. *p.* 12.

(x) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 4. *c.* 4. *S.* 5. & *c.* 11. *S.* 9.

(y) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 8, 9.

(a) *De Incarn. Verb. p.* 69. *Com.*

(b) *S. Ambroſ. in Rom.* 1. 20.

Theologizing, which is ſo hugely diſſonant from it, that theſe ſtrange Imaginations of the ancient Writers touching Chriſt and his Works cannot reaſonably be thought the Theology of the New Teſtament. Which would contradict common Senſe, if it ſuppos'd, that Chriſt is a Deity knowable by natural Reaſon or by the Creatures, or that his Exiſtence, Power and Goodneſs is manifeſted by the Creation. If according to the Scholaſtic Theology he was the Deity of the old Creation, then he created univerſal Nature, yet took no care, that there ſhould be any Notice or Footſtep of him in univerſal Nature. Which is extremely diſagreeable and incompetible to the Creator, who muſt be known by his Works, who cannot but intend, to reveal and manifeſt himſelf by the Creation, that he may be ſerv'd and glorify'd, and whoſe Creation is neceſſarily the Foundation of his Religion. If the Son of God was the Creator of univerſal Nature, his Religion muſt neceſſarily be founded by that Creation; but the Religion of the Son of God was not founded by that Creation; therefore that Creation was not his Work. At and in the Creation God was unto Men the Imperial Eſtate of God, which he could not be without obliging them, to ſerve and glorifie him as God. He could not be God, if he did not claim of all capable Creatures the Rights and Dues of his Godhead. If therefore at the time of the old Creation the Son was in conſort with God (c) *God Almighty*, *Lord and King and Creator of all things*, he muſt neceſſarily at that time claim of all capable Creatures the Rights and Dues of his Godhead, and to be ſerv'd and glorify'd as God in conſort with God. Upon the account therefore of his Godhead (which is *Majeſtas Imperii*) he muſt neceſſarily make himſelf known to them by his Creation, take care, that they have in their Minds Notices of him and of their Duty to him, and plant in their Natures Inſtincts of Religion towards him, as we find, that the great Author of Nature hath done. He cannot have his Godhead otherwiſe. Otherwiſe it will be infinitely unreaſonable, to interpret theſe words of the Apoſtle touching the Son, to be meant of the old Creation; *all things were created by him and for him.* For is it imaginable, that in the old Creation he *made all things and made them for himſelf*, yet hath not taken care, that in the whole comprehenſion of that Creation there ſhould be any Notice of his Right of Sovereignty, nor ſo much as any Notice of his Exiſtence? (d) *Every Creature is of Subject-ſervient Condition to the Logos, being* (in the old Creation) *created and made by him*, ſaith *Athanaſius*. But the Logos doth not, nor ever did claim and demand Subjection and Service of the Creatures as their Creator in the old Creation; which is a certain Argument, that he is not the Deity of that Creation. Nor can we ſuppoſe him to be ſuch, without ſuppoſing him to be in Nature our Father, which is not his agreeable Appellation.

But in the Scholaſtic Theology Chriſt is ſuppos'd, to have given *all Phyſical Laws to Nature, to the univerſal Matter, and the Law of Reaſon to* Adam, and conſequently the Law of Nature as it is ſuch, is the Law of Chriſt. It muſt be ſuppos'd, to be his Law, if he is the Creator of Nature: But this Suppoſition, that the Law of Nature (as it is ſuch) is the Law of Chriſt (or of the Son of God) is ſo extremely alien from the Goſpel-Theiſm, and the whole Frame of reveal'd Religion, that the Scripture cannot be ſuppos'd to teach it; and therefore it may not be ſuppos'd to teach, that Chriſt is the Creator of univerſal Nature. If the Law of Nature (as it is ſuch) is the Law of Chriſt, he is neceſſarily the Deity of that Law: But that Law (as it is ſuch) is not the Law of Religious Duty to the Son of God; therefore he is not the Deity of it, nor is it his Law, nor is he the Creator of Nature. He is not in this Law (as he is in the new Law) the Imperial Eſtate of the Son of God to Mankind, nor are they oblig'd by it, to perform the Duties that belong to ſuch a Sovereignty. From their Deity of the Law of Nature all legitimate civil Governors have deriv'd their governing Power; and if the Son of God was this Deity, they were his Vicegerents. They deriv'd their governing Power from God, as he is the Creator and providential Governor of this World of Humane Civil Society (conſiſting of the *cives hujus mundi*;) and they muſt neceſſarily derive it from the Son of God, if he is alſo the Creator, Founder and providential Governor of this World of Humane Civil Society: But then they muſt be Chriſt's Officers and Miniſters, as they are Governors of Civil Society (Parents, Maſters, Magiſtrates) which is a Suppoſition not agreeable to Chriſtianity. It is much leſs agreeable to Chriſtianity, to ſuppoſe the Son of God, to be the Deity of the Law of Nature, as it is *the Spiritual-religious Moral Law*. For this Law (as it is a Settlement and Diſpenſation of things) is not the Law of ſaving, but of making condemned Sinners, the Law or Religion of their criminal and penal State, of their Naturaliſm and Unregeneracy, and of their Spiritual Servitude, not of their Liberation and Freedom. Which if the ancient Scholaſtic Divines had underſtood, they would not have celebrated their Abſtraſt Son or Logos (the Deity of the Law of Nature) as in his univerſal Empire and Government the Saviour of the Univerſe. For ſo *Euſebius* conſidereth his Abſtract Logos as preſiding over the Univerſe, imparting to all Light, Wiſdom and all Goods, and as being κοινὸς ἁπάντων σωτὴρ, *the common Saviour of all.* So *Clemens* conſidereth the Abſtract Son in his providential Government (*e*) and becauſe of his Beneficence therein he ſuppoſeth, that the Apoſtle ſtileth him σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, *the Saviour of all Men.* Theſe ancient Writers conceiv'd, that the Son of God muſt be a Saviour-King of the Univerſe: But therefore they ought to have ſuppos'd him the Deity of a Saving Religion, not of the Law, which is Law not Saving Grace, but the oppoſite thereto and to the Salvation of Men. Such a Law-deity inſtead of making Satisfaction, would require, that Satisfaction ſhould be made to him for the Violation of his Law. Chriſt therefore never was ſuch a Law-Deity. God the Father that was a Law-deity, is not become a Goſpel-deity without great methods of Mediation: But the Son of God without any ſuch methods is a Goſpel-deity; which plainly argueth, that he never was a Law-deity, but is natively a Goſpel-kind of Son, and meerly the Deity of Saving Grace and the Law thereof, as he is repreſented by the Evangeliſt. *Joh.* 1. 14.

VI. If the Son of God was the Creator of univerſal Nature and a governing univerſal

(c) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *S.* 3, 5.

Col. 1. 16.

(d) Δούλη τοῦ λόγου πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, δι' αὐτοῦ γενομένη καὶ ποιηθεῖσα. *S. Athanaſ. Or.* 3. *c. Arian. p. m.* 193.

(c) *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 458.

Providence, the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament could not be ſilent of it, at ſuch a rate as they are. For *Moſes*, the *Prophets*, the *Hagiographa* ſay nothing of it; but they attribute (the Old) Creation and Providence wholly and only to the God of *Iſrael*, who is not our Lord Chriſt, but his God and Father, *Act.* 3. 13, 25, 26. *Joh.* 8. 54. *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. It is to God definitively ſuch, that the Old Teſtament attributeth the Creation, not to an Eternal Trinity, nor to an Abſtract Son of God, which are as unknowable by the Light of the Old Teſtament, as they are by the Light of Nature. All Men acknowledge, that an eternal creative Trinity is but obſcurely ſignified in the Old Teſtament, and thoſe obſcure ſignifications of it (ſo reputed) when they are carefully conſider'd, are found to ſignifie juſt nothing. The Scholaſtic Divines therefore are extremely criminal, inſiſting in their Diſputes with the Jews upon ſeveral Texts of the Old Teſtament (which are not Prophecies of the Meſſiah) to prove the Article of the Trinity; whereas they ought to content themſelves, to prove this one Article, that Jeſus is the true Meſſiah, which will infer his Divinity and the truth of the Chriſtian Trinity. But to prove ſo great an Article as the Trinity only by little Phraſeologies and modes of ſpeaking in the Plural Number (and thoſe alſo diſtorted from their genuine ſenſe) what is it, but to expoſe Chriſtianity to the ſcorn of Unbelievers? If no better proofs of the Trinity than theſe little Phraſeologies can be found in the Old Teſtament, the ancient Writers had great cauſe to ſay, (*f*) that the Trinity was but obſcurely notic'd there; and ſome ſay, it ought to be ſo for this reaſon, *becauſe weak Eyes cannot bear too much Light.* As if the Eye-ſight of Men was in great danger by the refulgent Light of the Scholaſtic Trinity, *cujus recta confeſſio eſt ignoratio ſcientiæ,* (*g*) as S. *Jerom* ſaith. This could not be the reaſon, why the Trinity was but obſcurely notic'd in the ancient Scriptures: but the matter is quite otherwiſe than the ancient Writers ſuppos'd; for the Trinity is not at all notic'd in the Old Teſtament (otherwiſe than by Prophecies of the Meſſiah) no ſuch thing as a creative Trinity or an abſtract creative Son of God is to be found there. Yet there if any where in the Bible theſe Articles ought to be found: For there and there alone it is, that the Hiſtory of the old Creation is largely related, the old Creation-work is largely celebrated in devotional Hymns and Pſalms, a Sabbath-day is inſtituted to commemorate the old Creation-work, to ſignifie, that the *Iſraelites* God was the great God that formed all things, and that they were the Worſhippers and Religioniſts of the Creator of Heaven and Earth. Therein God propoſeth himſelf, to be ſerv'd and worſhipp'd as the great Creator and providential Governour of the World, and that ſacred Volume is a voluminous Inſtitution of the Duties of Piety to the great Creator and his Providence. To know him and acknowledge him as the only true God, to contemplate and admire him and his Works, to take him for our God and to make him our God, our Hope, Truſt and Dependence, to honour and obſerve him and to have a reſpectful Eye to his Providence in all our Ways and Affairs, to be duely humble towards him, thankful for his Mercies, obedient to his Laws and Inſtitutions, reſigned to his Will, ſubmitted to his Diſpoſals, devoted to his Service, to miniſter his Divine Service, and out of a dutiful regard to him, to practiſe the Duties of Juſtice and Charity towards Men, to make him our fear and our dread, and to love him infinitely above all. To theſe Duties of Piety (and ſuch more) the Old Teſtament is a voluminous Inſtitution. But why is it, that in this voluminous Inſtitution of Piety Mankind are not inſtituted to any one Duty of Piety to a creative providential Trinity? nor to an abſtract creative and providential Son of God? If he was the Creator and providential Governour in the Times of the Old Teſtament, why is it, that throughout that ſacred Volume Mankind are never called upon, to contemplate his Works, to depend upon his Providence, to honour him and do him ſervice, and to give him thanks for their Souls and Bodies and the manifold Accommodations of Life? Why is it, that neither a Trinity, nor an abſtract Son of God are ever taken notice of (in the Old Teſtament) as a Deity of Religion? Why is it, that there is no mention of either in all the deſcriptions of the Old Creation in the Old Teſtament? But on the contrary Creation and Providence is only attributed to God definitively ſo called, to the God of *Iſrael* as the true God in oppoſition to falſe Gods, *Jonah* 1. 9. *I am an Hebrew, and I fear the Lord the God of Heaven, which hath made the Sea and the dry Land.* Jer. 51. 14, 15. *The Lord of Hoſts hath made the Earth by his Power, he hath eſtabliſhed the World by his Wiſdom, and hath ſtretched out the Heaven by his Underſtanding.*

VII. The Scholaſtic Hypotheſis (that the Son of God was the Creator of Univerſal Nature and a governing Univerſal Providence) is extremely diſſonant from the New Teſtament in the whole ſtream and tenour of it, whereby it appeareth, that the only Benefits which we have from the Son of God, are the choice and ſaving Benefits (the Benefits of the Goſpel of our Salvation, of the Religion of Regeneracy and of the Kingdom of God) to be waſh'd from our Sins and made the Saints of God, to dwell in his Purity and in his Peace, to be ſaved from our deadly criminal and penal Evils, from our ghoſtly deadly Enemies, and to be made Heirs of the Heavenly Glory and Felicity. The infinitely valuable Soul-goods (whereby we are ſav'd from the contrary deadly Evils) the true Light and Wiſdom, the true Life and Health, the true Liberty and Safety, the only true Nobility and Honour, the true Treaſure and Pleaſure, the true Bread, the true Vine and the true Riches, theſe are the only Goods that we have from Chriſt (of which the ſenſitive Goods are but Shadows) theſe are his only Riches, and theſe are the Chriſtians Wealth. *This is the record, that God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son,* 1 Joh. 5. 11. (*g*) As the Heathen Gods had their ſeveral Powers and Provinces, and were donours of ſeveral Benefits, *Ceres* of Corn, *Bacchus* of Wine, *Æſculapius* of Health: So *unius pontificium Chriſti eſt dare animis ſalutem*, the Salvation of Souls is Chriſt's only Power, Province and Benefit. In Nature and Providence (the comprehenſion of Creation and Providence) this earthly life is abundantly taken care of, but the wants of Souls are not provided for. As Creator and Providential Governour of this World God hath made to the Sons of *Adam* a donation of the Earth and of the good things that are here; hath made them to live in Society (in Families, Cities and Nations) and to enjoy the vaſt Advantages and

Comforts

(f) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 1, 2.

(g) *Proœm. in l.* 18. *Com. in Eſai.*

(g) *Arnob. adv. Gent. l.* 2. *p.* 89.

Comforts of civil Peace and Society; he hath appointed Order and Government in the leſſer and greater Societies of Men, governeth them by his Vicegerents, is a Civil-religious Lawgiver and Judge of Men and Nations, rewardeth civil Virtues and puniſheth Vices and Crimes, exerciſeth abundance of goodneſs to the World (in being a Patron of the Poor, making the barren Woman to keep Houſe, giving us fruitful Seaſons) and great Clemency (for in the courſe of his Providence he is not inexorable and implacable) and ſo exuberant is his Bounty (*h*) *ut pronæa noſtra Epicurea fuiſſe videatur*, that Parental Providence may ſeem to have been an Epicurean. In Nature and Providence Mankind are furniſhed with all the common humane kind of Goods (Parts, Arts, Sciences, civil Virtue:) but no proviſion is made of the ſaving Goods and Benefits ſave only in Chriſt, nor is there any having them ſave only in ſaving Chriſtianity; and theſe only are the Goods of the Kingdom of God, of Sanctity and Chriſtianity imperial; theſe only are the Goods of Chriſt's introducing, and theſe only are his Buſineſs, for which he is appointed of God as the Founder and Donour of them. Thus Chriſt is repreſented throughout the New Teſtament: but according to the Scholaſtic Theology all our common Goods and Bleſſings of Creation and Providence are from Chriſt, the *Logos* and his governing Providence is the cauſe ἁπάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, *of all Goods*, (*i*) ſaith *Clemens*, which is a Conceit ſo extremely alien from the New Teſtament, as ſcarce any thing can be more. If the holy Writers of it had ſuppos'd, that Chriſt is the Author and Donour of all our common Goods and Bleſſings, they would have taught us, to be thankful to him for our Being and Well-being in the World, for our natural Faculties, the parts and powers of our Souls and Bodies, for our Bodily Food, Health, Strength and Beauty, and the manifold Accommodations of this Earthly Life, for the Lights of Heaven and the Fruits of the Earth, and plenty of Corn and Wine, for Wife and Children, Arts and Sciences, and for Civil Laws and Government. But doth the Religion of Chriſtians oblige them, to pay their Thankſgivings to Chriſt for theſe common Bleſſings in Nature and Providence? Are theſe reputed his Gifts and Chriſt's Benefits, and is he upon account of them celebrated amongſt intelligent Chriſtians as the great Benefactor to the World? Do Chriſtians love Chriſt and devote their Life to him for this reaſon, becauſe in Nature and Providence he hath given them Life and Breath and all things? If this was the ſenſe of the New Teſtament, that Chriſt is the great Creator of our Nature and of the World, the holy Writers of it muſt have told us, that we owe unto him as ſuch our Subjection and Service; they muſt have claim'd and demanded our Homage and Fealty upon that account; they muſt have taught us, to contemplate and admire his Creation-works in Nature, and how is it poſſible, that they could forget, to call upon all Mankind, to remember, love and obey this their Creator? But this Opinion ſignifieth nothing in Religion, it is not the Foundation of any Duty, the ground of any Piety; therefore it is not a Truth of Religion, nor the Senſe of the New Teſtament.

How marvellouſly diſſonant the ancient Writers are from the ſenſe of the New Teſtament, appeareth from this their Philoſophic-paganizing Theology touching the Son and the Holy Spirit. *Athanaſius* ſaith of our Saviour, that when he was here on Earth in an Humane Body, (*k*) *being in the whole Creation and containing all things, he vivificated the Univerſe of things.* Another ſaith, (*l*) *In him we live, and move, and have our being.* A third ſaith, (*m*) *He is Life according to his Nature vivificating all living things.* Which attribution to the Son of God (that maketh him to be the *Zeus* of the World) is as incongruous as that of a late Writer of the Life of Faith, who ſuppoſeth, that the Walls of *Jericho* fell down at the ſound of the Rams-horns, becauſe Chriſt ſtood on the top of them, ſo making us a Military kind of Chriſt. But the ſame ancient Writer further ſaith, (*n*) *That the* Logos *of God is in all things that are moved as the vivificator of them, we do affirm, and the moſt wiſe* Paul *will confirm it, who hath written this. There is one God, who is above all, and through all, and in all* (O wonderful diſtortion of Scripture!) *for otherwiſe that which is created and produc'd out of nothing could not continue in good eſtate, if it did not partake of the incorruptible and true God. He ſuppoſeth therefore, that the Son is of a demiurgic nature, fecund and vivific and of a different nature from all thoſe that have Life from him. But this vivification of every thing that needeth Life, is by the Holy Spirit, as the Son himſelf ſomewhere ſaith, it is the Spirit that quickeneth. And the fabrication of all things that are made is perfected from the Father by the Son in the Spirit.* So what (*o*) *Plotinus* ſaith of the Mundane Soul this Father attributeth to the Holy Spirit, making the Platoniſts Soul of the World the ſame with the Holy Spirit (only changing the Name, for the Thing is the ſame.) At ſuch a rate the humour of Philoſophic-paganizing the matters of the Chriſtian Theology hath prevailed in the Church.

VIII. The Faith of the Creation, the Creator and of governing Providence is on this ſide the Faith of Chriſt, which we do not proceed to, till we proceed to the Faith of Redemption, of the New Creation and the New Teſtament; for the Faith concerning Redemption and the New Teſtament is the ſame with the Faith of Chriſt. In all places of the *New Teſtament* therefore, wherein the holy Authors are not treating of the matter of *Redemption* and *the New Teſtament*, but only of the matter of *the Creation* and *the Creator*, they make no mention of Chriſt; which ſheweth, that they did not ſuppoſe him, to be the Deity of the old Creation. In all ſuch places they make ſuch nominations and deſcriptions of him as plainly diſtinguiſh him from Chriſt; for every one knoweth, who it is that our Saviour meaneth, when he ſaith of our Father which is in Heaven, *He maketh his Sun to riſe and his Rain to deſcend on the Juſt and Unjuſt. If God ſo cloath the Graſs of the Field. He which made them in the beginning, made them Male and Female. In thoſe days ſhall be Affliction, ſuch as was not from the beginning of the Creation which God created.* The meaneſt Chriſtian being taught by

---

(h) Cic. de N. D. l. 2.

(i) Str. l. 7. p. m. 506.

(k) Ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει ὢν καὶ περιέχων τὰ ὅλα ἐζωοποίει τὰ ὅλα. *De Incarn. Verb. p.* 69. *Com.*

(l) Ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν ϗ κινούμεθα ϗ ἐσμέν. *Gr. Naz. or.* 36. *p.* 591.

(m) Ζωὴ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶ, πάντα ζωογονῶν. *S. Cyr. Theſaur. p.* 108.

(n) Ὅτι γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἐστὶ τοῖς κεκινημένοις ὡς ζωοποιὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ἰσχυριζόμεθα ϗ ἡμεῖς. πιστώσεται δὲ γεγραφὼς ὁ πάνσοφος Παῦλος· εἷς Θεὸς ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων ϗ διὰ πάντων, ϗ ἐν πᾶσιν.—— οἶδεν οὖν ἄρα δημιουργικῆς ὄντα φύσεως τὸν υἱὸν, γονιμόν τε ϗ ζωοποιὸν, ϗ ἑτέρας ὄντα φύσεως παρὰ πάντα τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ ζωῆς δεκτικά. ζωοποιεῖ δὲ πᾶν τὸ ζωῆς ἐπιδεὲς ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. ὡς γὰρ αὐτός που φησὶν υἱὸς, τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, ϗ πᾶσα τῶν γεγονότων ἡ πρᾶξις τελεῖται παρὰ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ ἐν πνεύματι. S. Cyr. c. Jul. l. 8. p. 274.

(o) Ibid. p. 275.

by our Saviour, underſtandeth, at whoſe Hands in his daily Prayers he ought to ask his daily Bread; which he doth not ask at the Hands of of the *Logos* (who is ſuppos'd by *Euſebius*, to take care of the Food of all Animals) but at his Hands who is repreſented by the Pſalmiſt *as giving Food to all Fleſh* and as the great Houſekeeper of the World. Agreeably to our Saviour's Diſcourſes the whole New Teſtament ſpeaketh (in all ſuch places which treat not of the matter of Redemption and the New Creation) the ſame diſtinguiſhing Nominations and Deſcriptions pervade it; and it alſo repreſenteth the Faith of the Creation, of the Creator and of governing Providence as commenſurate with the Faith of the true God, ſo that the one extendeth not beyond the other; they are the ſame, and both are on this ſide the Faith of Chriſt. *Every Creature of God is good, which God hath created to be received.* *That which thou ſoweſt, thou ſoweſt not that Body that ſhall be: but God giveth it a Body, as it hath pleaſed him, and to every Seed his own Body.* *Let them that ſuffer according to the Will of of God, commit the keeping of their Souls to him as unto a faithful Creator.* *Through Faith we underſtand, that the Worlds were framed by the* (ῥῆμα) *Word of God*. In theſe places (and innumerable ſuch more) it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the holy Writers would have Chriſt, to be conſider'd as the Deity of the old Creation; and in many other places it is apparent, that they would not have him to be conſider'd as ſuch a Deity. For when they call him *the Chriſt of the Creator*, they would not have him to be counted the Creator, *Act*.4. 24, 25. *Lord, thou art God, which haſt made Heaven and Earth and the Sea, and all that in them is. Againſt whoſe Chriſt the Rulers were gathered together.* When the Apoſtle confronteth the two *Adams* (the Firſt and the Second) as *Natural* and *Spiritual*, as *Earthly* and *Heavenly*, without making any other difference between them, it is manifeſt, that he would not have the Second *Adam* to be conſider'd as the Creator of the Firſt *Adam*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 45,—50. So the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* confronteth *Moſes* and *Chriſt*, and thus oppoſeth them; the one was a meer Servant in the Family of old *Iſrael*, the other is the (imperial) Son, the builder of the Family of Chriſtians; without making any other difference between them, *Heb.* 3. 5, 6. And becauſe in his Diſcourſe he maketh no other difference between them, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that in this Diſcourſe he would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Creator of *Moſes*. The foregoing words therefore (wherein God and Man are oppos'd) muſt not be interpreted of Chriſt, but of God definitively ſo called, to whom *Moſes* was related as a meer Servant, but Chriſt as an imperial Son. *Every Houſe is builded by ſome Man, but he that built all things is God. And* Moſes *verily was faithful in all his Houſe as a Servant; but Chriſt as a Son over his own Houſe, whoſe Houſe are we*, Heb. 3. 4, 5, 6. As in this nomination and deſcription of the Deity of the old Creation Chriſt is diſtinguiſh'd from the Deity of the old Creation: ſo in the Book of the Apocalypſe, *He that ſitteth upon the Throne* is diſtinguiſh'd *from the Lamb*, and the old Creation is not attributed to the Lamb, but only to him that ſitteth on the Throne, *Apoc.* 4. 9, 11. To him only that is the Scriptural oppoſite to the falſe Gods this Divine Book attributeth the old Creation, *Apoc.* 14. 7. And who is it, that is the ſole Scriptural Oppoſite to the falſe Gods? *The Creator as ſuch is the Scriptural Oppoſite to the falſe Gods. Chriſt is not the Scriptural Oppoſite to the falſe Gods. Therefore Chriſt is not the Creator.* It was not to Chriſt according to his Divine Nature, an Abſtract *Logos* or Son of God, that the Heathen World of Idolaters were horribly irreligious, their Idolatry concern'd only the true God and the Religion of the true God, who as the true God diſtinct from Chriſt is the Scriptural Oppoſite to the Heathen falſe Gods and their Idolatry, which *was a worſhipping and ſerving the Creature inſtead of the Creator*, Rom. 1. 25. The true God as ſuch is the Creator, and the Creator as ſuch is the true God, and this true God the Creator (the ſcriptural oppoſite to the Idols and falſe Gods) is diſtinct from Chriſt; for he is nominated and deſcrib'd as the Deity of natural Light, *Rom.* 1. 19, 20. In which nominations and deſcriptions the New Teſtament meaneth, that Chriſt ſhould not be conſider'd as the Deity of the old Creation; for it would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Deity of natural Light, the oppoſite to the Heathen Idols and Idolatry. And ſo in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe to the *Athenians* and *Lycaonians* the Apoſtle oppoſeth to their Idols and Idolatry the Deity of the old Creation, and this Deity he nominateth and deſcribeth as the Deity of natural Light, and therefore in this nomination and deſcription alſo he would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Deity of the old Creation, *Act.* 17. 24,—28. *God that made the World and all things therein, hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men, for to dwell on all the Face of the Earth, that they ſhould ſeek the Lord* (having natural notices of him) *if haply they might feel after him and find him.* Act. 14. 15,—18. *We preach unto you, that ye ſhould turn from theſe Vanities unto the living God, which made Heaven and Earth and the Sea, and all things that are therein; who in times paſt ſuffer'd all Nations to walk in their own ways. Neverthleſs, he left not himſelf without Witneſs* (of his Exiſtence and Goodneſs) *in that he did good and gave us Rain from Heaven and fruitful ſeaſons.* As by this note the true God is diſtinguiſh'd from falſe Gods, he is the Creator of Heaven and Earth, (r) *hâc notâ Deus optimè diſtinguitur à Diis falſis:* So the God of the old Creation is hereby diſtinguiſh'd from the *Logos* or Son of God, he is a Deity of natural Light and the ſcriptural oppoſite to the Idol-Gods, which the Son of God is not. So the Apoſtle in oppoſition to the Philoſophic Pagans ſtileth the External Creation *the Wiſdom of God*, 1 Cor. 1. 21. And this their Atheouſneſs he counteth their principal crime, that by *the Wiſdom of God* (the External Creation) *they knew not God*. The Deity therefore of the old Creation is he, whoſe Wiſdom is reſplendent in the External Creation, and who is very knowable by the Phænomena of Nature. In which nomination and deſcription of the Deity of the old Creation, it is manifeſt, that the Apoſtle would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Deity of that Creation.

IX. The true Idea of the Son, the Holy Ghoſt and the Trinity plainly infer, that Chriſt is not ſuch a Creator of univerſal Nature and ſuch a governing Providence as the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth. For univerſal Nature iſſueth from God, as he is Parental Nature (or Providence;) if therefore Chriſt is the Creator of Univerſal Nature, he muſt be thought the Son of God, as God is Parental Nature, and conſequently he cannot be an holy imperial kind of Son, nor better than a Pagan and mundane kind of Son, agreeable only to the pagan and mundane kind of Theiſts. Nor can the Son and the Holy Spirit be underſtood to be in God as he is mundane parental Nature, but only as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial. And therefore it is not agreeable to the genuine notices and right underſtanding of God, to ſuppoſe his Son or his Holy Spirit, to be the Creator and providential Benefactor of this Animal world, the Goods whereof are thoſe that belong to mundane Nature and common Providence, and are of natural Diſpenſation. Nor are the Operations of common Providence and the Formation of this Earth with its Animal-inhabitants of any Affinity with the Operations of the Holy Spirit and the Buſineſs of the Holy Imperial Son. Nor is there any Reaſon imaginable, why in the old Moſaic Creation (which is of a very different Nature from the new Creation) there ſhould be a Ternary of Omniſcient and Omnipotent creative Agents; for there could be no need of doing the ſame thing three times over. But diſtinct Cauſalities in the Creation (ſuch as they are) are allotted them (s) by the Fathers that ſymbolize with the Platoniſts making the Son the *Demiurgus*, who therefore according to this Theology hath much more right to the Name of *the Maker of Heaven and Earth* than the Father. Nor is he ſuppos'd, to be alone the Father in the Creation; for it is a Maxim in the Scholaſtic Theology (t) *tota Trinitas eſt Pater noſter per creationem & gubernationem*, the whole Trinity is our Father by Creation and governing Providence. And if ſo, the Holy Ghoſt is our Father, and the whole Trinity is the Father of Chriſt as Man (as Man he is ſuppos'd, to have been made by the whole Trinity) who therefore is his own both Father and Son, and the Holy Ghoſt alſo is his Father by Creation. (u) The creative Virtue or Power according to this Theology is common to the whole Trinity, and belongeth to the Unity of Eſſence, not to the diſtinction of Perſons. But howſoever that be, and how undivided ſoever their Operations are, yet the Creation is ſuppos'd, to be the Work of a Trinity of Perſons as the Deity thereof. And it hath been commonly fancied, that in the old Creation Impreſſions of the Trinity were made upon the Creatures. But the moſt ſagacious Naturaliſts could never yet diſcover any ſuch Impreſſions. There are no Notices of a Trinity in the comprehenſion of Nature and Providence. And if we tranſcend Nature, and proceed to Law, nothing of a Trinity is to be found there. A Trinity appeareth not on this ſide Chriſtianity Imperial, to which it muſt be confin'd, becauſe the Perſon of Chriſt as *Deus-homo*, is an eſſential Ingredient thereof. And if there is no Trinity out of Chriſtianity Imperial, there can be no Trinity creative of univerſal Nature. If the Trinity was the Deity of the old Creation, all created capable Creatures by their Creation muſt neceſſarily be oblig'd to Religious Honour, Subjection and Service to this creative Trinity, and conſequently the old Creation muſt neceſſarily found the Religion of a Trinity. But the Myſtery of the Trinity is not knowable by natural Reaſon or by the Creatures (w) as the Schoolmen generally affirm: Nor was the Religion of a Trinity the Religion of the Old Teſtament-times. And if the old Creation did not found the Religion of a Trinity, it cannot be ſuppoſed, that the Trinity, or the Son of God as one of the Trinity was the Deity of that Creation. And there is this plain Demonſtration againſt it. In the old Moſaic Creation no Kingdom of God, no Holy Empire was made, it was not the Saint of God-kind of Creation. And therefore it was not *the Holy Spirit's kind of Creation*; nor was it *the Son of God's kind of Creation, nor was it God the Father's kind of Creation.* Whence it is manifeſt, that the Trinity was not the Deity of that Creation, nor was the Son of God the Deity thereof. But it will not follow, that God the Father was not the Deity thereof. For although he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial, and the Moſaic Creation was therefore not his kind of Creation, yet he might be and was the Author of it (not as iſſuing from paternal Sanctity, but) as iſſuing from *parental Nature and Providence.*

(r) Grot. Not. in loc.

X. The Creation attributed to Chriſt in the New Teſtament is in many places of it evidently meant of the Chriſtians new Creation. For Expoſitors generally agree, that the Apoſtle, *Eph.* 3. 9. ſpeaketh of the New Teſtament-creation, and it may be plainly proved from the Text it ſelf. For the old Creation is altogether remote and alien from the Subject-matter that the Apoſtle there treateth of, which is *the Goſpel and the calling of the Gentiles*, both which he calleth *The Myſtery which from the beginning of the World hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt. To the intent that now unto the Principalities and Powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold Wiſdom of God. According to the eternal Purpoſe which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.* God created all things by Jeſus Chriſt, ſo as to manifeſt and make known the Myſtery, which from the beginning of the World had been hid in God. This is the Apoſtle's ſenſe; as is plain from the Nature of this Creation (which is the Execution and Manifeſtation of the Divine Decree) and from the following Words. For God created all things by Jeſus Chriſt (ſaith the Apoſtle) to this end or intent, *that unto the Principalities and Powers might be known by the Church the manifold Wiſdom of God.* Chriſt's Creation therefore (here ſpoken of) is that which manifeſteth or maketh known the great *Goſpel-arcanum*, which was hid in God; therefore his Creation is the Chriſtians new Creation. And this will further appear by comparing the Apoſtle's Expreſſions. For *the Myſtery which from the beginning of the World was hid in God, and the eternal Purpoſe which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus*, are identical Expreſſions, and both ſignifie the Goſpel-œconomy as Recondite in the Divine Decree. By Chriſt's Creation this Recondite Goſpel-œconomy was brought into open actual Exiſtence, and his Creation of all things was to this intent, that this Recondite Goſpel-œconomy might be known and *known by the new created Church*; which is plainly expreſſive of the new Creation. Theſe things have the Evidence of common Senſe and the certitude of Mathematical Demonſtration. Chriſt's Creation hath the Name of an univerſal Creation (the Creation of all things) and this his Creation accor-

(s) Δῆλον ὅτι τῶν αὐτῶν πραγμάτων τοὺς τύπους ἐνσημαίνεται μὲν ὁ πατὴρ, ἐπιτελεῖ δὲ ὁ λόγος, οὐ δουλικῶς, οὐκ ἀμαθῶς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπιστημονικῶς τε καὶ δεσποτικῶς, καὶ οἰκειότερον εἰπεῖν πατρικῶς. *Gr. Naz. Or.* 35. *p.* 584.

(t) *Aquin. in* 1. *Cap. Ep.* 2. *ad Corinth. v.* 1.

(u) *Vaſq. in Th.* 1. *Par. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 131.

(w) *Barlow Exercit.* 4. *p.* 77, 78, 82, *&c.*

ding

by our Saviour, underſtandeth, at whoſe Hands in his daily Prayers he ought to aſk his daily Bread; which he doth not aſk at the Hands of of the *Logos* (who is ſuppos'd by *Euſebius*, to take care of the Food of all Animals) but at his Hands who is repreſented by the Pſalmiſt *as giving Food to all Fleſh* and as the great Houſekeeper of the World. Agreeably to our Saviour's Diſcourſes the whole New Teſtament ſpeaketh (in all ſuch places which treat not of the matter of Redemption and the New Creation) the ſame diſtinguiſhing Nominations and Deſcriptions pervade it; and it alſo repreſenteth the Faith of the Creation, of the Creator and of governing Providence as commenſurate with the Faith of the true God, ſo that the one extendeth not beyond the other; they are the ſame, and both are on this ſide the Faith of Chriſt. *Every Creature of God is good, which God hath created to be received. That which thou ſoweſt, thou ſoweſt not that Body that ſhall be: but God giveth it a Body, as it hath pleaſed him, and to every Seed his own Body. Let them that ſuffer according to the Will of of God, commit the keeping of their Souls to him as unto a faithful Creator. Through Faith we underſtand, that the Worlds were framed by the* (ῥῆμα) *Word of God.* In theſe places (and innumerable ſuch more) it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the holy Writers would have Chriſt, to be conſider'd as the Deity of the old Creation; and in many other places it is apparent, that they would not have him to be conſider'd as ſuch a Deity. For when they call him *the Chriſt of the Creator*, they would not have him to be counted the Creator, *Act.* 4. 24, 25. *Lord, thou art God, which haſt made Heaven and Earth and the Sea, and all that in them is. Againſt whoſe Chriſt the Rulers were gathered together.* When the Apoſtle confronteth the two *Adams* (the Firſt and the Second) as *Natural* and *Spiritual*, as *Earthly* and *Heavenly*, without making any other difference between them, it is manifeſt, that he would not have the Second *Adam* to be conſider'd as the Creator of the Firſt *Adam*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 45,—50. So the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* confronteth *Moſes* and *Chriſt*, and thus oppoſeth them; the one was a meer Servant in the Family of old *Iſrael*, the other is the (imperial) Son, the builder of the Family of Chriſtians; without making any other difference between them, *Heb.* 3. 5, 6. And becauſe in his Diſcourſe he maketh no other difference between them, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that in this Diſcourſe he would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Creator of *Moſes*. The foregoing words therefore (wherein God and Man are oppos'd) muſt not be interpreted of Chriſt, but of God definitively ſo called, to whom *Moſes* was related as a meer Servant, but Chriſt as an imperial Son. *Every Houſe is builded by ſome Man, but he that built all things is God. And* Moſes *verily was faithful in all his Houſe as a Servant; but Chriſt as a Son over his own Houſe, whoſe Houſe are we*, Heb. 3. 4, 5, 6. As in this nomination and deſcription of the Deity of the old Creation Chriſt is diſtinguiſh'd from the Deity of the old Creation: ſo in the Book of the Apocalypſe, *He that ſitteth upon the Throne* is diſtinguiſh'd *from the Lamb*, and the old Creation is not attributed to the Lamb, but only to him that ſitteth on the Throne, *Apoc.* 4. 9, 11. To him only that is the Scriptural oppoſite to the falſe Gods this Divine Book attributeth the old Creation, *Apoc.* 14. 7. And who is it, that is the ſole Scriptural Oppoſite to the falſe Gods? *The Creator as ſuch is the Scriptural Oppoſite to the falſe Gods. Chriſt is not the Scriptural Oppoſite to the falſe Gods. Therefore Chriſt is not the Creator.* It was not to Chriſt according to his Divine Nature, an Abſtract *Logos* or Son of God, that the Heathen World of Idolaters were horribly irreligious, their Idolatry concern'd only the true God and the Religion of the true God, who as the true God diſtinct from Chriſt is the Scriptural Oppoſite to the Heathen falſe Gods and their Idolatry, which *was a worſhipping and ſerving the Creature inſtead of the Creator*, Rom. 1. 25. The true God as ſuch is the Creator, and the Creator as ſuch is the true God, and this true God the Creator (the ſcriptural oppoſite to the Idols and falſe Gods) is diſtinct from Chriſt; for he is nominated and deſcrib'd as the Deity of natural Light, *Rom.* 1. 19, 20. In which nominations and deſcriptions the New Teſtament meaneth, that Chriſt ſhould not be conſider'd as the Deity of the old Creation; for it would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Deity of natural Light, the oppoſite to the Heathen Idols and Idolatry. And ſo in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe to the *Athenians* and *Lycaonians* the Apoſtle oppoſeth to their Idols and Idolatry the Deity of the old Creation, and this Deity he nominateth and deſcribeth as the Deity of natural Light, and therefore in this nomination and deſcription alſo he would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Deity of the old Creation, *Act.* 17. 24,—28. *God that made the World and all things therein, hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men, for to dwell on all the Face of the Earth, that they ſhould ſeek the Lord* (having natural notices of him) *if haply they might feel after him and find him.* Act. 14. 15,—18. *We preach unto you, that ye ſhould turn from theſe Vanities unto the living God, which made Heaven and Earth and the Sea, and all things that are therein; who in times paſt ſuffer'd all Nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheleſs, he left not himſelf without Witneſs* (of his Exiſtence and Goodneſs) *in that he did good and gave us Rain from Heaven and fruitful ſeaſons.* As by this note the true God is diſtinguiſh'd from falſe Gods, he is the Creator of Heaven and Earth, (r) *hâc notâ Deus optimè diſtinguitur à Diis falſis:* So the God of the old Creation is hereby diſtinguiſh'd from the *Logos* or Son of God, he is a Deity of natural Light and the ſcriptural oppoſite to the Idol-Gods, which the Son of God is not. So the Apoſtle in oppoſition to the Philoſophic Pagans ſtileth the External Creation *the Wiſdom of God*, 1 Cor. 1. 21. And this their Atheouſneſs he counteth their principal crime, that by *the Wiſdom of God* (the External Creation) *they knew not God.* The Deity therefore of the old Creation is he, whoſe Wiſdom is reſplendent in the External Creation, and who is very knowable by the Phænomena of Nature. In which nomination and deſcription of the Deity of the old Creation, it is manifeſt, that the Apoſtle would not have Chriſt to be conſider'd as the Deity of that Creation.

IX. The true Idea of the Son, the Holy Ghoſt and the Trinity plainly infer, that Chriſt is not ſuch a Creator of univerſal Nature and ſuch a governing Providence as the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth. For univerſal Nature iſſueth from God, as he is Parental Nature (or Providence;) if therefore Chriſt is the Creator of Univerſal Nature, he muſt be thought the Son of God, as God is Parental Nature, and conſequently he cannot be an holy imperial kind of Son, nor better than a Pagan and mundane kind of Son, agreeable only to the pagan and mundane kind of Theiſts. Nor can the Son and the Holy Spirit be underſtood to be in God as he is mundane parental Nature, but only as he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial. And therefore it is not agreeable to the genuine notices and right underſtanding of God, to ſuppoſe his Son or his Holy Spirit, to be the Creator and providential Benefactor of this Animal world, the Goods whereof are thoſe that belong to mundane Nature and common Providence, and are of natural Diſpenſation. Nor are the Operations of common Providence and the Formation of this Earth with its Animal-inhabitants of any Affinity with the Operations of the Holy Spirit and the Buſineſs of the Holy Imperial Son. Nor is there any Reaſon imaginable, why in the old Moſaic Creation (which is of a very different Nature from the new Creation) there ſhould be a Ternary of Omniſcient and Omnipotent creative Agents; for there could be no need of doing the ſame thing three times over. But diſtinct Cauſalities in the Creation (ſuch as they are) are allotted them (*s*) by the Fathers that ſymbolize with the Platoniſts making the Son the *Demiurgus*, who therefore according to this Theology hath much more right to the Name of *the Maker of Heaven and Earth* than the Father. Nor is he ſuppos'd, to be alone the Father in the Creation; for it is a Maxim in the Scholaſtic Theology (*t*) *tota Trinitas eſt Pater noſter per creationem & gubernationem*, the whole Trinity is our Father by Creation and governing Providence. And if ſo, the Holy Ghoſt is our Father, and the whole Trinity is the Father of Chriſt as Man (as Man he is ſuppos'd, to have been made by the whole Trinity) who therefore is his own both Father and Son, and the Holy Ghoſt alſo is his Father by Creation. (*u*) The creative Virtue or Power according to this Theology is common to the whole Trinity, and belongeth to the Unity of Eſſence, not to the diſtinction of Perſons. But howſoever that be, and how undivided ſoever their Operations are, yet the Creation is ſuppos'd, to be the Work of a Trinity of Perſons as the Deity thereof. And it hath been commonly fancied, that in the old Creation Impreſſions of the Trinity were made upon the Creatures. But the moſt ſagacious Naturaliſts could never yet diſcover any ſuch Impreſſions. There are no Notices of a Trinity in the comprehenſion of Nature and Providence. And if we tranſcend Nature, and proceed to Law, nothing of a Trinity is to be found there. A Trinity appeareth not on this ſide Chriſtianity Imperial, to which it muſt be confin'd, becauſe the Perſon of Chriſt as *Deus-homo*, is an eſſential Ingredient thereof. And if there is no Trinity out of Chriſtianity Imperial, there can be no Trinity creative of univerſal Nature. If the Trinity was the Deity of the old Creation, all created capable Creatures by their Creation muſt neceſſarily be oblig'd to Religious Honour, Subjection and Service to this creative Trinity, and conſequently the old Creation muſt neceſſarily found the Religion of a Trinity. But the Myſtery of the Trinity is not knowable by natural Reaſon or by the Creatures (*w*) as the Schoolmen generally affirm: Nor was the Religion of a Trinity the Religion of the Old Teſtament-times. And if the old Creation did not found the Religion of a Trinity, it cannot be ſuppoſed, that the Trinity, or the Son of God as one of the Trinity was the Deity of that Creation. And there is this plain Demonſtration againſt it. In the old Moſaic Creation no Kingdom of God, no Holy Empire was made, it was not the Saint of God-kind of Creation. And therefore it was not *the Holy Spirit's kind of Creation*, nor was it *the Son of God's kind of Creation, nor was it God the Father's kind of Creation.* Whence it is manifeſt, that the Trinity was not the Deity of that Creation, nor was the Son of God the Deity thereof. But it will not follow, that God the Father was not the Deity thereof. For although he is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial, and the Moſaic Creation was therefore not his kind of Creation, yet he might be and was the Author of it (not as iſſuing from paternal Sanctity, but) as iſſuing from *parental Nature and Providence.*

(r) Grot. Not. in loc.

X. The Creation attributed to Chriſt in the New Teſtament is in many places of it evidently meant of the Chriſtians new Creation. For Expoſitors generally agree, that the Apoſtle, *Eph.* 3. 9. ſpeaketh of the New Teſtament-creation, and it may be plainly proved from the Text it ſelf. For the old Creation is altogether remote and alien from the Subject-matter that the Apoſtle there treateth of, which is *the Goſpel and the calling of the Gentiles*, both which he calleth *The Myſtery which from the beginning of the World hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt. To the intent that now unto the Principalities and Powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold Wiſdom of God. According to the eternal Purpoſe which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.* God created all things by Jeſus Chriſt, ſo as to manifeſt and make known the Myſtery, which from the beginning of the World had been hid in God. This is the Apoſtle's ſenſe; as is plain from the Nature of this Creation (which is the Execution and Manifeſtation of the Divine Decree) and from the following Words. For God created all things by Jeſus Chriſt (ſaith the Apoſtle) to this end or intent, *that unto the Principalities and Powers might be known by the Church the manifold Wiſdom of God.* Chriſt's Creation therefore (here ſpoken of) is that which manifeſteth or maketh known the great *Goſpel-arcanum*, which was hid in God; therefore his Creation is the Chriſtians new Creation. And this will further appear by comparing the Apoſtle's Expreſſions. For *the Myſtery which from the beginning of the World was hid in God, and the eternal Purpoſe which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus*, are identical Expreſſions, and both ſignifie the Goſpel-œconomy as Recondite in the Divine Decree. By Chriſt's Creation this Recondite Goſpel-œconomy was brought into open actual Exiſtence, and his Creation of all things was to this intent, that this Recondite Goſpel-œconomy might be known and *known by the new created Church*; which is plainly expreſſive of the new Creation. Theſe things have the Evidence of common Senſe and the certitude of Mathematical Demonſtration. Chriſt's Creation hath the Name of an univerſal Creation (the Creation of all things) and this his Creation accor-

---

(s) Δῆλον ὅτι τῶν αὐτῶν πραγμάτων τοὺς τύπους ἐνσημαίνεται μὲν ὁ πατὴρ, ἐπιτελεῖ δὲ ὁ λόγος, οὐ δουλικῶς, οὐκ ἀμαθῶς, ἀλλ' ἐπιστημονικῶς τε καὶ δεσποτικῶς, καὶ οἰκειότερον εἰπεῖν πατρικῶς. *Gr. Naz. Or.* 35. *p.* 584.

(t) *Aquin. in* 1. *Cap. Ep.* 2. *ad Corinth. v.* 1.

(u) *Vaſq. in Th.* 1. *Par. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 131.

(w) *Barlow Exercit* 4. *p.* 77, 78, 82, *&c.*

ding to the Apoſtle is *The Chriſtians new Creation.*

And ſuch it is according to the *Apocalypſe*, wherein our Saviour is intituled, *Apoc.* 3. 14. *The beginning of the Creation of God*; which according to the beſt learned Expoſitors (*x*) ſignifieth the Chriſtians new Creation, and this Senſe is demonſtrable from the Text it ſelf, and from all the Terms that are in it. For it will hereafter appear, that in all the places of the New Teſtament, wherein our Saviour is call'd ἀρχὴ, (the beginning) the beginning of the new Creation is meant. Which is ſo plain, that the Fathers have learn'd from thence, to ſtile our Saviour (*y*) ἀρχὴ τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως, *the beginning of the new Creation.* The Creation of God ſignifieth διακριτικῶς, *diſtinctively*, hereby this Creation is diſtinguiſh'd from the old Moſaic Creation. For the Creation of God ſignifieth alſo κατ' οἰκείωσιν, *in a Senſe of Affinity and Alliance*, that this Creation is of God originally ſo as to be of his Kind and Quality, and of his Kind of Nobleneſs and Excellency, as being *The Divine and Saint of God-kind of Creation*, which the the Moſaic Creation was not. For *the Creation of God* ſignifieth in a Senſe of Excellency and Nobilitation, as amongſt the Pagans θεῶν τροφὴ, *Deorum Cœna* ſignifieth ſuperlative eximious Food and Entertainment, and as *the Lamb of God, the Bread of God, the Armour of God, the Peace of God, the Elect of God, the City of God*, ſignifie in Scripture. As *the Bread of God* is the divine eximious Food, ſo the Creation of God is the divine eximious Creation, far more excellent than the Moſaical, which in reſpect of the Goods and Excellencies of it was a meer Humane kind of Creation and did not tranſcend the Humane things. *That was not firſt which was Spiritul, but that which is Natural.* The beginning of the Creation of God therefore is a great Attribute and a great Nobilitation of the Perſon of our Saviour; for it denoteth him, to be of the Creator not the Creature-party; it denoteth the Precellency of his Creation above the old Moſaic Creation; and it is plainly an Attribute of his Humane-divine Perſon, which proveth this Creation of God, to be the Chriſtians new Creation. For it is not an Abſtract Logos, to which the Creation of God is here attributed, but to the crucify'd Jeſus as ſuch. *Theſe things ſaith the* Amen, *the faithful and true Witneſs, the beginning of the Creation of God.* As all God's Miſſionaries (the Prophets and Apoſtles) were Divine Witneſs-bearers, ſo a principal Branch of the Work and Office of the Meſſiah (*z*) was teſtifying and bearing Record. The Prophets were (*a*) ἀξιόπιστοι μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας, *Witneſſes of the Truth of Chriſtianity worthy to be believ'd:* But Chriſt (becauſe of the eminency of his Perſon, his ability to Teſtifie, the excellency and certainty of his Teſtimony, the unexceptionable Fidelity and Integrity, and his unparallel'd Sufferings for his Teſtimony) is the Prince of Martyrs and Divine Witneſs-bearers, the moſt authentick and creditable Witneſs that ever was or can be; and therefore he is ſtiled *The Amen, the faithful and true Witneſs.* Under this Notion he is conſider'd in this Apocalyptick Text; wherein therefore he is conſider'd as the Founder and Maker of Chriſtianity real and perſonal (the things of it and the perſons of it;) for ſuch he was as *the faithful and true Witneſs.*

In many other places of the New Teſtament the Creation attributed to Chriſt is evidently meant of the Chriſtians new Creation, and they are ſo expounded by all Chriſtians. (*b*) *The new Creature is our Regeneration.* (*c*) *The Spiritual Reformation of Men into new Men and new Creatures.* (*d*) *The Word created is uſed to ſignifie the ſecond Creation, our Regeneration by the Grace of Chriſt.* (*e*) Διττὴ ἡ κτίσις, *there is a twofold Creature, that which is made and that which is renew'd. When our Soul grown old in Sin is throughly made new by Baptiſm, created again as it were, this is* καινὴ κτίσις, *a new Creation.* (*f*) *Our Renovation is called Creation, and we a new Creature. And in this ſenſe we are ſaid in Scripture, to be created by God, the Workmanſhip of God created in Chriſt Jeſus, the new Man created according to God, the new Man renew'd according to the Image of him that created him, and a new Creature, and the Creation of God or the Work of his Creation.* The Church of Regenerate Chriſtians therefore is (*g*) *nova Creatio vel novus Mundus* (a new Creation or a new World) and the making it is called *nova creatio mundi Evangelici.* (*h*) *Regnum Chriſti eſt novus mundus*, the Kingdom of Chriſt is the new World. He that is entred into the Church of Regenerate Chriſtians (*i*) εἰς ἑτέραν ἦλθε δημιουργίαν, *is come into another Creation*, which is brought into Exiſtence, *that the manifold Wiſdom of God might be known by the Church to the heavenly Principalities and Powers.* But it is not only the actual Regeneration of Men, that is the Chriſtians new Creation; for the Religion of their Regeneration and the making thereof is alſo their new Creation. Whence they obſerve the Lord's Day anſwerably to the old Sabbath in Commemoration of our Redemption, which they account the new Creation. (*k*) *The Sabbath had reference to the old Creation; But in Chriſt we are a new Creature, a new Creation by him, and ſo to have a new Sabbath.* They look upon the new Creation as finiſh'd at our Saviour's Paſſion and Reſurrection. (*l*) *The Serpent's Head being bruiſed* (perfecta nova creatione) *the new Creation being finiſh'd, the Sabbatiſm ought to be tranſlated to that day, on which theſe things were done.* (*m*) *Quo nempe Chriſtus novæ creationis & redemptionis opus complevit*, namely, that day on which Chriſt accompliſh'd the Work of the new Creation and Redemption, which was (*n*) *nova creatio ſtatus Evangelici*, the new Creation of the Evangelical State. Thus all Chriſtians and Divines are taught by the Tenour of their Religion and the ſtile of the New Teſtament, to contradiſtinguiſh and oppoſe two Creations, two kinds of Creation; *The Old and the New, the Humane and the Divine Kind, the Natural and the Evangelical* (or the Chriſtian) *the one in Nature the other by Grace, the one is from God in Nature* (for ſo we are the Sheep of his Hand) *the other is from God in and by Chriſt.* This latter is not the former, but an oppoſite Creation (an oppoſite kind of Creation;) and ſeeing thoughout the New Teſtament no other Creation is attributed to Chriſt, but *that which is from God in and by Chriſt*, there-

---

(x) *Ribera, Grot. Ham.*

(y) *S. Athanaſ. or.* 3. *c. Arian. p.* 237. *Com.*

(z) *Joh.* 3. 11, 32, 33. *ch.* 4. 44. *ch.* 8. 13, 14. *ch.* 18. 37. 1 *Joh.* 5. 8.

(a) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 224, 225.

(b) *Nova Creatura eſt regeneratio noſtra.* S. Ambroſ. Com. in Gal. 6.

(c) *Vorſt. in Eph.* 2. 10.

(d) Τὸ δὲ ἐκτίσθη ἐπὶ τῆς δευτέρας διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναγεννήσεως. *S. Baſil. in Pſal.* 32. *p.* 206.

(e) *S. Chryſoſt. in Galat. p.* 762. & *T.* 8. *p.* 145, 148.

(f) *Renovatio noſtri dicitur creatio, & nos creatura nova. Et hoc ſenſu dicimur nos in Scripturis à Deo creati. Eph.* 2. 10. Ποίημα τοῦ Θεοῦ κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. *Et c.* 4. 24. Καινὸς ἄνθρωπος ὁ κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθείς. *Et Colloſſ.* 2. 10 Νέος ἄνθρωπος ἀνακαινούμενος κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν. *Et nova creatura.* 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. *Gal.* 6. 15. *Et* κτίσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Apoc.* 3. 14. *Vel* κτίσμα αὐτοῦ. *Jac.* 1. 18. *Epiſcop. Reſp. ad Def. Cameron. p* 18.

(g) *Lightfoot Hor. in Matth.* 28. 1. *Joh.* 21. 22.

(h) *Forer. in Iſa.* 65. 17.

(i) *S. Chryſoſt. in* 2 *Cor. Hom.* 11.

(k) *Bp. Andrews Speech ag. Trask. p.* 72, 73.

(l) *Lightfoot. ſupr.*

(m) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. l.* 1. *c.* 4. *S.* 13.

(n) *Lightfoot ſupr.*

therefore it never attributeth the Old Creation to Chriſt, nor is this the Senſe of any place in it.

XI. There are other evident Reaſons, why we ſhould ſuppoſe, that the Creation attributed to Chriſt in the New Teſtament is always meant of the new Creation. For (1.) Chriſt muſt be denominated *the Deity of the New Teſtament*, to ſignifie, that God's Peculiarities and Creature-tranſcendencies belong to Chriſt in reſpect of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs; and in many reſpects what God was as to the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs, that Chriſt is as to the New Teſtament-times and Affairs. The Truth whereof may be ſomewhat illuſtrated by a mode of ſpeaking (before obſerv'd) not unuſual with the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament, which is, to ſpeak of the Old Teſtament-affairs in the New Teſtament-language. As 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. the Prophetic Spirit of the Old Teſtament-times is called *the Spirit of Chriſt*, not becauſe Chriſt was the Donor of it in thoſe times (which is a groundleſs and incongruous Conceit) but becauſe in the times of Chriſtianity and in the apprehenſion and conſideration of Chriſtians the Prophetic Spirit is the Spirit of Chriſt as the Donour of it. So the reproach of God's People in the Old Teſtament-times is called *the reproach of Chriſt*, Heb. 11. 26. Not becauſe the old literal *Iſrael* were Chriſt's People, but becauſe the reproach of Gods People now is the reproach of Chriſt, to which the reproach of God's People in ancient times anſwereth. (*o*) *What is the reproach of Chriſt?* Τὸ ὀνειδίζεσθαι τοιαῦτα οἷα ἡμεῖς, *to be ſo reproach'd as we Chriſtians are.* (*p*) Thoſe Contumelies which the Iſraelites ſuffer'd, which were a Figure of thoſe that Chriſtians ſuffer for Chriſt, are called the reproach of Chriſt. As there is a correſpondence between the Old and New Teſtament-times and Affairs: So Chriſt in reſpect of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs is repreſented as anſwering to God in reſpect of the old Teſtament-times and Affairs. For in the Prophetic Scripture of the New Teſtament Chriſt is ſtiled *Alpha* and *Omega*, *the firſt and the laſt*, becauſe he is ſuch in reſpect of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs, as God was ſuch in reſpect of the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs. And as thoſe Attributes are an Aſcription of Deity unto God in the Old Teſtament: So they are an Aſcription of Deity unto Chriſt in the New Teſtament. *Iſa.* 44. 6. and 48. 12. *Apoc* 1. 11, 17. and 22. 13. Chriſt in the New Teſtament is repreſented as *the Redeemer and only Saviour* in reſpect of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs; and ſo God is repreſented in the Old Teſtament *as the Redeemer and only Saviour* in reſpect of the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs. *Iſa.* 44. 6. and 43. 11. In the Old Teſtament God was Righteouſneſs and Salvation to the literal *Iſrael*, and this was his Divine Peculiarity and Creature-tranſcendency; and in the New Teſtament Chriſt is Righteouſneſs and Salvation to the Spiritual *Iſrael*, and this is his Divine Peculiarity and Creature-tranſcendency. *Jer.* 23. 6. This Name *the Lord* is Chriſt's Attribute in the New Teſtament, as it is the Attribute of God in the Old Teſtament; and ſo to bring up Children in *the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord* in the ſtile of the New Teſtament, is not only to bring them up in Piety towards God, but in Chriſtian Piety. *Eph.* 6. 4. To ſearch the Heart, to try the Reins, to circumciſe the Heart, to pour out the Spirit, to kill and to make alive (*q*) are God's Divine Peculiarities in the Old Teſtament; and they are Chriſt's Divine Pecularities in the New Teſtament. In the Old Teſtament God challengeth this as one of his Creature-tranſcendencies; *every Knee ſhall bow to me and every Tongue ſhall confeſs to God.* And in the New Teſtament Chriſt (by his Apoſtle) challengeth it as one of his Creature-tranſcendencies. *Rom.* 14. 11. *Phil.* 2. 11. In the Old Teſtament one of God's Peculiarities and Creature-tranſcendencies is to be *the Hope and Truſt of Iſrael*; and in the New Teſtament it is one of Chriſt's Peculiarities and Creature-tranſcendencies, to be our *Hope* and our *Truſt*. Jer. 14. 8. and 17. 5. *Col.* 1. 27. *Eph.* 1. 12. So the Religious Worſhip, the Service of Prayer and Invocation, that belong'd to God peculiarly in the Old Teſtament, belongeth to Chriſt in the New Teſtament. *Pſal.* 50. 15. *Matth.* 4. 10. *Joh.* 5. 23. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. Chriſt therefore muſt be conſider'd as the Deity of the New Teſtament (in conjunction with God the Father) he muſt be conſider'd as the Deity of the New Teſtament in reſpect of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs, that anſwereth to the Deity of the Old Teſtament in reſpect of the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs. He muſt not therefore be conſider'd as the Deity of the Old Teſtament in reſpect of the Old Teſtament-times, Affairs, Creation. (2.) If the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament did attribute to Chriſt the old Moſaic Creation, they would contradict themſelves. For they attribute to him the new Creation (the Creation of God) as his Character, and as διακριτικῶς, *diſtinctively* his Creation, which is to ſay, that the old Moſaic Creation was not his Creation. His Honour and Glory is, that not the *Humane*, but the *Divine* kind of Creation is his Creation. (*r*) *Divinior hæc creatio quàm prior illa.* This is a Diviner Creation than that former Creation, that did but produce Man and Woman out of the Earth, provide Suſtenance for them, gave them the Goods of Humane Life, and did not tranſcend the Humane Things. (3.) When the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament wrote of Chriſt's Creatorſhip, it is not probable, that their thoughts were employ'd about the old Creation, but the new Creation. For the old Creation was vaſtly remote and diſtant, could not reaſonably much affect them, was not nearly ally'd to them and the matters which they were converſant about, nor was it the Creation of their Religion: But the new Creation was new and proximate, could not but much affect them, was nearly ally'd to them and the matters of the New Teſtament which they were converſant about, was their Creation (peculiar to Chriſtianity) and their Religion. And as if we ſuppoſe Chriſt, to have been the Deity of the old Creation, and immediately to have had a People of that Creation, it would be reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that this Creation would be much in their thoughts, and that they would celebrate it and the Author of it: So it is as reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that Chriſt's People being thoſe of the new Creation, this was the Creation, which they had in their Minds in their Celebrations of his Creatorſhip. (4.) The Creation attributed to Chriſt by the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament is certainly that Creation, which ought to be the Subject-matter of the New Teſtament, which is not the old, but the new Creation. For it cannot be ſaid of the old Creation, that it is the Creation,

(o) S. Chryſoſt. in loc.

(p) Grot. Not. in loc.

(q) *Deut.* 30. 6. *Jer.* 7. 10. *Joel* 2. 28. *Joh.* 5 21. *Act.* 2. 17. *Col.* 2. 11. *Apoc.* 2. 23.

(r) *Grot. Not. in Eph.* 3. 9.

tion, which ought to be the Subject-matter of the New Teſtament: But this muſt be ſaid of the new Creation, becauſe it is the new Creation, the Creation of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs, and the Chriſtians proper Creation. This alſo is the Creation, which is ally'd to the Son of God according to his true Idea (as he is the Holy Empire's Imperial Son) which the old Creation is not. For the forming Gnats, Fleas, *Cimici's*, ζωά τε χερσαῖα ϗ ἔνυδρα, *and Land and Water-animals* (which is attributed to the Evangelical Logos) cannot be thought a Creation that is ally'd to the Son of God according to his true Idea. There is alſo this difference between the old and new Creation; the former is a Creation as to matters *Phyſiological*, the latter is a Creation only as to matters *Theopolitical*, which are the Theologicals. And for this reaſon the new Creation (and that only) ought to be the Subject-matter of the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the Creation, not of the *Phyſiologicals*, but the *Theopoliticals* and *Theologicals*. It is of great conſideration alſo, that the Creation which the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament attribute to Chriſt, they never attribute to an Old Teſtament-Son of God, but always to a New Teſtament-Son of God (as will be plainly demonſtrated;) therefore the Creation which they attribute to him, is not the old, but the new Creation.

XII. They make Divine Panegyricks of our Saviour, inſiſt upon his Glories and Magnificences in an highly laudatory ſtrain, make large Aſcriptions of Deity (or Creature-tranſcendency) to his Perſon: But in all theſe Aſcriptions they conſider him as the Deity of the New Teſtament only; and his Creation which they inſiſt upon, they connex with ſuch Attributes, as plainly ſhew, that they mean only his New Teſtament-creatorſhip. This will appear by illuſtrating two places of Scripture. *Col.* 1. 13--19. *Who hath delivered us from the power of darkneſs, and hath tranſlated us into the kingdom of his dear Son. In whom we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveneſs of ſins. Who is the image of the inviſible God, the firſt-born of every Creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt. And he is the head of the body of the church, who is the beginning, the firſt-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleaſed the father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.* Heb. 1. 2 — 6. *God hath in theſe laſt days ſpoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the Worlds. Who being the brightneſs of his glory and the expreſs Image of his perſon, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himſelf purged our ſins, ſat down on the right hand of the majeſty on high. Being made ſo much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels ſaid he at any time, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he ſhall be to me a Son. And again, when he bringeth in the firſt-begotten into the world, he ſaith, and let all the angels of God worſhip him.* There is great Affinity (or rather Identity) between theſe two illuſtrious places of Scripture. For as the Author to the Hebrews intituleth Chriſt *The brightneſs of his Glory and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*: So the Apoſtle to the *Coloſſians* ſtileth him *The Image of the inviſible God.* As the Author to the Hebrews ſtileth him *The Firſt-begotten and the Heir of all things*: So the Apoſtle to the *Coloſſians* ſtileth him *The Firſt-born of every Creature.* The one ſaith, *He upholdeth all things by the Word of his Power*: The other ſaith, *By him all things conſiſt.* The one ſaith, *By him God made the Worlds*: The other ſaith, *By him were all things created that are in Heaven and that are in Earth.* This Creatorſhip theſe Holy Writers connex with ſuch Attributes of our Saviour, as plainly ſhew, that they mean by it only his New Teſtament-creatorſhip. For

(1.) In the Apoſtle's Divine Panegyrick *Col.* 1. 13. this is the firſt Attribute; *Who hath deliver'd us from the Power of Darkneſs, and tranſlated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son.* He attributeth to Chriſt the Kingdom-eſtate of the New and Goſpel-kingdom of God, which ſignifieth him to be *The Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial*, and that the Apoſtle conſidereth him only as the Deity of the New Teſtament. So the Divine Author to the Hebrews repreſenteth him. *Ch.* 1. 8. *Unto the Son he ſaith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Sceptre of Righteouſneſs is the Sceptre of thy Kingdom.* He conſidereth Chriſt as in his Kingdom-eſtate (on the Throne) and attributeth Deity to him, but no other than the Deity of the New Teſtament; for his Kingdom (whoſe Scepter is the Scepter of Righteouſneſs) is no other than the Kingdom of Chriſtianity; nor is his Kingdom-eſtate any other than that, to which he was rais'd *by God's anointing him with the oil of gladneſs above his fellows*, and by ſaying unto him *ſit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footſtool.* Heb. 1. 9, 13.

(2.) A ſecond Attribute is *Col.* 1. 14. *In whom we have redemption through his blood.* Which Attribute implieth the Deity of Chriſt (for that ſacred Blood which is the price of our Redemption, can be no leſs than divine Blood) but it neither expreſſeth nor implieth any other Deity of Chriſt than that of the New Teſtament.

(3.) A third Attribute is *Col.* 1. 15. *Who is the Image of the inviſible God.* The Apoſtle is not contemplating a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son of God, but Chriſt in his *preſent Kingdom-eſtate*, who being as ſuch a Divine Imperial Perſon, the Imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity Imperial and of Imperial-perſonal Deiformity, is *the Image of the inviſible God.* But a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son is not the Image of that God, who is the Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial; nor can ſuch a Metaphyſical kind of Son be the Image of any other than a Metaphyſical kind of Father; nor is ſuch an Abſtract Son of God leſs inviſible than the inviſible God. Whereas in the Apoſtle's Words (s) *tacita Antitheſis ſubintelligenda eſt*, an Antitheſis muſt be underſtood; for Chriſt is ſtiled *the Image of the inviſible God*, to ſignifie, that he is like unto God inviſible, but not a like inviſible. By this Divine Attribute therefore the Apoſtle aſcribeth no other Deity to Chriſt but only the Deity of the New Teſtament. As appeareth alſo from 2 *Cor.* 4. 4, 6. where the Light and Glory which he is as *the Image of God*, the Apoſtle conjoineth with the Light of his glorious Goſpel; and the Light of the Glory of God and of the Knowledge of the Glory of God (which ſhineth) *in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt*, is ſaid to be the Light which ſhineth

(s) *Davenant in loc.*

neth in Regenerate Chriſtians. The Apoſtle therefore conſidereth him as the Deity of the Goſpel and of our Regeneracy; and ſo Expoſitors agree, that the Apoſtle's deſign in this place (wherein Chriſt is conſider'd as the Image of God) is, to commend the Light and Splendor of the Goſpel-miniſtry, and that he alludeth to the refulgency of the Face of *Moſes*. *Beza* ſaith, (t) *He is the Image of God, that is, in him God is repreſented to us, and may be perſpicuouſly beheld and contemplated. For now* Paul *doth not call Chriſt the Image of God otherwiſe than in reſpect of his Office: So that they are not things pertinent (although true) which ſome of the Ancients have in this place diſcours'd touching Conſubſtantial.* The words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 1. 3. *Who being the brightneſs of his Glory and the expreſs character of his Perſon*, are expounded by the ſame Author (*Beza*) not as meant of an Abſtract Son, but of the Humane Divine Perſon of the Son of God. Which Expoſition is not without great reaſon; for it is certain, that the Apoſtle writeth Chriſtianity, and that his words ought to be underſtood according to Chriſtianity. *The expreſs Image of his Perſon* therefore ſignifieth, *The moſt God-like Imperial Perſon according to Chriſtianity poſſible or conceivable.* This the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt is; but this a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son cannot be ſuppos'd to be.

(4.) A fourth Attribute is *The firſt-born of every Creature*, Col. 1. 15. which honourary Title is not to be expounded according to that vulgar Rule, *ſolet in ſcripturis primogenitum vocari, quodcunque in ſuo genere excellens atque ſummum*, whatever in its kind excelleth and is the higheſt, is uſually in Scripture called the Firſt-born; as *the firſt-born of the Poor*, *of Kings*, *of Death*, ſignifieth the chief of the Poor, of Kings and of Death. At this rate of expounding the Apoſtle calleth our Saviour *one of the Creatures*, but moſt excellent and higheſt, as the *Arians* and the followers of *Socinus* expound his Senſe, making him expreſly to contradict himſelf; for in the next words he repreſenteth our Saviour as Creator not Creature. This Attribute therefore is an Attribute of Creature-tranſcendence, and conſider'd as ſuch ſome will have it to ſignifie, not the Firſt-born or the Firſt-begotten, but *the begotten or him that was brought forth before all Creatures.* (u) But this is thought an harſh Conſtruction, and therefore others ſuppoſe, that the Firſt-born by a Metonymy ſignifieth *the Heir*, and the Heir is the Lord (in the Imperial Law, *Hæres pro Domino accipitur*;) the Firſt-born of every Creature therefore ſignifieth *the Lord of every Creature.* This commonly receiv'd and good Interpretation is agreeable to that parallel place, *Heb.* 1. 2. *Whom he hath appointed Heir* (Lord) *of all things.* And it is agreeable enough to the Apoſtle's Phraſe; for by *the Firſt-born of every Creature* he may reaſonably be ſuppos'd to mean *every Creature's firſt-born in reſpect of dominant and imperial condition. Athanaſius* affirmeth, (w) that our Saviour is never called in Scripture πρωτότοκος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the primogenit of God:* but this is a great miſtake. He is called *the primogenit of God*, not ſo much with reſpect to time, but becauſe he is unto God the Heir and the Imperial Son (as the primogenit is amongſt Men) hath the dignity of the primogeniture, and is *the begotten that is firſt, before and above all Creature.* Unto God the Imperial Son is the primogenit as a Son to a Father; but he is alſo every Creature's primogenit, as being in reſpect of every Creature *The Lord the Son.* Which imperial condition accrueth to him both natively and by officiary dignity. It accrueth to him by officiary dignity; *for by him were all things created that are in Heaven and that are in Earth*, Col. 1. 16. And it accrueth to him natively, (x) *For as the firſt-begotten of the Kingdom is begotten Lord of the Kingdom, and the firſt-born of the Empire is the Lord of the Empire: ſo he is called the firſt-begotten of every Creature, as being begotten Lord of every Creature: For the right of the firſt-begotten is the Dominion of the Paternal Inheritance.* In this ſublime Attribute *the Firſt-born* (or Lord) of every Creature our Saviour is conſider'd, not as an Abſtract Son, but as the Deity of the New Teſtament; as is plain from that parallel place, *Heb.* 1. 2. *Whom he hath appointed Heir of all things.* (y) So *Athanaſius*, *Cyril. Alex. Gr. Nyſſen*, *S. Chryſoſtom*, *S. Auſtin*, *Fulgentius*, and a Council of *Toledo* ſuppoſe, and diſpute, that Chriſt is denominated *primogenit* only with reſpect to his Humane Nature. They ſuppoſe therefore, that when he is ſo denominated in Scripture, he is conſider'd as the Deity of the New Teſtament.

(5.) A fifth Attribute is, *Col.* 1. 17. *He is before all things and by him all things conſiſt.* Which words (before all things) are by ſome Expoſitors underſtood to ſignifie Chriſt's pre-exiſtence before any Creatures were made: but others underſtand them to ſignifie his precedence before all Creatures in dignity of State and Place, his univerſal Primacy and Supremacy. And that this is the true meaning of them will appear by connecting them with the antecedent and ſubſequent words. For connected with the antecedent words they run thus; *All things were created for him* (to rule over) *And he is before all things.* Connected with the ſubſequent words they run thus; *He is before all things, and he is the Head of the Body the Church.* The words are an Idea of the new conſtituted Univerſe of Beings; for ſuch an Univerſe wherein Chriſt ſtandeth at the Head, wherein he is *before all things and by him all things conſiſt*, is manifeſtly the preſent Chriſtian conſtituted Univerſe. And the words are plainly expreſſive of Chriſt's preſent ſtate of Exaltation, wherein he is before all things (of Creature-tranſcendent Imperial condition) and therefore of the Godhead; for he is of the Godhead, *that is before all things and by whom* (in conſort with God) *all things conſiſt, upholding all things by the word of his power* (his omnipotent command) *Heb.* 1. 3. This great Imperial Potentate can diſſolve and deſtroy the World by the word of his power: but thereby he conſerveth it from running to rack and ruine, it is kept in frame and conſiſtence by him. As it is his doing, that it is conſtituted, as now it is: ſo it belongeth to him, who is that great Imperial Potentate, the Lord of the Univerſe, to keep it in frame and conſiſtence (till the time of the diſſolution of all things) chiefly with reſpect to his own Kingdom and ſo far as the concerns thereof do require. So all things, places and perſons are put into the Hands of Chriſt and are ſubjected to his diſpoſal. He is not a Parental Providence (*omnia fovens & conſervans*)

not

(t) *Qui eſt imago Dei, id eſt, in quo ſeipſum perſpicuè conſpiciendum præbet Deus, ut* 1 Tim. 3. 16. *Neque enim Dei imaginem nunc vocat Paulus Chriſtum, alio quàm officii ipſius reſpectu: ut licet vera, tamen ſint ἀπροσδιόνυσα, quæ nonnulli ex veteribus hoc loco περὶ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου, diſſeruerunt.*

Iſa. 14. 13. Pſal. 89. 27. Job 18. 13.

(u) Davenant in loc.

(w) C. Arian. or. 3. p. 235. Com.

(x) *Quemadmodum enim primogenitus regni genitus eſt dominus regni, & primogenitus imperii genitus eſt dominus imperii: ita dicitur primogenitus omnis creaturæ, pro quanto eſt genitus dominus omnis creaturæ; jus enim primogeniti eſt dominium hæreditatis paternæ.* Cajetan. in Col. 1. 15.

(y) Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 4. S. 2, 3. Davenant ſupr.

nor is he the providential Governour of the World, as God is; yet he is thus far an Univerſal Providence; It is a Branch of his Imperial Potentacy over all, to uphold all things by the word of his power, ſo far he preſideth over the new conſtituted Univerſe; the Polity, Order and State of it dependeth upon him (and therefore by him all things conſiſt) *who is the Head of all Principality and Power.* He is conſider'd by the Apoſtle as ſuch, and as preſiding over the new conſtituted Univerſe; therefore he is conſider'd as the Deity of the New Teſtament.

(6.) The remaining Attributes are, *He is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the beginning, the firſt-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.* In theſe Attributes he is ſo manifeſtly conſider'd as the Deity of the New Teſtament, that all Men acknowledge it; for (z) *they refer to the repaired Creature, that is, to the Church.* As he is denominated *The imperial Head of the Church, and The beginning* (the Archical cauſe of the Chriſtians all things) he is conſider'd as the Deity of the New Teſtament. His honourary Name *The firſt-born from the dead* doth not only or chiefly ſignifie, that he was the firſt-begotten to Life Immortal; but he is ſo denominated, becauſe he only is *The Imperial Son of the Reſurrection*, and therefore hath the Primacy and Pre-eminence; (a) πάντα γὰρ τίμια ϗ βασιλικὰ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, ϗ ἐν πᾶσι αὐτὸς πρωτεύει, *for all things in him are regial* (or imperial) *and therefore honourary, and in all things he hath the pre-eminence*, which is Creature-tranſcendence. For his Pre-eminence is the Pre-eminence of the Imperial Son, whence his Attributes are Branches of Creature-tranſcendence, and they are alſo ſuch as belong to him as the Deity of the New Teſtament. Of this Nature is the laſt Attribute of *All-fulneſs*, which belongeth to him as the Mediator and the Head of the Church (as Expoſitors ſay) and by Divine Appointment. Thus all the Attributes and Creature-tranſcendences wherewith our Saviour's Creatorſhip is link'd, combin'd and encompaſs'd in this place to the *Colloſſians*, do belong to him as he is the Deity of the New Teſtament, and denote him to be the Deity of the New Teſtament. Therefore his Creatorſhip which in this place is one of his Attributes and Creature-tranſcendencies joyn'd with the reſt) doth belong to him as he is the Deity of the New Teſtament, denoteth him to be the Deity of the New Teſtament, the Apoſtle in celebrating it conſidereth him as the Deity of the New Teſtament, and conſequently it meaneth only the New Creation. So the Creatorſhip which the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* attributeth to Chriſt, appeareth to belong to him, as he is the Deity of the New Teſtament, becauſe all the Attributes and Creature-tranſcendencies wherewith it is link'd and combin'd by that Divine Author are ſuch as belong to him as he is the Deity of the New Teſtament, and they proclaim him, to be only the Deity of the New Teſtament. Such as, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee. Sit thou on my Right-hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footſtool. By inheritance he hath obtained a more excellent Name than the Angels.*

(7.) Not only of theſe Attributes (which we have recounted) but of all the other Attributes and Creature-tranſcendencies of our Saviour (the whole number of them) it muſt be ſaid, that they belong to him only as he is the Deity of the New Teſtament. Such as *The Son of God, The choſen of God, The Chriſt of God, The Logos of God, Chriſt the Wiſdom and Power of God, The Light, The Life, The Way, The Truth, The Reſurrection, our Wiſdom, Righteouſneſs, Sanctification and Redemption, The great Apoſtle and High-prieſt of our Profeſſion, The Saviour, The Captain of our Salvation, The Shepherd, The Door, The Vine, The true Manna, The Lamb of God and our Paſſover, The true* Melchizedek, *The Lion of the Tribe of* Judah, *The Root of* David, *The Morning Star, The Meſſenger of the Covenant, The Rock, The Corner-ſtone, The Fountain of living Water, The only begotten, The firſt-begotten, The Lord of all, The Lord of Glory, The Prince of Life, The King of Kings and Lord of Lords, The Name above every Name, God manifeſt in the Fleſh, God bleſſed for ever, The firſt and the laſt, The Amen.* All which Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitations (and ſuch more) do belong to our Saviour only as he is the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, the Deity of the New Teſtament; whereby a Judgment may be made touching the meaning of that Creatorſhip which the Apoſtle attributeth to him, *Col.* 1. 16. *For by him were all things created, that are in Heaven,* &c.

XIII. In this Divine Panegyrick to the *Colloſſians* there are ſeveral other Indications, that this Creatorſhip (which is part of it) is not meant of the old but of the new Creation. Which Indications have been obſerv'd by ſeveral Divines, that are Scholaſtick Trinitarians, who therefore have interpreted the word *Creature* and *Creation* in this Panegyrick, not to reſpect the old Creation. The words immediately foregoing our Saviour's Creatorſhip (*the firſt-born of every Creature*, are interpreted by (b) S. *Chryſoſtom* and many others as meant of the new Creation. A Divine of our own Nation ſaith, (c) *In the new Creation Chriſt was the Image of the inviſible God, the firſt-born of every Creature, having the pre-eminence in all things, and he is before all things and by him all things conſiſt*, Col. 1. 15, 17, 18. *In the raiſing of the whole Creation which is by a new and ſpiritual Life and Holineſs communicated unto all the parts of it, the Work is carry'd on immediately by the Perſon of Chriſt the Mediator.——— Chriſt is the Head, the Beginning or Idea of the new Creation; the firſt-born of every Creature: whatever God deſigneth to us therein, he firſt exemplify'd in Chriſt Jeſus.* Another Divine of our own interpreteth the Apoſtle's words touching the Creation of Angels, to ſignifie their Ordination or Political Creation. For of the Text, *Col.*1.15. *Who is the Image of the inviſible God, the firſt-born of every Creature*; he ſaith, (d) *which ſurely may not be incommodiouſly expounded, The Prince of the whole Hierarchy, or the Prince of the whole Ordination or Creation taken politically. For* κτίσις *ſo ſignifieth*, 1 Pet. 2. 13. Submit your ſelves to every κτίσις, Ordinance of Man, whether it be to the King as ſupreme, or unto Governours. *And there is nothing more uſual in Latin than the Phraſe of creating Magiſtrates. He is rightly called the Prince of the Political Creation, both becauſe he is the firſt-begotten in reſpect of God the Father,*

(z) *Davenant in Col.*1.17.

(a) *S. Cyr. Com. in Joann. p.* 388.

(b) *T.* 8. *p.* 145.

(c) *Owen* πνευματολ. *p.*452, 492, 493.

(d) *Quod certè non incommodè exponi poteſt, princeps totius Hierarchiæ, vel princeps totius ordinationis vel creationis politicè ſumptæ. nam* κτίσις *ſic ſignificat*, 1 Pet.2.13. ὑποτάγητε οὖν πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν. *Eſtque nihil magis tritum apud Latinos quàm phraſis creandi magiſtratus. rectè autem dicitur princeps creationis politicæ, tùm quòd ipſe ſit* πρωτότοκος, *reſpectu Dei patris, qui hoc regnum huic primùm commiſit, omne dans illi judicium ac poteſtatem in cælo atque terra; tùm quòd iſte poſteà omnes ſub ſe magiſtratus creaverit. Nam per eum creata vel ordinata ſunt omnia quæ in cælis ſunt & quæ in terra, viſibilia & inviſi-*

Father, who firſt committed this Kingdom to him, giving him all Judgment and Power in Heaven and Earth; and alſo becauſe afterwards he created all Magiſtrates under him. For by him were created or ordinated all things that are in Heaven and that are in Earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities or Powers. If this place of the Apoſtle to the *Coloſſians* is plainly meant of the old Creation, it is marvellous, that Scholaſtic Trinitarians ſhould recede from that Interpretation. Would they recede from it, did they not diſcern Improbabilities in it, and plain Indications of another Senſe? Such a plain Indication is this obvious obſervation, that the holy Writers of the New Teſtament aſcribe Creation to the Son of God in thoſe Diſcourſes, wherein they are celebrating ſuch Creature-tranſcendencies, that belong to him as he is (God-man) the Humane Divine Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. As in this place to the *Coloſſians*, ch. 1. 16. (e) *Quæ præcedunt, oſtendunt hic de Chriſto agi, quod hominis eſt nomen*, what goeth before ſheweth, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of the Perſon of Chriſt, which Name denoteth an Humane Nature. If the foregoing and ſubſequent words are meant of the new Creation, this muſt be the ſubject-matter which the Apoſtle is treating of, and conſequently Chriſt's Creatorſhip (here ſpoken of) muſt be interpreted of the new Creation. And this we may infer from the great affinity and paralleliſm that is obſerved between the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* and this to the *Coloſſians* (*Grotius* obſerveth, that the Apoſtle wrote his Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, *cùm adhuc quæ ad Epheſios ſcripſerat, in animo hærerent*;) for as the Apoſtle to the *Epheſians*, ch. 1. 20,—23. deſcribing our Saviour's exaltation to his Godhead of Eſtate inſiſteth upon theſe two Branches of it; his univerſal imperial Potentacy (all things being put under his Feet) and his imperial Headſhip over the Church which is his Body, the fulneſs of him that filleth all in all: So in this Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians* deſcribing our Saviour's Divinity and Godhead of Eſtate, he inſiſteth upon theſe two Branches of his Sublimity; the one is, *that all things were created by him, and he is before all things*, which ſpeaketh his univerſal imperial Potentacy; the other is his imperial Headſhip over the Church and his having all-fulneſs. As theſe two Epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians* are of great reſemblance and affinity: So there is ſuch reſemblance and affinity between theſe two places of theſe two Epiſtles (in the Subject-matter, their Notions and Expreſſions) that they ought to be look'd upon as parallel places, and the one ought to be interpreted by the other. To the *Epheſians* the Apoſtle repreſenteth the Univerſe of (Rational) Beings as ſubjected to the Meſſiah; *every Name that is named, not only in this World, but alſo in that which is to come.* To the *Coloſſians* the Apoſtle repreſenteth the Univerſe of (Rational) Beings as created by the Meſſiah; *all things that are in Heaven and that are in Earth, viſible and inviſible.* To the *Epheſians* the Apoſtle repreſenteth *all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion* as ſubjected to the Meſſiah: To the *Coloſſians* he repreſenteth *Thrones and Dominions, Principalities and Powers* as created by the Meſſiah. Writing to the *Epheſians* he conſidereth Chriſt as *The Imperial Son* of the holy popular kind (the King Meſſiah, the Deity of the New Teſtament) when he repreſenteth all things as ſubjected to him: writing to the *Coloſſians* he conſidereth Chriſt as *The Imperial Son*, when he repreſenteth all things as created by him. For when he ſaith, *that Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers* were created by Chriſt, he hath plainly reſpect to Empire and Dominion (his words ſound Empire and Dominion;) therefore he conſidereth him as *The Imperial Son, the Deity of the New Teſtament.* The ſame Inference may be drawn from the contexture of theſe words to the *Hebrews*, ch. 1. 2. *Whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the Worlds.* For in theſe words the Divine Author conjoyneth our Saviour's Creatorſhip (his making the Worlds) with this other Creature-tranſcendence, *The appointed Heir of all things*, which is the ſame with The Imperial Son. Therefore in attributing to him *the making the Worlds* he conſidereth him as the Meſſiah, the Deity of the New Teſtament. Moreover, God's *making the Worlds by his Son* is a thing connex'd with the appointing him Heir of all things (Lord of all things:) but the old Creation hath no connexion at all with the appointing him Heir of all things; therefore the making the Worlds here ſpoken of muſt not be underſtood of the old Creation by the Abſtract Son or *Logos*; of whom it would be abſurd to ſay, that in the old Creation he was the Almighty Creator of all the Angelical Powers, and God hath exalted him above them; who is neither Son, nor Imperial Son of the holy popular kind, nor ever was, nor ever will be an Imperial Eſtate of Sanctity Imperial; and therefore all things were not created for him, as Religion requireth, and as they are for Chriſt, *Col.* 1. 16. To Chriſt the Apoſtle attributeth a Creation which is connex'd with *the beginning* that he ſpeaketh of: but it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that he attributeth to Chriſt a Creation that was done and paſt ſeveral thouſand Years *before this beginning.* Nor is our Saviour ever ſaid in Scripture, *to have created Heaven and Earth and the Sea*, which are the Phraſes, that the Scripture always uſeth, to expreſs the old Creation, to the *Coloſſians* the Apoſtle ſaith only, *that all things that are in Heaven and that are in Earth*, were created by him. This the followers of *Socinus* obſerve and urge, and it is a material Obſervation, how much ſoever ſome contemn it.

XIV. But although this illuſtrious Text to the *Coloſſians* muſt be interpreted of the new Creation, yet not in the uſual Notion of it. For ſuch an Interpretation would be liable to theſe Objections. (1.) *All viſible things, the things that are in Earth*, cannot be ſaid, to be new created; for the greateſt part of Mankind (the Unregenerate) are not new made. (2.) *All the inviſible things, the things that are in Heaven* (the ſeveral Orders of Angels) were never new created to Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs, nor have they any need of it. (3.) In the new Creation by Chriſt all things are not made for him; for he is a Mediator for God, to reduce Mankind to their Obedience and Subjection to him, and when he hath accompliſh'd his work of Mediation and deſtroy'd all Enemies, he ſhall deliver up his Kingdom to his Father. But this Objection proceedeth upon a miſtake, that Chriſt is a meer officiary Mediator, whereas he is the Mediatory Sovereign, and ſuch a Mediator that is the Imperial Lord the Son and an Imperial Eſtate of Religion. All things therefore were created *for him* as the final cauſe (although

bilia, ſive throni, ſive imperia, ſive poteſtates. Dr. H. More op. Philoſoph. Vol. 1. p. 513.

(e) *Grot. Not. in Col.* 1. 16.

though not as the ultimate final cauſe) as his Religion, Chriſtianity and Godlineſs requireth. But this cannot be ſaid of a Scholaſtic Abſtract Son, and therefore the Objection may be retorted upon the Objectors. The two firſt Objections are Impertinencies, as will appear by diſtinguiſhing the ambiguity of the word *creating*. For all the things that are in Heaven and in Earth, viſible and inviſible (the Univerſe of Rationals) are not ſuppos'd, to be ſo created by Chriſt, as to be in the uſual ſenſe his Creation (or new Creation) as the regenerate Chriſtian Church is: but *whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers*, they were created by him *as to his right and ſtate of Empire and Dominion over them* (ſo far they were of his creating) and this is manifeſtly the Apoſtle's Senſe, which Senſe will be clearly underſtood by theſe following orderly Notices of our Saviour's Creatorſhip.

(1.) When the holy Writers of the New Teſtament ſpeak of our Saviour's creating the Univerſe, they have reſpect to a new making or creating it, and they affirm, that it was his doing. As when the Apoſtle ſaith of God, *who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt*, he hath reſpect to that creating all things, which belongeth to the new Teſtament and the Deity thereof: ſo when the holy Writers ſpeak of Chriſt's creating the Univerſe, they have reſpect to a new making or creating it, that which belongeth to the New Teſtament. And they affirm, that this was his doing; which is to ſay, that the Univerſe was made by him as to the New Teſtaments making or creating it. They ſay therefore, the Univerſe was created by him as being of new and Chriſtian creating, and as it is of new and Chriſtian creating. It is created and made by him, ſo as to be a new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe, and as it is ſuch a conſtituted Univerſe. Which is to ſay, It is created by him as to the *Theopoliticals*, *the Chriſt-imperials* or *Chriſtian Imperials*.

(2.) It doth not belong to an Evangelical Imperial Son, to create the World's *Phyſiologicals* (ſuch as the Land and Water-animals) theſe things are alien from his Character: but it belongeth to an Evangelical Imperial Son, to be *Fundator imperii*, the founder and maker of his Empire, which is the new Kingdom of God and the new Creation (uſually ſo called) a *Theo-polity* and *Chriſto-polity*. Which Divine Polity (like other Polities) is founded upon a ſettlement of rights and dues, and this ſettlement of rights and dues is the Chriſtian Religion, which was made by Chriſt (or which God made in and by Chriſt) who is *Fundator Eccleſiæ*, *Opifex Domûs*, *Architectus Domûs*, the Founder of the Church Catholic, the Maker and Architect of his Houſe, *Heb.* 3. 3, 6. which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if he was only The maker of the Catholic Church on Earth (which is but an handful of People in compariſon:) but he is the maker of the great Catholic Church (that above as well as that below) which is commenſurate with Chriſtianity Imperial and the new Kingdom of God. For Chriſt is the maker of the Catholic Church on Earth by making the Chriſtian Religion, which is the Settlement, Law and Religion, not only of the Catholic Church on Earth, but it is actually the Religion of the whole Kingdom of God, which is one Kingdom and Empire, one new Kingdom and Empire. It was deſign'd to be ſuch a Kingdom, when our Saviour made the Chriſtian Religion, which was not properly made for the Holy Angels, but for this World of Sinners; yet in the making this Religion it was deſign'd, to be the Religion of the Holy Angels (although not in all reſpects) and the new Kingdom of God upon Earth was made with deſign, that the Holy Angels ſhould be Subjects and Citizens thereof, *Col.* 1. 19, 20. *Eph.* 1. 10.

His Religion is jurally the Religion of the Univerſe as being the Religion of the Kingdom of God.

(3.) By making the Settlement of the Chriſtian Religion (which compriſeth the making a new Lord and a new Law) the Univerſe of capable Creatures became of right and by obligation (at leaſt by remote obligation) Chriſt's Subjects and Servants, his Imperial Potentacy became commenſurate with the extent of the Univerſe, as being both the Lord of the Church and the Lord of the World. So that thereby a new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe did emerge into Exiſtence, which is of a twofold nature, and muſt be conſider'd as it is the *Intrinſic* and the *Extrinſic*. The new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe as it is the *Intrinſic*, is the Catholic or Chriſtian Church (the new Kingdom of God:) The new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe as it is the *Extrinſic*, is the World without the Church, which is therefore a new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe *Extrinſic*, becauſe Chriſt is an Extrinſic Imperial Head thereof. The former of theſe is the New and Chriſtian kind of Creation, and therefore fitly called *The new Creation*: The latter of them is not fully of kind and quality ſuch a Creation, nor may it be called The new Creation without due diſtinction of Senſe; but a new Creation it is, as being of Chriſt's creating. The great diſtance between theſe two (The new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe as it is the *Intrinſic* and the *Extrinſic*) doth not hinder a very cloſe connexion between them. For if the new Kingdom of God is made, Chriſt (who is the intrinſic Imperial Eſtate of it) is neceſſarily an Imperial Potentate over all the World. There is alſo a connexion between the creating the whole and the parts. For *the Worlds* as they are the new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe, were of Chriſt's making. *All things that are in Heaven and that are in Earth*, as they are the new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe, were of his creating. And this World and all capable Beings are of his creating, as they are parts of the new and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe, and ſo as to be parts thereof.

(4.) All things are conſtituted under Chriſt (and it is his doing, that they are ſo conſtituted) both as to *his right and eſtate of Empire and Dominion over them.* For they are jurally unto him (as Creatures are defined) the *Subject-ſervient Party*; and they are ſtated as Underlings to him, who is of Creature-tranſcendent Imperial Eſtate. Conſider'd therefore as to their Theopoliticals (or Chriſt-imperials) both of right and ſtate, or as they are to him *pars ſubdita*, both of right and in ſtate, they are of his creating. And their Creation muſt be denominated, not a *Phyſiological*, but a *Theopolitical* (or Chriſtopolitical) Creation. Of this nature is that Creation which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of in his Panegyric to the *Coloſſians*; it is the new Creation underſtood, not in the *uſual* and *ſtricter*, but in the *larger* Senſe.

XV. Of the ſame nature is that Creation which the Divine Author to the Hebrews attributeth to the Son of God, *by whom he made the Worlds*, Heb. 1. 2. For *the Worlds* in this Divine

Author may reaſonably be thought of the ſame ſignification with *all things in Heaven and in Earth* ſpoken of by the Apoſtle in his Panegyrick; and conſequently this Divine Author by making the Worlds meaneth no other than a Creation in reſpect of Theopoliticals. But againſt this Interpretation it is objected, that the Divine Author in this place (δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, *by whom alſo he made the Worlds*) uſeth the ſame Phraſe as in that other place of his Epiſtle, *Heb.* 11. 3. Πίςει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ, *through Faith we underſtand, that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God*; from whence it is inferr'd, that theſe two places ſpeak of one and the ſame Creation. But this Inference is not at all well grounded; for the diſagreement between theſe two places is far greater than the agreement. Both of them ſpeak of a Creation of the Univerſe, and in both of them the Divine Author uſeth τοὺς αἰῶνας, to ſignifie the Univerſe, and this is all the agreement that is between them. But in the one of them, *Heb.* 11. 3. the Divine Author ſpeaketh of a Creation, which he receiv'd by Divine Revelation: In the other, *Heb.* 1 2. he ſpeaketh of a Creation, which he only teacheth as a Divine Revelation. In the one of them he ſpeaketh of a Creation, which he receiv'd by a Faith in the Old Teſtament; in the other he ſpeaketh of a Creation, which he pretendeth not to have receiv'd by any ſuch Faith, but only teacheth it as a Propoſition of the New Teſtament. In the one he ſpeaketh of a Creation by the Imperial Son of God; in the other he ſpeaketh of a Creation, which he attributeth not at all to the Son of God, but wholly and only to the omnipotent Command of God.

But there is another and a grand Objection againſt our Interpretation of this Divine Author. (f) *For ſhewing that greater things have been ſpoken of him than ever were attributed to any of the Angels, amongſt the reſt he ſaith; The Scripture ſpake unto the Son, Thy Throne,* O *God, is for ever and ever. And not only ſo, but alſo, Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands. They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt, and they all ſhall wax old as doth a garment. And as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed: But thou art the ſame, and thy Years ſhall not fail. Whoſoever the Perſon be, to whom theſe words were ſpoken, it cannot be denied but that he was the Creator of the World. But theſe Words were ſpoken to the Son of God as the Apoſtle himſelf acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the Order and Series of the Chapter, the deſign of which is to declare the ſupereminent excellency of our Saviour Chriſt. Nay the Conjunction* And, *referreth this place of the Pſalmiſt plainly to the former, of which he had ſaid expreſly, unto the Son he ſaith. As ſure then as thy Throne,* O *God, is for ever and ever, was ſaid unto the Son; ſo certain it is, Thou Lord haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, was ſaid unto the ſame.* This is the Objection (repreſented in its full ſtrength) which I will clearly aſſoil, having premiſ'd this Obſervation; that theſe Texts of the Pſalmiſt cited by the Divine Author and mention'd in the Objection, are devotional Sayings, Attributions or Doxologies, and that the Objection rightly connecteth them together; for the latter of them (though not in words, yet) in ſenſe is the ſame with the former. *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands. They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt, and they all ſhall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed: But thou art the ſame, and thy Years ſhall not fail.* Which is as much as to ſay, *Thy Throne,* O *God, is for ever and ever* (which is the ſummary of this long devotional Attribution) and this is the Divine Attribute, which the Divine Author inſiſteth and dwelleth upon. Which Divine Attribute and others of like Nature ought to be underſtood and conſider'd, not as primarily and in the firſt place the Attributions of the Son of God, but as primarily the Attributions of God (his Doxologies) and as communicated to the Son. Let us ſuppoſe, that the Text of this Divine Author ran in this form of Words, *But unto the Son he ſaith, the Lord killeth and maketh alive:* We muſt ſuppoſe, that this Attribute (the Lord killeth and maketh alive) is underſtood and conſider'd by this Divine Author as primarily an Attribution of God (and a Doxology belonging to him) and communicated to the Son, and that this Communication of it is meant by this Divine Author's Expreſſion, *But unto the Son* he ſaith. So this Divine Attribute *Thy Throne,* O *God, is for ever and ever,* is underſtood and conſider'd by this Divine Author as primarily an Attribution of God, one of his Doxologies, and communicated to the Son (for to whomſoever theſe words are ſpoken, they are a Divine Attribute communicated to him) and this Communication of it is ſignified by this Expreſſion, *But unto the Son he ſaith.* In like manner the latter Text of the Pſalmiſt, as it is cited by this Divine Author, muſt be expounded; *Thou Lord in the beginniug haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands: They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt.* This is primarily and in the firſt place an Attribution, not of Chriſt, but of God; for it cannot be pretended, that in the proper literal ſenſe of his words the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh of Chriſt; they that expound this Pſalm or any part of it, to be meant of Chriſt, expound it in a myſtical Senſe, which is quite remote from the buſineſs in hand. For this Divine Author taketh the Pſalmiſt's Words in the proper literal Senſe, and therefore underſtandeth and conſidereth them as primarily an Attribution of God, and one of his Doxologies. So they are in the Pſalmiſt (plainly and undeniably) and ſo they are in this Divine Author, who muſt not be ſuppos'd, to pervert plain Scripture to an alien Senſe. But this Attribution of God, as it is one Divine Attribute, a communicable Attribute, and in Senſe the ſame with that before cited, *Thy Throne,* O *God, is for ever and ever,* he looketh upon as communicated to the Son of God, and therefore by the Particle *And* he connecteth theſe two Texts of the Pſalmiſt. His Senſe is; the Pſalmiſt communicateth to the Son this Attribution of God, *Thy Throne,* O *God, is for ever and ever*; and in ſo doing (virtually and implicitly) the Pſalmiſt communicateth to the Son this Attribution of God, as it is in Senſe the ſame with the former; *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands. They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt, and they ſhall wax old as doth a Garment. And as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed: But thou art the ſame and thy Years ſhall not fail.* This Attribution of God the Pſalmiſt doth not communicate to the Son otherwiſe than as it is one Attribute in Senſe the ſame

(f) *Bp. Pearſon on the Creed Art.* 2. *p.* 225, 226. *Ed.* 1.

with the former (Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever;) nor doth this Divine Author otherwiſe communicate it; and conſequently it is not his intention, to communicate to the Son *the Creatorſhip of Heaven and Earth.* This is not the Attribute, that he inſiſteth upon, nor doth he cite the Pſalmiſt's words concerning it otherwiſe than as an Introduction to, and an illuſtration of the Attribute which he inſiſteth upon, and becauſe they are connex'd with it, and it ſo dependeth upon them, that it could not be cited without citing them alſo. In the immediately antecedent and ſubſequent Words (as is undeniably plain and evident) his only ſcope and intention is, to prove Chriſt in ſuch a ſtate of Exaltation which is Creature-tranſcendence; to which purpoſe the attributing unto him the Creatorſhip of Heaven and Earth is altogether impertinent. And it would be an extreme impertinence and impropriety, in this Author, to compare Chriſt with the Angels, to collect Arguments and Teſtimonies to prove his Precellency above them, if he look'd upon Chriſt as the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and did by plain Teſtimony of Scripture prove him ſo to be. Nor would it be a leſs impertinence and impropriety, to command the Angels to Worſhip Chriſt (when he was brought into the World) if he was their Creator in their old Creation; for could the Angels be ignorant of their Creator or of the Duties of Religious Worſhip which they owe to the Creator? Beſides, the Old Teſtament being only a Prophecy of the Son of God, it cannot be ſuppos'd to attribute the old Creation to him.

The Objection that pretendeth to prove the contrary, is only a puzzling difficulty, no ſolid Proof. That we may clearly extricate our ſelves out of this difficulty, we ſay, that the Words (*Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine Hands*) are and are not ſpoken to the Son of God, and that we deny the truth of this Propoſition, *whatſoever the Perſon be, to whom theſe words were* (in any ſenſe) *ſpoken, he was the Creator of the World.* For the words are not by the Pſalmiſt ſpoken to the Son *attributively*, but only *deſcriptively, as deſcribing, and as part of the deſcription of a Divine Attribute of the Father prefigurative of the Son.* They are ſpoken to the Father *attributively* (as attributing to him the old Creation) and *deſcriptively* as deſcribing his Immutability and Eternity, and as part of the deſcription of this his Divine Attribute, which is *prefigurative of the Son.* For (as we have ſeen before) that which is ſpoken of God in ſeveral Texts of the Old Teſtament, is apply'd to Chriſt in the New Teſtament. Which Texts of the Old Teſtament muſt be called *prefigurative*; for they ſpeak of God the Father primarily, and in the firſt place, but of the Son *prefiguratively*, ſo as to preſignifie and propheſie what the Son ſhould be, or do and ſuffer. This place of the Pſalmiſt is one of theſe *prefigurative* Texts. It attributeth to the Father immutability and eternity of duration *prefiguratively* of the ſtable and immutable duration of the Sons Throne and Kingdom. It attributeth therefore to the Son an immutable and ſtable duration of Throne and Kingdom as prefigur'd in this deſcription of the Father's immutability and eternity of duration. But it doth not attribute any thing to him as prefigured by the Father's *laying the Foundation of the Earth and framing the Heavens in the beginning.* Thoſe words are only part of the deſcription of the Father's immutability and eternity of duration, which is prefigurative of the Sons immutability and ſtability of Throne. They are not ſpoken therefore to the Son *attributively*, but only *deſcriptively*, as part of the deſcription of the Father's immutability and eternity of duration, which is prefigurative of the ſtable and immutable duration of his Throne. This is that God-eminence or Creature-tranſcendence which according to the Apoſtle is attributed to the Son in that Text of the Pſalmiſt, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* With which Text of the Pſalmiſt the Apoſtle by the Conjunction *And* connecteth this other (touching the immutability and eternity of God) as attributing to the Son the ſame God-eminence (or Creature-tranſcendence) an immutable and eternal duration of Throne; for this is here prefiguratively attributed to the Son of God. And thus the Senſe of this Divine Author (without any diſtortion of Scripture) is clearly explained.

CHAP. X.

1. *Of the creative Logos in the Proem of S.* John's *Goſpel, that he is not a Scholaſtic Abſtract Logos, but God's Imperial Son as being the Word of the Chriſtian Religion. This proved from the Reaſon of his Name according to ſeveral ancient Writers.* 2. *According to ſeveral modern Divines.* 3. *From the New Teſtament.* 4. *From Chriſt's Evangely.* 5. *The Evangeliſt's Logos not any ſort of Abſtract Logos. Not the Platanic Logos.* 6. *Not the Stoical Logos.* 7. *Not the Targumic Logos.* 8. *Not the Old Teſtament's creative Logos.* 9. *Not the Logical Logos.* 10. *Not the uſual Scholaſtic Logos.* 11. *Of an Aprocryphal Logos.* 12. *Of the Attributes connex'd with the Evangeliſts Logos. Of the Notion of Life in general.* 13. *That it is the great and only concern of Men.* 14. *Of the Good that Life is.* 15. *Life the* ſummum bonum. 16. *Piety requireth, that Life be our great and only Concern.* 17. *Wiſdom requireth, that Life be our great and only Concern.* 18. *Our Saviour is called the Life as being the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal.* 19. *This proved from ſome of our Saviour's Diſcourſes.* 20. *With other places of Scripture.* 21. *The Senſe of this Name the Life argu'd.* 22. *Scholaſticiſm profaneth Life.* 23. *In like manner it perverteth the Light.* 24. *Maldònate's good Account of it.* 25. *The Light which Chriſt is illuſtrated.* 26. *Further illuſtrated.* 27. *A Conſectary from theſe Attributes the Life and Light.*

1. THERE are other illuſtrious places of the New Teſtament, wherein our Saviour's Creatorſhip is celebrated; for as the Chriſtian *Logos* he is repreſented as *creative*, and a

Creation is expreſly attributed to the *Logos* in the Proem of S. *John*'s Goſpel, (*g*) which term *Logos* is of various ſignifications and may be rendred *Word*, *Speech*, *the Reaſon or Cauſe we aſſign of any thing*, *the Eſſence or Definition of a thing*, *Supputation*, *Proportion*, *Notion*, *Reaſon* (whereby we are Rational) Learnings alſo are called in Greek λόγοι, (*h*) and the learned Diſſertations of *Epictetus* collected by *Arrianus* (which were certain Diſcourſes of his at Home amongſt his own Domeſticks or thoſe that came to viſit him) are called Ἐπικτήτου λόγοι. So the Greek Writers of Hiſtory divide their Commentaries εἰς λόγους, *into Diſſertations*. A Diſſertation is a ſort of Speech, and Speech is that which *Logos* (*i*) properly and primarily ſignifieth, whence *Eraſmus*, *Vatablus*, *Beza* (and others) would have the Evangeliſt's *Logos* rather tranſlated *Sermo* than *Verbum*. Some tranſlate it *ratio* and others *definitio*, but (without ſcrupulouſly examining theſe different Verſions) the true rendring of it will clearly enough appear by conſidering the Perſon, to whom it is applied and whom it denoteth and ſignifieth. For all Expoſitors agree, that it is the Name of a Divine Perſon, and denoteth the Son of God, who is unqueſtionably *the Word of the Goſpel* (the Chriſtian Theology and Religion) and not a few of them agree, that the Name is given him upon this account. For although many of them aſſign other Reaſons, yet they ſuppoſe, that this is a principal Reaſon, why the Evangeliſt hath ſtiled the Son of God *the Logos*, becauſe he is the Word of the Chriſtian Theology, and the ancient Writers have diſcours'd touching the Reaſon of the Name very agreeably to this account of it. *He is called the Logos*, ſaith *J. Mart.* (*k*) Ἐπειδὴ τὰς παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμιλίας φέρει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *becauſe he bringeth the Speeches of the Father unto Men.* Some reſemblance there is according to this Father, between the Son of God and *Mercury* the Son of *Jupiter*, whom he calleth (*l*) λόγον τὸν ἑρμηνευτικὸν ϗ πάντων διδάσκαλον, *The interpretative Logos and the Teacher of all. Athanaſius* diſcourſeth (*m*) *that the Logos proceeding from the Father is rightly called* ἑρμηνεὺς ϗ ἄγγελος, *the Interpreter and Meſſenger of his Father. Epiphanius* ſaith (*n*) *He is called Logos* ἐπειδὴ ἑρμηνεύς ἐστι τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ βουλημάτων, *becauſe he is the Interpreter of the Counſels of God.* (*o*) *Verbum patris ideo dictum eſt, quia per ipſum innoteſcit pater*, He is called the Word of the Father, becauſe the Father is made known by him, ſaith S. *Auſtin.* Διὰ τὸ συναφὲς ϗ τὸ ἐξαγγελτικὸν, *becauſe he is in Conjunction with the Father, and becauſe of his declaring him*, ſaith *Gr. Naz. The Son may be call'd the Word or Speech* (ſaith *Origen*) *becauſe he maketh manifeſt the ſecret things of his Father. He is rightly called the Word, by whom the knowledge of the Father is made manifeſt*, ſaith *Rich. Victorinus.* Quæ eſt doctrina patris niſi verbum patris? Ipſe ergo Chriſtus doctrina patris, ſi verbum patris. *What is the Doctrine of the Father but the Word of the Father? Chriſt therefore is the Doctrine of the Father, if he is the Word of the Father*, ſaith the *Alex. Cyril.* The ſame Author ſaith, that he is called the Angel of the great Counſel, *becauſe he is the living Logos of God, the Interpreter of the Mind and Will of the Father.* According to *Theophylact* the Son is called the Logos, becauſe he declareth his Father's *arcana* (*p*) *quoniam ipſe eſt verbum, qui agnitionem patris facit*, becauſe he is the Word, that cauſeth the knowledge of the Father, ſaith *Irenæus.* S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith (*q*) the Son of God is called the Logos by the Evangeliſt, ἐπειδὴ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῖν ἔμελλεν ἀπαγγέλλειν, *becauſe he was to declare to us the things of the Father. For all things* (ſaith he) *that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you.* S. *Chryſoſtom* therefore conſidereth the Meſſiah in his Miſſionary Oeconomy, and ſuppoſeth him as ſuch, to be denominated the Logos of God. (*r*) *Therefore he is called the Word, becauſe he revealeth the ſecrets of the Mind of God.* (*s*) *For if Speech proceedeth from Men, we think, that Mind is the Fountain of it, and attending to the Speech we diſcern the Mind ſignified thereby; how much more vividly and excellently beholding the Word do we form a Conception of his Father, as our Saviour himſelf ſaith, he that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father?* (*t*) *He was the Word for this Reaſon, becauſe God would uſe his Voice to the People, becauſe he was to be the Maſter of the Doctrine of God and of bringing the heavenly ſecret unto Men, becauſe God did firſt ſpeak to him, that by him he might ſpeak to us, and he might reveal the Word and Will of God to us. With great Reaſon therefore he is called the Speech and Word of God.* (*u*) *The Word* is he that hath τὴν ἐνδεικτικὴν ϗ παιδευτικὴν ἡγεμονίαν, *the Chieftainſhip of ſhewing and teaching, of whom we learn frugality, not to be faſtuous, to love the true liberty, to love Mankind alſo and that which is good.* Ταύτῃ οὖν ϗ σωτὴρ ὁ λόγος κέκληται, *for this Reaſon the Name of the Word is given to our Saviour*, ſaith *Clemens.* (*w*) *The only begotten Son is ſent down from the boſom of the Father*, λόγος τῆς πίστεως, *the Word of Faith.* (*x*) S. Peter *in his Preachment* νόμον ϗ λόγον τὸν κύριον προσεῖπεν, *called our Lord the Law and Word; the Law as well as the Word of God, one that revealed God's whole Evangelical Will to us as a Law-giver.* (*y*) Hujus indulgentiæ, gratiæ diſciplinæque arbiter & magiſter, Sermo & filius Dei mittitur. *Of this Indulgence Grace and Diſcipline the Maſter and Diſpoſer the Word and Son of God is ſent* who as ſuch is (*z*) λόγος σωτήριος *the Word of Salvation*, as *Origen* ſpeaketh, who alſo calleth our Saviour (*a*) *the Doctor of Theology.*

(t) *Verbum, ea ſcilicet ratione, quia voce ejus ad populum fuerat uſurus, quod ille magiſter futurus eſſet doctrinæ Dei, & cæleſtis arcani ad homines perferendi, quod ad ipſum primò locutus eſt, ut per eum ipſe ad nos loqueretur, & ille vocem Dei ac voluntatem nobis revelarit. Meritò igitur Sermo & Verbum Dei dicitur.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 8.

(g) *Petav. de Trin. l. 6. c. 1.*

(h) *Salmaſ. in Epict. p.* 237.

(i) *Ibid. p.* 181.

(k) *Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 358.

(l) *Apol.* 2. *p.* 67.

(m) *Or. c. Gent. p.* 34. *Com.*

(n) *Hær.* 73.

(o) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 3. *S.* 1, 2. & *c.* 5. *S.* 7. & *l.* 3. *c.* 3. *S.* 18.

(p) *Iren. l.* 4. *c.* 14.

(q) *In Joann. Hom.* 2.

(r) *Orig. Peri Archon. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(s) *Athanaſ. ſupra.*

(u) *Clem. Pædag. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

(w) *Ibid. c.* 3.

(x) *Idem p.* 579. *Dr. Hammond on Pſal.* 2.

(y) *S. Cypr. de Idol. Van.*

(z) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 83.

(a) *C. Celſ. p.* 157.

II. Modern Divines and Expoſitors generally agree, that the Son of God is called the Logos, becauſe he is the Word of the Goſpel. (*b*) *The Nature of a Word is to expreſs or repreſent the Mind of the Speaker.* (*c*) *That may be called the Word of any one* (quod eſt manifeſtativum ejus) *which maketh him manifeſt.* (*d*) Verbo æternus pater ſecretiora mentis ſuæ arcana revelat. *By his Word the eternal Father revealeth the ſecrets of his Mind.* (*e*) *The Son of God is intituled Logos, not only becauſe he is born by Cogitation, but alſo* (quia eſt perſona proferens Evangelium ex ſinu æterni patris) *becauſe he is a Perſon that bringeth the Goſpel out of the Boſom of the eternal Father.* (*f*) *As a Man maketh himſelf known to others by his Word, ſo is the Father by Chriſt revealed to the World.* —— *And that we may expound Scripture by Scripture, methinketh that of the Author to the* Hebrews *is a Comment upon this Title, when he ſaith, God in theſe laſt days hath ſpoken to us by his Son, who therefore is his Word.* (*g*) *Chriſt is called the Word in reference to the Word uttering, becauſe he is the Interpreter of his Father's Will, and declareth his Father's Mind to the Sons of Men.* So λόγος is ſometimes beſt tranſlated an Interpreter, as in this Saying of *Philo.* (*h*) Μωσῆς

μὲν

(b) *Mr. Lawſon The polit. p.* 2.

(c) *Aquin.* 1. *Qu.* 34. *Art.* 2.

(d) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *p.* 511.

(e) *Melanthon. Exam. Theol. p.* 178.

(f) *Mr. Hardy Lect. on* 1 *Joh.* 1. *p.* 40, 41.

(g) *Dr. Arrowſmith* θεανθρ. *p.* 19.

(h) *Op. ſc. p.* 64.

μὲν ἐστι νοῦς ὁ καθαρώτατος, Ἀαρὼν δὲ λόγος αὐτοῦ, *Moſes is a moſt pure Mind, and* Aaron *his Logos or Interpreter.* Accordingly *Eugubinus* (notwithſtanding his Humour of extravagant Philoſophic-paganizing) thus expoundeth the Evangeliſt's Logos or *Verbum.* (*i*) *The Name Logos ſignifieth not, as I ſuppoſe, a ſpiritual Nativity by a Cogitation, but a Speaker and Interpreter. The Word of God is as it were the Speech of God, and the Hebrews uſe the denominations inſtead of the denominated; as a Saviour they call Salvation, and a Redeemer Redemption.* (*k*) *From the holy place in the Tabernacle God declared his Mind and Will. From thence God gave out to* Moſes *his* λόγια, *ſuch words of Direction and Command as were neceſſary for the good Government of his People. This was a great Favour; but in Chriſt God revealed his Mind more clearly and abundantly, and told ſuch things as never came from the former Holy Place. He was the* λόγος, *in this reſpect, becauſe he acquainteth us with the ſacred Will of God, and uttereth things ſecret from the Foundation of the World. He was not only the Interpreter of God's Mind, as the Prophets were, but the immediate Interpreter, as the word which we ſpeak, is of ours. For he was in the Boſom of the Father; he knew his Father's Mind, not by the Mediation of Angels, or Viſions or Dreams, but by a more intimate diſcovery of God's Counſels to him, as a Perſon that was one with him. — The Article* ὁ λόγος, *ſheweth, that the Title belongeth to him particularly and eminently; he hath declared moſt perfectly the Mind and Will of God to us.* (*l*) *Chriſt is called* ὁ λόγος, Joh. 1. *becauſe he doth reveal and make known the Will of God to us. Beza* inclineth to think, that the Son of God is called the Logos by the Evangeliſt, *becauſe he is the ſole Interpreter of his Father's Mind. Zegerus* ſaith, *The Son of God is therefore called the Word, becauſe by him God the Father ſpake forth his Divine Will to us.* Qui arcanum Dei conſilium de noſtra ſalute nobis expoſuit, *ſaith* Piſcator. *Gomarus* muſt be reckon'd one of this Sentiment; and the Jeſuit *Maldonate* liketh their Opinion, who ſuppoſe, that the Word is ſo called, *becauſe he is the Interpreter of his Father's Mind and Will, as our vocal Word is the Interpreter of our Mind and Will.* He citeth *Origen, Clemens Alex. Epiphanius, Chryſoſtom, Baſil, Gr. Naz. Theophylact* and *Euthymius* as of this Opinion; to which we may add (*m*) the *Dort*-interpreters; and *Camero* ſaith, *ſententia quidem non eſt incommoda*, it is an Opinion, not to be diſlik'd. Some Expoſitors (as *Druſius*) to illuſtrate the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, alledge the *Alcoran*, which ſtileth our Saviour כלמה אללה *The Word of God.* It acknowledgeth him alſo, to be God's Embaſſador, and the Goſpel to be the Word of God. So that it ſeemeth, that *Muhammed* ſtiled our Saviour *The Word of God* with reſpect to his Goſpel: (*n*) But the Commentators upon the *Alcoran* will have him ſo called, becauſe he was born without a Father meerly by the Word and Command of God.

III. If in theſe numerous Sayings there is a good Sence and diſcernment of things, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that the Evangeliſt's Logos is not an Abſtract Logos, but an Humane-divine Perſon; for theſe Sayings import, that the Logos is the Son of God under this formal Conſideration, *as being the Word of the Goſpel.* Which is to ſay, that the Logos is the Son of God, not conſider'd in his primary, but in his officiary Capacity as the Chriſt.. The Son of God conſider'd in his primary Capacity (being the Imperial Son) is according to his true Idea an Humane-divine Perſon, how much more muſt we ſuppoſe him to be ſuch conſider'd in his officiary Capacity as the Chriſt, who is manifeſtly a complex Perſon? The Evangeliſt's Logos is *the Word of the Goſpel* conſider'd as ſuch; and the Word of the Goſpel conſider'd as ſuch is no other than the Chriſt of God, who cannot be ſuppos'd, to be an Abſtract Logos. A Scholaſtic Abſtract Logos is not ſuch a kind of Logos as *the Word of the Goſpel* (conſider'd as ſuch) he is not a God-kind or a Saint of God-kind of Logos as the Logos of God neceſſarily is: The Evangeliſt's Logos therefore is not any Scholaſtic Abſtract Logos. Of this we may have greater Aſſurance from ſeveral diſtinct Conſiderations of this Name *the Logos.* For,

(1.) *The Logos of God* cannot (conſiſtently with common Reaſon and Sence of Religion) be counted an unholy Philoſophical Name, but it muſt be conſider'd as a Biblical or Scriptural Name; and not only ſo, but it muſt be conſider'd as the ſame Name with that of the Bible, which is uſually called *the Word, the Word of God.* Apoc. 19. 13. And if we ask, what it is, that the Holy Writers call *the Word*, and *the Word of God*, it muſt be anſwer'd, that it is *the Word of ſupernatural Revelation* (the Oracles of God) *the divine Doctrine, the holy People's Word, the Word of their Religion.* The Evangeliſt's Logos therefore is *the Word of ſupernatural Revelation, and of divine Doctrine, the holy People's holy Word, the Word of our Religion.* Which in the perſonal Acceptation is not any Abſtract Logos, but conſider'd as ſuch is eſſentially the Perſon of the Lord Chriſt. *For if the Word ſpoken by Angels was ſtedfaſt, and every Tranſgreſſion receiv'd a juſt Recompence of Reward; how ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo great Salvation, which at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord?* Heb. 2. 2, 3. As the Word ſignifieth Doctrine in Scripture; ſo in *Origen*'s Phraſeology. * *Antichriſtus falſus eſt Sermo, falſum Verbum, Verbum mendax. Videamus nè quis nos ſeducat vel Sermo vel virtus. Seducuntur à falſis intellectibus & Verbis venientibus in nomine Chriſti, qui eſt Verbum & Veritas.* Chriſt is the Word and Truth in the ſame Senſe, that Antichriſt is a Lying Word.

(2.) The Logos of God (θεοῦ λόγος,) is the ſame with Theology. And as that which the holy Writers and the holy People call *the Word* and *the Word of God* is Theology (the Word which is their Theology:) So he whom the Evangeliſt calleth *the Word* and *the Word of God* is Theology (the Word which is the Chriſtians Theology) and the Evangeliſt uſeth λόγος, (*Sermo*) in ſuch a Senſe, as the *Arabians* uſe (*o*) *Alcalam* (Sermo) whereby they ſignifie Theology. But the term Theology is ambiguous; for uſually the Greek Fathers mean by it *Theology* in the ſenſe of *honourary Divinity.* (*p*) As θεολογεῖν τὸν λόγον, θεολογεῖν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, θεολογεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, is, *to Theologize concerning the Logos, Chriſt or the Son of God*, in the ſenſe of honourary Divinity; and to ſpeak of Chriſt κατὰ θεολογίαν, *according to Theology*, they contradiſtinguiſh to the ſpeaking of him κατ' οἰκονομίαν, *according to*

his

(i) *Dicitur Verbum ſive locutio, quaſi locutor & interpres Dei.* —— *Eſt enim Verbum Dei quaſi locutio ejus & Sermo, Miſſio, Interpres, Legatus. Et ſolet Hebraiſmus pro denominatis abuti denominationibus, ut ſervatorem appellant ſalutem, & redemptorem redemptionem.* —— *Λόγος rectiùs vertitur Sermo, locutio, quàm Verbum. Sonat enim id nomen locutorem, internuntium, non nativitatem, ut reor, ſpiritualem.* De Per. Philoſ l. 1. c. 23, 26.

(k) Bp. *Patrick Witneſſ. Par.* 2. *p.* 177, 87.

(l) *Burgeſs Vind. Leg. Lect.* 8. *p.* 80. *Ed.* 1.

(m) *Curcell. diſſ. de voc. Trin. n.* 24.

(n) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. p.* 105. *Ed.* 1.

* *Tract.* 27. & 29. *in Matth.*

(o) *Pocock. Spec. p.* 195, 198.

(p) *Heinſ. Ariſt. Sac. p.* 273, 274. *Petav. T.* 1. *Proleg. c.* 1.

his humanity or œconomy in the Fleſh. So they ſay of God, that amongſt the Hebrews alone ἐθεολογεῖτο, *he was accounted God*; and of Chriſt ἄνω θεολογεῖται, *above he is accounted God.* And hence it is that our Evangeliſt had the Name of θεόλογος (the Divine) becauſe at a greater rate than the other Evangeliſts he inſiſteth upon and illuſtrateth the Divinity of our Saviour, who is the Object of Theology in the Senſe of honourary Divinity. But no *Logos* either is or ever was the Object of Theology in the Senſe of honourary Divinity, ſave only the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. There is neither Precept nor Example in Nature or Scripture for the religious honouring or worſhipping any Abſtract *Logos.* No *Logos* but the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus is according to Religion, to be loved, ador'd and celebrated; therefore our Evangeliſt's *Logos* is (not an Abſtract *Logos*, but) the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus. Who is called by *Ignatius* θεοῦ γνῶσις, which is the ſame with θεογνωσία (the Title of one of *Gr. Nyſſen*'s Books) or Theology. This the Evangeliſt's *Logos* is unto us (Theology both inſtitutive and conſtitutive) the Evangeliſt in drawing his Pourtraiture and repreſenting his Idea conſidereth him as of the regenerate Chriſtian's Family and as Author of the regenerate Chriſtians Religion and Theology of *Life* and *Light*; therefore he conſidereth not his *Logos* as Abſtract, but as the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus.

(3.) The Name *Logos* in the Evangeliſt is anſwerable to one of the Jews Names of the Old Teſtament, which is הדבור ὁ λόγος, *the Word*, (q) and ſo in the New Teſtament the Goſpel is uſually called *the Word*, as we uſually read of *preaching the Word, receiving the Word, doing the Word*; and of thoſe that *obey not the Word, ſtumble at the Word*; *of the Miniſtry of the Word, the Word of Chriſt, the Word of the Truth of the Goſpel.* The Goſpel is the Word in a Doctrinal Acceptation, and Chriſt as connoting and conſignifying his Goſpel is the Word in a Perſonal Acceptation. Chriſt and the Goſpel (ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλία, (r) *the Diſcipline of Jeſus*) are inſeparably connex'd, and are ſo much the ſame, that they are not only called by one common Name *The Word*, but this one common Name in ſome places of the New Teſtament may be expounded indifferently either of Chriſt or the Goſpel. For as connoting his Goſpel he is *the Word of Grace, the Word of Life, the Word of Salvation*, (s) by which Names the Goſpel is called. But the Word of Grace, *Act.* 20. 32. is by ſome expounded, to be meant of Chriſt, and others expound it of the Goſpel. S. *Luke* ſpeaketh of *the Eye-witneſſes and Miniſters of the Word*, and the Word which he ſpeaketh of, is by ſome expounded of Chriſt and others expound it of the Goſpel. Touching *the Word of Life*, Phil. 2. 16. *Calvin* ſaith; *It may be expounded two ways, either of Chriſt or of the Goſpel.* So (t) ὁ τῶν χριστιανῶν λόγος, *the Word of the Chriſtians*; μαθόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ θείου λόγου, *thoſe that have learned from the Divine Word*; ὑποτάξας ἑαυτὸν μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, *he that ſubjecteth himſelf to God alone and to his Word*; οὐδὲ τοῦτον ἐπιτρέπει ἡμῖν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, *the Word of God doth not permit us ſo much*; all theſe Expreſſions may be underſtood either of Chriſt or the Goſpel. Conſidering therefore the ſignification of ὁ λόγος in the New Teſtament, and alſo the connexion and identity between the Doctrinal and the Perſonal *Logos*, it is not imaginable, that ὁ λόγος ſtanding in the front of the New Teſtament is of a ſignification altogether alien from the ſignification of the term in the New Teſtament, or that it ſignifieth an Abſtract *Logos* altogether remote from the New Teſtament and of no affinity with the Goſpel. Ὁ λόγος ſtanding in the front of the New Teſtament muſt ſignifie agreeably to the Senſe and Languge of the New Teſtament, and therefore muſt ſignifie Chriſt (or the Son of God) connoting his Goſpel. Which ſignification of it is inconſiſtent with an Abſtract *Logos.* *Grotius* obſerveth, (u) *ſolent enim quæ Evangelio conveniunt Chriſto tribui ejus promulgatori ac factori*; Thoſe things that agree to the Goſpel are wont to be attributed to Chriſt the promulger and maker thereof. So the Name λόγος which belongeth to the Goſpel, is attributed to Chriſt.

(4.) *The word* (ὁ λόγος) ſignifieth *The word of Life*; for ſo our Evangeliſt himſelf interpreteth it. (w) *Nor is there a better way of expounding, than to illuſtrate every Author* (who hath his peculiar Idioms and Phraſes) *with his like kind of ſpeaking. For who can be a better Interpreter than every one of himſelf?* The *Alexandrian Dionyſius* obſerveth, (x) *That the Proem of S.* John's *Goſpel and the beginning of his firſt Epiſtle* συνᾴδουσι μετ᾽ ἀλλήλοις, *are conſonant to each other.* So *Oecumenius* obſerveth, that this Sentence in the front of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel, *In the beginning was The Word*, is like that in the front of his firſt Epiſtle, *That which was from the beginning The Word of Life.* Our Saviour is called *The Word* in the ſame Senſe, that he is called *The Word of Life.* The Word of Life he cannot be but as connoting the Chriſtian Religion (therein only he is Life to us;) therefore he is called *the Word* as connoting his Goſpel. He is not called The Word of Life as an Abſtract *Logos*; therefore he is not called *the Word* as an Abſtract *Logos.* But the Name ſignifieth this truly great thing The Perſon of Chriſt as to his officiary dignity. So ſome Diſcourſes of the ancient Writers imply, that they ſuppos'd a great affinity between the Name of *John* the Baptiſt and of our Saviour, *A Voice*, and *The Word*, and that theſe Names were given them upon a like account. * *In Evangelio non vox cernitur, ſed ſermo qui voce præſtantior eſt.* —— *à Johanne annunciatus eſt Chriſtus*; *videamus ergo quid Vox de Verbo annunciet.* In the Goſpel it is not the Voice that is heard, but the Word, which is more excellent. *John* ſhewed Chriſt (that was his buſineſs) let us ſee therefore what *the Voice* declareth touching *the Word.* The Word ſignifieth what the Meſſiah is as to his Office, *The Evangelical Word.*

IV. This Name The Word (or ὁ λόγος) muſt be interpreted to ſignifie the Perſon of Chriſt, becauſe ſtanding in the front of the New Teſtament it muſt be interpreted, to ſignifie the Deity of the New Teſtament. And ſtanding in the front of Chriſt's Evangely it muſt be interpreted to ſignifie a thing or perſon Evangelical, which an Abſtract *Logos* is not. As theſe Phraſes uſual in the Chriſtian Religion, *to be born again, dead to Sin, a new Creature*, muſt be expounded touching the matters of Chriſtianity, in the Chriſtian Senſe, and it muſt be conſider'd, how they ſignifie in the Chriſtian Religion: ſo it muſt be conſider'd, how this Name *The Word* ſignifieth in Religion and in the Chriſtian Religion, agreeably whereto the Evange-

(q) Ἀντονομαστικῶς ſic apud *Rabbinos Verbum Dei appellatur, juxta illud* הדבור פירוש מטו *explicatio eſt ex Verbo.*

(r) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 396.

(s) *Act.* 13. 26. *and* 14. 3. *and* 20. 32. *Phil.* 2. 16.

Luk. 1. 2.

(t) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 3. *p.* 159. *&* *l.* 7. *p.* 363. *& l.* 8. *p.* 401, 404.

(u) *Not. in Joh.* 6. 33.

(w) *Nec enim interpretandi ratio melior, quàm ut ſuo quemque auctorem dicendi genere ſimili illuſtres. Quis enim melior quàm ſui quiſque interpres exiſtat?* Schot. Ep. Henr. Gravii. Annot. in Ep. S. Hieron. præmiſſa.

(x) *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 7. *c.* 25.

* *Origen in Luc. Hom.* 1. *&* 21. *So Clem.* παιδαγωγ. *p. m.* 6.

liſt's *Logos* muſt be expounded. This Evangelical Name muſt be underſtood to ſignifie in a Senſe properly Evangelical, the Chriſtian and Evangelical kind of Word, as all the other Names and Attributes of our Saviour in the New Teſtament muſt be underſtood in the Chriſtian and Evangelical Senſe. Such as thoſe which S. *Auſtin* conjoyneth, (y) *He is called The Word and the Truth, The Power and the Wiſdom of God.* If Chriſt in the Goſpel is intituled *the Truth*, this muſt be underſtood of him as connoting his Goſpel and the ſaving truth of Chriſtianity (it would argue a Man unholy, to diſtort ſuch an Attribute to a graceleſs unholy Senſe;) if Chriſt therefore in the Goſpel is intituled *the Word*, this muſt be underſtood of him as connoting his Goſpel and our ſaving Chriſtian Theology. A Man muſt be egregiouſly unſkilful in the word of Righteouſneſs, that thus argueth with *Thammerus*, (z) *The Power of God, and the Wiſdom of God, was known to the Gentiles; therefore Chriſt who is the Power of God and the Wiſdom of God, was known to the Gentiles.* For theſe honourary Names and Attributes *Chriſt the Power of God and the Wiſdom of God* muſt be underſtood in a Senſe properly Chriſtian and Evangelical; and conſequently this honourary Name *the Word* is of like Interpretation, and muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſignifie his Perſon, who connoteth his Goſpel and is therefore (a) ὁ θεῖος ἡμῶν λόγος, *our Divine Word.* Connoting his Goſpel he is *the Word of Eternal Life*; and therefore *Abul-pharagius* in the beginning of his Hiſtory of Dynaſties hath fitly conjoyned *the Word* with Life Eternal. *Praiſe be to God, who is the firſt without beginning and the laſt without end* (qui verbum poſſedit unicum) *who poſſeſſed the one only Word and Eternal Life.* This one only Word that is Eternal Life, is only the Word of the Goſpel (as ſuch;) and we muſt ſay of him (b) *many things God taught us by the Prophets*, (ſed quanto majora ſunt quæ Filius loquitur, quæ Dei ſermo propria voce teſtatur ?) *but how much greater things are they, which the Son ſpeaketh, which the Word of God teſtifieth with his own Voice?*

Theſe Arguments will be conſiderably ſtrengthened, if we conſider the Object of the Evangeliſt's Contemplation. For there are ſeveral Indications in this Proem, that he contemplateth the Son of God as in his miſſionary œconomy. He conſidereth him as *coming into the World*, v. 9. coming as a Light, v. 7, 8. as the Light of Men, v. 4. as a Light ſhining in Darkneſs, v. 5. and as uſher'd into the World by *John* the Baptiſt his harbinger and forerunner, v. 6, 7, 8. The Evangeliſt therefore contemplateth the Son of God as in his miſſionary œconomy, in which œconomy he was *the Word of the Goſpel*; therefore by the Word the Evangeliſt meaneth not any Abſtract *Logos*, but him only that is The Word of Chriſtianity conſider'd as ſuch. He contemplateth our Saviour as *the Word of Chriſtianity*, but ſo as withall to contemplate his Divinity (or Deity) of Perſon; for he ſetteth forth τὴν θεότητα τοῦ λόγου, *the Deity of the Word* in ſaying *The Word was with God and the Word was God.* The Object therefore of his Contemplation is auguſt and illuſtrious, no leſs than *the Son in and of the Godhead:* but there was great reaſon, that the Evangeliſt in the entrance of his Evangely ſhould contemplate this Creature-tranſcendent Son under the Name and Notion of *the Word*, becauſe his intent was, to repreſent and deſcribe the Author of the Chriſtian Religion as ſuch, and ſo θεολογεῖν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, *to theologize the Son of God* (or ſet forth his Divinity) as withall to ſet forth τὸ θειάσμον τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ, *the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion.* He is unto us the Religion of Chriſtianity, and muſt be known as the Author of it; and as ſuch he is *the Life* and *the Word* of it, nor is there any other *Word of Life.* He is ſo *the Word* as to be all the ſuperlative good things and realities, of which he is The Word and Evangely. For ſo in Hebrew to be called is to be, and דבר ſignifieth both a Word and a Thing, and is rendred ῥῆμα or λόγος (Word) when it denoteth a matter or thing; as *Exod* 8. 12. על דבר ἐπὶ λόγῳ βατράχων, *about the Word* (the thing or buſineſs) *of the Frogs.* So 1 *King.* 14. 19. the reſt of the Acts of *Jeroboam* are in the Hebrew the reſt of the דברי which ſignifieth words and things. So *Luk.* 2. 15. this ῥῆμα, word or thing which is done. So *Act.* 8. 21. *Mark* 1. 45. *Luk.* 1. 37. *with God no word or thing ſhall be impoſſible.* Agreeably whereto the Evangeliſt muſt be expounded, when he intituleth our Saviour *the Evangelical Word*; for he doth not mean to repreſent him as a meer Doctrine or Preachment, *meerly that Verbality:* but he deſigneth to repreſent him as *that Verbality and that Reality.* He is ſo *the reality* of the word of Life, as to be *the verbality* of it: and he is ſo the *Verbality* of *the word of Life*, as to be *the reality* of it. Theſe Notices are worthy of a Chriſtian Evangeliſt and agreeable to his Character.

But not any ſort of Abſtract *Logos* poſſible or conceivable is agreeable to his Character. Theſe are of great variety, and all of them claſh with one another (ſo that the Evangeliſt's *Logos* cannot be all of them, nor can it reaſonably be ſuppos'd to be any one of them; for all of them may with equal right and reaſon pretend to be this one *Logos*) all of them claſh with the certain Rules of interpreting Holy Scripture, and all of them claſh with the certain acknowledg'd Attributes of the Evangeliſt's *Logos*; for not one of them is a Chriſtian-Saint of God-kind of *Logos*, nor a Saint of God-kind of Creative *Logos* as ſuch; all of them are of kind and quality Non-chriſtian, the moſt of them are ſuch graceleſs unholy kind of *Logos*'s, as are extremely diſſonant from the Evangeliſt's Logos, *who is full of Grace.* Of theſe there is cauſe to complain, (c) *that ſome of the ancient Chriſtians ſo put on Chriſt, as not ſufficiently to put off* Plato. *Nor can it modeſtly be deny'd by any, that they diſtorted the moſt recondite Myſteries of the Goſpel to Philoſophical Senſes, not without loſing in great degree Divine Truth, and great miſchief to the Church.* To run to the Schools of Heathen Philoſophers, to interpret the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, is the crime of Philoſophic-paganizing the matters of the Chriſtian Theology. The recondite Myſteries of the Goſpel are the matters of the Science of Sanctity (which belong to the Saints of God as ſuch) and therefore are not common and unholy things, that are on this ſide Sanctity; nor are they the Peculiarities of Scholaſticks and Secular Philoſophy. The Doctrines of the Bible are the holy Peoples Learning, which therefore cannot be unholy or unpopular. To diſtort them to ſuch a Senſe, is inſtead of the holy and ſaving Truths of the Chriſtian Religion to ſubſtitute ſpurious and illegitimate Futilities.

V. The

(y) De Fid. & Symb. c. 2.

(z) Melanchthon Exam. Theol. p. m. 29.

(a) Clem. Pæd. l. 1. c. 9.

(b) S. Cypr. de orat. dom. init.

(c) *Veterum Chriſtianorum nonnullos ita Chriſtum induiſſe, ut non ſatis exuerint Platonem. Neque ſanè verecundè à quoquam negari poteſt, reconditiſſima Evangelii myſteria in ſenſus Philoſophicos eos detorſiſſe, non ſine magnâ veritatis divinæ jacturâ atque Eccleſiæ noxâ.* Owen. Θεολ. παντοδ. Præfat. Petav. de Trin. Præfat. c. 3.

V. The Platonic *Logos* is one of theſe Futilities; for being nothing better than τὸ ὂν or *Ens*, it is not an holy kind of *Logos* (not the holy Peoples holy *Logos*, the *Logos* of their Religion) nor was it the Deity of any Religion (of any affinity with Religion or Religious People, Pagan, Chriſtian or other) but was one of the Peculiarities of the Myſtic-metaphyſical Ontologiſts and Theamatiſts. Had the popular Pagans known this Philoſophic-pagan Deity (the Platoniſts ſecond God) it had been the moſt ſuitable Object of their Devotion imaginable; they being World-worſhippers and this Platonic *Logos* being the intelligible archetypal World, and according to *Plato*, (d) θεῶν ἰδέα, *the Idea of all the Pagan Gods.* (e) The *Logos* and Son of God which Platoniſm acknowledgeth and in ſome ſort deifieth, is nothing better than the World, the *intelligible* World, and in conjunction therewith the *ſenſible* World, which two Worlds in Platoniſm are *Brothers* and *Brother-Gods.* So *Philo* platonizing extravagantly, (f) will have, not only the intelligible, but the ſenſible World, to be the Son of God. The Platonic *Logos* therefore is not *the only begotten Son of God:* nor can he be the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, unleſs the Platonic *Hen* or *T'Agathon* is the true God. But we have plainly demonſtrated, that this Platonic *T'Agathon* is not the true God; therefore the Platonic *Logos* cannot be the Evangeliſt's *Logos*. His mundane Brotherhood ſpeaketh him the mundane Syſtem-Logos and a mundane kind of Logos. And becauſe he is definitively *Idearum regnum* (the Kingdom of the Platonic Idea's) he is no better than a Figment, that can have no Exiſtence; nor can there be any ſuch Beings as the Platoniſts call *Noes*, whence their abſtract Intellect or *Logos* can have no real Exiſtence; nor is ſuch an Intellect meet to be the *Demiurgus*, that neceſſarily produceth all things in the way of ſeminal forms. But ſome ſort of Exiſtence this imaginary Deity had in their Theurgy, wherewith it hath great affinity. (g) For the *Egyptians* are ſaid, to have repreſented this Deity by a Serpent; the Platonic Ideas were the Magick Oracles intelligible *Jynges*; (h) by the Methods of Theurgy the Platoniſts pretend to unite their Souls τῷ ἀϊδίῳ λόγῳ, *to the Eternal Logos*; and *Hecate* pretendeth, that her Oracles are always true, that ſhe never made any falſe Predictions. (i) *But ſhe deſcending from the all-ruling Mind of the Father* (the Logos) *always ſhineth with truth.* A *Logos* of this Character is ſaid by *Clemens*, (k) *to be the Son in the Holy Trinity, by whom all things were made according to the Will of the Father.* (l) *The* Logos *of God ſaith, I am the Truth; he is therefore to be contemplated by the Mind. But* Plato *in his* Phœdrus *ſaith, that Truth is Idea, and Idea is* ἐννόημα τοῦ θεοῦ, *the Notion of God, which the Barbarians* (the Hebrews and Chriſtians) *have called* λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, *the Logos of God.* So *Origen* ſaith, (m) that the Soul of Jeſus was united τῇ ἀκρᾷ μετοχῇ τοῦ Αὐτολόγου, *by the higheſt participation of* Logos *it ſelf never to be ſeparated.* If theſe Learned Men had contented themſelves to ſay, as *Origen* ſometimes doth, (n) that the *Logos* in the Chriſtian Trinity is analogous to the *Logos* in the Platonic Triad, this had been Prudent and Chriſtian, and a great recommendation of Chriſtianity to the admirers of the Platonic Philoſophy: but to confound things Profane and Holy, Secular and Spiritual, Natural and Evangelical, Paganical and Chriſtian, as alſo the Old and New Teſtament (which is the uſual way of the ancient Writers of the Church) is extremely injurious to the Scriptures and to the Sanctity and Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion, and in ſeveral Inſtances deſerveth as ſevere a cenſure as a Learned Man hath given of the Verſes of the Paraphraſt *Nonnus*, which are full of Platonic bombaſt, (o) *inſtead of Sacred Poeſie, in very many places he ſeemeth to have left us* (recoctum Paganiſinum) *recocted Paganiſm.* Nothing is more incongruous to a Chriſtian than ſo to commonize and vulgarize Chriſtianity (which is of a Saint of God-kind of Excellency and Precioſity) as to make it of one piece with the vileneſs of Heathen Philoſophy. Nothing is in it ſelf more incongruous, than to aſſert, that the true God was not known in Paganiſm, and yet to affirm, that the true *Logos* and Son of God was known in it; and not only ſo, but that the true Trinity was known in Paganiſm. Yet thus inconſiſtently (p) *Clemens* (q) and the *Alex. Cyril* diſcourſe. But it is not poſſible, that ſhould be the Chriſtian Trinity, the belief whereof is not the Chriſtian Faith, and which is not characteriſtical and diſtinctive of our Profeſſion: nor can the Platonic *Logos* be any more the Chriſtian *Logos*, than the Mundane *Pſyche* is the Holy Spirit, although S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (r) *the chief of the Heathen Philoſophers ſpake of the Father and the Son, but not of the Holy Spirit*; as if the Philoſophic Pagans had good Notices of the Father and the Son in the Holy Trinity, without having Notices of the Holy Spirit. But if touching the Son there was a great agreement between the Philoſophic Pagans and the Chriſtians in S. *Auſtin*'s time, either the Philoſophic Pagans hugely chriſtianiz'd, or the Chriſtians hugely paganiz'd in their Notices of the Son of God. And this (not that) was indeed the truth of the caſe, (s) whence the *Academicks* boaſted, that the Chriſtians had ſtolen their *Dogmata* from *Plato*, eſpecially thoſe illuſtrious Sentences which S. *John* hath placed in the front of his Goſpel, as if theſe were meant of the Platonic *Logos*. If I meet with ὁ λόγος in the Writings of the Metaphyſical Platoniſts, I am bound to underſtand it of a λόγος τῶν ὄντων, (as they underſtood it in their Metaphyſicks:) but meeting with it in the Goſpel-Theology I am bound, to underſtand thereby a *Logos* that is of kind and quality (not Exotick, but) Chriſtian and Evangelical. The Platonic-pagan Theiſm is not the Goſpel-Theiſm.

VI. The Evangeliſt's *Logos* is not the *Stoical Logos* (the Soul and Mind of the World, an artificial Reaſon compriſing all the Spermatic Reaſons) as *Lactantius* and *Eugubinus* ſuppoſe, and *Tertullian* (t) favoureth the Conceit. So *J. Mart.* diſcourſing of the *Stoicks* ſaith; The Demons hate thoſe that live (u) *according to their part of Spermatic Reaſon, according to the knowledge and contemplation of the* Logos *of the Univerſe, which is Chriſt.* So *Voſſius* ſaith of the Arcadian great God *Pan*, (w) that *Pan* amongſt the Heathen did not only ſignifie *univerſal mundane nature naturate*, but alſo *univerſal mundane nature naturant* (which is ὁ λόγος διὰ πάντων διήκων, *an univerſal reaſon pervading all things*) in which Notion *Pan* (as he ſuppoſeth) is the ſame with the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, *by whom all things were made, and without whom not any thing was made that was made.* Accordingly he interpreteth the Story in

Plutarch's

(d) *Procl. Plat. Theol.l.*3.*c.*19.

(e) *Plotin. En.*3.*l.*2.*c.*2.

(f) *Petav. T.*4.*l.*12.*c.*11.*S.*7.

(g) *Witz. Ægypt.l.*1.*c.*3.

(h) *Jambl. de Myſt. S.*10.*c.*6.

(i) Ἀλλ' ἀπὸ παγκρατέοιο νόου πατρόθεν κατιοῦσα Αἰὲν ἀληθείης σφραγίζεται. *Gale in Jambl. p.* 222, 223.

(k) *Str.l.*5.*p.m.*436.

(l) *Ibid. p.*403.

(m) *C.Celſ. l.*6.*p.*308, 309. *l.* 7. *p.*342.

(n) *Ibid. l.* 6. *p.*281.

(o) *Heinſ. Ariſt. Sac. p.* 92.

(p) *Str.l.*6. *p. m.* 495, 497. & *l.* 5. *p.*436.

(q) *C.Jul. l.*7. *p.*232. & *l.* 8. *p.* 270. & *l.* 9. *p.* 294.

(r) *Qu.* 25. *in Exod.*

(s) *Baron. ad an.*384. *n.* 36.

(t) *Apol. c.* 21.

(u) Κατὰ σπερματικοῦ λόγου μέρος, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς λόγου, ὅ ἐστι Χριστοῦ, γνῶσιν καὶ θεωρίαν. *Apol.* 1. *p.* 45.

(w) *De Idol.l.*7 *c.*4.

Plutarch's Book of the *Defect of Oracles* touching the Demons howling and lamenting the death of the great God *Pan*, that thereby the death of Chriſt was ſignify'd. But if in this Paganical Story (which may relate to ſome cuſtomary Rite of Mourning in the Kingdom of Darkneſs) the death of the great God *Pan* was interpreted to ſignifie, not the death of Chriſt, but *the ſpoiling of one of the Pagans Principalities and Powers* by his death, the Interpretation would be much more regular and Chriſtian-like. For to ſuppoſe, that the Heathens great God *Pan* is Chriſt and the only begotten Son of God, is a Chriſtianizing the Heathen, the height of profaning God and his Son, a confounding God and *Baal*, Chriſt and *Belial*, the Iſraelitical and the Goſpel-Theiſm with the Pagan Theiſm, Nature and Grace, Heathen mundane Nature and the Kingdom of Darkneſs with the Kingdom of God and his Chriſt. The Heathens great God *Pan* may not be thought the true God, much leſs the Logos in the Chriſtian Trinity; for in the beſt Notion of him (as the ſame with the Stoicks Logos or Coſmical *Jupiter*) *Pan* is nothing better than the deifying Soul of the World (animative mundane Nature) one of the Deities and the ſupreme Deity of the Pagans Theopolity. But there is great Reaſon, to think, that *Pan* or the Stoical Logos is the ſame with that celebrated Egyptian Deity *Cneph*, as he was a Popular-pagan Deity (eximiouſly worſhipped amongſt the *Egyptians* eſpecially by the *Thebans*, and whom they accounted the Opificer of the World;) for although in the Egyptians *Acroamatical* Theology (x) *Cneph* is the ſame with the Platonic *Logos*, yet the Popular-pagan *Cneph* could be no other Deity than the Stoical Logos, *the regial Mind and Soul of the World*. He was painted with a Plume upon his Head and in all probability had his Name from כנף *a Wing*, (which was to ſignifie (y) *that he is a Logos* (Reaſon) *not eaſily found out*, *hidden*, *not externally appearing that he is the Origin of Life*, *and a King*, *and is mov'd intellectually*. An uſual Symbol of this Deity was *a winged Serpent with the Head of an Hawk* (which doth not ſpeak him of Affinity with God and his Son;) his hidden Nature ſpeaketh him the ſame Deity (z) that the Egyptians called *Ammon* or *Hammon* (which ſignifieth occult or hidden) which is the ſame Deity with *Bel*, *Moloch*, *Iſis*, *Minerva*, *Serapis*, *Oſiris*, *Bacchus*, *Jupiter*, *Pluto*, *Ceres*, *Venus*, *Diana*, *Cybele*, *Proſerpina* (Hecate) *Juno*, *Bellona*, *Rhamnuſia*, *Janus*, *Apollo*. If therefore the Evangeliſts Logos is the God *Pan*, he was *all in all* amongſt the Pagans, no leſs than the vaſt Rabble of their Deities. So in ſome Athenian Solemnities all things were referr'd to the Honour of *Pan*, *numinis univerſa numina complexi*, a Deity (ſaith *Voſſius*) that compris'd all the Deities. But one of theſe Deities is of ſingular Remark; (*a*) for according to *Phurnutus Pan* and *Jupiter* (the Soul of the World) is *Priapus*, that filthy Deity, whoſe obſcene Symbol (too immodeſt to be nam'd) was deſign'd to repreſent his abundance of Seminal Virtue. And by a like immodeſt Symbol *Mercury* was repreſented; δείκνυσι δὲ καὶ τὸν σπερματικὸν λόγον τὸν διήκοντα διὰ πάντων, *the naſty Symbol was deſign'd to ſignifie and repreſent* (the Stoical Logos) *that ſpermatic Reaſon which pervadeth all things*. In an obſcene Picture at *Samos* (*b*) *Jupiter* was repreſented as having to do with *Juno* in a nameleſs manner; and the meaning of the Picture was (according to *Chryſippus*) *Juno* repreſented and ſignified the matter τοὺς σπερματικοὺς λόγους τοῦ θεοῦ παραδεξάμενα, *receiving the Seminal Reaſons of* Jupiter *the Stoicks God*. This is the venerable Deity (the Pagans obſcene *Jupiter*, *Mercury*, *Priapus*) that the Son of God muſt be, if he is the great God *Pan*, or the Stoicks Logos; and at this rate we abuſe our ſelves and our Saviour by an extravagant and irreligious paganizing the Matters of the Chriſtian Theology. (*c*) *Frater* and *Soror* amongſt the Pagans ſignified in a laſcivious Senſe, whence the Pagans ſuppos'd that they ſo ſignified amongſt the Chriſtians: So amongſt the Pagans *Logos* ſignified τὸν ἐν ὕλῃ λόγον τὸν θεὸν, *the God artificial Reaſon in the Matter*, and by a like miſtake as the Pagans committed, it is ſuppos'd, ſo to ſignifie in Chriſtianity. And (which is marvellous) Chriſtian Divines that have a mighty Zeal againſt Paganizing the true God, yet make no ſcruple of Paganizing the true Son of God. *Origen* often expreſſeth a great Zeal againſt Paganizing the true God, yet touching the Son of God thus he writeth. (*d*) *According to* Celſus *the Logos of the Univerſe is God himſelf: But according to us, he is not God himſelf, but his Son.* So the Platoniſts ſuppos'd, and this was a point of difference between the School of the *Stoicks* and that of *Plato*, who yet were of one Religion and both Orthodox Pagans. And if the Chriſtians do agree with either of them touching the Logos and Son of God, there ought to be no great variance between *Origen* and *Celſus*, Chriſtianity and Paganiſm.

VII. The *Targumic* Logos is a creative Logos; for thus we read in the *Jeruſalem Targum*, Gen. 1. 27. *The word of the Lord created man in his ſimilitude.* Gen. 3. 23. *The word of the Lord ſaid, behold Adam whom I have created one and alone in my world, as I am one and alone in the high heavens.* In the *Targum* of *Jonathan*, Iſa. 45. 12. *I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it.* The Chaldee Paraphraſes or *Targumim* uſually ſpeak in this Stile; inſtead of יהוה and *Elohim* they often ſubſtitute *Memra Domini* (the Word of the Lord) by which Name they have been ſuppos'd, to mean *a divine Perſon, yet a diſtinct Perſon from God, the ſame with the Evangeliſt's Logos* (the Second Perſon in the Trinity and the Meſſias;) *for is it not reaſonable, to think, that the Evangeliſt uſed* ὁ λόγος, (the Word) *in the received Notion of the Jews of his Age?* But this account of the Evangeliſt's Logos is at firſt ſight extremely ſurpriſing and improbable. For ſeeing in all the Hebrew Text of the Old Teſtament there is no appearance of the Evangeliſt's Notion of the *Logos*, it is not imaginable, that the *Targumiſts* ſhould have any notice of it, unleſs (as *Philo*) they deriv'd their notices from the School of *Plato*; and if ſo, their Logos is nothing of kin to the Evangeliſts. But there is no appearance, that the *Targumiſts* were *Platoniſts*; and as for the Jewiſh Church ſhe could not furniſh them with notices of the Evangeliſt's Logos her ſelf being unfurniſh'd by the ancient Scriptures; and if ſhe had known the Exiſtence of this divine perſonal Logos, the Religious Worſhip, not of God only, but of God the Son alſo, muſt neceſſarily have been her Religion in the Old Teſtament-

(x) *Jambl. de Myſt.* p. 158. *Gale not. in loc.*

(y) Ὅτι λόγος δυσεύρετος, καὶ κεκρυμμένος, καὶ οὐ φανός, καὶ ὅτι ζωοποιός, καὶ ὅτι βασιλεύς, καὶ ὅτι νοερῶς κινεῖται. *Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop.* 4. p. 123. *Ed.* 2. *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 3. *c.* 12. *Voſſ. ſupr. l.* 9. *c.* 11.

(z) *Voſſ. ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 2, 3.

(a) *Voſſ. ibid. l.* 2. *c.* 7. & 32. *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 184.

(b) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 4. *p.* 196.

(c) *Annot. in Min. Fel. p.* 82.

(d) Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τῶν πάντων λόγος ἐστι κατὰ μὲν Κέλσον αὐτὸς ὁ θεός· κατὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 247.

ment-times, when there was no Inſtitution of any ſuch Religion, no ſuch Religious Worſhip (the Worſhip of two divine Perſons) was required, no Religious Worſhip of the Son (*e*) could then be duly practis'd, nor was any ſuch Worſhip practis'd by the Jewiſh Church, whoſe Worſhip was the legal Moſaic-religious Worſhip. The common Opinion hath been, that the Chaldee Paraphraſes are the moſt ancient Monuments of Jewiſh Learning, that they were made at firſt for the benefit of the People, who (becauſe of the Babylonian Captivity) better underſtood Chaldee than Hebrew, that two of them (that of *Onkelos* on the Pentateuch and *Jonathan* on the Prophets) were made about our Saviour's time and were read in the Synagogues, whence it became a known thing amongſt the Jews, that *Memra Domini* (the Word of God or the Logos) was a divine Perſon, yet a diſtinct Perſon from God, and that by this divine perſonal Logos all things were made. But how well theſe things were known amongſt the Jews let *Origen* determine. (*f*) *I have had Conteſts with many Jews, and ſuch as were accounted their wiſe Men, yet I never heard of any one of them, who ſuppos'd, that there is a Logos, who is the Son of God.* The Evangeliſt therefore doth not uſe ὁ λόγος, (the Word) in the received Notion of the Jews of his time; Nor doth he uſe it in the Notion of the Chaldee Paraphraſts. For I do and muſt affirm, that *Bilibra Veritatis* hath made it uncontrollably plain and evident, that although the Chaldee Paraphraſts uſe *Memra Domini* (the Word of the Lord) in very various Senſes, yet they never mean by it the Second Perſon of the Trinity, or an Abſtract Scholaſtic Logos, or the Meſſias; whence it is manifeſt, that the *Targumic Logos* is not the Evangeliſt's Logos. The Allegations of *Rittangel* to the contrary are groſs Impertinences.

Uſually the Chaldee Paraphraſts by *Memra Domini* (the Word of the Lord) mean the firſt divine Perſon called יהוה and *Elohim* in the Old Teſtament (which Names they uſually render by *Memra Domini*) according to the received Notion of the Jews, of which denomination theſe Paraphraſts were. So the Learned Hebricians obſerve, (*g*) that מימר *Word* in theſe Paraphraſts is the ſame with נפש *Soul or Perſon*, and that *his Word* is to be interpreted by αὐτὸς, *ipſe, as the Statutes made between his Word and the Children of* Iſrael, are the Statutes made between himſelf and them. (*h*) במימריה *reddi poteſt Dominus per ſeipſum, vel Dominus ipſe.* מימרא Sometimes ſignifieth only *Ego, Tu, Ipſe*, and is apply'd unto Men. *Job* 7. 7. and 27. 3. A League between Me and Thee is in the *Targum A League between my Word and thy Word.* 2 Chron. 16. 3. A Covenant between him and between all the People and between the King is thus rendred in the *Targum, A Covenant between his Word and between all the People and between the Word of the King.* 2 Chron. 23. 16. In the *Targum* it is ſaid of *Jacob* (*i*) דבירא ὁ λόγος, *the Word deſir'd to ſpeak with him.* The Phraſe is obſervable, ſaith *Buxtorf*; for the *Targum* ſaith, *the Word deſir'd to ſpeak with him. In* Bereſ. Rab *it is, God deſir'd to ſpeak with him.* It is a Phraſeology extremely out of the road, to call God *the Word, his Word*, and *the Word of God*: But this is the Chaldaic Paraphraſtical Phraſeology. As the Jews conſider an Intelligent Being or a Perſon as *a Speaker of Words*, inſomuch that *Animal loquens* is their definition of a Man, and a rational Soul is called by *Onkelos, Anima loquens*, Gen. 2. 7. So by theſe Jewiſh Paraphraſts every Perſon is conſider'd as *a perſonal Word*, and this is the *Targumic* Logos. But more eſpecially and eminently the God of the Jews (who was to them that vocal Word, the Word of divine Revelation, which is *the Word* in a ſenſe of Eminence) is conſider'd by theſe *Targumiſts* as *the perſonal Word*, and this divine Perſon is that which is uſually their Logos. We have hitherto conſider'd them as of good Antiquity and Authority: But there are thoſe that Diſcourſe with great Reaſon (*k*) that not one of theſe Chaldee Paraphraſts was made till after the times of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, that there was no need of making Chaldee Paraphraſes about our Saviour's time, that *Joſephus* maketh no mention of them, nor any of the ancient Fathers (not *Origen* or *S. Hierom*) that ſome of the *Targums* make mention of the *Talmud* (which ſheweth, that they were written after it) and that they were at firſt made after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* by the Jews in their diſperſion at *Babylon*, whither many of them reſorted and ſet up their flouriſhing Schools there. For various Reaſons therefore the Chaldee Paraphraſts ſignifie little in giving an account of the Evangeliſts Logos. Yet a conſiderable Conformity there is between the Targumiſts and the Evangeliſts Logos. For as the Targumiſts Logos, ſo our Evangeliſts Logos is conſider'd and repreſented as *a perſonal Word.* Both to the Targumiſts and our Evangeliſts Logos the Name of God and the Creation of all things is attributed. As the Targumiſts Logos, ſo our Evangeliſts Logos is a divine Perſon. (*l*) *Paraphraſtes ſæpiſſimè hoc nomen divinum* יהוה *efferre ſolet per* מימרא דיי *ut Johannes dicit* ὁ λόγος. The Paraphraſt very often uttereth this divine Name *Jehovah* by the Word of the Lord, as S. *John* ſaith *the Word.*

VIII. If the Son of God is not the *Targumic Logos*, he muſt not be thought that *creative Word* (or Logos) to which the Old Teſtament attributeth the Creation, and which is repreſented in the Moſaic Hiſtory as *a vocal Word* (or Speech) of God, that may be called *the Moſaic* Logos. But if we inquire of Expoſitors, where and whence the Evangeliſt had his Name ὁ λόγος? Some of the beſt of them anſwer (*m*) he took it from the Old Teſtament and the Moſaic Hiſtory of the Creation, wherein God is ſaid, to have created all things by his Word. *God ſaid, Let there be Light. By the word of God the heavens were of old.* 2 Pet. 3. 5. So *Pſal.* 33. 6. and 148. 8. *Heb.* 11. 3. whether theſe Expoſitors have made a good Conjecture touching the reaſon of the Name of the Evangeliſts *Logos*, may appear by comparing their reaſon of it with our foregoing account of it. But we muſt further inquire of them, whether thoſe places of the Old Teſtament which affirm, that *God created all things by his Word*, do mean, that he created all things by the Evangeliſts Logos? For ſo we are told, that this Doctrine of the Evangeliſt touching his Logos, that all things were made by him (*n*) *is no new Doctrine, but only an Interpretation of thoſe Scriptures, which told us, God made all things by his Word. For God ſaid, Let there be Light. And ſo, by the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the hoſt of them by the breath of his Mouth.* Pſal. 33. 6.

(e) V. S. Cyr. Com. in Joan. p. 773.

(f) Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ πολλοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ σοφοῖς ἐπαγγελλομένοις εἶναι συμβαλὼν, οὐδενὸς ἀκήκοα ἐπαινοῦντος τὸ, λόγον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. C. Celſ. l. 2. p. 79.

(g) Hotting. Hexaem. p. 52, 54, &c.

(h) Dr. Lightfoot Hor. in Joh. 1. 1.

(i) Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. col. 497.

(k) Hoornbeek c. Jud. Proleg. p. 49. Simon. Hiſt. Crit. l. 3. c. 24.

(l) Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. Col. 125.

(m) Grot. Capell. Camero. Lightfoot.

(n) Bp. Pearſon on the Creed, Art. 2. p. 233.

(o) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 7.

(o) For in this place of the Pſalmiſt the Lord, Word and Spirit, ſignifie ſo many Perſons; which is the received interpretation from the common conſent of all the Greek and Latin Fathers. It muſt be acknowledg'd, that the Fathers with one conſent thus interpret the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament; when thoſe ancient Scriptures ſay, that God created all things by his Word, they interpret them to ſignifie the Evangeliſts Logos: But if the Fathers were not of greater regard in matters of Piety and for ſettling the Rule of Faith than for interpreting the Holy Scriptures (for it is one thing to err from the Rule of Faith, another thing to err in expounding the Scriptures) they would be of no great regard in Theology. By interpreting the Scriptures at their rate it is an eaſie matter, to find the Chriſtian Trinity in the Firſt Chapter of *Geneſis.* For there we read (p) that *God ſaid, Let there be Light, let there be a Firmament* (there is the Father and the Word mention'd) *and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters.* 'Ουκοῦν διαμνημονεύει ϗ μάλα σαφῶς πατρὸς ϗ ὑιȣ̃ ϗ ἁγίȣ πνεύματος; *doth not the Text then make mention and very clearly, of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt?* Such are the Grounds of the Scholaſtic Theology; it is founded upon the Fathers uſual mode of interpreting Scripture, which (in reſpect of the matter in hand) is manifeſtly blind miſtake in five reſpects. For,

(p) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 21, 22, 54. *Athanaſ. c. Arian. Or.* 3. *S. Baſil. adv. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 123. *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 11. *c.* 32.

(1.) They turn the creative Word of the Old Teſtament into a Word of another kind. Their creative Word is λόγος ἐνυπόστατος, *a ſubſtantial and perſonal Word,* Verbum Dominus; whereas the creative Word in the Old Teſtament is only *Verbum Domini,* λόγος ἀνυπόστατος, *an unſubſtantial and imperſonal Word.* It is repreſented as a vocal Word or Speech of God (for the breath of his Mouth literally and properly ſignifieth a vocal Word, λόγον σημαντικὸν, *a ſignifying Word)* the Text of the Pſalmiſt therefore, *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the breath of his mouth,* cannot ſignifie the Evangeliſts Logos. But the beſt Expoſitors do not ſuppoſe, that the World was made by *a vocal Word* of God, but only *Verbo voluntatis & imperii,* by the Word of his Will and Command (q) ψιλῷ τῷ βȣλεσθαι, *meerly by willing.* We will ſuppoſe therefore (according to Expoſitors) that this is the Pſalmiſt's creative Logos, *the meer Will and Command of God;* and it is manifeſt, that he ſpeaketh of no other but this one Logos; therefore he cannot mean, *that the Heavens were made by a commanded Logos.* But,

(q) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 5. *c.* 8. *S.* 2.

(2.) The Fathers have multiply'd this one creative Logos into two creative Logos's: The one *the Word of Command,* the other *the commanded Word.* So *Irenæus* interpreteth the Text of the Pſalmiſt, *Pſal.* 148. 5. *(r) He commanded and they were created, he ſpake and they were made. To whom did he give Command? To his Word, by which the Heavens were compacted, and all the Hoſt of them by the Spirit of his Mouth.* In the ſame manner *Origen,* not only in his other Works, but in ſeveral places of his Book againſt *Celſus* interpreteth the Pſalmiſt. *(s) If God commanded* (ſaith he) *and the Creatures were made, who according to the Mind of the Prophetic Spirit could be able to fulfil ſuch a Command of the Father,* ἢ ὁ ἔμψυχος λόγος ϗ ἀλήθεια τυγχάνων, *but he that is his living Word and the* (Platonic) *Truth? (t) Touching thoſe Commands,* Fiat hoc aut hoc, *we ſay, that the next immediate Opificer of the World is the Son of God the Logos, who is as it were* αὐτȣργὸς τȣ̃ κόσμȣ, *the Maker of the World with his own Hands: But the Father of the Logos* τῷ προστεταχέναι τῷ υἱῷ ἑαυτȣ̃ λόγῳ ποιῆσαι τὸν κόσμον, *becauſe he gave Command to his Son the Logos, to make the World, is the primary Opificer.* The Father is ſuppos'd, to have given thoſe Commands, *Let there be Light, let there be a Firmament:* But the commanded Son or Logos executed them, as *Origen* affirmeth, προσταχθέντα τὸν λόγον πεποιηκέναι πάντα, *the commanded Logos made all things, made all things that the Father commanded him.* (u) So the Alexandrian *Cyril* diſcourſeth (w) and ſo *Euſebius* uſually, who alſo in like manner interpreteth the Pſalmiſt. Τȣ̃το δὲ ὁ ψαλμῳδὸς ᾐνίττετο, *This the Pſalmiſt ſignified* (ſaith he) when diſcourſing of the firſt Cauſe he ſaith, *He ſpake and they were generated, he commanded and they were created.* Ἄντικρυς τὴν τȣ̃ πρώτȣ πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον αἴτιον ὡς ἂν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν, διάταξίν τε ϗ παρακέλευσιν ὑφιστάμενος, *he manifeſtly affirmeth, that there was an Order and Command of the Firſt Cauſe to the Second, as of a Father to a Son.* So *Tertullian* ſpeaking of the Moſaic Creation calleth the Father (x) *eum qui jubet,* Him that commandeth, and the Logos he calleth *eum qui facit,* Him that executeth. At the ſame rate (y) *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem, S. Baſil, Novatianus de Trinitate, Proſper, Marius Victor,* the Author *de Incarnatione* in *S. Auſtin's* Works diſcourſe. *Theophylact* on *Joh.* 1. 3. compareth God making the World to a King commanding his Son to build a City; and *Athanaſius* ſo interpreteth the Pſalmiſts Words (he commanded and they were created) that he will have the Father to have given Command to the Son.

(r) *Ipſe præcepit & creata ſunt, ipſe dixit & facta ſunt. Cui ergo præcepit? Verbo ſcilicet: Per quod, inquit, cœli firmati ſunt, & ſpiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum.* Adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 8.

(s) *L.* 2 *p.* 63.

(t) *L.* 6. *p.* 317.

(u) *C. Jul. l.* 1. *p.* 54.

(w) *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *Pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 13, 14. *Dem. Ev. l.* 5.

(x) *C. Prax. c.* 12.

(y) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *S.* 7.

(3.) They confound the Faith of the Old Teſtament and of the New Teſtament properly ſuch; for to believe the Creation that is by the Logos or Son of God, is the New Teſtament-Faith properly ſuch; but it is made to be the Faith of the Old Teſtament by ſo expounding it, as to teach this Faith, that God created the World by his Son and by commanding his Son to create it. In miſinterpreting the Old Teſtament at this marvellous rate there was no difference between the *Catholicks* and the *Arians,* they agree in it, and they agree alſo in thundring out their Anathema's againſt all that do not ſymbolize with them in their Dogma, which (in part) was founded upon it. *(z) If any one confeſſing one God, doth not confeſs Chriſt to be before all Worlds God and the Son of God, and to have been obſequious to the Father in the Creation of all things, let him be Anathema.*

(z) *Si quis unum dicens Deum, Chriſtum autem Deum, ante ſecula Filium Dei, obſecutum Patri in creatione omnium, non confitetur, Anathema ſit.* S. Hilar. de Synod.

(4.) They expound the Scriptures contrarily to the Evidence of common Sence. For is there any thing more plain and evident, than that the creative Word ſpoken of in the Old Teſtament is only the Imperial Command of God? A modern Author ſaith (a) *there is none that is not perſwaded, that the Word that formed the Heavens and the Breath or Spirit of the Mouth of God are the ſame thing.* But in ſo ſaying he miſtaketh; for his Self-evident Expoſition is contradicted by the general conſent of the Fathers. It ſeemeth very plain and evident, that the voice which *Adam* is ſaid to have heard in the Garden, ſignifieth only a vocal Word: But *Theophylus ad Autolycum* (b) will have it to ſignifie the Son of God, becauſe he is called *Sermo* or *Verbum,*

(a) *Mr. Jurieu Accompliſh. of the Proph. Par.* 2. *p.* 207.

(b) *L.* 2. *p.* 100.

bum. They that ſee not with diſtorted Eyes, can diſcern but one creative Word in the Texts of the Old Teſtament, and cannot but diſcern, that this one creative Word is imperſonal (only a vocal Word or a mental Command of God:) But the generality of the Fathers have introduc'd two creative Words of two different kinds into the Texts of *Moſes* and the Pſalmiſt; and S. *Auſtin* who contradicteth the other Fathers, and acknowledgeth but *one creative Word*, maketh this one creative Word of a quite different kind from that which the Holy Writers of the Old Teſtament mean. For their creative Word is οὐκ ὑφεστὸς, *a non-ſubſiſtent Word*, that muſt have Subſiſtence by the Performance of it (*Fire and Hail, Snow and Vapour, ſtormy Wind fulfilling his Word*, Pſal. 148. 8.) But this Father's ſole creative Word is δύναμις οὐσιώδης ϗ ἐνυπόστατος, *a ſubſtantial and perſonal Power.* (c) *What is this that they ſay, the Son created all things the Father commanding, as if the Father did not create, but only command to be created by the Son? Let them that are carnally wiſe imagine, by what other words the Father commanded his one Only Word.* As the Greek Fathers ſuppoſe, that the Son in a Metaphyſical and Scholaſtic Senſe is (d) *voluntas Patris* (the Will of the Father) which is an Incongruous and Anti-ſcriptural Notion: So S. *Auſtin* hath a like Incongruous and Anti-ſcriptural Notion, that the only command of the Father touching the Creation of all things was the Generation of the Son.

(5.) This is an Inſtance, that they diſtort the plaineſt things in the Bible from an Holy-popular to a School-philoſophic Senſe. For this Father affirmeth, *ipſam juſſionem Patris ut fierent omnia, non eſſe niſi Verbum Patris, per quod facta ſunt omnia.* The Command of the Father for the making all things is only the (perſonal) Word of the Father, by whom all things were made. Agreeably whereunto he interpreteth our Saviour's Saying, *This Commandment have I received of my Father.* (e) *The Word did not receive a Commandment from a Word, but every Commandment is in the only begotten Word of the Father.* But thus to expound our Saviour's Sayings (*He gave me a Commandment what I ſhould ſay; as the Father gave me Commandment, even ſo I do*) is expreſly to contradict the Text. And if there was no word of Command touching the Creation of all things beſides the perſonal Word of God, this inferreth, that at the Moſaic Creation God gave no ſuch Commandment as *Fiat Lux, Fiat Firmamentum, Fiant Luminaria.* Thus the Fathers account of the creative Logos of the Old Teſtament is come to a very fair iſſue, *which is a total deſtroying it.* Doubtleſs, it is high time for us to awake, to relinquiſh theſe ancient Follies, to bethink our ſelves of a better Idea of our Saviour and a better Interpretation of the New Teſtament than the ancient Writers were acquainted with, whoſe miſinterpreting the New Teſtament was a principal Cauſe of their miſinterpreting the Old Teſtament.

IX. The Evangeliſt's creative Logos is by Eccleſiaſtical Writers interpreted *Reaſon*, which may be called *the Logical and Phyſiological Logos*, and muſt be defin'd *that generated demiurgic Reaſon, which Eccleſiaſtic Writers call the Logos* J. Mart. ſaith (f) *God firſt before the Production of any Creatures generated of himſelf* δύναμίν τινα λογικήν, *a certain rational Power, by whom he created and adorn'd all things.* (g) λόγον οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε, *the reaſon of which all Mankind* (and all Rationals) *participated*, whence he is ſtiled (h) τοῦ παντὸς λόγος, *the Logos of the Univerſe* (the mundane Syſtem Logos) and with reſpect to him Reaſon in Man is ſtiled σπερματικὸς λόγος, *the ſeminary Reaſon* (that which is ſown in our Nature) μέρος τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου, *part of the ſpermatic divine Logos.* (i) *Socrates* and *Heraclitus* ϗ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες, *and ſuch as lived according to Reaſon*, are ſaid by this Father, to have been (in ſome Senſe) Chriſtians, Chriſt was ἀπὸ μέρους, ***in part known unto*** Socrates, and he ſuppoſeth alſo, that what S. *John* hath ſaid of the Logos (k) was very well underſtood by the Heathen, and that the Logos is the ſame with their *Minerva*, only he ridiculeth them for making Reaſon a Woman. *Becauſe they knew* (ſaith he) ἐννοηθέντα τὸν θεὸν διὰ λόγου τὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι, ὡς τὴν πρώτην ἔννοιαν ἔφασαν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν· *that God cogitating did make the World by Reaſon* (or Logos) *this as being the firſt intelligence they called Minerva. Athenagoras* undertaketh, to tell the Heathen, what we Chriſtians mean by *the Son of God*, and thus he deſcribeth him. (l) *God was from eternity Rational and had* (λόγον) *Reaſon in himſelf: But becauſe all material things were without quality as alſo the Earth, which were only Subject-matter* (to be impregnated with Form) *and the thicker parts were jumbled with the lighter above them, therefore Reaſon* (λόγος) *came forth, to be unto the Matter* ἰδέα ϗ ἐνέργεια, *Form and Efficiency. The Son of God is* λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ ϗ ἐνεργείᾳ, *the Reaſon of the Father in Idea and Efficiency; for from him and by him all things were made.* Νοῦς ϗ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, *the intelligent Mind and Reaſon of the Father is the Son of God.* By *Tatianus* the Logos is called (m) λόγος ἐκ τῆς λογικῆς δυνάμεως, *Reaſon from the Rational Power of the Father.* And he repreſenteth the Logos (n) *as with and in the Father* διὰ τῆς λογικῆς δυνάμεως, *by a rational Power.* Τοῦτον ἴσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν. *This* (Logos) *we know to be the archical Cauſe of the World. Theophilus ad Autol.* diſtinguiſheth the Logos (as in Logick) into a λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, *internal* and προφορικὸς, *prolatitious.* (o) *The internal Logos God always had within him* (*as being his Intelligent Mind and Prudence and therefore his Counſellor:*) *But when he would put in Execution his Counſel and make the Creatures, he generated this Logos prolatitious.* So *Tertullian* ſaith, that before the Univerſe was conſtituted, he was not alone (p) *for he had with him that which he had in himſelf his Reaſon. For God was Rational, and Reaſon was firſt in him* (before *Sermo* or the Word was produc'd) *and ſo all things were from him. This the Greeks call Logos.* Accordingly he ſuppoſeth, that Logos in our Evangeliſt ſhould rather be rendred *Ratio* than *Sermo*, becauſe Reaſon is elder than Speech: But the matter (as he ſaith) is indifferent; for God having order'd and made a diſpoſal of all things in his Reaſon, *ipſum protulit Sermonem, in quo ineſt hæc ipſa ratio*, produc'd the Word himſelf, wherein this Reaſon is, that all things might be made by him. (q) *Hic eſt virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic ſapientia ejus*, this is the Power of God, this is his Reaſon and Wiſdom, ſaith S. *Cyprian. Clemens* telleth us (r) that *Epicharmus* maketh expreſs mention of the Logos, when he ſaith, ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώπȣς κυβερνᾷ, *Reaſon governeth Men, thereby they preſerve their Life* (by Food) *thereby they find out Arts, and are taught what is uſeful; and this Reaſon of Men* πέφυκ' ἀπὸ τȣ̃ θείȣ λόγȣ, *hath its Origin from the Reaſon of the Gods.* In this Author's Writings generally *the Word* and *Reaſon* are terms ſynonymous, and to live according to the Word (or Logos) and according to Reaſon is the ſame thing. So according to *Origen* (s) the Logos that was in the beginning is the Fountain and Original, whence Reaſon is communicated to all rational Beings; and as the Logos is the Image of the Father, ſo rational Beings as ſuch are εἰκόνες τῆς εἰκόνος, *the Images of this Image.* (t) *The Participation of Chriſt as he is the Logos, cauſeth all Rationals to be rational.* According to his Theology (*u*) he is Αὐτολόγος, *Reaſon it ſelf, and he pervadeth all things, that all things* διὰ λόγȣ γένηται, *may be made by Reaſon.* The Greek Fathers generally prove the Exiſtence of the Son of God from eternity by this Argument (*w*) God was never ἄλογος, *without Reaſon.* The Son is called by *Athanaſius* ἐκ λογικȣ̃ λόγος, *Reaſon from him that is Rational. Paſchaſius* the Deacon calleth him *Reaſon,* and S. *Ambroſe* ſaith, *ipſe Filius ratio dicitur,* the Son himſelf is called Reaſon. *Theodotus Ancyranus* diſcourſing againſt *Neſtorius* ſaith (*x*) *vidiſti* λόγον, *id eſt, rationem, ſupra rationem omnem naſci.* The Logos is interpreted *Reaſon*; and with theſe Ancients the modern Scholaſtic Divines ſymbolize (*y*) for they ſuppoſe, that the Logos hath his Name, becauſe by him Rationals are made ſuch, and that we are made after the Image of the Logos, becauſe we are made Rational. But this Image in Mankind is ſuppos'd, to be greatly obliterated by Brutiſhneſs of Life and Heatheniſm of Religion, whereby they are become rather ἄλογοι, *Irrationals* than *Rationals,* and therefore it was neceſſary, that the Logos (Reaſon) of God ſhould come, to recover and repair them (z) as *Athanaſius* diſcourſeth. So *Jobius* in *Photius* will have the Evangeliſts Logos, to ſignifie Reaſon ſent to repair Mankind, that were become Irrational, and this Logos he calleth πλαστȣργόν, the Former of all things. (*a*) *Some eximiouſly learned Men carp at ſome ancient Writers of the Church as ſpeaking of God the Logos, of the Irrationality of Men and the Participation of the Logos in a Philoſophical way and ſtile, not a Theological.* But it is ill Nature and want of Grace, to ſay of thoſe learned Men, that *they carp at the ancient Writers*; for theſe Ancients are highly culpable as Paganizing the Chriſtian Logos in the firſt place into Reaſon and in the next place into demiurgic Reaſon.

(c) *Quid eſt, quod dicunt, jubente Patre omnia creaſſe Filium, tanquam Pater non creaverit, ſed à Filio creari juſſerit? Cogitent qui carnaliter ſapiunt, quibus aliis verbis juſſerit Pater unico verbo.* S. Aug. ap. Petav. ſupr.

(d) *Ibid. T.* 1. *l.* 5. *c.* 8, 9. *T.* 2. *l.* 8. *c.* 4.

(e) *Verbum non à Verbo accepit mandatum: Sed in Verbo unigenito Patris eſt omne mandatum.* Tract. 47. in Johan.

(f) *P.* 284, & 44.

(g) *P.* 83.

(h) *P.* 45, 51.

(i) *P.* 48, 83.

(k) *P.* 97.

(l) *P.* 10.

(m) *P.* 146.

(n) *P.* 145.

(o) *P.* 88, 102.

(p) *Habebat enim ſecum quam habebat in ſemetipſo, rationem ſuam ſcilicet. Rationalis enim Deus, & ratio in ipſo prius: Et ita ab ipſo omnia. Hanc Græci* λόγον *dicunt.* C. Prax. c. 5, 6.

(q) S. *Cypr. de Idol. van.*

(r) *Str. l.* 5. *p. m.* 441.

(1.) As Paganizing the Chriſtian Logos into Reaſon (Philoſophic-paganizing the Matters of the Chriſtian Theology) not diſtinguiſhing (as they ought) between Nature and Grace, Natural and Evangelical, Holy and Prophane, Phyſiology and Theology, Logical and Theological, the mundane Syſtem and the Kingdom of God, Heathen People (and Philoſophers) and God's People, common Science (which treateth of Reaſon) and the Science of Chriſtian Sanctity which is the knowledge of Chriſt Jeſus. They that are pleas'd with a Godleſs kind of God and a Chriſtleſs kind of Chriſt may find them in theſe ancient Writers Interpretations of the Logos and their Expoſition of the Proem of S. *John*'s Goſpel, which are devoid of Divine Senſe, diſſonant from the Genius of the New Teſtament, and alien from Chriſt (the Deity thereof) who if in reſpect of his Divine Nature he is (definitively) Reaſon, and was chiefly deſign'd, to repair and improve Humane Reaſon, ought to have founded an Academy of Scholars, and not a Church or Commonwealth of Saints. According to this mode of Theologizing (which deſerveth *Caſaubon*'s Cenſure, that it is a toying and trifling in Divine Matters) this is the Senſe of the firſt Verſe of our Evangeliſt, *In the beginning Reaſon was, and Reaſon was with God, and Reaſon was God (b)* and thus a late Paraphraſt hath render'd it. A Paganical kind of Deity is the Divine Logos of theſe Ancients; for ſuch is their Logical and Phyſiological kind of Logos (*c*) as *Origen* will have it. Some of them obſerve (*d*) that Logos (Sermonem ſignificat & Rationem) *ſignifieth both Speech and Reaſon,* and they are willing, that in our Evangeliſt's Text and in the ſame place it ſhould be underſtood in both theſe Notions, which they underſtand no otherwiſe than as the ancient Heathen did (*e*) who made their *Mercury* the Preſident (*utriuſque* λόγȣ, *tum rationis tum orationis*) *of both Logos's of Reaſon and Speech.* But that in our Evangeliſt's Text it cannot ſignifie in their unholy Senſe *Reaſon,* is demonſtrable from that parallel place the firſt Verſe of his firſt Epiſtle, where ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, cannot be rendred *the Reaſon of Life. The Word* is a Religious Name (it denoteth that which is Religion) and it is a Name diſtinctive of the Second Perſon in the Chriſtian Trinity from the other Perſons of the Godhead: But *Reaſon* is no diſtinctive Name of a Perſon in the Chriſtian Godhead, it is only a Name diſtinctive of the Second Perſon in the Godhead of the School of *Plato* and thoſe few Fathers, who Platonize ſo far, as to ſuppoſe God the Father (*f*) κρείσσων ἢ πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις, *tranſcendent to all rational Nature.* In the Platonic Phyſiology and mundane Syſtem the ſecond archical Hypoſtaſis muſt be the firſt Intellect or Reaſon; the Name Reaſon is fit and accommodate for this Platonic Son of God; for meer Intellect or Reaſon is that which conſtituteth and diſtinguiſheth him: But it doth not conſtitute, diſtinguiſh and denominate a Son of God, much leſs the only begotten Son of God. Reaſon is not his proper Eſſence, nor ſpecific Nature or Difference, nor that which is characteriſtical and diſtinctive of him; it is not that which he is of definitive notion or proper kind, nor his proper kind of thing; ὁ λόγος therefore as it ſignifieth Reaſon, cannot be his Name and Character. To ſuppoſe it ſuch, is to make Reaſon his *forma ultima (forma ultima denominat)* which is a commonizing and prophaning him. For meer Reaſon is a vile and common kind of Good and Excellency (on this ſide the Saint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies) and is it likely, that the Evangeliſt ſhould notice and characterize the Son of God by that which is on this ſide a Saint of God, and which is common to wicked Men and Devils? That he ſhould characterize him by that which is not ἰδιότης χαρακτηρίζων, *a characteriſtical property,* and characterize his Divinity by that which is of Kind and Quality but Naturaliſm and Unregeneracy? Some ſay, that λόγος *was a term of Art,* whereby the Gentiles in the Apoſtles days expreſs'd a Divine Perſon, agreeably whereto the Evangeliſt muſt be ſuppos'd to ſpeak; and therefore

---

(s) *T.* 1. *Com. in Joh. p.* 25, 46, 47.

(t) *Periarchon. l.* 1. *c.* 3

(u) *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 258. *l.* 6. *p.* 325.

(w) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 1. *S.* 2. & *c.* 9. & *c.* 11. *S.* 4.

(x) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 19. *S.* 3.

(y) *Idem de Trin. l.* 6 *c.* 5. *S.* 13. *l.* 7. *c.* 12. *S.* 16.

(z) *Idem T.* 4. *l.* 2. *c.* 15. *S.* 4. *Le*

(a) *Veteres quoſdam Eccleſiæ Scriptores cavillantur viri quidam eximiè eruditi, quaſi de Deo* λόγῳ, *hominum* ἀλογίᾳ *& illa* τȣ̃ λόγȣ μετοχῇ *Philoſophico dicendi modo ſtyloque, & non Theologico uterentur.* Montacut. Appar. 1. n. 55.

(b) *M. Le Clerk.*

(c) *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 247.

(d) *Tertull. c. Prax. c.* 5. *Apol. c.* 21. *S. Aug. de* 5. *Hær. c.* 6. *Lactant. l.* 4. *c.* 9.

(e) *Voſſ. de Idol. l.* 2. *c.* 32

(f) *Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 7. *c.* 13.

Orpheus, *Timæus Locrus*, the *Stoicks* and the *Platoniſts* with their *Logos* are with great pomp brought upon the Stage, to interpret the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, although their *Logos* is no better an Interpretation of the Evangeliſt's *Logos* than *Philo Byblius*'s Ἐλιοῦν is of the Hebrews *Gneljôn*, the words are the ſame, but the things are vaſtly diſſonant. The Pagan Theiſts were univerſally Mundane Theiſts, and their *Logos* was the *Logos* of their Mundane Theiſm, which Chriſtians muſt account Exotick and Heterogeneous; for how vaſtly diſſonant is the God-kind of *Logos* from their common Reaſon and Underſtanding.

(2.) As Paganizing the Chriſtian *Logos* into Demiurgic Reaſon. For *Athenagoras* noticeth our Divine *Logos* in the ſame manner that *Anaxagoras* notic'd his Νοῦς or Demiurgic Mind. Πάντα χρήματα ἦν ὁμοῦ· εἶτα Νοῦς ἐλθὼν αὐτὰ διεκόσμησε· *All things were jumbled together; then came Mind and made a regular diſpoſal of them.* *J. Mart.* hath made a medly of two very diſſonant paganical *Logos*'s the *Platonic* and *Stoical*. For ſometimes (g) he confoundeth our *Logos* with the Platonic Demiurgic *Logos*: but his *ſeminary Divine* Reaſon he borroweth from the School of the Stoicks, who call God (their God) σπερματικὸν Λόγον τοῦ κόσμου, *the ſeminary Reaſon of the World.* By *Seneca* he is called *ratio faciens* (Demiurgic Reaſon) which *Stoical* Notion of the Deity (h) *Grotius* hath cited (together with certain counterfeit Sayings of *Orpheus*) to interpret or illuſtrate the Evangeliſt's *Logos*. Multitudes of the like Notices touching a Demiurgic Mind and Reaſon occur in the Heathen Writers, which (ſo far as they are true) are the ſuggeſtions of Natural Reaſon, and are of great regard in meer Theiſm or Natural Religion, but do all the Heathen Naturaliſts Notices of a Demiurgic Reaſon advance any Man one Hair's-breadth towards the knowledge of Chriſt Jeſus? They are Branches of Natural Theiſm, but are they alſo Branches of Goſpel-Theiſm? If Reaſon and a Demiurgic Wiſdom is the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, we muſt comment upon theſe words of his, *All things were made by him*, (v. 3.) as a late Paraphraſt doth. (i) *Theſe things concern not* Cerinthus, *who did not deny, that all things were made by Reaſon: but they are ſpoken, that Chriſtians might underſtand, that to be true which* Philo *and other Jews before him taught touching the Creation of the World by the* Logos. *They are oppos'd to the Doctrine of the* Epicureans, *which was, that all things were made fortuitouſly and without Reaſon.* If it be reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that Chriſt's Evangeliſts write their Goſpels againſt *Epicurus* and *Lucretius* and their fortuitous concourſe of Atoms, then it is reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that Reaſon and Demiurgic Reaſon is our Evangeliſt's *Logos*: but till this marvellous Incongruity appeareth, to be reaſonable and agreeable, we muſt agree with S. *Auſtin*, who upon the firſt Verſe of our Evangeliſt (*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*) thus commenteth. (k) *Hoc autem animalis homo non percipit*, this the Natural Man doth not underſtand. He ſuppoſeth therefore, that our Evangeliſt's *Logos* and his honourary Attributes are matter of ſupernatural Revelation; and not only ſo, but that they are the Chriſtian and Divine Good and Excellency, which the Heathen Naturaliſts (notwithſtanding their Diſcourſes of a Demiurgic Reaſon) do not underſtand. S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith of our Evangeliſt, (l) οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπινον τῶν τούτου, ἀλλὰ θεῖά τε καὶ οὐράνια ἐστι τὰ διδάγματα, *Nothing of this Evangeliſt is Humane, but his Doctrines are Divine and Heavenly.* But if Reaſon and a Demiurgic Reaſon is our Evangeliſt's *Logos*, his Doctrines are not Divine and Heavenly, they are no better than Humane-kind of Documents, and as good Notices of things are in meerly Humane and Heathen Authors, and in every Man's Underſtanding that is not an Atheiſt. Such a *Logos* properly belongeth to the Pagans Mundane Phyſiology.

X. A *ſixth* ſort of (Abſtract) Creative *Logos* is the uſual Scholaſtic *Verbum*, which hath been conſider'd already, and muſt now again come under conſideration, becauſe it pretendeth, to be *the Logos* of our Evangeliſt. *Logos* ſometimes ſignifieth a Notion of the Mind (ἔννοια) which Philoſophers call *Verbum Mentis*, and in this Acceptation the Son of God is ſuppoſed, to be called *Logos*, (m) as being *Proles Mentis* the Iſſue (from Eternity) of the Intelligent Mind of the Father, as in us *Verbum Mentis* (a Notion of the Mind) hath its origin from our Intelligence. If our Mind perfectly comprehendeth it ſelf, our mental Word containeth and expreſſeth our whole Mind, of which it is the Image, and whatever is in it is repreſented in our mental word: ſo the word of God (his *Verbum Mentis*) containeth in it and expreſſeth the whole Father. (n) It is the Image both of the Divine Subſtance and Hypoſtaſis which is the Father, and of all thoſe things, which in any ſort are therein contain'd. And becauſe all created Beings are contained in God as in their Cauſe and Idea, therefore they are all delineated and deſcrib'd in this Divine Mental Word, whereby God created all things as by their Idea and Exemplar. But there is this difference between the Mental Word in God and in us; in us it doth not proceed from our Eſſence and it is non-ſubſiſtent: but the Divine Subſtance (*ipſa eſt intellectio*) *is it ſelf Intellection* (the knowledge of himſelf and of all things) from which Intellection (otherwiſe called *dictio interna*) the Divine Mental Word hath its origin and is the *terminus* of it; whence it is ſaid, to proceed from and be born of, the Eſſence and Subſtance of God. And becauſe this Divine Mental Word is from the very Subſtance of God by true Generation, and that Generation it ſelf is the Subſtance of the Genitor (not an Action ſuperadded to the Subſtance) therefore this Divine Word is eſſential, ſubſtantial, ſubſiſtent, living, intelligent, wiſe, and not different from the producer of it by any property of Eſſence. In this account of their Mental-conceptional *Verbum* the School Divines agree, but not without conſiderable diſagreements amongſt themſelves, and greater diſagreements of their *Verbum* from the Evangeliſt's *Logos*. For,

(1.) They ſay of the *Logos*, (o) *when he is called* Verbum, *he is not compared to External Speech, which is properly* Sermo, *which conſiſteth of ſeveral words: but to the Interiour Notion and Conception, which is called by Philoſophers* Verbum mentis non ſermo, *which is of a ſimple uncompounded nature, not like an Oration, a thing conſiſting of divers parts. The Divine Notion therefore which is moſt ſimple, ought to have much rather the Name of* Verbum *than of* Sermo, *ſeeing by one only word, not by more and repeated words, God the Father ſaid and made all things.* This Mental-conceptional or Notional

(g) *Apol.* 2. *p.* 93.

(h) *Not. in Joh.* 1. 1.

(i) *Hæc nihil ad Cerinthum, qui non negabat à Ratione omnia eſſe facta: ſed dicuntur, ut intelligerent Chriſtiani, verum eſſe quod Philo aliique ante eum Judæi docebant de creatione mundi per* Λόγον. *Oppoſita ſunt doctrinæ Epicureorum, qui ſine ratione & caſu omnia facta eſſe contendebant.* M. le Clerk.

(k) *Tr.* 1. *in Johan.*

(l) *Hom.* 2. *in Johan.*

(m) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 10. *S.* 2. *l.* 5. *c.* 8. *S.* 7. *l.* 6. *c.* 2.

(n) *Ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *S.* 8. & *c.* 2 *S.* 6, 8. *Aquin.* 1. *Qu.* 34. *Art.* 1. & 2.

(o) *Petav. ibid. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *S.* 5.

Word is like a *Vocabulum* or a Word that is but a part of Speech; it is not like an Oration or *Sermo* (a perfect Speech) ſuch as a Propoſition or Diſcourſe. But the Evangeliſt's *Logos* is *Sermo*; therefore he doth not mean by it this Scholaſtick *Verbum*. The word *Logos* (deriv'd from λέγω) uſually and properly ſignifieth *Sermo*, (*p*) the Scholaſtic Divines acknowledge, that it rather ſignifieth *Sermo* than *Verbum*, in all the Latin Fathers it is rendred *Sermo*, agreeably whereto the Syriac rendreth it; *Eraſmus* is of Opinion, that it ought to be ſo rendred, and he is follow'd by *Calvin*, *Beza* and ſeveral others. The Scholaſtic Divines that diſpute for their *Verbum* (*q*) ſometimes render it *Sermo*. And *Chamier* ſaith, (*r*) that λόγος cannot ſignifie *Verbum niſi abuſive*, and that it rather anſwereth to *Sermo* or *Ratio*. The Evangeliſt's λόγος muſt be ſuppos'd to ſignifie *Sermo*, which is nothing like the Scholaſtic *Verbum*.

(2.) A brangling Diſpute there is amongſt the Schoolmen touching the Identity of *intellectio & dictio interna* (Intellection and internal Saying:) but the chief of them affirm, that Cogitation or Intellection which is our Mental-conceptional or Notional Word, (*s*) *locutio ſive dictio nominatur*, *is that which is called ſpeaking or ſaying; for to ſay within our ſelves, is nothing elſe, but to think within our ſelves.* But it is manifeſt, that a Man may think of Blaſphemy or other falſe and fooliſh things without ſpeaking Blaſphemy, Falſhood and Filthineſs. In the Holy Scriptures thoſe that are ſaid, *to ſpeak or ſay within themſelves*, are not thoſe that only form a ſimple Notion or Conception in their Mind, but thoſe that form in their Mind and aſſent to a Propoſition. The Scripture is not acquainted with any *dictio interna* or *Verbum mentis*, which is not a Speech formally or equivalently (an Affirmation, Negation, Command or the like;) the *Verbum mentis* therefore or *dictio interna* of the Schools (which is not like a Speech, but a part of Speech only) is not tolerable Senſe or Language in Theology; nor any where elſe ſave only in the Schools, of ſubtil philoſophizing, where all our Cogitations, Conceptions and Intellections are called λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, *an Internal Speech*. Which yet is not ſo to be underſtood, as if we were ſuppoſed to ſay all the falſe and fooliſh things that come into our Mind: but we are ſuppoſed *internally to ſpeak of them*, which is that which Philoſophy meaneth by λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, *Internal Speech*. If our Mind therefore thinketh of it ſelf, or if God is the Object of his own Cogitation, the Schools, if they will ſpeak truly and properly, (*t*) ought not to ſay *dicit ſeipſum*, but *dicit de ſeipſo*. And if they would ſpeak thus truly and properly the production of an infinite perſon by their *dictio interna* would appear to themſelves, to be a very vain and fond Imagination. Beſides, their Senſe and Language is altogether alien from the Scripture, and therefore cannot be the Senſe of it touching our Divine Logos.

(3.) The generality of the School-Divines affirm, that their Notional *Verbum* is a *Verbum* properly ſuch, as proper is oppos'd to tropical: but *Chamier* (who in the main is a Scholaſtic Divine) diſputeth and proveth, (*u*) that this Scholaſtic *Verbum* is but a Metaphorical *Verbum*, and ſome of the Pontifician Divines (*Salmero* and *Lucas Brugenſis*) are of his Opinion. And the thing is plain and manifeſt from the Phraſeology of the School-Divines. For they ſay of their Notional *Verbum*, (*w*) *habitudinem habet ad dicentem* (it importeth a relation to a Speaker;) the Cogitation which this *Verbum* is, *locutio ſive dictio nominatur* (is called Speaking or Saying) *dicere in patre eſt Verbum proferre* (ſaying in the Father is a producing the *Verbum*) all which Phraſeology is plainly Metaphorical. But therefore the Evangeliſt's *Verbum* cannot be the Scholaſtic *Verbum*; for his *Verbum* is the *Word of Life and Salvation*, and *the Word of God* in the ſenſe of the New Teſtament, which cannot be ſuppos'd, to be a meer Metaphorical *Verbum*. Nor may we ſuppoſe *his being conceived*, *begotten and born*, to be only improper and metaphorical, and himſelf, to be only *an improper and metaphorical Child and Son of God*. Yet ſuch he is according to this Scholaſtic Theology, which ſuppoſeth his *Conception* to be only Notional; his being *begotten* and *born* to be only *Mental-conceptional* (which it impudently calleth *true Generation*;) and his being a *Child* or *Son* to be only *a Child of the Mind* (a Thought or Notion) as is before diſcours'd. If we ſtile our Saviour *Verbum mentis* as expreſſive of the Mind of his Father in an Holy-popular Senſe, this is his true Character. But to ſtile him *Verbum mentis* in the Senſe of Schoolmen and Metaphyſicians, is deſtructive to the truth and propriety of his Generation and Sonſhip, as is viſible in S. *Auſtin's* Phraſeology, which is manifeſtly Metaphorical. (*x*) *Dicere & eructare idem eſſe ait ac generare. Quid eſt dico? Verbum profero.* Yet in this Theology it is a maxim, (*y*) *eo ipſo Filius quòd Verbum*, he is therefore a Son or Child becauſe he is a Notional *Verbum*, a Child of the Mind and born of it. But who ſeeth not, that in this Appellation of *Verbum* (in the Scholaſtic Senſe) there is a double impropriety? For a Notion of the Mind is but improperly *Verbum*, and is much more improperly *Filius*. Scholaſtic Divines therefore are ill obſervers of their own Rule, which is to follow the proper ſignification of words; for they have ſlighted our Evangeliſt's proper Appellation, which is *Verbum vitæ*, the vital Word, and ſubſtituted an hugely improper Appellation of their own, which is *Verbum mentis*, the mental Word.

(4.) The Proceſſion of the Divine *Verbum* is by and from Intellect (and the Proceſſion of the Holy Spirit is from the Divine Will) as the Appellation of *Verbum mentis* ſignifieth. But againſt this receiv'd Doctrine of the Schools *Durandus* argueth, (*z*) that the Creatures have not a generative fecundity by or from Intellect, but antecedently thereto by their (Vital) Nature; therefore it is ſo in God. This Argument will appear, to have great ſtrength in it, if we conſider, that Generation is a propagation of the Species, and conſequently of the Vital Nature conſtitutive of every Species. In Men and other Animals Generation is the production of the Animal-vital Nature; therefore Generation *in divinis* is definitively the Communication of the Divine Vital Nature, and conſequently the proximate Principle of it is not Intellect. As none but unholy Scholaſticks can believe, (*a*) that the Divine Nature and Eſſence is conſtituted by Intellection (which is common to Wicked Men and Devils:) ſo one would hope, it ſhould be peculiar to Men of that Character, to believe, that not Grace, (Life and Nature Divine) in us, but Notion (empty and unholy Notion) anſwereth to the Son of God, and is of like original, being alike the Operation of Intellect. Another Argument *Durandus* urgeth; *The condition of Intellect is oppoſite to Fecundity*, (Theory is barren, there is no productive cauſality

---

(p) *Ibid. S.* 4.

(q) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 10 *S.* 6. *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *Diſp.* 9. *p.* 546.

(r) *Panſtrat. T.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 7.

(s) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 6. *c.* 2. *S.* 2.

(t) *V. Vaſqu. in* 1. *Thom. T.* 2. *Diſp.* 141.

(u) *Ubi ſupr. c.* 7, 8.

(w) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 3. *c.* 10. *S.* 6. *l.* 6. *c.* 2. *S.* 5, 7.

(x) *Ibid. l.* 7. *c.* 14. *S.* 6.

(y) *Ibid. S.* 3. & *in Addend. p.* 875.

(z) 1. *Diſt.* 6. *Qu.* 2.

(a) *Gonet. Cyp. T.* 1. *Diſp.* 2. *p.* 225.

lity in ſpeculative Intellect ſave only of Notion;) *therefore it cannot be the principle of an Act, which is the production of a Divine Perſon.* If a Divine Perſon might be produc'd by a meer Act of ſpeculative Intellection, a like Act might produce the whole Creation without any ſuch Divine Volitions, as *Fiat Lux, Fiat Firmamentum.* But this is not all that *Durandus* hath to ſay againſt the Doctrine of the Schools; for he argueth, that Intellection, one and the ſame Intellection is in all the three Divine Perſons; if therefore the Intellection of the Father is the Scholaſtic *Verbum*, or is productive thereof, the Intellection of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt alſo muſt be ſo. By the Eſſential Intellection in God (called *Logos* (*b*) by *Irenæus*) no Scholaſtic *Verbum* is produc'd; therefore no ſuch *Verbum* is produc'd by the Perſonal Intellection. This ſound Argument gravell'd the Monk *Jobius* (*c*) as *Photius* obſerveth: but the Schoolmen (that will not ſeem to be baffled) pretend to anſwer it. One anſwereth, (*d*) *that the* Verbum *is not produc'd by every Intellection, but by that only which hath the reſpect of Production:* but it is very plain, that there is no ſuch Intellection, as there is no ſuch Speculation, which hath the reſpect of Production. Another anſwereth, (*e*) *that it is intellection modify'd with the relation of Paternity which produceth the* Verbum; as if the relation of Paternity was not poſteriour to Generation, which is the Foundation of it. Another Scholaſtic Divine anſwereth, (*f*) that the Intellection *productive of the* Verbum, *is that which expreſſeth the ſimilitude of him that is underſtood* (which all Intellection doth;) *or it is Intellection endow'd with a certain Fecundity*; and he might as well talk of barren Theory endow'd with a certain Fecundity. A *fourth* Schoolman anſwereth from *Aquinas*, (*g*) *that we muſt diſtinguiſh between* (intellectionem & dictionem) *Intellection common to all the Perſons and Saying proper to the Father.* Which Anſwer deſerveth *Chamier*'s cenſure, (*h*) *immanis βαττολογία eſt, propter terminorum identitatem*; it is an huge nugacity becauſe of the identity of the terms, which differ in ſound, but in ſenſe are the ſame. So a principal Schoolman determineth, that (*i*) *intellectio, dictio interna, verbum mentis*, are in us the very ſame, and there is no reaſon, why they ſhould be diſtinguiſh'd in God, as *Chamier* rightly affirmeth.

(5.) The principal Maxims of the Schoolmen touching their *Verbum mentis* are diſlik'd by ſeveral Scholaſtic Divines, and their Argumentations are cenſur'd as of no validity. *Zanchy* ſaith, (*k*) *What the Schoolmen write touching God the Father, that by ſeeing and conſidering himſelf he generated the* Logos, *and that the emanation of the Son from the Father is according to the emanation of Intellect, and other things of that nature, which have no teſtimony from the Word of God, but are only excogitated by Humane Subtilty, theſe, if they be Aſſertions, are to be rejected by us as temerarious and vain, to ſay no worſe. For who knoweth, how the Father generated the Son, whether by way of Intellect, or by way of Love, or ſome other way?* The Schoolmen know not, that the Proceſſion of the Son is from Intellect, and Self-cogitation, nor that he proceedeth from the cognition of all the Divine Perſons and of all poſſible Creatures, nor how all created Beings are in God, nor that they are deſcrib'd and delineated in the Divine *Logos*; they know not any thing of theſe Metaphyſical Matters, of which they talk with the greateſt confidence. And they are as good at deducing Conſequences as the Hebrew Doctors (that can infer *quidlibet ex quolibet*) for there is no Conſequence in theſe Scholaſtic Argumentations. *The Intellection of God is his Eſſence and Subſtance; therefore a* Verbum mentis *is produc'd by it, that hath the Divine Eſſence, Nature and Subſtance. The Intellection of God the Father is the Eſſence and Subſtance of God; therefore his* Verbum mentis *muſt be a Subſiſtent, Subſtantial, and Divine Perſon diſtinct from God the Father.* An ordinary Underſtanding would rather make this Inference. If the Intellection of God the Father is the Eſſence and Subſtance of God, his *Verbum mentis* cannot be any thing diſtinct from God the Father; at leaſt not any thing more diſtinct than the *Verbum mentis* of a Man or Angel is diſtinct from the Intellectualiſt. Accordingly *Vaſquez* ſaith, (*l*) *before the Myſtery of the Trinity was reveal'd, one might grant, that there is Intellection in God,* (ſed eam eſſe ipſammet eſſentiam Dei, non autem productionem alicujus Verbi) *but that this Intellection is the very Eſſence of God, not the Production of any Perſonal* Verbum. The Intellection of God and his Mental-conceptional *Verbum* are abſolutely the ſame, and if both are the ſame with the Eſſence and Subſtance of God, there cannot be in God the production of a diſtinct perſonal *Verbum* by Intellection; and conſequently there is no ſuch thing as the Scholaſtic *Logos.* The Intellection of God the Father being the ſame with his Eſſence and Subſtance is not producible; therefore his *Verbum mentis* is not producible, and conſequently it is not the Evangeliſt's *Logos.*

(6.) The *Logos* of the School-Divines as it is *unpopular* is *toto genere* diſſonant from the Evangeliſt's *Logos.* If we ſuppoſe, that his *Logos* is the ſame with theirs, we muſt ſuppoſe him a School-philoſophic Writer, that he uſeth the Name *Logos* in a School-philoſophic Senſe, and that he writeth his Evangely only for the uſe and benefit of a few, namely, the School-philoſophic Men, who call their *Logos* or *Verbum*, (*m*) *divina notio* (the Divine Notion) *and they reſemble it to that Interiour Notion of the Mind of Man* (quæ à philoſophis verbum mentis nominatur) *which is called by Philoſophers The Word of the Mind.* (*n*) *As* Verbum *ſignifieth the Exteriour Word, ſo it is underſtood by all, that underſtand and ſpeak the Latin Tongue:* (At de interiori pauci tantum, nempe philoſophi) *but they are few, namely Philoſophers only, that underſtand it of the Interiour Word, or* Verbum mentis. The Evangeliſt's *Logos* therefore by the School-Divines is interpreted, (*o*) *de obſcuris paucorum Scholaſticorum cogitationibus*, of the obſcure Cogitations of a few Scholaſticks. But our Evangeliſt (*p*) *was a poor Fiſherman, not converſant in what the World calleth Learning, either before or after he convers'd with Chriſt; no Rhetorician, no Sophiſt, no Philoſopher, but unacquainted with the Secular Wiſdom.* And he wrote his Evangely for the common Edification of the Faithful and the common Salvation of all Men. *Beza* therefore thinketh it not at all probable, that the Evangeliſt by his *Logos* meant the Scholaſtic *Verbum.* (*q*) *Mihi non fit veriſimile, tam ſubtiliter illum voluiſſe hoc loco diſſerere.* Another ſaith, (*r*) *This Interpretation hath too much Subtilty in it, to be agreeable to the Simplicity of Evangelical Doctrine.* (*s*) *Chriſt is called ὁ λόγος, not in reſpect of any ſuch Scholaſtical Senſe* (ſaith another) *but becauſe he doth reveal and make known the Will of God to us.* Scholaſtic Divines ſee reaſon, to diſcard the Scholaſtic *Verbum*, and there is the ſame reaſon, to diſcard the Platonic *Logos.*

(*b*) L. 2. c. 48.

(*c*) Col. 631.

(*d*) Vaſqu. ſupr. Diſp. 112. c. 4.

(*e*) Gonet. ſupr. T. 5. Diſp. 2. p. 54.

(*f*) Petav. ſupr. l. 6. c. 4. S. 6. l. 3. c. 10. S. 2.

(*g*) Valentia T. 1. Diſp. 2. Qu. 1. punct. 3.

(*h*) Supr. c. 8.

(*i*) Vaſqu. ſupr. Diſp. 112. c. 4. & Diſp. 141. c. 4.

(*k*) De 3. Elohim par. 1. l. 5. c. 8.

(*l*) Supr. Diſp. 112. c. 4.

(*m*) Petav. ſupr. l. 6. c. 1. S. 5.

(*n*) Chamier. Panſtrat. T. 2. l. 1. c. 8.

(*o*) Ibid. c. 7.

(*p*) S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 2. in Johan.

(*q*) Annot. in Joh. 1. 1

(*r*) Gomarus.

(*s*) Burgeſs vindic. Leg. Lect. 8. p. 80. ed. 1.

(7.) The Scholaſtic *Verbum* and the Platonic *Logos* are of great affinity, for both are expreſſive and alſo factive of the Univerſe. Whence the Scholaſtic Divines ſay of God, (t) *God did firſt ſay as it were in himſelf the Univerſe of Creatures, before he made it according to and by that ſame word or locution of his. S.* Auſtin *calleth the Word of God a certain Art of the omnipotent and wiſe God full of all Reaſons living and incommutable.* So the Platonic *Logos* is (u) *omniformis formarum omnium ratio, an Univerſe of all Reaſons, abſtract* (living) *Forms and Species.* Agreeably to what the Platoniſts ſay of their *Logos* the Scholaſtic Divines ſay of their *Verbum* (w) *Eſt Idea quam & λόγον, id eſt, rationem, ſive deſcriptionem futuri operis appellant veteres.* It is the Idea, which the Ancients alſo call *Logos*, that is, the reaſon or deſcription of the future Creation-work. *It is the Art and Idea of the ſupreme Artificer.* The Ideas both in the Platonic *Logos* and the Scholaſtic *Verbum* are called (x) *δημιουργικοὶ λόγοι, demiurgic Reaſons*, (y) both of them are alike accommodate for Speculation (for according to S. *Auſtin* the Angels ſpeculate all things *in Verbo*;) and ſo great is the affinity between theſe two *Logos's*, that ſome of the principal Scholaſtic Divines (z) are willing, that they ſhould be accounted the very ſame, if the Arianiſm which the Platonic Triad involveth, be taken away. This great affinity between them inferreth, that if the one of theſe *Logos's* is ſpurious and illegitimate, the other cannot be true and genuine.

(t) *Priùs in ſe quaſi dixiſſe cunctam creaturam, quàm eam ſecundum eandem & per eandem ſuam locutionem conderet.* Anſelm. ap. Petav. T. 1. l. 4. c. 11. *S. Auguſtinus Verbum Dei artem quandam vocat omnipotentis atque ſapientis Dei, plenam omnium rationum viventium incommutabilium.* Ibid.

(u) *Ficin. in Plotin. p.* 46.

(w) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 3. *S.* 9. *l.* 3. *c.* 6. *S.* 11.

(x) *Idem T.* 1. *l.* 4. *c.* 11.

(y) *Ibid. c.* 2.

(z) *Ibid. c.* 9.

(8.) The Scholaſtic *Logos* as unholy (a common and unholy kind of thing) is *toto genere* diſſonant from the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, (a) *Cur hoc ſanctum venerandumque ſecretum ad profanos actus adulterata profeſſione transfertis?* Why is it, that you transfer this holy and venerable Secret to common and profane Acts (of Mental Notion and Intellection) by your illegitimate profeſſion of Scholaſticiſm? For a bare word is not that which holy People call *The Word*, nor the Evangeliſt's *Word*, which belongeth not to common Learning. As the Idea of God, ſo the Idea of the Son or *Logos* of God cannot belong to the common Learning of Metaphyſicks, which treateth of *Entity*, but not of *Sanctity*, and is not genuine *Theology*, but *Ontology*. Agreeably whereto the ancient Scholaſtic Divines of the Church have ſtiled their Metaphyſical *Logos* or Son of God, (b) τὸ ὄντως ὄντα, τὸ πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσι τοῦ εἶναι παρεκτικόν, *He that truly is, that giveth Being to all Beings.* In their Diſpute againſt the *Arians* they maintained, that the primigenial τὸ ὂν did belong to the Son, and were careful to load him with ſuch Metaphyſical Attributes as theſe; (c) ἐξ ὑποστάσεως ὑπόστατος, καὶ ἐξ οὐσίας οὐσιώδης καὶ ἐνούσιος, καὶ ἐξ ὄντος ὤν. *He is ſubſiſtent from Subſiſtence, from Subſtance ſubſtantial and eſſential, and* (ex Ente Ens) *Being from Being.* It is poſſible, to make a tolerable good ſenſe of theſe Attributes, but they are not agreeable Notices of the Son of God, nor ſavour of the Chriſtian Theology, they are alien from his kind of Attributes, and they miſrepreſent him as a Platonic and Metaphyſical kind of *Logos*.

(a) *Jul. Firmic. de error. p.* 40.

(b) *S. Baſil. c. Eunom. l.* 2. *p.* 56. *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 265.

(c) *S. Athanaſ. c. Arian. or.* 5. *p.* 303. *Com.*

(9.) The Evangeliſt's *Logos* is of the ſame nature with other honourary Names and Attributes of our Saviour, which ought to be underſtood in an Holy-popular and Evangelical ſenſe, but in the Scholaſtic Theology are diſtorted to an Unchriſtian and School-philoſophic ſenſe. For ſo this Theology proveth, (d) that the Son was generated antecedently to any Will of God (before God did will any thing) *becauſe the Son is the Wiſdom of God, and Wiſdom is before Will.* The Apoſtle calleth Chriſt *The Power of God and the Wiſdom of God* becauſe of the illuſtrious exerciſe of thoſe Divine Attributes in the Evangelical Oeconomy, 1 *Cor.* 1. 24. But this Theology underſtandeth theſe Attributes in a School-philoſophic ſenſe (as we have ſeen before) and ſuppoſeth them to be meant of the Scholaſtic *Verbum, as he is the Idea and the Art of the ſupreme Artificer.* (e) *Omnia in ſapientia Pater facit: id eſt, omnia per filium fecit, qui eſt virtus Dei & ſapientia.* The Father maketh all things in Wiſdom (ſaith S. *Ambroſe*:) *that is, he made all things by the Son, who is the Power and Wiſdom of God.* So he is ſtiled by the *Alexandrian Cyril*, (f) ἐνέργεια δημιουργική, δύναμις ἐνεργητική, *the demiurgic Energy and Efficiency, the energetic force of the Father, whereby he was and is and ever will be operative and energetic to make all things.* So S. *Auſtin* ſtileth God, (g) *Pater verbi & ſapientiæ ſuæ, Pater virtutis ſuæ, per quam cuncta formavit.* The Father of the Word and of his (demiurgic) Wiſdom, the Father of his Power by which he formed all things. (h) *If Chriſt is the Wiſdom of God, and the Pſalmiſt ſaith, thou haſt made all things in Wiſdom; as all things were made by him, ſo they were made in him* (ſecundum artem continet omnia antequam fabricet) *he containeth all things according to art, before he maketh all things.* Wiſdom is ſuppos'd to ſignifie that demiurgic Idea, Art and Reaſon, which the Scholaſtic *Verbum* is. But how much more Chriſtianly and Evangelically doth S. *Ambroſe* interpret our Saviour's Attribute of *Wiſdom*, when he ſaith of him, (i) *ſapientia appellatur, quia de corde Patris adveniens arcana cœleſtia credentibus reſeravit.* He is called Wiſdom, becauſe coming out of the Boſom of the Father he revealed the Heavenly Secrets to Believers. Such ſtrictures of very valuable truth there are in the Scholaſtic Theology, which yet in great part is nothing better than a diſtortion of the Holy Scriptures to an Unchriſtian School-philoſophy. For if Chriſt is called *The Life*, this Theology interpreteth it to ſignifie, *that the Ideas of all things* (in Verbo vita ſunt) *are Life in the Scholaſtic* Verbum. If Chriſt is intituled *The Counſel and Will of the Father*, in this Theology it meaneth, that he is (l) ἐνούσιος βούλησις, *the ſubſtantive Will of the Father.* (m) The Father muſt not be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak unto or command the Son, for ſo there would be two Words in the Godhead; and it would be a Sacrilegious Opinion, to ſuppoſe, that the Father by a Temporal Word ſendeth the Eternal Son. The Scripture therefore in this Theology is thus interpreted. *Loqui vel mandare aliquid Filio, eſt ipſum verbum producere.* To ſpeak or command any thing to the Son, is to produce the Scholaſtic *Verbum.* (n) *Becauſe all the Creation-works are delineated and deſcrib'd in the* Verbum, *therefore the Apoſtle ſaith*, Col. 1. 16. Omnia in ipſo creata ſunt, *all things were created in him.* A Theology that at this rate diſtorteth the Scriptures and the Names of our Saviour to Unchriſtian School-philoſophic Notions, muſt in all reaſon be ſuppos'd, ſo to pervert the Evangeliſt's *Logos.* And conſequently the Evangeliſt's *Logos*, as it is not *The Platonic*, nor the *Stoical*, nor the *Targumick*, nor the *Moſaic*, nor the *Logical Logos*, ſo neither is it the *uſual Scholaſtic Logos.* None of theſe

(d) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 8. *S.* 6.

(e) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 6.

(f) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 8.

(g) *Idem T.* 1. *l.* 5. *c.* 9.

(h) *Idem de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(i) *Ibid. l.* 5. *c.* 9.

(k) *Gonet. Clyp. T.* 5. *p.* 540.

(l) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 5. *c.* 8.

(m) *Idem de Trin. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *S.* 3, 5.

(n) *Ibid. s.* 8.

Abſtract Logos's is the Logos of our Evangeliſt.

XI. There can be no Son of God in the Senſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament, which is not a Saint of God. The Evangeliſt's Logos is ſuch a Saint of God-kind of Son, and *the Son of God* in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament. *Joh.* 1. 18. But not any of thoſe multifarious Abſtract Logos's (*Platonic, Stoical, Targumic, Logical, Phyſiological, or uſual Scholaſtical*) is of this his eſſential Character; therefore not one of them is the Logos of our Evangeliſt. Nor is there any Abſtract Logos any where to be found, that is not like thoſe, which we have enumerated and conſider'd, and of which we may not affirm, that it may be clearly prov'd, not to be our Evangeliſt's Logos. He is thought to be ſignify'd in ſome few obſcure places of the Books called the *Aprocrypha:* But there is no probability of finding him there. For it is not likely, that the Deity of the New Teſtament (peculiarly ſuch) is to be found in thoſe Books, that underſtand and notice nothing of the Matters of the New Teſtament, nor ſay any thing of *the Meſſias*, which was in all times a great Article of the Jews Religion, and is in great part the Subject-matter of the Old Teſtament. If theſe Books did deſignedly notice the Son of God, they would deſignedly notice the Meſſias: but of him they have no notices. Nor is it likely, that they notice an Abſtract *Logos* the Son of God, ſeeing there is no ſuch notic'd Son of God, to be found in the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, whence theſe Apocryphal Books derive their notices. And agreeably whereto the Book of *Wiſdom* muſt be interpreted, *Ch.* 18. 15, 16. *Thine almighty word leapt down from heaven, out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of war into the midſt of a land of deſtruction, and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a ſharp ſword, and ſtanding up filled all things with death, and it touched the Heaven, but it ſtood upon the Earth.* For it is viſible, that this Story and Idea of a mighty Fierce, Military and deſtroying Executioner is altogether oppoſite to the Character of our Evangeliſt's Logos; and that this Apocryphal Paſſage is nothing elſe but the Story of the deſtroying Angel in *Egypt* amplified and magnificently deſcrib'd. For in the coming forth of that Angel conſider'd in complication with God's Almighty Imperial Word of Command, *his almighty word leapt down from heaven, out of his royal throne, and his commandment was brought as by a fierce man of war.* The Son of *Sirach* ſaith, *Ch.* 51. 10. *I called upon the Lord, the Father of my Lord.* But in this Author (*o*) Father is the Name of a Governour. *The Father of my Lord is the Governour of my Lord.* And he ſpeaketh *of my Lord the King*, from whom he was in danger of his Life, *V.* 6. The Book of *Baruch* ſaith, *Ch.* 3. 36, 37. *This is our God, he hath found out all the way of knowledge, and hath given it unto Jacob his ſervant and to Iſrael his beloved. Afterward did he ſhew himſelf upon earth, and convers'd with men.* In which words there is no appearance of an incarnate Logos, nor of any Logos or Son of God, nor of any converſe with Men in Humane Fleſh. The Author manifeſtly ſpeaketh of the God of *Iſrael*, the God of their Law and their σέβασμα, (whom they ſerved with their Religious Worſhip) who having ſettled Religion in the Territory of *Jacob*, afterward *ſhewed himſelf upon Earth* (exhibited a viſible appearance of himſelf, which is the *Schecinah*) *and converſed with Men* by his Oracles and otherwiſe as a God with his People. This ſeemeth to be the ſenſe of this *Apocryphal* Text.

XII. The *Logos* is but one of the Names, whereby our Evangeliſt noticeth the Perſon of whom he writeth; there are other honourary Names and Attributes, whereby he noticeth, deſcribeth, and ennobleth him; for in the Proem of his Goſpel he conjoineth *the Logos* and *the Life*. And if we can ſhew, that Life in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament is only to be found in the Chriſtian Religion, and in the Founder thereof as ſuch; and that it is the peculiarity of his Human-divine Perſon, to be and to be intituled *the Life* in the ſenſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament; this will ſufficiently fix and determine the Evangeliſt's Senſe, and we ſhall know his Logos by the Life that he ſpeaketh of, *Joh.* 1. 4. *In him was life, and the life was the light of men.* Becauſe in him Life was (*p*) the benefit of life unto us; therefore the Evangeliſt denominateth him *the Life*, as our Saviour denominateth himſelf *Joh.* 11. 25. and 14. 6. And ſo the Evangeliſt denominateth him in a parallel place, *The life was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it.* 1 Joh. 1. 2. Life may be conſider'd *in genere Entis & in genere Boni*, and may ſignifie only in a ſenſe of Being (an indifferent ſenſe) and it may ſignifie in a ſenſe of Well-being. For every Subſtance in ſome ſort actively Vital hath ſome ſort of Life or Vitality in it; and they that live in Sin and Miſery to extremity, although their Life is a deadly kind of living, yet in ſome ſenſe are alive. And the Jews ſay (*q*) *Res cujus nomen eſt homo, eſt res compoſita ex vita & ratione.* But Life uſually ſignifieth (in a ſenſe of Well-being) the good and benefit of Life (Life is in its Nature a good (*r*) ſaith *Ariſtotle*) and if any live in extremity of Pain and Miſery, this is counted ἀληθῶς οὐ βίος, ἀλλὰ ξυμφορά, *not to be truly Life, but Calamity*, as *Euripides* ſpeaketh of this mortal Life, which yet hath ſomething of the good and benefit of Life in it, and our Saviour reputeth it a valuable good. *Matth.* 6. 25. Accordingly, Life ſignifieth, that which hath the value of Life, and ſuch a Life which is not to be valued as the good of Life, is called βίος ἄβιος, *a life-leſs Life* (no living Life) which is the ſenſe of thoſe common Sayings, *Non eſt vita vivere, ſed valere. Vita in exilio vitalis non eſt. Nec voluptas ſine vita, nec vita ſine voluptate.* Life is valuable, as it is more or leſs a Life of felicitative Enjoyment, which is an uſual ſignification of Life; (*s*) for the Scripture calleth our formal Felicity *vitam quandam noſtram*, and all Men ſpeak of Life and living with reſpect to felicitative Enjoyment. As the Phraſe of the jolly Heathen in their Revels was, *Amici, dum vivimus, vivamus* (by ſuch Monitions they excited one another to their *Vita* ἀπολαυστικὴ, Life of ſenſual Enjoyments;) the Jews Salutation to Kings was, O *King live* (in Felicity and Proſperity) *for ever*; and when they uſe this Phraſe in drinking one to another לחיים *to your Life*, they include Welfare and Proſperity in the ſignification of Life. So do the Holy Writers, 2 *Pet.* 3. 8 *He that will love life and ſee good days.* 1 Theſſ. 3. 8. *Now we live* (as to living comfortably) *if ye ſtand faſt in the Lord.* Becauſe of the manifold troubles of this Life a Poet ſaith (*t*) *It is but a little part of our life that we live*,

---

(o) *Ch.* 23. 1, 4.

(p) *Maldonat. in loc.*

(q) *Hotting. Diſſ. de nom. Dei p.* 313.

(r) *Eth. Nicom. l.* 9. *c.* 9.

(s) *Valentia T.* 2. *p.* 41. *vid. Grot. Not. in Gal.* 3. 12.

(t) *Exigua pars eſt vitæ quam nos vivimus. Cæterum omne ſpatium non vita, ſed tempus eſt.* Gat. Not. in Ant. p. 180.

the whole ſpace of it is not life but time only. As Life may be no Life, ſo (if the good and comfort of Life be wanting, and Men live in extreme ignominy and miſery) it may be worſe than none; as in thoſe days when *Men ſeek Death and cannot find it.* Apoc. 9. 6. The Name of Life therefore is duly appropriated to a Life (more or leſs) felicitative; and Life being the oppoſite to Death, it importeth a freedom from Death (more or leſs) and all that Death importeth. Which may be conſider'd as it importeth the *criminal* kind of Evils; but more eſpecially and eminently it importeth the *penal* kind of Evils, and in this ſenſe Life and Death are oppos'd. *Deut.* 30. 15. *I have ſet before thee life and good, and death and evil.* Prov. 12. 28. *In the way of righteouſneſs is life, and in the path-way thereof there is no death.* As Life and Death are oppoſites, ſo the ineſtimable value and concern of the benefit of Life will beſt appear, if it be conſider'd in complication with its oppoſite Death, agreeably to the Phraſe of Scripture, wherein the benefit of Life is thus uſually expreſs'd, *that we may live and not die. Gen.* 42. 2. and 43. 8. and 47. 19. *Numb.* 4. 19. *Deut.* 33. 6. 2 *King.* 18. 32. *Pſal.* 118. 17. *Ezek.* 18. 21, 28. and 33. 15. Life thus repreſented will appear (by many Reaſons) to be the great and only concern of Mankind, and they ought to conſider it as ſuch, that they may underſtand how unſpeakable an Excellency, and how ineſtimable a Benefit the *Logos* and *Life* of God is.

XIII. Mankind ought to account Life (that they may live and not die) their great and only Concern in Conformity to natural Inſtinct and Inclination. (*u*) For all Animals make it their chief Concern, to conſerve their Life, and to provide the neceſſaries thereof (ſuch as their Food and Coverts) to this they are carry'd by natural Inſtinct, and it muſt be reckoned amongſt the *prima naturæ.* The prime regard of all living Creatures is to Life, therein Mankind agree with other Animals and amongſt themſelves. They differ about Arts and Sciences, their Pleaſures, Faſhions and Ornaments: But they agree in the love of Life (ſome ſort of Life) and hate and fear and flee form Death with no ſinall Concern. (*w*) *We do not all Philoſophize* (ſaith *Clemens*) *but do we not all follow after Life?* This temporal Life although full of labour and trouble (*x*) *yet is deſir'd by all, both Old and Young, Princes and Peaſants, Wiſemen and Fools.* Men in exquiſite Torments yet deſire to live, if they have but Hopes to be freed from them; and ſo long they retain their deſire to live, till Pain and Torture quite ſurpaſs the ſweetneſs of Life, and extinguiſh the Senſe of it. Some have deſired to live in any Condition, though in the moſt exquiſite Torture, yet they would not die by any Means (*y*) as *Mæcenas* would rather undergo Deformity, Debility and the dolours of the Croſs, than not live. Which blind unreaſonable fondneſs for this mortal Life as an inſtance ſheweth, how deeply the love of Life is implanted in Humane Nature, as Self-love is, which is the love of Life. For the Life of a Man is himſelf; if his Life be ſav'd, he is ſav'd; if his Life is loſt, he is loſt. To ſay of Chriſt, that he gave *Himſelf* for us, and that he gave *his Life* are ſynonymous Expreſſions. *Gal.* 2. 20. *Matth.* 20. 28. (*) *How do'ſt thou love thy ſelf,* εἰ μὴ φιλοζωεῖς, *if thou loveſt not life?* Bodily Life is the ſame thing with the ſenſitive Soul, whence *Saul* ſaith to *David, My ſoul was precious in thy ſight* (becauſe his Life was precious) and Life eternal is of the ſame regard and value with the rational immortal Soul. For if Life eternal be loſt, the Man muſt be put to death as to the Soul (ſubjected to Death and dying for ever;) which is a State of Puniſhment like that of S. *Baſil's* Diſtemper, of which he ſaid (z) *tantum vivere permittens quantum ad dolorem ſentiendum opus eſt.* Whence *Tatianus* calleth it θάνατον ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ, *S. Auſtin, mortem ſine morte,* Death without dying. (*a*) So the Soul is loſt, and the Man is loſt, when Life is loſt. As the Soul therefore is of Value ineſtimable, of Sovereign peerleſs Regard (all worldly Things are as nothing in compariſon of the Soul;) ſo is Life, all things muſt be vilify'd and nullify'd in compariſon of Life, that the Soul may live and not die. The Soul muſt be regarded, as much as any thing can be regarded, being of immeaſurable Worth and Moment, and of the ſame Worth and momentous Importance is Life. As the Soul is our one thing and our All (nothing elſe is of very conſiderable regard) nothing more is requiſite, to make our Happineſs conſummate, than to ſave the Soul; nothing more is requiſite, to make our Miſery conſummate, than to loſe the Soul (all is loſt, if the Soul is loſt:) So the whole of Man's intereſt, is to *enter into Life*; and if Life is loſt, all is loſt that is valuable and deſireable (all our Honours and Comforts, all our Excellency and Felicity) and we our ſelves are loſt and caſt away. So all this World is gone, when bodily Life is gone, and in ſuch ſenſe Life may be ſtiled *totus Theſaurus hominis.*

XIV. Life is ſo great a Good, that in all reaſon Mankind ſhould account Life (that they may live and not die) their great and only Concern. This they ought to do, not only in compliance with blind Inſtincts, but with the plain and certain notices of Reaſon touching the good of Life. For

(1) Life is the excellency and ennoblement of a Being, and a Being is the more excellent, as the life of it is more excellent. Dead Bodies are extremely vile (κοπρίων ἐκβλητότεροι, *viler than Dung*) having loſt their life and livelineſs, which was their nobleneſs, amiableneſs and uſefulneſs. A dead Lion is worſe than a living Dog. *Eccl.* 9. 4. And in ſome reſpect what S. *Auſtin* ſaith is true (*b*) *Muſca Sole præſtantior,* a Fly is better than the Sun. For although in ſeveral reſpects a Fly is nothing in compariſon of the Sun, yet thus far it is a nobler Being, it hath an higher kind of Perfection than the Sun hath, having a ſenſitive Soul and Life. The Men of Country-buſineſs uſually diſparage Goods by calling them *Dead-goods,* and this mortal Life is duly diſparaged, when it is denominated *vita minimè vitalis.* The Goods of it are jejune and diſpirited things, that have in them nothing more than an overly and ſuperficial Vital ſweetneſs, and in themſelves and to us they are but as dead Carcaſes (cadaverous kind of things) *the things of mortality and corruption.* Matth. 8. 22. So the *Muhammedans* ſay (*c*) *mundus cadaver eſt,*

(u) *Principio generi animantium omni eſt à natura tributum, ut ſe, vitam corpuſque tueatur: declinetque ea, quæ nocitura videantur. Omniaque quæcunque ad vivendum ſint neceſſaria, inquirat & paret: ut paſtum, ut latibula.* Cic. de Off. l. 1.

(w) *Clem. Pæd. l.* 3. *c.* 11.

(x) *Expetitur tamen ab omnibus & optatur: hanc enim tàm ſenes quàm pueri, tàm reges quàm infimi, tàm denique ſapientes quàm ſtulti cupiunt.* Lactant. l. 3. c. 12.

(y) *Debilem facito manu*
Debilem pede, coxâ
Tuber adſtrue gibberum
Lubricos quate dentes
Vita dum ſuper eſt, bene eſt,
Hanc mihi vel acutâ
Si ſedeam cruce, ſuſtine.

* *Clem. ſupr.*

1 *Sam.* 26. 21.

(z) *Baron. ad an.* 372. *n.* 39.

(a) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 6. *c.* 12.

(b) *De* 2. *animabus c.* 4. *vid. Gat. Not. in Ant. p.* 205.

(c) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. p.* 319. *Ed.* 1.

eſt, & petentes eum canes. But *life, living, he that liveth for ever and ever*, and *Lahai* (he that liveth) in the Name of *Hagar's* Well, *Gen.* 16. 14. are the honourary Names and Attributes of God. *Vita eſt optimus modus Entis.* Life is the higheſt of all Excellencies and Perfections, it is higher than Power, which is below underſtanding; and it is higher than underſtanding, the light whereof is ſubſervient to virtuous Life, and the excellency whereof conſiſteth in its ſubſerviency to Life felicitative. *The excellency of knowledge is, that wiſdom giveth life to them that have it.* Eccl. 7. 12. The greateſt difference amongſt Beings is made by their different Lives, whereby they become either of the Divine or Diabolical Kind. And as none can be more vile than thoſe of the Diabolical, ſo none can be more excellent than thoſe of the Divine Kind. Which height of Excellency accrueth to them from their Life (of Grace and Glory) for * ἕκαστος ὡς ζῇ, τοῦτό ἐστιν, *every one as he liveth*, *this he is*, whether Good or Evil, Virtuous or Villainous, Happy or Miſerable. The *Gnoſticks* therefore ought to have preferr'd Ζωὴ, *Life*, and to have ſet it before all the reſt of their προβολαὶ, or *Emiſſions* (*d*) as *Irenæus* obſerveth.

* Procl. in Polit. p. 351.

(d) *Peccaverunt autem & circa Zoen dicentes eam ſexto loco emiſſam, quam oportebat omnibus præparare.* Adv. Hær. l. 2. c. 18.

(2.) Life is the neareſt and deareſt of Goods, as that uſual Expreſſion implieth, *meum Cor, mea Vita.* It is the neareſt Good, the moſt intimate and central, as being the Eſſence of all things living (it toucheth us to the quick) as near us as we are to our ſelves and as our own Soul. And it is the deareſt and choiceſt of Goods and Comforts (the choiceſt Jewel in our Cabinet is the Jewel of Life;) for nothing is ſo ſweet as Life, which hath a vital Solace and Refreſhment in it (Souls were called by the Pagan Theologers (*e*) μέλισσαι, Bees becauſe of the ſweetneſs of Life) nothing Men account ſo precious as the *precious Life*. Pro. 6. 26. *I pray thee, let my life be precious in thy ſight*, ſaith a Captain to *Elijah*. 2 King. 1. 13. The laying down our Life for any Perſon is the higheſt Expreſſion of ardent love to him, becauſe it is a parting with our choiceſt Treaſure. *Job.* 13. 38. As Death is the King of Terrors, ſo Life is the (duly reputed) King of Goods, that tranſcendeth and preponderateth all other. *Skin after skin, and all that a man hath, will he give for his life.* Job 2. 4. When Men would expreſs what is deareſt to them, they mention their Life and Fortune. The greateſt Good that can be done to Men, is to ſave Life, and the greateſt Hurt is to deſtroy Life, whence the one is that which conſtituteth a Saviour, the other a Deſtroyer. *Luk.* 9. 56. The Stoicks contempt of Life therefore and of Death is a manifeſt inſtance of their Prophaneneſs and unpopular Humour. *Uſque adeone mori miſerum eſt? Non eſt res magna vivere.* Such were the inhumane Maxims of their School (they thought it no great matter to live or die) their gallantry counted it Pedantry, to fear Death or to value Life, out of which (as they ſuppos'd) they might go forth when they pleas'd. But really the Life and vital Blood of a Man is a ſacred thing. *Gen.* 9. 5, 6. The great Ones of the World will have their Subjects, to Swear by their Life, whence it appeareth, that they account it the moſt ſacred and precious thing they have. So *Joſeph* ſware by the Life of *Pharaoh*, *Ittai* by the Life of *David*, and *Eliſha* by the Life of *Elijah*. The Primitive Chriſtians ſware (*f*) *per ſalutem* (by the Welfare or Life of the Emperours) God himſelf ſweareth by his own Life, and when Holy Men Swear (in the Old Teſtament) uſually it is by *the living God*, or as *the Lord liveth*, which form of Swearing is expreſſive of the Sacredneſs and Precioſity of Life. And the Moſaic Law in the Prohibition of eating Blood ſeemeth, to deſign, that ſuch a Sacredneſs muſt be put upon the vital Blood of Animals, it muſt not be commoniz'd as Food is, for this Reaſon, *becauſe the blood is the life of all fleſh.* Lev. 17. 14. (*g*) The Blood of Animals being the Life of Animals this conciliateth a ſort of venerableneſs to it, and therefore God injoin'd a Religious Abſtinence from it.

Vita eſt ipſum eſſe viventis.

(e) Voſſ. de Idol. l. 2. c. 28.

Sam.15. 1.
King. 2.

(f) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 32.

(g) *Spencer. de Leg. Hebr.* l. 1. c. 7. S. 2.

(3.) Life is the ſolid and ſubſtantial Good, Subſtance, not Shew or Shadow, as the Soul is an animatively vital Subſtance, which is the ſame thing with Life. *Pſal.* 26. 9. *Gather not my ſoul with ſinners, nor my life with bloody men.* So this earthly Life of Man conſiſteth in being *a living Soul* (Gen. 2. 7.) this Life therefore muſt be reputed in ſome ſort a ſubſtantial Good. For although it is but mutilately and diminutively Life, and if compar'd with a Diviner Life all the Vitality that is in it, is but ſuperficial and evanid, yet it is not exteriour ſhew, but ſuch a Good as *Seneca* wiſheth for; *da mihi bonum, quod ſentiam, non quod oſtendam.* And if it be compar'd with umbratile Notion and Theory, and with the impertinent Grandeurs and Fineries of the World, it muſt be counted the ſolid and ſubſtantial Good of a Man. So in Religion Spiritual Life is the ſolid and ſubſtantial Good, but the exterior Ritualities and Opinions that are devoid of it, are only ſhew and ſhadow.

(4.) Life is the firſt of all Goods and of all Neceſſaries; for there is no living virtuouſly or felicitatively without Life. Beings without Life may be uſeful to others, but without a perceptive Life themſelves can have no enjoyment of any thing; and as the Faculties and Appetites of Life decay in any, all their felicitative Enjoyments diminiſh, die and wither away. As in old *Barzillai's* wither'd Body; *I am this Day Fourſcore Years Old: and can I diſcern between Good and Evil? Can thy Servant taſt what I Eat or what I Drink? Can I hear any more the Voice of ſinging Men and ſinging Women?* All felicitative Enjoyment is founded upon Life, and groweth from that Root, which therefore is the prime fundamental Good and *the firſt of all Neceſſaries.* Many things Men may ſpare for this Reaſon, becauſe they can live without them (as one ſaid of Metaphors *poterimus vivere ſine illis:*) But they ſay uſually, *They muſt live*, and therefore they comply with the Vices of the World, becauſe (as they pretend) without ſo doing they cannot live. Their concern is, to live in the World, and this they account neceſſary, which is not neceſſary without due Limitation. For there are various degrees of Neceſſity, but *the one thing neceſſary*, which is of infinite indiſpenſable Neceſſity, is *to live and not die eternally*; for there is no (tolerable) living in the Region of the Second Death, no living without gaining and ſecuring eternal Life. Whence the choice of an Holy Life is not only reaſonable and of great Concern, but is to all Men matter of infinite and indiſpenſable Neceſſity; for otherwiſe *they cannot live.* There is no premiant Life for them, that neglect the Holy Life; they that live and

2 Sam.19. 35.

die in their Sins, muſt *die the Death*. A neceſſity there is of having Food and Raiment: But the Meat that endureth to everlaſting Life, is of far greater Neceſſity. The light of Life is far more neceſſary than the bodily Eye-ſight; Sin unpardon'd is far worſe than peſtilential Air; and the cure of mortal Sins is a matter of far more urgent and indiſpenſable Neceſſity than the cure of mortal Diſeaſes, which if not cur'd, will certainly iſſue in Death. And is it poſſible, that Men ſhould be unconcern'd in a Matter of infinite indiſpenſable Neceſſity, and in a Caſe wherein their Life lieth at ſtake? That they ſhould not beſtir themſelves like the *Gibeonites* for their Lives (that they might live though but as hewers of Wood and drawers of Water) or like the Diſciples when they were ſinking and drowning (*Luk*. 8. 24.) or that they ſhould not Petition with *Benhadad*, *that they may live*, live upon any terms? 1 *King*. 20. 32.

(5.) Life is the laſt and higheſt in the Series, Order and Progreſſion of Goods, *ultimum & extremum bonorum*, and the final iſſue of all our Goods. For as all the Evils of the Wicked tend to and end in Death: So all the Goods of the Righteous tend to and end in *Life* and *Immortality*, which denoteth the beatitude of Heaven, that hath its Excellency and Nobilitation from Life, *the Book of Life*, *the Tree of Life*, *the Crown of Life*, and *Life Eternal*, which is (h) τὸ ἀληθινῶς ζῆν, *living indeed* (i) ζωὴ ὄντως, *the true Life* (as *Plato* ſpeaketh) becauſe without any mixture of the contrary: As he is a true King (k) according to *Ariſtotle*, whoſe Sovereignty is not mix'd with any Subjection. Eternal Life is therefore the true Life, becauſe it knoweth no death or dying, is ſubject to no withering or decay. It comprehendeth and includeth the true Joy, that knoweth no Sorrow; the true Friendſhip, that knoweth no Falling out; the true Beauty, that knoweth no Blemiſh; the true Health, that knoweth no Sickneſs; the true Glory, that knoweth no Stain or Sullying; the true Banquet, that knoweth no want of Feſtival Entertainment; the true Treaſure, that knoweth no Thief, nor Moth, nor Ruſt; the true Inheritance, that feareth no Ejection by force or fraud; the true Serenity, where no Storms or Tempeſts ariſe (where no Clouds cover the Sky, nor any toſſing Waves do come;) the true Reſt, that knoweth not any Toil or Inquietude; the true Honour, that knoweth not any Diſgrace; the true Vigour and Activity, that knoweth not any Wearineſs; the true Sweetneſs, that knoweth not any Satiety; the true Comfort, that neither feeleth nor feareth any Croſs or Calamity; the true Pleaſure, that knoweth no Pain, nor any want of Pleaſure; where Want and Weakneſs and Sin and Sorrow are baniſh'd beyond the Lines of Communication, Joy and Solace are in an eternal Spring, and all the truly vital Goods are ever ever flowing. Life eternal is the unſtained Pulchritude of Life and Living, there can be no mean and beggarly and inglorious Living, no wretched caytiff miſcreant kind of Living, no foul or ſordid way of living in Life *immortal*, *incorruptible and eternal*, which is the fulleſt height of Life and Living in conſummate Glory and Felicity. This is the Life, which as being the true Life, Life without want of Life (deletery of all that is deadly and deſtructive of Death and Mortality) and as being the final Eſtate of Life (oppoſite to the final Eſtate of Death) the New Teſtament uſually meaneth by the Name of Life. Which as it is the fulleſt height of Life, ſo it is the fulleſt height of Good; for there is no Good higher than this *Zenith*, to live with God and as God liveth, and to bear his Image in Immortality. When we have attain'd to this State of Life, we have attain'd our Conſummation and the height of our Perfection. *Phil*. 3. 12. The Myſtery of God is then finiſh'd, and all that Religion deſigneth is at an end; for nothing higher, nothing further, nothing more can be propos'd, promis'd, deſign'd or deſir'd than eternal Life. Of this Life it muſt be ſaid (l) καλλιςὸν τί ἐςιν ἡ ζωὴ, *Life is a thing eximious and ſuperlative.*

(6.) Life is the ultimate and final Good, as that ſignifieth the final Cauſe of all things; for there muſt be *aliquid ultimum in expetendis* (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) which is the laſt thing intended and aim'd at; all is in order to it, and it is in order to none, which therefore is the ultimate and final Good οὗ ἕνεκα, *for which all things are*. This ultimate and final Good as to us and our Intereſt is Life; for other things are but the way to this end (*the way that leadeth unto life*, Matth. 7. 14.) they are ſubordinate and ſubſervient unto Life, and are deſireable upon account of it: But Life is (m) καθ' αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν, *Self-deſirable*; other Goods may be deſirable alſo for their own ſake, but they are alſo deſirable in order to Life: But (as to us and our Intereſt) Life is not deſirable in order to any further Good, all things refer to it, and it to none. *The Life is more than Meat*, as the End is above the Means. *Matth*. 6. 25. Houſes and Lands, Meat, Drink and Clothing, and all the Furniture of the Earth, Air and Sea, are deſign'd to be (n) *vitæ ſubſidia*, Helps of Life, *by theſe things men live*. Iſa. 38. 16. Reaſon and Underſtanding, Arts and Sciences, are for the uſe of Life, and ſo are our Hands and the Organs of our Body. (o) *Ut facere ad vitam poſſimus quæ foret uſus.* So Laws and Government are for Life, that Men may live well and happily; and what is not Life or conducive and ſubſervient to Life, is no needful good of Man, but is impertinent and inſignificant. There are many ſubordinate Ends and Goods; Health is the end of Phyſick, Refreſhment is the end of Food, Wiſdom is the end of Study, but all is for Life. *Give me underſtanding and I ſhall live*. Pſal. 119. 144. All things in * Religion are Life or deſign'd for Life. *Bleſſed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of Life*. Apoc. 22. 14. *Seek good and not evil, that you may live*. Amos 5. 14. The Precepts of Religion are the Statutes of Life. *Ezek*. 33. 15. The Promiſe of it is Life. *Deut*. 32. 47. 2 *Tim*. 1. 1. The Reproofs and Inſtructions of it are the way of Life. *Pro*. 6. 23. The holy Oracles of it are *the word of Life*. Phil. 2. 10. The Scope of its Counſels, Exhortations, Beſeechings and Expoſtulations is, to bring Men to *Repentance unto Life*, and to ſave their Souls from Death. *Iſ*. 55. 3. *Jam*. 5. 20. The Goods and Benefits which it affordeth, are *vitalia Beneficia*, Bread, Water, Wine and Milk, which are the Suſtenance of Life. *Iſa*. 55. 1. *Come eat of my bread, and drink of the Wine that I have mingled*. Prov. 9. 5. Such is the Banquet, which Wiſdom provideth for her Gueſts, an Entertainment whereby they may live. But what is not requiſite to Life (more Knowledge, or more Riches than are requiſite to Life) Wiſdom accounteth vain and ſuperfluous, according to our Saviour's Argument. *Luk*. 12. 15. *Take heed*

and

(h) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. *p.* 392.

(i) *Procl. in Polit. p.* 356.

(k) *Polit. l.* 3. *c.* 16.

(l) *Oenomaus ap. Euſeb. pr. Ev. l.* 5. *c.* 35.

(m) *Ariſt. Eth. Nicom. l.* 9. *c.* 9.

(n) *Elmenhorſt. in Arnob. p.* 184.

(o) *Ibid. p.* 73.

* *Beata vita ad quam omnia referuntur.* Cic. de Fin. l. 4

and beware of Covetouſneſs: for a Man's Life conſiſteth not in the abundance of the things which he poſſeſſeth.

XV. Life (that he may live and not die) is the *ſummum bonum* of Man and his *ſummum bonorum*, which therefore he ought to make his great and only concern. That good as good is to be deſir'd (*bonum & appetibile convertuntur*) that the chiefeſt and greateſt good is chiefly to be deſired, that there is a ſubordination amongſt Goods, ſome are higher, others are inferior and ſubordinate, and (ſeeing there are degrees of Goods) that there muſt be ſome one which is the chief and higheſt of Goods, *τὸ μέγιστον ϗ ἄριστον, the beſt and greateſt of Goods* (the paramount, peerleſs and incomparable Good) thus far Mankind do agree. They are agreed, that there is a Sovereign and Supreme Good (the ſummity and top-flower of Goods) but what it is, and where it is to be found, in this they are not well agreed. The old Philoſophers (that profeſs'd the ſtudy of Wiſdom) had endleſs debates and uncertain conjectures touching the chief good, which a Man ſhould deſire above all other. But this Problem which extremely puzzled theſe Heathen Sages, is no difficulty to Chriſtians; for according to their Science of Sanctity (*f*) the *ſummum bonum* is Life Eternal and the *ſummum malum* is Eternal Death. To which account of the Supreme Good the Philoſophers made ſome approach; for with them (*g*) *ſummum bonum* is the ſame thing with *beata vita*: but the principal reaſon, why they were bewildred in their inquiries after it, was becauſe they fondly ſuppos'd, that it might be enjoy'd in this Life. But *Plato* ſaw, that no ſuch thing as perfect happineſs is to be had in this World; the enjoyments of this Life are no great happineſs, the want of them is no great miſery, and death will ſpeedily put a period both to our wants and our enjoyments: but the Goods and Evils of Life and Death Eternal are boundleſs and immeaſurable both for weight and duration. Theſe gravitating upon a conſiderative Mind will make her look no more at the things that are ſeen; for the things that are ſeen are Temporal, but the things that are not ſeen are Eternal. (*h*) *Mittamus animum ad iſta quæ æterna ſunt, contemnamus omnia quæ adeo precioſa non ſunt, ut an ſint omninò dubium ſit.* Nothing elſe is a great matter, or of great concern; but theſe are of great and infinite concern, and (ſpeaking comparatively) the only concern of Man. For there is no compariſon, no proportion between the common external Goods and the ſaving Saint of God-kind of Goods; nor between the things that are ſeen and the great unſeen things; the Goods and Evils of a Moment and of Eternity. All fleſhly Goods are but flaſhy Goods, all earthly Riches are but Pelf, all earthly Glory is but Pageantry, all worldly Fineries are but Fallacies and Fancies, all ſenſitive Delights are but Deluſions, and all earthly Subſtance is as a Shadow: but ſuch is not the everlaſting Treaſure. So the Pains of Death (celebrated for their Bitterneſs) and all the Torments which the Wit of Man can invent, or Tyrants can inflict, are but Flea-bitings in compariſon of the never-dying Death, which is the upſhot and conſummation of Death, the fulneſs and extremity of Evil (Sorrow that knoweth no Joy, Miſery without any want of Wo;) for Man cannot be made more miſerable than Sin and Hell and the Wrath of God will make him.

Life is *ſummum bonorum*, the ſummary and aggregate of all Goods, (*i*) as perfect happineſs is defin'd. For Life is Felicitative Good and Felicitative Good is Life (of kind and quality ſuch:) as Death is the deadly kind of thing, and every deadly kind of thing is of kind and quality Death, whence every *Egyptian* Plague and Calamity being of a deadly nature is ſtiled Death, *Exod.* 10. 17. *Intreat the Lord your God, that he may take away from me this Death.* As all deadly Calamities are comprehended under the Name of Death, and fall under that Title: So all manner of felicitative Goods are compris'd under the Name of Life (which ſignifieth *omnimodam felicitatem*) Pſal. 36. 9. *With thee is the Fountain of Life.* Life ſignifieth felicitative Good as *Peace* doth (*Qui dicit pacem, dicit omnia bona*) for they are terms ſynonymous. *Mal.* 2. 5. *My Covenant was with him of Life and Peace.* Rom. 8. 6. *To be ſpiritually minded, is Life and Peace.* In the Old Teſtament the premiant good is Life (the felicitative good which importeth a freedom from the deadly things, the oppoſites to Life;) *ye ſhall keep my Statutes and my Judgments, which if a Man do, he ſhall live in them*, Lev. 18. 5. In the New Teſtament Life uſually ſignifieth the final eſtate of Life, wherein there is a deliverance from all Evil, and the enjoyment of all Good; all Wants are therein ſupply'd, all Capacities are filled, all Deſires are fully ſatisfy'd, and therein we ſhall fully acquieſce, *Joh.* 6. 35. *He that cometh to me, ſhall never hunger, and he that believeth on me, ſhall never thirſt*; that is, he ſhall have Life Eternal, and ſhall never be pinch'd with the ſenſe of want and penury any more. As it is commonly thought, that in the Moſaic Creation all the ſcatter'd Beams of Light were at length gather'd together into one Body of Light, which made the Sun on the fourth Day: ſo all the vaſt variety of Goods is collected and ſumm'd up into this one Life *Eternal.*

XVI. Piety and Virtue (the holy kind of Virtue) requireth, *that Life* (that we may live and not die eternally) be our great and only regard and concern. For if God and the Soul, if the Buſineſs of Piety and Life Eternal, is of no regard with us, or but of underling regard, this is Carnality, Wickedneſs and Worldlineſs of Mind and Life, the very Life and State of Ungodlineſs. This conſtituteth, diſtinguiſheth and denominateth *thoſe that are after the Fleſh, that chiefly mind the things of the Fleſh, the earthly things and the things that are ſeen; that ſow to the Fleſh, and are the worldly kind of labourers for the Meat that periſheth, the Servants of Mammon, or the lovers of Pleaſure* (more than lovers of God) *the Children of this World and the Friends of it.* Which are the oppoſite Kind and Family to thoſe that are after the Spirit, that chiefly mind the things of the Spirit, ſeek the things that are above, look at the things that are not ſeen, and with the beſt of their care and endeavour ſtrive to enter in at the ſtrait Gate, which is the entrance into Life. Of theſe two oppoſite Kinds and Families the one is the wickedly and worldly affected and addicted, the other is the Godly affected and addicted; the one is the World's Partiſans and Adherents, the other

Rom. 8. 5.
Phil. 3. 19.
2 Cor. 4. 18.

(f) S. Aug. de C. D. l. 19. c. 4.

(g) *Beata vita quæritur, idque eſt unum, quod philoſophia ſpectare & ſequi debet.* Cic. de Fin. 5. *Cùm ea cauſa impulerit eos, qui primi ſe ad philoſophiæ ſtudium contulerunt, ut omnibus rebus poſthabitis totos ſe in optimo vitæ ſtatu exquirendo collocarent.* Idem Tuſc. 5.

(h) Sen.

(i) Ἀγαθὸν ἐκ πάντων ἀγαθῶν συγκείμενον. *Plato. Omnium bonorum complexio.* Cic. *Status omnium bonorum aggregatione perfectus.* Boeth.

is God's faithful Adherents; the one is the Mundane, Unregenerate and Heathen kind, that are mainly intent upon the Goods and Evils of this animal ſenſitive Life (who are therefore of the Heathen kind, becauſe in the main at leaſt they are aliens from God and Piety) the other is the Holy Heavenly kind, that duely alienate their Souls from this ſinful World and Fleſh, and in their eſtimation of things, their Affection, their Election and Endeavours, their Aim and Deſign they are Holy and Heavenly, making account, that they have no very valuable Country or Home, or Eſtate and Inheritance on this ſide Heaven; that ſet all things under Heaven at nought in compariſon of the Favour of God his Service and Rewards, duely vilifie and nullifie this World with all its deluſive Proſperities, Treaſures and Pleaſures, taking care of the Soul and of an Heavenly Felicity far above all the World, *making the one as All the other as nothing*, accounting nothing too much, nothing too dear to gain Eternal Life and to eſcape Eternal Perdition. Such is the Life and Virtue of the Saints of God, (k) *who are in the Fleſh, but do not live after the Fleſh; that partake of theſe things of the World as Citizens, but dwell in their native Country as Strangers*, that eſteem the reproach of Chriſt greater Riches than the Treaſures in *Egypt*, and ſo run the Race of Piety, that they will lay hold on Eternal Life at any rate. They could not be Holy, if they were not Heavenly (for their Hearts would be alienated from God and Piety, and they would be devoid of the Saint of God-kind of Life and Virtue) neglect and ſlight Piety and the Heavenly Felicity, purvey for and pleaſe the Fleſh, affect and mind the World, be intent upon riſing and thriving in it, to gain and enjoy a worldly happy Eſtate, this is the atheous courſe of Life diametrically oppoſite to the Saint of God-kind of Life and Virtue (that looketh with eſtrangement upon the World and is duely out of love with it) which is the only ſaving Virtue and the Virtue that Chriſtianity deſigneth. For a Religion that only deſigneth our Sanctity and Salvation, that pretendeth not to any Mundane and Fleſhly Felicity, but to alienate the Soul from it; that is a Religion of bearing the Croſs and ſuffering the loſs of all things for Righteouſneſs ſake, of mortifying ſenſitive Nature, of dying to Sin, of being crucify'd to the World, of renouncing it and forſaking all things (ſo far as they come in competition or compariſon with the Service of Chriſt and Life Eternal;) that injoyneth the forſaking this mortal life and all its Intereſts, ſo as not to make any great reckoning of them, and a great unconcernedneſs for the *many things* that ſtand againſt the *one thing* neceſſary; that forbiddeth the worldly kind of caring for worldly things (that we may live a life of diviner cares) and injoyneth a Fleſh-diſpleaſing courſe of life ἀνήδονος τῶν τῇδε, *alien from the Pleaſures that are here* (as *Plotinus* ſpeaketh;) that requireth the ſerving God with our beſt and our All and at any rate (with the whole Man and the whole Soul) the doing the work of Godlineſs *with all diligence and with all our might* (with the moſt zealous and aſſiduous induſtry) in order to the gaining Life Eternal; ſuch a Religion deſigneth, that Life Eternal ſhould be our chief and only regard and concern. Chriſtianity therefore is the Buſineſs of deſigning, ſeeking and gaining Life Eternal, prizing it at the higheſt rate of prizing, ſticking at no Difficulties, Labours or Sufferings for ſo Divine a Purchaſe, *the ſeeking a better Country, a labouring to enter into God's reſt* (not with faint and cold attempts, but with ardent deſires and endeavours, and the greateſt care and diligence) *a working out our Salvation, a fighting the good fight of faith and warring a good warfare, a preſſing forward toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God, an agoniſtical wreſtling, running and ſtriving for the incorruptible Crown.*

If this Saint of God-kind of Life and Virtue is wanting in a Man, the Eſſence, Subſtance and Summary of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs is wanting. (l) *The firſt Virtue and the All of Virtue is, to be one of this World's Pilgrims and Strangers, and not* (culpably) *to have any thing in common with the things that are here, but to be parted from them as a Stranger*. As the Worldly Concupiſcence is the All of Wickedneſs, ſo to be an Alien from the World, is the All of Godlineſs; and they that are not Aliens from the World are totally Aliens from the Chriſtian Life, and are not entred into Chriſtianity and Godlineſs. For the firſt thing that Chriſtianity requireth, is, ἀποτάσσεσθαι, ἀπαρνεῖσθαι, *to abandon all things, to deny and forſake our Earthly All for the Kingdom of God's ſake*, ſo far as this Saint of God-kind of Life and Virtue requireth. Every one that becometh a Chriſtian (a Convert to God) of a wicked, carnal and worldly kind of Man becometh a ſpiritual, holy and heavenly kind of Man; the bent of his Heart and Life is turned another way, and he hath another kind of chief Good, and another chief Buſineſs and Concern than before; which is not to pleaſe his Fleſh and enjoy the World (the Profits, Pleaſures and Braveries thereof) but to pleaſe and enjoy God, and that premiant good which his ſervice affordeth, *Life Eternal*, which therefore becometh his chief and only concern and ultimate deſign, and all the Intereſts of this Life (which were before the intereſt that bore ſway in him) are now but as Cyphers in his Arithmetick. Every Man propoſeth to himſelf ſome End and Deſign, which he chiefly aimeth at and intendeth, and is moſt concern'd and ſollicitous about. *Eſt aliquid quò tendis, & in quod dirigis arcum.* And ſuch as the End is, ſuch is the Man, whether a truly pious or a deadly atheous kind of Man. For the truly pious are thoſe that are for gaining the everlaſting Kingdom: The deadly atheous are thoſe that are for making their preſent Markets.

XVII. *Wiſdom* requireth, that Life (that we may live and not die eternally) be our great and only regard and concern. For the firſt part of Philoſophy or Wiſdom (*m*) is to give all things their due valuation (*pretia rebus imponere*) to eſtimate aright how much every thing is worth and what it amounteth to (πόσου ἕκαστον ἄξιόν ἐστι, *Quanti quidque ſit judicare*;) And the ſecond part of Philoſophy is *de impetu* touching the vigorous proſecution of things, which ought to be leſs or greater according to the worth and weight of them, *Impetus ex dignitate rei cujuſque concipitur*. If Life Eternal therefore is of infinite worth and weight, it ought to be valu'd at the higheſt rate (elſe it is undervalu'd;) if it is infinitely the greateſt concern of all Men, Wiſdom requireth, that it ſhould be of infinitely the greateſt conſideration and regard with all Men, and that they proſecute it with the greateſt zeal and diligence. But it is madneſs and dotage ſo to eſtimate and proſecute the things of this Life, which ſhrink into non-entities (*hoc aliquid nihil eſt*) when compar'd with Life Eternal. It is Wiſdom and Reaſon, that the concerns of an Immortal Heaven-born Soul ſhould be incomparably preferr'd before the concerns of a vile Body, and the concerns of Eternity before thoſe of an ἐφήμερος ζωὴ (as the Philoſophers call this Life, *a Day-life*) and the favour and frowns of God before the favour and frowns of Men. A Godly Life with all its hardſhips and incumbrances that iſſueth in Life Eternal, ſhould in reaſon and prudence be preferr'd incomparably before the fooleries and gulleries of ſenſitive pleaſure, that iſſue in Eternal Death. In the juſt computation of things a little ſorrow ought to ſignifie nothing, that will be compenſated with Eternal Joys, and ſaveth from Eternal weeping and gnaſhing of Teeth. And what ſignifie the trivial gauds and grandeurs of this World (which is but a Pedlar's Pack of Small Wares) or its ſadneſſes and ſufferings if compar'd with eternal living and dying? When *Alexander* had travell'd through *India*, and overrun many large and great Countries, and ſome brought him word of his Souldiers taking ſome ſmall Towns in *Greece*, methinks, ſaid he in contempt of their News, I hear *Homer's* tale βατραχομυομαχία, *a Battel of Frogs and Mice.* So all the Affairs of this Life, all the Buſineſs, Succeſſes and Miſadventures of it, all its Greatneſſes and Diſgraces, its Enjoyments and its Wants, and all its *Tragi-comedies* ſeem Impertinencies and Inſignificances, make no appearance and are of no regard, when we lift up our Eyes to Life Eternal. There is no reaſon, that any thing elſe ſhould be of great regard, ſo vain and vile are Senſual Pleaſures and all the goodly admired things of this World, that will quickly be, as if they had never been. It is not reaſon, but deliration, to prefer theſe puffy Vanities, gilded nothings, Shells without a Kernel, Briars and Thorns (indeed) before the weight of Eternal Life, and to ſell that for a Meſs of Pottage, which cannot be bought at too dear a rate. Not only becauſe it is an unfathomable Felicity, but becauſe the gaining this unfathomable Felicity is connex'd with the eſcaping an unfathomable Miſery, which is otherwiſe unavoidable. If there were not too final Eſtates, the one of living, the other of dying for ever, the choice of an Holy Life and the concern of Life Eternal would not be indiſpenſably neceſſary; for many like the *Reubenites* and *Gadites* could be well contented, to take up their Portion on this ſide *Jordan* without entring into *Canaan*; they would not value the gaining Heaven, if the loſs of it did not ſink them into Hell. But the World of Mankind (thoſe more eſpecially to whom the Chriſtian Religion is revealed) muſt be dichotomiz'd into the Children of *Light* and *Darkneſs*, of *Life* and *Death*, the Heirs of Salvation and the Sons of Perdition. As a Man therefore can deſire nothing more than to be a Child of God and of the Divine Family, ſo he muſt be ſatisfy'd with nothing leſs; for if he is not of the Divine Family, he is of the Infernal Family. A Man can deſire nothing more than Life Eternal, and he muſt be ſatisfy'd with nothing leſs; for if he loſeth Life Eternal, his Portion unavoidably will be Eternal Death: Loſe Salvation, and what remaineth? nothing but Perdition. Joſh.12.6.

(k) *J. Mart. Ep. ad Diognet. p.* 476.

(l) Ἡ πρώτη ἀρετὴ, καὶ ἡ πᾶσα ἀρετὴ, τὸ ξένον εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου τούτου καὶ παρεπίδημον, καὶ μηδὲν κοινὸν ἔχειν πρὸς τὰ ἐνταῦθα πράγματα, ἀλλ' ἀπηρτῆσθαι αὐτῶν ὥσπερ ξένον. S. Chryſoſt. *in Hebr. or.* 24.

(m) *Sen. Ep.* 89. *Epictet. diſſ. l.* 2. *c.* 23. *Lactant. l.* 6. *c.* 5.

If Life Eternal is not our great and only regard and concern, it will be loſt by negligence and wickedneſs. For none chuſe and live the holy Life, duely mind the buſineſs of Godlineſs, or are faithful to God and his Service, but they that make the gaining Life Eternal their great and only deſign. The reſt of Mankind perſiſt in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs, and neglect Godlineſs having other Fiſh to fry. They eagerly purſue Shadows, but neglect and loſe the Subſtance; whence in all their gettings they get nothing, that is of any great advantage (becauſe nothing to their eternal advantage;) in all their doings they do nothing to purpoſe, nothing to their true end (which they ought to propoſe to themſelves:) but all their gettings and their doings are an undoing themſelves, which is contrary to their own end; for Happineſs in general they would not loſe, nor incur Miſery for ever. They love themſelves, yet ruine themſelves (ſo far are they from being good to themſelves,) they have not a wiſe and virtuous care of themſelves, their regard is not for their only valuable and conſiderable ſelf; this they loſe for nothing or as good as nothing, and rather chuſe to endure an Hell of Blackneſs, and Flames, and Torment, than not to pleaſe a vain fancy, not to gratify a fooliſh Luſt, not to enjoy a merry Hour: Theſe are Prodigies of Fooliſhneſs and Madneſs, and if any acted as extravagantly in their Secular Affairs as the generality of Men act in their Soul-affairs, they would be begg'd for Fools, or ſent to *Bedlam* as diſtracted Men. They that in their Secular Affairs are hugely thoughtful and careful, vigilant and provident, that will take pains and venture hard for this Earthly Life, that will be true to their Intereſt (as the *French* ſay, Intereſt will not lye) will not barter away their precious Commodities for a trifle, nor loſe an Hogg for an half-penny worth of Tar, that will have a care of the main chance, and will not run into Debt and Poverty (but keep it off with a long Staff) will not be perſwaded to be ſo wiſe touching their Soul-affairs, nor (as to thoſe great Affairs) to conduct their Lives by their own prudential Maxims. They that will be ſollicitous for a Moment, will not imploy their care and ſollicitude for Eternity. They that will ſwallow many a bitter Pill and Potion, and endure lancing, cutting, cauterizing and diſmembring, to preſerve a vile Body alive a few Days, and count it their Wiſdom ſo to do (for they that throw away their Lives, as ſome deſperate diſcontented Perſons do, are thought unnatural, immoral and out of their Wits) will not be perſwaded, to endure the very tolerable Cares and Sorrows, and Labours and Hardſhips which are in Godlineſs, *that they may live and not die eternally.* They have but one Work to do in the World, but this one Buſineſs, the Buſineſs of Piety in order to Life Eternal (and Secular Buſineſs as Piety requireth.) This is their *one thing and their All* (in point of Duty and Intereſt) and 'tis the height of unreaſonableneſs, that their All with them ſignifieth nothing; it would be their Wiſdom, to make it their great and only concern.

XVIII. In the œconomy of our Religion the great and only concern of God and of the Son of God is *Life, that we may live and not die eternally*, which is Life in the Senſe of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament. For the only deſign of God in ſending his Son was, *that we might* *live through him* (live now and for evermore) 1 *Joh.* 4. 9. *That whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life,* Joh. 3. 16. This was the whole deſign and end of his Undertaking, and all the benefit that he affordeth, is compris'd in this one word *Life. I am come, that they might have Life,* ſaith the Son of God, *Joh.* 10. 10. *This is the Will of him that ſent me, that every one which ſeeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlaſting Life,* Joh. 6. 40. *Ye will not come to me, that ye might have Life,* Joh. 5. 40. Our Saviour inviteth Men to come to him, that they might have Life, and ſo do the holy Writers, *Joh.* 20. 31. *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God, and that believing ye might have Life through his Name.* 1 Joh. 5. 11. *Theſe things have I written unto you, that believe on the Name of the Son of God; that ye may know, that ye have Eternal Life, and that ye may believe* (continue to believe) *on the Name of the Son of God.* All that is got by gaining Chriſt is Life, and all that is loſt by loſing Chriſt, is Life, 1 *Joh.* 5. 12. *He that hath the Son, hath Life, and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not Life.* Joh. 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting Life; and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee Life.* This is the Stile and Tenour of the New Teſtament, and eſpecially of our Evangeliſt; from whoſe illuſtrious often-repeated Notices of our Saviour it appeareth, that (as to what He is) He ought to be thus repreſented; *He is the gift and benefit of Life Eternal unto Men* (that is, the gift and benefit of Life Eternal is in Chriſt) and this is his true Idea. As moſt clearly appeareth in our Evangeliſt's Summary of the Chriſtians Creed, 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. *This is the Record, that God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son.* The Teſtimony or Record of God concerning his Son is both the ground of a Chriſtian's Faith and the matter of it (both the formal and material Object of Faith;) for our Faith is founded upon the infallible Teſtimony of God, and the matter of it is *The witneſs of God which he hath teſtify'd of his Son;* namely, that Jeſus is the Son of God, the true Meſſiah, the Saviour of the World; which is the ſame thing, as to teſtifie, *that the Gift and Benefit of Life Eternal is in him and in him only.* This Divine Teſtimony implieth, that an Eternity is deſign'd for Men, and that Men are deſign'd for Eternity; that the World of Mankind in their Naturaliſm and Unregeneracy (being a World of Ungodly Sinners) are debarr'd from Life Eternal and are ſubjected to Eternal Death; which is a great Article of Chriſtianity; for *tolle morbos, tolle vulnera, nulla eſt medicinæ cauſa.* If Mankind in their now original ſtate had not been a World of deadly Sinners, in the ſtate of Sin and of Death, and under the Domination of their ghoſtly deadly Enemies, they had not needed a Saviour. Nor had they needed a Saviour, if Life Eternal might be obtain'd by Law-juſtice, by Humane Merit, by Natural Religion or Natural Light, or by the Judaical Law-religion: this Divine Teſtimony is expreſs, that there is but one way to Life Eternal, *this Life is in his Son* (in his Religion) and therefore they muſt be in Chriſt, that are the Heirs of Life Eternal. It is not to be obtain'd but by the New Teſtament, and in the New Teſtament it is repreſented as the great and only concern of Man, the tranſcendent Gift of God and his free Gift through the Merit of Chriſt; who therefore is of this Idea (as to what He is) *He is the Gift and Benefit of Life Eternal unto Men.* It is not an Abſtract *Logos*, but it is the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, that is of this Idea; which alſo appeareth in our Saviour's account of his Religion, *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* Which words import, that to be a genuine Chriſtian Religioniſt (a true Religioniſt of the true God and the true Meſſiah) is Life Eternal to a Man, and there is no other way of attaining it. For *if ye believe not that I am he* (ſaith our Saviour) *ye ſhall die in your Sins,* Joh. 8. 24. The Jews expected Life Eternal from their Religion, and the Gentiles had as great expectations from their Heathen Piety: but to a World of Sinners there can be no other Religion of Life Eternal but the Chriſtian: Which is therefore the Religion of Saving Grace, *that as Sin hath reigned unto Death, ſo might Grace reign through Righteouſneſs unto Eternal Life by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord,* Rom. 5. 21. The available promiſe of Life is peculiarly in Chriſt Jeſus, 2 *Tim.* 1. 1. His Religion and His alone maketh its Believers Heirs *according to the hope of Eternal Life,* Tit. 3. 7. *This is the promiſe that he hath promiſed us* (the Chriſtian Religioniſts) *even Eternal Life,* 1 Joh. 2. 25. The Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt therefore (the founder of the Chriſtian Religion) is *The Life,* as being (in his Religion) *the Gift and Benefit of Life Eternal unto Men.* And if Scripture muſt be interpreted by Scripture, if one place of the New Teſtament muſt be interpreted agreeably to the whole ſtream and tenour of it, if our Evangeliſt muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak the Senſe of the New Teſtament; he muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſtile the Son of God *The Life* as being (in his Religion) the Gift and Benefit of Life Eternal unto Men. And to what purpoſe ſhould he (in his Proem) ſtile the Son of God *The Life,* but to renown and recommend (the Goſpel) the Chriſtian Religion and the Author of it as ſuch?

XIX. *The Life* in the Proem of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel muſt be an Attribute of the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, and muſt denote and ſignifie him, if therein this Evangeliſt ſpeaketh his own Senſe (that which is his Senſe throughout his Goſpel and his other Writings;) and in all reaſon he muſt be allow'd, to be his own Interpreter. *Optimus Interpres verborum quiſque ſuorum.* Peruſing his Goſpel and his other Writings it is apparent and clear as the Day, that throughout the tenour and current of them *Life ſignifieth Life Eternal, and Life Eternal ſignifieth The benefit of Life Eternal* (or Salvation) *which the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt is in his Religion unto Men.* This appeareth from many other bright and illuſtrious places (beſides thoſe already cited) and from thoſe more eſpecially, wherein *Life is the Elogy and Blazonry of our Saviour, his honourary Name and Title.* For ſo in this Evangeliſt *Life* is the royal ſtile of the Son of God, and his Title of Honour, deſign'd to ſhew the Illuſtriouſneſs of his Perſon and the ineſtimable worth, precioſity and importance that he is of; He is all that unſpeakable good, excellency and felicity which his honourary Names and Titles ſignifie; ſome of which are theſe following.

(1.) Our Saviour in this Evangeliſt implicitly ſtileth himſelf *The fountain and donour of Life,* Joh. 4. 10. *If thou kneweſt the gift of God* (ſaith he to the Woman of *Samaria*) *and who it is that ſaith*

ſaith to thee, give me to drink; thou wouldeſt have asked of him and he would have given thee living Water. Our Saviour ſtileth himſelf *the Gift of God*; for he telleth the Woman, that the reaſon why ſhe did not ask of him the Water of Life (a better kind of Water than he requeſted of her) was *becauſe ſhe did not know the Gift of God*; which Words are expounded in the next following; *ſhe did not know, who he was, that ſaid unto her, give me to drink.* Our Saviour therefore ſtileth himſelf *the Gift of God*, and he is ſo both in the *perſonal* and in the *real* Acceptation. He is the Perſon that is *the Gift of God* (a Gift of the greateſt Kindneſs and Beneficence;) for *God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son.* Joh. 3. 16. And he is the thing (or reality) that is the Gift of God tranſcendent to all other Gifts, which is Life eternal. For when our Saviour ſaith to the Woman, *If thou kneweſt the Gift of God, and who it is that ſaith to thee, give me to drink*, his Senſe is; *If thou kneweſt, that the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal is in me* (or that I am the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal unto Men) *thou wouldeſt have asked, and I would have given thee living Water.* By which living Water ſome Expoſitors underſtand *the Doctrine of the Goſpel*, others *the Mercy and Grace of God* which Chriſt diſpoſeth of, and ſome ancient Writers ſay, it is *the Water of Baptiſm*: But theſe Interpretations are too far remote from the matter which our Saviour manifeſtly ſpeaketh of, to which the Interpretation of ſome others maketh a great approach; for they ſuppoſe, that by *living Water* is meant the Holy Spirit called *Rivers of living Water.* Joh. 7. 39. But this Interpretation is not rightly nor fully expreſſive of our Saviour's Senſe; for the thing that he ſpeaketh of, is Life eternal, as manifeſtly appeareth from *V.* 13, 14. *Whoſoever drinketh of this Water ſhall thirſt again: But whoſoever drinketh of the Water that I ſhall give him, ſhall never thirſt: But the Water that I ſhall give him, ſhall be in him a Well of Water ſpringing up into everlaſting Life.* That Water which totally exempteth a Man from Thirſt (from being in want of Water or from being afflicted with the Senſe of Want and Penury any more) can be nothing on this ſide Life eternal. Living Water therefore ſignifieth Life eternal; which if we will diſtinctly underſtand (as to the conſtitutive Ingredients of it) it muſt be conſider'd (as a live Spring that is ever ever flowing and ſcaturient) as an ebullient Fountain of felicitative Life ſpringing up to an eternity of Living. It is *puteus aquæ vivæ*, as the Jews call their Law. For Life eternal is (n) *ſempiternal Vitality*, and vital Sanctity in a Man (or the Holy Spirit) as it is ſempiternal Vitality, is a Well of living Water (a Fountain of this felicitative Life) ſpringing up to an eternity of Living. Our Saviour therefore repreſenteth himſelf to the Samaritan Woman as in his Religion and to his Believers the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal.

(2) Our Saviour in this Evangeliſt ſtileth himſelf *the Food of Life to us.* Joh. 6. 35, 48. *I am the bread of life.* V. 51. *I am the living bread that came down from heaven: If any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever: And the bread that I will give is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the World.* 55. *For my fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* Chriſt repreſenteth himſelf as the true Manna and the true Bread, his Fleſh and his Blood (that is, his Sacrifice, or himſelf ſacrific'd and crucify'd) *as Meat indeed and Drink indeed*, to ſignifie, that he is *the Food of Life to us*, which is his officiary Dignity, and one of his illuſtrious Names and Titles. For this Name denoteth, that he is of the ſame Uſe and Benefit to us, and of the ſame Neceſſity that our Food is, *We live by it and cannot live without it. Agreeably to our vital food and ſuſtenance Chriſt crucify'd is life to us, life eternal.* Food reſtoreth the Soul, *Pſal.* 23. 3. Men that were Dying and giving up the Ghoſt have been by Food recover'd from the Grave's Mouth. 1 *Sam* 30. 12. So Men live by their Food: And ſo by Chriſt crucify'd the dead World is recover'd to Life, his Death is the revivification of Souls, as being thereby the procuring cauſe the Author and Founder of the State of Life and Salvation for them. *His Fleſh therefore is Meat indeed and his Blood is Drink indeed*, becauſe by his Sacrifice (in a Sacrifice the Blood was parted and ſeparated from the Fleſh, which therefore is ſignified by Fleſh and Blood) we Sinners dead in Sin and ſubjected to dying for Sin, live as to Life eternal, and there was no living without it. For thereby (o) τὸν θάνατον εἰς ζωὴν ἀνεσταύρωσεν, *he crucify'd Death into Life*; by his Bloodſhed he became to us (p) πηγὴ ζωοποιὸς, *a vivific Fountain* (his Blood was as Water of Life to us;) and the Iſraelites *Manna* (which was to them the Food of Life) was a Type of Chriſt chiefly upon this account, becauſe it was a Type of his ſacrific'd Fleſh or Body. For *Manna* was Bread, and Bread is an Emblem or Symbol of the Body (the ſame word in Hebrew that ſignifieth the Body, ſignifieth Bread;) the *Manna* therefore was a Type of Chriſt, becauſe that Bread repreſented and ſignified Chriſt's Body, which by the Sacrifice of it procur'd Life for us, who otherwiſe muſt have dy'd in our Sins. As *Manna* was the Food of bodily Life to the *Iſraelites*, but not till it was broken and bruiſed, *Numb.* 11. 8. So Chriſt's Fleſh or Body could not be the Bread of Life to us but by being broken, bruiſed and ſacrific'd. By his Pains we have Eaſe, by his Dolours we have Comfort, by his Sacrifice we have Expiation of Sin, and by his Death we have Life, the Life that knoweth no Death. The *Iſraelites* Rock in the Wilderneſs (a Type of Chriſt) did not afford them their Water of Life, till it was ſmitten by the Rod of *Moſes*: So if Chriſt had not been ſmitten by the Rod of the Law (ſacrific'd and ſlain) nothing had iſſu'd from him, that is as Water of Life to us, nothing that affordeth us vital Conſolation, Eaſe, Reſt, and Peace for our Souls, no cooling Water of Mercy and Pardon for our Refreſhment, nor had he been of uſe and value to us for Life and Salvation. He is *the Food of Life to us* (that Bread and Water of Life, of which Old *Iſrael*'s Manna and Water out of the Rock were Types) but as ſacrific'd and crucify'd; and as all vital Goods and Comforts are in Scripture ſet forth and ſignified by bodily Food, Meat and Drink, *Pro.* 9. 5. *Iſa.* 55. 2. So Chriſt crucify'd is all the Soul-vital Goods and Comforts to us, in compariſon of which all our bodily vital Comforts are ſhadowy, and ſapleſs, lean, lifeleſs, and diſpirited, cold comforts, or as *Lycophron* calleth an evil Wife ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα, *a cold Arm-full.* But a certain delicious reliſh there is in bodily Food, it nouriſheth and corroborateth them that eat and drink of it, and affordeth them not bare Life only, but a vital ſolace, livelineſs and vigor, 1 *Sam.* 14. 27. 1 *King.* 4. 20. So to Divine Believers nothing is of ſo delicious a reliſh as

(n) Petav. T. 1. l. 3. c. 3. S. 6.

(o) Clem. προτρεπτ. p. m. 53.

(p) Ibid. p. 51. *Eſt cibus qui ſalutem largitur & vitam, qui hominem ſummo Deo commendat, qui languentes relevat, errantes revocat, lapſos erigit, qui morientibus æternæ immortalitatis largitur inſignia.* Jul. Firmic. de Error. Prof. Rel. p. 36.

Chriſt crucify'd (*hoc tibi ſapiat Manna*) by him they are ſav'd from their doleful forlorn Condition, they have in him a Magazine of Conſolations (which diſconſolate Souls reliſh) and he is to them that were *without ſtrength* (Rom. 5. 6.) Vivacity, Strength and Vigor, and Life Spiritual and Eternal. *Joh.* 6. 57. *As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father: So he that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me.* But as nothing is ſo neceſſary for us as our Food, without it we faint and droop and pine away and die (if we are without it but a few Hours we are in a melancholy languiſhing Condition:) So without Chriſt Sacrific'd there is no Life in us, nor Life for us, but we are in a forlorn famiſh'd Condition and ſink into eternal Death. Chriſt is therefore *the Food of Life* to us analogous to bodily Food: But his Name alſo denoteth the Eminency and Tranſcendency of that *Food of Life* that he is. For whereas other vital Food is of an earthly Nature and Original, and is only Food for the Body; Chriſt is the Food typify'd by Manna, that came down from Heaven beſides and beyond the ordinary courſe of Nature, and was a Celeſtial or Angelical ſort of Food. So Chriſt is Food come down from Heaven, that is of Kind, Quality and Excellency Divine and Heavenly, and the Food of Life to our diviner part. Our bodily Subſtance is in continual Flux and Waſt, and tending to Death; our bodily Food is mortal and periſhing in it ſelf and its effect, and will ſcarce preſerve our ruinous Cottages a few days from tottering into a Grave: But Chriſt is another-kins *Food of Life*, as being the Gift and Benefit of a never-dying Life to us. *The Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World. He that cometh to me, ſhall never hunger* (he ſhall have Life eternal) *and he that believeth on me, ſhall never thirſt.* Significatur æterna ſatietas, ubi nulla egeſtas. S. *Aug. Verily, verily I ſay unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlaſting Life. I am that Bread of Life. Your Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderneſs and are dead. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever.* (For he is an Heir of Life eternal.) *He that eateth me, he ſhall live by me.* (He ſhall have Life eternal by me, and be ſav'd from eternal Death.) *This is the Bread that came down from Heaven: Not as your Fathers did eat Manna and are dead: He that eateth of this Bread* (ſhall have Life eternal) *ſhall live for ever.* Thus amply and copiouſly doth God's Meſſiah under the Name and Emblem of *the Food of Life* declare his officiary Dignity, which is to be *the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal to us.*

Joh. 6. 33--35. and v. 47--58.

(3.) Our Saviour in this Evangeliſt repreſenteth himſelf as *the Food of Life*, that muſt be eaten and drunk in order to Life eternal, as bodily Food muſt be eaten and drunk in order to live by it. *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. Whoſo eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day. I am the living Bread, which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever.* Chriſt as ſacrific'd is in his Religion and conſequently to his Believers *the Food of Life.* He gave himſelf in Sacrifice (his Body and Blood) to be unto them *the Food of Life.* Chriſtian Believers as ſuch are Believers on him, on him as ſacrific'd, on him as the Food of Life. Their being Chriſtian Believers conſiſteth in taking and receiving him and his Sacrifice as the Food of Life; and what a Man taketh for his Food of Life, he eateth and drinketh either corporally, or mentally and ſpiritually as we eat our (q) λογικὴν τροφὴν, λογικὸν βρῶμα, *rational Food and Nutriment.* The taking and receiving Food, the taking and receiving it as Food, is an eating and drinking it. The taking and receiving therefore the Food of Life which Chriſt is, the taking and receiving it as the Food of Life is the eating and drinking (both by way of Duty and of Benefit) that Food of Life which he is. As his becoming Chriſt is his becoming the Food of Life to his Religioniſts, ſo our becoming his Religioniſts is eating and drinking that Food of Life, which Chriſt and Chriſt ſacrific'd is. And this may be call'd *the computational eating him, eating and drinking his Body and Blood*, which is that which our Saviour inſiſteth upon and requireth; for it is the *believing on him* that he inſiſteth upon *Joh.* 6. 29, 35, 36, 37, 40, 44, 47, 64, 65. But to this computational eating and drinking we muſt add *the Sacramental* (a Branch thereof;) for Chriſt's Religioniſts are the Religioniſts of his Sacrifice. And as in all other Religions (that of Jews and Gentiles) the Religioniſts ate and drank of the Sacrifices: So Chriſt hath inſtituted the Holy Euchariſt, which is *Epulum ſacrificiale ac fœderale*, a confederating with him by feaſting upon his *Sacrifice.* This is the Subject of our Saviour's Diſcourſe, and is it poſſible, that his Diſcourſe upon this Subject (the Chriſtian Sacrifice) ſhould have no Relation to that Sacrament, which is a feaſting upon that Sacrifice? His Diſcourſe of being *born of Water and of the Spirit* cannot but relate to his Inſtitution of Baptiſm: So his Diſcourſe of eating his Fleſh and drinking his Blood cannot but relate to his Inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt. They that heard this Diſcourſe, ought to have conſider'd, that our Saviour was diſcourſing as the Author and Founder of his Religion or Inſtitution; that (although the Holy Euchariſt was not yet particularly and expreſly inſtituted, yet) in this Diſcourſe he plainly maketh his Religion an Inſtitution in general of eating his Body and drinking his Blood; and if they ſaw, that afterwards he inſtituted a ſolemn Rite or Sacrament of eating his Body and drinking his Blood, how could they doubt, that in his general Diſcourſe concerning it, he had this ſolemn Rite in his Eye, and that his Words had reſpect thereto? Eſpecially if they conſider'd, that his Religion is eſſentially the Religion of his Sacrifice, that in the Holy Euchariſt his Religioniſts communicate in Chriſt crucify'd (or in his Sacrifice) that his general Diſcourſe ought to be underſtood from the whole of his Inſtitution, and conſequently his intention in it was, that his Religioniſts ſhould not only eat his Body and drink his Blood mentally and ſpiritually, but alſo ſymbolically and ſacramentally, and that to them who ſo eat it Chriſtianly, he intended, that his Sacrifice ſhould be the Food of Life. To this our Saviour's Diſcourſe relateth, but ſo as to import nothing more than the tenour of Chriſtianity importeth, namely, that without his Sacrifice and our being the Religioniſts thereof (one mode whereof is a due receiving the Holy Euchariſt) there is no Life for us. But it doth not import, that abſolutely without receiving the Holy Euchariſt there is no Life for us; much leſs doth it import the literal eating and

(q) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 7. *p.* 372.

and drinking Chriſt's real corporeal Fleſh and Blood, as the Jews miſtook. For the rectifying whoſe Error our Saviour addeth *V.* 62, 63. *What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?* This will confute your groſs miſtake touching the eating and drinking literally my corporeal Fleſh and Blood that I bear about me, and which within a while will be removed to a vaſt diſtance from you. *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing: The words that I ſpeak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* It is that which is Spiritual, that is, Vivificative; the literal eating my corporeal Fleſh is of no avail: The eating and drinking which I Diſcourſe of (ſaith our Saviour) is *the Spiritual-vital*, or is a Spiritual-vital Buſineſs both in reſpect of the Duty-part and the Benefit-part, which is the State of Life, Spiritual Life, Eternal Life. From which account of our Saviour's Senſe it appeareth, that the many Allegations which ſome Expoſitors have made from that whiſling Allegoriſt *Philo* touching his Logos and that nutriment of the Soul which Wiſdom and Virtue is, are hugely alien from our Saviour's Diſcourſe, and do not at all illuſtrate it. For all Humane Inſtitutions of Virtue are hugely alien from thoſe divine Words, of which our Saviour ſaith, *They are Spirit and they are Life.* Nor is it our Saviour's Doctrine (Truth and Wiſdom) which he propoſeth as the Food of Life, but himſelf as ſacrific'd and crucify'd. And what Affinity is there between a Platonic Logos and Chriſt crucify'd?

XX. In the entrance of this Diſcourſe our Saviour thus repreſenteth himſelf as the Gift *Joh.* 6. 27. and Benefit of Life eternal unto Men. *Labour not for the Meat which periſheth, but for that Meat which endureth unto everlaſting Life, which the Son of Man ſhall give unto you: For him hath God the Father ſealed.* Expoſitors have various Conjectures touching this Meat (which it would be tedious to examine) but it is ſufficient to ſay, that it may ſignifie the Food of our regenerate Life (which in the effect of it is Meat that endureth to Life everlaſting;) and it may ſignifie only *ſempiternal Vitality*, as it ſuſtaineth us in Life to Eternity; for as it ſo ſuſtaineth us, it is Suſtenance of Life (or Meat) which endureth to everlaſting Life. And this latter is moſt probably our Saviour's Senſe, becauſe (in theſe Words) his Deſign is only to repreſent himſelf as the Meſſiah, whom God hath ſealed (authoriz'd and appointed) to be the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal unto Men. Accordingly, he ſaith *Joh.* 14. 6. in our Evangeliſt, *I am the Way* (the only Way of going to God) *and the Truth* (his Doctrine and the Doctrine concerning him being the only Saving Truth) *and the Life*, as being the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal unto Men. He is ſo in various reſpects and degrees. For ſometimes he is renowned as the only Doctor of Life *Joh.* 6. 68. eternal and the way to it. *Lord, to whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the Words of eternal Life.* Sometimes as the only Publiſher of Life (that is to *2 Tim.* 1. 10. us of any avail) *who hath aboliſh'd Death, and hath brought Life and Immortality to Light through Rom.* 8. 2. *the Goſpel.* Sometimes as the Author and Foun- *2 Cor.* 3, 6, 8. der of (the only Religion of Life) *the Law of Joh.* 20. 31. *the Spirit of Life, of the miniſtration of the Spirit and of Life.* Sometimes as the procuring Cauſe *Rom.* 5. 17, 18, 21. of Life (the meritorious impulſive Cauſe of it) *we have Life through his Name. By the Righteouſneſs of one the free Gift came upon all Men unto Juſtification of Life. They which receive abundance of Grace and of the Gift of Righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in Life by one, Jeſus Chriſt. That as Sin hath reigned unto Death, even ſo might Grace reign through Righteouſneſs unto eternal Life, by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* Sometimes as the Fountain of Life. *He ſhew'd me a pure River of Water of Life* *Apoc.* 22. 1. *proceeding out of the Throne of God and of the Lamb.* Sometimes as the Head of the Family of Life, *Apoc.* 21. 27. *and* 3. 5. *and* 2. 7. and the Lord and Owner of Life, as being the Sovereign Keeper of the Book of Life, and ſtanding at the Head of it; whence it is call'd *the Lamb's Book of Life.* To him that overcometh he promiſeth; *I will not blot out his Name out of the Book of Life. To him I will give to eat of the Tree of Life.* He is the Lord and Owner of eternal Life (of the ſupernal Paradiſe with its Tree of Life) it is in his Hands, and he beſtoweth it on whom he pleaſeth. *For as the* *Joh.* 5. 21, 26. *Father raiſeth up the dead and quickneth them: Even ſo the Son quickneth* (to Life eternal) *whom he will. And as the Father hath Life in himſelf; ſo hath he given to the Son, to have Life in himſelf.* As in the Father, ſo in the Son there is an infinite fulneſs of Life ὀντωδῶς, *eſſentially* and conſtitutively, as *Vivens* (living in himſelf;) and alſo ἐνεργητικῶς, *efficient-cauſally* and operatively as *Vivificans* (making others alive;) whence the Apoſtle ſaith of the Second *Adam, He is a quick-* *1 Cor.* 15. 44. *ning Spirit.* As to his Body Chriſt is now wholly Spiritual and Heavenly, Divine and Immortal (therefore rightly called a Spirit;) and he is vivificative to others; for he will quicken and enliven all his Members into Life incorruptible and immortal. *I am he that liveth and* *Apoc.* 1. 18. *was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, and have the Keys of Hell and of Death.* He ſo liveth, as that he is Lord of Life and Death eternal; whom he pleaſeth, he can let out of the Region of Death, and raiſe all his Followers to the ſame immortal Life, that himſelf enjoyeth. Whence he promiſeth unto them a Reſurrection unto Life (that he will raiſe them up at the laſt Day) and in our Evangeliſt he ſtileth himſelf *the Reſurrection and the Life.* He is *Joh.* 6. 40. *and* 11. 25, 26. the Author of the Reſurrection to Life eternal; he that believeth in him, though he be dead and in a Grave, yet ſhall he live (becauſe Chriſt will raiſe him to Life immortal;) and if any Man be alive and believeth in him, *he ſhall never die*, becauſe Chriſt will give unto him the never-dying Life. *My Sheep hear my voice* (ſaith he) *and* *Joh.* 10. 27, 28. *I know them and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal Life and they ſhall never periſh.* Chriſt is therefore the Authoritative Donour of Life eternal. *Thou haſt given him Power over all* *Act.* 3. 15. *Joh.* 17. 2. *Apoc.* 2. 10. *fleſh, that he might give eternal Life to as many as thou haſt given him. Be thou faithful unto Death, and I will give thee a Crown of Life.* Sometimes he is repreſented as the Imperial Potentate of Life (or Salvation;) for ſo the Apoſtle repreſenteth him to the Jews his Murderers. *Ye have killed the Prince of Life.* Act. 3. 15. He is the Gift and Benefit of Life eternal therefore in reſpect of all that he is, and in the various degrees thereof. For in reſpect of his Doctrine he is *the Word of Life.* Phil. 2. 16. Joh. 6. 68. In reſpect of his Sacrifie he is the Food of Life. *Joh.* 6. 51. In reſpect of his New Teſtament he is *the Promiſe of Life.* 2 Tim. 1. 1 In reſpect of his Holy Spirit (the Diſpenſation thereof) he is the Fountain of Life. *Joh.* 7. 38. And at the laſt Day he will be the authoritative Donour of the Crown of Immortality, and *Mortality ſhall be ſwallowed up of Life.* 2 Cor. 5. 4.

He is the Benefit of Life eternal to us in the ſeveral degrees of *Inchoation* and *Perfection*. For the State of Life (the oppoſite to the State of Sin and of Death) which he is to his Believers, is an Inchoation of Life eternal. *Rom.* 5. 18. And ſuch is alſo (*the Spirit of Life*) the Life of Divine Grace and Sanctification, one Branch whereof is *the Light of Life* which he promiſeth to his Believers. *Joh.* 8. 12. And at the laſt Day he will be the Perfection and Conſummation of Life eternal to his People; *when Chriſt who is our Life* (the Author and Donor of our glorious felicitative Life) *ſhall appear, then ſhall ye alſo appear with him in Glory.* Col. 3. 4.

XXI. By this time (one may juſtly ſuppoſe) we are certainly acquainted with the Senſe of the New Teſtament, when it ſpeaketh of Life, and more eſpecially with the Senſe of our Evangeliſt; whence we may thus argue touching the meaning of this Name *the Life* in the Proem of his Goſpel and his Firſt Epiſtle. Either in thoſe Proems he ſpeaketh of *the Life* in a Senſe quite diſſonant from himſelf (throughout his Writings) and quite diſſonant from the Tenour of the New Teſtament: Or elſe in thoſe Proems by this Name *the Life* he meaneth only *that Gift and Benefit of Life eternal*, which only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah (not any Abſtract Logos) is unto Men. But he cannot be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak in thoſe Proems ſo diſſonantly from himſelf and the New Teſtament; therefore this honourary Name *the Life* in thoſe Proems (being underſtood in the perſonal Acceptation) denoteth only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah, not any Abſtract Logos. It is not a natural Life, but only Life ſpiritual and eternal, which the Religion of Chriſtianity and the New Teſtament concerneth it ſelf about; and conſequently our Evangeliſt in his two Proems meaneth only this Life, which not an Abſtract Logos, but only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah in his Religion is unto Men, therefore this honourary Name *the Life* in thoſe Proems denoteth only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah not any Abſtract Logos. It is not poſſible, to argue with any firmitude and certainty touching the Senſe of the Holy Writers, if theſe Arguments do not aſcertain our Evangeliſts Senſe in his two Proems, of one of which we will take a ſhort view; for it ought to be conjoin'd with thoſe many other places of the New Teſtament which we have remark'd. 1 *Joh.* 1. 1, 2. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have ſeen with our Eyes, which we have look'd upon, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life; For the Life was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it, and bear Witneſs, and ſhew unto you that eternal Life, which was with the Father and was manifeſted unto us.* If we enquire what *the Word of Life* ſignifieth in other places of the New Teſtament (beſides theſe two Proems) we find, that it always ſignifieth *the Word of the Chriſtian Religion*, which alone is the Word of Life. *Joh.* 6. 68. *Act.* 5. 20. *Phil.* 2. 16. So it always ſignifieth, when it is underſtood in *the real Acceptation*; therefore in theſe two Proems wherein it is underſtood in *the perſonal Acceptation*, it denoteth only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah (who alone is this Word of Life) not any Abſtract Logos. If we alſo inquire what Life this Holy Writer meaneth, when he ſtileth a certain Perſon of Honour *the Life* and *the Word of Life*; himſelf interpreteth his own meaning; for in the ſame Contexture of Words he ſtileth the ſame Perſon *that eternal Life*; and is it an Abſtract Logos, who in the Senſe of the New Teſtament and of our Evangeliſt is *that eternal Life?* Is it not only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah? We ought to conſider further (*r*) that the Apoſtles were to be Men, that could and did Witneſs upon the Credit of their Eyes and Ears what they publiſh'd. This perſonal Quality was requir'd in them, to Witneſs what they had ſeen our Lord do, the Words that they had heard him ſpeak, upon their own Knowledge, and to Teſtifie of him and the miraculous Things that befel him (eſpecially his Reſurrection) as thoſe that had ſeen the Lord, that ſo (being to preach the Goſpel to all Nations) they might be able to ſatisfie all Men touching the Truth of the Goſpel. *Act.* 1. 21, 22. *Joh.* 15. 27. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. 2 *Pet.* 1. 16. 1 *Cor.* 9. 1. This Holy Writer therefore ſpeaketh as an Apoſtle (an Apoſtolical Eye-witneſs) and his Words relate to his Apoſtolical Witneſs-bearing, when he ſaith, *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have ſeen with our Eyes, which we have look'd upon, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life.* This Proem therefore muſt be underſtood agreeably to the Apoſtolical Witneſs-bearing, not touching an Abſtract Logos (which the Apoſtles were not concerned to bear Witneſs to, nor were they capable of it) but touching the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah and that Benefit of Life eternal which he is in the Chriſtian Religion. So *Tertullian* (ſometimes) rightly interpreteth our Saviour's Name. (*s*) *They that knew him to be the Word of Life, continued accompanying him to the end.* We have great Aſſurance that in this Proem of our Evangeliſt *the Word* or *Logos* and *the Life*, denote and ſignifie not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of God's Meſſiah; and conſequently they ſo denote and ſignifie in the Proem of his Goſpel. *The Life* therefore ſo manifeſtly ſignifieth the Benefit of Life eternal, which only the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt is in his Religion, that even *Grotius* (who as much as he can, befriendeth an Abſtract Logos) giveth this wiſe Caution. (*t*) *Vitam hic cave aliam accipias quam vitam æternam.* Take heed, that you do not miſunderſtand this Name *the Life*, to be meant of any other Life but Life eternal. Agreeably to *Grotius* the Jeſuit *Maldonate* largely diſcourſeth. And theſe Words *the Life was manifeſted and we have ſeen it*, are thus expounded by *Ven. Bede* upon the place. *Illam vitam dicit, quæ in Evangelio loquitur, ego ſum reſurrectio & vita.*

XXII. S. *Baſil* taketh Notice (*u*) that our Evangeliſt calleth the Son of God ϗ φῶς ϗ ζωὴν ϗ ἀνάστασιν, *the Light, the Life, and the Reſurrection*; whence he ought to have obſerv'd, that *the Life* which he meaneth, is that which is connex'd with the Reſurrection. But although he overlooketh this obſervable, he ſubjoineth this good rule, (*w*) *When you hear him called the Light, do not think him to be this ſenſible and viſible Light; and when you hear him called the Life, do not think him, to be this common Life, which even Brute-animals live.* To ſuppoſe, that this Name *the Life* denoteth the Son of God,

---

(r) *Mr. Thorndike of the Govern. of the Church* p. 3, 4.

(s) *Qui ſcierunt illum vitæ eſſe Verbum & à Deo veniſſe, perſeveraverunt in Comitatu ejus uſque ad finem.* De præſcript. c. 3.

(t) *Not. in Joh.* 1. 4.

(u) *Hom. in Joh.* 1. 1. p. 505.

(t) Οὔτε φῶς ἀκούσας, ἐπὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸν τοῦτο ϗ ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρατὸν καταφέρῃ· οὔτε ζωὴν ἀκούσας, τὴν κοινὴν ταύτην νόει, ἣν ϗ τὰ ἄλογα ζῇ.

God, to be the common Animal Life, is alike abſurd, as to ſuppoſe, that this Name *The Light* denoteth him to be the common Light of the Sun. Yet at this rate the Scholaſtic Theology miſ-interpreteth the Scripture and the Proem of S. *John*'s Goſpel; and at this rate S. *Baſil* himſelf contradicteth his own Rule. For he ſuppoſeth, that the Abſtract Son of God is called *The Life*, as being by an eternal proceſſion, (x) ἐκ τ ὄντως ζωῆς ἡ ζωοποιὸς πηγὴ, *from that which is Life indeed a vivific Fountain*; and he explaineth what he meaneth by this vivific Fountain; for he ſtileth the Abſtract Son (or *Logos*) of God, (y) τ ὄντως ὄντα, τὴν πηγὴν τ ζωῆς, τ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐστι τοῦ εἶναι παρεκτικὸν, *The Being that truly is, the Fountain of Life, that giveth Being to all Beings.* His Senſe is the ſame with this of *Athanaſius*, who ſaith of the Son, (z) *As from the Fountain of the Father He is Life, in whom all things* (all Animals) *have Vivification and Conſiſtence.* So the *Alexandrian Cyril* (before cited) ſaith, (a) *The* (Abſtract) *Son proceeding from the Eſſence of the Father as from an everliving Fountain is naturally Life, vivificating all things.* So S. *Chryſoſtom* ſuppoſeth, that theſe words of our Evangeliſt, *In him was Life*, do ſignifie, (b) *the everflowing and inexhauſtible Virtue of the* (Abſtract) *Divine Logos, both to procreate and conſerve all created Beings.* So (c) *Origen*, (d) *Gr. Naz.* (e) and others of the ancient Writers ſuppoſe, that the *Logos* (or Son of God is called *The Life*, becauſe he is the Fountain of Natural Life (the procreative and conſervative cauſe thereof) and *in him we live* our Natural Life. But ſeeing it is plainly demonſtrative from the whole tenour of the New Teſtament and from our Evangeliſt himſelf, that in ſtiling the Son of God *The Life* he meaneth no other Life but Life Eternal, therefore this Expoſition of the ancient Writers is demonſtratively a Scholaſtic and Unchriſtian miſtake, and ſuch is alſo their Philoſophic Demiurgic *Logos*. It is reaſonable and agreeable, that in the Goſpel of the Son of God he ſhould be called by ſuch Names, that denote what he is by Office and Dignity, and as Author of the Goſpel or the Chriſtian Religion: but this Expoſition is altogether remote from the Idea of the Son of God as Author of the Goſpel, altogether alien from the Evangelical kind of things, from the purport and intent of Chriſt's coming and from the buſineſs of Chriſtianity. If our Evangeliſt had been writing of Natural Religion and the Duties thereof, it had been pertinent and agreeable, to have told us of the Fountain of our Being and our Natural Life: but he is not writing of any ſuch matters, nor doth the knowledge of the Son of God at all belong to Natural Theology and Religion; therefore he cannot be the procreative and conſervative cauſe of Natural Life, nor is it the Evangeliſt's intention, ſo to repreſent him. If it had been the intention of the holy Writers of the New Teſtament, ſo to repreſent him, they would have told the Heathen, that by their Idolatry they were alienated from this the true *Zeus*, that is, αἰτία τοῖς ζῶσι τοῦ ζῆν, *the cauſe of life to all living things*: but they never made uſe of ſuch Notices as theſe in preaching the Son of God to the Heathen. In our Evangeliſt the Son of God is intituled *the true Bread, the true Vine*, and the *true Light*, his Fleſh and Blood is called *Meat* and *Drink indeed* (in compariſon of which all other is but ſhew and ſhadow;) and it cannot be ſuppos'd, that by this honourary Name *The Life* he meaneth any thing leſs than (f) τὴν ὄντως ζωὴν, δι᾽ ἣν ζῶμεν τὴν ἀληθῆ ζωὴν, *the Life indeed by which we live the true life.* So by *Ignatius* (g) Jeſus Chriſt is called τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν, *our true Life*, and he ſaith of him, (h) οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν, *without whom we have not the true Life.* The Son of God therefore muſt be ſuppoſed, to be denominated *The true Life unto us*, which cannot be the Natural Life: And as theſe Names *the true Bread, the true Vine*, and *the true Light*, cannot ſignifie, that he is both the common Bread, a common Vine and the common Light, and alſo *the true Bread, the true Vine, and the true Light*: So this Name *The true Life* cannot mean, that he is both the Natural Life to us and the true Life. Yet thus inconſiſtently (and jumbling together things Natural and Evangelical) it is interpreted by S. *Chryſoſtom* and S. *Gr. Nazianzen*. For the former having interpreted *The Life*, to ſignifie, that the Son of God is the procreative and conſervative cauſe of Natural Life, proceedeth to ſay, *That the Evangeliſt beginneth with the Reſurrection and with wonderful things Evangelical.* (i) *For Life being come to us the dominion of Death is diſſolv'd, and the Light ſhining to us it is no more Darkneſs with us, but Life always remaineth in us, and Death cannot vanquiſh it.* This indeed is a genuine Interpretation of theſe Evangelical Names (The Life and The Light) and the genuine Evangelical Character of the Son of God: but to interpret his Name *The Life*, to ſignifie the Fountain of common Nature and Natural Life: This is to make the things of Unregeneracy the proper Subject-matter of the Theology and Religion of Regeneracy; This is to make Chriſt ſuch a Son of God as ought to be treated of in Phyſiology and Natural Theology: This is not to interpret the Goſpel as the Goſpel touching things Evangelical. But thus *Gr. Naz.* will have this Name *The Life*, to ſignifie, not only that we have the Holy Spiritual Life from the Son of God, but (k) κατὰ τὴν διπλῆν τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος δύναμιν καὶ πνοὴν *according to the twofold Inſpiration, the one of Natural, the other of Spiritual Life*, and that he is πάσης λογικῆς φύσεως σύστασις καὶ οὐσίωσις, *efficiently the Conſtitution and Eſſentiation of all Rational Nature.* The ancient Writers that in their Diſputes with the Hereticks declaim againſt the Wiſdom of this World, at this rate diſtort the things Evangelical to School-philoſophic Notions, that profane *Life* and the Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion. And we that ſhould tranſcend them in Wiſdom (as living in an Age more Learned than they) yet in the Theology of the Godhead have not advanc'd one jot beyond their Scholaſtic Vanities, as appeareth from the Expoſition, which a Divine of our own hath lately made of our Evangeliſt's Proem, and *the Life* and *Light* which he ſpeaketh of. (l) *The Word was the Fountain of Life, even of the Rational Life. In him was Life and the Life was the Light of Men. He enlightned Mankind with Natural Reaſon and Underſtanding.* (m) *He is the Fountain of all Rational Life. In him was Life and the Life was the Light of Men.*

(x) *Adv. Eunom. l.* 2. *p.* 59.

(y) *Ibid. p.* 56.

(z) Αὐτὸς ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς τοῦ πατρός ἐστι ζωὴ, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ζωογονεῖται καὶ συνέστηκεν. *C. Arian. or.* 4. *p.* 252. *Com.*

(a) Ὁ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸς, ὥσπερ ἀπό τινος πηγῆς ἀεὶ ζώσης, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας προελθὼν, ζωὴ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶ τὰ πάντα ζωογονῶν. *Com. in Johan. p.* 50.

(b) *Hom.* 5. *in Johan. p.* 580.

(c) *Peri-archon. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(d) *Or.* 36. *p.* 591.

(e) *Euthym. Theophyl.*

(f) *Clem. Strom. l.* 7. *p. m.* 507.

(g) *Ep.* 1. *p.* 3.

(h) *Ep.* 6. *p.* 51.

(i) Τῆς γὰρ ζωῆς παραγενομένης πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέλυται τοῦ θανάτου τὸ κράτος, καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς λάμψαντος ἡμῖν οὐκέτι τὸ σκότος ἐστίν.

(k) *Or.* 36. *p.* 591.

(l) *Dr. Sherlock of the Scripture proofs of Chriſt's Divin. p.* 125.

(m) *Ibid. p.* 139.

The ancient Writers ſuppoſe, that the Son of God is the Fountain of Natural Life (of Vegetative Life to Plants, of Senſitive Life to Animals, of Rational Life to Men) by the Intervention of the Holy Spirit, ſo diſtorting the things of the New Teſtament, which are the Saint of God-kind of things, into things of another nature, kind and quality; at once turning the Holy Spirit (that peculiarly belongeth to the Church and Saints of God and is meerly a Saint of God-kind of thing) into an univerſal Principle of Natural Life, an *Anima mundi* (as it were) or Spirit of the World (a Mundane Vivificative Spirit) and perverting the Holy Imperial Son of God (who peculiarly belongeth to the Church and Kingdom of God, and is eſſentially a Saint of God-kind of Imperial Son) into a principle of Common Life and a Mundane-Syſtem-kind of *Logos* like that of the School of *Plato*. Whence S. *Auſtin* (whom the Schoolmen follow) deriv'd his Philoſophic-pagan kind of Expoſition of our Evangeliſt s Text, *In him was Life*. For connecting with theſe words part of the former Verſe, he thus readeth the Evangeliſt's Text (as many others have done) *Quod factum eſt, in ipſo vita erat*, every thing that was made or created, was in him (the Abſtract *Logos*) Life: which he thus illuſtrateth; (n) *Suppoſe an Artificer to make an Atk; it muſt be conſider'd, as it is in the Artificer's Art, and as it is in the Work done. As it is in the Work done, it is not Life: but as it is in the Artificer's Art, it is Life; becauſe the Soul of the Artificer liveth, where all theſe things are, before they are produc'd.* Thus a frigid and frivolous Scholaſtic Subtilty is brought upon the Stage, to expound a Text, that is of infinite importance to Life and Salvation; and what ſignifieth it to Life and Salvation, whether things made according to Art live in the Mind of the Artificer or not? If this is the Senſe of our Evangeliſt's Text *Amelius* and other Pagan *Platoniſts* that knew not God or the Son of God, were much more fit to be Expoſitors of it than S. *Auſtin* and the Schoolmen. For their Abſtract *Logos* in this reſpect degenerateth from the Platonic; the Idea's that are in it, are not any Realities or Subſtantialities, not any one of them is an *Eſſence and Life*, they are meer Notionalities and conceptional kind of Species, not any one of them is ſuppos'd to have ſuch a Life, which conſtituteth it alive and living, as to any thing in it ſelf every one of theſe Idea's is devoid of Life, and therefore cannot properly (but only metonymically and figuratively) be ſaid to be Life, much leſs Life it ſelf. Yet they ſay, that between Humane Artificers and this Divine Artificer (the Abſtract *Logos*) there is this difference; although the Idea of a thing in ſome ſort liveth in the Mind of an Humane Artificer, yet *non eſt vita*, becauſe his Intellection is not his Eſſence: but in God his Intellection is his Eſſence and his Life, and whatever is in God, is not only Life, but Life it ſelf. Which is moſt true of the *Platoniſts Logos*, that is called by them ζωὴ, *Life*, and ζῶον, *Animal*, (or that which liveth) not only becauſe it is *Intelligence* (which is called by them (o) θεωρία ζῶσα, *living Theory*) but alſo becauſe the Idea's of it are ſuppos'd to be, not the meer *Notionalities*, but the great *Realities* and *Subſtantialities* of things, each one of them is *an Eſſence, Life, Intellect*, (all things live there) and all of them are *Animals and Gods*. Of this Platonic Logos *Amelius* the Platoniſt interpreted our Evangeliſt's Text (not receding from the Principles of his Art, like the Muſician that defin'd the Soul an Harmony) his reading of the Text was the ſame with that of S. *Auſtin*; ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, *that which was made* (or created) *in him was Life*. And this was his Interpretation; ἐν ᾧ τὸ γινόμενον ζῶν, ϗ ζωήν, ϗ ὂν πεφυκέναι, *In whom whatſoever was made, was Living and Life and true Being*. This Platonic Interpretation ſo far agreeth with that of S. *Auſtin* and the Schoolmen; they both ſuppoſe touching their Abſtract Demiurgic *Logos*, that before all things were created by him, they were contain'd in him (which is a Mundane Syſtem) and the divineſt kind of thing which they attribute to their Abſtract Demiurgic *Logos*, is common Intellection or Idea, that may be found in the damned, and is foreign or exotic to the Son of God, the Life of God and *Life Eternal*.

XXIII. The other Attribute which our Evangeliſt connecteth with his Creative *Logos* is *The Light*, v. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9. *The life was the light of Men. And the light ſhineth in darkneſs, and the darkneſs comprehended it not. John came for a witneſs, to bear witneſs of the light. He was not that light, but was ſent to bear witneſs of that light. That was the true light, which lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* Some Scholaſticks in the Interpretation of this Attribute have proceeded to great extravagances, as *Gaſſendus* relateth. (p) *There have been Catholicks, who have held, that God is the* Intellectus agens, *who is the true Light, that lighteth every Man coming into this World.* This Conceit was deriv'd from ſome of *Ariſtotle*'s Interpreters (Greeks and Arabians) *Plato* doth not acknowledge an *Intellectus agens*, but his Abſtract *Logos* is ſuppos'd to be *an intelligible Sun*, that affordeth intellectual light to Mankind in their Philoſophic Contemplations; and this Platonic Intelligible Sun a Divine of our own accounteth the true Son of God. (q) *What* Ariſtotle *attributes to a Light within us* (ſaith he) Plato *referreth to a Sun without us; to him who is the true Light, that inlightneth every one that cometh into the World, I mean to the Eternal Son of God.*—— Platoniſts *had as good reaſon, to conceive, that* S. John *was one of their Tribe from the ninth as from the firſt Verſe of the firſt Chapter of his Goſpel. Mankind is illuminated by Chriſt the Eternal Word and Wiſdom of God. This Illumination hath place in Metaphyſical Contemplations.* So *Plato* ſuppoſeth; but his Metaphyſical Contemplation is Phantaſtry, not Wiſdom; his intelligible Sun is as grand a Figment as the Ariſtotelians *Intellectus agens*, and they that confound his intelligible Sun with the Evangeliſt's Son of God, may as well confound the Chriſtian *Converſion* with the Platonic *Converſion* (or ἐπιστροφὴ) which is a turning the Mind to the intelligible Idea's and ſuper-intelligible Good. The Platonic Contemplation and Illumination is not ſo good as the Light of Nature and common Reaſon, of which the Abſtract Son of God is commonly ſuppos'd, to be the Fountain, and the Evangeliſt is commonly ſuppos'd, to ſtile him *The Light*, becauſe he is the Fountain of it. Some (as *Beza* and *Piſcator*) ſuppoſe, that he is ſtiled *The Light* for this only reaſon, becauſe he is the Fountain of Natural Light, and according-

(n) *Attendite arcam in arte & arcam in opere. Arca in opere non eſt vita: arca in arte vita eſt: quia vivit anima artificis, ubi ſunt iſta omnia, antequam proferantur.* Tr. 1. in Johan. Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. p. 500.

(o) *Plotin. En.* 3. *l.* 8. *c.* 7.

(p) *Fuiſſe Catholicos, qui putaverint Deum Intellectum agentem, qui eſt Lux vera, quæ illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum.* T. 2. p. 433.

(q) *Sarſon. Analyſ. of* 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *See another monſtrous extravagance in J. Bapt.* Criſp. Quin. Prim. p. 45.

ly *Theophylact* and the *Alexandrian Cyril* expound the Evangeliſt. (r) *He ſaith, The Life was the Light of Men, that is, The all vivificating God the Logos, The Life in all Beings, illuminateth the rational Animal, and affordeth a largeſs of Intelligence to thoſe Animals that are capable of it.* To this Senſe ſome Expoſitors confine the Evangeliſt's words: but the generality of the Ancient Scholaſtic Divines do not thus confine the Evangeliſt's words; although they expound them, to ſignifie, that the *Logos* is the Fountain of Natural Light, yet they alſo ſuppoſe them to ſignifie, that he is the Fountain of the ſpiritual ſaving Light, which is peculiar to regenerate Chriſtians. *Origen*, who ſuppoſeth all Men, that partake of Reaſon, to partake of Chriſt, yet ſuppoſeth ſome only to have, (s) τὸ νοητὸν γνώσεως φῶς, φῶς ἀληθινόν, ϗ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, ϗ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *the intelligible Light of Knowledge, the true Light, the Light of the World and the Light of Men.* Theſe are they, that do not worſhip the Heavenly Bodies becauſe of their ſenſible Light, (t) *that underſtand how God is Light, and how the Son of God is the true Light.* According to this Father (of whoſe Philoſophy touching Light it is remarkable, that he ſeemeth to think (u) all Light to be from Flame or Fire as the effulgency of it) the Light which our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of, is the Light which ſhineth into our Hearts, and giveth us the light of the knowledge of God πρὸς φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, *to illuſtrate the Goſpel.* That Light which the Scripture ſpeaketh of, when it ſaith, *thy Law is a Light unto my Feet, and a Lamp unto my Paths.* That Light which aroſe to us that ſate in Darkneſs and the Region of the Shadow of Death. That Light of which the Scripture ſaith; *the People that ſate in darkneſs, have ſeen a great light.* It is the light of the wiſe Virgins, and that which is in the Scriptures, wherein this Light is conſerv'd and ſhineth. And ſo *Clemens* clearly explaineth, in what Senſe he ſuppoſeth Chriſt to be the Light, in thus exhorting an Heathen, to become a regenerate Chriſtian. (w) *Receive Chriſt, receive thy Sight, receive thy Light. Hail Light: for from Heaven Light is riſen upon us, that were buried in Darkneſs, and ſhut up in the Shadow of Death, Light more pure than the Sun, ſweeter than this Life. That Light is Life Eternal and whatever partake of it live. Make haſt thou that art as blind as* Tireſias, *believe thy Sight* (the cauſe of it) *the Sun's Illumination is not ſo bright as Chriſt's, by whom the Eyes of the blind ſee. The Night will be put to flight, the Fire will be profligated, Death will be driven away.* He that diſcourſeth ſuch things as theſe (although he mentioneth not our Evangeliſt's Text, as *Origen* doth) muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean, that the Son of God is in our Evangeliſt's Proem called *The Light*, as being in himſelf and to us that ſpiritual ſaving Light that is in Chriſtianity and Regeneracy, which is a true Idea of the Son of God. *Gr. Naz.* ſaith, He is called *The Light* (x) *as being the brightneſs of Souls that are cleanſed in Speech and in Life. For if Darkneſs is Ignorance and Sin, Light muſt be Knowledge and Life Divine.* S. *Auſtin* ſaith, (y) *The Illumination of us Chriſtians is a participation of the Word, namely, of that Life which is the Light of Men.* In his Expoſition of our Evangeliſt and elſewhere he requireth an antecedent purging and cleanſing our ſelves, to qualifie us for the reception of this Light, which therefore is not the Natural Light. So S. *Chryſoſtom* (expounding our Evangeliſt's Proem) requireth a cleanſing the Soul from all Paſſions (vile Affections) to qualifie us for a participation of this Light; and he ſpeaketh to us theſe divine words. (z) *This Light cometh by Faith, and when it is come, it plenteouſly for the future illuminateth the receiver, and if thou liveſt a pure life agreeable to it, it remaineth with thee continually, dwelling within.* This Light he reckoneth amongſt thoſe Soul-goods, which the Son of God παρέσχεν ἡμῖν ἐλθών, *afforded us coming amongſt us, which the Evangeliſt* (ſaith he) *hath ſignify'd by one word, And the Life was the Light of Men.* Agreeably to theſe Fathers *Jul. Firmicus* ſaith of this Light. (a) *It cannot ſhine, unleſs an immaculate Conſcience and an incorrupt Life guardeth and commendeth us; then the Grace of true Light will riſe unto us: then the Author of Light will inſinuate himſelf into us: then we may both receive and ſee the true Light.* By this Name our Evangeliſt calleth the Light which he ſpeaketh of, and this Name demonſtrateth the miſtake of thoſe ancient Writers, who interpret the Light (in our Evangeliſt's Proem) to ſignifie both the *Natural* and the *Evangelical* Light. For (as we have before argu'd) this Name *the true Bread* and *the true Vine* cannot ſignifie both *common Bread* and a *common Vine*, and alſo *the true Bread* and *the true Vine*: So this Name *The true Light* cannot ſignifie both *the common Light of Reaſon* and *the true Light*. The *Light* and the *true Light* in our Evangeliſt certainly ſignifieth the Evangelical Light (which only is of this denomination;) therefore it doth not ſignifie the Natural Light.

XXIV. This Point the Jeſuit *Maldonate* ſtrenuouſly proveth in this following Diſcourſe, that is truly Divine and Chriſtian. (b) "As we have ſaid, that by Life in this place is not meant Natural Life, whereby we live to the World, but Spiritual Life, whereby we live unto God: So it is paſt doubt with me, that it is not the Natural Light, that is here meant, but the Spiritual Light, whereby we know and diſcern the things of the Spirit of God. For the Evangeliſt is teaching us, how the Word is Life to us, namely, *by illuminating every Man coming into the World, for the Life was the Light of Men.*

(r) Διὰ τοῦτό φησι, ϗ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τουτ' ἔστιν, ὁ πάντα ζωογονῶν θεὸς λόγος, ἡ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσι ζωή, ϗ τὸ λογικὸν φωτίζει ζῶον, ϗ τοῖς συνέσεως δεκτικοῖς τὴν σύνεσιν ἐπιδαψιλεύεται. S. Cyr. Com. in Joh. p. 54.

(s) C. Celſ. l. 5. p. 237.

(t) Ibid. p. 238.

(u) Οἷον ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἐξάπτεσθαι φῶς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ. Ibid. l. 6. p. 278.

(w) Ἀπόλαβε τὸν Χριστόν, ἀπόλαβε τὸ βλέπειν, ἀπόλαβέ σου τὸ φῶς. Χαῖρε φῶς· ὅτι φῶς ἡμῖν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τοῖς ἐν σκότει κατορωρυγμένοις, ϗ ἐν σκιᾷ θανάτου κατακεκλεισμένοις ἐξέλαμψεν, ἡλίου καθαρώτερον, ζωῆς τῆς ἐνταῦθα γλυκύτερον. τὸ φῶς ἐκεῖνο, ζωή ἐστιν ἀΐδιος· ϗ ὅσα μετείληφεν αὐτοῦ ζῇ· σπεῦσον τειρεσία· πίστευσον ὄψει· Χριστὸς ἐπιλάμπει φαιδρότερον ἡλίου, δι' ὃν ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν ἀναβλέπουσιν, νὺξ σε φεύξεται, πῦρ φοβηθήσεται, θάνατος οἰχήσεται. Προτρεπτ. p. 52, 55.

(x) Ὡς λαμπρότης ψυχῶν, ϗ λόγῳ ϗ βίῳ καθαιρομένων· εἰ γὰρ σκότος ἡ ἄγνοια, ϗ ἡ ἁμαρτία, φῶς ἂν εἴη ἡ γνῶσις, ϗ βίος ὁ ἔνθεος. Or. 36. p. 591.

(y) *Illuminatio noſtra participatio verbi eſt, illius ſcilicet vitæ quæ lux eſt hominum.* De Trin. l. 4. c. 2.

(z) Παραγίνεται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ φῶς διὰ πίστεως ϗ παραγινόμενον καταλάμπει λοιπὸν μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς δαψιλείας τὸν ὑποδεξάμενον, κἂν βίον αὐτοῦ παρέχῃς καθαρὸν μένει διηνεκῶς ἐνοικοῦν ἔνδον. *Hom.* 5. *in Johan. p.* 581.

(a) *Lucere non poteſt, niſi immaculata nos conſcientiæ ornamenta protexerint, niſi integra nos & incorrupta vita commendet, tunc orietur nobis veri luminis gratia: tunc ſe nobis lucis auctor inſinuet: tunc verum lumen & accipere poſſumus & videre.* De error. prof. rel. p. 39.

(b) Com. in Joh. 1. 4.

“ This manifeſtly appeareth, to be his Senſe both from thoſe things that follow, and from the uſual Language of Scripture. In the *fifth* Verſe the Evangeliſt addeth, *The Light ſhineth in Darkneſs and the Darkneſs comprehended it not.* Therefore he doth not ſpeak of the Natural Light, which all Men comprehend, but of the Spiritual Light, which few have comprehended. He addeth in the *ninth* Verſe; *This was the true Light, which enlightneth every Man coming into the World*; where doubtleſs he ſpeaketh of the ſame Light and of the Spiritual Light, *Joh.* 3. 19. when he ſaith, *Light is come into the World, and Men loved Darkneſs rather than Light*, doubtleſs he ſpeaketh of Spiritual Light, as of Spiritual Darkneſs. When Chriſt ſaith, *ch.* 8. 12. *I am the Light of the World, he that followeth me, walketh not in Darkneſs, but ſhall have the Light of Life:* It is manifeſt, that Light and Darkneſs are taken Spiritually. *Ch.* 9. 5. he ſaith, *While I am in the World, I am the Light of the World.* And *ch.* 12. 35, 36. *Walk while ye have the Light, while ye have the Light, believe in the Light, that ye may be the Children of Light.* Hereunto the Prophecies agree; for S. *Matthew* interpreteth this following Prophecy of Chriſt and his Preaching, *Iſa.* 9. 2. *The People that walked in Darkneſs have ſeen a great Light: they that dwell in the Land of the Shadow of Death, upon them hath the Light ſhined.* Iſa. 49. 6. *I have given thee for a Light to the Gentiles, that thou mayeſt be my Salvation unto the end of the Earth.* Every where Light ſignifieth the Spiritual Illumination of Men; and I do not know, that any Inſtance can be produc'd from Scripture, where Light ſignifieth Natural Reaſon. On the contrary, Darkneſs which is oppos'd to the Light of Chriſt, is always taken for bad Manners and the Errors of Life, from which Chriſt reclaimeth us. For we go out of the way, when we walk in Darkneſs, *Rom.* 13. 12. *Let us caſt off the Works of Darkneſs and put on the Armour of Light.* 2 Cor. 6. 14. *What communion hath Light with Darkneſs.* Eph. 5. 8. *Ye were ſometimes Darkneſs, but now are ye Light in the Lord.* S. *John* ſaith in a place moſt like unto this whereof we diſcourſe, 1 *Joh.* 1. 5, 6. *God is Light, and in him is no Darkneſs at all. If we ſay, that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in Darkneſs, we lye.* And *ch.* 2. 9. *He that ſaith, he is in the Light, and hateth his Brother, is in Darkneſs even until now.* From which words of the Apoſtle this Commentator (that diſcourſeth ſo like a Chriſtian Divine) might have obſerv'd, that *Darkneſs* in the Chriſtian Theology and the New Teſtament ſignifieth the ſtate of Unregeneracy. Agreeably whereto himſelf interpreteth, *Joh.* 1. 5. *The Light ſhineth in Darkneſs, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not.* (c) *The Light he calleth Chriſt and his Doctrine, of which he had ſpoken in the next foregoing words; In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men. Darkneſs he calleth Men, who were in their Sins, that is, in Darkneſs, as* S. Paul *ſaith; ye were ſometimes Darkneſs, but now are ye Light in the Lord.* What *Tatianus* ſaith of the Soul in general, is in the Senſe of the Chriſtian Theology true of an Unregenerate Soul, (*d*) *ſhe is Darkneſs and hath nothing of Light.* To paſs from an unregenerate into a regenerate ſtate is (*e*) *to paſs from Darkneſs into Life.* (*f*) *There Foulneſs, and Darkneſs, and the horrour of a perpetual Night are in Domination. If thou deſireſt, that at leaſt ſome ſlender Beam of Light may ſhine into thee, lift up thine Eyes to him that ſaid, I am the Light of the World.* It is not the Natural Light, that Chriſt meaneth, when he ſaith, *I am the Light of the World*; therefore the Evangeliſt doth not mean it, when he ſaith, *The Life was the Light of Men.* The Evangeliſt diſcourſing of the Light is writing his Goſpel, which muſt be interpreted as the Goſpel touching the things (and conſequently the Light) Evangelical. All the ſaving Light that Mankind have, they have it from Chriſt, who introduc'd his Evangelical Light into a World of Heathen Sinners (of no better Character) that were in the atheous Darkneſs of *Ignorance, of Sin and of Miſery*; for ſuch is the Darkneſs of Unregeneracy (as on the contrary in the ſtate of Regeneracy there is the Light of Saving *Knowledge*, of *Grace* and of *Comfort*;) Uunregenerate Mankind at Chriſt's coming (as being in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs) were invelop'd in Darkneſs; and therefore the Evangeliſt ſpeaking the Language of the New Teſtament calleth them *The Darkneſs*, Joh. 1. 5. To this comprehenſion of Darkneſs the Natural Light belongeth: but ſo doth not the Light which our Evangeliſt in his Proem attributeth to Chriſt (it belongeth to an oppoſite Comprehenſion;) therefore by the Light which is Chriſt's Attribute our Evangeliſt doth not mean the Natural Light, but the Light of the glorious Goſpel of Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. The Light which is in Chriſtianity and Regeneracy, 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. *Eph.* 5. 8. 1 *Joh.* 2. 9. The benefit of ſaving Light, 1 *Joh.* 2. 8. and 5. 20. Our Evangeliſt in the Proem of his Goſpel ſpeaketh of *the true Light* both in the *perſonal* and *real* acceptation (for the true Light in the *perſonal* is the true Light in the *real* acceptation;) he ſpeaketh of the *true Light* in his firſt Epiſtle; and who can doubt, but that he meaneth by the true Light, not the Natural Light which is in Darkneſs, but the Saving Light which is in Chriſtianity and Regeneracy? For *the Darkneſs is paſt* (ſaith he to Regenerate Chriſtians) *and the true Light now ſhineth*, 1 *Joh.* 2. 8. It is evident therefore to common Senſe, that this is our Evangeliſt's Senſe in the Proem of his Goſpel; *The Saviour of the World was the benefit of Saving Light to the benighted World.* The Life was the Light of Men in Darkneſs.

XXV. This Light was not receiv'd or admitted into the comprehenſion of Darkneſs (the Darkneſs comprehended it not, ſaith the Evangeliſt) it is the Light which is receiv'd by Faith and rejected by Infidelity; which ſheweth, that it is not the natural Light.

(g) *We Sons of* Adam *that are born Blind are illuminated by*

(c) *Lucem vocat Chriſtum ejuſque doctrinam, de qua proximis verbis dixerat, In ipſo vita erat, & vita erat lux hominum. Tenebræ homines qui in peccatis, id eſt, in tenebris erant; ſicut D. Paulus ait, Eratis aliquando tenebræ, nunc autem lux in Domino.* Idem Com. in loc.

(d) *Anima per ſe tenebra eſt, & nihil habet lucis: hinc illud, Tenebræ non comprehendunt lucem.* Tatian. or. c. Græc. p. 152.

(e) Μεταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ σκότους εἰς ζωήν. *Clem. Strom. l.* 1. *p. m.* 259.

(f) *Illic ſordes, ſquallor, caligo, tenebræ, & perpetuæ noctis dominatur horror. Si vis ut tenuis ſaltem tibi ſplendor luminis luceat, erige vultus, & demerſos erige oculos, & deſertis his ad eum te confer qui dixit: Ego ſum lux mundi.* Jul. Firmic. de error. prof. rel. p. 39.

(g) *Ego ſum lumen mund, qui me ſequitur, non ambulabi* *our Lord having the Eye-ſalve of Faith; but the mixture of the Spittle with the Clay is antecedent thereto.* For it is not an Abſtract Logos, from whom we have this Illumination, or who is this Light, but only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. And this is evident to common Senſe; for every one knoweth, who it is, to whom *John* Baptiſt was a Witneſs and Fore-runner as to the true Light, *Joh.* 1. 6, 7, 8. And this is he, who alone is the Light that our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of; which therefore is not the natural Light. Nor is it leſs than palpable Nonſence, to ſuppoſe, that *John* Baptiſt was ſent to bear Witneſs unto natural Light, or to an Abſtract Demiurgic Logos the ſuppos'd Fountain thereof. He came to bear Witneſs unto him only, whom all Men are called by the Goſpel, to believe on; and therefore he only is the Light in the *perſonal* and *real* Acceptation. *V.* 6, 7, 8. *There was a man ſent from God, whoſe name was John. The ſame came for a witneſs, to bear witneſs of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was ſent to bear witneſs of that light. John* was a burning and ſhining Light, but not to be compar'd with Chriſt, conſidering the Light that he is as his kind of good and excellency, eſſentially and in infinite fulneſs in himſelf, and he is it unto us alſo. (h) *We that were formerly fooliſh and blind wandering in the darkneſs of Death, being illuminated by the light of Grace, let us hold on in the path of Life, our Lord being our guide and governour.* (i) *We are in Chriſt, that is, in the Sun and the true Day. We are in Chriſt, that is, always in the light.* (k) *If thou haſt begun to be a Man of light, do the things of Chriſt; for Chriſt is light and day.* So in Scripture he is intituled *the Sun of Righteouſneſs* (or Salvation) which ſpeaketh him the great Luminary (to whom *John* Baptiſt was a Fore-runner as the Phoſphorus is to the Sun) and another of his Scriptural Names is *Oriens ex alto*, the Day-ſpring from on high. *Luk.* 1. 79. Becauſe of which Name of the Meſſiah *(l)* ſome have an extravagant reſpect for the Eaſtern part of the World; the day alſo of his Nativity hath been called Ἐπιφάνεια, *the appearance of Light*, the Night before it *vigiliæ luminum* (becauſe of abundance of Candles that were then lighted) and at this time our Anceſtors ſent Candles to one another. Candles were alſo lighted, when the Goſpel was read (certainly not to ſignifie natural Light) the new-baptiz'd Perſon carried a lighted Candle in his Hand, and put on white Garments, to denote, that he was a Son of Light. Which Ritualities, although they were deviſ'd by dark Superſtition (which ſinketh Religion into exteriour Rites and neglecteth the Subſtance) yet were introduc'd into the Church, to ſignifie that eximious Evangelical Light for which Chriſt is celebrated in Scripture, but no where ſo much as in our Evangeliſts Proem. To his Followers he is *the light of Life*, the light of the holy Life into which they are regenerated, which leadeth unto Life eternal. From him they have a φωτεινὸν ὄμμα, *luminous Eye*; and becauſe Mankind have loſt their Eye-ſight in matters of Sanctity and their Salvation, the deſign of his coming was (m) *ut in agnitionem veritatis ocularet*, to give us our Eye-ſight to the acknowledgment of the Truth, as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh, (n) ἥλιος ψυχῆς, *the Sun of the Soul* is his agreeable Name; and accordingly our Evangeliſt repreſenteth him like the Sun, as in his Cauſality univerſally illuminative. *V.* 9. *That was the true light, which lightneth every man, that cometh into the world.* Some learned Expoſitors ſuppoſe (o) that theſe laſt words *coming into the World* do not refer to Man, but to *the true Light*; becauſe in the Evangeliſts theſe Expreſſions *coming and coming into the World* are frequently us'd touching our Saviour, his Name is ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *he that cometh*. Joh. 4. 25. Matth. 11. 3. Luk. 19. 38. And uſually his coming into the World is mention'd in our Evangeliſt and elſewhere. *Joh.* 3. 19. and 6. 14. and 11. 37. and 12. 46. and 18. 37. 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. According to this moſt probable Expoſition the Evangeliſt's Text ſhould be thus rendred; *That was the true Light, which coming into the World enlightneth every Man.* But how can it be ſaid of the Meſſias, that he enlightneth every Man? (p) *Did Chriſt preach the Goſpel to all the World* (ſaith a Divine of our own) *or was the Goſpel preached to all the World and to every Man in the World, at the time when S.* John *wrote this? Or was every Man in the World enlightned by it? This as to matter of Fact was falſe, and therefore could not be the Evangeliſt's meaning. And there is this demonſtration, that this is not his meaning; becauſe all this according to this Expoſition relateth to what Chriſt did in the Fleſh, whereas the Evangeliſt attributeth all this to the Word before the Incarnation.* Something material there is in this Argumentation, which yet is not levell'd ſo much againſt *Socinianiſm*, as againſt the Sanctity and Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion, that is ſadly profan'd by that Scholaſtic Theology, which ſuch Argumentations as theſe are deſigned to uphold and maintain. Which therefore do not convince, but make *Socinians*, who are not without the uſe of their Faculties, to diſcern the abſurdities of the Scholaſtic Theology; nor can they fail to diſcern the abſurdity of the laſt part of this Argumentation, which is called *a Demonſtration*. For no Man of Sence can imagine, that *John* Baptiſt's Witneſs-bearing to our Saviour as to the true Light was before his Incarnation; yet his being *the Life and Light unto Men*, is no more attributed *to the Word before the Incarnation*, than *John* Baptiſt's Witneſs-bearing is attributed to him before the Incarnation But there is in our Evangeliſts Narratives an unexactneſs in obſerving the time and order of things, of which this Evangeliſt's mentioning *the Word made Fleſh* is a palpable and acknowledg'd Inſtance. Diſmiſſing therefore this pretended Demonſtration, we will conſider the more material part of this Argumentation, which is touching our Saviour's *lighting every Man*, and which may ſeem a great difficulty. But there is really no more difficulty in expounding this Text of our Evangeliſt, than in expounding theſe other Texts. 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Who is the Saviour of all men.* 1 Cor. 15. 22. *In Chriſt all ſhall be made alive.* Rom. 5. 18. *By the righteouſneſs of one the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life.* For as Chriſt is the benefit of Salvation, of Life and of Righteouſneſs unto all Men, but it is in his Religion and by

---

in tenebris; quia Dominus illuminat cæcos. Illuminamur ergo fratres, habentes collyrium fidei. Præceſſit ejus ſaliva cum terra, unde inungeretur qui cæcus eſt natus. Et nos de Adam cæci nati ſumus. S. Aug. Tr. 34. in Joann.

(h) *In tenebris mortis errantes improvidi & cæci prius fuimus, luce gratiæ illuminati iter vitæ, duce & rectore Domino teneamus.* S. Cypr. de Orat. Dom.

(i) *In Chriſto, hoc eſt, in ſole & die vero ſumus. In Chriſto, hoc eſt, in lumine ſemper ſumus.* Idem ibid.

(k) *Si homo lucis eſſe cœpiſti, quæ ſunt Chriſti gere; quia lux & dies Chriſtus eſt.* Idem de Zelo & Liv.

(l) *Joh. Gregor. Not. & Obſ. c.* 18. *&* 22.

(m) *Tertull. Apol.* c. 21.

(n) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. p. m. 34.

(o) *Grot. Hammond.*

(p) *Dr. Sherlock Scripture-proofs.* p. 127.

“ This manifeſtly appeareth, to be his Senſe both from thoſe things that follow, and from the uſual Language of Scripture. In the *fifth* Verſe the Evangeliſt addeth, *The Light ſhineth in Darkneſs and the Darkneſs comprehended it not.* Therefore he doth not ſpeak of the Natural Light, which all Men comprehend, but of the Spiritual Light, which few have comprehended. He addeth in the *ninth* Verſe; *This was the true Light, which enlightneth every Man coming into the World*; where doubtleſs he ſpeaketh of the ſame Light and of the Spiritual Light, *Joh.* 3. 19. when he ſaith, *Light is come into the World, and Men loved Darkneſs rather than Light*, doubtleſs he ſpeaketh of Spiritual Light, as of Spiritual Darkneſs. When Chriſt ſaith, *ch.* 8. 12. *I am the Light of the World, he that followeth me, walketh not in Darkneſs, but ſhall have the Light of Life:* It is manifeſt, that Light and Darkneſs are taken Spiritually. *Ch.* 9. 5. he ſaith, *While I am in the World, I am the Light of the World.* And *ch.* 12. 35, 36. *Walk while ye have the Light, while ye have the Light, believe in the Light, that ye may be the Children of Light.* Hereunto the Prophecies agree; for S. *Matthew* interpreteth this following Prophecy of Chriſt and his Preaching, *Iſa.* 9. 2. *The People that walked in Darkneſs have ſeen a great Light: they that dwell in the Land of the Shadow of Death, upon them hath the Light ſhined.* Iſa. 49. 6. *I have given thee for a Light to the Gentiles, that thou mayeſt be my Salvation unto the end of the Earth.* Every where Light ſignifieth the Spiritual Illumination of Men; and I do not know, that any Inſtance can be produc'd from Scripture, where Light ſignifieth Natural Reaſon. On the contrary, Darkneſs which is oppos'd to the Light of Chriſt, is always taken for bad Manners and the Errors of Life, from which Chriſt reclaimeth us. For we go out of the way, when we walk in Darkneſs, *Rom.* 13. 12. *Let us caſt off the Works of Darkneſs and put on the Armour of Light.* 2 Cor. 6. 14. *What communion hath Light with Darkneſs.* Eph. 5. 8. *Ye were ſometimes Darkneſs, but now are ye Light in the Lord.* S. *John* ſaith in a place moſt like unto this whereof we diſcourſe, 1 *Joh.* 1. 5, 6. *God is Light, and in him is no Darkneſs at all. If we ſay, that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in Darkneſs, we lye.* And *ch.* 2. 9. *He that ſaith, he is in the Light, and hateth his Brother, is in Darkneſs even until now.* From which words of the Apoſtle this Commentator (that diſcourſeth ſo like a Chriſtian Divine) might have obſerv'd, that *Darkneſs* in the Chriſtian Theology and the New Teſtament ſignifieth the ſtate of Unregeneracy. Agreeably whereto himſelf interpreteth, *Joh.* 1. 5. *The Light ſhineth in Darkneſs, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not.* (c) *The Light he calleth Chriſt and his Doctrine, of which he had ſpoken in the next foregoing words; In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men. Darkneſs he calleth Men, who were in their Sins, that is, in Darkneſs, as S.* Paul *ſaith; ye were ſometimes Darkneſs, but now are ye Light in the Lord.* What *Tatianus* ſaith of the Soul in general, is in the Senſe of the Chriſtian Theology true of an Unregenerate Soul, (d) *ſhe is Darkneſs and hath nothing of Light.* To paſs from an unregenerate into a regenerate ſtate is (e) *to paſs from Darkneſs into Life.* (f) *There Foulneſs, and Darkneſs, and the horrour of a perpetual Night are in Domination. If thou deſireſt, that at leaſt ſome ſlender Beam of Light may ſhine into thee, lift up thine Eyes to him that ſaid, I am the Light of the World.* It is not the Natural Light, that Chriſt meaneth, when he ſaith, *I am the Light of the World*; therefore the Evangeliſt doth not mean it, when he ſaith, *The Life was the Light of Men.* The Evangeliſt diſcourſing of the Light is writing his Goſpel, which muſt be interpreted as the Goſpel touching the things (and conſequently the Light) Evangelical. All the ſaving Light that Mankind have, they have it from Chriſt, who introduc'd his Evangelical Light into a World of Heathen Sinners (of no better Character) that were in the atheous Darkneſs of *Ignorance, of Sin and of Miſery*; for ſuch is the Darkneſs of Unregeneracy (as on the contrary in the ſtate of Regeneracy there is the Light of Saving *Knowledge*, of *Grace* and of *Comfort*;) Uunregenerate Mankind at Chriſt's coming (as being in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs) were invelop'd in Darkneſs; and therefore the Evangeliſt ſpeaking the Language of the New Teſtament calleth them *The Darkneſs*, Joh. 1. 5. To this comprehenſion of Darkneſs the Natural Light belongeth: but ſo doth not the Light which our Evangeliſt in his Proem attributeth to Chriſt (it belongeth to an oppoſite Comprehenſion;) therefore by the Light which is Chriſt's Attribute our Evangeliſt doth not mean the Natural Light, but the Light of the glorious Goſpel of Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. The Light which is in Chriſtianity and Regeneracy, 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. *Eph.* 5. 8. 1 *Joh.* 2. 9. The benefit of ſaving Light, 1 *Joh.* 2. 8. and 5. 20. Our Evangeliſt in the Proem of his Goſpel ſpeaketh of *the true Light* both in the *perſonal* and *real* acceptation (for the true Light in the *perſonal* is the true Light in the *real* acceptation;) he ſpeaketh of the *true Light* in his firſt Epiſtle; and who can doubt, but that he meaneth by the true Light, not the Natural Light which is in Darkneſs, but the Saving Light which is in Chriſtianity and Regeneracy? For *the Darkneſs is paſt* (ſaith he to Regenerate Chriſtians) *and the true Light now ſhineth*, 1 *Joh.* 2. 8. It is evident therefore to common Senſe, that this is our Evangeliſt's Senſe in the Proem of his Goſpel; *The Saviour of the World was the benefit of Saving Light to the benighted World.* The Life was the Light of Men in Darkneſs.

XXV. This Light was not receiv'd or admitted into the comprehenſion of Darkneſs (the Darkneſs comprehended it not, ſaith the Evangeliſt) it is the Light which is receiv'd by Faith and rejected by Infidelity; which ſheweth, that it is not the natural Light.

(g) *We Sons of* Adam *that are born Blind are illuminated by*

(c) *Lucem vocat Chriſtum ejuſque doctrinam, de qua proximis verbis dixerat, In ipſo vita erat, & vita erat lux hominum. Tenebræ homines qui in peccatis, id eſt, in tenebris erant; ſicut D. Paulus ait, Eratis aliquando tenebræ, nunc autem lux in Domino.* Idem Com. in loc.

(d) *Anima per ſe tenebra eſt, & nihil habet lucis: hinc illud, Tenebræ non comprehendunt lucem.* Tatian. or. c. Græc. p. 152.

(e) Μεταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ σκότους εἰς ζωήν. *Clem. Strom. l.* 1. *p. m.* 259.

(f) *Illic ſordes, ſquallor, caligo, tenebræ, & perpetuæ noctis dominatur horror. Si vis ut tenuis ſaltem tibi ſplendor luminis luceat, erige vultus, & demerſos erige oculos, & deſertis his ad eum te confer qui dixit: Ego ſum lux mundi.* Jul. Firmic. de error. prof. rel. p. 39.

(g) *Ego ſum lumen mundi, qui me ſequitur, non ambulabit* *our Lord having the Eye-ſalve of Faith; but the mixture of the Spittle with the Clay is antecedent thereto.* For it is not an Abſtract Logos, from whom we have this Illumination, or who is this Light, but only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. And this is evident to common Senſe; for every one knoweth, who it is, to whom *John* Baptiſt was a Witneſs and Fore-runner as to the true Light, *Joh.* 1. 6, 7, 8. And this is he, who alone is the Light that our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of; which therefore is not the natural Light. Nor is it leſs than palpable Nonſence, to ſuppoſe, that *John* Baptiſt was ſent to bear Witneſs unto natural Light, or to an Abſtract Demiurgic Logos the ſuppos'd Fountain thereof. He came to bear Witneſs unto him only, whom all Men are called by the Goſpel, to believe on; and therefore he only is the Light in the *perſonal* and *real* Acceptation. *V.* 6, 7, 8. *There was a man ſent from God, whoſe name was John. The ſame came for a witneſs, to bear witneſs of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was ſent to bear witneſs of that light. John* was a burning and ſhining Light, but not to be compar'd with Chriſt, conſidering the Light that he is as his kind of good and excellency, eſſentially and in infinite fulneſs in himſelf, and he is it unto us alſo. (*b*) *We that were formerly fooliſh and blind wandering in the darkneſs of Death, being illuminated by the light of Grace, let us hold on in the path of Life, our Lord being our guide and governour.* (*i*) *We are in Chriſt, that is, in the Sun and the true Day. We are in Chriſt, that is, always in the light.* (*k*) *If thou haſt begun to be a Man of light, do the things of Chriſt; for Chriſt is light and day.* So in Scripture he is intituled *the Sun of Righteouſneſs* (or Salvation) which ſpeaketh him the great Luminary (to whom *John* Baptiſt was a Fore-runner as the Phoſphorus is to the Sun) and another of his Scriptural Names is *Oriens ex alto*, the Day-ſpring from on high. *Luk.* 1. 79. Becauſe of which Name of the Meſſiah (*l*) ſome have an extravagant reſpect for the Eaſtern part of the World; the day alſo of his Nativity hath been called Ἐπιφάνεια, *the appearance of Light*, the Night before it *vigiliæ luminum* (becauſe of abundance of Candles that were then lighted) and at this time our Anceſtors ſent Candles to one another. Candles were alſo lighted, when the Goſpel was read (certainly not to ſignifie natural Light) the new-baptiz'd Perſon carried a lighted Candle in his Hand, and put on white Garments, to denote, that he was a Son of Light. Which Ritualities, although they were deviſ'd by dark Superſtition (which ſinketh Religion into exteriour Rites and neglecteth the Subſtance) yet were introduc'd into the Church, to ſignifie that eximious Evangelical Light for which Chriſt is celebrated in Scripture, but no where ſo much as in our Evangeliſts Proem. To his Followers he is *the light of Life*, the light of the holy Life into which they are regenerated, which leadeth unto Life eternal. From him they have a φωτεινὸν ὄμμα, *luminous Eye*; and becauſe Mankind have loſt their Eyeſight in matters of Sanctity and their Salvation, the deſign of his coming was (*m*) *ut in agnitionem veritatis ocularet*, to give us our Eye-ſight to the acknowledgment of the Truth, as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh, (*n*) ἥλιος ψυχῆς, *the Sun of the Soul* is his agreeable Name; and accordingly our Evangeliſt repreſenteth him like the Sun, as in his Cauſality univerſally illuminative. *V.* 9. *That was the true light, which lightneth every man, that cometh into the world.* Some learned Expoſitors ſuppoſe (*o*) that theſe laſt words *coming into the World* do not refer to Man, but to *the true Light*; becauſe in the Evangeliſts theſe Expreſſions *coming and coming into the World* are frequently us'd touching our Saviour, his Name is ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *he that cometh.* Joh. 4. 25. Matth. 11. 3. Luk. 19. 38. And uſually his coming into the World is mention'd in our Evangeliſt and elſewhere. *Joh.* 3. 19. and 6. 14. and 11. 37. and 12. 46. and 18. 37. 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. According to this moſt probable Expoſition the Evangeliſt's Text ſhould be thus rendred; *That was the true Light, which coming into the World enlightneth every Man.* But how can it be ſaid of the Meſſias, that he enlightneth every Man? (*p*) *Did Chriſt preach the Goſpel to all the World* (ſaith a Divine of our own) *or was the Goſpel preached to all the World and to every Man in the World, at the time when S.* John *wrote this? Or was every Man in the World enlightned by it? This as to matter of Fact was falſe, and therefore could not be the Evangeliſt's meaning. And there is this demonſtration, that this is not his meaning; becauſe all this according to this Expoſition relateth to what Chriſt did in the Fleſh, whereas the Evangeliſt attributeth all this to the Word before the Incarnation.* Something material there is in this Argumentation, which yet is not levell'd ſo much againſt *Socinianiſm*, as againſt the Sanctity and Divinity of the Chriſtian Religion, that is fadly profan'd by that Scholaſtic Theology, which ſuch Argumentations as theſe are deſigned to uphold and maintain. Which therefore do not convince, but make *Socinians*, who are not without the uſe of their Faculties, to diſcern the abſurdities of the Scholaſtic Theology; nor can they fail to diſcern the abſurdity of the laſt part of this Argumentation, which is called *a Demonſtration.* For no Man of Sence can imagine, that *John* Baptiſt's Witneſs-bearing to our Saviour as to the true Light was before his Incarnation; yet his being *the Life and Light unto Men*, is no more attributed to *the Word before the Incarnation*, than *John* Baptiſt's Witneſs-bearing is attributed to him before the Incarnation. But there is in our Evangeliſts Narratives an unexactneſs in obſerving the time and order of things, of which this Evangeliſt's mentioning *the Word made Fleſh* is a palpable and acknowledg'd Inſtance. Diſmiſſing therefore this pretended Demonſtration, we will conſider the more material part of this Argumentation, which is touching our Saviour's *lighting every Man*, and which may ſeem a great difficulty. But there is really no more difficulty in expounding this Text of our Evangeliſt, than in expounding theſe other Texts. 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Who is the Saviour of all men.* 1 Cor. 15. 22. *In Chriſt all ſhall be made alive.* Rom. 5. 18. *By the righteouſneſs of one the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life.* For as Chriſt is the benefit of Salvation, of Life and of Righteouſneſs unto all Men, but it is in his Religion and by

---

in tenebris; quia Dominus illuminat cæcos. Illuminamur ergo fratres, habentes collyrium fidei. Præceſſit ejus ſaliva cum terra, unde inungeretur qui cæcus eſt natus. Et nos de Adam cæci nati ſumus. S. Aug. Tr. 34. in Joann.

(h) *In tenebris mortis errantes improvidi & cæci prius fuimus, luce gratiæ illuminati iter vitæ, duce & rectore Domino teneamus.* S. Cypr. de Orat. Dom.

(i) *In Chriſto, hoc eſt, in ſole & die vero ſumus. In Chriſto, hoc eſt, in lumine ſemper ſumus.* Idem ibid.

(k) *Si homo lucis eſſe cœpiſti, quæ ſunt Chriſti gere; quia lux & dies Chriſtus eſt.* Idem de Zelo & Liv.

(l) *Joh. Gregor. Not. & Obſ.* c. 18. & 22.

(m) *Tertull. Apoſt.* c. 21.

(n) *Clem.* προτρεπτ. p. m. 34.

(o) *Grot. Hammond.*

(p) Dr. *Sherlock Scripture-proofs.* p. 127.

his officiary Dignity that he is ſo, and therefore he is effectually ſo to none, but thoſe that enter into his Religion: So he is the benefit of *ſaving Light to every Man*, but it is in his Religion and by his officiary Dignity that he is ſo, and therefore he is effectually ſo to none but thoſe that enter into his Religion, whoſe Baptiſm is called φωτισμός, *Illumination.* He is therefore the benefit of Saving Light to every Man, ſo that all that enter into his Religion are ſavingly illuminated by him, and (to which we muſt add) ſo that all that are ſavingly illuminated, are illuminated by him. For S. *Auſtin* well ſuppoſeth, that this is (in part) the Senſe of our Evangeliſt's Text *he lighteth every Man* (q) *every Man that is ſavingly illuminated, hath his Illumination from him.* Agreeable to this Expoſition are the Words of a pious Writer Expoſitory of our Evangeliſt's Text. (r) *As the Son a Creature of God is one and the ſame in the whole World: So the Light and preaching of the Truth every where ſhineth, and enlightneth all Men that are willing to come to the knowledge of Truth.* Of this Evangelical Light not an Abſtract Logos, but only the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt is the Fountain; therefore it is not an Abſtract Logos, but only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah, which our Evangeliſt intituleth *the Light*; and it is not of the Natural, but only of this Evangelical Light that he muſt be underſtood to ſpeak in the Proem of his Evangely. Such as *the Life* is, that he ſpeaketh of, ſuch is the *Light.* (s) The Greeks and Latins and the Hebrews alſo uſually conjoin *Life* and *Light* as being of great Affinity. *With thee is the Fountain of Life, and in thy Light ſhall we ſee Light.* Pſal. 36. 9. But *the Life* which our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of, is only the Evangelical, of which the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah is the only Fountain, not the natural Life; therefore ſuch is the Light which he ſpeaketh of; and conſequently it is not an Abſtract Logos, but only the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah, which our Evangeliſt intituleth *the Life* and *the Light.*

(q) *De C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 2. *de peccat. merit. l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(r) *Sicut ſol creatura Dei in univerſo mundo unus ac idem eſt: ſic & lumen & prædicatio veritatis ubique lucet & illuminat omnes homines volentes ad cognitionem veritatis venire.* Herman. Hamelman. de Tradit. Apoſtol. p. 50.

(s) *Grot. Not. in Joh.* 1. 4.

XXVI. The Jews call their Rabbins Lights (t) becauſe they are ſuppoſ'd to enlighten the Minds of Men by their Doctrine. And our Evangeliſt muſt be ſuppoſ'd, ſo far to ſymbolize with them, as to call the Son of God *the Light of Men*, becauſe of his illuminating Men by his Doctrine (in various degrees) and whereby he enlightned both Jews and Gentiles. *Matth.* 4. 16. *Act.* 26. 18. As the Life which he is, and which our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of in his Proem, is that which he is in his revealed Word: So the Light which he is, and which our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of in his Proem, is that which he is in his Doctrine and revealed Word. So the *Muhammedans* call their *Alcoran* (u) *Light*, the Jews call their Law אוריתא which ſignifieth (w) both *Light* and *Doctrine*, and the Holy Writers ſay, *The Law is Light.* Pſal. 19. 8. *Pro.* 6. 23. Νόμος δὲ φῶς ὁδοῦ, *the Law is the Light of the way of Life* (x) ſaith *Clemens.* (y) Τὸ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας φῶς ἀληθὲς, *the Light of Truth is the true Light* (ſaith he) which is moſt true of the Evangelical Light, that is not umbratile Shew, but ſubſtantial Truth and Reality. (z) *Sweet is the Word that hath enlightned us above Gold and precious Stone, more deſirable than Honey and the Honey-comb. For is not that deſirable, that hath made a Mind buried in darkneſs* (living and) *operative, and the luciferous Eyes of the Soul ſharpſighted? As if the Sun was not, all would be Night notwithſtanding the other Stars: So if we had not known the Word and been enlightned by it, we had not differ'd from fed Birds, that are fatned in darkneſs and nouriſh'd for Death.* (a) *I urge thee to be ſaved* (ſaith he to an Heathen) *this Chriſt would have; in one word he would give thee Life. And what is this Word? Learn it compendiouſly, the Word of Truth, the Word of Incorruption, that regenerateth a Man, that reduceth him to Truth, is the Spur of Salvation, that profligateth Corruption, putteth to flight Death, buildeth a Temple in Men, to ſeat God in Men.*

(t) *Lightfoot Hor. in Joh.* 8. 12.

(u) *Hotting. Hiſt. Or. p.* 151. *ed.* 1.

(w) *Idem Exercit. Anti-Mor. p.* 5.

(x) *Strom. l.* 1. *in fin*

(y) *Strom. l* 6. *p. m.* 49?.

(z) *Idem* προτρεπτ. *p. m.* 52.

(a) Σωθῆναί σε ἐπείγομαι· τοῦτο Χριστὸς βούλεται· ἑνὶ λόγῳ ζωήν σοι χαρίζεται· κ̀ τίς ἐστιν οὗτος; μάθε συντόμως, λόγος ἀληθείας, λόγος ἀφθαρσίας, ὁ ἀναγεννῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀλήθειαν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρων, τὸ κέντρον τῆς σωτηρίας, ὁ ἐξελαύνων τὴν φθορὰν, ὁ ἐκδιώκων τὸν θάνατον, ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώποις οἰκοδομήσας νεὼν, ἵνα ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱδρύσῃ τὸν Θεόν. *Ibid. p.* 54.

The Son of God was the Light of the World, not only becauſe illuminative thereof, but becauſe of the illuſtriouſneſs of his Perſon. As upon that account King *David* was denominated *the Light of Iſrael*, the Turks call the *Grand Senior* the Light of the Univerſe, the Jews ſay (b) *The firſt* Adam *was the Light of the World*, and the *Britains* called King *Lucius* (c) *Lever Maur* the great Light. The King Meſſiah therefore as ſuch a Perſon of honour and illuſtriouſneſs was the Light of the World and the great Light; whence it appeareth, that for ſeveral Reaſons *the Light* and *the Meſſiah* are terms ſynonymous. Such they manifeſtly are in our Evangeliſt; for when he ſaith of *John* the Baptiſt, *he was not that Light, but was ſent to bear Witneſs of that Light*; his Senſe is, that *John* was not the Meſſiah, but was ſent to bear Witneſs of the Meſſiah. *He confeſſed and denied not, but confeſſed, I am not the Chriſt.* Joh. 1. 20. *The Light* therefore (as alſo *the Word* and *the Life*) is one of our Evangeliſt's honourary Names of the Meſſiah, as the Jews ſay (d) *Lux eſt Nomen Meſſiæ*, Light is the Name of the Meſſiah. And if *the Light* and *the Meſſiah* are terms ſynonymous in our Evangeliſt's Proem, the Light doth not denote an Abſtract Logos, nor the Natural Light (of which he is ſuppoſ'd to be the Fountain) but it denoteth only our Lord Chriſt that Humane-divine Perſon) with his Evangelical Light.

(b) *Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. Col.* 1321.

(c) *Fuller Church Hiſt. p.* 12.

(d) *Lightfoot Hor. in Joh.* 8. 12.

XXVII. From our Evangeliſt's honourary Names of the Meſſiah *the Life and the Light* we may infer his (Chriſtian) Deity of Perſon. (e) *Si Creatura eſt, Deus non eſt: Si Deus non eſt, nec vita eſt.* If he is a Creature, he is not God: If he is not God, neither is he Life. So the Fathers argue, inferring the Deity of our Saviour from theſe ſublime Attributes (the Life and the Light;) for they conſider theſe Attributes as Abſtract Terms, and ſo conſidered they are plainly Divine Peculiarities and Creature-tranſcendencies; for no Creature is Life and Light it ſelf, but only hath a Participation of them. Thus far therefore the Fathers Argumentation is unexceptionably ſolid and *worthy of all Acceptation*, and the whole of it had been ſo, if with a ſolid Chriſtian Verity they had not complicated much of Scholaſtic Vanity. (f) For they ſuppoſe that theſe Abſtract Terms are the Attributes of an Abſtract

(e) *S. Ambroſ. de Fide l.* 1. *Proleg.*

(f) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 6. *S.* 4. *&c.*

Abſtract Logos, to which our Evangeliſt is a Stranger. They ſuppoſe alſo, that theſe Attributes of Life and Light denote (not only the holy, but) the common Life of Nature and Light of Reaſon, which is another diſagreement from our Evangeliſt. They alledge alſo theſe Divine Attributes, to prove their Scholaſtic abſolute Simplicity and uncompoundedneſs of the Divine Eſſence of the Son, which is a Theory peculiar to Schoolmen and Metaphyſicians, and belongeth not to an Evangeliſt. Sometimes touching theſe Attributes of the Abſtract Form they expreſs themſelves ſo unwarily, as if they ſuppos'd the Son of God, to be Self-originated, and deny'd the derivation of his Eſſence from the Father. (g) *That which liveth by another, cannot be Life it ſelf, as that which hath heat from another, cannot be heat it ſelf. But Chriſt our God hath ſaid, I am Life.* It is not ſafe, to lay much ſtreſs upon the Scholaſtic Theology of the Fathers; we will rather caſt our Eye upon their Chriſtian Theology touching the Meſſiah; for this clearly inferreth the Chriſtian Deity of his Perſon. Our Evangeliſts Text according to that reading of it which ſome of the Ancients follow (*whatever was made, in him is Life*) is expounded by S. *Ambroſe* to mean (h) that every part and ingredient of Chriſt's Oeconomy, his Birth, Infancy, Death, Burial, Reſurrection (and ſuch more) is Life to us. Which is a bad Expoſition, but is ſound and Chriſtian Theology; and this Theology is an Aſcription of Deity to his Perſon. For if to be the Author and Donor of Natural Life is Deity and Creature-tranſcendence; how much more is it Deity and Creature-tranſcendence, to be the Author and Donor of Life Spiritual and Eternal to us? Which Deity is of the Chriſtian kind, and belongeth to him as he is the Deity of the New Teſtament: But to ſuppoſe him an Abſtract Demiurgic Logos; the Fountain of natural Light and Life (a Deity well known in the old Metaphyſical Theology of the Pagans) is to make him a Scholaſtic and Metaphyſical kind of Deity.

(g) Πᾶν γὰρ τὸ δι' ἑτέρου ζῶν, αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι οὐ δύναται. ὡς οὐδὲ τὸ ὑφ' ἑτέρου θερμανθὲν αὐτοθερμότης εἶναι. Ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν εἴρηκεν· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ζωή. *S. Baſil. Ep.* 141. *p.* 928.

(h) *Quod factum eſt, In ipſo vita eſt. Ipſe noſtra in omnibus vita eſt. Caro facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Infantia facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Judicium factum eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Mors facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Remiſſio peccatorum facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Vulnus factum eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Illuſio facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Diviſio facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Sepultura facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Reſurrectio facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Venditio facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Redemptio facta eſt, in ipſo vita eſt. Hæc eſt vita quæ facta eſt hæc eſt vita quæ apparuit, hæc eſt vita quam audivimus hæc eſt vita quæ erat apud Patrem.* In Pſal. 35.

CHAP. XI.

1. *The Character of our Evangeliſt's Proem, that it is an Hiſtory of the Termination of Chriſt's generative Oeconomy and of the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy. Agreeably whereto the ſeveral parts of it muſt be expounded.* Sect. 1. *The beginning in this Proem ſignifieth not Eternity, nor the Moſaic beginning, but an Evangelical beginning, which is the beginning of this Goſpel-hiſtory, or the beginning of the Times of Chriſtianity.* Sect. 2. *Our Evangeliſt's Proem is an Hiſtory of the beginning of Chriſt's miſſive Oeconomy, wherein he is not conſider'd in his primary, but only in his officiary Capacity.* Sect. 3. *Not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humanedivine Perſon of Chriſt, is the Logos that was with God. This is proved by ſeveral good Arguments.* Sect. 4. *Of Chriſt's generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity, and the Termination thereof in an aſcenſional remove to his being with God. The more than Probability thereof.* Sect. 5. *The Creation in our Evangeliſt's Proem is the New Teſtament-creation* (peculiarly ſuch) *which is illuſtrated and proved by great Arguments.*

I. THE Account which we have given of the Names and Attributes of Chriſt in our Evangeliſt's Proem *the Word*, *the Life*, and *the Light*, demonſtrateth, that they are not to be underſtood *Scholaſtically*, but *Evangelically*, and that they denote him to be by officiary Dignity *the Evangelical Word*, *the Life Evangelical*, *the Light Evangelical*. This account fixeth and determineth the Senſe of our Evangeliſt's Proem, and directeth to a true and genuine Expoſition of the whole of it; which muſt be conſider'd as *an Hiſtory* (an Encomiaſtic Hiſtory) *of the Termination of Chriſt's generative Oeconomy and of the beginning* (or commencing) *of his miſſive Oeconomy*. That this is the true Notion and Idea of it (in ſome degree) appeareth from the Title of it, which is *the Goſpel according to S.* John. For not only the joyous things of Chriſt's Religion are called *the Goſpel*, nor only the Preachment of them, nor only the Settlement of them: But the Hiſtory of them is called *the Goſpel*. (i) *Evangelium, id eſt, hiſtoria eorum quæ docuit & fecit Jeſus Chriſtus, jucundiſſimum illud ſalutis nuntium afferens.* (k) *The Goſpel ſignifieth that bleſſed Story of the Birth, Life, Actions, Precepts and Promiſes, Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, which of all other Stories in the World we Chriſtians ought to look on with moſt Joy as an* Εὐαγγέλιον, *or good Word,* i. e. *a Goſpel.* (l) *Hiſtoria hæc nominata eſt Evangelium.* (m) *Definire Evangelium licet Hiſtoriam, Chriſti ad nos adventum actaque continentem.* In the Titles and Inſcriptions of our Holy Books A Goſpel is the ſame thing with an Evangelical Hiſtory. The Four Goſpels (n) *Commentarios de rebus Chriſti recte appellaveris,* you may rightly call Commentaries or Memoirs touching the things of Chriſt. This is plain and Self-evident, there can be no Diſpute or Controverſie touching the Nature and definitive Notion of a Goſpel; from whence it appeareth, that our Evangeliſt's Proem is *Hiſtory, Evangelical Hiſtory*. Which plain Self-evident

(i) *Beza Annot. in Matth.* 1.

(k) *Dr. Hammond.*

(l) *Piſcator Arg. in Matth.*

(m) *Maldonat. Pref. in* 4. *Evang.*

(n) *Grot.*

evident Principle is plainly deſtructive of the ancient and uſual Scholaſtic Interpretations of it. For as the Scholaſtic Divines have compar'd our Evangeliſt to an high flying Eagle: So themſelves no ſooner begin their Comments upon his Proem, but they ſoar high and aloft into the Philoſophic kind of Sublimities of Scholaſticiſm and Metaphyſical Ontology, quite forgetting, that their Buſineſs is to expound an Hiſtorian, and an Evangelical Hiſtorian, not an Unchriſtian and Unpopular School-man and Metaphyſician. Our Evangeliſt writeth of a certain Perſon, whom he ſtileth *the Word*; and the Controverſie is, whether by this Name he meaneth an Abſtract Logos or the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah? To determine this Controverſie fairly and without prejudice, let us bethink our ſelves, which of theſe two Notions is moſt ſuitable and agreeable to the Character of our Evangeliſt and the Book that he writeth. Is not *the Word of the Goſpel* conſider'd as ſuch moſt ſuitable and agreeable to a Goſpel-hiſtorian? Is it not moſt ſuitable for him, to begin his Goſpel-hiſtory with *the Word of the Goſpel in the perſonal Acceptation*, the Author and Founder of the Goſpel-religion, conſider'd as ſuch? Doth not every Hiſtoriographer of a famous Perſon at the beginning of his Hiſtory nominate and decypher the very Perſon, whoſe Hiſtory he writeth? And is an Abſtract Logos the very Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus? Or doth our Evangeliſt write the Hiſtory of an Abſtract Logos? An Abſtract Logos cannot be the Subject-matter of an Hiſtory (and therefore is not likely to be the Subject-matter of this Hiſtorical Proem) nor can a Scholaſtical Logos be the Subject-matter of an Evangelical Hiſtory. The Scholaſtic notional *Verbum* is counted *a Word*, but it is only by Schoolmen and Metaphyſicians, no Hiſtorian counteth it *a Word*. The Platonic Logos is not a Logos either of the *Hiſtorical* or the *Evangelical* kind. Ὁ γὰρ λόγος φῶς, τὸ γὰρ εἶδος φῶς, ſaith *Plotinus*. For as the Evangeliſt's *Light* is not any ſuch kind of thing as *Form* or *Species* in Phyſiology: So the Evangeliſt's Logos is not of any Affinity with the Platonic Logos. His Logos is an Hiſtorical and Evangelical kind of Logos, which can be no other than the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. So in all other places of his Writings wherein the Son of God is ſtiled ὁ λόγος, the Name manifeſtly and undeniably ſignifieth the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. 1 *Joh.* 1. 1. and 5. 7. *Apoc.* 19. 13. We have great aſſurance therefore, that no ſuch thing as an Abſtract Logos is to be found in the Book of God. If this Abſtract Logos was the Perſon of Chriſt, there would be great reaſon, that he ſhould be of infinite Precioſity to us: But Chriſt is (*o*) the Name of a Dignity and of two Natures (although not of two Perſons) an Abſtract Logos cannot be the Perſon of Chriſt, nor any thing better than an exotic Logos to a Chriſtian. Diſmiſſing therefore an Abſtract Logos and its ſeveral ſorts (according to the ſeveral Schools of Metaphyſicians) we muſt affirm, that *the Goſpel according to S.* John is the Hiſtory of our only Lord and Saviour Chriſt Jeſus, and that *the Termination of his generative Oeconomy and the Inchoation of his miſſive Oeconomy* is the Subject-mater of our Evangeliſt's Proem, of the remaining parts whereof we will give a diſtinct account.

SECTION I.

Of the Term Beginning.

I. FROM the Character of our Evangeliſt and his Proem (which is Hiſtory, Evangelical Hiſtory) we may determine the Senſe of the primary Words of it *In the beginning was the Word*, which are commonly thought to ſignifie the Exiſtence of an Abſtract Logos from Eternity. But they that thus underſtand them, are divided in the Interpretation of them. For the Ancients interpret them, to ſignifie his eternal Exiſtence directly and primarily; the Moderns underſtand them, to ſignifie it only by illation and conſequentially. Some of the Ancients obſerve (*p*) that *the Beginning* here is not a Relative, nor conjoined with any thing, whoſe beginning it is (as it is, when we ſpeak of the beginning of Life or Wiſdom) but it is put abſolutely. And the beginning in this Acceptation is *That which is before all* (and nothing is precedent to it) *as Eternity is*. It denoteth Eternity, as S. *Baſil*, S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, *Gr. Naz.* S. *Cyril*, S. *Hilary*, *Fulgentius* (and others) interpret it. But ſome of theſe ancient Writers (as S. *Baſil* and (*q*) S. *Cyril*) are not conſiſtent with themſelves in their Interpretation of *the beginning*; for ſometimes they interpret it, to ſignifie God *the Father*. And ſo (*r*) *Clem. Orig. Theophil. Antioch. Gr. Nyſſen*, *Athanaſius*, and S. *Auſtin* interpret *the beginning* in our Evangeliſt. In like manner the Text of *Moſes*, *In principio creavit Deus cœlum & terram*, hath been thus underſtood by many of the ancient Writers (*s*) *In Filio fecit Deus cœlum & terram*. Thus the beginning by theſe ancient Interpreters hath been made to ſignifie both *Father* and *Son*, and (which is more ſtrange) it hath been made to ſignifie *the Son* in the Old Teſtament and *the Father* in the New Teſtament; the Old Teſtament hath been made, to begin with the Son, and the New Teſtament with the Father. This is a ſhrewd Indication, that we are not to expect a good Interpretation of *the beginning* from the ancient Writers, that make the Old Teſtament, to be the New, and the New, to be the Old Teſtament. But ſo our Evangeliſt is ſuppos'd, to begin his Hiſtory from Eternity infinitely higher than *Moſes* beginneth his Hiſtory; therefore it is infinitely the more ancient matter of Hiſtory; and conſequently the New Teſtament is made the Old Teſtament, and the Old Teſtament is made the New Teſtament. The beginning in our Evangeliſt is ſuppos'd, infinitely to tranſcend the Moſaic beginning; but if our Evangeliſt in writing his Hiſtory wrote like an Hiſtorian, he could not deſign by *the beginning* to tranſcend the Moſaic beginning, becauſe when he wrote, the Moſaic beginning was the higheſt beginning, that Hiſtory (true Hiſtory) was acquainted with. Our Evangelical Hiſtorian by *the beginning* plac'd at the entrance of his Hiſtory certainly meaneth the *Æra* or *Epocha* of his Hiſtory, which is an Hiſtory written (not in the other, but) in this World, which knoweth not any Hiſtorical *Epocha* higher than the Moſaic beginning, nor any Hiſtorical *Res geſta* higher than that beginning. *Moſes* by *the beginning* in the Proem of his Hiſtory meaneth the beginning of

---

(o) S. *Chryſoſt. in Johann. Hom.* 3.

(p) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 2. c. 8. S. 2. &c.

(q) *Com. in Johann. p.* 13.

(r) *Petav. ſupr. Maldonat. in loc.*

(s) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. c. 5. S. 5. *Heinſ. Ariſt. p.* 62, 63. *Viv. in S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 11. c. 32.

of the *Res geſtæ* of the Old Teſtament-times; therefore our Evangeliſt by *the beginning* in the Proem of his Hiſtory meaneth the beginning of the *Res geſtæ* of the New Teſtament-times. His beginning is an hiſtorical beginning: But Eternity (ſuppoſing it to be a beginning) can be no hiſtorical beginning. He that writeth of the Exiſtence of God from Eternity, writeth of a Theological Propoſition, not Hiſtory: So if the Evangeliſt did affirm the Exiſtence of an Abſtract Logos from Eternity, this muſt be thought a Propoſition of Theology, not Hiſtory. But it belongeth not to our Evangeliſt, to write of meer Theological Propoſitions. (t) *Propoſitio hæc eſt, Evangelium Jeſu Chriſti.* This is his Propoſition, the Evangely of Jeſus Chriſt. (u) *Evangeliſta, non Diſputator Johannes erat: Et non eſt officium Evangeliſtæ probare quæ dicit, ſed hiſtoricè narrare.* The buſineſs of an Evangeliſt is not that of a Diſputant, to prove what he affirmeth, but to relate things hiſtorically. Accordingly, our Evangeliſt is ſuppos'd to relate the eternal Exiſtence of the Logos *per modum hiſtoriæ*; and we will alſo ſuppoſe (not grant) that he hiſtorically relateth the Matters of Eternity, and maketh them the matter of his Hiſtory. But if he writeth an Hiſtory of theſe Matters, it muſt not be ſuppos'd, that he writeth it Ἀνιστορήτως, *un-hiſtorically*, and ſo as not to write an Hiſtory of them, but mutilating it into a meer Dogmatical Aſſertion and Theological Propoſition. As ſuppoſe, that a Pagan Hiſtorian ſhould propoſe to himſelf, to write the Hiſtory of the Goddeſs *Minerva*, and without making the leaſt mention of her Origin from *Jupiter*'s Brain, ſhould begin his Hiſtory with theſe Words, *In the beginning the Wiſdom was, and the Wiſdom was with God, and the Wiſdom was God.* If by theſe Words he deſign'd to ſignifie her Exiſtence from Eternity, then he writeth his Hiſtory Ἀνιστορήτως (un-hiſtorically;) for he quite omitteth her eternal Generation, her *Natales*, that *Res geſta*, or hiſtorical Paſſage, which ought to have been the prime matter of his Hiſtory; he mutilateth the matter of Hiſtory into a meer Dogmatical Aſſertion, and writeth not like an Hiſtorian (a Regiſter of Hiſtorical Paſſages) but as a Diſputant laying down his Theſis, or as a Writer of meer Theological Propoſitions. But it is impoſſible, that an Hiſtorian, much more that an inſpir'd Evangeliſt ſhould write at this rate; that he ſhould quite omit *the eternal Generation of the Son from the Subſtance of the Father, his* Natales, that *Res geſta* or Hiſtorical Paſſage, which ought to have been the prime matter of his Hiſtory, and yet deſign to ſignifie his Exiſtence from Eternity by ſaying theſe Words; *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

(t) *Bucer. in Johan. Proleg.*
(u) *Maldonat. in Joh.* 1. 1.

II. If the Evangeliſt deſign'd, to ſignifie the Exiſtence of the Logos from Eternity, it had been as eaſie, to have ſaid, that the Logos was *eternal*, as that he was in *the beginning*. No reaſon can be ſhew'd, why he declin'd the clear and uſual Terms expreſſive of Eternity, and choſe to uſe an ambiguous Phraſe in an unuſual Senſe; for it is not uſual in Scripture or common Language, to call Eternity the Beginning. The certain way of underſtanding his Senſe of this Phraſe is to conſult his own Writings and the reſt of the New Teſtament (for his Phraſeology muſt be underſtood in his own Senſe and the Senſe of the New Teſtament:) But throughout the New Teſtament there is no appearance, that *the beginning* denoteth Eternity. In many places of it we read of what was done πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, *before the times of the ages of the World:* But this vaſt Antecedent to time is not made the *Epocha* of an Hiſtory, or any part of an Hiſtory, nor is it ever called *the beginning*, as our Evangeliſt is ſuppos'd to call it; which is to ſay, that he ſpeaketh not agreeably to the Language of the New Teſtament. In our Saviour's Speeches, in the other Evangeliſts, in the Writings of the other Apoſtles, and in other places of our Evangeliſt's Writings *the beginning* ſignifieth nothing like Eternity. In our Saviour's Speeches ſometimes it ſignifieth *the Moſaic beginning.* Matth. 19. 4, 8. Mar. 10. 6. and 13. 19. Joh. 8. 44. Agreeably whereto we read in *Xenophon* (w) ὁ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ποιῶν ἀνθρώπους, *He that from the beginning made Men.* How great the World ſhould be, and what Paſſages ſhould be in the Life of it κεῖται ἐξ ἀρχῆς, *is determined from the beginning* (x) ſaith *Plotinus.* Sometimes in our Saviour's Speeches ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, (from the beginning) ſignifieth (y) *ab ipſo tempore quo Chriſtus ipſe Evangelizavit* (from the time that Chriſt himſelf Evangeliz'd) *Joh.* 6. 64. and 8. 25. and 15. 27. and 16. 4. So another Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of thoſe, that *from the beginning were Eye-witneſſes and Miniſters of the Word.* Luk. 1. 2. His Goſpel he ſtileth *a Treatiſe of all that Jeſus began both to do and teach.* Act. 1. 1. Sometimes the beginning ſignifieth the beginning of Evangelizing in a larger Senſe, ſo as to comprehend *John* Baptiſt's Miniſtery (z) whence Evangelizing had its beginning. So S. *Mark* beginning his Hiſtory from the Baptiſt's preaching prefixeth this Title to it, *The beginning of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God.* (a) *The compaſs of the Goſpel-hiſtory in the proper Deſcription of it is from the preaching of the Baptiſt till Chriſt's Aſcenſion,* Act. 1. 22. *Beginning from the Baptiſm of John, unto that ſame day that Chriſt was taken up from us.* *Act.* 10. 37. *That Word which was publiſhed throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the Baptiſm which John preached.* In ſome Diſcourſes of the Apoſtles *the beginning* ſignifieth the beginning of their preaching the Goſpel. *Act.* 11. 15. *The Holy Ghoſt fell on them as on us* ἐν ἀρχῇ, *at the beginning.* Sometimes they call the beginning of preaching the Goſpel to a People *the beginning of the Goſpel,* Phil. 4. 15. and thoſe that early receiv'd the Goſpel, are ſaid, *to be choſen to Salvation from the beginning.* 2 Theſſ. 2. 13. Sometimes the beginning is (*b*) the ſame with ancient time; as when the Apoſtle ſaith, *Thoſe which knew me* ἄνωθεν or ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, (which are of the ſame ſignification) *from the beginning.* Act. 26. 4, 5. (c) ἀπ' ἀρχαίου, *uſurpatur pro, ab initio.* So a Phyſician is ſaid, to reſtore his Patient εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον, *his former* (or ancient) *ſtate.* So the beſt Expoſitors tranſlate and expound that of the Apoſtle *Act.* 15. 7. *Ye know, that* ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων, from ancient or former Days, or from the beginning (as ſome render the Words) *God made choice a-*

(w) Ἀπομν. α.
(x) *En.* 5. *l.* 7. *c* 3.
(y) *Lightfoot. Hor. in Luc.* 1. 2.
(z) *Grot. N. t. in Matth. T. t.*
(b) *Lightfoot. ſupr.*
(c) *De Dieu & Grot. in Act.* 15. 7.

(a) *Hiſtoriæ Evangelii ambitus propriè deſcribitur eo tempore, quod ab annunciatione Baptiſtæ ad Chriſti aſcenſum interceſſit.* Ut liquet ex Act. 1. 22. & 10. 37. Grot. ibid.

mong us, that the Gentiles by my Mouth ſhould hear the Word of the Goſpel. So *Mnaſon* (being a Diſciple from the beginning) is called ἀρχαῖος μαθητής, *Act.* 21. 16. And we often read, that the things of former times, which may ſeem to us not very long paſt, are called the things of ancient Times. For ſo the Canons commonly called The Apoſtles Canons are called, (*d*) by the Synod of *Antioch* and S. *Baſil*, ἀρχαῖοι κανόνες, by the Council of *Conſtantinople* οἱ παλαιοὶ θεσμοὶ, and by the Council of *Chalcedon* οἱ πάλαι κανόνες, *ancient Laws and Canons.* It muſt not therefore ſeem ſtrange to us, that our Evangeliſt, who liv'd long after the other Apoſtles, wrote his Goſpel very late (and probably his Epiſtles alſo) and wrote againſt upſtart Hereſies, looketh upon his Evangelical beginning as of ſome Antiquity, 1 *Joh.* 2. 7. *I write no new Commandment to you, but an old Commandment, which ye had from the beginning: the old Commandment is the Word which ye have heard from the beginning.* The beginning ſignifieth nothing higher (as is ſelf-evident and as the beſt Expoſitors ſay) than *ab initio Evangelii prædicati vel ſuſcepti*, from the beginning of the Goſpel preached or received. So it ſignifieth, *v.* 24. *Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning remain in you.* Ch. 3. 11. *This is the Meſſage, that ye have heard from the beginning.* 2 Joh. 5, 6. *Not as though I wrote a new Commandment unto thee, but that which we had from the beginning, that we ſhould love one another. This is the Commandment, that as ye have heard from the beginning, ye ſhould walk in it.* So the Synod of *Antioch* in their Epiſtle to *P. Samoſatenus* recommend, (*e*) πίστιν ἣν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρελάβομεν, *the Faith which we have received from the beginning.* And the Inſtitution of a Penitentiary Prieſt (*f*) *Sozomen*, deriveth ἀρχῆθεν, *from the beginning.* What is from the Apoſtles, we count from the beginning; but thoſe things are more properly ſo, that are ſtrictly from the commencing of the New Teſtament-times. Theſe are the Times, that Chriſtians uſually have reſpect unto, when they ſpeak of the *beginning*, which is *a beginning* far remote from Eternity.

(d) *Bevereg. Annot. in Can. Apoſt. p.* 4.

(e) *Bib.Gr. Pat. T.* 1. *p.* 30.

(f) *Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 16.

III. But to prove, that in the Books of the New Teſtament *The beginning* ſignifieth Eternity, (*g*) ſome alledge, 1 *Joh.* 1. 1. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have ſeen with our Eyes, which we have looked upon, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life. For the Life was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it and bear Witneſs.* Which Proem of our Evangeliſt's firſt Epiſtle conſiſteth of an *Act* and an *Object.* The Act is, *We have heard, we have ſeen with our Eyes, we have looked upon, our Hands have handled, we have ſeen and bear witneſs.* All which Expreſſions denote the Apoſtle's teſtifying as Eye-witneſſes. The matter which they teſtify'd as Eye-witneſſes (the Object of their Act) was *That which was from the beginning.* For *that which was from the beginning* (ſaith the Evangeliſt) *we have heard, we have ſeen with our Eyes, we have looked upon, and our Hands have handled.* And the Matter which they teſtify'd as Eye-witneſſes (the Object of their Act) was, *that the Life was manifeſted. For the Life was manifeſted* (ſaith the Evangeliſt) *and we have ſeen it and bear witneſs.* According to this Text therefore, that which the Apoſtles teſtify'd as Eye-witneſſes, was *That which was from the beginning*; That which the Apoſtles teſtify'd as Eye-witneſſes was only this matter of fact, *The Life was manifeſted*; therefore this matter of fact is *That which was from the beginning.* But this matter of fact was from no other beginning ſave only the Evangelical; therefore *The beginning* in this Text ſignifieth only *The Evangelical beginning.* And if the beginning ſo ſignifieth in the Proem of our Evangeliſt's firſt Epiſtle, it muſt be underſtood, ſo to ſignifie in the Proem of his Goſpel; for theſe are generally acknowledg'd to be parallel places, and they are ſo in reſpect of *The beginning* notwithſtanding that a Scholaſtic Divine hath diſcours'd, (*h*) *The beginning in S.* John*'s Epiſtle is that, in which the Apoſtles ſaw, and heard, and touch'd the Word: The beginning in his Goſpel was that, in which the Word was with God, that is, not ſeen nor heard by the Apoſtles.* For if the Preaching of the Baptiſt, the Evangelizing of Chriſt and of the Apoſtles are ſo conjunct and ſynchronal, that they belong to one Evangelical Beginning, much more *The Word's being with the Father* and his being *manifeſted to the Apoſtle's Bodily Sences* were ſo conjunct and ſynchronal, that they belong'd to one Evangelical Beginning. If our Saviour's Reſurrection is, that which was *from the beginning*; then his being in the Grave is, that which was *in the beginning.* So if his *Manifeſtation* is, that which was *from the beginning*; then his being with the Father is, that which was *in the beginning.* The Word was heard, ſeen and touch'd by the Apoſtles, and this is, that which was *from the beginning*, as our Evangeliſt ſaith in the Proem of his firſt Epiſtle: therefore his being with God, not ſeen, heard or touch'd by the Apoſtles, is that which was *in the beginning*, as he ſaith in the Proem of his Goſpel. This Evangeliſt therefore in the Proem of his firſt Epiſtle and in the Proem of his Goſpel (as appeareth from the Paralleliſm of theſe two places) ſpeaketh of one and the ſame Evangelical Beginning.

(g) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 16. *c.* 3. *S.* 7, 8, *&c.*

(h) Biſhop *Pearſon* on *the Creed, Art.* 2. *p.* 235. *ed.* 1.

In another Text of our Evangeliſt wherein he enumerateth the ſeveral ranks of Graduates in Chriſtianity, *The beginning* is thought to ſignifie Eternity, 1 *Joh.* 2. 13. *I write unto you Fathers, becauſe ye have known him that is from the beginning. I write unto you young Men, becauſe ye have overcome the wicked One. I write unto you little Children, becauſe ye have known the Father.* The little Children have ſo much knowledge, as to know the Father of the Regenerate Family. The young Men have not only Knowledge, but ſtrength of Grace. The Fathers are the great Proficients in the Chriſtian Wiſdom, which is the Knowledge of Chriſt, whom the Evangeliſt ſtileth *Him that is from the beginning.* For the Father he mentioneth afterwards, and it is not agreeable to the Stile of the Scriptures, to ſtile the Father *Him that is from the beginning:* but it is very agreeable, ſo to ſtile the Son of God, who is *our Beginning* and Antiquity, (*i*) as *Ignatius* ſaith, (ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖα ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς) whoſe Affairs are our *Origines Sacræ*, and whom we muſt call *Him that is from the beginning* in a peculiar Senſe, as being *Him that is the original Founder of our Inſtitution, Him that is archically that beginning of things which is the Goſpel*, and

(i) *Ep. ad Philadelph. p.* 44.

as being ***Him that is that Word of Life and of our Religion that was from the beginning***, as this Evangeliſt ſpeaketh in the entrance of this Epiſtle. That Proem plainly directeth us to this Interpretation of the Name (*Him that is from the beginning*:) but they have no ſuch direction, that interpret it, to ſignifie Eternity; nor is their Interpretation agreeable to the Evangeliſt's uſual Senſe of the word (beginning) nor do the moſt of them that make this Interpretation agree with themſelves. For if our Evangeliſt's *beginning* is the *Moſaic beginning*, as the moſt of the modern Expoſitors ſuppoſe in their Expoſition of his Proems, thoſe of them that interpret this Name (Him that is from the beginning) to be meant of Chriſt, ought ſo to interpret it in this place: but here they are inconſiſtent with themſelves; for all of them agree, in this place to interpret this Name, to ſignifie *The Eternal or him that is from Eternity*. But the beginning never ſignifieth in any Author Sacred or Profane meer Eternity (as will appear preſently;) nor is it reaſonable, to interpret it, to ſignifie Eternity, unleſs other words be conjoyned with it, that ſo determine the Senſe of it. For is the beginning a word accommodate to ſignifie Eternity, that knoweth no beginning? throughout this Epiſtle doth The beginning ſignifie any ſuch thing as Eternity? Chriſtians ought to be commended by our Evangeliſt for knowing him and adhering to him, that is the original Founder of their Inſtitution (that in ſuch Senſe is from the beginning:) but what ſignifieth it to the Evangeliſt's purpoſe to make mention of his Eternity? But to a Mind prepoſſeſs'd with Prejudices *The beginning* ſoundeth like Eternity, and Expoſitors will infer from it our Saviour's exiſtence from Eternity, although their Concluſion is a Contradiction to their own Premiſes. For thus a known Expoſitor argueth. (*k*) *What clearer Argument of the Divinity* (Eternity) *of Chriſt can be deſir'd than S.* John'*s affirmation*, *that the Word was in the beginning, that is, had no beginning?* This Expoſitor interpreteth *The beginning* (in the Proem of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel) to ſignifie the Moſaic beginning, he denieth, that it ſignifieth Eternity; yet he argueth, that this Saying of the Evangeliſt *The Word was in the beginning*, doth ſignifie, that he had no beginning, which is to ſay, that *The beginning* ſignifieth Eternity. The *Alex. Cyril* argueth, (*l*) that there cannot be ἀρχὴ τῆς ἀρχῆς, *a beginning of the beginning*, which is true, if it be underſtood touching the ſupreme cauſal beginning, (*m*) ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἀγέννητον, *for the ſupreme cauſal beginning* (or the firſt Principle) *is neceſſarily ingenit*, *all things are from it, and it is from none.* But we are not diſcourſing of the ſupreme cauſal beginning, but of the *Modal beginning*, of which S. *Baſil* ſaith, (*n*) ἀρχῆς τὸ ἐξώτερον οὐχ εὑρίσκεται, *nothing is beyond the beginning.* As the ſupreme cauſal beginning, ſo according to theſe ancient Writers the *Modal* beginning can have no beginning, it muſt be *a beginning-leſs beginning*. Our Evangeliſt therefore is ſuppos'd to begin his Hiſtory with a beginning, wherein there is nothing of Hiſtorical beginning; and to call that *the beginning*, which is properly called *The not beginning*, as an endleſs end is properly called *the not ending*. So of our Evangeliſt's Text, ***In the beginning was the Word***, this is the Senſe according to S. *Hilary*, (*o*) *he was before all beginning.* But this cannot be the Senſe of the Evangeliſt's words. It is far better, to interpret words of Scripture agreeably to the uſe of Scripture and the common uſe of Mankind, rather than by a Scholaſtic Subtilty to ſtrain them to ſignifie our imaginary Philoſophic Sublimities. And it is certain, that in Scripture *the beginning* put abſolutely doth not uſually ſignifie *a beginning-leſs beginning*, *Gen.* 1. 1. 1 *Chron.* 17. 9. *Iſa.* 1. 26. and 40. 21. and 41. 4, 26. and 46. 10. and 48. 3, 5, 7, 16. *Eccl.* 3. 11. *Jer.* 17. 12. *Luk.* 1. 2. *Joh.* 16. 4. and 6. 64. and 8. 25, 44. *Act.* 15. 18. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. 1 *Joh.* 2. 7, 24. *Heb.* 1. 10.

IV. The beginning doth not ſignifie Eternity in any place of the New Teſtament: but ſome with a mighty confidence pretend to ſhew, (*p*) that it ſo ſignifieth in ſome places of the Old Teſtament. They alledge, *Habak.* 1. 12. O *Lord my God, art thou not* מקדם *from everlaſting?* So the Hebrew word ſignifieth: but it hath other ſignifications; and in this place by the Septuagint and the Vulg. Latin it is rendred *à principio*, from the beginning. And from hence it is, that theſe argue, that *the beginning* denoteth Eternity. But this Argument is a fallacy from the ambiguity of a word, and they might as well argue in this manner; The Hebrew word מקדם ſignifieth *from Eternity*, and it alſo ſignifieth *from the Eaſt*; therefore the Eaſt in Scripture denoteth Eternity. For as in ſome places of Scripture where it ſignifieth from *everlaſting* it is rendred by the Seventy and the Vulg. Lat. from *the beginning*: ſo *Gen.* 2. 8. it is rendred by *Aquila* ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (from the beginning) by *Symmachus* ἐκ πρώτης, by *Theodotion* ἐν πρώτοις, by *Hierom* and the Vulg Lat. *à principio*; but Learned Men of latter times generally ſuppoſe, that it ſignifieth (in this place) *Eaſtward, or from the Eaſt*, as our Tranſlators have render'd it. The ſame Anſwer may be made to the ſame Argument drawn from the ambiguity of the ſame Hebrew word in the Prophecy of *Mic* 5. 2. *Whoſe goings forth have been from of old* (which is render'd by the Seventy and the Vulg. Lat. *à principio*) *from the Days of Eternity.* And as for the Senſe of this famous Prophecy, it cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to mean the Eternal Generation of the Meſſiah or his Exiſtence from Eternity, both becauſe that Notion is altogether alien from the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament touching the Meſſiah, and becauſe the Prophecy maniſeſtly ſpeaketh of (not an Abſtract *Logos*, but) Meſſiah the Prince and Governour of *Iſrael* as ſuch, and his goings forth to be a Prince and Governour. The Allegation therefore of theſe Texts of the Old Teſtament is altogether impertinent to the Elucidating the Senſe of our Evangeliſt's *beginning*: but two other Texts are alledg'd from the Old Teſtament, which are of greater conſideration. The one is *Eccluſ.* 24. 9. πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέν με, *before the World from the beginning he created me*, ſaith Wiſdom. In this place *the beginning* is antecedent to the whole Creation; and ſo it is in the Book of Proverbs, *chap.* 8. 22, 23. *The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old: I was ſet up from everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was.* Although the Hebrew word which is here rendred *from everlaſting*

(k) *Maldonat. in Joh.* 1. 1. *p.* 196.

(l) *Com. in Joh.* 10.

(m) *Procl. Theol. Plat. l.* 6. *c.* 1.

(n) *Hom.* 16. *p.* 504.

(o) *De Dei patris & filii unitat.*

(p) *Petav. T.* 4. *l.* 6. *c.* 3. *S.* 7, 8, *&c.*

laſting is uſually render'd *Ab olim*, *à ſeculo*, and may be underſtood, to ſignifie nothing more than from ancient times (that Wiſdom was conſtituted from the moſt ancient times) yet in fair conſtruction the tenour of the words appeareth to be of another importance, and without diſtortion and violence cannot be made to ſignifie any thing leſs than Eternity. But then we ought to diſtinguiſh between *a meer Eternity* and an *originative Eternity*, which are thus differenc'd; In an *originative Eternity* ſomething is ſaid, to have been always originated, generated, created or conſtituted; but there is nothing of this in a meer Eternity. A meer Eternity cannot be called *The beginning*, nor doth *The beginning* in any Author, any Scripture, or in common Language, ever denote a meer Eternity. Nor will common Senſe allow it to be called The beginning; for if nothing is begun, there is no beginning: as if nothing is ended, there is no end. If we ſuppoſe (as too many have done) the Uncreatedneſs and Eternity of the Univerſe, and that all things were, as now they are, from Eternity; this meer Eternity cannot be called *The beginning*, nor can *The beginning* denote this meer Eternity, wherein nothing is begun, but the Univerſe is ſelf-originated, nor can we ſay of ſuch a World, that it exiſted from the beginning, for there is no beginning. But this meer Eternity is not the Eternity, that *Solomon* and the Son of *Sirach* ſpeak of, which is an *Originative Eternity* (wherein Wiſdom is fictitiouſly and allegorically ſaid to be created and conſtituted) and ſuch an *originative* Eternity which is primordial and anteceſſional to a created Univerſe that ſucceedeth it, or commenceth into exiſtence after it. Wiſdom therefore is ſaid, to have been *from the beginning* as being produc'd from ſuch an Eternity (from everlaſting) and as being the firſt of the Operations or Productions of God (*the beginning of his way*) and conſequently *The beginning* in theſe Texts of *Solomon* and the Son of *Sirach* denoteth ſuch an Eternity which they ſpeak of. But ſeeing *The beginning* can ſignifie only this *originative Eternity*, and this *originative Eternity* as ſo ſignify'd is the origin, that is in (or from) Eternity, therefore *The beginning* as it denoteth Eternity, doth not denote meerly Eternity, but *the origin*, that is, in or from Eternity; for this origin is that, which in theſe Texts (of *Solomon* and the Son of *Sirach*) is called *The beginning.* Touching common Language therefore, touching Profane Authors, touching the New and Old Teſtament, touching the Hebrew Writers and the Chaldee Paraphraſts, touching all theſe we muſt affirm, that *The beginning* as it denoteth Eternity, doth not in any of them ever denote meerly Eternity, but only *the origin* that is in (or from) Eternity. If therefore in the Proem of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel *The beginning* doth denote Eternity, it doth not denote meerly Eternity, but the origin that is in (or from) Eternity. If he ſpeaketh of Eternity, he muſt be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak of the *originative Eternity* (that beginning) as *Solomon* and the Son of *Sirach* do. But he cannot be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak of the *originative Eternity*; for if he had ſpoken of Eternity as the originative Eternity, he muſt have ſaid of the *Logos* (as *Solomon* and the Son of *Sirach* ſay of Wiſdom) that he was then originated, generated, created or conſtituted: but he doth not ſay ſo, nor any thing of that nature; therefore he doth not ſpeak of the *originative Eternity*, and conſequently he doth not ſpeak of Eternity. If *Moſes* in the Introduction of his *Hexaemeron* ſpeaking of originative time, had ſaid, *In the beginning Heaven and Earth was*, without ſaying any thing of their Origination, his Phraſe had been intolerable, and had implied, that they were in the beginning without any Origination: So if the Evangeliſt in his Introduction ſpeaking of originative Eternity doth ſay, *In the beginning the Logos was* without ſaying any thing of his Origination, his Phraſe is intolerable, and implieth, that he was in the beginning without any Origination. The Texts of *Solomon* and the Son of *Sirach* plainly relate Wiſdom's *Natales*, and tell us, that ſhe was *created*, *formed* and *conſtituted* from the beginning: but our Evangeliſt in the Proem of his Goſpel hath not ſaid one Syllable of this Nature touching the *Logos*, nor doth he ſo much as uſe in his Proem theſe terms *from the beginning*. This Argument is alone ſufficient, to deſtroy the Fathers Expoſition of our Evangeliſt's *beginning*, it rendreth all their Sublimities concerning it altogether impertinent to the expounding his Proem. His *beginning* is an *Hiſtorical* and an *Evangelical-hiſtorical beginning:* but Eternity is no ſuch *beginning*.

So the Subſtantive Verb *Erat* in the front of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel (*In principio erat Verbum*) is an hiſtorical word: but the ſame Scholaſtic Subtilty hath been us'd in the Interpretation of it, which hath been us'd in the Interpretation of our Evangeliſt's *beginning*. Some ſay, (*q*) that *Erat* ſpoken *ἀορίστως*, *indefinitely*, ſtoppeth no where, but extendeth to Infinity (Pre-eternity) and therefore *In principio erat Verbum* ſignifieth, that the *Logos* always was and exiſted from Eternity. But at this rate of arguing, if one ſhould ſay, *Abrahamus erat*, this muſt ſignifie, that he was from Eternity. Some ſay, that this Verb doth not denote a beginning of Exiſtence, nor expreſs any difference of Time, *quod ad ſignificandam æternitatem longè eſt aptiſſimum*, which is by much the moſt fit to ſignifie Eternity. And it is true, that the Verb *Erat* doth not expreſs *a beginning of Exiſtence*; which is one reaſon, why the Evangeliſt made uſe of it; yet not with deſign, to ſignifie the Exiſtence of the *Logos* from Eternity, but becauſe he deſign'd to give no Hiſtorical Account of his Generation. But it is not true, that the Verb *Erat* doth not expreſs any difference of Time. For S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, (*r*) *The Verb* Erat *when it is ſpoken of our Nature*, τὸν παρελθόντα χρόνον σημαίνει, *ſignifieth the Time paſt and ended:* but he addeth, that when it is ſpoken of God, τὸ ἀΐδιον ἐμφαίνει, *it denoteth Eternity.* And ſo doth *Erit* as well as *Erat*. *Erat* cannot be thought moſt fit to expreſs Eternity, if we are not all extremely miſtaken in our Accounts of the Name *Ejeh aſher Ejeh*, *Ero qui Ero*, which in the ancient Writers of the Church is read *Ego ſum qui ſum.* Several of them ſuppoſe, that the Verb *Erat* denoteth *Perennity* and *Firmitude*, and therefore the Evangeliſt choſe rather to uſe it than *Fuit*, which denoteth a thing to be paſt, ſo as to ceaſe

(q) *Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 8. ſ. 5. & l. 4. c. 12. ſ. 7.*

(r) *In Johan. Hom. 3. p. 567.*

ceaſe to be. But this Grammatical Subtilty hath nothing of ſolidity in it; for Wiſdom ſaith in the Preter-perfect Tenſe, *The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way*, which doth not imply, that he hath ceaſed, to poſſeſs her. There is nothing of valuable Truth in theſe Remarks of the ancient Writers touching the Verb *Erat*: But they have obſerv'd, that the Evangeliſt ſaith, *the Word was in the beginning*, not *the Word was made in the beginning* (which ſpeaketh him none of the things that were made) which would be an Obſervation of great value, if the Evangeliſts beginning was (as modern Divines ſuppoſe) *the Moſaic beginning*. But we have ſeen, that *the Word of Life was manifeſted*, and that according to our Evangeliſt this matter of Fact is that *which was from the beginning*; his beginning therefore is extremely remote both from *Eternity* and the *Moſaic* beginning, and is nothing elſe but the beginning of his Goſpel-hiſtory or of the Times of Chriſtianity.

V. His beginning is certainly a beginning of the matter of his Hiſtory: But he writeth no Hiſtory at all of the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs (but only of the New Teſtament-times and Affairs) yet his beginning is ſuppoſed, to be the Old Teſtament-beginning. An Hiſtorian obſerveth ſome tolerable order, writeth as an Annaliſt, writeth a continu'd courſe of Hiſtory: But our Evangelical Hiſtorian (in the Proem of his Goſpel) is ſuppos'd, to write Hiſtory *per Saltum* at a prodigious rate. For he is ſuppos'd, to begin his Hiſtory at the Moſaic beginning, yet to skip over all the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs and ſeveral Thouſands of Years (without ſaying one Syllable of them) and preſently after this beginning, in the *Fourth* Verſe of his Proem, to fall upon things Evangelical, and in the *Sixth* Verſe of it he falleth upon the Times and Affairs of *John* the Baptiſt. (s) Several of the beſt Expoſitors ſuppoſe, that in the *Fourth* Verſe of his Proem he falleth upon the things Evangelical, *the Life* and *Light* of the New Teſtament-times. All that he diſcourſeth in this and many ſucceeding Verſes through the main of his Proem (touching the Life, the Light, the ſhining of it in darkneſs, the darkneſs not comprehending it, touching the Baptiſt and his Teſtimony and the Precellency of the Meſſiah) is unqueſtionably the Evangelical beginning and the peculiar matters thereof. Our Evangeliſt therefore in this his Proem certainly writeth of the Evangelical beginning; if he alſo writeth in it of the *Moſaic* beginning (or of the beginning as it ſignifieth Eternity) then he writeth in this Proem of two beginnings, which is contrary to his Text, which knoweth but one beginning. And this is plainly a demonſtration, that he writeth not of Eternity or the *Moſaic* beginning. A correſpondence there is between the Old and New Teſtament (as between Literal and Spiritual, Old and New:) But this correſpondence is deſtroy'd by ſuppoſing a Coincidence and Identicalneſs of the Evangeliſts beginning and the *Moſaic*. If in the Front of a Book of the Old Teſtament we meet with theſe Words *in the beginning*, the Author muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean thereby the old beginning; for that is his beginning: But by the ſame words in the Front of a Book of the New Teſtament the Author muſt be ſuppos'd, to mean the new beginning; for this is his beginning. Where ſhould we find the old beginning but in the Front of a Book of the Old Teſtament? And where ſhould we find the new beginning but in the Front of a Book of the New Teſtament? An Hiſtorical Writer of the New Teſtament writeth after the new Creation of all things, and after the new and evangelical beginning (perhaps a great while after them:) To ſuppoſe him in the Front of his Book, to overlook this beginning, and by theſe words *in the beginning* to mean the *Moſaic* beginning, is as incongruous, as if meeting with this Name *Logos* in a *Stoical* Writer, we ſhould interpret it, to mean the Platonic Logos. So we are taught to interpret the *Moſaic* Hiſtory, as if *Moſes* was writing S. *John's* Goſpel; and to interpret S. *John's* Goſpel, as if he was writing the *Moſaic* Hiſtory. But if we thus interpret his Proem, we muſt ſuppoſe him, to jumble together things vaſtly diſſonant (without making any thing like a diſtinction between them) the *Moſaic* beginning and the Evangelical, the things Moſaical and Evangelical, the things Natural and Spiritual, the things Humane and Divine, the things Common and Holy, the times and things of the old Creation and the times and things of the new Creation, an Abſtract Logos and the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. Whence they that thus interpret our Evangeliſt, can never frame a tolerably clear and certain, orderly, agreeable and coherent Interpretation of his Proem; but they fall into numerous diverſities of Interpretation, they know not where he endeth his Sayings of things Moſaical, and falleth upon the things Evangelical, nor where he breaketh off his Diſcourſe of an Abſtract Logos, and beginneth with the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt; and they jumble together things Natural and Evangelical, Secular and Spiritual, Unholy and Holy, as confuſedly, as they ſuppoſe our Evangeliſt to Diſcourſe. His repetition of *the beginning* may inſtruct us touching the Senſe of it; for they that follow the ancient and common Expoſition, can give no tolerably good account of this ſtrange repetition, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God. The ſame was in the beginning with God.* But according to our Evangeliſt the Goſpel-beginning of things (the beginning of our Saviour's Evangelizing) conſiſteth of theſe two things in Conjunction; *The Life was with the Father and was manifeſted unto us.* So he ſaith in the Proem of his Firſt Epiſtle, 1 *Joh.* 1. 2. and ſo he ſaith in the Proem of his Goſpel *The Word was with God, and the Life was the Light of Men.* Joh. 1. 1, 4. His being with God had reference to his Meſſias-ſhip and Evangelizing (as our Evangeliſt throughout his Goſpel declareth, that Chriſt *had been with God, came from God, and was ſent by him*;) and if this was the Goſpel-beginning of things (as manifeſtly it was) thence it appeareth, that it is the Evangelical, not the Moſaical beginning, that our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of. And it is *majoris aſſeverationis gratiâ*, for the greater aſſurance of ſo ſtrange a thing (of great Importance to be believ'd) and to conciliate Credit and Authority to our Saviour's Meſſiasſhip and Evangelizing, that our Evangeliſt maketh this repetition, *The ſame was in the*

(s) *Grotius, Lighfoot, Maldonate.*

Joh. 1. 1, 2.

(t) ó *libra veritat. p.* 358. *beginning with God.* (*t*) *Such is the manner of the Hebrew Tongue* (ſaith *Abarbinel*) *to repeat a thing twice or thrice for greater Confirmation.*

Nothing is more reaſonable, than that the real beginning of Chriſt's Goſpel ſhould be the beginning of it as Hiſtorically written and deſcrib'd. And to this beginning we have great reaſon, to apply the Words of *P. Fagius*
(u) *In Gen.* 1. 1. touching the Moſaical beginning. (*u*) *Eſt* ראשית *nomen abſtractum à primitivo* ראש *quod caput ſignificat, unde* ראשית *non ſimplex initium ſive principium ſignificat, ſed primum illud capitale & admirandum.* It is the new beginning of all things, that is the great and admirandous beginning, and which (upon many accounts) is far to be preferr'd before the old *Moſaic* beginning. The Chriſtians *Cenſus* alſo (as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh) is not from the old *Moſaic* beginning (nor from Eternity) but from the new beginning; for with them (in a laudable ſenſe) *all old things are paſſed away, all things are become new.* Our Evangeliſt's beginning therefore which he celebrateth, is not the old, but the new beginning of all things.

SECTION II.

Of the beginning of Chriſt's miſſive Oeconomy in his Officiary Capacity.

AS they that write of the Jews Affairs diſtinguiſh them into Jews *Native* and *Factive:* So the Oeconomy of all officiary Dignities muſt be diſtinguiſh'd; for they are *factively* officiary Dignities, and what appertaineth to them as ſuch is their *factive Oeconomy in their officiary Capacity*; but the whole of what appertaineth to them *natively* and antecedently to their *factive Oeconomy in their officiary Capacity* is fitly called *their generative Oeconomy in their primary Capacity.* So every Prophet, Prieſt and King muſt be diſtinctly conſider'd, as to what he is in *his generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity*, and as to what he is in his *factive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity.* Which *factive* Oeconomy, if we ſpeak of a Prophet, is moſt fitly called *his miſſive Oeconomy.* Amos 7. 14, 15. *I was no Prophet, neither was I a Prophet's Son; but I was an Herdman and a Gatherer of Sycomore Fruit. And the Lord took me, as I followed the Flock, and the Lord ſaid unto me, go, Propheſie unto my People Iſrael.* The Prophet diſtinctly repreſenteth what he was in *his generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity*; he was *no Prophet, nor Prophet's Son, but an Herdman and a Gatherer of Sycomore Fruit.* And he repreſenteth what he was in his *miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity, he was a Prophet of God to the People of Iſrael.* In like manner our Bleſſed Saviour muſt be diſtinctly conſider'd, as to what he was in his *generative Oeconomy in his firſt or primary Capacity*, which was quite terminated, when he entred upon his Meſſias-ſhip; and as to what he was in *his miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity*, which commenc'd upon his entrance upon his Meſſias-ſhip and the ſeveral Offices thereof. This is that which we mean by his *Miſſion* (without regarding the Scholaſtic Notion of Miſſion) and having thus diſtinguiſh'd a twofold conſideration of our Saviour, I do affirm, that our Evangeliſt in his Hiſtorical Proem doth not conſider our Saviour *in his generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity*, ſave only that he relateth the Termination of this Oeconomy: But this Proem is properly *an Hiſtory of the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity, connexed with the cloſe of his generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity.* There is a neceſſary Connexion between theſe two Oeconomies (the beginning of the one being the ending of the other, and the ending of the one being the beginning of the other) the Termination or Cloſe of the one and the Inchoation of the other. And the ſame words of the Evangeliſt that ſignifie the Termination of the one (of which an account will be given hereafter) do alſo import the Inchoation of the other. So that the whole of this Proem may and muſt be conſider'd as *an Hiſtory of the beginning of Chriſt's miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity*, which is its true Character. For

(1) In the Front of his Proem this Evangeliſt ſtileth our Saviour by no other Name but ὁ λόγος, *the Word*; and ſeeing it is in his miſſive Oeconomy that he is *the Word* (the Evangelical Word) thence it appeareth, that in the entrance of his Goſpel he conſidereth *the beginning* of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy. Expoſitors inquire, why the Evangeliſt would rather call him by the Name of *the Logos* than by the Name of *the Son* or ſome other Name? The ancient Writers anſwer Scholaſtically (*w*) that he would not call him the (w) *Maldonat. in loc.*
Son, leſt Men ſhould phancy any thing of Paſſion, or any thing carnal in his Generation. But this cannot be the reaſon; for within the compaſs of a few Verſes the Evangeliſt ſtileth him *the only begotten Son*; and there is not the leaſt appearance, that in ſtiling him *the Logos* he had any reſpect at all to his Generation. Yet for this reaſon the Scholaſtic Theology will have him to be ſtiled *the Word*, becauſe he is *Verbum mentis*, as a Notion of our Mind is. Some ſay, he is ſtiled *the Logos*, becauſe *the Logos* was very well known amongſt the Jews and the Heathen Philoſophers, and becauſe God created all things by his Word (of Command:) But theſe Reaſons have been conſider'd and confuted. God did not ſpeak to us by his Son *until theſe laſt days.* Heb. 1. 2. Yet ſome will have him, to be called *the Word* (or the Word of God) becauſe by his Miniſtery God ſpake unto the Fathers of the Old Teſtament. And ſome ſay, that our Saviour is called *the Word objectively*, becauſe of him (the Meſſiah) the Word of Promiſe was in the Old Teſtament. But they that aſſign this Reaſon, ruin their own Scholaſtic Theology; for they ſuppoſe, that our Evangeliſt's Logos is not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. Which is a great Truth, and the only true Reaſon why this Humane-divine Perſon is ſtiled *the Word* is aſſign'd by our Evangeliſt himſelf (the beſt Interpreter of his own Senſe;) for he calleth him *the Word of Life.* 1 Joh. 1. 1. Therefore he is intituled *the Word* (or Logos) becauſe he is *the Word of Life Eternal to us*; and he is ſo only in his miſſive Oeconomy, which our Evangeliſt conſidereth in giving him this Name *the Word*, as we have ſeen from S. *Chryſoſtom*, and with him a vaſt number of Expoſitors (before cited) thus far agree; they ſuppoſe him to be called

called *the Word* as being the Interpreter of his Father's Mind and Counſel, and becauſe of his Evangelizing.

(2.) The Word (Evangelical) was ſuch by his Miſſion from God. The Evangeliſt therefore in the entrance of his Goſpel conſidering our Saviour as *the Word* (Evangelical) muſt neceſſarily conſider the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy. The Goſpel is uſually ſtiled ὁ λόγος, *the Word*, and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, *the Word of God*; for that is his Word, which he ſpeaketh unto, and which is ſpoken by his Meſſengers, that have their Miſſion from him. *Matth.* 13. 20. *Mark* 16. 20. *Luk.* 1. 2. and 8. 11, 21. *Act.* 4. 31. and 6. 2. and 8. 14. *Rom.* 10. 17. 2 *Cor.* 2. 17. *Eph.* 6. 17. Accordingly the Son of God is *the Word* (Evangelical) as having his Miſſion from God. *Joh.* 14. 24. *The word which you hear, is not mine, but the Fathers which ſent me.* Joh. 3. 34. *For he whom God hath ſent, ſpeaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him.* He ſpeaketh the words of God, ſo as not to ſpeak them at the low imperfect rate of a meer inſpir'd Man, that hath but a degree and meaſure of ſupernatural Inſpiration (ſuch as *John* Baptiſt;) *for God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him.*

(3.) The Meſſiah hath not meerly his Miſſion from God, but from his *being with God*; and his being with God is ſuch, as is connex'd with his being *the Word* (Evangelical;) for by our Evangeliſt it is connected therewith. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.* In the very entrance of his Goſpel our Evangeliſt conſidereth *the Word's being with God*, whence he hath his Miſſion; which is an Indication, that in the entrance of his Goſpel he conſidereth *the beginning of the Word's miſſive Oeconomy.* But of this there is more than an Indication in the Text; for according to this Evangeliſt *the Word's being with God* is ſuch as is connex'd with his being *the Word* (Evangelical;) which demonſtrateth, that in the very entrance of his Goſpel he conſidereth *the beginning* of *the Word's* miſſive Oeconomy. So Expoſitors agree, that this part of the *Firſt* Verſe, *The Word was with God*, and this part of the *Eighteenth* Verſe, *The only begotten Son which is in the Boſom of the Father*, are parallel places. With his being *in the boſom of the Father* the Evangeliſt connecteth his miſſive Oeconomy, which he looketh upon as having its origin from his being in the Boſom of the Father; for he ſaith, *he hath declared him.* And in like manner in the *Firſt* Verſe with his *being with God* the Evangeliſt connecteth his being *the Word Evangelical*; therefore in this place as in the other the Evangeliſt conſidereth the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy. So we have ſeen, that the Evangeliſt repeateth and inſiſteth upon *his being with God*, and *his being with God in the beginning* (Evangelical;) therefore in the entrance of his Goſpel our Evangeliſt conſidereth the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy, and his *being with God* he conſidereth as the origin thereof and in reference to it. So 1 *Joh.* 1. 2. he ſtileth *The Word Evangelical that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifeſted unto us*; which is a deſcription of the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy. This he deriveth from his *being with God*; this he connecteth with his *being with God*; for his *Manifeſtation* is the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy.

(4.) The honourary Names given to our Saviour by this Evangeliſt in the Proem of his Goſpel, ſhew, that it is properly an Hiſtory *of the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity.* For although the Evangeliſt relateth *the Termination of his generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity*, whence he hath the honouraray Name of *God*; yet all the other honouraray Names of our Saviour in this Proem, relate to his *miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity.* Namely, *The Word, the Life and the Light*, which denote what he is by officiary Dignity, as he is the Meſſiah. For as he is the Meſſiah, he is by officiary Dignity *the Word of Life, the gift and benefit of Life eternal, and the gift and benefit of ſaving Light unto Men.* He is by officiary Dignity what his Admirers and Lovers ſtile him (x) ἡ πνοὴ, καὶ ζωὴ, καὶ φῶς, *my Breath, my Life, and my Light.* The Meſſiah is celebrated for *ſhewing Light to the People and to the Gentiles.* Act: 26. 23. And an Hebrew Doctor ſaith (y) *that in the time of the Meſſiah all Nations ſhould be reduc'd to the knowledge of God.*

(5.) Of the Eternal Generation of the Word or Son of God (that generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity) neither our Evangeliſt nor any other Holy Writer hath ſaid any thing; whence it is reaſonable, to think his Proem an Hiſtory of *the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity.* The ancient Writers ſay (z) *That* Matthew *is a Narrator of the Generation according to the fleſh.* Mark *hath begun his Goſpel from the preaching of* John, *and* Luke *alſo beginneth from* σωματικαὶ ἀρχαί, *corporeal Beginnings. But the Evangeliſt* John, *who wrote laſt, having elevated his Mind above all that is ſenſible and above all time, aſcended to him that is above all, he alſo teſtifying, that though we have known Chriſt after the fleſh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. For taking hold of the beginning it ſelf, and leaving all corporeal and temporary Cogitations below his Theology, he ſuper-ſounded all former Preachments by the magnificence of his Knowledge. The beginning, ſaith he, is not from* Mary, *nor from theſe times, but what? In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, compriſing in few words* τὴν ἐξ ἀϊδίου ὕπαρξιν, τὴν ἀπαθῆ γέννησιν, *his Subſiſtence from Eternity, his Generation without Paſſion*, and ſuch more. (a) *The other Evangeliſts with great accuracy explain our Saviour's Genealogy according to the fleſh; which ſort of things* S. John *little regarded, but by a fervid and igneous motion of Mind he attempted to reach the things that are above the Mind of Man*, καὶ τὴν ἄῤῥητόν τε καὶ ἄφραστον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου γέννησιν ἐξηγεῖσθαι τολμᾶν, *and to dare to expound the arcane and ineffable Generation of the God Logos.* Sometimes they report (b) that S. *John* was deſired by ſome Orthodox Perſons to write of the ſupernal Generation and Nativity; and S. *Hierom* relateth (c) that our Evangeliſt at the deſire of the Biſhops of *Aſia* wrote his Goſpel againſt *Cerinthus* and other Hereticks, and chiefly againſt the Dogma of the *Ebionites*, who aſſert Chriſt not to have exiſted before *Mary. Whence he was neceſſitated to declare his Divine Nativity.* He that readeth ſuch Diſcourſes as theſe, may expect to find in our Evangeliſt as large an account of our Saviour's eternal Generation and Nativity, as o-

(x) *Theophylact in Phil.* 1. 21.

(y) *Hornbeek c. Jud. l.* 3. c. 4.

(z) S. *Baſil. adv. Eunom. l.* 2. p. 52. *S. Chryſoſt. in Johan.* p. 572.

(a) S. *Cyr. in Johan.* p. 8, 10.

(b) *Theophylact in Johan. Proœm.*

(c) *De Script. Eccleſiaſt.*

ther Evangeliſts have given of his Genealogy: But he will find himſelf ſadly miſtaken, when he cometh to conſult his Hiſtory and findeth nothing in it (not ſo much as one Syllable or Iota) that ſoundeth like an eternal Generation and Nativity. Nothing of this Nature is expreſs'd, but by Scholaſtic Chymiſtry much of this nature is extracted out of the Name *Logos*. For the Son of God is ſuppos'd to be (d) S. Baſil. Hom. 16. p. 506. ſo called (d) *becauſe he iſſu'd from Mind as a mental Word, becauſe he was generated without corporeal Paſſion, and becauſe he is the Image of the Genitor* (as the word which we ſpeak is of our Cogitation) and this Name is ſuppos'd to imply, that his Generation is *locutio quædam ac dictio*, a certain Saying. But is it poſſible, that a Scholaſtic *mental Word* and a Grammatical *Vocabulum* can be thought any thing better than profane trifles? And ſhould it not be thought a childiſh miſtake, to interpret the Divine Word by Analogy thereto? For in Chriſtianity *the Word* ſignifieth nothing leſs than the Word which is the Goſpel (the Doctrine of the Chriſtian Religion) and in the perſonal Acceptation it ſignifieth nothing leſs than the officiary Dignity of the Meſſiah the Founder of the Chriſtian Religion. To ſuppoſe, that his eternal Generation was *a certain ſaying or ſpeaking*, is as uncouth a Conceit as that of the *Muhammedans*, who ſuppoſe, that the Bleſſed Virgin became with Child of him by ſmelling of a Roſe.

(6.) Of the temporary Generation of the Word or Son of God (that generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity) our Evangeliſt doth not treat in his Hiſtorical Proem: But he writeth the Hiſtory of our Saviour in the ſame manner that he writeth the Hiſtory of *John* the Baptiſt. For as he thus be- Joh. 1. 6. ginneth his Hiſtory of *John*; *There was a Man, whoſe name was John:* So he thus beginneth his Hiſtory of our Saviour, *In the beginning was the Word.* He taketh no notice of the things that appertain'd to the Baptiſt's generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity, no notice of his Parentage, his miraculous Birth, or of his manner of Life: But he beginneth his Hiſtory of *John* with his miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity, *There was a Man ſent from God, whoſe name was John.* In like manner he taketh no notice of the things that appertain'd to our Saviour's generative Oeconomy in his primary Capacity (ſave only that he mentioneth the Termination of it, and that Termination belongeth alſo to his miſſive Oeconomy) no notice of his Parentage, his miraculous Birth or of his manner of Life: But he beginneth his Hiſtory of our Saviour with his miſſive Oeconomy in his officiary Capacity, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, in him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men.* It may ſeem, that theſe words in our Evangeliſt's Proem *the Word was made Fleſh*, do relate to our Saviour's generative Oeconomy, and are expreſſive of ſuch an Incarnation, as the Scholaſtic Theology treateth of: But for this reaſon they muſt not be ſuppos'd, to belong to his generative Oeconomy, becauſe from many Conſiderations it appeareth, that our Evangeliſt's Proem doth not treat of the generative, but the miſſive Oeconomy of our Saviour. And this account of it agreeth with the account of the ancient Writers (e) that our Evangeliſt wrote his Goſpel (e) Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 24. to ſupply what was wanting in the other Evangeliſts; for they are hugely deficient in their account of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy, but abound in their Narratives of his generative Oeconomy. And for this reaſon in the entrance of his Goſpel he choſe rather to call our Saviour by the Name *Logos* than *Filius*; for had he called him by the Name *Filius*, this would have ingag'd him, to give an account of his generative Oeconomy, which he deſign'd not to treat of. If he had deſigned to treat of his generative Oeconomy, he would in his Proem have made uſe of ſuch Names of our Saviour as relate to that Oeconomy; whereas the Names that he uſeth, are ſuch as relate to the miſſive Oeconomy.

(7.) There is an appearance of a want of order in our Evangeliſt's Proem; for he ſpeaketh of theſe Excellencies of *Life* and *Light*, and theſe Benefits which the Meſſiah was unto Men by a long anticipation, before he ſaith any thing touching *the Word's being made Fleſh*, or touching his being in the World. *Grotius* ſaith (f) *That theſe things are preſuppos'd as* (f) Grot. in Joh. 1. 4. *known to all, and are mention'd when there is occaſion; and ſcrupulouſly to exact order in this ſort of diſcourſing, is to ſeek a knot in a Bulruſh.* And this may ſerve to excuſe want of exact order and method in our Evangeliſt's Proem. But doubtleſs there was ſomething in his Mind, that cauſ'd him to diſcourſe at this ſeeming diſorderly rate, and the true reaſon of it was; In the very entrance upon his Goſpel he conſider'd the Perſon of Chriſt as with God, and as with God appointed to his officiary Dignity of the Meſſiah, and therefore ſtileth him *the Word*, and falleth upon thoſe Excellencies and thoſe Benefits of *Life* and *Light*, which belong to him as the Meſſiah, before he taketh any notice of his *being made Fleſh*, and his *being in the World.* Before he conſider'd *his being in the World and his being made Fleſh* he conſider'd (g) *quòd Pater in illo vitam lucemque ho-* (g) Maldonat in Joh. 1. 4. p. 504. *minum conſtituiſſet*, that the Father had conſtituted in him the Life and Light of Men, which was the cauſe of his *being in the World and his being made Fleſh.* And therefore before theſe are mention'd, in a regular and orderly conſideration of things a Diſcourſe of *Life* and *Light* hath the Precedence in our Evangeliſt's Proem. From which rational account of his regular and orderly conſideration of things it appeareth, that his Proem from the very entrance of it is *an Hiſtory of the beginning of the miſſive Oeconomy of the Meſſiah.*

(8.) Our Evangeliſt's Proem ſpeaketh of our Saviour's *coming into the World*, which ſignifieth the beginning of the miſſive Oeconomy of the Meſſiah. When he ſaith, *The Life was* V. 4. 10, 11. *the Light of Men, he was in the World, he came unto his own*, he manifeſtly ſpeaketh of our Saviour's coming into the World, although in thoſe places he uſeth not that Phraſe; and in thoſe places alſo he manifeſtly ſpeaketh of ſuch a coming into the World, which was the beginning of the miſſive Oeconomy of the Meſſiah. But ſome of the beſt Expoſitors have obſerv'd (h) that our Evangeliſt (*v.* 9.) (h) Grot. Dr Ham. Not. in Joh. 1. 9. uſeth the Phraſe of *coming into the World*, that it belongeth to the Meſſiah, and that it ſignifieth not *to be born*, but *in Nomine Dei hominibus apparere*, to appear unto Men in the Name of God, and ſo to come into the World as God's Meſſiah. For our Saviour diſtinguiſheth *his being Born* from his *coming into the World*. Joh. 18. 37. *To this end was I born, and for this cauſe came I into the world.* In ſuch ſenſe our Saviour ſaith *Joh.* 3. 19. *Light is come into the world.* Joh. 12. 46. *I am come a light into the world.* So the People ſay, *Joh.* 6. 14. *This is of a truth that Prophet, that ſhould come into the world.* So Chriſt ſaith, that he was ſent by the Father into the World. *Joh.* 10. 36. and 17. 18. and (in the ſame place) that the Apoſtles were by him in like manner ſent into the World. This coming into the World therefore (in our Evangeliſt's Proem) doth not refer to Chriſt's Birth in the World, but to the manifeſtation of him to the World, his entring on his Office of preaching the Will of God to them, ſo as his coming may be all one with his being ſent, *i. e.* his Commiſſion from God to declare his Will to the World, as *Joh.* 8. 42. *I came not of my ſelf, but he ſent me.* This is uſed of the Apoſtles, where it cannot poſſibly be underſtood of their Birth. *Joh.* 17. 18. *As thou haſt ſent me into the world, ſo alſo I have ſent them into the world.* So 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Jeſus Chriſt came into the world.* And *Joh.* 11. 27. *I believe, that thou art Chriſt,* ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος, *that cometh into the world,* which was certainly deſign'd by *Martha* as an Expreſſion of her Belief, that he was the Meſſiah. Thus far I have tranſcrib'd the Diſcourſes of two learned Expoſitors, in which I will remark theſe three things. Firſt, That according to theſe Expoſitors our Saviour's *coming into the World* doth not refer to his Birth, but to *the manifeſtation of him to the World, his entring on his Office of Preaching.* From whence it followeth, that the Proem of our Evangeliſt's Firſt Epiſtle (which is a Parallel to the Proem of his Goſpel) referreth in the whole of it to our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy; for the Subject-matter of it is *the manifeſtation of the Life and the word of Life.* 1 Joh. 1. 1, 2. Another thing I infer from one of theſe Expoſitors; that it was not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, that did come into the World. For ſo he expoundeth 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Jeſus Chriſt came into the world.* Joh. 11. 27. *I believe, that thou art Chriſt the Son of God, that cometh into the world.* Both theſe Expoſitors ſuppoſe, (which is a third thing remarkable) that our Saviour's coming into the World and his *being ſent* are the ſame thing, and that our Saviour's Miſſion was like that of the Apoſtles. Whence I infer, that the Scholaſtic Incarnation was not our Saviour's Miſſion, as the Scholaſtic Theology and the ancient Writers of the Church ſuppoſe.

(9.) Some large parts of our Evangeliſt's ſhort Proem are manifeſtly parts of an Hiſtory of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy and of the beginning thereof; which is an Indication, that his Proem is of this Nature and Character, *An Hiſtory of the beginning of the miſſive Oeconomy of the Meſſiah.* For to ſuch an Hiſtory the Evangeliſt's account of *John* the Baptiſt manifeſtly belongeth. *V.* 6, 7, 8. *There was a man ſent from God, whoſe name was John. The ſame came for a witneſs, to bear witneſs of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was ſent to bear witneſs of that light.* To ſuch an Hiſtory belongeth alſo the Evangeliſt's account of the courſe entertainment, that our Saviour found in the World upon his coming into it, which is mention'd three times in this ſhort Proem. *V.* 5. *The light ſhineth in darkneſs, and the darkneſs* (received or) *comprehended it not.* V. 10. *He was in the world, and the world knew him not.* V. 11. *He came unto his own, and his own received him not.* Which Words ſome refer to the univerſality of Mankind (as being Chriſt's own, becauſe he at firſt created them) others much more reaſonably refer them to the *Jews* only, who are fitly called Chriſt's own; for if we conſider him as a Man, they were peculiarly his own Nation and People. 2 *King.* 4. 13. If we conſider him as a Prophet, they were his own People, as peculiarly the People of his Miniſtration. *Rom.* 15. 8. If we conſider him as the Meſſiah, he was their Meſſiah, peculiarly promis'd to them and ſent to them. *Matth.* 15. 24. They were therefore peculiarly *his own* as peculiarly ally'd to him, not the Aliens from the Meſſiah, as the Gentiles were. And at theſe Words *He came unto his own and his own received him not,* we will conclude our Evangeliſt's Proem; for here he breaketh off his proemial deſcription of the Perſon of the Meſſiah, and in the following Verſes maketh a deſcription of regenerate Believers.

(10.) Our Evangeliſt's ſhort Proem ought to be interpreted by his larger Goſpel, which at ſo great a rate inſiſteth on our Saviour's Miſſion from God, that in all reaſon the Proem thereof muſt be look'd upon as *an Hiſtory of the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy.* The ſound of this Goſpel is Chriſt's Miſſion from God. *God ſent not his Son into the world, to condemn the world. My meat is to do the will of him that ſent me. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath ſent him. He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life. I ſeek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath ſent me. The works that I do, bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me. And the Father himſelf which hath ſent me, hath born witneſs of me. This is the Father's will which hath ſent me, that of all which he hath given me, I ſhould loſe nothing. And this is the will of him that ſent me, that every one which ſeeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlaſting Life. As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father. He that ſeeketh his glory that ſent him, the ſame is true. Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go unto him that ſent me. No man can come to me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him. Though I bear record of my ſelf, yet my record is true; for I know whence I came, and whither I go. My judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father that ſent me. I am one that bear witneſs of my ſelf, and the Father that ſent me, beareth witneſs of me. He that ſent me, is with me. I muſt work the works of him that ſent me. Becauſe of the people which ſtand by, I ſaid it, that they may believe, that thou haſt ſent me. He that ſeeth me, ſeeth him that ſent me. He that receiveth me, receiveth him that ſent me. All theſe things will they do unto you for my names ſake, becauſe they know not him that ſent me. I go my way to him that ſent me. This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent. As thou haſt ſent me into*

Joh. 3. 17.
ch. 4. 34.
ch. 5. 23, 24, 30, 36, 37.
ch. 6. 39, 40, 44, 57.
ch. 7. 18, 33.
ch. 8. 14, 16, 18, 29.
ch. 9. 4.
ch. 11. 42.
ch. 12. 45.
ch. 13. 20.
ch. 15. 21.
ch. 16. 5.
ch. 17. 3, 18, 21, 23, 25.
ch. 20. 21.

to the World, even ſo have I alſo ſent them into the World. That the World may believe, that thou haſt ſent me. I have known thee, and theſe have known, that thou haſt ſent me. As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you. *Grotius* in his Explication of the Title of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel compareth S. *Peter* and our Evangeliſt to two of *Alexander*'s Friends, of which one was the lover of *Alexander*, the other was the lover of the King. So he ſuppoſeth, that S. *Peter* was chiefly φιλόχριστος, *the lover of Chriſt*, and our Evangeliſt was chiefly φιλιησοῦς, *the lover of Jeſus.* But ſeeing he hath wav'd the treating of our Saviour's generative œconomy, and the Name which he peculiarly giveth him, denoteth his Meſſias-ſhip; ſeeing all the eximious divine Excellencies which he aſcribeth to our Saviour (in his Apocalypſe and other Writings) are ſuch as belong to him as Chriſt, and almoſt all that his Goſpel (as alſo the Proem of his firſt Epiſtle) ſoundeth forth is the Meſſiah and his miſſive œconomy; it muſt be ſaid, that in his Writings he appeareth to be φιλόχριστος, *the lover of Chriſt*, rather than φιλιησοῦς, *the lover of Jeſus.*

(II.) From this Goſpel it appeareth, that our Saviour's *being with God* had reference to his Meſſias-ſhip and his being the Evangelical Word; and from hence we may infer, that the Proem of his Goſpel is *an Hiſtory of the beginning of our Saviour's miſſive œconomy.* *Joh.* 1. 18. When he ſaith, *No man hath ſeen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the Boſom of the Father, he hath declared him:* He plainly affirmeth, that our Saviour had been with God, and his words imply, that he had ſeen him; and when he ſaith, *he hath declared him*, he ſignifieth our Saviour's officiary dignity as *The Word Evangelical*, and that his being with God had reference to (his being The Word Evangelical) his declaring him in his miſſive œconomy, and was the beginning thereof. *What he hath ſeen and heard that he teſtifieth*, Joh. 3. 32. *We ſpeak what we do know, and teſtifie what we have ſeen*, ſaith our Saviour. *Ye have neither heard his voice, nor ſeen his ſhape. He that ſent me is true, whom ye know not: but I know him, for I am from him, and he hath ſent me. Not that any Man hath ſeen the Father, ſave he which is of God, he hath ſeen the Father. I ſpeak that which I have ſeen with my Father; and ye do that which ye have ſeen with your Father. If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of my ſelf, but he ſent me. My Doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me. I can of mine own ſelf do nothing, as I hear, I judge. I do nothing of my ſelf, but as my Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe things. The words that I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of my ſelf. The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's which ſent me. He that ſent me is true, and I ſpeak to the World thoſe things which I have heard of him. He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me. I have given unto them the words which thou gaveſt me, and they have received them, and have known ſurely, that I came out from thee, and they have believed, that thou didſt ſend me. All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you. I have not ſpoken of my ſelf; but the Father which ſent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I ſhould ſay, and what I ſhould ſpeak. Whatſoever I ſpeak therefore, even as the Father ſaid unto me, ſo I ſpeak. As the Father gave me commandment, even ſo I do. I have glorified thee on the Earth, I have finiſhed the work which thou gaveſt me to do. I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me. The Cup which my Father hath given me, ſhall I not drink it? Say ye of him whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the World, thou blaſphemeſt?* When our Saviour ſo often affirmeth, that he came immediately from God, that he had ſeen him and heard his words, received his Doctrine, Miſſion and Commiſſion, Mandate and Meſſias-ſhip from him, he plainly ſignifieth, that he was with him in reference to his being *The Word Evangelical* (The Meſſiah) and that from this Origin his miſſive œconomy is to be deriv'd. In our Evangeliſt's Goſpel therefore we may plainly read the true Expoſition of thoſe primary words of his Proem *The Word was with God.* For they ſignifie, that *the Word was with God* in reference to his being *The Word Evangelical* which is his miſſive œconomy. From the primary words of this Proem therefore rightly expounded it appeareth, to be *an Hiſtory of the beginning of our Saviour's miſſive œconomy.*

Joh. 3. 11.
ch. 5. 17, 30.
ch. 6. 46.
ch. 7. 16, 28, 29.
ch. 8. 26, 28, 38, 42.
ch. 11. 42.
ch 12. 44, 49, 50.
ch. 14. 10, 31.
ch. 15. 15.
ch 17. 4, 8.
ch. 18. 11.

SECTION III.

Of the Word that was with God.

I. THE true Character of our Evangeliſt's Proem (which we have now ſettled) will go a great way in reſolving a grand Queſtion, which is involv'd in thoſe primary words of it *The Word was with God.* For it muſt be conſider'd, whether *The Word that was with God*, was an *Abſtract Logos* (the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity) or *the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah?* For the reſolution whereof we may look back to our Idea of the Son of God; for if we have not extremely miſrepreſented his Idea, our Evangeliſt's *Logos* (the ſame with the only begotten Son, *Joh.* 1. 18.) can be no Abſtract *Logos*. In our account of his Incarnation and new Creation we have confuted the Hypotheſis of an Abſtract *Logos*; and ſince we began to interpret our Evangeliſt, we have ſhew'd, that his *Logos* is not an Abſtract *Logos*, that his *Beginning*, *Life* and *Light* are only the Evangelical, and that his Proem is *an Hiſtory of the beginning of the miſſive œconomy of the Meſſias*; which are Propoſitions inconſiſtent with the ſuppoſition of an Abſtract *Logos*. But that nothing may be wanting to a due determination of this Queſtion, we will obſerve many other Notices concerning it, that occur in our Evangeliſt's Goſpel and ſome other places of the New Teſtament. From our Evangeliſt we may learn what kind of *Logos* he ſpeaketh of, if we review the many places which we have (but now) cited from him. For theſe places put together will make this ſhort Hiſtory of his *Logos*. *In the beginning the Word was with God, to the purpoſe of being an Eye and Ear-witneſs of the things Heavenly; he ſaw God, had converſe with him at the moſt intimate rate, heard his Voice, had his Words and his Doctrine from him, was taught by him what he ſhould ſay and what he ſhould ſpeak, was ſent* *by him into the World, received Mandates from him touching the Work that he was to do, came down from Heaven, and was made* (or became) *Humane Fleſh*, Joh. 1. 14. *Came from God and went to God*, Joh. 16. 28. In this Hiſtory ſuch a *Logos* is repreſented to us, which is manifeſtly the Prince of Evangeliſts, that brought down from Heaven the Goſpel of God. The whole of it therefore is hugely agreeable to the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah: but nothing of it is agreeable to an Abſtract *Logos* otherwiſe than as diſtorted by Scholaſtic Interpretation, which is alien, exotic and heterogeneous to it; for it is Hiſtory that ought to be hiſtorically underſtood.

II. From our Evangeliſt it appeareth, that *the Word was with God* (in Heaven) at the time immediately antecedent to his Manifeſtation. *For the Life was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it, that Eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifeſted unto us*, 1 Joh. 1. 2. *The Word was with God.—— In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men*, Joh. 1. 1, 4. (i) *The Word's being with God* (according to the beſt Expoſitors) *denoteth his being with God in Heaven in his inviſible ſtate, which is oppoſite to his being in the World, in the Fleſh* (in the Senſe of our Evangeliſt) *conſpicuous and apparent and in his ſtate of manifeſtation.* So the Evangeliſt's words ſignifie (plainly enough) *That Eternal Life was with the Father, and was manifeſted unto us.* He was with the Father before he was manifeſted and till he was manifeſted (while he was in his inviſible ſtate and inconſpicuous he was with the Father) the Word therefore was with God at the time immediately antecedent to his manifeſtation, which ſucceeded his inviſible ſtate, and if it did ſucceed it, could not but immediately ſucceed it. The time of his *manifeſtation* is certainly known, and conſequently the time of his *coming forth from the Father, coming into the World* and *coming down* from Heaven, is eaſily known, and is clearly enough expreſs'd by *John* the *Baptiſt*, Joh. 3. 31. *He that cometh from above, is above all: he that is of the Earth is earthly and ſpeaketh of the Earth: he that cometh from Heaven is above all.* It is eaſie, to interpret this Phraſe *of coming from above* and *coming from Heaven* figuratively and allegorically: but ſo it is eaſie, to allegorize away the Hiſtory of the Bible. As theſe words, *he that is of the Earth*, are Hiſtory: ſo are theſe words, *he that cometh from above, he that cometh from Heaven*; they plainly ſignifie, (*k*) ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς ἄνωθεν ἡμῖν ἀφίκετο, *that Chriſt did come to us from above.* And if the Perſon of Chriſt did come to us from above, not an Abſtract *Logos* (or the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity) but the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah did come to us from above, and it is his Divine Honour, that the Baptiſt emblazoneth by intituling him *He that cometh from above, He that cometh from Heaven*, but eſpecially by this μεγαλυσμὸς, *He is above all.* For in theſe words he muſt neceſſarily conſider Chriſt as Chriſt, or as the Saint of God-kind of Imperial Son (who is above all in Rank and Graduality and all Excellency;) and ſeeing it is the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt (not an Abſtract *Logos*) that throughout the New Teſtament (*l*) is celebrated *as above all*, therefore it is not an Abſtract *Logos*, but the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, whom the Baptiſt celebrateth, as *He that cometh from above, He that cometh from Heaven and is above all.* Which alſo appeareth from the Nature of the Baptiſt's Teſtimony; for he was not ſent, to give his Honourary Teſtimony to an Abſtract *Logos*, but to the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt. (*m*) *Qui de ſurſum venit, ſupra omnes eſt, Chriſtus eſt: qui autem eſt de terra, de terra eſt, & de terra loquitur, Joannes eſt.* The Baptiſt compareth not himſelf with an Abſtract *Logos*, but with the Perſon of Chriſt: and he compareth himſelf with Chriſt, not as a Man, but as a Prophet. As a Prophet he was not ſent down from Heaven, but was of the Earth, of Rank and Degree he was but earthly (but an earthly Prophet;) and he ſpake *but of the Earth*, becauſe as to his revealed Notices of things he was but a Prophet of the Earth: Whereas to the Meſſiah the things of Heaven were notic'd upon his own knowledge; of Rank and Degree he was ſupernal, peerleſs and tranſcendent; and as to his Miſſion he was a Prophet (Prince and Potentate) ſent down from Heaven. Throughout all the Baptiſt's Diſcourſes there is not the leaſt Indication, that he knew any thing of the Second Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity; the Diſcourſe which we have now under conſideration, manifeſtly and undeniably in the whole of it relateth to the complex Perſon of the Meſſiah, *v.* 30. *He muſt increaſe, but I muſt decreaſe.* V. 29. *He that hath the Bride* (the Church) *is the Bridegroom.* V. 27, 28. *A Man can receive nothing, except it be given him from Heaven. Ye your ſelves bear me witneſs, that I ſaid, I am not the Chriſt.* This was the Divine Perſon, whom *John* thus intituleth and ennobleth, *He that cometh from above, He that cometh from Heaven.* And it appeareth, that he came from Heaven, at that time when he came to *John* to be baptized, and was made manifeſt unto *Iſrael*, *Joh.* 1. 32. Until that time the Word was with God (to Men inconſpicuous:) but then *the Life was manifeſted* and became *the Light of Men.* Which manifeſtation of the Meſſiah (connex'd with his being with God) was not till about thirty years after his Bethlehemitical Nativity; therefore his being with God was not antecedent to his Bethlehemitical Nativity, nor belong'd to an Abſtract *Logos.* His being with God immediately preceded his manifeſtation, and therefore belong'd to his Humane-divine Perſon and was introductory to his miſſive œconomy.

III. The Baptiſt calleth Chriſt *an Eye and Ear-witneſs of the things in Heaven*, Joh. 3. 32. *What he hath ſeen and heard, that he teſtifieth.* Which Expreſſions the moſt Expoſitors (*n*) interpret figuratively, departing from the literal Senſe of Scripture without any reaſon or neceſſity, againſt plain reaſon and neceſſity. For the Baptiſt's teſtimony of our Saviour muſt be underſtood as Encomiaſtic Hiſtory; and ſeeing he affirmeth, that the Humane Divine

---

(i) *Verbum erat apud Deum. Opponitur hoc ei quod infra dicitur*, ὁ λόγος *in mundo fuiſſe, caro factus, ſpectatus. vult enim dicere ante eum fuiſſe inconſpicuum. Dicitur enim Deus eſſe* ἀόρατος. 1 Tim. 1. 17. *& habitare lucem inacceſſam.* 1 Tim. 6. 16. *Idem indicat in* 1 Ep. 1. 2. καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη. *Et mox* ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. & Eph. 3. 9. *ſic infra*, 17. 5. παρὰ σοι. Grot. Not. in Joh. 1. 1. *Acuta etiam eſt & germana, ut mihi videtur, interpretatio Gregorii*, lib. 5. Moral. cap. 19. *Idem eſſe Verbum fuiſſe apud Deum, & fuiſſe inviſibile, fuiſſe quodammodo abſconditum.* Maldonat. in Joh. 1. 1.

(k) *S. Chryſoſt. in loc.*

(l) *Eph.* 1. 21. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21, *&c.*

(m) *S. Aug. Tr.* 14. *in Joann.*

(n) *Maldonat. in l. c.*

Perſon of Chriſt did come *from above* and *from Heaven*, ſhall he not be thought, to affirm, that literally and properly he was an Eye and Ear-witneſs of the things in Heaven? So one Expoſitor well interpreteth his words. (o) *Qui de terra eſt, loquitur terrena, & quæ didicit in terra: at qui de cœlo eſt, loquitur quæ didicit in cœlo, ea ſcil. quæ vidit & audiit à Deo.* He that is of the Earth, ſpeaketh the things that he learned in the Earth: but he that is from Heaven, ſpeaketh the things that he learned in Heaven, namely, the things which he ſaw and heard from God. But is it imaginable, that this was an Abſtract *Logos*, who was furniſh'd to be a Prophet by what he learned from God in Heaven, and by what he learned from his Eyes and Ears in Heaven? Not only the Baptiſt, but our Saviour himſelf in many of his Diſcourſes (before-cited) ſtileth himſelf an Eye and Ear-witneſs of the things in Heaven; and ſeeing he requireth, to be believed as the faithful and true Witneſs touching matter of fact, ought he not, to be an Eye and Ear-witneſs, to qualifie him for belief? He was the great *Apoſtle* of our Profeſſion, and therefore muſt be an Apoſtolical ſort of Teſtifier; which he could not be, unleſs he teſtify'd of the things Celeſtial upon the credit of his Eyes and Ears. And it is not an Abſtract *Logos*, but only the Humane Divine Perſon of the Meſſiah, that could ſo teſtifie. An Abſtract *Logos* is not any thing like what all mean by an Eye and Ear-witneſs; nor would any intelligent Perſon call any one ſuch a Witneſs upon account of his having been an Abſtract *Logos*; ſuch Scholaſticals are quite out of the road of popular Notion and Expreſſion, they are quite alien and remote from what Mankind mean by teſtifying upon the credit of their Eyes and Ears (upon which the force of their Teſtimony dependeth;) the Baptiſt therefore in his Character of our Saviour cannot be ſuppos'd to mean an Abſtract *Logos*. Nor can our Saviour mean an Abſtract *Logos*, when he ſaith, *Joh.* 6. 46. *Not that any Man hath ſeen the Father, ſave he which is of God, he hath ſeen the Father.* To the ſame Senſe the Evangeliſt ſaith, *Joh.* 1. 18. *No Man hath ſeen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the Boſom of the Father, he hath declared him.* The Chriſt of God therefore did ſee God, and ſo ſee God, as to be an Exception from this general Rule, *No Man hath ſeen God*; therefore the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt as ſuch did ſee God; for if an Abſtract *Logos* only did ſee God, this was not properly a Man's ſeeing God, nor an exception from this general Rule, *No Man hath ſeen God*, nor can it be ſaid of an Abſtract *Logos* with any tolerable propriety *that he hath ſeen God* (as it is ſaid of the Juſt with great propriety, that they ſhall ſee God) nor is it a thing of intelligible apprehenſion or conception. (p) The greateſt Scholaſtic Divines pretend not to underſtand any thing of it, nor to have any Notion of it, unleſs this of S. *Auſtin* may paſs for a Notion. (q) *Videre Filii hoc eſt natum eſſe de Patre*, the ſeeing of the Son is his being born of the Father. At the ſame rate (as we have ſeen before) the Scholaſtic Theology interpreteth our Saviour's Diſcourſes, *Joh.* 12. 49, 50. *I have not ſpoken of my ſelf; but the Father which ſent me, he gave me a commandment, what I ſhould ſay and what I ſhould ſpeak*, Joh. 14. 31. *As the Father gave me commandment, even ſo I do.* (r) *The ſpeaking of God is the generating the* (Scholaſtic) Verbum. *To teach the Son, is to have generated him learned and knowing* (ſo as to be incapable of being taught, and ſo as not to teach him at all.) *To give all Judgment to the Son, is to generate him the Judge* (ſo as not to give or commit to him any Judgment at all.) *Our Saviour uſually ſaith, The Father hath given him: whereby he would have us to underſtand, that the Father generated him* (and otherwiſe gave him nothing.) *The Father ſpeaketh to the Son* (The Word) *not by another Word or Speech, but by communicating to him his Nature, wherewith the Son received all that was in the Father, Wiſdom, Knowledge, Will, Commandment, the counſel and purpoſe of creating and doing ſomething in time.* In Diſcourſes touching *the Creation* in the New Teſtament Scholaſtic Divines very much inſiſt, *that words ought to be underſtood according to their proper natural ſignification*: but how well they obſerve their own Rule, appeareth from the figurative Interpretations and Scholaſtical Expoſitions, which they make of the Baptiſt's Diſcourſes and our Saviour's *touching his ſeeing God, hearing the Father, being taught by him, receiving his Doctrine from him, receiving Commandments from him, and Precepts touching Work to be done, his coming forth from him, his deriving his Commiſſion from him, his having all Judgment committed to him, and the Father's giving to the Son, to have Life in himſelf*, (with ſuch more) all which amounteth to nothing more than this (as the ancient Scholaſticks ſuppoſe) *The Father generated him from Eternity.* But thus to ſophiſticate and adulterate Theology by unholy and irrational Interpretations of Scripture (for a Prophet muſt be generated, before he is made a Prophet, and muſt have his Inſtructions, Miſſion, Commiſſion and Credentials after his Exiſtence) thus to wreſt the Divine Diſcourſes of our Saviour (like a Noſe of Wax) to make his words not Senſe, and to ſignifie what is contrary to their ſignification, is doubtleſs a crime next door to expunging them out of the Bible. To which *Theophylact* proceeded a great way in his Interpretation of one Text *God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him*, which he thus expounded; *To Chriſt he did not give the Spirit at all, for Chriſt hath it eſſentially.* What ſhall we ſay to ſuch Theologers, as dare *in terminis*, contradict the Scriptures, to uphold their own Prejudices? I am ſorry, to cite S. *Chryſoſtom* as in any degree guilty of ſuch a Crime; but thus he writeth upon *Joh.* 3. 32. *What he hath ſeen and heard that he teſtifieth.* (s) *The Baptiſt carrieth his Speech to that which is low; for it is humanly ſpoken, to ſay, what he hath heard and ſeen. For his knowing was not by receiving notices of things from ſeeing and hearing; but iſſuing perfect from the Father he had all in*

(o) Lightfoot Hor. in loc.

(p) S. Cyr. in Joh. p. 349. S. Aug. Tr. 19. in Joan.

(q) Ibid. Tr. 20.

(r) *Loqui Dei, eſt Verbum genuiſſe. Docere Filium eſt Doctum & ſcientem genuiſſe. Judicium dare Filio, eſt judicem ipſum gignere. Plerumque dicit, Dedit mihi pater: in quo vult intelligi, quod eum genuerit pater. Pater loquitur Filio* (Verbo) *non verbo vel ſermone altero, ſed communicatione ipſa naturæ, qua cum omnia Filius accepit quæ in Patre ſunt, ſapientiam, cognitionem, voluntatem, juſſionem, creandi vel in tempore faciendi aliquid conſilium & propoſitum.* Petav. de Trin. l. 2. c. 4. S. 6, &c. l. 6. c. 4. S. 3, &c. l. 8. c. 1. S. 10.

(s) Ἐπὶ τὸ ταπεινότερον τὸν λόγον ἄγει· τὸ γὰρ ὃ ἤκουσε καὶ ἑώρακεν, ἀνθρωπινότερον εἴρηται· οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ παραλαβεῖν ὄψει, οὐδ᾽ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι ᾔδει ἃ ᾔδει· ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ πᾶν εἶχε, τέλειος ἐκ τῶν πατρικῶν κόλπων προελθὼν, καὶ οὐ δεόμενος τοῦ διδάσκοντος.

his Nature, and needed not one to teach him.---- When he ſaith, as I hear, I judge, and I ſpeak what I have heard of my Father, and we ſpeak what we have ſeen, and other ſuch things, it is not to let us know, that he ſpeaketh what he ſpeaketh being taught, τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας ἐςὶ νομίζειν, *for ſo to ſuppoſe, is extreme madneſs; but that nothing which he ſpake might be ſuſpected by the impudent Jews.* One may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that *John* Baptiſt's Character of our Saviour, *Joh.* 3. 27---34. is truly noble, divine and illuſtrious: But *S. Chryſoſtom* ſaith τοῖς ταπεινοτέροις ἐνδιατρίβει μάλιςα, *he moſt inſiſteth upon the lower ſort of things.*

IV. Our Evangeliſt repreſenteth the Logos as ſent from being with God in Heaven (which is neceſſarily the Logos that was with God;) the Miſſion of this Logos ſo ſent was a *Prophetic* or Apoſtolic Miſſion; therefore this Logos was no Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah. By the Prophetic Miſſion I mean ſuch a kind of Miſſion as the Prophets of God have, and which is oppoſite to the Scholaſtic kind of Miſſion. (*t*) For the Scholaſtic Theology in treating of the *Miſſion of the Divine Perſons* (the Son and the Holy Ghoſt) hath chiefly regard to their eternal Proceſſion or Egreſſion from the Father, but not to this alone; for the Miſſion of a Divine Perſon in this Theology is thus defin'd. *It is the eternal Proceſſion of a Divine Perſon, ſo as to be withall a temporal Operation.* (*u*) So the Miſſion of the Son by the Father unto us and into the World is ſaid to be his eternal Generation, ſo as to be with all intentionally and actually his (Scholaſtic) Incarnation, whereby he appeared unto Men. *To come forth from the Father by eternal Generation, and to come into the World by aſſuming Humane Nature* (ſo deſcending from his Highneſs to our Meanneſs) is *to be ſent* (*w*) as this Theology ſuppoſeth. But thus Scholaſtically to interpret the Scripture, is enormouſly to miſinterpret it; for neither doth our Saviour's *coming into the World* ſignifie the Scholaſtic Incarnation; nor doth his *coming forth from the Father* ſignifie his eternal Generation. This ſome of the principal Scholaſtic Divines obſerve and diſcourſe; that our Saviour compareth his *coming forth from the Father* and his *return to the Father*, and that the one anſwereth the other. *Joh.* 16. 28. *I came forth from the father, and am come into the world: Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* (*x*) *Wherefore it is better to interpret both of them in the ſame ſenſe* (as appertaining to the Humane Nature) *and to apply them to the temporary Miſſion.* But if our Saviour's *coming forth from the Father* muſt be underſtood of his Humane Nature (as the tenor of his Words and this Scholaſtic Divine argue) it muſt be underſtood of ſuch *a coming forth from the Father*, which is anſwerable to his return to the Father; and conſequently the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt muſt be underſtood, to have come forth from God and out of Heaven, as he return'd to God and into Heaven; which is deſtructive to the Hypotheſis of an Abſtract Logos of eternal Generation. The eternal Generation (ſuppoſing it true) or the Emiſſion of a Ray of the Sun (which is a Similitude that the ancient Writers uſe (*y*) and which *Maldonate* applaudeth) is of no Affinity with our Saviour's Miſſion; and the Scholaſtic Incarnation is about as far diſtant from it, as the Ark of Bulruſhes wherein *Moſes* was expos'd, was diſtant from the fiery Buſh in the Wilderneſs, wherein God appear'd to him. To call ſuch things as theſe our Saviour's Miſſion, and to jumble an eternal and temporary Egreſſion into one Miſſion, is contrary to the common Sence of Mankind, and it is marvellous, that the ancient Writers could ſo groſly miſtake in ſo plain a caſe. A principal origin of their miſtake was their not underſtanding the meaning of our Saviour's *coming into the World*; for although amongſt the Hebrew Doctors *coming into the World* is an uſual Periphraſis of Men, and denoteth their being born into this World, yet we do not find, that it ſo ſignifieth in any one place of the Bible, and as apply'd to our Saviour it is manifeſtly of another Notion, and is the ſame with his Prophetic kind of Miſſion, which is the only Miſſion, that the Scripture is acquainted with. (z) *He that receiveth a mandate from God, to bring any thing, is ſaid to be ſent by him.* When our Saviour ſaith, that *he came not of himſelf, but God ſent him.* Joh. 8. 42. The ſenſe is, he came not (*a*) *as falſe Prophets do*, of his own head, but was ſent as a Meſſenger, *Malach.* 3. 1. and as an Apoſtle, *Heb.* 3. 1. whence ſome think, that the Name *Shiloh* ſignifieth ἀπεςαλμένος, or as the vulg. Lat. hath it *qui mittendus eſt*, which is the Name of the Meſſiah (*b*) *who was ſent by God by ſuch an authoritative Miſſion, as gave him the fulleſt height of Authority.* (*c*) *In S.* John's *Goſpel Chriſt every where declareth, that he was ſent by the Father, and not ſeldom in the ſenſe of teaching*, ſaith *Grotius.* Who ſeemeth to be ſo far carry'd away with common prejudice, as to ſuppoſe, that our Saviour ſpeaketh of his Miſſion in ſeveral Senſes: But he that can find in Scripture any ſuch ambiguity in the word *Miſſion*, or that our Saviour had ſeveral Miſſions, will make a great diſcovery. He never ſpeaketh but of one Miſſion, that he had from the Father, and often repreſenteth it as an Apoſtolic kind of Miſſion. *Joh.* 17. 18. *As thou haſt ſent me into the world, ſo have I alſo ſent them into the world.* Sometimes he repreſenteth it as a Prophetic kind of Miſſion. *Matth.* 10. 40, 41. *He that receiveth you, receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that ſent me. He that receiveth a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, ſhall receive a Prophet's reward.* Prophets that are Founders of a Religion, either really have been, or pretend to have been with God. Amongſt the Heathen *Numa* and *Minos* pretended in ſome ſort, to have been with God. And the *Pythagoreans* ſay (*d*) *It is not eaſie to*

(t) *Petav. ſupr. l.* 8. *c.* 1.

(u) *Sic mitti à Patre Filium, eſt gigni, naturam hominis aſſumpturum & ſuo tempore aſſumentem.*

(w) *A Patre exire, & venire in hunc mundum, mitti eſt.* Gonet. Clyp. T. 5. Diſp. 13. Art. 1. p. 762.

(x) *Quare eodem ſenſu interpretari ambo illa ſatius ſit, & ad temporariam miſſionem accommodare.* Petav. de Trin. l. 8. c. 1. S. 3.

(y) *Com. in Joh.* 3. 34.

(z) *Qui mandatum aliquod à Deo accipit ad aliquid perferendum, is mitti ab eo dicitur.* Ut ſupr. 1. 6. & 3. 17 34. & 5. 36, 38. & 6. 57. & 8. 42. Grot. Not. in Joh. 10. 36.

(a) *Ut qui falsò ſibi prophetæ munus arrogant.* Jer. 3 21. Grot. Not. in loc. Maldonat. in loc. S. Cyr. in Joan p. 940.

(b) *Qui ſumma cùm poteſtate à Deo miſſus eſt.* Grot. Not. in Gen. 49. 10.

(c) *Chriſtus à Patre ſe miſſum paſſim in hoc libro prædicat, nec rarò in illo ſenſu docendi.* Idem Not. in Joh. 17. 18.

Mittuntur Prophetæ cum mandatum à Deo accipiunt. Grot. Not. in Joh. 1. 6.

(d) *Jambl. de vit. Pythag c.* 28.

know what pleaſeth God ἂν μὴ τις ἢ θεῶν ἀκούσῃ, *unleſs one either heareth the Gods, or gaineth the knowledge of it by Divination. Moſes* the Founder of the Jews Religion was really with God upon Mount *Sinai.* (e) *Muhammed* pretendeth, that he was commanded by the Angel *Gabriel,* to travel up into Heaven, to ſpeak with God Almighty, that this Angel conducted him through Seven Heavens, and that at length he arriv'd at the Preſence of God, from whom he receiv'd his Law, and who conferr'd upon him certain wonderful Prerogatives. Agreeably to the pretended or true Prophets the Evangeliſt ſaith of our Bleſſed Saviour, *the Word was with God.* Who if he was in a proper ſenſe *an Eye and Ear-witneſs of the things in Heaven, if he did ſee God, converſe with him, hear his voice, had his words from him, was taught by him what he ſhould ſpeak, receiv'd a certain Doctrine and Commandments from him* (as himſelf ſaith) then he had a Prophetic Miſſion from his being with God in Heaven, which is only competible to his Humane-divine Perſon, not to an Abſtract Logos. On the other hand, if he had a Prophetic Miſſion from being with God in Heaven, then in a proper ſenſe of the words he was *an Eye and Ear-witneſs of the things in Heaven, did ſee God and converſe with him, heard his voice, had his words from him, was taught by him what he ſhould ſpeak, receiv'd a certain Doctrine and Commandment from him,* and conſequently thoſe numerous Texts of Scripture that ſpeak of theſe matters, muſt be underſtood of his Humane-divine Perſon, and not of an Abſtract Logos, to whom they are unapplicable. His divine Diſcourſes touching theſe matters prove his Prophetic Miſſion from being with God in Heaven; and his Prophetic Miſſion proveth the true ſenſe of his Words (that they muſt be underſtood in a proper ſenſe) which inferreth, that it was his Humane-divine Perſon that was ſent from being with God in Heaven. *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* (*f*) *Ut me cognoſcant ut Legatum tuum* (Legatum à latere) which ſpeaketh our Saviour, to have had a Prophetic Miſſion from being with God in Heaven. And is there any thing more certain, than that our Saviour as a divine Prophet and Legate brought with him from God his Credentials and the Atteſtations of his Miſſion? *The works which my Father hath given me to do, do bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me.* Joh. 5. 36. *If I bear witneſs of my ſelf, my witneſs is not true* (it is not creditable, no valid proof, nor obligeth any Man to believe it) *there is another that beareth witneſs of me.* Joh. 5. 31, 32. Our Saviour proved his Miſſion, as a Prophet is oblig'd to do; therefore his Miſſion was the Prophetic kind of Miſſion.

V. The Doctrine of the Scholaſtic Theology touching our Saviour's Miſſion is ſo various, uncertain and inconſiſtent, and ſuch a blunder'd confounded buſineſs, that I will not undertake, either to repreſent or refute the whole of it; but will content my ſelf to remark ſome few of its inconſiſtences. The generality of Scholaſtic Divines do not ſcruple to apply the term *Miſſion* to the Abſtract Logos; but becauſe Miſſion implieth ſome change of place, *Gr. Nyſſen* ſaith of this ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity (g) οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως πέμπεσθαι λέγοιτο, *he cannot rightly be ſaid to be ſent.* So other Scholaſtic Divines ſay, *Filius non ſecundum deitatem à Patre miſſus eſt.* And S. *Chryſoſtom* asketh, why doth our Saviour ſay, that he was ſent? To which he anſwereth, παχύτερα λέγει, *he ſpeaketh the craſſer ſort of things,* which is a very courſe Complement to our Saviour. But to this fine paſs Scholaſticiſm hath reduc'd the Theory of our Saviour's Miſſion, at this rate that Theology muſt be ſaid to interpret his divine Diſcourſes; for even ſuch Scholaſtic Divines who do not ſcruple to apply the term Miſſion to the Abſtract Son (or the Son according to his Deity) yet ſuppoſe (and it is one of their fundamental Maxims) that in his Nature from Eternity he hath all that the Father hath, and receiv'd nothing from the Father ſave only what he receiv'd in the eternal Generation; and therefore could not receive in time *a certain Doctrine, Mandate, Miſſion or Commiſſion from him, nor an Authority and officiary Dignity.* They ſuppoſe (*h*) that the Miſſion of the Son as to the Subſtance of it (or the Action it ſelf) was not any thing done in Time, but was from Eternity, yet ſo as that the Miſſion was not complete and perfect until a temporary Generation. But why then are we told of the Abſtract Son (*i*) *that he undertook to execute a Commiſſion in our Fleſh?* For the undertaking this Commiſſion importeth a receiving from the Father a certain Doctrine, Mandate, Authority and officiary Dignity, and that in time; for the undertaking this Commiſſion could not be from Eternity. And becauſe this undertaking to execute a Commiſſion, neceſſarily belongeth to the Miſſion of Chriſt and is eſſential thereto, therefore it is deſtructive to his Miſſion from Eternity. For it cannot be ſuppoſed, that in his eternal Generation he undertook to aſſume the Humane Nature and the officiary Dignity of being the Meſſiah; or that he heard and ſaw thoſe things, which our Saviour teſtify'd, and undertook to teſtifie them, to ſpeak to the World thoſe things which he heard of God, and to finiſh the Work that God gave him to do. He did not undertake to execute a Commiſſion in the Generation that he is ſuppos'd to have had from Eternity; therefore in that Generation he did not receive the Goſpel from the Boſom of the Father; and if the Abſtract Son did not then receive it, he could not receive it afterwards; therefore it is only the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt that receiv'd the Goſpel from the Boſom of the Father.

As in ſeveral other Inſtances touching our Saviour's Miſſion, ſo in the Interpretation of Scripture there is an Inconſiſtence in the Scholaſtic Theology. For many of thoſe places of Scripture which the Fathers generally interpret, to be meant of our Saviour's Divine Nature ſo called in this Theology (interpreting them agreeably to their Scholaſticiſm) modern Scholaſtic Divines ſuppoſe rather to be meant of his Humane Nature; and theſe are ſuch modern Scholaſtic Divines, that are ſworn to interpret Scripture according to the conſent of the Fathers. *Joh.* 5. 19, 20. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do: For what things ſoever he doeth,* theſe

(e) Dr. *H. More Myſt. of Godl. B.* 5. *c.* 9.

(f) *Grot. Not. in loc.*

(g) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 8. *c.* 1. *S.* 4, 6.

(h) *Ibid. S.* 10.

(i) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 2. *c.* 17. *p.* 120.

theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe. For the Father loveth the Son, and ſheweth him all things that himſelf doeth ; and he will ſhew him greater works than theſe. Of theſe Words a Scholaſtic Divine ſaith (k) *They ſeem properly to relate to Chriſt as Man. For the Father was not about to ſhew unto him any thing new, ſave only as he was Man. The judiciary power and function ſpoken of in the following words* (the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment unto the Son) *cannot fitly be ſaid, to be communicated to the Word or to Chriſt, as he is God, but as Man.* So *Joh.* 8. 28, 29. *As my Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe things ; and he hath not left me alone, for I do always thoſe things that pleaſe him.* Joh. 6. 38. *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that ſent me.* Quæ omnia & his ſimilia in humanam naturam congruunt. *All which and ſuch like belong to the Humane Nature.* It cannot be ſuppos'd, that when our Saviour was in Heaven, God did *ſhew things, teach things, commit all judgment to the humane Nature*, unleſs the humane Nature was in Heaven. And if theſe and the like places muſt be underſtood of Chriſt as Man, they muſt be underſtood, to ſpeak of his Miſſion as Man, and of his temporary Miſſion to preach the Goſpel, in preaching which Chriſt muſt be ſaid, *to ſpeak thoſe things, which the Father had taught him as Man* ; which plainly implieth and inferreth, that it was not an Abſtract Logos, but the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, that receiv'd and brought the Goſpel from God (the Boſom of the Father) and had his Miſſion and Commiſſion from being with God. The ſame Inference may be made from the Diſcourſes of other Scholaſtic Divines. *Joh.* 8. 28. *I do nothing of my ſelf, but as my Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe things.* (l) Summa eſt, debere hoc de Chriſto intelligi, quatenus homo eſt. *The ſummary of what we ſay of this place, is, it muſt be underſtood of Chriſt as Man.* It is the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt therefore (not an Abſtract Logos) that receiv'd the Goſpel from God in Heaven, *that proceeded forth and came from God, did come, and was ſent into the World*, as we have before inferr'd from (m) a late Expoſitor. 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Jeſus Chriſt came into the world. Joh.* 11. 27. *Thou art Chriſt the Son of God, that cometh into the world.* Joh. 17. 3. *Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* Joh. 10. 36. *Whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the world.* Joh. 6. 27. *The Son of Man whom God the Father hath ſealed.* It was the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, the Perſon of the Son of Man (which an Abſtract Logos is not) whom God ſanctified, ſealed and ſent.

VI. From the Logos that came down from Heaven we may with great certainty determine, whether the Logos that was with God in Heaven, was an Abſtract Logos or not. For the only Logos that came down from Heaven, is the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt. Expoſitors that follow the Scholaſtic Theology, are ſometimes willing to expound our Saviour's *deſcent from Heaven* figuratively (at the ſame rate that they expound his Divine Diſcourſes before mention'd ;) for theſe words *he that came down from Heaven*, Joh. 3. 13. are interpreted to mean *qui ſingulari Dei dono nobis conceſſus eſt*, who is granted us by the ſingular Gift of God. *I came down from Heaven*, Joh. 6. 38. is thus expounded, *à Patre ſingulariter miſſus ſum*, I am ſingularly ſent by (or from) the Father. Theſe are the Expoſitions of *Grotius*, and in this method of expounding he goeth on a great way: But at length he findeth, that this figurative kind of expounding will not do, that our Saviour's words are too expreſs and full, to admit of any ſuch kind of Expoſition, and therefore he betaketh himſelf to the uſual Scholaſtic method of expounding them. *Joh.* 6. 62. *What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up, where he was before?* (n) *That is* (ſaith he) *into Heaven, where the Logos was before, when he was with God. For Heaven is the Region of God. Chriſt attributeth to himſelf what belongeth to the* (Abſtract) *Logos*. So the Scholaſtic Theology interpreteth both *our Saviour's being in Heaven and coming down from Heaven* ; and it appeareth to miſunderſtand the former by its apparent miſunderſtanding the latter. For by Union of his inviſible Divine Nature (ſo called in this Theology) to humane viſible Nature he is ſaid to have *deſcended from Heaven.* The Scholaſtic Incarnation (as this Theology ſuppoſeth) is meant by his *coming down from Heaven.* Which is a making our Saviour to ſpeak altogether unintelligibly in a point, which moſt nearly concern'd his Meſſias-ſhip, and wherein he was concern'd, to ſpeak moſt clearly and intelligibly to his Hearers. It is a making his words to ſignifie, what they do not ſignifie nor any thing like it. For the Scholaſtic Union of the Divine Nature with the Humane is not any ſuch thing, as all Men mean, when they ſpeak of a Perſon's *deſcending from Heaven* : As the Union of the Humane Nature with the Divine is not any ſuch thing, as all Men mean by a Perſon's *aſcending to Heaven.* The Scholaſtic Incarnation may as juſtly be called our Saviour's *aſcent to Heaven*, as his *deſcent from Heaven* ; for becauſe of the Hypoſtatical Union (o) *the Man Chriſt was in Heaven, and is ſaid, to have aſcended into Heaven* (as Scholaſtic Divines ſay ;) and if by his Incarnation *ſecundum aliquid ſui* he deſcended on Earth, he as much *ſecundum aliquid ſui*, aſcended to Heaven. The Scholaſtic Divines diſcourſe alſo (p) that the Divine Nature (the Abſtract Logos) is in all places, doth not change place, and cannot properly *aſcend* and *deſcend* ; that our Saviour is ſaid, to have *deſcended from Heaven*, becauſe though he was in Earth before (as well as in Heaven) yet he did not appear, was not ſeen, but having aſſum'd the Humane Nature *cœptus eſt repente in terris videri, perinde ac ſi de cœlo deſcendiſſet*, he began preſently to be ſeen on Earth, as if he had deſcended from Heaven. (q) *By aſſuming the Humane Nature he as it were deſcended from Heaven to the Earth, that is, he as it were relinguiſh'd the heavenly Glory.* Thus our Saviour's coming down from Heaven ſo frequently and earneſtly inſiſted on by him is in this untoward Scholaſtic Theology dwindled into a *quaſi deſcendit*. And whereas our Saviour mentioneth it as the greateſt thing imaginable, this Theology ſaith (r) *It ſeemeth ſublime*,

---

(k) Petav. *ſupr. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *S.* 9.

(l) Maldonat. in loc.

(m) Dr. Ham.

(n) *In cœlum, ubi ante fuit ὁ Λόγος, cùm eſſet πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Supra* 1. 1. *Nam Dei regio cœlum. Tribuit Chriſtus ſibi quòd τῷ Λόγῳ convenit.*

(o) *Homo ille Chriſtus in cœlo fuit, in cœlum dicitur aſcendiſſe.* V. Maldonat. in Joh. 3. 13.

(p) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 8. *c.* 1. *S.* 4. *Maldonat. ſupr.*

(q) *Aſſumendo naturam humanam quaſi è cœlo in terram deſcendit, hoc eſt, cœleſti gloriæ ſe quaſi abdicavit.* Piſcator in Joh. 3. 13.

(r) *S. Chryſoſt. in Joh. Hom.* 27.

ſublime, but is very unworthy of his Magnificence; for he is not in Heaven only, but every where and filleth all. An Abſtract Logos indeed would be much better repreſented as filling Heaven and Earth by the immenſity of his Eſſence, than as coming down from Heaven: But this is an Argument, that the Divine Perſon which came down from Heaven, was not the Abſtract Logos, but the Evangelical Logos, the Perſon of the Meſſiah in his Offices. And if this is not demonſtrable from Holy Scripture, I deſpair of underſtanding a Demonſtration.

VII. In the Sixth Chapter of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel our Saviour's *coming down from Heaven* is ſpoken of no leſs than ten times, and ſix times he is intituled *that Bread which came down from Heaven, the true Bread from Heaven, the Bread of God which cometh down from Heaven, the living* (or vivific) *Bread, the Bread of Life that cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World.* Our Saviour diſcourſeth of the Iſraelites Manna as a Type and but a fore-ſhadowing Type of himſelf (of Chriſt and him crucify'd) and there is great correſpondence between the Type and the Antitype. For Chriſt ſetteth forth his Office under the Emblem of Food to us, which is vital and vivific, and there is no living without it. As Manna was the Food of bodily Life to the Iſraelites, came down from the aerial Heaven, was a celeſtial bodily Food (noble Food (*r*) ſaith the Jewiſh Arab:) So Chriſt is *originally and of Kind and Quality* celeſtial Food to us, *the Food of Life* (or the Bread of Life) to the World, as being the Gift and Benefit of Life Eternal unto Men. *Manna* was Bread, Bread is an Emblem and Symbol of the Body, that Bread ſignify'd Chriſt's Body, which given in Sacrifice is to us the Food and Bread of Life; for ſo our Saviour's Sayings mean (*s*) *τεθνήξεται ὁ θάνατος ἐν θανάτῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, Death ſhall die in my death.* (*t*) Manna was at firſt unknown to the Iſraelites, was freely given by God (provided and prepar'd without their Labour) was of a ſweet and pleaſant taſt, white in colour, of equal diſtribution and plenteouſly diſtributed; in all which reſpects it reſembled Chriſt. Before it was eaten, it was bray'd in a Mortar or broken in a Mill; and ſo Chriſt our heavenly Manna was broken upon the Croſs. And as Manna was given only in the Wilderneſs, and ceaſed ſo ſoon as the Iſraelites came to the Land of Promiſe: So is Chriſt our Spritual Food in the Euchariſt, ſo long as we travel in the Wilderneſs of the World, but when we ſhall arrive in the heavenly *Canaan*, we ſhall have no more need of Sacraments. From which account of the marvellous correſpondence between Chriſt and Manna it appeareth, that Manna was a Type, not of an Abſtract Logos, nor of this Logos as united to an Humane Nature, but of Chriſt in his officiary Dignity (of the Meſſias-ſhip) who as ſuch is our heavenly Manna, and as ſuch came down from Heaven. *As he is that Bread, the true Bread, the Bread of God, the Bread of Life, the living* (or vivific) *Bread, that Bread of Life that giveth Life to the World,* he came down from Heaven. As Chriſt therefore in his ſaving Office (or Offices) he came down from Heaven. It is the complex Perſon of Chriſt and this complex Perſon in his ſaving Office that is the Antitype to Manna; as ſuch therefore he came down from Heaven. Chriſt is the Antitype to Manna, as it did literally and properly come down from Heaven; Chriſt therefore did properly come down from Heaven: But neither an Abſtract Logos, nor the Humane Nature of Chriſt as united to the Scholaſtic Logos did properly come down from Heaven. The Jews murmur'd at our Saviour for ſaying, *he came down from Heaven*, when he had a Father and Mother here upon Earth. *Joh.* 6. 41, 42. They ſuppos'd therefore this to be our Saviour's meaning, that literally and properly he came down from Heaven. And our Saviour doth not at all find fault with them for miſtaking his Senſe, but on the contrary, he plainly telleth them, *V.* 46. that *he which is of God hath ſeen the Father*, and therefore had been with God in Heaven. He only findeth fault with the Jews for not believing *his coming down from Heaven*, which he accounteth the ſame thing as their not believing his officiary Dignity of the Meſſiah, *V.* 44, 45. Our Saviour therefore aſſerteth and teacheth, that he the Meſſiah in his officiary Dignity did come down from Heaven, and that his coming down from Heaven and his being the Meſſiah in his officiary Dignity is the ſame thing. But an Abſtract Logos is not ſo much as the Perſon of Chriſt or the Meſſiah; this therefore is not he that came down from Heaven.

Some obſerving that the Scholaſtic Theology cannot tolerably well expound thoſe places of Scripture, that ſpeak of our Saviour's *deſcending from Heaven*, becauſe they manifeſtly ſpeak of a *local* deſcending, have endeavour'd to infer from them (*u*) *the Pre-exiſtence of the Soul of the Meſſiah*, as ſuppoſing that they imply the local deſcending of our Saviour's Soul from Heaven. But although the Theory of the Præ-exiſtence of Souls is probable enough, yet the local deſcent of our Saviour's Soul from Heaven (as Præ-exiſtence implieth) is no more than the local deſcent of an Angel from Heaven; which is a trivial buſineſs in compariſon of our Saviour's coming down from Heaven, whereby he meaneth nothing leſs than his Meſſias-ſhip, *his being by officiary Dignity the holy imperial Lord the Son, his coming to us with his divine Authority and his divine ſaving Office.* For to be *the true Bread that cometh down from Heaven and giveth Life to the World*, what is it, but to be by officiary Dignity the Meſſias, the Saviour of the World and the Saviour-king of the holy Empire? His coming down from Heaven therefore importeth nothing leſs than his Divinity or Deity of Perſon as to officiary Dignity. (*w*) *Veniendo enim inde, unde homo venire non poteſt, Deum ſe oſtendit veniſſe.* So an ancient Writer argueth; and there had been no flaw in his Argument, if he had added this due Explication; *by coming from thence, whence Man cannot come, he ſheweth himſelf, to be God that came*, as being the imperial Son of God; ſo that he ought to be look'd upon as *God manifeſt in the Fleſh.* Not but that an Angel may *come down from Heaven:* But he cometh not down as an imperial Potentate. If any one cometh down from Heaven as an imperial Potentate, he

must

(r) Dr. Ham. on Pſal. 78. Not. e.

(s) S. Cyr. in Joh. p. 353.

(t) Mr. Mede on 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4, 5.

(u) Dr. H. More Myſt. of Godl. B. 1. c. 8.

(w) Novatian. de Trin. c. 23.

muſt be *a divine and heavenly imperial Potentate*, of Creature-tranſcendent Condition and of the Godhead. Our Saviour's coming down from Heaven therefore ſignifieth nothing leſs than his Deity of Perſon, which is alſo ſignified by other Phraſes of like Nature. For he that is *of God*, Joh. 6. 46. He that is *from above*, Joh. 8. 23. He that *came forth from the Father*, Joh. 16. 28. He whom *the Father hath ſanctify'd and ſent into the world*, Joh. 10. 36. As the Lord Meſſiah, or as the Lord from Heaven, is neceſſarily of Creature-tranſcendent Condition. But ſeeing our Saviour came down from Heaven by a local deſcent and as the Lord Meſſiah in his officiary Dignity (as the Bread of Life to the World) therefore it was the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah, that *came down from Heaven*. And this is the true *deſcenſus Dei venerabilis ad humanæ ſervationis* (ἀνθρωπίνης σωτηρίας) *rerumque mortalium gratiam*, as *Chalcidius* ſpeaketh. In this ſenſe *Arnobius* might truly ſay of Chriſt (x) *Deus ille ſublimis fuit, Deus radice ab intima, Deus ab incognitis regnis, & ab omnium principe Deus ſoſpitator eſt miſſus.*

VIII. A Scholaſtic Divine of good Note ſaith of our Saviour (y) *that by coming down from Heaven he meaneth that he undertook ſo long and laborious a Journey, not that he might do his own but his Fathers Will.* If by deſcending from Heaven he meaneth a long and laborious Journey, then he meaneth by it *a local deſcending*, which is incompetible to an Abſtract Logos, who by any local deſcent that can be aſcrib'd to him is but where he was before; nor is it reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that he can be out of Heaven any more than God the Father can be; nor can he be ſaid, to *come forth from the Father*, that is always alike inſeparate and indiſtant from the Father. Of thoſe Words of our Saviour that he came not *to do his own Will, but the Will of him that ſent him*; this Scholaſtic ſaith (z) *Chriſt ſeemeth, to ſpeak as Man, when he ſaith, that he was ſent by the Father, and when he ſpeaketh of his not doing his own, which is the Humane Will, but that of the Father which is the Divine Will.* Another eminent Scholaſtic Divine ſaith of theſe Words *I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me* (a) *they belong to the Humane Nature.* So the Alexandrian *Cyril* expoundeth theſe Words, and S. *Auſtin* (b) interpreteth them to ſignifie Chriſt's *Humility* and *Obedience*, which was the ſubjecting his own Will to the Will of his Father. The Words imply therefore, that in Chriſt when he deſcended from Heaven, there was a twofold Will, which cannot be in the Abſtract Logos or the Second Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity (c) who hath not any diſtinct Will from the Will of the Father, nor is he obedient to the Father, as the Scholaſtic Theology commonly ſuppoſeth. And ſo his Words (*I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me*) are by a Party of Scholaſtic Theologers expounded to ſignifie, *I have no Will diſtinct from the Will of the Father.* Which is a making our Saviour's Words not tolerable Senſe, a deſtroying the Emphaſis that is in theſe Words *him that ſent me*, a deſtroying our Saviour's Characters of his divine Humility, Obedience and Reſignation of his own Will; and theſe Expoſitors might as well expound at the ſame rate his Words at the time of his Paſſion (d) *not my Will, but thine be done.* Is it poſſible, that an ordinary Underſtanding can miſtake the Senſe of theſe plain Words, *Joh.* 5. 30. *My judgment is juſt, becauſe I ſeek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath ſent me?* (e) Our Saviour ſo apparently ſpeaketh, of his Humane Will, of his Divine Virtue, of the origin of Sin (our own Will) of the Rule of Righteouſneſs (the Will of God) and of the formal Nature of Sin (diſobedience to the Will of God,) that he cannot reaſonably be thought to mean (according to the Hypotheſis of the Scholaſtic Trinity) *that he had no Will diſtinct from the Father.* But thus the Scriptures are diſtorted, to ſerve an Hypotheſis. A like inſtance whereto we have in an Interpretation of our Saviour's *coming forth from the Father*, Joh. 16. 28. His coming forth from the Father muſt be anſwerable to his return to the Father (f) as ſome of the principal Scholaſtic Divines acknowledge. But the moſt that are of this Sentiment, thus deſtroy the Congruity of it. (g) *Our Saviour in his aſcent was Man, but in his deſcent he was God only: Whence his aſcent was a change of place, but in his deſcent there was no change of place*; which quite ſpoileth the Congruity between his coming forth from the Father and his return to the Father. If this is a groſs Incongruity, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that as his Humane-divine Perſon aſcended into Heaven, ſo it was his Humane-divine Perſon, that came down from Heaven. As it was the Perſon of the Meſſiah (not an Abſtract Logos) that return'd to God: So it was the Perſon of the Meſſiah, that came from God.

IX. Our Saviour's coming down from Heaven is the ſame thing with his *coming into the World* (Joh. 16. 28.) which was not his *Bethlehemitical Nativity*, but his manifeſtation to the World in his Office. Whence it appeareth, that it was the Perſon of Chriſt in his Office, that came down from Heaven, and that his coming down from Heaven was the ſame thing with his Miſſion. (h) *De cœlo miſſus à Patre eſt.* The Bread from Heaven (i) *à ſolo Deo datus, id eſt, miſſus eſt.* He was ſent from being in Heaven, and as every one that is ſent, is ſent in his Office, ſo the Lord Meſſiah was ſent in his ſaving Office, and this muſt neceſſarily be his meaning, when he ſaith, *This is the Father's Will which hath ſent me, that of all which he hath given me I ſhould loſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up at the laſt day. He that heareth my word and believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life. The Father himſelf which hath ſent me, hath born witneſs of me. My doctrine is not mine,*

(x) *Adv. Gent. l.* 1. p. 32.

(y) *Quod dicit ſe de cælo deſcendiſſe, hanc habet Emphaſin, ut ſignificet ſe tam longum & tam laborioſum ſibi iter non ſuſcepiſſe, ut ſuam ſed ut Patris faceret voluntatem.* Maldonat. in Joh. 6. 38.

(z) *Videtur ut homo loqui, cum ſe dicat à Patre miſſum. ——Chriſtum tanquam hominem locutum eſſe, cùm dixit, ſe non ſuam, id eſt humanam, ſed Patris, id eſt, divinam facere voluntatem.* Idem ibid.

(a) Petav. *de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *S.* 9.

(b) *In Joan Tr.* 25. *contr. Ser. Arian. c.* 7.

(c) Petav. *T.* 4. *l.* 9. *S.* 3.

(d) Petav. *T.* 4. *l.* 9. *c.* 6 *S.* 8.

(e) *Maldonat. in loc.*

(f) Petav. *de Trin. l.* 8. *c.* 1. *S.* 3.

(g) *Quod autem ait ſe de cælo deſcendiſſe, rectè intelligendum eſt. Neque enim ita deſcendit, ut cælum reliquerit, & locum mutârit: Sed ut in terra naturam humanam aſſumſerit, atque Deus in carne manifeſtatus ſit. Ubi obſervandum, aliam eſſe rationem aſcenſionis Domini in cælum. Etenim aſcendit in cælum ita ut mundum reliquerit, ac proinde locum mutârit ſecundum humanam naturam. Hujus diverſitatis ratio eſt diverſa ratio perſonæ, de qua utrumque dicitur. Nam quum illa de cælo deſcendit, tantum erat Deus: quum autem aſcendit, erat etiam homo.* Piſcat. in Joh. 6. 33.

(h) *Novatian. de Trin. c.* 23.

(i) *Maldonat. in Joh.* 6. 32.

but his that ſent me. He that ſeeketh his Glory that ſent him, the ſame is true. My Meat is to do the Will of him that ſent me, and to finiſh his Work. I muſt work the Works of him that ſent me. Our Evangeliſt ſaith, 1 *Joh.* 4. 9, 14. *God ſent his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him. We have ſeen and do teſtifie, that the Father ſent the Son, to be the Saviour of the World.* It could be no other than the Perſon of Chriſt (which an Abſtract *Logos* is not) that was ſent in his ſaving Office, nor could any other be *ſanctified and ſent into the World*, Joh. 10. 36. For to be ſanctified (in this place) is to be made by officiary dignity the holy One of God (the Chriſt of God) which is incompetible to an Abſtract *Logos*. When our Saviour ſaith, *Joh.* 5. 22, 23. *The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son: that all Men ſhould honour the Son even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath ſent him.* His words imply, that when the Father ſent the Son, he committed all Judgment to him, and conſequently ſent him in his officiary dignity of the Meſſias-ſhip. So *v.* 26, 27. *As the Father hath life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son, to have life in himſelf; and hath given him authority, to execute Judgment, becauſe he is the Son of Man.* Though many different Interpretations are made of theſe words, *becauſe he is the Son of Man*, yet the Son of Man muſt be ſuppos'd to ſignifie the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt, to whom *God gave authority, to execute Judgment, and to have life in himſelf* (the power of quickening Men to Life Immortal) and theſe Powers were given unto him, when God ſent him (as our Saviour's Diſcourſe implieth, *v.* 24.) therefore it was the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah in his officiary dignity, whom God ſent; and if he had his miſſion from being in Heaven, this was the Perſon that came down from Heaven, (k) *veniens cum poteſtate planè divinâ.* He that receiv'd his miſſion from being with God in Heaven, and therewith an authority, power and ſaving office plainly divine, can be no other than the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt ſent down from Heaven.

Agreeably whereto our Saviour ſometimes very plainly ſaith, that the Son of Man came down from Heaven, *Joh.* 3. 13. *No Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man.* Joh. 6. 62. *What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?* Our Saviour ſpeaketh of his *aſcending* and *deſcending* in the ſame Senſe; therefore he ſpeaketh of the local deſcending of his whole Perſon; for in ſuch Senſe he ſpeaketh of his aſcending. Without diſtinction or limitation of Senſe the Son of Man *aſcended*; therefore without diſtinction or limitation of Senſe the Son of Man *deſcended.* Our Saviour ſaith, *The Son of Man was there before, whither he aſcended*; the Scholaſtic Theology ſaith, *He was there before only according to his Deity*; which is to ſay, he was there before, ſo as not to be there before; he was there before only in a mutilate and partial Senſe; he was there before, ſo as not to be there before as the Son of Man; and our Saviour's Propoſition is not more true than this contrary Propoſition, *The Son of Man was not there before.* Or rather, it muſt be ſaid, that our Saviour's Propoſition is not ſo true as the contrary; becauſe (according to this Theology) *the Son of Man as the Son of Man was not there before.* This cannot be the Senſe of our Saviour's words in fair conſtruction; the tenour of the New Teſtament refuteth this Interpretation; and S. *Ambroſe* thus explodeth it. (l) *As if any one was ſent and deſcended except as the Son of Man, as Wiſdom it ſelf hath ſaid: No Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, the Son of Man? Therefore, if as the Son of Man he was ſent and deſcended: ſo as the Son of Man he liveth becauſe of the Father.* When our Saviour ſaid to his Diſciples, *Joh.* 16. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World: again, I leave the World, and go to the Father.* The Diſciples ſaid to him again (in the next Verſe) *Lo, now ſpeakeſt thou plainly, and ſpeakeſt no Proverb or Parable.* They ſuppos'd therefore, that our Saviour's words were clearly and plainly expreſſive, not ſhaded with any obſcurity, no figurative Speech, and that they were to be underſtood in the plain, ordinary and literal Senſe. But they are not ſo to be underſtood, if our Saviour *came forth from the Father and came into the World* only according to his Scholaſtic Deity and as an Abſtract *Logos*. For in this conſtruction of them the former part of his words involve in them a grand Figure of the Scholaſtic kind. Whence this part of them muſt be ſuppos'd as dark as the Night, and the other part of them as clear as the Day.

X. Of our Saviour's deſcent from Heaven a Judgment may be made from his *Humiliation* and *Incarnation*; *who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himſelf of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeneſs of Men; And being found in faſhion as a Man, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Croſs*, Phil. 2. 6, 7, 8. From which illuſtrious Text we have proved by an Argument plainly demonſtrative, that the voluntary Humiliation of our Saviour (which was his Incarnation) is by the Apoſtle attributed, not to an Abſtract *Logos* (or the ſecond Perſon in the Scholaſtic Trinity) but to the Humane-divine Perſon of the Lord Jeſus; that antecedently to this voluntary Humiliation and Incarnation his Humane-divine Perſon was *in the form of God*; and conſequently this Humane-divine Perſon is the *Logos* that was with God and the Perſon that came down from Heaven. He leſſen'd himſelf, *emptied himſelf, and being rich became poor*, 2 Cor. 8. 9. But ſuch a Mutation and Diminution, an Humiliation, Exinanition, and becoming poor, a parting with his Glory and Beatitude (as alſo a properly local Mutation) are things utterly incompetible to the infinite and infinitely perfect, eternal, unchangeable, almighty and all-ſufficient eternal God, and conſequently to the *Logos* in the Scholaſtic Trinity. All the numerous Arguments whereby we have prov'd our Explication of the Incarnation and diſprov'd the Scholaſtic Notion of it, have place here, and prove, that it was the ſame Humane-divine Perſon of the Lord Jeſus, which aſcended and that deſcended according to that of the Apoſtle, *Eph.* 4. 10. *He that deſcended, is the ſame alſo that aſcended up far above all Heavens.*

(k) Grot. Not. in Joh. 3. 31. & c. 5. 33.

(l) *Quaſi quis miſſus eſt, atque deſcendit, niſi quaſi Filius hominis, ſicut ipſa ſupra ſapientia dixit. Nemo aſcendit in cœlum, niſi qui de cœlo deſcendit filius hominis? Ergo ſi quaſi filius hominis miſſus eſt atque deſcendit: ita quaſi filius hominis vivit propter Patrem.* De Fide l. 4. c. 5.

SECTION IV.

How the Word had his being with God and his being God.

I. ACcording to to the old Rule ἀρχομένȣ δ᾽ ἔργȣ πρόσωπον χρὴ θέμεν τηλαυγὲς, our Evangeliſt maketh the front of his Goſpel magnificent and glorious. For to ſay of the Evangelical Word, *He was with God and was God*, is in Senſe to ſay, that his Name is *God the Word*; and that in the ſame Senſe that he is God the Son, he is *God the Word*, which is our Evangeliſt's ſecond Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity, 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. His *being with God* and *his being God* manifeſtly ſpeaketh his Divinity (or Deity) of Perſon and Creature-tranſcendency of Condition, which is not any thing leſs or more than his being the Imperial Son of God, which is the Idea of our Saviour. And this is that which the Evangeliſt deſign'd to ſignifie in the entrance of his Proem; for in ſaying, that *the Word was with God and was God*, he ſignifieth, that the Word was with God as a Perſon of the Godhead belonging to that Imperial Eſtate, of it and in it as the Imperial Son thereof. In ſaying that *the Word was God*, he deſigneth alſo to ſignifie his Deiformity (that he was in the form of God) which was his State oppoſite and antecedent to his being by voluntary Humiliation Humane Fleſh. The Evangeliſt alſo in the Front of the New Teſtament ſaith, that *the Word was God*, with deſign to ſignifie, that he is the Deity of the New Teſtament and of the New Teſtament-Creation. And his ſaying, that He was God, ſo as to be with God, implieth, that he is no *Extrinſic Heterouſian* (ſuch a Deity as the *Arians* imagin'd) but that his Deity conſiſteth in being a Perſon of his Father's Godhead. By the ſame means therefore and from the ſame origin he had his *being with God* and *his being God* in the Evangeliſt's Senſe.

His *being with God* and his *being God* muſt be conſider'd as a neceſſary Qualification for his Meſſias-ſhip. For without Divinity and Creature-tranſcendency of Perſon in his *primary* Capacity he could not be qualify'd for Divinity and Creature-tranſcendency in his *officiary* Capacity; not for the ſaving Office, the Lordſhip and Sovereignty, the Imperial Authority and Government of the Lord Meſſiah. If he had not been The Imperial Son (the Lord the Son) in his *primary* Capacity, he could not have been The Imperial Son in his *officiary* Capacity. Without being with God and being God he could not have been *the Evangelical Word*, *the Life and Light of Men*, not the Celeſtial Prophet, the great High Prieſt, the Divine Imperial Prince and Potentate. This being with God and being God in his primary Capacity was the neceſſary Qualification for his Meſſias-ſhip: but therefore it was not deſign'd, to be his permanent condition, but his *being with God and his being God* in his Meſſias-ſhip was deſign'd to be his permanent condition, and was accordingly the reward of his Obedience and Sufferings.

His *being with God and his being God* muſt be conſider'd as a neceſſary antecedent to his *Miſſion*, *voluntary Humiliation* and *Incarnation*, without which he could not have exercis'd and expreſs'd his ſtupendious Humility and Self-abaſement, Obedience and Patience, Self-denial and amazing Love to us (that ought at the deepeſt rate to affect, and at the higheſt rate to enraviſh and ingage our Souls) in parting with his Celeſtial Beatitude and Glory for the form of a Servant and the ignominy of the Croſs, the contradiction of Sinners and the heavieſt load of Sufferings. Nor without *his being with God and being God*, could God the Father have exercis'd and expreſs'd a marvellous immenſity of love to us *in ſending his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him*, 1 Joh. 4. 9, 10. Which ſending his only begotten Son into the World was not at our Saviour's Birth, but at his *Miſſion*, of which this Evangelical Proem is an Hiſtory.

II. Our Evangeliſt in writing his Proem deſign'd not to treat of our Saviour's Generation; for which reaſon he hath not taught nor related, *whence or how the Word had his being with and his being God.* But although he hath overlook'd that which he counted not his Buſineſs, yet he manifeſtly repreſenteth *the Word's being with God and his being God* as natively and generatively belonging to him; for the Senſe of his Proem is, that the Word was with God and was God, when his miſſive œconomy did commence; and the ſame Divine Perſon that in the entrance of his Proem he ſtileth *The Word that was with God*, within the compaſs of a few Verſes he ſtileth *The only begotten Son of God that was in the Boſom of the Father.* The Word therefore had his *being with God and his being God* natively and generatively, and conſequently not by the *Arians* Effection or Creation (which cannot be ſuppos'd a proper Generation) but either by the Scholaſtic *Eternal Generation* or by his *Humane-Divine* Generation. Of the Eternal Generation ſo many great things have been diſcours'd already, that it may ſeem unneceſſary to ſay any thing more of it: but for the winding up our Diſcourſes about it, we will annex an Argument (before diſcours'd of) that is plain and obvious, but of certitude plainly Mathematical.

> A Perſon that is eſſentially in his conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence, a complex Perſon, and a Perſon that is not eſſentially in his conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence a complex Perſon, are not the ſame Perſon. The Perſon of Chriſt is eſſentially in his conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence a complex Perſon: The Perſon of an Abſtract Eternal *Logos* is a Perſon, that is not eſſentially in his conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence a complex Perſon. Theſe therefore are not the ſame Perſon.

This Argument aſcertaineth our Idea of *The Son of God*, of his *Incarnation*, of his *Creation*, and our *Interpretation* of the Evangeliſt's Proem. And all theſe great things are alſo aſcertain'd by that Doctrine, which we have before called *One demonſtrated* Rule for the Interpretation of the New Teſtament: whereby it appeareth, that the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt was in *the form of God* antecedently to his voluntary Humiliation and Incarnation, which ought not to be attributed to any Abſtract Eternal *Logos*, but to the Humane-divine Perſon of the Lord Jeſus. In like manner, *that being with God and being God* which our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of, is not to be attributed to any Abſtract Eternal Word, but to the Humane-divine Perſon of the *Evangelical Word*, who had his *being with God and his being God* natively and generatively (by his Humane-divine Generation) *as the completion and termination of his generative and the beginning of his miſſive œconomy.*

III. For in a Generation there is a Proceſs to the *Completion* and *Termination* thereof, which is the Being or Perſon generated in full Eſtate. As the generation of a young Lion or Eagle proceedeth to a Lion and Eagle in full Eſtate ſuch. In the generation of a Man-child or a Female there is a Proceſs to a Man and a Woman of full Eſtate ſuch. So the generation of a Child that is a Son and Heir proceedeth. And as in Nature ſo in Grace, there is the ſame Proceſs in the generation of a Regenerate Chriſtian, and in like manner in the generation of the Son of God *there is a Proceſs to the Son of God in full Eſtate ſuch.* Scholaſtic Divines ſay, that our Saviour's Humility and Exinanition is to be admir'd, (m) *ſeeing in his aſſumed Nature, inſtantly from his Conception and Nativity, he could have ſhew'd a ſhining Divine Majeſty and Glory, as he did in his Transfiguration and after his Aſcenſion, ſo that he had been ſubject to no Infirmities.* We may not ſubſcribe to ſuch Sayings as theſe, that are contrary to the nature of things; for he that is born *The Son of God and the Son of Man* (Deus-homo) muſt be ſo in various degrees (as we are Men in various degrees) in the degree of *Inchoation, Progreſſion* and *Completion.* But they that ſay ſuch things as theſe, will allow me, to ſay, that in the completion of his Generation (or generative œconomy) he could ſhew his *Divine Majeſty and Glory*, and therefore could ſubſiſt in *the form of God* (or the form of the Son of God) his exteriour Deiformity. This might be done; and if we conſider the Proceſs of things in Generation, we may pronounce, that this muſt be done; for being generated *God-man*, he muſt neceſſarily in the completion of his Generation be *the Son of God* in full Eſtate as well as *the Son of Man* in full Eſtate, and muſt ſubſiſt *in the Form of God* as well as in *the Form of Man.* He muſt as neceſſarily ſubſiſt in *the form of God*, as we ſubſiſt in the form of Men; or as ſince his aſcenſion he retaineth the Humane Nature, yet ſubſiſteth *in the Form of God*, carrieth the Name and Title, the Port, and State, and Majeſty of God, and is attended and ador'd as God. His generative œconomy (as to his Perſon) cannot be completed but by his ſubſiſting *in the Form of God* (ſo that his Body of Humane Fleſh muſt be chang'd into an Heavenly and Divine Body;) and if he ſo ſubſiſteth, he cannot be an Inhabitant of this lower World, but of the Kingdom of Glory and muſt be with God in Heaven. His Generation is of like nature with our Regeneration; and as when the œconomy of our Regeneration is completed and finiſh'd, we have our Deiformity (exteriour) and are removed from Earth to Heaven: So when his generative œconomy was completed and finiſh'd, he ſubſiſted in his Imperial-perſonal Deiformity (exteriour) and removed from Earth to Heaven. We cannot have the whole of our Regeneration, unleſs we have our exteriour Deiformity and aſcend into Heaven: nor could he have the whole of his Generation without ſubſiſting in his Deiformity and being with God in Heaven. His Generation in his primary Capacity may be illuſtrated from his Generation in his Officiary Capacity; for as his Generation in his Officiary Capacity was the raiſing him to his Heavenly Glory and Beatitude: So the completion and termination of his generative œconomy in his primary Capacity was *his ſubſiſting in the form of God and his being in Heaven with God.*

According to our Idea it is Deity of Perſon (a Filial Deity of Perſon) to be the Son of God; it is to be the Filial Lord, Prince and Potentate Creature-tranſcendent, the Filial Imperial Eſtate of the Kingdom of God. But his Deity of Perſon will be very mutilate and partial, and he will be but very mutilately and partially the Filial Lord, Prince and Potentate Creature-tranſcendent (or the Filial Imperial Eſtate of the Kingdom of God) unleſs he be with God as a Perſon of the Godhead. It is a Filial Deity of Perſon, ſo to be with God; and without being ſo with God much of Deity of Perſon, Place and Eſtate will be wanting to the Son of God. That the Son of God therefore may have his Deity of Perſon, that the Holy Imperial Son may not want much of his Imperial Sonſhip, he muſt be with God as a Perſon of the Godhead, and this muſt be the completion of his generative Oeconomy. The terminative Product of it was a Son, that was *the image of the inviſible God.* Col. 1. 15. *The brightneſs of the glory of God and the expreſs character of his perſon.* Heb. 1. 2.

IV. The Generation of the Perſon of our Saviour muſt be conſider'd as *the Generation of a Man, the Generation of a Saint* (a Saint of God-kind of Son) *and the Generation of one that is infinitely more than a Saint* the Holy Imperial Son of God. As it was the Generation of a Man the Holy Child Jeſus muſt be conſider'd *as increaſing in wiſdom and ſtature.* Luk. 2. 52. As it was the Generation of a Saint, it proceeded gradually, and could not have its Completion and Termination, till our Saviour arriv'd at the heavenly State. As it was the Generation of the Holy Imperial Son, it could not have its Completion, till our Saviour arriv'd at the Godhead, *to be with God, and to be God as a Perſon of the Godhead.* Every Saint of God-kind of Son muſt at length be with God, every Child of God (as we commonly ſuppoſe) goeth to God, when he dieth: But this great Child of God was not liable to Death; he muſt go to God by the Law of his Generation and Sonſhip, and

---

(m) *Cùm potuiſſet in aſſumptâ naturâ, ſtatim à conceptione & à nativitate oſtendere lucentem divinam majeſtatem & gloriam, ſicuti fecit in transfiguratione, & poſt aſcenſionem, ita ut nullis infirmitatibus ſubjectus fuiſſet.* Chemnit. de 2. in Chriſt. Natur. c. 3. p. 12.

Death is not the time of his going to God, but when as an Heir it is fit, that he ſhould enter upon his Eſtate. Being the Son and Heir of the Godhead and of the Kingdom of God, he had the Rights and Dues of ſuch a Son, and muſt actually enjoy them. He was born to be actually of the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead. The Holy Empire's Imperial Son muſt be actually a Perſon of the Holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate, although he never was the Meſſiah, nor had any ſuch regard to us lapſed Sinners, or to our Redemption, as his being the Meſſiah importeth. And becauſe he is born to this high and holy Eſtate, his generative Oeconomy cannot have its Completion without his actual Poſſeſſion of it. (*n*) Τί ἐπειδήγε ηὐξήθης, οὐ βασιλεύεις; *when thou art grown up to be a Man, why do'ſt thou not Reign*, ſaith the Profane *Celſus* to our Saviour. He ſuppos'd, that if our Saviour was the Son of God, when he was grown up and out of his Minority, he muſt enter upon his reigning Imperial Eſtate. If we ſuppoſe the Regial Son of an Immortal King, to be generated and born abroad afar off from Court, and to be nurs'd and educated where he was born, yet when he is grown to Man's Eſtate, the Father would have him at Court; for he was generated, to be of his Imperial Eſtate. This the great King will not fail to do; for the heavenly Imperial Eſtate is the place that he ought to be in, who is the Imperial Son of God *Deus natus & genitus*. And he and every one ought to be in his own place, as a Star ought to be in the Firmament, a Malefactor in Priſon, and *Lazarus* ought to be in *Abraham*'s Boſom. It is not material, whether our Saviour was generated on Earth or in Heaven, if by his generative Oeconomy and the Law of his Generation and Sonſhip he muſt ſubſiſt as a Divine Imperial Perſon *in the form of God* and the Imperial Eſtate of God, till he diveſteth himſelf of it by a voluntary Humiliation, which he did not till his *miſſive Oeconomy* commenc'd. Till that time (which was about the Thirtieth Year of his Age) *the Word* continu'd with God. And that we may probably determine the time, when he began to have his Being with God, let us ſuppoſe, that one by his Generation is as much a Saint as he is a Man, and conſequently that he is fully a Man (in Years and Stature) and fully a Saint at the ſame Age. If ſo his terreſtrial Body at that Age muſt be chang'd into an etherial Conſiſtence, and become an αὐγοειδὲς σῶμα, *luciform Body*, that he may be fully a Saint, which he cannot be without being a glorious Saint. In like manner let it be ſuppos'd, that our Bleſſed Saviour was by his Generation *as much God as he was Man*, and therefore we may reaſonably ſuppoſe his being God and his being Man in the degree of *Completion*, to have been at the ſame Age. And if ſo, his terreſtrial Body, when he became a Man (in Years and Stature) was chang'd into an heavenly and divine Body, then he ſubſiſted in his Deiformity and was in Heaven with God.

V. But although our Saviour is ſuppos'd, to have had *his being with God and his being God* as the Completion and Termination of his generative and the beginning of his miſſive Oeconomy, yet this Hypotheſis implieth, that he could not have it without ſome ſort of *Tranſlation* or *Aſcenſion* to Heaven; againſt which Suppoſition it is commonly objected, that it wanteth the Teſtimony of Holy Scripture. Three Evangeliſts make no mention of it, thoſe Evangeliſts that are ſo diligent in deſcribing his Nativity, Circumciſion, Oblation in the Temple, Reception by *Simeon* (and the like Paſſages touching our Saviour) and is it likely, that theſe would have omitted his Aſcent into Heaven? Is it imaginable, that ſo divine an Action of ſo high concernment could have paſſed, and that none of theſe Evangeliſts ſhould ever make mention of it, and that a Fourth Evangeliſt, if he doth make mention of it, ſhould but ſlightly intimate it? If it was neceſſary, to be believ'd, why is it not more plainly reveal'd? Why not the time and place mention'd in Scripture, as well as of his Faſting and Temptation? When our Saviour was transfigur'd, he took care, that it ſhould be done in the preſence of Witneſſes: But of this ſuppos'd Aſcenſion (which is a matter of far greater concernment than his Transfiguration) there is no ſuch Evidence, no credible Witneſſes. And as it wanteth Teſtimony, ſo there is no pretence of reaſon for this ſuppos'd aſcent into Heaven, nor is any one upon any occaſion ever ſaid, to deſcend from Heaven, but ſuch an one as was there, before he appear'd on Earth. Nor is this ſuppos'd Aſcenſion agreeable to Religion; for Chriſt according to Rule did not enter into Heaven, till he was High Prieſt, nor then without Blood, nor more than once, agreeably to the Jewiſh High Prieſt's entring into the Holy of Holies. *Heb.* 9. 7, 12, 24. Theſe Objections are made againſt a party of the *Socinians* (who have a wild and pedantick Notion of our Saviour's aſcent into Heaven) and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that they have ſomething of difficulty in them, but not ſo much as ought to ſhake our Hypotheſis (abundantly prov'd and demonſtrated) *that the Humane-divine Perſon of our Saviour came down from Heaven, and conſequently was with God in Heaven.* For,

(1.) This diſputed Aſcent of our Saviour to Heaven is but a difficulty, and there is no Theory, which is not incumbred with difficulties, ſome of the moſt certain Theories are incumbred with ſuch difficulties, that poſe and baffle every one's Underſtanding. (*o*) A conſiderable number of theſe Verities there are in *Geometry* and *Phyſiology*, nor is Theology without ſome of them. But all intelligent Perſons think it a grand extravagance to disbelieve a certain Truth, becauſe it is attended with a difficulty, yea though it be an inſuperable difficulty. If therefore our Hypotheſis touching the Humane-divine Perſon of the Son of God (that as ſuch he came down from Heaven and was in Heaven) appeareth from the manifold and mighty Proofs of it, to be a certain Verity, it ought not to be disbeliev'd, becauſe it involveth ſuch an Aſcent to Heaven, which is a difficulty, not although this difficulty was greater than it is, inſoluble and inſuperable.

(2.) This objected difficulty is but a trifle in compariſon of thoſe vaſtly numerous and vaſtly inſuperable difficulties, which are involv'd in the Scholaſtic *Trinity*, *Logos* and *Incarnation*. To object a trivial difficulty, and yet to entertain theſe Scholaſtic *Dogmata*, that are

(n) *Celſ. apud Orig. l.* 1. *p.* 47.

(o) *Mr. Boyle Diſc. of things above Reaſon.*

are clogg'd with many mountainous difficulties, is to ſtrain at a Gnat, and to ſwallow a Camel. That is the beſt Hypotheſis (*cæteris paribus*) that is incumber'd with the feweſt difficulties, and that Hypotheſis is likely to be true and good, that is atttended but with one conſiderable difficulty.

(3.) The objected ſilence of Scripture touching this diſputed Aſcenſion is but ***Argumentum à teſtimonio negativè***, which is none of the beſt ſort of Arguments. Suppoſe, that the Holy Writers are totally ſilent concerning it, themſelves ſay, that they are ſo touching many other Paſſages of our Saviour (*Joh.* 20. 30.) and they might be ſilent concerning this for Reaſons that we know not. But there is a reaſon very viſible, why they have not made an Hiſtorical Narrative of it. For there is but one Evangeliſt, that could relate it (as will appear preſently) and that one Evangeliſt beginneth his Goſpel from the beginning of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy, which is on this ſide *the diſputed Aſcenſion*, ſo that an Hiſtorical Narrative of it did not fall in his way of writing. He maketh not a Narrative of our Saviour's generative Oeconomy, and therefore maketh no Hiſtorical Narrative of our Saviour's going to God. And probably he thought it needleſs to make a particular Narrative of this diſputed Aſcenſion into Heaven, becauſe throughout the tenour of his Goſpel he inſiſteth upon that, which implieth and inferreth it, and in order to which only it is neceſſary to be believ'd, which is *our Saviour's coming down from Heaven*. For this is that which is neceſſary to Salvation, to be believ'd, *his Divine Miſſion and Authority* (his coming down from Heaven) his diſputed going up to Heaven is needful, to be believed only in order thereto; and they that believe his coming down from Heaven, may be ſound Chriſtian Believers, although they know or believe nothing of his diſputed Aſcent into Heaven. It is not therefore a matter of ſo high concernment and ſo neceſſary to Salvation, to be believ'd, as the Objectors ſpeak; but it is neceſſary to a right Explication of the Chriſtian Religion.

(4.) The Holy Writers are not ſo ſilent touching this diſputed Aſcenſion, as they are touching the *Eternal Generation*, which is not ſo much as once in the leaſt degree mention'd by any one of the Evangeliſt's or any other of the Holy Writers. I will retort therefore the Objectors Arguments upon themſelves. The Evangeliſts are very particular as to our Saviour's Birth, Baptiſm, Faſting, Preaching, Miracles, Suffering, Reſurrection and ſolemn Aſcenſion, but not one word amongſt them touching the *Eternal Generation*. They that are ſo diligent in the deſcription of his temporary Nativity, Adoration by the Wiſemen, Circumciſion, Oblation in the Temple, his deſcent into *Egypt* and reception by *Simeon*, would they have omitted his eternal Generation and Nativity, if there had been truth in it? Do they tell us ſo particularly all the Circumſtances of his Humane-divine Generation, and did they not think his eternal Generation worthy our knowledge? If it is an Article of Faith (and it is ſo in Creeds and Liturgies, in Confeſſions of Faith and in the Fathers) if the belief of it is neceſſary to Salvation (as Scholaſtic Divines ſuppoſe) why is it not revealed and plainly revealed? The Holy Writers that abound in laudatory Expreſſions concerning Chriſt, that have called the Holy Spirit *the Eternal Spirit*, and frequently ſtile God *the Eternal God*, whence is it that they have not ſo much as once ſtiled the Son, *the Eternal Son?* Either the Eternal Generation or this diſputed Aſcenſion muſt be ſuppos'd (for it is certain, that our Saviour was with God in Heaven, before he came down from Heaven in his Meſſias-ſhip) and if neither the one, nor the other is reveal'd, Divines and Chriſtians are at liberty, to believe either of them, as they ſee cauſe. And if they would uſe this their liberty, impartially making uſe of their Reaſon, and weighing the Contexture of their Religion, doubtleſs this diſputed Aſcenſion would carry their Aſſent againſt the Eternal Generation. If our Evangeliſt had not ſuppos'd the truth of the diſputed Aſcenſion, and that his Words plainly enough ſignified it, in all reaſon it muſt be ſuppos'd, that he would have mention'd the Eternal Generation, eſpecially when he ſaith, *the only begotten Son was in the Boſom of the Father*.

(5.) The Eternal Generation and this diſputed Aſcenſion being two Hypotheſes that ſtand in Competition, the one of which muſt neceſſarily be choſen, let that be accounted the true and beſt Hypotheſis, which beſt ſalveth the Phænomena, which giveth the beſt account of the Chriſtian Trinity, of our Saviour's Nativity and Generation and the Proprieties thereof, of his two Natures and his Offices, of his being with God (ſeeing God, hearing his Voice; receiving his Doctrine and Commandments from him, and the like) his Incarnation, Miſſion, coming down from Heaven. Let that be accounted the true and beſt Hypotheſis, which beſt expoundeth the Scripture, reconcileth the ſeeming Diſagreements of it, giveth ſuch an account of the Senſe of Scripture, which is moſt Divine and Chriſtian, moſt agreeable to Holy People and the Character of Holy Scripture, leaſt liable to Objections, moſt recommendable to Reaſon, and to them that are without, which hath leaſt of unholy Nugacity, of humane Sophiſtry in it and nauſeous Scholaſtic Subtilty (the Elements of this World) and let a Judgment be made (p) ὁ πότερα μᾶλλον πνεῖ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ, ϗ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν εὐσεβείας, *which of them breaths moſt of the true God and the manner of Piety towards him.* It is objected, that this diſputed Aſcenſion *hath no pretence of Reaſon for it*, but we have ſeen, that the Reaſon and Philoſophy of it is laudable, and it is manifeſt, that in reaſonableneſs and credibility it far tranſcendeth the Eternal Generation, which is clogg'd with vaſt Improbabilities and Impoſſibilities, and no better Reaſons are alledg'd for it than theſe following. (q) God was from Eternity actually a Father; therefore the Son was generated from Eternity. God was abſolutely perfect from Eternity; therefore he did generate from Eternity. If he did not generate from Eternity, but became actually generative in time, then he is mutable.

(6.) This diſputed Aſcenſion is one of thoſe many heavenly things, which could not be atteſted or related by three of the Evangeliſts, who knew nothing of them. S. *Hierom* ſaith, they knew nothing of the Eternal Generation: But he ought to have ſaid, that they knew nothing of *the Completion of our Saviour's generative Oeconomy, nor of the heavenly part* (but only the earthly part) *of his miſſive Oeconomy*. For in thoſe three Evangeliſts (S. *Matthew*, S. *Mark* and

S. *Luke*)

(p) *Orig. c. Celſ. l.* 8. p. 428.

(q) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 9. *S.* 7, *&c.*

S. *Luke*) there is not one Syllable touching our Saviour's *being with God, his being with the Father, and in the Boſom of the Father, his having heard and ſeen the things in Heaven, his having ſeen God, heard his Voice, receiving his Words and Doctrine from him, his being taught by him what he ſhould ſpeak, his being ſanctified and ſent by him into the World with Atteſtations of his Miſſion, his coming forth and proceeding from the Father, his going again to the Father and returning to him that ſent him, his receiving Mandates from the Father touching what he ſhould do, his being the Bread of Life, the Bread from Heaven, his coming down from Heaven and aſcending up where he was before.* Of theſe matters which are in great degree the Body of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel, and which are the heavenly part of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy, there is not one Syllable in the other three Evangeliſts. Whence it appeareth, to be a grand Impertinence in learned Men, thus to argue ; *Thoſe Evangeliſts that are ſo diligent in the deſcription of our Saviour's Nativity and Circumciſion, his Oblation in the Temple, his Reception by* Simeon (and the like Paſſages) *would they have omitted his aſcent into Heaven?* For theſe Evangeliſts that are ſaid to be ſo diligent in their deſcriptions, are thoſe that knew nothing more than the earthly part of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy ; and can it be expected, that they ſhould ſay any thing of *his aſcent into Heaven*, that ſay not a Syllable touching *his coming down from Heaven?* What they are deficient in, our Evangeliſt hath ſupply'd ; and hence his Senſe hath been miſtaken ; for he hath been thought, to treat of the Eternal Generation, while he is treating only of the heavenly part of our Lord's miſſive Oeconomy, and that which is connex'd therewith the Completion of his generative Oeconomy.

(7.) There is nothing in this diſputed Aſcenſion, that claſheth with the Type of the Jewiſh High Prieſt's *alone entring into the Holy of Holies.* For it is perverſe arguing, to infer from thence, that the Son of God might not enter into Heaven, till he was High Prieſt (as if the Heir of Heaven might not enter upon his Eſtate, till he was made an High Prieſt) the Type inferreth no ſuch thing, nor hath the Apoſtle any ſuch meaning. But *the High Prieſt alone enter'd into the Holy of Holies*, to ſignifie, that as to any ſaving Religion for Sinners Heaven was ſhut to all ; and being ſo ſhut it was peculiar to our High Prieſt, to enter into it by his Blood (correſpondently to the Jewiſh High Prieſt) *whereby the way into the Holieſt of all ſhould be made manifeſt.* So the Apoſtle expoundeth it, *Heb.* 9. 7, 8. While the Earthly Tabernacle ſtood (the Law-religion and Miniſtration) the way into the Heavenly Sanctuary was not opened by a Saving Religion, whence it was the priviledge of our High Prieſt, to enter thither by his Blood, and thereby *the Kingdom of Heaven is opened to all Believers*, which was before repreſented as ſhut, there being no Saving Religion for Sinners but the Religion of the Son of God. Who as he compleated the buſineſs of offering *by once offering* (without any repeated Offering :) ſo he compleated the buſineſs of entring into Heaven *by once entring* (without any repeated entring) *having obtained Eternal Redemption for us*, Heb. 9. 12. And can it be inferr'd from this once ſufficient entring into Heaven (ſolemnly and as High Prieſt) that he never might, never did (in any Senſe) enter into Heaven before? not till he was made High Prieſt and had finiſh'd the work of our Redemption? Our Saviour's *entring into Heaven* is of the ſame conſtruction with his *coming into the World*, which the Apoſtle repreſenteth as but *an once appearing, an once coming into the World*, before his ſecond coming, *Heb.* 9. 28. Yet his *once coming into the World* is in different ſenſe a twofold coming. For his being born into the World was his coming into the World in his primary Capacity and in the Senſe of the Hebrew Doctors: and his public manifeſtation to the World was *his coming into the World* in his officiary Capacity and in the Senſe of the Holy Writers, who do not conſider his Birth as *his coming into the World*, but overlook it, when they ſpeak of his coming into the World. So our Saviour's entring into Heaven in his primary Capacity was a ſort of entring and aſcending into Heaven, but this the Holy Writers overlook (as not concerning the buſineſs in hand, nor needful to be taken notice of) when they ſpeak of his ſolemn entring and aſcending into Heaven in his officiary Capacity. His diſputed Aſcent hath nothing in it, that claſheth with Religion or the Type of the Jewiſh High Prieſt: Nor is there any thing in it, that claſheth with the Phraſe of Scripture, although a learned Man objecteth ; *that never any Perſon upon any occaſion is ſaid to deſcend from Heaven, but ſuch as were really there before they appear'd on Earth.* But in this little Objection there is an heedleſneſs or a defect of Memory. For the Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt firſt appear'd on Earth, yet this Humane-divine Perſon (as this Author will grant) is ſaid *to deſcend from Heaven.* 1 Theſſ. 4. 16. So *Moſes* and *Elias* muſt be ſaid, to have come down from Heaven, but with this difference from our Saviour, they did not appear on Earth in an humane Body. The reaſon of which difference is very manifeſt ; for the buſineſs of an *Incarnation* was peculiar to our Saviour's Perſon ; whoſe Humane-divine Perſon was by his aſcent into Heaven and coming down from thence the more exact Antitype to Manna, which was firſt drawn up from the Earth, and then ſent down from Heaven.

(8.) This diſputed Aſcent into Heaven is well atteſted, although not atteſted by Eye-witneſſes. The Objectors explode it, becauſe they ſuppoſe, that if ſuch a thing had been, our Saviour would have taken care that there ſhould have been Eye-witneſſes of it, as he took care, that there ſhould be Eye-witneſſes of his *Transfiguration* (that could teſtifie of time and place) and they ask, *Where are the Witneſſes of this ſuppos'd aſcending into Heaven?* To which I Anſwer ; *Where are the Witneſſes of our Saviour's deſcending from Heaven*, the one being matter of Fact as well as the other? If you ſay (according to the Scholaſtic Theology) that his coming down from Heaven was a thing wholly inviſible, whence there could be no Witneſſes of it ; I reply, that his aſcending was alſo deſign'd to be ſo, no ſolemn Aſcenſion but only an aſcenſional remove and ſuch a going to God as was wholly inviſible (like Holy Men's going to God when they die ;) for otherwiſe the Son of God muſt have ſhew'd forth his Glory before the time of ſhewing forth his Glory. This ſuppos'd Aſcenſion therefore is of a very different Nature from the Transfiguration ; for the time of the

Tranſfiguration was the time of our Saviour's ſhewing forth his Glory, he was then in his Meſſias-ſhip, then his Diſciples were about him, and his Tranſfiguration was deſign'd to be an Atteſtation to the Truth of his Meſſias-ſhip: But this ſuppos'd Aſcenſion could not be deſign'd, to be any Atteſtation to his Meſſias-ſhip (as being antecedent to it) and therefore it was not requiſite, that there ſhould be any Witneſſes of it. It was a matter properly belonging to the heavenly part of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy (of which there are no Witneſſes) and ought to ſymbolize with other things of the ſame Nature. But although there are no Eye-witneſſes of it, yet as a revealed Truth it is amply atteſted and demonſtrated (not only from the Nature and Philoſophy of it, but) by the numerous Arguments which we have us'd againſt an Abſtract Logos, by the Teſtimony of *John* Baptiſt, by the numerous Diſcourſes in our Evangeliſt touching our Saviour's Miſſion from Heaven (his having been with God, coming forth from the Father, coming into the World, coming down from Heaven and his return) and from the Apoſtle's account of his Deiformity. Have we ſuch abundance of demonſtrative Evidence for it, and ſhall it be thought to want the Teſtimony of Eye-witneſſes? If the *Muhammedans* had but the thouſandth part of ſuch Evidence for their great Prophet's Aſcenſion into Heaven, their belief of it would not be thought ill founded. In ancient times this was thought a very deſireable, but more than humane accompliſhment, to aſcend into Heaven and bring down Wiſdom from thence. *Wiſd.* 9. 16. *The things that are in heaven, who hath ſearched out?* Baruch 3. 29. *Who hath gone up into heaven and taken her* (Wiſdom) *and brought her down from the clouds?* If any one had been of this Character, he would have been thought the greateſt of Prophets and the wiſeſt of Men. Our Saviour therefore being a Perſon of the deſirable and more than humane accompliſhments, the greateſt of Prophets and wiſeſt of Men, it is but reaſonable, to ſuppoſe, that he is the perſon, *who hath gone up into Heaven, and brought Wiſdom down from above the Clouds.* Accordingly our Evangeliſt ſtileth him *the Word of Life that was with the Father*, and ſaith of him *the Word was with God*, and *the only begotten Son which was in the Boſom of the Father, he hath declared him.* Theſe things the Evangeliſt ſaith, without giving us the leaſt Syllable of notice touching his Eternal Generation; therefore he would have us, to conceive, that our Saviour did go up into Heaven and *ſo was with God.* The Phraſe which he uſeth, is that which is uſual amongſt all pious People, who ſay of Holy Men departed, *they are now with God* (whereby they mean, that they are gone up to Heaven) this is the Phraſe that our Evangeliſt uſeth, and he muſt be underſtood to uſe it in the Senſe, that pious People uſe it. Hereby he expoundeth the Senſe of his own Saying, *Joh.* 1. 18. *No man hath ſeen God at any time*; from which general Rule our Saviour is ſuppos'd (by our Evangeliſt) to be an Exception; therefore his Humane-divine Perſon did ſee God. By ſaying *the Word was with God*, he expoundeth alſo the Senſe of our Saviour's Saying, *What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?* Joh. 6. 62.

(9.) This diſputed Aſſent is atteſted by the beſt of Eye-witneſſes (more than a thouſand other Witneſſes) our Bl. Saviour himſelf. *John* 3. 11, 12, 13. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto thee, we ſpeak that we do know, and teſtifie that we have ſeen; and ye receive not our witneſs. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how ſhall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.* In this *Perioche* of Scripture our Saviour attributeth to himſelf a Prerogative tranſcending all other Prophets (Teachers of divine Things) *he was a Prophet come down from Heaven.* This is plain from his words; for he ſtileth himſelf *he that came down from Heaven*, he profeſſeth himſelf able to teach *Nicodemus* the heavenly things, *and yet to ſpeak no more than he knew, nor to teſtifie any more than he had ſeen.* Our Saviour's Senſe therefore is (as S. *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophylact* and *Euthymius* rightly expound his words) that *Nicodemus* ought not to look upon him meerly as a Prophet or Teacher come from God, a Prophet of the Earth, but as a Prophet deſcended from above (r) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ πάρειμι νῦν, *for I am now come from Heaven.* This is one and but one part of our Saviour's Senſe, it is but one Branch of Prerogative, which our Saviour attributeth to himſelf beyond all Prophets; for it is connex'd with this other Branch of Prerogative and Tranſcendency above all Prophets, *our Saviour and he alone had aſcended up into Heaven.* As he was a Prophet come down from Heaven, ſo he had aſcended up into Heaven, which no meer Prophetic Man ever did or could do. *No man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven.* So that our Saviour's Senſe is (s) τῶν μὲν προφητῶν οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν ἐκεῖ, *none of the Prophets hath aſcended thither.* (t) *That he was diſcriminated from the other Prophets by a great Tranſcendency; for not any one of them aſcended into Heaven, ſo as that he could ſee the things that are done there; he only hath aſcended thither and is always there* (mentally and as diſcerning the Arcana of Heaven) *therefore Credence muſt be given to him more than to the other Prophets.* (u) *Heaven ſignifieth the inacceſſible Light which God inhabiteth, the revealed Splendor of the Divine Majeſty: To this no Man beſides the only begotten Son of God could any more aſcend, than any one beſides him could know the Father.* A School-divine *Becanus Sum. The. Par.* 3. *Tract.* 1. *C.* 9. *Quæſt.* 2. as I find him cited (w) undertaketh to prove, that Chriſt according to his Humanity from the firſt moment of his Conception had the beatifical Viſion. And thus he proveth it. *Joh.* 3. 13. *No man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven. Where the Verb* Aſcendit (ſaith he) *is of the Preter-perfect Tenſe, whereby Chriſt ſignified, that he had now already aſcended into Heaven, which could not be true of a corporeal Aſcent, but of a ſpiritual, by the beatifical Viſion.* Becauſe of his prejudice this Man could not underſtand our Saviour, to ſpeak of any other Aſcent but only the beatifical Viſion, and ſo far he is a bad Expoſitor of the Text: But he rightly obſerveth, that our Saviour's Words ſignifie, *that he had now already aſcended into Heaven.* Some would have the Greek Words ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, to be tranſlated *he that was in*

Heaven;

(r) S. Chryſoſt. in loc.

(s) Idem ibid.

(t) *Magno ſe diſcrimine cæteris antecellere Prophetis, neminem enim aliorum in cœlum aſcendiſſe, ut quæ illic geruntur videre poſſet; ſe ſolum aſcendiſſe, ſemperque illic eſſe, itaque magis ſibi, quàm cæteris Prophetis credendum eſſe.* Maldonat. in loc.

(u) *Cœlum ſignificat lucem inacceſſam quam Deus inhabitat, revelatum divinæ majeſtatis ſplendorem: Ad hunc tàm nemo potuit aſcendere præter unigenitum Dei, quàm nemo præter eum Patrem cognoſcere.* Bucer. in loc.

(w) Mr. *Jeanes* of *the Fulneſs of Chriſt.* p. 345. Ed. An. 1656.

Heaven; and it muſt be acknowledg'd, that ὁ ὢν is often ſo rendred, and that an Enallage of Tenſe (a putting one Tenſe for another) is uſual in our Evangeliſt (as all Men obſerve:) but becauſe it cannot be proved, that ὁ ὢν ought to be ſo rendred in theſe words of our Saviour, it is not worth the while, to inſiſt upon that Verſion. But let none imagine, that this Text (which we have illuſtrated) is the only place, which clearly proveth our Hypotheſis touching our Saviour's aſcent into Heaven; for I do aſſirm (and it is proved already) that the Body of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel (which ſpeaketh of the Heavenly part of our Saviour's miſſive œconomy) manifeſtly implieth and inferreth it. They that expound our Saviour's *aſcent up to Heaven* figuratively, may do well, to try their faculty (as **Grotius** hath done) if they can ſo expound all the places, that ſpeak of *his deſcent from Heaven.* For by the rule of contraries his *aſcent up to Heaven* muſt be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe with his *deſcent from Heaven*, that is, literally and properly. As our Saviour's being with and receiving his Doctrine from God in Heaven, ſpeaketh him a Creature-tranſcendent Prophet: ſo it was reaſonable and agreeable, that a Creature-tranſcendent Prophet ſhould be with God in Heaven, and receive his Doctrine from him there. Beſides, the Meſſiah muſt be an Heavenly Prince and Potentate ſent down from above; and the Jews (with a great deal of truth) tell us of a certain Treaty between God and the Meſſiah (touching his Undertaking) which could not well be any where but in Heaven. (x) *The bleſſed God brought forth the Soul of the Meſſiah, and ſaid to him, wilt thou heal and redeem my Sons after ſix thouſand Years? He made anſwer, I will. He ſaid unto him, wilt thou alſo bear Chaſtiſements, to wipe away their Iniquities, as it is written, ſurely he hath born our griefs? He made anſwer, I will bear them with gladneſs.*

(10.) This diſputed Aſcenſion is an Hypotheſis, that is neceſſary, to give an account of our Saviour's Life, and to ſalve the Credit of our Evangeliſts, which cannot be ſalv'd by the Scholaſtic Theology. This Theology ſaith, (y) *Of the whole time of the Childhood of Chriſt and his Youth till the thirtieth year of his Age, neither the other Evangeliſts nor* Luke *relate any thing, beſides what* Luke *alone relateth, that Chriſt when he was twelve years of age, came up to* Jeruſalem *with his Parents at the Feaſt, privily withdrew himſelf from them, and diſputed with the Doctors. What he did all the reſt of the time of that Age, he compriſeth in this one word, he increaſed in Body and Spirit, which afterwards he repeateth in other words, ſaying, he grew in Wiſdom and Age, and in favour with God and Man.* The Evangeliſts in their Hiſtory of Chriſt are ſaid to relate nothing conſiderable touching above one half of the time of his Life (the ſpace of eighteen Years) and if they have written his Hiſtory at this rate, can they reaſonably be thought ſo *diligent* and *particular* in relating all paſſages touching our Saviour, as the Objectors againſt his diſputed Aſcenſion pretend? For what a lamentably defective Hiſtory of the Life of Chriſt have we from four Evangeliſts, if we ſuppoſe, that there is in it a vaſt chaſm of eighteen Years vacuity and ſilence? If they have overlook'd the main of his Life, the prime of his Years, and many of thoſe Years wherein he was (paſt growing in Body and Spirit) in the full age and ſtate of Man? Is it credible, that in theſe *eighteen years* of the Life of Chriſt nothing of great remark ſhould be done by him, nor that any thing of great remark ſhould befall him? that this long interval of time ſhould be like the Conſtellation *Camelopardus*, that hath not one bright Star in it? that in all this tract of time there ſhould be *no going of him to God nor any ſending from God unto him?* or is it poſſible, that four Evangeliſts (of which one wrote, to ſupply the defects of the other) ſhould make this more than half of our Saviour's Life-time one continu'd *tempus* ἄδηλον, *unhiſtoriz'd time of Darkneſs and Silence?* But this is not all that ought to be ſaid; for we muſt ask, if any one ſince the Creation writing a Book of the Hiſtory of any Perſon did ever leave out and omit more than one half of his Life-time? did ever any Man of Senſe write Hiſtory at ſuch a rate? and ſhall we ſay, that our Evangeliſts were not Men of common Sence? He that is not convinc'd by this Argument, that the Scholaſtic Theology in its Notices of our Saviour is very much amiſs, cannot have that worthy opinion of our Evangeliſts, that he ought to have. Something (doubtleſs) in our Saviour's Affairs great and extraordinary, and which is related by one Evangeliſt, but was unknown to the reſt, muſt be ſuppos'd to have happen'd in this great interval of eighteen Years of his Life-time; and this ſomething muſt be his removal from the Earth and his aſcent up into Heaven (for it can be nothing elſe) which our Evangeliſt relateth, when he ſaith, *In the beginning the Word was with God. The ſame was in the beginning with God.* Of *John Baptiſt* we read, that *the Word of God came unto him*, before he undertook his Prophetic imploy: but throughout the Goſpels we never read, that any ſuch word of God (any word of Miſſion or Commiſſion) came to our Saviour; therefore our Saviour went unto God, and thereby became *God the Word.* Of *John Baptiſt* we read, that *that he was in the Wilderneſs, till the day of his ſhewing unto Iſrael*, ſo that till he was thirty years of age, we know where to find him: but of our Saviour we never read, that he was at *Nazareth till the day of his ſhewing unto Iſrael*; which is an Indication, that for ſome conſiderable time before he was thirty years of age we muſt look for him elſewhere and not at *Nazareth.* At *Nazareth* (after his diſcourſe with the Doctors at twelve years of age) he liv'd in great privacy; for a ſtate of great privacy ought to be preparatory to his publick Prophetic Office; as *John Baptiſt*'s Wilderneſs was preparatory to his publick Prophetic Office, and amongſt the *Turks* living in a Wilderneſs, (z) conciliateth veneration to their pretended Prophets. But our Saviour was no Wilderneſs kind of Man, he lived in Humane Society, yet in ſuch privacy, that we do not ſo much as once read of his *going up to* Jeruſalem, to thoſe Feaſts, to which all the Males were by Law oblig'd to reſort three times in a Year, for the ſpace of the abovesaid eighteen Years. Such was his privacy and latent condition (which is the cauſe, that his Hiſtory is written at ſuch an unparallel'd rate of deficiency) that *John Baptiſt* did not ſo much as perſonally know him, till our Saviour came to him, to be baptiz'd, *Joh.* 1. 31. *Grotius* ſaith, (*a*) that till the time the Baptiſt was ſent to baptize, he did not know (*Meſſiam in terris eſſe*) *the Meſſias to be upon Earth.* If ſo, it is but reaſonable, to think, that *John* ſuppos'd him about that time to come down from Heaven, as his words plainly ſignifie, *Joh.* 3. 31. This therefore was the great thing that occurr'd within the compaſs of the eighteen Years of our Saviour's privacy, *his aſcenſional remove to Heaven and his coming down from Heaven.* Of which great tranſaction none was capable of giving a good account but himſelf (and thoſe whom he inform'd) and he is not ſparing to publiſh it to the World in his Divine Diſcourſes recorded by our Evangeliſt, but not by any other Evangeliſt.

(x) *Hulſ. Theol. Jud.* p. 328.

(y) *De tota Chriſti pueritia, & adoleſcentia uſque ad annum triceſimum, nihil neque alii Evangeliſtæ, nec Lucas narrant, præter id quod ſolus commemorat Lucas, Chriſtum cum duodecim eſſet annorum, & cum parentibus ad diem feſtum Jeroſolymam veniſſe, clam ſe ab illis ſubduxiſſe, & cum Doctoribus diſputaſſe. Quid reliqua fecerit ætate, hoc uno verbo comprehendit, creviſſe corpore & ſpiritu, quod aliis verbis poſtea repetit, dicens eum creviſſe ſapientia & ætate, & gratia apud Deum & homines.* Maldonat. in Luc. 2. 40.

(z) *V. Maldonat. in Matt.* 4. 1.

(a) *Not. in Joh.* 1. 31.

(II.) It is commonly ſaid, that (*b*) *from the Diſputation of Jeſus with the Doctors to the time of his manifeſtation to* Iſrael, *which was eighteen Years, the holy Child dwelt in* Nazareth *in great obedience to his Parents, in exemplar Modeſty, ſingular Humility, working with his Hands in his ſuppos'd Father's Trade, for the ſupport of his own and his Mother's Neceſſities, and that he might bear the curſe of* Adam, *that in the Sweat of his Brows he ſhould eat his Bread*; *all the while he increaſed in favour with God and Man.* This ſmooth Story is deriv'd from *J. Mart.* from whom we have an unwritten Tradition, that our Saviour in the time of his privacy *made mechanic works, Yokes and Ploughs*; and this Tradition is thought probable (*c*) although *Origen* denieth it, and it is not without great improbability. It is thought probable, becauſe the Jewiſh wiſe men learn'd and exercis'd a Trade, and becauſe the Jews thought themſelves oblig'd, to teach their Children a Trade. But they alſo thought themſelves oblig'd to teach their Children Learning, yet our Saviour was not taught Learning, as the Jews ſaid, whoſe ſaying that *he never learned*, is of as good credit, as their ſaying that he was *a Carpenter*. There was no reaſon why our Saviour ſhould be taught Learning, and there was as little reaſon, why he ſhould be taught a Trade, who was not to live by a Trade, nor was concern'd in the curſe of *Adam*, nor did his Hands ever miniſter to his Neceſſities when he was a Preacher, as S. *Paul*'s Hands miniſtred to his Neceſſities, and the Jewiſh wiſe mens Hands miniſtred to theirs, when there was occaſion. (*d*) *Grotius* thinketh, that the making theſe Mechanic Works was not repugnant to our Saviour's Dignity, becauſe when he made them, he was in the ſtate of *Exinanition*: but this is a great miſtake; both becauſe it appeareth from the Apoſtle, (*e*) that his ſtate of *Exinanition* and *Humiliation* did not commence till his miſſive œconomy and entrance upon his Meſſias-ſhip; and becauſe the ſtate of growth and improvement (of increaſing in Wiſdom and Stature and favour with God and Man) cannot be thought a ſtate of *Diminution* and therefore not of Humiliation and Exinanition. When he became of full eſtate a Man, and the time of his growth and improvement was at an end, it is not imaginable, how he could live upon Earth. For he could not live in meanneſs, privacy, and making mechanic works, but in his ſtate of Exinanition and Humiliation, which yet did not commence till his entrance upon his Meſſias-ſhip at the thirtieth year of his age. And becauſe when he became of full eſtate a Man, he was then the holy Imperial Lord the Son of full age, and ought to be actually a Perſon of the Imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, he ought not then to live any longer in a Subject-eſtate, the Subject-eſtate of an Heir in the time of his non-age (*Gal.* 4. 1.) or in Subject-eſtate to any Creatures although Parents really or reputatively. It is but reaſonable therefore, to ſuppoſe, that at that age he was remov'd from the Earth, and that the Hiſtory of our Evangeliſt muſt be thus connected and continu'd. S. *Luke* ſaith, that after our Lord's diſcourſe with the Doctors at twelve years of age, *he went down with his Parents and came to* Nazareth *and was ſubject unto them.* In this ſtate of ſubjection unto them he continu'd, ſo long as was fit for him, to be continu'd in it, and no longer. The primary words therefore of our Evangeliſt's Proem muſt be thus connected with thoſe words of S. *Luke. He went down with his Parents to* Nazareth, *and was ſubject unto them, ſo long as was fit for him, to be continu'd in that ſubjection: but when it was no longer fit for him to be continu'd in that ſubjection, then the Word was with God as a Perſon of the Godhead.* By thus connecting the words of theſe two Evangeliſts we make the Hiſtory of the Life-time of our Saviour a continu'd coherent Hiſtory (without a vaſt chaſm of Vacuity and Darkneſs in it) we ſalve the Credit of the Holy Evangeliſts, and rightly repreſent the Imperial Son of God *as generatively raiſed to the Godhead.*

(b) *Biſhop Taylor's Great Exemplar, par.* 1. *Ad. ſect.* 8.

(c) *C. Celſ. p.* 299. *Spencer. Not. p.* 81. *vid. Baron. ad an.* 12. *n.* 8, 9.

(d) *Not. in Matth.* 13. 55.

(e) *Phil.* 2. 6, 7, 8.

Luk. 2. 51.

SECTION V.

Of the Creation which the Evangeliſt's Proem attributeth to the Evangelical Word.

I. AGreeably to that Divinity and Creature-tranſcendence which the Evangeliſt attributeth to the *Word or Logos* (in his magnificent and glorious deſcription of his Perſon) he repreſenteth him as *Creative*, and twice in his Proem attributeth to him an univerſal Creation, *v.* 3. *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* V. 10. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not.* This Branch of this illuſtrious Proem is ſhaded with ſuch obſcurity, that they who rightly interpret it, yet very much miſtake the Senſe of it; for they miſ-interpret their own Interpretation. *Socinus* and his followers rightly underſtand the Evangeliſt, to ſpeak of the Evangelical Creation, but (becauſe of the Pedantry of their Theology) they are far from underſtanding aright this Evangelical Creation. For when the Evangeliſt ſaith of our Saviour, that *all things were made by him*, he is ſaid to mean, that all things appertaining to the New Teſtament were made by him, which is a true Interpretation: but if the whole meaning of it be thus expounded; that all Men were renew'd and reform'd by him (as to their Morals) *quantum in ipſo fuit*, and that by effectually reforming ſome the Chriſtian Church was actually made by him; then this true Interpretation is miſ-interpreted and falſified; So when the Evangeliſt ſaith of our Saviour, *that the World was made by him*, he is ſaid to mean (not the *mundus naturalis*, but) the *mundus humanus*, and this is the true Interpretation. But to ſuppoſe, that the World of Mankind was made by him only as *a Light*, ſome being actually reform'd by him, and all being ſo *quantum ad agentem attinet*; this is to make the Evangeliſt guilty of the falſity of an undue appellation; for this is far from being juſtly called *a making the World.* As the Perſon of the Son of God is in this School of *Socinus* minorated into a meer Man as to his Eſſence: ſo his new Creation is dwindled into a *diminutive*, that is far from being proportionate to an univerſal Creation. They have rightly underſtood our Evangeliſt's Proem, to ſpeak of the new Creation, that are hugely deficient in underſtanding the new Creation. But if the New or Evangelical Creation be duely underſtood, if the ſeveral Senſes of it be rightly diſtinguiſh'd and ſetled (as is done before in this Diſcourſe) we may affirm with great aſſurance, that the Creation which our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of in his Proem, is no other but the Evangelical Creation; for this Interpretation is a neceſſary conſequence of all our foregoing Explications and Arguments. So much evidence and certainty as there is in all our Explications of the Idea of the Son of God and the Arguments appertaining to them, that confront the Scholaſtic Theology (which ſurely is very great certainty) ſo much certainty there is, that theſe Texts of the Evangeliſt which ſpeak of a Creation, are meant of the *Evangelical* not of the *Moſaical* Creation. But the Senſe of them may be further illuſtrated and aſcertained by ſeveral Obſervations and Arguments yet remaining, which Obſervations and Arguments are certain Rules, that ought to be obſerv'd in expounding an ambiguous place of Scripture, without the obſervance whereof Men may diſpute and brangle to Eternity about the Interpretation of Scripture, having no rule or method, to fix and determine the Senſe of it.

II. There is *one All things*, that is certainly and unqueſtionably made by Chriſt: there is *another All things*, of which the queſtion is, whether they were made by Chriſt or not. When the Evangeliſt ſaith, that *All things were made by him*, he cannot mean leſs than *That all things*, which was certainly and unqueſtionably made by him; therefore he meaneth thereby *The Evangelical all things*. His Propoſitions are univerſal. *All things that were made, were made by him. Not any thing that was made, was made without him.* Which univerſal Propoſitions neceſſarily comprehend, ſpeak of and mean *That all things which was certainly and unqueſtionably made by him*; therefore they neceſſarily comprehend, ſpeak of and mean *The All things of the Evangelical Creation*; for this *All things* was certainly and unqueſtionably made by him. From whence it followeth, that the Evangeliſt doth not ſpeak of the Moſaical *All things* (the *All things* of the Moſaical Creation;) for the Evangeliſt's *Beginning* cannot ſignifie both the Moſaical and the Evangelical Beginning (it neceſſarily ſignifieth but one of them;) therefore if he ſpeaketh of the Evangelical *All things*, he doth not ſpeak of the Moſaical *All things*. As the true *Life* and *Light* cannot ſignifie both the Common, Natural and Moſaical Life and Light and the true Evangelical Life and Light: ſo the Evangeliſt's *All things* cannot ſignifie both the Moſaical and the Evangelical *All things*. To make this Argument (which hath the certitude of a demonſtration) eaſily intelligible, Let us ſuppoſe, that the Patriarch *Abraham* was the maker of the Religion and Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, and that at the ſame time he made the Univerſe of Rationals as to the *Theopoliticals* and ſo as to be the parts of a new conſtituted Univerſe: but that a party of Philoſophic *Abrahamitæ* are of Opinion, that he made alſo the Univerſe as to Phyſiologicals and in the Moſaic Creation. And let us ſuppoſe, that an inſpir'd Jewiſh Hiſtorian hath thus written his Hiſtory; *In the beginning* Abraham *was, and was with God. All things that were made, were made by him. Not any thing that was made, was made without him.* If the Philoſophic *Abrahamitæ* do interpret his Hiſtory to this Senſe; Abraham *was and was with God in the Moſaic Beginning, and all things that were made in the Moſaical Coſmopœia were made by him*; theſe Expoſitors may be thus confuted. What the inſpir'd Jewiſh Hiſtorian ſaith of *All things that were made*, cannot refer both to the Iſraelitical and the Moſaical *Beginning*, and therefore cannot mean both *All things* of the Iſraelitical and the Moſaical Creation. But it muſt neceſſarily mean *the All things of the Iſraelitical Creation*; for this inſpir'd Hiſtorian ſaith, *All things that were made, were made by him.* Which univerſal Propoſition neceſſarily comprehendeth, ſpeaketh of and meaneth *what was unqueſtionably made by him* (or the All things that were certainly and unqueſtionably made by him;) therefore it neceſſarily comprehendeth, ſpeaketh of and meaneth *the All things of the Iſraelitical Creation*; and conſequently, it doth not ſpeak of *the All things* of the Moſaical Creation. This Argument we will rely upon as demonſtrative of the Senſe of our Evangeliſt's Texts (for both of them ſpeak of the ſame Creation) to which we will add many Obſervations that are of great weight.

III. Our Evangeliſt's Text touching the Creation ſtanding in the Front of the New Teſtament may reaſonably be ſuppos'd, to carry a correſpondence to the beginning of the Old Teſtament. For the Holy Writers of the New Teſtament love to deſcribe the matters of the New Creation (the things Evangelical) analogically and anſwerably to the matters of the Old Creation (the things Moſaical) and there is a correſpondence between the Old and New Teſtament, as between Literal and Spiritual, Old and New. But this correſpondence is deſtroy'd, if we ſuppoſe the Evangeliſt's Creation, to be coincident and the ſame with the Moſaical; this is to make him an Hiſtoriographer of the Old Teſtament-creation, and the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs, inſtead of the New Teſtament-creation and the New Teſtament-times and Affairs. A Divine of our own therefore hath diſcarded theſe groſly incongruous Conceits, and thus he diſcourſeth touching our Evangeliſt's Proem and his Creation. (f) *In the work of Redemption Chriſt indeed made a new World, we are wholly a new Creation, and we muſt be ſo: and therefore when* S. John *began the Narrative of the Goſpel, he began in a manner and ſtile very like to* Moſes *in his Hiſtory of the firſt Creation, In the beginning was the Word*, &c. *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* This Biſhop of the Church (although he underſtood the New Creation but partially and mutilately) interpreteth our Evangeliſt's Text, not to mean the Moſaical Creation, but the New and Evangelical Creation deſcrib'd analogically thereunto. And with this modern Biſhop we will conjoyn an ancient Biſhop, who (in good degree) ſymbolizeth with him in his Expoſition of our Evangeliſt's Text. (g) *Cùm omnia per ipſum facta dicantur, ipſe conditur novi utique teſtamenti & veteris deſignatur.* When all things are ſaid to be made by him, he is denoted

(f) *Biſhop Taylor of Confirmation, p.* 1, 2.

(g) *S. Ambroſ. de Fide, c.* 5.

to be the maker both of the New Teſtament and the Old. S. *Ambroſe* agreeth with our modern Biſhop, that our Evangeliſt's Narrative touching his *Logos* (*All things were made by him*) is to be underſtood touching his making the New Teſtament (the New Teſtament's All things:) but there are great Vitioſities in his Interpretation. For he doth not duely diſtinguiſh between the Old and New Teſtament, and he will have our Evangeliſt's words touching his *Logos* to ſignifie, that he is both the maker of the Old and the New Teſtament, which is a contradiction; for his words cannot relate to two ſuch beginnings. But notwithſtanding theſe Vitioſities his Interpretation conſiderably befriendeth the true Expoſition of our Evangeliſt's Text, and ſo doth *Clemens*, when he ſaith of the Grace of the Father; (*b*) οὐκέτι δίδοσθαι λέγεται ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ γίνεσθαι· οὗ χωρὶς ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. *It is not ſaid to be given, but made by Jeſus, without whom not any thing was made.* If our Evangeliſt's Text (*that all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*) is meant of making the Grace of the Father, it muſt be meant of making *the New Teſtament's All things.* And what unprejudic'd Mind would not think it to be ſo meant, that obſerveth it to ſtand in the front of the New Teſtament?

(h) *Pædag. l.* 1. *c.* 7.

IV. Our Evangeliſt's Texts (touching a Creation) muſt be conſider'd as a part of his Writings, and muſt be interpreted agreeably thereto; for he muſt be allow'd to be his own Interpreter. (*i*) *The moſt certain way of expounding an Author is from other places of his Writings.* I ſhould go on in the common track, and interpret our Evangeliſt's Texts, to be meant of the Moſaic Creation, if I did not read a Text in this ſame Evangeliſt, which I am certain, is meant of the New and Evangelical Creation (as is before diſcours'd.) *Apoc.* 3. 14. *Theſe things ſaith the Amen, the faithful and true Witneſs, the beginning of the Creation of God.* If we ask our Evangeliſt, what is his Creation? he anſwereth, *The Creation of God.* The Creation of God is certainly The Creation of the *Theopoliticals*, which are the Theologicals, whence a Divine of our own (*k*) hath called his Syſtem of Theology *Theopolitica.* I am certain, that *the Creation of God* ſignifieth another kind of Creation than the Creation of Naturals and Phyſiologicals, that it is the Saint of God-kind of Creation. And I am alike certain, that the Evangeliſt's creative *Logos* is a Saint of God-kind of creative *Logos*, and conſequently his Creation is the Saint of God-kind of Creation (the Creation of God) with reſpect whereunto it muſt be ſaid of him, *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.* Which words are a deſcriptive notice of his Creation; for there is a Creation, *wherein all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made*; and this is the Creation, that is his Creation. Our Evangeliſt hath given us alſo another deſcriptive Notice of his Creation by ſtiling him in his Apocalypſe ἡ ἀρχὴ, *the beginning of the Creation of God*, whereby he interpreteth his Goſpel. For although in the Proem of his Goſpel he doth not in expreſs words ſtile his *Logos The beginning*, yet in ſenſe and juſt conſtruction he ſo ſtileth him, when he ſaith, *In the beginning the Word was with God, All things were made by him.* His Senſe manifeſtly is, *The Word was the beginning of all things.* Agreeably whereto the ancient Scholaſtic Divines ſpeak of their Scholaſtic *Logos.* For *Tatianus* ſaith of him, (*l*) τοῦτον ἴσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχὴν, *this we know, to be the* (arche or) *beginning of the World. Gr. Naz.* ſtileth him, (*m*) ἀρχὴ τῶν ὅλων, *the beginning of all things*, whereby he meaneth, the archical cauſe of the Moſaic Creation of all things. But the New Teſtament hath no ſuch meaning; when it ſtileth our Saviour *the Beginning* and *Alpha*, it hath manifeſtly reſpect only to the Evangelical Creation and Affairs, *Col.* 1. 18. *Apoc.* 3. 14. and 22. 13. So the Fathers ſometimes ſtile him, (*n*) ἀρχὴ τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως, *the beginning of the new Creation*, (*o*) ἀρχὴ ὁδῶν εὐαγγελικῶν, *the beginning of the Evangelical ways of God.* And ſo our Evangeliſt in his Proem expounded according to his own Writings (as alſo according to other places of the New Teſtament and theſe Sayings of the Fathers) ſaith of his *Logos*, *He was the beginning of the Evangelical Creation of all things* (the beginning of the Creation of God) this he ſaith in ſaying, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, All things were made by him.* Thus our Evangeliſt is his own Interpreter; which is ſuch an Argument of the truth of our Interpretation, as the Scholaſtic Theology cannot ſhew the like.

(i) *Si nulla certior eſt Auctoris exponendi ratio quàm per ejuſdem verba, ſenſum hujus loci excipiemus ex aliis locis.* Huet. Dem. Ev. pr. 7. p. 539. ed. 2.

(k) *Mr. Lawſon.*

It is not probable, that in his Apocalypſe he ſhould ſpeak of the Evangelical Creation, and overlook it in his Evangely, which is the proper place of it.

(l) *Or. c. Græc.* p. 145.

(m) *Or.* 29. p. 490.

(n) *S. Athanaſ. c. Ar. or.* 3. p. 237. *Com.*

(o) *S. Baſil. Ep* 141. p. 932.

V. The Text in our Evangeliſt's Proem which is under conſideration, muſt be conſider'd as parallel to ſome part of the Proem of his firſt Epiſtle, theſe places being parallel. For in both of them the Evangeliſt taketh the riſe of his Diſcourſe from *the beginning.* In both our Saviour is ſtiled *The Word.* In both he is ſtiled *The Life.* And in both theſe Proems our Evangeliſt reporteth, that he was *with God* or *with the Father.* After he hath ſaid, that *the Word was with God*, or *the Life was with the Father*, in the Proem of his firſt Epiſtle next and immediately he diſcourſeth of his *Manifeſtation*, which is his miſſive Oeconomy. In the Proem of his Goſpel therefore, after he hath ſaid, *that the Word was in the beginning with God*, he muſt be ſuppoſ'd next and immediately to diſcourſe of his *Manifeſtation* and *miſſive Oeconomy*, as both the nature of the thing and the paralleliſm between theſe two Proems inferreth. The Creation therefore which in the *third Verſe* of this Proem he attributeth to the *Logos*, belongeth to his *Manifeſtation* and *miſſive Oeconomy*, his Diſcourſe of it is part of his Diſcourſe touching the *Manifeſtation* of the *Logos* and his *miſſive Oeconomy*; and conſequently this Saying *All things were made by him*, is certainly meant of the Evangelical Creation of all things, which is the ſame thing with the Manifeſtation of the *Logos* and his miſſive Oeconomy. The whole of this Proem muſt be expounded and limited by his miſſive Oeconomy. *V.* 4. *In him was Life*, viz. in his miſſive Oeconomy. *The Life was the Light of Men*, viz. in his miſſive Oeconomy. *V.* 5. *The Light ſhined in Darkneſs*, viz. in his miſſive Oeconomy. So *v.* 3. muſt be expounded; *All things were made by him*, viz. in his Manifeſtation and miſſive Oeconomy.

This is fair, clear and certain reaſoning from Scripture-grounds and maketh the Senſe of Scripture as bright as the day. If any ſhould object (*p*) that according to our Interpretation the

(p) *Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed, Art.* 2. p. 231, *ed.* 1.

the Word did nothing in the beginning, whereas according to the Evangeliſt *all things were made by him in the beginning*; our Anſwer is, that this is not fair reaſoning, but captious and perverſe. For *the beginning* (as alſo the *World*) is a term, that may and muſt be underſtood in a leſſer or greater Latitude of Senſe; as appeareth from our foregoing Diſcourſes of it and our Saviour's Saying, *the Devil ſinneth from the beginning*. According to our Interpretation *the Word's making all things* began with his miſſive Oeconomy, and in the greater Latitude of Senſe the Evangelical beginning comprehendeth the whole of our Saviour's miſſive Oeconomy, in which the Chriſtians all things were made. Sometimes the Scholaſtic Divines allow themſelves to Diſcourſe at random and as they fancy, and this they call Reaſoning. As when one of them thus argueth; *But how doth making all things ſignifie new making them? Eſpecially making all things in the beginning? Which one would think, ſhould rather ſignifie the firſt than the ſecond Creation.* Do we need, to make anſwer to ſuch marvellous Argumentations as theſe, that know not the New Teſtament's making or creating all things, that ſuppoſe this Creation without *a beginning*, that know not the Evangelical beginning, an Evangeliſt's beginning, nor his Word of Life with his creative Manifeſtation, nor *his all things that are of God* (2 Cor. 5. 18.) that ſuppoſe none of theſe things to be taken notice of by an Evangeliſt, but will have his Evangely interpreted, as if he was only writing an Hiſtory of the Moſaic *Coſmopœia*? The Moſaic viſible Creation is (q) δηλωτικὸν, *manifeſtative of him that createth*, that external Moſaic Creation is not at all manifeſtative of the Evangeliſt's Logos; this therefore is not the Creation which the Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of. His Creation is the ſame with *the creative Manifeſtation* of the Son of God, which next and immediately ſucceedeth *his being in the beginning with God* both in the Proem of our Evangeliſt's Goſpel and his Firſt Epiſtle. So he is his own Interpreter.

(q) *S. Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom.* 4. *p.* 575. *Grot. Not. in Rom.* 1. 20.

VI. Our Evangeliſt's Creation in the Proem of his Goſpel muſt be conſider'd as a part of the New Teſtament, and as appertaining to the Logos of the New Teſtament, whereby his Senſe may be clearly determin'd. For ſuch as his creative Logos is, ſuch is his Creation. If the moſt proper Name of his Logos is *Ens ex Ente*, if in his Nature and Eſſence he is the intelligible World, the archetypal Idea and exemplar of the Univerſe of Creatures; if he is the divine Notion and his Proceſſion is by and from Intellect, if he is the Scholaſtic Art and Hand of the ſupreme Artificer, the demiurgic Reaſon, Skill and Power (celebrated by Philoſophers) if theſe are the Ingredients of his Character, we ought to pronounce, that he is of Kind and Quality, of Character and Deſcription the old Creation's creative Logos. But if none of theſe Ingredients are to be found in his true Character (nor any ſuch like) if all the Ingredients of it are quite of another nature, and are ſuch as muſt belong to him, as he is *the Evangelical Word of Life and Salvation*, then we ought to conclude, that he is not the old, but the new Creations creative Logos, and that this is the Evangeliſt's Creation. If it could be prov'd, that the Evangeliſt's Logos is an Abſtract Logos, his Creation muſt be ſuppos'd, to be the old Creation: But if it plainly appeareth, that all the Ideas of an Abſtract Logos which hitherto have been form'd, are nothing better than Unholy and Unchriſtian and Philoſophic-pagan kind of Vanities, then we ought to pronounce that his Logos is no other than the Chriſtian Logos of a Chriſtian Writer, the Evangelical Logos of an Evangeliſt (which one would think, is Self-evident) and that his Creation is no other than the Chriſtian and Evangelical Creation. The Chriſtian and Evangelical Creation is *the Creation of all things by Jeſus Chriſt*, as the Apoſtle defineth it, *Eph.* 3. 9. (meaning, that all things were created by him, as the making and founding the Chriſtian Religion implieth;) for it is certain and plainly demonſtrable, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of the New and Evangelical Creation of things, when he ſaith, *that all things were created by Jeſus Chriſt*; therefore our Evangeliſt ſpeaketh of the ſame Creation of all things, when he ſaith of Chriſt Jeſus, *all things were made by him*; for one part of the New Teſtament muſt be interpreted by another.

VII. Our Evangeliſt's Creation in the Proem of his Goſpel muſt be conſider'd as a part of *Chriſt's Evangely*, which ſpeaketh of the matters Evangelical, and muſt be underſtood *Evangelically*. For the Goſpel is not interpreted as the Goſpel, unleſs it be ſuppos'd, to ſpeak of things Evangelical, and not of quite diſſonant kind of things, ſuch as the Formation of the Bodies of Gnats and Fleas by a Philoſophic kind of demiurgic Logos, that is the great Opificer of mundane Nature and containeth the exemplar Idea's of all mundane things. It is not imaginable, that ſuch a Logos and his Creation ſhould have any place in Chriſt's Evangely, which is not concern'd about the Formation of a World of Animals, but the Sanctity and Salvation of a World of Sinners. It is no more than every man will do, to interpret a Book of Metaphyſicks or Mathematicks, to ſpeak of things Metaphyſical or Mathematical: Yet in Theology thus much will not be allowed to be done, to interpret a Chriſtian Evangeliſt writing the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Evangely to ſpeak of the things Evangelical, but his Sayings muſt be diſtorted to things *Philoſophical* or *Moſaical*, the matters of mundane Nature and common Providence. This Diſeaſe is hereditarily deriv'd from the ancient Writers of the Church; for ſuch Texts of the Old Teſtament that manifeſtly ſpeak of the matters of the old Creation, they uſually interpret, to ſpeak of the matters of the new Creation; and ſuch Texts of the New Teſtament that manifeſtly ſpeak of the matters of the new Creation, they uſually interpret, to ſpeak of the matters of the old Creation. So the Apoſtle's Texts (wherein he repreſenteth Chriſt as the mediate Cauſe of all things in the Chriſtian Religion) *all things are of God by Jeſus Chriſt*, 2 Cor. 5. 18. *One Lord Jeſus Chriſt by whom are all things, and we by him.* 1 Cor. 8. 6. are by theſe ancient Writers interpreted to mean (r) that all things in Nature and common Providence are by one Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And *Proclus* in his Epiſtle to the *Armenians* argueth (s) *If the* (old) *Creation of all things was not by Chriſt, how is it, that* Paul *proclaimeth, one Lord Jeſus Chriſt by whom are all things? If all things are by Chriſt, it is manifeſt, that he is the Logos of the Evangeliſt, who proclaimeth, In the beginning the Logos was with God, all things were made by him.* But if the

(r) *S. Hilar. de Trin. l.* 4. *S. Athanas. c. Arian. or.* 3. *p.* 210. *Com. S. Baſil. adv. Eunom. l.* 5. *p.* 12?.

(s) *Ap. Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 11. *S.* 7.

old Moſaic Creation had been the Subject-matter of our Evangeliſt's Diſcourſe, he muſt have diſcours'd of the things of that Creation; to have diſcours'd pertinently of it, he muſt have made ſome mention of the matters of it, of Nature, the Law of Nature, natural Duties, governing Providence, an habitable World, the Lights of Heaven, the Dignity of Man, the Affairs of Humane Life, Society and Government; theſe things would have been in his Mind, and ſomething of them would have been in his Diſcourſe, if he had been converſant about the Moſaic Creation: But our divine Fiſher-man is as mute as a Fiſh touching all ſuch matters as theſe, and ſaith not a Syllable of them; all that he thinketh of, and treateth of in his Proem, is wholly heterogeneous, and that which meerly appertaineth to the Evangelical Creation. If he diſcourſeth of the Moſaic Creation and of an Abſtract Logos as the Author of it, *the Life* and *Light* which he immediately connecteth with his Creation, muſt be meant of natural Life and Light, and muſt be the Attributes of that Abſtract creative Logos: Whereas on the contrary, it is plainly demonſtrable, that they are not meant of natural Life and Light, and that they are not the Attributes of an Abſtract Logos, but only of the Humane-divine Perſon of the Meſſiah, who can be the Author of no other Creation but the Evangelical. Our Evangeliſt is celebrated (*t*) for ſounding forth Myſteries, eternal Myſteries, and every thing that he ſpeaketh is ſaid to be a Myſtery. But what Myſtery is *natural Life and Reaſon and a demiurgic Reaſon?* If an Abſtract demiurgic Logos was well known amongſt the Holy People in the Old Teſtament-times (as is commonly thought) this could not be in the Church any great Myſtery. And it was certainly no Myſtery to the ſublimer ſort of Heathen Philoſophers, that were of the Myſtic-metaphyſical Genius, to whoſe Diſciples alone ſuch a demiurgic Logos can be a very valuable Myſtery. But the Evangelical *Word* and *Life* and *Light* and the Evangelical *Creation* are great Myſteries indeed and infinitely valuable, and are celebrated by the Holy Writers as an eternal Myſtery. *Rom.* 16. 25, 26. *Eph.* 3. 9, 11. *Col.* 1. 26. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9.

The New Teſtament muſt be interpreted by the New Teſtament. As S. *Paul* when he ſaith of Chriſt, *by whom are all things*, muſt be underſtood to mean *the Evangelical or New Teſtament all things:* So our Chriſtian Evangeliſt when he ſaith of Chriſt, *all things are made by him*, muſt be underſtood to mean *all things of the Creation of God, the Evangelical Creation.* And his other Text wherein he attributeth *a Creation of the World* to his Logos, will have no difficulty in it, if (agreeably to his Character and the Nature of his writing) we underſtand it to be meant of the Evangelical Creation of all things. For in this divine Creation of all things *the World* (Mundus Humanus) was made by him as to the *Theopoliticals* (or Chriſto-politicals) in greater or leſſer degree it was made by him (the believing part of it was made by him in greater degree, the other part of it in leſſer degree) it had *a making* by him and from him, who was the new Maker thereof. The Evangeliſt's Intention is not only to attribute a Creation to his Logos, but to deſcribe it, and to repreſent a magnifying Idea of it, as if he had ſaid, *ſuch was his Creation, the World was made by him.* And being a Chriſtian Evangeliſt writing an Evangely, he might juſtly ſuppoſe, that all Men would underſtand him, to mean Evangelically, eſpecially ſeeing the tenour of his Words plainly directeth ſo to interpret them. For when he ſaith of his Chriſtian Logos, *he was in the World, and the World was made by him*, the words imply, that *he was in the World* amongſt Men and in his miſſive Oeconomy, when the World was made by him. *He was in the World and ſo the World was made by him.* Beſides, the Evangeliſt's words cannot be ſuppos'd, to charge the World with Ingratitude, becauſe they did not acknowledge Chriſt, who was their Creator in the old Creation. For it is no Chriſtian Duty, to own Chriſt as our Maker in that Creation: Nor doth the Scripture ever demand of Mankind any Duty unto him upon account of that Creation. But they are juſtly chargeable with great Blindneſs, Wickedneſs and Worldlineſs, becauſe *he was in the World, and* (in his Divine Creation of all things) *the World was made by him, and the World* (as to the generality of it) *knew him not.* In making the new Kingdom of God the World was neceſſarily made by him (partly in a greater and partly in a leſſer degree) *it was made by him as to the Theopoliticals, it was made his redeem'd World, of Right and by Obligation and in State his Subjects.* And is not this Interpretation more agreeable to the Chriſtian Sentiment than a Philoſophic demiurgic Logos a Principle of the mundane Creation?

VIII. To unprejudic'd Reaſon it is not imaginable, that the Subject-matter of the Evangeliſt's Diſcourſe ſhould be the Moſaic Creation. For it is not imaginable, that the Evangeliſt diſcourſing of a Logos and of the Creation ſhould overlook and pretermit his own kind of Logos and Creation, the recent and proximate Creation, the far moſt excellent and divine Creation, and ſhould only inſiſt upon a foreign and exotick kind of Logos, a foreign and exotick kind of Creation, an hugely remote and diſtant Creation, a far meaner and leſs excellent Creation. The Humane-divine Perſon of Chriſt (the Evangelical Word) as he is the Saint of God-kind of Son, is ally'd to the Family of regenerate Chriſtians, he is the Founder of it and their kind of creative Logos, not the natural Man's kind of creative Logos, not a mundane kind of creative Logos, not a common kind of creative Logos, not an exotick; and is not this he, of whom the Evangeliſt ſaith, *the World knew him not?* His Creation as it is the Evangelical and Chriſtian, is the regenerate Chriſtians kind of Creation, not the natural Man's kind of Creation, not the mundane and common kind of Creation, not an exotick; and is not this the Creation wherein the Chriſtians *all things were made?* This Creation was recent and newly done, when the Evangeliſt wrote, and he could not but be highly affected with it; and can it be ſuppoſed, that he overlook'd and pretermitted this proximate Creation and his own kind of Creation, to treat of another kind of Creation, that was ſeveral Thouſand of Years remote, paſt and diſtant? He could not overlook the God-

kind

(t) *Omnes quidem ſancti Evangeliſtæ, omnes Apoſtoli præter proditorem, omnes ſancti. Tamen ſanctus Johannes, qui ultimus ſcripſit Evangelium, quaſi neceſſarius requiſitus & electus à Chriſto, majore quidem tuba fudit æterna myſteria. Quicquid locutus eſt, myſterium eſt.* S. Ambroſ. de Sacram. l. 3. c. 2.

kind of creative Logos, nor the God-kind of Creation (the Creation of God) which far tranſcendeth the Moſaical Creation, that (in reſpect of the Goods and Excellencies of it) was but a Terreſtrial-animal and Humane kind of Creation. The Evangelical Creation was much more difficult and (u) much more divine than the Moſaical (w) for which reaſon Chriſtians call it *the new Creation*. So all Chriſtians ſpeak, they call our Redemption the new Creation. Whence an Anſwer may be made to an Objection, which concerneth our Interpretation of the Evangeliſt, although the Objection is made againſt that Interpretation of the Evangeliſt, which *Socinus* and his Followers have made. (x) *Novam creationem ſtatuunt ſine nova creatura.* They ſuppoſe a new Creation without any new Creature. But this is no valid Objection againſt our Interpretation of the Evangeliſt's Creation; for we ſuppoſe, that the great Work of our Redemption was the making the Chriſtian Religion, *which is the new Conſtitution of all things conſtitutively made* (after which it is *executively* introduc'd) that this is in great part the new Creation; and no Man of Senſe will think it an Abſurdity, to ſuppoſe, that there may be ſuch a new Creation before any new Creature be made. We are concern'd alſo to ſay ſomething to that, which ſome learned Men have diſcours'd touching the *Socinians* Interpretation of our Evangeliſt's Creation, againſt which they have objected, that the Firſt Chapter of *Geneſis* may as well be interpreted of the Creation of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*, and not of the natural and material World. But what do theſe Objectors think of the Men of their Sentiment, who interpret the Firſt of *Geneſis*, literally to ſpeak of the great myſterious things of the new Creation, which is as abſurd and incongruous, as to interpret it of the Creation of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*? If they acknowledge (with all Chriſtians) that the Redemption of the World is the new Creation, they may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that the World was made by the great Redeemer of it as ſuch, and they muſt ſuppoſe, that the Univerſe was made by him, *ſo as to be a New and Chriſtiano-conſtituted Univerſe*, and as it is ſuch an Univerſe. To interpret a Chriſtian Evangeliſt's *making the World* of this Creation of it, is not like the diſtorting the Firſt of *Geneſis*, to ſignifie the Creation of the Commonwealth of *Iſrael*. Is it poſſible, that a Chriſtian Evangeliſt writing the Hiſtory of the Redeemer of the World, ſhould be totally ſilent touching his Creation as ſuch, and in all his Elogies of him ſhould only mention an alien and heterogeneous Creation? It is not eaſie, to ſay, whether the *Socinians* Interpretation of our Evangeliſt's Creation be more abſurd, who ſuppoſe him by *making the World*, to mean only *a morally reforming* the manners of it; or theirs, who ſuppoſe a Chriſtian Evangely, to be an Hiſtory of the *Geneſis* of the natural and material World. The Firſt of *Geneſis* muſt be interpreted according to the Nature and Genius of ſuch a Chapter, which manifeſtly treateth of the natural and material World. The Book of the *Apocalypſe* muſt be interpreted according to the Nature and Genius of ſuch a Book, which myſtically treateth of the State of the Church of the New Teſtament. So our Evangeliſt's Proem muſt be interpreted according to the Nature and Genius of ſuch a Writing, which manifeſtly treateth of the Redeemer of the World and of his Creation as ſuch. His Logos is *the Evangelical Word of Life*, who as ſuch is by officiary Dignity the Redeemer and new Maker of the World, which is at leaſt ſo far Chriſtianiz'd by him, as to be *made a redeemed World, and at leaſt in a leſſer degree of Right and in State Chriſt's Subjects*. But many that ſpeak great things of the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion and the New Teſtament, yet will not otherwiſe be ſatisfied, but the terms of Chriſt's *making all things* and *making the World* in our Evangeliſt's Proem muſt be underſtood in the obvious Senſe (and accordingly they interpret other the like places of the New Teſtament) which is to ſay, that the terms of *making* and *creating* muſt be underſtood in ſuch a Senſe, as every Fool would imagine at the firſt hearing. But thus neither the Old nor New Teſtament muſt be underſtood.

IX. The Texts of our Evangeliſt touching a Creation deſign to attribute to our Saviour Deity of Perſon (for they repreſent him as Creator, not Creature:) But this his Deity is only as to the New Teſtament-times and Affairs. The New Teſtament is a great diſplay of his divine Nobilitations and Creature-tranſcendences, of which a principal is his Creatorſhip, which in our Evangeliſt's Proem muſt be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe as in other Texts of the New Teſtament. But thoſe other Texts (as is before prov'd) do not attribute to him Deity of the old Creation, nor as to our Naturals, nor as to mundane Nature and common Providence, nor as to the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs; therefore the Texts of our Evangeliſt touching a Creation muſt be underſtood of the New Teſtament-creation. He had no intention to indoctrinate us to believe an Abſtract Logos, that was the Deity of the old Creation, as to mundane Nature, common Providence and the Old Teſtament-times and Affairs: But his whole deſign was, to indoctrinate Men to believe, that *Jeſus is the Chriſt* (Ch. 20. 31.) whoſe Deity as ſuch is only as to the New Teſtament-times and Affairs. When he ſaith, that *the Word was with God*, his Senſe is, that *the Word was with God* to the purpoſe of becoming *the Evangelical creative Logos*; and therefore he immediately ſubjoineth, *all things were made by him*; which muſt be underſtood with this additional Explication; *ſuch he was in his miſſive Oeconomy, and as to the New Teſtament-times and Affairs*. So when he ſaith, *The World was made by him*, it muſt be underſtood with this additional Explication; *ſuch he was in his miſſive Oeconomy and as to the New Teſtament-times and Affairs*. But touching the former Text Expoſitors have alſo obſerv'd, that it is uſual in Scripture, to repeat the Senſe of an Affirmation by a Negation of the contrary. *Iſa.* 38. 1. and 39. 4. *Jer.* 42. 4. and 38. 25. *Lam.* 3. 2. *Joh.* 1. 20. 1 *Joh.* 1. 5. So our Evangeliſt is not content, meerly to ſay of his Chriſtian Logos, *all things were made by him*: But he maketh a Repetition of this branch of his Narrative in a negative form of Expreſſion, and addeth *a limitaneous extenſive* Explication of it, when he ſaith, *without him was not any thing made that was made*. *Grotius* thinketh, that theſe words were added by the Evangeliſt in oppoſition to the *Gnoſticks*, who phancied, that of ſeveral parts of the World there were ſeveral Creators: But this is an incongruous Suppoſition. For theſe *Simonian Gnoſticks* were

(u) *Grot. Not. in Eph.* 3. 9.

(w) *Idem Not. in Joh.* 1. 4.

(x) *Cloppenb. Compend. Socin. Confut. p.* 53.

Anti-judaical (Adverſaries to the God of the Jews, the Law and the Prophets;) if therefore our Evangeliſt had written againſt them touching the Creation, he muſt have aſſerted in the firſt place, *that the God of the Jews was the Maker of the things that were made, and not one of thoſe Angels* (Principalities and Powers) *by which the Gnoſtics ſuppos'd, that the ſeveral Parts of the World were made.* But our Evangeliſt is only hiſtorically (and encomiaſtically) relating, not diſputing; and he is not relating Old Teſtament-hiſtory or teaching Old Teſtament-doctrine: But he introduceth a new Maker of all things, thereby ſignifying the Deity of Chriſt, who is only the Deity of the New Teſtament, and conſequently our Evangeliſt's Creation is the new Creation.

Of the *Limitaneous-extenſive Explication and Repetition* in our Evangeliſt's Text we may give another and a better Account, than that which the Scholaſtic Theology giveth. For it appeareth from our Interpretation, that the Evangeliſt addeth his *Limitaneous-extenſive Explication* (without him was not any thing made that was made) both to limit and confine his foregoing Words to the Creation which he ſpeaketh of, and to extend them to the Univerſality thereof. His Intention is not to ſay of his Chriſtian *Logos*, that abſolutely and unlimitedly *without him was not any thing made:* But *that without him was not any thing made that was made* in that making of Things, which he ſpeaketh of and contemplateth. His *Repetition* in the Negative form of ſpeaking is a dwelling and inſiſting upon his foregoing Affirmation, maketh it more full and ſenſibly affective, and he chuſeth to dwell upon it for theſe Reaſons. (1.) To repreſent our Bl. Saviour as *the mediate Cauſe* of all things in the Evangelical Diſpenſation, and not only actually, but neceſſarily ſuch. For being the procuring Cauſe of all, in this great Oeconomy of things *without him nothing was made*, and without him nothing could be made. In ſuch Senſe *by him are all things*, all things were made by him, nothing could be made without his mediate Cauſality. (2.) The Evangeliſt inſiſteth upon his Affirmation (all things were made by him) the more fully to repreſent our Saviour as *Lord* of the Evangelical all things. For he is ſo the mediate Cauſe of all things in the Chriſtian Religion, as to be a Sovereign Diſpoſer and Lord of Affairs; and he can be no leſs than ſo being (not Creature, but) Creator; *for all things were made by him.* He is the Lord of our Religion, of the Church and of the Univerſe, the Lord of our Wiſdom, Righteouſneſs, Life and Salvation, the Lord of the Vineyard and of the Harveſt, and our Religion is his Affair and Buſineſs. 1 *Cor.* 3. 5. (3.) The Evangeliſt inſiſteth upon his Affirmation (all things were made by him) to make all Men (and Chriſtians more eſpecially) ſenſible of the origin *of their all things*; that by and in Chriſt they have all things (as to Spirituals and Eternals) but out of him nothing. For as to the matters of Life and Salvation for a ſinful World *without him nothing was made.* Having now given a full account of our Evangeliſt's Proem, I will humbly bleſs God, that hath inabled me, to reſcue out of the Hands of the Scholaſtic Divines (Ancient and Modern) this choice and divine Portion of Scripture, the miſtaken Interpretation whereof was the Fountain of that Scholaſtic Theology, which prevail'd in the Church in ancient times (to the infinite prejudice of Chriſtianity) and ever ſince it hath been accounted the Caſtle and Fortreſs of the Scholaſtic Theology, whereby it hath been thought ſo ſtrongly defended, as to be impregnable. Many have thought, that departing from the Scholaſtic Theology it is impoſſible to make any good Sence of this divine Proem: But the contrary is moſt true; for without departing from the Scholaſtic Theology it is impoſſible to make any tolerable good Senſe of it. Some have ſaid, that it is a ſhameful thing, to ſuppoſe, that any thing which Chriſt hath done for the Redemption of Mankind, is a creating them (as if the ſame thing did not admit of different Notions and Conſiderations:) But who they are, that ought to be aſham'd of their Interpretation of this divine Proem, will beſt be underſtood by comparing the different Interpretations of it and the Reaſons on which they are founded; of which matters all Men may ſatisfie themſelves.

CHAP. XII.

1. *An Idea of the new Creation in the uſual and ſtricter Acceptation, which is the Chriſtian Religion, conſider'd both as it is the new Conſtitution of all things conſtitutively made and executively introduc'd.* 2. *This importeth a Diſtribution of things into old and new.* 3. *And that all old things are paſt away.* 4. *And that if any Man is in Chriſt, he is a new Creature.* 5. *The Chriſtians new Creation is a great thing and a great change in the Univerſe and of Man.* 6. *The new Creation as it is the Chriſtian Religion executively introduc'd is an Evidence of our Saviour's Divinity and the Truth of his Meſſias-ſhip.* 7. *The Chriſtians new Creation is a great Obligation to Holineſs of Life.*

I. TO repreſent an Idea of the new Creation in the uſual and ſtricter Acceptation, the Chriſtian Religion muſt be conſider'd *as the new Conſtitution of all things, both as it is conſtitutively made, and as it is executively introduc'd.* For the Idea of the new Creation (in the ſtricter Acceptation) compriſeth both theſe in conjunction, which therefore are uſually conjoyn'd by the ancient Writers in their Accounts of it. As in that of *Tertullian* before cited. (y) *Touching the Meſſiah it is in the firſt place to be enquir'd, whether we muſt not expect the Inſtitutor of a new Law, and of a new Teſtament, and of new Sacrifices, and of a new Circumciſion, and of an eternal Sabbath: one that abrogateth the old Law, appointeth a new Teſtament and new Sacrifices, aboliſheth the old Ceremonies, and the old Circumciſion with its Sabbath, and preacheth a new Kingdom not to be deſtroy'd.* From Teſtimonies of Scripture it appeareth (z) *that the firſt Carnal Circumciſion was to be aboliſh'd, the former Moſaic Law, the old Yoke, the old Paſtors, the old Temple of God, the old Sacrifice and the old Prieſthood were to ceaſe. And a ſecond ſpiritual Circumciſion, a new Law, a new Teſtament, a new Yoke, new Paſtors, a new Sacrifice, and a new Prieſthood ſhould ſucceed; and that there are two People predicted, the old and the new.* (a) *In Chriſtianity there is a new Soul, (for it is cleans'd) and a new Body, a new Worſhip and new Promiſes, and Teſtament and Life, and Table and Veſtment, and abſolutely all things new. Inſtead of a Jeruſalem below, we have a Metropolis above; and a ſpiritual Temple inſtead of a ſenſible one, fleſhy Tables inſtead of Tables of Stone, Baptiſm inſtead of Circumciſion, the Body of the Lord inſtead of Manna, inſtead of Water out of the Rock Blood out of his Side, the Croſs inſtead of the Rod of Moſes or Aaron, the Kingdom of Heaven inſtead of the promiſed Land, one High-prieſt inſtead of Prieſts innumerable, and a ſpiritual Lamb inſtead of a brutal Lamb.* In this new Creation of all things a principal thing that was made, was the State of Remiſſion of Sins, (or of Righteouſneſs) which was made and provided for the World of Sinners, but cannot be enjoy'd by them till they become Chriſtian Believers. Divines therefore conſider it as *conſtitutively* made and as *executively* introduc'd. (b) *In the Death of Chriſt Reconciliation was made* (a Settlement of the State of Reconciliation:) *but it is by Faith that it is executively introduc'd.* Chriſtians come out of their old Eſtate, (the State of Sin and Condemnation) and enter into their new Eſtate, (the State of Grace and Reconcilement and Citizenſhip in the Kingdom of God) by this new Conſtitution of all things, the executive Introduction whereof is the making regenerate Chriſtians, the new World of regenerate Believers, which is the Church. (c) *God made the Iſraelitical People to himſelf by freeing them from the Thraldom of Egypt; the Chriſtian People he hath made to himſelf by freeing us from the Servitude of Vice. This is the new Creation,* ſaith *Grotius*, who hath not diſtinctly enough repreſented the Extent and Amplitude of the new Creation in the ſtricter Acceptation.

II. The new Creation importeth a Diſtribution of all things into *old* and *new*, which Diſtribution is ſometimes made in a ſenſe of Indifference, without any reſpect to Praiſe or Diſparagement; as *Matth.* 13. 25. *Every Scribe which is inſtructed into the Kingdom of Heaven, is like unto a Man that is an Houſholder, which bringeth forth out of his Treaſure* (variety of Proviſions) *things new and old.* So 1 *Joh.* 2. 7. *Brethren, I write no new Commandment unto you, but an old Commandment which ye had from the beginning; the old Commandment is the Word which ye have heard from the beginning.* But uſually amongſt Chriſtians and by the holy Writers *the old things* are ſo denominated in a ſenſe of Vilipendency, and *the new things* are ſo denominated in a ſenſe of Excellency, as by καινὸς οἶνος, *new Wine*, is meant οἶνος ἔξοχος, *eximious Wine.* In this ſenſe the old and new Settlement of Religion are oppos'd, *Heb.* 8. 8, 9. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, when I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of Iſrael and the Houſe of Judah. Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers.* The old and new Law, the old and new Worſhippers are oppos'd. (d) *The moſt high God ſent from Heaven a Teacher of Righteouſneſs, that in or by him he might give a new Law to new Worſhippers.* The Chriſtians call their new Law the Goſpel, *(e)* ſaith an Hebrew Doctor. The *old* and *new* Iſrael of God are oppos'd, for Chriſtians are the new Iſrael, *novus Populus*, as they are ſtiled in the Title or Argument before, Pſal. 114. in the *Syriac* Pſalter. *(f) Utatur populus novus ad æternitatem vocatus Pater noſter.* The *old* and *new* Eſtate are oppos'd, the one the State of Sin and of Death, the other the State of Grace and of Life. (g) For Chriſt by his Death hath ſav'd his People from the *old* Domination of Death, to which they were ſubjected in their *old* Eſtate; and by a *new* Commandment he maketh the *new* Man, to which the *old* Man is uſually oppos'd. (h) *A new Man came into the World* (who is the new Man in himſelf and to us) *he gave new Precepts to the World, and to our old Life oppos'd the Contrariety of his newneſs.* (i) *He that introduc'd a new Eſtate of*

(y) *C. Jud. c.* 6.

(z) *S. Cypr. Teſtimon. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *&c.*

(a) Ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ϗ ψυχὴ καινὴ (ἐκαθάρθη γὰρ) ϗ σῶμα καινὸν, ϗ λατρεία καινὴ, ϗ ἐπαγγελίαι καιναὶ, ϗ διαθήκη ϗ ζωὴ, ϗ τράπεζα ϗ στολὴ, ϗ πάντα καινὰ ἁπλῶς. *S. Chryſoſt. in* 2 *Cor. Hom.* 11. *p.* 609.

(b) *In morte Chriſti facta eſt reconciliatio, ſed non eſt executioni mandata: in morte Chriſti oblatum eſt ſacrificium reconciliationis, ſed reconciliatio ipſa non eſt applicata: ſed executio & applicatio reconciliationis obtentæ per mortem Chriſti fit per fidem.* Cajetan. in 2 Cor. 5. 20.

(c) *Grot. Not. in Eph.* 2. 10.

(d) *Summus Deus doctorem juſtitiæ miſit è cœlo, ut novis cultoribus novam legem in eo vel per eum daret.* Lactant. l. 4. c. 13.

(e) *Elias in Tiſb. p.* 49.

(f) *S. Aug. Ser.* 182. *de Temp.*

(g) *Ille enim qui venit per crucis irriſionem carnis perimere corruptionem, & vetuſtatem vinculi mortis noſtræ ſuæ mortis novitate diſſolvere: mandato novo fecit hominem novum. Res enim vetus erat ut homo moreretur. Quod ne ſemper valeret in homine, res nova facta eſt, ut Deus moreretur.* S. Aug. de Temp. Ser. 39.

(h) *Novus enim homo venit in mundum: nova præcepta dedit mundo: & vitæ noſtræ veteri novitatis ſuæ contrarietatem oppoſuit.* Greg. M. Hom. 32. in Evangel.

(i) *Qui contra mortis vetuſtatem attulit vitæ novitatem, ipſe* *contra vetus peccatum opponit novum mandatum.* S. Aug. ubi ſupr.

Life againſt the old State of Death, he oppoſeth a new Commandment againſt old Sin and Corruption. The old things, to which Chriſtianity confronteth and oppoſeth its new things, (which are of a new Nature and Excellency) are the things of our Unregeneracy, (the things of the old Houſe) *the Law-Religion, the State, Life, People, Religioniſts of Unregeneracy,* the Vice and Virtue, Impiety and Piety, Unrighteouſneſs and Righteouſneſs of Unregeneracy, (which is proper thereto) and theſe Chriſtianity calleth *old* in a ſenſe of Vilipendency, making them either as nothing (in reſpect of Salvation) or as worſe than nothing. But there are ſome other things, which Chriſtians call *old* not without ſome degree of Diſparagement, yet not in a ſenſe of Vilipendency. (*k*) Such are the Books of the Old Teſtament, to which they prefer the new; and ſuch is the old Creation, to which they prefer the new Creation, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, *Eph.* 2. 10. *We are his Workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus.* (*l*) *For in theſe Words St. Paul had not reſpect to the Creation, whereby we are made Men, as* Oecumenius *thought; but to the Grace in Chriſt, whereby we are made, not Creatures, but new Creatures. Chryſoſtom ſaith, the Apoſtle meaneth Regeneration, which is indeed another Creation; from not being we are produc'd into Being. What we were before (that is, the old Man) is dead; we are made what we were not before. The Buſineſs is a Creation, and a better than the former Creation. For by the former we live only, but by this we live well. Theodoret, Theophylact, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtom, Primaſius, Sedulius, Anſelm, Aquinas, all agree. So do the Papiſts at this day, Stapleton, Juſtinian; to ſay nothing of all ours. The thing is manifeſt therefore; we are created, that is, we are juſtified to good Works: therefore good Works follow Creation or Juſtification.*

III. The new Creation according to the Apoſtle's account of it is of this Idea; *It is the new Conſtitution of all things conſtitutively made and executively introduc'd, whereby all the old things* (proper to Unregeneracy) *are paſt away, and all things are become new,* 2 Cor. 5. 17. In the Chriſtian Religion *as conſtitutively made* all things are jurally paſt away; and in Chriſtianity *as executively introduc'd* all the old things are both jurally and actually paſt away, *all things are become new.* For Chriſt died that his Liege-people might be in the holy and happy State of Regeneracy, wherein they are of the new and noble Birth, of a new and divine Family, have a new Father and Mother, (the Mother of all regenerate Chriſtians, *Gal.* 4. 26.) new Brethren and Relations, a new Lord and a new Law, a new Work and Buſineſs, a new City and Country, and a new Inheritance. (*m*) *Omnia reſonant novitatem,* All things that are in Chriſt, and conſequently the Types of them in the Old Teſtament, *do reſound newneſs,* that newneſs whereby thoſe umbratile Types are antiquated, and all the things of old Judaiſm (properly ſuch) *are paſt away.* The old Church conſiſting of thoſe that were born after the Fleſh only, (the Heirs of an earthly Canaan) her mundane Temple-Religion, outſide and pompous Worſhip, (ſuitable only to Unregeneracy) the old God-ſervice devoid of the Chriſtian newneſs is paſt away, (*Rom.* 7. 6.) and *the Righteouſneſs that is in the Law,* (the civil-religious Virtue and Piety of the carnal Jews and of ſuch as they were) is in Chriſtianity diſparag'd as ſpurious and illegitimate. All the τὰ ἐξωτερικὰ, *the things on this ſide Chriſt and ſaving Chriſtianity,* all the natural Man's Goods and Excellencies, (even thoſe of ſecular Learning and Philoſophy, of civil Virtue and human Morality) all the unregenerate Religioniſts gainful admired things, (ſuch as *Paul*'s Judaical Advantages and Glories, *Phil.* 3. 7.) all the gay and ſpecious things of the World, (the worldly Man's gainful admired things) ſo far as they ſtand in Competition or come in Compariſon with the choice and ſaving and ſaint of God-kind of Goods and Excellencies, Chriſtianity at a great rate depreciateth and diſcardeth with all that is juſtly denominated *the luſt of the fleſh, the luſt of the eyes and the pride of life.* The old Differences between Man and Man are out of date in Chriſtianity, *where there is neither Greek nor Jew, Circumciſion nor Uncircumciſion, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free,* (theſe things are of no regard, Chriſt as he is Chriſtianiſm in himſelf and to us is only of regard) *but Chriſt is all in all,* Col. 3. 11.

As the State of God's People, the Manifeſtations, Appearances and Behaviour of God, and ſome of his Names and Titles in the Old Teſtament Times were hugely diſſonant from what they are in the New Teſtament, ſo the Chriſtian Spirit is hugely diſſonant from the old judaical legal Spirit, (properly ſuch) which as it was a judaical ſervile Spirit, judaically ſuperficial and external, cuſtomary and ritual in Matters of Religion, judaically ſecular and mundane, a judaical military and fighting Spirit, a judaical vindictive Spirit, a judaical zealotick kind of Spirit, a judaical curſing and anathematizing Spirit, a judaical hurtful and deſtructive Spirit, (judaically hurtful and deſtructive to our Enemies, or the Enemies of God and Religion) can have no place in genuin Chriſtianity. The things of old Gentiliſm alſo (properly ſuch) in like manner as the things of old Judaiſm; the old Heathen State, and whatever is of kind and quality Heatheniſm of Mind and Life, of Virtue and Religion, is all done away in Chriſt, and they that become Chriſtians muſt (*n*) τῶν παλαιῶν πατρῴων ἐθῶν ἐπιλαθέσθαι, *forget their old Manners and Cuſtoms deriv'd from their Forefathers.* (*o*) *According to ancient Prophecy all things muſt be made new by Chriſt, ſo that we may ſeem to live as it were in a new World; for there will be a new religious Worſhip, a new Righteouſneſs of Practice, new Promiſes, new Beatitudes, new Men, new Laws.*

In their new and divine Eſtate of Regeneracy Chriſtians are ſav'd from the Reign and Domination of their ghoſtly and ghaſtly Enemies, their old Thraldom and Slavery, their old Infamy and Beggary are paſt away, they are *purged from their old Sins,* their old execrable Villainy and foul Criminality is done away in Chriſt, upon account of whoſe Righteouſneſs ungodly Sinners are *creatively* made the Righteous. (*p*) *For what elſe could cover our Sins but his Righteouſneſs? We the Wicked and Ungodly in whom could we be juſtified but in the Son of God only?* ὢ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς, ὢ τῆς ἀνεξιχνιάστου δημιουργίας, ὢ τῶν ἀπροσδοκήτων εὐεργεσιῶν, ἵνα ἀνομία μὲν πολλῶν ἐν δικαίῳ ἑνὶ κρυβῇ, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ἑνὸς πολλοὺς ἀνόμους δικαιώσῃ. *O ſweet Permutation!*

(k) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 20. *c.* 4.

(l) *Etenim his verbis Paulus, non ad creationem reſpexit qua facti ſumus homines, ut Oecumenius exiſtimavit; ſed ad gratiam in Chriſto, unde ſimus, non Creaturæ, ſed novæ Creaturæ. Chryſoſtomus,* Τὴν ἀναγέννησιν ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται ὄντως κτίσις ἑτέρα ἐστίν· ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρήχθημεν. ὅπερ ἦμεν πρότερον ἀπεθάνομεν, τουτέστιν ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, ὅπερ οὐκ ἦμεν πρότερον ἐγενόμεθα. ἄρα κτίσις τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστιν, καὶ τῆς ἑτέρας τιμιωτέρα· ἐξ ἐκείνης γὰρ τὸ ζῆν, ἐκ δὲ ταύτης τὸ καλῶς ζῆν ἡμῖν περιγέγονεν *Conſentiunt Theodoretus & Theophylactus, Ambroſius, Chryſoſtomus, Primaſius, Sedulius, Anſelmus, Thomas. Denique & hodierni Papiſtæ, Stapletonus, Juſtinianus, ut noſtros omnes miſſos faciam. Itaque manifeſta res eſt, creati ſumus, id eſt, juſtificati ſumus ad bona opera. Ergo bona opera conſequuntur Creationem, ſive Juſtificationem.* Chamier. Panſtrat. T. 3. l. 21. c. 11.

(m) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 16. *c.* 26.

(n) *J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p.* 287.

(o) *Clarius in Iſa.* 65. 17.

(p) *J. Mart. Ep. ad Diognet. p.* 500.

tation! O unſearchable Workmanſhip (or Creation!) *O Benificences ſurmounting all Expectation! that the Iniquity of many is covered in one juſt one, and the Righteouſneſs of one juſtifieth many Unrighteous.* By their ſaving Religion theſe are come out of the deadly criminal and penal State, and are in the uncriminal and uncondemnable State; their deadly Evils (criminal and penal) are paſt away, and they that were before of the alien and inimical, of the atheous, carnal, and mundane kind in Genius and Diſpoſition, Life and Practice *(in vetuſtate corruptionis*, in the oldneſs of their Corruption) are now become (*q*)
(q) *Ibid. p.* 494. καινὸν γένος, *a new kind* (of the Salutary and Saint of God-kind) and their old and vile Apprehenſions and Eſtimations, their old Sentiments and Reliſhes of things, their old Volitions and Affections, and their former unholy Converſation are now changed and paſt away. For *they have put off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh by the Circumciſion of Chriſt*, Col. 2. 11. Such a
(r) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 16. *c.* 26. Change the old Circumciſion ſignified. *(r) Quid enim aliud circumciſio ſignificat, quàm vetuſtate exuta naturam renovatam?* For what elſe doth Circumciſion ſignifie, but a renew'd Nature, the Oldneſs being put off.

2 *Cor.* 5. 17. IV. The new Creation which Chriſtianity is, importeth, *That if any Man be in Chriſt* (in the plenary Senſe) *he is a new Creature.* To be really a Chriſtian, is to be *a new Creature*; in the Definitive Notion whereof Three things concur according to the Apoſtle. For by *a new Creature* he meaneth, *one that is of the new Creation, one that is new made or created, and one that is made a new kind of Man according to Chriſtianity.* He conſidereth a new Creature as *one that is of the new Creation*; for *to be in Chriſt*, is to be of that ſpecific Comprehenſion, which he is of, which is the new Creation *as Executively introduced*, the new World of regenerate Believers. The Apoſtle alſo having ſaid, *If any Man be in Chriſt, he is a new Creature*, immediately ſubjoineth a Deſcription of the new Creation (the true Idea of it) *Old things are paſt away, behold all things are become new.* The new Creation may be fitly expreſs'd in the Words of *Seneca* touching a
(s) *Nat. Qu l.* 3. *c. ult.* Revolution of the World, *(s) Deo viſum, ordiri meliora, vetera finiri*, God deſign'd to begin better Things, and that the old Things ſhould be ended. This was his Deſign in ſending his Son, and this Deſign he accompliſheth in him, and by him. *In Chriſt there is a new Creation as conſtitutively made, and as executively introduced*, and this demonſtrateth, *that if any Man be in Chriſt, he is a new Creature.* He is a new Creature, as being one of the new Creation, and he is one of the new Creation both real and perſonal. For he is one of the new Creation of Perſons (the new Church or People of God, the new Religioniſts;) and he is one of the new Creation of Things; for he is one that belongeth to the new Settlement or Diſpenſation of Things, one of the new Eſtate, the new Life and Practice, the new and Chriſtian Virtue and Righteouſneſs. Such a new Creature the Apoſtle conſidereth as one that is *new made or created*, when he ſaith, *Eph.* 2. 9, 10. *By Grace are ye ſaved through Faith. Not by Works, leſt any Man ſhould boaſt. For we are his Workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good Works.* It is not the Counſel and Deſign of God, that we ſhould be ſaved in the Method of being the legal Self-ſaviours, by being righteous in our ſelves, by our own Works (good Deeds and Well-deſervings:) But his Counſel and Deſign of ſaving us is in a quite different method, by his Coſt and by his Sovereign Grace, and by being his new Creatures. For (according to this Deſign and Counſel of his) Chriſtian Believers are *new made and created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good Works.* They are *creatively* made the ſaved People and the Saints of God, both in reſpect of their State and their Nature; ſo entirely are they dependent upon God, and beholden to him for their new Being out of worſe than nothing, as for their firſt Being out of nothing. They are *God's Workmanſhip* (it is his Work to create them a ſaved holy People) his new Creation-Work. Which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if they were wholly paſſive, and did nothing in this Creative kind of Workmanſhip; for the Duty-part and the Benefit-part of Religion concur in their new Creation; whence they are ſaid to *put on the new Man*, and the Apoſtle requireth it as Duty, and the Summary of all Duty, *to become a new Crea-* *Eph.* 4. 24. *Col* 3. 10.
ture, Gal. 5. 15. The new Creature that he inſiſteth upon, is the Eſſence and Summary of Chriſtian Virtue and Duty, and denoteth one that is a new Creature, according to Chriſtianity, whom the Apoſtle defineth *a new Man, new created, and created after God in Knowledge, Righteouſneſs, and true Holineſs.* And this is one that is *new made a new kind of Man, according to Chriſtianity.* To be a Chriſtian indeed, is to be thus Chriſtianiz'd in Soul and in Practice; for when we were Chriſtianiz'd, as the Epiſtle of *Barnabas* ſaith, *(t) having received the* (t) *P.* 245.
Remiſſion of Sins, and hoping in the Name of the Lord, ἐγενόμεθα καινοὶ, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι, *we became new, being again created from a new Beginning, (u) Per Dei indulgentiam recreati ſpiritaliter* (u) *S. Cypr. de Orat. d min.*
& renati, Created again ſpiritually, and renew'd by the Mercy of God. If Men are Chriſtianiz'd, the new Creation is executively introduc'd, and conſequently they are new Creatures. *(w) And if any one be in Chriſt a new* (w) *Clem. Str. l.* 3. *p. m.* 329.
Creature, οὐκ ἔτι ἁμαρτητική, *he is no more of the ſinning Trade*, (or the ſinning kind) *Old Things are paſt away. We have put off the old Life, behold all things are become new. Chaſtity from Fornication, Continence from Incontinence, Juſtice from Injuſtice. (x) It is a new Creature that is in Chriſt,* (x) *Idem ibid. l.* 5. *p. m.* 409.
which is, ἀφιλόνεικος ϗ ἀπλεονέκτητος ϗ ἰσότης δικαία, *devoid of Contention and Avarice, and is a juſt Equality.*

To be in Chriſt, is to be *in Chriſtianiſm of Religion and Condition*, (not in Naturaliſm and Unregeneracy) and nothing is ſo, but to be a new Creature. *For in Chriſt Jeſus neither Cir-* *Gal.* 5. 15
cumciſion availeth any thing, nor Uncircumciſion, but a new Creature. To be of the new and Chriſtian Creation, of the new and Chriſtian Birth, of the Chriſtian Family, of the Chriſtian State and Life, to belong to Chriſt (to conſort and ſymbolize with him, and be of his Affinity and Cognation) and to the new and Chriſtian Settlement of Things; to Chriſtianize in the main, and ſo as is eſſential to the true and legitimate People of Chriſt; to be of Kind and Quality Chriſtian (a Chriſtian kind of Believer, Liver, Lover, Worſhipper) *is to be a new Creature.* Yet in a mutilate and partial Senſe, ſome are ſaid to be in Chriſt, that are not new Creatures, *Joh.* 15. 2. They are ſo far his Intrinſicks, as to be his Subjects and Servants in a Political State and Relation, but not in a Senſe of Alliance and Friendſhip, they are not in the main in Chriſtianiſm of Religion and Condition, but are Aliens and extraneous (*Chriſtiani ſine Chriſto*)

they are ſo in Chriſt, as in the main not to be in Chriſt. (y) *For they are no Chriſtians, who profeſs to own Chriſt, but live not according to his Precepts.* (z) *We do not call him a Muſician* (ſaith the Philoſopher) *that doth not ſing well, nor him a Carpenter, that doth not uſe his Hatchet well; nor ought we to call him a Philoſopher, that doth not live according to his Profeſſion and Inſtitution.* (a) All Men ſhould call themſelves by that Name, which denoteth what they are in Fact, and not call themſelves *Stoicks*, when they are in Fact *Epicureans. As we call that the Statue of* Phidias, *which is formed according to the Art of* Phidias: *So he is a* Stoick, *that is formed according to that Inſtitution.* And ſo they only are of Kind and Quality Chriſtian, that are form'd into new Creatures; and they that are form'd into new Creatures, are no further Chriſtian, than they are form'd according to their Inſtitution. (b) *Why doſt thou deceive us, and being but a Vermin calleſt thy ſelf a Man?* Being but a Caytiff, calleſt thy ſelf a Nobleman? (c) Ἄπιθι τ᾽ ὄνομα μετὰ τοῦ γένους. *if you be of another kind, take to your ſelf another Name. Call not your ſelf a* Greek, *when you are in Qualities and Properties a* Mede *and* Perſian. (d) *All may bear Names according to their Profeſſions*, but uſually they do it as inconſiſtently, as a cowardly Dog is called *Lion*, the Furies are called *Eumenides*, the Blind are called Seers, and a dull Fellow was called *Noetus* (as *Epiphanius* ſaith:) So a vaſt numerous Rabble call themſelves Chriſtians and Chriſtian Religioniſts, that as to the being really what thoſe Names ſignifie, are no ſuch Men. Their true Character is, *They are Chriſtians no Chriſtians, worſe than none.* Yet ſome diſpute, *That theſe are the Members of Chriſt's Body and Spouſe, becauſe they are in Covenant with him as his Subjects and Diſciples.* But this proveth no more, than that they are in a Political State and Relation of his Subjects and Servants, without being his Subjects and Diſciples, as thoſe Names are Names of Alliance and friendly Relation. In the Body of Chriſt, as it is a Polity, none but the faithful Covenanters can be ſaid to be his Members (his Citizens, the Members of his holy City) the reſt are Citizens, in the main no Citizens (being devoid of the Virtue and Duty of Members) worſe than none. (e) *Can we conceive the City of God to be inhabited by Devils? Or is it poſſible, Chriſt's Members ſhould be thrown into Hell?* Cives non Cives, *Such Members of Chriſt's Church they are, as Traitors are of a Commonwealth, as* Catiline *and* Cethegus *were at* Rome. In Chriſt's Body, as it is a vital Body, a dead Member is neceſſarily a Member no Member; for Naturaliſts ſay, that is not the part of a Man which is not animated, and fit to do its Office and Function. If the Eye hath loſt its Sight (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) it is no more an Eye, unleſs Equivocally, as an Eye of Stone, or a painted Eye. It is a monſtrous Paradox to ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt to be conſtituted by the Limbs of Satan, and to call them, *Bone of his Bone, and Fleſh of his Fleſh*; which is to ſuppoſe them to be originated from him, and moſt nearly and intimately ally'd unto him. Such an Hypotheſis is not likely to make the Church viſible, unleſs Darkneſs and Wickedneſs maketh her viſible, which can make no Society viſible, ſave only the Kingdom of Darkneſs. But the Church is viſible by the viſible Chriſtianity of viſible Chriſtians. And as they that ſuppoſe all true Chriſtians to be inviſible (as to their being ſuch) do not mean, that there are no viſible Chriſtians: So they that ſuppoſe all true Members of the Church to be inviſible (as to their being ſuch) do not deny that there are viſible Members of the Church. And theſe viſible Chriſtians and viſible Members of the Church (which are, as to us, true Chriſtians, and true Members of the Church) conſtitute the viſible Church.

V. The Chriſtian's new Creation is a great thing, and a mighty Change in the Univerſe and of Man. For as it is the new Creation conſtitutively made, it is a great Change in the Univerſe; and, as it is the new Creation executively introduced, it is a great Change of ſinful Man. If it was not ſo great a Change, it would not be a Creation in that ſublime Senſe of Scripture, (f) wherein *creare* ſignifieth *magnificè aliquid efficere*, the making of ſomething new and wonderful. *Numb.* 16. 30. Creation properly denoteth ſuch Operation, which is Creature tranſcendent Agency (Agency proper to the Creator, which is ſupernatural and miraculous;) the new Creation therefore muſt be ſomething eximious and magnificent at a great rate. And it muſt be of great Amplitude and Magnificence, as being a Creation contradiſtinguiſh'd to the old Creation, analogous to it, and (in ſeveral reſpects) tranſcending it. And not only tranſcending the old Creation, but all other new Creations (ſo called in Prophetick Scripture, *Iſa.* 65. 17. 2 *Pet.* 3. 13. *Apoc.* 21. 1.) for the moſt eminent new Creation of Things poſſible or conceivable, was the founding the Chriſtian Church and Religion at the Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, when the Kingdom of God, and the Settlement of all things appertaining to it, the Terms of Life and Death; the Worſhip, Service and People of God, were changed from old to new; the unchangeable God himſelf as the Deity of a Religion and Government, and as to his Diſpenſation of things, became a new Deity to us; a new Entrance into Heaven was open'd by a ſaving Religion for Sinners; Sin, Satan, Death and the Law were vanquiſh'd, and *all old things* (jurally) *paſt away*. Which ſtupendous Mutation of all things (g) was probably ſignified by the Earthquake and Eclipſe, that ſtupendous Mutation that was in Nature at our Saviour's Paſſion. *Job* 18. 4. *Shall the Earth be forſaken for thee? And ſhall the Rock be removed out of his Place?* Theſe are great Things (*magnalia Dei*) but far greater Things than theſe were done for us, when the new Creation of all Things was conſtitutively made. The Name of it, *A new Creation*, is enough to ſhame and baffle the little ſhrimpiſh Apprehenſions that Men are apt to have of the Undertaking of Chriſt, as if he came only (like a Perſon of little Deſigns) to die for the Elect, and to fulfil all Righteouſneſs for them; or (as ſome ſay) only to be a Teacher and a Lawgiver, an Example of an holy Life, and a Pattern of Patience in his Death, whereby he confirm'd the Truth of his Doctrine. Which Hypotheſis maketh him a Martyr, but not the Meſſiah; for the Meſſiah he could not be, unleſs he was by Officiary Dignity the holy Imperial Son of God, whoſe honourary Undertaking was the new making and founding the holy Empire (agreeably to the firſt Rank of Sovereign Honours, *Fundatores Imperii*) *by the new Creation of all Things as conſtitutively made.* This is the firſt and ſovereign Grandity of the new Creation, and the ſecond is like unto it, *viz. The new Creation as*

(y) Grot. *Not. in Matth.* 7. 21. *Gat. Not. in Ant.* p. 36. 356.

(z) *Ep Ct. Diſſ. l.* 4. c. 8.

(a) *Ibid. l.* 2. c. 19.

(b) *Ibid. l.* 3. c. 26. p. 369.

(c) *M. Tyr. Diſſ.* 34.

(d) *Tertull. ad Nation. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

(e) *Mr.* Farindon *Ser.* 2. *on Matth.* 22. 11, 12.

(f) *Voſſ. Theſ. Theol.* p. 3.

(g) *The reſt of our Creation our great Redeemer did remove with the ſame ſhake, which at his Paſſion did the Earth, and all things with it move.* Mr. Herbert's *Poems*, Sunday.

executively introduced, that is nothing leſs than the making a new World of new and divine kind of Creatures, which ſpeaketh it a Work of vaſt Amplitude and Magnificence, and which in all the Parts of it, is *a great Thing*, *a great Change*, *and a Buſineſs of Creature-tranſcendent Agency*. For,

(1.) Such it is to be a new Creature (new created) in reſpect of the outward Man, as *Sylla* in *Lycophron* is ſaid, ἀνακτισθῆναι, *to be created again by the Fire*, and to be made immortal. Amongſt the *Arabians*, the *Koreiſchites* (who deny'd the Reſurrection) objected, (*h*) *How ſhall we that are Bones and Duſt be raiſed into* חליקא גרירא, *a new Creature* (to be a new Creature in reſpect of the outward Man, a glorious immortal Creature?) And if to be new and divine kind of Creatures in reſpect of the outward man, is a great Thing, a great Change, and a Buſineſs of Creature-tranſcendent Agency, It muſt be nothing leſs than ſo, to be a new and divine kind of Creature, in reſpect of the inward man. For both are a Reſurrection from the Dead, and a Reſurrection unto Life; the one conſiſteth in having a lucid, heavenly and divine Body, the other in having a lucid, heavenly and divine Soul; Grace is Glory begun, and Glory is Grace conſummate; they differ but gradually (as a Man and a Child) as the Schools ſay. A Reſurrection to an holy ſpiritual Life is analogous to, and of great Affinity with the Reſurrection to a glorious immortal Life, and is an Inchoation thereof. *For he that hath wrought us for the ſelf-ſame thing is God*, 2 Cor. 5. 5. (*i*) *It is not Nature, but God, who* (by his Creature-tranſcendent Agency) *hath made us unto this very thing, to put on an Houſe from Heaven, to have a glorious Body*. (k) *By the Words* hath wrought, *the Apoſtle expreſſeth the Efficacy of Grace, whereby we, who were Aliens from an Heavenly Life, are made meet for Immortality. Whence we are ſaid, to be God's Building, and Creation, and Workmanſhip*.

(2.) Such is the Change that this new Creation is in the ſtate of vile ungodly Sinners, and ſuch are the mighty Benefits and Privileges which they enjoy. For upon their ſerious Converſion to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, they are in the ſtate of Nearneſs, Alliance and Acceptance, of Safety and Impunity, of Honour and Freedom, of Righteouſneſs and Bleſſedneſs, of Sonſhip and Inheritance; they emerge out of the oppoſite State, (*l*) and *Vaſa iræ*, the Veſſels of Wrath, become *Vaſa miſericordiæ*, the Veſſels of Mercy. By entring into Federal Society with God He becometh unto them a God, and they become unto Him a People (the People of his Holineſs) conſecrate, elect and peculiar, his ſpiritual Temple and holy Habitation, *as God hath ſaid, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People*, 2 Cor. 6. 16. They are not only pardon'd at the rate that human Governours ordinarily pardon penitent Criminals, that in ſome ſort pardon them yet do not receive them into Favour: But the Converts to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs are made Favourites, they are intereſs'd in the ſpecial ſaving Love of God (the ſame Love wherein Chriſt is inſtated, *Joh*. 17. 23.) in all the Divine Promiſes, and in all the vaſt Immunities, Rights and Privileges of his People. They are unſordified, dignified, ennobled, (that were before vile execrable Varlets, *ſine re, ſine ſpe*, without Inheritance, and without Hope) and are not only made the Servants of God (although a dutiful Servant, is *humilis amicus*, a lower ſort of Friend, as the Philoſopher ſaith;) but God is ſo kind to them, as to give them the neareſt and greateſt Degree of Kindred, to make them his Sons and Heirs, and Chriſt is not aſhamed to call them Brethren. (*m*) *It is not only that we may live, that the Grace of God is given, that Sin is taken away, and the Puniſhment is taken away with it; but that we may be made the Sons of God, the Coheirs of Chriſt, and Heirs of the Father*. They that were without Chriſt, are made the living Members of Chriſt; *are joined to the Lord, and are one Spirit*, derive Juice and Sap from him, as Branches from the Vine, and Life and Spirit, as Members from the Head; they have Communion with him in his divine Unction (*n*) in his Divine Offices (of Prophet, Prieſt and King,) in his Ignominy alſo, his Thorns and his Croſs, and ſhall have Communion with him in his Glory. (*o*) The Emperor *Tiberius* caſt *Herod Agrippa* into Priſon, and bound him with Chains: But afterwards *Cajus Caligula* (when he came to be Emperor) cauſed him to change his Garments, and to cut his Hair, placed a Crown upon his Head, and made him Tetrarch of *Iturea* and *Trachonitis*, and Governour of *Judea*, and inſtead of an Iron Chain he gave him a Chain of Gold, of equal weight with the Iron Chain. When this was done (ſaith the Hiſtorian) Men were ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ τῶν γεγονότων, *in Incredulity of theſe Occurrences*, they could not believe ſo great and marvellous a Change; which yet was but a trifling Mutation, in compariſon of that important Change that is made in the Condition of the Slaves of Sin, when in their new Creation they are releas'd from their ſpiritual Thraldom, the Priſon of Sin, the Dungeon of Hell, the Chains of their Luſts, of Darkneſs and eternal Death, are totally unſerviliz'd and unenſlav'd (as to Religion) cloath'd with the white Raiment, raiſed to be of regial, reigning Condition (their Head is deſign'd for a Diadem, as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh) and their Names are in the Book of Life.

(3.) Such is the Change which this new Creation is in the Nature of vile ungodly Sinners; for becoming Converts to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, both in their State and in their Nature, *they paſs from Death unto Life*. (*p*) *Thoſe that were dead, and ſuch as were no Partakers of the true Life, hearing the Word*, ἀνεβίωσαν, *lived again, as thoſe that are alive from the Dead*. Such is the Chriſtians new Creation, which the Apoſtle often expreſſeth by *being quickened* (or made alive;) for both the old and the new Creation is the making living Creatures. *Eph*. 2. 1. *And you hath he quickened, who were dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins*. V. 5. *Even when we were dead in Sins, hath quickened us together with Chriſt*. Col. 2. 13. *And you being dead in your Sins, and the Uncircumciſion of your Fleſh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all Treſpaſſes*. God in quickening Chriſt, made a Donation of the State of Life (the State of Remiſſion of Sins) to his Believers; ſuch a Vivification they have (together with Chriſt) in reſpect of their State; but they have alſo, in conſort with Chriſt, a Vivification in reſpect of their Nature; for they are made alive (from the dead) ſo as to have and live a new and ſpiritual Life. The Chriſtian

(h) *Hotting. Hiſt. or. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *ed.* 1.

(i) *Non natura, ſed Deus eſt, qui effecit nos ad hoc ipſum, ſcilicet ad induendum ſeu ſuperinduendum domicilium Cœleſte, ad habendum corpus glorioſum* Cajetan. in loc.

(k) *Camero in loc.*

(l) *Gregor. Mag. Pſal.* 101. *v* 11.

(m) Οὐ μόνον ἵνα ζήσωμεν, ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, ϗ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνῃρέθη, ϗ ἡ κόλασις συναναιρέθη ἀλλ' ἵνα ϗ υἱοὶ θεοῦ γινώμεθα ϗ συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ ϗ κληρονόμοι πατρός *Oecumen. ap. Chamier. Panſtrat. T.* 3. *l.* 21. *c.* 2.

(n) *S. Chryſoſt. in Cor. Hom.* 3. *in fine.*

(o) *Joſeph Antiqu. l.* 18. *c.* 18

(p) *Clem.* παιδαγ. p. 3.

Religioniſts alſo proteſs *riſing*, and being *riſen* with Chriſt (whence the Apoſtle exhorteth them to *ſeek the things above*, and to *walk in newneſs of Life*) in their Baptiſm ritually and by their undertaking, they are riſen with him (by being his Believers, which is *the Faith of the Operation of God*, Col. 2. 12.) and if they are his genuine Believers, they are riſen with him into a new and divine State (given them at his Reſurrection) and alſo in reſpect of their Nature, they are are ſo riſen with him, that they are Chriſtianly alive, and live ſpiritually and divinely. They are born of the Spirit, which is Life, and are of a Religion, which is the Diſpenſation of Life, and whereby the Soul recovereth her Life; the old natural Man ſpringeth again, and the withered Branches of old *Adam* being tranſplanted, ſprout and flouriſh. (q) *The Soul, grown old in the old Age of Sin, is made new,* ὡσανεὶ ἀνακτισθεῖσα πάλιν, *being as it were created again.* (r) *She regaineth* (by this renewing Religion) *her ancient Pulchritude, which is her Deiformity.* And as the Ancients call the Son of God, (s) ἔμψυχον θεῖον εἰκόνα, *The living Image of God,* ſuch the Soul becometh by her new Creation. *Origen* thus deſcants upon the Pſalmiſt's Prayer, *Create in me a clean Heart.* (t) *Our* προαίρεσις, *Purpoſe and Endeavour is not ſufficient for us to have our Heart altogether clean, but we need God to create it ſuch.* Such a new Creation is (as it were) *a new Heaven, and a new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteouſneſs.* (u) *For from a clean Heart evil Cogitations do not iſſue any more, nor Murders, nor Adulteries, nor Fornications, nor Thefts, nor falſe Witneſs, nor Blaſphemies, nor an evil Eye, nor any other of the filthy things,* (w) *purgatio animæ,* (which the Philoſophers were inquiſitive about) is a principal Deſign in this new Creation, which is not meerly a cleanſing Souls from their vicious Qualities, but an implanting in them the Divine Vertues; Nature is changed (which is extremely difficult) and they have in Chriſt a new Nature, together with the Inhabitation of a Divine Spirit, whereby they are guided and animated, ſtrengthen'd and comforted, and raiſed to an holy Magnanimity. (x) *For they that receive the Word preach'd with Power, are filled with Power, which they ſhew in their Diſpoſition and Life, being prepar'd to ſtrive for the Truth unto the Death.*

(4.) Such is the Change which this new Creation is in the Converſation of ungodly Sinners. (y) *We that formerly took pleaſure in Fornications, now embrace Chaſtity only: We that did uſe Magick-Arts, have conſecrated our ſelves unto God: We that loved our Money and Poſſeſſions above all things, now bring what we have into a common Collection, and communicate to every one that needeth: We that hated and killed one another, and would not live with them that were not of our own Tribe, have now, ſince the Appearance of Chriſt, Familiarity with them, praying for our Enemies, and endeavouring to perſwade thoſe who unjuſtly hate us, to be of good Hope, that living according to the excellent Precepts of Chriſt, they will obtain the ſame things with us from God, the Lord of all.* (z) So great a Mutation of things there was in the primitive Times, and ſo God changed them that were of the Satanical Brood, introducing (a) καινὴν καὶ οὐρανίαν πολιτείαν, *a new and Heavenly Converſation*, of unlikeneſs to the World, of depreciating and diſaffecting the World (its Treaſures and Pleaſures, Proſperities and Preferments) of reſtraining and ſubduing ſenſitive Nature, of warring the good Warfare (for Victory and a Crown) of departing from all Iniquity (not living in the habitual practice of any Sin, nor doing any Act of heinous Sin) and doing all good Works (as there is Ability and Opportunity;) ſo bringing forth Fruit unto God, and gathering Fruit unto Life eternal. Such is the Converſation of the ſerious Converts to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, and ſuch is their Change and Amendment of Life. Thoſe Eyes that were before full of Adultery, are now turn'd away from beholding Vanity; and thoſe Hands which were before employ'd in wanton Touches and Dalliances, or in lifting up Cups of ſtrong Drink, are now lifted up in Prayer. He that before was a Swearer, now feareth an Oath; and he that before ſpake Blaſphemy and Profaneneſs, now ſpeaketh Holineſs and Godlineſs. He that before could not endure the Strictneſs of the Divine Laws, now couneth Piety his reaſonable Service, and all things Vanity, but Piety.

(5.) Such is the Change which this new Creation is in the Politick Capacity of ungodly Sinners. For Strangers and Foreigners, and ſuch as were of the Kingdom of Darkneſs, upon their ſerious Converſion to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, are made Citizens of the Kingdom of God, and of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*, (the City of God and his Saints) and Collegues with the holy Angels. The holy Angels above, and all the Saints of God of all Times and Places, are the Liege-People of God and Chriſt (the People of the holy League) and are link'd and combin'd as Fellow-Subjects and Fellow-Citizens into one holy City and Commonwealth. But Mankind are revolted from being the Subjects of the Kingdom of God, in their Unregeneracy they are Aliens (as in every Kingdom and Commonwealth, he that is not a Citizen and a Deniſon is an Alien) they have no Freedoms, nor any Rights or Privileges there. (b) *For not any one that mindeth the Things of the Fleſh can be found* ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μεγάλῃ πόλει, *in this great City.* The Sons of Carnality and Wickedneſs are ſuch as belong to another Kingdom: But upon their Entrance into Chriſtianity and Godlineſs, they are creatively made Citizens of the ſupernal City, which is their new Creation, and a great Change. (c) *Magnum Beneficium, ut de ſervitute Diaboli tranſlati ſimus in regnum Filii,* A great Benefit it is, to be tranſlated from the Servitude of Satan into the Kingdom of the Son of God. Of regenerate Chriſtians there is great Reaſon to ſay, ἐξ οἵων εἰς οἷα, *From what heavy things, to what high and holy things are they raiſed!* And it appeareth from this Account of their new Creation, that (as St. *Hierom* ſaith) *Grande eſt eſſe Chriſtianum,* It is a great thing to be a Chriſtian. Which as it importeth a Change from being old, to be made new; from being far off, to be made nigh; from living in Sin to dying unto Sin: So from being *vile Earth and miſerable Sinners*, to be Cœleſtial Citizens.

VI. The new Creation, as it is the Chriſtian Religion executively introduced, is a Threefold Evidence of our Saviour's Divinity, and the Truth of his Meſſias-ſhip. For if we conſider the new creative Character of his Religion, the prevalent Introduction of it into the World, and the new creative Virtue and Efficacy that is in it (atteſted by Obſervation and Experience) each one of theſe Conſiderations is of great weight to aſſure us, that Jeſus

is

Col. 3. 1.
Rom. 6. 4.

(q) *St. Chryſoſt in Gal.* 6. 15.

(r) *S. Cyr. in Eſai. l.* 4. p. 563.

(s) *Valeſ. Diſſ.* 2. *in loc. quæd. Conc. Nic.*

(t) *C. Celſ. l.* 7. p. 354.

(u) *Ibid.*

(w) *S. Aug. de C. D. l.* 10. c 32.

(x) *Orig. ſupr. l.* 1. p. 49.

(y) *J. Mart. Apol. l.* 2. p. 61.

(z) Ὅση πραγμάτων γέγονε μεταβολὴ, καὶ πῶς ἅπαντα μετεῤῥύθμισε, καὶ ἀπὸ δαιμόνων ἀγγέλους τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰργάσατο; *S. Chryſoſt. c. Judæos, or.* 4.

(a) *Idem in Gal.* 6. 15.

(b) *S. Athanaſ. in illud profect. in peregrin.* p. 778 *Com.*

(c) *Cajetan. in Col.* 1. 13.

is the true Meſſias, and his Religion is of God.

(1.) The creative Character of his Religion is of Affinity with an ancient Opinion among the *Rabbins*, touching *the Renovation of the material World in the Days of the Meſſiah*. A Party amongſt them there hath been, that have oppoſed this ancient Opinion, and have affirm'd, (d) *That between the preſent ſtate of the World and the times of the Meſſiah there is no Difference, but only the Bondage under the Kingdoms of the Gentiles, or the Subjugation of thoſe Kingdoms*; *That there will be no Mutation in Nature, nothing new in the Works of the Creation.* This was the Opinion of the famous *Maimonides* (whoſe Maxim was, *Quod mundus retinet & ſequitur conſuetudinem ſuam:*) But he is oppoſed by ſeveral other *Rabbins*, who diſpute for the Renovation of the material World (the more refin'd State of it) which, according to the ancient Opinion, muſt commence with the Days of the Meſſiah. But touching the Days of the Meſſiah, there is great Diverſity of Opinion among theſe *Hebrew* Doctors. (e) For the more ancient *Rabbins* expected, that their Meſſiah would ſuddenly appear (with whoſe coming their Reduction from Captivity, the Re-edification of their City and Temple, and the Subjugation of the World are connex'd) and that his Coming would be long before the End of the World. But becauſe of the long Delay of his Coming, the modern *Rabbins* have entertain'd another Opinion; for they ſuppoſe, that his Coming will not be till the Reſurrection, and the End of the World; by which End of the World they do not mean the Deſtruction, but the Renovation of it. Theſe modern *Rabbins* therefore ſo far agree with the ancient Opinion, they connect with the Coming of the Meſſiah, *the Renovation of the World* (a new World:) and this their Opinion touching the Renovation of the World they ground upon ancient Prophecy, which predicteth *new Heavens and a new Earth*. By the renovation of the World therefore, they mean that which ancient Prophecy calleth, *The new Creation*; which new Creation (with great Reaſon) they connect with the Coming of the Meſſiah, and conſequently they ſuppoſe, *That at the Coming of the Meſſiah there muſt be a new Creation and a new World.* From which Character of the Meſſiah it appeareth, that the Chriſtian Meſſiah is the true Meſſiah; for his Religion is a new Creation, his Church and Kingdom is a new World, and his Renovation of the World is the Genuine, Legitimate and Saving; whereas the *Rabbins* dream only of a Renovation of the material World. The many Predictions, Promiſes, Types and mighty Expectations of the Meſſiah, and the promiſed Salvation by him (together with the Reaſon of the thing) plainly demonſtrate, that his coming cannot be deferr'd till the End of the World. This Rabinical Suppoſition ſpeaketh the deſperate Obſtinacy and Deliration of the *Jews*, and that they are quite out of Hopes of ſeeing their (formerly) long expected Meſſiah. The firſt Coming of the Meſſiah muſt be long before the End of the World (as the ancient *Rabbins* ſuppoſed) therefore he is already come. And ſeeing a new Creation is connex'd with his Coming, this new Creation (that muſt be long before the End of the World) cannot be the End of the World, nor any thing elſe imaginable, but (agreeably to the ſpiritual Nature of the Kingdom of the Meſſiah) the Chriſtians new Creation.

(d) *Mr. Mede on 2 Pet. 3. 1, 2, &c. L'Emper. Col. Med. præfat.*

(e) *Hulſ. Theol. Jud. p. 175. Hoornbeek, c. Jud. l. 2. c. 1. & l. 5. c. 6.*

(2.) The prevalent Introduction of the Chriſtian Religion (or the new Creation) into the World, proveth the Truth of it, and the Divinity of its Original. For it came into the World naked and unaſſiſted by any ſecular Learning, or any Hman Power, expoſed to all manner of Force and Violence, could not be convicted of Falſhood, nor born down by Power. It had not prevail'd in the World, if the *Jews*, who were infinitely concern'd to do it, and eagerly intent upon it, could have diſcover'd any Fraud in it (which they might eaſily have done, if there had been any;) or if the penal Laws of Heathen States and Princes, and their direful Executions, could have ſuppreſs'd it; or if all the Machinations of Earth and Hell (for none of theſe were wanting) could have put a ſtop to the Progreſs of it. It ſeem'd not at the Riſe of it a Religion likely to prevail in the World; for Men were apt to be ſtumbled at the Difficulties of Faith that are in it (as to the *Jews* it ſeem'd abſurd, that this Man ſhould give us his Fleſh to eat) at the Plainneſs and Simplicity of the Chriſtian Worſhip (which is not, like the Judaical and Pagan, a ſtately Mode of God-Service) at the Severity of Chriſt's Precepts, and the Chriſtians Portion in this World (the hard things which he requireth of us, and bringeth upon us;) and more-eſpecially they were apt to be ſtumbled at the external Meanneſs of Chriſt's Perſon, a Meſſiah of ſuch a Guiſe ſeem'd contemptible and odious in their Eyes. He recommended not himſelf by any thing that is plauſible to Fleſh and Blood; he brought his Followers no ſecular Advantages, but great Diſadvantages, (for to be a Chriſtian, was to give up a man's ſelf to Scorn and Deriſion, his Eſtate to Rapine, and his Body to Racks and Flames;) his Religion was oppoſite to the World (to what the World lik'd and lov'd, and counted their Happineſs, to their Life, their Laws, their Cuſtoms, their Philoſophy, their ſacred admir'd things of Religion) and the World was as oppoſite to his Religion. No Impoſtor would attempt to introduce ſuch a Religion, not at all ſuited to the mundane Genius, nor any Worldly Deſign, and which was far more likely to enrage the World (as it did effectually) than to gain Entertainment in the World. They that introduced it were, in all reſpects, poor and mean perſons, not likely of their own heads to contrive this new Religion, not likely to baffle all the Wit, and Learning, and Power, and ancient Religion of the World; not likely of themſelves to undertake ſo great an Atchievement (againſt the mightieſt Impediments) as to make a new World of Converts. But by their Teſtimony the World was induced to entertain it; for they were perſons not to be ſuſpected, that with great Zeal, Diligence and Confidence, as Eye-witneſſes, teſtified matters of fact, of which they had full aſſurance by their Senſes. They were perſons not to be ſuſpected of any thing, that might invalidate their Teſtimony; for they were manifeſtly perſons of ſound Underſtanding, not ſo fooliſh as to be impoſed upon themſelves by palpable Deceits, nor ſo mad and extravagant, as to go about to alarm the World for nothing, and worſe than nothing; to undergo all manner of Hardſhips and Contumelies, only to make themſelves miſerable, or to abuſe others and miſchief themſelves to no end. They were men of common Honeſty, and more than ſuch, not liable to the ſuſpicion of horrible Impiety, that might

V. S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 7. in 1 Cor.

render them liable to be ſuſpected of Impoſture; for as their Religion is utterly oppoſite to all Evil, ſo they are not chargeable with any Wickedneſs in their Lives. They could not be ſuſpected of any worldly Deſign in teſtifying to this new Religion, for they got nothing in the World by it, but loſt their earthly All, (their Livelihood and their Life) by it, which they might have ſav'd, if they would have been ſilent and have ſaid nothing of it. They muſt be ſtrangely in love with Priſons and Contumelies, and a Deluge of Sufferings, if theſe could induce them to go about the World to tell a known Lie. Nothing therefore but their great aſſurance of the Truth of their Teſtimony, nothing but the Senſe of their Duty and Hope of eternal Rewards, nothing but their Deſire of the Converſion and Salvation of Men, could prevail with them ſedulouſly and induſtriouſly to preach Chriſt throughout the World, and to expoſe themſelves to all manner of Hardſhips, and to Death for his ſake. No Man of Senſe can doubt but that in their Hearts and Souls they were the fervent Lovers of Chriſt, and therefore thought themſelves abundantly aſſur'd of the Truth of their Teſtimony concerning him. They were invincible and immovable in their Belief of it, no Threats nor Perſecutions could ſhake their Steddineſs and Conſtancy, they would ſuffer for it and die for it. They publiſh'd their Teſtimony of Chriſt on the wide Theater of the World, in the Face of his Murderers, in the moſt publick Places and greateſt Cities, (where the moſt inquiſitive Men were) and dar'd all the World to diſprove their Teſtimony, or to diſcover any Flaw in it. Which irrefutable and uncontrollable Teſtimony of the Apoſtolick Planters of the Goſpel is a great aſſurance of the Truth of it, and muſt neceſſarily ſignify conſiderably towards the gaining the World to Chriſtianity. But ſuch a Cauſe had been extremely inſufficient to produce ſo great an Effect (to prevail with Men to forſake their Forefathers, the Religion wherein they had been educated, to contemn their ancient Wiſdom and Virtue, and to make ſo great a Change, as to embrace Chriſtianity with all its Hardſhips and Incumbrances) if the interior Operations of the Grace of God upon the Souls of Men had not accompany'd the Apoſtle's Preaching, if God had not endow'd the Apoſtles with ſupernatural Graces (a marvellous irreſiſtible Wiſdom and Power of Speech, an unconquerable Fortitude, an admirable Patience, Meekneſs and Humility, with all other Graces which ſhone in the Converſation of theſe divine Men, and ſhew'd them to be Men of God;) and if God had not born Witneſs to theſe Witneſſes of Chriſt by plain and evident, numerous and uncontrollable Miracles. (*f*) *For the Men illiterate and poor, and indigent and abject, had not overcome the World, if they had not been aſſiſted by Miracles.* (*g*) *Without Powers and Miracles they had not moved the hearers of new Diſcourſes and new Doctrines to relinquiſh their Forefathers Inſtitutes, and to embrace with Dangers and unto the Death their Doctrines.*

(3.) The new creative Virtue and Efficacy that is in this new creative Religion, (atteſted by Obſervation and Experience) proveth the Truth of it and the Divinity of its Original. For when by the Preaching of the Apoſtles it was introduc'd into the World, it made a marvellous Alteration in Men for the better, they were chang'd by it (*h*) *from their old Converſation, their Laſciviouſneſſes, Injuſtices, and inordinate Luſts, to an eximious Purity and the love of it, which he that conſidereth will ſee, that Jeſus attempted what is above human Nature, and what he attempted he hath performed. Philoſophy reclaim'd one* Phædon *and one* Polemo, *but by Jeſus Multitudes become* σωφρόνων χορὸς, *the Chorus of the Soberiz'd, that ſay of their former Life, we were ſometimes fooliſh, diſobedient, deceiv'd.* (*i*) *Do we not deſervedly admire the Power of the Word, that like an Incantation impelleth People by Multitudes to a well compoſed Life from a looſe, to a good from being unjuſt, and from being timid to ſuch firmitude of Mind, as to contemn Death for Piety? The Perſuaſiveneſs of their Word that firſt labour'd in conſtituting the Churches is not like that of* Plato *or other Philoſophers, that have nothing more than human Nature, but their Word ran very ſwiftly, or rather that of God by their Miniſtry, changing Multitudes that were by Nature and Cuſtom addicted to Sin, ſo as no Puniſhments of Men could change them, but his Word changed them, forming and faſhioning them according to his Will.* Miracles of Grace were uſual in the Primitive Times, and theſe prov'd that a divine Power was the Author of them, as well as thoſe that were wrought in external Matter. Nor is Chriſtianity yet effete, it hath not loſt its new creative Virtue and Efficacy; for although the Chriſtian Church is extremely degenerate, pretending Chriſtians in vaſt Numbers tranſcend the Heathen in Vice and Wickedneſs, and the Miracles of Grace are now greater Rarities than in ancient Times, (*Recedente diſciplina receſſit & gratia, S. Cypr.*) yet at this day there are Multitudes of truly ſanctified and regenerate Chriſtians, who find in themſelves that this Doctrine of Chriſtianity is true, that there is a regenerate and divine Family, and having in themſelves a fore-taſte of the heavenly Felicity, they have as great Reaſon to believe the Reality of it as others have to believe the World's Vanity. They find that there is in Chriſtianity a Spirit of Illumination, whereby their Minds are enlightned (to diſcern the things that differ, and approve the things that are excellent) which ſometimes were ſo blind, that they were the World's Admirers and Lovers, counted the Matters of Chriſtianity and Godlineſs mean, abſurd and fooliſh, thought Sin a ſmall matter, a Life of Senſuality better than an Holy, and ſaw not the Turpitude of their flagitious Practices, nor their tremendous Iſſue. Their Minds were filled with dark heatheniſh Conceits, which are now diſpell'd by that *Light of Life,* which Chriſt hath promiſed to his Followers, and how can I doubt of his Divinity, *ſeeing he hath opened mine Eyes?* They find that there is in Chriſtianity a Spirit of Adoption, which giveth them a ſenſe of the Paternal Love and Favour of God towards them, (whereby they ſerve him with a filial Affection, and are the filial, not the baſe and ſervile kind of Religioniſts;) and they find that there is in it a *Spirit of Life,* for they feel themſelves ſpiritually alive, that were ſometimes dead as to God and the Life of living to him. They find alſo a living Law in themſelves and a new Nature which anſwereth to the written divine Law, and therefore is manifeſtly of a divine Original, and carrieth the Print of a divine Hand. For as the Law of Chriſt enjoyneth them to abhor that which is evil, to love God and Man, and the Children of God with an eſpecial Love, ſo their new Nature hath a deadly Antipathy againſt Sin, and a lively univerſal Charity is the Pulſe and Conſtitution

---

(f) Οὐ γὰρ ἂν τ̃ οἰκουμένης ἐκράτησαν οἱ ἀγράμματοι ϗ πτωχοὶ ϗ πένητες ϗ εὐτελεῖς, εἰ μὴ τ̃ σημείων εἶχον βοήθειαν. S. Chryſoſt. *T.* 6. *p.* 713.

(g) Orig. c. Celſ. l. 1. p. 34.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 21, 50.

(i) *Ibid. l.* 3. *p.* 152.

tution of their Soul. As they are infinitely bound to love their Saviour, ſo the Love of him is their vigorous vital Principle, (and as their Life and their Breath) and for them to deny Chriſt and Chriſtianity is as Death to their inmoſt Life and Nature. They find in themſelves a ſupernatural kind of Spirit, whereby they are inclin'd and inabl'd to live a Life of delightful devotional Converſe with God, of doing Good to Men, to forgive Injuries, to love Enemies, and to deny and vanquiſh their fleſhly Luſts and Appetites, whereby the reſt of the World are carry'd Captive. And as in the Primitive Times Chriſtian Believers had the Holy Spirit with the ſupernatural Gifts of it, whereby their Religion was atteſted to be from God, ſo in all Times they have the Holy Spirit with the ſupernatural Graces of it, which is the like Atteſtation to their Religion; for none can give the Holy Spirit but God only. If any one ſhould ſend forth ſuch a Spirit into all the Brutes in a Country as turneth them all to be rational, and maketh them all to underſtand and diſcourſe like Men, all that ſaw it would acknowledge, that he who can do ſuch a wondrous Work is of God and of divine Power. So the divine Power of the Saviour of Souls muſt be acknowledg'd that doth theſe wondrous Works in the Souls of Men, by his divine Spirit he turneth Sinners into Saints of God, and changeth Souls from the Love of Sin and the World to the Love of God and of Holineſs. Which is as great a Miracle, (being done againſt the greateſt Oppoſition and Impediments) as if one ſhould change all the Brutes in a Country into Rational Creatures. His renewing Souls ſheweth him to be the true Saviour and Phyſician of Souls, for none can do ſuch Works as he doth in the Souls of Believers. *If he was not of God he could do nothing.*

VII. The Chriſtians new Creation is a great Obligation upon them to all Holineſs of Life. The Rabbins ſay, (*k*) *that Water is us'd in purifying a leprous Perſon to admoniſh him to look upon himſelf after that Ablution as in that very Hour created*, (becauſe before the Creation of Man all the World was Water) *and as he is renew'd in his Body to renew his Actions to Good, to rectify his Doings, and attentively obſerve the ways of God.* They ſuppoſe alſo, that the ſhaving the Hair of a leprous perſon is deſign'd to admoniſh him (*l*) *to look upon himſelf as created that day, ſo to renew his Works unto Good on that day when his Hair beginneth to grow.* All are obliged to renew their Works unto Good, but they that are new created are minded of it and more eſpecially oblig'd to it by their new Creation. The Chriſtians new Creation is ſo great a Mercy, ſo high a Favour, and ſo coſtly unto God, that they are infinitely obliged to him for it, and infinitely oblig'd by it to ſerve him in a Life of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs. And as in the old Creation all Creatures are made for ſome Work, ſome End and Uſe, ſo theſe new Creatures are made (in their new Creation) for an Office, Calling and Employment, and are deſign'd for this End and Uſe, to live a Life of doing all good Works. By their new Creation they are qualify'd to do them, and it is the Ordination and Appointment of God that they ſhould walk in them, *Eph.* 2. 10. He that would be at the vaſteſt Coſt and Expence to new create them that they might do the truly good Works ſheweth, that theſe are no Trifles in his Eyes. And as every Man that planteth an Orchard of Trees expecteth to gather Fruit from them, and the great Ones of the World expect no little Service from them that are called ***their Creatures***, (becauſe they have raiſed them) ſo with great Reaſon God enjoyneth his new Plantation of the Trees of Righteouſneſs to bring forth Fruit, and demandeth a great deal of Service from his new Creatures, whom he hath ſaved from being Slaves of Sin and Satan, and made them his Servants, of Caitiffs Kings, of Sons of Perdition the Sons of God. His Servants in State and Relation muſt be his Servants in Fact, doing all the Duty that is eſſentially requiſite in ſuch Servants, ſerving him faithfully, and making it their chief and only Care and Buſineſs to be his Servants, who requireth abundance of Work and Buſineſs to be done by his Servants. *The Citizens of his Kingdom* muſt be the dutiful and loyal Subjects of their divine Sovereign Lord, which they cannot be that are Rebel-Sinners againſt him. *His holy People* muſt live as thoſe that are appropriated and dedicated to him and his Service, and therefore muſt not alienate, prophane or pollute themſelves, nor live to themſelves, but to his Service; and their Behaviour muſt be ſuch as becometh the Profeſſion of Sanctity, *Eph.* 5. 3. (*m*) *We ought to act as the Sons of God, and to have our Converſation as his Temples.* (*n*) *If we are the Sons of God, if we have begun to be his Temples, if having received the Holy Spirit we are alive holily and ſpiritually, if we have lifted up our Eyes from Earth to Heaven, if we have erected our Breaſt (full of God and Chriſt) to the ſupernal and divine things, let us do no other things but thoſe that are worthy of God and Chriſt.* To Chriſtians it is always ſeaſonable to inculcate this Exhortation, *Recedant vetera, nova ſint omnia, corda, voces, opera:* Away with old things, let all things be new, Hearts, Words and Works. They are new Creatures by a Law which obligeth them to become new Creatures, and by that Law they are oblig'd to be God-like in Soul and Practice; for the new Creatures of God are (initially at leaſt) created after the divine Image. But becauſe they are at firſt but initially new Creatures, (*Cœleſtes & ſpirituales eſſe cæpimus,* (*o*) we have begun to be heavenly and ſpiritual) they are oblig'd by that Law to be by degrees more entirely and perfectly new Creatures, (*p*) νέους ἀντὶ παλαιῶν ἀεὶ γίνεσθαι, *of old always to be becoming new.* They may not judaize or heathenize in Religion, Life and Practice, becauſe they are new Creatures according to Chriſtianity. (*q*) μεταπλαττόμεθα γὰρ πρὸς καινότητα ζωῆς εὐαγγελικῆς, *for we are changed into the newneſs of the Evangelical Life.*

(k) *Hottin. de jur. Hebr. Lex* 173. *p.* 250.

(l) *Ibid. Lex* 174.

(m) *S. Cypr. de orat. dom.*

(n) *Idem de Zelo & Liv.*

(o) *S. Cypr. de orat. dom.*

(p) *Gr. Naz. or.* 3. *in fine.*

(q) *S. Cyr. c. Jul. l.* 10. *p.* 346.

CHAP. XIII.

An Introduction to the Contents of this Chapter, wherein our Idea of the Chriſtian Trinity is conſider'd and recommended. 1. *Our Idea of the Trinity is of a good appearance.* 2. *It is ſufficiently intelligible.* 3. *It is of kind and quality Chriſtian.* 4. *It combineth the main Article of Chriſtianity with the main Article of Judaiſm.* 5. *It aſſerteth the ſcriptural Unity of God, which is largely proved.* 6. *It ſuppoſeth that no Trinity is to be admitted which deſtroyeth this Scriptural Unity of God. How far it is deſtroy'd by a Scholaſtic Coeternal Trinity.* 7. *Our Idea of the Trinity ſuppoſeth the Son and the Holy Ghoſt to exiſt in the Unity of God and in the way of his Monothe-iſm.* 8. *The Unity of God as imperial in his new Kingdom is our Idea of the Trinity, which voideth the Anti-Trinitarians Objections.* 9. *Our Idea of the Trinity is a golden Mean between two Extremes, that are two oppoſite extravagant Hypotheſes.* 10. *Our Idea of the Trinity ſheweth ſuch an Unity of Trinity as the Scholaſtic Theology cannot ſhew.* 11. *Our Idea of the Trinity ſheweth, that the Church may for the better change her Hypotheſis of the Trinity and the Myſteries connex'd therewith, and that according to common Prudence ſhe ought ſo to do.*

ALthough the Chriſtian Church is manifeſtly founded upon the Faith of a Trinity in the Godhead, yet from her eldeſt Times ſhe hath had her Anti-Trinitarian Adverſaries, as well as her Trinitarian Adherents, and ſo ſhe continueth to have unto this day. Both Parties have ſtrenuous Arguments on their ſide, which is a certain ſign that they have Truth on their ſide, and the Hypotheſis of both Parties is incumbred with unanſwerable Objections, which is a certain ſign that both Parties are in Error. And the Error on both ſides is momentous, whence both Parties are not without cauſe zealous in their way. For the Anti-Trinitarians are palpably at an hideous rate injurious to the Honour of the only Lord and Saviour, yet they have great reaſon to charge the Trinitarians that they are very injurious to the Honour of the only true God. There is a mixture therefore of Piety and Impiety in both Parties, and there is a mixture alſo of Agreement and Diſagreement amongſt themſelves. For the Anti-Trinitarians have their ſeveral diſagreeing Hypotheſes both touching the Son and the Holy Ghoſt; the Trinitarians have their ſeveral Schemes and Explications of the Trinity; and ſome (Declaimers againſt new Theories) ſecurely deride and ſcorn all Schemes and Explications of it, as being of *Card. Cajetan*'s Mind, *In ſolâ ignorantiâ quietem invenio*, Ignorance affordeth Reſt to the Mind, and freeth from the Anxiety that is in Enquiries after Knowledge. But this beſt Effect of it is accompany'd with innumerable very bad Effects. For Pride (a proud Ignorance) is the Product of it, (r) ἐξ ἀγνοίας τὸ τῆς ἀλαζονείας ἐπιγίνεται πάθημα, *there is a Pride that cometh from Ignorance.* Ordinarily it begetteth a fooliſh and ſinful Confidence, ἡ ἀμάθεια φέρει θράσος, *A Fruit of Ignorance is Confidence.* It begetteth a Contempt of the moſt valuable things. *Omnia quæ neſcit dicit ſpernenda colonus.* And it commonly begetteth a Contempt of the Wiſe and their Wiſdom, as *Jul. Scaliger* obſerveth. *Nullam utique majorem ignaris inſcitia parit voluptatem quàm expeditum faſtidioſumque contemptum.* Ignorance bringeth no greater Pleaſure to the Poſſeſſors of it than an expedite and diſdainful Contempt. Such is the Treatment which new Theories muſt expect (from the ignorant and unwiſe) and which hath been given (amongſt other new Theories) to ſome new Theories of the Trinity, which yet in Subſtance were not new Theories, but the ſame that were in the elder Times of the Church, which upon Examination have not been found genuin and legitimate, nor effectual to cure, but rather to increaſe the Evils of the Church. It was but needful therefore that a truly new Theory of the Trinity ſhould be thought of, and ſuch a Theory which neither violateth Truth nor Goodneſs, neither Philoſophy nor the Science of Sanctity, which is agreeable both to Reaſon and to divine Revelation, ſolveth the Difficulties and Objections of all Parties, and which all the contending Parties may agree in without any great Receſſion from their own Principles. Of this Character is our Idea of the Chriſtian Trinity, and with theſe due Recommendations of it commix'd with ſome needful Explications we will conclude our Theory.

(r) *Theodoret.* θεραπ. *Ser.* 1. *p.* 6.

I. Our Idea of the Trinity of divine Perſons is of a good Appearance and a comely Aſpect, it is not without due Concinnity and Pulchritude, for there is nothing in it manifeſtly abſurd and incongruous, or that may be juſtly called a monſtrous and prodigious Imagination. The Intellect that is the Diſcerner and Judge of Order and Decor, of Regularity and Proportion, can diſcern nothing miſ-ſhapen, nothing of extravagant Conceit, nothing of enormous Apprehenſion, nothing but what is beauteous and graceful in the Aſpect of our Idea of the Trinity, which muſt be contemplated both as it is an Imperial Eſtate (or Sovereignty) and as it is a Nature or Eſſence, and alſo as it is in part unoriginate, and in part originated.

1. *As an imperial Eſtate*, or The divine Regality.

It conſiſteth of

- The imperial Eſtate of God, (the imperial Eſtate of the Kingdom of God) the filial imperial Eſtate of Chriſt, (the filial imperial Eſtate of the new Kingdom of God) and of the Holy Ghoſt the Inſpiration-virtue of this holy Government.
- The political imperial Perſon of the Father, the political imperial Perſon of the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon.
- The Father as the imperial Eſtate of the Godhead the Perſon of the Almighty God, and the Perſon of his Son and his Spirit as his Perſons in and of his Godhead, appertaining to his being God as an imperial Eſtate, the imperial Eſtate of his Government and Kingdom.

2. *As a Nature or Eſſence.*

It is of this Idea.

The one divine Eſſence of God is a Subſtance, that Subſtance is a vital Subſtance and the divine vital Subſtance (or Eſſence) which is vital Sanctity.

The one divine vital Eſſence of God, which is vital Sanctity, is both the vital Sanctity which is *the meerly Conſtitutive*, and the vital Sanctity which is *the Communicative*, (the Holy Ghoſt) the former he is as his conſtitutive Nature, the other eſſentially belongeth to him as to his Place, which alſo belongeth to the Imperial Son as to his Place, but with this difference, he hath it derivatively from God.

So the vital Sanctity which the Imperial Son is as his conſtitutive Nature, is that which the one divine vital Eſſence of God is *derivatively*, (which as this Derivative is the Son's divine vital Eſſence) as to the Father it is vital Sanctity *the Primitive* and his conſtitutive Nature, as to the Son it is vital Sanctity *the Derivative* and his conſtitutive Nature.

That Derivative vital Sanctity which the Imperial Son is as his conſtitutive Nature, and that which belongeth to him as to his Place, is no other than that which the one divine vital Eſſence of God is in the Comprehenſion of it, and conſequently it is that (that vital Sanctity) which is his divine vital Eſſence in the larger Notion and Comprehenſion.

3. *As in part unoriginate in part originated.*

This we ſay of it,

That God was neceſſarily and from Eternity the Imperial Eſtate of God, to whom the Holy Spirit (the Inſpiration-virtue of the Godhead and of the Church) eſſentially belong'd (as to his Place) which therefore is *unoriginate*.

The Imperial Son is originated, as being generatively introduc'd into the Godhead.

We know no Imperial Son but the Perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, (an human-divine Perſon) the Head of the Church and Sovereign of Men and Angels.

God as in Chriſt is the Chriſtian Trinity. For God is the *Father*, Chriſt is the *Son*, God in Chriſt is to him derivatively that vital Sanctity, which is his conſtitutive Nature, and that which belongeth to him as to his Place, which is *the Holy Ghoſt*. My Senſe is, God is ſo in Chriſt that his divine vital Eſſence in reſpect of the vital Sanctity, which it is derivatively, is Chriſt's conſtitutive Eſſence.

Of the Scholaſtic Trinity the Anti-Trinitarians ſay, that at firſt ſight it appeareth monſtrous, contrary to Reaſon and common Senſe. But in our Chriſtian Trinity, or the Chriſtian Godhead, *(Si non me fallat imago)* there is nothing that is not agreeable and elegant, regular and orderly, the whole of it is a beauteous Idea.

II. The Myſtery of the Trinity according to our Idea is *clearly intelligible*, ſo far as is needful and as it ought to be. It ought to be intelligible in the ſame degree with our *Creed*, (for the Doctrine of the Trinity contained in the Form of Baptiſm is our moſt ancient Creed) and no Man will endure to have his Creed counted unintelligible, for every intelligent Believer underſtandeth both what he believeth and why he believeth it. And although the Matters of his Faith are incumbred with Difficulties, (as almoſt all things are) yet he hath an intelligible Notion of them, and can intelligibly notice them unto others, whom he is bound to inſtruct. The Doctrine of the Trinity therefore can be no Creed, unleſs it be of an intelligible Idea. Our Creed is our Catechiſm, the Doctrine of the Trinity therefore muſt be as intelligible as our Catechiſm ought to be, and therefore muſt be intelligible to the mean Capacities of the generality of Mankind in order to Life and Salvation. For a Chriſtian Catechiſm is Nonſenſe without the Myſtery of the Trinity, which ought to be repreſented in clear Terms, underſtood in a popular Senſe, that ſignify Matters, of which the generality of concerned Men and Chriſtians may form a competently clear and intelligible Notion and Conception. Such a Notion they may form of the Chriſtian Trinity according to our Idea, and the Anti-Trinitarians will not ſay of it, *It is a falſe Myſtery, we have no Conception of it, no more than of Words without Senſe, and that we are like the Samaritans, who worſhipp'd they knew not what.* But they have too much cauſe thus to reproach the Scholaſtic Trinity, which is not a Matter fit for any to be converſant about ſave only Metaphyſicians and Scholaſticks, and they find it impoſſible to form any tolerable Conception of it. (s) *The Doctrine of the Trinity is ſo far above natural Reaſon improved to the higheſt pitch, that the greateſt Wits in the World have been confounded in the ſearch thereof.* (t) *The eternal and bleſſed Trinity which I underſtand not, I believe, and hold that by Faith which my Mind as intelligent is incapable of*, ſaith a devout Abbot. A late Schoolman in the Entrance of his Contemplation of this Trinity maketh an Exclamation, which the Egyptians are ſaid to have made when they ſacrific'd, (u) *ô tenebræ. ô tenebræ. ô tenebræ.* Such is the Scholaſtic Trinity, (Darkneſs unknowable and inexpreſſible) which therefore cannot be an Inſtitution of the Chriſtian Religion, *the light of the glorious Goſpel of Chriſt.* Of the Words of our Saviour to *Peter* touching St. *John* the Evangeliſt, *If I will, that he tarry till I come, St. Auſtin* maketh an allegorical Expoſition to this Senſe, (w) *My Will is, that what John hath preached in his Goſpel touching the Equality and Incommutability of the Three Perſons and the Incarnation, be a Secret and a Myſtery unknown unto Men till I come.* Agreeably to which Scholaſtic Conceit it is now become popular Diſcourſe, that God will have the Myſtery of the Trinity inexplicable. Which cannot be ſaid without a foul Reflexion upon the holy Writers of our Religion, that have written copiouſly of this Myſtery. For it implieth, that either they did not underſtand what they wrote, or that they have not written intelligibly.

III. Our Idea of the Trinity is of Kind and Quality Chriſtian (not Scholaſtical, Philoſophical and Unholy) all the Divine Perſons of it are of a Character truly Divine and Chriſtian, agreeable to the only Fountain of the Doctrine of the Trinity; for they are Perſons of the New Teſtament's Notion and Deſcription. If we aſk, Who is the firſt Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity? The Style of the New Teſtament reſolveth us, It is the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch. *Rom.* 15. 6. *That ye may with one Mind and one Mouth glorifie God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* (x) *This is* Stylo novo, *never found in the Old Teſtament, but very often in the New. For this cauſe I bow my Knees to the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Eph. 3. *The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt knoweth that I lye not.* 2 Cor. 11. *Bleſſed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* 1 Pet. 1. *As the old Covenant ceaſed upon the bringing in a new and better Covenant : So there was a Ceſſation of the old Style upon the bringing in this new and better Style. It is the Evangelical Style.---- To us Chriſtians there is but one God the Father, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt his Son. This is* Deus Chriſtianorum. *If either you hope as Chriſtians to receive Grace from that God, that alone can give it; or mean as Chriſtians to give Glory to that God, that alone ought to have it: This, this is He, and none other; God even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. It is a Style of Diſtinction.* By this Style of Diſtinction (the Evangelical Style) we Chriſtian Religioniſts are diſcriminated from Jews and Pagans, *Deus Chriſti eſt Deus Chriſtianorum*, The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch is our God. This, this is He, whom in the Form of Baptiſm (the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Creed of it) we acknowledge and profeſs to believe in; and this, this is He, who is the firſt Perſon of our Trinity. So the Expoſitors of the Creed aſſure us; for thus they diſcourſe. (y) *Seeing nothing can be more clear than that, when it is ſaid, In the Name of the Father and of the Son, the Notion of Father hath in this Particular no other Relation but to that Son, whoſe Name is join'd with his; and as we are baptized into no other Son of that Father, but that only begotten Chriſt Jeſus, ſo into no other Father but the Father of that only Begotten : It followeth, that the proper Explication of the firſt Words of the Creed is this; I believe in God, the Father of Chriſt Jeſus.* (z) Cultu Evangelii Deum ut Patrem Chriſti colimus, *In the Evangelical Worſhip we worſhip God as the Father of Chriſt.* Having thus inveſtigated the firſt Perſon of our Trinity, we will call this certainty *The Foundation of God that ſtandeth ſure*, from which all the Scholaſtic Theology in the World cannot remove us. We may imagine a Scholaſtic Co-eternal Trinity, wherein an Abſtract *Logos*, or Scholaſtic *Verbum*, is the ſecond Perſon, and the firſt Perſon is the Father of that Abſtract Son, and this is the Trinity of the Scholaſtic Theology, both the *Platonic* and *Ariſtotelian* : But becauſe in our Trinity the firſt Perſon is the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch, in that Scholaſtic Trinity the firſt Perſon is not the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch; therefore that Scholaſtic Trinity is not our Trinity. No Trinity can be our Trinity, which is not the Trinity of the Chriſtian Religion and Diſpenſation as ſuch, (this Trinity as ſuch is our Trinity, our only Trinity:) Whence it is eaſie to make a Judgment, how far Chriſtians are unconcern'd in the Scholaſtic kind of Trinities. For we ought to look upon them as Aliens and Foreigners, of an exotick (and illegitimate) kind, as being of kind and quality *Unpopular* and *Unchriſtian.* Our Trinity is the Saint of God-kind of Trinity, but ſuch is not the Metaphyſicians kind of Trinity. Our Trinity is the Summary and Rule of the Chriſtian Faith; but ſuch is not a Co-eternal Trinity as it is ſuch; for it is an Alien from the Chriſtian Faith, which is the Faith of Chriſt. Our Trinity is Chriſt's kind of Trinity: But the Co-eternal Trinity of the Scholaſtic Theology as it is ſuch, is none of Chriſt's; for Chriſt is not in it, nor the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch. Our Trinity is the Trinity of Chriſt's People as ſuch; the Acknowledgment of it conſtituteth, diſtinguiſheth, denominateth them, and is to them peculiar and appropriate : But a *Platonic*, *Ariſtotelian*, or other Scholaſtic Co-eternal Trinity, wherein the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is not as ſuch, may be acknowledged by Jews and Heathens, that yet remain Jews and Heathens ſtill.

(s) Mr. *Lawſon* Theopolit. B. 1. c. 7.

(t) *Æternam beatamque Trinitatem, quam non intelligo, credo, & fide teneo, quam non capio Mente.* S. Bernard. Ser. 16. ſuper Cant.

(u) *Genet Clyp.* T. 5. p. 1.

(w) *Volo ſecretum illud & ignotum hominibus eſſe myſterium, quod Joannes in Evangelio prædicavit, de trium perſonarum æqualitate & incommutabilitate, & de proprietate, qua maxime diſtat à ceteris homo ille, quem Deus ſuſcepit.* Petav. T. 4. l. 11 c. 4. S. 6.

If we ask, Who is the Second Perſon of the Trinity? Some Scholaſticks anſwer, The Metaphyſical *Ens* of the *Platoniſts*, others the *Stoicks Logos*, or the great God *Pan*; others the *Jewiſh Logos* (that of the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts or Targumiſts;) others the *Moſaic Logos*; ſome ſay, *Reaſon*, or a *Rational Power*; others ſay ἔννοια, *a Notion of the Mind.* Such a Variety of ſtrange Sons of God the Scholaſtic Theology furniſheth, to conſtitute a Co-eternal Trinity: But Chriſt in his Baptiſmal Doctrine of the Trinity, knoweth no Son of God, but the Perſon of the Chriſt of God, in whoſe Name we are baptized, and by the Acknowledgment of whom we are Chriſtianiz'd. The Chriſtians Chriſt of God as ſuch, (or the Lord Chriſt as ſuch) is the Second Perſon of our Saviour's Trinity; therefore no Perſon (real or imaginary) that is not the Perſon of the Lord Chriſt, is the Second Perſon of our Saviour's Trinity: Elſe we might have a Chriſtian Sovereignty and a Chriſtian Creed, wherein the Perſon of Chriſt is wanting: Elſe our Saviour's Inſtitution of Baptiſm would not compriſe that Profeſſion of Faith which is neceſſary to Chriſtianize us, and to qualifie us for Baptiſm. For in the Apoſtles times they that were baptized were obliged antecedently thereto to profeſs the Faith of Chriſt, which was their Belief, that *Jeſus is the Son of God*, or that *Jeſus Chriſt is Lord.* Our Saviour's Words at the Inſtitution of Baptiſm ſhew, what Perſon he meant by the *Son* in his Form of Baptiſm (his Doctrine of the Trinity;) for immediately before his Aſcenſion, he ſaid to his Apoſtles, *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and Earth. Go ye therefore* (becauſe all Power is given unto me) *and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* The Son in our Saviour's Trinity is none other but the Perſon of Chriſt, to whom all Power in Heaven and Earth was given. They that were baptized according to his Inſtitution, were baptized *in the Name of Chriſt*, whom they ſuppos'd as ſuch, to be the Son of God; (This, this alone is the Son in our Saviour's Trinity;) for theſe Two Names, *Chriſt*, and *The Son of God*, are in Senſe the ſame Name, as to believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, and that he is the Son of God, is the ſame thing. (a) *Theſe Two Names were by the* Jews *accounted equivalent.* So they are in *Nathaniel*'s Confeſſion, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, *Joh.* 1. 49. *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of* Iſrael. Such they are in *Martha*'s Expreſſion of her Faith, *Joh.* 11. 27. *I believe, that thou art the Chriſt the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World.* So in *Peter*'s Confeſſion of his Faith (in the Name of himſelf and the other Apoſtles) *Matth.* 16. 16. *Joh.* 6. 69. *We believe, and are ſure, that thou art that Chriſt, the Son of the living God.* So in *John* the Baptiſt's Teſtimony concerning *Jeſus.*

(x) Bp. *Sanderſon's Serm. on Rom.* 15. 6.

(y) *Bp. Pearſon on the Creed, Art.* 1. *p.* 59. *ed.* 1.

(z) *Tolet. in Rom.* 15. 6.

Matth. 28. 18, 19.

(a) *Bp. Pearſon on the Creed, Art.* 2. *p.* 208. *ed.* 1.

Jeſus. Joh. 1. 34. *I ſaw and bare record, that this is the Son of God.* So in the High Prieſt's Examination, *Matth.* 26. 63. *Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the Bleſſed?* So in the Expoſtulation of the Devils, (who learn'd it from the *Jews*) Matth. 8. 29. *What have we to do with thee, Jeſus thou Son of God?* As the Devils, ſo the holy Scriptures ſpeak of the Son of God, in the ſenſe of the *Jews* (as is ſelf-evident and the Learned agree;) therefore as according to the ſenſe of the *Jews*, ſo according to the ſenſe of the Scriptures, to be the perſon of the Son of God, and to be the perſon of Chriſt, is the ſame thing. Our Saviour himſelf counteth it the ſame thing to be the perſon of the Meſſiah, and the perſon of the Son of God. *Joh.* 10. 36. *Say ye of him whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* We have therefore abundant, plain and demonſtrative evidence, that as the Father (the firſt Perſon) in our Trinity is the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch, ſo the Son (the ſecond perſon) in our Trinity is the perſon of Chriſt as ſuch (and this none can deny, that underſtand our Religion;) from whence it followeth, that our Trinity is meerly Evangelical, and the Chriſtian kind of Trinity, and that the Scholaſtic co-eternal Trinity (*Platonic* or *Ariſtotelian*) is not our Trinity, not our kind of Trinity, but is of kind and quality exotick and illegitimate. That is not Chriſt's Trinity, wherein the Perſon of Chriſt is wanting.

IV. Our Idea of the Trinity combineth *our Saviour's Meſſias-ſhip*, the main Article of Chriſtianity, with the main Article of Judaiſm, *The Unity of God*; and ſo doth our Saviour's Trinity and the whole New Teſtament. God in the firſt Commandment (*Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me*) took care to impreſs upon the minds of the *Jews*, next to the belief of his Exiſtence, the belief of his Unity; for this firſt Commandment is (b) *περὶ μοναρχίας, touching the Empire of one*, is *καθαίρεσις τῆς πολυθείας, the deſtruction of Polytheiſm*, (c) and is the Foundation (ſaith *Maimonides*) on which all the reſt depend. A great part of the Old Teſtament therefore is employ'd in inculcating upon the Minds of the *Jews* the Oneneſs of God. *Hear*, O Iſrael, *the Lord our God is One Lord. The Lord he is God, there is none elſe beſides him. I am He, and there is no God with me. I am the Lord, and there is none elſe, there is no God beſides me; that they may know from the riſing of the Son and from the Weſt, that there is none beſides me; I am the Lord, and there is none elſe. Is there a God beſides me? Yea there is no God. I know not any.* The *Jews* uſually inculcate his Oneneſs and Singularity in their devotional Aſcriptions to God. *Thou art great, and do'ſt wondrous things, thou art God alone. That all the Kingdoms of the Earth may know, that thou art the Lord God, even thou only. Thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth; thou haſt made Heaven and Earth.* The New Teſtament, as well as the Old, inculcateth the Unity of God, and in Chriſtianity, as well as Judaiſm, it is a great Article: But Chriſtianity hath a great Article peculiar and appropriate to it ſelf, which is, That Jeſus is the Lord Meſſiah, the Chriſt and Son of God. *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God. Whoſoever believeth, that Jeſus is the Chriſt is born of God. If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt believe in thy Heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved. Other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt.* Which foundation is expreſs'd by the Eunuch in his profeſſion of Faith antecedent to his Baptiſm; *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* This main Article of Chriſtianity is uſually in the New Teſtament, combin'd with the main Article of Judaiſm, ſometimes with changing the Old Teſtament Name of God into a New Teſtament Name, and ſometimes without changing it; as, *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is Life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.* Jude 4. *Denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* But oftentimes the main Article of Chriſtianity is in the New Teſtament, combin'd with the main Article of Judaiſm, with changing the Old Teſtament Name of God into a New Teſtament Name; as, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things.* Eph. 4. 5, 6. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all.* 2 Joh. 3. *Grace be with you, mercy and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of the Father.* 2 Theſſ. 2. 10. *Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and God, even our Father, comfort your hearts.* Eph. 6. 23. *Peace be to the Brethren, and love with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* In this ſtyle St. *Paul's* Salutations run in the beginning of his Epiſtles; *Grace be unto you, and Peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Our Religion is manifeſtly a combination of theſe two main Articles of Judaiſm and Chriſtianity; ſuch is our Saviour's Doctrine and Creed of the Trinity, which is therefore our Creed, and the ſummary of our Faith, becauſe it is a combination of theſe two main Articles, and theſe two political imperial perſons, the one true God and the true Meſſiah, the one true God become an Evangelical Father, and the the Evangelical Son of the Father. Who is not combin'd with God meerly as the *Muhammedans* combine their Prophet with God (*there is one God, and* Muhammed *his Meſſenger*;) but he is combin'd with God as the divine imperial Son, with the divine imperial Father, ſo as to be a divine imperial perſon of the divine imperial eſtate, our Saviour's Meſſias-ſhip (the main Article of Chriſtianity) is therefore duly combin'd with the Unity of God (the main Article of Judaiſm) becauſe Chriſt Jeſus is combin'd with God the Father, as *the holy Imperial Lord the Son*, of whom that Text of the Pſalmiſt, which ſpeaketh of his being begotten into the divine imperial eſtate by his Reſurrection, is three times expounded in the New Teſtament; *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* This divine Evangelical Son as ſuch combin'd with the divine Evangelical Father as ſuch in conjunction with the Holy Spirit of this holy Government is the Trinity of our Faith and Religion, which knoweth no other Trinity. A Scholaſtic co-eternal Trinity wherein there is no combination of the main Article of Judaiſm with the main Article of Chriſtianity, is not the Trinity of our Religion, nor is it the Trinity of any Religion, and conſequently it is no genuine or legitimate Trinity. But touching the Name *Father* in our Trinity, it muſt be further remark'd, that it ſignifieth not only God's Paternity to our Lord Chriſt, but to the Chriſtian Family; for ſo it ſignifieth in

(b) *Grot. Explic. Decal.*

(c) *Maim. de Fund. Leg. c.* 3.

Deut. 4. 35. *and* 6. 4. *and* 32. 39. *Iſa.* 44. 8. *and* 45. 5, 6.

Pſal. 86. 10.

2 *King.* 19. 19.

Iſa. 37. 16.

Joh. 20. 31.

1 *Joh.* 5. 1.

Rom. 10. 9.

1 *Cor.* 3. 11.

Act. 8. 37.

the New Teſtament, ſo it is always expounded to ſignifie in our Creed (commonly called the Apoſtles Creed) and ſo it muſt be ſuppoſed to ſignifie in our Saviour's Creed of the Trinity, agreeably to what the Apoſtle ſaith of God, *Eph.* 3. 15. *Of whom the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is named.* So *Clemens Romanus* ſaith of God, (*d*) *Who choſe the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and us by him, to be a peculiar People.* He ſaith no more than the Scripture ſaith, That Chriſt and Chriſtians are *the Choſen of God*, and to both he is a Father, according to the new Covenant, (*e*) *Which changeth the Name of God, a Name of greater diſtance and terrour, into the Name of Father, a Name of more nearneſs and indulgence.*

(d) *Ep.* 1. *ad Corinth. p.* 73. *ed. ann.* 1633.

(e) *Bp. Sanderſon ſupr.*

V. Our Idea of the Trinity ſuppoſeth, that *the one God* inſiſted on in the Scriptures, both of Judaiſm and Chriſtianity, doth not mean *one eſſential God Trine in perſons* (a Triune God) *but that there is one that is the one ſole perſon of the Almighty God* (God definitively and abſolutely) *and the Father is this One.* This is the Scriptural Unity of God, which hath been before diſcourſed of: But becauſe it is a matter of greateſt Importance, that is extremely miſtaken in the Scholaſtic Theology, and the conſequence of it is as much miſtaken by the Anti-Trinitarians, we will reſume, illuſtrate and ſtrengthen this Argument; which we muſt enter upon by repreſenting this common acknowledg'd Notion of *the Father*, That He is *one ſingular perſon.* For ſo he is repreſented in the Apoſtles Creed, in our Saviour's Trinity, and in all other accounts of the Trinity in the New Teſtament. 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt.* Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all.* Eph. 2. 18. *Through him* (Chriſt Jeſus) *we have an acceſs by one Spirit unto the Father.* Joh. 14. 16, 26. *I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter, the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my name.* The Father in the Trinity is one perſon and is the only perſon, that can be called, *The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And the only perſon that can be called his Father, is the only perſon that is called our Father in the New Teſtament, (who is firſt his Father, then our Father;) therefore throughout the New Teſtament (that uſually ſpeaketh of his Father and our Father) this name, *The Father*, ſignifieth one (no more than one) perſon. And in reaſon it muſt ſo ſignifie; for this name, *The Father*, denoteth the abſolutely independent and firſt Cauſe, which are Attributes not competible to any more than one divine perſon. This is plain indiſputable Reaſon, and with the ſame plain indiſputable Reaſon we affirm, *That there is one, that is the one ſole perſon of the Almighty God, and the Father is this one.* For,

(1.) The New Teſtament's Enumerations of the perſons of the Trinity plainly ſhew, *That one of them is the one perſon of God, and that the Father alone is he.* 2 Cor. 13. 14. *The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all.* The Apoſtle here enumerateth the three perſons of the Trinity, which are, *God, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt.* The name *God* therefore here is the name of *a perſon of one of the Trinity of perſons*; it denoteth one divine perſon, diſtinct from the other divine perſons. One only Perſon of the Trinity therefore is *the perſon of God*; and conſequently is *the ſole one perſon of the Almighty God*; and it is manifeſt, that the Father is this one, as in our Saviour's Trinity God is the ſame with the Father. *Eph.* 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all.* One God is in this place the Name of one of the perſons of the Trinity, diſtinct from the other divine perſons. And as this Name, *One Spirit*, denoteth one that is the one perſon of the Holy Ghoſt; this Name, *One Lord*, denoteth one that is the one perſon of Chriſt the Lord; ſo this Name, *One God*, denoteth one that is the one perſon of God, who is ſtyled *Father of all*, and therefore the Father alone is He. 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 5, 6. *There are diverſities of gifts, but the ſame Spirit. And there are differences of adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord. And there are diverſities of operations, but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all.* In this place the Apoſtle ſaith, (*f*) *There is the ſame Spirit, the ſame Lord, and the ſame God.* He enumerateth therefore the perſons of the Chriſtian Trinity, of which one is the perſon of the Holy Spirit, another is the perſon of our Lord, and another is the perſon of God; *one that is alone the one perſon of God*; and who that is cannot be unknown to the Readers of St. *Paul*; for as *Eraſmus* obſerveth, (*g*) *Suo more patrem appellat Deum*, uſually he calleth the Father God, as being alone *the one perſon of God.*

(f) S. *Chryſoſt. in loc.*

(g) *In* 2 *Cor.* 13. 14.

(2.) The ordinary Notices of two of the perſons of the Trinity plainly ſhew, *that there is one that is the one perſon of God, and that the Father alone is He.* For all Chriſtians know, that Chriſt is *the Son of God*, and that the Holy Spirit is *the Spirit of God*, in which definitive Notices of the divine perſons this name *God* is the name of a perſon (of ſuch a perſon, that is the perſon of the one Almighty God;) it denoteth one, that is the one perſon of God, and the perſon of the Father; there is one therefore, that is the one perſon of God, and the Father alone is He. This alſo is manifeſtly imply'd in the Exiſtence of God in order of nature antecedent to a Trinity. For it is ſelf-evident, that God did in order of nature exiſt before he generated, and was a perſon (the imperial divine perſon of God) antecedently to his being a Father. So conſider'd, he appeareth to have been the one ſole perſon of the Almighty God from Eternity, and ſo he continueth to Eternity, according to that of the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 20. θεὸς εἷς ἐστι, *God is one perſon*, becauſe one perſon only is the perſon of God.

(3.) The divine Attributes, peculiar and appropriate to the firſt perſon of the Trinity, plainly ſhew, *that there is one that is the one perſon of God, and that the Father alone is He.* For to this firſt perſon belongeth *Self-Exiſtence, Innaſcibility, abſolute Self-Perfection and Self-fulneſs, abſolute Supremacy, Liberty and Independence, Ownerſhip, abſolutely univerſal, abſolutely the fulleſt height of Dominion and Power, peerleſs Supereminence, and to be abſolutely the firſt Cauſe and the laſt End.* The firſt perſon therefore is ſuch an one perſon, as is the one perſon of the Almighty God peculiarly and appropriately as the one God. The ſame Inference may be drawn from the uſual Idea of God, *A Being abſolutely perfect.* For *Self-exiſtence* belongeth to the firſt perſon of the Trinity, meerly upon this account, becauſe He is *a Being abſolutely perfect.* This firſt perſon therefore (the firſt one) is ſuch an one, that is *a Being abſolutly perfect*, and therefore is one that is the *one and ſole perſon* of the Almighty God, the one only God, beſides whom there is no other.

(4.) The holy popular Idea of God plainly ſheweth, that *there is one, who is the one ſingular* *perſon of God, and that the Father alone is He.* For (according to this Idea) *God is the Lord, King or Potentate, Creature-tranſcendent.* Which Names ſignifie a perſon, one ſingular imperial perſon, who is the one imperial perſon of God, of whom the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. *Unto the King eternal, immortal, inviſible, the only wiſe God, be Honour and Glory for ever and ever.* Rom. 16. 27. *To God only wiſe be Glory, through Jeſus Chriſt for ever.* 1 Tim. 6. 15, 16. *Who is the bleſſed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; who only hath Immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath ſeen, nor can ſee, to whom be Honour and Power everlaſting, Amen.* So *the one Lawgiver, God the Judge of all, the Lord God omnipotent, the God of Gods, the moſt high God, the God of Glory, the Father of Glory, the Father of Lights, the Father of Spirits, the Father of Mercies, God the Father* (of whom the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is named) are names that plainly ſignifie *the one perſon of one Almighty God, and that the Father alone is He.*

(5.) The notices of God, and of his Unity, in the Old Teſtament, plainly ſhew, *that there is one, who is the one* (imperial) *perſon of God, and that the Father alone is He.* For it is God the Father only that ſpeaketh, and is ſpoken to as God in the Old Teſtament, as is plain from *Pſal.* 110. 1. *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord.* Heb. 1. 2. *Who in theſe laſt Days hath ſpoken to us by his Son.* Act. 3. 13. *The God of our Fathers hath glorified his Son Jeſus.* This is He, whoſe Voice is throughout the Old Teſtament, *I am God, and there is none elſe.* Exod. 20. 3. Deut. 32. 39. Iſa. 45. 5, 6. 21, 22. and 44. 6. and 46. 9. and 43. 10, 11. Hoſ. 13. 4. This is He, who throughout that holy Volume is ſtyled, *Our Lord, The Lord, the Name of the Lord, The Lord of Lords, The Lord of Hoſts, The Lord the King, The Lord of Heaven and Earth*; all which Titles of Honour plainly denote one imperial perſon. The Saying of *Moſes* therefore, *Deut.* 6. 4. *The Lord our God is one Lord*, plainly ſignifieth, that God is one (or no more than one) not only as to Eſſence, but that He is one ſingular (political) imperial perſon. So God being a name of perſonal Nobilitation, and the Godhead of eſtate being the Kingdom-eſtate Creature-tranſcendent, this name, *The one God*, muſt neceſſarily ſignifie, *The one imperial perſon of God.* And ſo God, the divine Majeſty, or the great King (as our Saviour ſtyleth him) is every where repreſented and deſcribed in the Old Teſtament as *The one imperial perſon of God.* Jer. 10. 10. *The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlaſting King.* Pſal. 20. 9. *Save, Lord, let the King hear us when we call.* Pſal. 84. 3. *O Lord of Hoſts, my King and my God.* Pſal. 103. 19. *The Lord hath prepared his Throne in Heaven, and his Kingdom ruleth over all.* As an imperial perſon he hath his Dues and Rights of Sovereignty, his Kingdom, his Throne, his Palace, his Court, his Hoſts, his Attendants, his imperial Chariot, Kings as ſuch are his Sons, are called Gods, and *Artabanus* the *Perſian*, in his Diſcourſe with *Themiſtocles*, (*h*) calleth the King, εἰκόνα θεοῦ, *The Image of God.* His name *God* ſignifieth an imperial perſon; therefore this great Article, *One God*, meaneth this his Oneneſs, Singularity and Solitareity, *He is the one only imperial perſon of God.* His uſual Name is, *The Omni-imperial one* (παντοκράτωρ) the ſole Monarch of the Univerſe, and the ſole Founder of it, as himſelf ſaith. *Iſa.* 44. 24. *I am the Lord that maketh all things, that ſtretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that ſpreadeth abroad the Earth by my ſelf.* Nehem. 9. 6, 7. *Thou even thou art Lord alone, thou haſt made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Hoſts, the Earth and all things that are therein, and thou preſerveſt them all, and the Hoſt of Heaven worſhippeth thee. Thou art the Lord the God, who didſt chuſe* Abram, *and broughtſt him forth out of* Ur *of the* Chaldees, *and gaveſt him the name of* Abraham. From theſe places of the Old Teſtament it appeareth, that the Son of God was not the Creator of univerſal Nature, but only *God the Father Almighty*, as our Creed ſaith. For the God of *Abraham* was the ſole Creator of univerſal Nature; the God of *Abraham* is no other than the imperial perſon of God the Father, *Act.* 3. 13. therefore there is one, that is the one and ſole imperial perſon of God, the ſole Creator of univerſal Nature, *that ſtretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that ſpreadeth abroad the Earth by himſelf*, Iſa. 44. 24.

(*h*) *Plutarch. in Themiſtocl.*

(6.) The Unity of God in Judaiſm plainly ſheweth, *that there is one, that is the one* (imperial) *perſon of God, and that the Father alone is He.* The one God in the *Jews* Religion was not *a Trinity in Unity*; for a Trinity (our Saviour's Trinity) is the Chriſtian Religion properly ſuch; which could not be in the times of Judaiſm; for it ſucceeded Judaiſm, and aboliſhed it. As the *Gentiles* worſhipped the reputed imperial Perſon of that God or Goddeſs, who was their imperial eſtate of Religion: So the *Jews* were Worſhippers of the one imperial perſon of the God of *Iſrael*, who was to them an imperial eſtate of Religion. Their Theocracy was ſtrictly a Monarchy, the Government of a ſingle, political, imperial perſon; they had not (as Chriſtians have) a Mediatory Sovereign in their Religion; a principal Deſign of their Law was the cure of Polytheiſm and Idolatry, and to make them the Worſhippers of their own *Jehovah* alone, who was *the holy one of Iſrael*, and reſided amongſt them as a political King, *a ſingle, political, imperial Perſon.* Their Devotions are Celebrations of the *Monothe-iſm* of one ſingle imperial perſon. *There is none holy as the Lord, for there is none beſides thee.* 1 Sam. 2. 2. *O Lord of Hoſts, God of* Iſrael, *thou art the God, even thou alone.* Iſa. 37. 16 *Neither is there any God beſides thee.* So 1 *King.* 8. 60. It is not any ſort of Unity of the Godhead which we may imagine, but it is this *Anti-polytheiſm*, the *Monothe-iſm* of God the Father (that he alone is the perſon of God) which is the Scriptural Unity of God, and which was the grand Fundamental of the *Jews* Religion. *Deut.* 6. 4. So the Scribe ſpeaketh of one ſingular imperial perſon, when he ſaith, *Marc.* 12. 32. *Well, Maſter, thou haſt ſaid the truth; for there is one God, and there is none other but He.* The Style of their holy Books ſheweth, what their Religion meant by one God; namely, *That there is one imperial perſon of God, and no other.* Deut. 4. 35. *Unto thee it was ſhewed, that thou mighteſt know, that the Lord he is God, and there is none elſe beſide him.* The God of the *Jews* was only He, that for a great while ſent only his Servants into his Vineyard, but at laſt ſent his Son. *Matth.* 21. 37. He only was their one God, that juſtifieth both *Jews* and *Gentiles* by the faith of Chriſt, to whom the legal Sacrifices were offer'd, and to whom Chriſt's Sacrifice (typified by the legal Sacrifices) was offer'd upon the Croſs. *Rom.* 3 30. He whom the *Jews* called their God, our Saviour calleth his Father. *Joh.* 8. 54. The Temple of their God he calleth his Father's Houſe. *Joh.* 2. 16. and he repreſenteth them as (illegitimate) Worſhippers of the Father. *Joh.* 4. 21. Their one God therefore was the one imperial perſon of God, and they never did, never could underſtand the firſt Commandment otherwiſe, or *Hoſ.* 13. 4. *Thou ſhalt know no God but me.*

(7.) In the Religion of the New Teſtament this Unity of God (the *Monothe-iſm* of God the Father) is aſſerted and celebrated as the grand Fundamental at the ſame rate as in the Old Teſtament. For there is one God (beſides whom there is no other) and this one God is the Father. *Eph.* 4. 6. 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *Rom.* 3. 30. To us there is but one God, and if a Chriſtian be ask'd, Who this one God is? he muſt anſwer, The Father. 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 6. He who is God, and *the Father. Eph.* 5. 20. who is God and the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. *Col.* 1. 3. Who is God and our Father. *Gal.* 1. 4. Who is the only Lord God. *Jude* 4. *God only wiſe. Rom.* 16. 27. Who ſtandeth at the Head of our renowned Syſtem and Republick, and is the imperial Head thereof; for ſuch is *God the Judge of all* conjoin'd with *Jeſus the Mediator of the new Covenant.* Heb. 12. 23, 24. The Scripture doth not ſpeak of God in the ſtyle of the Scholaſtic Theology, calling him *Hic Deus*, but *Deus* ſimply and without Addition; and He muſt be no leſs than ſo, whom our Saviour calleth, *My God. Joh.* 20. 17. *My God, my God.* Matth. 27. 46. *The only true God.* Joh. 17. 3. Throughout the New Teſtament the name God, in hundreds of places (almoſt always) is put abſolutely (without any thing to limit it, and muſt be underſtood without Limitation) and when it is ſo put abſolutely, it neceſſarily ſignifieth the one ſole imperial perſon of God, that can be no other but the Father. So we read of *the God of all grace, God who is rich in mercy, that God ſo lov'd us, that the Son of God is come, that God gave his Son, God ſent his Son, God teſtified of his Son, He which is of God, the Son of the living God, the Lamb of God, the Choſen of God, the holy One of God, the Gift of God, the Bread of God, the Image of the inviſible God, the Power of God, the Wiſdom of God, who is made unto us of God Wiſdom, who was with God, came forth from God, did go to God, ſpake the Words of God, the Teſtimony of God, which he heard of God, increaſed in favour with God, was approved of God, anointed by God, caſt out Devils by the Finger of God, was ordained by God, was delivered by the Fore-knowledge of God (for God ſpar'd not his own Son) who offered himſelf without ſpot to God, to bring us to God, to reconcile us to God, to redeem us to God*; who hath introduced *the Goſpel of God, the Salvation of God, the Righteouſneſs of God, the Myſtery of God, the Church of God. the Kingdom of God, hath made us the People of God, the Elect of God, the Heirs of God, the Habitation of God, Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father, who now appeareth in the Preſence of God, ſitteth on the Throne of God, is at the Right-hand of God, by whom we draw nigh unto God* (that is, the Father) *who in that he liveth, he liveth unto God, and will deliver up the Kingdom to God even the Father, unto God who is one, and the one God, the living and true God*, of whom our Saviour ſaith, οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς, εἰμὴ εἷς ὁ θεὸς, (no perſon is good but one, that is God) *who is his Head, his God, and his Owner, the God of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Father of Glory, God even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, God our Father and his Father, God of whom are all things, God by him hath created all things, God by him hath given us the Victory, God by him wrought Miracles, God giveth the Spirit without meaſure to him, God appointed him to be the Heir, God called him to be an High Prieſt, God gave him the Throne, God ſet him at his own Right-hand, God highly exalted him, God made him both Lord and Chriſt, God ſet him forth to be a Propitiation, God hath called us to his eternal glory by Jeſus Chriſt, God in Chriſt, God for Chriſt's ſake hath forgiven us, God hath choſen us in him, God gave him the Apocalypſe, God gave us unto him, who by him do believe on God, that raiſed him from the dead, and gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God. Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me*, ſaith our Saviour. In all which innumerable places (and ſuch more) the name God undeniably ſignifieth *one perſon, one imperial perſon of God*, whoſe name (*i*) in the New Teſtament is uſually ſynonymous with the Father, who is αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς, *God himſelf.* 1 *Theſſ.* 3. 11. the perſon of God. *Job* 13. 7. *Hebr.* 1. 3.

Quamvis ſit & Deus, unum tamen Deum patrem de obedientia ſua oſtendit, ex quo & originem traxit. Novatian. de Trin. c. 31.

(i) *Rom.* 15. 6. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. and 15. 14. 2 *Cor.* 1. 3. *Jam.* 1. 27. and 3. 9.

(8.) Throughout the Bible God always ſpeaketh, is ſpoken to, and ſpoken of by Perſonal Pronouns of the ſingular Number, (I, Thou, He, Me, Him, Himſelf;) which plainly ſheweth, *that there is one that is the one ſole perſon of the Almighty God, and as ſuch the one only God.* The *Alexandr. Cyril* affirmeth, (*k*) that the three men which appear'd to *Abraham* in the Plain of *Mamre*, were a Type (or Repreſentation) of *the holy conſubſtantial Trinity.* And this he ſuppoſeth to be the reaſon, why *Abraham* ſpeaking to them, did not ſpeak in the Plural, but (becauſe of the Unity in Trinity) in the Singular Number, οὐχὶ κύριοι, κύριε δὲ μοναδικῶς, *not Lords, but Lord ſingularly.* But there is nothing of ſolidity in this Conceit; for Expoſitors generally agree, that as in the proceſs of his Diſcourſe, ſo in his firſt Salutation of the three men, he ſpake only to one of them, that ſeem'd to be of greater Eminency than the other, therefore he ſpake in the Singular Number; whence ſome Divines infer, (*l*) that this one more eminent than the reſt was *Jehovah*, one of the perſons of the Trinity. According to their Senſe therefore, if we ſpeak only to one perſon of the Trinity, we ought to ſpeak in the Singular Number: But if we ſpeak to the three perſons of the Trinity together, the laws and ſenſe of Language, and the nature of the thing require, that we ſpeak in the Plural Number. But ſo the Bible never ſpeaketh unto God, nor doth God ever ſo ſpeak of Himſelf, but always in the Singular Number; which is a plain Indication, that there is no ſuch Trinity in the Godhead, as the Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth, namely, *A Trinity of Divine Perſons, co-eternal, co-eſſential and co-equal. Each one of which Trinity of perſons is the perſon of the Almighty God,* (becauſe of the Unity of Eſſence) the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence, which is a thing, not a perſon, is primarily the one God, but not a perſonal God (or Divine Majeſty;) and the three coeternal Perſons, as having or being this one Divine Eſſence, are the one God: But neither are theſe one perſonal God, or divine Majeſty. So that, according to this Theology, there is no ſuch thing as *The one ſole perſon of the Almighty God, who as ſuch is the one only God beſides whom there is no other.* According to this Theology, it may be ſaid of God the Father, that He is the alone *ingenit* and *unoriginated God, the fountain of the Deity:* But this is ſo far from excluding *Polytheiſm*, that it implieth it.

(k) *C. Jul. l.* 8. *p.* 268.

(l) *Hoornbeek c. Jud. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 395.

It is commonly ſaid (in this Theology) that he is alone God, (*m*) *becauſe he alone is ingenit and the Fountain of the Deity*. But this is ſo far from excluding Polytheiſm, that it is no more than may be ſaid of the Supreme Deity in Paganiſm. This doth not make him *The one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God, or The one only God ſimply and abſolutely*, but only ſo far as to be the ingenit Perſon and the Fountain of the Deity. Nor doth this make him any thing more than *Hic Deus*, (this Perſon of God) a Perſon that is one of thoſe Perſons, each of which is the Perſon of the Almighty God. There are other Perſons, each of which is ſuppos'd to be the Perſon of the Almighty God as well as He; and therefore to make our Prayers, Praiſes and religious Expreſſions moſt agreeable to this Theology, they muſt be (as the Devotions of ſome blind Romaniſts are) of the Plural Number, and run in a Stile of Polytheiſm, (not thou art God, thy Kingdom come, but you are God, your Kingdom come) and the whole Trinity muſt be *our heavenly Father*, as ſometimes this Theology ſaith.

(9.) Expoſitors uſually obſerve, that in Scripture *Name* ſignifieth Perſon, *Names* Perſons, a Number *of Names* a Number of Perſons, as *Act.* 1. 15. If therefore by God the Scripture meaneth a Number of Perſons, (as the uſual Scholaſtic Theology ſuppoſeth) it muſt mean thereby *a Number of Names*. But this is never the meaning of the Bible, by *God* it always meaneth not *Names*, but one ſingular *Name*, *My Name*, *My great Name*, *My holy Name*, *Thy Name*, *His Name*, this glorious and fearful Name *The Lord thy God*. The Bible therefore proclaimeth, that there is but one Name or Perſon, *that is the Perſon of the Almighty God*, called by the Jews השם, *the Name*, and by the Book of Wiſdom *the incommunicable Name*. As there is but one Perſon, that is the Perſon of the Almighty God, ſo there is but one Perſon, that is the Honour-perſon of the Almighty God, who alone muſt be feared *as this glorious and fearful Name the Lord thy God*; to whom Doxologies are made as to him *that ſitteth upon the Throne*, (with whom the Lamb is conjoyn'd;) and of whom alone it muſt be ſaid, *of him and through him and to him are all things, to whom be Glory for ever, Amen. Who hath firſt given to him?*

Rom. 11. 35, 36.

VI. Our Idea of the Trinity ſuppoſeth, that no Trinity ought to be admitted, which (more or leſs) deſtroyeth the Scriptural Unity of God, (the Scriptural Monothe-iſm of God the Father) which is the great important *Unity in Trinity*. They that undertake to explain the Trinity preſently diſcern that they have this great Difficulty to overcome, to ſhew that a Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead is conſiſtent with this great Principle, that *there is but one God*. But this Difficulty is really two Difficulties, for it is not enough to ſhew that a Trinity of Perſons is conſiſtent with any ſort of one God, (real or imaginary) but we ought to ſhew, that by our Trinity the Scriptural Unity of God is not violated, which is the Monothe-iſm of God the Father. For this is the only Unity of God that is inſiſted on or expreſs'd in the Holy Scriptures. (*n*) By one God they never mean three Perſons, nor do they ever ſay, that the three divine Perſons are one God; but this is their Senſe touching one God, *that altho' there are three Perſons in the Godhead, the Monothe-iſm of God the Father is not violated thereby*. To explicate the Trinity aright therefore is not meerly to ſhew *an Unity in Trinity*, but our principal Care muſt be to ſhew, that notwithſtanding the Trinity of Perſons the Father is the one and ſole Perſon of the Almighty God; for by this Method only the true Unity of God is ſecured. But ſo unhappily have theſe great things been manag'd in the Church, that little or no Care hath been taken of that, which ought to have been our principal Care. For in our uſual Scholaſtic Theology even this Principle is deſtroy'd, *that one is the one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God*, (every one of the divine Perſons is ſuppos'd to be the Perſon of the Almighty God, of the only true God) and conſequently the Being or Exiſtence of *the one Perſon that is the one and ſole Perſon of the Almighty God is deſtroy'd.* Which are ſuch marvellous Impieties, that if the Church had fram'd the main of her Prayers and religious Worſhip according to this Hypotheſis, her Communion would not have been tolerable to a Chriſtian. But notwithſtanding that the Scholaſtic Theology is a Miſt of Darkneſs, which hath invelop'd the Church, this illuſtrious Principle, that the Father is *the one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God*, hath in all Times caſt ſo much Light and Splendor into her Eyes, that the main of her Religious Worſhip hath been addreſs'd to the Father, and in her Prayers as well as in her Creed *The Father Almighty and The one Imperial Perſon of God* have been repreſented as Terms convertible. But for this her Piety ſhe is not beholden to her Scholaſtic Theology, which hath taught her otherwiſe, and which hath ſo much miſtaken this divine Myſtery, *A Chriſtian Trinity in Unity*, that her Anti-Trinitarian Adverſaries with great Reaſon have always charg'd it, and continue to charge it with the Crime of *Polytheiſm*; nor is it poſſible to vindicate it from ſo foul an Imputation. This is a certain mark of a true and genuin Trinity, if the Scriptural Unity of God is not violated thereby; but this will infer, that there can be no Scholaſtic Coeternal Trinity. For

(1.) We have ſeen, that in the uſual Trinity of the Scholaſtic Theology, (which may be called the *Ariſtotelian*) the Scriptural Unity of God is many ways deſtroy'd. Its Trinity of Perſons are ſaid to be one God, but it cannot be pretended that they are the Scriptural one God. The one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God is made to be only *Hic Deus*, (one of the three *Coequals*, *Creators and Governors of the Univerſe*, every one of which Perſons is *the Perſon of the Almighty God* as well as He;) three Perſons one in Eſſence are ſuppos'd to be *The one God*, which this great Article *one God* meaneth, which certainly meaneth, that *there is one only God in a perfect and plenary Senſe*, (but if God is one, not in Perſon, but in Eſſence only, as being the three Perſons, then He is one, not in a perfect and plenary, but only in a mutilate and partial Senſe;) inſtead of one that is of *Perſonal Nobilitation God Almighty*, and the only one of that Perſonal Nobilitation, one Eſſence is ſubſtituted, which is of no Perſonal Nobilitation. This Scholaſtic Antipolytheiſm therefore is not the Scriptural Antipolytheiſm; and ſo far this Theology befriendeth Polytheiſm, it cannot be clear'd of an Inconſiſtence with the Scriptural Theiſm and Antipolytheiſm. Nor can it be clear'd of an *extra-*

(m) Ὅτι μόνος ἀγέννητος, ϗ μόνος πηγὴ θεότητος. *S. Athanaſ. orat. c. Sabell. Gregal. authoritate innaſcibilitatis Deus unus eſt. S. Hilar. de Synod. ob id unus Deus, quia ex ſe Deus. Idem de Trin. l. 4.*

(n) *Ne ſemel autem toto Novo Teſt.* τὸ *Deus expreſſo textu, ad Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum ſimul determinatur, cum unus Deus appellatur, ut iſta tria unum illum Deum eſſe dicatur.* Henr. Nicol. ap. Curcell. diſſ. de voc. Trin. n. 60.

vagant deifying the Holy Ghoſt, and the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity alſo, (though not ſo groſly) it maketh them God in an unlawful Senſe, which extravagant and ſinful deifying them is not without Polytheiſm. But the Trinity of this Theology will appear liable to the Charge of Polytheiſm from the Tenour of the *Athanaſian* Creed, which prohibiteth the ſaying *three Eternals, three Incomprehenſibles, three uncreated, three Almighties, three Gods and three Lords.* For it is manifeſt, that notwithſtanding this Prohibition of the Creed, yet according to the Theology of it we may and muſt ſay, *that there are three Eternals, and three Almighties*, as the Creed it ſelf ſaith, that there are *three Coeternals and Coequals*, and the three Perſons are ordinarily ſaid to be *Equals and Conſubſtantials.* (*o*) *The Creed only meaneth, that we ſhould not uſe this Language in the Senſe of the Arians*, (ſo as to make the three Perſons three diſtinct Eſſences) *and it would not have us to uſe this Language for fear of giving Advantage to the Arians. But if there was no ſuch Fear* (ſaith *Petavius) we might as well ſay three Eternals and three Almighties as three Coeternals. Some doubt not to ſay three Eternals and three Almighties. The Fathers and ancient Writers ſay*, (as ſuppoſing every one of the Perſons to be the Perſon of the Almighty God) *three Goods, three Supremes*, (tria ſumma) *three Holies, and not only ſo, but uſing Abſtract Terms they ſay three Lights, three Splendors, three Sanctities, three Lives, and three Glories. But their meaning is, that as to Eſſence they are only one Light and Life, one Sanctity and Glory; but as to Perſon they are three Lights and Lives, three Sanctities and Glories.* According to which Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology, (which is the Senſe of the beſt Authors of it) *we muſt ſay, The three Perſons are only one Almighty as to Eſſence, but as to Perſon they are three Almighties: They are only one God as to Eſſence, but as to Perſon they are three Gods.* (*p*) Tres ſunt habentes æternitatem & omnipotentiam, *there are three that have Eternity and Omnipotency*, and theſe may be called as to Perſon *three Eternals and three Almighties.* In like manner Tres ſunt habentes Divinitatem vel Deitatem, *there are three that have the Divinity or Deity*, and theſe may be called as to Perſon three Gods. Let us ſuppoſe that three coequal Perſons have the Sovereignty of our Nation, and that theſe are one in Eſſence (in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology) yet being three Sovereign Perſons they are neceſſarily three Sovereigns as to Perſon; and ſo far the three Perſons in the Scholaſtic Trinity (*coeternal and coequal*) muſt be ſuppos'd to be three Gods. And they muſt be ſuppos'd to be ſuch, becauſe the Buſineſs of being a Sovereign and of being a God is a Buſineſs of Perſonal Honour and Nobilitation. Three Sovereign Perſons are neceſſarily three Sovereigns as to Perſon both in an Human and in the Scholaſtic Divine Sovereignty. But this Polytheiſm will yet be more evident, if we conſider that the three Perſons of this Scholaſtic Trinity exiſt in the Godhead, (the one eſſential God) each one in the Perſon of God, the diſtinct Perſon of God, (the Almighty God) each one in the diſtinct Perſon of a God; and three diſtinct Perſons that ſo exiſt are neceſſarily three diſtinct Gods as to Perſon.

(2.) If this Theology would clearly expreſs its Trinity, it ought to ſay, that *three divine Perſons are God, yet ſo as to be but one God*; and then it ought to ſay how far and in what ſenſe theſe are God and but one God. But the *Athanaſian* Creed contenteth it ſelf to ſay, *as we are commanded by the Chriſtian Verity, to acknowledge every Perſon by himſelf to be God and Lord; ſo we are forbidden by the Catholick Religion to ſay there be three Gods or three Lords.* We may not ſay ſo becauſe of their Unity of Eſſence, yet every one of them is ſaid to be *by himſelf God*, and he muſt be ſuppos'd to be but one God. And if every Perſon is by himſelf one God, how ſhall we avoid this Conſequence, *The three Perſons being each of them one God, are one God three times number'd, which is three Gods?* This Scholaſtic Trinity manifeſtly multiplieth that God that neither is nor can be multiplied. For there is and can be but one Perſon that is *the Perſon of the Almighty God, God definitively and abſolutely ſo:* but this one Perſon in this Scholaſtic Trinity is multiplied into three Perſons, every one of which is ſuppos'd to be Perſonally *the one Almighty God, or God definitively and abſolutely ſo.* Whence ariſeth another Mode of Polytheiſm; for the one Perſon of the Almighty God, (or God definitively and abſolutely ſo) is as ſuch *The one Godhead*; to introduce therefore three Perſons, every one of which is the one Perſon of the Almighty God, (or God definitively and abſolutely ſo) is to introduce three Godheads. Of God (the Father) we may not ſay, *there is another Perſon that is Almighty, All-wiſe, of infinite Perfection, King of Kings and Lord of Lords*, as a ſelf-owner as well as He. Nor may we ſay, that there is another Perſon who is God as a ſelf-owner as well as He. For this *Æquiparantia* (if I may ſo call it) claſheth with the Unity and Solitareity of his Godhead, his being the one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God. But according to this Scholaſtic Theology we muſt ſay, *there is another Perſon and a third Perſon alſo* who is God as well as He *without any Difference or Inequality*, which cannot be excus'd from Polytheiſm. It is a vain Palliation of this Impiety to ſay, that we ſuppoſe theſe three divine Perſons as being one God to have the ſame Scholaſtic divine Eſſence; for this is our Crime, we communicate the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence with all the infinite Perfections thereof to others beſide the one and ſole imperial Perſon of God *in the way of Polytheiſm.* For although we do not ſuppoſe the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence to be triplify'd, yet we ſuppoſe it to be communicated *in the triplify'd and triplifying way of Polytheiſm*, ſo that three divine Perſons are conſtituted, and every one of them is the Perſon of the Almighty God *without any Difference or Inequality.* And what can theſe three Perſons be but three Gods as to Perſon? Three Perſons may be conceiv'd to exiſt in the Godhead, either *in the way of the Father's Monothe-iſm, or in the way of Polytheiſm.* According to this Scholaſtic Theology three divine Perſons are not in the Godhead in the way of the Father's *Monothe-iſm*, (which it deſtroyeth) but in the way of Polytheiſm. Not in the way of conſtituting a true Monarchy, but in the way of conſtituting a *Polyarchy*, that is ſomewhat Monarchical.

(3.) Polytheiſm is not ſo conſpicuous and apparent in the uſual Scholaſtic Trinity as it is in the *Platonic*, which is *three diſtinct Scholaſtic divine Eſſences, or three diſtinct infinite intellectual Subſtances, Minds and Spirits*, (every one of which is a diſtinct Scholaſtic infinite intelligent Being and Perſon) *exiſting in the way of Polytheiſm.* Of this ſort of Trinity there are two different Schemes, (the Aſſerters of it are of two different Opinions;) for ſome ſuppoſe that theſe *three diſtinct Scholaſtic divine Eſſences and Perſons are co-ordinate and coequal:* Others ſuppoſe that they *are*

gradually

(o) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 9. *S.* 8, 9. & *l.* 8. *c.* 9. *S.* 8, 9, 10, 14.

(p) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 9. *S.* 9, 10.

gradually ſubordinate and dependent, as the three archical Hypoſtaſes are in *Plato's Triad*, which is thought by ſeveral of the ancient Writers of the Church (*q*) to be the ſame with our Trinity. This was the Senſe of the beſt learned of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, ſeveral of which make the Son, not to be of the (numerically) ſame Scholaſtic divine Subſtance with the Father, but a different inferior intellectual Subſtance, as *Clemens* ſaith. (*r*) *The Nature of the Son is next to the ſole Almighty. This is the greateſt Preheminence, which ordereth all things according to the Will of the Father, and governeth the Univerſe in the beſt manner, operating all things by an indefatigable Power, in thoſe things that it operateth reſpecting the arcane Notions.* This place is rightly rendred by *Petavius*, and is ſtrangely perverted by a learned Man of our own, (*s*) who is not aware that *Clemens* ſpeaketh as a Platoniſt. Nor is he aware that he ſpeaketh as a Platoniſt when he ſaith, (*t*) *God doth not fall under Demonſtration, and therefore not under Science. But the Son is Wiſdom, Science and Truth, and whatever is cognate to theſe, and therefore hath Demonſtration and Enarration.* This place is interpreted in a Goſpel-ſenſe (as meaning, that no Man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him) but doubtleſs we are very careleſs Readers either of the Goſpel or of *Clemens*'s *Stromata*, if we can think them very Evangelical. His *Logos* or Son of God is no other than that which pervadeth *Origen*'s Book againſt *Celſus*, which is the ſame with the Platonic *Logos*, but with this difference, *Clemens* and *Origen* do not ſuppoſe that the ſecond and third Hypoſtaſes of the Trinity are neceſſary Emanations from the Firſt, as the Platoniſts ſuppos'd. For not meaning as the *Arians*, but taking the Word *making* in a large ſenſe, (ſo as to comprehend generating) *Clemens* ſaith (*u*) *there is one God*, ὃς ἀρχὴν τῶν ἁπάντων ἐποίησεν, τὸν πρωτόγονον υἱόν, *who made the beginning* (or Principle) *of all things his firſt begotten Son.* So *Origen* calleth his Son of God, (*w*) πρεσβύτατον πάντων τῶν δημιουργημάτων, *the oldeſt of all the Works of God.* Theſe Fathers therefore entertain'd not the Platoniſts Conceit touching the neceſſary Emanation of the Hypoſtaſes of their Triad, (who alſo, as to the later ſort of them at leaſt, ſuppos'd that the World iſſu'd from the Maker of it, and from the Goodneſs of God by neceſſary Emanation, as Light and Heat iſſue from the Sun and Fire) and indeed it is marvellous that any Chriſtian Divines ſhould entertain ſo unphiloſophical and irreligious a Conceit. For to ſuppoſe with a late Philoſopher, (*x*) that a ſecondary Subſtance of the Soul of Man exiſteth by immediate Emanation from its primary Subſtance, is ſufficiently unphiloſophical, (for the ſecond Subſtance muſt be produc'd by the Operation of the primary, or elſe muſt be in it before it emaned from it:) but to ſuppoſe that from a living Soul, (which emitteth no *Effluvia*) from a living Body, from a living Perſon, another living Soul, living Body, living Perſon, iſſueth into Exiſtence meerly by immediate Emanation; that two living Perſons iſſue into Exiſtence meerly by immediate Emanation from one of the ſame Species, whoſe Subſtance is not at all leſſen'd by his Emanations; that one infinite omnipotent Subſtance and Perſon exiſteth by immediate Emanation from one of the ſame Character (who can loſe nothing of his Subſtance;) that two infinite omnipotent Subſtances and Perſons exiſt meerly by immediate Emanation from but one infinite omnipotent Subſtance and Perſon; that after the neceſſary Exiſtence of God the Father (whereby he hath his intire Eſſence) there is a neceſſary Exiſtence of two emanatory divine Perſons (præter-eſſential to his Godhead;) theſe are prodigiouſly unphiloſophical Imaginations. Nor are they leſs irreligious. For they are inconſiſtent with God's being Owner and Maſter of himſelf, (his own Nature) they make the Son and the Holy Spirit alike his Sons, they bereave him of giving Exiſtence to either of them, they make him no Owner of them, nor the God and Father of his Son; they make him to be no Father, his Son to be no Son, (in the ſenſe of Law and Morality) no Saint of God-kind of Son; they make his Generation to be no proper natural Generation, they allow him no conſiſtent but only a tranſient kind of Subſtance that is always *in fieri* (from Eternity to Eternity;) and though he is called a Dependent on the Father, yet they make him really no Dependent, as not being at all beholden to the Father for his Exiſtence. So that *the Self-exiſtence* and *Independence* of the Father ſignifieth nothing as to the giving him a Preheminence above the other Perſons. There are many and great Reaſons therefore why the Platonic Ante-Nicene Fathers ſhould diſcard the neceſſary eternal Emanations of the Platonic Triad, (moſt of which are Reaſons alſo againſt the neceſſary Emanation of the Perſons of the Scholaſtic *Ariſtotelian* Trinity;) but they were not ſo happy as to diſcard the Polytheiſm thereof.

(4.) As the Platoniſts call the Hypoſtaſes of their Triad *three Kings* and *three Gods*, *The firſt, ſecond* and *third God*, and they muſt be called three diſtinct Gods; ſo the firſt Perſon in his Platonic Trinity is called by *Origen* (*y*) πρῶτος θεὸς, *the firſt God*, and the Son he calleth τὸν δεύτερον θεὸν, *the ſecond God.* And this muſt be ſuppos'd to be the Senſe of *Clemens*, when having cited *Plato*'s Deſcription of his Triad he ſubjoyneth (*z*) *I do not underſtand it otherwiſe*, ἢ τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα μηνύεσθαι, *but that the Holy Trinity is ſignified thereby.* Agreeably whereto he ſcrupleth not to ſpeak the Language of a Pagan Polytheiſt. (*a*) *A Diſciple being according to the Similitude of God received into the place of a Son and Friend of God*, κατὰ τὴν συγκληρονομίαν τῶν κυρίων καὶ θεῶν γίνεται, *is a Coheir of the Lords and Gods.* (*b*) *Juſt. M.* ſpeaketh of two Gods, calling the Son τὴν μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν δύναμιν, and θεὸν ὑπηρέτην, *A Power after the firſt God, the God that miniſtreth to him.* (*c*) In ſeveral places he calleth the God that appeared to *Abraham* and *Moſes* (the Son) θεὸν ἕτερον, *another God.* He ſpeaketh indeed inconſiſtently with himſelf; for ſometimes he ſaith, *there is not* ἄλλος θεός, *another God beſides the Maker of the Univerſe*; but this ſelf-inconſiſtence demonſtrateth, that although ſuch Holy Men believ'd their Creed, that there is but one God, yet they miſunderſtood the Trinity; for when they come to explicit Notions of it, they muſt have *at leaſt a firſt and a ſecond* God, that is, θεὸν ἕτερον, *another God.* Such is *Origen*'s ſecond God; for we have ſeen from his own plain words (*d*) that his *Logos* or Son of God is the very ſame with the Platonic, a Philoſophic-Pagan Deity, inferior to *T'Agathon*, or the ſupreme Deity. This therefore cannot be his Senſe

touching

One ſaith of the Hypoſtaſes of the Platoniſts Triad, *The firſt though it be look'd on as the Fountain of the Godhead, yet in all other reſpects is no more independent than the ſecond and third; for as much as it can no more be or act without them than they without it* Mr. Wiſe ag. Atheiſm, Introd. p. 92, 93.

(q) Dr. *Cudw. Intell. Syſt. p.* 622, 625.

(r) Ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ φύσις ἡ τῷ μόνῳ παντοκράτορι προσεχεστάτη· αὕτη ἡ μεγίστη ὑπεροχή, ἣ τὰ πάντα διατάσσεται κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἄριστα οἰακίζει, ἀκαμάτῳ καὶ ἀτρύτῳ δυνάμει πάντα ἐργαζομένη, δι' ὧν ἐνεργεῖ τὰς ἀποκρύφους ἐννοίας ἐπιβλέπουσα. *Strom. l.* 7. *p. m.* 504, 505.

(s) *Dr. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. p.* 89, 90. *ed. an.* 1703.

(t) Ὁ μὲν οὖν θεὸς ἀναπόδεικτος ὤν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστημονικός. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς σοφία τε ἐστὶ, ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τούτῳ συγγενῆ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει καὶ διέξοδον.

(u) *Strom. l.* 6. *p. m.* 464.

(w) *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 257.

(x) *Dr. H. More Immort. of the Soul l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(y) *C. Celſ. l.* 6. *p.* 308, 318. & *l.* 5. *p.* 258.

(z) *Strom. l.* 5. *p. m.* 436.

(a) *Ibid. l.* 6. *p. m.* 483.

(b) *P.* 93. & 279.

(c) *Annot. in D. Bull. ſupr. p.* 75.

(d) *C. Celſ. l.* 5. *p.* 247 *l.* 6. *p.* 308.

touching the Son, (e) *that he is the moſt very God himſelf, not in any Perfection of Divinity inferior to him that is called the ſupreme God. On this account therefore only the Son is called by him the ſecond God, becauſe he is God of God, and had his origin from God the Father. In a word,* Origen *calleth the Son the ſecond God only for the ſame Reaſon that he is called by St.* Baſil *the ſecond in order from the Father.* But it is one thing to ſay he is in order *the ſecond Perſon*, another thing to call him *the ſecond God*. There is no Order but *inter diverſa*; if we have an Order and Subordination of Gods, we have *divers* Gods, and therefore are *Polytheiſts*. Polytheiſm with great Reaſon is by the *Athanaſian Creed* and the uſual Scholaſtic Theology charg'd upon this Platonic kind of Trinity, wherein there are *three Eternals, three Increates, three Infinites, three Almighties*, Eſſences and Perſons that are ſuch) exiſting in the triplify'd and triplifying way of Polytheiſm. Each of theſe thus ſubſiſteth in the diſtinct Eſſence and Perſon of a God, and therefore they are three diſtinct Gods. Every Hypoſtaſis is manifeſtly one diſtinct *eſſential* and *perſonal* God, therefore they are three Gods. Such eſſential Gods they are, as *being diſtinct infinite ſcholaſtic intelligent Subſtances*; or as being *diſtinct infinite ſcholaſtic Eſſences of infinite Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power*; *or as being diſtinct infinite ſcholaſtick almighty Minds and Spirits*; for every ſuch Being hath the Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence as its own Eſſence, which as neceſſarily conſtituteth an eſſential God, (a God as to Eſſence) as the Scholaſtic Human Eſſence conſtituteth *an eſſential Man*. And as this Name *Man* is the Name of a *Species*, which comprehendeth the individual Men; ſo (according to this Trinity) the Name *God* is the Name of a *Species*, which comprehendeth under it three individual Gods. The Hypoſtaſes of this Trinity are (doubtleſs) no other than three Individuals of the ſame Species.

(5.) In this Trinity there is by way of Propagation a twofold Repetition and Multiplication of the infinite Scholaſtic Divine Eſſence (and Attributes) which plainly deſtroyeth the Singularity and Solitareity of one only God, and muſt neceſſarily conſtitute three Gods, as the like Repetition and Multiplication of a Scholaſtic Human Eſſence muſt neceſſarily conſtitute three Men. If the divine Sovereignty is ſo repeated and multiply'd there muſt neceſſarily be three Gods (diſtinct divine Sovereignties) and it cannot be otherwiſe, if the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence is ſo repeated and multiply'd: nor can this divine Eſſence be ſo repeated and multiply'd without a Repetition and Multiplication of divine Sovereignties (the infinite imperial Perſon of one, a ſecond and third God) for ſuch they muſt be, although we ſhould ſuppoſe ſuch a Subordination and Dependence of one upon another as is in *Plato*'s Triad, the loweſt Hypoſtaſis whereof is Creator, Providential Governor and King of the Univerſe, not leſs Almighty to the World, (or *ad extra*) nor leſs a God to the World than the firſt Hypoſtaſis. But this Subordination and Dependence of the ſecond and third Hypoſtaſis in this Platonic Trinity is deſtroy'd by the Hypotheſis of their neceſſary Exiſtence from Eternity by Emanation; and therefore they muſt be ſuppos'd his Equals (in juſt Computation) Gods at as high a rate as He, and may be worſhipp'd at the ſame rate with him (ultimately without ſubordinate Relation to him) and for the ſame Reaſon that *he is one God each of them is alſo one God, which is to ſay, they are three Gods*. They are three ſuch diſtinct *Infinites* and *Almighties* as the one *Infinite* and *Almighty* is, and therefore are three ſuch diſtinct Gods; as three ſuch diſtinct Scholaſtick Eſſences and Beings as a Man and an Angel is are neceſſarily three Men and three Angels. It is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that God can beget Children, and propagate his divine vital Nature; but to ſuppoſe that he can produce and propagate ſuch an infinite Scholaſtic Almighty Subſtance, two ſuch infinite Scholaſtic Almighty Subſtances as himſelf is, that taken together are twice as great and good as himſelf, (and by the ſame Reaſon he may produce an hundred ſuch) this is a monſtrous Suppoſition, an accumulating infinite Scholaſtic Subſtances upon infinite, All-ſufficients upon All-ſufficient, a compounding one God of three infinite Scholaſtic Almighty Eſſences, (an horrible Bungle in the Deity and in the Univerſe) a making God but the third part of the Deity, and (if we ſuppoſe this Trinity to conſiſt of Equals) it is a making three *Supreme Beings*, which is not Senſe. But if we ſuppoſe an Inequality in this Trinity, and that it conſiſteth of ſubordinate Hypoſtaſes, (as the Platoniſts did) yet ſeeing each one of them is a God, it muſt conſiſt of one greater and two leſſer Gods, which are three Gods. Each of them is conſtitutively and diſtinctly in himſelf one infinite Scholaſtic divine Eſſence (with the Attributes) one God, one diſtinct God; therefore they are one God thrice number'd, which is *three Gods*. This Platonic kind of Trinity abateth ſome of the Evils of the uſual Scholaſtic Trinity, but tranſcendeth it in the Evil of Polytheiſm. For the three Hypoſtaſes of the uſual Scholaſtic Trinity are as to numerically one Eſſence numerically one God; but the three Hypoſtaſes of this Trinity are not in any reſpect one ſuch God. They are three infinite diſtinct Scholaſtic Subſtances, Eſſences and eſſential Gods, and ſo they will continue, although we ſuppoſe their *ſpecifical Coeſſentiality* or *Conſubſtantiality*, *the Inſeparableneſs of their Subſtances*, (compar'd to the Sun and his Rays, the Fountain and the Stream) their περιχώρησις, *Permeation or mutual In-being*, *their concurring to all the ſame Actions* ad extrà, *their concurrent making up one intire* τὸ θεῖον, *Divinity*, (as the Root, the Stock and the Branches make one intire Tree;) for the Reſult and Upſhot of all theſe little Scholaſtic Devices (and ſuch more) is not one God numerically ſuch, but only a Collective or little Syſtem of diſtinct yet conjoyned Gods, one of which is *Divinitatis Caput*, (the Head of this Divinity) as *Arnobius* ſpeaketh. That one τὸ θεῖον, or Divinity, which they are ſuppos'd concurrently to make up, is ſaid to be *one intire thing*, (whereas God is a Name of Perſonal Honour and Nobilitation;) but they ſtill remain *diſtinct eſſential ſcholaſtic Gods*; and it is a Vanity, an Impoſſibility, and a Self-contradiction, to pretend to unite them into *a numerically one God*.

VII. According to our Idea of the Trinity, the Son and the Holy Spirit *exiſt in the Unity of God, of his imperial Eſtate and his divine Eſſence*, (who is the imperial Eſtate of Government in his Kingdom) *and in the way of his Monothe-iſm*. As the Scholaſtic Trinities are prejudicial to the Unity of God, and introduce Polytheiſm:

(e) *Ut ipſe Deus ſit ipſiſſimus, neque ullâ divinitatis perfectione illo minor, qui ſummus Deus dicitur, nempe Deo Patre. Proinde hâc tantum ratione ſecundum Deum dici Filium, quòd Deus ſit de Deo, hoc eſt à Deo Patre originem ſuam habeat. Verbo dicam, Origines Filium non aliâ ratione ſecundum Deum appellavit, quàm eundem* τάξει δεύτερον τοῦ πατρὸς, *ordine ſecundum à Patre dixit Baſilius.* Dr. Bull ſupra p. 263.

So our Idea of the Trinity is deſtructive to that Polytheiſm, which they introduce. They have their Origin from this fundamental Miſcarriage, The not contemplating the Godhead as an Imperial Eſtate regularly conſtituted. For no rational man would conſtitute an Imperial Eſtate of three co-eternal, co-equal, omniſcient and almighty Sovereigns, each of which is the Perſon of the Eternal Almighty God, and conſequently every one of them is *by himſelf* (as the *Athanaſian* Creed ſpeaketh) a ſort of imperial Eſtate. But all men muſt acknowledge, that an holy Sovereignty or imperial Eſtate, which conſiſteth of an holy imperial Father, an holy imperial Son and an holy Spirit of the Government is a regularly conſtituted Imperial Eſtate; and it may be underſtood and illuſtrated by imagining and ſuppoſing a like imperial Eſtate amongſt men. For we may ſuppoſe the Papal Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate (an imperial Eſtate of Religion) to conſiſt of the holy imperial Father, the imperial Son of the Papacy, and of the Spirit of Popery; which imaginary Papal Sovereignty or Imperial Eſtate, is an imperfect Image and Reſemblance of that divine Sovereignty or imperial Eſtate which God is in his Kingdom. In the Unity of which imperial Eſtate, together with his divine Eſſence, the Son and the Holy Spirit exiſt, and ſo exiſt, that the Father only is the imperial Eſtate of God, the one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God, and therefore they are ſaid to exiſt in the Unity of God in the way of his Monothe-iſm. By this Idea of the Trinity the Unity of God and Unity in Trinity, or *three perſons and one God*, (which is the Faith of Chriſtians) are duely ſecured, as will appear from theſe following Obſervables concerning it.

(1.) This Trinity is no more than God imperial, or God as an imperial Eſtate. For God as ſuch in the larger notion and comprehenſion, is three divine Perſons. The Son and the Holy Spirit exiſt in that imperial Eſtate, which He is, exiſt in the Unity of it, are comprehended in it; ſo that God in the comprehenſion of that imperial Eſtate which He is, is three divine Perſons; the Son and the Holy Spirit belong to this imperial Eſtate which He is, belong to the Unity of it; they appertain to his being God, the one God as an imperial Eſtate. And ſeeing one God as imperial is three Perſons, the three Perſons are neceſſarily one God; for one God is the comprehenſion of them, they are comprehended in the Unity of God as an imperial Eſtate, and in ſuch ſenſe they are one God, and in ſuch ſenſe that there is no Polytheiſm in the Godhead.

(2.) The divine vital Eſſence of God in the larger notion and comprehenſion is that vital Sanctity, which the Son is as his conſtitutive nature, and this vital Sanctity is the divine vital Eſſence of God. The divine vital Eſſence of God alſo is that vital Sanctity, which the Holy Spirit is (the communicative) and this is the divine vital Eſſence of God. So that the Son and the Holy Ghoſt exiſt in the Unity of the divine vital Eſſence which God is, as well as in the Unity of that imperial Eſtate which God is. Their Divinity or Deity of Perſon conſiſteth in being perſons of his Sovereignty and of his Eſſence; this their Divinity or Deity of perſon therefore (both as to Sovereignty and as to Eſſence) is that which is His, ſuch is his Monotheiſm. They are not God in the triplify'd and triplifying way of Polytheiſm; but they are God only as appertaining to God, the one as the imperial Son, the other as the Holy Spirit of his imperial Eſtate and Government, to whom his Sovereignty and his Eſſence appertaineth as ſuch. As ſuch they exiſt undividedly from God, and as one with him (appertaining to him indiviſively) the imperial Son being one with him in his Sovereignty, one with him in his Eſſence, one with him in Reality and due Perſonality (the Son being the Father's Repreſentative) and ſo far he is God; but not ſo as to imply or infer *Ditheiſm* (two Gods) the Unity of God is not prejudic'd thereby: But on the contrary the one only God, as in the comprehenſion of his Imperial Eſtate, ſo in the comprehenſion of his divine vital Nature and Eſſence is three Perſons, three Perſons belong to his Unity, and are comprehended in it, not only *as He is the Sanctity imperial, but as He is the Sanctity vital*, and conſequently the three Perſons are one God. The Holy Ghoſt is ſo one with God, as to be the great Eſſentiality belonging to his Godhead, that of himſelf and his divine vital Eſſence which is the *Communicative*, who therefore is far from being another God beſides himſelf.

(3.) The Son and the Holy Ghoſt exiſt in the Godhead in their proper Character (as the Son and the Holy Ghoſt;) for although they are God with due diſtinction and limitation of ſenſe, as being perſons and ſuch perſons of the Godhead, yet neither of them doth exiſt in the Godhead in the perſon of a God, or in the Perſon of God *definitively and abſolutely ſo*, the perſon of the Almighty God (or as the imperial Eſtate of God;) nor can the imperial Son be another or a different God from the Father. He that is of the Godhead, ſo as to be only the imperial Son of it, is not of the Godhead, ſo as to be another or a different God for this reaſon, *becauſe he is of the Godhead, ſo as to be only the imperial Son of it*: As he that is of the Papacy, ſo as to be only the imperial Son of it, is not of the Papacy, ſo as to be another Pope. Agreeably whereto the Names which the ancient Writers have given to the Son, may and ought to be underſtood; they uſed them as terms to eſtabliſh their own ſenſe, but they ought to be underſtood in another ſenſe, of which they are capable. For the Son ought to be called *God of God* (Deus de Deo) *Light of Light*, *very God of very God* with this limitation, ſo as is competible to *the divine imperial Son*, and not otherwiſe. The Holy Ghoſt is not in ſuch ſenſe God, as to be ſtrictly the divine Sovereignty, but is only the divine Inſpiration-virtue and Agent of the Divine Sovereignty and Government, and he that is of the Godhead as ſuch, and only as ſuch, cannot be ſuppoſed to be another God.

(4.) Touching the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes there is great difference between our Chriſtian Trinity and the Scholaſtic Trinities. For in theſe Trinities every divine Perſon is a perſon, that is his own diſtinct comprehenſion of the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes as well as the Father, and thereby is in and by himſelf God, and a God as well as the Father, agreeably to what the *Athanaſian Creed* ſaith, *Each Perſon is by himſelf God* (the Perſon of the Almighty God, omniſcient, omnipotent, omni-imperial) which muſt be thought an heinous violation both of the Honour and of the Unity of God. There is indeed in theſe Trinities an ἐμπεριχώρησις, *a mutual Inexiſtence and Immeation* of the three divine Perſons; they are ſuppoſed not only to be inſeparably conjoin'd, but intimately to penetrate and pervade one another. But this their Inexiſtence ſignifieth nothing to the abating the heinous violation of the Honour of God, becauſe it is a mutual ἐμπεριχώρησις, *Inexiſtence*, that is as broad as it is long. Nor doth it ſignifie any thing to the abating the heinous violation of the Unity of God; ſor notwithſtanding this Scholaſtic *Inexiſtence*, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are Perſons, that are their own diſtinct comprehenſion of the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes as well as the Father, and thereby each of them is in and by himſelf God, and a God as well as the Father. But things are quite otherwiſe in our Chriſtian Trinity, in which there is none but the Father's *one ſole Comprehenſion of the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes*, (which cannot be multiply'd, nor Scholaſtically communicated) to which Comprehenſion (the Father's Godhead) the Son and the Holy Ghoſt belong, therein they have their Inexiſtence, they are Perſons of it, and they are God, *ſo as that all their Divinity or Deity is the Father's, as comprehended in his Monothe-iſm, and belonging to the Comprehenſion thereof. Whatever Omniſcience, Omnipotence, or Omni-imperial Authority the imperial Son or the Holy Spirit have, it is the Father's, as comprehended in his Monothe-iſm, and belonging to the Comprehenſion thereof.* Each of theſe divine Perſons hath ſuch an *Omniſcience*, *Omnipotence* and *Omni-imperial* Authority, as belongeth to one of his Idea? But this will not infer, that they are abſolutely *omniſcient*, *omnipotent* and *omni-imperial*. Some Scholaſtic Trinitarians ſay, (*f*) *The Son is not able to beget the Father, nor the Holy Ghoſt to produce either Father or Son; theſe Hypoſtaſes are not omnipotent* ad intra (inwards or within the Deity:) *When the Father is ſaid to be omnipotent, the Son omnipotent, the Holy Ghoſt omnipotent, the term Omnipotent is not of the ſame ſenſe.* We may not argue with the Fathers touching the Holy Spirit, (*g*) *Quid eſt quod neſciat, qui novit omnia quæ Dei ſunt? Spiritus enim etiam alta Dei ſcrutatur.* What is there, that he doth not know, who knoweth all the things of God? For the Spirit ſearcheth even the deep things of God, becauſe the Holy Spirit hath the Omniſcience of *the Spirit of Revelation*, hence it is inferr'd. But by no good conſequence, that he is abſolutely omniſcient. Theſe are conſiderable matters of difference touching the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes.

(5.) If every divine Perſon is *neceſſarily and eternally* a Perſon, that is his own diſtinct Comprehenſion of the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes as well as the Father, and thereby is in and by himſelf God, and a God as well as the Father, every divine Perſon (notwithſtanding his Origination from the Father) muſt be ſuppoſed *a Self-Owner as well as the Father*, and the conſequence is *Patri non eſt auctoritas*, which is deſtructive to the Honour and to the Being of one only God: But if the Son and the Holy Ghoſt exiſt in the Father's Godhead as his imperial Son and his Holy Spirit, and if they are God, ſo as that all their Divinity or Deity is the Father's as comprehended in his *Monothe-iſm*, and belonging to the Comprehenſion thereof, then we may ſay with St. *Auſtin*, and with far better reaſon than he, (*h*) *Deus ſummus & verus cum Verbo ſuo & Spiritu ſancto, quæ tria unum ſunt, unus Deus.* The ſupreme and true God with his Word and Holy Spirit, which three are one, one God. For all that the imperial Son and the Holy Spirit is as to Divinity or Deity, belongeth to the *Monothe-iſm* of the one God, and is comprehended in it.

VIII. Our Chriſtian Trinity is nothing more than *the Unity of God as imperial in his new Kingdom* which voideth the *Unitarians* Objections againſt the Trinity. The Unity of God as it offereth it ſelf to our Contemplation, is of two ſorts (not conſidering his Unity in the typical *Jewiſh* Church:) The one is *a Coſmical-providential*; the other is his *divine Theopolitical Unity*. In natural Religion, in Deiſm and Pagan Theiſm there is an Unity of God; for the Pagan Theiſts were generally of this Perſwaſion, That the Univerſe is a Monarchy, and they believ'd, as the *Stoicks* argued, *that there is but one Jove and Providence*, one Coſmical Regent and governing Providence, whereby the Univerſe was conſtituted and is govern'd. But beſides this *Coſmical-providential Unity* of God, there is *a divine Theopolitical Unity*; for God muſt be contemplated as the imperial Eſtate of Sanctity imperial (which is an obligation upon us, to become his Liege-Subjects in the Comprehenſion of Sanctity imperial) which is the only Comprehenſion, that himſelf and his People are of, the City of God, his Church and his Kingdom. In his new Kingdom God is the imperial Eſtate and ſole imperial Perſon of God: But ſo that his imperial Son as ſuch is God as a Perſon of his divine Sovereignty and Godhead, the filial imperial Eſtate of Chriſtianity imperial, the filial imperial Lord of all, our (mediatory) divine Sovereign Lord, and the Saviour-King of the holy Empire. Which holy Empire is made holy by the God-agency and Operation of the Holy Spirit, who is ſuch an Agent-virtual kind of Perſon, that as ſuch ought to be in this divine Sovereignty and Government, is eſſential to the imperial Head of the Church and to the holy Empire, is of ſuch immenſe vital Sanctity, ſo many Creature-tranſcendencies, and is ſo almoſt God himſelf (as being that of God, that of himſelf his Holy Spirit) that he muſt be thought an Intrinſick of the one imperial Eſtate of the Godhead, which is the imperial Eſtate of the Kingdom of God. And becauſe this Holy Spirit and the imperial Son are comprehended in the Unity of God, as he is the imperial Eſtate of his now Kingdom, therefore the Chriſtian Trinity may be juſtly ſaid to be nothing more *than the Unity of God as imperial in his new Kingdom.*

This goeth a great way to facilitate the Belief of the Chriſtian Trinity; for the *Unitarians* Objections and Arguments againſt the Scholaſtic Trinities are chiefly founded upon the *Unity of God*, which is their κυρία δόξα, *capital Article*. For this they contend and diſpute, for this they expreſs the greateſt Zeal and Concern, for this they incur the Averſation and Deteſtation of all parties, for this (as they profeſs) they are ready to part with their Eſtates and Lives, and from this their principal Article they denominate themſelves *Unitarians*. They are not ſatisfy'd with that Unity of the divine Nature (or Eſſence) which the uſual Scholaſtic Theology acknowledgeth (which cannot clear it from introducing a Plurality of Gods) they diſpute for another ſort of *Unity of God*, namely, *That God is but one Perſon*, (or that there is but one divine Perſon) and this is τὸ κρινόμενον, *the matter in Controverſie*, between them and their Adverſaries. Our Hypotheſis inter-

(f) *Dr. Cudw. Intell. Syſt.* p. 598. *Dr. H. More Myſt. of Godl. B.* 9. c. 2.

(g) *S. Ambroſ. de ſp. ſanct. l.* 2. c 12.

(h) *De C. D. l.* 5. c. 11.

interpoſeth between them as a Mediator, it granteth an unanſwerable Firmitude in the *Anti-Trinitarians* Objections of Polytheiſm againſt the Scholaſtic Trinities, and in their Arguments for the Unity of God, as they aſſert it againſt them: It ſaith as they ſay, it diſputeth as they diſpute, that God is but one Perſon; yet our Hypotheſis is *Chriſtian-Trinitarian*, and theirs is *Unchriſtian-Unitarian*. Notwithſtanding our Agreement in terms, and (in good degree) in ſenſe, and although we both alike zealouſly aſſert the Unity of God, yet we differ in ſomething, and in ſomething very conſiderable, which is eſſential to Chriſtianity; for their Doctrine of *the Unity of God* as it is *Anti-Trinitarian* (excluſive of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt from being Perſons of the Godhead) is deſtructive of Chriſtianity in ſome main and principal parts of it. They inſiſt upon ſuch an Unity of God, as appeareth in Nature and common Providence, as is found in *Deiſm*, *literal Judaiſm*, *Muhammediſm* and *Pagan Theiſm*, (The Coſmical-providential Unity of God) and this they recommend, ſo to exterminate the Chriſtian Trinity: But they might as well and by the ſame reaſon inſiſt upon ſuch a Kingdom, or City of God, as is in Nature and common Providence, in *Deiſm*, *Judaiſm* and *Paganiſm*, ſo to exterminate the only true Kingdom of God, which is not to be found in *Deiſm* or *Judaiſm*, in Nature or common Providence. There is no ſaving Religion but that of the Kingdom of God (out of which the Life and State of Holineſs and of Alliance to God is not to be found;) how little therefore doth ſuch an Unity of God ſignifie, which is on this ſide the Kingdom of God? How little doth it ſignifie, to be *a Pagan, a Judaical, or a Muhammedan Unitarian?* And if the *Unitarians* will be Chriſtian *Unitarians*, they muſt acknowledge *the Unity of God as imperial in his new Kingdom*, in which Unity of his Godhead there are manifeſtly three divine Perſons, and therefore they muſt embrace the Chriſtian Trinity, which is nothing but pure Chriſtianity, is in all reſpects truly divine, agreeable in great degree to their own Notions, and of ſo unexceptionable a Make and Character, that it is not liable to any of their Objections and Arguments againſt the Trinity, which plainly confute their own Hypotheſis, do not affect our Hypotheſis, but all of them vaniſh before it as a Miſt before the Sun.

(1.) One ſort of their Arguments is drawn from thoſe Texts, which expreſs the Unity of God. For to prove, that Chriſt is not a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead their prime Allegation is, *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God.* Whence they argue, that all other perſons beſides the Father are excluded from being the true or ſupreme God. But this illuſtrious Text really proveth the Chriſtian Trinitarian, not the Unitarian Hypotheſis. For the Words do not *exclude*, but manifeſtly *include* our Saviour as to the being a Perſon of the ſupreme Godhead. His Words cannot exclude, what they manifeſtly include, imply and infer. Becauſe God the Father is the only true and ſupreme God, therefore the holy imperial Lord the Son is neceſſarily a Perſon of the only true and ſupreme Godhead, (this our Saviour's words include and imply) as becauſe a King is the only true and ſupreme King, therefore his regial Son is neceſſarily a Perſon of the only true and ſupreme Regality. This prime Allegation therefore is againſt themſelves, and ſo are theſe other Texts, which are their principal Allegations. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *To us there is but one God the Father; of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things.* Eph. 4. 5, 6. *There is one Lord; one Faith; one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all.* 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 5, 6. *There are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit. And there are differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord. And there are diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all.* Rom. 3. 30. *It is one God which ſhall juſtifie the Circumciſion by faith, and Uncircumciſion through faith.* From ſuch places the *Unitarians* argue, that God the Father is peculiarly and appropriately *The one God and the only ſupreme God*, and Chriſt is diſtinguiſh'd from him as *The Lord* (which denoteth Inferiority;) therefore Chriſt is not the ſupreme God. Meaning (as in part they do) that Chriſt is not a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead. And as this is their Meaning, I ſay, that their Premiſſes deſtroy their Concluſion: For no man can attentively read theſe Texts and compare them, but he will plainly diſcern that the ſenſe of them is our Chriſtian Trinitarian Hypotheſis, *viz. That God the Father is the one and ſole imperial Eſtate of God, and that the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are Perſons of his imperial Eſtate, the one as the imperial Son, the other as the divine Ghoſtly Agent of his Sovereignty.* God the Father muſt be acknowledged peculiarly and appropriately *The one God:* But becauſe Chriſt is *The Lord* (the imperial Son, who is neceſſarily of the ſame imperial Eſtate with the Father) therefore Chriſt is neceſſarily a Perſon of the one true and ſupreme Godhead. But againſt this the *Unitarians* argue from 1 *Tim.* 2 5. that there is *one God* (beſides whom there is no other) and Chriſt is only the *Mediator* between God and Men. To which I anſwer, That to be the Mediator, is nothing elſe, but to be by Officiary Dignity *The holy imperial Lord the Son* (our mediatory divine ſovereign Lord) who is neceſſarily a Perſon of the one ſupreme Godhead. Nor is it tolerable in Religion, to make him a Mediator of a more inferior quality (not tranſcending a Creature) an *Heterouſian Extrinſick* to the Godhead. He that underſtandeth theſe Anſwers to the principal Allegations of the Unitarians, needeth not to be taught what Anſwer to make to the reſt of the multitude of their Allegations, that God (the Father) is *the only Lord God, God only wiſe, and there is no other true God but the God of* Iſrael; *that God is greater than Chriſt, his Head, God and Father, and none is good ſave one, that is God; that Chriſt is diſtinguiſh'd from God, and is only The Son of God The Word of God, The Image of God, The Bread of God, and is ſaid to have been with God, in the form of God, to be equal with God, to come forth from God, to ſit at the Right-hand of God, and to be ordain'd of God the Judge of quick and dead.* All which ſort of Texts do not confute, but confirm our Chriſtian Trinitarian Hypotheſis touching the Unity of God, but the Anti-Trinitarians are not ſatisfied with any other Unity of God, than that which deſtroyeth the *divine Perſonality* of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, and conjoineth into a Trinity *two Creatures and one God* (things that are far worſe than the worſt of Scholaſtic Trinities) they inſiſt and urge, *That God is but one Perſon; there is no other God but one; the Lord thy God, the Lord is one; God is one. This the whole Bible atteſteth, and till* *they can remove the firſt Commandment out of the way* (ſaith an Unitarian Diſputant) *it will be impoſſible for Men of ſenſe to be of the Trinitarian Perſwaſion.* To which Argumentation a Chriſtian Trinitarian maketh anſwer, That God definitively ſo called is but *one Perſon.* He will not ſay in the ſenſe of the uſual Scholaſtic Trinity, or in the ſenſe of the Platonic Trinities, that God is three Perſons: Nor will he allow himſelf at all, ſimply to ſay, that God is *three Perſons*; for this is to ſay, that *one is three,* and it cannot be ſaid without the Fallacy *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter.* Yet it muſt be ſaid of God, that in the Comprehenſion and Unity of his Godhead there are three Perſons, ſo that in ſome ſenſe and reſpect God (definitively ſo called) is three Perſons, and three Perſons are one God, as belonging to the Unity of his Godhead. As to the firſt Commandment the ſenſe of it may be thus explain'd and illuſtrated. Let us ſuppoſe, that we are Roman Catholicks, and that the legitimate Pope giveth us this Commandment, *Ye ſhall have no other Pope but me.* This Commandment expreſly excludeth all illegitimate Popes: But it doth not hinder an imperial Son and the Spirit of the Roman Catholic Religion and Government from being in the Papacy; nor can it be ſuppos'd to exclude what it manifeſtly implieth, includeth and inferreth. It manifeſtly implieth, that we muſt have the legitimate Pope for our Pope, and conſequently (ſuppoſing ſuch Perſons to be in the Papacy) that we muſt acknowledge his imperial Son and the Spirit of his Religion in the quality of his imperial Son and Spirit. The Application of this to the Godhead is eaſie and obvious; nor is it hard to ſatisfie this Argumentation of the *Unitarians. Who ſeeth not, that one almighty, moſt wiſe and good God is ſufficient? In the viſible World or created Nature there is nothing in vain, much leſs is there or can there be in the divine Nature any thing uſeleſs, needleſs and ſuperfluous. If a Being is infinite in all Perfections, there is no need that it ſhould be multiply'd, or be more than one.* This Objection hath its riſe from their unacquaintedneſs with the true and Chriſtian method of contemplating God. For that which they look at, is the *Coſmical-providential Unity of God,* (whence they conſider him only as one infinite Spirit and all-ſufficient Mind) not knowing, that God muſt be contemplated as *an imperial Eſtate, as the imperial Eſtate of Sanctity imperial, of his own Kingdom and of his new Kingdom.* In reſpect of his Imperial Eſtate, Headſhip, Government and Kingdom of Sanctity imperial (although God may not, nor can be multiply'd, yet) the Exiſtence of his Holy Spirit in his Godhead is indiſpenſably neceſſary. And as he is the imperial Eſtate of God in his new Kingdom, there muſt be in his Godhead both his divine imperial Son (the Lord Meſſiah) and his divine Spirit, as every man that is acquainted with the Affairs of the Kingdom of God will not fail to acknowledge. *Tertullian* thus diſputeth againſt the *Unitarians* of his time, the *Monarchiani, Noetians* or *Sabellians,* that called themſelves *Unius Dei cultores.* *(i) The very Rule of Faith removeth us from the Polytheiſm of the World to one only and the true God, who indeed is only one, but whom we muſt believe with his Oeconomy.* The Chriſtian Trinity is God with his Oeconomy, which is in Chriſtianity of neceſſary Exiſtence, and neceſſary to be believed. And now every one may diſcern, that theſe Queſtions of an Unitarian Writer do not at all concern our Hypotheſis. Qu. 1. *Whether one infinitely wiſe, powerful and good Perſon be not as ſufficient to all purpoſes and intents, as three, or even three thouſand ſuch Perſons?* Qu. 2. *If three Perſons are neceſſary towards compleating the Nature and Notion of God, would not ſeven ſuch Perſons be a more compleat God than three?*

(2.) A ſecond ſort of Arguments in great plenty the *Unitarians* raiſe from thoſe many Texts of Scripture, that ſpeak of our Saviour's Meſſias-ſhip. *Crellius* in the firſt and ſecond Section of his firſt Book, *De uno Deo,* hath multiply'd his Scriptural Arguments to the number of ſeven and forty: But of this huge number ſcarce one Argument doth affect our Hypotheſis. All that he hath diſcourſed touching the *Unity of God, the Diſtinction of God from the Son of God, his miſſive Oeconomy, his Neſcience of the Day of Judgment, his Aſcription of Goodneſs, Greatneſs and Superiority to the Father, his receiving his All from him, his aſcribing his All to him, his praying to him, and delivering up the Kingdom to him, his Generation, Incarnation, Prieſthood, Mediatorſhip, of his Equality to the Father, his being his, and his Image, of the Father's being his God and his Head, and of his being tempted by Satan,* ſignifieth juſt nothing to the prejudice of our Hypotheſis touching the Deity of our Saviour. But becauſe the numerous Texts which he hath cited touching our Saviour's *miſſive Oeconomy,* may ſeem (more eſpecially) to countenance his vile *Unitarian* Hypotheſis of creaturizing the Son of God, therefore I will briefly explain them, and ſet the ſenſe of them in clear light. I ſay therefore, that all of them amount to nothing more than this, to ſignifie, *That our Saviour is not his own, but God's Meſſiah*; which is to ſay, that he is not the imperial Perſon of God *definitively* ſo called, but the imperial Son of God; and the ſenſe of that is, that he is a Perſon of the Godhead, but not otherwiſe than as the imperial Son of God. They are therefore no Prejudice to, but a great Confirmation of our Hypotheſis; for any one that underſtandeth the ſenſe of Language, may be ſatisfied, that this is the whole import of our Saviour's Language, *I am not mine own, but God's Meſſiah,* when he ſaith, *I am not come of my ſelf, but he that ſent me, is true. I am come in my Father's Name. I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of my ſelf, but he ſent me. My Judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father that ſent me. He that ſent me is with me: The Father hath not left me alone: For I do always thoſe things that pleaſe him. I have not ſpoken of my ſelf; but the Father which ſent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I ſhould ſay, and what I ſhould ſpeak. I ſpeak therefore even as the Father ſaid unto me. My doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me. If any man will do his will, he ſhall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of my ſelf. He that ſpeaketh of himſelf, ſeeketh his own glory: But he that ſeeketh his glory that ſent him, the ſame is true, and no unrighteouſneſs is in him. When ye have lift up the Son of Man, then ſhall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of my ſelf; but as the Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe things. The words that I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of my ſelf; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's which*

Joh. 5.19, 20, 26, 27, 30, 36, 43. *and* 6. 37, 38. *and* 7. 16, 17, 18, 28. *and* 8. 16, 28, 29, 40, 42, 50, 54. *and* 10. 25, 29, 37, 38. *and* 12. 44, 49, 50. *and* 14.10, 14, 31. *and* 15. 10. *and* 17. 2, 6, 8, 22, 24. *and* 18.11. *Matth.* 11. 27. *and* 26. 39. *and* 28. 18. *Luc.* 22.29. *Apoc.* 2.26, 27.

(i) *Ipſa regula Fidei à pluribus Deis ſeculi ad unicum & verum Deum transfert, unicum quidem, ſed cum ſuâ* οἰκονομία, *credendum.* Adv. Prax. c. 3.

ſent me. I told you the truth, which I have heard of God. All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you. I have given them the words which thou gaveſt me (ſaith Chriſt to his Father) *and they have received them, and have known ſurely, that I came out from thee, and they have believed, that thou didſt ſend me. He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me. The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do; for the Father loveth the Son, and ſheweth him all things that himſelf doeth. I can of mine own ſelf do nothing; as I hear, I judge, and my judgment is juſt, becauſe I ſeek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath ſent me. I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that ſent me. I ſeek not mine own glory: There is one that ſeeketh and judgeth. If I honour my ſelf, my honour is nothing: It is my Father that honoureth me. To ſit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but it ſhall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father. As the Father gave me commandment, ſo I do. I have kept my Father's commandment, and abide in his love. The works which the Father hath given me to finiſh, the ſame works that I doe bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me. Believe the works, that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all. All that the Father giveth me, ſhall come to me. As the Father hath life in himſelf; ſo hath he given to the Son, to have life in himſelf; and hath given him authority to execute Judgment. As thou haſt given him power over all fleſh* (ſaith Chriſt to his Father) *that he ſhould give eternal life to as many as thou haſt given him. I have manifeſted thy name unto the men which thou gaveſt me out of the World: Thine they were, and thou gaveſt them me. The glory which thou gaveſt me, I have given them. That they may behold my glory, which thou haſt given me. All things are delivered to me of my Father. All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth. The cup which my Father hath given me, ſhall I not drink it? Not as I will, but as thou wilt. I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me. He that overcometh, to him will I give power, even as I received of my Father.*

The holy Writers of the New Teſtament ſpeak of our Saviour agreeably to the tenor of his own divine Diſcourſes, and repreſent him not as his own, but as God's Meſſiah. For this is their meaning and the whole of their ſenſe, when they ſay, that *he was fore-ordain'd* (by God) *before the foundation of the World; that God gave him and ſent him in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh; anointed him with the Holy Ghoſt and with Power; gave not the Spirit by meaſure unto him; made him Sin for us, and deliver'd him to death for us all. Of God he is made unto us wiſdom and righteouſneſs and ſanctification and redemption. He glorified not himſelf to be made an High Prieſt; but he that ſaid unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee. In the days of his fleſh he offered up prayers and ſupplications with ſtrong crying and tears, unto him that was able to ſave him from death. Called of God an High Prieſt. Conſider the Apoſtle and High Prieſt of our profeſſion Chriſt Jeſus, who was faithful to him that appointed him. Who by him hath reconciled us to himſelf, by him giveth us the victory, by him hath created all things, who raiſed him from the dead, exalted him by his right hand, gave him the promiſed Holy Spirit, put all things under him, all principality and power, and every name that is named, gave him the throne of his Father* David, *gave him to be Head over all things to the Church, ordained him to be the Judge of quick and dead, committed* (gave) *all judgment unto the Son, made him both Lord and Chriſt, and gave him the name above every name. For the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.* A vaſt number of Texts of this nature are produc'd by *Crellius*, to deſtroy the Scholaſtic Trinitarian Divinity of our Saviour, and to eſtabliſh his own Hypotheſis, which creaturizeth the Son of God. And it muſt be acknowledged, that they effectually deſtroy the Scholaſtic Trinitarian Divinity of our Saviour; for the Language which he ſpeaketh (that he came from God, in his Name, was ſent, taught and commanded by God) is not agreeable to one, that is the Perſon of the Almighty God; innumerable things in theſe Texts are affirm'd and deny'd of our Saviour, which are utterly incompetible to ſuch a Perſon; and it is groſs Self-contradiction to ſuppoſe, that He, who is not his own, but God's Meſſiah, is the Perſon of the Eternal Almighty God, of the moſt *High God*, *the Jehovah* in the ſtrict ſenſe. But on the other hand, I do affirm, that theſe numerous Texts which *Crellius* hath produc'd, do as effectually and fully deſtroy his own vile Hypotheſis (touching the Perſon of our Saviour) as they do the Scholaſtic Trinitarian. And this may eaſily be made evident to any capable Underſtanding. For the Name *Meſſiah* denoteth an imperial or regial Perſon; and the ſame Perſon that is the Meſſiah, is the perſon of the Son of God; this therefore is his definitive Notion or Idea; He is the imperial Son of God, of the great King, who cannot be one of *the Creature-party, the Subject-party*, but is neceſſarily one of *the Creature-tranſcendent, the imperial Party.* Again, the Name of God's Meſſiah (of whom he ſaith, *I have ſet my King upon my holy hill of* Sion) manifeſtly denoteth *A divine imperial Perſon*; it denoteth therefore one that is of the divine imperial Eſtate, which is the Godhead. He is ſo as the Son and Heir of this imperial Eſtate (not meerly by an abſurd and arbitrary Gift of God to a Creature;) he is ſo by Birth-nobilitation, and in the way of Generation (both in his primary and officiary Capacity;) and he is ſo as the imperial Saint of God-kind of Son, which he cannot be, if as to his Eſſence, he is but a Creature. If any one with Judgment readeth theſe numerous Texts, that are ſet before his Eyes, he cannot but diſcern, that our Saviour's Character and Deſcription (both in his own and the holy Writers Diſcourſes) conſiſteth of manifold *Creature-tranſcendencies*, (His being with God, ſo as to be in the Boſom of the Father, to have intimate converſe with him and from him, is manifeſt Creature-tranſcendence; ſuch are his Offices of divine High-Prieſt, univerſal King, Judge and Saviour; and his Exaltation is full of Creature-tranſcendencies) throughout his divine Diſcourſes and the holy Writers he is repreſented as ſo nearly ally'd to God, and ſo dear to him, as is enough to ſatisfie any unprejudic'd mind, that there is no other Diſtance between them but that of divine imperial Father and Son, not that of God and Creature. The creaturizing Hypotheſis of the Unitarians is ſo far from being proved by the numerous Texts which they cite, that they are all of them Proofs of Chriſt's true Divinity, which is *his Creature-tranſcendence* (ſo far are they from doing prejudice to it) and are really argumentative againſt

1 *Pet.* 1.
20. *Joh.* 3.
16, 17, 34,
35. *and* 5.
22. *Luc.* 1.
32. *Act.* 2.
33, 36. *and*
3. 26. *and*
10. 38, 42.
Rom. 8. 3,
32. 1 *Cor.*
1. 30. *and*
15. 27, 57.
2 *Cor.* 5.
18, 21.
Eph. 1. 21,
22. *and* 3.
9. *Phil.* 2.
9. *Heb.* 5.
7, 10. *and*
3. 1, 2.

themſelves. For what can be more expreſſive of Creature-tranſcendence than this illuſtrious Text which they cite, *Joh.* 5. 36. *As the Father hath life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son to have life in himſelf.* What can be more expreſſive of Creature-tranſcendence than his very Name, *The Son of God?* The Unitarians diſpute, (*k*) that Chriſt is ſaid to be *equal with God*; which ought not to be ſaid, if he is one of the Creatures. That he is ſaid to be *the Mediator* (our mediatory divine Sovereign) and that is Creature-tranſcendence. That he is *the Image of the inviſible God* (peculiarly and appropriately) which is to be *the imperial Son*, and that is *Creature-tranſcendence.* And how abſurd an Impertinence would it be in our Saviour to tell his Diſciples, *The Father is greater than I,* if he was but a Creature? So they object the former part of this following Text as a mighty Argument for their Hypotheſis, *Joh.* 5. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do: For what things ſoever he doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe.* But the former part of this Text doth not at all befriend the Unitarian Hypotheſis (it only importeth, that as to his Meſſias-ſhip our Saviour could do nothing of himſelf, as not being his own, but God's Meſſiah:) And the latter part of the Text plainly deſtroyeth it. For this is an high Strain of Creature-tranſcendence, *What things ſoever the Father doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe.* It is a great reproach to the Underſtanding of *Crellius*, that he hath filled his Book with Texts of Scripture, which proclaim our Saviour's *Creature-tranſcendence,* yet himſelf and his Aſſociates make this contradictious Inference from them, *That He is one of the Creatures.* For the Proof whereof he citeth the Apoſtles divine Panegyrick of our Saviour (every Branch whereof proclaimeth his Creature-tranſcendence) wherein he is ſtyled *The Primogenit of every Creature*; which is ſuppos'd to imply, *that he is one of the number of the Creatures.* But doubtleſs this is an honourary Attribute, which denoteth this Creature-tranſcendence, that he is (as being the Heir) *the Lord of all Creatures,* as the following Words ſhew.

(3.) A third ſort of the *Unitarians* Arguments (in their late Pamphlets) is heavy Criminations of the Trinity. For they charge it with *Polytheiſm, Idolatry* and *Inconſiſtence* with Piety towards God in the main Branches of it. To prove the Charge of Polytheiſm, thus they argue. *If this Concluſion is right and neceſſary, The Father is a divine Perſon, the Son is a divine Perſon, the Holy Ghoſt is a divine Perſon; therefore there are three divine Perſons: This muſt likewiſe be ſo; The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghoſt is God, therefore there are three Gods. As three Angelical Perſons are three Angels, and three human Perſons are three Men, ſo three divine Perſons are the ſame with three Gods.* But if they thus argue touching our Idea of the Trinity, they will deceive themſelves by Equivocation of Words. For let us imagine, that in the Regality of a Nation there are three ſuch Perſons, as I have deſcrib'd to be in the Godhead, then we muſt ſay, *there are three regal Perſons, each of which is ſo far King as to be of the Regality, yet there are not three Kings, but only one King; for one of them is the only one King.* An Unitarian will object, that *Regal Perſons* and *Kings* are the ſame: But in the matter ſpoken of they are not the ſame. Having no fitter terms, we call thoſe *Regal Perſons,* that are only ſo far Regal Perſons, and ſo far King, as to be of the Regality: And in the ſame ſenſe we ſay, (*l*) *Tres Divini*; we call thoſe Divine Perſons that are only ſo far divine Perſons, and ſo far God, as to be of the Godhead. But as in the forementioned Regality there is only one King, which is the Father, neither of the other Regal Perſons being another King, nor exiſting in his Regality in the Perſon of the King, or of a King: So in the Godhead there is only one God, which is the Father, neither of the other divine Perſons being another God, nor exiſting in his Godhead in the Perſon of the Almighty God, or of a God, otherwiſe than as his imperial Son and his holy Spirit. But the *Unitarians* further inſiſt and argue; *It is impoſſible that there ſhould be three Almighty and All-knowing Perſons, and yet but one God, ſeeing every Almighty and All-knowing Perſon is a God, a moſt perfect God, to whom nothing can be added.* To which a Chriſtian Trinitarian anſwereth, that the Son and the Holy Spirit have not *Almightineſs* and *Omniſcience* otherwiſe than in God the Father, as his imperial Son and his holy Spirit; nor have they any other *Almightineſs* or *Omniſcience,* than that which belongeth to his imperial Son and his holy Spirit as ſuch; ſo that their *Almightineſs* and *Omniſcience* is the Father's, as comprehended in his *Monothe-iſm,* and belonging to the Comprehenſion thereof. Such an *Almightineſs* and *Omniſcience* doth not conſtitute either of them the Perſon of God, or of a God, or of another God; ſo that here is no Shadow of Polytheiſm in the Chriſtian Trinity. But with reſpect thereto it may be juſtly ſaid, That as there is but one, that is the Perſon of God, ſo there is but one, that is the Perſon of the *Almighty* and *All-knowing*; as there is but one, that is abſolutely and in himſelf God, ſo there is but one that is abſolutely and in himſelf Almighty and All-knowing.

The *Unitarians* ſometimes expreſs their Deſire that the Scholaſtic Trinitarians ſhould own them for Chriſtian Brethren, as not differing in matters neceſſary to Salvation. But in another Humour they cenſure them as denying the fundamental Article of Religion, (the Unity of God in their Senſe) *and as breaking Covenant with God by Polytheiſm.* As if their ſinful Scholaſtic Polytheiſm (which is alleviated by the Abſtruſeneſs of the Myſtery, by excuſable Ignorance, by the good Deſign of it, by holding faithfully in Mind and Meaning, and in the main at leaſt, the Article of one God both in Doctrine and Worſhip, and which is only a polytheizing God's own Son and Holy Spirit, with whom we are in Covenant) was like the ſetting up a Competitor-King in a Monarchic Government, a Paganical or an Heretical ſort of Polytheiſm, (like that of the *Gnoſticks*) which maketh them *the People of a ſtrange God.* At the ſame criminal rate of Cenſuring they count the *Trinitarianiſm* of the Chriſtian Church from the eldeſt Times no better than *Idolatry*; as if this was the early Fruit of Chriſt's coming, inſtead of aboliſhing Idolatry he only rais'd up a new World of Idolaters. But Men are not made Holy or Wicked by their Speculative Underſtandings. *Clemens* and *Origen* ſpeculatively idoliz'd a Platonic *Logos*, *Athenagoras* an *Idea*, *Theophil. Antioch.* an *internal Speech* of God, *Tertullian* and *Lactantius* a *prolatitious Speech* of God, all of them ſpeculatively idoliz'd an Abſtract kind of *Logos*, yet they were not Idolaters, if they did not terminate their Religious Worſhip upon their Philoſophic Crotchets, but upon the ſecond Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity, the Perſon of our Bl. Saviour, to whom

---

(k) *Crellius de uno Deo, l.* 1. *S.* 2. *c.* 1, 3, 14, 18, 27, 30, 35.

Col. 1. 15.

(l) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 11. *S.* 9.

11

our *Unitarians* profeſs to pay a Religious Worſhip, but *not the ſupreme Worſhip*, *not equal to the Father*. For as they ſuppoſe, *He that worſhippeth another Perſon beſides him with equal Worſhip, doth not worſhip the Lord his God and ſerve him only, but worſhippeth him and another, ſerving them together*, (tranſgreſſing the great Law of Religious Worſhip) *and giving his Glory to another. We ought to have but one Object of ſupreme Worſhip, whoever hath more deſtroyeth that Unity, and is guilty of Idolatry. If the having one Object of ſupreme Worſhip is the adoring one God, the having three ſuch Objects and the adoring each ſingly and by himſelf is the Worſhip of three Gods.* But although legitimate Trinitarians muſt be ſaid to have more Objects than one of their Soveraign (or Supreme) Worſhip in *a meer Logical Senſe*, yet it muſt be ſaid that the Object is not more than one *in juſt legal Conſtruction*, nor is it more than one *in the culpable Senſe of Law and Religion. In juſt legal Conſtruction* the Object of their Soveraign Worſhip is not more than one. For as the having God for our King includeth the having his Imperial Son for our King, and his Holy Spirit for our ſanctifying Regent, ſo the making God the Object of our Soveraign Honour and Worſhip includeth the making his Imperial Son and his Holy Spirit the Object of our Soveraign Honour and Worſhip, (each one agreeably to his Idea;) and the making them the Object of our Soveraign Honour and Worſhip as ſuch, includeth the making him the primary Object of our Worſhip. They are ſo one and undivided, ſo comprehended and included in one, that in juſt Computation and legal Conſtruction they are but one Object of our Soveraign Worſhip, which one Object is *The one God* (the Father) *in reſpect of what he is in the Unity and Comprehenſion of his Eſſence and Sovereignty*. If it may be juſtly ſaid that our Trinity is no more than *the Unity of God in his new Kingdom*, it muſt be ſaid to be (in juſt legal Conſtruction) but one Object of our Soveraign Worſhip. Nor have we more than one Object of Soveraign Worſhip *in the culpable Senſe of Law and Religion*, which importeth Vice and Crime, *the Crime of making that God which is not God, by giving it the Soveraign Worſhip that is proper to God.* This Sin, as it is the Sin of Polytheiſm, is the meaning of having ſeveral Objects, (or more than one) of our Religious Worſhip in the culpable Senſe of Law and Religion. For the Senſe of the Law is, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, ſo as not to have any idoliz'd Not-God, *Matth.* 4. 10. And this is the Senſe of the Prohibition in the Prophet, *I will vot permit my Glory to be communicated to any idoliz'd Not-God.* (This is that *Another* which the Text meaneth) *Iſa.* 42. 8. Theſe Texts rightly interpreted are not Arguments againſt, but for the divine Worſhip of the Perſons of the Chriſtian Trinity. For becauſe the Religious Worſhip muſt be given unto God, it muſt be given to his Imperial Son (as ſuch and agreeably to his Idea;) for this God accounteth a giving it to himſelf. His Godhead and his appropriate Worſhip and God-ſervice muſt be reſerv'd intire to himſelf (without communicating it to that which is not God, ſo making an Idol, a falſe Competitor-God;) as the ſole Regality of an earthly King and his peculiar Soveraign Honour muſt be reſerved to himſelf intire. It muſt not be alienated from him, the Religious Worſhip muſt be done to God *without doing it to any thing that is not God*; but muſt it therefore be alienated from his Son, who is certainly one of the Imperial Eſtate of his Godhead? Is this to be undutiful, diſloyal and traiterous to his Sovereignty? In communicating his Godhead regularly to his Imperial Son there can be nothing more of Evil than in communicating regularly the Regality of an earthly King to his imperial Son. We can eaſily conceive that both theſe may be done without multiplying Kings or making more Gods than one; and that the regular ſerving the imperial Son of an earthly King and alſo of the moſt high God in conſort with the Father is ſuch *a ſerving them* as is a ſerving him (the Father) and *a ſerving him only* in the Senſe of the Law. But to underſtand theſe Texts, to prohibit ſuch *ſerving another*, which is only ſerving another in a meer Logical Senſe, is the Property of brangling Sophiſters, not of ſerious Religioniſts. And we ſhall be of that Character, if we raiſe needleſs Squabbles about the Terms of *an equal, ſupreme or ſoveraign Worſhip*, which are to be underſtood in a due Latitude of Senſe. But to the *Unitarians* it ſeemeth evident, *that if the having one Object of ſupreme Worſhip is the adoring one God, the having three ſuch Objects and the adoring each ſingly and by himſelf is the Worſhip of three Gods.* But this is no neceſſary Conſequence, for theſe three Objects (Logically ſuch) may be only three Perſons of one regularly conſtituted Regality. And if there was ſuch a Sovereignty on Earth (as there is in Heaven) the honouring the ſeveral Perſons of it each ſingly and by himſelf, (that is, with particular reſpect to each of them at ſome time more than another) with a regularly Soveraign Honour would not be a making them three Kings, but only three Perſons of one Sovereignty. So if we argue (as the *Unitarians* might argue with more Honeſty) *If the having one Object of Religious Worſhip*, (which is the Supreme and Soveraign) *is the having one God, the having three ſuch Objects and adoring them each ſingly and by himſelf is the Worſhip of three Gods*; this Conſequence muſt be deny'd, (and the Argument is ruinous to thoſe *Unitarians* that profeſs to worſhip Chriſt with the divine Worſhip) for a legitimate Trinitarian doth not give Religious Worſhip to the divine Perſons *to each ſingly and by himſelf*, as if he was worſhipping three Sovereignties, but as to the Perſons of one regularly conſtituted Sovereignty, making them no more nor other than what they really are, duly obſerving their Order, Relation and their Unity, and making (as he ought) the Father the uſual ſtated Object of his Solemn Religious Worſhip. And he that doth ſo doth not by giving them the Religious Worſhip make them three Gods, but only three Perſons of one Godhead.

A *third* Unitarian Crimination of Trinitarianiſm is the Inconſiſtence thereof with Piety towards God in ſeveral main Branches of it. For the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are ſuppos'd to be Competitor-Gods, *that rob the Father of that Honour, Power, Dominion, Glory, Praiſe, Adoration and Love, which without them he would wholly enjoy to himſelf, and which he can now only ſhare with two others. How can we love the true God with all the Heart and all the Soul, if we have as much Love for two other Perſons as for him? we thereby aſcribe to them his Excellence, we impute to them his Merit, we pay to them his Dues.* But in the Chriſtian Trinity theſe Criminations can have no place, unleſs they be underſtood in ſuch a ſenſe as deſerveth not Crimination, but Commendation. For it is well-doing to think them reſplendent with his Excellence, to count their meritorious Doings his Doings by them, to pay them honourary

Dues as Dues to thoſe that are his and his Dues. The Father is not the leſs lov'd by our loving the Son with a (regularly) Soveraign Love, but on the contrary, he is therefore duly lov'd, becauſe the Son is ſo lov'd, (who ought to have our Soveraign Eſtimation and Affection out of reſpect to the Father, for his Sake and to his Glory) and the ſo loving the Father implieth and inferreth the ſo loving and honouring the Son. As it is not a godly thing, ſo it is not the Mind of God to have the Divine Honour and Worſhip appropriated to his own Perſon, and ſo *to enjoy it wholly to himſelf*, but to have it in (regular) Conſort with his divine imperial Son, *Apoc.* 5. 13. This he doth not count a Violation of his *Excellence*, *Merit*, *Dues*, nor a robbing him of *Honour*, *Power*, *Dominion*, *Glory*, *Praiſe*, *Adoration and Love*, (but the due giving them to him) *nor only a going Share with others*. Which are the groſs carnal Conceits of the *Unitarians*, that proceed from a bad Spirit, and demonſtrate that they are not φερώνυμοι, (as *Irenæus* was) *thoſe that duly anſwer to their Name*; but that in reſpect of the Unity and Concord of Chriſtians they are *Contra-Unitarians*. Otherwiſe they would commend the Scholaſtic Trinitarians Piety, although they condemn their Scholaſtic Theology. Which muſt be acknowledg'd to do this Prejudice to Piety, (amongſt many other) it rendreth the indubitable Maxims of it of a doubtful ſenſe, and not certainly intelligible. For when our uſual Books of Piety teach us our Duties unto God (to believe in him, to fear him, to love him, to call upon him, to honour his holy Name, and ſuch more) who can certainly ſay what they mean by God? Do they mean the coeternal Trinity or three Perſons? So they muſt mean, if they ſpeak conſiſtently with their own Theology. But ſo they do not mean, for they ſpeak ſo conſtantly and ſo emphatically in the Singular Number, as plainly ſheweth that they mean by God one ſingular Perſon; and in teaching us to call upon God they always teach us to cry *Abba Father*, which doth not mean a Trinity. Our Practical Divinity therefore is on this account laudable, it agreeth not with the Scholaſtic, but rightly teacheth Piety towards him who is the one ſole Perſon of the Almighty God, God definitively and abſolutely and our God. Who maketh but a very ſlender appearance in the uſual Scholaſtic Trinity, but appeareth like himſelf *as the only true God* in our Chriſtian Trinity. Which therefore is a Cure for the Evils of the Scholaſtic Trinity, and is not liable to the Anti-Trinitarians Charge of an Inconſiſtence with Piety, which is a Charge to which their own way is moſt liable, for there are greater Evils in it than in the Scholaſtic Trinity, and their Remedy is worſe than the Diſeaſe.

IX. For a marvellous irreligious Extravagance is viſible in *their Hypotheſis*, *their Interpretations of Scripture*, and *in the Anſwers* which they make to good Arguments. (1.) Their *Hypotheſis* is an hideous Minoration and Diſparagement of the Perſon of our Saviour, an *hominizing*, *creaturizing* and *undeifying* him, whom yet they call *The Son of God*, and they cannot deny that he is of *Creature-tranſcendent Generation and Birth-Nobilitation*; therefore according to his Idea he is the *Creature-tranſcendent Son of God*. Such he is in his *primary* and ſuch he is in his *officiary* Capacity, for themſelves call him *The great Spiritual King, the Meſſias or Chriſt*. He is therefore according to his Idea *The great Spiritual King the Son of the great Spiritual King the Father*, which is to be *the imperial Son of God*, who is neceſſarily *A divine imperial Perſon*, *of the imperial Party in Religion*, *and one of the imperial Eſtate in the Kingdom of God*, *which is the Godhead*. Is he the Creature-tranſcendent King and Potentate, to whom all the Branches of the Meſſias-ſhip, (even the Soul-Sovereignty) do belong, and muſt he not be thought the Creature-tranſcendent Son of God both in his primary and his officiary Capacity? *Being made* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *ſo much better than the Angels, as he hath by Inheritance obtained a more excellent Name than they*. Upon which words an intelligent Unitarian Writer thus gloſſeth. (*m*) *The Greek Word which we tranſlate obtained by Inheritance, ſignifieth no more than barely obtained; the Words by Inheritance are uſeleſs and dangerous and falſe two; for the Name Chriſt hath obtained, came to him by free Donation, not by Inheritance. And therefore it is that the moſt famous Criticks render* κεκληρονόμηκεν *by* obtinuit, ſortitus eſt, *he gained or obtained*. But this is not fair dealing; for the famous Criticks upon the place with great Conſent render the Greek Word *Hæreditavit*, *jure hæreditario conſecutus eſt*, *jure naturalis & unigeniti Filii Dei*. And this they have done with great Reaſon, not only becauſe the Greek Word properly ſo ſignifieth, but becauſe meer Donation (an Act of meer Beneficence) is a very different thing from the Donation of a Father as ſuch, who hath reſpect to natural Relation, Right and Due in giving his Patrimony to his *primogenit Son*, who is properly his Heir. But all the Children of God are ſtiled *his Heirs*, and have Right to inherit *Titulo Filiationis* in Conjunction with Chriſt the principal Heir, which ſpeaketh him The imperial Son, the Lord of the Family, (not a Servant in it) *the Lord of all*, as the eldeſt Son and Heir of a Family is *Dominus rerum Paternarum & Herus minor*. It is a great thing therefore, and importeth Deity or Creature-tranſcendence, to be the Son of God in ſuch ſenſe as our Saviour was, or to be the Perſon of the Meſſiah. Our Saviour counted it a divine Sentiment in *Nathanael* and *Peter* to acknowledge his divine Sonſhip. Both himſelf and the blind Man thought his being the Son of God was ſome great thing; for our Saviour ask'd him, *Doſt thou believe on the Son of God?* And being told by our Saviour that he was a Perſon of that Character, thereupon the Man anſwered, ***Lord**, I believe, and he worſhipp'd him*. The Jews and their High-Prieſt thought it Blaſphemy in our Saviour to call himſelf *The Son of God*, and their Sanhedrin put him to Death, (*n*) as guilty of an affected Divinity or Deity of Perſon, *rent their Cloaths*, and cry'd out of the Blaſphemy, *becauſe he made himſelf The Son of God*, Joh. 19. 7. But ſay our Unitarians, *He never ſaid of himſelf any higher thing than this*, *which is true of every good Man*, *I am the Son of God*. Thus they degrade him and bring him down to the common Level, (which is a ſecond Humiliation of the Son of God) they raiſe him to the pitch of an *exalted Man* and *a dignify'd Creature*, but in that beſt Eſtate make him as mean and abject as thoſe Terms can be underſtood to ſignify. For (as themſelves ſay) *they aſcribe to him none of the Attributes of the divine Nature*, *Omnipreſence*, *Omniſcience*, *Omnipotence*. *They only ſay theſe two things*, *that he is the Interceſſor between God and Men*, *which Interceſſion is only in general for all the Churches and for all Mankind*, *not for particular Perſons from a particular knowledge of their Wants*, *Deſires or Prayers*, *which are known to God only*, *or if to others only* by

Heb. 1. 4.

Rom. 8. 17. Matth. 21. 38. Heb. 1. 2. Col. 1. 15.

Joh. 9. 35. Joh. 10. 36. Matth. 26. 63.

(m) Def. of the Hiſt. of the Unitar. c. 7.

(n) Petav. T. 4. l. 7. c. 1. S. 7.

by God's Revelation to them, which otherwiſe cannot be known to a Man in Heaven. He is alſo made Head of the Church, which he protecteth and directeth, as it pleaſeth God to order from time to time by the Miniſtry of the holy Angels. Thus our reigning Saviour-King is brought down much-what to the ſame level with one of the reigning Popiſh Saints and Interceſſors, every one of which could he ſend the holy Angels would be (as to us at leaſt) as good a Man in Heaven as our Bl. Saviour. They call him *The great Spiritual King*, but they make him a Mock-King, a Cypher-King, that is good for little or nothing. In his heavenly Condition is he the Meſſiah the Saviour-King to the World, that cannot authoritatively diſpenſe the ſaving Goods and Bleſſings, (the Remiſſion of Sins, the Holy Spirit and Eternal Life) that cannot ſave us from our Criminal and Penal Evils, or from our deadly ghoſtly Enemies, or give us Grace and Peace, or aſſiſt us in Temptations, or feed his Flock like a Shepherd, or receive our departing Souls, or deliver us from our great Wants and Woes? Is he qualify'd to be ſuch a Saviour-King, or to be King of the Univerſal Church, or to have the Soul-Sovereignty, or to be Judge of the Quick and Dead, that cannot know his Subjects, nor our Concerns and Affairs particularly, nor otherwiſe than as a Prophet may know them (by particular Revelation) nor can otherwiſe *ſearch the Heart and Reins*, (which is not to be called *a ſearching them*, but an having them revealed to him) nor can be an Inſpector of our inward and outward Converſation, nor can know our Sins and Duties, Virtues and Vices, Wants and Diſtreſſes, nor what is done for his Service, nor can take particular effectual Care for our Safety and Welfare?

They clear themſelves of Idolatry in doing divine Worſhip to Chriſt, for our *Unitarians* allow him no ſuch Worſhip. But by this means they deſtroy the Religion of Chriſtianity, *(o)* which conſiſteth in *ſerving the Lord Chriſt*, in doing the Duties of Subjects to him as to our divine imperial Lord, and in living a Life of doing him Service. But although they are willing at the coſt of loſing their Religion to clear themſelves of Idolatry, yet their Hypotheſis unavoidably intangleth them in it. For the better ſort of Unitarians (*Socinus* and his Followers ſtrictly ſo called) diſpute vehemently, that the divine Worſhip ought to be given to the Lord Chriſt (a Creature) becauſe God hath commanded it. But this is giving to a Creature that which no Creature can be worthy of, and which is incongruous to any Creature; it is that which God cannot command, which no Command can juſtifie; in the nature of the thing it is downright Idolatry, *a giving God's Glory to a Not-God.* Our Unitarians therefore refuſe to give unto Chriſt the divine Worſhip, and allow him only an inferior Honour and Worſhip agreeable to his Dignity. But this inferior Honour and Service, whether it be inferior in kind or only in degree, whether it be *the Abſolute* or *the Relative*, yet if it is the due Worſhip of Chriſt it is the Chriſtians Religion and God-Service, and conſequently is the Religious Worſhip, (the Worſhip proper to God) which if communicated to any Creature is of the ſame Nature with the Pagans and the Papiſts Creature-Worſhip, and is Idolatry for the ſame Reaſons. To worſhip a Being of the other World is neceſſarily deifying to it, (for it is an aſcribing to it the divine Perfections) whence that Worſhip is neceſſarily the Religious Worſhip. And ſuch muſt be the Worſhip that is given unto Chriſt, (who is not worſhipp'd unleſs he is worſhipp'd as Chriſt) no other inferior Worſhip is competible to him, what is not Creature-tranſcendent Honour and Worſhip is not worſhipping and honouring him, but diſhonouring and diſparaging him, as our *Unitarians* diſparage him, that allow him no other Acts of Worſhip but *ſuch as may be pay'd to a Civil Power, to a Perſon in high Dignity and Office, or to Prophets and Holy Men and glorified Saints.* And is this a making him The great Spiritual King, *King of Kings and Lord of Lords?* But at the ſame rate their Hypotheſis (which is *Pelagian* as well as *Unitarian*) diſparageth Chriſt's whole Undertaking for our Salvation, *the great Love of God in ſending and not ſparing his own Son, his marvellous Love to us in dying for us, his ſtupendious Humiliation, his dreadful Paſſion, and his expiatory Sacrifice on the Croſs.* All which great things are ſo dwindled and minorated in *Unitarianiſm*, that no Man needeth any other Preſervative againſt it than to have a faithful Eſteem and Love for his Saviour, which is ſo neceſſary in every pretending Chriſtian, that without it he is ſubjected to an *Anathema Maranatha*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. Nor are theſe great things only diſparag'd in *Unitarianiſm*, but of ſeveral of them it muſt be ſaid, that according to that Hypotheſis (which doth not acknowledge any thing like an Incarnation) there could be no ſuch things. For what good Senſe can be made of God's *giving* and *ſending* his only begotten Son into the World according to *Unitarianiſm?* Why ſhould he be called *his only begotten Son*, ſeeing God might have begotten many as good Sons as *Unitarianiſm* ſuppoſeth our Saviour to have been? What can thoſe Words ſignify according to this Hypotheſis, *Chriſt Jeſus came into the World to ſave Sinners?* Or thoſe other Words of the ſame Apoſtle, *though he was rich, yet for your ſakes he became poor? being in the form of God he took upon him the form of a Servant?* If he was not in a magnificent and ſublime Condition antecedently to his Humiliation he never was rich, never was in the form of God. And how could he take upon him the form of a Servant if this was the beſt Eſtate that ever he was in? The Senſe is, ſaith an Unitarian Interpreter, (p) *Tho' Chriſt was rich and glorious by reaſon of the Authority and Power conferred on him, yet he was willing to lead a poor Life, that by his Poverty we might obtain eternal Riches and Glory.* But this Expoſition of the Apoſtle's Senſe is not tolerable Senſe, unleſs Chriſt was in a State of Authority and Power, and condeſcended to part with it, and to live a poor Life. But the Authority and Power which this Expoſitor ſpeaketh of, (our Saviour's officiary Dignity of the Meſſias-ſhip) was connex'd with his poor Life and commenc'd with it; and could ſuch Authority and Power make him more rich and glorious than he was in his Poverty and Meanneſs? Of our Saviour's Agony in the Garden this mean and trivial Account is given by an Unitarian. *He conflicted then with great Temptations, the Devil was very buſy to fill his Mind with horrid Idea's and Repreſentations.* Which is as wiſe a Notion as this of Chriſt's Sacrifice, *that it was an Oblation and Application, as all former Sacrifices under the Law were,* (not to the Juſtice of God, but) *to the Mercy of God by way of humble Suit and Deprecation.* Unita-

(o) *Rom.* 14. 7, 8. *Col.* 3. 24. *Phil.* 1. 21. 2 *Cor.* 5. 15. *Matth.* 10. 37. *Apoc.* 2. 3.

(p) *Def. of the H. ſt. of the Unit.* p. 51.

rianiſm is not the great Myſtery of Godlineſs, it bereaveth us of a wonderful Saviour and of his Love-miracles, and Chriſtianity of its great tranſcendent things; it deſpoileth his Paſſion of the mighty Efficacy that is in it for the Cure of Sin, for wounding and warming and carrying captive the Soul; it is no School of deep Humility (from the Example of a deeply humbled Saviour) no mighty vaſt Obligation to Gratitude, no great Incentive of raiſed divine Affections; but the whole of it is a low and dead Flat, and a dry Morſel, not ſavoury Meat.

(2.) Their vile ignoble Hypotheſis putteth them upon a levelling way of interpreting Scripture, that is a manifeſt Diſtortion of the Sacred Text, (ſometimes ſelf-inconſiſtent) and an abſurd, jejune and empty account of things. For ſuch is the Account which our Unitarian Interpreters give of the Reaſon of Chriſt's Sufferings. *The Lord Chriſt* (ſay they) *did not freely offer himſelf for us, to undergo Puniſhment due to us: Neither could he do it, nor could God accept of it or allow it. We content our ſelves to teach, that our Bl. Saviour being to confirm his Goſpel by his Death, and to be made perfect by Sufferings, did alſo offer himſelf as a Sacrifice, and as a ſort of Ranſom and Price for us, to the Mercy and Benignity of God.* A like enormouſly defective and falſe Account they give of the Form of Baptiſm. *To be baptized in the Name of a Perſon or Perſons is a Rite by which one delivereth himſelf to the Inſtitution, Inſtruction and Obedience of ſuch Perſon or Perſons. But it is in vain pretended that a Perſon or thing is God becauſe we are baptized unto it or in the Name of it. Becauſe as Chriſtians are now baptized unto the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, ſo the Jews were baptized unto* Moſes, *and* John's *Diſciples unto* John. But the Chriſtians Baptiſm ought to be diſtinguiſh'd from all other Baptiſms, becauſe it is the Baptiſm of the Kingdom, (the Door or Entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven) whereby they become (q) ἰσοπολῖται τοῖς ἀγγέλοις, *Conſorts in Citizenſhip with the holy Angels.* Themſelves and the holy Angels are the Creature or Subject-Party in the Kingdom of God, but it would be madneſs to ſuppoſe that the imperial Son and the Holy Spirit are of the Creature-Party; therefore the Chriſtians Baptiſm (which is a federal Rite) is a confederating Allegiance with the three divine Perſons of their divine Sovereignty, which is the Godhead. The Name of one of theſe divine Perſons is *The Word of Life* (in the Perſonal Acceptation;) but according to our late Unitarian Interpreters *The Word of Life which was with the Father* ſignifieth (imperſonally) *The Goſpel that was in the Mind and Decree of the Father.* So *The Word that was with God,* (the only begotten Son that was in the Boſom of the Father) according to theſe Interpreters ſignifieth two divine Attributes, *The Wiſdom and Power of God.* So in their Interpretation of *the Word's being made Fleſh,* they make Fleſh to ſignify, not the Subſtance ſo called, but barely Meanneſs and Infirmity. The Scripture ſaith; *For as much as the Children are partakers of Fleſh and Blood, he alſo took part of the ſame.* Their Interpretation is, *The Soul of Chriſt took part in Fleſh and Blood,* (as if the Soul had free Election before its Union with the Body) *that is, was incarnate,* (as every other Man's Soul is.) And this is all that they ſuppoſe is meant by his *coming in the Fleſh, he was clothed with a Body of real Fleſh.* The Text is, *When he cometh into the World he ſaith; A Body haſt thou prepared me.* Their Interpretation is, *God prepared a Body for the Soul of Chriſt.* When the Apoſtles ſaid to him, *Lord increaſe our Faith,* they meant only (according to theſe Interpreters) *by thy Prayers to God.* So when he commanded his Diſciples *that Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be preached in his Name,* they ſay the Senſe is, *He commanded them to require Men to repent, and on their ſo doing to aſſure them in his Name,* (as might be done in any honeſt Man's Name) *that God would forgive them.* If he is definitively Chriſt the great ſpiritual King, thoſe places of Scripture that ſpeak of him muſt be meant of him as ſuch, and he muſt be underſtood to ſpeak of himſelf as ſuch when he ſaith, *I and the Father are one, I am in the Father and the Father in me,* (ſo as to be one in Reality and due Perſonality;) he muſt be ſuppos'd as ſuch *to give Reſt to Souls, to remit Sins, to ſhed forth the Spirit on his Apoſtles, and to deliver them from the Gentiles;* Miracles muſt be ſuppos'd to have been wrought in his Name, and we muſt be ſuppos'd *to be ſanctify'd by Faith in him* as ſuch. But all theſe Sayings of Scripture are *Unitarianly* interpreted to mean only *an Oneneſs of Deſign and Love, an In-being by Obedience and Love on the part of the Lord Chriſt and Believers, and of Protection and Love on the part of God. He gave Reſt to Souls by his Doctrine, which every Goſpel-Preacher may do. Our Saviour never claimed any higher Authority or Power* (for remitting Sins) *than the Apoſtles were veſted with. The Lord Chriſt was no more than the Inſtrument, Miniſter and Mediator, by whom and at whoſe Inſtance God ſhed forth the Spirit. He delivered the Apoſtle from many Machinations of the Jews and Gentiles, but all this as Mediator,* (by his Interceſſion) *not as God. The Miracles done in his Name prove that he is a moſt powerful and effectual Mediator with God, not that he is the true and proper Author of them. Such as ſincerely believe the Lord Chriſt and the Doctrine by him delivered do ſanctify themſelves* (by abſtaining from Sin) *and this is the only meaning of our being ſanctify'd by Faith in Chriſt.* But are not theſe Interpretations of Scripture in great degree a denying his Name and an Apoſtacy from Chriſtianity? Of the ſame nature are theſe following Interpretations. *The Dead ſhall hear the Voice of the Son of God, for he would call divers from the Dead, as former Prophets had done. All Men ſhould honour the Son as they honour the Father, becauſe the Ambaſſador repreſenting the Majeſty of him that ſendeth him his Perſon is ſacroſanct, and in divers reſpects to be honoured as his principal is.* But is this the Honour due to the great Spiritual King, to honour him only as an Ambaſſador? He is brought down to the common Level of Saints by this following Interpretation. *We ſay the Lord Chriſt was in Heaven while he was upon Earth, in the ſame Senſe that* St. Paul *ſaith the like of himſelf, our Converſation is in Heaven.* The Apoſtle ſaith of Chriſt, *In him dwelleth the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily.* But the Unitarians Interpretation attributeth little more to Chriſt than to Believers. *The fulneſs of God or of the Godhead here is the fulneſs of the Knowledge of God, this dwelt in Chriſt, and with this he hath filled or compleated us Chriſtians.* Their Interpretation of this Saying, *He that hath ſeen me hath ſeen the Father,* attributeth little more to Chriſt than to other Miniſters of God. *The meaning*

(q) S. Baſil. Hom. 13. p. 479.

only is, that in ſeeing and hearing Chriſt and his true Miniſters revealing to us the Nature and Will of God, we ſee and hear him. They ſo interpret this Saying of Chriſt, *No man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven*, as to attribute little more to *Chriſt* than to *Moſes. He was taken up into Heaven (before he entred upon his Office) to be inſtructed in the Mind and Will of God, as* Moſes *was into the Mount.* Our Saviour ſaith, *Before* Abraham *was, I am.* Their Interpretation is, *That Chriſt was before* Abraham *in the Decree and Ordination of God*; which may be ſaid of any ordinary Man. *To be in the form of God* (ſay they) *is common to our Saviour with all other Men: But he was more in the form or likeneſs of God than any other Man or Men, becauſe he had a more perfect Holineſs, and a miraculous Power and Authority.* (But thus the Prophets were in the form of God, nor did Chriſt ever diveſt himſelf of this form, and the Apoſtle here oppoſeth the likeneſs of Men to the form of God, which therefore is not common to Men;) *yet though he was in a greater likeneſs to God than ever any other Creature*, non rapuit æqualitatem cum Deo, *He was far from imitating the Pride and Ambition of Lucifer.* This ſurely was no very wonderful Humility, for a Creature to come ſhort very much of the Pride of *Lucifer*: But it is very wonderful, that Men who call themſelves Chriſtians, ſhould at this rate debaſe and diſgrace their Saviour, and expound the Scriptures to his Diſparagement. His Blood (whereby he purchaſed a Church) they account no more than human Blood. By *the Spirit of Chriſt* they underſtand not that Spirit, of which he is the Owner and Donor, but *the ſame Spirit of Prophecy that was in Chriſt.* They call him, *The Lord Chriſt*, but they make him one of the Subject-party. And according to theſe Interpreters, the holy Founders of our Religion (throughout the New Teſtament) make their devotional Precationary Addreſſes for Grace and Peace and other Bleſſings, to one that cannot hear Prayers, nor grant and beſtow Bleſſings, to one that is conſtantly join'd with God as undivided from him, of the God-eminency and the God-agency, yet is as far diſtant from him as the Creature from the Creator; that is conſtantly join'd with God *as the Lord*, as a divine imperial Perſon of the imperial Party in Religion, yet is far from having a divine imperial Power, and from being of the Lordly Regency and Agency in our principal Concerns; that is ſaid to give Gifts unto Men, yet cannot give Grace; that is a Man in Heaven, whoſe Grace cannot reach from Heaven to Earth, nor be with us, or our Spirits (much leſs with Millions of People in all parts of the World;) that is no Fountain of Grace, (yet of his Fulneſs we receive it;) whoſe Grace muſt be ſuppos'd *ſufficient for us*, yet he can beſtow no Grace, (only he is better at Petitioning than we;) and whoſe Power is ſaid *to reſt upon his Servants*, but by this Power is not meant *the Power of a Sovereign*, but only the Power of a Petitioner for Grace. Such is the deadly Theology of our *Unitarians*, who will be counted Chriſtians, although they own not Chriſt for their divine Sovereign Lord, nor will they allow him thoſe Attributes which alone can render him capable of being ſuch an *Omniſcience* and *Omnipreſence*. But the Angels (ſay they) *ſignifie to him our State and Condition, which are miniſtring Spirits ſent forth into all the Earth as his Eyes, to ſee and relate the State of things: For what other Reaſon can they be called his Eyes?* But this blind Conceit argueth, that the Authors of it want their Eye-ſight. For can he need the Reports of Angels for his Information, that is capable of judging the Secrets of Men? *Rom.* 2. 16. And do they not know, that theſe Eyes of Providence (the Seven Arch-Angels) are attributed to the omniſcient God, as well as to the Son of God? Of whoſe Omnipreſence they give this Account. *The Lord Chriſt is in the midſt of, and is with his People; not as God is, by an immediate Preſence, but by his moſt powerful Aid and Help, which he affordeth, partly by his continual and ſucceſsful Mediation for them all in general, partly by the Angels which are under his Directions.*

(3.) Uſually they anſwer thoſe Texts of Scripture, that are alledged againſt them on behalf of the Deity of Chriſt, by expounding them in their method of irreligious Extravagance. *Heb.* 1. 6. The Apoſtle declareth the Decree of God touching the ſubjecting the Angels to Chriſt, citing the Pſalmiſt's Words, *Worſhip him all ye Gods.* Of which Apoſtolic Citation theſe Interpreters give this Account, *That the holy Writer affecteth to ſpeak in Scripture-Language, and therefore uſeth thoſe Words ſpoken upon another occaſion, and not of Chriſt.* And thus they make the Apoſtle's Citation of Scripture altogether-impertinent to his purpoſe. Whereas they ought to have ſaid, *That the Father's bringing his firſt Begotten into the* (upper) *World*, and his ſetting him over the Angels, was an expounding the Decree in the Pſalmiſt (that all the Gods ſhould worſhip him) not only to concern the Worſhipping his own Perſon, but the Perſon of his imperial Son. This ſurely is the ſenſe of the divine Author, which implieth, that there is ſuch an Undividedneſs and almoſt Identity of God and his Son, as would be utterly incompetible to him, if he was but a Man and a Creature. Which almoſt Identity appeareth alſo from another place uſually alledged, to prove the Deity of Chriſt, 1. *Joh.* 3. 16. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, becauſe he laid down his life for us.* The Unitarian Interpreters object, that God cannot lay down his Life; nor do we ſuppoſe, that he can lay it down in his own Perſon: But he did lay it down in the Perſon of his Son, and this was equivalent to the laying it down in his own Perſon. But of this his amazing Love to us in laying down his Life for us, the Unitarian Hypotheſis can give no Account, but what is miſerably lame and mutilate, abſurd, jejune and empty. Such as our Unitarian Interpreters give of this honourary Name of our Saviour *Alpha* and *Omega*, *The Firſt and the Laſt.* Againſt which they firſt make this Exception, That it is wanting in good Greek Bibles (which ſheweth, that they have no great Good-will towards it;) and then they tell us, *That both Almighty God and our Lord Chriſt are the Firſt and the Laſt, but in different ſenſes.* What theſe different ſenſes are, they do not ſay, nor can they ſay (with any tolerable good ſenſe) without aſcribing Deity (the Deity of the New Teſtament) to our Saviour; Who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords as the Imperial (or Creature-tranſcendent) Son, and only as the Imperial Son: And in like manner he is *Alpha and Omega, The Firſt and the Laſt*, as the divine Imperial Son in Regency (the Regency of Affairs) and only as the divine Imperial Son; but this is no prejudice to his true Divinity; on the contrary, it ſpeaketh him a divine Imperial Perſon. Such he appeareth to be by his New Teſtament-Creation, of which our Unitarian Interpreters can give no Account, but what is abſurd, jejune and empty. For ſome of them learnedly diſpute, that the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe touching Chriſt's Creation of Angels and of Men, *Col.* 1. 16. is to be underſtood of his New Teſtament-Creation: But from their Unitarian Hypotheſis they are not able to ſay, how or in what ſenſe Angels and Men had a New Teſtament-Creation by Chriſt. For this is all that they have to ſay; *Chriſt is the Lord of every Creature; for by him are all, both viſible and inviſible Creatures, even all Men and Angels, modelled or diſpoſed into a new Order, being ſubjected to him and his Commands.* This would be good ſenſe, if it was Chriſt's doing: But according to theſe *Unitarians* this was none of Chriſt's doing, it was only the Father's doing in ſubjecting to him Men and Angels; ſo that this New Teſtament-Creation was purely his doing, and it cannot be thought Chriſt's Creation, unleſs we will call his meer taking Poſſeſſion of his given *Lordſhip and Sovereignty* his Creation of all things. Touching his Creatorſhip they contradict one another: For ſome of them (particularly, that vile Book, *The Hiſtory of the Unitarians*) will not acknowledge, *That either the old or new Creation is aſcribed to our Bleſſed Saviour*, and what the Apoſtle ſaith, *Col.* 1. 15, 16. *Who is the image of the inviſible God, the Firſt-born of every Creature; for by him were all things created that are in Heaven, &c.* they thus interpret. *Theſe words, For by him were all things created, are not ſpoken of Chriſt, but of God.* Which is a ſhutting their Eyes againſt the Light, an outfacing the Sun, a contradicting the whole tenour of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe, which is a Panegyric (not of God, but) of the Perſon of Chriſt; a Contradiction to the Apoſtle's Buſineſs, which was to teach the *Coloſſians* the Goſpel, and to magnifie it, and not to teach them what they needed not to be taught, and what none of thoſe that endeavour'd to ſeduce them from Chriſt and Chriſtianity did oppoſe, *That the World was a World of God's Creatures.* This therefore is an Inſtance of their *marvellous Diſtortions and Transformations* of the Sacred Text. And ſo they diſtort *v.* 16. of this Firſt to the *Coloſſians*, not reading with our *Engliſh* Tranſlation, *All things were created by him and for him: But all things were created for him and to him.* So making δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ϗ εἰς αὐτὸν, of the ſame Signification; whereas the Apoſtle always uſeth them in a different Senſe, the one to expreſs the efficient, the other the final Cauſe. *Rom.* 11. 36. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Heb.* 2. 10. So they diſtort *Joh.* 1. 3. For when they pleaſe, they will have it read, *All things were made* (not by him, but) *for him.* And in like manner they pervert *Heb.* 1. 2. not rendring it *by whom*, but *for whom he made the Worlds.* It is but rendring δι᾽ οὗ ſo as it never ſignifieth in the New Teſtament, and pulling down a main Pillar of their own Cauſe, which is, *that Chriſt is the mediate Cauſe of all things in Chriſtianity*, and is of Character, *He by whom are all things*, and then theſe Texts will ſay, as they would have them. So by foul dealing and mutilating the the Apoſtle's Text, *Eph.* 3. 9. *Who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt* (leaving out the words *by Jeſus Chriſt*, which *Beza* found in all Greek Copies) theſe turn the New Creator into No Creator. And by a like Artifice they transform him into a Creature. For inſtead of *the Beginning of the Creation*, Apoc. 3. 14. they ſubſtitute *the Chief of the Creation.* And ſo (to bereave our Saviour of Divinity and divine Worſhip) they have ſubſtituted O Lord Jeſus (a Phraſe never uſed in Scripture) inſtead of Lord Jeſus. *Act.* 7. 59. Inſtead of *Thy Throne, O God*, they have ſubſtituted, *God is thy Throne*, *Heb.* 1. 8. And the words of *Thomas* to our Saviour they dichotomize, allotting one half of them to Chriſt, and the other half to God, rendring them thus, *O my Lord, and O my God.* Inſtead of *The Word was with God*, they ſubſtitute, *The Word was with the God.* Inſtead of, *To bind all that call upon thy Name*, they ſubſtitute, *To bind all that are called by thy Name*, *Act.* 9. 14. Inſtead of, *He that deſtroy'd them, which called on this Name*, Act. 9. 21. they ſubſtitute, *He that deſtroy'd them, who are called by this Name.* So the Apoſtle's magnificent Elogy of our Saviour, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Who is over all God bleſſed for ever, Amen*, they (with ſome others) have turn'd into a Thankſgiving, thus reading the words, *God who is over all, be bleſſed for ever, Amen.* But ſuch a Thankſgiving for the Exaltation of Chriſt the Greek words cannot ſignifie, unleſs there is in them an Ellipſis (of a Verb) which is not to be ſuppos'd and ſupply'd without Neceſſity: But there is no Neceſſity of ſuppoſing it, no likelihood that there is ſuch an Ellipſis in them; and therefore the ſupplying it is a perverting the words from their genuine ſenſe. There is no Indication in the Text or Context of any Deſign in them, ſave only to ſet forth the Dignity of Chriſt, thereby to ſet forth the Eminence of the *Jewiſh* Nation, *of whom Chriſt came.* The Relative ὁ ὢν manifeſtly referreth to the Antecedent Chriſt, and therefore the words admit not this *Unitarian* Verſion, the running whereof is not agreeable to the ſtyle of Religion, and the ſenſe of it introduced into the Text is a forced unnatural thing. Nor is the Term εὐλογητὸς (*bleſſed*) when it is uſed in Thankſgivings in the New Teſtament, poſtpon'd to the Perſon to whom it is apyly'd (as it is in this Text) but is put before him, as *Socinus* obſerveth. As for the annex'd *Amen*, it doth not argue, that this Text is a Thankſgiving; for it is uſed in meer laudatory devotional forms of Speech. *Rom.* 1. 25. But the plaineſt places in the Bible may be eluded, if we will allow our ſelves to accuſe the Original of Falſification, and the beſt Tranſlations of Corruption; to make bold ſacrilegious Attempts upon ſacred Texts, and to affix to them a forced unnatural ſenſe. By theſe methods of maintaining irreligious Extravagances the holy Books of our Religion may be rendred inſignificant for the proving almoſt any divine Truth.

(4.) But on the other hand, the Scholaſtic Theology is not without extravagant Aſcriptions of Deity to our Saviour, extravagant Allegations for the proof of it, and extravagant Anſwers which it maketh to the Anti-Trinitarians Arguments againſt it. For when they argue, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* The Scholaſtic Trinitarians anſwer, (r) That the Name God is ſometimes taken ὑποστατικῶς, *perſonally*, and ſometimes ὐσιωδῶς, *eſſentially*, and that in this Acceptation it is taken in this place. Whereas the Name God is always taken ὑποστατικῶς, *perſonally*,

(r) *Zanch. de* 3. *Eloh. l.* 3. *c.* 11. *S.* 16.

nally, and is always a Name of perſonal Honour and Nobilitation. But in the ſame manner they expound that in the Prophet, *My Glory will I not give to another* (s) to be the Saying of *the Father*, *the Son and the Holy Ghoſt*. And ſo they expound the Apoſtle's words, *To us there is but one God the Father*, (t) *Unus tantum eſt Deus, nempe οὐσία, Hanc ſolent Apoſtoli vocare Deum unum.* There is but one God as to Eſſence, this the Apoſtles are wont to call one God. Whereas the Apoſtle's meaning is plainly otherwiſe, namely, that there is but one Perſon, that is the Perſon of God, not three Perſons that are ſo, as the Scholaſtic Trinitarians ſuppoſe. So they anſwer the words of our Saviour to his Father, *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.* The Anti-Trinitarians argue, That by the Word only (whether it belongeth to the Subject or the Predicate) every other Perſon but the Father is excluded from being the true God; and the Anſwer of the Scholaſtic Trinitarians ſaith, (u) *Pater eſt habens ſolam veram Deitatem, igitur & Pater eſt ſolus verus Deus, & Filius eſt ſolus verus Deus.* The Father is he that hath the only true Deity, therefore the Father is the only true God, and the Son is the only true God. Which Anſwer is a downright Contradiction to the words of our Saviour. The Anti-Trinitarians argue, that the ſupreme (or moſt High) God, neceſſarily and from Eternity ſuch, muſt continue in all reſpects ſuch to Eternity (as a ſupreme King neceſſarily and from Eternity ſuch, muſt continue in all reſpects ſuch to Eternity) his Perſon cannot become a Servant, an Embaſſador, nor have the Office of a Mediator and Interceſſor, nor be made the Apoſtle and High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion (much leſs become poor, ſick and die;) therefore the Dignity of Chriſt's Perſon could not be ſo degraded and minorated, if he was the ſupreme God. To this Difficulty the Scholaſtic Theology ſaith, (w) That the Function of Mediator belongeth to Chriſt according to his Human Nature, yet as conjoin'd with his Divine, which retaineth its Perfections. But this Anſwer leaveth the Difficulty where it was. For although we ſuppoſe our Saviour to continue the ſupreme God ſtill in reſpect of the inherent eſſential Perfections of his divine Nature, yet ſeeing he is not only a divine Nature, but a divine Perſon, and but one Perſon, and this one Perſon is the Perſon of the Supreme God, his high Dignity of Perſon is neceſſarily in ſeveral reſpects loſt by the Scholaſtic Incarnation, and by his taking upon him the Perſon and Office, the State and Relation of a Mediator. As the atoning Mediator his Buſineſs properly was, only to reconcile us to God (the Father) not to himſelf, or to the Holy Ghoſt: But if himſelf and the Holy Ghoſt had been the ſupreme God equally with the Father, it muſt have been as properly and as much his Buſineſs to reconcile us to himſelf and to the Holy Ghoſt, as unto God (the Father;) ſo the Anti-Trinitarian argueth. To which the Scholaſtic Trinitarian anſwereth, (x) *That himſelf and the Holy Ghoſt did receive us into Favour through his Satisfaction.* But ſuppoſing that they did ſo, yet he was not the Mediator between himſelf and us, or between us and the Holy Ghoſt; nor was his Sacrifice an Oblation to himſelf, or to the Holy Ghoſt; nor was their Reconcilement to us an immediate Effect of it, or any thing more than a Conſequent of the Father's Reconcilement. This Anſwer therefore being unſatisfactory, ſome ſay, that in this Diſpenſation (wherein the Son was the atoning Mediator) *the Father ſuſtained the Perſon of the ſupreme offended Lawgiver.* But if the Father only ſuſtain'd the Perſon of the ſupreme offended Lawgiver, He only ſuſtain'd the Perſon of the ſupreme God, and He alone is ſo; which is the thing that the Anti-Trinitarians diſpute for. The Supreme God, or God in the higheſt and moſt perfect ſenſe (ſay they) hath none to command him, there is none greater than He; He doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority, ever doth his own Will, and ſeeketh his own Glory; He declareth himſelf to be the prime Object of Faith and Worſhip, needeth not the Concurrence of any other to aſſure him, that he judgeth right; needeth not to be tried by Temptation; He giveth what and to whom he pleaſeth, needeth not the Aid of any other; is not the Miniſter or Prieſt of any other, doth not mediate or intercede with any for his People, much leſs for himſelf, he cannot die, and he deriveth his Power from none beſides himſelf. But in our Lord Chriſt all things are contrary; the Father is greater than he, ſent him, gave him Commandment (what to ſay and do) he did not publiſh a Doctrine of his own, nor aſcribe his Miracles to himſelf, but to the Father and the Holy Ghoſt dwelling in him; He came not in his own Name or Authority, nor to do his own Will, or to ſeek his own Glory, nor did he propound himſelf as the principal Object of our Faith and Worſhip; He was tried by great Temptations, aſcrib'd the Certainty of his Judgment to his Father's Preſence with him, placed his Safety in his Preſence and Help, pray'd often and fervently not only for his Diſciples, but for himſelf; is the Miniſter and Mediator of God and Men, was obedient to the Father's Commandment, by whom all things were given him (even his Divinity;) declared, that he could do nothing of himſelf; that to ſit on his Right-hand was not his to give; He died, and was raiſed from the Dead by the Father. Theſe many things (and ſuch more) are ſaid of Chriſt, which could not be ſaid, if he was God in the Senſe of the Scholaſtic Theology; for their being ſaid of him, is as much as to ſay, *That he is not in ſuch ſenſe God.* To which this Theology anſwereth, that they are ſaid of him either in reſpect of his human Nature, or in reſpect of his eternal Generation of the Father, or chiefly (δ) as he is the Mediator, in which Quality, Relation and Office (by voluntary Condeſcention) he is inferior to the Father, and was to execute it according to his Will and to his Glory. But this Anſwer is extremely inſufficient; becauſe human Nature, an Humiliation, the Perſon and Office of a Mediator are incompetible to one, that is the Perſon of the Almighty God; becauſe theſe many things that are ſaid of our Saviour, plainly expreſs the Relation and Duty of a Son to a Father (the Duty of Obedience and Piety, not meer voluntary Condeſcention;) becauſe they plainly denote, that God was Chriſt's Owner and his God, and that he was not his own, but God's Meſſiah; and whereas in all his Sayings and Doings he repreſenteth himſelf not as his own, but God's Meſſiah, if he had been the Second Perſon of

(s) *Ibid.* c. 8.

(t) *Ibid.* c. 11. *S.* 3.

(u) *Idem Ibid. Petav. de Trin. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *S.* 2.

(w) *Petav. Ibid. c.* 2. *S.* 6.

(x) *Zanch. ſupr. c.* 11. *S.* 1.

(δ) *Idem ſupr. c.* 9. *S.* 1. *c.* 10. *S.* 3, 8, 11, 12, 15.

the Scholaſtic Trinity, according to right and due he ought always to have been joined in Co-equality with the Father. The Anti-Trinitarians argue, that our Saviour's Dominion and Power is wholly delegated and deriv'd, is the Gift of the Father, as the Reward of his Obedience; which therefore did not belong to him *eſſentially* and *originally*, becauſe of his (ſuppoſed) divine Eſſence. To which Argument the Anſwer is, (y) *That by the Gift of the Father the Son acquir'd no Authority, which did not originally belong to his divine Nature*, (in Conjunction with the Father) *only the Exerciſe of this original Power* (the Father for a time ſuſpending his own Right) *is ſolely entruſted in his Hands, and this Privilege is all that is given him by the Father.* But this is an extravagant Evaſion directly contrary to the Scripture in both parts of it. For God hath not ſuſpended his own Right, ſeeing Chriſt is Advocate with the Father, and God is ſtill *the Judge of all.* And the Scripture is expreſs, that the Son is *the Heir of all things, that his Glory and his Kingdom was given him*, (and not only the ſolitary Exerciſe of a Power which he had before, but) *All Power was given him, and the Name above every Name, the Father hath given him Authority, and made him Lord of all.* The Apoſtle ſtileth our Saviour, *The Image of the inviſible God*, and becauſe the Epithet *inviſible* is not uſeleſs, hence the Anti-Trinitarians infer, that *He is the viſible Image of the inviſible God.* To which Argument this Anſwer is made, (z) That this is a fond Suppoſition; for the Son is ſaid to be the Image of the Father meerly *becauſe being generated by the Father, he is all* (the Deity) *that the Father is.* At this rate of Extravagance the Scholaſtic Theology anſwereth *our Saviour's Neſcience of the Day of Judgment, his having God for his Head, his giving up the Kingdom to the Father*, and ſeveral other Texts of Scripture.

(5.) Our Idea of the Trinity therefore is a Golden Mean between Two Extremes; it ſecureth the Honour and Unity of God and the true Honour and Divinity of his Son from two oppoſite extravagant Hypotheſes and the Scriptural Arguments, whereby they impugn each other; for it voideth thoſe Arguments on both ſides, and they ſignifie nothing againſt it. The true Honour and Divinity of the Son of God is well noticed by *Tertullian*, who would not ſay two *Gods*, or two *Lords*, but ſaith he, (a) *If the Father and the Son are to be named together, I will follow the Apoſtle, and call the Father God, and Jeſus Chriſt the Lord. But if Chriſt is to be named alone, I may call him God with the ſame Apoſtle; of whom Chriſt came, who is over all God bleſſed for ever.* There is a Paſſage of the ſame nature in *Gr. Naz.* which would be hard to be underſtood, if this of *Tertullian* did not expound it. (b) *Define our Piety* (ſaith he to *Maximus* the *Cynic*) *teaching us to know one ingenit God the Father, and one generated Lord the Son; called God when named by himſelf, but Lord when named with the Father; That becauſe of his Nature, this becauſe of the Monarchy.* *Elias Cretenſis* having made a long Commentary on this place to no purpoſe, (c) *Petavius* undertaketh the Expoſition of it, (with a mighty confidence that he hath found out the true meaning of it) but to as little purpoſe as the other. For he ſuppoſeth this to be the intended ſenſe of it, that Chriſt is not only σχετικῶς, *relatively* God, conſider'd as conjunct with the Father, as the Image of the King is called the King (as the *Arrians* ſuppos'd) but καθ' ἑαυτὸν, *is by himſelf* (or abſolutely conſider'd) *God*, as having the Scholaſtic divine Nature or Eſſence. And that he is *the Lord*, not as being of inferior Condition to the Father (as the *Arrians* ſuppos'd) but διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν, *as being of one and the ſame Potentacy and Principality with the Father* in the ſenſe of the Scholaſtic Theology. But this is not the meaning of *the Monarchy* (which in this and other ancient Writers of the Church ſignifieth that Unity of Principle, which God the Father is) nor is this Expoſition agreeable to the Scope of the place, which is deſign'd to ſhew, what Language Chriſtians ſhould uſe, when they ſpeak of the Father and the Son; as appeareth from theſe Words, ὅταν λέγηται, προσαγορευόμενος, ὅταν ὀνομάζηται. The ſenſe of *Gr. Naz.* therefore is the ſame with *Tertullian*'s, and both agree, that in Imitation of the Apoſtle we ſhould not call the Son God, as naming him ſo together with the Father (although at other times we may call him God;) and there is great reaſon, that this Rule ſhould have the Force of a Law, and be carefully obſerv'd in the Chriſtian Church, that ſo both real ſinful Polytheiſm, and the Scandal and Appearance of it may be avoided. The Guides of the Church therefore are concern'd to conſider, whether they can juſtifie the uſual Language of our Liturgy and Litany, which is *God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghoſt.* Which uſual Language ſpeaketh the Senſe and Doctrine of the uſual Scholaſtic Theology and Trinity, it repreſenteth God the Father as no more than one of the Perſons of the Godhead (as the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are) and it is not agreeable to the tenour of the Scriptures, as *Tertullian* and *Gr. Naz.* obſerve. Whoſe Rule was a Mean that eſchew'd Extremes on both hands, and was wiſe with Sobriety. Καπνοῦ καὶ κύματος ἐκτὸς ἔεργε Νῆα, *It ſteer'd the Ship, keeping it at a diſtance both from the Smoke and Waves.* And ſuch is our Idea of the Chriſtian Trinity, a moderate Hypotheſis between the Anti-Trinitarian and the Scholaſtic Trinitarian Hypotheſes, which muſt be denominated, *An Extravagance combating with an Extravagance.*

X. Our Idea of the Trinity ſheweth ſuch an *Unity of Trinity* as the Scholaſtic Theology cannot ſhew. For it ſheweth *an eſſential Union* of the three divine Perſons, and it ſheweth *an Unity of Eſſence*, with a due Diverſity of Eſſence, in both which reſpects the Scholaſtic Theology is extremely defective. For in the uſual Scholaſtic Trinity there is Unity of Eſſence (and conſequently an eſſential Union of the Three divine Perſons) but due Diverſity of Eſſence is wanting. In the other Hypotheſis of *three Scholaſtic divine Eſſences*, both Unity of Eſſence is wanting, and an Eſſential Union of the three divine Perſons, as appeareth from the Account which a learned Scholaſtic Divine of our own hath given of this Hypotheſis from the Fathers. For to explain the Unity of *his Scholaſtic Triune God*, theſe three things he ſheweth from the Fathers. (*d*) *Firſt*, That if they held two or more *Principles*, that would be the holding two or more Gods (Ditheiſm or Tritheiſm:) But therefore they held only one God, becauſe they held but one Fountain of the Divinity, which is the Father, from whom the Son and the Holy Spirit have their Origination. The Fathers expatiate in this Plea, and ſuppoſe it to ſignifie very much to free them from Polytheiſm; although it is manifeſt, that three Men are not the leſs three Men, becauſe two of them iſſue from the third. He ſheweth therefore, *Secondly*, That the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are not a Triune God, meerly becauſe the two latter have their Origination from the former (for Creatures alſo have their Origination from God:) But that the Son and the Holy Ghoſt may be one God with the Father, they muſt be ὁμογενῆ & ὁμοούσια, *co-eſſential and conſubſtantial*, as having the Scholaſtic *divine incommutable Eſſence and Attributes.* But as three Men, whereof one is the Father, the other are Sons, are three Men, although they have the ſame ſpecific human Nature, and are in ſuch ſenſe *co-eſſential and conſubſtantial:* So the three divine Perſons, notwithſtanding their (ſpecific) Conſubſtantiality, will yet be three Gods. *Thirdly* therefore he ſheweth, That the Son and Holy Ghoſt may be one God with the Father, it is requiſite, that they be propagated from him *interiori productione non externâ*, not by an external Production, but by an interiour, *ſo as to be inſeparably in the Father, and the Father in them*; *which Mode of Union the* Greeks *call* περιχώρησιν, *the* Latin *Scholaſticks call it Circumince ſſion*, which is their mutual *Inexiſtence* or *Immeation.* So *Athanaſius* ſaith, (*e*) ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀμέριστον, καὶ ἀδιαίρετον, καὶ ἀχώριστον εἶναι τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός *The Logos which is from the Father, is indiviſible and impartible and inſeparable from him, and therefore they are one God.* An ancient Confeſſion of Faith made by certain Eaſtern Biſhops ſaith, (*f*) *Affirming, that the Son is, liveth and ſubſiſteth in like manner as the Father by himſelf, we do not therefore ſeparate him from the Father, conceiting corporeally Places and Diſtances between the Conjunction of them. For we believe them to be immediately and indiſtantly conjoin'd, and to be inſeparable from each other. The whole Father embracing the Son, and the whole Son being as appendent and a connatural Adherent to the Father, and reſting alone in the Boſom of the Father perpetually.* (*g*) If they had ſeparate Exiſtence, as human Perſons have, the three Hypoſtaſes would be three Gods, and they that aſſert ſuch three Hypoſtaſes, deſerve the Name of **Tritheites**, ſuch as the Roman *Dionyſius* complaineth of, τρεῖς θεοὺς τρόπον τινὰ κηρύττουσιν, εἰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ξένας ἀλλήλων παντάπασι κεχωρισμένας, διαιροῦντες τὴν ἁγίαν μονάδα. *They preach in ſome ſort three Gods, dividing the ſacred Monad into three Hypoſtaſes alien from one another, and plainly ſeparate. For the divine Logos muſt be united to the God of all, and the Holy Spirit muſt remain and inhabit in God. And the divine Triad muſt be gathered together, and collected into one, as into a certain Head or Summity, the God of all the Almighty.* (*h*) *We ſay the Father and Son are one God, becauſe the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father. We ſay, thoſe three are one, becauſe two of them are ſo from one, as that they are not ſeparated from him.* Againſt this Hypotheſis of our Scholaſtic Divine one of his Adverſaries hath made this Objection, *Either by this mutual Inexiſtence, Immeation and Inſeparateneſs of the three Hypoſtaſes their Subſtances become continuous, (as the Parts of the ſame Angel or Soul are continuous and indiſcerpible:) Or they are only contiguous, there is only a Contact of their Subſtances, not a Continuity, whereby their Subſtances and Perſons would be identified. If there is only a Contact of their Subſtances, they are as much three Gods, as three Men embracing one another are three diſtinct Men, not one Man. The Parts of the ſame numerical Subſtance are continuous: If the Subſtances of the three Hypoſtaſes are only contiguous, this will never make them to be one God, becauſe meer Contact is only a Juxta-poſition, not a real Union.* Theſe are really great Objections, and they were not unknown to this learned Scholaſtic Divine; yet he hath not vouchſafed to give any Anſwer to them, but hath paſs'd them over *ſicco pede* without taking any notice of them. Which I know not how to reconcile with Sincerity and fair Dealing; for all faithful Enquirers after Truth look on both ſides their Hypotheſis. And what ſignifieth it to diſpute for an Hypotheſis from the Authority of Fathers and Councils, if upon Examination it is found irreconcileable with Reaſon and Religion? What can the ancient Tradition of ſuch an Hypotheſis be, but an ancient Miſtake, that for many Ages hath led us out of the way? Let us ſuppoſe with the ancient Writers, (*i*) that the Father is the Fountain of the Divinity (by neceſſary Emanation) as the Sun is of emitted Light, or as a Fountain is of Water; that the Son hath the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes as well as the Father, (being generated of his Eſſence as Light floweth from Light) and that he cannot be inferior to the Father in thoſe things that belong to him *quâ Deus*, (*k*) as we ſee in the Propagation of Animals and of Men. Let us ſuppoſe alſo, that the Son hath not a ſeparated and divided Exiſtence from the Father, as the Ray is not disjoin'd from the Sun. If we grant all theſe Scholaſtic Suppoſitions, yet it will remain a neceſſary, demonſtrative and eternal Truth, *That three diſtinct Scholaſtic divine Eſſences are three diſtinct eſſential and perſonal Gods, that can never be united into one God.* (*l*) *J. Damaſcen.* is ſo far from uniting them into one God, that he compareth the Trinity to three contiguous Suns. There is no Appearance of an Union by Eſſentiality in this Scholaſtic Trinity. Men do but talk of the Inſeparableneſs of three infinite Subſtances and Hypoſtaſes, and talk againſt their ſeparate Exiſtence, but cannot ſhew, that they have any Union by Eſſentiality. But in our Idea of the Trinity the Holy Ghoſt is eſſential to the Imperial Eſtate of God, (that Eſtate of Headſhip and Government) which is an Union by Eſſentiality. The divine vital Eſſence as it is vital Sanctity the Derivative, is the Eſſence of the Son, which is another Union by Eſſentiality. The three Hypoſtaſes of our Chriſtian Trinity are (in this State of the Univerſe) neceſſary in the Godhead, they belong to one imperial Eſtate of Government, and one of them is the one only true God: But the three **Hypoſtaſes** of the Scholaſtic Co-eternal and

---

(y) *Mr. Boyſe Vindicat. of the true Deity of our Sav.* p. 92, 117, 118 *but vid.* p. 39, 43.

(z) *Petav. de Trin.* l. 5. c. 6. S. 7.

(c) T. 4. l. 15. c. 15. S. 10.

(a) *Apoſtolum ſequar, ut ſi pariter nominandi fuerint Pater & Filius, Deum Patrem appellem, & Jeſum Chriſtum Dominum nominem. Solum autem Chriſtum potero Deum dicere, ſicut idem Apoſtolus, Ex quibus Chriſtus qui eſt Deus ſuper omnia benedictus in ævum omne.* Adv. Prax. c. 13.

(b) Ὅριζε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν εὐσέβειαν, διδάσκων· ἕνα μὲν εἰδέναι Θεὸν ἀγέννητον τὸν πατέρα· ἕνα δὲ γέννητον κύριον, τὸν υἱόν, Θεὸν μὲν ὅταν καθ' ἑαυτὸν λέγηται προσαγορευόμενον· κύριον δὲ, ὅταν μετὰ πατρὸς ὀνομάζηται. Τὸ μὲν διὰ τὴν φύσιν, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν. *Orat.* 23. p. 420.

(d) Dr Bull Def. Fid. Nic. S. 4. c. 4. vid. p. 130, & 154. ed. an. 1703.

(e) Ibid. p. 287.

(f) Ibid. p. 285.

(g) Ibid. p. 285. & Sect. 2. c. 11. n. 1.

(h) *Unum Deum dicimus, & ambos unum Deum, quòd & Pater ſit in Filio, & Filius in Patre. Illa tria ideo unum, quia ſic ſunt ex uno illa duo, ut tamen ab eo non ſint ſeparata.* Ibid. p. 289.

(i) *Ibid. Sect. 2. c. 9. n. 4. & p. 282.*

(k) *Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 3. S. 3.*

(l) *Dr Bull ſupr. p. 288.*

and Conſubſtantial Trinities cannot be ſhew'd to be neceſſary in the Godhead; nor can it be pretended, that they belong to one imperial Eſtate of Government; *they are collected indeed into one Almighty God, and* (as is commonly ſaid) *make together* unum ſummum Ens, *but a very ſtrange one.*

XI. Our Idea of the Trinity ſheweth, that the Church may for the better change her Hypotheſis touching the Trinity, and the Myſteries connex'd therewith; and that according to common Prudence ſhe ought ſo to do. The Church ought to obſerve certain Rules in explaining her Faith (touching the Trinity and Incarnation) to which Rules our Idea of the Trinity is agreeable, but the Scholaſtic Trinities are not agreeable. Nor can it be expected, that the Scholaſtic Theology ſhould cure her Evils, which in all times hath been the cauſe of them. This therefore, with its exotic Myſteries, ſhe ought to relinquiſh, ſubſtituting in its ſtead a better ſort of Theology, which will introduce a better kind of Trinity than thoſe which the Scholaſtic Theology furniſheth. For,

(1.) The Church ought to explain her Faith of the Trinity and the Incarnation, as is moſt agreeable to the New Teſtament, which is the proper and the only Seat of thoſe Doctrines. But who can find in the New Teſtament a Trinity, that is devoid of Chriſtianity, and hath not the Perſon of Chriſt in it? Let any Man of Senſe take a New Teſtament into his Hand, and carefully read it, and he cannot chuſe but obſerve, that throughout the tenor of the Apoſtles Writings this is the Name of God, *The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, which is his New Teſtament and Evangelical Name. Whence in all Reaſon he ought to infer, that the firſt Perſon of our New Teſtament and Evangelical Trinity is *the Father*, in the New Teſtament and Evangelical Senſe, that is, *The Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as ſuch*, who is not the firſt Perſon in the Scholaſtic Trinities; for he is (*m*) ἅμα τῷ εἶναι πατὴρ, *not exiſtent before he was a Father.* Such a Father is no where to be found either in the Old or the New Teſtament. But when a Man hath found out and ſatisfied himſelf who it is that is the firſt Perſon in our Goſpel-Trinity (*The Father*) he may eaſily ſatisfy himſelf who is the ſecond Perſon of it, (namely *The Son*) for the ſame Evangelical Name of God, *The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, ſheweth who is both the Evangelical Father and Evangelical Son, who can be no other but the Perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. This is the only Evangelical Son of the Evangelical Father, and this only (this human divine Perſon) is the ſecond Perſon or The Son in our Goſpel-Trinity. And this any Man may be further aſſur'd of who conſidereth what is meant by the Son, on whoſe Name Chriſtians believe, and in whoſe Name they are baptized, and that this Name The Son (the ſecond Perſon in our Goſpel-Trinity) *The Son of God*, *The Son of the Father*, always throughout the New Teſtament ſignifieth in the Jews Notion *the Perſon of the Meſſiah*, and never ſignifieth an Abſtract *Logos* or Scholaſtic *Verbum*, which is the ſecond Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity. It is by fallacious Reaſonings that the Scholaſtic Theology hath excogitated ſuch a Son of God, which is not the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus (the only Evangelical Son of God) for if our Saviour was not an Abſtract Son, (or *Spiritus Dei*, as the ancient Writers call him) that had from Eternity the Scholaſtic divine Eſſence and Attributes, and was the Maker and Providential Governor of the viſible Univerſe, it was ſuppos'd that he could be no better than *a made-God*, *a Creature-God*, *a God of Yeſterday*, *or a God meerly by Deputation and Office*; and that this Text of the Prophet would be applicable to him, *Jer.* 10. 11. *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, even they ſhall periſh from the Earth and from under theſe Heavens.* As if the Son and the Holy Spirit did not belong to the God of *Iſrael*, (as comprehended in his Monothe-iſm, and belonging to the Comprehenſion thereof) who ſpake theſe Words, and who is the one only true God, that as the Maker of Heaven and Earth is oppos'd to all the idoliz'd Not-Gods. Or as if his Son or his Holy Spirit did belong to that Party of Gods to which he is oppos'd, and who are therefore falſe Gods, becauſe they are Aliens from and Oppoſites to him that is the only true God, the Oppoſite to *the new Gods*, (*Deut.* 32. 17.) to which Party of Gods neither his Holy Spirit nor his Imperial Son can be ſuppos'd to belong. His being the only true God excludeth any other from being the Perſon of *the Eternal Almighty God*. It excludeth therefore any other from being God, as being the Perſon that is *The Maker of Heaven and Earth*. And it excludeth any one from exiſting in and of his Godhead in the Perſon of a God, for ſuch an one muſt be another God. But his being the only true God includeth, implieth and inferreth, that his imperial Son exiſting as ſuch in and of his Godhead is as ſuch ſo far and in ſuch ſenſe God as being a Perſon of the Godhead. Whom we do affirm, (*n*) *non eſſe creatum, ſed genitum*, not to have been created, but begotten.

(2.) The Church ought to explain her Faith of the Trinity and the Incarnation as is moſt agreeable to the Reaſon and Underſtanding, the Wiſdom and divine Affections of the Holy People, that are of a ſound Mind, to whom it is given to underſtand the Myſteries of the Kingdom of God, and of whom *Acoſta* ſaith, *I have ſeen ſome People, that ſcarce underſtood Latine, yet knew ſo much of the Scriptures, that I ſtood amazed at them: all the great Profeſſors of Theology with all their continual Study could ſcarce teach any thing the like.* There is a Sanctity of Mind which maketh Men of quick Underſtanding in the Matters of the Saint of God-kind of Learning, and which is requiſite for the Underſtanding them: But doth Sanctity of Mind contribute any thing to the Underſtanding the Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation? Doth divine Illumination ſignifie any thing? Not a jot; for it is they only that are learned in uncouth Crotchets and crooked Spinoſities (ſuch as *ſubſtantial Modes*, *ſubſiſting Relations*, *Suppoſitality*, *Subſiſtentiæ*, *Perſeity*, *Notionalia*, *Perichoreſis*, *Dictio interna*, *Spiratio*) that are the Maſters in theſe Scholaſtic *Arcana*; for in theſe they conſiſt. And are theſe abſurd and unholy Futilities the great Myſtery of Godlineſs, or the Myſteries of the Kingdom of God? Are theſe the matters of the Saint of God-kind of Learning and Wiſdom, or are they ſavoury Meat, ſuch as they love, who ſavour the things that are of God? The Doctrine of the Chriſtian Trinity, the Divinity and Incarnation of the Meſſiah rightly repreſented are the Depths of the Chriſtian Wiſdom and divine Philoſophy: But ſince the Scholaſtic Theo-

(m) *Petav. de Trin. l.* 5. *c.* 4.

(n) *Zanch. de* 3. *Elch. l.* 3. *c.* 12. *S.* 4.

logy was introduc'd into the Church, each of them hath been turn'd into ſuch a Syſtem of unholy exotic Trifles, that a regenerate Chriſtian cannot but diſguſt as not agreeable either to his Reaſon or his Religion. For what holy Man is not diſguſted to find his divine Saviour turn'd into a *Stoical Logos* by *J. Martyr?* Into a *Logical Logos* by *Athenagoras?* Into a ſubſiſting Sound by *Theophilus*, *Tertullian* and *Lactantius?* Nor are the Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation leſs diſagreeable to the intellectual Nature of Mankind in general, than they are to the divine Nature of a Chriſtian. (o) *All the Diſpute that the Schools can have* (ſaith a Scholaſtic Divine) *of the holy Trinity and Incarnation of our Lord Chriſt, cannot advance us in the Underſtanding of thoſe Myſteries; but only teach us, by what Terms we may expreſs our ſelves in them according to the Faith of the Church.* (p) *All diſpute about Eſſence and Perſons and Natures, and all the Terms whereby, either the Scriptures expreſs themſelves in this Point* (the Trinity) *or the Church excludeth the Importunities of Hereſies from the true Senſe of the Chriſtian Faith, improveth no Man's Underſtanding an Inch in this Myſtery. The Service it doth, is to teach Men the Language of the Church, by diſtinguiſhing that Senſe of ſeveral Sayings, which is, and that which is not conſiſtent with the Faith.* If this is the true State of Things, if no Terms Scriptural or Eccleſiaſtical do at all improve our Underſtanding in this Myſtery of the Church's Faith, it is certain, that her Myſtery of Faith is of a Character repugnant to the Myſtery of the Chriſtian Faith, *which is a Knowledge and Wiſdom* (our Science of Sanctity) *the Knowledge of God and of the Son of God.* If the Schools cannot underſtand or expound the Church's Myſteries of Faith, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that the Church her ſelf doth not underſtand them; whence it is marvellous, that ſhe ſhould make the moſt nice and ſubtil Determinations about them, expecting to be believ'd in as infallible by an implicit Faith. If her Scholaſtic Theology ſerveth only to teach us the Language of the Church, it ſerveth for little better uſe than to teach us (as Parrots) to ſay by rote the Articles of our Faith, without teaching us any (tolerably) clear Underſtanding of them. So that if the Church perſiſteth in following the Track of the Scholaſtic Theology, the great Eſſentials of our Faith muſt for ever remain, like the *Egyptians* firſt Deity, σκότος ἄγνωστον, *unknown Darkneſs.* No Emendation of things can be expected from this Theology.

(3.) The Church ought to explain her Faith of the Trinity and the Incarnation as is moſt agreeable to the nature of things. (q) *Rerum naturæ aſſentior*, The nature of things muſt rule our Opinions, and muſt not be perverted to ſerve an Hypotheſis, which hereby appeareth to be falſe, if the nature of things is ſo perverted by it, as they cannot or may not be perverted. As if the Nature of *the Soul of Chriſt* is ſo perverted that it is made to be but as an Accident and *Hang-by* of his Perſon. If his Human Nature is allow'd to have an *Exiſtence* of its own, but to want *Subſiſtence*. If his Generation is ſuppos'd to be but *a Notion* or mental Conception, or (as ſome ſay) *a neceſſary Emanation*. So the Nature of Sonſhip is perverted, for neither a mental Conception nor a neceſſary Emanation can be a Son. So the Nature of *a ſingular conſtitutive Eſſence* is perverted when it is made to be a common Eſſence, as *a ſpecific Nature* is. The Nature of *Relation* is perverted, for it can be nothing more than a relative Notion, (*Ens rationis ratiocinatæ;*) but the divine Perſons are ſuppos'd to be conſtituted Perſons by their *Relations*, and in God *Relation* is ſaid to be Subſtance. (r) *As the Notion of Relation in God hath ſomething peculiar, of which there is no Example in created things; ſo alſo hath the Notion of a Perſon. For ſuch Relation which is in created things, is counted by the moſt Philoſophers a certain Mode, an Accident of the Subject, whereby it is compar'd to another thing, which it confrontingly reſpecteth. But Relation in God, even as by our Reaſon and mental Conception it is diſtinguiſh'd from the Eſſence, is a Relation ſubſiſting by it ſelf, and by it the Eſſence it ſelf ſubſiſteth. In the ſame manner in created things the Word Perſon ſignifieth ſomething abſolute, in God ſomething relative; but ſuch a Relative which is peculiar to himſelf, that is, ſubſiſtent. Whence it is, that whereas Perſon in every Nature ſignifieth that which is diſtinct in it the whole Diſtinction* (of Perſons) *in God is taken from the Relations of Origination; a divine Perſon properly and directly ſignifieth the Relation.* At this rate the Nature and Notion of *Relation* and *Perſon* is diſtorted in the Scholaſtic Trinity. And it muſt be ſaid, that a late learned Divine of our own writing in Defence of it hath (in ſome degree) diſtorted the Notion of a *Perſon*, the better to accommodate it to his Scholaſtic Trinity. (s) *A Perſon* (ſaith he) *is a compleat intelligent Subſtance with a peculiar manner of Subſiſtence.* (t) *Here lieth the true Idea of a Perſon, which ariſeth from that manner of Subſiſtence which is in one individual, and is not communicable to another. An individual intelligent Subſtance is rather ſuppoſed to the making of a Perſon, than the proper Definition of it; for a Perſon relateth to ſomething which doth diſtinguiſh it from another intelligent Subſtance in the ſame Nature; and therefore the Foundation of it lieth in the peculiar manner of Subſiſtence, which agreeth to one and to none elſe of the kind; and this is it which is called Perſonality.* This is oftentimes repeated (u) *that the proper Reaſon of Perſonality is the peculiar manner of Subſiſtence, which lieth in ſuch Properties as are incommunicable to any other.* But there is much of Miſtake in theſe repeated Affirmations, as will appear from a twofold Conſideration of *a Perſon*. For *a Perſon* may be conſider'd as of Kind and Quality ſuch; and ſo the intellectual Nature (added to a *Suppoſitum*) is his proximate ſpecific Form and Difference, that which conſtituteth, diſtinguiſheth and denominateth him; and therefore is the proper Reaſon of his Perſonality. And *a Perſon* may be conſider'd as *A Singular or Individual*, (diſtinguiſh'd from another intelligent Subſtance in the ſame Nature) and ſo this Mode of Subſiſtence (which this Author ſpeaketh of) or thoſe his individuating Properties incommunicable to any other, may be ſaid to be the Reaſon of his *Perſonality*, or rather of his *Individuality*. But if an individual Subſtance is in our Definition of a Perſon, what need is there of adding *the peculiar manner of Subſiſtence?*

(o) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 2. c. 17. p. 132.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 131.

(q) *Sen. de vit. beat.* c. 3.

(r) *Ut relationis in Deo notio peculiare quiddam habet, cujus nullum creatis in rebus exemplum cernimus; ita etiam & perſonæ. Nam relatio, qualem in rerum natura cognoſcimus, modus quidam à pleriſque philoſophis conſtituitur rei ſubjectæ accidens, per quam illa comparatur ad alteram, quam ex adverſo reſpicit. At in Deo, etiam quatenus ab eſſentia, ratione & ἐπινοίᾳ, diſtinguitur, per ſe ſubſiſtens eſt relatio, per eamque eſſentia ipſa ſubſiſtit. Eodem modo perſonæ vox creatis in rebus abſolutum aliquid ſignificat, in Deo, relativum; ſed ejuſmodi, quale privatim illi convenire diximus, hoc eſt, ſubſiſtens. Proinde cùm perſona in quacunque natura id quod in ea diſtinctum eſt ſignificet: in divinis tota diſtinguendi ratio ſumatur ex relationibus originis; perſona divina propriè ac directè relationem ſignificat.* Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 11. S. 11.

(s) *Bp. Stillingfleet of the Trin.* p. 261.

(t) *Ibid.* p. 260.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 72. *and Pref.* p. 14.

(4.) The Church ought to explain her Faith of the Trinity and Incarnation as is agreeable to the certain Principles and Maxims of *Human Arts and Sciences*, Truths Logical, Phyſiological, Mathematical, Moral and Political, which the Pagan Sages had in ſo high Eſteem, that they deſpis'd Wealth, Kindred and Country, and trudg'd into foreign Countries to learn the Knowledge of the Truth. They have extoll'd it to the Heavens and rais'd it to the Skies. (w) They have ſaid, that God hath Light for his Body and Truth for his Soul; that it is the beginning of all Good to the Gods, and leadeth to all Good; that it is the greateſt of the Gods, and a Citizen with the Gods; that as a Queen it ſhould rule and reign; and ſome of them built Altars to the Truth. Which high and rapturous Elogies of the Truth, (although ſavouring of Heatheniſm) ſhould excite in us an high and raiſed Eſteem of it, and ſo great a Regard for it, as not to violate, not to ſlight or trample on the Truths that are in Human Sciences, upon a Pretence that the Teachers of them were Naturaliſts, and we are Supernaturaliſts, that being back'd by Divine Revelation may venture to contradict all the Sciences in the Circle. But ſuch Pretenſions are very vain and inconſiſtent with themſelves; for Truth always agreeth with Truth, (as *Ariſtotle* ſaith) and that cannot be Divine Revelation which contradicteth any of the Maxims of Truth in the Human Sciences. Of which one of the moſt conſiderable, (the great Fundamental of our Reaſonings) is that Logical Maxim, *Quæ ſunt eadem uni tertio, etiam inter ſe ſunt eadem.* They that are the ſame with ſome third thing wherewith they are compar'd, are the ſame with one another. But this great ſelf evident Maxim is expreſly contradicted by the Scholaſtic Trinity; and therefore the Scholaſtic Divines ſay of it, (x) *It doth not hold univerſally true.* (y) *Although in things finite and created it is repugnant that two things ſhould be really the ſame with a third, and yet really differ from one another, yet in an infinite Being this is not repugnant.* The Perſons in this Scholaſtic Trinity are ſuppos'd to be really the ſame with the Eſſence, yet to differ really from one another; which is an expreſs Contradiction to this Logical Maxim, that is of the ſame Nature and Certainty with this Mathematical Maxim; *Thoſe that are equal to a third thing, are equal to one another.* And as it is a Contradiction to affirm that *Thoſe which are equal to a third, are not equal to one another*; ſo (doubtleſs) it is a multiply'd Contradiction to affirm that *The Perſons*, who (without Limitation) are really the ſame with the Eſſence, yet really differ from one another; that the Eſſence which is but one thing and differeth not from it ſelf, yet is really the ſame with three things really diſtinct, and conſequently really differeth from it ſelf; that this Scholaſtic divine Eſſence is ſingular and individual, yet is common and communicable, (the whole of it being in each of the three Perſons) as a ſpecific Nature. For this is one of the Scholaſtic Trinity's Contradictions to the Maxims of Human Science. The ancient Logick affirmeth, that a ſingular Nature or Subſtance is not common to more or communicable; but the Scholaſtic Trinity, (that is not to be convicted of Error by Demonſtration) will have it otherwiſe. So the ancient Logick ſuppoſeth, that if any ſingular Nature is perfect nothing more is requiſite to make it an Hypoſtaſis; that every individual Nature, (ſuch as the Nature of Man) hath its proper Subſiſtence; but with this Maxim the Scholaſtic Incarnation cannot conſiſt. According to Human Science, if our Saviour hath two Intellects and two Wills he muſt be two Perſons; but this the Scholaſtic Incarnation, (which is not like the Union of Soul and Body, wherein there is but one Intellect and Will) expreſly contradicteth.

(5.) The Church ought to prefer that Explication of the Trinity and Incarnation which is moſt free from Abſurdities, leaſt incumber'd with Difficulties and rational Objections. All poſſible Explications of theſe great Articles, (as all great Theories) are incumber'd with Difficulties and Objections, our own Hypotheſis is not exempt from them. For againſt our Idea of the Holy Spirit it will be objected, that we ſuppoſe the divine vital Eſſence (in reſpect of the vital Sanctity which it is) to be both *the meerly conſtitutive* and *the communicative*, ſo diſtinguiſhing it and making a ſort of Duplicity in it, that muſt be thought an Injury to a divine Attribute *The Simplicity of God.* Which the Schools ſuppoſe to be abſolute and omnimodous, (z) whereby all διπλόν, *Duplicity* or *Binality*, (the joyning together divers things) is excluded, ſo that the divine *Intellect*, *Will*, *Attributes*, *Operations and the divine Perſons*, muſt be all one. But it would be great Weakneſs to be determined in theſe Matters by the Deciſions of the Schools. And if we make uſe of our own Reaſon, we cannot but ſuppoſe that the Holy Spirit belongeth to and is in the imperial Eſtate of God *infinitely* and *eſſentially*, and throughout his Character he appeareth to be *a communicative Agent of the Godhead.* A Duplicity therefore muſt be admitted there, but ſuch as is a Perfection, not any Imperfection. The Schools themſelves, that declaim againſt all Duplicity in God, (a) yet ſuppoſe in the Deity *a Triplicity*, (which is more than a Duplicity) they allow us to ſay *triplex Deus* and *triplex Deitas*, a triple Deity and a threefold God. Another Objection will probably be made againſt our Idea of the conſtitutive Nature and Eſſence of the divine imperial Perſon of the Son of God, who is the Human Nature in Conjunction with the divine vital Eſſence, *as it is vital Sanctity the Derivative.* For againſt this Idea, (which is neceſſarily the Idea of the imperial Saint of God-kind of Son) ſome will ſay that it ſuppoſeth an Union between finite and infinite. Which cannot be ſuppoſed without admitting one of theſe two things; either that finite and infinite are commenſurate and equal, or that the finite is united only to ſome part of the infinite, and is disjoyned from the reſt of it. But to this Argument it may be anſwer'd, that a finite Subſtance may be united to the whole of an infinite Subſtance, *as it is a vital Principle*, (an infinitely vital Principle) without being commenſurate thereto. And this Union is as eaſily conceivable as the Union of Soul and Body, or of any finite Subſtances. Theſe Objections to which our Idea of the Trinity is liable, as they are not many in number, ſo they are not great in weight, they are but Trifles in compariſon of thoſe vaſtly great and numerous Objections both from Scripture and Reaſon which incumber the Scholaſtic Trinity. Of the latter ſort of which Objections a Divine of our own ſaith, (b) *What the Light of Reaſon argueth againſt*

(w) *Gothofr. exerc. in 1 Tim.* 3. 15. p. 3766.

(x) *Negetur univerſè id eſſe verum.* Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 9. S. 14.

(y) *Quamvis repugnet in rebus finitis & creatis aliqua duo eſſe idem cum tertio ſecundum rem, & inter ſe realiter differre; id tamen non repugnat in ente infinito.* Vaſqu. in Th. 1. Par. T. 2. Diſp. 122. c. 2.

(z) *Petav. T.* 1. *l.* 2. c. 2. *S.* 4.

(a) *Idem de Trin. l.* 8. c. 9. *S.* 7.

(b) *Mr. Thorndike Epil. B.* 2. c. 17. p. 129.

againſt the Myſtery of the Trinity I acknowledge to ſeem ſo ſtrong, that it ſeemeth to forbid all uſe of Reaſon in them that admit the Chriſtian Faith. Againſt the Scholaſtic Incarnation the uſual Objections are, that it is *incongruous*, *needleſs* and *impoſſible*, and that the Father and the Holy Ghoſt muſt be incarnate if the Son is ſo. But nothing of this nature can be objected againſt our Explication of the Incarnation.

(6.) The Church ought to prefer that Explication of the Trinity and Incarnation which moſt ſubſerveth theſe Intereſts of Chriſtianity, to promote Piety and the Peace of the Church, tendeth moſt effectually not to cauſe but to cure Infidelity, and to propagate the Chriſtian Religion. And ſuch is our Explication of theſe great Articles, which riddeth our Hands of the Scholaſtic Theology, (that Peſt of the Chriſtian Theology) wholly conſiſteth of Piety, in great part of ſavoury ſaving Piety, (for ſuch is vital Sanctity) this it tendeth to promote together with the due Honour of God (the Father) which is heinouſly violated by the Scholaſtic Trinity. It hath a mighty Tendency to the Peace of the Church, for which the *Unitarians* ſometimes expreſs a great Concern. And if they are really ſo well minded to the Peace of the Church as they profeſs, they cannot be unwilling to ſacrifice thereto their erroneous *Unitarianiſm*, wherein they cannot find any good Settlement, any clear Satisfaction, but they may eaſily find themſelves bewildred by it in Mazes and Labyrinths of Difficulty and Uncertainty. For like ſome of the ancient *Pneumatomachi* (that were at ſuch Uncertainty about the Holy Ghoſt, that they neither dar'd to call him God nor Creature) ſo the *Unitarians* are bewildred; they know not what to make of the Holy Ghoſt; ſome of them ſuppoſe him a created Angel, others the Power and Energy of God. They are bewildred and crumbled into Parties about the Invocation and Adoration of Chriſt, ſeveral of them oppoſing it, and others of them vehemently diſputing for it, and counting them no Chriſtians that deny it. They are bewildred in their Account of Chriſt's Sufferings, as appeareth from the Alterations that they have made in their *Racovian Catechiſm*. For Time was when they would not acknowledge his Death an expiatory and propitiatory Sacrifice for our Sins, which they now acknowledge in Words, but they ſo ſophiſticate it and pervert it from the true Nature and Notion of ſuch a Sacrifice, as plainly ſheweth that they are not well reſolved in their Minds what to make of it. They are alſo bewildred in their Interpretation of *the Proem of St. John's Goſpel*, (and ſeveral other places of Scripture) for ſome of them follow the Interpretations of *Socinus*, others excogitate Interpretations of their own. And ſeeing there is no ſure Footing, no ſolid Satisfaction to be found in their School, this ſhould be a great Reaſon to diſpoſe them to relinquiſh their *Contra-unitive Unitarianiſm*, and to advance thus far towards Unity and Concord with the generality of Chriſtians as to become genuin *Chriſtian Trinitarians*. Upon theſe Terms Chriſtians may unite, and the Church may recover her Peace by the Hypotheſis of a Goſpel-Trinity, which can never be free from Schiſms ſo long as ſhe retaineth her Scholaſtic Trinity, for as of old, ſo it will be to the end of the World, the Seed of perpetual Feuds and Schiſms. The State of the Church will be as in ancient Times, when the main Body of Chriſtians were Scholaſtic Trinitarians, that were oppos'd by a Party of *Unitarians*. For ſuch were the *Ebionites*, *Nazarens*, *Elceſaitæ*; the *Sabellians* were a ſort of *Unitarians*; the Followers alſo of *Theodotus Byzantinus*, *Artemon*, *Paulus Samoſatenus*, and the *Arians* were ſeveral ſorts of *Unitarians*. The Re-union of ſuch to the Church ought to be endeavour'd by all due Means. And there are others (whoſe Recovery ought to be endeavour'd) that in ſome degree hold Communion with the Church, but are really laps'd into groſs Infidelity. To which (ſo far as appeareth) they are ſtrongly tempted by the Hypotheſis of the Scholaſtic Trinity; for this is their uſual and ſtrongeſt Objection againſt the Faith of Chriſt. Of which a Scholaſtic Divine ſaith, (c) *Were it not to be ador'd as a Myſtery it would be exploded as a Contradiction.* But all that are well diſpos'd towards Divine Myſteries are not diſpos'd to adore Scholaſtic Myſteries, but rather to explode them as Contradictions. So they are exploded by *Jews* and *Muhammedans*. And it appeareth from the ſad Experience of many Ages that they have been the grand Impediment both of receiving and retaining the Chriſtian Faith, and have in great degree deſtroy'd it out of the World. If when the *Turks* firſt took *Conſtantinople*, (d) and demanded of the Chriſtians an Account of their Faith, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* had repreſented to them the Chriſtian Trinity, and not a Scholaſtic, Co-eternal, Co-eſſential and Co-equal Trinity, and ſuch a *Triune* God, (illuſtrated by very frivolous and improper, yet ordinary Similitudes) the *Turks* would have had other Thoughts of the Chriſtian Religion than they then had, or have had ſince that time. In the Chriſtian Church the Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation are but overly conſider'd by the moſt, and ſo conſider'd they are of no very frightful appearance, few ſee into the Bowels of them, and if they do, they know not how to remedy the Evils of them but by a worſer Evil, (that of Unitarianiſm) therefore they paſs ſomewhat currant in the Church. But they involve in them Multitudes of Propoſitions, which are ſo incredible, that I am often prone to think it is not poſſible for any one of tolerable Underſtanding explicitly to believe them. Is it poſſible to believe that three diſtinct Perſons have but (numerically) one and the ſame Intellect, Will and Power of Action? that the divine Perſons are conſtituted Perſons by their Relations, whereas they muſt be divine Perſons antecedently to thoſe Relations? that a Perſon is begotten, yet nothing but a Mode is produc'd into Exiſtence? If theſe Propoſitions, and multitudes of like nature, (involv'd in the Scholaſtic Trinity and Incarnation) were form'd into diſtinct Articles, and every Member of the Church was oblig'd to believe them diſtinctly and expreſly, as Articles of his Faith, I am perſuaded that not one of a Thouſand would give aſſent to them. What then remaineth, but that we bid adieu to *profane Scholaſticiſm*, and univerſally entertain a truly Chriſtian Explication of the great Articles of our Chriſtian Faith, that ſo there may be *Glory to God on high, Faith, Holineſs and Peace on Earth, and the Kingdoms of this World may much more illuſtriouſly become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Chriſt. Amen.*

FINIS.

(c) *Dr. South.* 3. *Vol. of Ser.* p. 316.

(d) *Mart. Cruc. Turco-Græc. l.* 2. *p.* 111.

The INDEX.

A.

ABEL, a Type of Chriſt and a Prophet, Page 731. was perſecuted and a Martyr, p. 735. How his Sacrifice appear'd to be accepted, p. 734.

Abraham, a Grand Senior, p. 742, 767. Of Chriſt's Exiſtence before him, p. 767. Of his ſuppos'd ſecular Learning, p. 12. Of his Inſtitution of Religion, p. 741, 742. Of his Faith, p. 722, 724.

Of *Acmonides*, p. 104. Of the Acroamatical Theology and its Deities, p. 132. How God is ſaid to be a pure Act, p. 365.

Of *Adam* and his Paradiſe, p. 455, 456. Of his Creation and the Proviſion that was made for him, p. 459, 461. Of the extravagant Elogies of him, p. 464. How accommodate the Paradiſaical Oeconomy was to our Firſt Parents, p. 469. Of the *Adamical* Inſtitution, p. 737.

Of *Adad*, p. 109. Of *Adrammelech* and *Anammelech*, p. 107.

Of Affirmative Attributes of God, p. 362.

Of the Afflictions of the Saints of the Old Teſtament, p. 735.

Of *Aglibelus* and *Malachbelus*, p. 109, 137.

Of the Air-Jupiter, p. 104.

Of *Alcalam*, p. 109.

Of the Jews *Allegorical* Interpretations of Scripture, p. 10. *Homer* turn'd into Allegory, p. 492. The Chriſtians are blam'd for Allegorizing, p. 469.

Of the Name *Alpha* and *Omega*, p. 356, 877.

Of the Name *Altar* and of bowing to it, p. 429, 430, 433.

Of *Ananias*, p. 568, 576.

Of *Anaxagoras*, p. 2, 147.

Our *Angels* anſwer not to the Pagan Gods, p. 6, 113. The ancient Pagans knew not the Name, nor *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, p. 6, 10. The Holy Angels are ill confounded with the Pagan Gods and Demons, p. 38. Of the Polity and Government of the Univerſe by perfect tutelar Angels according to the Pagans, p. 35. According to the Jews, p. 36. According to many Chriſtian Theologers, p. 37, 38. The Holy Angels are providential Superintendents and Meſſengers, but have not a Pagan-like mundane Magiſtracy, p. 40, 93. A Diſcourſe againſt that Magiſtracy and the Guardian Angel, p. 41, 42. Of God's appearance by Angels in ancient times, p. 490, 491. Of the Angel of his Name and Preſence, p. 42, 490, 492. Of the time when the Angels were created, p. 437, 493. Their Creation not mention'd by *Moſes*, p. 459, 494. A deſcription of the divine Angelical Family, p. 442. They may be ſaid, to be regenerated, p. 390. They belong to the Church, p. 447, 448. Of Prayers made to Angels and of the *Angelitæ*, p. 47, 48, 53, 54, 131. The Patriarchs are ſuppos'd, to have been taught Learning by Angels, p. 12.

Of noxious Animals and their Creation, p. 503.

Of our Saviour's being the *Anointed*, p. 889. All his Offices compris'd therein, p. 891.

Of *Antiquity* and Newneſs, p. 765, 766. A diſtribution of things into Old and New, p. 767, 768, 1027.

Of *Apathy*, p. 168, 260. Of the Name *Apollyon*, p. 316.

What ſort of Witneſſes the Apoſtles were, p. 986, 1006.

Of the *Apthardocites*, p. 937.

Of the *Apoſtate* Angels their Lapſe and their Region, p. 32, 215, 216, 494, 503.

Apoſtacy of the ſame Nature with the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, p. 567.

Of our Saviour's *Apotheoſis*, p. 206, 207.

The *Arians* and other Anti-Trinitarians Objections from Scripture, p. 882, 883, &c.

Arimanius ſuppoſed to be the Holy Ghoſt, p. 133, 134.

Of *Ariſtotle*'s Converſe with the Jews, p. 12, 14. Of his Moral Virtue, p. 266, 816. Of his Magnanimity, p. 261. Of his Acroaticks and Exotericks, p. 595, 596. His Character, p. 129.

Of our Saviour's diſputed *Aſcent* into Heaven, p. 1015, &c.

Of the Philoſophic-pagan *Aſceticks*, p. 597.

Of *Aſmodeus*, p. 31. Of the *Aſſideans*, p. 11.

Of *Aſtarte* and *Atergatis*, p. 109, 110.

Of the Gentiles *Aſtrolatry* ſuppos'd to be permitted to them, p. 105, 106.

Of *Aſtrology* complicated with Magick, p. 80. Much of the Pagans Learning and Religion was *Aſtrology*, p. 93, 94, 96. Much of Aſtrological Myſtery in Paganiſm, p. 97. The Jews are great Aſtrologians, p. 95, 97, 105, 106. Of the *Egyptians* Genethliacal Aſtrology, p. 35.

Atheiſm confuted by the Pagan Theiſts and by the Light of Nature, p. 161, 163, 180, 189, 437, 495, 656. Juſt Atheiſts, p. 270.

Of *Athe-iſts* and *Anti The-iſts*, p. 213, 219.

Atheling the Name of our Engliſh Princes, p. 837.

Athens the Head of Pagan Piety, p. 225.

Of *Atheous* Ignorance, p. 243. Of *Atheizing* the Godhead, p. 392.

Of *Azazel* the Scape-goat, p. 23, 24.

B.

Of *Baal*, Belus, Beelſamen, p. 106, 108, 109.

Of the various Notions of the Oriental *Baal*, p. 108, 109.

Of the *Barbarians* and Greeks, p. 266, 600.

Of *Bar Jeſus*, p. 320.

Babylon called a Perſian City, p. 82. Of the Babylonians Antiquity, p. 95.

Baptiſm (external) not of avail without Sanctification, p. 774.

Of the Form of *Baptiſm* as it concerneth our Saviour's Deity, p. 877.

Beaſts of the Field a Name of Unclean Spirits, p. 486.

Of *Bætulia*, p. 20, 109. Of *Bethel*, p. 119.

Our *Beatitude* is the ſame thing with the Kingdom of God, p. 449.

Of the *Beauty* wherein Virtue conſiſteth, p. 645, 646, 651.

The Name *Beelzebub* interpreted, p. 31.

Of the *Beginning* in the Proem of S. *John*'s Goſpel, p. 994, &c.

Of *Believers* (God's Believers) the Nature and Nobleneſs of their Faith, p. 721, 722, &c. How far the ancient Saints of the Old Teſtament-times were Chriſtian Believers, p. 732, 733.

What kind of *Benefits* they are, that we have by Chriſt, p. 948.

Of the *Birth-nobilitation* of the Son of God, as he was Born Chriſt the Lord, p. 843, 850, 855. He was *Deus natus ac genitus*, and the meaning of that Name, p. 861. His Scholaſtic Birth-humiliation is a miſtake, p. 851, 921.

Of the *Birth-nobilitation* of the regenerate and divine Family, p. 850.

Of two *Birds* in the Purgation of a Leprous Perſon, p. 25.

Of *Biſhops* wanting in Humility, p. 782, 783.

The *Bleſſedneſs* of God how to be underſtood, p. 207.

Blood ſuppos'd to be the Food of Demons, p. 28, 30.

The eating of *Blood* was forbidden becauſe of the Sacredneſs of Life, p. 977.

By *Blood* Covenants were anciently made, p. 743.

Bravo's an accommodate Name of the Philoſophers, p. 260, 261.

Of

Of the *Bread* of Life and *Bread* from Heaven, the Names of our Saviour, p. 983, 1010.

Of *Burning* the Dead for Purgation, p. 90.

C.

Of *Cabala*, p. 13. The Cabala of a Luciform Body, p. 18. Of the Platonic Triad, p. 136, 137, 141, 143. Of the Cabaliſts Emanations, p. 47. Of their Enſoph, p. 237.

Of the *Cauſality* ordinative, executive, ſubordinative, p. 517.

Of the *Chaos*, p, 112, 497, 498, 531.

The *Chaldeans* Wiſdom Senior to the *Egyptians*, p. 82, 95. Their Wiſdom Aſtrological, p. 100. In the Chalday Oracles there is much of ancient *Perſian* Theology, p. 96.

Of Divine *Charity*, p. 415, 777, 813, 819, 821.

How ornamental Chaſtity is, p. 672.

Of *Chius* and *Chronos*, p. 106. Of expoſing Children, p. 670, 671.

Of the Name *Chriſt*, p. 889. He is called the Spirit of God, p. 532, 905. Confounded with the Pagan *Jove*, p. 150. Was typify'd in Paradiſe, p. 454, 455, 501. Whether he had come, if Man had not ſinned, *Ibid*. It is a great thing to like the Life of Chriſt, p. 823. His Virtue not the mundane, p. 818. He is arcane and wonderful, ſuperlative and tranſcendent, p. 807, 818, 819. Chriſt and Chriſtians the Objects of the World's hatred, p. 819, 823, 824. His Idea as he is called *The Son of God*, p. 836, 837. His Idea as he is called *The Chriſt*, p. 888. His Names are *God the Word*, *God the Image*, *God the Son* (Deus natus & genitus,) p. 844, 865. But becauſe he is eſſentially the Perſon of *The Word*, of the *viſible Image* of the inviſible God, of the Imperial Saint of God-kind of Son, of *the mediatory King* of the Holy Empire, of *the Chriſt of God*, this demonſtrateth, that he is eſſentially *an Humane-divine Perſon* according to his Generation, which was Humane-divine, p. 845, 851. He is God's and God is his God, p. 883. Of his Sonſhip to God as he is politically and in place the Divine Imperial Son, p. 895. Of his Humiliation, p. 819, 876, 915. Of his *Exaltation*, p. 885. Of S. *Paul*'s Panegyrick of Chriſt, p. 956. Of the neceſſity of Chriſt's coming and of his Sacrifice, p. 705, 706. Of our Evangeliſt's Hiſtory of his Life, p. 1019. Of a Fanatick Notion that the World is Chriſt's Body, p. 158, 159.

The *Chriſtian* Religion muſt be conſider'd under Four Notions, as *The new Settlement of Saving Grace, The new Kingdom of God, The great Myſtery of Godlineſs, and the new Creation*, p. 761. It conſiſteth of things Superlative and Tranſcendent, p. 819. Is in all reſpects the Diſcipline of univeral Sanctity and Godlineſs, p. 808, 810, 813. The only efficacious Diſcipline of Godlineſs, p. 815. Of Initial Chriſtianiſm, p. 737.

Chriſtians are Chriſt's People, the Holy Covenanters, p. 769, 809, 813. They are oblig'd to great Sanctity, p. 799, 813, 814, 1035. Their Virtue is Chriſtlike, p. 811. Their State is tranſcendent, and ſuch is their Virtue and Piety, p. 820. The World called Chriſtian in great part conſiſteth of Impietiſts, p. 246, 825. Theſe are Chriſtians no Chriſtians worſe than none, p. 809. They live worſe than the worſt of Men, p. 246.

The *Church* is the Holy Popular Syſtem, p. 211, 212, 218, 609, 610, 611, 613, 446, 447. A City and a Family, p. 610, 611. The City of God and his Saints, p. 447. The City of the Regenerate, p. 390. The wicked are not true Members thereof, p. 219, 788, 1030. The Univerſe of Rationals, is one City according to the Pagans, p. 3, 9. Our Churches of the nature of Synagogues, p. 424.

Circumciſion is of a ſanctificative Notion and was a federal Mark of the Holy Seed, p. 742, 743.

Of our Firſt Parents *Coats* of Skins, p. 472, 473, 501.

Of the Firſt and Second *Commandment* and the Idolatry which they forbid, p. 123.

Of ſpeaking in the *Computative* Senſe, p. 637, 638.

Of a *Combat* between the upper and lower Soul, p. 688, 708. Of Concupiſcence, p. 250.

Of *Conſcience* what it is, p. 674. It witneſſeth the Exiſtence of God, p. 661. Noticeth the Law of Nature, p. 635, 664, 668, 674.

Of the *Conſent* of Nations touching the Exiſtence of God, and the Laws of Nature, p. 662, 667.

Of the word *Conſubſtantial*, p. 853, 868, 869, 906.

Of *Contracts* whence accrue Rights and Dues, p. 651, 652.

Of a *Covenant*, p. 762, 763, 764. The Firſt Duty in Chriſtianity is to enter into Covenant, p. 788. 769.

Of the Moſaic *Covenant* as oppoſite to the Covenant of Grace, p. 745, 746. It was not an expreſs Covenant touching future Rewards and Puniſhments, p. 747, 748. Of the difference between the old and new Covenant, p. 417, 769, 770.

Our primitive *Country* is Heaven, p. 506.

The Chriſtians Religion only is an Inſtitution to *the Croſs*, p. 825. Their account of it, and how they have entertain'd and endured it, p. 826, 827.

Of the definitive Notion of a *Creature*, p. 907. Of the Nature of the Moſaic Creation, p. 459. It was not the original Creation, p. 493. By the original Creation the original Kingdom of God was made, p. 444, 445. Creation was out of Societive deſign, p. 446. The holy imperial Goodneſs of Will was the cauſe of the Creation, p. 523. God is the final cauſe of it as Religion and Godlineſs requireth, p. 517, 525.

Chriſt is *Creator*, but is not the Deity of the old Creation, the Creator and providential Governour of the World: But the Creation which is attributed to him in the New Teſtament is the new Creation, p. 944, 951, 954, 1021, &c. The new Creation underſtood and conſider'd in ſeveral Notions, p. 958, 1027, 1028. How all old things are paſt away, all things are become new, p. 1028. How great a change this new Creation is, p. 1030. Renenerate Chriſtians are the new Creatures, p. 1029. The new creative Nature of Chriſt's Religion is an Evidence of the Divinity of it, p. 1032.

D.

Of *Darkneſs* and *Light* in the Theology of the ancient *Magi*, p. 84. In the *Perſian Ditheiſm*, p. 21, 22. Of the Darkneſs which Heatheniſm is, and the State of Unregeneracy, p. 243, 244, 245 395, 990. Of the *Darkneſs* which Wickedneſs is, p. 249, 250.

Of Chriſt as the Son of *David*, p. 843, 890, 891.

Mankind antecedently to the State and Life of true and ſaving Religion muſt be look'd upon as *Dead*, p. 277, 282. The State of Death deſcrib'd, p. 280, 281. How Death was introduc'd by *Adam*, p. 471, 472, 686. Of the Death threatned to him, p. 464. Every deadly thing is called Death, p. 979. They that die in their Sins muſt be put to Death, p. 977, 978. There is no tolerable living in the Region of the Second Death, p. 976, 977, 979.

Of the *Decani* in Aſtrology, p. 95, 97.

Deities defin'd according to the Senſe of the Pagans, p. 6, 8, 71. Whence they had the Notion of a Deity, p. 71, 104. They acknowledge a ſupreme Deity, p. 7, 146. Their ſupreme Deity was politically imperial and animatively vital to the World, p. 2, 161. The ſupreme Deity of their exoterical Theology, p. 102, 103. The ſupreme Deity was with them a term of Polytheiſm, p. 147, 225. Who was really their ſupreme Deity, p. 290, 291. Of the Stoicks ſupreme Deity, p. 149, 151. Of the Platoniſts ſupreme Deity, p. 136, 137, 220, 221, 230, &c. Their Grandiloquies concerning him, p. 236. His uncouth Worſhip, p. 148, 231, 234, 235. Therewith the Rabbins agree, p. 362. This ſupreme Deity was no Deity of Religion and Laws, p. 148. But unknown to Mankind, p. 77, 83. Every ſupreme Deity is not the true God, p. 221, 232. Of the various Acceptations of the Pagans Deities, p. 107. Of theſe various ſorts of Deities, *Sempiternal, Deiformities, Mythical* and *Symbolical*, p. 115, 116, 117, 119. The Pagano-Chriſtians *Superi* are one Chorus or Syſtem reſembling the Pagan, p. 63, 147. They are of different Graduality as the Pagan, p. 60, 69, 254. What the Pagans thought of our God, p. 229, 241. He was not the Deity of a Religion amongſt them, nor one of the Deities of their Theopolity, p. 221, *&c.* He is not therefore the Imperial Eſtate of the mundane Empire, p. 210, 217.

The Name *Demon* interpreted, p. 36, 63. Of the Pagan Demons from whom they had their Sacra, Religion and Virtue, p. 6, 8, 80, 81, 288, 306. They appertain to the original Conſtitution of the Univerſe (according to the Pagans) are not purely Incorporeal, are chang'd into Gods, p. 7, 8, 27, 28. They were incorporated in their Statues and there reſided, p. 120, 305, 323. Of the Vices and Temptations of evil Demons, p. 29. The Pagans Demonology greatly befriendeth Chriſtianity, p. 32. The Jews Doctrine of evil Demons, p. 30, 31. They are ſometimes in the Abyſs, p. 33.

Of *Demoniacks*, p. 286.

Of *Demonolatry*, p. 36, 288, 305. Of Church-demonolatry and the Ground of it, p. 49, 62.

Of the *Den* of the *Magi*, *Pythagoras* and the *Sibylls*, p. 84, 310, 328.

Of the *Deſcent* and *Re-aſcent* of Souls, p. 84. The Cauſes and Conſequences of their Deſcent, p. 86, 87.

Of *Devotion*, p. 400. Of devotional Idolatry, p. 405.

Of the Name *Diabolus*, p. 215. What Notions the ancient Writers have of the Devil, p. 29, 38.

Men ſhould not be ſcandaliz'd at the *Diviſions* of Chriſtians, p. 801.

Of *Divination*, vid. Magick.

Of *Dominion* and Property amongſt Men, p. 652. Of the Ground of God's Dominion and Sovereignty, p. 372, 641, 642.

Of *Drunkenneſs*, p. 177, 280, 672.

E.

When the *Earth* was created, p. 493.

Of an *Egg* in the Coſmogony, p. 531, 533.

Egypt a Fountain of Literature, p. 95. The Wiſdom thereof arcane, p. 77.

The Platoniſts Notion of Ἔιδωλον, p. 138.

Of *Elias* and his Zeal, p. 735.

Of the *Eloquence* that is in Holy Scripture, p. 621, 622.

The *Elements* ſuppos'd to have Souls, p. 113.

An Holy Popular *Empire* the deſign of Chriſtianity, p. 634, 635.

Of the *End*, vid. Final Cauſe.

Of the Name *Ens*, p. 345, 346, 354, 350.

Of a marvellous *Equality* of the Divine Perſons, p. 571, 573, 586. Of their inequality as to Honour and Worſhip, p. 586. And as to Glory, p. 589.

Of the Senſe of *Equipollence*, p. 627. Of the *Eſſens*, p. 94, 312.

Of the *Divine vital Eſſence*, which is vital Sanctity, p. 378, 865, 866. Of the Eſſence of God in the larger and ſtricter Notion and Comprehenſion, p. 865. Of a different conſideration of the Divine Eſſence, which the Scholaſtic Theology doth not acknowledge, p. 870. It cannot explicate, that ſeveral Perſons are of one ſingular Scholaſtic Eſſence, p. 860, 870. Nor that ſeveral Perſons are God, and yet there is but One God, p. 870. A Plurality of Divine Eſſences conſtituteth a Plurality of Gods, p. 869.

The Diſcipline of *Ethicks* natural, p. 175, 675.

The *Evils* of this terreſtrial Life according to the Pagan Theologers, p. 86, 87. Of our Evangeliſts, p. 1019.

Of an imaginary Preſence of Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*, p. 427. The Bread and Wine are Symbols of Equivalence, p. 629.

Of our *Exile* from Heaven. p. 506, 507.

Of the *Example* of the Old Teſtament Saints, p. 734.

An *Expiation* of Sin is in Chriſtianity, p. 810.

Of the Platoniſts Divine Eye, p. 75.

Mankind are born without their Eye-ſight, and ſo continue while in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs, p. 244, 245. The Divine Knowledge is our Spiritual Eye-ſight, p. 395.

Ἐφ᾽ ᾧ, what it ſignifieth, p. 687.

F.

Of the Platonic *Faith*, p. 78. Of the Faith of Jews and Pagans, p. 698. Of the Faith of God's Believers, p. 721, 734, 742. Of the Law of Faith, p. 452, 718, 719, 770. Of the Life of Faith, p. 821. Of the Faithful and their Faithfulneſs, p. 275, 276, 725, 726, 821. Of Infidels as to Saving Faith, p. 825.

Of two oppoſite *Families* of Men, p. 250, 274, *&c.* Of the Angelical Family, p. 442, *&c.*

A *Father* defin'd, p. 181, 773. God is a Father in Nine Reſpects, yet none but the regenerate Family may ſay Our Father, p. 444, 580. The whole Scholaſtic Trinity ſuppos'd to be Our Father, p. 951.

Of the Stoicks *Fate*, p. 162. Of the Aſtrological Fate, p. 94, 95.

Of *Feudal* Law and Cuſtoms and of *Fideles*, p. 725, 726.

Of *Fervour* in Piety, p. 402, 403, 404, 418, 789, 822.

Of the *Final* Cauſe, and the Final Cauſe of the Creation, p. 514, 519. There can be no Final Cauſe of God, but all things are for him and to him as Religion and Godlineſs requireth, p. 517. How they are for and not for his Glory, p. 515, 525. Self is not the end of Man, p. 515, 524. Nor is a Syſtem of Selves the only ultimate end, p. 638, 640.

Of the Pagans *Fire*-Worſhip and their Fire-Theology, p. 112, 113, 115. Of Purgation by Fire, p. 90, 91.

Of Chriſt as the *Firſt*-born, p. 955. And as he is the *Food* of Life to us, p. 528, 983, 1010.

Of the meaning of *Fleſh* and Spirit, p. 420, 421, 528, 771. Of Sin in the Fleſh, p. 253.

To Men in their Graceleſneſs and Wickedneſs the matters of the Chriſtian Life ſeem fooliſhneſs, p. 245. Of the Sin of *Forgetting* God, p. 629.

Of the *Form* of God and Form of a Servant attributed to Chriſt, p. 876, 915, 916. Fornication conſider'd as a ſin againſt our own Body, p. 672. Of the *Frænum* of our Firſt Parents, p. 472.

Of Chriſt's *Fulneſs*, p. 868, 870, 896, 897, 940.

G.

Of *Gad* and *Meni*, p. 106.

The *Generation* of the Son of God is not the Scholaſtic Generation of an Abſtract Son, p. 847. The Scholaſtic Theology miſtaketh in that Binary of Generations, which it attributeth to him, p, 845, 919, 927. The account which the Fathers have given of the Generation and Nativity of an Abſtract Son, p. 848, 940. Our Saviour's Scriptural Generation is of ſuch Properties, as ſhew it to be a true and proper and natural Generation, p. 852. The Scholaſtic unſcriptural Generation is not true and proper, natural and agreeable to Scripture, p. 847, 856, 857, 920. It maketh the Son no Son, the Father no Father, p. 858. The incommunicable Perfection which his Paternity implieth, is deſtroy'd by it, p. 859. There can be no Production of a diſtinct Perſon in *Divinis* according to this Theology, p. 859, 860. Of that Similitude of Nature which conſtituteth a generated Son of God, p. 853. Whether the Son of God is ſuch only upon account of his Eternal Generation, p. (907.) His Generation and Exiſtence from Eternity cannot be prov'd from the Old Teſtament, p. 879. Nor from the New Teſtament, p. 880. A Diſcourſe againſt the Scholaſtic Eternal Generation, p. 889. Of the difference between Generation and Creation, p. 853, 900, 908. Of the Natural and Political Generation of a King, p. 856.

Of the *Guardian* Genii, p. 33, 36. Reaſons againſt them, p. 41, 42, *&c.*

Of the Jews Contempt of the *Gentiles*, p. 600. Of the Gentiles Σεϐόμενοι, p. 213.

Of the Scape-*Goat*, p. 23, 24.

The Fathers call the Saints *Gods*, p. 375, 376. Of the Exiſtence of God as notic'd by Nature, p. 657. Which is a Law of Religion, p. 682, 683. Of the innate Idea of God, p. 671. God is a Name of Honour and Nobilitation, p. 342. It denoteth an Imperial Eſtate, p. 197, 198, 337, 338. An Imperial

rial Eſtate Creature-tranſcendent, p. 339. How it is a Proper Name, p. 344. The plenary Idea of God belongeth to the Science of Sanctity, p. 357. He is not duely notic'd without noticing the Sovereignty that he is, p. 366. We may have a true definitive Notion of God, p. 367. God was Lord and King from Eternity, whence the Ground of his Dominion and Sovereignty may be underſtood, p. 368, 372. Of his Dominion and Sovereignty, p. 372, 517, 641. The Pagan and Chriſtian Theology agree in attributing to governing Providence the Name of Lord and King, p. 193, 194. Theſe Theologies agree touching a Supreme Potentate and many Divine Attributes, p. 197. This great King and Potentate is reſembled by the Kingdom-eſtate of Secular Sovereign Princes, p. 199, 200. God is King and Monarch of the Univerſe in a limited Senſe, p. 208, 209. He is not ſubordinate to the common Good, p. 372, 517, 523, 642. God is of all Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation and Perfection, whether it be of State or of Nature, of Degree or Kind, p. 373, 374. He is politically and of kind the holy Empire's Imperial Eſtate, p. 377. As to what he is of proper kind therefore he is *The Sanctity Imperial, Vital and Imperial-perſonal*, p. 378, 379, 380. God muſt be conſider'd as within the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial, p. 389, 390. He muſt be notic'd as of the God-kind, p. 391. Such Honour and Service is owing to him, which is proper to his degree, p. 399, 400, 402. Our Religion and Piety muſt be of his Kind and Quality, p. 406. God doth not demand Honour and Service from us meerly with reſpect to our Benefit, p. 388, 389. Of a Fanatic Notion that God is all things, p. 158. Of knowing God, p. 361, 362, 391.

Godlineſs (the Godily Man's kind of Virtue) is Sanctity of Virtue and of Tranſcendence Divine, p. 815. It is beyond all things, that are on this ſide Godlineſs, p. 817, 818. The Chriſtians good Life is their new Life, p. 821. A tranſcendent Care of the Soul and a tranſcendent Regard for God and his Service, p. 822. A tranſcendent Goodneſs and Meekneſs towards Men, p. 722, 822. It had a tranſcendent bad Entertainment in the World, p. 823. The Tranſcendence of the Chriſtians Virtue and Godlineſs appear'd in the Primitive Chriſtians Sufferings, p. 826. Chriſtians ſhould be intent upon Godlineſs, p. 813. The Good that Godlineſs is, p. 812.

Good definitively notic'd, p. 636, 637. The good Life and Practice, p. 645, 646. *Bonum honeſtum* denoteth a ſpecific Nature and is not of arbitrary Determination, p. 649, 650. Of the rule and meaſure of what is Good and Evil, p. 648, 649. *Bonum honeſtum* is that which is Righteouſneſs, p. 647. The common Good how far it is and is not the end, p. 638, 639, 641. The common Good twofold, p. 642.

Of *Goodneſs* communicative and of Well-doing and the holy kind of Goodneſs, p. 516, 518. Of a bad kind of Goodneſs attributed to God, p. 516. Goodneſs is operative, p. 522. Of the Pagans good Men, p. 761, 817.

The *Goſpel* what it ſignifieth, p. 993. Of the Goſpel-ſettlement, p. 769. Holy Ghoſt. See Holy Spirit.

Glory is the thing that God is, p. 589, 590. How his Glory is to be underſtood, p. 526, 793. What Glory we are to give to him, p. 591, 592. How the Glory of God is his and our End, p. 515, 525. Of the Hymn called *Gloria Patri*, p. 592. 593. His Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Glory, p. 535. Of the Glory that Chriſt had with him before the World, p. 880.

Of *Clemens*'s *Gnoſtick*, p. 17. Of two ſorts of Gnoſticks, p. 46, 47. Of their Theology and ſupreme Deity, p. 136, 144, 236.

Grace defin'd, p. 711, 712. Why the Chriſtian Religion is the Religion of Saving Grace, p. 712, 718, 719. Of the Grace of Chriſt's Perſon, p. 939.

Of *Greatneſs* the notion and diſtribution thereof, p. 790, 791. Of the Greatneſs of God and the Aſcriptions thereof, p. 793, 794. Why the Myſtery of Godlineſs is called Great, p. 794. Of the Pride of the *Greeks*, p. 600.

H.

Of *Hades*, p. 457. Of two Scholaſtic Hands of God, the Son and Holy Spirit, p. 579. Wherein all Men ſhould place their Happineſs, p. 814.

How far the *Heathen* did and did not know God, p. 239, 240, 241. Of the Heathen State, p. 212. The deadlineſs thereof, p. 273, 274, 281. Of the Heathens Salvation, *Ibid.* and p. 737. The Heathen were Aliens from being God's Religioniſts, p. 223, 225. Of their atheous Ignorance, p. 243. Of their atheous Life, p. 246, 248. Of their Virtue and Well-doing, p. 272. Mankind are natively Heathen Religioniſts, p. 225. The Heathen World Satan's mundane Empire, p. 285. Several ſorts of Heatheniſm, p. 92.

Heaven when made, p. 436, 498. Of the Heaven of Beatitude and Immortality, p. 438, 439. Heaven a Temple reſembled by the Jewiſh Sanctuary, p. 440, 441. Heaven a City, p. 446, 447. Heaven our Primitive Home, p. 506, 507. Heaven and Earth Pagan Deities, p. 104. Heaven their Supreme Deity, p. 102, 147, 152. The felicity of Heaven, p. 978. Holineſs is an Heaveniſm of Mind and Life, p. 980.

Of the *Hebrews* and the Traduction of Learning from them, p. 12, 796. They make Traductions from the Pagans, p. 18, 19, 237.

Of *Hecate* and the *Hecatine* Circle, p. 92, 98, 133, 143.

Of the *Hegemonicon* of the World, p. 161.

Of the *Heroes*, p. 6.

Of an *Heir*, p. 761, 762.

Of Hell and the Situation of it, p. 504.

Of *Heliogabalus*'s Deity, p. 109.

Of *Hen* or T'*Agathon*, p. 71, 73, 76, 134, 136, 148, 230.

Of *Hereſies*, p. 219. Of Heretical-pagan Deities, p. 221, 236.

Of *Hieratici*, p. 84. Of the Schools Hierarchies, p. 145.

Of this great Attribute of God *that All is His* (as Religion and Godlineſs requireth) p. 183. The various Illuſtrations of this Attribute, p. 183, 372.

Of *Holy* and *Holineſs*, vid. Sanctity.

Of the *Honour* and Service we owe unto God, and why he demandeth it, p. 388, 399, 405.

Chriſt (as being eſſentially the Son of *David*) is an *Humane-divine* Perſon, and the Humane Nature is his Eſſentiality, p. 836, 839, 922, 924, 925, 932. His Humane Nature is ſuppos'd, to be Deify'd by his Incarnation, p. 939. Yet it is deny'd to be a *Suppoſitum* and is made no Subſtance, p. 930, 931.

Humility is found in Paganiſm, p. 262, 263.

Of *Hyle*, p 29. Of *Hypocriſie*, p. 407, 408. *Hypoſtaſis* defin'd, p. 928, 929.

I.

Of S. *James* and S. *Paul*'s ſeeming difference, p. 720, 721, 729.

Of the Platonic *Ideas* as ſuppos'd to be the *Realities*, p. 73, 140, 141.

Idolatry what it is and how diſtinguiſh'd, p. 339, 405. The proneneſs of Mankind to the Religion of Idolatry, and the inducements to it, p. 253, 254, 356, 357. The Idolatry of *Jeroboam*, p. 124. The Idolatry that is in Marianolatry, and Saint-worſhip, p. 57, 68, 69. Groſs Idolatry is againſt Man's Dignity, p. 122, 672.

The *Jews* Anti-Trinitarian Objections, p. 887. The Wickedneſs of the preſent Jews, p. 690, 700. Of their God, p. 361, 362, 364, 391, 392. Of their Book *Jezirah*, p. 13.

Of the Name *Jehovah*, p. 346, *&c.* How far Chriſt is Jehovah, p. 873.

Of Atheous *Ignorance*, p. 243. Ignorance and Vice how connex'd, p. 247. None can be innocently ignorant of what is the Law of Nature, p. 666, 668.

Images and Symbols of the Gods for what they were chiefly deſign'd, p. 119. How far the Heathen made them Gods, p. 120, 121. How their Image-worſhip violateth the Second Commandment, p. 123. Man the Image of God, p. 466.

Immortality how brought to Light by the Goſpel, p. 736.

A fond *Immaterialiſm* of the Pagan Theologers and the Rabbins, p. 87, 88, 598, 608.

Of the *Immutability* of God, p. 365, 366, 922, 926.

Of *Imputing* Righteouſneſs, p. 695, 696.

A Diſcourſe againſt the Scholaſtic *Incarnation*, p. 911. There are marvellous Incongruities in it, p. 898, 919, 927, 933. Like the Scholaſtic Trinity it is a Riddle of Philoſophy, p. 923. The true Incarnation was not an aſſuming the Humane Nature in the Scholaſtic Senſe, p. 851, 921. Of a monſtrous Scholaſtic Incarnation, whereby *Deus eſt Aſinus, Diabolu*[illegible]*Hinibilis*, p. 938.

Of *Inceſt*, p. 654, 667. Of Inchantments of Things and Perſons, part of the Pagans Pharmacy, p. 299, 300.

Infidelity is from Ungodlineſs, p. 814. Of the Infidelity of Hypocrites, p. 728.

Of the Platoniſts Theologizing by *Inſpiration*, p. 75.

Of the *Inſtincts* in Nature, p. 660, 661, 673.

Of the Platoniſts Firſt Intellect and Abſtract Intellects, p. 71, 73, 138, 139, 140, 141. Their Intellectual Form of Life, p. 79, 608. Of two Intellects in the Soul, p. 79, 139, 608. Of *Intellectus agens*, p. 361, 546, 547.

Of the due *Intelligibleneſs* of the Chriſtian Religion, and how far it is deſtroy'd by the Scholaſtic Theology, p. 803, 806.

Of *Iſis*, p. 102, 157, 158.

The *Iſraelitical* Theiſm involv'd a Faith of Chriſt, p. 732, 733.

Judaiſm was from the beginning of the World, p. 729.

Neither Jews nor Chriſtians acknowledge *Jupiter* to be God, p. 222, 226, 229. Of the Pagan *Jupiter*, p. 2, 102, 107, 108.

Goodneſs muſt not be devoid of *Juſtice*, p. 522, 523. Juſtice ſignifieth univerſal Righteouſneſs and jural Practice, p. 647, 651, 656. Whether Juſtice is for Society, p. 639.

Of *Juſtifying* and *Juſtification*, p. 719, 720. Of Juſtifying Sinners in the humble and noble way, p. 704, 705.

K.

Of the Name and Aſcriptions of *King* and *Kingdom*, p. 194, 195.

The Holy Ghoſt is not the *King* of a Kingdom, p. 548, 549, 577.

The *Kingdom* of God is the ſame with the City of God and denoteth the illuſtrious Properties thereof, p. 447, 448. As real it is the *Summum Bonum*, p. 449. Of the original Kingdom of God, and how it is differenc'd from his new Kingdom, p. 450. Of the Law of this original Kingdom, which ought to be counted the original Law, p. 450, 451, 452.

Of the new *Kingdom* of God and the various Acceptations of it, p. 779, 780. The Kingdom of Chriſtianity is rightly called *The Kingdom of Heaven*, yet the mundane Spirit hath prevailed in the Chriſtian Church, p. 782.

Old *Iſrael* was not the *Kingdom* of God, p. 611, 784. Our prime Duty is to become Citizens of the Kingdom of God, which ought to be taken with an holy Violence, p. 788, 789.

Of the Egyptian God *Kneph*, p. 134.

Of *Knowing*, κτ᾽ γνῶσιν, p. 242. Of Knowing God, p. 238, 239.

Of the excellency of the *Knowledge* of Chriſt, p. 801. God is repreſented as unknowable (as the Trinity is) who is only unknowable by the Sons of Carnality, p. 361, 362, 391. He is made unknowable by the Scholaſtic Theology, p. 803, 806. The Theology of the Godhead is Philoſophic-paganiz'd by Jews and Chriſtians, p. 360, 361. Knowledge is inſtitutive and conſtitutive, p. 343, 393. Knowledge difficult to attain, p. 860. Of the worth aud weight of it, p. 247, 803. It is Light and is in the Soul as the Eye in the Body, p. 243, 248.

The *Knowledge* of God belongeth to the Science of Sanctity, p, 357, 358. The Tranſcendence of that Learning and Knowledge which this Science is, p. 358, 359. God is in himſelf and to us a Divine kind of Knowledge, which is the Light of Life, p. 393, 398. In unholy Mankind there is a great ineptitude for knowing and judging of Things Divine, p. 398.

L.

Of *Law* or Obligation, p. 204, 650. The Law of Nature defin'd, p. 635, 656. It is of a larger and narrower Notion, p. 667. The Obligation of it is not meerly Politic and Prudential, p. 643, 644. That which is in its own Nature Righteous and Unrighteous muſt be antecedent to a made Law, p. 649. The Laws of Nature are of Self-obligation, p. 339, 649, 650, 665. They have the Sanction of Laws, p. 664, 665. The great certainty of the Law of Nature, p. 666. How it is written in the Heart, p. 664, 668. How the Law of Nature is notic'd, p. 663, 666, 672. The Maxims of it are Self-evident, p. 669. The Firſt Law of Nature is Subjection to the Law-giver, p. 643. The Law of Nature cannot be diſpens'd with, p. 654. Of the Eternal Law, p. 655. The Law of Nature is an univerſal Law, p. 655, 656. Of the Law of the World according to the Stoicks, p. 162. Of the great Laws of duely equal Love to our Neighbour and the like doing to others, p. 651, 661. The Decalogue is the Law of Nature, p. 678. The Law of Nature muſt be conſider'd as Civil-religious and as Spiritual-religious, p. 678, 679. How it hath a Legiſlation from God, p. 665.

Of the Original Law, p. 450, 451. Of the Law of Innocence, p. 469, 470.

Of the Moſaic Law, p. 408, 745. Of the Chriſtian Religion as it is a Law, p. 763, 765. The Moſaic Law muſt be conſider'd as it is no more than the Law-religioniſts Religion, and as it is the Chriſtian Religion initially introduc'd, p. 408, 745. In the former Notion it is a Civil-religious Law and the Settlement of the Holy Spiritual Law, p. 746, 748. As it is a Civil-religious Law it is a Covenant of Civil-religious Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins, and of Civil-religious Truth of Piety, p. 409, 411. As it is the Chriſtian Religion initially introduced, it is an Inſtitution of Spiritual-religious Righteouſneſs (the Righteouſneſs of the Saints of the Old Teſtament) and alſo a Prophetic and Typical Inſtitution to the Chriſtian Religion, p. 750, 752, 830. The Ceremonial Law was not chiefly inſtituted for remedying Idolatry, p. 750, 760.

Who they are that belong to the Law, p. 682, 683. Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs is not attainable by Nature and the Law, p. 688. Nor the State of Righteouſneſs, p. 451, 629, 694, 702, 747, 770. The Law is to its Religioniſts Law-form and Form of Law, p. 702. The diſpenſation of the Letter, p. 417, 542, 619, 682, 706, 745, 771. The Law is the Religion of Man's Unregeneracy, and of his Spiritual Servitude, p. 706, 771. How the Motions of Sin are by the Law, p. 689, 690.

Of Secular *Learning*, p. 359. The Apoſtles were without it, the Arts and Terms of it, p. 619, 620.

Of the *Epheſian Letters*, p. 299.

Of Humane *Liberty* of Will, p. 94, 95.

Of *Lights* in Churches, p. 431. Of an ancient rituality of Lights, p. 991. Chriſtians the Lights of the World, p. 821. Of the primigenial Light in the Moſaic Creation, p. 499, 500. Of the relative Creation of the Celeſtial Lights, p. 496, 497. Of the Affinity of Light with God, p. 590. Of Light and Darkneſs in the Scripture-Theology, p. 243, 244, 250, 378, 393, 395, 396, 783, 784. What our Saviour's Name *The Light* and *The true Light* importeth, p. 988.

Of the worth and weight of *Life*, p. 976, &c. Of our Saviour's Name *The Life*, p. 982, 983, &c. Of Life brought to Light, p. 736.

Of his Name *The Logos*, p. 961. It denoteth not an Abſtract Logos, p. 994. Why he is called by the Evangeliſt Logos rather than *Filius*, p. 1002. The Logos that was with God, was not an Abſtract Logos, p. 1004. Of the Platonic Logos, p. 965. Of the

7

the Stoical Logos, p. *Ibid.* Of the Targumic Logos, p. 966. Of the Moſaic Logos, p. 967. Of the Logical Logos, p. 969. Of the uſual Scholaſtic Logos, p. 971. The Evangeliſt's Logos is *The Word of Life*, p. 982, 986. All in ſome ſort have good Life, p. 818. Of the Seat of Life, p. 485.

Of the Name *Lord*, p. 193, 194. God is Lord and Owner of all, p. 183, 184. The Holy Ghoſt is not the Honour-perſon of the Lord, but Chriſt is, p. 576, 872.

Of the *Love* that God is, p. 379, 864. The new Society-Love is peculiar to the new Law, p. 770. The Love-practice is the Societive, p. 653. Of the Pagans Love-deity, p. 111, 531. Of their Love of Boys, p. 177, 312.

Againſt *Lukewarmneſs*, p. 401, 402, 418.

M.

Of the *Madneſs* of unholy Mankind, p. 246.

Magick defin'd and diſtinguiſh'd into *Goety* and *Theurgy*, p. 79, 80. Into that of interiour and the more remote Dealing and Correſpondence, p. 301, 302. Chriſt and Chriſtians accus'd of Magick, p. 294. The Magick of the *Jews* and *Muhammedans* and that which is amongſt profeſſed Chriſtians, p. 307, 308. The Pagans high Eſteem of it, p. 295, 297, 300, 301. Of Natural Magick ſo accounted by the Pagans, p. 98, 154, 155. Of the *Perſians*, *Indians*, *Egyptians* and *Chaldeans* Magick, p. 81, 82, 295, 296, 297. In Paganiſm Magick was every where in Domination, p. 294. Of the Hail-magicians, Inchantments, Spells and Charms, p. 297, 298, 299, 300. The Pagans Religion was a Religion of Divination, p. 300, 301. Of their Divination by Signs, by familiar Spirits and other Methods, p. 301, 302, 303, 304. Of the Divination that was in their Oracles, p. 324, 325. Of their Perſonal Oracles, p. 320, 325, 328. Their Religion was Magick, p. 305, 306. The Platoniſts Supreme Deity was Magical, p. 237. Of the Pagans that were Magical Saintiſts, of which number *M. Antoninus* was one, p. 309, 310.

Of the *Marianolatriſts* Mother of God, p. 63, 64. *Minerva* her Parallel, p. 67.

The *Martyrs* and Saints departed were made to ſucceed the Pagans tutelar Spirits, p. 48, 49.

Of the *Marriage* of Brother and Siſter, Polygamy and Divorce, p. 654.

Of the *Materiarii*, p 498.

Of our Saviour's *Manifeſtation* when it was, p. 918, 1005.

Of his *Miſſive* Oeconomy, p. 1000.

His *Meſſias-ſhip* is incompetible to the Second Perſon of the Scholaſtic Trinity, p. 887, 898.

In great variety of Notion he is *Mediator*, p. 892, 893.

Of *Melchizedek*'s Order of Prieſthood, p. 881,

Of Chriſtian *Meekneſs* and Goodneſs, p. 772, 822.

Of the Word *Merachepheth*, p. 531, 533.

Merit diſtinguiſh'd and explain'd, p. 704.

Of *Merodach*, p. 106.

Of *Mendes* and *Mendeſians*, p. 28. It is not enough to live like Men, p. 815, 821.

The *Meſſiah* in his primary Notion is a King, p. 889.

Of *Micah* and his Teraphim, p. 99.

Of the Flower of the *Mind*, p. 79.

Of *Miraculous* Magical doings in Paganiſm and by Oracles, p. 322, 323.

Of *Miracles* that introduc'd Church-Demonolatry, p. 59, 60, 62, &c. Of Miracles by Reliques and Saints departed, p. 50, 54, 54. Of the Miracles of S. *Thecla*, p. 60. Of Miracles by Images, p. 129.

Of *Mithras* and his Sacra and the Triplicate *Mithras*, p. 96, 133, 135, 403.

Reaſon for *Modeſty* and Moderation, p. 801.

Of *Monadiſts*, *Dyadiſts*, *Triadiſts*, p. 153.

How far God is *Monarch* of the Univerſe, p. 208, 209. Of the Scholaſtic Monarchy, p. 572.

Of *Morality*, p. 816. The great Rules of Morality Self-evident, p. 669. Of civil Moralities, p. 820. Of Moral Impotency, p. 693.

Fond Conceits of *Moſes*, p. 12, 16, 69. Whence he had his Learning, p. 17.

Of the *Muhammedans* and their God, p. 391, 393, 693.

Of the *Mundus Moſaicus*, p. 497.

Of the *Mundane* Spirit in the Church, p. 782.

Of Church *Muſick*, p. 431.

What a *Mount* ſignifieth, with an account of what Virtue and Righteouſneſs the Sermon on the Mount requireth, p. 680, 828, 832.

Of the Philoſophic-pagans Theology *Myſtic-metaphyſical*, p. 75, 234. Myſteries of the *Egyptian* Theology, p. 77. Of the Platonic Myſticks, p. 235. Of the Myſticks in the Church, p. 83, 84. Of the Heathens Popular-religious Myſteries, p. 794, 795.

Of Chriſtianity as it is a *Myſtery*, and what that Name implieth, p. 798, 799. It is an Holy-popular kind of Myſtery, p. 796. Of a mean outſide, p. 800. Abſtruſe and Obſcure yet a Science, p. 801, 803.

Of the Stone *Mnizurin*, p. 28.

N.

Of the *Nakedneſs* of our Firſt Parents, p. 469, 473.

Of *Name* what it ſignifieth, p. 383, 384.

Of the *Native* State of Mankind, p. 214.

Of *Nature* what it ſignifieth, p. 656, 673, 681, 682, 776, 777.

Nature the Cure of Diſeaſes, p. 813.

Of God as denominated *Nature*, p. 151.

Of a Theological State of *Nature*, p. 190.

Generable corruptible *Nature* diſparag'd, p. 74.

The Life of Grace is a *Nature*, p. 775, 776.

It is a Divine good *Nature*, p. 777.

Of a live Sin-*Nature* in Man, p. 251.

Of common good *Nature*, p. 777, 779, 817, 818, 823.

Of *Natural* Affection, p. 660, 271.

Degrees of *Neceſſity*, p. 977. Neceſſity of Virtue is not meerly from common good, p. 640.

Of *Necromancy*, p. 302.

Of *Nemeſis*, p. 665.

Of *Newneſs* as an Attribute of the Chriſtian Religion, p. 768, 774.

Of a *New* God, p. 910. Of the New Creation, p. 951, 952, 958, 1021, 1027.

Of the *New* Kingdom of God, p. 785. Of the New Life, p. 821. Of the Righteouſneſs of the New Man, p. 820, 828. Of the New Eye, p. 395. Of the New Covenant and Inſtitution, p. 772, 785, 828, 830, 832. Of New Duties, p. 833. Of the New Creatures, p. 1029. The New Things only ought to take place, p. 765, 768, 774, 1028.

Chriſt the Deity of the *New* Teſtament, p. 953.

Of *Nibchaz* and *Nergal*, p. 107.

Of the Inſtitution of *Noah* and of his Deluge, p. 739, 741.

Of Eſtates of Honour and *Nobilitation*, p. 201. Of the Creature-tranſcendent Nobilitation, p. 343, 373.

Of the Platonic *Noes*, p. 138.

Of the *Number* kind of Theology, p. 75, 76, 231.

O.

Of *Ob* in Scripture, p. 302.

No *Oblations* or Sacrifices are made to the Holy Ghoſt, p. 587, 588.

The *Obligation* of Laws is not only from the Sanction of them, p. 643, 644.

Of *Occupancy*, p. 652.

Of Chriſt's *Offices*, p. 890.

Of *Ophion* and *Ophioneus*, p. 27, 31, 292, 454.

Opinion what it is, p. 141.

Of the Pagans *Oracles*, p. 316. Of ſeveral ſorts of them, p. 320. Of their Ceſſation, p. 328. Of the *Sibylline* Oracles, p. 328, 331. Of the *Chalday* Oracles, p. 83, 96. The *Oracle* the Eſſential part of a Temple, p. 427.

Of *Original* Sin in ſome ſignifications of it, p. 240. The Article explain'd, p. 467, 468, 509, 510, 511, 684, 688.

Of *Orders* in the Pagans Univerſe of Rationals, p. 5, 6, 7. Order in their and the Pagano-Chriſtians Religious Worſhip, p. 60, 69.

Order is in Virtue, Vices are inordinate, p. 400, 645, 650, 672.

Of the *Origin* of the Soul, p. 505, 510, 512.

Of *Oromaſdes* and *Arimanius*, p. 133, 135.

Orpheus's mode of Theologizing, p. 75, 112.

Of an *Owner* or Proprietor, p. 183, 184.

The INDEX.

P.

At what a rate unreform'd Chriſtendom *Paganizeth*, p. 254, 255. And reform'd Chriſtendom alſo, p. 813.
Of the God *Pan*, p. 966.
The Holy Ghoſt the *Paraclet*, p. 539.
Of *Paradiſe*, p. 441, 456, 458. Of the Paradiſaical Oeconomy, p. 463, 469.
Of that *Pardon* of Sin wherewith the Law-religioniſts content themſelves, p. 701, 702.
Of Chriſt's *Paſſion* how great it was and why, p. 943. How greatly it is deſtroy'd by the Scholaſtic Incarnation, p. 934, 935, 937.
Of the Philoſophers *Patience*, the *Stoicks* Patience and Paſſive Obedience, p. 171, 172, 264. The Saints departed are ſuppos'd to be our Patron-ſuperiorities. p. 48, 49.
Of the *Peace* made by Chriſt, p. 787, 893. Peace connex'd with Life, p. 979.
Of the *Perichoreſis* of Divine *Perſons*, p. 870. And of two Natures in Chriſt, p. 926.
Of *Pelagius*, p. 252, 611, 635, 685, 693.
Of the Notion of a *Perſon*, p. 929, 1063.
Of the *Perſian* Magi and their Learning, p. 82, 83, 95.
Of *Perfection*, p. 693. The Chriſtians way of good Practice the Perfect way, p 811, 829. How the Law is Perfect, p. 751. Perfect the ſame with Upright, p. 466.
Of the *Perſecution* of God's People in the Old Teſtament-times, p. 735, 736. Of the Primitive Chriſtians, p. 333.
Of *Piety*, p. 400. The Truth of it, p. 406. The Truth of it according to the Religion of Soul-intereſts, p. 408. The true and genuin kind of Piety, p. 412, 414, 418, *&c.*
Of *Polygamy*, p. 735.
Of the *Polyonymy* of one God, p. 159, 160.
A meerly *Politic* and prudential Inſtitution of Piety and Morality not Legitimate, p. 639.
Of the *Pope's* Magnificence, p. 374. Of extravagant Church-pomp, p. 434, 435.
Of the various ſignification of *Populus*, p. 598. A diſtribution of Things and Perſons into *Popular* and *Philoſophical*, p. 595. Of the common People, p. 599. They were the firſt that entertain'd Chriſtianity, p. 602, 603. Their Good is the great Good, and if they are Holy, they are truly Noble, p. 603, 604. The Holy Scriptures are *Popular* in a large Senſe, p. 604. They are in all reſpects Popular, p. 613. The Popular formal way of ſpeaking, p. 631.
In the Virtuous there is ſomething pure, p. 650. Of the Pagans regard for Purity, p. 258, 259. And for Purgation of the Soul, p. 90, 91. Of the Jews Purgatory, p. 669.
Of *Puniſhment* which is Subjection to the courſe of Nature as diſtinct from that which is Subjecton to courſe of Law, p. 513.
The diſtribution of *Philoſophy*, p. 2. The deſcription of a *Philoſopher*, p. 73, 141, 596, 597. Of the Philoſophers addictedneſs to the Heathen Religion, p. 255. Whether all the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity are ſuitable to their Reaſon, p. 267.
Of the *Philoſophic*-pagan Theology, p. 70, 72. Inſtances of criminal Philoſophic-paganizing, p. 4, 16, 17, 26, 29, 34, 38, 39, 48, 74, 87, 148, 151, 280.
Of *Philo*, p. 4, 10, 19, 38, 93, 96, 105, 114, 146, 156, 176, 277, 279, 281, 346, 350, 364, 395, 405, 437, 453, 456, 516, 517, 634, *&c.*
Of the Religion of Holy *Places*, p. 431, 432.
Of *Plato* and his *Parmenides*, p. 76. Of his Divine Similitude, p. 265. Of his Amours, p. 178. Of his Ignorance of what is Righteouſneſs, p. 266. Himſelf and his Followers great admirers of the Oracles, p. 319. His Senſe touching evil Demons, p. 26. And touching the Cauſe of the Univerſe, p. 515, 516. Of an extravagant Eſteem of him, p. 18. Stories of his Salvation, p. 283. He was in good earneſt a Pagan Religioniſt, p. 93, 147. But in conſort with *Pythagoras* is ſuppos'd to have deriv'd his Wiſdom from the Jews, p. 10, 19. Whence they had their Theology, p. 75, 83, 85. The origin of the Platoniſts Theologizing, p. 71. Their various modes of Theologizing, p. 75. Platonic Language not eaſily underſtood, p. 74.
Of a *Placable* Providence, p. 410. Of governing Parental Providence, p. 180, 182. Of a juſt governing Providence, p. 664, 667.
Of Πνεῦμα & Πνευματικὸς, p, 245, 421.
Of *Prædeſtination* as the Object of it is real and perſonal, p. 312, 313. How much of perſonal Prædeſtination ſtrictly ſo called is certain, p. 714, 715. Of a ſtrange Prædeſtination of Chriſt, p. 941.
Of *Prayers* of Imprecation, p. 831.
Of *Præ-exiſtence* rightly repreſented, p. 512.
Of the *Preſidentiary* Spirits according to the Pagans, p. 8, 9, 35. According to the Jews, p. 37. According to ſome Chriſtian Theologers, p. 37, 38.
Of the *Pride* of the Philoſophic Pagans, p. 169, 171, 261.
Of Chriſt's Prieſtly Office and of his being a Prieſt to himſelf, p. 890, 893, 887, 894, 898.
Of the productive *Proceſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt, p. 555, 562.
Our Saviour was ſent (and came down) from Heaven as a *Prophet*, p. 1005, 1007. The Saints in the ancient times of the Old Teſtament were Prophets, p. 731. Who the Prophets were, p. 304, 618. The ancient Prophecies prove the Truth of Chriſtianity, p. 456, 753. The ancient Prophecies of Chriſt are complicated with Types, p. 754.

R.

Of ſpeaking in the *Raiſed* Senſe, p. 631, 632.
There is ſomething better than *Reaſon*, p. 318. Of right Reaſon, p. 394. Of right Reaſon as the ſuppoſed meaſure of Good and Evil, p. 648, 655. How it is Law, p. 664. What is right Reaſon in Morality, p. 667. They that live according to Reaſon, are ſaid to be Chriſtians, p. 282. The Reaſonableneſs and Congruity of the Chriſtian Religion is ſpoiled in the Scholaſtic Theology, p. 806.
Notices of *Regeneration*, p. 772. It compriſeth a Regeneration of State and of Nature, both the Fact of Man and the Grace of God, p. 773, 774. The method of Chriſtianity in bringing Men to good Life is by renewing their Souls into it, p. 775. It deſigneth to change Nature, p. 775, 1031. Two oppoſite Families of Men and Religioniſts, thoſe that are born after the Fleſh and thoſe that are born of the Spirit, p. 250, 417. The Divine Family is originated by Regeneration, p. 390. The genuin kind of Virtue is that of the Regenerate, p. 414. Regeneration is a Recovery and Reſtauration, p. 508. S. *Paul*, *Rom.* 7. doth not ſpeak of the Regenerate Man, p. 707. The Tranſcendence of a Regenerate State, p. 820. Our Reformation was a dutiful Ἀνανέωσις, *renewing our ſelves*, p. 776.
Of *Reigning*, p. 194.
Religion conſider'd as an Inſtinct and as an Inſtitution, p. 340. It is the ſame with Sanctity, p. 358. Wherein Men ſhould place their Religion, p. 814. Religious Worſhip muſt be the Spiritual-religious, p. 419, 420.
Of *Reliques* and their Worſhip, p. 49, 132.
Remarks upon the Platonic T'Agathon, p. 230.
Of *Remphan* and *Rimmon*, p. 106.
Of abſolute *Reprobation*, p. 162, 189, 526.
Of *Reverence* for Churches and the *Religion* of Holy Places, p. 432, 433.
Of *Rewards* and Puniſhments in this and another Life, p. 664, 665, 666, 697, 698.
The *Righteous* deſcrib'd and confronted to the wicked, p. 274. The Law-religioniſts cannot define, who are the Righteous and the Wicked, p. 699. Of Righteouſneſs of Life and Practice, p. 647, 648, 651. Of Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs (the Righteouſneſs of the Kingdom of God) p. 415. Of terrene, carnal and mundane Righteouſneſs, and a ſhadow of Righteouſneſs, p. 413, 688, 812. Of the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, p. 415, 829. In Chriſtianity is the perfect rule of Righteouſneſs, p. 810.
Righteouſneſs is Honour, p. 694. Of Righteouſneſs as it is the ſame with Salvation, p. 695. Of the State of Righteouſneſs (the Righteouſneſs of Juſtification) p. 694, 695, 701. Of a creative making Sinners the Righteous, p. 696. Of the Law-religioniſts way of attaining Righteouſneſs with God, p. 697.

The

The INDEX.

The New Settlement was made by Chriſt's *Reſurrection*, p. 720.

S.

Of the Patriarchs *Sabbatizing*, p. 730, 731.

Of the Divine Inſtitution of *Sacrifice*, p. 737, 738. Of Humane Sacrifices, p. 293, 326.

Of the Philoſophic methods for the *Salvation* of the Soul, p. 85, 90, 91, 93. There is but one way to Salvation, p. 787.

Of the *Samaritans*, p. 692.

Of the *Samothracian* Deities, p. 795, 796.

Of the *Saints* departed, *vid.* Church-Demonolatry.

The Notion of *Sanctity* or *Holineſs*, p. 375. 612. Of the Sanctity Imperial that God is, p. 378. Of the Sanctity *Vital*, p. 379. Of the Sanctity Imperial Perſonal, p. 380. His Sanctity Imperial-perſonal explain'd, p. 384, &c. Of Sanctity of *Purity* and Sanctity of *Dignity*, p. 382. God muſt be contemplated as within the comprehenſion of Sanctity Imperial, p. 390. Of *Sanctus Sanctorum*, p. 385. Of the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, p. 427.

The Chriſtian Religion is an Inſtitution of *Sanctification* as well as of Sanctity, p. 786. The Holy Spirit may be called our Sanctifier, p. 543. Of the Science of Sanctity and the Tranſcendence thereof, p. 357, 358.

Of *Satan* and his Kingdom, p. 215, 285. How many ways Mankind are ſubjected to his Kingdom, p. 286, 287, 289.

Of *Satisfactions* for Sin, p. 700, 702.

Of *Saturn*, p. 106, 108, 225. How honourary it is to be a Saviour, p. 891, 892. Whether Chriſt was a Servant to his Father, p. 841.

Of *Sehirim*, p. 28, 31, 125.

Of *Self-denial*, p. 822.

Of inordinate *Self-love*, p. 251, 273.

Of *Serpents* and their Worſhip, p. 291. Their remarkable Properties, p. 475. The Serpent conſider'd as that eminent Species of ſubtiliſt, p. 479, &c. Of the Serpent that tempted our firſt Parents, p. 479, 480. Of the Doom of the Serpent, p. 482. Of the Seed of the Serpent, p. 488. Of the fiery flying Serpent, p. 477, 481. Of the Seed that is in the Regenerate, p. 854.

Servitude defin'd and deſcrib'd, p. 191, 192, 418. Of Servitude to Sin, p. 250, 252, 419, 689, 707, 709. Of the Religion of our Servitude, p. 707. Of the Servile Religioniſts, p. 418, 419, 706, 707. Of Servile Fear, p. 419, 707, 710. The Pagans Seventh Day no Traduction from the Hebrews, p. 14, 15.

Of the *Sibylls*, p. 328.

Simplicius deſtroyeth the Platonic Triad, p. 272. Of the Simplicity of God, p. 364. Of the Pythagoric Silence, p. 77. By Silence T'Agathon muſt be worſhipped, p. 235. This the Jews applaud, p. 362. Of the *Valentinians Sige*, p. 145.

Sin the greateſt Evil, p. 642. God's Children will not Sin upon any terms, p. 725, 821. Of one that thought there was no ſuch thing as Sin, p. 177. The whole of Virtue and Religion is not to Sin, p. 812. The Servant of the Lord a Title of Honour, p. 589.

Of the *Sincere*, p. 275. Of the Societive Diſpoſition and Practice, p. 164, 271, 652, 661.

Of the *Sophiſts* and Vitaliſts, p. 608.

Of what worth and weight the *Soul* is of, p. 509. The Souls of Men are in a lapſed Condition, p. 787. They were not created without Grace, nor out of the State of Grace, p. 186, 502, 508. Of the Souls Liberation and Reduction, p. 91, 92. The Univerſe of Minds and Souls produc'd in the original Creation, p. 437. Their origin whence deriv'd, p. 505. A living Soul what, p. 459. The univerſal mundane Soul a Fundamental in Paganiſm, p. 147. This the Supreme Deity of the Pagans Religion and Laws, p. 148, 149. Chriſtian Writers Symbolize with the Pagan touching the mundane Soul. p. 150, 151, 356. There are not two Souls of the World, p. 134, 154. Of the Science of the Soul of Chriſt, p. 941.

Of *Symbolical* Deities, p. 119. Of the Symbolical Idolatry of Chriſtendom, p. 125, 126, 130. 131.

A Prayer to the Sun, p. 93. The Platoniſts pray'd peculiarly to the Sun, p. 98. Of Sun-leſs Day-light, p. 499, 500. The Hegemonicon of the World was ſuppos'd to be in the Sun, p. 161. Of the Sun as a Magical Deity, p. 97, 133. Of what eminency his Deity was, p. 108, 110, 135.

The *Scripture* is of kind the Holy-popular Book (the Book of the Church or Holy People) as being the Book of Religion, of the Chriſtian Religion, the Book of the Law, and the Book of Life, accommodate to the Univerſality of God's People, p. 595, 604, 607, 609, 622, 624. Agreeably whereto the Terms of it ought to be underſtood, p. 621, 622. Which inferreth, that the genuin Trinitarians muſt not be the Scholaſtic, but the Holy Popular Trinitarians, p. 796, 797.

Of *Sheſhack*, p. 106. Of the Egyptian *Sphinges*, p. 77.

The Holy *Spirit* is of difficult Contemplation, p. 527. Of the various ſignification of *Spirit* and of the Spirit of God, p. 527, 531. How far the Holy Spirit is the *Schecinah*, p. 534, 537. A definitive Notion of the Holy Spirit, p. 535, 563. The Holy Spirit is confounded with the Spirit of the World, p. 151, 536. Of the Holy Spirit's Perſonality, p. 539. Of his Perſonating, p. 538, 539. The Holy Spirit is the Supereminent Good to us, p. 545. He is no Political kind of Perſon, p. 546. Is an unoriginated Eſſentiality of God Imperial, 555, 562. Of the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, p. 567, 568. Of multifarious extravagant Deifyings of the Holy Spirit, p. 569. He is not *Zeus Pater*, p. 580, 581. He is not the Imperial Eſtate of a Religion or God-ſervice, p. 588. Of the Religious Worſhip that is and is not competible to the Holy Ghoſt, p. 583, 586, 594. Of the Seat of the Holy Spirit, p. 577. Our Saviour is called *that Spirit*, p. 576.

Of the *Stoicks* Polytheiſm, p. 160, 161. Of their Inſtitution of Virtue, p. 163.

Of *Subſiſtence* and a *Suppoſitum*, p. 928.

Of the Philoſophic Pagans *Swearing*, p. 178. Of *ſtanding upon Swords*, p. 28. Of the Flaming Sword at the *Eaſt* of *Eden*, p. 471.

T.

Of *Tartak*, p. 107. Of *Tartarus*, p. 217.

Of *Teleſms* and *Teraphim*, p. 99, 316. Of *Teletæ*, p. 85.

A *Temple* defin'd, p. 424. Of the Throne of God, p. 427. No mundane Temple in Chriſtianity, p. 424. Temples may be without Images, p. 428. What the Chriſtian Apologiſts meant by denying, that they had any Temples or Altars, p. 428. Mundane Temple-religion is the Soul of Popery, p. 427, 428. The Church is a Temple, p. 567. S. *Auſtin* miſtaketh in his Inference from thence, p. 588.

Τεταγμένος, p. 717. Of a *Teſtament*, p. 761, 763. The Old Teſtament of a different Nature from the New, p. 749, 750. The Old Teſtament enormouſly miſinterpreted, p. 968.

Of *Tutelar* Spirits or Patron-Ghoſts, p. 33, 37.

Of *Types* in Paradiſe and the Moſaic Creation, p. 451, 501. Types look backward and forward, p. 510. Various ſorts of Types in the Moſaic Inſtitution, p. 754, 755, &c.

Of the Platonic *Theamatiſts*, p. 78.

Of Theiſm of Religion and Condition, p. 217, 218.

Of the Firſt Theory in Theology, p. 1. Of the genuin Theology, p. 358, 359. Of the Scholaſtic Theology touching the Godhead and certain Propoſitions of that Theology, p. 361, 366. A Character of this Theology, p. 634, 797. The Notions of it are Unpopular and Unholy; for all Holy Things are the Popular, p. 613. It diſtorteth the Scriptures from a Popular-religious to a School-philoſophic Senſe, p. 622, 634, 881, 974. It ſpoileth the due Intelligibleneſs of the Chriſtian Religion, p. 803, 805, 807. No Scholaſtic Learning is in the Holy Scriptures, p. 615, 619, 620.

Of the Pagans *Theurgy*, p. 80. 81. Of the Pontificians Theurgy, p. 130.

Of the *Tranſmigration* of Souls, p. 19, 88.

Of *Tranſubſtantiation*, p. 806.

Of the *Tree* of Knowledge of Good and Evil, p. 469.

Of the *Triad Zoroaſtrian, Platonic, Egyptian*, p. 18, 83, 133, 134.

The Chriſtian Theology is the Science of the Chriſtian *Trinity*, p. 805. Which therefore is a Popular-religious Myſtery, not a myſterious Riddle of School-philoſophy, as the Scholaſtic Trinity is, p. 797, 860, 888, 922, 948, 1037, (907.) So our Idea of the Trinity is as intelligible as the Chriſtian Faith, p. 1037. Is of Kind and Quality Chriſtian, agreeable to the New Teſtament and the Underſtanding of Holy People, p. 1037, 1062. Is agreeable to the Nature of Things and the certain Maxims of Humane Sciences, p. 1063, 1064. It claſheth not with the Scriptural Unity of God, but combineth the main Article of Judaiſm with the main Article of Chriſtianity, p. 1039. It is no more than *God Imperial* or God as an Imperial Eſtate in his new Kingdom, p. 1047, 1048. It is a Golden Mean between two Extremes, p. 1060. It ſubſerveth the Intereſts of Chriſtianity, p. 1065. Our Idea of the Trinity ſummarily repreſented, p. 865, 867, 1036, 1037. The Trinity is not notic'd in the Old Teſtament, nor by natural Light, p. 948, 951.

Of the great Excellency of *Truth*, p. 802, 808. Of Eternal Truths, p. 655 Of the Truth of God which the Pagans chang'd, p. 118.

U.

Of *Vago*-Theiſts, p. 392. Againſt *Vain*-Glory, p. 262.

The Incorporeal Subſtance is the *Vital*, p. 528. The Chriſtian Religion is *The Vital*, and Regenerate Chriſtians are the Holy Vitaliſts (the Holy Vital Religioniſts) p. 417, 541, 542, 607, 608.

Some ſort of *Virtue* and Religion is in Unregenerate Mankind, p. 269, 684.

The Chriſtians *Virtue* is Divine, p. 816. The difference between the Heathen Virtue and the Chriſtian, p. 412, 413, 688, 689, 826, 829, 830. How our Saviour's Inſtitution of Virtue is higher than that of the Moſaic Law, p. 830, 831. The genuin kind of Virtue and Piety deſcrib'd, p. 414, 419.

Virtue defin'd, p. 259, 412, 645. Of the Philoſophic-pagan Virtue, p. 260, 261, 816. Pride a grand Ingredient of it and their temper of Mind Gigantic, p. 260. Of the Platoniſts and *Ariſtotle*'s Divine Virtue, p. 265, 266. Whether all Chriſtian Virtues and Duties were taught by the Philoſophers, p. 267. Virtue Self-amiable, p. 639. It is the Rule and Meaſure of endeavouring the Publick Good, p. 640. It is not a meer Subſervient to pleaſure, nor is it to be deriv'd meerly from neceſſity of Publick Good, p. 640, 641. Of the Utility wherein Virtue conſiſteth, p. 646.

Ulyſſes's choice of a private Life, p. 34. Of the Uncleanneſs of Paganiſm and of the Philoſophic Pagans, p. 177, 256.

Of *Unexactneſs* in Holy Scripture, p. 624. Ungodlineſs the Adverſary to Chriſtianity, p. 814.

An *Unite* ſuppoſed to be the Principle, p. 71, 76.

Ipſum Unum, p. 71, 73, 134, 231.

Of the *Unity* and Undividedneſs that is in the Univerſe according to the Pagans, p. 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 132, 154, &c.

Of the Scriptural *Unity* of God, which is *The Mono-Theiſm* of God the Father, *viz*. That he is the One Perſon of the Almighty God beſides whom there is no other, p. 871, 883, 1040, 1043, 1049. No Trinity ought to be admitted, which more or leſs deſtroyeth the Scriptural Unity of God, p. 1043, 1044. Our Chriſtian Trinity is nothing more than *The One God in reſpect of what he is in the Unity and Comprehenſion of his Eſſence and Sovereignty*, p. 1046, 1048, 1053. Our Idea of the Trinity ſheweth ſuch an *Unity of Trinity*, as the Scholaſtic Theology cannot ſhew, p. 1060, 1061. The multitude of Pagan Deities reduc'd to one, p. 159.

Of the *Unknown* God at *Athens*, p. 225.

What *Upright* ſignifieth, p. 466.

W.

The Holy Angels called *The Watchers*, p. 39.

War the Father of all things according to *Heraclitus*, p. 86.

Wiſdom notic'd, p. 615, 616. Of being Wiſe in the main, p. 394. Of Wiſdom celebrated in the Book of *Proverbs*, p. 878.

Of forming a Rib into a *Woman*, p. 463.

The Origin of *Women* according to *Plato*, p. 85.

Womaniſh tenderneſs aſcrib'd to the Bleſſed Virgin, p. 102, 103.

The *Woman* and her Seed explain'd, p. 488, 489.

The matters of the Chriſtian Religion are *Wonderful*, p. 807.

What thoſe *Idle Words* are, of which we muſt give account, p. 629.

Works and the Works of the Law explain'd, p. 703.

Of the good *Works* of the Gentiles, p. 268, &c.

Of the Law of *Works*, p, 452, 770.

What the *World* ſignifieth, p. 823.

Of the Syſtem of the viſible World as repreſented in Scripture, p. 496. 617. Three Worlds according to the Hebrews, p. 439. Of the World as Sinful, p. 252. Of the Rudiments of the World, p. 430. How far Chriſtians renounce the World, p. 434, 435.

According to the Pagans the World is a God and a World of Gods, p. 71, 74. It is their Supreme God, yet according to a certain ſtating of things it is ſometimes called the Firſt, ſometimes the Second, and ſometimes the Third God, p. 155.

Of the Platoniſts Intelligible *World*, p. 74.

Of the Pagans Sovereign and Subordinate *Worſhip*, p. 7, 60, 69.

Of the *Worſhip* of T'Agathon, p. 235.

The main Body of the Duties of Religious Honour and Worſhip, p. 400, 586, 587. Of our Saviour's Rule of Religious Worſhip, p. 421, 422. Of our Sovereign Soul-honour and Worſhip, p. 402.

Of Duty to the *Whole*, p. 164, 230, 334.

Z.

Of the Ancient and Modern *Zabii*, p. 100. Their anomalous Rites, p. 331.

Of *Zaratus*, p. 14, 71, 135.

Of *Zeal* and Diligence, p. 822.

Of *Zeus*, p. 181, 228. *Zeus* the mundane Soul ſuppoſed by ſome to be the Son of God, by others the Holy Spirit, p. 82, 149, 150. The *Zeus* of *Aratus*, p. 181, 226. 227, 229.

Of *Zoroaſter* and his Antiquity, p. 83. His Theology, p. 83, 132. Of his Deity, p. 292, 294, 298, 305. He invented T'Agathon, p. 135. Of his *Kebla*, p. 431.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

The END.